



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Mid Ræde ond Mid Rihte Geleafan: Leadership in the Old English Judith
Author(s)	Webb, Jena
Publication Date	2012-01-10
Item record	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10379/3051">http://hdl.handle.net/10379/3051</a>

Downloaded 2024-04-27T02:25:46Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



*Mid Ræde ond Mid Rihte Geleafan:*  
Leadership in the Old English *Judith*

Jena D. Webb

Dr. Frances McCormack  
School of Humanities  
Department of English  
National University of Ireland, Galway

January 2012

Summary	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Notes and Abbreviations	iii
Chapter I: <i>Ɔæt wæs god cyning!</i>	1
- Germanic Leadership: Warband to Kingdom	3
- Anglo-Saxon Leadership: the Literary Sources	14
- Plan of the Present Work	24
Chapter II: <i>Ecce dedit vobis Dominus regem</i>	27
- The Old Testament Exemplar in Anglo-Saxon England	28
- <i>Liber Iudith</i> in Anglo-Saxon England	33
- In Praise of Virginitv	37
- The Chaste Overcome the Arrogant	44
- Conclusion	53
Chapter III: <i>Swa him heora ealdor bebead</i>	55
- <i>Folces Ræswa</i>	58
- <i>Se Rica</i> and <i>Egesful Eorla Dryhten</i>	59
- <i>Goldwine Gumena</i>	60
- <i>Swiðmod Sinces Brytta</i> and <i>Morðres Brytta</i>	63
- <i>Gumena Baldor</i>	68
- <i>Folctoga</i>	70
- <i>Hearra</i> and his <i>Stercedferhðe Hæleð</i>	71
- <i>Burga Ealdor</i>	73
- <i>Pearlmod ðeoden Gumena</i>	74
- <i>Lað Leodhata</i> and <i>Wærloga</i>	76
- Holofernes as Antithesis of God	78
- Lord of Warriors	81
- <i>Winedryhten</i>	84
- <i>Goldgifa</i>	86
- <i>Healdend</i>	87
- Conclusion	89
Chapter IV: <i>Quia timebat deum valde</i>	91
- <i>Mirati sunt ... in sapientia eius</i>	92
- <i>Ancilla tua Deum colit</i>	97
- <i>Confirma me Domine Deus Israel</i>	104

- Conclusion	108
Chapter V: <i>Mid elne onrbyrde</i>	110
- <i>Swæsende</i> and <i>Medoburh</i>	110
- <i>Mece</i>	113
- <i>Heafod</i> and <i>Helm</i>	116
- <i>Wundenlocc</i> and <i>Feax</i>	121
- <i>Cenra to Campe</i>	126
- <i>Herereaf</i>	130
- Conclusion	135
Chapter VI: <i>Fons sapientiae verbum Dei</i>	137
- Germanic <i>Wyrð</i> and Divine Providence	138
- The <i>Deoden</i> and <i>Mundbyrd</i>	142
- <i>Word</i> and <i>Bearhtm</i>	146
- <i>Heolstor</i> and <i>Leoht</i>	152
- The <i>Via Sancta</i>	156
- Conclusion	160
Conclusion: <i>Æt þam ende ne tweode</i>	161
Appendix I: Character Epithets from <i>Judith</i>	
- Holofernes, Judith, God	166
- Assyrians and Bethulians	168
Appendix II: The Biblical Analogues of <i>Judith</i>	170
Appendix III: Comparison of Judith-Texts	178
Bibliography	199

### Summary of Thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to provide an examination of leadership as portrayed in the Old English *Judith*. The poet employs three elements – *fortitudo*, *sapientia* and *anima* – that are portrayed as crucial in a successful ruler, king or spiritual exemplar. Judith embodies all three characteristics and is thus portrayed as an *exemplum admirandum* of morality and the martial success achieved through faith in God. Holofernes, however, exhibits the ideal epithets of a Germanic leader, but perverts Anglo-Saxon customs through a lack of *sapientia* and *anima*. He is thus relegated to the position of *exemplum horrendum*.

The following work analyses the aspect of leadership in *Judith* within the multifaceted background of Anglo-Saxon society. I establish the Germanic interpretation of leadership from the late antique to medieval periods and its transformation with the advent of Christianity. Thereafter I introduce the importance of the Old Testament as an exemplar for kingship among the Anglo-Saxons, thereby introducing the insular *Liber Judith* tradition. The second half of the thesis concentrates on the poem and how the epithets and actions of the two characters produce models of leadership for contemporary society.

## Acknowledgements

The production of this thesis is indebted to my family, friends and peers, who continually offered humour and wisdom to maintain my sanity. My deepest thanks to my advisor and friend, Dr. Frances McCormack, who kept me grounded, focused and motivated, but more importantly, who took the amazing journey with me through the creation of this thesis. Thanks to the Department of English at the National University of Ireland, Galway, who offered support, wisdom and understanding during difficult times. My thanks to my examiners for their helpful comments and suggestions that made this thesis better and better.

Thank you to Dr. Larry Swain for his assistance with Old English and Latin translations; Francesca Bezzone for her countless hours of checking my Latin translations, primarily Aldhelm; Sarah Corrigan for allowing me to bounce ideas off her during many much needed coffee breaks; Rachel Veiders for acting as my theological encyclopaedia.

The most heartfelt thanks to my parents, Carol and Jeff, who first encouraged the love of history, language and learning, and always supported me to do what I loved no matter how far it took me from home. Thanks to my sisters, Kelly and Cortney, who are my best friends and who dedicated themselves to keeping me sane during those long hours of translations, breakdowns and caffeine-deprived stress.

Finally, I dedicate this thesis to my cousin, who lived each day to the fullest and whose passion for life I shall forever try to emulate. *Fær wel*, Adam.

## Notes and Abbreviations

Three biblical sources were used in the course of this thesis: the *Septuagint*, the *Vetus Latina* and Jerome's *Sacra Vulgata*. The standard text for the *Liber Judith* is from the *Vetus Latina* manuscript *Cod. Reg. & Germ.* on the *Brepolis* database. My reasons for this are explained in Appendix II, pp. 169-76. All other biblical citations are from the *Sacra Vulgata* unless otherwise stated. All textual abbreviations are based on the *Vulgata*'s system of abbreviation.

The standard *Judith* text used in this thesis is Mark Griffith's 1997 edition. The other Old English poems cited within this thesis are taken from Krapp and Dobbie's editions of the *Vercelli Book*, *Junius Manuscript* and *Exeter Book*. All *Beowulf* citations are from Klaeber's edition.

The Perseus Digital Library database was the source for all Latin (Lewis and Short *Latin Dictionary*) and all Greek (Liddell and Scott *Greek-English Lexicon*) translations. The Bosworth and Toller *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* is the primary source of Old English translations, with reference to the online *Dictionary of Old English A to G* and the corresponding *Old English Corpus* where relevant. All Old English textual abbreviations are based on the *Old English Corpus* abbreviations, excluding *Exodus* (*Exod.*) for clearer differentiation with the biblical book of the same name (*Ex.*).

## Abbreviations

<i>And.</i>	<i>Andreas</i>	<i>Mald.</i>	<i>Battle of Maldon</i>
<i>ASC</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i>	<i>Max. I, II</i>	<i>Maxims I, II</i>
<i>Beo.</i>	<i>Beowulf</i>	<i>Mt.</i>	<i>Matthew</i>
<i>Brun.</i>	<i>Battle of Brunanburh</i>	<i>NJBC</i>	<i>New Jerusalem Biblical Commentary</i>
<i>BTASD</i>	<i>Bosworth and Toller Anglo-Saxon Dictionary</i>	<i>Os.</i>	<i>Hosea</i>
<i>Cor.</i>	<i>Corinthians</i>	<i>Pan.</i>	<i>The Panther</i>
<i>Dan.</i>	<i>Daniel</i>	<i>Par.</i>	<i>Chronicles</i>
<i>Dream.</i>	<i>Dream of the Rood</i>	<i>Phoen.</i>	<i>The Phoenix</i>
<i>Dt.</i>	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
<i>Ecl.</i>	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
<i>El.</i>	<i>Elene</i>	<i>Prv.</i>	<i>Proverbs</i>
<i>Ex.</i>	<i>Exodus</i>	<i>Rg.</i>	<i>Kings</i>
<i>Exod.</i>	<i>Exodus</i>	<i>Rid.</i>	<i>Riddles</i>
<i>Gen. A, B</i>	<i>Genesis A, B</i>	<i>Sap.</i>	<i>Wisdom</i>
<i>Guð.</i>	<i>Guðlac</i>	<i>Sat.</i>	<i>Christ and Satan</i>
<i>Hbr.</i>	<i>Hebrews</i>	<i>Sea.</i>	<i>The Seafarer</i>
<i>Hell.</i>	<i>Descent into Hell</i>	<i>Sir.</i>	<i>Sirach</i>
<i>Husb.</i>	<i>The Husband's Message</i>	<i>Sm.</i>	<i>Samuel</i>
<i>Idt.</i>	<i>Judith</i>	<i>Sol.</i>	<i>Solomon and Saturn</i>
<i>Io.</i>	<i>John</i>	<i>SV</i>	<i>Biblia Sacra Vulgata</i>
<i>Is.</i>	<i>Isaiah</i>	<i>Th.</i>	<i>Thessalonians</i>
<i>JDay I, II</i>	<i>Judgment Day I, II</i>	<i>Vain.</i>	<i>Vainglory</i>
<i>Jud.</i>	<i>Judith</i>	<i>VL</i>	<i>Vetus Latina</i>
<i>Jul.</i>	<i>Juliana</i>	<i>Wan.</i>	<i>The Wanderer</i>
<i>Lc.</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>Wid.</i>	<i>Widsith</i>
<i>LXX</i>	<i>Septuagint</i>		

Chapter I: *Bæt wæs god cyning!*<sup>1</sup>

In the progression from pagan warband to Christian kingdom, the Anglo-Saxons developed a unique understanding of leadership. They were able to assimilate new theological ideology with native Germanic customs that resulted in a complex literary tradition. It is the purpose of this thesis to analyse the concept of leadership represented in the Old English *Judith*, to study how that concept of leadership reflects the Anglo-Saxon conceptualisation of the same, and to examine how the positions of the protagonist and antagonist are transformed to exhibit specific concepts of a contemporary, Christo-Germanic society before AD1000. The study of literary evidence provides an additional source of information regarding the evolution of leadership, particularly with the advent of a vernacular tradition. Old English literature offers a sizable portion of evidence concerning the transition from pagan warlords to Christian kings, which, in turn, presents a new perspective on the society in which this body of literature was written. I posit that *Judith* represents a tripartite idealisation of what constituted leadership among the Anglo-Saxon community, expounded through the character development and contrast of Holofernes and Judith.

In the Anglo-Saxon period, leadership was defined by a combination of Christian and Germanic ideals. The first of these is represented in this thesis by the term *fortitudo* (“courage, fortitude”) and classifies the martial prowess of the Germanic ruler and his people before and after the conversion to Christianity. It encompasses the traditional aspects of the Germanic warband society that were brought to Britain from the continent. The second term, *anima* (“soul, life”), refers more specifically to the Christian religion and the traditions therein, but also to the conscious effort on the part of the missionaries to adapt the pagan religion to suit the new monotheistic faith.<sup>2</sup> After the conversion, association with the faith defined Anglo-Saxon regnal lines; as God gave kings the authority to rule so too could he rescind it should their *anima* not adhere to the laws of the Church (Alcuin, *Patribus Regibus* ll. 71-78). The final term, *sapientia* (“wisdom”), reflects both the pre- and

---

<sup>1</sup> “that was a good king,” *Beo.* ll. 11b, 863b, 2390b.

<sup>2</sup> For the most part, I discuss *anima* in correlation with *sapientia*, itself described through the phrase *sapientia dei*. The choice of *anima* rather than *spiritus* or another synonym arises from Alcuin’s description of the two swords in *Epistola CLXIII, ad Carolum* (PL 100.422C-28C), one presenting the body, *corpus*, and the other the soul, *anima*. These are the weapons of the *miles Christi* as well as those who support the faith in other ways, such as the king who guides his people towards God through his own exemplary faith.

post-Christian traditions among the Germanic people. It signifies the wisdom of the Germanic people, as represented by the surviving gnomic verse in the Old English and Norse literary tradition, and the later introduction of Christian wisdom as defined by biblical and patristic learning. In the Anglo-Saxon period, *sapientia* and *anima* are better understood through the concept of *sapientia dei* or “wisdom of God”. The Christian emphasis on wisdom as God-given connected the new faith with the Germanic tradition of *sapientia* as demonstrated in the gnomic verses, and it intensified the connection between the ruler and God, since a king without *sapientia dei* cannot be victorious in either this life or the next.<sup>3</sup>

The character of Holofernes, as depicted in the Old English *Judith*, exhibits only one of these three qualities, namely *fortitudo*; the absence of the other two directly results in his inability to lead his army to victory. The majority of the epithets employed by the poet for the general describe him as an ideal leader, a gracious and gift-giving lord, yet his actions disrupt the order of society by perverting accepted traditions used to bind a community together. The heavy use of foreshadowing throughout the poem ensures that the audience is familiar with the narrative outcome, thereby allowing emphasis to be placed on Holofernes’ failings as a leader among his people. Despite the fact that he is not given any dialogue within the extant poem, and even though he is dead by line 111a, his character is described in far more detail than either the heroine or her divine benefactor. The Assyrian general exists in the poem as an *exemplum horrendum* who destroys himself through a lack of wisdom, piety and moderation.

The king, lord or general must be wise, learning through experience and leading by example. He must be a mediator between the *folc* and the divine, whether represented by the polytheism of paganism or the monotheism of Christianity. He must also be brave and lead his men into battle through heroic example. These elements of mind, soul and body encompass the qualities of an ideal Germanic

---

<sup>3</sup> I borrow the terms *fortitudo* and *sapientia* from Kaske’s articles on *Beowulf* and *Judith*, which discuss the importance of wisdom and fortitude within the poems’ characters. These terms, as discussed by Kaske, reflect the two halves of the Germanic warrior or king: words that reveal or judge *sapientia* and the deeds that define or negate *fortitudo* (Kaske, “Beowulf” 277). This concept translates into the Christian tradition with the transformation of wisdom into *sapientia dei*, but maintains the Germanic ideals discussed in Kaske’s articles. See Robert E. Kaske, “*Sapientia et Fortitudo* as the Controlling Theme of *Beowulf*,” *An Anthology of Beowulf Criticism*, Ed. Lewis E. Nicholson (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame P, 1963) 269-310; “*Sapientia et Fortitudo* in the Old English *Judith*,” *The Wisdom of Poetry* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1982) 13-29.

leader, both before and after the conversion to Christianity.<sup>4</sup> These three qualities of leadership are all present in the Old English *Judith*; Holofernes' epithets suggest that he is an ideal leader, yet the text reveals he is lacking in all three traits. Judith, however, possesses all of them and triumphs against God's enemy, all the while never holding the title of king, prince, lord or ruler. It is the purpose of this thesis to establish the Old English *Judith* as a representative of the ideologies of leadership in the Anglo-Saxon tradition and to the importance of *fortitudo* and the *sapientia dei* as essential elements therein.

In order to analyse *Judith* as a text concerned with leadership in Anglo-Saxon society, it is important for a brief overview of the tradition of Germanic leadership and its development from the classical to medieval period. This introduction is a brief study of the socio-political history of Germanic leadership, beginning with the barbarian tribes that praised martial prowess and the wisdom of the *comitatus*. It will address the evolution of a pagan ideology through the conversion of the sixth century and the introduction of Christian piety into the definition of a successful leader. It concludes with a synopsis of Germanic sources in the vernacular and an exposition of the manner in which they exemplify the use of *fortitudo*, *anima* and *sapientia* (or *sapientia dei*) to distinguish the *exemplum admirandum* of leadership among the Germanic people from that of the *exemplum horrendum*.

### Germanic Leadership: Warband to Kingdom

Classical authors, the majority of whom had no direct contact with the northern tribes, were the first to discuss the Germanic people. They were often concerned with one particular characteristic of the northern barbarians and their leaders: martial prowess, or *fortitudo*. Todd summarises Roman opinion of the Germanic people: "To the Romans the Germanic peoples were first and foremost warriors, and their historians [i.e. the Romans] were naturally interested in barbarian armament and barbarian conduct of war" (*Northern Barbarians* 140). As early as the second century BC, Seneca says of the Germans:

Germanis quid est animosius? Quid ad incursum acrius? Quid armorum cupidius, quibus innascuntur innutriunturque, quorum unica illis cura est in alia neglegentibus? (Seneca 1.11)

---

<sup>4</sup> For examples of the combination of these elements in the Anglo-Saxon literary tradition, see *Max. II* ll. 1-4, 10b-12, 14-17a, 28b-29a, 32b-33a, 51-55a, 58b-64a.

Who is more courageous than the Germans? Who is more bold in a charge? Who more eager for arms, among which they are born and bred, of which alone is their care to the neglect of all else.<sup>5</sup>

Pausanias describes the Germanic people as the most numerous and warlike barbarians in Europe (8.38.6), while Tacitus describes them as loath to till the land when there was battle to be had: *iners videtur sudore adquirere quod possis sanguine parare* (“it seems weak to acquire with sweat that which you can obtain with blood,” *Germania* 14). The accuracy of these statements aside, we can start to understand how the citizens of the Empire viewed the Germanic people: as indefatigable warriors, who shunned civilised life in order to wage war. The difficulty in relying on these attestations is that they are entirely one-sided, steeped in Roman political propaganda that “concentrated upon groups and events of particular interest to the Roman Empire (usually those nearest the frontier)” (Heather 31).

Little is known of specific leaders among the Germanic tribes unless they had direct contact with the Empire. One such, Arminius, a first century Cherusci warrior-prince, was trained within the Roman military and achieved citizenship and military renown within the Empire (Paterculus 2.118.2). His eventual return to his people resulted in an uprising of the Cherusci against the Empire, made famous by the Battle of the Teutoberg Forest in AD9 and the defeat of Varus’ legions.<sup>6</sup> Arminius’ intelligence, combined with his martial prowess, reflects an early combination of *sapientia* and *fortitudo* required of a Germanic leader and the same principles that prevail in Anglo-Saxon literature centuries later. These very traits are celebrated in the poetic character of Judith nearly a millennium after Arminius’ death, while Holofernes is condemned for the lack of them.

Arminius united his people against Rome through exemplary prowess on the battlefield. He demonstrated the ability to unite the warband-based Cherusci into a viable force able to successfully battle an enemy with superior military capabilities.<sup>7</sup> Eventually Arminius grew into a symbol of *romanitas* that did not integrate with the

---

<sup>5</sup> All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

<sup>6</sup> After Teutoberg, Augustine withdrew his forces; no attempt was ever made by Augustine or any subsequent emperors to regain the territory north of the Danube (L. Stein 140).

<sup>7</sup> By opposing Rome he won his people’s loyalty, for Segestes, his former ally, states that he was drawn into that war – *in bellum tractus* – because of unanimous consent of the nation – *consensus gentis* – and without him they would not remain united against the Empire (Tacitus, *Annales* 1.55).

tribal society he attempted to rule. He “fell to treachery generated by the jealousy of his followers” (Heather 35) and was assassinated as a despot. As soon as Arminius appeared to emulate what his people saw as distinctly Roman qualities he lost favour and was executed as a traitor to his *patria*; they believed he had broken his oath to them and was punished accordingly.

Similarly, in sixth-century Britain Gildas chastised British kings for breaking oaths and waging unjust wars against their own people (Gildas 27). The fear of tyranny was also felt in the later Scandinavian *þing*-based society. In order to avoid situations like that faced by the Cherusci in the first century AD, the people “restricted rulers’ powers” (Sundqvist, *Freyr’s Offspring* 84), thereby avoiding despotism. The leaders of Scandinavian societies, like their ancestors, “built their authority on personal ties of loyalty and mutual need for protection” (Ibid 85). In his *Gesta Danorum*, Saxo Grammaticus explains that the usurper Lothar was removed from power by his people as punishment for his despotic reign:

nec ... tolerabiliorem regem quam militem egit, ut prorsus insolentia ac scelere regnum auspicari videretur ... Nec diu scelerum impunitus patriae consternatione perimitur, eadem spiritum eripiente, quae regnum largita fuerat. (1.2.2)

nor did he act more tolerably [as a] king than [he did as] a soldier, as he straightaway seemed to begin [his] rule with insolence and also wickedness ... Nor [was he] long unpunished [for his] crimes; he was destroyed by mutiny of his [own] country, the same that had granted [him] the kingdom snatched away [his] life.

Lothar abused his role as king and was consequently exiled by his own citizens.<sup>8</sup> In *Judith*, too, Holofernes loses the loyalty of his warriors by distracting himself with self-aggrandisement and personal desires. He has failed to uphold the customs of their society and betrays his army to slaughter, the poet even referring to him as a *wærloga* or oath-breaker (see Chapter Three, pp. 75-77). Instead of avenging their fallen leader, as is expected of the retainers of a *comitatus*, the Assyrians flee, *werigferhð* (“weary at heart,” *Jud.* l. 249a). I do not suggest that these historical

---

<sup>8</sup> In Uppsala, as late as the eleventh century, King Olaf Ericsson’s people “recall[ed] how their forefathers had slain over-arrogant kings” (Swanton, *Crisis* 23) and threatened him with death unless he mended his ways.

events were analogues for *Judith*, but rather that the poem reflects concerns similar to the Germanic tradition of leadership.

The relationship between the lord and his warriors was of eminent importance among the barbarian tribal societies. The warband was a social relationship, based on a system of reciprocity. The leader offered his protection and material wealth to those men willing to serve him; through his retinue he gained strength to expand his sphere of influence and defend against enemies. The principal goals for his retainers were to serve their chief on the field of battle and to earn him glory, as well as honour, for which they were compensated with treasure and mead (Todd, *Early Germans* 31; Evans 56, 58). Should their leader have fallen in battle, they were obliged, through their oath of loyalty, to “stand and fight until they were victorious or, as was more often the case, they were all slain” (Underwood 108; see also *Ibid* 10, 148; Evans 68). We see this represented in the story of Finnsburh, as it appears within both *Beowulf* (*Beo.* ll. 1068-159b) and the fragment poem of the same name, when Hengest and the Danes take revenge on Finn for the slaying of their lord, Hnæf. *The Battle of Maldon* memorialises this particular aspect of the lord-retainer relationship when Byrhtnoth’s thegns are slain while avenging him (*Mald.* ll. 260-324). The retainers of Holofernes, however, ignore the traditions of vengeance and instead flee the field of battle without avenging their general.

The power of the leader in early Germanic society depended heavily on the strength and ability of his retinue. The honour of the king or lord relied on the fidelity of his followers, thus is explained the ceremonies of feasting and gift-giving which “reinforced their vows of loyalty, bolstering the king’s power and good name” (Pollington, *Warrior* 37). The absence of these rituals risked transforming the king into a tyrant in the eyes of his people. The giving of gifts or meting out of spoils by the lord of the hall expressed his public affirmation of loyalty to his retainers, while the latter’s reception of these objects renewed their allegiance to their chosen leader. Gregory of Tours, in his *Historia Francorum*, recounts Clovis sharing the spoils of war with his retainers at Soissons in order to honour their courage in battle.<sup>9</sup> In the

---

<sup>9</sup> *cunctum onus praedae in medio positum, ait rex: ‘Rogo vos, o fortissimi proeliatore, ut saltim mihi vas istud ... extra partem concidere non abnuatis.’ ... illi quorum erat mens sanior aiunt: ‘Omnia, gloriose rex, quae cernimus, tua sunt, sed et nos ipsi tuo sumus dominio subiugati. Nunc quod tibi bene placitum videtur facito; nullus enim potestati tuae resistere valet’* (“all the booty was set in their midst, the king said: ‘I ask you, o bravest warriors, that you do not refuse to divide (minutely) to me that dish, in addition to my share,’ ... those of saner mind replied: ‘Glorious king, all that we see,

Icelandic *Egils Saga*, the West Saxon King Æthelstan is depicted as ceremoniously gifting his own *gullhring* (“gold-ring”) to Egil for his aid in defeating the confederation of Irish, Scots and Norsemen at the famous Battle of Brunanburh.<sup>10</sup> The sharing of these treasures was a “basic tenet of lordly behaviour, viewing a chieftain’s generosity as an integral component of his ability to rule and to instil in his followers a deep sense of loyalty and service” (Evans 114).

The transition from warband to monarchy with a royal army in the early medieval period did not extinguish the older ceremonies of loyalty between lord and retainer, but adapted it to a larger scale of use, demonstrated in Clovis I’s meting out of treasure after the defeat of Siagrius (Gregory of Tours 2.27). Medieval warriors continued to provide “military service, loyalty and noble service” to their lord and “[i]n compensation for this tribute . . . received protection, subsistence and luxury goods” (Sundqvist, *Freyr’s Offspring* 85). The Old English sources correspond to those of the continent by exhibiting various forms of gift-giving in the extant literature. Hroðgar bequeaths gifts in honour of Beowulf’s victory against Grendel (*Beo.* ll. 1020-29), the treasure representing both the hero’s achievement as well as the Danes’ debt of honour to him. In *Exodus* and *Judith*, the motif of gift-giving is altered to incorporate the acquisition of spoils of war rather than the symbolic exchange within the meadhall. After the Red Sea closes over the Egyptians, the Hebrew warriors gather up the spoils that the sea washes to shore in honour of their victory (*Exod.* ll. 582-90). In *Judith*, the Bethulians gift Holofernes’ personal possessions to the heroine after the battle as payment for her courageous undertaking to free the city (*Jud.* ll. 334b-41a). The protagonists are rewarded for achieving victory over their enemies, which further enhances their relationships to their respective lords. Beowulf’s various actions reaffirm his loyalty to the secular leaders Hroðgar and Hygelac; for Moses and Judith, however, their deeds celebrate their allegiance to God as the one true lord who can topple kings and generals.

---

they are yours, but we are subject to your dominion. Now do that which seems well pleasing to you; for no one is able to resist your power’,” Gregory of Tours 2.27).

<sup>10</sup> “when they had sat there for a time, then the king drew his sword from the sheath, and took from his arm a gold ring large and good, and placing it upon the sword-point he stood up, and went across the floor, and reached it over the fire to Egil. Egil stood up and drew his sword, and went across the floor. He stuck the sword-point within the round of the ring, and drew it to him; then he went back to his place. The king sat himself again in his high-seat. But when Egil was set down, he drew the ring on his arm,” Trans. W. C. Green (*Egils Saga* 55).

The introduction of Christianity refocused the old polytheistic concepts of faith with their emphasis on mortal glory into the monotheistic teachings of Christ on individual salvation and the glory of heaven. The amalgamation of Germanic *fortitudo* and Christian *anima* is best expressed in Alcuin's *Epistola CLXIII ad Carolum* where he answers the Frankish emperor's question regarding the two swords mentioned in the Gospel of Luke 22:36. Christ says to his disciples before he goes to pray on Mount Olive, '*sed nunc qui habet sacculum tollat similiter et peram et qui non habet vendat tunicam suam et emat gladium*' ("but now he who has a purse let [him] take it and similarly a satchel and he who has not, let him sell his own tunic and buy a sword'," Lc. 22:36) to which his disciples reply, '*Domine ecce gladii duo hic at ille dixit eis satis est*' ("Lord behold these two swords and he said to them, it is enough'," Ibid 22:38). Alcuin explains that these two swords represented Jesus' passive resistance to his captors as well as the greater battle for the faith: *sunt corpus et anima* ("they are the body and the soul," Alcuin, *Ad Carolum* PL 100.425D), both given by God in order to fight in his name. Faith resides in the soul, *anima*, but it is in the body, *corpus*, that the deeds are made manifest, and so both are required to serve God (Ibid PL 100.426B-26C). Included in this concept is the role of the *miles Christi*, who must embody the swords of faith and good works in order to spread the message of Christianity.<sup>11</sup>

The role of the soldier of Christ fully expresses the concepts of *fortitudo* and *anima*, whether through passive resistance or offensive aggression. The ideal exemplar for medieval Christian kings to emulate was Constantine the Great. The emperor's acceptance of Christianity at the Battle of Milvian Bridge AD312, as narrated by Eusebius of Caesarea, set precedence for subsequent emperors to convert to the new faith.<sup>12</sup> While educating himself in the Christian faith, Constantine "began the erection of a political theory that presented him as the divinely sanctioned imperial agent of the Christian God on earth" (Odahl 331). Constantine, as with his

---

<sup>11</sup> *Quae omnia funditus vendenda, id est abjicienda sunt, ut dignus [in] gladio verbi Dei sectator Christi efficiatur miles ... duo gladii sunt corpus et anima, in quibus unusquisque secundum sibi a Deo datam gratiam in Domini Dei voluntate praeliari debet. Et satis erit voluntati Dei, si corpore et animo illius implebuntur praecepta* ("that all things without exception should be sold, that is, they should be abandoned, so that the soldier of Christ, the worthy follower of the word of God, may accomplish [things] with his sword ... The body and the soul are two swords, where he has to battle himself towards God, in accordance to the grace given to him and by the will of the lord God. And it will suffice to the will of God if his teachings will be fulfilled by [his] body and by [his] soul," Alcuin, *Ad Carolum* PL 100.425C-25D).

<sup>12</sup> The sole exception was that of Julian the Apostate, who reigned from AD361-63 (P. Brown 91).

predecessors, understood his power to be divinely given, but unlike his predecessors, his derived from the monotheistic Christian deity who led him to victory in battle and the position of emperor in the west. By setting himself at the epicentre of a theological revolution, he supplied a reason for the upper classes “to abandon conservative beliefs in favour of the new faith of their masters” (P. Brown 27).

The ecclesiastical leaders of the late fourth and early fifth centuries saw in Constantine the Great a model of Christian leadership that extended beyond a single man’s conversion. The emperor acted as a shepherd, leading his citizens towards Christianity. Saint Augustine summarises the power of kingship as divinely given: *non tribuamus dandi regni atque imperii potestatem nisi Deo vero, qui dat felicitatem in regno caelorum solis piis; regnum vero terrenum et piis et impiis, sicut ei placet, cui nihil iniuste placet* (“we do not attribute power of giving kingdoms and empires to anyone but the true God, who gives happiness in the kingdom of heaven to the pious only; [he gives] earthly power to the pious and impious, just as it pleases him, for whom nothing unjust is pleasing,” *De Civitate Dei* 5.21). Augustine defines a happy king as one who rules justly in the name of God and is slow to punish faults of others (Ibid 5.24); the just man rules from a sense of duty and a love of mercy, exhibited through *iustitia* (“justice,” Ibid 5.19). Valued above all, however, is the leader’s piety and humility before the divine being who granted to them their authority in the first place: *Per me reges regnant et tyranni per me tenent terram* (“through me kings reign and tyrants through me hold the land,” Ibid 5.19).<sup>13</sup>

Isidore of Seville further developed Augustine’s discussion of kingship by emphasising the idea that he who acts the tyrant is no longer king (*Etymologia*, PL 82.342A-42B). If the king succumbs to vice then he puts himself above God and without God’s favour he will lose his power on earth. At the fourth Council of Toledo, Isidore and his fellow bishops decreed that

*quicumque amodo ex nobis vel cunctis Hispaniae ... violaverit aut regem nece attrectaverit, aut potestate regni exuerit, aut praesumptione tyrannica regni fastigium usurpaverit, anathema in*

<sup>13</sup> It seems likely that Augustine took this quote from either the *Septuagint* (δι’ ἐμοῦ μεγιστᾶνες μεγαλύνονται, καὶ τύραννοι δι’ ἐμοῦ κρατοῦσι γῆς (“by me great men are made great, and tyrants by me [have] rule of the land”) Παροιμίαι Σολομώντος (Proverbs of Solomon) 8:16) or a copy of the *Vetus Latina* that matched the Greek. The *Vulgata* replaces the second half of the verse with *legum conditores iusta decernunt* (“makers of law decree just things,” Prv. 8:15).

*conspectu Christi et apostolorum ejus sit. (Concilium PL 84.384D-85A)*

henceforth, whoever among us or among all the people of Hispania ... [that] violated or touched the king with death or deprived [the king] from the rule of the kingdom, or usurped with tyrannical presumption the dignity of the kingdom, is anathema in the gaze of Christ and his apostles.

It was not, therefore, sufficient that a king simply rule, “he must also serve the interests of his people” (Parsons 134) both in his secular and spiritual administrations. Those who sought to be king in the medieval period needed to cultivate Christian ideals of kingship as Isidore described them or else lose their right to the throne.

The Christian king was directly associated with the fate of his people and their salvation. In his *Regula Pastoralis*, Gregory I makes an important statement regarding what he believed were the expected actions of a Christian leader:

Scire etenim praelati debent, quia si perversa unquam perpetrant, tot mortibus digni sunt, quot ad subditos suos perditionis exempla transmittunt. Unde necesse est ut tanto se cautius a culpa custodiant, quanto per prava quae faciunt, non soli moriuntur sed aliorum animarum, quas pravis exemplis destruxerunt, rei sunt ... Quisquis enim ad vivendum aliis in exemplo praeponitur, non solum ut ipse vigilet, sed etiam ut amicum suscitetur admonetur. (Gregory I, *Reg. Past.* 77.54B-55A)

For indeed prelates ought to know that if they ever perpetrate perversities [then] they are worthy of as many deaths as examples of perdition they transmit to their subordinates. Whence it is necessary that they guard themselves more carefully as much from guilt as during the perverse [things] that they do, [for] they do not die alone but they are guilty [of the deaths] of other souls, which they destroyed by corrupt examples ... For whoever is appointed to live in example for others is warned that he be vigilant not only for himself, but also that he encourage a friend [to do the same].

Chaney considers the position of the pagan Germanic leader as sacred, the king or lord serving as priest or mediator between the gods and his people as well as military commander. In his in-depth study on the cult of kingship in Anglo-Saxon England, he says that “[t]he most fundamental concept of Germanic kingship is the indissolubility of its religious and political functions. The king is above all the intermediary between his people and the gods” (*Cult of Kingship* 11-12). It is Baetke, however, who best summarises the theoretical position of sacral kingship:

Der sakrale Charakter des germanischen Königtums ist umstritten; es ist aber wahrscheinlich, daß zum mindesten in den Stämmen mit alter Königsverfassung das Königtum als sakrale Institution galt und dem Inhaber des Thrones auch eine führende Stellung im Kult zukam.  
(Baetke 21)

The sacral character of the Germanic kingdom is disputed; it is however likely that, at the very least, in the tribes with older monarchies, kingship was considered a sacred institution and the owner of the throne also took on a leading position in the cult.

This ideology is congruent with the teaching of the Church Fathers and allowed Gregory I a platform upon which to establish the mission to Anglo-Saxon England.

The position of the king served a dual purpose for Gregory: to rule justly and to guide his people to the true faith. In Anglo-Saxon England, Æthelberht’s position as king of the Kentings was interpreted as God-given by the Christian missionaries of the sixth century, as was his subsequent renown in warfare and accumulation of wealth. As with Constantine and Clovis before him, Æthelberht’s conversion to Christianity would assure him everlasting glory (Higham 99-100).<sup>14</sup> Gregory wrote to Æthelberht and emphasised the king’s duty in leading his people away from idol worship and towards Christianity:

Christianam fidem in populis tibi subditis extendere festina, zelum rectitudinis tuae in eorum conuersione multiplica, idolorum cultus insequere, fanorum aedificia euerte, subditorum mores ex magna uitae munditia, exhortando, terrendo, blandiando, corrigendo, et boni operis exempla monstrando aedifica (Bede 1.32)

---

<sup>14</sup> It was under a similar consideration that Edwin of Northumbria accepted Christianity in the seventh century, specifically so he might defeat King Cwichelm of Wessex (Bede 2.9).

Hurry to extend the Christian faith among your people, increase your zeal of rectitude in their conversion, pursue the cultivation of idolatry, overturn buildings of sanctuaries, edify the habits of [your] subordinates because of the great cleanness of life, by exhorting, terrifying, flattering, chastising, and teaching the examples of good works.

The nature of the conversion of Æthelberht was vital in the conversion of his people; they required a model to lead them to an acceptance of the new religion. The king or lord must set an example for all to follow, just as St. Augustine explained centuries before in his *De Civitate Dei* and as the character of Judith, despite a lack of rank, exhibits in the Old Testament. Gregory focuses on the king as key in the conversion of his people, stating as much in his letter to Bertha, Æthelberht's Frankish and Christian queen (Gregory I, *Ad Bertham* 77.1141C-42D).<sup>15</sup>

The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons was “essentially a conversion by persuasion, gradual, conciliatory, and assimilative” (Skemp 429). When the missions to convert the Anglo-Saxons began, the Church was faced with the challenge of integrating the new religion with a strong, Germanic culture. A people known for battle-lust would not readily accept a religion based on peace and passive moral-resistance (Russell 167); moreover, the concept of individual salvation opposed the Germanic *wridu*, or kinship bond, which emphasised the whole, specifically the tribe, rather than the self (Ibid 121). Faced with pagan elements it could not suppress, the Church imbued them with “a Christian dimension, thereby assimilating them” (Ibid 168; see also Gregory I, *Ad Mellitum* 77.1215A-16A). Gregory I was well aware of the subtlety required by the missionary and employed a strategy of *condescensio* whereby he would relax or strengthen “a prescribed reprimand according to

---

<sup>15</sup> The conversion of the Kentings does not necessarily reflect that of the other seventh century kingdoms in Anglo-Saxon England. The pre-existence of a Christian element at the court of Æthelberht, namely his Frankish, Christian queen Bertha and her bishop Liudhard, as well as a continued relationship with Catholic Frankia allowed Augustine's mission purchase in the south eastern corner of England (Wood, “Mission of Augustine” 5-10). Æthelberht's conversion did not, however, assure Christianity a permanent position in Kent, as revealed by Æthelberht's son Eadbald who remained a heathen for a great part of his reign. Indeed, the majority of royal lines Bede discusses in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* “experienced apostasies or reversion to pagan worship at some point in the seventh century” (Yorke, “Reception of Christianity” 161). The death of Penda in battle against Oswiu of Northumbria ended the pagan kingship of Mercia; the Winchester Manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* even specifies that with Penda's death the Mercians became Christians (*ASC* 655). Thus, just over half a century after the arrival of the Augustinian mission in Kent, the royal houses of Anglo-Saxon England had become Christians.

individual circumstances” (Demacopoulos 360).<sup>16</sup> The Augustinian mission to Anglo-Saxon England in the late sixth century concentrated on the congruencies between the old and new religion, stressing those elements that would most appeal to the Germanic spirit.

As discussed above, the earliest writers of antiquity associated Germanic leaders with warfare and martial prowess. Missionaries therefore imbued Christian figures with military virtues and the ethics of heroism so favoured by the Germanic people. The transformation of Christ himself into a warrior figure was enabled by a pre-existing supreme-being cult, most likely centred on the god Odin, which allowed the monotheistic religion to steadily replace the pagan deities (Dunn 101).<sup>17</sup> The inherent similarities between Christ and Odin, in particular, are best exemplified in their respective self-sacrifices: Christ’s crucifixion led to the redemption of mankind, while Odin’s self sacrifice on the world tree of *Yggdrasil* allowed him to discover the knowledge of the runes.<sup>18</sup> Detailed in the *Hávamál*, in the section known as *Odin’s Rune-song*, we are told that he hung nine nights, wounded by his own spear as a sacrifice to himself.<sup>19</sup> Odin’s self sacrifice contains inherent parallels with Christ’s redemption of man that allowed missionaries to fuse the two religions into a single, common tradition. As leaders of their respective traditions, Odin and Christ served as exemplars for the secular kings or lords who needed to emulate not only the physical fortitude but also the spiritual lessons taught by these powerful figures.

The importance of *fortitudo* within Anglo-Saxon lordship is retained after the conversions of the late sixth and seventh centuries, but it is altered. As can be seen in the differentiation made by Gregory I between ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ bloodshed (see p. 20, n. 22), the introduction of a single omnipotent deity reordered the emphasis of the social hierarchy and the ideologies inherent therein. After the conversion to

---

<sup>16</sup> This included the ability of Augustine to consecrate bishops on his own while in England, while the lower clergy, which Demacopoulos believes to be mostly Anglo-Saxon converts, could remain married.

<sup>17</sup> There is no distinct Anglo-Saxon mythology that survives to use as a comparison for the Christian tradition, but the shared Germanic mythos of the Scandinavian and northern Germanic tribes was carried to Britain with the tribal migrations (see Richard North, *Heathen Gods in Old English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997).)

<sup>18</sup> The runes signify a “secret knowledge” (Slusher 28) and the “[p]ossession of runes gave one a supernatural power ... He who possessed the secret knowledge of a rune gained power over the corresponding thing” (Ibid 30). Knowledge of the runes could supply power “over the spiritual and material world” (Ibid 30).

<sup>19</sup> *Veit ek, at ek hekk / vindgameiði á / nætr allar níu, / geiri undaðr / ok gefinn Óðni, / sjalfur sjalfum mér, / á þeim meiði / er manngi veit / hvers af rötum renn (Hávamál 138); (“I know that I hung, on a wind-rocked tree, nine whole nights, with a spear wounded, and to Odin offered, myself to myself; on that tree, of which no one knows from what root it springs,” Trans. B. Thorpe).*

Christianity, kingly wisdom became intimately connected to the knowledge of the biblical and patristic traditions, better understood as *sapientia dei*. The emphasis on *sapientia dei* in Christo-Germanic kingship resulted in a new set of principles the lord must follow in order to rule successfully. The pre-eminence of Augustinian thought in Anglo-Saxon England, supported by the missions and influence of the Roman Church, heavily influenced how kingship was understood by the medieval west. According to Augustine, it was not enough for the king to have a long reign with sons to carry on his line, to defeat his enemies or keep insurrection at bay. He must also be pious and humble in order to receive God's favour and retain his authority on earth (Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* 5.24). As the king was responsible for his people's morality, he must himself follow the tenets of Christianity in order to act as an exemplar. The Christian king must become a *Cristes gespelia* ("deputy of Christ"), and "he must avenge with the utmost diligence offences against Christ" (qtd. in Chaney, *Cult of Kingship* 185-86; see also Robertson 119).<sup>20</sup>

#### Anglo-Saxon Leadership: the Literary Sources

In the discussion of kings and lords, all relevant Anglo-Saxon material stresses the importance of *fortitudo* and, after the conversion to Christianity, *sapientia dei* in creating an *exemplum admirandum* of leadership. Thus the description of the ideal leader retains a multi-faceted view of *fortitudo* in that a leader must achieve victory on the field of battle, attain glory for himself and his men, as well as enforce the social traditions that bind a community together. Similarly, he must maintain peace among his own people, reward his loyal thegns, and act as exemplar for the community to follow. All this Judith does, leading her people to victory by using her own exploits as a model for Bethulian success, despite a lack of rank or secular authority. Holofernes, who is described as a lord of men, fails in all aspects of communal affairs and never reaches the battlefield because he falls to the sword of God's handmaiden.

Anglo-Saxon literature offers many examples of martial prowess among kings and generals. Scyld Scefing, the ancestor of Hroðgar, "is the ideal against which

---

<sup>20</sup> Gregory of Tours, in the *Historia Francorum*, is openly antagonistic towards Chilperic I, *Nero nostri temporis et Herodis* ("the Nero and Herod of our time," 6.46), chastising the king for those vices that caused him to act as a 'lesser man' rather than a king. More importantly, Gregory berated the king for his hatred and betrayal of the bishops (Ibid). This so-called hatred of churches earned Gregory's disdain, exhibited in his likening of Chilperic to the classical tyrants Nero and Herod, the latter of which Luke cites in his gospel as playing a role in Christ's trial (Lc. 23:7-12).



bond between the war-leader and his thanes, since gold is usually captured in war, turned over to the king and then redistributed” (21). Scyld’s position as an *exemplum admirandum* of leadership within the poem reaffirms the necessity of these martial qualities in order for a medieval Germanic society to survive and flourish.

The martial aspect of *fortitudo* is only part of the duty of the Germanic ruler. Scyld represents a victorious war-leader and is said to be a ring-giver, but there is no reference to his hall or the community over which he ruled. The hall was the “‘indoor’ aspect of men’s lives, the world of shelter and comradeship, contrasted with the ‘outdoor’ world of toil and danger, warfare and exile” (Pollington, *Mead Hall* 32). Its importance in Anglo-Saxon society, whether as a physical manifestation or philosophical emblem of the ideal society, is summarised in a single gnomic line: *Cyning sceal on healle / beagas dælan* (“the king shall distribute rings in the hall,” *Max. II* ll. 28b-29a). Through Hroðgar, we are shown the tradition of hall-life, ripe with ritual. He does not seek battle, as does Scyld, but boasts of the peace he maintained within his kingdom from the building of Heorot until the coming of Grendel (Garmonsway 140). He adheres to the traditions of his people by giving gifts to Beowulf in acknowledgement of his heroic service and by offering up feasts and passing the ceremonial mead cup among his retainers. The hall therefore represented the accomplishments of the lord and his community, the rituals and structure itself symbols of his success in a position of authority.

Hroðgar epitomises the lord-retainer relationship by his construction of a grand hall in which these rituals of society might be observed.

Him on mod bearn,  
 þæt healreced hatan wolde,  
 medoærn micel men gewyrcean  
 þon(n)e ylde bearn æfre gefrunon,  
 ond þær on innan eall gedælan  
 geongum ond ealdum, swylc him God sealde. (*Beo.* ll. 67b-72)

It came into his mind that he wished to command a hall-building,  
 [for] men to build a great meadhall that children of men [would] hear  
 of forever, and there within to distribute all to young and old, such as  
 God gave him.

It is Grendel's disruption of the hall, the literal intrusion of the foreign and other, that demands action on the part of the Danes. The monster's conduct perverts the standards of hall-etiquette, just as Holofernes does when he overindulges in drink and leaves himself vulnerable to Judith's attack. The mead-cup was "expressive of reciprocity and trust" (Magennis, *Appetites* 21) between lord and followers, symbolic of their mutual *treow* ("trust"). Rather than partaking of mead from the shared ceremonial cup, Grendel drinks the blood of the thegns (Ibid l. 742). He introduces barbarity into Heorot, which the establishment of the hall sought to dispel. Grendel loathed the *scop*'s sharing of lore and the playing of music within the hall (*Beo.* ll. 88-114); he loathed those pastimes that sought to "impose pattern and order ... making it strikingly different from the chaos outside" (Hume 66). Chaos is symbolised by the figure of Grendel who seeks to silence the noise by attacking Heorot and returning to his lair with thirty Danes as spoils (*Beo.* ll. 115-25).

*Fortitudo*, as depicted in the representation of both Scyld and Hroðgar, encompasses two aspects of Germanic life: the world of the hall and that of the battlefield. The inability to maintain the former and prevail in the latter threatened to disrupt the balance of society, just as depicted in *Judith* when Holofernes perverts the feasting tradition and dooms his men to death. The *Beowulf* poet attributes Hroðgar's inability to avenge his fallen warriors and banish Grendel from Heorot to the worship of pagan gods by his counsellors.<sup>21</sup> The poet continues, however, to say that Hroðgar could not avert this tragedy because *wæs þæt gewin to swyð* ("that struggle was too strong," Ibid l. 191b), suggesting that Grendel's attacks stemmed from a lack of action or *fortitudo* among the Danes rather than the return of pagan practices (Kaske, "Beowulf" 289; Evans 71). This corresponds with Holofernes' failure to accept God as his lord, his ignorance of the *sapientia dei* resulting in his death at the hands of Judith. Through Hroðgar's inaction Heorot becomes a shell as Grendel abducts the retainers one by one thereby revealing a lack of *fortitudo* within the lord's defence of the hall; he "speak[s] the right words and fulfil[s] many ceremonial duties but [is] unable to take any lead in defending his nation" (Irving, Jr. 355). The destruction or perversion of the hall's traditions signifies a crumbling of society, which occurs in *Judith* after Holofernes' vices overcome his senses and he

---

<sup>21</sup> Klaeber suggests that "[s]ince Hroðgar is throughout depicted as a good Christian, the Danes' supplication to a heathen deity ... might conceivably indicate that in a time of distress they returned to their former ways – as was done repeatedly in England ... " (Klaeber 135). See *Beo.* ll. 171b-88.

leaves his men defenceless and alone. The king who did not adhere to these tenets of *fortitudo* forfeited his position, his authority and, oftentimes, his life. The loss of organisation doomed the warriors to exile without comradeship or a lord to serve, an existence best memorialised in *The Wanderer*: *Gemon he selesecgas ond sincþege, / hu hine on geoguðe his goldwine / wenede to wiste. Wyn eal gedreas!* (“He remembers hall-warriors and treasure-giving, how in youth his gold-friend (i.e. lord) accustomed him to feasting. All pleasure has perished!” *Wan.* ll. 34-36).

The antithesis of the likes of Scyld and Hroðgar is Heremod, a king destroyed by his own wickedness (*Beo.* l. 915b), much like Holofernes. Heremod is the ancestor of the famous Scyld, but unlike his descendant he fails to uphold the rules of society and is found wanting in both his role as a military leader and an enforcer of societal bonds. He is keen to slaughter, but kills his own people rather than the enemy: *breat bolgenmod beodgeneatas, / eaxlgesteallan* (“enraged he cut down [his] table-companions, shoulder-comrades,” *Ibid.* ll. 1713-14a). Moreover, he does not distribute *beagas* among his men in honour of their glory or its future attainment: *nallas beagas geaf* (“not at all did he give rings,” *Ibid.* l. 1719b). He brings the kingdom of the Scyldings to near ruin, a decline that was only reversed by Scyld much later; he thus becomes an *exemplum horrendum* of leadership in *Beowulf* (*Ibid.* ll. 1709b-22a; Klaeber, 162-64). Holofernes mirrors these actions by not bequeathing treasure to his loyal retainers at the *swæsende*; he also fails to share words of praise with his men or commendations on their courage and strength. His drunkenness nullifies his ability to offer protection to his warriors, who are subsequently slaughtered as a result of his poor leadership.

The ultimate threat to authority in the Old English literary corpus was vainglory. *Superbia* (pride) was a key quality in the heroic tradition, but its exaggeration into arrogance risked the health of the realm (Swanton, *Crisis* 41-42). The poem *Vainglory* discusses at length the dangers of pride, recalling Satan’s pride before his fall from heaven (*Vain.* ll. 57-65a). The poet warns that,

‘Se þe hine sylfne in þa slīþnan tid  
 þurh oferhygda up ahlæneð,  
 ahefeð heahmodne, se sceal hean wesan  
 æfter neosiþum niþer gebiged,  
 wunian witum fæst, wýrmum beþrunge.’ (*Ibid.* ll. 52-56)

‘He who in the time of cruelty sets himself up through pride, elevates himself [with] arrogance, he will have to be humbled, miserably after death, to live fixed with tortures, encompassed with snakes.’

*Oferhygd* (“pride, arrogance”) threatens not only corporeal power and wealth, but also the rewards in the hereafter; he who is arrogant risks forsaking glory, on earth and in heaven, for the pits of hell. In Hroðgar’s speech against excessive pride, he employs Heremod as an exemplar: the ancestor of the Scyldings exhibited overweening pride when he punished his own people without fear of reprisal (Swanton, *Crisis* 127). Hroðgar warns, that as a man’s *oferhygd* increases *þonne se weard swefeð, / sawele hyrde* (“then the guardian sleeps, keeper of the soul,” *Beo.* ll. 1741b-42a); pride cannot, after all, defend a kingdom or reward warriors for their courage. Hygelac, for example, dies “in reckless and perhaps unnecessary combat, and in so doing show[s] some measure of *ofermod* (pride)” (Irving, Jr. 363) because he thought of his own glory before that of his people.

Beowulf, in his final battle with the dragon, refuses aid from his retainers and goes forth alone to certain death:

Gebide ge on beorge byrnum werede,  
 secgas on searwum, hwæðer sel mæge  
 æfter wælræse wunde gedygan  
 uncer twega. Nis þæt eower sið,  
 ne gemet mannes, nefn(e) min anes. (*Beo.* ll. 2529-33)

Await ye on the barrow protected with mail, warriors in war gear,  
 which of us two would better survive wounds through bloody-  
 conflict. It is not your undertaking, nor in the power of men, except  
 mine alone.

Swanton explains that Beowulf’s decision to approach the dragon alone represents an inactive conscience and a rising arrogance in his own abilities (Swanton, *Crisis* 143). He is “no longer reliant upon the strength of God ... neither does he consider himself dependent upon the *folc*” (Ibid 141). In *Judith*, Holofernes’ arrogance blinds him to the threats approaching him and his men and ultimately brings about his

downfall, for, as Augustine warned: *superbia ... avertit a sapientia* (“pride diverts from wisdom,” Augustine, *Arbitrio* PL 32.1307).<sup>22</sup>

The advent of Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England redefined the concepts behind courage and the Germanic celebration of *superbia*. Exemplars of leadership were celebrated without the details of physical victory in order to emphasise the effectiveness of Christ’s sacrifice for mankind. In the *Dream of the Rood*, Christ does not physically fight his persecutors, for his battle is with the sins of mankind: he triumphs through his death, thereby supplying a new representation of *fortitudo* for Christian Anglo-Saxons to emulate.<sup>23</sup> He is transformed into a “victorious Germanic warlord” (Russell 43), a young hero who hastens bravely and with great zeal to relieve mankind of suffering, just as Beowulf defended his people against the dragon and Judith saved the Bethulians from Holofernes. In the tenth century, Abbo of Fleury and Ælfric of Eynsham transformed the death of Edmund, king of East Anglia in the mid-ninth century, into a *passio* reminiscent of Christ’s self sacrifice. Edmund had fought the encroaching Danes until he was slain in battle, *circa* AD869 (*ASC* 870 [860]). Abbo and Ælfric, however, depicted Edmund as refusing to fight the Danes, seeking instead to imitate Christ with passive resistance (Ælfric, *Lives II* ll. 101-05). Christ’s crucifixion was translated into the Germanic ideology of kingship by depicting it as a defence the faith. Edmund is rewarded for his unwavering belief, as after his beheading *his sawl siþode gesælig to Criste* (“his blessed soul journeyed to Christ,” *Ibid* l. 126), the greatest reward man might achieve. These texts idealise the role of leadership into that of an *exemplum admirandum* of the faith, altering the concept of Germanic *fortitudo* into a new Christian interpretation of strength and communal duty.

---

<sup>22</sup> In his *Historia Francorum*, Gregory of Tours cites the *bella regum* as “characteristic of king[ship]” (Wallace Hadrill, *Early Medieval* 98) and reveals his favour for those who establish themselves as martially proficient. Gregory I was also not averse to the use of violence by kings “so long as it was the right blood” (*Ibid* 100), specifically those who opposed the Church or its emissaries. Bede also condones violence as a display of *fortitudo*, explaining that it is necessary in maintaining the borders of a Christian kingdom. Oswiu of Bernicia, for example, is highly praised for his defeat of Penda of Mercia and the restoration of Christian morality to Northumbria (Bede 3.24). Oswiu triumphed by God’s divine grace. Here we see what Gregory I distinguished as ‘right’ versus ‘wrong’ bloodshed: the bloodshed that resulted in the death of Penda, whose former victories were won *per diabolicam artem* (“through diabolical skill,” Nennius 65), confirms why it is a ‘right’ use of violence because he was pagan and an antagonist of the faithful. The story of Judith conforms to these principles; the decapitation of Holofernes is justified as moral and righteous because he is a heathen and aggressor against God’s people.

<sup>23</sup> Chaney connects the imagery of Christ’s death in the *Dream of the Rood* to the death of the god Baldr in Norse tradition, just as Loki was amalgamated with the Devil (Chaney, *Cult of Kingship* 51).

The Germanic vernacular tradition reflects the original concepts behind headship before the coming of Christianity with an emphasis on martial prowess but also on *sapientia*, both required to serve the *folc* and the gods. When the Anglo-Saxons, Scandinavians and other Germanic people began writing in the vernacular, their style was imbued with Christian character. *Fortitudo*, as discussed above, continued to represent the ideal Germanic “quality of a hero ... [that is] physical might and courage” (Kaske, “Beowulf” 272), yet evolved into the Christian concept of battling sin, vice and the antagonists of the true faith. The fortitude of the Germanic ruler was supplemented with *sapientia*; lords and chiefs surrounded themselves with wise men (*witan*) to aid in their decision-making and were expected to abide by the opinions of their people (Tacitus, *Germania* 11; Swanton, *Crisis* 36). The disregard of this council could result in the rebellion of his people. Similarly, if he did not have the sagacity for warfare then his army could be more easily defeated and “[a] leader’s authority lasted only as long as his success in war” (Todd, *Early Germans* 33). The importance of *fortitudo* and *sapientia* are best represented in the figure of \*Tiwaz, an early Germanic god, who was “honoured ... for his wisdom as [well as] for his dominance in war” (Todd, *Early Germans* 104).

Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian gnomic verse exhibit specific lessons on the ideal form of pre-Christian *sapientia*: it is “the gift of wisdom made word and passed on again to a dependent society” (Bjork 1014). The *Hávamál* contains several stanzas dedicated to the quality of wisdom. In stanza twenty-six, for example, *sapientia* is directly tied to experience; a man can think himself wise, but can do little if he hides away from the world.<sup>24</sup> In stanza fifteen, the ideal qualities of a prince emphasise *sapientia* and *fortitudo* together:

Þagalt ok hugalt  
 skyldi þjóðans barn  
 ok vígdjarft vera;  
 glaðr ok reifr  
 skyli gumna hverr,  
 unz sinn bíðr bana. (*Hávamál* 15)

<sup>24</sup> *Ósnotr maðr / þykkisk allt vita, / ef hann á sér í vá veru; / hittki hann veit, / hvat hann skal við kveða, / ef hans freista firar* (*Hávamál* 26); (“A foolish man thinks he know everything if placed in unexpected difficulty; but he knows not what to answer, if to the test he is put,” Trans. B. Thorpe).

Taciturn and prudent, and in war daring should a king's children  
be; joyous and liberal every one should be until the hour of his death.

(Trans. B. Thorpe)

Similarly, in the Old English *Maxims*, wisdom is glorified as a key quality in the development of an able ruler: *Geongne æþeling sceolan gode gesiðas / byldan to beaduwe and to beahgife. / Ellen sceal on eorle, ecg sceal wið hellme / hilde gebidan* (“good companions ought to encourage a young prince to battle and to ring-giving. Courage must [exist] in a warrior, a sword ought to experience battle with a helm,” *Max. II* ll. 14-17a). Here, *sapientia* is directly connected to *fortitudo*, the former teaching how the latter must be employed in order to train the young *æþeling*.<sup>25</sup>

Hroðgar, like Scyld before him, is accorded the epithet of *god cyning*. Unlike Scyld, however, his status as a ‘good king’ is derived from his sagacity; he idealises what Kaske terms as “kingly *sapientia*” (Kaske, “Beowulf” 272). Indeed, Schücking remarks that this “strong emphasis on the king’s intellectual powers” (42) permeates the whole of *Beowulf*. We are told that Hroðgar was successful in warfare, earning the loyalty of his retainers until his army was enlarged and his renown intensified (*Beo.* ll. 64-67). He exhibits the *sapientia* of kingship in his rule over Heorot, through the giving of gifts and celebration of his followers’ achievements. Upon his return home, Beowulf describes Hroðgar as a *snotra fengel* (“wise prince,” *Ibid* l. 2156a) before regaling Hygelac with the history of those treasures the Danish king gifted to the hero. Wisdom, however, is God-given, as Hroðgar warns Beowulf, along with land and lordship and all can be lost to kingly vice, such as arrogance or indolence (*Beo.* ll. 1726-27; see also Kroll 121). When Hroðgar speaks to Beowulf of Heremod’s arrogance, he ends his speech with these words: *Du þe lær be þon, / gumcyste ongit! Ic þis gid be þe / awræc wintrum frod* (“you learn from this, understand manly virtues! I spoke this tale, wise in winters, for you,” *Ibid* ll. 1722b-24a). Experience has made Hroðgar wise, his long years as king and the trials he faced – both his successes and failures – helping to define him as an ideal leader.

*Sapientia dei* was a critical element of leadership in the medieval period. A king or lord who gained divine favour, earned through the knowledge of the bible and patristic tradition as well as devout faith, would thereby receive the *fortitudo* to

<sup>25</sup> Such a combination of *sapientia* and *fortitudo* reappear elsewhere in *Maxims II*; with regard to the ideals of kingship, see *Max. II* ll. 1b, 28b-29a and 31b-33a.

maintain his borders and increase his earthly authority. This new interpretation was combined with the traditional Germanic features of kingly wisdom, which stressed the martial aspect of the leader and his ability to guide his people on the proper path. Beowulf is perhaps the best example of this amalgamation of wisdom from the two traditions. Kaske, in his work on *sapientia* and *fortitudo* within *Beowulf*, best summarises the hero's varied use of wisdom within the poem:

He is wise in the ways of violence (440-55, 1384-9) ... in his manner of accepting it ... and ... in his ability to plan against it. His skill in using words and his accurate appraisal of men ... make him an effective and persuasive speaker ... His wise foresight is shown by his preparations for combat, his arrangements for the management of his affairs in case of his death (1474-91), his clear realisation of the possible outcome of his own actions (440-55) and his ability to predict accurately in the affairs of others (974-7, 1674-6, 2029-69). [He] knows the value of controlling himself ... the councils of wise men (415-17) and the dependence of human affairs on Wyrð (455) and on God (1272-3, 1657-64). ("Beowulf" 276)

Beowulf's *sapientia* is all encompassing, allowing him to act as an ideal warrior and later as king. He employs his wisdom in the fight against Grendel and his acceptance of fate when he goes to fight the dragon. Vital to his role as an *exemplum admirandum*, however, is his ability to acknowledge God's divine grace as the key to his many victories. Upon recounting his battle with the water beasts during his race with Breca, Beowulf explains that he survived only because '*mec God scylde*' ("God protected me'," *Beo.* l. 1660b)

In other Old English texts, the association between wisdom and God is more explicit. In *Andreas*, the hero's *fortitudo* and *sapientia* are emphasised after he has contact with the Divine (*And.* ll. 996b-99a, 1058-85a); Juliana's wisdom is specifically Christian, her *fortitudo* emanating from her faith (*Jul.* ll. 430-32, 510-22, 547-53). Again and again the heroes of Old English texts triumph because of divine aid, notably sent in the guise of knowledge, itself a manifestation of *sapientia dei*. In *Judith*, certain epithets describing the heroine "emphasise the wisdom which comes from God" (Purdie 28), and which also brings about Holofernes' defeat; his ignorance of "God's involvement" (Locherbie-Cameron 72) leaves him vulnerable to Judith's actions within the Assyrian camp. The absence of *sapientia dei* in the

general's character nullifies any *fortitudo* he might possess, therefore emphasising the necessity of both qualities in the person of authority.

