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The Old English elegies include a group of poems found in the Exeter Book manuscript that have traditionally been treated as a single genre due to their general sense of lament – *The Wanderer, The Seafarer, The Riming Poem, Deor, Wulf and Eadwacer, The Wife’s Lament, Resignation, Riddle 60, The Husband’s Message,* and *The Ruin.* In this study, I conduct a linguistic stylistic analysis of all ten poems using systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and a variety of computational and linguistic tools: Lexomics, Voyant, and Microsoft Excel. My results focus on three characteristics of the poetry: (1) the similarity of the linguistic style within the poems, measured by Lexomics; (2) an oscillation between first- and third-person clausal Themes, measured using SFL analysis; and (3) themes in the lexical categorization, measured through detailed lexical analysis. In the end, my methodology creates a new and more nuanced definition of the elegy: a relatively short reflective or dramatic poem, similar in style and content to other elegiac poems, that alternates between first- and third-person perspectives and includes (1) themes of exile; (2) imagery of water or the sea, the earth, and/or the weather; and (3) words expressing both joy and sorrow. Ultimately, I argue for a recategorization of only five poems as “Old English elegies”: *The Wanderer, The Seafarer, Wulf and Eadwacer, The Wife’s Lament,* and *The Riming Poem.*
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The Old English elegies include a group of poems found in the Exeter Book manuscript that have traditionally been treated as a single genre due to their general sense of lament. These poems – The Wanderer, The Seafarer, The Riming Poem, Deor, Wulf and Eadwacer, The Wife’s Lament, Resignation, Riddle 60, The Husband’s Message, and The Ruin – are not elegies in the classical sense since they do not follow the standard Latin elegiac couplet used by the Greeks and Romans. Meter is a primary characteristic of the standard Latin elegy – a dactylic hexameter verse followed by a dactylic pentameter verse – and they are typically laments or odes to a specific person. However, the Old English elegies use the alliterative meter standard to Old English poetry. Their general sense of lament is the closest characteristic to standard elegy that they possess. Scholars have debated not only about what to label these poems but also which poems to include in the group, since each of the poems is unique and different from the others in its own way. Lengths, structures, and content vary across all ten poems. This study seeks to analyze the poems linguistically, looking for similarities and characteristics that can define “Old English elegy” and determine which poems belong in the genre.

The linguistic theory on which the analysis is based is systemic functional linguistics (SFL). Using SFL categories of linguistic analysis, I strive to find patterns in the use of a number of linguistic features in these ten poems. For example, I will discuss the use of first- and third-person clausal Themes (or subjects) within the poems and how they form a pattern of oscillation
within each poem. My linguistic analysis has found other patterns that could connect some of the poems but has excluded others.

As part of the linguistic analysis, I use several digital tools: Lexos, Voyant, and Microsoft Excel. Lexos compares the word distribution within texts to determine similarity; Voyant can measure word use over a corpus, and MS Excel’s formula functions produced visual aids in the form of bar graphs. Using Lexos, I have found that the ten poems are similar stylistically, though *Deor* and *Resignation* tend to be less similar to the other eight. Using Voyant, I have found a pattern of oscillation between first- and third-person clausal subjects (or Themes), and lastly using Microsoft Excel, I have found a pattern in the use of certain lexical words associated with exile, water, the earth, weather, joy, and sorrow. Ultimately, I use these patterns to create a new, more nuanced definition of “Old English elegy.”

In order to situate my research within the scholarship of Old English poetry and to explicate how assigning a title such as “elegy” is strongly tied to a history of genre analysis, I provide in this chapter a discussion of genre theory in general and how it has been applied in Old English literary analysis.

Traditionally, genre has been a classification system in which one can place a text based on that text’s characteristics – either from structure or content. However, this simple definition ignores the complexities that genre scholars across time have pointed out. In the introduction to his anthology *Modern Genre Theory*, David Duff traces the history of the modern genre debate from its origins in the European Romantic movement through the Russian Formalists, Structuralism, and into modern developments, including the problems of confusion in terminology (Duff 2000). Since it is not the purpose of this study to trace the history of genre study, I will point readers to Duff. Instead, this study examines the elements of genre theory
which can be applied to medieval literature – an oral or residually oral culture – and some clarification of the terminology used. Mikhail Bakhtin’s distinction between ordinary and literary language – what he calls “primary” and “secondary genres” – offers an entry point for the application of genre theory to medieval literature (Bakhtin 2000). As Duff points out, Bakhtin believes that “all genres, of literature and speech, are not simply sets of devices and conventions, but ‘forms of seeing and interpreting particular aspects of the world’, ways of ‘conceptualising reality’ that are stored within the ‘genre memory’, it being the role of the great artist to awaken the ‘semantic possibilities’ that lie within a particular genre” (Duff 2000, 10). This statement aligns with Alastair Fowler’s claim that the main value of genres is not in classifying texts but in helping the critic interpret and evaluate the text (Fowler 1982). Fowler offers a thorough analysis of genre terminology, and it is his analysis to which most modern scholars turn.

Bakhtin does not use Fowler’s terminology in the same way Fowler does, so to avoid confusion, I will explain Bakhtin’s theory of speech genres and then move to Fowler. Since medieval literature existed in a largely oral culture, its literature, specifically Anglo-Saxon poetry, is more closely related to speech than any later written literature. For example, Anglo-Saxon poetic meter is based on alliteration – a technique designed to be heard and one that defines poetic structure, more so than rhyme, because word placement matters more in alliteration. Every word must be chosen carefully based on the initial sound of the word rather than just words whose endings sound the same at line ends. This relationship between Anglo-Saxon poetry and speech provides a stronger link between the many facets of Bakhtin’s speech genres. In fact, Bakhtin’s theory claims that the oral speech genres (i.e., primary speech communication) are “play[ed] out” in more “complex cultural communication” (i.e., secondary genres) (Bakhtin 2000, 94).
Bakhtin’s speech genres encompass all aspects of language – written and oral. He specifies that each utterance we use to communicate is made up of three aspects. “All three of these aspects – thematic content, style, and compositional structure – are inseparably linked to the whole of the utterance and are equally determined by the specific nature of the particular sphere of communication. Each separate utterance is individual, of course, but each sphere in which language is used develops its own relatively stable types of these utterances. These we may call speech genres” (Bakhtin 2000, 83). There are many different kinds of speech genres, including everyday speech and literary speech, and they make up primary and secondary speech genres. As Bakhtin writes:

It is especially important here to draw attention to the very significant difference between primary (simple) and secondary (complex) speech genres (understood not as a functional difference). Secondary (complex) speech genres – novels, dramas, all kinds of scientific research, major genres of commentary, and so forth – arise in more complex and comparatively highly developed and organized cultural communication (primarily written) that is artistic, scientific, sociopolitical, and so on. During the process of their formation, they absorb and digest various primary (simple) genres that have taken form in unmediated speech communion. These primary genres are altered and assume a special character when they enter into complex ones. They lose their immediate relation to actual reality and to the real utterances of others. (Bakhtin 2000, 84-85)

Therefore, while not actually everyday spoken utterances, the Old English elegies retain some element of primary genres. For example, in *The Wanderer*, the poem begins with a speaker – “Swa cwæð eardstapa” (line 6a)¹ – and the whole poem becomes a simulated primary genre that is actually a literary-artistic event. Each of the poems that contains a first-person narrator can be considered as belonging to the same group. Because of the oral nature of Anglo-Saxon culture, these first-person poems are more like speeches made up of primary genres – such as laments – that have been transformed into complex secondary genres. The utterances (i.e., the texts) taken

¹ All Old English text is from Krapp and Dobbie’s edition. Translations are my own.
as a whole contain Bakhtin’s three aspects of the utterance – content, style, and structure – which “reflect the specific conditions and goals of each [area of human activity]” (Bakhtin 2000, 83).

In addition, for Bakhtin, the relationship between the speaker and addressee is important. All utterances across time must consider their audiences:

This question of the concept of the speech addressee (how the speaker or writer senses and imagines him) is of immense significance in literary history. Each epoch, each literary trend and literary-artistic style, each literary genre within an epoch or trend, is typified by its own special concepts of the addressee of the literary work, a special sense and understanding of its reader, listener, public, or people. … Thus, addressivity, the quality of turning to someone, is a constitutive feature of the utterance; without it the utterance does not and cannot exist. (Bakhtin 2000, 94)

In the case of Anglo-Saxon poetry, the texts point to the conceptual audience that is Christian, upper-class, and most likely male. Choices in words and content indicate *scops* conceived of an audience primarily with these characteristics. However, it is impossible to know who specifically the audience for these poems could have been. All we have is the context of the manuscript itself and its story. Modern scholars cannot determine anything else about the audience – their vocation, level of education, or even the specific events they were experiencing because the poems cannot be accurately dated. Therefore, Anglo-Saxon poetry possesses Bakhtin’s idea of an implied audience and can consequently be considered an utterance even though it lacks any indication of an actual audience, though an analysis of audience is beyond the scope of this study.

Bakhtin’s terminology has not been adopted everywhere. In fact, modern genre theory faces some confusion about the terminology used within the discipline. For example, *mode* can mean the method of composition, but it is just as often used to mean the same thing as *genre*. Fowler outlines the structure of genre and how it functions (Fowler 1982). He distinguishes between *type, kind, subgenre, mode,* and the term *genre* itself. He suggests genres should be
thought of in terms of types: “Indeed, genres are best not regarded at all as classes, but types. As E.D. Hirsch brings out the distinction, ‘A type can be entirely represented in a single instance, while a class is usually thought of as an array of instances. … When we assign a work to a generic type, we do not suppose that all its characteristic traits need be shared by every other embodiment of the type” (Fowler 1982, 37-38). Texts can be multiple types because they belong to different categories. Fowler’s categories consist of (1) kind (or historical genre), (2) subgenre, (3) mode, and (4) constructional type (Fowler 1982, 55). Each category is distinguished from the others based on a range of features called its “generic repertoire” or “the whole range of potential points of resemblance that a genre may exhibit” (Fowler 1982, 55). A mode consists of only internal features (i.e., content). Constructional types consist only of external features (i.e., the text’s structure or form). These differ from kind and subgenre in that kind and subgenre are made up of both content and structure. Kind is the standard definition of genre, or what some may call a “fixed genre” – a genre that has been given a name, and that name has lasted over time, such as tragedy or comedy; however, it is tricky to pin down the constituents (i.e., texts) of that genre because genres change quickly over time. Subgenre, then, is the same form as kind, but it adds content that makes it subtly different from the overall kind (Fowler 1982, 56). Subgenres are divisions of kinds associated with subject matter or motifs. However, they retain the common features of the kind, including external forms (i.e., structure) (Fowler 1982, 112).

Fowler specifies the difference between mode and kind further: “Although genre terms are notoriously inconsistent, they exhibit at least one regularity. The terms for kinds, perhaps in keeping with their obvious external embodiment, can always be put in noun form (‘epigram’; 2 Fowler references E.D. Hirsch’s book Validity in Interpretation (1967).
‘epic’), whereas modal terms tend to be adjectival” (Fowler 1982, 106). He uses the example “comedy” versus “comic.” A text can be a “comic play” or a “comic novel,” but “comedy” is a kind, a historical genre with its own features. Mode and kind can be combined, in which case they refer to “a combined genre, in which the overall form is determined by the kind alone” (Fowler 1982, 107). Modes generally do not stand on their own, though Fowler notes, “Of the longer kinds, many have had corresponding modes, such as epic (heroic), tragic, comic, historical, romance, biographical, and picaresque” (Fowler 1982, 108). Therefore, in the case of the Old English elegies, it is possible some of the poems are “Old English elegies” in kind while others simply have an “Old English elegiac” mode. They all share the same overall constructional type – Anglo-Saxon poetry; however, some poems may also be a subgenre of the “Old English elegy” kind, differing slightly in content and structure.

Fowler traces the evolution of genres, including regional and temporal variations, claiming that genres change over time as the values and emotions of a culture change. However, one flaw in his argument is that he leaves out Anglo-Saxon literature almost completely. He mentions Beowulf only twice and Deor once when he discusses the origins of genres, but that is the extent of his treatment. He occasionally mentions Chaucer or Sir Thomas Malory, but early medieval literature is largely ignored. He claims, “It is commonly agreed that medieval writers felt a supreme indifference toward the traditional genres: even got on pretty well without any genre theory at all” (Fowler 1982, 142), though agreement by whom is never stated. He continues, “It seems obviously true that awareness of genre was in abeyance during the Middle Ages. Not that the classical terminology disappeared, of course…. All the genre terms are liable to be used in strange ways” (Fowler 1982, 142-143), and then discusses some alternate uses of generic terms in Chaucer, Malory, Dante, and other 14th-century texts. However, I disagree with
his claim that “awareness of genre was in abeyance during the Middle Ages.” Early English texts such as saints’ lives, riddles, and general Anglo-Saxon poetry all have generic features (in both content and form) that can distinguish them from other texts of the time.

John Miles Foley (2003) offers some proof of this genre awareness as he discusses the genre of Old English poetry using the metaphor of organic ecosystems. He argues that some genres in oral cultures such as Anglo-Saxon England “leak” into other genres in the manner of “cross-species fertilization” (Foley 2003, 78). He examines three poetic traditions – Greek, South Slavic, and Old English – and their rules for genre leakage. Foley finds “the Old English poetic tradition is the most interactive of the three examined; it follows rules, to be sure, but it clearly shows a free-flowing, aesthetically productive sharing of expressive strategies. We will read the poetry best when we are attuned to the implications of these shared generic signals” (Foley 2003, 91). Before analyzing The Seafarer, Foley examines the riddles and their leakage into the Advent Lyrics and Solomon and Saturn I and II. He claims that the poets use genre leakage to emphasize the message of a text or reframe it into a more recognizable text for its audience (Foley 2003, 97), thus implying genre awareness.

As he moves to The Seafarer, Foley claims that the Old English elegies have “no close analogues from other traditions. For that reason these eight or nine poems are best served by recognizing them not as derivative of something else but as constituting an Old English genre in its own right, a form that has first allegiance to itself and, as we shall see, strong connections to the rest of the poetic tradition that constitutes the larger verbal ecosystem” (Foley 2003, 97-98). In other words, the elegies are their own kind, though it sounds as though he means the elegies are a subgenre or mode because his “strong connections” come from the composition of Anglo-Saxon poetry, which he seems to consider the whole “ecosystem” rather than a kind. For Foley,
“traditional composition and generic leakage can dovetail; in *The Seafarer* they are virtually the same phenomenon” (Foley 2003, 98). To prove his point, Foley examines harsh sea weather passages on top of the traditional Anglo-Saxon theme of “Exile.” This layering of context makes the situation worse for the seafarer and adds a layer of emphasis for the audience, one which they would recognize since the theme of “Exile” occurs elsewhere in Anglo-Saxon poetry (Foley 2003, 99). Another common theme in Anglo-Saxon poetry that Foley claims bleeds into *The Seafarer* is “Joy in the Hall.” He uses the envelope structure around the Finnsburg episode in *Beowulf* to compare the sounds of hall songs with the bird songs that are not really songs in *The Seafarer*. Because the audience would understand the theme of “Joy in the Hall,” this genre leakage adds a layer of understanding to the poem. (Foley 2003, 101).

Foley never overtly defines *genre*, instead assuming it to be the traditional definition – characteristics that define a group of texts while assuming that different genres exist within Anglo-Saxon poetry. Instead, he focuses on “shared generic signals” (Foley 2003, 91), which are parallel to Fowler’s content. Therefore, I am not sure how much “bleeding” happens between genres when Foley references the elegies. His argument is more convincing when he discusses the riddles, which have a clear structure and content, and the Latin genres of lyric and dialogue, which influenced the *Advent Lyrics* and *Solomon and Saturn I and II*. Foley’s argument gets confusing when he starts treating the entire Anglo-Saxon poetry tradition as a genre while referring to it as an “ecosystem” rather than a genre.

