

**Rights and Obligations: Conceptions of Social Relations  
viewed through the Treatment of Possessions in the Biblical  
Poems of Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Junius XI**

Submitted by Jaka Jarc to the University of Exeter  
as a thesis for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in History  
In September 2015

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature: .....

## **Abstract**

My thesis examines social conceptions framing rights and obligations by reviewing how possessions are used and exchanged in the poems of MS Junius XI. I identify several major additions to the scriptural source material of the poetic narrative where the poems present a unique treatment of possessions in a social environment. These poetic additions often feature novel combinations of events and even entirely new sub-stories. In reviewing these departures I focus specifically on possessions and examine how they frame the rights and obligations within social interactions. Focusing on objects of social exchange enables the discussion of the literary narrative to relate to secondary historical literature on possessions as well as social conceptions. This has not yet been done for the poems of Junius XI.

This thesis is divided into four thematic chapters ordered from the most tangible to the most abstract: moveable objects, landed possessions, degrees of possession of people, and abstract notions of authority framing social interactions tied to holding and exchanging possessions. In chapter two moveable possessions will be discussed in relation to social status, cultural identity, exchange and hierarchy. The third chapter will examine the interplay between the allegorical and practical notions of land possession. The fourth chapter will discuss social hierarchy framed as a range of rights and obligations discussing to what degree people are themselves treated as possessions. The discussion will examine what types and levels of relative personal freedom is detectable in the Junius XI poems. The final chapter will amalgamate findings and issues of the previous chapters by examining how the exchange and treatment of possessions impact various types of authority which frame social interactions, hierarchies and values.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe an immense debt of gratitude to my life partner Marjetka Pezdirc, without whom I would never have attempted this thesis, and to my son Rihard Aleksander who was born with an innate patience for my schedule. I am grateful for the kind and supportive guidance of Julia Crick; she was always ready to listen, comment, and steer while never overstepping. Eddie Jones gently spurred me on in my initial stages; his help is much appreciated. Christina Lee was supportive in moments of self-doubt, while her straightforward approach facilitated my transition from continental to insular writing habits; I am beyond grateful for both. I also appreciate the constructive engagement of my examiners Sarah Hamilton and Elizabeth Tyler. In the final stages of the re-write my dear friend Jonathan Matthieu's watchful eye engaged my Slovenian commas and causal structure, and persevered.

I am grateful to the Department of History at the University of Exeter for understanding my professional and personal issues, the diligent support of Sarmishtha Ghosh, and in the later years Simon Barton. I owe a debt of gratitude to the University of Nottingham, where my interests evolved into a firm belief that I too had something to offer in the field of medieval studies. I wish to acknowledge Dr. Janez Peršič for imparting his unique take on medieval history and Richard Marsden for helping me transform my interest in the Old English language into a love for Old English literature. I also received helpful comments for further work when I was able to present some findings at the 'New Voices' panel at the 2011 IMC in Leeds.

In the course of my PhD I was fortunate enough to have social support and cultural distraction of the Exeter University Soul Choir; the people I met include Dr. Chris Elphick, who physically carried this thesis "across the finish line" (twice), and Katherine Bolden whom I could always count on to remind me of the importance of staying positive. I was able to discuss my work, foreign though it must have seemed to them, with David Modic and Kim Komljanec; their willingness to lend an ear helped me organize my thoughts and replenish my depleted ego.

Last but certainly not least, I am grateful to my father who taught me perseverance and self sufficiency, my mother who taught me the importance of happiness and to my wider family for their emotional support, belief in my capabilities and for encouraging me in my curiosity ever since I can remember.

I have received financial support from the 'Javni sklad Republike Slovenije za razvoj kadrov in štipendije'; it enabled me to afford to study at all.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- ASE** - Anglo-Saxon England
- B&T** - Bosworth and Toller Dictionary of Old English, Bosworth, Joseph (1898) An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Online [‘online text’], Prague <[bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/](http://bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/)> [‘Accessed on 30 August 2015’].
- OE** - Old English
- DOE** - Toronto University Dictionary of Old English, Cameron, Angus, Amos, Ashley Crandell, and al., Antonette diPaolo Healey et 'Dictionary of Old English: A to G Online', DOE <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>>, [Accessed 30 August 2015]
- DOE corpus** - Healey, Antonette diPaolo, Wilkin, John Price, and Xiang, Xin (2009) Dictionary of Old English Corpus on the World Wide Web [‘online text’], University of Toronto <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/>>
- Microfiche Concordance** - Healey, Antonette DiPaolo, Venezky, Richard L, A Microfiche Concordance to Old English (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware).

## Table of Contents

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Research question</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>The Sources</b>	<b>10</b>
I. MS Bodleian Junius XI	10
II. The Poems: Content and Context	13
III. The Date of the Junius XI Manuscript and its Poems	17
IV. Dating Individual Poems of Junius XI: Issues and Suggestions	19
<b>Manuscript Unity and Instructional Intent</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>The Scholarship of Possessions, Rights, and Obligations</b>	<b>27</b>
I. Scholarship Using Old English Literary Sources	27
II. The Literary Scholarship of Allegory and the Interpretation of Possessions as Markers of Social Exchanges in the Junius XI Poems	38
<b>Method</b>	<b>40</b>

<b>2 MOVEABLE POSSESSIONS: IDENTITY, STATUS AND THE MORALITY OF EXCHANGE</b>	<b>45</b>
Allegory and Interpretation	47
Possessions in motion – People’s Treasure	50
Inheriting Treasure: Transient Authority and Collective Identity	53
Treasure in Exchange: Moral and Practical Implications	62
Conclusion to Chapter 2	70
<b>3 LANDED POSSESSIONS IN THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>72</b>
Introduction	72
<b>A) LANDED POSSESSIONS IN THE INTERIM PARADISE</b>	<b>73</b>
Interim Paradise and the Colour Green	74
Paradise, Landed Possessions and Security	78
Interim Conclusion	83
<b>B) EARTHLY LANDED POSSESSIONS</b>	<b>84</b>
Possession of Land and its People: “ <i>Folcscearu</i> ,” “ <i>Folcstede</i> ” and “ <i>Landriht</i> ”	85
<b>Possessions and Benefits Associated with Landed Possessions</b>	<b>92</b>
Animals as Part of Landed Possessions	93
Tilling the Land: Right or Penalty	96
Fruits	100
Conclusion to Chapter 3	107

<b>4 SOCIAL HIERARCHY, PEOPLE AS POSSESSIONS</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>A) SLAVES AS POSSESSIONS</b>	<b>112</b>
Choice and Esteem – Serving and Slaving	114
Work-Slaves - Social Mobility Within the Rank of Slave	123
<b>B OBLIGATION BY CHOICE</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>The Theological Background to the Freedom of Choice of Master</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>Hierarchy as an Expression of Possession</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>Chapter Conclusion</b>	<b>145</b>
<b>5 SOCIAL CONCEPTIONS OF AUTHORITY</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>148</b>
A) SECULAR AND SACRED AUTHORITY OF A KING	149
Military Command as Sacred Kingly Authority	152
Division of Sacred Authority in <i>Genesis A</i> , King and Bishop	155
<b>B) CUSTODIANSHIP AS TEMPORARY POSSESSION OF AUTHORITY</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>C) PERSONAL AUTHORITY</b>	<b>160</b>
The Currency of Possessing Lord's Favour	160
Rights and Obligations in Junius XI and the Elements of <i>Swerian</i>	162
The Temporary Nature of Personal Authority	167
<b>D) LEGALITY OF AUTHORITY</b>	<b>169</b>
Relationship of Scripture, Biblical Paraphrase and Law-Codes	173
<b>E) JUDICIAL AUTHORITY, Practical Examples of Possessing Authority</b>	<b>175</b>
The Case of Adam and Eve – Personal Judicial Authority	176

Impact of Judicial Authority on Land Possession	181
<b>F) THE CASE OF CAIN, Security of Kin and Lord</b>	<b>182</b>
<b>G) THE CASE OF THREE IN THE FIRE, Judicial Authority – Rights and Obligations</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>Chapter Conclusion</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>6 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>191</b>
People and Possession	191
Common Traits	193
Nature of Rights and Obligations	194
Social Interactions	195
<b>TEXTUAL APPENDICES, QUOTES OF PRIMARY SOURCES</b>	<b>197</b>
<b><i>GENESIS A (I)</i></b>	<b>197</b>
<b><i>GENESIS B</i></b>	<b>201</b>
<b><i>GENESIS A (III)</i></b>	<b>206</b>
<b><u>EXODUS</u></b>	<b>222</b>
<b><u>DANIEL</u></b>	<b>222</b>
<b><i>CHRIST AND SATAN</i></b>	<b>224</b>
<b><u>OTHER SOURCES</u></b>	<b>225</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>228</b>

## 1 Introduction

### Research question

This thesis examines how social interactions are conceptualised in the Old English vernacular biblical paraphrases contained in the late tenth- or early eleventh-century illustrated manuscript, MS Bodleian Junius XI: *Genesis A*, *Genesis B*, *Exodus*, *Daniel*, and *Christ and Satan*. I will focus on those segments of the Junius XI poems where scriptural depiction of social interactions and treatment of possessions are altered by the Old English poets either through addition, omission, or change in emphasis. The poetic treatment of scriptural narrative in Junius XI presents an original blend of scriptural content and original Old English poetic form, style, and formulas. This blend promises to lend a unique perspective on social conceptions: social cultural identity, the notion of right to a homeland, rights and obligations regulating hierarchical relations, and the nature of authority.

These conceptions will be examined in relation to possessions, which form part of the social interactions and exchanges within the Old English narrative. I will begin by looking at material possessions in order to frame my discussion of social exchanges and allegorical symbolism. This is because material possessions are the common denominator of both. Chapter two will focus on what I define as ‘moveable possessions’, namely items that can be uprooted and moved. The second chapter will discuss in what way the capacity of the possessions to be moved is significant for the Israelites’ cultural identity and to the rights and obligations of its elites. This line of examination is especially evident in *Genesis A* and *Exodus*, where the Israelite people are predominately depicted in migration. The third chapter will discuss the right to possess land and the idea of homeland. The discussion will have moved from the Israelite people in migration to the idea of the Israelite people in settlement and the focus will be on landed possessions. Chapter four will discuss hierarchical relations and focus on the similarities and differences between the master-slave relationship and the lord-retainer relationship in the Junius XI treatments of scriptural narratives. Chapter five will discuss the types of authority the Old English poets of Junius XI added to their scriptural

sources. In this chapter the possessions will frame the social interactions but they themselves will no longer serve as the focus of the examination. This final chapter will complete the discussion by shifting the focus of discussion from possessions as the means of social interactions to authority as an abstract notion, which simultaneously frames social interactions and governs the treatment of possessions themselves within these very interactions.

The thesis will discuss Old English social conceptions as literary ideals which are tied to Christian moral imperatives transformed through their adaptation to the stylistic and traditional traits inherent in Old English poetry. The intent is to assemble a collection of insights rather than to reach a single sweeping conclusion. The details of my approach will be discussed in the “Method” section of this introduction (on p. 40). The underlying test, however, is what insight can be gained by examining social interactions in the poems of Junius XI. I propose that the contribution will not be negligible since interpretation will take into account the implications of form and symbolism of Old English poetry our recently newly gained appreciation of the depths of Christian knowledge among Old English poets (see p. 38), and the development of historical examination of the individual types of possessions (see p. 27).

## **The Sources**

### I. MS Bodleian Junius XI

The discussion of this thesis is focused on narratives contained within a single manuscript. This is why, before discussing scholarship pertaining to possessions and social conceptions under investigation, I will provide general information about the manuscript: its editions, the editions of poems, the issue pertaining to the dating of the manuscript and individual poems, the question of manuscript unity, and finally the scholarship on the poems that relates to my research question.

In 1655, the Dutch scholar Franciscus Junius first published the Junius Manuscript as ‘Cædmon’s Paraphrase.’ He saw it as one long poem. Based

on language and style the general consensus is currently that the collection consists of at least five separate poems, which are the focus of this thesis: *Genesis A*, *Genesis B*, *Exodus*, *Daniel*, and *Christ and Satan*. Benjamin Thorpe published the first readable text of Junius XI in 1832 as *Cædmon's Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures in Anglo-Saxon; with an English Translation, Notes, and a Verbal Index*.<sup>1</sup> The manuscript was next notably examined and described by Sir Israel Gollancz in 1927,<sup>2</sup> George Phillip Krapp in 1931,<sup>3</sup> and more recently in 1996 by Remley<sup>4</sup> who limited his discussion to the Old Testament Narratives making up the so-called *Liber I* and excluding *Christ and Satan*. J. R. Hall was extremely critical of Remley's *Old English Biblical Verse* in his 1999 review though he never reproached him for his knowledge, but rather for the lack of clarity of his argument and a few smaller omissions. Muir's digital edition of Junius XI,<sup>5</sup> contains photographs of the original manuscript, transcriptions, as well as commentary and Kennedy's translations of the Junius XI poems.<sup>6</sup> I used the digital edition as my main source for parsing the narratives because it includes photographs of the actual manuscript in searchable format and afforded me the option to examine the writing and the illustrations.

The scholarship examining the Old Testament poems as a whole has been augmented by editions of individual poems, especially Doane's editions of the *Genesis* poems<sup>7</sup> and Lucas' 1977 edition of *Exodus*.<sup>8</sup> Lucas chronologically

---

<sup>1</sup> First according to Irving, *The Old English Exodus*; B. Thorpe and B. Rogers, *Caedmon's Metrical Paraphrase*.

<sup>2</sup> Gollancz (ed.), *Caedmon Manuscript*.

<sup>3</sup> Krapp (ed.), *The Junius Manuscript*.

<sup>4</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*.

<sup>5</sup> Muir, 'A Digital Facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Junius 11'.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.; Kennedy and Caedmon, *The Caedmon Poems*.

<sup>7</sup> Doane, *Genesis A; The Saxon Genesis*.

<sup>8</sup> Lucas, *Exodus*.

followed Irving's 1953 edition,<sup>9</sup> however Irving continued to develop his scholarship on *Exodus* in several subsequent comments and amendments well into the 1970s.<sup>10</sup> The latest editions of the *Daniel* and *Christ and Satan* poems are Robert Finnegan's *Christ and Satan*<sup>11</sup> and Farrell's *Daniel and Azarias*.<sup>12</sup> Doane's editions of the Genesis poems included commentary on the larger manuscript issues. Though this was not an actual edition of the Junius XI poems, Remley's 1996 *Biblical Verse* critically revised the scholarship on the Old Testament narratives of Junius XI (excluding *Christ and Satan*) including that of the later part of the twentieth century.<sup>13</sup> Finally I must mention the latest addition to the Junius XI publications, Daniel Anlezark's 2011 *Old Testament Narratives* which is useful as a translation of the Old Testament poems of Junius XI with notes to compare with Kennedy's.<sup>14</sup> All the translations of the Junius XI poems featured in the thesis, including those in the Appendix, are from Kennedy's translation of the Junius XI poem, and are occasionally discussed alongside Anlezark's and Bradley's where the discussion calls for comparison.<sup>15</sup> The scriptural passages in the original and translation are taken from the Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Bible.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Irving, *The Old English Exodus*.

<sup>10</sup> Irving, 'New Notes on the Old English Exodus'; E. B. Irving, 'Exodus Retraced'.

<sup>11</sup> Finnegan, *Christ and Satan*.

<sup>12</sup> Farrell (ed.), *Daniel and Azarias*.

<sup>13</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*.

<sup>14</sup> Anlezark, *Old Testament Narratives*.

<sup>15</sup> Kennedy, *The Caedmon Poems*; Bradley, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*; Anlezark, *Old Testament Narratives*.

<sup>16</sup> Weber and Gryson (ed.), *Biblia Sacra Vulgata Editio Quinta*; Challoner (ed.), *Douay-Rheims Bible*. Both are available online at <<http://www.latinvulgate.com>> ['Last accessed 30 August, 2015'].

## II. The Poems: Content and Context

The first poem of the manuscript, *Genesis A*, runs from lines 1 – 234, which describe the creation which is then interrupted by *Genesis B*. The majority of *Genesis A* then takes place after the conclusion of *Genesis B* and runs from line 851 to line 2936, from the expulsion from Eden to the conclusion of the episode of Abraham's sacrifice. Between lines 235 and 850 *Genesis B* is seamlessly interpolated where the expected content of *Genesis A* would be the committal of the original sin. Doane suggests that the scribe was following an extant exemplar which contained the *Genesis A* and *Genesis B* poems already combined; the exemplar necessitated the inclusion because the available version of *Genesis A* at the time was either unreadable or missing.<sup>17</sup>

With its 2312 lines, *Genesis A* is the longest of the Junius XI poems. Its form is more descriptive than that of, for example, *Exodus* or *Christ and Satan*. It follows scripture much more directly than the other poems do. This is why it will be easier to compare its passages relating to possession to scripture.<sup>18</sup> On the whole, this poem lends itself best to comparison with scripture since the similarities between the Vulgate and *Genesis A* are consistently identifiable and so it is easier to spot original additions on the part of the Old English poet. There is also plentiful extant scholarship on possible sources for the poets' additions other than the direct passage of the Vulgate.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, p. 11.

<sup>18</sup> The General consensus seems to be that most poets were well learned in Christian tradition including Irish and Patristic writing, where there were individual books of scripture these were not available in a unit: Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 10. And what there was of scripture was the Latin Vulgate: Biggs, 'An Introduction and Overview of Recent Work', p. 2; Hall, 'Biblical and Patristic Learning', p. 328.

<sup>19</sup> In addition to critical editions of individual poems there are several publications dealing with the possible sources of individual passages, for example: Biggs, Hill; Szarmach, Hammond (eds.), *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*; Calder and Allen (eds.), *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry*; Moore, 'On the Sources of the Old-English "Exodus"'; Battles, 'Genesis A' and the Anglo-Saxon 'Migration Myth'; Hill, 'Pilate's Visionary Wife and the Innocence of Eve'; Johnson, 'The Fall of Lucifer in 'Genesis A' and Two Anglo-Latin Royal Charters'; Raw, 'The Probable Derivation'; Ritter, 'The Angles and the Angels'; Wright, 'The

Genesis B is an Old English adoption of an Old Saxon poem. This has been conclusively proven with the discovery of the Saxon Genesis in the Vatican library in 1894, though Edward Sievers had speculated its existence based on textual analysis in 1875, nineteen years prior.<sup>20</sup> *Genesis B*'s lines are usually counted continuously with *Genesis A*; they run from 235 to 859. I count them in the same way, though consistently mark it *Genesis B* in my discussion. It is a fairly short poem and does not follow scripture, though it includes parts of its narrative. *Genesis B* has been perceived as superior in style in comparison with *Genesis A*.<sup>21</sup> The style is more dramatic, focused on first person speech with added plasticity of characters, and most importantly, it is a much freer interpretation of scripture.

At the centre of the poem are Satan's lament and his pride as the motivator for the leading of Adam and Eve into sin. The poem begins with the creation of Adam and Eve and God's grant of Paradise and its benefits into their possession. Doane viewed the interpolation as a matter of either necessity or choice in order for *Genesis A* to contain the Fall of Man story.<sup>22</sup> The poem's foreign inception did not impact the editor's choice to include it mid-narrative, which is why I have no qualms about using it alongside the other poems of Junius XI. I do however strive to consistently remark which of my conclusions

---

Blood of Abel and the Branches of Sin'; Anlezark, 'Connecting the Patriarchs'; Breeze, 'Habakkuk 1:8 as Source for *Exodus* 161–69'; Bright, 'The Relation of the Cædmonian *Exodus* to the Liturgy'; Cross and Tucker, 'Allegorical Tradition and the Old English *Exodus*'; Earl, 'Christian Traditions and the Old English *Exodus*'; Ferguson, 'The Old English *Exodus* and the Patristic Tradition'; Green, 'Gregory's *Moralia* as an Inspirational Source'; Hall, 'The Building of the Temple'; Hill, 'The Virga of Moses'; Keenan, 'Exodus 513, The Green Streets of Paradise'; Klaeber, 'Concerning the Relation Between *Exodus* and *Beowulf*'; Martin, 'Allegory and the African Woman in the Old English "*Exodus*"; Moore, 'On the Sources of the Old-English "*Exodus*"; Trahern, 'More Scriptural Echoes in the Old English *Exodus*'; Calder and Allen (eds.), *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry*.

<sup>20</sup> Sievers, *Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis*; see also Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*.

<sup>21</sup> Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. 41.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

are tied to *Genesis B* and try to correlate any conclusions with evidence in other poems.

*Exodus* is the shortest of the Junius XI poems and consists of 590 lines of text relating the story of the Israelites' wandering through the desert and crossing the Red Sea. The style of the poem is much less descriptive than that of the *Genesis A* and *Daniel* poems but it contains far more allegory and imagery. *Exodus* also contains two so-called patriarchal digressions in a single continuous block of narrative; one recapitulates the story of Noah's Flood emphasising the ensuing covenant and the other recalls Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Isaac. The emphasis throughout is based on God's promise of future bliss and the hereditary right to the Promised Land. These parts of the narrative were, at various times, proposed to be interpolations but are now generally viewed as an integral part of the poem connecting several of its themes.<sup>23</sup> Early on, the patriarchal ingression was viewed as a disturbance in the poetic flow: Hugo Balg suggested treating the digressions excerpt separately, as *Exodus B*.<sup>24</sup> Alois Brandl also proposed the ingressions be treated as a separate poem; he proposed the title "Noah und andere Patriarchen".<sup>25</sup> Sedgefield did not include the passage in his edition and even criticized Krapp for including it.<sup>26</sup> W. P. Ker called the digression "intolerable," and Charles Kennedy thought it interrupted the poetic sequence of *Exodus*.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Most notably Gollancz proposed to rearrange the three larger parts in a new order: I. Gollancz (ed.), *Caedmon Manuscript*. Brandl listed the Noah episode as a separate independent fragment under the name "Noah und Andere Patriarchen" in Irving, *The Old English Exodus*, p. 8. There is an excellent overview of the issue by Hauer, 'The Patriarchal Digression in the Old English 'Exodus', Lines 362-446'. He, however, belongs among the proponents of the unity theory: Ferguson, 'Noah, Abraham, and the Crossing of the Red Sea'; Anlezark, 'Connecting the Patriarchs'.

<sup>24</sup> Balg, *Der Dichter Caedmon und seine Werke*, pp. 24-7.

<sup>25</sup> Brandl, *Geschichte der altenglischen Literatur*, p. 1029.

<sup>26</sup> Sedgefield, *Specimens of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*; he criticized Krapp in Sedgefield, 'Review: The Junius Manuscript by George Philip Krapp', pp. 352-5.

<sup>27</sup> Ker, *The Dark Ages*, pp. 176. 260-1; Kennedy, *The Earliest English Poetry*.

Even though, as Hauer put it, the rejection by the early scholars can be understood given what was known at the time, he landed on the side of unity.<sup>28</sup> The term digressions remains in use, in spite of Richard Marsden's convincing argument that they are integral to the poem's intended message of the ancient right to the Promised Land, which is attained at the close of the poem and that the term 'digressions' should be replaced with 'ingressions'.<sup>29</sup>

*Daniel* comprises 764 lines. The narrative begins with the enslavement of the Israelites and concludes abruptly with the destruction of the Israelite sacrificial vessels. These are perceived as a part of Solomon's treasure and as belonging to the Israelite people. It follows the Vulgate relatively closely but takes its matter from several of its books. The parts of the Vulgate preceding the beginning of *Daniel* are condensed into a short introduction to the poem's main narrative. *Daniel* also includes a long version of the song of the three Youths in the Furnace, which was proposed to have taken as its source, not the Vulgate, but the Canticle version.<sup>30</sup>

*Christ and Satan* stands out from the other poems. Among other things (see p. 22) it does not treat Old Testament narrative and is not dependent on the Vulgate as a source. The editor, like Ælfric, had no qualms about indiscriminately using New Testament Apocryphal matter such as the Gospel of Nicodemus, which has been identified as a possible source of parts of *Christ and Satan*.<sup>31</sup> Indeed, Old English biblical poetry includes narratives of New Testament Apocrypha just as readily as canonical narrative. According to Biggs, "the Anglo-Saxons would have inherited both an interest in and a distrust of the Apocrypha from the Latin fathers, in particular Jerome and Augustine."<sup>32</sup> In content, however, *Christ and Satan* fits well in the cycle of the

---

<sup>28</sup> Hauer, 'The Patriarchal Digression', p. 78.

<sup>29</sup> Marsden, 'The Death of the Messenger', p. 143.

<sup>30</sup> Steiner, 'Über die Interpolation im angelsächsischen Gedichte 'Daniel'', pp. 21-5.

<sup>31</sup> Hall, 'Ælfric and the Epistle to the Laodicians'; F. M. Biggs, 'An Introduction and Overview of Recent Work', p. 22.

<sup>32</sup> Biggs, 'An Introduction and Overview', p. 11.

Junius XI poems. It presents doomsday as the antithesis to the creation in Genesis and provides catharsis to the transient mortal suffering of the Israelite wanderings of the *Exodus* and *Daniel* poems.

### III. The Date of the Junius XI Manuscript and its Poems

The Junius XI manuscript has not yet conclusively been dated. The manuscript seems to have been thoroughly edited at its creation; the *Liber I* consists of the first four poems that treat Old Testament narratives and excludes *Christ and Satan*, which makes up the entirety of the so-called *Liber II*. It is written in a single insular minuscule hand typical of the late tenth century following a uniform layout, most pages being ruled for twenty-six lines.<sup>33</sup> On palaeographic grounds Ker dated Junius XI to the turn of the eleventh century.<sup>34</sup> Francis Wormald dated the copying of Junius XI to the second quarter of the eleventh century, because of the presence of 'Scandinavian' artwork.<sup>35</sup> Similarly, Doane dated the manuscript to about 1025,<sup>36</sup> as did Lucas.<sup>37</sup> Barbara Raw has stated that some of the illustrations were added later, perhaps as late as 1100-1250.<sup>38</sup> As Remley put it in 1996: "... her comments regarding the prominent display of the volume (possibly on a lectern) thus perhaps suggesting a hitherto unsuspected Anglo-Norman cultivation of Old English verse."<sup>39</sup>

The debate is on-going; in 2002 Leslie Lockett applied integrated analysis to the dating of the manuscript. In her words: "Junius XI has not yet been the

---

<sup>33</sup> Krapp (ed.), *The Junius Manuscript*, p. ix.

<sup>34</sup> Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 334, p. 406.

<sup>35</sup> Wormald, 'Decorated Initials in English Manuscripts from A.D. 900 to 1100'.

<sup>36</sup> Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. 29; Doane, *Genesis A*, pp. 13, 18.

<sup>37</sup> Lucas, *Exodus*.

<sup>38</sup> Raw, 'The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11', p. 199.

<sup>39</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 20.

subject of a thorough, interdisciplinary analysis, and efforts to date it by individual features have produced discrepant results.”<sup>40</sup> She concludes that the Junius XI manuscript collection dates to between 960-990.<sup>41</sup> Doane argues that there may have existed a single exemplar containing *Liber I* without the *Genesis B*, which was added later, its inclusion necessary because the exemplar was in part damaged.<sup>42</sup> The exemplar is conjectured to have existed about a century before the construction of the Junius XI manuscript, which would have the scriptural narratives possibly circulating together in written form throughout the tenth century, though possibly without *Christ and Satan*.<sup>43</sup>

The date of the binding is less pertinent to the scope of this thesis, but it deserves a very short recapitulation just to help us keep in mind the various types of dating involved in examining even a single manuscript. Stoddart dates the current binding to the fifteenth century, a view accepted by Gollanz, Timmer and, more recently, Doane.<sup>44</sup> Doane, writing in 1978, decided for the fifteenth century in spite of having access to Lucas’ (1977) argument for the latest binding dating to 1025-1050.<sup>45</sup> Pacht and Alexander in 1973 proposed that the re-sewing, and so presumably the latest binding, dates to c. 1200. Barbara Raw, based on technical and stylistic evidence, decided on an early thirteenth century date.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Lockett, 'An Integrated Re-examination of the Dating of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11', p.142.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 173.

<sup>42</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, p. 22.

<sup>43</sup> Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, pp. 34, 48-9.

<sup>44</sup> Stoddart, 'The Caedmon Poems in MS Junius 11', p. 158; Gollancz (ed.), *Caedmon Manuscript*, p. xxxv; Timmer, *The Later Genesis*, p. 3; Doane, *Genesis A*, p. 6.

<sup>45</sup> Lucas, *Exodus*, p. 4.

<sup>46</sup> Raw, 'The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11', p. 205.

#### IV. Dating Individual Poems of Junius XI: Issues and Suggestions

Dating is a common problem for Old English poetry, a form which adheres to poetic language and employs standard formulas and set phrases no matter the time of its creation. As Elizabeth Tyler explains, due to the “exceptional stylistic stability of Old English poetics, individual Old English poems are difficult to date and thus to fit into a chronological framework.”<sup>47</sup> The general issues of dating Old English poetry have been explained in detail by Cronan in his 2004 article<sup>48</sup> and are often echoed in relation to dating specific poems.<sup>49</sup> The issues may be recapitulated as follows: the creation of individual poems is an open ended accretive process with no single date or place of composition.<sup>50</sup> Even if parts of poems could be dated, for example on the basis of language, dialect, or terminology for social hierarchies (such as introducing foreign terms denoting ranks either of Danish or Norman origin) this is not proof of the dating of the poem as a whole, or that the poem even was initially composed in the form in which it is preserved today. An illustration of this potential problem, though also proof of the capacity of scholarly examination, is the initial assumption that *Genesis A* and *B* were a single text followed by the identification of *Genesis B* as a separate interpolated and imported poem even before the *Saxon Genesis* was discovered.

The bulk of *Genesis A* is written in a standard mixed poetic dialect<sup>51</sup> and is generally impossible to date as a unit. The *terminus ad quem* proposed by Doane is 1000-25, while he proposes the earliest possible date to be 680; as

---

<sup>47</sup> Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, p. 157.

<sup>48</sup> Cronan, 'Poetic Words, Conservatism and the Dating of Old English Poetry'.

<sup>49</sup> Andersen, *The Battle of Maldon*; Liuzza, 'On the Dating of Beowulf'; Lockett, 'An Integrated Re-examination of the Dating of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11'.

<sup>50</sup> Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, p. 157.

<sup>51</sup> Sisam, 'Dialect Origins of the Earlier Old English Verse'.

Doane notes, this is nothing more than calling it an Old English poem.<sup>52</sup> By proposing that *Genesis A* was included in an exemplar a century before the current binding of Junius XI, Doane implies that the poem existed in written form in the tenth century. A large part of *Genesis A* has been verbally paralleled with the *Beowulf*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* poems. Doane in his edition agrees that *Genesis A* could be contemporaneous with *Beowulf*. However he does not agree with *Beowulf*'s early date.<sup>53</sup>

*Genesis B* was hypothesized to be an interpolation even before the discovery of the Vatican manuscript containing parts of the actual Old Saxon Genesis in 1894.<sup>54</sup> According to Doane, the poem's latest editor, the Old English *Genesis B* was included in an exemplar for the Junius XI, which was at least a century older than Junius XI.<sup>55</sup> Doane leans on codicological evidence to refute Timmer's hypothesis that *Genesis B* was interpolated only at the time of the copying of Junius XI.<sup>56</sup> He also argues against the late tenth-century date of the *Genesis B* translation which had been proposed by Gordon Hall, Robert Pribsch, and Thomas Ohlgren who based their individual cases on extralinguistic analysis.<sup>57</sup> Doane convincingly explains the process by which the Old Saxon *Genesis* was translated, or as he phrases it, 'inscribed', retaining many original words with some words shortened to fit Old English metre. He views Old Saxon as intelligible to the Old English audience and states that the poem circulated in Anglo-Saxon England as early as 900, possibly even 850. Finally he points out that even if the poem was included in order to stand in for scriptural matter which had been either corrupted in an

---

<sup>52</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, pp. 36-7.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>54</sup> Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. ix.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>56</sup> Timmer, *The Later Genesis*, pp. 14-15.

<sup>57</sup> Hall, 'The Transmission and Date of Genesis B'; Pribsch, *The Heliand Manuscript Cotton Calligula A. VII in the British Museum*, p. 40; Ohlgren, 'Some New Light on the Old English Cædmonian Genesis', pp. 61-62; Doane, *Genesis A*, pp. 34, 49.

exemplar or somehow not deemed sufficient, this does not address the question of how and in what way the Old Saxon poem came to circulate in Anglo-Saxon England in the first place.<sup>58</sup>

For the original composition of *Exodus* an early date and similarity with *Beowulf* have been proposed by Lucas who dated the poems to 700-800,<sup>59</sup> disagreeing with Irving who favoured the late seventh or early eighth century.<sup>60</sup> The poem exhibits a sense of unity and consistent form which is why there have been attempts in the past to find a single source for the poem; in the late nineteenth century Groth and Mürkens proposed *De Transitu Maris Rubri*, written in the fifth century by Avitus, Bishop of Vienne.<sup>61</sup> However, as Irving reports, in 1911 Samuel Moore demolished every one of Mürkens' arguments.<sup>62</sup> Lucas, the latest editor, sees "the Christian tradition in which the poem must have been written" as the real source of the poem; he then points to three elements of the Christian tradition which were in his opinion the source for *Exodus*: the Bible, scriptural commentary, and the liturgy.<sup>63</sup> Alternative dates have not been proposed by later scholarship, which can be seen as another testament to the difficulty of dating Old English poems.

Similarly the dating of *Daniel* has largely been left unaddressed ever since Kemp Malone suggested an origin in early eighth-century Northumbria.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, pp. 49-54.

<sup>59</sup> Lucas, *Exodus*, p. 71.

<sup>60</sup> Irving, *The Old English Exodus*, pp. 23-5; Irving, 'Exodus Retraced', p. 209; Irving, 'On the Dating of the Old English Poems Genesis and Exodus'.

<sup>61</sup> Groth, 'Composition und Alter der altenglischen (angelsächsischen) Exodus'; Mürkens, *Untersuchungen über das altenglische Exoduslied*.

<sup>62</sup> Moore, 'On the Sources of the Old-English "Exodus"'; Irving, *The Old English Exodus*, p. 13.

<sup>63</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, pp. 53-8.

<sup>64</sup> Malone, 'The Old English Period (to 1000)'.

Farrell's latest edition of the poem never proposed a date at all.<sup>65</sup> As Doane reasoned, while previous editors had the freedom to construct "elaborate and confident conclusions about the composition and homes of their poems," Kenneth Sisam's seminal 1959 article, 'Dialect Origins of the Earlier Old English Verse' made it difficult for later scholars to attempt the same by pointing out that it is impossible to distinguish which preserved layers can be discerned in poems in a single existing copy.<sup>66</sup> The poem's abrupt termination, and the absence of a note *finit Liber I*, which would balance out the note penned in at the end of *Christ and Satan: finit Liber II. Amen*, have been used to argue that *Daniel* in its current form is incomplete;<sup>67</sup> Krapp maintained that there was probably a loss in the manuscript, though he suggested that it was improbable that the Junius XI manuscript ever contained a paraphrase of the entire scriptural Book of *Daniel*, even if such a paraphrase existed elsewhere.<sup>68</sup>

*Christ and Satan* stands out from the manuscript in several ways. Physical differences, the layout, handwriting and size of folia demonstrate that the inclusion of this poem was not simultaneous with the others; Lucas proposed that *Christ and Satan* was previously a separate booklet which circulated autonomously before being added and bound into the Junius XI manuscript.<sup>69</sup> This would also account for *Daniel's* abrupt ending.<sup>70</sup> Barbara Raw disagreed;

---

<sup>65</sup> Farrell (ed.), *Daniel and Azarias*.

<sup>66</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, p. 25; he is recapitulating Sisam, 'Dialect Origins of the Earlier Old English Verse', pp. 119-39.

<sup>67</sup> Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, p. 407; Hall, 'The Oldest English Epic of Redemption', p. 186; Lucas, 'On the Incomplete Ending of Daniel and the Addition of Christ and Satan to MS Junius 11', p. 52; Raw, 'The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11', pp. 187-207; Krapp (ed.), *The Junius Manuscript*.

<sup>68</sup> Krapp (ed.), *The Junius Manuscript*, pp. xxxi-xxxiii.

<sup>69</sup> Lucas, 'On the Incomplete Ending'. A more detailed description of the physical evidence to the poems late inclusion can be found in: Raw, 'The Construction', pp. 202-3; Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, pp. 21-22.

<sup>70</sup> Lucas, 'On the Incomplete Ending'.

according to her *Christ and Satan* was already included at the time the manuscript was re-bound in its current binding in the thirteenth century.<sup>71</sup> She adds that the manuscript was still being read in the 12<sup>th</sup> century.

Like *Exodus*, *Christ and Satan* has no identified single source though Wright has suggested Irish influences; the *Christ and Satan* poet, like the *Exodus* poet, composed using a vast and varied knowledge of Christian lore.<sup>72</sup> The central issue has long been the question of the poem's unity, resulting in a scholarly debate as to whether *Christ and Satan* is a collection of excerpts, or a single poem.<sup>73</sup> In 1925 Gollancz, agreeing with Clubb's assessment that the poem was a unit and the work of a single poet, divided it in two thematic parts: 'the lament of the fallen angels' and 'the harrowing of hell' and added that there was a third 'afterthought' which he dubbed 'the temptation'.<sup>74</sup> More recently, in 1977, Finnegan argued convincingly for a single poem in the only recent critical edition of *Christ and Satan*; by way of homiletic Anglo-Saxon analogues, he presented a thematic dramatic structure in three parts as purposefully developing Christ's character from omnipotent to a more relatable human character.<sup>75</sup>

### **Manuscript Unity and Instructional Intent**

The poems in Junius XI may be studied not only in isolation, but as a compilation selected by an editorial hand at the time of copying. There is evidence of some coherence of theme and purpose, which will be explored in this section. Scholarship has identified several unifying and common traits in

---

<sup>71</sup> Raw, 'The Construction', pp. 203-5.

<sup>72</sup> Krapp (ed.), *The Junius Manuscript*, p. xxxv; Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, p. 130.

<sup>73</sup> Clubb, *Christ and Satan an Old English Poem*; Finnegan, *Christ and Satan*; Sleeth, *Studies in Christ and Satan*.

<sup>74</sup> Clubb, *Christ and Satan*, p. xlvii; I. Gollancz (ed.), *Caedmon Manuscript*, p. cv.

<sup>75</sup> Finnegan, *Christ and Satan*, pp. 22-36.

theme, content, theology, and even use and intent of the poems at their inclusion into the manuscript; as early as 1912, Bright argued that the first three poems of Junius XI were intended for use in the liturgical service for Holy Saturday. He excluded *Christ and Satan* from his proposed typological series, noting that it was an unplanned later addition.<sup>76</sup> He was quickly opposed by Gollancz in 1927,<sup>77</sup> and in 1996 by Remley.<sup>78</sup> In 1974 Rendall based part of his argument proposing common elements between *Exodus* and the Harrowing of Hell of *Christ and Satan*.<sup>79</sup> In 1977 Lucas joined Bright in interpreting the *heofoncandel* as the paschal candle, which he saw as further evidence for the intended liturgical use of the manuscript as a whole.<sup>80</sup> Barbara Raw concurred in 1978.<sup>81</sup> Recently, in 2005, Anlezark stated that only the section of the patriarchal narrative in *Exodus* relating the sacrifice of Isaac “suggests the possibility of a direct connection to the Easter readings”,<sup>82</sup> while in 2006, Lapidge generally agreed that in Junius XI there is an emphasis on the baptismal symbolism.<sup>83</sup> The prevailing view purports that at least the *Liber I* collection of Junius XI poems was a larger purposefully assembled unit intended for specific use, while *Christ and Satan* was added later, either by design or simply to fill a perceived void in the dramaturgical arch from creation to doomsday.

---

<sup>76</sup> Bright, 'The Relation of the Cædmonian Exodus to the Liturgy'.

<sup>77</sup> Gollancz (ed.), *Caedmon Manuscript*.

<sup>78</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 173.

<sup>79</sup> Rendall, 'Bondage and Freeing from Bondage in Old English Religious Poetry', p. 508.

<sup>80</sup> Lucas, *Exodus*, p. 50.

<sup>81</sup> Raw, *The Art and Background*, pp. 1, 84.

<sup>82</sup> Anlezark, 'Connecting the Patriarchs', p. 172.

<sup>83</sup> Lapidge, 'Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages', p. 16.

There are no titles or paragraphs to disturb the flow of the verse. If read aloud divided according to the liturgical cycle,<sup>84</sup> and readings during lent,<sup>85</sup> the verse could have been read in topical clusters, making it still more difficult for the audience to perceive the individual poems as autonomous. Even if the clusters were a mere similarity, as argued by Irving,<sup>86</sup> reading the poems by parts, even out of sequence, would make the specific dissimilarities of individual poems even less likely to be able to shine through or to appear relevant to a listener. If read out loud in clusters, the narrative of the manuscript would appear much more uniform and monolithic than if read to oneself, poem by poem, as the narratives are divided today.

In addition to their thematic unity, the scriptural paraphrases of Junius XI are also appropriate for my purposes because of their instructional nature and their inherent potential to relate the ideals of social conduct that they are trying to instil in its audience.<sup>87</sup> The mere fact that scriptural narrative was adapted to the Old English poetic genre, rather than simply translated, points to the existence of an instructional intent. The Junius XI poems belong to a greater and older Anglo-Saxon tradition of scriptural instruction through vernacular genres. As early as Bede, separate vernacular texts had been composed for the instruction of the unlearned: "Bede saw the great importance of the use of the vernacular for basic instruction in the faith and provided ignorant priests with his own English translations of the creed and the Lord's Prayer".<sup>88</sup> In England four codices mostly versifying biblical stories

---

<sup>84</sup> The idea was first presented in 1912 in Bright, 'The Relation of the Cædmonian Exodus to the Liturgy'.

<sup>85</sup> Raw, 'The Construction'.

<sup>86</sup> Irving, *The Old English Exodus*, p. 1.

<sup>87</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 43.

<sup>88</sup> Day, 'The Influence of the Catechetical *Narratio* on Old English and Some Other Medieval Literature', p. 55. The four codices are: The 'MS Bodleian Junius XI', 'Cotton MS Vitellius A XV' (i.e. 'The Nowell Codex', sometimes informally referred to as the 'Beowulf Manuscript'), 'Exeter Cathedral Library MS 3501' (i.e. 'The Exeter Book'), 'Codex Vercellensis' (i.e. 'The Vercelli Book').

which were written in late tenth and early eleventh century “represent a much larger and more accomplished body of vernacular poetry than survives on the Continent”.<sup>89</sup> This large body contains scripture which is reframed to the Anglo-Saxon social and cultural environment; it is also presents scriptural matter in a much more dramatic and entertaining way.

Over sixty years ago Hardin Craig alluded to the question of the instructional intent of vernacular paraphrases in discussing the Corpus Christi cycle drama: “It is evident that a parallel exists between the cycles of plays and the great religious epics of the Middle Ages”.<sup>90</sup> Woolf emphasises that “whilst the cycles were consciously designed, the authors were not primarily moved by liturgical considerations. Far more important was the intention of instructing the unlearned”.<sup>91</sup> The poems of Junius XI often add dramatization to the scriptural narrative. This results in a similar didactic effect of combining scriptural narrative with vernacular entertainment and its familiar forms. Remley believed that the “Junius poems may be viewed as reflexes of Anglo-Saxon methods of biblical instruction”.<sup>92</sup> Conner as late as 2008 shared the same view but elaborated that apart from themselves being didactic, the poems are already based on didactic materials achieving a tradition of belief.<sup>93</sup> Conner dubs them “doctrinal religious poems” and compares them to heroic and battle poetry in the way they speak to the minds of all audiences. He goes on to define the poems by quoting Certeau as “situated on the side of relaxation.”<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Abrams, 'Germanic Christianities, 600-c. 1100', p. 127.

<sup>90</sup> Hall, 'The Oldest English Epic of Redemption', p. 189; he is referencing Craig, 'The Origin of the Old Testament Plays', p. 482.

<sup>91</sup> Woolf, *The English Mystery Plays*, p. 75.

<sup>92</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 43.

<sup>93</sup> Conner, 'Religious Poetry', p. 260.

<sup>94</sup> Certeau and T. Conley, *The Writing of History*, pp. 273-4.

## **The Scholarship of Possessions, Rights, and Obligations**

### I. Scholarship Using Old English Literary Sources

The rights and obligations of possession fall primarily under the purview of history. Themes of these discussions that are most relevant to this thesis include Anglo-Saxon social hierarchy, various types of moveable possessions, land tenure, slavery, and legal concepts. My discussion will focus on interpreting poetic passages and comparing them to their scriptural sources and analogues. I will therefore discuss literary scholarship on social themes as well as symbolism and allegorical subtext tied to possessions within individual poems of Junius XI.

I will also discuss Anglo-Saxon historical scholarship to identify the main issues of rights and obligations relative to individual types of possession. Historical discussions of social interactions, rights and obligations are usually not dependent on poetic sources though occasionally, depending on the object of historical examination, the poems provide the needed context. For example, Barbara Rosenwein has included poetry in her examination of emotions in history adding that even historical sources in Anglo-Saxon England are often literary in nature; she demonstrated that the context of literature can be invaluable to our understanding of the history of emotions.<sup>95</sup> The purpose of the final chapter of this thesis is similar. Even though the conceptions of social relations and possessions are at first glance more static and objective than emotions, our understanding of their social context should benefit from a literary narrative context, especially where the narrative has been adapted to the cultural environment of the audience. Anglo-Saxon historians also occasionally use poetry to support conclusions from other sources. I will give examples of scholarship discussing treatment of individual types of possessions and social interactions below beginning with the closest approaches to my own, namely those that focus primarily on poetry.

---

<sup>95</sup> Rosenwein, 'Worrying About Emotions in History', p. 825.

The approach most relatable to the focus of my subsequent chapter is Elizabeth Tyler's in her *Old English Poetics*.<sup>96</sup> Much of her discussion has proved applicable in my research; she included poems from Junius XI in her discussion and also systematically enumerated and discussed individually named possessions that comprise or represent treasure. Her systematic distinctions will be used as a point of departure for my discussion of the significance of treasure as a common denominator of a cultural unit of people as well as a device of social stratification (Chapter 2, starting on p. 45). She chose to focus on treasure in part because it can be historicized in the context of social, political, as well as artistic and economic changes in the long Anglo-Saxon period.<sup>97</sup> Like her I think it useful that items comprising treasure can be compared to the archaeological and written record. The same rationale can be extended to my examination of landed possessions and, at least where written record is concerned, possession of slaves. Her discussion analysed the place of treasure within Old English verse and defined it as a poetic convention. She then turned to the vocabulary of treasure, discussing five terms individually: *maðm*, *hord*, *gestreon*, *sinc*, and *frætwe*.<sup>98</sup> Her terminological framework will prove helpful in my own examination of moveable possessions as indicative of the accumulation of treasure, especially where I will construct a discussion of the significance of inherited treasure, in bestowal, and in exchange. This thesis will not discuss treasure as a stylistic convention, instead a part of the subsequent chapter will build on her interpretation of the nature of treasure. It will examine treasure in its capacity to co-define cultural traits of the Israelite people within the narratives of the Junius XI poems.

Elizabeth Tyler elsewhere pointed out the link between treasure, and cultural identity as well as its social implications in discussing Ædward's treasure in

---

<sup>96</sup> Tyler, *Old English Poetics*.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 25-37, collocations on pp. 38-101.

the eleventh-century *Vita Ædwardi Regis*.<sup>99</sup> The genre of *vita* has characteristics of a historical source, but also elements of literary writing (for example, it can be written in verse). My examination of biblical poems also taps into two different areas: on the one hand biblical narrative, which may be remote from an Anglo-Saxon experience, but on the other, is also steeped in Anglo-Saxon literary traditions (such as typescenes, formulas, word compounds, and typical imagery). The poems of Junius XI were imbued with Old English formulaic and symbolic subtext bringing them closer to the *vita*, while the *vita* is strongly Christian and dipped in allegory which brings its style closer to the poems of Junius XI. Therefore I find Elizabeth Tyler's discussion of the cultural and social significance of treasure entirely applicable to my own discussion of the Junius XI poems. She reviews the role of treasure in gift-giving as an idealized mode of governance in poetic sources;<sup>100</sup> she discusses the Scandinavian traits of Edward's golden ships as part of his treasure and demonstrates how such possessions can contribute to the depiction of cultural identity and political emphasis;<sup>101</sup> finally she reviews the lavishness of dress which Edward rejects as either indicative of foreign cultural identity or improper non-ecclesiastical display. My discussion is informed by Tyler's above discussion of governance and cultural identity in relation to treasure.

Aside from the cultural and social significance, the notion of treasure also contains a theological aspect. Timothy Reuter's discussion of the role of treasure in tenth-century medieval governance is informative about the significance of the notion of treasure in medieval Christian thought. He reviewed the notion of treasure as a theological category and discussed the difference between the scriptural treatment of heavenly treasure as a positive representation of wealth and the amassing of valuables as a reprehensible act.<sup>102</sup> He further argued that the distinction between spiritual and amassed

---

<sup>99</sup> Tyler, "When Wings Incarnadine with Gold Are Spread".

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 86-90.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 90-99.

<sup>102</sup> Reuter, 'You Can't Take It with You', pp. 11-12.

physical treasure is evident from the fact that elites in Europe in the middle ages would “invest” (in their wills) their fortunes in monasteries, for the good of their souls.<sup>103</sup> The distinction between spiritual treasure as marker of cultural identity and material treasure as marker of political influence and social status will be correlated to the evidence of the Junius XI poems in the second chapter with a view to pointing out where the two categories overlap (p. 45-62).

In the second part of the second chapter (pp. 62-70) I will review the moral implications expressed by the Junius XI poets concerning the exchange of moveable possessions for services. This discussion is influenced by Godden’s article ‘Money, Power, and Morality in Anglo-Saxon England’ which examines the attitudes towards money and payment exhibited in scriptural instruction, for example Alfred’s introduction to *Boethius* or Ælfric’s homilies. Godden links the ideal of poverty in late tenth- and eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon England to the monetary economy where a shift from an economy largely based on bullion or exchange to a nascent coin-based fiscal system influenced the Christian doctrine concerning wealth.<sup>104</sup> In discussing the concept of wealth and its implication for governance he demonstrates the change through the evolution of the Old English word *rice* and shows how the central emphasis of *rice* shifts from a meaning of (political) ‘power’ in *Beowulf*, to meaning both ‘power’ and ‘wealth’ in the ninth-century Old English version of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*, to denoting benefits tied to wealth in Ælfric’s homilies.<sup>105</sup> The second half of his article then constructs a review of the morality of amassing wealth in late Anglo-Saxon Christian writing. He reviews Ælfric’s position, wherein distinction by wealth was a natural occurrence but it was the responsibility of the rich to share the wealth. The amassing of wealth, according to Godden, is morally questionable which Ælfric addresses by

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>104</sup> Godden, ‘Money, Power and Morality in Late Anglo-Saxon England’.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., pp. 41-54.

finding justifications for the rich.<sup>106</sup> Barbara Rosenwein comments that in the tenth and eleventh centuries the attention to the moral implications of actions were shifting from the external act to the inner intention; not merely actions but already intentions could be sinful.<sup>107</sup> In discussing the moral implications of the exchange of goods for services (see pp. 62-71) I will discuss how the Junius XI poems, in particular *Genesis B* and *Daniel*, reflect this 'awakening of the conscience.'<sup>108</sup>

Possessions exchanged in a social context can also symbolise rank or station within social hierarchy. The historical and archaeological scholarship both discuss these possession exchanges within the framework of 'heriot', "a death-due which originated in the return of the weapons with which a lord had outfitted his man."<sup>109</sup> The two disciplines view it as a device of lordship in forming their following. My discussion of the role of swords and types of dress in determining social hierarchy must and will take into account the general currents of historical debate concerning heriot. The debate began by discerning whether soldiery was in various periods of the Anglo-Saxon military history reserved for the elites or a mass levy or even both.<sup>110</sup> The discussion was recapitulated by R. P. Abels, who began by discussing the notion of a generally conscripted military force and noted Stenton's adherence to the view of the military service as an obligation of lower social ranks.<sup>111</sup> He also discusses the opposing views of Chadwick, Maitland and Vinogradoff.<sup>112</sup> In

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., p. 59.

<sup>107</sup> Rosenwein and Little, 'Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities', p. 19.

<sup>108</sup> The term was coined by Chenu, *L'éveil de la conscience dans la civilisation médiévale*.

<sup>109</sup> Abels, 'Heriot'.

<sup>110</sup> Stafford, 'King and Kin, Lord and Community'; Brooks, 'Arms, Status and Warfare in Late Anglo-Saxon England'; Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England*.

<sup>111</sup> Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 117-19; Stenton, Sir, *Anglo-Saxon England*.

<sup>112</sup> Chadwick, *Studies on Anglo-Saxon institutions*, pp. 158-62; Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, pp. 156-61; Vinogradoff, *English Society in the Eleventh Century*, pp. 22-38, 74-89.

Junius XI the notions of military obligation are often tied to the oath of loyalty accompanied by bestowal of moveable possessions. This thesis will examine hierarchical relation both by discussing the category of loyalty and the significance of items bestowed as part of the reciprocal agreement between lord and follower.

Whilst the poems only touch on heriot and military obligation tangentially, the notion of loyalty and obedience to one's lord was often the focus of scholars discussing the poems of Junius XI. Peter Lucas examined the notions of loyalty and obedience in the poems *Genesis A* and *Genesis B*; he discussed Noah's and Abraham's obedience to God which he tied to the Covenant as an agreement of rights and obligations on the part of the patriarchs.<sup>113</sup> Brockmann, on the other hand, argued that the sources *Genesis A*, even those often ascribed to what he called the 'heroic ethos', stemmed from scripture. He viewed the Old English secular content not as opposed to scripture but as coexisting with it.<sup>114</sup> His examination of secular social topoi of the Cain and Abel episode will inform my examination of the role of possessions in the exile of Cain and other instances of exile where the exiled are dispossessed of possessions as part of the dissolution of an agreement of mutual rights and obligations (see p. 182).

The dissolution of a lord-retainer agreement will also be discussed in relation to the fall of Lucifer as depicted by *Genesis B*. Cherniss discussed how scriptural matter in *Genesis B* is informed by vernacular style, cultural allegiances and preconceptions of the author while tying the narrative to the historical realities of the time of the poem's translation at the time of King Alfred or slightly after around 900.<sup>115</sup> Like Cherniss, I will form a part of my argument about hierarchical relationships and the freedom of choosing a lord

---

<sup>113</sup> Lucas, 'Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis'.

<sup>114</sup> Brockman, 'Heroic' and 'Christian' in *Genesis A*'.

<sup>115</sup> Cherniss, 'Heroic Ideals and the Moral Climate of *Genesis B*'; the time of King Alfred was proposed by Timmer, *The Later Genesis*, p. 43. Doane proposes the same date in Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. 54.

by focusing on references to the possession of items, people and authority at the heart of what is essentially Lucifer's failed coup d'état in *Genesis B* (see p. 131).<sup>116</sup> Unlike Cherniss, who focuses on the heroic ethos and direct social interactions, I will focus on rights and obligations within hierarchical relations observed through the exchange of possessions featured in the poem.

