Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem
Bölcsészettudományi Kar

DOKTORI DISSZERTÁCIÓ

NAGY ANDREA

WOMEN, WORDS AND VIOLENCE IN OLD ENGLISH POETRY

Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola,
Dr. Kállay Géza PhD, egyetemi tanár

Angol irodalom és kultúra a középkorban és a kora újkorban doktori oktatási program,
Dr. Kállay Géza PhD, egyetemi tanár

A bizottság tagjai és tudományos fokozatuk:

Dr. Kállay Géza PhD, egyetemi tanár, elnök
Dr. Nádasdy Ádám DSc, egyetemi tanár, opponens
Dr. Karáth Tamás PhD, egyetemi adjunktus, opponens
Dr. Velich Andrea PhD, egyetemi docens, a bizottság titkára
Dr. Pikli Natália PhD, egyetemi adjunktus, bizottsági tag
Dr. Kristó László, Dr. Szalay Krisztina (póttagok)

Témavezető és tudományos fokozata: Dr. Halácsy Katalin PhD, egyetemi docens

Budapest, 2014

Nyilatkozat*

Alulírott ……………………………………. ezennel kijelentem és aláírásommal megerősítem, hogy az ELTE Bölcsészettudományi Kar ………………………………… Doktori Iskola …………………………………………………. doktori oktatási programján írt jelen disszertációm saját szellemi termékem, amely hivatalos szövegkiadásban még nem jelent meg sem nyomtatott, sem elektronikus formában.

A mások munkájaként megjelent kiadványból vagy betekintésre átadott kéziratból, internetes forrásból, személyes adatközlésből stb. származó szövegrészeket idézőjel és pontos hivatkozások nélkül nem építettem be a disszertációmba.

Budapest, 20………, ……….., …….. .

………………………….
aláírás

* A nyilatkozatot a disszertáció minden leadott példányába be kell köttetni és eredeti aláírással ellátni.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I am deeply grateful to my supervisor, Katalin Halácsy, for her help, guidance and patience throughout these years, and for believing that this dissertation would one day be finished. *Köszönöm, Kati!*

There are two people who did not see that day arrive and to whom I owe much. István Géher was the supervisor of my MA thesis and the first to point me in the direction of women in Old English poetry. He was always there to give advice and lend a friendly ear. Kathleen Dubs guided our first steps as doctoral students, and she accepted to be one of the readers of my dissertation. They are sorely missed.

I am grateful to Ágnes Kiricsi and Tamás Karáth for their thorough reading of the first version of this dissertation, as well as for their corrections and sound advice. I would also like to thank Zsuzsanna Simonkay, Zsuzsanna Nagy, Tibor Tarcsay, Dóra Pődör and László Kristó for reading various drafts and versions of parts of the text; Tibor Fabiny for his advice and for lending me his books; Leena Kahlas-Tarkka for helping with the initial stages of the research; and the staff of the libraries of the University of Helsinki and of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for their kind assistance.

In the years it took me to write this dissertation, my friends and family supported and encouraged me in more ways than it would be possible to enumerate here. I would like to thank Dóra Pődör, Éva Kellermann, Kata Ágnes Miklós, Hedvig Hanuska, Renáta Felfalusi, Magdolna Kiss, Katalin Szlukovényi, Mátyás Bánhegyi, Csaba Csides and Dóra Nagy; my mother, Ilona Bekő, my grandparents, Mária Takács and István Bekő, my brothers Levente and Tamás, and my aunt, Ildikó Pusa.

Without the help of those mentioned here, this dissertation would never have been completed. All its errors and deficiencies, of course, remain my own.

Ic þancie eowra ælcum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1
  1.1. Defining violence 2
  1.2. “Good” and “bad” violence 8
  1.3. Evaluation and Appraisal 16
  1.4. Violence in Old English Literature 22
  1.5. The texts 31
2. THE WOMEN OF OLD ENGLISH POETRY IN SECONDARY LITERATURE 33
3. WOMEN AS AVENGERS: GRENDEL’S MOTHER AND JUDITH 43
  3.1. Grendel’s mother 43
    3.1.1. What is a monster? 44
    3.1.2. The motif of vengeance 45
    3.1.3. Evaluation 50
    3.1.4. Femininity and revenge 52
  3.2. Judith 54
    3.2.1. Vengeance 55
    3.2.2. Evaluation 57
    3.2.3. Differences between the Latin and Old English texts 60
    3.2.4. Femininity 61
  3.3. Conclusion 62
4. WOMEN AND POWER: ELENE AND MODTHRYTH 63
  4.1. Elene 64
    4.1.1. Evaluation 68
      4.1.1.1. Elene evaluated by the narrator 68
      4.1.1.2. Judas and the Jews evaluated by Elene 71
      4.1.1.3. Judas and the Jews evaluated by the narrator 75
      4.1.1.4. Evaluations by other characters 78
    4.1.2. Differences between the Latin and Old English versions 79
  4.2. Modthryth 80
  4.3. Conclusion 86

5. THE TRIUMPHANT VICTIM: JULIANA 88
  5.1. Levels of conflict and perception 88
  5.2. The description of the conflict 92
    5.2.1. Words referring to battle 92
    5.2.2. Vengeance 93
  5.3. Meanings of violence 94
  5.4. Juliana’s femininity 96
  5.5. Activity vs. passivity 99
  5.6. Violence and communication 103
  5.7. Conflicting meanings 105
  5.8. Evaluation 109
  5.9. Differences between the Latin and Old English versions 111
  5.10. Conclusion 111
6. PEACEWEAVERS: WEALHTHEOW, HYGD AND HILDEBURH 112
  6.1. The figure of the peace-weaver 112
  6. 2. Wealhtheow 114
  6.3. Hygd 118
  6.4. Hildeburh 121
  6.5. Conclusion 130
7. CONCLUSIONS 131
  7.1. Conflict and evaluation 131
  7.2. Female roles in the context of violence 136
WORKS CITED 141

APPENDIX: ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

In the present dissertation, I would like to examine the role violence plays in the representation of female characters of Old English poetry. Although there are very few women in these poems who directly become the targets of physical violence, and the number of those who commit an act of violence is only slightly higher, violence plays an important part in the portrayal of the characters considered here and in the construction of the fictional world in which they move. Thus, the scope of this presentation includes not only women who commit a violent act or whom violence is committed against, but also those women whose actions are defined by the context of male violence, either because they are trying to prevent it from disrupting their lives or the life of their community, or because they have become its unintended victims.

In the dissertation, I will argue that violence is not always a negative concept, and that it is strongly linked to the idea of community: whether violence is judged as good or bad depends on whether it upholds or threatens the order of a given community. The conflicts in the poems are usually represented on two or three levels, the personal, the communal and the religious (or cosmic), the latter not always being present in all works and for all characters. In general, the more the personal is in harmony with the other two levels, and the more violence is subject to rules, the more positive its evaluation becomes, while violence is understood as a negative force when the personal is in conflict with the communal and the cosmic. In my view, this consideration is more important than the gender of those who are engaged in a conflict, thus I will examine whether violence committed by women or power used by women for violent ends is disapproved of and represents gender transgression, and whether female violence is judged differently from violence committed by men.

I will also claim that judgement on violence is never objective, as the narrator identifies with one of the parties in the conflict, presenting the story and commenting on it from this biased point of view, delivering explicit evaluations as well as using other methods which will be detailed below. For examining evaluations of violence, I will use the theory of evaluation presented by J. R. Martin and P. R. R. White in their 2005 book *The Language of Evaluation*.

In the present introduction, I will first attempt to define the concept of violence, after which I will turn to the question of when violence can be regarded as positive, examining possible differences between good or bad, that is, constructive and destructive violence. Then I will proceed to discuss the issue of evaluation, outlining the framework that will be used in the analysis of the texts. Following this, I will discuss the importance of violence in Old English poetry, and finally I will list the texts that will be examined in the subsequent chapters.

1.1. Defining violence

In a dissertation whose main focus is violence in literary texts, it is indispensable to provide a definition of the concept of violence. However, when attempting to formulate such a definition, we soon have to realize that this concept proves particularly slippery. The 20th century, termed by John Keane "the long century of violence" (qtd. in Bufacchi, *Violence and Social Justice* 189), saw two bloody wars on an unprecedented scale and the invention of weapons of mass destruction, which threatened humankind with extinction. This awakened an interest in the nature of violence, which gained new impetus after the September 2001 events in the United States and the subsequent terrorist attacks in European capitals. The resulting literature on violence is vast. Remarkably, however, many of the authors who explore this subject, whether in the field of literary criticism or political theory, decline to give a definition of the concept of violence in their works. As Vittorio Bufacchi, writing about the numerous edited volumes on political violence, remarks, "the reluctance of the editors to ground the disparate ethnographic case studies on a shared definition of violence takes away from the theoretical value of these books" (*Violence and Social Justice* 11).

This reluctance, however, is not accidental or simply due to negligence on the part of the editors. Paradoxically, although violence is an unavoidable part of the human experience, it is hard to define what it actually is. Even though none of us would fail to intuitively recognize violence, provide examples, or identify a violent act, formulating a comprehensive theoretical definition of the concept of violence proves nearly impossible. There is little consensus in the literature as to what constitutes violence, and existing definitions are often in disagreement. It has even been suggested that "what violence means and is will always be fluid, not fixed; it is mutable. This is why it is crucial that a programme on violence not be framed through definitions of violence" (Stanko 3). Willem de Haan also remarks that violence is "notoriously difficult to define" (28), and suggests "exploring a diversity of definitions" (38).

The root of the problem is partly the complex nature of violence itself. Another reason for the lack of consensus may be found in the fact that violence has been studied by scholars in several different fields – political science, criminology, biology, social studies, psychology, as well as literary theory, to name just a few. As Wilhelm Heitmeyer and John Hagan put it in their introductory study to the *International Handbook of Violence Research*,

> violence takes extremely varied forms and may possess many different qualities; not only is there a very substantial range of (current) definitions, but there are also many disagreements about the authority of definitions of what violence is, or is said to be. Consequently, theories of violence not only vary in their validity and significance but also address different subjects and involve controversial assessments of the efficacy of possible strategies for addressing the problem. (3–4)

Thus, first of all, I would like to address the question of what kind of action can be regarded as violence. Vittorio Bufacchi proposes as a starting point the definition in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, according to which violence is "the exercise of physical force so as to inflict injury on, or cause damage to, person or property" ("Two Concepts" 195). Most authorities on the subject would accept that what is described here qualifies as violence, and would incorporate its criteria into their own theory, but virtually every word of the OED definition can be and is disputed. To quote Heitmeyer and Hagan again, "there is, admittedly, a broad consensus that violence causes injury and sometimes death and results in many different forms of destruction, so that there are always victims. But at that point, if not before, the consensus certainly ends" (4).

The first problem concerning the definition above is whether violence should be understood as exclusively physical, or the concept should be extended to include other (e.g. psychological or verbal) manifestations as well. Another question is whether violence or a violent act should be taken to be synonymous with "force" or "the exercise of force". Thirdly, the formulation of the words "*so as to* inflict injury on" (emphasis added) implies intentionality, so it should also be examined whether violence is always intentional. I will address these questions in the following, and I would also like to state here that the scope of my analysis excludes acts of violence committed against animals, property and inanimate objects, and will be restricted to violence against human beings or anthropomorphic fictional characters.

As has been stated above, identifying the direct, physical use of force as violence poses few problems. However, accepting it as an exclusive definition of the concept proves to be too restrictive and excludes several forms of violence from consideration. Martha Reineke, for example, tells the story of one of her students, who attended college against the wishes of her husband. The husband frequently ridiculed the woman, claiming that she was "too stupid to last five minutes in college". Accepting this – repeatedly reinforced – assessment, the woman doubted her own abilities and experienced problems in college, even ran out of the room in tears in one instance. Later she overcame these difficulties and became successful in her studies, at which point her anger turned against the husband whose negative assessment had kept her from realizing her wishes for years. The husband in this story certainly did not use force, much less physical force; nevertheless, he caused injury and damage to his wife. Reineke concludes that violence "does not always present itself in terms of physical assault". It "transpires also as paralysis […] which can keep a woman locked in her home for years, unable to assert herself" (1–2). Reineke's focus is violence against women, but I think the story also has a more general applicability, in that it serves to illustrate that damage can be caused by means other than physical, and that psychological violence is no less a real threat than a direct, physical act.

The above story also shows that words can become a medium for violence. This is the view expressed by Parrish, who writes that "language is also one of the primary weapons used to inflict emotional and psychological violence" (4). This is a point that several scholars would disagree with. Spierenburg, for example, defines violence as "intentional encroachment upon the physical integrity of the body" (24), and rejects all other definitions (19), including the existence of verbal violence. As he puts it, "words are words and bullets are bullets" (13). De Haan, however, remarks that "in some cases, verbal aggression may prove to be more debilitating than physical attack" (29).

Parrish sees an even more intimate and necessary connection between communication and violence. He regards persons as "primarily discursive entities that occur as language, existing face-to-face as the creators of meaning as they operate as language within the world" (2). If every person is a creator of meaning, it is inevitable that these meanings come into conflict. Furthermore, Parrish stresses that "we all struggle to impose our own meanings and values upon the world, to the detriment of the meanings and values proposed by others." Imposing the meaning we create, especially if it comes at the expense of the meanings of others, is violence, and Parrish identifies it as such, concluding that it is “an inevitable and indispensable part of the human condition” (xii) and that “violence […] is itself the very structure of discourse” (4).

If we allow that violence is of a more complex nature than the use of physical force and it has possible non-physical manifestations, we face the equally difficult problem of where to draw the line, without our definition becoming too inclusive to allow any practical applicability. At the opposite end of the scale from the rather restrictive definition of the OED we find that of Johan Galtung, in whose opinion “violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations” (168). Although Galtung’s definition manages to cover all possible forms and manifestations of violence, its shortcoming lies in that it also covers much more than that: to use simple examples, an illness, a natural disaster, or even too little sleep can cause human beings to have “somatic and mental realizations below their potential”, yet to call these violence would clearly stretch the concept too far. One may even be inclined to agree with the harsh dismissal of Keane that such a definition “effectively makes a nonsense of the concept” (qtd. in Bufacchi, *Violence and Social Justice* 25).

In his article “Two Concepts of Violence”, Bufacchi sets out to review and summarize these conflicting definitions. Bufacchi distinguishes two groups of theoretical approaches, “narrow” or “minimalist conceptions of violence” versus broader, or “comprehensive conceptions”. The definitions of the OED and of Galtung represent the extreme positions of these two groups, respectively. According to Bufacchi, the distinction lies in that minimalist conceptions restrict the idea of violence to the use of physical force, whereas comprehensive conceptions equate violence with violation, which is a much broader concept. The narrow understanding of the former has the advantage of offering an unambiguous, clear-cut definition which is relatively easy to operate with. Its disadvantage, as we have seen, is that it excludes various, less readily self-evident forms of violence which nevertheless affect people’s lives in a very real way. In contrast, the latter group attempts to include the varied and complex manifestations of violence; this, however, may result in providing definitions which are too fluid and of little practical value. Understanding violence as violation also requires a definition of what is being violated. Adherents of the comprehensive conceptions, working mostly in the field of sociology or political theory and interested therefore in structural, rather than direct interpersonal violence, tend to define it as the violation of human rights, but as Bufacchi remarks, “almost any act can be said to violate someone’s rights, making violence ubiquitous and therefore meaningless” (Bufacchi, “Two Concepts” 197)

Bufacchi’s analysis has the advantage of providing a solid framework for the wealth of conflicting definitions, but it also points out that there is little correspondence between the two broad groups he proposes. In an attempt to review the common ground and to sum up what has been said so far, let us go back to Heitmeyer and Hagan’s observation that all definitions agree that in an act of violence there is always a victim. It is necessary to also posit an agent, a perpetrator of the act of violence, in order to avoid identifying violence with the results of an illness or the forces of nature. Differing concepts agree on the point that the victim suffers injury or damage, however, this damage need not be physical, and consequently, equating violence with the use of physical force is too restrictive. On the other hand, if violence is more than the use of direct physical force, it is also less than the violation of something as broad and abstract as human rights or “potential realizations”.

Furthermore, it should also be pointed out that even in the cases when violence involves the use of physical force, the injury done to the victim is more complex than simple physical harm. Violence exposes the vulnerability of the victim and can induce fear, feelings of inferiority, and a sense of insecurity or of being constantly threatened. These psychological factors can have lasting effects and continue to disrupt a victim’s life long after the physical injuries have healed.

Bufacchi, seeking to construct a definition of violence which is less restrictive than the minimalist conceptions and less fluid than the comprehensive ones, and has therefore more general validity than both, proposes to define the concept as the violation of integrity. By integrity he means, quite literally, wholeness and unity. Interpreting the body or personhood as an autonomous, complete system, the violation of integrity thus means a violation of the intactness of the system, of the wholeness of the body or, more importantly, the self (Bufacchi, *Violence and Social Justice* 40 ff.) The idea of violence as the violation of the self is the view also taken by Robert McAfee Brown, who identifies violence as a violation of personhood, and makes the important observation that “there can be violation of personhood quite apart from the doing of physical harm” (7). Susan J. Brison also writes about “the disintegration of the self experienced by victims of violence” in her book *Aftermath: Violence and the Remaking of a Self* (4). Brison, a professor of philosophy who was sexually assaulted and left for dead by her attacker, uses her own experience as a rape victim as a starting point for her interdisciplinary approach on sexual violence. In her account, it is the psychological trauma which she finds the most painful and disruptive, even more than her (rather severe) physical injuries, and she describes the healing process the survivor has to go through as "piecing together a shattered self" (x).

The advantages of Bufacchi's definition of violence as the violation of integrity are numerous: it supplies the missing link between minimalist and comprehensive conceptions, incorporating the former and limiting the scope of the latter. It includes the idea of harm and injury, but avoids restricting violence to the use of physical force. Finally, by interpreting violence as damage to the integrity of the self, it also accounts for the psychological injury caused by physical violence. In fact, Bufacchi goes as far as to state that

> [t]he experience of injury, suffering or harm is a consequence or symptom of having one's integrity violated. It is the violation of integrity that is the essence of an act of violence, not the injury, suffering or harm. To define violence in terms of the harm rather than the violation is to mistake the symptom for the disease. (*Violence and Social Justice* 43)

As regards the question of intentionality, Bufacchi postulates that "[a]n act of violence occurs when integrity is violated intentionally, or when violation of integrity is foreseen and avoidable but unintended" (*Violence and Social Justice* 91). If somebody intentionally inflicts harm or injury on another person, the result is clearly an act of violence. It can also be argued that if injury is done to a person or persons without it being intended, it is rather an accident than violence. Bufacchi terms this the Intention-Oriented Approach, which he claims is too narrow in its scope, and sees the necessity to complement it with the Victim-Oriented Approach, which focuses on consequences rather than the motivation of the perpetrator (*Violence and Social Justice* 67–85). The Victim-Oriented Approach is useful for the purposes of the present study in that it accounts for the unintended victims of a violent act, that is, indirect rather than direct violence, and I agree with Bufacchi's definition of the victim as "any living creature that is injured by, or suffers as a result of, the direct or indirect act of other person" (*Violence and Social Justice* 83), repeating that I will limit my analysis to humans or characters possessing human characteristics.

Thus the definition that I propose and intend to follow throughout the rest of this dissertation is that violence is a physical or non-physical act committed by a perpetrator against a victim with the intention of violating the integrity of this victim, which results in (physical, psychological, and often both) harm, injury and suffering, possibly even the death, of the victim, and can result in harm, injury and suffering, perhaps even the death of other, unintended victims.

1.2. “Good” and “bad” violence

The next question to address regarding the nature of violence is whether violence is always “bad”. It is no less difficult to give a satisfying answer to this question than to formulate a definition of violence. For most people, violence is an unambiguously negative concept, and the above definition of violence as a violation of integrity resulting in injury and suffering also suggests that it is so. Bufacchi considers violence bad because of the injury and suffering it causes as well as because it makes the victim “feel vulnerable, violated, degraded and inferior to the perpetrator of violence” (*Violence and Social Justice* 125). As an act of violence cannot exist without a victim, “it is always done to someone or something in particular” (Bufacchi, *Violence and Social Justice* 33), it follows that, from the point of view of the victim, violence is necessarily and evidently bad. The main reason Bufacchi gives for violence being even worse than death is what he calls the Humiliation Factor. The Humiliation Factor operates not only during the act of violence, but also before (threat of violence) and after the act (memories of violence, post-violence trauma) (*Violence and Social Justice* 125).

However, an act of violence does not occur in a vacuum: the badness of violence depends on the identity of the victim, that of the perpetrator, as well as on the context in which the act of violence takes place. For example, there are cases when violence is justified, “the two most common and widely respected justifications” being “self-defense, broadly construed, and protection of the innocent, also broadly construed” (Audi 182).

The problems of taking the Victim-Oriented Approach on violence, that is, stating that violence is bad because it both injures and exposes the vulnerability of the victim, become more visible if we consider that the judicial act of sentencing a criminal is, in fact, also an act of violence, and this violence “is most obvious when observed from the defendant’s perspective” (Cover 297). Cover argues that besides the violence implied by the sentence (restriction of freedom, or even the loss of life), the experience of the defendant is that of a victim of violence. The point he makes is strongly reminiscent of Bufacchi’s Humiliation Factor. “Most prisoners walk into prison because they know they will be dragged or beaten into prison if they do not walk. [...] The experience of the prisoner is, from the outset, an experience of being violently dominated, and it is colored from the outset by the fear of being violently treated" (Cover 296–297).

The paradox of violence is that although it is a potentially disruptive and destructive force, societies are built on violence. As the idea of justice is linked to the idea of retribution, order and stability are ensured by and based on acts of violence. As Bufacchi notes,

> [...] if violence is the problem, violence is also the solution. We escape the prepolitical state of promiscuous violence by forming a political society under the rule of a centralised authority that, to paraphrase Max Weber's famous dictum on the state, claims a monopoly over the legitimate use of violence. ("Two Concepts" 193)

Bufacchi also points out that, in order to avoid the paradox of violence, it is customary to consider that legitimate violence is no longer violence. According to this view, violence is always unlawful, and the state does not use violence, but authorized force. Siegfried R. Christoph defines violence as "a violation against something sanctioned by rule, custom, or law" (115), and goes on to remark that "[a]n act of violence may be sanctioned by law or custom and would therefore not be said to violate" (115–116). Albrecht Classen makes the same point when, paraphrasing Heinz-Horst Schrey, he writes that "power that meets the voluntary agreement is transformed into authority, but power that is imposed on others against their will is considered violence" (2–3). Bufacchi calls this "a convenient illusion", and I agree with his claim that "the force used by state institutions may be legal, even legitimate, but it is still violence" (*Violence and Social Justice* 190).

Although Bufacchi claims that, in theory, violence can be justified, he calls attention to the danger and the extreme difficulty of doing so, since an act of violence, even if justified or legitimate, can easily elicit a reaction in the form of another (justified or unjustified) act of violence, which can result in a self-perpetuating cycle (*Violence and Social Justice* 177–178). This is corroborated by de Haan and Nijboer's study of Dutch youths living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, who rather resort to "self-help" than report threats and crimes to the police. The authors conclude that "the continuous threat of violence is not only a condition for self-help, but is also the result" (85).

Another author who discusses the cyclical nature of violence is René Girard in his book *Violence and the Sacred.* According to Girard, violence is mimetic in nature: acts of violence are imitations or re-enactions of a previous one. One violent act leads to another, as it elicits a violent response, and violence can only be subdued by the use of violence, which results in its proliferation. In societies Girard terms "primitive", which lack judicial institutions and a centralised system of retribution, violence, especially murder, has to be avenged by another member of the community. This opens up the possibility of further revenge, and generates a self-sustaining cycle of "reciprocal violence" which threatens the entire community with destruction. This "interminable round of revenge" can be checked most effectively by the evolution of a judicial system. In the absence of such a system, less effective methods have to be used, such as compensation, containment (e.g. trials by combat), or channelling the desire for revenge against a specific target, unifying the community (20–21). According to Girard, war is such a mechanism for finding a different direction for violence, and he argues that taboos, rites and sacrifices in primitive societies also form such a mechanism. In sacrifice, a victim is found whose destruction re-unites the community in an act of "unanimous violence", restoring order and harmony. The victim can be an animal, an external enemy, or somebody marginal to the community, such as a slave or a prisoner of war. What is common in these victims is that their killing is "an act of violence without risk of vengeance" (13), which stops the cycle of violence and the threat it represents to the community. This is what makes possible the distinction between "holy, legal, and legitimate" violence, opposed to "unjust, illegal, and illegitimate" violence (24–25). According to this theory, unanimous violence can be "generative in that, by putting an end to the vicious and destructive cycle of violence, it simultaneously initiates another and constructive cycle, that of the sacrificial rite – which protects the community from that same violence and allows culture to flourish" (98).

The idea that violence can be a generative and constructive as well as a destructive force also appears in more recent literature. Thus Albrecht Classen claims that "violence, or rather the energetic opposition to it, has been one of the key constitutive elements in human civilization" (21). Classen, writing specifically about the European Middle Ages, describes the dangers of cyclical violence and observes that completely peaceful solutions to violence have never existed in practice, neither in the Middle Ages, nor in modern times. A possible antidote to the destructive potential of violence is to control it through authority, which is essentially the same as the monopoly of violence described by Weber, Girard, Bufacchi and others. Authority is maintained either by the threat of violence or by an actual act of violence, thus violence can be both destructive and constructive.

> Uncontrolled violence quickly spirals into something monstrous, inviting each side to take a higher degree of revenge for acts of violence, and the resulting blood feud [...] eventually will engulf both sides and destroy the entire

> community. [...] Violence, if exerted by government or a ruler, in the name of the commonwealth, be it through the force of the laws, be it through a penal system, has often succeeded in maintaining and subduing rampant violence. In other words, violence per se is not necessarily an evil force. (Classen 17)

If we accept that violence can be justified as well as unjustified, legitimate as well as illegitimate, constructive as well as destructive, this still leaves the problem of when to judge a given act of violence as positive or negative. People living in modern democratic societies tend to see the answer in authority and lawfulness (often not viewed as violence at all, as has been noted above). However, this is an unsatisfactory and oversimplified view, as the power of the state does not necessarily make its violence acceptable or constructive, as illustrated by repressive regimes, revolutions, and the persecution of minority groups, for which we find abundant examples both in the 20th century and in earlier history. One possible answer can be found in morality, but acts of violence can rarely be judged against absolute moral values, even if we accept that such exist.

Another possibility is offered by the realization that the concept of violence is inextricably linked with that of justice. This is the point made by Bufacchi, but the idea is not new, and appears in Saint Augustine's *The City of God*: "Justice removed, what are kingdoms but great bands of robbers? What are bands of robbers but little kingdoms?" (qtd. in Lefebure 44). True justice, however, with the exception of divine justice, is an ideal which cannot be fully achieved. Human justice is a human construct, open to the possibility of error, influenced by interest and often subjective, as demonstrated by controversial issues as police atrocities, the death penalty, or the 'war' on terrorism.

Indeed, it is a recurring thought in the literature that violence is subjective, and its positive or negative aspect cannot be measured in absolute terms. As pointed out above, violence, even if justified or legitimate, is necessarily bad from the point of view of the victim. Our perception of violence is influenced by who the victim is, how successfully the perpetrator justifies his violence and what kind of authority he has to justify these claims. Classen writes that "violence in its negative connotation is very much a matter of perspectives, as it depends on the beholder and on how much power the beholder has to document his or her suffering or to identify what happened as violence" (3). Stacey L. Hahn similarly argues for a subjective assessment:

> Attitudes towards the use of violence usually in the form of physical acts or harsh words may be positive or negative depending on who applies the violence, who becomes the recipient of violent acts, whether violence is open

> or hidden, and to what purpose it has been wielded. [...] violence can be both constructive and destructive depending on the variables mentioned above. When violence is applied in the name of human or divine law so as to maintain social order, right criminal wrongs, preserve one's lands or the Christian faith, it is generally perceived as justifiable and beneficial. (187)

Several authors have commented on the dual assessment of violence in medieval texts. Richard W. Kaueper, for example, notes that "[m]any of the works of literature patronized and enjoyed by a broad segment of society worried […] over socially disruptive violence, even as they portrayed with considerable fondness the heroic violence of bold men acting in approved causes" (x). Writing a decade later, Warren C. Brown also calls attention to the fact that

> From a modern perspective, medieval accounts of violence can seem contradictory. They can present violence as lawless and anarchic, as a force of evil that disrupts the right order of the world. They can also present it as a tool of right and justice, as a weapon for the protection of the poor and helpless, and even as God's way of aiding his faithful. […] Violence desecrates churches and monasteries; it is also the means by which God and his followers protect the faithful and their interests and avenge wrong. One gets the sense in fact that violence was not considered intrinsically bad. It could rather be good or bad depending on who was using it against whom and for what purpose. (1–2)

Total ethical relativity, however, is unacceptable as it renders meaningless the analysis of an act of violence. To solve this problem, Bufacchi proposes that an act of violence not only involves the perpetrator and the victim, but is a trilateral relationship which includes a "hypothetical impartial spectator" who provides critical assessment of the claims of both perpetrator and victim. Bufacchi defines the spectator as "anyone who is able to form a judgement as to the propriety or impropriety of the conduct observed, whether they are directly involved (or even present) in the act in question or not" (*Violence and Social Justice* 38). I agree with Bufacchi that the assessment of violence is meaningless unless we understand it as a trilateral relationship, but the main weakness of the "impartial spectator approach" is that complete impartiality can never be achieved, especially if the spectator is not present when the act is committed. The focus of Bufacchi's analysis is contemporary political violence, and in assessing contemporary violence we have the advantage of a wealth of available data. Even so, if an act of violence is not immediately experienced, what we have access to, even in the most detailed accounts, is only a representation of the act itself, and representations, either by the victim or a third party, can rarely lay claim to complete objectivity. The problem is even more evident in the study of medieval texts, where there are no contemporary witnesses, and both historical and literary accounts of an act of violence are handed down by an author who interprets the facts. As Classen points out,

> Crimes committed by people from different time periods have sometimes been regarded with approval if they were carried out in the name of a victorious tribe, people, or country against another social group or entity, which, however, would depend on how a chronicler reported it, coloring our opinion about the justification of this or that act of violence accordingly. (2)

The solution proposed by both Girard and Hahn is that the distinction between positive and negative (constructive and destructive) violence is the distinction between order and chaos. Thus positive violence is one that creates order from chaos or which restores this order. For Hahn, writing about late medieval literature, constructive violence is external, directed outside the community, and its victims are “outlaws, giants, or the Saracen other”, whereas she identifies destructive violence with internal, familial violence, which can “threaten to dissolve the family or social structure [...], menace the welfare of future generations, and snowball into a vicious cycle of reprisals” (187). We can easily replace the concept of family in Hahn’s theory with the larger concept of community or society. Thus we can define negative violence as one which disrupts the harmony of the community or threatens it with destruction, whereas positive violence is one which is beneficial for the community by preserving or restoring its order. Positive violence is dependent on how the community defines itself and its values, and is directed at the ‘Other’, be that an external enemy, or a member of the community who becomes ‘other’ by endangering these values.

Violence is positive and constructive if it serves creating, upholding or re-establishing order. This kind of violence is important in that it ensures harmony and the functioning of the community. In Girard’s words, it “defines an inner circle of nonviolence essential to the accomplishment of basic social functions – that is, to the survival of the society” (53). Girard also claims that the difference between primitive and civilized societies lies between private and public violence, and he continues: “By definition, primitive societies have only private vengeance. Thus, public vengeance is the exclusive property of well-policed societies, and our society calls it the judicial system” (15). For him, violence can be constructive only if it is unanimous, involving the participation of all members of the community, whereas private violence is always destructive and leads to cyclical repetition.

It follows that if positive violence has an order-keeping function in society, than this violence has to be either collective, or if it is individual, it has to be sanctioned by the community. Individual violence involves a greater danger of launching a cycle of reciprocity and of disrupting the harmony of the community, as it can more easily be motivated by the interest of the individual than of the group. Thus individual violence can only be positive if it aims to conserve order and it bears the community's approval. Like Girard, Max Weber writes that complex groups of humans strive towards the creation and the reinforcement of order. He famously defines the state as an organization whose "administrative staff successfully upholds a claim to the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force in the enforcement of its order" (154). Weber does not think exclusively in terms of modern societies, as the formulation of his definition seems to suggest. Order can be collectively constructed and supported by the majority, as in the case of modern democracies, but it can also be imposed upon the community and subsequently accepted by its members. He also states that "physical force is by no means limited to political groups even as a legitimate method of enforcement," as in the case of medieval groups (154). The monopoly on the legitimate use of violence does not mean that only the collective or impersonal violence of the state or group can be legitimate: individual violence can also have a claim to legitimacy if it is approved by the order of the group. "The use of force is regarded as legitimate only so far as it is permitted by the state or prescribed by it" (156), as in the case of, for example, self-defence.

Given the dual nature of violence, even constructive, order-creating violence involves the danger of spilling over and escalating into a cycle of reciprocal violence. Girard says that the group can be "contaminated" because "cyclical violence still presents a threat to any society [...] the potentiality for such self-destruction always exists" (53). Raymund Schwager emphasises that this is an even more pronounced problem in societies without an established judicial system.

> People who live in states with well-established governments and a smoothly functioning judiciary cannot even begin to imagine how grave the threat of internal violence was for societies without these institutions. […] When there is no governing authority to regulate the punishment of crimes, the cycle of blood vengeance will not stop by itself. (6)

Although violence is an efficient means to curb violence and restore order, it follows from its potentially destructive and cyclical nature that it is not a weapon to be used lightly. Bufacchi argues that violence should only be used as a last resort, after “all peaceful alternatives have been exhausted” (*Violence and Social Justice* 181). Communication can and should be used to avoid violence or the necessity to resort to violence; however, it often fails to provide a solution. Classen, who suggests that the evil of violence can be avoided if it is “resolutely tied with rational communication”, warns that “the breakdown of communication, however, may quickly lead to violence” (17). Reineke is also of the opinion that “violent acts become necessary when speech breaks down, it becomes ‘inadequate’” (3).

When “rational communication” fails, it is also possible to attempt to avoid violence through a threat, which may act as a deterrent. Threats, however, are similarly double-faced as acts of violence in that they can have the power to prevent or stop violence from occurring, but if they do not prove effective, violence usually ensues.

If violence cannot be avoided, and the community wants to ensure its survival, it becomes essential that violence be controlled and regulated as far as this is possible. These regulations are based on the consensus of the community, and those who agree to the terms of this “contract” are protected and empowered by it, whereas those who fail to comply are potentially threatening and have to be destroyed. Legitimate violence has to serve a socially sanctioned purpose, which can be the survival or the prosperity of the community, or the elimination of the elements not conforming to or threatening the social consensus. In religious texts, this purpose can be defeating those who threaten the divinely imposed order of things, the agents of Evil, or propagating the faith. Any act of violence which transgresses these rules is deemed destructive, endangers the order and has to be punished in order to prevent or put a stop to the cycle of violence. As Body-Gendrot writes, “[v]iolence becomes dysfunctional when it is not controlled, channeled, contained by rules and laws and civil norms and when it becomes disruptive for social life in society” (Introduction 3). Such regulations can be provided by the judicial system, by religion, or by codes of behaviour circumscribing the actions of those whom the community gives the license to use violence. It is by this system of regulations and prohibitions that acts of violence can become approved and justified, while negative violence is the overstepping of boundaries imposed by this system. Christoph also argues that the evaluation of violence depends on a “shared community of values” (123), and that negative violence is one which implicitly or explicitly violates the idealized order of this community.

> Violence not only denoted an objective act of brutal physical force, but also very much an interpretation of that act, and interpretation that was steeped in affective considerations and cultural ideals. In the long run, the question is perhaps not whether the violence described is realistic, but rather how its stylized representation helps to affirm, or reaffirm, the legitimacy of an idealized social and moral order. (Christoph 123)

The assessment of violence is thus a social product. In modern societies with an elaborate judicial system, this system defines, controls and regulates the use of violence, as well as justifies and legitimizes it under certain conditions. Similarly, in any community there is a system of values and regulations in place which controls the use of violence and prescribes the acceptable forms of behaviour. According to de Haan, violence is "highly ambivalent in the ways it is socially sanctioned, legitimized and institutionalized" (29).

In the above, I have argued that (1) violence is evaluated subjectively,[1] (2) its evaluation depends on whether it upholds or threatens the values of a community, and that (3) representations of violence express this subjective assessment. In the next section, I would like to present the framework for the analysis of this subjective evaluation at the level of the text employed in this dissertation, the system of appraisal described in Martin and White (2005), Martin (2000) and White (2001).

1.3. Evaluation and Appraisal

Appraisal focuses on how emotions and value judgements are encoded in a text. To quote Martin and White,

> It is concerned with how writers/speakers approve and disapprove, enthuse and abhor, applaud and criticize, and with how they position their readers/listeners to do likewise. It is concerned with the construction by texts of communities of shared feelings and values, and with the linguistic mechanisms for the sharing of emotions, tastes and normative assessments. (1)

The framework presented in the book consists of the three interrelated systems of *attitude*, *engagement* and *graduation*, each of which comprises further subsystems (see the table on p. 20 below). The first of these, *attitude*, involves the expression of feelings, judgements and valuations, that is, the emotional, ethical and aesthetic dimensions of evaluation, respectively. It includes the three corresponding subsystems of *affect*, *judgement* and *appreciation*. *Affect* means registering the positive and negative emotional responses of a person (the emoter), who is either the author (authorial affect) or another party (non-authorial affect). It can be expressed by verbs and adjectives of emotion (e.g. “sad” or “wept”), adverbs (e.g. “sadly”), or nominalization (verbs and adjectives turned into nouns, e.g. “sadness”) (Martin and White 46). The authors list six factors which help in categorizing affect, which are the following: (i) feelings can be positive or negative; (ii) they can be manifested as a “behavioural surge” (e.g. “smiled”, “wept”) or a mental process (e.g. “disliked”); (iii) directed to a specific other (the trigger), e.g. “disliked him”, or undirected (e.g. “felt sad”); (iv) gradable in intensity (low, median and high, e.g. “disliked – hated – detested”); (v) realis (a reaction to the present, e.g. “disliked”) or irrealis (directed towards the future, e.g. “feared”), the latter of which “always seems to implicate a Trigger” (Martin and White 48); and (vi) they can be grouped into four[2] sets, *un/happiness* (“sad/happy”), *in/security* (“anxious/confident”), *dis/satisfaction* (“angry/pleased”) and *dis/inclination* (e.g. “feared / longed for” – dis/inclination is always *irrealis*) (Martin and White 45–52, Martin 148–152).

---

[1] "Subjective" is not synonymous with "individual opinion" here. Its use is intended to express that acts of violence are not judged against absolute moral norms of good and evil.

While affect records emotions, *judgement* expresses assessments of human behaviour using “language which criticises or praises, which condemns or applauds” (White 1). Martin and White divide judgements into two broad groups, those expressing *social esteem* and *social sanction*, both of which can be realized as positive or negative evaluations. Possible categories related to *esteem* include *normality* (“how unusual someone is”, e.g. “lucky/unlucky”, “predictable/unpredictable”, “celebrated/obscure”), *capacity* (“how capable they are”, e.g. “powerful/weak”, “successful/unsuccessful”) and *tenacity* (“how resolute they are”, e.g. “brave/cowardly”, “loyal/disloyal”), while *sanction* is concerned with *veracity* (“how truthful someone is”, e.g. “truthful/lying”, “candid/devious”) and *propriety* (“how ethical someone is”, e.g. “moral/immoral”, “just/unjust”, “polite/discourteous”) (Martin and White 52–53). *Sanction* is of particular importance here, since it is “an assessment that rules of behaviour, more or less explicitly codified in the culture, have either been upheld or breached” (White 1). Martin and White also call attention to the fact that values belonging to *sanction* form the basis of “civic duty and religious observances”, and they are “more often codified in writing, as edicts, decrees, rules, regulations, and laws”, whereas *esteem* “is critical to the formation of social networks” (52).

---

[2] Martin and White in fact list only the first three of the four sets mentioned here, and discuss dis/inclination separately under realis and irrealis affect. However, in their sample text analyses they consistently use the label dis/inclination in addition to un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction, a method which I followed in my own analysis.

The third subsystem of attitude, *appreciation*, is the evaluation of things, phenomena, and performances. Categories of *appreciation* include *reaction* (are the objects pleasing or catching attention, e.g. “captivating/boring”, “beautiful/ugly”), *composition* (“balance and complexity”, e.g. “consistent/contradictory”, “intricate/plain”) and *valuation* (which is less clearly defined and refers to how “innovative, authentic” or “worthwhile” something is, e.g. “penetrating/shallow”, “authentic/fake”, “valuable/worthless”) (Martin and White 56–58). Human beings can also be the subject of appreciation if it is their properties, rather than their behaviour, which is evaluated. Of course, like affect and judgement, appreciation can also be positive or negative, as indicated by the above examples.

Regarding the last two categories, Martin and White write that judgement and appreciation can be seen as “institutionalized feelings, which take us […] into the uncommon sense worlds of shared community values” (45).

In addition to the above, attitude can be *explicit* and *implicit*, which Martin and White discuss in greater detail in relation with judgement. *Judgement* is *explicit (inscribed)* when “the evaluation is explicitly presented by means of a lexical item carrying the judgement value, thus, *skilfully, corruptly, lazily* etc.” (White 3). *Implicit judgement* can be of two kinds: *provoked*, in which case there is no explicit judgement, but the text “does employ evaluative language and these wordings act to direct us towards a Judgemental response” (White 5), and *evoked*, when a description seemingly does not contain evaluation but may trigger judgemental responses in the reader, e.g. “the government did not lay the foundations for long term growth” (White 4). Concerning the latter, White warns that the tokens of evoked judgement “assume shared social norms” and “each reader will interpret a text’s tokens of judgement according to their own cultural and ideological positioning” (4).

The second system of appraisal, *engagement*, means the positioning of the voice of the writer/speaker with reference to other possible voices and positions (Martin and White 94). The value position in the text can be “presented as one which can be taken for granted for this particular audience, as one which is in some way novel, problematic or contentious, or as one which is likely to be questioned, resisted or rejected” (Martin and White 94). The categories of *engagement* include *disclaim*, when the textual voice rejects contrary positions, *proclaim*, when “the textual voice sets itself against, suppresses or rules out alternative positions”, *entertain*, when “the authorial voice represents the proposition as but one of a range of possible positions”, and *attribute*, which is similar to entertain in allowing for alternatives, but the source of the proposition is an “external voice” rather than the author’s own (97–98). Utterances that do not allow for other viewpoints are considered *monoglossic* (e.g. “The banks have been greedy”)**,** whereas those that recognize alternatives are *heteroglossic* (e.g. “In my view the banks have been greedy”, where the phrase “in my view” allows for other possibilities and at the same time, by showing that the utterance expresses the viewpoint of the authorial voice, helps categorize the statement as *entertain*) (100). *Heteroglossia* can be further divided into *dialogistic contraction* versus *dialogistic expansion* (102). Dialogistically *expansive* utterances “make allowances for dialogically alternative positions” (e.g. by the use of verbs like “shows” or “demonstrates”), while dialogistically *contractive* ones aim to distance the authorial voice from such positions and to “restrict the scope” of these (e.g. by the use of verbs such as “claim”) (102).

Finally, *graduation* shows whether the speakers/writers are “more strongly aligned or less strongly aligned with the value position being advanced by the text and thereby to locate themselves with respect to the communities of shared value and belief associated with those positions” (Martin and White 94).

The table below summarizes the systems of *attitude*, *engagement* and *graduation* based on Martin and White.

Attitude	Affect	(i)	positive	
			negative	
		(ii)	behavioural surge	
			mental process	
		(iii)	directed	
			undirected	
		(iv)	low	
			median	
			high	
		(v)	realis (present)	
			irrealis (future)	
		(vi)	un/happiness	
			in/security	
			dis/satisfaction	
			dis/inclination	
		(vii)	explicit	inscribed
			implicit	provoked
				evoked
	Judgement	(i)	positive	
			negative	
		(ii)	social esteem	normality
				capacity
				tenacity
			social sanction	veracity
				propriety
		(iii)	explicit	inscribed
			implicit	provoked
				evoked
	Appreciation	(i)	positive	
			negative	
		(ii)	reaction	
			composition	
			valuation	
		(iii)	explicit	inscribed
			implicit	provoked
				evoked
Engagement	monoglossic	bare assertions		
	heteroglossic	dialogistic contraction	disclaim	deny
				counter
			proclaim	concur
				pronounce
				endorse
		dialogistic expansion	entertain	
			attribute	acknowledge
				distance
Graduation				

The system as outlined above was elaborated for the analysis of Modern English texts, whether literary or non-fictional. It is a legitimate question, of course, how useful such a framework may prove in reading texts from such a remote period. Its application to Old English poetry certainly presents some challenges. For example, as regards *affect*, it may be difficult, if not impossible, to judge the intensity of the lexical elements used (see point (iv) on p. 17 above), as our knowledge of such nuances in the meaning of Old English words may not be sufficient for this. Similarly, provoked and especially *implicit judgement* also poses problems since they rely on "the cultural and ideological position" of the readers and the "social norms" they share with the authorial voice (White 4, quoted above). As the norms and expected ideological positions of the originally intended audience[3] of Old English poetry can be inferred from the texts themselves, this may easily result in circular reasoning. Nevertheless, *explicit judgement*, measuring human behaviour against accepted norms, may prove useful in examining how the evaluation of violence is constructed subjectively in these texts. In addition, since violence is "deeply emotive" (Levi and Maguire, qtd. in Bufacchi, "Two Concepts" 199) *affect*, exploring the emotional content of utterances and the emotional attitude of characters and narrator to events and (other) characters, also seems a tool which may enrich our understanding of how violence is viewed in these poems.

Thus, in my analysis of the texts, I will employ mostly the system of attitude, especially affect and judgement (appreciation, as it focuses primarily on the evaluation of objects rather than persons, is of lesser usefulness here), arranging the results in Tables 1–25 in the Appendix. Since violence is an interpersonal phenomenon, I find it necessary to discuss not only the evaluation of the female characters considered in the present dissertation, but also that of their adversaries as well as of other characters as far as this is relevant to the representation of the central conflict in each case. Each of the tables focuses on a particular character, indicating the appraiser (i.e. the narrator, another character, or the evaluated character him- or herself) in a separate column. An exception to this is *Elene*, where the attitudinal elements are arranged according to the person of both the appraiser and the appraised (Tables 6–14). The tables indicate the subclasses of *affect* and *judgement* in the form of labels with binary values (+ or –) according to whether the evaluation is positive or negative.

---

[3] Of course, it is impossible to define who this intended audience was, as the authors and exact dates of composition of the poems are not known. Thus, I use the phrase to mean the Anglo-Saxon audience whom the author could expect to understand his value judgements, warnings and allusion, some of which we cannot interpret with certainty or which remain indecipherable for us.

1.4. Violence in Old English Literature

The history of Anglo-Saxon England is one of battles, wars and invasions. The period of formation of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was marked by warfare between the invaders and the native Celtic population and between the emerging kingdoms, as well as by dynastic rivalries. The later history of the kingdoms is characterized by the fight against the Viking invaders. Besides the fight against external enemies, another element which contributed to creating a climate of violence was the Germanic blood-feud and the obligation to take revenge. The early Anglo-Saxons had a social structure based on kinship groups, where the kin was responsible for avenging any injury committed against and liable for injuries caused by one of its members. In such a system, the dangers of an escalating cycle of violence which threatened the community's survival were obviously quite high, and it was of paramount importance that the community put a stop to the cycle of revenge. Such an alternative to the blood-feud was found in the Germanic *wergild* system.

It is important to remember that Anglo-Saxon England developed at the crossroads of two cultures, and besides its pagan Germanic heritage it was also shaped by Christianity to a significant extent. The Church also found it important to curb the violence of the blood-feud in order to ensure survival and the creation of that nonviolent space in which religious culture could flourish. George Hardin Brown, who reads Bede in the light of Girard's theory of violence, argues that the first law codes of the newly converted Anglo-Saxon kings and the institution of the *wergild* were efforts to create such a regulating system, the beginnings of "a judicial system in which, according to Girard's formulation, public vengeance takes the place of private vengeance" (23), in order to quell the cycle of reciprocal violence exemplified by the Germanic feud. James W. Earl similarly sees Anglo-Saxon society as a warrior culture whose main concern is to regulate the social violence inherent in the system and provide legal alternatives to the codes of revenge and feuding (147).

