Beyond "Germanic" and "Christian" Monoliths: Revisiting Old English and Old Saxon Biblical Epics

The notion of early medieval vernacular biblical epics, such as the Old English Genesis poems or the Old Saxon Heliand, as a meeting ground for the teachings of the Bible and the Germanic world has long been a staple of criticism. There are countless analyses arguing either for the "Germanization" of Christianity or the "Christianization" of Germanic, or "heroic," motifs in these texts; yet such an approach tends to suffer from a lack of reflection on what is imagined to be "Germanic" or, indeed, "Christian."[1] Too often, thematic studies are based on the assumption of a homogenous "Germanic" or "Christian" tradition from which a text derives,[2] and even very recent scholarship is still too dependent on binary and mutually exclusive categories. To identify certain components of a text as either "Christian" or "Germanic" is to underestimate the extent to which an image can fuse "Christian" or "Germanic" elements in order to draw on multiple resonances. Only a more inclusive view allows us to explore the emphases of a specific narrative structure in its particular context: texts that are both Germanic and Christian can take very different forms.

A new approach is needed to explicitly trace parallels and fundamental differences between poems in different styles and from different literary traditions. This heterogeneity in both theological focus and traditional Germanic influences is amply illustrated by the Old English poems on Genesis, contained in MS Junius 11, and the poetic corpus of Old Saxon, a closely related Germanic language. The poem commonly called Genesis B, a transliteration from the Old Saxon interpolated into the longer Old English Genesis A, is substantially different in narrative focus from the Old English text. Together with the surviving fragments of its Old Saxon antecedent, it does, however, show a certain affinity with the ninth-century Old Saxon gospel harmony which J. A. Schmeller, its first editor, named after its central figure, the Heliand. As shall be shown, all of these texts in alliterative meter may legitimately,

and somewhat tritely, be said to be both "Christian" and "Germanic," or "heroic," in nature. But it is the decision of which aspects of these two broad traditions to foreground that determines their specificity as texts and cultural artifacts: individual aspects of either tradition can be fused at points of what we may call thematic overlap.

The first step is then to become aware of these points at which aspects of "Germanic" or "Christian" themes are superimposed, which will help to highlight the heterogeneous origins and narrative foci of the individual texts.[3] As a second step, we may then retrace subtle distinctions and similarities between texts and attempt to integrate them into wider literary cultures. Unfortunately, and possibly due to the reticence of scholars of medieval English and medieval German to cross subject boundaries, comparative work on vernacular biblical epics is still rare. A valuable study of the Latin biblical epic and its influence in early medieval England has recently been produced by Patrick McBrine; yet he can only deal briefly with the poems of MS Junius and not at all with the Heliand.[4] Just as the biblical epics McBrine analyses are shown to differ significantly in literary method and narrative preoccupations, these vernacular poems deserve a more nuanced appraisal of their themes and terminology.

***

After the Second World War, most scholars were quick to distance themselves from the romantic fascination with pure "Germanic" motifs that E. G. Stanley criticized in The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism. The notion of "Germanicness," however, persisted unchallenged in popular consciousness. It also survived in the New Critical approach championed by Stanley B. Greenfield,[5] but this critical trend was supplanted by doctrinal interpretations, of which Bernard F. Huppé was the most prominent exponent.[6] Yet these tend to be similarly problematic in assuming a common exegetical, especially Augustinian, background for all texts. Studies like J. R. Hall's reading of the entire Junius Manuscript as an "epic of redemption" are more convincing,[7] being based on a single arrangement of texts rather than

on individual textual elements. At the same time, however, such readings are not designed to produce insights on individual poems, and indeed Hall makes no distinction between Genesis A and Genesis B in his analysis.

These same interpretational trends can be traced in scholarship on Genesis A. In 1974, Bennett A. Brockman claimed the Cain and Abel episode as a "peculiarly Germanic" scene within a Christian narrative,[8] stressing its social resonance. Conversely, while A. N. Doane speaks of a "bifurcated pedigree" in his 1978 standard edition, revised in 2013,[9] in practice this essentially means a distinction between "Germanic" form and doctrinal "Christian" content. Doane's view of "Germanic" elements as mostly superficial features of poetic language is of course partly justified: an instance of this is the generic application of the comitatus system by casting angels as "þegnas" (retainers) following their alliteratively linked "þeoden" (king), God (l. 15).[10] This can quite rightly be seen to encourage what Renée Trilling has more recently called a "Germanicized understanding" of spiritual obedience as personal loyalty.[11] Overall, however, this type of cultural and semantic transfer is too often described as purely one-sided: a doctrinal Christian truth expressed in terms comprehensible to a generically Germanic people.

More importantly, a focus on categories like "Germanic" or "Christian" prevents us from examining the narrative foci of individual texts, which are subsumed into these monoliths. The advantages of a comparative approach are evident in Patrick McBrine's recent survey of Latin biblical epics and their reception among scholars and poets in early medieval England. A nuanced perspective on Christian adaptational techniques in a classical, and especially Virgilan, style makes it possible for McBrine to compare Juvencus' "strong individual impression," achieved "rather quietly through his choice of words,"[12] with Sedulius' "more thematically driven" and exegetically inspired Carmen Paschale.[13] It is a testament to the endurance of the "Christian" and "Germanic" monoliths that even McBrine is

led to unspecifically refer to "Germanic heroism" in his discussion of Genesis A and Genesis B,[14] two widely diverging poems between which he eventually makes very little distinction.