In addition to moveable exchanged possessions, land also figures in the workings of a lord-retainer agreement. I will discuss rights and obligations tied to landed possessions in the narrative of Junius XI poems in my fourth chapter. It was H. J. Berman who provided the primary guideline for my discussion of landed possessions in the social context of the poems of Junius XI; he noted in the middle ages land was not owned by anyone but that it was held by superiors in a ladder of tenures leading to the supreme lord. In the poems of Junius XI this lord was God.<sup>117</sup>

Recently Scott Smith discussed landed possessions in various sources;<sup>118</sup> he examines representations the vocabulary of land tenure in Latin diplomas, charters, legal, philosophical and homiletic texts, and finally poetry. His approach is beneficial to my examination because he includes poetry among his sources. In his chapter five he discusses poetic appearances of terms tied to land-tenure, among them are *eðelriht*, which he defines as ancestral land with hereditary right, and *landriht* ['a right to land']. He juxtaposes the acquisition of land in *Guthlac A* as a "transformative and salvatory experience" with the use of the same compound in *Deor* where he sees the loss of land as erasure of social identity.<sup>119</sup> Smith notes that *landriht* in *Beowulf* is held

---

<sup>116</sup> I will use other articles pertaining to the social hierarchy of *Genesis B*, for example: Cherewatuk, 'Standing, Turning, Twisting, Falling'; Evans, 'Genesis B and its Background'; Lucas, 'Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis and the Interpolation of Genesis B into Genesis A'.

<sup>117</sup> Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 312; his notion came to my attention in Reynolds, 'Bookland, Folkland and Fiefs', p. 212.

<sup>118</sup> Smith, *Land and Book*.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 173-4, 99-200.

collectively and sees the loss of *landriht* as an erasure of an entire people; he notes in passing that in *Genesis A* and *Exodus* *landriht* is also communal, however he does not discuss these two Junius XI poems at length.<sup>120</sup> His connection of what I call cultural identity with the right to a homeland will be discussed in my third chapter which deals with social implications linked to landed possessions, however my discussion will be focused on the evidence of the poems of Junius XI.

The question of communal land has been the subject of some debate by historians, particularly in connection to the division between the terms *bocland* and *folcland*. The debate concerning *bocland* and *folcland* spans a century during which time it has been greatly transformed and finally largely discarded; early on, Vinogradoff in his discussion of the notion of communal property put great emphasis on the term *folcland* itself.<sup>121</sup> Vinogradoff was, according to Kennedy, reviving a view “supported by most scholars until the publication of John Allen’s *Inquiry into the Rise and Growth of the Royal Prerogative*” in 1830.<sup>122</sup> Maitland adopted Vinogradoff’s negation of the notion of communal property and systematically explained the term in the context of the documents containing it and presented an evolution of a legal notion of “national land.

Maitland’s contention that ‘book-land’ is contrasted with ‘folk-land’<sup>123</sup> now has to be viewed in concert with other proposed definitions of *folcland* as well as with the notion that *folcland* may not be an extremely important category in the first place. Already in 1933 Turner proposed that *folcland* could refer to the land of the crown other than King’s personal property; as such it would serve

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., pp. 199-200.

<sup>121</sup> Vinogradoff, 'Folkland', p. 11.

<sup>122</sup> Kennedy, 'Disputes About Boland', p. 176; Allen, *Inquiry into the Rise and Growth of the Royal Prerogative*. The notion that *folcland* marks public land is also supported by John, *Land Tenure in Early England*; John, *Orbis Britanniae*.

<sup>123</sup> Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 244.

to provide maintenance of the army and finance the affairs of the realm.<sup>124</sup> More recently Wormald proposed that *folcland* simply stood for land other than *bocland*.<sup>125</sup> Susan Reynolds notes that there exist only five texts where *folcland* is mentioned, of these *The Wife's Lament* uses it to refer to the general notion of country, she notes citing the *Microfiche Concordance*.<sup>126</sup> Hudson also takes into account the scarcity of appearances of *folcland* and proceeds to draw our attention to several other existing Old English compounds which complicate the discussion of types of landed possessions: *earningaland* or *erninglond* ('land held for services'), *frelond* ('free land'), and *heregeatland* ('heriot land'), *geneatsland*, *thegnland*, *bisceopa land*, and *preostaland*. Joined by so many terms closely defining the types of rights and obligations to land, it is impossible to submit to the division between land held by book and a land freely used by the general public.<sup>127</sup>

Still scholars may at times facilitate their discussion by employing the categories of *folcland* and *bocland* in their discussions. For example Scott Smith based his survey of correlations between historical and literary attitudes towards land-ownership on a tripartite division of bookland, folkland, and loan-land.<sup>128</sup> Since the terminology is problematic I will not employ the category of *folcland* in my review of the rights and obligations pertaining to landed possessions. Nevertheless, the underlying notion of communal land tenure will be examined as an expression of the people's right to a homeland. This notion of *patria* or homeland will be reviewed in concert with the notion of security provided by the granting lord. The notion of land in the Junius XI poems often inextricably binds the allegorical significance of the Promised

---

<sup>124</sup> Turner, 'Bookland and Folkland'.

<sup>125</sup> Wormald, 'On ða Wæpnedhealfe', p. 267. See also Baxter and Blair, 'Land Tenure and Royal Patronage in the Early English Kingdom', pp. 18-23.

<sup>126</sup> Reynolds, 'Bookland, Folkland and Fiefs'; Healey, Venezky, Dictionary of Old English Project, *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English*.

<sup>127</sup> Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*, pp. 103-6.

<sup>128</sup> Smith, *Land and Book*, pp. 18-20.

Land with the tangible notion of homeland as a consequence of binding oral contract between a lord (God) and his people, rather than merely a vision of allegorical promise (more on allegorical significance of land on pp. 72-84), so much so that Remley noted that the informing theme of *Exodus's* patriarchal narratives is the land-right of the Israelites.<sup>129</sup>

The focus of the fourth chapter will be on people as objects of social exchange in the same way as chapters two and three will have focused on moveable (p. 45) and landed (p. 72) possessions. Among people as objects of hierarchical exchange, slaves are at the bottom of the framework of rights and obligations. I will show that the literary context of the poems of Junius XI is useful for the examination of Anglo-Saxon slavery in context because the poets have a tendency to adapt biblical social hierarchies in their own ways while retaining and even elaborating the discussion of scriptural slaves (p. 112). Pelteret's seminal examination of Anglo-Saxon slavery refers to literary sources for context of other sources, albeit briefly.<sup>130</sup> He concluded that the disappearance of Anglo-Saxon slavery, though brought about by several factors, was primarily the consequence of the higher cost of keeping slaves than of having free dependants.<sup>131</sup> This view has been challenged by Wyatt, who deemed the economic factors as much less significant than Pelteret; Wyatt also argued that slavery was more common in late Anglo-Saxon England than Pelteret would have us believe.<sup>132</sup> However, Wyatt's focus on the combined evidence of Anglo-Saxon, Irish, and Scandinavian slavery allowed him less space for the examination of literary evidence; he introduces *Beowulf* only.<sup>133</sup> Pelteret, on the other hand, has been able to include a larger portion of Old English poetic evidence including *Genesis A, B, Exodus*, and *Christ and Satan*. Pelteret's approach is therefore more easily correlated to

---

<sup>129</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 229.

<sup>130</sup> Pelteret, 'Slavery in Anglo-Saxon England'; Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*.

<sup>131</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*.

<sup>132</sup> Wyatt, *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland*, pp. 26-35.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 182-87.

this thesis. I will discuss Pelteret in more detail in the introduction to my fourth chapter (pp. 112-114). I will build on his definition of slavery to define how the poems of Junius XI frame not only the rank of slave but other hierarchical ranks as well.

My discussion of the significance of possessions in the frame of rights and obligations will culminate in the review of authority as a social conception (in the fifth chapter see pp. 148-192). The defining scholarship on the exertion of authority lies in the domain of legal history and is not usually critically discussed by literary scholars. Anglo-Saxon legal scholarship dealing with jurisdiction typically does not focus on poetic sources, and to my knowledge no work has discussed jurisdiction or authority specifically in the poems of Junius XI. This is why I will focus on scholarship focused on more general aspects of the exertion of authority. To that effect, Barabara Rosenwein's book *Negotiating Space*, which discusses the wider geographical area of medieval Europe,<sup>134</sup> provides valuable background for the understanding of how rights work in different social contexts. She discusses rights and obligations in her evaluation of the notion of immunity of residential space and personal immunity in medieval Europe as types of freedom tied to the authority as well as protection of various lords. My examination of security will frame rights in a similar way, as a reflection of peace and freedom guaranteed by a lord (pp. 160-169). Rosenwein discusses examples from all of medieval Europe and also points to the development of certain immunities in specific parts. Though she discusses Anglo-Saxon England at the outset of her final chapter, her discussion is focused on immunities in the narrowest sense and serves as a short link between the wider discussion of European medieval immunities and modern day immunities in the English-speaking world. Therefore, for the examination of specifically Anglo-Saxon legal conceptions of the basis of authority and jurisdiction I will complement her approach with the more specialised scholarship on Anglo-Saxon law.

My examination of the Anglo-Saxon exertion of authority will strongly benefit from scholarship on Anglo-Saxon legal historical views of jurisdiction, and

---

<sup>134</sup> Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*.

rights and obligations. In places my discussion of the literary context of authority will refer to Patrick Wormald's exhaustive examination of legal conceptions, ideals and representations.<sup>135</sup> I will also refer to Hudson's entries on jurisdictions and types of authority.<sup>136</sup> These are more general in nature and ordered by topic and chronology and thus easier to relate to literary matter. I will adapt Hudson's subdivision of jurisdiction into the categories of personal jurisdiction (based on personal relationships) and legal jurisdiction (based on grants through written medium or intermediaries) to the wider notion of authority and distinguish between personal and legal authority (Hudson's distinction is discussed on p. 161).<sup>137</sup>

## II. The Literary Scholarship of Allegory and the Interpretation of Possessions as Markers of Social Exchanges in the Junius XI Poems

Literary scholarship has identified several instances of allegorical subtext of the scriptural narrative of the poems of Junius XI. This has resulted in a much greater appreciation of the theological knowledge of the poets than was previously acknowledged. For example, in 1974 Irving retracted his own statement from 1953, noting that the *Exodus* poet was better versed in Christian doctrine than he previously thought.<sup>138</sup> This is an excellent illustration of the shift of respect for Old English poets' knowledge of scripture and understanding of scriptural allegory. Several scholars have presented cases for inclusion of distinctly profound allegorical readings of individual excerpts from Old English poetry.<sup>139</sup> In discussing appearances of possession in the

---

<sup>135</sup> Wormald, *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West*; P. Wormald, *The Making of English Law*.

<sup>136</sup> Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>138</sup> Irving, 'Exodus Retraced', p. 209. Commenting on: Irving, *The Old English Exodus*.

<sup>139</sup> Lapidge, 'Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages', pp. 11-40; M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature 900-1066*; M. Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England', pp. 33-89; M. Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library*; R. Marsden, *The text of the Old Testament in Anglo-*

poems of Junius XI allegorical readings must therefore be taken into consideration; this way the additions to the biblical narrative made by the Old English poets are discussed within the context of an Old English Christian culture rather than, as was often interpreted in the nineteenth century, as part of a covert pagan literary production.<sup>140</sup> In addition, the allegorical symbolism of possessions within a social exchange can illuminate the side of social structure which was in the minds of the audience inextricably linked to religious categories. Of the several allegorical interpretations of the Junius XI poems some can shed light on the role of possessions in social exchanges. However, due to the scriptural nature of the text and the instructional intent of the manuscript (on instructional intent see p. 23), such social implications will here be cautiously approached as ideals.

Various types of moveable possessions appearing in the Junius XI poems have been interpreted as allegorical representations of valuables. In *Exodus* Noah's ark is referred to as the greatest treasure chest. Vickrey argued that the treasure implied to be on board was an allegory for people as the ultimate treasure which the ark safeguarded.<sup>141</sup> Ferhatović used Vickrey's conclusions to construct part of his argument concerning the appearance of *burhweardas* ['city-guardians'] as the guardians of material culture in *Exodus* to refer to urban civilisation of the Egyptians.<sup>142</sup> Though his interpretation reaches beyond rights and obligations linked to moveable possessions, or even people

---

*Saxon England*; J. D.A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English 597-1066*; B. F. Huppe, *Doctrine and Poetry*; R. I. Page, 'The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England'; J. Morrish, 'King Alfred's Letter as a Source on Learning in England', pp. 87-107.; S. Keynes, 'King Athelstan's Books', pp. 143-201.; K. Powell and D. Scragg (eds.), *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England*; J. Gardner, *The Construction of Christian Poetry in Old*; T. Hall, 'Biblical and Patristic Learning', pp. 327-344.

<sup>140</sup> Discussed at length in Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*; Stanley, *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism*.

<sup>141</sup> Vickrey, 'Exodus and the Treasure of Pharaoh'.

<sup>142</sup> Ferhatović, '*Burh and Beam*, Burning Bright'.

as possessions, Ferhatović's insights will feature in my discussion of cultural identity of a people.

My subsequent chapter focused on landed possessions will also correlate the practical implication of land as a possession alongside its allegorical significance, including its promise, fertility and symbolism. In 1970 Keenan interpreted the colour green in *Exodus* as indicative of paradise.<sup>143</sup> His discussion will be linked to Ananya Kabir's discussion of the nature of the interim paradise as an allegorical landed possession.<sup>144</sup> Her vivid and innovative approach was not aimed at land tenure, but rather at the nature of paradise in Anglo-Saxon Christian perception. Among other Old English sources, her analysis included the Junius XI poems. She, however, did not focus on social conceptions, but rather exclusively on theological imperatives across the Old English literary corpus. The fourth chapter of this thesis will build on Ananya Kabir's detailed analysis of allegorical representations of homeland and correlate the theological imperatives of the Christian realms of Earth, Heaven and Paradise with rights and obligations in the social context of both possessing a homeland and the personal right to inhabit and use land.

## Method

There are indisputable impracticalities tied to examining the categories of social history in a purely literary source, and especially in poems of the so-called 'heroic genre' this must be taken into account. As Elizabeth Tyler points out, we are encumbered by our understanding of Old English poetic devices and by the longevity of poetic tradition itself as a historical social phenomenon; furthermore, she maintains that the nature of conservation of style and convention of Old English poetry often fails to receive its due attention.<sup>145</sup> The Old English poetry retains similar phrases, imagery, and

---

<sup>143</sup> Keenan, 'Exodus 513; The Green Streets of Paradise'.

<sup>144</sup> Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*.

<sup>145</sup> Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, p. 3.

other conventions through the centuries. The orality of the earliest Old English verse is generally accepted, though the question remains whether at the time of written distribution, oral transmission continued.<sup>146</sup> What is evident from the Old English poetic corpus, as noted by Scragg, is that even in written form Old English poems retain techniques and rhetorical devices developed in an oral tradition and so reflect the needs of that tradition.<sup>147</sup> Pasternack, in explaining the primacy of aural nature of Old English poetry, even attempts to reframe the entire terminology of Old English written poetry; she replaces existing terms in order to depict a truer image of the significance of orality in the written verse; for example she replaces the term 'writing' with 'inscribing', the term 'poem' with the term 'verse sequence' in order to accentuate its accretive and evolving nature.<sup>148</sup> I view these terminological innovations as excellent tools of explanation and give credence to the distinctions in questions, though I opt to continue to use the generally accepted terms for fear of introducing undue confusion.

We are not sure who the authors were, or indeed how many were involved in the creation of the poems by the time they were included in Junius XI in the late tenth or early eleventh century. The poems, though similar in content, are dissimilar to each other in style and emphasis. Where *Genesis A* and *Daniel* are linear, *Exodus* is interspersed with digressions as is, in its own way, *Christ and Satan*. *Exodus* culminates in a single event of the crossing of the Red Sea, while *Genesis A*'s dramaturgical structure has no single culmination. Even the dates of individual poems, where scholars dare propose them, are far apart. It is therefore difficult if not impossible to approach the poems by way of authorial intent. However their inclusion in a single manuscript, in the order that they appear, testifies to an editorial intent. Furthermore the Junius XI manuscript, once assembled, impacted the audience of the eleventh century. The incontrovertible facts in interpreting the poems are their inclusion

---

<sup>146</sup> Oral transmission was supported by Magoun Jr., 'The Oral Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry'; Scragg, 'The Nature of Old English Verse'.

<sup>147</sup> See Scragg, 'The Nature of Old English Verse', pp. 55-6.

<sup>148</sup> Pasternack, *The Textuality of Old English Poetry*, pp. 2, 22.

in a single manuscript and their intended exposure to an Old English audience, predominately dated to c. 1000.

Since nothing can be asserted about the authorship of the poems, reception theory is the most viable approach in interpreting these poems. This theory takes into account the audience as an essential contributor to the received narrative where the narrative is understood by way of a process of reaction and even interaction between the reader and the text.<sup>149</sup> In a way, Old English poetry doubly demands the application of reception theory, since the poems are the product of accretion over time and therefore every addition to an original narrative is executed by a person who was originally a member of the audience. Furthermore, since Junius XI poems are composed as adaptations of scriptural narrative to a specific genre and cultural environment, the very initial stages of their composition are in fact a documented reaction on the part of an educated audience member to scripture.

It is important in this interpretation to take into account the specifically literary characteristics of my sources. The oral style of Old English poetry is framed by form, which assists memorisation through poetic devices such as rhythm and alliteration, perhaps more aptly named 'rhetorical devices'.<sup>150</sup> The poets are assisted by a large vocabulary of imagery set in standard phrases and epithets within a formulaic system which allows for creation of ever-new formulaic phrases, as well as repetitive use of pre-existing ones. Such style necessitates word economy, which in turn results in a frequent use of compounding where the two elements form a compound-word. The compound can be interpreted to form a variety of simultaneous layers of meaning at once depending on how the two elements are taken to correlate (do they enlarge or narrow the semantic range, do they contradict or support

---

<sup>149</sup> The Reception Theory, which has evolved since, was first outlined in 1970 by the German literary historian Hans Robert Jauss, available in English: Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*.

<sup>150</sup> Scragg, 'The Nature of Old English Verse'.

their relative meanings).<sup>151</sup> Such style is ubiquitous throughout the Old English poetic corpus. These styles also transcend geographical specifics and are therefore problematic in terms of dating, allocating and even interpreting in historical context.

Robinson, in his excellent examination of *Beowulf* and the Appositive style, went beyond merely identifying features of poetic style.<sup>152</sup> His subject of examination was *Beowulf*. The poem's narrative takes place outside Anglo-Saxon political space and before Christianisation. Robinson exposed the complexity of poetic language by exposing polysemy, used in Christian terminology echoing a pagan past, as a purposeful effort on the part of the poet, attempting to present Anglo-Saxon pagan forebears in a less than abhorrent light. He argued that the poet wanted to retain the audience's sympathy while remaining critical of paganism. The poet was argued to purposefully lend the protagonists' the capacity to know morally laudable behaviour without the benefit of baptism or Christian doctrine. Robinson's observations can be adapted to my discussion of the poems of Junius XI since these also contain the very elements of *Beowulf* which Robinson focused on: the Old Testament narrative of the Old Testament poems of Junius XI is likewise set outside the scope of Anglo-Saxon geographical realm and in pre-Christian times. The poets of *Beowulf* and the poems of Junius XI continuously sympathise and even identify with the Israelite people, though they were, strictly speaking, just as pagan as the Geats in *Beowulf*. To this effect Richard Marsden pointed out that as Anglo-Saxon audience would be able to draw analogies between the plight of the Israelites and their own situation of constant threat of subjugation; Marsden supported his contention with Ælfric's homily on the biblical Judith wherein explicit parallels are drawn between Viking attacks on the English and the Assyrian threat against the Israelites.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., pp. 165-6; Robinson, *Beowulf and the Appositive Style*, p. 14.

<sup>152</sup> Robinson, *Beowulf and the Appositive Style*.

<sup>153</sup> Marsden, 'The Death of the Messenger', p. 150.

Therefore I will proceed with my search for social conceptions in the originality of the poems of Junius XI mindful of the complexity of poetic language, the difficulty of allegorical interpretation, the skill of the poet and the formulaic nature of poetry, spurred on by the sentiment of Paolo Borsa, Christian Høgel, Lars Boje Mortensen, and Elizabeth Tyler, namely that “written texts of a given period, area or social network within medieval Europe are in need of further promotion as a fitting subject for both literary and historical scrutiny.”<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> Borsa, Høgel, Mortensen, and Tyler, 'What is Medieval European Literature', p. 9.

## 2 MOVEABLE POSSESSIONS: IDENTITY, STATUS AND THE MORALITY OF EXCHANGE

In this chapter I will examine moveable possessions within social interactions in the poems of Junius XI. I will argue that accumulated wealth, transportable in migration, in the Junius XI poems holds similar traits and significance to treasure as defined by Elizabeth Tyler.<sup>155</sup> She divided terms of treasure into the following categories: “(1) precious object or a group of objects (*maðm* [‘treasure’], *sinc* [‘treasure’], compounds such as *sincgestreon* (treasure-possessions)’, (2) general words which can include treasure, with broader meanings (such as *wela* [‘wealth’], *ead* [‘riches’], *gestreon* [‘possessions’], *hord* [‘hoard’], *frætwe* [‘ornament’]...), (3) Words for specific precious objects and substances (terms for gold, silver, precious gems, jewellery, money and rings), and (4) words for objects possibly precious; for example books, cups and dishes, and clasps are found in this category.<sup>156</sup> Elizabeth Tyler purposefully omits words for precious metals from closer examination on the basis that their semantic fields lack complexity. She does, however, note the disparity between the frequency of appearances of gold and silver in poetry as opposed to wills and documents.

The central part of the definition of treasure for the purposes of this chapter lies in the interplay between the use of valuables in payment and the growing significance of the idea of treasure as a marker of status and authority. I take my cue from Elizabeth Tyler’s discussion of the treasure of Edward the Confessor,<sup>157</sup> and from other chapters of the same edited monograph, especially the chapter by Timothy Reuter,<sup>158</sup> which frame treasure as an ideal representation of status and station (see above p. 28). Timothy Reuter argued

---

<sup>155</sup> Tyler, “When Wings Incarnadine with Gold Are Spread”; Tyler, *Old English Poetics*.

<sup>156</sup> Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, pp. 9-38 and esp. 25-36.

<sup>157</sup> Tyler, “When Wings Incarnadine with Gold Are Spread”.

<sup>158</sup> Reuter, ‘You Can’t Take It with You’.

that early medieval treasure represented a sum of mostly positional goods intended to present the status of a king group and not primarily used as disposable wealth.<sup>159</sup> According to Reuter, treasure is different from other types of wealth: It evolves through accumulation in time, and owners come to think of it not in terms of its monetary value but the status associated with it, which is why it is preserved. Thus it begins to serve as a symbol for status. The treasures begin serving as purely a symbolic representation of status.<sup>160</sup> In her examination of the notion of treasure in the *Vita Ædwardi*, Elizabeth Tyler also noted the interplay between treasure as display and as payment.<sup>161</sup> I will show how their observations coincide with the moral implications of payment in the poems of Junius XI, especially with those featured in *Daniel*.

Tyler and Reuter's discussion is focused on the significance of treasure as a social concept incurring status. They took a step beyond earlier examinations, which can focus on the treasure's direct uses and stop there; for example in his 1977 article, Helder viewed the treasure as a source of economic circulation of wealth. He posits that concealing the treasure in *Beowulf* was antisocial, because it hindered circulation.<sup>162</sup> The Junius XI poems exhibit a socially constructive view of treasure. They express a combined significance of treasure as a mark of status and an instrument of governance through gift-giving. The narrative ties the treasure to a single culturally unified Israelite people. The treasure appears in the context of their migration, slavery, and autonomous settlement. The poetic narrative presents treasure being transported in periods of migration as well as housed in urban settlements in other periods. It is traceable through the narrative as part of the same inherited hoard of the highest social ranks.

I will argue that such treasure within the poetic narrative serves as a material foundation of the migrating Israelite people's cultural identity. Next I will

---

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., pp. 23-4.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., pp. 16-17.

<sup>161</sup> Tyler, "When Wings Incarnadine with Gold Are Spread".

<sup>162</sup> Helder, 'Beowulf and the Plundered Hoard', p. 321.

examine how the symbolic connotations of moveable possessions in Junius XI change in the context of settlement. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of how individual moveable possessions figure in social stratification and exchange. I will argue that two modes of exchange in the poems of Junius XI incur two opposite moral attitudes on the part of the poets; general gift-giving appears in the narratives as a morally sanctioned motivator of future obedience. This is the opposite of payment as a finite transaction with no expectation of mutual obligation; I will show that the Junius XI poems present such a one-sided purchase as morally questionable.

### **Allegory and Interpretation**

Before I attempt any interpretation of literal attitudes towards moveable wealth in the poems of Junius XI, it is useful to take note of allegorical Christian attitudes towards the transience of mortal life and earthly wealth elsewhere. The complex allegorical phrasing of *Exodus* has invited numerous allegorical interpretations in modern scholarship.<sup>163</sup> One of these is the correlation between possessing a treasure and the allegorical interpretation of treasure as people. Particularly in *Exodus*, Egyptian treasure has been interpreted to stand exclusively for people;<sup>164</sup> the *Exodus* poet's description of Noah's ark as a treasure chest has incited interpretations of the term 'treasure' as a common

---

<sup>163</sup> Cross and Tucker, 'Allegorical Tradition and the Old English Exodus'; Earl, 'Christian Traditions and the Old English Exodus'; Farrell, 'A Reading of Old English Exodus'; Green, 'Gregory's Moralia as an Inspirational Source for the Old English Poem Exodus'; Haines, 'Unlocking "Exodus" ll. 516-532'; Hall, 'Mansceaðan'; Hermann, 'The Green Rod of Moses in the Old English Exodus'; Hill, 'The Virga of Moses and the Old English Exodus'; Kruger, 'Oppositions and Their Opposition in the Old English Exodus'; Martin, 'Allegory and the African Woman in the Old English "Exodus"'; Thundy 'Afrisc Meowle and the Old English Exodus'; Trahern, 'More Scriptural Echoes in the Old English Exodus'; Trask 'Doomsday Imagery in the Old English Exodus'; Vickrey, 'Exodus and the Battle in the Sea'; Vickrey, 'Exodus' and the 'Herba Humilis'; Vickrey, 'Exodus and the Tenth Plague'; Vickrey, 'Exodus and the Treasure of Pharaoh'; Vickrey, 'Exodus' and the Robe of Joseph'.

<sup>164</sup> Vickrey, 'Exodus and the Treasure of Pharaoh'.

formulaic reference to people.<sup>165</sup> By extension, allegorically possessing a treasure is implicitly tied to the treasure-holder's authority over people.

This implicit correlation also exists outside the poems of Junius XI. To begin with there is a distinction between eternal treasure in the heavenly realm which is often contrasted in Anglo-Saxon homilies with the fleeting nature of earthly treasures. For example treasure appears in Ælfric's homilies as *woruldlican gestreon* (see Appendix A on p. 225). He consistently marks the *gestreon* as a worldly benefit contrasting it with spiritual wealth. Ælfric's homilies express late Anglo-Saxon moral attitudes towards distribution of wealth in a social environment; according to him earthly riches should be used to ensure eternal life and enjoyment of heavenly riches; if the rich spend their wealth otherwise, God will turn them away.<sup>166</sup> Furthermore, in his Homily for the First Sunday in Lent,<sup>167</sup> Ælfric directly stated that God gives the rich wealth so that they can feed the poor. Authority therefore includes the obligation to share wealth. Similar notions to those expressed by Ælfric are woven into the poetic narratives of Junius XI. When the Jewish people abandon God's teachings at the outset of Daniel, their sin results in a loss of autonomy and moveable wealth. The correlation of allegorical and practical wealth may have also been expressed by Ælfric in his Homily 29 St. Laurence, wherein he explained that the bishop had commanded Laurence to distribute the church's treasure as he deems fit. Lawrence then distributed it among priests, poor strangers, and widows, to each according to their need.<sup>168</sup> Godden posits: "It may have been the exemplary function of this story of an archdeacon

---

<sup>165</sup> Hall, 'The Building of the Temple in Exodus', p. 619.

<sup>166</sup> Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 204-5. Ælfric was generally ill disposed towards perishable wealth as a goal, see for example also the Homily for Second Study after Easter, pp. 241-3; the Homily for Pentecost on pp. 326-9; the Homily St. Lawrence, in Vol. II – Homily for the First Sunday in Lent, pp. 104-5.

<sup>167</sup> Thorpe, *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 102-3.

<sup>168</sup> Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 419.

defending the church's treasure from the secular powers and converting it into spiritual wealth."<sup>169</sup>

God awards possessions to a chosen representative who must then distribute the possessions to lower social ranks; God implicitly distributes authority by virtue of wealth. To this effect Godden argued that Ælfric's use of the term *rice* translates simultaneously as power(ful) and wealth(y); to illustrate that this was not a general Old English attitude he juxtaposes Ælfric's homilies with the ninth-century Alfredian translation of Boethius wherein the two concepts are discussed both separately and in contrast to each other.<sup>170</sup> The Junius XI poems use *rice* in wider sense which encompasses, like Ælfric, the concepts of power and wealth at the same time. It is often not simple to make out whether *rice* in the poetic narratives is referring to the ruler's authority or his wealth, or whether the poets viewed them as separate at all. In fact, it seems possible that the poetic language did not accommodate this distinction because it did not seem significant in the frame of the narrative reality; in the literary reality the currency of wealth mirrored the currency of power.

The Junius XI poems exhibit seemingly contrasting attitudes towards possessions. On the one hand they present it as symbolic representation of God's favour which is tied to eternal bliss, but on the other they are shown as merely transient earthly matter. The poets tie the two senses through the medium of inheritance. Moveable possessions by themselves are transient earthly wealth symbolic of the fleeting nature of mortal life. However, when moveable possessions form hereditary treasures, their symbolic significance transcends individual ruler's lifetimes and becomes symbolic of God's enduring favour. In this chapter I will show examples where the Junius XI poems treat inherited wealth just like that: they are not owned, but rather held by individual generations of rulers as a mark of God's favour towards their rule and towards the people they represent. Furthermore, I will show through examples that they are held for as long as the elites conform to Christian

---

<sup>169</sup> Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*, p. 238.

<sup>170</sup> Godden, 'Money, Power and Morality in Late Anglo-Saxon England'.

norms and remain loyal to the supreme Lord and his law. But first I must examine the significance of moveable possessions in migration.

### **Possessions in motion – People’s Treasure**

*Genesis A*’s lines 1649, 1767, 1802, 1845, 1873, 1929 and 2011-2 directly refer to the migration of the Israelites. These accounts consistently describe the Israelites travelling with all their *æhta*. This term is used consistently and exclusively to mark a grouping of portable property, which is clear because at times the poems enumerate the various items – perhaps giving an example of what they are. In fact, the Old English poets often depart from scriptural accounts by opting to amplify and expand simple references. The Old English phrasing of the Israelite migration as ‘relocating with their worldly goods’ [‘*æhta*’] is a reflection of scriptural descriptions. However, *Genesis A* often lists various types and items of possession, amplifying the scriptural accounts, where the Israelites’ transported goods are described exclusively as ‘*substantia*’ or ‘*omnia substantia*’ (Vulgate Genesis XII: 5, XIII: 6, XIV: 11, 12, 16).<sup>171</sup> In the Vulgate Genesis the image of migration is invoked by transportation of possessions as an abstract, the sense of totality is conjured by implying that all possessions were uprooted. *Genesis A* is different; the poet is much more focused on individual possessions. The poets build continuity by referring to the same individual items at various chronological points, and generally treat the carried wealth as a type of treasure. These repeated references frame treasures as the common denominator of the migrating peoples’ cultural identity. Meanwhile the same treasures are held by the elites as an expression of their status and authority.

The *Genesis A*, in lines 1649-1650a, describes the the migration of Eber’s kin, Hebrews: “Gewiton him þa eastan æhta lædan – feorh and forme” [‘They departed out of the east, taking with them all their substance, their cattle and

---

<sup>171</sup> I.) *that of which a thing consists, the being, essence, contents, material, substance* II.) *fortune, substance, property* – II.) is referenced specifically for the Vulgate Genesis 36, 6. These are the senses given for *substantia* by Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*.

their goods.'] Kennedy translates *æhta* ['possessions, property'] as "all substance". The poem refers to general moveable wealth consisting of cattle and goods or provisions. In this example the possessions being transported are cattle and food provisions. In several instances in both *Genesis* poems *æhta* is more precisely defined by subdivision into types of possessions elaborating scriptural narrative. For example, for goods transported during Abraham's migration to Canaan the term used in Scripture is "uniuersa substantia" ['all substance'], i.e. literally everything in his possession. When moving to Canaan in the Vulgate Genesis XII: 5, they "tulitque Sarai uxorem suam et Lot filium fratris sui universamque substantiam quam possederant et animas quas fecerant in Haran" ['took Sarai, his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all the substance which they had gathered, and the souls which they had gotten in Haran.'] The *Genesis A* account, in lines 1767-1773, specifies *æhta* as consisting of *golde and seolfre* and *ceapas* ['gold and silver, cattle']. The third time possessions are mentioned in the context of migration, at the point of Israelites' exile from Egypt (see appendix 31 on p. 214), in lines 1873-1879, the Pharaoh charges his men to see to it that the Israelites are allowed to safely transport their *æhte* comprised of *begas, ... ceapas, wif and willan and heoran woruldgestreon*. The Old English account literally defines worldly treasure in apposition to *begas* and *ceapas*, defining the treasure as comprising bracelets and rings. In this manner the *Genesis A* accounts expand and more precisely define the 'substance' of scriptural narrative through mentioning items usually associated with Anglo-Saxon treasures, such as are attested to in earlier Anglo-Saxon hoards as described by Webster,<sup>172</sup> or in Old English accounts as discussed by Elizabeth Tyler.<sup>173</sup>

In line 1857b of the excerpt above the epithet for ruler describing the Pharaoh (*sinces brytta* ['dispenser of treasure']) was tied to distribution of treasure. This correlation, coupled with the mention of valuables typical of treasure, also confirms that the poet did not imagine the moveable possessions accompanying the migration as a combination of everything owned by all the

---

<sup>172</sup> Carver, 'Burial as Poetry'; Webster, 'Ideal and Reality'.

<sup>173</sup> Tyler, "When Wings Incarnadine with Gold Are Spread".

migrating people, symbolising the totality of the migration, but was rather meant to invoke the image of treasure. Like Abraham, Lot also relocates with his people and his possessions. The Vulgate (Genesis XIII: 5) described Lot as in possession of cattle and herds and tents like Abram, but makes no additional mention of his possessions upon settling in Sodom. The *Genesis A* account, however, does. Lot's relocation is described in lines 1927-31 as involving possessions defined as consisting of *beagas from Bethlehem and botlgestreon, - welan, wunden gold* ['from Bethel<sup>174</sup> all his substance, rings and household treasure and riches and twisted gold'].

Gold and ornamental valuables are also referred to later when Lot and his retinue are seized in war with their possessions in lines 2016-17: "þara þe læddon Loth and leoda god - suðmonna sinc, sigore gulpon" ['leading Lot captive away, and with him the goods of the people and gold of the Southmen']. In scripture the war also results in acquiring possessions, but these are again referred to simply as *substantia* (Vulgate Genesis XIV: 11, 12), *Genesis A* again utilises *æht* but elaborates, defining it as *sinc* – ['gold, treasure, silver or jewels and treasure']. The reference to Bethel also implies that these are the same or similar *beagas* as those mentioned in relation to the city in *Genesis A* lines 1927-31. Here the *beagas* were included among valuables comprising *botlgestreon* ['household treasures'], in very eminent company of the highest value, specifically the *wunden gold* ['wound gold']. The same *gestreon* reiterated in the context of Lot's capture was previously transported and defined as belonging to the household. This treasure is consistently tied to the elites and seems indicative of status. It is further specified to be *suðmonna sinc* ['the treasure of the southern people']. The poet thus directly states that the possessions of the captured leaders are a part of the people's treasure. It follows that the poet associates *æht* simultaneously with the treasure of their elite as well as with the people as a cultural unit represented by this elite. In effect the ruler and the treasure

---

<sup>174</sup> This is probably a correction on Kennedy's part, correcting the Old English Bethlehem to the Scriptural Bethel.

appear to hold a comparable measure of significance in defining a people as a cultural unit.

### **Inheriting Treasure: Transient Authority and Collective Identity**

Treasure transcends individual lifetimes through the means of inheritance. Its symbolically eternal nature reflects the fleeting transience of mortal life on one hand while testifying to God's enduring favour on the other. By virtue of its lasting nature treasure made up of tangible earthly wealth reflects spiritual wealth. In its eternal nature the treasure in the narrative of the poems of Junius XI is similar to grave goods. Both extend beyond the point of death, though they do so in contrasting ways; grave-goods are tied to the individual and his transition to the beyond, while treasures are tied to the ruling family and the people outlasting individual lifetimes in the Earthly realm. The similarity between the two treatments is in the transcendent qualities of possessions. Carver noted that both are constructs of the same symbolic language and adhere to the same dramatic principles.<sup>175</sup> Carver elsewhere argued that grave goods at deposition played a role in forming the identity of a folk group in a tribal society, a role which later passes to the king.<sup>176</sup> I argue that the treasure in the Junius XI poems simultaneously assumes the role of the symbolic cultural representation of a people and a social representation of the rulers, and that through this the two are linked.

There is special significance attached to moveable possessions in the context of inheritance in Junius XI poems, which as I will show, are commonly shown as a treasure. They symbolise authority. The most consistent term used in the context of inheritance in *Genesis A* is *yrfe*. *Genesis A* feature the variant spelling of *irfe* for which B&T gives "inheritance" which is what Doane

---

<sup>175</sup> See Carver, 'Burial as Poetry', pp.37-8.

<sup>176</sup> Carver, 'Kingship and Material Culture in Early Anglo-Saxon East Anglia'.

proposes<sup>177</sup>. *Yrfe* also clearly stands for inheritance in *Genesis A*'s lines 2788-9, where Abraham's illegitimate son Ishmael is said to never divide/share inheritance with Isaac, as well as lines 2188-90 where Abraham is assured that he will have legitimate heirs and that his *gerefan* will never have control of his inheritance. Kennedy translates *yrfe* as "treasure", but also translates several other Old English terms in the Junius XI poems with the same word. The terms he translates as "treasure" are: *yrfe* (lines 1067, 1167), *gestreon* (line 1071), *magum... æðelinga gestreon* (1069-71), *botlgestreon* (line 1076), *epelstol* (line 1129), *woruld (bryttade)* (line 1224). From a practical point of view his choice to translate all these varied terms the same way makes sense. Inheritance is consistently tied to authority over people and the capacity to distribute valuable possessions among them. Kennedy's translation of *yrfe* as 'treasure' is not generally problematic since the inheritance so defined in the poem is in fact limited to moveable possessions.

*Genesis A* reflects scriptural passages that enumerate the lineage of the patriarchs. However, where the Vulgate merely states the name and ages at death and life events, *Genesis A* elaborates by describing some of the more significant feats or characteristics of individual heirs. The first scriptural lineage starting with the children of Adam and Eve in *Genesis A* is given in two parts, divided by Cain's expulsion from society. The branch of Cain's lineage begins after his expulsion in line 1053 with the birth of his son Enoch, and concludes with the sons of Lamech at line 1103. The second branch begins in line 1104 with the birth of Adam's legitimate heir – Cain's younger brother Seth. It concludes when the two branches of offspring cross again, namely when the act of the sons of Seth procreating with the daughters of Cain incurs the Flood.

Cain's lineage is described first in *Genesis A*. Cain was expelled bereft of all possessions, and the poet made a special effort to explain that his son Enoch built cities, which can be seen as supplying a basis for the future inheritance of Cain's offspring. The fact that the poet added an explanation not found in scripture, that Irad increased the number of the kin of Cain, results in instant

---

<sup>177</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, p. 411.

multiplication of heirs and a generation of a larger social unit. The other genealogical branch, running parallel to Cain's progeny, acts as its contrast. In lines 1128-9a, Adam's youngest heir, Seth, immediately has a whole nation to rule, which is clear from the poet's explanation (also not in scripture) that he "safeguarded the people": "leod weardode – eafora æfter yl drum; epe/ stol heold". Kennedy omits "leod weardode" ['safeguarded the people'] and translates *epe/ stol* as treasure rather than "hereditary domain" or "homeland" as given by the DOE. He simply states that Seth "possessed the treasure, [and took himself a wife]." Seth can immediately act as ruler, sanctified by God to represent a people. The poet thus continually invokes the right of Seth's progeny to ancestral land. This is done in addition to and on par with inheriting treasure. For example in lines 1167-8 Malaleheel inherits "land and yrfe" – [Kennedy: land and treasure'] and enjoys (line 1177) "woruldgestreona" worldly riches. His heir Jared in line 1180 receives "land and leodweard" [Kennedy: land and rule']. The term *yrfe* in *Genesis A* seems freely interchangeable with *leodweard*.

Cain's progeny demonstrates no claim on land at any point. Even though Enoch is expressly defined as the one who built cities, these are never mentioned as hereditary lands. What stands at the heart of the Cain lineage's inheritance is moveable possessions and authority over the people. In lines 1066-68, Cain's great grandson, Irad's son Mahalaleel is the first of their kin to be designated "*yrfes hyrde*" [Kennedy: warden of treasure, literally "warden of inheritance"]. The two genealogical branches therefore present different bases for the inherited authority. Seth's genealogical branch possesses authority by ancestral right, set up in an ancestral administrative and geographical region. Since Cain's progeny has no ancestral lands (because Cain was exiled), *Genesis A* instead derives the elites' authority and people's common cultural denominators through growing accumulated treasure. Even without a homeland or the right to one, Cain's progeny become a unified people by means of common ancestry and common rule, with treasure as its symbol and practical basis.

In *Genesis A* lines 1069-71a, the focus shifts from Mahaleel to Methusael; the poet swiftly moves from defining rulers as *yrfes hyrde* to rulers as distributors

of *gestreon* ['treasure']. The definition of treasure in this context is developed further in the very next lines (1069-75a), where Lamech succeeds Methusael and inherits, as the poet states: "fletgestealdum – botlgestreonum" (Kennedy translates each as treasure). The DOE entry for *flettgesteald* gives "household goods and property" and remarks there are only two instances of this compound in the Old English literary corpus, both limited to *Genesis A*. According to a proximity search of the DOE corpus the individual parts of this compound are also not habitually used together.

The second instance of the phrase appears in line 1610, and refers to Japheth's death and his son inheriting wealth and authority. It occurs after the Flood when the Earth needs to be repopulated. Noah and his sons begin a new family tree; In several ways this narrative echoes Adam's lineage, and it is likewise divided in two branches. Ham's lineage echoes Cain's. Each failed to show reverence to his father and their individual family lines are condemned in relation to the other genealogical branch. Just as Cain and his kin before the Flood, Ham's line does not have any claim to inherited land, whereas Seth's children – as did Noah's progeny – are granted this favour.

Noah's progeny, we learn, accumulates a type of household treasure; it is attributed to the household rather than being described in the course of migration. Although possession of a homeland reduces the need for treasure, the poems consistently allot treasure a central role. The difference is that the treasure, as I will discuss, is often conceptually tied to the city rather than to the ruling lineage in the Junius XI poems. The assurance of security passes from lineage to settlement. At the start of the excerpt, in lines 1602-3, Noah's offspring distributes wealth "Siððan his eaforan ead bryttedon – bearna stryndon; him was beorht wela" [Kennedy: And his sons possessed his wealth, and begat children and prospered.]. Kennedy translated the general meaning, however the poet in describing the items as "beorht wela" ['bright goods'] utilises the same description, i.e. glistening adornments and precious moveable possessions, which form the treasure in migration discussed above. In *Genesis A* line 1611 these items receive a new epithet; they are described as *flettgesteald* ['household goods, treasure of the domestic hall']. The first

part *flett-* refers to hall both according to B&T and Doane,<sup>178</sup> and is a well-known location of treasure-hoards in heroic poetry.

The poets make a connection between possessions and authority. For example, in *Genesis A* lines 2405b-6, Sodom's treasure is destroyed. This treasure is not defined by affiliation with members of the elite or a people, but linked to the city: "ofer since salo hlifian – reced ofer readum golde" ['high halls towering above precious treasure and mansions above ruddy gold.']. The destruction of Sodom's firmly built structures invokes a powerful image of the transience of this world and pairs the destruction of a people with the material representation of its urban culture. Throughout, the treasure remains central to cultural identity. It defines urban society to the point where it itself becomes associated with the city and whereby realm and treasure join in defining a people's cultural identity.

The use of the term *epelstol* clearly presents the correlation between the ruler as protector of a people and the authority bestowed on him by his ancestry. Kennedy translates *epelstol* as treasure, but the DOE also gives "ancient throne". Ancient throne encompasses both hereditary domain and ancestral authority. Similarly, *yrfestol* ['hereditary seat'] is another symbolic representation of the continuous nature of authority since it transcends the lifetime of individual rulers. The phrase *yrfestole weold*, 'hereditary seat' also appears in lines 2177-9 of *Genesis A*, where Abraham laments that he would never have a son by blood, and despairs that he has no need to erect a hereditary seat: "Ne þearf ic yrfestol eaforan bytlían ænegum minra, ac me æfter sculon mine woruldmagas welan bryttian." ['No need have I to heap up treasure for any child of mine, but after me my kinsmen shall enjoy my wealth. Thou grantest me no son, and therefore sorrow presseth on my heart. I can devise no counsel. My steward goeth to and fro rejoicing in his children, and firmly thinketh in his heart that after me his sons shall be my heirs. He seeth that no child is born to me.'] As the use of the verb *bytlían* (to build) indicates, the word *yrfestol* here represents a seat of power as a structure and location of rule. It implies a perfect marriage of possessing inherited right of authority,

---

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., p. 349.

ancestral land or administrative centre, and treasure as a marker of excellence and source for gift-giving. At the close of *Exodus*, in lines 555-55, the loot is divided among the victorious Israelites. Here the victory over Canaanites gains Israelites the coupled gain of cities and treasures, again presenting the concept of static treasure as tied to urban settlement, where God “hafað us on Cananea cyn gelyfed - burh and beagas, brade rice” [‘hath given the tribes of Canaan into our hands, their cities and treasure, and wide-stretching realms.’]

The connection between treasure and people is made most explicit in *Exodus* where the compound *hordweardas* [‘treasure-keepers’] is used to denote Egyptians, where Vickrey interprets treasure as allegory for the Israelites.<sup>179</sup> The pursuing Egyptians drown far from home. However, the description of their drowning implies an image of the destruction of an urban, settled society, as though Egypt itself were destroyed in the same way as Sodom (*Exodus* lines 36-39): “hordwearda hryre heaf wæs geniwad – swæfon seledreamas, since berofene. – Hæfde mansceaðan æt middere niht – frecne gefylled, frumbearna fela – abrocene burhweardas.” [‘Ailing arose at the fall of their princes; their hall-joys were hushed and their treasure was scattered. Fiercely at midnight He smote the oppressors, slaying their firstborn, laying their watchmen low.’] Kennedy translates watchmen, but the sense-for-sense association incurred by the term *burhweardas*, [‘city guards’], implies an urban setting while the compound *hordweardas* at the start of the excerpt invokes the image of treasure in the same context.

Ferhatović interpreted these enigmatic *Exodus* lines as God’s wrath expressed by “breaking and scattering a nation’s material culture in addition to murdering its descendants”.<sup>180</sup> By putting the destruction of material culture on the same footing as the destruction of the line of descendants, the poet reaffirms the equal significance of the notions of kindred and treasure in constructing a common cultural identity. Ferhatović includes in material

---

<sup>179</sup> Vickrey, ‘Exodus and the Treasure of Pharaoh’.

<sup>180</sup> Ferhatović, ‘*Burh and Beam*, Burning Bright’, p. 513.

culture objects other than precious metal valuables and jewellery (see Introduction, p. 39). He identifies the *burhweardas* as statues of idols, which he views as part of urban imagery, alongside “laughter smiths” which he sees as an Anglo-Saxon type of performer. He goes on to argue that the destruction of the Egyptian urban culture represents the defeat of pagan society faced with the Christian God. The dispossession of the pursuing Egyptians of their treasure alludes to the fall of an urban material culture.

The direct connection between the concept of urban settlement and treasure as markers of cultural identity is also expressed in *Daniel*. In lines 55-67 we learn that the Israelite treasure-guardians (*hordwearda*) were defeated. We also learn that the treasure of the city was contained in a palace, i.e. Solomon's temple, and here, like in Sodom, the treasure was plundered from under stone walls (line 61: *Gestrudan gestreona under stanhliðum*). The outset of *Daniel* presents the destruction of an urban society and describes the despoiling of Solomon's treasure in much the same way as the destruction of Sodom in *Genesis A* and the destruction of Egyptians in *Exodus*. The built strongholds represent the security of a settled civilisation, a civilisation which should protect and safeguard treasures, but the strongholds turn out to be incapable of standing up to God's wrath. As a result of abandoning Christian values, the material culture, which expresses a people's cultural identity, is destroyed. In the subsequent narrative treasure remains a significant representation of the Israelites' cultural identity even outside the protective walls of urban settlements.

Ferhatović's interpretation of *Exodus* as representative of a primarily artistic and pagan material culture includes the interpretation of *burhweardas* as statues of pagan idols (see Introduction, p. 39). Such an interpretation is not mirrored by any references to idols in the other Junius XI poems. Instead in *Genesis A* and *Daniel* Israelite material culture is symbolically represented by moveable objects, such as *æhta* and *frætwa* and precious metals, items elsewhere in the poems associated with treasure which are here destroyed. For example, in *Daniel* the lines referring to the Babylonian siege connect the protective nature of the city and the possessions housed within (lines 43-4) “þær Israela æhta wæron – bewrigene mid weorcum; to þam þæt werod

gefor” [‘against the city within whose walls their (Israelites’) wealth was stored’]. In further description the same items are clearly stated to be part of treasure. In the following excerpt the treasure is also tied directly to urban cultural identity (lines 59-64, see Appendix DIII on p. 223) where the same image of stone walls is invoked.

*Daniel* is more similar to *Genesis A* than *Exodus*; its diction is more straightforward and it follows scripture more closely. It also describes migration in terms of people transporting treasure. Like *Genesis A* and *Exodus* before it, *Daniel* also presents the plundering of a people’s treasure as a primordial sign of losing their Lord’s favour. In lines 1-32 the poem states directly that the people, interchangeably referred to as Hebrews (*hebreos*) and Israelite people (*Israhela cyn*) “lived in prosperity distributing treasure” and were able to govern their own kingdom (line 8: “Þenden hie þy rice rædan moston”) before they abandoned the teachings of faith seduced by earthly joys presented as a gateway to the Devil’s craft. Unlike *Exodus*, *Daniel* does not present the loss of treasure as a consequence of military action, but rather as God’s punishment for lax morality. This is stated clearly and unequivocally at the start of the poem, in the course of an excerpt bridging the gap between the victory at the end of *Exodus* implying ensuing prosperous living and the enslavement by Babylonians in *Daniel*. The despoiling of material culture in *Daniel* represents the culmination and echo of previous instances where abandoning God’s teaching, i.e. spending the allegorical treasure of God’s wisdom, incurs the loss of God’s favour and security of His protection. In effect, obedience of God’s law, the treasure, and homeland stand as the three pillars of Israelite cultural identity; when one was lost in the biblical paraphrase the other two soon followed.

The clear connection between the loss of autonomy and treasure in *Daniel* also sheds new light on the capture of Lot with his people in *Genesis A*. In *Daniel* the loss of treasure is directly associated with loss of autonomy, while in the capture of Lot the loss of the people’s autonomy is never mentioned directly. This makes sense since Lot’s people had long since left their homeland and thus had no geographical symbol of autonomy to lose. But there is a direct connotation between the loss of moveable possessions and

the loss of personal freedom; both are manifest in the capture of the social elite with their valuables. The loss of property is more than an inconvenience: it is the loss of symbolic representations of rulers' personal freedom and with it a people's autonomy. Likewise, even though *Daniel* presents the Israelite people in Babylonian slavery as static and settled, they never appear in the narrative as a cultural unit. Having lost their land and treasure they also lost their ruling class and with it, as the poem reflects, their cultural identity. The poem, like the Vulgate, is focused on individuals who have kept to God's teachings and kept their faith in Babylonian slavery. Their story is combined with the retrieval of Solomon's treasure plundered by the Babylonians at the outset of the poem.

Like their scriptural counterparts the protagonists of *Daniel* begin to reshape Babylonian society by instructing the pagan king Nebuchadnezzar in Christian doctrine. The core of the message is theological, teaching the audience of the importance of loyalty to God even in adversity. However, the combination of the significance of faith in Daniel is framed by the symbolic significance of the holy vessels. The significant alteration in the Old English version of the story is the presentation of the Holy Vessels as the same treasure that had served to define Israelite cultural identity in migration as well as in autonomous settlement. *Daniel* refers to Solomon's treasure in terms of the Old English vernacular tradition, where Solomon's wisdom is contained in allegorical gems and valuables. Here treasure is an allegory for wisdom as a representation of Christian teachings. At the outset of *Daniel*, in lines 59-61, where the Vulgate is content to give *vasorum domus Dei* ['vessels of the house of God'], the Old English poet describes the red gold, jewels and silver of the *gestreon* treasure: "bereafodon þa receda wuldor readan golde – since and seolfre, Salomones templ. – Gestrudan gestreona..." [(From Solomon's temple), that glorious building, they took red gold and jewels and silver. They plundered the treasure (under the walls of stone.)] Furthermore at line 703 the poem adds a wholly original phrase for the vessels, dubbing them *Israhela gestreon*, literally the possessions, or treasure of the Israelites. The treasure is not identified by their rulers (Solomon) and their cities, but by Israelites as a cultural entity. In comparison the Vulgate refers exclusively to the sacred

vessels of gold and silver plundered by Nebuchadnezzar from the temple in Jerusalem (Vulgate Daniel, V: 2: “asa aurea et argentea quae asportaverat Nabuchodonosor pater eius de templo quod fuit in Hierusalem”). This seemingly small distinction reflects a larger difference in the practical understanding of the notion of treasure. In the Vulgate the emphasis of Babylonian transgression is on the idolatry of using sacrificial vessels at a pagan banquet including sacrifices to idols in various materials (stone, gold, silver).

Throughout *Daniel*, Solomon’s treasure is used to define the Israelites’ cultural identity and even their political autonomy. Unlike the destroyed possessions of Sodom’s treasure, Solomon’s treasure survives the Babylonian onslaught to be regained by the exceptional individuals who kept the knowledge of God’s wisdom, the four youths of Israel and Daniel. Recovering Solomon’s treasure serves as an allegory of returning God’s teachings to a people. By regaining a national treasure a people’s identity is revived.

### **Treasure in Exchange: Moral and Practical Implications**

Moveable possessions accumulated as hereditary treasure play a significant role in shaping a network of rights and obligations, one that is also reflected in the Junius XI poems. As argued so far, treasure, by virtue of its value alone, bestows importance on the rulers and people who possess it. It also marks God’s favour and can therefore be seen as a symbol of rightful authority. With such significance it should not be surprising that the protagonists of the Junius XI poems make use of treasure as a means of transferring authority. The various types of transfer include; bestowal, reward, award, dispossession, withdrawal and payment. The contexts reveal varying moral attitudes towards individual types of exchange. The moral implications are set out clearest in those parts of the Junius XI poems where God acts personally as a bestowing authority; here unsanctioned behaviour is easiest to discern, mostly through examining the consequences of immoral actions.