George Hardin Brown sees an authentication of Girard's views in the conflicts between the emerging Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. In his opinion, "Anglo-Saxon kingship arose out of the taproot of mimetic rivalry" (20), and he postulates a sacral origin for

Germanic kingship. On the other hand, David Williams points out the significant role played by the Church in both creating the first written laws and solidifying the authority and power of the kings, as well in introducing the concept of sin. Loyalty to kin was gradually replaced by loyalty to the lord, or at least the importance of the latter grew. While these sometimes conflicting loyalties gave rise to further complications and caused fresh outbursts of violence, Williams emphasizes the importance of the loyalty to the lord. Blood feuds based on kinship loyalties did not consider the guilt of the parties and entailed automatic revenge, similarly to the situation Schwager describes as "a relationship of mutual violence, where […] attack is countered by attack" (7). According to Williams, the idea of "the king's peace" and the ever-growing proportion of the fine paid to the king by the perpetrator were turning points as far as the creation of order and the institution of public vengeance are concerned (15).

Religion is one of the systems which can provide a framework for controlling and regulating violence. Although it may seem out of place to claim that it is also a system which can sanction violence through its regulations and make it constructive, Leo Lefebure observes that "throughout the Middle Ages, religion played the dominant role in either authorizing or challenging the exercise of authority and violence". An example he gives for this is medieval courtly culture, "one of the most striking characteristics" of which is "the religious valorization of military service and selective authorization of violence" (37). While the Anglo-Saxon warrior class was not so intimately linked with religion as later medieval knighthood, its representatives enjoyed the support of the Christian church. George Hardin Brown claims that the early Northumbrian kings appearing on the pages of Bede's *History*, including royal martyrs, participate in a mimetic rivalry in which the strongest (the most "violent" or "monstrous") often wins, tolerated and even supported by the church because it benefited from the stability a strong ruler ensured. He writes that Bede "sees the mimetic rivalry as a given and necessary evil, with its concomitant feuds and sacrifices. Strong rulers, even ruthless ones were the price for Christian life and progress in this world" (27), that is, the price for the creation of order and of the nonviolent space necessary for such progress.

The aim of the present dissertation is not a study of Anglo-Saxon society, but of Anglo-Saxon poetic works. I do not claim that literature provides an accurate description of contemporary society, and I do not wish to draw conclusions regarding this society from literary works. For one thing, Old English poetry is restricted in the scope of its themes. It does not concern itself with representations of everyday life, or of servants and churls. It is, on the one hand, the literature of a warrior aristocracy and thus it focuses on their interests. On the other hand, it is Christian and religious, and it focuses on saints and Biblical figures. These two aspects, the heroic and the religious, often overlap. Secondly, whether it is about warriors or religious figures, this literature is predominantly about men in a masculine world, in which women have restricted and marginal roles.

Thirdly, Anglo-Saxon literature does not aspire to realism and historical truthfulness in the way some modern works can. Its aim is not to hold a mirror to contemporary society and describe it in accurate detail. Rather, it presents the ideals of a community, what they think and how they picture themselves, in other words, it presents the values and the order the community wishes to preserve, as well as the system of regulations and prohibitions by which they wish to preserve them. Literature is a form of communication which also creates meaning. Literary representations of violence are not objective, factual accounts by impartial observers. They convey the values and the judgement of the community who is responsible for the production of the literary text. Schwager remarks:

> Since the unified violence of all against one occurs only because all others attach themselves to one instantaneously victorious action because of its mimetic effect, the conceptual world of the random victor becomes *the* truth for that particular community. […] these imagined notions are shared by all and therefore count in the future as certain truth. (24)

This “truth”, the community’s judgement on violence, is encoded in the language through which violent action is described. Warren C. Brown also notes that “[a] third-party observer can, depending on his or her own worldview and position with respect to the victim and perpetrator, easily identify with one or the other” (7–8) and that “the observer or reporter’s position, whether he or she is the victim, perpetrator, or a third party, is embedded in the norms about what constitutes violence and about when violence is justified that he or she believes to apply, believes ought to apply, or has an interest in applying” (8). This is also the case in the texts considered in the present dissertation. The narrator who gives and account of a violent conflict does not aim at an impartial, objective representation of the facts. Influenced by the norms of his own community and by the message he constructs, he takes the side of one of the adversaries in the conflict and identifies with his or her point of view, judging the events and the characters accordingly. Not only is the preferred point of view dominant in the narration and in the evaluation of the characters, but “right” characters are also allowed more space to explain their aims and motives, while the point of view of the "enemy" is simultaneously suppressed, and characters belonging to the latter group are mostly silenced. Thus the text itself becomes the expression of the subjective perception of violence. This perception is communicated through the language employed, which is structured according to whether violence is judged as positive or negative, the identity and relationship of the characters, and their relation to the system of values of the community. Since Anglo-Saxon literature as we have it is the literature of the male warrior elite, it presents the ideals and it also reflects the system of regulations by which this class lived and defined itself. Since warriors lived between the sometimes conflicting loyalties to lord and to kin, and the idea of loyalty and honour also contained the obligation to revenge, which entailed the dangers of an escalating cycle of blood feud, many of these regulations are rules governing and validating the use of violence. In order to diminish its destructive potential, violence has to be strictly regulated and constrained, and a code of behaviour has to be created to ensure the conservation of order, against which individual behaviour can be measured. Literature, besides presenting this code, also serves to reinforce and validate it, as well as shows the dangers of not abiding by the rules. As Christoph writes concerning stylized violence in later medieval romances, which can be regarded as valid for Anglo-Saxon times, too,

> stylized violence in the romances is not [...] merely a fictionalizing of actual conduct, but rather a construction of custom and usage that binds the members of a community to constraints on their behavior. This code is invoked and held to be generally applicable to check irrational impulses, because those impulses would lead more easily to a capricious violation of order. (122)

Although the literature Christoph examines is that of chivalric culture, therefore later than the works under consideration here, his statement has a more extended validity and can be applied to other groups. Like chivalric culture, Anglo-Saxon culture is the product of a warrior elite, thus the regulation and containment of violence and the preservation of the idealized order of the community are paramount among its concerns. Williams expresses a similar view when he writes about *Beowulf* that "the poem presents a complex vision of history and society focusing on the struggle of societies to evolve institutions and moral codes that will ensure the survival of civilization" and claims that the poem has a "didactic social intent" (17).

The idealized order presented in Anglo-Saxon poetry is that of the *comitatus*, an all-male community which defines itself by the heroic code, the regulations built around the use of violence. Donald L. Marshall describes the male gender role as "the set prescribed and proscribed behaviours, expectations and values deemed appropriate for men […] Masculinity is considered the embodiment and enactment of the male gender role" (204). Masculinity and the male role in the world of the Old English poems are inseparable from the idea of violence. It is violence, ensuring the survival of the community and its values, and committed abiding by the formal system of rules, which binds the community together. The *comitatus* seems to illustrate Fanon's statement that "the practice of violence binds men together as a whole, since each individual forms a violent link in the great chain, a part of the great organism of violence" (qtd. in Lawrence & Karim 25).

Within the masculine world of the *comitatus* the paramount role is that of the hero, who is often the same person as the lord. Although the hero is an individual, he acts on behalf of the community, represents its values and strives to restore its order. Schwager writes that "heroes appear in order to overcome the dangerous situation and try to reinstate justice" (7), while according to Girard, the role of the hero is linked to a sacrificial crisis, when the distinction between pure and impure (constructive and destructive) violence is blurred (*passim*). In a similar vein, Eric Wilson writes about the world of *Beowulf* that

> No act of violence in the poem is self-contained, but it results from prior violence and causes future bloodshed; the violence is so excessive that it threatens the very moorings of civilization. This rush toward cultural annihilation is checked only by heroic figures like Beowulf who somehow rise above the violence and even establish peace. (7)

It must be noted, of course, that the peace established in this manner is precarious and can only be temporary, lasting until another conflict emerges.

The hero is a paradoxical figure, since he is stronger and more violent (and usually *the* strongest and most violent) of all, thus he has the greatest destructive potential. Indeed, Girard says that the heroic and the monstrous are "mimetic doubles", two sides of the same coin (18). Following Girard, Wilson also argues that "the king or hero holds his place in society not because he merely puts an end to violence and reflects the traits held to be the most valuable by his culture, but because he often is the most violent threat to a culture" (8), and he points out that in the world of *Beowulf* the good king is necessarily the strongest and the most violent member of the community, "both the causer of reciprocal violence in instigating or participating in blood feuds, and the queller of the same violence in that his fierce sword finally brings his enemies to surrender" (10). What separates the hero from the monster is the former's capability to suppress the cycle of violence and restore order to the community, and his violence is acceptable because it has the community's approval behind it.

Many of the above observations refer to heroic poetry, but not exclusively. Christian Anglo-Saxon literature appropriated the vocabulary, imagery and motifs of native Germanic poetry as well as its form. Christian heroes are presented in terms of the Germanic *comitatus*, a famous example being the treatment of the figure of Christ in *The Dream of the Rood*. Fulk and Cain note that in "biblical narratives and saints' lives, […] patriarchs and saints are recast as God's heroic champions, and Christ's apostles play the role of his *comitatus*" (5), while Earl goes so far as to call the religious literature of the Anglo-Saxons a "martial-arts adaptation of the Christian faith" (136). More importantly, the Christian hero, saint or martyr is placed into the context of the war between the forces of good and the forces of evil, battling pagan enemies or the servants of hell. Even if the fight remains on the spiritual plane, it is nevertheless presented in terms of a real battle. The hero of religious poetry is not less violent than his secular counterpart, and he employs violence to defeat the enemy and to prevent the moral order from degenerating into chaos. Furthermore, Hermann points out the link between spirituality and violence in Old English literature. Reading the works in the light of the *psychomachia*, the spiritual warfare between vices and virtues, good and evil for the prize of the human soul, he argues that, on the one hand, spiritual life is often cast in terms of battle, on the other hand, battle narratives have a spiritual significance (*passim*).

In Old English poetry, violence is often glorified. Earl writes that Old English literature is "best known for its morbid portrayal of suicidal male heroics" (136), which in his psychoanalytical reading he sees as the expression of Thanatos. However, the emphasis is not on suicidal behaviour and the mark of the hero is not that he wishes or is willing to die. The motivation of the hero is to defeat his enemy, ensure the survival of the community and to win fame for himself. He might be ready to die in the process, but death in itself is not enough to ensure lasting fame. Fame can be achieved, firstly, by being victorious on the battlefield, and secondly, if victory cannot be attained, by dying a good death. Fame is dependant on several factors like strength, courage, loyalty, fulfilling the *beot*, in short, on living up to the expectations of the community and upholding its values, and it is the community's way of rewarding appropriate behaviour. Writing about *Beowulf*, Eric Carlson also identifies prestige (fame) and preservation of the household/society as the two main desires which motivate the violence committed by characters in the poem. The two desires are interlinked, because prestige can be achieved by acting for the preservation of the community, and also because prestige itself aids in preservation by ensuring obedience within the community and acting as a deterrent for external enemies (693–694). Furthermore, Carlson argues that the fame of an individual "is a result of and in direct proportion to that individual's willingness and ability to use violence" (694). It is this kind of violence, constructive, order-preserving and regulated, which is glorified, while its opposite, destructive violence which knows no constraints, is reviled or held up as a negative example.

As I wrote above, Anglo-Saxon poetry, secular or religious, is male-dominated and male-oriented, and it primarily reflects the ideals and the ideal order of a male community, in which women are marginalized, with a few exceptions. I would like to emphasize that I do not wish to say that women were insignificant in Anglo-Saxon society nor do I wish to draw conclusions regarding women's social status in this society. Although Anglo-Saxon culture was undoubtedly patriarchal, the work of Christine E. Fell, Jo Ann McNamara and others has convincingly shown that Anglo-Saxon women enjoyed greater freedom of action and greater access to power than their post-Conquest counterparts (see Fell, McNamara, and McNamara and Wemple). In literature, and especially in the vernacular poetry, however, the focus is on the order and values of a community of men, and the question of violence is represented in this context. Female characters appearing in the poems are not an integral part of this order, they rather exist together or beside it, defined primarily in the context of their relation to the male community and thus in the context of their relation to male violence.

One of the problems for interpreting female roles in Old English poetry is precisely that this poetry focuses so much on men and representing male interests that we do not really know what a woman is expected to do or how she is expected to behave if she becomes engaged in a violent conflict. John William Sutton, for example, writes that the heroic ethos "is a resolutely *male* institution, closely linked to aristocrats' conceptions of masculinity" (emphasis in the original), and he adds that "[i]n those rare cases in which female characters are depicted in 'heroic' terms [i.e. they commit violence], they are almost invariably masculinised in some way" (5), a view which is held by numerous other scholars as well. On the other hand, not only are female 'heroic' figure rare, but women also rarely become the direct, intended victims of the violent act; usually, they are accidental victims, their suffering the result of an act of violence directed against another. This can be observed especially in secular poetry, since due to the nature of warrior society, men are much more likely to become targets and victims of acts of violence.

However, we can note that, due to the military character of this world, men are also much better equipped to cope with the injury and damage resulting from violence. To oversimplify a little, the order and rules of heroic society provide models and solutions to men, which help them cope with violence and its consequences. If a man becomes the object of an act of violence, he can choose from a few pre-determined and prescribed options: he can take revenge, or he can die trying. The system of vows, personal loyalty and striving for fame help men whose behaviour conforms to these norms avoid becoming victimised, that is, they do not have to lose their self-respect or be "reduced to less than they were before", as Bufacchi puts it in his discussion of the Humiliation Factor (*Violence and Social Justice* 119). Death on the battlefield or while taking revenge erases the shame of defeat, thus defeat does not necessarily equal weakness or vulnerability. There are numerous role models which show men how to behave in the given circumstances.

In contrast, no such role models or mechanisms for coping are available for women, and we know very little about the socially expected reaction. According to one possible interpretation, the answer to this question is the emphasis on female passivity in contrast with male activity. In this approach, taking action, e.g. taking revenge is a male prerogative, while the role of women is to suffer or mourn in a passive way. Counterexamples, women taking revenge and actively taking action, such as Modthryth or Grendel's mother are held up as negative examples, and there are even interpretations according to which the monstrosity or "monster-ness" of the latter lies exactly in the fact that she takes the initiative, thereby appropriating the male role, instead of remaining passive. This is why she is often regarded as man-like or masculine, the "inversion of the Anglo-Saxon ideal of woman" (Chance 95).

I will argue that the above view, represented by Chance and Sutton, follows from the fact that masculine violence receives much greater exposure in Old English poetic texts and the conditions in which it is sanctioned are more clearly visible. The Anglo-Saxon ideal of woman is more difficult to define than the male one, but it cannot be equated with passivity. Of the ten female characters considered in the present dissertation, only three remain entirely passive (and even this number can be disputed), and there are other possible reasons for their passivity besides their gender, as I intend to show. On the other hand five women in this group demonstrate violent behaviour to some extent. In my view, the evaluation of violence does not depend on the gender of the participants but, whether perpetrator and victim are male or female, it is determined by the purpose for which it is carried out and by the degree to which it ensures (or threatens) the integrity of the community. Furthermore, between the extremes of passive suffering and actively engaging in a violent act, Old English poetry contains several examples of women whose lives are defined by the male violence around them, and the strategies available to them.

The aim of the present study is to explore the relationship between women and violence in Old English poetic texts. Since the element of violence is present in most poems, the texts under consideration include the majority, but certainly not all, of the female characters in Old English poetry, the protagonists of the religious poems *Juliana*, *Judith* and *Elene*, and the figures of Wealhtheow, Hygd, Hildeburh, Modthryth and Grendel's mother in *Beowulf*. Another character who is related to violence and thus should belong to this group is Hildegyth in *Waldere*. However, the poem as we have it consists of two short fragments, only the first of which contains a speech which can be attributed with some certainty to Hildegyth, and it is doubtful whether she appears at all in the second fragment. Due to these uncertainties and the shortness of the text, I have decided against including Hildegyth in the present analysis. I have also excluded the figure of Eve in *Genesis B* because, although the story is set in the context of the conflict between good and evil, there are no acts of violence described in the passages involving this character. On the other hand, I also found it necessary to include in the analysis the (male) adversaries of female protagonists as well as other male characters for the sake of comparison, in order to see whether the use of violence or the inability to use it is evaluated differently in the case of women and men.

Each of the female characters in the above list represents a different type. Parallels and contrasts between them can also be interpreted in more than one way, nevertheless, some of them seem to function as "doubles", sharing a similar situation, but differing in one or two key features. In my analysis, I intend to focus on whether the character in question remains passive or engages actively in the act of violence; the role of communication in the conflict; and finally, whether violence is represented as positive or negative. Following the introduction and the review of secondary literature on women in Old English poetry, Chapter 3 will focus on revenge and women who perpetrate direct physical violence, Judith and Grendel's mother. Chapter 4 will discuss women who initiate conflicts and have the power of life and death over others, Elene and Modthryth. The subject of Chapter 5 is Juliana, who, as a martyr, belongs in a separate category, while Chapter 6 will look at women as negotiators, trying to prevent violence, Wealhtheow and Hygd, as well as Hildeburh, the failed peace-weaver who has to cope with the aftermath of violence. Finally, in Chapter 7 I will attempt an overview of female roles in the context of violence and present some conclusions.

1.5. The texts

Judith and *Beowulf* both survive in Cotton Vitellius A XV, a composite manuscript whose second half, the so-called Nowell Codex, dates from the second half of the 10th century. The manuscript belonged to the library of Sir Robert Cotton and was damaged in the fire which ravaged the collection in 1731. The leaves were subsequently mounted in a paper casing which prevented further damage, but also made some lines illegible until the publication of Kevin Kiernan's *Electronic Beowulf* in 1999. The manuscript is now part of the collection of the British Library (Fulk, Björk, and Niles xxv–xxvii).

Judith is the last text in the manuscript, on folios 202r–209v. The poem as we have it contains 349 lines, but is incomplete and it is uncertain how much of its beginning is missing. *Beowulf*, the text preceding *Judith* in the codex on folios 129r–198v, is the longest surviving Old English poem with its 3182 lines.

Elene is a 1321-line long poem by Cynewulf, found on folios 121r – 133v of the Vercelli Book. The manuscript, which contains another poem by Cynewulf, *The Fates of the Apostles*, as well as *Andreas*, *The Dream of the Rood* and several prose pieces, was probably compiled in the late 10th century (Bradley 109–110). It can only be guessed how the codex made its way to Vercelli, Italy, but it has been there since at least the 11th century, and can be found in the capitular library of the basilica in that city. The poem is one of the few Old English poetic works whose author is known, thanks to the runes in ll. 1257–1269, which, read together, spell out the name 'Cynewulf'.

Juliana forms part of another tenth-century collection of Old English poems, the Exeter Book, which is MS 3501 in the Exeter Cathedral Library. Unlike the Vercelli Book and the Nowell Codex, this volume, donated to the cathedral by Leofric, the first bishop of Exeter, contains only poetry. *Juliana*, found on folios 65v–76r of the MS, is another poem by Cynewulf and, like in *Elene*, the author's name is hidden in the text in the form of runes in ll. 704–08 of the 731-line piece.

For poems other than *Beowulf*, I have used the texts in Krapp and Dobbie's *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* (*Elene* vol. 2, pp. 66–102; *Judith* vol. 4, pp. 99–109; *Juliana* vol. 3, pp. 113–133). For *Beowulf*, the primary text I refer to in my study is the fourth edition of *Klaeber's Beowulf*, but I have also consulted George Jack's 1994 student edition, as well as the second edition of the manuscript facsimile with Julius Zupitza's transliteration and notes, published in 1959 by the Early English Text Society.

Modern English translations, unless otherwise indicated, are from S. A. J. Bradley's 1982 *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. Although Bradley's text is often difficult and more than occasionally inconsistent, his versions are among the more reliable ones, as he does not sacrifice accuracy to the original to the requirements of verse form and meter. For *Beowulf* and *Judith*, I also consulted *The* Beowulf *Manuscript* edited and translated by R. D. Fulk (2010), as well as a few poetic translations, especially that of Liuzza (2000).

2. THE WOMEN OF OLD ENGLISH POETRY IN SECONDARY LITERATURE

The image of the women of Old English poetry that emerges from the secondary literature is dominated by two assumptions: firstly, that women are unimportant, marginal figures in these poems, who have little to do with the world governed and arranged by men; and secondly, that they are passive. Those women who do not fit this description, like Modthryth in *Beowulf*, have been regarded as counterexamples to what is considered to be the ideal, and claimed to be unfeminine, even monstrous, an interpretation which casts its shadow even over the heroines of the religious poems. Another representative of this latter group is Grendel’s mother, who for a long time was not even considered together with other female characters, but was rather grouped together with the “monsters”.

The idea that women were unimportant or secondary characters in Old English poetry was already present in the earliest works dealing with the topic. In 1895, Richard Burton wrote that “[t]he role of woman in Old English poetry is comparatively a scant one”, although “the few glimpses we get of woman are precious, and doubly interesting for their very rarity” (2). In a slightly later piece, Grace Fleming von Sweringen, who examines the women of *Beowulf* together with other female characters from “Germanic hero-sagas” (and devotes less than a page of her 12-page article to the Old English poem), also states that “a real feminine role” is missing from these works, and if women do appear, it is “without their taking any active part in the story” (501).

Similarly, in these early writings we also find the idea, echoed in later literature, that woman in Old English poetry is essentially and ideally passive, and those figures who are not are in some ways unnatural and held up as negative examples. Von Sweringen, for example, writes about “these passive women” (referring, among others, to Wealhtheow and Hygd) as opposed to “real heroines” (502). Burton considers scenes involving Wealhtheow and Hygd “a pleasing free-hand description of a woman on her social and public side” (4), and claims that the poet had “the sense of the innate feminine gentleness” (6). He warns, however, that this picture is selective (4), and not all women were “white doves of gentleness in character” (6). The counterexample, which Burton regards as typical of the age as the depictions of the gentle queens mentioned above, is of course Modthryth, whom he considers “a sort of Lady Macbeth of the early Middle Ages” (4), “a very termagant […], a woman terrible to face, like a blood-thirsty animal for quarrel and killing, ungovernable in her passions, a stirrer-up of tribal troubles, and altogether dreadful" (5).

Neither of these early articles makes any mention of Grendel's mother. Although it is not stated explicitly in the texts, the reason for this might be that the authors did not regard her as a woman, relegating her to the realm of the inhuman, as so many later scholars have done. Nor does she receive attention in J. R. R. Tolkien's 1936 essay "*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics", considered an important milestone in *Beowulf* criticism. In fact, she is not even mentioned in the main text, which focuses on "the *monsters* – Grendel and the Dragon" (246; emphasis in the original), and is confined to a paragraph in brackets in the Appendix (280).

Women were not really the focus of interest of early scholars. In fact, the women of *Beowulf* were rarely the subject of scholarly interest before the second half of the 20th century. The reams that were written about the epic focused rather on versification, grammar, the historical background, the interactions between male characters and the stories within the poem. In his 1950 book on *The Digressions of Beowulf*, in which he argued that these digressions have an important part to play in the structure of the poem, Adrien Bonjour briefly addressed the figures of queens Wealhtheow, Hildeburh and Modthryth. Bonjour saw Wealhtheow as a tragic figure, with Hildeburh's story recounted to call attention to the Danish queen's plight. In considering Modthryth, however, he proposed that she may be compared not only to queen Hygd, but also to the infamous Danish king Heremod, the parallels and contrasts between these characters highlighting issues of leadership and the uses and abuses of power. Bonjour's aim is not to examine female roles within the poem, nor does he draw conclusions concerning women, but the fact that he calls Modthryth "a feminine Heremod at his worst" (55) suggests that he saw no fundamental differences as far as the use of power by men of women are concerned, and he did not regard it as impossible for a woman to have access to power.

Bonjour is a rare exception in this respect. As Alexandra Hennessey Olsen writes in *A Beowulf Handbook*, "traditionally, the study of gender roles in *Beowulf* has been based on the assumption that, since men were responsible for public functions […], they also held the power in the world of the poem. Women, it was assumed, held more passive and private roles […] and were therefore marginalized by the poet" ("Gender Roles" 313).

This view appears, for example, in John Sklute's examination of the figure of the peace-weaver in Old English poetry (1970). Among others, Sklute, like Bonjour, also discusses Wealhtheow and Modthryth. In Wealhtheow, like Bonjour again, he sees a character of “tragic irony”, “although she herself may not realize fully the implications of her admonitions” (208). Modthryth falls short of the ideal embodied in the Danish queen, and in Sklute’s view “the poet moralizes by telling us that peace-weavers ought not to behave so violently” (209). At the end of the article, he comments that after her marriage to Offa, the queen turned to “the far more peaceful, and womanly, occupation of being diplomatic” (209). Thus, Sklute assumes that power and violence are male prerogatives, while being peaceful and diplomatic are “womanly occupations”.

In the late 20th century, works on women and works of feminist criticism (the two are not necessarily one and the same) tried to shed new light on women’s roles in Old English poetry, but they remained informed by the assumption that women are weak and that power is a masculine characteristic. Women who did not fit this mould were claimed to behave in an unfeminine manner, transgressing gender boundaries and appropriating masculine roles.

The first book entirely devoted to the women of Old English works was Jane Chance’s *Woman as Hero in Old English Literature* in 1986. Late as this date may seem, not everybody agreed at the time that the topic merited such in-depth discussion. As one (female) reviewer wrote in 1988, “[u]nfortunately, Chance’s argument and presentation of evidence are frequently weakened by her wish to represent the position and literary treatment of women in Old English literature as being of as much substance, status and importance in the eyes of the Old English poets then as in our eyes today. *Evidently* this is a somewhat problematic proposition” (Brewer 280; emphasis added).

In spite of Chance’s promise “to examine freshly the sources and to ask new questions about the appearance of women in the literature of the period” (xiv) (and notwithstanding the fact that her work remains an important and relevant piece of criticism even today), she seems to take for granted “the literary social ideal of the aristocratic woman as primarily a passive, peaceful, and colorless addition to society” (xiii–xiv), and argues “that the primary conventional secular role of Anglo-Saxon woman demanded her passivity and peace-making talent” (xiv). This ideal is “monstrously inverted” by women like Grendel’s mother, who “behaves in a heroic and masculine way” (xvi). In Chance’s view, heroism in women is only redeemed and made possible by religious fervour and chastity. She regards Juliana, Judith and Elene as representations of the “three categories of virginity”, i.e. the virgin, the widow and the sexually abstinent mother (34),[4] and as allegorical embodiments of the Church (36). Thus, in Chance's view, in order to be accepted in a heroic/active role, women have to become "dissociated […] from their sex" (53) or to transcend it, becoming less and more than a woman at the same time, or simply something *else* than a woman. As Overing and Bennett put it, "[t]he catch, of course, is that they may be not-weak as long as they are not-women […] but the cost is identity, sexual and spiritual. […] The escape from passivity is predicated upon denial and obliteration of the female body, a point Chance makes abundantly clear" (18).

---

[4] Chance’s argument raises a few questions. First of all, nowhere is it mentioned in the Old English *Judith* that the protagonist is a widow, and as Chance herself remarks, “it is not that the *Judith*-poet deemphasizes

In the article quoted above, which appeared in 1990, Gillian Overing and Helen Bennett argue that as long as we try to define women along a male activity – female passivity dichotomy, we cannot reach any other conclusions than that men are active and powerful, while women are passive and weak, or not women: "The controlling premises of binarism motivate or provide an unacknowledged rationale for many of these critical arguments, elevating on occasion the most glib sexual stereotyping (female=passive victim, male=active hero) to critical and cultural principles" (17). Even though certain authors "are attempting to revalue or reconsider women's roles and their representation, the basic conceptual assumption of woman as weak/passive/victim is construed, and only to be understood, in terms of its binary, oppositional relationship to man as violent/active/strong. There is no room for 'other' possibilities, or alternative constructions of female (or male) identity" (17).

Later in the same year that Overing and Bennett published their article, the first volume of essays dedicated to the study of female roles from a feminist point of view appeared, *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. The editors, Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen state in the Introduction that the study of women in Old English literature is "an area of Old English studies that remains dominated by the scholarly consensus established in the nineteenth century" (11), i.e. by assumptions "about female 'passivity' and male 'activity'" within Anglo-Saxon culture, assumptions which "have become our ideological heritage" and reinforced the view that "women were passive, victimized and peripheral" (12). Damico and Olsen also think that allegorical readings, while adding new layers of interpretation, "tend at the same time to destroy character […]. Allegory reduces the person to a less-human figure who stands for something more than human. […] The result of such interpretations is to diminish the

---

her widowhood; in fact he stresses her virginity" (39). Secondly, although the mothers in *Beowulf* live with their husbands and have sons, the question of their sexuality is not discussed. Lastly, and ironically, Grendel's mother could also be said to lead a chaste life on the evidence of the poem.

reader’s engagement with what is essentially feminine in the flesh-and-blood heroine” (13). Accordingly, they claim that the aim of the volume’s essays, which they call “revisionist”, is “correcting ‘false visions’ of women and […] articulating reality anew. […] Each essay proposes alternative conceptions of women and thus asserts an ideology which challenges that held by many nineteenth-century and contemporary scholars. […] In particular, they question the uncritical image of Anglo-Saxon women as passive victims” (15–16).

Nevertheless, the volume partly contains writings published earlier, like the one by Sklute cited above, an article by Chance on Grendel’s mother (published in 1980 in *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* and later in a slightly modified form as a chapter of her book *Woman as Hero*), in which she considers the character an “inversion of the Anglo-Saxon ideal of woman […] both monstrous and masculine […] because she insists on arrogating the masculine role of warrior or lord” (149), or Audrey L. Meaney’s “The *Ides* of the Cotton Gnomic Poem”, first published in 1978, which maintains that women, especially outstanding women, “were regarded as dangerous by the good men of Anglo-Saxon England” (162) and that there was “a proper place” for women “for there are many ready to condemn her” (168). Another (previously unpublished) essay in the volume, Joyce Hill’s “‘Þæt wæs geomuru ides!’ A Female Stereotype Examined” discusses “the highlighting and stereotyping of an idealized male heroism” and the parallel “highlighting and stereotyping of female helplessness” in heroic poetry, a stereotype embodied in the figure of Hildeburh (240). Hill argues that while male characters like Scyld Scefing provide “an opportunity to present in their ideal form concepts of success in war, decisive action, integration into a comitatus,” etc., the female is “a figure of inaction and isolation, a victim of the destructive forces of ‘heroism’” (241). Thus, though it represents an important contribution to criticism with its focus on female roles and its “‘plurality’ of approaches” (15), the volume does not manage to deconstruct the basic dichotomy of female passivity vs. male activity or the assumption that action by women is heavily circumscribed at best and constitutes gender transgression at worst.

The years that have elapsed since then have brought little change in this respect. Even Olsen, summarizing the work done on the women of *Beowulf* in 1998, – although she makes the observation quoted on p. 33 above and warns that certain roles and speech acts may be similar in the case of men and women and thus do not depend on gender – concludes that “[i]n general, the men in *Beowulf* both act and speak, while the women use speech acts to influence male action”, and she perceives a “normally male role” versus a “normally female role” (“Gender Roles” 324). In 2001, the electronic journal *The Heroic Age* published its 5th issue devoted to “Anthropological and Cultural Approaches to *Beowulf*”. Several of the articles in this issue deal with the female characters of the epic from various aspects. In one of these articles, Dorothy Carr Porter argues that women are central characters in *Beowulf*, but in her view women like Grendel’s mother and Modthryth are “monsters” who “act in a more masculine manner than do the other women,” because “they use physical strength and weapons” instead of “using words or marriage to exert influence” (n. pag.). In the same issue, Carolyn Anderson also examines the figure of Grendel’s mother whom she sees as a masculine and monstrous woman embodying the threat of “loss of identity, of differentiation”, an “imitation man” (n. pag.). Almost ten years later, in her book *Monsters, Gender and Sexuality in Medieval English Literature* (2010), Dana Oswald also argues that Grendel’s mother transgresses not only the boundary between human and inhuman, but also the one between masculine and feminine, and that she represents a threat not only to human community, but also to Beowulf’s masculine identity.

The year 2001 also saw the publication of Shari Horner’s book *The Discourse of Enclosure: Representing Women in Old English Literature*, which examines a selection of prose and poetic texts, including *Beowulf*, *Juliana* and the female elegies. In Horner’s opinion, the dominant theme in the texts written for and about women is enclosure, “derived from the increasingly restrictive conditions of early medieval monasticism” (6), which also “inform or structure representations of women in literary texts” (14). Women are enclosed on many levels from the physical to the emotional and spiritual, while their bodies can also be interpreted as enclosures. Even though Horner asserts (at the beginning of a chapter with the telling title “Voices from the Margins”) that her reading of *Beowulf* “will not simply reconfirm traditional models of Anglo-Saxon femininity as passive and long-suffering” (66), she is of the opinion that the women in the poem “are defined in terms of the desirability of containment […] and the dangers of escape” (20), the latter exemplified by Modhtryth and Grendel’s mother, whose characters offer “a series of tantalizing glimpses of the dangers of uncontrolled femininity, before the dominant models of female containment are authorized by Beowulf himself” (19).

Even critics writing about active female characters like Judith maintain the idea that women are ideally passive and action is a male prerogative. Thus, Peter J. Lucas (1992) thinks that the importance of a woman hero lies precisely in her weakness because “[i]f a male hero had the help of God it would be unfair. […] If the hero were a man much of the credit would accrue to himself, so that to a large extent it would be merely a personal victory. A male hero would diminish the efficacy of the help of God theme" (26). Alfred G. Litton (1993) interprets Judith's acts as an example of gender reversal, and claims that she is more masculine than other heroines in Old English poetry. Karma Lochrie (1994) regards violence, sexual desire and drunken revelling as part of masculinity, "underlying […] the masculine economy" (8), and argues that Judith appropriates masculine violence, thus becoming "a threat to the masculine order she exploits" (10). Writing ten years after Lucas, Hugh Magennis states that "within the ideological world of traditional Old English poetry, heroic action is the prerogative of men, not women. Women have an honoured role […] but that role does not normally include carrying out heroic acts. In situations of danger or crisis, they make their contribution not through physical action but through words, of wisdom, incitement and advice. And they are often portrayed passively […]" ("Gender and Heroism" 5). Accordingly, Magennis believes that "anxious disapproval is expressed towards those women whose behaviour is contrary" to prescribed models of feminine behaviour, "like the threatening (Mod)Thryth in *Beowulf*" (7). As regards Judith, "she is presented as taking on the male role of the hero, with its violent action. […] the poet applies male heroic vocabulary to her […] and highlights her role as a military leader. These are the ways in which Judith might be regarded […] as significantly masculinised", although Magennis also notes that "consciousness of her femaleness is consistently maintained" (15). In 2007, John William Sutton addressed the figure of Judith as Holofernes's killer and claimed that her gender is important because to be killed by a woman is a source of shame for a warrior. He writes that although she "may be masculine in her deeds here, but she is still definitively a woman to the poem's medieval audience, so Holofernes's death at her hands carries significant stigma" (68). In 2010, Ivan Herbison interpreted Judith's killing of Holofernes as a comic subversion of the heroic tradition.

Thus, although recent secondary literature recognizes and expresses the need to re-evaluate the role of women in Old English poetry, it reinforces categories and views that have their roots in the Victorian period. All the works cited in the above paragraphs rely on the explicit or inexplicit assumption that if women take violent or even assertive action, they break norms, and their action is inconsistent with their femininity. A solution critics offer to the problem of this perceived inconsistency is that they view these women as masculinised, thus suppressing their womanness. Alternatively, if their femininity is taken into account, their actions must be regarded as ironic reversals of the norm or threats to the male order. That is, they have to correspond to an ideal largely based on our expectations in order to be regarded as women, or they are pronounced to be masculine or relegated to the realm of monsters.

Exceptions to this view are rare. One such is Marie Nelson, who in her book *Structures of Opposition in Old English Poems* (1989) examines the purposes of aggression, arguing for the "Anglo-Saxon poet's unqualified approval of action sufficiently aggressive to assure the continuation of life" (123), and interpreting active women like Judith, Juliana and Elene as "women who served the cause of continued life" (124), be that life physical or spiritual. In contrast with several other critics, Nelson does not believe that action is a male prerogative and that women engaged in acts of violence are guilty of gender transgression, and she claims that "the male-female opposition is totally subordinated to the opposition that lies at the heart of the saint's life" (147), and the female heroes are "worthy […] of praise that Hrothgar gave to Beowulf" (148).

A second assumption, similar and related to the one above, is that women exist in a world of their own, in the sphere of the private, sharply separated from the public sphere dominated by men, in a mysterious space deliberately obscured from our vision. When they come forward from the "margins" and enter the sphere of the public, they may do so only to perform limited and ceremonial roles, like those of hostess, cup-bearer or mourner, or to try to influence men and further interests of their own, which are essentially different from those of men.

For example, in his 1996 book *Images of Community in Old English Poetry*, Hugh Magennis discusses the "concern with community in poetic texts" (1), and argues that "the individual is shown ideally as engaged in a communal enterprise" (38). At the same time, Magennis considers women subservient and vulnerable, noting that "the communal life portrayed in the poetry is overwhelmingly *patriarchal,* the role and function of women being defined by reference to the male goals of warriorship and kingship" (36; emphasis in the original). Another author, Mary Dockray-Miller (2000) examines the female characters in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and *Beowulf* from the aspect of motherhood. According to her, these women are primarily motivated by the urge to protect and nourish their children. She interprets the female characters as challenging heroic values and working against, or around, "a patriarchal culture that occludes motherhood even as it celebrates fathers, patrilineal genealogy, violence, and heroic death" (118).

These views remain prevalent even though, as Overing and Bennett point it out, "woman's power in comparison to man's is greatest where private and social spheres coincide. Where the two spheres are clearly divided, women’s power is much more limited, their status clearly inferior to that of their male counterparts” (16), even though works on history and social history have shown that, on the one hand, women could and did become powerful figures in Anglo-Saxon society, and, on the other hand, public and private were not sharply separated in the early Middle Ages. For example, Jo Ann McNamara argues that class, rather than gender, “was the decisive factor”, and women “drew their importance from their familial roles” (19–20), especially from the conjugal family which “seems to harbor the key to women’s power” (26). McNamara concludes that “in its origins, European civilization was based on the cooperation of men and women” and “it was a time when the sexes collaborated for good or evil more closely than they did in the millennium that followed” (29–30; see also Nelson “The problematic”, and Kelly-Gadol).

In the world of the Old English poems, there is no sharp dividing line between the personal and the communal. The affairs of the royal or aristocratic families presented in these poems determine the fate of kingdoms and peoples, and are interwoven with the affairs of God, while emotional reactions are triggered by public rather than private events. The private and public are intertwined and the focus is on the public, but this is equally true of women and men. While it is true that women are determined by their families and communities, so are the male characters.

In the following chapters, I will argue that the women and men of Old English poetry inhabit the same world and are motivated by the same interests. This interest is what Nelson calls “the continuation of life” (123), and what I refer to in a somewhat less abstract manner as preserving the order and peace of the community and ensuring its survival. I will also argue that the communal always takes precedence over the personal (thus I disagree in this respect with Magennis, who claims that “the primary heroic goal is personal, not communal, glory” (*Images* 38)), and acting in the interest of the communal is the main criterion for evaluation. The personal becomes the focus of attention only insofar it is in harmony with, or disrupts, the communal.

My analysis will focus on the relationship of women and violence, be that either an act of violence they directly engage in, or violence by others that has an impact on them. Using the theory of evaluation of Martin and White, I intend to show that there is no difference in the evaluation of men and women as regards their use of violence or power. Women’s use of violence is evaluated in the same terms and along the same criteria as that of men, the main criterion being whether they are acting in the interest of the community, as suggested in the above paragraph.

I will also argue that there are in fact very few female characters we may call truly weak or passive in Old English poetry. Women are no mere onlookers or helpless pawns in a game played by men. They actively try to and do influence the world around them, and their choice of means – whether by action or by words – depends on the situation. When they are indeed passive, they are so in circumstances in which men would be equally helpless.

3. WOMEN AS AVENGERS: GRENDEL'S MOTHER AND JUDITH

I will start the discussion of female characters with women who actively participate in a violent conflict. Judith and Grendel's mother are the only two in the group of women considered in the present dissertation who commit acts of direct physical violence, and they share several similarities: firstly, both women kill a man, Æschere in the case of Grendel's mother, and Holofernes in Judith's case. Secondly, both killings are committed stealthily, during the night, when the opponent is sleeping. Thirdly, in both cases, the violence is external, i.e. the women and their adversaries do not belong to the same community, and the act of violence is committed in the opponent's "home". Fourthly, the women are not the initiators of conflict in either poem, and their actions are motivated by vengeance: Grendel's mother avenges the death of her only son, while Judith avenges the wrongs suffered by her community, while she also takes revenge for the sexual threat to which Holofernes subjects her. Despite these similarities, the evaluation of the two characters could not be more different: while Grendel's mother is condemned by the narrator, other characters, readers and critics alike, and viewed as a monster, Judith is depicted in heroic terms, and she is the closest we can get to the figure of a female hero in Old English poetry.

In the present chapter, I will examine how these characters and their situation are evaluated by the narrator as well as by other characters, and I will argue that their contrasting evaluations stem from their different positions with regard to the community whose point of view the narrator represents: that of the Danes and Geats in *Beowulf*, and that of the Bethulians in *Judith*. While Grendel's mother is the embodiment of the irrational and the personal, Judith uses necessary violence and subjects her personal interests to that of her community.

3.1. Grendel's mother

Grendel's mother is generally regarded as the most strongly negative female character in Old English poetry. However, as Christine Alfano has pointed out, both critics and translators tend to interpret her in an even more negative light than the text of the poem would warrant, dehumanizing her and turning her into a monster, assigning to the words used to describe her a rather different meaning than when they refer to other characters[5] (12). Jane Chance also observes that some of the expressions describing Grendel’s mother are used elsewhere without negative connotations (e.g. *wif*, *ides* or *aglæca*), and she remarks that she is “*rather oddly* […] described in human and social terms, and through words […] *normally* reserved for human women” (95; emphasis added). Chance’s choice of words suggests a rejection of the humanity (as well as the femininity) of Grendel’s mother, and she interprets the character to be a “parodic inversion both of the Anglo-Saxon queen and mother” (97). Alfano also calls attention to the fact that the same critics tend to extend the concept of the monstrous to include other characters, for example, Modthryth, seen by Irving to be “entitled at least temporarily to the label of the female monster” (qtd. in Alfano 8–9). According to this line of reasoning, any woman becomes monstrous or at best uncomfortable if she resorts to violence, or fails to conform to the pattern of female passivity. I agree with Alfano that this is an easy generalisation and that the “predilection to read a character as monstrous is specifically gendered by critics” (9). While it seems that some modern readers seem to feel much more threatened by female action and aggressiveness than the Old English poets themselves, I think that viewing her as no more than a “powerful, unconventional woman” (Alfano 10) is erring on the other side. In the following, then, I would like to investigate what the monstrosity of Grendel’s mother consists in, and how this monstrosity is linked to violence and gender.

3.1.1. What is a monster?

Jennifer Neville addresses the issue of monstrosity in her article “Monsters and Criminals: Defining Humanity in Old English Poetry”, in which she formulates definitions of the monstrous. She defines a monster as “someone who inverts (and thus defines) humanity so as to threaten society” (103) and stresses the importance of the fact that “monsters do not threaten individuals only, but society as a whole” (112). Discussing Grendel, she argues that he is monstrous because he “stands outside of the social boundaries that define humanity. He is a monster not simply because he has glowing eyes, but because he breaks those boundaries, intrudes into human society, performs acts forbidden by society, and thus threatens society’s very existence” (117). Thus monstrosity is not dependent on form or gender, but on the transgression of the rules which define human society, an observation which is consistent with the argument on disruptive violence presented in the Introduction to the present thesis.

---

[5] One of Alfano’s examples is the problematic phrase *ides aglæcwif* (l. 1259), translated by Bradley as “this female monster” (445), which translation proves Alfano’s point. For a discussion of this and other examples, see especially Alfano 4-8.

In his dissertation on Grendel, Marcus Dale Hensel takes a somewhat different view. Hensel argues that a monster is defined by “both abnormal morphology and deviant behavior” (29 ff). I believe, however, that deviant behaviour is more important than external appearance. Grendel’s larger-than-human size or strength are less frightening or disturbing than the fact that he has a human shape and looks like a human being, while violating the rules that hold human community together. I agree with Neville in this respect, who concludes that “refusal to conform to social rules […] is the essence […] of monstrousness” and that “[t]his criterion for defining monsters inevitably privileges man-shaped monsters”[6] (122), that is, monstrousness is much more frightening if it consists in the perversion of humanity than if it comes in a completely alien form. Thus, I believe that monstrosity is intimately linked with the concept of disruptive violence.

3.1.2. The motif of vengeance

Monstrosity and its significance are also discussed by Kathryn Hume, who argues that “[t]he controlling theme of the poem […] is *threats to social order*” (5, emphasis in the original). These threats are different forms of violence, “[s]pecifically […] troublemaking, revenge and war – problems inescapably inherent in this kind of heroic society, yet profoundly inimical to its existence. The poem’s structure is simply the progressive sequence of these threats, each embodied in a suitable monster. In Beowulf’s conduct, we see the best responses possible within this society” (5–6). Hume’s observations refer to the main storyline, with the monsters representing aspects of external violence, to which we can add that in the other scenes and so-called digressions of *Beowulf* there are further examples of the threat of both external and internal violence, and “most of the seemingly extraneous referential material is actually directly relevant to the action of the movement in which it appears” (Hume 21).

Hume’s argument is also consistent with Neville’s point about the monstrous as a perversion of humanity. Grendel, the first monster to appear in the poem, represents troublemaking, and “his symbolic equivalence to a force normally found within society is underlined by his human shape and by the author’s ironic treatment of him as *healðegn*” (7). Grendel’s mother, in turn, embodies revenge, a force more difficult to control than mere troublemaking, as it “can carry on and extend the scope of the violence indefinitely” (7), that is, it raises the possibility of cyclical violence – which, according to Hume, is why she proves a more difficult adversary for Beowulf than her son (14).

---

[6] Neville points out that the same criterion can be applied to other characters, and cites Holofernes in *Judith* as an example (122), who will be discussed later in the present chapter (122).

In fact, Grendel’s mother has no other function in the poem than to commit this act of vengeance, and she is entirely defined by it. The very first reference to her is in line 1256 of the poem, where the narrator tells us that *wrecend þa gyt / lifde æfter laþum* “an avenger still lived on after the adversary” (445[7]). This is the first and only occurrence of the word *wrecend* in the poem. Similarly, the infinitive of the verb *wrecan* in the sense ‘to avenge’ occurs only 3 times in the text, in each case in connection with Grendel’s mother. In line 1278 we read that *wolde […] sunu deað wrecan* “she meant to avenge her son’s death” (445), which is repeated in *wolde hyre mæg wrecan* “she meant to take vengeance for her kinsman” (447) in l. 1339 and *wolde hire bearn wrecan* “she meant to avenge her child” (452) in l. 1546. In addition, there are two other references in the poem stating that her goal was to take vengeance for her son, using the past tense of the verb *wrecan* (ll. 1333, 2120). Thus, Grendel’s mother is strongly associated with the idea of vengeance.

The motif of vengeance is closely related to the problem of the dual nature of violence. Hume writes that “[w]hat makes vengeance so uncontrollable and tragic is the fact that it is directed by the same laudable forces which help create and ensure social order in a violent world – the desire to conserve and protect kin or allies” (7). Indeed, revenge is not considered exclusively a threatening and destructive act in *Beowulf*. There are examples when it is viewed positively, and Beowulf’s killing of Grendel and his mother is also thought of in terms of revenge. For example, when Hrothgar asks the hero to seek out Grendel’s mother, he promises *Ic þe þa fæhðe feo leanige* “I shall reward you for this act of vengeance” (l. 1380; 448). When Beowulf returns from the mere with Grendel’s head, he claims that *fyrendæda wræc, deaðcwealm Denigea, swa hit gedefe wæs* “I have avenged their violent deeds, the killing of the Danes, as was fitting” (ll. 1669b–70; 455), and later, when he summarizes his exploits to his own king, he again says *Ic ðæt eall gewræc* “all that I avenged” (l. 2005b; 464). In addition, there are also several references to “paying back”, such as he *wolde Grendle forgyldan* “meant to repay Grendel” (l. 1576–77; 453),

---

[7] Unless otherwise indicated, page numbers here and in subsequent chapters refer to Bradley’s translation.

