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“Since Berofene”: Death and Treasure in Exodus and Beowulf

The poet of the Old English Exodus is often assumed to have been influenced by the well-known allegorical interpretations of the biblical Exodus. As such, scholars have read the Egyptians’ plundered treasures, which play a much larger role in the Old English poem than in the biblical account, in these allegorical terms. However, while acknowledging that allegorical interpretations of Exodus must have been known to the Old English poet, this paper will argue that the despoiling of the Egyptians is informed as much (if not more so) by the heroic, vernacular tradition, in which death and the loss of treasure are closely associated. By comparing the scene of plunder at the start of Exodus with three scenes of deprivation in Beowulf, this paper will argue that the poet of Exodus had Beowulf in mind when composing the account of death and despoiling on the night of the Israelites’ departure.
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The Old English Exodus closes with the striking image of the victorious Israelites distributing the plundered treasures of the Egyptians on the shores of the Red Sea.

While this detail is not present in the biblical Exodus, it is found in Wisdom 10.19.1

However, the scriptural account does mention the despoiling of the Egyptians on the night that the Israelites make their departure:

Feceruntque filii Israel sicut praeciperat Moyses: et petierunt ab Ægyptiis vasa argentea et aurea, vestemque plurimam. Dominus autem dedit gratiam populo coram Ægyptiis ut commodarent eis: et spoliaverunt Ægyptios (Exodus 12.35-6).2

---

1 Lucas, ed., Exodus, 54-5. Lucas notes that the poet’s main source was Exodus 13.20-14.31, though it is not clear which version they used; there is evidence to suggest that the poet knew the Old Latin version of Genesis, and probably also Exodus (52-3). See Breeze, “The Book of Habakkuk”, for evidence that Habakkuk is among the Old English poet’s biblical sources.

2 See also Exodus 11.2. All quotations from the Vulgate are from Weber, et al., ed., Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem. All translations are original unless otherwise stated.
(And the children of Israel did as Moses had instructed: and they asked the Egyptians for silver and golden vessels, and much clothing. And the Lord gave favour to the people in the presence of the Egyptians, so that they obliged them: and they plundered the Egyptians.)

In the Old English poem, this preliminary looting appears to be synonymous with the death of the Egyptian first-born sons, who are referred to as “treasure-guardians”. As James W. Bright notes, the Old English poet “selects this culmination of the calamities (not the series of plagues) as the effective cause of the national distress.” Loss of life and treasure appear fundamentally interconnected:

\[ ða wæs ungeare ealdum witung \\
    deaðe gedreced drihtfolca mæst, \\
    hordwearda hryre (heaf wæs geniwad); \\
    swæfon seledreamas since berofene \\
(33-6).\]

3 “Hordwearda” (Exodus, line 35a). For the identification of the hordweardas with the first-born sons, see Irving, ed., Exodus, 68.

4 Bright, “On the Anglo-Saxon Poem Exodus”, 13; as Bright observes, “the overthrowing of the idols” is also grouped together with the despoiling and death of the first-born.

5 All quotations from Exodus are taken from Lucas, ed., Exodus, unless otherwise stated. The emendation ungeare (“recently”), makes better sense than the MS reading ingere; as Edward B. Irving hypothesises, it must be assumed that “God’s action takes place ‘recently’ in relation to the moment of the Exodus itself” (Irving, “New Notes on the Old English Exodus”, 292). For alternative interpretations, see Greenfield, “‘Exodus’ 33a” and North, Heathen Gods, 58-64.
(Then the greatest of nations was soon afflicted by ancient punishments, by death, by the fall of the treasure-guardians [mourning was renewed]; the joys of the hall slept, deprived of treasure).  

Here the poet describes, from the point of view of the Egyptians, the dual tragedy of the death of the first-born sons and the deprivation of treasure. The designation of the first-born as treasure-guardians implies that the two losses are part of the same blow dealt by the departing Israelites.

The final line of this passage has been the subject of no little scholarly debate. Bright holds that the entirety of “heaf wæs geniwad; / swæfon seledreamas since berofene” is parenthetic. In his edition of the poem, however, Irving argues that the phrase since berofene (“deprived of treasure”) is “syntactically homeless” unless it is attached to the following sentence, which Irving finds awkward. J. R. R. Tolkien, on the other hand, holds that this line is “a fine and bold expression in which grammatically berofene goes with seledreamas, which stands, of course, for men making merry in a king’s or chieftain’s hall”; he adds that these men “are robbed of treasure by the general mourning.” Lucas shares Tolkien’s opinion that since berofene should be attached to seledreamas, but argues that, like hordweard, this compound

---

6 Peter Lucas notes that the phrase hordwearda hryre must be parallel with deaðe (Lucas, ed., Exodus, 79).
9 Tolkien and Turville-Petre, ed., The Old English Exodus, 38. C. H. De Roo, in contrast, thinks very little of this line, maintaining that it is one of many examples in Exodus “of the inept use of traditional rhetoric to inject excitement into the poem” (De Roo, “Old English Sele”, 116).
refers to the first-born. Bright likewise interprets since berofone as describing the
treasure-guardians, suggesting that if the poet’s language were “plainly logical”, rather
than “boldly figurative”, berofone would be berofenra, “to qualify hordweard”. This
paper will follow Lucas’s interpretation that since berofone qualifies the noun it
immediately follows, seledreamas. As these seledreamas had once been in possession
of sinc (“treasure”), it must be assumed that they are human and so should be
understood, as Lucas argues, as variation on hordweard, which refers to the murdered
first-born, erstwhile treasure-guardians.