Some recent studies offer more nuanced perspectives on Genesis A, which show that generically "Christian" or "Germanic" motifs can in fact point to specific cultural and exegetical backgrounds. Paul Battles identifies the "Anglo-Saxon migration myth" as an important narrative element within the supposedly purely biblical Babel episode:[15] the poem departs from traditional exegesis by introducing an account of purposeful migration, underlined by the repetition of the phrase "tofaran sceolde […] on landsocne" (ll. 1664-1665; should scatter … in search of land), "toforan þa […] on landsocne" (ll. 1697-1699; then scattered … in search of land). According to Battles, the narrative recalls the Anglo-Saxon migration to Britain and situates "the Anglo-Saxons' immediate, regional-tribal history within the larger framework of universal Christian history."[16] It is important to recognize this culturally specific process, especially since "the power of the vernacular to unite scriptural and ancestral history" was already described in relation to the Old English Exodus by Nicholas Howe in 1989.[17] Equally, we must be careful of supposedly purely "Germanic" episodes, as Andy Orchard's defense of a doctrinal reading of Abraham's victory in the War of Nine Kings shows. This seems to be a "wholly native invention" in the heroic mode,[18] playing with the traditional motif of the beasts of battle by having "freora feorhbanan | fuglas slitan || on ecgwale" (ll. 2088-2089; birds tear at the slayers of the free in the sword-slaughter). Yet it can also be read as an allegorical battle against vices in the tradition of Prudentius' Psychomachia.[19] Beyond exclusive labels and monolithic cultural origins, the specific character of Genesis A thus appears more clearly. It situates its unmistakably English, rather than generically Germanic, audience in relation to the chosen people, and, at points of possible thematic overlap between traditional and doctrinal motifs, draws on the specific exegetical potential of its martial episodes.

It is this type of reading that is proposed in this article: as a first step, pinpointing instances of thematic overlap, and the ways in which themes are adapted and combined, will make it easier to delineate narrative focus. The War of Nine Kings in Genesis A, for one, begs a more extensive analysis, as the examination of a single textual detail suggests. This detail is the word heorðwerod (hearth-band): its repeated use to refer to Abraham's retinue (ll. 2039; 2076) is probably based on a single occurrence of the Latin vernaculos or domesticos.[20] It obviously designates a chosen body of close familiars; indeed, earlier in Genesis A, it refers to Japheth's children and is varied as "sunu and dohtra" (l. 1606; sons and daughters). This compound only occurs once in another text, referring to Byrhtnoth's personal retainers in The Battle of Maldon (l. 24).[21] To the banal recognition of the battle scene as "Germanic," we must then add that the focus lies on few loyal retainers prevailing against a powerful enemy. It is this emphasis that is expressed in the climax, which has no direct biblical parallel:

næfre mon ealra
lifigendra her lytle werede
þon wurðlicor wigsið ateah
þara þe wið swa miclum mægne geræsde (ll. 2092-2095)

(Never did any man
among the living here with a small band
set out on a more honorable military expedition
than he who against such a great force did rush.)

The depiction of Abraham's men as a tight-knit band that heroically triumphs in battle seems designed to engage a secular audience; yet, as Orchard notes, it also reinforces the allegorical reading given by Bede, demonstrating "the value of faith in overcoming great odds with little resources."[22] Both senses may be derived from, and indeed encouraged by, this narrative

focus: this is the story of a small but faithful chosen people, which can be read as both biblical and English by its vernacular audience.

We must, in short, remain aware that Germanic biblical epics are the products of cultures incorporating both Christian and Germanic traditions. Their cultural resonance emphasizes specific aspects of both traditions, re-shaping them for the purposes of the specific text, instead of neatly slotting into a "Christian" or "Germanic" monolith. A view of the text as a specifically designed product of a heterogeneous cultural heritage can then lead us to reconstruct the text's individual appeal. Indeed, as the assumption of an undifferentiated exegetical or ideological background for the poet is problematic, so are pre-formed conceptions of the ideology of its audience.[23] To adapt Hugh Magennis' pronouncement on the audience of Beowulf: "A more fruitful question than what was the original audience of [a poem] might be what could [it] have been used for in Anglo-Saxon England."[24] To thus focus on use is to investigate the pragmatic effects of the text, the audience it constructs. It is not unreasonable to suspect that poems survived because their narrative managed to resonate with different yet parallel elements of a both Germanic and Christian culture, as we have seen in the case of Genesis A.[25] Monolithic categories have too long obscured divergences in narrative focus between texts, which indicate different constructed audiences and can thus be ascribed to different literary cultures.

***

The same kind of fixed categories have long hampered criticism of Genesis B. The poem's more obvious thematic indebtedness to certain aspects of "Germanic" tradition led Michael D. Cherniss to point out the neglected "dominance of heroic ideals" among Christian elements in 1969;[26] his reading is not without merit, if somewhat categorical in asserting that the text's "Germanic" appeal supplants its biblical message, making it "essentially a heroic poem."[27] Conversely, impressive doctrinal readings of the text as based on Gregorian theology have been produced, most notably by Thomas D. Hill in 1975,[28] as well as by Andrew Cole in

2001.[29] The danger, here as elsewhere, however, is to treat Genesis B simply as an Old English theological text, and to presuppose a homogenous ideological background. As in the case of Genesis A, it is more rewarding, instead of retracing an exclusive ideological source, to examine the fusion of various themes and their adaptation to the individual poetic framework of the text.

A major step came in 1991, when two new editions of Genesis B together with the fragments of the Old Saxon Genesis were published: one, by Ute Schwab, in German and including reproductions of the manuscripts,[30] and a more extensive English edition by A. N. Doane.[31] This has paved the way for comparative approaches to Genesis B and its Old Saxon source, which in turn allows us to better discern both texts' thematic and narrative focus. Doane also prints the 26 lines for which both poems overlap with the Old English passage facing its Old Saxon source; this makes it possible to appreciate how the poem has been altered by its transliteration into Old English. Above all, a more detailed analysis of both texts makes it easier to move beyond general categories such as "Germanic" or "Christian" and find the points of thematic overlap at which both traditions have been fused. The two texts stand at the intersection between two closely related yet different literary corpora, Old English and Old Saxon, each both Christian and Germanic. These subtle differences can be revealed by their narrative focus.

An obvious feature of Genesis B—and its Old Saxon source—is its remarkable emphasis on close personal relations and interdependence. There is, first of all, Adam and Eve's relation to God: Eve's statement that "his [God's] hyldo is unc betere || to gewinnanne | þonne his wiðermedo" (ll. 659-660; it is better for us two to win God's favor than his hostility) highlights the couple's direct dependence on God's favor;[32] it also emphasizes the binary choice between submission and rejection as part of a reciprocal arrangement, guaranteeing security in return for acceptable performance. At the same time, as Daniel Anlezark remarks, the use of the dual to refer to the couple underscores their intimacy,[33] and

it implicitly refers to them in terms of their relationship of mutual co-dependency. But Eve is also subordinate to Adam, "hire hearran" (l. 654; her lord); she in turn advocates subjection to the disguised demonic messenger as a hierarchical link between the couple and God: "unc is his [the messenger's] hyldo þearf" (l. 664; we two have need of his favor). The narrative is clearly concerned with establishing a hierarchy within a closely interconnected group of central figures; the theme of hyldo as an interpersonal link of patronage is thus crucial to an understanding of the text. It frames loyalty to God in terms of hierarchy and the acceptance of imposed order for personal benefit.

