

The
Text in the
Community

Essays on Medieval Works,
Manuscripts, Authors, and Readers

edited by
**JILL MANN &
MAURA NOLAN**



University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame, Indiana

Copyright © 2006 by University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
www.undpress.nd.edu
All Rights Reserved

Designed by Jane Oslislo
Set in 9.9/13.8 Janson by Four Star Books
Printed in Hong Kong by Kings Time Printing Press, Ltd.

Library of Congress Cataloging in-Publication Data

The text in the community : essays on medieval works, manuscripts,
authors, and readers / edited by Jill Mann and Maura Nolan.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-268-03495-8 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN 0-268-03496-6 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Literature, Medieval—History and criticism. 2. Manuscripts, Medieval—History.

I. Mann, Jill. II. Nolan, Maura.

PN671.T38 2006

809'.02—dc22

2005035128

∞*This book is printed on acid-free paper.*

contents

List of Illustrations vii

List of Contributors xi

Abbreviations List xiii

Acknowledgments xv

Introduction i

MAURA NOLAN

1

Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages ii

MICHAEL LAPIDGE

2

“He Knew Nat Catoun”:
Medieval School-Texts and Middle English Literature 41

JILL MANN

3

Computing Cynewulf: The *Judith*-Connection 75

ANDY ORCHARD

❁ vi ❁
Contents

4

The Contexts of Notre Dame 67 107

A. S. G. EDWARDS

5

The Haunted Text:
Ghostly Reflections in *A Mirror to Devout People* 129

VINCENT GILLESPIE

6

The Visual Environment of Carthusian Texts:
Decoration and Illustration in Notre Dame 67 173

JESSICA BRANTLEY

7

The Knight and the Rose:
French Manuscripts in the Notre Dame Library 217

MAUREEN BOULTON

8

*The Meditations on the Life of Christ: An Illuminated Fourteenth-Century
Italian Manuscript at the University of Notre Dame* 237

DIANNE PHILLIPS

Index of Manuscripts 283

General Index 287

list of illustrations

PLATE 1. Scrope/Chaworth coat of arms (University of Notre Dame, MS 67, f. 11r). Reproduced from the original held by the Department of Special Collections of the University Libraries of Notre Dame. 8

PLATE 2. Virgin and Child and St. John (University of Notre Dame, MS 67, f. 108r). Reproduced from the original held by the Department of Special Collections of the University Libraries of Notre Dame. 9

PLATE 3. Recumbent figure and bishop (University of Notre Dame, MS 67, f. 109v). Reproduced from the original held by the Department of Special Collections of the University Libraries of Notre Dame. 10

FIG. 2.1. University of Notre Dame, MS 6, ff. 5v–6r. Reproduced from the original held by the Department of Special Collections of the University Libraries of Notre Dame. 45

FIG. 2.2. University of Notre Dame, MS 6, ff. 6v–7r. Reproduced from the original held by the Department of Special Collections of the University Libraries of Notre Dame. 46

FIG. 2.3. University of Notre Dame, MS 6, ff. 7v–8r. Reproduced from the original held by the Department of Special Collections of the University Libraries of Notre Dame. 47

FIG. 6.1. A Carthusian mourner from the tomb of Philip the Bold, made for the Charterhouse of Champmol, Dijon (France). Detail from Claus Sluter, Claus de Werve, and Jean de Marville, *Tombeau de Phillippe le Hardi*. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dijon (France). Photograph © Musée des Beaux-Arts de Dijon. 178

❧ viii ❧
List of Illustrations

FIG. 6.2. Jean de Beaumetz, French, active 1361–died 1396. *The Crucifixion with a Carthusian Monk*, 1390–1395. Tempera and gold on wood, 56.6 x 45.7 cm. © The Cleveland Museum of Art, 2004. Leonard C. Hanna, Jr. Fund, 1964.454. **180**

FIG. 6.3. Dom Benedict Lambres praying at the oratory in his cell in the second Great cloister of the Charterhouse of Farneta, in 1949. Printed by permission of Jan de Grauwe. **183**

FIG. 6.4. Detail of the *Couronnement de la Vierge*. Enguerrand Quarton. Retable painted for the Charterhouse of Villeneuve-lès-Avignon. Musée de l'Hospice, Villeneuve-les-Avignon, France. **184**

FIG. 6.5. St. Bruno leaving the city for the wilderness. *Belles Heures of Jean, Duke of Berry*, f. 95v. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Cloisters Collection, 1954. **188**

FIG. 6.6. Frontispiece narrating the foundation of the Carthusian Order. *Statuta Ordinis Cartusiensis* (Bâle, 1510). British Library shelfmark 704.h.21. Reproduced by permission of The British Library. **190**

FIG. 6.7. Carthusians and the vision of the Seven Stars. London, British Library, MS Additional 25042, ff. 10v and 11r. Reproduced by permission of The British Library. **191**

FIG. 6.8. “Debate for the Soul.” London, British Library, MS Additional 37049, f. 19r. Reproduced by permission of The British Library. **193**

FIG. 6.9. *Querela divina-Responsio humana*; with Christ, wounded heart, and praying layman. London, British Library, MS Additional 37049, f. 20r. Reproduced by permission of The British Library. **195**

FIG. 6.10. *Querela divina*; with Christ, wounded heart, and praying Carthusian monk. London, British Library, MS Additional 37049, f. 24r. Reproduced by permission of The British Library. **196**

FIG. 6.11. Death with bell and spear. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 322, f. 19v. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. **197**

FIG. 6.12. Deathbed scene. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 322, f. 27r. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. **199**

FIG. 6.13. *Nova statuta Angliae*. London, Public Record Office E 164/10, f. 44r. Reproduced by permission of the National Archives, Kew. **202**

❁ ix ❁
List of Illustrations

FIG. 6.14. Nicholas Love, *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*. Glasgow, University Library, MS Hunter 77 (T.3.15), f. 3v. Reproduced from Glasgow University Library, Department of Special Collections. 203

FIG. 8.1. Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 42 inf., f. 159r. Used by permission of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. 242

FIG. 8.2. Opening miniature: *Christ Enthroned with Kneeling Patrons* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 1r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 244

FIG. 8.3. *Presentation of the 3-year-old Virgin to the Temple* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 5v). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 247

FIG. 8.4. *Visitation* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 10v). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 248

FIG. 8.5. *Joseph Wishes to Leave Mary* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 12r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 249

FIG. 8.6. *Bathing of the Child* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 15r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 251

FIG. 8.7. *Circumcision of Christ* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 18r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 252

FIG. 8.8. *Adoration of the Magi* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 20r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 253

FIG. 8.9. *Meal at the House of the Magdalen* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 57v). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 255

FIG. 8.10. *Flagellation of Christ* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 76r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 257

FIG. 8.11. *Way to Calvary* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 78r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 258

FIG. 8.12. *The Virgin, Holy Women, and St. John Lamenting* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 80r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. 259

List of Illustrations

FIG. 8.13. *Nailing of Christ to the Cross* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 80v). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. **260**

FIG. 8.14. *Lamentation* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 87r). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. **262**

FIG. 8.15. *Apparition of Christ to James Minor* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 100v). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. **264**

FIG. 8.16. *Christ before Pilate* (University of Notre Dame, Snite Museum of Art, Acc. No. 85.25, f. 74v). Used by permission of the Snite Museum of Art. **266**

list of contributors

MAUREEN BOULTON
University of Notre Dame

JESSICA BRANTLEY
Yale University

A. S. G. EDWARDS
University of Glamorgan

VINCENT GILLESPIE
University of Oxford

MICHAEL LAPIDGE
University of Notre Dame

JILL MANN
University of Notre Dame

MAURA NOLAN
University of California, Berkeley

ANDY ORCHARD
Centre for Medieval Studies, Toronto

DIANNE PHILLIPS
University of Notre Dame

abbreviations list

- CCCM Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis
*DLF*² *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le moyen âge*, ed. Geneviève Hasenohr and Michel Zink, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1992)
- EETS e.s., o.s. Early English Text Society extra series, original series
IMEV *A New Index of Middle English Verse*, Julia Boffey and A. S. G. Edwards (London, 2005)
- IPMEP* *Index of Printed Middle English Prose*, ed. R. E. Lewis, N. F. Blake, and A. S. G. Edwards (New York and London, 1985)
- Jolliffe P. S. Jolliffe, *A Check-list of Middle English Prose Writings of Spiritual Guidance* (Toronto, 1974)
- LALME* *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval England*, ed. Angus McIntosh, M. L. Samuels, and Michael Benskin, 4 vols. (Aberdeen, 1986)
- MED* *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. H. Kurath, S. M. Kuhn, and R. E. Lewis (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1954–2001)
- MGH Monumenta Germaniae Historica
- MVC* *Meditationes Vitae Christi*
- PL* *Patrologia Latina*
- STC* *A Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed 1475–1640*, 2nd. ed., begun by W. A. Jackson and F. S. Ferguson, completed by K. F. Pantzer, 3 vols. (London, 1976–91)
- Walther, *Initia* Hans Walther, *Initia carminum ac versuum mediæ aevi posterioris latinorum* (Göttingen, 1959); *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen* (Göttingen, 1969); subsequent supplements in *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*

acknowledgments

Most of the essays in this volume were delivered as papers at an inaugural conference entitled “Medieval Manuscripts at Notre Dame,” which took place at the University of Notre Dame from 13 September to 15 September 2001. Thanks go not only to our speakers and conference members, but also to Harriet Baldwin of the Center for Continuing Education, who helped to organize the event; to Christian Dupont for organizing the accompanying manuscript exhibition in the Hesburgh Library; to Sarah Weber for producing visual CD-ROMs; and to Gail Hinchion-Mancini for handling publicity. We are also grateful to our generous sponsors at the University of Notre Dame: the Office of the Provost, the Graduate School, the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts, the Medieval Institute, the Department of English, the Devers Program in Dante Studies, and the Center for Continuing Education. Finally, we should like to thank Matt Dowd for his meticulous and intelligent copyediting of this volume.



