

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

## 1. Summary of the dissertation

It is somewhat of a commonplace among students and scholars of Old English literature that Old English poetry is primarily male-dominated. Women characters are few, and rarely in the focus. They are marginalized, passive and pathetic, and the so-called exceptions have to be found excuses for – e.g. that they are not native characters, but ones imported from another culture. Therefore, when I started working on this dissertation which examines the relationship of women and violence, I expected to find women in the role of – intended or accidental – victims, or in that of helpless onlookers as men vie for glory and fame. In the course of my research and of analyzing the texts, my views gradually changed, and the emerging picture is rather different from the one I originally envisioned. I argue in the dissertation that the use of violence and power is not evaluated on the basis of gender, but on the characters' level of integration into the community and on their alignment with the interests of the community.

In the dissertation, I analysed the representations of female characters in the context of violence in four texts, the epic *Beowulf* and the religious poems *Judith*, *Elene* and *Juliana*. These texts include the majority, but certainly not all, of the female characters in Old English poetry: the protagonists of the three religious poems, as well as 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 to her with some certainty, and it is doubtful whether she appears at all in the second fragment. Due to these uncertainties and to the shortness of the text, I have decided to exclude Hildegyth from 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.

As the concept of violence is interpreted in widely differing ways in the relevant literature, first I found it necessary to formulate my own definition. Taking as my starting point Vittorio Bufacchi's discussion of the subject in his *Violence and*

*Social Justice* (2007), I defined violence as 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, and possibly even the death, of the victim, and which can also result in harm, injury and suffering, and perhaps even the death of other, unintended victims.

Secondly, relying on René Girard and others, I also argued for a distinction between positive and negative violence, that is, succinctly put, violence that upholds and violence that destroys the order of a given community. Furthermore, I claimed that representations of an act of violence are subjective. This is not only so in the case of the characters who participate in conflicts, but the narrating voice in Old English poems also clearly takes sides, describing and interpreting the actions accordingly.

After this, I proceeded to perform a close reading of the selected texts, analysing the descriptions of the female characters, and in the case of the three religious poems, those of their adversaries as well, with the help of Martin and White's appraisal theory as presented in their book *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English* (2005), focusing on *judgement* (evaluations of behaviour) and *affect* (evaluations of emotions). From *Beowulf*, I also included 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. Furthermore, in the case of *Judith* I briefly compared the Old English text with the Book of Judith in the Vulgate to establish whether the characteristics of the Old English version were taken over together with the story from Latin or are modifications introduced by the Anglo-Saxon author. As the immediate Latin sources of *Elene* and *Juliana* are not certain, in the case of these two works I relied on secondary literature in order to attempt a similar comparison. I summarize the findings of my dissertation in Section 4 below.

## **2. The theory of appraisal**

According to Martin and White, appraisal focuses on how emotions and value judgements are encoded in a text. The framework presented in their book consists of the three interrelated systems of *attitude*, *engagement* and *graduation*, each of which

comprises further subsystems. The first of these, *attitude*, involves the expression of emotions, judgements and valuations, that is, the emotional, ethical and aesthetic dimensions of evaluation, respectively. It includes the three corresponding classes of *affect*, *judgement* and *appreciation*. *Affect* means registering the positive and negative emotional responses of a person (the emoter), who is either the author (in which case we can talk about authorial *affect*) or another party (non-authorial *affect*). This can be expressed by verbs and adjectives of emotion (e.g. “sad” or “wept”), adverbs (e.g. “sadly”), or by 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”); and (vi) they can be grouped into four sets, *un/happiness* (e.g. “sad/happy”), *in/security* (e.g. “anxious/confident”), *dis/satisfaction* (e.g. “angry/pleased”) and *dis/inclination* (e.g. “feared / longed for” – *dis/inclination* is always *irrealis*) (Martin and White 45–52, Martin 148–152).

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 areas related to *esteem* include *normality* (“how unusual someone is”, e.g. “lucky/unlucky”, “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 expresses “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).

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

In addition to the above, *attitude* can be *explicit* or *implicit*. To take judgement as an example, it can be *explicit* 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: *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), or *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).