Even more remarkable is that the same principles of favor and close interpersonal connections also apply to the fallen angels. As A. N. Doane points out in the commentary to his edition, modern readers will miss the original introduction of "a subordinate devil who volunteered or was chosen in some way for the mission to Eden in the text lost after [line] 441;"[34] this loss today reinforces the effect of the subsequent use of "godes andsaca" (l. 442; God's enemy) as a primary designation for the messenger rather than Satan himself. It ties the subordinate devil directly—if negatively—to God and clearly positions him within the hierarchy of chosen loyalty. In a very similar fashion, the messenger's dual use in "unc wearð god yrre" (l. 740; God became angry with us two) highlights his link to Satan and establishes the two fallen angels as a parallel hierarchical couple to Adam and Eve. In Genesis B, the biblical narrative is transformed into a study of personal status and social links between all characters: the recognition of this narrative emphasis provides the key to identifying the loci of potential thematic overlap within the poem, points which engage an audience that is both Christian and Germanic.

It is easy to apply conceptions of social hierarchy to a story visualized in such terms: as Peter J. Lucas writes, "the motif of the Germanic comitatus is more or less integral to the interpretation of whole episodes."[35] Satan's proud rejection of due authority in Genesis B, "nis me wihtæ þearf || hearran to habbanne" (ll. 278-279; I have no need at all to have a lord),

mirrors his subsequent fall as God "acwæð hine þa fram his hyldo" (l. 304; declared him then to be out of his favor). The relationship with God is a bilateral social contract: rejection of the terms by one party prompts an equal reaction by the second party. Yet despite Satan's fall, the same type of contract operates between him and his messenger: "nu hæbbe ic þine hyldo me || witode geworhte" (ll. 726-727; now have I made certain of your favor towards me), exclaims the messenger after his work is done. Temptation consists of having Adam and Eve reject one social contract for another, so that they should later "feondum þeowian" (l. 488; serve fiends). Again the dual appears as a means to create intimacy, this time used by the snake towards Eve: "swa wit him butu || an sped sprecað" (ll. 574-575; so we two both may speak to him with success); this budding link between the two lowest-ranking characters in each parallel hierarchy becomes part of the tempter's insidious strategy to provoke a shift of allegiance.[36] This social approach may be summarized in Michael D. Cherniss' words: "pride becomes the violation of the social hierarchy;"[37] the biblical story can thus be understood within the framework of personal loyalty.

Conversely, theological readings of Genesis B highlight alternative modes of understanding: according to Thomas D. Hill, the narrative presents an allegorical "subversion of hierarchy" that accords with the Gregorian model of sin as exactly such a subversion.[38] It is perfectly reasonable to accept this reading, as well as Cole's linking to Gregorian theology based on apocryphal sources,[39] as possibly complementary to purely social interpretations: above all, we must recognize that both modes of reading suggest credible cultural resonances that can account for the text's narrative structure and its literary appeal. A complementary view is more difficult in the case of other doctrinal readings like Margaret J. Erhart's: in her sophisticated analysis of relationships in Genesis B, she argues that the apparently secular concept of hyldo (favor) is in fact closely associated with the following of Christian teachings, lar (teachings): as Adam and Eve lament after the fall, they have "hyldo godes, || lare forlæten" (ll. 771-772; neglected God's favor, [his] teachings). The relationships Erhart

traces are those of teacher and disciple rather than lord and retainer.[40] Yet, perhaps, some nuance is lost in asserting the dominance of one set of cultural resonances over another: as the variation of hyldo as lar in the quotation above suggests, neither of these terms, along with the traditions they represent, exists in isolation from the other.

In fact, the association of Christian concepts with terms of social hierarchy that Erhart traces parallels the general semantic trend that D. H. Green identifies regarding the term huldi and its cognates in different Germanic languages: its double sense of both Christian faith and as feudal following results from its "adaptation to christian ends by an extension of its feudal function."[41] The term, it is true, acquires a Christian meaning as a result of this semantic shift; but the Christian idea it designates remains conceptualized in feudal terms. Turning back to Erhart's reading of Genesis B, we may posit that the doctrinal reading she proposes can only exist in superposition with a social interpretation. Thus the poem's narrative structure becomes a place of thematic overlap: hyldo as a central narrative theme insures the text's theological and social resonance. While, however, these interpretations coexist, they draw on very specific Germanic and Christian elements: hyldo, the loyalty between lord and retainer within the comitatus system, and lar, the doctrinal faithfulness of students to their teacher. Through selective narrative principles and the fusion of these two themes, the poem constructs a field of resonance that relies, for its social and theological effect, on the implications of a structure of personal and ideological loyalty: what emerges is a text concerned with the establishment and the preservation of social and religious hierarchy.

This emphasis on the individual's role in a hierarchical system of loyalty in found, in even stronger form, in the Old Saxon original, which is partially preserved in the ninth-century Vatican MS Palatinus Latinus 1447. Early in the surviving fragment, Adam's exclamation that "uuit ebbiat unk giduan mahtigna god, || waldand, uureda[n]" (ll. 23-24; we two have made mighty God, our lord, angry with us both) positions God's wrath as a direct effect of the couple's actions;[42] they are the subject, God the object. Thus the onus to act and

comply lies with the couple. As A. N. Doane's comparison of the 26 lines present in both texts shows, this direct responsibility is lost in the transliterated Old English text,[43] which simply has the statement "ac unc is mihtig god, || waldend, wraðmod" (ll. 814-815; and mighty God our lord is angry with us two). The Old Saxon phrasing has the effect of reinforcing the emphasis on the performative aspect of loyalty to their lord and teacher: deviation in act from the role of retainer and disciple breaks the interpersonal pact and results in the loss of God's huldi. At the same time, the importance of performance allows for another central point to emerge: because huldi is lost through action, it may be regained by action. Although they disobey God, they do not directly reject him: they may be cast out of Eden, but are not quite forsaken. Later fulfillment of the contract to regain God's huldi is not out of the question.