The literary representation of leadership among the Anglo-Saxons is founded in a complex use of equivocality, in this instance the old Germanic tradition and the new Christian milieu. In his work on *Beowulf*, Robinson discusses the importance of reading Old English literature, as its contemporaries would have, with multiple interpretations:

A poet who, in a deeply Christian age, wants to acknowledge his heroes' damnation while insisting on their dignity must find and exercise in his listeners' minds the powers of inference and the ability to entertain two simultaneous points of view, that are necessary for the resolution of poignant cultural tensions. (13-14)

This approach may be applied to all Old English literature rather than just *Beowulf*. *Judith*, the focal point of this thesis, exhibits a combination of Old Testament imagery with Germanic heroism and pagan elements balanced with Christian symbolism. We must, therefore, approach the Anglo-Saxon literary tradition, and *Judith* in particular, fully conscious of possible apposition of secular and religious terminology. What follows is an in-depth analysis of *Judith* against a variegated background of disparate leadership traditions. It will focus on Holofernes as the antithesis of Anglo-Saxon headship, as he is without *sapientia dei*, and Judith as the embodiment of the ideal combination of Germanic strength and Christian wisdom.

#### Plan of the Present Work

The organisation of the remainder of this thesis narrows in scope to study the poem of *Judith* within the Anglo-Saxon tradition. Chapter two seeks to establish a background to *Judith*'s creation and the development of leadership therein. It focuses on the *Liber Iudith* as a part of the Old Testament tradition in Anglo-Saxon England as a representation of how the Christo-Germanic community defined kingship. The impact of the Old Testament on the Anglo-Saxons is vital in understanding the strong tradition of the Judith story and therefore how it was employed to depict the role of the leader to its audience.

Chapter two will also address two other texts of English provenance that employ Judith as an exemplar for medieval Anglo-Saxon society: the seventh-century, Anglo-Latin *De Laude Virginitate* by Aldhelm of Malmesbury and Ælfric

of Eynsham's late tenth-century homily on the *Liber Iudith*. These examples frame the Anglo-Saxon period, the former representative of the early school at Canterbury, while the latter reflects the Benedictine Reform near the turn of the millennium. Both texts allow for a more in-depth understanding of how Judith and Holofernes were viewed within the Anglo-Saxon period and how the emphasis on their characteristics adapted and changed with a developing medieval society.

Chapters three and four are character analyses of *Judith*, the former of Holofernes, the latter of Judith. Both chapters analyse the poet's description of the two main characters as variations on leadership through their individual epithets. Holofernes is transformed into a Germanic lord, the Assyrians his retainers. His character follows the Germanic-lord framework described by Tacitus (*Germania* 7, 11, 14), situating him at the head of a figurative Assyrian mead-hall, but the expected examples of his *fortitudo* are entirely lacking, thereby transforming him into an *exemplum horrendum*. Judith's character, imbued with *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei*, becomes an *exemplum admirandum* of, not only the faith, but the position of a leader within a Christian community.

These chapters are subdivided by in-depth examinations of the epithets employed by the poet for Judith and Holofernes, respectively.<sup>26</sup> Although the protagonist of the story, Judith is often defined by Holofernes' characteristics rather than any explicit detail the poet attributes directly to her. Emphasis is removed from the protagonist as a model of heroic leadership and transplanted to the antagonist, who in turn becomes a model of the anti-leader. The focus is therefore placed on the villain of the story in order to promote the positive message of Judith as God's handmaiden. The epithets pertaining to these characters are compared, where necessary, to the original biblical characters to emphasise the poet's variations on, and diversion from the biblical texts. Select terms are then discussed in relation to the greater Anglo-Saxon literary corpus, examining other uses of specific words within the Old English word-hoard. The purpose of this analysis is to determine the tradition of certain key epithets regarding leadership and how *Judith* employs this tradition through its own characters.

Chapters five and six are in-depth analyses of select episodes within *Judith* that focus on the characteristics of Anglo-Saxon leadership as defined in the

---

<sup>26</sup> For a list of these epithets, see Appendix I, pp. 165-66.

previous chapters, and in particular, the roles of *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei* in defining the ideal ruler. The purpose of each subsection within this chapter is to study individual omissions and alterations that enforce the use of Germanic and Christian ideas as representations of the perfect leader. These sections focus on the opposition of ideals, namely on that between wisdom and ignorance, but also between vice and virtue, Christianity and heathenism. All analyses of the poem are discussed in apposition to the biblical analogues in order to establish patterns within the poet's methodology. However, throughout these chapters *Judith* is examined against an Anglo-Saxon background that blends traditional Germanic elements with the Christian faith to create new exemplars for a converted society.

Chapter II: *Ecce dedit vobis Dominus regem*<sup>27</sup>

The first half of the Bible supplied the Anglo-Saxons with figures of authority – kings, queens, prophets, warriors – whom they could emulate while establishing their new Christian kingdoms. The power of the ruler was understood as god-given; position and authority were maintained through constancy of faith and good works on the part of the king. In the transition from a martial, pagan polytheism to a Christian monotheism that celebrated pacifism, no work was more important than the Old Testament. It provided the link missionaries required during the conversion process to establish the Anglo-Saxons in the broader Judeo-Christian tradition. The relationship between the Anglo Saxons and the Old Testament was founded on a shared cultural identity with the early Israelites. Both peoples began as tribesmen who battled their way towards security and settlement in their respected promised lands: the Hebrews in Israel and the Anglo-Saxons in England. The apocryphal *Liber Iudith* served a similar educational function by supplying examples of faith and leadership through its heroine, who employed physical strength and moral superiority to overcome the enemy of God.

The stories of the kings of Israel and Judea found in the Old Testament were employed by medieval English authors to guide contemporary society, and, in particular, persons of power toward service of both God and the faithful. Secular rulers and holy people served as exemplars in a developing Christo-Germanic society through demonstrations of military strength, both passive and aggressive, and acts of faith in the one true God. Leaders in Anglo-Saxon England were defenders as well as guides directing their flock (both lay and religious) towards salvation. In the *Liber Iudith* we find this dual aspect of leadership in the character of the Bethulian widow.

The Anglo-Saxon writings on Judith's story, namely *De Laude Virginitate*, Ælfric's homily and the poetic *Judith*, maintain the original theme of the biblical book. It is a “‘rescue-story’, [a] narrative about persons who come forward in critical situations and save the chosen people” (Otzen 68). Although Judith does not hold a position of power, like that of Nebuchodonosor, king of Ninevah and Assyria,<sup>28</sup> or his general, Holofernes, she is nevertheless a model of the ideal Judeo-Christian

---

<sup>27</sup> “Behold, the Lord gave a kingdom to you,” I Sm. 12:13.

<sup>28</sup> It is only in the *Liber Iudith* that Nebuchodonosor is associated with Ninevah and Assyria. The historical Nebuchodonosor was in fact king of Babylonia (Otzen 81-87).

leader. She delivers her people from foreign oppression, guiding them to salvation while emphasising that “Israel’s God is the only god, and he will demonstrate his position by saving his chosen people from the heathen powers” (Ibid 98); this martial theme melded smoothly with the pre-conversion, Germanic *comitatus* culture. The heroine represents the ideal qualities of a Christian leader in all three Anglo-Saxon texts with only minor alterations.<sup>29</sup> The poem, for instance, removes references to her chastity and widowhood, but not her overall piety and virtue. Although Ælfric places more emphasis on Judith’s role as an exemplar for the secular world than does Aldhelm, it is in the poem, *Judith*, that a distinctly Germanic type of leadership supersedes the more traditional themes of chastity. Furthermore, it is in Holofernes rather than Judith that the position of leadership is emphasised, albeit as an *exemplum horrendum* that ought not to be imitated.

What follows is an overview of the Old Testament’s prominence in Anglo-Saxon England. The characters and stories from the first half of the Bible appear in a variety of Anglo-Saxon texts and serve as models for the ideal virtues of a Judeo-Christian leader. This summary of the Old Testament tradition introduces the *Liber Iudith* and its use in England between the seventh and early eleventh centuries, as well as its importance as a medium for spiritual education in Anglo-Saxon society. The remainder of the chapter is dedicated to the analysis of two texts, both of which employ Judith as an exemplar for their respective societies: Aldhelm’s *De Laude Virginitate* and Ælfric’s homily on the *Liber Iudith*. These texts establish precedence for how Anglo-Saxon authors employed the story of Judith and, therefore, how *Judith* deviates from this tradition with a unique rendering of the story into the Germanic heroic tradition.

#### The Old Testament Exemplar in Anglo-Saxon England

Skemp succinctly summarises the Anglo-Saxon’s understanding of Old Testament literature:

In the Old Testament he [the Anglo-Saxon] was brought into contact with the writings ... of wandering shepherd tribes, evolving through conquest and captivity, in constant conflict with other tribes and among themselves, under changing social organisations, and with

---

<sup>29</sup> I specify ‘Christian’ here because all three Judith-based texts were written in a Christian society and the text itself had long-since become a part of the Christian commentary tradition.

unusually important interaction of religion and leadership, into national life. (435)

Based on the similarities between their history and that of the Hebrew people, the newly converted kings of Anglo-Saxon England saw themselves as God's newly chosen race, the heirs to his kingdom. Like the Israelites seeking their homeland across the Red Sea, the Germanic tribes recalled their migration to Britain from the continent as a sort of exodus; the conversion to Christianity they accepted as the final step in their homecoming to a new promised land while figures of headship in the bible were associated with ideal paradigms of authority (Alcuin, *Ad Lindisfarnenses* PL 100.150A-52A; Howe 25; Hanning 58). Men like Gregory I and Alcuin saw the Anglo-Saxon conversion as a part of a "larger historical process" (Howe 25) tracing back to the earliest Hebrew belief in a single deity. Among the Anglo-Saxons, the Old Testament "complemented and challenged the literary tradition of the Germanic inheritance" (Godden 206) and offered corollaries to the Germanic exodus to Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries. The similar background regarding the historical diaspora of the Hebrew tribes and the Germanic migration across Europe and eventually to Britain, supplied a moral and political exemplar with which the Anglo-Saxons could associate themselves and subsequently follow.<sup>30</sup>

Kings and leaders of the Old Testament were often recalled in the medieval period as models of right and wrong among contemporary rulers. The concept of *regis gratia dei* ("king by the grace of god") was affirmed by the books of the Old Testament and allowed for a centralisation of power in a single ruler and his descendants (Swanton, *Crisis* 12; Chaney, *Cult of Kingship* 11-12, 63). The employment of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England, for purposes of conversion and education, increased the importance of these particular kings. Gildas, well before the Anglo-Saxon conversion of the late sixth century, was first to provide a parallel between the Israelites and the Anglo-Saxons. He compares

---

<sup>30</sup> The Old Testament was a constant influence in Anglo-Saxon culture and the production of biblical texts in Latin was a long-lived tradition in England. The famous *Codex Amiatinus*, now the "earliest surviving complete Vulgate Bible anywhere" (Marsden 76) was written in Northumbria at the command of Abbot Ceolfrith of Wearmouth-Jarrow in AD716 (Ibid 41, 76-77, 86). Seventeen extant manuscripts, compiled in Anglo-Saxon England, contain Old Testament material; the sixth-century leaf of Maccabees is Italian in origin (see Marsden 39-40). The importance of the Old Testament in the conversion of the Frisians is attested in Boniface's letters, which record his request to have certain books of the Old Testament sent to him so they might assist him in his preaching among the heathens (Bonifacius, *Epistola III* PL 89.690C-92A; *Epistola XVIII* PL 89.711C-12B; *Epistola XX* PL 89.713A-20B).

Vortigern, the *superbus tyrannus* (“arrogant tyrant,” Gildas 23.1) and his counsellors to Pharaoh and the princes of Zoan (Is. 19:11), who offer foolish advice to their leader in a time of crisis: *Quos propensius morte, cum abessent, tremebant, sponte, ut ita dicam, sub unius tecti culmine invitabant: ‘stulti principes’, ut dictum est, ‘Taneos dantes Pharaoni consilium insipiens’* (“[those people] whom they feared more readily [than] death when absent, they invited voluntarily, as I may say, under the roof of a single house: ‘foolish [are] princes,’ as it was said, ‘of Taneos giving foolish advice to Pharaoh,” Gildas 23.2). The invitation of the Saxons to aid the Britons, as well as the eventual fall of the island to Germanic rule, are attributed to Vortigern and his unwise counsellors; the precedent set in Isaiah provided Gildas a framework on which to base his people’s history. Howe remarks that by emphasising this comparison between Vortigern and his counsellors to these particular Old Testament figures “who then were the Israelites, the chosen people, but the Anglo-Saxons” (46).

Bede is perhaps the most effusive writer on the inheritance of Old Testament traditions among the Anglo-Saxons. In his composition of the *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, he too referred to the Anglo-Saxons as a chosen race divesting the Britons of the island through God’s will: *Siquidem, ut breuiter dicam, accensus manibus paganorum ignis, iustas de sceleribus populi Dei ultiones expetiit, non illius inpar, qui quondam a Chaldaeis succensus, Hierosolymorum moenia, immo aedificia cuncta consumpsit* (“in fact, as I say briefly, the fire kindled by the hands of the pagans, people of God attained lawful revenge for crimes not dissimilar to that once set on fire by the Chaldeans, [and] devoured the fortifications of Jerusalem, indeed all the buldings ” Bede 1.15). Bede compares the conquest of Britain by the Germanic people to the Chaldean siege of Jerusalem (III Rg. 24:10-11) because God punishes both the Britons and the kings of Judah (Ibid 24:2-4, 19; II Par. 36:8) for their sins through oppression. While he does not associate the Anglo-Saxons with the Chaldeans as a people, he can compare their situations and see the reasons for their respective successes as similar in origin. Control of the land, according to Bede, is directly associated with the preaching of the faith. He explains that the Britons, like the Judeans, lose their land to outsiders because they never taught the faith to the Angles and Saxons (Bede 1.22). We are reassured, however, for he says that God *non ... plebem suam, quam praesciuit, deseruit, quin multo digniores genti memoratae praecones ueritatis, per quos crederet, destinauit* (“did not desert his

people, whom he foreknew, in that he sent to the [afore]mentioned people much more suitable heralds of truth, through whom [the people] might believe,” Bede 1.22). Christianity came to the Anglo-Saxons despite the Britons’ inability to teach it, for they were the chosen race to rule England.

The *Historia Ecclesiastica* expresses Bede’s understanding of leadership against a biblical backdrop. He knew that “the history of God’s dealings with his people was inextricably linked with the history of its kings and the holy men who guided them” (McClure 94). Bede placed Anglo-Saxon kings, such as Æthelberht, Edwin or Oswiu, into the tradition of the kings of Israel, who were leaders of the faith as well as defenders of the faithful. Bede compares the military exploits of Æthelfrith of Northumbria and Saul, both of whom achieved great success in conquering neighbouring enemies, despite Æthelfrith’s paganism (Bede 1.34; McClure 87). In Yorke’s words “Anglo-Saxon kings provided many of the examples of good and bad behaviour and the Old Testament provided Bede with models for his portrayals” (*Kings and Kingdoms* 22).

The kings of the Old Testament, like their Anglo-Saxon counterparts, were dependent on divine judgment. Saul, the first king of Israel, was famed for his victories against a multitude of enemies in order to preserve the borders of Israel (I Sm. 13:14; 15:26). However, when he disobeyed the commands of YHWH, his kingdom was taken from him:

numquid vult Dominus holocausta aut victimas et non potius ut oboediatur voci Domini melior est enim oboedientia quam victimae ... quoniam quasi peccatum ariolandi est repugnare et quasi scelus idolatriae nolle acquiescere pro eo ergo quod abiecisti sermonem Domini abiecit te ne sis rex. (I Sm. 15:22-23)

Does the lord want holocausts or victims and not rather that the voice of the lord be obeyed, for obedience is better than sacrifices ... because it is like the sin of divination to oppose [him] and like the crime of idolatry to not wish to acquiesce for him; therefore because you cast aside the word of God, he cast you aside [and] you may not be king.

Saul was appointed by YHWH but was later removed from the privileged position when he did not adhere to God's commandments.<sup>31</sup> Similarly, Solomon, King David's son and successor, was recognised as the wisest man on earth, unsurpassed by all who came before him and those who would follow (III Rg. 3:9-12; 4:30-31; 10:23).<sup>32</sup> Despite his wisdom, Solomon also turns against YHWH by reverting to idolatry and is punished through the division of his kingdom (Ibid 11:4-12). The power of these kings remains whole and their lands safe while they adhere to the commandments of God, but is irretrievably lost when they do not. While only a general in Nebuchodonosor's army, Holofernes represents leadership within the *Liber Iudith*, just as Saul and Solomon do in the *Libri Regum*. It is through his inability to understand the omnipotence of God that he is punished like Saul and Solomon and condemns himself to slaughter at the hand of the almighty's earthly vessel, Judith.

In the *Versus de Patribus Regibus et Sanctis Euboricensis Ecclesiae* Alcuin commemorates the "political, ecclesiastical and intellectual history" (Godman xxxix) of Northumbria by narrating the history of Britain from Roman to Anglo-Saxon rule. As with Gildas and Bede before him, he witnesses the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms as divinely wrought:

Hoc pietate Dei visum, quod gens scelerata  
ob sua de terris partum peccata periret  
intraretque suas populus felicior urbes,  
qui servaturus Domini praecepta fuisset.  
Quod fuit affatim factum, donante Tonante  
iam nova dum crebris viguerunt sceptris triumphis  
et reges ex se iam coepit habere potentes  
gens ventura Dei. (Alcuin, *Euboricensis* p. 10, ll. 71-78)

<sup>31</sup> While it is not discussed in detail in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Æthelfrith's paganism might have appeared as a reason for his removal by Rædwald, king of East Anglia and recent convert to Christianity under the patronage of Æthelberht of Kent (Stenton 112). Edwin, who succeeded Æthelfrith upon the latter's death, reportedly converted after a divine vision (Bede 2.12) thereby bringing Christianity to Northumbria. McClure also associates King David's fight against the Philistines (I Sm. 23:1-5; II Sm. 5:17-25) with Bede's commentary on the Mercian conflict with Northumbria in the seventh century (Bede 3.24; McClure 88-89). Bede makes no mention of David or the Philistines in the *Historia*; McClure's argument resides on the impact of the Old Testament as a sourcebook on military exploits for Bede to imitate when discussing his own people (McClure 87-90).

<sup>32</sup> In a dream, God comes to Solomon and offers him a single request, to which the boy replies that he would have a docile heart *ut iudicare possit populum tuum [Deum] et discernere inter malum et bonum* ("so that he might be able to judge your [i.e. God's] people and to discern between evil and good," III Rg. 3:9).

This vision with piety of God might have died, because the criminal race had been created from the earth on account of their own sins, and a more blessed people entered their cities, who would have preserved the precepts of God. Because it was sufficiently done, by God's grace (literally, "giving"), for new kingdoms acquired strength from repeated victories and the coming (fut. act. part. *venio*) race of God began to have powerful kings from it.

These lines stress two key themes in Alcuin's poem: the loss of British control over the island through *segnitia* ("slowness, inactivity") and a lack of piety, as well as the recognition of the Anglo-Saxons "as modern-day Israelites, God's new chosen people" (Hanning 59). The arrival of a new, pagan Germanic people in the eighth century led men like Alcuin to believe that like the Israelites and Britons before them, the Anglo-Saxons had become "a disobedient people being punished by God by wars and defeat at the hands of foreign invaders" (Howe 22). The onslaught of Scandinavian raids reaffirmed the Anglo-Saxons' position as God's new chosen race, demanding that they repent lest they too be overcome like the kingdom of Israel, a theme prevalent in the *Liber Iudith* (Otzen 101-06).

#### *Liber Iudith* in Anglo-Saxon England

The Old Testament was primarily accepted as a book of history, from which the Anglo-Saxons adopted a framework for the creation of the world and man; it was "a storehouse of historical *exempla* to prove the reality of God's judgment" (Hanning 58, his italics). The Old Testament appears in Anglo-Saxon law texts, such as the preface to Alfred's law codes where he cites the Mosaic Law almost verbatim before expounding on his own decrees (B. Griffiths 43). By the end of the tenth century, "substantial parts of the Pentateuch, along with versions of Joshua and Judges, were translated" (Marsden 395) into Old English, while Ælfric of Eynsham, who assisted in the translation of the *Heptateuch*, composed three homilies based on apocryphal texts, namely the *Libri Iudith*, *Esther* and *Machabaeorum* as well as the Old English *Hexameron*.

In addition to these citations and translations are Old English poems that focus on, or include strong elements of, the Old Testament. The Junius manuscript contains poetic adaptations of the Books of Genesis, Exodus and Daniel; the tenth-century Exeter Book includes the fragmentary poems *Azarias* (based on Daniel) and

*Pharaoh*; *Beowulf* and *Judith* both appear in the Nowell Codex; and the *Psalms* and *Solomon and Saturn* reside in other manuscripts.<sup>33</sup> The importance of these Old Testament stories can be found in their recurrence within Anglo-Saxon texts. Genesis, for instance, appears in the Anglo-Latin and vernacular tradition, in both poetic and prose forms.<sup>34</sup> The Book of Exodus is also a focal point among Anglo-Saxon authors, from Bede's use of the Israelite migration from Egypt in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* to the poetic adaptation of the same name.<sup>35</sup> A third and, for this particular study, more important Old Testament book to reappear in Anglo-Saxon writing is the *Liber Iudith*.

In Anglo-Saxon England, the story of Judith is employed in the Anglo-Latin and vernacular tradition, in both prose and verse, just like the first two books of the Pentateuch. The importance of Genesis and Exodus is hardly surprising as they offer a new, Judeo-Christian explanation for creation and for the covenant between God and his chosen people. The recurrence of the *Liber Iudith*, however, is a unique curiosity among Anglo-Saxon literature. The story was established in the Maccabean revolt of the second century BC; the composition of the Book of Judith dated sometime to the first or second century BC and thus after the closing of the Hebrew canon (Moore 63-65). In the Catholic Church, Judith is numbered among the deuterocanonical texts and was considered by the Church Fathers as a text intended "for edification and instruction" (Reid). She was an exemplary leader for the followers of Christianity because she exhibited the moral superiority and physical strength required to battle non-believers and sinners.<sup>36</sup>

The use of the Bethulian heroine as a model of chastity in widowhood began with the early Church Fathers; Jerome recommended "Judith as a 'castitatis

<sup>33</sup> Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems* (New York: Columbia UP, 1942): 31-48, 160-69 (*Solomon and Saturn*); 80-87, 189-90 (*Psalms*).

<sup>34</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the Book of Genesis in Anglo-Saxon England, see Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe, "The Book of Genesis in Anglo-Saxon England," Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1976. Print.

<sup>35</sup> Howe offers a reading of *Exodus* in relation to the Anglo-Saxon "migration myth" (Howe, 72-107). For a more in-depth edition into the poem, see Peter J. Lucas, ed., *Exodus*, Exeter: University of Exeter, 1994. Print.

<sup>36</sup> Jerome, in his *Prologus Iudith*, describes the *Liber Iudith* as non-canonical, but that he included it in his *Vulgata* because of a discussion had at the first Council of Nicaea: *Sed quia hunc librum Synodus Nicaena in numero sanctorum Scripturarum legitur computasse, acquievi postulationi vestrae* ("but, because the Nicene Synod has decided that this book be created from a number of Holy Scriptures, I have assented to your request," *Praefatio* PL 22.39A). Jerome considered the original Hebrew bible to be the only source of the true canonical texts, referring to them as the *hebraica veritas* ("Hebrew truth"), from which Judith is excluded. For more see: Stefan Rebenich, "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilingus' and the 'Hebraica Veritas'," *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993): 50-77.

exemplum” (Clayton 222). The heroine’s critics forgave her for the seduction of Holofernes because she retained her chastity upon leaving the Assyrian camp after four days therein. According to Pringle,

the Fathers discuss Judith tropologically as an example of chaste widowhood, or simply as an example of chastity ... in this case Holofernes represents the flesh, or carnal temptation ... Secondly, they see her as a type of the Church, cutting off the head of the Old Serpent symbolized by Holofernes. Most Anglo-Saxons who knew the story of Judith would probably have known these stock interpretations. (84)

The importance of the Old Testament allowed Judith to serve as an example for Anglo-Saxon Christians; it established precedence for a courageous enterprise that would appeal to Germanic culture while retaining the fundamental religious implications of the original. Aldhelm is therefore able to exemplify Judith as a model of chastity, who served her people in a time of tribulation by striking down the enemy of God because of her virginal virtues.

Despite the connection between the Old Testament and the Anglo-Saxons, the apocryphal status of the Judith story in the biblical tradition makes the Anglo-Saxon partiality for reproducing it a curiosity.<sup>37</sup> Anglo-Saxon writers, like the early commentaries, employed Judith as an example of virtue and chastity, thereby reducing, although not eliminating, the importance of the patriotic message originally intended for Israel. She remained the ideal representative of chastity preserved; the *Ecclesia* triumphant; a model of virginity and unwavering faith as well as the transition of the Old Law into the New. The Anglo-Saxons retained these interpretations, furthering her role as a symbol of the faith. Indeed, her chasteness in widowhood and unerring faith in God are the key elements in the Judith story that appealed to the Anglo-Saxon community thereby making her a leader of the faith and a moral exemplar. Her story survives in three texts, none of which are direct translations of the biblical book, but rather adaptations of the story for the respective

---

<sup>37</sup> The *Liber Iudith*’s significance to the Anglo-Saxon community is perhaps best expressed in its continued resurgence in literary form. The early eighth-century *Codex Amiatinus* included the *Liber Iudith*, but it is more likely that the book would have circulated more regularly in smaller volumes. St. Gallen, an important centre of literary exchange with Northumbria, was “particularly prolific in the productions” (Marsden 44) of such volumes in the second half of the ninth century. Many of these contained the Major and Minor Prophets as well as “the deuterocanonical books, especially, Judith, Esther, and Tobit” (Ibid 44).

authors' particular purposes. The earliest, Aldhelm's *De Laude Virginitate* and *Carmen de Virginitate*, were written in the seventh century and are concerned with the theological discussions of virginity. Ælfric of Eynsham, who adapted her story into a vernacular homily in the late tenth or early eleventh century, employed the heroine for the dual purpose of exemplifying moral virtue and national defence with Judith as the exemplary leader of both. The poetic *Judith*, which survives as a fragment in the Nowell Codex, does not exhibit a similarly obvious purpose as its counterparts, nor is its date of provenance possible to accurately decipher. The poem, furthermore, does not emphasise the heroine's qualities as does its counterparts, but rather those of Holofernes, thereby promoting him as an *exemplum horrendum* of leadership.

Holofernes does not receive the same attention in the Anglo-Saxon tradition as Judith. In the original biblical text he is the general, sent by Nebuchodonosor, king of the Assyrians, to conquer those people who refuse to acknowledge the Assyrian king as the one and only god (Idt. 2:4; 3:13). He is an extension of the ruler's military might, but holds minimal authority in comparison; for the story's original audience, he represented the foreign powers that had claimed Israel and her people before the Maccabean revolt. Judith's decapitation of Holofernes, therefore, symbolises the community of Israel defeating foreign aggressors (Otzen 98-101), while the key theme throughout "is the struggle between the God of Israel and the heathen king usurping the place of God" (Ibid 101). The usurper, however, is Nebuchodonosor; Holofernes is merely the *princeps militiae suae* ("prince of his army," Idt. 2:4) who assures earthly power through physical domination. He is Judith's foil, his character defined in its opposition to hers: where she is pious (Ibid 8:4-8), he is irresolute (Ibid 11:21); where she is wise (Ibid 11:20-21), he is unobservant (Ibid 10-12); where she guides her people to victory (Ibid 13:17-19; 15:10-12), he delivers his to slaughter (Ibid 14:8-18). The only positive characteristic specifically attributed to Holofernes is his success as a military commander (Ibid 2:12-18). Thus, when authors like Aldhelm and Ælfric mention the Assyrian general, it is brief and focuses solely on his heathen vices in opposition to Judith's virtues.

Where Aldhelm and Ælfric were concerned with the theological implications of Judith's character the Old English poem, a 349-line fragment,<sup>38</sup> presents a more in-depth portrayal of Holofernes. *Judith* expands his unremarkable position as military commander in Nebuchodonosor's army to the position of a traditional Germanic lord. His role as an *exemplum horrendum* supersedes Judith's position as the primary centrepiece of the story; the poem deemphasises her chaste widowhood while the ambiguity of her actions is minimised through a shifting of focus onto Holofernes as an anti-leader. Through an analysis of the more typical interpretation of Judith, namely as an example of chastity, the unique prominence of secular leadership represented by Holofernes in *Judith* becomes more apparent. What follows is an examination of Aldhelm and Ælfric's works on Judith and the themes therein, which will establish precedence for Judith's story in Anglo-Saxon England and perhaps clarify the alterations made by the poet and its effect on the poem's significance.

#### In Praise of Virginitate

Aldhelm's *De Laude Virginitate* was composed in the latter half of the seventh century in response to a letter from the double-monastery at Barking.<sup>39</sup> While the specific questions of abbess Hildelith are lost with the original letter, the focus of the text implies that she sought information regarding the Church's position on *virginitate*.<sup>40</sup> Aldhelm's reply to Hildelith's request was a treatise founded in the patristic and biblical traditions that emphasised virginitate as "sovereign among virtues and akin to the beatific life of the angels" (Dempsey 62). Judith's appearance in chapter fifty-seven of the *De Laude Virginitate* is as an exemplar of Judeo-Christian virtues, not as a military or political leader. Holofernes, in contrast, receives no attention.

Critical to an understanding of the treatise is the context in which it was written. Aldhelm combined the theological background of the bible and patristic

<sup>38</sup> I take this line count from M. Griffith's edition of *Judith*, which this thesis uses as its primary edition of the poem.

<sup>39</sup> Dempsey suggests that *De Laude Virginitate* was composed between AD675-690 (76), while Herren and Lapidge suggest it was composed anywhere from AD675/80 into the first years of the eighth century (*Prose Works* 14-15).

<sup>40</sup> The letter from Hildelith to Aldhelm has not survived, but the opening of his prose work discusses the correspondence between himself and the abbess and his praise of her, *inter alia*, chosen celibacy (Aldhelm PL 89.103C-04D).

traditions with the unique customs of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The first incompatibility was in the distinction of the female virginal states. The traditional tripartite division of virginity within Christian doctrine was restricted to *virginitas* (“virginity”), *iugalitas* (“marriage”) and *viduatus* (“widowhood”). *Virginitas* and *viduatus* required complete celibacy, thus the emphasis on Judith’s chastity after Manasses’ death (Idt. 16:26). *Iugalitas*, however, was understood in terms of St. Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians, which set precedence for Church doctrine regarding marriage:

his autem qui matrimonio iuncti sunt praecipio non ego sed Dominus uxorem a viro non discedere quod si discesserit manere innuptam aut viro suo reconciliari et vir uxorem ne dimittat. (I Cor. 7:10-11)

moreover, these who are joined together in marriage, not I, but the Lord warns not to separate wife from husband; [and] that if she departs she remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband and the husband may not cast off [his] wife.

St. Paul, while not condemning marriage, stressed that the virgin or unwed woman could afford to dedicate more time to the devotion of the Lord than a married woman, whose priority was her mortal husband: *et mulier innupta et virgo cogitat quae Domini sunt ut sit sancta et corpore et spiritu quae autem nupta est cogitat quae sunt mundi quomodo placeat viro* (“the unmarried woman and virgin reflect upon the things that are of God so that she may be holy both in body and in spirit; however, the one who is married thinks on things that are of the world: [namely] how she may please [her] husband,” I Cor. 7:34). Marriage was a necessity, but it was with a chaste existence (represented by *virginitas* and *viduatus*) that a woman could better commune with God, as Judith does in her celibate widowhood.

Aldhelm, however, was confronted with a discordant contemporary custom that deviated from Church doctrine. In Anglo-Saxon England it was not unheard of for a noble woman or, in rarer circumstances, a nobleman, to leave a marriage and join a religious community. One such notable figure was queen Æthelthryth, who forsook her second marriage to Ecgfrith, king of Northumbria, to seek a life of

celibacy and founded the abbey at Ely (Stenton 162).<sup>41</sup> The resolution of this incompatibility is credited to Theodore of Tarsus, ordained archbishop of Canterbury in early AD 668 (Bede 4.1; Stenton 131; Higham 37). Penitentials attributed to Theodore stipulated that a marriage could be dissolved under certain circumstances, particularly if either spouse desired to dedicate their lives to Christ (see Charles-Edwards). This amendment adapted Christian law to Anglo-Saxon customs (Lapidge and Herren 55). Aldhelm, in what can be taken as an acceptance of the decision made in the penitential, substitutes *castitas* (“chastity”) for *viduatus* (“widowhood”). This replacement thereby addressed not only those widows who remained chaste after their husband’s death, just as Judith did in the Bible, but also those women who sought dissolution from their living spouses: *Porro tripartitam humani generis distantiam orthodoxae fidei cultricem catholica recipit Ecclesia [:] ... virginitas, castitas, jugalitas* (“Moreover, the Catholic Church accepts a tripartite difference of human kind [among] female worshippers of the orthodox faith [:] ... virginity, chastity, marriage,” Aldhelm PL 89.116D).

The importance of this adaptation to Church doctrine, as well as Judith’s appearance in chapter fifty-seven, is in the dedication of the *De Laude Virginitate*.

Reverendissimis Christi virginibus omnique devotae germanitatis affectu venerandis, et non solum corporalis pudicitiae praeconio celebrandis, quod plurimorum est, verum etiam spiritualis castimoniae gratia glorificandis, quod paucorum est, scilicet Hildelithae regularis disciplinae, et monasticae conversationis magistrae, simulque Justinae ac Cutbergae, necnon Osburgae, mihi contribulibus necessitudinum nexibus conglutinatae, Aldgidae ac Scholasticae, Hidburgae et Burngidae, Eulaliae, ac Teclae, rumore

<sup>41</sup> In Ælfric’s *Vita Æðeldryðe*, he details the continued abstinence of the English saint, despite two marriages, until she *wolde ða ealle woruld-þincg forlætan* (“wished to forsake all wordly things,” *Vita Æðeldryðe* l. 343) and joined a convent at Coldingham; later she became abbess at Ely. Eight years after her appointment at Ely she suffered from a tumour on her neck, but, as Ælfric tells us, she *swiðe þancode gode / þæt heo on þam swuran sum geswinc þolode* (“thanked God very much that she suffered a certain affliction in [her] neck,” *Ibid* l. 343). She attributes this affliction to her youthful adornment of jewellery about her neck and that the tumour is a symbol of God’s mercy for it shone like gold and gemstones (*Ibid* ll. 436-37). The tumour is thus a form of redemption for her youthful vanity, which she forsook, along with her royal husband, for her spiritual marriage to Christ. Both the biblical Judith, before her mission to the Assyrian camp, and Æthelthryth reject ornamentation as a worldly vanity, instead choosing to adorn themselves with the riches of holy chastity.

Other noble women also removed themselves from the secular world to join or found abbeys as well as double monasteries: Hild, kin to the Northumbrian king Oswiu, became the abbess of Whitby; her successor was Ælflæd, the same king’s daughter; and two sisters of Ine, king of Wessex, founded the monastery at Wimborne (*ASC* 718).

sanctitatis concorditer Ecclesiam ornantibus, Aldhelmus segnis Christi crucicola, et supplex Ecclesiae vernaculus optabilem perpetuae prosperitatis salutem. (Aldhelm PL 89.103C-03D).

To the most reverend virgins of Christ [who are] to be venerated with all the affection of devoted brotherhood and [have] to be celebrated not only through the honouring of corporal chastity – [which belongs] to many – but indeed to be glorified on account of their spiritual purity – [which belongs] to a few: to Hildelith, of the monastic way of life and of the scripture; to both Iustina and Cuthburg and also Osburg, joined together by destiny, in natural unity of a shared religion; to Aldgith and Scholastica, Hildburg and Berngith, Eulalia and Tecla, ornamented by rumour of sanctity in harmony with the church. Aldhelm, small cross of the symbol of Christ and humble servant of the Church, which is the longed for salvation of perpetual prosperity.

Aldhelm celebrated the nuns at Barking *non solum corporalis pudicitiae*, but *verum etiam spiritualis castimoniae* (“not only of corporal chastity, [but] also true spiritual purity,” Ibid PL 89.103C).<sup>42</sup> In his *salutatione*, Aldhelm stresses not virginity, but chastity among the women at Barking who rejected their secular life, just like Judith after her husband’s death, to seek out a life of religious contemplation: *de periculoso saeculi naufragio ... navigantes ad portum coenobialis vitae festinantes* (“from the dangerous shipwreck of the world ... sailing to port, hurrying to the life of the monastery,” Ibid PL 89.110B).

Aldhelm’s distinction between chastity and virginity is directly related to the recipients of his treatise. Modern scholars conjecture that the audience of the *De Laude Virginitate* contained at least one woman who was not widowed, but who had willingly left her marriage to enter into an ascetic life: Cuthburg. Lapidge remarks that it is “not unreasonable, that it is the same Cuthburg who had abandoned her royal husband and who later became foundress of Wimborne” (*Prose Works* 52), her husband being Aldfrith, king of Northumbria. The possibility that these women were one and the same would create difficulty for Aldhelm when discussing the Christian

---

<sup>42</sup> *Castimonia* is defined as morality, but also purity and chastity with the added nuance of abstinence; *pudicitia* is similarly defined as modesty, chastity, virtue or shamefacedness.

doctrine on virginity unless he replaced *viduatus* with *castitas*. His use of Judith in the treatise offers further support for his re-categorisation. While the Bethulian heroine is a widow, she deliberately provokes a man's lust in order to incapacitate him. The natural incompatibility between Judith's original role in the Old Testament and later Christian teaching makes her an unusual character to reappear in Anglo-Saxon literature, but in Aldhelm's treatise she becomes a model of post-marital chastity understood by the women at Barking. She not only remained chaste after Manasses' death, but also in the Assyrian camp as she seduced Holofernes and defended the faithful against heathen foes. It is perhaps because of this differentiation that he focuses in the early chapters of the *De Laude Virginitate* on two key models of female life: the wife and the virgin.

Aldhelm begins his discussion on the wife and the virgin by citing I Cor. 7:34 (quoted above, p. 38), which states that the wife is concerned with her mortal husband, while the virgin is free to think only of Christ. He extends this discussion by listing the differences between the married and unmarried woman, with particular attention paid to the vanity of the wife:

Ista collum lunulis et lacertos dextralibus ornari ac gemmiferis digitorum annulis comi concupiscit; illa pulcherrimo fulgentis pudicitiae cultu splendescere, et auratis virtutum monilibus rutilare, simulque candidis meritorum margaritis decorari, desiderat. (Aldhelm PL 89.115C)

That one woman greatly desires for her neck to be adorned with *lunulis* and her upper arms with armbands, but also for her fingers to be embellished with gemmed rings; she desires to shine with the most cultivated beauty of resplendent chastity and (desires) to redden virtue with gilded necklaces and at the same time be decorated with the white pearls of merits.

The wife's attention, he warns, is directed towards the painting of her face, curling of her hair and displaying of decorations on her neck, wrists and fingers. The virgin, on the other hand, *coronam gloriae in capite proferet* ("displays the crown of glory upon [her] head," Ibid PL 89.115C-15D); her chastity and inherent virtues are her adornments. Beginning at chapter twenty, he provides nearly forty virginal figures from the Old and New Testaments, both male and female, as exemplars of chastity.

Judith appears at the end of this list, the final example of the virginal, heroic figures within the Judeo-Christian tradition who served God through their holiness (PL 89.156D-57B). Despite the brevity of the chapter, Judith assumes a pivotal purpose in Aldhelm's discourse. He employs Judith as an *exemplum admirandum* for two key themes within the *De Virginitate*: the importance of chastity and the dangers of ornamentation and self-adornment.

Judith's role as an *exemplum castitatis* is interesting, as mentioned above, because she was not a virgin, but a chaste widow. In addition, she purposely employs the arts of seduction to lure Holofernes into lustful complacency in order to kill him. Indeed, while generally praising Judith for her virtues, the intensity of Aldhelm's language and tone of chapters LVII and LVIII suggests that he had a certain amount of difficulty accepting Judith's actions in the Assyrian camp.<sup>43</sup> Her decision to approach Holofernes as a seductress is never explained in the biblical text; she tells Ozias, a leader of the people (Idt. 6:11) that he must not ask what she does but merely accept it (Idt. 8:31-34). Aldhelm, however, finds it necessary to explain why this chaste woman willingly adorns herself as a temptress.<sup>44</sup> He writes that Judith herself *haud secus decipiendum credidit, nec aliter obtruncandum rata est, nisi cum nativa vultus venustate ornamentis etiam corporalibus caperetur* ("by no means believed he could be deceived in another way, nor think he could be otherwise killed, unless he was captivated by the innate beauty of her face and even more so by her bodily decorations," Aldhelm PL 89.157A). Despite this, Aldhelm and his predecessors were no doubt comforted that God protected Judith in her ventures; she is, after all, divinely ordained to subdue the heathen Holofernes (Idt. 13:17-21).

Judith's manipulation of the Assyrian general through jewellery, fine clothes and perfumes, results in his destruction, but it simultaneously endangers her position

---

<sup>43</sup> Jerome supplies an extra verse in his *Vulgata*, which does not appear in the *Septuagint* or *Vetus Latina* traditions, that alleviates concern regarding Judith's immoral conduct with the general: *cui etiam Dominus contulit splendorem quoniam omnis ista conpositio non ex libidine sed ex virtute pendebat et ideo Dominus hanc in illam pulchritudinem ampliavit ut incomparabili decore omnium oculis appareret* ("and the lord gave her magnificence because all this preparation did not depend on wantonness but on virtue and therefore the lord intensified this in her beauty so that she appeared incomparably pleasing in the eyes of all," Idt. 10:4). This is a reminder that Judith serves God and that God has ordained her mission, just as the women of Barking serve God. Aldhelm does not include any reference to this verse in his *De Virginitate*, but possibly because it would minimise his secondary objective in using Judith as an exemplar for the dangers of ornamentation.

<sup>44</sup> A reason for Judith's ornamentation, however unsatisfactory, is provided in Idt. 9:13: *capitur laqueo oculorum suorum in me et percuties eum ex labiis caritatis meae* ("let him be seized by the snare of his own eyes through me and you shall (then) strike him by the favours/graces from my lips").

as a chaste widow. Aldhelm forgives Judith's actions within the Assyrian camp because she acts on behalf of her fellow citizens who are besieged. She is not motivated by personal glory or provoked by carnal desire and, fortunately for writers seeking to use her as a moral exemplar, remains pure throughout the text. When her task is complete she takes up her widow's weeds and once again lives a life of chastity and contemplation (Idt. 16:26). For Aldhelm, however, this story is the ultimate example of the perils caused by vanity, wantonness and desire and other such vices of the secular world. In his discussion of Judith he even exclaims that *non nostris assertionibus, sed Scripturae astipulationibus ornatus feminarum rapina virorum vocatur* ("it is not by our assertions but by confirmations of scripture [that] the adornment of women is called the rape of men," Aldhelm PL 89.157A). Holofernes dies because of his lust, seduced by Judith's beauty and her adornment.

Aldhelm further emphasises the dangers of ornamentation in chapter LVIII of the *De Laude Virginitate* by giving another biblical example of men and women corrupted by adornment. Taken from the Book of Proverbs, an unnamed woman adorns herself *ornatu meretricio et luxu lenocinante* ("in harlot's attire and with enticing luxury," Aldhelm PL 89.157B) while her husband is away and lures strange men to her. They follow, *ut merito quasi bos ductus ad victimam* ("just as an ox led to slaughter" Ibid; see also Prv. 7:7-27). Aldhelm does not leave his audience in doubt as to his opinions of this woman and her licentious behaviour. Immediately following this example from Proverbs Aldhelm elaborates on his disdain for such vain ornamentation.

The importance of this issue is best explained through the contemporary difficulties facing the Church in the seventh century. Secular ornamentation was a recurring problem among the monastic communities of the seventh and eighth century; the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-eighth canons from the AD747 Synod of Clovesho "decry colourful dress in monastic communities, as does Boniface's letter to Cuthbert of Canterbury" (Neuman de Vegvar 60). Aldhelm criticises vanity in men and women, lay and religious:

Puderet referre quorundam frontosam elationis impudentiam et  
comptam stoliditatis insolentiam, quae in utroque sexu ...  
deprehenduntur ... ut crustu interdicto phalerataque venustate carnalis  
statura comatur ab habitu corporea membratim ac particulatim  
perornetur. (PL 89.157C)

It is shameful, at all times, to repeat the bold impudence of [self-] exaltation and the adorned extravagance of stupidity, which are imitated (*deprehenduntur*) in either sex ... so that the form of his body can be adorned with forbidden jewels and ornamented beauty and so that his corporeal form can be greatly embellished, limb by limb, little by little.

His disdain of these men and women and their reliance upon corporeal adornments is illustrated in Aldhelm's list of what they wore and the lengths to which they would ornament themselves (Ibid PL 89.157C-58A). Judith's appearance in the treatise serves a double purpose in that it emphasises the danger facing men confronted with adorned women and also the saintly power she possessed that allowed her to resist carnal desires.

Aldhelm began the *De Laude Virginitate* with nineteen chapters discussing the Christian attributes of virginity and chastity through various analogies. He likened the women of Barking to Olympic athletes seeking training from an instructor (PL 89.103D-05D) and to bees visiting flowers in the morning to gather nectar (PL 89.105D-07C). Aldhelm praises the virtues of the women at Barking who choose to live a pure and simple life in their monastery, just as Judith eschewed society after her husband's death. More so, he commends those women of noble birth who forsook their birthrights to marry themselves to Christ. By joining the monastery at Barking, these women renounce the secular world and the vices inherent therein, just as Judith did in pre-Christian times by sequestering herself in a private chamber above her home (Idt. 8:5-8). Aldhelm employs Judith, among others, as a leader of chaste morals, a paragon of virtue and strength that the women at Barking might imitate.

#### The Chaste Overcome the Arrogant

Nearly three hundred years after Aldhelm's death, Judith re-emerged as an exemplar of chastity and the superiority of the virtuous over the sinner. In the late tenth century, Ælfric of Eynsham employed the story of Judith to confront the moral laxity of Anglo-Saxon society. Instead of a treatise on virginity, however, the 452-(extant) line homily presents a combined focus on the heroine's unwavering faith

against an invading heathen army (Assmann 76-104).<sup>45</sup> Judith is also mentioned, albeit briefly, in Ælfric's introduction to the Old and New Testaments, otherwise known as the *Letter to Sigeward*, wherein he impresses the importance of her actions as a model for society in defeating its own heathen enemy (see *Heptateuch*). Despite the length of the homily, particularly in comparison with the *De Laude Virginitate*, Holofernes appears as a background character, his importance eclipsed by that of the pious heroine. *Judith*, in contrast, removes descriptions of Judith's chastity and emphasises Holofernes as a socio-political caveat.

The resurgence of Judith was intimately connected with the socio-political events of the tenth and early eleventh centuries. Two major developments since the time of Aldhelm greatly affected Ælfric's writing: first was the English monastic reform, a branch of the Benedictine Reform ushered in from the continent in the mid-tenth century (Blair 142, 346-54); the second was the increasing intensity of Scandinavian attacks. The pervading belief among the Anglo-Saxons was that the Vikings were a punishment sent by God for their sins (Wulfstan II. 8-21; Howe 12-20). The raids that defined the latter half of the ninth and early tenth centuries led to a decline of monastic communities as well as an overall lapse of continuity in the English church. The state of priesthood, if contemporary reports like those of Ælfric and Wulfstan are to be believed, was in serious regression (Blair 351, 491).<sup>46</sup> By the time of Alfred, the stream of men and women entering into a clerical life virtually

---

<sup>45</sup> Assmann, in his 1888 edition of the Judith homily, suggests a date of composition before the treatise on the Old and New Testaments and after the *Heptateuch*: "Was die entstehungszeit dieser homilie über das buch Judith angeht, so ist dieselbe wol sicher ebenso wie die mit ihr gewiss zu gleicher zeit entstandene Esther nach der heptateuchübertragung (997), jedoch natürlich vor der vorrede zum alten testament entstanden, folglich vor 1005" ("The origin of this homily on the Book of Judith, as is certainly also the case with Esther which was created at the same time, was after the transmission of the Heptateuch (997), but certainly before the Introduction of the Old Testament, therefore, before 1005," Assmann 86). The dates of the Judith homily, according to Assmann, are from AD998-1005, presumably while Ælfric was still at Cerne Abbas. Marsden agrees with Assmann, in that the *Heptateuch* would have been completed before the turn of the century (394). Ælfric's *Letter to Sigeward* regarding the *veteri testamento et novo*, would have been composed after his homilies, sometime between AD1005 and AD1012, after his move to Eynsham (*Heptateuch* 15).

<sup>46</sup> Many of Ælfric's writings focus on the issue of celibacy among the clergy and monastic houses. He includes in his *Vitae Sanctorum* the *passio* of Chrysanthus and Daria, which details the martyrdom of husband and wife who remained chaste, even in marriage (*Ælfric, Lives II* ll. 378-98). Saint Æthelthryth remained a virgin through both marriages before asking her second husband, Ecgfrith, to release her from wedlock whereupon she founded the monastery at Ely (*Ælfric, Lives I* ll. 432-40; Bede 4.19). To Sigferth he sent a sermon on chastity (C. White 67) while in a letter to Wulfstan (Ibid 139) and another to Wulfsig of Sherborne (Ibid 135) he addresses the debate of clerical marriages. It is known that while at Eynsham Ælfric was very much outspoken against marriage among the clergy, a stance ill favoured among Mercian monks with whom Ælfric dealt personally at Eynsham (Ibid 63).

ceased, and it is this, according to Stenton, which “most seriously imperilled Christianity in Danish England” (434).<sup>47</sup>

By the reign of Æthelred II the pattern of paying the invaders tribute resulted in decreased English morale, evidenced in the fragmentary *Battle of Maldon* and even in Ælfric’s *Letter to Sigeward*, wherein he describes Judith’s story as an example *þet ge eower eard mid wæpnum beweriacn wið onwinnendne here* (“that ye defend your land with weapons against an attacking army,” *Heptateuch* ll. 777-80). The Anglo-Saxons required an *exemplum admirandum*, someone who could emphasise Christian virtues as well as secular strength; for Ælfric, Judith served just such a purpose. In Ælfric’s homily, Judith assumes a role of idealistic chastity and morality, implying spiritual warfare as key in defeating attacks from foreign invaders and restoring peace to the people. He sought to underscore Judith’s unerring trust in God, but not her specific actions in achieving victory; it was, after all, her morally superior state that earned her God’s support. Her character served as a socio-political, as well as spiritual exemplar; contemporary Anglo-Saxons were meant to imitate her courage and model their lives after her virtuous nature in order to find salvation, like the women of Barking before them.

Traditionally, Christian writers saw Judith as a metaphor for the Church, and thus her beheading of Holofernes as the Church’s vanquishing of the Devil (Campbell 159-63; Pringle 84; Swain 47-48). For Ælfric she also served as an exemplar for the Christian community, establishing the ideal of a chaste and virtuous woman he could employ as an exemplar for his peers. He repeats this concept in his ‘epilogue’ to the homily stating that *heo getacnode untweolice mid weorcum / þa halgan gelaðunge*, (“she certainly signified with her works the holy church,” Assmann ll. 412-13). She is the *Ecclesia* as well as Christ’s *clæne bryd* (“pure bride,” Ibid l. 415a), but more specifically she is the moral example of chaste living under heaven. Ælfric addresses *nunnan* of his own time, severely cautioning them against the sinfulness of fornication:

Sume nunnan syndon,    þe sceandlice libbað,  
tellað to lytlum gylte,    þæt hi hi forlicgan

<sup>47</sup> Blair suggests that elements of the early Anglo-Saxon Church changed, not by the ninth century raids but “by royal, aristocratic, and monastic intervention in the tenth and eleventh centuries” (300). The ecclesiastical sphere was being integrated slowly into the secular world of politics “and from Alfred onwards the greatest laymen of all, the kings of Wessex, were developing an agenda which involved bending ecclesiastical institutions to their service” (Ibid 323) more so than any other Anglo-Saxon kings before them.

and þæt hi leohtlice magon swa lytel gebetan.  
 Ac heo ne bið na eft mæden, gif heo hi æne forligð,  
 ne heo næfð þa mede þæs hundfealdan wæstmes.

.....  
 forðan þe he fordemð þa dyrnan forligras  
 and þa fulan sceanda he besengð on helle,  
 swa swa hit on læden stent æfter Paules lare:  
 Fornicadores et adulteros iudicabit Deus. (Ibid II. 429-41)

There are some nuns, who live shamefully, they consider as a little sin that they fornicate and they may easily atone [for] such so little [sin]. But she is thereafter no maiden, if she once fornicates, nor does she have the reward of fruit a hundred-fold ... because he will condemn those deceitful fornicators and foul wretches he will burn in hell, just as it stands in the Latin after the teaching of Paul: God will judge fornicators and adulterers.

The choice of an Old Testament figure that traditionally seduces a man seems an odd choice as a moral example for Anglo-Saxon nuns. Ælfric could not have been comfortable reiterating this detail while simultaneously preaching about chastity and so reduces Judith's role as a seductress. Unlike Aldhelm before him, who simply used the seduction as an anti-example, Ælfric glosses over the more ambiguous elements of Judith's story by referencing her morality and piety.<sup>48</sup> He emphasises her virtues rather than her actions (namely, the seduction and murder) so that her character can act as a model of proper behaviour.

In the bible, when Judith first goes before Holofernes, she *ornavit se vestimento suo et ingressa stetit ante faciem eius* ("she ornamented herself with her garments and entering stood before his face," Idt. 12:15). Instead of seduction, Ælfric introduces an interview of sorts, where Judith must make a lasting and valid impression on Holofernes lest he see through her false promises. Clayton explains this presentation of Judith as Ælfric's attempt "to impose paradigms which would circumvent or contain the nature of her actions and make them seem more acceptable to his own view of how a religious woman should behave" (223). Her active flattery

---

<sup>48</sup> For example, see Assmann II. 282-92.

of and attention to the general at the feast are removed entirely; she promises simply to be merry: *and het hi beon bliðe on his gebeorscipe, / and heo him behet þæt heo swa wolde* (“and commanded that she be merry at his sharing of drink, and she promised him that so she would [be],” Assmann ll. 291-92).

Judith’s chastity is strongly emphasised throughout the homily. The strength of her faith is highlighted when first she appears in the story as a widow who *swiðe gelyfed ... on þone lyfigendan god* (“greatly believed ... in the living God,” Ibid l. 194). Ælfric edits his text so that she might avoid any chance of contamination of her *anima*, such as when she is in the Assyrian camp. At the feast, for instance, he assures his audience that Judith would eat none of Holofernes’ food because of *his hæðenscipe* (“his heathenism,” Ibid l. 271a). She will not keep any of Holofernes’ possessions after the Assyrians have fled in order to avoid the sin associated with his person:

heo nolde agan, swa swa us sægð seo racu,  
 þæs wælhreowan hærereaf, þe þæt folc hire forgeaf,  
 ac amansumode mid ealle his gyrlan,  
 nolde hi werian, ac awarep hi hire fram,  
 nolde þurh his hæþenscipe habban ænige synne. (Ibid ll. 424-28)

she did not wish to possess, just as the narrative tells us, the savage one’s treasure, which the people gave her, but spurned [them] with all his apparel, she would not wear [them], but cast them from her, she did not wish to have any sin because of his heathenism.

Furthermore, Ælfric adds a short speech upon Judith’s return to Bethulia concerning her continued purity:

Godes engel soðlice me gescylde wið hine,  
 þæt ic unwemme eft becom to eow,  
 and god sylf ne geþafode, þæt ic gescynd wurde,  
 ac butan besmitennysse he asende me ongean,  
 on his sige blissigende and on eowre alysednysse. (Ibid ll. 326-30)

An angel of God truly protected me from him, so that I returned to you after unstained, and God himself did not allow that I become

shamed, but without defilement he sent me back, exulted in his victory and in your redemption.

Judith's self-sacrifice, namely in the fact that she places her chastity in danger of corruption, assures the salvation of her people. God watches over her so that her chastity not be ruined, a point repeated within the 'epilogue': *Heo eadmod and clæne and ofercom þone modigan, / lytel and unstrang and alede þone micclan* ("she [was] humble and chaste, overcame the arrogant one, little and weak, and overcame the great one," Ibid ll. 410-11). For the remainder of the homily Judith's actions become pointed examples of chastity, morality and piety, all of which further emphasise her dedication to the worship of God and are critical in achieving victory for her people.

Judith's victory is God-given; it was in her unwavering faith that she receives divine aid in defeating the enemy. The thematic element of defending the faith against a heathen enemy, a key component of the *liber's* composition in the second century BC, was also immensely important to Ælfric. The increasing Scandinavian incursions of the tenth century demanded immediate attention, yet received little from the upper echelon of government (Stenton 373-80). The tumultuous events at the end of the tenth century are repeatedly alluded to within Ælfric's *Letter to Sigeward*. He stresses the danger of inactivity, both on a spiritual and physical level, just as Wulfstan expounds upon in his *sermo*. The general theme in works by both authors was that "as long as the people worshipped God, all was well. But once the people turned away, a foreign and heathen foe would take them over until they repented and a godly leader would lead them to freedom again" (Swain 46).<sup>49</sup> Ælfric's emphasis on Judith's piety and chastity stress the attributes his own people must acquire if they are to similarly win God's favour and defeat the encroaching Scandinavians.

Late tenth- and early eleventh-century spiritual leaders strongly believed that God had allowed the Vikings to afflict the English for the latter's weakened faith (Pringle 88; Howe 15). It was a recurring theme expounded upon by Wulfstan in his *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, AD1014, but it also infiltrated Ælfric's homily on Judith where the unity of true faith and worldly justice are intimately connected in Achior's speech to Holofernes:

---

<sup>49</sup> Ælfric suggests in his letter that such godly representatives had taken the form of Alfred, Æthelstan and Edgar; the omission of the current king, Æthelred II, reflects Ælfric's disappointment in the current administration (Swain 45-46).

Swa oft swa hi bugon fram his biggengum  
 to þam hæðenum godum, hi wurdon gehergode  
 and to hospe gewordene þurh hæðene leoda.  
 Swa oft swa hi gecyrdon mid soðra dædbote  
 eft to heora gode, he gedyde hi sona  
 mihtige and strange to wiðstandenne  
 heora feondum. (Assmann, ll. 122-28a)

As often as they turned from his worship to the heathen gods, they became ravaged and subject to insult from heathen peoples. As often as they returned again with true repentance to their God, he immediately made them mighty and strong to withstand their enemies.

Achior's lengthy response to Holofernes (Assmann, ll. 85-144; Idt. 5:5-25) "in a text where so much else is shortened, shows the attitude which he [Ælfric] wishes to inculcate" (Clayton 219), namely that God will protect them so long as they stay true to his laws. Victory was therefore on the side of the righteous, but as the Anglo-Saxons, the new Israelites, were the victims of heathen attacks it was assumed that they had faltered in their faith: *ac wæs here 7 hete on gewelhwilcan ende oft 7 gelome, 7 Engle nu lange eal sigelease 7 to swyþe geyrigde þurh Godes yrre ... eal for urum synnum* ("but there was devastation and hate in nearly every district again and again,<sup>50</sup> and the English for a long time now [have been] entirely defeated and also exceedingly disheartened through God's anger ... all for our sins," Wulfstan ll. 112-14, 116). Judith, as a socio-political figure, exhorts the Anglo-Saxons to defend their homeland through a strengthening of faith, which would in turn redeem them in the eyes of God. The glory of battle is thus usurped by the victory of Christian belief over heathen foes.

In Ælfric's *Letter to Sigeward*, written after his appointment as abbot at Eynsham, circa AD1003-9, the martial defence exhibited in the *Liber Iudith* is the critical concept that claims his attention (Swain 39). His comments on Judith, second to last in his section on the Old Testament, are kept brief, mentioning only the key elements of the story: *Iudith þeo wudewe, þe oferwan Holofernen ðone Syriscan*

---

<sup>50</sup> *oft 7 gelome*: literally "often and frequently."