The passage poses a number of questions for which this paper will offer some
answers. Firstly, why does the poet refer to the first-born as the treasure-guardians? The
term hordweard is used at the end of the poem, more fittingly, to refer to the Egyptians
in general, but here it seems unusually placed. The epithet hordweardas is suitably
ironic at the end of the poem, as the Egyptians’ treasure is soon to be distributed by the
victorious Israelites, but at the beginning it is implied the treasure was the responsibility
of the first-born sons alone. Secondly, why are the first-born called seledreamas (“joys
of the hall”), and why is it specifically the seledreamas who are deprived of treasure?
The answers to these questions have been found before in an allegorical reading of
Exodus, but here I would like to suggest that, while the poet was undoubtedly informed
by the exegetical tradition surrounding the Exodus, they were equally (if not more so)
inspired by the tradition of vernacular poetry.

Allegorical readings

*Exodus* is preserved solely in the eleventh-century manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11, which contains three other biblical poems in Old English, two based on Old Testament material, *Genesis* (made up of *Genesis A* and *Genesis B*) and *Daniel*, as well as *Christ and Satan*, which is inspired by the New Testament.12 Lucas asserts that *Exodus* is one of the oldest poems in Old English, as evidenced by its contracted forms and the cases of “monosyllabic words ending in vocalic liquid or nasal”, suggesting a date of composition between 700 and 800 AD.13 Similarly, Irving makes the case for a date “in the earliest years of the eighth century”.14 As Irving notes, in any case, *Exodus* seems to belong to roughly the same period as *Beowulf*, which it resembles both linguistically and stylistically.15 The relationship between *Exodus* and *Beowulf* has been the topic of some debate, and will be discussed in greater detail below.

However, the question which has been foremost in recent studies of *Exodus* and the other Old Testament poems of the Junius manuscript is the extent to which these poems rely upon the exegetical traditions surrounding the biblical books on which they are based. In the case of *Genesis A*, it seems likely that the poet had a historical, rather than allegorical interest in Genesis.16 However, while the *Exodus* poet never spells out a consistent allegorical message, there is nonetheless an explicit invitation to read beyond the literal level:

---

16 Wright, “*Genesis A ad litteram*”; Boyd, “*Doctrine and Criticism*”; and Brockman, “‘Heroic’ and ‘Christian’ in *Genesis A*”.
Gif onlucan wile lifes wealhstod,  
beorht in breostum, banhuses weard,  
ginfæsten god gastes cægon,  
run bið ger  
ecenod, ræd forð gæð  
(Exodus, lines 523-6)

(If the interpreter of life, the mind, bright in the breast, will unlock the ample good with the keys of the spirit, the mystery shall be explained, wisdom shall go forth).

The most obvious allegorical interpretation for Exodus is that the crossing of the Red Sea represents the salvation offered by baptism. This allegorical meaning is perhaps hinted at when the poet refers to the road the Israelites follow as the lifweg (“life-way”) (Exodus, line 104b). Moreover, the patriarchal digression in Exodus, featuring the Flood and Abraham’s aborted sacrifice of Isaac, can be seen to parallel the liturgy for Holy Saturday, a ceremony closely associated with baptism, which has led some scholars to believe that the poem has a direct source in the liturgy. Other scholars have found a more general source for the poem in the exegesis concerning Exodus. Bernard Huppé, for example, holds that Exodus “must be understood [...] in the light of certain exegetical concepts developed by the Fathers in their commentaries on the portion of the Old Testament ‘paraphrased’ in the English poem.” According to Huppé’s reading, the Old English poem engages closely with the exegetical parallels known to early

17 Dictionary of Old English, s.v. banhus: “‘bone-house’, a kenning for the body”; “banhuses weard ‘the body’s guardian’, a kenning for the mind” (Cameron, Amos, and Healey et al., ed., Dictionary of Old English: A to I online; henceforth DOE).

18 Bright, “The Relation of the Cædmonian Exodus to the Liturgy”.

medieval readers of the Bible: for example, Pharaoh represents the Devil; the shore where the Israelites find safety represents heaven; Egypt represents both this world, which man escapes through Christ, and Hell, from which man is also freed by Christ.\footnote{Huppé, \textit{Doctrine and Poetry}, 219-22.}

However, other scholars have suggested that, while the poet would have been aware of this exegetical reading of Exodus, the poem does not flag up these parallels to the extent that it could. Philip B. Rollinson, for example, argues that just because the poet “could have discussed the crossing of the Red Sea in terms of baptism [...] does not mean that he has had to”\footnote{Rollinson, “Influence of Christian Doctrine”, 282.} J. E. Cross takes issue with Rollinson’s grouping of his own and S. I. Tucker’s approach with Huppé’s very allegorical reading, countering that he and Tucker were not arguing that \textit{Exodus} should be read as an allegory, “but that the poet gave hints that he was drawing on allegorical interpretations of the Israelites’ historical journey”\footnote{Cross, review of \textit{Anglo-Saxon England}, vols I and II, 186. See Cross and Tucker, “Allegorical Tradition”.}. While it seems undeniable that biblical exegesis would have shaped the poet’s view of the story of Exodus, the impact on the poem itself remains up for debate.