That this importance of individual relationships within a Germanic and Christian framework does indeed generally set the Saxon Genesis apart from Genesis A may be seen in a comparison of the two poems; for this, we return to the Abel and Cain episode. In the Old Saxon fragment, Cain's crime is conceptualized as an act of personal offence against God: "ik ni uuelda mina triuuua haldan" (l. 66; I did not want to hold my loyalty); this breach of the comitatus code parallels Satan's rejection of his compact with God in Genesis B, a vow to refuse "hearran to habbanne" (l. 279; to have a lord). At the same time, Erhart's insistence on the importance of lar as well as hyldo seems borne out by the phrasing that connects Cain's loyalty to God's "hlutrom muoda" (l. 67; pure spirit). What might be called a broadly Christian emphasis on teaching and a broadly Germanic emphasis on loyalty are both encapsulated by this pointed highlighting of an interpersonal relationship. Accordingly, God reacts by excluding Cain from his personal favor and teaching: "Thu ni salt io furthur cuman te thines herran sprako || uueslean thar mid uuorđon thinon" (ll. 77-78; you shall never again come to speak with your lord, to converse there with your words). In social terms, Cain becomes an exile, but the crucial loss is that of direct speech. Cain is thus barred from both

lordly command and spiritual instruction: these are the values we find at the center of the episode.

Even though the traditional theme of exile is invoked in Genesis A,[44] this is done in a more general fashion than in the Old Saxon poem. Cain does initially acknowledge the loss of God's hyldo as his crime's immediate effect on social relationships: "ic forworht hæbbe, || heofona heahcyning, | hyldo þine" (ll. 1024-1025; I have lost your favor, high king of the heavens). His actions are thus first framed as part of a reciprocal contract, with failure resulting in loss of protection; but importantly, the text also incorporates a generalized view of social consequences. Cain is condemned to "widlast wrecan, | winemagum lað" (l. 1021; go on a long journey, loathed by his kinsmen). The focus shifts from individual loyalty to social recognition, from the lordless retainer to the social outcast. Cain has left the chosen people, and this spiritual loss is given an additional social dimension. This emphasis on the group rather than the individual recalls the way in which Satan is not set apart individually in the beginning of Genesis A; instead, God is simply "þam werode wrað" (l. 35; angry with the host) and casts the undifferentiated angels into hell. The poem thus draws on different aspects of Germanic traditions and, in consequence, also foregrounds different aspects of the biblical text. The emphasis here is on divine grace as part of a group condition: spiritual safety and social inclusion among the chosen people go hand in hand.

It is therefore true to say that both Genesis A and the Saxon Genesis add a supplementary social dimension, a layer of "Germanicized understanding,"[45] to the narrative. Yet this assessment can be supplemented by recognizing the differences in the way traditional elements are incorporated into their narrative structure—and, conversely, the different ways in which these elements are fused with exegetical themes to shift the focus of the underlying biblical narrative. The two diverging narrative emphases in the Cain episode create diverging spaces of thematic overlap that resonate both with "Germanic" and "Christian" traditions. The Saxon Genesis directs us towards a more personalized understanding of the biblical narrative:

the concepts of hyldo and lar are central to a view of divine favor as the result of a personal contractual relationship; in effect, the poem constructs itself as a personal drama of, and a lesson in, religious and social obedience. Some of this emphasis, as we have seen, is already lost in the Old English transliteration. In Genesis A, on the other hand, hyldo is only part of the broader religious and social picture, in which spiritual failure is equated with social exile: its employment of traditional themes has a generally amplificatory effect relating to the broader focus on the genesis of a chosen people, which is also closer to the biblical source. This is a radical difference in narrative focus that can point us towards a wider distinction between constructed audiences and literary cultures.

***

These readings of the Old English Genesis poems may also be set in relation with the Old Saxon Heliand, a ninth-century epic life of Christ. Primarily, it provides an interesting point of comparison that helps to establish a distinctly continental literary culture, which can in turn be contrasted with the distinctly insular Genesis A. We may, however, equally be able to shed some light on the scholarly divide that seems to have arisen in the case of the Heliand. Critical trends can again be divided into two factions, depending on whether "Germanic" or "Christian" elements are seen as dominant. On one side, D. H. Green firmly rejected the notion of a form of Germanized Christianity in favor of a process of "Christianisierung des Germanentums" (Christianization of Germanic culture),[46] and in espousing this view he is in line with many German critics. Klaus Gantert, in his 1998 study of the Heliand, feels comfortable enough to say that a view of the text as a synthesis of "Christian" and "Germanic" elements now represents the critical consensus. Yet this view is only synthetic in that it is very similar to A. N. Doane's opinion of Genesis A: "Germanic" motifs are employed to accurately express the "konzentrierten Glaubenswahrheiten der christlichen Religion" (concentrated truths of the Christian religion) to a Germanic audience.[47] In other

words, we return to a somewhat unsatisfying split between "Germanic" form and "Christian" content.

On the other side, we find the American critics in the wake of G. Ronald Murphy's revival of Old Saxon studies, who take a more "Germanic" view. Michael Moynihan, for example, points out the recasting of biblical episodes "into a Germanic setting" in his study of the theme of the mead-hall; he also remarks on the importance of "Germanic" imagery within the narrative.[48] This school of thought tends to argue that the process of adaptation to a new audience affected Christian theological discourse, which is also accepted in modern historical perspectives such as that of James C. Russell: "To the extent that Christian notions of sin and salvation were assimilated by the Germanic peoples during the early Middle Ages, they may be said to have been Christianized; to the extent that Christianity became more religiopolitical and magicoreligious during this period, it may be said to have been Germanized."[49] This type of approach offers a more nuanced view, but its application to literary texts presents the same problems we have seen above: yet again the broad categories of what is "Christian" or "Germanic" obscure too much of the finer details of the narrative's specific cultural resonance.