Historically, “elegy” is most definitely a poetic kind, to use Fowler’s terminology, whose evolution can be traced through time. However, whether the “Old English elegies” are part of

---

3 Requirements for Fowler’s *kind* and *subgenre*. 
that evolution is open to debate. I would argue they are not. The poems typically included under this label have few features related to the traditional elegy kind and possess a primarily Germanic influence instead of the Latin Christian influence of the elegies, though the Latin Christian tradition occasionally does influence some of the Anglo-Saxon poems. Most prominently, they are unlike traditional elegies in form. Therefore, they may be operating as some kind of elegiac mode within a larger kind. Fowler states, “Modal terms never imply a complete external form. Modes have always an incomplete repertoire, a selection only of the corresponding kind’s features, and one from which overall external structure is absent” (Fowler 1982, 107). So perhaps these are just “elegiac Anglo-Saxon poems,” and calling them “Old English elegies” is inaccurate since their kind is not true “elegy,” and “Old English” is not the mode but rather the kind (i.e., “Old English poetry”) as Foley seems to imply even though he does not call it that. I doubt their label will change permanently since part of a historical genre is the name it has been traditionally called, but changing the way we think about the poems can begin with what we call them. Determining which have elegiac elements and what those elements are is a first step in identifying a “genre” or “kind” in order not just to classify the poems for the sake of classification, but to understand them, interpret them, and evaluate them.

In her critical edition, Anne Klinck discusses the genre of the Old English elegies. She agrees that “the poems considered here are not elegies in the classical sense of compositions in elegiac metre… nor in the tradition of the English pastoral elegies modelled on the eclogue and the idyll” (Klinck 1992, 11). As Klinck specifies how she will use the term genre, she acknowledges Fowler’s study and his differentiation between kind and mode. However, she

---

4 For the sake of clarity, I will continue to use their historical label. See Klinck (1992).
prefers not to use his terminology and instead simply uses “genre,” defining it as “a particular historical manifestation which corresponds to a transhistorical tendency” (Klinck 1992, 224). She uses the analogy Fowler expresses: “The view advanced by Fowler that genre features exist in families is also congenial to Old English elegy: collectively, the group of features defines the family, but no single feature need be shared by all its members” (Klinck 1992, 224). Klinck then continues to enumerate the features she believes make up an “Old English elegy.”

First, she claims “the essential element of elegy as it is found in these Exeter Book poems is the sense of separation: a distance in time or space between someone and their desire” (Klinck 1992, 225). Next, that sense of separation leads to some sort of consolation or overcoming of it. Each of the poems approaches this overcoming of separation differently (Klinck 1992, 226-227). Klinck also comments on the structure of the poem, saying that none of the formal features (such as a clear autobiographical account or a two-part structure) are essential (Klinck 1992, 227). Last, before discussing the potential sources of the poems, Klinck discusses the poetic vocabulary:

Certain turns of phrase are also typical. In addition to the usual heroic vocabulary about lord and retainers, feasting and entertainment in the hall, the giving of treasure, a few motifs predominate. Words expressing wretchedness, sorrow, dreariness and woe, or longing and expectation, or absent brightness and joy are thematic in all the poems. In several of them, words for the self combine with verbs of intention and narration in the introduction of the speaker. (Klinck 1992, 227)

She also points out that words for weather and isolation, words for falling, and images contrasting isolation against companionship are frequent (Klinck 1992, 230). Then, after discussing potential sources and analogues, Klinck gives her definition of Old English elegy:

---

5 This is similar to Fowler, but she “would take issue with his theory that the mode originates in the historical kind; [she is] inclined to believe that the reverse is true” (224).
“Old English elegy is a discourse arising from a powerful sense of absence, of separation from what is desired, expressed through characteristic words and themes, and shaping itself by echo and leitmotiv into a poem that moves from disquiet to some kind of acceptance” (Klinck 1992, 246).

Klinck’s definition relies mostly on themes and content, rather than structure. She goes so far as to claim that structure is not essential in determining whether any one of these poems fits with the others. Granted, she disagrees with Fowler about the evolution of mode and kind; however, since she does not expand on her disagreement, her definition must stand on its own, and it lacks any structural component beyond a movement from one theme to another, and this movement is more focused on theme than structure. Historical genres depend on their structural features as distinguishing elements. It is possible that the structural form for these poems falls under the umbrella of “Anglo-Saxon poetry” and its structural features, or even the broader structure of “lyric” poetry. It seems Klinck was taking that for granted, perhaps rightly. Nevertheless, in a linguistic analysis of the poems, it is possible to determine a more finite underlying structure that can determine which poems belong together and which are only similar in theme.

Genre matters. To understand a text fully and to interpret and evaluate it in relation to other texts like it, one must understand its genre. Without its multiple genre features, Beowulf, for example, is difficult to evaluate as the exceptional poem that it is. Its use of epic themes, its deviation from epic structure into digressions, its inclusion of elegiac passages as well as other passage types (such as Hrothgar’s “sermon”), among its other characteristics, both complicate the interpretive process by referencing numerous genres and give scholars a way of interpreting the poem based on its features compared to other Anglo-Saxon poetry. Similarly, determining a
list of features for the elegies can deepen our understanding of them and offer further insights into how they function, even potentially how medieval audiences would have received them.

The chapters in this dissertation follow the logical steps of this study. In Chapter 2, I provide a history of the debate among scholars about what to call the elegies and which poems belong in that grouping. This chapter also briefly explains systemic functional linguistics and then addresses genre theory in relation to medieval literature in general and the elegies specifically. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology I have used. Chapter 4 presents my findings, and Chapter 5 discusses the implications of my findings and draws conclusions about what I have found.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

When defining the genre of the elegies, scholars have used the poems’ form, style, and primarily their content. Few have used the language itself, and no one has used digital methods to search for patterns within the language. Stanley Greenfield’s definition of elegy has become the standard: “a relatively short reflective or dramatic poem embodying a contrasting pattern of loss and consolation, ostensibly based upon a specific personal experience or observation, and expressing an attitude towards that experience” (Greenfield 1965, 143). Anne Klinck has done the most thorough analysis of the poems in her 1992 critical edition. In the 1980s, prior to Klinck, there was interest in defining the elegies using the content of the elegies compared to different cultures – specifically Christian Latin and Old Norse. After Klinck, there has been a small shift in focus with a few scattered attempts at defining elegy, but it seems the Christian Latin and Old Norse connections are now taken for granted, and both before and after Klinck, scholars tend to focus on only one poem at a time, deciding where it fits within Old English poetry if not within the elegies. Only recently, in 2014, has a scholar (Paul Battles) addressed genre specifically, but it has been within the tradition of Old English poetry in general. However, the present study combines several fields in order to tackle the problem of the Old English elegiac genre from a novel and productive perspective. First, and most obviously, the field of standard literary scholarship offers ideas and terminology not only from medieval studies but
from genre theory as well. The second field, linguistics, offers both various methods of study, such as stylistics and corpus linguistics, and also the ability to analyze the language of the Old English elegies using Michael Halliday’s systemic functional linguistics theory. This theory’s primary claim is that language is a semiotic system and therefore involves choices in both lexicon and grammar. The theory lends itself to incorporating Mikhail Bakhtin’s theory of speech utterances and the ideas of several other genre studies scholars. Last, the recent field of digital humanities offers tools for conducting a closer analysis of language than a human brain can process. My innovative combination of these fields may produce a new way of looking at the Old English elegies and possibly Old English poetry in general.

I. Old English Elegy Scholarship

A brief review of the major scholarship will outline the trends that scholarship of the elegies has taken over the years. In 1942, B. J. Timmer made the distinction between elegy as genre and the elegiac mood and claimed there are only two true elegies: *The Wife’s Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer*. According to Timmer, *The Wanderer, The Seafarer, The Riming Poem,* and *Resignation* (which he calls *The Exile’s Prayer*) are religious didactic lyrics; Christianity used the elegiac mood for its own didactic purposes. In order to be a true elegy, a poem must contain “characteristic elegiac elements: lament over misery, separation from the lord and banishment, change of luck, comparison with former happiness,… and a longing for love… expressed in a lamenting tone” (Timmer 1942, 36). The distinction Timmer implies is that a true elegy has no religious didactic purpose:
The Christian poet who wanted to incite people to put their trust in God if they experienced misfortunes and lived in trouble availed himself of a once no doubt popular type of poetry (in this connection I point out the similarity of the first line of the Seafarer to that of the Wife’s Lament) and used it by way of introduction to his chief purpose, the religious admonition. For this reason it would be better not to call the Wanderer and the Seafarer ‘elegies’, but ‘religious didactic lyrics.’ (Timmer 1942, 38)

He then justifies the unity of The Wanderer and The Seafarer. Overall, Timmer uses his criteria to determine whether each of the nine traditional “elegies” is an elegy (he does not address Riddle 60). In relation to the study of the poems’ language, his criteria are based on the content of the lexicon, what most scholars logically use to judge the genre of these poems.

Twenty years later, Leonard H. Frey (1963) focused his arguments on exile. He used Stanley Greenfield’s study (1951) of the formulaic nature of exile poetry to examine the theme of exile in Anglo-Saxon Christian poetry, specifically Andreas, Guthlac B, and Christ and Satan. Frey was less concerned with the definition of elegy but used the term “exile-elegiac conditions,” which suggests he viewed exile and elegy as similar, if not the same, ideas. He set up The Wanderer as an example for all exile poetry:

The hundred-odd lines of the poem consist mainly of the wanderer’s lamentation, in the course of which he discloses (1) that he is so isolated as to have none to whom he can speak his heart; (2) that he lives on, deprived by death of both kinsman and chieftain; (3) that he knows the wretchedness of recalling treasure and kindness in the face of exile-solitude; (4) that he is painfully aware of the transience of worldly joy. The last half of the poem is largely a development of the theme of mutability… The last lines offer the inevitable Christian conclusion: seek mercy and comfort from God. (Frey 1963, 295)

Not all of the Christian narratives exhibit all of these parts of the pattern, but Frey analyzed each and concluded that the Christian narratives do indeed demonstrate “exile-elegiac conditions”

---

1 He uses The Exile’s Prayer to refer to Resignation. Timmer’s article appeared before the debate about the unity of Resignation (see Bliss and Frantzen 1976). However, from the way he talks about its structure, he appears to be referring to both Resignation A and B.
(Frey 1963). If this is the case, it would be worth investigating these Christian narratives for similar language patterns related to the Old English elegies.

In 1975, Rosemary Woolf explored the elegies through a Latin lens. She argues that some of the elegies could be of the *planctus* genre. She says, “The characteristics of [the *planctus*] genre that divide it from elegy are firstly that the speaker is invariably fictional and secondly that, whilst the subject of the lament may be a death, it can equally well be any kind of loss that is experienced intensely” (Woolf 1975, 192). She uses “the Lament of the Last Survivor” in *Beowulf* as an example of true *planctus* versus the elegy of the bereaved father found earlier in the poem. She then goes on to analyze *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer* and finds that “as *planctus*, however, they are markedly distinct” (Woolf 1975, 206) from the rest of the elegies. In the same publication as Woolf, James L. Boren (1975) interprets *Deor* specifically, relying on T.A. Shippey’s (1972) conclusion that “there is some justification for treating much Old English poetry, and especially the ‘elegiac’ group, as ‘wisdom literature’” (Shippey 1972, 67). Boren finds that *Deor* fits into the category of “wisdom literature,” illustrating that some scholars try to define individual poems rather than the elegies as a group.

Then in 1983, John M. Foley changed direction slightly by shifting focus away from primarily studying the content of the poems, and therefore the Christian Latin influences, and instead focused on *The Seafarer* and how the poet rhetorically creates the poem instead of what the poet says. He asks the following questions: “[H]ow can we presume to estimate and interpret the most elaborate and sensitive features of the poet’s art, that is, the structure, audience, and genre of the poem, until we understand the fundamental verbal bedrock on which they are erected? And secondly, how can we assume that there will always be a single answer for us to find, whether our questions address structure, audience, or genre?” (Foley 1983, 684). Therefore,
Foley examines “the nature of *Seafarer*-poet’s *diction* and its importance to an accurate and inclusive reading of the poem” (Foley 1983, 684). By examining various elements of the poem such as formulaic structure and echo words, he develops the terms “verbal structures” (Foley 1983, 693) – elements rooted in traditional poetic patterns – and “verbal designs” (Foley 1983, 694) – elements that tie the poem together but have no “history or resonance outside *The Seafarer*; the poet has created them consciously and specifically for this particular occasion without reference to the stock of the word-hoard” (Foley 1983, 693). These elements then affect the way audiences read or hear the poem by acting as signals that guide two audiences, or two different aspects of the same audience, together. And because *The Seafarer* has many sides and a complex diction, Foley argues it cannot be assigned one genre which would restrict its “many-sidedness” (Foley 1983, 698). It is all genres it has traditionally been assigned all at once.

In the same year that Foley published his article, Martin Green (1983) edited a collection of articles on the elegies, several of which examined the genre of the elegies not only through Christian Latin influences but Old Norse influences as well. In his introduction, Green outlines a brief review of the genre discussion (Green 1983, 14-17), but his book focuses on only eight of the ten poems typically included; *The Rimming Poem* and *Riddle 60* were excluded. Green discusses the effects of prior scholars’ work: “Seeing the poems against the background of Christian Latin learning has been a corrective to the earlier tendency to dismember the poems into pagan and Christian elements; but seeing them in this way has further complicated the question of genre” (Green 1983, 17). This complication suggests new genres, such as *planctus* and *consolatio* – which take comfort in the instability and transience of worldly values – that may be applicable (Green 1983, 17).
In Green’s book, three scholars discuss the relationship of the elegies to Old Norse literature. Joseph Harris (1983) uses Old Norse poetry, specifically the Old Norse Edda, and compares it to the Old English elegies to construct a “Common Germanic model” of elegy which he defines as “a dramatic monologue spoken by a figure from a known heroic story who told in the first person about the joys and especially the griefs of his life” (Harris 1983, 48). Raymond Tripp (1983) claims that “death-song” is a subgroup of elegy by examining the Old Germanic belief in the powers of Odin to cause the dead to rise and tell their stories. And last, William Johnson (1983), directly influenced by Tripp, applies the Old Norse tradition of death-song to *The Wife’s Lament*.

Shortly after Green’s book was published, Nicholas Howe (1985) compared one of the elegies to the Latin literary forms of catalogue and encyclopedia. He includes *Deor* as a catalogue poem, which he distinguishes from lists by their purpose and structure. A catalogue poem is more than a list of items. It provides information, as a list does; however, a catalogue poem expands on the information incrementally and in various detail. Howe claims, “The catalogue, whether in prose or poetry, is a practical means for presenting a great deal of information in discrete sections. In it, each item is noted and described individually rather than related by strict logic to the surrounding items” (Howe 1985, 27). These are didactic poems and are therefore often categorized as wisdom poetry. When determining which poems are catalogue poems, Howe claims, “My essential criterion for including a poem is that the catalogue be used not as an occasional stylistic feature but rather as the controlling principle of structure” (Howe 1985, 14). *Deor* fits this criterion, but it is the only elegy that does. Howe discusses *Deor* with *Widsið* and says:
[The poets] created of necessity their own catalogue structure because they had first created their own subjects. Like the other catalogue poems, Deor and Widsith present a series of discrete elements arranged in a suggestive pattern. Without this resemblance, one could not speak of these poems as having a common form... In these poems, the literal catalogue form has been transcended to accommodate their more personally conceived subjects. (Howe 1985, 166)

A few years later, Joseph Harris (1988) returns the discussion to Old Norse roots and argues that, “contrary to prevailing opinion, elegy is an old literary form among Germanic peoples and that heroic elegy in Old English and Old Norse can be traced to an ‘origin’ of sorts in an oral poetic genre that was common Germanic property” (Harris 1988, 81). To argue this, Harris traces some of the previous scholarship on the topic and then attempts to define “elegy” by reworking Stanley Greenfield’s standard definition. Harris outlines formal features from Greenfield’s definition, expanding on his own definition from his 1983 article: “a dramatic monologue spoken by a figure originally from heroic story who tells, in the first person, about the joys and especially the griefs of his life, ‘expressing an attitude toward [his] experience’” (Harris 1988, 90). However, he specifies technical terminology such as “formal elegy,” “elegiac form,” or plain “elegy” (Harris 1988, 91). He notes that “formal elegies” can appear in larger poems that have nothing to do with elegy, such as “The Lay of the Last Survivor” in Beowulf. Finally, he uses his definition of elegy and applies it to the passage he calls “Hadubrand’s Lament” in “Hildebrandslied,” concluding the passage was influenced by “formal elegies.” Harris, like so many other scholars, primarily uses the content of the poems to determine their genre.

Then, in 1990, Patricia Belanoff applied feminist theory to two of the elegies. She examines women’s songs, namely Wulf and Eadwacer and The Wife’s Lament, through the theoretical lens of Julia Kristeva’s theory of language acquisition which claims that language
uses elements of both male and female discourse. Belanoff claims that “the language is different because the poems are women’s songs, a genre which inevitably entails a differentness of language” (Belanoff 1990, 194). Through the discussion of semiotic and symbolic aspects of language (female and male, respectively), Belanoff links the two poems to “the frauenlieder genre more than to Old English poetry” (Belanoff 1990, 195). Belanoff takes concrete patterns in the poems, such as the use of first-person pronouns and finite verb forms, and extrapolates meanings based on Kristeva’s abstract ideas of language.