Certainly, the typological interpretation of events and characters is made nowhere near as overt as in the Latin biblical epics which cover the same material. As Michael Lapidge has shown, poems such as Avitus’s \textit{Historia Spiritualis}, Sedulius’s \textit{Carmen Paschale} and Arator’s \textit{Historia Apostolica} would have been “intensively studied in Anglo-Saxon England”\footnote{Lapidge, “Versifying the Bible”, 23-4.}. The extent to which the poet of \textit{Exodus} drew on Avitus’s \textit{Historia}, the fifth book of which describes the crossing of the Red Sea, has...
been addressed by a number of scholars. To Samuel Moore’s argument that the Exodus poet did not rely on Avitus as a source, Lapidge responds that Moore was “apparently unaware of how widely texts like Avitus were read by Anglo-Saxons”, comparing Avitus’ account of the crossing of the Red Sea with that in the Old English Exodus. Samantha Zacher’s view is more sceptical: she notes the lack of “clear verbal parallels” between Latin biblical poems and Old English verse, and observes that it is “noteworthy” that Anglo-Saxon writers did not praise or critique these Latin poets to the same extent that patristic authors such as Jerome, Augustine and Isidore did. In his recent monograph on Latin and Old English biblical epics, Patrick McBrine asserts that, in spite of some differences, “anyone familiar with the Latin genre will recognize the obvious kinship between Exodus and numerous poems in the Latin tradition, many of which share the English author’s interest in heroic dramatization and baptismal imagery.” The former is arguably the more evident in the Old English Exodus, which nowhere draws an explicit parallel between the events of the story and baptism.

Avitus’s versification of Exodus, like the Old English poem, features the Israelites’ plundering of the Egyptians on the night of their departure:

Inter ferventes inimica in sede furores
Praedatur dominum fugiens fallitque videntem,

24 The Historia, datable to c. 500 AD, recounts the following episodes from Genesis and Exodus: Creation, Temptation, the Fall, the Flood and the Crossing of the Red Sea; see further McBrine, Biblical Epic, 124-72; and Lapidge, “Versifying the Bible”, 17.
26 Zacher, Rewriting the Old Testament, 14-15.
27 McBrine, Biblical Epic, 19-20; see also 322-46 for McBrine’s reading of the Old English poem in the context of Latin biblical epic.
This passage is not mentioned in the comments of Moore, Lapidge, Zacher or McBrine. While the passage in the Latin *Historia* could well have encouraged the Old English poet to include a vivid description of the despoiling on the night of the Israelites’ departure, it does not explain why the Egyptian first-born are designated as the treasure-guardians, nor does it help to elucidate the place of the compound *seledream* in this context.

This compound is not unique in *Exodus*, though it is restricted to poetry, appearing once only in *Andreas*, *The Wanderer*, *Riddle 63*, *Beowulf* and Metrical Psalm 113. However, in none of these contexts does the compound refer to humans themselves, as it does in *Exodus*; in fact, in both *Andreas* and *Riddle 63* it forms part of the formula *secga seledream* (“hall-joy of men”), reiterating that the word does not normally refer to humans, but something which belongs to them: the pleasure of life in the hall. In *The Wanderer*, *seledream* seems to encompass all the happiness of secular, aristocratic life, forming part of the speaker’s lament on the transience of all worldly

---


29 *Andreas*, line 1656a; *The Wanderer*, line 93b; *Riddle 63*, line 1b; *Beowulf* 2252a; Metrical Psalm 113.6; based on a search in *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus* (Healey, Wilkin and Xiang, *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*).
things. The phrase *swæfon seledreamas* (*Exodus*, line 36a) (“the joys of the hall slept”) could plausibly be taken, in a similar sense, to mean that all the happiness of the hall had departed as a result of the slaughter of the first-borns. However, the compound *seledream* seems here to refer to the first-born treasure-guardians, the *hordweardas* who are *since berofene*. In *Exodus*, *seledream* refers not to abstract joys but, specifically, the deceased first-born sons, who have been robbed of the treasure they were guarding.

The *Exodus* poet’s singular use of *seledream* to refer to humans can perhaps be seen simply as part of the poet’s tendency towards unusual and striking imagery, a manipulation of vocabulary which Irving describes as the “compression and condensation of meaning into a brief phrase”; indeed, Irving goes as far to argue that no other Old English poem “has such violent metaphors or so many new and startling kennings.” Likewise, Frederick Klaeber refers to the *Exodus* poet’s “unique power of expression”, and Robert T. Farrell to the poet’s “bold, almost metaphysical imagery”. While it is possible that the poet’s use of *seledream* in this context can be put down to their own idiosyncrasy, there is nonetheless no explanation for the repeated reference to treasure in relation to the death of these *seledreamas*, or first-born sons. The plundering and the death of the first-borns are two separate events in the biblical Exodus, and yet here they are presented as simultaneous and interrelated.

---

30 The occurrence in *Beowulf* fulfils a similar function as part of the elegiac lament of the Last Survivor, who describes how his people have departed from this life: “gesawon seledreamas” (*Beowulf*, line 2252a) (“saw [the last of] joys in the hall”). All quotations from *Beowulf* are taken from Fulk, Bjork and Niles, ed., *Klaeber’s Beowulf* (also referred to as ‘Klaeber IV’), unless otherwise specified, with line numbers following in parenthesis.


32 Klaeber, “*Exodus* and *Beowulf*”, 218; Farrell, “A Reading of OE *Exodus*”, 401.
However, some scholars have found answers to these questions in an allegorical reading of the poem. As we have seen, the poet must have been influenced by the exegetical tradition surrounding Exodus to a certain extent, despite the fact that they choose not to draw the reader’s attention to allegorical parallels in the same way as the poets of Latin biblical epics. Cross and Tucker put it aptly when they argue that the poet is not following the allegorical tradition, but is nonetheless “conditioned by it.” They suggest that *Exodus* is not “one consistent allegory”, but is rather made up of the “symbolic pictures” which “would occur naturally to a learned Christian’s mind”. As we have seen, most of the events and characters in the narrative can be seen to have an allegorical parallel, some broadly symbolic, others specifically typological. In John F. Vickrey’s reading of the poem, the treasure taken from Pharaoh represents mankind delivered from the Devil by Christ just as, in the Gospels, the strong man (the Devil) is despoiled of his goods (humankind) by the stronger man (Christ). While the analogy between treasure and humankind may well have been one of the “symbolic pictures” which occurred to the poet, Vickrey’s interpretation of the role of treasure in the poem depends on a further, more complex, level of allegory.