More recent approaches, it is true, seem to point to a more symbiotic view of such "intertwining and overlapping between the familiar and unfamiliar,"[50] which refuses to admit the supremacy of one set of elements over another. Yet even in such cases, there is a notion of distinctness between two clear categories that can be less than helpful. We may take a particularly apposite formulation from an article by Ernst S. Dick, who speaks of a synthetic "Neureflexion auf dem Boden der Zeit" (rethinking on contemporary grounds).[51] Dick's study of semantic transfer in the Heliand, in describing new theological meanings superimposed on old worldly meanings,[52] reverts again a little too easily to a hierarchic and dualistic view, but his choice of terms establishes an interesting model for biblical epics. It is the same model that emerges from McBrine's comparison of Latin biblical epics: these texts are indeed

reimagined in order to sprout from the ground of their own time, and their individual circumstances determine which elements from Christian or Germanic traditions are to be combined in poetry. Thematic overlap as a literary technique goes beyond semantic transfer in invoking specific aspects of both traditions and letting them interact reciprocally. It is the choice what to superimpose at points of thematic overlap, which resonances are made prominent, that determines the individual appeal and implied audiences of texts and allows us to group them into different literary cultures.

There is of course little disagreement with the view that the Saxon Genesis shares a literary tradition with the Heliand, which survives in two long manuscripts and four fragments, mostly from the ninth century.[53] Eduard Sievers, when he first posited an Old Saxon source for the Old English Genesis B in 1875, assumed the Genesis poem came from the same author as the Saxon gospel harmony published by Schmeller. This supposition has since proved false, but a link does exist in that fragments of the Heliand are preserved in MS Palatinus Latinus 1447, the same manuscript that contains the only surviving text of the Old Saxon Genesis. Dietrich Hofmann argued that the Heliand served as a stylistic model for the Saxon Genesis;[54] A. N. Doane, for his part, posits a lost common archetype for manuscripts of both the Heliand and the Saxon Genesis that would have contained both poems.[55] To this, we may then add the similarities in theme and narrative that shall be set out below: in its treatment of "Germanic" and "Christian" elements at points of thematic overlap between these two broad traditions, the Heliand can be closely linked to the Saxon Genesis and Genesis B. It is another strong reminder that the Genesis poems of MS Junius 11 belong to two literary cultures which are both Germanic and Christian, yet nevertheless distinctly continental and insular.

Like the Saxon Genesis, the Heliand relies on the depiction of close personal relationships with a divine figure. The focus lies on Christ as "drohtin frô mîn" (l. 971; my lord and master),[56] and this seemingly conventional terminology is central to the narrative.

The poem explicitly has the apostles relinquish other social bonds in favor of Christ: "iro aldan fader | ênna forlêtun" (l. 1184; they left their old father alone); the protection of a worldly father is exchanged for that of a heavenly lord. There is furthermore a contractual element in the fact that Christ's followers "te hêrron gicurun" (l. 3310; chose as their lord) Christ for his personal qualities. This new relationship is superior to worldly lords, which is made explicit in the description of Christ as "milderan mêðomgeþon, | than êr is mandrohtin" (l. 1200; a more generous gift-giver than his man-lord before).[57] There is of course a sense of superposition and semantic transfer in which a new Christian meaning is given priority; but at the same time, it also shifts the perception of Christ within a Christian framework. It has been claimed that the Old Saxon drohtin (lord) lacks the religious and social polysemy of its Old English cognate dryhten, since in the limited Old Saxon corpus it consistently refers to Christ.[58] The occurrence of mandrohtin, however, appears to invalidate this line of argument; the fact that drohtin can clearly be modified to apply to a human lord points to its initial polysemy, while the consistent usage of its unmodified form creates a reliable point of double resonance in stylizing Christ as both lord and God. This personal relationship that binds him to his disciples and retainers actively draws on social codes to invoke a specific theological aspect: the choice of a new lord, in both a secular and religious sense, to be followed loyally and faithfully.

This use of social codes to unite and transform Germanic and biblical traditions is equally prominent when Christ offers his followers "mundburd" (l. 1242; patronage); the Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch records the first known use for this legal term, meaning Schutzgewalt or patronage, as dating from 479, and it remained in legal use until long after the composition of the Heliand.[59] The word in itself may be hardly remarkable: Genesis A makes ample use of the Old English equivalent mundbyrd. Yet the Old English text has mundbyrd being accorded by God, angels and worldly kings alike, confirming Peter J. Lucas' assertion that the comitatus system is used "rather loosely" in Genesis A.[60] In the Heliand, in

contrast, the usage is much more specific: of the eight times mundburd appears in the text, it is employed once in a figurative sense for the city of Jerusalem; the other seven times, it is applied to the power of Christ.[61] This consistency recalls the usage of drohtin within the poem: a term of probably secular origin is applied exclusively in a new biblical context, and creates a consistent locus of thematic overlap, emphasizing loyalty and patronage in a both social and religious sense. As in the case of the theme of the mead-hall examined by Moynihan, we may call this a "deliberate semantic transferal at both the conceptual and word levels;"[62] but this transferal can be said to go both ways. G. Ronald Murphy comes perhaps closer in speaking of "cultural equivalencies":[63] this form of thematic overlap fuses images of cultural importance and guides the narrative focus of the text.

This is not to say that thematic overlap must necessarily be found throughout a text. Indeed, its lack in certain episodes can equally be of significance in signaling a divergence between traditional narratives and Christian lessons. The most evident example in the Heliand is Peter's role in Christ's arrest:

Thô he gibolgan geng,
suîdo thrîstmôd thegan for is thiodan standen,
hard for is hêrron: ni uuas imu is hugi tuîfli,
bloð an is breostun, ac he is bil atôh,
suerd bi sîdu, slôg imu tegegnes
an thene furiston fîund folmo crafto (ll. 4869-4874)

(Then he went wrathfully,
the very bold-minded retainer, to stand in front of his king,
hardy in front of his lord: he was not doubtful in his mind,
nor fearful in his breast, but he drew his blade,
the sword by his side, struck out against him,

the first of the foes, with the strength of his hand.)