At the Creation God, as the archetypal ruler, bestows all the wealth needed to live and be safe upon his followers. *Genesis A* follows the Vulgate almost word for word in its account of God's bestowal of Adam and Eve's rights to use Creation, i.e. to receive the power (*geweald*) over wild and domestic animals, and over earth with its fruits and plants. Satan's lament in *Genesis B* also refers to Adam and Eve as beneficiaries of God's bestowal, surrounded by *welan* (*welan bewunden*). The term *welan* contains both the sense 'goods' as well as the more abstract notion of 'benefits'. Kennedy translates the term in different ways adapting it to individual contexts in which it appears.<sup>181</sup> Because of this disparity my discussion features the Old English term rather than selecting a specific translation. The aim is to see how uses of the term correlate through context; the working hypothesis here is that both the tangible and abstract sense are purposefully correlated in a single term to demonstrate the interdependence of wealth and the choice of good over bad (the notion of free will as a theological concept is discussed separately, see p. 135).

In lines 419-424a of *Genesis B* Satan complains that Adam and Eve are surrounded with those *welan* which he considers to be rightfully his own. He views them as part of his *rice mid rihte* ['kingdom by right']. Five lines below Satan again uses the term *wela* to refer to the category of possession taken away from Adam and Eve if they were to be led astray from God's commandment. The dispossession of *wela* in this context is contingent on morally reprehensible behaviour. Lines 464-6 of *Genesis B* make it even clearer that receiving wealth depends on morally laudable behaviour. Here the *Genesis B* poet, directly addressing the audience, explains the choice between the Tree of Knowledge and Tree of Eternal Life as the choice between *welan* ['bliss'] and *wawan* ['woes']. If they choose the wrong tree,

---

<sup>181</sup> In line 420 he gives "abundance", in line 422 and 431 he translates it "high estate", in line 466 he translates *welan and wawan* as "weal and woe", for line 643 he gives "bliss" in line 668 describing angels as *welan bewunden* is translated as "wrapped in beauty", even though the angels are described as God's retinue in his court and the phrase is the same as had described Adam and Eve in the context of the benefits derived from their lord, i.e. Lord. Kennedy, *The Caedmon Poems, Translated Into English Prose*.

*welan* is withdrawn from Adam and Eve, then later in the description of the choice of the correct tree *wela* denotes reward for choosing the tree of life. The poet, using the authoritative voice, relates the lesson of Adam and Eve's reprehensible behaviour directly to his audience in *Genesis B* lines 640-5 and impresses on them that, had Adam and Eve made the right choice, all men would have possessed the benefits of the heavenly kingdom and its ample *welan*. It is impossible to decide whether *welan* in this context represent abstract general benefits of Eden such as security and eternal life, or if the *welan* lost to Adam and Eve refer to the fruits, fishes and fowl freely available to them therein. However, it seems just as likely that the poet intentionally used a single word to encompass both notions simultaneously, since after all food and security overlap with sustenance.

In *Genesis B* *wela* is not only used in descriptions of Eden but also of Heaven, which is represented as a type of king's court. This may reflect real-life experiences, life in the lord's hall had many benefits, including wealth, such as land donations and precious objects. Heavenly *welan* are a spiritual category, but the practical representation of court presents it in terms of earthly wealth. What links spiritual and material wealth is that *wela* are bestowed almost exclusively in the contexts where morally laudable behaviour is rewarded and, in case of expulsion repossessed as punishment. I suggest therefore, that the types of earthly wealth as well as spiritual wealth denoted by *wela* exhibit a common dependency on moral stance and morally laudable behaviour, and that the abstract benefits appear closely connected with tangible possessions. After all, as argued above, wealth reflects God's favour, and wealth in use can create or be exchanged for abstract benefits such as authority and favours.

In other Junius XI poems besides *Genesis B* the primary sense of *wela* seems to be tangible wealth. This is all the more the case with examples outside the Junius XI manuscript. Even these can, however, correlate wealth with moral laudability; for example in King Cnut's grant of the port of Sandwich (OE and Latin)<sup>182</sup> testifies to King Cnut's Christian appreciation of the transience of

---

<sup>182</sup> A.D. 1023. King Cnut to Christ Church, Canterbury; grant of the port of Sandwich, Charter Sawyer 959 - online rendition of Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters; an Annotated List and*

*wela* as part of the transient earthly wealth: “þeahhwædere we magen gebecgen ðe ece meden ðas heouenlices liues mid þam riosenden welan” (Lat. *caduc/a* pl.: transitory things<sup>183</sup>) [‘And yet we may purchase the eternal reward of heavenly life with these perishable riches.’] The *wela* take on the role of earthly possession. The implication is, however, that *wela* in this document stands for earthly wealth, which can be exchanged for spiritual value.

In *Genesis A* the *wela* form part of the inherited treasure specifically relating tangible moveable possessions. They appear only in the line of descendants of Seth and none are mentioned in Cain’s line, which are, on account of the fratricide, not morally deserving of spiritual reward. In the case of Noah’s death in lines 1602-3 of *Genesis A* the inheritance is specified to include possession of men and glistening wealth (*beorht wela*). Noah was morally beyond reproach, which is why he was saved from the Flood at all; again the *wela* are tied to his high moral stance. In addition *wela* are described as “glistening.” This implies that the type of possessions for which the poet chose the term *wela* in this case comprised of tangible valuables such as metals or gems. The same goes for *wela* featured in the description of Lot and his family leaving Sodom, in *Genesis A* lines 1929-31, escaping destruction as a result of their moral stance and morally laudable behaviour. Lot is said to emigrate with all his moveable possessions [‘æhte’] including *botlgestreon* [‘household treasure’], *welan* [‘valuables?’], *wunden gold* [‘wound gold’]. The description executes a shift of focus from the general to the specific. The poet narrows the focus from the entire household treasure, to wealth, to the precise category of wound gold. Noble metals or jewellery are of course tangible material possessions. Before the destruction of Sodom Lot was saved with all his wealth, because he was the only exceptional person to exhibit proper behaviour.

---

*Bibliography.* Available: <<http://www.esawyer.org.uk/charter/959.html#>> [Accessed: 27 August 2015].

<sup>183</sup> Latham and Baxter, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources*, p. 62.

*Daniel* presents the same implication. In lines 7-9 a hearty kin is said to have ruled the Israelite homeland that received *beorht wela* ['bright possessions'] before they were morally compromised. Similarly in lines 55-82 the poem relates the Israelite bliss before the fall of the first Israel. The poem marks a significant contrast between the Israelites' life in their land, and subsequent oppression under the Babylonians. The poet posits the Israelites' falling into sinful ways as the reason for the change in their external living conditions and loss of their *welan*. Following the first very short mention of *wela* in *Daniel*, in lines 640-4, at the point where the *Daniel* poet revisits their initial time of godly and pleasant living, the compound *lifwela* is expounded in a detailed account of its constituent parts. After Nebuchadnezzar fails to take heed of his own prophetic dreams he acts contrary to morally laudable behaviour by abusing the holy vessels of Israel's treasure; his punishment is the loss of kingly authority and wealth, and exile to the wilderness. His exile includes his dispossessions of goods. He only returns to power after he exhibits better conduct and acknowledges the rule of God. As a result of acting reprehensibly, the poet explains, he learned that God is in charge of distributing *welan swa wite* ['bliss/in wealth and suffering/in deprivation']. The poet achieves a direct connection between reprehensible behaviour and distribution of wealth.

Exile, as the separation of a person from the people's treasure, includes dispossession of bestowed mercies including moveable objects. *Genesis B* in lines 54b-57 offers a description of the consequences of Satan's rebellion against his Lord. This description in effect describes individual building blocks of exile as a sequence of benefits forfeited with the loss of one's lord (see Appendix 1 on p. 197). The defeated Lucifer's rebellious troops lose: *sigor* – victory, referring to the battle in Heaven they had lost; *dom* – ordinance, since they strove against the natural order; *geweald* – power as they are thrown from their social positions in God's court, joy or heavenly song; and *frið* – security, which is dependent on the ['L']ord's protection. The rebels also lose *dugeð*, which could reasonably stand for property, honour or authority; all three proposed meanings seem equally valid in this context.

The return to *Genesis A*, after the inserted *Genesis B*, opens with an exegetical explanation mitigating God's judgement of Adam and Eve; the explanation is the poet's own invention and addition to scriptural matter. It maintains that expulsion did not leave Adam and Eve bereft of everything but that they were also allowed to keep goods or benefits described as *grundwelan* (line 957) in addition to natural resources tied to the land. According to the DOE corpus this compound is only found in this excerpt in the surviving Old English sources. The term *grund* is taken by the DOE to refer to earthly matter and accordingly the compound can be translated as *earthly riches*. This ties in well with the notion of being expelled to Earth and fits in well right before the description of animals and plants that remain in Adam and Eve's power. The enumeration lends the following sequence to the items allowed Adam and Eve upon expulsion: *hrystende hrof halgum tunglum* ['the roof bejewelled with holy stars'], *grundwelan* ['fundamental goods or benefits'], *tuddorteodra* ['stems of earthly and sea life – animals'], *wæstmas fedan* ['fruits for eating']. The *grundwelan* is used as the hypernym encompassing animals, plants and fruits. The compound in the context of Adam and Eve being punished is quite the reverse from a reward for morally laudable behaviour. However, this notion is actively accounted for by the poet. By clearly stating that God's mercies are contrary to what was expected for their transgression, the poet confirms that *wela* even in the compound *grundwela*, would normally be expected as a reward for morally laudable behaviour.

The withdrawal of bestowed benefits is also at the forefront of Cain's exile. As the narrative moves from Adam and Eve to Cain and Abel the two are initially described in lines 969-71 as friendly brothers (line 971, *willgebroðor*) acting properly, acquiring as a result of their behaviour *welan and wiste* ['goods and provisions'] through honest work. After Cain's expulsion he is dispossessed of *welan*. In the excerpt on Cain's exile, Cain states (*Genesis A*, line 1032): 'ademest me fram duguðe and adrifest from eared minum' ['hast Thou cut me off from good! Thou scourgest me from home!']. According to the DOE the technical meaning of *ademan* is 'to drive from as a result of judicial sentence', this is therefore at least partly a legal concept. Kennedy's translation of *duguð* as "good" is genial; he combines the semantic range that encompasses

excellence, strength, wealth, and even a band of men, signalling the social repercussions of exile.

God's bestowal (and withdrawal) of benefits and moveable possessions is reflected in the narrative by ideal social interactions between rulers and their followers, known as gift-giving. In this regard the Junius manuscript is similar to heroic poems. Authority exerted through distributing treasure is a theme epitomized by the formulaic phrase *sinces brytta*, dispenser of treasure, in *Genesis A* lines 1857, 2101, 2642, 2728, or by the phrase *sinc bryttian* or variant thereof *Genesis A* 1724-5, - or *dælan* ['distribute'] as in *goldhord dælan* in *Daniel* lines 1-4, where it is equated with having kingly authority "goldhord dælan, cyningdom habban" [(In Jerusalem as I have heard the Hebrews prospered) dispensing treasure and holding kingly sway']. In this capacity as reward the Junius XI poems often refer to *frætwa* (adornments, valuables) as parts of the ruler's treasure. For example in *Genesis B* lines 442-3 the devil's minion, on his way to corrupt Adam and Eve, does so motivated by *frætwa* ['trappings'] (*fus on frætwum* ['his mind on trappings']). The minion is already indebted to Satan for past gifts, which Lucifer had distributed in heaven.<sup>184</sup> Now he is further motivated by Satan's promise of future reward (*lean* ['award'], *Genesis B* line 435).

In Heaven Lucifer had given gifts unaware of what he might ask of his subordinates in the future, and as a result he knew he could expect them to act honourably and assist him in his hour of need according to their moral compasses. After the fall his approach is perverted, and he promises treasure in trade. The reversal of the order, with demand preceding payment, alters the moral implications of the arrangement. The problem seems not to be in demanding loyalty from followers, but rather in the order in which the exchange occurs. This is clear from the exchange in lines 2824-31 of *Genesis A*. Abimelech asks Abraham to repay his generosity and gifts of land with fidelity, a demand the poet presents as acceptable and honourable. There is a difference in the mode of exchange of goods in exertion of authority in these two examples. Satan's minion acts on his ruler's wish, but not before a

---

<sup>184</sup> *ðeodenmadmas* ['princely treasures'] *Genesis B*, line 409, *gife* ['gifts'], line 413.

promise of future reward is given. Reward promised in advance equals payment for services. This is not seen by the poet as honourable gift-giving, it is presented as a less than honourable exchange.

The derogatory attitude towards payment for services rendered is even more evident in *Daniel*, where Daniel refuses payment for his service of divination. His motivation for refusal is elaborated in lines 743-5 of *Daniel*: “No ic wið feohsceattum ofer folc bere – drihtnes domas, ne ðe dugeðe can – ac þe unceapunga<sup>185</sup> orlæg secge...” [‘Not for gain do I pronounce God’s judgments to the people, nor of mine own strength, but freely will I tell thy fate, and the meaning of the words...’] Kennedy translates *unceapunga* simply as freely, but the term itself carries a strong mercantile sense tied specifically to trade, buying and selling (DOE *ceapung*, *cyping*), Daniel is placing the exchange in terms of selling the word of God. This attitude expressed by Daniel in the poem strongly amplifies the simple statement of the Vulgate Daniel V: 17, where Daniel simply relinquishes payment for the benefit of others: “munera tua tibi sint et dona domus tuae alteri da” [‘let your gifts go to you and presents of your house give to another’]. The diction here does not imply humility but presents payment as tarnishing to the Lord’s decrees (*drihtnes domas*). Daniel had previously in the poem, in lines 163-4, accepted generosity including office and accompanying benefits. The issue can therefore hardly be the worldly gain itself. I propose the issue is the manner in which it is bestowed. Satan’s minion accepting payment for evil deeds and Daniel refusing to take payment for good morally laudable divination both reflect poorly on pre-agreed payment, conveying a difference between reciprocal favour and trading. The receiving of gifts in reciprocity based on honour and a sense of obligation is almost the opposite of trade. Lucifer, while still an angel and lord in Heaven, had given gifts unaware of what he might ask of his subordinates in the future, not because he knew he would ask them, but because he was honouring the agreement by providing upkeep, and

---

<sup>185</sup> The existence of a compound reserved for use with exchange where no payment is exchanged for action points to the more general mode of exchange with payment with a need for a term to mark the exception.

as a result he knew he could expect them to act honourably and assist him in his hour of need. Daniel on the other hand was sent for and told that he would receive gifts if he performed a task; this was presented as an abhorrent prospect, and the same Daniel, who had no issues receiving honours and prosperity from his lord as a matter of honour, refused payment for his God-given skill.

A refusal of payment is presented as laudable also in the Old English account of Abraham's military rescue of his nephew Lot from the Canaanites, which culminates in refusal of the resulting loot. Abraham refuses payment of his part of the loot; he merely wants his princes to have their fair share. The Vulgate reports (Vulgate Genesis XIV: 23-24) 'non accipiam ex omnibus quae tua sunt ne dicas ego ditavi Abram – exceptis his quae comederunt iuvenes et partibus virorum qui venerunt mecum Aner Eschol et Mambre isti accipient partes suas' ['I will not take of any things that are thine, lest thou say: I have enriched Abram. Except such things as the young men have eaten, and the shares of the men that came with me, Aner, Escol, and Mambre: these shall take their shares.'] The *Genesis A* account in lines 2123-2157 specifies exactly what Abraham is renouncing: *woruldfeah* ['worldly wealth'], *sceat ne scilling* ['scott nor shilling'], *hyrsted gold* ['wrought gold']. His stated purpose in the Old English account is not merely to avoid the appearance of growing rich from Lot's misfortune, but rather avoiding being seen as benefitting from Sodom's ancient treasure instead of appearing as the beneficent liberator per se. The pervading notion is that it is God who bestowed military victory, and Abraham is not to gain from that; similarly Daniel's power of divination is God's gift and as such should not be abused for gain.

## **Conclusion to Chapter 2**

All valuable moveable objects in the Junius XI poems that accompany Israelite migration and are presented in social exchanges can be seen as constituent parts of a "national treasure". Such a national treasure, in the absence of people's country, contributes to shaping a people's identity. It is

part of a ruler's legacy, though not his to keep but rather his to distribute among a people. The people's identity in the poems of Junius XI is so strongly linked with their treasure that people can be seen to metaphorically merge with treasures. Whether a people settle a homeland, or are defined by not possessing a homeland, a people's treasure retains a significant role in their cultural identity. It becomes housed in a civilised and urban setting and works as a device of their autonomy. In the poems of Junius XI the treasure, by displaying the status of rulers, simultaneously displays the status of the people and, when applicable, the land. It merges to combine the people's cultural identity with an autonomous political social environment. Upon losing their treasure while keeping their elites, the Israelites of *Daniel* lose their autonomy. When they regain their sacrificial vessels and treasure they also regain their autonomy, along with cultural identity. Similarly the exiles in the poems of Junius XI not only lose their kin and homeland but are also dispossessed of their moveable possessions. Their ties to the treasure and material culture of their kin are thus cut.

In the Junius XI poems moveable possessions are transferred from lifetime to lifetime through inheritance. The resulting symbolic sense of perpetuity supersedes the transience of individual earthly lives; it relates to God's eternal promise and eternal favour. They can also be exchanged through gift-giving; this is not to be confused with payment, even when the gifts occur in connection with service. The Junius XI poems can be seen to present a clear distinction between payment for services and gift-giving as sanctified social exchange in vertical hierarchical relations. The Junius XI poems present an idealized image of how moveable wealth should circulate in a social environment. The social self-awareness of the people in the poems is clear, it is symbolised by their material culture and common ancestry. The material culture is represented in the poems through their treasure, as a larger depository of wealth passed down the line of inheritance. Their authority and status are strengthened through payment and reward made possible by the treasure.

### 3 LANDED POSSESSIONS IN THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

#### Introduction

The previous chapter focused in part on cultural identity in migration; this chapter will examine the role of landed possessions primarily in stationary society, though the promise of land to a migrating people will also be addressed. In several places the Junius XI poems share attitudes towards landed possession with texts usually studied by historians, notably Old English documents and elements of documents in the forms of wills and boundary clauses to Latin diplomas. The terminology of landed possession has been a part of a recent study by Scott Smith in a literary examination of sources traditionally used by historians.<sup>186</sup> He primarily examines the literary parts of traditionally historical sources and very briefly brings them in line with poetic sources. In contrast, the present chapter focuses on attitudes within the poems of Junius XI compared with documentary evidence. I suggest that theology and literature could not ignore practical concerns when it came to inhabiting, tilling, loaning, granting and generally using landed possessions. Thereby the language of vernacular documents may be expected to overlap with parts of poetic formulation.

All five Junius XI poems cover Christian matter, and share God as the one constant protagonist. As a consequence the predominant types of realms are theological by nature. Due to the nature of the genre a large part of the identified land in possession is naturally set in Christian mythological topology. Where land is presented in the Junius XI poems as wild and uncultivated there is an identifiable stable imagery, which has been shown by Ananya Kabir to allude to a type of Paradise.<sup>187</sup> As I will show the uncultivated land in the poems of Junius XI is seen as un-owned. Therefore the novelty in

---

<sup>186</sup> Smith, *Land and Book*.

<sup>187</sup> Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*.

this chapter will lay in observing both land in possession and land outside possession.

The poems comprising Junius XI are not unanimous in their perception of Paradise. In fact one could argue for various types of Paradise within *Genesis A* alone. The notion of the interim Paradise that was Ananya Kabir's focus can be identified in parts of this poem, but it is not synonymous, for example, with the Garden of Eden, a point which Kabir established through her comparison with the Anglo-Saxon versions of the "Theban Legend".<sup>188</sup> Though in many ways Junius XI was compiled as a unit, the compiling authority does not seem to have been concerned with the imagery or uniformity of concepts of Paradise. Individual poets, on the other hand, distinguish between the ideal landscape of Paradise and the reality of earthly existence.

#### **A) LANDED POSSESSIONS IN THE INTERIM PARADISE**

A chapter on landed possessions in the vernacular biblical paraphrases of MS Junius XI must take into account the profound impact of allegory in relation to all lands appearing in the context of the poems. Due to the deliberately allegorical treatment of landed possession in the Junius XI poems I have opted to divide the chapter into two parts, the first focused on the allegorical significance of landed possessions and the second focused on more practical implications of landed possessions. The distinction between the examination in the first and the second sections of this chapter lies in the contrast between the self-replenishing ideal landscape of Paradise, and the earthly soil which needs to be cultivated through labour.<sup>189</sup> The imagery is informed by allegorical interpretations of Paradise as uncultivated green nature juxtaposed

---

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., pp. 69-73.

<sup>189</sup> The distinction occurred to me when reading Bennett's *Life on the English Manor*, where a peasant is mentioned asking leave at manorial court to build a cot in a clearing they had been making near a great wood. I wondered to whom the forest belonged, and who gave the permission to make a clearing beforehand: Bennett, *Life on the English Manor*, p. 24.

with cultivated landscape, the former standing for joy and the latter for hardship. In addition to allegorical imagery, the original poetic additions to scripture in the poems of Junius XI offer several unwitting insights into the practical benefits of land possession which will be the focus of the second section of this chapter. However, the vernacular biblical poetic genre often presents the allegorical and practical dimensions of narrative simultaneously, which is why allegorical symbolism, once discussed separately, will also be related to the second section of the chapter.

### **Interim Paradise and the Colour Green**

An extensive investigation by William E. Mead found that green is the most frequent among a relatively small number of colour words used in Old English poetry, and that examples of its use are almost wholly confined to the religious poems, with one-third in *Genesis A* alone.<sup>190</sup> Ananya Kabir, focusing on distinguishing between various types of Paradise, introduces a fascinating study of *neorxnawang* as interim Paradise. Her study includes the *Genesis* poems though the term is reviewed in the larger Old English literary context. She follows Alan Brown's<sup>191</sup> rationale explaining the term *neorxnawang* in the following way: 'x' symbol is interpreted as the *gyfu* rune; this rune reverses the direction in which the first element is read, *neorxna-* is thereby transformed into *xroen + na* or *groenna*. Thus *neorxnawang* stands for *groenna wang* ['green plains'].<sup>192</sup> She argues that in their allegorical sense *grene wange* ['green plains'] are idealized landscapes, that the use of green exclusively marked Paradise. She places the Garden of Eden among the types of Paradise located on Earth. She notes that the colour's focus is "on natural expanse rather than cultivated garden".<sup>193</sup> She expounds the image of

---

<sup>190</sup> Mead, 'Color in Old English Poetry', p. 171.

<sup>191</sup> Brown, 'Neorxnawang'.

<sup>192</sup> Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, p. 146.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

Paradise through various comparisons between Old English sources and patristic treatises and marks it as “the ideal outdoors”: an open, meadow-like space, uncultivated, filled with joy and frolicking, and temporary; she juxtaposes it with heaven, which is an ideal indoors: often a stronghold, and enclosure, an urban structure both safe and lasting.<sup>194</sup>

Kabir’s discussion prompts a fresh examination of the use of the colour green specifically in the Junius XI poems. *Grene* in *Exodus* appears twice in the shortness of 590 half-verses. The first instance occurs in line 281: the *grene tacne* [‘green symbol’] was in previous centuries often emended to *grene tane* [‘green rod’]. Hermann opposed this outright emendation as early as 1975.<sup>195</sup> Hermann argued that the green symbol is an allusion to the green sticks representing words of scripture with concealed meaning.<sup>196</sup> This fascinating connection is alluring, especially when one ties Hermann’s argument to the concluding lines of *Exodus* (lines 523-300) alluding to Christ who will unlock the meaning of wisdom. However, it is my intention to present an alternative allegorical reading that assumes a more consistent terminology than generally assumed, one, which brings this use of green colour in line with all others – referring to an interim Paradise. The *grene tacne* has usually been interpreted as a figure of Christ’s cross, often described as green,<sup>197</sup> replacing the older interpretation of it as Aaron’s rod<sup>198</sup> There have been other interpretations, such as Moses’ green twig as a teacher’s stick<sup>199</sup> – implying a didactic role, much like Herman’s interpretations. Elsewhere in *Exodus* the green colour is directly tied to Moses. He uses the green symbol to spread the Red Sea. It is the green ground that becomes accessible as a

---

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., pp. 141-67.

<sup>195</sup> Hermann, ‘The Green Rod of Moses in the Old English Exodus’.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., pp. 242-3.

<sup>197</sup> Luria, ‘The Old English Exodus as a Christian Poem’, p. 603.

<sup>198</sup> Thorpe and B. Rogers, *Caedmon’s Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures*, p. 187; Irving, ‘New Notes on the Old English Exodus’, p. 303-4.

<sup>199</sup> Vickrey, ‘Exodus’ and the ‘Herba Humilis’.

result of this action. Though the green symbol or sign can easily be interpreted as a figure of the cross, or a didactic tool, or even if viewed in its accusative form, as referring to the sea itself. It is tied in an almost envelope pattern to the green ground that appears accessible as a result of this action and the spreading of the Red Sea.

The second of the two appearances of *grene* in *Exodus* is within the phrase *grenne grund* in line 312 as the Israelites cross the Red Sea. Keenan sees its green colour as indicating a path to salvation.<sup>200</sup> Remley adopted his identification of this 'figure of deliverance'.<sup>201</sup> The culmination of crossing the ocean floor is marked by a short direct statement: *Folc waes on lande* ['the people were on the land']. This simple and final statement marks a dramatic shift. As Lucas remarks it notes an 'allusive condensation of meaning', which makes even such plain phrases as *Folc waes on lande* and *Sid was gedeled* seem numinous, or ominous.<sup>202</sup> When we apply the category of an interim Paradise, which was so well tied to the green colour by Ananya Kabir,<sup>203</sup> the path over the '*grenne grundas*' becomes the traversing of the interim Paradise to attain possession of the heavenly realm. The actual path is not in any way marked as possessed, but this is not necessarily true (or untrue) for the realm of Paradise it allegorises. In this connection the *grene tacne* at *Exodus* line 281 therefore refers to the symbol opening the path through the interim Paradise to the security of the heavenly enclosure.

Though Kabir's argument identifies the Garden of Eden as a type of Paradise, her book did not focus on distinctions between the various types of Paradise. In the Junius XI poems it is possible to identify two different types of interim Paradise: Eden and the Promised Land. Both are located between Earth and Heaven with the status of interim Paradise evident from their descriptions as green lands. The symbolism of the colour green has been convincingly

---

<sup>200</sup> Keenan, 'Exodus 513, The Green Streets of Paradise'.

<sup>201</sup> Remley, 'Aldhelm as Old English Poet', p. 94.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid. Also noticed by Shippey, 'Review: Exodus by Lucas', p. 617.

<sup>203</sup> Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, p. 147.

argued by Keenan in OE *Exodus* as part of a figure of abundance,<sup>204</sup> an interpretation which is seemingly at odds with the allegorical meaning ascribed by Kabir who sees green as signalling Paradise of an un-cultivated virgin nature.<sup>205</sup> Eden is not a cultivated environment and yet in the *Genesis A* it is described using the colour green. In spite of being uncultivated it is also described as a landed possession in both *Genesis* poems clearly bestowed on both Adam and Eve for enjoyment under the condition of obedience. In *Genesis A* in line 117, preceding the *Genesis B* insertion, recently created soil is yet 'græs ungrene' –[un-green with grass']. It isn't until line 197 that God instructs Adam and Eve to be fruitful and fill 'eorðe ælgrene' ['the earth all-green'] with their offspring the same happens again in line 1517 where Noah is given all creation to use – including *eorðe ælgren*. In both instances the Earth is devoid of cultivation and in both cases the potential for fertility of the Earth is tied to the fertility of mankind; in both cases the immediately preceding line contains God's instruction to "go forth and multiply".

After Adam and Eve's expulsion to Earth the idealized virgin landscape is cultivated up until the Flood. Like baptism the Flood cleanses the Earth of sin, and for a short moment after Noah's landing the landscape is entirely uncultivated and without sin. The virgin nature of the land is set out at every turn. When the dove returns to the ark, in line 1473-4 of *Genesis A*, it carries a branch of an olive tree with its green leaves. This is not an Old English addition, since the olive branch in scripture is also green. However when the land is next mentioned, the dove in line 1480 of *Genesis A* is said to have reached *grene bearwas* ['green woodlands'] while scripture never mentions where the bird landed, stating simply that it never returned (Vulgate Genesis VIII: 12). From here the *Genesis A* narrative moves swiftly to God's instructions after which Noah sets up an altar and begins tilling the soil.

---

<sup>204</sup> Keenan, 'Exodus 513, The Green Streets of Paradise'; defines the 'grenne grund' of OE *Exodus* as a figure for wealth and abundance.

<sup>205</sup> Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*.

In the Vulgate Genesis he simply plants a vineyard, but the *Genesis A* poet elaborates, adding the notion of hard work in lines 1555-1561 where Noah is described to have tilled the soil and laboured and worked and procured food before the Earth finally bore splendid fruits (see Appendix 29 on p. 213). The *Genesis A* poet therefore presents the green Earth of God's promise as an un-cultivated field that needs to be worked – allegorically Heaven can only be attained through effort and labour unlike in Eden where abundance was a fait accompli.

In *Genesis A* green land reappears in the context of Abraham's travels from Egypt to Canaan. God points out the seemingly empty and uncultivated Promised Land in passing. He describes it in lines 1787-8: "þis is seo eorðe þe ic ælgrene - tudre þinum torhte wille - wæstmum gewlo on gewæld don" – ['This is the roomy land, the beautiful, green realm, adorned with increase, which I will give thy seed to rule.'] The Promised Land is described as already filled with fruits (Kennedy translates *tudre* as 'increase'), just as Eden was. This is in contrast with direct descriptions of having to work the soil on Earth as a part of Adam and Eve's expulsion or punishment for Cain's fratricide marking the physical Earthly plain. Here both the land of the Promised Land and of the Garden of Eden is pre-filled with fruits rather than merely fertile. The colour green marks a specific type of uncultivated landscape. Eden and the Promised Land are both marked as ideal landscape and both described as green. Both are filled with fruits, providing sustenance. They contrast with the necessity of toil and hardship on Earth.

### **Paradise, Landed Possessions and Security**

The creation of the universe in *Genesis A* follows the Vulgate rendition reasonably closely. The first mention of landed possession in *Genesis A* appears in line 211 as "þæt liðe land" ['that pleasant land']. The expulsion from Paradise is a transition to a hard reality. The loss of the idealized landscape and security of the Garden of Eden is signalled by the introduction of previously unknown discomfort first mentioned in *Genesis B* in lines 783-8a

(see Appendix 13 on p. 202). Life in Eden was marked by opulence and security, which dispensed with any need for the protection of clothes or a dwelling. In *Genesis B* lines 800b-15, there follows a detailed account of the discomfort of the looming earthly life: hunger, fear of the elements and the implied lack of security follow, marking a psychological loss of Eden as a state of mind (See Appendix 17 on p. 204). The passage concludes in lines 812b-815a: “Nys unc wuht beforan – to scursceade, ne sceattes wiht – to mete gemearcod, ac unc is mihtig god – waldend wraðmod. To hwon sculon wit weorðan nu?” [‘We have no shelter from the weather, nor any store of food. And the Mighty Lord, our God, is angry with us. What shall become of us?’. By noticing that Eden has no tangible possessions Adam is already outside the absolute security of Eden and in the Earthly realm. Thereby the expulsion from Paradise marks the beginning of landed possessions including dwellings and moveable possessions including clothing and presumably tools for tilling fields as a result of loss of security and upkeep provided by their [‘L’]ord in Eden.

The appropriation of clothes also marks a distinction between the ideal security of untouched nature in Paradise and the frightening existence on untamed and hostile Earth, before it is appropriated and civilised through toiling. A comparable contrast between possessed landscape and security as opposed to wilderness and uncertainty of mortal life can be gleaned in the difference between *bearo* [‘grove, wood’] and *weald* [‘land covered with trees, wood, forest’] in the poems of Junius XI: one is planted and as such domestic and safe, while the other is wild, un-claimed and as such unsafe. There are only two passages containing the notion of untamed wooded area in the entire Junius XI,<sup>206</sup> and both of them deem it an unsafe and uncivilized no-man’s land. The woodland in *Genesis B* in lines 839-45 is referred to both as *holt* (840) and *weald* (l 839, 841, 846). It is contrasted with security of faithful service to one’s lord where Adam and Eve realize they have broken their oath and forfeited the lord’s protection run to the wooded area for cover. Like the rest of the uncultivated nature in Eden it invokes the image of security, while

---

<sup>206</sup> I do not include metaphorical forests of spears such as ‘oferholt’ in line 157 of *Exodus*.

in this case also the implications of hiding from repercussions. This dual nature of fear and protection is more clearly evident in the Earthly realm, as evidenced in *Daniel* in lines 567-77 where King Nebuchadnezzar's exile is presented as existence in the wilderness. The image of the king going mad is conjured by comparison with a stag in a wood, a location which is not mentioned in the Vulgate *Daniel* account.

A planted, and by implication proprietary cluster of trees is the picture of calm throughout the Junius XI poems. As opposed to the *holt* ['wood'] where Adam and Eve hid from their master, the tree of life in *Genesis A* in line 902 was said to grow in a *bearwe*, where no grove is mentioned in the Vulgate account. Its sacred nature is present in the exaggerated description of the original sin. Adam and Eve, instead of taking and eating of the fruit, as Vulgate III: 6 states – 'et tulit de fructu illius et comedit deditque viro suo qui comedit', the Saxon *Genesis* lines 900-1 has them committing a "hostile attack, committing an act of feud, plundering the grove" ("feondræs gefremede, fæhðe geworhte, - and þa reafode, swa hit riht ne wæs, - beam on bearwe and þa blæda æt."). They are disturbing the peaceful amenity of the grove with unsanctioned action. When Abraham settles in his new land he plants a grove first and then builds an altar in the *Genesis A*, lines 2841-42. Noah's dove first lands in a grove (*Genesis A*, lines 1479-80) again marking the location as primarily amenable. Perhaps the most interesting passage of Junius XI mentioning a grove appears in *Daniel* lines 499b-500, where King Nebuchadnezzar in explaining his dream describes the tree as *wudubeam* ['l. 498, forest tree'] unlike a tree in a grove ['l. 499, *Næs he bearwe gelic*'], seemingly referring to the tree's immense height and thus defining a grove by the manageable size of its component trees. The subsequent narrative, however, has the king expelled from civilisation, just as the tree is not part of the grove but of the uncultivated woodlands. Though grove is here not directly juxtaposed with wild woodlands, it certainly does not negate the emphasis as explained above. The woodland is wild and does not seem to be viewed as a personal possession. Groves are specifically mentioned in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (the *Genesis* poem lines 2554-7), where the burning groves are at the centre of the narrative as the epitome of destruction.

The presence of the altar and other sacred structures claim the groves as the possession of man. There is a perceivable connection between a grove and a cross-section between the otherworld and Earthly realm. In the *Genesis A* example the tree of life is the original point of no return between Eden and Earth. In the example of Abraham's contact with the Promised Land he sets up an altar. Similarly, Noah's dove lands in the unspoiled nature of the postdiluvian ideal landscape. The grove signals on one hand cultivated nature leading to a civilised Heaven and on the other hand nature un-corrupted by man though claimed and possessed thus closest to the interim Paradise.

Perhaps the clearest example of the allegorical security of landed possession within the interim Paradise is signalled in the baptismal imagery of the Flood, where water was the purging and destructive element, and the desire for land which conjured the image of the desire for security. The land in question is far more similar to Paradise than to the hardship-infused earthly realm, where Adam and Eve are sentenced to toil after having been exiled from Eden. In *Genesis A's* lines 1400-6 the Ark is raised above the realm of the Earth, exalted above the fertile soil closer to Heaven, as though distance from the earthly realm and from fertility and closeness to the ethereal Heavens provides security in contrast to the unsafe exile and toil which the unforgiving soil demands. This does not make water safe: the waters were at the time the source of all out devastation of the sinful. The repetitive mentions of ground or Earth as the common denominator of sin anticipated the wetness of the Flood as its contrast. The rain was specifically said to hail from above the Earth in line 1350 'wællregn ufan widre eorðan' – deadly rain from above over the broad Earth /land. And as the streams cover creation, the ark is specifically lifted from ground level – separated in line 1389 'earce from eorðan' from the ground. At this point the land was washed of sin. As such it was prepared in all its meanings – from soil, to ground, to the opposite of Heaven and Hell, to realm prepared to be cultivated as a landed possession. The poem contrasts the dramatic imagery of the Flood with the peaceful disembarking, to ensure a strong sense of calm and security once land is reached.

The calm is broken when the virgin nature of the cleansed landscape reverts to Earthly toils through Noah's cultivation. The similarity between lay and

sacred landed possessions is in their potential to cultivate. Whereas Eden is an uncultivated fertile landscape, Heaven is the City of God, an urban and cultivated structure; thereby landed possessions such as sacred altars in Junius XI poems are mid-way between untamed ideal landscape of Paradise and entirely cultivated Heaven. The altars are set up at moments, where they mark either the vicinity of the Promised Land – Abraham sets up an altar where God tells him he will one day possess the Promised Land – or after a contact with the ideal landscape such as when Noah set foot on virgin soil after the Flood has washed it of sin. The sacred structure such as an altar is a symbolic representation of the bestowal of land on a Patriarch, as such it signals security mirrored from its connection to Paradise and the protection of a powerful ['L']ord.

The altar, *wibed*, in *Genesis A*, mentioned in lines 1791, 1806, 1882 *weobed* 2842, *glædsted* 2843, is built either by a ruler, Abraham, or a people presumably in the possession of those who erected it. The larger more intricate sacred buildings are clearly marked as possessions by use of genitive of possession, for example Solomon's temple. The ownership here is not as important as the authority which the connection to Solomon invokes, but the two are connected. The sense of temple in the Junius XI poems is contained in the term *hof* which can stand for several kinds of buildings including residences and courts. The preferred translation in the context of Noah's ark is temple. In lines 1316, 1345, 1393, 1489 of *Genesis A* the allegorical sense is that the ark is a figure of Church<sup>207</sup> and the translation temple is as valid as 'structure' or even 'hall'. The word is not used consistently and takes on different meanings in different spaces, for example in *Genesis A* in line 1569 *halig hof* ['holy hall'] refers to Noah's home, and not his ark. Describing it as holy introduces the potential for error. What is common to the varied uses of *hof* including temple is the implication that a *hof* is a personal possession and that it ensures the owner's security.

---

<sup>207</sup> For the ark as the Church as a "unanimous tradition" see Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy*, p. 83; see also Earl, 'Christian Traditions and the Old English Exodus '.

As is evident in the description of Solomon's temple in *Exodus* the same *hof* can be simultaneously a temple, a court and a treasury. The *Exodus* poet describes it as a holy asylum (l. 392 *halig alh*). In *Daniel* in line 59b this notable structure is further described as plundered of "readan golde, - since and seolfre, Salomones templ" appearing as an excellent palace. Its palatial nature is reiterated in the same poem in line 710-1, in the description of the plundering of the Chaldeans where it is dubbed a *seld*. The significant difference between a temple and a grove altar is in the allegorical significance. Where the grove altar is oriented towards the ideal landscape of the interim Paradise of a promised land, the built urban structure of a temple is a hall and a residence containing treasures and as such a figure of the heavenly city. In the Junius XI poems, as discussed above, the calm harmony of a grove is consistently contrasted with the destruction of Earthly cities which can perhaps be taken as confirmation of the existence of an interim Paradise, just like the tower of Babel was seen as an attempt to circumvent the natural order and reach Heaven prematurely, so can the consistent destruction of urban structures throughout the Junius XI poems signal the same.

### **Interim Conclusion**

As this section has pointed out there are two types of Paradise in the Junius XI narrative, both of which contain the categories of peace, security, and fertility. The landed possession of Eden resembles the landed possession of the Promised Land type of Paradise. The ideal landscape of Eden provides all amenities, which is why no adjacent possessions are necessary. The expulsion from Eden results in a larger significance for possessions including plots of soil and land vital for survival on Earth. In the *Genesis A* and *Exodus* poems the Promised Land is a type of interim paradise tangible like Earth on one hand and peaceful and secure like heaven on the other. The cultivation of the soil and appropriation of tangible moveable possessions mark a turn in direction that transforms the wild threatening hardships of Earth into cultivated landscape producing fruit from wilderness, in effect creating the Promised

Land artificially. Since the landed possession of the ideal landscape technically amounts to ownership dependent on bestowal, there are no other possessions in existence until the expulsion to Earth necessitates tools for cultivation and clothes for protection. Through possessing land the cultivation process begins.

## **B) EARTHLY LANDED POSSESSIONS**

As I will demonstrate, the Junius XI poems introduce significant additions to scripture, putting forth a varied array of benefits tied to land possessions. Earthly landed possessions in the poems of Junius XI can be divided into two broad categories. First, arable soil and plots of land with various included uses such as pasture or hunting, Secondly, on what I deem secondary landed possessions and possessed objects such as dwellings, proprietary settlements etc. Thomas Charles-Edwards, who examined the wide semantic range of Old English *land*, was focused on the distinction between moveable and immoveable wealth; he observed that land exchange is conducted in one direction only, from grantor to beneficiary and from older generations to heirs, while moveable wealth exchanges hands in various directions.<sup>208</sup> A similar point has been noted by archaeologists concerning Anglo-Saxon weaponry, to the extent where buried weapons are exhumed and begin a new life of their own.<sup>209</sup> In Anglo-Saxon wills specialized slave labourers were either inherited with land or it was specifically stated otherwise. Built structures, chattels and tools are treated similarly. After all, judging by the designation of professional tasks in which certain slaves specialised, for example *bovarii*, they could certainly use their tools. By implication, where these slaves or even freer tenants are inherited so must their tools be.

---

<sup>208</sup> Charles-Edwards, 'The Distinction Between Land and Moveable Wealth in Anglo-Saxon England'.

<sup>209</sup> Härke, 'The Circulation of Weapons in Anglo-Saxon Society'.

This part of the chapter discusses what rights and obligations coincide with landed benefits. The poems of Junius XI mention the right to inhabit, to fish, hunt, graze and till the land. These categories will be presented in sequence in order to develop a working model of rights and obligations governing land possession. I will begin by examining land as a general category in relation to its inhabitants: first, of land possessed by its inhabitants, and second of land populated with existing inhabitants but possessed by social elites. I will then examine political land units (such as homeland and realm) and the mode of their transfer as an expression of these two points of view. The subsequent subchapters are ordered according to the prescribed and allowed use of landed possessions.

#### Possession of Land and its People: “*Folcscearu*,” “*Folcstede*” and “*Landriht*”

There are quite a few instances in the poems of Junius XI where landed possession is inextricably linked to possession of authority over people; viewed from the opposite angle, the notion of homeland is likewise defined by its inhabitants. This connection between the possession of land and possession of people is therefore two-sided, and depends on whether one views the land and its inhabitants as possessed by the elites, or the land and its rulers as possessed by the people. I argue that both points of view are valid because the relationship is reciprocal in nature.

The use of the compound *folcscearu* in the poems of Junius XI clearly demonstrates the inextricable link between the possession of men and realm. The DOE gives two meanings, which to this day get clustered together in the popular modern perception of nation: ‘1. land, country; nation, people 2. ‘the people’s portion’, apparently referring to the public interest, ‘the common good’. The compound translated element by element would mean ‘people-share’ or portion of people.<sup>210</sup> The context of the poems of Junius XI without fail ties *folcscearu* to a people as part of a homeland. Each appearance of the word is accompanied in the text by an accompanying explanation of this

---

<sup>210</sup> Anlezark consistently employs territorial senses: Anlezark, *Old Testament Narratives*.

connection. In the following examples the protagonist is often a visitor in a foreign land, though he may receive a portion of the land into his possession.

In *Genesis A*, lines 1865-72, Abraham is told to leave Egypt and seek friends elsewhere, the pharaoh orders his men to escort Abraham and his people away from the *folcscearu* [‘Kennedy: ‘(from) among that people’]. Further passages where the term appears in *Genesis A* use the term in the context of expulsion. For example, later in *Genesis A*, lines 2478-84, Lot, a foreigner who had settled in Sodom, would not join their sinful actions against the visiting angels. He was reproached by the locals for being a friendless immigrant who repaid hospitality with conceit and was encouraged to leave the *folcscearu* [‘Kennedy: ‘this land’]. In the passage on Lot’s looming excommunication the *folcscearu* is followed by a reference to inhabitants. The same connection is made when Abraham, after being expelled from Egypt, is accepted to reside in Canaan in *Genesis A*’s lines 2825b-31. Abimelech’s grant of cohabitation, in addition to accepting him as his thegn, bestows upon Abraham rule over the inhabitants of a part of his own kingdom. The term *folcscearu* is anticipated by a reference to *leodum*. Abimelech bestows upon him a dwelling and includes the instruments and people needed for its upkeep and concludes the bestowal by giving Abraham the right to distribute treasures.

A similar attitude is expressed by the poet at the point of Abraham’s departure from his homeland in *Genesis A* in lines 1779-82a, which is described as his leaving the land of his people, his *folcscearu*. The notion of a native’s land is therefore embodied by *folcscearu* in cases where foreign immigrants are rejected or accepted into the fold as well as where locals are concerned. A compounding connection between landed possession and possession of inhabitants comparable to the term *folcscearu* is exhibited in the use of the term *folc-stede*. The DOE defines *folc-stede* as: 1. “dwelling place” or 2. “battle-field”.<sup>211</sup> The term is exclusive to poetry with individual elements meaning *folc* [‘people, army’], and *stede* [‘place’]. The appearance of the term

---

<sup>211</sup> At least in line 2000 f *Genesis A*, where the DOE suggests the term ‘battlefield’ it can be easily replaced by ‘dwelling place’ or perhaps even ‘people’s land’.

in *Genesis A* line 2203 exhibits a direct tie between the inhabitants and the patriarch's landed possession. God recants his old promise to Abraham, which he phrases lines 2203b-2204: "gehet þe folcstede - wide to gewælde" ['gave thee this wide realm to rule']. This narrows the meaning down; instead of simply being a dwelling place, it is neither a built structure, nor is it a simple settlement. The phrase *wide to gewælde* implies a type of realm, as does the fact that a supreme ruler is bestowing it.

The nature of realm is strongly defined as a social territorial structure where the combination of inhabitants and land is indelible. From the point of view of the beneficiary of the landed possession authority over inhabitants is included. Therefore the inclination of translating the compound *folcscearu*, a term appearing in the same excerpts simply as land or territory is detrimental to the understanding of the intricacy of the socio-geographical side of landed possessions. In all four cases *folcscearu* is tied to the people as a defining factor of the socio-geographical unit. The above *folc-* compounds are a clear illustration of this connection, which also appears in other contexts, for example where authority over soil and men is tied in a phrase, such as at the point of inheritance.

The exclusivity of ownership by a people is further amplified in *Genesis A*, lines 1910-11 where Abraham states as the reason that he and Lot need to seek out new abodes the apparently infrangible *landriht* of the Canaanites (see Appendix 32 on p. 214). The passage positions Canaanites and Pherezites at the border of Israelite realm whereas the Vulgate Genesis XIII: 7 places all in the same geographical location, but does not position them in their homelands. It simply states that Abraham and Lot's herdsmen began to fight while "autem tempore Chananeus et Ferezeus habitabant in illa terra" ['at that time Canaanites and Pherezites lived in that land']. Consequentially, the two peoples resided in Abraham's realm. They are never stated to possess their own *landriht* to it. The Old English poet changed the details in his account, seemingly to accommodate this discrepancy. For example the poet frames a non-scriptural reason for Lot's migration, namely Abraham and Lot in *Genesis A* express unwillingness to invade Canaan and settle it with their abundant people. In the Vulgate account (Genesis XIII: 6 – 11) the emphasis is on the

inability of land to support Abraham and Lot's people and on the strife between Lot's and Abraham's herdsmen; there is no mention of any land-right of the surrounding peoples or of Canaanites themselves for that matter. *Genesis A* implies the possibility of strife between the brothers' followers in the spirit of pre-emption rather than actual strife. Next the poem focuses exclusively on the sanctity of borders and peoples' land-right (see Appendix 32 on p. 214).

In his vibrant discussion of documentary sources viewed through the lens of literary criticism, Scott Smith included a chapter in which he touched upon the evidence in literary sources. His main focus was on *landriht* and *eðelwyn* in *Deor* and *Beowulf*. He mentions *Genesis A* and *Exodus* poems merely in passing while discussing uses of *landriht* in a variety of sources: "*Genesis A* and *Exodus* also accentuate the communal nature of *landriht*, but they attend to the process of formation and survival rather than dissolution and destruction."<sup>212</sup> He states that in these two Junius XI poems *landriht* refers to communal rights to settle and attain a homeland at the point of its formation. He posits that this attitude sets *Genesis A* and *Exodus* apart from *Beowulf* where the common homeland is presented at the point of its downfall. However, Smith draws a general conclusion for *landriht* in Old English poetry; he ties the loss of the collective *landriht* in Old English poetry to the loss of a people's identity.

I will show that though this may be true of Geats in *Beowulf*, it is certainly not true of the chosen people following Moses in *Exodus*. They are following him in hope of establishing a homeland in the first place. Their identity as a people is firmly established and a matter of both scriptural and Junius XI's poetic realities. The tribes following Moses in *Exodus* even have individual identities, some traced back through family lineage while others through common core traditions. Possessing the promise of a homeland is arguably a significant factor in the formation of the wandering Israelites' common identity. God bestows *landriht* in *Exodus* to the patriarchs as proxies of the people receiving. For example, in the Noah patriarchal digression in lines 353-4, the

---

<sup>212</sup> Smith, *Land and Book*, p. 200.

Israelites' *landriht* is bestowed directly to Noah: "Him wæs an fæder, - leof leodfruma, landriht gepah" ['One father had they all, one of the patriarchs, a well-loved leader, wise of heart and dear unto his kinsmen, who held the landright'] (patriarchal digressions are referenced in the introduction, p. 15).

The motivation and grounds for the annihilation of Egyptians in the Vulgate Exodus is shown through continuous failed attempts to reason with the Pharaoh in view of his breaking his promise of safe passage to the Israelites from Egypt. The poet took the time to present two patriarchal digressions, merely to put forth a lengthy argument for the source of ancient rights, the *eðelriht* bestowed by God to Noah and Abraham.<sup>213</sup> In Junius XI the two stories appear twice, first in *Genesis A* and subsequently both promises are revisited in the so-called patriarchal digression in *Exodus*. There are two patriarchal digressions from the central narrative (referenced above p. 15). Marsden argues that they lend authority to the claim of the Israelites to their Promised Land by right and in this instance to their rightful homeland.<sup>214</sup> In line 211 of *Exodus*, when the Pharaoh's soldiers catch up with the Israelite protagonists, they "wæron orwenan eðelrihtes" ['or any hope of their inheritance'; DOE gives "eðelriht: right to a homeland, rightful domain"]. It was not their freedom from Pharaoh's yoke they feared losing, but their *eðelriht*. Thus the protagonists were shown to value the bond of a promise and prioritize their right. As Janet Nelson puts it: 'For Anglo-Saxons, *riht*, just like right in modern English, had the general sense of what is right (as in 'do right') and a secondary sense of 'justifiable claim, on legal or moral grounds, to have or obtain something, or to act in a certain way.'<sup>215</sup>

---

<sup>213</sup> For discussion on these two digressions, see: Hauer, 'The Patriarchal Digression in the Old English 'Exodus', Lines 362-446'; Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, pp. 216-26; Anlezark, 'The Old Testament Patriarchs in Anglo-Saxon England'; Anlezark, 'Connecting the Patriarchs'.

<sup>214</sup> Marsden, 'The Death of the Messenger', p. 158.

<sup>215</sup> Nelson, 'England and the Continent in the Ninth Century', p. 2.

The implication of security that accompanies the possession of a homeland is a significant common denominator of the patriarchal digressions and the central thread of the *Exodus* narrative. Like the *Genesis* A Noah and Abraham narratives discussed in the section above (see subchapter on Paradise and Security on p. 78), security is also the prevalent achievement in the Abraham digression in *Exodus*. The digression concludes with the promise of eternal security in lines 423b-25: “seo þe freoðo sceal - in lifdagum lengest weorðan, - awa to aldre unswiciendo.” [‘shall be to thee an everlasting peace through all the days of thy life for ever’]. The same notion of security (translated by Kennedy as ‘peace’) is central to the guarantee of safe passage to the Promised Land given by the Pharaoh and then broken.

Remley also concluded that the informing theme of the patriarchal narrative was the land-right of the Israelites.<sup>216</sup> He left the nature of *land-riht* out of his discussion, however. The three patriarchs can be viewed as connected through their prerogative to achieve a secure homeland for their people. Allegorically the sojourn in an ideal landscape of a Paradise, both Eden and Interim Paradise, is essentially defined by its security. On the other hand, nation building was also a factor in the reality to which the poet adapted scripture. Richard Marsden put it best: “The Old Testament had a special attraction for the Anglo-Saxons. For one thing, there were compelling analogies to be drawn between the plight of the Israelites and their own situation.”<sup>217</sup> In his further argument Marsden presented similarities between the Anglo-Saxon situation of the eighth century and later, citing Ælfric’s comparison between Viking attacks and scriptural threat of the Assyrians. Both allegorical Paradise and contemporary landed possession had a common notion of security of a rightful homeland. In *Exodus* the right to a secure homeland was guaranteed by the ruler but possessed by the people.

I will argue that the implication of a *landriht* is security and that those who possess a realm are obligated to provide security, which is why *landriht* is

---

<sup>216</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 229.

<sup>217</sup> Marsden, ‘The Death of the Messenger’, p. 150.

described as bestowed onto representatives of the people in the name of the people. In Junius XI the right to such representation is included in descriptions of inheritance. Of the forty examples of land in *Genesis A*, the ones that imply the sense of ownership in connection to inheritance are either paired with *leodgeard* (line 229), *leodweard* (lines 1180, 1196, 1236), or *yrfe* (line 1167). Inheritance of power over land and people includes the right to distribute land among the people, that land being unspecified landed possessions in line 1236 “Noah land bryttade.” In *Genesis A* it appears as land by hereditary right *eðelland* (in lines 1379, 1968) and land as realm in the phrase on *landsocne* [‘seeking a homeland’] in lines 1665, 1699 and 1750.

A part of *Genesis A* consists of a reasonably fast-paced description of a succession of rulers from Seth (line 1106) to Japheth (line 1242) – concluding with (line 1245b) “ðā giet wæs Sethes cynn”. Unlike scripture, which is limited to a dry account of genealogy, the *Genesis A* account includes a transfer of rights comprising landed possessions. The term *land* features heavily. In line 1167 of *Genesis A* “Him on laste heold land and yrfe (Mahalaleel)” [‘And after Cainan Mahalaleel possessed the land and treasure<sup>218</sup>’]. In lines 1180 and 1186 of *Genesis A* *Land and leodweard* [‘land and rule’] are passed to Jared and then Henoch; in line 1236 (Noah) *land bryttade* [‘Kennedy: ‘ruled the land’, literally: ‘distributed land’]. Right to land does not appear in the inheritance of Cain’s line, though it features prominently in Adam’s second, consequent line. This is possibly due to Cain’s status as an exile from his homeland.

Noah only has to provide security for his family and so his inheritance only contains land. After a few generations, when the population waxes, the poet specifies that the inheritance of his progeny consists of land and a type of people-custodianship. In light of my argument above, the pairing of people and custodianship lends political power an air of obligation, rather than right. The land is the commodity and *leodweard* [‘Kennedy: ‘safekeeping’, implies the sense of ‘the government of people’], or *leodgeard* [‘the people’s realm,

---

<sup>218</sup> Kennedy prefers the term treasure for several terms of possession – see discussion in the previous chapter on p. 56

abode'] seems to imply an included reciprocal obligation on the part of the ruler.

