

Wif and Wæpned, Freo Fægroste and Godes Handgescaft:

Eve and Adam in the *Anglo-Saxon Genesis*

A Thesis

Presented to

The Honors Tutorial College

Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for Graduation

from the Honors Tutorial College

with the degree of

Bachelor of Arts in English

by

Elana L. Harnish

June 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Chapter One: Manuscript History.....	6
Chapter Two: Analysis.....	29
Conclusion.....	58
Works Cited.....	62

Introduction

One of the few known pieces of Anglo-Saxon poetry is the poem *Genesis* (*G*) which, surviving only in Oxford MS. Bodleian Junius 11, is a reinterpretation of the Biblical Genesis (BG). Aside from the plot events of the creation of the world, and the creation, fall, and punishment of Adam and Eve, the two narratives are different. For example, the BG never states that the snake is Satan; in *G* the snake is not only identified with Satan, but the story of Satan's fall from God's grace is recounted in detail. However, *G* is not simply an extrapolation of the BG story; it is a retelling of the story from a different cultural perspective.

G, also known as the *Anglo-Saxon Genesis*, is remarkable piece of Old English epic poetry. It is one of the few examples of Anglo-Saxon poetry that have survived; the entirety of the surviving Anglo-Saxon poems (dating from 450 to 1100) are contained in a six-volume set, *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*. In studying *G* scholars have attempted to discover the date, authorship, and origin of the poem, but because of the lack of evidence they have not arrived at any certain answers. Although the author is unknown, scholars consistently refer to the author as male; therefore I will do so as well. Franciscus Junius (1591–1677) believed that the seventh-century poet Cædmon was the author, on the basis of the Venerable Bede's description of Cædmon's work, but by the end of the seventeenth century scholars doubted Junius's theory. George Hickes wrote to William Nicolson in 1699 expressing his doubt that Cædmon was the author; Hickes formally presented his objections in 1705 in his book

Linguarum Vett. Septentrionalium Thesaurus (Lucas, *Junius* xv). Scholars continue to debate almost all of the details of *G*'s history.

One of the details on which scholars agree, however, is that *G* is a poem created by the combination of two poems. A. N. Doane, who has created critical editions of both poems, has dated the manuscript to around 1025. The two poems were combined before 1025 when one was inserted into the other. These two poems are commonly referred to as *Genesis A* (*Gen A*) and *Genesis B* (*Gen B*), *Gen A* appearing at lines 1-234 and 852-2936 and *Gen B* at lines 235 to 851.

Most of the scholarship on *G* concerns one poem or the other rather than *G* as a whole. Furthermore, there is little scholarship on the characters of Adam and Eve in *G*, and what little there is does not address the way in which the insertion of *Gen B* into *Gen A* affects the final depiction of Adam and Eve in *G*. *Gen A* follows BG in dividing the responsibility for the Fall between Adam and Eve, though it focuses on Adam and his actions. *Gen B*, however, presents Eve as the focus and the person most responsible for the Fall. Though Adam and Eve deliberately ate the fruit and are thus both responsible for the Fall, the manner in which the narrator of *Gen B* depicts Eve and her actions implies that she carries the majority of the responsibility. Thus, because of the insertion of *Gen B* into *Gen A*, *G* presents Eve as the person who bears most of the responsibility for the Fall.

The fact that Eve carries the majority of the responsibility can be seen in the attitude of the narrator of *Gen B* toward her and her actions. First, the narrator does not seem sympathetic to Eve; He frequently reiterates that her actions are wrong and that

they cause a doom upon humankind. The author of *Gen B* shows, through the length and content of the Messenger's and God's speeches that Eve is the focus of his story. The narrator also makes it clear that Adam is convinced by Eve to eat the fruit and that it is her actions that cause the Fall. *Gen A*, however, follows BG more closely than *Gen B*, and in doing so has a more unbiased portrayal of the Fall. In BG and in *Gen A* because both Adam and Eve eat the fruit they both share the responsibility. However, the narrator of *Gen A* focuses on Adam and his role in the Fall. The focus on Adam indicates that the narrator of *Gen A* considers Adam to have the more important role in the Fall. However, because of the insertion of *Gen B* into *Gen A*, and because *Gen B* provides details of how the Fall came to pass and *Gen A* does not, *G* presents the Fall as an event for which Eve carries the majority of the responsibility.

Chapter One details *Gen A* and *Gen B*'s history; understanding the two poems and their relationship to each other is impossible unless their history is understood. Chapter Two presents an analysis of Adam and Eve in *Gen A* and *Gen B*, beginning with related research on the two characters. Chapter Three is the conclusion—the tying up of the evidence and the presentation of the findings.

Chapter One

Manuscript History

This chapter presents the history of *Gen A* and *Gen B* and the manuscript history. In order to understand the relationship between *Gen A* and *Gen B* the manner by which they came to be presented as one poem must also be understood. The authors, datings, and origins of the two poems will be discussed in this chapter as well as the content of the poems. Because the two poems originate from different times and places the authors must have created them with different motives; these two poems were not created with the intention of combining them. This chapter presents their physical history and the scholarship concerning that history as a necessary first step for considering the effect of their textual relationship.

The Junius manuscript contains four poems, *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Daniel*, and *Christ and Satan*. *Exodus* and *Daniel* are, like *G*, Anglo-Saxon interpretations of their Biblical counterparts, but *Christ and Satan* has no known source and is only loosely biblical. In the manuscript, *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* are all in the same hand, unlike *Christ and Satan*, which is in three different hands. The entire manuscript contains 116 leaves, with pages numbered i-ii and 1-229. *Genesis* is on pages 1-142 with *Gen B* on pages 13-40. The manuscript pages treat *Gen B* as an integrated part of *G* (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 28-30). Doane dated the manuscript to 1025 on the basis of the hands and the style of its illustrations (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 29). The provenance of the manuscript is uncertain; Canterbury is sometimes cited, but the evidence is circumstantial. In 1980 Peter J. Lucas brought forward evidence, though

circumstantial, that indicates that the manuscript was created in Malmesbury Abbey in 1025 (Lucas, *MS Junius 11* 197-220). James Ussher, the Archbishop of Armagh in the early 1600s, owned the manuscript and gave it to Franciscus Junius around 1651. In 1655 Junius published it in Amsterdam. Junius died in 1677 and left many of his manuscripts, including this one, which would later be given his name, to the Bodleian Library (Doane, *Genesis A* 30).

The entirety of Junius 11 is on seventeen gatherings, four sheets folded in half creating eight leaves or sixteen pages. *G* is on eleven gatherings, but as some leaves are missing, only four of those gatherings are complete, creating two gaps in *Gen A* and two gaps in *Gen B* (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 30-32). The first gap in *G* occurs between gatherings I and II, pages 8 and 9, lines 167 and 168. Because gathering II contains only two leaves, they were probably part of an entire gathering most of which has since been lost. In this gap should be the fourth through seventh days of creation and the creation of Adam, which could have constituted up to six leaves (Doane, *Genesis A* 5).

According to Doane, a second gap of one, two, or three leaves may occur after line 205. While the poem retains its sense, because what remains expands greatly on the BG it is likely that some content is missing. The content that would fit in this gap is Adam's naming of the animals and of Eve, God's giving authority to Adam over all things, and the Sabbath. Because the poem retains its sense, however, the author may have omitted all of this material rather than its having been lost from the manuscript (Doane, *Genesis A* 8-9). The third gap, in gathering II, is also of an unknown size.

Gathering II has two single leaves, pages 9-12. *Gen B* begins on page 13, indicating that the gap between pages 12 and 13 would have contained the beginning of *Gen B*. Gollancz hypothesized in 1927 that the missing leaves resulted from the interpolation of *Gen B*. He suggested that a scribe excised them in order to avoid repetition in the work. Timmer expanded on this hypothesis in *Later Genesis*.

However, in 1984 Barbara Raw brought forth evidence that rejected Gollancz's theory. She judged it most likely that the scribe copying *G* was working from another exemplar, including *Gen B* but probably not *Christ and Satan*, which had the same poems in the same order. Doane agrees with Raw, saying that it is also against common sense to think that a scribe excised the missing leaves, because a series of unlikely events would have had to occur for Gollancz's theory to be plausible (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 34). The numbering of the pages supports Raw's hypothesis:

Although the numbering is not completely carried out, the earlier sections especially being only sporadically numbered, yet when the numbers do begin to appear regularly in the later fits, they are correct, counting from the beginning of the book. This could only have come about if the scribe (and/or his exemplars) were following a correctly numbered copy that already contained all the material, including *Genesis B*. (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 34)

The fourth and final gap is within *Gen B*, after line 44. Raw noticed that the gap was caused by the excising of two leaves in gathering III, between the current pages 22 and 23. According to Raw, these leaves were lost after the thirteenth century,

when the manuscript was re sewn. The re sewing resulted in two sets of stitching, which Raw uses as evidence of when the leaves were lost: “The fact that the main stitching does not pass through the stubs of the single leaves implies that the missing leaves were cut out and the resulting single leaves re-attached after the main stitching of the manuscript was done” (Raw 193).

The Text

The focus of this thesis is the relationship between *Gen A* and *Gen B* as seen through an analysis of the characters of Adam and Eve. The details of *G* differ from the details of BG, though, so below is a summary of the events that take place in *G*. The insertion of *Gen B* into *Gen A* at the point of the Fall of Satan and the Fall of Adam and Eve gives *Gen B* more importance than *Gen A* because one of the major points of the creation story is how the Fall happened. Thus, *G*’s presentation of the Fall centers around *Gen B* and its interpretation of events.

G begins with a convention of Old English religious poetry: praise of God. The narrator introduces heaven and the angels but quickly shifts to an introduction of the fall of the rebel angels. Some of the angels became proud and insolent. God knew the rebel angels’ plans and created a place to punish them. The rebels bragged that they would take over the kingdom and create a throne in the north of heaven, but their plans came to naught. God crushed his foes and sent them to the dimmest, most painful exile.

The poem continues with the first three days of the creation of Earth (Gen 1:1-10). Presumably the last four days of Creation would follow, but at this point in the

poem, line 168, one or two leaves are missing (Doane, *Genesis A* 9). The poem resumes as God decides that Adam should not be alone in paradise and creates woman (Gen 2:18-25).