According to Vickrey, the early reference to the despoiling of the Egyptians anticipates the sharing of the spoils on the shores of the Red Sea, which ultimately represents salvation. The association of this looting with the death of the first-born can be explained, he suggests, by the fact that the killing of the first-born was known in the

---

34 Cross and Tucker, “Allegorical Tradition”, 123.
35 Luke 11.21-2; Matthew 12.29 and Mark 3.27; Vickrey, “*Exodus* and the Treasure of Pharaoh”, 160.
36 Vickrey, “*Exodus* and the Treasure of Pharaoh”, 163.
commentary tradition as “the overcoming of devils”, and therefore the killing of sin in ourselves; Vickrey goes onto argue:

The first-born are our sins, and our sins hold us captive as the devil’s treasure [...] therefore the first-born are *hordweardas*, ‘treasure-guardians’. The idea of ‘hordwearda hryre’ is essentially repeated in ‘since berofene’; the two phrases look, so to speak, at two sides of an equation. For to kill sin is to deprive the devil of what had been his; therefore, ‘by the fall of the treasure-guardians’ the devil, or at any rate his hall-joys, are at the same time ‘deprived of treasure’. 37

This interpretation of the passage (and wider poem) makes sense insofar as each character or event has an appropriate allegorical parallel. The only potential contradiction is that both the treasure and the Israelites represent mankind saved, which Vickrey himself acknowledges; however, I would argue that this is not the major obstacle in accepting this reading. 38 Rather, I would suggest that while the eschatological interpretation of the treasure of Pharaoh as mankind saved by Christ may well have occurred to the poet, the identification of the first-born with devils, which can then be identified with man’s own sin, depends on a significant interpretative leap in a poem which at no point makes any explicit reference to the allegorical meaning of the

37 Vickrey, “*Exodus* and the Treasure of Pharaoh”, 163-4. Other scholars have, likewise, interpreted the despoothing of the Egyptians as Christ’s victory over the Devil; see, for example, Walton, “‘Gehyre se ðe Wille’”, 8, who reads lines 39-46 as representing the Harrowing of Hell. However, not all critics have read the treasure in *Exodus* allegorically: Lucas sees the looting of the Egyptians’ treasure in terms of “Germanic heroic poetry”, and Cross argues, against Vickrey, that the distribution of plunder at the very end of the poem “may be taken historico-realistically without missing anything of the power of the poem” (Lucas, ed., *Exodus*, 64; Cross, review of *Anglo-Saxon England*, 187).

38 Vickrey, “*Exodus* and the Treasure of Pharaoh”, 162-3.
treasure. Rather than reading this passage in a strictly allegorical sense, I would suggest that some explanations for the striking vocabulary and surprising collocations can be found in the influence of the vernacular poetic tradition.

“X berofene”

While one branch of criticism has assumed that *Exodus* is deeply informed by allegory and exegesis, another branch has stressed that the poet, in Irving’s words, “seems far more interested in the story as story.” Malcolm Godden finds a middle-ground in his interpretation of the poem, arguing that while there are “several possible allusions” to an allegorical interpretation, “much of the poetry seems to have little to do with such a way of reading the text; it is rather as if allegory is just one of a number of ways in which the poet invites us to read his poem.” I would suggest that the poet expected his audience to read *Exodus* not only as an allegory but also, if not more so, in terms of contemporary vernacular poetry.

The poet’s source material, whether scriptural or exegetical, would have informed them that on the night of the Israelites’ departure from Egypt the Egyptians lost both their first-born sons and their treasure. With characteristically skilful handling of perspectives, the poet presents these events from the point of view of both the Israelites and the Egyptians; the phrase “dugoð forð gewat” (*Exodus*, line 41b) (“the troop went forth”), for example, can be read both as the departure of the Israelites and the death of the Egyptian first-born. The reader encounters both the victorious

downfall of an enemy (*hordwearda hryre*) and the tragic loss of all happiness (the death of the *seledreamas*). The central theme of this passage is deprivation, flagged by the presence of the formula “X berofene” (“deprived of X”) – in this case, *sinc* (“treasure”). It is worth noting that in the extant Old English corpus the verb *bereofan* only appears as this past participle, *berofene*; while the verb itself fell out of use, the fossilised past participle remained, occurring only nine times, exclusively in poetry and largely in this formula.42 The “X” in the formula is represented by treasure on a number of occasions;43 elsewhere the “X” is filled by *gaste,*44 referring to the deprivation of life, and many of the passages in which *berofene* occurs are concerned with death, destruction and decay.45 The “X berofene” formula, then, speaks to a traditional association between loss of life and loss of treasure. The idea that losing one’s life is synonymous with giving up treasure can also be found in *Genesis A*, as in the poet’s account of the death of Cush: “þa se rinc ageaf / eorðcunde ead, sohte oðer lif” (*Genesis A*, lines 1626-7) (“then the warrior gave up earthly wealth, sought the other life”).46 It is likely that this association between deprivation of life and treasure, bound up in the


43 In addition to *Exodus*, line 36b (*since berofene*), see *Beowulf*, line 2931b (*golde berofene*); and *Genesis A*, line 2078a (*golde berofan*). *Riddle 13* (“Ten Chickens”), line 7a, *reafe berofene*, could well fall under this category; while *reaf* here refers to the chicks’ “garments”, its primary meaning is “spoil” or “booty”, a sense which could fit with Patrick Murphy’s metaphorical interpretation of the riddle as “Adam and Eve”, who were bereft not only of clothing but their prosperity in Paradise (Murphy, *Unriddling the Exeter Riddles*, 53-60).