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). Subsystems 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 (Martin and White 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*) (Martin and White 100). *Heteroglossia* can be further divided into *dialogistic contraction* versus *dialogistic expansion* (Martin and White 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”) (Martin and White 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 thus locates them “with respect to the communities of shared value and belief associated with those positions” (Martin and White 94).

The following table presents a summary of the three systems of *attitude*, *engagement* and *graduation* based on Martin and White:

<b>Attitude</b>	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
			social sanction	tenacity
				veracity
(iii)		explicit	inscribed	
			provoked	
		implicit	evoked	
Appreciation	(i)	positive		
		negative		
	(ii)	reaction		
		composition		
		valuation		
	(iii)	explicit	inscribed	
		implicit	provoked	
		evoked		
<b>Engagement</b>	monoglossic	bare assertions		
	heteroglossic	dialogistic contraction	disclaim	deny
				counter
			proclaim	concur
				pronounce
		dialogistic expansion	entertain	
			attribute	acknowledge
			distance	
<b>Graduation</b>				

The system as outlined above was elaborated for the analysis of Modern English texts. As far as I know, no attempts have been made yet to apply it to Old English (although it has been used successfully in the analysis of Early Modern works). Its use for analysing texts from so remote a period of the development of the language 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 (point (iv) in the table above), as our knowledge of such nuances in the meaning of Old English words may not be sufficient for this. Similarly, provoked and especially evoked *judgement* also pose 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). As the norms and expected ideological positions of the originally intended audience of Old English poetry can only 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 to be a useful tool which may enrich our understanding of how violence is viewed in these poems.

Thus, in my analysis of the texts, I employed mostly the system of *attitude*, especially *affect* and *judgement* (*appreciation*, as it focuses primarily on the evaluation of objects rather than persons, was of lesser usefulness here), arranging the results in Tables 1–25 in the Appendix. Each of these 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. The structure of the dissertation**

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Defining violence
- 1.2. “Good” and “bad” violence
- 1.3. Evaluation and Appraisal
- 1.4. Violence in Old English Literature
- 1.5. The texts

#### 2. THE WOMEN OF OLD ENGLISH POETRY IN SECONDARY LITERATURE

#### 3. WOMEN AS AVENGERS: GRENDEL’S MOTHER AND JUDITH

##### 3.1. Grendel’s mother

- 3.1.1. What is a monster?
- 3.1.2. The motif of vengeance
- 3.1.3. Evaluation
- 3.1.4. Femininity and revenge

##### 3.2. Judith

- 3.2.1. Vengeance
- 3.2.2. Evaluation
- 3.2.3. Differences between the Latin and Old English texts
- 3.2.4. Femininity

##### 3.3. Conclusion

#### 4. WOMEN AND POWER: ELENE AND MODTHRYTH

##### 4.1. Elene

- 4.1.1. Evaluation
  - 4.1.1.1. Elene evaluated by the narrator
  - 4.1.1.2. Judas and the Jews evaluated by Elene
  - 4.1.1.3. Judas and the Jews evaluated by the narrator
  - 4.1.1.4. Evaluations by other characters
- 4.1.2. Differences between the Latin and Old English versions

##### 4.2. Modthryth

##### 4.3. Conclusion

#### 5. THE TRIUMPHANT VICTIM: JULIANA

- 5.1. Levels of conflict and perception
- 5.2. The description of the conflict
  - 5.2.1. Words referring to battle
  - 5.2.2. Vengeance
- 5.3. Meanings of violence
- 5.4. Juliana's femininity
- 5.5. Activity vs. passivity
- 5.6. Violence and communication
- 5.7. Conflicting meanings
- 5.8. Evaluation
- 5.9. Differences between the Latin and Old English versions
- 5.10. Conclusion
- 6. PEACEWEAVERS: WEALHTHEOW, HYGD AND HILDEBURH
  - 6.1. The figure of the peace-weaver
  - 6.2. Wealhtheow
  - 6.3. Hygd
  - 6.4. Hildeburh
  - 6.5. Conclusion
- 7. CONCLUSIONS
  - 7.1. Conflict and evaluation
  - 7.2. Female roles in the context of violence

#### WORKS CITED

#### APPENDIX: ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

### **4. Conclusions of the dissertation**

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 (as in the case of Judith, Elene, Juliana, Wealhtheow and Hygd). If a character is focusing exclusively on the personal, or if the personal is in conflict with the communal (as in

the case of Grendel's mother or Queen Modthryth), the character in question is judged negatively by the narrating voice. This may be observed in all the poems under consideration in the present dissertation.