The most complete analysis of the elegies comes from Anne Klinck (1992), who defends the elegy as a genre in her 1992 edition, *The Old English Elegies: A Critical Edition and Genre Study*. She uses themes (i.e., content), structures, trends in certain vocabulary, and possible sources of the elegies to define both what elegy is and is not. The theme of separation appears in the elegies, and Klinck examines the structures of the poems to determine where the sense of separation is overcome (Klinck 1992, 225-226). She claims that while several formal features such as an autobiographical account, a two-part structure, or repetition are associated with the elegies, none of those features are essential in order to fit them together as a group (Klinck 1992, 227).

Klinck also notes that the vocabulary is similar and ties the poems together. They contain heroic vocabulary but also motifs of sorrow, longing, and an absence of joy and themes of separation, disintegration, and hostility of natural elements expressed through fixed images such as people isolated by water (Klinck 1992, 227). Several of the poems contain “words for the self [which] combine with verbs of intention and narration in the introduction of the speaker” (Klinck 1992, 227). Verb forms using *bi-* often express deprivation and the adjective *leas* is common both by itself and in compound words (Klinck 1992, 229). Klinck also finds that words for
falling are prevalent in poems about the destruction of society, and she analyzes some word
frequencies and collocations as characteristic of some of the poems (Klinck 1992, 230).

As previous scholars do, Klinck also discusses the sources of the elegies and their
relation to genre. Examining the sources not only offers possible subgenres within the elegies,
but also characteristics that may define the elegies as a whole. In addition, since systemic
functional linguistics and Bakhtin’s theory of the utterance claim that language is social, these
sources are relevant in that knowing potential sources of the elegies could provide context for
language choices. She starts with oral Germanic sources and determines that, while features
cannot be traced to one dominant source, various oral and literary sources may have influenced
the elegies (Klinck 1992, 230). She first addresses Levin Schücking’s (1908) and Ernst Sieper’s
(1915) suggestion that “the elegies arose from a Totenklagelied” (Klinck 1992, 230). However,
she says, “No early Germanic funeral laments are recorded. But judging from the evidence of
Beowulf we can deduce that two kinds of utterances were formally associated with funerals. One
was a lamentation voiced by a woman at a funeral pyre…. The other type of funeral song is the
stately eulogy uttered by warriors riding around Beowulf’s burial mound” (Klinck 1992, 230).
Klinck discounts this as an influence because funeral songs are sung to one specific person and
none of the elegies appear to be. She says, “It is quite feasible, though, that narration by a real
person of his own woes would have developed into a genre of lament by fictitious persons,
which is what we see in some of the elegies” (Klinck 1992, 230). She admits that we don’t have
copies of these oral poems; however, she concludes, “It seems reasonable to infer that some of
the traditional language of the elegies is descended from a genre of autobiographical oral poems,
originally chanted to the harp, which narrated the speaker’s misfortunes, rather than from a genre
of death-poems, specifically” (Klinck 1992, 231). She does not expand on a description of the “traditional language of the elegies.”

Klinck then moves on to Christian sources and their influence on genre. She divides the elegies into homiletic elegies, such as *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*, and love poems, such as *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife’s Lament*. She claims that unless the love poems are interpreted allegorically, they are secular, so even though the elegies are products of a Christian society, they do not all necessarily have to be religious (Klinck 1992, 231). Klinck also analyzes the influence of Boethius and his *Consolation of Philosophy*. She defines consolation as a “movement towards reassurance, towards the assertion that the separation from what is loved in this world is not permanent (Deor) or will be transcended by a union in the next (*The Wanderer, The Seafarer*, and *The Riming Poem*)” and sees it within some of the elegies (Klinck 1992, 233). Stanley Greenfield sees consolation as a basic element of the elegies; however, Klinck does not think it is found in all elegies, so she does not think Boethius inspired the elegies collectively (Klinck 1992, 234).

Klinck does see some influence from Christian Latin sources in form and rhetoric. She claims, “These connections between the elegies dealing with social themes and the Christian Latin literature of the early Middle Ages appear in concept and motif rather than poetic structure” (Klinck 1992, 234). However, devices such as homeoteleuton (near rhyme) extending to rhyme, antithesis, anaphora, and parallelism are used more conspicuously in the homiletic poems (Klinck 1992, 235). Klinck ultimately concludes, “The relationship of these elegies to Christian Latin learning is not specific to their poetic genre, but defines the much larger category of homiletic literature which elegy overlaps” (Klinck 1992, 235). When compared to Latin
elegiac poetry, the elegies parallel both pagan Latin and Christian Latin poetry as a whole, including the love lyric (Klinck 1992, 236).

Last, Klinck looks at influences on genre from Old Norse and Celtic analogues. The composition of *The Rimming Poem*, *Deor*, and *Wulf and Eadwacer* resembles the strophic structures of Old Norse, but they were probably not directly influenced by them (Klinck 1992, 238-239). For Klinck, there is no specific elegiac Old Norse model. In fact, the Norse are more vehement in their grief and express not just sorrow but also anger, so there are affinities with Old Norse poetry but no direct influence (Klinck 1992, 239). Klinck finds Old Welsh poetry similar in “temper and motif” but without much “literary resemblance” (Klinck 1992, 241). In other words, whatever small Celtic influences exist, they are only found in the subject of the elegies, but not in the form.

Klinck concludes with three elements of Old English elegy as a genre: “personal statement is combined with observation of nature and moral comment” (Klinck 1992, 241). These elements resemble Latin, Celtic, and Germanic sources, but it is impossible to ascertain any true influence. She concludes, “In so far as Old English elegy is formally distinguished from other Anglo-Saxon poetry, the distinction lies in a sophisticated and deliberate use of repetition and echo as a structuring device” (Klinck 1992, 243).

Klinck concludes that there is no word for “elegy” in Old English. The closest she finds is *giedd*, which she defines as “a relatively extended utterance, of an artistic kind, with a narrative content and an instructive or exemplary value” (Klinck 1992, 245). The word *giedd* is

---

2 Even though she finds that there is no word for elegy, she would not argue that just because there is no word for it people have no concept of what an elegy is. Clearly these poems are related, so there must have been some conception of “Old English elegy,” but we may have lost the word or it was never written down.
associated with poetic entertainment and with wisdom, but it requires additional words surrounding it in order to combine this artistic narrative with personal observation or with sadness and longing (Klinck 1992, 245). Ultimately, she defines the Old English elegy as “a discourse arising from a powerful sense of absence, of separation from what is desired, expressed through characteristic words and themes, and shaping itself by echo and leitmotiv into a poem that moves from disquiet to some kind of acceptance” (Klinck 1992, 246).

Since Klinck, scholars have tended to accept the possibility of Christian Latin and Old Norse influences and moved on to interpreting genre in different ways. T.A. Shippey (1994) returned to his discussion of the elegies as wisdom poetry by focusing on *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer* as “close to the core of this group” (Shippey 1994, 146). In his article, he closely analyzes the two poems, not to define elegy in general, but to try to define what type of poems these two specifically are and how they work. This analysis implies that he has a definition of elegies in mind, and these poems are not elegies, though he never says what that definition is. He still considers them within the wider genre of wisdom poems, but he ultimately concludes that it is impossible to tell who their audience was or what they were used for, which limits our understanding of their genre. He says, “As for one’s ‘generic conception’, it is suggested that they do relate to a genre of wisdom poetry: but that genre has been created in our minds only by a process of elimination and the recognition of a certain blurred homogeneity…. [These poems] are in a modern sense pure ‘texts’, uncluttered by presupposition” (Shippey 1994, 156-157). His understanding of genre seems to stem from a historical perspective, a view taken by many scholars, including Hans Robert Jauss (2000), who will be discussed later.

Instead of trying to define genre herself, María José Mora (1995) thoroughly traces the study of the elegy genre and concludes that our idea of elegy came from 19th-century
Romanticism. This reaffirms John C. Pope’s (2001) conclusion that *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*

treat of similar themes and have similar structures, and they are classified with other poems referred to as ‘elegies’ – not in the classical sense of the word, but as lyrics on themes of worldly mutability infused with intense suffering in a mood of loneliness and isolation… This classification is a legacy of nineteenth-century scholarship on Old English, which tended to see mirrored in these lyrics the melancholy that infused the Romantic imagination and the oneness with the natural world toward which it yearned. (Pope 2001, 88)

This classification has remained the dominant one. Even so, Klinck remains the last scholar to offer a definition of Old English elegy itself, which is also based on the idea of mutability instead of the classical sense of elegy.

After Pope and Mora, several scholars have continued to examine individual poems and attempted to determine whether or not the poems are elegies based on this traditional view. Susan Deskis (1998) examines the genre of *Resignation B*, after linking the narrator to the biblical Jonah, through the use of structure, theme, and strategic employment of certain textual details (Deskis 1998, 197). Ultimately, she concludes the poem is not an elegy because it lacks two elegiac themes: “any reminiscence about an enjoyable past and any reflection on the transience of the world” (Deskis 1998, 197). Sung-Il Lee (2012) claims *The Husband’s Message* has political implications and does not read like an elegy with a “romantic longing for one’s faraway spouse” (Lee 2012, 164).

Patrick W. Conner (2005) takes a different approach to defining elegy. He reads the elegies “against culturally important documents written in the same period and [relates] them to the determining issues of the day… [taking] what is known as a ‘New Historicist’ approach to

---

the Old English elegies. Such a New Historicist project may rescue them from the romantic but unfortunate notion that they are timeless” (Conner 2005, 31). He examines guild documents and determines that several of the elegies were used “to perpetuate, to guarantee, and to strengthen the social relationships necessary to the production of a monastic economic hegemony” (Conner 2005, 34). He continues to claim that the guilds used them as entertainment at feasts and therefore the audience of these poems were listeners and members of the guild. He uses *The Seafarer* as the primary and best example, creating a paradigm for reading the elegies:

The subject presents a contrast between a dismal past and a present in which there has been a resolution of the earlier pain. This is the ‘confession’ component of the paradigm. The subject purchases the conditions of deliverance from mortal pain and generates in the reader a desire for a similar delivery. This component of the paradigm is the ‘production of desire.’ Next, the subject establishes the value of monastic capital as the means of satisfying this desire, the ‘identification’ between desire and the commodity which will satisfy it being the third component of the paradigm. The ‘exhortation,’ the last component of the paradigm, asks the reader directly to reproduce the conditions of monastic capital. (Conner 2005, 39)

Conner admits that not all the elegies (of which he includes only *The Wanderer, The Seafarer, The Rimming Poem*, and *Resignation*) match the paradigm in every component, but because the poems draw on similar imagery and are found in the same manuscript, they can be connected. He finally concludes that *Deor, Wulf and Eadwacer, The Wife’s Lament, The Husband’s Message*, and *The Ruin* (he excludes *Riddle 60* completely) “do not obviously share the paradigm of a desire for monastic capital” (Conner 2005, 43). Because of this, he labels them laments instead of elegies, though he claims the elegies were probably still used as entertainment at guild feasts. However, “the laments do not sell salvation, the elegies do” (Conner 2005, 43).

The latest scholar to tackle Old English genre is Paul Battles (2014). However, he hearkens back to earlier romantic ideals by using Klinck’s definition of elegy. While Battles is not trying to define elegy, the way he classifies elegy is relevant to the present study. He claims,
“Most Old English poems are generic hybrids, combining the characteristics of several genres” (Battles 2014, 1). He uses the language and structure of the traditional opening to classify poems:

The ‘traditional opening,’ which occurs in many poems, contains genre-specific cues that alert the audience to what manner of poem will follow. Analysis of the ‘traditional opening’ reveals three distinct kinds of verse: epic, elegy, and wisdom poetry. Each type of opening also provides information about the respective genre’s distinctive features, as shown by the first verses of *Beowulf, The Wife’s Lament*, and *Vainglory*. (Battles 2014, 1)

In the case of elegy, he uses the following characteristics of an elegiac opening: introductory element, reference to narrator, mention of subject matter, specification of time and/or place, desire to relate the experience, and assertion of the personal nature of the experience, which must be characterized by sorrow and anxiety (Battles 2014, 13). He applies this analytic framework to several poems, including poems not traditionally classified as elegies, such as *The Fates of the Apostles, The Dream of the Rood*, and *Judgment Day II*, finding elegiac openings although he admits that not all elegies have to begin with this particular opening (as not all fairy tales begin with “Once upon a time”), but certain cues can alert an audience to a particular genre (Battles 2014, 12). That language patterns found in the elegies may also appear in these traditionally non-elegiac poems complicates the concept of genre.

Battles’s claim that Old English poems are often hybrid genres is one reason this study is important. As Fowler (1982) argues, we need genre in order to better interpret and analyze texts. Therefore, we need to be able to determine what elements characterize an Old English elegy. While some scholars like Foley (1983, 2003) use style as an indicator of genre, still others, such as Klinck (1992), use content and theme. Bakhtin’s theory of speech genres (2000) offers a unifying place to start. We must examine the basic elements of the text – the language – to determine genre characteristics. Taking this structural approach challenges the claims of some scholars such as Shippey (1994), who view the poems from a historical perspective. Therefore,
we need a different approach, and since one of the claims of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) is that language develops directly from cultural values, analyzing the language through an SFL lens can relieve some of the tension between the two approaches. In fact, some scholars such as Belanoff (1990) have already attempted identifying genre through linguistic analysis. However, Belanoff’s analysis of Kristeva’s theory and her resulting application fail because Belanoff makes assumptions about male and female language. Clearly, Wulf and Eadwacer and The Wife’s Lament have a different “feel” from the rest of the elegies, and perhaps SFL analyses can offer a better explanation of what is happening in these poems.

II. Systemic Functional Linguistics

This present study differs from all previous scholarship primarily because of its addition of linguistic and digital tools for analysis. The study is unique in analyzing language patterns through the tools of systemic functional linguistics. SFL is a linguistic theory based on language as choice. Australian linguist Michael Halliday introduced the theory in the 1960s, and the theory has developed over the last fifty years into a whole school of linguistics, largely based in Australia and Great Britain, existing alongside formalist linguistics. J.R. Martin (2016) provides a brief history of SFL, including key works and avenues of exploration that have made SFL what it is today. In the United States, several scholars study SFL, but one of the most prominent is

---

4 Halliday introduced his understanding of how grammar is structured in his 1961 article “Categories of the Theory of Grammar.” He contrasts other formalist linguists by claiming “grammar is social.” He says, “My purpose in writing this paper is to suggest what seems to me to be the fundamental categories of that part of General Linguistic theory which is concerned with how language works at the level of grammar, with brief reference to the relations between grammar and lexis and between grammar and phonology” (242).
Mary Schleppegrell at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. She studies SFL in relation to learning English as a second language and its uses in education. However, Suzanne Eggins published *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* in 1994, which provides the clearest explanation for the non-specialist.

SFL makes four main theoretical claims:

1. Language use is functional.
2. Language’s function is to make meanings.
3. These meanings are influenced by the social and cultural context in which they are exchanged.
4. The process of using language is a semiotic process, a process of making meanings by choosing. (Eggins 1994, 2)

These claims – that language use is functional, semantic, contextual, and semiotic – lead to questions such as how people use language and how language is structured for use. These questions require systemicists to examine how many different sorts of meanings people can make and how language is organized to make these meanings (Eggins 1994, 2).

In order to understand the basic concepts behind SFL, it is necessary to first understand that language is a complex semiotic system. In semiotics, based on Saussure’s (1959) theory of signification, an arbitrary sign is assigned a meaning by virtue of social convention. The example Eggins uses is a traffic light. The colors red, yellow, and green by themselves do not mean anything. However, when they appear in a traffic light, our society has accepted that they mean “stop,” “slow down,” and “go,” which then influences our behavior. Therefore, the meaning is encoded in the expression making the traffic light a two-level system (Eggins 1994, 13-15).
Language is a similar kind of system, except language is a three-level system. Meanings (semantics) are realized in words and structures (lexico-grammar) which are then realized in sounds/letters (phonology/graphology) (Eggins 1994, 16). SFL is primarily concerned with the top two levels; therefore, for this study, my primary concern will be the first two levels as well – that is, with meaning and lexis. These two levels work together in the choices people make by fitting together like layers on top of each other (Eggins 1994, 21). Choice exists on two axes – the syntagmatic and paradigmatic (see Figure 1). On the syntagmatic axis, a speaker/writer chooses how a sentence will be put together. On the paradigmatic axis, the speaker/writer chooses which mutually exclusive words to use in order to express meaning. This works on the sentence level (i.e., choosing subjects, verbs, direct objects, etc.) and on the phrasal level (i.e., noun phrases, prepositional phrases, etc.). Each choice affects the following word choices due to grammatical rules. For example, in the noun phrase in Figure 1, the article “the” limits choices to nouns and potentially adjectives before the nouns. Once an adjective or noun is chosen on the syntagmatic axis, it affects the other choices by limiting options on the paradigmatic axis. Further in the syntactic string, the form of the noun “ball” will predict the form of the verb (i.e., there are only so many things a ball can do or be), which will then affect complementation.

