Jacek Olesiejko

Sin and moral tradition in Old English poetry: A study in tropological poetics

Praca doktorska napisana
w Instytucie Filologii Angielskiej
Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza
pod kierunkiem prof. dr. hab. Liliany Sikorskiej

Poznań, 2011

OŚWIADCZENIE

Ja, niżej podpisany

.....

doktorant Wydziału Neofilologii
Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
o ś w i a d c z a m,
że przedkładaną pracę doktorską

pt. .....

napisałem samodzielnie.

Oznacza to, że przy pisaniu pracy, poza niezbędnymi konsultacjami, nie korzystałem z pomocy innych osób, a w szczególności nie zlecałem opracowania rozprawy lub jej istotnych części innym osobom, ani nie odpisywałem tej rozprawy lub jej istotnych części od innych osób.

Jednocześnie przyjmuję do wiadomości, że gdyby powyższe oświadczenie okazało się nieprawdziwe, decyzja o wydaniu mi dyplomu zostanie cofnięta.

....

(miejscowość, data) (czytelny podpis)

Table of contents

Preface

During the Anglo-Saxon period (c. 450-1066 A.D.), the endemic pagan Germanic culture underwent progressive Christianisation. However, the ethics of Germanic tribes, associated with secular bonds that linked the individual to his kith and kin and his lord, still formed the foundation of communal values. Even after the Anglo-Saxon world became part of Christendom – after Augustine of Canterbury's arrival in the kingdom of Kent in 597 A.D. Christian morality did not immediately prevail over what preceded it. Due to the nations' resistance to change, the earlier pagan moral values eventually needed to be utilised as a tool in the process of Christianisation. This led to a fusion of two conflicting cultures, Christian and Teutonic. As a result, the concept of sin, previously foreign to Germanic and pagan morality, became part of Anglo-Saxon Christianised morality through a process of cultural adaptation and appropriation, and consequently shaped the ideals of moral conduct in an Anglo-Saxon heroic society. This conflation of two cultures, their worldviews, moral outlooks and ethical sensibilities – pagan and Christian – can be observed in the Old English literature, in which sin becomes an important and recurrent theme.

In early medieval culture the idea of sin was progressively gaining a vital ideological force of its own, and so it began to appear in legal, historiographical and homiletic discourses, and, as such, shaped the morality of the Anglo-Saxon society at its most dramatic stage of development, that is during its conversion to a new religion and the subsequent adoption of new moral values. Old English writers borrowed religious themes from a range of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Latin texts. For instance, in *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* (finished in 731 A.D.), Venerable Bede conveys the ideological image of the English nation, the *Gentis Anglorum,* as an ideal of Christian

community. He tells the story of how three Germanic pagan nations, the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes, conquered the Britons in the fifth century A.D. Bede points out that the British nations failed to continue the Roman Christian tradition on the British Isles and fell into idolatry and, consequently, their plight and destruction was a deserved punishment from God[1]. The *Poenitentiale Theodori*, a text from the seventh century, indicates the acts which constitute a turning away from God and serves as a handbook of penance. Represented within it are various sins ranging from idolatry and failure to observe religious rituals to the invalid reception of sacraments (Frantzen 1983: 66).[2] At the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, in the early eleventh century, Wulfstan of York also used the idea of sin as a cause for national disaster in his *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. The pagan Vikings, who were invading England in the early eleventh century, are depicted in Wulfstan's sermon as an instrument of punishment for the sins of the English. Wulfstan suggests that all English people should engage in national penance to elicit God's forgiveness and be granted peace[3].

Old English poetry likewise incorporates Christian ideas of sins and their consequences. In the imagery of this poetry an individual's moral or sinful life is often described in terms of heroic conduct. For instance, in the epic poem *Beowulf* and a religious lay, *Daniel*, both inscribed in early eleventh-century manuscripts, the sin of pride appears in the context of royal power, where kings, Heremod in *Beowulf* and Nebu-

[1] "It was not long before the hordes of these peoples eagerly crowded into the island and the number of foreigners began to increase to such an extent that they became a source of terror to the natives who had called them in. Then suddenly they made a temporary treaty with the Picts whom they had already driven far away and began to turn their weapons against their allies. First they made them provide a greater quantity of food; then, seeking an occasion for a quarrel, they would break the treaty and lay waste every part of the island. Nor were they at all slow in carrying out their threats. To put it briefly, the fire kindled by the hands of the heathen executed the just vengeance of God on the nation for its crimes. It was not unlike that fire once kindled by the Chaldeans which consumed the walls and all the buildings of Jerusalem. So here in Britain the just Judge ordained that the fire of their brutal conquerors should ravage all the neighbouring cities and countryside from the east to the western sea, and burn on, with no one to hinder it, until it covered almost the whole face of the doomed island" (*Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* 1: 15 p. 27-28). The quotation comes from Bede. [1969] 1999. *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* (Edited and translated by Judith McClure and Roger Collins.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[2] Apart from these historiographic and homiletic examples, the concept of sin also informed the ideology of gender. In the early eighth century, Aldhelm wrote *Carmen de Verginitate* with a dedication to a sorority of nuns at Barking Abbey, in which he provided a list of eight personified vices that could threaten the spiritual purity of their community.

[3] "Forþam hit is on us eallum swutol on gesene þaet we ær þysan oftor bræcan þonne we bettan, ond þy þysse þeode fela onsæge" 'Therefore, it is evident and clear to all of us that we have formerly more often transgressed than sought atonement; hence much has befallen this nation' (Sermo Lupi ad Anglos p. 53). The quotation comes from the edition of Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* by Dorothy Whitelock (ed.). [1939] 1976. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.* Exeter: University of Exeter. Unless otherwise stated, all translations from Old English to modern English are mine in this dissertation.

chadnezzar in *Daniel*, are used as examples serving to admonish young Christian rulers if they do not follow the correct dictates of leadership. In a much shorter religious poem, *Vainglory*, pride is even more specifically shown to be a major vice in the heroic hall, and the poem becomes a critique of Old English heroic culture. Even more significantly, since most of Old English poetic verse was still heroic in nature, with the advent of Christianisation the theme of rebellion, which is one of the most often recurring, came to be depicted not just in secular terms of treason against the king, but also in terms of the Satanic pride and sin against God. Thus, for example, Satan in poems *Genesis A* and *Christ and Satan* is characterised as a rebellious retainer, who is exiled from the heavenly hall as punishment for his ambition to become an overlord over the universe. These few examples clearly indicate that Anglo-Saxon poetry was indeed becoming a conglomerate of a number of competing traditions and ideologies, and when analysed, it will reveal the complex process of religious transition and transformation of Anglo-Saxon communities.

The present dissertation proposes, therefore, that Old English poetic texts should be recognised for their essential role in both presenting Anglo-Saxon morality as well as shaping identities in the age of conversion from Germanic paganism to Christianity. The primary aim of this dissertation is then to show the relationship between pagan/heroic and Christian traditions, and whether or how well they interacted, on the basis of Old English poetry which bears witness to actual historical and socio-cultural changes in Anglo-Saxon England. Such research will resultantly offer an insight into the culture of the Anglo-Saxon period and ultimately broaden the study of morality of the times.

The development of Christian cultures and morality has been of interest to many scholars and in their quest to discover and analyse the roots of Western Christendom they turned to the early medieval period. One of the subjects of their study was the idea of sin and its introduction to early pagan societies. One of the most important of works on the history of the concept of sin and its organisation is Morton W. Bloomfield's *Seven deadly sins* (1952) as it traces the development of the tradition of seven cardinal sins in a plethora of texts and documents written in the period from late Antiquity to the High Middle Ages, including Old English prose. His was the first English work on the development of lists of the seven deadly sins and their place in medieval culture. Although many later scholars polemicise with Bloomfield's ideas, their own studies grow out of his seminal work. More recent critical studies on sin, particularly Richard

Newhauser's edited collections: *Sin: Essays on the Moral tradition in the Western Middle Ages* (2007) and *The seven deadly sins: From communities to individuals* (2007) continue Bloomfield's research, broadening his scope of research by analysing sins from diverse perspectives. Newhauser's works particularly focus on the participation of seven deadly sins in the study of social and political ethics of the medieval world. Neither Bloomfield nor Newhauser, however, explore Anglo-Saxon poetry to trace the conceptual history of sins. The latter author in his 2007 edited collection mentions constructions of the deadly sins in ecclesiastical environments from the context of early medieval and Anglo-Saxon monasticism yet English poetry of this period is omitted in the study. Therefore, the present dissertation, though based on the discoveries of a number of researchers dealing with the history of sin, takes it as its aim to fill this thematic void in critical practices.

The turning to Old English poetry for the presentation of Anglo-Saxon morality and its notion of sin is further inspired by Wayne A. Meeks' *Origins of Christian morality* (1993), in which he explores the morality of early Christian society in the first two centuries A.D. Meeks' thesis on which this dissertation draws is that "we cannot begin to understand that process of moral formation until we see that it is inextricable from the process by which distinctive communities were taking shape. Making moral means making communities" (1993: 5). More importantly, however, Meeks' work is of interest here since he specifically cites the process of looking "at *the texts*, [as] our only means of access to the communities we want to study" (1993: 5; my emphasis, JO). This critical approach serves as the explanation for treating Old English poetry as the most comprehensive documentation of the formation of moral practices in early medieval English society.

Apart from the earlier mentioned histories of Christian morality and the idea of sin, the interpretative practice utilised in the present thesis is influenced by John Hermann's *Allegories of war: Language and violence in Old English poetry* (1989). Hermann perceives that early medieval religious and allegorical texts are also simultaneously political in nature: "since allegory is already a form of textual and cultural politics, the move beyond identifying allegory to thinking through its psycho-social implications is a desideratum for Anglo-Saxon studies" (1989: 187). His statement that the Christian as well as the Germanic elements in Anglo-Saxon verse are politicised is pivotal, since it helps to explore the way in which older ideas validated ideologies in early

medieval England. He further observes that "the temple of Christian poetry is erected upon the ruins of the pagan system" (1989: 17). His analysis of poetic texts remains valuable today, particularly for this thesis, as it is the only one in Anglo-Saxon scholarship, which is concerned with vice and spiritual conflict, and approaches allegorical structures and religious ideology in Old English poetry, making them relevant to early English society as a whole.

The critical ideas described above serve as a starting point in exploring a topic that remains largely unstudied by Anglo-Saxon scholarship, namely the investigation of the ways in which morality and discourses on morality in this period, with particular reference to Christian morality and the concept of sin, are represented in poetry. Since sin and morality are broad subjects, there arises a need to narrow the scope of research. To achieve its aims the dissertation will focus on three particular themes of religious nature in selected Old English poems: the idea of the sin of pride; the persona of *Miles Christi*, the Soldier of Christ; as well as the existence of heroic motifs and themes in penitential literature of the Anglo-Saxon period. These three themes are most recurrent in Old English poetry and will be shown to be the most revealing when it comes to the process of formulating morality in early English society. They also pose as important points of convergence of the two competing cultures in Anglo-Saxon England, proving that both Christian Latinate and pagan Germanic ideology became part of the poetic discourse of this period. The focus on these three distinct issues then will facilitate the formation of a coherent picture of Anglo-Saxon morality and moral discourses.

Since the analysis of Anglo-Saxon morality entails an exploration of a particular society and its culture, both from a diachronic and synchronic perspective, as well as viewing any literary text as both product and producer of the culture in which it originates the dissertation shares critical tools with historicism and cultural studies. According to John Hartley's opinion the foundational core of cultural studies is "the need to bring to the life of the imagination ... some sort of critical contact with socio-economic and historical realities" (2003: 17); therefore, literary texts interpreted in this thesis will not only expose the interplay between text and culture but also, as Hartley suggests, will show how "discourses [in this case poetic discourse, JO] organise practices" (2003: 19). Consequently, examples of Old English poetry discussed in the subsequent chapters, comprising a range of genres from heroic epic and devotional poetry to hagiography and biblical lay, will most thoroughly illustrate the process of adoption of new morality and

reflect the cultural practices of early medieval England. As a result, Anglo-Saxon poetry will be explored in the light of early medieval Christian culture, history and ideology because, as Richard Johnson observes, in such analysis "'the text' is no longer studied for its own sake, nor even for the social effects it may be thought to produce, but rather for the subjective or cultural forms which it realises and makes available" (1996: 97). This way of reading texts, a discursive approach, "examines not only how language and representation produce meaning, but how the knowledge which a particular discourse produces connects with power, regulates conduct, makes up or constructs identities and subjectivities, and defines the way certain things are represented, thought about, practiced and studied" (Hall 1997: 6). Accordingly, apart from presenting the intermingling of heroic/pagan and Christian discourse in Anglo-Saxon poetry, the thesis aims to ask what kind of cultural and ideological work particular Old English poems might have performed in early medieval England.

The introduction explores the historical specificity of Anglo-Saxon morality and its textual representations by tracing the complex origins of the ideas on the sin of pride, the *Miles Christi* theme, as well as the practice of penance, all of which contributed to the formation of ideas on the nature of the ideal Christian community and specific rules of membership in the early Middle Ages. It will also ask preliminary questions concerning how the idea of sin was used in early medieval texts, of varied cultural and historical backgrounds, to construct notions of what constituted the individual and the larger Christian community in Anglo Saxon England. This will be achieved by the introduction of works by particular Latin Church Fathers who formulated the most basic ideas on the Christian concept of sin and whose writings constitute the basic sources for early medieval morality.

Chapter One deals with the subject of *superbia* as this sin posed a very real danger to the social and political structure of the Christianised Anglo-Saxon nations, and threatened the stability of societal hierarchies. The poems interpreted in this section, *Genesis B, Daniel,* and *Beowulf,* comment on the gravity of the sin of pride. They have no definite time of composition but Anglo-Saxon literary historians place them between the late ninth century and circa 1000 A.D (Fulk and Cain [2003]2005: 112; Farrell 1974: 2; Kiernan [1981] 1996: 3; Niles [1993] 2006: 143). Since the Latin denotation of the sin of pride in Anglo-Saxon poetry translates to *ofermod* and *oferhygd*, the subsequent analysis of *superbia* will be broadened to show that within poetic discourse the

sin has a very different scope of meaning. Old English poetry encodes the fear of *ofermod* as a threat to both the individual human soul and society at large, suggesting that *ofermod* and *oferhygd* were part of both religious and political discourse. As such in poetry *superbia,* and its Anglo-Saxon translations, not only point to the overthrow of reason over the emotional aspects of the human mind, resulting in the individual's damnation, but also simultaneously trigger the overthrow of kingdoms. Consequently, in Old English poetry, *ofermod* and *oferhygd* occur not only in the context of religious rules of conduct but also within the discourse of royal power and the necessary obedience to authority.

Resistance to sin, *superbia* included, and one's decision to persist in virtue is in religious discourse often presented metaphorically in terms of warfare or a military campaign. Chapter Two, therefore, focuses on the figure of *Miles Christi*, the Soldier of Christ, in three Anglo-Saxon poems. One is a hagiographic text, Cynewulf's *Juliana*; the next an apostolic legend, *Andreas*; and the last a biblical heroic lay, *Judith.* The question of dating these three poems is relevant to the interpretation explored in this study, as all of them were probably composed during the Viking invasions on Anglo-Saxon England in the ninth and tenth centuries (Connor 2001: 46; Godlove 2009: 139; Griffith 1997: 47) and because of this can be read in the context of warfare, spiritual and physical, and the ways in which this motif reflects both heroic and Christian ideas. The selected works poetically represent the struggle of saints and saintly figures in the battle against evil and vice; hence the subsequent analysis examines their warfare in a way that is simultaneously psychological, social and metaphysical. It further points to the subjects of idolatry and paganism and the poems' discourses on sin and vice, which seem to have an ideological imperative of sanctioning violence within warfare. Through the simplistic identification of the enemy with the devil the poems spiritualise physical warfare by depicting it as participating in the cosmic victory of Christ over Satan; therefore, it will be shown that, the ideological force behind these poems lies in the construction of the identity of a Christian woman or man as a *Miles Dei* at different levels of their social existence. Whether depicting a virgin bound by the vows of chastity (Juliana), a preacher and missionary who has set off for a spiritual war (Andreas), or a warrior defending the Christian state against a heathen army (Judith), central to the imagery and structure of these poems is the idea of figuration since the characters exist both as individuals and figures/types of Christ. In contrast, the heathen communities

depicted in the poems invert the idea of *comitatus;* they are represented as *comitatus* of Hell identified with Satan, *hostis antiquus.* Consequently, as it will be shown, the identity formed through membership to Christian community is that of the virtuous individual; whilst the identity within the pagan community is imagined as participation in Satanic *superbia.*

The conditioning of one's physical self as a member of Christian congregation or community was related to penitential practices, hence Chapter Three analyses three late Old English poems, *Christ III, Judgment Day II* and *Soul and Body* in the context of penance in Anglo-Saxon England. The form of penance, especially that conducted in private, with which these poems are concerned, relates to specifically to personal piety. The interpreted poems participate in the ideological process of shaping the conception of identity in early Christian society, and the subsequent analysis will prove that the image of the body is ideologically significant in such a process as it lays the foundations for the conception of identity as belonging to the body of Christ. *Judgment Day II*, dated to late tenth century (Greenfield and Calder 1986: 238) and *Soul and Body*, composed around the tenth century (Moffat 1990: 1-3), are especially concerned with the actions of the body in this life and represent the significance of the integrity of the body and the soul. These three Anglo-Saxon poems help to envision the integrity of body and soul (with the soul taking precedent as a site of ethical judgment) as determinants of salvation which are fundamental to one's participation in the body of Christ, or the congregation of the faith

The present dissertation then aims to prove that the process of Christianisation incorporated poetic discourse into various religious, social and political discussions. It is to show that ancient verse, which was an inheritance of the pagan continental past of the Anglo-Saxons, was found conducive to transmitting Christian values. The themes that were vital to early Christian morality – *superbia*, warfare against vices, and penitence – were adapted and reshaped in Old English poetry, as well as other homiletic and penitential literature, so that they could be easily accessible in a form familiar to its Anglo-Saxon audience. The 'life' of poetry in Anglo-Saxon culture will, therefore, be explored in order to understand the ideological work it performed within such changing society. Ultimately, the thesis will also show how the pagan remained alive in the Christian and the old lived on in the new.

Introduction: the moral tradition in the early Middle Ages

The Judeo-Christian concept of sin was foreign to the Germanic culture in which the Anglo-Saxon community found its ancestry; consequently the introduction of the idea imposed a new conception of what the existential condition of men and women in the world was. In Anglo-Saxon literature, sin was no longer merely a transgression of limits imposed by human laws which might be checked and corrected by human actions. When the sin came to define the universal and constant mode of existence and predicated on people's relation to God and His plan of salvation, the notion of transgression involved much more than just the disruption of tribal kinship bonds. As Wayne Meeks points out, "making morals means making communities" (1993: 5). This introductory chapter will explore the ways that the conceptions regarding sin and morality contributed to the formation of ideas on the nature of the ideal Christian community and its rules of membership in early Middle Ages with particular attention to the Anglo-Saxon period. First of all, notions of the sin of *superbia,* or excessive pride, informed the conception of hierarchy as a guarantee of order within that society. Secondly, the *Miles Christi* metaphor was used in representations of an individual as an ideal in terms of Christian morality. Thirdly, the development of private penance, as opposed to public penance , influenced the late Old English religious poetry (Frantzen 1983: 177).

The idea of *superbia* in the ethos of Christian community in the early patristic and Anglo-Saxon tradition

In Old English poetry, no other vice receives as much attention from vernacular writers as *superbia,* or the sin of pride. *Superbia* as a theme in Old English poetry has been

widely analysed in the light of patristic and exegetical commentaries. In Old English, *superbia* was rendered *ofermod* (Bosworth and Toller 1882 : 735), *oferhygd* (Bosworth and Toller 1882 : 735), and sometimes, *wlenco* (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 749). As a theme, it occurs in such narrative poems as *Genesis B, Daniel,* and *Beowulf.* In the Middle Ages, it was believed that instances of *superbia* posed a very real danger to the social and political structure and revealed the fragility of societal hierarchies. Morton Bloomfield points out that "pride ... is the sin of rebellion against God" and "in a disciplined and corporate society, which the Middle Ages held as an ideal, exaggerated individualism, rebellion against the will of God, was considered particularly heinous" (1967: 75). In the Christian community, pride was deemed as detrimental both to both the secular state and religious communities; not only did it endanger the spiritual health of their members, but also the well-being of the whole community. The fear of *superbia*, encoded in a number of Old English poems, fosters a system of values that counteracts this menacing vice. What Old English poetry, especially heroic poetry, shares with patristic thought is that pride threatens the social structure, whose integrity depends on loyalty and obedience. The ideology of *ofermod* has its roots both in the Christian tradition as well as in the Germanic institution of *comitatus*. Although the Old English concept originates in the Germanic languages, it was found perfectly acceptable to translate the Latin term *superbia* to transmit the ideology of this concept in to Old English poetry.

In early Christian society morality was a fundamental issue when it came to the formation of the communal and individual identities of its members. In Anglo-Saxon England, the heroic ideals underscored the conception of what values should form a coherent community. This is in spite of the fact that in the continental past, the Anglo-Saxon model of society was depicted as a *comitatus*, the male bonds between a lord and his retainers owing loyalty to their superior (O'Keeffe 1991: 107). The central element to this hierarchy was loyalty and this did not change during the period of religious conversion. As the new Christian communities appeared those institutions that had been part and parcel of Germanic political reality remained although often hidden under the guise of other names. The central religious community in the early Medieval period, in mainland Europe and in England, was monastic with monks offering obedience to their abbot. The military classes in Anglo-Saxon England followed their heroic ideals and these values were often different from those of the religious communities. However, the political reality within which they lived was restructured by the new system of belief, or

rather their political beliefs adapted to the new reality so as to receive more sanctions and prerogatives for exercising power (Luscombe 1988: 166-167). Thus, the institution of kingship from this period is modelled on Christ and the expected allegiance from the faithful and so royal power becomes analogous to ecclesiastical power to provide the community with a new moral order to make it a Christian one (Luscombe 1988: 167). As Luscombe points out, when he analyses the Carolingian model of kingship of the ninth century, the king becomes a *typus Christi* (1988: 167). Here the Christian king contrasts from the Germanic warlord in that royal power in Christian ideology embraces the ethos of humility whereas the heroic tradition does not. As a consequence not only must the subjects be loyal and obedient and avoid *superbia,* as a vice that leads to rebellion and confusion, but also the king must keep himself under constant surveillance. This is why the sin of *superbia* was so vital in the religious and political discourses of the early middle ages; this also explains why *superbia,* or Old English *ofermod,* is the theme of such poems like *Daniel* and *Beowulf,* which are discussed in Chapter One, both poems are different and independent from one another and yet so similar in terms of their subject matter because these texts were engaged in the same political milieu.

The vice of *superbia,* not excluding other vices, was a perennial theme in early Middle Ages in many different sorts of writing. Those texts which are most relevant to the discussion of *superbia* in Old English poems deal with the issue of the formation and maintaining of community. It is no accident that the most important ideas concerning sin come from a number of texts which specifically deal with the formation of communities, and especially religious. No other communities in those times were as concerned with rules as these early religious ones; the *Rules* of St Benedict or Chrodegang being only the best-known examples. Every Christian community in the early Middle Ages is, to a greater or lesser extent, modelled upon the religious, or monastic, community.

The early medieval ideas on sin lay at the foundation of the monastic movement far away from Anglo-Saxon England both in time and space. In the writings of Evagrius of Pontus (c.345-399) and John Cassian (c. 360 to 430), two Desert Fathers[4] and "the most important harmatiological theorists to emerge from ... [the] monastic movement"

[4] Evagrius of Pontus was an Egyptian monk, who lived in the East c.345-399. John Cassian was Evagrius' student. He lived from c. 360 to 430. His works were well known in the early Middle Ages, and also in Anglo-Saxon England. As Morton W. Bloomfield observes, Alcuin paraphrases and quotes Cassian frequently in his *Liber de Virtutibus et vitiis ad Widonem comitem* (1967: 80).

(Newhauser 2000: 47), sin receives a particular emphasis. The first Christian attempts at the classfification of sins began in Egypt and these two men were the first to contribute to the development of the concept of seven deadly sins (Bloomfield 1967: xiv). As Morton Bloomfiefd observes, Evagrius of Pontus was the first Christian writer "to employs the scheme of cardinal sins" (1967: 45). John Cassian follows Evagrius's classification of thought in his religious writings, in which he describes the eight struggles that a monk has to undertake on his way to spiritual perfection. His spiritual writings were essential to the development of Monasticism in continental Europe as well as in the British Isles[5]. One text in particular, Cassian's *The Twelve Books of Cassian on the Institute of the Coenobia, and the Remedies for the Eight Principal Faults*, circulated in the Early Medieval period as the basic model for monastic life across Europe as well as Irish and English monasticism, and took its major inspirations from the East.

Since John Cassian borrows most of his ideas on the vices from Evagrius's texts, it will be convenient to discuss their ideas in conjunction. The so-called Cassianic order of vices is as follows: (1) gluttony; (2) fornication; (3) avarice; (4) anger; (5) sadness; (6) sloth; (7) vainglory; (8) pride (Bloomfield 1952: 59). Both Evagrius and Cassian agree that vainglory and pride are especially dangerous to the monk, who is about to attain perfection. Through-out all his writings Evagrius distinguishes between vainglory and pride, although both seem to mean the same thing to the modern mind. Whilst vainglory is connected with "the intention of publishing his struggles and hunting after the esteem that comes from people", pride begins only when its demon "induces the soul to refuse to acknowledge God as its helper and think that it is itself the cause of its good actions, and to take a haughty view of its brothers as being unintelligent because they do not all hold the same opinion of it" (*Practicos* 7:13-14)[6]. The way to overcome the demon of pride, as it is said in *Eulogios*, is to remain silent about one's ascetic achievement, as vainglory brings about pride, and attribute it to God's grace (*Eulogios* 15)[7].

[5] As Morton W. Bloomfield points out, "Cassian's work had great influence in Gaul, whence it spread to the Celtic Church, which established in the British Isles a persistent tradition of an eightfold sheme of sins" (1952: 71).

[6] Henceforward indicated as *Practicos* followed by the number of the chapter and verse. All quotations from *Practicos* come from The quotation come from Evagrius of Pontus. 2003. *The Greek Ascetic Corpus*. (Translated by Robert E. Sinkewicz.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[7] Henceforward indicated as *Eulogos* followed by the number of the chapter and verse. All quotations from *Eulogos* come from The quotation come from Evagrius of Pontus. 2003. *The Greek Ascetic Corpus*. (Translated by Robert E. Sinkewicz.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cassian maintains the Evagrian distinction between vainglory, the seventh struggle, and pride, the eighth and final struggle against the demons. It was there where the idea of seven deadly sins had taken its roots (Bloomfield 1952: 1). Like Evagrius, John Cassian places it as the last in order, although it is first in origin. However, he develops further ideas concerning *superbia*, or excessive pride, as he draws a distinction between two kinds of pride: one that attacks those who have achieved perfection in their careers as monks and is spiritual in nature and one which aims specifically at novices and is of the flesh. The first one is directed at God, the other at other human beings. John Cassian concentrates on analysing the spiritual form of pride. Of all virtues, pride is the most dangerous and detrimental to anchoretic endeavour; whereas vices tend to attack their corresponding virtue, for example, fornication as opposed to chastity, pride may annihilate all other virtues. Traditionally, John Cassian depicts Lucifer as the archetype of pride: "we see that that angel who, on account of his great splendour and beauty, was called Lucifer was cast out of heaven for no other vice than this one, and that, having been wounded by the dart of pride, he fell from the blessed and sublime post of the angels into hell" (*Institutes* 12:4)[8]. John Cassian says that Lucifer fell in spite of the highest virtue he possessed. The cause of Lucifer's Fall was his rejection of God's grace as the source of his virtue. Therefore, the anchorite must never think that he might achieve virtue on his own effort and must always remember to attribute his victories to Divine Providence. The human Fall, according to John, also stemmed from self-exaltation, "for in his belief that he could attain to the glory of the Godhead by his own free will and effort he lost even that which was his by the grace of the Creator" (*Institutes* 12:4). In *The Institutes*, Cassian distinguishes pride from other vices, because it has God as its adversary, while all other vices are usually directed at other human beings. John says of the vice of pride that "[t]his one ... of its very nature touches God, and therefore it is especially worthy of having God opposed to it" (*Institutes* 12:7). In *The Institutes*, John often pairs Satan, the example of pride, with Christ, the emblem of humility. John also emphasises that pride is the only vice, which can result from virtue, as the demon of pride "is accustomed to, rather, to strike only those who have over-come the aforementioned vices and who are already nearly situated at the summit of virtue" (*Institutes* 12:22).

[8] Henceforward indicated as *Institutes* followed by the number of the book and chapter. All quotations from *Practicos* come from The quotation come from Cassian, John. 2000. *The institutes.* (Translated by Boniface Ramsey, O.P.) New York: The Newman Press.

In the early Christian writings of the patristic period, there is a general agreement that *superbia* is a desire to question hierarchy, not only in the human, but also in the Divine dimension. *Superbia* often appears in the writings of St Augustine of Hippo. Augustine of Hippo gives a definition of pride in *Genesis against the Manichees:* "for what is it to be proud but to have abandoned the secret place of conscience and to want to seem be externally what one is not" (Augustine 1990: 99-100). In Augustine's *City of God*, superbia is one of the recurring issues.

> For 'pride is the start of every kind of sin' [Ecclus 10,13]. And what is pride except a longing for a perverse kind of exaltation? For it is perverse kind of exaltation to abandon the basis on which the mind should be firmly fixed, and to become, as it were based on oneself, and so remain (Augustine 2003: 571).

For Augustine Pride is a sign of self-love or self-pleasure and is in opposition to caritas, the love of God, which is the very foundation of the City of God[9]. The ordering principle of the City of God is obedience, whereas the driving force of the Babylon is the struggle for lust, the evil-ridden passion in terms of the pursuit of domination, in individual, social and political terms. Augustine is mindful of the juxtaposition of humility and pride and of the paradox that humility exalts and exaltation degrades human nature.

> That is why humility is highly prized in the City of God and especially enjoined on the City of God during the time of its pilgrimage in this world; and it receives particular emphasis in the character of Christ, the king of that City. We are also taught by the sacred Scriptures that the fault of exaltation, the contrary of humility, exercises supreme dominion in Christ's adversary, the Devil. This is assuredly the great difference that sunders the two cities of which we are speaking: the one is a community of devout men, the other a company of the irreligious, and each has its own angels attached to it. In one city love of God has been given first place, in the other, love of self". The devil would have convinced man, if the man had to begun to experience self-pleasure. "That is why he was delighted also with the statement, 'You will be like gods' [Gen 3,5] (Augustine 2003: 573).

Pride is also defined by Augustine as turning away from God and he interprets the city of Babylon as a type of the earthly, or non-spiritual, in the Old Testament. Augustine reinforces the association of Babylon with *superbia.* Simultaneously, Augustine forms

[9] "The earthly city is created by self-love reaching the contempt for God, the Heavenly City by the love of God carried as far as the contempt of self. In fact, the earthly city glorifies in itself, the Heavenly City glorifies in the Lord. Lust (domination) vs. love (obedience). Religion of the earthly city glorifies the creation, not the Creator" (Augustine 2003: 593).

the ethos of Christian community based on humility as an integrating force in a communal structure[10].

Another author for whom pride is a recurrent issue in his writings is Gregory the Great (540-604), who, very briefly, expounds on the concept of the seven deadly sins in *Moralia in Job,* his exposition on Job xxxix.25. He is the first writer to mention the concept of seven cardinal sins, separating *superbia* from the list, as it is the source from which those seven cardinal vices spring (Bloomfield 1952: 72). Like Evagrius and Cassian, Gregory the Great was a monk for most of his life before he became pope and monks were the work's primary audience. However, as Morton W. Bloomfield observes, "although this work was written for monks, it achieved such general popularity that it was chiefly responsible for broadening the application of the Sins so that they were no longer considered primarily monastic but became part of the general theological and devotional tradition" (1952: 72). In this work, Gregory is constantly attentive to pride and its dangers: "*Pride is the beginning of all sin.* But seven principal vices, as its first progeny, spring doubtless from this poisonous root, namely, vain glory, envy, anger, melancholy, avarice, gluttony, lust" (*Moralia* 31: 87).[11] Gregory adds that each sin is in possession of an army of its own[12]. Thus all the chief sins can corrupt the human

[10] Augustine uses the distinction of the Holy City of Jerusalem and the sinful city of Babylon as the metaphor for the general post-lasparian human existence. Augustine maintains that the distinction of the City of God and the earthly city is basically allegorical. The idea is, however, also a political one. Of course, the political institutions, or, to be more specific, the Roman Empire, of which Augustine writes in The City of God, cannot be equated with Babylon. R. A. Markus shows that Augustine created The City of God in the spirit of "disenchantment with the collective mirage of the Theodosian epoch" and of recognition that prophecy of Roman Empire being the foundation of the Christian Empire was a delusion (Markus 1988: 104). Augustine is viewed by Markus to undermine the identification of "Christian" with "Roman" and "by adopting an agnostic attitude to history Augustine emptied the idea of Rome of what had been its universally accepted religious significance" (Markus 1988: 105). Henry Chadwick propounds that Augustine entertains a far more optimistic vision of the political state, saying that "in historical time the two „cities" are mixed together with a common interest in justice and peace, and there is therefore a positive evaluation of the order and beneficent legal system of the Empire" (Chadwick 2004: 337). Chris Wickham puts forward a claim that the direct cause for Augustine to write his seminal work was the sack of Rome in 410 and claims that although it depicts the earthly city as "separate from earthly political forms... his book nonetheless presumes a considerable confidence in the imperial future" (Wickham 2010: 82).

[11] Henceforward indicated as *Moralia* followed by the number of the book and chapter. All quotations from *Moralia on the book of Job* come from The quotation comes from Gregory the Great. 1844-1850. *Morals on the book of Job.* (Edited and translated by John Henry Parker.) 3 vols. Oxford: J. G. F. And J. Rivington.

[12] "From vain glory there arises disobedience, boasting, hypocrisy, contentions, obstinacies, discords, and the presumptions of novelties. From envy there spring hatred, whispering, detraction, the exultation at the misfortunes of a neighbour, and affliction at his prosperity. From anger are produced strifes, swelling of mind, insults, clamour, indignation, blasphemies. From melancholy there arise malice, rancour, cowardice, despair, slothfulness in fullfilling the commandments, and a wandering of the mind on unlawful objects. From avarice there spring treachery, fraud, deceit, perjury, restlessness, violence, and hardness of

heart so as to give rise to other vices. Gregory uses a further division to the sevenfold system of vices. He conventionally divides them into two categories of spiritual and carnal vices. The spiritual vices are the first five in the list, whereas the carnal ones constitute the remaining two, lust and gluttony. Gregory further explains that each vice generates the next in the list[13].

The imagery that Gregory utilises is of a military nature. Pride is the general in charge of the comitatus of vices.

> For the tempting vices, which fight against us in invisible contest on behalf of the pride which reigns over them, some of them go first, like captains, other follow, after the manner of an army. For all faults do not occupy the heart with equal access. But while the greater and the few surprise a neglect mind, the smaller and the numberless pour themselves upon it in a whole body. For when pride, the queen of all sins, has fully possessed a conquered heart, she surrenders it immediately to seven principal sins, as if to some of her generals, to lay it waste. And the army of in truth follows these generals, because, doubtless, there spring up from them importunate hosts of sins (*Moralia* 31: 87).

Gregory consistently uses the established and conventional military representation of sins as an army laying siege to the human heart, which is subsequently conquered like a stronghold. In his *Moralia on the Book of Job,* Gregory presents *superbia* as falling into four categories.

> For there are four marks by which every kind of pride of the arrogant is pointed out, either when they think that they possess any good quality from themselves, or they believe that it is given them from above, yet that they have received it in consequence of their own merits, or unquestionably when they boast of possessing that which they have not, or when they despise others, and wish to appear the sole possessors of what they have (*Moralia* 23:12-13).

Gregory especially warns against the fourth type, the boast of the sole possession of anything, which is closest to Satan's *superbia*, because it is the imitation of "him who in despising the blessing of the society of Angels, and placing his seat in the north, and proudly desiring to be like the Most High, endeavoured by his evil longing to shoot up

---

heart against compassion. From gluttony are propagated foolish mirth, scurrility, uncleanness, babbling, dulness of sense in understanding. From lust are generated blindness of mind, inconsiderateness, inconstancy, precipitation, self-love, hatred of God, affection for this present world, but dread or despair of that which is to come" (*Moralia* 31: 88).

[13] Gregory also notices that the mind of the sinner has to work so as to subject all his virtues to his mind. Otherwise, virtues may generate pride (*Moralia* 31: 85). The Elect person takes pains not to "commit any evils and secondly, not to commit any good things in considerately" (*Moralia* 31: 85) and evil often stems from good works through the vice of negligence. "Arrogance rises from learning, cruelty from justice, carelessness from tenderness, anger from zeal, sloth from gentleness" (*Moralia* 31: 85).

to some singular pre-eminence" (*Moralia* 23:13). As such pride is seen as separating the individual from society.

As it will be shown in chapter 1, what the Old English poetic tradition shares with patristic thought is the anxiety that pride is a threat to unity not only of the individual soul, but to the entire community and its relationship to God. This theme was natural to both Christian and Germanic cultures, which, much as they were of distinct origins, valued obedience to authority as a principle virtue. Its importance is show in that pride is often referred to in Old English homilies. *Vercelli III* is a penitential homily written for the period of Lent, which was the traditional time for penance (Scragg 1992: 70). Its source is the *Capitula* of Theodulf of Orleans (Scragg 1992: 72). Here pride is described as "cwen eallra efla" 'the queen of all evils' and the chief cause for the Fall of the angels from heaven (*Vercelli III* p. 74)[14]. The most striking image of *superbia*, as far as homiletic works are concerned, is found in the fourth homily of the Vercelli Manuscript. The homily is eschatological and concerns the Judgment Day. In order to torment the souls in hell, "hæfð þæt dioful geworht bogan ond stræla. Se boga bið geworht of ofermettum, on tha stræla bioð swa manigra cynna swa swa mannes synna bioð" the devil constructed a bow and made arrows. The bow was made of pride and the arrows were as many as there are sins' (*Vercelli VI* p.102). Pride and the other sins form materials for the devil's instruments of injury and the homily says that the souls enduring eternal punishment in hell will suffer from the sins they have committed in their lifetime.

In Old English poetrypride also occurs where there is tension between an individual and a group and when the individual's pride affects the order within the community. However, a few excerpts from Old English poems will show that the representation of pride here is unique and different from the Latin idea of this particular sin. Pride as a bale in the heroic hall is a theme of a short Old English didactic poem *Vainglory*, which belongs to the codex called the Exeter Book. The poem develops the theme of pride while also giving a contrastingly clear opposing image of the heroic hall. *Vainglory* describes two contrasting types of people: the proud and the humble. It detracts from the ordinary heroic vision of the hall by its identification of pride ("oferhygd" l. 23)[15] as the major vice within

[14] Henceforth indicated as Vercelli followed by the number of the homily and page number. All quotations come from Scragg, Donald G. 1992. *The Vercelli homilies.* (The Early English Text Society.) Oxford: Oxford University Press. All translations from Old English into modern English are mine.

[15] Henceforth indicated as *Vainglory* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Krapp, George Phillip and Elliott (ed.). 1936. *The Exeter book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English into modern English are mine.

it. The typical warrior in the hall exudes pride and the many sins of which he is guilty are represented by the arrows of the devil being full of envy, a universal patristic conception of sin. Pride leads excessive boasting, which was actually an important aspect of heroic life. Boasting is identified with the sin of vainglory and leads to other sins like cheating ("wrencan" and "blencan" l. 38). Pride may also cause political disruption as it leads to disloyalty on the part of thanes. The hall is also accused of giving the warrior an opportunity to indulge in alcohol and consequently the cause of boasting is attributed to excessive drinking. The heroes enjoying the libations of the hall are described as "symbelwlonc":

> siteþ symbelwlonc, searwum læteð
> wine gewæged word ut faran,
> þræfte þringan þrymme gebyrmed,
> æfæstum onæled, oferhygda ful,
> niþum nearowrencum.
>
> They are sitting with feastly pride and allow, being overcome with wine, a torrent of words to go forth with evil intent. They throng for argument and swell with violence and hostility and are full of pride (*Vainglory* ll. 40-44).

The uncontrolled torrent of boasting and abuse that pours down from retainers' drunken mouths is in marked contrast to the voice of the speaker of the poem who exhorts the rejection of pride. In contrast to heroic idle speech, the song is delivered by a "witga" 'wiseman' (*Vainglory* l. 3) who is described as "gearowyrdig" 'ready with speech' (*Vainglory* l. 4). This corresponds to the "snottor ar" 'wise advice' and "wordhord" 'hoard of words' (*Vainglory* l. 3) from the beginning of the poem. The behaviour of the humble orator offers an alternative to the sinful life of the boastful thane in the poem. Pride in *Vainglory* is then specifically identified with Satan and his rebellion against God and hence Satan is configured as the prototype of a boastful thane.

Superbia is thus again seen as the sin of Satan. This is most particularly seen in *Genesis A* and *Christ and Satan.* (It also occurs in *Genesis B,* which is analysed in the second chapter.). In *Genesis A,* Satan's *superbia* is depicted as a rebellion against God. Satan is said to boast that he "wið drihtne dælan meahton" (*Genesis A* l. 26)[16] might share with his lord in "werodes thrymme" 'the unity of their army' (*Genesis A* l. 27). Satan and his followers obey, and in fact, need the rules of comitatus. What is more, he establishes "on norðdæle ham and heahsetl" 'his home and throne in the northern part of uni-

[16] Henceforth indicated as *Genesis A* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Krapp, George Phillip. 1931. *The Junius manuscript.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

verse' (*Genesis A* l. 33) 'his home and throne in the northern lands', suggests that he separates from the community of angels, who remain obedient to God. God's punishment results in the disintegration of Satan's comitatus so that the suffering in hell is rendered through the theme of exile. In the narrative of the fall, *oferhygd* 'pride' is the chief vice of the rebellious angels, and their expulsion from heaven involves humiliation and depravation that crushes Satanic pride and changes it to "sar" 'sorrow', an emotion , which in Old English poetry is part and parcel of the experience of exile. God "him mod getwæfde ond bælc forbigde" (*Genesis A* ll. 53-54). The "oferhidig cyn" 'proud kin' (*Genesis A* l. 66) is dispatched on "langne sið" 'a long journey' (*Genesis A* l. 68). *Christ and Satan* also gives an account of Satan's Fall in heroic terms. In the poem, Satan and his followers "hæfdan dryhtnes liht for oferhygdum ufan forleton, hæfdon hym to hyhte helle floras, beornende bealo" 'had forsaken the light of the Lord in heaven above and had as their joy the ground of hell and fiery woe' (*Christ and Satan* ll. 68-71). [17] The portrayal of Satan here is strikingly sympathetic and some elements of an exile lament, in the spirit of the Old English elegiac tradition, may be identified within it[18]. Satan is an exile thane deprived of his former glory and significance; he laments that "ic geþohte adrifan drihten of selde, weoroda waldend; sceal nu wræclastas settan sorhgcearig, siðas wide" 'I intended to drive the Lord away from his hall, the Ruler of people; I now shall follow the steps of exile and embark on sorrowful and manifold travels' (*Christ and Satan* ll. 186-188).

In Old English poetry, *ofermod* and *oferhygd* are sins that are invariably attributed to Satan. There is, however, one exception to this found in another important Old English poem in which *ofermod* occurs, namely, *The Battle of Maldon.* The poem depicts the battle which took place in 991, in which the earl Bryhtnoth and his army were defeated by Vikings. In the poem, Byrhtnoth, the East Saxon ealdorman, positions himself and his army in the estuary of Blackwater. Having refused to pay the tribute to the invaders, he has no other option but to face the challenge and engage in military conflict. The meeting of the two armies is made impossible by the river and the tide, and the Vikings ask Byrhtnoth to allow them passage across the bridge. The poet's comment on Byrhtnoth's

[17] Henceforth indicated as *Christ and Satan* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Krapp, George Phillip. 1931. *The Junius manuscript.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

[18] Recently, Rafał Borysławski analysed the problem of pride in *Christ and Satan* in his article "Between *oferhygd* and *wraeclastas:* Pride and exile in the speculative afterlife of *Christ and Satan* (2010).

decision is that "Ða se eorl ongan for his ofermode alyfan landes to fela laþere ðeode" 'then the earl began to give way to the hostile enemies because of his pride/excessive courage' (*Maldon* ll. 89-90)[19]. The hero is killed, some of his companions flee, whilst others remain at the battlefield in their suicidal commitment to Byrhtnoth and are slain one by one by the opposing army. Later critics have judged Byrhtnoth's *ofermod* in different ways; some argue *ofermod* is a Satanic *superbia*, as it is the only meaning of the word found across the entire corpus of Old English poetry, whereas others dismiss this reading and claim that *ofermod* may have more positive connotations of courage.[20]

Pride, then, is recurrent theme in Anglo-Saxon poetry However, the Old English *ofermod* stems from different values than the Latin Christian idea of *superbia*, as the above example from the Old English poetic corpus reveal. Religious texts, like *The Rule of St Benedict*, warn against *superbia*, because it poses a danger to the virtue of humility that binds the monastic community and imparts coherence to it. Indeed, *The Rule of Benedict* taught monks that humility is the most essential virtue in monastic life and that "the first step to humility is unhesitating obedience" (Benedict of Nursia 2008: 19). *The Rule* makes a contrast between self-exaltation and humility drawing upon the biblical story of Jacob's ladder on which angels were descending and ascending: "for we should surely interpret their descent and ascent as referring to the descent we make by self-

[19] Henceforth indicated as *The Battle of Maldon* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (ed.). 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon minor poems.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English into modern English are mine.

[20] Rosemary Woolf compares Satan of *Genesis B* with Byrhtnoth in terms of *ofermod* and finds Byrhthnoth's pride "neither evil nor unreasonable, but a splendid and generous gesture, though, from the point of view of practical strategy, misguided" (1953: 8)[20]. Blake dismisses the interpretation of *ofermod* as *superbia* and proposes that it means the same as *wlenco* in *Beowulf;* apart from its meaning 'pride', it also signifies 'high spirits' (1965: 339). Morton W. Bloomfield claims that while the word may indeed carry the notion of *superbia,* "it did not always mean pride" and that "it is possible that the word retains the ambiguity of its elements and of its German cognate *Übermut* – 'high spirits' or 'pride' – and that here it has something nearer the former meaning". He suggests that "Byrthnoth's action may be an example of 'ofer' 'mod', because the result is disastrous or because it is excessively lively, not because of the motive of its utterance" (1969: 547). Helmut Gneuss says that "the context in which *ofermod* appears in *The Battle of Maldon* makes it likely that the word is a term of criticism". But on the same page he states that "almost all our numerous instances of *ofermod* (noun or adjective) occur in religious contexts, whereas *The Battle of Maldon* is a Christian, but not a religious, poem; we cannot be certain of *ofermod* is an old native word which has borrowed one of its meanings for *superbia/superbus,* or if it is perhaps a loan-word formation in the West Germanic dialects" (1976: 130). Still, he concludes that "on the whole 'pride' with its various shades of meaning seems the best solution to a philological puzzle" (1976: 130)[20]. his conclusion is that the poet censures Byrhtnoth (1976: 131). For Edward B. Irving, his *ofermod* "bears some resemblance to Aristotelian hybris", but it is even more similar to "the tragedy peculiar to a heroic society, where the very assertion of heroic virtue may in itself be the cause of a tragic outcome" (1961: 462).

exaltation and the ascent by humility" (2008: 22). Augustine of Hippo also opposes humility to *superbia* (2003: 573).

The connection between humility and pride is often seen in Old English poetry, for example in *Vainglory*. However, *ofermod* is more often thematically juxtaposed to loyalty, as it is usually depicted as posing a danger to the allegiance between the lord and the thane. Subsequently, in Anglo-Saxon religious poetry, this relationship extends to heaven, as it often defines the spiritual bond between God and man and also man and woman. This can be seen to be because loyalty was the central heroic theme in Germanic poetry, as it was considered to be the important social value. It is the highest virtue in the comitatus, a term borrowed by critics of Anglo-Saxon poetry from Tacitus's *Germania* to describe the bond between the lord and his retainer in Old English poetry. Tacitus writes that "indeed it means a life-long infamy and shame to leave a battle alive when one's chief has fallen. To defend and protect him and to give him credit for one's own deeds of valour are the most solemn obligations of their oath of allegiance" (1999: 44-45)[21]. Criticism views the heroic code in Old English poems as a sentimental anachronism and a souvenir after Germanic pagan past in ideological conflict with the Christian literary tradition; "what has Ingeld to do with Christ?" (Fulk and Cain [2003] 2005: 193), a question asked by Alcuin, is a frequent quotation among the critics used to illustrate this conflict. However, the Anglo-Saxon Christianised culture had an important ideological interest in continuing the Christianised version of the heroic themes in poetry.

Historical sources from the Anglo-Saxon period make it evident that the heroic ideals from the pagan past did not expire with the advent of Christianity. On the contrary, heroic ethos was used even in religious writings as a way of constructing identity within the Christian community. Wulfstan disparages the English for their disloyalty to both God and state in his *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos,* which was written at the beginning of the eleventh century. This work outdates most of Old English poetry, but this only testifies to the continuance of heroic ideals, which were transmitted also in prose, as late as the eleventh century England. Wulfstan depicts Anglo-Saxon society as disintegrating from within and cites disloyalty to kinship and kingship as the greatest vice of the Anglo-Saxons.

[21] Tacitus wrote *Germania* in 98 AD and therefore using him as a reference when it comes to the Anglo-Saxon society may seem anachronistic, although it is a commonplace among Anglo-Saxonists.

> Forþam her syn on lande unqetrywþa micle for Gode and for worolde, and eac her syn on eared on mistlice wisan hlafordswican manege. And ealra mæst hlafordswice se bið on worolde þaet man his hlafordes saule beswice; and ful micel hlafordswice eac bith on worolde þæt man his hlaford of life forræde, oððon of lande lifiende drife; ond ægþer is geworden on þysan eared: Eadweard man forræde on syððan acwealde ond aefter þam forbærende, and Æ þelred man dræfde ut of his eared þæð. (*Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* p. 66)[22].

Although Wulfstan does not mention *superbia* in this sermon, the value that makes the society whole is loyalty both to kith and kin and to the sovereign power.

Another important idea found in the sermon is that sin is not just an individual affliction but affects the fate of the entire community. In his *Race and ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon literature* (2003), Stephen J. Harris demonstrates that in Wulfstan there is the conception of an Old Testament logic, where national sins may bring out about the end of the kingdom at the hands of foreign invaders who are sent as the instrument of God's justice (2003: 109).[23] The historical context for *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* is the invasion of the Vikings at the beginning of the eleventh century. Dorothy Whitelock argues for 1014 as the date of its composition; the year when king Athelred returned to England from his exile in Normandy, before he died two years later and the English throne was ascended by Cnut ([1939] 1976: 6)[24]. Apart from a preacher, Wulfstan was a statesman, an author of law-codes for two Anglo-Saxon kings, Athelred and Cnut[25]. The invasion, Wulfstan believes, was caused by the sins and evil deeds that the Anglo-Saxons commited as a nation. The end of the Sermon refers to Gildas *Historia Britonum.*

---

[22] All quotations from *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* come from Whitelock, Dorothy (ed.). [1939] 1976. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.* Exeter: University of Exeter. All translations from Old English into Modern English are mine.

[23] Stephen J. Harris states that since the Christian tradition does not define evil as an entity, but turning oneself from God, "the rise of evil, as it is described in *Sermo,* is not due to the encroachment of any substantial entity, as the Antichrist is sometimes portrayed, but to the increased propensity of individuals to turn their souls from God, and thereby to assent to the complete privation of good (the symbol of which is the Antichrist). Evil in England is expressed, at least as the *Sermo* describes it, as consistent defiance of the laws of God and man, as a privation of alliegance or loyalty to God and king. The Vikings are the symbols of that defiance of the law. (Literary characters posed as Englishmen who oppose Vikings, such as those of Maldon, therefore show their antithesis to privation through an overwhelming loyalty (2003: 216).

[24] Greenfield and Calder say that the Sermon cannot have been composed after Cnut's ascension on the throne; "the textual history of the sermon is ... one of excision, and the shorter [later] versions lack the references to the Danish attacks, since these would no longer be relevant after Cnut's accession to the thone" (1986: 90).

[25] He was aptly described as "an energetic public man imbued with a crusading spirit" (Greenfield and Calder 1986: 88).

> An þeodwita waes on Brytta tidum, Gildas hatte, se awrat be heora misdædum, hu hy mid heora synnum swa oferlice swyþe God gegræmedan þæt he let aet nyhstan Engla here heora eard gewinnan on Brytta dugede fordon mid eale. ... Soþ is þæt ic secge, wyrsan dæda we witan mid Englum þonne we mid Bryttan ahwar gehyrdan; ond þy us is þearf micel þæt we us beþencan ond wið God sylfne þingian georne.
>
> There was a learned man in the times of Britons, who was called Gildas. He wrote of their wrong-doing and how they earned God's anger with their sins to such an extent that He allowed the army of Angles to conquer their land and destroy the entire British nation. I tell the truth, we have heard about worse deeds committed by the English than among the Britons; and therefore there is a great need that we begin to reflect and intercede with God (*Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* p. 66).

One of the concepts that is central to the sermon and which appears throughout the text is *ungetrywwa* 'breach of allegiance" which seems to be the major vice against which Wulfstan inveighs (*Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* p. 55).

The sermon testifies that the heroic ideals of loyalty and allegiance were central to the later Anglo-Saxon political and homiletic discourse and suggests their powerful ideological work within the Old English poetic tradition. It seems that *superbia* in Old English poetry is also a theme that is ideologically significant for the Anglo-Saxon culture. Such poems as *Genesis B, Daniel* and *Beowulf,* encode a fear of *ofermod* as a powerful threat for the integrity of Christian community that results in disloyalty. *Superbia* is a special case in this context as in its complex psychological and sociological significance it is depicted as a violation of the heroic values, which extend from the earth to heaven.[26] In Anglo-Saxon poetic representations of *superbia*, the individual is but the image of the society[27]; the social integrity reflects the spiritual health of the individual and vice versa.

[26] Morton Bloomfield points to the tradition of relating particular sins to the human soul. He says that Alcuin borrowed this idea from Gregory of Nyssa and incorporated it into his *De anime ratione liber ad Eulaliam virginem.* "The human soul, he tells us [Alcuin], is, as the philosophers say, composed of three divisions, concupiscent, irascible and rational the first two of which are shared with the animals, only the last being purely human. From these the four virtues arise; but if they are corrupted, sins arise. Out of concupiscence come gluttony, lechery, and avarice; out of irascibility, sadness ad accidie arise; and presumably, although it is not named, ire. Corrupted reason produces pride and vainglory" (1967: 80-81).

[27] Gregory of Nyssa (c333-394 AD) claimed in his writings that the profane knowledge could corrupt human mind so that the order of faculties in the human soul could change from reason-spirit-desire, which corresponds to the Platonic division of the soul into rational, animal and vegetative, to reason-desire-spirit (Corrigan 2009: 89). Gregory of Nyssa drew upon Plato's *Republic*, where Plato states that when desire takes up a position between reason and spirit, it destructs the natural harmony between reason and spirit (Corrigan 2009: 89). Plato associates such a confusion of elements that takes place in the soul with oligarchic, democratic, and tyrannical states, where it becomes the dominant force (Rep 8, 553c-d). When Socrates discusses timocratic mode of government in a dialogue with Adeimantus in the eighth book of the *Republic*, he compares five types of governments to corresponding human psychological types. Each type of government causes a displacement in the human mind, whereby the acquisitive parts of it are in charge of the higher faculties. At the end of the book, Socrates, who represents Plato's

Miles Christi as the moral ideal for individual's life

In medieval writings, temptation to sin is often depicted as an attack on the soul. In hagiography and other religious genres, resistance to sin and a decision to persist in virtue is often visualised metaphorically in terms of warfare or a military campaign. The idea of *Mites Christi* (or *Miles Dei*) can be traced back to Paul of Tarsus's Letter to the Ephesians, where he exhorts the readers of his letter in the following manner: "induite vos arma Dei" 'take on yourself the arms of God' (Eph 6.11)[28]. This description was an inspiration for the military imagery in the representations of spiritual life in much of Western religious literature. In *The Institutes,* John Cassian frequently draws upon the idea and describes the monk as an Athlete of Christ (*Institutes* 5:12; 5: 17). The monk lives "to take up the struggle against the eight principal vices, thanks to your prayers and strengthened by the Lord" (*Institutes* 5: 1). He compares the spiritual warfare of the anchorites to the Olympic Games (*Institutes* 5:3). The military metaphor was also employed by St Benedict of Nursia in his *Rule.* As for its Old English redaction, as Joyce Hill observes, "*Cempa* and *campian* regularly translate *miles* and *militare* and in both the Latin and the Old English texts, the same words are used for spiritual and secular states in order to sharpen the contrasts that are so carefully presented in balanced, alternating statements" (1981: 60).

As far as the Old English writings are concerned the homiletic tradition is rich in military metaphor and was the chief source from which the poets drew their inspiration. Various homiletic writings testify to the fact that the Anglo-Saxons were well-versed with the idea of *Miles Christi.* The fourth homily of the anonymous Vercelli collection has a figure of devil, who shoots from a bow, signifying *superbia*, the arrows of sins at Christians, all of which is an allegorical representation of temptation; "se boga byð gewyrht of ofermettum, ond tha stræla bioð swa manigra cynna swa swa mannes synna bioð" 'the bow is made of pride, and there are as many kinds of arrows as there are sins' (*Vercelli IV* p. 102). Similar representation is found in *Beowulf* when Hrothgar tells Beowulf the story of evil king Heremod. Aelfric uses the metaphor in his homily for *Dominica in Media Quadragesime.* He lists eight vices, which follow the Cassianic or-

---

voice, connects dictatorship to lust (Rep 8, 553c-d). The reference is to Plato. [1994] 1998. *Republic.* (Translated by Robin Waterfield.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[28] The quotation comes from *Biblia Sacra Vulgata.* 2007 [1969]. (Edited by Robert Weber and Roger Gryson.) (The fifth edition.) Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. All translation from Latin to modern English are mine.

der of sins[29] and states that "þisum heafodleahtrum we sceolon symle on urum ðeawum wiðcweðan and ðurh godes fultum mid gastlicum wæpnum ealle oferwinnan" 'we must always oppose these capital vices and with God's help and with spiritual weapons fight against them' and we can never arrive in Heaven after death "buton we hit eft gewinon mid gastlicum gecampe" 'unless we win it back in spiritual warfare' (*Catholic Homilies* p. 125). Wulfstan also describes the life of a Christian as spiritual warfare in the homily *Be Cristendom* ("On Christianity"). He mentions virtues, which are spiritual weapons against vices and "mid þysan mæganan we is sculon werian and ðurh Godes fultum deofol oferwinnan ond his unþeawan fæste wiðstandan" 'with these virtues we must fight and with God's help oppose the devil and strongly oppose his temptation' (*Be Cristendome* p. 203)[30].

[29] By far the most important homilist of the Anglo-Saxon period was Aelfric, who brought "new standards for the composition of vernacular homilies" and "the intellectual and doctrinal rigor that he attempted to bring to all his literary endeavours may thus be viewed as an expression of the spirit of Aethelwold's reform" (Fulk and Cain 2005: 77). The text in question is the homily for midlent Sunday ("Dominica in Media Quadragesima") found the second series of his *Catholic Homilies* composed when he was a monk at Cernel from 987 and first published between 990 and 995 (Fulk and Cain 2005: 78). The homily in question consists of two parts. The first part of the homily is concerned with mosaic law and expounds on the signification of the Ten Commandments. The subject of the second part is a figural reading of the story of the seven walls of Iericho in the Old Testament. Aelfric gives an allegorical exposition of the biblical story. The seven walls of Iericho stand for the present world. After circling the city for seven days, the priest destroys the seven walls with the sound of silver trumpets and all the pagan inhabitants of the city are killed by the Israelites led by Joshua. After they conquer the city, the Israelites destroy seven nations and take over the land. According to Aelfric, the Israelites's warfare against the eight nations (to the nations destroyed by Joshual's army, Aelfric adds the eighth, the Egyptians, who perished in the Red Sea) represents spiritual warfare against eight vices. The number of sins is again eight after Cassian, *eahta heafodleahtras,* and they are listed as follows: (1) *gyfernyss* 'gluttony', (2) *galnys* 'lust', (3) *gytsung* 'covetousness, avarice', (4) *weamet* 'wrath', (5) *unrotnys* 'dispair', (6) *asolcennys* or *æmelnys* 'sloth', (7) *ydel gylp* 'vain boasting' and finally (8) *modignyss* 'pride' [The quotation comes from Godden, Malcolm R (ed.). 1979. *Aelfric's Catholic homilies. The second series text.* (The Early English Text Society.) London: Oxford University Press.]. The list of Aelfric resembles that in Vercelli XX, apart from the fact that he mentions pride as the last one and that despair comes before sloth. There are also differences in vocabulary, as Vercelli XX has *forlyr* for lust and *yrre* for wrath. Aelfric gives a comprehensive overview of these sins, providing the definition and indicating other vices, which come from the eight chief-sins (*Catholic Homilies* p. 123-124)[29]. This homily offerst the most complex treatment of sin in Anglo-Saxon vernacular homiletic tradition.