He him þæs lean forgeald "paid him reward" (l. 1584; 453) and *ðam leodsceaðan yfla gehwylces ondlean forgeald* "paid that scourge of the people quittance for every one of his evils" (ll. 2093b–94; 466). Finally, and most importantly, when addressing Hrothgar, Beowulf asks him not to grieve, as *selre bið æghwæm / þæt he his freond wrece, þonne he fela murne* "It is a finer thing in any man that he should avenge his friend than that he should unduly mourn" (ll. 1384–85; 448). Since vengeance is not only a threat to the survival of the community, but also an obligation and a means of protection and of securing stability, its moral value lies not in the act alone.

What does it depend on, then, whether vengeance is to be praised or feared? The first criterion is, of course, that the avenger has to have solid justification for committing it, that is, he or she has to be wronged. Secondly, vengeance is an act of violence, and as has been discussed in the Introduction, the important difference between a negative and a positive act of violence is whether it upholds or disrupts the order of the community, and, thirdly, whether it is suitably controlled in order to avoid escalation.

As regards the first of these points, although revenge is her motivation, technically, Grendel's mother is not entitled to it. The feud between her family and the Danes was initiated by her son, who represents unmotivated, irrational violence. Grendel has no other reason for attacking the Danes than the fact that he is disturbed by the sounds of joy, by the happiness of human society which he is inimical to. He is, as the poet characterizes him, *heorowearh hetelic* "a bloody outcast full of hate" (l. 1267a; 445). In the world of this poem, Grendel is the first hater. It is also mentioned later that Grendel is unwilling to respect the rules of human community, and unwilling to pay compensation for the lives he took. As he did not settle the feud with money, by paying the wergild of the killed warriors, the feud has to be settled by revenge. As a consequence, he is killed by Beowulf, which should put an end to feuding. Grendel's mother appears after this point in the story. As Hrothgar summarizes it, *Heo þa fæhðe wræc / þe þu gystran niht Grendel cwealdest / […] forþan he to lange leode mine / wanode ond wyrde. He æt wige gecrang / ealdres scyldig* "she has avenged that bloody deed by which you last night slew Grendel in violent fashion […] because he too long diminished and destroyed my people. In combat he fell, guilty of capital crime" (ll. 1333b – 1338a; 447). This means that she commits an unrightful killing, as criminals should not be avenged. As Chance notes, "[f]rom the Danish and human point of view she possesses no legal right to exact compensation for her kinsman's loss because Grendel is himself a homicide" (101). However, as Hume observes, "[f]euds do not start unless some interested party has a streak of unreasonableness, whether as aggressor or as injured party unwilling to accept fair compensation” (7). In this respect, Grendel’s mother represents the unreasonableness of the blind desire for revenge which disregards the rules aiming to curb it. She is a representation of the danger of escalating, cyclical violence, and *ge feor hafað fæhðe gestæled* “indeed she has gone far towards avenging the bloody deed” (l. 1340; 447), as Hrothgar says. Such escalating violence can get out of control and threatens the community with destruction. As the narrator remarks, *Ne wæs þæt gewrixle til, / þæt hie on ba healfa bicgan scoldon / freonda feorum* “that was no good bargain, that on both sides they had to trade in the lives of friends” (ll. 1304a–06b; 446).

As for the second of the above points, in the Introduction I argued that conflicts play out on three levels, the personal, the communal and the cosmic. In the world of the poem, it is the Danes and Beowulf’s troop who represent community, and the narrative voice sympathizes with their point of view, while Grendel and his mother embody everything that is the opposite of community. Several authors have noted that community is one of the central concerns in Old English poetry, and is associated with joy and security. For example, Halverson writes that “Heorot embodies the achievement of civilization” and “[i]t is a world that represents the imposition of order and organization on chaotic surroundings. The results of this ordering are (temporarily) security, light and warmth” (601). On the other hand, Grendel, “living in solitude, darkness, and silence and knowing no joy, embodies the ‘fearsome world outside’” (600), “the hostility of the natural world and its inherently anti-social aspects” (599). The Grendelkin are outcasts, who represent everything that is antithetical to the rules and the order of human society. They even fail to form a community of their own in the present of the poem, as they never appear together (except for Hrothgar’s reference to the *twegen micle mearcstapan* in ll. 1345–57, which is an account of an account, as Hrothgar reports to Beowulf what he himself heard from his subjects), and Grendel’s mother is not even mentioned until after Grendel is killed by Beowulf. Existing outside community, and motivated by her desire to take revenge for her child, she does not (and perhaps cannot) rise above the personal level. She does not consider the justness or the morality of her actions, but remains focused on and driven by her personal grief and misery. Such a narrow personal motivation, which is not aligned with or checked by the interests of community, is potentially disruptive and is generally represented as negative in Old English poetry. As Halverson puts it, “durable order depends on depersonalization” (607).

Furthermore, the vengeance committed by Grendel's mother has to be viewed not only in the context of the feud between her son and the Danes, but also of the larger and ongoing feud between God and the seed of Cain, representing the cosmic level in the poem. Indeed, just as Cain was the first murderer, God was the first avenger: *þone cwealm gewræc / ece drihten […] he hine feor forwræc, / metod for þy mane, mancynne fram* "the everlasting Lord avenged that murderous act […] exiled him for that crime far away from humankind" (ll. 107–10; 414). The poet tells us about the provenance of Grendel's mother right after identifying her as an avenger and a mother. Thus she is not simply a woman, but a descendant of Cain, the first murderer and the first outlaw, of a kin *morþre gemearcod* "marked with murder" (l. 1264; 445), an embodiment of violence and strife.

The third aspect in judging vengeance mentioned above is control. Vengeance, like all acts of violence, has to be regulated, ritualized and controlled in order not to get out of hand. Being able to control emotions, most importantly anger, marks the difference between constructive and destructive behaviour according to Wymer and Labbie in their article "Civilized Rage in *Beowulf*", who distinguish between "controlled" and "uncontrolled rage": "Controlled rage is useful to the development of social relations and the nation; uncontrolled rage is damaging to civil interaction and the formation of society" n. pag.). Since rage is a possible motivation and trigger for violent behaviour, the distinction the authors make is closely related to the concepts of positive and negative violence used in the present dissertation and to the idea that control, imposed both by the individual and the community, is a prerequisite for an act of violence not to become disruptive. Wymer and Labbie quote Norman Elias, who writes that violent behaviour has to be "confined and tamed by innumerable rules and prohibitions that have become self-constraints" and "placed under an increasingly strong social control", and they summarize their views on rage as follows: "1. rage is a tool used by the Good to maintain social order. 2. Rage is cultivated, reached through a process that is controlled and subordinated to a rational end when it is used for good. 3. Rage out of control is a serious threat to social order. 4. Rage out of control can most effectively be met by rage in control" (n. pag.), points which are in harmony with the ones made about violence in the Introduction. As opposed to the circumscribed and ritualized violence of heroes, monsters represent "the chaos and unpredictability of violence" (n. pag.). As Grendel's mother represents unregulated human nature, she is not constrained by the rules of the community. The emotions she is shown to have are not ordered or controlled in any way, but are raw, primitive, and short-term impulses like bloodlust, anger and fear. Thus, Grendel's mother embodies human nature without the restraining effects of civilization, isolated from community, and excluded from the cosmic order imposed by God on his creation. Her monstrosity resides in this fact rather than in any of her physical characteristics.

3.1.3. Evaluation

In the text, Grendel's mother is evaluated by the narrator, King Hrothgar and Beowulf (Table 1). However, the passages containing her description contain fewer attitudinal elements than one might expect, as the evaluation focuses on other characters, Beowulf, Hrothgar, Æschere, weapons, even Grendel. She is often referred to with pronouns or with neutral terms such as *merewif* 'water-woman' (l. 1519) or *grundhyrde* "guardian of the depths" (l. 2136; 467), expressions which do not carry negative judgement. Furthermore, in some cases she is mentioned as an addition to an utterance evaluating Grendel, as e.g. in ll. 1682–83, *gromheort guma, godes ondsaca / morðres scyldig, ond his modor eac* "the cruel-hearted creature, God's adversary […] and his mother too" (456).

The emphasis on the status of Grendel's mother as a mother is strong. She has no name, no identity besides this, which is why Dockray-Miller writes that her character is "defined completely by […] her son" (89). She is referred to 5 times as "Grendel's mother" (ll. 1258, 1282, 1538, 2118, 2139) in the text, and two more times as *his modor* 'his mother' (ll. 1276 and 1683) in contexts where Grendel is also mentioned. This is all the more significant because these are practically all the occurrences of the word "mother" in the text of the poem. Although almost all of the women who appear in *Beowulf* are mothers, which is an important part of their identity, they are not labelled with the word mother.[8] However, Grendel's mother is not mentioned at all in the first roughly 1200 lines of the poem, not once during the twelve years in which Grendel threatened and abused the Danish court. At the point when she appears, Grendel is already killed by the hero Beowulf, which means that in the passages where there is such a strong emphasis on her motherhood, she, in fact, no longer has a son. That is, she is defined by her loss, by a dead and absent son, and by her desire to take revenge.

Table 1 in the Appendix presents the evaluation of Grendel's mother. Expressions which can be regarded as neutral and do not carry either positive or negative evaluation or affect (like the examples in the first paragraph above), are excluded from the table. As regards the expressions which have evaluative content, judgement referring to Grendel’s mother is mostly negative, especially [– normality] and [– propriety], such as *manscaða* “wicked predator” (l. 1339), *felasinnigne* “grossly sinful” (l. 1379) or *atol* “terrible” (l. 1332). There are a few instances, however, when even elements of positive judgement occur referring to her strength, such as *mihtig* “mighty” (ll. 1339, 1519) or *ellenlice* “daringly” (l. 2122). The positive elements belong to [capacity] and [tenacity], both forming part of the category of esteem, which can be positive even in the case of negative characters when it refers to the strength, ability or courage of the adversaries. However, the elements belonging to sanction are consistently negative (positive esteem can even combine with negative sanction, as can be seen in line 13 of the table).

---

[8] The only other instance when a woman is called mother is the – also nameless – mother of the Swedish king Onela in l. 2932.

Besides judgement, the passages referring to Grendel’s mother also contain elements of affect. As the analysis of these elements shows, she is characterized by predominantly negative emotions, with the exception of [inclination], which expresses intent and can therefore be positive regardless of how the character is judged, as it will also be seen in the evaluation of other negative characters in later chapters. Negative affectual elements belong mostly to [happiness], including, for example, *yrmþe gemunde* “brooded upon her misery” (l. 1259), *galgmod* “desperate of mood” (l. 1277) and *sorhfull* “fraught with misery” (l. 2119). Andy Orchard argues that these emotions represent “the monster’s point of view”, and as a result, “our sympathy is evoked for Grendel’s mother” (30). I would like to argue, however, that representing the enemy’s point of view is not among the aims of Old English poetic texts. On the other hand, negative emotions, especially anger, misery and fear consistently appear in the description of characters that do not share the values of the narrating voice or those of the community it approves of. Apart from these negative emotions, we do not learn how Grendel’s mother assesses the situation, as she does not speak or offer evaluative elements of the conflict or of other characters.

Halverson also comments on the silence of the monster’s existence: neither Grendel nor her mother speaks. One possible explanation for this is that they, as monsters, are incapable of speech, like the dragon later on in the poem. In a wider context, however, silence is another important characteristic of negative characters. Enemies are not allowed to speak their mind in Old English poetry, except to express their fear or in order that their views can be proven wrong. Negative characters who deliver speeches all participate in scenes of verbal battle and are ultimately defeated, while in cases where violence is physical there is no dialogue between the adversaries. The power of speech and evaluation is an important force. Words create meaning and order, and this power is denied to the negative characters of the poems.

The silence of Grendel and his mother, then, is the silence of the enemy. Furthermore, it may be the case that, since they embody the opposite of human community, they remain unreadable and undecipherable to both the other characters and the narrator, who can only try to interpret their actions and possible motivations in terms of the human society which determines their existence. Not only do the monsters remain silent, but they have no articulated thoughts reported by the narrator, either. This lack of articulation, of creating meaning, may be another mark of their perverted (or anti-) humanity.

3.1.4. Femininity and revenge

As argued above, Grendel's mother represents the destructive power of vengeance and cyclical violence. Another point I would like to consider here is whether her being a woman compounds her monstrosity. Critical opinion divides on whether Grendel's mother as a woman has some justification for murdering Hrothgar's thane for the death of her son. On the one hand, Elaine Tuttle Hansen considers her the representative of "an earlier, more primitive world, where woman must fight when her men have been killed" (114). On the other hand, Jane Chance claims that a "mother must passively accept and not actively avenge the loss of her son" (99). Chance calls her an "inversion of the Anglo-Saxon ideal of woman" (95) as well as an "inversion of the Anglo-Saxon image of woman as peacemaker" (97), and sees in her an anti-type of the Virgin Mary as mother and queen. She also sees Grendel's mother as guilty of gender transgression, mentioning "her masculine aggression contrasting with the female passivity of both Hildeburh and Wealhtheow" (100), and claiming that "she arrogates to herself the masculine role of the warrior or lord" (97). She remarks that "she has never had an identity as a peace pledge to lose since she was never a wife" (100), but she argues that her actions are all the more monstrous because "female 'peacemakers' do not wage war" (101). Alfano also writes that "her moral ambiguity resides in her departure from the peace-weaver stereotype" (5). She goes on to point out, however, that characters like Judith and Elene "hardly conform to the peace-weaver stereotype, yet do not share Grendel's mother's title of 'monster woman'" and their "intrinsic humanity has rarely been questioned" (10).

As regards the above, it is true that Grendel’s mother is the only woman in Old English poetry who kills to avenge the death of a relative. I also tend to agree with Chance that taking vengeance is not the responsibility of a mother. However, we should also consider the fact that we have no female characters in a comparable situation. There are no other members to Grendel’s family, no male relatives who could carry out the act of vengeance. King Hrothgar tells Beowulf that his people saw two human-like forms in the wilderness, and they know of no father, nor other issue. There is no one else who could avenge Grendel’s death. In contrast, to take the women whom Chance mentions, Wealhtheow, for example, has no close kin she could desire to avenge in the time frame of the poem, and she is surrounded by a community of men whose task it is to commit acts of violence. On the other hand, she is far from passive, as by her speeches and interactions with other characters she is trying to avert from her community the threat of both present and future violence. As regards Hildeburh, she is another mother whose son is killed, however, the circumstances of his death are such that exclude the possibility of revenge (these characters will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6).

The fact that Grendel’s mother is a woman who kills may emphasize her otherness, her being outside the rules and conventions of human society. Since the roles of women are less clearly defined than those of men, their behaviour may be used to expose the shady areas, the problems in the system, calling attention to the risks of vengeance and the abuses of power. But while an avenging woman is certainly not the norm in Old English poetry, nor does vengeance alone turn her into a monster. Vengeance and violence are complex concepts in Old English poetry, and recognized as such by both characters and narrators. Just as male vengeance is not always praiseworthy and is not glorified in all circumstances, female vengeance cannot be considered unnatural, menacing and transgressive without taking other factors into account. Vengeance is a risk, and if it does not have solid grounds, is focusing only on the personal and is governed by unchained emotion, it has the potential to escalate and destroy, and would be considered so even if committed by a man. Unreasonableness, uncontrolled negative emotions, a conflict between the personal and the communal and/or cosmic, the deterioration of humanity and the lack of the power to create meaning are traits that characters engaging in negative violence demonstrate irrespective of their gender, as I hope to show in the present dissertation. On the other hand, if violence, even vengeance, is controlled and subjected to the good of the community, it is regarded as positive even if perpetrated by a woman, as will be discussed in connection with the other female character in this chapter, Judith.

3.2. Judith

Judith is the protagonist of the 349-line poem about her, and she is the closest example of a woman acting out a conventionally ‘heroic’ role. Chance, for example, calls *Judith,* together with *Elene* and *Juliana*, “religious heroic poems” (33) and their protagonists “fighting women saints” (31). She suggests that all three women have a “historical or political significance in relation to the defence of the nation or the newly established English Church” (33).

Chance also mentions that the militant spirit that links the three heroines has its root in the “spiritual heroism” (34–35) evident in saints’ lives and in treatises such as Aldhelm’s *De virginitate*. However, while spiritual, rather than physical, warfare is the central element in the case of Juliana and Elene, who fight with the power of their will and their words, Judith is unique in that she actually takes up a sword to behead her enemy. As has been mentioned in the introduction to the present chapter, with the sole exception of Grendel’s mother, Judith is the only female character in Old English poetry who commits an act of physical violence, and, with the same exception, she is the most violent woman presented in the poems, her killing of Holofernes described in rather horrifying detail. In spite of this, she is held up as a positive example. Furthermore, she is also one of the few characters who deliver speeches, exhorting her people and offering them advice.

The three different, but interconnected levels mentioned in connection with *Beowulf*, the personal, the communal and the cosmic, can be observed in this poem as well. On the personal level, Judith commits an act of violence in her own defence, protecting herself from the threat of sexual violence offered by Holofernes. On the social level, she belongs to the community of Jews threatened by Holofernes, and her action serves to avert the threat of violence from her people and makes it possible for them to defeat their oppressors. On the third level, Judith is a representative of the forces of good, and ensures the victory of God’s people over the pagans. This observation concurs with those of Chance, who claims that *Judith* portrays three types of “allegorical battling”: “the chaste soul or *anima* battling the lechery of Olofernes (Holofernes), the virtuous warrior of God or *miles Dei* modeled on Christ opposing the viciousness of the tyrant and evil associated with the Devil, and finally, a prefiguration of the Church or Ecclesia triumphing over Synagogue or paganism” (36).

3.2.1. Vengeance

Given the similarity between the actions of Judith and Grendel's mother, the question is what makes the act of violence committed by Judith not merely acceptable, but praiseworthy. If we apply the same criteria for judging vengeance as in the previous section, we find that, first of all, Judith is justified in killing Holofernes, as she is defending herself from his unwelcome sexual designs. Holofernes *þohte ða beorhtan idese / mid widle ond mid womme besmitan* "meant to defile the noble lady with filth and with pollution" (ll. 59–60; 497), as the narrator tells us. However, Judith's motives are not strictly personal, she is not acting only upon a personal sense of injury and danger. The personal is here aligned with the social, the benefit of the community, as Judith's violence is directed against an external, invading enemy, and puts an end to the suffering of her people at the hands of the Assyrians. Judith calls Holofernes *morðres brytta* "dispenser of violent death" (l. 90; 498), and later on in the poem *Holofernus unlyfigendes / þe us monna mæst morðra gefremede / sarra sorga, ond þæt swyðor gyt / ycan wolde* "the dead Holofernes, who perpetrated upon us the utmost number of violent killings of men and painful miseries, and who intended to add to it even further" (ll. 180–83; 500). To this the narrator adds that *he ær æfter worhte* "he had previously deserved" (l. 65; 498) his fate. Thus, Holofernes is identified as a murderer and the initiator of violence, and Judith's actions are put in this perspective: she is acting not only on her own behalf, but as an agent of just retribution on behalf of her people. Furthermore, since Holofernes "intended to add" to the violence already committed, she is not only taking revenge, but also acting preventively in defence of her community, the "us" in l. 181 indicating her strong identification and firm embeddedness in this community.

The same identification with the community may also be observed in the fact that Judith shares her victory with her people and, in fact, calls *them* victorious rather than herself. On her return, he tells them that ***eow** ys … tir gifeðe / þara læðða þe ge lange drugon* "triumph is granted **you** over those injuries which you have long suffered" (ll. 156–58; 500; emphasis added), and she also refers to the Bethulians as *sigerofe hæleð* "victorious heroes" (l. 177; 500).

Judith also attributes her victory to God: without giving details of the killing of Holofernes, she says simply that *ic him ealdor oðþrong / þurh godes fultum* "I took his life, with God’s help” (ll. 185–86; 500). What is more, before the act of decapitation, the heroine calls on God to exact revenge for the suffering caused by Holofernes: *gewrec nu, mihtig dryhten, […] þæt me ys þus torne on mode* “avenge now, mighty Lord, […] that which is so bitter to my mind” (ll. 92a–93; 498). Her prayer serves two purposes: first, it casts the killing of Holofernes in terms of taking vengeance, and provides justification for her action. Although Judith is the perpetrator of the act of violence, she is merely responding to the acts of Holofernes and preventing him from doing further harm. Secondly, through the wording of this passage, God Himself becomes the avenger, and Judith is no more than the instrument of divine retribution.

Apart from the passages quoted above, God is present throughout the poem, and even becomes an active participant in the story, which is often achieved through the use of active verbs. At the beginning of the text as it stands today, Judith *gearwe funde / mundbyrd æt ðam mæran þeodne* “readily met with a helping hand from the glorious Prince” (ll. 2–3; 496) when she needed that he *hie […] gefriðode* “should protect her” (l. 5), and he *tiðe gefremede* “granted her request (l. 6; 496). When Holofernes has Judith brought to her tent, *Ne wolde þæt wuldres dema / geðafian* “heaven’s Judge […] would not consent” (ll. 59–60; 497) to his designs on her, but *him þæs ðinges gestyrde* “prevented him from the act” (l. 60; 498). Then, after Judith’s prayer and call for vengeance, he *ædre mid elne onbryrde* “at once inspired her with courage” (l. 95; 498).

The connection between Judith and God is also expressed at the level of the phrases describing the heroine, who is called *eadigan* “blessed” (l. 35), *halige* ‘holy’ (ll. 56, 160, 260), *nergendes þeowen* “handmaid of the Saviour” (ll. 73–74), *scyppendes mægð* “the Maker’s maiden” (l. 78), *þeodnes mægð* “the handmaid of the Lord” (l. 165), and *metodes meowlan* “the woman of the Lord” (l. 261). With two exceptions, these phrases occur when Judith is in the Assyrians’ camp, which underlines the opposition between believer and heathen, and reminds the reader that the conflict takes place not only on the personal, but also on the cosmic scale The remaining two instances occur when Judith returns victoriously to her own community with the head of Holofernes, signalling again a wider perspective.

Thus, the personal, the communal and the cosmic points of view are in harmony with one another throughout the poem. Judith’s act of violence is motivated and sanctioned by the latter two, and justified at all three of these levels.

3.2.2. Evaluation

As regards the evaluation of Judith, the adjectives and phrases describing her mostly fall in four large groups: those referring to her beauty, her courage, her wisdom and the fact that she is a servant of God. In his article "The Old English Poetic Vocabulary of Beauty", Paul Beekman Taylor writes that in Old English poems, "beauty is a positive force" (211). Taylor also remarks that "beauty is rarely an isolated or single quality, or even a dominant one" (216). Examining the figure of Judith (and Juliana), he proposes a list of five main virtues that characterize these women, "strength of character, wisdom, moral and social superiority, beauty and piety" (216–17), and which, with some modifications, is also true for other women in poetry, who are characterized by "quickness of mind, sagacity of speech, thoughtful intent toward duty, and shining physical appearance" (217). Helen Damico also discusses the words denoting Judith's courage and wisdom (186), and argues that physical beauty is linked to mental acuity in Germanic literature.

Accordingly, elements of evaluation in Judith's characterization (Table 2) abound in positive judgement, mostly [+ normality] and [+ capacity], but also [+ propriety]. All the elements of judgement are positive, with no exception. On the other hand, there are few affectual elements, and the ones which appear cluster in lines 74–94, the scene in which Judith prepares to kill Holofernes and prays to God for help. These elements are negative, [– happiness] and [– security] referring to the heroine's sorrow and anxiety on behalf of herself and her people, which she calls upon God to avenge. After God "inspired her with courage" (498), however, *wearð hyre rume […] haligre hyht geniwod* "hope was abundantly renewed" (499), which represents [+security] (line 22 in Table 2) From this turning point onwards, the few affectual elements referring to her are all positive.

The description of Holofernes also abounds in elements of appreciating items, mostly of negative judgement (Table 3), offered both by the narrator and Judith. In fact, even though he only appears in the first half of the poem, his evaluation is more detailed than that of the heroine. As in the case of Grendel's mother, the evaluation of Holofernes also contains elements of positive judgement belonging to esteem ([+ capacity] and [+ normality]), especially at the beginning of the poem, where he is represented as a rich and powerful warlord. However, sanction ([propriety]) is overwhelmingly negative. Following the feast scene, when Holofernes retires to his bed, the elements of positive esteem become much less frequent, and the proportion of [– propriety] even higher. These elements of [– propriety] focus on certain well-defined characteristics: he inspires hatred (*lað*, ll. 45, 72, 101; *laðest*, l. 178), he is wicked (*niða geblonden, bealoful, se inwidda, se unsyfra, womfull, feondsceaða, deofulcunda*), a murderer and a heathen.

In addition, his characterization has two aspects which can also be observed in the description of Grendel and his mother, and which, I believe, play an important part in the portrayal of enemies or negative characters who threaten the peace, and are thus legitimate targets of violence. The first of these is the lack of speech also discussed in connection with Grendel's mother in *Beowulf*. Although the poet reports that Holofernes issues commands, these commands are restricted to ordering that Judith should be brought to his bed, and bidding his guests to drink and enjoy themselves. He does not speak directly, nor are his thoughts or feelings represented apart from his intentions involving Judith. It is also significant that there are no items of appreciation attributed to him, he offers no evaluation of the heroine, of other people or of his surroundings. The lack of articulated speech and of articulated thoughts is even more conspicuous as the narrator describes the *noises* he makes: he *hloh ond hlydde, hlynede ond dynede* "laughed and bawled and roared and made a racket" (l. 23; 497), *styrmde ond gylede* "bellowed and yelled" (l. 25; 497). These elements are the addition of the Anglo-Saxon poet: the Latin Book of Judith only states that "*Holofernes fecit cœnam servis suis*" ("Holofernes made a supper for his servants"[9]) (Jud 12.10), and he "*bibitque vinum multum nimis*, *quantum nunquam biberat in vita sua*" ("drank exceeding much wine, so much as he had never drunk in his life;" Jud 12.20). Nor is Holofernes a non-speaking character in the Latin text.

The image that emerges as a result of these changes and additions is of a man spiritually blind, driven by his instincts, and completely oblivious to the wider context of his actions and desires. Like Grendel's mother, he remains focused on the personal, unconscious of any deeper significance of his situation. He is unconscious even at the moment of his death, lying in drunken stupor, which denies him not only the possibility to defend himself, but also that of dying with dignity.

The other aspect is the dehumanization of the enemy. This is closely linked to the previous one, as the lack of speech, the almost animal-like behaviour of Holofernes at the feast, his inarticulate loudness and the manner of his death all contribute to this effect. However, the narrator is even more explicit in his use of words: as has been observed above, Holofernes is called *atol* (l. 75). This is a word which also appears several times in *Beowulf*, and, when its referents are living beings instead of inanimate objects, it is only used in connection with Grendel, his mother and the dragon. In addition, later on in the poem Holofernes is referred to as *þone hæðenan hund* “the heathen dog” (l. 110; 499). The placement of these phrases might also be significant: *atol* appears when Judith contemplates *hu heo þone atolan eaðost mihte / ealdre benæman* “how she might most easily deprive the monster of her life” (ll. 75–76a; 498), while *hund* is used when she strikes the second blow that kills him. Thus, questioning or denying Holofernes’ humanity is linked to his death, which further strengthens Judith’s superior moral position, and softens the fact that she kills another human being.

---

[9] English translations are from the *Douay-Rheims Catholic Bible*.

The opposition between Judith and Holofernes is further strengthened by the juxtaposition of the expressions referring to the heroine’s holiness with the adjectives applied to her adversary. A few lines after Judith is first called *halige* ‘holy’ (l. 56), we read that Holofernes intended *mid widle on mid womme besmitan* “to defile [her] with filth and with pollution” (l. 59; 497), while the phrases *nergendes þeowen* “handmaid of the Saviour” (ll. 73–74; 498) and *scyppendes mægð* “the Maker’s maiden” (l. 78; 498) form brackets, as it were, in which Holofernes is called *atol* “the monster” (l. 75), *se unsyfra* “the sordid fellow” (l. 76; 498) (or ‘impure, unclean, foul’, Bosworth–Toller 1131), and *womfull* “full of corruption” (l. 77; 498). Thus, the offence committed by Holofernes can also be interpreted on three different levels: not only does he threaten the person of Judith and persecute the Bethulians, but he is also guilty because he means to corrupt ‘something’ that is holy and belongs to God, and, accordingly, he is called *nergende lað* “abhorrent to the Saviour” (l. 45; 497).

Since after the return of Judith the conflict widens and becomes a battle between Jews and Assyrians, I would also like to discuss briefly the evaluations of these groups. The phrases describing Holofernes’s men contain judgement, mostly [– tenacity] and [– propriety] (Table 4). The repeated references to their drink-stupefied state stand in sharp contrast with the wisdom and courage of Judith and the Jews. Affect appears in abundance in the second half of the poem, when they discover their leader’s death and are attacked by the Bethulians. With a single exception of [+ inclination], these affectual elements are entirely negative, focusing on [– security] and [– happiness], emphasizing their growing fear and desperation. The poet only allows us a glimpse of the enemy’s emotions when it serves to enhance the bravery and glory of the Bethulians. There is almost no judgement in this part of the poem, except for the phrase *on fleam scacan*, which, although not explicitly judgemental, for an Anglo-Saxon audience is clearly a mark of inferiority and shameful cowardice. The flight of the Assyrians from the battlefield does more than any adjective to cast them in an unheroic light.

The description of the Bethulians (Table 5) also abounds in affect. The affectual elements are largely negative at first, emphasizing the sorrow and suffering they experience. There is also an emotion which does not appear elsewhere in the poem, anger against the heathens. The motifs of suffering and anger justify the killing of the Assyrians, reinforced by elements of negative judgement referring to the acts committed by the latter. The idea of revenge and just retribution is strengthened by the verbs *forgolden* "repaid" (l. 217; 501) and *guldon* "indemnified" (l. 263; 502). Elements of judgement referring to the Jews are positive throughout the text.

3.2.3. Differences between the Latin and Old English texts

The story of Judith is not Anglo-Saxon, but the author of the Old English text made modifications to his source. Although Christopher Fee claims that "[t]he Old English *Judith* first begins to move significantly away from the Vulgate when, after the decapitation of Holofernes, Judith addresses the Bethulians" (402), there are, in fact, important changes in the first part of the poem which affect the portrayal and evaluation of the characters. Firstly, the Latin text emphasizes Judith's beauty (enhanced by God when she goes to the Assyrian camp), her piety and her fear of God, but the phrases describing her wisdom and courage (the other two aspects mentioned at the beginning of Section 3.2.2.) are added by the Anglo-Saxon poet. These phrases belong to [+ tenacity] and [+ capacity], and include adjectives like *collenferhð* 'fierce-minded, bold in spirit' (l. 134) and *ellenrof* 'daring, brave' (ll. 109, 146), which also occur in the description of the hero Beowulf (*collenferhð* in l. 1806, in *ellenrof* ll. 340). Secondly, in the Latin version Holofernes commands his eunuch "*suade Hebraeam illam ut sponte consentiat habitare mecum*" ("persuade that Hebrew woman to consent of her own accord to dwell with me," Jud 12.10), whereas in the Old English poem he simply orders her to be fetched to his bed (ll. 34–37). Thirdly, in the Latin text there are conversations between the heroine and Holofernes, in which Judith intentionally deceives her opponent. The omission of these from the poem has two consequences: it eliminates the element of deception from the story, and it denies Holofernes the power and the opportunity to evaluate the protagonist.

Lastly, as noted in the previous section, the poet adds the term “heathen dog” and verbs denoting animal noises to the description of Holofernes.

The combined effect of these alterations is consistent with the portrayal of adversaries in Old English poetry: the Latin Judith is spiritually superior to Holofernes, but the heroine of the Old English version is also brave and heroic, while Holofernes is silenced and dehumanized.

3.2.4. Femininity

Judith’s femininity is an important issue. According to Chance, “the *Judith*-poet deliberately employs Anglo-Saxon heroic imagery and diction to cast their confrontation as an encounter between the soldier of God and her assailant. Judith anachronistically appears as an aristocratic Anglo-Saxon lady” (39). Damico also notes that “the treatment of the female warriors of Old English heroic poetry – Elene, Judith, Juliana – corresponds closely to the treatment given the Old English heroic male warrior (182). She cites Belanoff to support her argument, who showed that the same vocabulary is applied to “Cynewulfian and Old Testament heroines” as the ones used to define Beowulf, Hrothgar and Andreas (Damico 182). Belanoff writes elsewhere that “heroic poems, whether having male or female protagonists, portray their heroines/heroes confronting overwhelming odds”, but she considers Elene, Judith and Juliana as women who “function in stereotypically male roles” (200).

However, there is nothing in the text to suggest that Judith reverses gender roles in the poem. As has been noted above, she acts as an agent of her community and of God, transferring her victory over Holofernes to her people, from the personal to the communal level. Although the poet mentions that God gave her victory and she won glory, and she is called *eadhreðig* ‘triumphant’ in one instance (l. 136), adjectives referring to victory are more frequent in the description of the Bethulians, which strengthens the idea that she is acting on their behalf, with the sanction of the community. With a few exceptions, appreciating items referring to Judith disappear with her return to Bethulia. There are a handful of references to her afterwards, mostly about her wisdom and holiness, but references to courage are missing. After the killing of Holofernes, emphasis shifts to the Jews, and Judith assumes a role of advisor and source of inspiration rather than that of a warrior-maiden. I see this as counterevidence to the argument that she appropriates a male role or becomes a man. I tend to agree rather with Bradley here, who claims that "when [heroic diction] is applied to the feminine and vulnerable Judith its effect is startling and aptly suggestive of extraordinary stature conferred in answer to the prayer of the righteous" (496).

3.3. Conclusion

The difference in the evaluation of Judith and Grendel's mother is due to the fact that they represent two opposing aspects of vengeance, vengeance as a disruptive force, and vengeance as just retribution. Vengeance, like any act of violence, can be interpreted on three levels, the personal, the communal and the cosmic. For it to be evaluated positively, it has to have solid justification, and has to serve the interests of the community. When the personal, the communal and the cosmic are in harmony, the perpetrator of the act of violence is elevated to the status of a hero. In contrast, when the personal opposes the communal, the perpetrator is evaluated negatively and presented as a monster.

Besides the contrast between Judith and Grendel's mother, similarities may also be observed in the portrayal of enemies, in this case Grendel's mother, Holofernes and the Assyrians. The most important of these similarities are the following: 1. lack of control and the presence of negative emotions; 2. the lack of speech and/or evaluation offered by the character; 3. a tendency to represent enemies as less than human. Given that these elements appear in both poems considered in the present chapter and that the same words also occur in the description of Holofernes and that of Grendel's mother, it follows that "monstrosity" is more strongly linked with the disruptive character of the act of violence rather than with gender or the degree of humanity.

4. WOMEN AND POWER: ELENE AND MODTHRYTH

In the previous chapter, I considered female characters who engage in physical violence. The characters in the present chapter, Elene and Modthryth, do not commit an act of direct physical violence, but they have sufficient power to order others to be tortured or put to death, and to see these orders obeyed. Both of these characters are queens who have the power to decide the fate of others, and they both offer violence to a group of men. Elene uses verbal violence to threaten and intimidate, and her orders to torture Judas are carried out by her retainers, while Modthryth has the men who offend her executed.

There are several questions regarding the interpretation of both women: how great is the power of queens? What are the limitations on women's use of power? Does the use of violence involve a transgression of gender boundaries, does it make these women in a sense 'masculine', and is it something to be condemned by narrator and audience? What is the difference in the behaviour of these women which leads to Elene being considered, on the whole, a positive character, and Modthryth a negative one?

Modern scholars feel uncomfortable with the idea of such power at the disposal of women, and accuse these characters of appropriating masculine roles, or worse. Modthryth is often viewed as monster, comparable only to Grendel's mother. For example, Jane Chance calls her "a type of the female monster" (105), and Dorothy Carr Porter discusses her together with Grendel's mother in a section of her paper subtitled "Woman as Monster" (n. pag.). Elene is also often viewed with a certain antipathy and disapproval by her modern readers. James Doubleday writes, for example, that the poem "is, at first glance, one of the least attractive of the Old English poems to a modern audience", while the protagonist "seems to be one of the most unpleasant saints in the calendar" (116). The reason for the condemnation of these characters is their use of violence despite being women, and, in the case of Elene, her alleged 'anti-Semitism'.

The question is whether the Anglo-Saxon narrator shares the modern critics' objection to women in a position of power. Does the text contain an explicit or implied condemnation of their behaviour? In the following I will argue that the texts do not suggest that a woman in a position of power is necessarily disturbing, or something to be feared. The evaluation of these characters does not depend on their being women, not even on the fact that they resort to violence, but on the end to which they use it. Elene is presented as a glorious queen, a leader who wins an important battle and accomplishes her mission, strengthening the community of Christians. Interestingly, the narrator also calls Modthryth a great queen (*fremu folces cwen*, *Beowulf* l. 1932). Her actions are condemned not because she presumes to use violence, but because she uses it against her own community, threatening its peace and raising the spectre of internal violence, in contrast with Elene, who restores order and brings happiness.

4.1. Elene

A question which figures prominently in secondary literature is the question of Elene's power and authority, that is, how much power she has, whether her position is weakened by her gender, or to the contrary, whether her strength and authority mean that she assumes a masculine role. Karin Olsen writes that "Elene is always second-in-command, who, although an authoritative figure in her dealings with the Jews, remains subject to Constantine's and Judas Cyriacus's orders" (145). Klein notes that several critics think that Elene has less autonomy than her Latin counterpart, and her actions are completely dependent on Constantine's orders, but she goes on to argue that "while Cynewulf emphasizes Elene's close relationship with Constantine, this relationship is but one example of Cynewulf's efforts to portray the queen as firmly ensconced within a larger network of kin and community" (69). Klein interprets Elene's obedience to Constantine in the light of the importance of obedience in Christianity, and points out that she has a well-defined place in the hierarchy of obedience. While she fulfils Constantine's wishes, "she is surrounded by servants and retainers who are ever-ready and eager to fulfill her every command" (78). That is, if Elene is shown to obey Constantine or to have less power than he does, this is not because of her gender, but because of their respective positions in the community. As for Cyriacus, I will argue later in the chapter that while he indeed has higher spiritual authority as bishop, Elene retains worldly power.

The "larger network of kin and community" mentioned by Klein is important, as it is their relation to their community which can justify the actions of the characters. Constantine, in his turn, is not the highest authority appearing in the poem, either. Hermann calls attention to the fact that Constantine also exists within a "hierarchy of obedience" and, quoting Campbell, emphasises the importance of being governed by rules:

> Constantine early in the poem was established as the supreme worldly ruler. Once converted, he more than other people needed reminders that secular power is not

> ultimate. As a Christian ruler, his physical power must be limited by the knowledge that even secular affairs must be governed by divine principles. (qtd. in Hermann 120–21).

It should be noted here that rulers in Old English poetry in general do not have absolute power and cannot act without restrictions. The importance of abiding by the rules of the community, Christian or secular, is a central concern in most of the texts under consideration in the present dissertation. A close-knit community in which everybody has a well-defined role is just as important in the world of *Beowulf* as it is in religious poetry. The kings (and queens) of *Beowulf* are limited in their power, and the dangers of the abuse of power are repeatedly emphasised, as shown by Hrothgar's sermon (*Beowulf* ll.1700–84), and the episodes of Modthryth and Heremod.

Thus, if Elene is not the most powerful person in the poem, or if she owes obedience to other, worldly and heavenly, authorities, that is not only or even necessarily due to the fact that she is a woman. She is referred to as the emperor's mother, and this is important, as it serves to show that she has the power of Rome behind her. However, most of the adjectives referring to her represent her as a glorious, warlike queen and make no mention of her son. She is strong and wields power in her own right. Olsen, Chance and Klein, among others, point out that Cynewulf, departing from his Latin source, transformed her into a model Germanic queen, "an image of female royalty whom Anglo-Saxon readers might view not simply as a phenomenon of a bygone Roman past but as a figure who might be found within their own Germanic world" (Klein 56), using epithets such as *sigecwen* 'victorious queen' and *guðcwen* 'warrior queen' to describe her. She is a conquering queen who intrudes upon the Jewish community and threatens the use of force to secure the success of her mission. Cynewulf certainly does not seem to have the kind of suspicions about her behaviour that modern critics do, and there is no indication in the text that he sees her as anything but a powerful queen exercising her rights in carrying out her son the emperor's instructions.

Elene's power is evident from the fact that she sits on a throne, addressing speeches to her audience. Women in Old English poetry are rarely presented in such a position of authority. (Another queen who is shown sitting on a throne is Modthryth, but only after she is married to Offa and becomes a 'good' queen.) Elene's authority also finds expression in the repeated use of verbs of command in her description and the number of direct commands in her speeches, which continue to characterize her to the end of the poem.

As in the case of almost every assertive female character in poetry, another group of critics have a rather different view, and see Elene not as restricted in her autonomy, but as assuming "the role of Germanic war-lord" (Klein 75). The question here is whether by issuing commands and acting as a leader Elene is behaving like a man and subverting gender roles. Klein is of the opinion that "sustained gender transgression simply cannot be found in Elene at the level of individual female behavior" (75). While it is true that in Old English poetry we have very few images of a ruling, assertive queen, we know from other sources that women could and did wield power in Anglo-Saxon England, even if temporarily. The only other queen in poetry who is shown using power is Modthryth, and she is admittedly presented in unfavourable light, but not, I will argue, because she is a ruling woman, but because she abuses her power and turns it against her own community. After her marriage to Offa, she is shown as sitting on a throne beside her lord, a clear sign of her power, now channelled in the right direction. The other queens represented in poetry, more precisely in *Beowulf*, Wealhtheow and Hygd, appear in the presence of their lords, thus they are shown performing ritual functions, carrying the cup, giving gifts, but not actually exercising power. The ceremonial nature of their actions does not necessarily mean that these women are devoid of power, but that the situation in their scenes does not call for their use of it. At the same time, although Hygd does not rule after her husband's death, she clearly has the authority to make important decisions and offer the throne to Beowulf, while Wealhtheow claims the same readiness and eagerness of the Danish retainers "to fulfill her every command" as Klein mentions in relation with Elene above (*Beowulf* ll. 1230–31).

Being an aggressor, Elene does not seem to share much with queens like Wealhtheow and Hygd, who are epitomes of the passive peaceweaver (e.g. Chance 105). However, her main concern is the same as theirs, restoring order and defending the harmony of the community. Hugh Magennis writes that "Old English poems tell of striving for community and of absence of community. They demonstrate a preoccupation with questions of social harmony and of order and rule, under which shared lives can be carried on" (189). As argued by Klein, quoted above, Elene is fully integrated into society, with the power of an empire behind her. At the same time, she is also a representative of the community of the Christians. Thus, like other characters in religious poems, Elene functions on three different levels, not only the personal, but the social and the spiritual as well, as a queen and a Christian.

Much of the story of the poem is cast in heroic and military terms. According to Reinert, Cynewulf emphasizes "Elene's position as queen and military leader even above her spirituality and wisdom", and replaces the Latin text's emphasis on Elene's learning and spirituality "with a more heroic image of the queen, [and also] with a depiction of her that presents her as a dutiful thegn" (101). Klein also observes that, as a departure from the Latin text, Cynewulf's Elene is "almost always surrounded by a vast group of her own armed warriors" (69), which she interprets as part of a larger scheme: "All of the Christians in the poem are presented as firmly embedded within a community, which is figured as a felicitous by-product of Christianity, a reward for and feature of faith. […] In *Elene*, then, to be Christian is to be surrounded by an ever-present community that is loving and harmonious" (75–76). That is, according to Klein, Christianity is equivalent with community and harmony in the world of the poem, whereas being a non-Christian with solitude (77). I agree with this observation, and I believe that this is in harmony with the findings of the present dissertation, namely that positive characters are generally portrayed as part of a community, bound, but also protected and empowered by the rules of the community, while negative characters are alone, either physically, or by being spiritual outcasts (or both), defined by their exclusion from the happiness represented by social bonds and having no one they can trust. Their rejection of the rules results either in their destruction or, in a more fortunate case, their reintegration. This is the case with Judas/Cyriacus, whose conversion, as Klein notes, becomes such an "occasion for a public ceremony of communal reintegration" (76).

Somewhat paradoxically, then, through threats, torture and coercion, Elene extends the joy and security represented by the Christian order. This is a battle which does not end with the destruction of one community, but its inclusion into that of the victors, mutually strengthening each other. Travelling across the sea to a distant land in order to achieve this, Elene performs the functions of a peaceweaving queen, though with much greater success. Klein remarks that "throughout the text, she functions as a mediator, a catalyst in the process of helping others to discover Christian truth", and points out that it is Judas, not her, who actually finds the remains of the Cross (61), while Chance also comes to the conclusion that Elene "weaves peace between her tribe and God by triumphing over the Jews" (47–48).

4.1.1. Evaluation

The results of the analysis of attitudinal elements are shown in Tables 6–14. In selecting the passages to be analysed, I have focused on the figure of Elene in her interaction with Judas and the Jews. For this reason, I have omitted the beginning and end of the poem, in which Elene does not make an appearance, and also the conflict between Judas and the devil, which, although rich in attitudinal elements, is beyond the scope of the present study. Similarly, I have omitted minor characters like the Roman soldiers or the old man whom Elene summons. The attitudinal elements are arranged in the tables according to the person of the appraiser and the appraised. Because of this arrangement, I will only fill in the "Appraised" column if the person appraised is different from the character under consideration in the table in question.

The remaining text is long, and contains several appraisers: the narrator evaluates Elene, the Jews and Judas; Elene evaluates the Jews and Judas; Elene and Judas evaluate themselves. Interestingly, the Jews are not assigned appraisals of any of the characters, and Elene is not appraised by anybody apart from the narrator and herself.

4.1.1.1. Elene evaluated by the narrator

As shown in Table 6, the narrator's evaluation of Elene is mostly one of positive judgement, focusing on her power as a queen and her resoluteness in fulfilling her task. The emphasis on Elene's power is striking. In about a quarter (28%) of the instances quoted in the table, she is referred to as *cwen* 'queen' and once as *ides* 'lady' (both words appear elsewhere in the poem as well). Besides these, she is also called *caseres mæg* "the emperor's kinswoman" (l. 330; 173) and *rex geniðlan* "regal adversary" (l. 610; 180). These expressions place the focus on her authority and her position. She is not simply acting as a woman, but as a royal, representing the society she comes from. In addition, heroic and military terms abound in her description.

As Reinert remarks, "Whereas the Latin text described Helena solely in terms of her holiness and wisdom prior to her arrival in Jerusalem, Cynewulf's depiction of her is almost entirely comprised of heroic language" (102). Elene's arrival in Jerusalem is cast in the vocabulary of armed conflict: she is called *guðcwen* 'warrior queen' (l. 254) and *sigecwen* 'victorious queen' (l. 260) even before she does anything to earn this characterization. She arrives in all the glory and strength of somebody who has power, accompanied by her soldiers. The military atmosphere is further enhanced by the use of expressions like *herefeldas* “fields of battle” (l. 269; 172) and *lindwigendra land* (l. 270), describing the lands through which she approaches Jerusalem. *Lindwigendra land* is an ambiguous phrase. Klein and Bradley, for example, understand *lindwigendra* to belong to the phrase *heape gecoste* ‘with her proved troop’ (l. 269), but it could also be a variation on *Iudeas* ‘Jews’ (l. 268), evoking the image of two parties at war. The narraror’s choice of words suggests a physical conflict, and would be appropriate for representing the approach of an invading army, although the battle between the queen and the Jews will be one fought with words.

The fact that Elene arrives *secga þreate*, with “her contingent of men” (l. 271; 172), makes her unique among the female characters of Old English poetry in that she, as a woman, commands an army of men. Thus Elene is presented in similar terms to a hero or ruler commanding a troop of armed followers and her first action in Jerusalem is a command: *heht ða gebeodan* “commanded it to be proclaimed” (l. 276; 172). Elene is acting on Constantine’s behalf, but she is more than a messenger or ambassador, as shown by the abundance of verbs of command in her description. The repetition of *cwen* (21 times) also calls attention to the power she wields. At the same time, she is mindful of *þeodnes willan* “her prince’s wish” (l. 267; 172). The referent of *þeodnes* is her son, but the use of the word also evokes another lord it is often used to denote, God, thus linking the personal, social and cosmic levels.