The second gap appears here, at line 205, with one to three leaves missing (Doane, *Genesis A* 9). God surveys his land and deems it good. The narrator talks about the rivers in paradise (Gen 2:10-14) until the third gap in the manuscript, where one or two leaves are missing after line 234 (Doane, *Genesis A* 10).

Gen B begins when God tells Adam and Eve to eat freely of all trees in Paradise except for the tree of knowledge (Gen 2:16-17). *Gen B* goes on to repeat the fall of the rebel angels, but with much more detail. In this version a leader of the rebellion is identified, referred to as “the fiend” until identified as Satan in line 345. The fiend, whom God created to be second in power and whom God greatly loved, began to feel that he should no longer be subject to God. He considered his position to be slavery and thus rebelled against God. God heard his subject’s boasting and proud claims and became full of wrath. For three days and nights the fiend and his followers fell from heaven and into hell and were changed into devils. The fiend’s followers were trapped in fire and torment while the fiend, henceforth named Satan, was made ruler of the abyss and chained in place.

Satan then related to his followers how terrible their fate was. He stated how much he hated mankind and said that they had God’s grace while he and his followers had to suffer in Hell. He told his followers that if someone could cause Adam and Eve to fall from Grace that that devil would sit next to him in Hell for eternity.

During Satan's entreaty two leaves are missing after line 441(the fourth gap); the story skips to one of Satan's followers's arming himself and getting ready to leave Hell (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 30). This devil is called "the Messenger" (*boda*). His mission is to tempt Adam and Eve into disobeying God's command.

The Messenger disguises himself as a serpent and tries to tempt Adam first. The Messenger says that he bears a message from God saying that Adam should eat the fruit. Adam does not believe the Messenger because he knows that God is fully capable of coming down to Paradise himself. The Messenger then goes to Eve and tempts her by threatening her with punishment from God if she does not eat the fruit. He says that he will tell God how Adam has offended him, and that in turn God will punish Adam. He also tempts her by saying that she will have dominion over Adam and will be able to see heaven. Because, the narrator says, she was made with a weaker mind she eats of the fruit, and the Messenger gives her a false vision of heaven. Eve goes to Adam to tell him what the Messenger told her, that if he eats the fruit as well they would be angel-like and could avoid God's punishment. For a day she pleads with Adam to eat the fruit. Finally, Adam believes her and eats of the fruit (Gen 3:1-6).

Eve's vision is taken away from her, and suddenly the pair know that they are naked (Gen 3:7). Adam upbraids Eve, saying that she is the reason that they have fallen from God's grace. Eve replies that he is right in chastising her and that she is immensely sorry. The Messenger rejoices in his success. Adam and Eve pray for forgiveness and hide themselves, apart from each other, so that their nakedness is not

shown to God (Gen 3:8). *Gen B* ends here. The remainder of the story of Adam and Eve follows the BG fairly closely, with some embellishments expected from a reinterpretation.

In his critical edition of *Gen A* Doane discussed the parts of Genesis that would fit into the gaps created by the missing pages. The first gap would probably have included narratives from Gen 1:11-25 (the rest of the days of creation of the world), Gen 2:7 (the creation of Adam), Gen 2:8-9 and 2:15 (the creation of paradise), and Gen 2:16-17 (God's prohibition against eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil). The second gap would have included selections from Gen 2:19-20 (Adam's naming of the animals), Gen 2:23-25 (Adam's naming of Eve as "woman"), Gen 1:29-30 (God's giving to Adam dominion over all creatures), and Gen 2:2-3 (the Sabbath). The third gap, the one that takes place at the beginning of *Gen B*, could have included a repetition of the creation of Adam and Eve and the prohibition against eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Doane, *Genesis A* 9-10). In his critical edition of *Gen B* Doane posits that the fourth gap could have included replies to Satan's speech (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 31).

Further research has been done concerning the history of *Gen A* and *Gen B* since Doane wrote the introductions to his critical editions. Because of the newer research a better understanding of the sources of the two poems is possible. Paul Gardner Remley, in 1990, gave a detailed analysis of the sources used for the basis of the poems in Junius 11. Remley identified the Vulgate as a main source but also said that Old Latin texts that could not be confidently identified could be source texts,

though no evidence exists to support this guess (Remley 3-4). However, Remley suggested that there had to be at least one source other than the Vulgate because some material that appeared in *G* did not appear in the Vulgate. Because of the presence of material that cannot be traced back to the Vulgate, Remley referred to *G* as the result of the poet's response to biblical tradition and his own method of turning the biblical story into Old English verse.

Remley stated that the opening lines of *G* expressed the poet's praising of God and the justification for his work (Remley 11-12). Anglo-Saxons would have understood the importance of these opening lines, but it was not until the twentieth century that their similarity to some Latin liturgical texts was discovered. Remley also brought attention to the similarity between the opening of *G* and conventions in the Apocrypha. He cited Doane's notes to lines 18-81 of *Gen A* (Remley 17-18). The opening in *Gen A* arranges events in the theological tradition: Satan's fall precedes the creation of the earth and of Adam and Eve. On the other hand, *Gen B*'s order follows an alternate tradition, from Aelfric's *Exameron Anglice*, where Satan's fall happens on the fifth or sixth day of creation and thus directly precedes the creation of Adam and Eve (Doane, *Genesis A* 227-28).

According to Remley, scholars believe that Jerome's version of the Vulgate is the base text for *Gen A* (Remley 46-50). Doane pointed out that because *Gen A* is similar to Jerome's Vulgate in some places and differs in others, the passages that come from Jerome's Vulgate can easily be determined (Doane, *Genesis A* 59). Remley concluded that because of the presence among material from the Vulgate of material

not in the Vulgate, *Gen A* is evidence that an Old Latin biblical text circulated in England. However, he acknowledged that there were currently no known Old Latin (or Old English and Old Latin mixed) texts that could be considered a base for *Gen A*.

Genesis B

Early scholarship on *G* focuses on *Gen B*. In 1875 Eduard Sievers hypothesized that *Gen B* was not an original creation but was instead a translation and reinterpretation of a Saxon poem. He did not identify the source, but he thought that one must exist because of the presence of Saxon forms in *Gen B*. By comparing *G* to the Saxon epic *Heliand*, Sievers discovered that frequently *Gen B* and *Heliand* used the same words to refer to God. *Gen A* used words different from those in *Gen B* to refer to God (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 55-56).

Sievers's hypothesis was confirmed in 1894 when a manuscript was discovered in the Vatican Library containing a version of Genesis written in Old Saxon with twenty-six lines nearly identical to twenty-six lines in *Gen B*. This Saxon *Genesis* (*VG*) appears in Vatican MS. Palatinus Latinus 1447. It is 337 lines long, a little over half of *Gen B*'s 616 lines (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 56). The manuscript came from Mainz and dated to the ninth century (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 9). Lines 790-817 of *Gen B* coincide with lines 1-26 of the *VG*. In his analysis of the corresponding lines, Doane concluded that lines 790-817 of *Gen B* were a line-by-line translation of the twenty-six corresponding lines of the *VG* (*Saxon Genesis* 56).

If only twenty-six of *Gen B*'s lines can be found in Pal. Lat. 1447, where does the rest of *Gen B* come from? Lines 1-26 of the *VG* are written at the bottom of folio

1r, in a different and smaller hand than that of the text above it. The first gathering, which contains all of the Old-Saxon material, has ten leaves. Folios 1 and 2 are singletons, rather than an inner bifolium. According to Doane, ff. 1 and 2 were probably part of a different manuscript before being included in the *VG*. He gives seven pieces of evidence, but the two important pieces are the presence of a large wormhole through ff. 1 and 2 but not 3, and smaller holes through ff. 1, 2, and 3, suggesting that ff. 1 and 2 were not always part of the manuscript. Further, ff. 1 and 2 have a late Medieval shelfmark, D17, suggesting that they are the later pages of a manuscript as late as the fifteenth century, while folio 3 has an earlier shelfmark KLI, which suggests that it is the first page of a manuscript from around the thirteenth century. The implication for the whole is that ff. 1 and 2 were part of a different manuscript before being inserted into the *VG* (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 15-16). Thus, *Gen B* and the twenty-six lines at the bottom of folio 1r of the *VG* are probably two fragments of a source text that has yet to be found. The twenty-six lines at the bottom of folio 1r of the *VG* are older than *Gen B* and were probably part of a longer Old-Saxon work from which *Gen B* is derived (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 9).

Doane determined that *Gen B* was a line-by-line translation of an Old-Saxon poem, now lost, of which only twenty-six lines—those in Pal. Lat. 1447—are known to have survived. He ascribes the differences between *Gen B* and the surviving fragment of the Old-Saxon poem to the effects of translating from one language to another and the change from one metrical scheme and style to another. He concludes:

The Old English gives the impression that the revisers of the *Genesis* were in general anxious to make the new version conform to a more familiar metrical scheme (shorter lines, avoidance of isolated hypermetrical lines) and style (more hypotaxis), but carried this aim out in a rather mechanical line-by-line fashion, rather than by global rewriting of whole sentences or passages. (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 56)

This method of transcription resulted in a poem closer to prose than to Old English poetry. It created something that Doane says is neither Saxon nor truly English, something opposed to the purposefully balanced style of the Old-Saxon poem (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 55-56).

As with scholarship on the author and origin of *Gen B*, scholars also debate the date of *Gen B*. Bernhard Aegidius Konrad ten Brink posited in 1887, before the *VG* was discovered, that *Gen B* originated in the second half of the 800s (Timmer 43). In 1911 G. H. Gerould thought that *Gen B* had been written by the mysterious B, the author of the first life of St. Dunstan, and therefore must have been written at the end of the tenth century (Gerould 129-33). Sir Israel Gollancz said in 1927 that “So far as the evidence of the Folio is concerned, *Genesis B* may belong to any date from about the middle of the ninth to the last quarter of the tenth century.” B. J. Timmer, in 1948, dated *Gen B* to the end of the ninth century on the basis of his analysis of the language forms present in the poem.