![Figure 1: An example of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes.](image)
At the semantic level of language, in order to express the intended meaning, a speaker or writer must choose what word he or she wishes to use compared to all of the other choices that exist. These choices will express attitude about the topic. For example, a parent has a choice in what to call his/her child that expresses gender (boy/girl), attitude (brat – negative, child – neutral, darling – positive), and so on (Eggins 1994, 18). These choices appear on the paradigmatic axis. The opposition (or choice) is the important element, not the word itself. A language system creates meaning based on culturally established conventions that reflect the reality of the culture (Eggins 1994, 19).

A speaker or writer also has grammatical choice at the lexico-grammatical level on the syntagmatic axis. Lexico-grammar includes the words people choose (lexicon) and the order they put them in (grammar) (Eggins 1994, 114). Because language is a semiotic system and people have choices in their use of it through lexico-grammar, semantic complexity exists. Halliday has argued that there are three kinds of meaning that language is structured to make: experiential, interpersonal, and textual. These three exist in language at the same time, creating semantic complexity. These meanings are analyzed against other options for making meaning, and the entire structure of the theory can be organized around these three meanings.

In the lexico-grammatical level of language, language is able to make all three kinds of meaning at once. Table 1 outlines the three meanings and their associations. Experiential meaning is real-world meaning – what the text literally means. It is expressed through choices of Transitivity (Eggins 1994, 143). Interpersonal meaning “expresses the writer’s role relationship with the reader, and the writer’s attitude towards the subject matter” (Eggins 1994, 12). It is expressed through choices in Mood (Eggins 1994, 143). Textual meaning “refers to the way the
text is organized as a piece of writing (or speech)” (Eggins 1994, 12). This is expressed through choices in Theme (Eggins 1994, 143).

Table 1: SFL’s Three Meanings and Their Explanations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Real-world meaning</td>
<td>Transitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Role relationship and attitude</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Organization of text</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitivity “represents the encoding of experiential meanings… By examining the Transitivity patterns in a text, we can explain how the field of the situation is being constructed: i.e. we can describe ‘what is being talked about’ and how shifts in the field are achieved” (Eggins 1994, 266). Transitivity works together with Mood: “The reality of interaction demands that we not only talk about something, but that we talk to someone, and this simultaneous semiotic requirement is realized through the simultaneous structuring of linguistic choices for both Transitivity and Mood functions” (Eggins 1994, 270). Transitivity processes of the verb, found in Table 2, include (1) material, or physical actions; (2) mental, or verbs associated with perception, cognition, affection, and desire; (3) verbal, or verbs associated with communication; (4) relational, or verbs associated with possession, equivalence, or attributes; (5) behavioral, or human behaviors, and (6) existential, which include clauses that begin with the dummy subjects here, there, or it. Mood “refers to the organization of a set of functional constituents” (Eggins 1994, 152). The most common examples of Moods are statements (declarative), questions (interrogative), and commands (imperative). Theme, which expresses textual meaning, is “the starting point for the message: it is what the clause is going to be about” (Eggins 1994, 275). It is taken from the context surrounding the clause. The other element of Theme is Rheme, which is
“the part of the clause in which the Theme is developed” (Eggins 1994, 275). The Rheme is where Transitivity and Mood reside.

Table 2: Transitivity Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitivity Process</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Physical actions</td>
<td>I baked her a cake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Perception, cognition, affectation, and desire</td>
<td>I like cheese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>I told her about my cat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Possession, equivalence, and attributes</td>
<td>I am a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Human behaviors</td>
<td>She laughed at the movie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Clauses that being with dummy subjects</td>
<td>There are two squirrels outside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Halliday argues that we need all three of these meanings – experiential, interpersonal, and textual – in order to make sense of our communication and our world. In the Old English elegies, the experiential meaning seems to come from the lexicon and expresses loss, sadness, and aloneness, in general. Interpersonal meaning is difficult to determine because we have only one copy of the manuscript and no evidence of the writer’s attitudes towards the reader. The primary moods are declarative and command, though interrogatives also appear in a few places. The textual meaning may be the most prominent type of meaning to connect all of the poems together. It works with Mood and Transitivity to create overall meaning. The use of the lexicon, function words, the structure of clauses, and so on in the elegies should shed light onto all meanings, but primarily I am interested in providing a means of grouping them together using these SFL elements.

The interaction of all three meanings can be seen in our traditional class label of “subject.” Halliday lists three functional roles in regard to subject:
1. Theme – This is the psychological subject, or “the constituent which is ‘the concern of the message’” (Eggins 1994, 141).
2. Subject – This is the grammatical subject, or “the constituent ‘of which something is predicated’” (Eggins 1994, 141).
3. Actor – This is the logical subject, or “the constituent which is the ‘doer of the action’” (Eggins 1994, 141).

The first of these relates to the textual meaning (expressed through selections of Theme/Rheme), the second to the interpersonal meaning (expressed through selections of Mood), and the third to the experiential meaning (expressed through selections of Transitivity) (Eggins 1994, 143).

Depending on the arrangement of words and choices in grammar (e.g., what word should be the traditionally defined subject of the sentence), speakers/writers can emphasize certain elements. For example, the following four sentences say roughly the same thing but are constructed differently:

*The redback spider gave the captured beetle a poisonous bite.*

In this sentence, “the redback spider” is the Theme, Subject, and Actor, which makes it the primary focus of the sentence and therefore emphasized.

*A poisonous bite was given to the captured beetle by the redback spider.*

Here, “a poisonous bite” is the Theme and Subject, so it becomes the focus of the sentence, even though “the redback spider” is still the Actor, as it is in all of these sentences.

*The captured beetle was given a poisonous bite by the redback spider.*

In this sentence, “the captured beetle” becomes the Theme and Subject and therefore the focus.

*A poisonous bite is what the captured beetle was given by the redback spider* (Eggins 1994, 140).
This sentence has two clauses, one embedded inside the other, so there are two Themes and two Subjects – “a poisonous bite” and “the captured beetle.” Therefore, the emphasis is not necessarily on only one of the noun phrases and the sentence becomes more complex. Thus, analyzing texts by breaking them down into constituents allows systemicists to look for meanings more closely.

SFL is a descriptive approach to linguistics. It describes how language is functioning; as language makes meaning, it develops into different kinds of functions, or genres. These genres are made up of three variables: mode, tenor, and field. The mode variable refers to the role that language is playing. For example, in the case of the Old English elegies, the mode of these poems is a written manuscript (versus a spoken conversation among friends or a letter to a senator, etc.). The tenor variable refers to the interpersonal relationship between participants; each has a function or role to play in the interaction. When ordering a burger through a drive-thru, the tenor of this language use would be the driver and the employee speaking through the intercom. The field variable refers to the topic or focus of the activity (Eggins 1994, 9, 26).

Along with genre, a text also has a register. Register is the “immediate situational context in which the text was produced” (Eggins 1994, 26). A linguistic option, taken in context of the rest of the text, can be determined as appropriate or inappropriate in register and genre (e.g., in a drive-thru an inappropriate linguistic option would be to ask to purchase furniture (inappropriate in field) or show the employee a hand-written note (inappropriate in mode)). The analysis of constituents of a text allows systemicists to examine these roles more closely and explain how they work together to create genres.

One of the primary interests of SFL is how cultural context affects language use. Cultures develop structures in which language achieves certain goals. For example, the drive-thru
example is an example of a “Buying & Selling” genre because the interaction follows a specific set of moves beginning with a greeting from the employee, an order from the driver, perhaps some clarification from the employee, and usually a total dollar amount and a request to pull forward from the employee, with some variation depending on the details of each interaction.

Old English poetry itself has a set structure in its meter which identifies it as Old English poetry. But in closely examining the language of the elegies, we may be able to uncover similar patterns of moves that more clearly define “Old English elegy” and determine which poems belong to this genre.

Michael Cummings has applied SFL to Old English. In his article, “A Systemic-Functional Model for Old English” (1981), he analyzes Old English noun phrases by analyzing the functional constituents of noun phrases. First, he briefly explains the three-level system of SFL and then extends that theory into the realm of diachronic linguistics … [by] assum[ing] that any historical dialect implies semiotic and linguistic strata parallel to those of contemporary dialect. Such strata can also be assumed to have parallel functional, systemic and structural components. A diachronic linguistics is then the description of such components at two or more places on a time line, together with an orderly account of changes which have overtaken one set of components in order to produce their later parallels. (Cummings 1981, 198)

Within this framework, he examines several different noun phrases with pre- and post-modifiers to determine structures and placement of heads (in this case, nouns), determiners, qualifiers, and so on (or in SFL terms, thing, classifier, epithet, numerative, deictic, and qualifier) (Cummings 1981, 198). In other words, he works “to discover what ideational categories in semantics relate to what constituent elements in Old English nominal group structure… [and to identify] the assignment of word-class realizations to those elements of sequence structure which result from
the mapping together of various constituency elements” (Cummings 1981, 199). He then gives several examples of noun phrases and their analysis.

In another of his articles, “A Systemic-Functional Approach to the Thematic Structure of the Old English Clause” (1995), Cummings first seeks “to demonstrate an application of the Halliday model for theme/rheme to Old English prose texts, and to show how the analysis suggests a connection between the distribution of types of theme and the distribution of register in texts which move in and out of narrative register as they proceed” (Cummings 1995, 278). He uses sermons from Wulfstan and Ælfric and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and finds the results justify the approach, though they also raise questions about Old English prose. He then seeks “to relate the systemic functional analysis of Old English theme/rheme to more traditional philological approaches on the question of Old English clause order, in order to determine how the functional approach may clarify the issues” (Cummings 1995, 279). According to Cummings, the concepts of focus and prominence of a theme clarifies Old English clauses (Cummings 1995, 302-303). Cummings’s findings may be useful to this study overall; however, because poetry and prose are structured differently, some of his findings may not apply. Still, the fact that SFL can be applied to Old English and produce results is encouraging.

III. Genre Theory in Medieval Literature

In Mikhail Bakhtin’s theory of the speech utterance we can see connections to SFL’s theory of language as choice; therefore, Bakhtin’s theory will be my entry point and connection to genre studies. Bakhtin’s theory requires the separation of grammatical function and stylistics into two distinct ideas. For Bakhtin, the ways an individual uses grammar – the choices he/she
makes – constitute a particular style. The way grammar and style are then joined create different “speech genres.” However, Bakhtin uses the word “utterance” because his theory can be applied to written texts as well. Thus, if utterances within the elegies are similar in grammar and stylistics – including lexical choice – they can be defined as a particular group of texts – one genre.

Tzvetan Todorov compiled Bakhtin’s notes and synthesized them in his book *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle* (1984). In this book, he defines more sharply Bakhtin’s theory of the utterance, which is very similar to SFL. In the simplest terms, Bakhtin’s theory claims that “linguistic matter constitutes only a part of the utterance; there exists another part that is nonverbal, which corresponds to the context of the enunciation” (Todorov 1984, 41). Todorov gives the examples of utterances such as “So!” or “Hm... yes!” Without any sort of context, these utterances are confusing. In SFL terms, we would not be able to make meaning of these texts. Bakhtin also describes three elements of the external context: space/time (where and when it happened), theme (what the speech is about), and the “relation of interlocutors to what is happening” (Todorov 1984, 42) – what he calls “evaluation.” All of these elements must be held in common with the participants (what he calls the “interlocutors”) and cannot be individually interpreted. Therefore, the context of the utterance is always social (Todorov 1984, 43). This is similar to two of Halliday’s three kinds of meaning – interpersonal and textual. Both theories are based on an inherent truth that language requires a social element, and that element influences and is reflected within the language itself, making it appropriate to examine the similarities in language use within different poems.

Todorov’s article with Richard Berrong, “The Origin of Genres” (1976), examines the similarities and differences between literary genres and speech acts to determine how genres
develop. They define genre as “the historically attested codification of discursive properties”: the
discursive reality, which includes literary modes, registers, styles, and so on, and the historical
reality, which includes trends, schools of thought, movement, and general style (Todorov and
Berrong 1976, 200). Both of these realities are needed for genres to exist. Indeed, Todorov and
Berrong claim, “Genres are the meeting place between general poetics and event-based literary
history; as such, they constitute a privileged object that may well deserve to be the principal
figure in literary studies” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 201). For them, genre is the most
important part of literary studies.

Todorov and Berrong then move on to connect speech acts\(^5\) – the oral version of
Bakhtin’s utterances – to genres by looking at the difference between speech acts and literary
genres. They say, “Like all other speech acts genres arise from the codification of discursive
properties” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 202). They then give three possibilities by which genres
may be different from or interact with speech acts. First, “genre codifies discursive properties as
any speech act would” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 202). They give the example of a sonnet – a
literary genre but not a speech act. In this case, genre does not derive from a simpler speech act,
but they both exist in similar fashions. The second possibility states, “Genre coincides with a
speech act that also has a nonliterary existence” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 202), such as
prayer, which is both a literary genre and a speech act. And last, “[genre] derives from a speech

\(^5\) Todorov and Berrong define a speech act as follows: “A discourse is not made of sentences, but
of spoken sentences, or, to be more concise, of enunciations. The interpretation of the
enunciation is determined, in part, by the sentence that one speaks, as well as by the speech act
itself. A speech act includes a locutor who speaks, an allocutor who is addressed, a time and a
place, a discourse that precedes and follows it: in short, a speech-act context. In other words, a
discourse is always and necessarily a speech act” (162). They acknowledge more contemporary
definitions of linguistic speech acts as defined by Austin and Searle.
act by way of a certain number of transformations or amplifications” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 202). The example they give for this possibility is a novel, which develops from the speech act of telling. In the first two possibilities, genre and speech act are separate but not different in the way they exist. The third possibility, however, leads Todorov and Berrong to question the origin of genres: “What transformations do given speech acts undergo in order to produce given literary genres?” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 202). They then examine concrete examples from the Luba culture in Zaire and connect those transformations to Western literature through the fantastic genre and the autobiography genre.

Todorov, like his mentor Bakhtin, is primarily concerned with the novel, so he and Berrong conclude, “I do not dare plunge headlong into the series of transformations that presides over its birth; but I shall risk betraying a certain optimism and say that, here too, the process does not seem to be qualitatively different… there is not an abyss between literature and what is not literature, that the literary genres originate, quite simply, in human discourse” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 207-208). I agree with Todorov, and SFL supports his ideas through its analyses of language function. While I will not be looking at the transformations the elegies undergo, the connection between speech acts and genre is significant. If genres originate from human discourse, the language used in a poem that exists in a primarily oral culture should shed some light on the genre itself, no matter how that genre came into existence. Therefore, analyzing the language of the Old English elegies should produce interesting results.

Two other scholars have produced significant work within genre studies that relates to medieval literature. Hans Robert Jauss coined the well-known term “horizon of expectations” in his influential book Toward an Aesthetic of Reception (1982), and Ardis Butterfield (1990) offers
some objections to determining genre in medieval texts based on the lack of information we have about cultural context.

Hans Robert Jauss (2000) attempts to understand how genres have functioned historically and then constructs a theoretical model that explains the way these genres have operated. He frames his argument in modern genre theory and develops his influential idea about the “horizon of expectation.” He says that a reader (or listener) will possess “a trajectory of expectations … against which to register the originality and novelty [of a text]” (Jauss 2000, 131). He continues to explain:

This horizon of the expectable is constituted for the reader from out of a tradition or series of previously known works, and from a specific attitude, mediated by one (or more) genre and dissolved through new works. Just as there is no act of verbal communication that is not related to a general, socially or situationally conditioned norm or convention, it is also unimaginable that a literary work set itself into an informational vacuum, without indicating a specific situation of understanding. To this extent, every work belongs to a genre – whereby I mean neither more nor less than that for each work a preconstituted horizon of expectations must be ready at hand … to orient the reader’s (public’s) understanding and to enable a qualifying reception… Following this line of thought, literary genres are to be understood not as genera (classes) in the logical senses, but rather as groups or historical families. As such, they cannot be deduced or defined, but only historically determined, delimited, and described. In this they are analogous to historical languages, for which it likewise holds that German or French, for example, do not allow themselves to be defined, but rather only synchronically described and historically investigated. (Jauss 2000, 131)

So according to Jauss, by examining the language of the elegies, I can describe what is happening within them but not define a genre. This may be true. Because SFL’s primary claim is that individuals make choices in language based on the culture in which they live, Jauss’s comments make sense. However, this does not preclude looking for patterns within the language as a connecting tool.