In the rest of the poem, the narrator’s evaluation of Elene remains focused on positive judgement and her power, emphasized by the frequent use of *cwen* ‘queen’, *heht* ‘commanded’ and *bebead* ‘ordered’. The verbs of command could be interpreted as affectual elements [+security] according to Martin and White (65), but I understand them as tokens of inscribed judgement, as they reflect Elene’s capacity to issue commands and the degree of comfort with which she issues them. Although there are other queens in Old English poetry who expect their words to be obeyed (such as Wealhtheow and Hildeburh), none of them is as imperious as Elene. To the frequent repetitions of *heht* and *bebead* are added phrases like *on þrymme bad in cynestole* “waited in majesty upon a throne” (l. 330; 173), *sio þær hæleðum scead* “she who dictated to the people” (l. 709; 183), as well as the use of the word *negan*. Bosworth and Toller give the meaning of this word as ‘to approach one with anything, to address’ (421), but the related form *nægan* is glossed (besides the meanings already mentioned) as ‘assail, assault’ (420). Clark Hall also gives the meanings ‘accost, speak to’ as well as ‘attack’ (245). Reinert, citing Olsen, interprets it as “to attack or assail”, having “semi-martial connotations” (106).

Compared to the abundance of judgement, the narrator’s characterization of Elene contains very little affect. In the first part of the text, affect does not play an important part, and when it appears, it underlines her wish to fulfil her mission. Apart from the joy she feels on her arrival, there are only two passages in which affect becomes emphatic, in both cases positive: after Judas defeats the devil, and her even greater bliss when he brings her the nails. Negative affect appears only once, when she is angered by the Jews’ refusal to disclose the place of the Cross, and she becomes *yrre* ‘angry’ (l. 573) at having the truth disguised from her.

I also included the phrase *mid arum* ‘mercifully’ (l. 714) in the table, even though it is used of the soldiers releasing Judas from his prison, because they are carrying out Elene’s command, as reinforced by *swa him seo cwen bebead* ‘as the queen ordered them’ (l. 715) in the next line, thus it is in fact Elene who is acting mercifully.

The importance of Elene’s role is also shown by the confidence with which she speaks, and the emphasis on the publicness of her speeches. Reinert mentions the verb *maþelode* ‘to speak, to make a speech’, which in her opinion “usually connotes an especially important and public speech”, and she also mentions two instances of *for eorlum* ‘before the men’ introducing Elene’s second and fourth utterances, “increasing [her] position as an authority” (109).

In addition to Reinert’s examples, *for eorlum* also appears before Elene’s first speech to Judas (sixth speech in Table 7), as well as in l. 1197 when she commands the nails to be taken to Constantine. Other phrases that emphasize the publicness of her performance are *wlat ofer ealle* ‘she scanned across them all’ (l. 385) and *for herigum* ‘before the crowds’ (l. 406).

The speeches are also characterized by the boldness with which Elene speaks in public. Her first speech is preceded by the word *negan* (l. 287), discussed above, while the second by *maþelode* and *for eorlum* (l. 330). Before the third speech, *genegan* appears again, in combination with *wlat ofer ealle* (l. 385). Before the fourth utterance, not only *maðelode* and *for eorlum* (l. 404) are used, but she also speaks *undearnunga* ‘clearly’ (l. 405) and *hlude* ‘loudly’ (l. 406), while *for eorlum* ‘before the men’ is repeated in *for herigum* ‘before the crowds’ (l. 406). Before the fifth speech, which contains her threat, *maþelade* appears again, together with *yrre* ‘angry’ (l. 573), expressing negative affect, and *negan* is also repeated in l. 559. Before her sixth utterance, her speech to Judas, *for eorlum* appears together with *undearnunga*.

After the fourth command, Elene is called *rice* ‘powerful’ (l. 411) and *bald* ‘strong’ (l. 412). Judas is also called *bald* in one instance, by the Jews when they convey him to Elene (l. 593, as an answer to her last command/threat). While Elene is *bald in burgum* “strong within her cities” (l. 412; 175), Judas is *bald on meðle* “confident in debate” (l. 593; 179), the parallel phrases expressing their opposition.

After the conversion of Judas, references to Elene become fewer, thus it is all the more striking that the majority of her appearances involve issuing commands, while Judas, the main protagonist of the action in this part of the poem, issues only one command. Verbs of command abound even in the last scene of her speech to the Jews before her departure. She is also referred to as *bald* once again in l. 1072, when she speaks boldly to Judas. The use of *bald* in l. 1072, as well as the verbs of command used towards the end of the poem show that, far from receding into the background, the queen retains worldly power and the same authority that characterizes her at the beginning of the poem, even though Judas, who became a bishop – a position not open to Elene – surpassed her spiritually.

As we have seen, the narrator’s evaluation of Elene is repetitive and overwhelmingly positive, focusing on judgement and showing her joy when her wishes are fulfilled. When affect appears, she is represented by positive emotions. With a few exceptions, this appraisal is mainly complemented by Elene’s own speeches, as there is hardly any appraisal about her by Judas or the Jews. Elene’s evaluation of herself does not contain many attitudinal elements. She is focused on her mission, and her discourse is directed outwards, to the Jews and Judas. She does not talk about her own emotions in 1st person singular before the nails scene (l. 1070 ff.), and the affect which appears here emphasises her personal involvement.

4.1.1.2. Judas and the Jews evaluated by Elene

Elene evaluates both Judas and the Jews in her speeches, and these speeches are strongly attitudinal. As Reinert remarks, the speeches addressed to the Jews are deeply accusatory in tone, “referencing the plural ‘you’ thirteen times… and reflecting the Latin text’s repeated use of second-person plural verb forms… and second-person plural pronouns”

(106). The analysis of attitudinal elements in Table 7 reinforces this point, since these passages contain mainly negative judgement on the Jews' deeds. Positive elements also appear, implying a series of contrasts: first, the contrast between Christ's and God's love for the Jews and the favours Christ granted them, as opposed to the wicked deeds the Jews answered these with. Second, there is a contrast between the Jews' past and present behaviour (blindness and wickedness), and the deeds Elene expects and commands them to perform (truthfulness and obeying commands). There is also a third opposition between the terms she applies to the Jews' behaviour (overwhelmingly negative) and the wisdom of the men she wants them to find (positive). Positive judgement appears in relation with the latter, mostly in the form of commands, i.e. how the Jews should act and the kind of men she wants them to find.

It is interesting to note that, contrary to her negative view on the Jews' behaviour, Elene does not question their wisdom and the truthfulness of their answer. In fact, wisdom is the only positive virtue both Elene and the narrator consistently allow the Jews, and the conflict arises from the fact that the Jews have the capacity (wisdom and knowledge) to answer Elene's questions, but they are unwilling to reveal these answers (propriety and veracity). In the subsequent speeches (the second, third and fourth) this pattern is repeated. Elene's accusations become harsher and harsher as the men are fewer in number and ever more knowledgeable. She closes each utterance with commands for the men to go and find those wise ones among them who can provide her with an answer. The third and fourth speeches are given on the same occasion, interrupted by the answer of the Jews protesting their ignorance of how they offended her, to which Elene does not answer, only issues her command. In this passage the third speech contains the accusations and the fourth the command.

While in her first speech she contrasts the Jews' malice with the goodness of Christ, and accuses them with answering favours with wickedness, in her second speech she takes the viewpoint of Christ himself, so that it is indirectly Christ who complains about the ungratefulness of Jews and compares them to the beast who, although stupid, is clever enough to recognize the one who does him good. In this comparison the Jews are more foolish than the animal, since they are unable to realise that Christ is the one who can help them and free them from the snares of the devil.

The Jews hardly answer at all to these first speeches by Elene. This is no real battle in terms of verbal conflict. The queen clearly holds the upper hand, the power to define others, as well as the power to kill others. She explains, accuses and commands, and wants to persuade the Jews. She constructs a meaning, that of the Christian truth, which she wants them to accept. The Jews' refusal, however, generates a conflict, and represents the breakdown of communication. This leads to the next level, where communication becomes the threat of violence. Elene's fifth speech to the Jews is entirely a threat. She threatens them with violence and death if they do not fulfil her commands. However, this is also the last speech that Elene gives to the Jews. Ever fewer in number, the wise men at this point choose Judas (who confesses to knowing the truth about the Crucifixion) as their single representative, and the conflict is now between Elene and Judas. The last words of Elene about the Jews occur in a speech to Judas, where he is still regarded as part of a collective 'you' on whom Elene pronounces negative judgement.

The Jews, blind in spirit, claim that they do not know the answers to Elene's questions, and perhaps they really are too blind to see and grasp her meaning. Judas, however, reveals his knowledge to the Jews before she meets Elene, thus his lying and obstinacy become evident. Judas can be seen as the champion representing the Jews in the battle, but he is also the scapegoat, the one singled out to resolve the conflict. He has no living relatives to avenge him, and he is offered to Elene as a sacrifice.

Just as the narrator's characterization of Elene is full of verbs of command, Elene's direct speeches abound in direct imperatives. According to Martin and White, imperatives are dialogically contractive, since a direct command acknowledges no alternatives. Elene sees no alternative to the meaning she wants to construct, and as a queen, she fully expects her commands to be carried out. She has power over life and death, and whoever disobeys or disregards her commands deserves to be destroyed. Thus the anger the narrator mentions in l. 573 is not a sign of hysteria, or womanly impatience, as Reinert implies (113), but the frustration of a queen who is disobeyed and the frustration triggered by the breakdown of communication, which precedes and introduces Elene's threats.

Reinert questions Elene's authority to pronounce threats and issue commands, and sees her as overstepping the boundaries of her femininity. As mentioned above, several other critics also perceive a transgression of her gender in her behaviour. One expression Reinert brings as evidence here is Elene's accusation in l. 309 that the Jews *wroht webbedan* 'weaved intrigue' (or "fabricated a false accusation" in Bradley 172). Referring to weaving as a feminine activity, Reinert sees in this a reversal of roles, the feminization of the Jews as opposed to the masculinisation of Elene: "If an Anglo-Saxon audience also interpreted Elene's reference to weaving as an insult to the Jews, Cynewulf's addition of *webbedan* to her speech may have served both to reinforce her more masculine, authoritarian position in the poem and to explain or excuse any unfeminine speech acts she might perform" (108). Although the Jews may be interpreted as weavers of strife here, Reinert's idea of the Jews' feminization is carrying the point too far: the phrase *wroht webbian* also occurs in *Andreas* l. 672 (*he wroht webbade* 'he weaved intrigue') and in Blickling Homily X (*ne wrohtas to webgenne* "nor to contrive[e] false accusations" (Kelly 77)) (Bosworth–Toller 1180). In the first example, the phrase has a masculine subject, whereas in the second instance it occurs in a passage which begins with the words *ne beo nænig man* "let no one" (Kelly 77) or "let no man" (Morris 56), thus it does not seem to be commonly associated with women. Unless we suppose that anybody who commits a sin is a woman, it is more logical to suppose that strife-weaving is behaviour to be condemned regardless of the gender of the one who commits it.

As I have noted above, some critics consider Elene an uncomfortable or unpleasant character, partly because of her use of power, and partly because of her "anti-Semitism", deeply troubling to our modern sensibilities, which makes it difficult for modern readers to see her as the glorious figure Cynewulf clearly intends her to be. Nelson, for example, finds it necessary to disclaim any "complicity with anti-Semitism" by calling Judas "a candidate for torture" (*Fighting Saints* 200).

Repeating Nelson's disclaimer, I do not think the Elene is anti-Semitic in particular, any more than Juliana is anti-Roman, for example. Elene should not be interpreted on the personal level only, as a powerful woman transgressing her gender in trying to subdue men, nor only as the representative of the empire confronting the Jewish community: what we witness here is the clash of two different orders, the Christian and the Jewish one. The real battle takes place between the forces of good and evil. Elene has a mission, to find out the truth about the Cross, the "symbol of victory" (Bradley 167), and by withholding this truth from her, Judas and the Jews become the associates of the devil, taking the wrong side in the conflict.

Elene threatens the Jews and Judas with death. Although she does not use physical violence personally, she uses the threat of violence to force her will on Judas and threatens his integrity. In the poems under consideration, women do not offer such threats elsewhere. Grendel's mother kills stealthily, and so does Judith. They do not speak to their enemies, they do not try to avert violence with words, either. The conflict between Elene and Judas is the story of the breaking down of integrity with threats and torture. The words of the queen, *þe synt tu gearu, / swa lif swa deað, swa þe leofre bið / to geceosanne* "two things are open to you: either life or death, just as it better suits you to choose" (ll. 605b–07a;

180) do not offer her adversary a real choice. Whichever option Judas may choose, Elene will win: she will either destroy her enemy, or get her wish. Then she openly threatens death to Judas, emphasizing the public character of his punishment and humiliation: *ðu hungre scealt / for cneomagum cwylmed weorðan* "you shall be put to death by starvation in front of your kinsmen" (ll. 687–688; 182). The first step in fulfilling the threat is throwing Judas in prison, where he is weakened and his will breaks down, (*mægen wæs geswiðrod* "his strength was enfeebled", l. 698, 182; *cleopigan ongan* "he began to cry out", l. 696, 182).

Elene becomes a torturer and inflicts pain as she seeks answers to her questions, and she eventually obtains these answers. Should we understand her anger and violence as female unreasonableness? I believe not. Elene does not want to break Judas for her own personal goals, does not want to destroy him on a whim. She uses her power as a queen and, as shown by the positive judgement abounding in her description, she is entitled to this. Violence is necessary to destroy the "incorrect meaning" created by Judas and the Jews, "to break his obstinacy by force" (Olsen 144), and to construct a correct, Christian meaning as part of creating order. Judas' submission to Elene's will means that he is saved by accepting the Christian truth. By demolishing his integrity, Elene makes possible his transformation and his inclusion in the community of Christians. In a sense, she kills Judas. His death is not physical, but this does not make it any the less real. The old Judas is destroyed, and his confinement in the pit may be understood as a symbolic burial. However, he is given a new life, resurrected by the Cross, which miracle is made possible by his newly found faith. The transformation is marked by his adoption of a new name and a new, Christian identity as Cyriacus.

4.1.1.3. Judas and the Jews evaluated by the narrator

Like Elene, the narrator inscribes negative judgement to the Jews. His criticism is especially strong when he presents them as hiding the truth from Elene. Another similarity between the two evaluations is that the only positive judgement inscribed by the narrator to the Jews concerns their knowledge and wisdom. An important difference, however, is that in the narrator's appraisal affect is also presented. The Jews are characterized by negative affect, sorrow, anxiety and fear. This in keeping with the affectual elements found in the description of enemies in other poems: negative characters experience negative emotions.

After the conversion of Judas, the affect relating to the two sides diverges: this is the first section where Elene is inscribed positive affect, as discussed above, and also the point where Judas's negative emotions are transformed into joy. As words denoting happiness multiply with respect to him and Elene, the suffering of the Jews deepens. Finding the nail represents a second miracle, and a second conversion – that of the Jews. This is accompanied by another change in evaluation, corresponding to the miraculous change of heart of the former enemies: as they realise their sins (which they did not understand previously), they, too, experience joy for the first time. Understandably, this is followed by a change in the evaluative stance of Elene and the narrator: before her journey she gathers those who *heo seleste / mid Iudeum gumena wiste* "those among the Jews whom she knew to be the finest of men" (ll. 1201–02; 194) and addresses them as *leofra heap* "the assembly of dear friends" (l. 1205; 194).

As regards Judas' evaluation, if we consider Table 9, we can notice a marked difference between its first and second halves. In the first part, the narrator's judgement of Judas contains both positive and negative elements. The positive elements all belong to [+ capacity], and refer to Judas' wisdom, the one positive characteristic consistently allowed the pagan Jews in this poem. Negative elements comprise [– capacity], Judas' lack of power compared to Elene and his inability to avert her threats, and, more importantly, [– tenacity] and [– propriety], judging his behaviour and his hiding of the truth. Judas is not simply beguiled, he knows the truth since he heard it from his father, but still he wants to keep it secret, therefore he is guilty, and condemned as such by the narrator in *scyldigne* 'guilty' (l. 692).

Even more remarkable, however, is the abundance of negative affectual elements in this part, [– security] and [– happiness]. Negative characters are often characterised by and experience negative emotions elsewhere in Old English poetry, especially loneliness. Those who do not respect the rules of the community become unhappy and remain alone. Judas is called *anhaga* 'the solitary man' in l. 604. His companions give him up into the power of the queen as a sacrifice, to bear her anger alone, and he is alone against the might of the Romans. At the same time, by his wilful lies and obstinate refusal to reveal the truth, Judas stands against the community of Christians, from which he excludes himself. One who rejects the love of God, the love and inclusion that Christianity represents in the poem (Klein) must remain alone and in distress. This loneliness is expressed again in *duguða leas* 'without company' in l. 693.

The turning point comes when, after seven days in the pit, Judas sees the error of his ways and promises to reveal the place where the Cross is buried. When brought up, he is still *hungre gehyned* "reduced by starvation" (l. 720; 183) and confused, but also *elnes oncyðig* "conscious of courage" (l. 724; 183), a positive element. From this point onwards, the evaluation of Judas, both affect and judgement, becomes entirely positive. Positive appraisal, especially positive affectual elements become even more frequent after Judas' conversion. When smoke rises from the place the Cross is buried as an answer to his speech, he is described as *eadig* "blessed", *ægleaw* "clear-sighted in faith" (l. 805; 185) and *gleaw in geþance* "clear-sighted in his thinking" (l. 806; 185).

Finding the Cross marks Judas' inclusion in the community. He is no longer alone. He starts digging on his own, but lifts it from the pit *mid weorode* "together with the crowd" (l. 843; 186) and when he and the soldiers/members of the crowd set it at Elene's feet, they are described together as *eorlas anhydige* "of single purpose" (l. 847; 186). Judas and the Christians now have a common purpose, and he becomes part of the other side. His wisdom is still not complete, as he does not possess the knowledge to identify the Cross, but orders the trees to be put down and waits for a miracle. When the lifeless body is brought, he again orders it to be deposited on the ground. These are the first times that he issues orders: his conversion brings him power, as well as happiness and wisdom. When the true Cross is identified by its bringing the dead body to life, he is referred to as *rihtes wemend* "expositor of truth" (l. 879; 186) and *fyrhðgleaw of fæðme* "discerning of spirit" (l. 880; 186). We can notice a gradation in the terms describing Judas' wisdom. As mentioned above, this is his only positive characteristic at the beginning, when he is called *gearosnotor* "very shrewd" (l. 418; 175) and *wordes cræftig* "expert with words" (l. 419; 175). However, this is an empty, superficial cleverness, a self-serving skill. The clearsightedness he acquires after his conversion represents a different degree and quality of knowledge, and finally, in this passage, he is shown as capable of true spiritual wisdom.

As I suggested above, Judas gains new life when he emerges from the pit. The miracle of the Cross, which brings to life the dead body of the young man, also restores the soul and life of Judas. After this, his transformation is complete as shown in the episode when he faces the devil, where he is called *wisdomes ful* "filled with wisdom" (l. 938; 188) and *hæleð hildedeor* "emboldened to the fight" (l. 935; 188).

4.1.1.4. Evaluations by other characters

If we consider the interpersonal evaluations present in the poem, we find that the narrator appraises not only Elene, but the Jews and Judas as well. Judas, though he does not evaluate the queen, appraises both the Jews and himself (Tables 11 and 12). The Jews very briefly evaluate Judas (Table 13), Elene (no table provided due to the small number of examples), and in one instance, themselves, but attitudinal elements are scarce and add nothing to the narrator's evaluation. Taking into account the amount of direct speech in the poem and the abundance of evaluating items, this lack of appraisal on part of Judas and the Jews cannot be accidental. The silence is deliberate, as the enemy is not allowed to pronounce judgement on the protagonist. Negative characters are rarely allowed to express judgement is Old English poetry, and they are usually characterized by negative affect. The power of interpretation and evaluation rests with the narrator and Elene – and partly Judas, who knows the truth.

The Jews do not have the power of evaluation, nor the spiritual understanding necessary to interpret the events. Their evaluation of Judas is positive, but focuses entirely on his genealogy, wit, skill with words and need for courage, that is, it consists of positive judgement, mainly [+ capacity]. In two instances, they promise Elene that Judas can tell him the truth: *he þe mæg soð gecyðan* "he can reveal the truth to you" (l. 588; 179) and *he gecyðeð þe* 'he will make known to you' (l. 595). The reader knows that Judas does indeed possess the information necessary, but also that he will refuse to disclose the truth.

The only instance when the Jews offer any evaluation of Elene is when they answer her for the first time, after her third speech, mentioning her anger and protesting their ignorance of its source: *ne we geare cunnon / þurh hwæt ðu ðus hearde, hlæfdige, us / eorre wurde. We ðæt æbylgð nyton / þe we gefremedon on þysse folcscere, / þeodenbealwa, wið þec æfre.* "We do not readily understand why you, lady, have been so sternly angry with us. We are not aware of the wrong nor or the great offences which we… have ever committed against you" (ll. 399b–403; 175), which is later followed by *ðære æðelan* 'the noble lady' in l. 545. In Judas' speeches (no table provided), there are even fewer examples: once he refers to her as *ðeos cwen* 'this queen' (l. 533), and later addresses her as *hlæfdige min* 'my lady' (l. 656). Apart from the use of words which correspond to her status and acknowledge her power, these instances contain no appraisal. It may be that Judas and the Jews, spiritually blind, are not allowed to judge Elene. Klein also arrives at the same conclusion, maintaining that the Jews cannot read or interpret Elene, and she remains unreadable to them (60).

4.1.2. Differences between the Latin and Old English versions

Klein argues that Cynewulf makes key changes to his source, and "encases Elene in the linguistic, material, and social trappings that were particular to Anglo-Saxon discourses of queenship" (57), turning her into a mighty *guðcwen*. Reinert, quoted above (p. 66) also notes the use of heroic vocabulary. The frequent references to Elene as *cwen* or *hlæfdige* have been noted above on p. 66. In contrast, as Klein writes, the probable Latin source "most often refers to Helena by her proper name, rarely referring to her by the title *regina* or *domina*" (61). According to Klein, Cynewulf "also enhances the queen's social status by surrounding her with all the trappings of Anglo-Saxon royalty" (64), describing her as gold-adorned (using expressions that also occur in the descriptions of the queens of *Beowulf*) and sitting on a throne, while the Latin text "never refers to Helena's clothing" (64).

Furthermore, Reinert observes that the Old English poet "increases the vocabulary of truth and lies in Elene's speeches, underscoring his heroine's position as the authoritarian Christian seeking truth" (268). At the same time, judgement concerning truth and lies belongs to [veracity], and thus to social sanction, which is the most important factor distinguishing between positive and negative characters in the poem.

Reinert also points out that "”[w]hereas the Latin Helena shows no signs of impatience" (113), Elene's speeches show her "growing impatience" and "increasing exasperation" (116). What is more, the Old English heroine uses more threats of violence than her Latin counterpart, both against the Jews and Judas (264), and her threat to Judas "also incorporates a level of humiliation that does not appear in the Latin source when she suggests that Judas will be starved 'in front of kinsmen'" (265), that is, in public.

As a result, the figure of Elene that emerges from the Old English text is of a powerful and imperious queen who is both able and willing to resort to threats, humiliation and torture to achieve her goals, while at the same time the emphasis on positive and negative sanction underscores her moral and spiritual superiority to the Jews.

4.2. Modthryth

In the Introduction to the present dissertation, I wrote that most of the women characters investigated here represent different types, a slightly different combination of elements, and there is more than one possibility to group them based on the parallels and contrasts present in their description. Modthryth is a minor character in one of the digressions in *Beowulf*, the whole episode taking up less than 32 lines (ll. 1931b–1962). She does not engage in an act of physical violence, instead she resembles Elene in that she has the power to submit others to death. But whereas Elene is a victorious queen and a positive character who delivers bold and public speeches, Modthryth remains silent, her story being presented indirectly, and she is a negative character, at least up to her marriage to Offa.

Since Modthryth does not deliver speeches, all information about her comes from the narrative voice, which tells us about (and condemns) the acts of negative violence she perpetrated before marrying Offa, that is, that she killed the men who dared look at her (or had them killed). Accordingly, critics clearly have little sympathy for her figure. Bernice W. Kliman sees her as “dangerous” (35), and she is one of Tom Shippey’s examples of “wicked queens” (n. pag.). Similarly, Mary Dockray-Miller calls her a “violent queen” (79), and mentions her “all-encompassing evil” (81), Dorothy Carr Porter calls her an “evil queen” (n. pag.), while in Overing’s view she is a “hysteric” (81), “vain, mean, proud, apparently gratuitously violent, aggressive, power-hungry, and initially displays an almost casual contempt for men” (102–103).

Some readers go even farther in their negative view of Modthryth’s character. Based on the fact that, besides Grendel’s mother, she is the only woman in the poem who commits an act of violence (and indeed, of all the female characters under consideration here, only these two commit negative violence), they see an association between the two characters, and regard Modthryth as another example of monstrous femininity. Overing writes that “[w]ith the notable exception of Grendel’s mother, Modthryth is the most unwomanly, unqueenly female in the poem” (102). Porter pairs her with Grendel’s mother under the heading “woman as monster” (n. pag.), and Jane Chance also sees her as “a type of the female monster” (105).

Although it is possible to infer from the context that Modthryth is vain or dangerous, the text does not actually claim any of these. Adjectives like “wicked” or “evil” are missing even from the first part of the passage, which describes the *firen ondrysne* (‘terrible crime’,[10] l. 1932) she commits. There is also a complete lack of the vocabulary of the monstrous, even though characters representing negative violence are often described as or likened to monsters or beasts elsewhere in the poetry (e.g. Grendel, Grendel’s mother, Heliseus, or Holofernes). In fact, while the critical voices seem rather unanimous in their condemnation of Modthryth, the poet uses words like *ænlicu* “unmatched in beauty” (l. 1941; 462) and *gode mære* “renowned for her goodness” (l. 1952; 463). An interesting case in this respect is that of the adjective *fremu* (l. 1932), variously translated as ‘assertive’ (Bradley 463), ‘imperious’ (Jack 141), ‘vigorous, flourishing’ (Clark Hall 138), ‘famous’ (Porter n. pag.), and even ‘excellent’ (Overing 104 and Dockray-Miller 81), that is, with a meaning which is either positive, or at least not obviously negative.[11] This apparent discrepancy is not lost on the critics. Dockray-Miller notes that “the poet cannot condemn her completely with his language” (84), the reason for which is either because he “cannot quite make up his mind about her” (81) or, as she argues, because Modthryth’s gender transgression (a point which I will address later) creates ambiguity in the poem (84). Porter, however, observes that the poet’s choice of words is rather less confusing than it may seem at first sight, and points out that “although her actions are not praiseworthy the poet does not condemn her as a person” (n. pag.). This observation is supported by an analysis of elements of attitude in the passage.

Table 15 summarizes the attitudinal elements together with their target and their positive/negative values. As can be seen, the passage is strongly judgemental, with a few instances of appreciation. Positive and negative values are arranged in well-defined groups: the retainers whom Modthryth kills are judged positively, whereas all the negative evaluations refer to Modthryth’s actions or the results of these actions. However, where Modthryth’s person is concerned, the evaluation is just as positive as in the case of the *gesiðas* ‘companions’ (l. 1934).

What is conspicuous in the table is the almost complete lack of affectual elements. *Leofne* “dearly esteemed” (l. 1943; 462) could be a possible exception, as the word expresses strong emotional content referencing the value of *mannan* ‘man’; however, there is no emoter, the emotional reaction is not personalized. The narrative voice does not express personal emotions, as it is concerned with the social sanction of Modthryth’s behaviour and the esteem of the men who become her victims. More importantly, though, there is no affect inscribed to Modthryth at all. She is completely silenced: not only is her story told indirectly, but her emotional reactions and her appraisal of the events are not even indirectly conveyed, with one possible exception discussed below.

---

[10] Bradley translates the expression as ‘fearsome brutality’ (462), but Clark Hall gives the meaning of *firen* as ‘transgression, sin, crime’ (119) and that of *ondrysne* as ‘terrible’ (263), and Bradley himself translates *firen* elsewhere as ‘violent sin’ (435). Fulk, Bjork and Niles also gloss *firen* as ‘pain, violence, crime, sin, wicked deed’ (381) and *ondrysne* as ‘terrible, awful’ (421).

[11] For a discussion of the possibility that it might be the name of the character instead, see Fulk, Bjork and Niles 224–226.

As regards engagement, the sentence containing the most overt negative judgement, *ne bið swylc cwenlic þeaw…* "such is not a queenly custom" (l. 1940; 462), is monoglossic, a direct statement which leaves no room for alternative opinions. According to Martin and White, such monoglossic pronouncements usually signal that the author expects the audience to be in agreement. However, *ligetorne* (l. 1943) raises an interesting problem. The word, which is translated as 'imagined insult' (Bradley 462), 'pretended insult' (Overing 104) and even 'wrath and lying' (Gummere n. pag.), can be understood as yet another instance of negative judgement on Modthryth's behaviour, as she is the one who imagines, pretends, or lies that she has been offended. At the same time, I think it also has heteroglossic implications. By compounding it with *lige-*, the narrative voice denies the reality of *torn*, performing dialogistic contraction. This, however, allows for the possibility that there may be some who regard the insult as real – if not the poem's audience, then Modthryth herself. If it is so, then this is the single glimpse we receive of Modthryth's view of the events, even if the narrator immediately rejects its validity.

Torn is important because it reveals the reason why Modthryth puts men to death, and the narrator's denial of it justifies his negative judgement on her behaviour. Whether we accept his evaluation will decide whether we see her as a woman defending herself from a threat or one "gratuitously violent" (Overing 103). As mentioned above, the narrator seems to expect his audience to agree with him, and several critics certainly did. Bernice W. Kliman claims that what makes Modthryth bad is "her own reaction to men's desire for her" (35). According to Renoir, she suffers from "paranoiac delusions", and according to Sklute, from "confused libidinal drives" (qtd. in Overing 106). On the other hand, there are also readers – mostly women – who recognize the link between looking, sexuality and violence. Shari Horner, although in a different context, writes that the gaze "is analogous to rape" (*Discourse of Enclosure* 112). Regarding Modthryth's case in particular, Overing considers her "both heroine and victim", whose "violent response to being 'seen' reveals the barely displaced violence of the act of staring" (105).

Modthryth's refusal to be looked at is often interpreted as a rebellion against the masculine order and against an expected passive female role. It is surprising, in fact, how many critics see her actions, and especially her use of violence, as an appropriation of the masculine role, incompatible with a feminine identity. Porter claims that she (and Grendel's mother) "act in a more masculine manner than do the other women", because they "use violence to settle their disputes" (n. pag.). Klein, also discussing her together with Grendel's mother, writes that "the challenges offered by both Grendel's mother and Thryth are grounded in their attempts to invert stock female roles and to assume masculine ones" (105). According to Overing, "[a]ggressive, 'masculine' behaviour is not a 'lady/queenlike custom' […] and is thus construed as a force of evil" (103). Dockray-Miller even argues that her gender "is determined not by the author calling her a *cwen*, a queen […], but by her violent, authoritative and powerful action […] Her assumption of the masculine gender defines her deeds as *firen ondrysne*, a terrible crime in her society" (84). She points out that two words referring two physical violence, *handgewriþene* "hand-twisted" (l. 1937; 462) and *mundgripe* "arrest" (l. 1938; 462), only occur elsewhere in the same poem, and concludes that Modthryth is "ultimately masculine since she wields power in the same way as Beowulf does" (79). I will quote her argument at some length, since it sums up the main points used to support Modthryth's masculinity:

> she has repudiated the conventional female role of passive peace weaver and taken matters of violence, best left to men, into her own hands. The traditional view of the passive peace pledge complements the traditional view of the active hero in this male/female opposition. Within this opposition, power belongs to the masculine. Except for Modthrytho, only men have the power of violence and the power of wealth in the social systems described in *Beowulf*. […] those who wield power are men […] and those who are completely powerless are women, like Hildeburh or Freawaru. (83)

It does not seem to me that the text of the Old English passage, quoted above, contains any indication that the poet thinks of Modthryth as anything else than a woman. It seems that the widespread view of Modthryth's gender transgression rests on three reasons. (1) Her use of violence. According to this line of argument, men have a monopoly on power and action. Since Modthryth avails herself of both, she must become a man. It is this assumed masculinity (rather than the killing itself), which marks her as wicked and monstrous. (2) Her placement in the text right after the passage describing Hygd, seen as the type of the gentle and passive peaceweaver, with whom she is certainly in contrast. (3) The possible interpretation of the poet's judgement *Ne bið swylc cwenlic þeaw / idese to efnanne […] / þætte freoðuwebbe feores onsæce / æfter ligetorne leofne mannan* "such is not a queenly custom for a woman to follow […] that the peace-weaver should exact the life of a dearly esteemed man on account of an imagined insult" (ll. 1940b–43; 462) to mean that if a queen does commit such an act, then she is not an *ides* and not a *freoðuwebbe*, thus not a woman. Klein, especially, considers this sentence "an indictment [of] gender transgression" (236). It is worth noting, however, that Hygd or Wealhtheow, although they are often viewed as model peaceweavers, are never actually called *freoðuwebbe*, while Modthryth is. This is the only occurrence of the word in *Beowulf*, and John Sklute points out that it is used only three times in Old English poetry (204). Sklute also draws attention to the fact that the word alliterates with *feores onsæce* 'exact life' (l. 1942), emphasizing the discrepancy between the model which should be followed and the actual act. Sklute argues that the peace-weaver is understood to be a queen, who "has certain duties to perform", and that peaceweavers "have functioned to cement relationships" (207), "related to the idea of weaving bonds of peace by means of personal behavior or action" (208). Seen in this light, Modthryth's fault lies in breaking bonds rather than cementing them, or rather, weaving the bonds of strife instead of those of peace, as echoed in the word *wælbende* 'deadly bands' (l. 1936).

If Modthryth's greatest crime is that she acts in a way reserved for men, it seems logical to ask if the same actions would be judged any differently if they were committed by a man, which suggests a comparison with a man who performs similar actions, also a negative character in a position of power, Heremod. In *Digressions in Beowulf*, Adrien Bonjour explored the parallels between Heremod and Modthryth, whom he saw as serving to contrast with Beowulf and Hygd, respectively, but also in contrast with each other. In his analysis, Heremod starts out as a positive figure who degenerates into evil, while Modthryth is an initially negative character who is reformed by the end of her story (55). Bruce Moore writes that "the dissatisfaction felt with Bonjour's argument springs primarily from the fact that the structural and thematic parallel is not convincingly related to the concerns of the rest of the poem" (127). I think the parallel becomes much more relevant if we accept that the dangers of disruptive violence and the restoration of order are more important concerns in the poem than the male/female opposition. In fact, even the advocates of Modthryth's masculinity recognize the presence of this motif. Thus Klein writes that both Grendel's mother and Modthryth "assume the role of agent of retaliatory violence" (105), Chance notes that she "severs the ties of kinship binding her to her people" (105), and Overing also remarks in the introduction to her book that she "rends the web of peace with violence" (xxiv). Dockray-Miller even cites Hieatt's argument that there is a contrast between Modthryth and Beowulf which recalls the contrast between Beowulf and Heremod, and focuses "on the misuse and strength of power" (qtd. in Dockray-Miller

82). However, they tend to regard this either as secondary to Modthryth's masculinity or monstrosity, or as a direct consequence of her rebellion against the female role. I believe the comparison with Heremod demonstrates that Modthryth's actions would be judged just as negatively if they were committed by a man. Both characters are in a position of power which they use to perpetrate acts of violence on their own people, and this is what their crime consists in.

Porter writes that Modthryth is less of an evil figure than Grendel's mother because "she functions in society" (n. pag.). This may be true of the second half of the passage, but certainly not of the first, where Modthryth represents a threat to the community. In the Introduction, I quoted Hahn, in whose view destructive violence is identical with internal violence, which takes place within the family or community. Internal violence threatens to disrupt the social structure, and represents an even greater danger than external violence, which unifies the community. In my view, the narrative voice takes issue with Modthryth not because she wields power, but because she wields it for the wrong reasons (represented by the use of *ligetorne* "imagined insult", l. 1943) and directs it against the wrong target (the retainers), an action which threatens internal order. The emphatically positive evaluation of the men (words like *deor* "brave" or *leofne* "dearly esteemed") call attention to the discrepancy between the social esteem they deserve and the impropriety of Modthryth's behaviour.

Examining the Heremod episodes, we find that the narrator is rather more unequivocal in his condemnation of the king than in the case of Modthryth. The Heremod passages abound in instances of negative affect (Table 16), in conjunction with the repeated assertion that initially he possessed (or God provided him with) everything necessary to become an exemplary ruler. Taken together, these elements show him to be a moral failure. In this respect, the lack of affectual elements at the beginning of Modthryth's story may become significant. By negatively evaluating her behaviour, but not her person, the poet creates a careful balance. Modthryth is shown to act in a potentially disruptive way, deceived by her perceptions, but not morally corrupt like Heremod. The lack of affect contributes to this balance. As shown by *ligetorne*, the narrator cannot agree with or be sympathetic to her assessment of the events, while showing (and disagreeing) with her negative emotional reactions could condemn her more than he is prepared to do.

Instead of being denied, Modthryth's femininity has an important impact on the outcome of the story. Were he a man, the crisis she causes could probably be solved only by her death, as is the case with Heremod. No redemption is possible for a king who turns against his own people. In Modthryth's case, however, resolution is brought about not by death, but marriage. This is rather surprising, as 'happily ever after' endings are not characteristic of Old English poetry. Shippey points out that, compared to other queens and princesses given in marriage, whose marriages "are overwhelmingly sad or tragic ones", she "seems by contrast to be the poem's example of success" (n. pag.). This view is shared by Dockray-Miller, who notes that of all the mothers appearing in *Beowulf*, she is the only one "whose child grows into adulthood" (81). Although failing in her function as *freoðuwebbe* in the first half of her story, Modthryth becomes, in a sense, the most successful peaceweaver of all, whose marriage "does not weave peace between men but rather peace between herself and male retainers" (Klein 105).

4.3. Conclusion

Elene and Modthryth are the two most powerful female figures in Old English poetry, who oppose and command men, and who can order others to be put to death. Because of this, they are also characters who are often accused of transgressing their gender. However, as a comparison of the poems suggests, female power, even female vengeance, is not unequivocally negative, to be condemned out of context. The evaluation of the actions of these characters turns, as in the previous chapter, on whether they serve or threaten the order of their community, that is, whether the personal is in harmony with a larger perspective. In *Elene*, we may observe the three levels of interpretation also noted in the poems of the previous chapter. In Elene's case, personal motivation is almost entirely suppressed, and the cosmic-religious is the most strongly present. As the evaluation shows, not only is Elene's use of power depicted in positive terms, but it also seems that violence may be justified as a means to achieve a positive end, bringing joy and happiness.

Similarly, Modthryth's behaviour is evaluated in a negative manner not because of her gender, but because it is motivated by personal and, as the narrating voice suggests, irrational reasons. It is also important that Modthryth acts against her own community, representing internal violence.

In addition to the contrast between Elene and Modthryth, the figures of Judas and Modthryth may also be compared, showing that a positive transformation of negatively evaluated characters and their reintegration into the community is also a possibility. For Judas, this transformation is brought about by his conversion to Christianity and his assuming the role of a spiritual leader in the community. Interestingly, the cosmic level is entirely missing from Modthryth’s story, the conflict she participates in remains confined to the personal vs. the communal. Thus, reintegration in her case is due to her marriage, as a result of which she becomes a successful queen and a successful mother.

5. THE TRIUMPHANT VICTIM: JULIANA

In the previous chapters, I have examined female characters who commit an act of violence or are in a position to exercise power over other people. The present chapter is devoted to the analysis of a character who becomes the victim of violent acts. Cynewulf’s *Juliana* contains some of the most spectacular descriptions of physical violence against women in Old English poetry. The poem, which tells the story of a Christian virgin and her powerful pagan suitor, focuses on the idea of violence as violation of integrity and it also presents two systems of values coming into conflict between. In contrast with the works examined so far, in *Juliana* the viewpoint of the enemy is also elaborated, with both parties trying to impose their own meaning to the detriment of the other.

5.1. Levels of conflict and perception

As with the previous characters analysed so far, the story of Juliana also functions on three levels, the personal, the communal and the cosmic/religious. The conflict between Heliseus and Juliana originates at the personal level, but as it unfolds, it involves not only the community the characters live in, but also Heaven and Hell. Heliseus is motivated by personal desire when he *ongon fæmnan lufian* “began to yearn after Juliana” (ll. 26–27; 303) and *wæs … þæra wifgifta … georn on mode* “yearned in his mind for the marriage” (ll. 38–39; 303), securing her father’s consent. It is Juliana who takes the conflict to the next level, by answering and defying him in public, *on wera mengu* “in the midst of the multitude of men” (l. 45; 303). By publicly imposing conditions on the wedding and disregarding the agreement between Heliseus and her father, not only does she slight him as a suitor and a man, but she also defies him as a figure of authority in front of his people, which Heliseus later refers to as *orwyrþ*, ‘shame’ or ‘dishonour’ (l. 69). It is also Juliana who first casts the conflict in terms of religious difference when her condition for marrying Heliseus is that *þu soðne god / lufast ond gelyfest, ond his lof rærest, / ongietest gæsta hleo* “you love and believe in the true God and exalt his praise, […] acknowledge him the Refuge of souls” (ll. 47–49; 303).

The different levels of understanding of the characters in the poem give rise to different and conflicting interpretations of the situation. At the personal level, Juliana is a young woman who rebels against the will of her father and her suitor and thwarts their plans, which provokes their anger. Indeed, Affricanus, Juliana’s father is unable to see beyond this level and the fact that the governor *is to freonde god* “good to have as a friend” (l. 102; 304), and he considers his daughter’s rejection of him perverse. He calls Juliana’s opposition to the suit *unræd* “foolishness” (l. 120; 305) and accuses her of acting *on geaþe* “foolishly” (l. 96; 304), *ofer witena dom* “against the advice of sensible people” (l. 98; 304) and *unsnyttrum* “unwisely” (l. 145; 305). He also reminds her that the governor is *betra þonne þu, æþelra on eorþan* “a better person than you, of higher birth in the world” (ll. 100–101; 304). Obviously, his idea of a person’s worth is linked with riches, status and worldly values. As a heathen incapable of comprehending other considerations, he sees nothing here but a wilful girl who ruins his opportunity for social advancement on a whim.

Heliseus also regards Juliana’s behaviour as *dolwillen* “rashness” (l. 202; 307); however, her opposition, besides being a personal slight, is also a threat to his authority of governor and to the order of the community he presides over. There is a strong emphasis on the public nature of the heroine’s utterances. Both Reinert and Nelson emphasize the fact that Juliana’s first speech is given in public (*on wera mengu,* referred to above), which is then echoed in the account Heliseus gives to Juliana’s father, in the phrase *fore þissum folce* “in front of these people” (l. 74; 304). The second exchange between Heliseus and Juliana again takes place before a multitude of men, *duguð* […] *folc eal geador* “the court and the people all assembled” (ll. 162–163; 306).

At least initially, there is a contrast between the openness of Juliana and the secrecy and privacy of the pagan characters. While Juliana delivers her terms in public, the men first talk in private, *hy togædre […] sweor ond aþum* “together […] father-in-law and son-in-law” (ll. 63–65; 303). After Heliseus seeks counsel with Affricanus, the latter also tries to persuade Juliana in private, as does the devil later on, who also seeks to divert her from her purpose without witnesses. The idea that public shame is to be avoided is also brought up by the devil, who warns the saint to defend herself not only from death, but *deað fore dugude* “death in front of the people” (l. 256; 308), and it emerges again when he confesses that he brought about the death of Christ *weorud to segon,* as “the crowd was looking on” (l. 291; 309). As it turns out later on, the devil himself is afraid of being publicly humiliated. He dreads having to recount his mission *magum in gemonge* “among my fellows” (l. 528; 314), and when Juliana drags him out of the prison, he implores her not to shame him further *for eorlum* “before these men” (l. 542; 315).

However, since none of these characters manage to sway Juliana’s will, and neither their persuasion nor their threats are effective, Heliseus’ answer to the slights he received in public is public torture and humiliation, as he orders her to be whipped *for þam folce* "in front of the people" (l. 184; 306). As his authority was defied in public, his vengeance is also public. As argued in the Introduction to the present dissertation, upholding order in the community is of paramount importance and it can sanction the use of violence. By publicly rejecting the values of the society she lives in, Juliana becomes a threat to this community. Her Christianity turns her into an Other, and her refusal to accept the system on which the order of this society is built, she becomes dangerous and provokes a crisis. Heliseus wants to solve this crisis trying to impose his meaning and the rules of his community on Juliana. Thus the torture and death of the saint can be regarded as an attempt by Heliseus to eliminate the threat and restore the order of the pagan world. His violence unifies the community. Juliana is intended as a sacrifice whose death is aimed to heal the division, to stop the questioning of authority.

Viewed from a Girardian perspective, Juliana becomes a scapegoat. As Jean-Baptiste Dumont puts it, individuals designated as scapegoats "must be both inside the community and at the same time as remote from the community as possible" (16), a criterion which Juliana fulfils by rejecting to conform to the rules of her community. Furthermore, according to Girard's own definition of the scapegoat, "between these victims and the community a crucial social link is missing, so they can be exposed to violence without fear of reprisal. Their death does not automatically entail an act of vengeance. [...] sacrifice is primarily an act of violence without risk of vengeance" (*Violence and the Sacred* 13). The person who is entitled to vengeance or compensation if Juliana is harmed (as well as the one who is considered responsible for her actions) is Affricanus, her father. It is significant in this respect that Affricanus reneges on his rights as a father, and gives explicit permission to Heliseus to use violence:

> Ic þæt geswerge [...] gif þas word sind soð,
> monna leofast, þe þu me sagast,
> þæt ic hy ne sparige, ac on spild giefe,
> þeoden mæra, þe to gewealde.
> Dem þu hi to deaþe, gif þe gedafen þince,
> swa to life læt, swa þe leofre sy.
> (ll. 80–88)
>
> [I swear it […] if these words which you tell me are true, most esteemed among men, that I shall not spare her but I shall resign her to destruction, famous lord, at your disposal. Sentence her to death, if you think it fitting, or grant her life as may be more acceptable to you.] (Bradley 304)

Of course, viewed from the Christian perspective, rather than being an outcast, Juliana represents a different order and conforms to the rules of a different community, but this is an order which the pagans are unable to see or comprehend. Hermann, for example, comments that “Cynewulf has emphasized the fact that the struggle exceeds Eliseus’s power of comprehension” (160).

While the poem centres on the violence committed against the saint, to the reader of the poem, the torture she is submitted to can be interpreted in the wider context of the persecution of Christians. The beginning of the text sets up the background of collective violence against which the story of Juliana unfolds. Emperor Maximianus, the *arleas cyning*, (“ruthless king”) *cwealde cristne men* [...] *geat on græswong godhergendra* [...] *haligra blod, ryhtfremmendra* (“killed Christian people, on the grass-clad ground shed the blood of God’s worshippers, the saints, the doers of right”) (ll. 4–8; 302), and Heliseus, the governor of aristocratic stock, is part of this machinery of oppression. Again, from the point of view of the emperor, Christians are subversive and pose a threat against the established order. At the same time, his actions also constitute a reversal of our expectations. The ruler whose role it should be to regulate and curb violence commits an act of violence against his own subjects: the emperor’s *þegnas þryþfulle* (“harsh soldiers”) *oft þræce rærdon* (“often used violence”), *halge cwelmdon* (“murdered the pious”), and *gæston godes cempan* (“persecuted God’s soldiers”) (ll. 12–17; 302). In this particular context *þræce* ‘violence’ is clearly a negative concept, and the opposition *arleas* ‘ruthless’ – *ryhtfremmendra* ‘doers of right’ also conveys a clear value judgement on part of the narrator.

Seen in a wider context, points of view are reversed. The emperor’s suppression of Christianity is revealed to be part of the ancient feud between Satan and the divine order. The association between the pagan empire and the kingdom of hell can be observed at the level of the text, when the opening lines of the poem are echoed in the confession of the devil in ll. 321–337. Just as the emperor dispatches his *þegnas þryþfulle* (“harsh soldiers”, l. 12; 302) *geond middangeard* (“throughout the earth”, l. 3; 302) to persecute Christians, Satan, *hellwarena cyning* (“king of hell’s denizens”, l. 322; 310),

> onsendeþ geond sidne grund
> þegnas of þystrum, hateþ **þræce ræran**
> (ll. 332–333; emphasis added)

> [sends his soldiers from out of the darkness throughout the wide world and orders them to **use violence**] (my translation)[12]

While for Maximianus the Christians represent the Other in the Roman Empire, in reality it is the emperor and his pagans who are shown to be associated with the king of hell and his minions, the ones who try to subvert the divine order, and who thus become Other from the Christian point of view. This is the reason why Heliseus' attempt to restore the order of his community cannot succeed, as the order he seeks to restore is opposed to the cosmic order of creation. Bzdyl points out that the perceived superiority of the pagans at the beginning gradually turns out to be a delusion, and the superiority of the Christian view of the universe is proved (199). Since the pagan system of values is false, Juliana's death means the victory of the Christian world order, and spells destruction for the pagan world.