In the introduction to his critical edition of *Gen B*, *The Later Genesis*, Timmer identifies three different language stages: early West Saxon, late West Saxon, and

Anglian. Early West Saxon is also known as Alfredian West Saxon, dated to the seventh to ninth centuries; late West Saxon dates to around the tenth and eleventh centuries. The Anglian language was the dialect of Northern England during the sixth thru eleventh centuries. It is commonly thought that linguistic forms in any writing accumulate over time because of differing locations of scribes; each time a poem is copied the new scribe makes both errors and purposeful corrections, leaving evidence of his or her time and place. The new forms take the place of some of the old forms, and a version of the text containing multiple different forms results.

Timmer identified the forms of each language stage in *Gen B* by comparing the poem to the beginning of Ælfric's "Life of St. Oswald" in his *Lives of the Saints*. According to Timmer, the "Life of St. Oswald" is a typical example of a late West-Saxon text, containing, for example, interchanges of the vowels *i*, *ie*, and *y*.¹ By comparing the two works Timmer discovered that many instances of late West-Saxon forms were present in *Gen B*, but he was also able to identify early West-Saxon and Anglian forms in the poem (Timmer 19-27).

Timmer argued that the presence of the early West-Saxon forms in *Gen B* showed that *Gen B* originated at an earlier date than Junius 11. His study of the vocabulary of *Gen B* led him to state that the translator knew the poetry and prose of his time, but that "his grammar was sometimes shaky and the faulty construction and forms have remained in our MS" (Timmer 27). The fact that this shaky grammar was still present along with the early West-Saxon forms, said Timmer, implied that *Gen B*

¹ For more information on the characteristics of West-Saxon forms and examples see Doane, *Genesis A* 27-34.

had not been copied many times before it appeared in the manuscript. He further posited that *Gen B* had not gone through Anglian hands, even though Anglian forms were present. He attributed the Anglian forms, because they were few in number, to the translator's or scribe's knowledge of texts from the West Midlands, which in 1948 were considered to be in the style of traditional Old English poetry. Thus, Timmer dated *Gen B*'s translation and interpolation to the end of the ninth century (Timmer 26-27).

In 1991 Doane created his own critical edition of *Gen B* in *The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon Vatican Genesis*. Doane expanded on Timmer's identification of the language forms present in *Gen B*. Because *Gen A* and *Gen B* contain both early and late West-Saxon forms, Doane concluded that *Gen B* had been interpolated into *Gen A* at least a century before the creation of the Junius manuscript. Because *Gen A* has genuine Anglian forms while *Gen B* has only poetic ones (forms conventional in verse and lacking West-Saxon breaking), he argued that *Gen B* was interpolated only after *Gen A* went through an Anglian stage of transmission (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 47-48).

The Translator of the Source Text for the *Vatican Genesis* and *Genesis B*

In 1948 Timmer was confident that the translator of the source text of *VG* and *Gen B* was a Continental Saxon. Timmer explained his theory with a story that began in the seventh century, when Egbert, a Northumbrian monk, decided to convert the Frisians and the Saxons. Egbert began his mission by sending a group of twelve monks to Germany; in doing so he sparked the initial contact between the Anglo-

Saxons and the Frisians and Saxons. Willibrord, one of the original twelve monks sent by Egbert, worked among the Frisians and the Saxons until he died in 739. Boniface, a West Saxon whose English name was Wynfrith, continued Willibrord's work. He established many monasteries and appointed Englishmen as bishops and assistant bishops in Germany. Because of Boniface's actions the Anglo-Saxons had a major influence on the Germans.

A group of Frisians eventually murdered Boniface in 754; an Englishman named Lull succeeded him. Lull continued Boniface's work for another generation, causing the Anglo-Saxon culture to spread throughout Germany by means of the Anglo-Saxons in the monasteries. The English would have brought books with them to the Continent to place in the monasteries, Timmer said, thus introducing English poetry to the Germans. The spreading of culture by these three generations of Englishmen during the seventh century and beyond caused the Germans to develop a deep-seated knowledge and interest in Anglo-Saxon culture, facilitated by the similarity of the languages of English and Old Saxon.

According to Timmer, lines 1-26 of the *VG* and lines 790-816 of *Gen B* show that the Saxons were able to read and understand English. Old-Saxon literature came into being because of the influence of English culture, he said, and Old-Saxon literature developed because of the influence of the English during the eighth century. The Saxon epics *Heliand* and the *VG* are based on English religious poetry. Additionally, the Old-Saxon texts *Praefatio* and the *Versus* show that the Saxons were

familiar with the works of the English writers Cædmon and Cynewulf (Timmer 43-44).

According to Timmer, Saxon clerics in turn began to travel to English monasteries in the ninth century. They would have brought manuscripts with them, said Timmer, such as a copy of the *Heliand* and the source text of *VG* and *Gen B*. King Alfred brought many monks from the countries on the Continent to England, three of whom were Grimbald of the Franks, Asser of Wales, and John, a Continental Saxon monk. John was put in charge of Althelney, a monastery comprised of foreigners like himself. According to Timmer it is unlikely that John was the only Saxon who traveled to England, because the Saxons, being steeped in English culture, would have been drawn to monasteries in England that housed English literature and foreigners like themselves (Timmer 44-45).

Timmer based his hypothesis that the translator of the source text of *VG* and *Gen B* was a Saxon on this speculative history of cultural transmission between England and the Continent. Ten Brink hypothesized in 1877 that John of Athelney was the translator because he was the only Saxon mentioned by name in Asser's *The Life of King Alfred*, with a list of his literary credentials. Timmer, however, stated that it was impossible to attribute the translation of the source text of *VG* and *Gen B* to any one person because there would have been numerous Saxons, undoubtedly working as scribes, living in England in the ninth century. He said that five things could be known with confidence about the translator:

All that can be said with any degree of certainty about the translator of the *Genesis* into Old English is that he was an Old Saxon living in England, a clergyman, familiar with Old English religious literature, both prose and poetry, a man of lively imagination and considerable poetic feeling. (45)

According to Doane, however, Timmer's confidence was misplaced. Doane believed that the translator was not a Continental Saxon but was probably an Anglo-Saxon (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 50-51). There would have been various Anglo-Saxon revisers who would probably have been confused by the Saxon syntax, and, in order to preserve the text as much as possible, they ended up creating something neither Saxon nor English. Doane's evidence was in the *a* prefix added to the words *wende* and *hebban* in line 259. It was in these kinds of corrections, according to Doane, that the translation process could be detected. Because of the similarity in the ink and stroke width of those *a*'s with those of the scribe, and the fact that the added *a*'s are Carolingian rather than the three-stroke *a*'s that the scribe usually used (though he did sometimes use the Carolingian *a*), it is difficult to say for sure whether the added *a* prefixes were made by the scribe or a later corrector. Doane suggested that the *a*'s were added in order to make the lines conform to the Old English rhythm formula of *up* + unstressed particle: *ac he awende hit him to wyrсан þinge, ongan him winn up ahebban* (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 259-60).

A corrector, active in both *Gen B* and *Christ and Satan*, later changed the text again, Doane said (*Saxon Genesis* 50-51). He removed some of the Anglianisms (e.g.

changing *befelled* in line 371 to *befylled*), changed outdated West-Saxon forms to contemporary ones (early W-S *niotan* in l. 401 to late W-S *neotan*), and normalized the spelling of some words (OS *herran* in l. 263 to *hearran*). Doane referred to this corrector's work as a "hit-or-miss method of 'modernization'" that could be explained as a preparation for another, newer, copy.

Over time the text went through many corrections and updates by scribes and correctors, some changes difficult to detect, others appearing as hybrids of Old Saxon and Old English probably made by inconsistent revisers. The result is many instances similar to the opening line of *Gen B*, *ac niotað inc þas oðres ealles*, which is neither truly Old Saxon nor Old English. It is thus necessary to reach a different conclusion from Timmer's, that the translator was a continental Saxon because of the instances of non-Old English words. Instead, according to Doane, multiple revisers, many of whom would have been Anglo-Saxon, created *Gen B*. Doane that they would have surely been confused by the Saxon syntax but would have wanted to change the text as little as possible (Doane, *Saxon Genesis* 51).

Genesis A

In 1978 Doane published a critical edition of *Gen A*, titled *Genesis A*, as a counterpart to his critical edition of *Gen B*. In his introduction Doane discussed the history and the language of *Gen A*. He stated that the prominent forms in *Gen A*, as in *Gen B*, are West-Saxon, and the forms that are apparent in the poem as it is seen today are early and late West-Saxon, as well as some distinctly non-West-Saxon forms (Doane, *Genesis A* 26). As Junius 11 is dated to around 1025, its poems would have

gone through numerous copyings; the multitude of forms from different locations and times, he says, makes the forms impossible to separate and used to determine an accurate origin of the poem:

Most irregular forms are sporadic, and their significance is by no means easy to determine. On the other hand, certain non-standard features are numerous enough that, although they are sporadic and in a sense accidental, they do appear to make some sort of pattern. Almost any non-standard form, except for those few which occur in patterns of frequency, is possibly a mistake, or a non-significant vagary of the scribe. Every explanation must be regarded cautiously. (Doane, *Genesis A* 26)

Thus, while giving insight into the history of *Gen A*, the forms present in the poem cannot be used to date it with confidence. The earliest forms can be identified, but there may have been earlier forms or forms from other geographical locations that were changed by one of the revisers.

According to Doane, there were commonalities between *Gen A* and *Beowulf* that allow for them to have originated from around the same date. Because *Gen A* was similar to *Beowulf* in vocabulary and differed from other West-Saxon poetry known to be composed after 900, Robert J. Menner in 1951 dated *Gen A* early, with *Beowulf*. The relationship between the poems, in terms of syntax and their commonalities with certain aspects of the Vulgate, was shown by Frederick Klaeber in *Die ältere Genesis und der Beowulf*. While neither poem's date of composition were known, the

similarities between *Gen A* and *Beowulf* suggested that they were written around the same time (Doane, *Genesis A* 36-37).