44 *Andreas*, line 1084b.

45 In addition to *Exodus*, line 36b, see *Beowulf*, line 2457a; *Andreas*, line 1084b; and *The Ruin*, line 4a.

46 See further, Faulkner, “Treasure and the Life Course”.


fossilised berofene formula, would have appealed to the Exodus-poet as they imagined the night of the Israelites’ departure, and the dual losses suffered by the Egyptians. When composing this passage, the Exodus poet may well have been thinking not only of the allegorical interpretation of the spoiling of the Egyptians, but also of expressions of deprivation in contemporary vernacular poetry, namely Beowulf.

“Beowulf” and “Exodus”

In a paper of 1918, Klaeber observed: “That the numerous verbal correspondences between Exodus and Beowulf cannot be accidental is universally and very properly conceded.”47 The most striking of these parallels is the line “enge anpaðas, uncuð gelad”, which appears in both poems (Exodus, line 58 and Beowulf, line 1410), although there are many additional correspondences. While, as Klaeber notes, scholarship had previously assumed that the Exodus poet was borrowing from Beowulf, in his 1918 paper he concluded that “the balance of probability inclines at least slightly in favour of the priority of Exodus.”48 However, he later retracted this opinion, returning to the more

48 Klaeber, “Exodus and Beowulf”, 224. Klaeber’s argument in this paper is based upon the belief that enge anpaðas, uncuð gelad is more likely to be original to Exodus than Beowulf, as it “corresponds well enough to per viam deserti”, and is “entirely suitable in its context, since the poet’s idea of desertum seems to have been that of a secluded, lonesome, inaccessible forbidding region” (Exodus 13.18; see also Exodus 13.20; Klaeber, “Exodus and Beowulf”, 219).
traditional assumption that *Exodus* borrows from *Beowulf*.\(^{49}\)

Comparison of the passage in *Exodus* describing the death of the first-born sons and looting of the Egyptians with several passages in *Beowulf* concerning loss and deprivation supports the argument for the *Exodus* poet’s knowledge of and (perhaps subconscious) borrowing from *Beowulf*. The first passage under consideration comes at the end of the poem, where Beowulf urges the young warrior Wiglaf to inspect the dragon’s hoard:

```
Nu ðu lungre geong
  hord sceawian under harne stan,
Wiglaf leofa, nu se wyrn ligeð,
  swefed sare wund, since bereafod.
(Beowulf, 2743b-6)
```

(Now you go quickly to examine the hoard under the grey stone, dear Wiglaf, now the serpent lies dead, sleeps sorely wounded, deprived of treasure.)

The loss in this passage belongs to the dragon: it has been deprived of both its treasure and its life. As the reader views these events from Beowulf and Wiglaf’s perspective, these losses are seen as the defeat of an enemy. The vocabulary emphasised in bold is echoed in the passage from *Exodus*, which likewise describes the death and despoiling of an enemy, though, as we have seen, the poet merges the Israelites’ perspective with that of the Egyptians, resulting in a clash of triumph and defeat. *Exodus*, line 36 and

---

\(^{49}\) Klaeber, “Beowulfiana”, 202-3; Lynch likewise argues for the priority of *Beowulf* (Lynch, “Enigmatic Diction”, 171-256). See Irving, ed., *Exodus*, 26, for the alternative explanation that “enge anpaðas, uncuð gelad” is a traditional phrase which would have occurred in many other poems, now lost.
*Beowulf*, line 2746 are particularly worthy of close comparison:

\[
\text{swæf}on \text{ seledreamas} \quad \text{since berofene}
\]
\[(Exodus, \text{line 36})\]

\[
\text{swefed} \text{ sare wund,} \quad \text{since bereafod}
\]
\[(Beowulf, \text{line 2746}).\]^{50}\]

The verb *swefan* ("to sleep, die") occurs in both lines, though in a different number and tense. The b-lines are near-identical, though the *Beowulf* poet makes use of the verb *bereafian*, rather than *bereofan*. Like *bereofan*, the primary meaning of *bereafian* is "deprive".

It seems likely that the *Exodus* poet had this line from *Beowulf* in mind when describing the scene of death and plunder on the night of the Israelites’ departure. Indeed, the passage from *Beowulf* may have also inspired the poet’s description of the first-born sons as *hordweardas*, as the word *hord* also occurs in the *Beowulf* passage. The parallel with the scene in *Beowulf* works on the allegorical level, as well as the literal: the dragon can be seen to resemble Pharaoh/the Devil in that it has been robbed of treasure which it had unjustly hoarded for a long time, just as the Devil has been robbed of mankind by Christ.\(^{51}\) However, these verbal parallels arguably suggest that the Old English *Exodus* was motivated at least as much by the vernacular, heroic tradition than by allegory, if not more so. It should be emphasised that the echoes of

---

\(^{50}\) This parallel is not noted in Lynch, “Enigmatic Diction”, 262-4.

\(^{51}\) On Christological readings of Beowulf, see Leneghan, *Dynastic Drama*, 231-4; see also McNamee, “*Beowulf*: An Allegory of Salvation?”; Cabannis, “*Beowulf* and the Liturgy”; Hill, “On *fæder bearme*".
Beowulf not only suggest that the Exodus poet was influenced by the Old English epic, but that they were drawing upon the traditional association between death and the loss of treasure found elsewhere in Old English heroic poetry, the corollary of which is an association between possession of treasure and life.\textsuperscript{52}

The second passage in Beowulf which repays comparison with the Exodus passage also occurs in the latter part of the poem, when Beowulf recalls the death of Hrethel’s eldest son Herebeald, and evokes an archetype of a mourning father. The concept of deprivation in this passage is flagged by the fossilised berofene, exactly as it appears in the passage from Exodus:

\begin{quote}
Gesyhð sorhcearig on his suna bure
winsele westne, windge reste,
reote berofene,\textsuperscript{53} ridend swefað,
haeled in hoðman; nis þær hearpan sweg,
gomen in geardum, swylce ðær iu wæron.
\end{quote}

(\textit{Beowulf}, lines 2455-9)

(Sorrowful, he sees in his son’s room a deserted wine-hall, the windy resting place, deprived of joy; the riders sleep, warriors in the grave; there is no sound of the harp, entertainment in the yards, as there was before.)