5.2. The description of the conflict

5.2.1. Words referring to battle

Although the conflict between the characters is mainly one of words and wills, leading to one-sided acts of violence, it is cast from the beginning in the vocabulary of war. It is Heliseus who first refers to *uncres gewinnes* "our quarrel" (l. 190; 307), using a word which, besides 'quarrel', also means 'battle, contest, war, strife, hostility' (Bosworth–Toller 467) and 'conflict, struggle' (Bosworth–Toller, Supplement 451). Then he admonishes the saint to *læt þa sace restan / lað leodgewin* "let it rest, the struggle, the distasteful contention" (ll. 200–01; 307), and accuses her of initiating the conflict (*sacan ongunne*, l. 206; 307). The same word appears again when Juliana is hung up by her hair and suffers *sace singrimme* "extremely savage treatment" (l. 230; 307–08). Juliana's father describes her behaviour with the word *orlegu* (l. 97), which Bradley translates as "opposition" (304), while Calder uses the more forceful "strife" (359), and Clark Hall also gives its meaning as "strife, war" (269).

---

[12] I have departed from Bradley's translation here, who in the first instance translates *þegnas* as 'soldiers' and *þræce ræran* as 'used violence', while in the second, he uses 'servants' and 'offer force', respectively (Bradley 310). Both translations are possible, of course, but I think the close textual parallel is significant here. By their association with the king of hell and his servants, Maximian and his pagans are identified as rebels against the cosmic order of God's creation.

As has been noted above, the vocabulary of conflict is also used to describe the emperor’s persecution of the Christians, when his soldiers *þræce rærdon* “used violence” (l. 12; 302) against the *Godes cempan* “God’s soldiers” (l. 17; 302). The use of the word *cempa* ‘warrior’ or ‘champion’ referring to the persecuted Christians is particularly important here: even though in this passage it is only the emperor’s men who commit physical violence, the choice of words suggests parties mutually engaged in conflict, a full-scale war between the two sides. As it is also pointed out above, the phrase *þræce ræran* ‘use violence’ (l. 333) is repeated in the devil’s speech, linking the conflict within the empire to the spiritual battle between the forces of good and evil, the devil and the soul of the believer. The same word appears once again in the devil’s confession in the compound *flanþræce* “a storm of darts” (l. 384; 311), and in *þræchwile* “hard time [referring to the conflict between Juliana and the devil]” (l. 554; 315). Similarly, during the confession of his sins, the devil admits that he led Simon to *sacan ongon* “began his persecution” against Christians (l. 298; 309). He also uses another word, *guð* ‘war, battle’, in *gæstlic guðreaf* “spiritual armour” (l. 387; 311), *guðe wiðgongan* “prevail in the fray” (l. 393; 311), and *æt guþe* “in the fray” (l. 397; 311), along with several other allusions.

5.2.2. Vengeance

It is also Heliseus who first invokes the concept of vengeance when he insists that if Juliana does not listen to him and “persist[s] … in perversity” (Bradley 204; *gedwolan fylgest* in the original (l. 202), where *gedwola* is glossed by Bosworth and Toller as ‘error, madness, heresy’ (386)), he will be obliged to *wrecan* “take vengeance” for the offense (l. 204; 307). The idea is repeated later by the devil when he urges the people to *wrecan ealdne nið* “take vengeance for old persecution” (l. 623; 317), which is somewhat ironic because Juliana is the one persecuted. Firstly, the similarities in vocabulary and viewpoint construct a parallel between Heliseus and the devil as agents of evil. Secondly, by interpreting their actions as vengeance, both adversaries put the blame on Juliana, claim to be reacting to a feud that she initiated, suggesting that they are entitled to harm her.

Furthermore, it can be observed that Juliana’s opponents try to avoid taking full responsibility for their actions and claim to be devoid of free choice. Before he orders Juliana to be beaten, Heliseus claims that he *nyde sceal niþa gebæded* “**constrained** by your hostile attitude, I shall be **obliged** to” (l. 203; 307; emphasis added) avenge the blasphemy (*godscyld*, l. 204; 307) she committed. In l. 343, the devil also protests that he came to the saint *nyde gebæded* “forcibly constrained” (Bradley 310), and in l. 462 he repeats Heliseus’s exact words from l. 203, quoted above. Heliseus, Affricanus and the devil all protest that they want to avoid violence, although at the same time they are the ones who threaten her with violence and are its agents and perpetrators, or try to awaken her fear of physical pain (the devil). They all claim to want peace and the avoidance of suffering for the saint and put the responsibility on Juliana for her harsh fate.

5.3. Meanings of violence

The use of heroic vocabulary generates expectations in the reader on several counts: firstly, it promises a narrative of violence, confrontation and heroic deeds, contributing thereby to presenting the martyr’s story as a battle. Secondly, as has been mentioned before, heroic society is primarily the world of men, thus it raises the prospect of a conflict unfolding between male adversaries. Thirdly, the *dryht* is a system or community in which roles are well defined, and in which the use of violence is regulated and ritualized. We may suppose that an audience familiar with the conventions of Anglo-Saxon heroic literature approaches the text with these expectations in mind. As the narrative unfolds, however, it comes into conflict with these expectations in all three respects. Firstly, the battle is metaphoric and takes place on the spiritual rather than the physical plane. Secondly, the conflict does not take place between two groups of men, but it is Juliana, the only female character in the poem who faces alone the enmity of the men around her and defeats it. As for the third point, instead of regulated and codified heroic behaviour we see almost animal savagery and cruelty. Instead of military feats, we read about torture, aggression and murder performed on a naked female body, which Hermann calls “exceptionally unheroic and cowardly” (160).

The main focus of the poem is on Juliana’s integrity, which is assaulted on several levels, the physical, the sexual and the spiritual. This is spectacularly evident on the physical level, of course, as she is subjected to cruel torture. As regards sexuality, I agree with Nelson that “sexual purity is not the central concern” of the poem (*Structures of Opposition* 108), but Juliana’s virginity is important insofar as it is part of this integrity. However, the primary goal of Heliseus is not to inflict pain on Juliana, nor is his motivation only to possess her sexually. The torture has a single aim: to break Juliana’s will and to coerce her to sacrifice to the idols. Writing in a different context and about contemporary issues, Robert M. Cover states that “torturers almost always require betrayal – a demonstration that the victim’s intangible normative world has been crushed by the material reality of pain and its extension, fear. […] The logic of that world is complete domination” (294). Similarly to Helisesus, Affricanus’ goal is also to dominate and submit her to his will and authority.

Juliana resists this domination, and is more concerned with preserving her spiritual rather than physical integrity, which, as Nelson remarks “depends on her freedom to worship as she pleases” (*Structures of Opposition* 108). Olsen expresses a similar idea when she identifies “the reasons why women became virgin martyrs during the Patristic period and ascetic nuns during the Middle Ages: they sought to assert their personal autonomy” (227). Both Horner and Nelson acknowledge the central importance of integrity in the martyr’s story, although for Horner it is bodily integrity which “symbolizes her pure spirituality” (*Discourse of Enclosure* 121). In *Structures of Opposition*, Nelson writes that the poem “begins with a challenge to a woman’s integrity” and concludes that she “is able to preserve her own integrity” (124), while in *Three Fighting Saints* she expresses the view that Juliana survives the ordeals “without sacrificing any degree of her own self (99).

According to the definition of violence presented in the Introduction to the present dissertation, an act of violence results in harm, injury and suffering. However, Juliana does not sustain any injuries when tortured, her integrity, her whole-ness remain unchanged both in the physical and in the spiritual sense. Nor can we see the humiliation factor operating in her case, she does not become “degraded and inferior” (Bufacchi, *Violence and Social Justice* 125) or in any way “reduced to less” than she was before (*Violence and Social Justice* 119). Thus the meaning of violence itself is questioned. Juliana’s inviolable wholeness deprives her enemies of their strength, and renders them impotent. It is her adversaries who feel shame and fear, and she is the only one in the story who can inflict real pain, both on the devil and on Heliseus. As Donald G. Bzdyl puts it, Heliseus (and Juliana’s father) “suffer psychological torment, pain of another sort, but just as real as Juliana’s” (198) – even more real, in my opinion, since the saint does not show any sign of suffering – and the “roles of tormentor and victim are graphically reversed” (202). Bzdyl’s observation is also supported by the reversal of the humiliation factor: instead of Juliana, it affects Heliseus, who “degenerates into something less than human” (204). Nelson also agrees that he “descend[s] to less than human status”, and the two “no longer share a common humanity" (*Structures of Opposition* 111–112). Heliseus in his frustration and fury becomes *swa wilde deor* ('like a wild beast', l. 597; 316).

Of course, Juliana's power stems from her status as a martyr. Joseph Wittig calls attention to the fact that martyrs imitate the passion of Christ, and explores the ways in which Cynewulf modified his narrative in order to enhance the parallel between the ordeals of Juliana and the suffering of Christ (151–52). He sees Juliana as the "imitator, embodiment and new exemplar" of "central and potent Christian events" (148). Juliana's ability to subvert the meaning of violence can also be understood in this context, as a reflection of the power of Christ.

Nor does Juliana's death mean the victory of her enemies. The saint, who defeated the devil while alive, and remained true to her God, has nothing to fear from death. The meaning of death itself is questioned as well, since the death of the martyr is the fulfilment of her goals, the final victory, the beginning of eternal life. To quote Nelson again, even the end of Juliana's life conveys "a sense of extraordinary wholeness" (*Three Fighting Saints* 110).

5.4. Juliana's femininity

Juliana is not only a martyr, but a female martyr, which is equally important for interpreting her character. Stacy S. Klein writes that "placing a woman in middle of a text […] or asking readers to view an event through the eyes of a woman […] is an effective strategy for upsetting an audience's expectations, forestalling their primary reactions and creating a space of cultural critique" (9). This is especially true of the complex character of Juliana, who upsets the expected meanings related to violence, and at the same time successfully deprives of its meaning the violence committed against her.

The importance of Juliana's femininity is not accepted by all critics. Shari Horner writes that in order to triumph, Juliana has, in a sense, "to become male", or at least to deny her feminine body and her feminine sexuality ("Spiritual Truth" 670). Horner reads Juliana as belonging to "the discourse of enclosure", and argues that the poem may have been intended for a community of nuns, with its main emphasis on virginity, as "both body and spirit must be kept intact, protected from hostile invaders of any kind" (*Discourse of Enclosure* 102). Nelson, as referred to above, does not believe that the preservation of virginity is the main concern of the poem (*Structures of Opposition* 108). She points it out that Juliana “says nothing of her intention to avoid sexual experience” (*Structures of Opposition* 105), and it is not the idea of marriage that she objects to. As she says to Heliseus,

> Gif þu soþne god
> lufast ond gelyfest, ond his lof rærest,
> ongietest gæsta hleo, ic beo gearo sona
> unwaclice willan þines.
> (ll. 47b–50)
>
> [If you love and believe in the true god and exalt his praise, if you acknowledge him as the refuge of souls I shall be immediately and unwaveringly at your will.] (Bradley 303)

She is ready to become Heliseus’ wife with the same resolve and determination with which she withstands him if he does not comply with her conditions. *Unwaclic*, which Bradley translates as “unwavering” (303) is given by Clark Hall as “steadfast, strong” (386), traits which characterize Juliana throughout the poem, as will be shown below.

Nor is Juliana’s femininity suppressed in the poem: indeed, it is hard to escape the emphasis Cynewulf places on her womanhood: it is present in Heliseus’ praising words of her beauty (ll. 167–69), in the masculine gaze of the audience first in the scene when she confronts Heliseus (ll. 162–63), then later when her naked body is displayed while she is tortured. Her identity as a woman is also stressed by repeated references to her as *fæmne* ‘woman’, especially in her encounter with the devil.

This encounter takes place in the prison where Heliseus casts her. The devil appears in the form of an angel and tempts Juliana, urging her to save her life. The scene upsets again the expectations about power relations raised in us by the situation and the gender of the characters. Juliana, as Nelson puts it, refuses to act as a captive, her resistance is not broken, and in an unexpected, almost shocking display of strength, she captures the devil instead. By the sheer force of her will, she compels the visitor to reveal his true identity and confess the long sequence of crimes he committed against the human soul. At this point in the story, the passive victim paradoxically becomes the one who commits violence. This violence is spiritual rather than physical, since the devil is a spiritual adversary. (Although we must note that the manuscript has a lacuna here, therefore we cannot know for certain if physical violence took place.[13]) Nevertheless, the violence is real, since it inflicts pain on the devil, breaks his will and defeats him. Calder understands this scene as an instance of *flyting*, a verbal battle (366). It may be interesting to note in this respect that Carol J. Clover remarks in a different context that a *flyting* between a man and a woman invariably ends with the victory of the man ("Germanic Context" 450, "Regardless of Sex" 373). There are, admittedly, few scenes where the *flyting* takes place between woman and devil, but we may agree that the outcome here is not what we would expect.

---

[13] In the Latin Acta, Juliana literally beats the devil. Hermann argues that this is a conscious omission on Cynewulf’s part (169).

Admitting defeat, the devil states that Juliana is *wigþrist ofer eall wifa cynn* "daring in battle beyond all womankind" (l. 432; 312). The value of this statement is uncertain in itself, since women are not generally represented as bold in battle, but the alliteration linking *wigþrist* and *wifa* calls attention to the apparent contradiction and to Juliana's womanhood, which is emphasised again at the end of the passage:

> Ic to soþe wat
> þæt ic ær ne siþ ænig ne mette
> in woruldrice wif þe gelic,
> þristran geþohtes ne þweorhtimbran
> mægþa cynnes
> (ll. 547b–51a)
>
> [I know for certain that neither early nor late have I met any woman like you in the worldly kingdom, more confident of purpose or more stubborn among womankind.] (Bradley 315)

A final important reference to her femininity and her strength of will is made by Heliseus later on in the poem, when

> Grymetade gealgmod ond his godu tælde
> þæs þe hy ne meahtun mægne wiþstondan
> wifes willan
> (ll. 598–600a)
>
> [Rabid-hearted, he stormed and abused the gods because they with their power could not withstand the will of a woman.] (Bradley 316)

5.5. Activity vs. passivity

The figure of Juliana itself escapes easy categorization and has been read in a number of conflicting ways. On the one hand, she is often placed in the same group as Elene or Judith because, as Horner remarks, “these are the only three extant Old English narratives to feature a female protagonist, and all three exemplify the heroic values of Christian sainthood”, however, “she lacks the physical aggressiveness and military bearing and actions of Elene and Judith” (Horner, *Discourse of Enclosure* 123). While Judith and Elene are active and assertive characters, Juliana is a martyr, a victim, one of the very few women in Old English poetry who become the target of direct physical violence. The torture she is subjected to and her refusal to defend herself suggest that she might rather belong to the group of passive sufferers. However, her lack of action does not equal passivity or submissiveness. As has been noted by several critics, although she refrains from physical action, she is far from passive both verbally and spiritually. Although she is not included in the section entitled “Religious Heroic Poetry” of the volume *Anglo-Saxon Literature* (a section which contains articles devoted to both *Judith* and *Elene*), both Shari Horner and Marie Nelson write about her “verbal battle” with the devil (Horner, *Discourse of Enclosure* 121; Nelson, *Structures of Opposition* 111), Jane Chance mentions her “martial skill” (44), while Nelson elsewhere calls her a “fighting saint” (*Three Fighting Saints* 98) and a “heroic woman” (*Structures of Opposition* 124). Similarly, Helen Damico, although she observes that “the tortures and humiliations she undergoes are not heroic features” (182), nevertheless calls her a female warrior and groups the poem together with *Elene* and *Judith* as “heroic poetry” (182), claiming that Juliana’s “weapons are words” (183), and comparing her to Elene in “severity of mind, tenacity of purpose, and courage” (186).

Alexandra Hennessey Olsen also mentions that “readers have tended to view Juliana as a passive person, primarily because she refuses marriage, and those who have perceived her choice of virginity as active have tended to view that action as negative”. Olsen sees Juliana, together with Elene and Judith, as “active and heroic”, as “all three make men submit to their wills”. She makes an important point when she notes that “Juliana in fact chooses the chain of circumstances that leads to her martyrdom; martyrdom is not forced upon her, so that it is impossible to treat her as the passive victim of circumstances beyond her control.” She argues that instead of wanting to turn Juliana into a passive character, Cynewulf focuses on her “mental rather than physical strength”, “and on the verbal actions that Juliana chooses in preference to the actions prescribed by her pagan father and suitor” (223). Olsen claims that Juliana should be read as belonging to the tradition of autonomous Germanic women, who “normally use speech rather than action when speech fails” (225). Citing possible analogues from later Scandinavian literature, she identifies the martyr as the type of the “taunter”, who goads the men around her into torturing and killing her. (227).

The importance of the verbal actions of Juliana is also pointed out by John Edward Damon, according to whom “through most of the poem, Juliana remains essentially passive, wielding words instead of weapons; however, she does engage in one fierce struggle when she binds the demon” (98). He considers Juliana’s physical passivity ideologically important, as she is presented as “a spiritual warrior who refuses to engage even in defensive battle, by linking it to the unrestrained violence of her pagan opponents” (97). Nevertheless, at the same time she is “actively engaged in incorporeal, spiritual warfare” (96). The contrast between her physical passivity and spiritual activity “establishes clearly the Christian/heathen dichotomy alongside a corresponding pairing of passive resistance/aggressive violence” (97).

The interpretation of the character of Juliana is made even more difficult by the question whether she can be considered a victim at all. She does not engage in a physical fight with her oppressors, she is no Judith wielding a sword to protect herself from her adversaries. Several critics see her as the embodiment of the typically passive female martyr. However, Juliana is not weak, defeated or helpless, she is not unable to defend herself. She offers what Nelson aptly calls a “heroic resistance” to her aggressors (*Three Fighting Saints* 99). She questions and defies all forms of authority governing the world of men around her, the authority of the father over his daughter, the power of men over women, the power of the governor over his subjects, even the power of the pagan gods. Her resistance provokes anger in the men whose power over herself she rejects, and this is what unleashes the acts of violence committed against her: but she is not a taunter, as Olsen suggests (227), or “a suicidal woman who gets someone else to kill her” (Nelson *Three Fighting Saints* 98).[14] She offers a “heroic resistance” to categorization as well, because due to her refusal to subject herself to the system of conditions defined by her adversaries, the categories of victim and aggressor lose their meaning. Juliana imposes her meaning on the world around her, and thus she dooms her enemies to failure from the very beginning.

---

[14] Nelson in fact disagrees with this characterization.

Even though Juliana remains inactive at the physical level, this does not form part of the dichotomy of male action – female passivity. Juliana is, first and foremost, a martyr, and martyrs, male or female, do not engage their enemies physically. Writing about the ways in which the ideals of chivalry shaped masculinity from the Middle Ages to the modern era, Allen J. Frantzen claims that there are two possible responses to violence for Christians under attack: taking revenge, that is, responding to violence with violence, or forgiving their persecutors. He calls the first response "sacrificial, because it calls for the taking of one life to avenge the loss of another and thus for perpetuating cyclical violence" and the second "antisacrificial, because it opposes the taking of life and seeks to bring the cycle to a halt" (3). Discussing the above quote by Frantzen, John William Sutton writes that "Christ provided a powerful example of antisacrificial heroism" (7). Martyrs imitate Christ, thus their heroism is also antisacrificial, aimed at stopping the cycle of violence and restoring the divine order. Robert M. Cover writes about martyrs in general that they

> insist in the face of overwhelming force that if there is to be continuing life, it **will not be on the terms of the tyrant's law**. […] Martyrs require that any future they possess **will be on terms of the law to which they are committed**, even in the face of world-destroying pain. […] Martyrdom is an extreme force of resistance to domination. (295; emphasis added)

It is exactly this resistance, called "heroic" by Nelson (*Three Fighting Saints* 99) that we see exemplified in the poem. While Juliana can be regarded as passive physically, she is certainly active verbally and spiritually, what is more, she becomes violent herself at least in one instance, during her fight with the devil.

The weapons Juliana wields are the force of her will and her faith, her steadfastness. Calder notes that this "unflinching steadfastness" (365), as he calls it, is entirely Cynewulf's modification and is in contrast with the Latin text in the Acta, in which the saint has to be encouraged and urged not to lose her faith (366). Occurrences of various meanings of *fæste* abound in the poem. First it is used to describe Juliana's resistance to Heliseus: *heo þæs beornes lufan* ***fæste*** *wiþhogde* ("she steadfastly rejected the man's love", ll. 41b–42a; 303). When her father attempts to persuade her to marry the governor, we learn that *hio to gode hæfde freondraedenne* ***fæste*** *gestaþelad* ("she had steadfastly consecrated her conjugal state to God", ll. 106b–07; 304). When tempted by the devil, she *ongan* ***fæstlice*** *ferþ staþelian* ("firmly braced her spirit", l. 270; 308; emphases added), which, as we know, leads to her grabbing the devil and holding him *fæste* (‘fast’, l. 433).[15] Her steadfastness is the key to her victory, as the devil reveals:

> Gif ic ænigne ellenrofne
> gemete modigne metodes cempan
> wið flanþræce, nele feor þonan
> bugan from beaduwe, ac he bord ongean
> hefeð hygesnottor, haligne scyld,
> gæstlic guðreaf, nele gode swican,
> ac he beald in gebede bidsteal gifeð
> **fæste** on feðan, ic sceal feor þonan
> heanmod hweorfan, hroþra bideled,
> in gleda gripe, gehðu mænan
> (ll. 382–91, emphasis added)
>
> [If I meet with a storm of darts any staunch soldier of the Lord, renowned for courage, who is unwilling to flee away far from the battle but, astute in his thinking, lifts up against me a targe, a holy shield and a spiritual armour, and is not willing to fail God, but who, bold in prayer, makes a stand, steadfast amid the infantry, I have to retreat far away from there, humiliated and deprived of my pleasure, to bewail my sorrow in the clutch of smouldering fires.] (Bradley 311)

Juliana’s steadfastness is in contrast with the spiritual weakness of the men and the devil. Motivation is an important issue here. The warrior in heroic society is driven by courage, by the prospect of achieving fame and glory, and by loyalty to his lord. However, if we examine the motivation of Juliana’s adversaries, we find a contradiction. The devil, for example, turns out to be a coward: his wicked deeds are motivated by his fear of punishment and of his father:

> we beoð hygegeomre,
> forhte on ferðe. Ne biþ us frea milde,
> egesful ealdor, gif we yfles noht
> gedon habbaþ; ne durran we siþþan
> for his onsyne ower geferan.
> (ll. 327b–31)
>
> [we are miserable in mind and frightened at heart. He is no kindly master to us, that fearsome prince; if we have not done something evil we dare not afterwards come anywhere into his sight.] (Bradley 310)

---

[15] Hermann brings further examples of words containing the root *fæst* or of a related meaning, and states that there are about fifty references to the “notion of firmness” in the poem (156).

The cowardice of the devil is in stark opposition with Juliana’s courage, which is emphasised again and again in the text. She repeatedly states that she is not afraid, *ne ondrœde ic me* “I do not fear” (ll. 134 and 210; 307), and she is called fearless several times, thus *unforht* ‘fearless’ (ll. 209 and 601), *seo unforhte* (l. 147), and *seo þe forht ne wæs* “she […] who was not afraid” (l. 258; 308).

The ultimate irony is that the devil is also afraid of physical pain, the beatings and torments he will suffer at the hands of his father if he fails in his task (l. 337), while Juliana cannot be swayed by torture. At the same time, the devil is *forhtafongen* ‘afraid’ (l. 320) of Juliana as well, and his fear proves stronger than his loyalty. While the devil becomes disloyal to his lord out of fear, Heliseus becomes disloyal to his gods out of anger (ll. 598–600). Expected meanings are contested again: that which is superficially clothed in the vocabulary of the heroic turns out to be cowardly and false in reality, while Juliana, who is seemingly weak and passive, is revealed as the true hero through the power of her faith and her “heroic resistance”. There is an important lesson here: even a woman, weak and frail by nature according to the medieval and Christian view of the world, can be strong enough to withstand the combined power and authority of a governor and a father and become *Godes cempa*, the champion of God.

5.6. Violence and communication

As regards violence and communication, all three facets (the breakdown of rational communication, speech as threat and verbal violence) are present in the poem. The torture is preceded by several scenes in which the characters (Heliseus and Juliana, and Affricanus and Juliana) try to convince one another, to impose their meaning upon the other. Speeches play an important part in the poem, and Juliana’s verbal presence is very strong. Heliseus’s plight is introduced by the narrator, but it is in fact Juliana who delivers the first direct speech in the poem. This means that the dialogue between the main characters starts with an answer and an implied rejection. Laura Reinert calls Juliana’s first speech one of persuasion and negotiation, but it is, in fact, an ultimatum. She offers Heliseus a real choice, but whatever his decision is, Juliana and her view of the world will emerge on the winning side. He can have her, but only if he is willing to accept the superiority of her God and her beliefs. If he does not concede this victory to her, she will still prove the superiority of her faith by her unyielding adherence to it, no matter what method of coercion he might devise. This is Juliana’s *beot* as the champion of God, the vow which will determine her course of action and the one she will keep in her fight against evil.

At this point, the saint already gets the upper hand by being the first to construct her meaning and setting out the terms from which Heliseus can choose, casting doubt on his authority and superiority, which may explain the latter’s strong emotional reaction and his interpreting Juliana’s words as *orwyrð* ‘dishonour’ (l. 69). Heliseus also tries to deliver the same kind of ultimatum in ll. 166–74, when, first addressing Juliana as *se swetesta sunnan scima* “sweetest incandescence of the sun” (l. 166; 306), he offers her the choice between sacrificing to his gods and suffering torture. Interestingly, although her beauty and his attraction for her are emphasized, it is not marriage that is in question here any longer, but religion, although Affricanus is still trying to convince Juliana about the suit. The issue here is domination, Heliseus wants Juliana to accept the world order he represents. However, Juliana’s steadfastness renders him ineffective: he is not good at playing her game.

There is a contrast between the two worlds; the meaning of the word ‘true’ is different for the characters, as is the meaning of truth. Juliana and Heliseus give completely different meanings and referents to the same words, which shows the impossibility of understanding one another, as they are not speaking the same language. One system of meaning has to win over the other. They construct different systems of meaning which come into conflict, but the narrator and the devil confirm Juliana’s interpretation, thereby revealing Heliseus and Affricanus to be deceived. We know that Juliana’s ‘reading’ of the world is the right one, but Heliseus does not, and neither is willing to give up and accept the other’s meanings. This is the phase where communication is used to avoid violence – interestingly, mostly by Heliseus – but speech breaks down and conflict becomes unavoidable. Language is used as a threat and vows are made about stances before the ‘fight’.

Communication cannot prevent violence, since Juliana and Heliseus belong to and construct different systems of meaning, but communication as threat does not function either, as Heliseus’s threats are impotent against Juliana’s steadfastness. The breakdown of communication leads to the breakout of violence. This is inevitable as the meanings constructed by the parties are irreconcilable, but while “the saint has confidence in argument […] the pagan’s best hope is violence” (Kay 17).

Of course, violence cannot prevail against the argument of the saint, either, nor is it sufficient to silence her voice. Juliana’s voice dominates the end of the poem just like its beginning, as not only the first, but the last speech is also delivered by her, while Heliseus' commands are reported by the narrator, as are the inarticulate noises he makes in his fury. After finishing her last speech, Juliana is beheaded. Sarah Kay points out that decapitation is a frequent motif in medieval stories of martyrdom, which has a symbolic meaning: "The final solution, for the persecutor, is to cut the saint through the throat, putting an end to the rebel voice which the text endorses as true. […] But even this apparent success backfires: the very fact of silencing the voice endows it with permanence, and instead of being annihilated, it is incorporated into the texts in order to direct medieval audiences" (18).

5.7. Conflicting meanings

Two world orders clash in *Juliana,* two systems of meaning are constructed, which are mutually exclusive. The difference between the two systems is brought out by the way the same words are used with different meanings by the two communities. Calder has noted the presence of three fathers in the poem (360), to which I would add the figure of Maximianus. These four characters correspond to the three levels on which the action takes place: Affricanus, Juliana's father (personal level); Maximianus, the father of the people (communal level); and finally, God, the father of all humankind (cosmic level), as well as Satan, the father of the devils. All of these fathers betray the very people their responsibility is to protect – except God. A father should protect his daughter and love her, but Affricanus threatens her daughter with death instead:

> gif þu unrædes ær ne geswicest,
> ond þu fremdu godu ne forð bigongest
> ond þa forlætest þe us leofran sind
> þe þissum folce to freme stondað
> þæt þu ungeara ealdre scyldig
> þurh deora gripe deaþe sweltest
> (ll. 120–23)
>
> [if you do not soon stop your foolishness, and if you go on worshipping alien gods and neglect those who are dearer to us and who stand in support of this nation, then, before long, being deemed to have forfeited your life, you shall suffer death through savaging by wild animals] (Bradley 305)

Enraged, he places her life in Heliseus's hands to do as he sees fit, relinquishing his right to avenge her. As argued above, Affricanus only sees the personal level, the personal affront. He is too blind to see the social and the spiritual level. Although he seems to love his gods more than his daughter, whom he threatens with death, his true aim is to marry Juliana to Heliseus. He believes that Juliana also acts on the personal level, and interprets her steadfastness as wilful obstinacy and stupidity. Affricanus betrays the love a father should feel for his daughter, all for the love of gods who prove to be false and impotent.

Similarly, Maximianus, the ruler who should protect his subjects, turns against them and persecutes them. Finally, Satan also punishes and threatens his followers, who live in constant fear and torment. He is no *frea milde* "kindly master", as the devil states (l. 328; 310). In this context, it is a subtle parallel in the text, which further enriches its irony, that Satan can be equated with the pagan gods whom Heliseus calls *þa mildestan* "the most merciful" (l. 207; 307), and he is the opposite of the true God whom Juliana praises as *mild mundbora* "merciful Protector" (l. 213; 307).

There is also irony in the fact that Heliseus, Affricanus and the devil all start their speeches by emphasizing Juliana's beauty. Their praise of her beauty is no more than a means by which they want to achieve their purpose, which is to break her will and make her submit to their own. Heliseus wants to possess her, Affricanus wants the elevation in status and the advantages which go with being father-in-law to the governor, and the devil wants to avoid the punishment which is sure to ensue if he fails to achieve what his father, Satan tasked him with. None of them loves and appreciates Juliana for her own sake, and their appreciation soon turns to hate and enmity when she opposes their plans.

The pagans are shown to be incapable of true love. Although they repeatedly claim to love Juliana, both Heliseus and Affricanus love several other things – their gods, their status, their pride – better than her. Affricanus starts talking to Juliana protesting his love for her: he calls her *seo dyreste / and seo sweteste in sefan minum* "the dearest and sweetest to my heart" (ll. 93–94; 304), and *minra eagna leoht* "the light of my eyes" (l. 95; 304). The reader knows these protestations to be false, as Affricanus is already consumed by rage before he utters these words, and after Juliana's reply he answers her *þurh yrre* "in his fury" (l. 117; 305). *Minra eagna leoht* is also ironic because the pagans are spiritually blind, incapable of seeing and understanding the truth; thus the phrase becomes an empty endearment.

Heliseus does not understand the meaning of love, either. When he is introduced to the reader, we learn that he is *æhtwelig* "wealthy" (l. 18; 302), *rice* "powerful" (l. 19; 302), *rondburgum weold* "ruled over fortified cities" (l.19; 302), *heold hordgestreon* "owned hoarded wealth" (l. 22; 302), *hæfde ealdordom micelne ond mærne* "possessed great and renowned power" (ll. 25–26; 303), and **then** *his mod ongon fæmnan lufian* "his heart began to yearn after Juliana” (ll. 26–27; 303). This and the alliteration later on *weliga* “wealthy” and *wifgifta* “marriage” (l. 38; 303) seems to suggest he regards Juliana as another thing to possess, beautiful in the same way as gold or precious objects are beautiful.

The false love of these characters is contrasted with the true love of God: for example, shortly after Affricanus claims that Juliana is the dearest to his heart – which we know not to be true – we learn that she is *gode leof* “dear to God” (l. 131; 305). Similarly, Juliana, although she denies her father and her husband-to-be, knows the meaning of true love.

The idea of false fathers and false love is accompanied by that of false lords and protectors: although the pagans are described in terms of the heroic society, they violate the idea of loyalty, protection, distribution of rewards and personal affection. The only instance of treasure-giving in the poem is ironic, in the scene when Heliseus’s troop arrives in hell. It is repeatedly emphasized that Heliseus is *folcagend* “the people’s ruler” (l. 186; 306) and *folctoga* “governor” (l. 225; 307), and that he is very rich (*æhtwelig* “wealthy”, l. 18; *heold hordgestreon* “owned hoarded wealth”, l. 22; *welegum* “wealthy man”, l. 33; *se weliga […] goldspedig guma* “wealthy, gold-abounding man”, ll. 38–39; etc.) and loves riches, but never in one instance does he give or promise treasure to anyone. While it may be going too far to read the sin of avarice into his behaviour, he is certainly not an example of a good lord by Anglo-Saxon standards. The absence of treasure-giving is also mentioned in connection with Satan. According to Anglo-Saxon values, these are failed lords, inspiring fear rather than loyalty among their followers.

The conflict between the two world views is manifested in the epithets used to refer to the gods in the story, the heathen gods of the Romans and Juliana’s Christian God. The Christians are referred to as *godhergendra* “God’s worshippers” by the author in l. 6, as a variation on *cristne* “Christian people” (l. 5) and *haligra* “the saints” (l. 7), and they are identified as *godes cempan* “God’s soldiers” in l. 17 (302). When Heliseus is introduced, even before we get to know his name, we learn that he visits the heathen shrine *ofer word godes* “against the word of God” (l. 23; 302). As opposed to this, Juliana has *godes egsa* “the fear of God” (l. 35; 303) and *Cristes lufan* “the love of Christ” (l. 31; 303) foremost in her mind. In her first speech, she links the themes of marriage and religion by promising to become Heliseus’s wife if he accepts *soðne god* “the true God” (l. 47; 303), and calls Heliseus’s gods *sæmran* “inferior” (l. 51; 303). On the other hand, Heliseus calls Juliana’s God *fremdne* “alien” (l. 74; 304) and Affricanus calls the heathen gods *soð godu* “the true gods” (l. 80; 304). Later on, in l. 121 he repeats Heliseus’s view that Juliana worships *fremdu godu* “alien gods” (the fact that he uses the plural reflects his complete ignorance) and compares these to the ones that *us leofran sind* “are dearer to us” (l. 122) and *þissum folce to freme stondað* “stand in support of this nation” (l. 123; 305).

Similarly, the characters use the word *gedwola* ‘error, heresy’ with different referents. It is first used by Juliana in l. 138 (translated by Bradley as “idolatry” (305)), then by Heliseus in l. 202 (translated as “perversity” (307), as quoted above), for each other’s beliefs. The third occurrence of the word is in the devil’s phrase *þurh deopne gedwolan* “in his profound misguidedness” (l. 301; 309), referring to Simon’s persecution of Christians, and then it appears again in *gedwolena rim* “a series of delusions” (l. 368; 311), referring to the devil’s own methods of tempting those who believe in God.

As may be expected, the narrator’s point of view coincides with that of Juliana, reinforcing the meanings she assigns to words. What is more, not only does the narrator offer his evaluation of the events, but he also invokes authorities in the first lines of the poem, as the text begins with the phrase we *ðæt hyrdon … deman dædhwate* “we have heard … bold men pass judgement” (ll. 1–2; 302). The main difference between the poems analyzed in previous chapters and the present text, however, is that while in *Beowulf*, *Judith* and *Elene* the point of view shared by narrator and positive characters is the dominant (or only) interpretation, while negative characters are silenced or not granted the power to evaluate their victorious adversaries, in *Juliana*, although there is an evident correspondence between Juliana’s stance and that of the narrating voice, negative characters have an alternative and opposing view, which is also illustrated in detail. As I have mentioned above, this is necessary because the poem’s central conflict is about two opposing worldviews, with the Christian one demonstrated to be the valid one.

It is significant in this respect that the point of view of the negative characters of the poem is not unified. There is a difference between the understanding of Heliseus and Affricanus, on the one hand, and that of the devil, on the other hand. The former hold on to views that are ultimately proven false, but which they believe to be true. They are deceived, ignorant of the cosmic level perceived by Juliana, the narrator and the readers. The devil, however, as the deceiver, knows the truth and deliberately opposes it. When forced to, he confesses it, unexpectedly validating the saint’s point of view.

5.8. Evaluation

The elements of evaluation in the poem reflect the conflicting viewpoints of the characters discussed above. The narrator's judgement on Heliseus (in Table 18), Affricanus (Table 19), Maximian and the devil (Table 20) is overwhelmingly negative. As in the case of other negative characters examined in the previous chapters, the evaluation also contains positive elements in terms of [capacity] and [normality] (esteem), while [propriety] (sanction) is always negative. In the devil's characterization we also find several instances of [– veracity], also belonging to sanction.

As may be expected, the narrator evaluates Juliana in positive terms, focusing especially on [+ tenacity] (in Table 17). Juliana also evaluates her adversaries. While, as noted in the previous paragraph, the narrator's evaluation of Heliseus and Affricanus allows for [+ capacity], expressing their strength and power, Juliana's judgement of the same characters (in Tables 18 and 19, respectively) is based on [– capacity], emphasizing their impotence in the face of her resoluteness, as well as [– propriety]. Her evaluation of the devil (in Table 20) is negative, in harmony with that of the narrator, focusing on [– propriety] and [– veracity].

What is different from the other texts considered so far is that in this case the speeches of the negative characters also contain evaluation. Affricanus' and Heliseus' evaluation of Juliana is positive when they attempt to persuade her (in Table 17), emphasizing her beauty ([+ normality]), and negative when they scold or threaten (especially [– propriety] and [– capacity], thus the exact opposite of the narrator's evaluation of her). The devil, however, offers an entirely positive evaluation of the protagonist both in terms of esteem and of sanction, with the single exception of line 157 of Table 17, when he denounces her in public.

As regards the emotional states of the characters and the related affectual elements, there is a stark contrast between Juliana's serenity and peace of mind and the pagans' internal turmoil. Heliseus, Affricanus and the devil are all characterized by negative emotions, mostly fear, anger and sorrow, which is consistent with the affect assigned to negative characters in the other poems previously examined. For example, after Heliseus is introduced, we learn that *his mod ongon / fæmnan lufian (hine fyrwæt bræc)* "his heart began to yearn after […] a virgin – desire took him by storm" (ll. 26–27; 303) and that he was *þæra wifgifta georn on mode* "yearned in his mind for the marriage" (ll. 38–39; 303), a desire Juliana interprets as *swencan* “torment” (l. 47; 303). When rejected, he becomes *yrre gebolgen* “excited with rage” (l. 58; 303) and his state of mind continues to deteriorate: he is *hreoh ond hygeblind* “wild and blinded in his mind” (l. 61; 61), *frecne mode* “in aggressive mood” (l. 67; 303), and tells Affricanus that *me þa fracedu sind / on modsefan mæste weorce* “these insults are painful in the extreme” (ll. 71–72; 304). Later he is *yrre gebolgen* “swollen with fury” (l. 582; 316), *hreoh and hygegrim* “wild and savage-minded” (l. 595; 316), and *sorgcearig* “anxious with despair” (l. 603; 316), engaging in irrational displays of impotent fury: *ongon his hrægl teran* “began to tear his robe” (l. 595; 316), *grennade and gristbitade* “bared his teeth […] and ground them” (l. 596; 316), *grymetade gealgmod* “rabid-hearted, he stormed” (l. 598; 316). These extreme manifestations of rage, especially baring his teeth, suggest that Heliseus, by allowing himself to be overpowered by his emotions, seems to be losing his wits and his humanity, which receives a more explicit expression in l. 597, *wedde on gewitte swa wilde deor* “crazed in his wits as a wild beast” (316). This is another phenomenon which may be observed in the poems previously discussed.

Affricanus has the same emotional reactions as Heliseus: he *geswearc* “grew furious” (l. 78; 304), *anræd ond yreþweorg, yrre gebolgen* “single of purpose and evilly disposed, swollen with fury” (l. 90; 304). There are no positive feelings shown on part of Affricanus and Heliseus, their emotional world is one of turmoil: they are frustrated, angry, raging men characterized by negative affect throughout the poem, while the devil is a whining coward. Their only positive feelings are the ones they claim to have for Juliana, which are shown to be false, and for their gods, who are impotent idols. These latter are also proved to be self-interested, false feelings. Heliseus renounces his gods in the end, when it seems that they are not strong enough to prevail over a young woman’s will. He remains without any spiritual solace or support.

In contrast, Juliana is characterized by positive affect. She is *glædmode* “cheerful of spirit” (l. 91; 304), blithe and self-assured throughout the poem, even in prison, no matter what tortures or adversaries she is facing. The final fate of the characters also reflects this difference in affect: while Heliseus and his retainers perish at sea and arrive in hell *hroþra bidæled, hyhta lease* “deprived of comforts, destitute of hopes” (ll. 681–82; 318), Juliana’s soul is admitted *to þam langan gefean* “into lasting joy” (l. 670; 318).

5.9. Differences between the Latin and Old English versions

Daniel G. Calder comments that whereas in the Latin version of the story “the reader sees […] Juliana’s growth in grace […] which the writer presents more humanistically,” in the Old English poem there is a “‘polarisation’ of character and attitude,” with Juliana an “unswerving Christian” and Heliseus “an equally passionate devotee of Satan” (357). Secondly, according to Calder, the poet elaborates on and rewrites the speeches found in the Latin text, focusing on “motifs which become central to the interpretation of the narrative as a whole” (357), such as “divine love and earthly lust” (364), “hatred masquerading as affection” (366), faith and protection, motifs whose importance has been discussed above. Thirdly, Cynewulf transforms Juliana’s character, strengthening her resolve and eliminating all elements of fear and insecurity, so that the emerging heroine “has little in common with the Latin Juliana” (365). Thus, Cynewulf deepens the conflict of meanings essential to the poem, while the elements of judgement and affect in the characters’ portrayal are the Old English text’s own characteristics.

5.10. Conclusion

Juliana represents a conflict of words, worldviews and beliefs. For this reason, it is unique among the poems discussed in the present dissertation in that it allows negative characters to speak, offer their interpretation of the events and evaluate the heroine. At the same time, the distribution of affectual elements is consistent with that found in the other poems considered so far: characters who do not share the same values as the narrating voice are described through negative affect, mainly anger and fear, while the protagonist is characterized by positive emotions throughout the text.

The different points of view are associated with different levels of knowledge and understanding: while to the heathen characters Juliana seems to be a wilful young girl who refuses to conform to the rules of the community, it is in fact they who fail to perceive the divine order of the world and thus exclude themselves from it. The narrator’s use of evaluative elements supports the meanings Juliana assigns to words, which are also reinforced, in a somewhat unexpected manner, by the devil. In the end, not only does Juliana’s interpretation emerge as the dominant and valid one, but by resisting others’ attempts to impose their meanings upon her, she also manages to preserve her integrity even in death.

6. PEACEWEAVERS: WEALHTHEOW, HYGD AND HILDEBURH

In the previous chapters, I have examined female characters who participate in violent conflicts, either as the perpetrators or the targets of an act of violence. The present chapter will focus on women whose main aim is to preserve peace in a community constantly threatened by acts of violence committed by men. The characters discussed in the following are the queens and mothers in *Beowulf*, Wealhtheow, Hygd and Hildeburh. Dockray-Miller writes that "violence is a determinant in the lives of all the mothers of *Beowulf*" (88), to which we may add that violence is in fact a determinant in the lives of all the women in the poem. The women under consideration in the present chapter form the group traditionally regarded as peace-weavers. All three, but especially Hildeburh, have been cited as epitomes of female passivity (in contrast with the action taken by Grendel's mother and Modthryth), even regarded as helpless victims, or as representing a softer, more womanly order or system of values as opposed to the masculine world of feud and vengeance. In the following, I would like to argue that these women are far from being passive or marginal characters. They are firmly embedded in their community, they wield a certain amount of power, and they further their interests through speech and counsel. Instead of being outsiders or characters confined to the periphery of the world of the poem, they participate in it, and their actions are consistently directed at preserving order and fending off negative violence. These actions can be interpreted on both the personal and the communal level, while the third, cosmic, level referred to in the previous chapters is almost entirely different in their case. Finally, I propose that if these women are forced into passivity, as in the case of Hildeburh, this is not so much due to their gender as to the fragility and ultimate impossibility of preserving peace in a world dominated by violence.

6.1. The figure of the peace-weaver

Before embarking on an analysis of individual characters, I would like to discuss the role of the peace-weaver in general. In his article "*Freoðuwebbe* in Old English Poetry", L. John Sklute notes that the compound "appears only three times in Old English poetry, once in *Widsith*, once in *Beowulf*, and once in Cynewulf's *Elene*" (204). Of these, its occurrence in *Elene* refers to an angel, God's messenger, while in *Beowulf* it is used in the description of Modthryth, who at this point in her story is the exact opposite of a peace-weaver. In Sklute's definition, *freoðuwebbe* "is related to the idea of weaving bonds of peace by means of personal behaviour or action." When used to refer to a queen, it

> is a poetic metaphor referring to the person whose function it seems to be to perform openly the action of making peace by weaving to the best of her art a tapestry of friendship and amnesty. [… It] expresses the duty of the king's wife […] to construct bonds of allegiance between the outsider and the king and his court. […] Although a peace-weaver is not the sole securer of good will, her presence and her actions help the lord at his task. (208)

Sklute also points it out that the compound is related to the word *friðusibb* 'peace-pledge', used of Wealhtheow in the poem, concluding that "whatever the precise meaning of *friðusibb*, it seems to function in the same way as *freoðuwebbe*" (208).

If we accept the proposition that the queens discussed in the present chapter are peace-weavers, even if not explicitly called so, what is then the "behaviour and action" expected of a peace-weaving queen in the poem?

Jane Chance claims that a peace-weaver can fulfil her role "either biologically through her marital ties with foreign kings as a peace pledge or mother of sons, or socially and psychologically as a cup-passing and peace-weaving queen within a hall" (98). Expanding on this statement, I suggest that peace-weavers uphold peace in four respects: first, they weave peace with their movements, by carrying around the cup and serving warriors in a fixed order, thereby strengthening the order of the community. Secondly, they distribute treasure, rewarding warriors and reinforcing loyalty. Sklute claims that a queen dispenses treasure "to honor her guests and to enhance the reputation for magnanimity at her particular court" (208), while Hill also observes that "Wealhþeow and Hygd […] participate in the public ceremonies of gift-exchange which are so bound up […] with loyalty, status and honour" (237). Thirdly, queens weave peace with their actions and words, applying different strategies in order to preserve stability. Sklute comments on the second and third aspects stating that "the warp of [a peace-weaver's] weaving is treasure and the woof is composed of words of good will" (208). Chance expresses the same idea, writing that "her speeches accompanying the mead-sharing stress the peace and joy contingent upon the fulfillment of each man's duty to his nation" (98). Gillian Overing takes a more pessimistic view of the peace-weavers' role when she writes that they "are assigned the role of creating peace, in fact, embodying peace, in a culture where war and death are privileged values" (231). Finally, the peace-weaver or peace-pledge married into another tribe weaves peace with her own body, intertwining the bloodlines of two communities in her offspring, whose survival she works to ensure. As Michael C. Drout puts it, the child embodies the contract existing between two tribes, “and thus as long as the child lives, so does the agreement between men, tribes, or nations, and any peace-weaving will be successful” (207).

For these women, fending off violence and preserving the order of the community is of vital importance, as this ensures the survival of their progeny, as well as a place for them in society. These women are defined by their links to the community. As noted above, they only function on the personal and communal levels. These two aspects are in harmony, as can be expected, because a conflict between the personal and the communal, or an exclusive focus on the personal is the mark of a potentially disruptive or ‘negative’ character, as discussed in Chapter 3. What is more, the communal aspect is the stronger and more prominent in their portrayal, as this is the focus of attention of poem and narrator (as well as of the society represented). The women of *Beowulf* are dependent on the social context, therefore vulnerable and exposed to the deficiencies and disadvantages of a system sustained by violence and the threat of violence.