[30] Wulfstan of York gives two lists of sins in his homilies. One of them corresponds to the Cassianic order "eahta leahtras" 'eight vices' (*Be Cristendome* l. 63) [Henceforward indicated as *Be Cristendome* followed a page number. All quotation come from Bethurum, Dorothy (ed.). [1957] 1998. *The Homilies of Wulfstan.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.]. Wulfstan groups the vices in pairs (*Be Cristendome* l. 63-65): (1) *gitsung* 'avarice' and *giternes* 'gluttony'; (2) *galnes* 'lechery' and *weamodnys* 'anger'; (3) *unrotnys* 'sadness' and *asolcennys* 'sloth'*;* (4) *gylpgeornys* 'vainglory' and *ofermodignys* 'pride'. He also contrasts these eight vices with weight *mægena* 'strengths, virtues' (*Be Cristendome* p. 203): (1) *rumheortnys* 'munificence' and *syfernys* 'moderation'; (2) *clænes* 'cleanness' and *modþwærnes* 'patience'; (3) *glædnes* 'gladness' and *anrædnes* 'concord'; (4) *sybgeornes* 'desire for peace'; *eadmodnes* 'humility'. There is another list of sins in a homily on the vision of the Prophet Isaiah. The order of vices is as follows: (1) *idel renco* 'vainglory'; (2) *gitsung* 'avarice'; (3) *oferfyll* 'gluttony'; (4) *swicdom* 'deceit'; (5) *unrihtwisness* 'unrighteousness'; (6) *andgytlest* 'foolishness'; (7) *heardheortness* 'hardiness of heart'; (8) *unlagu*

As for the Old English poets, the *Miles Christi* convention was not only well known, but it also perfectly suited the heroic diction of their poetry and fused naturally with already existing formulas that had been used to convey militaristic themes. It is true, of course, that many critics have found (and some still do) imagery of spiritual warfare strained in Old English diction[31]. On the contrary, however, the military mode of expression in religious poetic mode was central to the ideology of Anglo-Saxon culture. In later Old English verse, the idea of *Miles Christi* was used to suppress and replace the Germanic conception of the hero. The objective of chapter two will be to reveal how the literary concept of *Miles Christi* restructured the conceptions of individual and social life in Old English poetry. This idea was crucial to forming a new conception of the individual that would fit into the new Christian morality emerging in England in the period of the conversion. It also caused the transformation of the idea of the enemy in poetry, the consequences of which was twofold. First of all, the enemy came to represent vice, or was the embodiment of the devil. Secondly, the enemy was depicted in ironic and comic ways. Africanus and the devil in *Juliana,* the Jews and Mermedonians in *Andreas,* and Holofernes in *Judith* represent sin and inversion of all moral values that individuals were to follow in the new model Christian community. Additionally, they are often depicted as comic figures or ignoble characters. In heroic poems like *Beowulf* or *The Battle of Maldon,* the enemies never lose their dignity; the protagonist must fight with adversaries of either noble stock or supernatural manifestations larger than life in order to become a hero and a model in heroic society. The saint, the hero of Old English hagiographic poetry or biblical epic, are also portrayed ironically, as they prevail over the enemy owing to the strength given to him or her by God.

Even so, the physical aspect of spiritual violence in Old English religious verse is not without significance. In the Old English poem *Juliana,* the image of *Miles Christi* may well be a metaphor for spiritual conflict, but the poem is replete with physical vio-

---

'injustidce'; (9) *ofertruwa* 'overconfidence' (*Isaiah on the Punishment for Sin* p.216-218) [The quotation from Bethurum, Dorothy (ed.). [1957] 1998. *The Homilies of Wulfstan.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.]. This list differs in content and number (nine items) from both the Cassianic and Gregorian list and includes vices that are often found in penitentials and secular law. The contrast between *idel renco* and *ofertruwa* seems to be Cassianic, the former consisting of publishing one's own virtues, therefore identified with vainglory, the latter consisting of asserting the independence of one's achievement from God's grace, therefore associated with *superbia.*

[31] Still, many critics found the mediation of Christian themes through heroic diction incongruous in Old English poetry (or some Old English poems). Rosemary Woolf remarks that "the apostles, for instance, even though they are the apostles of the Apocryphal tradition, rather than of the New Testament, are ill at ease in their disguise of Germanic retainers, *Cristes thegnas*" (1953: 1).

lence directed at the female body; the conflict between Juliana and her kin is then not purely spiritual as it ends with her death. Although she earns the status of a saint and enters heaven after dying a martyr's death, the violence in the poem leads to dissolution of kinship relations. What is more, in both *Andreas* and *Judith, Miles Christi* appears in the context of physical battle. It seems that the idea of *Miles Christi* was significant for Anglo-Saxon culture in two ways. First of all, in a culture where moral life was conceived as psychological warfare against sin, *Miles Christi* was an essential model for a hero in literary representations. Secondly, it was also useful in political discourses and in the ideology of promoting and sustaining a holy war against pagans. These three poems, *Juliana, Andreas,* and *Judith* will be discussed in Chapter Two, which concentrates on the images of violence, warfare and their ideological import in Anglo-Saxon religious texts. The thesis of the second chapter is that literary representations of human conflicts in Old English poetic texts are modelled on hagiographic representations of spiritual warfare in order to find sanction in the exercise of power over the Other. If the human conflict involving a Christian individual or army against an enemy is depicted as participating in the struggle between Christ and Satan, this enemy is thereby identified with the devil. What sounds as an obvious connection is used to form the basic tenets of medieval thought that created identities in communities and also ideologies of war. Individual enemies, like Holofernes in *Judith,* are made into representations of vice of lust and pride. Anglo-Saxon England was surrounded by pagan communities until its late period. Danelaw was inhabited by Danish converts, but also by a population that still persisted in pagan practices. The conflict between *Miles Christi* and the pagan adversary in these poems mirrors the opposition of vice and virtue of the Psychomachian tradition. The literary conception of *Miles Christi* in Old English poetry has two sources. The first source comprises patristic psychological ideas on temptation and spiritual warfare. The second source is the conception of the devil, which transformed the representation of the enemy in Old English poetry.

In the context of early medieval morality depicted in patristic writings, the idea of individual's life was imagined to be a struggle against the flesh, its passions and also material values. Resistance to this was thought to be best realised in anchoretic and hermitic life. Evagrian and Cassanic thought, in the early Middle Ages, provided a vision of community organised as a spiritual warfare against vice. Although these two writers addressed primarily monastic communities, they also served as a model for all Christian communities. It will be shown that the ideas of monastic communities, along-

side other factors, took part in shaping the ethos of the warrior in Christian heroic lays like *Judith*. Much as secular communities of the Anglo-Saxon warrior aristocracy were far removed from values cultivated by anchorites and hermits, many Anglo-Saxon poems on heroic themes do feature elements of spiritual warfare. The physical war is depicted in terms of spiritual conflict. Although a poem like *Beowulf* and the hero's battles with monsters are not allegorical in themselves, the identification of Grendel with the kin of Cain, outlawed from the human community by the Creator, makes Beowulf participate in the universal conflict between good and evil[32]. Whilst the characters in the poem are pagan and their world is the Scandinavian reality in times long before conversion, good and evil are represented in the poem in Christian terms. In Old English religious heroic lays, the Christian ideology of saintly life and purity of heart did claim some influence, even in the heroic ethos, and the Christian literary representations of war, conquest and conversion of pagan nations find their model in hagiography and borrow values from anchoretic life.

The language and imagery within hagiography and other texts, which are related to monastic existence, often depicted the life of a monk in terms of warfare. In the writings of Evagrius of Pontus and John Cassian the life of a monk was imagined to consist of the struggle against eight demonic thoughts. The initial training of a monk helps to achieve *hesychia*, or stillness, which "refers the state of calm or tranquillity resulting from the avoidance of all external circumstances that might upset the internal balance and equanimity of the mind (Sinkewicz 2003: xxi-xxii). Sinkewicz notes that the idea of sinful thoughts that disturb the monk's mind was founded on Platonic and neo-Platonic psychology, which located the passions in the passionate parts of the soul, namely, the concupiscible and the irascible. Passions are aroused by the senses and "although the monk has to a large extent abstracted himself from the multiplicity of sensations in the secular world, he must still deal with the impressions left by the senses on his mind,

[3232] There were allegorical interpretations of *Beowulf* . For example Morton Bloomfield, the author of the seminal *Seven Deadly Sins,* interprets Unferth in *Beowulf* figurally in "*Beowulf* and Christian allegory: an interpretation of Unferth" (1949-1951). "It is my contestion that the author of *Beowulf* and consciously patterned the figure of Unferth after the personified abstractions currently used in the Christian Latin poetry with which he was familiar. I am not concerned with any particular indentification, but I do suggest that he did think of Unferth as *Discordia,* as his name indicates. Perhaps the most famous figure of that name which could have been known to him occurs in Prudentius' *Psychomachia* where *Discordia* (heresy) is the antagonist of *Concordia*. The *Beowulf*-poet may have used Unferth as *Discordia*, however, without especially modelling him on the Prudentian character. I do urge, however, that he was consciously using the allegorical method in shaping Unferth and that this method is a legacy of the Christian tradition brought to England after 597" (Bloomfield [1949-1951] 1963: 160). This reading is strained and rather unacceptable.

whether stored in the memory or actualised in the mental representations (*noemata*) of his thoughts" (Sinkewicz 2003: xxv). The struggle with demons and sinful thoughts, if successful, results in impassability and Evagrius distinguished between imperfect and perfect impassability of the soul:

> For Evagrius, impassability itself represents a progression of growth from the 'little (or imperfect) impassibility' to 'perfect impassibility'. The first stage involves a mastery of the passions of the inconcupscible part of the soul, principally gluttony and fornication. Progress through the second stage advances with the gradual control of the passions of the irascible part, but perfect impassibility remains goal that is not fully attainable in this life. The passions of the irascible part of the soul persist in the human person until death. Impassibility, is not, however, a purely negative concept, for it ultimately involves a restoration of these two parts of the soul to their proper nature: the concupiscible is turned towards desire for knowledge of God and the irascible develops an aversion to all evil and an utter hostility towards the demons" (2003: xxxi-xxxii).

Impassibility, as Kevin Corrigan defines it, "is a reconfiguration of being human. Instead of a body-soul material focus, we get a formal focus where the body-soul-mind trajectory is shaped along a higher self-dependent axis. Spiritual knowledge, of which prayer is the highest expression, involves a transformation of being from the human to the angelic" (Corrigan 2009: 58).

Although its reality is, first and foremost, psychological rather than material, the forces that imprint the sinful thought on the human mind were imagined to have palpable existence; sins came to human minds through the work of demons. As Corrigan points out, "the battle with *logismoi* is not so much against actual sins, as against the tendencies of thinking, imagination, or concepts as a means of temptation" (Corrigan 2009: 74). As Sinkewicz further observes, "behind each thought there stood a demon at work" (Sinkewicz 2003: xxv). He points out that "although at times it seems almost as if Evagrius has reduced the demonic reality to a mere psychological manifestation, at other times he makes it abundantly clear that he perceives demons as individual, rational beings, that seek with savage ferocity to pervert the human mind from its natural activity, the contemplation of God" (Sinkewicz 2003: xxv). Evagrius of Pontus formulates an idea of eight *logismoi*, that is, thoughts, which threaten monks in their spiritual struggles. Corrigan points out that "the battle with *logismoi* is not so much about the actual sins, as against the tendencies of thinking, imagination, or concepts as means of temptation" (Corrigan 2009: 73). These thoughts are suggested by demons and for Evagrius demons are "a kind of real psychic after-image, related to the mind's cramped condition, yet not simply identical with the mind's experience" (Corrigan 2009: 74).

The monastic movement and the idea of life of the monk as a spiritual warfare exerted a vast influence on literary representations of Psychomachia. This is best exemplified by Prudentius's epic poem *Psychomachia* from the early fifth century, which depicts an allegorical war between the vices and virtues. Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, c. 640-709, adopted the Cassianic order of eight thoughts in the poetic part of his *opus geminatum* entitled *Carmen de Verginitate*[33]. The text is addressed to a community of nuns at Barking Abbey. The passage gives a list of eight vices, each imagined as an army attacking a chaste soul, but it is also influenced by the imagery of Prudentius's *Psychomachia* (McGowan [2001] 2008: 21-22). The order of vices is similar to that found in Evagrius and Cassian, starting with gluttony and ending with pride. Aldhelm describes the preparation of an army of virtues to a combat with vices

> Behold, the troops gather together in companies for battle – the companions of Justice and the holy battle-line of the Virtues; opposite them stands the malignant camp of Vices who cast dense showers of darts of evil (deeds), just as the rival throng of two hosts bearing standards prepares to fight, while the trumpet sounds its fanfare and the horns of the legions rouse a War with their song (*Carmen de Verginitate* p.157)[34].

The monastic life of virgin is similarly depicted as warfare of virtues against vices in eight steps. The first step is to fight gluttony, identified with the Egyptian army of Pharaoh drowning in the Red Sea and the Original Sin of Adam. Gluttony is easily countered with fasting. Drunkenness is a symptom of gluttony and led Lot to commit debauchery with his daughters. Here Aldhelm gives a tropological reading of the Book *Judith*, whereby Holofernes stands for lust and Judith for chastity. The second vice that threatens the monastic virtue is fornication.

---

[33] There is a number of vernacular Anglo-Saxon sources, which refer to either Cassianic or Gregorian traditions. Whenever a list of sins is mentioned in the homilies and in other Anglo-Saxon writings, the number of eight usually occurs, as opposed to the later medieval (and modern) concept of seven deadly sins. Two homilies from the Vercelli Book provide us with the presentation of the eight capital sins. These capitals sins may appear in a slightly different order, but the content of each list is the same. In each homily, the concept of *headleahtor* is used as a designate of the capital sin. The word for 'sin' is usually either *leahtor* or *synn*, including various spelling variations. What is more, the list of the capital sins is connected with themes and topics taken up by the particular homiletic text. Both homilies share the same sources, as the lines35-56 are a translation of a homily from St Pere de Chartres collection, Cambridge, Pembroke College 25. Vercelli XX's section on the vices and virtues is a summary of Alcuin's *De Virtutibus et Vitiis*. According to D. G. Scragg, both pieces seem to have been very popular in Anglo-Saxon England on the evidence of their wide manuscript distribution (1992: 70).

[34] Henceforth indicated as *Carmen de Verginitate* followed by chapter and subchapter numbers. All quotations from Aldhelm's *On Virginity* come from Aldhelm. 1985. *Aldhelm. The poetic works.* (Tranlated by Michale Lapidge and James L. Rosier.) Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

The third vice is avarice and is exemplified by the three villains: Judas, Ahab and Achar. Anger, the forth Vice, brings about discord and breaks a community from within. The remedy for this is patience, who "silences the loud cry lest the greatest of furies be able to conquer minds – even though this fury, stained with Gorgon blood, hisses and gnashes, biting with her poisoned snakes, as this daughter of black Night raises her head from the infernal regions and so rising out of murky Styx into the world Allecto incites stupid minds to sin" (*Carmen de Verginitate*: 161). The next assault is at despair's hands and exposes the hearts of virgins to malice. Aldhelm mingles the image of *Miles Christi* with the idea of *Christus Medicus.*

> But with his shield the Soldier of Christ quickly checks the spears of Despair, and likewise every other kind of blade which is wont to prick the mind; lest perchance they weaken, the joys of troubled heart and a spirit which tempers the heart with joyful movement heals this disease so that hardness and rancour do not corrode the innermost part of mind, whereby the Soldier of Christ would be unable to live in peace (*Carmen de Verginitate* p.161).

Despair is followed by sloth, which is defended with the virtue of perseverance.

The seventh army is led by vainglory, which accompanied the sin of Eve in paradise: "from this source evil arose for wretched mortals: the first man, relying especially on Vainglory, had no fear and was engulfed by empty hope" (*Carmen de Verginitate*: 162). Vainglory is blamed on causing heresy and boasting. The eighth army has Pride at the forefront accompanied by Disdain. Aldhelm differentiates between *superbia* and the remaining seven sins: "the other seven armies, which I enumerated previously, originate among mortal men of earthly stock; the Monster, however, of which my page is now speaking, took his beginnings on the high summits of heaven, when the angelic leader and the first shining light of heaven eagerly desired to promote his own greatness from the north and in his wickedness vowed to be like the Lord" (*Carmen de Verginitate*: 163). Only humility can oppose the sin of *superbia.* Aldhelm's Latin treatise is the only insular source that gives a broad account of the tradition of the eight evil thoughts. Although it lacks the psychological insight and theological sophistication of its precedents, the account of spiritual warfare it gives is sustained by the military metaphor drawn upon form Paul's Second Letter to Corinthians and Prudentius *Psychomachia,* which was well-known in Anglo-Saxon England.

The Old English poets were not the first to use poetry to express a spiritual conflict. For this, they found a precedent in Latin writing, especially Prudentius's *Psy-*

chomachia, which was a familiar text in Anglo-Saxon libraries. John Hermann says that being "the first poem of this kind, it served as the model for the personification of allegory of war, influencing painting, sculpture, throughout the Middle Ages" (Hermann 1989: 8)[35]. *Miles Christi* is then superficially related to Psychomachia. Whereas Psychomachia is based on the personification of vices and virtues, the concept of *Miles Christi* is not reliant on purely abstract thoughts and may well involve actual physical warfare. John Hermann claims that "far more prevalent than sustained personification allegory in Old English are microallegories of war, fragments of an implicit allegorical system that does not operate the personified virtues and vices of Prudential tradition" and that "the affiliations of these recurrent motifs of spiritual warfare can be mapped out in terms of the biblical notion of the spiritual warrior" (Hermann 1989: 38)[36].

The idea of spiritual warfare was a major theme that shaped the literary forms of the early and later Middle Ages. In contrast to Prudentian *Psychomachia,* the saint as a spiritual warrior does not exist in abstraction from the world. The saint, especially the martyr, at this time was a figure of power. The genre of saints' lives is correlated by literary historians to the genre of the *Acts of the Martyrs* (Louth: 2004: 358-359). There is also an affinity between hagiography and monastic literature, for the ascetic, too, saw himself as a successor to the martyr, and engaged in the same struggle" (Louth 2004: 359). Each activity of a saint is an enactment of the eternal cosmic struggle between Christ and Satan; as Hermann notices, "a frequent way of referring to the warfare between Satan and man in Old English poetry is through a cluster of terms for the old strife" (Hermann 1989: 39)[37]. The figure of *Miles Dei,* hence, acquired its ideological importance by token of the belief that through their heroic martyrdom or renunciation holy men and women realised the power of God on earth and continually participated in defeating the devil.

---

[35] John Hermann parallels the Roman foundations of the Christian epic of Prudentius with Anglo-Saxon appropriation of Germanic heroic poetry. "In Prudentius's writings, Christianity represents not jarring discontinuity with Roman civilization, but its fulfilment. Such pragmatic appropriation of the literary heritage of Empire resembles the appropriation of the Germanic epic poetic by the Anglo-Saxons. And their works are haunted by a similar question – just what Ingeld might have to do with Christ" (Hermann 1989: 16).

[36] Hermann identifies the Pauline figure of spiritual warrior in the Old English poem *A Journey Charm* (1989: 38).

[37] "The Old strife stems from the mythic prehistory when Satan and the rebel angels initiated the war in heaven, and its mere mention inscribes present spiritual conflict within a panoramic time span. Because it originates "outside" time, it can be represented as taking place everywhere within it, paradox of investigation characteristic of mythic rhetoric" (Hermann 1989: 39).

Hermann also observes that the Christian tradition of *hostis antiquus*, or Satan who is at war with God, transformed the Anglo-Saxon heroic concept of the old enemy known from the epic tradition: "when the enemy is seen as ancient, present assaults are framed within the history of the Christian warrior, as well as mythic prehistory" (Hermann 1989: 40). The devil in earlier medieval hagiography figures as a much more threatening, and a far more dangerous force, which stems from a different conception of the devil's role as configured in antiquity and the early Middle Ages. A Rosemary Woolf points out that this had a significant influence on the genre of saints' lives. Woolf observes that in Old English poems the devil is a figure of importance and dignity and claims that "according to the theory of the 'devil's rights' the nature of Redemption consisted of the defeat of the devil by Christ on the Cross, and in literary treatment the devil was therefore represented more seriously than he was in the Middle Ages, when the 'satisfaction' theory reduced him to a subordinate role". What is more, "the commonest patristic definition of martyrdom was the conquest of the devil" (Woolf 1966: 42)[38]. Consequently the early medieval conception of the devil was generally different from how he appeared in the High Middle Ages, especially after the controversy of the devil's right in the twelfth century and Anselm of Canterbury's solution to it (Southern [1953] 1993: 225). The complex idea of the devil's right, was connected with the doctrine of redemption, and is summarized by R. W. Southern in *The making of the Middle Ages* (1953).

> By sin – by disobedience to God and obedience to the will of the Devil – man had voluntarily withdrawn himself from the service of God and committed himself to the service of the Devil. It was rather like the act of *diffidatio* in feudal custom by which a man rejected the authority of his overlord and submitted himself to another. Of course, the overlord did not acquiesce in this state of affairs: it meant war – but still, the rules of *diffidatio* having been observed, the war must be fought according to the rules. So it was in the war between God and the Devil over the soul of Man. God could not fairly use His omnipotence to deprive the Devil of the rights he had acquired over Man by Man's consent: the rule of justice must be observed even in fighting the Devil…. The only hope for Man therefore lay in some breach of the rules by the Devil himself ([1953] 1993: 223-224).

It was commonplace in early medieval thought that God was under an obligation to respect the Devil's right to rule humanity after the Fall of Adam and Eve and that only the Devil's injustice (that is killing the innocent Jesus Christ) could free God from this ob-

[38] The early medieval conception of the devil's rights over mankind earned as a result of the original sin and lost to him as a result of Christ's sacrifice (Marx 1995: 16).

ligation. In his *Devil's Rights and the Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England,* C. W. Marx argues that "patristic thinking on the redemption can be said to have been concerned with two broad questions, (i) the reconciliation of humanity to God and God to humanity, and (ii) the defeat of the Devil and the freeing of humanity from his possession" (Marx 1995: 2). Marx discusses Augustine's view on the nature of the Devil's right over humanity in *De Trinitate* and concludes that "the idea that God elected to overcome the Devil with justice characterized much early medieval thinking on the issue of the defeat of the Devil, and implies that the Devil held a right of possession over humanity" (Marx 1995: 2).

Marx contrasts the early medieval conception of the Devil with later medieval conventions in the following way:

> In the new formulation the Devil is conceived as a figure within a model of society: the Devil is a servant of the king; he is ha jailer, one who must do the will of the king and one who is treated in law like any of the king's servants. The Devil has no personal rights within the social structure. This Devil is one whose law-breaking activities are crimes against the king and against individuals within the state: deception, robbery, and treason. In the patristic formulation, the Devil was guilty of the unlawful use of power, a crime less clearly defined, but at the same time more sinister; it was analogous to the disruption of the social order. The later analogy is more specific: the Devil is one who exists within a framework or social structure in which the capacity for disruption is less, because of the overriding power of the king; the Devil has no 'right of possession'. The analogy implies that evil consists of crimes against both the state and the individual, and a greater sense of confidence in society and its ability to maintain order – evil can be overthrown (Marx 1995: 26).

The Devil of Old English literature is a powerful being and both *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* emphasise the glory and prosperity that Satan possessed before his Fall because of his *oferhygd.* The Devil of the Old English Bible inspires pity, rather than emerging as a ludicrous mock-heroic creature of later morality plays. In Old English poetry, the cosmic struggle between God and Satan is depicted as the strife between two powerful lords each with his own comitatus and his own hall. The Devil used to belong to the heavenly *dryht,* and the Old English poetic tradition is almost Manichean, in its depiction of the post-lapsarian Satan as an alternative cosmic power to God.

The figure of *Miles Christi* was culturally significant in the Anglo-Saxon period and that is why it vital part of literary representation of social and political violence in Old English poetry. In *Juliana,* the heroic values of her father and her betrothed, whom she rejects and is consequently tormented and killed, are identified with the *comitatus* of the devil, who visits and tempts her in prison. Through the symbolic and employment of

the heroic diction of the poem, the language of *comitatus* is used to characterize the actions of the evil characters within it. Although Juliana is described as *cempa, or* "warrior", she is *Cristes cempa,* and her heroic battle is waged through passive resistance, which endows her with a spiritual strength strong enough to conquer the devil that tempts her during her imprisonment. In *Andreas,* the protagonist of the poem, Andrew the Apostle, defeats the devil in Mermedonia in a scene, which is reminiscent of the representations of the Harrowing of Hell. The text of the poem uses the concept of the Rights of the Devil to sanction the violence against the Mermedonians and the violent conquest of their land. The poem is relevant to Anglo-Saxon political reality at the time of the Viking invasions in the post-Alfredian era. Similarly, *Judith* rewrites its Biblical source, the *Book of Judith,* to fit the cultural context of the Viking invasion; the enemy is demonized to be defeated and killed and the story of conversion is removed from the Old English poem so that it could express the ideology of a holy war.

Penitential practice in Anglo-Saxon England and its influence on Old English devotional poetry

The ideas of sin and virtue did not only appear in representations of secular society. The sinful condition of man also figures in devotional poetry. As an expression of piety, devotional poetry may strike one as only concerning personal and subjective meditation. In contrast to the arcane liturgical practices that were carried out in Latin, devotional poetry in the Anglo-Saxon period was in the vernacular and, therefore, was more essential than liturgy and theological scholarship in involving Anglo-Saxons in devotional practices. As Barbara Kowalik observes in *Betwixt* engelaunde *and englene londe*" (2010), "the speech genre of prayer, covering penitence, supplication, praise, and thanksgiving addressed to powerful celestial beings, is plentifully represented in Anglo-Saxon England by prayers in the Old English vernacular as well as Latin" (Kowalik: 2010: 93). The aim of Chapter Three will be to explore the ways in which vernacular devotional poetry, especially penitential poetry, is informed by the conceptions of society and the individual.

The rise of penitential poetry resulted from the advent of private penance, which was a new development unknown in Antiquity. The early Middle Ages inherited from

Antiquity the public rite of penance, which took place during Lent, when the penitents were dismissed by the bishop on Ash Wednesday from the church and received back on Maundy Tuesday and had their sins absolved by him (Bedingfield 2002: 223). As Bedingfield points out, public penance was practiced as late as the times of Wulfstan in the early eleventh century and this practice "stems from the Roman system of canonical, or 'public', penance" (Bedingfield: 2002: 223). The penitent participated in the ceremony once in a lifetime and the alternative to it came no earlier than the sixth century. According to Sarah Hamilton, in late Anglo-Saxon England there existed a dual system of penance "akin to that first articulated by Carolingian reformers, the so-called Carolingian dichotomy.... Secret penance was for those sins whose effects were limited, public penance for those 'high' sins whose ramifications were wider, or more horrifying, such as fratricide" (Hamilton 2005: 65-66). As Hamilton describes it, the institution of public penance was very ancient and goes back to fifth century[39]. It was established that the public rite of penance was the prerogative of the bishop and that the private penance could be delivered by rank-and-file clergy (Hamilton 2005: 66).

Irish monks adopted the practice of confessing one's sins to their superior monk from the example set by Egyptian monks. Soon the Irish laity also sought confession and penance from them and the practice was soon adopted by the secular Franks, to whom Columbanus went on a mission in the eighth century (Frantzen 1983: 37). According to Frantzen, the Irish monks were authors of the first handbook of penance (Frantzen: 1983: 20). In his *Literature of penance in Anglo-Saxon England,* he gives an account of the textual history of Old English handbooks. Following the Carolingian reforms, Halitgar, Bishop of Cambrai (d. 831) created a handbook of penance, in which he contributed to a new development in the genre: the handbook was supposed to contain *ordo confessionis.* Allen Frantzen says that "the *ordo* posed the priest as a model for the penitent" and that Halitgar enhanced the handbook's pedagogical aim as he "wished the priest to teach by example as well as precept, not merely to live as a good

[39] "The eighth-century Old Gelasian Sacramentary contains the earliest full rite for the public entry into penance on Ash Wednesday, and a version of this service was included in the later eighth-century Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries, and entered the mixed Gelasianised-Gregorian sacramentaries of the tenth and eleventh centuries. The Gelasian *ordo* (and its descendants) is very simple: the (male) penitent should be received into penance, dressed in the *cilicium,* and shut up (presumably in a monastery) until Maundy Thursday, when he is reconciled with the bishop. The evidence that the public reconciliation of penitents took place on Maundy Thursday goes back even earlier, to the fifth century" (Hamilton 2005: 69).

Christian ought to, but to demonstrate, through his own emotional responses, the misery caused by sin" (Frantzen 1983: 106).

The next important stage in the development of penance, according to Frantzen, took place in the eighth century England. Frantzen finds the penitential issued under the name of Theodore of Tarsus a landmark in the history of penitential literature for three reasons: "it is the first known handbook to have originated outside an Irish monastery; the first English source to refer to the textual tradition of the penitential; and the first of the many non-Irish handbooks which significantly altered both the design and the purpose of penitential" (Frantzen 1983: 63-64)[40]. During their reforms of the ninth century, the Franks revitalised the ancient tradition of public penance, but viewed the concept of private penance with suspicion. Frantzen observes that the Frankish bishops considered the handbooks to be unreliable and dangerous, their authors were anonymous and the penitentials invested the parish priest with excessive prerogatives[41]. This interrogation was to be guided not by the handbook, but by the list of the eight chief sins – gluttony, fornication, sloth (or languor), avarice, vainglory, envy, anger, and pride" (Frantzen: 1983: 102). However, one important penitential was produced in Francia by Halitgar, bishop of Cambrai, "written at the request of Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims, probably in 830"; this penitential is a landmark in the history of penance, as it, for the first time,

[40] As Frantzen notices, the scribe called *Discipulus Umbrensium,* who was, in fact, responsible for writing the text in question, designed a collection not only as a penitential in content but also useful for administrative work; it includes a bulk of non-penitential and canonical material carefully separated from the penitential tariffs. Frantzen claims that the purpose of this work was to impose "a uniform penitential handbook for all English confessors" (1983: 64-65). Frantzen says the important work that Theodore's penitential fulfilled was "to serve a standardising influence on ecclesiastical organization within each diocese" and was "created to serve a wandering, monastic, decentralised church [which was the case in Ireland], the handbook soon became a rulebook specifying that penance was properly the duty of the clergy and only the 'liberty 'or privilege of the monastery" (1983: 65). Also, another significant change this handbook brought about was that penance was no longer "the practice of a small segment of society living near monastery, but a prescription for social observance intended for all devout Christians" (1983: 67). There are other handbooks written in the eighth century England, one is attributed to Bede, often designated as "pseudo-Bede", the other to Egbert of York, designated as "pseudo-Egbert". Frantzen dismisses the possibility that they are genuine (1983: 70).

[41] The council of Chalon in 813 even dismissed the Insular penitentials, whether Irish or English, although no other council of the period made a similar decision. As Frantzen notices, at the following councils, for example at the council of Tours, which also happened in 813, it was decided that three authorities could be relied upon when it comes to penance: "canons, the Bible, and accepted custom" (1983: 98). However, Frantzen is convinced that the Frankish bishops' "reservations against the penitentials were ... not based on misgivings about private penance itself" and "a council in Mainz in 852 permitted secret confession and penance for secret sins" (1983: 100). As Frantzen further points out, Theodulf of Orleans himself dismissed penitentials and "his recommendation – followed by the 813 council of Chalon – was that the priest should ask the penitent about the occasion of his sins and assign penance according to penitent's guilt.

contains *ordo confessionis,* which "supplies a procedure to guide the administration of confession" (Frantzen 1983: 103). Frantzen also points to the development in the ideas on the psychological aspects of penance in the ninth century. Alcuin "stressed the penitent's interior disposition – the sincerity of his contrition and his willingness to accept penance – as the conditions necessary for the forgiveness of sins". Moreover, "Hrabanus Maurus, writing in mid-century, echoed Alcuin's belief that unless confession began with compunction – humbleness of mind, tears, and the fear of judgment – forgiveness was impossible" (Frantzen 1983: 115-166).

The Old English textual history of the penitential, and the large number of manuscripts containing handbooks of penance, testify to a widely established penitential practice in later Anglo-Saxon England. According to Frantzen (1983: 133-8), there are three vernacular Anglo-Saxon penitentials, "Scrift Boc", "Handbook" and "Penitential". Frantzen traces their origin as being a result of Carolingian reforms of the ninth centuries and are, to a large extent, compilations and adaptations of Irish, Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian sources. The "scrift boc" and "Penitential" share the *incipit* attributed to Egbert, Archbishop of York. Frantzen claims that "Script Boc" is an earlier text, as it follows its source, Halitgar's Penitential, closely, whereas the "Penitential" is a free translation of Halitgar's text. The third text, the "Handbook for the use of a confessor" [henceforth, "Handbook"], Frantzen finds entirely different from the "scrift boc" and the "Penitential". It is the most complete handbook of penance in Anglo-Saxon England. It contains a confessional prayer and an *ordo confessionis,* but Frantzen argues both elements are interpolations on the part of the compiler of the original text. It also has a reduced and less confusing number of tariffs than the two other handbooks. Frantzen concludes that its "narrow scope – signalled by the elimination of penalties for bishops – makes the "Handbook" the most practical of the vernacular penitentials; it makes few assumptions about the priest's knowledge of his duties as confessor and in fact gives nearly as much attention to advising him as to providing the tariffs themselves" (Frantzen 1883: 138).

Historians' opinions vary when it comes to the question of whether the practice of confession was a regular activity (at least in the period of Lent) or an idealised fiction. As Sarah Hamilton points out, it is necessary to be cautious when examining the data, as in the Middle Ages "church law is usually aspirational; it represents only what the authorities wanted to happen, hence the reliance on precedent" (Hamilton 2001: 35).

Still, at least 300 manuscripts containing handbooks survived from before 1000 AD (Hamilton 2001: 44). Frantzen pays attention to handbooks' contribution to the tenth century reform in England (Frantzen 1983: 122-50). Catherine Cubitt observes that "the Old English sources show that in the late ninth century there was already a developed vernacular vocabulary for the practice of penance" and gives evidence from the texts as early as those of Alfred's educational reform (Cubitt 2006: 44). She points out that the word "scrift" 'confessor,' is found in the Old English translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* by Alfred the Great and in Alfred's law and the word is commonly found in the homilies of the tenth and eleventh centuries (Cubitt 2006: 44). She demonstrates that "the pastoral concerns of the later tenth and eleventh centuries ... were no sudden growth: the close relationship between penance and secular law seen in Alfred's code and the earlier tenth-century evidence for vernacular penitential texts shows how deep-rooted penance was in Anglo-Saxon religious culture" (Cubitt 2006: 63). In the period of Benedictine Reform of the second half of the tenth century, Anglo-Saxons accepted both public and secret penance. Sarah Hamilton comments that "Wulfstan ... envisaged a dual system of public and secret penance, akin to that first articulated by Carolingian reformers, the so-called Carolingian dichotomy, which was repeated by Wulfstan's contemporary, Aelfric. Secret penance was for those sins whose effects were limited, public penance for those 'high' sins whose ramifications were wider, or more horrifying, such as fratricide" (Hamilton 2005: 65-66).

Hamilton observes that scholars falsely "assumed that 'secret' penance prevailed in pre-Conquest England because the texts of most of the early medieval penitentials, the earliest manuscripts of which are continental, have been shown to have insular origins" (2005: 67). She points to documents and sources that testify to public penance flourishing as late as in the eleventh century Worcester (Hamilton 2007: 72). She concludes that public penance served two purposes. It was a means by which the clergy exerted their authority over the laity, since "it was a ritual in which the penitent underwent a change of status, from laymen to penitent, which was defined by the change of dress on Ash Wednesday, from normal clothes to hairshirt, and the imposition of ashes" (Hamilton 2007: 87). The second was to facilitate Episcopal control over rural clergy: "the rural clergy serving small and relatively isolated communities probably rarely saw their bishop and the requirement in the *PRG* [Ponitificale Romano-Germanicum], for example, that they accompany the penitent to the cathedral on Ash Wednesday and

Maundy Thursday would bring them into contact with their superior at least twice a year" (Hamilton 2007: 88). Also, Frantzen admits that "the Anglo-Saxons inherited the dual system of penance developed by Carolingians. Private penance was required for private sins and public penance for offenses public in nature" (Hamilton 1983: 141).

Penitential practice also exerted a significant influence on devotional poetry. Old English poetry was especially conducive to the transmission of devotional and penitential practice. Devotional poetry was largely traditional and was heavily reliant on the alliterative half-line and was formulaic in themes and expression. It often referred to the heroic ideals. However, it brought new practices into an old poetic custom. It is typical of Anglo-Saxon poetry (especially those poems to be discussed in Chapter One and Two) that it represents the values of communal life and promotes the ideals of communities, whether heroic or Christian. Devotional poetry of the later Anglo-Saxon period is replete with conceptions regarding the individual. Hence, the thesis of Chapter Three is that the penitential themes in Old English poetry construct a notion of the individual as a member of the Body of Christ, and consequently the wider Christian community. In *Interactions of thought and language in Old English poetry* (1995), Peter Clemoes observes that Christian values restructured the traditional notion of an individual in Old English poetry, as "for the age-long view that individuality was determined by social values and that warrior aristocracy was the determining group the church substituted an individual ultimately answerable to Christ the Judge" (Clemoes [1995] 2006: 363). Still, he further observes, "with its social traditions, Old English poetry more easily converted an individual's private sense of shame into a desire to avoid public shame on Doomsday" (Clemoes 2006: 367). In Old English poetry, individuality is given a prominent voice while being curbed, as the vernacular verse "embraced a principle that each sinful soul stands alone before Christ its judge but preferred to dramatise this situation on the world stage at doomsday" (Clemoes 2006: 367).

There is an important reason why in Old English poetry the penitential themes appear in conjunction with the theme of Judgment Day. The collocation of penitence and Judgment Day was influenced by the conception of an individual, whose identity is determined by the extent to which he embraces the values of his or her community. Wayne A. Meeks observes that "the notion of final judgment that emerges in catholic Christianity holds that it is not only universal but also corporate in its moral implications" (Meeks 1993: 179). He also points out that Judgment Day as an image in early

Christian writings was used to construct ideas on social life, as "when initiates into the Christian group are taught that those who do x, y, and z 'will not inherit the kingdom of God', they are not merely being warned that if they revert to such vices they will someday be punished. They are being told something about the character of the people over whom God reigns in the new age" (Meeks 1993: 179). In Anglo-Saxon literature, Judgment Day is most often represented, not only in social, but, more specifically, heroic terms. The emotion that underlies morality in Old English heroic works, as well as penitential literature, is shame. Judgment Day is a moment of disgrace for a sinner, but the good will be showered with eternal glory and admitted to heaven, which is imagined as a hall. Subsequently Anglo-Saxon morality was shame-oriented. When Beowulf defeats the dragon that invaded Geatland and is dying of its poisonous bites, he tells his retainers to construct a barrow on the place of his burial pyre in commemoration of his glorious deeds. Beowulf's fame is contrasted with the fates of the retainers, who escaped from the place of combat and left Beowulf and Wiglaf fighting the fire drake alone. Wiglaf's condemnation of the retainers and his sentence of exile for them are finished with a gnomic remark: "deað bið sella eorla gehwyclum þonne edwit-lif" 'death is better for each warrior than life in disgrace' (*Beowulf* ll. 2890-2891)[42]. In *Beowulf*, the pagan hero reaches immortality through fame, which lives on through oral poetry recited from generation to generation.

There was one literary theme that especially appeared in conjunction with penitential and Judgment Day themes. M. R. Godden describes this idea as the penitential motif typical of Anglo-Saxon homiletic writings and also identified it in the poem titled *Christ III.* In his article "An old English penitential motif" (1973), he encapsulates its idea in the following way: "it is better to be shamed for one's sins before one man (the confessor) in this life than to be shamed before God and before all angles and before all men and before all devils at the Last Judgment" (Godden: 1973: 222). He finds the motif in fifteen Old English works and divides them into three groups.

> A group of seven express the motif in the form of a comparison ('shame now is better than shame later') and all refer to the hosts of angels, men and devils in the same words. A second group of six use a relative clause instead of a comparison ('he who is not shamed now must be shamed later') and refer to the three hosts in several different

[42] All quotations from *Beowulf* come from Dobbie, Elliot van Kirk (ed.). 1953. *Beowulf and Judith.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 4.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translations from Old English into modern English are mine.

> ways. And the remaining two express the motif in the form of a comparison, like the first group, but do not mention the three hosts (Godden 1973: 222).

As Allen Frantzen points out in *The literature of penance in Anglo-Saxon England* (1983), the motif had a particular appeal to Anglo-Saxon audiences. He says that "if shame is defined as the scorn visited on one who fails to meet the reciprocal obligations of his social role, Anglo-Saxon values, as reflected in both law and poetry, can be said to be 'shame-dominated'" (Frantzen 1983: 177). It is no accident then that attempts at self-expression in Old English devotional poetry often clash with representation of Judgment Day as an event when the individual displays his vices and virtues before God, the hosts of angels and other people undergoing judgment. The descriptions of Judgment Day in Old English poetry do not encode the fear of losing one's life but rather they encode a genuine fear of suffering shame for one's misdeeds before God and the three hosts[43]. The descriptions of fiery punishment in the Old English version of *Visio Sancti Pauli* were for the Anglo-Saxons as equally terrifying as the possibility of suffering public shame on Judgment Day. This accounts for the peculiar nature of representations of Judgment Day in Old English poetry and homiletic literature as an essentially humiliating public experience rather than a physically apocalyptic event. This also explains why the Judgment Day theme is persistently present in most Anglo-Saxon penitential poetry. The Day of Judgment is described in all three penitential poems discussed in Chapter Three; *Christ III*, *Judgment Day II* and *Soul and Body* and they encode spiritual anxiety over the Second Coming of Christ.

The theology of penance therefore contributed to a new literary conception of the individual central to Christian spirituality of Anglo-Saxon poetry, the penitent sinner. This idea of the universal individual is a departure from the heroic model known to the Anglo-Saxon audience, as it is far from being an embodiment of virtue, but, rather, an everyman, with whom the audience is to identify. This formulation of the individual may be found in Cynewulf's signature at the end of the four poems attributed to him,

[43] "Cynewulf urges each of his readers not to neglect the *gæstes þearf* but to be ready for the dreadful judgment at the Lord's second coming. This soul's need is what the Old English penitential homilies and *libri poenitentiales* refer to as the *sawle þearf,* i.e. the need of the soul for the medicine of penance. For the doctrine taught in the homilies and penitentials and reflected in much of the poetry is that, after baptism (*poenitentia prima*), it is the penance (*poenitentia secunda*) which cleanses the soul from the stains of sin, heals its wounds and releases it from spiritual bondage; and only thus freed and purified may the soul stand without fear before the judge on the last day. This is Cynewulf's twin theme: let us attend to the soul's need (i.e. penance) in this life so that we may endure the judgment in the text" (Rice 1977: 115).

Christ II (*Ascension*), *Juliana, Elene* and *The Fates of the Apostles.* The signatures are not so much authorial claims as a personal expression of spiritual anxiety of a man who signs himself Cynewulf.

> Þus ic frod ond fus þurh þæt fæcne hus
> Wordcraeftum wæf ond wundrum læs,
> þragum þreodude on geþanc reordode
> Nihtes nearwe. Nysse is gearwe
> Be ðære rode riht ær me rumran geþeaht
> þurh ða mæran miht on modes þeaht
> wisdom onwreah. Ic waes weorcum fah,
> synnum asæled, sorgum gewæled,
> bitrum gebunden, bisgum beþrungen.
>
> Thus I, old and ready for death, through this doomed flesh, I weaved with power of words a wondrous lay, sometimes suffering while dressing my thought in words at night. I did not know about the rood until a greater power revealed wisdom to my mental powers. I was blemished by past actions and stained with sin, ridden with sorrow and bound with bitterness and cares (*Elene* ll. 1236-1244).

The minstrel intimates the spiritual fears that accompanied the composition of the poem and his sinful condition that prompted the work. The ending of the poem also refers to the liturgy of Lent, which was connected with the liturgy of penance in the Anglo-Saxon church[44]. In *Fates of Apostles,* Cynewulf's plea is even more desperate. The poem starts with an exclamation that "ic ðysne sang sithgeomor fand" 'I found this song in sorrow' (*Fates of the Apostles* l. 1)[45]. The signature is a work of a man unsure of his own salvation[46]. He addresses the reader of the manuscript and asks for prayer and intercession on his behalf and on the part of twelve apostles, whose heroic deaths he describes in his poem. Cynewulf laments "hu, ic freonda beþearf liðra on lade, þonne ic

[44] "Sie are manna gehwam behliden helle duru, heofones ontyned, ece geopenad engla rice, dream unhwilen, ond hira dæl scired mid Marian, þe on gemynd nime þære deorestan dægweorðunga rode under roderum, þa ricesta ealles oferwealdend earme beþeahte" 'let the gates of hell be closed to every one and heaven be opened, the eternal seat of angels and of unceasing happiness and his portion allotted by Mary to one who celebrates the most holy feast of the cross under heaven, which the saviour embraced with his arms' (*Elene* ll. 1228-1235).

[45] Robert C. Rice says that "the opening with the personal and elegiac *ic* ... points to a purpose profoundly associated with the poet's own spiritual condition with has led him to a meditation on the journeys of the apostles from this life to their heavenly reward" (1977: 107).

[46] "His [Cynewulf's] sadness is not the Bernardine grief for the sufferings the saints; it is the self-centred sorrow of the man weighted down by the consciousness of sin while contemplating the inevitability of death the judgment it brings. Contemplation of death, especially one's own, was a prominent feature of medieval penitential exhortation, no less in the Old English than in the Middle English period. It is a constant theme in penitential homilies, which often vividly describe the decay and wormy gore of the grave as well as the fearful state of the soul in the interim between death and doomsday" (Rice 1977: 107).

sceal langne ham, eardwic uncuð, ana gesecan, lætan me on laste lic, eorðan dael, wælreaf wunigean weormum to hroðre" 'how, I need friends on my solitary journey, when I seek a distant home in a land unknown, when I leave this transitory body, a portion of earth, so that it can be food and comfort to worms' (*Fates of the Apostles* ll. 91-95).

It is important not to misunderstand Cynewulf's signature as a mere appropriation of the ancient Germanic conception of immortality through fame. As Ralph W. V. Elliot points out, "Cynewulf, using the old but still remembered runic lore of his Germanic ancestors, has left us in the texture of his two finest poems [*Christ II* and *Elene*] his name to be known, prayed for, and admired" (Elliot [1953] 2001a: 290). Further, Barbara Kowalik, in *Betwixt* engelaunde *and englene londe*" (2010), also points out that Cynewulf "calls upon the ideal reader of *Fates* ... to resurrect his name via finding and reassembling its runic letters (ll. 96-98)" and that "the vital technologies of reading and writing are, therefore, endowed with the hope of salvaging the poet's work from the ocean, *lagu*, of forgotten words and deeds, and he further admonishes the reader to be "gemynding" (mindful, l. 107) of his name" (Kowalik 2010: 110). What is more, "the song is supposed to promote Cynewulf's personal salvation as well, for the reassembling of the runes figures the desired reconstruction of his body" (Kowalik 2010: 110). Prof. Kowalik identifies the genre of *Fates* as one which "approximates the petition and also bidding prayer, both of which were popular in Middle Ages" (Kowalik 2010: 110).

The ending of *Juliana* also reveals the poet's anxiety over his soul and is, in effect, a prayer to the heroine of the poem for intercession on Judgment Day: "Is me þearf micel þæt seo halge me helpe gefremme, þonne me gedælað deorast ealra, sibbe toslitað sinhiwan tu, micle modlufan" 'I have a great need the holy maid grants me help when the two friends [that is, Cynewulf's body and soul] are separated' (*Juliana* ll. 695-699). The figure of the poet despairs over the unknown fate of his soul after his passing away and laments that "Min sceal of lice sawul on siðfæt, nat ic sylfa hwider, eardes uncyðgu; of sceal ic þissum, secan oþerne ærgewyrhtum, gongan iudædum" 'my soul will depart from the body on a journey and I do not know the unknown land; I will go to another dominion depending on my past deeds' (*Juliana* ll. 699-704). His death is conceptualised in terms of journey. Cynewulf's signatures are symptomatic of how the penitential practices of the day were used in literary representations of self to curb and confine individuality within the frames of Christian community. Robert C. Rice observes that "the

personal focus of each of Cynewulf's other epilogues draws the reader into the sphere of penitential meditation. They reiterate most of the same penitential motifs: the personal sense of sin, the fear of death and judgment, the need for intercession of the saints and of the living and the final hope in the mercy of God and the reward of the heavenly homeland" (Rice 1977: 113).

Although none of his poems explicitly refers to confession in the way that *Christ III* does, the ending of poems work in the same way as *Christ III, Judgment Day II,* and *Soul and Body* so as to involve the reader/listener in its penitential mood. Cynewulf's signatures uses representations of collectivity and individuality in the same way as the body of penitential literature that flourished in later Anglo-Saxon England, *The Lord's Prayer II* expands on the Latin *Et dimitte nobis debita nostra* "and forgive us our sins" with a reference to Judgment Day as an event when one may risk being exposed to shame for sins that were not confessed during one's lifetime. The utterance to God in the poem is: "Forgif us ure synna, þæt us ne scamige eft, drihten ure, þonne þu on dome sitst and ealle men up arisað þe fram wife and fram were wurdon acænned" 'forgive us our sins so that we will not have to suffer shame again, our lord, when you come to sit on the throne and all men, who were born of man and woman, shall rise from dead' (*Lord's Prayer II* ll. 85-89). On the Day of Judgment the sins and virtues of the resurrected will be published before the three hosts: "Ne magon we hit na dyrnan, for ðam þe hit drihten wat, and þar gewitnesse beoð wuldormicele, heofonwaru and eorðwaru, helwaru þridde" 'we will not be able to hide anything, for the Lord will know them and the witnesses to our deeds will include magnificent hosts of angels, hosts of people and hosts of hell, all three' (*Lord's Prayer II* ll. 94-96). The plea in the prayer asks God to forgive our sins now, because those deeds, which remain unatoned, will bring us public shame in front of the three hosts of heaven.

Another important conception that informs the idea of the individual in Old English penitential poetry is philosophical anthropology; that is the dual nature of a human being consisting of soul and body. Conceptions on the human metaphysical situation in Antiquity and the early Middle Ages contributed to ideas on the body and its relation to the soul. St. Paul of Tarsus's Letter to Galatians; "caro enim concupiscit adversus spiri-

tum, spiritus autem adversus carnem" 'for the flesh desires what is against the spirit and the spirit desires what is against the flesh' (Gal 5: 17)[47]

> qui enim secundum carnem sunt quae carnis sunt sapiunt qui vero secundum Spiritum quae sunt Spiritus sentiunt
> nam prudentia carnis mors prudentia autem Spiritus vita et pax
> quoniam sapientia carnis inimicitia est in Deum legi enim Dei non subicitur nec enim potest
> qui autem in carne sunt Deo placere non possunt
> vos autem in carne non estis sed in Spiritu si tamen Spiritus Dei habitat in vobis si quis autem Spiritum Christi non habet hic non est eius
> si autem Christus in vobis est corpus quidem mortuum est propter peccatum spiritus vero vita propter iustificationem
>
> For they who exist according to the flesh desire things that come from the flesh, but those who live according to the spirit desire things that come from the spirit. The wisdom of the flesh is death, but the wisdom of the spirit is life and peace. This is because the wisdom of the flesh is a fiend to God, as it does not subject itself to the law of God. It cannot be subject to it either. These who live according to the flesh cannot please God. However, You do not live according to the flesh but according to the spirit, for the Spirit of God inhabits you. These people who do not have the Spirit of Christ do not belong to Him. But if Christ is in you, your body is dead because of sin, but the spirit lives because of justification (Romans 5-10).

On the one hand, body was perceived as the source of temptation and sin. On the other, it was held that only the reasoning soul can make a choice between good and evil. As Meeks points out, "though Paul often sets 'flesh' against 'spirit', he usually avoids equating 'flesh' with 'body'", as "the human predicament is the result not of the limitations of physical existence, but of sin" (Meeks 1993: 133).

This motif of the soul and body is also found in Old English. This literary tradition is best exemplified by the Old English poem *Soul and Body* extant in two versions, one in the Exeter Manuscript, the other in the Vercelli Book. The poem is an address of a damned soul to its body. In the Exeter version of the poem, the soul visits its body decaying in the grave to castigate it for its sinful life that resulted in the soul being damned. The Vercelli version of the poem is longer, as it also presents a similar address of the saved soul to its body. In Old English homiletic writings, the body is depicted as a home to the soul but more significantly it also serves as a type; either the prefiguration of the heavenly abode or its hellish punishment. The evil body in MS Junius 85 homily

[47] The quotation is taken from *Biblia Sacra Vulgata.* 2007 [1969]. (Edited by Robert Weber and Roger Gryson.) (The fifth edition.) Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. Translation mine.

is called "deofles hus" (*Junius* 961)[48]. The soul reproaches the body for its sins and says that "wit þonne butu sculon beon birnende in ðæm ecan fyre" 'we will be burning together in the eternal fire' (*Junius* 962). According to the soul, it also exercised a degree of choice in its lifetime and when it could choose between the teachings of the devil and those of the Lord, it chose to follow the former (*Junius* 962)[49]. The soul accuses the body of the vice of anger and superbia: "þu wære yrres hyrde ond oferhydig" (*Junius* 962).

> 'Wa me, forðæm ic þa awirgedan þinc mid ðe lufode! Wa me, forðam ic ða toweardan þingc ne gemunde! Wa me, forðæm þe ic me hellewite ne ondred! Wa me, forðæm þe ic heofonarice ne lufode! Wa me, forðæm Pe ic geþafode ealle oa yfel]e ou dydest! Forþon ic nu for ðinum gewyrhtum eom cwylmed, and for þinum yfelum dædum ic eom on hellewite bescofen. Ic wes Godes dohter, and ængla swistor gescapen, and þu me hafaest forworht, þæt ic eam deofles beam, and deoflum gelic. Forþon ic ðe wrege and þe ofercyme mid werignesse, forþæm þu me forworhtest and awergedne gedydest.'
>
> Woe to me, because I loved with an accursed thing! Woe to me, because I did not thinkg about eternal things. Woe to me, because I did not fear the eternal punishment. Woe to me, because I did not love the heavenly kingdom! Woe to me, because I consented to all evil you did! Therefore I am punished for all your deeds and for your wrong-doings I am sentenced to hellish punishment. I was God's daughter, created as angel's sister and you have turned me to the likeness of the devil. Therefore I denounce you and subdue with weariness, because you corrupted me and left accursed (*Junius* 962).

In contrast, the blessed soul praises the body for its perseverance in the battle against sin. The body is compared to "þæt scearpuste scyrsex" 'the sharpest sword', as "þu cuþest synna the fram aceorfan" 'you are able to cut off sins from yourself' (*Junius* 963). The soul comes to the body "mid sibbe" 'in peace' (*Junius* l. 963). The body of the blessed soul stands in antithesis to the wicked body, it is "godes brytta" 'the bride of God' (*Junius* 962). In contrast to the wicked body, it did not follow the devil's teaching, but kept to the "godcundan lare" 'lying teachings, heresies' (*Junius* l. 962). It is "godes hus" 'the house of God' (*Junius* 963), "forðæm þe þu God wunaþ on þam and eardað the his bebodu fylgiaþ and healdaþ" 'because you dwell in God and adhere to his commands' (*Junius* 963).

The sermon known as Cambridge University Library, MS Ii.1.33 also finds its only edition in Willard's article. The theme of the soul and body in this homily occurs

[48] Henceforth indicated as *Junius* followed by page number. All quotation from MS Junius 85 homily come from Willard, Rudolph. 1935. "The address of the soul to the body" *Publications of Modern Language Association* 50:4, 957-983.

[49] "Geherstu, forworhta lichoma, forhwan lærde þe deofol to helle, butan þæt þu fela yfela dydest? Forhwon noldest ðu, forwordena and eac forwyrhta, geheran ða godcundan lare, þe þe laerdon to Godes rice? And þu noldest gecerran to him" (*Junius* 962).

in the context of penance. The soul perishes in hell, because "hi heora lif ær mid unrihte leofedon on þisum deadlican life, and næfre nan dædbote don noldon" 'it lived his life unrighteously and never performed any penance' (*Cambridge* 963)[50]. The soul says to the body that "þu worhtest mycel yfel mid me" 'you committed much evil with me' (*Cambridge* 964). Body was easily led astray by the devil and is guilty of "oferætas, oferdruncennysse and morgenmettas and synlice lustas and stalan and þyfþa and lease gewitnessa and morðslyhtas and manaðas and yvel gewit and facn and tælnyssa and reaflac and oþer manifealde yfel þysum ungelice" 'gluttony and excessive drinking, break fasts and sinful desires, theft and stealing, perjury, murders, evil intentions, frauds, slanders, plundering and many other sins' (*Cambridge* 964). The body rotting in the grave is juxtaposed to the soul being subjected to infernal afflictions:: "Lige on þyssum duste afuled and forrotad; and ic eom gecwylmed and forbærned daeghwamlice on hellewitum" 'you lie in the earth defiled and rottened; and I am tormented and burned every day in hell' (*Cambridge* 964). Hence, in the homily, the body decaying in the ground is the image of the damned soul subjected to eternal torment. The death of the body is but the image of the eternal death that is yet to come to both: "domesdæg is wel neah, þe þu arisan scealt, and ic þonne cume to þe, and þu þonne onfest min, mid þinum yfelum dædum þe þu ær geworhtest on þisum middanearde, and wyt þonne beoð mid deofle, and wyt þar beoth gecwylmede and getintregode butan æclum ende, aefre to worulde" 'the Day of Doom is approaching when you will rise and I will come to you and you will receive me with your evil deeds that you committed in this middle-earth, and we both will then be with the devil and both will be subjected to eternal death' (*Cambridge* 964).

This tradition is also found in Old English writings and gives an insight to the contemporaneous native ideas on the relationship and dualism of the soul and the body. The themes of sin and penitence gave the anonymous Old English poets an opportunity to elucidate on the nature of a human being and speculate on its metaphysical condition. The penitential mood of many Old English religious poems can also be seen to evoke many notions and concepts that were central to Anglo-Saxon morality. Old English poetry imagines the afterlife in heaven as life in the hall with Christ as the eternal Lord to

[50] Henceforth indicated as *Cambridge* followed by page number.All quotation from homily XL of MS Ii l.33, Cambridge University Library, come from an edited version in Willard, Rudolph. 1935. "The address of the soul to the body" *Publications of Modern Language Association* 50:4, 957-983. All translations from Old English to modern English are mine.

Whom humanity owes obedience. The simple heroic notion of life in a warrior-band informs the early Christian ideas on moral life in the entire poetic corpus extant from the Anglo-Saxon period. Religious poetry, however, restructures the idea of the individual in its particular portrayal of moral practice. Whereas in heroic poetry, the aim of moral life is the acceptance of ones personal obligations to one's kin and one's king the aim of moral practice in Old English religious poetry is personal salvation and responsibility for one's soul to the point of exclusion of all earthly communal values. In heroic culture, breaking the bond between the community and individualal is irretrievable. In Christian morality, on the contrary, penance and forgiveness for sins renew the bonds between God and man and transcend all human loyalties.