Klinck argues that it is impossible to apply Jauss’s horizons of expectation to the Old English elegies; however, she makes this statement within the terms of genre evolution. She
concludes that because of the impossibility of accurately dating the elegies and therefore the inability to determine a chronology, plus the fact that nothing like them exists in Middle English, we cannot determine how they evolved (Klinck 1992, 224-225). Jauss adopted the Formalist viewpoint that genres evolve based on social conditions. He was interested in their function within the literary system of a period. He says, “Literary genres do not exist alone, but rather form the various functions of a given period’s system, to which they connect the individual work: ‘A work which is ripped out of the context of the given literary system and transposed into another one receives another coloring, clothes itself with other characteristics, enters into another genre, loses its genre; in other words, its function is shifted’” (Jauss 2000, 141). However, this study is not concerned with the evolution of the elegies, only their existence as text and what their language can tell us about their connections to each other. Jauss’s belief that genre comes from the culture of the time is useful because SFL claims that language also comes from the culture of the time. So therefore, language should tell us something about the genre of the elegies.

Ardis Butterfield makes similar arguments but also presents some potential problems. In “Medieval Genres and Modern Genre Theory” (1990), Butterfield claims that genre study is needed to compare texts, even though some say it is not. Genre study has always existed, and literary history relies on it, but we cannot agree on what constitutes particular genres or where genre comes from (from reader or author). Jauss’s “horizon of expectation” consists of (1) the initial response from the audience at the moment the piece appeared and (2) comparing that response to our own response. But medieval audience response is hard to judge because of lack of evidence; Jauss has been criticized for only alluding to this idea and then contradicting himself in his discussion (Butterfield 1990, 184). Because we cannot share medieval audiences’
expectations, Butterfield claims that, since we do not share the expectations, we have to be careful when placing genre labels on medieval texts, especially when we have clear genre clues, because we do not know if the text is perhaps a parody (Butterfield 1990, 186). However, because the Middle Ages was an oral culture, it is worth looking for audience expectations, though we must be careful when doing so (Butterfield 1990, 186-187).

According to Butterfield, we need to view genre as both “a linguistic and social experience” so we can “breach the impasse which results from trying to divide it up into either internal or external evidence of expectation… It might even recover the possibility of some medieval works being both complex (complexly produced and received) and powerfully generic” (Butterfield 1990, 188). Thirteenth-century texts, including romances with various insertions (like lyrics and music), present some difficulty between performance and genre. How do we understand the process of transliteration? Butterfield uses Guillaume de Dole, a poem using multiple genres including spoken and sung speech acts, to illustrate the problem.

Butterfield uses Bakhtin’s theory of speech-act genres and his view of the language within the novel to support the idea that romances with motets inserted are like the author who is both outside of his text as author but also simultaneously present in his text because the text is his language. “The audience of a motet hears a single sequence of sound, yet one which is constantly broken up by voices crossing one another: jarring and grating, yet also meeting and making contact” (Butterfield 1990, 191). Butterfield continues, “The songs simultaneously represent and are represented by the narrative. They approach, then, an image of the trouvère’s art, yet not in Bakhtin’s fully internalized sense since they are created not within the narrator’s own speech, but outside it” (Butterfield 1990, 192).

Butterfield elaborates on this double layer of discourse. She says:
This may be clearer if we consider Bakhtin on the opposition between authoritative and ‘internally persuasive’ discourse. The former is a type of discourse which remains ‘sharply demarcated, compact and inert’: it ‘permits no play with the context framing it’, its semantic structure is ‘static and dead’. In ‘internally persuasive’ discourse, by contrast, the semantic structure is open to all kinds of creative variation. The refrain is not fully accounted for by either of these definitions separately: for it is authoritative in the sense that it can be repeated exactly (both verbally and musically), yet ‘internally persuasive’ since it can also be subject to (and can prompt) much variation and adaptation. Part of the pleasure in its use may actually concern the making of authoritative discourse into something internally persuasive. (Butterfield 1990, 192-193)

While the elegies are not songs with musical notation, the language of all of the elegies themselves may lend itself to patterns that create “internally persuasive discourse.” The elegies that contain a refrain may warrant a closer look in association with Butterfield’s ideas.

Butterfield uses an anonymous 13th-century pastourelle, “En avril au tens novel,” to “illustrate the importance of the issues under discussion – performative, transmissive, socio-cultural and linguistic” (Butterfield 1990, 194). She uses this song because unlike other surviving pastourelles, it has a variable refrain at the end of each of the six strophes (Butterfield 1990, 194). In relation to the song analysis, she concludes that the song’s presentation of performance and transmission (socio-cultural and linguistic) is problematic because we are unsure of exactly how it was received, but “the question of how it was received cannot be divorced from how it was composed and transmitted; similarly, the part-internal, part-external role of the refrains proves to be socially, as well as formally anomalous” (Butterfield 1990, 198-199). So Butterfield offers this final conclusion:

In conclusion, it would seem that both the dialogic and the broader sociocultural approaches to genre have much to teach us about the Middle Ages. To think of genre as a matter of expectation, and thus of audience response, is central to a culture in which oral performance still predominated; at the same time the complexities of transmission and medium (verbal, musical) in many thirteenth-century compositions complicate, in turn, our ability to discern expectation. In this way, medieval works expose some of the inadequacies of modern genre theorists; in particular, that an abstract, post-oral sense of
what Williams terms the ‘presence’ of a work can strangely simplify a discussion of how
the process of interpretation takes place, not just for a work that is orally performed, but
for any attempt to comprehend speech acts and their relation to writing. In this sense, the
attempt to explicate the medieval may turn out to help explicate other, less historically
distant, problems of interpretation. (Butterfield 1990, 199)

Therefore, because Butterfield agrees that genre is part social and part textual but finds it
difficult to define the social element, she may find an attempt at defining a genre for the elegies
problematic. However, through SFL, the social element is located within the language and the
connotations of lexico-grammatical choices, so an in-depth analysis of the language itself may
reveal something that leads to a better understanding of audience response.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

To analyze the language of the elegies, I have engaged a methodology of stylistics, the more quantifiable hybrid of linguistics and literary criticism. According to Peter Stockwell and Sara Whiteley in the Cambridge Handbook of Stylistics, “As a discipline, stylistics is progressive, systematic, transparent, replicable, evidential, and textually grounded” (Stockwell and Whiteley 2014, 4). It uses the quantitative methods of linguistics to support hypotheses. However, it is not a substitute for literary criticism. A close analysis of the text is still needed to understand and interpret the text as well as interpret the findings. Linguistics and criticism must work together in order to fully understand the poems and interpret the data collected. As part of the data collection process, I am taking a corpus-based approach. Stockwell and Whiteley say, “Corpus-stylistics studies can confirm or reject intuitive assertions made by literary scholars; they can provide measured evidence for detailed stylistic analyses; and they can even capture textual features that are so diffused across a long text that they might only be felt subliminally or subconsciously” (Stockwell and Whiteley 2014, 2). A corpus-based approach can support or refute traditional scholarship on the Old English elegies. Because the corpus of Old English poetry is small, relatively speaking, a corpus-stylistic approach makes the most sense.

To find patterns in language, and specifically in poetry, a stylistician studies the lexicon and its relation to theme, any repetition of language (or formulas, in the case of Old English
poetry), word formation such as affixation and compounding, transitivity (involving processes, participants, and circumstances), and word distribution. This study examines these areas using several electronic tools to produce the results found in Chapter 4. These tools include Lexomics, Voyant, and Microsoft Excel. They have allowed me to record information which I then manipulate to look for patterns according to these standard stylistic elements. Compared to other electronic tools, these are the simplest to use and Lexomics and Voyant are freely available online. Lexomics produces overall patterns of similarity and offers more detailed places to look for patterns within the poems. I also used Lexomics to generate word frequency lists. Microsoft Excel has given me the spreadsheet storage and ability to manipulate individual data such as words and clauses. Finally, Voyant is the tool I used to identify specific patterns within each poem. All of these together help me to look for common characteristics within the ten poems that may connect them as a genre.

Computers have made generating data much easier. Matthew Jockers has defended their use in his book, *Macroanalysis: Digital Methods and Literary History* (2013). Jockers uses what he calls “macroanalysis” techniques to look at sample texts and analyze them. He distinguishes between analyzing texts on the microscale and the macroscale:

Like it or not, today’s literary-historical scholar can no longer risk being just a close reader: the sheer quantity of available data makes the traditional practice of close reading untenable as an exhaustive or definitive method of evidence gathering. Something important will inevitably be missed. The same argument, however, may be leveled against the macroscale; from thirty thousand feet, something important will inevitably be missed. The two scales of analysis, therefore, should and need to coexist. For this to happen, the literary researcher must embrace new, and largely computational, ways of gathering evidence. (Jockers 2013, 9)

---

1 Kleinman, LeBlanc, Drout, and Zhang (2016)

2 Sinclair and Rockwell (2016)
Jockers claims that computer-assisted research can discover influences from various factors such as the nationality or gender of the author and that computer-assisted research can explore authorial choices related to genre. His work is the foundation on which I build my methodology. Electronic tools make finding large linguistic patterns easier. Once those patterns are found, a scholar can then examine each instance individually and discuss the implications. The following are the tools I used and the ways I used them.

I. Lexomics

The Lexos program developed by Scott Kleinman, Mark LeBlanc, and Michael Drout analyzes the language of different texts to determine their relatedness. According to the Lexomics FAQ page, "Lexomics is the analysis of the frequency, distribution, and arrangement of words in large-scale patterns. More specifically as relating to our current suite of tools we have built and use, we segment text(s), count the number of times each word appears in each segment (or chunk), and then apply cluster analysis to build dendrograms (branching diagrams or trees) that show relationships between the chunks" (Kleinman, LeBlanc, Drout, and Zhang 2016). Using Lexos, the Lexomics team has successfully identified both the previously known relationship between Daniel and Azarius and the previously known divisions between Genesis A and B, Guthlac A and B, and Christ I, II, and III in order to test the tool’s effectiveness.

As the Lexomics team describes, dendrograms are tree diagrams that express the relationship between chunks of text (see Figure 2). The dendrogram groups texts together into clades, or clusters, according to how similar the texts are to each other. In order to determine
specific relationships between texts, Lexos uses hierarchical agglomerative clustering, a statistical technique used to measure the distance between each relative frequency of every word. If two texts are similar in word frequency, distribution, and arrangement, they will appear next to each other in the dendrogram and be connected with a horizontal line. For example, in Figure 2, texts A and B and texts D and E are connected in clades. Each horizontal line connects texts and the length of the vertical lines expresses the degree of similarity. The shorter the lines, the more similar the texts, so texts D and E are more similar to each other than texts A and B are to each other. Text C is more similar to texts D and E than to texts A and B, and so on.

Before I could run any dendrograms, however, I had to prepare the digital texts in order for the Lexomics program to read and interpret them. This process is called “scrubbing.” The

---

3 Relative frequencies are found by dividing how many times a word appears in a text by the total number of words in the text. Typically, this is called a type to token ratio where types are unique appearances of a word and tokens are the total number of words in the text. The computer is able to measure the distance in various numbers of dimensions in order to produce an appropriate dendrogram through Lexos. Kleinman, LeBlanc, and Drout have created tutorials which explain how dendrograms are created and how to read them: http://wheatoncollege.edu/lexomics/educational-material/
Anglo-Saxon poetic corpus can be found online, so copying and pasting from this source was efficient and prevented introducing modern-era scribal error in the form of typos. To begin the process of scrubbing, I copied and pasted each elegy into a Word file and saved that file as a .txt file because the Lexomics program does not support .docx files. Scrubbing involves removing all punctuation, ensuring all text is lower case, removing all digits including line numbers, and changing special characters such as ash (æ), thorn (þ), and eth (ð) into readable characters for the program. Because .txt files cannot save special characters, I had to choose “Unicode” as the text encoding when prompted. Next, I uploaded the .txt files to Lexos and clicked “Scrub.” Once scrubbing was complete, I saved the texts as both .txt and .docx files. I then could begin chunking the texts.

Lexos allows the user great flexibility in setting statistical parameters. However, for my basic analysis, I used the default settings unless otherwise noted. To create my dendrograms, I had to first decide on the size of each text I wanted to use in the comparisons. Dendrograms are more accurate when text sizes are equal. The elegies are all of different lengths, so in order to create accurate dendrograms, I needed to decide where to break the poems into chunks. Lexos can automatically cut texts into chunks of the desired length. Drout et al. have determined that an optimal chunk size is “between 400 and 1500 words, with a preference for chunks between 450 and 900 words. Analyses based on chunks as small as 225 words are likely to be correct in their

---

4 Digital copies of the complete corpus of Anglo-Saxon poetry can be found at http://www.sacred-texts.com/neu/ascp/. They use the Krapp and Dobbie critical edition of the ASPR.

5 The Windows default is “Western European (Windows),” but this was not producing usable texts for Lexos. After trial and error, I discovered the error and the solution.
broad outlines but may suffer from noisier variation” (Drout et al. 2011, 313-314). However, they also admit “optimal chunk size is not only problem-specific (if we are searching for a 450-word passage [in Daniel], we probably do not want to use 1500-word chunks) but also affected by the heterogeneity of the vocabulary of the text” (Drout et al. 2011, 313). Because the elegies range in length, the shortest being less than 450 words, I tried various chunk sizes and compared the results. I used the cutting tool within Lexomics to chunk the text and started with chunking based on the smallest poem, Riddle 60 which has 97 words.\(^6\) I cut the other poems into approximately 100-word chunks.

Part of the cutting tool in Lexos gives users the option to set a percentage for the last segment size threshold. Since texts rarely divide easily into even chunks of set word counts, and because chunks need to be relatively equal in size while still containing as many words as possible in the set parameters, the size of the last segment is important. The last segment threshold gives the user flexibility and final say when deciding on the number of words in the last chunk. The default percentage in Lexos is 50%. This means that the last chunk will contain at least 50% of the number of words in the rest of the chunks. For example, Deor is 224 words. Evenly dividing the poem into 100-word chunks will leave a chunk of 24 words at the end, which does not meet the 50% threshold for the last chunk. Therefore, Lexos divides the poem into chunks that will meet the requirements: as close to 100 words as possible, with the last chunk meeting the 50% threshold requirement. This means that with 224 words, Deor is divided

---

\(^6\) As a rule, I separated Riddle 60 from The Husband’s Message because it is not clear whether they are one poem or not, so to be able to compare them to each other, I created two separate files. Even if I had combined them as one file, chunking would have separated Riddle 60 from The Husband’s Message anyway.
into three chunks: the first two consisting of 85 words each and the last chunk consisting of 54 words.

I tried several different word chunk sizes including 100, 225, 300, 400, and 450 and used both 50% and 20% thresholds for each. I found that the 100-word chunks with a 50% threshold were optimal for comparing the elegies because all chunks for all poems were relatively equal in size. The smallest poem, *Riddle 60*, has only 97 words and the next smallest, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, has 117 words. When larger word chunks were used, these two poems became outliers on the dendrogram because their size was unequal to the rest of the chunks. When I used 100 words with a 50% threshold, each of these poems was considered its own chunk in its entirety and was relatively equal in size to the rest of the chunks (see Table 3).

Table 3: Number of Words per Chunk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Section 3</th>
<th>Section 4</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>Section 6</th>
<th>Section 7</th>
<th>Section 8</th>
<th>Section 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wan</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulf</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rid60</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husb</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruin</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I used a 20% threshold, the shorter poems were divided up into two chunks, but those chunks were significantly smaller than the chunks for the rest of the poems, so those smaller chunks became outliers on the dendrogram, again because the diversity of their lexicon
was not the same as the rest of the chunks due to their size. For this reason, it is not useful to run the poems through Lexos and compare them when they are not chunked at all: the poems are of varying lengths and therefore have different levels of lexical variety. Therefore, the dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold is of most importance since it produces similar chunk sizes in all poems. The final dendrogram appears in Figure 31 in Appendix A.