If, as seems likely, the Exodus poet did know Beowulf, it is easy to imagine how this passage might have come to mind when they composed the scene of the Israelites’ departure. As outlined above, the events of this night are presented from the perspective of both the Egyptians and the Israelites, the one merging into the other. While these

\textsuperscript{52} Faulkner, “Treasure and the Life Course”.

\textsuperscript{53} In Fulk, Bjork and Niles, ed., \textit{Klaeber’s Beowulf}; MS reote is emended to reot[g]e (84).
events represent a triumphant victory for the Israelites – perhaps inspiring the poet to look to Beowulf’s account of the death and despoiling of the dragon – the very same events are the cause of mourning and lamentation for the Egyptians. As in Exodus, this passage from Beowulf expresses grief and loss through the dwindling of joyful aristocratic pursuits, such as music, a device well-known in Old English poetry. This passage may have occurred to the Exodus poet not only because its theme is loss and lamentation, but because it describes the death of a son – moreover, the image is inspired by the death of a first-born son. The memory of this passage, I would suggest, accounts for the echoes of vocabulary in the Exodus passage. Both feature the verb swefan and the fossilised past participle in berofene in the same line, just as the previous passage from Beowulf, describing the death of the dragon, featured swefan and the very similar past participle bereafod.

The manuscript reading reote, emended to “reot[g]e” in Klaeber IV, poses something of a problem. The editors of Klaeber IV argue that “MS reote defies convincing explanation”, and recommend emendation to reotge, “assuming the generalized meaning ‘dreary’”. This emendation removes the complement from berofene: of all nine occurrences of berofene all but one other is without complement,

54 In Beowulf, see the “Lament of the Last Survivor” (lines 2247-66) and the messenger’s prophecy of the gloomy days facing the Geats (3007b-27); see also The Seafarer, lines 19b-22, where the calling of sea-birds replaces the noise of human merriment. See further Osborn, “Reote and Ridend”, 445.

55 Fulk, Bjork and Niles, ed., Klaeber’s Beowulf, 246; Klaeber, ed., Beowulf, lxxx, suggests reote, positing a Kentish spelling of Anglian *rote (“joy”). Other explanations have been offered: for example, Osborn, “Reote and Ridend”, suggests emendation to rote (“rota”), a chordophonic musical instrument, though Stanley, “Memorabilia”, 169, argues against such an interpretation.
and this is in a corrupt passage of *The Ruin*.

The *DOE* retains the MS reading *reote* in *Beowulf*, line 2457, offering only the example from *The Ruin* under the definition “without expressed object (in a corrupt passage)”.

Under *reot*, Bosworth-Toller offers the definitions “(joyous) sound (?)” and “gladness (?)”, with the line in *Beowulf* as the only example.

Alfred Bammesberger defends the reading “bereft of joy”, on the understanding that an abstract noun could well have been formed from the adjective *rot* (“glad, cheerful”), and even posits that the *Beowulf* poet could have coined this abstract noun, meaning “joy”. Given the ubiquity of the “X berofene” formula, outside of the corrupt passage from *The Ruin*, it seems probable that *reote*, whatever its meaning, is intended as the complement for *berofene* in *Beowulf*, line 2457.

We can identify two parallels, then, between *Beowulf*, line 2457 and *Exodus*, line 36: the past participle *berofene*, describing the loss of treasure and (perhaps) the loss of happiness, respectively, and the verb *swefan*, alluding to the sleep of death in both cases. Moreover, the *Beowulf* passage features the image of the empty *winsele* (*Beowulf*, line 2456a) (“wine-hall”), a compound which finds an echo in the *Exodus* poet’s *seledreamas*. As we have seen, the use of *seledreamas* to refer to men is unique in the extant corpus: the *Exodus* poet’s unusual decision can perhaps be explained by their memory of this passage from *Beowulf* which, similarly, deals with the death of a son, and occurs as a response to the death of Hrethel’s eldest son. Finally, a little earlier in his description of the archetypal grief of a father, Beowulf observes that the father does not care to wait for any further *yrfeweadas* (*Beowulf*, line 2453a) (“heirs”).

---

56 *DOE*, s.v. *bereofan*.
57 *DOE*, s.v. *bereofan*; *The Ruin*, lines 3-4.
59 Bammesberger, “Old English *Reote*”. 
can hear an echo of *yrfeweardas* in the *hordwearda* of *Exodus*, line 35a, which similarly refers to sons. The presence of a *weard* compound designating children in both passages strengthens the case for the influence of this passage from *Beowulf* on the scene in *Exodus*. In addition, the allusion to children as *yrfeweardas* in *Beowulf* could help to explain why the *Exodus* poet calls the Egyptian first-born “treasure-guardians”: like the heirs which the grieving father no longer cares about, the Egyptian first-born in *Exodus* would have been expected to take over responsibility for the family treasure upon the death of the father. The allusion to treasure at this point in the poem, of course, resonates with the despoiling carried out by the Israelites.