Chapter 1: *Ofermod* and *oferhygd: superbia* in Old English poetry

1.1. Introduction

In Old English poetry, *superbia* is depicted as a disease of both the soul and the community and, of all seven cardinal sins, it has the most complex psychology and sociology. Criticism, nevertheless, rarely gives justice to its complexity. *Ofermod* and *oferhygd* have been studied in isolation and dismissed as belonging to didactive and exhortative discourse. The way *superbia* is depicted in these and some other Old English poems has never been approached from the perspective of vernacular traditions and studying Anglo-Saxon culture itself. Most critics apply the Augustinian conception of pride when they take it as theme in these poetic works. If a closer look is taken at the Old English vocabulary which translates the Latin concept of *superbia,* that is, *ofermod* and *oferhygd,* it turns out that these lexical terms draw upon psychological conceptions that are foreign to the Latin word *superbia.* When it comes to the way the concepts of *ofermod* and *oferhygd* are to be understood, it is necessary to approach them in the light of two distinct traditions, which shaped the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons: the continental tradition regarding sin and the human soul, represented by Latin fathers, as well as the vernacular vocabulary on the 'mind' founded on the vernacular Germanic poetic tradition of the Anglo-Saxons. This chapter will reveal that Old English poetry, especially in case of the three poems that are the object of the following analysis, invariably depicts

superbia as a threat to hierarchy in a way that responds to the inherent complex psychology and sociology of this sin. Subsequently, *superbia* was the greatest threat to the individual human soul, the first sin, from which all other vices are seen to spring. The representations of *superbia* in Old English poetry will be shown to be peculiar to Anglo-Saxon culture.

The Old English expressions for *superbia* are usually *ofermod* and *oferhygd*; each of these having a number of possible of spelling variations throughout manuscripts of the period. The Bosworth-Toller dictionary of Old English language defines the noun *oferhygd* as: (1) pride, arrogance (with negative connotations); (2) honourable pride, high spirit (with positive connotations) (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 735). The dictionary also testifies to the existence of adjectival forms, *oferhygd* and *oferhydig,* meaning "proud". There is also a verb *oferhydigian* "to be proud" (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 735). *Ofermod,* according to Bosworth-Toller, has the following meanings: (1) pride, arrogance, over-confidence and (2) high style (often glossed with Latin *coturnus*). *Ofermod* may also function as an adjective; another adjectival form is *ofermodig:* proud, arrogant, haughty. The verb *ofermodian* means "to be proud or haughty, to be puffed up with pride" (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 736). There also exists a form *ofer-mettu,* meaning *"*pride, arrogance, haughtiness" (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 736). Helmut Gneuss studied the adjective *ofermod* in *The Battle of Maldon* in his article from 1976 and he proposes five areas of meaning of the word:

> 1. pride, great pride, excessive pride, foolish pride, foolhardy pride; arrogance, haughtiness, disdain; overweening courage
> 2. overconfidence, superb self-confidence
> 3a. recklessness, rashness, rash courage, foolhardiness, Ger. Übermut (= high spirits, wantonness, exuberance)
> 3b. over-courage, overboldness
> 4. great, high courage
> 5. magnanimity, greatness of heart, over-generosity (1976: 119).

Another study that, briefly, attends to the usage of Old English vocabulary corresponding to the Latin *superbia* is Mechthild Gretch's *The intellectual foundations of English Benedictine reform* (1999: 414-418). She studies the Old English terminology of *superbia* mainly in the texts associated with Aethelwold's school in Winchester, the so-called Old Minster, established after 963. She points to the Alfredian roots of the terminology employed in the manuscripts produced by the school. In translations attrib-

uted to Alfred (the *Regula Pastoralis,* the *Boethius,* the *Soliloquies* and the prose *Psalter*), Gretsch discovers the predilection for compounds with *mod*: *ofermettu* (noun), *ofermod* (adjective), *ofermodigian* (verb), but no form similar to *oferhygd. Oferhygd,* Gretsch continues, is found in Waerferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* (a text associated with Alfred's cycle of translations) and the anonymous Old English rendering of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum.* Gretsch tries to reconstruct the origin for Alfred's vocabulary for *superbia,* as, she claims, "for reasons which cannot clearly be recovered now, Alfred felt the urge to create afresh the Old English *superbia* terminology" (1999: 415). She posits the Old Saxon origin of *mod* expression for pride on the ground that Alfred's translation of the *Regula Pastoralis* were influenced by John the Old Saxon as well as by Grimbald, who was a monk at Saint-Bertin in Flanders. The other suggestion for attributing such a provenance to this vocabulary is the evidence from the Old Saxon *Heliand* and the Old Saxon *Genesis* (and its Old English translation known as the *Later Genesis* or *Genesis B*), as Gretsch finds the words for superbia in this poetry, *obarmod* and *obarmodi,* akin to Alfred's *ofermod* and *ofermettu* (1999:417).

In the period of the tenth century English Benedictine reform, Gretsch observes that the terminology is still rather consistent, and is that of Alfred's, although the glossator of the *Royal Psalter* uses the noun *ofermodnes* instead of *ofermettu* (1999:417). But, as she points out, *ofermod* words occur alongside *oferhygd* and *oferhygdig* till the end of the Anglo-Saxon period. Gretsch also attests the use of *modig* as *superbus* in the Athelwold's translation of the *Rule of St Benedict,* which she finds to be an innovation, since in this text the word tends to connote the positive sense of "noble minded, brave" (1999: 418). More recently, Małgorzata Fabiszak and Anna Hebda used the cognitive approach to analyse pride lexemes in Old and Middle English literature in "Cognitive historical approaches to emotion: Pride" (2010). Their study offers a genre distribution of *pride* vocabulary in Old and Middle English literature: "the genre distribution clearly shows that *pryd*/pryt*/prud*prut, oferhygd*/oferhyd*,* and *ofermet** predominantly appear in the religious (and philosophical) writings. *Wlenc*/wlanc*/wlonc** and *giel*p/gylp*/gilp/*gelp** differ noticeably in their genre distribution. The frequency of *Wlenc*/wlanc*/wlonc** in fiction and travelogue doubles the occurrences in religious writing, while for *giel*p/gylp*/gilp/*gelp** the number is almost half of the religious frequency" (2010: 271). They also point out that *ofermod* lexemes appear only in negative terms in Old English literature (2010: 271).

Anglo-Saxon vocabulary for pride, however, cannot be taken for granted as a mere translation of *superbia.* The etymology of these words makes for a number of connotations that are vital for understanding poetic texts, where *ofermod* and *oferhygd* appear as a theme. The root in the Anglo-Saxon words for *superbia* is either *mod* or *hygd.* The Bosworth and Toller dictionary defines *mod* as "the inner man, the spiritual as opposed to the bodily part of man", but also "with more especial reference to intellectual and mental faculties, *mind*" (1882: 693). *Hyge,* from which *–hygd/higd,* comes, means "mind, heart, soul" (1882: 579). It is important to establish the meaning of *mod* and *hygd* to be able to define *ofermod* and *oferhygd* as well as their variants. *Mod* is understood to be the volitional aspect of the soul. Godden distinguishes two traditions concerning the nature of mind in Anglo-Saxon England. One tradition is represented by Alcuin of York, King Alfred and Aelfric of Eysham, whose ideas continue the thought of Plato, Augustine and Boethius and "[i]n particular, they show the gradual development of a unitary concept of the inner self, identifying the intellectual mind with the immortal soul and life-spirit" (Godden 2002: 284). The other tradition was represented by Old English poets and occasionally permeated the writings of Aelfric and Alfred and "it was a tradition which preserved the ancient distinction of soul and mind, while associating the mind at least as much with passion as with intellect" (Godden 2002: 284). Godden defines *mod* not necessarily as a purely intellectual faculty, but as "an inner passion or wilfulness, an intensification of the self that can be dangerous" (Godden 2002: 300). Britt Mize, whose article is a more recent contribution to knowledge on the Anglo-Saxon mental vocabulary, says that "both in the Gregorian version of the soul-as-fortress motif and [the Old English poems] *Vainglory* and *Juliana* is that the diabolical attack targets the desiring, volitional part of the self, which for Old English poets is generally *mod* (or some aspects of it) and not the *sawol*" (Mize 2008: 81).

Consequently, the association of *oferhygd* and *ofermod* with the intellect-words *hygd* and *mod* reveals the complexity of the Old English terms for the Latin *superbia.* The Old English *mod* does not exactly correspond to the modern English word *mind* and the fact that the modern English *mood* derives from that word may be more informative when it comes to the word's denotation and connotations. In his article "Anglo-Saxons on the mind", Godden argues that "in so far as it refers to a power rather than location or centre of consciousness, *mod* seems to convey to many Anglo-Saxons writers not so much the intellectual, rational faculty but something more like an inner passion or wil-

fulness, an intensification of the self that can be dangerous" (Godden 2002: 300). Furthermore, Godden, claims that "there was presumably some rooted sense that passions, or feelings towards other people and things, did not just take hold of one from outside or inside but involved, at some level, an act of will" and that "such uses link with the prevalence of active, simplex verbs for psychological states where modern English has to use a periphrastic form with an adjective; *modigian* 'to be proud', *yrsian* 'to be angry', *murnan* 'to be sad', *gladian* 'to be happy'" (Godden 2002: 299)[51]. Godden's conclusion is that "linguistically, at least, passions can resemble mental actions rather than mental states" (2002: 229).

When *ofermod* and *oferhygd* are considered as aspects of *mod* in Old English poetry, they might therefore be defined as an excessive and overpowering energy of mind, which is opposed to that of the eternal *gast. Ofermod*, as well as *oferhygd*, is therefore the quality of overreaching the proper boundaries of self and as such it is not coincidental the chief heroic value of Old English poetry heroic poetry lies in keeping one's *mod* under control. Consequently, *superbia* is a sin that can infect not only the individual soul, but the entire society as a whole. Keeping one's *mod* in control makes it possible for the individual to fit into the tightly regulated social structure, in which the chief virtue was the obedience to one's lord. A well-studied gnomic remark in *The Wanderer* calls it "indryhten þeaw" 'a lorldly custom' when a thane is able to "his ferðlocan faste binde" 'bind his breast fast', as "ne mæg werig mod wyrde wiðstondan" 'a weary mind will not withstand fate' (*The Wanderer* ll. 12-15). In heroic society pride results in disobedience. Resultantly, the connection between humility and obedience is seen as being natural and universal in every community, where the loyalty of a warrior to his lord guarantees social order.

1.2. Satanic and human Fall and the psychology of repentance in *Genesis B*

The poetic representation of the Fall in Old English *Genesis B* has unquestionably received great attention in critical commentaries Whilst the critical tradition, in relation to this, is rich and has often been concerned with the theme of *superbia*, many aspects of

[51] Godden points out that emotions collocate in Old English with the verb *niman* in expressions like *nimð lufe to Gode* 'he takes love for God' (Godden 2002: 300).

superbia still appear unstudied. The first objective of the following subchapter is to examine the way in which Satan's Fall is related to the human Fall in the poem. In the poem, the contrasting stories of devils and humans and their respective Falls demonstrates *superbia*'s threat to community's integrity. The poem depicts Adam and Eve as living in a comitatus relationship with God, owing to Him obedience and faith, as he is their Creator. The devils live in an inverted *comitatus*, which is a parody of the heavenly angelic one. More importantly, the poem is not merely an imaginative representation of the Fall as a heroic story; it depicts the spiritual dimension of community, in which humility is the chief virtue and compunction the model of behaviour and fear of God as a constant frame of pious mind. Finally, *superbia* is related to the penitential theme exemplified in the story of Adam and Eve. In the following pages, the allegorical interpretation of the Fall that uses Adam represent reason and Eve as sense will suggest the interpretative possibilities for *ofermod* in the poem. *Genesis B* articulates the fear of *superbia* as the sin, which destroys not only the human mind but the entire community around it.

The poem entitled, by modern editors, *Genesis B* is an interpolation inserted into a larger poem, *Genesis A,* found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 (Fulk and Cain [2003] 2005: 110). *Genesis B* is a translation of *Saxon Genesis*[52]. *Genesis B* is an account of the angelic and human Fall that differs from the story found in the Biblical Genesis. It opens with the prohibition given in person by God to Adam and Eve not to eat the fruit of knowledge of good and evil. *Genesis B* elaborates on the Old Testament story of temptation in that the messenger of Satan, but not the Satan himself, appears as the tempter in the story. Moreover, the nature of his appearance to both Adam and Eve is unclear. Even though he appears to Adam as an angel of light, and Eve also reports to her husband the appearance of an angel, he is also described as a serpent in the course of the narrative. The temptation unfolds in a different way than usually described the biblical source. Rather than Eve the tempter first appeals to Adam. Yet the messenger finds it impossible to conquer the will of the First Man and so turns to Eve, whom he considers to be weaker. His second attempt is successful and so it is Eve, who later

[52] Fulk and Cain give a hypothetical reason for this interpolation. "The simplest explanation for the make up of *Genesis* is that *Genesis B* was translated (probably by a continental Saxon, in view of the many un-English idioms) and inserted into *Genesis A* when the latter was discovered to lack and account of the Fall in Eden – not improbably due to a lacuna in the exemplar, just Junius 11 suffers from the loss of leaves here and there" (Fulk and Cain 2005: 112).

manages to persuade Adam to eat the forbidden fruit. Another divergence from the Biblical Genesis is the depiction of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; rather than being shown as attractive in appearance, it is represented as dark and ugly.

Although the poet has often been praised for his imaginative and unorthodox treatment of the Fall, it seems that the departures in the narrative serve to illustrate early medieval doctrines of the human Fall. The traditional reading of the Fall, in which Adam represents reason, Eve sense and the Tempter persuasion has been often applied to the poem. Among the Church Fathers, the major exponent of this interpretation is St Ambrose and he uses the allegory to describe Adam and Eve's transgression in *De Paradiso.*

> We stand by the conviction held by one who preceded us that sin was committed by man because of the pleasure of the sense. We maintain that the figure of the serpent stands for enjoyment and the figure of the woman for the emotions of the mind and heart. The latter is called by the Greeeks αἴσθησις When according to this theory, the senses are deceived, the mind, which the Greeks call νους, falls into error. Hence, not without reason the author to whom I refer [Philo of Alexandria, *De opificio mundi*] accepts the Greek word νους as a figure of a man and αἴσθησις as that of a woman (*De Paradiso* 2: 11)[53].

Ambrose's *Paradise* was well known in Anglo-Saxon England and it is frequently quoted by Bede in his commentary *On genesis* (early eighth century). Augustine of Hippo identified Adam with reason and Eve with affection in his commentary *On genesis against Manicheans* as well[54]. In *The City of God,* he also follows the same allegorical interpretation when he says that the tempter approached the woman first "no doubt starting with the inferior of the human pair so as to arrive at the whole by stages, supposing that the man would not be so easily gullible, and could not be trapped by a false move on his own part, but only if he yielded to another's mistake" (*City of God* 14:11)[55]. Gregory the Great applies his fourfold process of committing sin through sug-

[53] Henceforth indicated as *De Paradiso* followed by chapter and subchapter numbers. All quotations are from Ambrose. 1961. *Saint Ambrose: Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*. (Translated by John J. Savage.) New York: Fathers of the Church, INC.

[54] Augustine makes a misogynist remark that the devil still "deceives by woman. Nor can our reason be brought to the consent that is sin, except when delight is aroused in that part of the soul which ought to obey reason as its ruling husband" (*On genesis against Manecheans* 14: 20). The quotation is taken from Augustine. 1990. *On genesis. Two books on genesis against the Manichees and on the literal interpretation of genesis, an unfinished book.* (The Fathers of the Church 84.) (Translated by Roland J. Teske.) Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

[55] Henceforth indicated as *The City of God* followed by chapter and subchapter numbers. All quotations are from Augustine. 2003. *The City of God.* (Translated by Henry Bettenson.) London: Penguin Books.

gestion, pleasure, consent, and boldness to defend to the story of the Fall; "For the serpent tempted, Eve was pleased, Adam yielded consent, and even when called in question he refused in effrontery to confess his sin" (*Moralia* 4:49)[56]. Bede identifies the woman (Eve) with sense and sexual desire, which must be checked and restrained by the husband (Adam): "and he will rule over her, restraining her carnal motions, and moving her forward to the comprehension of heavenly life by the constant practice of divine education, from which if she had never withdrawn, she would always have reigned jointly with him in freedom" (*On Genesis* 3: 16c)[57].

This account has often been applied to the interpretation of *Genesis B.* John Vickerey claims that the poem "recalls an allegory in which Adam was understood to represent reason, *ratio*, and Eve the animal bodily sense, *sensus corporis animalis* (1965: 164)[58]. Thomas D. Hill modifies Vickrey's approach and rejects Vickerey's model of allegory 'of this for that' and instead claims that Adam, Eve and the Tempter in *Genesis B* are not allegories as such, but that the allegory of reason, sense and suggestion is implicit in the relationship between them (Hill 1975: 287). Hill uses the theory to suggest that the poet reconciles the biblical account of a Promethean overreaching and the allegorical reading of exegetes, thereby harmonizing the two meanings of the Fall by separately depicting the angelic Fall as Promethean overreaching and the human Fall as a subversion of the hierarchical order of reason over sense (Hill 1975: 287). In his view, pride in the poem is to be attributed to Satan and his followers, whereas no specific sin is associated with the human pair. Instead, the poet uses an interlace technique to present the human Fall, and every human sin, as a re-enactment of Satan's Fall (Hill 1975: 289). Susan Burchmore follows the allegorical reading of the poem, but, at the same time, states that the poem is faithful to the biblical commentaries

[56] Henceforward indicated as *Moralia* followed by the number of the book and chapter. All quotations from *Moralia on the book of Job* come from The quotation comes from Gregory the Great. 1844-1850. *Morals on the book of Job.* (Edited and translated by John Henry Parker.) 3 vols. Oxford: J. G. F. And J. Rivington.

[57] Henceforth indicated as *On Genesis* followed by chapter and subchapter numbers. All quotations are from Bede. 2008. *On Genesis.* (Translated Texts for Historians 48.) (Translated by Calvin B. Kendall.) Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

[58] Vickrey suggests that the allegorical tradition made the poet rework the Biblical story of the human Fall in a highly idiosyncratic way. "For to suppose that his intention was to depict through character and action the belief of authorities that Adam represented reason and Eve the animal bodily sense – almost, that Adam was reason and Eve the animal bodily sense – and that reason could not be overthrown except by delectation through the body is to account for two of the remarkable features of the poem: that Adam is tempted first, and unsuccessfully, and that he is tempted by a devil disguised as an angel" (1965: 165).

in yet another way; "just as the poem's emphasis is upon the process by which the tempter deceives his victims, so too the psychology of deception is a major concern of the exegetical commentaries" (1985: 119)[59]. This allegorical reading of the human Fall may be expanded upon in the light of the themes in the poem and theological ideas outside it that it may be illustrating. It seems that the allegory of reason, sense and suggestion may account for other elements in the narrative. It has previously not been noticed in the poem that the violation of the hierarchical order of mind and sense (where mind should govern sense, not vice versa) accounts not only for the human Fall but also is implicit in the Fall of Satan. Therefore, the relationship between the Angelic and human Fall in the poem must undergo a deeper examination.

The seriousness of pride in the poem is twofold. First of all, it results in a breach of loyalties and allegiances that disrupt the cosmic hierarchy and the relationship between the Creator and His creation. Satan's *superbia* consists of asserting his independence from God's grace, *hyldo* (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 581), which is also the condition of Adam and Eve's prosperity and continuance of their existence in Paradise. Secondly, *superbia* in the poem is a sin that precludes conversion, which not only involves a religious anathema, but also makes the restoration to grace, through repentance, impossible. It is not accidental that the poem introduces the theme of repentance. The ideology of penance is central to the poem and, with the relationship between God and humans understood in terms of analogy with the earthly comitatus in the poem, it is depicted as the means of restoration to God's grace. In *Junius Manuscript*, the subject of *superbia* is interconnected with the theme of exile (Borysławski 2010: 21). Paradise here is inhabited by Adam and Eve in their pre-lapsarian state, and although it is later to be lost through sin, is imagined to be a model for a Christian community. The allegory implies an analogy between the health of the individual soul and the wider community. The poem therefore must be approached as an allegory from a twofold perspective; as a tropological interpretation of the human soul attacked and subsequently cured of *superbia* and as an image of the community that binds its members with a complex structure of bonds and allegiances. The hierarchy of reason and sense within the soul is in itself an image of values that take precedence in the community, of the society taking precedence over the individual, and the law overcoming the desire.

[59] Burchmore suggests that "the confusion about the tempter's appearance is an integral part of the poet's theme of visual deception" (1985: 120).

Obedience and loyalty as a surety for the continuance of God's grace is the theme of the poem. The subject that is established in the narrative is grace and favour on the part of God, who is described in terms of an earthly chieftain, on the one hand, and the loyalty and obedience on the part of angels and human, on the other, who are depicted as existing in God's thaneship. The poem commences with the lines that present God's commandment not to eat of the tree of knowledge is uttered to both Adam and Eve: "Hnigon þa mid heafdum heofoncyninge georne togenes and sædon ealles þanc, lista and þara lara" 'they bowed their heads to the Heavenly king together in zeal and expressed thanks for his advice and teaching' (*Genesis B*, ll. 237-239)[60]. Adam and Eve's settled condition in paradise seems to anticipate and contrast with the plight of the rebellious angels when they are exiled from heaven. The first human pair are allowed to inhabit the place and are not troubled with sorrow; "nyston sorga with to begrorniane" 'they did not know any sorrow (*Genesis B*, ll. 242-243), "ðenden heo his halige word healdan woldon" 'as long as they are willing to keep God's word' (*Genesis B*, ll. 246).

The next movement of the poem narrates the Fall of the angels and continues the themes of obedience and grace. This Fall contains the foreshadowing of, and the counterpoint to, the human Fall in the manner of the interlace technique[61]. Additionally, as Thomas D. Hill notices, it functions as a type of 'every human sin' and introduces Satan as the archetype of excessive pride (1975: 287). It is God's expectation that "þæt hie his giongorscipe fyligan wolden, wyrcean his willan forþon he him gewit forgeaf" 'that they follow his service and work his will and, therefore, he instituted their minds/reason' (*Genesis B*, ll. 249-250). One of the angels, Lucifer, is advanced to the highest seat above his peers and he is expected to show forth the highest example of loyalty as "lof sceolde he drihtnes wyrcan" 'he should express in deeds the glory of God' as well as "sceolde his drihtne thancian þæs leanes þe he him on þam leohte gescerede" 'he had to be grateful to his Lord for the rewards that He showered on him' (*Genesis B*, l. 256). The exultation of Satan in the poem is marked by a change of metre;

[60] Henceforth indicated as *Genesis B* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Krapp, George Phillip. 1931. *The Junius manuscript.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

[61] The interlace structure of the poem, which foregrounds this relation is noticed by Thomas D. Hill. He suggests that it allows the poem to be "polysemous in that it bears more than one significance in traditional Christian exegesis. The Fall thus involves both Promethean overreaching and subversion of hierarchical order, and the crucifixion involves both Christ's humiliation and defeat as a man and His triumph and vindication as God, since it was only through the Cross that He could redeem the world" (1975: 288).

he is introduced with the hypermetric lines. Satan is raised above the entire host of angels not only in honour and power, but also in his physical and mental capabilities. As shown in the lines where God made "ænne hæfde he swa swiðne geworhtne, swa mihtigne on his modgeþohte, he let hine swa micles wealdan, hehstne to him on heofona rice" 'one so strong and of so powerful mind and allowed him to rule a great dominion, as he was second to Him in might' (*Genesis B* ll.252-254). Satan's *superbia* begins when he becomes over-indulgent in his being self-pleased and, as all other excessively proud characters in Old English poetry, in being too self-assured in his security so as to feel independent from grace. As such his *ofermod* that violates the hierarchy of heavenly *comitatus* is not only disobedience, but ingratitude for the gifts he received from God. The narrator says that Satan "Lof sceolde he drihtnes wyrcean, dyran sceolde he his dreamas on heofonum, and sceolde his drihtne þancian þæs leanes þe he him on þam leohte gescerede þonne læte he his hine lange wealdan" 'should have worked the deeds of praise to his Lord and *dyran* his happiness in heaven, he ought to have thanked his Lord for his rewards showered on him in the brightness of heavenly light for his to enjoy them for long' (*Genesis B* ll. 256-258).

If the first movement of pride is being self-pleased, the second and last movement of *superbia* in Satan's *mod* brings about his recognition of himself as a self-created being more potent even than God. He is consequently depicted as a thane whose ambition is to establish an alternative kingdom to compete with his former lord. Satan's *superbia* reaches its extreme when he utters the boast of being greater than the Creator; "Feala worda gespæc se engel ofermodes þohte þurh his anes cræft hu he him strenglicran stol geworhte, heahran on heofonum" 'the excessively proud angel spoke many words and thought that he could build a far superior stronghold with his own strength, higher in heaven' (*Genesis B* ll. 271-274). Pride as such does not come from temptation, but, as in the writings of the Desert Fathers, it is the desire to recognize oneself as the original creative force and to trust in one's self-generative capabilities (Cassian *Institutes* 12:22). The passage that concentrates on Satan's *superbia* continually draws attention to his *mod* and reveals the process of its accelerating corruption. In her study devoted to the concept of mind in Old English poetry, Antonina Harbus points out that "apart from the senses clustering around 'mind', *mod* is also construed as connoting 'pride' and 'courage' on some occasions in Old English, thereby encoding the perception that the mental faculty was also the basis of character and conscience" (2002: 41).

In *Genesis B, mod* and *gewitt* are the seat of ethical choice and intelligence. The "ofermod" (l 263) that affects Lucifer is depicted as a mental dysfunction whereby his reason is overwhelmed by sense. Before he experiences the urge, he seems to be overpowered by his senses. The rebellious boast that he will forsake God's service follows the recognition that "his lic wære leoht and scene, hwit and hiowbeorht" 'his body was bright and shining, of brightly white hue' (*Genesis B*, ll 265-266). This recognition of his independence removes the thought of obedience and loyalty to God from his mind: "Ne meahte he æt his hige findan þæt he gode wolde geongerdome, þeodne þeowian" 'he could not find in his heart the will to serve God' (*Genesis B,* ll 266-268). He professes himself to be like God, when he says that "ic mæg wesan god swa he" 'I might be a god/as good as he is' (*Genesis B,* l 283). This description of Satan is in the poem should also be understood in the context another tradition, which is shown in the poem *The Wanderer,* where the exile prides himself on being able to "his ferðlocan faste binde" 'bind his breast fast', as "ne mæg werig mod wyrde wiðstondan" 'a weary mind will not withstand fate' (*The Wanderer* ll. 12-15)[62]. *The Wanderer* identifies the possible dangers for the human soul not as an external demonic factor, but as the hidden force of the human psyche. It is plausible to apply this conception to the depiction of the soul infected by pride in *Genesis B.* Satan's *superbia* is depicted as a irrational force that comes to possess Satan's mind: "cwæð þæt hine his hige speone þæt he west and norð wyrcean ongunne, trymede getimbro" 'he said that his mind/heart urged him that he should establish a stronghold in western and northern parts' (*Genesis B*, ll 274-276).

Satan's sensuality is growing through the narrative. In *Genesis B,* pride is identified with lust. Lust, and desire, is what Satan and Eve have in common in the poem. The narrator says about the fallen angels that "Hie hyra gal beswac, engles oferhygd" 'their wantonness deceived them, the angels' pride' and that "þæt him for galscipe god sylfa wearð mihtig on mode yrre" 'the almighty God became angry with them on the ground of their wantonness' (*Genesis B,* ll. 327-328; 341-342). This idea may be supported with recourse to the early Christian tradition. In Old English, *galscipe* is identified with Latin *luxuria, libido,* and *petulantia,* all of which have sexual connotations associated with lust (Bosworth and Toller Dictionary 1882: 360). In *The City of God,* Augustine

[62] The quotation from *The Wanderer comes* from Krapp, George Phillip and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (eds.). 1936. *The Exeter book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 3.) New York: Columbia University Press. Translation mine.

identifies lust with the desire for earthly dominion[63]. Further, the occurrence of sin is depicted here as a psychological process that results from the displacement of the faculties of intellect and the wording used to describe Satan's Fall anticipates the depiction of the human Fall in the poem. If the allegory of reason, sense and suggestion is implicit in the human Fall, it must be also recognised that Lucifer's Fall from grace in the poem is shown as a process in which the elements of mind are displaced and that it seems to reflect the patristic ideas on the nature of soul. As a consequence, the connection between *superbia* and *lust* becomes vitally important in the poem. In case of Satan the lust that springs from his *superbia* is not as much a sin as the punishment for his sin. Like his desire for glory, his desire for sensual experience cannot be satisfied and is perpetually thwarted by the eternal pain inflicted on him in hell. The sensuality in which increasingly grows within in the poem is his punishment; this idea may well be a reflection of the Boethian idea that sin that sinners commit is in fact a sufficient punishment for them (Boethius 1999: 79)[64].

When Satan's tempter comes, Adam refuses to listen to his bidding on the grounds that (1) he remembers the commandment God gave to him "strange stemne" 'in mighty voice' (*Genesis B* l. 525), (2) that God told him to beware of deceit (*Genesis B* l. 527-529) and (3) that breaking the commandment will result in punishment in hell (*Genesis B* l. 529-530). The contrast between Satan and Adam is that Satan reason has been perverted by sense. Adam's reason, in his prelapsarian condition, is not corrupted by sense and he proves to be perfectly able to discern between reality and appearance, not trusting his sensory data but basing his judgment upon logical reasoning. He tells the tempter that "þinra bysna ne mæg worda ne wisna wuht ocnawan siðes ne sagona" 'your messege I cannot understand, a word of it' (*Genesis B* l. 533-535) and, as a result, remains adamant in continuing his obedience to God. Adam wins the trial and proves that he is superior to the tempter. He represents reason unconquered by sense.

On his failure to move Adam to breach his loyalty to God, the tempter embarks on enticing Eve. Defeated by Adam's adherence to Adam's "hyldo," the messenger ap-

[63] The earthly city is created by self-love reaching the contempt for God, the Heavenly City by the love of God carried as far as the contempt of self. In fact, the earthly city glorifies in itself, the Heavenly City glorifies in the Lord. Lust (domination) vs. love (obedience). Religion of the earthly city glorifies the creation, not the Creator" (*The City of God* 14: 28)

[64] Philosophy tells Boethius that "he who abandons goodness and ceases to be a man cannot rise to the status of a god, and so is transformed into an animal" (Boethius 1999: 79).

proaches Eve, but in contrast to his earlier attempt his efforts are now directed against Eve's sense of loyalty and obedience to God and Adam. More than that, his temptation of Eve is more subtle than that used with Adam. Now it appeals to what constitutes the basis of human obedience, fear of God.

> Ic wat, inc waldend god
> abolgen wyrð, swa ic him þisne bodscipe
> selfa secge, þonne ic of þys siðe cume
> ofer langne weg, þæt git ne læstan wel
> hwilc ærende swa he easten hider
> on þysne sið sendeð.
>
> I know that the all-ruling God will be angry with you, when I bear him this errand in person, when I am back from this exploit that both of you have not heeded the message he sends hither to the eastern parts (*Genesis B*, 551-556).

His address is a direct threat to Eve; if she ignores the fake command, as Adam did before her, she will incur Divine Wrath[65]. He also arouses *superbia* in Eve by suggesting to her that she should try "Adam eft gestyran gif þu his willan hæfst and he þinum wordum getrywð" 'to rule Adam, if he inclines to your will and trust your word' (*Genesis B*, l. 568-569). Still, he is concerned with sustaining the fear of God in Eve, as he persuades her to make Adam "he þone laðan strið, yfel andwyrde an forlæteð on breostcofan" 'forsake the evil contest and his evil answer in his mind' (*Genesis B*, ll. 572-574). If Eve proves successful, the tempter promises that [he will] "forhele ic incrum herran þæt me hearmes swa fela Adam gespræc, eargra worda" 'hide from the Lord the fact that Adam has done to me so much harm and spoken so many wicked words' (*Genesis B*, ll. 579-580). He refutes Adam's accusation that he is not similar to God's angels and introduces himself to Eve as belonging to God's comitatus (*Genesis B*, ll. 583-587)[66].

The narrator depicts Eve's mind as yielding to evil inclination

> Lædde hie swa mid ligenum and mid listum speon
> idese on þæt unriht, oðþæt hire on innan ongan
> weallan wyrmes geþeaht, (hæfde hire wacran hige
> metod gemearcod), þæt heo hire mod ongan
> lætan æfter þam larum; forþon heo æt þam laðan onfeng
> ofer drihtnes word deaðes beames

[65] When analysing *Genesis A* and *B*, Peter J. Lucas says that in Old English religious epic "fear of the Lord ... is very much a controlling factor in the minds of the virtuous; it is a prerequisite for a just society" (Lucas 1992: 124).

[66] Buchmore says that "because his lies have failed to seduce Adam, the serpent is careful to be more subtle and indirect with Eve. He does not insist that he is God's servant, but appeals instead to the woman' fear of punishment and to her desire to preserve Adam from harm" (1985: 129).

> weorcsumne wæstm.
>
> He led her astray with lies and enticed her by deception to that which was not right, until the serpent's instigated thought began to well up in her heart (the Creator made her mind weaker) and her mind inclined to the evil teaching; therefore she accepted the fatal fruit of the tree of death from the enemy against the word given to the Lord (*Genesis B*, ll. 588-594).

After the prolonged period of temptation commented upon by the narrator (*Genesis B*, ll. 588-610), she inclines to it and eats the fruit. As a result, Eve's eyes open and she is able to see the throne of God as testimony to the tempter's words. The tempter asks her to bring the fruit to Adam and tells her that the vision open to the eyes of both will be a token of truth. The text's insistence that God created her mind weaker and that she had "wraðþran geþanc" 'the weaker mind' (*Genesis B* l. 631), validates the idea that Eve represents *sensus corporis animalis* of the allegorical interpretation. Eve is thus depicted as deeply sensual. The underlying motivation behind eating the fruit is, however, not the pleasure itself, but the suggestion that she might desire rule over Adam, which makes her sensuality similar to that of Satan.

In the patristic thought, Eve, to a large extent, embodies the Augustinian lust for dominion that characterises the earthly city of Babylon. Patristic exegesis invariably attributes the sin of pride to Eve. In *The City of God,* the most typical patristic exposition of the human Fall, Augustine of Hippo says that "the devil would have convinced man, if the man had begun to experience self-pleasure. That is why he was delighted also with the statement, 'You will be like gods'" (*The City of God* 14: 13). Augustine propounds that the original evil takes place in the Biblical account of the Fall when "man regards himself as his own light, and turns away from that light which would make man himself a light if he would set his heart on it. This evil came first, in secret, and the result was the other evil, which was committed in the open" (*The City of God* 14: 13). In his commentary on the biblical *Genesis,* Venerable Bede expresses no doubt that Eve's sin arises from pride and claims, on the authority of Augustine of Hippo's opinion, that "this tempter would not have cast man down unless a certain kind of pride which should have been suppressed had preceded in man's soul, so that he might learn by the humiliation of sin, how much he wrongly presumed of himself" (*On Genesis* 3: 1a).

Throughout the scene of temptation Eve is thus exposed to deception. In his address to her, the tempter of *Genesis B* repeats his appeal to loyalty and obedience, but he

supports his ensnaring speech, not with logical arguments, but with the vision of the throne of God. Rosemary Woolf reads the messenger's disguise in *Genesis B* as allegorical giving analogues from apocryphal writings and Gregory's *Moralia on the book of Job.* She argues that "the meaning of the disguise of an angel of light becomes plain, that is, that it is an allegorical figure for the kind of self-deception by which a person may deceive himself that an action, wrong, but much desired, is right" (1963: 191-192). She also compares the psychological situation of Eve in *Genesis B* to that of St Juliana in Latin sources and Cynewulf's poem and points out that Eve, like Juliana, who is being convinced by the devil that God does not require her to be constant and exhorts her to sacrifice to idols, should remain steadfast in her loyalty to the Creator (1963: 192). Susan Burchmore suggests that *Genesis B* poet's interpretation of the Fall corresponds to the patristic reading of the Biblical story as a warning against heretics and heresy which "introduces into the story of the Fall that passage from 2 Corinthians 11 which includes Paul's remark that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, a verse which ... might explain Eve's view of the tempter's form in *Genesis B*" (1985: 123) [67].

The alternative critical take on the story, as depicted in *Genesis B,* is a view that the poet makes every effort to exonerate Adam and Eve from guilt. Evans argues that "throughout the poem he maintains a continual contrast between the catastrophic nature of the actual deeds and the goodness of the motives which inspired them" (1963b: 8). He takes a sympathetic view on Adam and Eve's actions; "we feel no more inclined to condemn this Adam and this Eve than we do to blame Oedipus for his hideous mistakes" and "their errors are errors of judgment, not sins, and the nemesis which overtakes them is determined by a causal rather than a moral law" (1963: 115)[68]. Similarly, Anne L. Klinck argues that the poet renders Adam and Eve's ruin tragic and pitiful. She identifies the mood of the poem as that of dramatic irony and reads the poem as a tragedy of Adam, "a tragedy which is seen in essentially ironic terms, and manipulates the scene so as to stress the elements of irony and contrast" (Klinck 1979: 599). She foregrounds the element of ignorance in Eve's transgression and plays down the sin of

[67] Buchmore suggests that "Eve's reference in the poem to the tempter's angelic appearance was not meant to indicate that he was actually in the shape of an angel, but only to remind the audience that the serpent in the Fall story represents not only the suggestion of delight, but also heretics or false apostles who use the senses to pervert the mind (1985: 124).

[68] Evans argues that the *Genesis B* poet based his story on literary rather than theological sources (1963b: 115).

pride. She compares Eve to Desdemona: "Like *Genesis B* poet's Eve, Shakespeare's Desdemona is the loved and loving, and also the innocent vehicle of her husband's tragedy. Thus the sense of tragic waste created in *Genesis B* is similar to that of Shakespeare's play" (Klinck 1979: 601). Klinck makes the mistake of bringing into an Old English poem a non-medieval concept. The author of *Genesis B* cannot have entertained a Romantic concept of love when writing his poem and even if he had this would spoil the moral design of it, for the only kind of love he will have considered is the Christian love for God, *Caritas,* which is grounded on reason, rather than emotion and desire.

What is more, this notion of love implies the violation of the loyalty of a thane to their lord whereas the relationship between the humanity and God supersedes all personal relations between people. The narrator often implies through gnomic remarks that such a violation of comitatus would be considered to be the greatest offence in the Germanic heroic code. If Eve is shown as having forgotten the command, such a lapse again cannot have been found excusable within the context of Germanic comitatus. Although she is deceived, the bond of grace and obedience is broken. The gnomic remarks make it necessary to withdraw from the view held by Klinck, who argue that author of *Genesis B* exempts Adam and, especially, Eve from guilt (Klinck 1979: 601). Evans and Klincks' readings of the poem, which argue for the poet's sympathetic stance, allow for the consideration of a contradiction within the narrative that would be impossible in the context of the Germanic heroic code, which forms the basis of the story.

Adam and Eve are contrasted with Satan to provide a behavioural model for repentance. The sin of pride makes repentance barely possible, as it involves the assertion of independence from the Creator; consequently this vice appeared especially detrimental to any form of penitential practice. In the depiction of humans, the text focuses on the process whereby pride can be overcome. The human pair is therefore treated differently than Satan to illustrate the process, and possibility, of conversion. Eve's pride is manifest when she approaches Adam with the fruit. She is depicted as being confident that the eating of fruit from tree of knowledge of good and evil does not cause death. She assures Adam that they can continue in their happiness without God. The contrast between them and Satan is that whereas Satan is self-deceiving and, because of his corrupted *mod,* unable to recognise the real nature of himself in relation to God, Adam and Eve are deceived by others. Their deception relies on the external evidence they receive from the devil, not on their own self corrupted psyche. Eve believes what the tempter

tells her, because she has been shown evidence by the devil. However, once the false vision vanishes, Eve and Adam are able to see through the deception and comprehend their mistake. Also, as the narrative continues, they grow in self-awareness and are able to see the true nature of their relation to God.

The poet of *Genesis B*, depicts the process whereby *superbia* arises in the human soul and the story demonstrates how the sin of *superbia* inverts the hierarchy of universe, which is imagined as the Hall with the Heavenly paradise as the seat of God and his angelic comitatus. This is why Satan's Fall in the poem is relevant to the human Fall in the poem. This demonstrates the contrast between Satan's Fall and the human Fall in the poem and introduces the audience to the poem's proper subject: sin and restoration to God's grace through penance. If the prerequisite of original sin in the poem is pride, the pride that infects Eve' mind is different from that which contaminates Satan's and those of his followers' *ofermetto*. Satan's pride is combined with the fourth stage of sin in the Gregorian scheme, boldness to defend.

There is another contrast between Satan and the human pair that reinforces the penitential theme. When Satan suffers in hell, constrained and bound with metal fetters, his constant mood is that of sorrow and ever-increasing despair caused by the frustration of his desire for vengeance. Satan is depicted as growing both in pride and sorrow.

> þæt me is sorga mæst,
> þæt Adam sceal, þe wæs of eorðan geworht,
> minne stronglican stol behealdan,
> wesan him on wynne, and we þis wite þolien,
> hearm on þisse helle.
>
> It is the greatest sorrow to me that Adam, who was made of earth, will take over my majestic throne and exist in joy, while we suffer this punishment and pain in this hell. (*Genesis B* 1931: 364-368)

Satan's sorrow causes in him envy for the bliss of humanity and increases in him a desire to avenge his plight by bringing about human disobedience. In the poem, there is a contrast between Satan's sorrow, which increases despair and separates him from God, and Adam and Eve's sorrow, which leads to compunction. This is because the patristic tradition differentiated between the evil thoughts of sorrow, which lead to existential despair and damnation, and the good thoughts of sorrow, which prompts repentance thereby making salvation possible. Adam and Eve, in contrast to Satan and his followers, "godes him ondredon, heora herran hete" 'they feared God, their Lord's hate'

(*Genesis B*, ll. 767-768). Furthermore, unlike Satan, Adam and Eve do not recognize themselves as independent and self-sufficient. Therefore their minds are affected only by the first movement of pride, which is being self-pleased. All this is a significant departure from the accepted biblical account. Adam and Eve in the poem behave differently than their counterparts in the Biblical Genesis. Their states of mind are different, because they are not guilty of boldness to defend. The biblical commentaries invariably insist on human obstinacy to recognize the sin; Adam blames Eve and Eve blames the Serpent. In the commentary on Genesis, Bede gives an extensive quote from Augustine's *De Genesis ad litteram.*

> Pride! Did he say, I have sinned? He has the disgrace of embarrassment, and he lacks the humility of confession. These things were written because these questions were of course also asked in order that they might be written for our advantage, so that we may notice how men suffer from pride today, only trying to hold the Creator responsible if they do any evil, although they wish to take the credit if they do any good (Bede 2009: 131).

As a result of their sorrow for sin and compunction, Adam and Eve in *Genesis B* "to gebede feollon" 'fell to prayer' (*Genesis* B, l. 777) and "hie bædon þæt hie his hearmscreare habban mosten georgne fulgangan, þa hie godes hæfdon bodscipe abrocen" 'they prayed to him that they could readily fulfil his penalty after they had broken his commandment' (*Genesis B*, ll. 780-783)[69].

Adam and Eve become repentant, when they recognise their nakedness as a sign of their limitations. In *Genesis B*, the moment when the first people realise their nakedness is symbolically underscored by the exile theme. In their pre-lapsarian condition, Adam and Eve "nyston sorga wiht to begrornianne" 'did not know any sorrow that would affect their mind' (*Genesis B* ll. 242-243). In the post-lapsarian state, nakedness exposes humans to harsh nature, which has become a threatening force as a result of

[69] Evans finds possible sources for the penitential behaviour of Adam and Eve in *Genesis B.* "The *Vita Adae et Evae* had described at some length the post-lapsarian experiences of Adam and Eve, their desire to appease the wrath of God and their attempts to do penance, but it did not begin its account of these until after expulsion. The same is true of the lesser-known analogue in Claudius Marius Victor's *Alethia*, another of the Christian Latin Fall poems. Here they prostrate themselves on the ground, dumb with grief, until Adam rises to address his Creator in a long prayer in which he freely admits his guilt and asks only for guidance in the fulfilment of punishment. His mood as expressed in this prayer is rather closer to that attributed to him in Genesis B than is his state of mind as portrayed in the Vita. The latter places all the stress on his penance, the Alethia on his prayer and his ignorance of the means by which he is to serve his sentence. If the Saxon poet did borrow this episode from his Latin predecessor he gave it much stronger force by placing it before rather than after the condemnation" (Evans 1963a: 16).

original sin. After the Fall, Adam and Eve do not profess the independence from the Creator that characterizes Satan either in the biblical tradition or as a quality of his character in *Genesis B.* On the contrary, their destitute condition allows them to perceive the truth never recognised by Satan and his followers; they can only find themselves accomodated in the new hostile environment through their restoration to God's *hyldo.* They can still affirm their dependence on God.

The poem recognises the fallibility of human nature that stems from the inherent duality of soul and body, reason and sensuality. The ideology of penance that informs the poem testifies to the context of the penitential practice in Anglo-Saxon England. In the poem, the first trial of Adam and Eve takes place at the moment of temptation. The second test comes when Adam and Eve are exposed to the physical depravation of exile and have to consider an alternative vision of universe without God. Eve's vision of God gives way to harsh reality. When Eve recognises her mistake, she can see that the vision that the devil endowed her with is a transient one which quickly vanishes; instead the opposing vision of the reality of hell is opened to both her and Adam. Adam realises his error when he measures the difference between hell and Paradise: "nis heofonrice gelic þam lige" 'not at all is heaven like the fire of hell' (*Genesis B* ll. 795-796) Adam realises the deprivation to which they, and future generations, will be exposed.

> Nu slit me hunger and þurst
> bitre on breostum, þæs wit begra æ
> wæron orsorge on ealle tid.
> Hu sculon wit nu libban oððe on þys lande wesan,
> gif her wind cymð, westan oððe eastan,
> suðan oððe norðan? Gesweorc up færeð,
> cymeð hægles scur hefone getenge,
> færeð forst on gemang, se byð fyrnum ceald.
>
> Now hunger and thirst bite into my heart. ... How shall we live or continue in this land, when the wind comes, whether from the west or from the east, from the south or from the north? (*Genesis B* ll. 802-809)

Adam and Eve's repentance is brought about by the self realisation of their own weakness. The poem's penitential mood is built through the text's dependence on the tradition of the exile theme[70]. Rafał Borysławski shows that in the Old English poetic tradi-

[70] This theme is elucidated upon by Stanley B. Greenfield in his study of theme of exile in Old English poetry (1953) Here, he discusses different types of oral formulas that recur through the corpus of Anglo-Saxon verse, the most important of which are the exile's status of excommunication from society and the subsequent deprivation he is subjected to ([1953] 1989: 126-127).

tion the theme of pride is reinforced by the theme of exile and both themes fuse especially in the poems of Junius Manuscript. In his article "Between *oferhygd* and *wraeclastas*" (2010), Borysławski discusses the theme of pride and exile in *Christ and Satan,* the last poem of the Junius Manuscript, as "admonitory vision of an afterlife as exile effectuated by pride" (2010: 21). The exile theme that resonates in *Genesis B,* where it is also linked to the theme of *superbia* and works as a reminder that the human nature is essentially weak.

The landscape description that ends the poem and echoes Adam's lament contemplates the world and the forces of nature working so as to inspire humility. The landscape asserts the weakness and vulnerability of humanity in the face of natural conditions; the post-lapsarian landscape is a tropological image of the fallen human condition that testifies to the sinful nature of the human soul. On the one hand, the earth is endowed with graces and gifts from God; "he him to frofre let hwæðere forð wesan hyrstedne hrof halgum tunglum and him grundwelan ginne sealed" 'He gave them for comfort the sheltering firmament replete with stars and vast circuit of land' (*Genesis B* ll. 955-957). On the other hand, Adam and Eve "gesæton þa æfter synne sorgfulre land, eard and eðyl unspedigran fremena gehwilcre þonne se frumstol wæs þe hie æfter dæde of adrifen wurdon" 'inhabited a more sorrowful land after their sin, a land that was not abundant with graces than their first home, from which they were driven away after their wrong-doing' (*Genesis B* ll. 961-964). The description is a tropological image that suggests that in the post-lapsarian universe humanity is withdrawn from the full enjoyment of grace, but, at the same time, with a possibility of restoration through repentance and obedience. It also links the poem intertextually to the tradition of the theme of exile.

1.3. *Superbia* and the theme of *translatio imperii* in *Daniel*

The Old English *Daniel*, which comes as the third poem in the Junius Manuscript, following *Exodus* and preceding *Christ and Satan,* is appreciated as one of the most elaborately constructed verse sequences in the whole body of Old English poetry. Unlike most of *Genesis A,* it is not merely a translation of its biblical source, namely, the deutorocanonical Book of Daniel. Rather, the Old English *Daniel* is usually seen as an independent work, which develops theme different to the biblical story. The major narra-

tive departure from the Vulgate story is the figure of Nebuchadnezzar himself, who is the protagonist of the poem; the eponymous character is in fact of lesser importance[71].

Because of the attention that is given to Nebuchadnezzar[72] in the poem, *Daniel* has often been read as an exemplary study of *superbia.* Graham D. Caie reads the poem as a warning against pride and applies the generic concept of exemplum to his interpretation. The narrative of *Daniel*, he says, features three exempla. The first exemplum illustrates the pride of the Hebrew, who are punished with Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem, which at the conclusion of Exodus has been delivered to Canaan. The other exemplum is about Nebuchadnezzar's pride and his humiliation that results in his conversion. The third exemplum depicts Belshazzar and his destruction by the Medes (1978: 2). He identifies Nebuchadnezzar as the personification of pride and takes him to be a universalised figure of Everyman. Gillian Overing argues that the poem is a psychological portrait of the conversion of a heathen into Hebrew Monotheism (which, typologically, stands for Christianity in the poem) exemplified by the figure of Nebuchadnezzar (Overing 1984: 10). For Overing, the obstacle that stands in the way of Nebuchadnezzar's conversion is *oferhygd*, which she defines as "the strength of individual ego, expressed in the OE concept of *oferhygd,* does not allow the king to see outside himself, to expand his limited sensory understanding and imagine a reality greater than the self" (1984: 10). These critics thus recognize the Old English poem's originality, first and foremost, in Christianising the Old Testament story by identifying the typological significance of characters and themes in the poem. Nebuchadnezzar might be this seen as the universalised figure of a sinner and depicts his penance and subsequent conversion from sin and idolatry to faith and Hebrew monotheism, which prefigures Christianity.

The reading of the poem as an exemplary story of an individual ridden by the sin of pride, and as a psychological study of conversion from sin to faith, is challenged only by Earl R. Anderson. When it comes to interpreting Nebuchadnezzar as a personification of *superbia*, Anderson finds such a tropological interpretation of the poem as a warning against pride unwarranted in the exegetical tradition (1987: 1). For him, Nebu-

[71] Antonina Harbus claims that the poet shifts the emphasis from Daniel's prophetic abilities, which made for the significance of the biblical Book of Daniel in the early medieval exegetical tradition, to Nebuchadnezzar's dreams (Harbus 1994: 491). According to Caie, in contrast to the biblical book's intention to instruct and encourage the faithful in times of persecution, the poem was designed as a warning against the sin of pride (1978: 2). It seems that the poet uses the biblical material to achieve his own purposes.
[72] Nebuchadnezzar's name is also the only one to be capitalized in the entire manuscript (Caie 1978: 2).

chadnezzar and Belshazzar are "the world's most powerful magnates, and their activities had implications for the fortunes of nations" and, although he admits the importance of pride for the thematic unity of the poem, "the medieval historiographical and political concept of *translatio imperii* ... related tradition about the Hebrews as the *populus Dei* who through sin lost their favoured position and eventually were superseded by the *populus christianus*" (1987: 1). Anderson admits that, as many critics claim, *Daniel* treats the theme of pride and humble obedience, but it is subordinated to the controlling theme of *translatio imperii.* While Anderson foregrounds the role of the Hebrews in the narrative of *Daniel* in his reading of *translatio imperii,* he seriously downplays Nebuchadnezzar's role in the poem and in the development of the political themes in it. According to the poem, the concept of *Populus Dei,* "representation of the Hebrew as God's chosen people" is the work's central theme. In the Medieval political ideology, as Anderson says, it was assumed that the Jews, who crucified Christ, had lost their status, which was taken over by Christians; "in this role they were superseded by *populus christianus*" and "the idea of a *populus christianus* was the basis for the authority of Christian governments, and so for the medieval idea of kingship" (1987: 16). As Anderson says, "when a ruler or a people adopt evil practices, God intervenes in history by transferring military and political power – the *imperium* – from one nation to another. The *translatio imperii* was seen as God's instrument to provide 'correction' of a people" (1987: 17). Anderson argues that in the medieval thought, the Biblical book of Daniel is "a *locus classicus* for the idea of *translatio imperii*" (1987: 18).

Although Anderson downplays the theme of *superbia* in the poem, it is necessary to relate *superbia* in the poem to its thematic structure and the theme of *translatio imperii* and *populus christianus. Superbia* in the poem is presented as a threat not only to an individual's soul, but to the entire nation. The concept of the *translatio imperii* in the poem is underlined by the so-called Old Testament logic[73]. *Superbia* is specifically related to the conversion narrative that runs through the poem. Though essentially it is a historical narrative, Daniel is also a story of a conversion that takes place on two levels;

[73] The idea of Old Testament Logic is discussed by Harris in *Race and ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon literature* (2003). He quotes Wormald's definition of this concept: "Old Testament logic was that the cause of political disaster was sin and crime. To obey God's law was a sine qua non of lasting worldly success. Anglo-Saxon experience, whether Northumbrian, Mercian, Kentishman or West Saxon, was that Bede's implied warning had almost come to pass when another pagan people [Vikings] crossed the North Sea and threatened to remove their own hard-won promised land as the punishment of their backsliding Any further lapse could well mean that the English would finally suffer what they had themselves inflicted on the Britons Obedience to the new English government was the price of survival" (Wormland 1994 15).

the personal and the political. Nebuchadnezzar is represented as a pagan figure, who converts to Judaism (which seems to be a prefiguration of Christianity in the poem). The poem's narrative foregrounds his conversion. However, it is not that Nebuchadnezzar's conversion lays at the centre of the narrative; in the Middle Ages it was assumed that salvation was something given to the entire community. This idea permeates the entire *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* authored by Bede[74]. Although the poem is a psychological study of sin, especially *superbia*, and the story of the conversion of an individual, his importance is to the larger community is shown as conversion of the entire nation depends on this individual. The events that follow Nebuchadnezzar's conversion depart from the Biblical narrative in a way that is significant ideologically; the king, who has, until recently, been a proud earthly lord, is at the end of the poem shown as a model of Christian kingship, a preacher and teacher of faith. Nebuchadnezzar assumes the role similar to that of an ideal Christian ruler. When Harris analyses the portrayals of kings in the Old English translation of Orosius's *World History*, he says that they "testify to the power of Christendom's faithful leaders over heathens. Such power may have been of interest to a ninth-century Anglo-Saxon witnessing the ingress of Viking invaders. In other words, the constant faith of a king determines the fate of his people" (Harris 2003: 103)[75].

Daniel belongs to the stories that founded the myth of the Anglo-Saxons as being a new *Populus Dei.* Central to this idea in the poem, is the tropological level of signification that operates within it. Pride infects not only Nebuchadnezzar, but also the Hebrew, whose sins brings about the national disaster and earns them Babylonian bondage. Later on, in the last movement of the poem, the sins of Belshazzar trigger the de-

[74] Harris shows that in his commentary on *Ezra,* Bede "describes the important relation between race (the Jewish people) and salvation (the Jewish faith), so one can be reasonably sure that Bede is alert to the salience of race in salvation history (2003:47).

[75] In early medieval Europe, the eighth century Carolingian France saw the development of the idea of a priestly kingship. "With the anointing of Pepin as King at Soissons in 751, and again at St Denis along with his sons Carloman and Charles in 754, the old magical power of the long hair of the former Merovingian kings was replaced by a sacrament whereby the Carolingian kings became *Christi.* The Carolingian image of kingship was shaped by the Old Testament models of holy kings such as David and Solomon or Melchizedek who was both king and priest. Otto I's imperial crown publically displayed his authority as a king and as a high priest; it was both a royal crown and a bishop's mitre. He was at once *rex et sacerdos,* like Melchizedek and also like Christ. By the tenth century both in Germany and in France a king entered upon his office and fulfilled his duties by means of rites that were very similar to those used for making of bishops. Kingship became the *typus Christi* and imitated priesthood as well as imitating antiquity and Byzantium. Kings became canons of cathedrals and abbots of monasteries and not in a merely titular way. To the question whether the king was a layman or a cleric the answer often was that he was a cleric" (Luscombe 1998: 167).

struction of Babylon by the Medes. As such the poem insists on the relation between faith and the continuance of earthly power. Kingdoms are lost and destroyed through excessive pride. The earthly lust for dominion is depicted as existing in eternal conflict with the Providential scheme that attaches to human history, a scheme, which, in the medieval historical writing, imparts grace and salvation not only to individuals but to communities. Essential to the structure of *Daniel* is the relationship between tropological and historical significance of the narrative[76].

As in *Genesis B, superbia* in *Daniel* is often configured as a political and heroic vice, as it relates to the issues of idolatry and heathen wisdom as opposed to Christian revelation. This implicit connection between *superbia* and the political matter means that one of the important questions to be asked, in relation to the poem, is what its presentation of *superbia* brings to its vision of kingship. Some illumination is cast upon this issue are found in the way that Augustine's association of the desire for dominion with the sin of lust parallels ideas that are found in the text of the poem (Augustine 2003: 573). Similarly to *Genesis B*, *Daniel* reveals the psychological mechanism of pride and the sin in question not only breaks the hierarchy of community, but also the natural hierarchy of reason over sense in the human mental faculty. Consequently, *Daniel* is not a poem of sin and virtue in conflict; rather it depicts a process in positive and negative terms. Nebuchadnezzar falls because of his *superbia,* but rises through humility and his memory of the greatness of God; this is a positive example of movement from paganism to faith, from damnation to salvation. The Hebrews in the poem mirror Nebuchadnezzar in negative terms, they lose the faith they have possessed and, by the same token, they lose their grace, as they forget the greatness of God. In the poem, conversion is conceptualised as a recollection and remembering of God's greatness and, similarly, *superbia,* asserting one's independence from God, is imagined as a lapse in memory.

Daniel, then, encodes the fear of pride as a sin, which first and foremost threatens the stability of the social order and which is associated with boasting, drunkenness and violence. *Daniel* depicts *superbia* as a typical aspect of life in prosperity, which leads to *wlenco* 'pride' (*Daniel* l. 17) [77]. The introductory part of the poem establishes

[76] As Harris points out, "identification with the transcendent process of Christian salvation always requires the effacement of self and a secondary emphasis on secular affiliations" (2003: 59).

[77] Henceforth indicated as *Daniel* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Krapp, George Phillip. 1931. *The Junius manuscript.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

the theme of pride, namely, the premise of the entire nation suffering under divine punishment for their sins. The poem commences with the heroic "gefrægn" formula (*Daniel* l. 1) and recollects a time when the Hebrew "eadge lifgean" 'lived in prosperity/blessedness' (*Daniel* l. 1) in the confines of Jerusalem, a time "þenden þæt folc mid him hiera fæder wære healdan woldon" 'when this people wanted to keep covenant with their Father among themselves' (*Daniel* l. 10-11). The Hebrews were then given "mod and mihte" 'glory and might' by "metod" 'the Measurer' (*Daniel* l. 14), until they "wlenco anwod æt winthege deofoldædum, druncne geþohtas" 'fell into pride at banquet by evil deeds and drunken thoughts' (*Daniel* l. 17-18). This pride is the direct cause for the Hebrews turning away from the wisdom of God, as they "in gedwolan hweorfan" 'turned to heresy' (*Daniel* l. 22). Like *oferhygd* and *gylp* in *Vainglory*, the Hebrew's "wlenco" in *Daniel* is associated with drunkenness, as they are shown to be affected by the sin at a feast and the "druncne geþohtas" are in apposition to "wlenco" at line 14. The feasting in the introductory part of the poem, mainly unscriptural detail not found in the source, is not simply an inheritance of the heroic tradition, as Anderson claims (1987: 9)[78].

The Hebrews' plight is not presented as a fortuitous result of Boethian wheel of Fortune. The chief transgression that they are blamed for in the poem is their disloyalty to God. Their Fall from grace takes place when "hie lagung beswac" 'desire/longning deceived them' and when they "sylfe forleton drihtnes domas, curon deofles cræft" 'forsook the judgments of God and chose the ways of the devil' (*Daniel* ll. 29; 31-32). This causes God to become "reðemod" 'wrathful' (*Daniel* l. 33). The poet stresses the Hebrews' change of fortune from prosperity to destruction by enemies brought about by God as punishment to "unhold leodum" 'disloyal people' (*Daniel* l. 34). Their ruin is brought about through their assertion that their earthly success is independent from the Creator's will; an oblivion of God and gifts of grace that makes their pride similar to that of Satan and leads to damnation.