Computing Cynewulf

The *Judith*-Connection

ANDY ORCHARD

SCHOLARS OF OLD ENGLISH HAVE FOR MORE THAN FOUR DECADES been generally both keen and able to use computers in their work,¹ and indeed the speed of technological development has been such that even surveys of such computational tools produced less than ten years ago can now seem distinctly dated.² Within that period, there has been a huge level of increased activity associated with the World Wide Web, and scholars of Anglo-Saxon England now have a vast and bewildering array of electronic tools at their disposal.³ Quite apart from the proliferation of more or less well-informed discussion-groups and the possibility of almost instantaneous communication with colleagues and students all over the world,⁴ the modern scholar has access to a huge range of electronic manuscript facsimiles,⁵ machine-readable corpora, bibliographies, sound-files, texts, and hyper-texts,⁶ as well as a plethora of online databases and other ongoing research-projects.⁷ The widespread availability of a combination of machine-readable texts and electronic concordance-packages has likewise made the generation of customized concordances of individual texts, authors, or groups of

texts quick and efficient, thereby hugely facilitating the process of textual comparison.⁸

Meanwhile, the past half-century has seen a similar revolution in the perception of Old English verse, with an ever-increasing focus on putative techniques of composition. Although the essentially formulaic nature of much of the surviving literature from Anglo-Saxon England has long been noted, attempts to assess the frequency, type, distribution, and purpose of such formulas have generally been too narrowly focussed to be of wide or lasting significance. The study of formulas, begun in the late nineteenth century to demonstrate conscious literary borrowing from one author to another,⁹ paradoxically became after 1953 the tool used to demonstrate an inherited “oral-formulaic” tradition in Old English verse.¹⁰ Since then, it has been comprehensively demonstrated that Anglo-Saxons from literate backgrounds (and composing in Latin) were also capable of producing highly formulaic texts,¹¹ and the close study of formulas has in general been relegated to the critical backwater. However, the use of machine-readable texts, computer-generated concordances, and electronic databases now offers the modern critic an opportunity to examine the formulas in Anglo-Saxon literature at a level and intensity previously unfeasible, and has effectively revitalized the whole issue of addressing the possibility of the direct influence of one Old English poem or poet on another in a much more comprehensive way than ever before.¹²

Some direct connection between *Beowulf* and *Andreas* is perhaps still the most strongly asserted, most recently in a connected series of doctoral dissertations by Anita Riedinger, Carol Hughes Funk, and Alison Powell.¹³ In the course of her work, based on a detailed comparison of formulaic phrasing derived from customized computer-generated concordances, Powell in particular gives details and analyses of nearly ninety parallels unique in the extant poetic corpus to *Beowulf* and *Andreas*, and nearly 150 unique to *Andreas* and Cynewulf.¹⁴ For the *Andreas*-poet at least, we seem more and more able to track down “the tradition” within which he worked. The suggested connection to Cynewulf is all the more interesting in that there is also a substantial amount of evidence linking *Andreas* to *Guthlac B*, the poem (presently unsigned but lacking a conclusion) that seems most likely also to have been composed by Cynewulf.¹⁵ Both the Vercelli Book (Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS CXVII), which contains the signed poems

Fates of the Apostles and *Elene*, as well as *Andreas*, and the Exeter Book (Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3501), which contains the signed poems *Christ II* and *Juliana*, as well as *Guthlac B*, have clear links with Cynewulf. Such widespread influence should perhaps encourage further speculation about the extent to which Cynewulf can be connected with the other two surviving major codices containing Old English verse, namely the Junius Manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11) and the *Beowulf* manuscript (London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius A.xv). In fact, although several earlier scholars (notably Claes Schaar) had argued that Cynewulf was influenced both by *Beowulf* and several of the biblical poems of the Junius Manuscript,¹⁶ widespread early acceptance of the implications of the so-called “oral-formulaic” theory (namely that there once existed a large body of now lost Old English verse, composed using a common stock of traditional formulas) effectively curtailed all discussion of direct links between individual poems. It is striking to note the extent to which (for example) editions produced before and after the watershed year of 1953 treat parallel phrasing in different poems.¹⁷

A test-case for an assessment of the significance of verbal overlap between poems is provided by the verbal parallels that link *Judith* (in the *Beowulf* manuscript) and *Elene* (in the Vercelli Book). Both poems are clearly the works of literate poets, to the extent that both rely more or less heavily on identifiable Latin sources, but both nonetheless are demonstrably “formulaic,” and evidently rely on traditional techniques of composition.¹⁸ The overall differences in style and diction between *Judith* and *Elene*, moreover, are such as to preclude the possibility of common authorship.¹⁹ A strong case can be made, however, for a more specific connection between the two poems than a series of common selections from a shared pool of traditional diction might imply. With the aid of a computer-generated concordance, it is possible to identify every single example of parallel phrasing between *Judith* and *Elene* extending the length of a half-line or more.²⁰ There are in fact some thirty-three such examples, which can be presented as follows:

- [1] *Jud* 5 gefriðode, frymða waldend. Hyre ðæs *fæder on roderum*
 Ele 1150 gefullæste, *fæder on roderum*
- [2] *Jud* 10 ealle ða yldestan ðegnas; hie ðæt *ofstum miclum*
 Jud 70 ut of ðam inne *ofstum miclum*

- Ele* 44 under earhfære *ofstum myclum*
Ele 102 geiewed wearð, *ofstum myclum*
Ele 999 *ofstum myclum* eft gearwian
- [3] *Jud* 13 þæs ðe Iudith hyne, *gleaw on geðonce*
Ele 806 Iudas mapelode, *gleaw in gepance*
- [4] *Jud* 22 *goldwine gumena*, on gytesalum
Ele 201 *goldwine gumena* in godes þeowdom
- [5] *Jud* 30 swiðmod *sinces brytta*, oðþæt hie on swiman lagon
Ele 194 Ða wæs on sælum *sinces brytta*
- [6] *Jud* 41 *fundon ferhðgleawe*, ond ða fromlice
Ele 327 *fundon ferhðgleawra*, þa þe fyrngemynd
- [7] *Jud* 49 mihte wlitan þurh, *wigena baldor*
Ele 344 ond þæt word gecwæþ *wigona baldor*
- [8] *Jud* 60 geðafian, *þrymmes byrde*, ac he him þæs ðinges gestyrde
Ele 348 *þrymmes byrde*; þanon ic ne wende
Ele 858 geprowode, *þrymmes byrde*
- [9] *Jud* 62 galferhð *gumena ðreate*
Ele 254 hwonne heo sio guðcwen *gumena þreate*
Ele 1095 Glædmod eode *gumena þreate*
- [10] *Jud* 67 wunode under *wolcna brofe*. Gefeoł ða wine swa druncen
Ele 89 wliti wuldres treo ofer *wolcna brof*
- [11] *Jud* 81 *be naman nemnan*, nergend ealra
Ele 78 ond *be naman nemde*, (nihthelm toglađ)
- [12] *Jud* 82 woruldbuendra, ond þæt word acwæð
Jud 151 þurh ðæs wealles geat, ond þæt word acwæð
Jud 283 ond þæt word acwæð to ðam wiggendum
Ele 1071 onwrige wuldorgifum, ond þæt word acwæð
- [13] *Jud* 83 *Ic ðe, frymða god* ond frofre gæst
Jud 189 fisan to gefeohte. *Syððan frymða god*

- Ele* 345 *Ic frumþa god* fore sceawode
Ele 502 folca to frofre, *syððan him frymða god*
- [14] *Jud* 83 *Ic ðe, frymða god* ond *frofre gæst*
Ele 1036 fæst on ferhðe, *siððan frofre gast*
Ele 1105 fæder, *frofre gast*, ðurh fyres bleo
- [15] *Jud* 84 *bearn alwaldan, biddan wylle*
Jud 187 þyssa burgleoda *biddan wylle*
Ele 789 þurg þæt beorhte gesceap *biddan wille*
Ele 813 Nu ic þe, *bearn godes, biddan wille*
- [16] *Jud* 86 *ðrynesse ðrym.* Pearle ys me nu ða
Ele 177 in *þrynesse þrymme* geweorðad
- [17] *Jud* 95 ædre mid elne onbryrde, swa he deð *anra gebwylcne*
Ele 1287 in fyres feng folc *anra gebwylc*
- [18] *Jud* 118 *þystrum forðylmed,* þæt he ðonan mote
Ele 766 *þeostrum forþylmed.* He þinum wiðsoc
- [19] *Jud* 134 oðþæt hie becomon, *collenferbðe*
Ele 247 *collenferbðe,* cwen siðes gefeah
Ele 378 *collenferbðe,* swa him sio cwen bead
Ele 848 *collenferbðe.* Cwen weorces gefeah
- [20] *Jud* 155 *cyninga wuldor;* þæt gecyðed *wearð*
Ele 5 acenned *wearð,* *cyninga wuldor*
Ele 178 acenned *wearð,* *cyninga wuldor*
- [21] *Jud* 155 *cyninga wuldor;* *þæt gecyðed wearð*
Ele 1049 *Criste gecweme. Þæt gecyðed wearð*
- [22] *Jud* 169 *eft to eðle,* ond ða ofostlice
Ele 1219 *eft to eðle,* ond þa eallum bebead
- [23] *Jud* 203 *hælēð* under helmum, of ðære *haligan byrig*
Ele 1005 *hælēð* hwætmode, to þære *halgan byrig*
Ele 1053 *hælēða* gerædum to þære *halgan byrig*
Ele 1203 *hælēða* cynnes, to þære *halgan byrig*