Greatly expanding on the biblical narrative, the poem has Peter act as a heroic retainer resorting to violence; as Murphy notes, he becomes an example of traditional "warrior virtues."[64] Crucially, however, these virtues are explicitly rejected by Christ as he declares: "Ac it haƀad uualdand god, || alomahtig fader | an ôðar gimarkot" (ll. 4892-4893; but God our lord, the almighty father, has determined something else). Interestingly, Christ makes no direct reference to a comitatus-like bond in this episode, and the terminology for God similarly avoids this particular lexical field. In this case, Klaus Gantert is right to describe the use of traditional motifs as designed to create a "verstärkte[n] Kontrast zwischen zwei Situationen" (heightened contrast between two situations),[65] and thus better convey the Christian message; this type of Kontrastimitation also features prominently in McBrine's study of the Latin biblical epic.[66] What is highlighted is a moment of thematic divergence, in which a Christian sense of forbearance is separated from, and granted supremacy over, the expected martial response. Within the wider framework of the poem, the concept of Christian duty is shifted to an extent not transmitted in the Saxon Genesis or Genesis B.

It could be argued that through its application of terminology, the poem "Christianizes" a Germanic system; ultimately, however, considerations of linguistic and ideological "Germanization" or "Christianization" must be connected to a wider analysis of narrative design. The use of social and legal terms in a Christian context seems to result from the poem's general preoccupation with direct personal bonds: they become a place of thematic overlap that serves as a narrative focus. Similarly to the Saxon Genesis, the Heliand emphasizes the contractual nature of a relationship with God. The word huldi again features prominently: to accept Christ's protection is to "huldi hebbian | endi heƀenrîkies || sulic gidêli" (ll. 4519-4520; have his favor and such a part of the kingdom of Heaven), and in return to relinquish some traditional social codes at his bidding. Where Genesis A operates at a less specific level in linking a chosen people standing in God's favor to an English

audience, the Saxon (and Saxon-derived) poems manipulate and fuse Germanic and Christian traditions to emphasize aspects of individual loyalty and the adoption of a new legal and spiritual relationship. To state they are more "Germanic" or less "Christian" than Genesis A would be fruitless; they employ and combine aspects of both traditions to different ends. In addition to the more obvious formal characteristics of Old Saxon verse,[67] this difference in narrative focus marks them as products—and producers—of a significantly different literary culture.

***

With all this in mind, it is best to discard all notions of monolithic and exclusive cultural influences. Awareness of thematic overlap allows us to recognize the validity of multiple cultural resonances. This is perhaps particularly relevant in the case of the Heliand, whose origin has been the subject of much discussion: the perceived gulf between "Germanic" and "Christian" influence is such that Harald Haferland has come to regard the poem as the result of teamwork between clerics and a native poet.[68] The genesis of the poem is doubtless an interesting problem, but questions of broad thematic origin threaten to preclude more nuanced discussion of thematic and narrative aspects. In the same way, it is dangerous to dismiss poetic changes or additions as part of the "inevitable degree" of "distortion" that any translation into a poetic medium entails.[69] Such broad conclusions, ascribing textual features of poems like Genesis A to "the natural pressure of the verse medium itself,"[70] ignore the significance of invoking and combining aspects of different traditions. This applies of course equally to assumptions that Christian narratives will simply reproduce conventional doctrines rather than adapting them for their own ends.

Points of thematic overlap can show us instead where narrative focus, emphasized by multiple resonances, is to be found. In its terminology, the Heliand carefully combines legal codes of personal loyalty with the direct acceptance of a new faith: only where social codes significantly diverge does the poem create a clear opposition. This type of missionary impulse

is shared to some extent with the fragments of the Old Saxon Genesis and thus the Old English Genesis B, although the transliteration of the latter somewhat modifies this emphasis. It is on this basis that the literary and cultural context of the poem can best be approached: these texts share a narrative focus and form part of an individual Old Saxon literary culture, in which their themes must have found resonance. As for Genesis A, we see that it simultaneously draws on traditional heroic and Christian themes to amplify its relatively faithfully reproduced narrative: it is a story of continuity between a biblical and an English chosen people as a social group dependent on God, although it does not seem to maintain a clearer focus throughout. In this respect, it differs significantly from the more systematic overlaying of terminology and thematic concerns we encounter in Genesis B and the Heliand, and can therefore be expected to be the product of quite different circumstances.

Having established a foundation for solid thematic analysis, we may adapt the anthropological approach summarized by John D. Niles with the question: "Why did the phenomenon of a poem of this kind happen at all?"[71] Rather than merely identifying influences, we can ask why they were chosen for inclusion and found resonance. This approach may, for instance, make thematic analysis relevant as a supplement to more classical metrical and linguistic analysis in order to open up historicist approaches. The historical contextualization of the Heliand as part of the conversion of the Saxons by the Franks in the late eighth and early ninth century is fairly secure; James E. Cathey concludes that it was written for "persuasion and pacification" after Widukind's baptism in 785.[72] This accords perfectly with the established narrative focus on the adoption of a new bond of personal loyalty, resonating both in a religious and political sense. It is possible to identify such concordances for the other poems: Daniel Thomas has recently situated Genesis B in the context of Frankish power politics of the slightly later ninth century, and has traced its resonance in tenth-century England.[73] A similar process is perhaps more difficult for Genesis A, but its difference from the Saxon conversion poems and emphasis on Christian social unity

at least accords with a likely origin in Mercia in the early eighth century:[74] its narrative focus could well fit a literary culture one or two generations removed from Christianization. More can be made of the matter.

Such approaches depend on the realization that the false dichotomy between "Christian" and "Germanic" influences has tended to obscure rather than elucidate. While these categories can be useful to a certain extent, they must not be viewed as exclusive or universally valid: even a look at the most closely related corpora of Germanic literatures, Old English and Old Saxon, reveals that both "Christian" and "Germanic" elements can variously be fused to create thematic overlap and shape heterogeneous thematic and narrative foci. It is once we have ceased to regard texts as emanations of monolithic traditions that we may fruitfully set them in relation to each other, and use them to supplement other methods of analysis to set them in relation with their cultural contexts. In short, Old English and Old Saxon literatures need not be viewed as a meeting point for the clashing worlds of "Christian" and "Germanic" culture: a much better image might be that of a network of entangled thematic strands, which in individual texts are made to overlap at different points and to different effect depending on their audiences and their literary cultures.