The final passage in *Beowulf* to be examined comes at the very end of the poem, in the messenger’s mournful speech. The messenger predicts that, among other gloomy outcomes for the Geats, all the treasure from the dragon’s hoard will be burned:

```
nalles eorl wegan
maððum to gemyndum, ne mægð scyne
habban on healse hringweordunge, ac sceal geomormod, golde bereafod
oft nalles ëne elland tredan,
nu se herewisa hleahtor alegde, gamen ond gledo dream.
(Beowulf, lines 3015b-21a)
```

(No man to wear a treasure in remembrance, nor woman to have on her neck a shining ring-adornment; rather, they will have to cross a foreign country, not just once but often, mournful, deprived of gold, now the leader of armies has laid aside laughter, merriment and revelry.)

---

60 Faulkner, “Treasure and the Life Course”.

The deprivation here is namely of treasure, signalled by the past participle of *bereafian* in the phrase “golde bereafod”, so similar in sense and structure to the phrase *since berofene* in *Exodus*. However, the loss of Beowulf himself reverberates throughout this passage: once again we see a dual loss of life and treasure. As in *Exodus*, death and despoiling is represented through a decline of merriment, the “gamen ond gleodream”.

This rhetorical technique which, as we have seen, occurs elsewhere in *Beowulf*, among other poems, clearly informs the *Exodus* poet’s description of the Egyptians’ suffering, in which the *seledreamas* are put to sleep. A more speculative – but intriguing – possibility is that the *dream* element of the compound had an influence on the *Exodus* poet’s unusual choice of the word *seledream*. The fact that the elements *sele* and *dream* occur in two passages from *Beowulf* featuring *berofene* or *bereafod*, in the context of deprivation (whether of life or treasure), cannot be ignored.

**Oral-formulaic theory and literate borrowing**

The preceding argument has built a case for the *Exodus* poet’s knowledge of a particular group of passages from *Beowulf* based upon the evidence of shared vocabulary. This evidence can be presented most clearly as a table (see Table 1). The table shows that there are numerous parallels between the passage in *Exodus* and these three passages from *Beowulf* which all deal with loss. However, it is worth assessing the degree to which shared vocabulary can be relied upon for evidence of direct borrowing. It could well be argued that the echoes of these passages from *Beowulf* in the *Exodus* passage could simply be put down to the coincidental choice of the same vocabulary for the description of similar scenes of deprivation. Indeed, proponents of the oral-formulaic theory would argue that the *Exodus* poet employs the same vocabulary as the *Beowulf* poet because both poets rely on a “common fund”, in Francis P. Magoun, Jr.’s words, of
conventional phrases and formulas, such as *since berofenelbereafod*: the Exodus poet need not have ever read *Beowulf*, or heard the poem performed. Magoun holds that “one verbal similarity or even a number of verbal similarities in themselves prove nothing beyond suggesting that given singers have found the same formulas useful to express a certain idea in a similar measure of verse.” Traditionally, then, shared vocabulary was not seen to be sufficient evidence for borrowing between poems.

However, this attitude depends upon an oral-formulaic approach to Old English poetry, which has since been called into question. Magoun asserts that oral poetry “is composed entirely of formulas”, while “lettered poetry is never formulaic”. The work of scholars such as Magoun, then, assumes a direct correlation between a high density of formulaic language, as is found in Old English poetry, and oral composition. Larry D. Benson, however, complicates this assumption, arguing that “poems which we can be sure were not orally composed use formulas as frequently and sometimes more frequently than supposedly oral compositions such as *Beowulf* or the poems of Cynewulf.” John Miles Foley defends the supposed orality of Old English poetry, but argues for a more nuanced approach which takes into account “both ‘oral’ character and ‘literary’ art”. The work of Benson and Foley shows that it is possible for literate poets to manipulate the formulas traditionally assumed to be the preserve of oral poets.

64 Benson, “Literary Character”, 335. The poems that Benson refers to are the verse preface to the Old English *Pastoral Care*; Riddle 35, which translates Aldhelm’s *De Lorica*; the Metrical Psalms; *The Phoenix*; and *The Metres of Boethius*.
From this brief survey of the oral-formulaic debate, it would seem that only two options present themselves: either the *Exodus* poet was an oral poet who drew upon traditional formulas which also happen to occur in *Beowulf*; or they were a literate poet who knew and adapted traditional formulas – again, without having necessarily known *Beowulf*. It could be felt, then, that little possibility remains for the *Exodus* poet’s direct borrowing from *Beowulf*. However, Andy Orchard has recently argued that such verbal parallels as this paper has identified in *Beowulf* and *Exodus* could, in fact, be evidence for conscious imitation. Orchard observes that since the application of the oral formulaic theory to Old English verse “it has become customary to scoff at the efforts of earlier scholars to associate poems through their shared formulae.”⁶⁶ He goes on to argue that this approach is “dangerously oversimplistic”.⁶⁷ In his discussion of *Andreas*, to take one example, Orchard stresses the importance of asking “precisely how traditional the diction of *Andreas* was, and whether (and to what extent) the *Andreas*-poet can be shown to be basing himself not simply on a general set of inherited conventions, but on specific poems and poets that we can still identify today.”⁶⁸ While acknowledging the existence of traditional diction, then, Orchard reminds us that the poetic wordhord need not be the only explanation for similarities in vocabulary between two or more poems.