6. 2. Wealhtheow

In addition to being called *friðusibb folca* “the people’s pledge of peace” (l. 2017; 464), Wealhtheow, Hrothgar’s queen meets the above criteria for a peace-weaver. Firstly, she carries the cup around in Heorot, offering it first to her lord, then *duguþe ond geogoþe* “[to] seasoned and youthful retainers” (l. 621; 428), and finally to Beowulf, the guest in the hall. As Overing notes, “[a]s the peace-weaver who is herself the representation and embodiment of her function, Wealhtheow physically draws lines of connection, enacts the process of weaving, as she carries the cup from one warrior to another” (96–97). Camargo also takes this action to mean that “she actively creates harmony by carrying the mead cup from man to man” (127), while Sklute remarks that this seems to be her “chief function” in the poem (207), and she is portrayed doing this on three occasions.

Wealhtheow also distributes treasure, richly rewarding Beowulf with *wunden gold / […], earmreade twa, / hrægl ond hringas, healsbeaga mæst* “coiled gold […] two decorative armbands, a cloak and collars – the greatest torque” (ll. 1193–95; 443). Hrothgar also rewards Beowulf for his achievements, thus Wealhtheow’s gifts are independent of those of her husband's, which reflects her power and her possession of valuable objects that she is free to give away.

As regards her weaving peace by marriage, it has been suggested that her name might be telling in this respect, and she is once called *ides Helminga* "lady of the Helmings" (l. 620; 428), which refers to her people by birth. She can also be considered successful from this point of view, as she and Hrothgar have three children. In fact, Dockray-Miller considers her the most successful of all the mothers in the poem, as her sons do not die in the narrative present of the work (106).

Even more importantly, however, Wealhtheow uses speech to weave peace. As Sklute writes, she "does more" than fulfilling a ceremonial function, she also "offers *freondlaþu / wordum* 'words of friendly invitation'" (207). Dockray-Miller also notes that, besides serving drink, "[h]er main function seems to be […] ensuring harmony ("peaceweaving") in Heorot" (106). Dockray-Miller is making an important point here, as the social function of the peace-weaver is exactly to ensure harmony in the hall and within the community.

One quality of Wealhtheow's that aids her in this is her wisdom and understanding, for which she is praised several times. She is *cynna gemyndig* "a lady thoughtful in matters of formal courtesy" (l. 613; 427), *mode geþungen* "distinguished for the quality of her mind" (l. 624; 428), and *wisfæst* "being of wise understanding" (l. 626; 428).

The narrator's description also makes it clear that Wealhtheow possesses power and authority. Although she is not said to be occupying a throne, she sits beside Hrothgar. She is several times referred to as queen (ll. 613, 623, 641, 665) and lady: *ides Helminga* "lady of the Helmings" (l. 620), *ides Scyldinga* "lady of the Scyldings" (l. 1168), and the narrator also calls her *folccwen* "the people's queen" (l. 641), a term also used to refer to Modthryth later on (*folces cwen*, l. 1932). Furthermore, her status is evident from the emphasis on her wealth and jewellery: she is *goldhroden* "bejewelled with gold" (ll. 514, 640), *beaghroden* "ring-bejewelled" (l. 623), *gan under gyldnum beage* "wearing a gold crown" (l. 1163).

Wealhtheow is shown to be preoccupied with present and future danger and preserving stability. She lives in a Danish court beset by various threats of violence, both external and internal. All of her actions and words presented in the short passages in which she appears aim at fending off these dangers, and in fact she has no other function than this in the poem.

The first and most immediate of these dangers is of course Grendel. Wealhtheow first appears in the poem at the banquet preceding Grendel's attack. Bringing Beowulf a cup, she gives thanks to God for the warrior who intends to cleanse Heorot, and expresses her satisfaction that her wish is fulfilled. This is not a direct speech, her words are reported by the narrator; nevertheless, the first thing we learn concerning her thoughts is her preoccupation with the ongoing violence and her desire for a remedy. Dockray-Miller also observes that Wealhtheow does not speak during her first appearance, and she attributes this to the fact that there is no need for the queen to take a more active role, as the events proceed according to her wishes (107), a conclusion with which I agree. After Beowulf's short speech, in which he vows to kill Grendel or die himself, the narrator remarks that *ðam wife þa word wel licodon* "these words pleased the lady well" (l. 639; 428).

Another concern of Wealhtheow's is the perceived threat to the succession of her sons presented by Beowulf. She attempts to avert this danger through two speeches, one addressed to Hrothgar and the other to the hero. As Porter writes, "Wealhtheow is actively protecting her own interests, and the poet gives no indication that her words were ignored or not accepted into consideration by Hrothgar" and also that "the poet gives no reason for us to believe that her demands will go unheeded" (n. pag.).

A third danger Wealhtheow is trying to fend off is that of internal violence within the Danish court, the possible strife for succession between her sons and Hrothgar's nephew Hrothulf. She reminds Hrothulf of the *arna* 'honours' (l. 1187; 443) shown to him during his childhood, and expresses her hope that he will behave in a similar manner towards her children.

Dockray-Miller proposes the interesting argument that Wealhtheow sees no threat in Hrothulf, in fact, she wants to secure the throne for him rather than her own sons, because "her children will be safest in that social structure" (111), and that she, "like Hygd, wants to keep her sons off the throne in order to keep them safe" (106). This interpretation, however, is not substantiated by the text of the poem, or at least it is not more substantiated as the more conventional reading. Dockray-Miller's focus is on Wealhtheow as a mother, and in her view the main concern of all the mothers in *Beowulf* is "to protect, nurture and teach their children" (78). While this is a valid point, it only takes the personal level in consideration. Staver also believes that the queen wants to promote Hrothulf as Hrothgar's successor, but according to her, the reason for this might be that Wealhtheow fears treachery and civil war, and "[a]s a 'peace-weaver,' [she] must do her best to pour oil on troubled waters" (64–65). Wealhtheow is not only a mother, but also a queen, and thus she is also concerned for the integrity of her community. That there is tension within that community is suggested by the fact that the queen addresses the issue of Hrothulf's future behaviour towards her sons at all, as well as by the way in which she does this. Although Wealhtheow's speech contains only positive evaluation of Hrothulf, this is accompanied by a conditional clause: Hrothulf will act as the queen expects him to "if he remembers" past favours. Furthermore, she introduces her statements on how Hrothulf will act by *Ic… cann* "I know" (l. 1180) and *wene ic* "I believe" (l. 1184), expressions which belong to the engagement category of entertain (see pp. 18–20 in the Introduction). By using entertain, according to Martin and White, "the authorial voice indicates that its position is but one of a number of possible positions and thereby, to greater or lesser degrees, makes dialogic space for those possibilities" (104), thus this is an example for dialogic expansion. Concerning the category of "mental verbs," to which "I know" and "I believe" belong, the authors write that "such locutions […] construe a heteroglossic backdrop for the text by overtly grounding the proposition in the contingent, individual subjectivity of the speaker/writer" (105).

Hill claims that "Wealhþeow's comments about the future of the Danish kingdom are clear but indirect and deferential, as if there are limits to a woman's public intervention" (240). This observation, however, is not accurate. As Reinert points out, of all the women she examined (i.e. all those who deliver direct speeches in Old English poetry), Wealhtheow uses the greatest number of imperatives (45), which reflects on her status and power. As Reinert puts it, "[a] speaker – male or female – who presumes to tell another person what to do must believe he/she owns some position of power or authority in relation to the hearer" (43). Cramer in her article "The Voice of *Beowulf*" also examines the grammatical structure of Wealhtheow's speeches, and observes that, short as these speeches are, the queen uses a high number imperatives; furthermore, she "speaks in the present and future tenses […] only twice in her two first speeches does she talk about the past; she is a person oriented to the active present" (qtd. in Overing 95).

While in her speech to Hrothgar, uttered in the presence of Hrothulf, the queen may indirectly exhort the latter to behave honourably, nothing remains of this indirectness in her second speech, addressed to Beowulf. As Reinert notes, this speech contains a total of seven imperatives (87), and is delivered in public, *fore þæm werede* "in the presence of that great assembly" (l. 1215; 444), another sign of authority. It should also be noted that the dialogic expansiveness present in the first speech is also absent from her final comments on the Danish court:

> Her is æghwylc eorl   oþrum getrywe,
> modes milde,   mandrihtne hold**;**
> þegnas syndon geþwære,   þeod ealgearo,
> druncne dryhtguman   doð swa ic bidde.
> (ll. 1228–31)
>
> [Here every earl is true to the other, gentle of disposition, and loyal to his lord. The thanes are obedient, and the people are entirely at the ready: the men of this court, having drunk to it, will do as I bid.] (Bradley 444)

These are what Martin and White call "bare assertions", monoglossic because "not overtly referencing other voices or recognizing alternative positions. […] By this, the speaker/writer presents the current proposition as one which has no dialogistic alternatives which need to be recognised, or engaged with, in the current communicative context" (99). The switch from heteroglossia to monoglossia may be explained by the different identities of the addressees. When speaking to her husband and the members of the royal family, Wealhtheow may at least acknowledge the possibility of tension and future discord, while at the same time trying to avert and prevent it. However, when speaking to Beowulf, who is, after all, external to the community, she represents this community as united and strong. Wealhtheow is very much the queen here, distributing treasure, making direct requests and promises, assuming that her commands will be obeyed, and brooking no alternatives.

6.3. Hygd

Hygd, King Hygelac's wife is one of the silent characters of the poem, and we only learn about her through the narrator's description. The picture that emerges is consistent with the characteristics of a peace-weaving queen listed above, and is similar to Wealhtheow in many respects, as Horner also notes: "The opening and closing descriptions of Hygd firmly identify her as a conventional peace-weaver, and the final passage links her to Wealhtheow" (*Discourse of Enclosure* 87). Firstly, just like Hrothgar's queen, she walks about the hall serving drink to the warriors: *meoduscencum hwearf / geond þæt healreced Hæreðes dohtor* "through the hall Hareth's daughter wended with draughts of mead" (ll. 1980–81; 463), and *liðwege bær / hæleðum to handa* "delivered the drinking-cup into the hands of the Hæthnas" (ll. 1982–83). Secondly, although we do not see her dispensing treasure, the narrator assures us that *næs hio hnah swa þeah, / ne to gneað gifa Geata leodum, / maþmgestreona* "she was not niggardly nor over-frugal towards the Geatish people in gifts and precious treasures” (ll. 1929–31; 462). It should be also noted here that Hygd is the recipient of the torque Beowulf received from Wealhtheow, just as Hygelac receives the gifts bestowed upon the hero by Hrothgar. Thirdly, Hygd is also a mother: she has a son, and possibly a daughter. Fourthly, like Wealhtheow, she is also praised for her wisdom, and almost with the same words: she is *wis, welþungen* “wise and well-accomplished” (l. 1927; 462). In addition, she *lufode ða leode* “treated the people with affection” (l. 1982; 463). This description is of a well-loved and successful queen, who contributes to the harmony of the court.

Hygd’s most important action, however, comes after Hygelac’s death, when she offers Beowulf *hord ond rice, / beagas ond bregostol* “treasure-store and kingdom, rings and royal throne” (ll. 2369–70; 473). The reason for this, in Dockray-Miller’s view, is that “Hygd tries to protect her son in a brilliant display of diplomatic and maternal negotiation that makes clear her power. […] Hygd uses persuasion and arguments of nurturance as she tries to keep Heardred alive” (101). On the one hand, the “arguments of nurturance” are not at all clear from the text of the poem. On the other hand, as in Wealhtheow’s case, Dockray-Miller only takes the personal aspect of Hygd’s offer into account. Nor can I agree with her claim that “[c]lose reading of the passage reveals that Hygd thinks primarily of her child and keeping her alive” (104). It is quite possible that Hygd fears for her son’s life, but the narrator’s brief account of the episode does not explicitly stress this worry. What he does tell us, however, is that the queen *bearne ne truwode / þæt he wið ælfylcum eþelstolas / healdan cuðe* “was not confident of her son, that he would be able to maintain ancestral sovereignties against alien armies” (ll. 2370–72; 473). That is, Hygd does not trust Heardred’s ability to rule and defend the “ancestral sovereignties” against possible invaders. Her concern is as much for the community’s wellbeing as that of her son’s. Of course, these two aspects, personal and communal, are not in conflict, but reinforce each other: the best chance for anyone’s survival is a strong and stable community.

Wealhtheow’s and Hygd’s situation can be compared from this point of view as well. Both queens have sons who are or will probably be minors at the time of their fathers’ death. If we interpret Wealhtheow’s speech to mean that she wants her sons to succeed to the throne, the two women employ different strategies to reach similar aims. Wealhtheow expects Hrothulf, Hrothgar’s nephew, to be to her sons what Beowulf will be to Heardred, and assumes that her people will follow her wishes when her husband dies. Hygd, on the other hand, passes over her son and offers the kingdom to Beowulf, because she regards this as a more viable and secure strategy. However, Hygelac’s nephew does not want to seize power, and rather acts as the guardian Wealhtheow wanted Hrothulf to become. This connection can also be observed at the level of the text: we learn that Beowulf *freondlarum heold* "by his friendly counsels […] supported" (l. 2377; 474) Heardred, *estum mid are* "lovingly and with respect" (l. 2378; 474) until he became older. The word *ar* also appears twice in Wealhtheow's speech. She expresses her hope that Hrothulf *geogoðe wile / arum healdan* "will wish to treat these young ones honourably" (ll. 1181–82; 443), and at the same time she reminds Hrothulf of what she and her husband *arna gefremedon* "have previously done for him by way of honours" (l. 1187; 443) when *he* was young. *Ar*, then, seems to be what is expected of an older person when taking care of the future generation.

Ultimately, of course, both strategies fail. Dockray-Miller regards Wealhtheow as more successful than Hygd, as her sons do not die in the narrative present of the poem. However, this only has limited validity, and that again only as regards the personal. In the end not only will all sons die, but the poem predicts or suggests that both communities will be destroyed. Preventing violence can only have temporary success.

To return to Hygd's offer of the kingdom to Beowulf, Dockray-Miller observes that "some critics tend to ignore this brief episode, probably because it is difficult to fit into the male-dominated world of the poem. In a traditional critical view […] kings decide on succession and queens pass cups" (102), and thus "Hygd's offer of the kingship to Beowulf also indicates a masculine sort of power" (103). She also quotes Malone, who wrote that "[s]uch a state of things presupposes a woman of unchallenged authority […] Personal competence and a devoted following would seem to be necessary implications here" (102). If we examine the text, we find that the narrator does not evaluate or comment on Hygd's action, he simply states the fact of the offer. On the other hand, there is no indication whatsoever that he considers this untoward or disturbing. Furthermore, she does seem to have the following Malone writes about: the poem mentions the *feasceafte*, the "necessitous people" (l. 2373; 474) who attempt to persuade Beowulf to become king. This seems to mean that Hygd's wish is known to the people, and she is backed up by them. Thus, instead of acting out of personal motives, at the personal level, she represents the community.

We should also remember that this kind of "unchallenged authority" is the same that Wealhtheow claims and asserts to be hers in her speech to Beowulf (ll. 1230-31), in a manner that recognizes no alternatives, as discussed above. Many critics take this statement to be ironic, and see Wealhtheow as a desperate or tragic figure. While irony may indeed be present for the audience who know about the future fate of Heorot, at the time of uttering this line, Wealhtheow is a queen who has the power to act independently (as shown by her gift to the hero) and who is not afraid to speak her mind in the presence of her husband and the court. Given that in Hygd we have an example of a queen who could decide on the issue of succession after the death of her husband, and the Geats supported this decision, Wealhtheow may have had no reason to doubt that the Danes would react differently in a similar situation.

In the scenes discussed so far in the present chapter, both queens have the power to issue commands, expect them to be obeyed and have a say in the fate of the kingdom, or at least assume that they have the power to do so. Instead of suggesting that this signifies the appropriation of a masculine role on their part, it is perhaps more plausible to suppose that they indeed possessed this kind of power, especially as the narrating voice does not seem to make any disapproving comments on their behaviour. Rather than forcing everything into the male action – female passivity dichotomy, we should entertain the possibility that queens have power and authority in the world of *Beowulf*, and they exercise it, far from being helpless.

6.4. Hildeburh

Hildeburh is the emblematic passive sufferer in Old English poetry, and this aspect of her story and character has been the focus of scholarly attention. Mary Dockray-Miller writes that “Hildeburh is the representative suffering woman in Old English poetry” (96), while Joyce Hill considers her “the stereotype of the sorrowing woman” (241).

Hildeburh is most often contrasted with Grendel’s mother, as two women who react in opposing ways to the death of her sons. While Hildeburh passively mourns, Grendel’s mother takes action and revenge. The usual conclusion scholars draw from this comparison is that Hildeburh should be viewed as the model of proper feminine behaviour in such a case. For example, Chance writes that “[t]he idea is stressed that a kinswoman or mother must passively accept and not actively avenge the loss of her son” (99). By taking action, the argument follows, Grendel’s mother falls short of this ideal, thus she is monstrous and masculine.

The above kind of interpretation, however, leaves some aspects of Hildeburh’s story out of consideration. The comparison between her and Grendel’s mother cannot be straightforward, as their situation is rather different. The feud between Grendel's mother and the Danish court is an external conflict that takes place between a community and beings that are outside of any human community, as argued above in Chapter 3. Although the feud depicted in the Hildeburh episode also takes place between two communities, from the point of view Hildeburh, who belongs to one of these tribes by birth, and to the other by marriage, it is an internal conflict which affects her family. Caught in a web of conflicting loyalties, there remains nothing for her to do. Since family members die on both sides, there is nobody on whom she could take revenge, should she want to. Her passivity is not the only or ideal response, as has been claimed, but it follows from the fact that there is nothing she can do. It is impossible for her to take revenge or exact any kind of compensation for the murder of her kin.

Some scholars argue that Hildeburh may harbour feelings of resentment towards her husband, and may in fact want to take revenge on him. The text, however, lacks evidence for this. Dorothy Carr Porter observes that the narrator does not "register any wish on her part that the murders of son and brother not be avenged" (n. pag.). On the other hand, nor does he register any wish to the contrary, and this has more than a little significance in a poem in which revenge is a central and well-developed theme and in the case of a character whose emotions are otherwise portrayed in detail.

It should also be noted here that marriage is central to the lives of women in *Beowulf*. As Klein observed, "the women in *Beowulf* are identified primarily in relation to their male kin" (87), their fathers, husbands or sons. The role of a woman, her place in the community, is defined by her male relatives and especially her marriage. As the example of Modthryth shows (see Chapter 4.2), marriage can also be a source of positive transformation and (re)integration into society. We may also note that Grendel's mother, the only truly negative female character in the poem, does not have a husband. If we take this into consideration, together with the fact that there are no examples of strife within marriage or women turning against their husbands in the world of *Beowulf*, there is little reason to suppose that Hildeburh wishes for the death of her husband.

Citing John Hill, Dockray-Miller argues for the possibility that Hildeburh does not feel any loyalty for her husband and his people as she "is defined as her father's daughter […] rather than as the queen or lady of the Frisians" (96). While it is true that Hildeburh is referred to as *Hoces dohtor* (l. 1076), I would argue against seeing such implications in the use of the phrase, as the narrator consistently employs such formulas in the case of the other queens as well. Wealhtheow, for example, is called *ides Helminga* "lady of the

Helmings" (l. 620), referring to her people by birth, as well as *ides Scyldinga* "lady of the Scyldings" (l. 1168) and *cwen Hroðgares* "Hrothgar's queen" (l. 6103). The description of Hygd is even more similar to that of Hildeburh from this aspect, as she is nowhere referred to as queen of the Geats or Hygelac's wife, while she is twice mentioned as *Hæreþes dohtor* (ll. 1929, 1981), that is, "defined as her father's daughter". Despite these references, both Wealhtheow and Hygd are well integrated in their husbands' courts, and the textual evidence does not suggest that this was any different for Hildeburh, who *ær mæste heold / worolde wynne* "had once enjoyed the greatest worldly happiness" (ll. 1079–80; 440) before the fighting broke out.

Regarding the half-lines quoted above, Marijane Osborn suggests that *mæste […] worolde wynne* refers to Hildeburh's son and brother as the people who meant the greatest joy in the world to her, among whom "her Frisian husband is notably not included" (n. pag.). This is not, however, the way the passage is usually read, nor do Modern English translations support this view. Fulk, for example, translates it as "where she had counted on her greatest happiness in the world" (157), while Liuzza renders it as "where she once held / the greatest worldly joys" (86). These interpretations point to a more general and inclusive meaning of the joys Hildeburh experienced. This great joy, which only exists in Hildeburh's past, is contrasted with *morðorbealo maga* "the slaughter of her kin" (l. 1079; Liuzza 86), probably the source of Osborn's interpretation. The phrase, however, does not necessarily refer narrowly and exclusively to the death of two people. The same half-line is used in another instance in the poem, when the dying Beowulf consoles himself with the thought that

> Ic ðæs ealles mæg
> feorhbennum seoc   gefean habban;
> for ðam me witan ne ðearf   waldend fira
> **morðorbealo maga**,   þonne min sceaceð
> lif of lice
> (ll. 2739a–43b; emphasis added)

> [Sickened as I am by mortal wounds, I can take satisfaction in all that; on that account the ruler of men need not accuse me of the **murder of kinsmen** when the life departs from my body.] (Fulk 267)

Thus *morðorbealo maga* represents disruptive internal violence, an act of violence directed at other than an external enemy, violating the order of the community, which is repeatedly portrayed as a sin in the poem. Furthermore, *worolde wynne* alliterates with *wig* 'fighting' in the second half-line of l. 1080. Therefore, I would argue that Hildeburh's joy was the time when her relatives were living peacefully together, which is also congruent of the wider claim of the present dissertation that happiness is dependent on peace and order within the community.

I suggest that instead of Grendel's mother, Hildeburh could be more successfully compared to the characters of the Geat King Hrethel and the anonymous old man whose son is hanged (ll. 2435–71). What links these characters is the impossibility to take vengeance or expect compensation for a loved one, in all three cases a young son. All three passages are also heavily affectual, focusing on the sorrow and impotence of the bereaved parent. In the passage referring to the old man, the son is hanged, probably for a crime, which excludes the possibility of compensation, a situation called *geomorlic* "grievous" (l. 2444; Fulk 247). This old man, we are told, *gyd wrece, / sarigne sang* "may tell a tale, a song full of pain" (ll. 2446–47; Fulk 247), *symble bið gemyndgad morna gehwylce / eaforan ellorsið* "is continually reminded every morning of his offspring's departure" (ll. 2450–51; Fulk 247), he is *sorhcearig* "sad" (l. 2455) and *sorhleoð gæleð / an æfter anum* "will chant dirges, one after another" (ll. 2460–61; Fulk 249), whereas his home seems to him *reote berofene* "bereft of joy" (l. 2457; Liuzza 128), without the sound of the harp or entertainment, which is contrasted with a happier past (*swylce ðær iu wæron* "such as once had been", l. 2459; Fulk 249).

This old man is expressly used as an example to illustrate King Hrethel's sorrow. Hrethel's firstborn Herebeald is accidentally killed by his younger brother Hæðcyn, another situation in which no compensation is possible. *Þæt wæs feohleas gefeoht* "an inexpiable killing" (l. 2441; Fulk 247), Beowulf, who is narrating this episode, tells us, *sceolde […] æðeling unwrecen ealdres linnan* "the prince […] had to lose his life unavenged" (ll. 2442–43; Fulk 247). Later he adds, more specifically, that Hrethel *wihte ne meahte / on ðam feorhbonan fæghðe gebetan* "could by no means take satisfaction for the offense on the killer" (ll. 2464–65; Fulk 249), as the king cannot kill or take revenge on his own son. This situation, however, is *hreðre hygemeðe* "wearying to contemplate at heart" (l. 2442; Fulk 247). There is no remedy for the king's: *heortan sorge / weallende wæg* "felt surging, heartfelt sorrow" (ll. 2463–64; Fulk 249), and finally, having lost all joy, he dies: *He ða mid þære sorhge, þe him swa sar belamp, / gumdream ofgeaf* "then with that grief he whom the pain had encompassed gave up human joys" (ll. 2468–69; Fulk 249).

The passages discussed above abound in expressions of sorrow, and stress the connection between grief and the impossibility to take revenge. The Hildeburh episode also elaborates on the queen's distress: she is *geomuru ides* "a rueful lady" (l. 1075; Fulk

157), who *meotodsceaft bemearn* “regret the dictates of fate” (l. 1077; Fulk 157), *gnornode* “lamented” (l. 1117), and *geomrode giddum* “mourned with dirges” (l. 1118; Fulk 159), much like the old man. Read in the context suggested above, her sorrow may not only derive from the death of her relatives, but also from the fact that there is no course of action she could take to remedy the situation. This sorrow (and the joy that preceded it) is the focus of Hildeburh’s description, almost the only fact that the narrator chooses to tell us about her. Dockray-Miller is of the opinion that, similarly to Grendel’s mother, “she is angry and confused” (98), but this is an assumption which results from an interpretation of the circumstances, and not supported by the expressions used in the text itself.

Dockray-Miller also claims that “Hildeburh’s narrative shows us that, for mothers, mourning and vengeance are not the opposites Beowulf thinks they are” (96). However, sorrow and vengeance are closely linked in the world of the poem. When sorrow is mentioned, it is often associated with the ideas of death and violence, and in most cases retribution is not far away. The most famous example for this is Beowulf’s utterance that Dockray-Miller is referring to in the above quote, *Ne **sorga**, snotor guma; selre bið æghwæm / þæt he his freond wrece, þonne he fela murne* “Do not grieve, wise warrior. It is better for each that he avenge his friend than that he lament much” (ll. 1384–85; Fulk 177). In other instances, the word is used of the Danish warriors immediately before Grendel’s first attack, when they ***sorge** ne cuðon* “knew no cares” (l. 119; Fulk 95) yet, a situation which quickly changes in the following lines. After the attack, Hrothgar *þegn**sorge** dreah* “endured misery over his men” (l. 131; Fulk 95), and for twelve years experienced *sidra **sorga*** “sprawling miseries” (l. 149; Fulk 97) because Grendel *sibbe ne wolde […] fea þingian* “wanted no truce […] or to […] negotiate a settlement” (ll. 154–56; Fulk 97), nor did he pay *beorhtre bote* “gleaming compensation” (l. 158; Fulk 97), a predicament which was *cuð gyddum **geomore*** “revealed grievously in narratives” (ll. 150–51; Fulk 97). Later, when Grendel is killed, the narrator tells us that Beowulf *oncyþðe ealle gebette / inwid**sorge**, þe hie ær drugon* “remedied all the suffering, the anguish that they [the Danes] had experienced (ll. 830–31; Fulk 141). In his own account of the fight to Hygelac, Beowulf also states that Grendel *worna fela / Sigescyldingum **sorge** gefremede, / yrmre to alder. Ic þæt eall gewræc* “inflicted so very much pain and misery on the Victory-Scyldings; I avenged all that” (ll. 2003–05; Fulk 219). Further references to *sorg* include Wiglaf just before he goes to Beowulf’s aid against the dragon (*hiora in anum weall / sefa mid **sorgum*** “the heart in one of them seethed with regret”, ll. 2599–2600; Fulk 257), as well as to Guthlaf and Oslaf in the Hildeburh episode, who ***sorge** mændon* “spoke of the tenacious grasp of grief" (l. 1149; Fulk 161), which several critics suppose to mean that they incited the Danes to revenge against Finn (Fulk, Bjork and Niles 191).

A spelling variant of *sorg*, *sorh*, also appears various times in the text. It occurs for the first time in Hrothgar's speech to Beowulf, when the king says that ***sorh** is me to secganne* "it is an anguish for me to tell" (l. 473; Fulk 117) about the *færniða* "violent wrongs" (l. 476; Fulk 117) that Grendel committed in Heorot. It is also used in connection with Grendel's mother, who *gegan wolde / **sorh**fullne sið, sunu deað wrecan* "intended to mount a grievous undertaking, to avenge her son's death" (ll. 1277–78; Fulk 171), and the phrase, as well as its association with revenge, is repeated in Beowulf's account: *þa wæs eft hraðe / gearo gyrnwræce Grendeles modor, / siðode **sorh**full* "Grendel's mother was ready right off to avenge the injury, came travelling full of grief" (ll. 2117–19; Fulk 225), followed a few lines later by *hyre bearn gewræc* "avenged her child" (l. 2121; Fulk 227). Hrothgar uses the word again after the attack by Grendel's mother: ***Sorh** is geniwod / Denigea leodum. Dead is Æschere* "Grief is renewed for the Danish people: Æschere is dead" (ll. 1322–23; Fulk 173). Finally, after Beowulf defeats Grendel's mother, he claims that he *fyrendæda wræc* "avenged their [i.e. Grendel's and his mother's] criminal doings" (l. 1669; Fulk 197), as a result of which the king may now ***sorh**leas swefan* "sleep care-free" (l. 1672; Fulk 197).

These passages represent 13 of a total of 25 occurrences of *sorg/sorh* in *Beowulf*, while the word is used in another 4 instances to refer to Hrethel and old man, already discussed above. In addition, another word meaning 'sorrowful', *geomor*, is used twice in connection with Hildeburh and once in connection with the old man, and it also occurs in the Ingeld episode, when Beowulf predicts that an old retainer *onginneð **geomor**mod geongum cempan […] higes cunnian, / wigbealu weccean* "will begin with complaining intent to probe the thoughts of a young champion […], to stir up violent trouble" (ll. 2044–46; Fulk 221), which will lead to a renewal of the feud between Danes and Heathobards.

The above examples seem to suggest that sorrow is an emotion that 1. often accompanies or precedes taking revenge or violent action, 2. can result from an act of violence when it is not yet avenged, 3. can be remedied by revenge. When revenge is impossible, however, only sorrow remains, which in the absence of remedying action can consume the one who experiences it, as shown by the case of King Hrethel.

One scholar who notices the link between Hildeburh and the Geatish king is Martin Camargo in his article "The Finn Episode and the Tragedy of Revenge in *Beowulf*", in which he writes that "[h]er position is precisely that of Hrethel […] Each passage treats the theme of vengeance tainted with strife among kin from the point of view of innocent victims" (129–30), remarking also that "she has no enemy on whom to avenge the losses she has suffered" (129). In spite of this, Camargo draws very different conclusions from the comparison of these characters. In his opinion, Hildeburh "is unable, as a woman, to take revenge with her own hands" (129), and he also states that "when women act like man, their conduct seems monstrous" (127–28), citing the example of Modthryth, who "acted contrary to her woman's nature" (128). However, as I argued in Chapter 4, Modthryth is not criticized by the narrator because she acts like a man, but because she becomes an agent of internal violence,[16] and her conduct would not be judged any differently if she were a man. Similarly, being a man does not automatically mean that one can take revenge in all circumstances, as the comparison with Hrethel and the nameless old man shows. Following the same line of argument, it may also be suggested that Hengest, the leader of the Danes in the attack on Finn, is free to take revenge not because he is a man, but because his position is much less ambiguous: he does not have the same kind of double loyalty that ties Hildeburh's hands. Thus the passivity forced on Hildeburh by the situation is not a consequence of her gender and should not be used as evidence to support the view that women were expected to remain silent and leave all action to men in situations of crisis. Taking action does not divest a woman of her femininity, just as King Hrethel does not become a woman by dying of grief for his unavenged son.[17]

In fact, Hildeburh is not "completely powerless", as Dockray-Miller suggests (83). Chance writes that "all she does, this sad woman […] is to mourn her loss with dirges and stoically place her son in the pyre," and seen in this an expression of the queen's passive role and "the loss of her identity" (100). On the other hand, the fact that Hildeburh orders her son and brother to be placed on the same pyre side by side indicates that she clearly has the power to dispose of the bodies, which is reinforced by the use of the verb *het* 'commanded' (l. 1114) to represent her action. Even after her son is dead, Hildeburh is a queen who can see her commands obeyed. She also accomplishes by this a final, symbolic act of peace-weaving, as the blood of the warriors of both tribes mingles as it is consumed by fire, *gæsta gifrost* "the most ravenous of spirits" (l. 1123; Fulk 161).

---

[16] It is from this aspect that she can be compared with Hygd, whose description forms parentheses around the Modthryth episode, and whose every action, as we have seen above, is aimed at maintaining the peace of the community.

[17] It may be suggested that old age feminizes men and this is where the similarity between Hildeburh, Hrethel and the old man stems from. Clover, for example, expresses this view in "Regardless of Sex" (n. 68). However the impossibility to take revenge on part of these characters is not due to the fact that they are incapacitated by old age, but to their very specific situations discussed above, which point out the cul-de-sacs of the obligation for revenge. Clover also claims that the rest of the "funeral-lamenters" in *Beowulf* are women (*ibid*.). This, in fact, is not entirely true, as the poem ends with a lament for Beowulf uttered by twelve Geatish warriors who are called *hildediore* 'brave in battle' (l. 3169). The vocabulary used in this passage echoes that of the passages discussed here, e.g. *wordgyd wrecan* (l. 3172, cf. *gyd wrece* in the old man episode) and *begnornodon* (l. 3178, cf. ides *gnornode*).

When Hildeburh loses her power is after the death of her husband. With both her child and her husband killed, and the Frisian court disintegrating around her, there is no longer a community to which she belongs. Some critics regard the end of her story in a more positive light: Porter, for example, suggests that "although she was married into a non-Danish tribe, […] she is still considered a Danish queen, and the Danes still think of her as one of their own" (n. pag.). However, the expression used by the narrator is *seo cwen numen* "the queen taken" (l. 1153; Fulk 163), like a captive or an object, in a clause added as if an afterthought to the account of Finn's death. In the closing lines of the passage, Hildeburh is taken back to Denmark on a ship which also carries Finn's treasures, "reduced to the status of an object, as if she were a part of the booty of war," as Hill puts it (241). Klein also writes that she is "reduced to a kind of war booty" (98), which she regards as a "perversion of normative queenly roles" and of the relationship between queens and treasure (98), while Dockray-Miller observes that "she becomes a direct object in the grammar of the poem" (99). The objectification of Hildeburh is reinforced by the complete lack of affect inscribed to her in this passage. We no longer have any information concerning her emotions, whether she was sad, joyful or resigned. As she sails away to an uncertain and undefined fate, she is completely silenced. Klein also notes that "the last time we saw a ship laden with treasure" was Scyld's funeral at the beginning of the poem. "Much as that image of Scyld is the last we see of the king and his treasures, so too is this our last glimpse of Hildeburh" (99). Having lost her status as queen, wife, and mother, Hildeburh has also lost, at least symbolically, her place among the living.

To return once more to Camargo's analysis, the author also notes that the stories of Hildeburh and Hrethel "immediately precede the taking of revenge by the hero Beowulf" (130), the fights with Grendel's mother and the dragon, respectively. He sees in this a questioning of the heroic virtue of the protagonist, even evidence that the heroic code is "fundamentally defective", as "heroic virtue, on the one hand, and innocent suffering and kin-killing on the other […] are but two sides of the same coin", and from a "Christian perspective, all strife involves kinsmen because all men are brothers" (130). This opinion is echoed by Klein, who writes that "a heroic ethos of vengeance and violence […] is shown, in the end, to reduce the value of the warrior's life to nothing" (96), and by Belanoff, according to whom "[i]f suffering caused by male activity […] can be so vividly portrayed, the activity itself cannot be viewed as ideal and unflawed. […] life cannot be single-mindedly focused on competitive confrontations and defense" (200). I consider these conclusions problematic on two accounts. Firstly, Camargo's argument does not provide sufficient grounds for regarding Beowulf's exploits as anything less than praiseworthy. The Grendelkin, as we learn from the narrator, are outcast, the descendants of Cain, and enemies of God; furthermore, the hero could not defeat Grendel's mother without divine help, while the dragon is not even human – these adversaries are not exactly "brothers".

Secondly, although it is true that heroic feats and kinslaying are two sides of the same coin, and the text does point out in several instances the dangers of uncontrolled violence, *Beowulf* does not contain a wholesale condemnation of violence or vengeance, just as it contains no wholesale glorification, either. As I argued in the Introduction and elsewhere in the present dissertation, violence can sustain as well as destroy order. In *Beowulf*, we may also observe a careful distinction between internal and external violence (with both narrator and characters repeatedly warning against the former), as well as the right and wrong reasons to take revenge. In both instances mentioned by Camargo, Beowulf fights external enemies, who threaten a community with destruction. On the other hand, the examples of Hildeburh and Hrethel show the negative side of violence, which can occur by accident or by vengeance getting out of control, disrupting the lives of those who are *unsynnum* "guiltless" (l. 1072).

Finally, Camargo also suggests that "the women in *Beowulf* seem to symbolize" "the love and compassion which Christianity offers as its ideal" (133). However, as noted above, the religious aspect or any reference to religion is almost entirely absent from the characterization of the female characters of the poem. The only mention of God by a woman in the text is when Wealhtheow gives thanks for the arrival of Beowulf – who comes to kill Grendel. The women of *Beowulf* do not exist in world parallel or antithetical to that of their men. As Dockray-Miller observes, "there is no social world in *Beowulf* outside the hall and the heroic ethos" (100), and the female characters participate in this world, doing what they can to preserve the peace of the hall and of the community it stands for. I agree here with Magennis, who writes that "[e]ven Hildeburh […] is not shown as repudiating these values [i.e. those of heroic society]" (105). But when hall and society collapse, there remains nothing for women to do and no place for them to go.

6.5. Conclusion

It has become somewhat of a commonplace in literature to regard the queens of *Beowulf* as passive and helpless victims. Hill, for example, writes that “the stereotype of the woman-as-victim, as *geomuru ides*, was a dominant one in Old English” (242), “the female being a figure of inaction and isolation, a victim of the destructive forces of ‘heroism’” (241). Camargo believes that “Hildeburh’s fate […] is shared by nearly all of the female characters of *Beowulf*” (127), while Horner considers Hygd a model of passive femininity (*Discourse of Enclosure* 86). In fact, the characterization of these women, especially Wealhtheow and Hygd, suggests that they possess wealth and authority, are not afraid to speak up and take decisions, show affection to and are respected by the people around them. They function well at the communal level, and their primary concern is to ensure the peace of the community.

Hildeburh is indeed a tragic and passive figure, but the mention of her “greatest joys” in the narration implies that her life before the renewal of the feud between Frisians and Heathobards may have been rather similar to that of Hygd and Wealhtheow. Moreover, her passivity is not the result of her gender, but of the fact that she is caught in a situation that is impossible to resolve. Therefore, I argue that she should not be interpreted as a generic model for female behaviour, especially since she is the only truly passive female character in the poem (as well as in all the poems examined in the present dissertation), and, as attested by the example of King Hrethel, such a situation could prove equally painful and hopeless in the case of a man.

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1. Conflict and evaluation

In Old English poetry, interpersonal relationships are represented along three dimensions, the personal, the communal and the cosmic. Of these three, the communal can be shown to be present in all poems, and is of primary importance. Characters evaluated positively by the narrating voice belong to a community, act on behalf of it, and their personal concerns are in harmony with the interest of this community. This may be observed in all the poems under consideration in the present dissertation. In *Judith*, the protagonist acts on behalf of the Bethulians, defending them and being instrumental to their defeating their enemies, as well as protecting herself from the sexual assault of Holofernes. In *Elene* and *Juliana*, the protagonists represent the community of Christians while they also fulfil their personal wishes. Of the women in *Beowulf*, Queens Wealhtheow and Hygd work to protect the community while at the same time trying to protect their children.

If a character is focusing exclusively on the personal, or if the personal is in conflict with the communal, the character in question is judged negatively by the narrating voice. Such is the case of Grendel's mother, who does not belong to any community, and is motivated solely by her personal grief and desire for vengeance. Another example is Queen Modthryth, who, out of a personal sense of injury, kills the men whose function is to protect and uphold the order of the community. Among the male characters, yet another example can be found in King Heremod, who is blind to his obligations as a leader, and puts to death his own companions.

The third dimension, that of the cosmic order, is not perceived by all characters, although it is present in all poems examined. In *Judith*, *Juliana* and *Elene*, the protagonists are aware of this aspect and act as its representatives, thus in their case the personal, the communal and the cosmic are aligned. What is more, Juliana and Judith have an almost personal relationship with God. By defeating the devil and forcing him to confess, the angelic voice that demonstrates direct divine intervention (as an answer to Juliana's prayer), and her superior knowledge, Juliana becomes a participant in the drama of the battle between good and evil. Due to the active verbs used in *Judith*, God becomes a participant in the drama between Assyrians and Bethulians. In *Beowulf*, however, although the narrator refers several times to the divine order of creation, and the hero and King

Hrothgar are also aware of a God ruling the world, this kind of knowledge seems to be non-existent or non-accessible to women. The only woman in the epic who makes a single reference to God is Wealhtheow. For the rest, the communal level is the highest one they can perceive.

In the Introduction to the present dissertation, I defined violence as a violation of a person's integrity, which may involve physical as well as non-physical acts. I also argued for a distinction between positive and negative violence, that is, violence that upholds or destroys the order of a given community. Then I proceeded to analyse the descriptions of the selected female characters, and in the case of the three religious poems, those of their adversaries, with the help of Martin and White's appraisal theory, focusing on judgement (evaluations of behaviour) and affect (evaluations of emotions). From *Beowulf*, I also included the figures of King Heremod, King Hrethel and the anonymous old man mourning for his dead son for the sake of comparison (with the characters of Modthryth and Hildeburh, respectively). The following observations can be made on the basis of the analysis:

1. *Judgement*. According to Martin and White, judgement can be divided into two broad categories, esteem (comprising normality, capacity and tenacity) and sanction (which consists of veracity and propriety). In the case of the so-called positive characters (those characters whose personal goals are in harmony with the communal and/or the cosmic, i.e. Juliana, Elene, Judith, the Bethulians, the peaceweavers Wealhtheow, Hygd, Hildeburh, and King Hrethel), the narrator's evaluation of judgement is entirely positive as regards both categories. The only exceptions to this are Hildeburh and Hrethel (Tables 23 and 24), in whose description we can also find elements of [– capacity], as these characters are in a situation which makes it impossible for them to act.

As regards the evaluation of negative characters by the narrating voice, this is not uniformly negative. These characters may be evaluated positively in the category of esteem, especially capacity (e.g. strength or wisdom) and tenacity (e.g. boldness), while they consistently receive negative evaluations as regards sanction, especially propriety. Limited positive esteem is justified as there is no glory to be won by defeating an enemy who is inferior in all respects, thus adversaries can be shown to be strong if the conflict is physical (e.g. Grendel's mother) or wise if the battle is rather one of wills (e.g. Judas). At the same time, negative sanction is to be expected based on Martin and White's observation that sanction "underpins civic duty and religious observances" (52), as these characters either threaten the community and/or are heathens opposing Christian protagonists. The instances where they are described by elements of [+ propriety] include cases referring to how they *should* behave, as opposed to their actual behaviour, or the examples of "turning" characters, who are transformed from negative into positive ones, such as Modthryth in *Beowulf* and Judas in *Elene*.

Besides propriety, veracity is also an important characteristic separating positive and negative characters, as it represents a quality that seems to possess great significance in the world of Old English poems. Hugh Magennis notes, for example, that the guile and duplicity of characters like Judith and Juliana in Latin texts is eliminated in the Old English versions (*Images* 22), which also eliminates the possibility of [– veracity], i.e. negative *sanction*, being applied to a positive character.

In addition to evaluations by the narrating voice, characters also evaluate one another. The evaluations offered by positive characters agree with those of the narrator. This is again to be expected, as these characters belong to communities whose values the narrating voice shares, endorses or depicts in a favourable light. On the other hand, as regards negative characters, we may observe that they do not have the power to judge their adversaries, and they are not shown to reflect on their environment. This is the case even in *Elene*, where the conflict unfolds verbally rather than physically. Neither Judas nor the Jews evaluate the protagonist, while the Jews' evaluation of Judas is limited entirely to esteem.

A notable exception to the above among the analysed texts is *Juliana*, in which the worldview of the negative characters – Heliseus, Affricanus and the devil – is elaborated in as much detail as that of the heroine, rich in elements of judgement. In the case of the first two of these characters, their evaluation of each other and the protagonist is the exact opposite of that of the narrator. Thus, whereas the narrator's evaluation of Juliana is entirely positive, Heliseus' and Affricanus' evaluation of her is mostly negative as regards both sanction and esteem. Evaluations offered by the devil agree with those of the other two adversaries when he speaks in public and when he initially tries to deceive Juliana. When forced to confess, however, his evaluation of both the main character and himself agrees with that of the narrator.

2. Affect. It may be observed that characters' evaluations of themselves focus on affect rather than judgement. This is entirely true of Judith and Elene, whose self-evaluation contains only elements of affect, and predominantly true of Juliana, although in her case we can encounter a few instances of judgement ([+ veracity] and [+ tenacity]) as well. On the other hand, the self-evaluations of Judas and the devil in *Juliana* contain both judgement and affect, especially the confession of the latter, which shows negative sanction and positive as well as negative esteem.

In evaluations by the narrator and by other characters, the distribution of positive and negative affect parallels that of positive and negative judgement. That is, characters judged positively by the narrating voice (and by other voices in agreement with it) are shown to experience mostly positive emotions. When they do show negative affect, it is usually attributable to the actions of adversaries, as e.g. when Judith and the Bethulians are threatened by Holofernes or when Juliana is tortured by Heliseus. These instances are usually well-defined, limited (for example, Juliana's evaluation by the narrator contains very few elements of negative affect, mostly [– inclination] and only one occurrence of [– happiness] [Table 17], and even Elene, who criticizes and threatens the Jews and Judas, is characterized by very little negative affect [Table 6]), and can be remedied.

In contrast, the evaluation of characters judged negatively also abounds in negative affect. A consistent exception to this is [+ inclination], which represents the willingness to perform an act or follow a certain course of action. These characters have overwhelmingly negative emotions, especially sorrow, fear, (uncontrolled) anger, and hate. Although negative emotions are by no means limited to negatively judged characters, it is a recurring feature of the latter that they experience sorrow and unhappiness even when they have every reason to be happy (and it is implied that they would be, should they conform to the rules), as shown by the examples of Heremod, who was blessed with strength and expected to become a good king, or the Jews in *Elene*, who were cherished by the Creator. The improper behaviour of these characters is at the same time the cause and the effect of their unhappiness. Discussing the figure of Judas, Catharine A. Regan writes that "according to Augustine, the sinner's failure to choose the good injures his nature. The sinner's intellect is darkened and he suffers pain, tribulation and sorrow, the signs that right order has been violated. He cannot escape misery because it is the inseparable companion of sin" (31–32). Regan is referring here to a passage in *De libero arbitrio* 3.18: "*Nam sunt re uera omni peccanti animae duo ista poenalia, ignorantia et difficultas. Ex ignorantia dehonestat error, ex difficultate cruciatus adfligit*"[18] (qtd. in Regan, n. 8). This observation is true not only of Judas, but also of the other characters whose behaviour violates "right order".

Emotions like sorrow and joy are also closely related to the idea of community. Characters who are outside of a community or who exclude themselves from it through their sins or improprieties cannot experience lasting joy, only negative emotions. Joy is dependent on belonging to a community, following its rules and bringing the personal in harmony with the communal. Nowhere is this more conspicuously shown than in the case of the ‘turning’ characters, especially Judas: after he agrees to reveal the hiding place of the Cross and places his trust in God, he is characterized by fully positive affect (as well as judgement). Prior to this point, the affectual elements in his description are entirely negative (accompanying elements of negative sanction and mixed esteem, as noted above).

---

[18] "For there really are two penalties for each sinful soul: ignorance and trouble. Through ignorance the soul is dishonored by error; through trouble it is afflicted with torments" (Augustine 109).

A group which should be separately mentioned in connection with affect is that of the characters at the end of the Appendix (Tables 23–25). These characters are described mainly through affect, the proportion of affective elements being higher than that of elements of judgement. These affective elements are almost entirely negative, with a single exception in the case of Hildeburh (Table 23), which, however, refers to an earlier period in contrast with the present. In this case, the negative emotions are not due to any sin or fault of the characters in question, nor a result of any action of their own. They are just incidental victims of events taking place around them and disrupting the harmony of their community (be it a family or a nation), also affecting their lives in the process. Community remains a central issue in these cases, with the difference that it is not the characters who are excluded from the community, but the community itself that disintegrates around them.

Thus, the picture that emerges is that the characters belonging to communities whose “side” the narrative voice takes or whose point of view it communicates are evaluated positively in terms of both judgement and affect, while people posing threats to these communities are depicted through negative elements of evaluation. Furthermore, while protagonists (and other positively evaluated characters) frequently utter speeches in which they express their opinion of their environment, echoing the evaluations of the narrator, antagonists usually remain silent, which does not only refer to the lack of speech on their part, but also to the fact that their thoughts remain unreported, and they do not possess the power to evaluate other characters. In addition to negative sanction, negative affect and a lack of evaluative power, it is also a common feature in the portrayal of negative characters that they are dehumanized to varying degrees (presented in the Appendix as [– normality]). This is true both of characters conventionally regarded as “monsters” (e.g. Grendel’s mother) and of those who are unequivocally human in form but monstrous in their behaviour and their use of violence for improper ends (such as Holofernes in *Judith*, called a dog, or Heliseus in *Juliana*, compared to a wild beast).