II. Microsoft Excel Analyses

I first used Microsoft Excel to code every word of the elegies, and then I recorded the Transitivity and Mood of clauses. Last, I created graphs and charts with the resulting information. In addition to the corpus version of Krapp and Dobbie’s standard scholarly edition of the Exeter Book, I also used Klinck’s thorough glossary to enter the definition, part of speech, inflection, and number for each word. In cases where anything was unclear, I used my own knowledge of Old English and consulted the Bosworth-Toller online dictionary and the Clark-Hall dictionary. Occasionally, Klinck’s edition differs from the Krapp and Dobbie edition. Because the online sources followed the Krapp and Dobbie edition, and therefore so did my dendrograms, I noted Klinck’s usage in a separate column and included any additional information in the Notes column. Then I coded the word as Krapp and Dobbie used it. There were not enough of these differences to affect my analysis.

---

7 I recorded the print edition, and therefore Krapp and Dobbie’s emendations, rather than the manuscript version of the text because the print edition is the edition found online. The online corpus uses it, including their emendations, as well as the Dictionary of Old English. Lexos used to have a word frequency tool which used the Krapp and Dobbie edition as well. This kept some consistency across tools.
Several of the poems have damaged lines in the manuscript. In addition, *The Husband’s Message* uses five runes, and *The Ruin* uses one rune. In these places, especially in *The Husband’s Message* and *The Ruin*, I used the Krapp and Dobbie print notations. Generally, they used periods and asterisks to mark damage. Therefore, I used the same number of periods or asterisks as Krapp and Dobbie used in their edition. Because I recorded word order within a line, I counted partial words as one word and other damaged areas as _,#,__, depending on where these spaces occur. Overall, there were only 32 places where damage occurs (see Figure 3). I recorded the runes as their symbol and meaning. Out of a total of 4,003 words, 32 instances of damage and six runes did not affect my data in Microsoft Excel significantly. However, the damage does potentially affect the data in Lexos, and I note their potential effects in the Lexomics program in my Findings chapter, specifically for *The Husband’s Message* and *The Ruin*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Line Num: Word ord</th>
<th>Poem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>115 7.5 The Seafarer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>24 2.5 The Wife’s Lament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>41 4.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>38 0.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>7 4.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>15 0.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>16 3.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>2 0.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>45 3.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>46 0.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>8 0.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>42 3.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>47 2.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>14 2.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>36 2.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>38 2.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>49 1.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>4 2.5 The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>13 2.5 The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>5 1. The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>num</td>
<td>12 4. The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>48 1. The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>17 1. The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>16 1. The Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>37 1. The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>39 1. The Husband’s Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>unlan</td>
<td>115 4. Resignation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3: Treatment of damage within the manuscript.*
I created two Excel files. In the first, I coded each word of the elegies, recording several pieces of information: the word itself, the line number in which it appears, the word order within the line, the poem it appears in, the word Klinck used, the definition, the part of speech, the category the word falls under, the inflection, the number (singular or plural), and the frequency it appears within the elegies. I also included a Notes column for any additional information I might need, such as information to find the word again (e.g., the infinitive form of a verb). Figure 4 presents a screenshot of a portion of that spreadsheet. These columns allowed me to sort words according to various criteria. I could easily find all the nouns, for example, or all or the words in the nominative case. Using the name of the poem, line number, and word order, I could also put the words back in their original word order within the elegies, if necessary.

For the category column, I used general theme words to code the Old English word. For example, adverbs such as *ær* were coded as “time” and verbs such as *sprecan* were coded as “speech.” After coding approximately 300 words, I condensed the categories I was using into fifteen general categories, which are presented in Table 4. While these categories could be refined and some may be expanded, I chose these fifteen because every word could fit into one of them with very little overlap. I did not want more than fifteen categories because coding the words could get unwieldy, and too many categories could result in inconsistencies in assigning words and thus a greater chance for inaccuracies in the data. I broke these categories down into subcategories eventually as I analyzed patterns, but the larger categories allowed me to sort and filter the words initially. For example, I consider the “destruction/death” category as one for

---

8 That is, in the phrase, “The red ball bounces down the street,” the word “bounces” is word 4.

9 The categories in Figure 4 include original categories I started with before condensing them to only fifteen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Line Num</th>
<th>Word in Klinck</th>
<th>Word in Klinck</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Inflection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>always, forever</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>See (2), Wife (2), Res (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>always, forever</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>always, forever</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>always, forever</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adden</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>announce</td>
<td>verb - class 2 strong</td>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abidan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>wait for</td>
<td>verb - class 1 strong</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>plus gen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abilgen</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>angered</td>
<td>verb - class 3 strong</td>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>past participle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>abilgen - plus dat; les (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abilgen</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>angered</td>
<td>verb - class 3 strong</td>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>past participle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>abilgen - plus dat; les (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>See (1), Rim (2), Reid (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ec</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wife (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acteo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>oak-tree</td>
<td>noun - neuter</td>
<td>nature</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acteo</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>oak-tree</td>
<td>noun - neuter</td>
<td>nature</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acwîš</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>utter</td>
<td>verb - class 5 strong</td>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>present 3rd</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anjîsh</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>verb - weak</td>
<td>verb - weak</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>að</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>oath</td>
<td>noun - masculine</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Example of coding in MS Excel.
words with a negative connotation that were not emotions or about exile, such as æfestum.

Additionally, the category “protection/togetherness” is conceptually similar to the “destruction/death” category except it comprises words with a positive connotation. I added the category “quality/manner” for words that can have either a positive or negative connotation, such as ful or fæste; however, if the word was a quality or manner and had a clear connotation, I coded it with either “destruction/death” or “protection/togetherness.” Finally, I used the “other” category sparingly, but it was necessary for words such as se, þæt, or forms of the verb beon – i.e., some function words – that do not fit anywhere else.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Fifteen Content Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exile/loss/separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian/religious/fate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction/death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality/manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/togetherness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some of the columns, I needed to make editorial decisions. First, I did not lemmatize the words as I recorded them because I wanted to be able to track where each word was used in the sentence, so I needed to maintain its inflection. If I had lemmatized, I would not have been able to do this. Therefore, I recorded each instance of each word’s use individually. Second, I

10 If the word se or þæt was used as a pronoun, I coded it according to its antecedent.
recorded the part of speech, including whether it was a masculine or feminine noun or adjective or a weak or strong verb and what class of verb it was. I used the format “Part of Speech – Masculine/Feminine” or “Part of Speech – Class Number Weak/Strong” as a search parameter. For example, the word *ceare* in line 9 of *The Wanderer* would be coded as “noun – feminine” and the word *cunnad* in line 29 of *The Wanderer* would be coded as “verb – class 2 weak.” For the inflection column, I noted Nominative, Accusative, Genitive, Dative, and Instrumental case for nouns and adjectives. I noted the tense and person for verbs. In the case of adjectives, I noted grammatical gender in the Part of Speech column, recording the number in a separate column, allowing me to sort this parameter separately.

I then compiled the data using Excel’s formula tools. I counted the number of words used for each part of speech (both generally and by gender, class, and type), category, inflection, and number. For example, there are 766 verbs in the elegies; of those, there are 267 weak verbs, 139 anomalous verbs, 101 preterite-present verbs, 47 class 1 strong verbs, 24 class 2 strong verbs, 54 class 3 strong verbs, 26 class 4 strong verbs, 43 class 5 strong verbs, 23 class 6 strong verbs, and 36 class 7 strong verbs. Using this data, I then created bar graphs in Excel expressing the information visually. For example, Figure 71 in Appendix B is a bar graph that includes the verb information presented above. I not only performed these compilations and graphs for the entire corpus of elegies, but I also performed them individually for each poem. These graphs allowed me to search for patterns of usage within and across all of the poems.

I next recorded information for each clause of the elegies in another Excel file, treating each poem separately, and recorded the Theme (subject) of the clause, the verb and its Mood, and the SFL transitivity process for each clause (see Figure 5). I then used Excel formulas similar to the ones used for the lexical data to compile and analyze the relative frequencies of the
Figure 5: Example of SFL spreadsheet (*Riddle 60*).
occurrence of each. Because I wanted to compare data across poems, I used the relative frequency (dividing the number of elements by the total number of clauses within the poem itself). Each of the poems has a varying number of clauses; therefore, relative frequency counts (rather than raw frequency counts) are comparable across all poems. In the first file, the raw numbers were acceptable since I was using them to examine the entire corpus.

When recording pronouns in Theme, I included the implied pronouns that did not directly appear in the text. For example, in the first two clauses of *Riddle 60*, *ic* appears in the text once, but the conjugation of the verb in the second clause is preterite first-person singular; therefore I included the *ic* in parenthesis and counted that as an instance of first person. I did the same for pronouns in second and third person. Because Old English verbs are conjugated for person, recording the implied pronoun gives a more accurate picture of person use within Themes of the poems.

### III. Voyant

I also used the Voyant online program (Figure 6) which allowed me to upload files of the elegies and perform various analyses on the text. The corpus shown in Figure 6 contains the text of all ten elegies. Voyant does not require the text to be scrubbed or prepared in any way, but since I already had the files from the Lexos program with line numbers removed, I used those. As I uploaded files, I analyzed each poem individually and as a dataset. Each time I uploaded a file(s), I had to redefine options for the program. Specifically, I had to change the stopwords option from “auto-detect” to “none.” Stopwords are words that the program ignores. Usually,
Figure 6: Example of Voyant interface.
these are function words such as *he* and *in*, but I was interested in what role these words were playing in the poems.

The primary tool that I used within Voyant was the Word Trend tool (see Figure 7). Voyant has other tool options such as Keywords in Context (KWICs), Collocations, and Phrase Search. However, these tools simply produced the known formulas and general grammatical structure of Old English. I found no striking patterns within them. However, the Word Trend tool creates a basic line graph that shows the distribution of a word over the corpus being analyzed. The x-axis is the number of segments the corpus was divided into (which is customizable), and the y-axis is either the raw or relative frequency of the word. The raw frequency is the number of times a word appears in the corpus, and the relative frequency is the number of times a word appears as a percentage of all words in the corpus.

Figure 7: Example of Voyant’s Word Trend tool tracking the five most common words in the corpus across all ten poems.

---

11 In the KWIC tool, all instances of a selected word will appear with a few words before and after it. The Collocation tool will show the number of times two words appear within x number of words of each other. The Phrase tool will produce phrases that are repeated, sorted by length of the phrase and number of words within the phrase (essentially, the Old English concept of poetic formulas).
I began by uploading one poem at a time to Voyant’s interface. When selecting words to appear in the tool, which is done in Voyant’s “Terms” tool, I began with pronouns because they were among the words most often used in all of the poems. I noticed that they were primarily the nominative pronouns *ic* and *he*. Therefore, I went back to my SFL Excel file in which I recorded the SFL clausal information.\(^{12}\) I used the most frequent Themes in each poem to determine which words to select in Voyant’s Word Trend tool. These were mostly pronouns. I noticed a trend in the fluctuation between uses of first and third person; this trend is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

For the tool, I used the same settings across all ten poems, specifically the raw frequencies instead of the relative frequencies, because the raw frequencies are minimal and manageable. For the x-axis, I left each poem evenly divided into the default ten sections. Voyant then plots the word frequencies in different colored lines, allowing me to compare their usage across a corpus. For example, in Figure 8, *ic* appears three times in sections 1 and 2 of the poem, zero times in sections 3 and 4, twice in section 5, and so on.

Even though the poems are of different lengths, dividing the poems evenly into the same number of sections allows Voyant to produce line graphs that visually depict the frequency of words within one poem. The number of sections used does not change the frequency or location of the words within the poem, so while changing the number of divisions changes the shape of the line graph, the more divisions that exist, the more difficult it is to see patterns. Too much variation causes too much noise in a graph, and because there are only a few uses of each pronoun throughout the poems, fewer sections smooth out the line graph. For example, the graph

\(^{12}\) The organization of the clausal analysis spreadsheet was more conducive to viewing the nominative words and where they were used than the file with the individual words.
that plots the frequency of *ic* and *he* in *The Wanderer* divided into 10 sections (approximately 69 words in each section) (see Figure 8) is much cleaner than the graph dividing the poem into 51 sections (approximately 13 words per section) (see Figure 9). The information is approximately the same, the exception being the beginning few sections in which it is easier to see the colored lines of the hills and valleys in their inverse pattern. However, the rest of the graph is too noisy to be of much use because of the extra hills and valleys. The graph with 10 sections has smoothed out that noise. If we were comparing the use of the pronouns across poems instead of within each poem, the number of section divisions would matter more. For example, if we compared the use of a word and its appearance in both *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*, we would need sections with approximately equal word counts. However, since I do not see a discernible pattern of pronoun use across poems, other than that most poems introduce the use of *ic* relatively early, the number of sections for each poem can stay the same no matter the length of the poem.

Figure 8: Word trends of *he* and *ic* in *The Wanderer* using 10 section divisions.
After applying these three corpus analysis tools to the poems traditionally labeled as “Old English elegies,” I had various data sets to analyze. Lexomics produced results related to the stylistic similarities of chunks of the poems. The Excel spreadsheets allowed me to count the number of different characteristics of each word and clause, and Excel’s graphing functions allowed me to visually represent those various pieces of data in order to see the relationship between them more easily. Last, Voyant, using the same scrubbed texts as Lexomics and Excel, offered me the opportunity to see visually the trends of word use over each poem. All of these tools together gave me several options for examining stylistic elements within the Old English elegies, which has been useful in understanding genre characteristics. As Jockers suggests, I used them to produce results and then went back to the text itself to perform close readings (Jockers 2013). Specific uses of these tools produced results which can be found in the next chapter: Findings.

Figure 9: Word trends of *he* and *ic* in *The Wanderer* using 51 section divisions.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, I will discuss the results of each analytic tool and present visual samples of the results. The dendrograms, graphs, charts, and tables can be found in both this chapter and Appendix A, and references will be made to relevant graphics when necessary. Letting the texts dictate the approach – rather than imposing my ideas onto them – means trying various approaches to see what yields good results. This is the methodology I use in this study; however, it has produced more information than necessary. Therefore, I include results I have not directly used in Appendix B. Some of that information suggests further research, and the details about the charts in Appendix B can be found in the introduction to that appendix. In this chapter, I will discuss the results of my analysis using three digital tools: Lexos, Voyant, and Microsoft Excel.

Lexos produces the dendrograms, or stylized tree diagrams, that compare textual chunks to one another. Figure 10 depicts the dendrogram resulting from the Lexomics analysis. Several larger clades, or clusters of similar chunks grouped together with horizontal lines, separate the elegies into several sections. Some interesting results appeared on this dendrogram. In this

---

1 I have been extremely cautious and conscientious about my data; any errors are the result of human oversight.

2 I will be referring to the chunks by their shortened title followed by the number of the chunk for the particular poem. So for example, *The Wanderer* has eight chunks. I will refer to them as Wan_1, Wan_2, Wan_3, and so on.
chapter, I will describe the structure of the dendrograms and then discuss their importance in Chapter 5. Figures 31 through 35 in Appendix A present the five major sections of this dendrogram, represented by the boxed areas, each of which will be discussed below.

Figure 10: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk.

Figure 11 is a zoomed-in image of the leftmost outlying chunks in the lexomic analysis, and Figure 12 separates out the three clades within this group of outliers.

Figure 11: Zoomed-in image of boxed section in Figure 31, Appendix A.

Figure 12: Separate clades within outliers of Figure 11.
Chunks of eight poems appear in these outliers: *The Ruin, The Seafarer, The Wanderer, The Rimming Poem, Resignation, The Husband’s Message, Deor, and The Wife’s Lament*. The clades within the outliers include Sea_3 and Wan_5, the entire three sections of *Deor*, and Wan_8 and Wife_4; these clades indicate that these chunks are outliers but are more similar to each other than the non-outliers, the largest group of clades consisting of the right two-thirds of the dendrogram.

The first of the non-outlier clades is presented in Figure 13 as well as a smaller clade consisting of Res_4 and Res_5 with this larger clade. Figure 14 separates the clades farther to make them easier to read. The first is the single clade consisting of Res_4 and Res_5. The next group consists of two clades similar to each other, the first including Sea_1 and Sea_2 and the second including Wan_1 and Wan_2. Wan_4 is similar to these two. In the final group of Figure 14, Rim_1 and Rim_2 are one clade, which is similar to the threesome of Rid60_1, Wife_2, and Wulf_1.