The time frame in which *Gen A* was written, however, can be determined. The obvious *terminus ad quem* is the date of the manuscript, 1025. However, it is possible to place the *ad quem* around 900: “if it is true that *Genesis A* was partiall revised at the time of the translation of *Genesis B*, then the later *terminus* can be placed ca. 900” (Doane, *Genesis A* 36). Doane states that “the *terminus a quo* is much hazier, perhaps the generation before 680, the date of the death of Abbess Hild, Cædmon’s patroness, will do” (Doane, *Genesis A* 36). Because of the story that the Venerable Bede relates in his *An Ecclesiastical History of the English People* concerning Cædmon’s divine inspiration, Cædmon is considered to be the first English writer of Biblical poetry. Thus, Biblical poetry written in England could not have existed before Cædmon, and *Gen A* could not have been written much earlier than 680 (Doane, *Genesis A* 36).

Bede’s story about Cædmon details Cædmon’s experience with being granted the gift of song. Cædmon was not born with his gift; it was bestowed upon him one night after he left a feast. Cædmon was employed by Abbess Hild’s monastery, and one night, after he had left a party, Cædmon went to guard a shed as he had been assigned. In a vision a man asked him to sing a song, and when he protested that he could not sing, the man told him to sing of the Creation. In his vision he sang an inspiring song of the Creation and when he awoke he remembered the words he sang in his sleep and added more verses praising God. When he told his superior, he was taken to Abbess Hild, who instructed him to take the monastic vows. He continued

composing songs, all concerning Scripture, from all of Genesis to the coming judgment. According to Bede, no one could equal him; he was not taught the art of music but received it through heavenly grace (Bede).

The song of the Creation that Bede related is the only poem of Cædmon's that has been identified as his, but because of Bede's story the term *Cædmonian* is used to define all Old English poetry that is based on Scripture. Thus, *G* is considered to be a Cædmonian poem and could not have been written before the generation of Abbot Hild and Cædmon, around 680.

Further Scholarship on *Genesis*

Further scholarship on *G*, concerning its language forms, was done by Eduard Sievers in 1929. According to Doane, Sievers divided the *Anglo-Saxon Genesis* into three parts rather than two. Sievers identified part I as lines 1-234, part II as 235-851 (*Gen B*), and part III as lines 852-2936. He hypothesized that each part might have had a different origin, which would mean that *Genesis* actually contained three distinct poems. Siever's hypothesis is not the only explanation for the differences between parts I and II, though his hypothesis of diverse origin for all three parts cannot be disproven. However, Doane pointed out that some forms in each section are distinct from those in the other sections (Doane, *Genesis A* 35).

Though the forms vary among parts I, II, and III, according to Doane a diverse origin of the three parts was not the only or the most likely explanation for the difference. Parts I and III did not differ enough in style to justify a theory of different origin. The differences were simply a higher poetic element and more numerous

examples of early West-Saxon elements in part I than in part III. Doane also cited Timmer's analysis of the prominent early West-Saxon forms in part II to explain its difference from the other parts (Doane, *Genesis A* 35). Doane suggested different stages of copying or revision rather than of origin:

The reasonable presumption is that the translation from Old Saxon to West-Saxon was made in Alfredian times and copied few enough times that these early West-Saxon forms have not been smoothed out. I tend to believe that the differences between I and II arose when the interpolation of *Genesis B* took place, about the same time as the translation was made, and that I bears the signs of an incomplete revision made at that time, which brought the earlier poem into early West-Saxon forms. Presumably the revision of III was not as thorough, or was by a different person. (*Genesis A* 35-36)

In Petur Knutsson 1995 article "Translation or Dialectal Adjustment?" he compared the similarities between the words in the corresponding twenty-six lines of *Gen B* and *VG* to the similarities between the corresponding lines of Martin Næs's 1983 translation from Icelandic into Faroese of the book of poems *Hauströkkrið yfir mér*. Because Faroese and Icelandic were similar languages when written and each could be read by both Icelanders and Faroese, they were similar in that respect to Old Saxon and Old English. Knuttson explained how, through the translation of the book of poems into Faroese, most words were changed to cognates while some words were changed completely. In the Icelandic to Faroese example Knutsson stated that because

native Faroese speakers exist today they could report that certain words, if translated into cognates, would result in an odd usage of the word or a completely different meaning than what was intended by the Icelandic. Knutsson thus stated that the need for a better word could explain the presence of words that appear in Old English in *Gen B* as non-cognates of their counterpart and Old-Saxon words in the corresponding twenty-six lines of the *VG*.

However, Knutsson also stated that it was highly unlikely that *Gen B* was translated directly from the fragment in *VG* and that, like Cædmon's hymn, of which the Northumbrian version survives in four manuscripts and West-Saxon version in thirteen, the surviving fragments *Gen B* and *VG* were likely to have been in many more manuscripts that have not been found. In comparing the four Northumbrian versions of Cædmon's hymn to the thirteen West-Saxon versions, Knutsson found many differences among the versions. He explained these differences by saying that depending on the manuscript used by the translator and the number of errors or changes in that manuscript, the resulting manuscripts could differ greatly as they are further and further removed from the original.

This differing of manuscripts based on the source manuscript used in the copying process could be another explanation for the non-cognate words in the Old English *Gen B*. If the first explanation is the case, that some words had to be changed in order for them to make sense, then *Gen B* could be considered a translation. If the second explanation is accurate, that the poem in its present state is the result of the

scribe using a manuscript that had direct cognates and is now lost, *Gen B* would be more a dialectal adjustment than a translation.

The history of *Gen A* and *Gen B* and the manuscript that they appear in is important to understand because a conclusion concerning the relationship between the two poems cannot be reached without their history. Because *Gen B* is a translation of an Old Saxon poem that is now lost it can be assumed that it was created for a different purpose than to be inserted into *Gen A*. If it was not meant to be inserted into another poem that would indicate that the Saxon author, in creating the poem, would have had a style and motive completely his own. The translator as well may have had his own motives for translating *Gen B* if he did not translate it in order for it to be combined with *Gen A*. Thus, it is apparent that *Gen A* and *Gen B* are quite distant from each other in regards to the motives for their creation, their origins, and their intended purposes. Only through an understanding of their differences can a conclusion concerning their relationship be reached.

Chapter Two

Analysis

Only recently have scholars considered the content of *G* instead of the mysteries of its history. Few have studied the characters of Adam and Eve, instead focusing on Satan and God. This chapter examines the only two significant studies of the relationship of Adam and Eve, neither of which recognizes the way in which *Gen B* places the greater responsibility for the Fall on Eve.

According to Remley the author of *Gen A* wrote the characters of Adam and Eve on the basis of the content in readings of a mix of Old Latin and Vulgate, readings of both versions of the Bible, and uncanonical additions or glosses found in other Latin scriptures (Remley 63-73). The description of Eve's creation is an example of this combination:

The abstract nouns *fultum* and *wraðu* ("help"; "aid") indicate that God creates Eve as a succor to Adam (Gen II.18: *adiutorium*, "assistance," the usual reading of the *Vetus Latina*, extant Anglo-Latin sources and some critical editions of the Vulgate) rather than as his servant or "helpmeet" (*adiutor*). (Remley 63)

In response to the lack of scholarship on whether the material in Eve's creation comes from an influence of Latin patristic exegesis or from non-biblical materials (as in secular folk traditions), Remley posited that the poet included non-canonical details because he was confronted with different accounts of the narrative of Eve's creation from his numerous sources (Remley 63-73).

In 1992 Peter J. Lucas, in his article “Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis and the Interpolation of *Genesis B* into *Genesis A*,” used the Germanic *comitatus* code in order to explain the difference between Satan’s fall and Adam and Eve’s fall. Tacitus explained the *comitatus* code in *Germania*. Translated from Latin, it says “to defend and protect him [the chief], to devote one’s own feats even to his glorification, this is the gist of their allegiance: the chief fights for victory, but the retainers for the chief” (Lucas, “Loyalty” 122). According to Lucas, the *comitatus* was integral in understanding the motives of the characters in *Gen B*, but in *Gen A* the author used the *comitatus* loosely. The difference in the use of the *comitatus* code between *Gen B* and *Gen A* could be seen in the way that the narrator of *Gen B* refers to Adam and Eve as God’s *giongran* ‘thanes’ while the author of *Gen A* calls Adam and Eve God’s *bearn* ‘children’. At the core of the *comitatus* code, and thus of *Gen B*, was loyalty; at the core of *Gen A* was obedience, as seen in God’s commandment not to eat of the fruit of the tree of death. Lucas explored these themes and concluded that the compiler inserted *Gen B* into *Gen A* because it explained the difference between Satan’s fall and Adam and Eve’s fall. Satan fell because he did not want to obey God any longer, so he became disloyal and fought against him. Eve disobeyed God, but she did so thinking that it was out of loyalty to Him: *heo dyde hit þeah þurh holdne hyge* ‘she did it out of a loyal heart’ (l. 708) (Lucas, “Loyalty” 131). Thus, God confined Satan in Hell, but He allowed Adam and Eve to keep the stars, and He clothed them even though He expelled them from Paradise (Lucas, “Loyalty” 122-135).

Rosemary Woolf, in her 1963 article “The Fall of Man In *Genesis B* and The *Mystère d’Adam*,” focused on the author’s purpose in writing *Gen B*. In regards to *Gen B*, her main point in her article was that the author focused on the psychological aspect of the Fall rather than just providing an explanation of the event. Woolf concludes that the *Gen B* author sought to portray Eve sympathetically. The author, Woolf says, was concerned with how the Messenger was able to persuade Adam and Eve into disobeying God. She goes on to say that modern critics had obscured the psychological subtlety of the *Gen B* author by commonly interpreting the narrator’s comments as absolving Eve of blame because the Messenger deceived her. Woolf stated that Stephen Humphreys Gurteen’s description of Eve in 1896, Woolf said, summed up the incorrect interpretation perfectly: Eve was “the prototype of true womanhood, selfless and self-sacrificing” (Woolf 189).

According to Woolf, this interpretation of Eve was wrong, and she cited proof in the description of the devil’s disguise. She asked the question, is the devil’s disguise impenetrable? She discussed three points to this question: the form of the devil’s disguise, his attempt to tempt Adam first, and the manner in which he attempts to tempt Adam and Eve.