It it also important to point out out that many of the features discussed above characterize the Old English poems alone rather than their (certain or possible) Latin sources. For example, Juliana’s immutable steadfastness, Holofernes’ lack of speech and his dehumanization through the presentation of animal noises, or the elimination of Judith’s duplicity mentioned above are all the results of authorial modifications which bring these stories in line with patterns of evaluation that can be observed across the Old English texts

Of course, it should be noted that the analysis of evaluation used in the present dissertation is a rather simplified and not very detailed version of the complex system elaborated by Martin and White. Furthermore, such an analysis Old English texts should be regarded with due caution, as our understanding of these texts depends on (often conflicting) scholarly interpretations and on dictionaries, whose entries are often coloured by these interpretations, thus a certain circularity of argument cannot be avoided. Nevertheless, the outcome of the analysis shows certain tendencies that seem to be rather consistently present by similar types of characters across different texts. Due to the topic of the present dissertation, the analysis focuses on female characters and the male figures who act as their allies or adversaries, or who serve as close parallels. At a later stage, the research could be extended to include a greater number of male characters and/or other surviving Old English texts, in order to see whether the observations made on the basis of the present analysis would remain valid in the case of such larger-scale investigation or whether new aspects or tendencies would emerge.

7.2. Female roles in the context of violence

In the texts examined in the present dissertation, we have seen women appear in a variety of roles, both as perpetrators and victims of violence, as well as in situations in which they tried to avert the threat of violence from their family or community. It is a question whether female actions and reactions to violence are subject to specific rules, whether they are perceived and interpreted differently from those of men. In these texts, we can find several parallels between male and female characters, some of which have been addressed in greater detail above, such as the pairs Heremod – Modthryth or Hildeburh – Hrethel. In addition to these, there are numerous common elements in the stories of women and man.

One of the obvious parallels is between Judith and Beowulf, both of whom single-handedly defeat enemies who threaten their community with destruction. Judith kills Holofernes with a sword she finds in his pavilion, while Beowulf also kills Grendel's mother and decapitates the dead Grendel with the magic sword he finds in the enemy's lair. Secondly, both protagonists take the head of the vanquished enemy with them, and display it publicly, offering it up for the gaze of their audience while giving an account of their exploits: *þas sælac […] þe þu her to locast* "these spoils of the deep which you here look upon" (ll. 1652–54; Bradley 455), says Beowulf to Hrothgar, while Judith tells the Bethulians that *Her ge magon sweotole … on… heafod starian* "here you may openly gaze upon the head" (ll. 177–79; 500).

Thirdly, both characters invoke vengeance and claim to have acted and achieved victory on behalf of the community. Addressing Hrothgar, Beowulf calls Grendel's head *tires to tacne* "a token of victory" (l. 1654; 455) and assures him that *þu him ondrædan ne þearft […] aldorbealu […] swa þu ær dydest* "you need not fear deadly malice […] as you did before" (ll. 1674–76; 455). Similarly, Judith tells her people that *eow ys […] tir gifeðe / þara læðða þe ge lange drugon* "triumph is granted you over those injuries which you have long suffered" (ll. 156–58; 500). However, there is a subtle difference between the two scenes: Beowulf, the hero from abroad, gives a first person singular account which leaves no doubt that it was he who achieved victory and saved the Danes from further trouble; Judith, on the other hand, shares victory with the Bethulians, and, in fact, calls *them* victorious rather than herself: *sigerofe hæleð* "victorious heroes" (l. 177; 500), as well as *eow ys […] tir gifeðe*, quoted above.

Finally, both heroes attribute their victory to God: *ætrihte wæs / guð getwæfed, nymðe mec god scylde* "had God not shielded me, the fight would have been over straightaway" (ll. 1657–56; 455), Beowulf claims, *ac me geuðe ylda waldend* "but the Ruler of man granted me" (l. 1661; 455) to catch sight of the giants' sword, while Judith, without giving details of the killing of Holofernes, says simply that *ic him ealdor oðþrong / þurh godes fultum* "I took his life, with God's help" (ll. 185–86; 500).

Beowulf serves as a parallel not only for Judith, but also for Elene, who is said to arrive *secga þreate*, with "her contingent of men" (l. 271; 172). A similar phrase is used twice by Beowulf: *mid minra secga gedriht* " with a company of my men" (l. 633; 428) when he describes the purpose of his visit to Heorot to Wealhtheow, and *mid þinra secga gedryht* "with the company of your men" (l. 1672; 455) referring to Hrothgar and his followers.

Besides the use of this particular phrase, the arrival of Beowulf and Elene can be compared in other ways, as well. Both characters make a journey over the sea to a distant country to achieve their goals. But while Beowulf, who comes to assist the Danes, is questioned and tested repeatedly, presents himself formally to Hrothgar and formulates his purpose – to fight for the king – as a request, Elene, who needs to enlist the help of the Jews in finding the Cross, does not ask, but issues orders.

The above examples pointed out similarities – as well as differences – between female and male protagonists who are evaluated positively by the narrating voice. However, if we compare the characters in the two Cynewulfian poems, *Elene* and *Juliana*, what we find is slightly different. Elene's behaviour parallels not that of Juliana, but of Heliseus. As Damon notes, Elene "performs a role of domination and physical coercion often reserved in hagiography for the persecutors of martyrs" (95), and "[t]he very terms and ideas associated with the persecuting state in 'Juliana' are applied in 'Elene' to the Emperor Constantine and to Elene, his mother" (108). Both Elene and Heliseus want to break the will of their opponents in order to obtain what they want. The methods they resort to show some similarities as well, although the torture ordered by Elene is not as extreme or horrifying as the one Juliana is subjected to. The difference, of course, is in the reasons as well as the outcome: Elene succeeds and thereby brings joy and happiness not only to herself and to a reborn Judas-Cyriacus, but also to the community, to "people" in general. In contrast, Heliseus loses, and the community whose order he sought to protect is also destroyed.

Not only is a comparison possible between Elene and Heliseus, but also between Judas and Juliana. Both characters are imprisoned and threatened by their persecutors.[19] But while Judas is weakened and broken by the seven nights he spends in the pit, Juliana's resolve does not diminish. While Judas prays for deliverance, Juliana prays for the power to see clearly and to remain steadfast.[20] Judas submits to Elene's will, while Juliana cannot be defeated.

Even though Elene and Juliana represent opposite roles as persecutor and persecuted, they also share features such as their faith in God, their superior understanding of the order of the world (as opposed to their adversaries), as well as their superiority in the battle of wills and their power to define and limit the options open to their enemies. Elene presents Judas with a choice: he may choose to die or to comply with her wish. Whichever he chooses, he will be defeated: there is no alternative which would allow him to win or to escape making the choice. Elene is in a position of authority and has Judas physically in her power when she gives this ultimatum. Remarkably, Juliana, who possesses no authority in the society of heathens in which she lives, and who is perceived as weak by her enemies, presents the same kind of choice to Heliseus: he may accept Christianity or he must accept losing her. There is no third option. Thus Heliseus is doomed to failure from the beginning, but he does not realize that there is no alternative for him, and he is destroyed searching for one.

---

[19] Another similarity between the two characters is that both confront and overcome the devil, but a detailed consideration of this aspect is outside the scope of the present dissertation.

[20] It should be remembered that the lack of any fear and uncertainty on Juliana's part is the result of Cynewulf's modification of the story (see Calder 365–66).

The following observations may be made on the basis of the above and of the preceding chapters: Firstly, it seems that no single role or line of action can be defined that women are expected to conform to. In the analysed texts, we have seen women perform a variety of functions, perpetrating physical violence, taking vengeance, resisting violence by others, giving orders, or striving to preserve peace and harmony. Secondly, as we have seen, many of these actions are also performed by men, with narrators often using the same phrases or formulas. The evidence does not suggest that any of these actions are by definition forbidden to women or that they are evaluated in a different manner depending on the gender of the person performing them. The basis of a positive or negative evaluation is not gender, but community, that is, whether an action upholds or threatens order, or whether an act of violence is sanctioned, legitimate and constructive or illegitimate and destructive.

Thirdly, perhaps the most important result of the analysis is questioning the conventionally assumed dichotomy of male activity vs. female passivity. The majority of the women characters discussed in the present dissertation *do* something, i.e. they actively try to influence their environment and the future of their community through actions, counsels or threats. Their acts range from killing an enemy to deciding the fate of the kingdom. Of the 8 female characters considered in the previous chapters, 7 may be said to be active and powerful at least to some extent. This means that the view that female characters in Old English poetry should ideally be passive is not supported by the texts. The only character of the 8 who is truly passive is Hildeburh. However, as I argued in Chapter 6, this is not because she is held up as a model for feminine behaviour, but because she serves as an example of the destructive potential of internal violence and of the inability to obtain compensation. This kind of passivity is not gender-based, either, as shown by the similarly tragic fate of King Hrethel of the Geats.

Critics have long taken the view that women in Old English poetry are marginal, secondary figures, alien to this world and to its rules. As I argued in Chapter 2, this view is rooted in Victorian ideals of gender roles, and it is reinforced rather than deconstructed by feminist criticism. What nineteenth-century scholars hold up as an ideal, their later counterparts formulate as criticism against a poetic tradition that, in their interpretation, is deeply uncomfortable with powerful female figures.

I hope to have shown that the above view is not borne out by the texts of the poems themselves. This is not to say that there are no gender differences or gender roles in Old English poetry. Men are the warriors, and it is primarily their task to engage in violence. However, preserving the community and preventing destructive violence is as much a concern of women as of men. Women belong to the community, are defined by the community and their main concern is to contribute to keeping the community together. If the community falls apart, there is no consolation left for them. Taking this into consideration may represent a step towards reinterpreting the role of women in Old English poetry in a different light.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

Fulk, R. D., Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, eds. *Klaeber's Beowulf*. 4th ed. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2008. Print.

Jack, George, ed. *Beowulf: A Student Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Print.

Zupitza, Julius. *Beowulf: Reproduced in Facsimile from the Unique Manuscript British Museum MS. Cotton Vitellius A. XV*, with a transliteration and notes. 2nd ed. Early English Text Society 245. London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1959. Print.

Krapp, George Philip and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, eds. *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*. 6 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931–53. Print.

Kelly, Richard J., ed., trans. *The Blickling Homilies: Edition and Translation*. London: Continuum, 2003. Print.

Sabatier, Pierre, ed. *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*. Vol. I. Remis: Reginaldum Florentain, 1743. *Open Library*. 29 August 2010. Web. 18 March 2013.

Translations

Bradley, S. A. J., ed., trans. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. London: Everyman, 1982. Print.

Douay-Rheims Bible Online. Web. 18 March 2013.

Fulk, R. D., ed., trans. *The* Beowulf *Manuscript. Complete Texts and* The Fight at Finnsburg. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. Print.

Gummere, Francis, trans. *Beowulf*. Adelaide: The University of Adelaide, 2013. E-book.

Liuzza, R. M., trans. *Beowulf*. Broadview Literary Texts, 2000. Print.

Morris, R., trans. *The Blickling Homilies*. Cambridge, Ontario: In parentheses Publications, 2000. Print.

Dictionaries

Bosworth, Joseph. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Ed. T. Northcote Toller. 1898. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954. Print.

Hall, J. R. Clark. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* 4th ed. Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 14. Toronto: University of Toronto Press in association with the Medieval Academy of America, 1984. Print.

Secondary Sources

Alfano, Christine. "The Issue of Feminine Monstrosity: A Reevaluation of Grendel's Mother." *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23.1 (1992): 1–16. Web. 07 July 2012.

Anderson, Carolyn. "*Gæst*, gender and kin in *Beowulf*: Consumption of the Boundaries." *The Heroic Age* 5 (2001): n. pag. Web. 07 July 2012.

Audi, Robert. *Religious Commitment and Secular Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.

Augustine. *On the Free Choice of the Will, On Grace and Free Choice, and Other Writings.* Ed. Peter King. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Print.

Belanoff, Patricia A. "Women's Songs, Women's Language: *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife's Lament*." *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 193–203. Print.

Body-Gendrot, Sophie. Introduction. *Violence in Europe: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Sophie Body-Gendrot and Pieter Spierenburg. New York: Springer 2008. 1–10. Print.

——. *The Social Control of Cities?: A Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. Print.

Bonjour, Adrien. *The Digressions in* Beowulf. 1950. Medium Ævum Monographs V. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970. Print.

Brewer, Charlotte. Review of *Woman as Hero in Old English Literature,* by Jane Chance. Review of English Studies 39 (1988): 280–81. Print.

Brison, Susan J. *Aftermath: Violence and the Remaking of a Self.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003. Print.

Brown, George Hardin. "Royal and Ecclesiastical Rivalries in Bede's History." *Renascence* 52.1 (Fall 1999): 19–34. Print.

Brown, Robert McAfee. *Religion and Violence*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987. Print.

Brown, Warren C. *Violence in Medieval Europe*. Harlow: Pearson, 2011. Print.

Bufacchi, Vittorio. “Two Concepts of Violence.” *Political Studies Review* 3.2 (2005): 193–204. Print.

——. *Violence and Social Justice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007. Print.

Burton, Richard. “Woman in Old English Poetry.” *The Sewanee Review* 4.1 (Nov 1895): 1–14. Print.

Bzdyl, Donald G. “*Juliana*: Cynewulf’s Dispeller of Delusion.” *The Cynewulf Reader*. Ed. Robert E. Bjork. New York and London: Routledge, 2001. 193–206. Print.

Calder, Daniel G. “The Art of Cynewulf’s *Juliana*.” *Modern Language Quarterly* 34.4 (1973): 355–71. Print.

Camargo, Martin. “The Finn Episode and the Tragedy of Revenge in *Beowulf*.” *Studies in Philology* 78.5 (Winter 1981): 120–34. Print.

Carlson, Eric R. “Mutable Desires: Girardian Two-Object Rivalries in *Beowulf*.” *Journal of Literature and Art Studies* 2.7 (July 2012): 691–702. Print.

Chance, Jane. “The Structural Unity of *Beowulf*: The Problem of Grendel’s Mother.” 1980. *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 248–61. Print.

——. *Woman as Hero in Old English Literature.* 1986. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005. Print.

Christoph, Siegfried R. “Violence Stylized.” *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature*. Ed. Albrecht Classen. New York and London: Routledge, 2004. 115–26. Print.

Classen, Albrecht. *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature*. New York and London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Clover, Carol. “The Germanic Context of the Unferþ Episode.” *Speculum* 55 (1980): 444–68. Print.

——. “Regardless of Sex: Men, Women and Power in Early Northern Europe.” *Speculum* 68 (1993): 363–87. Print.

Cover, Robert M. “Violence and the Word.” *On Violence: A Reader*. Ed. Bruce B. Lawrence and Aisha Karim. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007. 292–313. Print.

Damico, Helen. *Beowulf’s Wealhtheow and the Valkyrie Tradition*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984. Print.

——. “The Valkyrie Reflex in Old English Literature.” *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 176–90. Print.

Damico, Helen, and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Introduction. *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Damico and Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 1–26. Print.

Damon, John Edward. *Soldier Saints and Holy Warriors: Warfare and Sanctity in the Literature of Early England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003. Print.

Dockray-Miller, Mary. *Motherhood and Mothering in Anglo-Saxon England.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000. Print.

Doubleday, James. “The Speech of Stephen and the Tone of *Elene*.” *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation for John C. McGalliard*. Ed. Lewis E. Nicholson and Dorores Warwick Frese. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975. 116–23. Print.

Drout, Michael D. C. “Blood and Deeds: The Inheritance Systems in *Beowulf*.” *Studies in Philology* 104.2 (Spring 2007): 199–226. Print.

Dupont, Jean-Baptiste. “Mimesis: The Scapegoat Model.” *Transactions on Advanced Research* 3.2 (July 2007): 15–18. Print.

Earl, James W. “Violence and Non-Violence in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric’s ‘Passion of St. Edmund’.” *Philological Quarterly* 78 (1999): 125–49. Print.

Fee, Christopher. “*Judith* and the Rhetoric of Heroism in Anglo-Saxon England.” *English Studies* 78 (1997): 401–06. Print.

Fell, Christine. *Women in Anglo-Saxon England.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985. Print.

Fleming von Sweringen, Grace. “Women in the Germanic Hero-Sagas.” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 8.4 (Oct 1909): 501–12. Print.

Frantzen, Allen J. *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice and the Great War*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2004. Print.

Fulk, R. D., and Christopher M. Cain. *A History of Old English Literature*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell, 2005. Print.

Galtung, Johan. “Violence, Peace and Peace Research.” *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (1969): 167–91. Print.

Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977. Print.

Haan, Willem de, and Jan Nijboer. “Youth Violence and Self-Help.” European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice 13 (2005): 75–88. Print.

Haan, Willem de. “Violence as an Essentially Contested Concept.” *Violence in Europe: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Sophie Body-Gendrot and Pieter Spierenburg. New York: Springer 2008. 27–40. Print.

Hahn, Stacey L. “Constructive and Destructive Violence in Jean d’Arras’ *Roman de Mélusine*.” *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature*. Ed. Albrecht Classen. New York and London: Routledge, 2004. 187–206. Print.

Halverson, John. “The World of *Beowulf*.” *ELH* 36.4 (1969): 593–608. Print.

Hansen, Elaine Tuttle. “Women in Old English Poetry Reconsidered.” *The Michigan Academician* 9 (1976): 109–17. Print.

Harris, Joseph. Review of *Beowulf’s Wealhtheow and the Valkyrie Tradition*, by Helen Damico. *Speculum* 61.2 (April 1986): 400–03. Print.

Heitmeyer, Wilhelm, and John Hagan, eds. *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003. Print.

Hensel, Marcus Dale. “*De Monstro*: An Anatomy of Grendel.” Diss. University of Oregon, 2012. Web. 15 February 2013.

Herbison, Ivan. “Heroism and Comic Subversion in the Old English *Judith*.” *English Studies* 91.1 (2010): 1–25. Print.

Hermann, John P. *The Allegory of War: Language and Violence in Old English Poetry*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1989. Print.

Hill, Joyce. “‘Þæt wæs geomuru ides!’ A Female Stereotype Examined.” *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 235–47. Print.

Horner, Shari. *The Discourse of Enclosure: Representing Women in Old English Literature*. SUNY Series in Medieval Studies. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001. Print.

——. “Spiritual Truth and Sexual Violence: The Old English *Juliana*, Anglo-Saxon Nuns, and the Discourse of Female Monastic Enclosure.” *Signs* (Spring 1994): 658–75. Print.

Hume, Kathryn. “The Theme and Structure of *Beowulf*.” *Studies in Philology* 72.1 (1975): 1–27. Print.

Kaueper, Richard W. Introduction. *Violence in Medieval Society*. Ed. Richard W. Kaueper. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2000. ix–xiii. Print.

Kay, Sarah. “The Sublime Body of the Martyr: Violence in Early Romance Saints’ Lives.” *Violence in Medieval Society*. Ed. Richard W. Kaeuper. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2000. 3–20. Print.

Kelly-Gadol, Joan. “The Social Relation of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women’s History.” *Signs* 1.4 (Summer 1976): 809–23. Print.

Klein, Stacy S. *Ruling Women: Queenship and Gender in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006. Print.

Kliman, Bernice W. “Women in Early English Literature, *Beowulf* to the *Ancrene Wisse*.” *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 21 (1977): 32–49. Print.

Lawrence, Bruce B., and Aisha Karim, eds. *On Violence: A Reader*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007. Print.

Lefebure, Leo D. “Authority, Violence, and the Sacred at the Medieval Court.” *Violence in Medieval Courtly Literature*. Ed. Albrecht Classen. New York and London: Routledge, 2004. 37–66. Print.

Litton, Alfred G. “The Heroine as Hero: Gender Reversal in the Anglo-Saxon *Judith*.” *CEA Critic* 56.1 (Fall 1993): 35–44. Print.

Lochrie, Karma. “Gender, Sexual Violence and the Politics of War in the Old English *Judith*.” *Class and Gender in Early English Literature: Intersections*. Ed. Britton J. Harwood and Gillian R. Overing. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994. 1–20. Print.

Lucas, Peter J. “*Judith* and the Woman Hero.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 22 (1992): 17–27. Print.

Magennis, Hugh. “Gender and Heroism in the Old English *Judith*.” Writing Gender and Genre in Medieval Literature: Approaches to Old and Middle English Texts. Ed. Elaine M. Treharne. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002. 5–18. Print.

–––. *Images of Community in Old English Poetry*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Print.

Marshall, Donald L. “Violence and the Male Gender Role.” *Campus Violence: Kinds, Causes, and Cures*. Ed. Leighton C. Whitaker and Jeffrey Pollard. Binghamton: The Haworth Press, 1994. 203–18. Print.

Martin, J. R. “Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English.” *Evaluation in Text*. Ed. S. Hunston and G. Thompson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 143–75. Print.

Martin, J. R., and P. R. R. White. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.

McNamara, Jo Ann. “Women and Power through the Family Revisited.” *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003. 17–30. Print.

McNamara, Jo Ann, and Suzanne Wemple. “The Power of Women through the Family.” *Feminist Studies* 1 (1973): 126–41. Print.

Meaney, Audrey L. “The *Ides* of the Cotton Gnomic Poem.” 1978. *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 158–75. Print.

Moore, Bruce. “The ‘Thryth-Offa Digression’ in *Beowulf*.” *Neophilologus* 64 (1980): 127–33. Print.

Nelson, Janet L. “The Problematic in the Private.” *Social History* 15.3 (October 1990): 355–64. Print.

Nelson, Marie. *Judith, Juliana, and Elene: Three Fighting Saints*. New York, Peter Lang, 1991. Print.

——. *Structures of Opposition in Old English Poems*. Costerus New Series 74. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1989. Print.

Neville, Jennifer. “Monsters and Criminals: Defining Humanity in Old English Poetry.” *Monsters and the Monstrous in Medieval Northwest Europe*. Ed. K. E. Olsen and L. A. J. R. Houwen. Leuven, Paris and Sterling: Peeters, 2001. 103–22. Print.

Nicholson, Lewis E. and Dolores Warwick Frese, eds. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation for John C. McGalliard*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975. Print.

Olsen, Alexandra Hennessey. “Cynewulf’s Autonomous Women: A Reconsideration of Elene and Juliana.” *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 222–32. Print.

——. “Gender Roles.” *A Beowulf Handbook*. Ed. Robert E. Bjork and John D. Niles. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997. 311–24. Print.

Olsen, Karin. “Cynewulf’s Elene: From Empress to Saint.” *Germanic Texts and Latin Models: Medieval Reconstructions.* Ed. K. E. Olsen, A. Harbus and T. Hofstra. Germania Latina IV. Leuven: Peeters, 2001. 141–56. Print.

Orchard, Andy. *Pride and Prodigies: Studies in the Monsters of the* Beowulf-*Manuscript*. 1985. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995. Print.

Overing, Gillian R. *Language, Sign and Gender in* Beowulf. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990. Print.

Overing, Gillian, and Helen Bennett. “Anglo-Saxon Studies: Gender and Power: Feminism in Old English Studies.” *Medieval Feminist Newsletter* 10 (Fall 1990): 15–24. Print.

Osborn, Marijane. “‘The Wealth They Left Us’: Two Women Author Themselves through Others’ Lives in *Beowulf*.” *The Heroic Age* 5 (2001): n. pag. Web. 05 August 2012.

Oswald, Dana M. *Monsters, Gender and Sexuality in Medieval English Literature.* Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2010. Print.

Parrish, Rick. *Violence Inevitable: The Play of Force and Respect in Derrida, Nietzsche, Hobbes, and Berlin*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 2006. Print.

Porter, Dorothy Carr. “The Social Centrality of Women in *Beowulf*: A New Context.” *The Heroic Age* 5 (2001): n. pag. Web. 03 August 2012.

Regan, Catharine A. “Evangelicalism as the Informing Principle of Cynewulf’s ‘Elene’.” *Traditio* 29 (1973): 27–52. Print.

Reineke, Martha J. *Sacrificed Lives: Kristeva on Women and Violence*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997. Print.

Reinert, Laura M. “‘Heo spræc þicce’: The Privileges and Proprieties of Female Speech in Anglo-Saxon Poetry.” Diss. Saint Louis University, 2008. Print.

Schwager, Raymund. *Must There Be Scapegoats?: Violence and Redemption in the Bible*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1987. Print.

Shippey, Tom. “Wicked Queens and Cousin Strategies in *Beowulf* and Elsewhere.” *The Heroic Age* 5 (2001): n. pag. Web. 20 August 2012.

Sklute, John L. “*Freoðuwebbe* in Old English Poetry.” *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 204–10. Print.

Spierenburg, Pieter. “Violence: Reflections about a Word.” *Violence in Europe: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Sophie Body-Gendrot and Pieter Spierenburg. New York: Springer 2008. 13–25. Print.

Stanko, Elizabeth A., ed. *The Meanings of Violence*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Staver, Ruth Johnston. *A Companion to* Beowulf. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2005. Print.

Sutton, John William. *Death and Violence in Old and Middle English Literature*. Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2007. Print.

Taylor, Paul Beekman. “The Old English Poetic Vocabulary of Beauty.” *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. 211–21. Print.

Tolkien, J. R. R. “Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 22 (1936): 245–95. Print.

Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press, 1947. Print.

White, P. R. R. “Attitude: Judgement.” *An Introductory Course in Appraisal Analysis*. The Appraisal Website, 2001. Web. 30 August 2010.

Williams, David. *Cain and Beowulf: A Study in Secular Allegory*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1982. Print.

Wilson, Eric. “The Blood Wrought Peace: A Girardian Reading of *Beowulf*.” *English Language Notes* 34 (1997): 7–30. Print.

Wittig, Joseph. “Figural Narrative in Cynewulf’s Juliana.” *The Cynewulf Reader*. Ed. Robert E. Bjork. New York and London: Routledge, 2001. 147–70. Print.

Wymer, Thomas L., and Erin F. Labbie. “Civilized Rage in *Beowulf*.” *The Heroic Age* 7 (2004): n. pag. Web. 25 March 2011.

APPENDIX

ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

Table 1. Grendel's mother

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	1259	ides		+ normality	narrator
2.	1259	aglæcwif		+ tenacity	narrator
3.	1259	yrmþe gemunde	– happiness		narrator
4.	1277	gifre	– satisfaction		narrator
5.	1277	galgmod	– happiness		narrator
6.	1278	sorhfulne sið	– happiness		narrator
7.	1278	sunu deað wrecan	+ inclination + satisfaction		narrator
8.	1291	se broga	– security		narrator
9.	1292	wæs on ofste	+ inclination		narrator
10.	1292	wolde ut þanon	+ inclination		narrator
11.	1293	feore beorgan	+ inclination		narrator
12.	1330	to handbanan		– propriety	Hrothgar
13.	1331	wælgæst wæfre		+ tenacity – propriety	Hrothgar
14.	1332	atol		– propriety	Hrothgar
15.	1332	æse wlanc		+ tenacity	Hrothgar
16.	1333	fylle gefægnod	+ satisfaction		Hrothgar
17.	1333	þa fæhðe wræc	+ satisfaction		Hrothgar
18.	1339	mihtig		+ capacity	Hrothgar
19.	1339	manscaða		– propriety	Hrothgar
20.	1339	wolde hyre mæg wrecan	+ inclination + satisfaction		Hrothgar
21.	1340	feor hafað fæhðe gestæled		+ tenacity	Hrothgar
22.	1349	ellorgæst		– normality	Hrothgar
23.	1379	felasinnigne secg		– propriety	Hrothgar
24.	1498	heorogifre		– propriety	narrator
25.	1499	grim ond grædig		– propriety	narrator
26.	1502	atolan clommum		– propriety	narrator
27.	1504	þone fyrdhom ðurhfon ne mihte		– capacity	narrator
28.	1505	laðan fingrum	– happiness		narrator
29.	1506	seo brimwylf		+ tenacity	narrator
30.	1518	grundwyrgenne		+ tenacity	narrator
31.	1519	merewif mihtig		+ capacity	narrator
32.	1546	wolde hire bearn wrecan	+ inclination + satisfaction		narrator
33.	1568	fægne flæschoman	– security		narrator
34.	1599	seo brimwylf		+ tenacity	narrator
35.	1621	se ellorgast		– normality	narrator
36.	1669	feondum		– propriety	Beowulf
37.	1669	fyrendæda		– propriety	Beowulf
38.	1670	deaðcwealm		– propriety	Beowulf
39.	1680	deofla		– propriety	narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
40.	2118	gearo gyrnwræce	+ inclination – happiness		Beowulf
41.	2119	siðode sorhfull	– happiness		Beowulf
42.	2120	wif unhyre		– propriety	Beowulf
43.	2121	hyre bearn gewræc	+ satisfaction		Beowulf
44.	2121–2122	beorn acwealde ellenlice		+ tenacity	Beowulf
45.	2128	feondes fæðmum		– propriety	Beowulf
46.	2136	grimne gryrelicne		– propriety	Beowulf

Table 2. Judith

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	1–2	tweode gifena	– security		narrator
2.	3	heo ahte mæste þearfe	– security		narrator
3.	6	heo ahte trumne geleafan	+ security	+ tenacity	narrator
4.	13	gleaw on geðonce		+ capacity	narrator
5.	14	ides ælfscinu		+ normality	narrator
6.	35	eadigan mægð		+ normality	narrator
7.	41	ferhðgleawe		+ capacity	narrator
8.	43	seo torhtan mægð		+ normality	narrator
9.	55	snoteran idese		+ capacity	narrator
10.	56	seo halige meowle		+ normality	narrator
11.	58	ða beorhtan idese		+ normality	narrator
12.	73–74	nergendes þeowen þrymful		+ normality	narrator
13.	74	þearle gemyndig	– happiness		narrator
14.	78	scyppendes mægð		+ normality	narrator
15.	85	me þearfendre	– security		Judith
16.	86–87	þearle ys me nu ða heorte onhæted	– happiness		Judith
17.	87–88	hige geomor swyðe mid sorgum gedrefed	– happiness		Judith
18.	91–92	nahte ic… næfre… maran þearfe	– security		Judith
19.	93	þæt me ys þus torne on mode	– happiness		Judith
20.	94	hate on hreðre minum	– happiness		Judith
21.	95	ædre mid elne onbryrde		+ tenacity	narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
22.	97–98	wearð hyre rume on mode haligre hyht geniwod	+ security		narrator
23.	108	sloh ða eornoste		+ tenacity	narrator
24.	109	ides ellenrof		+ tenacity	narrator
25.	122	hæfde … gefohten foremærne blæd		+ normality	narrator
26.	124	hyre sigores onleah		+ normality	narrator
27.	125	seo snotere mægð		+ capacity	narrator
28.	133	þa idesa ba ellentriste		+ tenacity	narrator
29.	134	collenferhðe		+ tenacity	narrator
30.	135	eadhreðige mægð		+ normality	narrator
31.	140	glædmode	+ happiness		narrator
32.	144	bebead		+ capacity	narrator
33.	145	searoðoncol mægð		+ capacity	narrator
34.	146	ides ellenrof		+ tenacity	narrator
35.	147	leof	+ happiness		narrator
36.	147	lungre het		+ capacity	narrator
37.	148	gleawhydig wif		+ capacity	narrator
38.	160	seo halige		+ propriety	narrator
39.	165	þeodnes mægð		+ normality	narrator
40.	171	seo gleawe		+ capacity	narrator
41.	171	het		+ capacity	narrator
42.	176	seo æðele		+ normality	narrator
43.	186–187	ic … biddan wylle	+ inclination		Judith
44.	254	seo beorhte mægð		+ normality	narrator
45.	256	Iudith seo æðele		+ normality	narrator
46.	260	ða halgan mægð		+ propriety	narrator
47.	261	metodes meowlan		+ normality	narrator
48.	333	gleawe lare		+ capacity	narrator
49.	334	mægð modigre		+ tenacity	narrator
50.	340	þære beorhtan idese		+ normality	narrator
51.	341	gearoþoncolre		+ capacity	narrator
52.	342	hyre weorðmynde geaf		+ normality	narrator
53.	343	mærðe		+ normality	narrator
54.	344	sigorlean	+ satisfaction		narrator
55.	344	heo ahte soðne geleafan		+ propriety	narrator
56.	345	ne tweode	neg – security		narrator
57.	346	heo lange gyrnde	+ inclination		narrator

Table 3. Holofernes

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	9	het		+ capacity	narrator
2.	9	se gumena baldor		+ capacity	narrator
3.	11	ðam rican þeodne		+ capacity	narrator
4.	20	se rica		+ capacity	narrator
5.	21	egesful eorla dryhten		– propriety + normality	narrator
6.	22	goldwine gumena		+ propriety	narrator
7.	21–22	wearð… on gytesalum	+ satisfaction		narrator
8.	23	hloh ond hlydde, hlynede ond dynede	+ satisfaction		narrator
9.	25	se stiðmoda		– propriety	narrator
10.	25	styrmde ond gylede	+ satisfaction		narrator
11.	26	modig		– tenacity	narrator
12.	26	medugal		– tenacity	narrator
13.	28	se inwidda		– propriety	narrator
14.	30	swiðmod sinces brytta		– propriety + normality	narrator
15.	32	het		+ capacity	narrator
16.	32	gumena aldor		+ normality	narrator
17.	34	het		+ capacity	narrator
18.	34	niða geblonden		– propriety	narrator
19.	38	heora ealdor		+ normality	narrator
20.	38	bebead		+ capacity	narrator
21.	39	byrnwigena brego		+ normality	narrator
22.	44	se rica		+ capacity	narrator
23.	45	nergende lað		– propriety	narrator
24.	47	þæs folctogan		+ normality	narrator
25.	48	se bealofulla		– propriety	narrator
26.	49	wigena baldor		+ capacity	narrator
27.	52	se modiga		– tenacity	narrator
28.	57	se brema		+ normality	narrator
29.	57–58	wearð… on mode bliðe	+ happiness		narrator
30.	58	burga ealdor		+ capacity	narrator
31.	59	þohte … mid widle ond mid womme besmitan		– propriety	narrator
32.	61	se deofulcunda		– propriety	narrator
33.	62	galferhð		– propriety	narrator
34.	63	bealofull		– propriety	narrator
35.	66	þearlmod		– propriety	narrator
36.	66	ðeoden gumena		+ capacity	narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
37.	68	se rica		+ capacity	narrator
38.	68–69	swa he nyste ræda nanne on gewitlocan		– capacity	narrator
39.	71	ðone wærlogan		– tenacity	narrator
40.	72	laðne leodhatan	– happiness	– propriety	narrator
41.	75	þone atolan		– propriety	narrator
42.	76	se unsyfra		– propriety	narrator
43.	77	womfull		– propriety	narrator
44.	90	þysne morðres bryttan		– propriety	Judith
45.	98	þone hæðenan mannan		– propriety	narrator
46.	99–100	teah hyne … bysmerlice	– normality		narrator
47.	100	þone bealofullan		– propriety	narrator
48.	101	laðne mannan	– happiness		narrator
49.	102	ðæs unlædan		– normality	narrator
50.	104	þone feondsceaðan		– propriety	narrator
51.	105	heteþoncolne	+ inclination	– propriety	narrator
52.	106	on swiman læg		– capacity	narrator
53.	110	þone hæðenan hund		– propriety	narrator
54.	111	se fula leap		– propriety	narrator
55.	113	genyðerad wæs		– normality	narrator
56.	114	susle gesæled	– happiness		narrator
57.	115	witum gebunden	– happiness		narrator
58.	116	hearde gehæfted in hellebryne	– happiness		narrator
59.	117	ne ðearf he hopian no	– security		narrator
60.	121	hyhtwynna leas	– happiness		narrator
61.	178–179	ðæs laðestan hæðenes heaðorinces	– happiness	– propriety	Judith
62.	181	þe us monna mæst morðra gefremede		– propriety	Judith
63.	182	sarra sorga	– happiness		Judith
64.	182–183	ond þæt swyðor gyt ycan wolde	+ inclination	– propriety	Judith
65.	184–185	he mid læððum us eglan moste	– happiness	– propriety	Judith
66.	248	þæs bealofullan		– propriety	narrator
67.	254	se beorna brego		+ normality	narrator
68.	256–257	se galmoda, egesfull ond afor		– propriety	narrator
69.	338–339	se rinca baldor swiðmod		– propriety + normality	narrator

Table 4. The Assyrians

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	16	wlance		+ tenacity	narrator
2.	16	weagesiðas		– propriety	narrator
3.	17	bealde byrnwiggende		+ tenacity	narrator
4.	19	fæge	– security		narrator
5.	20	rofe rondwiggende		+ tenacity	narrator
6.	30	on swiman lagon		– capacity	narrator
7.	32	agotene goda gehwylces		– capacity	narrator
8.	41	fromlice		+ tenacity	narrator
9.	53	niðe rofra		– propriety	narrator
10.	55	stercedferhðe		+ tenacity	narrator
11.	195	fæge frumgaras	– security		Judith
12.	196	gedemed to deaðe		– propriety	Judith
13.	225	heardra gemang		– propriety	narrator
14.	226	laðum cynne	– happiness		narrator
15.	228	ealdgeniðlan		– propriety	narrator
16.	229	medowerige		– tenacity	narrator
17.	237	elðeoda		– normality	narrator
18.	244–245	forhtlice færspel bodedon	– inclination		narrator
19.	245	medowerigum		– tenacity	narrator
20.	247	slegefæge hæleð	– security		narrator
21.	249	werigferhðe		– tenacity	narrator
22.	250	hogedon	+ inclination		narrator
23.	257–258	næs ðeah… nan þe… dorste	– inclination		narrator
24.	265–266	wearð … dom geswiðrod		– tenacity	narrator
25.	267	bælc forbiged		– normality	narrator
26.	268	þearle gebylde		+ tenacity	narrator
27.	269	sweorcendferhðe	– happiness		narrator
28.	272	torn þoligende	– happiness		narrator
29.	272–273	wæs hyra tires æt ende, eades ond ellendæda		– normality	narrator
30.	274	him wiht ne speow	– satisfaction		narrator
31.	275	sið ond late		– tenacity	narrator
32.	275	wearð… sum to ðam arod		+ tenacity	narrator
33.	277	niðheard neðde		+ tenacity	narrator
34.	277	hyne nyd fordraf	– security		narrator
35.	280–281	gefeoll freorig to foldan	– security		narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
36.	281	ongan his feax teran	– happiness		narrator
37.	282	hreoh on mode	– security		narrator
38.	284	unrote	– happiness		narrator
39.	287	we sculon nyde losian	– security		Assyrian soldier
40.	288	somod… forweorðan	– security		Assyrian soldier
41.	289	hreowigmode	– happiness		narrator
42.	290–291	gewitan him werigferhðe on fleam sceacan		– tenacity	narrator
43.	297	laðra lindwerod	– happiness		narrator
44.	303	laðra gemong	– happiness		narrator
45.	310	laðan cynnes	– happiness		narrator
46.	314	ðam laðestan	– happiness		narrator
47.	315	hyra ealdfeondum unlyfigendum		– propriety	narrator
48.	320	ealdhettende	– happiness		narrator
49.	322	þa ðe him to life laðost wæron	– happiness		narrator

Table 5. The Bethulians

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	142	weras wæccende		+ tenacity	narrator
2.	144	geomormodum	– happiness		narrator
3.	152	ðam sigefolce		+ normality	narrator
4.	154–155	ge ne þyrfen … murnan on mode	neg – happiness		Judith
5.	156–157	eow is wuldorblæd torhtlic … ond tir gifede		+ normality	Judith
6.	158	þara læðða þe ge lange drugon	– happiness		Judith
7.	159	wurdon bliðe	+ happiness		narrator
8.	161	wæs on lustum	+ happiness		narrator
9.	166–167	æghwylcum wearð… mod areted	+ security		narrator
10.	170	mid eaðmedum		+ propriety	narrator
11.	177	sigerofe hæleð		+ normality	Judith
12.	178	leoda ræswan		+ capacity	Judith
13.	196–197	ge dom agon, tir æt tohtan		+ normality	Judith
14.	199–	snelra werod…		+ tenacity	narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
	200	cenra			
15.	200	cynerofe		+ normality	narrator
16.	214–216	þa ðe hwile ær elðeodigra edwit þoledon, hæðenra hosp	– happiness		narrator
17.	216–217	þæt hearde wearð… eallum forgolden	+ satisfaction	+ tenacity	narrator
18.	224	grame guðfrecan	– satisfaction		narrator
19.	225	wæron yrre	– satisfaction		narrator
20.	227	styrnmode		+ tenacity	narrator
21.	227	stercedferhðe		+ tenacity	narrator
22.	228	wrehton unsofte		+ tenacity	narrator
23.	231	slogon eornoste		+ tenacity	narrator
24.	233	niðhycgende	– happiness		narrator
25.	262	fuhton þearle		+ tenacity	narrator
26.	263	hæfte guldon	+ satisfaction	+ tenacity	narrator
27.	264	hyra fyrngeflitu	– happiness		narrator
28.	265	ealde æfðoncan	– satisfaction		narrator
29.	292	mægeneacen folc		+ capacity	narrator
30.	298	sigore geweorðod		+ normality	narrator
31.	299	dome gedyrsod		+ normality	narrator
32.	302	hæleð higerofe		+ tenacity	narrator
33.	305	guðe gegremede	+ inclination		narrator
34.	306	þearle gelyste	+ inclination		narrator
35.	311	cynerofe		+ normality	narrator
36.	318–319	hæfdon domlice… fynd oferwunnen		+ normality	narrator
37.	324	mægða mærost		+ normality	narrator
38.	325	wlanc		+ tenacity	narrator
39.	331	þrymme geeodon		+ capacity	narrator
40.	332	cene		+ tenacity	narrator
41.	336	eorlas æscrofe		+ normality	narrator

Table 6. Elene evaluated by the narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	247	cwen siðes gefeah	+ happiness		
2.	254	sio guðcwen		+ capacity	
3.	260	sigecwen		+ normality	
4.	266	seo eadhreðige Elene		+ normality	
5.	267	þriste on geþance		+ tenacity	
6.	266–267	wæs… gemyndig… þeodnes willan		+ tenacity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
7.	268	georn on mode	+ inclination		
8.	275	þa æðelan cwen		+ normality	
9.	276	heht ða gebeodan		+ capacity	
10.	286	þa leoflic wif		+ normality	
11.	286–287	ongan þa… negan		+ tenacity	
12.	325	swa hio him to sohte	+ inclination		
13.	329–330	on þrymme bad in cynestole		+ capacity	
14.	330	caseres mæg		+ capacity	
15.	331	geatolic guðcwen		+ capacity	
16.	384–385	hio sio cwen ongan wordum genegan		+ tenacity	
17.	405–406	undearninga ides reordode hlude		+ veracity	
18.	411	sio rice cwen		+ capacity	
19.	412	bald in burgum		+ tenacity	
20.	416	þe him sio cwen wite	– satisfaction		
21.	558–559	þa sio cwen ongan… wordum negan		+ tenacity	
22.	573	him yrre oncwæð	– satisfaction		
23.	600	georne bæd	+ inclination		
24.	605	tireadig cwen		+ normality	
25.	611	rex geniðlan		+ capacity	
26.	619	seo eadige		+ normality	
27.	620	undearnunga		+ veracity	
28.	662	seo æðele cwen		+ normality	
29.	669	him oncwæð hraðe		+ tenacity	
30.	670	caseres mæg		+ capacity	
31.	686	þurh eorne hyge	+ inclination		
32.	691	heht		+ capacity	
33.	709	sio þær hæleðum scead		+ capacity	
34.	710	hio bebead hraðe		+ capacity	
35.	714	mid arum		+ propriety	
36.	716	swa him seo cwen bebead		+ capacity	
37.	848–849	cwen weorces gefeah on ferhðsefan	+ happiness		
38.	955	sefa wæs þe glædra	+ happiness		
39.	958	wundrade	+ satisfaction		
40.	961	Gode þancode	+ satisfaction		
41.	962	hire se willa gelamp	+ satisfaction		

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
42.	979	sio cwen bebead		+ capacity	
43.	997	sigecwen		+ capacity	
44.	1017	ða seo cwen bebead		+ capacity	
45.	1022	heo … heht		+ capacity	
46.	1050	Elene heht		+ capacity	
47.	1062–63	Elenan wæs mod gemynde	+ inclination		
48.	1068	cristenra cwen		+ capacity	
49.	1072	bald reordode		+ tenacity	
50.	1028–29	þære arwyrðan cwene		+ propriety	
51.	1130–31	eall gefylled… wifes willan	+ satisfaction		
52.	1130	swa him… bebead		+ capacity	
53.	1130	seo æðele		+ normality	
54.	1131	þa wæs wopes hring	+ happiness		
55.	1133	nalles for torne tearas feollon	neg – happiness		
56.	1134–35	wuldres gefylled cwene willa	+ satisfaction		
57.	1136	leohte geleafan		+ tenacity	
58.	1136	lac weorðode	+ happiness		
59.	1137	blissum hremig	+ happiness		
60.	1138	gnyrna to geoce	+ happiness		
61.	1138	Gode þancode	+ satisfaction		
62.	1142–43	heo gefylled wæs wisdomes gife		+ capacity	
63.	1145	æðelne innoð		+ normality	
64.	1147–48	ongan þa geornlice… on sefan secean soðfæstnesse	+ inclination	+ veracity	
65.	1151–52	seo cwen begeat willan in worulde	+ satisfaction		
66.	1155–57	þeodcwen ongan georne secan nearwe geneahhe		+ tenacity	
67.	1160	heht ða gefetigean		+ capacity	
68.	1165–66	his lare geceas þurh þeodscipe	+ inclination	+ propriety	
69.	1196	þa þæt ofstlice eall gelæste		+ tenacity	
70.	1197	heht		+ capacity	
71.	1201	heht		+ capacity	
72.	1204–05	seo cwen ongan læran		+ capacity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
73.	1218	hio wæs siðes fus	+ inclination		
74.	1219	þa eallum bebead		+ capacity	