- [24] *Jud* 206 *wulf* in *walde*, ond se wanna hrefn
Ele 28 *wulf* on *wealde*, wælrune ne mað
- [25] *Jud* 210 *earn* ætes georn, *urigfēðera*
Ele 29 *Urigfēðera* *earn* sang ahof
Ele 111 *urigfēðra*, *earn* sið beheold
- [26] *Jud* 221 leton forð fleogan *flana scuras*
Ele 117 On þæt fæge folc *flana scuras*
- [27] *Jud* 222 *bildenædran*, of hornbogan
Ele 119 hetend heorugrimme, *bildenædran*
Ele 141 *bildenædran*. Heap wæs gescyrded
- [28] *Jud* 237 *ebton elðeoda* ealle þrage
Ele 139 *ebton elþeoda* oð þæt æfen forð
- [29] *Jud* 280 *lifes belidenne*. He þa lungre gefeoll
Ele 877 *life belidenes* lic on eorðan
- [30] *Jud* 310 *lāðan* cynnes. *Lythwon becom*
Ele 142 *lāðra* lindwered. *Lythwon becwom*
- [31] *Jud* 326 to ðære beorhtan byrig, Bethuliam
Ele 821 in þære beorhtan byrig, þær is broðor min
- [32] *Jud* 336 *eorlas æscrofe*, Holofernes
Ele 275 *eorlas æscrofe* mid þa æðelan cwen
- [33] *Jud* 344 *sigorlean in swegles* wuldre, þæs þe heo ahte soðne geleafan
Ele 623 *sigorlean in swegle*, saga ricene me

While several of these parallels are certainly more striking than others, the degree of overlap seems notable in several ways. Some thirty-six lines of *Judith* (or a little over 10 percent) apparently contain parallels with *Elene*, and in two cases both half-lines of verses in *Judith* can be matched in *Elene*.²¹ From the alternative perspective, some forty-eight lines of *Elene* (or about 3.5 percent) apparently contain parallels with *Judith*. Such figures are of themselves of little value, but when these parallels are measured against the entire surviving corpus of Old English poetry, a rather more intriguing picture begins to emerge.

No fewer than eleven of the thirty-three parallels highlighted here are in fact uniquely shared by these two poems within the extant corpus,²² and a further two are paralleled elsewhere only among other signed poems of Cynewulf.²³ In another nine cases, the parallels are found outside *Judith* and the signed poems of Cynewulf in only one other poem each (and one of the other poems in question, *Guthlac B*, has in fact a good claim to be considered also written by Cynewulf).²⁴ Even in the case of the remaining parallels, it is striking the extent to which the phrases in question are found elsewhere largely in the same limited set of poems:²⁵ *Andreas* and *Beowulf* in particular both feature prominently. The frequent overlap in repeated diction between these two poems is perhaps less surprising given that it has been argued not only that the *Andreas*-poet knew and consciously echoed both *Beowulf* and the works of Cynewulf, but that Cynewulf himself knew and consciously echoed *Beowulf*.²⁶ In fact, it might well be concluded from the available evidence that only one of the verbal parallels linking *Judith* and *Elene* has any widespread currency in the extant poetic corpus of Old English, appearing in a further seventeen sources.²⁷

Even if one takes the view that what is important in the context of identifying patterns of formulaic usage is not only precise verbal correlation but also the extent to which similar phrasing can be identified by so-called formulaic “systems,”²⁸ it is surely striking how often the closest parallels within such systems surviving in the extant corpus are again for the most part to be found within the same highly limited set of poems.²⁹ Likewise, it is interesting to note the extent to which the parallels detected here between *Judith* and *Elene* are evidently clustered, a feature which can best be illustrated simply by detailing their distribution in fifty-line sections of each text:³⁰

	<i>No. of ‘unique’ parallels</i>	<i>No. of parallels</i>
<i>Judith</i> 1–50	4	[7]
<i>Judith</i> 51–100	3	[10]
<i>Judith</i> 101–50	1	[2]
<i>Judith</i> 151–200	1	[5]
<i>Judith</i> 201–50	3	[6]
<i>Judith</i> 251–300	1	[2]
<i>Judith</i> 301–50	3	[4]
TOTAL	16	[36]

<i>(cont.)</i>	<i>No. of 'unique' parallels</i>	<i>No. of parallels</i>
<i>Elene</i> 1–50	0	[4]
<i>Elene</i> 51–100	0	[2]
<i>Elene</i> 101–50	5	[7]
<i>Elene</i> 151–200	0	[3]
<i>Elene</i> 201–50	0	[2]
<i>Elene</i> 251–300	2	[2]
<i>Elene</i> 301–50	4	[4]
<i>Elene</i> 351–400	0	[1]
<i>Elene</i> 401–50	0	[0]
<i>Elene</i> 451–500	0	[0]
<i>Elene</i> 501–50	1	[1]
<i>Elene</i> 551–600	0	[0]
<i>Elene</i> 601–50	1	[1]
<i>Elene</i> 651–700	0	[0]
<i>Elene</i> 701–50	0	[0]
<i>Elene</i> 751–800	1	[2]
<i>Elene</i> 801–50	1	[4]
<i>Elene</i> 851–900	1	[1]
<i>Elene</i> 901–50	0	[0]
<i>Elene</i> 951–1000	0	[1]
<i>Elene</i> 1001–1050	0	[3]
<i>Elene</i> 1051–1100	0	[3]
<i>Elene</i> 1101–1150	1	[2]
<i>Elene</i> 1151–1200	0	[0]
<i>Elene</i> 1201–1250	0	[2]
<i>Elene</i> 1251–1300	0	[3]
<i>Elene</i> 1301–1321	0	[0]
TOTAL	17	[48]

In *Judith*, the clustering of these parallels at the beginning of the poem is clear: nearly half of the parallels (whether “unique” or not) appear in the first 100 lines, which describe the feast of Holofernes, the bringing of Judith to his tent, her call for divine aid, and her intention to kill him.³¹ A further cluster occurs in the passage from lines 201–50 (actually 203–37),

which describes a battle between the Jews and the Assyrians in a manner unparalleled in the Vulgate source, and a final cluster occurs in the final lines of the poem (actually 326–44), describing the return of the victorious Jews and praise of Judith. The clustering of parallels in *Elene* seems still more localized, being more or less restricted to one section in lines 101–50 (actually 102–42), describing Constantine’s battle against the Huns, and another in lines 301–50 (actually 327–48), describing how Elene summoned the wisest of the Jews in order to locate the Cross.

The densest passage of overlapping diction occurs in *Judith* just before the eponymous heroine decapitates her would-be rapist, when she somewhat anachronistically prays for strength to the Trinity (parallel phrasing is italicized):³²

Ongan ða swegles weard	80
<i>be naman nemnan,</i> nergend ealra	
woruldbuendra, <i>ond þæt word acwæð:</i>	
“Ic ðe, <i>frymða god</i> ond <i>frofre gæst,</i>	
bearn alwaldan, <i>biddan wylle</i>	
miltse þinre me þearfendre,	85
<i>ðrynesse ðrym.”</i>	

(*Judith* 80b–86)

Then she began to call by name the guardian of glory, the saviour of all those who live in the world, and spoke these words: “I will ask you, God of creation, Spirit of comfort, Child of the Almighty, for your mercy for me in need, the power of the Trinity.”

That fully five of the six lines of this passage should overlap in diction with *Elene* is surely striking, the more so since their diction is so obviously not drawn from the Old Testament source. While the Vulgate certainly has Judith pray at this point, there is of course no reference to the Trinity; the parallel passage simply notes “And Judith stood before the bed praying with tears, and the motion of her lips in silence, Saying: Strengthen me, O Lord God of Israel” (“Stetitque Iudith ante lectum orans cum lacrimis et labiorum motu in silentio dicens confirma me Domine Deus Israhel” [Judith 13:6–7]). Although none of the six parallels in these five lines is

Holofernus. Þær wæs eallgylden
 fleohnet fæger ymbe þæs folctogan
 bed ahongen, þæt se bealofulla
 mihte wlitan þurh, *wigena baldor*,
 on æghwylcne þe ðær inne com 50
 hælēða bearna, ond on hyne nænig
 monna cynnes, nymðe se modiga hwæne
 niðe rofra him þe near hete
 rinca to rune gegangan. Hie ða on reste gebrohton
 snude ða snoteran idese; eodon ða stercedferhðe, 55
 hælēð heora hearran cyðan þæt wæs seo halige meowle
 gebroht on his burgetelde. Þa wearð se brema on mode
 bliðe, burga ealdor, þohte ða beorhtan idese
 mid wile ond mid womme besmitan. Ne wolde þæt wuldres dema
 geðafian, *prymmes hyrde*, ac he him þæs ðinges gestyrde, 60
 dryhten, dugeða waldend. Gewat ða se deofulcunda,
 galferhð *gumena ðreate*,
 bealofull his beddes neosan, þær he sceolde his blæd forleosan
 ædre binnan anre nihte.