*ealdormon, hæfð hire agene boc betwux ðissum bocum be hire agene sige* (“the widow Judith, who conquered Holofernes the Assyrian nobleman, has her own book between these books about her own victory,” *Heptateuch* ll. 772-76). It is his addition to this summary that speaks more clearly about contemporary concerns affecting Ælfric as a member of the Anglo-Saxon community. Instead of reiterating the moral implications of Judith’s character, which were so intensely espoused in the homily, he instead suggests to Sigeward that the text be an example *þet ge eower eard mid wæpnum beweriaen wið onwinnenne here* (“that ye defend your land with weapons and against [an] attacking army,” *Ibid* ll. 778-80). The stress on military defence in the early years of the eleventh century is not particularly remarkable. Viking raids had been consistent during the previous decades and the stability of English authority remained intact until the turn of the millennium. It is thus justifiable to relate Ælfric’s writing, such as his *Letter to Sigeward*, to the political turmoil between AD990 and 1010, in particular Æthelred II’s repeated defensive failures.<sup>51</sup>

The demand for action in such political turmoil is hardly surprising. Wulfstan, in his *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, expressed his belief “that an invasion of heathen outsiders signified God’s way of punishing the natives of the islands” (Howe 12):

7 unrihta to fela ricsode on lande; 7 næs a fela manna þe smeade ymbe þa bote swa georne swa man scolde, ac dæghwamlice man ihte yfel æfter oðrum 7 unriht rærde 7 unlaga manege ealles to wide gynd ealle þas þeode. 7 we eac forþam habbað fela byrsta 7 bysmara gebiden, 7, gif we ænige bote gebidan scylan, þonne mote we þæs to Gode ernian bet þonne we ær þysan dydan. (Wulfstan ll. 11-17)

And too many injustices ruled in the land; and there was never many men who thought about the relief as eagerly as one should, but daily

<sup>51</sup> William of Malmesbury notes in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum* that Swein Forkbeard, a leader among the raiders of the time, lost his sister Gunnhild in the massacre (William of Malmesbury 300-05). Stenton theorises that it was this particular death that recalled Swein the following year (AD1003) to England’s shore resulting in an inland penetration deeper “than any earlier raiding army” (375). Ten years later Æthelred would be forced to flee to Normandy (*ASC* 1013). From AD997-1001, a sizable Scandinavian army campaigned (rather than intermittently raided) on England’s coast (Stenton 373); this wave of attacks was settled by tribute, but the truce ended when Æthelred ordered the slaughter of all Danes in England, remembered as the St. Brice’s Day massacre (*Ibid* 374; *ASC* 1002).

one evil increased one after the other, and set up injustice and many violations of the law all too widely through all the nation. And therefore, we have also suffered many injuries and insult, and, if we shall obtain any relief, then we must better deserve of it [from] God than we [have] done before this.

Ælfric's homily does not exhibit, in Stenton's words, the "sheer monotony of commination" (Stenton 460), or divine vengeance, as does Wulfstan's sermon, nor does his letter to Sigeward equal the emotive language of his contemporary's outraged discourse. Both texts insist upon a unanimous failing among the Anglo-Saxon people in regards to their weakened faith. When discussing his Maccabees homily, Ælfric associates secular triumph directly with true faith: *heo sige hæfdon þurh ðone soðan God, þe heo on lyfdon æfter Moyses æ* ("they had victory through the true God, in whom they believed according to Moses' law," *Heptateuch* ll. 795-97). Judas Maccabeus, *þe mæra Godes cempa* ("the famed warrior of God," *Ibid* l. 814), he cites as saying *ac uten wurcæn mihte on ðone almihtigæ God* ("but let us work with virtue in the almighty God," *Ibid* ll. 825) for he would punish the enemies of his people. Ælfric, like Wulfstan, was aware that the Viking incursions were a punishment from God for English sins, and he employed the figure of Judith as a medium for the two problems facing England: moral laxity and national defence. Ælfric emphasised the importance of good works and righteousness in the journey towards salvation within the *Letter to Sigeward* (Swain 46-48) and his homily on Judith (Assmann ll. 410-17), creating an intimate connection between strength of faith and victory in the corporeal world. It is this affiliation between chaste maiden and bold warrior that commands Ælfric's discussion of Judith.

In the homily, Ælfric re-established the heroine as a religious figure worthy of imitation. Her defeat of the Assyrians was accomplished through her *fortitudo*, but also through the strength of her *anima*. Her constancy of faith in God brought her victory against the heathen enemy, just as Ælfric and his contemporary Wulfstan believed possible for the Anglo-Saxons. Judith represents not a king or commander, but an *exemplum admirandum* for all people to emulate. She exhibits piety and virtue, but also the strength to defend the faith as a devout Christian and precursor of the *miles Christi*.

## Conclusion

In the prose *De Virginitate*, Aldhelm focused on two aspects of the *Liber Judith*: the heroine's infallible virtue and the dangers associated with ostentatious ornamentation; he celebrates the former and condemns the latter. Ælfric's homily reaffirms his predecessor's emphasis on *castitas*, Judith continuing to be employed as an ideal figure of chaste purity. He attaches to this traditional reading a stress on her heroic, God-given strength in order to emphasise the needs of his community at war with pagan invaders. Judith becomes an exemplar for contemporary society, first among the religious community of the sixth and seventh centuries and then again in the tenth and eleventh. Neither Aldhelm nor Ælfric stray from the traditional reading of the Book of Judith, adapting individual elements – such as Aldhelm's focus on ornamentation and Ælfric's emphasis on the decapitation and routing of the Assyrians – to suit the needs of contemporary society.

The Judith story, both as a spiritual and secular exemplar, was an enduring influence in Anglo-Saxon England between the seventh and eleventh centuries. Immediately discernible is the form of leadership Judith exhibited among the Anglo-Saxons: she was a religious exemplar, motivating others through her constant faith and inherent virtues. Her role as a 'military commander' relies on her dedication to serving God and defending his people. Due to the military exploits and heroic nature of the heroine, the Old Testament remained an effective educational tool among a warrior-based society. After the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, her morality and faith created a precursor of the *miles Christi* figure. Holofernes, however, receives only a cursory reference in Aldhelm's treatise and no more attention in Ælfric's homily than in the original *liber*.

The position of the Old English *Judith* in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, based on these other texts, implies that the poem would exhibit similar themes and motifs. We, as the audience, expect a female character that reinforces the importance of chastity and moral fortitude through firm faith in God. We are instead presented with a text unique in the Judith tradition, for while Judith retains the virtues traditionally exhibited by her character, *Judith* focuses greater emphasis on Holofernes. Instead of Judith's character defining him as an ancillary antagonist, the poet focuses on the general as the primary agent whose actions reverberate throughout the text. The following chapters focus on the epithets employed by the poet to effect a different reading of Judith and Holofernes' characters; rather than a treatise on virginity or a

homily on chastity, the poem develops a socio-political subtext that forewarns the danger of a leader without the requisite qualities of a Christo-Germanic king: *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei*.

Chapter III: *Swa him heora ealdor bebead*<sup>52</sup>

In the biblical and patristic traditions, the typical depiction of Holofernes is as a generic villain, who is a slave to his own destructive vices. His position is inferior to that of Judith and his character is defined in opposition to hers. In the Old English *Judith*, however, he appears as a figure of curious importance as the extant poem focuses on his role as a leader in the story. Emphasis on his character appears not only through the narrative description of his actions, but by the poet's attribution of epithets to him in the Old English tradition, such as *sinces brytta* ("giver of treasure," *Jud.* l. 30a) or *goldwine gumena* ("gold-friend of men," *Ibid.* l. 22a). Judith, described as God's handmaiden and saviour of Bethulia, receives thirty-five epithets within the 349 lines of text; God in turn receives thirty-one.<sup>53</sup> Judith's appellations range from descriptions of her physical beauty (*ides ælfscinu* "elf-shining woman," *Ibid.* l. 14a) to her holiness as one of God's chosen (*halige meowle* "holy maiden," *Ibid.* l. 56b). Holofernes, Nebuchodonosor's general and enemy of the faithful, receives fifty-two epithets despite his death at line 111a. Twenty-six focus on his role as lord or ruler; five set him in direct opposition to God and the faith; and the remaining twenty characterise him more generally (*inwidda* "guileful, deceitful, wicked," *Ibid.* l. 28a, *brema* "famous," l. 57b, *herewæðan* "war-hunter," ll. 126a, 173b). His actions condemn him as an *exemplum horrendum* of leadership, but many of his epithets associate him with ideal qualities of a Christo-Germanic lord.

The patristic writers viewed Holofernes as a villain, depicting him as either Satan incarnate or lust personified. The Old English poem, on the other hand, presents a more focused view of his role as a leader. While Astell claims that he "becomes the devil incarnate – not a transparent type of Satan" (120-21), Holofernes in fact exhibits aspects expected of a Germanic secular leader, exemplifying both the best and worst characteristics of an Anglo-Saxon lord: *fortitudo* and a lack of *sapientia dei*. The traditional reading of Holofernes as the anti-Church is muted and Judith ceases to betoken the allegories often seen in her character. Most intriguing of all is the reinforced emphasis on his failed role as a Germanic leader, which the poet develops in a manner more fitting to traditional Anglo-Saxon heroic literature. It is because of these stylistic alterations that we are introduced to a new and unique

<sup>52</sup> "as their lord commanded them," *Jud.* l. 38b.

<sup>53</sup> I include in the list of epithets attributed to God the separation of the Trinity at lines 83-86a, which includes mention of the Trinity itself (*ðrynesse ðrym* "splendour of the trinity," *Jud.* l. 86a).

description of Holofernes. What follows is an analysis of the figure of Holofernes based on the variety of epithets chosen by the poet and how they promote then condemn his ability to become an ideal lord.

The poet's employment of both positive and negative epithets in the depiction of Holofernes affirms that he was a cautionary figure for those in the position of power. He nominally reflects the ideals of Germanic leadership, but is otherwise stressed as the archetype for the anti-lord, "the antithesis of heroic" (Lucas, "Woman Hero" 22). Huppé describes Holofernes' actions in the feast scene of *Judith*,

as representing [his] arrogant pride, worldly power and debauched folly. His power is suggested by the way his bold warriors hasten (*ofstum miclum*, 10) to obey him, and by the epithets describing him ... In their number and variety they parallel the epithets for God in the introduction except that Holofernes' power is evil and in its consequences, destructive. (160)

Holofernes exhibits pride and folly at the feast by plying his men with too much wine, lusting after Judith and believing himself invincible. Throughout the poem, Holofernes is presented as a lordly figure who reflects the ideals of leadership within Anglo-Saxon society. The poet chooses to liken Holofernes to a secular, Germanic ideal, as discussed in Chapter One, while the traditional reading demands he be held in contempt for his violence against God's chosen people. There are two possible explanations for this: firstly, the lordly depiction the poet sought to recreate may no longer have been the norm in Anglo-Saxon England when the poem was composed; Holofernes would therefore represent a former ideal superseded by a new model, presumably God. Secondly, the poem could reflect a questioning of the qualities of contemporary leadership, with particular emphasis on the capacity of said leader to conform to the standards of society and more specifically, to exhibit a balance of *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei*.

Twenty times within the extant poem, Holofernes is positively, or at the very least, neutrally, described as a leader among his people:

9b, 32b	<i>se gumena baldor</i>	the prince of men
11b	<i>ðam rican þeodne</i>	to the powerful ruler/king
12a	<i>folces ræswan</i>	to [the] ruler of the people

20b, 44a, 68a	<i>se rica</i>	the powerful one
22a	<i>goldwine gumena</i>	gold-lord/friend of men
38b	<i>ealdor</i>	leader/lord
39a	<i>byrnwigena brego</i>	ruler/lord of warriors in mail
47b	<i>þæs folctogan</i>	of the leader of the people
49b	<i>wigena baldor</i>	lord of warriors
56a	<i>hearran</i>	[to the] lord
58a	<i>burga ealdor</i>	lord/leader of towns/fortresses
251a	<i>hlaforde</i>	[to the] lord
254a	<i>se beorna brego</i>	ruler/lord of men/warriors
268a	<i>þeodnes</i>	[of the] ruler/king
274a	<i>winedryhten</i>	friend and lord
279a	<i>goldgifan</i>	gold-giver/lord
289a	<i>healdend</i>	possessor/lord

In and of themselves, these epithets are not extraordinary. They are found throughout the Old English poetic corpus and describe various rulers and leaders, both secular and religious. Here they are unique in that they describe Holofernes, the heathen enemy of the faithful, in a manner similar to how Hroðgar or Moses are portrayed in *Beowulf* and *Exodus*, respectively. More interesting is that there are only three negative epithets describing Holofernes' role as leader, with three others that are potentially ambiguous:

Negative:

66a	<i>þearlmod ðeoden gumena</i>	severe prince of men
72a	<i>laðne leodhatan</i>	hateful tyrant
90a	<i>morðres brytta</i>	giver of death

Ambiguous:

21a	<i>egesful<sup>54</sup> eorla dryhten</i>	terrible/awe-inspiring lord of warriors
-----	---	---

<sup>54</sup> In the Old English poetic corpus, *egesful* is also used to describe the power of God as he smites Pharaoh and the Egyptians beneath the Red Sea (*Exod.* ll. 500b-06a). This example makes it difficult to assume a strictly negative interpretation for the term. Thus I include it with the other ambiguous epithets for Holofernes as context is required to differentiate its meaning.

30a	<i>swiðmod sinces brytta</i>	stout-hearted/arrogant giver of treasure
338b-39a	<i>rinca baldor swiðmod</i>	stout-hearted/arrogant lord of men

What follows is a discussion of a selection of those epithets employed to describe Holofernes as an idealised Germanic leader. In the remainder of this chapter I will focus on the epithets attributed to Holofernes rather than his actions within the poem; I will balance them with other examples found within the Old English corpus in order to decipher the effect these stock-phrases have on the character of Holofernes in *Judith*.

#### *Folces Ræswa*

We are introduced to Holofernes at extant line 7b, immediately after the invitations to the feast are distributed. In line 9b, he is described as a *gumena baldor*, a prince of men calling forward his most senior thegns to dine with him. Two lines later he is referred to as a *rican þeoden* (“powerful king,” *Jud.* l. 11b) and a *folces ræswan* (“ruler of the people,” *Ibid.* l. 12a). All of these epithets depict a generic ruler and appear in several other Old English texts; the use of *ræswan* in line 12a, however, is more interesting.

The stem *ræsw-* appears in a weak verb, *ræswan*, with the meaning to think or suppose; as weak verbs are formed from either nouns or adjectives it is likely that the noun *ræswa* bore stronger connotations of one who thinks, rather than a leader or ruler. The BTASD includes an addendum for its second, more common definition of the noun: “one who takes thought (for the public good), (a) a prince, king ... (b) a leading man, chief person, leader” (785). This suggests that the ruler who is also a *ræswan* rules with the consideration of his people’s best interests. In *Daniel*, however, there is a secondary definition of counsellor: *ða ... se ðe wæs cyninges ræswa, / wis and wordgleaw* (“then was the counsellor of the king, wise and prudent in speech,” *Dan.* ll. 416-17a). Here, *ræswa* refers to the counsellor of the king, not the king himself. The application of this definition to Holofernes supplies an ironic reading of his character, which complements the poet’s depiction of the villain in the remainder of the text.

More than once in the extant text his lack of *sapientia* is emphasised as a key factor in his downfall (*Jud.* ll. 19b-21a, 63b-67a). Alongside the stress on Holofernes' leadership is an equal emphasis on his "lack of insight and inability to think clearly" (Astell 124), whether drunk or sober. Here, at the beginning of the fragment, one cannot know what has already been said regarding the Assyrian general; within the surrounding lines, however, he is depicted by the use of standard epithets as a stereotypical Germanic lord. Between lines 7b and 12a there are no indications that the feast will result in the death of Holofernes or that he is in fact the antithesis of what those epithets imply. The feast represents a traditional Germanic event and in holding it Holofernes is fulfilling one of his duties as a *gumena baldor* ("prince of men"). This is reflected in the epithets selected by the poet. The remainder of the poem, however, belies his nominal role as *ræswan* because he does not act in his men's interests, but his own. He receives their counsel only when he allows it and then through the barrier of the fly-net before abandoning them to their fate in the pursuit of his own vices.

*Ræswa* appears once more in the extant text at line 178a during Judith's second speech to the Bethulians. She bids them gaze upon Holofernes' severed head, referring to her people as *sigerofe hæleð / leoda ræswan* ("triumphant men / leaders (or counsellors) of people," *Jud.* ll. 177b-78a). The Bethulians as triumphant leaders is interesting at this point of the text in that they have yet to take action against the Assyrians who have laid siege to their city; only Judith has thus far demonstrated victory in battle. In her second speech, Judith displays Holofernes' head as a trophy of her personal victory against the enemy and a token of future success. The epithets she uses for her fellow citizens are figurative and also foreshadow events to come; they will win the war because God is with them, a reassurance she gives in both speeches (*Ibid.* ll. 154b-55a, 183b-86a, 196b-98). The reappearance of the term *ræswa* echoes its occurrence in line 12a, when Holofernes is described as the counsellor/leader of the people (*folces ræswan*, *Ibid.* l. 12a), but without the irony. The Bethulians are transformed by Judith's actions, and later their own, into counsellors for the rest of the faithful. Just as she urges the Hebrews to take up arms (*Ibid.* ll. 186b-89a) so too does she imply that they must become exemplars of the faith and counsel others to victory.

*Se Rica and Egesful Eorla Dryhten*

Holofernes is mentioned again after his thegns join him at the feast and the drink begins to flow. *Se rica*, the general's next epithet, is located within the ominous lines of future Assyrian loss: *hie þæt fæge þegon, / rofe rondwiggende, þeah ðæs se rica ne wende* ("they consumed it as doomed men, renowned shield warriors, though the ruler did not know it," Ibid ll. 19b-20). The poet already acknowledged Holofernes' power through the epithet *rican þeoden* (Ibid l. 11b); the substantive *rica* consolidates Holofernes' authority through an emphasis on his *fortitudo*. It appears three times within the extant text, each time after Holofernes has commanded something to be done. At line 11b, he has called his men to drink; at line 44a, Judith has been summoned to his tent; and at line 68a, he has ordered his men to deliver him to his tent where Judith waits. All three times he is described as a *rica*, a powerful ruler obeyed by his warriors regardless of the doom hanging over them. After each use of *rican*, however, is an epithet that demeans his position as ideal leader, such as *egesful eorla dryhten* in line 21a.

The first instance of the substantive *rican* is connected to the epithet in the following half line: *egesful eorla dryhten* ("terrible/awe-inspiring lord of warriors," Ibid l. 21a). This is one of three ambiguous epithets describing Holofernes' role as a leader within the text. Here he is a lord of warriors, reflecting his position over the banquet of a typical *comitatus*, but the allusions to doom in lines 16a and 19b are confirmed by the adjective *egesful* attached to this otherwise standard epithet. *Ege(s)ful* is defined as "fearful, terrible, wonderful" (BTASD 243). Holofernes is a powerful leader of warriors, his *fortitudo* exhibited through the martial success of the Assyrian army; *egesful* alters this reading to emphasise the fear that follows his authority or, rather, reinforces it. It can also be read paronomastically, *egesful* representing the awe Holofernes inspires through his *fortitudo*, awe that turns to fear as his army conquers city after city.

#### *Goldwine Gumena*

Holofernes is referred to as a *goldwine gumena* ("gold-lord/friend of men") as he becomes merry from drink, *gytesæl* (*Jud.* l. 22b). In this line and a half, we are presented with a simple depiction of a lord hosting a banquet in his hall. We know from the previous lines, and possibly prior knowledge of the story, that he is fated to fall to Judith's sword, but at this particular moment he is merely a gold-friend or generous lord. The term evokes the tradition of wine shared within the mead-hall and

the gold distributed by the lord of that hall (Magennis, *Appetites* 21). Discussion of the feast's significance will be withheld until Chapter Five, but it is important to mention the traditional imagery behind the poet's alteration of the scene. Biblically, the banquet is the moment when Judith seduces Holofernes (Idt. 12:12-20); his men leave him incapacitated in his bed and the heroine beheads him. In *Judith*, however, the seduction is removed entirely from the feast sequence, as is Judith herself, and Holofernes' warriors are transformed into Germanic *fletsittendas* ("hall sitters," *Jud.* l. 19a). The setting of the feast scene is similar to those banquets found in *Beowulf* and Holofernes as the *goldwine gumena* imitates men like Hroðgar or Beowulf who host their warriors with feasting and drinking.

Outside of *Judith*, *goldwine* appears eight times within the poetic corpus. In *Beowulf* it is thrice used by Wealhtheow and Beowulf to describe Hroðgar (*Beo.* ll. 1169-72, 1474-76, 1600b-2) and then appears twice for Beowulf himself once he is lord among the Geats (*Ibid.* ll. 2417-19b, 2583b-86a). Constantine is also referred to as *goldwine* in *Elene*; his position as lord and his allegiance to his men are paralleled with his new devotion to God. God becomes Constantine's *goldwine*, establishing a Christian hierarchy of Lord to lord (Swanton, *Crisis* 63) through the use of traditional heroic terminology.

Ongan þa dryhtnes æ      dæges ond nihtes  
 þurh gastes gife      georne cyðan,  
 ond hine soðlice      sylfne getengde  
 goldwine gumena      in godes þeowdom,  
 æscrof, unslaw. (*El.* ll. 198-202a)

Then he began eagerly to relate the lord's law by day and night through the gift of spirit, and truly devoted himself, gold-lord of men, in God's service, spear-famed [and] quick.

*Goldwine* also occurs twice in *The Wanderer*, the leaderless retainer recalling better times in his lord's hall: *Gemon he selescegas ond sincþege, / hu hine on geoguðe his goldwine / wenede to wiste* ("he remembered hall-warriors and the receiving of treasure, how, in youth, his gold-lord accustomed him to feasting," *Wan.* ll. 34-36a). The pleasures of the feast and of treasure-giving are defining characteristics for the warrior who is now bereft of lordship, just as the Assyrians are left without guidance at the end of the poem (*Jud.* ll. 280b-92a).

As with these other figures, Holofernes demonstrates trust and pride in his warriors through the splendour of the feast; he is portrayed as a typical lord celebrating an upcoming victory. As *goldwine* he represents an idealised role centred on the bonds of the *comitatus*, despite the subtle foreshadowing of failure. The effects of the feast are the ultimate symbols of Holofernes' inability to act as a proper Germanic lord; he is a *goldwine*, but with excessive drink and inarticulate roaring (*Jud.* ll. 23-25) rather than the symbolic cup-sharing or speech-giving (Pollington, *Warrior* 29-42; Sundqvist, *Freyr's Offspring* 90, 213). As the general laughs and shouts the poet supplies an interesting, albeit ambiguous, description of Holofernes: *se stiðmoda* ("fierce-minded," *Jud.* l. 25a).

There are few examples of *stiðmod* within the Old English poetic corpus – five instances in five poems, excluding *Judith*. The use of this term in *Judith* appears in the tumultuous feast scene and alludes to Holofernes' arrogance, further emphasised by *modig* ("high-spirited, noble; proud, arrogant") in line 26a. In other Old English texts it also bears the implication of destructive hubris. In *Beowulf* it is the hero himself who receives the label of *stiðmod* while fighting the dragon: he is described as standing firm, armed and bearing a shield (*Beo.* ll. 2566-68). This scene precipitates Beowulf's death against the dragon, for it is his stubborn decision to face the beast alone that results in his demise. In the *Dream of the Rood*, Christ is also referred to as *stiðmod* as he strides towards the cross (*Dream.* l. 40a). We find the hero approaching his imminent death, but in a manner of acceptance; he is referred to as *strang ond stiðmod* ("strong and fierce-minded," *Ibid*), qualities that enable him to sacrifice himself for mankind. For Christ and Beowulf, their fierce-mindedness is for the greater good, namely the leader looking beyond himself to the welfare of his subjects; had they not the sternness of character that allowed them to defeat their enemies their followers would suffer.

*Genesis* uses *stiðmod* to describe God himself, the *stiðmod cyning* ("fierce-minded king," *Gen. A* l. 2425a), when he sends messengers to Sodom before its forthcoming destruction. The reader knows Sodom will be levelled, just as we know that Christ will sacrifice himself and that Beowulf will die in this final heroic battle. The term *stiðmod* suggests, perhaps not courage, but the fortitude to go on despite prophesied outcomes. The fourth instance of *stiðmod* appears in *Christ and Satan* and again refers to God. However, this example differs from those mentioned above, for it is Satan who describes God as *strang and stiðmod* (*Sat.* l. 246a) while telling

the story of his fall from heaven. Unlike the other texts, *Christ and Satan*'s use of *stiðmod* causes a subtle nuance of negativity: Satan believes he was justified in his rebellion against God and inciting his fellow angels to value themselves above their creator. It is God's esteem for mankind that pushes Satan to speak out and his belief that this favouritism results in an obstinate eclipsing of his angels (*Sat.* ll. 242b-44). *Stiðmod* assumes a negative quality because Satan does not possess *sapientia dei*; it is ultimately the angels' pride that brings them unto ruin: *wæs him eall ful strang wom and witu; hæfdon wuldorcýning / for oferhigdum anforlæten* ("to them, sin and punishment was full strong; they had forsaken the king of glory on account of pride," *Ibid* ll. 225-26).

Between lines 21b and 27, Holofernes transforms from a typical Germanic *goldwine* into *se inwidda* ("the evil/wicked one," *Jud.* l. 28a). He regresses from an idealised lord to an embodiment of evil through intemperance, roaring and shouting in ignorance of the fate that awaits him and his warriors (*Ibid* ll. 19b-21a). He acts with arrogant impunity; his fierce-mindedness stems from a belief of invulnerability and a false sense of his own *fortitudo*. Vice literally deprives Holofernes of authority within his own army until he is *goldwine* in name only; his fierce-heartedness turns into arrogance as he plies his men with wine: *modig ond medugal, manode geneahhe / bencsittende þæt hi gebærdon wel* ("arrogant and drunk with mead, he frequently urged bench-sitters that they might have enjoyed themselves well," *Ibid* ll. 26-27). Holofernes urges his men towards their own destruction through his devotion to worldly pleasures, entrapped by his own ignorance.

#### *Swiðmod Sinces Brytta and Morðres Brytta*

The poet continues to stress Holofernes' position as a lord among loyal retainers. In the midst of intoxicating his warriors, he is called *swiðmod sines brytta* ("stout-hearted/arrogant giver of treasure," *Ibid* l. 30a). Its implication is similar to that of *goldwine*, recalling the obligation of the lord to his retainers and the necessary distribution of treasure to reaffirm loyalty and to bestow honour (Pollington, *Warrior* 37-39). More interesting is *swiðmod*, an example of the poet's use of paronomasia to depict the two sides of Holofernes' character: the ideal lord and its antithesis. *Swið* is defined as "strong" (BTASD 959), thus *swiðmod* suggests strength of mind or a spirit not easily bent. In a positive sense this would imply the stout-heartedness of a warrior or ruler who showed bravery and courage, but strength, if employed in a

ruthless manner, would denote the sin of arrogance or haughtiness (BTASD 960; Momma 68).

Old English characters described as *swiðmod* are rare in the poetic corpus, appearing in only three other texts besides *Judith*: once in *Beowulf*, thrice in *Solomon and Saturn* and six times in *Daniel*. Upon Beowulf's return from the mere-battle, where he has defeated Grendel's mother and retrieved Grendel's head: *Com þa to lande lidmanna helm / swiðmod swymman; sælace gefeah, / mægenbyrþenne þara þe he him mid hæfde* ("then the protector of seafarers came to land, swimming (literally, to swim) stout-hearted, joyful in sea-booty, the mighty burden that he had with him," *Beo.* ll. 1623-25). The use of the term *swiðmod* describes not just the hero's chore in bearing the head to land, but also his will and determination to do so. His *swiðmod* return after the battle with the mere-wife is also connected to his triumph and the pride produced from a successful conquest. Strong-spirited and not easily swayed from his choices, his *swiðmod* reaction to victory acts as a precursor to his *stiðmod* stance against the dragon in his old age (*Ibid.* l. 2566).

*Solomon and Saturn* uses *swiðmod* in a similar fashion to that found in *Beowulf*. Instead of corporeal battles, the Pater Noster section of the poem depicts a spiritual struggle where the "letters of the Pater Noster are personified as warriors ... attack[ing] ... the Devil" (Jonassen 1). The letter P is transformed into a warrior, battling back the Devil with a golden goad: *Hafað guðmæcga gierde lange, / gyldene gade, and a ðone grymman feond / swiðmod sweopað* ("the war-like man has a long rod, a golden goad, and, stout-hearted, forever beats the fierce enemy," *Sol.* ll. 96-98a). The letters Q and V are also personified as warriors who advance against the Devil (*Ibid.* ll. 124-28). As with *Beowulf*, the letters of the Pater Noster fight with *fortitudo*, their prowess enhanced by the power of the divine resulting in the combined strength of *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei*.

The term *swiðmod* appears six times in *Daniel* for Nebuchodonosor, king of Babylon, and each of these uses is connected with the *sapientia dei* offered to him and his subsequent misunderstanding of the information provided. Where *Beowulf* and *Solomon and Saturn* impart the quality of stout-heartedness to their respective warriors' *fortitudo*, Nebuchodonosor requires *sapientia* in his final battle against the ignorance associated with heathenism. The term appears again at line 100a, when Nebuchodonosor brings three Israelites, well learned in books of law to his court; line 161b, when Nebuchodonosor learns of his forgotten dream from Daniel; line

268a, during the attempted burning of the three Israelites, Nebuchodonosor witnesses the angel saving them, a clear manifestation of divine power; line 451a, after the aforementioned miracle, he accepts the might of God, threatening punishment to any who denied divine intervention in the saving of the youths, then seeks to understand how it was accomplished (*Dan.* ll. 458-71); line 528a, the king demands that his leaders explain his dream, knowing they could not because only Daniel, God's prophet could; and in line 605a,

wearð ða anhydig ofer ealle men,  
 swiðmod in sefan, for ðære sundorgife  
 þe him god sealde, gumena rice,  
 world to gewealde in wera life. (Ibid ll. 604-07)

He became stubborn over all men, stout-hearted in mind, because of the special gift that God gave him, the empire of men, a world to rule in the life of men.

It is a common theme within the text that Nebuchodonosor is offered wisdom through the prophet Daniel, which he craves, but he cannot implement it because *his mod astah, / heah fram heortan* ("his mind arose, high from [his] heart," Ibid ll. 596b-97a). He is "specially gifted by God but ... falls from grace, and is exiled, because of the pride that arises from his great talents" (Sharma 114). His *swiðmod* qualities effect arrogance rather than the *fortitudo* exhibited by Beowulf and the letters of the Pater Noster, but this does not abandon Nebuchodonosor to hopelessness. God exiles him for seven years until he "humbly acknowledge[s] God" (Ibid 105) and is restored to Babylon where he preaches the Christian faith to his people. Unlike Beowulf, Nebuchodonosor's strong-mindedness incapacitates him until he is humbled by God, the state of being *swiðmod* bordering on the sin of *oferhygd*.

Returning to Holofernes we find a slightly different interpretation of the adjective. Unlike Beowulf, he takes no action in the extant poem; the feast scene displays the opposite of a strong will and an unbreakable spirit. Unlike Nebuchodonosor he does not receive *sapientia*, which is arguably the one saving grace of the former, and he does not benefit from the support of the divine. Safe within his tents, surrounded by his thegns and victory assured, the Assyrian lord is consumed with pride, the feast exhibiting his arrogance through a perversion of the

heroic ethos. Where Nebuchodonosor corrects his display of pride with humility, Holofernes succumbs to *superbia*, the most dangerous of sins for a ruler (Augustine, *Arbitrio* PL 32.1307; Schücking 39).

Holofernes is not simply *swiðmod*, but a *swiðmod sinces brytta*. His role as distributor of wealth is perverted the moment he offers excess wine instead of treasure to his retainers (*Jud.* ll. 17b-19a; Lucas, “Woman Hero” 22). He celebrates not an upcoming battle, but a hypothetical victory: he is arrogant in his merriment and doomed by his ignorance. The phrase *sinces brytta* appears in several texts in its various grammatical forms a total of eight times (excluding *Judith*): four times in *Beowulf*, once in *Elene*, thrice in *Genesis* and once again in *The Wanderer*. The position of the treasure-giver, along with that of the *goldwine*, was fundamental to the *comitatus* relationship, as discussed in Chapter One. The giving of gifts assured loyalty on the part of the warriors to their lord, promising victories and wealth in the future. Holofernes as a typical *sinces brytta* would have earned the loyalty of his men and thus the authority garnered by victory in battle. The wealth of his possessions at the end of *Judith* (ll. 336b-40a) indicates a level of success in his leadership position, as do the many positive epithets attributed to him by the poet, despite the absence of gift-giving.

A second use of *swiðmod* at line 340a reminds the reader that Holofernes’ success, which brought him to the position of leader of the Assyrian army, was undone by arrogance. In the spoils sequence, Judith is given all of his possessions, the treasure (*sinc*) of a stout-hearted/arrogant lord of men (*rincan baldor / swiðmodes*, *Ibid* ll. 338b-39a). *Judith*’s poet is too adept at parallels for us to think that this use of *swiðmod* and *sinc* at line 340a does not recall the same pattern in line 30. Holofernes’ arrogance is bound up with his worldly power and goods that ultimately reveal themselves as false and worthless. By adding *swiðmod* the poet warns that Holofernes was less brave and more obstinate, as was Nebuchodonosor before his exile. His treasures, the final testament to his former rank and power, are made inconsequential when they are passed on to his murderer, Judith, just as his temporary reign of oppression is made insignificant by the greater glory of God.

The description of Holofernes as a *swiðmod sinces brytta* established him as a successful leader of a warband whose stout-heartedness became the sin of arrogance. The poet emphasises the destructive quality of Holofernes’ pride by reusing the term *bryttan* in line 90a. The inherent importance of giving between a

lord and his retainers is, however, inverted with the inclusion of the noun *morðor*. Holofernes' depiction as a 'giver of death' appears in Judith's prayer as she begs for mercy and deliverance as well as forgiveness so that she *mid þys sweorde mote / geaheawan þysne morðres bryttan* ("might with this sword hew this giver of death," Ibid ll. 89b-90a). This is an explicit condemnation of Holofernes' past actions. The stout-heartedness he shows at his feast as a *sinces brytta* leads to his death and that of his men, but because it is Judith who refers to him as a dispenser of death she includes the subjugation of Israel in his crimes. The employment of the term *brytta* in lines 30a and 90a confronts the audience with the full weight of the general's failure in serving his men. Unlike the ideal lord, he no longer gives honour through gifts, but ignominy through death.

The only other example of this epithet, according to the *Old English Corpus*, is found in *Andreas*. After Andrew empties the prison of the Mermedonians Satan accosts the saint, seeking to incite retribution against God's faithful servant:

Ongan þa meldigan morþres brytta,  
 hellehinca, þone halgan wer  
 wiðerhygende ... (*And.* ll. 1170-72a)

Then the giver of death began to accuse, the hell-limper, the holy man  
 [with] hostile thoughts ...

Here *morþres brytta* describes Satan as he delivers Andrew to the cannibal tribe. In knowing that the saint will be tortured and consumed by the heathens, Satan literally dispenses death unto him unlike God, the one true Lord, who protects Andrew with deliverance from danger (Ibid ll. 1215-18). The association of Satan as a giver of death leads Huppé to read its use in *Judith* as a suggestion of "diabolical powers" (167) within Holofernes. M. Griffith agrees and adds that the use of the demonstrative pronoun with several of the general's negative epithets "strengthens the association with *the devil*" (77, Griffith's emphasis).<sup>55</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Lucas comments that *morðres bryttan* is "usually employed in Old English poetry to refer to the devil" ("Woman Hero" 24). He cites Woolf's 1953 article "The Devil in Old English Poetry" in which she states, "despite Satan's optimistic promise to his messenger, in *Genesis B*, there is nothing of value in hell to be given, all that he can dispense is evil, and he therefore becomes *morþres brytta*, not the familiar *sinces brytta*" (8). Nowhere in *Genesis B* does this epithet appear, but is rather employed by Woolf as an antithesis to the more common *sinces bryttan*, perhaps from the appearance of both in *Judith*.

In the whole of the Old English poetic corpus, the epithet *morðres brytta* appears only in *Andreas* for Satan and again in *Judith* for Holofernes, but with unique nuances for each villain. Satan's entry into the text of *Andreas* is precipitated by mischief and revenge for his exile from heaven. Holofernes' actions are a result of pride, but also ignorance (M. Griffith 77; Locherbie-Cameron 73). Satan is not ignorant (*And.* ll. 1185-94) but all too aware of the fate to which he sentences Andrew by calling forth the Mermedonians. Holofernes' weaknesses are further emphasised by the final example of *bryttan* at line 93a where God receives the epithet *torhtmod tires bryttan* ("glorious giver of glory"). God is the true representative of an ideal lord and leader. He does not exhibit pride, nor does he distribute death. Attached to this epithet is a further implication of God's sole role as leader, for he is the *mihtig dryhten* ("mighty lord," *Jud.* l. 92b), who gives eternal glory in heaven and on earth instead of physical treasures.

#### *Gumena Baldor*

At the beginning of the feast, Holofernes is described as a *gumena baldor*, a prince of men (*Ibid.* l. 9b), who calls his men to feast. The significance of this moniker in the early lines of the extant text is not extraordinary, as it is followed by two more positive descriptions of Holofernes as leader. The repetition of the epithet in line 32a after the general is described as a *swiðmod sincas brytta*, however, re-establishes his position as a traditional leader of men.<sup>56</sup> The retinue is now drunk from excess wine, *agotene goda gehwylces* ("drained of every good," *Ibid.* l. 32a); during which period Holofernes is described as *se inwidda* and *swiðmod sincas brytta*. These negative epithets reflect his perversion of the traditional Germanic feast, condemning him as an anti-lord. Huppé describes the double use of *gumena [b]aldor* at lines 9b and 32b as a "framing ... which focuses on Holofernes' mad wilfulness, [and] relates the entire scene of the feast to him and his evil power" (160).

The translation of the epithet, however, does not directly support a reading of Holofernes as 'evil'. His description as *inwidda* ("guileful, deceitful, evil, wicked," BTASD 597) in line 28a is the only unambiguous appellation that maligns his

<sup>56</sup> In line 32a of M. Griffith's edition of *Judith*, the text reads: *Swa het se gumena aldor*. In his textual notes, he comments that the initial 'b' was erased from the text (M. Griffith 97). I therefore include other examples of the epithet *gumena aldor* displayed in the *Old English Corpus* alongside *gumena baldor* in this study.

character; the use of *swiðmod*, as discussed above, is ambiguous. There are only three examples of *gumena baldor* in the Old English poetic corpus, two in *Judith* and one in *Genesis*.<sup>57</sup> The use of *gumena baldor* in *Genesis* occurs at line 2694a when Abraham explains to Abimelech why he initially claimed Sarah to be his sister (*Gen. A ll. 2623b-27*). Abimelech, much like Holofernes, has Sarah brought to him (*Ibid ll. 2628-29*) and succumbs to drunkenness from too much wine (*Ibid ll. 2634b-35*). Unlike the Assyrian general, however, God visits Abimelech in his dream, informing him that he has taken Abraham's wife, not his sister, and must return her to Abraham (*Ibid ll. 2638-66a*). He does so and asks Abraham why he lied about his relationship with Sarah, to which Abraham replies: '*Ac ic me, gumena baldor, guðbordes sweng / leodmagum feor lare gebearh*' ("But I, prince of men, with cunning protected myself from blow of war-shield, far from [my] kinsmen," *Ibid ll. 2694-95*).

Despite Abimelech's transgression, he is forgiven upon repentance. The epithets for him within this section (*Ibid ll. 2632b-741*) are all positive representations of leadership, several of which he shares with Holofernes: *waldend* (*Ibid l. 2635a*), *peoden* (*Ibid ll. 2628a, 2674b, 2709b*), *æðeling* (*Ibid ll. 2637a, 2657a, 2722b*), *sinces brytta* (*Ibid ll. 2642a, 2728b*), *folces weard* (*Ibid l. 2667a*), *cyning* (*Ibid l. 2672b*), *gumena baldor* (*Ibid l. 2694a*) and *aldor* (*Ibid l. 2736b*). Even after Abraham forgives Abimelech, God still intends to punish the prince for separating Sarah from her husband (*Ibid ll. 2742-77*). Where Holofernes is slain for his actions against the faithful, Abimelech is forgiven because Abraham prays for mercy on his behalf (*Ibid ll. 2750-52a*). It is the act of repentance, though not an open display of faith, which saves Abimelech and his people from God's wrath; his epithets reveal him as a leader who combines *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei*, whereas Holofernes only displays *fortitudo* and even then it is merely superficial.

The second use of *gumena [b]aldor* in *Judith* (l. 32b) presents Holofernes in a positive light. He is described in the following two lines as a typical lord seeing to his guests' needs long into the night. Modern *Judith* scholarship focuses almost solely on the drunkenness of the Assyrians at this part of the text, but despite its vital importance to the progression of the story, none read the mixing of these positive and negative leadership epithets as particularly poignant. As mentioned above, Huppé discusses the evil or diabolical traits of Holofernes as he leads his men to

<sup>57</sup> I do not include the two examples of *gumena aldor*, one in *Daniel* (l. 548a) and the other in *Genesis* (l. 1863b). Krapp does not mention the loss of an initial 'b' in his textual notes for either poem.

death (158-61), while others focus on the general's mind as it becomes clouded with drink (Godfrey 12; Astell 122-24). His actions at the feast receive the most attention as they pervert the idealised examples evidenced in *Beowulf*. The three to one ratio of positive/neutral leadership epithets to negative in the twenty-seven lines detailing the feast are not commented upon by modern scholars.<sup>58</sup> Momma mentions the “widening gap between the deteriorating behavior of the Assyrian prince and the positive epithets” (61) attributed to him by the poet, but proceeds quickly to a discussion of the feast (66).

### *Folctoga*

After the feast scene, the poet digresses into a description of the *fleohnet* hanging around Holofernes' bed (*Jud.* ll. 46b-54a). The purpose of the netting, to be discussed further in Chapter Six, is to serve, in the most literal sense, as a physical barrier between the general and those who wish to speak with him. It provides privacy but also separates him from his men with the implication that Holofernes does not entirely trust his warriors (Berkhout and Doubleday 631). There are four epithets for Holofernes within these eight lines: *folctoga* (“leader,” *Jud.* l. 47b), *se bealofulla* (“the evil one,” *Ibid.* l. 48b), *wigena baldor* (“lord of warriors,” *Ibid.* l. 49b) and *se modiga* (“the proud one” *Ibid.* l. 52b). Despite the introduction of suspicion on the part of Holofernes towards his seemingly loyal warriors, he receives only one explicitly negative epithet, *se bealofulla*.

The pattern of these four epithets begins with *folctoga* at line 47b. He is a leader of the people, who, despite his gluttonous actions at the feast, still fulfils the traditional duty of rewarding his warriors with food and drink. *Wigena baldor* at line 49b further reinforces his position among the Assyrians, associating him with authority and prestige implied by the luxurious *fleohnet*. The use of *bealofull* and *modiga*, however, adjust the image of Holofernes as an ideal leader and emphasise those vices that will lead to his demise. In the lines preceding the *fleohnet* section, Holofernes is referred to as *nergende lað* (“hateful to the saviour,” *Ibid.* l. 45b), with *bealofull* at line 48b emphasising his position as enemy of God. The placement of this epithet within the description of the netting also stresses his relationship to his

---

<sup>58</sup> I exclude the epithet *se inwidda* (*Jud.* l. 28a) as it does not suggest a role of leadership, as do the others. It will be included in the subsequent section of this chapter regarding Holofernes' lack of *anima*.

warriors; he hides behind his wealth and authority thereby altering the standard reciprocity of the lord-retainer relationship. He does not share his wealth with his warriors, nor does he hold a proper *symbol* (“feast, banquet,” BTASD 962-63) with the requisite speeches and praise. Pride overcomes him and *se modiga* fails in his role as leader, thereafter suffering the eternal punishments of hell because he is worthless to God, a point further supported in *Vainglory* (*gode orfeormne*, l. 49b (see also ll. 44-50a)).

Holofernes is not the sole recipient of *folctoga* as an epithet. In her second speech, Judith commands the Bethulians to arm themselves and rush forth to battle so as to fell the *folctogan* (*Jud.* l. 194a) and *fæge frumgaras* (“doomed leaders,” *Ibid* l. 195a) of the Assyrian army. The *folctogan* in this instance are Holofernes’ officers, who unwittingly take control of the army now that their lord is dead. The Assyrians have assumed a role bereft of leadership, despite their momentary ignorance of the fact. When they become aware of this loss of authority they turn in flight (*Ibid* ll. 290b-92a) thus failing to redeem themselves among an audience whose past revolved around the *comitatus* structure.

Holofernes is described as a leader of the people when the poet discusses his bed surrounded by the golden fly-net, which symbolises both his mortal authority and his downfall. The Assyrian leaders become *folctogan* when Judith speaks of their upcoming slaughter; they are doomed, *fæge*, just as their own leader before them. The two epithets balance the actions of the lord with its effects on his followers, the fate of the one dependent on that of the other. Judith even alludes to the deaths of the Assyrians as directly associated with the decapitation of Holofernes when she presents the head in her second speech.

#### *Hearra and his Stercedferhðe Hæleð*

Holofernes’ role as leader is supported by the actions of the Assyrians throughout the poem. He invites them to the feast and they obey (*Ibid* ll. 7b-12a); he orders them to drink and they do (*Ibid* ll. 21b-29); and when he commands Judith be brought to his tent, they comply hastily (*Ibid* ll. 34b-46a). After the *fleohnet* section, his warriors return to their *hearran* to report that Judith awaited him in his tent (*Ibid* ll. 54b-57a). As Huppé attests, this sequence of orders confirms Holofernes’ position “as a man of worldly power” (162), whose men obey him speedily and without question. The epithets employed by the poet for the Assyrians between lines 11a and

46a are, in the majority, positive, depicting them as typical Germanic retainers. Four times they are described as shield-warriors (*Jud.* ll. 11a, 17a, 20a, 42a), the tragic irony being that they fail in defending *heora hearran* (“their lord,” *Ibid.* l. 56a) from the enemy.

The warriors comply with all of Holofernes’ orders, revealing a substantial amount of loyalty given his less-than-traditional actions at the feast (*Ibid.* ll. 21b-34a). The introduction of the *fleohnet*, however, alters the reader’s perception of the lord-retainer relationship between Holofernes and his men. The physical barrier implies distrust on the part of Holofernes (Berkhout and Doubleday 631), but also a hesitancy to receive counsel he is loath to hear. Thus, when his retainers report to him that they have done as he asked, the poet refers to them as *ða ste(rced)ferhðe / hæleð* (“stout-hearted warriors,” *Jud.* ll. 55b-56a). The definition of *stercedferhð* encompasses the same concept elicited by *swiðmod*. It describes men as stout-hearted or courageous, but can also express a more extreme concept of a hard or cruel mind.<sup>59</sup> While Holofernes is described as *stiðmod* (*Ibid.* l. 25a) and *swiðmod* (*Ibid.* ll. 30a, 339a), the Assyrians have exhibited no damning qualities, as has their leader. Their stout-heartedness is therefore complicit with their allegiance to Holofernes; they serve him with blind loyalty and are accordingly punished by God.

There are other examples of *stercedferhð* in the Old English poetic corpus, which exhibit a similar definition as seen in *Judith*. In the Cynewulfian poem *Juliana*, the heroine’s enemies are referred to as *stearcferpe* as they lead Juliana to her death: *ða wæs gelæded londmearce neah / ond to þære stowe þær hi stearcferpe / þurh cumbolhete cwellan þohtun* (“then was she led near the borderland and to that place where the stout-hearted ones<sup>60</sup> through warlike hate thought to kill [her],” *Jul.* ll. 635-37). In *Elene*, it is employed to describe the enemies of the Christian Constantine who are rising against Rome; the enemy infantry is *stærceðfyrhð* (*El.* l. 37a) as it camps in foreign land (*ælfylc*, *Ibid.* l. 36b) on the banks of the Danube (*Ibid.* ll. 35b-39a). All three texts are connected through this pattern of resolute violence against persons associated with the Christian faith. Their *stearc* minds will not yield

<sup>59</sup> Stearc: “I. stiff, rigid, not soft, not bending ... Ia. fig. unyielding, stiff-necked, obstinate ... II. hard, rough, strong, of wind or weather ... III. rough, attended with hardship, hard, of living, discipline, etc. ... IV. stern, severe ... V. strong, impetuous, violent, vehement” (BTASD 914).

<sup>60</sup> As with *stercedferhðe* in *Judith*, I take *stearcferpe* in *Juliana* as a nominative plural, describing the heroine’s enemies and not the heroine herself. This reading agrees with that of Charles W. Kennedy in his collection of poetic translations (Charles W. Kennedy, ed., *The Poems of Cynewulf* (New York: Peter Smith, 1949).

to the truth presented by Christianity; they are lacking in *sapientia dei* and attack the faithful.

In *Judith*, the Assyrians also act without *sapientia dei*, exhibiting blind allegiance to their lord (Astell 128). The poem exhibits one explicitly anti-Christian epithet for the Assyrians, referring to them as *hæðenas* in the midst of the battle against the Bethulians. There are no such epithets for the warriors when they report to Holofernes in lines 54b-57a, but there is a double meaning hidden within the Assyrian epithet of heathenism. In relation to the other texts discussed above, it would be logical to assume that it is Judith whom they deliver unto punishment, as was Juliana. More likely, the warriors are described as courageous for approaching Holofernes who was described in the *fleohnet* section as *bealofulla* and *modiga*. The previous lines regarding the fly-net implies that a certain amount of tenacity was required on the part of the Assyrians when approaching their lord, distrusting as he was (*Jud.* ll. 46b-54a; see also Berkhout and Doubleday 633).

#### *Burga Ealdor*

The trust placed in Holofernes by his warriors is founded on his ability to lead them to victory. In the biblical story of Judith, the siege of Bethulia will be lifted when Judith leads Holofernes into the city (Idt. 11:15). In *Judith*, Holofernes' goal of conquering Bethulia is illustrated by the epithet *burga ealdor* ("lord/leader of towns/fortresses") in line 58a, but ironically reminds the audience that he has not, nor will ever have, a city to rule because the *beorhtan idese* ("bright woman," *Jud.* l. 58) and her people are defended by God. The Assyrian lord's lack of a city is further emphasised by the repetition of terminology describing his tent: *træf* (Ibid ll. 43b, 255a, 268a) and *burgeteld* (Ibid ll. 57a, 248b, 276b). His position as a *burga ealdor* is made ironic by his lack of a city or even a proper hall in which to host his feast; his leadership becomes superficial without a proper realm to govern.

In contrast to the impermanence of the Assyrian camp, Bethulia's status as a city and stronghold is commented upon several times within the extant poem: *wlitegan byrig weallas blican* ("the shining walls of the beautiful city," Ibid l. 137), *wealgeat* ("city gate," Ibid l. 141a), *fæstenne* ("stronghold," Ibid l. 143a), *ginnan byrig* ("spacious city," Ibid l. 149a), *wealles geat* ("gate of the wall," Ibid l. 151a), *heanne weall* (Ibid l. 161a), *fæstengeat* ("fortress gate," Ibid l. 162a), *medobyrig* ("mead city," Ibid l. 167a), *haligan byrig* ("holy city," Ibid l. 203b) and *beorhtan*

*byrig* (“bright city,” Ibid l. 326). Bethulia is described as a shining city and stronghold with high walls, unlike the Assyrian encampment that receives no description other than Holofernes’ tent and the *fleoynet* therein. The poet described Bethulia as a *medoburh* (Ibid l. 167a), which suggests that for Bethulia “drinking ... still function[s] as symbolic of good communal life” (Magennis, “Adaptation” 337). This contrasts the effects of the drinking within the enemy camp, where Holofernes, without a proper hall, perverts the Germanic traditions of the lord-retainer relationship by attempting to create order in the wilderness outside the *haligan byrig* (“holy town,” *Jud.* l. 203b), God’s city. Holofernes’ role as leader is doomed before Judith arrives at the camp because he is unable to promote ‘community’ through his lack of *anima* and *sapientia dei* (Pollington, *Mead Hall* 22-29). When his *gæst* finally settles in a permanent location, it is in hellfire, trapped for all eternity in *ðam heolstran ham hyhtwynna leas* (“in the dark home lacking joys of hope,” *Jud.* l. 121).

#### *Pearlmod ðeoden Gumena*

Holofernes’ position outside the community of the faithful condemns him to fail in his mission to conquer God’s handmaiden and her city. His opposition to God, not merely the faith, is further emblemised by the shared epithet *pearlmod ðeoden gumena* (“severe prince of men,” Ibid ll. 66a, 91a). The compound *pearlmod* is defined as “of severe mind, (1) in a bad sense, stern, cruel ... (2) in a good sense, *severe* in dealing with evil” (BTASD 1042). Holofernes is described as severe minded after the poet informs the reader directly of his intentions towards Judith, namely that he wishes *ða beorhtan idese / mid widle and mid womme besmitan* (“to defile the bright woman with filth and with sin,” *Jud.* ll. 58b-59a). He is led to his tent where the heroine awaits him, where we are told he shall die, *swylcne he ær æfter worhte / pearlmod ðeoden gumena þenden he on ðysse worulde / wunode under wolcna hrofe* (“such as he had worked for, severe prince of men, while he dwelt in this world under the roof of clouds/heaven,” Ibid ll. 65b-67a).

The inclusion of this last half line reminds the audience that Holofernes’ power is of a worldly nature and relegated to displays of *fortitudo*. The Assyrian general’s role as leader is often paralleled with God’s omnipotence. God’s guardianship is unshakable; he protects his warrior from the *hehstan brogan* (“highest danger,” Ibid l. 4b) while Holofernes abandons his warriors, *bealofull his beddes neosan* (“to go to/seek the evil of his bed,” Ibid l. 63a). Later, when they are

in dire need of his leadership he fails to appear. This juxtaposition and opposition of the two figures are blatantly realised in the repeated epithet *pearlmod ðeoden gumena*.

Judith refers to God as a *pearlmod þeoden gumena* (Ibid l. 91a), along with several other epithets, in her prayer. His role as a severe or strict prince of men occurs just after Judith has begged for *gesynta* (“deliverance,” Ibid l. 90b) for she is about to decapitate Holofernes. Here, *pearlmod* no doubt reflects the laws of the Judeo-Christian faith, and the punishment for transgressions against the commandments, particularly *non occides* (“you shall not kill,” Ex. 20:13). The severity of God as leader of men is nominally balanced with that of Holofernes, what M. Griffith refers to as a “perverted mirror image of the divinity” (77). The new use of the shared epithet for God provides the poet with an overt display of power shifting from physical to divine. It is God to whom Judith prays for salvation, compassion and mercy (*Jud.* ll. 83-94a), not Holofernes despite his decadent display of wealth and worldly authority. To reinforce this exchange of power, the poet refers to Holofernes as a *morðres brytta* in line 90a, which recalls the earlier epithet, *swiðmod sinces brytta* of line 30a; furthermore, this epithet is balanced with another at line 93a, when Judith calls God a *torhtmod tires brytta*. Holofernes’ corporeal power offers treasures, but also death without the promise of eternal salvation. God, however, is a giver of glory on earth and in heaven, which Judith receives for her unwavering faith (Ibid ll. 341b-49).

The epithet impresses upon the reader Holofernes’ role as a mortal prince of men. He conforms to the customs of Germanic society by offering a feast to his thegns, but provides only the skeleton of the tradition. Instead of gifts he plies his warriors with excess quantities of wine; instead of speeches commending their bravery, he roars incoherently (Godfrey 12). He does not maintain self-control, which would allow him to survive the night and perhaps lead his men to victory (Astell 125). Through his excess of drink Holofernes becomes incapacitated, and Judith is thereby successful in dispatching him. After all, “[j]udgment and self-control are qualities necessary for the successful Germanic heroic leader. Such a leader may preside over copious drinking in the hall ... but should not allow himself to be misguided as a result of drinking” (Magennis, *Appetites* 119). Holofernes is unable to uphold his role and the inherent obligations of a *ðeoden gumena* and so falls to one who does uphold the Christo-Germanic customs of leadership.

*Lað Leodhata and Wærloga*

Once left in his bedchamber, deprived of his faculties, the positive epithets denoting leadership are replaced with negative descriptors. As of line 71b, Holofernes receives four negative epithets in only six lines of text; one of these, *lað leodhata* (“hateful tyrant,” *Jud.* l. 72a) refutes the fourteen positive leadership descriptions that came before it. The BTASD defines the compound as “tyrant” (630), as does M. Griffith in the glossary of his edition (72). The two elements combine *leod* (“people, nation, race, country,” BTASD 629-30), and *-hata*, which is most likely derived from the verb *hatian*, to hate (BTASD 512). Thus he would be a hater of the people, but it is not clear if the poet refers to the Bethulians, the Assyrians or both.

Despite the perversity of the feast, Holofernes has committed no direct crimes against his retainers. The foreshadowing of their demise because of his *oferhygd* does not reflect hatred on his part towards his men, but rather a selfish existence based on worldly power and a distinct ignorance of God’s all-encompassing authority. *Leodhata* occurs thrice in the Old English poetic corpus, here in *Judith* as well as once each in *Elene* and *Exodus*. In *Elene*, *leodhata* is employed to describe the sinners destined for hell upon the Day of Judgment:

Bið se þridda dæl,  
 awyrgeðe womsceaðan, in þæs wylmes grund,  
 lease leodhatan, lige befæsted  
 þurh ærgewyrht, arleasra sceolu,  
 in gleda gripe. (*El.* ll. 1298b-1302a)

The third portion, cursed sinners, false tyrants, honourless troops will  
 be in the ground of welling fire, fastened in fire in a grip of flames on  
 account of former deeds

Along with the epithets *awyrgeðe womsceaða* (“cursed sinners,” *Ibid.* l. 1299a) and *arleasra sceolu* (“wicked host,” *Ibid.* l. 1301b), *leas leodhata* (“lying haters of the people,” *Ibid.* l. 1300a) establishes the villainy of the sinners and the reasons why they will not ascend to heaven. Employing ‘tyrant’ as a translation of *leodhata* here does not fit the context created by the other epithets. The literal reading of ‘haters of

the people’ would suggest that the sinners hate the faithful, those who will rise to heaven rather than the poet narrowing his focus to rulers alone.

*Exodus* not only uses *leodhata*, but also modifies it with the adjective *lað* as does the poet of *Judith*. The subject of the epithet in *Exodus* is less arbitrary than in *Elene* as it describes God as he destroys the first-born of Egypt.

Bana wide scrað,  
 lað leodhata, land drysmyde  
 deadra hræwum, dugoð forð gewat,  
 wop wæs wide, worulddreama lyt. (*Exod.* ll. 39b-42)

A murderer wandered widely, hateful tyrant, the land mourned  
 corpses of the dead, a troop went forth, lamentation was wide, joys of  
 this life little.

This final plague results in the freeing of the Israelites from slavery, thus the deaths of the Egyptians are portrayed as a form of victory in battle (Ex. 11:1-12:36). God is a *bana* (“killer, murderer,” *Exod.* l. 29b), a *lað leodhata* as he ravages the land. To translate *leodhata* as tyrant does not seem fitting in this instance, as God had sent nine other plagues to warn Pharaoh into freeing the Jews. A ‘hater of people’, however, does fit here if we accept that *leod* represents the Egyptians; only the *leodhata* in *Elene* reflects the damned’s feelings towards the faithful. Therefore, *leodhata* should reflect a sense of enmity by the holder of the epithet towards others within the text, particularly since the enemy of the sinner is the faithful and, in regard to *Exodus*, the enemy of God and his people, in this instance, are Pharaoh and the Egyptians.

The use of *leodhata* to describe Holofernes follows the pattern argued for the translations of *Elene* and *Exodus*. As the general has laid siege to Bethulia and doomed his men to death, it seems likely that *leodhata* describes him as an enemy or hater of the people, specifically the Israelites. There is a second epithet, appearing just before *lað leodhata* at line 72a that supplies a possible double meaning to reading Holofernes as a hater of the Bethulians alone. Lines 71b-72a refer to him as *wærlogan*, / *laðne leodhatan*, a deceiver of pledges, a hateful hater of people. The compound *wærloga* is built of two elements, *wær* (“covenant, agreement, pledge,” BTASD 1156-57) and *leogan* (“to lie, deceive,” Ibid 632). Thus, in its entirety, the

compound is defined as someone “who is false to his covenant, a faithless, perfidious person” (Ibid 1157).

M. Griffith comments that *wærloga* “is literally applicable to Holofernes because of his explicit intention to abuse the covenant between host and guest and is symbolically appropriate for a devilish figure” (120). Thus, Griffith assumes that Holofernes’ role as a troth-breaker is connected to his role as host and his failure to uphold the customs inherent therein. The placement of *wærloga*, however, is important. While it is not explicitly tied to the position of leadership, the use of this epithet alongside *leodhata* implies that the pledge Holofernes broke was connected to his role as lord, not just host. Furthermore, *wærloga* shares line 71 with the phrase *weras winsade*. The physical proximity of these two epithets links the excessive celebration presented by Holofernes with his breaking of a covenant between lord and retainer. Holofernes betrayed the Assyrians through the application of excess wine rather than the distribution of *sinces*. Drinking was “expressive of reciprocity and trust within warrior society” (Magennis, *Appetites* 21) and through their overindulgence Holofernes and his warriors destroy that trust and fail to protect one another. The drinking blinds the Assyrians to danger and incapacitates them so that they are unable to perform the duties expected of them, specifically the defence of their lord.