Table 7. Jews evaluated by Elene

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
First speech (288–319)					
1.	290–291	ge… wyrðe wæron wuldorcyninge	+ happiness		
2.	292	dryhtne dyre	+ happiness		
3.	292	dædhwæte		+ tenacity	
4.	293–294	ge ealle snyttro unwislice, wraðe wiðweorpon		– capacity – propriety	
5.	294	ge wergdon	– happiness	– propriety	
6.	297	ge mid horu speowdon		– propriety	
7.	302–303	ge to deaþe þone deman ongunnon		– propriety	
8.	306	ge modblinde		– capacity	
9.	306–308	mengan ongunnon lige wið soðe, leoht wið þystrum, æfst wið are		– veracity – propriety	
10.	308	inwitþancum		– veracity – propriety	
11.	309	wroht webbedan		– veracity – propriety	
12.	309–310	eow seo wergðu… sceðþeð	– happiness		
13.	310	scyldfullum		– propriety	
14.	310–311	ge… deman ongunnon		– propriety	
15.	311	gedweolan lifdon		– veracity	
16.	312	þeostrum geþancum	– happiness	– propriety	
17.	313	gangaþ nu snude		+ tenacity	
18.	313	snyttro geþencaþ		+ capacity	
19.	314	weras wisfæste, wordes cræftige		+ capacity	
20.	315	æðelum cræftige		+ capacity	
21.	315–316	æ… on ferhðsefan fyrmest hæbben		+ propriety + tenacity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
22.	317	me soðlice secgan cunnon		+ veracity + capacity	
Second speech (333–376)					
23.	333	higegleawe		+ capacity	
24.	354	þam ic blæd forgeaf		+ normality	
25.	355	halige higefrofre	+ happiness	+ propriety	Elene citing Isaiah
26.	355	ac hie hyrwdon me	– happiness	– propriety	Elene citing Isaiah
27.	356	feodon þurh feondscipe	– happiness	– propriety	Elene citing Isaiah
28.	357–358	nahton foreþances, wisdomes gewitt		– capacity	Elene citing Isaiah
29.	357–359	þa weregan neat… ongitaþ hira goddend		+ capacity	Elene citing Isaiah
30.	359–360	nales gnyrnwræcum feogað frynd hiera	neg – happiness	neg – propriety	Elene citing Isaiah
31.	361–362	me Israhela æfre ne woldon folc oncnawan	– inclination		Elene citing Isaiah
32.	362–363	þeah ic feala for him … wundra gefremede	+ happiness		Elene citing Isaiah
33.	365	eow dryhten geaf dom unscyndne		+ normality	
34.	366	mihta sped		+ capacity	
35.	367–368	hu ge heofoncyninge hyran sceoldon, lare læstan		+ propriety	
36.	368	eow þæs lungre aþreat	– satisfaction		
37.	369	ge þam ryhte wiðroten hæfdon		– propriety	
38.	370	onscunedon þone sciran scippend eallra	– happiness		
39.	371–372	gedwolan fylgdon ofer riht godes		– propriety – veracity	
40.	372–373	ge raþe gangaþ ond findaþ gen		+ tenacity	
41.	373–374	þa þe fyrngewritu þurh snyttro cræft selest cunnen		+ capacity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
42.	375–376	þæt me ondsware… secgan cunnen		+ capacity + veracity	
43.	376	þurh sidne sefan		+ capacity	
Third speech (386–395)					
44.	386	oft ge dyslice dæd gefremedon		– capacity	
45.	387	werge wræcmæcggas		– propriety	
46.	387	gewritu herwdon	– happiness	– propriety	
47.	388	fædera lare		+ capacity	
48.	389	ge blindnesse bote forsegon		– propriety – capacity	
49.	390	ge wiðsocon soðe ond rihte		– propriety	
50.	393	þeah ge þa æ cuðon		+ capacity	
51.	394–395	ge ne woldon þa… soð oncnawan	– inclination	– veracity	
52.	395	synwyrcende		– propriety	
Fourth speech (406–410)					
53.	406	ge nu hraðe gangað		+ tenacity	
54.	407–408	þa ðe snyttro mid eow, mægn ond modcræft, mæste hæbben		+ capacity + normality	
55.	409–410	þæt me þinga gehwylc þriste gecyðan, untraglice		+ veracity	
Fifth speech (574–584)					
56.	574	ic eow to soðe secgan wille		+ veracity	
57.	575	þæs in life lige ne wyrðeð		+ veracity	
58.	576	gif ge þissum lease leng gefylgað		– veracity	
59.	577	mid fæcne gefice		– veracity	
60.	578–579	eow in beorge bæl fornimeð, hattost heaðowelma	– security		
61.	579–580	eower hra bryttað lacende lig	– security		
62.	580–581	eow sceal… apundrad weorðan to woruldgedale	– security		
63.	580	þæt leas		– veracity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
64.	582	ne magon ge ða word geseðan		– capacity	
65.	582–583	ge hwile nu on unriht wrigon under womma sceatum		– propriety	
66.	583	ne magon ge þa wyrd bemiðan		– capacity	
67.	584	bedyrnan þa deopan mihte		– capacity	
Sixth speech (621–626)					
68.	625–626	ge hwile nu… mannum dyrndun		– veracity	
69.	626	þurh morðres man		– propriety	
70.	644	ge swa monigfeald on gemynd witon		+ capacity	
71.	648–649	ge þæt geare cunnon edre gereccan		+ capacity	

Table 8. Jews evaluated by the narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
75.	320	eodan þa… reonigmode	– happiness		
76.	321	eorlas æcleawe		+ capacity	
77.	321	egesan geþreade	– security		
78.	322	gehðum geomre	– happiness		
79.	322	georne sohton	+ inclination	+ tenacity	
80.	323	þa wisestan wordgeryno		+ capacity	
81.	324	oncweðan meahton		+ capacity	
82.	325	swa tiles swa trages	– security		
83.	327	ferhðgleawra		+ capacity	
84.	327–328	þa þe fyrngemynd… gearwast cuðon		+ capacity	
85.	377	modcwanige	– happiness		
86.	378	collenferhðe		+ tenacity	
87.	379	forþsnottera		+ capacity	
88.	380–381	þa ðe leornungcræft… mæste hæfdon		+ capacity	
89.	381	þurh modgemynd		+ capacity	
90.	382	on sefan snyttro		+ capacity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
91.	384	ceastre weardas		+ capacity	
92.	396	anmode		+ tenacity	
93.	413	geomormode	– happiness		
94.	413	georne smeadon	+ inclination		
95.	414	sohton searoþancum		– veracity	
96.	414–416	hwæt sio syn wære þe hie… gefremed hæfdon wið þam casere		– propriety	
97.	536–537	þa gleawestan on wera þreate		+ capacity + normality	
98.	550	heremeðle		+ tenacity	
99.	555	geomormode	– happiness		
100	556	leodgebyrgean		+ normality	
101	558	cyðdon cræftes miht		– veracity + capacity	
102	560	fyrhðwerige	– happiness		
103	565	heo wæron stearce, stane heardran		– tenacity	
104	566	noldon þæt geryne rihte cyðan		– veracity	
105	567	ne… andsware ænige secgan		– veracity	
106	568	torngeniðlan		– propriety	
107	569	hio worda gehwæs wiðersæc fremedon		– propriety	
108	570	fæste on fyrhðe		+ tenacity	
109	584–585	wurdon hie deaðes on wenan, ades ond endelifes	– security		
110	835–836	arleasra sceolu… Iudea cynn		– propriety	
111	836–837	hie wið godes bearne nið ahofun		– propriety	
112	837	swa hie no sceoldon		– propriety	
113	838	þær hie leahtra fruman larum ne hyrdon		– propriety	
114	976	wæs Iudeum gnornsorga mæst	– happiness		
115	977	werum wansæligum	– happiness		
116	977	wyrda laðost	– happiness		
117	979	cristenra gefean	+ happiness		
118	1115	leode gefægon	+ happiness		
119	1116	weorud willhreðig	+ satisfaction		

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
120	1116	sægdon wuldor gode	+ satisfaction		
121	1117	ealle anmode	+ security		
122	1117–18	þeah hie ær wæron … in gedwolan lange		– veracity	
123	1118	acyrred fram Criste		– propriety	

Table 9. Judas evaluated by the narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	418	gidda gearosnotor		+ capacity	
2.	419	wordes cræftig		+ capacity	
3.	586	giddum gearusnottorne		+ capacity	
4.	604	anhagan	– security		
5.	609	ne meahte he þa gehðu bebugan	– security	– capacity	
6.	610	oncyrran		– capacity	
7.	610	he wæs on þære cwene gewealdum	– security		
8.	627	him wæs geomor sefa	– happiness		
9.	628	hat æt heortan	– happines		
10.	628	gehwæðres wa	– happiness		
11.	655	gnornsorge wæg	– happiness		
12.	683	stiðhycgende		– tenacity	
13.	692	scyldigne		– propriety	
14.	693	duguða leas	– security		
15.	694	siomode in sorgum	– happiness		
16.	695	under hearmlocan	– happiness		
17.	695	hungre geþreatod	– happiness – security		
18.	697	sarum besylced	– happiness		
19.	698	meðe		– tenacity	
20.	698	mægen wæs geswiðrod		– capacity	
21.	720	hungre gehyned		– capacity	
22.	724	elnes oncyðig		+ tenacity	
23.	803–804	aræred wearð beornes breostsefa	+ satisfaction + happiness		
24.	805	eadig		+ normality	
25.	805	ægleaw		+ capacity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
26.	804–805	he mid bæm handum… upweard plegade	+ satisfaction		
27.	806	gleaw in geþance		+ capacity	
28.	827	wilfægen	+ satisfaction		
29.	828	elnes anhydig		+ tenacity	
30.	839	wæs modgemynd myclum geblissod	+ happiness		
31.	840	hige onhyrded		+ tenacity	
32.	841	inbryrded breostsefa	+ satisfaction	+ tenacity	
33.	847	eorlas anhydige		+ tenacity	
34.	848	collenferhðe		+ tenacity	
35.	874–875	wæs on modsefan miclum geblissod	+ happiness		
36.	876	heht		+ capacity	
37.	879	rihtes wemend		+ veracity	
38.	880	fyrhðgleaw on fæðme		+ capacity	
39.	881	deophycgende		+ capacity	
40.	934	gleawhydig		+ capacity	
41.	935	hæleð hildedeor		+ tenacity	
42.	935–936	him wæs halig gast befolen fæste		+ tenacity	
43.	936	fyrhat lufu	+ happiness		
44.	937	weallende gewitt þurh witgan snyttro		+ capacity	
45.	938	wisdomes ful		+ capacity	
46.	954	tireadig		+ normality	
47.	955	gesælig		+ normality	
48.	958	þæs weres snyttro		+ capacity	
49.	959	swa geleafful		+ tenacity	
50.	960	swa uncyðig		+ capacity (– capacity)	
51.	961	gleawnesse þurhgoten		+ capacity	
52.	965–966	ðæs geleafan… wuldorfæste gife in þæs weres breostum		+ tenacity	
53.	1034	geclænsod wearð		+ propriety	
54.	1034	Criste getrywe		+ tenacity	
55.	1035	lifwearde leof	+ happiness		
56.	1035–36	his geleafa wearð fæst on ferhðe		+ tenacity	
57.	1038	he þæt betere geceas		+ propriety	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
58.	1039	þam wyrsan wiðsoc		+ propriety	
59.	1040	gedwolan fylde		+ propriety	
60.	1041 –42	him wearð… meotud milde	+ happiness		
61.	1043 –44	se ðe ær feala tida leoht gearu		– propriety	
62.	1045	inbryrded breostsefa on þæt betere lif	+ satisfaction	+ propriety	
63.	1046	gewended to wuldre		+ propriety	
64.	1047	swa geleaffull		+ tenacity	
65.	1047	swa leof gode	+ happiness		
66.	1048	Criste gecweme	+ satisfaction		
67.	1058	cræftum gecorene		+ propriety	
68.	1071	wuldorgifum		+ normality	
69.	1093 –94	se halga… bisceop þæs folces		+ propriety	
70.	1093	ongan hyge staðolian		+ tenacity	
71.	1094	breostum onbryrded		+ tenacity	
72.	1095	glædmod eode	+ happiness		
73.	1096 –98	geornlice… hleor onhylde		+ tenacity	
74.	1098	hygerune ne mað		+ veracity	
75.	1099 –100	to gode cleopode eallum eaðmedum		+ propriety	
76.	1125	ða wæs geblissod	+ happiness		
77.	1125	se ðe to bote gehwearf		+ propriety	
78.	1128	egesan geaclod	– security		
79.	1211	boca gleaw		+ capacity	
80.	1211 –12	wæs se bissceophad fægere befæsted		+ propriety	
81.	1217 –18	ða gen him Elene forgeaf sincweorðunga	+ satisfaction		

Table 10. Judas evaluated by Elene

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	606–607	swa þe leofre bið to geceosanne	+ happiness		
2.	607	cyð ricene nu		+ veracity	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
3.	608	hwæt ðu… þafian wille	+ security		
4.	623	saga ricene me		+ veracity	
5.	663	wiðsæcest ðu to swiðe soðe ond rihte		– propriety	
6.	665	sægdest soðlice		+ veracity	
7.	666	nu on lige cyrrest		– veracity	
8.	673–674	þu scealt geagninga wisdom onwreon		+ veracity	
9.	677	swilt for synnum		– propriety	
10.	687–688	ðu hungre scealt cwylmed weorðan	– security		
11.	689	butan þu forlæte þa leasunga		– veracity	
12.	690	me sweotollice soð gecyðe		+ veracity	
13.	1073	eorla hleo		+ propriety	
14.	1074	ryhte getæhtesð		+ propriety	
15.	1087	ar selesta		+ normality	
16.	1087	eallum eaðmedum		+ propriety	

Table 11. Judas evaluating the Jews

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	423–424	orscyldne eofota gehwylces… hengon		– propriety	
2.	424	þurh hete	– happiness		
3.	426	þæt wæs þrealic geþoht		– propriety	
4.	426	is þearf mycel	– security		
5.	427	þæt we fæstlice ferhð staðelien		+ tenacity	
6.	428	we ðæs morðres meldan ne weorðen		– veracity – propriety	
7.	457	on þone halgan handa sendan		– propriety	
8.	459	þurh wrað gewitt		– propriety	
9.	460	hie wiston ær þæt he Crist wære		+ capacity	
10.	470	þara scylda		– propriety	Judas quoting his father

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
11.	470–471	nales sceame worhte gaste minum		neg – propriety	Judas quoting his father
12.	472	þæs unrihtes		– propriety	Judas quoting his father
13.	477	ne meahton… deað oðfæstan		– capacity	Judas quoting his father
14.	477	swa disige		– capacity	Judas quoting his father
15.	478	weras wonsælige	– happiness	– propriety	Judas quoting his father
16.	493	ealdfeondum		– propriety	Judas quoting his father
17.	495	þa weadæd		– propriety	Judas quoting his father
18.	496	for æfstum	– happiness		Judas quoting his father
19.	497–498	synna leasne… feore beræddon		– propriety	Judas quoting his father
20.	520	laðlic wite		– propriety	Judas quoting his father
21.	531	nu ge geare cunnon		+ capacity	

Table 12. Judas evaluated by himself

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	419	ic wat geare		+ veracity	
2.	454–455	ic fromlice… ageaf ondsware		+ tenacity	
3.	667	he þæt on gehðu gespræce	– happiness		
4.	668	on tweon swiðost	– security		
5.	668	wende him trage hnagre	– security		
6.	699	ic eow healsie	+ inclination		

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
7.	700	of ðyssum earfeðum	– happiness		
8.	701	heanne fram hungres geniðlan	– happiness		
9.	702	lustum cyðe	+ inclination	+ veracity	
10.	702–703	ic hit leng ne mæg helan for hungre		neg – veracity	
11.	704	þreanyd þæs þearl	– happiness		
12.	704	þes þroht to ðæs heard	– happiness		
13.	705	ic adreogan ne mæg		– capacity	
14.	706	ne leng helan		neg – veracity	
15.	707	ic ær mid dysige þurhdrifen wære		– capacity	
16.	708	ðæt soð		+ veracity	
17.	708	to late seolf gecneowe		– tenacity	
18.	788–789	ic þe… biddan wille	+ inclination		
19.	795	ic gelyfe þe sel	+ security	+ tenacity	
20.	796	þy fæstlicor ferhð staðelige		+ tenacity	
21.	797	hyht untweondne	+ security		
22.	807	nu ic þurh soð hafu seolf gecnawen	+ security		
23.	808	on heardum hige		– tenacity	
24.	809–810	sie ðe… þanc butan ende	+ satisfaction		
25.	811	me swa meðum		– tenacity	
26.	811	swa manweorcum		– propriety	
27.	813	ic þe… biddan wille	+ inclination		
28.	816	minra gylta		– propriety	

Table 13. Judas evaluated by the Jews

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	542	fyrngidda frod		+ capacity	
2.	588	sægdon hine sundorwisne		+ capacity + normality	
3.	588	he þe mæg soð gecyðan		+ veracity + capacity	
4.	591	he is… æðeles cynnes		+ normality	

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
5.	592	wordcræftes wis		+ capacity	
6.	592	witgan sunu		+ normality	
7.	593	bald on meðle		+ tenacity	
8.	594–595	he gencwidas gleawe hæbbe, cræft in breostum		+ capacity	
9.	595–596	he gecyðeð þe… wisdomes gife		+ capacity	
10.	597	þurh þa myclan miht		+ capacity	

Table 14. Elene evaluated by herself

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	679–681	þæt me halig god gefylle… feores ingeþanc… willan minne	+ satisfaction		
2.	686	ic þæt geswerige	+ security		
3.	1078	mec on fyrhðsefan fyrwet myngaþ	+ inclination		
4.	1079	wolde ic	+ inclination		
5.	1081	a min hige sorgað	– happiness		
6.	1082	reonig reoteð	– happiness		
7.	1082	geresteð no	– satisfaction		
8.	1083–84	ærþan me gefylle… willan minne	+ satisfaction		

Table 15. Modthryth

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraised
1.	1932	fremu folces cwen		+ capacity + tenacity + propriety	Modthryth
2.	1931–32	wæg… firen ondrysne		– propriety	Modthryth
3.	1933	deor		+ tenacity	men
4.	1934	swæsra gesiða	+ happiness		men
5.	1936	wælbende		– propriety	chains
6.	1940	cwealmbealu		– propriety	?
7.	1940	ne bið swylc cwenlic þeaw		– propriety	Modthryth
8.	1941	ænlicu		+ normality	Modthryth

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraised
9.	1943	ligetorne	– happiness	– veracity	Modthryth
10.	1943	leofne mannan	+ happiness		men
11.	1946 –47	leodbealewa læs gefremede, inwitniða		neg – propriety	Modthryth
12.	1952	gode		+ propriety	Modthryth
13.	1952	mære		+ normality	Modthryth
14.	1951 –54	well… breac		+ propriety	Modthryth
15.	1954	hiold heahlufan	+ happiness		Modthryth

Table 16. Heremod (901–915), (1709–1722)

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	901–902	Heremodes hild sweðrode, eafod ond ellen		– capacity – tenacity	narrator
2.	903	on feonda geweald forð forlacen	– security	– propriety	narrator
3.	904	snude forsended		– propriety	narrator
4.	904–905	hine sorhwylmas lemede to lange	– happiness	– capacity	narrator
5.	905–906	he his leodum wearð… to aldorceare	– happiness		narrator
6.	907	oft bemearn	– happiness		narrator
7.	908	swiðferhþes sið		– propriety	narrator
8.	909	bealwa to bote gelyfde	+ satisfaction	+ propriety	narrator
9.	910	geþeon scolde	+ satisfaction	+ propriety	narrator
10.	911	fæderæþelum onfon		+ normality	narrator
11.	911–913	folc gehealdan etc.		+ capacity	narrator
12.	915	hine fyren onwod		– propriety	narrator
13.	1711	ne geweox he him to willan	– satisfaction		Hrothgar
14.	1711 –12	ac to wælfealle ond to deaðcwalum		– propriety	Hrothgar
15.	1713	breat bolgenmod	– satisfaction	– propriety	Hrothgar
16.	1714	he ana hwearf	– security		Hrothgar
17.	1715	mære þeoden		+ capacity + normality	Hrothgar
18.	1715	mondreamum from	– happiness		Hrothgar
19.	1716 –17	mægenes wynnum, eafeþum stepte	+ happiness	+ capacity	Hrothgar

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
20.	1717 –18	ofer ealle men forð gefremede		+ normality	Hrothgar
21.	1718 –19	him on ferhþe greow breosthord blodreow		– propriety	Hrothgar
22.	1719	nallas beagas geaf		– propriety	Hrothgar
23.	1720	dreamleas gebad	– happiness		Hrothgar
24.	1721	þæs gewinnes weorc þrowade	– happiness		Hrothgar
25.	1722	leodbealo longsum	– happiness		Hrothgar

Table 17. Juliana

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	28–29	in gæste bær halge treowe		+ propriety + tenacity	narrator
2.	29	hogde georne	+ inclination	+ tenacity	narrator
3.	31	fore Cristes lufan	+ happiness		narrator
4.	31	clæne geheolde		+ propriety	narrator
5.	33	heo from hogde	– inclination		narrator
6.	35–36	hire wæs godes egsa mara in gemyndum	– security		narrator
7.	41–42	heo þæs beornes lufan fæste wiðhogde	– inclination	+ tenacity	narrator
8.	44	heo þæt eal forseah	– satisfaction		narrator
9.	49–50	ic beo gearo sona unwaclice willan þines	+ inclination	+ tenacity	Juliana
10.	61	haligre		+ propriety	narrator
11.	69	geywed orwyrðu		– propriety	Heliseus
12.	70	mæglufan minre ne gyme	– inclination		Heliseus
13.	91	glædmode	+ happiness		narrator
14.	93	dohtor min seo dyreste	+ happiness		Affricanus
15.	94	seo sweteste in sefan minum	+ happiness		Affricanus
16.	95	minra eagna leoht	+ happiness		Affricanus
17.	96	on geaþe		– capacity	Affricanus
18.	97	þurh þin orlegu	– happiness		Affricanus
19.	97	unbiþyrfe		– capacity	Affricanus
20.	98	ofer witena dom		– capacity	Affricanus
21.	99	wiðsæcest þu to		– propriety	Affricanus

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
		swiþe			
22.	99	sylfre rædes		– capacity	Affricanus
23.	105	seo eadge		+ normality	narrator
24.	107	fæste gestaþelad		+ tenacity	narrator
25.	108	næfre ic… þafian wille	– inclination		Juliana
26.	120	unrædes		– capacity	Affricanus
27.	122	forlætest þe us leofran sind		– propriety	Affricanus
28.	124	ealdre scyldig		– propriety	Affricanus
29.	126	þu geþafian nelt	– inclination		Affricanus
30.	127–128	micel is þæt ongin ond þreaniedlic		– propriety	Affricanus
31.	128	þinre gelican		– normality	Affricanus
32.	129	þæt þu forhycge	– inclination		Affricanus
33.	130	seo eadge		+ normality	narrator
34.	131	gleaw		+ capacity	narrator
35.	131	gode leof	+ happiness		narrator
36.	132	ic þe to soðe secgan wille		+ veracity	Juliana
37.	133	nelle ic lyge fremman		neg – veracity	Juliana
38.	134	næfre ic me ondræde	neg – security		Juliana
39.	135	ne me weorce sind witebrogan	neg – happiness		Juliana
40.	145	unsnyttrum		– capacity	Affricanus
41.	147	seo unforhte	+ security		narrator
42.	148	þurh gæstgehygd		+ capacity	narrator
43.	159	on feonda geweald	– security		narrator
44.	163	þære fæmnan wlite		+ normality	narrator
45.	166	min se swetesta sunnan scima	+ happiness		Heliseus
46.	167	þu glæm hafast		+ normality	Heliseus
47.	168	ginfæste giefe, geoguðhades blæd		+ normality	Heliseus
48.	171	beoð þe ahylded	+ security		Heliseus
49.	174	þu onsecgan nelt	– inclination		Heliseus
50.	175	seo æþele mæg		+ normality	narrator
51.	188	synna lease		+ propriety	narrator
52.	192–193	þu ær fela unwærlicra worda gespræce		– tenacity	Heliseus
53.	194	onsoce to swiðe		– propriety	Heliseus
54.	196	wiþerhycgendre	– happiness		Heliseus
55.	199	leahtorcwidum		– propriety	Heliseus
56.	202	þurh þin dolwillen		– capacity	Heliseus

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
57.	202	gedwolan fylgest		– propriety	Heliseus
58.	204	þære grimmestan godscyld		– propriety	Heliseus
59.	205	tælnissum		– veracity	Heliseus
60.	206	sacan ongunne	– happiness		Heliseus
61.	209	þæt æþele mod		+ normality	narrator
62.	209	unforht	+ security		narrator
63.	210	ne ondræde ic me	+ security		Juliana
64.	212	hæbbe ic me to hyhte	+ security		Juliana
65.	214	mec gescyldeð	+ security		Juliana
66.	222	ic… mod staþelige	+ security		Juliana
67.	229	seo sunsciene		+ normality	narrator
68.	230	slege þrowade, sace singrimme	– happiness		narrator
69.	233–234	hyre wæs… in ferðlocan fæste biwunden	+ security		narrator
70.	235	milde modsefan		+ propriety	narrator
71.	235	mægen unbrice		+ normality	narrator
72.	237	halig		+ propriety	narrator
73.	238	wærfæst		+ tenacity	narrator
74.	241–242	hyre wæs halig gæst singal gesið	+ security		narrator
75.	246	þære halgan		+ propriety	narrator
76.	247	seo dyreste	+ happiness		devil
77.	248	seo weorþeste		+ normality	devil
78.	249–251	ðe… hafað þa wyrrestan witu gegearwad, sar endeleas	– happiness		devil
79.	251	gif þu onsecgan nelt	– inclination		devil
80.	252	gleawhycgende		+ capacity	devil
81.	253	wes þu on ofeste		+ tenacity	
82.	257	eadhreðig mæg		+ normality	devil
83.	258	seo þe forht ne wæs	+ security		narrator
84.	259	Criste gecweme		+ normality	narrator
85.	263–265	þe sind heardlicu, wundrum wælgrim, witu geteohhad to gringwræce	– happiness		devil
86.	268	egsan geaclad	– security		narrator
87.	270	ongan þa fæstlice ferð staþelian		+ tenacity	narrator
88.	271	grondorleas		+ veracity	narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
89.	284	fæste geheald		+ tenacity	voice from above
90.	287	wæs þære fæmnan ferð geblissad	+ happiness		narrator
91.	288	domeadigre		+ capacity	narrator
92.	315	seo halge		+ propriety	narrator
93.	341–342	þu sylfa meaht on sefan þinum soð gecnawan		+ veracity	devil
94.	345	seo halge		+ propriety	narrator
95.	352	ead mæg		+ normality	devil
96.	355–356	þu þy sweotolicor sylf gecnawe		+ veracity	devil
97.	431	gedyrstig		+ tenacity	devil
98.	431	þurh deop gehygd		+ capacity	devil
99.	432	wigþrist		+ tenacity	devil
100	432	ofer eall wifa cyn		+ normality	devil
101	433	þu mec þus fæste fetrum gebunde		+ tenacity	devil
102	434–437	þu in ecne god… hyht staþelie	+ security		devil
103	449	miltsige		+ propriety	devil
104	454	seo wlitescyne		+ normality	narrator
105	454	wuldres condel		+ normality	narrator
106	463	swa þu me beodest		+ capacity	devil
107	466	on þinne dom		+ capacity	devil
108	511	þriste		+ tenacity	devil
109	512	halig		+ propriety	devil
110	512	hrinan dorste		+ tenacity	devil
111	513	modig		+ tenacity	devil
112	514	þurh halge meaht		+ capacity + propriety	devil
113	519	bealdlice		+ tenacity	devil
114	520	þream forþrycte		+ capacity	devil
115	521	þa miclan meaht mine oferswiðdest		+ capacity	devil
116	522	fæste forfenge		+ tenacity	devil
117	533	on hyge halge		+ propriety	narrator
118	535	breostum inbryrded		+ tenacity	narrator
119	536	halig		+ propriety	narrator
120	539	hlæfdige min		+ capacity	devil
121	541	þu furþur me fraceþu ne wyrce	– satisfaction		devil
122	542	edwit [ne wyrce]	– satisfaction		devil
123	543	þu oferswiþdest		+ capacity	devil
124	550	þristran geþohtes		+ tenacity	devil
125	550	ne þweorhtimbran		+ tenacity	devil

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
126	552	unscamge		+ propriety	devil
127	553	on ferþe frod		+ capacity	devil
128	565	facnes clæne		+ propriety	narrator
129	566	leahtra lease		+ propriety	narrator
130	567	seo halie		+ propriety	narrator
131	568	mægþa bealdor		+ normality	narrator
132	568	gesund		+ capacity	narrator
133	583	leahtra lease		+ propriety	narrator
134	584	butan scyldum		+ propriety	narrator
135	589	sio halge		+ propriety	narrator
136	589–590	stod ungewemde wlite		+ capacity	narrator
137	593	æghwæs onsund		+ capacity	narrator
138	593	sægde ealles þonc	+ satisfaction		narrator
139	600	seo wuldres mæg		+ normality	narrator
140	601	anræd		+ tenacity	narrator
141	601	unforht	+ security		narrator
142	601	eafoða gemyndig		+ capacity	narrator
143	604	on hyge halge		+ propriety	narrator
144	605	Criste gecorene		+ normality	narrator
145	607	þære halgan		+ propriety	narrator
146	607	wearð hyht geniwad	+ security		narrator
147	608	miclum geblissad	+ happiness		narrator
148	610–611	endestæf of gewindagum	neg – happiness		narrator
149	612	lif alysed	+ security		narrator
150	613	clæne		+ propriety	narrator
151	613	gecorene		+ normality	narrator
152	614	synna lease		+ propriety	narrator
153	620	forhogde	– inclination		devil
154	620–621	mec swiþast geminsade		+ capacity	devil
155	622	hy laþra leana hleotan	+ satisfaction – happiness		devil
156	627	seo eadge		+ normality	narrator
157	633–634	heo mec eft wille… gehynan yflum yrmþum		– propriety	devil
158	639	him frofre gehet	+ satisfaction		narrator
159	669–670	hyre sawl wearð alæded… to þam langan gefean	+ happiness		narrator
160	689	haligre		+ propriety	narrator
161	696	seo halge		+ propriety	narrator

Table 18. Heliseus

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	18	æhtwelig		+ capacity	narrator
2.	18	æþeles cynnes		+ normality	narrator
3.	19	rice gerefa		+ capacity	narrator
4.	23	ofer word godes weoh gesohte		– propriety	narrator
5.	25–26	hæfde ealdordom micelne ond mærne		+ normality	narrator
6.	26–27	his mod ongon fæmnan lufian	+ happiness		narrator
7.	27	hine fyrwet bræc	+ inclination		narrator
8.	33	welegum		+ capacity	narrator
9.	38	se weliga		+ capacity	narrator
10.	39	goldspedig guma		+ capacity	narrator
11.	39	georn on mode	+ inclination		narrator
12.	46–47	þu þec sylfne ne þearft swiþor swencan	neg – happiness		Juliana
13.	53	ne meaht þu habban mec		– capacity	Juliana
14.	54	ne geþreatian		– capacity	Juliana
15.	55	næfre þu þæs swiðlic sar gegearwast	– happiness	– capacity	Juliana
16.	56	þurh hæstne nið	– happiness		Juliana
17.	58	se æþeling		+ normality	narrator
18.	58	wearð yrre gebolgen	– satisfaction		narrator
19.	59	firendædum fah		– propriety	narrator
20.	61	hreoh	– satisfaction	– propriety	narrator
21.	61	hygeblind		– capacity	narrator
22.	64	hæðne wæron begen		– propriety	narrator
23.	65	synnum seoce		– propriety	narrator
24.	66	rices hyrde		+ capacity	narrator
25.	67	frecne mode		– propriety	narrator
26.	71–72	me þa fraceðu sind on modsefan mæste weorce	– happiness		Heliseus
27.	73	heo mec swa torne tæle gerahte	– happiness		Heliseus
28.	84	monna leofast	+ happiness		Affricanus
29.	86	þeoden mæra		+ normality	Affricanus
30.	87	gif þe gedafen	+ inclination		Affricanus

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
		þince			
31.	88	swa þe leofre sy	+ happiness		Affricanus
32.	100	se is betra þonne þu		+ normality	Affricanus
33.	101	æþelra for eorþan		+ normality	Affricanus
34.	101	æhtspedigra		+ capacity	Affricanus
35.	102	he is to freonde god		+ normality	Affricanus
36.	104	ece eadlufan	+ happiness		Affricanus
37.	113–114	ne mæg he elles mec bringan to bolde		– capacity	Juliana
38.	116	nafað he ænige her		– capacity	Juliana
39.	127	modges gemanan		+ normality	Affricanus
40.	129	hlaford urne		+ capacity	Affricanus
41.	159	on feonda geweald		– propriety	narrator
42.	164	se æðeling		+ normality	narrator
43.	165	bliþum wordum	+ happiness		narrator
44.	176	næfre þu geþreatast		– capacity	Juliana
45.	179	þu forlæte þa leasinga		+ veracity	Juliana
46.	181	ongyte gleawlice		+ capacity	Juliana
47.	184	frecne mode		– propriety	narrator
48.	185	bealg hine swiþe	– satisfaction		narrator
49.	186	folcagende		+ capacity	narrator
50.	186	het		+ capacity	narrator
51.	187	þurh niðwræce	– happiness		narrator
52.	189	ahlog	+ satisfaction		narrator
53.	189	hospwordum spræc	– satisfaction		narrator
54.	203	ic nyde sceal		+ propriety	Heliseus
55.	203	niþa gebæded	– happiness – inclination		Heliseus
56.	211	awyrged womsceaða		– propriety	Juliana
57.	214	þinum scinlace		– propriety	Juliana
58.	225	þam folctogan		+ capacity	narrator
59.	225	fracuðlic þuhte	– happiness		narrator
60.	226	he ne meahte		– capacity	narrator
61.	227	het		+ capacity	narrator
62.	232	laðgeniðla		– propriety	narrator
63.	249	þes dema		+ capacity	devil
64.	249–250	ðe… hafað þa wyrrestan witu gegearwad		– propriety	devil
65.	251	sar endeleas	– happiness		devil
66.	256–257	þæs deman… yrre	– satisfaction		devil

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
67.	530	se gerefa		+ capacity	narrator
68.	531	gealgmod guma	– happiness		narrator
69.	569	þam weligan		+ capacity	narrator
70.	569	wæs weorc to þolianne	– happiness		narrator
71.	571	synnum fah		– propriety	narrator
72.	571–572	sohte… hu he sarlicast… meahte	+ inclination – happiness		narrator
73.	577	se hearda		– propriety	narrator
74.	582	yrre gebolgen	– satisfaction		narrator
75.	594	se dema		+ capacity	narrator
76.	595	hreoh ond hygegrim		– propriety	narrator
77.	595	ongon his hrægl teran	– satisfaction		narrator
78.	596	he grennade	– satisfaction		narrator
79.	596	gristbitade	– satisfaction		narrator
80.	597	wedde on gewitte	– satisfaction		narrator
81.	597	swa wilde deor		– normality	narrator
82.	598	grymetade	– satisfaction		narrator
83.	598	gealgmod	– happiness		narrator
84.	598	his godu tælde	– satisfaction		narrator
85.	602	se dema		+ capacity	narrator
86.	603	sorgcearig	– happiness		narrator
87.	605	hine se cwealm ne þeah	– satisfaction		narrator
88.	610	inwitrune		– propriety	narrator
89.	612	leahtra ful		– propriety	narrator
90.	671	se synscaþa		– propriety	narrator
91.	672	sceohmod	– security		narrator
92.	678	þurh þearlic þrea	+ satisfaction – happiness		narrator
93.	681	hroþra bidæled	– satisfaction		narrator
94.	682	hyhta lease	– security		narrator

Table 19. Affricanus

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	78	geswearc	– satisfaction		narrator
2.	78	swiðferð		– propriety	narrator
3.	80	ic þæt geswerge	+ inclination		Affricanus
4.	85	ic hy ne sparige	– inclination		Affricanus
5.	89	eode þa fromlice		+ tenacity	narrator
6.	90	anræd		+ tenacity	narrator
7.	90	yreþweorg	– satisfaction		narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
8.	90	yrre gebolgen	– satisfaction		narrator
9.	117	þurh yrre	– satisfaction		narrator
10.	118	feondlice		– propriety	narrator
11.	119	ic þæt gefremme	+ inclination		Affricanus
12.	136	hæstlice		+ tenacity	Juliana
13.	137	manfremmende		– propriety	Juliana
14.	137	to me beotast	+ inclination		Juliana
15.	138	ne þu næfre gedest		– capacity	Juliana
16.	138	þurh gedwolan þinne		– propriety	Juliana
17.	140	ellenwod	– satisfaction		narrator
18.	140	yrre ond reþe	– satisfaction		narrator
19.	141	frecne		– propriety	narrator
20.	141	ferðgrim		+ tenacity	narrator
21.	142	het		+ capacity	narrator
22.	158	þurh yrre	– satisfaction		narrator

Table 20. Devil

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	243	hæleða gewinna		– propriety	narrator
2.	244	yfeles ondwis		– propriety + capacity	narrator
3.	245	gleaw gyrnstafa		+ capacity	narrator
4.	245	gæstgeniðla		– propriety	narrator
5.	246	helle hæftling		– capacity	narrator
6.	260	se wræcmæcga		– propriety	narrator
7.	262	þegn geþungen		+ normality	devil
8.	263	halig		+ propriety	devil
9.	268	se aglæca		+ tenacity	narrator
10.	269	wuldres wiþerbreca		– propriety	narrator
11.	276–277	þes ar bodað frecne færspel		– propriety	Juliana
12.	284	þone frætgan		– propriety	voice from above
13.	285	secge mid ryhte		+ veracity	voice from above
14.	290	ic gecræfte		+ capacity	devil
15.	297–298	ic gelærde… searoþoncum		– veracity	devil
16.	302	neþde ic nearobregdum		– veracity	devil
17.	302	ic… bisweac		– veracity	devil
18.	311–313	ic wraþra fela… bealwa gefremede,		– propriety	devil

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
		sweartra synna			
19.	315	heardra heteþonca	– happiness		devil
20.	317	feond moncynnes		– propriety	Juliana
21.	319	se aglæca		+ tenacity	narrator
22.	320	forhtafongen	– security		narrator
23.	320	friþes orwena	– security		narrator
24.	326	þurh misgedwield		– propriety – veracity	devil
25.	327	ahwyrfen from halor		– propriety	devil
26.	327	we beoð hygegeomre	– happiness		devil
27.	328	forhte on ferðþe	– security		devil
28.	330	ne durran we	– inclination		devil
29.	339–340	we þa heardestan ond þa wyrrestan witu geþoliað	– happiness		devil
30.	343	þisse noþe		+ tenacity	devil
31.	343	wæs nyde gebæded	– inclination		devil
32.	344	geþread	– happiness		devil
33.	345	hæleþa gewinnan		– propriety	narrator
34.	346	wrohtes wyrhtan		– propriety – veracity	narrator
35.	347	fyrnsynna fruman		– propriety	narrator
36.	348	sawla feond		– propriety	Juliana
37.	348–349	þu… þurh synna slide swiþast sceþþe		– propriety	Juliana
38.	350	facne bifongen		– propriety	Juliana
39.	350	se feond		– propriety	narrator
40.	351	wræcca wærleas	– security	– veracity	narrator
41.	352–354	yfla gehwylces… þara þe ic gefremede		– propriety	devil
42.	355	synna wundum		– propriety	devil
43.	356	þis is soð		+ veracity	devil
44.	357	witod tealde	+ security		devil
45.	358	þriste geþoncge	+ security		devil
46.	358	þæt ic þe meahte		+ capacity	devil
47.	359	butan earfeþum	neg – happiness		devil
48.	360	ahwyrfan from halor		– propriety	devil
49.	363	þurh mislic bleo		– veracity	devil
50.	363	mod oncyrre		– propriety	devil
51.	368	þurh gedwolena rim		– veracity	devil

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
52.	372	synnum onæle		– propriety	devil
53.	376–377	ic brogan to laðne gelæde	– security – happiness		devil
54.	377	ic… ofonn	– satisfaction		devil
55.	389–390	ic sceal… heanmod hweorfan	– happiness		devil
56.	390	hroþra bidæled	– satisfaction		devil
57.	391	gehðu mænan	– happiness		devil
58.	392–393	ic ne meahte mægnes cræfte guðe wiðgongan		– capacity	devil
59.	393	ic geomor sceal	– happiness		devil
60.	396	ic onbryrdan mæge		+ capacity	devil
61.	402	þurh teonan		– propriety	devil
62.	404–405	onsende… bitre geþoncas	– happiness		devil
63.	409	ic beo lareow georn	+ inclination	+ tenacity	devil
64.	412	me to gewealde		+ capacity	devil
65.	413	in synna seað		– propriety	devil
66.	413–414	ic þære sawle ma geornor gyme	+ inclination	– propriety	devil
67.	418	earmsceapen		– normality	Juliana
68.	418	unclæne gæst		– propriety	Juliana
69.	421	wærleas wunne		– veracity	Juliana
70.	421	gewin tuge		– propriety	Juliana
71.	422	hogdes wiþ halgum		– propriety	Juliana
72.	423	nydbysig	– happiness		Juliana
73.	424	fore oferhygdum		– propriety	Juliana
74.	425	þy wærra weorþan sceolde	– inclination		Juliana
75.	427	þy unbealdra		– tenacity	Juliana
76.	429	se werga		– propriety	narrator
77.	430	earm aglæca	– happiness	+ tenacity	narrator
78.	434	æghwæs orwigne		– capacity	devil
79.	439	in manweorcum		– propriety	devil
80.	440	mod oncyrre, hyge from halor		– propriety	devil
81.	440–441	me hwilum biþ forwyrned… willan mines		– capacity	devil
82.	442–443	me her gelamp sorg on siþe	– happiness		devil
83.	443–444	ic þæt sylf gecneow to late		– capacity	devil
84.	444–445	sceal nu lange… scame þrowian	– happiness		devil
85.	445	scyldwyrcende		– propriety	devil

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
86.	446	ic þec halsige	+ inclination		devil
87.	449	me þearfendum	– security		devil
88.	450	unsælig	– happiness		devil
89.	451	gedyrstig		+ tenacity	devil
90.	451	þus dolwillen		– capacity	devil
91.	452–453	me þyslicre ær þrage ne wende	– security		devil
92.	455	þam wærlogan		– propriety	narrator
93.	456	scealt ondettan		+ veracity	Juliana
94.	456	yfeldæda ma		– propriety	Juliana
95.	457	hean helle gæst		– propriety	Juliana
96.	458	þu to teonan þurhtogen hæbbe		– propriety	Juliana
97.	459	micelra manweorca		– propriety	Juliana
98.	460	deorcum gedwildum		– veracity	Juliana
99.	462	ic nyde sceal niþa gebæded	– inclination – happiness		devil
100	463	mod meldian		+ veracity	devil
101	464	þreaned þolian	– happiness		devil
102	465	þreat ormæte	– security		devil
103	465–466	ic sceal… þolian ond þafian	– happiness		devil
104	467	womdæda onwreon		– propriety + veracity	devil
105	467–468	ic… sweartra gesyrede		– propriety	devil
106	469	ablende bealoþoncum		– propriety	devil
107	473	forbræc bealosearwum		– propriety	devil
108	484	to geflite fremede	– satisfaction	– propriety	devil
109	486–487	ic him byrlade wroht of wege	– satisfaction		devil
110	492	ic bealdlice		+ tenacity	devil
111	493	þurh mislic cwealm		– propriety	devil
112	494	searoþoncum slog		– veracity	devil
113	494	ic asecgan ne mæg		– capacity	devil
114	496–497	eal þa earfeþu þe ic… gefremede		– propriety	devil
115	497	to facne		– propriety	devil
116	500	ic ealdor oðþrong		– propriety	devil
117	506	yfel endeleas		– propriety	devil
118	506–507	ic eall gebær, wraþe wrohtas		– propriety	devil
119	524–525	ic þe sceolde synne swetan		– propriety – veracity	devil

	Line no.	**Appreciating item**	**Affect**	**Judgement**	**Appraiser**
120	525	mec sorg bicwom	– happiness		devil
121	526	hefig hondgewinn	– happiness		devil
122	526	ic bihlyhhan ne þearf	– satisfaction		devil
123	527	æfter sarwræce	– happiness		devil
124	529	gnorncearig	– happiness		devil
125	536	hæþenne		– propriety	narrator
126	536	hreowcearig	– happiness		narrator
127	536–537	ongan þa… siðfæt seofian	– satisfaction		narrator
128	537	sar cwanian	– happiness		narrator
129	538	wyrd wanian	– satisfaction		narrator
130	539	ic þec halsige	+ inclination		devil
131	543	þone snotrestan		+ capacity	devil
132	546–547	þu mec þreades þurh sarslege	– happiness		devil
133	547	ic to soþe wat		+ veracity	devil
134	551	is on me sweotul		+ veracity	devil
135	554	æfter þræchwile	– happiness		narrator
136	555	sawla gewinnan		– propriety	narrator
137	556	wiste he þi gearwor	+ security		narrator
138	557	manes melda		– propriety	narrator
139	615	hean helle gæst		– propriety	narrator
140	615	hearmleoð agol	– happiness		narrator
141	616	earm ond unlæd	– happiness		narrator
142	617	awyrgedne		– propriety	narrator
143	618	ceargealdra full	– happiness		narrator
144	624	ic þa sorge gemon	– happiness		devil
145	625–627	bisga unrim… earfeða dreag, yfel ormætu	– happiness	– propriety	devil
146	628	ongean gramum	– satisfaction		narrator
147	629	hearm galan	– happiness		narrator
148	629	helle deofol		– propriety	narrator
149	630	feond moncynnes		– propriety	narrator
150	630	ongon þa on fleam sceacan		– tenacity	narrator
151	632	wa me	– happiness		devil
152	632	forworhtum		– propriety	devil
153	633	earmne	– happiness		devil

Table 21. Wealhtheow

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	613	cwen Hroðgares		+ capacity	narrator
2.	613	cynna gemyndig		+ propriety	narrator
3.	614	goldhroden		+ normality	narrator
4.	615	freolic wif		+ normality	narrator
5.	620	ides Helminga		+ normality	narrator
6.	623	beaghroden cwen		+ capacity	narrator
7.	624	mode geþungen		+ normality	narrator
8.	625	gode þancode	+ satisfaction		narrator
9.	626	wisfæst wordum		+ capacity	narrator
10.	626	þæs ðe hire se willa gelamp	+ satisfaction		narrator
11.	627–628	heo… gelyfde fyrena frofre	+ security + satisfaction		narrator
12.	639	ðam wife þa word wel licodon	+ satisfaction		narrator
13.	640	goldhroden		+ normality	narrator
14.	641	freolicu folccwen		+ normality + capacity	narrator
15.	923	cwen		+ capacity	narrator
16.	1168	ides Scyldinga		+ normality	narrator
17.	1180	ic… can	+ security		Wealhtheow
18.	1184	wene ic	+ security		Wealhtheow
19.	1186–87	wit… arna gefremedon		+ propriety	Wealhtheow
20.	1192–93	freondlaþu wordum bewægned	+ happiness		narrator
21.	1194	estum geeawed		+ propriety	narrator
22.	1220	ic þe þæs lean geman	+ satisfaction + inclination		Wealhtheow
23.	1225	ic þe… tela	+ inclination		Wealhtheow
24.	1231	dryhtguman doð swa ic bidde		+ capacity	Wealhtheow
25.	1649	þære idese		+ normality	narrator
26.	2016	mæru cwen		+ normality + capacity	Beowulf
27.	2017	friðusibb folca		+ propriety	Beowulf

Table 22. Hygd

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	1927	wis		+ capacity	narrator
2.	1927	welþungen		+ normality	narrator
3.	1929	næs hio hnah		neg	narrator

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
				– propriety	
4.	1930	ne to gneað gifa		neg – propriety	narrator
5.	1982	lufode ða leode	+ happiness		narrator
6.	2174	ðeodnes dohtor		+ normality	narrator
7.	2175–76	hyre syððan wæs æfter beahðege breost geweorðod		+ normality	narrator
8.	2369	gebead		+ capacity	narrator
9.	2370	bearne ne truwode	– security		narrator

Table 23. Hildeburh

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	1071	ne… herian þorfte	– satisfaction		narrator
2.	1072	unsynnum		+ propriety	narrator
3.	1072–73	wearð beloren leofum	– happiness		narrator
4.	1075	þæt wæs geomuru ides	– happiness		narrator
5.	1077	meotodsceaft bemearn	– satisfaction		narrator
6.	1079–80	þær heo ær mæste heold worolde wynne	+ happiness		narrator
7.	1114	het		+ capacity	narrator
8.	1117	ides gnornode	– happiness		narrator
9.	1118	geomrode giddum	– happiness		narrator
10.	1153	seo cwen numen		– capacity	narrator
11.	1158	drihtlice wif		+ normality	narrator

Table 24. Hrethel

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	2435	ungedefelice		– propriety	Beowulf
2.	2441	þæt wæs feohleas gefeoht	– satisfaction		Beowulf
3.	2441	fyrenum gesyngad		– propriety	Beowulf
4.	2442	hreðre hygemeðe	– happiness		Beowulf
5.	2442–43	sceolde… æðeling unwrecen ealdres linnan	– satisfaction		Beowulf
6.	2462	Wedra helm		+ capacity	Beowulf

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
7.	2463 –64	heortan sorge weallende wæg	– happiness		Beowulf
8.	2464 –65	wihte ne meahte on ðam feorhbonan fæghðe gebetan	– satisfaction	– capacity	Beowulf
9.	2466	he þone heaðorinc hatian ne meahte	neg – happiness		Beowulf
10.	2467	þeah him leof ne wæs	neg happiness		Beowulf
11.	2468	mid þære sorhge	– happiness		Beowulf
12.	2468	þe him swa sar belamp	– happiness		Beowulf
13.	2469	gumdream ofgeaf	– happiness		Beowulf

Table 25. Old Man

	Line no.	Appreciating item	Affect	Judgement	Appraiser
1.	2444	geomorlic	– happiness		Beowulf
2.	2446 –47	gyd wrece, sarigne sang	– happiness		Beowulf
3.	2448 –49	he him helpe ne mæg… gefremman		– capacity	Beowulf
4.	2449	infrod		– capacity	Beowulf
5.	2450 –51	bið gemyndgad morna gehwylce eaforan ellorsið	– happiness		Beowulf
6.	2451 –52	oðres ne gymeð to gebiddanne	– inclination		Beowulf
7.	2455	sorhcearig	– happiness		Beowulf
8.	2457	reote berofene	– happiness		Beowulf
9.	2458 –59	nis… gomen in geardum	– happiness		Beowulf
10.	2460 –61	sorhleoð gæleð an æfter anum	– happiness		Beowulf
11.	2461	þuhte him eall to rum	– satisfaction		Beowulf