Woolf stated that although the devil is described as being disguised as an angel of light in *Gen B*, it seemed as if the author had trouble with such a contradiction to BG, seen in the statement that the devil *wearp hine þa on wyrmes lice* ‘changed himself then into snake’s likeness’ (l. 491), when he approached Adam. However, the devil could not have been in the form of a serpent when speaking to Adam because he

claimed to be an angel of God, having just come from beside the throne. After the devil tempted both Adam and Eve the narrator called the devil a serpent again, saying that Eve was convinced by *wyrmes geþeaht* ‘snake’s thought’ (l. 590). Then, when Eve tempted Adam she said that *þes boda sciene, godes engel god* ‘this messenger shines, God’s good angel’ (l. 656-57). According to Woolf, it was obvious from the switching back and forth that the author saw the devil in the orthodox manner, but in writing the devil’s speeches he used a source that portrayed him disguised as an angel of light.

Woolf stated that there was no doubt that the nature of the Fall in *Gen B* was apocryphal in that the devil tempted Adam and Eve disguised as an angel of light, and the details of the disguise were the proof that the disguise was penetrable. She said that because the devil tempted Eve with what one would expect Eve to desire, to leave the pain of penance and to regain what she lost, the disguise of an angel of light represented a self-deception when one persuaded oneself that the wrong thing one desired was actually right.

To Woolf, it was clear that Church tradition dictated that the devil was sometimes disguised as an angel of light, and even though he claimed to have a divine message the person who believed him was not blameless. She said that the author’s use of an apocryphal source caused him to divert from the BG, but it did not change the fact that Eve was sinful in believing the devil.

In regards to the content of the devil’s temptation, according to Woolf, when the devil’s form was disguised he could only be identified through his speech. The

question, then, was can a person recognize the devil through his speech if the person was not immediately stirred by what he or she was tempted with? Woolf said that because Adam confronted the devil after hearing him speak he could be identified in that manner. It was almost a philosophical reasoning of Adam's that God could not contradict himself; he was thus prompted to reject the devil. In Eve's case, because she had *wifes wac gepoht* 'woman's weak mind' (l. 649) she could not come to the same conclusion as Adam: "to prove the point therefore that Eve was to blame, it is necessary to show that her moral sense as well as her reason failed her" (Woolf 194).

Eve was portrayed as the reason for the Fall because her pride was stirred by the devil's temptations. He promised her *meaht þu Adame eft gestyran* 'you might afterwards move Adam' (l. 568). According to Woolf the temptation of emulating Adam would have seemed convincing to the author of *Gen B*, but had no grounds in the BG. Though the narrator of *Gen B* did not stress Eve's subordination to Adam (though it could on one of the missing pages), Woolf said that the author, the translator, and the audience would have recognized the idea. She further stated that any audience would have recognized that the devil was attempting to rouse Eve's pride and therefore "Eve listened with a willful credulity springing from nascent vanity" (Woolf 196).

Finally, Woolf discussed the narrator's seemingly gentle attitude toward Eve. Rather than apologetic, these comments should be seen as sympathetic, said Woolf. Her proof was in the organization of the poem. Adam and Eve could be portrayed as either the heroes or the villains of the creation story, depending on who they were

contrasted with. If they were contrasted with Christ and the Virgin Mary they were, naturally, the villains. If, however, they were contrasted with Satan, they were the heroes of the Creation story. Woolf's second source of proof was in the fact that, with one exception, all of the narrator's sympathetic comments occurred after Eve ate the fruit and during the account of her persuasion of Adam. The exception occurred, Woolf said, when Eve was about to take the fruit; at this point the narrator first referred to her *wacra hyge* (l. 590). Woolf stated that the reference to her weaker mind was an excuse for her sin rather than a denial of it. Furthermore, the reference would not have been interpreted as anything more than the narrator's expression of sympathy for Eve as a victim, said Woolf, if it had not been mistakenly linked with the passage *heo dyde hit þeah þruh holdne hyge* (l. 708). The author was concerned with showing that Eve acted in good faith and was entirely fooled by the vision that the devil gave her. The comment that *heo dyde hit þeah þruh holdne hyge* was meant to show that Eve did not act with deliberate evil intent. Without the narrator's sympathetic descriptions, said Woolf, Eve would have seem proud and foolish through her speech and actions alone.

However, while Woolf argues that the narrator of *Gen B* comments on her in a sympathetic manner, much of the language used to describe her and her actions is much harsher than the language used in *Gen A*. When the narrator first refers to Eve's *wacran hige*, in line 590, the surrounding comments are a reminder and reinforcement of the doom that her actions bring upon humankind:

Lædde hie swa mid ligenum and mid listum speon
idese on þæt unriht, oðþæt hire on innan ongan
 590 *weallan wyrmes geþeaht, (hæfde hire wacran hige*
metod gemearcod), þæt heo hire mod ongan
lætan æfter þam larum; forþon heo æt þam laðan onfeng
ofer drihtnes word deaðes beames
weorcsumne wæstm. Ne wearð wyrse dæd
 595 *monnum gemearcod! Þæt is micel wundor*
þæt hit ece god æfre wolde
þeoden þolian, þæt wurde þegn swa monig
forlædd be þam lygenum þe for þam larum com.
Heo þa þæs ofættes æt, alwaldan bræc
 600 *word and willan.*

He then misled them with lies and with cunning, seduced the woman to do wrong, until her heart with the serpent's command began to seethe (she had been designed by God with a weaker mind), so that she, within her mind, began to follow after that command; because she took, against the Lord's word, the injurious tree of death's hurtful fruit. No worse deed ever happened to men! It is a great wonder that the eternal God, the Lord, would ever endure that so many thanes would be led

astray by the lies of him who came on account of the teaching. She then ate that fruit, broke the Almighty's word and will.

Eve's trespass against God may be explained by her weak thought, but the statements made by the narrator after she begins to believe the Messenger's lies indicate a strong negative opinion of Eve. She ate the fruit *ofer drihtnes word* 'against the Lord's word', caused the worse deed that had ever been done to human kind, and she broke the Almighty's word and will. This is the first time that the narrator details the disobedience of Eve's thoughts and actions in conjunction with mentioning her weaker mind. The second time the narrator mentions Eve's mental capacities he says that she has *wac gepoht*:

647 *Forlec hie þa mid ligenum . . .*
 648 *and hyge Euan,*
 wifes wac gepoht, þæt heo ongan his wordum truwian,
 650 *læstan his lare, and geleafan nom*
 þæt he þa bysene from gode brungen hæfde
 þe he hire swa wærlice wordum sægde,
 iewde hire tacen and treowa gehet,
 his holdne hyge.

He then misled them with lies . . . and Eve's heart, the woman's weak mind, so that she began to trust his words, listen to his command, and

take the belief that he had brought the vision from God, which he so carefully told her in words, showed her a sign, and promised favor.

This time the narrator states that Eve has *wac gepoht* 'weak mind'. Eve's mind is not just weaker than Adam's; it is weak in general. It is probable that the detail of Eve's *wac gepoht* was either part of the source or is the author's fabrication. However, after the narrator mentions her weak mind he repeatedly emphasizes the wrong that she committed. According to the narrator she performed the worst deed ever done by a human being. Thus, the narrator seems to be unsympathetic to Eve.

In the passage above the narrator reiterates the disobedience of Eve's actions. Eve trusted the Messenger and learned his teachings. Furthermore, because the phrase used to refer the lies of the Messenger is the same as the phrase used to refer to God's commandment it is apparent that the Messenger's teaching replaced God's in Eve's mind, *laestan his lare* in line 538 and line 650. She did not simply trust the Messenger, she trusted his words over what God himself had told her.

The phrase *wifes wac gepoht* refers to Eve's inability to deduce what Adam deduced; she was fooled by the devil's disguise. Contrary to what Woolf states in her article, the phrase does not necessarily explain why Eve trusted the Messenger. She might not have been able to see through the Messenger's disguise, but, according to the narrator of *Gen B* and his repeated detailing of how disobedient her actions were and the doom that her actions brought, that is not an excuse for her trust in him. Additionally, it would be reasonable to assume, based on Adam's statement that he expected a sign from the Messenger to prove that he came from God: *ne þu me*

oðiewdest ænig taken ‘nor did you show me any sign’ (l. 540), that if the Messenger had given Adam the sign he would have been fooled. Adam expects a sign from the Messenger, and because Eve tells him that she has received a sign from the Messenger, Adam believes her.

Not only does the narrator reiterate the disobedience of Eve’s actions after mentioning her *wacran hige*, but in other passages he also reinforces Eve’s character as someone who kept a teaching different than the one God gave her and who thus carried the majority of the responsibility for the Fall, which is opposed to the narrator’s description of her in *Gen A*, where Adam and Eve shared responsibility for Fall.

The narrator stresses the importance of learning God’s teaching and obeying it. He first describes Adam and Eve as eagerly bowing before God and accepting His teaching and command:

Hnigon þa mid heafdum heofoncyninge
 238 *georne togenes and sædon ealles þanc,*
 lista and þara lara.

They then bowed with heads to the king of heaven, eagerly before him
 and said thanks for all, his counsel and their teaching.

Then the narrator states the reason for keeping God’s teaching and command. If they do not keep his teachings they will experience sorrow and will no longer be dear to God:

Stod his handgeweorc
somod on sande, nyston sorga wiht
 243 *to begrornianne, butan heo godes willan*
lengest læsten. Heo wæron leof gode
ðenden heo his halige word healdan woldon.

There stood his handiwork together in the sand; they did not know a bit of sorrow to mourn for, as long as they should do God's will for a very long time. They were dear to God as long as they would keep his holy word.

Adam also states that it is important for him to keep God's teaching; in this speech he reveals his mental ability. He understands that it is a firm command not to eat of the tree of death:

Ponne ic sigedrihten,
mihtigne god, mæðlan gehyrde
 525 *strangre stemne, and me her stondan het,*
his bebodu healdan, and me þas bryd forgeaf,
wlitesciene wif, and me warnian het
þæt ic on þone deaðes beam bedroren ne wurde.