#### Holofernes as Antithesis of God

There are multiple epithets for Holofernes that describe him as wicked or foul, most appearing to counter the otherwise idealistic interpretation of his character as suggested by the lordly epithets. After he is called a *gumena baldor* (“prince of men,” *Jud.* l. 32b), for example, he is referred to as *niða geblonden* (“corrupted with troubles,” Ibid l. 34b). His position as a leader is tempered by his vices, just as his position as a *sinces brytta* was modified by the ambiguous *swiðmod* (“stout-hearted/arrogant giver of treasure,” Ibid ll. 30a). The consistent contrast between Holofernes and God, as well as Judith, is only directly referred to in five epithets; moreover, only one of these directly opposes Holofernes and the almighty.

In the beginning of the text, Holofernes’ warriors bring him to his tent, where Judith waits, and *þær se rica hyne reste on symbel, / nihtes inne, nergende lað / Holofernus* (“wherein the powerful one always rested himself at night, Holofernes himself, odious to the saviour,” Ibid ll. 44-46a). These two and a half lines turn

Holofernes not only into the enemy of God, but a being hated by the almighty. It is worth noting, however, that we are not told explicitly *why* Holofernes is loathsome to the saviour, only that he is (Ibid ll. 57b-59a). What is interesting about the poet's choice of epithet in line 45b is that God has been absent from the poem since the opening lines. His dominance in the first six lines of the extant text is peculiar to *Judith*, which contains a multitude of epithets, five to the biblical one:

Dominum Deum Israel	mæran þeodne (“famous prince,” <i>Jud.</i> l. 3a)
(“Lord God of Israel,”	hehstan deman (“highest judge,” Ibid l. 4a)
Idt. 12:8)	frymða waldend (“ruler of creation,” Ibid l. 5a)
	fæder on roderum (“father in heavens,” Ibid l. 5b)
	ælmhtigan (“almighty,” Ibid l. 7a)

Despite the higher ratio of epithets in the poem as opposed to the corresponding biblical text, God is not included in the initial *swæsende* section. This choice seemingly maintains a secular focus on the feast, with Holofernes at its core, but the secular is ultimately compared to the spiritual within the poem. The tradition of the comitatus is re-evaluated in a broader sphere, namely the subservience of all men to God rather than a corporeal lord like Holofernes (Swanton, *Crisis* 33-34).

The epithet *nergende lað* (“odious to the saviour,” *Jud.* l. 45b), along with *deofulcunda* (“devilish one,” Ibid l. 61a) are the clearest examples of animosity towards Holofernes in a strictly Christian light. The term *deofulcund* is unique to *Judith* in the Old English corpus and appears after the general's designs on Judith are clarified, namely that he will defile (*besmitan*, Ibid l.59a) her. We are further assured that God will prevent Holofernes from accomplishing his goal: *Ne wolde þæt wuldres dema / geðafian, þrymmes hyrde, ac he him þæs ðinges gestyrde, / dryhten dugeða waldend* (“the judge of glory, shepherd of splendour, lord God of elite hosts did not wish to permit it, but he restrained that thing,” Ibid ll. 59b-61a). In these two lines appear four epithets for the almighty, impressing upon the audience divine favour for Judith as she approaches danger.<sup>61</sup> The subsequent reference to Holofernes as devil-kind (*deofulcund*, l. 61b) presents us with clear opposition between the Assyrian general and God as well as Judith, *seo halige meowle* (“the holy woman,” Ibid l. 56b). Here it is Holofernes' lust (*galferhð*, Ibid l. 62a) that

<sup>61</sup> It is possible that we are meant to recall the *hehstan brogan* (“highest danger”) mentioned in line 4b, another danger from which God intends to protect his handmaiden. I avoid referencing it in the body of this thesis, as we cannot be certain as to what the poet intended this *broga* to represent, as the opening of the text is lost.

brings divine intervention and sets him farther apart from the image of the ideal leader. The association subjects Holofernes' character to Christian judgment, which emphasises the accepted vertical hierarchy by the poet and his audience: *Dryhten to dryhten to folc* (Swanton, *Crisis* 63).

After Judith's prayer (*Jud.* ll. 83-94a), the poet includes four lines in which God answers Judith's prayer by imbuing her with strength, both spiritual and physical. This addition is unattested in any of the biblical analogues; within *Judith* these lines stress the opposition between Holofernes' powers as a ruler to those of God. Judith is inspired with courage *swa he deð anra gehwylcne / herbuendra þe hyne him to helpe seceð / mid ræde ond mid rihte geleafan* ("as he does for anyone of the people living here (i.e. in the world) that sought him for help with wisdom and with true faith," *Ibid.* ll. 95b-97a). This is the precise cause of Judith's victory as a leader of Bethulia and as a *miles Christi*, and it is the absence of *sapientia dei* in Holofernes that condemns him to lose his lordly position, the loyalty of his men and, ultimately, his life. It is after God's renewal of Judith's *mod* ("mind, spirit," *Ibid.* l. 97b), a section that idealises her as a model Christian, when the poet first refers to Holofernes as *hæðen* ("heathen," *Ibid.* l. 98b).

There are three instances of the term *hæðen* being used to describe Holofernes within the extant *Judith*. The aforementioned example at line 98b appears just before the decapitation and continues a succession of negative epithets starting with *wærloga* at line 71b and ending at line 126a with *herewæða*. In the decapitation scene alone, there are six negative epithets (*bealofull*, "evil," *Ibid.* l. 100b; *lað mon(n)*, "hateful man," l. 101b; *unlæd*, "miserable/wicked," l. 102a; *feondsceaða*, "bitter enemy," l. 104a; *hæðen hund*, "heathen hound," l. 110a), framed at the beginning and end with the term *hæðen* (*Ibid.* ll. 98b, 110a). Holofernes' role as a lord and leader is completely overshadowed by his status as a heathen. Judith's handling of him degrades him, objectifying him before she decapitates him. Godfrey suggests that the adverb *bysmerlice* ("shamefully," *Ibid.* l. 100a) refers not to the intended rape, but to Holofernes' shame at being handled by Judith while incapacitated (Godfrey 22). The negative epithets between lines 71b and 126a decrease Holofernes' position within the text until his very humanity is removed in line 110a when he is called a *hund*. The repeated use of heathenism to describe him implies that this characteristic was fundamental in his failure, because he did not have God's strength to rely on, as did Judith.

In Judith's second speech (*Jud.* ll. 177-98), she reveals the severed head to her people, telling them to look upon it as a symbol of their victory. At this moment, Judith assumes control of the Bethulians, while Holofernes is described as the *laðestan* ("most hated [one]," Ibid l. 178b) and the *hæðen heaðorinc* ("heathen warrior," Ibid l. 179a).<sup>62</sup> His heathenism is crucial to his loss of rank within the Assyrian army, falling from a *wigena baldor* ("prince of warriors," Ibid l. 49b) to a mere warrior (Ibid l. 179a); it was God, Judith says, who did not grant him longer life: *ac him ne uðe god / lengran lifes, þæt he mid læððum us / eglan moste* ("but to him God did not grant longer life, that he might trouble us with injuries," Ibid ll. 183b-85a). Holofernes' role as a heathen denies him power, for it opposes him to God and thereby deprives him of divine assistance.

These epithets (*nergende lað*, Ibid l. 45b; *deofulcunda* l. 61a; *hæðen* ll. 98b, 110a, 179a) define Holofernes as an enemy of Judith, her people and above all God. They signify why his importance and authority on earth will come to an end, thus emphasising the essential aspect of *sapientia dei* in a Christo-Germanic leader. Holofernes is not connected with a role of leadership again until line 251a, when his men rush to the tent that has tragically become his tomb. As his warriors unwittingly seek assistance from their deceased leader, the poet establishes a cruel reminder of Holofernes' former glory for he is no longer their *hlaford* ("lord," Ibid l. 251a), but a headless corpse.

### Lord of Warriors

Interspersed within the epithets for Holofernes are references to his role as a military commander. There are seven epithets employed by the poet that describe Holofernes as a leader of warriors: *byrnwigena brego* ("ruler/lord of warriors in mail," Ibid l. 39a), *wigena baldor* ("lord of warriors," Ibid l. 49b), *laðestan / hæðenes heaðorinces* ("of the most hateful one of the heathen warrior," Ibid ll. 178b-79a),<sup>63</sup> and *beorna brego* ("lord/ruler of men/warriors," Ibid l. 254a). The description of his position among the Assyrians is less striking than those epithets that label him as a warrior. In the biblical original, Holofernes is a *princeps* of Nebuchodonosor's

<sup>62</sup> See M. Griffith's note regarding lines 178b-79a, wherein she expresses that the separation into two epithets is "likelier" (129).

<sup>63</sup> M. Griffith suggests that *laðestan* be taken as a nominal adjective, thus "the most odious one," though he does cite the translation "of the most odious, heathen warrior" as a more natural reading of the two half lines based on a "strong and frequent use of enjambement in the poem" (M. Griffith 129).

army but never a warrior (Idt. 2:4); he commands from afar and leaves his men to fight the battles, the final one without him. In *Judith*, he is primarily presented as a lord of men, which adheres to the original description of his character, but three times he is referred to as a warrior: *herewæða* (*Jud.* ll. 126a, 173a) and *cumbolwiga* (Ibid l. 259b). The significance of these two epithets is in the reduction of Holofernes' status among the Assyrians from a lord of warriors to a mere soldier.

The first instance of *herewæða* follows a series of negative epithets after *serica* ("the powerful one," Ibid l. 68a). These terms define Holofernes as terrible (*atol*, Ibid l. 75a), foul (*unsyfre*, Ibid l. 76b; *womfull*, l. 77a), wicked (*bealofulla*, Ibid l. 100b; *unlæd*, l. 102a) and a giver of death (*morðres brytta*, Ibid l. 90a). He transitions during the decapitation from a *hæðenan hund* ("heathen hound," Ibid l. 110a) to a foul corpse (*fula leap*, Ibid l. 111b), the poet removing Holofernes' very humanity. When Judith takes the severed head to her maid, however, the poet describes the Assyrian as a *herewæðan* ("warrior," Ibid l. 126a) despite his headless state. The return of his humanity, ironically after he is dead, is connected with Judith's own role as triumphant hero. Lines 122-24 are a celebratory aside, focusing on Judith's victory: *Hæfde ða gefohten foremærne blæd / Iudith æt guðe, swa hyre god uðe, / swegles ealdor, þe hyre sigores onleah* ("Judith had won outstanding glory at battle, just as God granted her, lord of heaven, who granted her victory," Ibid ll. 122-24). Although it is God who gave her the strength required to kill Holofernes, it was Judith who physically accomplished the action. By delivering a warrior's head she elevates her own status as a heroic figure in the *miles christi* tradition (Magennis, "Gender" 15; Damico 183, 185).

The second example of *herewæða* appears in line 173a and recalls that of line 126a. Holofernes is called a *herewæða* first when his head is put into the maid's pouch (*fætels*) and again when she removes it: *Ða seo gleawe het ... / hyra ðinenne þancolmode / þæs herewæðan heafod onwriðan* ("then the wise one ordered ... her thoughtful female servant to unwrap the warrior's head," *Jud.* ll. 171-73). There are multiple parallels between this *herewæða* and that found in line 126a: both times it is the maid who is handling the head, first by placing it in her pouch and later as she unwraps it. The head is also *blodig* in both instances, the only two times the poet uses the term within the extant poem. The significance of these two depictions of Holofernes as a warrior might coincide with the poet's references to the decapitation as a 'battle' in the same sections (*æt guðe*, Ibid l. 123a; *æt beadowe*, l. 175b). The

irony of these descriptions is that Holofernes is dead and therefore unable to fight; even while alive he was incapacitated from drink. M. Griffith suggests that the ‘battle’ is an allegory for the battle between good and evil (125-26), which supports other figurative imagery of Judith as a *miles Christi* (discussed further in Chapter Four).

Holofernes is referred to as a warrior once more at line 259b, where he is labelled a *cumbolwiga*. The first part of the compound noun, *cumbol*, adds a special significance to Holofernes as a warrior. A *cumbol* is a banner or standard, primarily with a military connotation (*Exod.* l. 175b; *Brun.* l. 49b; *Beo.* l. 2505b). Thus the Assyrians are banner-warriors in line 243b as the head guards, perceiving the Bethulian threat, *wrehton cumbolwigan / ond him forhtlice færsþel bodedon* (“roused the banner-warriors and fearfully announced to them the sudden bad news,” *Jud.* ll. 243b-44). It is likely that these are the same warriors who attended the feast at the beginning of the extant text (*yldestan ðegnas*, “chief thegns” *Ibid.* l. 10a; *yldestan ealdorþegnum*, “chief senior thegns” l. 242), an assumption verified by the poet’s addendum of them being *medowerig* (“mead-weary,” *Ibid.* l. 245a). These warriors bear the news of the attack to Holofernes, but hesitate, for they believed their *beorna brego* (*Ibid.* l. 254a) to be in bed with Judith (*Ibid.* ll. 253b-61a) and thus delay the discovery of their dead lord until it is too late.

The description of Holofernes as a banner-warrior occurs in a set of epithets paralleled with a set for Judith, opposing his status as a warrior with the *haligan mægð ... / metodes meowlan* (“holy woman ... woman of God,” *Jud.* ll. 260-61a). The poet, in his sardonic manner, derides the hierarchy of the Assyrian army by demoting Holofernes from a *beorna brego* (“lord/ruler of men/warriors,” *Ibid.* l. 254a) to a mere *cumbolwiga*. The poet’s reminder of Holofernes’ role as a ‘leader of men’ also recalls his failure in that particular position: Judith overtakes his position of authority because she is imbued with *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei*. By clarifying Judith’s position as the handmaiden of God the poet further emphasises Holofernes’ shattered authority; she triumphed because she possessed *sapientia dei* proving that the *gumena ðreat* (“troop of men,” *Ibid.* l. 62b) that accompanied Holofernes was inadequate against a lone warrior loyal to God. The poet thus elevates her status in the hierarchy of heaven while simultaneously diminishing Holofernes’ military rank – at least nominally – to little more than a generic soldier, attributing his loss of authority to his lascivious and ferocious nature (*Ibid.* ll. 256b-57a). He is transformed

into a *cumbol*, an “emblem of their group identity ... a group ‘soul’” (Pollington, *Warrior* 82), while his death severs the bond of the *comitatus* and condemns his men to ignominious slaughter. Holofernes, through his actions and failures in the role of leadership, embodies the despair of the lordless warrior evoked in *The Wanderer*: *woriað þa winsalo, waldend licgað / dreame bidrorene, duguþ eal gecrong, / wlonc bi wealle* (“the wine-halls crumble, the lords lie [dead] deprived of joy, the retainers all dead, proud ones near the wall,” *Wan.* ll. 78-80a).

### *Winedryhten*

The epithets between lines 268 and 289 describe Holofernes’ role as a leader in a positive manner. They appear in sections of the battle scene that have precedence in the biblical originals, yet reveal a conscious alteration on the part of the poet. The biblical section that corresponds to lines 246b-89a (Idt. 14:9-16) includes a single reference to Holofernes as commander of the army; it occurs only when the command is given to wake the general, but appears only in the *Septuagint* and *Vetus Latina*, not the *Vulgata*,:

<i>Septuagint</i>	<i>Vetus Latina</i>
ἔγειρον δὴ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐτόλμησαν οἱ δοῦλοι καταβαίνειν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς εἰς πόλεμον, ἵνα ἐξολοθρευθῶσιν εἰς τέλος. (LXX Idt. 14:13)	Suscita dominum nostrum, quoniam ausi sunt filii Israel descendere ad nos in bellum, ut pereant usque in finem. (VL Idt. 14:12)
Wake our lord, for the slaves have dared to come down against us in battle, so that they might be utterly destroyed to the end.	Rouse our lord, since the sons of Israel have been prepared to descend against us in war, so that they be destroyed constantly to the end.

Apart from this one example, Holofernes is referred to either by name or an appropriate pronominal form. In *Judith*, the Assyrians stand outside *hyra þeodnes træf* (“their prince’s tent,” *Jud.* l. 268a). When the unfortunate warrior decides to wake Holofernes the poet returns to the communal symbolism of the *comitatus* so deeply expressed in the feast scene: *hogedon þa eorlas aweccan / hyra winedryhten* (“the warriors intended to wake their lord and friend,” *Ibid.* ll. 273b-74a).

*Winedryhten* is defined as a “friendly, gracious lord” (BTASD 1233). The compound implies that Holofernes is considered a friendly-lord among the

Assyrians; he represents an ideal within the *comitatus* relationship; his role as commander, indeed as an ideal Germanic lord, is espoused in this single epithet. The lord's purpose within a *comitatus* was to "plan, initiate, and lead" (Evans 126) his men on successful raids. It can be argued that until Judith's arrival in the Assyrian camp, Holofernes provided exactly what he was meant to: Bethulia was besieged and, according to the biblical analogues, near surrender; his warriors would have reaped their reward from the city's spoils and earned security in their patronage under Holofernes (Sundqvist, *Freyr's Offering* 85). The term is not negative, but in fact echoes a traditional concept of the lord-retainer relationship; his position as a *winedryhten* in fact idealises his role as the Assyrian commander.

A cross-reference with other Old English poems reveals the word's reappearance eleven times in five texts, excluding *Judith*. It is twice used in *Guðlac* to describe the saint (*Guð.* ll. 1010b-13a, 1201b-06a) and twice again in the *Battle of Maldon* for the fallen Byrhtnoth (*Mald.* ll. 246-48, 261-64). Five examples occur in *Beowulf* – twice for Hroðgar and thrice for Beowulf (*Beo.* ll. 360-64a, 862-63, 1602b-5a, 2720-23, 3174b-77); the term also appears in *Andreas*, not for a mortal man, but in reference to God himself (*And.* ll. 918-24). The most poignant use of *winedryhten*, however, is found in *The Wanderer*. The poet describes the loss of a hypothetical lord by his retainer:

Forþon wat se þe sceal his winedryhtnes  
 leofes larcwidum longe forþolian,  
 ðonne sorg ond slæp somod ætgædre  
 earmne anhogan oft gebindað. (*Wan.* ll. 37-40)

Therefore he knows [it], he who must do without counsels of his beloved friendly lord for a long time, when sorrow and sleep all together often bind the miserable solitary one.

The warrior, lost without his commander to serve, is comforted only by the discovery of a new allegiance with God, the ideal leader who will never fail him: *Wel bið þam þe him are seceð, / frofre to fæder on heofonum, þær us eal seo fæstnung stondeð* ("Well is him who seeks mercy [for] himself, help from the father in heavens, where all protection exists for us," Ibid ll. 114b-15). Holofernes shares formidable company when his warriors look to him as a *winedryhten*, himself unique in the *winedryhten* collection as being the only villain. His retainers' faith in his

abilities is only removed with the discovery of his death, but even then there are signs of Assyrian loyalty to him expressed through the epithets in the surrounding text (*winedryhten*, *Jud.* l. 274a, *goldgifa* l. 279a, *healdend* l. 289a).

### *Goldgifa*

Only a few lines after *winedryhten*, the poet describes Holofernes as the Assyrians' *goldgifa* (*Ibid* l. 279a). The *goldgifa*, "a giver of gold, a liberal lord or chief" (BTASD 484), is a key aspect of Anglo-Saxon lordship. Treasure-giving was a "basic tenet of lordly behaviour ... a chieftain's generosity ... [was] an integral component of his ability to rule and to instil in his followers a deep sense of loyalty and service" (Evans 114). The term *goldgifa* is less attested than *winedryhten* in the Old English poetic corpus, occurring in only two other texts besides *Judith*.

Beowulf is described as such by Wiglaf when the latter exhorts his companions to assist their lord against the dragon: *God wat on mec, / þæt me is micle leofre, þæt minne lichaman / mid minne goldgyfan gled fæðmię* ("God knows in me that it is much dearer to me, that fire embrace my body with my gold-giver," *Beo.* ll. 2650b-52). The elegy of *The Seafarer* offers a similar perspective to *The Wanderer* in discussing the despair of warriors adrift without leadership:

næron nu cyningas    ne caseras  
ne goldgiefan    swylce iu wæron,  
þonne hi mæst mid him    mærþa gefremedon  
ond on dryhtlicestum    dome lifdon. (*Sea.* ll. 82-86)

there are not now kings, nor caesars, nor gold-givers such as there once were, when they, the greatest ones, performed great [deeds] among themselves and in the most lordly glory they lived.

The poet laments the loss of the old societal laws and the loss of glory therein. The poem moves on to praise the glory of God, reassuring the reader that the momentary pleasures of the earth are nothing compared to the eternal joys of heaven (*Ibid* ll. 103-05). It is this final note on the waning tradition of the Germanic *comitatus* (Swanton, *Crisis* 12) that echoes the depiction of Holofernes in *Judith*.

To the Assyrians, Holofernes has proved a proper lord, sharing with them his wealth and wine for services rendered. It is only the poet's omniscience that imbues the traditionally positive terms of *winedryhten* and *goldgifa* with an ironic and

negative understatement. The Assyrians cannot see that Holofernes has led them to their destruction (Godfrey 17; Locherbie-Cameron 73). The warrior's reaction to the discovery of Holofernes' corpse expresses a different reception to the general's death than the analogues. In line 281a, the warrior falls to the ground, *freorig*, before tearing at his hair and clothes, *hreo on mode* ("distracted in mind," *Jud.* l. 282a). In the biblical editions, Bagao tears at his clothing, but not his hair, the bible instead favouring lamentation in the form of crying and shouting (*Idt.* 14:14). The use of *feax* by the poet, however, recalls the decapitation when Judith *genam ða þone hæðenan mannan / fæste be feaxe sinum* ("seized the heathen man firmly by his hair," *Jud.* ll. 98b-99a). The attention to the lone warrior's head emphasises the headless corpse before him while metaphorically describing the present plight of the Assyrian army. They are distracted in spirit and mind, which reveals the panic of the warriors now that they are without guidance (Astell 132).

### *Healdend*

When the warrior exits Holofernes' tent to speak with his comrades waiting outside, he does so with a newly acquired prescience. He foretells of their imminent destruction because he alone has gained *sapientia* by finding his lord dead: '*her ys geswutelod ure sylfra forwyrð / toward getacnod*' ("here is our destruction revealed, shown [to be] imminent'," *Jud.* ll. 285-86a). This lone warrior sees what Holofernes was unable to see and shares this newly gained *sapientia* with his comrades: '*her lið sweorde geheawen, / beheafdod healdend ure*' ("here lies hewn by sword, our beheaded lord'," *Ibid.* ll. 288b-89a). *Healdend* refers to "one who holds, keeps, sustains ... a guardian, keeper, ruler" (BTASD 518); the noun stems from the verb *healdan* ("to hold, retain or possess," *Ibid.* 517). Holofernes' authority exists in a form of possession, but not in a negative sense; he theoretically sustains his warriors as a typical lord of a *comitatus*, providing feasts and treasure in reward for their loyalty. The suffering of his retainers occurs upon his death, when they finally realise what the audience has known all along: Holofernes is their leader in name only and cannot provide what they require.

The lone discoverer was noted as *freorig* and *hreo on mode* amid his physical reactions; Bagao does not exhibit these manifestations of despair in the corresponding verses of the biblical text (*Idt.* 14:14-15). Upon hearing the news of Holofernes' death, the thegns cast down their weapons and flee *hreowigmode*

(“grieving at heart,” *Jud.* l. 289b) and *werigferhðe* (“weary-hearted,” *Ibid.* l. 290b). The majority of their reactions are internal, unlike those analogous lines of the biblical exemplars that describe crying and boisterous lamentation (*Idt.* 14:17-18, 15:1-2). By the casting down of their weapons, in lieu of torn clothing, the poet expresses a release of the warriors from the comitatus; they disassociate themselves from their duty by leaving their weapons behind and fleeing.

By Holofernes’ death the hierarchy within the Assyrian army is broken. The warriors, finally understanding their fate, flee. Unlike the warriors of *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer*, the Assyrians lack a replacement for their fallen commander, mortal or godly. The original story of Judith requires a routing of the enemy in order to impress upon the audience the might of an army dedicated to God. An absence of revenge in the Old English text, however, would be atypical of the Germanic tradition (Pollington, *Warrior* 38, 95), thus the rout becomes a slaughter. The impromptu battle serves as yet another fault in the Assyrians’ collective character as well as a declaration of Bethulian superiority. Leaderless throughout the story, especially with the added removal of Ozias and Joachim from the poem, the Bethulians maintain belief in a higher power that delivers them through Judith’s bravery and strength of faith. The poet continues the parallel of these two opposing issues of leadership and lack thereof after the initial Assyrian flight:

... him on laste for  
 sweet Ebrea sigore geweorðad,  
 dome gedysod. Him feng dryhten god  
 fægre on fultum, frea ælmihtig. (*Jud.* ll. 297b-300)

... behind them came the Hebrew army honoured with victory, exalted with glory. The lord God fittingly gave [them] help, the lord almighty.

These few lines recall and reinforce the themes of *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer*: the inconsolable loss of one’s home and liege, as well as the disparity between faith in a mortal lord and God almighty (Huppé 182). The Assyrians are slaughtered because they are without a leader to unify and inspire them to stand and fight, whereas Judith (with God’s assistance) rouses the formerly *gemormod* (“despondent,” *Jud.* l. 144a) Bethulians to rout the enemy.

## Conclusion

Holofernes' character in the Old English *Judith* is a combination of Germanic leadership and Christian vices. There are no surprises in his inability to triumph; God's people, when faithful to divine laws, are indefatigable (Idt. 5:17, 21, 24-25). Holofernes was originally a general and symbol of Nebuchodonosor's power before transforming into a personification of evil in patristic literature. In the poem, however, he represents a pre-Christian lord who is unable to adhere to the ideals of a *comitatus* society because he is governed by his vices; lust, gluttony and, more importantly, pride condemn him to failure. M. Griffith notes the overall irony regarding the poet's use of heroic terminology for Holofernes who is in truth "a perversion of the heroic chieftain" (65), but only because he is a heathen and lacks *sapientia dei*.

The poet stresses Holofernes' position among his men and his role as a Germanic leader with positive epithets. In a Germanic sense, he nominally represents an ideal lord, like Beowulf or Hroðgar; many of the positive epithets appear from an Assyrian perspective and reflect their opinion of their lord. The Assyrians view Holofernes as a model leader, thinking of him in terms of a typical Germanic ruler such as a *winedryhten*, *sinces brytta* or *goldwine*. His men do not worship him (Berkhout and Doubleday 633) but rather exhibit loyalty typical of a *comitatus* relationship (Underwood 109). The Assyrians, like Holofernes, are without *sapientia dei* and, without their lord to guide them like Æthelberht did the Kentings, they are left in the wilderness of heathenism. The power he holds over his warriors and the besieged Bethulians is merely superficial, for without faith Holofernes has no true authority. He is a false lord because, quite plainly, he is *not* God, the ultimate leader (*Jud.* ll. 347b-49). Obvious as this seems it is also overwhelmingly important: Holofernes had no hope of victory from the outset, long before he arrived in Bethulia or met Judith.

Holofernes represents the pre-Christian Anglo-Saxon chiefs and kings. His perversions of the lord-retainer society ought to be read as an inevitability of the non-Christian community to fail without belief in God. The Bethulians are, after all, depicted as a *comitatus* with God as their lord, Judith his mortal vessel. The Assyrians and Holofernes are representatives of the pre-Christian, Germanic world, while the Bethulians and Judith reflect the corporeal and heavenly glory of the faithful. Both people demonstrate the required amount of *fortitudo*, in that they are warriors following a designated leader into battle. The absence of *sapientia dei* in

Holofernes is his greatest failing; his ignorance of Christ, or at least Christianity as a whole, imprisons him and his followers in heathenism. As a Germanic lord he is near to an ideal, but his inability to accept, acknowledge or understand (it is not specified in the text) faith in God dooms all the Assyrians and negates his role as a Germanic leader. It is his ignorance of God and not his position as a lord of a *comitatus* that condemns him to an ignominious death, thereby vilifying the heathenism of the past rather than its traditions.

Chapter IV: *Quia timebat deum valde*<sup>64</sup>

In the original *Liber Iudith*, Bethulia is confronted by the might of Nebuchodonosor's armies and by a general whose success has subjugated countless cities to the Assyrian king's will (Idt. 2:12-18; 3). Bethulia is on the threshold of surrender as the wells run dry and the people begin to suffer (Ibid 7:11-15). Defeat is all but inevitable until a single woman steps forth as champion and liberates her people from the enemy. Judith is a remarkable figure to serve as an *exemplum admirandum*; where other biblical heroines are defined by their piety, courage or wisdom, Judith is characterised by her ambiguity. She is a mere widow, but the city elders obey her; chaste, yet employs seduction; pious, but kills willingly. In her name, however, we find an explanation for contrary actions: יהודית ('Yehudit') in Hebrew means 'Jewess', thus classifying the character of Judith as anyone and everyone. She is a "metaphor for the community of faith" (Levine 17), first Israel and later Christendom, as well as a generic model for emulation by the faithful (Day 75; Stocker 5, 8).

Despite her strengths, the ambiguity of her character resulted in theological scholars often "view[ing] Judith herself as deficient in character and immoral in her conduct" (Moore 65). The seduction, for example, is, from the offset, a morally ambiguous act by a supposedly chaste and exemplary religious figure. Her slaying of Holofernes is hardly better, calling into question the inherent violence of Judith's character, while the deceit she uses to infiltrate the camp simultaneously suggests moral turpitude (Stocker 4). Jerome's interpolation in chapter ten of his edition of the *Liber Iudith* implies that he too had difficulty with her actions: *cui etiam Dominus contulit splendorem quoniam omnis ista conpositio non ex libidine sed ex virtute pendeat et ideo Dominus hanc in illam pulchritudinem ampliavit ut incomparabili decore omnium oculis appareret* ("also the lord bestowed on her magnificence because all that arrangement depended not on lust, but from virtue and therefore the lord intensified this beauty in that one so that she appeared in the eyes of all with incomparable splendour," SV, Idt. 10:4). His need to explain her actions suggests that he had a concern for how her character would appear to others. Judith was, "ironically, the saint who murdered for her people" (Moore 65), a precursor to the *miles Christi* tradition and thus viable as an exemplar of the faith.

---

<sup>64</sup> "because she was fearing God greatly," Idt. 8:8.

There are recurring traits in the biblical Judith's character: wisdom, beauty (natural and ornamental), her role as seductress and the lust it incites, and also her celibate widowhood. In the extant *Judith*, there is no mention of her chastity or widowhood; her beauty is relegated to references of radiance, which reflect less her attractiveness and more an ethereal and spiritual quality; and the seduction in the biblical *liber* never occurs. The Old English poem focuses more generally on her *sapientia* and *anima*, and the *fortitudo* these two elements inspire, as a contrast to Holofernes whose *fortitudo* appears only in epithetic form. Judith is not, however, a ruler in the same sense as the general Holofernes or the absent king Nebuchodonsor. She is a shepherd of the community, leading her people through examples of ideal Judeo-Christian behaviour. Even the execution of Holofernes is acceptable, albeit not exemplary, as it emblemises the actions of the *miles Christi* defending against non-believers.

Judith's epithets, unlike those of Holofernes, do not depict a Christo-Germanic lord or ruler, but rather the qualities required of that leader. The remainder of this chapter seeks to study the character of the Old English Judith as the *exemplar admirandum* of Anglo-Saxon leadership and to analyse, therefore, how her character acts as an antithesis of Holofernes, who is a leader in name only. As with the previous chapter, I will focus on an epithetical study – this time of Judith herself – and examine how the elements of *fortitudo*, *sapientia* and *anima* define her as both a *miles Christi* and leader of a Christian community.

*Mirati sunt ... in sapientia eius*<sup>65</sup>

Judith's role in the introductory lines of the extant text is minimal, the focus fixed firmly on Holofernes' behaviour at the banquet. Judith only appears in a brief mention at lines 12b-14, where the narrative informs the reader that it is now the fourth day of her visit.<sup>66</sup> Kaske notes that in Old English verse the poets combine wisdom and courage to create “the essential quality of the hero,” but that when

<sup>65</sup> “they wondered at her wisdom,” *Idt.* 11:18.

<sup>66</sup> Due to the lost opening, I will refrain from labelling her a widow. There is no evidence within the extant text of *Judith* that reveals her to be a widow; that the biblical texts do emphasise her widowhood does not mean that the Anglo-Saxon poetic adaptation retained that particular detail. Nor do I concur with Spiegel in her statement that the “large number of royal epithets applied to Judith in the remaining portion suggests that the Old English poem portrayed her as a royal widow” (140-41). Judith may share epithets with royal figures in the Old English corpus, but the poem at no point suggests she herself was a royal person.

portraying a heroine the essential quality is “simply wisdom, with its complementary courage and prowess to be somehow obtained or enlisted from elsewhere” (“Judith” 15). Judith’s courage originates directly from God (Purdie 28), but her wisdom and keen mind allow her to maintain a constancy of faith, while Holofernes remains a heathen, blind to the powers of the *hehstan deman* (“highest judge,” *Jud.* l. 4a).

Five of Judith’s epithets describe her as *gleaw* (“clear-sighted, wise, skilful ... prudent,” BTASD 480): *gleaw on geðonce* (“wise in thought,” *Jud.* l. 13b), *ferhðgleaw* (“prudent, wise,” *Ibid.* l. 41a), *gleawhydig wif* (“sagacious woman,” *Ibid.* l. 148a), *gleaw* (“prudent, wise,” *Ibid.* l. 171a) and *gleaw lar* (“wise advice,” *Ibid.* l. 333b). At this point of the text, Judith has come into the Assyrian camp accompanied only by her maidservant in order to defeat the enemy of the faithful. The opening of the extant poem affirms that she has sought protection from God against the *hehstan brogan* (“highest danger,” *Ibid.* l. 4b), implying that she was aware of the dangers awaiting her. She approaches her fate with *fortitudo animae* because of her wisdom, which is first commented upon when the poet reintroduces her into the text at line 13b. The placement of the epithet *gleaw on geðonce* at this particular point relies heavily on the previous line, where Holofernes is described as a *folces ræswa* (“ruler/counsellor of the people”). The poet opposes the wisdom and its employment by the two characters with these epithets; while Holofernes proves that he is more concerned with his own desires than that of his men, Judith’s every action is for the greater good of her people.

Reference to the heroine’s wisdom in line 13b directly contrasts with that of Holofernes, the counsellor of the folk (*Ibid.* l. 12a). Before the feast begins, the protagonist and antagonist are balanced by their wisdom, the combination of Judith’s *fortitudo* and *sapientia dei* “serv[ing] mainly to emphasize her binary opposition with Holofernes, who is portrayed as a male anti-hero” (Lucas, “Woman Hero” 17). In her discussion of *Beowulf* and *Judith*, Godfrey observes that “despite a Christian flavouring (particularly apparent in *Judith*), the language of these poems draws on distinctly secular concepts about the mind and intellectual activity” (30). The pervading theme of wisdom versus ignorance throughout *Judith*, developed in Chapter Six of this thesis, establishes it as a key element behind the composition of the poem (Godfrey 12).

The intimate connection between *sapientia* and *anima* within Judith’s character reappears with the second description of the heroine as *gleaw* and further

evokes the biblical concept of *sapientia dei* (Sir. 1:1, 5; see Chapter Six, pp. 137-60). The Assyrians, who are ordered by their lord to fetch Judith, march noisily to find her in the *gystern* (“guest house/chamber,” *Jud.* l. 40a).<sup>67</sup> The poet describes her at this point as *ferhðgleaw*, “wise in mind/spirit” (BTASD 283), before she is led to Holofernes’ tent. Here too he foreshadows the demise of the general during the feast (*Jud.* ll. 16b, 19b-21a, 30b-32a), and even in the initial lines of the fragment he implies that God will intervene to prevent danger to her person (*Ibid.* ll. 1b-7a). Judith is apparently aware of what is to come, for she is again described as wise once they reach Holofernes’ tent: *Hie ða on reste gebrohton / snude ða snoteran idese* (“they then quickly put the wise woman to bed,” *Ibid.* ll. 54b-55a). She knows of Holofernes’ fate and that the feast will incapacitate him and later that her removal to his chamber would provide her with the opportunity to destroy him. Here knowledge is derived from *sapientia dei*; Judith’s awareness, understanding and cunning are all embodied in the wisdom given to her by God.

The description of Judith as *gleaw* is supplemented in line 148a with the term *gleawhydig* (“wise of thought, heedful, prudent, sagacious,” BTASD 480). The wisdom in her *hyge* (“mind, heart, soul,” *Ibid.* 579) derives from God and is mentioned as she returns victoriously to Bethulia, thus connecting the divine first with her sagacity and then the defeat of Holofernes. Her wisdom is again associated with her triumph at line 171a with the substantive *gleaw* when she displays Holofernes’ severed head to the Bethulians. The exhibition of the head celebrates Judith’s success, but also Holofernes’ weaknesses. He was not wise, but ignorant, blinded by vice until incapacitated and decapitated by God’s handmaiden. Judith succeeds because of *sapientia dei* and, ironically, cuts off Holofernes’ source of wisdom, which is empty (Astell 23). These later instances of *gleaw*-based epithets (*Jud.* ll. 148a, 171a) recall those from earlier in the poem (*Ibid.* ll. 13b, 41): all wisdom is divinely-given and reference to Judith’s *sapientia* at these particular moments of the text reaffirm God’s support in her mission.

In line 333, the poet renders the success of the Bethulians against the enemy as achieved *purh Iudithe gleawe lare* (“through the wise advice of Judith”). Her wisdom thus encompasses the faithful and guides them to victory. There is no

---

<sup>67</sup> Regarding the translation of *bearhtme* (*Jud.* l. 39b) I agree with M. Griffith that it derives from the noun *bearhtme/breahtm* meaning ‘tumult’ (115). I read the section then as the warriors bringing the din of the feast with them to Judith, who waits for them with opposing composure.

requirement that Judith appear on the battlefield; she has, after all, achieved victory in decapitating Holofernes. Judith's wisdom manifests in the *fortitudo* to decapitate him and, by witnessing the success *sapientia dei* has brought her, the faithful are able to defeat the Assyrian army. She leads by example; her battle with the general inspires the Bethulians to raise arms against the enemy. From *sapientia dei* arose her *fortitudo* and with this same combination the faithful triumphed.

Along with the epithets containing the element *gleaw*, the poet twice describes Judith as *snotor* ("prudent, wise," BTASD 892). Both instances of the epithet *snotor* occur in relation to Judith's presence in Holofernes' tent, framing the confrontation between heroine and villain: in line 55a, Judith is led to Holofernes' chambers; at line 125a, she exits the tent with the general's severed head. Holofernes committed what Godfrey terms as an "intellectual suicide" (16); he overindulges in vice thereby numbing his mind. His lack of clear thinking leaves him vulnerable to Judith's attack, but also unreceptive to *sapientia dei*, were it ever offered. This is the moment of truth for Judith's mission as she comes face to face with her enemy. The decapitation of Holofernes is the closest Judith comes to participating in battle, although she enters armed only with her wisdom and faith. The term *snotor*, however, opposes her at a critical moment to Holofernes, whom we are told guards himself with a fly-net (see Chapter Six, pp. 141-44). His counsel comes from his warriors whom he allows to approach a self-made barrier; Judith's *sapientia*, however, comes from God, an origin affirmed by the epithet in line 56b: *seo halige meowle* ("the holy woman").

The second use of *snotor* appears after the decapitation, following a detailed description of the punishment for those who do not follow her example (Ibid ll. 111b-21). Judith, the *snotor mægð* leaves the tent and delivers the severed head to her maid before returning victoriously to Bethulia (Ibid ll. 125-26). Her delivery of the head "underlines the proper association between knowledge and heroic behaviour" (Locherbie-Cameron 73), namely that the former generates the latter. This reference follows an aside by the poet wherein God's favour in Judith is once again attested: *Hæfde ða gefohten foremærne blæd / Iudith æt guðe, swa hyre god uðe, / swegles ealdor, þe hyre sigores onleah* ("Judith had won outstanding glory in battle, just as God, the lord of heaven, who gave her glory, granted her," Ibid ll. 122-24). Upon the death of Holofernes, Judith fully embodies the figure of the *miles Christi*. She fought for the faith, in the name of God and defeated the sinner who

sought to oppress her people. Her transformation into a warrior of God is supported by the epithets between lines 125 and 138a, which identify her as a heroic figure returning from battle (see Chapter Four, pp. 103-07). *Snotor*, along with her faith, was crucial in Judith's success against Holofernes; her wisdom earned her God's favour and the gift of courage required to decapitate her enemy (*Jud.* ll. 94b-98a).

There are two other epithetic references to Judith's *sapientia* within the poem. The first, *searoðoncol* (*Ibid.* l. 145a) appears as Judith reaches the walls of Bethulia where the warriors await her return. Translated as "cunning, sagacious, wise" (BTASD 853), the compound noun also gives the idea of artifice originating in the element *searu*, meaning "design, contrivance" (*Ibid.* 852), with a further negative connotation of "deceit, stratagem" (*Ibid.*).<sup>68</sup> In this single word the poet recalls Judith's infiltration of the Assyrian camp and Holofernes' decapitation. It was with *sapientia dei* and *fortitudo animae* that she accomplished her goals and thus returns victorious to Bethulia. The epithet *searoðoncol* refers to Judith's thoughts before leaving the city; she wisely ordered the guards to keep watch in her absence and now returns victorious from battle. Her *sapientia* encompasses the faithful, her exploits directly affecting their actions (Godfrey 30); without Judith supplying an *exemplum admirandum* for her people to emulate they would have succumbed to the enemy.

Judith's *sapientia* is supplemented by her courage (*ellenþrist*, *collenferhð*); she knows she will have victory because God favours her. The combination of these three elements, *sapientia*, *fortitudo* and *anima*, brings her victory over her enemy. This is confirmed with the repetition of *ides ellenrof* in the following line, connecting her Germanic *fortitudo* with her Christian *sapientia*. In her first speech to the Bethulians (*Jud.* ll. 152b-58) she specifies that their deliverance was a direct result of God's favour for them. He is *bliðe* ("happy, pleased with," *Ibid.* l. 154b) with them and has granted them victory and even glory (*tir*, *Ibid.* l. 157b) for all they have suffered (Huppé 172). The terms *searoðoncol* and *gleawhydig* recall her dangerous journey into the Assyrian camp and they emphasise the *fortitudo animae* required to breach Holofernes' defences. Strength, wisdom and faith are inseparable characteristics of the ideal leader and while Judith cannot be a Germanic lord or

---

<sup>68</sup> The adjectival form of *searoðoncol* also appears in *Christ* and *Andreas*, but both times for a generic use of unspecified persons. For instance, in *Christ* the term is used for a hypothetical 'anyone', specifically that 'no one' was able to understand God's creation of Christ (*Christ* l. 220). In *Andreas*, a group of Mermedonians are described as 'clever men' when they seek a solution to their hunger (*And.* l. 1161).

leader of a *comitatus* she still represents the antithesis of the anti-leader, here represented by Holofernes (Lucas, “Woman Hero” 22).

The final ‘wisdom’ epithet in *Judith* occurs at line 341a and once again describes the heroine’s *sapientia*. *Gearoþoncol* (“prudent, wise, ready-witted”) is a compound of *gearo*, which has a connotation of ‘preparedness’, and *þancol*, meaning, “addicted to thought, acute” (BTASD 1036). Judith’s wisdom is referred to just after the Bethulians gift her with the spoils of war, after she is described as a *beorhtan idese* (*Jud.* l. 340b). Her radiance (see Chapter Four, pp. 96-103) is intrinsically linked with her faith. The defeat of the heathen enemy was accomplished through a combination of *sapientia* and *anima*, resulting in the concept of *sapientia dei*. Lines 341b-45a confirm that because of her *fortitudo* she will achieve renown not only on earth, but also in heaven – the former satisfying the Anglo-Saxon heroic ethos and the latter appeasing Christian sensibilities. Many of the epithets referring to Judith as wise appear near those descriptions of her radiance or holiness (*ælfscinu*, *Ibid.* l. 13b; *torhtan* l. 41a; *halig* l. 55a; *beorht* l. 340b.); the other examples of *sapientia* are connected to her courage or nobility (*ellenrof*, *Ibid.* l. 148a; *æðele* l. 171a; *modig* l. 334a). In lines 340b-41a, the stress is on worldly power and wealth as it coincides with her reception of Holofernes’ former possessions; the radiance of the treasures as well as Judith herself connects worldly riches to heavenly reward (Huppé 185). This relationship is confirmed by line 343, when earthly and heavenly glory are balanced: *mærðe on moldan rice, swylce eac mede on heofonum* (“renown in the earthly kingdom, as well as reward in heaven,” *Jud.* l. 343).

*Ancilla tua Deum colit*<sup>69</sup>

The element of *anima* appears in several different epithetical forms within the poem and, as mentioned briefly above, is a key attribute that allows Judith to succeed against the enemy. She is referred to as holy and as God’s handmaiden, thus expressing her firm devotion to the faith. Judith is also described as radiant, both physically and spiritually, through the adjectives *beorht*, *torht* and the singular use of *ælfscinu*. These terms connect the physical and spiritual attributes of the heroine, supplying the poet with an exemplar for both religious and lay communities. Her

---

<sup>69</sup> “your servant/handmaid worships God,” *Idt.* 11:14.

radiance is less a description of external beauty than of the internal radiance of the pious Christian: Judith is the metaphorical light that infiltrates the darkness of the Assyrian camp.

The first and, perhaps, more interesting of Judith's 'radiant' epithets is found at line 14a: *ides ælfscinu* ("marvellously attractive woman," Ibid l. 14a). *Ælfscinu* is an ambiguous term in the Old English literary corpus as it appears in only two texts: *Judith* and *Genesis*. The second half of the compound, *-scinu*, is less confusing than that of the first. *Scyne*, *scin* and even the verb *scinan* all denote an emanation of light or an unspecified brightness; *scine* is more specifically defined as beautiful, fair or bright (BTASD 15). Both definitions (brightness, beauty) suit the character of Eve in *Genesis B*: *ides scenost, / wifa wlitegost* ("most shining woman, most beautiful woman," *Gen. B* ll. 626b-27a). In *Judgment Day II*, the splendours of heaven are described as shining: *þurh þa scenan scinendan ricu, / gebletsodost ealra, þæs breman fæder* ("through the bright shining kingdoms, most blessed of all, of the famed father," *JDay. II* ll. 296-97). In *Christ* it refers to the shining figure of Christ himself before the *goda* ("good ones," *Christ* l. 910a) on Judgement Day: *lufsum ond liþe leofum monnum / to sceawianne þone scynan wlite* ("pleasing and sweet to beloved men, to behold the shining countenance," *Christ* ll. 913-14).

The *ælf-* element, a cognate of the Old Norse *álfr* ("elf"), is more curious. Häcker argued in her 1996 article that *ælf* was related to the term *engel*, thus allowing her to describe the *ælfscinu* Judith as "beautiful and holy" (9). Hall refutes Häcker's argument by noting the insufficient evidence in Old English, for "the only angels with which *ælf*e are clearly associated are fallen ones" (90). His hypothesis instead claimed that by "the ninth century, *ælf*e were paradigms of seductive, female beauty. This evidence fits with the use of *ælf* as the basis for glossing words for nymphs which were seductive, beautiful otherworldly females" (Ibid 94).

Heather Stuart discusses the instances of *ælfscinu* in Old English literature as bearing the implication of "inspired by God" (25). Thus, Stuart says of Judith: "her inspiration is that of the wise woman as well as that of the ascetic saint, with heroic overtones" (Ibid). Through *ælfscinu*, Stuart sees a religious aspect derived over time by "disparate notions about elves, spectres, possession, saintliness and divinity" (Ibid). Hall, however, counters this hypothesis in that this "interpretation bears little resemblance either to the word's literal meaning or to its contextual usage" (89).

In *Genesis*, the examples of *ælfscinu* reflect the seductive and beautiful properties of Sarah. The first example occurs when Abraham fears the Egyptians might kill him for his wife (*Gen. A ll.* 1822-29); Pharaoh validates this fear, for he takes Sarah to sate his own lust only to be punished later by God (*Ibid ll.* 1844-72). Abimelech follows in Pharaoh's footsteps and marries Sarah, but when God reveals Abimelech's error he immediately amends the situation and frees Sarah from her obligation, referring to her as *ælfscieno* (*Ibid ll.* 2729-35). Sarah's beauty is concern enough for Abraham that he lies about their marriage, making the claim that she is his sister. On account of her *ælfscieno*-quality, men sin to be with her, albeit unintentionally.

In the case of Judith, *ælfscinu* reflects a pre-banquet perception of the heroine, an epithet made by the poet that reflects the initial reaction of the Assyrians. Her beauty, specifically her shining radiance, and her *sapientia* are traditionally the qualities that helped her gain access to the camp (*Idt.* 11:21). The fact that Judith is *ælfscinu* (apart from the element of supernatural power implied by the term) may have been enough to induce Holofernes' intention to defile her. The allusion to her wisdom and radiance in lines 13 and 14 recalls both her entrance to the Assyrian stronghold and how it is accomplished, while foreshadowing her upcoming success. "Beauty," Hall states, "rather than brightness, is unambiguously the significance of *ælfscýne* in context: Sarah is a liability because she is *pulchra* ('beautiful'); Judith is called *ælfscýne* when she steps forward to seduce Holofernes" (92). Both Sarah and Judith are beautiful but they are also both protected by God in their various travails, thereby preventing harm from befalling them. Thanks to divine favour, Judith is imbued with the strength to enter the enemy camp and accomplish her mission.

Judith is described as a *torhtan mægð* ("bright maiden," *Jud.* l. 43a) just prior to the *fleohnet* section (*Ibid ll.* 46b-54a) when the Assyrians lead her *to træfe þam hean* ("to the high tent," *Ibid l.* 43b).<sup>70</sup> Her brightness contrasts with the darkness associated with Holofernes' character. Night is mentioned three times by the poet between lines 34 and 64, each instance connected to the general or his actions within the text. Filth or stains are alluded to five times in connection with Holofernes' person, while lack of light reappears in the *helle bryne* section when he is imprisoned underground. On the other hand, once Judith returns to Bethulia, day dawns and light

<sup>70</sup> *Torht*: "... I. of the brightness of light, literal or figurative ... II. of splendid appearance, bright, beautiful ... III. splendid, glorious, noble, illustrious ..." (BTASD 1003).

imagery reappears. The city itself is shining, as are the weapons of the Bethulians; the slaughter of the mead-weary Assyrians is specifically said to occur in the morning: *morgencollan* (245b).<sup>71</sup>

The contrasting imagery of light and darkness initially suggests a religious reading, implying that Judith figuratively illuminates darkness with the light of God. The instance of *torht* at line 43a, however, appearing just before the poet describes the detail of the *fleohnet*, suggests that she is also dispelling ignorance. The canopy is an extension of Holofernes' mind, representing his character and stressing an "inner, secret sin" (Berkhout and Doubleday 631-32), specifically pride. It is symbolic of Holofernes' mind as well as his false and self-destructive trust in worldly power (Huppé 164) while also serving as a barrier between him and the acceptance of *sapientia dei*. In describing Judith as *torht*, the poet inserts light where before there was only the figurative darkness of Holofernes' thoughts. The heroine is here representative of the wisdom of God infiltrating the heathen mind of the enemy, even if only metaphorically.

The repeated contradistinction between light and dark, wise and ignorant, faithful and heathen is further supported by the three instances of *beorht* in describing Judith. In lines 58b-59a, the heroine's brightness is opposed to Holofernes' lustful intentions: *pohte ða beorhtan idese / mid widle ond mid womme besmitan* ("he intended to defile the bright woman with filth and with sin," *Jud.* ll. 58b-59a). The term *beorht* is employed here to emphasise her virtuousness and holiness in contrast with Holofernes' lecherous and sinful desire. The radiance of her person emphasises her chastity and purity like "the Virgin Mary, and the unfallen Lucifer and Eve" (Chance 41). The assurance of God's protection over Judith in lines 59b-61a supports both her role as his handmaiden and the righteousness of her actions, particularly as an *exemplum* to be emulated. Moreover, the epithet for God in line 61a, *dryhten dugeða waldend* ("lord, ruler of hosts"), establishes him as the ideal leader in opposition to Holofernes who is referred to as *deofulcunda* in the same line ("devil-kind," *Jud.* l. 61b). Judith's virtue earns her divine assistance, thereby implying to the audience that by imitating her lifestyle they too would receive God's favour.

---

<sup>71</sup> Light/dark imagery is reflected in Judith's epithets as well as in imagery throughout the poem, discussed further in Chapter Six, pp. 152-56.

The next use of *beorht* occurs in line 254 and further supports her position as a holy handmaiden, as well as a *miles Christi*. Her brightness is paired with Holofernes' epithet *beorna brego* ("chief of men/warriors," Ibid l. 254a), which parallels her radiance with the general's leadership. He is a leader of men, but Judith is God's handmaiden; she is a retainer to a divine lord and because of this is able to defeat the mortal *brego*. The epithets for Holofernes between lines 253b-61a are expressed from an Assyrian point of view and they display what Huppé reads as the fear of the thegns disturbing their lord from his pleasure (180). It is Judith, however, whom "the Assyrians should fear" (Ibid), for she is emboldened by God and becomes a divine warrior, a *metodes meowlan* ("woman of God," *Jud.* l. 261a). *Judith* is "not so much about the triumph of good over evil ... as about the value of faith in God as exemplified by Judith" (Lucas, "Woman Hero" 25). Her radiance, represented by *torht* and *beorht*, symbolises the victory of the faithful over the non-believers and of divine wisdom extinguishing mortal ignorance.

Judith's radiance is a manifestation of her physical beauty (Taylor 217), but also a figurative description of her holiness. She is described as *halig* four times within the extant poem (*Jud.* ll. 56b, 98b, 160b, 260a), but there are parallels between the uses of *halig* within the text, beyond the simple repetition of the word. The first instance at 56b sees Judith left alone in Holofernes' tent, his men rushing off to inform their lord that she is waiting. She is *halig* then, but also, as discussed above, *snotor*, while Holofernes remains a *hearra* ("lord," Ibid l. 56a) powerless to stand against her. The importance of her holiness at this particular moment, however, is found not in comparison with the figure of Holofernes, but with his *burgetelde* ("private chamber/tent," Ibid l. 57a). All other associations with Holofernes' tent or bed reflect his wickedness and general ignorance to the world around him; the tent becomes an extension of his self, representing his thoughts, intentions and vices (Huppé 164; Astell 125). By Judith entering his private space, she brings with her the holiness associated with her person (see *torht/beorht* section above).

The instances of *halig* at lines 98b and 160b support those at lines 56b and 260b. Lines 56b and 260b represent Judith bringing divine light into dark places and are supported by epithets describing Judith's radiance (Ibid ll. 58b, 254b). Line 98b in turn represents her position as *miles Christi* and occurs in the brief aside between the prayer and decapitation (Ibid ll. 94b-98a). God has heard her prayer and so *ædre mid elne onbryrde* ("quickly inspired [her] with courage," Ibid l. 95a) so that hope

*wearð hyre rume on mode / haligre hyht geniwod* (“became abundantly [renewed] in her spirit/mind, hope of the holy one renewed,” Ibid ll. 97b-98a). She is a chaste soul “battling the lechery of Olofernes ... the virtuous warrior of God or miles Dei modelled on Christ opposing the viciousness of the tyrant” (Chance 36); through her *rihte geleafan* and *ræde* (“true faith, wisdom” *Jud.* l. 97a) God imbues her with *fortitudo* to decapitate the general. Thus *sapientia dei* engenders strength and endurance in the face of danger as well as eternal salvation.

At line 160b, *seo halige* speaks to the Bethulian watchmen awaiting her arrival. Although her safe return is ultimately supported by God’s constant protection of his handmaiden, the substantive at line 160b depicts her as a holy messenger. She declares victory in her first speech between lines 152b and 158; by her holy epithet in 160b she becomes the symbol of that victory and divine favour. Once again she impresses upon the audience that her success in battle was due to her firm faith in God and his reciprocal support, much like the Germanic lord-retainer relationship (Swanton, *Crisis* 63).

Judith is last described as a *halig mægð* in line 260a, during the dramatic aside in the midst of the battle scene. Her holiness is emphasised with the additional epithet *metodes meowlan* at line 261a, in order to elevate her above Holofernes. The contrasting pairs of epithets for Holofernes and Judith between lines 253b-61a idealise the heroine’s actions within the poem while simultaneously demoting Holofernes from a lord of men to a mere *cumbolwiga* (“banner-warrior,” *Jud.* l. 259b). The poet’s use of *halig* next to *cumbolwiga* emphasises that, despite her lack of an authoritative position, through her devotion to God she is able to surpass Holofernes’ corporeal power; God is omnipotent and his handmaiden will be rewarded with eternal life in heaven. The general’s heathenism dooms him to hell where he is imprisoned (*gehæfted*, Ibid l. 116a) and devoid of any control (Huppé 168).

In piety, Judith finds strength; her radiance and holiness serve as epithetical symbols of divine favour and from God she receives *fortitudo* to kill Holofernes. God guides and protects her during her mission to save Bethulia from the enemy army. Her relationship to her lord, however, is best illuminated in lines 73b-74a: *nergendes þeowen þrymful* (“saviour’s glorious handmaiden”). *Þeowen* defines Judith as a female servant, subordinate and loyal to the will of God and thus one who “exemplifies the soldier of Christ” (Chance 40). Her role as his handmaiden is

reiterated in line 78a with the epithet the *scyppendes mægð* (“creator’s maid”); as the Assyrians serve Holofernes, so too does Judith serve God. Here she seizes a *scearpne mece* (“sharp sword,” *Jud.* l. 78b) before praying to God for *miltse* (“grace, mercy,” *Ibid.* l. 85a) and taking on the martial qualities of a *miles Christi*.

The importance of Judith’s role as a servant of God, particularly as the *nergendes þeowen*, is reinforced by the earlier epithet for Holofernes at line 45b: *nergende lað* (“hateful to the saviour”). By reusing *nergend* in both epithets the poet draws an explicit contrast between the heroine and the villain. This repetition also marks a shift in power within the text; at line 45b, Holofernes has ordered that Judith be brought to his bed and he is duly obeyed. By lines 73b-74a, however, Holofernes is unconscious and any semblance of power he might have held has transferred to Judith. Her authority stems directly from God, the *nergend ealra / woruldbuendra* (“saviour of all world-dwellers,” *Ibid.* ll. 81b-82a); the Lord’s dominion, however, is not reserved to the faithful, but to all who dwell on earth, which includes the Assyrian general. It is Judith’s dedication to the faith that instils her with *fortitudo* to decapitate Holofernes, garnered through her prayer to God in her moment of need (*Ibid.* ll. 83-94a).

In the lines between Judith’s two speeches (*Ibid.* ll. 159-75), the poet focuses on her role as a spiritual figure. In line 160b she is termed *seo halige* who has imparted the glorious news of her victory over the high walls of Bethulia. As the people throng to meet her she is referred to as the *þeodnes mægð* (“maiden of [the] prince” *Ibid.* l. 165a). The joy of the Bethulians is dependent on God, and on Judith’s own particular devotion to him, which leads her people towards victory. These lines do not, however, merely display a Christian theme. In line 159b, the Bethulians are referred to as *burhsittendas* and the city itself becomes a *medobyrig* (“mead city,” *Ibid.* l. 167a). The Germanic imagery combined with the Christian epithets coalesce the two traditions, glorifying the old customs through the new faith. Judith thus becomes an exemplar for a Christo-Germanic audience, both secular and religious, just as the early missionaries blended the old and new for conversion purposes.

There is one further epithet treating Judith’s direct relationship to God. At line 261a, in the poet’s aside during the battle sequence, she is described as *metodes meowlan* (“God’s woman/maid”). The string of epithets for Judith between lines 253b and 261a pre-empts the revelation of Holofernes’ death – the only other location in the extant poem where her epithetical association with God is attested.

The epithet, *metodes meowlan*, recalls her prayer and her request for divine aid while also reminding the audience how that assistance was employed. The aside describes the Assyrian fear of disturbing their lord who was supposedly in bed with Judith, but it emphasises that it was through God's help that she avoided the fate of a ruined woman and successfully dispatched her enemy. The strength of her *anima* allowed her to decapitate Holofernes, while the Assyrians ironically fear waking the dead. Once again, the poet affirms that Judith's faith allowed her to triumph, just as it will the Bethulians and the poem's audience if they follow her example.

*Confirma me Domine Deus Israel*<sup>72</sup>

The interpretation of Judith as *miles Christi* is not unique to modern scholars, nor to scholars of *Judith*. Her original Old Testament character was forthright in her actions, deciding to approach Holofernes alone and battling him with her physical beauty, mental agility and God-given strength (Day 86). Ælfric, in his *Letter to Sigeward*, remarks on the importance of the Judith story as an exemplar for his peers in battling the encroaching Danes (Swain 39) although the homily itself does not exhibit this emphasis on her martial prowess. The extant *Judith*, however, does supply a typically Germanic rendering of the battle between protagonists and antagonists (Hermann, "Spiritual Warfare" 2). Nearly one hundred and twenty lines are dedicated to the slaughter of the fleeing Assyrians, while the religious imagery found in the original biblical book is omitted. Although Judith does not physically lead the Hebrew army into battle, and while the decapitation of Holofernes is not the typical Anglo-Saxon representation of "ritual warfare" (Pollington, *Warrior* 42-47), her actions nevertheless lead her people to victory. This emphasis begins at the end of the beheading scene with the epithet *ides ellenrof* ("daring woman," *Jud.* 1. 109a).