(*Judith* 37b-64a)

They quickly acted, the retainers, as their lord commanded them, the leader of mail-shirted warriors: they advanced in tumult to the guest-house, where they found Judith, wise in spirit, and then promptly the shield-warriors began to lead that shining woman to the high pavilion, wherein the powerful one always rested for the night, the one hateful to the Savior, Holofernes. There was a beautiful fly-net, all-golden, hung around the commander's bed, so that the evil one, the prince of warriors, might look through on each of the children of men who came therein, but none of mankind on him, unless the proud one ordered some battle-brave person of his men to step closer for consultation. They quickly brought to his bed the wise lady; then the stout-hearted men went to tell their leader that the holy woman had been brought to his private chamber. Then was the famous one happy in his heart, the prince of cities; he thought to besmirch that

frod fyrnweota, fæder Salomones,
ond þæt word gecwæp wigona baldor:
 ‘Ic frumþa god fore sceawode, 345
 sigora dryhten; he on gesyhðe wæs,
 mægena wealdend, min on þa swiðran,
þrymmes byrde; þanon ic ne wende
 æfre to aldre onsion mine.’”

(*Elene* 326–49)

Then they found in a crowd a thousand men wise in spirit, who most readily among the Jews knew ancient tradition; then they thronged in a crowd to where the emperor’s kinswoman waited in might on a royal throne, a magnificent warrior-queen adorned with gold. Elene made a speech and spoke before the men: “Hear, you wise in heart, holy mysteries, words and wisdom; listen, you have received the teachings of the prophets, how the giver of life would be born in the guise of a child, the ruler of powers about whom Moses sang, and the guardian of Israel spoke these words: ‘There shall be born unto you a boy in secret, glorious in power, whose mother shall not be made great in increase through a man’s love;’ about whom King David, the wise ancient prophet, father of Solomon, chanted a lordly song, and the prince of warriors spoke these words: ‘I beheld before the God of creation, Lord of victories he was in that vision, the ruler of powers, on my right-hand side, the shepherd of splendour; from there I did not ever turn my face.’”

It is surely noteworthy that the three half-lines these two passages share should occur in precisely the same order in each (*fundon ferbðgleawra . . . wigona baldor . . . þrymmes byrde* in *Elene*; *fundon ferbðgleawe . . . wigena baldor . . . þrymmes byrde* in *Judith*), and that the first two of these parallels should be found uniquely in these two passages in the extant corpus. One might also note the overlap between the opening of Elene’s address here (*ond þæt word gecwæp . . . Ic frumþa god*, *Elene* 344a and 345a) and Judith’s prayer before decapitating Holofernes, cited above (*ond þæt word acwæð / Ic . . . frymða god*, *Judith* 82b–83a),³⁹ as well as the curious circumstance that

Elene's speech begins with a fourfold invocation of God in clearly parallel phrasing (*frumþa god . . . sigora dryhten . . . mægena wealdend . . . þrymmes byrde*, *Elene* 345a, 346a, 347a, and 348a) that bears more than a passing resemblance to a similar fourfold invocation of God in the parallel passage in *Judith* (*wuldres dema . . . þrymmes byrde . . . dryhten, dugeða waldend, Judith*, 59b, 60a, and 61a). Unless one is to posit the existence of an oral-formulaic "summoning of Jews" theme that happens to be attested only in these two poems in the extant corpus, one must surely suppose that there is a direct link between *Elene* and *Judith*, albeit that they are clearly composed by different poets and survive in different manuscripts.

The direction of borrowing seems to be indicated by the fact that whereas the extended details of the summoning of Judith to Holofernes' tent (as with the references to the Trinity in *Judith* cited above) are not found in the Vulgate, there does seem a basis in Cynewulf's Latin source for the relatively elaborate description of the summoning of the wise Jews in *Elene*. An immediate difficulty, however, is the problem of identifying precisely what Cynewulf's Latin source might have been: Michael Lapidge's recent work on identifying a Latin source-text for Cynewulf's *Juliana* closer than any found so far has highlighted the difficulties implicit in any such analysis.⁴⁰ All critics agree that *Elene* is based on some version of the *Inuentio Crucis* legend, usually referred to as the *Acta Cyriaci*,⁴¹ but recent scholarship has shown just how complex was the transmission of that text.⁴² Nonetheless, all versions of the *Inuentio Crucis* contain a description of the summoning of the wise Jews that must underlie Cynewulf's rendering. The most widely circulating version of the relevant passage reads as follows:⁴³

Inuenerunt qui dicebant se scire legem, uiros numero mille. Et adducentes eos ad beatam Helenam statuerunt testimonium perhibentes eos legis scientiam multam habere. Helena autem dixit ad ipsos: "Audite mea uerba et auribus percipite meos sermones. Non enim intellexistis in sermonibus prophetarum, quemadmodum prophetauerunt de aduentu Christi? Pro hoc ergo uos hodie interrogo. Quia prior Moyses dixit quia: 'Puer nascetur et mater eius uirum non cognoscat.' Et iterum laudationum conscriptor David: 'Praeuidebam Dominum in conspectu meo semper, quoniam a dextris meis est, ut non commouear.'"

They found men who said that they knew the law, a thousand in number. And leading them to Saint Helena, they made their case, bearing witness that they had great knowledge of the law. But Helena said to them: “Hear my words and receive my declarations in your ears. For have you not understood in the declarations of the prophets, how they prophesied about the coming of Christ? Therefore I ask you for this thing today. Because first Moses said that: ‘A boy will be born and his mother will not know a man.’ And again David, the author of adulations: ‘I always saw the Lord before me in my sight, for he is on my right, so that I may not be moved.’”

Variant readings in the critical apparatus are in some cases undoubtedly closer to what Cynewulf must have had before him: one tenth-century manuscript (Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. perg. 91) apparently has Moses be more specific about the boy who is to be born, saying that *Puer uobis in secreto nascebatur* (“A boy was born to you in secret”), and such a reading (but with the tense of the verb in the future, as elsewhere) surely underlies Cynewulf’s assertion that *Eow acenned bið cniht on degle* (*Elene* 339: “A boy will be born to you in secret”). But whatever the precise Latin source, it remains unquestionable that, whereas Cynewulf was working directly from such a Latin text in crafting this passage, the parallel passage from *Judith* has no such extensive and obvious direct Latin source. Surely the likeliest explanation for the overlapping diction between *Judith* and *Elene* at this point, including parallel half-lines unique in the extant corpus and appearing in the same order, is that the *Judith*-poet has in this case been directly influenced by *Elene*.

Certainly, another pair of parallel passages in *Judith* and *Elene* strongly suggests the notion of a direct connection between the two texts. Both poems famously contain extended battle-sequences that represent considerable expansion of material in their respective Latin sources, and therefore in each case the poet is thrown back on his own resources, as well as, one might argue, on “the tradition.”⁴⁴ The passage from *Judith* is briefer, and might be quoted first (layout mine):

Pa wearð snelra werod snude gegearewod,
cenra to campe.

Stopon cynerofe 200
 secgas ond gesiðas, bæron sigepufas,
 foron to gefeohte forð on gerihte,
 hælēð under helmum, of ðære haligan byrig
 on ðæt dægred sylf.

Dynedan scildas,
 hlude hlummon. Pæs se hlanca gefeah 205
 wulf in walde, ond se wanna hrefn,
 wælgifre fugel. Wistan begen
 þæt him ða þeodguman þohton tilian
 fylle on fægum; ac him fleah on last
 earn ætes georn, urigfēðera, 210
 salowigpada sang hildeleoð,
 hynrednebbā.

Stopon heaðorincas,
 beornas to beadowe, bordum beðeahhte,
 hwealfum lindum, þa ðe hwile ær
 eðeodigra edwit þoledon, 215
 hæðenra hosp. Him þæt hearde wearð
 æt ðam æscplegan eallum forgolden,
 Assyrium, syððan Ebreas
 under guðfanum gegān hæfdon
 to ðam fyrdwicum.

Hie ða fromlice 220
 leton forð fleogan flana scuras,
 hildenædran, of hornbogan,
 strælas stedehearde; styrmdon hlude
 grame guðfrecan, garas sendon
 in heardra gemang. Hælēð wæron yrre, 225
 landbuende, laðum cyne.

Stopon stýrnmode, stercedferhðe,
 wrehton unsofte ealdgeniðlan
 medowerige; mundum brugdon
 scealcas of sceaðum scirmæled swyrd, 230

ecgum gecoste, slogon eornoste
Assiria oretmæcgas,
niðhycgende, nanne ne sparedon
þæs herefolces, heanne ne ricne,
cwicera manna þe hie ofercuman mihton. 235

Swa ða magoþegnas on ða morgentid
ehton eþeoda ealle þrage,
oðþæt ongeaton ða ðe grame wæron,
ðæs herefolces heafodweardas,
þæt him swyrdgeswing swiðlic eowdon 240
weras Ebrisce.