I am most grateful to Hannah McKendrick Bailey for reading and commenting on this article in its draft stages; any remaining errors are of course my own.

[1] The problems of the "Germanic" approach are addressed by E. G. Stanley in The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1975); Joyce Hill in turn discusses the "Christian" approach in "Confronting Germania Latina: Changing Responses to Old English Biblical Verse," in The Poems of Junius 11: Basic Readings, ed. R. M. Liuzza (New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 1-19.

[2] For a problematization of the notion of a Germanic ethnicity or culture, see especially Jörg Jarnut, "Germanisch: Plädoyer für die Abschaffung eines obsoleten Zentralbegriffs der

Frühmittelalterforschung," in Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen: Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters, ed. Walter Pohl (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), pp. 107-113.

[3] A frequent lack of awareness regarding textual backgrounds, particularly regarding the Old Saxon origins of Genesis B, was already remarked upon by René Derolez, "Genesis: Old Saxon and Old English," English Studies, 76 (1995), 409.

[4] Patrick McBrine, Biblical Epics in Late Antiquity and Anglo-Saxon England: Divina in Laude Voluntas (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017).

[5] On attention devoted more recently to Germanic elements of Old English poetry, see Patrizia Lendinara, "The Germanic Background," in A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature, ed. Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 127-132.

[6] Bernard F. Huppé's most influential work is probably Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's influence on Old English poetry (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1959), which focuses mostly on the poems of the Junius Manuscript.

[7] J. R. Hall, "The Old English Epic of Redemption: The Theological Unity of MS Junius 11," in The Poems of Junius 11: Basic Readings, ed. R. M. Liuzza (New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 23.

[8] Bennett A. Brockman, "'Heroic' and 'Christian' in Genesis A: The Evidence of the Cain and Abel episode," Modern Languages Quarterly, 35 (1974), 124.

[9] Genesis A: A New Edition, Revised, ed. A. N. Doane, 2d rev. ed. (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2013), p. 61.

[10] Genesis A: A New Edition, Revised, ed. A. N. Doane, pp. 145-283; further references to this poem are given in parentheses after quotations in the text.

[11] Renée R. Trilling, The Aesthetics of Nostalgia: Historical Representation in Old English Verse (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), p. 89.

[12] McBrine, Biblical Epics, p. 56.

[13] McBrine, Biblical Epics, p. 112.

[14] McBrine, Biblical Epics, p. 281.

[15] Paul Battles, "Genesis A and the Anglo-Saxon 'migration myth,'" Anglo-Saxon England, 29 (2000), 44.

[16] Battles, "Genesis A and the Anglo-Saxon 'migration myth,'" p. 65.

[17] Nicholas Howe, Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), p. 80.

[18] Andrew Orchard, "Conspicuous Heroism: Abraham, Prudentius, and the Old English Verse Genesis," in The Poems of Junius 11: Basic Readings, ed. R. M. Liuzza (New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 121.

[19] Orchard, "Conspicuous Heroism," p. 127.

[20] Genesis A: A New Edition, Revised, ed. A. N. Doane, p. 228.

[21] The Battle of Maldon, ed. D. G. Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981).

[22] Orchard, "Conspicuous Heroism," p. 125.

[23] McBrine, Biblical Epics, p. 6.

[24] Hugh Magennis, "Audience(s), Reception, Literacy," in A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature, ed. Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), p. 85.

[25] This type of attention to cultural and historical resonances is the basis of Daniel Thomas's study of the possible resonances of Genesis B in ninth-century Saxony and tenth-century England, "Revolt in Heaven: Lucifer's Treason in Genesis B," in Treason: Medieval and Early Modern Adultery, Betrayal, and Shame, ed. Larissa Tracy (Leiden: Brill, 2019), pp. 147-169.

[26] Michael D. Cherniss, "Heroic Ideals and the Moral Climate of Genesis B," Modern Languages Quarterly, 30 (1969), 480.

[27] Cherniss, "Heroic Ideals and the Moral Climate," p. 496.

[28] Thomas D. Hill, "The Fall of Angels and Man in the Old English Genesis B," in Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation, ed. Lewis E. Nicholson and Dolores Warwick Frese (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), pp. 279-290.

[29] Andrew Cole, "Jewish Apocrypha and Christian Epistemiologies of the Fall: The Dialogi of Gregory the Great and the Old Saxon Genesis," in Rome and the North: The Early Reception of Gregory the Great in Germanic Europe, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., Kees Dekker, and David F. Johnson (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), pp. 157-188.

[30] Die Bruchstücke der altsächsischen Genesis und ihrer altenglischen Übertragung: Einführung, Textwiedergaben und Übersetzungen, Abbildung der gesamten Überlieferung, ed. Ute Schwab (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1991).

[31] The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon Vatican Genesis, ed. A. N. Doane (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).

[32] Genesis B, in The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon Vatican Genesis, ed. A. N. Doane (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 207-231; further references to this poem are given in parentheses after quotations in the text.

[33] Daniel Anlezark, "Old English Biblical and Devotional Poetry," in A Companion to Medieval Poetry, ed. Corrine Saunders (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), p. 108.

[34] The Saxon Genesis, ed. A. N. Doane, p. 277.

[35] Peter J. Lucas, "Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis and the Interpolation of Genesis B into Genesis A," Neophilologus, 76 (1992), 122.

[36] Eric Jager, "Tempter as Rhetoric Teacher: The Fall of Language in the Old English Genesis B," Neophilologus, 72 (1988), 435.

[37] Cherniss, "Heroic Ideals and the Moral Climate," p. 485.

[38] Hill, "The Fall of Angels and Man," p. 282.

[39] Cole, "Jewish Apocrypha and Christian Epistemologies of the Fall."

[40] Margaret J. Erhart, "Tempter as Teacher: Some Observations on the Vocabulary of the Old English Genesis B," Neophilologus, 59 (1975), 435.

[41] D. H. Green, The Carolingian Lord: Semantic Studies on Four Old High German Words: Balder, Frô, Truhtin, Hêrro (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 147.

[42] Vatican Genesis, in The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon Vatican Genesis, ed. A. N. Doane (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 232-252; further references to this poem are given in parentheses after quotations in the text.