The two sword strokes required to kill Holofernes, summed up in a few words in the biblical original, are given more attention within the poem in what appears to be an attempt at dramatic suspense (Ibid ll. 98b-111b). When Judith takes her second swing to Holofernes' neck, the poet refers to her as *ellenrof* ("strong, powerful, daring, brave" BTASD 247); this is the first of a series of heroic descriptors for Judith (Olsen 289). The adjective appears several times in the Old English poetic corpus, describing several heroes, including Beowulf, Waldere,

---

<sup>72</sup> "strengthen me, lord God of Israel," *Idt.* 13:7.

Abraham, Andreas, as well as other secondary characters. Most interesting of these figures, however, is the anthropomorphised panther. *The Panther* illustrates the union of saintly and secular warriors into the ultimate hero, Christ, through the term *ellenrof*: *þonne ellenrof up astondeð, / þrymme gewelgad, on þone þridan dæg, / sneome of slæpe* (“then the brave one stands up, endowed with glory, on the third day, swiftly from sleep,” *Pan.* ll. 40-42a). The description of the panther as *ellenrof* associates his character with the heroic traditions of the Anglo-Saxons and ties the secular heroic ethos, *fortitudo*, with Christian spiritual power and glory, *anima*.

The combination of physical fortitude and Christian faith creates the ideal warrior, the *miles Christi*, and exemplar of leadership. Judith in line 109 has already exhibited her unwavering faith in God and has received from him *ellen* (“courage, strength,” *Jud.* l. 95a) and renewal of spirit (*rume on mode*, *Ibid.* l. 97b) required to accomplish her objective. Judith as *ellenrof* describes not only her courage in decapitating Holofernes, but all her actions leading up to that moment. Her role as a woman of daring is juxtaposed with Holofernes’ heathenism; faith brought her courage and thereafter victory, while the general’s absence of faith brought him only ignominious death. The poet delays the moment of execution with an explicit shifting of power between the villain and heroine: the place where she was to be bedded becomes Holofernes’ tomb and the handmaiden of God steals his victory. The decapitation is the key moment at which the true leader is revealed, and in which Holofernes’ principal shortcoming is defined: he is a heathen hound (*hæðen hund*, *Ibid.* l. 110a) and it is his lack of faith that destroys him.

Judith is referred to as *ellenrof* one more time in the poem as she returns to Bethulia (*Ibid.* l. 146a). After a series of epithets shared with her maid, here *ellenrof* refers only to Judith and recalls the previous use of the epithet in line 109a, which also solely described the heroine. As with the epithet *snotor* (see Chapter Four, pp. 94-95), these uses of *ellenrof* frame a particular action by Judith in the Assyrian camp: the first occurs as she decapitates Holofernes, the second as she returns to Bethulia with his head. Upon her return to Bethulia, however, the poet reflects upon her initial departure, explaining that warriors had stood guard in her absence, *swa ðam folce ær / geomormodum Iudith bebed, / searoðoncol mægð, þa heo on sið gewat, / ides ellenrof* (“as Judith, the shrewd woman, commanded the previously despondent people, when she, a daring woman, set out on [the] journey,” *Jud.* ll. 143b-46a). Judith’s courage is here connected with her cunning, a product of

*sapientia dei*, and recalls her bravery as she left the city. Her courage or *fortitudo* during the decapitation was God-given, an answer to her constant faith (*anima*) and prayer for mercy. Lines 143b to 146a suggest that she also found courage in her *sapientia* before leaving on her divine mission. The repetition of the term *ellenrof* connects Judith's *anima* with her *sapientia* and confirms that these elements are mandatory in the acquisition of *fortitudo*, which itself derives from God. Those who seek courage or bravery are thus instructed by the poem to remain constant in their faith in God so that they too could achieve glory in battle, as did Judith.

In lines 125-32a are a series of epithets for Judith and her maid as they begin their return trip to Bethulia. Absent from the previous 125 lines in the poem, Judith's maid appears at line 127 ready to receive Holofernes' head; the only variation between the biblical analogues and the Old English poem is the poet's addition of particular shared epithets for the heroine and maid. The retention of the maid in the poem is interesting in that she appears only twice, in lines 125-41a and again in lines 171-75; the latter appearance is, however, entirely unique to *Judith*. All other instances where the maid appears in the bible are removed in the corresponding text of the poem. The maid's presence in lines 171a-73 is tied to the strong Germanic tradition behind the text, for she becomes Judith's retainer and the heroine her lord.

Judith's maid is referred to as a *foregenga* (Ibid l. 127b) an attendant or, more literally, her forerunner (BTASD 306). *Foregenga* is rare in the Old English corpus, appearing in only three other texts. In *Exodus* it refers to the vanguard of light sent by heaven to keep darkness at bay and to guide the Jews on their travels (*Exod.* l. 120). *The Phoenix* also uses the term in respect to man's forbearers, namely Adam and Eve, as they left paradise (*Phoen.* l. 437); *Guthlac*, in turn, employs the term for its saintly hero (*Guð.* l. 533). *Judith* is unique in using the word for someone serving another person: *foregenga* establishes the maid as a servant but in a Christo-Germanic tradition (Damico 185). In all other uses of the word there is a direct connection to the serving of God, but here the maid serves the handmaiden of God. The maid's position as a *foregenga* elevates Judith to a higher rank, fitting her with a retainer to accompany her in battle and loyally bear back the spoils of war. This concept can also be seen in the use of *gingre* at line 132a of *Judith*.

*Gingre*, from *geong* (M. Griffith 198), is translated as a vassal, follower and disciple, or, in this particular case, a handmaiden or female servant (BTASD 477). As the noun replaces the biblical *ancilla* ("maid servant, handmaid"), the specific

definition of a female servant is apt. However, there is no reason to think that the handmaid represents anything different from the general definition of *geong* (“follower, vassal”). The heroic imagery employed by the poet to describe Judith and her servant as they return to Bethulia suggests that the maid adopted a figurative representation of a Germanic retainer in the poem. The relationship between Judith and her maid is transformed into a lordly or high-ranking military figure returning with a faithful retainer. The heroine returns from *guð* with spoils and a trophy of war in the form of Holofernes’ head. The maid, despite shared epithets between line 132b and 141a, is not Judith’s equal. The servant becomes Judith’s vanguard, leading the way back from battle; the epithet *beahhrodene* (*Jud.* l. 138b) further intensifies this heroic imagery, as the ornamentation becomes the armour of the women who have seen combat (Damico 184; Olsen 289).

Line 129b introduces Judith and her maid as a Germanic, military unit. Between lines 132b and 141 are five collective epithets for Judith and her servant. At this point of the text, the women are leaving the camp and returning to Bethulia victorious, thus the epithets stress their daring and bravery. The first of these, *ellenbrist* (*Jud.* l. 133a) is a compound noun combining *ellen* with the adjective *briste* (“bold,” BTASD 1070). The term is entirely unique to Judith, appearing in no other text in the Old English corpus. Judith was bold in strength, even audacious (M. Griffith 194) in their goal of triumphing against the famed Assyrian general: “her deed was fearful, awesome, above and beyond the nature of her sex, indeed of humanity” (Huppé 170). Her success and prowess are shared with a loyal retainer, who loyally followed Judith into danger.

At line 134b, the duo is described as *collenferhð* (“fierce minded, bold-spirited” BTASD 165). The examples of *collenferhð* in the poetic corpus exhibit a standard use of the word to describe courageous men. It is used once for Beowulf (*Beo.* l. 1806) and thrice for the daring Andreas (*And.* ll. 349, 538, 1578). It also appears in *Elene*, *The Wanderer*, *Fate of the Apostles* and *The Whale*, all instances of which describe strength in battle, be it religious or secular. In none of these, however, is the term used to describe a woman (M. Griffith 69); in *Elene* the soldiers are described as *collenferhð* (*El.* ll. 247a, 378a, 848a), never Elene herself. The bravery of Judith and her maid transforms them into Germanic warriors defending the faith against the heathen host. The epithets employed in *Judith* as the women return to Bethulia both “masculinise and heroise Judith” (M. Griffith 69) so that they

serve as secular as well as religious exemplars, thereby addressing a broader Anglo-Saxon audience.

The passing of the severed head from Judith to her maid is also significant. Once the head enters her maid's keeping at line 130, Judith becomes a messenger, not a warrior; her fight is done, her spoils taken. There is precedence in *Beowulf* for the retainer carrying the spoils in honour of his lord. Beowulf, having defeated the dam, decapitates the corpse of Grendel (*Beo.* ll. 1584b-90). He returns to the surface with only two objects representing his victory beneath the mere: *þone hafelan and þa hilt* ("the head and the hilt," *Ibid.* l. 1614). When Beowulf returns to his men, they react much like the Bethulians welcoming Judith home:

Eodon him þa togeanes, Gode þancodon,  
 ðryðlic þegna heap, þeodnes gefegon,  
 þæs þe hi hyne gesundne geseon moston.

.....  
 Ferdon forð þonon fepelastum  
 ferþpum fægne ... (*Ibid.* ll. 1626-28, 1632-33a)

They went towards him, thanked God, mighty troop of thegns; they rejoiced of their prince that they might see him unharmed. ... They went forth from there on footpaths glad in [their] hearts.

Grendel's head is weighty enough that four warriors must carry it to Heorot (*Ibid.* ll. 1637b-39), despite the fact that Beowulf was able to hold it himself before handing it over to his retainers. It becomes a rite of honour for his loyal warriors to bear the head onward. The poet stresses that this was no easy chore, yet it was accepted proudly, with the men themselves described as *cyningbalde men* ("kingly bold men," *Ibid.* l. 1634b).

Anglo-Saxons may have read the act of Judith passing Holofernes' head to her maid, although preceded in the original biblical story, in a similar fashion as Beowulf handing over Grendel's head to his warriors. Judith transfers the trophy of her triumph so that she might travel unhindered; so too is her speech unencumbered by allowing her maid to reveal the head, the poet avoiding any breaks in her testimony to the Bethulians. Just as Beowulf's men became *cyningbald* as they bear the head to Heorot, so Judith's maid shares the description of *ellenþrist* and *collenferhð* with her mistress.

## Conclusion

Edna Purdie, in her 1927 *The Story of Judith in German and English Literature* states that the “poet’s main interest is in the figure of the heroine ... He [the poet] troubles very little about Holofernes, not at all about any minor characters” (29). Although her statement regarding the minor characters is accurate, Judith is in fact secondary to Holofernes in terms of emphasis and importance. The poet completely omits a description of the chastity that so defined her in the biblical, patristic and Anglo-Saxon tradition (Chamberlain 155). The epithets describing her holiness define her as God’s handmaiden, but not as a saint or allegory of *Ecclesia*. The poet describes her holiness as achieved through her wisdom while God paradoxically grants her wisdom because of her firm faith. These very characteristics, which bring Judith renown and glory, are the exact qualities Holofernes lacks and are thus what condemns him to *helle bryne*. The heroine is defined in opposition to the Assyrian leader. Holofernes retains the title of leader/lord, but lacks the ability to successfully command his army and dies before he can demonstrate his martial prowess on the battlefield. Judith’s positive characteristics (specifically the combination of *fortitudo*, *sapientia* and *anima*) assist in magnifying the general’s inherent faults and warn the audience against following his example.

Traditional elements of Judith’s character are omitted from the Old English poem; her virtues are simplified to a generalised holiness; her widowhood is never explicitly mentioned; and the famed beauty that seduced Holofernes is replaced with heroic valour and spiritual radiance. Her character is made ambiguous by the poet, allowing for a generalised reading of her role within the story all while emphasising the negative qualities of the general. The lack of specifics supplied by the poet regarding Judith allows her to act as an ambiguous yet positive archetype for the Anglo-Saxon community to imitate (Lucas, “Woman Hero” 22; Chamberlain 158). The few physical descriptors, along with the representation of her as a heroic figure, serve to minimise her nominal impact on the poem while conversely emphasising Holofernes as an anti-lord.

Chapter V: *Mid elne onrbyrde*<sup>73</sup>

The previous chapters have focused on the nominal distinction between Holofernes and Judith as *exempla horrenda* and *admiranda*, respectively. The remaining chapters will turn towards the actions and events of the poem that define it as a unique source for understanding key elements of Anglo-Saxon leadership, namely *fortitudo*, *sapientia* and *anima*. The poem balances the Old and New Laws of the Judeo-Christian tradition with the pagan Germanic heritage: the feast is adapted to suit Anglo-Saxon culture; the prayer is redirected to the Trinity rather than YHWH; and Judith requests martial strength alongside spiritual fortitude. It is not feasible to completely separate *fortitudo* from *sapientia* and *anima* as the three elements are deeply intertwined, not only in the depiction of leadership, but also in the text as a whole. Some slight overlap will occur, therefore, but I will maintain a clear focus through each chapter and employ the other elements as support only.

This chapter seeks to address specific examples of *fortitudo* within *Judith*. As discussed in Chapter One, Kaske defines *fortitudo* as representative of the Germanic heroic ideal, specifically a warrior who exhibits “physical might and courage” (“Beowulf” 272; see p. 2 n. 3). Discussed in this chapter are those episodes and objects that emphasise the Anglo-Saxons’ Germanic heritage and how they symbolise leadership in both protagonist and antagonist. The symbols of *fortitudo* – strength, courage and martial prowess – are found in several areas of the poem. Here I will address the concept of leadership through synecdochical and metonymical images of the Germanic hall: the sword, the head and helm, the variation of hair as further representation of the head, the battle and the spoils of war.

*Swæsende and Medoburh*

The extant *Judith*, beginning at the feast, establishes immediately the Germanic themes that will permeate the rest of the poem. The biblical feast serves as the moment of Holofernes’ seduction by Judith: he over-imbibes and becomes incapacitated, providing Judith with the opportunity to strike his head from his body. The poet adapts this scene by omitting the seduction and inserting traditional elements of a Germanic hall scene, on which Magennis remarks, “[a]part from the famous descriptions of feasts in *Beowulf* the most extensive treatment of feasting in

---

<sup>73</sup> “inspired with courage,” *Jud.* l. 95a.

Old English poetry occurs in *Judith*” (“Adaptation” 331). The poet establishes the traditional aspects of the meadhall for his Anglo-Saxon audience yet subverts expectation by creating a model of the anti-leader.<sup>74</sup>

The feasting in the poem begins in a traditional fashion: Holofernes issues invitations to his *yldestan ðegnas* (“most senior thegns,” *Jud.* l. 10a) and they drink with him into the night. We cannot be certain as to whether or not the poet retained the original purpose behind the feast (namely Judith’s promise to deliver Bethulia into Holofernes’ hands, and the Assyrians’ celebration of an impending victory). The initial lines of the feast (*Ibid.* ll. 7a-14) do reflect, however, a neutral atmosphere within the Assyrian camp; the vocabulary describes a stereotypical *symbol* (“feast, banquet”) like any that appear in *Beowulf*. As discussed in Chapter Three, Holofernes is initially described as a typical lord of a *comitatus*, his epithets and those of the thegns illustrate a relationship similar to that of Hroðgar and his warriors in *Beowulf* (ll. 64-67a). These lines are, according to M. Griffith, intended to be read ironically as they give way to over-indulgence and hedonism (65); the perversion of the Germanic tradition allows wildness to infiltrate the ‘hall’ and ends with a dead lord.

Holofernes demonstrates the *fortitudo* of a Germanic lord, holding a feast in what we expect to be a tribute to his men’s valour and courage. Theoretically, Holofernes follows the protocol of a Germanic leader by providing his men with a feast and drinks; the perversity of the scene develops from excess and a subsequent lack of etiquette (Magennis, “Adaptation” 332). There are no rituals during the feast, no swearing of oaths or giving of gifts; the symbolic ‘cup’ that often represents the “joys of the hall” (Magennis, “Cup as Symbol” 518) is replaced by *bollan steape* (“deep bowls,” *Jud.* l. 17b), which M. Griffith equates to the symbolic  *poculum*

---

<sup>74</sup> Discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the Germanic feast represented the reciprocal relationship between lord and retainer; it was symbolic of the community and civilised life (Sundqvist, *Freyr’s Offspring* 213), while life outside the hall is equated with a wilderness of violence and danger (Pollington, *Mead Hall* 32). Thus the warrior in *The Wanderer*, bereft of lord, seeks a new community to call home: *sipþan geara iu goldwine minne / hrusan heolstre biwrah, ond ic hean þonan / wod wintercearig ofer wapema gebind, / sohte sele dreorig sinces bryttan* (“since formerly I covered my lord with dark earth, and I, wretched, travelled thence sorrowful as winter over freezing waves, hall-sorrowful (i.e. sorrowful at separation from hall) sought a giver of treasure,” *Wan.* ll. 22-25). The leaderless warrior wakes from dreams of his old life to find himself surrounded by a desolate wasteland of water, snow and ice (*Ibid.* ll. 25a, 45-48). Similarly in *Beowulf*, Grendel represents “alienation, isolation [and] exclusion” (Pollington, *Mead Hall* 22) from the civilised Germanic society represented by Heorot; the poet’s reference to Cain further ostracises Grendel from the community for God expelled (*forwrecan*, *Beo.* l. 109b) Cain and all his descendents from *mancynne* (“mankind,” *Ibid.* l. 110b).

*mortis* (“cup of death,” M. Griffith 111; see also C. Brown 395). The *swæsende* becomes little more than a skeletal representation of the Germanic feast and a moralistic lesson against the dangers of inebriation (Magennis, “Adaptation” 332; *Appetites* 93-108; Evans 109).

A vital alteration to *Judith*’s depiction of the feast scene is the absence of the heroine from the festivities. As mentioned above, the biblical original depicted Judith plying Holofernes with drink in a ruse of seduction so that he would be unable to defend himself once they were left alone. The poem, however, separates the heroine from the drunken debauchery and brings her to a separate location to await Holofernes (*Jud.* ll. 37b-46a). Judith’s absence allows for the removal of the seduction detailed in the biblical story and thus maintains the heroine’s heightened level of radiant holiness as established by her epithets. Furthermore, her delayed entry focuses the text on Holofernes and those vices that develop during the night of debauched drinking. He is *modig ond medugal* (“proud and drunk with mead,” *Ibid.* l. 26a), the former the direct cause of the latter, while both elements lead to his downfall. The poem *Vainglory* cautions against such vices, warning against men who are *symbelwlonc* (“feast-proud,” *Vain.* l. 40a) or *oferhygda ful* (“full of pride,” *Ibid.* l. 43a), for he *bip feondes bearn / flæsce bifongen, hafað fræte lif, / grundfusne gæst gode orfeormne, / wuldorcyninge* (“is a child of the devil surrounded by flesh, he has a shameful life, a spirit hastening to the abyss worthless to God, king of glory,” *Vain.* ll. 47b-50a).

Reminders of the disastrous feast reappear throughout the poem. Holofernes’ drunkenness leaves him at Judith’s mercy, for he is unable to defend himself against her plans (*Jud.* ll. 67b-69a). The Assyrians are doomed men because of their intemperance (*Ibid.* ll. 30b-32a) and wake, *medowerig* (“mead-weary,” *Ibid.* l. 245a), to find themselves under attack. After Judith’s return to Bethulia the poet refers to the holy city as a *medobyrig* (“mead-city,” *Ibid.* l. 167a), a term noticeably lacking from any description of the Assyrian camp. Despite the *swæsende* associating the Assyrians with a Germanic hall and Holofernes with a traditional lord of a *comitatus*, the camp never achieves the same status as Bethulia because they lack faith in God and therefore the *fortitudo* he grants Judith and her people.

There is one other example of a *meduburh* in the Old English poetic corpus, appearing in *The Husband’s Message*. It refers to the hall where the now-parted lovers were once happy when together at home, *on meoduburgum* (“in mead-cities,”

*Husb.* l. 17a). The exile views the *meduburh* as a representation of the ideal home, where there is order and a code of honour (Pollington, *Mead Hall* 116). The term *winburh* (“town where wine is drunk, where there is feasting, where a prince feasts his followers, a chief town,” BTASD 1231) is more common in Old English literature, but retains the same significance as the *meduburh*.<sup>75</sup> In *Andreas*, for instance, the city of the cannibalistic Mermedonians becomes a *winburg* after they accept the Christian faith. The *Andreas* poet combines Christian faith with Germanic custom, creating an inseparable link between them: the heathen Mermedonians can only achieve redemption in the mind of Anglo-Saxon society through the acceptance of Christ. Where once the mead-city represented the pagan Germanic past, the conversion transformed the pagan symbol of community into a Christian ideal, namely a mortal city of God.

The descriptions of Bethulia within *Judith* reiterate its radiant and holy qualities through the terms *wlitig byrig* (“beautiful city,” *Jud.* l. 137a), *beorht byrig* (“bright city,” *Ibid.* l. 327a) and *halig byrig* (“holy city,” *Ibid.* l. 203b). The terms *meduburh* and *haligan byrig* further suggest a correlation between the heroine’s home and “[h]eaven as a city reflecting [the] splendour and community under God” (Pollington, *Mead Hall* 114). It is the absence of holiness in the Assyrian camp that differentiates it from Bethulia; Holofernes’ attribute of *fortitudo* is weak without the support of faith. Christian symbolism is omitted from the description of the feast to express a world-focused existence among the Assyrians and an inability to combine the two traditions. Bethulia becomes a shining beacon besieged by a heathen enemy, whose faith will ultimately lead it to victory.

### *Mece*

The adaptation of the feast scene so that it resembled a traditional, albeit ironic, Germanic banquet is unique to *Judith* as is the battle later in the poem. There are elements within the original biblical story, however, that required little or no alteration to suit an Anglo-Saxon audience. For example, the *mece* (“sword”), first mentioned in line 77b, is an interesting narrative tool that represents Holofernes as a warrior and as the leader of the Assyrian army; it signifies his *fortitudo* and status as head of the Assyrians. The *mece*, however, also transforms Judith into the image of a

---

<sup>75</sup> For examples of *winburh*, see: *And.* ll. 1637a, 1672a; *Dan.* ll. 58a, 621b; *Jul.* l. 83a; *Wid.* l. 77a.

*miles Christi*, who wields the sword against the general in the name of God. She embodies, not just the *fortitudo* of a warrior, but also the *anima* of a Christian exemplar.

In the biblical texts, the sword is introduced during the decapitation when Judith retrieves Holofernes' own weapon from where it hangs above his bed (Idt. 13:8). The use of the sword against its master is a mockery of his death as Judith is a woman and not a warrior. Among the Anglo-Saxons, the "sword was the most symbolically important weapon ... Though the spear was more popular and so more numerous, the sword held a glamour greater than that of any other piece of offensive equipment" (Pollington, *Warrior* 110). *Judith* does not specify ownership of the *mece*. It appears as mysteriously as the *fleohnet* vanishes after line 54a, which according to Mullally is "not uncommon" (270), citing as precedence the sudden appearance of the giant's sword in *Beowulf*. The poem describes Judith seizing a *scearpne mece* ("sharp sword," *Jud.* l. 78b) implying that it is already present in the tent as it was in the biblical story. Since it is Holofernes' tent it can be supposed that it was indeed his sword, and the Old English text therefore repeats the mockery of his role as a leader. The sword, if we read it as Holofernes' own, represents his role as a military man, although it is not until later in the poem that he receives warrior-epithets (Ibid ll. 126a, 173a, 179a). The loss of the sword to Judith is, therefore, metonymy for the deprivation of Holofernes' authority within the text.

There is a double meaning inherent in the *mece*. The first is that of Holofernes' loss of power. The second reading stems from the Christian elements within the poem that also help to develop Judith into a warrior of Christ. The sword is transformed in Judith's hand into a Christian weapon, symbolising the triumph of good over evil. Cherniss suggests that "[i]n function, as well as appearance, swords and crosses might well seem to an Anglo-Saxon to be related. Just as the cross is the symbol of the kingly power of Christ ... so the hilt of the temporal ruler's sword appears to have been the symbol of his kingly power" (250). After her prayer, the heroine is blessed with *miltse* and empowered to continue in her 'battle' against the general (J. Hill, "Soldier of Christ" 68). Through its association with her person, the sword is also blessed so that it becomes a holy weapon symbolic of the fight against heathenism (Astell 30). The figurative relationship between the sword and the cross is not a creation of the poet, but a continuation of Christian imagery begun as early as the reign of Constantine. The emperor, having had a vision of a cross of light

bearing the inscription τούτῳ νίκα (“conquer by this,” Eusebius PG 20.939), created a standard with this image to lead his armies into battle (Ibid 1.29). While not a physical weapon employed in battle, the cross was associated with spiritual victory and martial glory.

A pattern similar to that in *Judith* is found in *Beowulf*, during the eponymous hero’s battle with Grendel’s mother (*Beo.* ll. 1557-69). Beowulf’s own sword has failed him, *se beadoleoma bitan nolde* (“the flashing sword would not bite,” Ibid l. 1523) and we are further assured that *ða wæs forma sið / deorum madme, þæt his dom alæg* (“this was the first time for the precious treasure that its glory failed,” Ibid l. 1527b-28). The hero is not outdone, however, because God favours him against the *mere-wif* (Ibid ll. 1553b-56). Beowulf sees a *sigeeadig bil* (“victory-blessed sword,” Ibid l. 1557b), an *ealdsweord* (“ancient sword,” Ibid l. 1558a) and with this weapon he defeats the *mere-wif* and then decapitates the already dead Grendel (Ibid ll. 1564b-90; see also Godfrey 3). Although the poet is not explicit on the provenance of the giant’s sword, it can be assumed that it is a part of the monster’s hoard, an object of her possession with which Beowulf kills her. It is not the mystery of the sword on which the *Beowulf* poet focuses, but rather on divine intervention in the battle itself (Ibid ll. 1550-56; Swanton, *Crisis* 122); God is Beowulf’s “ultimate source of ... victory” (Swanton, *Crisis* 125).

Judith’s triumph over Holofernes can similarly be attributed to the divine. The strength required to defeat the Assyrian general, itself uncharacteristic of a typical *miles Christi* (J. Hill, “Soldier of Christ” 63), is overseen and forgiven by God (*Jud.* ll. 94b-98a). In interpreting Andreas as a soldier of Christ, J. Hill says, “spiritual warfare is one of obedience to God” (72) and Judith proves this with her *ræde ond mid rihte geleafan* (“wisdom and true faith,” *Jud.* l. 97a). As God’s handmaiden, Judith serves him as a Germanic warrior would his lord; her prayer and God’s response to it assures the audience that while she is not passive in her actions she still fights for the faith against the heathens. By removing ownership of the *mece* the poet creates a neutral object converted to a symbol of the faith once Judith is renewed in spirit (Ibid ll. 97b-98a). She is transformed into a warrior for her people and the divine. The sword is her literal and figurative weapon against the general and his heathenism while she represents the corporeal hand of God, fulfilling his will on earth (Otzen 103).

*Heafod and Helm*

The decapitation of Holofernes is the central event of the *Liber Iudith*. It is the climactic moment when Judith conquers the leader of the enemy army and is thereafter able to lead her people to victory. The Old English poet does not alter this section as he does other episodes of the story, but adds dramatic details, such as Judith's manipulation of her victim's body and the additional descriptions of the second blow to Holofernes' neck (*Jud.* ll. 99b-110a). The 'duel' between Judith and Holofernes presages the battle between the Bethulians and Assyrians. More importantly, the heroine's victory prepares her as a leader for the Hebrews while the fallen Holofernes epitomises an archetype of a false lord. He is proven to be a "parody of the masculine ideals of governance, loyalty, fealty, and power" (Lochrie 6), while Judith exemplifies the qualities crucial to successful leadership.

Perhaps most symbolic of Holofernes' role as a leader is the *heafod* imagery the poet develops around the decapitation. The severed head serves as a literal and figurative representation of the fall of the Assyrians and triumphal rise of the Bethulians. In the biblical texts, Judith strikes twice against Holofernes' neck, removes the head and tumbles his body from the bed (Idt. 13:10-11). The head is then carried out to her maid and put in the *pera* ("bag, wallet") before the women return to Bethulia (Idt. 13:10-12). *Judith* imitates all of this except for the pushing of the body from the bed; instead it is the head that *wand / forð on ða flore* ("rolled forth on the floor," *Jud.* ll. 110b-11a). Huppé notes that after his decapitation, Holofernes becomes an object, "his head rolling on the ground and his soul descending into hell" (167); Judith manipulates his unconscious body, dominating him until she is able to remove his authority with the sword.

The objectification of Holofernes continues in the lines immediately following the section detailing his imprisonment in hellfire. In lines 125-27, the poet states that Judith hands the severed head over to her servant's keeping before they return to Bethulia. The biblical analogues describe Judith as putting the head into a *πήρα* or *pera*.<sup>76</sup> The *Septuagint* contains an interesting detail in the description of the *πήρα*, stating that it was a pouch *τῶν βρωμάτων* ("of foods, meats"). Alone, *πήρα* is defined as a 'leather pouch' or 'wallet' with the particular use of carrying food. The

<sup>76</sup> The bag of food recalls Judith's preparation before leaving Bethulia; her maid packs them a kosher meal so that they do not need to eat food prepared in the Assyrian camp. The meal itself is a representation of Judith's piety (Otzen 105). For more examples of the bag in use, see Idt. 10:5; 12:19.

*Vetus Latina* imitates this detail: *et misit illud in peram escarum suarum* (“and she put it in her pouch of foods,” *Idt.* 13:11.). *Esca*, meaning “food”, creates a word-for-word translation of the Greek description of the βρώμα. This additional detail infuses the situation with a cruel irony: the πήρα is originally intended for βρώμα, brought by the maid as a replacement for the non-kosher Assyrian food, but carries back to Bethulia Holofernes’ severed head. In *Judith*, the poet imitates the Greek and Old Latin tradition by also mentioning the original purpose of the bag. The *fætel*s (“pouch, bag,” BTASD 268), which now carries the *blodig* head, was once employed for carrying *hyra ... nest* (“their food,” *Jud.* l. 128b). The retention of this detail associates the general with the provisions that were carried into the encampment four days prior; the connection strips away his humanity entirely until he is nothing more than lifeless meat. The prayer, decapitation and constancy of God’s will throughout create a ceremony of purification, completed when Judith eliminates the enemy of her people. The severed head, now empty of its foul *gæst*, is figuratively purified through its association with Judith and her constant faith.

The *heafod* reappears again in line 179 during Judith’s speech to the Bethulians. During her explanation of Holofernes’ death, his “head serves as both a gift to the Bethulians and as a sign of a larger gift, victory in battle” (Mullally 273). Judith verbally strips Holofernes of his former role as leader, labelling him as the most loathsome one (*laðost*, *Jud.* l. 178b) and a heathen warrior (*hæðen heaðorinc*, *Ibid.* l. 179a). Judith is in effect attributing his fall to a lack of faith or *anima*, which was vital to her success. Furthermore, she declares to her people that they might openly *heafod starian*, / *Holofernus unlyfigendes* (“look upon the head, of the lifeless Holofernes,” *Ibid.* 177a-80). The offer to look openly upon the head recalls the *fleohnet* of lines 46b-54a, where no one was able to see him unless summoned closer. If the fly-net “signifie[d] both a lack of trust and an abuse of power” (Locherbie-Cameron 73) on the part of Holofernes, then Judith’s public display of the head represents his new impotent state.

Holofernes’ death betokens the end of Assyrian *fortitudo*, and after the decapitation the poet focuses attention on the Assyrians as leaderless or headless. Twice after Judith displays the head, the poet openly mocks the lordless Assyrians. The battle sequence is broken into three parts (*Jud.* ll. 199-241a, 261b-67a and 289b-311a, respectively), the divisions made by the poet alternating between Bethulian and Assyrian reactions to the attack. The first pause of action details the Assyrians

perceiving the danger and then alerting the *heafodweardas* (“chief guards,” Ibid l. 239) to the seriousness of the situation before warning the *yldestan ealdorþegnum* (“the highest chief thegns,” Ibid l. 242). It is the use of the term *heafodweard* that commands attention here. *Weard*, meaning “a guard, warder, watchman ... protector, lord” (BTASD 1176), is compounded with the noun *heafod* to imply that these were not ordinary guards but protectors of their chief and leader, Holofernes. More literally, they were guardians of his *heafod*. It is a “grim play on words which suggests that these head guardians have not been able to guard the head of Holofernes, so that they have become headless head guardians” (Huppé 179). Their position is rendered superfluous with Holofernes’ death and thus condemns them to the wilds outside the *comitatus*.

The other example of the poet’s cunning use of *heafod* imagery occurs during the last lines of the battle sequence. The Assyrians have been annihilated, converted into *wælsce* (“heaps of slain,” *Jud.* l. 312b) and *reocende hræw* (“reeking corpses,” Ibid l. 313b). The poet details the number of dead with his second and final pun, mocking the sudden absence of *fortitudo* as the Assyrians flee: *Ðær on greot gefeoll / se hysta dæl heafodgerimes / Assiria ealdorduguðe, / laðan cynnes* (“there fell on the ground the greatest part of the head-count of chief leaders of the Assyrians, of the hateful people,” Ibid ll. 307b-10a). Literally, *heafodgerim* means head-count or “number of heads” (BTASD 514), the calculation of dead Assyrians totalled by the heads littering the battlefield. Again the poet recalls his audience to Holofernes’ tent and the moment of his own decapitation; the Assyrians fail because they were headless, leaderless, a further ironic ploy regarding the cause of their destruction. The poet refuses to allow the audience to forget just how the Bethulians came to triumph, as well as the powerful importance of Holofernes’ decapitation to their ultimate salvation.

References to helms supplement the *heafod* imagery as metaphors for leadership. The head becomes a synecdoche of the leaderless warriors, while the imagery surrounding the *helmas* denotes a figurative loss of protection. The helmet was a practical piece of armour standard to the Anglo-Saxon warrior (Pollington, *Warrior* 155-64); its manifestation in the poem, however, represents the failed defence of Holofernes and his army. The first example appears in Judith’s pre-battle speech: she bids the Bethulians begin their preparation for an assault on the Assyrian camp; the list of armour and weaponry they will don is traditional of Anglo-Saxon

warriors (*Jud.* ll. 191b-94). Judith has taken on the role of leader, rousing her people to battle while displaying the *blodig* (*Ibid.* l. 174b) head of her enemy. The Bethulian helmets are described as *scir* (“clear, bright,” BTASD 836) and are the only defensive objects to receive an adjective among the list in lines 191b-94. This is a positive portrayal of the heroic Bethulians who are favoured by God to triumph over their heathen counterparts. The shining quality of the helm is reflective of Hebrew *fortitudo* and *anima*; God has helped defeat Holofernes through Judith, bestowing on the faithful the same holy luminescence Judith exhibits in her epithets (see Chapter Four, pp. 96-101).

The other examples of helmets within the poem belong to the Assyrians. All three references occur during the spoils sequence, the first at line 317b when the Bethulians are gathering up the booty from the battlefield. They collect *heolfrig herereaf, hyrsta scyne, / bord ond brad swyrd, brune helmas, / dyre madmas* (“bloody booty, bright trappings, shield and broad sword, burnished/dark-coloured helmets, precious treasures,” *Jud.* ll. 316-18a). In this seemingly conflicted description of the spoils, the poet creates a balance between the Assyrians and Bethulians. The first description of the treasures, *heolfrig herereaf*, reflects the bloodiness of the battlefield and the corpses therein; thus, the bloody spoils become metonyms for the corpses of the enemy, which are themselves symbolic of Assyrian failure. The subsequent description of the *hyrsta scyne* in turn represents Bethulian victory and their newly acquired wealth. The poet opposes Assyrian failure with the triumph of God’s people through the metonymic use of the spoils (Huppé 185).

The description of *brun* helmets, however, is less clear. The *Dictionary of Old English* translates *brun* as “gleaming” or “burnished”, as does Klaeber’s edition of *Beowulf* in his discussion of the hero’s sword as it drives into the dragon’s bone (*Beo.* ll. 2575b-80a). Another definition for *brun*, however, is “brown, dark, dusky” (BTASD 128). The lines preceding *brun* in *Judith* offer little by means of clarification: the war-booty is said to be *heolfrig* while the treasure is described as *scyne*, both appearing one after the other in line 316. Tremaine does not agree that the Old English *brun* ever meant shining or gleaming and argues that it refers to the “technique of ‘browning’, an artificial way to retard rust, which resulted in a brown and shiny appearance” (qtd. in Matschi 118). Matschi partially supports this theory through an onomasiological study of the term *brun* that suggests a translation of a dark red shade or russet, particularly when describing metal (Matschi 62).

It is possible that the adjective *brun* presents a paronomastic reading that reflects the descriptions of bloody treasures and shining trappings. *Brun* implies that the helms are burnished but also a dark red; they were acquired in a glorious battle against the enemies of God, but were taken from the dead. The description of the recovered helms as *russet* is made more interesting when compared to the Bethulians' *scire helmas* of line 193a. Judith describes the helms of the Hebrews as shining and bright, reflecting the holiness of their purpose in battling a heathen enemy. Furthermore, the term recalls the epithets describing Judith's radiance and holiness; the shining quality is reflective of God's favour and the victory he provides those loyal to him. The ambiguous meaning of *brun*, therefore, provides further opposition between the heathens and the faithful, the victors and the fallen. Its connection with the helm, and thus the head, also absorbs into the comparison the opposition of Holofernes' and Judith's roles as leaders of their respective people and the disparate fates awaiting their armies.

The next appearance of *helm* occurs in line 327a as a portion of the accumulated spoils gathered from the battlefield. Along with the *hupseax* ("hip dagger," Ibid l. 327a), *hare byrnan* ("grey corselets," Ibid l. 327b) and *guðsceorp* ("armour," Ibid l. 328a), the *helmas* represent the failed protection of the Assyrian armour. The large number of dead, which is referenced more than once by the poet, is supported by the weakness and failure of their protection (see *Jud.* ll. 307b-19, 310b-11a, 312b-13a, 321b-23a.). Just as Holofernes believed in the false protection of the *fleohnet*, so too were his men guilty of misdirected faith. By specifying *helmas*, *hupseax* and *byrnan* as treasures collected, the poet draws attention to the uselessness of these objects against the Bethulian force, the former offensive glory of the Assyrians overshadowed by their ultimate failure in defending themselves.

The final instance of *helm* as armour appears in line 337a and concerns the helmet of the late Assyrian lord himself. In honour of Judith's advice and courage in leading her people to victory they give to her his *swatig helm* ("bloody helm," Ibid l. 337a). Each of Holofernes' former possessions represents something specific to the late general as well as to Judith. The helm in particular adopts the role of protection, as in line 193a, but also of false defence as in lines 317b and 327a. A metonymy of Holofernes himself, his *helm* was not retrieved from the field of battle like the *brune helmas*, but from his tent. The cruel irony of the helmet as *swatig* is that Holofernes never wore his helmet into battle, his head having been removed while he lay abed

behind the false protection of his *fleohnet*. His *helm* never had the opportunity to guard him against the *fag mece* (“stained/ornamented sword,” Ibid l. 104b), which leads Huppé to rightly suggest that the “helmet cannot in fact be stained with blood – it is rather the bloody head which is suggested by metonymy” (185). Among the possessions listed, the *helm* alone is given an adjective denoting violence; not even the *sweord*, which was presumably the weapon with which Judith decapitated Holofernes, is described with an adjective (*Jud.* l. 337a). By emphasising the helmet, the poet recalls the decapitation scene and the loss of Assyrian power with the death of their leader. It is an object of defence that failed to defend, just as Holofernes failed to defend his warriors.

#### *Wundenlocc and Feax*

The connection made between an Anglo-Saxon secular audience and Holofernes is through images of his head, both attached and severed. All references to head, helm and hair recall the decapitation and, therefore, the success of the Bethulians and failure of the Assyrians. Judith’s epithets focus on her *anima* and *sapientia*, along with the resulting *fortitudo*, all of which emphasise her character as *exemplum admirandum*. Absent from the poem, but not the original *liber*, however, are descriptions of her beauty. *Ælfscinu* is perhaps the closest the poem comes to matching the biblical *pulchra*, but the poet adopts a different manner of describing his heroine by emphasising her physical appearance with the word *wundenlocc*. By focusing on Judith’s hair, the poet creates a parallel between her head and that of Holofernes, whose hair is referred to solely as *feax*, and their respective roles as heads of their people.

*Wundenlocc* is defined as “with braided locks” (BTASD 1281); the first element of the compound derived from the verb *windan* (“to twist, roll,” BTASD 1232). The compound appears twice as a description for Judith. The first example occurs in line 77b as Judith takes up the *mece*: *Genam ða wundenlocc / scyppendes mægð scearpne mece* (“the braided-haired woman of God seized a sharp sword,” Ibid ll. 77b-78). The use of *niman* in line 77b, however, is echoed in line 98b when Judith *genam ða þone hæðenan mannan / fæste be feaxe sinum* (“seized the heathen man firmly by his hair,” Ibid ll. 98b-99a). Both instances involve Judith seizing objects directly associated with the upcoming decapitation of the Assyrian leader: the sword that will kill him and the hair of his soon-to-be severed head. The verb

*niman* links the two lines together, paralleling the *scearpne mece* of 78b with the *feaxe* of line 99a. Moreover it draws attention to the hair and therefore the respective heads of the heroine and villain. The description of Judith as *wundenlocc* in line 77b foreshadows the seizure of Holofernes' *feax*, but it also creates an image of physical opposition between God's handmaiden and the heathen general. Any intimacy suggested by Judith gripping his hair is removed by the repetition of *niman*, as it clearly echoes the seizure of the sword and links the two as little more than tools for Judith's successful mission (Huppé 166). In both sections the poet focuses on her plaited locks, connecting them to the image of her holding first the sword and then the incapacitated leader's hair (*Jud.* l. 99a).

In order to oppose the characters, the poet balances Holofernes' *feax* with Judith's *wundenlocc*. The repetition of *wundenlocc* at line 103b recalls the initial seizure of the sword and Holofernes' hair. She, *wundenlocc*, strikes at the general, her *feondsceaða* ("bitter foe," *Ibid.* l. 104a), with the *fagum mece* (*Ibid.* l. 104b). This juxtaposition of her physical descriptor with that of Holofernes' role as a dire enemy establishes Judith as the hero, her hair a synecdoche of her person and all she represents.

*Feax* appears once more in the text at line 281b. When Holofernes' corpse is discovered by one of his more daring warriors, the man's intense reaction results in the tearing out of his own hair: *He þa lungre gefeoll / freorig to foldan, ongan his feax teran* ("he then quickly fell cold to the ground, [and] began to tear his hair," *Ibid.* ll. 280b-81). Again our attention is drawn to the hair of the warrior and thus the head, which Holofernes lost, literally, and his warriors metaphorically. The emotional response of the unfortunate warrior echoes the decapitation nearly one hundred and eighty lines earlier. This emphasis on the head is further heightened when the biblical exemplars are taken into account. When Bagao discovers Holofernes' mutilated corpse he shouts and cries and tears at his clothing (*Idt.* 14:14). Nowhere does it describe him tearing his hair. It is therefore likely that line 281b was a deliberate and considered poetic alteration, possibly as an attempt to return focus to the symbolic importance of the head and hair as metaphors of leadership. The warrior's actions recall the decapitation and loss of his *goldgifan* ("gold-giver/lord," *Jud.* l. 279a).

In the greater Old English poetic corpus, *wundenlocc* appears in only one other text, thus leaving the significance of the term in *Judith* difficult to interpret. In

*Riddle 25*, the modern-designated ‘Onion’ riddle, the term *wundenlocc* describes a woman who is pulling up an onion: *Felep sona / mines gemotes, seo þe mec nearwað, / wif wundenlocc* (“soon she feels my meeting, she who confines me, the braided-haired woman,” *Rid.* 25 ll. 9b-11a). The double-entendre within the riddle suggests sexual intimacy between the *wif* and the answer to the puzzle. Lucas suggests that the description of Judith’s hair as *wundenlocc* implies that it was partially or fully uncovered, which is curious, as “it was customary in Anglo-Saxon England for women to cover their hair” (“Woman Hero” 20). He cites C.W. and P. Cunningham in describing the “veil or head-rail ... [as] indispensable; worn by all classes, even in bed, though sometimes discarded in intimate domestic life” (qtd. in Lucas 20). This leads Lucas to suggest that as *wundenlocc* appears while Judith is alone in Holofernes’ tent it intends to represent the intimacy of the scene (“Woman Hero” 20). The example of *wundenlocc* in *Riddle 25*, therefore, supports the theory of an intimate setting of “a pagan man ... intend[ing] to rape a sexually-desirable woman” (Olsen 291).

The sexually charged implication suggested by the likes of Lochrie (11), Hermann (*Allegories* 190-92) and, to a point, Lucas, becomes less viable when the final example of *wundenlocc* in *Judith* is presented. When the Bethulian warriors, who have pillaged the battlefield, return to Bethulia with their spoils, they are described as *wlanc, wundenlocc* (“proud, plaited-locked,” *Ibid.* l. 325a) as if their “Stolz ... in ihrem Haar lag” (“pride was in their hair,” Swanton, “Altenglische” 301). The repetition of *wundenlocc* recalls the personal victory of Judith when she strikes off Holofernes’ head; she shares this distinct characteristic with her fellow Bethulians, leading Heather Stuart to presume it was an ethnic identifier (“OE \*ælfsciene” 23), while Huppé reads it as “a comment on victory” (168). It is possible that both of these interpretations are accurate. The adjective associates the warriors directly with their leader, while the addition of *wlanc* in line 325a recalls the pride of the Assyrians as they go to the feast (*wlance to winegedrince*, “proud to wine-drinking,” *Jud.* l. 16a) and opposes them to the sober Bethulians. The two armies exhibit pride, but only one achieves victory under the guidance of a true leader. Reference to the hair differentiates the two people and their respective leaders: the one victorious and the other doomed to failure.

The poet’s emphasis on head, helm and hair imagery, might suggest an established tradition of such symbolism in Anglo-Saxon England. The hair-epithets

in *Judith*, particularly those employed for Holofernes, take on a new significance when seen against the tradition of the *reges criniti* (“long-haired kings”) first termed by Gregory of Tours in his *Gesta Francorum* (2.9). The image of the ‘long-haired’ kings has come to define medieval Frankish royalty, most notably discussed in J.M. Wallace-Hadrill’s *The Long-Haired Kings*. Wallace-Hadrill suggests that the origin of this notable hairstyle might have been little “more than a sign that an oath had been taken, to lead a war-band in a particular engagement and this degenerated, later, into an old-fashioned hair-style denoting rank” (17). Whatever the beginnings, the length of a man’s hair in the early Frankish kingdom was a clear indication of rank: long hair referred to nobility or royalty just as the tonsure depicted a Churchman. Gregory of Tours gives many examples concerning the hair and its political implications,<sup>77</sup> none so poignant as the dilemma detailed in 3.18 of his *Gesta*, where Clothild, wife to Clovis I, must choose between seeing her son shorn or killed:

At illa exterrita nuntio et nimium felle commota, praecipue cum gladium cerneret evaginatum ac forcipem, amaritudinem praeventa, ignorans in ipso dolore quid diceret, ait simpliciter: 'Satius mihi enim est, si ad regnum non eriguntur, mortuos eos videre quam tonsus'.  
(Gregory of Tours 3.18)

And that one was struck with terror and greatly agitated with animosity by the message, especially when she saw the unsheathed sword and tongs, and being overcome with bitterness and not knowing what in her anguish she was saying, said simply: ‘It is better for me to see them dead than tonsured, if they are not raised to kingship’.

If Childebert is not to be king, she says, better to have him killed outright rather than cut his hair, *ut reliqua plebs habeantur* (“so that they be regarded [like] the other common people,” Ibid 3.18).

Another apt example of the importance placed on the hairstyle of the nobility is found in 4.4 of Gregory’s *Gesta*. Macliavius flees from his brother, Chanao, and finds sanctuary in the Church, receiving the tonsure and later becoming bishop.

---

<sup>77</sup> Gregory of Tours 2.9, 41; 3.18, 29; 4.4; 6.6; 7.38; 10.15. This list does not include the references to ‘hair-shirts’ or several instances regarding women’s hair, focusing instead on the implication of hair length among men in secular or religious terms.

Upon Chanao's death, however, Macliavius *apostatavit, et dimissis capillis ... cum regno fratris simul accepit* ("apostatized and, having set free his hair ... at once accepted the kingdom of his brother," Ibid 4.4). Macliavius' hairstyles clearly represent a physical adaptation to different life choices: the tonsure indicating his time spent as a priest, the 'long hair' a symbolic return to his royal inheritance. Similarly, the cutting of a noble's hair, as was witnessed in the Clothild section, was also a form of dishonouring the former noble. In 7.38 of the *Gesta Francorum*, Gundovald, king of Aquitaine, is betrayed, brutally tortured and ultimately killed:

Venitque omne vulgus, et defixis in eo lanceis, pedes eius fune legantes, per omnia exercituum castra traxerunt; evellentesque caesariem ac barbam eius, insepultum ipso quo interfectus fuerat loco reliquerunt. (Ibid 7.38)

And he came with all the people and a lance having been thrust into him and his feet being gathered with rope, they dragged him through the entire army camp; and tearing out his long-hair and beard they left him unburied in that place in which they had killed him.

The additional detail concerning his hair and beard as a form of dishonour to an enemy, like leaving the slain unburied, emphasises the importance of this act to the reader. Again in 10.15, Gregory lists the cutting of hair alongside a list of torments undergone by the rebels hiding in the monastery at Poitiers: *vinctus a monasterium extraxerunt, ac ad stipites extensos, gravissime caesos, aliis caesariem, aliis manibus, nonnullis auribus naribusque decesis, seditio depraessa quievit* ("fettered they dragged him from the monastery, and stretched him against a post, most painfully cut to pieces all his long-hair, both hands, ears and nostrils, [then] they departed, the rebellion having been appeased," Ibid 10.15). Only a few have their hair shorn, which suggests that it was not an indiscriminate act, but one for a specific few, possibly those of noble rank.

If we return to Anglo-Saxon England we find remnants of this continental, Germanic tradition lingering in the seventh century. According to the laws of Æthelbert of Kent, the seizure or pulling of the hair demanded compensation from the aggressor: *Gif feaxfang geweorð, L sceatta to bote* ("if taking hold of hair occurs, fifty *sceats* for compensation" Liebermann 5). Although the law does not go into further detail as to why this is an offence or, more specifically, if long hair denotes

nobility, it is suggestive of the Frankish tradition depicted by Gregory.<sup>78</sup> If we see Judith as a representative of the Anglo-Saxon community, then the audience might see her grasping of Holofernes' hair as an affront to his person. His *feax* reaffirms his rank, just as the *fleohnet* and *swæsende* symbolise his wealth and power. Thus she mocks this rank and false authority when she grabs hold of his hair, just as he intended *besmitan* ("to shame") her with filth and sin (*Jud.* ll. 57b-59a). Holofernes is powerless and once his head is removed he is unable to punish Judith for her transgression; his inability to uphold the law and the authority of his position further demeans him as an exemplar of the anti-leader.

The poet's constant use of head/leadership imagery plays on the central opposition between Judith and Holofernes, both as individuals and as heads of their respective armies. The audience's attention is repeatedly drawn to the pinnacle of *fortitudo*, namely the position of leader, either to foreshadow or recall the beheading in lines 98b-111a. The helms and hair are extensions of this imagery, incorporating the concepts of protection and a medieval perception of identity. The terms *feax* and *wundenlocc* appear to oppose Holofernes' camp to Judith's, creating clear barriers between the two people just as her 'holy' epithets oppose her to Holofernes' role as a heathen.

#### *Cenra to Campe*

Nowhere is *fortitudo* more explicit than in the battle sequence to *Judith*. In chapter fourteen of the biblical *liber*, Judith commands that the people of Bethulia prepare for battle (Idt. 14:2). She intends for her people to give the impression of coming to battle, but does not wish them to attack. The purpose of the feint is to stir the Assyrians into alarm and eventually to press them into flight once they find their general dead. The closest the biblical editions come to an actual battle is the routing of the Assyrians, which is itself inextricably joined with the expulsion of the enemy from Israel (Ibid 15:2-3, 6). There is no pitched battle fought between the two armies, but rather flight followed by pursuit. The scene relies heavily on the dependence of the Assyrians on Holofernes' leadership, for without him they are exposed as cowards and rush towards the borders of Israel.

---

<sup>78</sup> Æthelbert had strong ties to the Frankish kingdom, both geographically and through a marriage alliance with Bertha, daughter of Charibert I of Paris (Higham 86-92).

*Judith* follows the pattern of its biblical exemplars, but only its skeletal form. Nearly one hundred and fifteen of the poem's extant lines are dedicated to the 'routing' of the Assyrians; half of these are specifically dedicated to battle themes and imagery. In the poem, Judith does not command the Bethulians to go forth and wait for the enemy to flee before them, but instead assumes the role of military commander and sends them straight into battle (*Jud.* ll. 186b-95a). The goal is not simply the expulsion of the enemy from the native land, but the absolute destruction of those who have so long oppressed God's chosen people.

By the battle scene, Judith and Holofernes have become figureheads of their respective armies, the one sending warriors to war, and the other nothing more than a powerless corpse. The armies become extensions of their respective leaders; they reflect the beliefs of their commanders (Christianity, heathenism), as well as their wisdom and ignorance, strength and weakness, virtues and vices. There are two theories of interpretation among modern scholars regarding the insertion of the battle scene into *Judith*. The first group reads these lines as a contemporary political polemic, urging the Anglo-Saxons to fight against the encroaching Danes of the ninth and tenth centuries (Chamberlain; Olsen). Judith is thereby transformed into a "national heroine and a personification of the nation" (Stocker 5). The second group sees the battle as an allegorical interpretation of the fight between good and evil, represented by "a heroic Virgin who stamps upon the Devil" (Chance 40; see also Hermann, *Allegories* 173-98 and "Spiritual Warfare"; Magennis, "Gender"). In both theories, there is the standard opposition of God's chosen (Christian Anglo-Saxons) fighting off a wicked enemy (the Devil or the heathen Danes).

Christian imagery within the battle sequence is minimised to a digression of only one and a half lines (*Jud.* ll. 299b-300) along with the occasional epithet for Judith (Ibid ll. 254b, 260a, 261a). The majority of the lines are dedicated to Germanic military terminology and heroic ideals (Purdie 28; Locherbie-Cameron 75). The two armies are metonyms of their respective leaders: the Bethulians progress to victory through the guidance of the lord's handmaiden; the Assyrians, however, are left leaderless and face slaughter. *Judith* portrays that an army's success is dependent upon the abilities of its lord, and that his or her *fortitudo* relies on the virtues of *anima* and *sapientia*. Only with all three elements can a leader guide his or her people to victory. *Judith* opposes these armies to create a sense of unity and identity among the Bethulians that counters the foreign 'otherness' of the

Assyrians. It does not seem that the poet intended the Anglo-Saxons to see themselves as the Bethulians in particular, but to relate with them as a chosen people defending their homeland (see Chapter Two, pp. 27-33).

The battle sequence is almost exclusively dedicated to the antagonistic relationship between the Bethulians and the Assyrians. Judith and Holofernes are mentioned only in passing (*Jud.* ll. 253b-61a); even God is only permitted a fleeting reference as the Hebrews continue the slaughter of their enemies. The Bethulians appear in *Judith* only after the heroine has returned to the city with Holofernes' head. In the seventeen lines between Judith's speeches the Bethulians are described as *burhsittendas* ("city-dwellers," *Ibid* l. 159b) joyously welcoming their heroine home (*Ibid* ll. 159-75), just as Beowulf's men welcomed him after he returned from the battle with the *mere-wife* (*Beo.* ll. 1626-43). The Hebrew people belong to a city, with a *heanne weall* ("high wall," *Jud.* l. 161a) and a *fæstengeat* ("fortress gate," *Ibid* l. 162a); it is an idealised Germanic city, a *medobyrig* ("mead city," *Ibid* l. 167a; see pp. 72, 102) that emblemises the glory of their ancestral past (J. Hill, "Soldier of Christ" 62). As discussed in Chapter Three (see pp. 72-73), Holofernes receives the epithet *burga ealdor* ("lord of cities," *Jud.* l. 58a) but has no city to rule; his camp in fact represents the wilderness outside of Bethulia's protective walls. The Assyrians are without a home and structure in their lives much like their lord (Campbell 158), while the Bethulians and Judith reap the rewards of the faith.

The poet builds a strong relationship between the Bethulians and their identity as the native people. There are four key instances of national identification for the two armies:

... þa ðe hwile ær / <i>elðeodigra</i> edwit þoledon ( <i>Ibid</i> ll. 214b-15)	... they who previously suffered a long time the abuse of <i>foreigners</i>
Hæleð wæron yrre / <i>landbuende</i> , <i>laðum cynne</i> ( <i>Ibid</i> ll. 225b-26)	The warriors, the native people, were angry with the <i>hateful people</i>
Swa ða magoþegnas on ða morgentid / ehton <i>elðeoda</i> ealle þrage ( <i>Ibid</i> ll. 236-37)	So the retainers in the morning pursued the <i>foreign people</i> continuously

<p>Þær on grot gefeoll / se hysta dæl          heafodgerimes / <i>Assiria</i>          ealdorduguðe, / <i>laðan cynnes</i>.          (Ibid ll. 307b-10a)<sup>79</sup></p>	<p>There fell on the ground the          greatest part of the head-count of          chief leaders of the Assyrians, of          the hateful people</p>
---	---

In lines 215a and 237a, the Assyrians are labelled as *elðeod* (“foreign people”), which, at the risk of being redundant, defines them as ‘not Bethulian’. The poet, through the Assyrian army, “creat[es] ... a mythic, demonic, alien enemy which must be overcome if the common good ... is to be safeguarded” (Pollington, *Warrior* 192). A general ‘otherness’ is bestowed upon them. Twice they are termed *lað cynn* (“hateful people/race,” *Jud.* ll. 226b, 310a), the first paralleled with the Bethulian epithet *landbuende* (“native people/land dwellers,” Ibid l. 226a) and the second to *magopegnas* (“retainers,” Ibid l. 236a). Judith’s role, as exhibited in her second speech, is to “channel the group’s aggression outwards against an external target” (Pollington, *Warrior* 192), first Holofernes and then his army.

The stress on identity is also prevalent in a high frequency use of *Ebrea* and *Assyria* in epithets for the two people:

218b	<i>Ebreas</i>	Hebrews
214a	weras <i>Ebrisce</i>	Hebrew men
253a	mægen <i>Ebrea</i>	might of Hebrews
262a	folc <i>Ebrea</i>	people of Hebrews
298a	sweot <i>Ebrea</i>	army of Hebrews
305b	guman <i>Ebrisce</i>	Hebrew men
218a	<i>Assyrium</i>	[to the] Assyrians
232	<i>Assiria</i> oretmæcgas	warriors of [the] Assyrians
265b	<i>Assyria</i>	of Assyrians
309	<i>Assiria</i> ealdorduguðe	chief leaders of [the] Assyrians

The use of these particular labels is not extraordinary in the sense that the poet did not change the origins of the characters from the biblical tradition. These particular identifiers, however, only appear in the battle scene when the two armies are in conflict. The battle is the final struggle between two, opposing people and their ideals

<sup>79</sup> Italics represent my emphasis.

(Pollington, *Warrior* n. 192). Whether this becomes a metaphor for the Anglo-Saxon wars against the Scandinavians or the Church's battle against the Devil is irrelevant; the fundamental theme is the defence of the homeland against the hated 'other'. The Bethulians fight for their city and their faith against foreigners and heathens.

The final examples of identity in the poem occur during the spoilage of the battlefield (*Jud.* ll. 311b-49). The Bethulians are described as *londbuendas* ("land dwellers," *Ibid.* l. 314a) and *eðelweardas* ("guardians of the homeland," *Ibid.* l. 320a) impressing upon the audience that they were the rightful owners of the land. The Assyrians are conversely old enemies (*ealdfeondas*, *Ibid.* l. 315a) of the Bethulian people. Chamberlain reads the multitude of epithets and phrases regarding 'old antagonism' as suggestive of "the English wars against the Danes" (147). He acknowledges the possibilities of an allegorical interpretation and that the 'old enemy' refers to Satan, but finds a greater "political resonance for the original audience of the poem" (*Ibid.*) rather than spiritual. Hermann, however, views the entirety of the battle sequence as representative of spiritual warfare, citing the more common definition of 'the Devil' in epithets like *ealdfeond* (*Jud.* l. 315a) and *ealdhettende* ("old foes," *Ibid.* l. 320b) rather than medieval polities warring with England (Hermann, "Spiritual Warfare" 4).<sup>80</sup>

It is possible, given the poet's propensity for ambiguity, that we can read the battle scene locally (that is, about the Danish troubles) as well as allegorically (namely the eternal battle between the faithful and Satan). The majority of the poem is a balance between secular, Germanic customs and Christian tradition. The negative qualities of the feast and lord-retainer relationship are laid at Holofernes' feet along with his inability to successfully combine *fortitudo* with *sapientia* and *anima*. The Bethulians defend, as did Judith, their society and the traditions therein, which includes the Germanic ideals as well as the Christian faith in God. It was Anglo-Saxon policy to promote a "sense of unity" (Foot, "*Angelcynn*" 35) for the Germanic Christians of Britain; it was "as one united Christian people that the relationship of the English with their non-Germanic neighbours is ... defined" (*Ibid.* 39). Holofernes and the Assyrians thus represent a generic 'other' that threatens Bethulian/Anglo-Saxon society; the failure of their conquest resides in the native

---

<sup>80</sup> *Ealdfeond* appears in several texts as the Devil: *Phoen.* ll. 401a, 449a; *Guð.* ll. 141b, 203b, 218a, 365a, 290b, 475a; *Christ* l. 567a; *Hell.* l. 89a.

inhabitants ability to realise and implement the ideals – *fortitudo*, *sapientia* and *anima* – set by Judith.