There are significant indications that the poet's consistent alliterative pairing of *land and leodweard* can be interpreted in this way. The Vulgate account is much drier in comparison, consisting of simple enumeration. There are no theological sources or parallels with such a detailed treatment of the inheritance. The line of descendants in *Genesis A* is a fluent description and it presents a sense of direction and evolution of underlying social realities; what is more, it does so in parallel with the line of descent. The terms of land holding can therefore be summarized thus: in both the primary and allegorical reading of the line of inheritance the elites possess *land* with its benefits paired with *leodweard* which stands for their obligation to safeguard the people who own *landriht* and consequentially possess *leodgearð*.

### **Possessions and Benefits Associated with Landed Possessions**

This section will examine how the Junius XI poems present the bestowal of all earthly landed possession as an amalgamation of other categories of possession. The previous section discussed landed possession framed as realms. This section will examine personal possession of land. The best place to begin is God's bestowal of all Earth on Adam and Eve. In Eden they are persons and only later receive a people and form a realm. Unlike the outset of this chapter dealing with Eden in allegorical terms as an ideal landscape, here Eden is examined as a factual landed possession.

The poet(s) of the *Genesis A* and translator(s) of *Genesis Bs* were faced with distinguishing between the Eden and on Earth. God names his creation *eorð* placing Paradise on the same vertical plane as Earth in line 166 of *Genesis A*; then in lines 169-172a Adam is described as the guardian and holder of Paradise (*neorxnawong*), which is governed by the lord keeper of Heaven (*rodora weard*). There is a lacuna thought to be three pages long between the creation of Earth and the definition of Adam as lord keeper of Paradise. In *Genesis B* the exact same position of Adam as keeper of Paradise and God's

thegn is implied in Satan's lament, where God replaced the fallen Angles with Adam and Eve allowing them to rule Eden. The distinction between the benefits of Adam and Eve's possession of Eden comes down to the different benefits of possessing either. Satan's terminology does not clearly distinguish Heaven from Eden or even Earth. Lucifer, in lines 358 of *Genesis B*, directly states that he wished to carve out a part of Heaven and not Eden. Eden was in fact not yet created at the time. Later in lines 419-24, he juxtaposes Adam and Eve's *eorðrice* with *heofonrice*. But here, Satan does not refer to possessing the realms, thrones, or authority over either of the kingdoms, his focus is on *welan* ['benefits'] attendant upon possessing either of the kingdoms. These benefits are not his only concern, but in addition to the loss of authority and realm, he resents the fact that Adam and Eve have those associated benefits on Earth which he should have received in Heaven. In line 431 of *Genesis B* Satan uses the same term (*welan*) for benefits arising from land possession, where he looks forward to Adam and Eve's expulsion. He assumes that such an expulsion would result in the exchange of those *welan* for *wyrð* and *wite* ['requital and some grim penalty']. *Genesis B* does not distinguish between Heaven and Paradise. Both represent abundance in contrast to hardship, a notion tied in *Genesis B* to Hell, and as I will argue, in *Genesis A* to Earth.

#### Animals as Part of Landed Possessions

The sequence in *Genesis A* begins with the creation of the known world. Soon thereafter the poem describes how Adam was bestowed powers over Paradise. These powers represent a breakdown of land possession into parts. The same can be observed in the Vulgate, but only when Adam is first created. If the listing of parts comprising land possession was included at Adam's creation, it must have been located in place of the current lacuna immediately before line 169.<sup>219</sup> In the Vulgate Genesis I: 26, 28 – 30 (for full text see Appendix 5 on pp. 198-1), God bestows upon Adam power over

---

<sup>219</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, pp. 8-11.

wildlife, cattle, soil and plant-life. The benefits of landed possession are much more pronounced in the *Genesis A* account (see Appendix 6 on pp. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**-200). The Vulgate merely puts man in charge of animals; *Genesis A* places fruits in a pairing with the freight (fruits) of the sea as source of sustenance. The same connotation is implied by *Genesis A*'s attitude that all life tied to land, including flesh, can be used, through the application of the verb *brucan*, which according to the DOE has strong dietary connotations. Land bestowal by category is revisited later in the poem in lines 1513-1528a (see Appendix 39 on p. 218), at the point where land is granted into Noah's possession after the Flood. Here the earlier formula of bestowal is repeated almost verbatim. Like Adam and Eve before him (in line 197 of *Genesis A*), Noah is told to repopulate the world using the phrase *fyllað eorðan* (in line 1513).

Both Adam and Eve's Eden (line 197) and Noah's unscathed landscape (line 1517) are *ælgrene* as representations of the Interim Paradise. In both cases the bestowal includes fish and birds as well as cattle. However, in subsequent lines, where Adam and Eve were told to use the animals for food, or at least where such use was strongly implied, Noah is merely stated to be the ruler of all living things, but never to eat them; instead the poet precisely echoed Genesis XI: 4-5 and the Vulgate's imperative that it is forbidden to feast on blood, from which he swiftly turned to the discussion of the sin of manslaughter. The powerful imagery of blood ties to manslaughter just as the image of trickling blood of Abel earlier in the same poem.<sup>220</sup> The connection of the Cain and Abel episode to Noah's landing is further amplified by the latter's inclusion of the phrase *broðor banan* where God is describing his potential wrath against murderers (*Genesis A*, line 1526). The image of blood is a signpost for murder in both cases.

The mention of feasting on blood immediately followed by the stringent condemnation of murder could serve as an emphasis for the prohibition of the use of animals as food or merely a change of direction in the narrative. At

---

<sup>220</sup> For a discussion of the sources and analogues of the image of the blood branches of sin, see: Wright, 'The Blood of Abel and the Branches of Sin'.

least prior to the renewed world washed by the baptismal waters of the Flood,<sup>221</sup> meat was clearly designated as food by *Genesis A* and directly tied to landed possession. Noah takes on board earthly creatures (lines 1305, 1313: *eorðan tudre*) and the fruits of the soil (line 1339: *eorðan wæstmum*). The meanings of earthly realm and soil are here indistinguishable and linked in the sustaining of life and survival. Even though the entry for the compound *eorðtudor* in the DOE is simply “mankind”, the sense of the word combination *eorð + tudor* here holds a wider meaning. Perhaps it is dependent primarily on the first element, *tudor*, for which B&T gives “That which grows from another (used of animals or of plants), offspring, progeny, product, fruit”.<sup>222</sup> This interpretation is further confirmed by the connection between the element and meat provisions for people on board when God instructs Noah to take seven *tudra ... to mete mannum*, which I take to mean: ‘(take seven) clean animals ... as food for the people’. The number seven is attributed in the Vulgate Genesis VII: 2 to the clean animals.

In addition, in lines 1438b-40 of *Genesis A* the *eorðan tudor* is paired in juxtaposition with *horde*: “Let þa ymb worn daga - þæs þe heah hlioðo horde onfengon - and æðelum eac eorðan tudres - sunu Lameches swearn fleogan.” Kennedy opted to translate *eorðan tudres* as seeds, being that they are connected to earth: “After many days, while the high hills yet harboured the seed and treasure of the tribes of earth, the son of Lamech let a dusky raven fly forth from the ark over the deep flood ...”<sup>223</sup>. Since Vickrey had presented an excellent argument for the hoard standing for people as

---

<sup>221</sup> In addition to viewing OE Exodus as a figure of baptism, the Flood as a figure of baptism known in Anglo-Saxon England is widely acknowledged: Anlezark, *Water and Fire*; Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, pp. 216-17; Anlezark, ‘Connecting the Patriarchs’, p. 187; Foot, ‘By Water in the Spirit’, pp. 186-7; Lapidge, ‘Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages’, p. 16. Luria, ‘The Old English Exodus as a Christian Poem’, p. 604.

<sup>222</sup> Bosworth, ‘An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Online’. Available: <http://www.bosworthtoller.com/031117> > [Accessed: 29 August 2015.]

<sup>223</sup> Translation from: Kennedy, *The Caedmon Poems*.

treasure,<sup>224</sup> both the scriptural connotation and the juxtaposition of *eorðan tuddor* with *hoard* imply that *tuddor* was meant to stand for cattle. The distinction is further significant, as the same phrase *mid mete and mid mannum* recurs in vernacular charters.<sup>225</sup> In at least one of them, according to the translation supplied by the Electronic Sawyer, the phrase is translated as “with its produce and its men.”<sup>226</sup> My proposed variant translation, stemming from the phrase in the *Genesis A* account above, would be “with its cattle and its men.” The bestowal of land in charters *mid mete and mid mannum* is the description of the benefits that are tied to landed possessions. The same are evident, as I have demonstrated, in the *Genesis A* narrative.

The passage describing the granting of Eden is informative of individual possessions that comprise the complex of landed possessions on a personal scale, barring those tied to working the land. This is to be expected since Eden was characterized by a carefree existence where food, comfort and security were readily available. The Noah Episode remedies this by including working the land. In both cases possessing land includes possessing its wildlife.

#### Tilling the Land: Right or Penalty

In terms of agricultural principles, *Genesis A*'s account of expulsion from the ideal landscape of Eden to Earth is epitomized in the shift from receiving ready made fruits of Eden to laborious tilling of unyielding soil. The narrative, however, continuously refers to fruits even after the expulsion. Fruits are a reminder of a time of plenty, when the Lord provided sustenance ready made, and an existence without hardships. The Junius XI poems, especially the

---

<sup>224</sup> Vickrey, 'Exodus and the Treasure of Pharaoh'.

<sup>225</sup> According to the DOE corpus the phrase *mid mete & mid mannum* appears in eleven charters: S 1242, S 1391, S 1426, S 1474, S 1476, S 1486, S 1487, S 1492, S 1498, S 1512, S 1538;

<sup>226</sup> 'The Electronic Sawyer', <<http://www.esawyer.org.uk/about/index.html>>[Accessed 10 May 2013].

*Genesis A* and *Daniel* poems, often juxtaposed hardship and plenty, i.e. Paradise and Earth. The Old English adaptation of scriptural narrative also alludes to the nature of possessing land as a source of produce. Judging by documentary evidence one would expect the ability to work the land to be a coveted right, but scripture presents tilling the soil as a harsh penalty for the original, and subsequent sins. The *Genesis A* poet presents working the land as both. The punitive dimension is stated outright while the positive connotation of the right to work the soil can be inferred from the general attitude in the poem. Let us first examine the hardship of working the land.

The Vulgate Genesis III: 17-24 clearly ties together the notion of Adam being made from soil and reverting to soil after death with the notion of eating the only forbidden fruit as the end of immortality. It puts forth a clear distinction between fruit as a consequence of fertility and the forbidden fruit as the bearer of death. While the Vulgate Genesis in ascribing culpability emphasises the aspect of eating the fruit, the *Genesis A* account emphasises disobedience as the primary offence. Where the Vulgate Genesis emphasises the connection between eating the fruit and the introduction of mortality as a natural conclusion tying Adam's creation from soil to his return to soil (Vulgate Genesis III: 19), the *Genesis A* account focuses on the causal relationship between disloyalty and exile. The Vulgate Genesis III: 22-24 (see Appendix 18 on p. 204) introduces the expulsion as an afterthought, where Adam is only expelled so he would not be able to attain access to the tree of eternal life. The focus of the punishment in *Genesis A* is the pain of death after a hard life of exile and hard toil working the soil. The notion of exile is at the heart of the punishment in *Genesis A*; the poet presents death as a final consequence of the penalty, rather than an inevitable outcome. Rather than the vessel of induction into the circle of the sapient as related by the Vulgate Genesis III: 22: "... ecce Adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis sciens bonum et malum." [...Behold Adam is become as one of us, knowing good and evil.] lines 937-8 of *Genesis A* present the forbidden fruit as a vessel of poison: "... adl unliðe þe þu on æple ær - selfa forswulge; forþon þu sweltan scealt." ['until that grim disease, which first thou tasted in the apple, shall grip hard at thy heart. So

shalt thou die.'] The punishment of *Genesis A* is expulsion, while death is the result of poisoning.

The *Genesis A* account follows scripture by presenting punishment as accompanied not by the option to work the land but by a necessity to do so in order to survive at all. This approach is soon remedied. The description of Adam and Eve's expulsion is immediately followed by a shift from land worked as punishment to the right to work the land, a situation described as a beneficial and desirable state. The shift is emphasised in several ways and appears conscious on the part of the poet. It is located in a departure from biblical narrative by an omniscient narrator stepping out of the storyline – a device which frequently appears in Junius XI, often marked by a sentence beginning 'Hwæt' (listen!). It is also markedly separated from the preceding narrative by an illustration on 44v – God decreeing punishment to Eve on the left and Adam on the right, and divided after the paragraph on God's decree of exile lines 939-951 on 45r by an illustration of Adam and Eve being expelled, and leaving Paradise.<sup>227</sup>

The poet steps out of the story and as an all-knowing narrator relates the mercies the Lord allowed even after the expulsion. This is a freestanding addition to scriptural matter containing a profound emphasis on the act of expulsion itself. A mere sentence of mention in scripture is here elaborated in twenty-two poetic lines. The second half of the exegesis presents an array of benefits left to Adam and Eve after expulsion, which clearly demonstrate the poet's positive view of the beneficial nature of the right to the use of landed possessions. The poet has Adam and Eve retain the right to the fruits (*wæstmas*) of the Earth and the sea for nourishment referring to these as ample riches (*tuddorteondra teohha gehwilcre*) (for the full passage see

---

<sup>227</sup> Muir, 'A Digital Facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Junius 11'. Photographs of the relevant folios are available online,

44v: <<http://image.ox.ac.uk/images/bodleian/msjunius11/44.jpg>> and

45r: < <http://image.ox.ac.uk/images/bodleian/msjunius11/45.jpg> > [Accessed 29 August 2015].

Appendix 19 on p. 206). This attitude is not a reflection of the scriptural or the allegorical reading of the expulsion.

The poet reiterates his positive interpretation of possessing the right to till the soil in the subsequent story of Cain and Abel, where the scriptural account of Cain's expulsion and social excommunication is mirrored by the *Genesis A* account, but augmented by an original account of the difficulties accompanying tilling the soil. When they were cast from Eden in *Genesis A*, Adam and Eve were forced to cultivate the wilderness in contrast to the Vulgate account, which has them merely separated from (the tree of) eternal life. By the time of Cain's expulsion, the land is already described as *grene folde* (*Genesis A* line 1030), an ideal and fertile landscape, quite the opposite of the hard soil described as part of Adam and Eve's penance. Cain and Abel are introduced as the first farmer as the first husbandman of the land in *Genesis A* lines 969b-71: "Us cyðað bec, - hu þa dædfruman dugeþa stryndon - welan and wiste, willgebroðor." ['The books tell us how these brothers, first of toilers, gained wealth and goods and store of food.'] The poet first calls upon the authority of scripture (*Us cyðað bec...*) before proceeding to explain the way in which Cain and Abel acquired the benefits and sustenance (line 971: *welan and wiste*), one tilled the Earth and the other kept a herd. The poet saw fit to explain that agriculture was a labour resulting in benefits best described as wealth and sustenance. This marks an additional distancing from the penal attitude towards tilling the soil exhibited at the Expulsion in scripture. In comparison with the Vulgate *Genesis A* positions the expulsion at the centre of the narrative and goes to great pains to describe it. In line 1030 of *Genesis A*, after admitting to fratricide, Cain is forced to abandon 'grene folde', green fields implying abundance and his land-soil, to be in effect separated from the potential of fruitfulness and abundance of the ideal landscape. The poet presents a distinction between the green fertile soil achieved on Earth through cultivation and the dry ground of untamed wilderness to which Cain is exiled, thereby superseding the scriptural attitude towards agriculture as hardship and by implication presenting it as a privilege to have the right to work the fertile soil.

This Old English original addition to the scriptural account of Cain's excommunication echoes the account of Adam and Eve's expulsion. Brockman noted in his examination of the heroic principles and the role of kinsmen in Cain's exile, that "... the ability of the vernacular writer to empathize with Cain's plight is striking. He grants Cain a "freolecu mæg" who gave him children æfter æðelum."<sup>228</sup> Cain's *freolecu mæg* ['comely wife'] in line 1053 echoes mentions of Eve, which is described in *Genesis A*, lines 184, 998 as *freolice fæmnan* and in line 895 *freolecu mæg*. Brockman's prerogative was to isolate the secular social orientation, which explains why he did not himself pursue this allegorical topos. Charles Wright, Doane, and Huppé all acknowledged the Augustinian provenance of the image of the branches of sin, which *Genesis A* uses to illustrate the blood of Abel spilled on the ground.<sup>229</sup> It would be hard to deny the allegorical significance in the Old English corpus of the branches of sin connecting all sinners from the first killer to the last through the progeny of Cain, including the monsters of *Beowulf*. But as I continuously argue it would be similarly hard to deny the *Genesis A* poet's ambition to adapt the scriptural narrative to his perceived practical reality, specifically where the poet adds his own original exhortation to the scriptural narrative.

### Fruits

Unlike the Vulgate where the creation begins outright, *Genesis A* in lines 103-10 begins the creation sequence by describing nothingness to be filled as devoid and unused land (*grund idel and unnyt*) (see Appendix 4 on p. 198). Nothingness was imagined by the poet as the absence of light, joy and fertility, its devoid nature amplified through a location remote from the ruler. The Junius XI poems present a strong tie between the ruler and the fertility of the land. Rob Meens has demonstrated the extent to which fertility in

---

<sup>228</sup> Brockman, "'Heroic' and 'Christian' in *Genesis A*", p. 126; Doane, *Genesis A*; Huppé, *Doctrine and Poetry*.

<sup>229</sup> Wright, 'The Blood of Abel and the Branches of Sin'.

Augustinian theology was tied to the just rule of the king; through Ps.-Cyprian and other writers he demonstrated the continental application of Old Testament and patristic principles.<sup>230</sup> The same attitude is mirrored in *Daniel's* account of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of his own exile in lines 495-523; its interpretation in lines 546-592, and its coming true in lines 612-656. The account includes references to wild animals (*Daniel*, lines 504, 571), which according to Ps.-Cyprian, disappear under the rule of a moral and just king, while the wild animals are less pertinent to the nature of fertile landed possessions and will not be referred to specifically.

The lengthy account of *Daniel* is stringently modelled on the Vulgate Daniel IV. The attitude expressed in *Daniel* does not counter scripture and the significance of the story to the Old English poet can be inferred from the detail lent to the prophetic dream as well as the fact that the dream is told three consecutive times (all detailed accounts): 1) while the king was dreaming, 2) as Daniel explained it, and 3) as it came true. In comparison the Vulgate Daniel IV does not report the dream sequence until Nebuchadnezzar reports it to Daniel and only repeats it once very quickly as Daniel interprets it.

The Old English version adds an emphasis to the fruits of the tree. The Vulgate Daniel IV: 9 reports that the tree in the king's dream bore fruits that were food for all sorts of creatures ("fructus eius nimius et esca universorum"), while the Old English *Daniel* lines 507-9 ascribes a wider significance, making the tree the sole source of nourishment for all creatures. The amplification does not mean that the Old English version ascribed a different value to the fruits, but rather that it amplified it. The sequence of the explanation of the dream in both scripture and the poem equate the king with the tree, the connection between the fruitfulness of the land and the king's just rule is most evidently exposed in the added matter of *Daniel*.

The most notable Old English addition is the rationale behind the loss of king's possession of his realm. In scripture, the reason for his abandoning or losing his throne is that king Nebuchadnezzar goes insane, while the Old

---

<sup>230</sup> Meens, 'Politics, Mirrors of Princes and the Bible'.

English version has the king literally dispossessed (*forfangen* in line 613) of his kingdom because of his arrogance or pride, for which both *gylpe* and *oferhygd* are used in the course of two poetic lines: 612-4.

The *Daniel* poet ascribed the sin of pride as the cause of the dispossession of Nebuchadnezzar's rule. The divine punishment of Babylonian rule that befell the Israelites at the outset of *Daniel* (lines 17-21) was caused by their pride, which led them to abandon the holy laws. But thereafter the sin was ascribed exclusively to Nebuchadnezzar in lines 107, 297 and during the dream sequence where pride is repeatedly presented as the sin that caused the loss of his authority in lines 494, 613, 656. His rule was doused in the sin of pride and as a result his kingdom during his absence is described as barren or neglected in line 584 (*anwloh*) in parallel to the dream tree being cut down. The fruits are given additional significance by the *Daniel* poet who adds mentions of fruit to the scriptural matter. In the dream, after the penance of the king in line 517, *Daniel* has the fruits appear on the tree again, the king's newly acquired moral stance is reflected in the fertility of the land. The conclusions put forth by Meens are confirmed here.<sup>231</sup> The original additions and emphases added to the scriptural narrative point to just such a connection. The poet emphasised king Nebuchadnezzar's sinful ruling, and on his own accord made it the central reason the king's loss of status. He emphasised the fruitfulness of the tree, which reflected the king's stance.

The connection between land and its fruits appears elsewhere in the Junius XI poems as well. As early as at Adam and Eve's expulsion the fruits are first tied to land. The creation before man, as described in line 89 of *Genesis A*, was "beorht and geblædfæst, buendra leas" ['a sunny, fruitful land, empty of dwellers'] the created grounds of Eden in line 214, were "hwæðre wæstmum" ['decked with increase']. In *Genesis B* there seems to be a difference between the terms *ofet*, *ofæt*, *æpl* on one hand; and *blæd*, *wæstm* on the other.

The first set of terms is used exclusively for the fruit of the Tree of Good and Evil and thus holds a negative connotation while the second is mostly, though

---

<sup>231</sup> Ibid.

not exclusively, used for other fruits including the fruit of the Tree of Eternal Life lacking negative connotations but not exclusively positive either, most probably used as a hypernym. There is an exhibited distinction between the desirable fruits of the green ideal landscape of the interim Paradise and the poisonous apple of the tree of Good and Evil. *Genesis B* presenting Paradise as laden with fruits uses the term *wæstm* in lines 462: *gewered mid wæstm* [‘laden with fruits’], 466b the apple of good and evil was not like a fruit *Næs se wæstm gelic*. In line 470 the fruit of eternal life, however, is a *wæstm*. The serpent on the other hand offers Adam an *ofæt* in lines 493, 500, 518. In line 520 the *ofæt* once devoured is said by Satan’s minion to become a glowing *wæstm*. The same goes for Eve, she is offered an *ofæt* in lines 564, which is only referred to as *wæstm* when aliterated with *weorcsum* – perverting the bright and Godly nature of the fruit by referring to it as noxious. *Æpl* and *ofet* are used in lines 637 and 638 respectively. The final three references to the noxious fruit in the *Genesis B* in lines 655, 677, 719 use the term *ofet*. *Genesis B* therefore presents a fairly consistent distinction.

*Genesis A* exhibits a far larger vocabulary when it comes to fruits, for the forbidden fruit the term *blæd* (lines 883,891, 902) is interchangeable with *wæstm* (line 894), and *æpl* (line 937). Naturally after the eating of the forbidden fruit the distinction becomes less vital but the connection to just rule, or at least loyalty to God remains. With this connection in mind the poet’s characterisation of God as merciful for allowing them to produce fruits from the land becomes clearer. Their wrongdoing resulting in a land more barren than before in Eden (see Appendix 19 on p. 206) also begins to make a new kind of sense. They are the rulers and progenitors of the human race, their wrongdoing is reflected in the poor fertility of the land which is described in *Genesis A*, lines 962-3: “eard and eðyl unspedigran - fremena gehwilcre þonne se frumstol wæs” [‘home and native land less rich in all good things than was their first abode’]; in this respect the unjust rule of the king, as described by Meens, is focused on maintaining the “right moral path.”<sup>232</sup> A

---

<sup>232</sup> Ibid Kennedy’s translation refers to Eden as *frumstol* while the DOE gives ‘original seat’, a meaning which implies their abode was a political realm under their control, rather than merely a home of two people.

similar prerogative is evident in the mode in which Cain is excommunicated; he is not truly exiled, but remained in God's protection. The poet (see above "Cain the First farmer" on p. 99) added the refusal of the Earth to yield fruits to him after he spilled the blood of Abel on the floor,<sup>233</sup> the Earth refusing to give fruits in *Genesis A* line 1015b ("Ne seleð þe wæstmas eorðe") as a direct consequence of his immoral act of fratricide (l 1030 *broðorcwealm*). The poet, unlike scripture, maintains his noble origin. Cain becomes a notable founder of the city with his new kin (1057, *mid þam cneomagum ceastre timbran*), far from his father's court (1053 *fædergeardum feor*). The kinsmen must have been new, because he is separated from his previous kin (1021 "widlast wrecan, winemagum lað" ['Loathed of thy kinsmen, an exile and a fugitive, shalt thou wander on the face of the earth'], 1047b-8 "Heht þa from hweorfan - meder and magum manscyldigne" ['He bade him go forth in his guilt from mother and kinsmen and from all his tribe']). When the poet returns to the unblemished line of Adam's other heirs he makes a special effort to emphasise that they reside in their native land, in *Genesis A* lines 1104-1105: "þa weað Adame on Abeles gyld – eafora on eðle oþer feded ['sunu']" – ['Then another son was born to Adam in Abel's stead; and his name was Seth']. Cain's progeny, though in their own realm, are not residing in their native realm from which they have been expelled. Cain becomes the ruler of a new kin, and as such, being referred to as *cyste/eas* ['fruitless'] in line 1004 makes him the unjust ruler, such as Meens identified in his article.

The connection between fruits and rulers comes to the forefront in *Genesis A* 1560-1, when the Earth to Noah "him wlitebeorhte wæstmas brohte - geartorhte gife, grene folde" ['that the green earth might bring forth her shining harvests, her gleaming crops']. He had tilled the green soil of the ideal landscape, which has been cleansed of sin by the Flood, and its supernatural year-round fertility can easily be tied to its virginity and Noah's excellent moral

---

<sup>233</sup> The blood of Abel prefiguring the blood of Christ is not always spilled on the ground, but sometimes on a rock; being spilled on the soil has consequences which impact fertility. See Wright, 'The Blood of Abel and the Branches of Sin', pp. 10, 17.

character, which caused God to save him as well as tied to his leading position as the first ruler and progenitor of all current mankind.

Similarly, wherever Abraham appears, *Genesis A* describes the land as fertile. When the Promised Land is first promised to Abraham in the *Genesis A* line 1789, he is to receive it in future “wæstmum gewlo on gewæld” [‘green realm, adorned with increase, ... to rule’]. When Abraham settles in Bethlehem he receives prosperous land riches *eadge eorðwelan*, described in *Genesis A*, line 1878. The land which Canaanite King Abimelech bestows onto Abraham is described in line 1948 as filled with an abundance of fruits *wilna wæstmum*.

After leaving Abraham, Lot became a ruler in his own right. He was also presented as a just ruler by invoking the image of fertile land: he inhabited the land of Sodom before it was sinful; in *Genesis A* line 1920-1924a it was described as green during his stay, “wæstmum þeah” covered with fruit, and bright like God’s Paradise.

In *Genesis A* the final occurrence of fruit as tied to the fertility of land occurs during the sequence describing the destruction of Sodom in lines 2550b-61a (see Appendix 41 on p. 219). The description of the destruction mentions the destruction of wicked men, then moves on to the destruction of possessions – starting with plants of the green soil, then groves, then fruits of the Earth (*eorðan wastma*). The destruction of the potential for fertility as well as the description of Sodom, from the outset when Lot first emigrates there, as an ideal and rural landscape rather than an urban centre. Sodom may have once been an Interim Paradise, but certainly not Heaven in any allegorical sense. The potential for fertility was squandered by the inhabitants, by refusing Lot’s intervention on the part of the visiting Angels. Furthermore, in the *Genesis A* account, Lot’s intervention is referred to mockingly as judicial authority bestowing upon Lot the title *aldordema* [‘chief judge’] in lines 2482-3: “Wilt ðu, gif þu most, - wesan usser her aldordema - leodum lareow?” [‘And now wilt thou be judge over us, if so may be, and teach our people?’] Even though his rule was moral, his counsel was not followed, and what ensued was not merely the destruction of a sinful settlement but also the destruction of the land’s fertility, the very signal of Lot’s noble authority.

The annihilation of land's fruits and fertility is not the only original addition on the part of *Genesis A* where Sodom is concerned. The fall of Sodom in the *Genesis A* account concludes with a description of all the destroyed things as "everything that men in Sodom had possessed". This focus on the destruction of property is exclusive to the Old English poetic rendition. The Vulgate Genesis XIX: 25 (Appendix 41 p. 220) mentions no possessions, nor does the Old English Heptateuch XIX: 25 (Appendix 41b same page). Both sources, however, contain the idea of all 'growing things' being destroyed, but Junius XI emphasis on the destruction of possession is not present. This peculiarity is also present in OE *Exodus*, as Ferhatović observes: "God shows his wrath by breaking and scattering a nation's material culture in addition to murdering its descendants."<sup>234</sup> Ferhatović interprets the destruction of statues and material objects as a cultural aspect of military victory; he focuses on the cities as centres of cultural identity (see discussion above pp. 39, 59). He interprets *burhweardas*, city guardians of OE *Exodus*, as Vickrey did before him, as statues, idols at city gates.<sup>235</sup> The material culture in both cases is pagan by nature, and the destruction of idols is certainly significant. However, where land and its fertility is concerned, the pagan idols are just as much a possession as the fertile lands and its fruits.

The references in *Genesis A* to fruitful soil occur both in idealised landscapes and Earthly realms as long as the ruler that they are associated with is a moral protagonist. When, as was the case with Adam, Eve and Cain, the ruler is a protagonist but is not moral the soil is explicitly described as non-fruitful. It bares adding that the above is a collection of all the references to fruits that appear in the *Genesis A* and *Daniel* poems. This means that, barring the poisonous fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, all mentions of fruitful land are exclusively tied to the rulers and patriarchs of the narrative and no other rulers or people are described as in any way tied to fertility of the soil.

---

<sup>234</sup> Ferhatović, '*Burh and Beam*, Burning Bright', p. 5.

<sup>235</sup> Vickrey, '*Exodus and the Tenth Plague*', p. 44.

The difference between the ideal landscape bearing fruit and the Earthly tilling of the soil is not emphasised in the connection between moral just rulers and fertility of the land they rule. The connection between a moral life and access to the interim Paradise, and consequently Heaven, is of course almost self-evident. By examining the realms where the lack of green soil marks Earthly nature it seems most probable that the scriptural Earthly nature of all places inhabited by Israelites but ruled by pagan kings could hardly be marked divine landscape.

### **Conclusion to Chapter 3**

The allegorical significance of references to land possession in the Old Testament poems of Junius XI presents land as a reflection of grace. The realm of Eden was bestowed on Adam and Eve as their possession including benefits tied to land possession such as animals, plants, and sustenance. There was of course no need to provide earth working tools or arable soil. The self-replenishing produce of Eden dispenses with the need for other possessions. The allegorical ideal landscape of Eden is mirrored several times in the poems of Junius XI, boasting the same greenery and self-replenishing fertility. Though the colour green, which was used throughout, presented an image of the secure interim paradise, its use was also tied to the notion of fertility.

The practical existence on the Earthly plain presented the poet with the difficult task of reconciling the punitive imperative of scripture and the view that the right to work the land is a privilege. Earthly existence is a consequence of the original sin and exile from Eden, and thus working the land is presented as painful punishment for the generations of Adam and Cain. Later the poems adopt a more favourable stance towards working the land. The *Genesis A* poet resolved the issue by presenting the soil as resistant to unjust rulers while fertile to the just.

A pervasive notion tied to the ideal of cultivated or sacred landscape was security. While the sacred realms of Paradise and Heaven present an innate

notion of security the Earthly plain contains realms wherein it was the obligation of the ruler to ensure it. Through their sin Adam and Eve were suddenly exposed to the elements and through their expulsion hunger became one of these elements of insecurity. The hardships tied to the earthly soil's resistance to cultivation resulted in a set of adjacent possessions such as clothes and presumably tools.

The role of the rulers in the Junius XI poems was to serve as the medium between the ideal security of divine origin, ensuring security which included the notion of a constant homeland complete with arable soil and sustenance. The inhabitants saw these benefits as rights tied to their land possession, the right to inhabit land in direct possession of their ruler. The reciprocal claim of the ruler was to absolute possession of the homeland for a lifetime, subject to inheritance and renewal. The renewal in *Genesis A* was limited to the ancient right to the land while the inheritance seemingly automatically transferred the power over the land and its people (*land and leodweard*).

This chapter presented an individual look at the benefits accompanying landed possessions. The focus was on sustenance where cattle in Junius XI was presented as the source of meat, tilling the land was presented as both a penalty and a right where fertility was dependent on morally upright living, especially on the part of the ruler. Finally, the chapter examined the destruction of land-based possessions, presenting the benefits tied to land possession as stemming from the hardship of working the land, and as an allegory of the demanding morally incorrupt life. Allegorically, fertility induced through cultivation reflects Christian civilization as a bridge between the innocent existence in Eden and final security of Heaven. Through moral existence Heaven can be attained, and the self-replenishing fruits of the ideal landscape re-acquired, dispensing with the need for possessions again. The path of landed possessions in the poems of Junius XI stretches from the ideal landscape of Eden, through the unattainable Ideal landscape of the interim Paradise, to final bliss in heaven. It stops over in the transient landscape of Earth to cultivate and civilize its wilderness through working the land and setting up sacred structures and at the same time cultivating people to ensure their reception in heaven.

## 4 SOCIAL HIERARCHY, PEOPLE AS POSSESSIONS

### Introduction

The previous chapters all touched upon social hierarchy by examining the objects involved in social exchanges. The previous chapter proposed an expanded view of land ownership, at least partly framing the relationships of lords and retainers. The second chapter examined how moveable possessions define the social conception of cultural identity. The same chapter also examined how individual moveable possessions mark levels of social hierarchy either by their perceived excellence (feathery coats of angels and swords), or by bestowal as markers of the lord-retainer relationship. This chapter, however, is focused on the people as the subjects of hierarchical relationships, their ranks and offices, and their status in relations to each other. The people will be viewed through the rights and obligations they adhere to in interaction with one-another.

In the poems of Junius XI people across the Anglo-Saxon social hierarchy are tied to higher ranks by means of rights and obligations. Consider, for example, Abels' statement that "a *ceorl* was "free" in so far as he had certain legal privileges and obligations, most notably the rights to take oaths and to defend himself and his own, his kin, his lord, and his dependents."<sup>236</sup> The obligations impinge on certain freedoms, and the implication which I will argue throughout the chapter, is that possession in its wider definition governs a large part of social interaction across the ranks. I will argue that the literary context of Anglo-Saxon biblical paraphrase evidence supports Moses Finley's assertion that "slavery and freedom were not viewed as polar opposites but as part of a continuum of status."<sup>237</sup> Social exchange often depends on several simultaneous reciprocal agreements, which makes them organic and thus

---

<sup>236</sup> Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 38.

<sup>237</sup> Finley, 'Between Slavery and Freedom', p. 36.

wider than the concept of possession can define, but they are certainly framed by the concept of possession.

The lines between Anglo-Saxon social ranks are difficult to draw, partly because the Anglo-Saxon period was long and socially diverse, and it is therefore difficult to distinguish between which were perceived as owned and which were perceived as autonomous ranks. The differences in autonomy are often specific to individual social situations, framed in a multitude of individual rights and obligations that are not, as a rule, interdependent or necessarily uniformly applied to individual social ranks. These distinctions are at the core of this chapter. Social mobility, especially between slaves and free lower farmers, noted by Pelteret, Wyatt and others,<sup>238</sup> is a practical example of how gradually the ranks blend into each other.

Old English law codes define slaves by means of limiting their legal rights, such as the right to possession or representation through oath-swearers as well as by often treating slaves differently, imposing corporal punishment for the slaves and monetary recompense for their owner and treating theft of slaves similarly to, though separately from, theft of valuable animals or objects.<sup>239</sup> Slaves have been defined in the past as possessions, although other social ranks are not traditionally viewed the same way.<sup>240</sup> But there is a degree of interpersonal possession comprising all vertical social relations in Anglo-Saxon England, I will argue that in the context of the poems of Junius XI the difference between slaves and other social ranks is in the amount and quality of the rights and in the degree of free choice they possess. Slaves are therefore merely subject to the most burdens and privy to the least rights rather than an isolated instance of people as possessions. Through defining possession in this way and applying it to interpersonal relations vertical social

---

<sup>238</sup> Pelteret, 'Slavery in Anglo-Saxon England'; Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*; Finley, 'Between Slavery and Freedom'; Wyatt, *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200*.

<sup>239</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, pp. 80-108.

<sup>240</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1-4.

relations appear less rigidly separated in relation to one another. Maitland maintained that servitude appeared in degrees rather than as an absolute: “A class may stand, as it were, half way between the class of slaves and the class of free men... ..and thus degrees of servitude are possible”<sup>241</sup>. He went on to state that the attitudes towards slavery may not have been general or standardized at all, but needed to be examined on a much more case by case basis. In part this chapter does just that, though not strictly in the way he meant it: instead of examining slavery in various geographical locations this chapter focuses on degrees applied to other ranks as well taking servitude to mean obligatory service no matter the rank of social hierarchy.

By viewing social ranks as framed by possession, Anglo-Saxon slaves suddenly do not appear as distinct from other ranks; the differences become subtle and intricate and can benefit from examination in a literary context, especially vernacular biblical paraphrase, which is rich in exegesis. I shall therefore examine the role of possession of people across the social scale instead of limiting my scope to the slave-owner relationship and its migration up the lower part of the social ladder where Maitland, and more recently, Pelteret and Wyatt concentrate their focus.<sup>242</sup>

As Edward James remarked, law-codes offer a highly selective view of the position of slaves: “The law-codes treat slaves as property, alongside cattle and carthorses; they were separated in every way from free peasants; yet in terms of their economic and social life there was probably little to choose between them.” Both were tied to the land and to their lord and master, yet both could work their own land and had a limited amount of personal freedom-which included, perhaps, the ability to contemplate upward social mobility.”<sup>243</sup> His position finds support in literary evidence. The state of being a possession

---

<sup>241</sup> Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 27.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid.; Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*; Wyatt, *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200*.

<sup>243</sup> James, 'Burial and Status in the Early Medieval West', p. 36.

is mirrored in the dynamics of social mobility to which the examination of the poems of Junius XI will also add some context.

I find it most prudent to begin my examination by looking at slaves, the most obvious example of people as possession. I will first identify the terminology of slavery in the poems of Junius XI and examine it in line with characteristics identified by scholarship in documentary sources. The chapter will then turn to appearances of *freoman* in the poems of Junius XI and try to propose an emendation to the understanding of the term, then I will turn to appearances of *ðegn*, a rank which is in the *Genesis* poems contrasted with *þeow* as its opposite. I therefore cast a wider net, examining social interactions of Junius XI poems in which possession plays a part including men of free social status. I will try to correlate all social ranks to the degree and nature of personal choice as a marker between autonomy and possession. I will examine what similarities between slavery and free status can be inferred from the context of Junius XI poems. I will attempt to determine whether slavery is merely marked by an extreme degree of possession figuring in social interaction across the hierarchical scale or whether perhaps a different framework should be employed.

## **A) SLAVES AS POSSESSIONS**

The defining factor making slaves possessions is usually the notion that they are not free. The notion of freedom in the frame of Anglo-Saxon society is, however, different from modern conceptions. Already in the nineteenth century Kemble argued that there were various degrees of free status in Anglo-Saxon England. He distinguished between groups retaining a degree of personal freedom and two sub-groups of those with no such freedom: *servi casu* who were initially free but had lost or traded their freedom and *servi natura* who were born into slavery.<sup>244</sup> Pelteret points out that part of Kemble's argument was based on continental sources and that such a division is

---

<sup>244</sup> Kemble and Walter Birch De Grey, *The Saxons in England*, pp. 193-4 and 203.

artificial.<sup>245</sup> According to Maitland, “every man who was not a *théow* was in some definite legal sense a free man.”<sup>246</sup> Pelteret notes that H. Loyn elaborated upon this legal sense in his inaugural lecture the *Free Anglo-Saxon*, delivered in 1975.<sup>247</sup> Loyn defined a free man as “one who possessed full standing in law; the practical tests (as opposed to legal concern with status) for what was or was not free seem increasingly to depend on obligations, particularly obligation to pay and an obligation in matters of justice”.<sup>248</sup> It is the general consensus among Anglo-Saxonists that the concept of slave is defined as a legal status and the possessor is defined by law-codes as the one legally responsible for damages and the like perpetrated by said slave. These defining legal factors evolve through time in favour of changing fiscal obligations and tangible rights. Slaves as evidenced in late Anglo-Saxon laws are not responsible for their own *wergild*, which defines the mode in which they were socially and legally a type of possession. Slaves are therefore perhaps the most direct example of persons as property. In this context Pelteret drew attention to the Anglo-Saxon legal use of ‘æht’ standing for “... ‘something owned by a person’, ‘property’, which then gained the specialised sense ‘someone owned by a person’, ‘a slave’.”<sup>249</sup>

A direct example of this correlation appears in *Genesis A* poem where Hagar, Sarah’s slave-woman, is strongly stated to be a possession. Indeed the fact is strongly emphasised as though it stood at the very basis of social order. After having run away from her mistress Hagar is instructed to return to her position. The given reason why she must do so is simple, directly stated in line 2272: “þec Sarre ah” – [‘Sarah owns you’] and reiterated again in line 2295 “wuna þæm þe agon” [‘dwell with them that have thee in possession’]. In *Genesis A* to be a slave is equivalent to being a possession; the question that

---

<sup>245</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, p. 7.

<sup>246</sup> Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 30.

<sup>247</sup> I could not obtain this lecture, and must here follow Pelteret’s account of it, see next note.

<sup>248</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>249</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

follows is how the concept of slave is defined in the poems of Junius XI in general, if it can be defined at all.

### Choice and Esteem – Serving and Slaving

Pelteret draws on M.I. Finley's study of the social history of Classical Greece to supply seven socio-legal features through which to examine social interactions: (1) Power over a man's labour and movements; (2) Power to punish; (3) Claims to property, or power over things; (4) privileges and liabilities in legal action; (5) privileges in the area of family: marriage, succession, and so on; (6) privileges in social mobility, such as manumission or enfranchisement (and their inverse); and (7) privileges and duties in the sacral, political, and military sphere. He adds to Finley's classification an eighth aspect – that of esteem.<sup>250</sup> In this final respect the poems of Junius XI are especially revealing.

Finley's classification can be applied to the poems of Junius XI to varied degrees. In terms of viewing social hierarchy as a system of mutual rights and obligations all Finley's socio-legal features will inform my examination in this chapter, except for number (7), which will feature prominently in the next chapter. The pronounced difference between slaves and servants in Anglo-Saxon legal sources lies in the level of personal freedom, legal rights and monetary value. In the poems of Junius XI, as I will show, the primary difference between the free and un-free servile social ranks is reflected self-worth and esteem epitomised in the distinction between service of a *ðegn* and that of a *þeow*.

A closer examination of *Genesis B*<sup>251</sup> reveals a consistently applied distinction between a loathsome experience of forced servitude, which is designated systematically and exclusively in the *Genesis* poems by the term *þeowian*, as

---

<sup>250</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>251</sup> In focusing on *Genesis B* it is impossible to rely on a comparison with the Vulgate since *Genesis B* is almost entirely original in the sense that it seems to stem from a general tradition drawing on a multitude of sources. Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, pp. 93-107.

opposed to voluntary loyal service, which is described throughout the poem as *ðegnian*.<sup>252</sup> The term *þeow* is not only exclusively used for slaves but also makes by far the most appearances throughout Junius XI of all the terms that could refer to slaves. It is reserved for male slaves while in place of *þeowen*, its female equivalent, *mennen* is represented most. Similarly *ðegn* is used to designate honourable service but may also refer to a specific social hierarchical position which will be discussed below (see p. 144). In spite of the consistency of their relative uses the narrative does not explicitly spell out the difference between *ðegn* and *þeow* types of subjugation, but rather expects the reader to be able to distinguish between them.

Pelteret explains that "... biblical 'slave' has been replaced in modern Christian religious discourse by 'servant'."<sup>253</sup> He maintains that the OE *þeow* had been the most common word for slave used<sup>254</sup> and enumerates its compounds.<sup>255</sup> (He also lists other words, most of which never appear in Junius XI.) He sought out several instances of *þeow* and its compounds in Anglo-Saxon documentary evidence and reported the large majority stand for 'slave'; In some cases, in addition to slavery 'spiritual service' and 'service due from a property to an overlord' also appear, the latter being especially common in Northumbrian texts.<sup>256</sup> Pelteret's examination of *þeow* led him to believe that the word held no pejorative meaning.<sup>257</sup>

The *Genesis A* and *B* poems do, however, present the position of *þeow* as unwanted and dishonourable. This is especially evident from its juxtaposition with *ðegn*. Though Pelteret notes a slight semantic distinction between *þeow*

---

<sup>252</sup> I have used part of my work on this chapter in a presentation I gave at the ISAS New Voices Panel at the International Medieval Congress at Leeds, on 12 July 2011.

<sup>253</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, p. 68.

<sup>254</sup> *Ibid.* note 87#

<sup>255</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 90, 305-15.

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41-2.

and *ðegn*, he ascribes no special terminological significance to *ðegn* and accepts it as both slave and servant<sup>258</sup> while Girch, though mirroring his semantic observation, accepts the meaning slave to be primary for both.<sup>259</sup> The strict terminological division that distinguishes poetic instances of *ðegn* from slavery only becomes apparent when counting and comparing individual cases across the *Genesis* poems (particularly *Genesis B*).<sup>260</sup>

Throughout *Genesis B* Satan is consistently clear about his disdain for *þeowian*, a term he uses exclusively to describe his previous forced servitude to God in heaven, as in line 264: “gylpword on gear, nolde gode þeowian” [‘scoffed at God with boasting, and would not serve Him’]. He repeats his detestation for service to God in line 268, again in line 744. Satan’s lament from the outset presents the selection of a lord as free choice and juxtaposes it with forced servitude, which is likened by Lucifer to slavery. The difference between the two in the context of *Genesis B* is whether the person serving has a choice in the matter, which is in effect the main difference between slavery and service in the *Genesis* poems; slaves do not have the right to choose a master and in this they are treated as objects with which the owner is free to do as he pleases. *Genesis B* thus frames the difference in Satan’s self-esteem as the difference between serving willingly and unwillingly.

The difference in the degree to which personal freedom, and with it the person, is in the possession of a master is generally proportional to the degree of personal choice (for an in depth discussion of Anglo-Saxon theology of choice and free will see below, p. 135). In addition to the difference in forced and voluntary service in the context of *Genesis B*, the manner of interpersonal possession depends on the difference between

---

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., pp. 44, 46.

<sup>259</sup> Girsch, 'Metaphorical Usage, Sexual Exploitation, and Divergence in the Old English Terminology for Male and Female Slaves', p. 39.

<sup>260</sup> Doane comments on *ðegnscipe*: “326b *þegnscipe* In GB (also at 744, 836) with sense of OS *theganskepi*, “service to a lord”; in OE *ðegnscipe* usually means “thaneship,” “thanely status” or “bravery.” Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. 267.

servicing a rightful master or the wrong one. An action as small as taking advice from the wrong person can lead to dishonourable service. A free subject who chooses to abandon the rightful seigneur also receives punishment. For Lucifer it is his choice to rebel against the Lord of Heavens, for Adam and Eve it is their choice to follow the advice of the serpent against a direct order by their Lord. I argue that *Genesis B* (I will argue a similar case for *Genesis A* below) presents an image of a society wherein the difference between being a possession as a slave and serving as a free person was fundamentally distinguished by whether 'the master-servant relationship' was chosen rightly or wrongly.

*Genesis B* does not present the decision as simple and obvious. Free will and the resulting difficulty of making the right choice is clearly set out at lines 459-487 with the introduction of the two trees in Paradise: according to the Augustinian interpretation, the tree of life and tree of death.<sup>261</sup> In the Vulgate (Genesis II: 17) the tree of knowledge of life and death is strictly forbidden on pain of death: "in quocumque enim die comederis ex eo morte morieris" ['For in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death.'] In lines 472b-476a of *Genesis B* (see Appendix 11 on p. 202) a similar choice is given but described in different terms. The result is not death but a miserable life in slavery. There is a tree of good and there is one of evil and Adam is presented with a choice between the two. The right choice results in receiving office from the ruler and his protection, both benefits synonymous with happiness. The poem parallels choosing the tree of death with choosing to follow the wrong lord. Unlike the OE poem, the Wanderer, in which expulsion results in losing one's lord, here the punishment is subjection to the rebellious lord.<sup>262</sup>

The second choice in *Genesis B*, at lines 478-489a, is directly stated to be wrong. The result given by *Genesis B* at lines 488-9a (see Appendix 12 on p.

---

<sup>261</sup> On the prevalence of the Augustinian interpretation of the Fall see Evans, 'Genesis B and its Background'.

<sup>262</sup> Lordlessness is also broached in *Genesis A*, in the third part, where Cain is expelled from society. For more information on lordlessness see: Reynolds, 'Bookland, Folkland and Fiefs'.

202) is a life of pain, blood and misery, old age or lack of capacity to perform valiant deeds or enjoy music and lordship, a short existence, in slavery to fiends in hell. The poet could have adhered to scripture rather than adding the Augustinian interpretation; the compiler of Junius MS could have corrected the narrative or simply chosen to omit this part of *Genesis B*. Both would have dispelled the strange repercussions of disobedience. As the narrative stands, the issue is not at all tied to the punishment for committing the crime of disobedience, but rather seems to be tied at this point of the narrative to Satan's social mobility; he is gathering recruits, and taking special pleasure in stealing his old enemy's subjects (see Appendix 9 on p. 201). Had they chosen him as their lord, he would have subjected them to himself. In *Genesis B*, at line 407b, Satan himself explains the consequences of the wrong choice of master by concluding his plan to corrupt Adam and Eve and cause them to disobey their lord with their servitude in hell. It turns out in the *Genesis B* conclusion and return to *Genesis A* that they do not choose Satan, and as a consequence, they receive exile on Earth rather than suffering slavery in hell. Slavery in this example would not be a punishment but a consequence of trusting the wrong lord, in essence making the wrong choice.

There is only one instance in Junius XI where *þeow* is used for a person of free status. It denotes 'lord's servant' in *Genesis A* line 2431 where Lot, Abraham's nephew, is described as *metodes þeow*. This is the only exception to the rule in Junius XI. Lot is confronted by two angels where the basis of the narrative is his incredible obedience, marked in the Vulgate by his prostrating himself on the ground (Genesis XIX: 1) and referring to himself as their *puer* (Genesis XIX: 2). The use of *þeow* for spiritual servants is not uncommon in Old English homilies. Ælfric's homily 'In natale unius apostoli' hints at the habitual use of *þeow* to denote slavery. Ælfric describes the nature of serving the Lord, taking care to emphasise that the Lord's friends are not His servants: "Ne hate ic eow ðeowan, forðan ðe se ðeowa nāt hwæt his hlaford deð." ['I call you not servants, because the servant knows not what his lord doeth.']<sup>263</sup>

---

<sup>263</sup> Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 522.

Thorpe's translation adds difficulty to the examination by adhering to the principle that "under the influence of the Authorised Version the biblical word 'slave' has been replaced in modern Christian religious discourse by 'servant'".<sup>264</sup> Ælfric adds to the confusion by using 'Godes ðeowum' ['literally 'God's slaves'] at the end of the same tractate in which he "does not call them servants/slaves". Pelteret saw this as a subconscious occurrence.<sup>265</sup> However, the demagogic skill exhibited by Ælfric throughout his work makes this unlikely. Rather, I think, it points to a purposeful use of the technique of repetition. Both in his homilies, as well as in the example from *Genesis A* above, where Lot is designated *metodes þeow*, God's subordinates are intentionally presented in terms of lowly rank and esteem in comparison with God.

The term 'þeow' never appears in *Exodus* or *Christ and Satan*, but those texts lack any kind of direct reference to slaves or slavery. The Israelite men under Moses' rule in *Exodus* are as warriors, especially during the crossing, where they are enumerated by standards, in clans. Although they had all until recently been slaves in Egypt, the poet perhaps omitted any mention of slavery as an unnecessary intrusion in the heroic imagery of the prefigured Anglo-Saxon chosen people.<sup>266</sup> Alternatively, he could have been influenced by the Anglo-Saxon legal prohibition of slaves performing military activity.<sup>267</sup> There is a hint at their slave status by noting they achieved freedom as a by-

---

<sup>264</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, p. 68.

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

<sup>266</sup> For an argumentation of parallels drawn by Anglo-Saxons between themselves and 'Israelites' see: Howe, *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England*. Battles also discussed the Anglo-Saxons' in relation to the Israelites in Battles, "Genesis A' and the Anglo-Saxon 'Migration Myth'".

<sup>267</sup> Pelteret argues for such a proscription in early Anglo-Saxon England and sees no reason to doubt its appearance in late Anglo-Saxon England, see: Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, pp. 30-1, 152, 248.

product of crossing the Red Sea, which was Irving's interpretation of the Old English *Exodus* line 584 "hæft wæs onsæled."<sup>268</sup>

In *Genesis B* all cases but the example above referring to God's service (see p. 118) use *þeowian* to describe forced servitude. This consistency in use could be attributed partly to the linguistic influence of the original Old Saxon. The Old Saxon poet possibly intentionally drew a distinction. Satan's desire to enslave mankind demonstrates his distinction between servitude, such as is demanded by a "bad" or "wrong" choice of Lord, and honourable service to a proper master – between *þeowian* and *ðegnian*. *Genesis B* utilises *þeowian* to describe loathed service in heaven and mankind's potential as Satan's slaves, while *ðegnian* defines Satan's minions as his thegns; this point will be elaborated below (see p. 130).

The first instance of a *þeow* in *Genesis A* appears in a scriptural explanation of the primordial source of slavery. After the Flood Noah with his sons Ham, Japeth and Sem and their wives repopulate the Earth. In the Vulgate (Genesis XI: 20-26) Noah's son Ham came upon his father naked and unconscious from drink and does not cover his nakedness. Somewhat curiously, when Noah finds out what happened he curses Ham's son Canaan, rather than Ham himself, to be a slave to the slaves (*seruus servorum*) of his uncles (Gen Book XI: 24-26 see Appendix 26 on p. 212). At this point *Genesis A* curses Canaan's father Ham and all his descendants. Replacing the innocent Canaan with his father Ham betrays a similar sense of justice as the Exegetes and as we share today,<sup>269</sup> namely that the guilty party was Ham and he should be personally punished, and if need be his offspring should be included in the punishment rather than have Ham go unpunished while the brunt of the penalty falls on his innocent son. Unlike in the example of choosing a wrong master, dishonourable behaviour results in penal enslavement. What is more important is that the poet denotes the status of slave as hereditary, which the

---

<sup>268</sup> Irving, 'Exodus Retraced', p. 217. The same point was argued in 1994 by Kruger, 'Oppositions and Their Opposition in the Old English Exodus', pp. 165-6.

<sup>269</sup> For a review of the debate of Ham and Canaan's culpability and punishment see: Goldenberg, *The Curse of Ham*, pp. 157-67.

Vulgate does not do explicitly. In both versions slavery can only persist from that point in history on through a hereditary process. The poet made no effort to explain the point that the status of penal slaves was inherited which is an indication that it did not seem a strange occurrence to him.

Apart from enslavement as a consequence of crime as seen above, *Genesis A* also presents an example of war as a source of slaves. This is evidenced by the instance of 'peownyd' in line 2030 referring to Abraham's kinsmen who had been enslaved in the battles before. It does not need to be emphasised that such servitude is primarily marked by lack of choice. In the Vulgate there is no mention of the kinsmen being enslaved nor is there any parallel to this sentiment. The enslavement is therefore an assumed consequence of Anglo-Saxon defeat, which coincides with Pelteret's finding that war was a source of slaves in Anglo-Saxon England into the tenth century.<sup>270</sup> Abraham seemingly mentions his enslaved kinsmen to provide his allies with added motivation for a counter-strike, the freeing of the wrongly enslaved thereby adding yet another testament to the abhorrent nature of slavery.