In the case of the passages from *Exodus* and *Beowulf* examined in this paper, it seems likely that the line “swæfon seledreamas since berofene” from *Exodus* consciously borrows from *Beowulf*’s “swefed sare wund, since bereafod”, given that three words in each line are almost identical: *swæfon/swefed*; *since*; and

---

⁶⁶ Orchard, “Both Style and Substance”, 273.
⁶⁷ Orchard, “Both Style and Substance”, 273.
⁶⁸ Orchard, “Originality of *Andreas*”, 332.
berofene/bereafod. I would suggest that the Exodus poet adapted the Beowulf poet’s since bereafod to the more traditional since berofene, based on the “X berofene” formula. These are the only examples of since berofene/bereafod in the extant corpus of Old English literature. The other parallels that this paper has highlighted, such as the presence of sele and dream compounds in passages from Beowulf which also feature berofene/bereafod, are more speculative, but nonetheless offer a possible explanation for the unusual use of seledreamas to refer to men. In this speculative tone, then, I would draw attention to one final parallel between Beowulf and this scene of death and destruction in Exodus.

Shortly after the passage from Exodus which has been the focus of this paper (lines 33-6), the poet goes on to further describe the effects of the losses suffered by the Egyptians, and in doing so apparently invents the hapax legomenon hleahtorsmiþ: “Wæron hleahtorsmiðum handa belocene” (Exodus, line 43) (“The hands of the ‘laughter smiths’ were locked”). The DOE defines hleahtorsmiþ as “entertainer, minstrel, literally ‘one who causes laughter’”.69 Editors of Exodus have tended to interpret these “laughter smiths” as musicians: for Tolkien, “[a] picture is evoked of the harpers striking their harps, and their hands then falling idle.”70 Irving argues that a “very general reference seems to be intended here, in keeping with the tone of lament in the preceding lines.”71 While once again acknowledging the Exodus poet’s tendency towards striking imagery, it must be recognised that hleahtorsmiþ is an odd choice of word for a minstrel or scop, given the full range of terms available to an Old English

---

69 DOE, s.v. hleahtorsmiþ.
70 Tolkien and Turville-Petre, ed., The Old English Exodus, 38. See also Irving, ed., Exodus, 69.
poet to describe somebody of their own profession. It is worth returning to the final passage from *Beowulf* considered above, which describes the Geats’ deprivation of gold, but also the loss of their king:

```
ac sceal geomormod, **golde bereafod**
oft nalles æne elland tredan,
nu se herewisa **hleahtor** alegde,
gamen ond gleo**dream**.
(Beowulf, lines 3018-21a)
```

(rather, they will have to cross a foreign country, not just once but often, mournful, deprived of gold, now the leader of armies has laid aside laughter, merriment and revelry.)

In addition to **golde bereafod** and **dream** (which are echoed in since berofene and seledream in *Exodus*), it is worth highlighting the *Beowulf* poet’s reference to the cessation of **hleahtor** (“laughter”). The silencing of laughter, along with the general decline of revelry, is of course part of the traditional expression of lament in Old English verse, and in itself would not constitute evidence for imitation. However, in light of the other parallels between the passage from *Exodus* and this passage from *Beowulf*, it could tentatively be suggested that the allusion to **hleahtor** in the *Beowulf*

---

72 The Old English Thesaurus offers six terms under the heading “an orator, singer, poet”: firstly woþbora; then under the subheading “singer, poet, minstrel”, gliwman; under the subheading “an evening singer”, æfensceop; and under the subheading “a poet”, leopwyghta, sangere and scop (Roberts and Kay with Grundy, *Thesaurus of Old English*). However, it should be noted that many of these terms would have been more suited to prose than poetry.

73 *The Seafarer*, line 21.
passage could explain the unusual compound *hleahtersmip*.

**Conclusion**

This paper has made the argument that the *Exodus* poet was drawing on certain passages from *Beowulf* which describe scenes of deprivation, featuring the verbs *bereafian* and *bereofan*, to describe the scene of death and plunder on the night that the Israelites leave Egypt. Moreover, I have speculated that the *Exodus* poet’s knowledge of these passages from *Beowulf* could well explain certain oddities in this scene, such as the designation of the first-born as *hordweardas* (“treasure-guardians”) and *seledreamas* (“joys of the hall”). As well as arguing for the *Exodus* poet’s knowledge of *Beowulf*, I have suggested that the poet was engaging with the traditional association between life and possession of treasure (or rather its corollary – death and loss of treasure), and the concept of children as (future) treasure-guardians found in other vernacular, heroic poems.

These findings complicate prior assumptions about the role of treasure in *Exodus*, which was previously understood to contribute to the poem’s allegory. While I would agree that the *Exodus* poet would almost certainly have been aware of the interpretation of Pharaoh’s treasure as mankind freed by Christ, I would caution that this might not necessarily be the only, or indeed the foremost, meaning that treasure holds in the poet’s rendition of Exodus. Seen in the light of the traditional association between life and possession of treasure, the sharing out of treasure at the very end of *Exodus*, apparently plundered from the bodies of the drowned Egyptians, takes on heightened significance, in allegorical terms, as the celebration of life everlasting.
through the ritual of baptism.74 In literal terms, the Israelites enjoy the treasure of their enemies, from whom they have escaped with their life and their freedom.

The passage under discussion here is only one very short section of a rich and complex poem, which does undoubtedly engage with the allegorical tradition surrounding Exodus. However, it is to be hoped that the findings of this paper prompt a reassessment of the main concerns of the Old English Exodus, a poem which revels in the imagery and vocabulary of vernacular heroic poetry.
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Table 1: Parallels between *Exodus*, lines 35-6, and relevant passages from *Beowulf*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key words/elements from Exodus 35-6</th>
<th>Occurrence in <em>Beowulf</em> 2743b-6</th>
<th>Occurrence in <em>Beowulf</em> 2451b-9</th>
<th>Occurrence in <em>Beowulf</em> 3015b-21a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hord</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weard</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (yrfewead)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swefan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sele</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (winsele)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X (gleodream)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinc</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berofene</td>
<td>X (bereafod)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (bereafod)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>