*Herereaf*

*Judith* retains the structure of the biblical story (with the addition of a battle) so that the end of the poem resembles that of the *liber*: the Assyrians are chased away (*Jud.* ll. 311b-23a; *Idt.* 15:7-8); the Bethulians plunder the abandoned camp and battlefield (*Ibid.* ll. 323b-34a; *Idt.* 15:13); they are greatly enriched and give to Judith Holofernes' personal treasure, which she then dedicates to God (*Ibid.* ll. 334b-49; *Idt.* 15:14-15). The poem stresses the same concepts as the original biblical text: Judith and her people are rewarded for their courage against the enemy and they praise God for his divine aid. The significance of the poetic adaptation is that the spoils comprise mostly military equipment with no reference to tents, plates or cattle as described in the biblical editions (*Idt.* 15:8, 14). The addition of the battle sequence adjusts “the story to the heroic mode of O.E. poetry, where swords and helmets are common, but tents and beds are not” (M. Griffith 61).

The process of plunder and redistribution, or gift-giving, was fundamental to Germanic warfare and vital to the maintenance of the kingdom. “Kings needed wealth – especially in the form of ‘prestige goods’ such as jewellery, armour, weapons and tableware – with which to reward their supporters at such public occasions as custom dictated (e.g. the *symbel*)” (Pollington, *Warrior* 190; see also Reuter 84). Carolingian sources offer many examples of leaders distributing treasure to their people for military service, the concepts of “victory and plunder ... more or less coterminous” (Reuter 76). Among the Anglo-Saxons we find the majority of examples in literary sources. *Beowulf* offers several examples of the gift-giving ritual between lord and retainer (*Beo.* ll. 1677-79a, 2155-62, 2379b-84a, 2501b-06, 2985-98; for examples of the gathering of spoils, see *Exod.* ll. 582-90). In each instance of gift-giving in *Beowulf*, the treasures exchanged represent loyalty and devotion to one's lord and the reciprocal favour of that lord to his faithful followers.

In the final scene of *Judith*, the poet once again alters the biblical story to reflect Germanic traditions through the development of plunder and redistribution. In the biblical story, the Assyrians are put to flight and the Bethulian army pursues them until the enemy is expelled from the borders of Israel (*Idt.* 15:6). The abandoned camp was then spoiled and the people of Bethulia *locupletati sunt valde*

(“were greatly enriched,” Ibid 15:7). Judith receives Holofernes’ personal possessions (Ibid 15:14) and once in Jerusalem, *donum dedit Judith omnia vasa Olofernis, quaecunq̄ue dederat ei plebs; et conopeum, quod sustulit ipsa de cubiculo, dedit in consecrationem Domino* (“Judith gave a gift of all Holofernes’ vessels, whatever the people had given to her; and the canopy, which she herself removed from the bed, she gave in consecration to God,” Ibid 16:23). The spoils are reward for her courage in the face of danger and her saving of Israel; her dedication of these objects to God in turn thanks the lord for his assistance in defeating the enemy of his people.<sup>81</sup>

In the poem, the development of Holofernes and Judith as opposing representations of leadership re-establishes the heroine as head of the Bethulian army at the end of the text. As discussed in the ‘Germanic Hall’ section of this chapter (see pp. 109-12), “[t]he ceremonial gift-giving from lord to retainer was the central ritual of the hall-life of the *comitatus*. The ritual symbolized and reconfirmed the bond between lord and man” (Miller 201). The spoils in *Judith* therefore accommodate the Germanic understanding of warfare, but they also reaffirm Judith’s symbolic position as a traditional lord. The specific catalogue of the spoils given to Judith serves two purposes. First, it reflects the wealth and prestige Holofernes held during life; second, it honours Judith as equal to his former rank and, because he is dead, celebrates her as the ideal representative of leadership on earth. A similar pattern is found in *Beowulf*. As the hero lies dying, he bequeaths his most personal possessions to Wiglaf:

Dyde him of healse    hring gyldenne  
 þioden þrithydig,    þegne gesealde,  
 geongum garwigan,    goldfahne helm,  
 beah ond byrnan,    het hyne brucan well. (*Beo.* ll. 2809-12)

He took a golden ring from his neck bold-minded prince, made a present to [his] thegn, to the young spear-warrior, [also] a gold-ornamented helm a ring and corselet, he commanded him to use them well.

---

<sup>81</sup> As to the variation between the varying biblical traditions and the spoil scene, see Appendix II, pp. 173-76.

In life these possessions are symbols of Beowulf's status and renown; the giving of these items to Wiglaf signifies that the retainer has earned the honour and status to be his lord's successor. There is a similar theme in *Judith*, when the heroine receives Holofernes' sword, helm and armour. She is not a replacement for the Assyrian despot, however, for Judith as a woman can never be the leader of a *comitatus* (Lucas "Woman Hero" 22); instead she acts as an exemplar of the power of the faith and a symbolic antithesis to Holofernes' role as the anti-lord.

The first item Judith receives from her warriors is Holofernes' sword. As discussed above, the *mece* or *sweord* symbolises Holofernes' role as a military commander and warrior; the irony is, of course, that he fulfils these roles in name only. In the above passage from *Beowulf*, we see a connection between Holofernes' sword and Beowulf's *hring gyldenne*: both objects are symbols of power and the individual's status among his people. The sword is the ultimate representation of a conquering army from which Holofernes' power derives, just as the golden ring around Beowulf's neck (presumably a sort of torque) depicts him as king among the Geats. The removal of the torque signifies the passing of authority to Wiglaf, just as the giving of the sword to Judith realises the shifting of power within the poem.

After the sword, the *Judith* poet lists Holofernes' *swatig* helm. As Holofernes' bloody helm was discussed in greater detail above it will suffice to recall the irony of the description. The general never wore his helm into the battle immediately preceding this episode and, therefore, it could not be literally bloody, but merely an allusion to its owner's decapitation. The term *swatig* is also a reminder that he did not fall in battle, but drunkenly in bed. He was slain while intoxicated in his own private chamber and by a woman, whose role in Germanic society would not have been as an active participant in battle (Lucas, "Warrior Hero" 22). There is no glory or honour in Holofernes' death. In contrast, Beowulf dies as a noble hero, a treasured king and warrior. The helm he bequeaths to Wiglaf is described as *goldfah*, although it was worn in the fatal battle against the dragon. The description of the golden helm is linked with Beowulf's retention of honour and his kingly status after his death; the image of a golden helm recalls his success as a leader and the wealth of his kingdom. Holofernes' *swatig* helm, however, recalls his vice-ridden life and ignominious death. Beowulf and Holofernes are one another's antithesis, represented in the description of the different helms and the associated qualities of their leadership.

Corselets are given to both Judith and Wiglaf, followed by *beagas* (*Judith*) or *beahas* (*Beowulf*). For both Holofernes and Beowulf these objects represent the wealth accumulated during their time on earth. Beowulf acquired wealth and glory for his people, serving them by fighting the dragon; he was an ideal king and warrior, adhering to the gift-giving culture in which he lived. He leaves these goods to Wiglaf as a testament of his achievements, symbols of his glory and that of his people during his reign. Holofernes' *sundoryrfas* ("private property, personal possessions," *Jud.* l. 339b) and *beaga ond beorhtra maðma* ("rings and bright treasures," *Ibid.* l. 340a), however, are associated with the ostentatiousness of the Assyrian army. As a military encampment, it is possible these extra treasures were acquired during their campaign in Israel or perhaps during the siege of Bethulia itself. Although the poet does not mention where the *sundoryrfas* originated, the importance of plunder to Anglo-Saxon society might suggest that the audience could view the wealth of the Assyrians as garnered from previous battles.

Judith's reception of Holofernes' possessions is short-lived. In lines 341b-45a, the heroine *sægde* ("ascribed," *Ibid.* l. 341b) her spoils of war to God, which is a variation of the biblical texts that describe her as offering the treasures up as anathema.<sup>82</sup> These lines stress that it was God,

þe hyre weorðmynde geaf,  
 mærðe on moldan rice, swylce eac mede on heofonum,  
 sigorlean | (in) swegles wuldre, þæs þe heo ahte soðne geleafan  
 to ða(m) ælmihtigan. (*Ibid.* ll. 342b-45a)

who gave her esteem, renown in the kingdom of earth, as well as  
 reward in heaven, reward for victory in the glory of the skies,  
 because she had true faith in the almighty.

Judith praises the lord for his assistance in her victory against Holofernes, declaring the spoils and the honours they entail as a sort of worldly manifestation of divine favour. Beowulf makes a similar thanksgiving as he speaks to Wiglaf while dying:

'Ic ðara frætwa Frean ealles ðanc,  
 Wuldurcyninge wordum secge,  
 ecum Dryhtne, þe ic her on starie,

<sup>82</sup> See Appendix II, pp. 173-76, for the variation between biblical and Old English texts.

þæs ðe ic moste    minum leodum  
 ær swyltdæge    swylc gestrynan.  
 Nu ic on maðma hord    mine bebohte  
 frode feorhlege,    ...’ (*Beo.* ll. 2794-800a)

‘With these words I say thanks to the lord, the king of glory, the eternal lord, for all of these treasures, which I look on here, that I was able to gain such things for my people before my death day. Now that I sold my old (allotted) life for a hoard of treasures ... ’

Beowulf thanks God for the riches he has attained on earth, describing them as won for his *leode* (“people”). However these treasures were obtained is unimportant, for the gathering of spoils was a principal duty for a lord of any *comitatus* (Pollington, *Warrior* 190); with these treasures he can reward his faithful men and procure security for his people. Judith and Beowulf’s respective speeches are declarations of their faith in God. Both he and Judith are declaring themselves to be God’s retainers on earth, serving him just as they serve their people. Their combined *fortitudo* as warriors along with the strength of their *anima* elevate them to the role of ideal leaders and, in the tradition of *rex gratia dei*, they are rewarded with eternal life in heaven.

### Conclusion

The Germanic elements of *Judith*, while set in a Judeo-Christian culture, continue to represent the traditions transmitted by the Germanic migrations of the fifth and sixth centuries. The emphasis on the meadhall, and the rituals therein, as well as warfare and spoils all indicate a relationship between the contemporary poet (and his audience) and the past. Holofernes represents a lord among men, his epithets repeatedly drawing attention to his status among the Assyrians, which intensifies his eventual downfall. He exhibits authority and power within the text; references to his wealth through the description of the *fleohnet* and his possessions establish his rank as above the other warriors. He represents the pre-conversion ideal Germanic leader as understood by Christian Anglo-Saxons. His *fortitudo* exists, however, in name only because he lacks wisdom and faith, unlike Judith, whose power is solely derived from God.

Judith, on the other hand, displays all the key qualities of a warband leader despite holding no title or rank. By approaching Holofernes alone she assumes the foremost position of the Bethulian army and her success in ‘battle’ rouses her people to follow her example. This was a key element discussed by Tacitus in his *Germania*, the *dux* leading his men by example: *duces exemplo potius quam imperio, si prompti, si conspicui, si ante aciem agant, admiratione praesunt* (“generals lead more by example than command, if [they are] eager, if [they are] conspicuous, if [they are] in front of battle [then] they are admired,” *Germania* 7). She fulfils her promise of glory in battle and provides the spoils required for a warband’s survival. She is Holofernes’ antithesis and accomplishes the duties required of a *comitatus* leader thereby increasing the renown of her people despite a lack of rank and physical prowess. She is not a warrior, but a woman who is imbued with divine grace, and it is that which guides her to victory and establishes her as an *exemplum admirandum* of leadership.

Chapter VI: *Fons sapientiae verbum Dei*<sup>83</sup>

In the Judeo-Christian tradition, *sapientia* is inextricably tied to God; he dispenses it to the faithful and withholds it from the wicked as punishment (Sap. 3:10; Sir. 1:26).<sup>84</sup> *Sapientia dei* assures glory, corporeal and heavenly, both of which the Bethulian heroine receives, just as promised in the *Liber Sapientia*:  
*concupiscentia itaque sapientiae deducet ad regnum perpetuum si ergo delectamini sedibus et stematibus reges populi diligite sapientiam ut in perpetuum regnetis* (“therefore the desire of wisdom leads to the eternal kingdom, therefore if you desire thrones and garlands, kings of the people, esteem wisdom so that you reign for ever,” Sap. 6:21-22). Wisdom is God-given, but so too is secular power, hence the idea of *rex gratia Dei*; to maintain one’s authority, the ruler must continue to educate himself in the wisdom of the faith, namely through scriptural and patristic learning.<sup>85</sup> *Sapientia* thus promises God’s favour, the *fortitudo* required by the secular leader to maintain his corporeal kingdom and the reward of eternity in heaven.

The association between the Israelites of the Old Testament and the Anglo-Saxons, as discussed in Chapter Two, provided a foothold for the early Christian missionaries to assimilate the pagan Germanic culture of Britain into the new religion. The importance of faith in this new Christianised, Germanic culture was affirmed through the conversion of kings. The Old Testament (and particularly the books of the Pentateuch) was employed to establish revised concepts of kingship among the Anglo-Saxons, stressing not only the martial prowess legendary of the Germanic people, but also the *sapientia* and *anima* required for favour by the one true God. Figures like David and Solomon acted as exemplars for missionaries and Church advisors who sought to stress the ideals of Christian leadership that Anglo-Saxon kings must emulate.

Apart from piety and beauty, wisdom is a key element of Judith’s character in the original biblical *liber* (Idt. 8:28; 11:18-19, 21). Her wisdom comes directly from God for she is his deputy on earth; he protects and guides her as she faces the

<sup>83</sup> “the source of wisdom [is] the word of God,” Sir. 1:5.

<sup>84</sup> *impii autem secundum quae cogitaverunt correptionem habebunt qui neglexerunt iustum et a Domino recesserunt* (“but the wicked will have reproof [i.e. punishment] according to that which they thought, they who neglected the just and withdrew from God,” Sap. 3:10); *in thesauris sapientiae intellectus et scientiae religiositas execratio autem peccatoribus sapientia* (“in the treasures of wisdom [are] understanding and religiousness of knowledge, but to sinners wisdom [is] a curse,” Sir. 1:26).

<sup>85</sup> The acquisition of knowledge I include as an element of *sapientia*, as wisdom is required in order to know when further learning is necessary.

enemy in his tent (Otzen 106). Her speeches are eloquent, her manner pious, thereby creating an *exemplum admirandum* of Christian virtue. Holofernes, on the other hand, is inconstant in his faith (Ibid 11:21) and falls victim to the vices of pride and lust. The general's lack of *sapientia* and his fickleness of faith reveals his *fortitudo* as insufficient to conquer God's chosen people (Ibid 16:5-14). The *Liber Sapientia* reasserts the Christian tradition of affirming that the wisdom of the faithful proves stronger than physical prowess: *melior est sapientia quam vires et vir prudens magis quam fortis ... quoniam data est a Domino potestas vobis et virtus ab Altissimo qui interrogabit opera vestra et cogitationes scrutabitur* ("wisdom is better than strength and a wise man is greater than a strong [one] ... Since power is given to you by the lord and strength from the highest who will examine your deeds and will search [your] thoughts," Sap. 6:1, 4). Holofernes' possession of corporeal power is thus useless against Judith and the power of the faith.

The Old English *Judith* also expresses the ineffectiveness of *fortitudo* as a solitary quality of leadership. The acquisition of *fortitudo*, and therefore success in lordship, is only feasible on a foundation of *sapientia* and *anima*. As mentioned in Chapter Four (see pp. 92-93) "Old English poets [took] the essential quality of the ... heroine to be simply wisdom, with its complimentary courage and prowess to be somehow obtained or enlisted from elsewhere" ("Judith" 15). *Sapientia* and *anima* are thus inseparable in her character and essential to her victory. Conversely, Holofernes' debilitating ignorance of Judith's plans and God's role therein brings him to ruin (Locherbie-Cameron 72). This chapter concentrates on the combination of faith and wisdom, as they are critical to Judith's role as an *exemplum admirandum* and Holofernes' position as her foil. The following analysis focuses on the depiction of wisdom and faith within the poem and the manner in which they define the general as the anti-leader and Judith as the ideal exemplar of leadership.

#### Germanic *Wyrd* and Divine Providence

This particular subsection concerns the multitude of references made by the poet about the fate of Holofernes and the omnipotence of God. The poem intermingles the traditions of heroic *wyrd* ("fate, fortune, chance," BTASD 1287) with Divine Providence to present a unique reading of *Judith*. "The ideas of fate and fortune in Germanic poetry," as defined by Gilbert, "... focus on the unpredictable and sudden turn of events in every part of a German warrior's life" (1). The heroic

element appears in the ability to transform these uncertainties into glory and renown. In approaching Holofernes single-handedly, Judith faces a similar struggle; after all, she must retain her virtue in the face of the general's wicked designs (*Jud.* ll. 57b-59a). The biblical origin of the story, however, brings with it the all-encompassing authority of God and thus Divine Providence: *omnes enim viae tuae paratae, et iudicia tua in providentia* ("for all your (i.e. God's) ways are prepared, and your judgments [are in] in providence," *Idt.* 9:5).<sup>86</sup> It is the omnipresence of the almighty that dooms Holofernes to an ignoble death and controls the element of *wyrd* within the poem.

The majority of instances in *Judith* where the poet foreshadows the fate of the Assyrians and their leader suggest Germanic *wyrd* at play rather than Divine Providence. In lines 19b-21a, Holofernes plies the Assyrians with drink, the poet describing them as *fæge* ("doomed," *Jud.* l. 19b). This reference to their fate ensures that the audience knows that tragedy will occur from the excess of the feast; Holofernes, their leader, on the other hand, *ne wende* ("did not think/suspect," *Ibid.* l. 20b) that they were drinking from the metaphorical *poculum mortis* ("cup of death"). Towards the end of the feast, the warriors are described as lying in a stupor (*on swiman lagon*, *Ibid.* l. 30b) as if they were *deaðe geslegene, agotene goda gehwylces* ("struck dead, drained of all good," *Ibid.* ll. 31b-32a). In this line the poet foreshadows the corpses of lines 312b-13a, after the Bethulians have slaughtered the enemy. In both instances it is the general's ignorance that condemns him, for "a man who is conscious of his fate is not a prisoner to it" (Gilbert 9). Despite the lack of reference to God in these lines and what can be construed as emphasis on Germanic *wyrd*, it is Holofernes' lack of faith that sentences him to death. The fate of his men is tied to his decisions and the choices he makes based on a lack of *sapientia* and *anima*.

Mentioned briefly above, Holofernes intends to defile or shame (*besmitan*, *Jud.* l. 59a) Judith *mid widle ond mid womme* ("with filth and with sin," *Ibid.* l. 59a) but God intervenes: *Ne wolde þæt wuldres dema / geðafian, þrymmes hyrde, ac he him þæs ðinges gestyrde, / dryhten dugeða waldend* ("the judge of glory, the shepherd of splendour, would not allow that, but he, the lord, ruler of hosts,

---

<sup>86</sup> 'Providence', with an application to God, appears only a few times in scripture: *Ecl.* 5:5; *Sap.* 14:3; *Idt.* 9:5. The concept of Divine Providence, however, reoccurs throughout the Old and New Testament as well as among the Church Fathers.

restrained him from that thing,” Ibid ll. 59b-61a). God’s prevention of Holofernes’ plans is not a direct intervention, but rather an external support of Judith, his handmaiden. She prays to him for mercy and he answers it by instilling her with courage; it is Judith as the hand of God who strikes down the general, and not God himself. This is further supported in her second speech, where she assures the Bethulians that their enemies are *gedemed to deaðe* (“doomed to death,” Ibid l. 196a) just as God ‘*getacnod ... / ... þurh mine | (h)and*’ (“indicated ... through my (i.e. Judith’s) hand,” Ibid ll. 197b-98). Bethulian success is thus gained through firm faith in God, not an attempt to control Germanic *wyrd*.

The poet assures the audience that Holofernes is unaware that God controls his fate, acting as an unseen, yet ever-present force, within the poem (Lucas, “Woman Hero” 24). Holofernes fails in his role as leader because of his ignorance of both the terrestrial and the celestial plans against him, whereas Judith succeeds as an *exemplum admirandum* through her faith and her acquisition of *sapientia dei*. In the feast section of the poem, however, there is no reference to God or his role in the story other than as a protector of Judith from the *hehstan brogan* (“highest danger,” *Jud.* l. 5b). As discussed in the previous chapter (see pp. 109-12), the feast is a secular and Germanic representation of Holofernes’ role as a lord of men. There are also no negative religious epithets for the general until line 45b, just before the *fleohnet* section. The feast, as discussed elsewhere in this thesis, is characteristically Germanic, despite its perversions (namely, no speeches, no gift-giving and the overindulgence in wine), and depicts Holofernes in the role of a lord before his retainers. In this section, the doom forecasted for his warriors is directly connected with his actions; Judith’s absence from the scene further intensifies Holofernes’ role as the orchestrator of Assyrian inebriation. At the moment when the general could still effect change in his situation he continues to overindulge; he does not believe in Divine Providence and would, having been transformed by the poet into a Germanic lord, follow the ideals of *wyrd*.

The inability to control his fate, in a strictly Germanic sense, implies that Holofernes has become a “prisoner of a malignant fate” who can either turn the tables against Judith and the Bethulians or die “an honourable death” (Gilbert 1). He achieves neither of these options, dying ignominiously while unarmed and unconscious from drink. Holofernes’ heathenism traps him in a state of ignorance for he is unable to understand that God is the ultimate distributor of fate: *dol biþ se þe*

*his dryhten nat, to þæs oft cymeð deað unþinged* (“foolish is the one who does not know his lord [i.e. God], when sudden death often comes,” *Max. I l. 35*). He hides behind corporeal wealth and power, but this too proves ineffective against God and his handmaiden. After Judith decapitates him, the poet emphasises Divine Providence by committing Holofernes’ spirit to *helle bryne* (“burning/fire of hell,” *Jud. l. 116b*). The addition of the hellfire scene between lines 111b and 121 reduces the options available to humankind: the virtuous ascend to heaven, while the sinners descend to hell.

In life Holofernes is imprisoned by his own ignorance, psychologically blinded by his heathenism. In the poem, he appears, while alive, either in his tent or behind the *fleohnet*. The poet assures the audience that despite this physical barrier God could look upon him, even if his warriors could not: Holofernes is able to see through the net upon those who came to him, but *on hyne nænig / monna cynnes* (“on him none of the race of men [could look],” *Ibid ll. 51b-52a*). Regardless, Holofernes remains in his man-made shelters until his spirit and body are separated; the head moves on to Bethulia with Judith while the *gæst* descends into hell. The *helle bryne* scene reaffirms the futility of the general’s efforts to segregate himself from his warriors by means of a “vividly compact ... description of Holofernes’ damnation” (Huppé 168):

...            ond ðær genyðerad wæs,  
susle gesæled    syððan æfre,  
wyrnum bewunden,    witum gebunden,  
hearde gehæfted    in helle bryne  
æfter hinsiðe. (*Jud. ll. 113b-17a*)

... and was there prostrated, fettered in torment thereafter, wound with snakes, bound with tortures, painfully imprisoned in hell-fire after going hence.

He is bound, fettered and painfully imprisoned in hell because he lacked the *sapientia* that would lead him to God. Holofernes’ fate becomes a caveat for the audience, imparting the wisdom of Divine Providence so that others will not make the same mistake the Assyrian did. The self-imposed prison represented by the *fleohnet* is transformed into a *wyrmsele* (“hall of serpents,” *Ibid l. 119a*), which replaces the image of the traditional Germanic hall established in the early lines of

the extant poem (Huppé 168). Holofernes has lost not only his life, but also his chance at eternal glory, both in the Christian and Germanic sense. That his *gæst* is imprisoned in hell assures the audience that he has received punishment for his sins. The *wyrmsele*, however, recalls the ideal structure of a *comitatus*-based society and that it has been denied Holofernes *awa to aldre butan ende forð* (“for ever and ever without end henceforth,” *Jud.* l. 120).

#### The *Deoden* and *Mundbyrd*

The introduction of Christianity in the sixth century expanded the traditional lord-retainer relationship by establishing God at the highest level: he was the lord to whom kings and warriors were all retainers. Protection among the Anglo-Saxons therefore involved two types: corporeal and divine. The earthly rulers of the seventh century established communities as their ancestors had done before them, but led them in faith as well as arms; the king was to act as mediator between God and man or else lose the almighty’s protection and thus eternal glory (Alcuin, *Ad Carolum* PL 100.422C-28C).

In *Judith*, the absence of *anima* and *sapientia* from Holofernes’ character deny him the *fortitudo* to achieve victory, thus identifying him as an *exemplum horrendum* of leadership. While God defends Judith against the general’s licentious designs (*Jud.* ll. 57b-61a) and instils her with courage (Ibid ll. 94b-98a), Holofernes fails to save his men when they are in danger (Ibid ll. 285-91a). Holofernes’ position as lord of the Assyrians is founded solely on corporeal power and wealth, which he displays through the excess of the feast (Ibid ll. 7b-34a), the luxury of the *fleohnet* (Ibid ll. 46b-54a) and the haste with which his warriors follow his commands. It is his reliance on the physical world rather than on God that condemns him to death; he remains ignorant of the faith because he is blinded by mortal power.

Tantamount to Holofernes’ dependence on material goods as expressions of his authority within the poem is the aside describing the *fleohnet*. The original fly-net or *conopeum* (“canopy”) in the *Liber Iudith* was employed in the depiction of an Egyptian couch with mosquito-curtains hanging around it. Rabanus Maurus draws direct attention to the fly-net in his *Expositio in Librum Judith*, citing the net as a snare for Holofernes’ deceitful thoughts: *et conopeum, hoc est, rete muscarum, insidias significat dolosae cogitationis* (“and the canopy, that is, a net of flies, indicates the plots of his deceitful intention,” PL 109.573A). The net for Rabanus

becomes a metaphor for Holofernes' mind and the vices therein. This idea is further corroborated by the *Liber Sapientia*, where the wicked think to hide in their sinfulness, but do not escape God's judgment unscathed: *et dum putant se latere in obscuris peccatis tenebroso oblivionis velamento dispersi sunt paventes horrende et cum admiratione nimia perturbati* ("and while they think to hide themselves in secret sins they were dispersed, being horribly frightened, from the dark cover of oblivion and were confused with excessive surprise," Sap. 17:3).

The netting in *Judith* follows a similar pattern as established in the *Liber Sapientia*. Holofernes hides behind his sins, metaphorically and literally. The *fleohnet* represents his obsession with worldly possessions as well as his sins of gluttony and pride. It also serves to hide him from sight unless he calls someone forward:

Pær wæs eallgylden  
 fleohnet fæger ond ymbe þæs folctogan  
 bed ahongen, þæt se bealofulla  
 mihte wlitan þurh, wigena baldor,  
 on æghwylcne þe ðær inne cóm  
 hæleða bearna, ond on hyne nænig  
 monna cynnes, nymðe se modiga hwæne  
 niðe rofra him þe near hete  
 rinca to rune gegangan. (*Jud.* ll. 46b-54a)

There was an all-golden beautiful fly-net and around the bed of the leader it hung, so that the evil one, the lord of warriors, might look through upon each one of the children of warriors who came therein, and on him none of the race of men [could look], unless the proud one might command any one of the brave warriors to go nearer to him for battle<sup>87</sup> consultation.

The curtain also acts as a protective barrier, hiding Holofernes from any who enter his tent that he does not wish to see. Figuratively, the *fleohnet* acts as a metaphorical escape. His ignorance of the powers outside his tent continues because he blinds himself with his own self-importance: the net is golden and *fæger* ("beautiful," Ibid

<sup>87</sup> Here I take M. Griffith's definition of 'battle' for *niðe* (see M. Griffith 208).

l. 47a) and hangs around his bed (*ymbe ... / bed ahongen*, Ibid ll. 47b-48a); he alone, *se modiga* (“the proud/arrogant one,” Ibid l. 52b), chooses who may approach him for counsel (*run*, Ibid l. 54a). Holofernes falsely believes himself safe, as he is able to see any and all the sons of men who come therein (Ibid ll. 50-51a). This statement is accurate in a literal sense, but figuratively it offers the key to the leader’s downfall: he is able to see the *hæleða bearna* (“children of men,” Ibid l. 50a), but not the *frymða waldend* (“ruler of creation,” Ibid l. 5a).

The first half of the compound noun, *fleoh-* has several associations in the Old English lexicon. There is the related noun *fleoge* “a fly” (BTASD 292), which reflects the *musca* from Rabanus’ *Expositio* and the original meaning behind *conopeum*. In *Judith*, *fleoh-* adheres to the tradition behind the netting, but further imitates Rabanus’ commentary on the canopy as a snare of treacherous thoughts (Berkhout and Doubleday 634). The *fleohnet* figuratively protects its occupant, particularly from outside disruption, while maintaining the original purpose expressed in the biblical analogues: an exhibition of Holofernes’ self-worth and over-confidence. There is another possible nuance within the term *fleohnet*. *Fleoh-* is also related to the verbs *fleon* and *fleogan*, both defined as “to flee” (BTASD 291, 292). The concept of ‘escape’ broadens the intrinsic meaning behind the *fleohnet*. It acts as a barrier between Holofernes and the rest of the world; the bed becomes his refuge for his ignorant heathenism, the netting an “oblique definition of what is wrong with Holofernes as a leader” (Locherbie-Cameron 73). He focuses on the corporeal world and is ignorant of the heavenly sphere; his failure to either understand or acknowledge God as the ultimate leader results in his downfall (Ibid 72).

The second half of the compound verb, *-net*, is the same in modern English. There are, however, added implications to the Old English definition. Attached to the meaning of a *net* is its use in hunting, be it for fowl, fish or other beasts.<sup>88</sup> As the curtain hangs around the bed (*Jud.* ll. 47b-48a) it is similar to a trap set outside a beast’s lair, represented by the *bealofull* (Ibid l. 63a) bed itself. If the canopy guarded Holofernes’ place of refuge then it would be logical to assume that the trap is set for Judith: the beauty of the curtain, its golden colouring, acts as a lure to the unwary. The general’s focus throughout the story is on physical pleasure, the gold of

<sup>88</sup> *Nett*, with the definition of a net or trap, appears in Ælfric’s Colloquy, p. 23 (l. 59).

the netting and his desire for Judith supporting the poet's description of him as *se bealofulla* ("the wicked one," Ibid l. 48b) and *se modiga* ("the proud/arrogant one," Ibid 52b) in the *fleohnet* section. Holofernes does not ensnare Judith, however, because his trap is unable to deceive God's handmaiden. It is the general himself who becomes caged by his ignorance and vices (gluttony, pride, lust), while Judith achieves eternal glory.

Holofernes' position within the poem is established in the very opening lines of the extant text. The audience is assured of God's unwavering *mundbyrd* of Judith; he is the *hehstan dema* ("highest judge," *Jud.* l. 4a) protecting his handmaiden against the *hehstan brogan* ("highest danger," Ibid l. 4b). The *mundbyrd* the poet mentions in line 3a is specifically divine in origin and, by the end of the poem, the only form of protection that survives.<sup>89</sup> God's assistance is acquired only through firm faith, which the poet assures us is a constant in Judith's nature; he mentions her *trumne geleafan* in line 6b and later her *rihte geleafan* in line 97a. Her *anima* is affirmed as vital to her attainment of God's help and therefore her success in defeating Holofernes and the Assyrian army. Some scholars, such as Huppé, argue that the opposition of the general with God is set up because Holofernes represents the Devil, his "god-like awesomeness" contrasting with the "true awesomeness of God" (Huppé 158). The poet does refer to Holofernes as *deofulcunda* in line 61b (see Chapter Three, p. 78), but this seems more like a comment on his heathenism rather than an allegorical reading of him as the Devil. Chamberlain notes that

[i]f Holofernes is to signify mainly the Devil ... it is unsuggestive that his 'soul' now goes to Hell for the *first* time, never to return ... since we know from other works (*Elene*, *Juliana*, *Guthlac*) that Old English poets thought of the Devil as constantly returning to earth. (155, his emphasis)

Holofernes' position is as an *exemplum horrendum* of leadership, as argued by the true focus of the poem. His opposition to God in line 4 merely establishes the detrimental absence of the *sapientia dei* in the general's character, an absence emphasised throughout the remainder of the poem.

---

<sup>89</sup> The reason for these lines cannot be known as the preceding text is lost. The tone of lines 1b-7a, however, reflects those lines after the prayer (*Jud.* ll. 94b-98a). It is possible that the opening of the extant poem reflect God's answering of the nightly prayers and ablutions Judith performs while in the Assyrian camp (see *Idt.* 12:6-9).

The initial lines of the extant text assure the audience that God will protect Judith throughout her mission in the enemy camp. He guards her against Holofernes' licentious designs and imbues her with the strength to decapitate the general when her prayer warns that she is in desperate need of divine mercy. The poet acknowledges that God is the one true lord of a new Christian *comitatus* (Swanton, *Crisis* 63-64); he protects Judith from harm while in the Assyrian camp and supports her in leading the faithful to victory. The almighty acts indirectly through Judith, reinforcing her *fortitudo* in her time of need (*Jud.* ll. 94b-98a). When the Assyrian warriors seek similar sustenance from Holofernes they are left wanting (*Ibid.* ll. 275-91a). The poet focuses on the irony of Assyrian ignorance for they are entirely unaware of their lord's death (*Ibid.* ll. 253b-61a) and therefore his fallibility (Astell 128; Locherbie-Cameron 73). Holofernes is unable to protect his warriors from destruction because of his own arrogance and is ultimately punished without reprieve in hellfire.

The final lines of the *fleohnet* section reemphasise Holofernes' false authority in opposition to Judith. The poet writes in his description of the netting that the general could look upon all the *hæleða bearna* ("children of men") who approached him and in lines 51b-52a we are assured that *nænig / monna cynnes* ("none of the race of men") could look upon him unless Holofernes summoned them forward for a consultation. The phrase *monna cynnes*, however, presages his destruction and proves the artificiality of his authority over men: none of the race of men could penetrate the *fleohnet*, but God is clearly not of men and thus his vision is not obscured. In his divine wisdom he sends not a man but a woman to destroy Holofernes. The Assyrian is ignorant of Judith's purpose and her omnipresent patron because he is blinded by his own vices, particularly his pride in his own power (*Jud.* ll. 52b, 67b-69a), a fate similarly warned against in much Anglo-Saxon literature, most notably in *Beowulf* by Hroðgar (*Beo.* ll. 1724b-54).

#### *Word and Bearhtm*

In the *Liber Sapientia*, the personification of Wisdom – a direct creation of God (*Sir.* 1:1, 5) – is attributed with the granting of worldly power (*Sap.* 3:8), the gift of eternal life (*Ibid.* 5:16-17; 6:21) and knowledge of all things (*Ibid.* 7:17; 8:8) to the faithful. *Sapientia dei* also granted us speech and the ability *praesumere digna horum quae dantur ... in manu enim illius et nos et sermones nostri et omnis*

*sapientia et operum scientiae disciplina* (“to conceive thoughts worthy of those things that are given to me for in his hand [are] we and our speeches/words and all wisdom and discipline of knowledge of works,” Ibid 7:15-16). Speech is important in the *Liber Judith*; Achior’s speech recounts the history of Israelites and warns Holofernes of the power of the Israelites’ God (Idt. 5:5-25); Judith’s prayers reflect her constancy of faith and courage therein (Ibid 9; 13:7, 9); her speeches reassure her people and later celebrate their victory through God (Ibid 8:10-33; 13:17-20; 14:1-5; 16:2-21); and other minor dialogue sets up clear opposition between the faithful and the enemy throughout the text (Ibid 11-12:1-4, 12-18; 13:22-31).

Speech is vital to the story as it is a conduit for the expression of ideals by both the writer and the society in which he lived. *Judith* retains this importance, but minimises the use of direct speech to a mere four examples (three of which are from the heroine) and instead develops the expression of sound in other instances. Judith’s eloquence defines her as a strong and coherent leader, exhibiting the wise qualities expressed in her epithets. Holofernes, on the other hand, is relegated to making incoherent noise; he never speaks within the extant poem, even in those sections where the biblical original depicts him participating in dialogue. His loss of speech curbs his ability to lead and further expresses a lack of *sapientia* among his other vices, for being “gifted as an orator ... is always well-becoming to a Germanic king” (qtd. in Schücking 42).

The first example of ‘noise’ in *Judith* occurs during the feast scene. Holofernes, having become inebriated, resorts to unintelligible sounds rather than the speeches expected of him as lord of a warband. The purpose of the hall was “to bring structure and dialogue to human interactions, to control society” (Pollington, *Mead Hall* 106), but Holofernes is made inarticulate through drink, dehumanised until his sounds mimic that of a beast rather than a man:

hloh ond hlydde, hlynede ond dynede,  
 þæt mihten fira bearn feorran gehyran  
 hu se stiðmoda styrnde ond gylede. (*Jud.* ll. 23-25)

he laughed and shouted, roared and resounded, so that the children of men could hear from afar how the stern-hearted one bellowed and yelled.

M. Griffith discusses these lines as a “remarkable accumulation of assonant, and nearly tautological verbs, the rhyme both within and across verses, and the consonant cluster alliteration all exaggerate the noisiness. Stylistic excess mimics excessive behaviour” (66-67). The excess of drink in this scene vilifies the general weakened by vice, but also as a man “living entirely without the calming and ordering grace of God” (Godfrey 14). God gives wisdom to those of faith and justice, but denies it to sinners: *quoniam in malivolam animam non intrabit sapientia nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis* (“since wisdom will not enter into a spiteful spirit nor will it live in a body submissive to sins,” Sap. 1:4). Deprived of wisdom, Holofernes is left with inarticulate noises and is in fact unable to make speeches because he is without divine favour; his inebriation acts as a manifestation of his ignorance and inability to lead his men to victory.

We are made all the more aware of his inability to speak when he is deposited in his bedchamber with Judith. He and his men are unaware of his fate and he lies unprotected in his bed while the heroine offers up an impassioned prayer to God; this presents a key contrast between Holofernes’ fall into inebriated unconsciousness and Judith’s increasing clarity of thought (Astell 126). She seeks *milts* (“mercy,” *Jud.* ll. 85a, 92a), *gesynto* (“salvation,” *Ibid.* l. 90b), as well as God’s forgiveness (*forgif me* “forgive me,” *Ibid.* l. 88b) because she is greatly afflicted (*gedrefed*, *Ibid.* ll. 86b-88a). These requests are adaptations of the biblical prayer in which Judith acts for God to strengthen her: *confirma me Domine Deus Israel* (“strengthen me lord God of Israel,” *Idt.* 13:7). *Judith* expands the prayer by inserting more personal details to her struggle in decapitating the general: her heart is *onhæted* (“inflamed,” *Ibid.* l. 87a), her thoughts *geomor* (“sad, gloomy,” *Ibid.* l. 87b), both *swyðe mid sorgum gedrefed* (“greatly afflicted with sorrows,” *Ibid.* l. 88a); the intensity of her concern is emphasised by the adverb *pearle* (“sorely, grievously”) in line 86b. It is not her faith that is lacking at this moment of truth, however, but her *fortitudo*, which God replenishes after her prayer (*Ibid.* ll. 94b-98a).

Judith’s power is drawn directly from God as she acts as his avenging soldier on earth. The poet emphasises this relationship in the final lines of the prayer: ‘*Gewrec nu, mihtig dryhten, / torhtmod tires brytta, þæt me ys þus torne on mode, / hate on hreðre minum*’ (“avenge now, mighty lord, illustrious dispenser of glory, what is so grievous in my mind, hot in my breast,” *Ibid.* ll. 92b-94a). The internal struggle we hear in Judith’s prayer is answered when God inspires her (*onbryrde*,

Ibid l. 95a) with courage/strength (*ellen*) because she sought him *mid ræde ond mid rihte geleafan* (“with wisdom and true faith,” Ibid l. 97a). This is the crux of Judith’s power over Holofernes: while she does not hold the physical strength or worldly authority, as does the general, she may seek it in God’s omnipotence because of her *sapientia* and *anima*. Holofernes’ *fortitudo*, without these supporting qualities, is proven powerless as a leader and the “marked emphasis on [the] mental and emotional state ... helps to promote within [the poet’s] readers an attitude of courageous followership” (Astell 122).

Upon her return to Bethulia, Judith gives two speeches crediting God with her victory over Holofernes before rousing her people to gather arms. The poet describes the citizens as *geomormod* (“sad at heart,” *Jud.* l. 144a), which recalls the heroine’s prayer in which she tells God that she has a *hige geomor* (“sad mind/heart,” Ibid l. 87b). She had commanded the warriors to await her return, but like her they despair of their fate until assured of divine assistance. Furthermore, in her prayer Judith explains that she is afflicted with *sorgas* (“sorrows, woes,” Ibid l. 88a); in her second speech she assures her people that Holofernes, the cause of those sorrows, is dead: *þe us monna mæst morðra gefremede, sarra sorga* (“who committed against us the most violent crimes of men, painful sorrows,” Ibid ll. 181-82a). The poet stresses Judith as a spokesperson of the Bethulian people just as she is God’s representative on earth. In this manner, she embodies the patristic ideal of Christian leadership, specifically as perceived by Augustine:

Illi autem, qui uera pietate praediti bene uiuunt, si habent scientiam regendi populos, nihil est felicius rebus humanis, quam si Deo miserante habeant potestatem. Tales autem homines uirtutes suas, quantascumque in hac uita possunt habere, non tribuunt nisi gratiae Dei, quod eas uolentibus credentibus petentibus dederit. (Augustine, *De Civitate* 5.19)

Moreover those who live well gifted with true piety, if they have the skill for ruling people, nothing is more blessed in human affairs than if they have [this] power through God’s compassion. Moreover such men, however much they are able to have in this life, do not attribute their virtues except to the grace of God, who will give them [i.e. virtues] to the willing, believing [and] desiring.

Judith's piety earns her God's grace and therefore the position of authority over her people. In both speeches she refers to the almighty powers of God and his role in leading her, and soon her people, to victory (*Jud.* ll. 154b-55a, 183b-86a).

Under Judith's leadership and God's favour the Bethulians prepare for battle, assured of victory and glory (*Ibid.* ll. 195b-205a). On the morning of the attack, the *dynedan scildas, / hlude hlummon* ("shields resounded, reverberated loudly," *Ibid.* ll. 204b-05a); the verb *dynian* recalls Holofernes' personal merriment when he *hlynede ond dynede* ("roared and resounded," *Ibid.* l. 23b), drunk with mead. The repetition of these terms connects the excessive rejoicing of Holofernes, as well as his failure to lead his men appropriately, with the Bethulians as they prepare for battle after Judith's success and rousing speeches (Huppé 177). Through 'sound' imagery Bethulian success is once again opposed with Assyrian failure; Holofernes' revelry balanced with the clamouring of shields as the battle begins. Line 223b furthers the opposition as the Bethulians are said to have rushed forth and *styrmdon hlude* ("raged loudly," *Jud.* l. 223b). Victory, however, is only for those who adhere to the heroic ethos, defined in *Judith* as a combination of Christian ideology and Germanic tradition. The general "exhorts his men to wine rather than war. He is the antithesis of heroic" (Lucas, "Woman Hero" 22) and therefore incapable of achieving victory. Judith, however, encourages her men to fight by her own example and the steady support of God.

The failure of Holofernes as a leader and exemplar for his warriors is again attested in lines 270-72a. Before the discovery of Holofernes the Assyrians stand outside his tent and after hesitating in waking him they *ongunnon cohhetan, cirman hlude / ond gristbitian, ... / mid toðan, torn þoligende* ("began to cough, to shout/cry loudly and to gnash their teeth, enduring grief," *Jud.* ll. 270-72a); all are incoherent noises and responses to the despair of the situation. Huppé reads the Assyrian reaction in these lines as bearing "symbolic significance" by "suggest[ing] the sounds of the damned in the exterior darkness" (180).<sup>90</sup> This is further supported by the New Testament, in which the sinners will be cast into hell and *ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium* ("there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth," Mt. 13:42). Like the

---

<sup>90</sup> Huppé cites several instances of this imagery in other Old English poems and the relationship of the damned being sent to hell: *Exod.* l. 462; *Guð.* ll. 264, 393, 908; *Gen. A* ll. 2409, 2549; *Christ* ll. 835, 997; *And.* ll. 1125, 1155.

sinner on the Day of Judgment, the Assyrians are helpless at this moment of the story, unable to wake their leader and too timid to approach his side.

The alteration made by the poet to this scene is interesting in that he removes direct speech from the mouths of the warriors until after Holofernes is discovered. In the biblical text, the officers of the army tell Bagao to wake his master because the Bethulians have risen against them: *Suscita dominum nostrum, quoniam ausi sunt filii Israel descendere ad nos in bellum, ut pereant usque in finem* (“awaken our lord, because the children of Israel have dared to come down against us in battle, that they may perish to an end/continuously,” Idt. 14:12). In *Judith*, there are no words spoken to relieve them of their gloomy (*sweorcendferð*, *Jud.* I. 269a) dispositions as there were for the disheartened Bethulians of lines 141b-46a. Judith brings to her people the *sermo dei* or word of God, which serves as their weapon against the heathen Assyrians: *vivus est enim Dei sermo et efficax et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti ... discretor cogitationum et intentionum cordis* (“for the word of God is living and effective and more piercing [than] every two-edged sword ... a judge of thoughts and intentions of the heart,” Hbr. 4:12). Holofernes’ lack of faith dooms his men to failure, for while “[i]t is a saving Word [i.e. the word of God], ... [it is] also one that judges, since it condemns those who refuse to hear it” (NJBC 928).

The revelation of Holofernes’ corpse introduces the first and only direct speech by an Assyrian within the extant text. It is at the precise moment when the Assyrians realise their fate and its connection to their leader; their destruction (*forwyrð*, *Jud.* I. 285b) is combined with the decapitation of their lord (Locherbie-Cameron 73). The unfortunate warrior who discovers Holofernes tears at his clothes (*Jud.* I. 282b), just as Bagao does in the biblical analogues, then tears at his hair (*Ibid.* II. 281b-82a; see Chapter Five, p. 122). It is in this moment, as he faces his dead *goldgifan* (“gold-giver,” *Ibid.* I. 279a) that fear consumes him body and mind, which is further emphasised in his direct speech to the Assyrian camp. The phrase *hreoð on mode* (“distracted in mind,” *Ibid.* I. 282a) identifies the warrior’s loss of courage, which was intrinsically linked with Holofernes’ leadership. The dead general “pervert[ed] the proper functions of a lord” and because of this “leav[es] them [i.e. Assyrians] equally undirected” (Godfrey 17).

The warrior’s mind is now disturbed and wild with sorrow, much as Judith’s was during her prayer, before God inspired her (*Jud.* II. 86b-88a). The ignorance in which Holofernes and, by association, his warriors lived is replaced with the

knowledge of their fate:

‘Her ys geswutelod ure sylfra forwyrd,  
toward getacnod, þæt þære tide ys  
mid niðum neah geðrunge, þe (we) sculon nu losian,  
somod æt sæcce forweorðan. Her lið sweorde geheawen,  
beheafdod healden(d) ure.’ (Ibid ll. 285-89a)

‘Here is revealed our own destruction, shown [to be] imminent, that  
the time is near, along with its troubles, when we shall now lose,  
perish together in battle. Here lies slain by sword our beheaded lord.’

The warrior’s words are weighted with his newly-acquired knowledge of the fate of his people; the verbs (*sweotolian*, *tacnian*) stress the revelation of what is to come, which differs greatly from the lack of awareness described in the rest of the poem (Ibid ll. 19b-21a, 63b-69a, 72b-73a, 195b-98, 247a). His speech further emphasises his acquisition of knowledge, albeit not the *sapientia dei* with which Judith is blessed. Overcome by cowardice at the sight of Holofernes’ corpse his army flees, their failure to uphold the customs of the warband, specifically that they do not seek vengeance for their leader’s death (Evans 58, 68), further justifies their slaughter at the hands of the Bethulians. The latter army adheres to the customs of heroic warfare as *hæfte guldon / hyra fyrngeflitu, fagum swyrdum, / ealde æfðoncan* (“they repaid their old insults, ancient grudges with sword hilts, with blood-stained swords,” *Jud.* ll. 263b-65a). Their observance of the old ways combined with the faith in God, both exemplified in their leader Judith, provides them with vast riches (Ibid ll. 330-31, 339b-41a) and eternal glory (Ibid ll. 343b-45a).

#### *Heolstor and Leoht*

There are many biblical verses dedicated to the differentiation between the people of the light and those of darkness. The righteous and just walk in the light of God, while the sinners are confined to darkness: *iustorum autem semita quasi lux splendens procedit et crescit usque ad perfectam diem via impiorum tenebrosa nesciunt ubi corruant* (“moreover the path of the just ones, as though a shining light, proceeds and thrives all the way to the perfect day; the way of the wicked [is] dark, they do not know where they fall,” Prv. 4:18-19). The adoption of the Christian faith enhanced the light/dark imagery within the Germanic literary tradition by

emphasising the new theological significance of God or Christ as the Light: *quoniam Deus qui dixit de tenebris lucem splendescere qui inluxit in cordibus nostris ad inlucinationem scientiae claritatis Dei in facie Christi Iesu* (“for God, who commanded light to shine from darkness, who illuminated in our hearts towards glory of knowledge [and] of the brightness of God in the appearance of Jesus Christ,” II Cor. 4:6). In *Judith*, light and dark imagery assists in depicting the opposing roles of leadership as represented by Holofernes and Judith. Spiritually, the heathens live in darkness, the faithful in light; metaphorically, Holofernes and his Assyrians are trapped in the darkness of ignorance and the Bethulians rejoice in the triumphant *sapientia dei* (see Augustine, *Confessiones* 7.1, 6).

The *Judith* poet plays on the binary opposition between light and dark, day and night. In the original *liber*, night and day communicate the passing of time: the feast occurs on the fourth day; the warriors leave Holofernes alone at night; the Bethulians go to battle in the morning of the following day; Judith prays at night in the camp, but during the day when in Bethulia. This progression of time is imitated in the poem (*Jud.* l. 12b, 204a), but the imagery becomes more focused on the connection between light and dark with the qualities of the characters within the text. Night and darkness are associated with Holofernes and the Assyrians (*Ibid* ll. 28, 33b, 45a, 64a, 118a, 121a), while light and day reflect Judith and the Bethulians (*Ibid* ll. 190b-91a, 204a, 236, 245b, 265a; see also Doubleday 437). This imagery further separates the two armies and their respective leaders into good and evil, faithful and heathen, saints and sinners.

On the fourth day of the feast (*Ibid* l. 12b), the Assyrians drink the day away, overcome by their gluttony. The purpose of warriors within a warband is “to fight and slay the enemies of his lord, to protect his lord to the best of his abilities, and to avenge his death in the event the lord was killed” (Evans 58). The Assyrians, however, overindulge on their ‘earned mead’ (*Ibid*) because Holofernes plies them with wine (*Jud.* l. 29) *ofer ealne dæg* (“throughout the day,” *Ibid* l. 28b), so drunk it was as if they were dead *oð þæt fira bearnum / nealæhte nihte seo þystre* (“until dark night approached the children of men,” *Ibid* ll. 33b-34a). The passage from day to night brings to the fore the sins of the Assyrians – pride, gluttony and lust – and with these the justification for Holofernes’ demise.

Drink and the general vice of gluttony bring the warriors into night and thus to their demise: *qui enim dormiunt nocte dormiunt et qui ebrii sunt nocte ebrii sunt*

*nos autem qui diei sumus sobrii simus induti lorica[m] fidei et caritatis et galeam spem salutis* (“for they who sleep, sleep at night and they who are drunk are drunk at night, but let us, who are of the day, be sober [and] clothed in the mail of faith and of charity and [for] a helmet the hope of salvation,” I Th. 5:7-8).<sup>91</sup> Day is thus reserved for the faithful and the virtuous that seek salvation in Christ; the Assyrians, led by the example of Holofernes, are trapped in the metaphorical and spiritual darkness of ignorance and heathenism. As night falls, Holofernes is led to his *træf* (“tent,” *Jud.* l. 43b) and the *bealofull* (*Ibid.* l. 63a) bed therein, *þær se rica hyne reste on symbel / nihtes inne* (“where the ruler himself always rested within at night,” *Ibid.* ll. 44-45a).

Huppé interprets Holofernes’ *træf* as “a heathen temple serving the devil, and standing opposed to the temple of God” (*Ibid.* 163). The allegorical combination of the tent, net<sup>92</sup> and Holofernes’ wickedness would therefore present the general as a god-like figure, an idol that his men worship (Berkhout and Doubleday 633). There is, however, no clear evidence in the poem itself that defines the general as bearing god-like powers, only an earthly authority over his men. As to the Assyrians worshipping him, the references to haste imply obedience and perhaps loyalty, but not reverence. Both references to Holofernes’ night-time resting place acknowledge his opposition to God; at line 45, he is referred to as loathsome to the saviour (*nergende lað*, *Ibid.* l. 45b); the next reference at lines 63b-64a comes right after an assurance by the poet that God would protect Judith from Holofernes’ filth and sin (*widl* and *wom*, *Ibid.* l. 59a). In both instances, his rest at night is associated with his heathenism, which gives credence to Huppé’s idea that the tent represents a heathen temple or “an abode of evil” (163), though I remain reluctant to read here that Holofernes is intended to represent a god-like figure. It is likely that the bed and tent are metonyms of the general himself, representing his vices and heathenism.

Temporal darkness, represented by night, is replaced in the *helle bryne* scene with the eternal darkness of hell (*Jud.* ll. 111b-21). Twice darkness is referenced amidst the detailed descriptions of the torment Holofernes will undergo. He lives in

<sup>91</sup> Early medieval Christian commentators viewed drunkenness “as an especially dangerous sin, since ... it overthrows reason in the mind” (Magennis, *Appetites* 93). Isidorus Hispalensis, for example, explains that *ebrietas ... perturbationem gignit mentis, furorem cordis, flammam libidinis* (“inebriation begets disorder of the mind, fury of the heart, flame of lust,” *De Ebrietate*, PL 83.649C).

<sup>92</sup> Huppé further interprets the *fleohnet* as “an analogy to the veil of the holy of holies within the temple” (Huppé 164; see Ex. 26:33-34), which suggests to him “not only the mysterious power of Holofernes, but even more powerfully the falseness and self-destructiveness of this power” (Huppé 164).

figurative darkness while on earth, represented by his ignorance and heathenism, but with his descent into hell the figurative becomes literal:

Ne ðearf he hopian no,  
 þystrum forðylmed, þæt he ðonan mote  
 of ðam wyrmsele, ac ðær wunian sceal  
 awa to aldre butan ende forð  
 in ðam heolstran ham, hyhtwynna leas. (*Jud.* ll. 117b-21)

He need not hope, enveloped by darkness, that he be allowed thence  
 from the hall of serpents, but there he shall live in eternity henceforth  
 without end in the dark home without hope of joys.

Trapped in this endless darkness, Holofernes exemplifies his position as an anti-leader. The audience, having observed his debauchery and death, now witness his fall into ignominy without the hope of ever receiving *sapientia dei*. His demise is a lesson to the audience to beware following his path of sin and ignorance lest they suffer a similar fate, for power is fleeting but God is eternal.

Night and darkness are replaced by dawn's light sent by God to herald the new day and the foreseen Bethulian victory (Ibid ll. 189b-91a; Idt. 14:2). Dawn symbolises the end of Assyrian oppression, God's light representing his divine favour over the Bethulian people (Ibid ll. 189b-91a; 199-204a). The poet retains the original use of dawn as the moment when the Bethulians prepare for 'battle', but the significance of the binary opposition between light and dark also emphasises this as the moment of the poem where God strengthens the Bethulians, just as he did Judith. Light represents the *fortitudo* of the faithful, embodied by the figure of Judith who is often described as shining or bright (see Chapter Four, pp. 96-101). In both instances when dawning light is mentioned so is God's assistance in the upcoming defeat of the Assyrians: through Judith's decapitation of Holofernes God betokens Bethulian glory and the death of their enemy (Ibid ll. 195b-98); when the Bethulians march forth in the morning it is from a *haligan byrig* ("holy city," Ibid l. 203b), a city of God's faithful.

Light in *Judith* represents the holiness of the people and the victory that is associated with their struggles. During the battle, reference to day/light appears in combination with the slaughter of the Assyrians. In the morning, the Bethulians assail the enemy, which the poet describes as *morgencollan* ("morning slaughter,"

Ibid l. 245b). This term appears only once in the Old English poetic corpus and is, according to M. Griffith an Old English convention, morning being used “as a time of distress” (134), which is reflected in lines 265b-67a, when the pride of the Assyrians is diminished in a *dægeweorce* (“day’s work,” *Jud.* l. 266a). I would suggest that the use of *morgen-* also intensifies the Christian aspect of the poem and its intrinsic importance in the Bethulians’ struggle against the heathen enemy. In the Gospel of John, Christ is recorded to have said, ‘*ego sum lux mundi qui sequitur me non ambulabit in tenebris sed habebit lucem vitae*’ (“I am the light of the world, he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life’,” Io. 8:12). Light was associated in Christianity with salvation and the cleansing of sin; Christ himself is seen as the light of salvation, sent by God to judge mankind (Io. 3:17-21). God is the *lux incommutabilis* (“immutable light,” Augustine, *Confessiones* 7.10) and the light is faith: *qui novit veritatem, novit eam, et qui novit eam, novit aeternitatem* (“he who knows truth, knows it [the Light], and he who knows it [the Light], knows eternity,” Ibid).

*Judith* employs light/day imagery to identify the faithful, while it condemns the sinners and heathens with images of darkness/night. Judith and the Bethulians are led through a combination of *sapientia dei* and traditional Germanic heroism to battle the wicked enemy and expunge them from the earth (*Jud.* ll. 307b-11a). Light/day are God-given and therefore tokens of his presence behind the Bethulians and Judith, the shining maiden. The light of dawn, while not an alteration or addition by the poet, assumes a symbolic interpretation of divine warfare; the Bethulians rush forth into battle as warriors of God, as his *milites Christi*.

#### The *Via Sancta*

A final image employed by the poet is that of the ‘path’. In *Judith* there are four instances where the poet employs the terms for ‘paths’ or ‘ways’ to describe not only the literal movements of the two armies, but also the spiritual choices of the respective people. The descriptions are at first functional, reflecting the movement of the armies as they appear in the biblical original: the Bethulians go forth at dawn (Idt. 14:8); the Assyrians, finding their general dead, flee (Ibid 15:1-3); the Bethulians chase after the retreating army (Ibid 15:2-6); finally, the Bethulians return from battle to gather the spoils of war (Ibid 15:8). *Judith* also describes these movements, but with alterations that emphasise the slaughter of the Assyrians and

triumph of the Bethulians through the use of ‘paths’ as physical manifestations of *sapientia dei*. This imagery also reflects the choices made by the respective armies based on the actions of their leaders. Holofernes fails in his role as lord of a warband and his men are left to fend for themselves; Judith urges her people to battle and through her example they achieve victory. The ‘paths’ are the result of Judith’s faith and Holofernes’ heathenism, her virtues and his vice; they represent the way of faith and the path towards damnation or eternal glory, the *via sancta* (“holy way,” Is. 35:8).

The ‘path’ imagery in *Judith* appears at the end of the poem during the battle scene. The paths of the two armies are constructed around two themes: the slaughter of the Assyrians and the victory of the Bethulians. There are four specific references to ‘paths’. The first appears in line 297b with the description of the Bethulians pursuing the fleeing Assyrians: *him on laste for / sweet Ebrea sigore geweorðod / dom(e) gedysod* (“behind them (literally, on [their] track) the Hebrew army was honoured with victory, exalted with power,” *Jud.* ll. 297b-98). The Bethulians are behind the Assyrians, literally on their ‘tracks’ or in their ‘footsteps’, an image that evokes the hopelessness of the enemy as they flee. These lines are immediately followed by the single reference to God in the battle scene: *Him feng dryhten god / fægre on ful(t)u(m), frea ælmihtig* (“the lord God fittingly gave them aid, lord almighty,” *Ibid.* ll. 299b-300). God assisted the Hebrew people in defeating their enemy; the Assyrians are, in effect, destroyed by the almighty, just as Holofernes figuratively fell to God’s vengeance through his handmaiden (*Ibid.* ll. 92b-93a; see also Huppé 182). The faithful follow the *via sancta* towards earthly glory and eternal salvation (*Prv.* 16:17); as heathens the Assyrians and their fallen leader are doomed to death: *quia rectae viae Domini et iusti ambulabunt in eis praevaricatores vero corruent in eis* (“because the ways of the lord are right and the just will walk in them, but the transgressors will fall in them,” *Os.* 14:9).

Religious imagery is prevalent throughout the poem. Judith is able to kill Holofernes because of divine assistance; Holofernes’ spirit descends into hell to be tormented for all eternity; God is thanked in all three of Judith’s dialogues; and the spoils are dedicated to the almighty upon the Bethulian return from battle. God is mentioned once in the one hundred plus lines of battle, the reference, a mere line and a half, almost disrupting the flow of poetic battle imagery (*Jud.* ll. 299b-300). It can be no coincidence that the poet avoids referencing God until the majority of the

battle is over. Just as God is seemingly absent during Holofernes' decapitation, so is he during the slaughter of the Assyrian army. Despite the absence of divine reference, God is ever-present during the Hebrew struggle against the enemy: "The implied relation of cause and effect follows naturally ... that the ultimate cause of their bravery is God's having taken them under his protection" (Huppé 183). The battle is representative of Bethulian confidence in God, their true lord, a confidence instilled by Judith's example of fighting Holofernes. They have faith that the almighty will guide them to victory and, in order to prove their belief, they attack the enemy.<sup>93</sup>

In line 302b, the second use of 'path' imagery appears with emphasis placed on the destruction of the Assyrian army when the Bethulians *herpað worhton / þurh laðra gemong* ("made a warpath through the crowd of foes," *Jud.* ll. 302b-03a). Their victory shifts to the background as the poet details the construction of the new 'military road' made of hewn shields, shattered shield-walls and the bodies of the slain (*Ibid.* ll. 303b-04a, 312b-13a). The Bethulians are creating their own road through the enemy, forging a new path of the faithful over the heathen enemy after following the example of Judith (Huppé 183). The Assyrian defences are overcome because of the absence of *sapientia dei*, embodied by Judith but lacking in Holofernes. The warpath becomes a gruesome symbol of the failed Assyrian campaign and the power of a people when they adhere to the true faith: *vulnerati autem multi corruerunt fuit enim bellum Domini* ("moreover many fell down slain for it was the battle of the lord," I Par. 5:22). The Bethulians follow the path of God by listening to his handmaiden and battling his enemies; through this they achieved what I Par 5:22 (cited above) foretold: *Þær on greot gefeoll / se hysta dæl heafodgerimes / Assiria ealdorduguðe, / laðan cynnes* ("there fell on the ground the greatest part of the head-count of chief leaders of the Assyrians, of the hateful people," *Jud.* ll. 307b-10a).