*Christ and Satan* is curious, because the focus of the poem is liberation of souls from Hell by Christ. This implies their previous forceful and penal enslavement, yet their subjugation or possession is never unequivocally established. *Genesis B*, which sets out the relationship between Satan and mankind, establishes that Satan wants to enslave souls. Similarly the Augustinian interpretation of the Trees of Good and Evil in *Genesis B* directly states that the consequence of making the wrong choice is enslavement.

In line 132 of *Christ and Satan* the souls are referred to as *hellescealcas*, a term that may be translated as slave but not necessarily. According to B&T *hellescealcas* stands for I. hell's servants, II. a term of reproach, III. a man, soldier and in other compounds 'official, administrator'. The examples supporting sense I, "servant", are taken from scripture and correlated with the Latin glosses "seruus, i" which makes the translation "servant" the consequence of the standardized translation of the Vulgate *servi* to servants

---

<sup>270</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, p. 70.

rather than slaves, no matter their original meaning.<sup>271</sup> The temptation to translate *scealc* as slaves is therefore great. However if it were in this case indeed translated as 'slave' this would be an isolated incident, and one which fits poorly with the poem's pervasive contrast between enjoyment and freedom of movement in Heaven, and the torment and geographic constraint of being locked up in a pit – as a result of being 'scyldig' – 'sinful, in transgression, guilty'. Between the eighth and eleventh centuries, which is the range of dates assigned to *Christ and Satan*,<sup>272</sup> imprisonment is a far less likely choice of punishment among Anglo-Saxons than slavery, and the two penalties are not exchangeable. Even though they both infer a loss of freedom, the types of freedom are different.

Elsewhere in Junius XI *Scealc* appears in the *Daniel* and *Genesis A* poems. In *Daniel* there are two instances of *scealc* at lines 230 and 252, both referring to Nebuchadnezzar's servants charged with manning the furnace wherein the three Israelite youths were to be burned; their role is otherwise undefined but the Vulgate term is (Vulgate Daniel III: 46) *ministri regis* – king's administrators. In *Genesis A* the term appears three times, limited to compounds determining administrative office rather than slave status. These compounds are: *Genesis A* line 1870 *ombihtscealcum* ['administrators'], *freoðoscealc* ['minister of order'] which appears twice both times as an epithet for God's angel sent to maintain order. In line 2303 of *Genesis A* the charge of the angel who was sent to calm Hagar down and have her return to her master thus keeping the peace, his role more akin to a reeve's by far than any slave's. The same goes for line 2499 where the angels sent to Lot before destroying Sodom and Gomorrah are introduced as *freodoscealcas*. This time maintaining order means keeping the peace through an act of punishment

---

<sup>271</sup> There are only twelve appearances of the word "slave" in the Vulgate and none parallel to the Junius XI narratives. There are too many examples to mention in the Vulgate Genesis narrative where *seruus* is translated simply as servant. For example, Genesis XI: 25-27 discusses Chanaan's penal subjugation to Japheth and the modern English translation of *seruus* is 'servant'.

<sup>272</sup> For a concise recapitulation of these issues see: Raw, 'The Construction', p. 187.

and so the meaning 'reeve' comes to mind before 'slave'. Therefore the example of *hellescealcas* in *Christ and Satan* is far more likely to stand for hell's administrators than slaves. As for the three in the fire: symbolically the moment at which they metaphorically achieve freedom is when the poet reports their bonds have been burned. This is reminiscent of St. Paul in II Timothy (2: 25-26) speaking of the pure of heart able to "recover themselves from the snares of the devil."<sup>273</sup> Subsequently they were elevated to the position of advisors to Nebuchadnezzar.

### Work-Slaves - Social Mobility Within the Rank of Slave

The Vulgate Daniel and OE *Daniel* both present the enslavement of the Israelites as a by-product of Babylon's occupation of Israel. There is, however, a difference in the exposition offered by the Old English poet. He employs the poem's exposition to bridge the change in narrative from the period of Abraham's peaceful settlement of Israel to the occupied Babylonian territory of Israel, a time period that spans several books of the Old Testament, though it was identified by Pelteret, from II Chronicles 36: 20.<sup>274</sup> The exposition is in the form of an explanatory didactic introduction to the central narrative with the central message that the occupation is a consequence of wrong choices and of lack of piety, a well-known Old English literary topos. By implication if slavery arises from war, and if war is a consequence of wrongdoing, enslavement is penal. This is especially viable since sin is not merely a general cognate of the crime of disobedience but is directly tied to it in *Daniel* at lines 19, 23-24a, 31-32 (see Appendix DI on p. 222).

Sins and Crimes are equated elsewhere in Junius XI poems, the same goes for Laws represented as Sacred Commandments. I stress it here merely to emphasise the connection between enslavement and wrongdoing. In essence

---

<sup>273</sup> More on the symbolic freeing of bondage in Rendall, 'Bondage and Freeing from Bondage in Old English Religious Poetry', p. 498.

<sup>274</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, p. 323.

the punishment for disobedience, be it of the laws or directly in the framework of personal fealty, can result in forced service. The Israelites enslaved in Babylon are referred to as *weorcþeowum* ['work-slaves']. The didactic introduction comes immediately before the collection of the most learned youths of Israel and thus marks a contrast between work-slaves and the enslaved boys with scholarly attributes. These boys are even said to be *æðele* ['noble'] (*Daniel*, line 89), though perhaps this is relative to their own people and ascribed them by the poet due to their piety as well as their office as advisors to the king. However, the perceived difference persists – marking a difference in slave status from the rest, i.e. *weorcþeowen*. The select boys, whose skill elevates them, are treated like thegns and receive the promise of security and gifts from their lord king in *Daniel* lines 99-103. *Daniel* is in large part a testament to social mobility. The Israelites are imprisoned in war as a consequence of idolatry, i.e. the wrong choice of lord; this results in their downward social mobility to the status of work-slaves, individuals among them are then elevated to serve as advisors to the highest king, as a result of their correct choice of lord as they refuse to commit idolatry in the face of death by burning (a symbolic ordeal).

The term work-slave appears in *Genesis A* as well. At lines 2717-2726 Abimelech bestows gifts to Abraham as recompense for having desired his wife, and among the presents are *weorcþeowen* ['work-slaves']. The work-slaves are bestowed at the same time as land as though the two went hand in hand. Work-slaves were presented as dehumanized possessions akin to land-possessions. However, the second appearance of *weorcþeow* in *Genesis A* in line 2262, shows that even though a *weorcþeow* may come as part of the bestowal of land the work is not necessarily tied to land, i.e. agricultural. This part of the poem contains the only appearance of a female form of this term in Old English, describing Hagar. She definitely came into Sarah's possession through land-bestowal since she is referred to as an Egyptian woman: *ides Egyptisc* in *Genesis A* in line 2229 and in the Vulgate Gen (*ancilla aegyptia*) XVI: 1, 3. She was, however most definitely a lady's bondwoman and not an agricultural worker. Both in the Vulgate and the further evolution of the *Genesis A* account she reports directly to Sarah and not Abraham. In relation

to her social standing Hagar is referred to as *þeowmennen* ['servant-girl'] (not as a result of alliteration) in line 2235 and 2248, and *mennen* in line 2260. In the case of Hagar the term *weorc-þeow* defined the source of possession and not necessarily the nature of her obligations.

Hagar is the only individually named slave of *Genesis A* with a dedicated portion of narrative. Hers is the story of a slave-woman who bears the son of a nobleman: she is in conflict with her owner and her position is difficult due to her child's potential claim for inheritance of possession, land and title. We first encounter Hagar when the then already ageing and childless Sarah proposes that Abraham conceive a child with her slave-maiden, thus ensuring a line of inheritance. One continuous passage contains three separate parts of the story.<sup>275</sup> The Old English poet felt that adaptation was needed and this affords us a glimpse into how he perceived generational social mobility – i.e. the legal position of illegitimate heirs resulting from sanctioned concubinage. This is reflected in a lengthy and original exegesis. In the Vulgate (Gen XVI: 4, 6) Hagar merely “despexit dominam suam” ['despised her mistress']. This single line of the Vulgate is expanded to 30 lines of description in *Genesis A* lines 2237-67 (see Appendix 37 on p. 217) wherein pregnant Hagar is described as becoming insolent and disobedient to her mistress and then as a result flees her mistress's wrath. The lengthy description is derived from Vulgate Genesis books XVI and XXI but amplifies the difference in status between the two women by repeatedly applying to Hagar the varied terminology for slave. The poet spared no epithet to denote Hagar's slave rank. Just to compare, the Vulgate uses “*ancilla*” ['handmaid'] four times in Vulgate Genesis book XVI and once in book XXI the status itself is noted and never expanded upon. The *Genesis A* poet begins by having Sarah describe Hagar exactly in lines 2228-9: “Her is fæmne, freolicu mæg, - ides Egyptisc, an on gewearde” ['Here is a

---

<sup>275</sup> In *Genesis A* lines 2227-36 before either of them imagines Sarah will be able to bear Isaac and in *Genesis A* lines 2237-2268a moving directly to the period of Hagar's pregnancy. These two parts are more or less parallel with Vulgate Gen XVI. The third part from *Genesis A*, lines 2268b-2298 deals with Hagar's escape from slavery and concludes with her return and the birth of Abraham's son Ishmael. In *Genesis A* the third part follows directly while in the Vulgate it only appears after four chapters in book XXI of Genesis.

virgin subject unto thee, a comely maid, a daughter of the Egyptian people.'] immediately explaining her lower status.

Hagar is also a *wif* ['woman'] and *ides* ['woman'] as is Sarah, but these non-specific nouns are not used in the description of her slave status as soon as Abraham beds her. Abraham orders the *þeowmenn* ['slavewoman'] to his bed, as though it made concubinage more acceptable if it was with an un-free person. In fact Margaret Clunies Ross, in examining mostly law codes and diplomatic sources, states various historical cases where abducting was an accepted mode of gender interaction as long as the woman was assumed to be a willing participant, this frames the so called "marriage by capture", especially in higher ranks of society.<sup>276</sup> Hagar certainly does not seem unwilling, and yet unlike in the Vulgate, the statement of her being a possession is spelled out in an obviously deliberate fashion by *Genesis A* poet through statements such as the above "on gewælde". Similarly, in line 2272, the angel addressing Hagar who had run away beckons her to return to her rightful place simply because she is a possession as though this were the strongest of possible arguments, in line 2272: "þec Sarre ah" ['Sarah owns you']<sup>277</sup> and again in line 2295 "wuna þæm þe agon" ['dwell with them that have thee in possession']. This sentiment is not nearly as strongly emphasised in the Vulgate.

The entire argumentation for Hagar's escape from slavery is an Old English addition to the scriptural narrative, again presumably to ground her actions in a situation that the intended audience could relate to. She becomes too proud, as did Lucifer,<sup>278</sup> just as all the sinners up to this point in *Genesis B* had. Though some scholarship has identified pride as an important concept of late Anglo-Saxon religious doctrine<sup>279</sup> the poet did not invent Hagar's growing

---

<sup>276</sup> Ross, 'Concubinage in Anglo-Saxon England'.

<sup>277</sup> Kennedy's translation omits this sentence; the translation above is mine.

<sup>278</sup> Cherniss, 'Heroic Ideals and the Moral Climate of Genesis B'.

<sup>279</sup> "The pride has become the focus and main reason behind's Satan's rebellion. The Benedictine reform saw pride as the most important sin that needed to be addressed." In

pride solely to impart a lesson about humility. If this were the intended emphasis such a lesson could easily have been developed in a separate exegesis, a device the poet of *Genesis A* uses frequently.

Hagar was a possession to manipulate not unlike an object; the result is that her rights and the rights of her son Ishmael can be omitted. The implication is that even if they are illegitimate children of their masters, slaves have no right to inheritance. What shines through most is Abraham's promise to Sarah in *Genesis A* in lines 2258-2259a: "Ne forlæte ic þe, þen den ['þenden'] wit lifiað bu - arna lease..." ['Never will I let thee be dishonoured while we two live...'] demonstrating a dishonourable but realistic concern that Abraham may well abandon his lawful wife for the slave-woman who bore his child. As Pelteret explains "the Church erected no barriers against the union of a slave and a person of free status"<sup>280</sup> though officially it had to be a consensual decision, and since the 'scrift boc' lays down an obligation of the free spouse to gain freedom from the other this was certainly a desired outcome for slaves.<sup>281</sup> In *Genesis A* Hagar seems to believe she can climb the social ladder, meanwhile the poet is using her story to impart the rigidity of social order not unlike Ælfric's<sup>282</sup> which points to a gap between life and doctrine. The obvious emphasis on Hagar's status seems deliberate and can be attributed to the legal question of her child's right to Abraham's inheritance.

Inheritance is emphasised throughout, beginning with where Hagar first appears in the *Genesis A* narrative and Sarah already attempts to turn her

---

Drout, 'Possible Instructional Effects of the Exeter Book 'Wisdom Poems'', p. 460. Pride was also stressed as Lucifer's motivation in Ritter, *The Angles and the Angels*, 102-3.

<sup>280</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, p. 103.

<sup>281</sup> Ibid., p. 104.

<sup>282</sup> Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation*, pp. 132-33. Abels makes note of the rigidity. The homily given by Godden as '19 Monday in Rogationtide' and by Thorpe as 'Monday on the Greater Litany' (FERIA SECUNDA LETANIA MAIORE) is itself quite clear on the matter: Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*, at 519-29; Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 314-32.

away for the first time. By contrast, at this point the Vulgate narrative is focused on the very existence of the line of descent. It only refocuses on inheritance well after both sons were born, in Vulgate Genesis XXI: 9-10; this is the part of scripture referring to Sarah's request to discard Hagar, which the Old English poet presented in two separate places. The first time before either of the heirs had been born, and the second, after. The order is important since discarding a slave seems less problematic than discarding a concubine and an illegitimate firstborn. The poet of *Genesis A* emphasises that Ishmael is illegitimate and his claim is dismissed outright. In the Vulgate Genesis, book XVII, where Abraham communes with God on Ishmael's behalf, God promises good fortune while making a point to state that God's covenant will be established with Isaac exclusively. In book XXV Ishmael and Isaac both bury Abraham, at which point Ishmael's life and death are described.

*Genesis A* opts to downplay Ishmael's claim on the inheritance. The account of Ishmael and Hagar's liberation from Vulgate Genesis XXI: 14-21 is entirely omitted, circumventing the matter of inheritance being divided, in line with the Anglo-Saxon custom of including both illegitimate and legitimate sons.<sup>283</sup> To strengthen his case for exclusion of the illegitimate child from inheritance, the Old English poet attributes terrible traits to Ishmael. These are not mentioned in Scripture, or generally in Christian lore. Jewish oral lore marks Ishmael as a wicked child, but there is no evidence that this was known in Anglo-Saxon England, let alone accepted in Anglo-Saxon Christianity. Even if it were, to my knowledge only *Genesis A* at lines 2289-92 marks Ishmael as a "cruel killer" and "adversary to his own family's descendants" (see Appendix 38 on p. 218). After being branded as such he fades into the background only to return in a reiteration of Vulgate Genesis XXI and Sarah's request to expel Hagar and Ishmael in *Genesis A* at lines 2791-2806. In the Old English version Abraham expels the two slaves instead of having Sarah do it. He also asks in advance for God's directly expressed blessing.

---

<sup>283</sup> Kuefler, "A Wryed Existence"; Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*, pp. 236-7.

Unlike the Vulgate, *Genesis A* has Hagar and Ishmael remain slaves; as such they seem to possess no right to the nobleman Abraham's inheritance but can be easily disposed of with no mention of any rights or legal protection. This coincides with Pelteret's contention that the Anglo-Saxons never fully resolved the issue of legal status of a child born from a union between a free person and slave beyond the fact that the child's status remain unaffected even if his parent be freed.<sup>284</sup> He adds that he knows of no example of a free father acknowledging an illegitimate son by a slave-woman.<sup>285</sup> Though this may be true of documentary sources, the originality of the exegesis in *Genesis A* above makes this literary source informative on the matter of illegitimate slave heirs. Ishmael was a slave and Abraham's possession and as such discarded and apparently owed nothing. The social reality seems to have been important enough for the poet to go against scriptural narrative by choosing to keep Hagar and Ishmael slaves in order to excuse the patriarch for excluding his firstborn from his inheritance. According to the *Genesis A* poet, no matter the legitimacy a firstborn was entitled to inheritance but he had to be of free status.

A similar attitude is expressed toward Reuben, whose clan is among those enumerated by the poet riding with Moses into the blood bath of the Red Sea crossing in the OE *Exodus* poem at lines 337b-339 (see Appendix EI to p. 222). The biblical story of Reuben losing the first-born's right to his brother is described quickly and in passing, as though the implied right of the first-born was generally accepted by the author and audience. In the Vulgate narrative Reuben forfeited his right by lying with one of his father's concubines. Reuben's story is presented as though his decision to fight was an act of good will on his part. The *Exodus* poet mentions the episode in passing but presents Reuben as the protagonist. This hints at an inalienable nature of the rights of the firstborn, quite different from Hebrew law where: 'The lawgiver has noted that even if Reuben had not offended, Jacob might still have given Joseph the primary blessing because of a special attachment to Rachel. The

---

<sup>284</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, pp. 104, 246.

<sup>285</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 246.

lawgiver responded to the complication introduced by Reuben's conduct with his law about the son of the hated wife.<sup>286</sup> In the Old English *Exodus* Reuben accompanies his Israelite kin in battle, though he would have been well within his rights not to fight with the kin that had dispossessed him, to which he had no ties and was no longer responsible for. Since the poet alluded that Reuben had no responsibility, the implication is he had been swindled out of his lawful inheritance. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the Ishmael of *Genesis B* would have been perceived as a lawful heir in the eyes of at least the poet and quite possibly the audience as well. It was only through skilled rhetoric and manipulation of scriptural narrative that the poet was able to present his claim to inheritance and ensuing change in status as abhorrent and wrong due to personal but not unlawful reasons.

## **B OBLIGATION BY CHOICE**

This section will begin by examining the category of personal choice in relation to the relationship between seigneurs and their subjects as outlined above in the subchapter on slaves. I will discuss the similarities between the free and un-free in their social interactions with their superiors. In the Junius XI poems the nature of the lord-retainer relationship is defined through loyalty and obedience. *Genesis A* and *B* differ in their treatment of obedience. Lucas noticed that at the outset of *Genesis A* obedience was not tied to loyalty, but that in the ensuing *Genesis B* obedience became contingent on loyalty.<sup>287</sup> Though this difference is easily perceivable, its interpretation can vary. I argue that the difference lies in the level of reciprocity involved: to what degree are the subordinates autonomous or to what degree they are possessions and in so being deprived of choice.

---

<sup>286</sup> Carmichael, 'Inheritance in Biblical Sources', p. 230.

<sup>287</sup> Lawrence, 'A Comparison of Old English and Old Norse Treatments of Christ's Harrowing of Hell', p. 17.

When Satan rebelled against his perceived status of servitude in *Genesis B* the other rebellious angels, his followers, choose to follow him voluntarily (See Appendix 8 on p. 201). Lucifer states that he is unwilling to be “made God’s junior” and was freely chosen by his followers. He refers to them as friends, but more poignantly as his *geneatas* – retainers. It really makes little difference whether *geneat* here stands for “warrior of high rank” or “a person paying rent to, and performing services for, the lord of a large estate” or, as is most probable from the poetic context, a little bit of both of these extremes as noted by Bloch.<sup>288</sup> The only way Lucifer could assemble a troop of men for a rebellion against a sitting Lord was if they chose him of their own volition. Satan says as much himself in line 285: “hie habbað me to hearran gecorene” [‘(These valiant souls) have chosen me their lord’].

The poet juxtaposes two contrasting points of view rather than merely iterating an absolute and proper Christian position that Satan’s infraction is simply a crime punishable by torture and imprisonment. The poet never downplays Satan’s position that his act of disobedience was a fight for a deserved position.

*Genesis B* is strongly occupied with examinations of freedom, choice and repercussions. What is most striking is that these examinations are presented by a Christian poet, and from conflicting points of view. This is in itself a testament to the didactic intent of the poet. He is leading the audience to make the right choice for themselves. Viewing Hell as an anti-kingdom with a parallel social hierarchy, the fallen angels’ choice to elect Satan as their leader results in his upward social mobility. Before he was the first lieutenant of God, now he is crowned king. The fallen Lucifer expects his retainers to follow him, offering their political support as an expression of loyal intent, one that costs them dearly. In addition Satan expects such behaviour to persist; in relation to him they are his ‘ðegnas’ (*Genesis B* 409, 414) and directly stated to be such of their own volition. It is made clear in this passage that Satan sees himself as hierarchically near God, in some ways his equal: Where God commands heaven, Satan commands hell. On the other hand, having been

---

<sup>288</sup> Lucas, 'Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis ', pp. 132-3.

defeated by God Satan now seeks strife with humanity. To paraphrase Doane, he is king in his petty little kingdom, free to wage war without having to answer for breach of peace.<sup>289</sup> This is very much a single kingdom with a single ruler and the reflected social customs of those in Heaven. What makes it so is the fact that Satan has, or possesses, his own retainers and they have, or possess, him as their ruler.

The choice to follow Lucifer can certainly be interpreted as wrong; it was for Adam and Eve as I noted above (see p. 117) and the same implication arises from the penalty portion of the poem. Choosing to follow Satan can also be seen as right in view of the new social hierarchy. Judging by the implications from the previous subchapter the wrong choice would result in the fallen angels becoming enslaved imprisoned in Hell and cast away from grace and all that is good, while the right choice would have them receive goods and freedom. On the subject of their freedom *Genesis B* is not very clear. This is possibly on purpose; on one hand the illustration and very fact that one of Satan's followers is able to travel to Paradise demonstrates that at least not all of them were bound. Satan is fastened with iron bands, expelled from his lord and at the same time imprisoned. His freedom is severely limited: for example he is certainly not free to move, the illustrations have him chained,<sup>290</sup> he describes himself as clasped by the neck utterly constrained, as Cherewatuk astutely noted: "Satan's only remaining power lies in inciting others to perversion, in encouraging others to fall out of right relation to God."<sup>291</sup> It is true he does not issue orders even though Satan's view of his social position is somewhat optimistic; he is not God's subject or his captive. He is a Lord, with his own court of counsellors – a retinue that is loyal to him by choice.

---

<sup>289</sup> Paraphrasing "petty hierarchies" discussed in Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. 123.

<sup>290</sup> Muir, 'A Digital Facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Junius 11', at 16v, 17r, 20r. Images available online: <<http://image.ox.ac.uk/images/bodleian/msjunius11/16.jpg>>, <<http://image.ox.ac.uk/images/bodleian/msjunius11/17.jpg>>, <<http://image.ox.ac.uk/images/bodleian/msjunius11/20.jpg>> Accessed: [30 August 2015]

<sup>291</sup> Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*.

In 1969 Cherniss proposed that Satan's paradoxical position on loyalty in *Genesis B* was intended as an ironical testament.<sup>292</sup> Refusing loyal service to his lord does not stop Lucifer from expecting loyalty from his retainers. According to Cherniss the irony was intentional and the hypocrisy clearly evident to the Anglo-Saxon audience. It is, however, equally arguable that Satan's strife against God, though judged by the *Genesis B* poet as a disrupting influence on the kingdom of heaven, may not have been seen as a paradox, but rather as a realistic prospect, where it is not hard to imagine subjugated lords attempting to elevate their station. The paradox may easily be seen as a recurring mode in which society was naturally transformed from within; a rise in power results in a change of hierarchy but a hierarchy still based on loyalty to one's lord, a hierarchy based on the initial choice rather than demanded servitude. The new centralized order was didactically instilled in *Genesis B* by associating choice of lord with Satan accompanied by his final gigantic failure, to completely derail the relationship between mankind and God.

The lesson of *Genesis B* is also accentuated here by an intentional change in diction. In lines 279-99 the poet (or editor) breaks the narrative and addresses the audience directly to explain that those disrupting the order of things by striving against their lord will receive punishment. In spite of Satan's defeat, the choice itself is not faulted by the poet as much as Satan's *ofermod* ['overheartiness, usually translated as pride'], here based in unrealistic self-appraisal. Satan's choice to challenge his lord may have been faulty, but at the same time his loyalty as well as the loyalty of his retainers is shown to exist by choice. Even though the wrong choice does not make Satan's followers slaves, it does tie them to Satan. Therefore, through their wrong choice, Satan possesses them.

---

<sup>292</sup> "Satan, a secondary Germanic lord (in the same way that Beowulf is lord of his small troop of Geats in Denmark), expects loyalty from his retainers at the same time that he is plotting disloyalty to his own lord. An audience accustomed to hearing Germanic heroic poetry would immediately recognize the hypocrisy reflected by this paradoxical demand." Cherewatuk, 'Standing, Turning, Twisting, Falling', p. 539.

Satan possesses his followers to a significantly smaller degree than the slave-master relationship discussed above. This is due to the limitations of the reciprocal nature of the relationship where both parties have personal interests. Satan is aware of that, and entices his subjects to act on his behalf as voluntary repayment (*Genesis B* 412-3) for princely gifts (*beodenmadmas*) Satan had meted out before and promise of reward after the deed (*Genesis B* lines 435b-440), a reward inclusive of elevation in rank consisting of sitting at Satan's side. This is the opposite of forced servitude. It is also the opposite of unyielding obedience to God.

Satan was chosen by his retainers, therefore his authority hinges on their willingness to serve him. Meanwhile, Adam and Eve choose God only after having disobeyed his command avoiding slavery in Hell and remaining entirely in the possession of God, as reflected by his manipulation of them and their offspring outside reciprocal obligation. As D.H. Green noted in his discussion of the terminology of thegnship, a "... trace of reciprocity survives where these words ['man, thegan, wini'] are still used in a secular context, but is significantly abandoned when they are used as terms to express the relationship between man and God."<sup>293</sup> His observation can be related to the context of *Genesis B*. Satan's authority hinges on exchange of goods offered in advance and called upon directly whereas God's authority does not. His rewards and punishments are consequences rather than motivation of his demand for obedience. Unlike Satan who promises a reward and reminds his followers of his previous generosity, God never threatens in advance or promises in advance. He bestows Paradise beforehand and inflicts punishment without threat or warning. He does not incite obedience but demands it. He treats Adam and Eve and mankind in *Genesis A* as objects. Serving God according to the poet is the right choice. By presenting Satan as subject to the checks and balances of a reciprocal agreement and God as in possession of absolute authority the greater degree of possession is presented as a positive state.

---

<sup>293</sup> Cherniss, 'Heroic Ideals and the Moral Climate of *Genesis B*', p. 486.

## The Theological Background to the Freedom of Choice of Master

But what of the freedom of Adam and Eve to choose disobedience? In line 457a Eve is created. In the narrative she is subjugated to the Lord by whom (*Genesis B* lines 458-9): “godes gegearwigean, þa him to gingran self – metod mancynnes mearcodde selfa” [‘performing many a goodly service since the Lord of men appointed them His ministers’]. Both Adam and Eve are described as subjected to their lord. In effect they are not free from the rule of their lord, but, and this is a major theological contention, they are free to choose between good and evil. The poet spends time and effort to explain the exact nature of Adam and Eve’s freedom, thus framing the degree to which they were not possessions. He points out that their choice to disobey is the root cause of human suffering but does not pass moral judgement. The intent seems quite the opposite, namely to alleviate blame. This is no easy task as the initial entrapment lies in the very fact that God put the tree there in the first place. Though this is a universal Christian and Jewish theological problem Anglo-Saxon theology adds its own emphasis. Indications that this question was politically, or at least theologically loaded in Anglo-Saxon England can be found in Ælfric’s translation of Alcuin’s *‘Interrogationes’*, or rather in the omission of Alcuin’s entire paragraph positing that the tree of life was poisonous.<sup>294</sup>

Kleist discussed treatment of the issue of free will across the known Anglo-Saxon period, reviewing works by Augustine, Gregory the Great, Pelagius, Bede, Alfred the Great, Lantfred of Winchester and finally the homilists Wulfstan and Ælfric of Eynsham comparing their attitudes towards free will and God’s mercy; his book is focused on the following questions: What is the relationship between fate and God’s omniscience, what is the relationship between God’s omnipotence and human will, what is the relationship between fate or God’s grace with the freedom of choice, and what does human freedom of choice entail?<sup>295</sup>

---

<sup>294</sup> Green, *The Carolingian Lord*, pp. 360-1.

<sup>295</sup> Kleist, *Striving with Grace*.

The Anglo-Saxon position on the nature of free will was echoed and framed differently in individual texts, especially in defining the relationships between Grace, Fate, Eternity and God; but the view of human capacity to choose both Good and Evil, and with it the amplified position of human agency in comparison to God's omniscience is nearly a constant Anglo-Saxon contrast to Augustine's view of Mankind as utterly corrupt and only salvageable through God's direct action.<sup>296</sup> Bede departs very slightly from Augustine on the topic of the functioning of Grace, where he opts to follow Gregory the Great's perspective that Grace is a passive state, which can either be chosen or ignored by individuals.<sup>297</sup> The implication is that man can choose to do good by choosing to make use of God's Grace. Bede's official and directly stated position was always stringently opposed to any heresy and especially against Pelagian teachings, quite evidently in the case of Irish church and the dating of Easter.<sup>298</sup> But in his examination of the concept of God's Grace he opted to follow Gregory. Bede treats Adam and Eve's expulsion from paradise in his rendering of *De Genesi ad Litteram*.<sup>299</sup> He opts to replace Augustine's original example of the fall of the angels with the Expulsion from paradise. Bede's example emphasises the role of human agency in the choice to eat the forbidden fruit, which he sees as the choice between Good and Evil. In Bede's view the sin is disobedience through pride. This is the sequence as he presents it: the forbidden tree is not evil, God's command is not evil, God's allowing the existence of temptation is not evil, even though in his omniscience He knew they would falter. The evil comes to exist through their wrong choice to disobey.<sup>300</sup>

---

<sup>296</sup> Specifically in Ch. 81 of his 'On Nature and Grace', see: St. Augustine, *The Works of Aurelius Augustine*, p. 305.

<sup>297</sup> Carroll, *The Venerable Bede*, p. 143.

<sup>298</sup> Bede, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, III: 25, pp. 152-59.

<sup>299</sup> Bede, *On Genesis*.

<sup>300</sup> Kleist, *Striving with Grace*, pp. 68-9.

Ælfric's general position on human agency, like Bede's, assumed the capacity of man to determine through action whether God will save them. Though he maintains that God's Grace is vital in this process, he contradicts Augustine in perceiving human corruption as a general tendency, rather than an absolute state. In his Homily for Palm Sunday he states that every man has a choice whether he will follow the devil or not.<sup>301</sup> His view and Wulfstan's are very similar; the people they are educating are already Christian. They are not being taught about the basics of faith at a time of spreading Christianity, like Bede, but shape their work with a mind towards educating people on morality, where the emphasis on human agency in adhering to ethical and moral standards seems much more appropriate. Wulfstan goes even a step further than Ælfric, stating in *De auctorio Dei* not only that Man has the capacity to choose between evil and good but, like the *Collatio* of John Cassian, he asserts that man must choose good first, only then does he 'deserve' God's help.<sup>302</sup>

Ælfric is on record condemning apocryphal sources, especially those tied to Old Testament narrative;<sup>303</sup> he does not, however, object to New Testament Apocrypha (apart from the *Legend of Thomas*); he among others, accepts the Gospel of Nicodemus.<sup>304</sup> This apocryphal narrative has been identified as one of the ultimate sources for *Christ and Satan* in Junius XI,<sup>305</sup> and a generally

---

<sup>301</sup> Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 239-41; Magennis and Swan (eds.), *A Companion to Ælfric*.

<sup>302</sup> Cassian, 'Coll. XIII.9', *The Conferences*, pp. 459, 574-5; Harden Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, p. 111.

<sup>303</sup> Biggs, 'An Introduction and Overview of Recent Work', p. 18-21; Kleist, *Striving with Grace*, pp. 188-98.

<sup>304</sup> Biggs, 'An Introduction and Overview of Recent Work', pp. 18-21.

<sup>305</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21-25.

very popular and well known story echoed continuously in Anglo-Saxon literary environment<sup>306</sup> with an existing Old English translation.<sup>307</sup>

This is not the only agreement between the attitudes expressed by Ælfric and by Junius XI narratives. Ælfric agrees with Augustine that Adam had the freedom to choose between good and bad, but he disagrees on the matter of mankind thereafter. Augustine sees mankind as eternally spoiled by sin and Ælfric sees mankind as continuously capable of choosing good over bad, thus starting on the path to enjoy God's (pre-existing and primary) Grace. *Genesis B* includes an exegetical definition of Adam and Eve's choices as a figure to be followed by mankind ever after. The excerpt appears at lines 464-6a, directly stating "þæt þær ylðo bearn moste on ceosan - godes and yfeles, gumena æghwīlc, - welan and wawan." ['that the mortal sons of men might choose of good and evil, weal and woe.'] Kennedy's translation perhaps carries a lesser emphasis than the original, where the subject of the sentiment are *ylðo bearn ... gumena æghwīlc* ['children of men... all men']. The sense is the same, all mortal men have the option to choose between both good and bad.

The presentation of choice between good and evil as something all men not only can but must do is voiced so clearly and directly in the *Genesis B*, a poem imported and kept attached to *Genesis A* among native Old English poems in Ælfric's time. In addition, the now prevalent opinion is that the *Genesis A* and *B* were together before inclusion into Junius XI, from about the beginning of the tenth century.<sup>308</sup> Even then it was entirely permissible to allow for the popular belief in human capacity to choose between good and evil to thrive, and it remained so for a century. From the point of view of the popular nature of the poetic genre it even stands to reason that the exegesis in *Genesis B* is indicative of a popular or at least literary Old English

---

<sup>306</sup> Lawrence, 'A Comparison of Old English and Old Norse Treatments of Christ's Harrowing of Hell', pp. 50-81; Tamburr, *The Harrowing of Hell in Medieval England*, pp. 102-48.

<sup>307</sup> Liuzza, 'Religious Prose', p. 333.

<sup>308</sup> Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. 48.

understanding of the concept of free will, one that was retained in the manuscript in spite of bordering on the heretical.

### **Hierarchy as an Expression of Possession**

At lines 464-6 the creation of the two trees is presented as God's design, purposefully providing 'choice' by creating the fruits of the tree with the intention of presenting them with the freedom to choose (see Appendix 10 on p. 202). The notion that God allows Eve to make the wrong choice is clearly stated by the poet. At *Genesis B* lines 595b-98 he exclaims: "Þæt is micel wundor - þæt hit ece god æfre wolde - þeoden þolian, þæt wurde þegn swa monig - forlædd be þam lygenum þe for þam larum com!" ['Great is the wonder that Eternal God, the Lord, would let so many of His thanes be tricked with lies by one who brought such counsel.'] Vickrey posits that the poet is marvelling "at the wisdom of God that "was willing to endure" that His thanes be suborned."<sup>309</sup> The same sentiment of wonderment can also be interpreted as indicating that Adam and Eve were treated as objects, rather than subjects in relation to God. The poet tacitly accepts that God's will supersedes Adam and Eve's capacity to freely choose. This makes them his possessions to a greater degree than Satan's minions were to Satan. God's authority over them is absolute.

Another excellent example of God's absolute authority over his subordinates as objects of possession are the accounts of the sacrifice of Isaac in Junius XI. When Abraham finally receives a lawful heir, *Exodus* and *Genesis A* both refrain from explaining God's motivation for demanding the sacrifice of the firstborn. As I argue elsewhere in this thesis, God's penalties were often carefully contextualised and explained by the Junius XI poets, Babylonian occupation was presented, for example the consequence of abandoning Christian teachings (see pp. 60, 102). The discarding of Hagar and Abraham's firstborn Ishmael (see p. 128), and the expulsions of Cain (p. 183), Nebuchadnezzar (see pp. 66, 186), and Adam and Eve (see pp. 97, 176)

---

<sup>309</sup> Evans, 'Genesis B and its Background (concluded)'.

were likewise carefully contextualised by the poets. It is therefore noteworthy that no effort is made to comment on God's demand for the sacrifice of a retainer's firstborn in two separate treatments of this story. This is especially strange for a literary tradition and society that elsewhere puts special emphasis on the ties of kinship.<sup>310</sup> The demand to kill a member of their own kin and only heir is an extreme show of loyalty. Such an expectation frames the follower not as a subject of an order but as an object. Service to God was outside the scope of human hierarchy, so marked by a demand for blind obedience.

By exhibiting their relative choices, both the fallen angels, and Adam and Eve contribute to their own falls. In the case of fallen angels, the social order seems dependent primarily on reciprocal benefit while in the case of Adam and Eve it stems from a more absolute authority. Neither of the followers are absolute possessions, though their autonomy is curbed in their relative individual ways. The difference between God's hierarchy as an absolute structure of order and Satan's hierarchy, contingent on reciprocal agreement, comes down to the degrees of choice the subjects or followers possess in relation to their seigneurs, itself dependent on their freedom. Though God in Genesis A often appears as part of human hierarchy, when it comes to freedom, obedience and loyalty, his authority is absolute and not contingent on reciprocity. The fallen angels and mankind create their own social hierarchies based on choice and reciprocal arrangements (I will discuss this at length in the final chapter).

Perhaps the best place to begin the discussion of the notions of choice and freedom within human hierarchies is the use of the term *freoman*, *frogman*.

---

<sup>310</sup> This is also evident in Anglo-Saxon laws. See: 'Early English Laws, (Cn 1018)', <[http://www.earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/texts/cn-1018/view/#edition,1/commentary,1\\_0\\_c\\_5](http://www.earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/texts/cn-1018/view/#edition,1/commentary,1_0_c_5)>, [Accessed 23 July 2011]; F. L. Attenborough, *Laws of Earliest English Kings*; J. Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*. I made use of some basic scholarship on laws and scholarship, see for example: S. Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia*, pp. 17-61; H. R. Loyn, 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon England'; A. Wareham, 'The Transformation of Kinship and the Family in Late Anglo-Saxon England'; P. Wormald, 'Lex scripta and verbum regis'.

DOE offers the following senses: 1) a man free in regard to social and legal status, 2) one who is not a slave. If we took freedom to be synonymous with personal independence, this entry would be a very strong description in a society for which there is general consensus that “almost the entire population would have been legally dependent on some other party.”<sup>311</sup> Anglo-Saxon social dependency on kin (oath-givers) and lord does not negate free status. The DOE customarily gives separate senses for poetry. The sense given for poetic use of *freoman* is simply ‘free-born, noble man.’<sup>312</sup> In all senses given by the DOE *freoman* is the antithesis of slave in so far as he possesses freedoms (or rights) denied to slaves. Though *Genesis A* never defines the term *freoman* directly, it is possible to discern through context that it is used with a consistent meaning and subtext in *Genesis A*. Noah’s sons, the new progenitors of the entire human race, are the first protagonists specifically referred to in *Genesis A* in line 1601 as free-men (*freomen*). In the preceding narrative of the *Genesis* poems persons had been possessed exclusively in the sense of being subjects to a ruler. After Adam and Eve are cast out of Paradise, the *Genesis A* narrative refrains from hierarchical designation, choosing kin over hierarchy, referring to Adam and Eve as God’s children (*Genesis A* line 856: *Godes bearn* lines 865, 873: *Godes sunu*, line 888 *Godes dohtor*).<sup>313</sup> In the context of being marked by Cain’s murder, mankind is referred to as children of the Lord (l. 993). Similarly, all the generations before Noah are tied to each other as well as God exclusively by bonds of family. Prior to this, in Junius XI the question of individual freedom had not yet come to the forefront. Rulers were individually mentioned and categorized while their subjects remained an undefined quality and quantity – ‘a people’ rather than simply ‘people’.

The first mention of freemen appears in *Genesis A* at lines 1599-1601, when Noah is said to enjoy the use of land for three hundred winters, with his sons,

---

<sup>311</sup> Vickrey, 'The "Micel Wundor of Genesis B"'.

<sup>312</sup> 'Dictionary of Old English', DOE <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>> , 'freomann, frigman', [Accessed: 31 August 2015].

<sup>313</sup> The difference was noted in Wyatt, *Slaves and Warriors*, p. 37.

*freomen* – after the flood. A connection emerges between *freomen* and children as heirs. In *Genesis A* lines 2175-6a: “Hwæt gifest þu me, gasta waldend, - freomanna to frofre?” – [‘What comfort canst Thou give me, Lord of spirits, who am thus desolate’]. The passage appears in the context of God’s promise of a son to Abraham. The word appears in alliteration, seemingly in place of ‘children’. Kennedy (used above) shied away from translating *freomanna* at all, while Anlezark translated the phrase as “What do you give me, ruler of spirits, as a comfort for free people,...”<sup>314</sup> correct though slightly out of place in the narrative since there is no mention of any free people anywhere around this sentence. It was Sisam’s contention that this is the case of scribal error substituting *fremena* with *freomanna*.<sup>315</sup> However, Doane himself notes that *freomanna* as the term used to denote Noah’s children at line 1598 of *Genesis A* and that this is the case of scribal error taking *liberis* to be free men rather than children.<sup>316</sup> At any rate this is a difficult phrase to translate, but I propose that not unlike *freobearn*, it was at least read after the inclusion in the Junius XI MS, even if it was not intended at inception, to denote an elevated social rank. In the case of Isaac, as it stands, the term serves to distinguish Isaac from the illegitimate Ishmael, who was born by a *mennen* – [‘slave-woman’].

Apart from the two mentions above, the term *freoman* does not appear again in Junius XI, nor does it appear in any other preserved old English poem. It does, however, appear as a legal term in Anglo-Saxon laws: Æthelberht 9 *frigman*, Wihtræd 10 *friman*, Alfred-Ine 1 *freomannum*’/’*frioum monnum*. In the Latin versions these terms are translated as *liber*, which in its nominative form can mean both “free” as well as “child”, which again points to the tie of *freoman* to children. This is also the case in Law II Cnut 45.1 *freoman* in Latin *liber*, Laws of Edward and Guthrum 8: *frigman* for which the Latin gives *liber homo*, finally definitively including adults. The same goes for Laws I Æpelræd.

---

<sup>314</sup> Lucas, 'Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis ', p. 122.

<sup>315</sup> Anlezark, *Old Testament Narratives*, p. 153.

<sup>316</sup> Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*, p. 38.

My search of the DOE corpus and the Microfiche Concordance turned up a single example containing the form *fremannen*: the Will of Thurketel from the archive of Busy St Edmunds.<sup>317</sup> It has been dated to before 1038 and is thought to be authentic by Hart who designates it no. 90.<sup>318</sup> Pelteret lists this will among those containing manumission of all slaves of an estate but does not comment on it specifically.<sup>319</sup> The *fremannen* receive the right to use a part of Thorketel's estate.

In poetry the notion of free-born children appears in other variants, most notably *freo bearn* – free child usually glossing simply Latin “*liber*”. In the narrative of the Latin Vulgate this correlation can explain the choice of the noun *freoman* to denote Abraham's heir and Noah's sons. Of course, such an explanation certainly does not negate the free status of the protagonists in question, some of which are not slaves, but it does place the emphasis on their position within the family first. The term is not limited to a single generation. In *Genesis A* at lines 1642 *freora bearna* denotes several generations of Ham's progeny at once.

The slave's vertical hierarchical move achieved through receiving the position or status of *gerefa* is paralleled by the position achieved by Daniel in the antecedent *Daniel* poem of Junius XI (strictly following the Vulgate book of Daniel). He was a slave captured in war, yet he became Nebuchadnezzar's personal advisor. In *Genesis A* the *gerefa*'s (Damascus') sons are directly described as freemen –the poet used the term to denote freedom of men across the social ladder, excluding slaves, but, notably, including house stewards, their free status diligently emphasised. Perhaps the difference in emphasis between the two Old English renderings of Genesis can be viewed as confirmation of Pelteret's assertion that though a legal distinction between

---

<sup>317</sup> Healey, Wilkin, and Xiang, 'Dictionary of Old English Corpus on the World Wide Web'; P. Sawyer, 'The Electronic Sawyer'. Available: <<http://www.esawyer.org.uk/charter/1527.html>> [Accessed: 31 August 2015].

<sup>318</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, p. 302.

<sup>319</sup> Hart, *The Early Charters of Eastern England*, pp. 66, 92.

slaves and free survived into the eleventh century, the difference in status grew ever less significant.<sup>320</sup>

Unlike the poet of *Genesis B*, which was in essence a translation of an Old Saxon poem, the *Genesis A* poet was presumably a native speaker of Old English and thereby unencumbered by constraints of translation. Still, the distinction between *ðegn* and *þeow* is evident in *Genesis A*. As I will show, the term *ðegnas* in *Genesis A* exclusively denotes the position of the rank second in line to the ruler. The term appears in sacred and secular contexts with the same narrowly defined sense. In relation to sacred service to God, his seconds in command are angels; they are also presented as hierarchically superior to people. They are referred to as *ðegnas* exclusively: These references can be found in *Genesis A* at lines 15, 80, 1574, 2570, 2908. No reference to angels from the Vulgate is omitted, and throughout the title *ðegn* is used consistently in the context of elated voluntary service rather than forced servitude.

The term is applied to secular hierarchy in the same way. In *Genesis A* at lines 1851, 1869 the Egyptian pharaoh's thegns are presented in direct communication and service to the lord as *ðegnas*. This is a direct parallel to the Vulgate where the term is *principes Pharaoni* ['pharaoh's princes or prime commanders']. Initially, in *Genesis A* line 1851 they are *cyninges ðegnas* who report Sarah's beauty to the pharaoh. In line 1869 the term is expounded "ðegnum sinum – ombihtscealcum" ['his thegns, officers']. In both cases the thegns seem to hold the position of stewards, personally tied to the king. In the second case this is further confirmed by adding *ombihtscealcum* ['servant in office, official'], describing his thegns by their office rather than status (I have discussed the term *scealc* above on p. 121). The term *scealc* is rare in the surviving Old English corpus and has almost as many variant spellings as it does appearances, which makes accidental or casual use unlikely.

In lines 1867b-8 of *Genesis A* the prince of Egypt ordered Abraham to relocate by having him "wine ceosan - ellor æðelingas, oðre dugeðe." – ['seek

---

<sup>320</sup> Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England*, pp. 123, 57.

friends elsewhere, other princes and another folk’]. In line 1858 of *Genesis A* the prince of Egypt is designated “æðelinga helm”. This description clearly demonstrates that a lord’s choice of followers is dependent on their geographical location within his jurisdiction and upon permission of his own seigneur. In fact by framing Abraham’s expulsion as the action of choosing his friends and princes elsewhere, the pharaoh expels him from the Egyptian kin as well as his own service.

Since Abraham was punished by having to seek out new followers, the freedom to choose princes and a people elsewhere appears not as a desired repercussion framing some elated sense of freedom, but rather as an undesirable side-effect of no longer possessing a lord. In the extract from *Genesis B* poem cited above (see p. 131) Satan was chosen by his retainers who exchanged Lord God for Lord Lucifer, thereby attaining a greater autonomy; they have become subjects rather than objects of possession. No matter the ratio of autonomy versus possession involved, the poet throughout presents the position of *ðegnas* as desirable partly because it consists of possessing a lord. The same implication can be assumed from the fact that angels appearing in *Genesis A* are consistently designated by the term *ðegnas* that possessing an immediate and powerful lord is a valuable commodity.

## **Chapter Conclusion**

The custodial relationship between free subordinates and their seigneurs can only be viewed as a relationship of possessor and possession in the very widest sense. The intricacies of individual cases allowed for only very general identification of obligations and services due. There are, however, a few conclusions that can be made. Perhaps the most significant among them is that even though slaves are usually and in passing deemed possessions, the role of ownership in their social standing is in fact a complex balance of rights and obligations and not at all a simple matter of being owned. The same rights and obligations apply reciprocal relationships across the social scale, though in different proportions. The process of seeking out notions of

possession within social hierarchy of the poems of Junius XI has uncovered context not available in other sources. The matter of esteem as epitomised by a strict distinction between *þeow* and *ðegn* was certainly worth noting. In fact the mere level to which the terminology of social hierarchy in the poems of Junius XI is consistent could perhaps prove worthy of examination elsewhere in Old English literature.

The comparison with homilies and theological sources has shown that additions to scripture resemble exegesis and haggadic type of explanations which widen the narrative. In so far as possession of people is concerned, these were most illuminating, shedding light on the matter of a firstborn lord's illegitimate child with a slave-woman and other examples of social mobility. In the scope of the poems of Junius XI upward mobility also seems to be tied to attaining office, though in the case of Damascus Eliezer the poems' attitudes towards social mobility of slaves are certainly more elusive than Ælfric's.

Of course the genre of vernacular biblical paraphrase sits somewhere between scripture and homily and as such tends to present ideals rather than norms. When the evidence can be reasonably assumed to be unwitting one could use biblical paraphrase and possibly other vernacular poetry as a platform for further examination. However, where the lessons offered witting testament to the state of social order more care must be taken. In terms of the office of *gerefa* performed by slaves, the context points to the unwitting nature of evidence. Despite overwhelming documentary evidence of wills and evident intent on the part of the poet in the example of Abraham denying Ishmael his inheritance, one ought not to conclude that upwards social mobility was an impossibility, merely that it was unwanted. And since it was unwanted at least the notion must have been reasonably frequent.

The chapter also examined the notion of possessing lords, following the idea that reciprocal rights and obligations translate to degrees of reciprocal possession. Having a lord was shown to be desirable, this is accepted among Anglo-Saxonists, though the notion that the less reciprocal the interdependency the more desirable the lord seems at first counter-intuitive. However, since a lord is an institution aimed at preserving order in face of

chaos, and since Anglo-Saxon Christianity plays a similar role, the preference for God's absolute authority over the reciprocal bartering between Satan and his followers is not surprising at all. The chapter has demonstrated that possession cannot serve as the main defining factor in Anglo-Saxon social interaction, but examining them in this way can provide a different view of social interactions, exchanges and hierarchies.

## 5 SOCIAL CONCEPTIONS OF AUTHORITY

### Introduction

The previous chapters examined rights and obligations which frame possession of individual objects, land, or even men. While the types of rights and obligations inform the nature and aim of possession, the degree to which a possession is owned is often a reflection of the level of the owner's authority. In the previous chapters the social conception of authority was consistently tied to the holding or exchanging of rights and obligations framing social interactions. The workings of authority in the narratives of Junius XI seems, therefore, deserving of its own discussion.

I will divide the discussion of authority by type, in relation to the types of rights and obligations held or exchanged in the narratives of the poems of Junius XI. I will review various types of authority appearing in the Junius XI poems by examining the obligations and rights framing the possession and exchange of possessions. This chapter examines authority in two contexts. First by reviewing how attitudes towards possessions in Junius XI poems mirror the interplay of secular and sacred authority. The second part examines how transfer of authority over possession itself is regulated in the context of the Junius XI poems. I will distinguish between two types of grounds for holding authority: the personal and the legal. After defining these categories, I will conclude the chapter by examining judicial authority as a combination of secular and sacred as well as personal and legal authority. I will demonstrate that: judicial authority regulates transfer of possession and protects ownership, it brings in profit and supports the possession of the right to taxation, it frames the possession of power; it is in a sense a most valuable abstract possession. The three examples of exerting judicial authority will illustrate how authority links to social conceptions discussed in the previous chapters; judicial punishment will be related to the exchange of possessions by framing rights and obligations as legal categories.

## A) SECULAR AND SACRED AUTHORITY OF A KING

The genre of biblical paraphrase combines sacred matter with heroic diction, poetic devices and narrative style. Since the protagonists in all of the poems consistently exert a mixture of both secular and sacred authority it is not easy to distinguish which principles define who is granting authority, how and to whom authority is transferred, and how the transfer is framed. *Exodus* is an unambiguous example of the melding of biblical paraphrase and added heroic traits, not the least of which is rewriting the entire episode of the crossing of the Red Sea to read as a military campaign.<sup>321</sup> In terms of social rank *Exodus* directly designates Moses as king. The transfer of authority from God, via the preceding patriarchs, to Moses is described at the outset of the poem in the context of transfer of property. Authority and other possessions (such as the might of weapons possibly including the ancient sword, the right to lead, knowledge and the right to the Holy Land) are transferred, held and exclusively managed by Moses, and either received by him from God directly or via inheritance from a chain of single individuals in their time. In this way the two conceptions are treated similarly.

The notion that Anglo-Saxon kingly authority stemmed from God is widely attested in Anglo-Saxon writing from the early conversion period onwards.<sup>322</sup> The same attitude is attested in *Exodus* where Moses, a scriptural ruler, is described utilising heroic attributes typical of all Old English poetry. The poet draws Moses as a heroic king and a Christian patriarch at the same time. In effect, authority stems from God by virtue of bestowal and from Moses' virtues as a ruler. He is an example of how the two authorities are combined in a

---

<sup>321</sup> Lawrence describes imagery in *Exodus* as "battle imagery without fighting" in Lawrence, 'A Comparison of Old English and Old Norse Treatments of Christ's Harrowing of Hell', p. 35. Also see: Speirs, 'The Two Armies of the Old English Exodus'; Hall, '*Exodus* 166b, *Cwyldrof*, 162–67, the Beasts of Battle'.

<sup>322</sup> Deshman, 'Christus rex et magi reges'; Wolfram, 'The Shaping of the Early Medieval Kingdom'; Ulmschneider, *Markets, Minsters, and Metal-Detectors*, pp. 98-106.

single person, a type of Christian king: a simultaneously sacred and secular ruler.<sup>323</sup>

In *Exodus* the relation between Moses and God is structured thus: The supreme ruler is God, to whom Moses is subjected. The title king in *Exodus* is used descriptively and non-exclusively since both Moses and God are termed kings. The hierarchical difference between the authority of the two is not emphasised directly, even though Moses' authority is an extension of God's. Rather the difference is marked indirectly through the bestowal of benefits, rights and authority from one to the other. The title of king is therefore used for two social positions in a vertical relationship. On one hand, God clearly possesses the authority of a king, as Irving remarked.<sup>324</sup> However, Irving went on to argue that the strife between Israelites and Egyptians is a feud thus implicitly reducing the authority of Moses to a position of mere thegn, framing the Old English *Exodus* narrative as a type of the supreme Ruler's sentencing and punishment, rather than as a battle between equal kings on the subject of the authority of rule.

Even though the direction of the *Exodus* narrative is from captivity to freedom, or allegorically, as Thundy puts it, "from the slavery of sin to the freedom of grace, from the old religion to the new religion, from the Old Dispensation to the New Covenant, from paganism to Christianity"<sup>325</sup>, at its very core the battle imagery<sup>326</sup> asserts that greater authority is bestowed by God. In fact, as far as kingly authority is concerned, Irving's assertion above overlooks the fact that Moses is described as *soðfæst cyning* in *Exodus*, line 9a, and as *cyning*, in line 175. Other patriarchs are specifically described as *eorðcyninga* ['earthly kings'] in *Exodus* in line 392b – Abraham is separately described as *cyning* in

---

<sup>323</sup> Lucas, *Exodus*, pp. 52-68; Irving, 'Exodus Retraced'; Irving, 'New Notes on the Old English Exodus'; Irving, *The Old English Exodus*.

<sup>324</sup> Irving, *The Old English Exodus*, p. 30.

<sup>325</sup> Thundy 'Afrisc Meowle and the Old English Exodus', p. 298.