![Figure 13: Zoomed-in image of boxed section in Figure 32, Appendix A.](image1)

![Figure 14: Separate clades within Figure 13.](image2)
The large middle clades are presented in Figure 15. These clades can be broken down into several smaller clades which ultimately fall under two main clades as shown in Figure 16. Res_3, Wife_1, and Res_9 form one of these clades. The other includes the clade of Res_7 and Res_8, which is the shortest clade of the entire dendrogram and therefore represents that Res_7 and Res_8 are the two most similar chunks of the entire corpus. Wife_3 is the next most similar to them and that entire group of three is similar to the clade of Res_2 and Res_6.

Figure 15: Zoomed-in image of boxed section in Figure 33, Appendix A.

Figure 16: Separate clades within Figure 15.

Figure 17 presents the third clade of the larger middle clade, and Figure 18 separates this clade into its smaller parts. The left clade in Figure 18 includes two smaller clades: Ruin_2 and Sea_5 plus a threesome of Sea_8, Wan_3, and Rim_5. The right clade in Figure 18 includes two clades as well, but each clade only has two texts: Rim_4 and Sea_6 plus Ruin_1 and Wan_6.

The far right clade of the dendrogram in Figure 19 includes just three texts. Sea_4 and Sea_7 are similar to each other and appear with Husb_3, the most similar chunk to these two.
One of the not-so-surprising results in this dendrogram is that all three sections of *Deor* are grouped together, though it is curious that these appear in the outlying group because it suggests that *Deor* is not an elegy. Interestingly, the most closely related chunks are Res_7 and Res_8, as noted in Figure 16. Sections 6-9 of *Resignation* are sometimes called *Resignation B*.³

³ Bliss and Frantzen (1976), Klink (1987), and Sobol (2015)
The fact that sections 7 and 8 are closely related and not found in the same clade as the rest of the poem seems to support the division. Indeed, Res_6 and Res_9 are within the larger clade in Figure 15. However, Res_2 is most similar to Res_6 and Res_3 is paired with Wife_1, which is similar to Res_9 (see Figure 16). If there were indeed a division in the poem, one might expect Res_2 and Res_3 to be paired farther away from Res_6-Res_9; they are not. This similarity between early and late chunks of the poem suggests the poem is possibly unified, with section 6 acting as a transition to sections 7-9.

Lexos analyzes larger lexical patterns between texts or chunks of text. However, in order to identify specific patterns within the poems, I also used corpus tools like Microsoft Excel and Voyant. Using an SFL analysis within MS Excel and Voyant’s Word Trend tool, I have found an inverse pattern of usage between first-person and third-person clausal Themes, i.e., traditional subjects or topics of clauses. In Figure 20, the colored lines represent the number of times ic and he appear in separate sections of The Wanderer. In this poem, there are approximately 11 clauses per segment. Figure 21 presents the distribution of first- and third-person pronouns in Riddle 60 with approximately one clause per segment. Figure 22 displays the animate Themes found in The Ruin. Approximately three clauses per segment appear in this poem. Line graphs for the word trends in the remainder of the poems are similar and can be found in Figures 36-42 in Appendix A. Figures 36 and 37 in Appendix A represent the use of ic and he in The Seafarer and Wulf and

---

4 Only 8 of the 88 words in section 6 are part of Resignation A (9% of that section), so Res_6 could be considered part of Resignation B since 8 words will not significantly affect Lexos’s measurement.

5 Voyant does not give the segment divisions within the poem, so I am estimating on the total number of clauses in the poem itself (110 clauses).
Figure 20: Word trends of *he* and *ic* in *The Wanderer* using 10 section divisions (also appears as Figure 8 in Chapter 3).

Figure 21: Word trends of *ic* and third-person pronouns in *Riddle 60*. 
Eadwacer, respectively. *The Seafarer* includes approximately 11 clauses per segment, and *Wulf* and *Eadwacer* includes approximately two clauses per segment. Figures 38 through 42 in Appendix A represent the pronoun patterns in the last five poems. *The Husband’s Message* has approximately 4 clauses per segment, *The Riming Poem* 13 clauses, *Deor* 4 clauses, *The Wife’s Lament* 4 clauses, and *Resignation* 11 clauses. The content of these figures will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

Voyant is best used for visualizing syntactic analysis. However, I used Microsoft Excel for keeping track of SFL analyses as well as analyzing individual words and their qualities. In Figure 23, the relative frequency of the first-person pronoun Themes of each poem is represented in a bar graph. *The Wife’s Lament, Resignation,* and *Riddle 60* use first-person Themes proportionately more than the other elegies. *The Ruin* does not use first-person pronouns at all. Only four poems use second-person Themes, and of those, only *The Husband’s Message* and *Resignation* use it to a large degree (see Figure 43 in Appendix A). Of third-person Themes, the majority are nominal, though the third-person singular masculine pronoun *he* is the next most common. Figure 24 represents the relative frequency of this pronoun in all ten poems. *Riddle 60*
does not use the third-person singular masculine pronoun as a Theme at all, but it uses third-person referential pronouns such as *þæt* and *þe*.

In addition to Theme, I recorded the transitivity processes for each clause of the elegies. Transitivity processes are categories used in SFL to group types of verbs and demonstrate subject to object relationships within a clause. Material Processes are physical actions; mental processes are verbs of perception, cognition, affection, or desire; verbal processes are verbs relating to communication; relational processes show possession, equivalence, or attributes; behavioral
processes express human behavior; and existential processes use the dummy subjects *here, there,* or *it* with the verb [BE]. Figure 25 is a three-dimensional bar graph that shows the relative frequencies of all of the transitivity processes in each poem. Its visual representation allows us to see that the majority of the processes are material; in addition to the bar graph, I have also included the percentage of each process in Table 5 in Appendix A. *The Ruin* has the highest percentage of material processes. Interestingly, *Riddle 60* has an even distribution with 25% each of material, mental, verbal, and relational processes.

![Transitivity Processes](image)

**Figure 25**: Relative frequency of transitivity processes for all poems (bar graph).

In Microsoft Excel, I also recorded information about individual words. One piece of information in that spreadsheet is the lexical category of each word. Several categories exhibit interesting characteristics for the Old English elegies. In Figure 26, the number of words
associated with the category Place are visually depicted in a bar graph. Figure 27 includes the words associated with Exile, Loss, or Separation. Figure 28 includes the words associated with Speech. I present a slightly different visual analysis in Figure 29 and Figure 30. Because of the broad range of these categories, these figures are three-dimensional bar graphs that show the distribution of Emotion words and Nature words, respectively. Tables 6 and 7 in Appendix A provide additional details by giving the exact numbers of words for each poem and each subdivision. Figure 29 and Table 6 clearly show that “joy” and “sorrow” are the two most frequently used Emotion terms. Words associated with stubbornness are the next most frequently used, followed by general emotion words such as wat and gefelan. Figure 30 and Table 7 are similar presentations but for words associated with Nature rather than Emotion. Words associated with earth, sea, and weather are used more frequently than any of the other categories.

Figure 26: Number of words associated with Place.
Figure 27: Number of words associated with Exile, Loss, or Separation.

Figure 28: Number of words associated with Speech.
Figure 29: Number of words associated with Emotion, subdivided.

Figure 30: Number of words associated with Nature, subdivided.
Overall, based on the data from the tools I used, I have not found one single characteristic that can be applied to all ten poems. However, I have found a number of characteristics that several of the poems share, and these characteristics both support the general definitions of Old English elegy that have been given in the past as well as provide a more detailed picture of what an “Old English elegy” is. In the next chapter, I will discuss the implications of these patterns as related to the genre of elegy in Old English and include topics for future research using the methodology I have presented.
Todorov’s definition of genre is “the historically attested codification of discursive properties” (Todorov and Berrong 1976, 200). The “discursive properties” of the Old English elegies have been difficult to pin down. Even the “historically attested codification” cannot be agreed upon in relation to these poems. Historically, not many people can agree about how to classify these poems. Two definitions stand out: Anne Klinck’s definition of elegy¹ and Stanley Greenfield’s definition.² Because Greenfield’s definition has been the standard for so long and Klinck performed an in-depth study for her critical edition, these two definitions are important, so it is useful to compare them. Greenfield’s definition addresses the length and type of the poem (“a relatively short reflective or dramatic poem”) as well as its pattern of mood (“contrasting [between] loss and consolation”) and its source and purpose (“expressing an attitude” about “a specific personal experience or observation”). Klinck, on the other hand, uses themes (“absence… separation… expressed through characteristic words and themes”) and structure (“echo and leitmotiv”), though she is not specific about the exact themes or leitmotivs. Klinck

¹ “a discourse arising from a powerful sense of absence, of separation from what is desired, expressed through characteristic words and themes, and shaping itself by echo and leitmotiv into a poem that moves from disquiet to some kind of acceptance” (1992, 246).

² “a relatively short reflective or dramatic poem embodying a contrasting pattern of loss and consolation, ostensibly based upon a specific personal experience or observation, and expressing an attitude towards that experience” (1965, 143).
also includes mood (“moves from disquiet to some kind of acceptance”). The two definitions share this element since Greenfield’s includes a “contrasting pattern of loss and consolation.” The issue with Klinck’s definition is that not all of the poems move from disquiet to acceptance. *Riddle 60* and *The Husband’s Message*, for example, do not start in disquiet. In addition, *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife’s Lament* do not end in acceptance. Similarly, for Greenfield’s definition, there is no consolation in *Wulf and Eadwacer*, certainly, and *The Wife’s Lament* can be interpreted as having none as well.

Because Greenfield’s definition is more vague, it can be applied to a greater number of the poems. Klinck’s definition focuses more on theme as a connecting tool, which may work to define an overall tone but does not necessarily provide enough information to define a whole poem. A definition that will apply to all ten poems will be either too vague to be of any use or so specific as to be impossible to create. At the very least a definition that could apply to all ten poems would be confusing with the number of restrictions or exceptions needed. Therefore, there do not seem to be any “discursive properties” that all of these poems share.

Indeed, I have found that there is no single pattern that is found in all of the poems. They share similar characteristics to varying degrees, but they do not exhibit a unifying pattern that makes each specifically an “Old English elegy.” However, several poems are similar to each other, and these similarities can explain how the poems are related to each other. I have found five connections between various poems. I will address each connection individually in the sections below and then conclude with a definition and application of that definition.
I. Lexomics Connections

Lexomics measures shifts in vocabulary distribution and similarities in vocabulary across chunks of text, and according to its developers, it also is useful in measuring style more than semantic content. Even so, chunks of texts with similar semantic content are often grouped together more closely than to others with different content. For example, in the instructional videos on the Lexomics website, the team compared the poems of Cynewulf to Guthlac A and B. In that dendrogram, all the Guthlac A chunks appeared together; all the Juliana chunks appeared together; all of the Elene chunks appeared together, etc. The program recognized not only Cynewulf’s style by grouping his poems together and not with Guthlac A, but it also recognized the content of each poem by grouping together chunks of the same poem. Therefore, style and content must be related, even if only marginally so. Indeed, systemic functional linguistics (SFL) explains why. A genre follows a specific set of moves, which in themselves require a particular style of language use. For example, in the Buying & Selling genre, the content of each transaction will be similar (dealing with a product or service for sale), and the style of each will also be similar since participants tend to use similar linguistic elements such as questions, short

---

3 As in Chapter 4, I will be referring to the chunks by their shortened title followed by the number of the chunk for the particular poem. So for example, The Wanderer has eight chunks. I will refer to them as Wan_1, Wan_2, Wan_3, and so on.

4 For example, the Lexomics team tested three different translations of Beowulf and the program was able to separate each translator’s text from the others, even though the content was the same for all texts. See Drout and Smith (2016).

5 Interestingly, a large chunk of Guthlac B appeared within the Cynewulf poems, suggesting he may have written at least part of that poem. See the same instructional video in previous footnote.
answers that may not be complete sentences, and imperative clauses. Even a broad genre like Dinner Conversation will contain some similar content such as comments on the food or the day’s events, despite other broad possibilities of possible conversation topics. The style of each example of a Dinner Conversation will also contain similar sentence structures (i.e., “This ham is delicious.”) and narratives that may contain more complex sentences. Therefore, content and style are naturally related and the results returned from the Lexomics program can be analyzed for style as well as content.

Of course, exceptions may exist. Examples of each genre may vary based on cultural contexts. The Dinner Conversation relies on the location of the dinner, the emotions of the participants, and other elements. The style of the Buying & Selling genre may depend on how well the participants know each other. However, the cultural context in which the elegies exist is one manuscript produced in the Anglo-Saxon culture in approximately AD 990. Therefore, it is possible to judge their style and content in an immediately stable environment.6

The grouping of chunks that have the same content is not 100% accurate; that is, chunks that have the same content are not necessarily directly paired with each other, but are often close to each other. For example, in the dendrogram in Figure 19 in Chapter 4, the far right clade consists of Husb_3, Sea_4, and Sea_7. Sea_4 (line 45 to mid in line 59) is about the anxieties of a sea voyage. Sea_7 (line 91 to hi in line 103) is about old age and gold not being helpful when someone dies. Husb_3 (hlipes in line 22 to ætsomne in line 33) is instructing the wife to take a sea voyage to find her husband. The two Seafarer chunks share a similar vocabulary distribution, even though their content is not the same. Husb_3, however, is very close in content to Sea_4.

---

6 Their audience reception is another story, but that discussion is beyond the scope of this project.
even sharing the word geac, which appears only these two times in the corpus of ten poems.

Other pairings are similar in structure and style. For example, Wan_8 is paired with Wife_4.

Both contain the gnomic statements of those poems with different content but similar style. So content matters to a degree.

In the dendrogram that compares all of the elegies, a clear grouping of three large clades emerges. These are found in Figures 13-18 in Chapter 4 (Figures 32-34 in Appendix A show the boxed in areas on the larger dendrogram). The group of chunks most closely related are Res_7 (from wæron in line 11 to he in line 25) and Res_8 (from þæt in line 25 to eþle in line 39) (see Figure 16). These two make up the largest portion of Resignation B and contain themes of misery, separation, and longing. Wife_3 (from eal in line 29 to the end of line 43) is the next most closely related chunk of text to Res_7 and Res_8, which makes sense because the primary themes found in this chunk are also longing and loneliness. Within that clade, Res_2 and Res_6 are also closely related. Res_2 (from regnþeof in line 15 to hæbbe in line 29) is asking for forgiveness from God while in Res_6 the speaker talks about preparing his soul for God and how he has angered God with his sins. If Resignation is a single unified poem, Res_6 transitions into the discourse of misery and loneliness and may act as a transition from Resignation A to Resignation B since it is almost entirely made up of the beginning of Resignation B (from me in line 68 to gewyrhto in line 80).\(^7\)

Outside of the three large clades, several outliers appear, including all three chunks of Deor (see Figures 11 and 12 in Chapter 4 and Figure 31 in Appendix A). This grouping outside of the large clade means that Deor is not measurably similar to most of the chunks of the other

\(^7\) The division traditionally occurs at line 69. See Bliss and Frantzen (1976). A complete discussion of this evidence is beyond the scope of this study but is an area for further research.
poems, possibly because of its use of proper names and its refrain which creates a similar word
distribution to itself. The rest of the outliers can be explained in various ways. From left to right,
Ruin_3 (from the third on in line 36 to the end) is the farthest out most likely because it contains
the most damage to the manuscript. Sea_9 (from biþ in line 115 to the end) only contains 62
words compared to approximately 86-97 of the majority of other chunks of poems (see Table 3
in Chapter 3). This low word count may skew the results slightly compared to the other chunks,
thus causing this chunk to be an outlier. Wan_5 and Sea_3 both contain lists of qualities. Wan_5
(from gehwam in line 63 to biwaune in line 76) lists the qualities of a wise man. The repetition of
ne to lowers the vocabulary distribution of this chunk. Likewise, in Sea_3 (from hægl in line 32
to the end of line 44), the poet expresses a desire to travel the sea and then lists the qualities of a
traveler who has anxiety about taking the voyage. Like Wan_5, Sea_3 repeats ne in a sequence
of qualities that lowers the vocabulary distribution of this chunk, which is why they appear
together on the dendrogram and not included in the larger clades.