Then I heard the Lord of Victory, mighty God, speak a firmer message, and he commanded me to stand here, to keep his commandment, and he

gave me this woman, beautiful woman, and bade me pay attention so
that I should not be tempted by the tree of death.

He also understands the difference between hearing a command from God himself and from a messenger. He tells the Messenger that he will keep God's command because it was given to him by God Himself:

535 *Ic wat hwæt he me self bebead,
 nergend user, þa ic hine nehst geseah;
 he het me his word weorðian and wel healdan,
 læstan his lare.*

I knew what he himself commanded me, our savior, when I saw him
nearby; he bade me obey his word and hold it well, keep his teaching.

Furthermore, Adam understands the punishment for not living life according to God's teaching. According to Adam, a black hell awaits a person who disobeys God:

he cwæð þæt þa sweartan helle
530 *healdan sceolde se ðe bi his heartan wuht*
 laðes gelæde.

He said that he who is led by his heart to know evil shall keep the black
hell.

Adam understands the importance of God's teaching and obeying it. He is also able to deduce that the Messenger is not a messenger from God. He points out three

reasons for his distrust in the Messenger. The first is *þu gelic ne bist aenegum his engla þe ic aer geseah* ‘you are not like any of his angels that I have ever seen’ (l. 538-39), the second: *ne þu me oðiewdest ænig taken/ þe he me þurh treowe to onsende* ‘nor have you shown me any signs that he through trust showed me’ (l. 540-41), and the third: *He mæg me of his hean rice/ geofian mid goda gehwilcum, þeah his gingran ne sende* ‘He may present me with every good from his high kingdom, even though he does not send his servant’ (l. 545-46). Thus, Adam demonstrates his mental prowess. The narrator, however, does not add comments concerning his character or his righteousness, as he does with his comments on the evil of Eve’s thought process and actions; as soon as Adam is done speaking the Messenger turns to Eve.

The Messenger spends more time tempting Eve than he does Adam. He speaks thirty-seven lines to Eve, but only twenty-six lines to Adam. Also, in his speech to Adam he appeals exclusively to him; he only uses the second-person pronouns *þu*, *þin*, *þe*, *þinum*, and *þine* ‘you and your’. In his speech to Eve, however, the Messenger begins by appealing to her connection to Adam with the dual pronouns *inc* and *incre* ‘you two’ before appealing to her power to save both her and Adam from God’s punishment. The strategic use of pronouns points to the Messenger’s manner of temptation. He first appeals to her connection to Adam, then to her power and her potential to have power over Adam, to the mistake that Adam made, and finally to the punishment that they will both receive because of Adam. The Messenger is much more involved in his temptation of Eve than his temptation of Adam, a distinction that

indicates that to the Messenger, and also possibly to the narrator, Eve is a more influential character in the Fall than Adam.

When the Messenger approaches Adam he spends his time explaining why he is there; he is concerned with convincing Adam that he is a messenger truly sent by God. He first tells Adam that *ic wið hine sylfne sæt* ‘I sat with him himself’, followed immediately with the fake message from God and the temptation:

Pa het he me on þysne sið faran,
 500 *het þæt þu þisses ofætēs æte, cwæð þæt þin abal and cræft*
 and þin modsefa mara wurde,
 and þin lichoma leohtra micle,
 þin gesceapu scenran, cwæð þæt þe æniges sceattes ðearf
 ne wurde on worulde.

Then he bade me go on this journey, bade that you eat this fruit, said that your power and craft and your heart would become more, and your body would be much lighter, and your shape become more beautiful, said that you would not need any wealth in the world.

The Messenger spends the rest of his time, eighteen lines, attempting to convince Adam that he is truly a messenger of God.

When tempting Eve, however, the Messenger spends more time tempting her and appealing to her desires than he does attempting to convince her that he is a

messenger of God. He introduces himself by saying that he knows that they will anger God if they do not do what he says:

Ic wat, inc waldend god

552 *abolgen wyrð, swa ic him þisne bodscipe*
 selfa secge, þonne ic of þys siðe cume
 ofer langne weg, þæt git ne læstan wel
 hwilc ærende swa he easten hider

556 *on þysne sið sendeð*

I know the Lord God will be angry against you two when I myself tell
 him this message, when I come from this journey over a long way, that
 you did not obey this errand as he sent it hither on this journey.

In introducing himself by threatening Eve with God's anger the Messenger uses a tactic to seduce Eve different from the tactic he used against Adam. Instead of focusing on convincing Eve that he is truly a messenger of God, he tempts her with a combination of threats and appeals to her desires. His first point of seduction is when he refers to her as *wif willende* 'woman willing' (l. 560). Previously the narrator has only referred to her as *Adames bryd* and other similarly connecting titles, so when the Messenger refers to her desires she becomes a being who wants things for herself. The Messenger may be tempting her with the possibility of equality with Adam. Then he reminds her of possible punishment with the threat *þu inc bam twam meaht/ wite*

bewarigan, swa ic þe wisie ‘you might know and beware for both of you, just as I teach you’ (l. 562-63). He next fully tempts her:

- Æt þisses ofetes! Þonne wurðað þin eagan swa leoht*
- 565 *þæt þu meaht swa wide ofer woruld ealle*
 geseon siððan, and selfes stol
 herran þines, and habban his hyldo forð.
 Meaht þu Adame eft gestyran,
 gif þu his willan hæfst and he þinum wordum getrywð.
- 570 *Gif þu him to soðe sægst hwylce þu selfa hæfst*
 bisne on breostum, þæs þu gebod godes
 lare læstes, he þone laðan strið,
 yfel andwyrde an forlæteð
 on breostcofan, swa wit him bu tu
- 575 *an sped sprecað.*

Eat this fruit! Then light will come to your eyes so that you might afterwards see widely all over the world, and see your lord’s throne itself, and have his favor afterward. You might afterward move Adam, if you have the will for it and he trust your words. If you say to him truly what law you yourself have in your breast, that you obeyed God’s command for a long time, he then will struggle against misfortune,

wrongly answer and surrender to in heart, so know him you two one
skillfully speak.

He tempts Eve by telling her that she will be able to see over the entire world and to see God on his throne if she eats the fruit. He also tells her that she will be able to have power over Adam if she can successfully convince him also to eat the fruit. He then reminds Eve of the accusations that Adam made against him and tells her *gif þu þæt angin fremest, idesa sea betste,/ forhele ic incrum herran þæt me hearmes swa fela/ Adam gespræc, eargra worda* ‘if you do that excellent endeavor, best of women, I will conceal from your lord the great harm that Adam spoke against me, vile words’ (l. 578-580). Then he spends five lines telling Eve that he has all the trappings of a messenger of God and that Adam thus spoke against him, as opposed to his eighteen lines in his speech to Adam that are spent attempting to convince him that he is truly a messenger sent from God.

The narrator’s portrayal of Eve’s temptation of Adam reinforces her role as the holder of the majority of the responsibility of the Fall. When she goes to Adam to tempt him the narrator states that it is because she is the corrupted handiwork of God that the Fall came to pass:

626 *þa gieng to Adame idesa scenost,*
 wifa wlitegost þe on woruld come,
 forþon heo wæs handgeweorc heofoncyniges,
 þeah heo þa dearnenga fordon wurde,
630 *forlæd mid ligenum, þæt hie lað gode*

*þurh þæs wraðan geþanc weorðan sceolden,
 þurh þæs deofles searo dom forlætan,
 hierran hylde, hefonrices polian
 monige hwile.*

Then the most shining woman went to Adam, the most beautiful woman who came into the world, because she was the heavenly king's handiwork, though she was then insidiously corrupted, led astray with lies, so that through perverse thought it should come to pass that they would, through the devil's cleverness, do evil to God and the Lord's favor, the Lord of the kingdom of heaven, judgment for a long time.

According to the narrator, another reason why Adam follows Eve in eating the fruit is that it is because the person tempting him is Eve herself. Her manner of temptation, speaking frequently and for an entire day, causes Adam to change his mind about eating the fruit:

Heo spræc ða to Adame idesa sceonost
 705 *ful þiclice, oð þam þegne ongan*
his hige hweorfan, þæt he þam gehate getruwode
þe him þæt wif wordum sægde.
Heo dyde hit þeah þurh holdne hyge, nyste þæt þær hearma swa fela,
fyrenearfeða, fylgean sceolde
 710 *monna cynne, þæs heo on mod genam*

*þæt heo þæs laðan bodan larum hyrde,
 ac wende þæt heo hylde heofoncyniges
 worhte mid þam wordum þe heo þam were swelce
 tacen oðiewde and treowe gehet,
 oðþæt Adame innan breostum
 his hyge hwyrfde and his heorte ongann
 wendan to hire willan.*

She spoke very frequently then to Adam, the woman most shining,
 until she began to turn his heart, so that he trusted that command that
 the woman said to him. She did it though through loyal heart. She did
 not know that such great harms, sinful woes, should follow mankind, of
 which she took in mind what teaching she heard from the evil
 messenger, but thought that she wrought the favor of the king of heaven
 with the words that she to the man showed a symbol and bade truth,
 until in Adam's inner breast his mind turned and his heart began to turn
 to her will.

The narrator makes it clear that Eve, and not the Messenger, convinces Adam.
 Eve's actions of turning from the Lord's teaching and convincing Adam to do the
 same cause the Fall. However, the narrator also adds that *Heo dyde hit þeah þurh
 holdne hyge, nyste þæt þær hearma swa fela,/ fyrenearfeða, fylgean sceolde/ monna
 cynne* 'She did it though through loyal heart. She did not know that such great harms,

sinful woes, should follow mankind' (l. 708). Woolf argues that this statement is meant to show that the narrator is sympathetic to Eve and that she did not act out of evil intent. However, the narrator explains that she did act deliberately when he says *ac wende þæt heo hyldo heofoncyniges/ ac wende þæt heo hyldo heofoncyniges/ worhte mid þam wordum þe heo þam were swelce/ tacen oðiewde and treowe gehet* 'but thought that she wrought the favor of the king of heaven with the words that she to the man showed a symbol and bade truth' (l. 712-14). She may not have acted out of evil intent, but her actions were intentional. After both Adam and Eve have eaten the fruit and the Messenger has left, the narrator declares *Þæt wif gnornode/ hof hreowigmod, (hæfde hyldo godes,/ lare forlæten)*, 'The woman lamented, having sorrow (she had given up God's favor, abandoned his teaching)' (l. 770-72). At this point the narrator does not state that the Messenger misled her as before, instead stating that she disobeyed God on her own.