(*Judith* 199–241a)

Then a troop of eager ones was quickly prepared, keen for battle; the very brave ones advanced, men and retainers, bore victory-banners; they went to the fight, straight ahead, heroes under helmets, from that holy stronghold, at the very break of day. Shields clattered, resounded loud. At that the lean wolf in the wood rejoiced, and the dark raven, carrion-keen bird; they both knew that those mighty men thought to supply them with their fill of the fey; but there flew in their wake an eagle eager for food, dewy-feathered; the dark-coated one sang a war-song, the one with horned beak. The battle-troops advanced, warriors to the fray, protected by bucklers, hollow shields, those who previously had endured the scorn of foreigners, the heathens' contempt. That was harshly paid back to them at the ash-play, to all the Assyrians, after the Jews under war-banners had reached the encampment. Then they promptly let fly forth showers of darts, battle-adders from horn bows, firm-fixed arrows. They stormed loud, the fierce war-fighters, sent spears into the throng of the hard ones. The warriors were angry, the land's inhabitants, with the hostile race; they advanced stern-hearted, resolute in spirit; they woke up unsoftly the ancient enemies, weary from drinking. With their hands the troops drew from their sheaths the brightly decorated swords, trusty of edge, slew the Assyrian warriors,

evil-schemers. They spared none of that army, high or low, of living men that they could overcome. So those noble thegns throughout the morning pursued the foreigners the whole time, until that army's body-guards, those who were fierce, perceived that the Jewish men mightily showed them sword-strokes.

The battle-scene itself has only the mildest warrant in the Scriptural source.⁴⁵ The first half (lines 199–220a), detailing the preparations for battle, can perhaps be seen as an imaginative elaboration of Judith 14:7 (“Mox autem ut ortus est dies, suspenderunt super muros caput Holofernis, accepitque unusquisque vir arma sua, et egressi sunt cum grandi strepitu et ululatu.” [“And immediately at break of day, they hung up the head of Holofernes upon the walls, and every man took his arms, they went out with a great noise and shouting.”]). The second half of the scene (lines 220b–241a) has no grounding in the Vulgate whatsoever.⁴⁶ The passage from *Judith* is widely celebrated for its use of incremental repetition,⁴⁷ the anaphoric repetition of key words or phrases to mark off successive phases of a narrative, as seen in *Beowulf* in the famous description of Grendel's approach to Heorot (*com . . . com . . . com* [he came . . . he came . . . he came]) in the same manuscript.⁴⁸ Here, successive verse-paragraphs begin with the finite verb *stopon* + compound (for example, *stopon cynerofe* [the royally brave ones advanced], line 200b; *stopon beaðorincas* [the battle-warriors advanced], line 212b; *stopon styrynmode* [the stern-hearted ones advanced], line 227a); only the last of this group carries the main alliteration, and the continued use of compounds (*stercedferhðe . . . ealdgeniðlan . . . medowerige*) underlines the force of expression at this peak of the battle.⁴⁹ The fact that four of these compounds should be packed together in a single dense passage of only two-and-a-half lines (lines 227–29a), and that two of the three compounds combined in the *stopon . . . stopon . . . stopon* sequence should be repeated elsewhere in *Judith*, seems to indicate that their disposition here is both deliberate and artful,⁵⁰ so rendering their repetition elsewhere in the corpus in a distinctly limited range of poems (with *Andreas* again prominent) all the more intriguing.⁵¹

When one compares this passage from *Judith* with the matching battle-scene from *Elene*, a number of parallels emerge. Half-lines unique in the extant corpus to these two passages are given in bold italics, overlapping words

and phrases are given in italics only; significant repetitions within the passage itself are indicated by underlining:

Heht þa onlice æðelinga hleo,
beorna beaggifa, swa he þæt beacen geseah, 100
heria hildfruma, þæt him on heofonum ær
geiewed wearð, ofstum myclum,
Constantinus, Cristes rode,
tireadig cyning, tacen gewyrcan.

Heht þa on uhtan mid ærdæge 105
wigend wreccan, ond wæpenþræce
hebban heorucumbul, ond þæt halige treo
him beforan ferian *on feonda gemang*,
beran beacen godes.

Byman *sungon*
blude for hergum. *Hrefn* weorces *gefeah*, 110
urigfeðra, ***earn*** sið beheold,
wælhreowra wig. *Wulf sang* ahof,
holtes gehleða. *Hildegese* stod.

Þær wæs borda gebrec ond beorna geþrec,
heard handgeswing ond herga gring, 115
syððan heo earhfære ærest metton.
On þæt fæge folc ***flana scuras***,
garas ofer geolorand *on gramra gemang*,
hetend heorugrimme, ***bildenædran***,
þurh fingra geweald *forð onsendan*. 120

Stoþon stiðhidige, stundum wræcon,
bræcon bordhreðan, bil in dufan,
þrungon þræchearde. Þa wæs þuf hafen.
segn for sweotum, sigeleoð galen.
Gylden grima, garas lixtan 125
on herefelda. Hæðene grungon,
feollon friðelease. Flugon instæpes

Huna leode, wa þæt halige treo
aræran heht Romwara cyning,
heaðofremmende. Wurdon hearingas 130
wide towrecene.

Sume wig fornam.

Sume unsofte aldor generedon
on þam heresiðe. Sume healfcwice
flugon on fæsten ond feore burgon
æfter stanclifum, stede weardedon 135
ymb Danubie. Sume drenc fornam
on lagostream lifes æt ende.

Ða wæs modigra mægen on luste,
ebton elþeoda oð þæt æfen forð
fram dægæs orde. Darodæsc flugon, 140
bildenædran. Heap wæs gescyrded,
lāðra lindwered. Lythwon becwom
Huna herges ham eft þanon.
Pa wæs gesyne þæt sige forgeaf
Constantino cyning ælmihtig 145
æt þam dægweorce, domweorðunga,
rice under roderum, þurh his rode treo.

Gewat þa heriga helm ham eft þanon,
huðe hremig, (hild wæs gesceaden),
wigge geweorðod. Com þa wigena hleo 150
þegna þreate þryðbold secan,
beadurof cyning burga neosan.

(Elene 99–152)

Then he ordered likewise, the protector of princes, ring-giver of warriors, just as he saw that sign, the war-leader of hosts, which had been shown to him in the heavens, with great haste, the glorious king, Constantine, Christ's cross, to be made a symbol. Then he ordered at dawn, with the break of day, warriors to waken and in that weapon-storm to raise the battle-standard and to carry that holy

tree before them into the throng of foes, to bear the sign of god. Trumpets sang, loudly before the hosts, the raven rejoiced in the deed, the dewy-feathered eagle beheld the foray, the battle of the slaughter-fierce ones; the wolf raised up a song, the wood's companion; battle-terror reared. There was the clash of shields and the thrash of men; the hard hand-swing and the crash of hosts, after they first found the arrows' flight. Onto that doomed folk dire enemies sent forth showers of darts, spears over the yellow shields into the throng of fierce ones, battle-adders through fingers' force. Bold-hearted they advanced, at times pressed on, broke through the shield-cover, plunged in the blade, thronged on hard in fray. Then was the banner raised, the sign over the troops, the song of victory sung. The golden helmet and spears shone on the field of war. The heathens perished, fell without peace. All at once they fled, the people of the Huns, as that holy tree the king of the Romans ordered raised, doing battle. The bold ones were widely split asunder. Some battle took off, some unsoftly saved their lives in that war-fray, some half-dead fled into the fastness and saved their lives along the stone cliffs, took their places around the Danube, some drowning took off in the water-stream at their life's end. Then was the force of the brave ones in hot spirits; they pursued the foreigners right up to the evening from the start of the day: ash-darts flew, battle-adders. The army was destroyed, the shield-troop of foes: few of the force of the Huns reached thence home again. Then it was clear that the almighty king granted victory to Constantine in that day's work, mighty honours, powerful under the heavens, through his rood-tree. Then the defender of hosts went thence home again, exulting in booty (the battle was settled), made worthy by war. The protector of warriors then went to seek his mighty abode, the battle-brave king, to visit the strongholds, with a band of thegns.

That there are (counting only once the two occurrences here of the half-line *hildenedran*) four parallels (three of them unique) linking this section of *Elene* to the matching scene in *Judith* may seem striking enough, the more so when it is realized that (as earlier) the four parallels appear in the same order in each. But it is only when one factors in the non-unique parallels

that the true extent of the overlap becomes clear:⁵² there are no fewer than twenty-one elements common to both passages, again appearing in substantially the same order.⁵³ Though to be sure there are parallels to both battle-scenes elsewhere in surviving Old English poetry,⁵⁴ none is quite so extensive or specific. We can see this simply with respect to the so-called “Beasts of Battle” motif: of the sixteen examples of this theme surveyed by Mark Griffith, no two are so similar to each other (and so different from the rest) as these.⁵⁵