Wlenco is not the only link between the Israelites and Nebuchadnezzar. The first dream of Nebuchadnezzar, and the subsequent events, are not only thematically impor-

[78] As Caie suggests, "there is ample Biblical and Patristic proof to show the connection between pride as root of all sins and gula (of which drunkenness is part), and in which state one loses the divine gift of *sapientia*, thus forfeiting by one's own volition God's protection. Consequently, the poet creates in *Daniel* a constant tension between worldly knowledge *scientia* and divine wisdom *sapientia*, the former unobtainable by the powerful Nebuchadnezzar" (1978: 4).

tant for the rest of the poem, but also serves to develop them from the introductory part of it. Just like the Israelites before the Babylonian invasion, Nebuchadnezzar becomes complacent in his sway over a vast political dominion and the poet connects his being "mære" 'great' and "modig" 'proud' and political aggression, as he is also "egesful ylda beanum" 'terryfying to the sons of men' (*Daniel* l. 105-106). The poet clearly juxtaposes *æ* 'the law [of God]' and *oferhygd* 'pride', the latter of which characterises Nebuchadnezzar: "No he æ fremede, ac in oferhygde æghwæs lifde" 'neither did he act according to the law of God, but he always existed in pride' (*Daniel* ll. 106-107)[79]. The description of the first dream follows and centres on the transient nature of the earthly city.

> þa þam folctogan on frumslæpe,
> siððan to reste gehwearf rice þeoden,
> com on sefan hwurfan swefnes woma,
> hu woruld wære wundrum geteod,
> ungelic yldum oð edsceafte.
> Wearð him on slæpe soð gecyðed,
> þætte rices gehwæs reðe sceolde gelimpan,
> eorðan dreamas, ende wurðan.
>
> Then, to the lord on the first sleep, when he turned to rest, the great prince, there came a noisy dream to his mind, which said how the world miraculously was framed and of redemption. The truth was told to him in the sleep that each kingdom should fall and end will come to all joys (*Daniel* ll. 107-112).

Nebuchadnezzar is sent an instruction from heaven, as the Israelites were in the prologue, and, similarly to them, he is not able to obey and appreciate the importance of the message. Indeed, his dream is a prophecy of the same disaster that he (ironically) inflicted on the Hebrew; in his blindness, he is unable to read the message. The truth contained within his dream passes unnoticed; Nebuchadnezzar, a prosperous king, is unable to apply the gnomic wisdom to his own experience. The passage is, in actuality, humorous and renders Nebuchadnezzar a comic figure; he is the agent of Hebrew's disaster and yet he cannot learn a lesson of wisdom from an event he has caused himself.

The poem stresses Nebuchadnezzar irrationality, and the contrast between the youths and the heathen kings (and partly on his counsellors), playing on the idea of the rational and irrational parts of the mind. Nebuchadnezzar wakes up "wulfheort" 'fierce like a wolf' from the dream (*Daniel* l. 116) and characterizes the dream as "wingal

[79] According to Farrell, the basic conflict in the poem is between God's *æ* 'law' and Nebuchadnezzar and his followers' earthly wisdom (1974: 35).

swæf" 'a drunken dream' (*Daniel* l. 116). Nebuchadnezzar cannot comprehend his dream because of the legacy of his sins that are his burden. In the imagery of the poem, knowledge and wisdom are not personal characteristics but gifts that come from Providence. Whereas Daniel and the youths are given knowledge freely, Nebuchadnezzar "for fyrenum onfon ne meahte, Babilonie weard, in his breostlocan" 'he could not receive [Daniel's judgement] in his heart because of his sins' (*Daniel* ll. 166-167)[80]. Thus, even though Daniel provides Nebuchadnezzar with a comprehensive explanation of the dream, the king is not able to assimilate the Divine message and the prophetic mystery behind it[81]. Nebuchadnezzar continues in his pride and folly, as he orders the construction of the golden idol and requires all the citizens to recognize it as the only true divinity.

In the Old English poem, the passionate aspects of Nebuchadnezzar's personality are stressed and the poem follows the Augustinian definition of pride as an expression of self-pleasure. In *Genesis B* too, the excessive indulgence with sense and self-pleasure is the first movement of pride in Satan's *mod,* which causes Satan to renounce God as his natural superior. The two aspects of pride characterising Satan, that is, the transgression of hierarchy and self-pleasure, are also central to Nebuchadnezzar's character. When Nebuchadnezzar conquests Jerusalem and brings "earma lafe" 'the last remnant' (*Daniel* l. 80) of the Israelites to Babylon, he sends his reeves among them to find out "hwilc þære geogoðe gleawost wære boca bebodes, þe þær brungen wæs" 'who among the youth was the wisest, among those who were brought hither [to Babylon]' (*Daniel* ll. 80-81). The earthly knowledge that Nebuchadnezzar seeks and possibly obtains is contrasted with Divine knowledge, which in the poem, is a gift. The three youths found by Nebuchadnezzar's reeves, Annanias, Azarias, and Misael are said to be "æfæste, ginge and gode in godsæde" 'true to God's law, young, and good in their fear of God' (*Daniel* ll. 89-90). The poet of *Daniel* uses h-alliteration to pinpoint the

[80] Like in *Genesis B,* when the messenger bring the errand to Eve, the word *breostloca* refers to the Anglo-Saxon concept of heart as a mental faculty for transmission and retention of knowledge (Jager 1988: 435).

[81] John Bugge claims that through developing the theme of prophecy, "*Daniel* states the most fundamental of themes, that through chosen spokesmen God manifests Himself to human beings who, in their own wanton sensuality, have lost sight of the elementary truths of His existence, His unique hegemony over all other gods, and the pre-eminent power He displays in the generative-existential act by which He sustains all creatures in being" (Bugge 2006: 132). Bugge also shows the *Daniel* poet develops a connotative parallel between idolatry and (sexual) impurity as opposed to the patristic association of prophecy and virginity and that in the poem drunkenness is associated with wanton behaviour (Bugge 2006: 133).

opposition between the heathen Nebuchadnezzar and the pious Israelites. When the youths are brought before Nebuchadnezzar's sight, they are described "**h**earde and **h**igeþancle, þær se **h**æðena sæt" 'courageous and wise-minded, where the heathen [Nebuchadnezzar] was sitting' (*Daniel* l. 94). They are also endowed with wisdom from God: "þa hie þam wlancan wisdom sceoldon, weras Ebrea, wordum cyðan, **h**igecræft **h**eane, þurh **h**alig mod" 'they had to teach wisdom to the proud one with speech, high wisdom, through holy mind' (*Daniel* ll. 96-98). Words signifying wisdom like 'higeþancle', 'higecræft heane', 'halig mod' might be associated with *hygd* words in the poem and the fact that *oferhygd* and *ofermod* corresponding to the sin of *superbia* are expressed as mental activities in the poem. Earlier in the poem, when Nebuchadnezzar is planning to invade and conquer Jerusalem "he secan ongan sefan gehygdum hu he Israelum eaðost meahte þurh gromra gang guman oðþringan" 'he sought in his thoughts which was the easiest way to destroy the Israelites through an attack' (*Daniel* ll. 49-51).

Although Nebuchadnezzar converts after the miracle in the furnace, whereby the youths are delivered by God's grace, his conversion is only partial. It only consists of recognising God's greatness as a physical power, but without assuming the appropriate humility and recognising one's actions as dependent on God's power, it too foretells disaster. *Daniel*, then, shows the concept of *superbia* as a destructive force that brings about, not only the end of Nebuchadnezzar rule, but the end of all kingdoms that are founded on earthly pride. The figures of Biblical Nebuchadnezzar and of Belshazzar, from the last movement of the poem, are explicitly connected to this essential theme of the poem. *Oferhygd* arises in Nebuchadnezzar's mind because of his prosperity and his adherence to the worldly gifts as opposed to the wisdom of Daniel and the three youths. *Oferhygd* that affects Nebuchadnezzar seems to be personified. After the furnace miracle and Daniel's counsel,

> No þy sel dyde,
> ac þam æðelinge oferhygd gesceod,
> wearð him hyrra hyge and on heortan geðanc
> mara on modsefan þonne gemet wære,
> oðþæt hine mid nyde nyðor asette
> metod ælmihtig, swa he manegum deð
> þara þe þurh oferhyd up astigeð.
>
> [Nebuchadnezzar] did no better than before. Instead, pride destroyed the prince, his intention became excessive in his mind than it was meeting, until the almighty God set lower, as he does to those who aspire high through pride (*Daniel* ll. 488-494).

The verb *seððan* ‘destroy’ also occurs when Belshazzar’s *wlenco* is described, who also dwelled in prosperity, “oðþæt him wlenco gesceod” ‘until pride destroyed him’ (*Daniel* l. 677).

In the poem, the only way to overcome pride is not only the debasement, which actually comes as divine punishment, but also recognition of God as the only divinity and the greatest power over the universe and over oneself. The towering tree that is sent as a sign in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and Babylon, the actual referent of the tree from the vision, signify the vanity of the human aspiration and in the age of conversion of the Anglo-Saxons symbolised idolatry itself. The excessive pride that Nebuchadnezzar feels at the sight of his mighty kingdom of Babylon, which he believes is his own achievement, proves him to be forgetful of the gifts of Providence and subsequently causes his madness. This is the critical point in the narrative, since pride consists in the recognition of one own achievement as independent from God’s grace. Through his boastful addresses to the city, Nebuchadnezzar professes Babylon to be a self-made achievement; oðþæt “ða for ðam gylpe gumena drihten forfangen wearð and on fleam gewat, ana on oferhyd ofer ealle men” ‘then the lord of men was forsaken because of his boast and run in flight, alone in his pride before all men’ (*Daniel* ll. 612-614). Both the Hebrews and Nebuchadnezzar are exiled from their cities and homes when they forget God. Consequently exile, in *Daniel*, is configured as an educative experience. His madness and banishment in the wilderness are evocative of the formulaic imagery of exile of *The Seafarer* and *The Wandere* from the Exeter manuscript. Nebuchadnezzar is a “nacod nydgenga” ‘naked fugitive’ (*Daniel* l. 632)[82]. Neville observes that in Anglo-Saxon literature, unlike in the modern, the experience of nature is terrifying to humanity, because nature is an overpowering threat against which society is the only shelter; “the distinction between humanity and the natural world involved not so much the assertion of human superiority (like in Elizabethan writing), but rather the recognition of human inferiority to nature’s power” (1999: 35)[83]. Nebuchadnezzar is able to recognise God’s power only when he acknowledges his own powerlessness in the face of hostile nature

[82] Stanley Greenfield identifies “wundorlic wrecca” (*Daniel* l. 633) as part of the exile formula that is common in Old English poetry (1989: 127).

[83] Neville observes that in Anglo-Saxon society an exile was exempt from society both in legal and spiritual terms; “lost in the natural world, they lose their status as members of society, a status which confers upon them both power over others and the right to protection from those more powerful – including God, for Anglo-Saxon law codes indicate that exiles were also excommunicated” (1999: 84).

and in exile from the safety of sheltering domesticity[84]. Within this dichotomy if the city stands for security and vanity, nature represents the chaos and depravity, which humbles the one, who has fallen from prosperity.

Nebuchadnezzar's restoration to sanity is conveyed through his recollection of the lost knowledge of God that was brought to him by the three youths and by Daniel. He "Gemunde þa on mode þaet metod wære, heofona heahcyning, hæleða bearnum, ana ece gast" 'remembered in his mind that there is the Measurer, the highest king in heaven and lord of men, one eternal spirit' (*Daniel* l. 624) that there was only one omnipotent God and "þa his gast ahwearf in godes gemynd" 'then his spirit turned to the thoughts of God' (*Daniel* l. 629). This is exampled in the poem where in earlier passages the verb *hweorfan* is used in the context of pride and turning away from God[85], at the conclusion it is used when the spirit/soul, *gast,* overcomes his *mod* and turns to God. This distinction is explained by Godden when he says that in Old English poetry *sawl* and *gast* refer to "the spirit which leaves the body at death and survives death" whereas "*mod* refers to thought and emotion" (Godden 2002: 302). It appears that the distinction operated widely in the poetic tradition and that the poet of *Daniel* holds to this tradition when he depicts Nebuchadnezzar's conversion. The simple expression of faith restores order to his intellectual faculties, being turned from animal to human again, but also impresses on his mind the Christian conception of hierarchy in community; God is uppermost within this scheme and the earthly kingship depends on the will of the King in heaven. *Daniel,* mingling the psychological dimension of sin with the political aspects of *superbia*, thereby depicts *superbia* as the sin, which is not only the most destructive to the unity of the human soul, but also the hierarchical order of society. Resultantly *Daniel* is a didactic poem that uses scriptural history to promote religious reform in the community as well as repentance within the individuals that constitute it; the instructional gen-

[84] Neville also points out that Babylon is imagined as "the source of joy for the people living within" and "like the kingdom of the Geats, which enjoyed fifty years of unassailable peace, the security and prosperity of Babylon seems impregnable, but even the mightly walls and fortifications of the greatest and strongest heroes, cannot prevail for ever" (1999: 83-84).

[85] Wayne A. Meeks demonstrates in *The origins of Christian morality* (1993) that the imagery of turning is symbolic of conversion in Christian thought: "Early Christianity was a movement of converts. That is, the Christians thought of themselves as people who had turned their lives around, from one state to another profoundly better. Turning around (Greek *epistphe,* Latin *conversion*) is a metaphor that could have broad and multiple consequences for the way the early Christians perceived their moral possibilities and obligations" (1993: 18).

ius of the poem lays in the realisation of the truth that the conversion of the state will never be complete until its individual members have undergone an inner conversion.

Importantly, Nebuchadnezzar's conversion from sin does not only involve embracing humility, he must also become a holy king who thinks it incumbent upon himself to promote faith among his subjects; this is a detail that does not takes place in any biblical source. The early medieval ideology of priestly kingship (Luscombe 1998: 166) reshapes the Biblical story significantly. In the Vulgate, Nebuchadnezzar is only impressed by God's infinite power. He is restored to sanity as soon as he recognises God's power over his life. In the Old English poem, Nebuchadnezzar's conversion is depicted as something more than personal; his conversion is represented as affecting the entire kingdom. In the poem, he starts as a heathen king and assumes the role of the persecutor of the faithful. After his exile, his mind, restored from wild madness to wisdom, mirrors the ideal of the ordered society. As such he becomes an exemplary figure for kings and princes, not unlike Constantine in Cynewulf's *Elene.* In contrast, Belshazzar, on whom the final part of the poem centres, is the depicted as the truly evil and oppressive pagan king. Belshazzar "wlenco" not only destroys himself, but also brings about the utter destruction of Babylon by the Medes.

For a more full understanding of how Nebuchadnezzar's spiritual recovery within this text and the importance of its relationship to *superbia* it is necessary to relate to the Insular interest in the Old Testament as a parallel for the history of Anglo-Saxon conversion. This is not only manifested in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum,* but also resonates in his biblical commentaries. Historians recognise the value of Bede's biblical studies and their role in shaping his view of history, which sees it as an aspect of Divine Providence. The influence of Bede's biblical commentaries on his historical work was appreciated by Judith McClure in her article "Bede's Old Testament Kings", who considers Bede's commentaries on I Samuel to shape his perception of Anglo-Saxon history (1983: 76-77)[86]. The idea of a covenant seems to have been of special importance to Bede in his biblical studies, as his work *On the tabernacle* is the major medieval study on the biblical *Exodus*. For Bede, history has a linear progress from the beginning of the world to the second coming of Christ and his first historical

[86] "Thus his exegesis of the Old Testament is particularly relevant to the study of his historical writing, because here he was dealing with the people of Israel at various stages of their history, in conditions which he readily perceived were analogous to those determining the development of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms" (McClure 1983: 76).

works are engaged in the universal aspects of providential history, namely, the description of the six ages of the world (Wallis 1999: lxxii). The national identity of the English people, the eponymous *Gens Anglorum,* is founded upon the biblical conception of God's chosen people. Like the Hebrews of the Old Testament, the Angles, Saxons and Jutes saw themselves as endowed with the missionary role of converting the British Isles, the task, which, according to Bede, was not fulfilled by the native British nations island (*Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* 1: 15 p. 27-28)[87]. As a political poem, *Daniel* is resonant of the tensions between Christian ideology and secular/pagan state politics. At the beginning of the poem, the Hebrews are punished by God for their disobedience to Him by losing their kingdom to the heathen enemy; thereby paralleling the British, who were conquered by Angles, Saxons and Jutes. In each case, the pagan enemy converts and assumes the missionary role in Christianising the once heathen state. This underpins both the spiritual and political reading of the poem.

The biblical material of *Daniel* thus is not only appropriate to the political realities of the Anglo-Saxon period but is also necessarily replete with types and prefigurations rich in images of repentance, conversion and redemption. For Bede in *Ezra and Nehemiah,* Babylon represents the confusion of sins and Jerusalem stands for freedom from sin. Supporting his points with the ideas of Jerome, Bede states that "It is also mentioned that Jerusalem is in Judea (i.e. in 'confession'), in order that we who have deserved through forgetfulness of God to be held captive by the Chaldeans (which means 'demons', i.e. evil spirits) and through the confession of divine mercy to be set free may return to the vision of free peace and light and there build a house to the Lord God of Israel" (Bede 2006: 15)[88]. The migration and descent myths[89], which are reso-

[87] The reference is to the following edition: Bede. [1969] 1999. *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* (Edited and translated by Judith McClure and Roger Collins.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[88] Anderson recognises *Ezra and Nehemiah* as the possible sources for the motif of the sacred vessels first taken away by Nebuchadnezzar from Solomon's temple and then destroyed by Belshazzar in the poem, which is an extrabiblical detail (1987: 11) and that the *Daniel* poet follows one of these theme from this commentary, as "Bede develops his own moral interpretation of Babylon as confusion of sin that diverts Christian from proper confession that leads to the liberating vision of peace and light" (1987: 16).

[89] Descent myths traced the origins and progress of different peoples (*gentes, populi, nationes*) from Noah or from Troy or Scandinavia. Such origin stories were very general from the sixth century onwards and outlived the Middle Ages. They reflect the wish of different people to find honourable beginnings for themselves and also to make sense of history by using the only historical records of earlier peoples they had. Such stories assumed that peoples were biologically united, on-going communities; they thereby reinforced a sense of national tribal solidarity. From the tenth century they gained an enhanced importance because then the solidarities of supposed common descent and custom came to coincide more closely with the solidarities of kingdoms; they were not weakened by the advances of centralised law and jurisdiction (Lucombe 1988: 163).

nant in many Old English poems, must be seen as paralleling the Christian idea of the City of God and the City of Babylon, as the Insular future of the Germanic tribes is a type of the Promised Land and Jerusalem and the continental past represent the earthly confines of sin and idolatry. In *Daniel*, the *translatio imperii* theme prompts the interpretation of Babylon as the earthly state, under whose subjection the Hebrews are forced to live after their fall from grace. Pride, as the refusal to recognise God as the only superior, is especially associated with idolatry in the poem. Azarias's prayer in the furnace is a prayer for deliverance not for the boys themselves but for the nation as a whole and contains the confession for sins (his or the nations), which does not come from the corresponding passage from the Vulgate. The boys' *eaðmod* 'humility' is juxtaposed with Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans' *oferhygd* 'pride', as they pray for God's "hyldo" grace (*Daniel* l. 292) "for eaðmedum" 'because of humility' (*Daniel* l. 294) in order to restore the covenant, which "for oferhygdum bræcon bebodo burhsittende, had oferhogedon halgan lifes" 'they broke for their pride, the city-dwellers, they despised the holy life' (*Daniel* ll. 297-299). The broken alliance with God is then associated with exile.

> Siendon we towrecene geond widne grund,
> heapum tohworfene, hyldelease;
> is user lif geond landa fela
> fracoð and gefræge folca manegum,
> þa usic bewræcon to þæs wyrrestan
> eorðcyninga æhta gewealde,
> on hæft heorugrimra, and we nu hæðenra
> þeowned þoliað.
>
> We are scattered across the width of the earth, our throngs separated, without mercy; our life is contemptible and we are infamous with many tribes, who drove us to the power of the worst earthly king and to savage captivity, and now we serve the heathen lord (*Daniel* ll. 300-307).

Their prayer is replete with the formuilaic expressions evocative of the exile theme, as the Hebrews are not only lordless, but also infamous among other nations. The biblical Azarias's request for divine wrath and vengeance upon the Chaldeans is silenced in the prayer. Azarias evokes the covenant between God and the patriarchs.

1.4. *Oferhygd* in Hrothgar's sermon and the heroic ethics in *Beowulf*

After Beowulf has defeated the Grendelkin that wreaked havoc in the Danish court, Hrothgar delivers to him a speech, which has been recognised as homiletic in tone and themes (Orchard 2007: 159). The presence of this homiletic passage in *Beowulf* has generated various critical reactions as to the ways the secular values and pagan history in the poem should be understood in the light of its Christian exhortation to eschew pride and avarice. Some critics have claimed that the notion of *oferhygd* that Hrothgar draws upon in his speech bring explicit connections to Christian values in the poem and consequently form a gauge against which the secular or pagan values of its heroes should be measured. Margaret Goldsmith ([1962] 1963 : 383-384) and J. R. R. Tolkien (1963 : 79) claim that in *Beowulf* the pagan characters mirror the Hebrews of the Old Covenant and that the judgement placed on their deeds must be framed by the laws of the Old Testament. Robinson's idea is that the poet's intention is to bring a double perspective on the heroes and their actions by means of the appositive structure and that the "*Beowulf* poet emphasised the fact where Christian and pagan morality converged in Hrothgar's speech" (Robinson 1989: 85). Robinson uses the idea of apposition to show that the poet juxtaposes the pre-Caedmonian or pagan values of the poem's heroes and post-Caedmonian enlightment of the converted Anglo-Saxons (Robinson 1989: 83). These critics and some others, stress the poet's historical perspective and *Beowulf*, in particular, as a historical poem. However, the heroic content of *Beowulf* is not only resonant of the Anglo-Saxon past from which it came, but must also be seen as meaningful and relevant to the political situation of the Anglo-Saxons in the post-Alfredian period[90]. The aim of the following subchapter is to add another dimension to Hrothgar's speech and themes that are related to in the poem, namely, the political perspective of the Anglo-Saxons from the time when the Beowulf manuscript was being compiled, that is, at the beginning of the eleventh century.

[90] Niles claims that *Beowulf* has been composed as late as in the tenth century and he gives seven reasons for this in "Locating *Beowulf* in literary history" (1993). The first argument concerns the setting of the first part of the poem in Denmark and is very convincing: "The action of most of the poem is set in Denmark and serves as a showcase for the magnificence of the Danish court. Such an interest in things Danish is understandable after the Danes had settled in England in some numbers, but not before. In addition, the poet depicts the Danes in an ambiguous light. Some of them are admirable, though rather better at talking than fighting. Others practice cursed rights, drink more beer than is good for them, or (like Hunferth) have a way of blustering overmuch and stabbing one another in the back. Such an ambiguous portrait of the Danes fits the tenth-century period after the Viking wars had cooled, when many Danes, now converted to faith, were being assimilated to the dominant culture" ([1993] 2003: 143-144).

Hrothgar delivers speech to Beowulf at the moment when the young hero has achieved the highest glory in his career as a monster-slayer and his mind, like Heremod's, is possibly in danger of being infected with pride (*Beowulf* ll. 1703-1705). Hrothgar praises Beowulf, because he has achieved a balance between physical might and wisdom: "Eal ðu hit geðyldum healdest, maegen mid modes snyttrum" (*Beowulf* ll. 1705-1706). Further, Beowulf is told that "to frofre weorðan eal lang-twidig leodum ðinum" 'you will become a comfort to your people' (*Beowulf* ll. 1707-1708). Hrothgar's speech is actually a warning against pride and uses the story of king Heromod to exemplify the evils of *superbia.* Not only does Heremod become the slayer of his table-companions, but also he abuses his riches by ceasing treasure-distribution, "ðeah the hine mihtig God maegenes wynnum, eafethum stepte, ofer ealle men forð gefremede" (*Beowulf* ll. 1716-1718). Heremod's story is followed by a reflection that prosperity bestowed by God upon princes inevitably brings about their ruin. The vice of the ruling classes is also depicted as bringing misfortune to an entire kingdom. In his speech, Hrothgar imagines a hypothetical prince, not dissimilar to Heremod, who, though exalted in worldly prosperity, falls into sin.

> Wunað he on wiste; no hine wiht dweleð
> adl ne yldo, ne him inwitsorh
> on sefan sweorceð, ne gesacu ohwær
> ecghete eoweð, ac him eal worold
> wendeð on willan; he þæt wyrse ne con – ,
> oð þæt him on innan oferhygda dæl
> weaxeð ond wridað; þonne se weard swefeð,
> sawele hyrde; bið se slæp to fæst,
> bisgum gebunden, bona swiðe neah,
> se þe of flanbogan fyrenum sceoteð.
> Þonne bið on hreþre under helm drepen
> biteran stræle – him bebeorgan ne con – ,
> wom wundorbebodum wergan gastes;
> þinceð him to lytel, þæt he lange heold,
> gytsað gromhydig, nallas on gylp seleð
> fætte beagas, ond he þa forðgesceaft
> forgyteð ond forgymeð, þæs þe him ær God sealde,
> wuldres Waldend, weorðmynda dæl.
>
> He [the hypothetical prince] dwells in prosperity; neither does anything disturb him, whether illness or age, nor does evil thought darken his mind. The enmity does not threaten him with the edge of a sword, but the whole world bends to his will; he doesn't know adversity – until "oferhygd" 'pride, arrogance' grows inside; the the guardian slumbers, the protector of the soul, being fast with sleep and bound with care. The murderer, who shoots with arrows from his bow, stalks near. Then he is stricken under his helmet with a bitter arrow – he does not know how to defend himself –with a crooked counsel of the accursed spirit; he does not appreciate that, which he has held for long and hoards angry thoughts, he gives no rings on the ground of his pride; neglecting what

> was ordained and forgetting the deal of glory God, the Wielder of glory, has given him (Beowulf: ll. 1735-1752)[91].

The representation of oferhygd is allegorical, as here it is presented as an enemy who attacks the sinner by surprise[92]. In Hrothgar's sermon, *oferhygd* consists of the misuse of the gifts of God[93]; a failure to recognise that God "ah eallre geweald" 'wields power over everything' (*Beowulf* l. 1727).

Hrothgar's sermon is by far the most Christian passage in the entire poem, in that it explicitly uses theological concepts and in that its imagery is largely homiletic. Many scholars draw similarities between Hrothgar's sermon and the Old English homiletic technique. The most obvious parallel is the use of allegory, which serves to illustrate the story of Heremod as a proud king. The imagery of sins as arrows shot by the devil from a bow is not only shared with Vercelli Homily IV (Scragg 1992: 102), but also has biblical precedents. Orchard points to Ephesians VI.13-17 and Psalm XC.4-6, "both passages, alongside Prudentius's *Psychomiachia,* which was widely read in Anglo-Saxon England, popularised the use of the theme of spiritual warfare in Anglo-Saxon literature" (2007: 161). According to Hermann, the description follows the Gregorian allegory of sin entering the human mind: "the arrows of the devil represent the first stage of *suggestio,* the incitement to sin; *delectatio,* the stirrings of pleasure in the flesh; *consensus,* the formal assent to sin; and *defensionis audicia,* the justification of sin brought on by pride" (1989: 42). However, Fred C. Robinson dismisses the reading of Hrothgar's speech as a sermon on Christian themes. Instead, he thinks, the speech merely reflects "universal wisdom that any noble heathen might share with a Christian" (1985: 33)[94]. Whereas Antonina Harbus argues "as a negative exemplum, Heremod has allowed the emotive faculty of thought to overrule his judgment, illustrating the dangerous confluence of desire and forgetfulness of the future" (2007: 169).

---

[91] All quotations from *Beowulf* come from Dobbie, Elliot van Kirk. 1953. *Beowulf and Judith.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 4.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

[92] The image of "the murderer" shooting with arrows resembles the image of *superbia* from homily IV of the *Vercelli Book*. The anonymous homilist depicts a devil in possession of a bow and "se boga bith gewoht of ofermettum, ond tha straela bioth swa manigra cynna swa swa mannes synna bioth" 'the bow is made of pride and there are as many arrows as there are human sins' (*Vercelli Homilies* 1992: 102).

[93] Andy Orchard observes that the aesthetic principle behind this passage is contrast and that "the implied contrast between wordly success and spiritual decay, between the physical world and psychological, is explicit in the direct comparison between the 'portion of pride' and 'portion of glories'" (1995: 50-51).

[94] He argues that "since people cannot be generous if they are avaricious and cannot monitor their own behaviour if they are consumed with arrogance, Hrothgar inevitable warns against vices which Christians also deplore" (1985: 33).

Critics, it seems, focus on the psychological subtleties and implications of the sermon. However, on closer examination *Beowulf,* like *Daniel* before it, can be seen to be a political poem and its ethical centre lays in Hrothgar's sermon, which encodes the fear of *superbia* as destructive, not only to the rational essence of humanity, but also a danger to prosperity of kingdoms. More importantly, the previous discussions of the sermon have to a large extent neglected another concept, which is central to the poem's ethics, which is *wlenco. Wlenco* is pride, but in contrast to *oferhygd,* it also has a positive meaning of courage and heroic confidence (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 749). *Wlenco* in itself is not an excessive pride, although it may become one. Both *oferhygd* and *wlenco* are dangerous to the soul, because they may remove the essence of what constitutes the centre of ethics in a pious society, namely the fear of God. Hrothgar's sermon pays particular attention to the fear of God; he exhorts Beowulf to fear the Lord, the Measurer. Like watchfulness, the fear of the Lord is depicted to shelter the soul from sin. In *Beowulf's* ethical world, the reverence paid to personified fate, *wyrd* (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 751), is especially important to keep one's *mod* in check. *Superbia* in the poem, as seen earlier in *Daniel* and *Genesis B,* results from the absence of the fear of God, whether in the individual, or the entire society. Rosemary Woolf observes that "pride was a prominent characteristic of Germanic heroes" and points to a contrast between Guthlac and Beowulf, "who *strenge getruwode mundgripe maegenes,* and who, despite a pious acknowledgment of God's assistance, would scarcely have been content to ascribe to him the glory of his victories" (1953: 6). *Oferhygd* and *wlenco* endager the hierarchy of the human soul and in the society incessantly. *Beowulf,* however, is not so much a moral poem, about vice, virtue and heroes who earn praise for the former and fail on account of the latter, but a poem which encodes the anxiety over violence and the role of material culture within Christian society. *Superbia* was not only a vice condemning the soul, but a social phenomenon resulting from the values of society. In Old English poetry, the proud individual may infect the ordered structured of community. The analogy of the hierarchy of reason over *sense* in the soul is a reflection of the hierarchical model of Christianised heroic society. As such the argument of the poem is that the health of the ruler's soul guarantees the health of his kingdom and his people. The danger of *superbia* lays in its threat as both a psychological and a social force; it may disintegrate an individual soul as well as overthrow the entire kingdom.

The perception that most of the characters in *Beowulf* share is that the hero fights for *wlenco*. When Wulfgar meets Beowulf and his fourteen companions at the

gates to Heorot, he reveals that he holds their "wlenco" in high esteem: "Wen ic þæt ge for wlenco, nalles for wræcsiðum, ac for higeþrymmum Hroðgar sohton" 'I can see that you seek Hrothgar for glory, not at all because of exile, but for high intention' (*Beowulf*: ll. 338-339). Wulfgar discriminates between the people who wander around the world because they are inflicted with exile and the people who venture a heroic exploit out of their own will. In the passage, "wlenco" appears to have the positive meaning in the heroic context, as, in Wulfgar's remark, the word *higeþrymmum* is in apposition to *wlenco*. The narrator's comment that follows Wulfgar's speech also involves a variation with *wlanc*, which is in apposition to *ellenrof*: "Him þa ellenrof andswarode, wlanc Wedera leod, word æfter spræc heard under helme" 'The one full of courage [Beowulf] answered him [Wulfgar], the proud Geat and uttered a speech, hard under the helmet' (Beowulf: 340-342).

"Wlonc", alongside its adjectival and verbal forms, appears frequently in homiletic writings and, as in *Beowulf*, it possesses a wide semantic field covering both neutral/positive and negative senses in the group of homilies from the Vercelli Book. For instance, the anonymous author of homily IV exhorts the listeners that "Ða þe her wepað for hiora gyltum, þa bioð þaer on mycelre wlenceo mid þam alwaldan God" 'those who here weep for their sins will be in great pride with the eternal God' (*Vercelli Homilies* 1992: 94), thereby extending the primary meaning of honour and glory to *wlenco*. *Wlenco* in the second negative meaning can be found in the same homily, when the homilist addresses the audience in the following manner: "Þa þe her bioð wlancoste ond nellaþ hira dryhten on þam ongitan, ac a þencað þæt þæt hie sien wædlan that bioð ðær on mæstre wædle, ond hie næfre hungor ne þurst on cyle alætað" 'those who are the proudest and will not understand God, but always think that they will be a poor man who is in the greatest poverty, and they will never relinquish their hunger thirst or cold' (*Vercelli Homilies* 1992: 92)[95].

In the poem, the words *wlonc* and *wlenco* appear especially in the military context. Beowulf is described as "maðmæhta wlonc" (*Beowulf*: l. 2832) after Wiglaf watches him dead after the mortal strife against the dragon. Hygelac is predicated with *wlonc* in the scene when he is challenged by Hygelac in the battle of Ravenwood. "Hygelaces hilde" (*Beowulf*: l. 2952) is in apposition to "wlonces wigcræft" (*Beowulf*: l.

[95] All quotations from Vercelli homilies come from Donald G. Scragg. 1992. *The Vercelli homilies.* (Early English Text Society.) Oxford: Oxford University Press. All translations from Old English into Modern English are mine.

2953). The word also occurs in a negative meaning, as when it is used to describe Grendel: "atol æse wlanc" (*Beowulf*: l. 1332). When Grendel's dam massacres Heorot in revenge for her son's death and kills Aeschere, Hrothgar's favourite thane and counsellor, she is described as "atol aesse wlanc" 'enemy exulting in/proud of carrion' (Beowulf: ll. 1332). Hrothgar rewards Beowulf with a ring, which was looted by Hygelac, when he "for wlenco wean ahsode, fæhðe to Frysum" (*Beowulf*: ll. 1205-1206). The only negative connotation of "wlenco", when applied to Beowulf, comes from Unferth's mouth, who disparages Beowulf and Breca saying: "git for wlence wada cunnedon, ond for dolgilpe on deop wæter aldrum neþdon" 'you tested ocean waters for pride and risked your lives in the deep water for a vain boast' (*Beowulf*: ll. 510). Again the peculiar use of the appositive structure testifies to the connotation that a word conveys in a particular context. Here, pride is in an apposition to a vain boast.

If *Beowulf* administers a measure of critique against the pagan past[96] and the concerns of the heroes', the severest disparagement of heroic values is put into the mouth of a pagan, who shows no signs of concern with Christian values. Unferth's challenge of credibility of Beowulf's heroic feats is a powerful threat against the conception of heroic virtue that Beowulf fosters in himself and that the other characters admire in him. Heroic behaviour that was considered especially notorious for Christian authorities might seem to have been pride and vainglory exuded in the hero's boasts. In the Old English poem *Vainglory,* boasting, and excessive drinking, is associated with *oferhygd.* It must be noted, however, that heroic boasts, or flyting speeches, of the medieval times did resonate with moral implications that are foreign to the modern conception of vainglory. Such a conception is described by Marie Nelson in "Beowulf's Boast Words", who analyses the flyting speeches in *Beowulf* in the light of the theory of speech acts.

[96] It cannot go unnoticed that the Danes in *Beowulf* still sacrifice to the pagan gods after the Grendel attack. Cnut's legislation, which disapproved the pagan worship, and the pagan content of *Beowulf* are here at odds. In the late Anglo-Saxon Engand paganism still represented a threat not to be ignored by the nominally Christian state and when Wulfstan became the bishop of York in 1002, which for many decades of the tenth century was under the pagan Danelaw, he was dispatched to the new see with the intention to converting pagan people, rather than simply fostering their fate (Whitelock 1957: 59). What is more, the Anglo-Saxon knew that they had shared their past with the continental peoples of Europe[96]. Robert L. Kellogg observes that "at almost any time from the eighth to the eleventh century it was the paganism of the old heroes that would have been a more plausible objection to composing poetry about them than their nationality" (Kellogg 1993: 145-146). They must have the same anxieties under the process of conversion like the Danes in the Danelaw. The Anglo-Saxon as well as other Germanic states were not unlike the entire Western Christendom, whose values were founded upon the pagan past. The Frisian king Radbod refused to convert and exclaimed that he prefers to burn in hell with his ancestors. The new Christian states would not make their history redundant, but the solution was to render it an ideological tool for a typological significance of this past.

She points out that OE "beotian" had a wider range of meaning that 'to boast' and its denotations extended to "promise or vow" (Nelson 2005: 300). She also points out that boasts tend to be concessive, in that Beowulf is always alert to the possibility of failure. Indeed, when Beowulf introduces himself by a boast to the guardian of the shore, the latter man appears to hold the hero in the highest esteem, because he is a man who aspires to great deeds: "Æghwæþres sceal /scearp scyldwiga gescad witan, /worda ond worca, se þe wel þenceð" 'each perceptive shield-wielder who intends well will discriminate words from works' (*Beowulf*: ll 287-289). As Nelson suggests, Beowulf does not merely boast but vows to vanquish the enemy and puts his honour at stake. If the implications of flyting are kept in mind when reading the dialogue between Unferth and Beowulf, which is a scene Nelson does not mention in her article, it appears that a positive light is shed on *wlenco* in the poem. The realities of military life being what they are even in the Christian perception, the hero's expected role is to continually test his prowess. When Beowulf dismisses Unferth's accusation, he mentions the latter's fratricidal deeds, which are the greatest moral blemish in the world when kin relations are of key importance in the social fabric.

The greatest blemish in Unferth's character Beowulf discloses is the fact that, in contrast to himself, Unferth has nothing to boast about: "Secge ic þe to soðe, sunu Ecglafes, þæt næfre Grendel swa fela gryra gefremede, atol æglæca, ealdre þinum, hynðo on Heorote, gif þin hige wære, sefa swa searogrim, swa þu self talast" 'I tell you in truth, the son of Ecglaf that Grendel would have never performed so much evil, terrible enemy, if your prowess and your mind were so bold as you consider them to be' (Beowulf: ll. 590-594). Consequently Unferth disappears from view and the Danes consider Beowulf to be their last resort. They want to believe that Beowulf can fight monsters, but his reputation, after all, rests on a single story, which is not traditional and not as widely known as the story of Sigemund and Fitela's combat against the dragon, as told by Hrothgar's minstrel following Beowulf's defeat of Grendel. There is no one else in the poem, apart from Beowulf, who might retell the story, and therefore his reputation as a monster-slayer is easy to challenge. As a result it is necessary for Beowulf to be self-assertive. The principle for moral evaluation of the heroes is not so much reliant on their excessive pride and vainlglory, but rather the extent to which their words correspond to their works.

If *Beowulf* represents an attempt at the continuity of ancestral values by accommodating them to the realm of the new Christendom it may also be inherent in the

poem's design that the concept of *oferhygd* is introduced into the epic. The characters lead their lives according to the standards of Germanic and Scandinavian tradition; the poem is a poetic answer to a question how the secular state can be compromised with the Christian ideology. This would then explain how the heroes' references applying to God are to be understood in the poem. These references they perform an important ideological function in the poem. They are to serve as examples for Christian, although they are pagan figures from remote Germanic past not a sentence. The dangers that are inherently threatened by pride were recognised by both the secular and religious communities. The monk engaged in spiritual combat relies on humility as a curative and protector against *superbia*; ascribing his spiritual victories to the power of God within himself. The Christian warrior is also supposed to rely on God's judgment and it lays with the hero's prudence to recognise the operation of *wyrd,* whether as an impersonal cosmic force deciding on the course of events or a metonym for the Christian God, behind all his actions. Indeed in *Beowulf,* all pagan heroes attribute their heroic achievements to God. Beowulf's power is valued by the narrator as God-given: "him Dryhten forgeaf wigspeda gewiofu, Wedera leodum. frofor ond fultum, þæt hie feond heora ðurh anes cræft ealle ofercomon, selfes mihtum" (*Beowulf* ll. 696-700).

Consequently recognition of God's power is not only a sign of one's personal piety, it also enjoins an important legal and political significance. Bloomfield argues that "a much more technical notion, that of the *judicium Dei,* the judgment of God, as it was known, appears to lie behind the episode" (1969: 546)[97]. "This term," as Bloomfield points out, "is used to by those who participated in or discussed trial by combat to refer to an organised attempt to call upon God to decide the justice of a claim or an action, and very often in the early Middle Ages to decide the truth of an accusation and treason" (1969: 546). To recognise Divine intervention behind one's action was not only a cure against *superbia,* which saved the warrior's soul, its ideological significance relies on spiritualising the human conflicts. If in hagiography, physical violence is a metaphor for spiritual conflict between cosmic forces of good and evil in which an individual is involved, in the Christianised heroic lay or epic, conversely, the physical violence is imagined to participate in the divine struggle against darkness. Before Beowulf's struggle with Grendel, the monster is recognised as *hostis antiquus*; "he wæs fag wið God" 'he was at strife against God' (*Beowulf* l. 811).

[97] In the same article, he also identifies it in *The Battle of Maldon.*

As a poem that juxtaposes the Christian with the ancient Germanic ethics, *Beowulf* concerns the question of appropriating the secular ideology of violence and incorporating it into a Christian framework of values. The ending of the poem, the celebration of Beowulf's heroic achievement and his funeral, endows the poem with an ambiguity that appears to leave the tension between *oferhygd* and *wlenco* unresolved. Beowulf: "cwaedon thaet he waere wyruld-cyninga, manna mildest ond mon-thwaerust, leodum lithost ond lof-geornost" (*Beowulf* ll. 3180-3183). *Lofgeorn* "eager for glory" is indeed ambiguous in itself. Orchard observes that it usually has "unreservedly negative connotations" in homiletic prose, but he also points to *lof* in *The Seafarer*, where "it appears to suggest that worldly *lof* can have heavenly benefits" (1995: 55). He finds one Christian usage of this notion, or rather its Latin equivalent, which is not derogatory, which *gloriae cupidissimus* "most desireous of glory" that can be found in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* with reference to a pagan king Athelfrith of Northumbria; Bede compares him to Saul (1995: 56).

1.5. Conclusion

Ofermod in Old English poetry occurred as a traditional theme and its role was not simply to bring a new concept to the vernacular tradition. Although *ofermod* should be studied in parallel with the early Christian idea of *superbia,* the Germanic poetic tradition of depicting *mod* and *ofermod* must be recognized. The Anglo-Saxon poets possessed a rich conceptual inventory for the description of the human psyche. The concept of *superbia* is transmitted across Anglo-Saxon poetry in a way that suggests that it was culturally, socially, politically and psychologically significant in early Christian society. The notion of pride as a disease that affects and destroys not only the human soul but also the wider community is as relevant to heroic society as to the monastic cloister. The importance of the concept in Anglo-Saxon poetry can be illustrated by parallels drawn in three independent poetic texts; highlighting an analogy between the hierarchy of *ratio* and *sense* in the human soul and the hierarchy within community. The poems that have been discussed so far are not merely didactic pieces created as a warning against pride, they were also important ideological tools for sanctioning obedience within society, As such they were primarily designed to impress upon their audiences

the notions of power and authority, and its associated obedience, not only within the secular state but also in religion.

Chapter 2: The *Miles Christi* at war with sin: Multiple dimensions of warfare and violence

2.1. Introduction

The Old English poetic tradition is rich in tropological imagery and thematic lore for depicting the interior spiritual state of a human being. The entire body of Anglo-Saxon verse manifests the attention that the anonymous poets paid to the portrayal of the human psychological and spiritual condition. In the Old English poetic tradition, there is a formulaic model of the human mind based on both the Germanic poetic tradition and the patristic tradition that had enriched poetic conceptions with the advent of Christianity. However, the Anglo-Saxon poets were more interested in exploring psychological realities rather than the historical milieu. Consequently the vernacular conception of how sin enters the human consciousness becomes relevant to the way that entire communities are depicted in Old English poetry. The present chapter explores the theme of the soldier of Christ, *Miles Christi* and how this concept works within the individual and the community as a whole. In this way social conflict is part of the cosmic struggle between God and the devil and, in three Old English poems in particular, violence is explored in terms of this eternal struggle: in Cynewulf's *Juliana, Andreas,* and *Judith.*

This struggle is both spiritual and physical, cosmic and political. The pagans represented in Old English poetry basically function as the other in the literal sense of their opposition to the hero or heroine; they are enemies to be vanquished. As foes to a

Christian, however, they participate in the cosmic struggle between good and evil, Christ and Satan, God and nothingness. Hence, all hagiography and all Christian warfare narratives, like *Judith*, which is not a saint's life but an Old Testament story, necessitates a figural reading; the earthly characters manifest their cosmic counterparts. For the Anglo-Saxon audience though, allegory was historically and politically significant; the physical enemy, especially the Vikings in the ninth and tenth centuries, were endowed with spiritual signification as the embodiment of evil. This battle, both in life and literature, was conceptualised as warfare between Christ and Satan actualised in a given historical context. The opposition between the Christian and pagan in Old English verse, breaks as the Anglo-Saxons had been themselves heathen before the migration and conversion. In Old English poems, the Other is therefore internalised. It is textually present in the form of the poem: the Germanic alliterative heroic verse, its themes and formulas which form the tissue of the Old English, versified Christian narrative and story.

The earlier critics, especially in the 1970s and 1980s, contributed to the present knowledge and understanding of the Anglo-Saxon vernacular hagiographic tradition, yet their work is, to certain extent, limited. Thomas Hill (1969), Daniel G. Calder (1986) and others attended to the liturgical elements in Old English hagiographic poems. What escaped their attention is that the spiritual meaning embedded in those texts is, in fact, not devoid of other kinds of significance. These can only be properly understood when their relationship to Anglo-Saxon history and culture is established. The spiritual warfare shown in *Andreas* and *Juliana,* as well as the biblical poem *Judith,* is relevant to contemporaneous ideology in that far from being purely allegorical representions of cosmic conflicts between the powers of good and evil, they refer to their actual cultural milieu. Violence and warfare in these narratives are multivalent; they operate on both a literal and allegorical level of signification.

To understand their figurative level it is useful to distinguish between the allegorical and the figural. This will make it possible to understand the relation of the literal elements in these texts to their non-literal meaning. As such figuration acts as the key concept to the symbolic processes that take place in the poems. The classic definition of *figura* as an aspect of the Western tradition of scriptural interpretation comes from Erich Auerbach's essay titled "Figura" (1959). The Western Church's insistence on a figural reading was necessitated by its rejection of the purely spiritual reading of Scripture. In

the world of Late Antiquity, there were two schools of interpreting scripture which Auerbach describes thus: "one party strove to transform the events of the New and still more of the Old Testament into purely spiritual happenings, to 'spirit away' their historical character – the other wished to preserve the full historicity of the Scriptures along with their deeper meaning" (Auerbach [1959] 1984: 36). He then distinguishes the figural from the purely abstract meaning through historical contextuality. Auerbach further juxtaposes *figura* to fulfilment; "Figural interpretation establishes a connection between two events or persons, the first of signifies not only itself but also the second, while the second encompasses and or fulfils the first" (Auerbach 1984: 53). Figural interpretation does not invalidate the historical significance of a given event: "the two poles of the figure are separate in time, but both, being real events or figures, are within time, within the stream of historical life" (Auerbach 1984: 53)[98]. He also points to another important opposition earlier in his essay.

> Beside the opposition between *figura* and fulfilment or truth, there appears another, between *figura* and *historia; historia* or *littera* is the literal sense or the event related; *figura* is the same literal meaning or event in reference to the fulfilment cloaked in it, and this fulfilment itself is *veritas,* so that *figura* becomes a middle term between *littera-historia* and *veritas* (1984: 47).

What is essential to Auerbach's conception of *figura* is that "it differs from most of the allegorical forms known to us by the historicity both of the sign and what it signifies" (Auerbach 1954: 54).

Auerbach's last important observation, which forms part of the inspiration of this chapter, is that "the strangeness of the medieval view of reality has prevented modern scholars from distinguishing between figuration and allegory and led them for them most part to perceive only the latter" (Auerbach: 1984: 74). Consequently the present chapter deals with multiple layers of violence and warfare that take place in three Old English poems: *Juliana, Andreas,* and *Judith.* The warfare in those poems takes place at different levels of realities: psychological, social/historical and metaphysical. The cosmic abyss between Heaven and Hell is materialised as a physical boundary between the Christian and pagan communities. The most common approach to these three works is

[98] He also says that "only our understanding of the two persons or events is a spiritual act, but this spiritual act deals with concrete events whether past, present or future, and not with the concepts or abstractions; these are quite secondary, since promise and fulfilment are real historical events, which have either happened in the incarnation of the Word, or will happen in the second coming (1954: 53).

to read them as allegorical and typological representations of theological ideas or what we could call Christian history, while ignoring the literal significance of the events and figures participating in these events. The two saints, Juliana and Andreas, and the Old Testament heroine Judith are, for example, often said to embody *Ecclesia* and their spiritual enemies are interpreted as *Hostis Antiquis.* John Hermann claims, however, that the relationship between the literal and figural does not favour the figural over the literal; "Typological studies decode undirectionality, inevitably displacing the literal level to reveal the typological. Moving in the opposite direction, however, reopens the historicity of the poem's rhetoric of the foreign" (Hermann 1989: 120-1)[99]. The poems in question do contextualise the spiritual level of meaning, which, also according to Auerbach's conception of *figura* is part and parcel of the symbolic processes that operate in the poetic texts. The present chapter is a cultural study, which analyses the relationship between levels of figural narratives and Anglo-Saxon culture.

The central idea that unifies *Andreas* and *Judith* is that on the earth the eternal struggle between God and Satan manifests itself materially in the conflict between Christian and pagan communities. In the case of *Juliana*, personal piety is juxtaposed to the secular world, which has a double significance in the poem. Literally it represents a pagan state in the period of Maximian's persecution. Figuratively, it stands for any secular community adhering to lust, avarice and pride, including a secular Anglo-Saxon household. The temptation in *Juliana* is an inversion of, if not a parody, of a conversion narrative; the saint is tempted to convert from faith to flesh and so choose the world and the devil. Also, the identification of the pagan community as sinful and the Christian community as virtuous is a simple way of sanctioning violence in politically motivated warfare and serves to support the ideology of a holy war.

2.2. The social dimension of spiritual violence in Cynewulf's *Juliana*: *Miles Christi* against lust, avarice and pride

Of all Old English versified saints' lives, *Juliana* is the most typical example of *passio*. *Juliana* draws upon the traditional image of *Miles Christi* and the essential theme of

[99] The quote from Hermann is concerned with the Old English poem *Andreas.*

every saint's life, which is the holy man or woman's battle with, and victory over, the devil. The present study of Cynewulf's poem will consider the *Miles Christi* metaphor in the poem in the context of two values that are vividly juxtaposed in the poem, namely, worldly heroic honour and shame, which are opposing sides of the same theme, and faith that entails conversion from the world. Juliana's spiritual conflict makes her face the conflict with the society she inhabits. The society in which she lives is marked by its unquestioning adherence to pride, avarice and lust. *Juliana* is the only poem in the whole body of Old English poetry, which depicts vices as a construct of social values and part of the structure of the entire society, rather than only relating them to individual human beings. Juliana, in the poem, is also embedded in the cosmic strife between God and the Devil. However, rather than being only an allegorical or typological figure, she is also strongly individualised throughout the narrative and the eternal cosmic conflict is transposed onto the narrower local perspective of a pagan community. The aim of this subchapter is to bring the figural and literal significances of the poem's narrative together and explore the multivalent images of violence within it.

The critical tradition favours the overtly allegorical reading of the poem. Daniel G. Calder points to Cynewulf's schematic techniques when it comes to the composition of *Juliana* and shows that the action of the poem is "a fixed ceremonial and public ritual involving pawn-like figures entangled in the cosmic struggle between Christ and Satan" (Calder 1973: 357). Joseph Wittig reads Juliana as a figure of *Ecclesia* (Wittig [1974] 2001: 158). Stephen Morrison argues that Juliana is modelled on the idea of *Miles Christi* and that "the basis for this metaphor is not to be sought in conventional battle description, but in the image complex presented in Paul's *Epistle to the Ephesians, VI.11-20,* which provides a stimulus for so many evocations of the figure of the *Miles Christi* in Old English homilies and lives of saints" (Morrison 1979: 82). Morrison argues that the words like *cempa,* "warrior", which are used in relation to Juliana in the poem, may "operate as fixed signalling devices announcing the evocative spiritual warfare" (Morrison 1979: 83). Raymond St-Jacques sees the story as evolving around the cosmic struggle between God and the devil and that the poem expresses "a view of universal history understood as a conflict between the forces of good and evil where, at certain times, evil seemingly engulfs the earth, but where ultimately it is overcome by good" (St-Jacques 1980: 134). Joyce Hill supports Morrison's argument that the word *cempa* in *Juliana* is not an anachronism, but it refers to spiritual warfare and strengthens

his idea with linguistic evidence, as the word was ubiquitous in the later Anglo-Saxon prose and had already lost its purely military connotations, and it was also used in homilies, which testifies to the fact that its heroic denotation was no longer in force when *Juliana* was written (Hill 1983: 273). She further observes that the Old English word *campian* 'to fight' had a similar semantic shift to the Latin verb *militare,* whose meaning changed from 'to fight' to 'to serve in civil service' (Hill 1983: 274). Her conclusion is that "...in both languages [Latin and Old English] the major cause of the shift was the frequency with which the *miles Christi* image was used and its consequent establishment as a stereotyped concept expressed, often allusively, by means of predictable vocabulary" (Hill 1983: 275).

However, the allegorical and typological interpretations outweigh this criticism, and they insist on the literal meaning of the story and recognise traces of realism in the poem. Leonore MacGaffey Abraham examines Cynewulf's divergences from the source and demonstrates that "Cynewulf was deliberately adapting the circumstances of the legend to conform to the social and legal customs of his own society, for the cogent reason that he would thereby give Juliana's trial, and its outcome, the persuasive force of the established law" (Abraham [1978] 2001: 171). Donald G. Bzdyl, refers to Aucherbach's definition of *figura,* and points out that "rather than seeing realistic and symbolic as mutually exclusive terms, figural interpretation demands that they be mutually inclusive. Acknowledging and understanding the realism of *Juliana* is just as important as recognizing the symbolic correspondence between Juliana's ordeal and the Church of the life of Christ" (Bzdyl [1985] 2001: 194). Hermann challenges the allegorical readings of the poem, as Cynewulf removes a number of figural elements from the Latin source (Hermann 1989: 156), although, at same time, he admits that the major innovation of the poem was the development of theme of spiritual warfare (Hermann 1989: 157) Hermann also observes that the poet removes from the story a number of typological references, which makes the allegorical interpretation of Juliana as representative of the Church implausible[100]. Horner identifies the possible historical setting behind the poem's composition as the period of the Viking invasion and consequently

[100] "Cynewulf's omission of Juliana'a earlier allusion to the Red Sea crossing seems curiously difficult to account for if such a typological reading is accepted. Indeed, one might prefer to abandon such a reading rather than go to the lengths required to justify such an omission" (Hermann 1989: 154).

reads the poem literally as being a text that "explores for female monastic readers the various defences of chastity" (2001: 106)[101].

Hermann and Horner largely reject the figural reading of the poem. However, I will validate the earlier figural readings of it. The following pages will show that Cynewulf rewrites the source material and endows the narrative with a number of figural significations, especially manifest in its characterisation, whereby different characters are associated with vices. Juliana undergoes three trials in the poem and at first she is tried by Heliseus, who represents lust. Her next encounter is with Affricanus, who corresponds to avarice. Finally, the devil, who visits Juliana in prison, represents *superbia,* and is the figure of *hostis antiquus.* The following pages will, additionally, link the figural elements of the narrative to the realistic ones. Most figural readings, as has been pointed out, have not considered the immediate cultural background of the English translation and the fact that Cynewulf adapted the Latin story so as to make the narrative mirror the Anglo-Saxon world. Joyce Hill points out that "clearly he was there drawing upon his own familiarity with the *Miles Christi* tradition and the fact that an allusion to it was customary in descriptions of martyr's deaths" (Hill 1983: 275). She also observes that "*campian for Criste* is being used as a formula in which the residual sense of physical combat has little significance. What we have, as with the prose uses of *cempa* in similar situations, is a minimal allusion to the Christian metaphor" (Hill 1983: 275).

Such views preclude the modern reader from grasping the cultural significance of the text in question. *Juliana*, apart from the *Wife's Lament,* is the only Old English poem, which describes an unheroic individual in the context of their family relations. True, Cynewulf was not interested in depicting Juliana's domestic life. However, the spiritual conflict in the poem encodes the tensions between the secular and religious communities in Anglo-Saxon England. The images of violence enacted upon Juliana's body are figuratively underscored by the anxiety over violence that ushers into the most

[101] Horner explains in what way the text shaped the imaginations of female audiences. "The historical circumstances of Anglo-Saxon female readers, facing the threat of the Danish invasions, can help answer this question. When nuns read of ... female heroics in texts such as *Juliana*, they witnessed both an affirmation of the value of female chastity, and the ideological negotiations at work in the monastic discourse of enclosure dictating that the female religious must remain inviolate, impermeable to either spiritual or physical invaders; she must "become male." In a text like *Juliana*, -- a hagiographical and thus idealised portrait, likely read by female readers – the discourse of enclosure functions both on a physical, spatial level and a spiritual one: the woman is closed *and* enclosed: she must maintain her body as an impenetrable fortress" (2001: 106).

intimate sphere of individual's life; an inner conflict, which can only be resolved through the annihilation of either one's body or one's soul. These images of Juliana's suffering, who forsakes kinship with secular and pagan community for the faith and love of Christ, must have struck a huge chord in the imagination of individuals, who had also forsaken their ties of kinship to enter a monastery or convent. Horner rightly observes that "this poem may well have had serious implications for Anglo-Saxon female audiences desirous of chastity but facing the real and immediate threat of violence and rape at the hands of Danish invaders" (Horner 2001 105).

This figural design behind the story certainly accounts for its heroic diction. Like many Old English saints' lives and other religious poems, *Juliana* shares the same heroic diction and themes with secular poetic tradition. It even borrows a significant number of formulaic expressions from *Beowulf*. Woolf makes a claim in her edition that "Cynewulf deliberately intended to recall *Beowulf* and thus to impart an epic quality to his narrative" (Woolf [1955] 1993: 19). While some poems, like *Exodus*, are praised for their poetic accomplishments in fusing Christian with heroic alliterative verse, others, especially *Andreas*, are criticised for their unsuccessful mixing of the two. Cynewulf may be said to be the only Old English poet, who deploys heroic diction within a strictly religious poem with a clear purpose. It has been remarked that the characters' repartee of the Latin source of the poem are replaced by Cynewulf with exchanges not dissimilar to operatic arias (Calder 1973: 357). Each exchange gives full volume to each character in the poem and Cynewulf allows the voice in the poem to shift between protagonists and antagonists in a way that gives the pagan and Christian worlds in the poem equal attention. This technique, whereby the voice shifts between the pagan and Christian characters, gives a dramatic weight to the work which is unparalleled in the Latin original. Further, the way in which the pagan and Christian worlds are contrasted is also unprecedented by the Latin *Vita.* The transformations to the legend come not only from the tradition that Cynewulf inherited from his Germanic ancestors, but also from a religious idea that had not yet existed in the times of author of the Latin *Vita*, namely private penitence. Of course, in the Latin *Vita* the devil Belial (unnamed and more generalised in Cynewulf's poem) undergoes a private confession, but this is only partly accurate as rather than being personally motivated; here Juliana forces him to speak about his transgressions. The Old English poem, however, juxtaposes confession with

the notions of public secular honour that is concerned with the primal obligation to kinship and kingship.