<sup>326</sup> Lawrence, 'A Comparison of Old English and Old Norse Treatments of Christ's Harrowing of Hell', p. 35.

*Exodus* in line 390. Furthermore Moses commands tribes that are also headed by *cyningas* *Exodus* I.185 and even the Pharaoh's subjects are *cyningas on corðre* ['kings in their pomp'] in *Exodus*, in line 466a. Either the use of the term is descriptive, or the title encompasses a wider array of ranks. In either case this type of kingly authority stretches vertically from the progenitor of the authority to at least the third knee.

It seems that *cyning* encompasses both the positions of king and emperor, as it does according to B&T. This is perhaps more precise than the narrower focus of the entry in the DOE "I. King, monarch, male sovereign, I.A. ruler of an earthly kingdom, I.A.1. ruler in general." Deshman points to the title *rex regum* denoting an emperor who receives the limited and temporary possession of Christ's authority.<sup>327</sup> He continuously references artistic depictions of crowned God – such images accompany *Genesis B* in Junius XI. The terminology of *Exodus* does not distinguish between the titles or between authority of emperor or kings. It is in effect the same larger and general authority, temporarily bestowed into possession of men.

This may be an overly simplified idealized representation of a complex network of authorities and multi-dimensional distribution of rights and obligations resulting in different types and amounts of authority evidenced in *Genesis A* which will be discussed as the chapter unfolds. Strictly in the frame of the Christian doctrine prevalent in *Exodus*, however, kingly authority is centralised and cascading. In *Exodus* there is only one primary source of authority, and that is God. The right to act as a conduit of God's authority is bestowed downwards through hierarchy of men. It can be bestowed, inherited alongside possessions and it can be divided according to the relevant social interactions it frames, be it sacral (military, judicial, titular etc.) or sacred. I begin by examining the basis of possessing military authority and the exclusivity of possessing it as reflected in *Exodus*.

---

<sup>327</sup> Deshman, 'Christus rex et magi reges', pp. 387-8.

## Military Command as Sacred Kingly Authority

In *Exodus* in lines 12-14a Moses receives from God the authority of king in a military capacity: “He wæs leof gode, leoda aldor – horsc and hreðegleaw, herges wisa – freom folctoga” [‘He was beloved of God, a lord of men, a wise and ready leader of the host, a bold folk-captain.’] He is beloved by God and, as I will argue he is skilled in war and a strong leader as a consequence. In *Exodus* in line 124b his people are described as *Moyses hyrde*. They are not described as his kin, but as is appropriate for heroic genre, his retinue.

As explicitly stated in *Exodus* lines 19-22a, God granted weapons into Moses’ possession as though symbolically granting him military authority. Moses is thus God’s immediate subject in much the same way as if God were his human lord. By humanizing God the *Exodus* poet brings the bestowal of military authority into the realm of a social exchange between a supreme lord and a lesser lord. Let me emphasise with ardour, by humanising God as a protagonist I am not attempting to, as Stanley warned, “remove all that is Christian... to prove that the poem is not Christian”.<sup>328</sup> I am merely pointing out that the poet’s efforts to explain the biblical narrative by bringing it closer to his audience’s understanding relates unwitting information about the military component of kingly authority. There is little doubt about the immense theological knowledge of the poet, as evidenced by the mere girth of scholarship discussing Christian allegories and scriptural themes contained in the Old English *Exodus* poem.<sup>329</sup> Likewise the conception of the right to

---

<sup>328</sup> Stanley, *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism*.

<sup>329</sup> Bright, 'The Relation of the Cædmonian Exodus to the Liturgy'; Cross and Tucker, 'Allegorical Tradition and the Old English Exodus'; Ferguson, 'The Old English Exodus and the Patristic Tradition'; Frank, 'What Kind of Poetry Is Exodus?'; Green, 'Gregory's Moralia as an Inspirational Source'; Haines, 'Unlocking "Exodus" ll. 516-532'; Moore, 'On the Sources of the Old-English "Exodus"'; Trask 'Doomsday Imagery in the Old English Exodus'; Thundy 'Afrisc Meowle and the Old English Exodus', *ibid.*; Trahern, 'More Scriptural Echoes in the Old English Exodus'; Vickrey, 'Exodus and the Treasure of Pharaoh'; Lucas, 'Old English Christian Poetry'; Luria, 'The Old English Exodus as a Christian Poem'; Earl, 'Christian Traditions and the Old English Exodus'; Anlezark, 'Connecting the Patriarchs'; Blackburn, *Exodus and Daniel*.

possess kingly authority the poem is as utterly Christian as its scriptural content. Through bestowal of weapons and attaining the Promised Land presented through battle imagery may make it seem that the authority of military command is somehow outside the purview of sacral influence, this is not the contention of the *Exodus* poet.

There is another clear signal to the sacred source of military authority, in lines 215b – 258, with the dramatic prologue to Moses’ speech to his army.<sup>330</sup> I suggest that the source for both the build-up to the speech as well as the speech itself was Deuteronomy XX. I further argue that scripture defined the origin of military authority. This does not negate accord with some oral pagan remnant, but where such a remnant can only be suspected on the basis of popular inclusion in Anglo-Saxon heroic poetry, the similarity with Scripture is in my view unmistakable. Remley, Irving, Marsden and Thundy have all believed that the author of *Exodus* knew Deuteronomy,<sup>331</sup> however, none of them identified book XX of Deuteronomy as a direct source of the lines below. Deuteronomy XX specifically posits that it was the priest’s job to speak to the army, Vulgate Deuteronomy XX: 2: “adpropinquante autem iam proelio stabit sacerdos ante aciem et sic loquetur ad populum: ...”. [‘And when the battle is now at hand, the priest shall stand before the army, and shall speak to the people in this manner...’] I will parallel Moses’ speech with the mode prescribed by Deuteronomy XX for the speech of the priest:

OE *Exodus* lines 259-261a

Vulgate, Deuteronomy XX: 3

Ne beoð ge þy forhtran, þeah	audi Israhel vos hodie contra inimicos
þe Faraon brohte -	vestros pugnam committitis non
sweordwigendra side hergas –	pertimescat cor vestrum nolite metuere
eorla unrim!	nolite cedere nec formidetis eos

<sup>330</sup> Chadwick in 1926 viewed introduction of lengthy speeches as the first defining factor of heroic poetry: Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*, p. 320.

<sup>331</sup> Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, p. 173; Irving, *The Old English Exodus*, pp. 11, 17; Marsden, ‘The Death of the Messenger’, p. 145; Thundy, ‘Afrisc Meowle’, p. 300.

<p>Do not fear any further, even though the Pharaoh brought swordfighters to the army flanks, countless earls!</p>	<p>Hear, O Israel, you join battle this day against your enemies, let not your heart be dismayed, be not afraid, do not give back, fear ye them not:</p>
--	--

lines 261b-263

XX: 4

<p>Him eallum wile - mihtig drihten purh mine hand - to dæge þissum dædlean gyfan,</p>	<p>quia Dominus Deus vester in medio vestri est et pro vobis contra adversarios dimicabit ut eruat vos de periculo</p>
--	--

<p>To all of them intends the mighty Lord by my hand give payback on this day</p>	<p>Because the Lord your God is in the midst of you, and will fight for you against your enemies, to deliver you from danger.</p>
---	---

It appears that Deuteronomy XX was utilised in the creation of *Exodus*, simultaneously granting Moses authority as King and a Priest. In general Anglo-Saxon heroic poetry as a rule prefaces battles with speeches by commanders. To list but a few examples: Finnsburh Fragment lines 10-12; Beowulf lines 1383-1396, 1510-1537, 1631-1660 (Wiglaf); Battle of Maldon lines 17-24 (Bryhtnoð) lines 211-224 (Ælfwine – assuming command, mid-battle, after Bryhtnoð’s death)). I do not propose that all commanders of OE heroic poetry were purposefully presented as priests, but I do suggest that these speeches are tied at once to military and sacral authority vested in the commanders of poems by Christian doctrine. The authority upon which their command was based was in large part scriptural. If we assume his knowledge of Deuteronomy XX the *Exodus* poet’s message is clear – there is no secular authority without divine grant. Possession of military command in *Exodus* therefore stems from God, though it falls exclusively under the jurisdiction of King. In *Genesis A*, however, the sacral and lay authority are treated in more detail. In the meeting between King Abraham and Melchisedech in *Genesis A*, line 2101 the poet focused on Melchisedech’s sacred authority omitting any mention of his lay authority while in the Vulgate Melchisedech is stated to be both king and priest (Vulgate Genesis XIV: 1).

### Division of Sacred Authority in *Genesis A*, King and Bishop

In asking the question how authority comes into possession of a ruler *Genesis A* introduces a complication, which the poet of *Exodus* avoided. It introduces the position of bishop Melchisedech. This is the only reference to a bishop in all Junius XI poems. In fact its inclusion is unusual also because there are very few such references elsewhere in preserved Old English poetry. The remaining Junius XI poems deal with secular authority, which is why the amplification of a bishop's role is perhaps even more important to note. Where *Exodus* focuses on the patriarchs presented as sacred kings, receiving their authority directly from God, *Genesis A* is generally wider in scope and adheres to much less stringent doctrine.

*Genesis A* exhibits a firm position on the Church's right to financial autonomy and on division of authority by amplifying the role of Bishop Melchisedech as a stand-in between kingly authority and God's authority. After having won the battle for the Sodomite people Abraham is met by their king who is accompanied by Melchisedech, in *Genesis A* lines 2101: "Solomia sinces hyrde. þæt wæs se mæra Melchisedech – leoda bisceop" ['(And with him journeyed) Salem's treasure-warden, Melchizedek the mighty, the bishop of the folk.'] Though his kingly rank is entirely obscured by the Old English poet, he is described as the protector of Salem's treasure, which is an epithet for king in his role as protector. It is hardly the most explicit of epithets, the passage emphasises his sacral role and authority as bishop.

Melchisedech possessed immense theological importance in prefiguring Christ, which was certainly known to Ælfric who translated Alcuin's *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi* into Old English.<sup>332</sup> Entirely omitting his kingly authority is certainly not the norm in the tenth century; in fact, one would expect the prefiguring of the New Testament to be made especially evident in a codex made up exclusively of biblical paraphrases. It certainly is the norm to

---

<sup>332</sup> Alcuin, Aelfric, Sigewulf, Maclean (ed.), 'Aelfric's Anglo-Saxon Version of Alcuini *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi presbyteri in Genesin*'.

emphasise prefiguring elsewhere in the poem. The lack of emphasis seems deliberate and clearly sets out the juxtaposition of secular and sacral authority that follows in the poem at the point of the division of loot. The Vulgate Genesis XIV: 18 describes him as: “Melchisedech rex Salem... erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi” –[‘Melchisedech, the king of Salem... he was the priest of the most high God.’] The Vulgate account of the meeting at Vulgate Genesis XIV: 19-20 is short and concise:

“benedixit ei et ait benedictus Abram Deo excelsus qui creavit caelum et terram - et benedictus Deus excelsus quo protegente hostes in manibus tuis sunt et dedit ei decimas ex omnibus”

[‘He blessed him, and said: Blessed be Abram by the most high God, who created Heaven and earth. - And blessed be the most high God, by whose protection, the enemies are in thy hands. And he gave him the tithes of all.’]

The much lengthier *Genesis A* poem’s account adds original context to this encounter. In place of the short blessing of Vulgate Genesis, *Genesis A* structures a speech in parts. In *Genesis A* lines 2103b-2105a the meeting opens with a formal greeting and presenting of gifts to Abraham “fyrdrinca fruman” [‘the lord of armed men’]. The role of Abraham is that of a commander and the bishop submits to his military strength. Next, Melchisedech argues that Abraham’s military success was contingent on God’s, or sacral, authority. The speech dedicated exclusively to this assertion goes on for fourteen lines in *Genesis A* lines 2107-20 (see Appendix 35 on p. 216).

Next, the poem amplifies the simple Vulgate account of the verbal blessing. Before the non-verbal act, a sort of gesture, of blessing *Genesis A* adds a preamble to the biblical narrative. The preamble lends justification to the paying of the tithe, but significantly, the tithe here is presented as given in exchange for the blessing. In *Genesis A* lines 2120-3: “Him þa se beorn bletsunga lean - þurh hand ageaf, and þæs hereteames - ealles teoðan sceat Abraham sealde - godes bisceope.” [‘And the prince (i.e. Melchisedech) laid his hand upon him and blessed him, and Abraham gave a tenth part of all the

booty unto the bishop of God.] The exchange of blessing for tithe makes it clear that the position of bishop is now between King and God, the sacral authority possessed by the bishop who can exert it for financial gains,<sup>333</sup> an exchange of abstract notion and authority for tangible possessions.

In the earlier *Exodus* poem kings possessed both secular and sacred authority exclusively. In *Genesis A* secular and sacred authority are somewhat divided, and though kingly authority is still authorized by God's grace the division is evident from autonomous financial gain collected in the name of God by bishops. Where Moses in *Exodus* possessed divine authorization and secular authority without intermediary, Abraham in *Genesis A* possesses military authority by divine grant. However, there is an intermediary between sacred and secular authority in the position of bishop. By introducing the exchange between Abraham and Melchisedech the poet took special care to circumvent Melchisedech's scriptural designation of king and so limited the scope of the exchange exclusively between secular and sacral authority. The source of both is still God but unlike that of Moses in *Exodus* King Abraham's possession of divine authority is at least in part not exclusive but contingent on outside sacral confirmation.

## **B) CUSTODIANSHIP AS TEMPORARY POSSESSION OF AUTHORITY**

*Genesis A* begins with the creation of the known world spanning the kingdoms of Paradise and Earth and is quickly followed by the grant of Paradise to Adam. The same process unfolds in the Vulgate but in much shorter form and happens simultaneously with Adam's creation. At Vulgate Genesis II: 15 he receives Paradise: "ut operaretur et custodiret illum", for which Douay Rheims gives "to dress it, and to keep it." I chose to preserve the word 'keep' (like 'hold') because even though the classical Latin verb *custodio* is more often translated 'protect, defend, hold in custody' in medieval Latin, which was

---

<sup>333</sup> Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*, p. 31.

possibly understood by the poet,<sup>334</sup> this was not necessarily the case. The earliest entry for *custod/ia* in Latham is “explicitly for keeping, tenure of land”.<sup>335</sup> In order to emphasize the temporary nature of what is therefore essentially a ‘holding’ or ‘tenure’ we can translate the passage as “to command and safeguard.” Possession of authority therefore comes with the inherent responsibility of safeguarding, an obligation invoking a sense of temporary possession.

*Genesis A* contains the same idea and adds definition to the nature of the Lord’s authority. Unlike the Vulgate, *Genesis A* also repeats the obligation of safekeeping in two places, adding its own emphasis. There is an unfortunately positioned lacuna of one or two leaves<sup>336</sup> immediately before line 169 at the point which one would expect the first account of Adam’s creation if the Vulgate sequence of events were continuously followed. However, the *Genesis A* poet describes Adam in the context of the creation of Eve (in lines 171-2a) as “neorxnawonges, nowre gesceafte – hyrde and hældend” [‘the keeper and holder of the newly built Paradise’]. I chose ‘keeper’ over ‘shepherd’ since his power extends over all of Paradise and not merely the animals.<sup>337</sup> Similarly *hældend* is translated as ‘holder’ in order to emphasise the sense of owner whose authority is temporary. No matter the terminological base, the transient nature in this particular case becomes fully evident when Adam and Eve are expelled from Paradise, namely their holding, for breach of

---

<sup>334</sup> There is consensus that the poet worked either with access to scriptural narrative (Doane also includes “apocryphal, historical, and interpretative material”) or was deeply educated in it: Doane, *Genesis A*, pp. 49-50. Johnson goes further and concludes a “reliance on some form of the Latin Bible.” Johnson, ‘The Fall of Lucifer’, p. 502.

<sup>335</sup> Latham and Baxter, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources*, at 128. (the earliest entry is for 1086)

<sup>336</sup> Doane, *Genesis A*, pp. 8-11.

<sup>337</sup> Doane gives three options: ‘shepherd, guardian, keeper’ - *ibid.*, p. 367. Anlezark chose ‘keeper’ though his edition does not contain a note to this choice or a glossary: Anlezark, *Old Testament Narratives*, p. 15.

oath. The downside of an arrangement where authority over a dominion is contingent on obedience is the loss of 'holding' arising from loss of Lord.

A similar example is presented in *Genesis B* in line 358; in remembering their temporary home, before the fall, the fallen Angels used the term *onlean* ['to grant temporary use']. Poetic word economy can serve the same purpose as legal terminology; in order to get the message across using the fewest words, words must be selected carefully with attention to their sub-meanings and they must be selected consistently. Descriptive epithets in *Genesis B* are varied, but they are in a sort of consistent variation; the choice of which term goes where seems especially significant. As Elizabeth Tyler discerned, and I am paraphrasing, both repetition and variation may well be a matter of conscious choice with particular aims.<sup>338</sup> For example, as stated above on p. 150, the *Exodus* poet chose to employ the term *cyning* several times though Old English poetic language offers many possible epithets for rulers. It is equally noteworthy when a term only appears a single time in a reasonably lengthy text such as *Genesis B* where, judging by the Old English poets' reverence for verbal economy, each individual term carries even more weight. The term *onlag* at *Genesis A*, line 356-60a marks the difference between absolute property and loan – between a bestowal *in perpetuo*, and a temporary residence. This would perhaps be less evident if *onlag* were chosen to conform with alliteration, but this is not the case (lines 356-60a):

“Is þes æniga stede ungelic swiðe - þam oðrum <ham> þe we ær cuðon,  
- hean on heofonrice, þe me min hearra onlag, - þeah we hine for þam  
alwealdan agan ne moston, - romigan ures rices.”

[‘This narrow place is little like those other realms we knew, on high in heaven, allotted by my Lord (in terms of discussing authority I lean towards translating *onlag* as ‘granted’ or ‘bestowed’ or even ‘granted the loan of’ as suggested by B&T), though the Almighty hath not granted us to hold our state, or rule our kingdom.’]

---

<sup>338</sup> Tyler, *Old English Poetics*.

Here the difference between holding and having a *ham* ['homestead'] is emphasized; it is the difference between having a lord and being a lord, between tenure and tenancy. And since Lucifer was not an autonomous, or supreme lord, his attempt at gaining absolute possession of the kingdom he inhabited resulted in the loss of tenure. The same tenure then passed to the next retainer, Adam, and later his kin. The fallen angel's lament above marks the beginning<sup>339</sup> of man's temporary hold of Paradise, and then temporary tenure of his land on Earth, his transient interim dwelling (*middan-geard*). The notion is repeated at the end of the Junius XI in *Christ and Satan*, in lines 346b-7a, before man finally travels to Heaven to take Lucifer's place at Doomsday. (This one is not given as a first person account but described by a narrator.) Here Christ is juxtaposed with the fallen angels, unlike they he – "on riht geheold hired heofona and þæt halige seld" ['rightfully retained the heavenly household and holy throne']. The transience of possession does not end until those worthy reach Heaven at which point they will possess life forever, as seen in *Christ and Satan* lines 358-364 (see Appendix CSII on p. 224). The difference is evident from the verb: *agon* ['they possess']; this Heaven is not designated by the poet a temporary hold but marked by absolute possession, or to use the legal term of the relevant Latin Anglo-Saxon charts *in perpetuo*.

### C) PERSONAL AUTHORITY

#### The Currency of Possessing Lord's Favour

Weber classified authority in three parts: rational-legal, personal-charismatic, and traditional authority.<sup>340</sup> Though the definition of his rational-legal authority corresponds with most of my observations of authority in the Junius XI poems,

---

<sup>339</sup> On the question of chronology of the creation of Angels in Anglo-Saxon England see Ritter, 'The Angles and the Angels', pp. 66-77.

<sup>340</sup> Translated as 'authority' in Weber, Henderson, and Parsons, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. In the translation of his first essay: Weber, 'Die drei reinen Typen der legitimen Herrschaft' it is translated as 'rule' i.e. Weber, 'The Three Legitimate Types of Rule'.

especially the 'communal type of relationship'. This is not the case with the personal-charismatic authority, which can be identified only in small parts of *Exodus* but as a minor factor of Moses' authority. Weber's third category of traditional authority is all-pervasive, in so far as all the Junius XI poems, in keeping with religious doctrine, define any rightful rule as God's. The interplay in the poetic narrative effectively dispenses with the need to present this category in their interpretation, since the religious context of scriptural paraphrases grounds all authority in Christian tradition.

Hudson's distinction between personal and legal concepts of seigniorial jurisdiction seems a better fit for discussing the scriptural poems in question. Rather than defining authority by who holds it, Hudson distinguishes it according to what serves as its basis. He prefaced his discussion of Anglo-Saxon lords' courts by introducing the following distinction: "One ['personal jurisdiction'] would derive from a lord's relationship to his men and lands, the other ['legal jurisdiction'] from a grant of powers normally exercised by the king or his officials."<sup>341</sup>

I follow suit in dividing authority in the poems of Junius XI accordingly into personal authority and legal authority. These are two aspects of possessing authority, two bases between which exclusive rights and obligations governing possession of authority can be systematically divided. As I will argue in this section, the poems of Junius XI contain indications that principles of personal authority were at some point alone in governing possession of authority. Legal principles were probably added to the combination later and never existed outside the relationship with personal authority, but cannot be viewed completely on their own. I will artificially extrapolate them in the subsequent sub-chapter for the sake of clarity and with a view to move on to the study of judicial authority, which in the context of Junius XI poems appears to be a practical example of the amalgamation of the two principles.

---

<sup>341</sup> Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*, p. 56.

## Rights and Obligations in Junius XI and the Elements of *Swerian*

Rights and obligations governing possession of personal authority in the poems of Junius XI can be correlated with the elements of the ‘*Swerian* oath’ of personal fealty. This is a long-lived formula mentioned in the laws of King Alfred, more extensively in the laws of Edward the Elder, and extremely specifically demanded by the laws of King Cnut.<sup>342</sup> Its long history is significant because it shows that the idea of the *Swerian* oath was old enough to have informed the poet of *Exodus* at the time of its construction, while at the same time actively used in the interim when the other poems were composed, and still relevant in the tenth century, when the manuscript was composed. The longevity of social notions in the Old English poems has long since been noted,<sup>343</sup> but the nature of the *Swerian* oath is evidenced outside poetic conventions, in documentary sources and therefore extends beyond the scope of poetic archaisms.

The principles of the *Swerian* oath of personal fealty can also be identified indirectly. In several places in Junius XI the same principles regulate rights and obligations of personal authority, thereby providing insight into the nature and level of its possession. Before identifying the principles of the *Swerian* oath in the context of poetic narrative, it is best for the sake of clarity to first examine the legal *Swerian* oath formula on its own merits, and take note of individual rights and obligations contained therein. These can then be individually identified in the context of the Junius XI poems. Poetic language refers to the favour owed by the seigneurs as *hyld*.

“þus man sceal swerigean hyld-aðas; On þone Drihten þe þes haligdom  
is fore halig, ic wille beon N. bold and getriwe, and eal lufian þæt he  
lufað, and eal ascunian þæt he ascunap. æfter Godes rihte and æfter

---

<sup>342</sup> Wormald, “Oaths”, Lapidge, *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 338-9.

<sup>343</sup> Elizabeth Tyler discusses the extent and usefulness of reviewing the conventionality of Old English poetry including the preserving nature of the Old English poetic diction in: Tyler, *Old English Poetics*.

worold gerysnum, and næfre willes ne gewældes wordes ne weorces, owiht don, þæs him laðre bið, wið þam, þe he me healde, swa ic earnian wille, and eall þæt læste, þæt uncer formæl wæs, þa ic to him gebeah and his willan geceas.”<sup>344</sup>

[‘This is how a man shall swear oaths of service/favour.<sup>345</sup> By the Lord, before whom these relics are holy, I will be loyal and true to N, and love all that he loves, and hate all that he hates, (however) in accordance with God's rights and secular obligations; and never, willingly, and intentionally, in word or deed, do anything that is hateful to him; on condition that he keep me as I shall deserve, and carry out all that was our agreement, when I subjected myself to him and chose his favour.’]

<sup>346</sup>

Due to the demands of alliterative verse and poetic style one cannot expect the poems to use the same terminology as the oath formula. However, as I will show, the poets made a discernible effort to put social exchanges in familiar terms, often including unwitting information about the principles of possessing personal authority. These principles, even where their terminology is not consistent, can be easily compared with the principles comprising the *Swerian* oath formula. The oath may be broken down into its individual parts thus:

The opening “I will be loyal and true to N” frames loyalty, which translates to exclusivity of subjugation. Divided loyalty on the same issues is impossible, the right to a subject’s exclusive loyalty is a basic right of the seigneur and obligation of the subject, and such a right/obligation is the first factor defining the possession of personal authority. The pledge to ‘love what he loves and hate all that he hates...’ translates to unyielding and unquestioning support in

---

<sup>344</sup> Schmid, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen In der Ursprache mit Übersetzung*, p. 404.

<sup>345</sup> The first part is my own translation, primarily because of the ‘hyld-’ component, but also because Dorothy Whitelock did not include this part.

<sup>346</sup> I saw no need to re-translate the second part: Whitelock, *The Beginnings of English Society*, p. 33.

everything be it 'in word or deed'– absolute obedience no matter personal opinion, such as one might find as the basis of order in any military. There are two conditions: the first 'in accordance with God's rights and secular obligations' posits that the authority of God's and secular law supersedes any order that may counter it. Such orders would be *unriht*, or unlawful. The second condition 'that he keep me as I shall deserve' is payment according to merit, which translates into upkeep dependent on service. The concluding statement 'and carry out all that was our agreement' anticipates additional agreed-on provisions which accompany the taking of the oath. The implication is that the *Swerian* formula was one part in the process of accepting authority, a process which also included the sanctification of agreements specified separately. These may very well have been the underlying reason for subjugation in the first place.

To reiterate the pledge of personal fealty is a pledge, that is (1) voluntary (2) exclusive (3) implies subjugation and (4) absolute obedience as long as the orders are (5) lawful (that is in keeping with God's law) contingent on (6) payment in the form of upkeep and (7) the provisions of the underlying agreement.

Identifying these principles in Junius XI poems exposes several examples of possession of personal authority that may otherwise remain unnoticed. The all-pervasive notion of personal authority can be observed in relation to human lords, Satan, or God personified. The submission to authority is throughout voluntary with reciprocal rights and obligations.

The *Swerian* oath, with all its precise provisions, can be boiled down to a reciprocal agreement. The instruction prefacing the *Swerian* oath of personal fealty refers to the oaths as *hyld-aðas*. Examining the term *hyld* is therefore common ground. Lucas argued that the term *hyld* reflects a *comitatus* code in Junius XI poems.<sup>347</sup> I argue that this term simply reflects the framework of personal authority as it does in the *Swerian* oath of personal fealty. If rights and obligations framing personal authority lend it the form of a possession,

---

<sup>347</sup> Lucas, 'Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis', p. 129.

the currency for which it is exchanged – *hyld*, at least in the context of the poems of Junius XI, can also be deemed a possession in itself. For example in the Book of Daniel, after the three youths are delivered from fire the Vulgate account gives the reason for their miraculous salvation as simply [“because they believed in him”]; in Vulgate Daniel III: 95 “...eruit servos suos quia crediderunt in eo”. Unlike the Vulgate account, *Daniel* interrupts the storyline to add an original explanation, using the example of their salvation as a point of departure to explain the nature of God’s authority in *Daniel* lines 477-80:

“<dema> ælmihtig, se ðe him dom forgeaf, - spowende sped, þam þe his spel berað. - Forðon witigað þurh wundor monig - halgum gastum þe his hyld curon.”

[‘<Lord> Eternal and Almighty, who gives them glory and abundant weal who preach His gospel. And He reveals Himself by many a wonder to holy hearts who seek His favour.’]

Appearances of *hyld* in the Junius XI poems proved a useful signal in identifying whether subjugation was desirable. At times it was accompanied by a mention of bowing of heads. According to Abels, bowing “was the way that the Anglo-Saxons described homage, referring to a symbolic act of subordination which accompanied the giving of an oath of fealty.”<sup>348</sup> The act of bowing the head in our time is often laden with the inference of oppression, and there is a case in *Genesis B* where a similar inference could be made. This connection, however, is not a general rule. There are examples where no such connection is evident. In fact the appearance of *hyld* in *Genesis B* lines 740-44, differs from others in two ways. The context makes it clear that the subjugation is involuntary and there is no mention of *hyld* though, as I will demonstrate, this is a pervasive term elsewhere in the same poem (as well as others).

---

<sup>348</sup> Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 82. He is referencing Beer, *Führen und folgen, herrschen und beherrschtwerden im Sprachgut der Angelsachsen*, c.v. "bugan".

“Unc wearð god yrre - forþon wit him noldon on heofonrice - hnigan mid heafdum halgum drihtne - þurh geongordom; ac unc gegenge ne wæs - þæt wit him on þegnscipe þeowian wolden.”

[‘God’s anger was kindled against us because in heaven we would not bow our heads in service before the Holy Lord. It pleased us not to serve Him.’]

Kennedy, possibly due to word economy, omitted the amplification of the repeated notion of subjugation. He translated *on þegnscipe þeowian* simply as ‘to serve’, whereas the poet was more exact. I argue that *þeowian* marks an undesirable type of service: ‘serve in subordination’. The difference between the service *on þegnscipe þeowian* and *hyld* is the point of Lucifer’s contention, but this contention is a matter of viewpoint. Throughout *Genesis B* Satan expresses his belief that man is the thegn that replaced the fallen angels in God’s service. This is clear from *Genesis B*, line 301 where the rebel angels “hyldo hæfde his ferlorene” [‘have lost his favour’]. Furthermore there are two examples where the fallen angels possess personal authority expressed by their reception of *hyld*. When Satan’s minion returns from having corrupted Adam and Eve he rejoices in *Genesis B* lines 726b-7: “Nu hæbbe ic þine hyldo me - witode geworhte, and þinne willan gelæst” [‘Now I have your favour for myself – surely earnt, and your will executed.’] This is a sign of chosen subjugation to personal authority like the one in the *Swerian* oath. Such a choice between earning favour and enmity is even more obvious at the point where Eve is using earning *hyldo* as an argument in convincing Adam to follow the instruction of the false God’s emissary, seen in *Genesis B* lines 658-60: “he is ærendsecg unces hearran, - hefoncyniges. His hyldo is unc betere - to gewinnanne þonne his wiðermedo.” [‘he is an envoy from our lord - King of heaven. His favour is better - for us to win than his enmity.’]

Throughout Junius XI poems *hyld* marks a desirable category, which is beneficial to possess and is worth exchanging for the benefits entailed in subjection to personal authority. Voluntary submission is not, however, tied exclusively to the term *hyld*. In *Christ and Satan* the term *ar* is used. The

souls in Hell in *Christ and Satan*, which have been doomed because they came to Earth before Christ was born, express their eagerness to submit to his authority quite plainly in lines 205-8 (in the Appendix CSI on p. 224). Instead of *hyld* the desirable repayment for subjugation to God here is *ar* – as given by DOE: under heading B.) ‘mercy, grace, favour’. The souls are willing to submit to personal authority in exchange for replacing forced servitude in Hell with voluntary subjugation, complete with the benefit of God’s *ara* [‘favours’]. The same term in *Genesis A* often accompanies *hyld* as its substance; *hyld* stands for the abstract possession of the lord’s favour, and *aran* stand for its practical manifestations. Whether it be *hyld* or *ar* both terms invoke the category a lord’s favour as his obligation traded for the abstract possession of loyalty and its practical manifestations. All of these categories are desirable in terms of their value in exchange and important abstract possessions in their own right.

#### The Temporary Nature of Personal Authority

The *Swerian* oath also implies that personal authority is not necessarily sworn *in perpetuo*. At the very least, the sworn subjugation is not hereditary by nature, and according to *Genesis A* it may well be that the obedience is only expected when called upon. In fact, *Genesis A* testifies to the possibility of a band of retainers being sworn for the duration of a battle. It is possible that the relationship outlasts it, but this is not evidenced by the poem where, as I will demonstrate in the following paragraph, the alliance is emphasised much more than in the scriptural account during the battle sequences and then never mentioned again.

In *Genesis A* lines 2025-6 and 2033b-8 (see Appendix 2 on p. 197) Abraham asks for military assistance which is followed by an oath of newly recruited allies. The oath in the poem can be seen as a paraphrase of the part of *Swerian* on aligning mutual interests: ‘to be loyal, to hate what he hates.’ This oath of allegiance is not paralleled in the Vulgate account (at Genesis XIV: 13b, see Appendix 3 on p. 198), where the alliance is merely mentioned in passing. *Genesis A*’s further account of the alliance consistently refers to the

alliance at every turn, repeatedly mentioning that the three swore an oath. When departing for battle Abraham gathers the three retainers and their men in *Genesis A* lines 2045-6: “Him þa Abraham gewat and þa eorlas þry - þe him ær treowe sealdon mid heora folcgetrume;” [‘And Abraham went out, and the three earls who had pledged their faith, together with a great company of their people.’] Here the poet takes the opportunity to inform us that each of the three brothers came with their own retainers. The subjugation to personal authority expands to dependents, which is perfectly in keeping with the *Swerian* formula. The *Swerian* demands that a retainer love all that his lord loves, and since the three military retainers possess authority over their own dependents in the first instance, presumably these retainers must love their own seigneur’s chosen lord. After Abraham is victorious the oath of fealty as far as *Genesis A* is concerned concludes with the provision of payment for service in *Genesis A* lines 2150-5:

“... ealle buton dæle þissa drihtwera, - **huðe** lædan, þe ic þe æt hilde gesloh Aneres and Mamres and Escol. - Nelle ic þa rincas rihte benæman - ac hie me fulleodon æt æscpræce”

[‘But thou mayest take hence with thee all that booty which I won for thee in battle, save only the portion of these lordly men, of Aner, and of Mamre, and of Eshcol. I will not willingly deprive these warriors of their right, for they upheld me in the shock of battle and fought to thine advantage.’]

The oath of loyalty bound Aner and Mamre and Eshcol to fight for Abraham’s beloved Lot: They were ‘loyal and true to’ Abraham. By fighting for Abraham’s kinsman with no personal vested interest they ‘loved what he loved’, by fighting his enemies they ‘hated what he hated’ they did so ‘in accordance with God’s law and secular obligations’. All this they did ‘on condition that he keep them as they had deserved.’ All this they did for the limited span of a military campaign, presumably because their oath was limited to this time frame. The three never re-appear in the narrative, and so it is impossible to tell if their oath would prove lasting. As it stands, personal authority which is contingent on oath-swearing can be in a seigneur’s possession for a

designated amount of time only, and in this it is similar to custodianship discussed above on p. 158.

#### **D) LEGALITY OF AUTHORITY**

In lines 1121-1236 *Genesis A*, following the Vulgate Genesis, sets out a sequence of inheritance of worldly authority from Adam to Noah. Unlike the much drier Vulgate account, each of the rulers receives a short description or epithet which speaks to the nature of their rule. The concept of inheritance itself positions authority among other possessions that are passed from father to son, in line with biblical custom.<sup>349</sup> Though this is probably not deliberate, through gradually adding qualities to the nature of the inherited authority, the poet generates a seeming evolution of the concept of authority.

As I will argue, this change corresponds with a move from the personal type of authority as defined in the subchapter above to a codified system which I dubbed legal authority in the introduction (see p.148). I have chosen this passage because it illustrates the concepts that frame my conception of legal authority, and does so in the course of transmission of its possession. In the course of the sub-chapter I will deal with passages pertaining to each individual heir separately. The entire passage is given (*Genesis A lines 1121b-1236*) in the Appendix 25 on p. 208. While the Vulgate genealogy (Vulgate Genesis V: 4-30) contains only ages and names the line of human descendants. *Genesis A* adds a description of authority types passed down.

The socio-historical evolution of scriptural narrative is elaborated and adapted to familiar social conventions in Old English poetry. Even though there is no description of its implementation in individual cases, the line of descendants as a whole depicts a transformation of kingly authority. Judging from the lack of emphasis or note on the part of the author or editor to such an effect, this is probably a side-effect due to the generally inherited epithets of scriptural

---

<sup>349</sup> Carmichael posits that the reason inheritance law is not given much prominence in the Bible is that these were matters that no one questioned: Carmichael, 'Inheritance in Biblical Sources', p. 229.

protagonists hailing from a general theological tradition rather than a conscious effort to construct a historical view of the evolution of the social conception of authority. The poet develops a gradual dramaturgical shift from a general overview to a more focused view of the stories of individual protagonists, adding a growing number of details to individual rulers. As the narrative progresses the number of human subjects greatly increases and the description of individual rulers' authority takes this increase into account. I opted not to add parallel examples from the Vulgate to the following examples from *Genesis A* because they are limited to: 'X was Y years old and had a son Q, he was Z years old when he died.' All information I give below was an original Old English addition to scriptural narrative.

After the expulsion from Paradise Adam and Eve find themselves without any Lord's *hyld* on their own in a new realm; the general implication of the line of inheritance of first-borns is that mankind are their own lords. The firstborns become kings after complex social structures evolve. Adam is immediately succeeded by Seth, and after the poet explicitly notes the number of people increased, thereby marking a point in the sacred history where the heir's authority becomes in effect a rule. Before, when the number of people was small, authority was presented in the poetic narrative more as a matter of seniority within the family. Seth's possession of authority is described by the verb *healdan* as custodial and temporary;<sup>350</sup> in *Genesis A* lines 1128-9: "Him on laste Seth leod weardode - eafora æfter yldrum; epelestol heold" – ['After him ['Adam'] Seth defended the people - successor after the forefathers, held the native seat']. Next, in *Genesis A* lines 1155,7, Cainan is proclaimed: "þære cneorisse wæs Cainan siððan... weard and wisa" a keeper and leader

---

<sup>350</sup> It is important to note that the very nature of genealogy necessitates awareness of transience; this is possibly why it recurs throughout *Genesis A*. Transience was a pervasive idea in Anglo-Saxon Christianity. It was, famously attested by Bede in his allegory about the sparrow flying through the court: Bede, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, II: 13, pp. 94-6; Similarly Ælfric refers to transience in his: XXV Annunciation St. Mary - Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 204-5. For further information on the transience of material things see Reuter, 'You Can't Take It with You'; Fell, 'Perceptions of Transience'.

of the tribe or progeny. Like the verb *weardode* for Seth above, here *weard* ['guard, watchman'] marks authority a custodianship amplified with the added quality of leadership. In *Genesis A*, line 1167, his son Malahel "him on laste heold land and yrfe" ['after him held land and inheritance']. He also held temporary custodianship of the land and inheritance of indefinite quality, possibly including men, chattels, and authority. The next to inherit, Jared, brings it all together neatly with the first appearance of the pairing of 'land and leod weard' in *Genesis A* lines 1179b-81: "[Malahel] eaforan læfde – land and leod weard. Longe siððan – eared gumum gold brittade." ['Malahel'] gave the land and rule unto his son. – A long time Jared dealt out gold to men.'] Referred to as the dispenser of gold, his authority now depends on the obligation of upkeep in addition to protection of land and men.

While such protection could fall under the auspices of the *Swerian* and thus personal authority, the rule of Jared is also the first to be marked by the introduction of the concept of legal authority as opposed to the concept of personal authority discussed thus far. In *Genesis A* lines 1182-3: "Se eorl wæs æðele, æfæst hæleð" ['He was a righteous prince, a noble earl'], here Kennedy's translation does not focus on the term *æfæst* ['literally firm in law']. Here 'earl' seemingly replaces kingly rule, and ascribes judicial authority to higher nobility. However, as Hudson posits when ascribing judicial authority to eorls: "Law-codes refer to men 'eorlisce ge ceorlisce', the former term perhaps indicating aristocratic status generally"<sup>351</sup> and I intend to apply this conclusion to this entry (and the next). The term *æfæst* may well mean 'firm in God's law' or simply 'devout', which are co-entries in the DOE. But in the context of a vernacular paraphrase, where law-givers are throughout divine and in keeping with my findings in the discussion of sacred authority above, any law fits the bill of God's law. I will argue that *eorlas* in *Genesis A* refer specifically to a rank below king, denoting highest human authority superseded only by God's.

Aside from the obvious reason that there appear no higher-ranking individuals either in the Vulgate or in *Genesis A*, this notion is made clear by the fact that

---

<sup>351</sup> Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*, p. 202.

the inheritance passes with no needed confirmation of a superior. God, a relative king to these *eorls* had at the point of expulsion given the world to Adam and Eve as representatives of mankind *in perpetuo*. In God's own words, they will suffer on Earth 'as long as they live'. In *Genesis A* lines 932-938, and immediately after, in lines 955-964, the poet breaks from narrative with his original addition to scripture, explaining that God in his mercy gave mankind the kingdom of Earth and all its benefits forever (see Appendix 19 on p. 206).

Thus the earthly kingdom is mankind's holding or tenure, thus its law stems from the bestowing ruler; it is God's law. The use of the term *eorlas* is significant in so far as it marks temporary custodians of God's legal authority. Hudson posits: "During the last century of Anglo-Saxon England the term ealdorman was being replaced by the term eorl, earl. ... such men combined aristocratic status with the holding of a major administrative office, by the end of the Anglo-Saxon period there was very clear pressure for the position to be hereditary."<sup>352</sup> The significant administrative office and noble status of *eorlas* in the *Genesis A* line of inheritance is evident and does not stop with Jared. Next Henoah upholds the authority of earldom at *Genesis A* line 1197b-9 - "ealdordom ahof – Freoðosped folces wisa, nalles feallan let – dom and drihtscipe - þenden he hyrde wæs heafodmaga" – ['ruled the folk, led them in ways of peace, and no wise let his sway and power lessen, while he was lord over his kinsmen.'] His authority consists of keeping the peace and upholding the law over the people he is charged with. This concludes the evolution of the nature of authority from purely personal authority to a regulated and administrative style of government, a style framing a combination of personal and legal authority.

But the evolution continues, adding the category of 'kin', which is needed for the execution of judicial authority. In *Genesis A*, line 1218 the poet is happy to state simply that Methuselah holds '*maga yrfe*' ['power over kinsmen'] before moving on to Lammeh. He continues in *Genesis A* lines 1224b-6a: "Sunu æfter heold, – Lammeh leodgeard, lange siððan – woruld bryttade"

---

<sup>352</sup> Ibid., p. 203.

[Kennedy: 'And Lamech, his son, succeeded him and kept the treasure.'] The phrase *woruld bryttade* (according to the DOE) does not refer to possessing treasure, but rather to the distribution of worldly gain, this can be either moveable or landed or both. The custodianship of the land in the sense of 'patria' or homeland is tied directly to the rule over people, again through distribution of wealth. The final recipient of Adam's inheritance is Noah, and his inherited rule is described in *Genesis A*, line 1236 as "[æŕ] land bryttade siððan lamech gewat" – Kennedy translates simply ['Noah ruled the land after the death of Lamech'] though a word for word translation is perhaps more useful, since for my purpose it is useful to distinguish define that ruling in this case was framed as distributing land: ['[before] distributed land after Lamech passed on']. The rule of Noah is divided in two by the Flood. Before (æŕ) Noah is signified as the ruler of inheritance stemming from lineage, while the rule he receives afterwards stems directly from his Lord through personal oath exchange after the world had been purged of all Adam's previous heirs. The succession of epithets down the line of inheritance therefore demonstrates a gradual shift in the emphasis on the priorities of kingly authority. Rulers, first defined by their obligations as custodians and defenders of the people on their land, are gradually replaced by those defined by authority and power arising from the rule of law and distribution of wealth and land to their subjects.

#### Relationship of Scripture, Biblical Paraphrase and Law-Codes

Whereas codification marks the birth of legal authority its inception, though presented by the *Genesis A* poet as scripture, is personal authority. The poet often adapts scriptural narrative to his understanding of legal authority rather than keeping to the legal notions generally framed in scripture. Though the two are brought in line, personal legal authority in the context of *Genesis A* does not arise from scripture, since in scripture God never directly grants personal authority. According to Wormald the notion of Anglo-Saxon court oath predates codification in the Laws of Alfred. He posits about the nature of 'oath breaking' ['bogbryce']: "... if it can be shown that there is really no trace

(in England) of the system that they evoke before Alfred's time, it must follow that he brought it into being *before issuing his code*.<sup>353</sup> He argues for tying Carolingian legal practices via Alfred to England. The notion of oath as a binding legal conception, is epitomized in the *Swerian* oath formula, from which I have developed the category of personal authority. It stands to reason that the notion of Anglo-Saxon personal legal authority existed outside the Christian social conception of authority. The adaptation of the social conception was at the same time an adaptation of Christian social conceptions to the Anglo-Saxon cultural realm.

In examining the possession of legal authority the intended use for Anglo-Saxon law-codes is not central to the argument. Whether the laws were actually used in litigation or, as is widely accepted, were not intended for use,<sup>354</sup> makes little difference to the matter of legal authority in the context of Junius XI. The poet is not concerned with individual provisions of any law-code. In fact, the lack of any reference to these, even in the form of an addition to the written account, makes it even more probable that law-codes were, as Hyams puts it, "kingship treaties"<sup>355</sup> rather than practical tools. This is also Abels' contention for earlier law-codes.<sup>356</sup> Though I accept the base of his contention I wish to emphasise, that even though "recasting customary law as king's law"<sup>357</sup> may have been beneficial to the king's standing, it may well have also worked to lend gravitas and guarantee to customary law, categories ensured by the king and his administrators personally. In this respect even codified customary law was not autonomous from personal legal authority.

Where poets have been shown to exercise multi-layered control of meanings, allegorical senses and symbolic subtext (mentioned above on p. 43), the

---

<sup>353</sup> Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 283-4.

<sup>354</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent*, pp. 148-9; Wormald, 'Lex scripta and verbum regis', pp. 105-38.

<sup>355</sup> Hyams, 'Feud and the State in Late Anglo-Saxon England', p. 10.

<sup>356</sup> Abels, *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 7.

<sup>357</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

additions to scriptural content of the Junius XI poems likely contains instances of unwitting information contained as the background of his explanations of scriptural actions. Some of these present an otherwise non-existent ideal of judicial authority. For example, while shaping the dialogue between God and Cain in the form of a judicial process, the poet's intent is an adaptation of the narrative that would presumably be familiar to the audience. Injecting propaganda without a realistic basis would be detrimental to the cause and would negate this intent. In short: though scriptural narrative in itself aims to attribute divine authorisation to all kingly authority the original Old English additions to scriptural narrative testify to a pre-existing recognised legal authority outside scripture. It would follow that the adaptation of scripture in Junius XI poems serves to authorise the rulers' possession of authority rather than curb it by holding it to a scriptural standard.

#### **E) JUDICIAL AUTHORITY, Practical Examples of Possessing Authority**

This, final subchapter, examines how the categories of secular, sacred, personal and legal authority discussed above are combined in judicial authority. Judicial authority is utilised in the Junius XI narrative wherever there arises an issue between the possessor of authority and his subject. The Vulgate account is usually brief, limited to simply reporting God's decree, while the Junius XI paraphrase adds an exchange which can be viewed as a judicial process. Its connection to the concept of possession is much more visible because, unlike the above abstract categories of authority, judicial authority in the Junius XI poems is presented in practice. Here the execution of judicial authority entails transfer of possession (land in case of exile), protection of ownership (in case of dispute), it yields profit (in wergild and penalties), supports taxation, the codified exchanges of possession thoroughly frame judicial authority. To this effect I will present three cases of exertion of judicial authority that represent three combinations of the above discussed categories of authority. First I will discuss the case of Adam and Eve's expulsion in *Genesis B* and *A* where judicial authority is rooted in the category of personal authority. Next, the expulsion of Cain in *Genesis A* will

serve to demonstrate the inclusion of the category of legal authority and its impact on abstract and tangible possession. Finally the chapter will conclude with the case of the three in the fire in *Daniel*, an episode which contains an example of unrecognized rule; it sheds light on the legal categories involved in possessing judicial authority and its dependence on legal authority.

### The Case of Adam and Eve – Personal Judicial Authority

In *Genesis A*, Paradise, which can be viewed as the first land tenure, is bestowed on Adam and Eve individually. This is different from the Vulgate where Eve is not tied to God's bestowal of the habitat at all. This distinction results in a difference in the type of Eve's obligation and her responsibility, which the poet's original additions clearly express. At the point of the creation of Eve the Vulgate posits simply (Vulgate Genesis II, 22): "et aedificavit Dominus Deus costam quam tulerat de Adam in mulierem et adduxit eam ad Adam." ['And the Lord God built the rib which he took from Adam into a woman: and brought her to Adam.']. Meanwhile the OE poet adds as explanation behind Eve's creation that God thought that Adam should no longer be a 'keeper' and 'holder' alone (*Genesis A lines* 169-171). Thus Eve by implication becomes a 'keeper' and 'holder' with the same responsibilities as Adam and in the same way tied to the Lord through the bestowed land.

Mintz, in her "Words Devilish and Divine: Eve as Speaker in *Genesis B*", focused on Eve's role but her criticism is aimed at equating Eve and Adam's share of blame.<sup>358</sup> In terms of her subjection to the Lord's judicial authority, as I will show, the poet took pains to distribute accountability in such a way to make Eve judicially an autonomous subject. Yes, as Mintz states, Eve is not solely responsible, but her share of culpability actually testifies in favour of her legal autonomy not against it. I agree with Vickrey that one should not simply accept Eve's general inferiority to Adam.<sup>359</sup> The issue may be that the setup for the crime and the crime itself are contained in *Genesis B*, while the

---

<sup>358</sup> S. B. Mintz, 'Words Devilish and Divine', pp. 617-8.

<sup>359</sup> Vickrey, 'Adam, Eve, and the Tacen in Genesis B', pp. 8-9.

punishment and part of the swearing of fealty fall in the respective surrounding passages of *Genesis A*.

Viewed strictly in the context of *Genesis B*, Eve is a self-contained character with a disposition different than evidenced in *Genesis A*. But though the crime occurs within the inserted *Genesis B* poem, the oath of fealty and judicial process are continuous in *Genesis A*. There are no visual markers separating *Genesis A* from *Genesis B*, to indicate that *Genesis B* interpolation was not intended to be read as anything but an integral part of the narrative. My examination of the two poems in concert may cast Eve's share of culpability in a different light, but the influence of judicial authority on possessions in the two poems are, nevertheless, the same.

I will argue that the judicial process in *Genesis A* demonstrates that Eve in possession of her own share of rights and obligations. The described exertion of judicial authority also illuminates the degree to which the abstract notion of possession frames other categories of authority, i.e. the relative shares of personal and judicial authority of the lord over Adam and Eve. Judicial authority also represents a large part of the Lord's abstract possession of Adam and Eve as persons. In this way possessing judicial authority defines possession of men as followers. Additionally, as I will argue, judgment based in judicial authority regulates the mobility of other possessions. In case of Adam and Eve's punishment, essentially expulsion from Paradise, the primary regulated possessions fall in two categories: the earthly realm they can possess, and Paradise they cannot. In addition provisions and valuables are presented as tied to the realms in question.

In the context of the *Genesis A* and *B* poems, original sin is treated as any other crime, with no modern distinction between a criminal and ethical offense. Therein it is possible to glimpse the workings of a judicial process, and through it the rights and obligations framed by judicial authority. The focus is on the role of judicial authority within the framework of other categories of possession. I will argue that God's judicial authority is aimed at punishing the transgression of disobedience, which is presented in the

narrative as a transgression against personal authority of the ruler circumventing any reference to the category of legal authority.

The narrative of the *Genesis* poems often departs from the Vulgate account, seemingly to accommodate Anglo-Saxon legal social conceptions, specifically those tied to the category of personal legal authority. For example, directly after the lacuna marking the beginning of *Genesis B* (in lines 235-239a),<sup>360</sup> stands God's prohibition against eating of the tree of life to which Adam and Eve acquiesce by bowing their heads (I have discussed bowing of heads as signal of accepting personal authority above on p. 165) after which, in *Genesis B*, line 239: "He let heo þæt land buan," ['He gave them that land to dwell in'], strictly speaking he allowed them (B&T: 'lætan' – allow, permit, suffer) to inhabit it. They have been accepted into his service through a process of swearing an oath and only then being allowed to settle on his land after they accepted his personal authority. Both of them had accepted it as clearly marked by the 3<sup>rd</sup> person dual *inc* in lines 894-5a, when God reiterates their crime in pronouncing sentence: "wæstmē þa inc wærn wordum minum – fæstew forbodene." ['... the fruit (which Eve ate and gave Adam')... when by My word it was forbidden to you both.'] Meanwhile the Vulgate only mentions the act of bestowal in relation to Adam signalling Eve as Adam's dependent by not including her in any ceremonial agreement of fealty as an autonomous subject.

In *Genesis B* Eve takes the obligation of responsibility for her actions: she is directly stated to have accepted the rights from her lord God and by individually bowing her head she accepted the obligation of submitting to his personal authority. She becomes implicitly bound to follow his commands, as well as to accept any ensuing legal repercussions. In short, she becomes his subject personally and directly. The poet of *Genesis B* departed from scriptural narrative in lines 708-710a (see Appendix 14 on p. 203) with a view to specifically emphasise the extenuating circumstances of Eve's actions. He

---

<sup>360</sup> Doane suggests that the third lacuna after line 234 may have been the reason for the introduction of *Genesis B* in the first place: Doane, *Genesis A*, p. 10.

did this with a “hypermetrical line that interrupts the intensity of the scene”<sup>361</sup> given above. The poet explained that Eve’s motivation hailed from her pure heart and that she did not know (*nyste*) what serious afflictions would follow.

Nevertheless though the poet makes it possible for the audience to understand her motivation, he makes no special effort to explain the extent of her culpability. It seems assumed that her responsibility for breaking her word was binding. In the Vulgate, on the other hand, Eve simply never gave her word, never made an oath and never ceremoniously bowed her head. In scripture there was no mention of the extent of her portion of culpability, merely her portion of punishment. In the Junius XI narrative her oath quite contrarily justified a lengthy account of her punishment, far surpassing the Vulgate in providing judicial context. In the Vulgate Eve (Vulgate Genesis III: 16) incites for all women ever after “dolores”, pains in childbirth, women will be forever “sub viri potestate” [“in the power of men”], which could simply mean under their authority, like Roman “pater familias”. In this manner the Douay Rheims Bible translates “under thy husband’s power”, probably in accordance with its contemporary conceptions of gender relations. The Old English account reserves a much viler fate for the women of mankind in *Genesis A* lines 919-24 (see Appendix 15 on p. 203). In addition to vividly describing the pains of childbearing and mortality Eve is dispossessed of all delights, not only subjected to man, but held in subjection through the severe oppression of fear (“mid weres egsan - hearde geneawad”), suffering and humiliation.

The implication of Eve’s punishment, as related by *Genesis B*, is that womankind will be forever abused by men, due to physical weakness through her punishment. The prospect is terrifying and not at all presented as a matter of fact. The poet seems to be deliberately painting a grimmer picture, designed to inflict horror, rather than reporting a normative state of gender relations. The man’s authority in *Genesis B*’s account of gender relations is not presented as legal and agreed to, but as a matter of personal authority.

---

<sup>361</sup> I owe the detail of the hypermetrical nature of the line to: Mintz, 'Words Devilish and Divine', p. 616.

The same can be said of God's authority. The process of swearing and ensuing pronouncing of sentence are tied exclusively to personal authority in this judicial process, which suffices for pronouncing and exacting a sentence of judicial authority.