[43] The Saxon Genesis, ed. A. N. Doane, p. 63.

[44] A brief discussion of the theme of exile in Old English poetry is offered in Stanley B. Greenfield, "The Formulaic Expression of the Theme of 'Exile' in Anglo-Saxon Poetry," Speculum, 30 (1955), 200-206; Greenfield identifies several common elements that can be reworked at will in specific poems.

[45] Trilling, The Aesthetics of Nostalgia, p. 89.

[46] Dennis H. Green, "Three Aspects of the Old Saxon Biblical Epic, the Heliand," in The Continental Saxons from the Migration Period to the Tenth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective, ed. Dennis H. Green and Frank Siegmund (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2003), p. 251.

[47] Klaus Gantert, Akkommodation und eingeschriebener Kommentar: Untersuchungen zur Übertragungsstrategie des Helianddichters (Tübingen: Narr, 1998), p. 59.

[48] Michael Moynihan, "Images of the Germanic Drinking Hall in the Old Saxon Heliand," in Vox Germanica: Essays in Germanic Languages and Literature in Honor of James E. Cathey, ed. Stephen J. Harris, Michael Moynihan, and Sherrill Harbison (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012), pp. 15-22.

[49] James C. Russell, The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 207-208.

[50] Harald Haferland, "The Hatred of Enemies: Germanic Heroic Poetry and the Narrative Design of the Heliand," trans. Erik Baumann, in Perspectives on the Old Saxon Heliand: Introductory and critical essays, with an edition of the Leipzig fragment, ed. Valentine E. Pakis (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2010), p. 214.

[51] Ernst S. Dick, "Kultureller Transfer und semantische Transformation im 'Heliand,'" in De consolatione philologiae: Studies in Honor of Evelyn Firchow, ed. Anna Grotans, Heinrich Beck, and Anton Schwob (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 2000), p. 25.

[52] Dick, "Kultureller Transfer," p. 26.

[53] For details of the transmission of the Heliand, see the introduction to Heliand und Genesis, ed. Otto Behaghel, 10th ed., rev. Burkhard Tæger (Tübingen: Max Niemayer, 1996), pp. xviii-xxiv.

[54] Dietrich Hofmann, "Die angelsächsische Bibelepik zwischen Gedächtniskultur und Schriftkultur," in Angli e Sassoni al di qua e al di là del mare: 26 aprile-1° maggio 1984, 2 vols. (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1986), II, 468.

[55] The Saxon Genesis, ed. A. N. Doane, p. 54; on the manuscript connection, see also Barbara Raw's tracing of the origins of the illustrations in MS Junius 11 to an Old Saxon Genesis manuscript, "The probable derivation of most of the illustrations in Junius 11 from an illustrated Old Saxon Genesis," Anglo-Saxon England, 5 (1976), 133-148.

[56] Heliand, in Heliand und Genesis, ed. Otto Behaghel, 10th ed., rev. Burkhard Tæger (Tübingen: Max Niemayer, 1996), pp. 7-210; further references to this edition are given in parentheses after quotations in the text.

[57] Note that the italicization in Behaghel and Taeger's edition merely indicates that a reading has been supplied from MS C to emend the faulty MS M.

[58] A. N. Doane, "The Transmission of Genesis B," in Anglo-Saxon England and the Continent, ed. Hans Sauer and Johanna Story, with the ass. of Gaby Waxenberger (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2011), p. 74.

[59] Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch, 13 vols., ed. Heino Speer et al. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1992-1996), IX, cols. 977-978.

[60] Lucas, "Loyalty and Obedience," p. 122.

[61] See Heliand, ed. Otto Behaghel, ll. 1916; 1955; 2070; 2233; 2693; 4695.

[62] Moynihan, "Images of the Germanic Drinking Hall," p. 164.

[63] G. Ronald Murphy, "The Old Saxon Heliand," in Perspectives on the Old Saxon Heliand, with an edition of the Leipzig fragment, ed. Valentine E. Pakis (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2010), p. 38.

[64] G. Ronald Murphy, "From Germanic Warrior to Christian Knight: The Heliand Transformation," in Arthurian Literature and Christianity: Notes from the Twentieth Century, ed. Peter Meister (New York: Garland, 1999), p. 18.

[65] Gantert, Akkommodation und eingeschriebener Kommentar, p. 83.

[66] See especially McBrine, Biblical Epics, p. 36.

[67] On the differences between Old Saxon and Old English meter, see especially Hofmann, "Die angelsächsische Bibelepik," pp. 471-476.

[68] Harald Haferland, "Was the Heliand Poet Illiterate?," trans. Valentine E. Pakis, in Perspectives on the Old Saxon Heliand: Introductory and critical essays, with an edition of the Leipzig fragment, ed. Valentine E. Pakis (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2010), pp. 204-205.

[69] Haferland, "The Hatred of Enemies," p. 226.

[70] Genesis A, ed. A. N. Doane, p. 93.

[71] John D. Niles, Homo Narrans: The Poetics and Anthropology of Oral Culture (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), p. 123.

[72] James E. Cathey, "The Historical Setting of the Heliand, the Poem, and the Manuscripts," in Perspectives on the Old Saxon Heliand, with an edition of the Leipzig fragment, ed. Valentine E. Pakis (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2010), p. 14.

[73] Thomas, "Revolt in Heaven;" this article comes after several investigations of the ideological context of the poem in Daniel Anlezark, "The Old English Genesis B and Irenaeus of Lyon," Medium Ævum, 86 (2017), 1-21, and Alexander J. Sager, "After the Apple: Repentance in Genesis B and its Continental Context," JEGP, 112 (2013), 292-310.

[74] On the date and place of origin of Genesis A, see especially the summary given in Genesis A, ed. A. N. Doane, pp. 51-55; a recent investigation of a possible source and its consequences for the dating of the poem can be found in Charles D. Wright, "The Fate of Lot's Wife: A 'Canterbury School' Gloss in Genesis A," in Old English Philology: Studies in Honour of R. D. Fulk, ed. Leonard Neidorf, Rafael J. Pascual, and Tom Shippey (Cambridge: Brewer, 2016), pp. 292-310.