The presentation of heroic values in *Juliana* is deliberate and shows how carefully Cynewulf adapts the Latin *Vita* to the Old English poetic tradition. In the first out of the three parts of the poem, Juliana is tried and interrogated by her human antagonists. Although many critics agree that Cynewulf generalised the more realistic and particular elements of the Latin version and have put forward a claim that the Mercian poet renders Juliana and Heliseus into types of *Ecclesia* and the world. The poem juxtaposes Christian with secular values through a conflict of obligations that subsequently breaks down relationships between characters. Cynewulf replaces the historical setting of the *Vita* and resituates it in a social milieu that is closer to his times and culture. Indeed, when Heliseus arrives at Affricanus' home to complain about Juliana's behaviour, because she has refused his proposal of marriage, both men are described as warriors preparing for a combat. The *Vita* states merely that "Audiens haec praefectus, vocavit patrem ejus, et dixit ei omnia verba quae ei mandaverat Juliana" 'having heard all this, the prefect called her father and reported to him everything that Juliana said to him' (*Vita* p. 34)[102]. In the poem, we can hear the sound of weapons and byrnies, as "reord up astag, siþþan hy togædre garas hlændon, hildeþremman" 'a din resounded, when they together inclined their spears, warriors' (*Juliana* ll. 62-64)[103].

The inclusion of elements of heroic society affect the poem in ways different to those suggested by Rosemary Woolf, in that it makes the poem merely adopt "an epic quality" (Woolf 1955: 19). In *Juliana,* the earthly reality is contrasted with the eternal one. Schneider claims that the poem is critical of heroic ideals, "there can be no more devastating way for a poet to discredit the prestige of physical strength than to link it consistently with despicable men" (Schneider 1978: 112). As he points out, in Cynewulf's poem the "religious protagonist is essentially unlike the traditional epic hero; his [Cynewulf's] villains have inherited the values of heroic society, often in a debased form" (Schneider 1978: 117). The heroic elements in *Juliana,* then, are far from formu-

[102] Henceforth indicated as *Vita* followed by page number. All quotation from Strunk, William (ed.). 1904. *Juliana.* Boston and London: D. C. Heath and Co. Publishers. All translation from Latin to modern English are mine.

[103] Henceforth indicated as *Juliana* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Krapp, George Phillip and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (ed.). 1936. *The Exeter book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

laic embellishments. The central elements of heroic society in the poem is the treasure-hoard and the way it organises the human relationship in regard to it. Juliana adopts "freondrædenne" 'friendship' (*Juliana* l. 107) with Christ, which is in conflict with "mægrædenne" 'alliance, marriage' (*Juliana* l. 109).

The poem describes both the social and psychological realities within it. The earthly bond of love is predominantly characterised by lust and illicit desire. Consequently Heliseus's desire for Juliana grows from his corrupted *mod*: "ða his mod ongon fæmnan lufian, (hine fyrwet bræc), Iulianan" 'then in his mind he came to love a woman, (his desire tormented him), called Juliana' (*Juliana* l. 26-28). Heliseus's corrupted *mod* is immediately contrasted with Juliana's *gæst*, which in Anglo-Saxon poetry is the eternal soul as opposed to transient *mod*. Juliana sets her mind on virginity, as she "in gæste bær halge treowe, hogde georne þæt hire mægðhad mana gehwylces fore Cristes lufan clæne geheolde" 'in her soul held the holy covenant and zealous intent that she will guard against all men her virginity for Christ' love' (*Juliana* ll. 28-31). Antonina Harbus remarks of the passage that "the use of *gast* as Juliana's centre of being, compared with *mod* for Eleusius's, positions her thoughts on a higher spiritual level, as *gast* has stronger connotations of 'spirit' than 'mind' in Old English, thought it can occasionally carry the latter meaning" (Harbus 2002: 94)

The reality of Juliana's love and Heliseus' lust is, however, not only psychological. Apart from lust, avarice is central to Heliseus' character and it receives an emphasis equal to that of the psychological detail. In fact, Heliseus' anger is not only an expression of his individual state of mind. If Juliana represents monastic renunciation, Heliseus manifests adherence to earthly values, and mainly avarice. As a divergence from the Latin source, the poem describes Heliseus as "æhtwelig æþeles cynnes rice gerefa" 'affluent reave, of noble stock and well-off' (*Juliana* ll. 18-19) endowed with "hordgestreon" 'treasure-hord' (*Juliana* l. 22). In the Latin *Vita* he buys prefecture on Juliana's insistence with gifts to the emperor; in contrast, in the Old English poem, his position is well established and independent of Maximianus' grace. Also the material culture into which Heliseus puts so much value is associated in the poem with idol-worship. In contrast, Juliana is characterised by the fear of God, which obliges her to reject Heliseus' treasure-hoard: "Hire wæs godes egsa mara in gemyndum, þonne eall þæt maþþumgestealdþe in þæs æþelinges æhtum wunade" 'on her memory was impressed the fear of God more dearly than all the treasure, which rested in the prince's

[Heliseus'] hands' (*Juliana* ll. 35-37). In the poem, Juliana's *gemynd* that establishes her continuing faith is juxtaposed to the inheritance of treasure and the continuation of material culture, which is strongly condemned in the poem.

In the first part of the poem, Juliana is tempted with reminders that she is obliged to conform to the earthly obligations of kinship and kingship; she is obliged to her father and to his future husband, who is, in Cynewulf's poem, her superior. In the *Vita,* Heliseus starts out as a "senator in civitate Nicomedia" 'a senator in the city of Nicomedia' (*Vita* p. 33) and when he proposes to her, Juliana agrees at first on condition that "nisi dignitarem praefecturae administraveris, nullo mod tibi possum conjugi" 'if you do not gain the dignity of a prefect, in no way will I be able to marry you' (*Vita* p. 34). When Cynewulf removes the condition from the narrative, not only does save Juliana from lying to the villain, but also manoeuvres the events of the narrative, so that Affricanus is under obligation to Heliseus. The latter is called "gerefa" (*Juliana* l. 19), but, as Lenore MacGaffey Abraham points out, "the powers ascribed to the CJ [Cynewulf's *Juliana*] Eleusius are associated more usually with an *ealdorman* (i.e., the ruler of a ducal tract of territory) than a *gereafa,* and Eliseus acts on his own authority on behalf of his gods, without reference to the Emperor" (Abraham 2001: 174).

The relationship between Affricanus and Heliseus is of different sort in the Old English poem than in the Latin source. The Latin *Vita* is not particularly specific about Affricanus' intentions when it comes the arranged marriage between Juliana and Heliseus. He rebukes her twice following Heliseus' complaint. At first, the father says simply, "en vero volo illi complere nuptias vestras" 'indeed I desire both of you finalise your nuptials' (*Vita* p. 34). When he is scolding her for the second time, he asks her to consent "nec tale perderet decus" 'lest she loses the great honour' (*Vita* p. 35). In the Old English poem, Affricanus reminds his daughter that she should obey Heliseus's will on the ground of his higher social standing, which he does not entertain in the *Vita.* Juliana's bridegroom is of a higher status than her and her father tells her she should not refuse someone "se is betra þonne þu, æþelra for eorþan, æhtspedigra feohgestreona" 'who is better than you are, nobler and owning more wealth and treasure' (*Juliana* ll. 100-102). The marriage would be an important alliance and a profitable business between the two men; "He is to freonde god. /Forþon is þæs wyrþe, þæt þu þæs weres frige, /ece eadlufan, an ne forlæte" 'he is good as friend; therefore it is advisable that

you should love this man with permanent love, do not forsake him' (*Juliana* ll. 102-104).

Juliana then is bound with more complex obligations than her Latin original. The way the characters are entangled in the human economic bonds suggests that Juliana is opposed to her antagonists as *Ecclesia* to *hostis antiquus*. The opposition is also to be conceived as that between those human beings who insist solely on identifying with the human *dryhten* that involves them in the obligations to kinship and kingship and those human beings and, in contrast, those who subject themselves to the kingship of Christ. She rejects her kinship with her father and Heliseus' kingship, or rather lordship, to embrace Christ not only as her spiritual husband but also as her *mundbora*; Juliana says "þæt he mundbora min geweorþe, helpend ond hælend wið hellsceaþum" 'that he will become my protector, helper and redeemer from fiends of hell' (*Juliana* ll. 156-157). The term *mundbora* had an important function in Anglo-Saxon legal writings (Richards 1997: 43). In human terms, she renounces political and fatherly authority, both of which constitute the basis for personal honour. Indeed, Juliana is exposed to public shame by Heliseus "þa fæmnan het þurh niðwræce nacode þennan, ond mid sweopum swingan synna lease" (*Juliana* ll. 186-188).

This difference between the heavenly and the earthly is shown by the human relationships in the poem being configured as purely economic. When Affricanus responded to Juliana's recalcitrance, "Hyre þa þurh yrre ageaf ondsware /fæder feondlice, nales frætwe onheht" 'he gave her an answer in angry words, the father full of malice, not at all did he deal out adornments to her' (*Juliana* ll. 117-118). He then insists that Juliana should maintain the alliance with her future bridegroom. Her answer may sound puzzling. She says that "nell ic lyge fremman" 'I have never told a lie' (*Juliana* l. 132). Juliana professes herself to be always true and never to have told a lie, because only beyond human obligations and alliance lies truth and unconditional loyalty. She further compares idol-worship to tribute paying; she gives honours to the real God. Not only, therefore, does Juliana reject treasure, when she turns Heliseus down, but also she refuses to make any vows and involve herself in any relationship other than her marriage to Christ.

When Juliana remains adamant in her refusal, Affricanus hands her over to Heliseus's authority and she is thrown into prison. However, her place of confinement is depicted somewhat differently from that in the Latin version. In the source, it is merely

reported that Heliseus "iterum jussit ligament per femora ejus mitt, et sic eam in carcerem recipi" 'ordered her to be tied by the legs and in this way thrown into prison' (*Vita* 37). When she is thrown to prison in the Old English poem, the principal imagery is that of both binding and fettering. Once Heliseus orders Juliana to be thrown into prison, the narrator says in the next sentence that "Hyre wæs Cristes lof in ferðlocan fæste biwunden" 'the glory of Christ was firmly enclosed in her heart' (*Juliana* ll. 233-234). The word *ferðlocan,* 'soul-enclosure,' transfers the imagery of enclosure from the narrow prison to Juliana's soul. In the prison, "symle heo wuldorcyning herede æt heortan, heofonrices god, in þam nydclafan, nergend fira, heolstre bihelmad" 'she always praised the king of glory in her heart, the God of heavenly kingdom, the Redeemer of mankind, now covered in darkness' (*Juliana* ll. 238-241). John P. Hermann observes that "the most significant of the Cynewulfian additions to the source is the theme of spiritual warfare" (Hermann 1989: 157). The central image of the spiritual battle in *Juliana* is the allegory of the soul as a fortress and in this poem there is a clear correspondence between the physical, and mental space, where this warfare is to take place.

The prison, then, is not a place of confinement for Juliana but one of worship and contemplation. Having overcome the temptations of lust and avarice, she is to be on trial for *oferhygd* 'pride' and she is now tempted by the devil himself.[104] Here, the poem elaborates on the kinship and kingship theme from the earlier part of the poem. The devil insists on his kinship bond with Satan, who, as his father, has dispatched him on the mission against the righteous (*Juliana* ll. 321-323), and describes the relationship between Satan and his followers as that of one between a king and his thane, if not the inversion of the ideal *comitatus*. Instead of protection, the devils subordinate to Satan are in constant fear of punishment that their lord looks forward to meting out for failure in bringing sin into souls; they are far from expecting protection and treasure from their lord. The poem thus inverts the formulaic and thematic tradition that usually go hand in hand with the depiction of human bonds as a source of comfort and protection. In contrast, the human bonds with God and Christ are imagined in terms of kingship, but never

[104] Donald G. Bzdyl compares the temptations Juliana undergoes to the typological correnspondence between Adam's original sin and Christ's redemption. "Whereas Adam sinned through avarice in his ordinate desire to possess the forbidden fruit, gluttony in eating the fruit, and pride in desiring to be like God, Juliana, in her own way, follows Christ who, as part of His reversal of the Fall, overcame avarice in rejecting the devil's offer of all the kingdoms in the world, gluttony in not turning the stones of the desert into bread, and pride in refusing to cast Himself down from the mountain" (Bzdyl 2001: 200).

kinship, which strengthens the idea that the adoption of Christ as one's lord testifies to the rejection of the earthly bonds. When Juliana tells her father that she refuses to be married to Heliseus, the narrator says that "hio to gode hæfde freondrædenne fæste gestaþelad" 'she has established her firm friendship with God' (*Juliana* l. 106-107). When she is approached by the devil, who is disguised as an angel of God, she appeals in her prayer to God as "beorna Hleo" 'the protector of men' (*Juliana* l. 272) and she prays seeking the intercession of the angelic *comitatus*, "þæt æþele gesceap þe þu, fæder engla, æt fruman settest" 'the noble creation that You, the Father of angels, have shaped at the beginning of things' (*Juliana* ll. 273-275), therefore identifying herself with the *comitatus* of the heavenly *Dryht*. This is in contrast to the villains and the devil, who are enmeshed in spiritual sorrow, Juliana is "glædmode" 'of blessed/happy disposition' (*Juliana* l. 91).

Both Juliana and the devil are strongly characterised as individuals that are involved in particular bonds and obligations, and yet their characterisation is strongly suggestive of the figuration technique. Endowed with the grace of God, Juliana simply seizes the devil, who is depicted as a weakling throughout the narrative. Her victory over the devil, which is the culmination of her spiritual warfare, is both personal and individual. The spiritual triumph of Juliana over the devil also involves an extraordinary appropriation of the penitential tradition, as Juliana has the devil confess all the evils he has committed or participated in since the Fall of the angels to hell. After he has confessed (a significant part of confession being actually lost due to a lacuna in the manuscript), Juliana commands the devil to tell her "hu þu soðfæstum þurh synna slide swiþast sceþþe, facne bifongen" 'how do you destroy the faithful through sinful snares and accomplish malice' (*Juliana* ll. 348-350), in other words, to explicate his actions in turning the righteous onto the ways of sin. The Old English *Juliana*, like *Genesis B, Daniel*, and *Beowulf*, is more concerned with the psychological process, whereby the sin destroys the human *mod.* The devil makes the same confession in the Latin source, but the Old English narrative is enriched with the Anglo-Saxon poetics of mind and *ofer-hygd.*

Subdued by Juliana, the devil explains how he destroys the souls of the faithful. At first, the devil studies the human soul to gain insight into the spiritual warrior's thought.

> þeah he godes hwæt
> onginne gæstlice, ic beo gearo sona,
> þæt ic ingehygd eal geondwlite,
> hu gefæstnad sy ferð innanweard,
> wiðsteall geworht.
>
> Though he intends to perform good deeds in spirit, soon I am ready to see through his thought he keeps secret, how firmly is his heart set and how resistance is wrought (*Juliana* 397-401).

This points to the reason why the necessity to constrain the mental faculty is a recurrent theme in Old English poetry; in *The Wanderer* it is a noble custom to keep one's mind under check. In *Juliana,* the heroine has set her heart and mind firmly on God. On her being placed in Heliseus' prison, "Hyre wæs Cristes lof in ferðlocan fæste biwunden" 'the praise of Christ was firmly fixed in her heart' (*Juliana* ll. 233-234). When the devil suddenly appears and tempts her to eschew her holy ways, Juliana strengthens her *ferhð* through prayer; the very act of prayer is rendered metaphorically as fortifying one's heart, as Juliana "Ongan þa fæstlice ferð staþelian, geong grondorleas, to gode cleopian" 'began to set her heart firm, young and innocent and to pray to God' (*Juliana* ll. 270-271). Juliana's mind and heart prove impenetrable even before the devil enters the spiritual battlefield. Since prayer itself diverts people from sin, the devil's method is to distract the spiritual warrior from it. Consequently prayer is imagined in the poem as fortifying the soul against the devil's assault; the strength of mind established through prayer and adherence to God's will is the principal weapon of spiritual warfare.

After the devil has studied a particular soul and its propensity for sin, he embarks on his assault upon it. This is depicted as showering the soul with a torrent of arrows. The manoeuvre through which the devil makes it possible for vice to enter the human soul is to undermine its fortifications, especially if he finds the heart easy to waver. The devil says to Juliana "Ic þæs wealles geat ontyne þurh teonan" 'I open the gates of the wall through iniquity' (*Juliana* ll. 401-402) and "bið se torr þyrel, ingong geopenad, þonne ic ærest him þurh eargfare in onsende" (*Juliana* ll. 402-403). Since Juliana's mind has proved impenetrable to the devil's insight, he also cannot force iniquity into her mind. However, it entered the minds of Heliseus and Affricanus, who are both described as "synnum seoce" 'afflicted with sin' (*Juliana* l. 65). This narrative innovation is of Cynewulf's invention, as the source does not characterise either villain at this point of narrative. The devil confides to Juliana:

> þonne ic ærest him
> þurh eargfare in onsende
> in breostsefan bitre geþoncas
> þurh mislice modes willan,
> þæt him sylfum selle þynceð
> leahtras to fremman ofer lof godes,
> lices lustas.
>
> Then I aim at him a shower of arrows, I shoot at his heart bitter thoughts and various desires of heart and it is more pleasing to him to commit sins and fulfil desires of body against God's praise (*Juliana* ll. 403-409).

In the Gregorian fourfold scheme of sin'a assault on the soul, this stage corresponds to suggestion, consent and delectation. In the patristic tradition, sins used to be represented by arrows. In the poem, "eargfare" are varied with "bitre geþoncas" in an appositive construction. The arrows are aimed at "breostsefan" (*Juliana* l. 405). In Old English thought and poetry, *breost* is the physical seat of mind and soul. The *breostsefa* in the present passage is strongly reminiscent of such expressions as *ferthloca* in other parts of the poem and is also suggestive of the Old English poetic tradition of depicting mind in terms of enclosure. Jager points that in the Old English *Genesis B* the Old English term *breost* often translates the Latin *pectus* and that "in Scripture and patristic writings, *pectus* is used to in a cognitive sense as the repository of knowledge or wisdom"(Jager 1991: 280). What is more, "in Augustinian usage, for example, the chest is the 'house' of wisdom and eloquence, the seat of rhetorical affections in the listener and – in the rhetor – the 'stronghold' of either Satan or God". Jager recognises a similar rhetorical ambiguity, "where the Tempter turns the 'breost' from God's verbal instrument into the Devil's (Jager 1991: 280). Similarly in *Juliana*, the *breostsefa* is the object of contention between the spiritual powers of good and evil. The devil describes himself as an able teacher of sin and well versed in methods of bringing confusion into the minds of the pure:

> Ic beo lareow georn
> þæt he monþeawum minum lifge
> acyrred cuðlice from Cristes æ,
> mod gemyrred me to gewealde
> in synna seað.
>
> I am eager to teach everyone so that he lifes according to my wicked practices and make him turn away from the law of Christ, his mind hindered to my power in the abyss of sin (*Juliana* ll. 409-413).

Also when Juliana is led from prison to Heliseus' judgment seat and she is dragging the devil behind her, she is described as "breostum inbryrded" 'inspired in her heart' (*Juliana* l. 535) and the lament of the devil that follows the qualification immediately (*Juliana* ll. 539-553) counterpoints the spiritual victory over the fiend that God has achieved through Juliana.

When Juliana converses with Heliseus and Affricanus, both men try to redirect Juliana's attention from God, who is unknown to them, back to the values and alliances they cherish. The principal agent of averting people from spiritual concerns in the poem is the devil. In Old English poetry, the devil often assumes the role of a rhetor, as has been remarked of *Genesis B*, who tries to influence the cognitive and affective faculties of the human mind[105]. The Old English *Juliana* plays on the patristic definition of sin as turning from the light of God into spiritual blindness. The devil says to Juliana that Satan dispatches him and his other followers in order that "þæt we soðfæstra þurh misgedwield mod oncyrren, ahwyrfen from halor, we beoð hygegeomre, forhte on ferðþe" 'that we pervert the minds of the righteous through deception and turn their mind from salvation' (*Juliana* ll. 325-328). The devil has also hoped that "þæt ic þe meahte butan earfeþum anes cræfte ahwyrfan from halor" 'that I might without any difficulty divert you from salvation' (*Juliana* ll. 358-360).

The heathens in the poem are largely described as deceived and, therefore, blinded by the devil. Both Affricanus and Heliseus are presented in a way that suggests an advanced infection with sin, which has taken place in their minds. When Heliseus has been angered by Juliana's refusal, he approaches "hreoh ond hygeblind, haligre fæder, recene to rune" 'full of sorrow and blind in thought, the father of the holy one' (*Juliana* l. 60). The h-alliteration juxtaposes Heliseus, who is *hreoh* and *hygeblind*, with Juliana described as *halig.* It is also ironic that the spiritually blind men meet for counsel; the irony encodes the limitations of the earthly vision. Whilst the fact that Heliseus is *hreoh,* "full of sorrow," may indicate on the literal level that he has been merely let down by Juliana, the attention that is given to his and Affricanus' spiritual condition suggests that his misery is part of the post-lapsarian existential human condition and

[105] Antonina Harbus points out that in *Juliana* Cynewulf "keeps the narrative focus in the mental arena by presenting decision-making as the chief source of conflict in the drama", which "lies in the presentation of conflict and discussion as attempts to change someone's mind" (Harbus 2002: 92).

may be related to the kind of exilic desolation that the devil assaulting Juliana suffers from.

The final destruction of the soul is brought about by the devil through infecting it with *superbia*, which corresponds to the last stage of the Gregorian fourfold scheme, the boldness to defend (*Moralia* 4: 48)[106]. The psychological analysis of the admittance of sin into one's mind coalesces in the poem through relating the activity of Satan and fallen angels since the historical beginning of sin, which was brought about by Satan's *oferhygd* "pride". Interestingly enough, Juliana is puzzled by the fact the devil, who is the embodiment of *oferhygd*, can so easily mingle with the pure. In patristic and monastic writings, *superbia* is the most likely of all sins to affect those, who have achieved perfection, and lead to their further spiritual corruption. John Cassian forewarns the monks who aspire to spiritual perfection that pride "is accustomed, rather, to strike only those who have overcome the aforementioned vices and who are already nearly situated at the summit of virtue" (John Cassian 2000: 267).

> Saga, earmsceapen, unclæne gæst,
> hu þu þec geþyde, þystra stihtend,
> on clænra gemong? þu wið Criste geo
> wærleas wunne ond gewin tuge,
> hogdes wiþ halgum. þe wearð helle seað
> niþer gedolfen, þær þu nydbysig
> fore oferhygdum eard gesohtes.
> Wende ic þæt þu þy wærra weorþan sceolde
> wið soðfæstum swylces gemotes
> ond þy unbealdra, þe þe oft wiðstod
> þurh wuldorcyning willan þines.
>
> Tell me, the wretched one, unclean spirit, how you, the ruler of darkness, manage join the hosts of the holy? You have waged a war against Christ and were intent ont struggling with saints. The hellish abyss was built for you, when you were thrown onto the ground as a punishment for your pride. I expect you should be more careful and less courageous against a holy one, who has often prevailed over you through the will of the Lord (*Juliana* ll. 418-428).

The narrative reminds the audience how dangerously close to pride Juliana is as a spiritual warrior and that the greatest peril does not lie outside, but within her soul. The heroine of the poem undertakes a spiritual struggle, which is modelled on that of a monk, who renounces the world to achieve the purity of heart, this in emphasised by the

[106] This quotation from *Moralia on the book of Job* comes from The quotation comes from Gregory the Great. 1844-1850. *Morals on the book of Job.* (Edited and translated by John Henry Parker.) 3 vols. Oxford: J. G. F. And J. Rivington.

action taking place in a cell. Juliana in contrast to the devil and Satan, who are depicted as being in opposition to her, is shown as the image of humility, as she rejects not only the world, thus being purified of avarice, but also she overcomes *luxuria* in that she remains adamant in her virginity. However, in what follows immediately afterwards in the poem, she is not characterised by humility as such. The devil admires her "deop gehygd" 'deep thought' (*Juliana* l. 431), owing to which she "wurde þus wigþrist ofer eall wifa cyn, þæt þu mec þus fæste fetrum gebunde, æghwæs orwigne" 'became so exalted above all womankind in boldness that you have bound me with fetters so firmly, unable to defend myself' (*Juliana* ll. 432-434). The fact that the devil capitulates and is bound by Juliana inverts the imagery of binding and fettering that characterises the prison and the soul assaulted by vices earlier in the poem and implies Juliana's spiritual freedom. Also, Juliana is of "deop gehygd" (*Juliana* l. 431) in contrast to her heaven antagonists, who are depicted as spiritually blind, therefore, with their *modas* "minds" weakened.

In the third part of the poem, when Juliana is brought to Heliseus' judgment, Cynewulf maintains the distinction between heavenly and earthly authority, but instead of playing on the idea of kinship and kingship, he develops the juxtaposition of God and Heliseus in their capacities as, respectively, *dema* "judge" and *mundbora* "protector". Juliana is brought to Heliseus' "domsetle," 'judgment seat,' (*Juliana* l. 534). The poem foregrounds the concept of shame throughout the violent events of Juliana's life. The torments Juliana suffers on the day of her martyrdom are punishment for breaking the alliance with the gods of her kith and kin. The devil, who suddenly reappears, incites the judge to mete out a punishment to Juliana, because "heo goda ussa meaht forhogde" 'she disdained the power of our gods' (*Juliana* l. 619-620). At the same time, the poem has Juliana restate her "sibbe", 'peace, bond,' (*Juliana* l. 652) with God, while making manifest the spiritual misery of her antagonist, whose existence is depicted in terms of living in a corrupted version of *comitatus.* Cynewulf contrasts the Heavenly *comitatus* with the Heliseus's band of retainers with whom he is drowned in the sea and dispatched to a hellish abode. In the final exhortative address to her tormentors Juliana instructs the "æfremmende", 'law-abiding,' (*Juliana* l. 648) that "þæt ge eower hus gefæstnige, þy læs hit ferblædum windas toweorpan" (*Juliana* ll. 648-650) and also "Weal sceal þy trumra strong wiþstondan storma scurum, leahtra gehygdum" (*Juliana* ll. 650-652). The description of the heavenly abode continues the fortress metaphor of the spiritual warrior's soul. The description of Heliseus and his train in hell, where "to þam

frumgare feohgestealda witedra wenan, þæt hy in winsele ofer beorsetle beagas þegon, æpplede gold" (*Juliana* ll. 685-688), is in a sharp contrast to the *sibb* between God and his heavenly retainers.

In *Juliana*, the social, psychological and metaphysical realities are superimposed on one another. The human reality is conceptualised as an existence in the fetters of hell and servitude to the Devil. The fact that the poem condemns the sexual and material values with which the world tempts Christians testifies to the monastic values it fosters and *Juliana's* legend was adapted by Cynewulf to fit the context of monastic life and the obligations of kingship and kinship, which bound the novices entering the cloister and, which they were expected to renounce. Although no one in Anglo-Saxon England was persecuted for their Christian faith, the poem's depiction of persecution is in a way faithful to the realities of the Old English period, as persecution becomes a metaphor for the social bonds and obligation of the human *sibb* that are obstacles to the spiritual values of the cloister.

2.3. Cannibalism and ideology of conquest and conversion in *Andreas*

The major theme of *Andreas* is the spiritual state of a pagan nation and the freedom from sin that Christianisation brings about. All the liturgical and typological associations in the poem reinforce the ideological work that the poem would have performed in the Anglo-Saxon period. The spiritual condition of the Mermedonians and their state of existing in punishment for sin is the primal concern of the narrative. The Mermedonians are depicted not only as cannibals, but also as spiritually blind, having their minds fettered by sin and, therefore, having their freedom constrained by the devil and having their reason overthrown by madness and bestiality. What is more, they are depicted as treaty-breakers, which suggests a typological interpretation by identifying them with *hostis antiquus*.

The objective of the present sub-chapter is to investigate the representation of the pagan community in *Andreas* by relating the poems historical and social relevance to the times of the Danish invasion and Danelaw. The poem uses the idea of *Miles Christi* in a way that is different from the narrative in a typical saint's life. The argument here is that the language of warfare that underscores the spiritual conflict in *Andreas*

sanctions and explains the physical violence against the heathen state in two ways; firstly an enactment of the crucifixion and secondly as the Harrowing of Hell. As such being a military warrior's action in *imitatio* of Christ's passion and the redemption of humanity from sin. What follows also addresses the issue of the foreigner and the heathen in the poem from other perspectives; they are the historical invasion of the Vikings, the imposition of Danelaw, and that of the Anglo-Saxon heathen past. However, far from merely taking a spiritual fight with the devil, Andreas is depicted as conquering Mermedonia both spiritually and physically (politically) and rescuing the Mermedonians from their slavery to their lord the devil. In this way, Andreas redemptive mission parallels the story of the Harrowing of Hell[107]. Although the influence of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the Harrowing episode has already been recognised by other criticism, the following sub-chapter points to the implications of this fact; the conversion of a pagan community in the poem is depicted in terms of the Harrowing of Hell. The spiritual warfare in *Andreas* involves conquest through physical violence and uses the apocryphal story of the Harrowing to represent a political conflict as part of the cosmic struggle between the Christian world and paganism.

Criticism of *Andreas* has already dealt with the allegorical and typological elements of the poem's narrative. Hamilton demonstrates that "an extended structure of dramatic irony that conveys and highlights the figurative language" in *Andreas* and that the Andreas poet stands out in his use of irony from other Old English poets in that the unity of the poem depends on the ironic structure (Hamilton 1972: 148). Elsewhere, he points out that "The poet uses *Beowulf's* phrasing and presents awareness of tradition. He inverts expectations established by *Beowulf*" (Hamilton 1975: 88). Other critics have explained the poem's themes and structure in terms of allegory and typology. Hill observes that "deliberate verbal ambiguities" point to typological meaning of a number of passages of *Andreas*" (Hill 1969: 268) and that "the flood in the poem (suggestive of Noah's flood, one of the types of baptism) is best understood within the poem as a figural representation of the mystery of Christian baptism" (Hill 1969: 265). Constance

[107] Constance B. Hieatt specified the paralells between *Andreas* and the Harrowing of Hell narratives in "The Harrowing of Mermodonia" (1976). She points out that Mermodonia is a type of Hell and that, like Christ, Andreas "also endures a similar three-day sojourn in conditions which symbolize the grave and/or Hell" (1976: 53). She also claims that Andrews experiences a symbolic death before the three days of being figuratively buried; "it is to be found in Andrew's voyage, a common enough symbol for death and rebirth" (1976: 57).

Hieatt argues that "in the poem, there is a re-enactment or sub-fulfilment of Christ's Passion and Resurrection" (Hieatt 1976: 52) and that the action of the poem is symbolic of the Harrowing of Hell. The most complex typological reading is given by Marie Michelle Walsh, who argues that the typology of *Andreas* involves the correspondence between the narrative with the events of the Old and the New Testament and their affinity to the liturgy of baptism (Walsh 1977: 138).

These readings of *Andreas,* which set it in the context of its reliance on the heroic tradition, usually fail to explain the ideological purpose of such a text. Other works, which foreground the spiritual reading of the poem, usually ignore its literal meanings and do not address the possibility that the religious significance of typological and allegorical elements in the poem might have had any political impact. Recent studies pay attention to the discrepancies between the literal events in the poem and the allegorical meaning they are suppose to convey. John P. Hermann in his *Allegories of War* states that the violence of this harmonious transformation is silenced by criticism, which "re-inscribes the rhetorical arc by which Andreas's miracle first causes, then cancels Mermedonian deaths" (Hermann 1989: 120-121). The typological associations in the poem, especially those concerned with the liturgy of baptism, sanction the physical violence in converting pagan states. Shannon N. Godlove assumes that "*Andreas* was probably composed in the ninth century, squarely in the midst of Viking incursions" and claims that "viewed in this historical context, the assimilation and neutralisation of a bloodthirsty heathen people might take on a special significance, encoding the religious and cultural anxieties of Christians living in Anglo-Saxon England in the ninth century" (Godlove 2009: 139)[108]. Consequently representations of political conflicts in Old English poetry are influenced by hagiographic discourse, and when the spiritual warrior is depicted as a warrior (or vice versa, as in *Judith* analysed in the next subchapter), the physical conflict is depicted as involved in the cosmic warfare between God and Satan. Hagiographic poetry was politically significant during the ages of conversion and was reinforced by the implied tradition of heroic warfare transmitted through the very form of the heroic verse it adopted.

[108] She also remarks that "the most recent criticial estimates place the composition of *Andreas* in the mid- to late ninth century Mercia, that is, in a time and place where the stability and integrity of a powerulf Anglo-Saxon kingdom was being severly compromised by Viking incursions" (2009: 158). Godlove argues that "the poem's depiction of the Mermedonians presents them as having a kind of inverted civilisation, the most telling sign of which is their manipulation of writing" (2009: 146).

The feature that marks the Mermedonians out as different from other cultures is their cannibalistic practice. The poet insists on vilifying the cruelty they inflict on any foreigner that trespasses over the boundary of the "mearcland", 'borderland' (*Andreas* l. 18)[109].

> Eal wæs þæt mearcland morðre bewunden,
> feondes facne, folcstede gumena,
> hæleða eðel. Næs þær hlafes wist
> werum on þam wonge, ne wæteres drync
> to bruconne, ah hie blod ond fel,
> fira flæschoman, feorrancumenra,
> ðegon geond þa þeode. Swelc wæs þeaw hira
> þæt hie æghwylcne ellðeodigra
> dydan him to mose meteþearfendum,
> þara þe þæt ealand utan sohte.
>
> The borderland was marked with death and fiend's wickedness, the habitat of these people and their homeland. There was no loaf of bread that these people could find on this plain. Neither was there water to drink. Only blood and human flesh of visitors from abroad. It was their custom that they turned each visitor, who sought their land, to food (*Andreas* ll. 19-28).

The description of Mermedonia inverts any preconceptions about the practices of a civilised community and their habitat. Not only is the land itself a territory on the edge of the world, but also it does not provide the conditions that would guarantee the biological survival of any civilisation, as the inhabitants of the distant land have no recourse to any resources that would make for their sustenance. Subsequently the geography of the poem is symbolic. The Mermedonians do not consider leaving their fatherland, because they are confined within the limits of their spiritual wretchedness. Andreas, then is represented as justifiably afraid to travel to Mermedonia. Mermedonia is constructed as a spiritual condition rather than an actual spot on the map. It has been remarked that in *Andreas* the practice of cannibalism is not a sin in itself, but a reflection of spiritual corruption. John Casteen posits that the cannibalism which the Mermedonians take part in should be read figuratively and he brings up parallels from the Old Testament, where cannibalism is depicted as "the judgment visited or threatened to be visited on a sinful nation for a particular sin against God" (Casteen 1978: 76). He points out that "most commonly, this sin entails rejecting the leadership of God's designated prophet, and

[109] Henceforth indicated as *Andreas* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Krapp, George Phillip and Elliott (ed.). 1936. *The Vercelli book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

thereby rejecting God" (Casteen 1978: 76). James Earl remarks that cannibalism in *Andreas* represents "a displaced reliance upon man himself for spiritual sustenance" and that the word *sylfaetan* (self-eaters) is a play on the idea developed by Augustine and Boethius that the wicked man acts to his own destruction and eventually becomes nothing owing to his own evil" (Earl 1980: 79). Thus cannibalism, as the sign of spiritual deprivation, is made manifest in the Old English *Andreas*.

Significantly, when the Mermedonians seize their victims, they do not just turn them into food. What happens prior to this is that the Mermedonians convert their prey into the same spiritual condition of destitution. The heathens blind their victims: "Swylc wæs þæs folces freoðoleas tacen, unlædra eafoð, þæt hie eagena gesihð, hettend heorogrimme, heafodgimmas agetton gealgmode gara ordum" 'such was the hostile tribe's token, violence of the wretched, that the vision of eyes, the persecutors ruthless at strifes, the gems of the head, in anger, destroyed with spears' (*Andreas* ll. 29-32). The fact of the Mermedonians blinding their victim is introduced by the word "swylc", 'such' (*Andreas* l. 29) mirroring the formula introducing the fact of their cannibalism. In turn, "Swelc wæs þeaw hira", which introduces the first mention of Mermedonians cannibalistic practice is one of the many formulas *Andreas* shares with *Beowulf*[110]. In both poems, the formula introduces an unacceptable heathen practice: for example when pouring libations to the devil when it comes to the Danes under Hrothgar's rule and then the inhumane practices of the Mermedonians, who blind and eat their victims.

After destroying their victims' physical sight, another torture they inflict on the newcomers is turning them mad by means of a potion.

> Syððan him geblendan bitere tosomne,
> dryas þurh dwolcræft, drync unheorne,
> se onwende gewit, wera ingeþanc,
> heortan on hreðre, (hyge wæs oncyrred),
> þæt hie ne murndan æfter mandreame,
> hæleþ heorogræd, ige, ac hie hig ond gærs
> for meteleaste meðe gedrehte.

[110] "Hwilum hie geheton æt hærgtrafum /wigweorþunga, wordum bædon, /þæt him gastbona geoce gefremede /wið þeodþreaum. Swylc wæs þeaw hyra, /hæþenra hyht; helle gemundon /in modsefan, Metod hie ne cuþon, /dæda Demend, ne wiston hie Drihten God, /ne hie huru heofena Helm herian ne cuþon, /Wuldres Waldend" 'at times they appealed to idols with prayers so that the soul-slayer [the devil] would provide them with help against the national calamity. Such was their custom, the hope of the pagans; they had hell in their hearts. They did not know the Measurer, the Judge. They did not know how to praise the King of heaven' (*Beowulf* ll. 178-183). The quotation is taken from Elliot van Kirk Dobbie (ed.). 1953. *Beowulf and Judith.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 4.) New York: Columbia University Press. Translation from Old English into modern English is mine.

> Then the magicians concocted a bitter drink through devilish craft, a deadly drink, which perverted mind and heart of men. They no longer cared for human joys, but hungry, ate grass and hay (*Andreas* ll. 33-39)

The poisonous drink is prepared by *dryas*, 'sorcerers', who are devoted to dwolcræft 'sorcery, magic' (*Andreas* l. 34). The impact the potion exerts on the human mind is expressed in terms of turning, which corresponds to the traditional imagery of sin in terms of a movement away from God. Although the passage does not directly state that the captives of the Mermedonians turn from God, the mention of their undernourishment due to their frugal diet of hay and grass is a tropological image of their spiritual destituteness and estrangement from God. As in the imagery of the soul as a fortress in *Beowulf* and *Juliana*, the devil is not so much interested in enticing people to a particular misdemeanour as in weakening their spiritual condition so that sin can enter their soul without obstacle. The soul as fortress metaphor is absent from *Andreas*, but the psychological process whereby sin assaults the human soul is described in a similar formulaic guise.

The process of turning humans into animals in *Andreas* is, in fact, modelled on the idea of temptation. Sin in patristic theology is defined as spiritual blindness and destitution; in Augustian terms, the sinner turns from God into nothingness. In Boethian terms, the sinner through his delight in sin loses his human nature and takes on an animalistic and unreasoned existence. Boethius, in his *Consolation of Philosophy*, states that "he who abandons goodness and ceases to be a man cannot rise to the status of a god, and so is transform to an animal" (*Consolation* 4:2)[111]. What happens to the minds of the wretches, who fall prey to Mermedonians, parallels the Ambrosian and Gregorian theory of sin. For Ambrose, the story of Adam and Eve from Genesis sets the psychological model for all subsequent sin and how it affects and changes the structure of the human soul. He outlines this model in *De Paradiso*. When *sensus corporis animalis* takes precedence over reason, human nature becomes the inversion of the human ideal (*De Paradiso* 2:11). Typologically, the Mermedonians refer to Satan in yet another way; they perform the role of the Serpent in Paradise[112].

[111] The quotation from *The Consolation of Philosophy* comes from Boethius. 1999. *The Consolation of Philosophy*. (Translated by P. G. Walsh.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[112] When it comes to the Gregorian scheme, the destruction of eyesight may correspond to pleasure and poisoning, which effects the destruction of free will, corresponding to consent, in his fourfold scheme of committing sin (suggestion, pleasure, consent and boldness to defend) (Gregory the Great 1884: 215).

The possibility of reading the Mermedonians' activities as the temptation of the sinner (or a saint) is obvious from the first movement of the poem. Matthew's actions prove that it is possible to oppose Mermedonians' evil craft and, therefore, not to yield to temptation. The first dramatic event in the poem, which follows the detailed characterisation of the Mermedonians, is Matthew's arrival in their city. At the beginning of the poem, Mathew is described as one of "rofe rincas, þonne rond ond hand on herefelda helm ealgodon, on meotudwange" 'the bold warriors, who defended their Lord with hand and shield on the battlefield' (*Andreas* ll. 9-11). The Mermedonians, in turn, are now described as "deofles þegn" 'the devil's thanes' (*Andreas* l. 43). The *Andreas* poet makes a firm juxtaposition between Matthew and the Mermedonians in the opening movement of the poem. The events that involve the blinding and fettering of Matthew are expressed in a tissue of heroic formulas. The subsequent strife takes place on two planes. Matthew fails on the physical and material ones, as he becomes subdued and vanquished by the enemy. However, on the psychological and spiritual plane he triumphs over the devil. It is impossible to overturn his reason through their sorcery (*Andreas* l. 34), because Matthew prevails with the power of the gospels; whereas the Mermedonians vanquish their opponents with dwolcræft 'magic' (*Andreas* l. 34), Matthew was the one, "se mid Iudeum ongan godspell ærest wordum writan wundorcræfte" 'who first among the Jews wrote down the gospel with wondrous craft' (*Andreas* ll. 12-13). The mightiest opposition in the poem is between the Apostolic *wundorcræft* and the devilish *dwolcræft*.

Although Matthew is physically blind[113], like other prisoners who await being consumed by their enemies in the poem, he remains adamant in his unshakable faith and

[113] Matthew's physical blindness is counterpointed by the unbelievers' spiritual deprivation. The next narrative moment where the imagery of spiritual blindness is revived is the story of the living stone. The Jews then are depicted as unable to see through the letter and representation and, therefore, remain adamant in their refusal to recognize Christ's divinity. When Andreas is travelling to Mermedonia he tells the Helmsman, who is Christ in disguise and whom Andreas does not recognise, an unscriptural story of Christ converting the sculptures at a Jewish temple into living stones, which proclaim his divine origin. The High Priest of the temple mocks Christ, as he relegates His origin to his earthly parents, Joseph and Mary. He also depicts Christ and his followers as exiles dislocated from the human bonds and the structure of human society when he says that they "wadað widlastas" 'go along the paths of exiles' (*Andreas* l. 677). Christ departs to the wilderness, but when he returns to the temple, the Jews resume in their reluctance to accept His teaching; "Haliges lare synnige ne swulgon, þeah he soðra swa feala tacna gecyðde, þær hie to segon" 'the sinful men did not obey the holy teaching, although he made manifest to them many sings of truth, while they were watching' (*Andreas* l. 710-711). Christ commands the statues of angels in the temple to rise and proclaim "hwæt min æðelo sien" 'what my noble origin is' (*Andreas* l. 734). Not only do the Jews dismiss the miracle as anything more than magic, but also they ignore another miracle, whereby the three patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob rise from their graves to identify Christ

resolute mind set only on God. Matthew's willed devotion to God puts him in contrast to the Mermedonians' perverted slavery to the devil.

> Hie þam halgan þær handa gebundon
> ond fæstnodon feondes cræfte,
> hæleð hellfuse, ond his heafdes segl
> abreoton mid billes ecge. Hwæðre he in breostum þa git
> herede in heortan heofonrices weard,
> þeah ðe he atres drync atulne onfenge.
>
> They bound the hands of the holy man and confined him with power they had from the devil, these doomed men. They also pierced the jewel of his head [eyesight] with the edge of a sword. However, he still praised the Lord of heaven in his heart, although he had drunk their poison (*Andreas* ll. 48-53).

Matthew's physical suffering and wretchedness are contrasted with his unharmed spiritual condition that he retains due to his faith. Like Juliana, in the earlier example, his mind is strengthened by prayer. Matthew praises God "mid elne forð" 'with continuing courage' (*Andreas* l. 54). The heroic formula transfers the imagery involved in the descriptions of the heathen's violent behaviour and demonstrates towards the newcomer the plane of spiritual conflict; indeed, prayer is imagined to be his weapon. His prayer continues the imagery of blindness, both physical and spiritual. The thematic thread of Matthew's physical blindness and spiritual vision is completed when "wuldres tacen halig of heofenum, swylce hadre segl" 'a wondrous and holy sign of heaven, such a bright token' (*Andreas* l. 89-90) descends upon him.

The final opposition between Matthew and the heathens is his steadfast loyalty to God and their existence as "wærloga", 'treaty breakers' (*Andreas* l. 71). The word *wærloga* acquires its force for two reasons. First of all, the term has a typological suggestion, as it directly involves the Mermedonians in the eternal struggle between God and *hostis antiquus.* In Old English poetry, the devil is invariably described as *wærloga*. Secondly, the heathen's blind servility to the devil is in opposition to Matthew's self willed devotion to God. In his prayer, Matthew asserts his free will that saves him from madness, spiritual blindness and the Mermedonians' devilish magic. The vision of para-

---

as the Lord. The Jews in the poem are hardened against realising the truth by the poison of the Serpent that wells forth in their hearts: "Man wridode geond beorna breost, brandhata nið weoll on gewitte, weorm blædum fag, attor ælfæle" 'wickedness grew inside their breasts, fiery enmity swelled in their thoughts, the blazing Serpent poisoned them with destructive venom' (*Andreas* l. 767-769) . Hermann calls the event "a miraculous short-circuiting of the path from signifier to signified" and points out that "The miracle eliminates the necessity of representation and interpretation, of which the Jews are not capable due to their hermeneutic depravity" (Hermann 1989: 126-127).

dise that becomes manifest to Matthew in prison underscores his loyalty, as heaven is to a become reward for his steadfastness and counterpoints the imagery of Mermedonia that is reminiscent of the landscape of hell. The imagery of binding and fettering fosters the imagery of Harrowing of Hell in the poem. The depiction of the Mermedonians as *wærlogan* and the vision of paradise suggests the entire history of salvation, of which Matthew's spiritual struggle is part.

The relationship between the two movements of the poem, the first concerning Matthew and his personal spiritual victory over the Mermedonians and the second concerning Andrew's victory over them explains the structure of the poem. Matthew's victory is spiritual and personal, but it cannot be complete. Much as the events in the poem are figural and the typological level of significance is never suspended in the poem, the second movement of *Andreas* is extremely realistic in political terms. Although sin can be conquered spiritually, conversion as the miracle of salvation of an individual may only be made into a political fact through real violence. The violence, pain and death to which the Mermedonians are subjected in the poem, entails a realisation that warfare and violence are part and parcel of the process of conversion. John Hermann observes in *Allegories of War* that violence in *Adnreas* is palpably physical, especially when it comes to depiction of the flood preceeding Mermedonians' spiritual revival.

> But many Mermedonian deaths are not cancelled. Only some of the young Mermedonians are brought back to life. underscoring the typological dimensions of a death by water which brings new life to a savage race, critics have ignored or sublated the literal violence implicated in the final coherence.... The Mermedonians's attempt to preserve their traditional culture appears reprehensible, largely due to the bizarre extremety of their characterisation as magicians, sadists, and anthropophagi (1989: 120).

Andreas's violence and warfare are physical, as Hermann points out. That Christianisation requires conquest and defeat, the Anglo-Saxons knew from historical writings, which included Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica.* In the poem, Andrew's victory and his political conquest of Mermedonians, which extends the boundaries of Christendom into pagan lands, is the fulfilment of Matthew's spiritual victory; Matthew's resistance to temptation prefigures Andrew's physical *passio*; *Andreas* develops a model for warfare, which is both spiritual and heroic. Andrew's *passio* represents warfare both as a battle against sin and the actual bodies of warriors, who serve the devil as their lord, a hellish *comitatus.*

The conquest over Mermedonia is depicted in terms of figural signification. The theme of spiritual depravity is strengthened by the imagery of the Harrowing of Hell. Hieatt suggests that "Andrew not only emulates Christ by suffering a parallel to His Passion – a requirement laid upon every Christian in some sense – but also endures a similar three-day sojourn in conditions which symbolise the grave and/or hell" (Hieatt 1976: 53). She also says that in the text the Mermedonians are identified with the devils and that "it is also impossible to differentiate between the Mermedonians and the demonic cohorts who encourage and participate in the tormenting of Andrew" (Hieatt 1976: 53). She also puts forward an allegorical reading of Andreas's sea journey with Christ on the ship to Mermedonia representing death and that "the sea-bird turned beast-of-prey [the *waelgifre* mew of 371-372] being the demonic forces that menace the soul as it parts from the earth-bound body" (Hiett 1976: 59).

Andreas's actions in the poem parallel those of Christ and are set in the cosmic struggle between good and evil, Christ and Satan[114]. Andreas's actions are dependent on the strength that he receives from God. When he wakes up in Mermedonia and recognises the fact that Christ was the pilot of the ship that brought him to the place, Christ re-appears as a boy. Christ says to Andreas that his sin did not consist in his inability to recognise Christ (which would be dangerously close to suggesting that he shares in the spiritual blindness of the Jews that he mentioned earlier), but, rather, in his having doubted God's ability to transport him to Mermedonia in just three days. Andreas's physical endurance will depend on his unconditional belief in God's *mundbyrd,* 'protection', because his task will be to enact and imitate Christ's passion, not only in the spiritual but also the physical dimension. At this point of the narrative, Christ tells Andreas of his own passion and focuses on his physical suffering, rather than on its redemptive results. Christ forewarns Andreas that he "scealt edre geneðan in gramra gripe" 'shall struggle in the grip of the cruel men' (*Andreas* ll. 950-951). Andreas is to be subjected to a long-lasting torture that will eventually result in the dismemberment of his body. Yet he is to prove his obedience and loyalty to God. Christ insists on Andreas single-minded persistence and his superhuman endurance so that he can withstand the pain: "ðu þæt sar aber; ne læt þe ahweorfan hæðenra þrym, grim gargewinn, þæt ðu gode

[114] Thomas Hill demonstrates that there are especially two fragments in which Andrew is a figura of Christ: 950-976 (1969: 271). Other parallels between Andreas and Christ are analysed by Constance B. Hieatt (1976: 52). She also observes that "the period of time involved here is, moreover, significant in itself. Andrew is imprisoned, suffering demonic torments, for three days" (1976: 52).

swice, dryhtne þinum" 'you will endure pain; do not let the heathen might make you cast aside the warfare and abandon God thy Lord' (*Andreas* ll. 956-959). Above all, Andreas is to remember Christ's own suffering and mockery at the ands of his tormentors.. Unlike *The Dream of the Rood,* in *Andreas* Christ is depicted as a passive victim in his redemptive suffering and He sets Himself as an example for Andreas to follow: "Wolde ic eow on ðon þurh bliðne hige bysne onstellan, swa on ellþeode ywed wyrðeð" 'I wish to give an example through blithe thought, as it shall be manifest to all nations' (*Andreas* ll. 970-972).

The purpose of Andreas *imitatio* is to be redemptive, as "Manige syndon in þysse mæran byrig þara þe ðu gehweorfest to heofonleohte þurh minne naman, þeah hie morðres feala in fyrndagum gefremed habban" 'there will be many in this great city whom you will turn to the heavenly light in my name, although they have committed many a murder in the olden days' (*Andreas* ll. 973-976)[115]. Its redemptive force stems from the belief that every martyr's suffering is heroic, insofar as it conquers the devil; every martyr imitates Christ's death, which was a victory over the devil. *Andreas* is also strong when it comes to emphasizing that a Christian hero must remain adamant in continuing loyalty to the heavenly *dryht* and, alternatively, the imagery of the lord and thane equally applies to the devils. Andreas in the poem imitates Christ in his role as a Redeemer of Patriarchs from hell.

This is exemplified by the Devil and his seven follower's who assault *Andreas* when he is imprisoned. The scene seems to parallel Christ's defeat of Satan in Hell. The central idea of the defeat of the devil in the Harrowing narrative is that the Devil has to be deceived by Christ. He accepted Christ in exchange for the forfeiture of his possession on condition that He is more than a human being (Southern [1953] 1993: 223-224). In the Old English rendition of the Gospel of Nicodemus, the personified Hell warns Satan that Christ, on entering Hell, "gif se death hyne ondraet thonne gefohþ he ðe and the byð aefre wa to ecere worulde" 'if death fears him, then he will fetter you will be in woe forever' (*Nicodemus* p. 211)[116]. Satan retorts "hwæt twynað the oððe hwaet

[115] *Andreas* constructs an idea of the heathen community as owned and possessed by the devil. The idea in the poem bears some semblance to the early Christian conception of the devil's rights over mankind that he loses through Christ's innocent death. Andreas's passion mirrors that of Christ insofar as it brings about the freedom of Mermedonians from the bonds of Satan, who, in the poem, is depicted as a treaty breaker and God's disobedient thane.

[116] Henceforth indicated as *Nicodemus* followed by page number. All quotations taken from Cross, J. E. 1996. *Two Old English Apocrypha and their manuscript source.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon

ondraetst ðu the ðone haelend to onfonne…? Ic wille hys deað to the gelædan and he sceal beon underþeod ægðer ge me ge the" 'why do you doubt and why are you afraid to receive the Redeemer? I will bring his death to you and he shall serve both me and you' (*Nicodemus* p. 211). Ignorant of Christ's identity as a Person of the Trinity, the Devil did not know that he would not receive God in Hell. In the Harrowing the Devil expected a human being.

In the poem, when Andreas is tormented on the second day, the Devil appears and tells the Mermodonians to throw him into prison. He expects Andreas to be a mere sinner and does not recognize his holiness. He addresses his inferiors to torment a sinner: ""Sleað synnigne ofer seolfes muð, folces gewinnan!" 'kill this sinner upon his mouth, the enemy of the folk' (*Andreas* ll. 1300-1301). When the Devil comes to him in the cell with his seven followers, he expresses his anxiety that Andreas has come to Mermedonia to claim for himself what the Devil considers to be his property.

> Hafast nu þe anum eall getihhad
> land ond leode, swa dyde lareow þin.
> Cyneþrym ahof, þam wæs Crist nama,
> ofer middangeard, þynden hit meahte swa.
> þone Herodes ealdre besnyðede,
> forcom æt campe cyning Iudea,
> rices berædde, ond hine rode befealg,
> þæt he on gealgan his gast onsende
>
> You have usurped for yourself this land and these people as your Teacher did once. The one whose name of Christ established his dominion over the entire middle-earth when he had might. Then Herod took his life, overcoming in combat the king of Judea, and took over his kingdom. He crucified Him so that he died on gallows (*Andreas* ll. 1320-1327).

Significantly, he recalls the Crucifixion and says that Andreas's claim to conquer Mermedonia is similar to Christ's claim to take humanity away from the Devil's sway. On the unnamed Devil's commands, his servants make an attack on Andreas. However, as soon as they perceive the sign of the cross on Andreas's face, they flee from him and prove themslves incapable of fighting off a spiritual warrior (*Andreas* ll. 1335-1341)[117].

England 19.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

[117] Karen Louise Jolly points out that in Old English literature "the sign of the cross is a powerful tool in saints' lives for dispelling demonic illusions and other afflictions. Warrior saints in particular, such as St Martin and St Oswald, adopt the cross as a spiritual weapon in place of a sword to repel demons and protect themselves from evil" (2005: 218). She also observes that "in the *Blickling Homilies*, devils cannot kill St Andreas because they see Christ's *rodetacen*, the cross-sign, on his countenance" (2005: 219).

When one of the devils is chastised for cowardice, he tells his lord to take arms against Andreas himself. This leads the Devil to confidently assert his rights over Mermedonia. He does not recognize God as the power behind Andreas's deeds, but, as a sign of spiritual ignorance, he accuses Andreas's of acting "aclæccræftum", 'by magic' (*Andreas* l. 1362) when he blames Andreas that he misleads and blinds many nations ("ðu leoda feala forleolce ond forlærdest!" 'you lead astray many nations' *Andreas* ll. 1363-1364). The Devil also judges Andreas and treats the apostle as if he was accountable to his statnic laws. His final question reveals his *superbia:* "Hwylc is þæs mihtig ofer middangeard, þæt he þe alyse of leoðubendum, manna cynnes, ofer mine est?" 'who is so mighty in the middle-earth among people, who might let you loose from the fetters against my will?' (*Andreas* ll. 1372-1375)[118]. After the lesson taught at the ship, Andreas knows that there is not such a person in the middle earth and is able to address the Devil's challenge in a way that brings him near to completing the victory over the enemy.

> Hwæt, me eaðe ælmihtig god,
> niða neregend, se ðe in niedum iu
> gefæstnode fyrnum clommum!
> þær ðu syððan a, susle gebunden,
> in wræc wunne, wuldres blunne,
> syððan ðu forhogedes heofoncyninges word.
>
> Lo! The Almighty God, the Saviour of man, who fastened you with fetters will help me. Since that time you have been suffering torment and existed in exile bereft of joy, after you despised the word of heavenly king (*Andreas* ll. 1375-1381).

Andreas asserts here that he acts under God's protection and that God has power over the devil; the fetters which the Devil has been threatening to use against Andreas are in fact the fetters which bind him in Hell as a result of his disobedience to God. It takes only two lines for the Narrator to briefly comment on the Devil's flight from Andreas presence (*Andreas* ll. 1386-1388) and, importantly, he never appears again in the poem[119].

Jolly does not refer to the corresponding scene in the poetic version of *Andreas,* which is presently being discussed.

[118] The formula *ofer mine est* is, ironically, used by Christ in the poem. Christ promises Andrew that "ne magon hie ond ne moton ofer mine est thinne lichoman, lehtrum scyldige, deathe gedalan" 'they, guilty of sins, are not allowed and able, against my will, kill your body' (*Andreas* ll.1215-1217).

[119] As Jonathan Wilcox observes, "comic discomfiture by the devils is unsurprising. They are incongruous almost by definition: on the one hand, figures of such apparent power that they entered into a feud with God; on the other hand, easily put to flight at God's will even by the slightest action of a saint" (2003: 207).

The events that follow the third day of Andreas's suffering in prison are followed by the flood of water that springs from beneath the columns of the prison at Andreas's command. The deluge in the poem, as it has been widely recognized by critics, is suggestive of the typology of baptism. In *Andreas,* the baptism that the Mermedonians undergo completes the conquest over Satan; not only do the Mermedonians recognize God's omnipotence, but also they consciously renounce the Devil. While they are embracing the new faith, they reject idolatry: "onfon fromlice fullwihtes bæð dryhtne to willan, ond diofolgild, ealde eolhstedas, anforlætan", 'they boldly received the baptism according to the will of God and forsook idolatry and pagan temples' (*Andreas* ll. 1640-1642). Andreas "deofulgild todraf ond gedwolan fylde" 'drove idolatry away and destroy heresies' (*Andreas* l. 1688), which causes Satan "sar to geþolienne" 'to suffer sorrow' (*Andreas* l. 1689), because "he ða menigeo geseah hweorfan higebliðe fram helltrafum þurh Andreas este lare to fægeran gefean, þær næfre feondes ne bið, gastes gramhydiges, gang on lande" 'he saw such a multitude of the people blithe in hearts turn away from the house of evil through Andreas's teaching to greater bliss in a place, where no foe will ever come, a terrible spirit' (*Andreas* ll. 1690-1694).

2.4. Ridiculing the foe: tropological representation of Holofernes and Assyrians in *Judith*

The Old English *Judith* has received various responses from critics. The issue most often commented on is the extent to which *Judith* is an allegorical poem. Judith, the poem's protagonist, has been interpreted in the light of patristic tropological commentaries on chastity[120]. She has also been viewed as a type of *Ecclesia*. Some other critics de-emphasise or reject an allegorical reading of the poem[121]. According to other approaches, the poem examplfies the relationship between allegory and the historical

[120] Campbell claims the Judith typifies Church and interprets the battle between Assyrians and Bethulians spiritually (Campbell 1971: 171). Pringle claims that "the original audience of the poem ... would have seen them [battle scenes] ... as a demonstration of the consequences of the tropological and typological meanings of the action represented in the first half of the poem" (Pringle 1975: 95).

[121] De Lacy rejects the allegorical meaning, as he finds no justification for it in the structure and themes of the poem: Judith accepts the spoils of war offered to her at the end of the poem; Holofernes is defeated before the army of Assyrians is, which makes it difficult to regard his death in apocalyptic temrs; the battle itself is not an apocalyptic event, as several Assyrians do survive it. (De Lacy 1996: 405-406).

situation of the Anglo-Saxons' in the times of the Viking raids.[122] As for the critical opinion of those who foreground the historical meaning in the poem, whether de-emphasising allegory or contextualising it, *Judith* was written to set a model of resistance against the pagan enemy in the age of the Viking raids.