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 (i.e. those characters whose personal goals are in harmony with the communal and/or the cosmic), the narrator's evaluation of *judgement* is entirely positive as regards both categories. The only exceptions to this are the characters in a situation which makes it impossible for them to act (such as Hildeburh or King Hrethel), in whose description we can also find elements of [- capacity].

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 in *Elene*). 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.

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.

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.

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* as well). 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.

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 of the community), 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.

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).

A group which should be separately mentioned in connection with *affect* is that of the characters described mainly through *affect* (Hildeburh, the anonymous old man and King Hrethel). In their description by the narrator, the proportion of affective elements is higher than that of elements of *judgement*, and these affective elements are almost entirely negative. 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 (e.g. Judith or Juliana) are evaluated positively in terms of both *judgement* and *affect*, while people posing threats to these communities (such as Grendel’s mother, Holofernes or King Heremod) are depicted through negative elements of evaluation.

It is also important to note that, while protagonists (and other positively evaluated characters) frequently utter speeches in which they express their opinion of their environment (e.g. Elene, Wealhtheow or Juliana), echoing the evaluations of the

narrator, antagonists (like Grendel's mother, Holofernes, or the Jews in *Elene*) 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*, or Heliseus in *Juliana*).

It should also be pointed 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 (which also eliminates [- veracity], i.e. negative *sanction* applied to a positive character) are the results of authorial modifications which bring these stories in line with patterns of evaluation that can be observed across the Old English texts.

In the texts examined in the present dissertation, women appear in a variety of roles, both as perpetrators and victims of violence, as well as in situations in which they try to avert the threat of violence from their family or community. One of the aims of this dissertation was to examine whether female actions and reactions to violence are subject to specific rules, and whether they are perceived and interpreted differently from those of men. The answers that emerge as a result of the analysis are the following:

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, 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, 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 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.

Perhaps the most important result of the analysis is questioning the conventionally assumed dichotomy of male activity vs. female passivity (discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2 of the dissertation, and referred to in the subsequent chapters). 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 a kingdom. Of the eight female characters considered in Chapters 3–6, seven 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 who may be claimed to be passive is Hildeburh. However, as I argue 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 argued in Chapter 2, this view is rooted in Victorian ideals of gender roles, and it is reinforced rather than deconstructed by feminist criticism. In my dissertation, I hope to have shown that this interpretation is not borne out by the analysis of the poems, that women belong to the community, are defined by the community and their main concern is to contribute to keeping the community together – which may be a step towards reinterpreting the role of women in Old English poetry in a different light.

## 5. Possible directions of further research

- The analysis of evaluation in the present dissertation uses the simplest version of the complex system elaborated by Martin and White. Further studies could refine the analysis, focusing on the system of *attitude* in greater detail. Investigating the possibilities of applying the system of engagement (i.e. the positioning of the narrative voice with respect to the characters and to the assumed audience) to Old English texts could also yield interesting results and lead to further insight on the poems.
- 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. 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.
- One of the findings of the present dissertation was the correlation between the characters' roles with respect to the community and the type of emotions they experience, or the connection between certain emotions and certain situations (e.g. sorrow and vengeance). Further studies could focus on the relationship between emotions and morality, or the role emotions play in the representation of good and evil in Old English poetry.



## Works Cited

- Bufacchi, Vittorio. "Two Concepts of Violence." *Political Studies Review* 3.2 (2005): 193–204. Print.
- . *Violence and Social Justice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007. Print.
- Fulk, R. D., Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, eds. *Klaeber's Beowulf*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2008. Print.
- Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977. 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.
- Martin, J. R. "Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English." *Evaluation in Text*. Ed. S. Hunston and G. Thompson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 143–175. Print.
- Martin, J. R., and P. R. R. White. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Sabatier, Pierre, ed. *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*. Vol. I. Remis: Reginaldum Florentain, 1743. *Open Library*. 29 August 2010. Web. 18 March 2013.
- White, P. R. R. "Attitude: Judgement." *An Introductory Course in Appraisal Analysis*. The Appraisal Website, 2001. Web. 30 August 2010.