As the Bethulians return from the slaughter of the Assyrians, the poet describes them as warriors *on wiðertrod* ("in withdrawal," *Ibid.* l. 312a). Literally, the term is used to describe the army's return from routing the enemy, *wiðer* meaning "opposite" (BTASD 1250) and *trod* "track" (*Ibid.* 1015); literally the

---

<sup>93</sup> It is uncertain in the poem, due to the lost opening, whether or not the Bethulians had lost faith in God and that Judith's victorious return reaffirmed their belief. I, therefore, avoid the reference to 'renewed' faith in this particular instance.

Bethulians turn on the path in the opposite direction, back to Bethulia.<sup>94</sup> The term *widertrod* represents a double meaning, referring to both “the Hebrews’ return, and to the Assyrians’ retreat” (Huppé 183). The track upon which the Bethulians return is a path of faith, celebrating the glory they achieved through God’s *fultum* (“aid, help,” BTASD 348). The Assyrians are denied the *via sancta* for God forbade the sinners to walk his path: *erit ibi semita et via et via sancta vocabitur non transibit per eam pollutus et haec erit nobis directa via ita ut stulti non errent per eam* (“there will be a path and a way and it will be called the holy way, the unclean will not cross over it and this will be [for] us a straight way, so that fools will not wander through it,” Is. 35:8).

The final ‘path’ image is a continuation of the *herpað* scene, appearing just before the gathering of spoils from the battlefield. The poet explains that the Bethulians gloriously conquered the enemy (*Jud.* ll. 318b-19) and that the dead, who were the *laðost ... / (cwi)cera cynna* (“most hateful of living people,” *Ibid.* ll. 322b-23a) now *on swaðe reston* (“rest on the track” or “in their wake”, *Ibid.* l. 321b). The verb *restan* (“to rest, sleep,” BTASD 792) recalls the mead-weary sleep of the enemy at the onslaught of the battle (*Jud.* ll. 225b-29a), but also, and perhaps more poignantly, the image of Holofernes who *reste* in his tent each night, the tent in which Judith decapitated him (*Ibid.* l. 44b). The defeat of the general is linked with that of his troop. The ‘path’ imagery originates with Judith’s mission into the Assyrian camp and proceeds to include the greater expedition of the Bethulians in battle against the Assyrians. Judith is, in effect, synecdoche of the faithful, represented by the citizens of Bethulia. Together they follow the path of victory, justice and righteous glory, for, as is said in the book of Deuteronomy: *sed per viam quam praecepit Dominus Deus vester ambulabitis ut vivatis et bene sit vobis et protelentur dies in terra possessionis vestrae* (“but you will walk upon the way your lord God commanded, so that you may live and it may be well with you and [your] days may be prolonged in the land of your possession,” Dt. 5:33).

The *via sancta* also represents the absence of faith among the Assyrians. They are heathens, ignorant of *sapientia dei* and thus deprived of *fortitudo* when most needed. The flight of the Assyrians further flouts the ideals of the *comitatus*: to run from battle where their lord is slain results in the deepest villainy of the Anglo-

<sup>94</sup> This sense is also found in the use of *widertrod* in *Genesis*, line 2084b, after the Elamites are defeated by Abraham’s army.

Saxon heroic society (Evans 68-71; Cross 269-82). Their retreat is balanced with the victorious return of the Bethulians, the former walking a way of glory while the corpses of the latter become the path upon which the Hebrews tread: *Cirdon cynerofe, / wiggend on wiðertrod, wælsceƿ oninnan, / reocende hræw* (“they turned back very brave, warriors in withdrawal, among heaps of slain, reeking corpses,” *Jud.* ll. 311b-13a). Failure to uphold the laws of the warband results in Holofernes and then his warriors being punished with disgrace; one goes to hell, the others become shells stripped of their wealth by the Bethulians (Huppé 184-85). Only the faithful may walk the path of God and seek eternal glory, just as Judith, the representative of the faithful, finds at the end of the poem:

Ealles ðæs Iudith sægde

wuldor weroda dryhtne, þe hyre weorðmynde geaf,  
 mærdæ on moldan rice, swylce eac mede on heofonum,  
 sigorlean | (in) swegles wuldre, þæs ðe heo ahte soðne geleafan  
 to ða(m) ælmihtigan. (*Jud.* ll. 341b-45a)

Judith ascribed the glory of these things to the lord of hosts, who gave her honour, glory in the kingdom of earth, as well as reward in the heavens, reward for victory in glory of heaven, because she had true faith in the almighty.

### Conclusion

The poet exemplifies, through his transformation of the Judith story, the crucial role faith and wisdom perform in the successes or failures of a leader. God provides *sapientia* in order that his people might strengthen their *anima* and achieve eternal salvation (Sap. 6:4); through these elements he bestows power upon men (I Sm. 12:13). The almighty can rescind this power, however, should the secular leader prove unworthy (Alcuin, *Patribus Regibus* ll. 71-78). Ignorance, particularly of God, leads to vice and thereafter the loss of power; the imagery within the poem – light/dark, noise/words, *wyrd/mundbyrd* – stresses the opposing positions of Judith and Holofernes within the poem. The heroine represents the light of faith (*anima*) and protection of God through her verbal eloquence, which is itself a manifestation of *sapientia dei*. Holofernes, however, represents the darkness of ignorance, which is further associated with his heathenism; he is unable to form coherent words while

controlled by his vices. Judith's success is contingent upon her faith and the wisdom granted by God, just as the collapse of Holofernes' power resides in his lack of faith and its reward of *sapientia dei*.

The poem affirms, through a multitude of figurative imagery, that *fortitudo* arises from faith. A Christo-Germanic lord, therefore, must maintain *rihte geleafan* in order to receive the strength required to rule effectively. Known for her wisdom and unwavering faith in God, Judith leads the faithful by example rather than title or rank; the Bethulians imitate her example and are subsequently emboldened to rise up against an oppressive enemy. Holofernes, however, offers no example for his warriors to follow as his obligations as a lord are obstructed by the overriding vices of his character. His erroneous leadership results in the Assyrians failing to perform their own duties correctly: they fail to fight when the Bethulians take up arms; they do not revenge their lord when he is found dead; they flee in terror rather than regrouping in a show of courageous honour as expected of a Germanic warband (Evans 58; Underwood 131, 134). The slaughter of the Assyrians reflects upon Holofernes' failures as a leader; for the fleeting pleasures of the flesh – power, women and drink – he abandoned his men to their fate. It is his geocentric focus that condemns him to death for he does not appear to know that God is the ultimate *tires brytta* (“giver of glory,” *Jud.* l. 93a) and that only through faith in the divine can an earthly leader achieve power and renown.

Conclusion: *Æt þam ende ne tweode...*<sup>95</sup>

The tradition of the *Liber Iudith* is as a rescue-story. Judith is the vessel of God on earth, smiting the wicked with divine aid in order to save the faithful from persecution. She is emphasised as an ideal representative of the faith and the strength it provides for its devoted followers. Nebuchodonosor and his general, Holofernes, are therefore examples of the non-believer who suffers defeat at the hand of God's chosen. In the Anglo-Saxon tradition, Judith maintains her position as an *exemplum admirandum*: Aldhelm and Ælfric both employ her character as a model of chastity and humility, while Ælfric stresses the martial portion of her story to embolden his people in their fight against the Scandinavian menace. The poetic *Judith* deviates from its fellow Anglo-Saxon texts in that it does not stress Judith's chastity or humility. The Old Testament story is adapted into Germanic, heroic language, and while Judith remains the heroine, she is described ambiguously, overshadowed by the attention attached to the character of Holofernes, the *exemplum horrendum* of Christo-Germanic leadership.

The Old English *Judith* readdresses the figure of Holofernes and develops his character to suit contemporary society, creating an image of the Germanic lord whose weaknesses of character deny him the role of an *exemplum admirandum*. The Old English poet adapts the Judith-story to Anglo-Saxon England; he creates a medieval 'modernisation' of a biblical narrative, rather than a commentary or mere vernacular adaptation. Holofernes receives the most epithets in the poem, while only alive for the first 111 lines and even then he is inebriated or asleep for most of them. The extant text focuses on his character and position as head of the Assyrian army; it stresses the dependency of his warriors on his decisions and actions. Holofernes' heathenism denies him *sapientia dei*, which proved vital in Judith's success, and without it his Germanic *fortitudo* fails. Although the poet refers explicitly to his heathenism only three times in the extant text, we are assured that he is an enemy of the faith through a terminological balance with both God and Judith. Where the heroine's virtues are simplified from the original *liber*, Holofernes' are stressed; his vices are directly associated with his failure to uphold both Germanic and Christian customs.

---

<sup>95</sup> "at the end none doubted," *Jdth.* l. 345b.

No Judith-text, patristic or medieval, focuses on Holofernes as does the Old English poem. He originates as Judith's opposite, her antithesis, and is therefore only important as an antagonist to her story. The Old English poem, however, focuses on the Assyrian general, with every episode of the text resulting from his choices, which bring him to die at the hands of God's handmaiden. The additions made by the poet – *fleohnet, helle bryne* and the extended battle – reflect Holofernes' decisions and actions, not Judith's. It is *his* wealth and vanity, exhibited in the netting; *his* punishment for vice depicted in hellfire; the slaughter of the Assyrians is laid directly at *his* feet. The removal of emphasis on Judith's virtues (other than wisdom and piety) as well as her beauty, demotes the purpose of her character. Holofernes dooms himself with his heathenism and vice, while Judith is merely an ambiguous vessel chosen by God to remove the enemy of the faith from the earth. The most strongly emphasised of Holofernes' crimes, however, is his betrayal of his warriors.

There are 115 lines dedicated to the slaughter of the Assyrian army. In these lines are references to Holofernes' failings and not God's role in that destruction, for the almighty is only mentioned briefly in the whole of the battle scene (*Jdth.* ll. 299b-300). Even when found decapitated, the discoverer makes no mention of Judith's role in Holofernes' death, whereas the biblical analogues all reference the heroine's part in bringing down Assyrian leadership.<sup>96</sup> The epithets and imagery within the poem point to Holofernes as the direct cause of the end result; God's handmaiden acts only as a tool in the general's death. The poem simplifies Judith into an ambiguous exemplary character to be emulated by Anglo-Saxon society. The generalised nature of her description provides the poet with an *exemplum admirandum* for a wider audience: she is a woman, but also a woman of God; she is a warrior, a *miles Christi*, but also a commander of her city, though without rank. Her character speaks to all members of a Christo-Germanic society without narrowing the appeal of her actions. Holofernes, however, reflects a specific facet of Christo-Germanic society: the leader.

The ideal lord, as presented in the poem, is the one who, regardless of rank or title, exhibits three crucial characteristics: *fortitudo*, *sapientia* and *anima*. In a Christo-Germanic society, such as that of the Anglo-Saxons, God was the ultimate source of power, success and renown on earth, as well as the reward of eternity in

---

<sup>96</sup> LXX, Idt. 14:18; VL, Idt. 14:16; SV, Idt. 14:16. Ælfric, in his homily, also has the warrior mention Judith as the cause of Holofernes' death (Assmann ll. 367-69).

heaven. In the poem this concept is expressed in the character of Judith, whose firm faith and wisdom – *sapientia dei* – results in the successful defeat of Holofernes. Her role as the *exemplum admirandum* is, however, overshadowed by the character of the general. The poet very clearly defines Holofernes as a leader of men, who exhibits traditional aspects of the Germanic culture that was prevalent before the conversions of the sixth and seventh centuries, even if they are perverted by the general's vice and ignorance. Holofernes' *fortitudo* exists in name only, his rank and title made superfluous by his lack of faith.

The poet's focus on Holofernes and the elements that define Anglo-Saxon leadership are left unclear by a lack of provenance for the poem. Judith's ambiguous characteristics create further difficulty in that she connects to various times, persons and situations within Anglo-Saxon history. Whatever the poem's original purpose, the poet's emphasis on Holofernes rather than on Judith allowed the poem to survive as a timeless exemplar of what qualities are required in order to rule in a Christian society. The strong secular elements of Holofernes' character and actions suggest that it could have reflected a certain socio-political event, warning against the use of *fortitudo* without *anima* and *sapientia*.

It is possible that with a greater study of *exempla horrenda* in Anglo-Saxon literature the unique focus of *Judith* will be better understood. The amalgamation of various traditions in one poem – Old Testament, Christian and Germanic – creates a complex source of analysis for better understanding the Anglo-Saxon community. A broader examination of Old Testament literature adapted into Old English poetic form, with particular emphasis on the villainous figures therein, might assist in the understanding of *Judith* and its intricate portrayal of Holofernes as an *exemplum horrendum* of leadership.

Modern scholars pay close attention to the heroine, but relegate Holofernes to the less important role of antagonist. What this thesis has sought to develop is a new consideration of Holofernes, whom the poet describes with elaborate detail in a tradition where the Assyrian is otherwise discussed in simplified terms of vilification. It is the general, not Judith, who directs the events of the poem; his actions result in God's retaliation through his handmaiden, his death and those of his men. The poet draws out these elements, all of which exist in the original *liber*, in order to emphasise Holofernes' character as a false leader, who fails to embody the ideals of Anglo-Saxon, Christo-Germanic society.

## Holofernes, Judith and God

	<u>Holofernes</u>	<u>Judith</u>	<u>God</u>
1	hehstan brogan (4b)	gleaw on geðonce (13b)	ðam mæran þeodne (3a)
2	se gumena baldor (9b)	ides ælfscinu (14a)	þæs hehstan deman (4a)
3	ðam rican þeodne (11b)	þa eadigan mægð (35a)	frymða waldend (5a)
4	folces ræswan (12a)	ferhðgleawe (41a)	fæder on roderum (5b)
5	se rica (20b)	þa torhtan mægð (43a)	ðam ælmihtigan (7a)
6	egesful eorla dryhten (21a)	ða snoteran idese (55a)	þæt wuldres dema (59b)
7	goldwine gumena (22a)	seo halige meowle (56b)	þrymmes hyrde (60a)
8	se stiðmod (25a)	ða beorhtan idese (58b)	dryhten (61a)
9	se inwidda (28a)	nergendes / þeowen þrymful (73b-74a)	dugeða waldend (61a)
10	swiðmod sines brytta (30a)	ða wundenlocc (77b)	ða swegles weard (80b)
11	se gumena baldor (32b)	scyppendes mægð (78a)	nergend ealra / woruldbuendra (81b-82a)
12	ða niða geblonden (34b)	ða wundenlocc (103b)	frymða god (83a)
13	ealdor (38b)	ides ellenrof (109a)	<i>frofre gæst (83b)</i>
14	byrnwigena brego (39a)	seo snotere mægð (125a)	<i>bearn alwaldan (84a)</i>
15	se rica (44a)	þa ideas ba ellenþriste (133)	<i>ðrynesse ðrym (86a)</i>
16	nergende lað (45b)	collenferhðe (134b)	swegles ealdor (88b)
17	þæs folctogan (47b)	eadhreðige mægð (135a)	þearlmod þeoden gumena (91a)
18	se bealofulla (48b)	beahhrodene (138b)	mihtig dryhten (92b)
19	wigena baldor (49b)	glædmode (140a)	torhtmod tires brytta (93a)
20	se modiga (52b)	haligre (98a)	þæs hehstan deman (94b)
21	heora hearran (56a)	searodocol mægð (145a)	swegles ealdor (124a)
22	se brema (57b)	ides ellenrof (146a)	metod (154b)
23	burga ealdor (58a)	gleawhydig wif (148a)	cyninga wuldor (155a)
24	se deofulcunda (61b)	haligre (160b)	frymða god (189b)
25	þearlmod ðeoden gumena (66a)	ða þeodnes mægð (165a)	arfæst cyning (190a)
26	se rica (68a)	seo gleawe (171a)	mihtig dryhten (198a)

Appendix I: Character Epithets from *Judith*

	<u>Holofernes</u>	<u>Judith</u>	<u>God</u>
27	ðone wærlogan (71b)	seo æðele (176a)	dryhten god (299b)
28	laðne leodhatan (72a)	seo beorhte mægð (254b)	frea ælmihtig (300b)
29	þone atolan (75a)	seo æðele (256a)	weroda dryhten (342a)
30	se unsyfra / womfull (76b-77a)	ða halgan mægð (260a)	ðam ælmihtigan (345a)
31	þysne morðres brytta (90a)	metodes meowlan (261a)	ðam leofan dryhtne (346b)
32	þone hæðenan mannan (98b)	Iudithe gleawe lare (333)	
33	se bealofulla (100b)	mægð modigre (334a)	
34	laðne mannan (101b)	þære beorhtan idese (340b)	
35	ðæs unlædan (102a)	gearoþoncolre (341a)	
36	feondsceaðan (104a)		
37	þone hæðenan hund (110a)		
38	se fula leap (111b)		
39	þæs herewæðan (126a)		
30	þæs herewæðan (173a)		
41	ðæs laðestan (178b)		
42	hæðenes heaðorinces (179a)		
43	þæs bealofullan (248a)		
44	hlaforde (251a)		
45	se beorna brego (254a)		
46	se galmoda / egesfull and afor (256b-57a)		
47	ðone cumbolwigan (259b)		
48	þeodnes (268a)		
49	winedryhten (274a)		
50	goldgifan (279a)		
51	healdend (289a)		
52	se rinca baldor / swiðmod (338b-39a)		

## Assyrians and Bethulians

	<u>Assyrians</u>	<u>Bethulians</u>
1	ða yldestan ðegnas (10a)	wiggend (141b)
2	rondwiggende (11a)	weras wæccende (142a)
3	weagesiðas (16b)	folce ... / geomormodum (143b-44a)
4	bealde byrnwiggende (17a)	to leodum (147a)
5	fletsittendum (19a)	gumena (148b)
6	þæt fæge (19b)	ðam sigefolce (152a)
7	rofe rondwiggende (20a)	burhsittende (159b)
8	bencsittende (27a)	here (161b)
9	dryhtguman (29a)	folc (162b)
10	duguðe (31a)	þam burgleodum (175a)
11	fletsittendum (33a)	folc (176b)
12	ambyhtscealcas (38a)	sigerofe hæleð (177b)
13	lindwiggende (42a)	leoda ræswan (178a)
14	hæleða bearna (51a)	gumena (186b)
15	niðe rofra / ... rinca (53b-54a)	þam burgleodum (187a)
16	þa stercedferhðe / hæleð (55b-56a)	randwiggend (188a)
17	gumena ðreate (62b)	snelra werod (199a)
18	wiggend (69b)	cenra (200a)
19	weras winsade (71a)	cynerofo / secgas ond gesiðas (200b-01a)
20	sceaðena gemong (193b)	hæleð (203a)
21	folctogan (194a)	þeodguman (208a)
22	fæge frumgaras (195a)	heaðorincas (212b)
23	fynd (195b)	beornas (213a)
24	fægum (209a)	Ebreas (218b)
25	elðeodigra (215a)	grame guðfrecan (224a)
26	hæðenra (216a)	hæleð (225b)
27	Assyrium (218a)	landbuende (226a)
28	heardra gemong (225a)	ða magoþegnas (236a)
29	laðum cynne (226b)	weras Ebrisce (241a)
30	ealdgeniðlan (228b)	se egesa (252a)
31	Assiria oretmæcgas (232)	mægen Ebrea (253a)
32	niðhycgende (233a)	mægen (261b)
33	þæs herefolces (234a)	folc Ebrea (262a)
34	elðeoda (237a)	mægeneacen folc (292a)
35	ðæs herefolces heafodweardas (239)	sweot Ebrea (299a)

	<u>Assyrians</u>	<u>Bethulians</u>
36	þam yldestan ealdorþegnum (242)	hæleð higerofe (302a)
37	cumbolwigan (243b)	sceotend (304b)
38	medowerigum (245a)	guman Ebrisce (305b)
39	slegefæge hæleð (247a)	þegnas (306a)
30	werigferhðe (249a)	wiggend (312a)
41	wiggend (258a)	londbuendrum (314a)
42	Assyria (265a)	eðelweardas (320a)
43	beornas (267b)	seo cneoris (323b)
44	þa eorlas (273b)	mægða mærost (324a)
45	þara beadorinca (276a)	wlanc wundenlocc (325a)
46	wiggendum (283b)	ða ðeodguman (331a)
47	heriges (293a)	eorlas æscrofe (336a)
48	laðra gemong (303a)	
49	Assiria ealdorduguðe (309)	
50	laðan cynnes (310a)	
51	wælsceþ (312b)	
52	reocende hræw (313a)	
53	ðam laðestan (314b)	
54	ealdfeondum (315a)	
55	fynd (319b)	
56	ealdhettende (320b)	
57	laðost ... / cwicera cynna (322b-23a)	
58	gumena (328a)	

The Biblical Analogues of *Judith*

M. Griffith, in his 1997 edition of *Judith*, makes an important point regarding the variants among the Latin Bibles as “heterogeneous mixtures of readings from the Vulgate and the Old Latin version(s), and some Anglo-Saxons are known to have used both, or to have known readings of both” (47). The difficulty in ascertaining a direct source for *Judith* does not exclude the possibility that a *Vetus Latina* edition was its exemplar. There is strong thematic evidence alongside the more general lexical choices made by the poet that suggests a *Vetus Latina* rather than a *Vulgata* analogue for the poem. By comparing the textual tradition of the *Liber Iudith*, from the development of the *Septuagint* to the *Vetus Latina* and finally Jerome’s *Vulgata*, discrepancies reveal similarities between *Judith* and the Old Latin tradition.

What follows are select examples of such comparisons, each of which is important to the poet’s purpose when composing his poetic adaptation of the *Liber Iudith*. The similarities between the *Septuagint*, *Vetus Latina* and *Judith* may be minor in and of themselves, but collectively they represent a possible relationship between the Old Latin and Old English texts to the exclusion of the *Vulgata*.

## Example I

LXX 13:4	εἶπεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς (“said in her heart”)
VL 13:6	dixit in corde suo (“said in her heart”)
SV 13:6	orans cum lacrimis et labiorum motu in silentio (“praying with tears and movement of lips in silence”)
<i>Jud.</i> ll. 86b-87a	‘Pearle ys me nu ða / heorte onhæted’ (“Grievously in me now is [my] heart inflamed”)

As Judith prepares to pray, the *Septuagint* and *Vetus Latina* explain that she says her prayer ‘in her heart’. She speaks, not aloud, but internally, beseeching the almighty for strength. The image of the heart is not repeated in the *Vulgata*; instead, the heroine prays silently, moving her lips and crying as she asks God for strength. The additional detail in the *Vulgata* displays a weaker heroine, so as to further emphasise her inspired spirit after the prayer, when beheading Holofernes. The image of the heart reappears in *Judith*, also during the prayer section. While she speaks aloud, Judith says that her heart is inflamed and inflicted with anxieties.

Although the biblical reference to the heart implies a silent prayer, the retention of the heart in *Judith* focuses on her internal turmoil, whereas the *Vulgata* focuses on external reactions despite a silent prayer.

## Example 2

LXX 13:5	ποιῆσαι τὸ ἐπιτήδευμά μου εἰς θραῦμα ἐχθρῶν ("make my pursuit into the destruction of [my] enemies")
VL 13:7	et fac cogitationem meam in quassationem gentium ("and make my plan into an affliction of the people [Assyrians]")
SV 13:7	ut sicut promisisti Hierusalem civitatem tuam erigas ("so that you raise up your city of Jerusalem as you promised")
<i>Jud.</i> 1. 92b	'Gewrec nu mihtig dryhten' ("Avenge now mighty lord")

Again the *Septuagint*, *Vetus Latina* and *Judith* share a subtle similarity. In both prayers, emphasis is placed on the obliteration of the enemy. The Greek and Old Latin clearly state that Judith desires aid and she asks that her plans lead to the destruction – θραῦμα and *quassationem* – of the enemy. *Judith* beseeches God to avenge the wrongs done to her people with the imperative *gewrec*. This passionate request, entirely lacking from the *Vulgata*, is replaced with the simpler, less violent reminders of God's promise to protect the city and his people.

## Example 3

LXX 13:10	καὶ ἐνέβαλεν αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν πήραν τῶν βρωμάτων αὐτῆς. ("and put it into her bag of meats")
VL 13:11	et misit illud in peram escarum suarum ("and put it in their bag of food")
SV 13:11	et iussit ut mitteret illud in peram suam ("and ordered that she put it in her bag")
<i>Jud.</i> 11. 127-28	on ðam fætelse ... / ... hyra begea nest ("in the pouch...of both their food")

Discussed in Chapter Five (pp. 115-16), the Greek and Old Latin add the detail that the severed head of Holofernes was placed in a bag Judith's maid had

filled with kosher food. *Judith* imitates this by mentioning that it was the bag in which their (Judith and her maid's) food was brought to the Assyrian camp. There is no reference to the Judaic tradition of kosher food within the extant text, yet this detail remains. The *Vulgata* does not include this description, despite the retention of kosher eating on the part of Judith earlier in the text (SV, Idt. 12:9-19).

## Example 4

LXX 13:12	καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσαν οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως αὐτῆς τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῆς, ἐσπούδασαν τοῦ καταβῆναι εἰς τὴν πύλην τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν (“and it happened that when the men of her city heard her voice, they made haste to go down to the gate of their city”)
VL 13:14	Et factum est, cum audissent viri civitatis vocem ejus, festinaverunt descendere ad portam civitatis suae (“and it was done, when the men of the city heard her voice, they hastened to go down to the gate of their city”)
SV 13:14	Et factum est cum audissent viri vocem eius (“and it was done when the men heard her voice”)
<i>Jud.</i> ll. 160-62	syððan hi gehyrdon hu seo halige spræc / ofer heanne weall ... / wið þæs fæstengeates folc onette (“after they heard how the holy one spoke over the high wall ... the people hurried towards the fortress-gates”)

This section consists of two key points: firstly, that the men of Bethulia hear Judith's voice calling from over the wall; secondly, that the people hurry down to the city gates in order to welcome her. The former is shared between all four the texts; Judith's voice is heard and a reaction follows. However, the latter point – the people running hastily to the gates – appears only in the *Septuagint*, *Vetus Latina* and *Judith*. The *Vulgata* excludes this, transitioning from the people hearing Judith's voice directly to their calling of the elders.

## Example 5

LXX 13:13	καὶ ἤνοιξαν τὴν πύλην καὶ ὑπεδέξαντο αὐτάς (“and they opened the gate and received them”)
-----------	--

VL 13:16	Et aperuerunt portas, et susceperunt eas ("and they opened the gates, and received them")
SV ---	<i>No parallel text</i>
<i>Jud.</i> ll. 169b-70	ond ða ofostlice / hie mid eaðmedum in forleton ("and they then quickly, with humility, let them in")

The *Septuagint*, *Vetus Latina* and *Judith* all describe Judith's return and entry into Bethulia in the same way. After going down to the gates, the Bethulians open them and allow Judith and her maid to enter. There is no corresponding text for this passage in the *Vulgata*.

## Example 6

LXX 14:4	‘καὶ ἐπακολουθήσαντες ὑμεῖς καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες πᾶν ὄριον Ἰσραήλ, καταστρώσατε αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν.’ ("and you and all who inhabit the border of Israel, having pursued them, overthrow them in their path")
VL 14:5	‘Et subsecuti omnes vos, et universi qui incolunt omnem finem Israel, prosternite illos in viis suis.’ ("and you and all who inhabit the border of Israel, having pursued them, prostrate them in their path")
SV 14:5	‘cumque cognoveritis fugere illos ite post illos securi quoniam Dominus conteret eos sub pedibus vestris’ ("and when you will know them to flee, go after them securely, since God will destroy them under your feet")
<i>Jud.</i> ll. 191b-98	‘Berað linde forð ... / ... / Fynd syndon eowere / gedemed to deaðe ... / ... swa eow getacnod hafað / mihtig dryhten þurh mine   (h)and.’ ("Bear forth shields ... Your enemies are doomed to death ... as the mighty lord has shown to ye through my hand.")

In Judith's second speech, she informs the Bethulians that the Assyrians will flee in fear before the massed Hebrew army. The Bethulians are meant to pursue them and cut them down in the midst of their panicked flight. The *Septuagint* uses the verb καταστρώννυμι ("to lay low, cover or spread out") to imply a slaughter, with the dead left in their wake. The *Vetus Latina* agrees with this nuance, supplying

the imperative *prosternite* (“to overthrow, destroy or prostrate”) to elicit a similar sense of a path made of Assyrian carrion.

Jerome also describes the terrified enemy’s slaughter, but attributes the violent glory directly to God instead of the Bethulian army for the lord will trample the Assyrians under the feet of the Bethulians. *Contero* is defined in the Lewis and Short *Latin Dictionary* as “to grind, crumble or separate into small pieces,” which has a slightly different tone than to cut down or overthrow. The *Vulgata* implies a trampling of God’s enemy with the Hebrews acting as the instruments of destruction, grinding their enemy into dust.

The Old English poem, as with the *Vulgata*, references God’s position within the greater defeat of the Assyrians, but in terms of fate. Judith proclaims that the Assyrians are doomed to death because God has assured Bethulian victory. The actual battle, however, rests with the faithful, not the almighty. *Judith* also mentions ‘paths’ within the battle scene, discussed in Chapter Six (pp. 156-60), as do the *Septuagint* and *Vetus Latina*, but not the *Vulgata*.

Example 7

LXX 15:7	οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀναστρέψαντες ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς ἐκυρίευσαν τῶν λοιπῶν (“the sons of Israel, having returned from the slaughter, possessed the remains”)
VL 15:8	Filii autem Israel reversi ... dominati sunt reliquorum (“moreover the sons of Israel returned ... having control of the remains”)
SV 15:8	hii vero qui victores reversi sunt ad Bethuliam omnia quaeque erant illorum abstulerunt secum (“and they who returned [as] victors to Bethulia they brought with them all that was theirs”)
<i>Jud.</i> ll. 311b-13a	Cirdon cynerofe, / wiggend on wiðertrod, wælsce oninnan, / reocende hræw. (“The brave ones turned back, warriors in withdrawal, among heaps of slain, reeking corpses.”)

When the Bethulians finish routing and slaughtering the Assyrians, they return to the abandoned camp to obtain spoils. The Greek states that the sons of

Israel return from the slaughter (ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς), whereupon they find the remains of the emptied Assyrian camp. Κοπή is defined as “cutting into pieces or slaughter,” which recalls the actual routing of the enemy. Neither the *Vetus Latina* nor the *Vulgata* make reference at this part of the text to the dead Assyrians. This alteration by the Latin texts instead emphasises the Bethulian victory, which is also the victory of the faith over the non-believers. *Judith*, however, retains the mention of the slaughter as preceded by the *Septuagint*.

Example 8

LXX 16:19	καὶ ἀνέθηκεν Ἰουδίθ πάντα τὰ σκεύη Ὁλοφέρνηου, ὅσα ἔδωκεν ὁ λαὸς αὐτῇ, καὶ τὸ κωνωπεῖον, ὃ ἔλαβεν αὐτὴ ἐκ τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀνάθημα τῷ Θεῷ ἔδωκε. (“and Judith dedicated all the things of Holofernes, which the people had given her, and the canopy, which she took from his bed-chamber, and gave them as anathema to God”)
VL 16:23	Et donum dedit Judith omnia vasa Olofernīs, quaecunque dederat ei plebs; et conopeum, quod sustulit ipsa de cubiculo, dedit in consecrationem Domino. (“And Judith gave as gift all the equipment of Holofernes, which the people had given to her; and the canopy which she herself took from the bedroom, she gave in consecration to God”)
SV 16:23	porro Iudith universa vasa bellica Holofernīs quae dedit illi populus et conopeum quod ipsa sustulerat in anathema oblivionis. (“and Judith gave all the military equipment of Holofernes, which the people gave to her, and the canopy, which she herself had removed, as an anathema of oblivion”)
<i>Jud.</i> ll. 341b-42a	Ealles ðæs Iudith sægde / wuldor weroda dryhtne (“Judith ascribed the glory of these things to the lord of hosts”)

After the Bethulians pillage the Assyrian camp, Judith dedicates the spoils her people gave her to the glory of God. In the *Septuagint*, she dedicates or imparts (ἀνέθηκεν) all of Holofernes' items (πάντα τὰ σκεύη). Σκεύη, on its own, generically means “equipment, attire or apparel.” The *Vetus Latina* agrees with the Greek, supplying *vasa* for σκεύη, which can be something specific like a “utensil or dish” or more general as “apparatus or equipment.” Jerome includes the adjective *bellica* (“of or pertaining to war, military”) in his description of Holofernes' possessions, most likely in reference to the objects being spoils of war.<sup>97</sup>

In *Judith* we find an obvious corollary between the *vasa bellica* of the *Vulgata* and the military spoils taken in the poem. While discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five (pp. 130-35), the spoils reflect a military defeat, as the poem supplies a battle scene unprecedented in the biblical analogues. The *vasa bellica* of the *Vulgata* are acquired under different circumstances and while still ‘spoils of war’ there is no reference made by Jerome to suppose these items are anything more than basic camp equipment taken by the Bethulians. The Old English poem instead appears to follow its own purpose, obeying traditional Germanic customs, as in the banquet and battle scenes, rather than textual parentage.

There is a final point to make in regard to the actual dedication of spoils to God by Judith, which concerns the verbs chosen within the various texts. The first main verb the *Septuagint* supplies is ἀνέθηκεν (aorist, active, indicative, 3<sup>rd</sup> singular of the verb ἀνατίθημι). In a religious sense, ἀνατίθημι can mean “to dedicate” or “to set up as a votive offering.” It is followed by the verb δίδωμι (“to give”) but in the aorist, active, indicative, 3<sup>rd</sup> singular form ἔδωκε. The *Vetus Latina* and *Vulgata* use one verb, *dare* (*sustulerat* functions in a sub-clause) supplying it in the perfect, active, indicative, 3<sup>rd</sup> singular form *dedit*; the *Vetus Latina* also uses it in the pluperfect, active, indicative 3<sup>rd</sup> singular, *dederat*. A cognate of δίδωμι it also means “to give.” In *Judith* there are only seven words to compare to the other texts and among them, one verb: *sægde*, the preterite 3<sup>rd</sup> singular of the *secgan* (“to ascribe, say, speak,” BTASD 855-56).

---

<sup>97</sup> The addition of *bellica* is indeed curious. In SV 15:14, the list of Holofernes' possessions bequeathed to Judith include gold, silver, clothes, gems and all [his] furniture (*auro et argento et vestibus et gemmis et omni supellectile*, SV, Idt. 15:14). None of these items have a military purpose. It may be assumed that the *vestibus* mentioned was in fact armour, but traditionally *vestis* (“the covering for the body, clothes, clothing, attire, vesture; clothes, garments”) has a more generic meaning. To assume that Jerome meant ‘armour’ with no indication otherwise seems unlikely.

An obvious similarity between the *Septuagint* and *Judith* is found in their respective choice of verbs: ἀνέθηκεν and *sægde*. Both these verbs represent speech rather than a physical offering at the altar. If the poet sought to adapt his text to a Germanic culture, the *Septuagint* offers a convenient parallel. The heroine, both Greek and Anglo-Saxon, dedicates the spoils to God without the overt implication of relinquishing rights to the items. The contrasting use of *dare* in both Latin texts emphasises a possible surrender of the spoils in the name of God. The use of the term *consecratio*, in the *Vetus Latina*, allows for a general reading of the spoils as dedicated rather than abandoned. The inclusion of *oblivionis* in the *Vulgata*, however, implies that Judith wished to have nothing to do with Holofernes' possessions after their dedication.

### Conclusion

The number of discrepancies between *Judith* and the *Vulgata* indicate that the source material for the poem was either a corrupted edition of the *Vulgata* or, more likely, a version of the *Vetus Latina*. Based on the omissions and alterations made by the Anglo-Saxon scholar, the relationship between *Judith* and the *Vulgata* becomes more distant. The comparison of *Judith* to the *Vetus Latina*, on the other hand, reflects a possible analogue tradition for the Old English poem. It is because of these similarities between the *Vetus Latina* and *Judith* texts that I opt for the Old Latin as my standard biblical edition of the *Liber Iudith*, rather than the *Vulgata*.

Appendix III: Comparison of Judith-Texts

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>12:10</p> <p>καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τετάρτῃ, ἐποίησεν Ὀλοφέρνης πότον τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ μόνοις καὶ οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὴν χρῆσιν οὐδένα τῶν πρὸς ταῖς χρεῖαις.</p>	<p>12:10</p> <p>Et factum est, quarto die fecit Olofernus coenam famulis suis solis, et neminem vocavit ad coenam de necessariis</p>	<p>12:10</p> <p>et factum est quarto die Holofernus fecit cenam servis suis</p>	<p>7b-14</p> <p>Gefrægen ic ða Holofernus / winhatan wyrcean georne ond eallum wundrum þrymlíc / girwan up swæsendo. To ðam het se gumena baldor / ealle ða yldestan ðegnas; hie ðæt ofstum miclum / ræfndon, rondwiggende, comon to ðam rican þeodne / feran, folces ræswan. Þæt wæs þy feorðan dogore / þæs ðe Iudith hyne, gleaw on geðonce, / ides ælfscinu, ærest gesohte.</p> <p>15-25</p> <p>Hie ða to ðam symle sittan eodon, / wlance to wingedrince, ealle his weagesiðas, / bealde byrnwiggende. Þær wæron bollan steape / boren æfter bencum gelome, swylce eac bunan ond orcas / fulle fletsittendum; hie þæt fæge þegon / rofe rondwiggende, þeah ðæs se rica ne wende, / egesful eorla dryhten. Ða wearð Holofernus, / goldwine gumena, on gytesalum: / hloh ond hlydde, hlynede ond dynede, / þæt mihten fira bearn feorran gehyran / hu se stiðmoda stymde ond gylede,</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	Judith
<p>12:17-19 καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτήν Ὁλοφέρνης· πίε δὴ καὶ γενήθητι μεθ' ἡμῶν εἰς εὐφροσύνην. καὶ εἶπεν Ἰουδίθ· πίομαι δὴ, κύριε, ὅτι ἐμεγαλύνθη τὸ ζῆν μου ἐν ἐμοὶ σήμερον παρὰ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς γενεσέωζ μου. καὶ λαβοῦσα ἔφαγε καὶ ἔπιε κατέναντι αὐτοῦ ἃ ἠτόίμασεν ἡ δούλη αὐτῆς.</p>	<p>12:17-19 Et dixit ad illam Olofernisi: Bibe nunc nobiscum in jocunditate <sup>18</sup>Et dixit Judith: Bibam domino, quia magnificata est vita mea in me hodie, prae omnibus diebus nativitatis meae. <sup>19</sup>Et accipiens, Manducavit et bibit coam illo, ea quae praeparaverat ei ancilla sua</p>	<p>12:17-19 et dixit ad eam holofernisi bibe nunc et accumbe in iucunditate quoniam gratiam invenisti coram me <sup>18</sup>et dixit Iudith bibam domine quoniam magnificata est anima mea hodie prae omnibus diebus meis <sup>19</sup>et accepit et manducavit et bibit coram ipso ea quae paraverat illi ancilla eius</p>	<p>26-34a modig ond medugal, manode geneahhe / bencsittende þæt hi gebærdon wel. / Swa se inwidda ofer ealne dæg / dryhtguman sine drencte mid wine, / swiðmod sinces brytta, oðþæt hie on swiman lagon, / oferdrencte his duguðe ealle, swylce hie wæron deaðe geslegene, / agotene goda gehwylces. / Swa het se gumena aldor / fylgan fletsittendum, oðþæt fira bearnum / nealæhte niht seo þystre.</p>
<p>12:11, 15 καὶ εἶπε Βαγῶα τῷ εὐνούχῳ, ὃς ἦν ἐφροσθηκῶς ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ· πείσομαι δὴ πορευθεὶς τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν Ἑβραίαν ἣ ἐστὶ παρὰ σοί, τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν μεθ' ἡμῶν· καὶ διαναστάσα ἐκοσμήθη τῷ ἱματισμῷ καὶ παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ τῷ γυναικείῳ,</p>	<p>12:10, 15 <sup>10</sup>et dixit Bagoe spadoni, qui erat super omnia ipse: Vade nunc ad mulierem illam Hebraeam, quae est apud te, et suade ei, ut veniat manducare et bibere nobiscum <sup>15</sup>Et surgens, ornavit se vestibus, et omni muliebri ornatu</p>	<p>12:10, 15 <sup>10</sup>et dixit ad Bagao eunuchum vade et suade Hebraeam illam ut sponte consentiat habitare mecum <sup>15</sup>et surrexit et ornavit se vestimento suo</p>	<p>34b-37a Het ða niða geblonden / þa eadigan mægð ofstum fetigan / to his bedreste, beagum gehlæste, / hringum gehrodene.</p>
<p>12:12 ἰδοὺ γὰρ αἰσχρὸν τῷ προσώπῳ ἡμῶν, εἰ γυναῖκα τοιαύτην παρήσομεν οὐχ ὀμιλήσαντες αὐτῇ, ὅτι ἐὰν ταύτην μὴ ἐπισπασώμεθα, καταγελάσεται ἡμῶν.</p>	<p>12:11 Foedum est enim in conspectus nostro, ut mulierem talem omittamus non fabulantes ei: quoniam si non illam adduxerimus ad nos, deridebit nos.</p>	<p>12:11 foedum est enim apud Assyrios si femina inrideat virum agendo ut immunis transeat ab eo</p>	

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>12:13-14</p> <p>καὶ ἐξῆλθε Βαγώας ἀπὸ προσώπου Ὀλοφέρνηου καὶ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτήν καὶ εἶπε· μὴ ὀκνησάτω δὴ ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ καλὴ αὕτη ἐλθοῦσα πρὸς τὸν κύριόν μου δοξασθῆναι κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ πιεῖν μεθ' ἡμῶν εἰς εὐφροσύνην οἶνον καὶ γεννηθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ὡς θυγάτηρ μία τῶν υἰῶν Ἀσσοῦρ, αἱ παρεστήκασιν ἐν οἴκῳ Ναβουχοδονόσορ. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἰουδίθ· καὶ τίς εἰμι ἐγὼ ἀντεροῦσα τῷ κυρίῳ μου; ὅτι πᾶν, ὃ ἔσται ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ ἀρεστόν, σπεύσασα ποιήσω, καὶ ἔσται τοῦτο ἀγαλλίαμα ἕως ἡμέρας θανάτου μου.</p>	<p>12:12-14</p> <p>Et exiit Bagoas spado a facie Olofernus, et introivit ad illam, et dixit ei: Non pigeat puellam bonam venire ad dominum meum, ut honorificetur ante faciem ejus; et bibes cum eo vinum in jocunditate, et fies in hodierno die honorifica, sicut una filiarum principum Assyriorum, qui adsistunt in domo Nabuchodonosor <sup>13</sup>Et dixit ad illum Judith: Quae sum ego, ut contradicam domino meo? <sup>14</sup>quoniam omne quod erit optimum ante oculos ejus festinans faciam, et erit hoc mihi gaudium usque ad diem mortis meae.</p>	<p>12:12-14</p> <p>tunc introivit Bagao ad Iudith et dixit non vereatur bona puella introire ad dominum meum ut honorificetur ante faciem eius et manducet cum eo et bibat vinum in iucunditate <sup>13</sup>cui Iudith respondit <sup>14</sup>omne quod erit ante oculos eius bonum et optimum faciam quicquid autem illi placuerit hoc mihi erit optimum omnibus diebus vitae meae</p>	<p>37b-46a</p> <p>Hie hraðe fremedon, / anbyhtscealcas, swa him heora ealdor bebed, / byrnwigena brego: bearhtme stopon / to ðam gysterne, þær hie Iudithðe / fundon ferhðgleawe, ond ða fromlice / lindwiggende lædan ongunnon / þa torhtan mægð to træfe þam hean, / þær se rica hyne reste on symbe, / nihtes inne, nergendes lað, / Holofernus.</p>
<p>10:21</p> <p>καὶ ἦν Ὀλοφέρνης ἀναπαυόμενος ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κωνωπέῳ, ὃ ἦν ἐκ πορφύρας καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ σμαράγδου καὶ λίθων πολυτελῶν καθυφασμένων.</p>	<p>10:19</p> <p>Et erat Olofernus requiescens in lecto suo in conopeo, quod erat ex purpura, et auro, et zmaragdo, et lapidibus pretiosis contextum et nuncuaverunt ei de illa.</p>	<p>10:19</p> <p>videns itaque Holofernem Iudith sedentem in conopeo quod erat ex purpura et auro et zmaragdo et lapidibus pretiosis intextum</p>	<p>46b-54a</p> <p>Þær wæs eallgyldan / fleohnet fæger ond ymbe þæs folctogan / bed ahongen, þæt se bealofulla / mihte wliton þurh, wigena baldor, / on æghwylcne þe ðær inne com / hæleða bearna, ond on hyne nænig / monna cynnes, nymðe se modiga hwæne / niðe rofra him þe near hete / rinca to rune gegangan.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>12:15-16</p> <p>καὶ προσῆλθεν ἡ δούλη αὐτῆς καὶ ἔστρωσεν αὐτῇ κατέναντι Ὀλοφέρνηου χαμαὶ τὰ κώδια, ἃ ἔλαβε παρὰ Βαγῶου εἰς τὴν καθημερινὴν δίαιταν αὐτῆς, εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν κατακλινομένην ἐπ’ αὐτῶν. <sup>16</sup>καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα ἀνέπεσεν Ἰουδίθ, καὶ ἐξέστη ἡ καρδία Ὀλοφέρνηου ἐπ’ αὐτήν, καὶ ἐσαλεύθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦν κατεπίθυμος σφόδρα τοῦ συγγενέσθαι μετ’ αὐτῆς· καὶ ἐτήρει καιρὸν τοῦ ἀπατήσαι αὐτήν ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας εἶδεν αὐτήν.</p>	<p>12:15-16</p> <p>Et accessit ancilla ejus, et stravit illi contra Olofernem in terra stragula, quae acceperat a Bagoa spadoea. Et introiens Judith, discubuit. <sup>16</sup>Et expavit cor Olofernensis in ea, et commota est anima ejus: quia erat cupiens valde ut concumberet cum illa, et quaerebat tempus ut occurreret illi, ex die qua viderat eam.</p>	<p>12:15-16</p> <p>et ingressa stetit ante faciem eius <sup>16</sup>cor autem Holofernensis concussus est erat enim ardens in concupiscentia eius</p>	<p>54b-67a</p> <p>Hie ða on reste gebrohton / snude ða snoteran idese; eodon ða stercedferhðe / hæleð 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 widle ond mid womme besmitan. Ne wolde þæt wuldres dema / geðafian, þrymmes hyrde, ac he him þæs ðinges gestyrde, / dryhten dugeða waldend. Gewat ða se deofulcunda, galferhð, gumena ðreate, / bealofull his beddes neosan, þær he sceolde his blæd forleosan / ædre binnan anre nihte. Hæfde ða his ende gebidene / on eorðan unswæsligne, swylcne he ær æfter worhte, / þearlmod ðeoden gumena, þenden he on ðysse worulde / wunode under wolcna hrofe.</p>
<p>12:20</p> <p>καὶ ηὐφράνθη Ὀλοφέρνης ἀπ’ αὐτῆς καὶ ἔπιεν οἶνον πολὺν σφόδρα, ὅσον οὐκ ἔπιε πώποτε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ ἀφ’ οὗ ἐγεννήθη.</p>	<p>12:20</p> <p>Et jocundatus est Olofernensis super eam, et bibit multum vinum, quantum nunquam biberat ulla die ex qua natus est</p>	<p>12:20</p> <p>et iucundus factus est Holofernensis ad illam bibitque vinum nimis multum quantum nunquam biberat in vita sua</p>	<p>67b-69a</p> <p>Gefeol ða wine swa druncen / se rica on his reste middan, swa he nyste ræda nanne / on gewitlocan.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
13:1 Ως δὲ ὀψία ἐγένετο, ἐσπούδασαν οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ἀναλύειν. καὶ Βαγώας συνέκλεισε τὴν σκηνὴν ἔξωθεν καὶ ἀπέκλεισε τοὺς παρεστῶτας ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπόχοντο εἰς τὰς κοίτας αὐτῶν· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες κεκοπωμένοι, διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πλεῖον γεγονέναι τὸν πότον.	13:1-2 Et ut sero factum est, satagerunt servi ejus abire, et Bagoas conclusit tabernaculum a foris, et dimisit adstantes a facie domini sui, et abierunt omnes in cubilia sua: <sup>2</sup> erant enim omnes fatigati et soporati, quoniam plurimus factus erat potus:	13:1-2 ut autem sero factum est festinaverunt servi illius ad hospitia sua et conclusit Bagao ostia cubiculi et abiit <sup>2</sup> erant autem omnes fatigati a vino	67b-73a Gefeol ða wine swa druncen / se rica on his reste middan, swa he nyste ræda nanne / on gewitlocan. Wiggend stopon / ut of ðam inne ofstum miclum, / weras winsade, þe ðone wærlogan, / laðne leodhatan, læddon to bedde / nehstan siðe.
13:2 ὑπελείφθη δὲ Ἰουδὶθ μόνη ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ, καὶ Ὀλοφέρνης προπεπτωκῶς ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ περικεχυμένος αὐτῷ ὁ οἶνος.	13:3-4 derelicta est autem sola Judith in tabernaculo <sup>4</sup> Et Olofernis prociderat supra lectum suum: erat enim solutus a vino.	13:3-4 eratque Iudith sola in cubiculo <sup>4</sup> porro Holofernis iacebat in lecto nimia ebrietate sopitus	73b-77a Ða wæs nergendes / þeowen þrymful þearle gemyndig / hu heo þone atolan eaðost mihte / ealdre benæman ær se unsyfra, / womfull, onwoce.
13:6 καὶ προσελθοῦσα τῷ κανόνι τῆς κλίνης, ὅς ἦν πρὸς κεφαλῆς Ὀλοφέρνου, καθεῖλε τὸν ἀκινάκην αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	13:8 Et accedens ad columnam tabernaculi, quae erat ad caput Olofernis, deposuit pugionem ejus ab illa.	13:8 et haec cum dixisset accessit ad columnam quae erat ad caput lectuli eius et pugionem eius qui in ea ligatus pendeat exsolvit	77b-80a Genam ða wundenlocc, / scyppendes mægð scearpne mece, / scurum heardne, ond of sceaðe abræd / swiðran folme.
13:4 εἶπεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς·	13:6 et dixit in corde suo:	13:6-7 orans cum lacrimis et labiorum motu in silentio <sup>7</sup> dicens	80b-82 Ongan ða swegles weard / be naman nemnan, nergend ealra / woruldbuendra, ond þæt word acwæð:

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
13:4 Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς πάσης δυνάμεως,	13:7 Domine Deus omnium virtutum,	13:7 confirma me Domine Deus Israhel	83-88a 'Ic ðe, frymða god, ond frofre gæst, / bearn alwaldan, biddan wylle / miltse þinre me þearfendre, / ðrynesse ðrym. Þearle ys me nu ða / heorte onhæted ond hige geomor, / swyðe mid sorgum gedrefed.'
13:4, 7 ἐπίβλεψον ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν μου εἰς ὑψωμα Ἱερουσαλήμ• ... <sup>7</sup> καὶ εἶπε• κραταίωσον με, ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραήλ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ	13:7, 9 respice in hac hora ad opera manuum mearum, ut exaltetur Hierusalem, ... <sup>9</sup> et dixit: Domine confirma me Deus Israel in hodierno die:	13:7, 9 et respice in hac hora ad opera manuum mearum ... <sup>9</sup> et ait confirma me Domine Deus Israhel in hac hora	88b-92a 'Forgif me, swegles ealdor, / sigor ond soðne geleafan, þæt ic mid þys sweorde mote / geheawan þysne morðres bryttan. Geunne me minra gesynta, / þearlmod þeoden gumena: nahte ic þinre næfre / miltse þon maran þearfe.'
13:5 ὅτι νῦν καιρὸς ἀντιλαβέσθαι τῆς κληρονομίας σου καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ ἐπιτήδευμά μου εἰς θραῦμα ἐχθρῶν, οἳ ἐπανάστησαν ἡμῖν.	13:7 quia nunc est tempus suscipiendi haereditatem tuam: et fac cogitationem meam in quassationem gentium, quae insurrexerunt super nos.	13:7 ut sicut promisisti Hierusalem civitatem tuam erigas et hoc quod credens per te posse fieri cogitavi perficiam	92b-94a 'Gewrec nu, mihtig dryhten, / torhtmod tires brytta, þæt me ys þus torne on mode, / hate on hreðre minum.'
			94b-98a Hi ða se hehsta dema / ædre mid elne onbryrde, swa he deð anra gehwylcne / herbuendra þe hyne him to helpe seceð / mid ræde ond mid rihte geleafan. Ða wearð hyre rume on mode, / haligre hyht geniwod.

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
13:7 καὶ ἐγγίσασα τῆς κλίνης ἐδράξατο τῆς κόμης τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ	13:9 Et accedens ad lectum, comprehendit comam capitis ejus	13:9 cumque evaginasset illud adprehendit comam capitis eius	98b-103a Genam ða þone hæðenan mannan / fæste be feaxe sinum; teah hyne folmum wið hyre weard / bysmerlice, ond þone bealofullan / listum alede, laðne mannan, / swa heo ðæs unlædan eaðost mihte / wel gewealdan.
13:8 καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ δις ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτῆς καὶ ἀφείλε τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ,	13:10 et percussit in cervice ejus bis in virtute sua, et abstulit caput ejus ab illo,	13:10 et percussit bis in cervicem eius et abscidit caput eius	103b-111a Sloh ða wundenlocc / þone feondsceaðan fagum mece / heteþoncolne, þæt heo healfne forcearf / þone sweoran him, þæt he on swiman læg, / druncen ond dolhwund. Næs ða dead þa gyt, / ealles orsawle. Sloh ða earnoste / ides ellenrof oðre siðe / þone hæðenan hund, þæt him þæt heafod heafod wand / forð on ða flore.
16:17 δοῦναι πῦρ καὶ σκώληκας εἰς σάρκας αὐτῶν,	16:21 Da ignem, et vermes in carnes ipsorum,	16:21 dabit enim ignem et vermes in carnes eorum	111b-13 Læg se fula leap / gesne beæftan, gæst ellor hwearf / under neowelne næs ond ðær genyðerad wæs,  114-17a susle gesæled syððan æfre, / wyrnum bewunden, witum gebunden, / hearde gehæfted in helle bryne / æfter hinsiðe.