But what is perhaps most interesting in comparing these two passages is the way that, despite much common material, each poet has managed to make his piece his own. The passage from *Elene* is a much more artful piece, employing a greater range of rhetorical effects: incremental repetition introduces two verse-paragraphs which focus on the cross as Constantine’s banner (*Hebt þa . . . Hebt þa*, lines 99a and 105a), before we find a beautifully compact Beasts of Battle scene (lines 109b–113), leading into the battle itself, introduced by rhyme (lines 114–15: *gebrec . . . geprec . . . handgeswing . . . berga gring*) and highlighted at its centre by precisely the same mechanism found in the parallel passage from *Judith*, namely *stopon* + compound (*stopon stiðhidige*, line 121a). The fact that the expression *stopon* + compound is not found at all elsewhere in surviving Old English verse only serves to heighten the parallel.⁵⁶ In the rest of the passage from *Elene*, essentially the same set of rhymes as before are repeated here (lines 121–23: *wraecon braecon . . . þraebearde*; cf. line 114: *gebrec . . . geprec*). And here also Cynewulf introduces his favoured technique of what might be termed “clashing verbs,” emphasizing action: finite verbs are found juxtaposed at the end of one line and the beginning of the next (lines 120–27: *onsendan / stopon*; *wraecon / braecon*; *dufan / þrunгон*; *grunгон / feollon*); it is perhaps worth highlighting the fact that if this is the only place in this passage where “clashing verbs” occur, they are entirely absent from the parallel passage in *Judith*.⁵⁷ Here too Cynewulf employs another favoured technique: beginning and ending consecutive lines with bisyllabic words of similar structure (a-lines: *stopon* : *braecon* : *þrunгон* : *segen* [manuscript *segn*] : *gylden*; b-lines: *wraecon* : *dufan* : *hafen* : *galen* : *lixtan* : *grunгон*). Even after the battle-scene, Cynewulf shows a greater control over his material than the *Judith*-poet, concluding with a familiar *sum . . . sum . . . sum* passage (lines 131b–137),⁵⁸ and two verse-paragraphs tracing the routes home of the opposing armies,

linked by the repeated phrase *ham eft þanon* (“back home thence,” lines 143b and 148b).

But if this passage is undoubtedly a set-piece *tour de force* in which Cynewulf is exercising his poetic talents to the full, it must also be observed that in this case (as previously) there is rather more warrant in the Latin source than there is for the parallel passage in *Judith*. The relevant passage in the *Inuentio Crucis* reads as follows:⁵⁹

Et surgens impetum fecit contra barbaros, et fecit antecedere signum, et superueniens cum suo exercitu super barbaros coepit concidere eos proxima luce. Et timuerunt barbari et dederunt fugam per ripas Danobii, et mortua est non minima multitudo. Et dedit Deus in illa die uictoriam regi Constantino per uirtutem crucis. Veniens autem rex Constantinus in suam ciuitatem . . .

And rising up he made an attack against the barbarians, and had the sign [of the Cross] go before, and coming upon the barbarians with his army he began to slaughter them at break of day. And the barbarians were afraid, and fled along the banks of the Danube, and no small multitude was killed. And God gave King Constantine the victory that day through the power of the Cross. But King Constantine coming into his own city . . .

To be sure, the battle-scene in *Elene* represents a considerable (and considerably artistic) expansion on the bare hints supplied by this passage, but at least in the *Inuentio Crucis* there is specific mention of a battle, a subsequent rout, and a triumphal return: in *Judith* the parallel battle-scene has been described as “a complete invention by the poet.”⁶⁰ In the light of the preceding evidence, it might be suggested that the *Judith*-poet consciously chose to augment his Latin biblical source at this point from a vernacular verse-source apparently well-known to him—and that direct source was *Elene*.

Close analysis of those passages where parallel half-lines from *Elene* and *Judith* cluster has led us to focus on three sections of *Judith* where the poet seems deliberately to have departed from his source;⁶¹ in each case, there is a tissue of verbal parallels connecting *Judith* to *Elene*, and in two of the three cases the unique parallels shared by the passages in question appear

in the same order. To suggest that the poets of *Judith* and *Elene* should both stumble upon the same sequence of unique formulations independently would surely “outrage probability.”⁶² The evidence appears to indicate that Cynewulf embellished his Latin source, and that the poet of *Judith* then employed a number of Cynewulf’s distinctive formulations in *Elene* in embellishing his own. Given that both Cynewulf and the *Judith*-poet were to some extent drawing on Latin learning and a Latin source, such a suggestion is simply in line with the known parallel mode of poetic composition employed by Anglo-Latin poets throughout the pre-Conquest period, namely, formulaic composition based in part on recycling a common stock of poetic formulas from curriculum-authors so widely scattered in the extant verse as to be simply part of the tradition, coupled with the conscious coining of idiosyncratic formulas by individual poets whose own phrasing was deliberately echoed by later generations.⁶³ Such was the technique employed by (for example) Aldhelm, Bede, Boniface, Alcuin, Aedilulf, Wulfstan of Winchester, and (so far as we can judge) every single Anglo-Saxon who ever chose to compose Latin verse.

The possibility of such direct and deliberate echoing of other texts and other authors makes the careful collection and analysis of formulaic phrasing in extant Old English verse (itself a task made much easier by the use of machine-readable texts and computer-generated concordances) a matter of high priority: only then can we come to a more considered assessment of the significance of the striking parallels of phrasing that link poems both within and across separate manuscripts.⁶⁴ To argue that Old English poets deliberately echoed each other’s works is of course to return to the state of scholarly debate prior to the application of oral-formulaic theory to Anglo-Saxon studies in 1953, and in particular to question the underlying assumption that if only more Old English verse had survived, many parallels of phrasing unique in the extant corpus today would be recognized as mere commonplace. But if the arguments presented above that *Judith* borrows directly from *Elene* are accepted, then there is evidence that not only (as is widely acknowledged) are there clear overlaps between the Exeter Book and the Vercelli Book (in the shape of *Soul and Body I* and *II*) on the one hand, and between the Exeter Book and the Junius Manuscript (in the shape of *Daniel* and *Azarias*) on the other, but that Cynewulf and his influence extend to three of the four surviving major Old English poetic codices. Given

such a pattern of survival, the notion that vast screeds of Old English poetry composed in the “classical” style have been lost is surely suspect. It is time to re-examine the assumptions of comparative chronology and the direct influence of one poem or poet on another that comprised so much of Anglo-Saxon scholarship for a century or so prior to 1953, even if with all the sophisticated panoply of computational aids we end up simply repeating old conclusions that were set aside as a result of the impact of oral-formulaic theory. After all, as generations of Anglo-Saxon poets composing in the alternate literary languages of Latin and Old English seem to have agreed: if a thing is worth saying, it is probably worth saying again.⁶⁵

NOTES

1. A pioneering work is Jess B. Bessinger, Jr., “Computer Techniques for an Old English Concordance,” *American Documentation* 12 (1961): 227–29; see too Angus Cameron, Roberta Frank, and John Leyerle, eds., *Computers and Old English Concordances* (Toronto, 1970).

2. See, for example, the excellent overview by Peter S. Baker, “Old English and Computing: A Guided Tour,” in *Reading Old English Texts*, ed. Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe (Cambridge, 1997), 192–215.

3. A useful index to such sites can be found at the “Old English Pages” site maintained by Cathy Ball, http://www.georgetown.edu/cball/oe/old_english.html. Other excellent examples of “clearing-houses” of Anglo-Saxon electronic research are the websites maintained by Simon Keynes, <http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/sdk13/sdk13home.html>, and by TOEBI, <http://www.hcu.ox.ac.uk/toebi/>. These sites, like all the others mentioned in this essay, were last accessed in January 2005.

4. The first and still most prolific discussion-group is ANSAX-L, based at listserv@wvnm.wvnet.edu; previous discussions are archived at <http://www.mun.ca/Ansaxdat/>.

5. So far, poetry has been extremely well-served: the best model available to date is Kevin S. Kiernan et al., eds., *Electronic Beowulf*, 2 CDs (London, 2000); a CD containing facsimiles and texts of the Exeter Book has been in preparation by Bernard J. Muir for some time. The Bodleian Library has put a complete facsimile of the Junius Manuscript on the web at <http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=bodleian&manuscript=msjunius11> and issued a CD: see Bernard J. Muir, ed., *MS Junius 11*, Bodleian Digital Texts 1 (Oxford, 2004).

6. Among the more promising examples of hypertexts available on the web are two which focus on Wulfstan’s sermons: an electronic *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*

produced by Melissa J. Bernstein at <http://english3.fsu.edu/~wulfstan>, and a version of the first six of Wulfstan's sermons by Joyce Tally Lionarons at <http://web-pages.ursinus.edu/jlionarons/wulfstan/wulfstan.html>.

7. The entire extant corpus of Old English, as defined by the ongoing Dictionary of Old English project (itself with a website at <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>), is to be found at <http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/o/oec>. Two large projects that have useful websites include "Fontes Anglo-Saxonici" (at <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk>) and "SASLC, Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture" at <http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/research/saslc>.

8. A now rather clunky-looking but still extremely effective DOS-based concordance-program is Micro-OCP, first released by the Oxford University Computing Service through Oxford University Press in 1988. Perhaps the best of the new generation of Windows-based concordance-programs is Concordance, available through <http://www.rjcw.freemove.co.uk>. It is notable that among the first attempts to employ computers in Old English were two published concordances: Jess B. Bessinger, *A Concordance to Beowulf*, programmed by Philip H. Smith (Ithaca, N.Y., 1969), and Jess B. Bessinger, *A Concordance to the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, programmed by Philip H. Smith (Ithaca, N.Y., 1978).

9. Representative studies include Arthur Fritzsche, "Das angelsächsische Gedicht *Andreas* und *Cynewulf*," *Anglia* 2 (1879): 441–96; Gregor Sarrazin, "*Beowulf* und *Kynewulf*," *Anglia* 9 (1886): 515–50; Gregor Sarrazin, *Beowulf-Studien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte altgermanischer Sage und Dichtung* (Berlin, 1888); Johannes Kail, "Über die Parallelstellen in der angelsächsischen Poesie," *Anglia* 12 (1889): 21–40; Gregor Sarrazin, "Parallelstellen in altenglischer Dichtung," *Anglia* 14 (1892): 186–92. See too Phoebe M. Luehrs, "A Summary of Sarrazin's 'Studies in *Beowulf*,'" *Western Reserve University Bulletin* 7 (1904): 146–65.