In the Vulgate Genesis God is only specifically said to possess direct authority over Adam, the only one of the two reported to have submitted to God's authority. The Vulgate Genesis III: 17 (see Appendix 16 on p. 203) describes Adam's crime as limited to eating the forbidden fruit with no reference to previous agreement of loyalty and his individual punishment is that he will have to work hard to till the soil. After this, almost like an afterthought, we are told that Adam is cast out with not so much as a mention of Eve. In the *Genesis B* account God's judgement is passed on the two perpetrators individually, their trespasses are also treated separately, and individual punishments are assigned for each of them in separate places in the text. The poet took special liberties to present proceedings in this way; the Lord's ruling is not tied to any codified set of rules, it is a judgment of disobedience and as such a matter of personal authority to which Adam and Eve swore by bowing their heads.

Their crime is not the actual eating of the forbidden fruit, but the innate disobedience of doing so. This is interesting in itself, since on one hand, according to Hudson, the kings could rather informally and personally deal with cases concerning their property, while cases of disobedience and treason "were heard before the largest gathering possible".<sup>362</sup> Here Hudson refers to the case of the Godwine family in the early 1050s, which was at the height of Anglo-Saxon administration. Though it is true that in vernacular biblical paraphrase there is no *witan* to assemble if there were truly a need for one, the poet could have easily added a casual phrase in the style of 'before all creation' or 'lord and his angels'. There was also no need for the special effort to present the exile as a part of a judicial process. The poet saw nothing unusual in a judicial process for the matter of direct disobedience to personal authority being decided personally by the lord without a *witan*'s confirmation.

---

<sup>362</sup> Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*, p. 45.

### Impact of Judicial Authority on Land Possession

As in the Vulgate, God ordains they will lose the right of use for the lands of Paradise and seek out another *eðel* ['homeland'] (at *Genesis A*, line 927). Unlike in the Paradise granted from their Lord they will henceforth be (Gen A, line 930) "dugeðum bedæled" ['separated from goods'], forced to work hard for their food for themselves, receiving no sustenance from their lord because (in *Genesis A* lines 931b-2a): "Hwæt, þu laðlice – wrohte onstealdest; forþon þu winnan scealt" ['Lo! thou hast sinned a grievous sin. Therefore shalt thou labour... ']. The punishment is exile, loss of lord, of his favour, upkeep and protection. Since *Genesis A* presents many instances where patriarchs are protected, and men are executed or otherwise punished for their crimes, or sins, the loss of lord's judicial oversight, or authority, is not hereditary, though exile and loss of tenure of Paradise is. However, following the exile, in *Genesis A* lines 952-964 (see Appendix 19 on p. 206), in the course of an exegesis not in scripture, the poet specifically explains that God does not retract all of his favours, i.e. *arna* (Gen A, line 953) (which is an equivalent of *hyld* - see discussion of 'ar, are' in *Christ and Satan* above on p. 166). He gives them ['seallan = transfer of ownership'] ample riches and has the animals of sea and Earth allocated for their use and produce for their nourishment. In effect, the poet skilfully presents contemporary reality as God's *arna*, while never referring to exile as a type of bestowal and framing the upkeep as stemming from mankind's toil by mercy of their Lord but not amounting to provided upkeep. In effect, the exile in *Genesis A* does not terminate the lord's authority but terminates the relationship of personal fealty and with it the seigneur's obligation of upkeep; this termination is present both in the scriptural and paraphrased accounts where they present toil and hard work as necessary for survival.

Disobedience in *Genesis A* (and in the conclusion of *Genesis B*) marked a transgression against personal authority for which a judgment was passed without including the category of legal authority. Both guilty parties were judged as personally responsible, with no mention of gender or familial

hierarchy. The sentence of exile negated the tenure agreement based on personal fealty but did not result in complete expropriation of all possessions. Quite the contrary; the poet added a provision to the scriptural narrative whereby mankind was allowed use of animals and produce even in exile.

## **F) THE CASE OF CAIN, Security of Kin and Lord**

Like Adam and Eve, Cain receives the sentence of exile. The main difference is of course the type of transgression. Though murder is (literally) valued differently in Anglo-Saxon law-codes than in modern society, what the poet brings to the forefront is the kinship bond between Cain and Abel. The poet introduces the term and concept of kinship, lending the judicial authority an Anglo-Saxon legal basis. Additionally, kin is simultaneously a category of legal authority and an abstract possession. Much like *hyld* it is, a category enabling both personal authority as well as an abstract possession of its own.

Unfortunately the poet did not helpfully depart from the Vulgate in the description of the murder itself, focusing instead on inserting a detailed depiction of the imagery of the blood branches of sin, which was identified as specifically typical of Anglo-Saxon early Christianity by Wright.<sup>363</sup> This theological point takes over the narrative and amplifies the consequences of the transgression immensely. The murder itself is not amplified, rather the act fades into the background. The *Genesis A* poet's treatment of the act of murder is reminiscent of the, understated by modern standards, financial evaluation of human life in Anglo-Saxon in law-codes. In this *Genesis A* is only slightly more descriptive than scripture, where murder is described simply and only once: Vulgate Genesis IV. 8 "...interfecit eum" ['he killed him'] compared to the Old English poetic treatment *Genesis A* lines 982b-3: "He þa unræden - folmum gefremede, freomæg ofsloh" – ['Then with his hands Cain wrought a deed of shame, struck down his brother Abel'].

---

<sup>363</sup> Wright, 'The Blood of Abel and the Branches of Sin'.

After the 'branches of sin' imagery, however, *Genesis A* introduces an elaborate account of what is distinctly reminiscent of judicial proceedings. The Vulgate moves swiftly: from Cain's statement in the Vulgate Genesis IV: 9: "... nescio num custos fratri mei sum" ['am I my brother's keeper'] directly to IV: 10: "dixitque ad eum quid fecisti vox sanguinis fratris tui clamat ad me de terra" ['And he said to him: What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me from the earth']. *Genesis A* account greatly elaborates on scriptural narrative by adding an interpretation of the reasoning behind both of these sentiments in *Genesis A* lines 1006-1013a (See Appendix 21 on p. 207). Cain refers to Abel as his *hleomæg* ['kinsman'] for the second time. (The first inkling of the notion of kin was introduced at the act of his killing, where *freomæg* may have simply been used to fill the need for alliteration.) Here the use of the term renders the scriptural sentiment that he is not his brother's keeper *hyrde* seemingly nonsensical. In terms of judicial process, this is in fact exactly what Anglo-Saxon kin are customarily and legally charged with: the keeping and protection both in court and in feud. But even this second reference to brother as kinsman could be ignored perhaps if it weren't for a third, included in *Genesis A*'s lengthy description of the rights and obligations lost and retained through the provisions accompanying the ensuing sentence of exile. This sentence is most informative of the type of authority involved in this judicial process. The Vulgate account of the difficulties of life in exile has many parallels with the Old English concept of exile, and it is certainly possible that the Vulgate was one of the sources or at least cognates for the institution of exile so popular in Old English poetry and prescribed in law-codes. God's punishment in Vulgate Genesis IV: 11-12 (See Appendix 22 on p. 207) is very similar to Adam and Eve's; the spilt blood renders the soil infertile and results in the necessity of hard toil for survival. In further support of this, Cain is sentenced to be a fugitive and a vagabond, "vagus et profugus".

In the Vulgate Genesis IV: 15 in response to Cain's fears of being killed, God makes his mark to signal the Cain must not be killed. *Genesis A* includes all of the above but intersperses it with special emphasis on the aspect of social exile, specifically on the importance of being bereft of kinsmen. While the

Vulgate Genesis IV: 14 ties loss of security directly to loss of lord and land by positing that Cain is in mortal danger because he was cast out and will be hidden from his Lord's sight (see Appendix 24 on p. 208), *Genesis A* adds and emphasises the loss of kin in *Genesis A* lines 1023-1030a, (See Appendix 23 on p. 207). The terminology of personal authority, as discussed above in this chapter, is unmistakable, Cain dares not hope for any favours (*are*) because he wasted the king's "hyldo, lufan..." ['favour and love'], both categories tied to personal fealty, love is even the subject of *Swerian*. *Genesis A* account, however, adds "...and freod" ['friendship, peace']. In this case *freodo* can be interpreted as standing for the king's peace in the guise of the protection of law. Adding references to the loss of kinsmen reinforces this notion. God decrees that Cain will wonder *winemagum lað* ['abhorrent to kinsmen'] and is in mortal danger because his Lord's sentence, as he laments, separates him from humanity where the term used is *ademan* "2. 'to drive (someone) out as a result of a judicial sentence'; *ademan fram* 'to proscribe, banish (someone) from (a group dat.)'."<sup>364</sup>

Furthermore, the term *fæhð* ['feud'] reinforces the significance of the role of kin in personal security, legal as well as corporal. The term *fæhð* appears in Anglo-Saxon law-codes; Alfred's Law-Code law 30.1 states *fæhð* is the justified recourse for punishing a man without kin, who commits homicide; Alfred's law 42 attempts to regulate it, making it a last recourse,<sup>365</sup> Ine's laws include *fæhð* as a legal recourse for a slave killing a freeman.<sup>366</sup> Kin is itself an abstract possession and frames legal authority as oath frames personal. Both categories figure prominently in *Genesis A*'s account of Cain's crime and punishment, unlike in the scriptural account. They also both clearly hail to an Anglo-Saxon legal context. For his personal breach of loyalty Cain loses the abstract possession of his lord's favour as well as tangible landed possession comprising his domicile and literally family estate. He is forced to settle

<sup>364</sup> Healey et al., 'Dictionary of Old English', *DOE* <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>> [Accessed 7 August 2014].

<sup>365</sup> Law AfrB 42 in Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen II*, p. 42

<sup>366</sup> Law Ine 74.2 – *ibid*, p. 81. also in Attenborough, *Laws of Earliest English Kings*, at 60-1.

(*Genesis A*, line 1053) “*fædergeardum feor*” [‘far from his father’s court’], while for the crime against his kin he loses two abstract possessions: protection and the comfort of cohabitation with his kin.

### **G) THE CASE OF THREE IN THE FIRE, Judicial Authority – Rights and Obligations**

This last, very short, example of a judicial process does not directly impact any tangible possessions, though the crime of the Israelites at the outset of the story results in the absolute dispossession of Israelites of their native land and of itemised valuables. The isolated case of the three in the fire is informative about the distribution of the abstract possessions which frame judicial authority. In the case of the ‘three in the fire’, the *Daniel* poet introduces a specific situation where unrightfully gained authority over Israelite land and people is incorporated in the person of Nebuchadnezzar. In order to make this point, the poet makes use of legal terms and categories such as *æ* [‘rightful law’] and *dema* [‘judge’]. The core of this sub-chapter’s examination lay in defining the nature of the three’s crime through the terminology and additions in *Daniel* by assessing the categories of personal and legal authority in a context of so declared unlawful rule.

Throughout the Old English *Daniel* poem the poet takes great pains to present Babylon’s rule as temporary custody, referring to Nebuchadnezzar exclusively as *weard* of Babylon,<sup>367</sup> never with a single phrase legitimizing his authority over the Israelite people. By referring to Babylonian rule as custody rather than lawful and standing kingly authority (*cyning-dom*) and to the Babylonian army as *herige hæðencyninga* [‘army of the heathen kings’] (*Daniel*, line 54), to Babylonian magistrates as *hæðenum deman* [‘heathen magistrates’] (*Daniel*, line 71), and continuously designating Babylonians as *hæðen* [‘heathen’] throughout the poem,<sup>368</sup> the poet subliminally maintained

---

<sup>367</sup> (*Daniel* II: 99, 104, 117, 167, 173, 176, 209, 228, 234, 460, 487, 641) – Twelve times.

<sup>368</sup> (*Daniel* II: 153, 181, 203, 218, 212, 241, 251, 266, 306, 329, 433, 444, 539) – Fifteen times.

the legitimacy of Christian kings possessing their authority from God and denying such legitimacy to pagan kings.

The Babylonian military victory over the Israelites is presented as God's punishment for Israelite disloyalty in the form of idolatry and abandonment of true law (*æcræftas*, *Daniel*, line 19). The other Israelite transgression is the breaking of personal fealty, which is marked by a reference to 'the ruler's power' (*metodes mægenscipe*, *Daniel*, line 20) and love for their seigneur (*Daniel* poem, line 21). The poet marks the significant difference between erroneous Israelites and heathen Babylonians by introducing the notion of *æcræftas*. Thus the matter of rightful authority becomes defined by having the capacity to follow rightful scriptural teachings, or simply *æ* ['law']. Seemingly this capacity alone presents the difference between lawful and unlawful rule, even where Israelites fail in their efforts to follow them.

The three refuse to honour gold as God. This transgression is framed by Nebuchadnezzar as disobedience, i.e. disregard for his personal authority. But *Daniel* never referenced voluntary submission on the part of the Israelite people and never introduced any part of *Swerian* by virtue of which Nebuchadnezzar would be able to claim rightful possession of personal authority. To reaffirm the distinction between personal and legal authority, the poet reintroduces *æ* as ['God's law'] later in *Daniel*, in lines 217-220 when he explains the refusal of the three to save themselves by symbolically accepting Nebuchadnezzar's personal authority:

“Noldon þeah þa hyssas hyran larum - in hige hæðnum. Hogedon georne - þæt æ godes ealle gelæste, - and ne awacodon wereda drihtne”

[‘Yet would the youths not hearken in their hearts unto his heathen counsels. They were resolved to keep the law of God and not forsake the Lord of hosts... ’]

The notion of legal authority here persists in the absence of a ruler and so must obedience. The implication is that legal authority remains in the possession of the rightful lord, even if he is temporarily unable to carry out the

obligations of personal authority such as *hyld*. But in this case the Lord keeps to his obligation conditioning his legal authority, to provide *frið*, a type of security often phrased as peace, which it is the obligation of Anglo-Saxon lawful kings to keep.<sup>369</sup> The breach of *frið* is a serious offence featuring prominently in law codes; unlike the Vulgate Daniel III: 16-17, *Daniel* does not frame Nebuchadnezzar's condition to the three as simply a matter of following his order. Instead, in lines 214b-16 of *Daniel*, the three are threatened with burning unless they accept *frið* from Nebuchadnezzar. The poet frames their refusal by terming the offer of Nebuchadnezzar's protection as fraudulent (*facne freoðo*) (See Appendix DII on p. 222). By refusing to voluntarily yield to the personal and legal authority of the Babylonian *weard*, as well as by steadfastly keeping to Christian law, they in effect negate any basis for Nebuchadnezzar's judicial authority, which as a result symbolically falters when the true Lord overturns his sentence. It becomes clear that the three voluntarily submit to his legal and personal authority, the two categories which are in this excerpt shown necessary to exert judicial authority. This is clear also from the reiteration of God's rightful authority in *Daniel* lines 476-480:

“forþam he is ana ece drihten, - dema ælmihtig, se ðe him dom forgeaf, - spowende sped, þam þe his spel berað. - Forðon witigað þurh wundor monig - halgum gastum þe his hyld curon.”

[‘He only is the Lord, Eternal and Almighty, who gives them glory and abundant weal who preach His gospel. And He reveals Himself by many a wonder to holy hearts who seek His favour.’]

In the case of the ‘three in the fire’ judicial authority was shown to be contingent either on the possession of personal authority or a combination of legal and personal authority. Possession of personal authority was demonstrated to be derived from voluntary and exclusive loyalty assured by oaths in exchange for choosing his protection (*hyld*) and upkeep through lawful and written law (*æ* and *dom*) in the form of a more enduring legal authority which both of these joined in the judicial authority (*dema*). Since the

---

<sup>369</sup> Hudson, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England II*, pp. 19-26.

unlawful ruler did not possess voluntary submission of the Israelites, he therefore did not have personal authority over them, nor did he possess rightful legal authority. As a result his judicial authority was overturned in the name of the true legal authority insured by written law (*æ*), where law and scripture are presented as one and the same within the framework of the biblical paraphrase.

## Chapter Conclusion

Sacred authority is the predominant base of sacral authority in the poems of Junius XI. I have shown that the *Exodus* poet presented it as the basis for military authority. It also frames the background of both personal and legal authority in all the poems of Junius XI. There are, however, differences in the way individual types of authority are framed in individual poems.

In *Exodus* there is no emphasis on the difference between personal or legal authority. There is also no differentiation between the secular and sacred authorization of authority, both of which are combined in the person of the ruler. In fact the combination is so firmly entwined that it was difficult to ascertain whether Moses is himself merely an extension of God, a type of executor, or an autonomous holder of authority which he received from God, in essence to possess.

In one passage from *Genesis A* sacred authority was divided between king and bishop. Apart from placing authority in a context of exchange of possessions this passage also demonstrated a division between different aspects of sacred and secular authorities. The secular king's authority remained rooted in God's mercy, though it appeared to be the subject of confirmation by an intermediary rather than bestowed directly into the king's possession. In *Genesis A* and B, *Exodus* and *Daniel I* I have identified the common difference between the categories of sacred and secular authority to be in the permanency of possessing it. Secular authority is marked throughout as temporary custodianship while sacred authority is eternal. This was a useful finding to apply in the examination of the principles governing the

possession of personal and legal authority. I was able to ascertain that at the outset of *Genesis A* personal authority was the exclusive category by which mankind received tangible possessions, complete with an accompanying framework of rights and obligations concerning their use. It was later in the narrative, after the Flood, that the poem gradually introduced the category of legal authority.

I have shown personal authority to be contingent on desirability. Though forced servitude certainly appears in the *Genesis A* and *B* poems and in the background of *Exodus*, it falls under a different category where possession of people is not contingent on mutual benefit; as such the poets of Junius XI present it as unlawful. Legal authority in the context of Junius XI appears to be more complex. Firstly, the basic premise of scriptural matter in any guise is that scripture is law which made it difficult to distinguish between the poets' theological prerogatives and unwitting information on the perceived poetic social reality. A degree of overlap between sacred and secular law was to be anticipated, but it often occurred that the poetic narrative over-emphasizes scriptural importance in governing the possession of legal authority. I examined additions and explanations of, what may have seemed to contemporaries, oddities of scriptural narrative. When the *Genesis A* poet added colour to drier Vulgate accounts and presented dramaturgic shifts, though perhaps accidental, the poet also signalled an evolutionary direction from possessing authority by virtue of personal agreement to the combined legal-personal basis.

In the case of Adam and Eve the poet adapted the nature of their transgression to fit the category of disobedience. This example demonstrated how judicial authority in personal matters is in the exclusive purview of the ruler by virtue of his personal authority. The judicial decree of exile results only in the dispossession of land, which was bestowed in the frame of personal subjugation and did not extend beyond this frame.

In the case of Cain the poet introduced the category of kinship to his punishment; the terminology used was very consistent and the same as can be found in law-codes. Adam and Eve's sentence was dispossession of land,

mitigated by allowing itemized possessions but retention of security. Cain's sentence also included a few allowances, but here security was treated as an abstract right bestowed separately after pronouncing the sentence as a benefit of yielding to jurisdictional authority. Cain's sentence was thereby divided between the breach of personal and legal authority, and consequences were corresponding.

*Daniel* case of the three in the fire contains the distinction between possessing authority by right as opposed to a temporary rule. It also expands the concept of legal authority to be based on the possession of æ ['law'] itemized into *domas*. It demonstrates how personal authority was enhanced by legal authority's permanence and how both must be possessed simultaneously for the possession of judicial authority.

In the simplest terms this chapter aimed to examine rights and obligations framing authority, and to discern how authority frames social interactions. It started by demonstrating that notions such as laws (*domas* and æ), peace (*frið*), favour (*hyld*), and others discussed above are governed by a similar framework of rights and obligations as those governing tangible possessions.

It was my intention to present poetic representations of exerting authority in sequence and examine how it fits into the framework of other social conceptions. Such an itemized examination quickly uncovered that the wide category of authority is the underlying mechanism for the rights and obligations governing the possession and exchange of tangible possessions. Furthermore, various subcategories of authority were shown to be in a dynamic relationship with each other through the same framework of rights and obligations. The main contribution of this chapter to the overall thesis is, perhaps, that it illuminates the findings of the previous chapter from a basis of possession in its most abstract form.

## 6 CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to extrapolate parts of the Junius XI poems that were added to the scriptural narrative by the poets and examine and interpret the original additions relating to possessions in order to identify and interpret social conceptions. The issue at the core of this examination was the general concept of possession and how this concept applies to individual types of possession. It was also my intention to examine whether individual types of possession can be better understood in a social context. It was never my aim to construct a complex of Anglo-Saxon social interaction, but rather to limit my observations to the examination of literary landscapes and cultural ideals. There were times where I dared pose a question relating to reality, or even pose parallels between Anglo-Saxon history as we view it today and social themes and more general issues in the narrative, but never with a view to suggesting an outright emendation of historical scholarship. Below is a recapitulation of the issues and findings in synthesis, meaning not chapter by chapter, but rather issue by issue. This is an attempt to connect the dots of individual social conceptions in a more organic way.

### People and Possession

The overlap between people and moveable possessions was glaringly evident in so far as the moveable possessions when compiled in treasures were demonstrated to express the cultural identity of a people as well as impact individual social positions. Through the medium of possessions social standing was passed hierarchically from the higher ranks, in direct possession of the treasure, to the lower with the right to partake of the treasure following proper social conduct. In this the treasure and landed possessions are very similar. However, in absence of land, i.e. in exile or migration, the identification of a social grouping through a common 'national' treasure comes to the forefront.

Overall the identification of hierarchical relations through the notion of ownership was successful, demonstrating that the social ranks from slave to master are governed through many of the same types of rights and obligations varying in degrees rather than type. The similarity is evident also in the conception of Anglo-Saxon freedom, which I have examined both in its theological and social manifestations. The notion of freedom in the Junius XI poems is not as dividing as we would assume it to be today and is limited to the initial choice of lord (between a rightful and wrongful one), but in both cases freedom is not an absolute value of distinction between slave and freeman in the way we see it today.

However, though the distinctions between slaves and other social ranks were not absolute, the examination of people as possessions was a step too far. In terms of social stratification the poems simply did not contain a wide enough scope of society to enable a thorough reappraisal of vertical social relations viewed through the spectrum of possession. Though the notion of possession was applied to reciprocal social relationships which yielded much information on the types of authority, their scope, overlap, and sources, the general definition of possession when applied to people had evolved to such an abstract state that it may easily have defined any reciprocal agreement involving rights and obligations. It remained a useful tool, however, because it was able to represent the multi-layered and multifaceted relationships on the social hierarchical scale in accordance with the same rules. The price paid to present Anglo-Saxon slavery as an integral part of the social scale was precision. The poems often did not refer to lower ranks at all, and when they did these were exceptional circumstances. The reward was that viewing all social relationships as part of the same large network of possession exchange and holding may have shed some light on how and why the rank of slavery was able to dissipate so quickly, as well as expose principles of permeability between social ranks in general. It must be said however, that by presenting Anglo-Saxon society within the poems of Junius XI as a fluid ladder of ranks governed by the same principles across the board, the thesis may have simply presented a society constructed by poets as a Christian ideal.

## Common Traits

The method was very successful in drawing parallels between different types of possession and different types of scholarship. While the objects of possession were less than informative on allegorical subtext, they were useful in building a foundation for the structure of rights and obligations defining possessions. The first chapter proposed translations of various terms referring to movable possessions in general. It thus exposed several issues which arose in subsequent chapters. By examining possession divided into spiritual wealth as a figure of heavenly reward and earthly possessions it set out the constant binary relationship between possession by divine right and possession tied to earthly authority. The chapter linked spiritual wealth and earthly wealth through treasure. Treasure was inherited which imbued the earthly transient possessions with a godly eternal nature. The hereditary passing of treasure by virtue of death emphasised a contrast between eternity and mortality.

The parallel owner of the eternal benefits of God's grace, often marked as treasure but also including fruits and general opulence, were the people among whom the wealth was distributed; the treasure depended on God's grant and grace and was held by a ruler for his people. It functioned to define common traits of the people and their cultural identity, especially in lieu of land during periods of migration. The distribution and the grant of rights and demand for obligations, on the other hand, framed social hierarchical relations within the people even upon settling in a land in times of occupation.

The same link to cultural identity was then discussed in relation to landed possessions. The distinction between transient earthly possession and eternal godly possession featured in the discussion of treasure was applied to landed possessions. This enabled the identification of Interim Paradise and its symbols in the scriptural narrative such as the Israelite Promised Land and Sodom before the destruction. The lord impacted the land's fertility and the security of its cultivation through his loyalty and obedience of Christian imperatives. The Lord was a reflection of his people, who were also charged with the same imperatives; treasure and land were instruments of a lord's

authority bestowed by God, with the understanding that they will be distributed among the people. Both categories of possession defined social hierarchical relations within a people, the cultural identity of a people, and were contingent on proper Christian conduct, pleasing to God. The common denominator of a people, land was also discussed in its role as a homeland. The homeland, like treasure, co-shaped the people's cultural identity. The lord distributed treasure, land, and alongside both were included relevant benefits, rights, and obligations. The interwoven complex of possessions thus also included authority.

### Nature of Rights and Obligations

To have a lord was simultaneously a right and obligation, just as it was to be a lord. In his capacity as temporary custodian, his authority stemmed from God but it included the obligation to provide protection and perhaps even its symbolic representations such as clothes. His possession of the land, treasure, people, and authority was at the same time a right and obligation as well. The principles governing these categories of possession were, however, also common. Treasures were demonstrated to belong to people and rulers simultaneously, and thus work as markers of display and status connecting the rulers, their people and the land. Similarly the homeland was at the same time in the possession of the people and under the authority of the ruler. When it came to possessing authority Junius XI presents it strictly as a matter of choice subject to relatively fast paced change. Where choice is concerned it seems to be unavailable to slaves directly, but rather in terms of theology slavery is certainly presented as a consequence of choice.

The right to use a particular object can be exclusive and certain objects, such as swords, and especially treasures mark status. The right to use land is exclusive as well. This is true even of a right to homeland belonging exclusively to a single people, as was evident when the poet perceived the peoples surrounding Abraham and Lot as rightful and exclusive inhabitants. Both types of possessions are temporary and bestowed by a ruler. Likewise authority is exclusive, though the source of authority marks out whether it was

bestowed or agreed upon. In *Exodus* all authority including military command stemmed directly from God and was in the exclusive possession of the king, conforming to the rest of the types of possession. Even though in *Genesis A* the authority over people was at one point divided between king and bishop it was done so with God's blessing. Similarly the right and obligation to provide security extends from lord to land, from lord and land to the people, and, reciprocally, from the people and land to the ruler. The right and obligation to keep to an oath is similarly reciprocal for lord and retainer.

The Junius XI poems presented land as the primary possession. In the bestowal or occupation of land many other benefits, rights and obligations, and possessions are appended. The latter include people and the land's fruits. Where land was not mentioned, for example where plunder was taken, but land not occupied, the most important items that appeared in every list of plunder was treasure. Women and their maids, which were possibly slaves, were the third most important possession listed among plunder upon occupation of a homeland. In *Daniel* authority over a people was related directly to their cultural identity, which was in turn dependent on their capacity to follow Christian imperatives. By steadfast Christian conviction of refusing Nebuchadnezzar the Israelites were able to reacquire their treasure and finally their land.

### Social Interactions

The interplay of various possessions and their common traits consistently appears in the context of social interactions. They do not appear as trade or exchange but rather as a symbolic representation of the basic legal principles governing society. The first chapter presented several implications of status and display in hierarchical social interactions and the nature of cultural identity in general social identification. Morality of payment was tied directly to validity of hierarchical relations framing the exchange of possessions and favours. Unfortunately the narratives did not feature an exchange of skills between individuals of the same hierarchical station focusing only on vertical social relations.

The social interactions pertaining to emigrating and immigrating appear throughout the poems of Junius XI and relate to all four chapters: i.e. to moveable possessions, landed possessions, slavery and social station, and the exertion of authority. Exile from society and homeland is described in the poems: *Genesis A, B, Daniel*, and partly *Christ and Satan*. The poets provided an opulent context of original additions informing us of the conventions and even exceptions contained in the penalty of exile in his cultural milieu. The examples from the Junius XI poems contain detailed accounts of the loss of kin, the loss of all possessions bestowed. However, as the expulsion of Adam and Eve demonstrated the lord could exert mercy and allow benefits to remain in the possession of the exile. The narrative of Junius XI also presents occasions where exiles and other migrating people are allowed to settle, the conditions upon which they do, and the benefits they reap under a new lord. Personal social exchanges are reflected in the poetic treatment of the right of the legitimate firstborn. Exodus discusses Reuben's right to his family's estate and how he lost his claim on it. When it came to the rights of the illegitimate Abraham's firstborn Ishmael, the poet was forced to present an entirely separate argument in order to excuse the socially deplorability of Abraham abandoning his firstborn son. The chapters examined these social exchanges in various places to great success.

The study of authority was successful in so far as it put forth a systematic discussion of its representations in the context of the poems. Observing them in a context of possession-related vertical hierarchical interactions also proved a useful avenue by which to connect the previous discussion of moveable possessions, land, and people. The cases of judicial authority in practice put forth interesting interpretations of biblical figures as ideals of judicial process., The concluding chapter constructed a framework by introducing categories of Anglo-Saxon authority and presenting it as a complex but inter-connected system of social interactions through rights and obligations regulating the degrees of possession sooner as a by-product rather than presenting a new interpretation of authority as dependent exclusively on the bestowal and withdrawal of possessions and benefits.

## TEXTUAL APPENDICES, QUOTES OF PRIMARY SOURCES

### GENESIS A (I)

**Appendix 1 to p. 66, Punishment for Disobedience:** “besloh synsceaþan *Genesis A* lines 54b-57 sigore and gewealde, dome and dugeðe, and dreame benam his feond, friðo and gefean ealle.”

Kennedy’s translation: [‘God, the Mighty, in His wrath, smote their insolence and broke their pride, bereft these impious souls of victory and power and dominion and glory;’]

\*My translation, word for word: “he took from the wicked (criminals) victory and power ordinance (rule by law) and property - honour /authority, and of joy he deprived his enemies, of protection and of all favour.”

### **Appendix 2 to p. 167, Temporary Personal Authority of Abraham**

**In the *Genesis A* lines 2025-6:** “[‘Abraham’] bæd him fultumes - wærfæst hæleð willgeðoftan...”

Kennedy: [‘And Abraham told these tidings to his friends; the faithful man besought his well-loved comrades, Aner and Mamre and Eshcol, to bear him aid’]

Word for word: [‘bade to come to his aid - faithful heroes, pleasant associates... ’]

**Lines 2033b-8** “Him þa broðor þry - æt spræce þære spedum miclum - hældon hygesorge heardum wordum, - ellenrofe, and Abrahame - treowa sealdon, þæt hie his torn mid him - gewræcon on wraðum, oððe on wæl feollan.”

Kennedy: [‘And quickly the three brothers spake and healed the sorrow of his heart with manful words and pledged their faith to Abraham to aid him, and avenge his wrath upon his foes, or fall in death.’]

### **Appendix 3 to p. 167, Vulgate Mentions of Abraham’s Allies**

**Vulgate Genesis XIV: 13b:** “...fratris Eschol et fratris Aner hii enim pepigerant foedus cum Abram.”

[‘...the brother of Escol, and the brother of Aner: for these had made a league with Abram.’]

### **Appendix 4 to p. 100, Barren Soil as Nothingness**

**Genesis A lines 103-10:** “Ne wæs her þa giet nymþe heolstersceado - wiht geworden, ac þes wida grund - stod deop and dim, drihtne fremde - idel and unnyt. On þone eagum wlat - stiðfrihþ cining, and þa stowe beheold - dreama lease, geseah deorc gesweorc - semin sinnihte sweart under roderum - wonn and weste, oð þæt þeos woruldgesceaft (gewearð).”

Kennedy: [‘As yet was nought save shadows of darkness; the spacious earth lay hidden, deep and dim, alien to God, unpeopled and unused. Thereon the Steadfast King looked down and beheld it, a place empty of joy. He saw dim chaos hanging in eternal night, obscure beneath the heavens, desolate and dark, until this world was fashioned by the word of the King of glory.’]

### **Appendix 5 to p. 93, Bestowal of Land-rights to Adam**

**Vulgate Genesis I: 26:** “et ait faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram et praesit piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et bestiis universaeque terrae omnique reptili quod movetur in terra”

[‘And he said: Let us make man to our image and likeness: and let him have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts,

and the whole Earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the Earth.']

**Vulgate Genesis I: 28 – 30:** “benedixitque illis Deus et ait crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et subicite eam et dominamini piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et universis animantibus quae moventur super terram

dixitque Deus ecce dedi vobis omnem herbam adferentem semen super terram et universa ligna quae habent in semet ipsis sementem generis sui ut sint vobis in escam

et cunctis animantibus terrae omnique volucris caeli et universis quae moventur in terra et in quibus est anima vivens ut habeant ad vescendum et factum est ita”

[‘And God blessed them, saying: Increase and multiply, and fill the Earth, and subdue it, and rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures that move upon the Earth.

And God said: Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed upon the Earth, and all trees that have in themselves seed of their own kind, to be your meat:

And to all beasts of the Earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to all that move upon the Earth, and wherein there is life, that they may have to feed upon. And it was so done.']

**Appendix 6 to p. 94, Itemized List of Land Adjacent Benefits includes lines 192-217 i.e.**

**Genesis A lines 192-217:** “þa gebletsode bliðheort cyning, - metod alwihta, monna cynnes - ða forman twa, fæder and moder, - wif and wæpned. He þa worde cwæð: - "Temað nu and wexað, tudre fyllað - eorðan ælgrene, incre cynne, - sunum and dohtrum. Inc sceal sealt wæter - wunian on gewealde and eall worulde gesceaft. - Brucað blæddaga and brimhlæste - and heofonfugla. Inc is halig feoh - and wilde deor on geweald geseald, - and

lifigende, ða ðe land tredað, - feorheaceno cynn, ða ðe flod wecceð - geond hronrade. Inc hyrað eal line " - † Þa sceawode scyppend ure - his weorca wlite and his wæstma blæd, - niwra gesceafta. Neorxnawong stod - god and gastlic, gifena gefylled - fremum forðweardum. Fægere leohte - þæt liðe land lago yrnende, - wylleburne. Nalles wolcnu ða giet - ofer rumne grund regnas bæron, - wann mid winde, hwæðre wæstmum stod - folde gefrætwod. Heoldon forðryne - eastreamas heora æðele feower - of þam niwan neorxnawonge."

Kennedy: ["Then the Gracious King, Lord of all human kind, blessed these two, male and female, man and wife, and spake this word: "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the green earth with your seed and increase, sons and daughters. And ye shall have dominion over the salt sea, and over all the world. Enjoy the riches of earth, the fish of the sea, and the fowls of the air. To you is given power over the herds which I have hallowed, and the wild beasts, and over all living things that move upon the earth; all living things, which the depths bring forth throughout the sea, shall be subject unto you.""]

['LACUNA -- One or more leaves missing']

## **GENESIS B**

### **Appendix 8, Genesis B lines 282b – 291, Satan on his Own Submission:**

“Hwy sceal ic æfter his hyldo ðeowian, - bugan him swilces geongordomes? Ic mæg wesan god swa he. - Bigstandað me strange geneatas, þa ne willað me æt þam striðe geswican, - hæleþas heard mode. Hie habbað me to hearran gecorene, - rofe rincas; mid swilcum mæg man ræd gepencean, - fon mid swilcum folcgesteallan. Frynd synd hie mine georne, - holde on hyra hygesceaftum. Ic mæg hyra hearra wesan, - rædan on þis rice. Swa me þæt riht ne þinceð, - þæt ic oleccan awiht þurfe - gode æfter gode ænegum. Ne wille ic leng his geongra wurþan.”

Kennedy: [“Why should I fawn for His favour, or yield Him such submission? I may be God as well as He! Brave comrades stand about me; stout-hearted heroes who will not fail me in the fray. These valiant souls have chosen me their lord. With such peers one may ponder counsel, and gain a following. Devoted are these friends and faithful-hearted; and I may be their lord and rule this realm. It seemeth no wise right to me that I should cringe a whit to God for any good. I will not serve Him longer.”

### **Appendix 9 to p. 118, Satan Stealing God’s Thegns**

**Genesis B lines 403-408:** “þæt we mihtiges godes mod onwæcen. Uton oðwendan hit nu monna bearnum, - þæt heofonrice, nu we hit habban ne moton, gedon þæt hie his hyldo forlæten, - þæt hie þæt onwendon þæt he mid his worde bebead. Þonne weorð he him wrað on mode, - ahwet hie from his hyldo. Þonne sculon hie þas helle secan - and þas grimman grundas. Þonne moton we hie us to giongrum habban, - fira bearn on þissum fæstum clomme.”

Kennedy: [“... that we should change the purpose of Almighty God. Let us therefore turn the heavenly kingdom from the sons of men, since we may not possess it, cause them to lose His favour and turn aside from the command He laid upon them. Then shall His wrath be kindled, and He shall cast them out from grace. They shall seek out hell and its grim gulf, and in this heavy bondage we may have (i.e. possess\*) the sons of men to serve us.”] \*my note

### **Appendix 10 to p. 139, Mankind has Free Will to Choose**

**Genesis B lines 464-6** “þæt þær ylðo bearn moste on ceosan - godes and yfeles, gumena æghwīlc - wean and wawan.”

Kennedy: [‘(High King of heaven, had set them there) that the mortal sons of men might choose of good and evil, weal and woe.’]

### **Appendix 11 to p. 117, Consequences of Eating from the Trees in Paradise**

**Genesis B lines 472b – 476a:** “ac moste symle wean - lungre on lustum and his lif agan - hylðo heofoncyniges her on worulde - habban him to wæron witode geþingþo - on þone hean heofon, þonne he heonan wende.”

Kennedy: [‘He might live his life in happiness for ever, and have the favour of the King of heaven here on earth. And glory was ordained for him in heaven, when he went hence.’]

### **Appendix 12 to p. 117, Consequences of the Wrong Choice**

**Genesis B lines 488-489a:** “Sceolde feondum þeowian, þær is ealra frecna mæste - leodum to langre hwile.”

Kennedy: [‘...seek out the murky realm of flame, and be subject unto fiends. There of all perils are the worst for men for ever.’]

\*Kennedy here translated *þeowian* as “be subject to” where I would, in keeping with my argument, rather use “serve in slavery”.

### **Appendix 13 to p. 79, Clothes and Built Structures**

**Genesis B lines 783b-788a:** “bare hie gesawon - heora lichaman; næfdon on þam lande þa giet - sælða gesetena, ne hie sorge wiht - weorces wiston, ac hie wel meahton - libban on þam lande, gif hie wolden lare godes - forweard fremman.”

Kennedy: ['They saw that their bodies were naked. In that land they had as yet no settled home, nor knew they aught of pain or sorrow; but they might have prospered in the land if they had done God's will.']

#### **Appendix 14 to p. 178, Eve's Ignorantia iuris nocet**

**Genesis B lines 708-10a:** "Heo dyde hit þeah þurh holdne hyge, nyste þæt þær hearma swa fela, - fyrenearfeða, fylgean sceolde - monna cynne..."

Kennedy: ['... this she did with good intent, and knew not that so many evils, such grim afflictions, would come upon mankind ...']

#### **Appendix 15 to p. 179, Eve's Amplified Punishment**

**Genesis B lines 919-24:** "Wend þe from wynne! þu scealt wæpnedmen - wesan on gewealde, mid weres egsan - hearde gearwad, hean þrowian - þinra dæda gedwild, deaðes bidan - and þurh wop and heaf on woruld cennan - þurh sar micel sunu and dohtor."

Kennedy: ["Turn thee from joy! Thou shalt live under man's dominion, sore smitten with fear before him. With bitter sorrow shalt thou expiate thy sin, waiting for death, bringing forth sons and daughters in the world with grief and tears and lamentation."]

#### **Appendix 16 to p. 180, Adam's Crime**

**Vulgate Genesis, III: 17:** "quia audisti vocem uxoris tuae et comedisti de ligno ex quo praeceperam tibi ne comederes maledicta terra in opere tuo in laboribus comedes eam cunctis diebus vitae tuae"

Douay Rheims: ['Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee, that thou shouldst not eat, cursed is the Earth in thy work: with labour and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life.']

## **Appendix 17 to p. 79, Discomfort Prefiguring Expulsion from Paradise**

**Genesis B lines 800b-15:** “Forþon he unc self bebead - þæt wit unc wite warian sceolden - hearma mæstne. Nu slit me hunger and þurst - bitre on breostum, þæs wit begra ær - wæron orsorge on ealle tid. - Hu sculon wit nu libban oððe on þys lande wesan - gif her wind cymð, westan oððe eastan - suðan oððe norðan? Gesweorc up færeð - cymeð hægles scur hefone getenge - færeð forst on gemang, se byð fyrnum ceald. - Hwylum of heofnum hate scineð - blicð þeos beorhte sunne, and wit her baru standað - unwered wædo. Nys unc wuht beforan - to scursceade, ne sceattes wiht - to mete gemearcod, ac unc is mihtig god - waldend wraðmod. To hwon sculon wit weorðan nu?”

Kennedy: [‘For God Himself bade us beware of sin and dire disaster. Now thirst and hunger press upon my heart whereof we formerly were ever free. How shall we live or dwell now in this land if the wind blow from the west or east, south or north if mist arise and showers of hail beat on us from the heavens, and frost cometh, wondrous cold, upon the earth, or, hot in heaven, shineth the burning sun, and we two stand here naked and unclothed? We have no shelter from the weather, nor any store of food. And the Mighty Lord, our God, is angry with us. What shall become of us?']

## **Appendix 18 to p. 97, Adam Expelled**

**Vulgate Genesis III: 22-24:** “...et ait ecce Adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis sciens bonum et malum nunc ergo ne forte mittat manum suam et sumat etiam de ligno vitae et comedat et vivat in aeternum - emisit eum Dominus Deus de paradiso voluptatis ut operaretur terram de qua sumptus est - eiecitque Adam et conlocavit ante paradisum voluptatis cherubin et flammeum gladium atque versatilem ad custodiendam viam ligni vitae.”

[‘And he said: Behold Adam is become as one of us, knowing good and evil: now therefore lest perhaps he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of

life, and eat, and live for ever. - And the Lord God sent him out of the Paradise of pleasure, to till the Earth from which he was taken. - And he cast out Adam: and placed before the Paradise of pleasure Cherubims, and a flaming sword, turning every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.']

### GENESIS A (III)

#### **Appendix 19 to pp. 98, 103, 172 and 181, Expulsion as Punishment and Benefits of Land Use**

**Genesis A lines 939-965:** “Hwæt, we nu gehyrað hwær us hearmstafas - wraðe onwocan and woruldyrmðo. - Hie þa wuldres weard wædum gyrede, - scyppend usser; het heora sceome þeccan - frea frumhrægle; het hie from hweorfan - neorxnawange on nearore lif. - Him on laste beleac liðsa and wylna - hihtfulne ham halig engel - be frean hæse fyrene sweorde; - ne mæg þær inwit full ænig geferan - womscyldig mon, ac se weard hafað - miht and strengðo, se þæt mære lif - dugeðum deore drihtne healdeð. - No hwæðre ælmihtig ealra wolde Adame and Euan arna ofteon, - fæder æt frymðe, þeah þe he him from swice, - ac he him to frofre let hwæðere forð wesan - hyrstedne hrof halgum tunglum - and him grundwelan ginne sealde; - het þam sinhiwum sæs and eorðan - tuddorteondra teohha gehwilcre - to woruldnytte wæstmas fedan. - Gesæton þa æfter synne sorgfulre land, - eard and eðyl unspedigran - fremena gehwilcre þonne se frumstol wæs - þe hie æfter dæde of adriften wurdon. - Ongunnon hie þa be godes hæse - bearn astrianan, swa him metod bebed.”

Kennedy: [‘Lo! now we know how our afflictions came upon us, and mortal misery! Then the Lord of glory, our Creator, clothed them with garments, and bade them cover their shame with their first raiment. He drove them forth from Paradise into a narrower life. By God's command a holy angel, with a sword of fire, closed fast that pleasant home of peace and joy behind them. No wicked, sinful man may walk therein, but the warden has strength and power, dear unto God in virtue, who guards that life of glory. - Yet the Almighty Father would not take away from Adam and from Eve, at once, all goodly things (here I would translate *arna* as “favours”), though He withdrew His favour from them. But for their comfort He left the sky above them adorned with shining stars, gave them wide-stretching fields, and bade the earth and sea and all their teeming multitudes to bring forth fruits to serve man's earthly need. After their sin they dwelt in a realm more sorrowful, a home and native land less rich in all good things than was their first abode, wherefrom He drove them

out after their sin. - Then, according to the word of God, Adam and Eve begat children, as God had bidden.']

#### **Appendix 21 to p. 183, Cain's Defence:**

**Genesis A lines 1006-1013a:** "Ne can ic Abeles or ne fore, - hleomæges sið, ne ic hyrde wæs - broðer mines." Him þa brego engla, - godspedig gast gear þingade: - "Hwæt, befealdest þu folmum þinum - wraðum on wælbedd wærfæstne rinc, - broðor þinne, and his blod to me - cleopað and cigeð."

Kennedy: ["I know not the coming or going of Abel, my kinsman, his lot or portion; I was not my brother's keeper." (legal category - kinsmen are in fact bound by custom to afford each other protection')] And the Gracious Spirit, Lord of angels, made answer unto him: "Why hast thou slain that faithful man thy brother in thy wrath, and his blood calleth and crieth unto Me?']

#### **Appendix 22 to p. 183, Cain's Punishment in the Vulgate**

**Vulgate Genesis IV: 11-12:** "nunc igitur maledictus eris super terram quae aperuit os suum et suscepit sanguinem fratris tui de manu tua - cum operatus fueris eam non dabit tibi fructus suos vagus et profugus eris super terram"

['Now therefore cursed shalt thou be upon the earth, which hath opened her mouth and received the blood of thy brother at thy hand. - When thou shalt till it, it shall not yield to thee its fruit: a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be upon the earth.']

#### **Appendix 23 to p. 184, Cain's Loss of Lord's Protection**

**Genesis A lines 1023-1030a:** "forþon þu flema scealt - widlast wrecan, winemagum lað." - Him þa <ædre> Cain andswarode: - "Ne þearf ic ænigre are wenan - on woruldrice, ac ic forworht hæbbe, - heofona heahcyning, hylde pine, - lufan and freode; forþon ic lastas sceal - wean on wenum wide lecgan,

- hwonne me gemitte manscyldigne, - se me feor oððe neah fæhðe gemonige, - broðorcwealmes. Ic his blod ageat, - dreor on eorðan. Þu to dæge þissum - ademest me fram duguðe and adrifest from - earde minum.”

Kennedy: [‘...Loathed of thy kinsmen, an exile and a fugitive, shalt thou wander on the face of the earth.” - And Cain made answer unto Him: ...."I need not look for pity in this world, High King of heaven, for I have lost Thy love and favour and goodwill. Weary the ways my feet must wander, in dread of woe, whenever one shall meet me in my guilt, near or far, and by his hate remind me of my brother's death. I shed his blood and poured his life-blood on the ground. From this day hast Thou cut me off from good! Thou scourgest me from home!']

#### **Appendix 24 to p. 184, Vulgate Cain's Loss of Lord's protection**

**Vulgate Genesis IV: 14:** “ecce eicis me hodie a facie terrae et a facie tua abscondar et ero vagus et profugus in terra omnis igitur qui invenerit me occidet me”

[‘Behold thou dost cast me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face I shall be hid, and I shall be a vagabond and a fugitive on the earth: every one therefore that findeth me, shall kill me.’]

#### **Appendix 25 to p. 169, Line of Inheritance from Adam to Japeth**

**Genesis A lines 1121b-1236:** “Us gewritu secgað - þæt her eahtahund iecte siððan - mægðum and mæcgum mægburg sine - Adam on eorðan; ealra hæfde - nigenhund wintra - 1125 and XXX eac, þa he þas woruld - þurh gastgedal ofgyfan sceolde. - Him on laste Seth leod weardode, - eafora æfter yldrum; eþelstol heold - and wif begeat. Wintra hæfde - 1130 fif and hundteontig þa heo furðum ongan - his mægburge men geicean - sunum and dohtrum. Sedes eafora - se yldesta wæs Enos haten; - se nemde god niðþa bearna - 1135 ærest ealra, siððan Adam stop - on grene græs gaste geweorðad. - Seth wæs gesælig; siððan strynde - seofon winter her suna and

dohtra - ond eahtahund. Ealra hæfde - 1140 ond nigonhund, þa seo tid gewearð - þæt he frið gedal fremman sceolde. - Him æfter heold, þa he of worulde gewat, - Enos yrfe, siððan eorðe swealh - 1145 sædberendes Sethes lice. - He wæs leof gode and lifde her - wintra hundnigontig ær he be wife her - þur gebedscipe bearn astrynde; - him þa cenned wearð Cainan ærest - 1150 eafora on eðle. Siððan eahtahund - and fifty no on friðo drihtnes - gleawferhð hæleð geogoðe strynde, - suna and dohtra; swealt, þa he hafde, - frod fyrnwita, V and nigonhund. - 1155 † þære cneorisse wæs Cainan siððan - æfter Enose aldordema, - weard and wisa. Wintra hæfde - efne hundseofontig ær him sunu woce. - Þa wearð on eðle eafora feded, - 1160 mago Cainanes, Malalehel wæs haten. - Siððan eahtahund æðelinga rim - and feowertig eac feorum geicte - Enoses sunu. Ealra nigonhund - wintra hæfde þa he woruld ofgeaf - 1165 and tyne eac, þa his tiddæge - under rodera rum rim wæs gefylled. - Him on laste heold land and yrfe - Malalehel siððan missera worn. - Se frumgara fif and sixtig - 1170 wintra hæfde þa he be wife ongann - bearna strynan. Him bryd sunu - meowle to monnum brohte. Se maga wæs - on his mægðe, mine gefræge, - guma on geogoðe, lared haten. - 1175 Lifde siððan and lissa breac - Malalehel lange, mondreama her, - woruldgestreona. Wintra hæfde - fif and hundnigontig, þa he forð gewat, - and eahtahund; eaforan læfde - 1180 land and leodweard. Longe siððan - Geared gumum gold brittade. - Se eorl wæs æðele, æfæst hæleð, and se frumgar his freomagum leof. - Fif and hundteontig on fyore lifde - 1185 wintra gebidenra on woruldrice - and syxtig eac þa seo sæl gewearð - þæt his wif sunu on woruld brohte; - se eafora wæs Enoc haten, - freolic frumbearn. Fæder her þa gyt - 1190 his cynnes forð cneorim icte, - eaforan eahta hund; ealra hæfde - V and syxtig, þa he forð gewat, - and nigonhund eac nihtgerimes, - wine frod wintres, þa he þas woruld ofgeaf - 1195 ond Geared þa gleawum læfde - land and leodweard, leofum rince. - Enoch siððan ealdordom ahof, - Freoðosped folces wisa, nalles feallan let - dom and drihtscipe - 1200 þenden he hyrde wæs heafodmaga. - Breac blæddaga, bearna strynde - þreohund wintra. Him wæs þeoden hold, - rodera waldend. Se rinc heonon - on lichoman lisse sohte, - 1205 drihtnes duguðe, nales deaðe swealt - middangeardes, swa her men doþ, - geonge and ealde, þonne him god heora - middangeardes, swa her men doþ, - geonge and ealde, þonne him god heora - æhta and ætwist

eorðan gestreona - on genimeð and heora aldor somed, - 1210 ac he cwic gewat mid cyning engla - of þyssum lænan life feran - on þam gearwum þe his gast onfeng - ær hine to monnum modor brohte. - He þam yldestan eaforan læfde 1215 folc, frumbearne; V and syxtig - wintra hæfde þa he woruld ofgeaf, - and eac III hund. Þrage siððan - Mathusal heold maga yrfe, - se on lichoman lengest þissa - 1220 worulddreama breac. Worn gestrynde - ær his swyltdæge suna and dohra; - hæfde frod hæle, þa he from sceolde - niþpum hweorfan, nigonhund wintra - and hundseofontig to. Sunu æfter heold, - 1225 Lamech leodgeard, lange siððan - woruld bryttade. Wintra hæfde - twa and hundteontig þa seo tid gewearð - þæt se eorl ongan æðele cennan, - sunu and dohtor. Siððan lifde - 1230 fif and hundnigontig, frea moniges breac - wintra under wolcnum, werodes aldor, - <and> V hund eac; heold þæt folc teala, - bearna strynde, him byras wocan, - eaforan and idesa. He þone yldestan - 1235 Noæ nemde, se niððum ær - land bryttade siððan Lamech gewat.”

Kennedy: [‘The writings tell us that Adam increased his tribe on earth, begetting sons and daughters eight hundred years. And all the years of Adam were nine hundred and thirty winters, and he died.

And Seth succeeded Adam: at his father's death the well-loved son possessed the treasure, and took himself a wife. And Seth lived an hundred and five winters in the world and increased his tribe, begetting sons and daughters. Enos was first-born of the sons of Seth; and he was first of all the sons of men to call upon the name of God since Adam, first a living spirit, set foot on the green earth. Seth prospered, eight hundred and seven winters begetting sons and daughters. And all the years of Seth were nine hundred and twelve winters, and he died.

And after he went hence, and the earth received the body of seed-bearing Seth, Enos was warden of the heritage. Dear was he unto God! He lived for ninety winters in the world, and begat children. And Cainan was first-born of the sons of Enos. Eight hundred and fifteen winters the man of wisdom lived, at peace with God, begetting sons and daughters. And all the years of Enos were nine hundred and five winters, and he died.

And after Enos Cainan ruled the tribe as lord and leader. He lived seventy winters, and begat a son. An heir was born unto his house, and his name was Mahalaleel. Eight hundred and forty winters Cainan lived, and increased his tribe. And all the years of the son of Enos were nine hundred and ten winters, and he died, and his appointed days beneath the heavens were fulfilled. And after Cainan Mahalaleel possessed the land and treasure many a year. The prince lived five-and-sixty winters, and begat a son. An heir was born unto his house, and his kinsmen called him Jared, as I have heard. Mahalaleel lived long, enjoying bliss on earth, the joys of men, and worldly treasure. And all the years of Mahalaleel were eight hundred five-and-ninety winters, and he died, and gave the land and rule unto his son. A long time Jared dealt out gold to men. He was a righteous prince, a noble earl, dear to his kinsmen He lived an hundred five-and-sixty winters in the world, and, when her time was come, his wife brought forth her first-born, a goodly son. And his name was Enoch. Eight hundred years his father lived, and increased his tribe. And all the years of Jared were nine hundred five-and-sixty winters, and he died, and gave the land and rule unto his son, the wise and well-loved prince. And Enoch ruled the folk, led them in ways of peace, and no wise let his sway and power lessen, while he was lord over his kinsmen. Now Enoch prospered and increased his tribe three hundred years. And God, the Lord of heaven, was gracious unto him! In his natural body he entered into heavenly joy and the glory of God, dying no mortal death as men do here, the young and old, what time God taketh from them wealth and substance and earthly treasure and their life; but with the King of angels he departed still alive out of this fleeting life, in the same vestments which his soul received before his mother bare him. He left the people to his eldest son. And all the years of Enoch were three hundred five-and-sixty winters, and he died.

Then Methuselah held sway among his kinsmen, and longest of all men enjoyed the pleasures of this world. He begat a multitude of sons and daughters before his death. And all the years of Methuselah were nine hundred and seventy winters, and he died.

And Lamech, his son, succeeded him and kept the treasure. Long time he ruled the land. He lived an hundred and two winters, and begat children. And

the lord and leader of the folk lived five hundred five-and-ninety years, enjoying many winters under heaven, ruling the folk with wisdom. And Lamech increased his tribe, begetting sons and daughters. He called the name of the first-born Noah; and Noah ruled the land after the death of Lamech.']