Some critics who claim that the author of *Judith* does not follow either the tropological or allegorical traditions of interpreting the biblical *Book of Judith* (even if he was conscious of biblical exegesis) and put forward arguments for the rejection of allegory in the poem. Joyce Hill dismisses the possibility of extending the *Miles Christi* metaphor to literary works dealing with primarily human conflicts and does not discuss the poem in her article "The soldier of Christ in Old English prose and poetry" (1981), "since it ... describes, albeit anachronistically and inaccurately, an historical, physical confrontation that is seen as a holy war" (Hill 1981: 78). Still, she admits that "it is relevant ... to extend the discussion to include Christians' confrontations with the human foes where there is either the direct divine intervention or where the physical battle is avoided, even if military vocabulary continues to be used" (Hill 1981: 64).

Nonetheless, this sub-chapter argues for a figurative interpretation of the conflict between Judith and Holofernes, and Bethulians and Assyrians, as an expression of the conflict between Christ and Satan. *Judith* adapts the source not only to relate to the political realities of the Anglo-Saxons, but it also adapts the tradition of tropological interpretation of the biblical *Book of Judith*, according to which Judith represents chastity and humility and Holofernes lust and *superbia*. However, its innovation lies in the restructuring of oppositions in the poem. The most significant change to the story of Judith that the Old English poem brings is its withdrawal from the story as a conversion narrative and the poet's insistence on the historical/literal level of signification of the *Book of Judith* as a narrative on holy war. Judith and Holofernes are not juxtaposed only in terms of vice and virtue, but also in terms of their respective heroic qualities. *Judith*

[122] Pringle claims the poem is an enactment of Aelfric's idea "that the English could never hope to vanquish their enemies, the diabolical Vikings, unless the whole society first purified itself by maintaining a system of monasteries and convents in which, on an individual level, the chaste *oratores* could do their essential work" (Pringle 1975: 97). Hermann that the most probable date for the poem's composition is the eleventh century. He points that whereas their earlier Patristic commentaries emphasised either the tropological reading (especially before the seventh century) or the allegorical (from the seventh to tenth century), it was only in the tenth century when scholars mixed the two interpretations. As both Rabanus Maurus of Fulda and Aelfric of Eysham approached the *Liber Judith* both allegorically and tropolically, Hermann thinks it reasonable to date the Old English *Judith* to tenth or eleventh century (Hermann 1989: 176).

is a poem that encodes a Christian framework for the heroic code; if moral perfection in the poem is a source of prowess, then sin results in a failure in that prowess. *Judith* reflects the psychological model of *mod* 'mind/courage' (Bosworth and Toller 1882: 693) according to its adherence to vice and virtue. Of all the three poems in this chapter, in which the theme of *Miles Dei* can be identified, *Judith* is the one, in which the idea is most in danger of subverting itself. In the narratives of the saints' lives, the theme serves primarily as an expression of spiritual prowess and in the Old English poetry tradition it was selected by poets, because it naturally fitted the formulas of heroic verse and so replaced secular heroic lays with hagiography for edification in faith[123].

The date of the composition of *Judith* is unknown, as is the case with most Old English poems, but it reasonable to argue that the poem was contemporaneous with Aelfric's *Judith* and the letter to Sigeberth and the language and rhyme in the poem testify to late 10th or early 11th century as the most probable time of its creation (Fulk and Cain 2005: 117). The opposition between Judith and Holofernes and the battle between the Bethulians and the Assyrians is to be understood in two ways. *Judith* is a short heroic epic on a Biblical theme, which exemplifies an heroic ideal for a heroic community. This ideal conforms to the needs of that community, but is at same time transformed by Christian values. On the one hand, therefore, the story depicts a military conflict that parallels the situation of the later Anglo-Saxon period, where the Anglo-Saxons faced invasion by pagan enemies from the continent, namely the Vikings. On the other hand, the attack of the heathen was a re-enactment of the eternal conflict between good and evil, Christ and Satan, *Ecclesia* and *hostis antiquus.* At times, the *Judith* poet strengthens the allegorical and tropological associations and at others he seems to subdue them totally. In *Judith* then, the Assyrians represent sin and *hostis antiquus. Judith* must have had a powerful impact on the audiences of Late Anglo-Saxon England in the times of the Viking invasions. Judith and Bethulians have a figurative relation to Christian Anglo-Saxons invaded by the pagan Vikings. This is made clear from the ways in which the poet changes the biblical source.

[123] Many critics read *Judith* as a poem, which draws upon hagiographic tradition. Doubleday claims the aesthetic principle of the poem is that of contrast, whereby "Judith's character is remade on the model of saints' lives; Holofernes is made diabolical" (Doubleday 1971: 493). Magennis says that the depiction of Holofernes mirrors the representations of villainous pagans in saints' lives (1983: 331). In another article, he that Judith in the poem is depicted in terms of the theme of opposition that makes the poem approach the genre of saints' life (Magennis 1995: 62).

Judith rewrites the biblical source, so that the opposition between the enemy and the Bethulians is complete and disregards a number of the features of the biblical narrative, which would might create ambiguity or doubt as to the characters' intentions. In the Vulgate, Holofernes's behaviour is courtly throughout the story. When he orders a lavish feast for his companions, he orders his eunuch Vagao to gently invite Judith to the reception: "Vade, et suade Hebraeam illam ut sponte consentiat habitare mecum" 'Go and persuade the Hebrew woman to consent to stay with me' (*Book of Judith* 12: 10)[124]. Of course, Holofernes intends to stay with Judith for the night, as "foedum est enim apud Assyrios, si femina irrideat virum agendo it immunis ab eo transeat" 'for it is considered shameful among the Assyrians that when a woman ridicules a man, she is allowed to part from him' (*Book of Judith* 12:10), but he does not appear to have the intention of subduing Judith by force. In the Vulgate, Judith is portrayed as a seductress, who uses her feminine charms to beguile her enemy and make Holofernes drink to the point of falling into unconsciousness. In the Biblical story, her penetrating intelligence is a source of powerful dramatic irony[125]. When Vagao comes to her and invites her to Holofernes's tent, she retorts with a question "Quae ego sum, ut contradictum domino meo? Omne quod erit ante oculos euis bonum et optimum, faciam" "Who am I to contradict my own Lord? I will do anything that appears good and best to his eyes' (*Book of Judith* 12:13). Vagao takes it to be a sign of her obedience to Holofernes and of her acceptance of a new political alliance, which implies that she has cut her ties with the Bethulians. The moral lesson for the reader is, however, that she remains obedient to God and emphasises her role as a vessel of God's will.

Judith comes to the feast and encourages Holoferness to get excessively drunk: "et jucundus factus est Holofernes ad eam, bibitque vinum multum nimis, quantum numquam biberat in vita sua" 'and Holofernes became blithe with her and drank so much wine as he had never drunk in all his life' (*Book of Judith* 12:20). Also, Holofernes does not attempt to rape Judith. Judith is also a more complex figure as on the one

[124] Henceforth indicated as Book of Judith and followed by verse number. All quotations taken from *Biblia Sacra Vulgata.* 2007 [1969]. (Edited by Robert Weber and Roger Gryson.) (The fifth edition.) Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. All translation from Latin to modern English are mine.

[125] Jonathan Wilcox suggests, while analysing the Old English *Andreas,* that "saints' lives are fundamentally ironic, being premised upon the duality of vision. The tormentors and the wordly see things one way, the saint and the saved (and the perceptive audience) see them in another. From the perspective of this world, the saint has a rough time of it indeed, generally suffering extremes of torture and bodily torment leading to pain-wracked death. Yet from the perspective of the final reckoning, all such torment is ultimately irrelevant, as the saint well recognises" (2003: 202).

hand, she arouses Holofernes sexual desire. She "ornavit se vestimento sue" 'adorned herself with garments' (*Book of Judith* 12:15) and, as a result, "cor autem Holofernes concussum est: erat enim ardens in concupiscentia eius" 'Holofernes's heart was stricken, for he was ardent in his desire for her' (*Book of Judith* 12:16). On the other hand, Joachim praises her for her chastity: "quia fecisti viriliter, et confortatum est cor tuum, eo quod castitatem amaveris, et post virum tuum, alterum nescieris" 'you acted manfully and your heart was strengthened, because you loved chastity and after the death of your husband you did not take another' (Book of Judith 15:11).

The Old English poet changes many details of the story. Judith does not attend the feast and Holofernes gets drunk at his own whim and also involves his retainers in his excessive drinking. Most notably, however, Holofernes is depicted as an Antichrist. Holofernes is described as "nergende lað" 'the adversary of the saviour' (*Judith* l. 45)[126]. Judith, alternatively is "nergendes þeowen þrymful" 'the faithful servant of the lord' (*Judith* ll. 73-74). If the feast in the poem is depicted as the participation in sin and drunkenness, Judith does not take part in it. She does not, apparently, act with the intention of arousing Holofernes's sexual desire, as she is ordered to be brought to Holofernes's tent by the soldiers just after the feast. This strengthens the tropological reading of Judith as representing chastity. Also the Old English poet anticipates the impending events of the narrative in a different way from that of the author of the *Book of Judith*. The Biblical heroine is an extremely intelligent and cunning woman, who not only develops an ingenious stratagem against their enemy, but also mocks them throughout the feast. When Holofernes entices her to drink and eat (in the Vulgate she consumes only the food and drink she has brought with her servant from Bethulia, as the Assyrians provisions are unclean), Judith says to him "Bibam, domine, quoniam magnificata est anima mea hodie prae omnibus diebus meis" 'I will drink, Lord, for my soul is magnified this day more than ever in my life' (*Book of Judith* 12:18). Holofernes does not know that she addresses God, not him.

The Old English poet removes the remarks from Judith's mouth, but achieves the effect of dramatic irony in a way that is typical of Old English poetry, that is, through the foreshadowing of doom and disaster: "hie þæt fæge þegon, rofe rondwig-

[126] Henceforth indicated as *Judith* followed by verse number. All quotations taken from Krapp, George Phillip. 1931. *The Junius manuscript.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

gende, þeah ðæs se rica ne wende, egesful eorla dryhten" 'they [the servants at the feast] received those who were doomed to die, those valiant heroes, although the lord [Holofernes] did not expect such fate, the terrible earl' (*Judith* ll. 19-21). This way of anticipation actually strengthens the idea of reading Holofernes as a diabolical figure to be juxtaposed with God. The conflict between the Assyrians and the Bethulians is then depicted in terms of the cosmic struggle between God and the Devil, with Holofernes leading the forces of darkness. Although Judith's chastity is not removed as a condition of her physical strength and valour it is no longer essential to the narrative and so Joachim the High Priest is therefore removed from the poem; his praise of Judith as the embodiment of the poem is no longer essential, as the idea is made clear through the polarisation of the narrative elements in the Old English version.

The most essential changes and additions to the story and characterisation are more subtle. The poet follows the poetic tradition not only in making the distinctions between good and evil sharper, but also shapes the narrative to emphasise the poetic psychology of *mod.* Moreover, it is indicated that Holofernes is accustomed to habitually indulge in boisterous behaviour.

> Hie ða to ðam symle sittan eodon,
> wlance to wingedrince, ealle his weagesiðas,
> bealde byrnwiggende. Þær wæron bollan steape
> boren æfter bencum gelome, swylce eac bunan ond orcas
> fulle fletsittendum; hie þæt fæge þegon,
> rofe rondwiggende, þeah ðæs se rica ne wende,
> egesful eorla dryhten.
>
> They took their seats at the feast, the proud ones sat to drinking, all wretched, though valiant warriors. Cups were frequently carried to the benches. These men were doomed, the heroic shield-bearers, although the lord did not expect it, the terrible general of the army (*Judith* l. 15-21).

As far as Holferenes and his retainers are concerned, pride is attributed to their drunken state, which is both literal, as excessive drinking has unfavourable influence on the warrior's *mod*, and figuratively, as the poem foreshadows their impending doom. In the poem, the indication of Holofernes's army doom is not as much a foreshadowing of the events bound to occur later in the narrative as a anagogical image of the damnation of the sinful and a fact that, like Judith's victory, has already taken place in the scheme of divine providence. Magennis rightly points out that "Holofernes really destroys *himself*: it is his own excess which brings about his downfall" and that "Judith takes advantage

of this, rather than herself leading to him on a provocative fashion" (Magennis 1983: 333). Indeed, it is traditional in Old English poetry that the proud mind works towards self-destruction.

Holofernes' principle characteristic is his being *swiðmod,* "fierce-heartedness", which is also associated with drunkenness. Holofernes is ironically called "goldwine gumena", 'the gold-friend of his men' (*Judith* l. 22), as he is not capable of performing the role of a generous king. The poet describes Holofernes through his blind pride and lack of control of his behaviour and lust[127]. The poem insists on Holofernes' sub-linguistic behaviour, as he "hloh and hlydde, hlynnede ond dynede /þæt mihten fira bearn feorran gehyran /hu ðe stiðmoda strymde ond gylede /modig ond medugal" 'roared and laughed, made so much noise and clamour that the sons of men could hear from distance how the fierce-hearted one raged and yelled, proud and drunken with mead' (*Judith* l. 23-26). In *Judith,* Holofernes' *stiðmod* is also associated with drunkenness. *Modig* and *medugal* alliterate, so do "swiðmod" and "swiman" 'swoon [singular dative]' (*Judith* l. 30). Holofernes "dryhtguman sine drencte with wine, swiðmod sinces brytta, oþþæt hie on swiman lagon" 'enticed his retainers into drinking until they lay in swoon, the fierce-hearted treasure-dispenser' (*Judith* ll. 29-31). Their drunken stupor is compared to death, since the Assyrian warriors look as if "hie wæron deaðe geslegene" 'they were slaughtered' (*Judith* l. 32). Holofernes is actually described as "inwidda", 'evil' (*Judith* l. 28), which is in strong contrast to the earlier appellation to him as "gumena goldwine" 'gold friend of his people' (*Judith* l.23). Magennis points out that the feast represented in *Judith* is the opposite of the general concept of banquets characteristic of Old English poetry: "instead of the ordered courtesy of the *Beowulf* feasts we find uproar and excess" and concludes that "[t]he concept of the feast as it appears in *Judith* is perhaps reinforced by the poets' recollection of unriotous banquets in the Bible, but it is to be understood primarily as one of the elements of traditional Old English poetry, taking its place in the complex of ideas and values associated with the Germanic hall" (Magennis 1983: 331)[128].

[127] Pringle points out that the poet "exemplifies the sequence, automatic both in Gregorian and Cassianic conceptions of the Seven Deadly Sins, from *gula* to *luxuria* (Pringle 1975: 95-96).

[128] Magennis observes that in contrast to Aelfric's homily, where the scene is depicted briefly, Rabanus's commentary, where it is given no mention at all, the poem highlights the feasting giving it the central place and thematic development (Magennis 1983: 332-333).

Another quality apart from drunkenness that the poet associates with *wlenco* and Holofernes's *swiðmod*-ness is his lust. Holofernes is described as lascivious.

> Þa wearð se brema on mode
> bliðe, burga ealdor, þohte ða beorhtan idese
> mid widle ond mid womme besmitan. Ne wolde þæt wuldres dema
> geðafian, þrymmes hyrde, ac he him þæs ðinges gestyrde,
> dryhten, dugeða waldend. Gewat ða se deofulcunda,
> galferhð gumena ðreate
> bealofull his beddes neosan, þær he sceolde his blæd forleosan
> ædre binnan anre nihte; hæfde ða his ende gebidenne
> on eorðan unswæslicne, swylcne he ær æfter worhte,
> þearlmod ðeoden gumena, þenden he on ðysse worulde
> wunode under wolcna hrofe.
>
> Then the lord became happy in his mind, the prince of the city??, intending to blemish the bright lady with sin and impurity. This the Arbiter of glory would not allow, but he, the Lord of Hosts, restrained the man from action. The devilish and lascivious one went away guarded by his retainers to seek his bed, where he was to lose his life on that night; then he was awaiting his unpleasant end, the tyrannical earthly prince, when he was living this world under the heavenly firmament (*Judith* ll. 57-67).

These verses are rendered in hypermetric lines by the poet, so that the narrative flow of the poem is suspended and Holofernes' action is looked upon from eternal perspective. Not only does God involve Himself in the events about to take place, as He makes it impossible for Holofernes to take any measure against Judith, namely, to stain her purity with sin, but also the poet indicates that in his bed Holofernes is awaiting the fulfilment of his fate, rather than sexual desire. The association of pride, lust and the lack of control over one's self is traditional in Old English poetry and these three qualities apply to Holofernes, whose similarity to Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar from the Old English *Daniel* is striking. The description of Holofernes and his retainers not only inverts the traditional imagery connected with the hall, but also sustains the sense of doom that awaits their damned souls. Holofernes' evil is then configured as being inherent in his personality. In contrast to the biblical Judith, who appears as a seductress, it is Holofernes, in the poem, who tries to blemish Judith's soul with sin.

Another possible tropological meaning, which is suggested by the biblical text, turns out to be removed from the poem. In the Vulgate, Holofernes explicitly represents *superbia* and Judith is the embodiment of humility, as she relies on God's grace and follows his will. Like Satan in the patristic tradition, Holofernes "in contemptu superbiae suae Deum Israel contempsit" 'despised the God of Israel in the contempt of his pride' (Judith 13:28). The Old English poet removes this biblical detail, which is central

to the characterisation of Holofernes in the Vulgate text. As in the case of Joachim's praise, this detail is removed with another speech from the poem. In the Bible, Judith characterises Holofernes as *superbus* in her address to Achior, who, after listening to her speech, converts to Judaism. The speech is removed from the poem together with Achior, to whom it is addressed. In the Old English poem, Holofernes's *superbia* is only implied, he is, after all, identified with *hostis antiquus,* and characterised as the enemy of the saviour, which in itself testifies to his Satanic pride. As mentioned before, the Old English Holofernes shares certain characteristic with other excessively proud characters of Anglo-Saxon biblical poetry such as Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. In the Old English *Judith* his major quality is the fact of his being *smithmod,* 'angry, fierce'; his ruling passion is anger, which makes him similar to Nebuchadnezzar in *Daniel*. Finally, the poem seems to juxtapose Judith in terms of wisdom and Holofernes' sinful nature in terms of a lack of wisdom. The way the poet refers to Judith and Holofernes' differing states of mind is strongly reminiscent of the Old English poetic tradition, which conceives virtue as the strength of one's *mod,* whereas the effect of sin sees ones *mod* destroyed by animal instincts and excessive emotion. While the poet emphasises Judith's wisdom, when it comes to her adversary, he concentrates his attention on Holofernes as *stiðmod,* "fierce-hearted".

The poet has every reason to emphasise Judith's being mindful of God's law more often than her chastity. Before Judith approaches Holofernes in his tent, she is described as "gleaw on geþonce", 'wise in thought' (*Judith* l. 13). When she is led to Holofernes' tent by his retainers, she is referred to as "snoteran idese", 'wise lady' [accusative singular in the Old English text, nominative in translation] (*Judith* l. 55). She is also termed "higeðoncol", 'thoughtful' (*Judith* l. 131), "searothoncol", 'discerning' (*Judith* l. 145), and "gleawhydig wif", 'a woman wise in thought' (*Judith* l. 148). The poet vividly contrasts the drunken Assyrians with Judith, who is always presented as fully conscious and discerning in her actions. Holofernes lies on his bed so drunk "swa he nyste ræda nanne on gewitlocan", 'that he has no council in his mind' (*Judith* ll. 68-69). In contrast, all believers, who have a firm belief in the effectiveness of prayer as Judith, are provided "mid ræde ond mid rihte geleafan", 'with council and right belief' (*Judith* l. 97). Judith follows the heroic tradition as a protagonist, who is in constant control of one's *mod.* Her mental state is essential to her heroic achievement. Both Judith and her maid-servant, who is her accomplice in the overthrow of the heathen leader, are termed

"collenferhð" 'courageous' (*Judith* l. 134). Throughout the first half of the poem, Judith is endowed with a clear purpose of action and a keenness of mind that Holofernes lacks.

In *Judith*, the proper frame of mind is dependent on God's grace and a fall from grace aggravates one's already sinful state. In contrast to the biblical source, where Judith is presented in merely a human dimension as a widow, whose intentions are set on heroic deed, the Old English poet depicts Judith growing in the strength of her *mod*. In the Vulgate, Judith asks God to endow her with physical strength: "confirma me, Domine Deus Israel, et respice in hac hora ad opera manuum mearum, ut, sicut promisti, Jerusalem civitatem tuam erigas", 'strengthen me, God of Israel, and see to the deeds of my hands at this hour' (Judith 13:7). Judith utters these words "orans cum lacrimis" 'praying in tears' (Judith 13:6), which testifies to her anxiety and hesitation. In the Biblical narrative, God is absent from the events and it is never manifest that He influences Judith's deeds. Consequently the role of God in the Old English *Judith* is different from that in the Vulgate. Olsen observes that the *Judith* poet makes the heroine more independent and stronger than the Vulgate text allows (Olsen 1982: 289). Indeed, the Old English Judith is more resolute and does not hesitate in contrast to the source. However, unlike the Vulgate, God participates in the action of the poem in a way that suggests a spiritual conflict between God and *hostis antiquus* behind the human and physical actions. The first lines of the extant version of the poem make it clear that "Heo ðar ða gearwe funde mundbyrd æt ðam mæran þeodne, þa heo ahte mæste þearfe hyldo þæs hehstan deman, þæt he hie wið þæs hehstan broga gefriðode, frymða waldend", 'Judith receives protection from a greater lord, as she had the greatest need, from the highest judge, who protected her against the greatest danger, the ruler of glory' (*Judith* l. 2-5). *Mundbyrd* is the protection from a king or lord that Anglo-Saxon laws guaranteed to their subjects (Richards 1997: 43). Judith acts under God's guidance throughout the poem. The success of her victory is dependent on her faith. The prayer to the Trinity, or any of the three persons of the Trinity, is a recurrent motif in the hagiographic literature on which the *Judith*-poet draws upon when depicting Judith as *Miles Dei*. In spite of the incongruity its presence in an Old Testament story creates, the poem seems to be more concerned with the effects of the prayer on Judith's mind and her resulting capacity to act. Judith does not pray for physical strength (in fact, Holofernes being as drunk as he is does not match a sober woman), but for faith, which renders her even more resolute.

> Hi ða se hehsta dema
> ædre mid elne onbryrde, swa he deð anra gehwylcne
> herbuendra þe hyne him to helpe seceð
> mid ræde ond mid rihte geleafan.
>
> The mightiest Judge endowed her with such a courage as he imparts to each earth-dweller, who seeks His help with good advice and with right belief (*Judith* ll. 94-97).

Like every hero or heroine of a saint's life, Judith is to be imitated by the audience, and the *imitatio* of the hero is in fact the theme in the other half of the poem. Now the poet demonstrates what the effects are of the prayer which is imprinted on Judith's mind: "Þa wearð hyre rume on mode, haligre hyht geniwod", 'then her mind became more spacious and her sacred thought was renewed' (*Judith* ll. 97-98). Judith's violent actions immediately follows this.

The action of the second part of the poem reduplicates the earlier part. Griffith shows that style and structure in *Judith* work performatively, "as the poet strives to enact in the reader the values which he shows his good characters displaying" (Griffith 1997: 90-91). Doubleday divides the poem into two parts: "Judith's triumph over Holofernes" and "The Jews' triumph over the Assyrians" (Doubleday 1971: 439), whereby "the personal contest of part one is contrasted with the group contest of part two; the triumph of Judith is parallel to the triumph of the Jews, her people" (Doubleday 1971: 439)[129]. Fee observes that The Old English poem marginalizes Judith's importance when it comes to the victory to the advantage of Bethulian soldiers (Fee 1997: 401)[130] and that "in the literary culture of *Judith,* the active heroism of a woman is appropriated by men, and she is relegated to the status of a figurehead" (Fee 1997: 406).

The second part of the poem is not only a display of the heroic prowess of the Bethulians, but also it shows that the poet of *Judith* had a very different conception when it comes to giving account of the story of Judith. In the Vulgate version, the events are depicted in terms of realism and the actions are highly mimetic. God is

[129] Doubleday claims that *Judith*-poet deliberately parallels Holofernes's evil desires and foreshadowing of his end with the scene, where his body is discovered and the Assyrians are put in flight: "[i]n a pause of the action, the poet tells of Holofernes' evil desires and prophecies, instead of their fulfillment, his deserved death; the passage in part two in which the representative of the Assyrians discovers Holofernes' body and the Assyrians' despair is their recognition of the fulfillment of that prophecy" (1971: 440).

[130] Fee observes that "In contrast to the Vulgate heroine, the Old English Judith acts more in the capacity of a noble figurehead whose audacious behaviour shames and inspires her warriors into similar feats of courage, than in the capacity of a war-chief whose daring plan offers a slim chance of survival" (Fee 1997: 401).

prayed to and spoken to, but he never intervenes in human actions in the physical sense. In the Bible, Judith's violence is purely human. The actions, of course, are wondrous enough to be interpreted by other characters as manifestations of Divine omnipotence; when Achior sees Holofernes's head brought to Bethulia by Judith, he converts as he is convinced of the Jewish God's power over his, now, ex-patriots. Nonetheless, there is nothing superhuman about Judith's triumph over Holofernes and the narrator finds means to make the subsequent victory on the part of Bethulians perfectly probable. In the Vulgate, the Bethulian army is not powerful enough to provide an effective defence against the enemy, but they may achieve their ends through cunning. Judith predicts the chain of events. The Bethulians are to rush out from the city (Judith 14:2) and when they are perceived, "tunc exploratores necesse erit it fugiant ad principem suum excitandum ad pugnam" 'it will be necessary the watchmen should flee to awake their general to the battle' (Judith 14:3). As soon as they discover his beheaded body, "decidet super eos timor", 'fear will possess them' (Judith 14:4) "cumque cognoveritis fugere eos, ite post illos secure, quoniam Dominus conteret eos sub pedibus vestries", 'and when you perceive that they take flight, pursue them confidently, for the Lord will destroy them under your feet' (Judith 14:5). When the Bethulians rush out from the confines of their city, the events that follow live up to Judith's predictions. Although their victory is attributed to God, the action of the Biblical story is highly realistic and mimetic in that God is mentioned as a rhetorical figure and there is no palpable *Deux ex Machina* elements in the course of events.

The treatment of the battle is entirely different in the Old English poem and it is all the more difficult to interpret, because *Judith* survives only in fragments that lack the beginning section and it is not known how many lines of the poem are actually extant. In the Old English *Judith,* the Bethulian soldiers do not take advantage of their enemies misfortune and they start the massacre on their enemies even before they discover Holofernes's death. For John Hermann, this fact testifies to the existence of allegorical meaning in the poem (Hermann 1989: 174-175). In the Vulgate text, when Judith presents the head of Holofernes to the Bethulians, the head inspires two events. The first, and the one that is of most concern to her, is the inspiration to do battle that surges in the hearts of Bethulians. The other event is the resulting conversion of Achior. In the Vulgate, Achior is one of the Assyrians, who takes sides with the Bethulians. When Judith enters Bethulia she exclaims that "Deus Israeli, cui tu testimonium dedisti quod

ulciscatur se de inimicis suis, ipse caput omnium incredulorum incidit hac nocte in manu mea", 'the God of Israel to whom you testified, has cut off the head of all unfaithful this night through my hands' (Judith 13:27). Also, Judith accuses Holofernes of *superbia* and of being an enemy to God himself: "ecce caput Holofernis, qui in contemptu superbiae suae Deum Israel contempsit" ,'this is the head of Holofernes, who in the contempt of his pride looked down on the God of Israel' (Judith 13:28).

The Old English poem adopts the Biblical of idea of Holofernes being an enemy of God. More than that, the poem constructs this opposition within a purely Christian framework by making the adversary directly in conflict with Christ the Saviour. Yet the story is also figurative in other terms. The Old English poem was written in a particular social and historical situation. One essential question that can be asked about the poem is what ideological work *Judith* could perform in Anglo-Saxon England in the times of Danelaw. This is when the Danes and Norwegians were not only fought against but also assimilated, in terms of political alliances and religion. *Judith* combines the traditions of the secular heroic poem and uses religious ideas to transmit the concepts of national unity in the period of invasion, which correlated directly, not only to the hegemony of Anglo-Saxon states, but also to *Gentis Anglorum* as part of Christendom. The age of the Viking invasion was the closing period of the Anglo-Saxon age and it is virtually the only period before the Norman conquest, which saw most of the Anglo-Saxon peoples in unity. The role of heroic poetry at this time, especially *The Battle of Maldon,* was to shape the identity of the Anglo-Saxons as Christians united against the pagan invaders. In *Judith,* the identification of the pagan Assyrians with sin and evil has direct political implications for the Anglo-Saxon audience and, hence, may be read as a political allegory. *Judith* is a poem that then sanctions actual physical violence against the enemy. What is new in *Judith* is the way that the heroic theme is treated by the poet and the ways in which the biblical story is rewritten to fit the established poetic tradition. The central problem that is at issue in the poem is the divine sanction of violence in Christian warfare against the pagan enemy. In *Andreas,* the violence is justified, when it leads to the assimilation of the pagan culture by the Christian one. In *Judith,* the pagans are enemies that threat a small community, which bear resemblance to an Anglo-Saxon *burh.* This would explain why Achior is removed from the narrative by the Old English poet. As a heathen converted to the correct belief, he would not fit the pattern of the oppositional position that *Judith* embodies. The ideological and political dimension of

the work fosters active resistance against pagan invaders with recourse to violence. Judith is a model of that heroic resistance for the Bethulians. The Bethulians' attack on the Assyrians in turn imprints the example of heroic virtue on the audience. *Judith* rereads and reinterprets the heroic tradition that the Old English Christian poets had inherited from their ancestors. Although the siege in the poem is set within the context of the eternal conflict with the Devil, it still reduces the literal level of the narrative to a local conflict. This also explains another divergence from the source. The Biblical author emphasises that Bethulia is part of Jerusalem and that Jerusalem benefits from their victory over the Assyrians. This is not the case in the Old English poem, where Jerusalem is not referred to and Joachim, the High Priest of Jerusalem is not present in the narrative at all.

Olsen claims that the didactive purpose of the poem, therefore, is to provide the warriors with a Christianised conception of heroic community in times when the violent action against the pagan enemy was necessary (Olsen 1982: 293). The adjective *modig* qualifies both Judith and Assyrians in the poem, which seems ambiguous. The word is first used at the feast scene in a collocation with "medugal"; the alliterative half-line "modig ond medugal" 'proud and drunk' (*Judith* l. 26) associates pride with drunkenness and evoke the idea of spiritual blindness. When it comes to the Assyrians, *modig* denotes their sinful pride. However, when the Bethulians emerge victorious after the battle with the Assyrians, they offer the spoliation to "maegth modigre", 'the proud maiden' (*Judith* l. 334). Judith has maintained the proper heroic mental state throughout her heroic exploit. It is also important that Judith receives this ambiguous appellation at the moment when she receives the spoliation that belonged to Holofernes, namely, his sword and helmet. At this point, the poet says that the Bethulians give to Judith "gearothoncolre", 'wise in thought' (*Judith* l. 341) everything that Holofernes "se rinca baldor swithmod" (*Judith* l. 339) possessed. Whereas Holofernes perished owing to his failure to maintain proper heroic conduct and self-discipline, Judith has achieved success due to her continual and unceasing maintenance of mental and spiritual discipline. The poet also emphasises that her success depends on her faith in the Trinity. Judith's acceptance of the treasure from Bethulians, at variance though it is with the Biblical sources, is symbolic for Anglo-Saxon society; the poet makes a point that if she is rewarded with earthly treasure for her heroic conduct, she is to be bestowed even more bountifully for her unshaken faith in the after-life. This suggests that the poet did not

follow the typological interpretation of the *Book of Judith*. If Judith in the poem were to be depicted as *Ecclesia*, she would not only reject the earthly treasure as a sign of transience, but also such a figure as Achior, a heathen who converts to the Judaism (typifying Christianity) would not be removed from the narrative of the poem[131]. The poem shows, through the appropriation of the tropological tradition, that the *mod* of a believer is strengthened by faith in the Trinity and the dysfunction of sinful *mod.*

The poem, on the contrary, motivates aggression and violence towards the enemy. Judith, then, serves as an example of physical strength and the single-minded confidence in her actions against an enemy. Here physical violence derives its ideological force from its being the image of the spiritual warfare of Christ against Satan. Around the time of the poem's composition, the battle of Maldon recorded in an Old English poem and the manuscripts of an Anglo-Saxon chronicle was not the sole example of violence against the Vikings. In 1002, King Athelred II had all the Danes in England slain on the allegation of treason and an attempt to kill him on St Brice's Day, 13 Novevember (Stenton 1971: 380). *Judith* follows the Old English poetic tradition, which associates heroic *wlenco* with blind pride that leads to the fall from grace and foreshadows impending doom on the battlefield. When it comes to the political anxieties that *Judith* encodes, the threat from the outside, which is explicit in the poem, suggests the implicit fear that unity might be broken from the inside. Not only did the Danes bring idolatry with them, but also the danger was, according the Church authorities, that the enemies could actually foster continuing paganism within the, not yet fully, converted *Gentis Anglorum.* This would account for the fact that the poet makes such a strong contrast between the protagonist, her adversary and the followers of both so absolute.

[131] Chamberlain makes this point concerning Achior notes three important facts about the omission of Anchior from the narrative of the poem: (1) Anchior's story is "essentially digressive from the main plot and therefore expendable; (2) "the omission of Achior is yet another instance of deliberate refusal by the poet to construct or exploit the more obvious allegorical possibilities suggested by his scriptural source"; (3) it was not the poet's intention to represent Judith as Ecclesia, as "an early medieval poet celebrating the faith and strength of Holy Church in its victory over the Devil would not be inclined to omit ... the dramatic conversion of the pagan" (Chamberlain 1975: 144).

2.5. Conclusion

The social realities in the three texts discussed here mingle with the psychological depiction of sin typical of Anglo-Saxon poetry as well as with the Anglo-Saxon poetic cosmology of Heaven as Hall with God as Lord and, alternatively, of Hell as an inversion of the heavenly *dryht,* an anti-Hall, to which the earth is bound by obligations to the Devil as Lord to heathen cultures. The protagonists asserts their opposition to worldly values either through renunciation, like in Cynewulf's *Juliana,* or physical aggression when it comes to heroic warfare against the heathen invaders in *Judith. Andreas* breaks the opposition between the Christian and the heathen, as the heathen culture in the poem is assimilated to Christendom at the end of the poem. also, each poem draws upon the theme of spiritual warfare that originates in the Christian Patristic tradition. However, the spiritual warfare in this poetry is related to the vernacular tradition of *ofermod* "superbia" as the subjection of mind to the passions and emotions and the possession of mind by the uncontrollable animal aspects of the human mind and soul.

Chapter 3: Old English poetry and penitential practice in Anglo-Saxon England

3.1. Introduction

There are not many poems in the Old English poetic corpus, which specifically relate to penance. As far as references to confession are concerned, there is one poem in the extant corpus, *Christ III,* which pays tribute to it. In contrast to the poems discussed in the previous chapters, these have had little appeal to critics of Anglo-Saxon poetry, with the scarce number of publications being testimony to this. The three poems that are discussed in the present chapter, *Christ III, Judgment Day II* and *The soul and body I* and *II,* prove the vitality of penitential practice of the late Anglo-Saxon Church. A great deal of attention has been given to a number of Old English poems that act as didactive pieces promulgating the idea of penance alongside other works, especially the whole body of Old English vernacular homilies, which repeatedly refer to the practice of penance. Old English poetry is especially devoted to the psychological description of penance, in which penance figures as a cure for the soul. Old English poetry reveals an intricate complexity when it comes to depicting the penitent's internal experience. However, the poems in question also perform ideological work in the promotion of penance during that period. Far from being a mere cure for the soul, as the churchmen insisted, the practice of penance served to instil a new sense of identity in penitents and

fulfilled a significant ideological purpose. The Old English poems that are to be discussed in this chapter are especially involved in this ideological discourse. Penance is not only a medicine to the individual soul but is also depicted as important to the health of the entire community.

The most important literary achievement connected with Anglo-Saxon moral tradition is homiletic writing. Preaching tradition values through vernacular language received a fertile soil in later Anglo-Saxon England. Hildegard Tristam notices that "the very fact that so many homilies in the vernacular were committed to writing, an expensive and time consuming affair, attests to the particular interests the monasteries took in using the vernacular for doctrinal, instructional, and political purpose" (Tristram 1995: 7). She also notices the artistry of Anglo-Saxon vernacular homily (Tristram 1995: 10). The audiences of homilies and sermons were both clerical and secular, but they were primarily used for the instruction of non-clerical audiences. Mary Clayton points out that "pastoral letters written by Aelfric and Wulfstan and the homilies themselves show that great stress was placed on the necessity of teaching the people" (Clayton 2000: 165). There are four major collections of homiletic writings in Old English (apart from a vast number of other sermons and homilies included in other Anglo-Saxon manuscripts):[132] the homilies of the Blickling Manuscript, the Vercelli homilies, the homilies of Aelfric of Eysham and of Wulfstan. In the collection of homilies from the Vercelli Book, which contains homiletic as well as poetic material (including such poems as *Andreas, Juliana* and *Soul and Body I,* which form part of the present study). The anonymous homilies of the Vercelli Book, 23 in number, are from the mid tenth century[133]. Aelfric of Eysham is responsible for two major collections. Aelfric, who demonstrates his familiarity with the Cassanic order of sins, was born in the middle of the tenth century and died in 1010. He created two series of *Catholic Homilies,* the first series being completed in 989 and the second in 992. Wulfstan was his contemporary and outlived him to continue his career as a preacher, bishop and statesman in England under the rule of the Danish King Cnut. He died in on 23 May of 1023. The cultural

[132] Hildegard L. C. Tristram estimates that there "is some 1200 texts in 85 manuscripts, of which 32 are more or less complete homilies collections" (1995: 3).

[133] The most recent editor of the Vercelli homiletic collection says that it is "likely that most items date from the tenth century, but we have as yet no means of being more precise" (Scragg 1992: xxxviii). He refrains from Gatch's (1977) proposition that they are product of Edgar's reform movement (1992: xxxix).

context for the homilies of Wulfstan and Aelfric is then that of the Benedictine reform of the second half of the tenth century and the early eleventh century. The Vercelli collection (as well as the Blickling collection) slightly pre-date the reform.

Another major change that the end of the millennium saw was the development in the practice of private, or secret, penance demonstrated by the high production of the so-called handbooks of penance in tenth century England; this practice was unknown to the authors of early Christianity. The influence of penance on religious literature is especially manifest in the Vercelli homilies. The development of themes and genres in these works happened alongside the changes that occurred in its audience. Secret penance developed as a result of the complex interaction between cloistered and secular communities (Frantzen 1983: 34-35). Evagrius of Pontus and John Cassian addressed only the cloistered audience and their major interest was in the spiritual struggle within coenobitic communities; Old English homilies, as Fulk and Cain point out, apart from being delivered to a congregation at a mass, "were also devised either for private study or, most commonly, for the internal use of religious houses" (Fulk and Cain 2005: 70). The growth of penitential practice also entailed the growth of moral writings on sin and temptation that would also appeal to educated secular audiences. As noted earlier, the process of conversion in Anglo-Saxon England had never been complete, although England was nominally a Christian state by the time of the Norman invasion in 1066. Vernacular religious literature, as opposed to the insular Latin scholarship of such writers as Aldhelm and Bede, played a major role in the conversion of secular audiences.

In Anglo-Saxon England, the subject of sin occurred most frequently in connection with the exhortation to penance aimed at general audiences, rather than only monastic ones. Most of the later Old English texts, in which lists of sins can be found, refer specifically to penitential practice. *Vercelli III* is a penitential homily written for the period of Lent, which is the time of penance (Scragg 1992: 70). Its source is the *Capitula* of Theodulf of Orleans (Scragg 1992: 72). It enumerates six things that are essential for the sinner to perform during the period of Lent, namely, *adentnes,* 'confession', *hreowsung,* 'contrition', *wæcce,* 'vigils', *faesten,* 'fast', *gebedu,* 'prayer', *ælmesse,* 'alms-giving' (*Vercelli III* p. 74)[134]. The first two, *adentnes* and *hreowsung*, are

[134] Henceforth indicated as *Vercelli* followed by the number of the homily and page number. All quotations come from Scragg, Donald G. 1992. *The Vercelli homilies.* (The Early English Text Society.) Oxford: Oxford University Press. All translation from Old English to modern English are mine.

directly connected with the sacrament of penance. According to the anonymous author of the homily, the confession should concern all the sins that the sinner has performed in thought, speech and deed[135].

Old English poems that are devoted to the themes of repentance intensify the penitential mood in the audience in a way that the contemporaneous theology of penance required. Penitential literature reinforced and facilitated the work of the confessor. There are a number of themes in handbooks of penance that also occur in poetry. Frantzen states that "penance was a prominent topic in Anglo-Saxon literature because it simultaneously required discipline and encouraged devotion, the twin imperatives of the Christian life" (Frantzen 1883: 152) and that "the heightened spiritual awareness achieved in confession was sustained by means of prayer, preaching, and poetry" (Frantzen 1983: 11). The penitential mood that the priest was advised to arouse in the penitent was also the didactive aim of the penitential poetic texts. Penitential poems were written in order to intensify the audience's sorrow for one's sins and their narrators or speakers made particular effort to establish a special sort of relationship with

[135] The list of eight capital sins, *heafodleahtras,* follows this exhortation. The first is greed/gluttony "forme giferes thaet is thaere wambe frecness", the second is *dyrne geligre* 'fornication', the third is *sleacmodnes ond unrotnes* 'sloth' , the forth is *gitsung* 'avarice', the fifth is *idelwuldor* 'vainglory', the sixth is *æfest* 'envy', the seventh is *irre* 'wrath' and, finally, the eigth is *oferhygd* 'pride'. Pride is described as "cwen eallra efla" 'the queen of all evils' and the chief cause for the Fall of angels from heaven (*Vercelli III* p. 74). The rest of the homily is devoted to the instruction on the sacrament of penance. *Vercelli XX* also provides a systematic grouping of eight capital sins. The homily is untitled and its importance lays in the fact that it takes the eight capital sins as actually its subject. What is more, each sin receives a comprehensive characterisation. The text mentions pride *ofermodignes* as the first in order and callis "cwen eallra yfela". The other capital sins appear in the following order: *gifernes* 'greed', *forlyr* 'fornication', *gytsung* 'avarice', *yrre* 'wrath', *sleacnes* 'sloth', *unrotnes* 'despair' and, ultimately, *idelwuldor* 'vainglory' (*Vercelli XX* p. 333). The order of appearance of each sin differs from what is found in *Vercelli III,* as pride is presented first (but *Vercelli III* presents it as the last on the list to give it, in fact, prominence over all others). The only similarity is that both homilies have greed followed by fornication. The sin of envy is absent from the list in *Vercelli XX,* which, instead, has the sin of despair. There is another homily in Vercelli Book, which offers lists of sins. The source for *Vercelli XXI,* which mentions the eight capital sins, is the same popular collection homilies. It is also untitled. In contrast to the two previous homilies, it does not contain a systematic grouping of eight sins. It contrasts a group of vices and virtues without any recourse to such a concept. The sins essential to the list, nevertheless, do appear in the homily. The work names the twelfth strengths of mind, most of which is contrasted with vices impediment to them. The first strength of mind is love for God. The second strength is *gethyld* 'patience' and is contrasted with *yrre* 'anger'. The third, *clænnesse* 'cleanness', is counterpointed with *unclænesse* 'lechery'. The fourth strength of mind is to forsake *idelwuldor* 'vainglory' as well as all other *gewitendlicu thing*. *Eaðmodnesse* 'humility', contrasted with *ofermodignesse* 'pride' is the fifth in order. The sixth is the pairing of *sothfastnesse* 'loyalty' and *leasunga* 'lies'. The seventh strength of mind is to refrain from *yrre* and *hatheortnesse* 'anger', the eighth is to fight *hatunghe* by means of *sybbe* 'peace', the ninth is to love *godcundne wisdom* 'divine wisdom' instead of *ælce disignesse*. The tenth strength of mind is to forsake "thone yflan lust thaes lichaman flaesces" 'the evil desires of the body'. The eleventh strength of mind is to abstain from *gytsunge* and embrace *wilsume ðearflicnesse* . Finally, the twelth is to love God and our neighbour (*Vercelli XXI* p. 353-354).

their audience. In what follows I would like to argue that the penitential practice of Anglo-Saxon England shaped the poetic tradition. It did not invent a new genre, as religious poetry has always been firmly rooted in established tradition and has always attained its authorial power from modes and conventions, which have rarely changed. The penitential themes in Old English poetry are usually limited to either vision or Judgment Day narratives. The traditional ways of expression then borrowed new themes to reflect new religious practices. There was another form of confession in Anglo-Saxon England, which has been ;largely overlooked by historians and scholars who limit their studies to either private or public confession. These poetic texts contributed to the body of devotional liturgical literature designed to prepare and encourage the faithful for the so-called confession to God alone. Its validity was not questioned by authorities of the period, it was also valued as enhancing compunction before undergoing the proper confession in the presence of the priest as the intercessor between the penitent and God. In all the poems discussed below, the only reference to confession is made in *Christ III.*

The poems that refer to the act of penitence can be characterised by a coherent thematic unity. This thematic unity is indebted to penitential homilies as well as the genre of Eschatological homily. The sources for the imagery and thematic thread of penance in Old English poetry are many. The most essential source is the handbook of penance, which promulgated the theme of the confessor as a physician of the soul, a metaphor, which in the patristic tradition was reserved for Christ. The other source was homiletic literature. Not only is there a number of Old English penitential homilies, but also repentance and sorrow for one's sins are a commonplace motif in eschatological homilies narrating the Judgment Day and exhorting the faithful to prepare for the universal Judgment of the righteous and wicked at the end of time as well as the individual judgment after one's death. Another source for penitential themes is Scripture. It would be impossible to explore the entire Old and New Testament for the theme of penance in itself, but it is necessary to observe that Old English homilies draw upon the Scripture to sanction confession and penance with evidence and arguments from this most authoritative text.

It is not possible to silence the native Germanic tradition that appears in a number of penitential poems, which contributed to the imaginative reshaping of the religious themes of this period. Although most of the penitential poems are strictly devotional, and only *Christ III* and *Judgment Day II* contain identifiable heroic vocabulary, the me-

tre of the versified prayers is still the Anglo-Saxon alliterative four-beat line; *dom* "reputation, glory" and kin obligation in heroic poetry and the question of salvation. Emphasising existential suffering as a punishment for one's sins instead of the concept of the unavoidable fate. Christianity and the reorientation of social values shifted its primary concerns from that of kinship, and familial obligation, to individual salvation. The irreparable loss of *dom* in pagan society vs. absolution of sin in the community of Christian believers: social implications. The vision of Judgment Day was ideologically useful, because it provided the audiences with the model of the ideal Christian community, also the idea of the Triumphant Church could easily be couched in terms of the heroic comitatus with God as chieftain and the angels and the saved as his faithful retainers.

3.2. The signifance of the penitential motif in *Christ III*

No other Old English poem is more important as witness to private penitential practice than *Christ III,* which is found in the Exeter Book. Not only is it unique among Old English poems, as it contained the so-called penitential theme, which is also found in a number of Old English homilies of the second half of the tenth century. It is the only vernacular poem that has a reference to the actual practice of private confession. Although private confession had established itself as a practice among the laity in the period of Lent by the end of the tenth century, no other Old English poem (apart from *Judgmennt Day II* discussed in the next sub-chapter) refers to the act of confessing one's sins to the confessor. The genre of the poem has been established to be a Judgment Day narrative and the present poem has been classified to this group alongside *The Dream of the Rood* (Chase 1980: 11). The real and most dramatic subject of the poem is the Judgment Day as an internal and psychological revelation of self and its awaking to a new identity as either damned or saved. Consequently the poem is concerned with the sinner's self and his or her self-knowledge.

Christ III has received scant attention from literary historians. It has often been thought of as a disorganised poem lacking both unity and a conceptual framework. Thomas D. Hill admits that the order of events in the poem defies chronology, although he justifies this lack of chronological order by claiming that "the apparent oscillation

within the poem – between the Judgment which seems ended before it began, and the stately progression of that sequence of events which tradition prescribed for the Second Coming of Christ – suggests something of the mystery as well as the terror of Judgment" (Hill 1973: 242-243). In their New Critical reading of the poem, Lois R. Kuznets and Martin Green say that the poem's "interruptions, repetitions, and digressions force him [the reader] to wonder whether factors other than the narrative line function as unifying principle in the work (Kuznets and Green 1976: 227). Turning to a musical metaphor, they hold that the poem's unity "rests on an intricate play of voice and image, leading the audience to participate in the emotional intensity of Judgment Day" and that "in a way analogous to musical form, the voice provides a bass line carrying the reader toward insight into relation between his own spiritual history and spiritual history of the world" (Kuznets and Green 1976: 228).

It has been shown that the immediate cultural context of the poem is the liturgy of Lent, which in Anglo-Saxon England and also on the continent, was a period specifically associated with penance, both private and public (Chase 1980: 11). What is central to the poem's preoccupation with repentance and penance is the interplay between personal guilt and public shame. In Old English literature about penance, especially homiletic, the subject is addressed by appealing to emotions that strengthen the bonds between members of community. It is not an accident that in Old English homilies and poetry, the penitential themes occur in the context of penance. Most penitential homilies in the Anglo-Saxon vernacular corpus are, indeed, eschatological homilies. Old English homilies, sermons and poems seem to express the ideology of penance couched in terms familiar from the Germanic heroic tradition, as the idea of Christian community contained within them, shares a similar conception of shame as an emotion of ethical colouring. There are two traditions vital to late Old English culture to which *Christ III* is indebted as far as this mode of thinking is concerned. The emphasis on the experience of shame as an ethical principle comes from the heroic values of Old English poetry and the idea of *dryht* in which loyalty to the lord is the highest virtue and failure to do this causes disrepute. In Old English heroic poetry, one's afterlife is conceived of as being immortalised in the memory of future generations or, more specifically, in heroic verse. The vision of Christian community in the poem is also shaped by another important tradition, that is, homiletic writing and the idea of the congregation as the body of the

Church. The purpose of this sub-chapter is to show that the penitential themes are used in the poem to achieve this vision.

In *Christ III* the penitential theme is sustained and reinforced by all these traditions. Although *Christ III* has already been studied as a Judgment Day narrative, little attention has been paid to the significance of one element in its narrative and its correspondence to all other themes in the poem. What connects *Christ III* with the body of Anglo-Saxon penitential literature is the formulation of what Godden terms a penitential motif in his article "An Old English penitential motif" (1973). Godden observes that the motif recurs in Anglo-Saxon homiletic and penitential works and summarises in the following manner: "it is better to be shamed for one's sins before one man (the confessor) in his life than to be shamed before God and before all angels and before all men and before all devils at the Last Judgment" (Godden 1973: 222). Godden points out that *Christ III* rephrases this motif but, he claims, ultimately, "*Christ III* is not a penitential work but a dramatic account of the events of Doomsday" (Godden 1973: 232). The purpose of this study, however, is to show how the motif corresponds to the cultural background of the poem, private penitential practice, and how it transformed in the poem to reinforce other themes central to it. Penitence is an important theme of the poem, since the motif receives the central position in it and is a climactic point in the dramatic account of the Judgment Day. It will be shown that the penitential motif is primarily used to build the conception of Christian community. The emotion of shame is used throughout the poem to build up the penitential atmosphere of the work and, since this emotion reinforces the penitential motif at the centre of the poem, the poem is penitential in theme and directs the audience's psychological response. Understanding the function of this element in the narrative will make it possible to see the purpose of the poem as a devotional text.

The vision of Judgment Day sustained throughout the length of the poem is seen from a double perspective when two hosts of angels, the good and the evil, appear and establish the dual conceptual frameworks of light and darkness. Christ's appearance to the hosts of angels and people is narrated three times and he is seen to gradually emerge from the light. When Christ appears as light coming from the East, his brightness dominates the scene and cancels the oppositions for a moment. The poet stresses the initial incomprehensibility of the vision. When Christ's descent on Mount Sion is narrated for the first time, "sunnan leoma cymeð of scyppende scynan leohtor þonne hit men mægen

modum ahycgan" 'the light of sun comes from the Creator shining more brightly than it men are able to envision in their minds' (*Christ III* ll. 900-902)[136].

Christ appears in two opposing aspects and his presence is experienced in two different ways depending on one's deeds; Christ is "on sefan swete sinum folce, biter bealofullum, gebleod wundrum, eadgum ond earmum ungelice" 'of pleasant disposition to his folk but bitter to the wicked, in wondrously varied countenance, unlike unto the blessed and the wretched' (*Christ III* ll. 907-909). He will be "þam godum glædmod on gesihþe" 'gracious to the good in his countenance' (*Christ III* l. 910) and "þam þe him on mode ær wordum ond weorcum wel gecwemdun" 'to those who will please him with the former words and works' (*Christ III* l. 916-917). To those who "mid firenum cumað" (*Christ III* l. 920), his aspect will be "egeslic ond grimlic to geseonne" 'awful and terrible to see' (*Christ III* l.918-919). The scene of Christ's arrival in the poem is dominated by the images of the destruction of all Creation by fire. The wind comes from the seven regions of the world and fire consumes all sinners and destroys the heaven, the earth and the sea. The human misery is counter pointed by the personification of all the natural elements; "Grornað gesargad eal middangeard on þa mæran tid" 'the entire earth will be groaning at that fearful hour' (*Christ III* ll. 970-971). The destruction of the earth not only demonstrates God's power but also reflects human frailty. The entire human and natural landscape that will be destroyed; "Hreosað geneahhe tobrocene burgweallas. Beorgas gemeltað ond heahcleofu, þa wið holme ær fæste wið flodum foldan sceldun", 'the wall of cities will fall, the mountains will melt and the steep cliffs, which formed firm shelters against the sea and floods and shielded the land' (*Christ III* ll. 976-979). The landscape, that has been depicted as a foundation for human prosperity, also evokes the image of treasure that melts in the fire of divine wrath. It is a recurrent theme in Old English poetry that the recognition of God's power can only come through the recognition of one's human fragility and insignificance. This recognition not only brings Nebuchadnezzar in *Daniel* to repentance and conversion, but also awakes remorse in the sinful in *Christ III*. For humanity depicted at this point of the poem, the Judgment Day does not yet come as a revelation of spiritual truth, but as a recognition of the change of their earthly status and as an event brining about a irre-

[136] All quotations from *Christ III* comes from Krapp, George Phillip and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (eds.). 1936. *The Exeter book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 3.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translations from Old English into modern English are mine.

trievable loss to their human concerns: "Seoþeð swearta leg synne on fordonum, ond goldfrætwe gleda forswelgað, eall ærgestreon eþelcyninga." 'the black flame will consume the sin-ridden and mell the golden treasure, the entire ancient hoard of princes' (*Christ III* ll. 994-996).

When the destruction of the world is completed, Resurrection takes place (*Christ III* ll. 1022 ff). The Resurrection is accompanied by the reference to material reality being destroyed and revealing the spiritual substance hidden behind the physical appearance of things and people. The sins that are visible on the damned are depicted as a profound shame to their honour. In the final description of the Resurrection, the poet magnifies human evil, as it marks the end of the apocalyptic events which causes stars to fall down on the earth and is followed by fire embracing its surface:

> Lyft bið onbærned,
> hreosað heofonsteorran, hyþað wide
> gifre glede, gæstas hweorfað
> on ecne eard. Opene weorþað
> ofer middangeard monna dæde.
>
> The air will be on fire, the heavenly stars will fall and devouring fire will wreak havoc, and the spirits will turn onto the eternal homeland. The deeds of men will be made manifest over the middle-earth (*Christ III* ll. 1042-1046).

It will not be possible for men "heortan geþohtas, fore waldende wihte bemiþan" 'to hide the thoughts of heart before the lord' (*Christ III* ll. 1047-1048). On Judgment Day, "hreþerlocena hord, heortan geþohtas, ealle ætyweð". 'the hoard of the breast-casket, the thoughts of heart will be made known' (*Christ III* ll. 1055-1056). The narrator provides a gnomic remark: "ær sceal geþencan gæstes þearfe, se þe gode mynteð bringan beorhtne wlite, þonne bryne costað, hat, heorugifre, hu gehealdne sind sawle wið synnum fore sigedeman", 'one should think of what his soul needs, who intends to bring a beautiful countenance before God, when the devouring and blazing fire will put on trial how the souls hold against sins before the Judge' (*Christ III* ll. 1056-1060).

What follows is a procession of souls, each of which presents to the Lord their inividual works. All the souls are "bi noman gehatne" 'called out by names' and "berað breosta hord fore bearn godes, feores frætwe" 'bear the hoard of their hearts in the presence of the Son of God, the treasure of their heart' (*Christ III* ll. 1071-1073). God's judgment on each individual soul takes place when he sees "hu gesunde suna sawle bringen of þam eðle þe hi on lifdon" 'how healthy souls his sons bring from their father-

land where they lived' (*Christ III* ll. 1074-1075). The vision of Christ in the poem is only reserved for the elect, as, to the sinful, Christ appears in a completely different aspect; the sight of the cross will be an affliction to the sinful and damned. After all the souls reveal what has been concealed in them during their lifetimes, the vision of the Cross appears to the eyes of the damned. The narrator makes it clear that the vision of the cross, stained with gore and blood, is only reserved for the sinful: "þær him sylfe geseoð sorga mæste, synfa men, sarigferðe" 'there the sinful people will behold the greatest of sorrows' (*Christ III* ll. 1080-1081)[137].

The cross was the symbol of salvation and an important object of devotion in Anglo-Saxon England (Keefer 2005: 161) and *Christ III,* alongside *The Dream of the Rood,* is a poem, which is a witness to the Anglo-Saxon cult of the cross. On Judgment Day, however, the symbolism of the cross is inverted. It is not a symbol of salvation to humanity; it is an object that inspires terror in the sinful.

> Ne bið him to are þæt þær fore ellþeodum
> usses dryhtnes rod ondweard stondeð,
> beacna beorhtast, blode bistemed,
> heofoncyninges hlutran dreore,
> biseon mid swate þæt ofer side gesceaft
> scire scineð. Sceadu beoð bidyrned
> þær se leohta beam leodum byrhteð.
> þæt þeah to teonum geteod weorþeð,
> þeodum to þrea, þam þe þonc gode
> womwyrcende wita ne cuþun,
>
> The cross of our Lord will be there not as mercy to them [the sinful], the brightest sign, stained with blood and gore of the king of heaven and drenched with His sweat. It will radiate over all Creation. There will be no shadows where the shiny beam will illuminate the people. It will be as an affliction, sorrow to people, those who do evil, who know no gratitude to God (*Christ III* 1083-1093).

What was formerly the symbol of salvation becomes the symbol of requital for the human wrong-doing; "he eftlean wile þurh eorneste ealles gemonian, ðonne sio reade rod ofer ealle swegle scineð on þære sunnan gyld" 'He will desire requital, when the rood, red with blood, will shine in the sky instead of the sun' (*Christ III* 1099-1103). Also, the sinful "geseoð him to bealwe þæt him betst bicwom, þær hy hit to gode ongietan woldan" 'will see as their affliction what would seem to be the best of all things, if they only had been able to perceive the worth of it' (*Christ III* ll. 1105-1106). The vision that

[137] "The notion that one crucifies Christ by sinning is ... adapted from the Jewish precept that to sin is to defile the name of one's maker" (Chase 1980: 31).

the damned have before their eyes also reveals Christ's wounds when He suffered on the cross.

In his article on the Judgment Day narrative in *Christ III* and *The Dream of the Rood,* Christopher Chase points to a number of "first-millennium texts concerned with judgment and penance" in which "the sinner is confronted with a graphic description of Christ's sufferings, that he may be moved to repent" (Chase 1980: 22)[138]. For Chase, the vision of the suffering Christ in *Christ III* (and *The Dream of the Rood*) generates repentance in the faithful and he traces the image of *Christus Patiens* the liturgical practices as early as those in the first millennium. "Briefly stated, the sinner of the first millennium responds to Christ's sufferings out of fear and remorse. Out of remorse because he acknowledges Christ's suffering to be the result of his transgressions; and out of fear because he believes that he is to be the result of his transgressions; and out of fear because he believes that he is to be afflicted at the Last Judgment with the very sins that he has committed" (Chase 1980: 30)[139]. The vision of Christ wounds is then central to the poem, for their vision is, in fact, not only limited to the damned, but, first and foremost, to the poem's audience, who, for a while, are identified with the damned.