10. Francis P. Magoun, Jr., "The Oral-Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry," *Speculum* 28 (1953): 446–67. For overviews, see Alexandra Hennessey Olsen, "Oral-Formulaic Research in Old English Studies: I," *Oral Tradition* 1 (1986): 548–606, and "Oral-Formulaic Research in Old English Studies: II," *Oral Tradition* 3 (1988): 138–90; Andy Orchard, "Oral Tradition," in *Reading Old English Texts*, ed. O'Keefe, 101–23; and John Miles Foley, ed., *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography* (New York, 1985). A web-based version of Foley's *Bibliography*, updated through 1992, can be found at <http://www.missouri.edu/~csotttime/biblio.html>.

11. The key study is Larry D. Benson, "The Literary Character of Anglo-Saxon Formulaic Poetry," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 81 (1966): 334–41, although an early dissenting view is that of Claes Schaar, "On a New Theory of Old English Poetic Diction," *Neophilologus* 40 (1956): 301–5. Other stud-

ies which extend the analysis beyond Old English verse include Michael Lapidge, "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse," *Comparative Literature* 31 (1979): 249–314; Andy Orchard, "Crying Wolf: Oral Style and the *Sermones Lupi*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 21 (1992): 239–64; Andy Orchard, *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8 (Cambridge, 1994), 73–125; Andy Orchard, "Old Sources, New Resources: Finding the Right Formula for Boniface," *Anglo-Saxon England* 30 (2001): 15–38; and Andy Orchard, "Both Style and Substance: The Case for Cynewulf," in *Anglo-Saxon Styles*, ed. G. H. Brown and C. Karkov (Albany, N.Y., 2003), 271–305.

12. I have in progress a project entitled "An Anglo-Saxon Formulary" which seeks to identify and catalogue formulaic diction in four key areas of Anglo-Saxon literature in both Latin and Old English prose and verse dating from the seventh century to the eleventh, namely Old English verse, Anglo-Latin hexameter poetry, Wulfstan's sermons and the Old English anonymous homiletic tradition, and the Latin letters of the Bonifatian correspondence. The results will eventually be presented on the web in an online database. In providing the chance for researchers to analyse formulas by any combination of texts, authors, scribes, or manuscripts, "An Anglo-Saxon Formulary" will complement a number of major international projects currently concentrating on the literary culture of Anglo-Saxon England (such as *Fontes* or *SASLC*; see n. 7 above), and will provide a powerful tool for a deeper understanding of Anglo-Saxon literature (whether composed in Latin or Old English) as a whole.

13. Anita Riedinger, "The Poetic Formula in *Andreas*, *Beowulf* and the Tradition" (PhD diss., New York University, 1985); Carole Hughes Funk, "History of *Andreas* and *Beowulf*: Comparative Scholarship" (PhD diss., University of Denver, 1997); Alison M. Powell, "Verbal Parallels in *Andreas* and its Relationship to *Beowulf* and Cynewulf" (PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2002). Anita Riedinger has also published a series of pertinent articles, including "The Old English Formula in Context," *Speculum* 60 (1985): 294–317; "Andreas and the Formula in Transition," in *Hermeneutics and Medieval Culture*, ed. P. J. Gallacher and H. Damico (Albany, N.Y., 1989), 183–91; and "The Formulaic Relationship Between *Beowulf* and *Andreas*," in *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period: Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr.*, ed. H. Damico and J. Leyerle, *Studies in Medieval Culture* 32 (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1993), 283–312. See also Andy Orchard, *A Critical Companion to Beowulf* (Cambridge, 2003), 163–66.

14. Powell, "Verbal Parallels in *Andreas*," 273–82 (listing eighty-nine parallels uniquely shared by *Andreas* and *Beowulf*) and 283–99 (listing 149 parallels uniquely shared by *Andreas* and the four signed poems of Cynewulf). See too, Orchard, "Both Style and Substance."

15. See Andy Orchard, *The Poetic Craft of Cynewulf*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 35 (Cambridge, forthcoming).

16. Claes Schaar, *Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group*, Lund Studies in English 17 (Lund, 1949; repr. New York, 1967), esp. 235–56 and 291–95.

17. Compare, for example, George P. Krapp, ed., *Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles: Two Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poems* (Boston, 1906), lvi–lvii (listing many parallels between *Andreas* and a range of poems, and deducing direct relationships between them), and Kenneth R. Brooks, ed., *Andreas, and the Fates of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1961), xxii–xxvii (where a handful of parallels are distinctly underplayed).

18. Mark Griffith, ed., *Judith* (Exeter, 1997), offers an exemplary edition; *Cynewulf's Elene*, ed. P. O. E. Gradon (Exeter, 1977), gives a much less full account. Still useful, especially in the present context, are Albert S. Cook, ed., *Judith, an Old English Epic Fragment* (Boston, 1893); T. Gregory Foster, *Judith: Studies in Metre, Language, and Style* (Strassburg, 1892); *Cynewulf's Elene*, ed. Charles W. Kent (Boston, 1889); and *Cynewulf's Elene*, 3rd ed., ed. F. Holthausen (Heidelberg, 1914).

19. For a detailed analysis of the diction and style of *Judith*, tracing both its similarities to and differences from the style and diction of *Cynewulf*, see Foster, *Judith*, 67–93.

20. In identifying these parallels, I have attempted to be as inclusive as possible, and have therefore counted what might be considered “natural” combinations of (for example) infinitive + auxiliary verb combinations (such as [15]), as well as cases where the half-line in question consists of a single (compound) word (such as [19] and [27]).

21. See parallels [2], [13], and [15] for cases where the same phrase matched in *Elene* occurs in more than one line of *Judith*, and parallels [13]–[14] and [20]–[21] for cases where both half-lines of an individual verse in *Judith* can be matched in *Elene*.

22. The parallels in question are [3], [6], [7], [9], [18], [26], [27], [28], [30], [32], and [33].

23. The parallels in question are [1] and [8]: the phrase *fæder on roderum* also occurs in *Christ B* 758b, and *þrymnes byrde* likewise occurs in *Juliana* 280a.

24. The parallels in question are [2] (cf. *Genesis A* 2673b: *ofstum miclum*), [4] (cf. *Beowulf* 1171a, 1476a, and 1602a: *goldwine gumena*), [10] (cf. *Exodus* 298b: *wolcna brof*), [11] (cf. *Paris Psalter* 67.4.5: *naman nemmed*), [13] (cf. *Gutblac B* 820b: *frymþa god*), [16] (cf. *Gutblac A* 646a and *Christ B* 599a: *þrynesse þrym*; *Juliana* 726b: *þrynis þrymsittende*); [23] (cf. *Christ B* 461: *hæleð mid blafof to þære halgan byrg*; *Christ B* 534: *hæleð hygerofe in þa halgan burg*; *Gutblac A* 812b: *in þa halgan burg*); [24] (cf. *Battle of Brunanburh* 65a: *wulf on wealde*); [25] (cf. *Seafarer* 24b–25a: *earn . . . urigfeþra*); [29] (cf. *Gutblac B* 1338a: *life bilidene*). For the argument that *Gutblac B* is

written by Cynewulf, see Orchard, “Both Style and Substance,” and Orchard, *The Poetic Craft of Cynewulf*.

25. So, for example, the phrase *sinces brytta* or equivalent (parallel [5]) is found in *Genesis A* 1857b, 2642a, and 2728b; *Beowulf* 607b, 1170a, 1922a, and 2071a; *Wanderer* 25b; and *Preface to Gregory’s Dialogues* 24b. The phrase *ond þæt word acwæð* or equivalent (parallel [12]) is found in *Genesis A* 1110b; *Genesis B* 639a; *Christ A* 316b; *Christ B* 474a and 714b; *Guthlac B* 1347b; *Azarias* 4b; *Juliana* 45a, 143b, 631b, and 640a; *Beowulf* 654b and 2046b; and *Wanderer* 91b. The phrase *frofre gæst* or equivalent (parallel [14]) is found in *Andreas* 906b and 1684b, *Christ A* 207b, *Christ B* 728b, *Guthlac A* 136b, *Guthlac B* 936b, *Juliana* 724a, and *Metrical Charm* 11.10. The phrase *biddan wille* or equivalent (parallel [15]) is found in *Andreas* 84b, *Juliana* 272b and 278b, *Beowulf* 427b, and *Kentish Psalm* 68b. The compound *collenferbð* or equivalent (parallel [19]) is found in *Andreas* 349b, 538a, 1108a, and 1578a; *Beowulf* 1806a and 2785a; *Fates of the Apostles* 54a; *Wanderer* 71a; and *Whale* 17a. The phrase *cyninga wuldor* (parallel [20]) is found in *Andreas* 171b, 555b, 854b, and 1411a; *Christ B* 508a; *Juliana* 279b; *Resignation* 21a; and *Menologium* 1b. The phrase *þæt gecyðed wearð* or equivalent (parallel [21]) is found in *Andreas* 90b and *Menologium* 52b. The phrase *eft to eðle* or equivalent (parallel [22]) is found in *Guthlac A* 355a and *Solomon and Saturn* 418a. The phrase *to ðere beorbtan byrig* or equivalent (parallel [31]) is found in *Andreas* 1649a, *Guthlac B* 1191a, *Beowulf* 1199a, and *Christ B* 519a.