#### **Appendix 26 to p. 120, Vulgate Genesis, Origin of Slavery:**

**Vulgate Genesis, XI: 24-26:** “evigilans autem Noe ex vino cum didicisset quae fecerat ei filius suus minor; ait maledictus Chanaan seruus servorum erit fratribus suis; dixitque benedictus Dominus Deus Sem sit Chanaan seruus eius.”

['And Noe awaking from the wine, when he had learned what his younger son had done to him, He said: Cursed be Chanaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said: Blessed be the Lord God of Sem, be Chanaan his servant.']

#### **Appendix 27, Noah's Ark a Metaphorical Shield – the Flood as a Battle scene.**

Wordplay describing Noah's ark appears in the **Genesis A lines 1333, 1354, 1357, 1403** – (*under earce bord/ bordum* '(under) the shield/boards of the ark'; *under wægbord* – under the shield against waves'; *Genesis A*, line 1369 – *he mid bearnum under bord gestah* ['he with sons stood under the shield/board']; in *Genesis A*, line 1418, 1433 the same ark is described as *nægledbord* – shield/boards nailed together, in *Genesis A*, line 1481 *salwed bord* – *þellfæstene* (dark board/shield – fortress of planks).

## **Appendix 28, Cain's Weapon of Choice**

**Genesis A lines 1521 – 28a:** 'Ælc hine selfa ærest begrindeð - gastes dugeðum þæra þe mid gares orde - oðrum aldor oðþringeð. Ne ðearf he þy edleane gefeon - modgeþance, ac ic monnes feorh - to slagan sece swiðor micle, - and to broðor banan, þæs þe blodgyte, - wællfyll weres wæpnum gespedeð, - morð mid mundum.'

Kennedy: ['For most he injureth himself and his soul's honour whoso shall slay another with the sword. Verily! in no wise shall his heart have joy in his reward! For many times more heavily will I avenge man's life upon his murderer, because his sword hath prospered in violence and blood, and his hands in death.']

## **Vulgate Genesis IX: 6**

'quicumque effuderit humanum sanguinem fundetur sanguis illius ad imaginem quippe Dei factus est homo.'

['Whosoever shall shed man's blood, his blood shall be shed: for man was made to the image of God.']

## **Appendix 29 to p. 78, Noah Must Till the Soil**

**Genesis A lines 1555-1561:** "Ða Noe ongan niwan stefne - mid hleomagum ham staðelian - and to eorðan him ætes tilian; - won and worhte, wingearde sette, - seow sæda fela, sohte georne - þa him wlitebeorhte wæstmas brohte, - geartorhte gife, grene folde."

Kennedy: ['Then a second time Noah began to establish a home with his kinsmen, and to till the earth for food. He toiled and wrought and planted a vineyard and sowed seed, and laboured that the green earth might bring forth her shining harvests, her gleaming crops, in every season.']

### **Appendix 31 to p. 51, Specification of Homonyms *æht and ceap***

**Genesis A lines 1873-1879:** “ða Abraham æhte lædde - of Egypta eðelmeorce; - hie ellenrofe idese feredon, - bryd and begas, þæt hie to Bethlem - on cuðe wic ceapas læddon, - eadge eorðwelan oðre siðe, - wif and willan and heora woruldgestreon.”

Kennedy: [‘So Abraham took his possessions and went out from the land of Egypt. Brave men conveyed the maiden, the bride with rings adorned, and they led their flocks and earthly riches unto Bethel to their olden dwellings again, wife and wealth and worldly treasure.’]

### **Appendix 32 to p. 87, Canaanites: Neighbours or Residents**

**Genesis A lines 1900b-13a:** "Ic eom fædera þin - sibgebyrdum, þu min suhterga. - Ne sceolon unc betweenan teonan weaxan, - wroht wriðian- ne þæt wille god! - Ac wit synt gemagas; unc gemæne ne sceal - elles awiht, nympe eall tela - lufu langsumu. Nu þu, Loth, gepenc, - þæt unc modige ymb meorce sittað, - þeoda þrymfæste þegnum and gesiððum, - folc Cananea and Feretia, - rofum rincum. Ne willað rumor unc - landriht heora; forðon wit lædan sculon, - teon [‘wit’] of þisse stowe, and unc staðolwagas - rumor secan.”

Kennedy: [“I am thy father's brother in blood kinship, and thou my brother's son. No strife shall rise, no feud grow up, between us two. God will not suffer that. We two are kinsmen; naught else shall there be between us save goodness and enduring love. Now, Lot, take thought how strong men dwell about our borders, mighty tribes with thanes and allies, men of valour, the tribe of the Canaanites and the tribe of the Perizzites. They will not give us of their land! Therefore let us go forth from this place, and seek out roomier fields...”]

### **Appendix 33, Lot Settles Sodom**

**Genesis A lines 1920-31a:** “Him þa Loth gewat land sceawigan - be lordane, grene eorðan. - Seo wæs wætrum weaht and wæstmum þeaht, - lagostreamum leoht, and gelic godes - neorxnawange, oðþæt nergend god - for wera synnum wylme gesealde - Sodoman and Gomorran, sweartan lige. - Him þa eard geceas and eðelsetl - sunu Arones on Sodoma byrig; - æhte sine <ealle lædde> - beagas from Bethlem and botlgestreon, - welan, wunden gold.”

Kennedy: [‘Then Lot departed to view the green earth and the land that lies by Jordan. And it was watered with rivers, and covered with pleasant fruits, bright with running streams, and like the Paradise of God before our Lord gave over Sodom and Gomorrah unto fire and black flame, because of the sins of men. And there the son of Haran chose him a dwelling and a settlement in the city of Sodom. And thither he took from Bethel all his substance, rings and household treasure and riches and twisted gold.’]

### **Appendix 34 to p. 65, Weapons in Abraham’s Battle**

**Genesis A lines 2039-46:** “Þa se halga heht his heorðwerod - wæpna onfon. He þær wigena fand, - æscberendra, XVIII - and CCC eac þeodenholdra, - þara þe he wiste þæt meahte wel æghwylc - on fyrd wegan fealwe linde. - Him þa Abraham gewat and þa eorlas þry - þe him ær treowe sealdon mid heora folcgetrume;”

Kennedy: [‘Then the holy man bade his hearth-retainers take their weapons. Three hundred and eighteen wielders of the ashen spear he gathered, loyal-hearted men, of whom he knew that each would stoutly bear his linden shield to battle. And Abraham went out, and the three earls who had pledged their faith, together with a great company of their people.’]

### **Appendix 35 to p. 156, Melchizedech's Speech: God's Role in Military Victory**

**Genesis A lines 2107-20:** "Wæs ðu gewurðod on wera rime - for þæs eagum þe ðe æsca tir - æt guðe forgeaf! Þæt is god selfa, - se ðe hettendra herga þrymmas - on gewæld gebræc, and þe wæpnum læt - rancstræte forð rume wyrcan, - huðe ahreddan and hæleð fyllan. - On swaðe sæton; ne meah-ton siðwerod - guðe spowan, ac hie god flymde, - se ðe æt feohtan mid frumgarum - wið ofermægnes egsan sceolde - handum sinum, and halegu treow, - seo þu wið rodora weard rihte healdest."

Kennedy: ["Well hast thou borne thee among men, before His eyes who gave thee glory in the battle -- that is, God the Lord, who brake the power of thy foes, and let thee hew thy way to security with the sword, regain the spoil, and fell thine enemies. They perished in the track of their retreat. The marching host throve not in battle, but God put them to flight. With His hands He shielded thee against the force of greater numbers in the battle because of the holy covenant which thou dost keep with the Lord of heaven."]

### **Appendix 36, Promise of Offspring and Landed Possessions to Abraham**

**Genesis A lines 2204b-2213a:** "Ic þe wære nu - mago Ebreas, mine selle - þæt sceal fromcynne folde þine - sidland manig, geseted wurðan - eorðan sceatas oð Eufraten - and from Egypta eðelmearce - swa mid niðas swa Nilus sceadeð - and eft Wendelsæ wide rice. - Eall þæt sculon agan eaforan þine - þeodlanda gehwilc,"

Kennedy: ['I give thee now My promise, prince of Hebrews, thy seed shall settle many a spacious kingdom, the regions of the world from the Egyptian borders even unto Euphrates, and where the Nile hems in a mighty land and the sea limits it. All this shall thy sons inhabit; each tract and tribal realm and lofty stone-built city, whatsoever those three waters and their foaming floods encircle with their streams.']

## Appendix 37 to p. 125, Hagar's Relationship to her Masters

**Genesis A lines 2237-67:** "Hire mod astah þa heo wæs magotimbre - be Abrahame eacen worden. - Ongan æfþancum **agendfrean** - halsfæst herian, higeþryðe wæg, - wæs laðwendo, lustum ne wolde - **peowdom þolian**, ac heo þriste ongan - wið Sarran swiðe winnan. - Þa ic þæt wif gefrægn wordum cyðan - hire mandrihtne modes sorge, - sarferhð sægde and swiðe cwæð: - "Ne fremest þu gerysnu and riht wið me. - Þafodest þu gena þæt me **peowmennen**, - siððan Agar ðe, **idese** laste, - beddreste gestah, swa ic bena wæs, - drehte dogora geham dædum and wordum - unarlice. Þæt Agar sceal <ongioldan>, - gif ic mot for þe mine wealdan, - Abraham leofa. Þæs sie ælmihtig, - <drihtna> drihten, dema mid unc twih." - Hire þa ædre andswarode - wishidig wer wordum sinum: - "Ne forlæte ic þe, þen den ['þenden'] wit lifiað bu, - **arna lease**, ac þu þin **agen** most - **mennen** ateon, swa þin mod freoð." - Ða wearð unbliðe Abrahames cwen, - hire worcþeowe wrað on mode, - heard and hreðe, higeteonan spræc - fræcne on fæmnan. Heo þa fleon gewat - þrea and **peowdom**; þolian ne wolde - yfel and ondlean, þæs ðe ær dyde - to Sarran, ac heo on sið gewat..."

Kennedy: ['... her heart grew arrogant. She stubbornly began to vex her mistress, was insolent, insulting, evil-hearted, and would not willingly be subject to her, but straightway entered into strife with Sarah. Then, as I have heard, the woman told her sorrow to her lord, speaking with bitter grief: "Thou hast not done me right or justice! Since first my handmaid, Hagar, knew thy bed, according as I counselled thee, thou sufferest her to vex me day by day in word and deed. But her atonement shall be bitter if I may still rule over my own maid, dear Abraham. And may Almighty God, the Lord of lords, be judge between us." - And straightway Abraham, wise of heart, made answer: "Never will I let thee be dishonoured while we two live. But thou shalt deal with thine handmaid even according as it pleaseth thee." - Then was the wife of Abraham hard of heart and hostile-minded, ruthless, and merciless against her handmaid, and bitterly declared her hate. And the maiden fled from thraldom and oppression, and would not brook punishment or retribution for what she wrought against Sarah. But she fled into the wilderness.']

### **Appendix 38 to p. 128, Ishmael Represented as a Killer**

**Genesis A lines 2289-92:** “unhyre, orlæggifre - <and> wiðbreca wera cneorissum - magum sinum; hine monige on - wraðe winnað mid wæpenpræce.”

Kennedy: [‘He shall be terrible, and swift to war; his hand shall be against the tribes of men, his kinsmen. Many shall war upon him bitterly.’]

### **Appendix 39, to p. 94, Bestowal of Land to Noah**

**Genesis A lines 1513-28a:** "Tymað nu and tiedrað, tires brucað, - mid gefean fryðo; fyllað eorðan, - eall geiceað. Eow is eðelstol - <and> holmes hlæst and heofon fugla - and wildu deor on geweald geseald, - eorðe ælgrene and eacen feoh. - Næfre ge mid blode beodgereordu - unarlice eowre picgeað, - besmiten mid synne sawldreore. - Ælc hine selfa ærest begrindeð - gastes dugeðum þæra þe mid gares orde - oðrum aldor oðþringeð. Ne ðearf he þy edleane gefeon - modgeþance, ac ic monnes feorh - to slagan sece swiðor micle, - and to broðor banan, þæs þe blodgyte, - wællfyll weres wæpnum gespedeð, - morð mid mundum.”

Kennedy: [“Be fruitful and multiply, enjoying honour, delighting in peace. Fill all the earth with your increase. To you is given the home of your fathers, dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field, over all the green earth and its teeming herds. Never shall ye eat in blood your shameful feasts through sin defiled with blood. For most he injureth himself and his soul's honour whoso shall slay another with the sword. Verily! in no wise shall his heart have joy in his reward! For many times more heavily will I avenge man's life upon his murderer, because his sword hath prospered in violence and blood, and his hands in death...”]

#### **Appendix 40, Abraham's Oath to Abimelech,**

**Genesis A lines 2824-2833:** “Gyld me mid hyldo, þæt ic þe hneaw ne wæs - landes and lissa. Wes þissum leodum nu - and mægburge minre arfæst, - gif þe alwalda, ure drihten, - scirian wille, se ðe gesceapu healdeð - þæt þu randwigum rumor mote - on ðisse folcsceare frætwa dælan - modigra gestreon, mearce settan. - Ða Abraham Abimelehe - wære sealde þæt he wolde swa...”

Kennedy: [‘Requite it now with kindness (I argue above that hyldo should here be translated as fidelity) that I grudged thee not of land or favour. Be gracious (or, I suggest “honourable” i.e. one who keeps their word) to this nation, my people if the Lord our God, who ruleth the fates of men, will grant thee to extend the borders of this people, dealing out wealth to warriors of the shield, and treasure to the brave.” - And Abraham gave a pledge unto Abimelech that he would do according to his prayer.’] [‘possible lacuna’]

#### **Appendix 41 to p. 106, Destruction of Sodom**

**Genesis A lines 2550b-61a:** “Lig eall fornam - þæt he grenes fond goldburgum in, - swylce þær ymb utan unlytel dæl - sidre foldan geondsended wæs - bryne and brogan. Bearwas wurdon to axan and to yslan, eorðan wæstma, - efne swa wide swa ða witelac - reðe geræhton rum land wera. - Strudende fyr steapes and geapes, - swogende <leg>, forsweah eall geador - þæt on Sodoma byrig secgas ahton - and on Gomorra.”

Kennedy: [‘All that was green in the golden cities the flame devoured; likewise no little portion of the wide land round about was covered with flame and terror. Fair groves and fruits of the earth were turned to ash and glowing ember, even as far as that grim vengeance swept the broad land of men. A roaring flame, destroying all things high and spacious, consumed the wealth of Sodom and Gomorrah. All this the Lord God destroyed, and the people with it.’]

**(41b) Old English Heptateuch, Vulgate Genesis XIX: 25:**

“God towearp ða swa mid graman ða burga, and ealne ðone eard endemes towende, and ealle þa burhwara forbærnde ætgædere, ond eall ðæt growende wæs, wearð adilegod.”<sup>370</sup>

[‘God destroyed then with such wrath the cities, and all the Earth likewise demolished, together with all their inhabitants, and all things that were growing demolished.’]<sup>371</sup>

---

<sup>370</sup> R. Marsden and Aelfric, *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's Libellus de Veteri Testamento et Novo*, p. 43.

<sup>371</sup> My own translation.

**Vulgate Genesis XIX: 25:** “et subvertit civitates has et omnem circa regionem universos habitatores urbium et cuncta terrae virentia”

[‘And he destroyed these cities, and all the country about, all the inhabitants of the cities, and all things that spring from the Earth.’]

#### **Appendix 42, to p. 45 Livestock, Silver, and Slaves**

**Genesis A lines 2719-6:** “Sealde him to bote, þæs þe he his bryd genam, - gangende feoh and glæd seolfor - and weorcþeos. [‘spræc’] Spræc þa wordum eac - to Abrahame æðelinga helm: - † "wuna mid usic and þe wic geceos - on þissum lande þær þe leofost sie, - eðelstowe, þe ic agan sceal. - Wes us fæle freond, we ðe feoh syllað!"

[‘and because he had taken his wife he gave him, to boot, wandering herds and servants and gleaming silver. And the lord of men said also unto Abraham: "Abide with us and choose thee a dwelling in this land, and an abode whereso it pleaseth thee; thee must I keep. Be thou a faithful friend, and we will give thee riches."’]

## EXODUS

### **Appendix EI to p. 129, Firstborn's Right – Reuben**

**OE Exodus lines 337b-9:** “He his ealdordom - synnum aswefede, þæt he siðor for - on leofes last. Him on leodsceare - frumbearnas riht freobroðor oðþah, ead and æðelo; he wæs gearu swa þeah.”

Kennedy: [‘For his sin's sake Reuben yielded his dominion and marched behind his kinsmen. From him his brother took his right as first-born in the tribe, his eminence and wealth. Yet was he ready.’]

## DANIEL

### **Appendix DI to p. 123, Sin and Crime in OE Daniel**

**OE Daniel lines 19, 23-24a, 31-32:** “Þa hie æcræftas ane forleton,

... Israhela cyn unriht don - wommas wyrcean ... þæt hie æt siðestan sylfe forleton - drihtnes domas, curon deofles cræft.”

Kennedy: [‘and they forsook the teachings of their law,

... the tribe of Israel following after sin, and doing evil) ... and in the end they turned them from the laws of God, and chose the Devil's craft..’]

### **Appendix DII to p. 187, Protection - “frið” as Marker of Rightful Authority**

**OE Daniel lines 214b-16:** “nymðe hie friðes wolde - wilnian to þam wyrrestan - weras Ebreas, - guman to þam golde, þe he him to gode teode”

Kennedy: [‘except they sought protection of that worst of demons, the golden image which he had made his god’]

**OE Daniel lines 222-3:** “ne hie to facne freoðo wilnedan, - þeah þe him se bitera deað geboden wære.”

Kennedy: [‘They had no longing to seek shelter with false gods, though bitter the death proclaimed!.’]

#### **Appendix DIII to p. 60, Solomon’s Treasure**

**OE Daniel lines 59-64:** “bereafodon þa receda wuldor readan golde – since and seolfre, Salomones templ. – Gestrudan gestreona under stanhliðum – swilc eall swa þa eorlas agan sceoldon – oðþæt hie burga gehwone abrocen hæfdon – þara þe þam folce to friðe stodon. – Gehlodon him to huðe hordwearda gestreon – feoh and frætwa, swilc þær funden wæs.”

Kennedy: [‘From Solomon’s temple, that glorious building, they took red gold and jewels and silver. They plundered the treasure under the walls of stone, all such as those earls possessed, till they had razed and wasted every stronghold, which stood for a protection to that people. They carried off as spoil the treasure of princes, as much as was found there, cattle and men;’]

## CHRIST AND SATAN

### **Appendix CSI to p. 167, Voluntary Subjugation on Judgement Day**

**OE *Christ and Satan* lines 205-8:** “beoran on breostum bliðe geþohtas - sibbe and snyterō; gemunan soð and riht, - þonne we to hehselde hnigan þencað - and þone anwaldan aræ biddan.”

Kennedy: [‘With blithe thoughts in our hearts, and peace and wisdom, let us be mindful of righteousness and truth, when we think to kneel before His royal throne, and pray the Lord for mercy.’]

### **Appendix CSII to p. 160, Rightful Possession of Paradise**

**OE *Christ and Satan* lines 358-364:** “þonne hie befæðmeð fæder mancynnes, - and hie gesegnað mid his swiðran hond, - læde&æth; to lihte, þær hi lif agon - a to aldre, uplicne ham, - beorhtne burhstede. Blæd bið æghwæm - þæm ðe hælende hyran þenceð, - and wel<sup>372</sup> is þam ðe þæt <wyrca> mot.”

Kennedy: [‘The Father of mankind shall fold them in His arms, and with His right hand bless them and lead them to the light, where they shall have eternal life, a heavenly home, a radiant city-dwelling, for ever and for ever. He shall have bliss whoso inclineth to obey his Saviour. Well shall it be with him who may obtain it!’]

---

<sup>372</sup> ‘wel’ is an adverb / abundantly/very/fully / usually translated as an adjective / good/ if the adverbial use is amended, which in this case is necessary since there is no verb save the verb ‘to be’ / I propose the emendation to a noun correlating to the noun above ‘blæd’ / glory/prosperity / here coupled with usually plural ‘wela’ = prosperity, riches.

## OTHER SOURCES

### **Appendix A to p. 48, Ælfric's Use of *gestreon* and Attitude Towards Earthly Wealth**

#### **Homily, Annunciation St. Mary, March XXV<sup>373</sup>**

“He forlet þa rícan idele. þaet sind ða rícan, þa ðe mid modignysse þa eorþlican welan lufiað swiðor þonne ða heofonlican.

Fela ricera manna geðeoð Gode, þæra ðe swa doð swa swa hit awriten is, “þæs rícan mannes welan sind his sawle alysednyss. His welan beoð his sawle alysednyss, gif he mid þam gewitendlicum gestreonom beceapað him þæt ece lif, and ða heofonlican welan mid Gode. Gif he ðis forgymeleasað, and besett his hiht on ðam eorðlicum welan, þonne forlæt God hine idelne and æmtigne, fram ðam ecum godnyssum.”

[“He hath sent the rich empty away.” Those are the rich, who with pride love earthly riches more than heavenly.

Many rich men thrive to God, those who do as it is written, “The rich man's wealth is his soul's redemption.” His wealth is his soul's redemption if he with those transitory treasures buy for himself eternal life, and heavenly wealth with God. If he neglect this, and place his hope in earthly wealth, then will God send him away void and empty, from everlasting good.’]

#### **Homily 17 SECOND STUDY AFTER EASTER<sup>374</sup>**

“Se hyra flihð þonnc he ðone wulf gesihð.” Se is hyra and ða hyrde, seðe bið begripen on woruld-ðingum, and lufað þone wurðmynt and ða ateorigendlican edlean, and næfð inweardlice lufe to Godes scepum. He cepð þæra sceatta, and blissað on ðam wurðmynte, and hæfð his mede for ðisum life, and bið

<sup>373</sup> B. Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, at 202-5.

<sup>374</sup> M. R. Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*, at 136; B. Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church - Sermones catholici or Homilies of Ælfric*, at 238-42.

bescyred þære ecan mede. Nast ðu hwa bið hyra, hwa hyrde, ærðam ðe se wulf cume;

He flýhð, forðan þe he geseh unrihtwisnyse and suwade. He flýhð forðan þe he is hyra, and ná hyrde, swilce hit swa gecweden sy, Ne mæg se standan ongean fræcednyssa þæra sceapa, seðe ne gymð þæra sceapa mid lufe, ac tylað his sylfes þæt is þæt he lufað þa eorðlican gestreon, and na Godes folc.

Wulf bið eac se unrihtwisa rica, ðe bereafað þa cristenan, and ða eadmodan mid his ricceterere ofsitt: ac se hyra, oððe se médgylða ne gedyrstlæeð ðæt he his unrihtwisnyse wiðstande, þæt he ne forleose his wurðmynt, and ða woruldlican gestreon ðe he lufað swiðor ðonne ða cristenan menn.”

[“The hireling fleeth when he seeth the wolf.” He is a hireling and not a shepherd, who is engaged in worldly things, and loves dignity and perishable rewards, and has no inward love for God's sheep. He takes heed of treasures, and rejoices in dignity, and has his reward in this life, and will be cut off from the everlasting reward. Thou knowest not who is a hireling, who a shepherd, before the wolf comes...

He flees not with body, but with mind. He flees because he saw iniquity and held silence. He flees because he is a hireling and not a shepherd, as though it were so said. He cannot stand against the perils of the sheep, who guardeth not the sheep with love, but provideth for himself; that is, he loves worldly gain, and not God's folk.

The unrighteous powerful man also is a wolf, who robs christians, and oppresses the humble with his power: for the hireling, or the mercenary, dares not withstand his unrighteousness lest he lose his dignity, and the worldly gain which he loves more than christian men.’]

## Homily, Pentecost<sup>375</sup>

“þa geleaffullan brohton heora feoh, and ledon hit aet ðæra apostola foton. Mid þam is geswutelod þæt cristene men ne sceolon heora hiht besettan on woroldlice gestreon , ac on Gode anum. Se gítsere ðe beset his hiht on his goldhord, he bið swa swa se apostol cwæð, "þam gelíc þe deofolgyld begæð."

Hi heoldon þæt gold unwurðlice, forðan ðe seo gitsung næfde nænne stede on heora heortan: forði hi ['biscopas'] dydon heora ðing him gemæne, þæt hi on soðre sibbe butan gytsunge beon mihton. Hi setton heora handa ofer geleaffulle men, and him com to se Halga Gast ðurh heora bisceþunge."

[‘The faithful brought their money, and laid it at the feet of the apostles. By this is manifested that Christian men should not set their delight in worldly treasure, but in God alone. The covetous who sets his delight in his goldhoard, is, as the apostle said, "like unto him who practiseth idolatry."

They ['bishops'] held the gold as worthless, because covetousness had no place in their hearts: they made their goods in common that they might be in true peace without covetousness. They set their hands over believing men, and the Holy Ghost came to them through their bishoping.']

---

<sup>375</sup> B. Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 326-9.

## Bibliography

- Abels, Richard P. (1988), *Lordship and Military Obligation in Anglo-Saxon England* (London: British Museum Publications).
- (1999), 'Heriot', in Michael Lapidge et. al. (ed.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Blackwell), 235-6.
- Abrams, L. (2008), 'Germanic Christianities, 600-c. 1100', in Thomas F. X. Noble, Julia M. H. Smith, and Roberta A. Baranowski (eds.), *Cambridge History of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Alcuin, et al. (1883), 'AElfric's Anglo-Saxon Version of Alcuini Interrogationes Sigeuulfi presbyteri in Genesin', Inaug –diss. (E. Karras, Leipzig).
- Allen, John (1830), *Inquiry into the Rise and Growth of the Royal Prerogative* (London).
- Andersen, Hans E. (1991), *The Battle of Maldon: the Meaning, Dating & Historicity of an Old English Poem* (Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen).
- Anlezark, Daniel (1997), 'The Old Testament Patriarchs in Anglo-Saxon England: Abraham and Noah', PhD thesis (University of Oxford).
- (2005), 'Connecting the Patriarchs: Noah and Abraham in the Old English "Exodus"', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 104 (2), 171-88.
- (2006), *Water and Fire: the Myth of the Flood in Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester Medieval Literature; Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press).
- (2011), *Old Testament Narratives* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

- University of London, (2013), 'Early English Laws, (Cn 1018)',  
 <[http://www.earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/texts/cn-1018/view/ -  
 edition,1/commentary,1\\_0\\_c\\_5](http://www.earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/texts/cn-1018/view/-edition,1/commentary,1_0_c_5)> [Accessed 23 July 2014].
- Attenborough, F. L. (1922), *Laws of Earliest English Kings* (Cambridge  
 Cambridge University Press ).
- Augustine (1872), *The Works of Aurelius Augustine: A New Translation*, ed.  
 Marcus Dods (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard university).
- Balg, Hugo (1882), *Der Dichter Caedmon und seine Werke* (Bonn).
- Battles, Paul (2000), "Genesis A' and the Anglo-Saxon 'Migration Myth",  
*Anglo-Saxon England*, 29, 43-66.
- Baxter, Stephen (2007), *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in Late  
 Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford Historical Monographs; Oxford: Oxford  
 University Press).
- Baxter, Stephen and Blair, John (2006), 'Land Tenure and Royal Patronage in  
 the Early English Kingdom: A Model and a Case Study', *Anglo-Norman  
 Studies* XXVIII, 19-46.
- Bede (1999), *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, eds B.  
 Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (2008), *On Genesis*, ed. Calvin B. Kendall (Liverpool: Liverpool University  
 Press).
- Beer, Herbert (1939), *Führen und folgen, herrschen und beherrschtwerden im  
 Sprachgut der Angelsachsen* (Breslau: Priebatsch).
- Bennett, H. S. (1937), *Life on the English Manor: a Study of Peasant  
 Conditions, 1150-1400* (Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University  
 of Cambridge).
- Berman, H. J. (1983), *Law and Revolution* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard  
 University Press).

- Biggs, F. M. (2003), 'An Introduction and Overview of Recent Work', in Kathryn Powell and Donald Scragg (ed.), *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer), 1-25.
- Biggs, F.M., Hill T.D.; Szarmach P.E., with the assistance of Hammond K. (ed.), (1990), *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 74; Binghamton, New York: Centre for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York).
- Blackburn, Francis A. (1907), *Exodus and Daniel: Two Old English Poems Preserved in MS. Junius 11 in the Bodleian Library of the University of Oxford, England* (Belles-Lettres; Boston, London: D.C. Heath).
- Borsa, Paolo, et al. (2015), 'What is Medieval European Literature', *Interfaces*, 1, 7-24.
- Bosworth, Joseph and Toller, T. Northcote (eds.) (1898) *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth and its Supplement* (first edition 1921), in *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Online* [<http://bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/>], Prague.
- Bradley, S. A. J. (1982), *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: An Anthology of Old English Poems in Prose Translation* (Everyman's Library; London: Dent) xxvi, 559 p.
- Brandl, Alois (1908), *Geschichte der altenglischen Literatur* (I; Strassburg).
- Breeze, Andrew (1993), 'Habakkuk 1:8 as Source for *Exodus* 161–69', *Neophilologus*, 77 (1), 161-62.
- Bright, James W. (1912), 'The Relation of the Cædmonian Exodus to the Liturgy', *Modern Language Notes*, 27 (4), 97-103.
- Brockman, Bennett A. (1974), "'Heroic' and 'Christian' in Genesis A: the Evidence of the Cain and Abel Episode", *Modern Language Quarterly*, 35, 115-28.

- Brooks, Nicholas P. (1978), 'Arms, Status and Warfare in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in D. Hall (ed.), *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference* (Oxford: BAR), 81-103.
- Brown, A. K. (1973), 'Neorxnawang', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 74, 610-23.
- Calder, Daniel G. and Allen, Michael J. (eds.) (1976), *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry: the Major Latin Texts in Translation* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer).
- Carmichael, C. (2008), 'Inheritance in Biblical Sources', *Law and Literature*, 229-42.
- Carroll, Anne Thomas Aquinas (1946), *The Venerable Bede: His Spiritual Teachings* (PhD; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan).
- Carver, M. (1989), 'Kingship and Material Culture in Early Anglo-Saxon East Anglia', in S. Basset (ed.), *Studies in the Early History of Britain* (Leicester).
- (2000), 'Burial as Poetry: the Context of Treasure in Anglo-Saxon Graves', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Treasure in the Medieval West* (York: York Medieval Studies), 25-48.
- Cassian, John (1997), *The Conferences* (New Jersey: Newman Press).
- Certeau, Michel de and Conley, Tom (1988), *The Writing of History* (European Perspectives; New York; Guildford: Columbia University Press).
- Chadwick, H. Munro (1905), *Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (1926), *The Heroic Age* (Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Challoner, Richard (ed.), (1899), *Douay-Rheims Bible* (Baltimore).

- Charles-Edwards, T. M. (1979), 'The Distinction Between Land and Moveable Wealth in Anglo-Saxon England', in P. H. Sawyer (ed.), *English Medieval Settlement* (London: Edward Arnold), 97-104.
- Chenu, M. D. (1969), *L'éveil de la conscience dans la civilisation médiévale* (Montréal: Institut d'études médiévales).
- Cherewatuk, K. (1986), 'Standing, Turning, Twisting, Falling: Posture and Moral Stance in 'Genesis B'', *Neophilologische Mitteilungen*, 87 (4), 537-44.
- Cherniss, M. D. (1969), 'Heroic Ideals and the Moral Climate of Genesis B', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 30 (4), 479-97.
- Clubb, Merrel D. (1925a), *Christ and Satan an Old English Poem* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Conner, P. W. (2008), 'Religious Poetry', in Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (ed.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing), 250-67.
- Craig, Hardin (1912-13), 'The Origin of the Old Testament Plays', *Modern Philology*, 10 (4), 473-87.
- Cronan, Dennis (2004), 'Poetic Words, Conservatism and the Dating of Old English Poetry', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 33 (1), 23-50.
- Cross, J. E. and Tucker, S. I. (1960), 'Allegorical Tradition and the Old English Exodus', *Neophilologus*, 44 (1), 122-27.
- Daniélou, Jean (1956), *The Bible and the Liturgy* (University of Notre Dame Liturgical studies, III; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press).
- Day, Virginia (1974), 'The Influence of the Catechetical *Narratio* on Old English and Some Other Medieval Literature', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3 (1), 51-61.

- Deshman, Robert (1976), 'Christus rex et magi reges: Kingship and Christology in Ottonian and Anglo-Saxon Art', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, (10), 367-405.
- Doane, Alger N. (1978), *Genesis A: A New Edition* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).
- (1991), *The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon Vatican Genesis* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).
- Drout, M. D. C. (2007), 'Possible Instructional Effects of the Exeter Book 'Wisdom Poems': a Benedictine reform context', in Patrizia Lendinara, et al. (eds.), *Form and content of instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the light of contemporary manuscript evidence : papers presented at the International Conference, Udine, 6-8 April 2006* (Textes et études du moyen âge; Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols), 447-66.
- Earl, J. W. (1970), 'Christian Traditions and the Old English Exodus', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 71, 541-70.
- Evans, J. M. (1963a), 'Genesis B and its Background', *The Review of English Studies*, 14 (53), 1-16.
- (1963b), 'Genesis B and its Background (concluded)', *The Review of English Studies*, 14 (54), 113-23.
- Farrell, Robert T. (1969), 'A Reading of Old English Exodus', *The Review of English Studies*, 20 (80), 401-17.
- (ed.), (1974), *Daniel and Azarias* (London: Methuen).
- Fell, Christine (1991), 'Perceptions of Transience', in M. lapidge M. Godden (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature* (Cambridge), 172-89.
- Ferguson, Paul F. (1978), 'The Old English Exodus and the Patristic Tradition', PhD thesis (Ann Arbor, Mich.).

- (1981), 'Noah, Abraham, and the Crossing of the Red Sea', *Neophilologus*, 65 (2), 282-87.
- Ferhatović, Denis (2010), '*Burh and Beam*, Burning Bright: a Study in the Poetic Imagination of the Old English *Exodus*', *Neophilologus*, 94 (3), 509-22.
- Finley, Moses I. (1964), 'Between Slavery and Freedom', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 6, 233-49.
- Finnegan, Robert E. (1977), *Christ and Satan: a Critical Edition* (Waterloo Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press).
- Foot, Sarah (1992), 'By Water in the Spirit': the Administration of Baptism in Early Anglo-Saxon England', in Blair and Sharpe (eds.), *Pastoral Care Before the Parish* (Studies in the Early History of Britain; Leicester, New York: Leicester University Press).
- Frank, Roberta (1988), 'What Kind of Poetry Is Exodus?', in Daniel Gillmore Calder and T. Craig Christy (eds.), *Germania: Comparative Studies in the Old Germanic Languages and Literatures* (Wolfeboro: D.S. Brewer), 191-205.
- Gardner, John (1975), *The Construction of Christian Poetry in Old English* (London and Amsterdam: Southern Illinois University Press).
- Girsch, Elizabeth Stephens (1994), 'Metaphorical Usage, Sexual Exploitation, and Divergence in the Old English Terminology for Male and Female Slaves', in Alan Frantzen and Douglas Moffat (ed.), *Work of Work: Servitude, Slavery and Labour in Medieval England* (Glasgow: Cruithne Press), 30-54.
- Godden, M. R. (1990), 'Money, Power and Morality in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 19 (1), 41-65.
- (2000), *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Goldenberg, David M. (2003), *The Curse of Ham: Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Gollancz, Israel (ed.), (1927), *Caedmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Biblical Poetry Junius XI in the Bodleian Library* (London: Oxford University Press).
- Green, B. (1971), 'Gregory's Moralia as an Inspirational Source for the Old English Poem Exodus', *Classica et Mediaevalia Kobenhavn*, 32 251-62.
- Green, D. H. (1965), *The Carolingian Lord; Semantic Studies on Four Old High German Words: Balder, Frô, Truhtin, Hêrro* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Groth, Ernst Johannes (1883), 'Composition und Alter der altenglischen (angelsächsischen) Exodus', Thesis.
- Gryson, Robert Weber and Roger (ed.), (1969), *Biblia Sacra Vulgata Editio Quinta* (Stuttgart).
- Haines, Dorothy (1999), 'Unlocking "Exodus" II. 516-532', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 98 (4), 481-98.
- Hall, Gordon G. (1911), 'The Transmission and Date of Genesis B', *Modern Language Notes*, 26 (5), 129-33.
- Hall, John R. (1975), 'The Building of the Temple in Exodus: Design for Typology', *Neophilologus*, 59 (4), 616-21.
- (1976), 'The Oldest English Epic of Redemption: The Theological Unity of MS Junius 11', *Traditio*, 32, 185-208.
- (1982), 'Mansceadān: Old English Exodus 37', *Neophilologus*, 66 (1), 145-48.
- (1990), 'Exodus 166b, Cwyldrof, 162-67, the Beasts of Battle', *Neophilologus*, 74 (1), 112-21.

- Hall, T. (2003), 'Ælfric and the Epistle to the Laodicians', in Kathryn Powell and Donald Scragg (ed.), *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer), 65-83.
- (2008), 'Biblical and Patristic Learning', in Philip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (ed.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing), 327-44.
- Harden Weaver, Rebecca (1996), *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy* (Patristic Monograph; Macon: Mercer University Press).
- Härke, Heinrich (2000), 'The Circulation of Weapons in Anglo-Saxon Society', in F. Theuvs and Janet L. Nelson (eds.), *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 377-99.
- Hart, C. R. (1966), *The Early Charters of Eastern England* (Studies in Early English history; Leicester: Leicester University Press).
- Hauer, S. R. (1981), 'The Patriarchal Digression in the Old English 'Exodus', Lines 362-446', *Studies in Philology*, 78 (5), 77-90.
- Healey, Antonette DiPaolo; Venezky, Richard L. (1980), *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English* (Dictionary of Old English Project, Newark, Del.: University of Delaware).
- Healey, Antonette diPaolo; Wilkin, John Price; and Xiang, Xin (2009) *Dictionary of Old English Corpus on the World Wide Web* [online text], University of Toronto <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/>>
- Healey, Antonette diPaolo; Cameron, Angus; Amos, Ashley Crandell et al., 'Dictionary of Old English: A to G Online', *DOE* <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/%3E>>
- Helder, W. (1977), 'Beowulf and the Plundered Hoard', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 78, 317-25.
- Hermann, J. P. (1975), 'The Green Rod of Moses in the Old English Exodus', *English Language Notes*, 12 (4), 241-43.

- Hill, T. D. (1980), 'The Virga of Moses and the Old English Exodus', in John D. Niles (ed.), *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays* (Cambridge D. S. Brewer), 57–65.
- Hill, Thomas D. (2002), 'Pilate's Visionary Wife and the Innocence of Eve: an Old Saxon source for the Old English "Genesis B"', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 101 (2), 170-84.
- Howe, Nicholas (1989), *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Hudson, John (2012), *The Oxford History of the Laws of England; Volume II, 871-1216*, [electronic resource] (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Huppé, Bernard F. (1959), *Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's influence on Old English poetry* (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- Hyams, Paul (2001), 'Feud and the State in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Journal of British Studies*, 40 (1), 1-43.
- Irving, E. B. (1953), *The Old English Exodus* (Yale Studies in English New Haven: Yale University Press).
- (1959), 'On the Dating of the Old English Poems Genesis and Exodus', *Anglia*, 77, 1-11.
- (1972), 'New Notes on the Old English Exodus', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für englische Philologie*, 90, 289-324.
- (1974), 'Exodus Retraced', in Jr. Robert B. Burlin and Edward B. Irving (ed.), *Old English Studies in Honour of John C. Pope* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 203-23.
- James, Edward (1989), 'Burial and Status in the Early Medieval West', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 39, 23-40.
- Jauss, Hans Robert (1982), *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota).

- John, Eric (1960), *Land Tenure in Early England* (Leicester: Leicester University Press).
- (1966), *Orbis Britanniae* (Leicester: Leicester University Press).
- Johnson, David F. (1998), 'The Fall of Lucifer in 'Genesis A' and Two Anglo-Latin Royal Charters', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 97 (4), 500-21.
- Kabir, Ananya Jahanara (2001), *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England; Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Keenan, H. T. (1970), 'Exodus 513; The Green Streets of Paradise', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 71, 455-60.
- Kemble, John M. and Birch, Walter De Grey (1876), *The Saxons in England: a History of the English Commonwealth till the Period of the Norman Conquest* (London: B. Quaritch).
- Kennedy, A. G. (1985), 'Disputes About Bocland: the Forum for their Adjudication', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 14 (1), 175-95.
- Kennedy, Charles W. (1943), *The Earliest English Poetry, a Critical Survey of the Poetry Written Before the Norman Conquest* (London, New York).
- Kennedy, Charles W. (1916), *The Caedmon Poems, Translated Into English Prose* (London, New York: Routledge; Dutton).
- Ker, N. R. (1957), *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- Ker, W. P. (1904), *The Dark Ages* (New York).
- Klaeber, Fr (1918), 'Concerning the Relation Between Exodus and Beowulf', *Modern Language Notes*, 33 (4), 218-24.
- Kleist, Aaron J. (2008), *Striving with Grace: Views of Free Will in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

- Krapp, George P. (ed.), (1931), *The Junius Manuscript* (Anglo-Saxon poetic records, New York: Columbia University Press).
- Kruger, Steven F. (1994), 'Oppositions and Their Opposition in the Old English Exodus', *Neophilologus*, 78 (1), 165-70.
- Kuefler, Mathew S. (1991), "'A Wryed Existence": Attitudes Toward Children in Anglo-Saxon England', *Journal of Social History*, 24 (4), 823-34.
- Lapidge, Michael (1985), 'Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England', in Peter Clemoes, Michael Lapidge, and Helmut Gneuss (eds.), *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 33-89.
- (1993), *Anglo-Latin Literature, 900-1066* (London; Rio Grande, Ohio: Hambledon Press).
- (2001), *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing).
- (2006a), 'Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages', in Jill Mann and Maura Nolan (eds.), *The Text in the Community: Essays on Medieval Works, Manuscripts, Authors, and Readers* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press), 11-40.
- (2006b), *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press).
- Latham, R. E. and Baxter, James Houston (1999), *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources* (London: Oxford University Press).
- Lawrence, G. (1966), 'A Comparison of Old English and Old Norse Treatments of Christs Harrowing of Hell', (University of Oregon).
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Short, Charles (1879, repr. in 1955), *A Latin Dictionary, Founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary*

*revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and Charles Short* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Liebermann, F. (1903), *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (Halle: Max Niemeyer).

Liuzza, Roy M. (1994), 'On the Dating of Beowulf', in Peter S. Baker (ed.), *Beowulf Basic Readings* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England; New York: Garland), 281-302.

--- (2008), 'Religious Prose', in Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine M. Treharne (eds.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture; Oxford, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers), 233-50.

Lockett, Leslie (2002a), 'An Integrated Re-examination of the Dating of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11', *ASE*, 31, 141-73.

Loyn, H. R. (1974), 'Kinship in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3, 197-209.

Lucas, Peter J. (1976), 'Old English Christian Poetry: the Cross in Exodus', in Gerald Bonner (ed.), *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede* (London: S.P.C.K.), 193-209.

--- (1977), *Exodus* (Cambridge: Methuen & Co Ltd.).

--- (1979), 'On the Incomplete Ending of Daniel and the Addition of Christ and Satan to MS Junius 11', *Anglia*, 97, 46-59.

--- (1992), 'Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis and the Interpolation of Genesis B into Genesis A', *Neophilologus*, 76 (1), 121-35.

Luria, Maxwell (1981), 'The Old English Exodus as a Christian Poem: Notes Toward a Reading', *Neophilologus*, 65 (4), 600-06.

- Magennis, Hugh and Swan, Mary (eds.) (2009), *A Companion to Ælfric* (Leiden, Boston).
- Magoun Jr., F.P. (1953), 'The Oral Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry', *Speculum*, XXVIII
- Maitland, Frederic William (1897), *Domesday Book and Beyond; Three Essays in the Early History of England* (Cambridge: University press).
- Malone, Kemp (1948), 'The Old English Period (to 1000)', in A.C. Baugh (ed.), *A Literary History of England* (New York).
- Marsden, Richard (1995a), 'The Death of the Messenger: The 'Spelboda' in the Old English Exodus', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 77 (3), 141-64.
- (1995b), *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England; Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Marsden, Richard and Aelfric (2008), *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's Libellus de Veteri Testamento et Novo* (Early English Text Society; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Martin, Ellen E. (1982), 'Allegory and the African Woman in the Old English "Exodus"', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 81 (1), 1-15.
- Mead, William E. (1899), 'Color in Old English Poetry', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 14 (2), 169-206.
- Meens, Rob (1998), 'Politics, Mirrors of Princes and the Bible: Sins, Kings and the Well-being of the Realm', *Early Medieval Europe*, 7 (3), 345.
- Mintz, S. B. (1997), 'Words Devilish and Divine: Eve as Speaker in Genesis B', *Neophilologus*, 81 (4), 609-23.
- Moore, Samuel (1911), 'On the Sources of the Old-English "Exodus"', *Modern Philology*, 9 (1), 83-108.

- Morrish, J. (1986), 'King Alfred's Letter as a Source on Learning in England', in Paul E. Szarmach (ed.), *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose: Sixteen Original Contributions* (Albany: State University of New York Press), vi, 420 p., 87-107.
- Muir, Bernard J. (ed.) (2004) *A Digital Facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Junius 11*, (Oxford: Bodleian Library).
- Mürkens, Gerhard Hieronymus (1899), *Untersuchungen über das altenglische Exoduslied* (Bonn).
- Nelson, Janet, L. (2004), 'England and the Continent in the Ninth Century; 3 Rights and Rituals', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 14 (1), 1-24.
- Ohlgren, Thomas H. (1975), 'Some New Light on the Old English Cædmonian Genesis', *Studies in Iconography*, 1, 38–73.
- Ogilvy, J. D. A. (1967), *Books Known to the English, 597-1066* (Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America) xx, 300 p.
- Pasternack, Carol Braun (1995), *The Textuality of Old English Poetry* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 13; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Page, R.I. and Lapidge, M. (1982), 'The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England [2]: the Evidence of English Glosses', in Nicholas Brooks (ed.), *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain* (Studies in the Early History of Britain; Leicester: Leicester University Press), 99-165.
- Pelteret, David A. E. (1985), 'Slavery in Anglo-Saxon England', in J. Douglas Woods and D. A. E. Pelteret (ed.), *The Anglo-Saxons: Synthesis and Achievement* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press), 117-33.
- (1995), *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England: From the Reign of Alfred Until the Twelfth Century* (Studies in Anglo-Saxon History, 7; Woodbridge and Rochester: Boydell).

- Powell, Kathryn and Scragg, D. G. (2003), *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* (Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies; Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer).
- Priebsch, Robert (1925), *The Heliand Manuscript Cotton Calligula A. VII in the British Museum* (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press).
- Raw, Barbara C. (1976), 'The Probable Derivation of Most of the Illustrations in Junius 11 From an Illustrated Old Saxon Genesis', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 5, 133-48.
- (1978), *The Art and Background of Old English Poetry* (London: Edward Arnold).
- (1984), 'The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 ', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 13, 187-207.
- Powell, Kathryn and Scragg, Donald G. (2003), *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* (Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies; Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer).
- Remley, Paul G. (1996), *Old English Biblical Verse: Studies in Genesis, Exodus and Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (2005), 'Aldhelm as Old English Poet: Exodus, Asser, and the Dicta Aelfredi', in Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe and Andy Orchard (ed.), *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge* (Toronto, Buffalo, London University of Toronto Press), 90-108.
- Rendall, Thomas (1974), 'Bondage and Freeing from Bondage in Old English Religious Poetry', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 73 (4), 497-512.
- Reuter, Timothy (2000), 'You Can't Take It with You: Testaments, Hoards and Moveable Wealth in Europe, 600-1100', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Treasure in the Medieval West* (York: York Medieval Press), 11-24.

- Reynolds, Susan (1991), 'Bookland, Folkland and Fiefs', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 14, 211-27.
- Ritter, Marie A. (1973), 'The Angles and the Angels: A Study in the Correlation Between the Christian Doctrine of Spirits and the Aesthetics of the Anglo-Saxon Poems Genesis A and B, and Christ I and II ', PhD Thesis (University of Notre Dame).
- Robinson, Fred C. (1985), *Beowulf and the Appositive Style* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press).
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. (2002), 'Worrying About Emotions in History', *The American Historical Review*, 107 (3), 821-45.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. and Little, Lester K. (1974), 'Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities', *Past & Present*, (63), 4-32.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. (1999), *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Ross, Margaret Clunies (1985), 'Concubinage in Anglo-Saxon England', *Past & Present*, (108), 3-34.
- Sawyer, Peter et al. (2013), 'The Electronic Sawyer', <<http://www.esawyer.org.uk/about/index.html%3E>>.
- Sawyer, Peter H. (1968), *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography* (Online edn., Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks; London: Royal Historical Society).
- Schmid, Reinhold (1858), *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen In der Ursprache mit Übersetzung* (2 edn.; Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus).
- Scragg, Donald C. (1986), 'The Nature of Old English Verse', in Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 55-70.

- Sedgefield, W. J. (1923), *Specimens of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (Edinburgh).
- (1931), 'Review: The Junius Manuscript by George Philip Krapp', *Modern Language Review*, XXVI, 352-5.
- Shippey, T. A. (1980), 'Review: Exodus by P.J. Lucas', *The Modern Language Review*, 75 (3), 616-18.
- Sievers, Eduard (1875), *Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis* (Halle A. S: M. Niemeyer) 49 p.
- Sisam, Kenneth (1953a), 'Dialect Origins of the Earlier Old English Verse', *Studies in the History of Old English literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 119-39.
- (1953b), *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Sleeth, Charles R. (1982), *Studies in Christ and Satan* (Toronto: University of Toronto).
- Smith, Scott Thompson (2013), *Land and Book: Literature and Land Tenure in Anglo-Saxon England* (University of Toronto Press).
- Speirs, Nancy (1987), 'The Two Armies of the Old English Exodus: twa þusendo, line 184b, and cista, lines 229b and 230a', *Notes and Queries*, ns-34 (2), 145-46.
- Stafford, Pauline (2006), 'King and kin, Lord and Community', *Gender, Family and the Legitimation of Power* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Stanley, Eric G. (1975), *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism* (Cambridge and Totowa, NJ: D. S. Brewer; Rowman and Littlefield).
- Steiner, Johann Wilhelm Georg (1889), 'Über die Interpolation im angelsächsischen Gedichte "Daniel"', Thesis.
- Stenton, F.M., Sir (1971), *Anglo-Saxon England* (3rd edn., Oxford History of England; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Stoddart, F. H. (1887), 'The Caedmon Poems in MS Junius 11', *Anglia*, 10, 157—67.
- Tamburr, K. (2007), *The Harrowing of Hell in Medieval England* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer).
- Thorpe, B. (1844, reprinted by Johnson Reprint Corporation 1971), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church - Sermones catholici or Homilies of Ælfric* (I and II; London: Ælfric Society).
- Thorpe, B. and Rogers, B. (1832), *Caedmon's Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures With an English Translation, Notes, and a Verbal Index* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London).
- Thorpe, B. (ed.), (1844 repr. 1971), *The Homilies of Anglo-Saxon Church - Sermones catholici or Homilies of Ælfric* (I and II; London: Ælfric Society).
- Thundy, Zacharias P. (1980), 'Afrisc Meowle and the Old English Exodus', *Neophilologus*, 64 (2), 297-306.
- Timmer, Benno J. (1948), *The Later Genesis* (Oxford: Scrivner Press).
- Trahern, Joseph B. (1975), 'More Scriptural Echoes in the Old English Exodus', in L.E. Nicholson and D.W. Frese (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation for John C. McGalliard* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame: University Press), 291-8.
- Trask, Richard M. (1973), 'Doomsday Imagery in the Old English Exodus', *Neophilologus*, 57 (3), 295-97.
- Turner, G. I. (1933), 'Bookland and Folkland', in I. G. Edwards (ed.), *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait* (Manchester), 357-86.
- Tyler, Elizabeth M. (2000), "'When Wings Incarnadine with Gold Are Spread': the Vita Ædwardi Regis and the Display of Treasure at the Court of Edward the Confessor", *Treasure in the Medieval West* 83-107.

- (2006), *Old English Poetics: The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England* (York: York Medieval Press).
- Ulmschneider, Katharina (2000), *Markets, Minsters, and Metal-Detectors: The Archaeology of Middle Saxon Lincolnshire and Hampshire Compared* (BAR British Series; Oxford: Archaeopress).
- Vickrey, Charles V. (1972), 'Exodus and the Battle in the Sea', *Traditio*, 28, 119-40.
- (1973), 'Exodus and the Tenth Plague', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 210, 41-52.
- (1975), 'Exodus' and the 'Herba Humilis', *Traditio*, 31, 25-54.
- Vickrey, John F. (1971), 'The "Micel Wundor of Genesis B"', *Studies in Philology*, 68 (3), 245-54.
- (1972), 'Exodus and the Treasure of Pharaoh', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1 (1), 159-65.
- (1989), 'Exodus' and the Robe of Joseph', *Studies in Philology*, 86 (1), 1-17.
- (1993), 'Adam, Eve, and the Tacen in Genesis B', *Philological Quarterly*, 72 (1), 1-14.
- Vinogradoff, Paul (1893), 'Folkland', *The English Historical Review*, VIII (XXIX), 1-17.
- (1908), *English Society in the Eleventh Century; Essays in English Mediaeval History* (Oxford: The Clarendon press).
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. (1971), *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent: the Ford lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term 1970* (Ford Lectures; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Wareham, Andrew (2001), 'The Transformation of Kinship and the Family in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe*, 10 (3), 375-99.

- Weber, Max (1922), 'Die drei reinen Typen der legitimen Herrschaft', *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 187, 1-2.
- (1958), 'The Three Legitimate Types of Rule (transl. by Hans Gerth)', *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions* 4, 1-11.
- Weber, Max, Henderson, Alexander Morell, and Parsons, Talcott (1947), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (New York: Free Press).
- Webster, L. (2000), 'Ideal and Reality: Versions of Treasure in the Early Anglo-Saxon World', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Treasure in the Medieval west* (York: York medieval Press), 49-59.
- Whitelock, Dorothy (1952), *The Beginnings of English Society* (Pelican History of England; Melbourne, London: Penguin Books).
- Wolfram, H. (1971), 'The Shaping of the Early Medieval Kingdom', *Viator*, 1, 11-20.
- Wolf, Rosemary (1972), *The English Mystery Plays* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Wormald, Francis (1945), 'Decorated Initials in English Manuscripts from A.D. 900 to 1100', *Archeologia*, (91), 107-35.
- Wormald, Patrick (1977), 'Lex scripta and verbum regis: Legislation and Germanic Kingship from Euric to Cnut', in P. H. Sawyer and I. N. Wood (eds.), *Early Medieval Kingship* (Leeds: York Medieval Press).
- (1999a), *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- (1999b), *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West: Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London Hambledon).
- (2001), 'On þa Wæpnedhealfe: Kingship and Royal Property from Æthelwulf to Edward the Elder', in N. J. and Hill Higham, D. H. (eds.), *Edward the Elder* (London and New York: Routledge), 264-79.

Wright, Charles D. (1993), *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, Keynes S. and Lapidge M. (eds.) (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

--- (1996), 'The Blood of Abel and the Branches of Sin: Genesis A, Maxims I and Aldhelm's *Carmen de uirginitate*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 25, 7-19.

Wyatt, David (2009), *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200* (The Northern World; Leiden: Brill).