The text now constantly draws attention to the psychic experience of the resurrected. Thomas Hill compares the poet's conception of the Judgment Day with that of Augustine in *The City of God* and states that "for Augustine and the poet, Judgment is not external and imposed upon mankind; both the blessed and the sinners in a sense judge themselves. What ultimately constitutes Judgment is their apprehension and recognition of their own nature" (Hill 1973: 241). The poem gives a vivid account of the emotions that possess the hearts of the blessed and damned. The sorrow and terror of the damned are equally given an impassioned account in the poem. The feeling that is most exposed, however, is not sadness and joy, but rather, the honour and pride on the part of the elect who earn eternal bliss for their noble words and works. However, equally important, is the shame that the damned are to suffer on the Judgment Day. Although the Judgment itself is portrayed as a psychic experience whereby each soul recognises his blessed or accursed state, it is at the same depicted as a public event. The

[138] These texts are, as Chase points out, the sermon 57 of Cesarius of Arles (the source of Christ's address to the sinners in the poem), Greek Ephram's *sermons ad monachos,* the "Improperia" of the Latin *Adoratio Crucis* (not a source, but a contemporaneous analogue to *The Dream of the Rood*) (1980: 22).
[139] What is more, he notes that "they are the fundamental morphology of the faith, ultimately deriving from some fundamental Jewish teachings" (1980: 31).

elect receive three signs testifying to their salvation; their radiance, reception of God's grace and reward, and the vision of the damned in hell (*Christ III* ll. 1237-1251).

Alternatively, there are three signs of damnation imparted to the wicked. First, the vision of their eternal suffering will be made manifest to their eyes. The second suffering that is inflicted on them is especially significant for the progress of the penitential mood in the poem. It will be the utmost shame for them when "þæt ællbeorhte eac sceawiað heofonengla here, ond hæleþa bearn, ealle eorðbuend ond atol deofol, mircne mægencræft, manwomma gehwone magun þurh þa lichoman, leahtra firene, geseon on þam sawlum", 'the host of angels, and sons of men, all earth-dwellers and the terrible devil, vast creation, will be able to see all evils on their souls through the bodies [of the sinful], sinful crimes' (*Christ III* ll. 1276-1282). The bodies of the sinful will, in fact, become "scandum þurhwaden swa þæt scire glæs, þæt mon yþæst mæg eall þurhwlita", 'shot through with shame as if they were sheets of glass that the man may easily see through' (*Christ III* ll. 2183-1284). The third token testifying to their damnation and increasing their terror will be their envy of the elect who are now secure in their bliss.

It is at this point, when the poem achieves its greatest emotional intensity and probes most deeply into the psychological torment of the damned, that the penitential motif is evoked. The penitential motif in *Christ III* runs as follow: "Wære him þonne betre þæt hy bealodæde, ælces unryhtes, ær gescomeden fore anum men, eargra weorca, godes bodan sægdon þæt hi to gyrne wiston firendæda on him" 'it would be better to them [the sinful men] if they had confessed their wicked deeds and all iniquities, humbling themselves in the presence of one man, to God's messenger, so that he knew the deeds' (*Christ III* ll. 1301-1304). In most of the homilies, from which the motif derives, the three hosts of the angels, humans and devils would be mentioned alongside God and the time of confession would be contrasted with Judgment as a public event when the sins will be revealed to the sinful men's shame before all (Godden 1973: 233). However, the hosts are not mentioned after the comparison, as the convention require, they are mentioned earlier at lines 1276-1282 quoted above. Godden points out that the motif in *Christ III* is divergent from the most common way of expressing it, as "the reference to the shame of the damned before the assembled hosts is diffused over the whole fifty-line description instead of being crystallised in a few words following the reference to confession" (Godden 1973: 233).

The motif, then, does not appear verbatim in the poem, but is changed to reflect the themes that appear earlier in the poem. The time of confession mirrors Judgment Day. Whereas on Judgment Day the sins manifest on the bodies of the damned will cause their shame, during the confession "Ne mæg þurh þæt flæsc se scrift geseon on þære sawle, hwæþer him mon soð þe lyge sagað on hine sylfne, þonne he þa synne bigæð" 'the confessor cannot see the soul through the body and whether the man tells lie to him when he confesses his sins' (*Christ III* ll. 1305-1307). This statement is not only the only reference to the act of confession in Old English poetry, it also raises the issue that had been of utmost importance to the theory of penance since the Frankish reforms since ninth century. Halitgar was the first scholar to insist on sincerity during confession and expressed the idea in his own manual that was known in England already in the tenth century. The gnomic statement that ends the reference to confession teaches that "Mæg mon swa þeah gelacnigan leahtra gehwylcne, yfel unclæne, gif he hit anum gesegð, ond nænig bihelan mæg on þam heardan dæge wom unbeted, ðær hit þa weorud geseoð" 'although the man can conceal each sin and polluting wickedness if he confides to one, but he can heal no iniquity and evil never atoned on that hard day when all people see it' (*Christ III* ll. 1308-13-11). Through juxtaposing confession with Judgment Day, the poem encourages the audience to confess now in order to avoid greater shame in the afterlife. The feeling of shame on the part of the sinner was recognised to be an important aspect in confession and in the manuals confessors were reminded of responding to penitents anxieties (Frantzen 1983: 178).

The penitential motif in the poem is also divergent from the form in which it commonly appears in homilies to enhance and reinforce the theme of Judgment Day as a shameful experience for the damned. Sincere confession and exposure of one's words and works to one person would certainly be better for the sinner than being humiliated in abject shame and having their sins displayed before the entire creation. The narrator points out that sins cannot be witnessed through our bodily eyes. On that day, people will see "eagum unclæne ingeþoncas" 'with their eyes unclean thoughts' (*Christ III* l. 1315). The narrator makes it obvious that sins cannot be seen with "heafodgimmum" 'jewels of the head' (*Christ III* 1330), that is , metaphorically, physical sight "hwæþer him yfel þe god under wunige" 'whether evil or good dwells within them' (*Christ III* l. 1332). On Judgment Day, "Nu we sceolon georne gleawlice þurhseon usse hreþercofan

heortan eagum, innan uncyste" 'Now we will earnestly and wisely see the internal blemish through our heart-caskets with the eyes of our hearts' (*Christ III* ll.1327-1329).

Confession is imagined as a cure that heals the wounds of sin and in the poem it is related to the Redeeming role of Christ. Christ in the poem himself appears wounded, although his wounds are only visible to the damned. At line 1336, as mentioned earlier, Christ arrives at the scene and is seen in two different aspects. The elect are blazed by his glory and radiance and are addressed by Him with an invitation to enter his Father's kingdom. The mood shifts again to terror when Christ addresses the damned, the address being a direct translation of a fragment of Cesarius of Arles's sermon (Scragg 1992: 139). The poet has Christ reiterate the entire salvific history beginning with the Human Fall from Eden and ending with Judgment Day. The image that is most relevant to the penitential mood and the penitential in the poem is evoked by the statement made by Christ that each sinner crucifies Him again in his heart and inflict on Him a more painful death than that on Golgotha.

> For hwon ahenge þu mec hefgor on þinra honda rode
> þonne iu hongade? Hwæt, me þeos heardra þynceð!
> Nu is swærra mid mec þinra synna rod
> þe ic unwillum on beom gefæstnad,
> þonne seo oþer wæs þe ic ær gestag,
> willum minum, þa mec þin wea swiþast
> æt heortan gehreaw, þa ic þec from helle ateah,
> þær þu hit wolde sylfa siþþan gehealdan.
>
> Why have you hung me on the cross made with your hands? This cross is harder! The cross of your sins is now more severer for me as I suffer it unwillingly than the one which I climbed out of my will when I pitied your misery in my heart and when I raised you from hell. If only you were eager to hold the gift from me! (*Christ III* ll. 1487-1494).

After that, Christ enumerates the sins that consist of failures in charity and ministry to those who are poor and deprived. The speech ends with the curse of damnation laid upon all sinful souls. The exhortatory remark that follows the description of placing the damned in hell among the devils vaguely refers to penance and repentance, but they continue to reinforce the reference to confession, which forms the central part of the poem.. The narrator says that "se sawle weard, lifes wisdom, forloren hæbbe, se þe nu ne giemeð hwæþer his gæst sie earm þe eadig, þær he ece sceal æfter hingonge hamfæst wesan", 'he has forsaken the guardian of his soul, the wisdom of his life, who does not care whether his soul will be wretched or blessed, where it will seek the eternal home after death' (*Christ III* 1550-1554). The narrator reminds the audience that repentance,

as a way to conversion, is available only now, in this life. He says "ðonne firena bearn tearum geotað, þonne þæs tid ne biþ, synne cwiþað" 'then the children of men will cry with tears, when it is not time to cry for one's sins' (*Christ III* ll. 1565-1567). What the passage brings from the penitential tradition is the medical metaphor, which sees Christ (and the confessor as well as the act of confession itself) as a healing force; "Ne biþ þæt sorga tid leodum alyfed, þæt þær læcedom findan mote, se þe nu his feore nyle hælo strynan þenden her leofað" 'no time for regret will be allotted to people to be able to find healing, who do not seek salvation/health in this life' (*Christ III* ll. 1571-1574).

The image of sins, that are presently concealed before the world but are bound to be displayed before the entire creation, recurs throughout the poem and reinforces the penitential theme within it.. Although God and the three hosts of angels, humans and the devils are omitted from the penitent theme as such, the audience is being constantly reminded of their presence on Judgment Day. The penitential motif is thus changed to suit the context. As an ideological tool the poet found the theme, not only, important to the structure of the poem but reveals his consciousness of the theme and of the theology of confession.

3.3. Penance and medical metaphor in *Judgment Day II*

Like most penitentials poems, *Judgment Day II*'s major theme is the Judgment Day and the poem teaches that confession and penance prepare the faithful for the Last Judgment. The Old English poem called *Judgment Day II* is found in the manuscript known as Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201. The poem is a translation of the poem attributed to the Venerable Bede (d. 735) and is dated to the late tenth century. Greenfield and Calder argue that "it is a late work, probably tenth-century, which substitutes end rhyme for alliteration in a few lines and even combines the two poetic techniques several times" (Greenfield and Calder 1986: 238). Caie, the most recent editor of the poem, says the work cannot have been composed earlier than the second half of the tenth century (Caie 2000: 10). The Old English *Judgment Day II* vaguely refers to confession and also draws upon the penitential motif. The poem itself is an exhortation to penitential practice and all the motifs that can be identified in it, the soul-to-body address and Doomsday theme, are integrated with the overall penitential subject of it. Not only the

tone of the poem but also its manuscript context strengthens the reading of the poem as penitential. Caie also points out that the manuscript in which the poem is contained also includes other material that is penitential in nature; namely, *Gloria* and *Lord's Prayer II.* Apart from the poetic material, 'Benedictine Office' precedes *Judgment Day II* (Caie 2000: 15. He also puts forward a not unlikely proposition, that the poem itself and the others that follow it "might well be exercises given by the confessor to the penitent as part of the necessary act of satisfaction" (Caie 2000: 19).

As Graham Caie puts it, "much of the imagery in *Judgment Day II* is shared with penitential literature: the need to feel fear, to cry tears of repentance, to consider sins as wounds and Christ as the only Physician, the need to reveal sin in the present in order to avoid the shame of exposure at Doomsday (Caie 2000: 67). The present discussion of the poem concentrates on the psychology of compunction and penance within the work. The poem's preoccupation with the penitent's internal state is complex, at it regards the soul's relation to body and body's role in bringing spiritual health to the soul. However, the poem does not insist on their separateness or castigates the body as inherently a source of evil. On the contrary, the focus is on the unity of the soul and the body within penitential practice as a condition for the spiritual health of both. The unity of soul and body is, it shall be argued, the kernel of the psychology of penance in the poem. This unity underlies the theory of compunction, which is not only central to monastic life, but also to the theory of penance. Although the poem depicts the proper exercise in the monk's spiritual struggle with sin through compunction and penance, the text is also mindful of the senses and sensual experience. This attention given to the body and the senses is especially prominent in the description of *hortus conlusus* and hell in the poem.

Jean Leclercq, in his seminal *Love of learning and desire for God* (1957), claims that compunction was central to early medieval monastic culture. Leclercq makes a distinction between the compunction of fear and the compunction of desire and points to the original medical denotation of the word *compunctio,* which, in monastic literature, was transferred to the sphere of spiritual life; "compunction becomes pain of spirit, a suffering resulting simultaneously from two causes: the existence of sin and of our tendency towards sin (*compunctio paenitentiae, timoris, formidinis*) and the existence of our desire for God and even our very possession of God". (Leclercq [1957] 1996: 29-30). In the poem, compunction is central to achieving self-knowledge. In his *Moralia,*

Gregory the Great claims that compunction brings about self-knowledge, which has been inhibited through one's sinful nature; "when it [the mind] raises itself by the compunction of prayer to aim at things above, having been roused by the eye of compunction, it returns to observe itself with greater vigilance" (Gregory the Great 1880: 506). Compunction brings about sudden awareness to the soul: "if warned by the fire of compunction, and touched by the sudden breath of contemplation, it starts from its lukewarmness, it soon begins to dread, as grave and deadly offences, those things which but a little before it believed to be trifling" (Gregory the Great 1880: 506). The poem and its psychological preoccupation must therefore be considered in the context of early medieval monasticism.

The poem is about reaching self-awareness of one's essentially sinful nature and the speaker of the poem concentrates on his internal state. It has been remarked that the speaker of *Judgment Day II* resembles the exilic speakers of poems like *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer* in his preoccupation with personal experience. As Caie points out, the poem "clearly demonstrates the deliberate progression from personal to general" and that "as in many OE didactic poems, the poet attracts the reader by a lyrical introduction and by promising personal experience, before beginning the instructional part in which the message then takes precendence, as in *The Wanderer, The Seafarer* and *The Dream of the Rood*" (Caie 2000: 54) . The didactive nature of the poem and the speaker of the poem, whose personal experience of existential anxiety moves him to the consideration of vanities of this world, make the poem close in nature to the Old English lyrical poems, which has earned their modern generic appellation as Anglo-Saxon elegies[140]. However, Old English elegiac poetry is concerned with transience and the ephemeral nature of the earthly abode. The existential fear that the beginning of the poem depicts in its speaker is not concentrated with the vanity of earthly values or human aspirations. Rather, it depicts the fear of the past. This is the deeds the speaker of the poem has performed and which have contributed to his present psychological state, his "earme mod"

[140] The classic definition of Old English elegy was formulated by Stanley B. Greenfield in his essay "The Old English elegies": "we may perhaps formulate a definition of the Old English elegy as a relatively short reflective or dramatic poem embodying a contrasting pattern of loss and consolation, ostensibly based on a specific personal experience or observation, and expressing an attitude towards that experience" (1966: 143).

'wretched mind' (*Judgment Day II* l. 9).[141] This is also combined with the dread of the future, of the Judgment of his soul that subsequently creates the dramatic tension of the poem. Old English elegies like *The Ruin* portray a sense of time passing; penitential and eschatological literature is preoccupied with the awareness of the world nearing the end of times.

The speakers of the elegies are configured as witnesses to the exterior evidence of world decay, whereas the narrator of a penitential poem becomes the commentator upon the flitting world. The experience of the speaker in *Judgment Day* is waking to the awareness that his or her Judgment Day will come, not so much with the moment of the Second Coming of Christ, as with his or her individual death. The present of the speaker is consumed by his memory of the past and expectation of the future. One the one hand, the speaker of the poem says, "þas unhyrlican fers onhefde mid sange, eall swylce þu cwæde, synna gemunde, lifes leahtra, and þa langan tid, þæs dimman cyme deaðes on eorðan", 'I begin this verse with song, like you told me, and remember my sins, vices of my life and the long time when death will come on earht' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 11-14). On other hand, he dreads "dom þone miclan for mandædum minum on eorðan" 'the great judgment for my sins [I committed] on the earth' and is terrified by his expectation of "hu mihtig frea eall manna cynn todæleð and todemeð þurh his dihlan miht" 'how the mighty lord will divide all mankind and judge through his lordly power' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 15-16; 19-20). The self-referential statement of the poem makes it clear that its composition is the result of this existential fear and the resulting compunction. In the penitent's dramatic situation, the assumption of the penitential mood entails the rejection of the joys of the present. The poet dramatises the situation of the penitent by expanding the description of the garden in which the speaker of the poem takes delight[142].

Bede, the author of the Latin original, himself was a monk and the description of *hortus conclusus* is, in fact, a metaphor for life in the cloister, which, in the monastic

[141] All quotations from *Judgment Day II* come from Dobbie, Elliott van Kirk (ed.). 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon minor poems.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translations from Old English into modern English are mine.

[142] Chase claims that "the image of *Christus Patiens* is a great catalyst in such lamentation. A believer like the poet of the Old English meditation "Judgment Day II" feels the need to weep over his sins, but has nothing on which to focus his thoughts. When Christ's sufferings are presented to the mind of a believer who wishes to lament his sins – as in the texts that we have been considering – his fear and remorse are magnified. His tears of compunction come forth *as if* he were lamenting the death of an only son" (1980: 32).

tradition, was indeed conceptualised as an earthly version of paradise[143]. Greenfield and Calder point out that in this poem "the Old English earthly garden, unlike Bede's, has an initial seductivity" (1986:240). The grove, *hortus conclusus,* at the beginning of the poem represents the attractive forces of nature that attacks the human soul with sensual desire, to which the speaker's eschatological preoccupations are clearly juxtaposed[144]. The wind that brings about his anxiety is one of the signs of the approaching day of Judgment, which is not an uncommon feature in the Last Judgment's description[145].

Sorrow in the speaker's mind is caused by the memory of his sins and so the act of remembering becomes a vital incentive to his compunction. The way his state of mind is depicted reverberates with expressions for sorrow that are typical of Judgment Day descriptions in Old English homilies. The speaker reveals his "earme mod" (*Judgment Day II* l. 9) and says that he was "eal ... gedrefed" (*Judgment Day II* l. 9) to the audience of the poem. He begins his song all "forht and unrot", 'in fear and in sorrow' (*Jugdment Day II* l. 10). The very act of speech itself is stressed in the poem to be the expression of sorrow: "ic murcnigende cwæð, mode gedrefed", 'Mourning, I spoke, my mind drenched with fear' (*Judgment Day II* l. 25). The sorrow that the speaker is experiencing is sustained by the fear of the Judgment Day and it is godly sorrow, as opposed to evil sorrow, that is leading to despair. In monastic literature, pondering on the Judgment Day, as well as the fear of Judgment in itself, is a weapon against demonic evil thoughts. Evagrius of Pontus suggest the monk should "put on the fear of God for the punishments of judgment so that out of fear of the inextinguishable fire you may put on the indivisible robe of ascetic works and be more quickly endowed with wisdom against the evil artifice of the thoughts, for 'fear is the beginning of wisdom' (Ecclus.

[143] The idea of representing cloister and monastic life by means of the tradition of *locus amoenus* is described by Leclercq in *Love for learning and desire for God;* "since eschatology never loses its rights, every garden where spiritual delights are found recalls Paradise and is described in the lush images which, in the Bible, depicted the garden of the Spouse or of the first Adam. The cloister is a 'true paradise' and the surrounding countryside shares its dignitiy" (1957: 130).

[144] Caie says the Old English poet elaborates upon Będę's symbolic description of the landscape and that his "clerical audience would immediately have comprehended the spiritual significance of the brief allusions to garden, wind and disturbed trees, whereas the vernacular poet might have felt it necessary to spell these out to his lay audience" (2000: 58). Caie gives an explanation for the fact that the description of the garden in the Old English poem is extended and far more elaborate than the original (2000: 58).

[145] Caie also observes that in the poem "the trees are personified and murmuring in the terror of the wind, while the clouds, again personified, are *gehrered* 'shaken', 'agitated', a near synonym of *gedrefed* 'agitated', 'disturbed' of the following line, but here referring to the mind of the persona". He also observes that the same words are used in *Christ III* and *The Dream of the Rood* in an eschatological context (2000: 63).

1:14)" (*Eulogios* 24). He also points out that "godly sadness calls the soul back with tears, refusing the joy and sadness of the opposing side, and it worries over approaching death and judgment; little by little it opens to accept this" (*Eulogios* 7). The Old English version of *Regula Sancti Benedicti* states that "se forma eadmodnysse stape is, thaet gehwa Godes ege habbe", 'the first step to humility is possible when everyone has the fear of God' (*Regula S Benedicti* VIIb: 4)[146].

The poem depicts an internal preparation for confession and penance. When the penitent assumes the proper frame of mind, that of sincere contrition in the face of pious fear of God, he has to attend to the penitential acts themselves. The aim of confession is the cure of the soul through the act of speech. The speaker of the poem makes the recesses of his soul manifest. More than this, the speaker of the poem insists on demonstrating his penance by means of visible signs, in the gestures, tears and positions of his body. The sinner addresses his eyes "þæt ge wylspringas wel ontynan, hate of hleorum, recene to tearum", 'so that you open the swelling springs of tears coming hot down the cheeks' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 26-28)[147]. Shedding tears of compunction is a frequent theme in monastic literature. Leclercq points out that "'tears of charity,' these 'suave tears,' engendered by the perception of God's sweetness, by the desire to enjoy it eternally, are accompanied by sighs, which are not signs of sadness, but of hopeful desire" and that "in the Middle Ages, monasticism has a whole literature of *suspiria*" (Leclercq 1996: 58-59). The speaker then says that "swiðe mid fyste, breost mine beate on gebedstowe", 'violently with this fist, I will beat my breast on the prayer place' (*Judgment Day II* l. 30). The third sign that testifies to his sorrow is his prostrate position on the ground: "and minne lichaman lecge on eorðan and geearnade sar ealle ic gecige", 'and I will lay my body on the ground and call forth my all deserved pain' (*Judgment Day II* l. 31-32)[148]. The tears and lamentations that accompany confession have a purgative effect

[146] The quotation comes from Arnold Schöer. 1888. *Die Winteney-version der Regula S. Benedicti*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

[147] Greenfield and Calder link the passage to the description of the garden at the outset of the poem and that "the Old English earthly garden, unlike Bede's has an initial seductivity" and that "it suggests the hiddenness of sins which must be *now* revealed to God through such an outpouring from the tear ducts" (1986:240).

[148] Hoffman points out that "while this last action may involve simply remorseful prostration, the mode of expression here (and, even more particularly, in later passages) suggests that the soul of the speaker, having placed the sinful body in the dust where it belongs, steps aside to contemplate and reproach it" (Hoffman 1969:1).

on the sinner's mind[149]; one's sinful nature has to be made manifest. Sin is imagined to be most destructive when hidden in the recesses of the human heart. Therefore, the speaker of the poem insists that "ne þær owiht inne ne belife on heortscræfe heanra gylta", 'no guilt can remain there in the inner parts of heart' (*Judgment Day II* 38-39). Rather, it has to be "openum wordum eall abæred, breostes and tungan and flæsces swa some", 'with open words made manifest, of the breast, of the tongue as well as of the body' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 42-43).

The revealing of one's sinful nature to oneself is a medicine to the soul and the medical metaphor that follows sustains the insistence that confession is a way of purging oneself from guilt and sin and, as Caie also observes, this idea is central to the penitential message of the poem (2000: 70-71). The cult of Christ as *medicus* originated early in Christianity and was promulgated by the writings of St. Augustine of Hippo (Abersmann 1954: 3)[150]. Abersmann also points out that the analogy between penitence and bodily cure can be found in the writings of Tertullian, the first Christian Latin writer, and St. Cyprian (1954: 6-7). The handbooks of penance invert the Divine and human roles and relegate the function of the physician of the soul from that of Christ to the confessor (Frantzen 1983: 31). The poem teaches that confession to God alone opens to the sinner the path to salvation. There is no actual reference to the confessor in the poem, and whereas in other penitential literature the medical metaphor transfers the power to forgive sins from Christ to the confessor. However, in *Judgment Day II* the metaphor applies only to Christ. Penance in the poem is "an hæl earmre sauwle and þam sorgiendum selest hihta, þæt he wunda her wope gecyðe uplicum læce", 'a healing to a wretched soul and the greatest of hopes to those who sorrow, when he shows his wounds to the heavenly physician with weeping' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 43-46). The Old English word for Saviour is *Hælend*, which means 'healer' and the word for salvation is

[149] It is specified in a number of tariffs that shedding tears is an activity that is to accompany penance. "Biscop gyf he dearnunga licge æfter canones dome fæste xii winter and ælmessan sylle swyðe on teara ongoteness abidde him godes are sume willað þæt he eft sy unhadod" 'If a bishop commits fornication secretly, according to the judgment of the canon he is to fast for 12 years and give alms generously and with the shedding of tears ask God's mercy for himself; some wish that he also be divested of holy orders' (*Scriftboc* 87b).

[150] The idea of *Christus Medicus* was invented "from the intense struggle of the second and third centuries between the cult of Asclepius, the pagan 'Savior and Healer', and the worship of Christ, whose work on earth has been depicted by synoptic gospels as that of physician of soul and body" (Abersmann 1954: 3). Abersmann observes that after a century, the metaphor had become outdated until it was revived in the writings of Augustine at the end of the fourth century, but it was Tertullian in the second century, earlier than Augustine, that introduced the term into Latin literature (1954: 6).

Hælo, whose another, literal, meaning was also "health, safety" (Bosworth and Toller 1898: 500). Christ is the only one who "mæg aglidene mod gode gehælan and ræplingas recene onbindan", 'can the heal the suffering mind with goodness and the unbind the prisoners in the instant' (*Judgment Day II* ll.47-48).

The depiction of sins as wounds is integral to the tradition of viewing Christ, and his mercy, as remedies to the wounded soul. Hermann points out, regarding *The Judgment Day*, that "if the missiles are often associated with the Gregorian stage of *suggestio*, the wounds imply consensus, marking the permanent or temporary defeat in the war against the powers of evil" (Hermann: 1989: 45). He also points to the emphasis the poem places on Christ's meekness: "Christ, who ministers to minds diseased, prisoners (*raeplingas*) captured and bound by the power of the enemy, will not bruise the wounded soul. Counterbalancing the warlike violence of the experience of temptation and consent to sin is a Christ who will heal the sinner who makes his wounds known" (Hermann: 1989: 46). John Cassian often conceptualises vice as fire and repentance as water that works to extinguish the fiery swelling wounding the soul from within.

> Armed with zealous mind and constant compunction we shall dull the wantonness of the flesh (which is the more vehemently inflated by the heat of food) and its hurtful stings, and with an abundance of tears and with the weeping of our heart we shall thus be able to extinguish the furnace of our body, which enkindled when the Babylonian king constantly offers us opportunities for sin and vice by which we are burned up more violently than by naphtha and pitch (*Institutes* 5: 2).

Weeping in the poem not only expresses sorrow but is also reminiscent of the flowing water in the *hortus conclusus* described at the beginning of the poem. At the beginning of the poem, the speaker finds consolation in nature. This, however, is ephemeral and does not respond to the speaker's existential doubts. It is the water of his tears that may make it possible to partake of his Lord's mercy. The speaker has to turn from the world by withdrawing into himself.

Whereas the parts of the poem, which describe the Judgment Day itself depict Christ in his capacity as a Judge, who obeys Justice in assigning either salvation or damnation on particular souls, the first part of the poem insists on his endless mercy. Christ's mercy to each sinner is exemplified by the story of the good thief from the Gospels.

> Se sceaþa wæs on rode scyldig and manful,

mid undædum eall gesymed;
he drihtene swa þeah, deaðe gehende,
his bena bebead breostgehigdum.
He mid lyt wordum ac geleaffullum
his hæle begeat and help recene,
and in gefor þa ænlican geatu
neorxnawonges mid nerigende.

The thief was on the cross, full of guilt and evil, blemished with wrongd-doing; he, however, approaching his death, offered his prayers to the Lord from the recesses of his heart. With few words, but with great faith, he implored for salvation and immediate help and went throught gates of paradise after the Saviour (*Judgment Day II* ll. 55-64).

The passage contains a pun, which cannot be translated into modern English, as the Anglo-Saxon word for salvation, *hælu*, means 'health' (Bosworth and Toller 1982: 500). The good thief is a model for each sinner, as he gains his spiritual health, the freedom from sin, through prayer that comes from "breostgehigdum", 'recesses of the heart'. He speaks with "lyt wordum", 'few words', but his faith is great enough to heal his wounded soul. His entrance to the paradise will be echoed at the end of the poem by a description of the eternal bliss of the elect in heaven.

The constant emphasis on the present, within the work, insists on the awareness of one's sinful nature and willingness to perform penance now. The fragment of the poem that follows then draws on the homiletic tradition of the soul's address to the body on the Judgment Day. In the poem, however, it is not the soul, but the mind, "earme geþanc", 'wretched mind' (*Judgment Day II* l. 65), that chastises the body. As Hoffman observes, *geþanc* translates *mens* of the original (Hoffman 1969: 171)[151], but in Old English poetry *mod,* rather than *sawul,* is the seat of ethical arbitration. Whereas in the classical instances of the soul and body theme, the soul chastises the body for sins at the Resurrection of the elect and the damned, the mind exhorts the body to repent now before the soul and body are parted in death. In the poem the body is a medium of repentance, an instrument, whereby penance is performed. The mind addresses the tongue and asks it why it does not confess its sins to "the læce", 'the physician' (*Judgment Day II* l. 66). The poet juxtaposes the present as a time, when "forgifnesse", 'forgiveness' can be obtained from the merciful lord ("nu þe ælmihtig earum atihtum, heofonrices weard, gehyreð mid lustum", 'now the almighty will hear with joy, the king of heaven, with attentive ears' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 68; 69-70)) with the future being a time when

[151] Hoffmann gives a further observation on the passage that "it is the soul, after all, which is speaking, and the mind, or its wicked thoughts, are made "earm" through the sinful nature of the flesh" (1969: 171).

Christ will appear in the capacity of a judge and the penitent will have to confess his sins before the Creator and the heavenly throng (*Judgment Day II* ll. 73-75).

At this point of the poem, the speaker's voice shifts from an emphasis on his personal anxiety and concern for the Judgment of his own soul to homiletic exhortations directed at the implied audience of the piece. The poet makes an extended exhortative remark in the second person plural. It is possible only now to ask for forgiveness and to divert the eternal anger of God on the Judgment Day: "Ic lære þæt þu beo hrædra mid hreowlicum tearum, and þæt yrre forfoh eces deman" ,'I exhort you should be readily in tears so that you escape the wrath of the ever-living judge' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 75-76). The penitent should immediately ask for "beþunga and plaster, lifes læcedomes æt lifes frean", 'fomentation and plaster, life's medicine, from the lord of life' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 80-81). In Old English, penance was termed *dædbote* (Bosworth and Toller 1898: 192), an expression the poet uses at line 85 to say that it is the will of Lord to perform the acts of penance now. The poem also draws upon a doctrine that God avenges sin only once: "ne heofenes god henða and gyltas ofer ænne syþ wrecan wile ænigum men", 'the God of heavens will not make vengeance for sins on men more than once' (*Judgment Day* ll. 88-89).

The moral lesson for the audience of the poem is the importance for sincere contrition as a condition for salvation. The other important condition is physical penance itself, which men and women performed through the acts of their bodies. The acts of the body not only strengthen compunction, but articulate it involving each member of the body in the performance of penance. The poem centres on the internal state of the speaker of the poem and his exhortative remarks on repentance as a constant frame of mind. The mental faculty that is central to compunction in the poem is memory. Memory is the principal aspect of the human mind, as it underlies one's moral behaviour. The speaker of the poem indulges in the acutely painful activity of recollecting his or her sinful past as part of the preparation for confession and parting from life. The blissful mood set forth by the *hortus conclusus* description may metaphorically signify approaching death. The clouds and wind that alter the speaker's mood are the first signs of the Second Coming in eschatological literature and triggers the preoccupation with eschatology. The speaker confesses not only "synna gemunde", 'I remembered [my] sins' (*Judgment Day II* 12) but also "Ic gemunde eac mærðe drihtnes and þara haligra on heofonan rice, swylce earmsceapenra yfel and witu", 'I also remembered the great lord and

the saints in the heavenly kingdom, likewise, the evil and punishment of the wretched' (*Judgment Day II* ll. 21-23).

For Augustine, memory is a tool for arriving at self-knowledge: "by thinking, as it were, gather together ideas which memory contains in a dispersed and disordered way, and by concentrating our attention we arrange them in order as if ready to hand, stored in the very memory where previously they were hidden, scattered and neglected" (*Confessions* p. 189)[152]. Augustine makes an analogy between recollection and rumination: "That is why by reminding myself I was able to bring them out of memory's store. Perhaps then, just as food is brought from the stomach in the process of rumination, so also by recollection these things are brought out from the memory" (*Confessions* p. 192). The speaker of *Judgment Day II* looks at its life from the perspective of the eternal present; contrition offers a moment of awareness and insight not only to one's soul, but also involves a consideration of one's life with the scheme of eternal providence. At the beginning of the poem, the speaker refers to Judgment Day in the preterit. He is endowed with a prophetic voice, in the same way that the Bible prophets tend to speak of future events in the past tense, as if he partook in the divine perspective of the eternal present. What is more, the soul, or rather the poet's *mod* and *gethanc* 'mind', is for a moment allowed to look at the body, which belongs to the earthly reality, from this eternal present.

Therefore the description of the Day of Judgment is integral to the theology of repentance that the poem expresses. The fear of final Judgment endows the speaker of the poem with a frame of mind that makes him, or her, repent at the beginning of the poem. The idea of didactive poetry, which exhorts repentance through arousing fear and anxiety, does not sound particularly attractive to contemporary audiences. Leclerqc observes that the idea of fear of God is a biblical Hebraism and in the Old Testament this concept is often extended to charity[153]. The fear of God in the poem is central to its ethical construction and underlies its principle of moral behaviour. Descriptions of the

[152] All quotations from St. Augustine's *Confessions* come from Augustine. [1992] 1998. *Confessions.* (Translated by Henry Chadwick.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[153] "It continues to be used, therefore, in a sense completely different from that given to it by secular authors. This loving fear is rather reverence, or respect. It is accompanied by confidence; it engenders peace; it is on a par with charity and with the desire for Heaven. What the Bible calls "fear of God" is a way of referring to charity under its somewhat negative aspect. The only true fear is that of losing the presence of the God one loves and whom one wishes to enjoy eternally. Understood in this way, fear is, like charity, the root of all virtues" (Leclercq 1996: 76).

punishment of the wicked in the afterlife were extremely popular in the middle ages and Bede himself makes a recourse to a story frame, according to which a sinner experiences a vision of the afterlife and undergoes a change of heart as a result, in the visions of Furseus and Dryhthelm in *Historia Ecclesiastica.* His *De die iudicci* is another example of such a vision. Fear of God is not only a virtue that testifies to piety but also a principle cause of internal conversion unto God.

Since the moment the wind aroused the penitent's anxiety over his salvation at the beginning the poem, the narrative has been building up the emotional intensity of his personal drama. The climax of this comes with a version of the penitential motif found in *Christ III.* Although it is not as faithful in phrasing to the classical expression of the motif found in the homilies, it produces a far greater effect, because the earlier description of the penitent's psyche are in sharp contrast to the depiction of Judgment Day as a social experience. Judgment Day will be a time of the revelation of sins and secret thoughts revealed before the entire race of Adam. At this point, the poet reassures the audience by reminding them that the shame for sins on Judgment Day may be avoided by contrition and penance in this life. What follows the references to Judgment Day as a horrifying experience for the sinful is a variation of the penitential motif: "eal þæt hwæne sceamode scylda on worulde, þæt he ænigum men ypte oððe cyðde, þonne bið eallum open ætsomne, gelice alyfed þæt man lange hæl" (*Judgment Day II* ll. 141-143). In the classical example, the motif relies on a comparison between the shame experienced before the confessor in this life and the shame that will be experienced by those who failed to confess their sins before death and whose sins will be revealed on Judgment Day before God, angels and people (Godden 1973: 233). Although there is no reference to God and the hosts present at the Resurrection, the emphasis is laid on the kinship of all people with Adam. The speaker of the poem addresses the reader in the second person plural as an everyman, as in *Christ III.* He then assumes the voice of homilists throughout and addresses humanity as an everyman and as a community whose members share their origin in the First Man.

At line 176, the poet shifts the addressee from the figure of the everyman to that of the body as the image of the soul. This part of the poem draws upon the tradition of the dialogue between soul and body at the Judgment that is the subject of the Old English poem, *Soul and Body,* as well a theme in a number of Anglo-Saxon homilies.

Hwæt dest þu, la, flæsc? Hwæt dreogest þu nu?
Hwæt miht þu on þa tid þearfe gewepan?
Wa þe nu, þu þe þeowast þissere worulde,
and her glæd leofast on galnysse
and þe mid stiðum astyrest sticelum þæs gælsan!
Hwi ne forhtas þu fyrene egsan,
and þe sylfum ondræd swiðlice witu,
ða deoflum geo drihten geteode,
awyrgedum gastum, weana to leane?

What are you doing, flesh? What can you achieve by weeping in time of need? Woe to thee, now, as you are a servant unto this world and and lives in gladness and in lust.... why are you not afraid of terrifying flame and do not dread the terrible punishment ready for you, which has been ordained by the lord to the devils, those accursed spirits, as woeful reward (*Judgment Day II* ll. 176-184).

The image of body as blemished with vices is a perversion of the body of the Church, whose identity the audience of the poem is to share. It is also the perversion of the physical body, for if the body is not subjected to penance, it is in the servitude of sin. The so-called *Confessionale Pseudo-Egberti* states that "se Apostol cwæð: 'Se þe ðurh his lichaman gesyngige, he eac þurh his lichaman bete', þæt is on fæstene and on wæcan and on gebedum and on halsungum to Gode mid heartan onbryrdnyse and mid teara agotnesse", 'The apostle says: the one who sins with his body should do his penance with the body', that is, through fasting, vigils, with prayers and entrities to God, with contrition of heart and with shedding of tears' (*PE* p. 174). As the body was not subjected to penitential practice in this life, it will suffer the eternal torment in hell. The description of torments that follows is depicts suffering in sensual terms. *Judgment Day II* is concentrates the reader's attention on pain and it may well been composed to foster an ascetic practices among monks or secular clergy.

The poem introduces the description of punishment in hell with an inexpressibility topos (*Judgment Day II* ll. 185-190). Punishment is depicted in terms of physicality and sensuality, as an alternation between extremes, ice and cold, fire and heat. Nothing can be heard apart from wailing and weeping, nothing can be seen apart from filth, also nothing can be smelt there apart from the stench of fire. This description of pain is juxtaposed to the *hortus conclusus* from the opening section, in which the moderate climate seems to be a delight to senses. A catalogue of abstractions follows the description of physical sufferings. As Greenfield and Calder put it, the "passage shows abstractions of vice, like those in later morality plays, gliding away from the world" (Greenfield and Calder: 240).

þonne druncennes gedwineð mid wistum,
and hleahter and plega hleapað ætsomne,
and wrænnes eac gewiteð heonone,
and fæsthafolnes feor gewiteð,
uncyst onweg and ælc gælsa
scyldig scyndan on sceade þonne

Then drinking will pass away with feasts; laughter and game will disappear altogether; debauchery will also go away. The guilty of sin will be cast away into shadow (*Judgment Day II,* ll. 235-241)

The poet also remarks that "leofest on life lað bið þænne", 'what is pleasing in this life will become hateful there' (*Judgment Day II* 244). The description of hell, as it were, represents *sensus corporis animalis* as the danger to the soul and the simple equation seems to be that the indulgence in bodily pleasure now will cause pain in the afterlife.

Although, as Greenfield and Calder remark, the poem is late[154], it still draws upon the heroic tradition insofar as it depicts heaven in terms of the heavenly comitatus and mingles the patristic tradition of *locus amoenus* with heroic qualifications. The nature of the garden that stands for paradise in the poem is different from that described at its beginning. The joys of the former were delusive and its attractive features configured the vanities of passing reality. The natural features of the heavenly garden, in contrast, are seen as the virtues of the blessed. As Hoffman points out, "traditionally in the Middle Ages, red roses symbolise the martyrs who shed their blood for the faith" (Hoffman 1968: 6). Like the penitential motif, the description of heavenly comitatus gives a sense of community and identifies the audience as fellow members of the congregation of the elect. Constituting the body of Christ, the congregation is in opposition to the body that is subject to the vice and filth of the world. The description of eternal punishment in the confines of hell inverts the joys of humans life experienced in the heroic hall. Strikingly, the vices that are a source of pleasure in this life will not just vanish from the hellish landscape (Hoffman 1968: 235). In contrast, the heavenly bliss is depicted in terms of Germanic comitatus and the joys of the hall.

The spiritual polarity in the poem oscillates between the body and soul, earth and heaven, sensual experience and self-knowledge. However, the oppositional pairings do not give priority to its other, spiritual element by denying the first; consequently physical and sensual reality is depicted as the first stage in a spiritual ascent. Self con-

[154] "It is a late work, probably tenth-century, which substitutes end rhyme for alliteration in a few lines and even combines the two poetic technique several times" (Greenfield and Calder 1986: 238).

templation is only possible after the contemplation of the world and its transience. Penance and confession are made possible through the actions of the body; the acts of penance condition the body. The poem thus depicts a complex psychology of compunction as a process whereby the soul and the body exist in unity.

3.4. Gluttony, lust and avarice in *The Soul and the Body* from the Vercelli and Exeter Manuscripts

*The Soul and Body'*s connection to Old English penitential literature is not obvious, since there is no reference to confession or any trace of penitential motif in the poem. However, the poem's ethical concerns attach to fasting and almsgiving which were the commonest penitential activities in Anglo-Saxon England. There are two sins emphasised in the address tradition, gluttony and avarice, and both correspond to the penitential practices of the period, fasting and almsgiving, respectively. In the poem, despite the body being presented as the root of sin in the soul's address, the unity of the soul and the body is depicted as central to one's existence as a Christian. That said one of the most ambiguous aspects of the text is its attitude to the body. On the one hand, the body is the image of the soul; an idea, which goes back to the tradition of soul and body theme. On the other hand the body and its physiology is the source of sin and therefore it is necessarily detrimental to soul. The poem, however, insists on the unity of both which can be achieved only through penitential exercise; the premise of this unity is that the spiritual health of the soul is conditioned upon the penitent's control of the body and its physiology. What is especially destructive to spiritual health, in the poem, is the triad of gluttony, fornication and avarice. It shall be argued that *Soul and Body II* is a poem that depicts the work of three sins that in the Christian medieval tradition are identified as sins of the body, as opposed to the sins of the spirit.

The Old English versified *Address of Soul to Body* is extant in two versions, one found in the Exeter Book, the other in the Vercelli Book. *Soul and Body I,* found in the Vercelli Book, consists of two parts; the first part being an address of the condemned soul to the wicked body and the second being the blessed sould praising the body. The Exeter version, *Soul and Body II,* differs from *Soul and Body II* in a number of textual variants and the lack of the second part, that is, the speech of the blessed soul. There is a

number of Old English homilies, where, as in the two poems, the soul visits its body to castigate, or to praise it, in the interim period after death but before Judgment. In the fourth homily of the Vercelli Manuscript, the body of the blessed soul is juxtaposed to the new dwelling the soul is to inhabit in heaven; the virtuous body prefigures heavenly paradise. The soul longs for the body and is reluctant to separate from it. Its tears, signifying remorse for sins, brought about its joy and its fasting caused the soul to indulge in spiritual nutrition. Each action of the body is imagined to provide a remedy for the soul and so remove the corresponding affliction in the afterlife. The soul praises the body for its renunciations. The alternative description of the sinful body in the homily is remarkably reminiscent of the Old English poem. The body is especially guilty of gluttony and, as in the poem, gluttony is juxtaposed to the Eucharist. The soul scolds the body, "nolde he mid þam lænan drynce gebycgan þone þæs ecan wines. ", 'he did not want to pay the eternal wine with the transitory drink' (*Vercelli* IV 99)[155] and "he wende þæt his ceole wære his hælend Crist", 'and it thought that his throat was his Saviour Christ' (*Vercelli* IV 99). It caused the soul to suffer spiritual thirst and hunger. It causes the soul's shame on Judgment Day, since it cannot partake of its earthly honour and vanity: "Ealle are he hæfde, ond nolde he me nanes rymetes on ðam geearnian æt ðam ecan deman", 'he used to enjoy the possession of all honour, but it did not want to earn me the comfort from the eternal Lord' (*Vercelli* IV 99). As a dwelling, then, the sinful body is a type of hell: "nystes ðu na hu swiðe he me swencte? On anum dæge he geworhte of ðusenda scylda, ond to nænigre hreowe gehweorfan nolde", 'did you not know how severely you oppressed me? On each day he committed thousand sins and he did not turn to repentance' (*Vercelli* IV 99). The sinful body is greedy and mean; it refuses to give alms and provide for the poor. It did not provide for the widows and the orphans. The body in the Vercelli homily is most extensively used to illustrate penitential practices.

The theme of the soul and body is connected to the practice of fasting, which was the most frequent penitential activity in the Old English period and figures in many of the tariffs in the handbooks of penance. Homosexuals (the so-called *baedlings*), adulterers, thieves and murderers were invariably assigned fasting as penance (as well as alms-giving, which might have been imagined as an alternative of *wergild* paid to God

[155] The quotation comes from Scragg, Donald G. 1992. *The Vercelli homilies.* (Early English Text Society.) Oxford: Oxford University Press. Translation mine.

but not to earthly authorities). Fasting was a reliable form of penance, because, although confession was supposed to be secret, the acts of penance were not. It was impossible for a penitent performing a seven-year period of fasting to go unnoticed in the community. Penance was a public matter and even the practice of secret penance engaged the individual in a set of ritualistic, and therefore noticable, behaviour. However, fasting, in terms of medieval spirituality, is not to be thought of purely as form of bodily deprivation. Fasting was believed by medieval people to be a cure for the soul and this belief is connected with the established nature of gluttony as sin, which actually endangered the soul rather than the body. Susan Hill compares the medieval conception of gluttony with the modern and observes that the "implicit connection between gluttony and corpulence – and our concomitant disdain for fatness – is ... a relatively recent cultural phenomenon" and claims that "prior to the seventeenth century ... such a strong connection between gluttony and obesity is lacking" (Hill 2007: 58). She further remarks that "Instead, discussions about gluttony in the Middle Ages highlight a distinctly medieval understanding of social limits and the excesses that threaten them, thereby creating a moral discourse about food practices that, I surmise, will later lend moral weight to the equation of gluttony with fatness" (Hill 2007: 58). What is more, she observers that "many medieval writers viewed gluttony as a marker for a particular form of spiritual deficiency" and that "the idea of gluttony in the Middle Ages – whether it is considered to be the first sin, or whether it is discussed in a monastery or the town – depends on the assumption that an individual's bodily behaviour makes a significant contribution to the spiritual health" (Hill 2007: 58)[156].

Consequently, in Old English penitential practice, the body had a significant role to play[157]. Far from being merely condemned as the primary source of sin (especially,

[156] Susan Hill discusses gluttony in the context of the medieval interpretations of Genesis and the original sin, which in the Middle Ages was viewed to be gluttony. "That one bite of the apple could suffice to render the first humans guilty of gluttony certainly defies our contemporary understanding of gluttony as overeating, and points to the idea that gluttonous behaviour includes more than overindulgence" (Hill 2007: 58). She concludes that "Adam and Eve can be gluttons underscores the notion that being fat is not a glutton's sin; rather; the importance of the sin of gluttony is that the misuse of food can have a significant negative impact, not only on an individual's spiritual journey, but also on the creation and maintenance of community" (Hill 2007:61).

[157] When Robert C. Rice comments on the opening lines of *Soul and Body*, he says "the consideration of the future state expressed in these lines and exemplified in the body of the poem is that eternal justice is based upon the acts of man during his earthly sojourn. For the soul who in the flesh did ill and did not atone through penance, both the 'long time' before the Last Judgment and the eternity following will entail grief and torment It will be noted that there is no indication of purgatorial cleansing in *Soul and BodyI*; the soul is either saved or damned and will await Doomsday accordingly. As in the Blickling and

gluttony, fornication and avarice), the body, through penitential practice of fasting, participates in repentance, which is primarily a spiritual process that takes place in the soul. In *The Soul and Body*, the body is imagined as a principal and active aspect of human being. In the poem, the soul visits the body to castigate it for its sins, which caused the damnation of both. The poem starts (and ends) with a gnomic remark, which states that it befits each man to take care over the fate of his, or her, soul after death (*Soul and Body II* ll. 1-5)[158]. The poem draws upon a theological idea that there is an interim period between judgement of the individual, that takes place immediately after one's death, and Judgment Day when Universal Resurrection is to take place. There is a tradition according to which the body and soul are separated only during the interim period between death and Resurrection.

> Min leof ic þe lǽre þæt þu þence hu þu hider on world acenned wære· oþþe þurh hwæt· oþþe on hwon þu þas lænan world· & hu þín lichama· & þin sawl hige dǽlan scýlon· & sýþþan on hwýlcere anbid stowe þin sawl bídan móte domes dæges· & eac þa tíd þonne þin sawl & þin lichama gegaderode beon scýlon· & eft to godes dome gelædd· & þonne þu scealt· & ælc man for his agenum gewýrhtum riht agýldan· & onfón æt þam dome· & sýþþan mid sawle & mid lichaman onfón· swa écum lífe· swa écum deaþe. swa þu ǽr geworhtest· swa écum lífe swa úngeendodon wíte.
>
> My dear one, I ask that you consider how you were born hither into the world, and through what you were born, when you will (go from) this fleeting world and how your soul and your body shall be separated and, afterward, in which place your soul shall await the Day of Judgment, and also the time when your soul and you body shall be gathered (reunited) and led to God's judgment, (where) you and everyone shall be rightly judged for his own works and receive at that judgment, and afterward, for both body and soul, either eternal life or eternal death, just as you previously merited, either eternal life or unending punishment. (*Introduction to penance* p 414)[159].

The *ordo* to the Handbook makes it clear that the body and the soul part in death only to be reunited for the period of Parousia and are to remain together eternally, afterwards. In the poem, body and soul are called *sibbe* 'kins' and death involves the separation of those "þa þe ær somud wæron, lic ond sawle", "who used to be together, body and soul'

Vercelli homilies, the emphasis is on either/or aspect of the soul's fate after death, while the doctrine of purgatorial atonement with the aid of the living remain largely hidden in the background" (Name: 1977: 108).

[158] All quotations from *Soul and Body II* come from George Phillip Krapp and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (eds.). 1936. *The Exeter book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 3.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translations from Old English into modern English are mine.

[159] The quotation and translation come from Allen Frantzen. 2011. *Anglo-Saxon penitentials: A cultural database* (http://www.anglo-saxon.net/penance/TOEI190_414.html) (date of access: 6 Apr. 2011). Allen Frantzen Internet database includes all Old English handbooks of penance, even those, which exist only in manuscripts and have not been published in print so far. It is also the most recent. This is why it is used in the present study in preference to older editions.

(*Soul and Body II* ll. 4-5). The soul visits its body every seventh night. The body is essential when it comes to life now and it will be returned to the soul in the afterlife to share either bliss or suffering with it.

The soul that is lamenting its plight in the poem suffers punishment in hell after the parting of the soul from the body happens and Judgment Day involves their reunion. The beginning of the poem places the blame on the wretched state of the soul on the body: "Long bið siþþan þæt se gæst nimeð æt gode sylfum swa wite swa wuldor, swa him in worulde ær efne þæt eorðfæt ær geworhte", 'it is a long time that the spirit receives either punishment or reward from God, depending on what its body earned for it earlier in their life' (*Soul and Body II* ll. 5-8). In the poem, the body is depicted as independent of the soul; the soul's castigation implies that the body has an independent free will and is the direct and only source of evil. When the soul starts to scold the body, it attributes it with its own intellectual faculty.

> Lyt þu geþohtes
> to won þinre sawle sið siþþan wurde,
> siþþan heo of lichoman læded wære!
> Hwæt, wite þu me, werga! Hwæt, þu huru wyrma gifl
> lyt geþohtes, hu þis is long hider,
>
> Little did you think to where your soul would depart on journey when she was led out of the body! what, you afflict me with punishment, you wretch! What, you banquet for worms, little did you think how long it would be here (*Soul and Body II,* ll. 19-23).

The soul insists on its own passive existence. It says to the body that "þe þurh engel ufan of roderum sawle onsende þurh his sylfes hond, meotud ælmihtig".' to you, the almighty God from heaven sent a soul through an angel from his own hand' (*Soul and Body II* ll. 27-28). The second unorthodox idea concerns the nature of soul's existence within the body whereby the body is a prison unto the soul

> Eardode ic þe in innan. No ic þe of meahte,
> flæsce bifongen, ond me firenlustas
> þine geþrungon. þæt me þuhte ful oft
> þæt wære þritig þusend wintra
> to þinum deaðdæge.
>
> I dwelled inside of you. Neither was it in my might to break out from you and sinful desired pressured me so much that I often thought it would three thousand years [to wait] until you die (*Soul and Body II* ll. 33-37).

This statement is on the verge of the neo-Platonic and Manichean heresy; the view that the body is the prison unto the soul was never an orthodox Christian teaching.

The traditional view on the dualism of the soul and the body gives primacy to the soul as the seat of intellectual and moral activity and the adopted Platonic tripartite division of the soul into vegetative, animal and reasoning parts made it possible to conceptualise the human soul as the image of the Trinity. The *locus classicus* of the dualism of body and soul is found in St. Paul of Tarsus's Letter to Galatians; "caro enim concupiscit adversus spiritum, spiritus autem adversus carnem", 'for the flesh desires what is against the spirit and the spirit desires what is against the flesh' (Gal 5: 17)[160]. Christian thought, however, never condemned the body. Peter Brown, in his *Body and Society: Men and women in early Christian society,* rightly observes that in St. Paul's conception "the human person, divided between *the spirit* and *the flesh,* was not primarily a being torn between body and soul" (Brown 1988: 49). The body is to be distinguished from the flesh. In the poem the body in no way corresponds to the late medieval concept of the three greatest temptations: the flesh, the world and the devil. Augustine states that "the cause of sin arises in the soul, not in the flesh". He considers an assertion that "the flesh is the cause of every kind of moral failing, on the ground that the bad behaviour of the soul is due to the influence of the flesh" only to refute it immediately. Although it is true, he provides a quote from the Scripture, "the corruptible body weighs down the soul" ([Wisdom 9: 15] *City of God,* XIV, 3), its corruption is not inherent but accidental to it. He also refutes the Platonic idea of body as the source of soul's corruption: "For the corruption of the body, which weighs down the soul, is not the cause of the first sin, but its punishment. And it was not the corruptible flesh that made the soul sinful; it was the sinful soul that made the flesh corruptible" (*City of God,* XIV, 3)[161]. But the most powerful argument against locating the source of sin in the flesh, Augustine finds in a claim that the Devil does not possess flesh and "those vices, which are predominant in the Devil, attributed to the flesh by the Apostle [St. Paul], although it is certain that the Devil is without flesh" (*City of God*, XIV, 3).

In the poem, the body and the soul do not form a clear polarity, despite of what the modern editorial title of it would suggest. The body in penitential poet is symbolic.

[160] The quotation is taken from *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*. 2007 [1969]. (Edited by Robert Weber and Roger Gryson.) (The fifth edition.) Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. Translation mine.
[161] The quation comes from Augustine. 2003. *The City of God.* (Translated by Henry Bettenson.) London: Penguin Books.

Not only does it serve as the image of soul on the earth, but also it is envisioned to literally decide on the fate of the soul in the afterlife. The body becomes the central instrument of penance and it is the object of penitential discipline. The most significant realisation of this discipline through the body is fasting and abstinence as a cure for the most dangerous sins that come from the body and infect the soul: namely gluttony, fornication and avarice. In the lists of the eight principal faults, both Evagrius of Pontus and John Cassian, open their catalogues of sins with these three, and which can be seen to influence the order of sins found in Gregory the Great's *Moralia on the Book of Job.* In the tariffs of early medieval handbooks, fasting and almsgiving figure as the commonest cures for all major sins. Although no specific list of sins occurs in Old English poetry, in the three penitential poems, mentioned earlier, gluttony and fornication are mentioned and represent the soul's corruption through the auspices of the body. The cure for sin is realised through control over the body achieved through abstinence and self-mortification. What is more, the insistence that the body may suffer physically in hell implies a logic that its suffering in the present life might avert the punishment in the afterlife.

The soul castigates the body for the satisfaction of its desire during its earthly life. This while its spirits hungered and thirsted spiritually, making its fate reminiscent of the Mermedonians in *Andreas.* The soul berates the body, as "Wære þu þe wiste wlonc ond wines sæd, þrymful þunedest, ond ic ofþyrsted wæs godes lichoman, gæstes drinces", 'you were proud with food and fed with wine, you boasted arrogantly, while I longed for the Body of God [Eucharist] and the spiritual drink' (*Soul and Body II* ll. 39-41). The reference to the Eucharist can be also found in the soul's address from the Vercelli homily IV. As for lust, the soul also identifies the body as the chief source for this. The soul bears a grudge to the body:

> þær þu þonne hogode her on life,
> þenden ic þe in worulde wunian sceolde,
> þæt þu wære þurh flæsc ond þurh firenlustas
> stronge gestyred ond gestaþelad þurh mec,
> ond ic wæs gæst on þe from gode sended,
> næfre þu me swa heardra helle wita
> ned gearwode þurh þinra neoda lust.
>
> I wish you had thought there during you lifetime, when I had to dwell in you, that you were directed through corporeal desires very strongly and established in me, and that was a spirit in you sent from God, you would have never prepared the hellish punishments for me for you lust's satisfaction (*Soul and Body II* ll. 39-45).

The reading of "gestyred", which is key to the understanding of this passage, has aroused some controversy among critics. Whereas the fragment from the Exeter Book quoted above reads "gestyred", 'direct", the Vercelli version of the poem reads "gestryned" instead. Shippey says that "Beneath all the accusations there is a strong feeling that the poet dwells on the details of corruption and coffin-worms just because he thinks the body (once soulless) is automatically evil – its rottenness after death is a true image of its real nature" (Shippey 1976 : 32). Moffat says that "E's *styran* 'direct, guide' establishes an opposition between in that version the body moved by *flæsc* and *firenlustas* and the soul trying to steady it (*gestaþelad*) against this motion" whereas "the meaning of V's *styran* is ambigious". He quotes Orton's gloss 'claimed', but prefers his reading 'begat', his translation for the line being "you were strongly begat by flesh and sinful desires". He states that "either reading results in an image of a considerably more passive body than it is depicted in E" (Moffat 1990: 72).

In Old English penitential literature the address-of-the-soul-to-the-body theme was extremely useful. It served as a warning that the conduct in the present life was a determinant of the soul's fate in the afterlife. First and foremost, the conception of the body in the soul and body tradition has an affinity with that found in the handbook of penance. Fasting was a penitential exercise and it functioned, not as a punishment resulting in corporeal (and social) discomfort of the penitent, as from a belief that fasting and the control of ones diet contributed to spiritual health. In the early lists of sins, gluttony was the first sin to be overcome in the spiritual quest of the monk and it was not an accident that Evagrius and Cassian placed gluttony in the most prominent place in the catalogue of sinful thoughts. However, the body was thought to be far from purely evil; it was important to sustain its physiological function while eschewing over-indulgence and its diet was not only to provide for physical health, but to improve its spiritual well-being. Penance itself was an exercise of the body. As Hill notes, "the association of gluttony with drinking and hurtful speech ... can be found in nascent form in Cassian and Gregory" (Hill 2007: 66)

The connection is especially recurrent in Anglo-Saxon poetry when it comes to the depiction of sinful life in the hall. Gluttony and drunkenness violate the norms of social life and cause boisterous behaviour. The connection is particularly prominent in *Vainglory*, where these transgression are identified with the behaviour of warriors feasting in

halls and also occurs in the scene of Belshazzar's feast concluding *Daniel.* The connection is obvious enough, as drunkenness generally leads to verbal abuses, like those of Unferth directed at Beowulf when the latter has arrived at Heorot, but was particularly relevant to a community fond of heroic poetry and, therefore, was readily picked up and emphasised in religious, non-heroic, Old English poetry. But overindulgence, first and foremost, violates the spiritual health of an individual, which depends on the unity of the soul and body, the balance between the two being achieved through the acts penance. The poem transmits the ideology of fasting not only as a way of remitting sins, but also as a way of life.

3.5. Conclusion

The penitential themes in later Old English poetry testify to the traditional nature of Anglo-Saxon vernacular literature. By studying penitential poems it is possible to see how poetry co-operated with other, especially homiletic discourses. The older and more traditional sources of alliterative metre are adapted to express new themes. The idea of heroic comitatus was employed for the formation of one's identity as a member of the larger Christian community. The Christian participates in the cosmic spiritual struggle through acts of the body, not only through participatng in violence like in the *Miles Christi* theme, but also through acts of penance. Acts of penance make it possible to maintain the hierarchy of *ratio* over *sensus corporis animalis*; thereby saving the soul from the sins of pride, gluttony and avarice; sins which destroy the integrity of one's body and soul essential in the earthly state of existence. Moreover, the proper acts of the body condition the soul's membership to the body of Christ.