26. See further Powell, “Verbal Parallels in *Andreas*,” 105–232, and Schaar, *Critical Studies*, 239–51 and 261–87.

27. The phrase *anra gebwylc(ne)* or equivalent (parallel [17]) also occurs in *Genesis A* 2490; *Exodus* 187; *Daniel* 369; *Christ and Satan* 430; *Andreas* 933 and 1283; *Soul and Body* I 98; *Dream of the Rood* 108; *Christ C* 1025 and 1029; *Phoenix* 503, 522, and 534; *Riddle* 13.5; *Judgement Day I* 3; *Beowulf* 732 and 784; *Paris Psalter* 60.4.3; *Metres of Boethius* 11.83, 18.3, 20.65, 20.228, 25.20, 25.63, and 26.95; *Rune Poem* 60; *Solomon and Saturn* 234 and 357; *Judgement Day II* 96.

28. For the concept of the formulaic system, see further Donald K. Fry, “Old English Formulas and Systems,” *English Studies* 48 (1967): 193–204; John D. Niles, “Formula and Formulaic System in *Beowulf*,” in *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley (Columbus, Ohio, 1981), 394–415; and Anita R. Riedinger, “The Old English Formula in Context,” *Speculum* 60 (1985): 294–317.

29. So, for example, one might posit the existence of a system “X (x) (*on/in*) *geþance/geþonce*” which might generate parallel [3] above. In fact, apart from the lines from *Judith* and *Elene* indicated, only the half-lines *þriste on geþance* (found in *Andreas* 237a and *Elene* 267a) and *þriste geþonce* (found in *Juliana* 358a) in the extant

corpus match the requirements of the system. This is not to deny the usefulness of studying formulaic systems, simply to re-assert the extent to which such study should give particular weight to verbatim repetitions. On the parallel use of what might be termed formulaic systems in Anglo-Latin hexameter verse, see Andy Orchard, “After Aldhelm: The Teaching and Transmission of the Anglo-Latin Hexameter,” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 2 (1992): 96–133, at 113, where I show that in his *Vita metrica S. Cuthberti* Bede uses the matching phrases *percussus corda pauore* (line 235), *uibratur corda timore* (line 663), and *percussus corda tremore* (line 929), all signifying how a character was “struck with fear.”

30. In counting ‘unique’ parallels here, I have included those where the parallel in question is either only found in *Elene* and *Judith* or where it is only found in *Elene*, *Judith*, and the poems of Cynewulf; in the latter category I have included *Guthlac B* alongside the four signed poems.

31. A useful breakdown of the structure of *Judith* is found in Cook, *Judith*, xxxix.

32. The parallels in question are nos. [11]–[16] above.

33. See nn. 24 and 25 above.

34. A less close parallel is found in *Metrical Charm* 11.10: *ac gebæle me ælmihtig and sunu and frofre gast*.

35. See n. 14 above.

36. Cf. Carl T. Berkhout and James F. Doubleday, “The Net in *Judith* 46b–54a,” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 74 (1973): 630–34. The allusion to Holofernes’s fly-net derives from *Judith* 10:19, whereas the passage preceding the one cited is drawn from *Judith* 13:1, and that following from 13:4.

37. For a useful description of the relationship of *Judith* to its source, see Griffith, *Judith*, 47–61, esp. 59–60, which discuss this very passage.

38. The manuscript has the normal Latin abbreviation for *mille* (“a thousand”) at line 327b, although the alliteration clearly requires the Old English *þusendo*; the word *word* is missing at line 338a, but again is clearly required by the alliteration and by the parallel with line 344a; and the manuscript reads the nonsensical *weno* at line 348b.

39. See parallel [13] and n. 24 above; the phrase *frumþa god* (or equivalent) only occurs outside these two poems in the extant corpus in *Guthlac B*.

40. Michael Lapidge, “Cynewulf and the *Passio S. Iulianae*,” in *Unlocking the Wordboard: Anglo-Saxon Studies in Memory of Edward B. Irving, Jr.*, ed. Mark Amodio and Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe (Toronto, 2003), 147–71.

41. For a fair if somewhat dated account, see *Cynewulf’s Elene*, ed. Gradon 15–22.

42. See Stephan Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross Was Found: From Event to Medieval Legend*, Bibliotheca Theologiae Practicae 47 (Stockholm, 1991). The older discussion by A. Holder, ed., *Inventio Sanctae Crucis* (Leipzig, 1889) is still useful.

43. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross Was Found*, 259–60 (lines 59–67).

44. Cf. Griffith, *Judith*, 62–63.

45. Cf. Griffith, *Judith*, 62.

46. As Griffith, *Judith*, 62, puts it, the scene is “a complete invention by the poet, being an imminent rather than actual event in the source.”

47. The standard study remains that of Kenneth Jackson, “Incremental Repetition in the Early Welsh *Englyn*,” *Speculum* 16 (1941): 304–21; see too Adeline Courtney Bartlett, *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (New York, 1935), 4–61.

48. Orchard, *Critical Companion*, 78–79 and 189–91.

49. Of these compounds, *cynerof*, *beāðorinc*, *stercedferbð*, and *ealdgeniðla* are confined to poetry, and *styrnmod* and *medowerig* are unique to *Judith* within the extant corpus, the latter occurring twice, in lines 229a and 245a.

50. So, for example, the compound *cynerof* occurs in lines 200b and 311b (the latter in a context which is a clear echo of its former appearance), and *beāðorinc* in lines 179a and 212b. It also seems noteworthy that the compound *stercedferbð* also occurs twice in *Judith*, in lines 55b and 227b.

51. Two of these compounds are uniquely shared in the extant corpus by *Judith* and *Andreas*: *cynerof* appears in *Andreas* 484a and 585a, as well as in *Judith* 200b and 311b, whilst *ealdgeniðla* appears in *Andreas* 1048b and 1341b, as well as in *Judith* 228b. Forms of the compound *stercedferbð* are uniquely shared in the extant corpus by *Andreas* (line 1233b), *Elene* (line 38a), and *Judith* (lines 55b and 227b).

52. One might add here parallels [23] and [24] above from the battle-scene in *Judith*, although in each case they are neither specific to the poems in question nor matched in the battle-scene in *Elene*.

53. Consider, for example, the following sequences: *blude . . . gefeab wulf . . . brefn earn . . . urigfēðera . . . sang . . . stopon . . . forð . . . flana scuras hilden.ædran . . . garas sendon in beardra gemang . . . stopon . . . unsofte . . . ebton eðeoda (Judith); sungon . . . blude . . . brefn . . . gefeab urigfēðra earn . . . wulf . . . sang . . . flana scuras garas . . . on gramra gemang . . . hilden.ædran . . . forð onsendan stopon . . . unsofte . . . ebton elpeoda (Elene).*

54. Cf. Griffith, *Judith*, 62–63.

55. Mark S. Griffith, “Convention and Originality in the Old English ‘Beasts of Battle’ Typescene,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 22 (1993): 179–99.

56. As with the compounds associated with *stopon* in *Judith*, the compound *stiðbidig* is rare within the extant corpus, being found elsewhere only in *Genesis A*

2897a and Cynewulf's *Juliana* 654a. One might also cite in this context the only other repetition of the verb *stopon* in *Elene* 716, where again it alliterates with a rare *stið*-compound: *Stopon ða to þære stowe stiðbycgende*.

57. Indeed, there seem to be only two examples of "clashing verbs" in all of *Judith*, at lines 175–76 (*gespeow/sprac*) and lines 277–78 (*fordraff/funde*).

58. See further, Matti Rissanen, "'Sum' in Old English Poetry," in *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson (Toronto, 1986), 197–225.

59. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross Was Found*, 256 (lines 14–19).

60. Griffith, *Judith*, 62 (and cf. n. 46 above).

61. It is worth noting that in a fourth passage from *Judith* identified above as containing a cluster of parallels with *Elene*, namely, *Judith* 326–44, which comes right at the end of the poem as it now survives, two of the three parallels identified in this brief (nineteen-line) passage are uniquely shared in the extant corpus by the poems in question. The parallels are given as [31]–[33] above.

62. The phrase is Robert E. Kaske's, quoted first in Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, and Paul E. Szarmach, eds., *Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 74 (Binghamton, 1990), xvi, and again by Christine Rauer, *Beowulf and the Dragon: Parallels and Analogues* (Cambridge, 2000), 10, in the middle of a useful discussion of the difference between sources and analogues.

63. For the model, see, for example, Andy Orchard, "After Aldhelm."

64. So, for example, one might note that a line that appears twice in *Andreas* (*Nu ðu miht gebyran, hyse leofesta* [*Andreas* 595 and 811]) appears to echo elements of both *The Dream of the Rood* (*Nu ðu miht gebyran, hæleð min se leofa* [78]) and *Elene* (*Nu ðu meabt gebyran, hæleð min se leofa* [511] and *hyse leofesta* [523a]); no other extant poem provides so close a match, and of course all three poems are contained in the Vercelli Book.

65. I am grateful to Tom Hall and Samantha Zacher for their help and advice in producing this paper; my greatest debt remains to Michael Lapidge, for his instruction and inspiration over more than two decades.