In putting emphasis on Eve's thought process and the consequences of her actions as well as on the Messenger's temptation of her, the narrator of *Gen B* makes it clear that he is treating Eve as the person who is mostly responsible for the Fall. Because of her, he shows, the Fall took place, as is evident in the narrator's statement after Eve has eaten the fruit that *Ne wearð wyrse dæd/ monnum gemearcod!* 'no worse deed ever happened to mankind' (l. 594-95). Furthermore, Adam himself blames Eve and accosts her for her actions:

Hwæt, þu Eue, hæfst yfele gemearcod

792 *uncer sylfra sið. Gesyhst þu nu þa sweartan helle*

*grædige and gifre. Nu þu hie grimman meahht
heonane gehyran.*

Lo, Eve, you have marked our own journey for us. You see now the
ravenous and greedy bleak hell. Now you might hear them groan from
here.

The focus on Eve in *Gen B* is contrary to *Gen A*, and BG, where Adam is portrayed as
the focus of the events of the Fall.

Gen A follows the events of BG more closely than does *Gen B*; except for the
description of the Fall of Satan and his followers, *Gen A* generally follows BG. In BG
Adam and Eve do not realize that they are naked until Adam follows Eve in eating the
fruit (Gen 3:7). God calls upon Adam to ask where they are (Gen 3:9) and punishes
Adam second (Gen 3:17). In Genesis 3:21 it is apparent in the syntax that Adam is the
main character and Eve is an appendage: “Unto Adam also and to his wife did
the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them.”

As in BG, in *Gen A* the narrator focuses on Adam and the effect of his eating
of the fruit. Because of the missing pages. Adam does not appear until God decides to
create a helper for him:

*Ne þuhte þa gerysne rodora wearde,
170 þæt Adam leng ana wære
neorxnawonges, niwre gesceafte,
hyrde and healdend. Forþon him heahcyning,*

*frea ælmihtig fultum tiode;
wif aweahte and þa wraðe sealde,
lifes leohtfruma, leofum rince.*

It did not seem appropriate to the heaven's protector that Adam should be any longer alone in Paradise, the new creation, shepherd and guardian. Therefore the high king, lord almighty, prepared a support for him; he, life's light source, created a woman and then quickly gave her to the beloved man.

The first two epithets given to Adam indicate his independence as a character. He is *hyrde and healdend* 'shepherd and protector' (l. 171-72). However, the first title the narrator gives Eve is *fultum* 'help' (l. 173), which immediately links her to Adam and indicates that she exists for him. She is then identified as *wif* (l. 174). Even before her creation is described, the narrator has identified her as a person who exists only for Adam.

The narrator describes the event of Eve's creation as one that is primarily focused on Adam. Though God is making another human being, the narrator describes what happened to Adam and how he felt during the process:

*He wæs reste fæst,
and softe swæf, sar ne wiste,
180 earfoða dæl, ne þær ænig com
blod of benne, ac him brego engla*

*of lice ateah liodende ban,
 wer unwundod, of þam worhte god
 freolice fæmnan.*

He was fast asleep, and undisturbed in sleep, did not feel soreness, part of pains, nor came there any blood from the wound, but from him the Lord of the Angels took a growing bone, from the man unwounded; of that God wrought the beautiful woman.

In the passage above the narrator follows the events of Gen 2:20 and 21 and is explicitly concerned with Adam. After Eve's creation the narrator connects her to Adam, saying that she is his woman and further showing that he is concerned with Adam:

185 *Heo wæron englum gelice,
 þa wæs Eve, Adames bryd,
 gaste gegearwod.*

They were like the angels; then Eve was made, Adam's woman, a spirit.

Thus, before, after, and during Eve's creation the narrator focuses on Adam and his role in her creation rather than on her character.

The narrator also identifies Eve as *freolice fæmnan* 'beautiful woman' (l. 184, *freolecu fæmne* l. 998), *moder* 'mother' (l. 194), *wif* 'woman' (l. 195), *freolecu mæg*

‘beautiful maid’ (l. 895), and *ides æwiscmod* ‘ashamed woman’ (l. 896). Adam refers to her as *freolucu fæmne* ‘beautiful woman’ (l. 884) and *bryd* ‘woman’ (l. 883). God calls her *wif* ‘woman’ (l. 911) and *dohtrum* ‘daughter’ (l. 198, *dohtor* l. 888). The narrator refers to her as *moder* and *wif* in line 194 and in line 195 and connects her to Adam in the process: *monna cynnes/ ða forman twa, fæder and moder,/wif and wæpned* ‘mankind/ the first two, father and mother,/ woman and man’ (l. 193-95). Though the syntax of the lines indicate that Adam and Eve are equal in their roles, because Eve’s first identification is as *fultum* to Adam, it is unlikely that the narrator intended to depict Eve as equal to Adam. The epithets and titles given to Eve reinforce her connection to the characters around her. She is either God’s daughter and beautiful creation, Adam’s bride and help, or the ashamed woman because she is deceived. The only titles that do not explicitly connect her to Adam are those that refer to her beauty. Her only value, then, other than as *fultum* to Adam and daughter to God, is in her beauty, which sets her apart from Adam in that Adam is useful in ways other than being attractive.

Adam, on the other hand, is most often referred to by the narrator in a manner that indicates his independence. The narrator refers to Adam by name, *Adam* or *Adame* at least eight times, when he only refers to Eve by name, *Eve* or *Eue*, about four times. Adam is also identified as, *fæder* ‘father’ (l. 974), *eorðbuende* ‘earth dweller’ (l. 221), *weard . . . woruldgescæfta* ‘guardian of the world’ (l. 863), *wer* ‘the man’ (l. 183), and *his sunu* ‘[God’s] son’ (865). God calls Adam *sunu* ‘son’ once (l. 873). While Adam is linked to God, the world, and to Eve, he is primarily depicted as independent

through his epithets *weard . . . woruldgesceafta, hyrde, healdend, gesceafta*, and *eorðbuende*, and the frequency of the use of his name indicates not only that Adam is an independent being and that his purpose is to guard Paradise but also that in *Gen A* he is the narrator's focus.

After the Fall, Adam and Eve both hide themselves from God. When God goes to Paradise to find out what they did, he specifically calls for Adam:

Pa sona ongann swegles aldor

863 *weard ahsian woruldgesceafta,*
 het him recene to rice þeoden
 his sunu gangan.

Heaven's Protector then soon began to ask for the guardian of the world, commanded him, his son, immediately to go to the Lord of the Kingdom.

God does not care why he cannot find Eve. He is only concerned that Adam is not approaching him.

When God calls for him Adam comes out of his hiding place but remains ashamed that he is naked. God notices his shame and asks him why he hid himself:

Saga me þæt, sunu min, for hwon secest ðu

874 *sceade sceomiende? Þu sceonde æt me*
 furðum ne anfenge, ac gefean eallum.

Tell me that, my son, why do you seek the shade feeling shame? You previously did not feel shame before me, but enjoyed all.

Though the narrator says that Adam and Eve sit apart from each other, ashamed, here God still addresses only Adam. God seems to care only about why Adam is hiding from him, not about why Eve is hiding. When Adam explains to God why he is ashamed he tells Him that it is because Eve gave him the fruit of the tree of death:

883 *Me ða blæda on hand bryd gesealde,
freolucu fæmne, freadrihten min.*

The woman gave me the fruit in hand, the beautiful woman, my Lord. In passage above Adam exclusively uses the pronouns *ic*, *me*, and *mine* and God uses the pronouns *þu*, *þe*, and *þin*. Only when Adam blames Eve does God turn to her. Thus, through God's actions and speech it can be seen that the narrator's primary concern is with Adam.

When God asks Adam why he is hiding he says *furðum ne anfenge, ac gefean eallum*, which indicates a softness of God's words in that he is bringing up Adam's previous carefree and joyful behavior. The softness in God's speech to Adam becomes more apparent when compared to what he says to Eve; when He asks her why she ate the fruit and gave it to Adam He reminds her that he gave her the gift of Paradise only to throw it away: *Hwæt druge þu, dohtor, dugeþa genohra,/ niwra gesceafta neorxnawanges,/ growendra gifa, þa þu gitsiende/on beam gripe, blæda name/ on treowes telgum, and me on teonan*. 'what did you do, daughter, with the ample gift of

the newly created paradise, growing gift, when you, desiring the tree, took the fruit of the tree's branch, and wronged me' (l. 888-92). Though he calls her *dohtor*, a title that could be considered loving and soft, when presented beside the accusation that *me on teonan dohtor* loses the majority of its softness. When God speaks to Eve he only uses the pronoun *þu*, except in line 894 when He reminds her that He forbade both of them eat the fruit, reinforcing the importance of following His word:

*“Hwæt druge þu, dohtor, dugeþa genohra,
niwra gesceafta neorxnawanges,
890 growendra gifa, þa þu gitsiende
on beam gripe, blæda name
on treowes telgum, and me on teonan
æte þa unfreme, Adame sealdest
wæstmæ þa inc wæron wordum minum
895 fæste forbodene?” Him þa freolecu mæg,
ides æwiscmod andswarode.*

“What did you do, daughter, with the gift of this newly created paradise, growing gift, when you, desiring the tree, took the fruit of the tree's branch, and wronged me, ate the injurious thing; you gave Adam the fruits which to you both were forbidden by my words.” The beautiful maid, the ashamed woman, answered him.

The narrator, God, Adam, and Eve continue to use singular pronouns to refer to themselves and to each other, reinforcing their individual roles during their punishments, until God is about to banish them from Paradise. God only uses *inc* to link Eve and the Messenger, as in line 915:

tuddor bið gemæne

915 *incrum orlegnið a þenden standeð*

woruld under wolcnum.