Conclusion

This study has tried to show how specific ideologies behind the notions of what constituted sin and morality were used to construct ideas of what values founded Christian community and how an individual should exist in, or be a part of, this community in Anglo-Saxon poetry. Traditions were enlivened in Old English poetic texts to propose a vision of an idealised Christian society and how it was to be achieved and maintained. As such Old English poetry became a new medium for promulgating Christian values. These values were based on a Christian morality required new ideals for the proper formation of a new type of community and its spiritual reform. Within this the traditional conception of a hero and a king was changed to embrace the virtue of humility, which underscored the heroic concept of loyalty. These works also took the concept of *Miles Christi* and reworked the heroic ideology and used in poetic texts to assimilate and reshape the ideal of an individual. The penitential themes found across the corpus of Old English poetry also drew upon the heroic conception of individual.

The study has explored the ways in which moral discourses shaped the ideas on individual and Christian community in a few later Anglo-Saxon texts. These texts are based on the moral ideals that had found their expression in earlier heroic poetry and religious verse. They are relevant to the models for moral behaviour and were vital for Anglo-Saxon culture and how they were influenced by the ideals of heroic individualism and ideal of Christian community. It has been shown that in the case of all the poems and texts discussed there is one theme underlying all of them and that is the reconciliation between the Germanic past of the Anglo-Saxons with the Christian faith of their cultural present. First of all, the theme of *ofermod* in Old English poetry is depicted as a threat to the harmony of social life, which is based on its members' adher-

ence to the values of loyalty and obedience. Hence, pride in Anglo-Saxon poetry is represented in a way, which is different to Latin ideas on *superbia* typical of Latin Fathers like St. Augustine or Gregory the Great. In Latin early medieval texts, the sin of pride is often juxtaposed with the virtue of humility. In Old English poetry, the sin of pride, however, is contrasted with loyalty and obedience, which are the chief values of Germanic heroic code. Secondly, the idea of *Miles Christi* made it possible for Anglo-Saxon poets to reconcile the heroic values with the Christian conception of moral life. The language of military warfare was used by them to represent metaphorically the idealised Christian individual's life of virtue. Thirdly, the penitential themes in Old English religious verse also convey Christian values in heroic verse. The so-called penitential motif, found in *Christ III* and a number of Anglo-Saxon homilies, evokes the heroic notion of honour. If in the heroic culture honour lies at the foundations of social relationships and is an incentive to moral behaviour, then in Christian religious verse, the concept of honour is used to warn against sin as a deed, which would earn the believer shame before God and other members of Christian community.

The theme of *ofermod* in Old English poetry appropriated the Germanic tradition and transmitted representations of Christian community. This is shown in a number of Old English poetic texts, where *ofermod* and loyalty are used to form an ethos for different communities and individuals, within those communities. In the age of the Viking invasions, the ideas of *ofermod* and *Miles Christi* were revived again in *The Battle of Maldon*. The poem commemorates the heroic death of the Earl Byrhtnoth and his followers, who perished in 991 A.D. at the hands of the Vikings. In this work, entitled by modern editors *The Battle of Maldon,* Byrhtnoth is described as being excessively *ofermod* "proud" when he allows the Viking the passage over the causeway and invites them to an open attack. Surprisingly, *ofermod* seems to have changed its meaning. In contrast to Satanic *superbia*, Byrhtnoth's *ofermod* seems to share positive connotations of heroic pride. If the Christianised sense of *ofermod* in, for example, *Genesis B* and *Daniel,* as discussed earlier, implied a disintegration of bonds between society and proud individual, and the dissolution of the earthly power with its Christian duties, the poem may well restore the significance of *ofermod* as a cohesive quality that integrates the bonds in a strictly heroic and military community.

Ofermod, or *oferhygd*, is a damnable sin in Old English poetry and leads to inevitable spiritual death, unless one corrects oneself and converts to humility as Nebu-

chadnezzar did in *Daniel*. However, Byrhtnoth, in *The Battle of Maldon*, is never damned in the theological sense. His behaviour does not indicate foolish pride. The hero does not suffer from the kind of *superbia* that threatens the spiritual warrior either. Also, the poem is not concerned with a psychological process; its characters are static and stick either to virtue and obedience or to disloyalty and shame without any change of heart. After he allows the Vikings passage across the bridge, Byrhtnoth invites them to a military clash, but assumes honourable humility: "Nu eow is gerymed, gað ricene to us, guman to guþe. God ana wat hwa þære wælstowe wealdan mote", 'now room is made for you, come, warriors, to us, men to war. It is only God, who knows who will hold the sway over this battle-field' (*The Battle of Maldon* ll. 93-95)[162]. In the poem, the word *ofermod* occurs with other words and formulations concerning the heroic frame of mind and it is not an isolated expression when it comes to the characterisation of the heroes. The ethics of the poem are strictly heroic. Unlike in *Beowulf,* there is no clash between the secular heroic values and Christian faith, because the interests of the poem are primarily military and political. In *Beowulf*, there is a clash between the Satanic *oferhygd* of Heremod and Beowulf's *wlenco,* the second of which is the desired elements in the hero's character. The conception of *ofermod* in the *Maldon,* therefore, mirrors the conception of *wlenco* in *Beowulf.* In *The Battle of Maldon, ofermod* was given a meaning it may have had before Christianisation.

The Battle of Maldon, then, Christianises the heroic code and the conflict between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes is depicted as participating in the eternal conflict between Christ and Satan. In Old English poetry, ideas on Christian morality were grafted onto the pagan ideals of Germanic heroic society. In *Maldon*, *ofermod* may well have been used instead of *wlanc*, because in the social world of Old English heroic poetry, the individual is never asked to be humble. In Old English poetry, *ofermod* is not conceived in opposition to humility as *superbia* is in the writings of St. Augustine of Hippo and other Latin fathers. It is, rather, opposed to disloyalty to group. Heremod in *Beowulf,* when accused of *oferhygd* by Hrothgar, is not imagined as rebelling against the Creator, who is often spoken about by the pagan characters in the poem. He rises above his peers and commits fratricide and becomes an exile as a result. The theme of

[162] Henceforth indicated as *The Battle of Maldon* followed by verse number. All quotations are from Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (ed.). 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon minor poems.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press. All translation from Old English into modern English are mine.

ofermod, then, was so recurrent in Old English poetry, because heroic individualism was a central idea in the representations of society in Old English poetry. This is why Satan in *Genesis B* is such an attractive figure and, despite his being condemned in the poem, is depicted as a tragic and pitiful figure not unlike the speaker of *The Wanderer*.

This also means that in the poetic tradition, *ofermod* was different than the patristic tradition of *superbia* and it is not possible to treat the latter as an origin for the former. This implies that Anglo-Saxon culture should also be treated independently from patristic tradition of Latin fathers and in its own terms as a discrete cultural entity. *Beowulf,* discussed in Chapter One, testifies to Anglo-Saxons' awareness that they had originated in pagan heroic culture on the continent and had important ideological reason to remember about these ties. Royal genealogies in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle resemble the one found at the beginning of *Beowulf.* This tension between the pagan past and Christian present is best illustrated by two phenomena of Anglo-Saxon culture: firstly the genealogies found in Anglo-Saxon chronicles and secondly in the condemnations of idolatry found in homiletic and jurist texts. The genealogy of king Aethelwulf of Wessex names Woden, the Germanic pagan god, as one of his ancestors (*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* [1996] 1997: 66). Woden, however, does not really figure as a god in this genealogy but as a descendant of Adam. The genealogy may be found in the Winchester Manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, the entry for the year 855: "and that Athelwulf was Egbert's offspring, Egbert Ealhmund's offspring ...Baeldaeg Woden's offspring... Itermon Hrathra's offspring – he was born in the ark: Noah, Lamech, Methuselah, Enoch, Jared, Mahalaleel, Cainan, Enos, Seth, Adam *the first man, and our father who is Christ. Amen*" (*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* [1996] 1997: 66).

Another text written around the same time shares with royal genealogies in the enthusiasm about the heathen past and repudiates the pagan roots of Anglo-Saxons. Wulfstan's *Sermon of False Gods* is measured against idolatry in general and against the veneration of Germanic deities in particular. It is a late Anglo-Saxon text dated to the early eleventh century. In this sermon, Wulfstan gives a historical outline of idolatry and begins with the biblical account of Nimrod building the tower of Babel. Wulfstan says that pagan gods, which heathen nations worship, used to be people recognised as divine beings through devil's influence: "þas manfullan men þe we ymbe specað wæron getealde for ða mærostan godas þa on ðam dagum, þa haðenan wurðodon hy swyðe þurh deofles lare" 'these evil men, which we are talking about, were taken for mighty

gods of their days and the pagans honoured them because of the teaching of the devil' (*De Falsis Dies* 222-223)[163]. In times of invasions in the tenth and early eleventh century, the revival of idolatry was considered to pose a serious danger to Anglo-Saxon Christianity. When the Danish King Cnut ascended to the English throne in 1016, he not only recognised the former English laws, but also their faith in one true God. In political terms, this faith sanctioned the exercise of power. In *Cnut's Letter to the People of England* (1019—1020), he says: "I inform you that I will be a gracious lord and a faithful observer of God's rights and just secular law" (*English Historical Documents* 1955: 415). The faith makes for one's membership to the community of the faithful and, in political terms, one's exercise of powers over the state. His law-code *1 Cnut* from between 1020-1023 prohibits heathen practice: "we earnestly forbid every heathen practice. It is heathen practice if one worships idols, namely if one worships heathen gods and the sun or the moon, fire or flood, wells and stones or any kind of forest trees, or if one practices witchcraft or encompasses death by any mean, either by sacrifice or divination, or takes any part in such delusions" (*English Historical Documents* 1955: 420).

These texts testify to the tension between the pagan tradition and Christian ideals, which continued until the twilight of the Anglo-Saxon period. Although in regal lists, the individual's right to hold the kingly sway comes from the fact that he inherits it from the ancient, therefore pagan, ancestors, the continuance of community as a cohesive whole depends on its following the Christian faith. This tension between pagan and Christian values was reconciled through poetic imagination, its ideas, language and form. In Chapter Two it was shown that *Juliana, Andreas* and *Judith*, among other literary pieces of the period, re-invented the ancient heroic diction, which became a tool for transcribing Christian ideals in heroic verse. The language of conflict and warfare was adopted to depict an idealised individual's spiritual existence in his or her relation to society and culture in the period of transition from pagan to Christian values. In poetry, heroic ideals were transmuted by the *Miles Christi* theme which made them embody new values and significations. Thus the concept of *Miles Christi* reinvented the idea of *hostis antiquus*, the ancient enemy, as seen in *Judith*, a Christian heroic lay. In *Juliana, hostis antiquus* is imagined to embody the sins that implicate individuals in heroic society in lust, avarice and pride. *Andreas*, based on apostolic legend, ideologises warfare

[163] The quotation is taken from Dorothy Bethurum' edition of Wulfstan's homilies. Dorothy Bethurum (ed.). [1957] 1998. *The Homilies of Wulfstan.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Translation mine.

and conquest as a means for conversion from idolatry. The theme of *Miles Christi* as it was used in Old English poetry was not only persistently present, but also informed ideologies of violence and warfare.

Of course, heroic ideals were not merely appropriated by Christian culture. Heroic diction in the later Old English poetry subverts itself; the friction between the Christian values expressed in the motif of spiritual conflict and physical violence and warfare is reflected in poetic diction itself. It entails a critique of heroic ideals, in the light of the new religion, and gauges them against Christian values. The antagonists of *Juliana*, *Andreas* and *Judith* are often depicted in heroic terms in order to provide a critique of the heroic vision of life. Affricanus, Heliseus and Holofernes are depicted as an inversion of heroic ideals and represent vices like greed and pride. Similarly, the Mermedonians in *Andreas* and Assyrians in *Judith* represent the inversion of heroic society.

Ancient ideas are used to inform the newer concept of an individual and his, or her, place within the Christian community. In devotional poetry, the Judgment Day theme is used to build the conception of an individual. As far as the three penitential poems discussed in Chapter Three, *Christ III*, *Judgment Day II* and *Soul and Body* are concerned, the emotional and psychological impact in them is achieved through the idea of sin as preventing one from joining the community of saints. The subjective voice behind the texts of Old English devotional poetry, as well as their addressees, is the sinner and penitent. *Christ III* uses the heroic concept of honour, which underlies its penitential mood and theme, as a foundation for Christian morality. *Judgment Day II* and *Soul and Body* are poems, which encode the anxieties over the transitory embodiment of the human soul within the body and give voice to different, Christian and folk ideas centring on the dichotomy between the soul and the body.

It may seem that late devotional poetry exhibits the preoccupation of poets and the Church authorities with the idea of poetical works as a cure to one's soul and that their chief focus is on the individual, not community. They give no voice to earlier poets' preoccupations with *superbia* and the ideology of *Miles Christi* as a model for a new Christian community. However, the penitential themes in this poetry also performed important ideological work, which was socially cohesive. This is best exemplified by the penitential motif, which depicts Judgment Day as a day of shame for the sinful, who will be humiliated before God, and three hosts, for all the sins committed during their lives. This penitential motif was recurrent in homiletic texts, and as was

shown in chapter 3, formed the central image in *Christ III*, and was underscored by heroic values.

It may not go unnoticed that in tenth century Anglo-Saxon England the motif was not a mere poetic embellishment in prose and poetry. On the contrary, this motif was also embraced by Anglo-Saxon liturgy. The *ordo confessionis* instructed a confessor how to hear confession and is found in "Scrift Boc" and "Penitential", the most important penitential handbooks in Anglo-Saxon England. The *ordo* was more than just a preparation for the sinner to undergo the proper confession. In ages, when the conversion into Christianity was far from complete, confession followed the guided dialogue between the confessor and the penitent, whose aim was to instruct the penitent in the rudiments of faith. After the instruction, the priest is supposed to encourage the sinner to confess sincerely even the most serious sins and to relieve the stress and embarrassment the penitent was exposed to during the act of confession by a consolatory remark that "betere ðe is þæt ðe sceamige nu her beforan me anum yrmicge þonne eft on domes dæge beforan Gode, þær hefenwaru and eorðwaru and helwaru beoð ealle ætsomne", 'it is better for you to be ashamed now before me than again on the Judgment Day before God, when the heavenly host, the earthly host, and the hellish host will be assembled' (*Ordo* 171) [164]. The penitential motif, which appears in *Christ III*, became an element of liturgy as it had an appeal from a community characterised by adherence to heroic conception of existence, for which shame and honour were underlying values. This shows that honour was a value, which was essential to Anglo-Saxon morality and therefore it underscored not only poetic representations but also ideals found in liturgy. Anglo-Saxon church and its authorities appealed to the heroic conception of life to teach the Christian notion of moral life. Old English penitential and devotional poetry maintained the moral tradition of the Germanic ancestors of the Anglo-Saxons to render Christian moral vision of life appealing.

On the whole, images of *superbia*, *Miles Christi* and the penitential themes in Old English poetry create identities of membership to a community based on heroic ideals. In various texts, they participate in evaluating the pagan past of the Anglo-Saxons and made it possible to construct new ideals of what constituted an individual and a communities for the edification of the Anglo-Saxon audiences. The Old English

[164] All quotations from the *ordo* come from Robert Spindler. 1934. *Das altenglische bussbuch*. Leipzig: Verlag von Bernhard Tauchnitz. All translations from Old English to modern English are mine.

texts acquired and transmitted meaning through their participation in other discourses, that is, through their intertextuality. As such the peculiar intertextuality of Old English poetry and culture is essential in revealing the full richness of these meanings. Nowadays, frozen in manuscript, they imply no voice of the author and no response of the audiences to which they were addressed. But they do imply tradition(s). Their meaning was, and may still be activated by their reliance on other texts, to which their production was a response, and the response they generated in later texts. The knowledge on how Anglo-Saxon culture drew upon tradition (or traditions) in order to establish foundations for its continuity gives the contemporary readers of Old English texts a far deeper understanding of this culture and its place, not just in, but through history.

Streszczenie rozprawy

Ta rozprawa doktorska pt: „Grzech w poezji staroangielskieg: próba analizy poetyki tropologicznej" dotyczy pojęcia grzechu i moralności w poezji okresu staro-angielskiego. Jej celem jest analiza wybranych tekstów poetyckich w kontekście kultury anglosaskiej i teologii kościoła staro-angielskiego. Przedstawienia literackie moralności i grzechu w literaturze staro-angielskiej są złożone ze względu na rozmaitość tradycji literackich i trendów, które nakładały się na siebie w literaturze okresu wczesnego angielskiego średniowiecza. W okresie Chrystianizacji, Anglo-Sasom, którzy byli narodem o korzeniach pogańskich, zaszczepiono wartości zgodne z nauką Kościoła Chrześcijańskiego. Nałożenie na siebie wartości Chrześcijańskich i pogańskich znalazło najgłębszy wyraz w poezji staro-angielskiej.

Motywem literackim, który najciekawiej obrazuje różnice kulturowe wynikające ze starcia się tradycji pogańskiej z Chrześcijaństwem, jest grzech pychy. Staro-angielskie słowo *ofermod* było odpowiednikiem łacińskiego pojęcia *superbia,* pycha. Grzech pychy jest głównym tematem trzech wierszy omawianych w rozdziale pierwszym, *Genesis B, Danielu* i *Beowulfie*. *Genesis B* jest studium grzechu Szatana. Konflikt pomiędzy Szatanem a Bogiem w wierszu jest obrazowany w ramach kultury heroicznej. Bóg sportretowany jest jako ziemski władca za pomocą wojennej metaforyki tego wiersza, który skazuje Szatana na wygnanie z nieba, przedstawionego jako twierdza, do piekła, jako kara dla Szatana za bunt i nieposłuszeństwo. W *Genesis B* pycha jest sprzężona z wartościami germańskiej kultury heroicznej jako wada, która niszczy porządek społeczny oparty na hierarchii i posłuszeństwie. Następnym wierszem, który traktuje o grzechu pychy, jest *Daniel* oparty na starotestamentowej księdze Daniela. Tematem dzieła jest grzech popełniony przez zbiorowość i wynikający zeń *translatio*

imperii, czyli utrata władzy i przekazanie jej przez Boga wrogowi jako kara dla narodu. Pycha Hebrajczyków doprowadza do ich niewoli Babilońskiej. W odróżnieniu od wersji biblijnej, głównym bohaterem jest jednak król Babilończyków, Nabuchodonozor, a nie Daniel i Hebrajczycy. Wiersz jest studium jego pychy. Nie jest on jednak ziemskim odpowiednikiem Szatana. W wierszu, Nabuchodonozor, po swoim nawróceniu na wiarę i uleczeniu swej duszy, staje się wzorem idealnego władcy. Staro-angielski *Daniel* jest wykładnią moralną na temat grzechu pychy, który zagraża Chrześcijańskiemu pojęciu sprawowania władzy. W podobny sposób zagadnienie grzechu pychy poruszone jest *Beowulfie.* Główny bohater eposu heroicznego, Beowulf, otrzymuje lekcję moralną od duńskiego króla Hrothgara, który poucza go o niebezpieczeństwach, które pycha przynosi władzy królewskiej.

Drugi rozdział porusza tematykę *Miles Christi,* czyli żołnierza Chrystusa w trzech poematach, w *Julianie* Cynewulfa, *Legendzie o św. Andrzeju Apostole* i w *Judycie*. Metaforyka *Miles Christi* była bardzo popularna w poezji staro-agielskiej. W poezji anglosaskiej, w figurze *Miles Christi* najściślej dokonuje się synteza germańskich wartości Heroicznych z Chrześcijańską nauką o moralności. W *Julianie* Cynewulfa, tytułowa św. Juliana jest zmuszana przez jej ojca Affrykanusa do zamążpójścia z Heliseusem, poganinem. Kiedy odmawia, decydując się zostać dziewicą i poświęcając swoje życie Jezusowi Chrystusowi, zostaje poddana torturom i wtrącona do więzienia. W więzieniu jest poddana dalszej próbie; nawiedza ją diabeł z zamierzeniem przywiedzenia Juliany na drogę grzechu. Juliana nie ustępuje kuszeniu i trwa cnocie. Następnego dnia po wielogodzinnych torturach zostaje stracona. Staro-angielska *Legenda o św. Andrzeju Apostole* opowiada o jego misji do Mermedonii, krainy zamieszkanych przez ludożerców opętanych przez diabła. Jego misja ma dwa cele. Po pierwsze musi on uwolnić uwięzionego na wyspie św. Mateusza ewangelistę. Po drugie musi on wybawić z grzechu Mermedonian, którzy są poganami. Występuje on przeciwko poganom i zostaje fizycznie pokonany. Jednakże konflikt zbrojny pomiędzy nim a Mermedonami jest obrazowany jako konflikt duchowy pomiędzy cnotą a grzechem. Andrzej zostaje pokonany fizycznie, ale zwycięża duchowo. W następstwie tegoż zwycięstwa dokonuje się cud. Bóg zsyła na ziemię Mermedonów potop, którzy niszczy cały naród. Kiedy wody spływają, Mermedonowie w sposób równie cudowny zmartwychwstają nawróceni na wiarę i wyrzekają się Szatana. Poemat *Judith* jest z kolei oparty na biblijnej księdze Judyty. Staro-angielska *Judith* ma cechy gatunkowe hagiografii, gdyż bohaterka jest

sportretowana jako *Miles Christi*, natomiast konflikt zbrojny pomiędzy Asyryjczykami i Betulianami jest obrazowany jako konflikt duchowy pomiędzy cnotą a grzechem. Wielki wpływ na wiersz miała tradycja hermeneutyczna pism ojców kościoła, która traktowała Judytę jako symbol cnoty czystości i Holofernesa jako symbol grzechu pychy.

Rozdział trzeci traktuje o wpływie, jaki sakrament pokuty kształtujący się we wczesnym średniowieczu miał na tradycję wernakularnej poezji religijnej okresu staro-angielskiego. Prywatna forma pokuty dokonywana przez osobistą spowiedź wiernego u kapłana powstała w Irlandii w siódmym wieku. Ta forma pokuty została przyjęta we Francji w okresie Renesansu Karolińskiego w ósmym wieku. W wieku dziewiątym i dziesiątym była powszechną praktyką w Anglii. W tym okresie istniały dwie formy pokuty: pokuta publiczna nałożona na pokutnika jako zadośćuczynienie dla grzechów skandalicznych i niebezpiecznych dla społeczności oraz pokuta prywatna za grzechy lżejsze. Pokuta publiczna należała do prerogatywów biskupa diecezji i można było ją odbyć jedynie raz w życiu w okresie wielkiego postu. Pokuta prywatna była prerogatywem zwyczajnych księży i można było ją powtarzać dowolną ilość razy w życiu. W korpusie poezji staro-angielskiej jest jeden wiersz, *Christ III*, który zawiera wzmiankę o spowiedzi świętej. Morał tego wiersza, który pojawia się w wierszu jako gnom, można streścić następująco: lepiej jest zawstydzić się swoim grzechem w tym życiu przed jedną osobą (spowiednikiem) niż zostać zhańbionym za grzechy niewyspowiadane w dniu sądu ostatecznego przed Bogiem, wszystkimi aniołami, wszystkimi ludźmi i wszystkim diabłami. Motyw ten znany jest krytykom literatury staro-angielskiej jako „motyw pokuty". W poezji anglosaskiej występuje tylko raz, w *Christ III*. Natomiast bardzo często pojawia się w staro-angielskich homiliach i pismach o charakterze liturgicznym. W rozdziale trzecim, *Christ III* jest analizowany pod kątem tematu pokuty. Innym wierszem analizowanym w rozdziale trzecim jest staro-angielski *Judgment Day II* datowany na dziesiąty wiek, który jest tłumaczeniem łacińskiego wiersza *Dzień Sądu* autorstwa Czcigodnego Bedy z ósmego wieku. W wierszu tym, podobnie jak w *Christ III,* temat pokuty poruszony jest w nawiązaniu do opisu dnia sądu ostatecznego. Trzeci wiersz omawiany w tym rozdziale, *Soul and Body*, stanowi monolog potępionej duszy wymierzony w jej grzeszne ciało. Tematem tego wiersza są grzechy ciała, nieczystość i obżarstwo.

Podstawowe wnioski, który wypływają z przeprowadzonej analizy dziewięciu wierszy, dotyczą wpływu kultury i teologii patrystycznej na poezję anglosaską. Trady-

cje germańskie w poezji staro-angielskiej były bardzo silne i nigdy nie zostały wyparte przez wpływy Chrześcijańskie. Poeci staro-angielscy użyli wernakularnych środków wyrazu dla wyrażenia ideologii Chrześcijańskiej. Przedłożona praca doktorska pokazuje, że chrześcijańska moralność w anglosaskich dziełach poetyckich jest często obrazowana przez pryzmat germańskich wartości heroicznych. Po pierwsze, najczęściej pojawiający się grzech w poezji staro-angielskiej, pycha, jawi się jako zagrożenie dla życia społeczności, dla której naczelnymi wartościami są wartości heroiczne. Pycha przedstawiana jest w poezji staro-angielskiej inaczej niż w pismach Ojców Kościoła, np. św. Augustyna czy Grzegorza Wielkiego. W tekstach patrystycznych pycha przeciwstawiana jest najczęściej cnocie skromności. W poezji staro-angielskiej natomiast przeciwwagę dla pychy stanowi lojalność, która w kulturze heroiczną stanowi podstawę trwałości związków międzyludzkich. Po drugie, metaforyka *Miles Christi* umożliwia ukazanie wartości heroicznych typowych dla poezji wernakularnej w świetle wartości chrześcijańskich. Po trzecie, poezja religijna poruszająca problematykę pokuty także odwołuje się do tradycyjnych wartości heroicznych. Tak zwany „penitentials motif" opisany w rozdziale trzecim odwołuje się do wartości heroicznych, przede wszystkim honoru. O ile w kulturze heroicznej honor jest podstawą relacji społecznych i przyczynkiem dla moralnego zachowania jest chęć zachowania twarzy przed władcą, to w poezji religijnej honor nakazuje wiernemu zachować twarz przed Stwórcą przez życie w cnocie i opieranie się kuszeniu i grzechowi.

References

Abraham, Leonore MacGaffey. [1978] 2001. “Cynewulf’s Juliana: a case at law”, in: Robert Bjork (ed.). *The Cynewulf reader.* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England.) Routledge: New York, 171-192.

Aldhelm. 1985. *The poetic works.* (Tranlated by Michale Lapidge and James L. Rosier.) Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Ambrose. 1961. *Saint Ambrose: Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*. (Translated by John J. Savage.) New York: Fathers of the Church, INC.

Anderson, Earl R. 1986. “*The Battle of Maldon*: a reappraisal of possible sources, date, and theme” in: Phylls Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton and Fred C. Robinson (eds). *Modes of interpretation in Old English literature.* Toronto: Univerreesity of Toronto Press, 247-272.

Anderson, Earl R. 1987. “Style and theme in the Old English *Daniel*”, *English studies* 68:1, 1-23.

Arbesmann, Rudolf. 1954. “The concept of ‘Christus Medicus’ in St. Augustine” *Traditio* 10, 1-28.

Astell, A. W. 1989. “Holofernes’ head: *tacen* and teaching in the Old English *Judith*”, *Anglo-Saxon England* 18, 117-133.

Auerbach, Erich. [1959] 1984. *Scenes from the drama of European literature.* (Theory and History of Literature 9.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Augustine. 1990. *On genesis. Two books on genesis against the Manichees and on the literal interpretation of genesis, an unfinished book.* (The Fathers of the Church 84.) (Translated by Roland J. Teske.) Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

Augustine. [1992] 1998. *Confessions.* (Translated by Henry Chadwick.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Augustine. 2003. *The City of God.* (Translated by Henry Bettenson.) London: Penguin Books.

Barker, Chris and Dariusz Galasiński. 2001. *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and identity.* London: SAGE Publications.

Barker, Chris. 2004. *The SAGE dictionary of cultural studies.* London: SAGE Publications.

Bede. [1969] 1999. *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* (Edited and translated by Judith McClure and Roger Collins.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bede. 1973. "Concerning figures and tropes" (Translated by Gussie Hecht Tannenhaus.) in: Joseph M. Miller, Michael H. Prosser and Thomas W. Benson (eds.). *Readings in medieval rhetoric.* Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 96-122.

Bede. 1999. *The reckoning of time.* (Translated Texts for Historians 29.) (Translated by Faith Wallis.) Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Bede. 2008. *On Ezra and Nehemiah.* (Translated Texts for Historians 47.) (Translated by Scott DeGreorio.) Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Bede. 2008. *On Genesis.* (Translated Texts for Historians 48.) (Translated by Calvin B. Kendall.) Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Bedingfield, Brad. 2002. "Public penance in Anglo-Saxon England", *Anglo-Saxon England* 31 , 223-255.

Belanoff, Patricia A. 1993. "*Judith:* sacred and secular heroine", in: Helen Damico and John Leyerle (eds.). *Heroic poetry in the Anglo-Saxon period. Studies in honour of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr.* (Studies in Medieval Culture XXXII.) Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 247-264.

Benedict of Nursia. 2008. *The rule of Benedict.* London: Penguin Books.

Berkhout, C. T. and J. F. Doubleday. 1973. "The net in Judith", *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 74, 630-4.

Bethurum, Dorothy (ed.). [1957] 1998. *The Homilies of Wulfstan.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Biblia Sacra Vulgata. [1969] 2007. (Edited by Robert Weber and Roger Gryson.) (The fifth edition.) Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Biggs, Frederick M. 1989-1990. The fourfold division of souls: the Old English *Christ III* and the insular homiletic tradition", *Traditio* 45, 35-51.

Bjork, Robert E. 1980. "Oppressed Hebrews and the Song of Azarias in OE Daniel", *Studies in Philology* 77:3, 213-226.

Blake N. F. 1965. "*The Battle of Maldon*", *Neophilologus* 49, 332-345.

Bliss, Alan and Allan J. Frantzen. 1976. "Integrity of *Resignation*", *The Review of English Studies* 27, 385-402.

Bloomfield, Morton W. [1949-1951] 1963. "*Beowulf* and Christian allegory: an interpretation of Unferth" in: Lewis E. Nicholson. *Anthology of* Beowulf *criticism.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 155-164.

Bloomfield, Morton W. [1952] 1967. *The seven deadly sins. An introduction to the history of the religious concept, with special reference to medieval English literature.* Michigan State University Press.

Bloomfield, Morton W. 1969. "Beowulf, Byrhtnoth, and the judgment of God: trial by combat in Anglo-Saxon England", *Speculum* 44:4, 545-559.

Boethius. 1999. *The Consolation of Philosophy.* (Translated by P. G. Walsh.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bolintineanu, Alexandra. 2009. "The land of Mermedonia in the Old English *Andreas*", *Neophilologus* 93, 149-164.

Borysławski, Rafał. 2010. "Between *oferhygd* and *wraeclastas*: Pride and exile in the speculatice afterlife of *Christ and Satan*", *Medieval English Mirror* 7, 21-30.

Bosse, Roberta Bux and Norman D. Hinton. 1990. "Cynewulf and apocalyptic vision", *Neophilologus* 74, 279-293.

Bosworth, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller (eds.). 1882. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brooks, Kenneth (ed.). 1961. *Andreas and the fates of the apostles.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Brown, Peter 1988. *The body and society: Men, women and sexual renunciation in early Christianity.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, Phyllis Rugg-Georgia Ronan Crampton-Fred C. Robinson. 1986. *Modes of interpretation in Old English literature: Essays in honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bugge, John. 2006. "Virginity and prophecy in *Daniel*", *English Studies* 87:2, 127-147.

Burchmore-Oldrieve, Susan. 1985. “Traditional exegesis and the question of guilt in the OE *Genesis B*”, *Traditio* 41, 117-44.

Burns, J. H. 1988. “Introduction”, in: J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval political Thought c. 350-1450.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-9.

Busse, W. G. and R. Holtei. 1965. “*The Battle of Maldon:* a historical, heroic and political poem”, *Neophilologus* 49, 614-621.

Bzdyl, Donald G. [1985] 2001. “*Juliana*: Cynewulf’s dispeller of delusion” in: Robert Bjork (ed.). *The Cynewulf reader.* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England.) Routledge: New York, 193-206.

Caie, Graham D. 1978. “The Old English *Daniel:* a warning against pride”, *English Studies* 59, 1-9.

Caie, Graham D. 2000. *The Old English poem* Judgment Day II. London: D.S. Brewer.

Calder, Daniel G. 1973. “The art of Cynewulf’s *Juliana*”, *Modern Language Quarterly* 34:4, 355-371.

Calder, Daniel G. 1986. “Figurative language and its context in *Andreas*: a study in medieval expressionism” in: Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton and Fred C. Robinson (eds.). *Modes of interpretation in Old English poetry. Essays in honour of Stanley B. Greenfield.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 115-136.

Campbell, Jackson J. 1971. “Schematic technique in *Judith*”, *ELH* 38:2, 155-172.

Cassian, John. 2000. *The institutes.* (Translated by Boniface Ramsey, O.P.) New York: The Newman Press.

Chadwick, Henry. 2004. “Augustine” in: Frances Young, Lewis Ayres and Andrew Louth (eds.). *The Cambridge history of early Christian literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 328-341.

Chamberlain, David. 1975. “*Judith:* a fragmentary and political poem” in: Lewis E. Nicholson and Dolores Warwick Frese (eds.). *Anglo-Saxon poetry. Essays in appreciation.* Notre Dame and London: Notre Dame University Press, 135-159.

Chase, Christopher. 1980. “*Christ III, The Dream of the Rood* and early Christian Passion imagery”, *Viator* 11, 11-33.

Cherewatuk, Karen. 1986. “Standing, turning, twisting, falling: posture and moral stance in *Genesis B*”, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 87, 537-544.

Chickering, Howell. 2009. “Poetic exuberance in the Old English *Judith*”, *Studies in Philology* 106:2, 119-136.

Clayton, Mary. 2000. “Homiliaries and preaching in Anglo-Saxon England” in: Paul E. Szarmach. *Old English prose: Basic readings.* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England.) New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc, 151-198.

Clemoes, Peter. [1995] 2006. *Interactions of thought and language in Old English poetry.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 12.) Cambridge: Cambrdidge University Press.

Connor, Patrick W. 2001. “On dating Cynewulf” in: Robert E. Bjork (ed.). *The Cynewulf reader.* New York and London: Routledge.

Corrigan, Kevin. 2009. *Evagrius and Gregory: Mind, soul and body in the 4th century.* Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Cross, J. E. 1996. *Two Old English Apocrypha and their manuscript source.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 19.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cubitt, Catherine. 2006. “Bishops, priest and penance in late Anglo-Saxon England”, *Early Medieval Europe* 14:1, 41-63.

Damico, Helen and John Leyerle (eds.). 1993. *Heroic poetry in the Anglo-Saxon period: studies in honor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr.* Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications.

Davis, Glenn. 2008. “Corporeal anxiety in *Soul and Body II*”, *Philological Quarterly* 87, 33-50.

De Lacy Paul. 1996. “Aspects of Christianisation and cultural adaptation in the OE Judith”, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97, 393-410.

Dobbie, Elliot van Kirk (ed.). 1953. *Beowulf and Judith.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 4.) New York: Columbia University Press.

Dobbie, Elliott van Kirk (ed.). 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon minor poems.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.) New York: Columbia University Press.

Dockray-Miller, Mary. 1998. “Female community in the Old English *Judith*”, *Studia Neophilologica* 70, 165-172.

Doubleday, J. F. 1971. “The principle of contrast in *Judith*”, *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 72, 436-441.

Earl, James. 1980. “Typological Structure of Andreas” in: John D. Niles (ed.). *Old English Literature in Context*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 66-89.

Elliott, Ralph W. V. [1953] 2001a. “Cynewulf’s runes in *Christ II* and *Elene*” in: Robert E. Bjork (ed.). *The Cynewulf reader.* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England.) New York and London: Routledge, 281-292.

Elliott, Ralph W. V. [1953] 2001b. “Cynewulf’s runes in *Juliana* and *The Fates of the Apostles*” in: Robert E. Bjork (ed.). *The Cynewulf reader.* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England.) New York and London: Routledge, 293-308.

English historical documents c. 500-1042. 1955. (Edited by Dorothy Whitelock.) London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Ericksen, Janet Schrunk. 2005. “Legalising the Fall of man”, *Medium Aevum* 74.2, 205-220.

Evagrius of Pontus. 2003. *The Greek Ascetic Corpus*. (Translated by Robert E. Sinkewicz.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, J. T. 1963a. “*Genesis B* and its background”, *The Review of English Studies* 54, 1-16.

Evans, J. T. 1963b. “*Genesis B* and its background: conclusion”, *The Review of English Studies* 54, 1-16.

Fabiszak, Małgorzata and Anna Hebda. 2010. “Cognitive historical approaches to emotions: Pride” in: Margaret E. Winters, Heli Tissari and Kathryn Allan (eds.). *Historical cognitive linguistics.* (Cognitive Linguistic Research 47.) Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Fanger, Claire. 1991. “Miracle as prophetic gospel: knowledge and power and the design in *Daniel*”, *English Studies* 72:2, 123-135.

Farrell, R. T (ed.). 1974. *Daniel and Azarias.* London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Fee, Christopher. 1997. “*Judith* and the rhetoric of heroism in Anglo-Saxon England”, *English Studies* 78:5, 401-406.

Fergusson, Mary Heyward. 1970. “The structure of the *Soul’s Address to the Body* in Old English” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 69, 72-80.

Frank, Roberta. 1986. “’Mere’ and ‘Sund’: Two Sea-changes in *Beowulf*”, in: Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton and Fred C. Robinson. *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 153-172.

Frantzen, Allen J. 1983. *The literature of penance in Anglo-Saxon England.* New Brunswick and New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Frantzen, Allen J. 1990. *Desire for origins: New language, Old English, and teaching the tradition.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Frantzen, Allen J. 2011. *The Anglo-Saxon penitentials: A cultural database.* (http://www.anglo-saxon.net/penance/.) (date of access: 6 Apr. 2001).

Frow, John and Meaghan Morris. 1997. "Australian cultural studies" in: John Storey (ed.). *What is cultural studies: A reader.* London: Arnold, 344-367.

Fry, Donald K. 1967. "Imagery and point of view in *Judith* 200b-231", *English Language Notes* 5:3, 157-159.

Fry, Timothy. 1951. "The unity of the *Ludus Coventriae*", *Studies in Philology* 48:3, 527-570.

Fulk, R. D, Robert E. Bjork and John D. Niles (eds.). 2008. *Klaeber's Beowulf*. (The fourth edition.) Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Fulk, R. D. and Christopher M. Cain. [2003] 2005. *A history of Old English literature.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Garner, Lori Ann. 2001. "The art of translation in the Old English *Judith*", *Studia Neophilologica* 73, 171-183.

Gatch, Milton McC. 1965. "Eschatology in the anonymous Old English homilies", *Traditio* 21, 117-165.

Gneuss, Helmut. 1976. "*The Battle of Maldon* 89: Byrhtnoth's 'ofermod' once again", *Studies in Philology* 73:2, 117-137.

Godden, Malcolm R (ed.). 1979. *Aelfric's Catholic homilies. The second series text.* (The Early English Text Society.) London: Oxford University Press.

Godden, Malcolm. R. 1973. "An Old English penitential motif", *Anglo-Saxon England* 2, 221-239.

Godden, Malcolm. R. 2002. "Anglo-Saxon on the mind" in: R. M. Liuzza (ed.) *Old English literature: critical essays.* New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 284-314.

Godlove, Shanon N. 2009. "Bodies as Borders: Cannibalism and Conversion in the Old English *Andreas*", *Studies in Philology,* 137-160.

Goldsmith, Margaret. [1962] 1963. "The Christian perspective of *Beowulf*" in: Lewis E. Nicholson (ed.). *An anthology of* Beowulf *criticism*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 373-386.

Greenfield, Stanley B. 1966. “The Old English elegies” in: Stanley B. Greenfield (ed.). *Continuations and beginnings: Studies in Old English literature.* London: Thomas Nelson and Sons LTD, 142-175.

Greenfield, Stanley B. 1972. *The interpretation of Old English poems.* London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Greenfield, Stanley B. 1989. *Hero and exile: The art of Old English poetry.* (Edited by George H. Brown.) London and Ronceverte: The Hambledon Press.

Greenfield, Stanley B. and Daniel G. Calder. 1986. *A new critical history of Old English literature.* New York and London: New York University Press.

Gregory the Great. 1844-1850. *Morals on the book of Job.* (Edited and translated by John Henry Parker.) 3 vols. Oxford: J. G. F. And J. Rivington.

Gretsch, Mechthild. 1999. *The intellectual foundations of the English Benedictine reform.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 25.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Griffith, Mark (ed.). 1997. *Judith.* (Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies.) Reed Hall: University of Exeter Press.

Hall, Stuart (ed.). 1997. *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices.* London: SAGE Publications.

Hamilton, David. 1972. “The diet and digestion of allegory in *Andreas*”, *Anglo-Saxon England* 1, 147-58.

Hamilton, David. 1975. “*Andreas* and *Beowulf*: placing the hero”, in: Lewis E. Nicholson and Dolores Warwich Frese (eds.). *Anglo-Saxon poetry: essays in appreciation. For John C. McGalliard*. London and Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 81-98.

Hamilton, Sarah. 2001. *The Practice of penance 900-1050.* Bury St Edmunds: St Edmundsbury Press.

Hamilton, Sarah. 2005. “Rites for public penance in late Anglo-Saxon England” in: Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield. *The liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon church.* London: The Boydell Press, 65-104.

Hansen, Elaine Tuttle. 1982. “Hrothgar’s sermon in *Beowulf* as parental wisdom”, *Anglo-Saxon England* 10, 53-67.

Harbus, Antonina. 1994. “Nebuchadnezzar’s dreams in the Old English *Daniel*”, *English Studies* 75:6, 489-508.

Harbus, Antonina. 2002. *The life of mind in Old English poetry.* (Costerius New Series 143.) Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Harris, Stephen J. 2003. *Race and ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon literature.* New York and London: Routledge.

Hartley, John. 2003. *A Short history of cultural studies.* London: SAGE publications.

Head, Pauline E. 1997. *Representation and design: Tracing a hermeneutics of Old English poetry.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Heinemann, F. J. 1970. "*Judith* 236-291: a mock–heroic approach to battle type scenes", *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 71, 83-96.

Henry, P. L. 1966. *The early English and Celtic lyric.* London: George Allen & Unwin LTD.

Hermann, John P. 1989. *Allegories of war: language and violence in Old English poetry.* Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Hieatt, Constance B. 1976. "The Harrowing of Mermedonia: Typological Patterns in the Old English Andreas," Neuphilologische Mitteilungen 77, 54–55.

Hill, John M. 2008. *The narrative of* Beowulf: *Arrivals and departures.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hill, Susan E. 2007. "'The ooze of gluttony': attitudes towards food, eating, and excess in the Middle Ages" in: Richard Newhauser (ed.). *The seven deadly sins: from communities to individuals.* Boston: Leiden, 57-70.

Hill, Thomas D. 1969. "Figural narrative in *Andreas*: the conversion of the Mermedonians", *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 70, 261-273.

Hill, Thomas D. 1970. "History and heroic ethic in Maldon", *Neophilologus* 54, 291-296.

Hill, Thomas D. 1973. "Vision and judgment in *Christ III*", *Studies in Philology* 70:3, 233-242.

Hill, Thomas D. 1975. "The Fall of angels and man in the Old English *Genesis B*" in: Lewis E. Nicholson and Dolores Warwick Frese (eds). *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation.* Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 279-290.

Hill, Thomas. D. 1981. "Invocation of the Trinity and the tradition of *lorica* in Old English poetry", *Speculum* 56, 259-267.

Hoffmann, R. L. 1969. "Structure and symbolism in the *Judgment Day II*", *Neophilologus* 52, 170-178.

Horner, Shari. 2001. *Representing women in Old English literature.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Howe, Nicholas. 1997. "Historicist approaches" in: Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (ed.). *Reading Old English texts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 79-100.

Howe, Nicholas. 2006. "*Beowulf* and the Ancestral Homeland" in: Eileen Joy and Mary K. Ramsey (eds.). *The Post-Modern Beowulf. A Critical Casebook.* Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 49-89.

Howe, Nicholas. 2007. "Historicis approaches" in: Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (ed.). *Reading Old English texts.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 79-100.

Hume, Kathryn. 1974. "The Concept of the Hall in Old English Poetry", *Anglo-Saxon England* 3, 63-74.

Huppé, Bernard F. 1959. *Doctrine and poetry: Augustine's influence on Old English poetry.* New York: State University of New York.

Irving, Edward B. 1961. "The heroic style of *The Battle of Maldon*", *Studies in Philology* 58:3, 457-467.

Jager, Eric. 1988. "Temper as rhetoric teacher: the Fall of language in the Old English *Genesis B*", *Neophilologus* 72, 434-448.

Jager, Eric. 1990. "Evoking/revoking God's word: the vox Dei in *Genesis B*", *English Studies* 71:4, 307-321.

Jager, Eric. 1991, "The word in the "breost": Interiority and the Fall in *Genesis B*", *Neophilologus* 75, 279-290.

Jeffrey, Elizabeth J. 1989. *Blickling Spirituality and the Old English vernacular homily. A textual analysis.* (Studies in Medieval Literature 1.) Lewiston: The Edwin Meller Press.

Johnson, Richard. 1996. "What is cultural studies anyway?" in: John Storey (ed.). *What is cultural studies: A reader.* London: Arnold, 75-114.

Jolly, Karen Louise. 2005. "Cross-referencing Anglo-Saxon liturgy and remedies: the signs of the cross as ritual protection" in: Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield. *The liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon church*. London: The Boydell Press, 213-244.

Joy, Eileen A. and Mary K. Ramsey (eds.). 2006. *The Post-Modern Beowulf. A Critical Casebook.* Morgantown: West Virginia University Press.

Kabir, Ananya Jahanara. [2001] 2006. *Paradise, death and doomsday in Anglo-Saxon literature.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 32.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karkov, Catherine. 2005. "The sign of the cross: poetic performance and liturgical practice in the Junius 11 Manuscript" in: Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield. *The liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon church*. London: The Boydell Press, 245-270.

Keefer, Sarah Larratt. 2005. "The veneration of the cross in Anglo-Saxon England" in: Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield. *The liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon church*. London: The Boydell Press, 143-184.

Kellogg, Robert L. 1993. "The context for epic in later Anglo-Saxon England" in: Helen Damico and John Leyerle (eds.). *Heroic poetry in the Anglo-Saxon period: studies in óhonor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr.* Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 139-156.

Kennedy, Charles W. [1952] 1963. *Early English Christian poetry.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kiernan, Kevin S. [1981] 1996. Beowulf *and the* Beowulf *manuscript.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Klinck, Anne L. 1979. "Female characterisation in Old English poetry and the growth of psychological realism: *Genesis B* and *Christ I*", *Neophilologus* 63 4*:* 597-610.

Kowalik, Barbara. 2010. *Betwixt* engelaunde *and* englene londe: *Dialogic poetics in early English religious lyric.* (Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature.) Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Krapp, George Phillip (ed.). 1931. *The Junius manuscript.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 1.) New York: Columbia University Press.

Krapp, George Phillip (ed.). 1932. *The Vercelli book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 2.) New York: Columbia University Press.

Krapp, George Phillip and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (eds.). 1936. *The Exeter book.* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Vol. 3.) New York: Columbia University Press.

Kuznets, Lois R. and Martin Green. 1976. "Voice and vision in the Old English *Christ III*", *Papers on Language and Literature* 12, 227-245.

Langeslag, P. S. 2007. "Doctrine and paradigm: two functions of the innovations in Genesis B", *Studia Neophilologica 79:2*, 113-118.

Leclercq, Jean. [1957] 1996. *Love of learning and desire for God: A study of monastic culture*. (Translated by Catharine Misrahi.). New York: Fordham University Press.

Lee, Alvin A. 1972. *The guest-hall of Eden: Four essays on the design of Old English poetry*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Liuzza, R. M. (ed.) 2002. *Old English literature: critical essays.* New Heaven and London: Yale University Press.

Locherbie-Cameron, M. A. L. 1988. "Byrhtnoth, his noble companion and his sister's son", *Medium Aevum* 57, 159-171.

Louth, Andrew. 2004. "Hagiography" in: Frances Young, Lewis Ayres and Andrew Louth (eds.) *The Cambridge history of early Christian literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lucas, Peter J. 1992. "Loyalty and obedience in the Old English *Genesis* and the interpolation of *Genesis B* into *Genesis A*", *Neophilologus* 76, 121-135.

Lucas, Peter. J. 1992. "*Judith* as the woman hero", *The Yearbook of English Studies* 22, 17-27.

Luscombe, D. E. 1988. "Introduction: the Formation of Political Though in the West", in: J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval political Thought c. 350-1450.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 157-173.

Macrae-Gibson, O. D. 1970. "How historical is *The Battle of Maldon*", *Medium Aevum* 39, 89-107.

Magennis, Hugh. 1983. "Adaptation of biblical detail of the Old English *Judith*: the feast scene" *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 84, 331-7.

Magennis, Hugh. 1995. "Contrasting narrative emphases in the Old English poem *Judith* and Aelfric's paraphrase of the book of Judith" *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 96, 61-66.

Magennis, Hugh. [1996] 2006. *Images of community in Old English poetry.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 18.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magoun, Francis P. 1963. "The oral-formulaic character of Anglo-Saxon narrative poetry" in: Lewis E. Nicholson. *An anthology of* Beowulf *criticism.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Markus, R. A. 1988. "The Latin Fathers", in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval political Thought c. 350-1450.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 92-122.

Marx, C. W. 1995. *The Devil's rights and the redemption in the literature of Medieval England.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

McClure, Judith. 1983. "Bede's Old Testament kings" in: Patrick Wormland, Donald Bullough and Roger Collins. *Ideal and reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon society. Studies presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 76-98.

McGowan, Joseph P. [2001] 2008. "Anglo-Latin literature" in: Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (eds.). *A companion to Anglo-Saxon literature.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 11-49.

McKinnell, John. 1975. "On the date of *The battle of Maldon*", *Medium Aevum* 44, 121-136.

McNamee, M. B. [1960] 1963. "*Beowulf* – an allegory of salvation" in: Lewis E. Nicholson. *An anthology of* Beowulf *criticism.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 331-352.

Meeks, Wayne A. 1993. *The origins of Christian morality: The first two centuries.* New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Mintz, Susannah B. 1997. "Words devilish and divine: Eve as speaker in *Genesis B*", *Neophilologus* 81, 609-623.

Mize, Britt. 2006. "The representation of the mind as an enclosure", *Anglo-Saxon England* 35, 57-90.

Moffat, Douglas (ed. and trans.). 1990. *The Old English* Soul and Body. Woodbrigde: D. S. Brewer.

Morrison, Stephen. 1979. "OE *cempa* in Cynewulf's *Juliana* and the figure of *Miles Christi*", *English Language Notes* 17:2, 81-84.

Nelson, Marie. 2005. "Beowulf's Boast Words", *Neophilologus* 89: 299-310.

Neville, Jennifer. 1999. *Representation of the Natural World in Old English Poetry* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 27.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newhauser, Richard. 2000. *The early history of greed: The sin of avarice in early Medieval thought and literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newhauser, Richard (ed.). 2007. *The seven deadly sins: From communities to individuals.* Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Newhauser, Richard. 2007. *Sin: Essays on the moral tradition in the western Middle Ages.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Nicholson, Lewis E and Dolores Warwick Frese (eds). 1975. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation.* Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press.

Niles, John D. [1993] 2006. "Locating *Beowulf* in literary history" in: Joy, Eileen A. and Mary K. Ramsey (eds.). *The Post-Modern Beowulf. A Critical Casebook.* Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 131-160.

North, Richard. 1991. "Getting to know the general in *The Battle of Maldon*", *Medium Aevum* 60, 1-15.

Nunning, Ansgar. 2006. "Narratology and cultural history: Tensions, points of contact, new areas of research" in: Herbert Grabes and Wolfgang Viereck (eds.). *The wider scope: Papers in English language and litetature from Bamberg Conference of the International Association of University Professors of English.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

O'Keeffe, Katherine O'Brien. [1990] 2006. *Visible song: Transitional literacy in Old English verse.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 4.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Keeffe, Katherine O'Brien. 1991. "Heroic values and Christian ethics" in: Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (eds.). *The Cambridge companion to Old English literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olsen, Alexandra Hennesey. 1982. "Inversion and political purpose in Old English *Judith*", *English Studies* 63:4, 289-293.

Orchard, Andy. [1985] 2003. *Pride and prodigies: studies in monsters of the* Beowulf-*Manuscript.* Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Orchard, Andy. [2003] 2007. *A critical companion to Beowulf.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Orchard, Andy. 1997. "Oral tradition" in: Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (ed.). *Reading Old English texts.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 101-123.

Orton, Peter R. 1979. "Disunity in the Vercelli book *Soul and Body*", *Neophilologus* 63, 450-460.

Overing, Gillian. 1984. "Nebuchadnezzar's conversion in the Old English Daniel: a psychological portrait" *Papers on language and literature 23:* 3-14.

Palmer, R. Barton. 1976. "Characterisation in Old English *Juliana*", *South Atlantic Bulletin* 41:4, 10-21.

Pasternack, Carol Braun. [1995] 2006. *The textuality of Old English poetry.* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 13.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pasternack, Carol Braun. 2007. “Post-structuralist theories: The subject and the text” in: Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe (ed.). *Reading Old English texts.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 170-191.

Phillips, Helen. 1997. “The order of words and patterns of opposition in *The Battle of Maldon*”, *Neophilologus* 81, 117-128.

Plato. [1994] 1998. *Republic.* (Translated by Robin Waterfield.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Portnoy, Phyllis. 1994. “Remnant and ritual: The place of Daniel and Christ and Satan in the Junius epic” *English Studies* 75:5, 408-422.

Pringle, I. 1975. “*Judith:* the homily and the poem”, *Traditio* 31, 83-97.

Raffel, Burton. 1975. “*Judith:* hypermetricity and rhetoric” in: Lewis E. Nicholson and Dolores Warwick Frese (eds.). *Anglo-Saxon poetry. Essays in appreciation.* Notre Dame and London: Notre Dame University Press, 124-134.

Rice, Robert C. 1977. “The penitential motif in Cynewulf’s *Fates of Apostles* and in the epilogues”, *Anglo-Saxon England* 6, 105-119.

Richards, Mary P. 1997. “Anglo-Saxonism in the Old English laws” in: Allen j. Frantzen and John D. Niles. *Anglo-Saxonism and the construction of social identity.* Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 40-59.

Riedinger, Anita R. 1993. “The formulaic relationship between *Beowulf* and *Andreas*”, in: Helen Damico and John Leyerle (eds.). *Heroic poetry in the Anglo-Saxon period.* (Studies in Medieval Culture XXXII.) Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 283-312.

Robertson, D. W., Jr. 1963. “The doctrine of charity in medieval literary gardens: A topical approach through symbolism and allegory” in: Lewis E. Nicholson (ed.). *Anthology of* Beowulf *criticism.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 165-188.

Robinson, Fred C. 1985. *Beowulf and the appositive style.* Knoxwille: The University of Tennessee Press.

Ryner, Bradley D. 2006. “Exchanging battle: subjective and objective conflicts in *The Battle of Maldon*”, *English Studies* 87, 266-276.

Schneider, Claude. 1978. “Cynewulf’s devaluation of heroic tradition in *Juliana*”, *Anglo-Saxon England* 7, 107-118.

Schöer, Arnold. 1888. *Die Winteney-version der Regula S. Benedicti*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Scragg, Donald G. 1992. *The Vercelli homilies.* (Early English Text Society.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sharma, Manish. 2005. "Nebuchadnezzar and the defiance of measure in the Old English Daniel", *English Studies* 86:2, 103-126.

Shippey, T. A. 1976. *Poems of wisdom and learning in Old English.* Rowman and Littlefield: D. S. Brewer.

Sinkewicz, Robert E. 2003. "Introduction" in: Evagrius of Pontus. *The Greek Ascetic Corpus*. (Translated by Robert E. Sinkewicz.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, xvii-xl.

Southern, R. W. [1953] 1993. *The making of the Middle Ages.* London: Pimlico.

Southern, R. W. [1990] 1970. *Western society and the church in the Middle Ages.* (The Penguin History of the Church 2.) London: Penguin Books.

Spindler, Robert. 1934. *Das altenglische bussbuch.* Leipzig: Verlag von Bernhard Tauchnitz.

Stenton, Frank. 1971. *Anglo-Saxon England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

St-Jacques, Raymond C. 1980. "The cosmic dimensions of Cynewulf's *Juliana*", *Neophilologus* 64, 134-139.

Tacitus. 1999. *Agricola and Germania.* (Translated by A. B. Birley.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tertullian. 2006. "On fasting" in: Schaff, Phillip (ed.). *Fathers of the third century: Tertullian, part four; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, parts first and second.* (http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf04.html) (date of creation: 28 June 2006).

The Desputisoun bitwen þe body and þe soule. 1970. (Edited by Wilhelm Linow.) Amsterdam, Rodopi.

Timmer, B. J (ed.). [1952] 1978. *Judith.* Exeter: University of Exeter.

Tne Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. [1996] 1997. (Translated and edited by Michael Swanton.) London: J. M. Dent.

Treharne, Elaine and Phillip Pulsiano. [2001] 2008. "Anglo-Saxon vernacular literature" in: Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne. *A companion to Anglo-Saxon literature*. (Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture.) Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 3-10.

Tristram, Hildegard L. C. 1995. *Early insular preaching: Verbal artistry and method of composition.* (Veröffentlichungen der Keltischen Kommission 11.) Wien: Die Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Vickrey, John F. 1965. "*selfsceaft* in *Genesis B*", *Anglia* 83, 154-171.

Vickrey, John F. 1969. "The Vision of Eve in *Genesis B*", *Speculum* 44*:* 86-102.

Vickrey, John F. 1989. "Genesis 598: þe for ðam larum com", *Neophilologus* 73, 454-460.

Vickrey, John F. 1989. "On genesis 623-5", *English Studies* 70:2, 97-106.

Wallis, Faith. 1999. "Introduction" in: Bede. *The reckoning of time.* (Translated Texts for Historians 29.) (Translated by Faith Wallis.) Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, xv-lxxxv.

Walsh, Marie Michelle. 1977. "The Baptismal Flood in the Old English 'Andreas': Liturgical and Typological Depths," *Traditio* 33, 137–58.

Warwick-Frese, Dolores. 1986. "Poetic prowess in *The Battle of Brunanburh* and *Maldon*: winning, losing and literary outcome" in: Phylls Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton and Fred C. Robinson (eds). *Modes of interpretation in Old English literature.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 83-100.

Whitbread, L. 1966. "The Old English poem *Judgment Day II* and its Latin source", *Philological Quarterly* 45:4, 635-656.

Whitelock, Dorothy (ed.). [1939] 1976. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.* Exeter: University of Exeter.

Whitelock, Dorothy. 1952. *The beginnings of the English society.* (The Pelican History of England 2.) Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Wickham, Chris. [2009] 2010. *The inheritance of Rome: A history of Europe from 400 to 1000.* London: Penguin Books.

Wilcox, Jonathan. 2003. "Eating people is wrong: funny style in *Andreas* and its analogues" in: Catherine E. Karkov and George Hardin Brown (eds.). *Anglo-Saxon styles.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 201-222.

Willard, Rudolph. 1935. "The address of the soul to the body", *Publications of Modern Language Association* 50:4, 957-983.

Wine, Joseph D. 1992. "*Juliana* and the figures of rhetoric", *Papers on Language and Literature* 28, 3-18.

Wittig, Joseph. [1974] 2001. "Figural narrative in Cynewulf's *Juliana*" in: Robert Bjork (ed.). *The Cynewulf reader.* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England.) Routledge: New York, 147-169.

Woolf, Rosemary (ed.). [1955] 1993. *Cynewulf's Juliana.* Reed Hall: University of Exeter Press.

Woolf, Rosemary. 1953. “The devil in Old English poetry”, *The Review of English Studies* 4, 1-12.

Woolf, Rosemary. 1963. “The Fall of man in *Genesis B* and *The Mystère d’Adam”* in: Stanley Greenfield (ed.) *Studies in Old English literature in honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*. New York: Russel and Russel, 187-199.

Woolf, Rosemary. 1966. “Saints’ lives” in: E. G. Stanley. *Continuation and beginnings. Studies in Old English literature.* London: Thomas Nelson LTD, 67-103.

Wormald, Patrick. 1994. “Engla Lond: The Making of an Allegiance,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 7, 1–24.