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>16:17 καὶ κλαύσονται ἐν αἰσθήσει ἕως αἰῶνος</p>	<p>16:21 ut comburantur, et sentiant usque in aeternum</p>	<p>16:21 ut urantur et sentiant usque in sempiternum</p>	<p>117b-21 Ne ðearf he hopian no, / þystrum forðylmed, þæt he ðonan mote / of ðam wyrmsele, ac ðær wunian sceal / awa to aldre butan ende forð / in ðam heolstran ham, hyhtwynna leas.</p>
<p>13:9 καὶ ἀπεκύλισε τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς στρωμνῆς καὶ ἀφείλε τὸ κωνωπεῖον ἀπὸ τῶν στύλων. καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον ἐξῆλθε, καὶ παρέδωκε τῇ ἄβρα αὐτῆς τὴν κεφαλὴν Ὁλοφέρνου,</p>	<p>13:10-11 et involvit corpus ejus a toro ipsius, et abstulit conopeum ejus a columnis. <sup>11</sup>et Et post pusillum exiit, et tradidit ancillae suae caput Olofernis,</p>	<p>13:10-11 et abstulit conopeum ejus a columnis et evolvit corpus ejus truncum <sup>11</sup>et post pusillum exivit et tradidit caput Holofernis ancillae suae</p>	<p>122-124 Hæfde ða gefohten foremærne blæd / Iudith ær guðe, swa hyre god uðe, / swegles ealdor, þe hyre sigores onleah.</p> <p>125-132a Þa seo snotere mægð snude gebrohte / þæs herewæðan heafod swa blodig / on ðam fætelse þe hyre foregenga, / blachleor ides, hyra begea nest, / ðeawum geðungen, þyder on lædde, / ond hit ða swa heolfrig hyre on hond ageaf, / higeþoncolre, ham to berenne, / Iudith gingran sinre.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>13:10</p> <p>καὶ ἐνέβαλεν αὐτήν εἰς τὴν πύραν τῶν βρωμάτων αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐξῆλθον αἱ δύο ἄμα κατὰ τὸν ἔθισμὸν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχήν· καὶ διελθοῦσαι τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἐκύκλωσαν τὴν φάλαγγα ἐκείνην καὶ προσανέβησαν τὸ ὄρος Βαιτυλοῦα καὶ ἤλθοσαν πρὸς τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς.</p>	<p>13:11-12</p> <p>et misit illud in peram escarum suarum.  <sup>12</sup>Et exierunt duae simul, secundum consuetudinem suam, quasi ad orationem; et transeuntes castra, gyraverunt totam vallem illam, et ascenderunt montem, et venerunt ad portam Bethuliae.</p>	<p>13:11-12</p> <p>et iussit ut mitteret illud in peram suam  <sup>12</sup>et exierunt duae secundum consuetudinem suam quasi ad orationem et transierunt castra et gyrantes vallem venerunt ad portam civitatis</p>	<p>132b-141a</p> <p>Eodon ða gegnum þanonne / þa idesa ba, ellenþriste, / oðþæt hie becomon, collenferhðe, / eadhreðige mægð, ut of ðam herige, / þæt hie sweotollice geseon mihten / þære wlitegan byrig wealles blican, / Bethuliam. Hie ða beahhrodene / feðelaste forð onettan, / oð hie glædmode gegan hæfdon / to ðam wealgate.</p> <p>141b-46a</p> <p>Wiggend sæton, / weras wæccende wearde heoldon / in ðam fæstenne, swa ðam folce ær / geomormodum Iudith bebead, / searoðoncol mægð, þa heo on sið gewat, / ides ellenrof.</p>
<p>13:11</p> <p>Καὶ εἶπεν Ἰουδὶθ μακρόθεν τοῖς φυλάσσουσιν ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν· ἀνοίξατε, ἀνοίξατε δὴ τὴν πύλην, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ποιῆσαι ἔτι ἰσχὺν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ κράτος κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, καθὰ καὶ σήμερον ἐποίησε.</p>	<p>13:13</p> <p>Et dixit Judith a longe eis qui custodiebant in turribus: Aperite, aperite nunc portam; nobiscum est Deus noster, qui dedit virtutem in Israel, et potestatem adversus inimicos, sicut hodie fecit et facturus est.</p>	<p>13:13</p> <p>et dixit Iudith a longe custodibus murorum aperite portas quoniam nobiscum est Deus qui fecit virtutem in Israhel</p>	<p>146b-58</p> <p>Wæs ða eft cumen / leaf to leodum, ond ða lungre het / gleawhydig wif gumena sumne / of ðære ginnan byrig hyre togeanes gan, / ond hi ofostlice in forlætan / þurh ðæs wealles geat, ond þæt word acwæð / to ðam sigefolce: 'Ic eow secgan mæg / þoncwyrd e þing, þæt ge ne þyrfen leng / murnan on mode: eow ys metod bliðe, / cyninga culdor; þæt gecyðed wearð / geond</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>13:12 καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσαν οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως αὐτῆς τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῆς, ἐσπούδασαν τοῦ καταβῆναι εἰς τὴν πύλην τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν καὶ συνεκάλεσαν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς πόλεως.</p>	<p>13:14 Et factum est, cum audissent viri civitatis vocem ejus, festinaverunt descendere ad portam civitatis suae, et convocaverunt majores natu plebis.</p>	<p>13:14 et factum est cum audissent viri vocem eius vocaverunt presbyteros civitatis</p>	<p>146b-58 (cntd. from above) woruld wide, þæt eow ys wuldorblæd / torhtlic toward ond tire gifeðe / þara læðða þe ge lange drugon.'</p> <p>159-61a Þa wurdon bliðe burhsittende, / syððan hi gehyrdon hu seo halige spræc / ofer heanne weall.</p>
<p>13:13 καὶ συνέδραμον πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου, ὅτι παράδοξον ἦν αὐτοῖς τὸ ἐλθεῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἤνοιξαν τὴν πύλην καὶ ὑπεδέξαντο αὐτὰς καὶ ἄψαντες πῦρ εἰς φράσιν περιεκύκλωσαν αὐτάς.</p>	<p>13:15-16 Et concurrerunt omnes, a minimo usque ad maximo: quoniam mirum erat eis reversam illam. <sup>16</sup>Et aperuerunt portas, et susceperunt eas; et incendentes ignem ad lumen, congryaverunt illam:</p>	<p>13:15-16 et concurrerunt ad eam omnes a minimo usque ad maximum quoniam speraverunt eam iam non esse venturam <sup>16</sup>et accendentes luminaria congryaverunt circa eam universi illa autem ascendens in eminentiori loco iussit fieri silentium cumque omnes tacuissent</p>	<p>161b-70 Here wæs on lustum; / wið þæs fæstengeates folc onette, / weras wif somod, wornum ond heapum, / ðreatum ond ðrymmum þrungon ond urnon / ongean ða þeodnes mægð þusendmælum, / ealde ge geonge. Æghwylcum wearð / men on ðære medobyrig mod areted, / syððan hie ongeaton þæt wæs Iudith cumen / eft to eðle, ond ða ofostlice / hie mid eaðmedum in forleton.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>13:15</p> <p>καὶ προελούσα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκ τῆς πύρας ἔδειξε καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἰδοὺ ἡ κεφαλὴ Ὀλοφέρνηου ἀρχιστρατήγου δυνάμεως Ἀσσοῦρ, καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ κωνοπεῖον, ἐν ᾧ κατέκειτο ἐν ταῖς μέθαις αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος ἐν χειρὶ θηλείας·</p>	<p>13:19</p> <p>Et proferens caput ejus de pera, ostendit, et dixit eis: Ecce caput Olofernus principis virtutis Assyriorum, et ecce conopeum, in quo recumbebat in ebrietate sua, et percussit illum Dominus in manu feminae.</p>	<p>13:19</p> <p>et proferens de pera caput Holofernus ostendit illis dicens ecce caput Holofernus principis militiae Assyriorum et ecce conopeum illius in quo recumbebat in ebrietate sua ubi et per manum feminae percussit illum Dominus Deus noster</p>	<p>171-86a</p> <p>Ða seo gleawe het, golde gefrætewod, / hyre ðinenne þancolmode / þæs herewæðan heafod onwriðan / ond hyt to behðe blodig ætywan / þam burhleodum, hu hyre æt beaduwe gespeow. Spræc ða seo ædele to eallum þam folce: / 'Her ge magon sweotole, sigerofoe hæleð, / leoda ræswan, on ðæs laðestan / hæðenes heaðorinces heafod starian, / Holofernus unlyfigendes, / þe us monna mæst morðra gefremede, / sarra sorga, ond þæt swyðor gyt / ycan wolde, ac him ne uðe god / lengran lifes, þæt he mid læððum us / eglan moste: ic him ealdor oðþrong þurh godes fultum.'</p>
<p>14:2</p> <p>καὶ ἔσται ἡνίκα ἂν διαφάνη ὁ ὄρθρος καὶ ἐξέλθῃ ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἀναλήψεσθε ἕκαστος τὰ σκεύη τὰ πολεμικὰ ὑμῶν καὶ ἐξελεύσεσθε πᾶς ἀνὴρ ἰσχύων ἔξω τῆς πόλεως καὶ δώσετε ἀρχηγὸν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὡς καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὸ πεδῖον εἰς τὴν προφυλακὴν υἰῶν Ἀσσοῦρ, καὶ οὐ καταβήσεσθε.</p>	<p>14:2</p> <p>et cum lucere coeperit, et exierit sol in terram, sumat unusquisque vestrum arma bellica sua, et exeat omnis vir in fortitudine potens extra civitatem, et date priores impetum in illos, tanquam descendentes in campum ad bellum adversus custodiam filiorum Assur.</p>	<p>14:2</p> <p>et erit cum exierit sol accipiat unusquisque arma sua et exite cum impetu non ut descendatis deorsum sed quasi impetum facientes</p>	<p>186b-97a</p> <p>'Nu ic gumena gehwæne / þyssa burgleoda biddan wylle, / randwiggendra þæt ge recene eow / fysan to gefeohte, syððan frymða god, / arfæst cyning, eastan sende / leohtne leoman. Berað linde forð, / bord for breostm ond byrnthomas, / scire helmas in sceaðena gemong, / fyllan folctogan fagum sweordum, / fæge frumgaras. Fynd syndon eowere / gedemed to deaðe ond ge dom agon, / tir æt tohtan ...'</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>13:14</p> <p>ἡ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· αἰνεῖτε τὸν Θεόν, αἰνεῖτε· αἰνεῖτε τὸν Θεόν, ὃς οὐκ ἀπέστησε τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ, ἀλλ' ἔθραυσε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν διὰ χειρός μου ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ.</p>	<p>13:17-18</p> <p>quae dixit ad eos voce magna: Laudate Deum, laudate Dominum nostrum. <sup>18</sup>qui non abstulit misericordiam suam a domo Israel: sed quassavit inimicos nostros per manum meam in hac nocte.</p>	<p>13:17-18</p> <p>dixit Iudith laudate Dominum Deum nostrum qui non deseruit sperantes in se <sup>18</sup>et in me ancillam suam adimplevit misericordiam suam quam promisit domui Israhel et interfecit in manu mea hostem populi sui in hac nocte</p>	<p>197b-98a</p> <p>'... swa eow getacnod hafað / mihtig dryhten þurh mine hand.'</p>
<p>14:11</p> <p>Ἦνίκα δὲ ὁ ὄρθρος ἀνέβη, καὶ ἐκρέμασαν τὴν κεφαλὴν Ὀλοφέρνηου ἐκ τοῦ τείχους, καὶ ἀνέλαβε πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραήλ τὰ ὄπλα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξήλθοσαν κατὰ σπείρας ἐπὶ τὰς ἀναβάσεις τοῦ ὄρους.</p>	<p>14:7</p> <p>Et postquam factum est diluculum, subierunt, et suspenderunt caput Olofernīs in muro, et accepit omnis vir arma sua, et exierunt secundum ordinem ad ascensum montis.</p>	<p>14:7</p> <p>mox autem ut ortus est dies suspenderunt super muros caput Holofernīs accepitque unusquisque vir arma sua et egressi sunt cum grandi strepitu et ululatu</p>	<p>199-205a, 212b-20a</p> <p>Þa wearð snelra werod snude gegearwod, / cenra to campe. Stopon cynerofe / seccgas ond gesiðas, bæron sigepufas, / foron to gefeohte forð on gerihte, / hæleð under helmum, of ðære haligan byrig / on ðæt dægred sylf. Dynedan scildas, / hlude hlummon. ... <sup>212b</sup>Stopon heaðorincas, / beornas to beadowe, bordum beðeahte, / hwealfum lindum, þa ðe hwile ær / elðeodigra edwit þoledon, / hæðenra hosp. Him þæt hearde wearð / æt ðam æscplegan eallum forgolden / Assyrium, syððan Ebreas / under guðfanum gegan hæfdon / to ðam fyrdwicum.</p>

Appendix III: Comparison of Judith-Texts

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
			<p>205b-12a</p> <p>Þæs se hlanca gefeah / 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, urigfeðera; / salowigpada sang hildeleoð, / hyrnednebba.</p> <p>220b-35</p> <p>Hie ða fromlice / leton forð fleogan flana scuras, / hildenædran of hornbogan, / strælas stedehearde. Styrmdon hlude / grame guðfrecan, garas sendon / in heardra gemang. Hæleð wæron yrre, / landbuende, laðum cynne, / stopon styrnmode, stercedferhðe; / wrehton unsofte ealdgeniðlan / medowerige. Mundum brugdon / scealcas of sceaðum scirmæled swyrd / ecgum gecoste, slogon earnoste / Assiria oretmæcgas, / niðhycgende. Nanne ne sparedon / þæs herefolces, heanne ne ricne, / cwicera manna þe hie ofercuman mihton.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>14:12</p> <p>οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἀσσοῦρ ὡς εἶδον αὐτούς, διέπεμψαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἡγουμένους αὐτῶν· οἱ δὲ ἦλθον ἐπὶ στρατηγοὺς καὶ χιλιάρχους καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα ἄρχοντα αὐτῶν.</p>	<p>14:8</p> <p>Filii vero Assyriorum, ut viderunt illos, miserunt ad duces, et ad tribunos suos, et ad omnes principes.</p>	<p>14:8</p> <p>quod videntes exploratores ad tabernaculum cucurrerunt</p>	<p>236-46a</p> <p>Swa ða magoþegnas on ða morgentid / ehton elðeoda ealle þrage, / oðþæt ongeaton ða ðe grame wæron, / ðæs herefolces heafodweardas, / þæt him swyrdgeswing swiðlic eowdon / weras Ebrisce. Hie wordum þæt / þam yldestan ealdorþegnum / cyðan eodon, wrehton cumbolwigan / ond him forhtlice færspel bodedon, medowerigum morgencollan, / atolne ecplegan.</p>
<p>14:13</p> <p>καὶ παρεγένοντο ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν Ὀλοφέρνηου καὶ εἶπαν τῷ ὄντι ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ· ἔγειρον δὲ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐτόλμησαν οἱ δοῦλοι καταβαίνειν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς εἰς πόλεμον, ἵνα ἐξολοθρευθῶσιν εἰς τέλος.</p>	<p>14:11-12</p> <p>Et venerunt ad tabernaculum Olofernīs, et dixerunt ad Bagoē, qui erat super omnia ejus: <sup>12</sup>Suscita dominum nostrum, quoniam ausi sunt filii Israel descendere ad nos in bellum, ut pereant usque in finem.</p>	<p>14:9-12</p> <p>porro hii qui in tabernaculo erant venientes et ante ingressum cubiculi perstreptentes excitandi gratia inquietudinem arte moliebantur ut non ab excitantibus sed a sonantibus Holofernīs evigilaret <sup>10</sup>nullus enim audebat cubiculum virtutis Assyriorum pulsando aut intrando aperire <sup>11</sup>sed cum venissent duces eius et tribuni et universi maiores exercitus Assyriorum dixerunt cubiculariis <sup>12</sup>intrate et excitate illum quoniam egressi mures de cavernis suis ausi sunt provocare ad proelium</p>	<p>246b-53a</p> <p>Þa ic ædre gefrægn / slegefæge hæleð slæpe tobredon / ond wið þæs bealofullan burgeteldes / werigferhðe hwearfum þringan, / Holofernus. Hogedon aninga / hyra hlaforde hilde bodian, / ærðonðe him se egesa onufan sæte, / mægen Ebreā.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>14:14</p> <p>καὶ εἰσήλθε Βαγώας καὶ ἔκρουσε τὴν ἀύλαίαν τῆς σκηνῆς· ὑπενόειτο γὰρ καθεύδειν αὐτὸν μετὰ Ἰουδίθ·</p>	<p>14:13</p> <p>Et introivit Bagoas, et pulsavit januam quae ante tabernaculum erat: suspicabatur enim illum adhuc cum Judith dormire.</p>	<p>14:13</p> <p>tunc ingressus Bagao cubiculum eius stetit ante cortinam et plausum fecit manibus suis suspicabatur enim illum cum Iudith dormire</p>	<p>253b-57a</p> <p>Mynton ealle / þæt se beorna brego ond seo heorhte mægð / in ðam wlitegan træfe wæron ætsomme, / Iudith seo æðele ond se galmoda, / egesfull ond afor;</p> <p>257b-74</p> <p>Næs ðeah eorla nan / þe ðone wiggend aweccan dorste / oððe gecunnian hu ðone cumbolwigan / wið ða halgan mægð hæfde geworden, / metodes meowlan. Mægen nealæhte, / folc Ebraea, fuhton þearle / heardum heoruwæpnum, hæfte guldon / hyra fyrngeflitu, fagum swyrdum, / ealde æfðoncan. Assyria wearð / on ðam dægeweorce dom geswiðrod, / bælc forbigeð. Beornas stodon / ymbe hyra þeodnes træf þearle gebylde, / sweorcendferhðe. Hi ða somod ealle / ongunnon cohhetan, cirman hlude, / ond gristbitian - gode orfeorme - / mid toðon, torn þoligende. Þa wæs hyra tires æt ende, / eades ond ellendæda. Hogedon þa eorlas aweccan / hyra winedryhten: him wiht ne speow.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>14:15</p> <p>ὡς δὲ οὐδεὶς ἐπήκουσε, διαστείλας εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κοιτῶνα καὶ εὗρεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς χελωνίδος ἐρριμμένον νεκρόν, καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ ἀφῆρετο ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>14:14</p> <p>Postquam vero nullus respondebat, aperuit, et introivit in cubiculum, et invenit illum jacentem nudum in testudine, et caput ejus sublatum ab eo:</p>	<p>14:14</p> <p>sed cum nullum motum iacentis sensu aurium caperet accessit proximans ad cortinam et elevans eam videns iacens cadaver absque capite Holofernus in suo sanguine tabefactum iacere super terram</p>	<p>275-80a</p> <p>Þa wearð sið ond late sum to ðam arod / þara beadorinca, þæt he in þæt burgeteld / niðheard neðde, swa hyne nyd fordraf. Funde ða on bedde blacne licgan / his goldgifan gæstes gesne, / lifes belidenne.</p>
<p>14:16</p> <p>καὶ ἐβόησε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ στεναγμοῦ καὶ βοῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ διέρρηξε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>14:14</p> <p>et exclamavit voce magna cum lacrymis et luctu, et scidit vestimenta sua</p>	<p>14:14</p> <p>et clamavit voce magna cum fletu et scidit vestimenta sua</p>	<p>280b-82</p> <p>Hi þa lungre gefeoll / freorig to foldan, ongan his feax teran, / hreoh on mode, ond his hrægl somod,</p>
<p>14:17</p> <p>καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν, οὗ ἦν Ἰουδιθ καταλύουσα, καὶ οὐχ εὗρεν αὐτήν· καὶ ἐξεπήδησεν εἰς τὸν λαὸν κρᾶζων·</p>	<p>14:15</p> <p>Et intravit in tabernaculum ubi erat Judith, et non invenit eam; et egressus est ad populum</p>	<p>14:15</p> <p>et ingressus tabernaculum Iudith non invenit eam et exilivit foras ad populum</p>	
<p>14:18</p> <p>ἠθέτησαν οἱ δοῦλοι, ἐποίησεν αἰσχύνην μία γυνὴ τῶν Ἑβραίων εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως Ναβουχοδονόσορ· ὅτι ἰδοὺ Ὀλοφέρνης χαμαί, καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.</p>	<p>14:16</p> <p>et dixit: Neglexerunt heri servi ejus, et fecit confusionem una mulier Hebraea in domo Regis Nabuchodonosor, quoniam ecce Olofernus in terra jacet, et caput ipsius non est in eo.</p>	<p>14:16</p> <p>et dixit una mulier hebraea fecit confusionem in domo regis Nabuchodonosor ecce enim Holofernus iacet in terra et caput ipsius non est in illo</p>	<p>283-89a</p> <p>ond þæt word acwæð to ðam wiggendum / þe ðær unrote ute wæron: / 'Her ys geswutelod ure sylfra forwyrd, / toward getacnod, þæt þære tide ys / mid niðum neah geðrunge, / þe we life sculon nu losian / somod æt sæcce forweorðan. Her lið sweorde geheawen, / beheafdod healdend ure.'</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>14:19</p> <p>ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν ταῦτα τὰ ρήματα οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς δυνάμεως Ἀσσοῦρ, τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτῶν διέρρηξαν, καὶ ἐταράχθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν σφόδρα, καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν κραυγὴ καὶ βοή μεγάλη σφόδρα ἐν μέσῳ τῆς παρεμβολῆς.</p>	<p>14:17-18</p> <p>Et audierunt verba haec presbyteri Assyriorum, sciderunt tunicas suas, et conturbata est anima eorum valde. <sup>18</sup>Et factus est clamor eorum in medio castrorum.</p>	<p>14:17-18</p> <p>quod cum audissent principes virtutis Assyriorum sciderunt omnes vestimenta sua et intolerabilis timor et tremor cecidit super eos et turbati sunt animi eorum valde <sup>18</sup>et factus est clamor incomparabilis in media castra eorum</p>	<p>289b-90a</p> <p>Hi ða hreowigmode / wurpon hyra wæpen ofdune,</p>
<p>15:2</p> <p>καὶ ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς φόβος καὶ τρόμος, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἄνθρωπος μένων κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ πλησίον ἔτι, ἀλλ' ἐκχυθέντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἔφευγον ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὁδὸν τοῦ πεδίου καὶ τῆς ὄρεινῆς·</p>	<p>15:1-2</p> <p>et incidit in illis timor et tremor. <sup>2</sup>et non erat homo qui staret ante proximum suum, sed diffusi unianimes fugiebant in omnem viam campi et montis:</p>	<p>15:1-2</p> <p>et solo tremore et metu agitati fugae praesidium sumunt <sup>2</sup>ita ut nullus loqueretur cum proximo suo sed inclinato capite relictis omnibus evadere Hebraeos quos armatos venire super se audierant fugientes per vias camporum et semitas collium</p>	<p>290b-91a</p> <p>gewitan him werigferhðe / on fleam sceacan.</p>
<p>15:3</p> <p>καὶ οἱ παρεμβεβληκότες ἐν τῇ ὄρεινῃ κύκλῳ Βαιτυλοῦα καὶ ἐτράπησαν εἰς φυγὴν. Καὶ τότε οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ, πᾶς ἀνὴρ πολεμιστὴς ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἐξεχύθησαν ἐπ' αὐτούς.</p>	<p>15:2-3</p> <p>et qui castra collocaverant circa Bethuliam, in fuga conversi sunt. <sup>2</sup>Tunc filiorum Israel omnis vir bellator diffuses est super illos.</p>	<p>15:3</p> <p>videntes itaque filii Israhel fugientes illos descenderunt clangentes tubis et ululantes post ipsos</p>	<p>291b-97a</p> <p>Him mon feaht on last, / mægeneacen folc, oð se mæsta dæl / þæs heriges læg hilde gesæged / on ðam sigewonge, sweordum geheawen, / wulfum to willan ond eac wælgifrum / fuglum to frofre. Flugon ða ða lyfdon / laðra lindwig.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>15:5</p> <p>ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ, πάντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔκοπτον αὐτοὺς ἕως Χωβά, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ παρεγενήθησαν καὶ ἐκ πάσης τῆς ὀρεινῆς, ἀνήγγειλαν γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὰ γεγονότα τῆ παρεμβολῆ τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ ἐν Γαλαὰδ καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ὑπερεκέρασαν αὐτοὺς πληγῇ μεγάλῃ, ἕως οὗ παρήλθον Δαμασκὸν καὶ τὰ ὄρια αὐτῆς.</p>	<p>15:6</p> <p>Et postquam audierunt filii Israel, omnes simul incubuerunt in illos, et conciderunt illos usque Choba. Similiter autem et qui in Hierusalem errant, venerunt ex omni montana; renuntiata sunt enim illis quae facta sunt inimicis eorum: et qui in Galaad, et qui in Galilaea erant, consecuti sunt eos, et interfecerunt illos plaga magna, quousque transirent Damascus et terminus eorum.</p>	<p>15:6</p> <p>omnis itaque regio omnisque urbs electam iuventutem misit armatam post eos et persecuti sunt eos in ore gladii quousque pervenirent ad extremitatem finium suarum</p>	<p>298b-311a</p> <p>him on laste for / sweot Ebrea sigore geweorðod, / dome gedysod. Him feng dryhten god / fægre on fultum, frea ælmihtig. / Hi ða fromlice fagum swyrdum, / hæleð higerofe herpað worhton / þurh laðra gemong, linde heowon, / scildburh scæron. Sceotend wæron / guðe gegremede, guman Ebrisce, / þegnas on ða tid þearle gelyste / gargewinnes. Þær on greot gefeoll / se hyhsta dæl heafodgerimes / Assiria ealdorduguðe, / laðan cynnes. Lythwon becom / cwicera to cyððe.</p>
<p>15:6-7</p> <p>οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Βαιτυλοῦα ἐπέπεσαν τῇ παρεμβολῇ Ἀσσοῦρ καὶ ἐπρονόμεισαν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπλούτησαν σφόδρα. <sup>7</sup>οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀναστρέψαντες ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς ἐκυρίευσαν τῶν λοιπῶν, καὶ αἱ κῶμαι καὶ αἱ ἐπαύλεις ἐν τῇ ὀρεινῇ καὶ πεδινῇ ἐκράτησαν πολλῶν λαφύρων, ἣν γὰρ πλῆθος πολὺ σφόδρα.</p>	<p>15:7-8</p> <p>Reliqui autem qui inhabitabant Bethuliam, incubuerunt in castra Assyriorum, et spoliaverunt eos, et locupletati sunt valde. <sup>8</sup>Filii autem Israel reversi a cacumine montis, dominati sunt reliquorum, et vicos, et civitates, et omnes campos obtinuerunt, et multa spolia possederunt; multitudo enim fuit magna.</p>	<p>15:7-8</p> <p>reliqui autem qui erant in Bethulia ingressi sunt castra Assyriorum et praedam quam fugientes Assyrii reliquerant abstulerunt et honestati sunt valde <sup>8</sup>hii vero qui victores reversi sunt ad Bethuliam omnia quaeque erant illorum abstulerunt secum ita ut non esset numerus in pecoribus in iumentis et universis mobilibus eorum ut a minimo usque ad magnum omnes divites fierent de praedationibus eorum</p>	<p>311b-18a</p> <p>Cirdon cynerofe, / wiggend on wiðertrod, wælsceol oninnan, / reocende hræw. Rum wæs to nimanne / londbuendum on ðam laðestan, / hyra ealdfeondum unlyfigendum / heolfrig herereaf, hyrsta scyne, / bord ond bradswyrd, brune helmas, / dyre madmas.</p>

Appendix III: Comparison of Judith-Texts

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>15:7?</p> <p>οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀναστρέψαντες ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς ἐκυρίευσαν τῶν λοιπῶν</p>	<p>15:8?</p> <p>Filii autem Israel reversi a cacumine montis, dominati sunt reliquorum</p>	<p>15:8?</p> <p>hii vero qui victores reversi sunt ad Bethuliam</p>	<p>318b-23a</p> <p>Hæfdon domlice / on ðam folcstede fynd oferwunnen / eðelweardas, ealdhettende / swyrdum aswefed. Hie on swaðe reston, / þa ðe him to life laðost wæron / cwicera cynna.</p>
<p>15:11</p> <p>καὶ ἐλαφύρευσε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἐφ' ἡμέρας τριάκοντα·</p>	<p>15:13</p> <p>Et spolia collegit populus multa per dies triginta.</p>	<p>15:13</p> <p>per dies autem triginta vix collecta est spolia Assyriorum a populo Israhel</p>	<p>323b-34a</p> <p>Þa seo cneoris eall, / mægða mærost, anes monðes fyrst, / wlanc, wundenlocc, wægon ond læddon / to ðære beorhtan byrig, Bethuliam, / helmas ond hupseax, hare byrnan, / guðsceorp gumena golde gefrætewod, / mara madma þonne mon ænig / asecgan mæge searoþoncelra. / Eal þæt ða ðeodguman þrymme geeodon, / cene under cumblum on compwige / þurh Iudithe gleawe lare, / mægð modigre.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	Judith
<p>15:11</p> <p>καὶ ἔδωκαν τῇ Ἰουδῖθ τὴν σικνην Ὀλοφέρνην καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀργυρώματα καὶ τὰς κλίνας καὶ τὰ ὄλκια καὶ πάντα τὰ σκευάσματα αὐτοῦ. καὶ λαβοῦσα αὕτη ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμίονον αὐτῆς καὶ ἔζευξε τὰς ἀμάξιας αὐτῆς καὶ ἐσώρευσεν αὐτὰ ἐπ' αὐτῶν.</p>	<p>15:14</p> <p>Et dederunt Judith tabernaculum Olofernīs, et omne argentums, et lectum, et apparatus illius: et cum accepisset Judith, imposuit super mulas suas, et junxit currus suos, et conguessit illa simul.</p>	<p>15:14</p> <p>porro autem universa quae Holofernīs peculiarīa fuisse probata sunt dederunt Iudith in auro et argento et vestibus et gemmis et omni supellectile et tradita sunt illi omnia a tradita sunt illi omnia a populo</p>	<p>334b-41a</p> <p>Hi to mede hyre / of ðam siðfate sylfre brohton, / eorlas æscrofe, Holofernes / sweord ond swatigne helm, swylce eac side byrnan / gerenode readum golde, ond eal þæt se rinca baldor / swiðmod sinceas ahte oððe sundoryrfes, / beaga ond beorhtra maðma, hi þæt þære beorhtan idese / ageafon gearoþoncolre.</p>
<p>16:19</p> <p>καὶ ἀνέθηκεν Ἰουδῖθ πάντα τὰ σκευῆ Ὀλοφέρνην, ὅσα ἔδωκεν ὁ λαὸς αὐτῇ, καὶ τὸ κωνωπεῖον, ὃ ἔλαβεν αὕτη ἐκ τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀνάθημα τῷ Θεῷ ἔδωκε.</p>	<p>16:23</p> <p>Et donum dedit Judith omnia vasa Olofernīs, quaecunque dederat ei plebs; et conopeum, quod sustulit ipsa de cubiculo, dedit in consecrationem Domino.</p>	<p>16:23</p> <p>porro Iudith universa vasa bellica Holofernīs quae dedit illi populus et conopeum quod ipsa sustulerat in anathema oblivionis</p>	<p>341b-45a</p> <p>Ealles ðæs Iudith sægde / wuldor weroda dryhtne, þe hyre weorðmynde geaf, / mærdæ on moldan rice, swylce eac mede on heofonum, / sigorlean in swegles wuldre, þæs ðe heo ahte soðne geleafan / to ðam ælmihtigan.</p>
<p>15:12-13</p> <p>καὶ συνέδραμε πᾶσα γυνὴ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ ἰδεῖν αὐτὴν καὶ εὐλόγησαν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῇ χορὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαβε θύρσους ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῆς καὶ ἔδωκε ταῖς γυναῖξι ταῖς μετ' αὐτῆς. <sup>13</sup>καὶ ἐστεφανώσαντο τὴν ἐλαίαν, αὕτη καὶ αἰ μετ' αὐτῆς, καὶ προήλθε παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἐν χορείᾳ ἡγουμένη πασῶν τῶν</p>	<p>15:15</p> <p>Et concurrerunt omnes mulieres Israel ad eam, ut viderent illam: et benedixerunt ei, et fecerunt illi choros ex se. Et accepit Judith tyrsos in manu sua, et dedit mulieribus quae cum ea erant; et coronavit se oliva, et eos qui secum erant.</p> <p>15:15: <i>Et omnes principes plebis Israel</i></p>	<p>15:15</p> <p>et omnes populi gaudebant cum mulieribus et virginibus et iuvenibus in organis et citharis</p>	<p>345b-46a?</p> <p>Huru æt þam ende ne tweode / þæs leanes ðe heo lange gyrnde.</p>

Septuagint	Vetus Latina	Vulgata Sacra	<i>Judith</i>
<p>15:12-13 (cntd. from above)            γυναικῶν, καὶ ἠκολούθει πᾶς ἀνὴρ            Ἰσραὴλ ἐνωπλισμένοι μετὰ στεφάνων καὶ            ὕμνων ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν.</p>	<p>15:15 (cntd. from above)  <i>praeibant ante populum: imperans            omnibus mulieribus: et sequebantur eam            omnes viri Israel cum armis et coronis, et            hymni erant in ore ipsorum.*</i></p>		
<p>16:13-16            ὑμνήσω τῷ Θεῷ μου ὕμνον καινόν·            Κύριε, μέγας εἶ καὶ ἔνδοξος, θαυμαστός            ἐν ἰσχύϊ, ἀνυπέβλητος. <sup>14</sup>σοὶ            δουλευσάτω πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις σου· ὅτι            εἶπας, καὶ ἐγενήθησαν, ἀπέστειλας τὸ            πνεῦμά σου, καὶ ᾠκοδόμησε· καὶ οὐκ            ἔστιν ὃς ἀντιστήσεται τῇ φωνῇ σου. <sup>15</sup>ὄρη            γὰρ ἐκ θεμελίων σὺν ὕδασι σαλευθήσεται,            πέτραι δὲ ἀπὸ προσώπου σου ὡς κηρὸς            τακήσονται, ἔτι δὲ τοῖς φοβουμένοις σε,            σὺ εὐλατεύεις αὐτοῖς. <sup>16</sup>ὅτι μικρὸν πᾶσα            θυσία εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας, καὶ ἐλάχιστον            πᾶν στέαρ εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμά σου· ὁ δὲ            φοβούμενος τὸν Κύριον μέγας            διαπαντός.</p>	<p>16:15-19            Hymnum dicamus Deo nostro, hymnum            novum cantemus Domino. <sup>16</sup>Adonai            Domine magnus es tu, et clarus, mirabilis            in virtute, et quem superare nemo possit.  <sup>17</sup>Tibi serviat omnis creatura tua: quoniam            dixisti, et factum est: misisti spiritum            tuum, et aedificata sunt, et non est qui            contra voluntatem tuam faciat. <sup>18</sup>Montes a            radicibus movebuntur cum aquis: petrae            autem a facie tua, sicut cera, liquescent.  <sup>19</sup>Illis autem qui timent te, propitius eris:            quoniam pusillum est omne sacrificium ad            odorem suavitatis tuae, et in minimo est            omnis adeps ad holocaustum: qui autem            timet Dominum, magnus est apud eum            semper.</p>	<p>16:15-19            hymnum cantemus Domino hymnum            novum cantemus Deo nostro <sup>16</sup>Adonai            Domine magnus es tu et praeclarus in            virtute et quem superare nemo potest <sup>17</sup>tibi            serviat omnis creatura tua quia dixisti et            facta sunt misisti spiritum tuum et creata            sunt et non est qui resistat voci tuae  <sup>18</sup>montes a fundamentis movebuntur cum            aquis petrae sicut cera liquescent ante            faciem tuam <sup>19</sup>qui autem timent te magni            erunt apud te prae omnia</p>	<p>346b-49            Pæs sy ðam leofan dryhtne / wuldor to            widan aldre, þe gesceop wind ond lyfte, /            roderas ond rume grundas, swylce eac            reðe streamas / ond swegles dreamas            þurh his sylfes miltse.</p>

\*Variant verse supplied by the Brepols *Vetus Latina Database*.

## Primary Sources

- Ælfric. *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch: Aelfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and His Preface to Genesis*. Ed. S. J. Crawford. EETS 160. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1922. Print.
- . *Lives of the Saints*. Vol. I. Ed. Walter M. Skeat. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966. Print.
- . *Lives of the Saints*. Vol. II. Ed. Walter M. Skeat. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966. Print.
- . *Ælfric's Colloquy*. Ed. G. N. Garmonsway. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1991. Print.
- Alcuin. *Epistola IX. Ad Lindisfarnensis*. PL 100. 150A-52A. Print.
- . *Epistola CLXIII. Ad Carolum*. PL 100.422C-28C. Print.
- . "Versus de Patribus Regibus et Sanctis Euboricensis Ecclesiae." *Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York*. Ed. Peter Godman, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983. Print.
- Aldhelm. *De Laudibus Virginitatis sive de Virginitate Sanctorum*. PL 89.103C-62A. Print.
- Assmann, B. 'Abt Ælfric's angelsächsische Homilie über das Buch Judith', *Anglia* 10 (1888): 76-104. Print.
- Augustine. *De Libero Arbitrio. Liber Tertius. Caput XXIV*. PL 32:1305-07. Print.
- . *De Civitate Dei Contra Paganos*. PL 41.13-804. Print.
- . *Confessions, Vol I: Books 1-8*. Trans. W. Watts. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1912. Print.
- . *Confessions, Vol II: Books 9-13*. Trans. W. Watts. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1912. Print.
- Bede. *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*. Ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1969. Print.
- Biblia Sacra Vulgata*. Robert Weber. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007. Print.
- Boniface. *Epistola III*. PL 89.690C-92A. Print.
- . *Epistola XVIII*. PL 89.711C-12B. Print.
- . *Epistola XX*. PL 89.713A-20B. Print.
- Bosworth, J. and T. N. Toller. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary based in the manuscript*

- collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*. Ed. T. N. Toller. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1898. (Reprint with supplement, 1921). Print.
- Briem, Ólafur, ed. "Hávamál." *Eddukvæði*. Reykjavík: Skálholt, 1968. Print.
- Caesar. *The Gallic War*. Trans. H.J. Edwards. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1917. Print.
- Dobbie, Elliott Van Kirk, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*. New York: Columbia UP, 1942. 55-57. Print.
- Eusebius. *Vita Constantini*. PG 20.910-1233. Print.
- Gildas. *The Ruin of Britain and Other Works*. Ed. John Morris. Trans. Michael Winterbottom. Chichester, U.K.: Phillimore & Co, 2002. Print.
- Green, W. C., trans. *The Story of Egil Skallagrimsson*. London: E. Stock, 1893. Print.
- Gregory I. *Regulae Pastoralis. Tertia Pars. Caput IV*. PL 77:54A-56B. Print.
- . *Epistola XXIX. Ad Bertham Anglorum Reginam*. PL 77:1141C-42D. Print.
- . *Epistola LXXVI. Ad Mellitum Abbatem*. PL 77:1214D-17A. Print.
- Gregory of Tours. *The History of the Franks*. Trans. O. M. Dalton. Oxford: Clarendon, 1927. Print.
- Gransden, Antonia, ed. *Abbo of Fleury's "Passio Sancti Edmundi"*. Maredsous: Abbaye De Maredsous, 1995. Print.
- Griffith, Mark, ed. *Judith*. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1997.
- Griffiths, Bill. *An Introduction to Early English Law*. Norfolk, England: Anglo-Saxon, 1995. Print.
- Isidori Hispalensis. *Etymologia. Liber Nonus. Caput III*. PL 82.341C-48B. Print.
- . *De Ebrietate (in Liber numerorum in sanctis Scripturis occurrentium)*. PL 83.649C-51A. Print.
- . *XLIX Concilium Toletanum Quartum. LXXV*. PL 84.363-90A. Print.
- Jerome. *Epistolae*. PL 22.550-732.
- . *Praefatio in Librum Judith*. PL 29.37-59

- Klaeber, F. *Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburg*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1950. Print.
- Krapp, George Philip, ed. *The Junius Manuscript*. New York: Columbia UP, 1931.
- . *The Vercelli Book*. New York: Columbia UP, 1932.
- and Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, eds. *The Exeter Book*. New York: Columbia UP, 1936.
- “Liber Iudith.” *Vetus Latina Database*. Brepols. Web. 14 May 2009. <<http://arts-itsee.bham.ac.uk/itseeweb/vetuslatina/vetuslatina.htm>>.
- “Liber Iudith, f. 716v-720r.” *La Bibbia Amiatina: riproduzione integrale su CD-ROM del manoscritto*. CD-ROM. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana: SISMELE, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2000.
- Lewis, C.T., Charles Short, E.A. Andrews, and William Freund, eds. *A Latin Dictionary, Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary. Rev., Enl. and in Great Part Rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975. Print.
- Liddell, Henry G., and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lucas, Peter J., ed. *Exodus*. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1994. Print.
- Nennius. *Historia Britonum*. Lampeter: Llanerch Press, 2005. Print.
- Paterculus. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Trans. F.W. Shipley. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1924. Print.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Books 8.22-10*. Trans. W.H.S. Jones. Vol. IV. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1935. Print.
- Plummer, Charles, ed. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel: With Supplementary Extracts from the Others*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965. Print.
- Rabanus Maurus. *Expositio in Librum Judith*. PL 109:539-92C.
- Saxo Grammaticus. *Gesta Danorum*. Mouzeuil-Saint-Martin: Bès éd., 2003. Print.
- Seneca. *Moral Essays*. Trans. J. W. Basore. Vol. I. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1958. Print.

- Septuaginta*. Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Tacitus. *Histories, Books 4-5. Annals, Books 1-3*. Trans. C.H. Moore and J. Jackson. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1931. Print.
- . *Agricola, Germania, Dialogus*. Trans. M. Hutton. Vol I. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1970. Print.
- Thorpe, Benjamin, trans. *Edda Saemunder Hinns Frôeta: The Edda of Saemund the Learned*. London: Trübner & Co., 1866. Print.
- William of Malmesbury. *Gesta Regum Anglorum*. Ed. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998.
- Wulfstan. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. Ed. Dorothy Whitelock. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1989.

#### Secondary Sources

- Allen, Michael J., and Daniel G. Calder, trans. *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry: The Major Latin Texts in Translation*. Vol. 1. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1976.
- Astell, A W. "Holofernes's Head: *Tacen* and Teachings in the Old English *Judith*." *Anglo-Saxon England* 18 (1989): 117-134.
- Baetke, Walter. *Die Aufnahme des Christentums durch die Germanen. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Germanisierung des Christentums*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973. Print.
- Belanoff, Pat. "The Fall(?) of the Old English Female Poetic Image." *PMLA* 104 (1989): 822-31. Print.
- . "Judith: Sacred and Secular Heroine." *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period: Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr.* Ed. Helen Damico and John Leyerle. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1993. 247-64. Print.
- Berkhout, Carl T., and James F. Doubleday. "The Net in Judith 46b-54a." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 74 (1973): 630-34. Print.
- Bjork, Robert E. "Speech as Gift in Beowulf." *Speculum* 69 (1994): 993-1022. Print.

- Blair, John. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- Brown, Carleton. "Poculum Mortis in Old English." *Speculum* 15 (1940): 389-99. Print.
- Brown, George H. "Old English Verse as a Medium for Christian Theology." *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*. Ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown. London: University of Toronto, 1986. 15-28. Print.
- Brown, Peter. *The World of Late Antiquity AD150-750*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2006. Print.
- Campbell, Jackson J. "Schematic Technique in *Judith*." *ELH* 38 (1971): 155-172.
- Carruthers, Leo. "Kingship and Heroism in *Beowulf*." *Heroes and Heroines in Medieval English Literature: a Festschrift Presented to André Crépin on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Ed. Leo M. Carruthers. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D.S. Brewer, 1994. 19-30. Print.
- Casiday, A.M.C. "St. Aldhelm on Apocrypha." *Journal of Theological Studies* 55 (2004): 147-57. Print.
- Chamberlain, David. "Judith: a Fragmentary and Political Poem." *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation*. Ed. Lewis E. Nicholans and Dolores Warwick Frese. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame P, 1975. 135-159. Print.
- Chance, Jane. *Woman as Hero in Old English Literature*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986. Print.
- Chaney, William A. "Paganism to Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England." *The Harvard Theological Review* 53 (1960): 197-217. Print.
- . *The Cult of Kingship in Anglo-Saxon England: The Transition from Paganism to Christianity*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1970. Print.
- Charles-Edwards, Thomas. "The Penitential of Theodore and the *Iudicia Theodori*." *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*. Ed. Michael Lapidge. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 141-71. Print.
- Cherniss, Michael D. "The Cross as Christ's Weapon: The Influence of Heroic Literary Tradition on *The Dream of the Rood*." *Anglo-Saxon England* 2 (1973): 241-52. Print.
- Chickering, Howell D. "Poetic Exuberance in the Old English *Judith*." *Studies in*

- Philology* 106 (2009): 119-36. Print.
- Clayton, Mary. "Ælfric's Judith: Manipulative or Manipulated?" *Anglo-Saxon England* 23 (1994): 215-227. Print.
- Clemons, Peter. "'Symbolic' Language in Old English Poetry." *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*. Ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown. London: University of Toronto, 1986. 3-14. Print.
- Cross, J. E. "The Ethic of War in Old English." *England Before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*. Ed. P. Clemons and K. Hughes. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1971. 269-282. Print.
- Damico, Helen. "The Valkyrie Reflex in Old English Literature." *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990. 176-90. Print.
- Damon, J.E. "Disecto Capite Perfido: Bodily Fragmentation and Reciprocal Violence in Anglo-Saxon England." *Exemplaria* 13 (2001): 399-432. Print.
- Day, Linda. "Faith, Character and Perspective in Judith." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 95 (2001): 71-93. Print.
- De Lacey, Paul. "Aspects of Christianisation and Cultural Adaptation in the Old English Judith." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97 (1996): 393-410. Print.
- Demacopoulos, George. "Gregory the Great and the Pagan Shrines of Kent." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1 (2008): 353-69. Print.
- Dempsey, G. T. "Aldhelm of Malmesbury's Social Theology: The Barbaric Heroic Ideal Christianised." *Peritia* 15 (2001): 58-80. Print.
- Deshman, Robert. "Benedictus Monarcha Et Monachus: Early Medieval Ruler Theology and the Anglo-Saxon Reform." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 22 (1988): 204-40. Print.
- Diesenberger, Maximilian. "Hair, Sacrality and Symbolic Capital in the Frankish Kingdoms." *The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages: Texts, Resources and Artefacts*. Ed. Richard Corradini, Max Diesenberger, and Helmut Reimitz. Leiden: Brill, 2003. 173-212. Print.
- Doubleday, James F. "The Principle of Contrast in Judith." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 72 (1971): 436-41. Print.
- Dubarle, A. M. "Les textes divers du livre de Judith: A Propos d'un Ouvrage

- Récent.” *Vetus Testamentum* 8 (1958): 344-73. Print.
- Duggan, Lawrence G. ““For Force Is Not of God”?: Compulsion and Conversion from Yahweh to Charlemagne.” *Varieties of Religious Conversion in the Middle Ages*. Ed. James Muldoon. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1997. 49-62. Print.
- Dunn, Marilyn. *The Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons C.597-C.700*. London: Continuum, 2009. Print.
- Enright, Michael J. *Lady with a Mead Cup: Ritual, Prophecy, and Lordship in the European Warband from La Tène to the Viking Age*. Dublin: Four Courts, 1996. Print.
- Estes, Jeide. “Feasting with Holofernes: Digesting Judith in Anglo-Saxon England.” *Exemplaria* 15 (2003): 325-50. Print.
- Evans, Stephen S. *The Lords of Battle Image and Reality of the ‘Comitatus’ in Dark-Age Britain*. New York: Boydell P, 1998. Print.
- Fanning, Steven. “Tacitus, *Beowulf*, and the Comitatus.” *The Haskins Society Journal* 9 (1997): 17-38. Print.
- Faulkes, Anthony. “Descent from the Gods.” *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 11 (1978-9 [1983]): 92-125. Print.
- Fee, Christopher. “*Beag & Beaghroden*: Women, Treasure and the Language of Social Structure in *Beowulf*.” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97 (1996): 285-94.
- . “*Judith* and the Rhetoric of Heroism in Anglo-Saxon England.” *English Studies* 78 (1997): 401-406. Print.
- Fell, Christine E. “Words and Women in Anglo-Saxon England.” *‘Lastworda Betst’*: *Essays in Memory of Christine E. Fell with Her Unpublished Writings*. Ed. Carole Hough and Kathryn A. Lowe. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2002. 198-215. Print.
- Foot, Sarah. “The Making of Angelcynn: English Identity before the Norman Conquest.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (1996): 25-49. Print.
- . “Remembering, Forgetting and Inventing: Attitudes to the Past in England at the

- End of the First Viking Age.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 9 (1999): 185-200. Print.
- Frank, Roberta. “Some Uses of Paronomasia in Old English Scriptural Verse.” *Speculum* 47 (1972): 207-26. Print.
- Garde, Judith N. *Old English Poetry in Medieval Christian Perspective: a Doctrinal Approach*. Cambridge: D.S.Brewer, 1991. Print.
- Garmonsway, G.N. “Anglo-Saxon Heroic Attitudes.” *Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honour of Francis Peabody Magoun*. Ed. Jess B. Bessinger and Robert P. Creed. London: Allen and Unwin, 1965. 139-46. Print.
- Geary, Patrick. *Before France and Germany: the Creation and Transformation of the Merovingian World*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. Print.
- Gilbert, Anthony J. “The Ambiguity of Fate and Narrative Form in some Germanic Poetry.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 22 (1992): 1-16. Print.
- Godfrey, Marie Flavia. “*Beowulf* and *Judith*: Thematizing Decapitation in Old English Poetry.” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 35 (1993): 1-43. Print.
- Gneuss, Helmut. “Dunstan und Hrabanus Maurus. Zur Hs. Bodleian Auctarium F. 4.32.” *Anglia* 96 (1978): 136-48. Print.
- Godlove, Shannon N. “Bodies as Borders: Cannibalism and Conversion in the Old English *Andreas*.” *Studies in Philology* 106 (2009): 137-60. Print.
- Green, D.H. “From Germania to Europe: The Evidence of Language and History.” *MHRA* 92 (1997): xxix-xxxviii. Print.
- . *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.
- Greenfield, Stanley B. *The Interpretation of Old English Poems*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972. Print.
- Häcker, Martina. “The Original Length of the Old English *Judith*. More Doubt(s) on the ‘Missing Text’.” *Leeds Studies in English* 27 (1996): 1-18. Print.
- Hall, Alaric. *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell, 2007. Print.
- Hamilton, Marie Padgett. “The Religious Principle in *Beowulf*.” *An Anthology of*

- Beowulf Criticism*. Ed. Lewis E. Nicholson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame P, 1963. 105-35. Print.
- Hanning, Robert W. *The Vision of History in Early Britain: From Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966. Print.
- Healey, Antonette DiPaolo. "Straining Words and Striving Voices: Polysemy and Ambiguity and the Importance of Context in the Disclosure of Meaning." *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*. By John Walmsley. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2006. 74-90. Print.
- Heather, Peter. *The Goths*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. Print.
- Herbert, Kathleen. *Peace-Weavers and Shield-Maidens: Women in Early English Society*. Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norfolk, England: Anglo-Saxon, 1997. Print.
- Hermann, John P. *Allegories of War: Language and Violence in Old English Poetry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan P, 1989. Print.
- . "The Theme of Spiritual Warfare in the Old English *Judith*." *Philological Quarterly* 55 (1976): 1-9. Print.
- Hicks, E. L. "Judith and Holofernes." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 6 (1885): 261-74. Print.
- Higham, N. J. *The Convert Kings: Power and Religious Affiliation in Early Anglo-Saxon England*. Manchester, UK: Manchester UP, 1997. Print.
- Hill, Joyce. "The Soldier of Christ in Old English Prose and Poetry." *Leeds Studies in English* 12 (1981): 57-80. Print.
- . "'Pæt wæs geomuru ides!' A Female Stereotype Examined." *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990. 235-47. Print.
- Hillgarth, J. N., ed. *Christianity and Paganism, 350-750: the Conversion of Western Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1986. Print.
- Horner, Shari. "Spiritual Truth and Sexual Violence: The Old English 'Juliana', Anglo-Saxon Nuns, and the Discourse of Female Monastic Enclosure." *Signs* 19 (1994): 658-675. Print.
- Howe, Nicholas. *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame P, 2001. Print.
- Hume, Kathryn. "The Concept of the Hall in Old English Poetry." *ASE* 3 (1974): 63-

74. Print.
- Huppé, B. F. *The Web of Words*. Albany, NY: State University of New York P, 1970. Print.
- Irving, Jr., Edward B. "Heroic Role-Models: Beowulf and Others." *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period: Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr.* Ed. Helen Damico and John Leyerle. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1993. 347-72. Print.
- Janzen, David. *The Social Meanings of Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible: A Study of Four Writings*. Danbury: Walter De Gruyter Inc., 2004. Print.
- Jonassen, Frederick B. "The Pater Noster Letters in the Poetic 'Solomon and Saturn'." *Modern Language Review* 83 (1988): 1-9. Print.
- Kaske, Robert E. "Sapientia et Fortitudo as the Controlling Theme of *Beowulf*." *An Anthology of Beowulf Criticism*. Ed. Lewis E. Nicholson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame P, 1963. 269-310. Print.
- . "Sapientia et Fortitudo in the Old English *Judith*." *The Wisdom of Poetry*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1982. 13-29. Print.
- Kennedy, Charles W., ed. *The Poems of Cynewulf*. New York: Peter Smith, 1949. Print.
- Kroll, Norma. "'Beowulf': The Hero as Keeper of Human Polity." *Modern Philology* 84 (1986): 117-29. Print.
- Lapidge, Michael. "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse." *Comparative Literature* 31.3 (1979): 209-31. Print.
- and Michael Herren, eds. *Aldhelm: The Prose Works*. Danbury: Boydell & Brewer, Inc., 1979. Print.
- Lemos, T M. "Shame and Mutilation of Enemies in the Hebrew Bible." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (2006): 225-241. Print.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Sacrifice and Salvation: Otherness and Domestication in the Book of Judith." "No One Spoke Ill of Her" *Essays on Judith*. Ed. James C. VanderKam. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992. 17-30. Print.
- Lieberman, Felix. *Die Gesetze Der Angelsachsen*. Aalen: Scientia, 1960. Print.

- Locherbie-Cameron, Margaret. "Wisdom as a Key to Heroism in Judith." *Poetica* 27 (1988): 70-75. Print.
- Lochrie, Karma. "Gender, Sexual Violence, and the Politics of War in the Old English *Judith*." *Class and Gender in Early English Literature*. Ed. Britton J. Harwood and Gillian R. Overing. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994. 1-20. Print.
- Loetscher, F. M. "St. Augustine's Conception of the State." *Church History* 4 (1935): 16-42. Print.
- Lucas, Peter J. "'Judith' and the Woman Hero." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 22 (1992): 17-27. Print.
- Magennis, Hugh. "Adaptation of Biblical Detail in the Old English *Judith*: The Feast Scene." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 84 (1983): 331-37. Print.
- . "The Cup as Symbol and Metaphor in Old English Literature." *Speculum* 60 (1985): 517-36. Print.
- . "Contrasting Narrative Emphases in the Old English Poem *Judith* and Ælfric's Paraphrase of the Book of Judith." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 96 (1995): 61-66. Print.
- . *Anglo-Saxon Appetites: Food and Drink and Their Consumption in Old English and Related Literature*. Dublin: Four Courts, 1999. Print.
- . "Gender and Heroism in the Old English *Judith*." *Writing Gender and Genre in Medieval Literature*. Ed. Elaine Treharne. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002. 5-18. Print.
- Mandel, Jerome. "Contrast in Old English Poetry." *The Chaucer Review* 6 (1971): 1-13. Print.
- Marsden, Richard. *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England*. CSASE 15. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.
- Matschi, Marion. "Color Terms in English: Onomasiological and Semasiological Aspects." *Onomasiological Online*. Ed. Joachim Grzega. Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, 2004. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. <<http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/matschi1041.pdf>>.
- McClure, Judith. "Bede's Old Testament Kings." *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society*. Ed. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill and Patrick Wormald. Oxford, England: B. Blackwell, 1983. 76-98. Print.

- McFadden, Brian. "Sleeping After the Feast: Deathbeds, Marriage Beds, and the Power Structure of Heorot." *Neophilologus* 84 (2000): 629-46. Print.
- Miller, William Ian. "Choosing the Avenger: Some Aspects of the Bloodfeud in Medieval Iceland and England." *Law and History Review* 1 (1983): 159-204. Print.
- Mitchell, Bruce. "Linguistic facts and the interpretation of Old English poetry." *Anglo-Saxon England* 4 (1975): 11-28. Print.
- Momma, Haruko. "Epanalepsis: A Retelling of the Judith Story in the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Language." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 36 (2003): 59-73. Print.
- Moore, Carey A. "Why Wasn't the Book of Judith Included in the Hebrew Bible?" *"No One Spoke Ill of Her" Essays on Judith*. Ed. James C. VanderKam. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992. 61-72. Print.
- Mullally, Erin. "The Cross-Gendered Gift: Weaponry in the Old English *Judith*." *Exemplaria* 17 (2005): 255-84. Print.
- Nelson, Marie. *Judith, Juliana, and Elene: three fighting saints*. New York: P. Lang, 1991. Print.
- Neuman de Vegvar, Carol. "Saints and Companions to Saints: Anglo-Saxon Royal Women Monastics in Context." *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and Their Contexts*. Ed. Paul E. Szarmach. Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1996. 51-93. Print.
- Nicholson, Oliver. "Constantine's Vision of the Cross." *Vigiliae Christianae* 54 (2000): 309-323. Print.
- North, Richard. *Heathen Gods in Old English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- Odahl, Charles. "God and Constantine: Divine Sanction for Imperial Rule in the First Christian Emperor's Early Letters and Art." *The Catholic Historical Review* 81 (1995): 327-52. Print.
- Odenstedt, Bengt. "Nuns and Midwives, Slaves and Adulteresses: Old English Terms Denoting Women." *New Trends in Semantics and Lexicography: Proceedings of the International Conference at Kazimierz, December 13-15, 1993*. Ed. Henryk Kardela and Gunnar Persson, *Acta Universitatis Umensis*:

- Umeå Studies in the Humanities* 127 (1995): 131–43. Print.
- Olsen, Alexandra Hennessey. “Inversion and Political Purpose in the Old English *Judith*.” *English Studies* 63 (1982): 289-293. Print.
- O’Keeffe, Katherine O’Brien. “The Book of Genesis in Anglo-Saxon England.” Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1976. Print.
- O’Sullivan, Sinéad. “Aldhelm’s *De Virginitate* - Patristic Pastiche or Innovative Exposition?” *Peritia* 12 (1998): 271-95. Print.
- . “The Image of Adornment in Aldhelm’s *De Virginitate*: Cyprian and his Influence.” *Peritia* 15 (2001): 48-57. Print.
- Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. London: Burns & Oates, 2002. Print.
- Parsons, Wilfrid. “The Mediaeval Theory of the Tyrant.” *The Review of Politics* 4 (1942): 129-43. Print.
- Pollington, Stephen. *The English Warrior: from Earliest times till 1066*. Norfolk U.K.: Anglo-Saxon, 2001. Print.
- . *The Mead Hall: The Feasting Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England*. Norfolk, England: Anglo-Saxon Books, 2003. Print.
- Potkay, Monica Brzezinski and Regula Meyer. Evitt. “Redeeming Ornament: Women in Old English Literature.” *Minding the Body: Women and Literature in the Middle Ages, 800-1500*. London: Twayne, 1997. 31-46. Print.
- Pringle, I. “Judith: the Homily and the Poem.” *Traditio* 31 (1975): 83-97. Print.
- Purdie, Edna. *The Story of Judith in German and English Literature*. Paris: H. Champion, 1927. Print.
- Rebenich, Stefan. “Jerome: The ‘Vir Trilingus’ and the ‘Hebraica Veritas’” *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993): 50-77. Print.
- Reid, George. “Canon of the Old Testament.” *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908. Web. 5 Sept. 2011 <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03267a.htm>>.
- Remley, Paul G. “The Latin Textual Basis of *Genesis A*.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 17 (1988): 163-89. Print.
- Renoir, Alain. “Old English Formulas and Themes as Tools for Contextual

- Interpretation.” *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*. Ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown, et al. London: University of Toronto, 1986. 64-79. Print.
- Reuter, Timothy. “Plunder and Tribute in the Carolingian Empire.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 35 (1985): 75-94. Print.
- Riché, Pierre and Guy Lobrichon, eds. *Le Moyen Age Et La Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984. Print.
- Richter, Michael. “Practical Aspects of the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons.” *Irland und die Christenheit*. Eds. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987. 362-76. Print.
- Ringe, Don. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- Robertson, A. J. *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*. New York: AMS Press, 1974. Print.
- Robinson, Fred C. *Beowulf and the Appositive Style*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1985. Print.
- Roitman, Adolfo D. “Achior in the Book of Judith: His Role and Significance.” “*No One Spoke Ill of Her*” *Essays on Judith*. Ed. James C. VanderKam. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992. 31-46. Print.
- Rollinson, Philip B. “The Influence of Christian Doctrine and Exegesis on Old English Poetry: an Estimate of the Current State of Scholarship.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 2 (1973): 271-84. Print.
- Rosier, James L. “The Uses of Association: Hands and Feasts in *Beowulf*.” *PMLA* 78 (1963): 8-14. Print.
- Russell, James C. *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. Print.
- Ryan, J. S. “Othin in England.” *Folklore* 74 (1963): 460-80. Print.
- Schücking, Levin L. “The Ideal of Kingship in *Beowulf*.” *An Anthology of Beowulf Criticism*. Ed. Lewis E. Nicholson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame P, 1963. 35-49. Print.
- Sharma, Manish. “Nebuchadnezzar and the Defiance of Measure in the Old English *Daniel*.” *English Studies* 86: 103-26. Print.

- Shippey, T. A. *Poems of Wisdom and Learning in Old English*. Cambridge, U.K.: D.S. Brewer, 1976. Print.
- Skemp, Arthur R. "The Transformation of Scriptural Story, Motive, and Conception in Anglo-Saxon Poetry." *Modern Philology* 4 (1907): 423-470. Print.
- Slusher, Jeffrey L. "Runic Wisdom in 'Njal's Saga' and Nordic Mythology: Roots of an Oral Legal Tradition in Northern Europe." *Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature* 3 (1991): 21-39. Print.
- Spiegel, Flora. "The Heroic Biography of Æthelflæd of Mercia and the Old English *Judith*: A Reexamination." *Quaestio* 5 (2004): 111-44. Print.
- Stanley, Eric. "Heroic Women in Old English Literature." *Heroes and Heroines in Medieval English Literature: a Festschrift Presented to André Crépin on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Ed. Leo M. Carruthers. Woodbridge, Suffolk, U.K.: D.S. Brewer, 1994. 59-70. Print.
- Stein, Leon. "Religion and Patriotism in German Peace Dramas during the 30 Years War." *Central European History* 4 (1971): 131-48. Print.
- Stenton, F. *Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1971. Print.
- Stocker, Margarita. *Judith, Sexual Warrior: Women and Power in Western Culture*. London: Yale UP, 1998. Print.
- Stuart, Heather. "The Meaning of OE \*ælfsciene." *Parergon* 2 (1972): 22-26. Print.
- Stuart, Howell. "The Anglo-Saxon Elf." *Studia Neophilologica* 48 (1976): 313-20. Print.
- Sundqvist, Olaf. "Aspects of Rulership Ideology in Early Scandinavia – with Particular References to the Skaldic Poem *Ynglingatal*." *Das frühmittelalterliche Königtum: Ideelle und religiöse Grundlagen*. Ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005. 87-124. Print.
- . *Freyr's Offspring: Rulers and Religion in Ancient Svea Society*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2002. Print.
- Swain, Larry J. "Ælfric of Eynsham's *Letter to Sigeward*: An Edition, Commentary, and Translation." Diss. University of Illinois at Chicago, 2008.
- Swanton, Michael J. *Crisis and Development in Germanic Society 700 - 800: Beowulf and the Burden of Kingship*. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1982. Print.
- . "Die altenglische Judith: Weiblicher Held oder frauliche Heldin."

- Heldensage und Heldendichtung im Germanischen*. Ed. Heinrich Beck. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1988. 289-304. Print.
- Taylor, Paul Beekman. "The Old English Poetic Vocabulary of Beauty." *New Readings on Women in Old English Literature*. Ed. Helen Damico and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990. 211-21. Print.
- Terasawa, Jun. "Ælfric's Judith: Is the Heroine a Model of Chastity or Patriotism?" *Text and Language in Medieval English Prose: A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi*. Ed. Akio Oizumi, Jacek Fisiak, and John Scahill. Frankfurt Am Main: Peter Lang, 2005. 269-77. Print.
- Timpe, D. "Zum politische Charakter der Germanen in der 'Germania' des Tacitus." *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte: Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65. Eds. P. Kneissl and V. Losemann*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988. 502-26. Print.
- Todd, Malcolm. *The Early Germans*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1995. Print.
- Tremaine, Hadley P. "Beowulf's *Ecg Brun* and Other Rusty Relics," *Philological Quarterly* 48 (1969): 145-150. Print.
- Underwood, Richard. *Anglo-Saxon Weapons and Warfare*. Grand Rapids, MI: Tempus Ltd., 1999. Print.
- Veale, Tony. "Metaphor and Metonymy: The Cognitive Trump-Cards of Linguistic Humour." Lecture. 8th ICLC: Cognitive Linguistics, Functionalism, Discourse Studies: Common Ground and New Directions. University of La Rioja, Spain, Logroño. 25 July 2003. *The Creative Language System Group at UCD*. 28 Feb. 2005. Web. 20 Nov. 2009. <<http://afflatus.ucd.ie/Papers/iclc2003.pdf>>.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. *Early Medieval History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975. Print.
- . *The Long-Haired Kings*. Toronto: University of Toronto in Association with Medieval Academy of America, 1982. Print.
- Walsh, Arlene. "The Depiction of Secular Women in Early Old English Poetry." *UNISA English Studies* 29.2 (1991): 1-7. Print.
- Wenisch, Franz. "Judith - Eine Westsächsische Dichtung?" *Anglia* 100 (1982): 273-

300. Print.

White, Caroline Louisa. *Ælfric: a New Study of His Life and Writings*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1974. Print.

Wonderly, William L. and Eugene A. Nida. "Linguistics and Christian Missions." *Anthropological Linguistics* 5 (1963): 104-44. Print.

Wood, Ian. "The Mission of Augustine of Canterbury to the English." *Speculum* 69 (1994): 1-17. Print.

Woolf, R. E. "The Devil in Old English Poetry." *Review of English Studies* 4 (1953): 1-12. Print.

Wright, Herbert G. "Good and Evil; Light and Darkness; Joy and Sorrow in *Beowulf*." *An Anthology of Beowulf Criticism*. Ed. Lewis E. Nicholson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame P, 1963. 257-67. Print.

Yorke, Barbara. *Kings and Kingdoms of Early Anglo-Saxon England*. New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.

---. "The Reception of Christianity at the Anglo-Saxon Royal Courts." *St. Augustine and the Conversion of England*. Ed. Richard Gameson. Stroud, Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1999. 152-73. Print.

---. "The Adaptation of the Anglo-Saxon Royal Court to Christianity." *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD300-1300*. Ed. Martin Carver. Woodbridge, U.K.: York Medieval Press, 2003. 243-57. Print.