Your two offspring will be mutually hostile as long as the world stands
under the heavens.

The narrator only returns to using the pronouns *hie* to refer to Adam and Eve at line 941, after God has punished Adam. Adam and Eve are linked in their exodus from Paradise. God clothes them both and sends them from Paradise.

The use of singular pronouns in these passages, as opposed to the purposeful use of *inc* to link Adam and Eve before the Fall, point to the narrator's thoughts concerning the characters and their actions. Specifically, the narrator separates Adam and Eve not only from each other but also from God. However, when God uses *inc* in line 894 to remind Eve that he forbade both of them to eat of the fruit, Adam's primary role in the Fall can be seen. If the narrator of *Gen A* shouldered Eve alone with the responsibility for the Fall, God would not have used the pronoun *inc* when reminding Eve of his instructions. Instead, the narrator could have had God use the pronoun *þu* and would have indicated his blame of her alone, shouldering her with the

majority of the responsibility for the Fall. Instead, God brings Adam into the picture when asking Eve about her motives for eating the fruit. These passages show that the narrator, through his descriptions and through God's speeches, follows BG in his focus on Adam and its equal division of responsibility between Adam and Eve.

Conclusion

The question concerning *Gen A* and *Gen B* is their relationship. How do they fit together? How does *Gen B* affect *Gen A*? Why did the compiler add *Gen B* to *Gen A* to create *G*? Why did he or she place *Gen B* where it is within the poem? What was the impact of the insertion on the resulting poem? These questions, of course, remain for now unresolved. Analysis of the portrayal of Adam and Eve in the two poems, however, offers some insights into the effect of the relationship between *Gen A* and *Gen B* on *G*.

Gen A follows the events in BG more closely than *Gen B* does; except for the interlude explaining the fall of some of heaven's angels, *Gen A* follows the order of events of BG with expansions, such as dialogues between God and Adam and Eve. *Gen B* also follows the order of BG, but because it expands it more than *Gen A* does, *Gen B* has to be considered as the author's creation, a result of the source that the author used, or possibly the influence of the author's Germanic culture, as we can see in the use of the word *þegn* (l. 414, 585, 597, 705, 744, and 836) and the narrator's description of the Messenger's preparation to tempt Adam and Eve as if her were preparing for battle (l. 444). The author does more than expand on the Biblical material; he adds events and details that cannot be found in BG, and *Gen B*'s dialogues are much longer than *Gen A*'s. *Gen B* also includes a detailed description of Satan's fall from heaven, his speech to his followers in hell, the presence of Satan's Messenger, the temptation of Adam, and the workings of Eve's mind.

In BG the Fall does not happen until both Adam and Eve have eaten the fruit, showing a shared responsibility between Adam and Eve. BG also focuses on Adam; he is the first human made by God and the last creature to be punished by God. Following the same pattern, *Gen A* focuses on Adam to the extent of making Eve a secondary character. The narrator states that she is made only to be Adam's *fulum* and frequently refers to her as Adam's *bryd* and *wif*.

In *Gen B*, however, the opposite is true. Though Satan's messenger goes to tempt Adam first, he does not seem to try very hard; he only speaks twenty-six lines to Adam, as opposed to speaking thirty-seven lines to Eve, and he spends his time with Adam attempting to prove that he is truly a messenger sent by God. The Messenger's temptation of Eve is also more dynamic than his temptation of Adam; the Messenger appeals to Eve's pride, saying *meaht þu Adame eft gestyran* 'You might afterward move Adam' (l. 568). The narrator of *Gen B* makes it clear that though Eve thought she was acting according to God's command, she acted against God when she kept the Messenger's command over His: *þæs heo on mod genam/ þæt heo þæs laðan bodan larum hyrde,/ ac wende þæt heo hyldo heofoncyniges* 'she took in mind what teaching she heard from the evil messenger, but thought that she wrought the favor of the king of heaven' (l. 710-12). She may have had *wac gepoht*, which implies that she did not have the power to determine that the Messenger was not sent by God, but she decided to keep the Messenger's *larum* instead.

When the compiler inserted *Gen B* into *Gen A* he significantly changed the effect of the poem. Over time, and possibly during the insertion, pages were either

removed or lost, changing the poem again and again. What remains is a fragmentary extrapolation of BG, some passages following the events of BG more closely than others. Perhaps if *Gen A* had remained unchanged Adam and Eve would have shared equal responsibility for the Fall. They both disobeyed God's command, and both received God's punishment. However, by inserting *Gen B* into *Gen A*, the compiler placed the focus, and thus the majority of the responsibility, on Eve. The narrator reiterates the wrongness of Eve's actions when she eats the fruit and tempts Adam, the Messenger brings out Eve's pride by tempting her with the ability to command Adam, and the narrator states that in keeping the Messenger's *larum* over God's she caused the worst event ever done to man. Adam still carries some of the responsibility in *Gen B* because he listened to Eve and ate the fruit, but the narrator shows, even through Adam when he blames her for their fate, that Eve carries the majority of the responsibility. *Gen A* describes the Fall almost as neutrally as BG, but because of the insertion of *Gen B*, *G* blames Eve for the Fall.

Thus, although *Gen A* expands the Biblical material less than *Gen B*, *G* as a whole is a significant expansion of BG. The scope of the expansion suggests that the compiler was not satisfied with *Gen A* as it was. He or she chose to insert *Gen B* to fill a void in *Gen A*. This choice of text with which to fill the void, however, repeats parts and contradicts others of *Gen A*. Both poems contain a narrative of the fall of some of God's angels, and *Gen A* focuses on Adam while *Gen B* focuses on Eve. The author of *Gen B* seems preoccupied with the psychological aspect of Eve's actions and through this preoccupation details her mental state and the dire consequences of her deed.

Thereby, to some extent, the author of *Gen B* excuses Adam for the Fall. This perspective not only accords with that of the author of BG but anticipates the common view of later generations, for whom Eve was the mother of human misery and the first of the human sinners. Although Adam took the fruit and disobeyed God, in *Gen B* the Fall of Adam and Eve becomes—perhaps for the first time in literature—the Hell that Eve inflicted on humankind.

Works Cited

- Bede. *An Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature, Volume A. The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. New York: Norton, 2006. 25-27. Print.
- Doane, Alger N. *Genesis A: A New Edition*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1978. Print.
- . *The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon Vatican Genesis*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991. Print.
- Gerould, G. H. "The Transmission and Date of Genesis B." *Modern Language Notes* 26.5 (1911): 129-33. Web. 11 April 2012.
- Knutsson, Petur. "Translation or Dialectal Adjustment?" *NOWELE* 25 (1995): 107-26. *ILLiad*. Web. 1 Oct. 2011.
- Krapp, George Phillip, and E. V. K. Dobbie, eds. *The Junius Manuscript*. New York: Columbia U, 1961. Print.
- Lucas, Peter J. *Franciscus Junius*. Atlanta: Rodopi, 2000. Print.
- . "Loyalty and Obedience in the Old English Genesis and the Interpolation of Genesis B in Genesis A." *Neophilologus* 76 (1992): 121-35. Web. 1 Oct. 2011.
- . "MS Junius 11 and Malmesbury." *Scriptorium* 34 (1980): 197-220. Print.
- Menner, Robert J. "The Date and Dialect of *Genesis A*, 852-2936." *Anglia* 70 (1951): 285-94.
- Raw, Barbara. "The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11." *ASE* 13 (1984): 187-207. Print.

Remley, Paul Gardner. "The Biblical Sources of the Junius Poems *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel*." Diss. Columbia U, 1990. Print.

Timmer, B. J. *The Later Genesis*. Bristol (UK): Scrivener, 1948. Print.

Woolf, Rosemary. "The Fall of Man in *Genesis B* and The *Mystère d'Adam*." *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*. Ed. Stanley B. Greenfield. Eugene: U of Oregon, 1963. 187-99. Print.

Works Consulted

The Battle of Maldon and Other Old English Poems. Trans. Kevin Crossley-Holland. Ed. Bruce Mitchell. New York: Macmillan, 1965. Print.

Biggs, Frederick M., et al. *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*. Binghamton: State U of New York P, 1990. Print.

Boenig, Robert. *Anglo-Saxon Spirituality*. Mahwah: Paulist, 2000. Print.

Bradof, Carol A. *Genesis B, Carolingian History, and the German Heroic Tradition*. New York: Columbia UP, 1991. Print.

Critchley, John. *Feudalism*. London: Allen, 1978. Print.

Doane, Alger N. "Interdialectics and Reading Genesis B." *Of Pavlova, Poetry and Paradigms: Essays in Honour of Harry Orsman*. Ed. Laurie Bauer and Christine Franzen. Wellington, NZ: Victoria UP, 1993. 112-22. Print.

Fouquin, Guy. *Lordship and Feudalism in the Middle Ages*. Trans. Iris and A. L. Lytton Sells. New York: Pica, 1976. Print.

Genesis A. Trans. Lawrence Mason. *Translations from the Old English*. Ed. A. S. Cook, et al. n.p.: Archon, 1970. Print.

Jager, Eric. *The Tempter's Voice: Language and the Fall in Medieval Literature*.

Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993. Print.

Luizza, R. M. *The Poems of MS Junius 11*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Ogilvy, J. D. A. *Books Known to the English, 597-1066*. Cambridge: Medieval

Academy of America, 1967. Print.

Poems and Prose from the Old English. Trans. Burton Raffel. Ed. Alexandra H. Olsen

and Burton Raffel. London: Yale UP, 1998. Print.

Stephenson, Carl. *Mediaeval Feudalism*. New York: Cornell UP, 1942. Print.

Strayer, Joseph R. *Feudalism*. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1965. Print.

Swanton, Michael. *The Dream of the Rood*. Exeter: U of Exeter, 1987. Print.

Treharne, Elaine, ed. *Old and Middle English c.890-1400, an Anthology*. Malden:

Blackwell, 2004. Print.

Wilson, Michael John. *The Rhetoric of Genesis A*. Kent: Kent State UP, 2002. Print.

Woolf, Rosemary. "The Devil in Old English Poetry." *The Review of English Studies*

4.13 (1953): 1-12. Web. 1 Oct. 2011.