Like Sea_9, Rim_6 (from swenced in line 80 to the end) is the last chunk of the poem and
only has 48 words. Rim_3 (from mægnade in line 33 to the end of line 48) contains a
disproportionate number of the words in, ic, min, and is; therefore, its vocabulary distribution is
also low.\(^8\) Res_1 (line 1 to arære in line 15) has a disproportionate frequency of the word ond as
the speaker lists what he offers to God. The chunks of The Husband’s Message are relatively
shorter than the rest of the chunks (see Table 3 in Chapter 3). Husb_2 (from þære in line 12 to on
in line 22) has an abundance of the use of second person, including the dual git. Husb_5 (from

\(^8\) I used Voyant to analyze the chunks individually. The specific word frequency information
comes from that program.
the second *ne* in line 45 to the end) has only 49 words and contains runes, which could affect the vocabulary distribution. Wan_8 (from the start of line 108 to the end of the poem) and Wife_4 (from the start of line 44 to the end of the poem) contain the gnomic passages of each poem, which are constructed in similar styles and thus the chunks are paired together. However, these show a different style from the other chunks of the elegies and thus they fall among the outliers.

In addition, Wan_8 contains the *her bide* phrases; the repetition lowers the vocabulary distribution. Husb_1 (from the beginning to *þu* in line 12) and Husb_4 (from *síppan* in line 33 to *meara* in line 45) have damage. As the closest outlier to the rest of the clades, Wan_7 (from the second *hwær* in line 92 to the end of line 107) contains the repetitive *hwær cwom* and *eala* phrases whose repetition may affect the vocabulary distribution as the *her bide* phrases did in Wan_8.

To test the integrity of the elegies as a group and in anticipation of future research to extend my analysis, I added several poems, including the first ten chunks of *Beowulf*,⁹ *Maxims I*, *Guthlac A* and *B*, *Dream of the Rood*, and lines 2247 to 2266 of *Beowulf*, otherwise known as “The Lay of the Last Survivor,” to Lexos and ran them with the rest of the elegy corpus. These poems represent some clear non-elegiac poems as well as poems that have been thought to have elegiac language in them. Clear separation occurs. In order to be comparable to the other ten poems, each of the additional poems has been divided into 100-word chunks with a 50% threshold for the last chunk (see Chapter 3). An initial inspection shows that the first ten sections of *Beowulf* are completely separate from the other poems, with the exception of Beo_5, which is similar to Rim_5 (see Figures 47 and 48 in Appendix A). Otherwise, the rest of the dendrogram

---

⁹ I used Lexos to chunk the entire poem into 100-word chunks with a 50% threshold for the last segment. See Chapter 3.
is almost the same as the one without *Beowulf*. This means that the first ten chunks of *Beowulf* are not similar in style to the elegies.

I analyzed “The Lay of the Last Survivor” through Lexos twice. The first time, I ran this section of *Beowulf* through the Lexomics chunking feature. This process created two sections of the poem (see Table 8 in Appendix A). However, when I analyzed them in Lexos with the other ten poems, the second chunk became the farthest outlier of all the poems, and the first chunk was only a little closer to the rest of the chunks, but still fell in the outlier section. Because the two chunks of “The Lay of the Last Survivor” contain 67 words and 44 words, respectively, the effect is similar to some of the other chunks whose word counts were significantly fewer than other elegy chunks. So I ran the poem as one chunk with 111 words. Since *Wulf and Eadwacer* has 117 words and is only one chunk among the elegies, I felt using “Lay” as one chunk would be more appropriate.

“The Lay of the Last Survivor” appeared among the group of chunks including Sea_1 and Sea_2, Wana_1 and Wana_2, Sea_4, and Wan_4 (see Figure 51 and 52 in Appendix A). The original group is in Figure 14. Sea_4 was pulled from the clade in Figure 19 and Husb_3 and Sea_7 of that clade were connected to outliers in their own clades (Husb_2 and Sea_3, respectively). Therefore, “The Lay of the Last Survivor” displaced some of the original elegy chunks, which suggests its language is similar to that of the other elegies.

To further test whether the style of the elegies is like other poems, I chose poems that have never been called an elegy and are considered other genres. *Maxims I*, a wisdom poem full

---

10 The clades of a dendrogram can spin on a three-dimensional plane, so while the new clade including “The Lay of the Last Survivor” is now the far right clade on the new dendrogram in Figure 51, this clade is still roughly the same as the clade in Figure 32.
of gnomic passages, is almost completely separate, though Sea_8 appears in its clade (see Figures 53 and 54 in Appendix A). Most of Guthlac A and B, a saint’s life, is separated from the other poems; however, several portions appear in clades among the other poems, and Riddle 60 appears in the very large Guthlac clade (see Figures 55 and 56 in Appendix A). The Dream of the Rood, a religious didactic poem often considered to be partly elegiac, is a little more integrated among the other poems, though a majority of the chunks still form their own clade separate from the other poems (see Figures 57 and 58 in Appendix A). The Dream of the Rood throws off the original dendrogram a bit because Rood_2 pairs with Deor_3; Rood_8, 11, and 10 are in a clade with Wulf_1, Ruin_2, and Sea_5; and Rood_7 is similar to Res_2 and Res_6. However, Rood_2 and Rood_7 appear in clades with Deor and Resignation, two poems that appear together in their own clades within the larger dendrogram of only elegies.

What is clear from these dendrograms is that the ten poems typically called Old English elegies are similar to each other in style and content. Their chunks are similar to each other when appearing in one dendrogram together, but when other poems are added, those outside poems stand alone more strikingly as they end up separated from the rest (for the most part). Sections of poems such as “The Lay of the Last Survivor” in Beowulf and parts of Dream of the Rood have been thought to have elegiac language, and Lexos supports this theory. Two poems, Deor and Resignation, demonstrate similarities within themselves, though they still appear among the elegies when other poems are included in the analysis. Therefore, through a Lexomic analysis, the ten poems typically considered elegies are found to have genre-like similarities in diction and remain relatively separate when compared to other non-elegies.
II. Alternation of First and Third Clausal Subjects

Texts can be broken into smaller chunks to see how they function as a whole through analyzing linguistic elements. For example, in the first 40 clauses of *The Wanderer*, the Themes of the clauses are about either sorrow or being alone (i.e., *anhaga*, *eardstapa*, *werig mod*, *wraeclast*, or *wineleas guma*) or they are pronouns. The Mood is mostly declarative, but within the first 40 clauses, the subjunctive clauses that do appear all have a personal pronoun as their Subject. Also, only half of the clauses are material processes, or physical actions, which reflects a text with less action and more reflection. All of these together begin to sound like the makings of a stereotypical “Old English elegy.”

In the analysis of this oscillating pronoun pattern, I am focusing on the first- and third-person singular nominatives *ic* and *he*. *Ic* is the most common pronoun (and most common word in the elegy corpus, appearing 89 times). *He* is the second most common nominative pronoun. *Ic* and *he* will always be the first- and third-person singular nominative of a clause (respectively) and therefore most likely always the Theme of a clause. The antecedent of *he* will also be a human (versus the antecedent of *hit* as an object); therefore, since they are the most common nominative pronouns, they seemed like the most likely place to look for patterns.

Using SFL analysis and Voyant, I have found an inverse pattern of usage between first-person and third-person clausal Themes. In *The Wanderer*, the narrator begins in third person, quickly shifts to first, and then continues to shift back and forth throughout the rest of the poem (see Figure 20 in Chapter 4). These shifts coincide with a possible second speaker and the narrator’s expressions of loss and loneliness and his reflections on others who share his fate. In *Riddle 60*, *ic* is used proportionately more than other Themes, and there are no uses of *he*. 
Instead, this poem uses third-person referential pronouns *þæt* and *þe* for the nominative personal relative pronoun *who*. An inverse pattern appears at the beginning of the poem as the narrator explains that few of the race of men might behold him (see Figure 21). The poem shifts back to first person, then to third as the narrator reflects how he is a wonder to a man who does not know how the narrator was made, and then back to first and second person as he addresses the reader/listener directly. The pattern in this line graph is a little more difficult to see because the *þæt* in section 4 is functioning as a demonstrative pronoun (not a referential relative pronoun), the *þæt* in section 8 is functioning as a conjunction, and the *þe* in section 9 is functioning as the second-person dative singular (not a referential relative pronoun). However, the poem is small enough to note these differences and still see the pattern. In a longer poem, such as *The Wanderer*, the use of the relative personal pronoun *þæt* (used as “who”) is unnecessary to see the shift to third person and so this issue is not particularly relevant for that poem.

In *The Seafarer*, *ic* begins the poem as the poet explains his sea travels. Around the middle of the poem in section 6, the third-person pronoun *he* spikes in usage, appearing twice in one segment (see Figure 36 in Appendix A). *Ic* reappears briefly in this segment and then the end of the poem shifts to third person as the poet generalizes about the loss of earthly pleasures and admonishes the reader to look to heaven. *Wulf and Eadwacer* has a clear oscillation in the first half of the poem as *he* and *ic* are each used once in alternating sections 2 through 5 (see Figure 37 in Appendix A). The latter half of the poem uses nominal themes and addresses Wulf directly. *The Husband’s Message* uses second person as well. After the speaker introduces himself, he directly addresses the wife. *He* appears at the end of the poem as the poet talks about the husband (see Figure 38 in Appendix A). Strictly speaking, the oscillation between *ic* and *he* in *The Husband’s Message* happens only once – *ic* is used at the beginning, *he* is used in parts 6 and 7,
and both appear at the end. However, the use of the second-person *þu* as a clausal theme is a third shift in focus along with the first and third person. *The Husband’s Message* is the poem with the greatest usage of *þu* (see Figure 43 in Appendix A). The addition of second person as a Theme sets *The Husband’s Message* apart from all but two of the other poems, *Resignation* and *Wulf and Eadwacer*, but the frequency of use, especially in the first half of the poem, fills the gap left by first- and third-person Themes (i.e., if neither first nor third person is being used, second person will be used).

*The Riming Poem*’s shift in point of view appears at the end of the poem (see Figure 39 in Appendix A). *He* is used once in segment 2 but *ic* appears most frequently in the first half of the poem. It appears again in section 8, and *he* appears in section 9. However, in sections 6 and 7, there are third-person Themes, but they are not third-person pronouns. They are nominals that generalize to the third-person point of view.

Because *Deor* uses a refrain, there are clearly sections in which the topic of that section is the primary theme. Therefore the third-person point of view takes up most of the poem until the end when the poet begins speaking about himself (see Figure 40 in Appendix A). The fluctuation in theme usage happens after each refrain but there is only one shift from third to first person; this pattern, combined with the fact that the third-person Themes are referencing specific people, makes *Deor* unique among the poems.

*The Wife’s Lament* is one of the top three poems in the use of *ic* as a theme (see Figure 23 in Chapter 4). Its use throughout the poem is not only more frequent but also more evenly distributed (see Figure 41 in Appendix A). The general third-person Theme *mon* appears in sections 6 and 8; however, *ic* is used either just as frequently or more frequently. But in section 10, the poem shifts focus to *he* as the speaker either curses or generally laments her husband.
Because of the distribution of *ic*, the feeling of vacillation in voice is not as prominent as in other poems, but general third-person Themes like *mon* and *he* do appear.

*Resignation* is the poem that contains the most frequent use of *ic*. However, its use dips in segment 5 where the third-person plural *hy* increases in frequency (see Figure 42 in Appendix A). *He* is used at the end of the poem but *ic* is still used more frequently than *he* is. Thus the vacillation in this poem is not as distinct either.

*The Ruin* is the exception to the elegies because it does not use any personal pronouns as a Theme for any of its clauses. The majority of the Themes are nominals that occur only once in the poem. However, those nominal Themes can be divided into two categories: animate (i.e., men) and inanimate (usually dealing with nature, death, or, most commonly, a building or structure). There are five nominal animate Themes: *beorn, betend, mod, walo, and werþeoda* – all referring to men or the minds of men.\(^{11}\) These tend to be spread evenly across the poem (see Figure 22 in Chapter 4). The pattern of alternation emerges when the viewer considers that the inanimate Themes do not appear in the graph. The poet inserts an animate Theme regularly, opposed to the inanimate Themes he has been using. Therefore, the hills and valleys are not as relevant as the even distribution of Themes across the poem. This distribution means the shifts appearing in this poem are not from first-person to third-person pronouns but happen between the animate and inanimate Themes. The men are not reflecting back on the loss of the buildings; their absence is a part of the destruction. Instead, like the shift in perspective from first to third person in the other poems, this shift may offer the reader or listener a feeling of alternation rather

\(^{11}\) *Beorn monig* (many a man/warrior), *betend* (repairers), *mod* (mind/spirit), *walo* (the slain in battle, pl), *hund cnea werþeoda* (a hundred (+gen) generations of nations of men)
than an actual shift in perspective. This feeling of alternation may simulate the pronoun alternation of the other poems, which would support Greenfield’s suggestion of connection through a feeling that they fit together (Greenfield 1965, 143). The biggest problem in analyzing The Ruin is the extent of manuscript damage. Since two chunks are incomplete – one in the middle and one at the end of the poem – any patterns found may challenge an accurate analysis. However, we can only work with what we have, and the patterns exist in the part of the manuscript that survives.

The conclusions about shifts in perspective support the general sense that the first-person speaker in the elegies reflects on general, third-person problems. However, the pattern is more prevalent in some poems than others. Wulf and Eadwacer, Riddle 60, and The Wanderer seem to fluctuate more while The Seafarer, The Husband’s Message, Deor, The Rime Poem, The Wife’s Lament, and Resignation all fluctuate just once. The Ruin has a regular shift in Themes, but not of first- and third-person clausal Themes. Therefore, if one were to look for a way to group all of the poems together, this would be one pattern that might work. The caution is that other poems which are not considered elegies also may have this pattern; in addition, The Ruin does not really follow the pattern, so more than this one test is needed.

III. Use of the Subjunctive Mood

Of Halliday’s three meanings in SFL, interpersonal meaning is expressed through Mood. Interpersonal meaning (and therefore Mood) also expresses the relationship of the speaker/writer to the listener/reader and the speaker/writer’s attitude towards the subject matter. So language requires a social element. For the elegies, this social element is mediated through the manuscript.
As readers, we have only the text with which to interpret the poems.

The manuscript itself is a cultural object, and two scholars’ studies of its use and structure stand out. Patrick Conner (1986) groups the Exeter Book into three booklets using manuscript and scribal evidence. He also makes a few observations about the literary relationship between the poems in each booklet and claims each booklet could stand alone by themselves.

Helena Znojemská (1999) claims that the organization of the Exeter Book is based on apposition. She justifies the inclusion of secular poems such as Deor, Wulf and Eadwacer, and The Wife’s Lament both by connecting them to the Germanic heroic tradition and by reading them in apposition to the religious poems that surround them.

In the manuscript text, we can also examine interpersonal meaning through Mood. When a text has an abundance of interrogative clauses, there are no definitive answers, and the text is directed back at the audience for answers. An abundance of imperatives will operate in a similar manner. Declarative/indicative clauses are to be expected since they are the most common; however, when they are the majority, the text may feel distant and matter-of-fact to an audience. In the elegies, the indicative mood is most common although a few poems use the interrogative and imperative moods (see Figures 66-67 in Appendix B). However, there is a pattern in the subjunctive mood which leads to a pattern in the manuscript as a whole.

In Old English, the subjunctive mood appears more frequently than in modern English. In both, it appears in conditions contrary to fact and in noun clauses following verbs of desiring, commanding, and the like. However, in Old English, it also appears in some clauses introduced by words such as though, before, or until or in first- or third-person imperatives usually translated as something like “Let us…” Typically, the subjunctive mood implies some mental attitude toward the action of the verb in the subjunctive (Baker 2007). Therefore, in the elegies,
which are largely poems about emotional states, one would expect to find the subjunctive mood often. This is not the case. As shown in Figure 46 in Appendix A, subjunctive forms appear most often in *Riddle 60, Resignation, The Husband’s Message*, and *The Wife’s Lament*. These poems seem to form a subset based on both the use of the subjunctive mood and a comparable number of parts of speech; namely, they have more nouns and pronouns than verbs (Figures 80-83 in Appendix B). They also tend to use first-person pronouns as Themes more frequently than the rest of the poems (see Figure 23 in Chapter 4). In addition, they can be found grouped near each other in the Lexomics dendrogram. In Figure 15 in Chapter 4, Wife_1 and Wife_3 are paired with sections 2, 3, and 6-9 of *Resignation*. In the right clade of Figure 14, Wife_2, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, and *Riddle 60* all appear together. Finally, the fourth section of *The Wife’s Lament* is paired with the eighth section of *The Wanderer* (see Figure 11 in Chapter 4), but it appears in the outlying section with Res_1, Husb_2, Husb_5, Husb_1, and Husb_4. So it appears that this group of four poems – *The Wife’s Lament, Resignation, Riddle 60, and The Husband’s Message* – share similar vocabulary distributions.

In Jockers’s argument, Jockers (2013) claims that both digital tools and close reading are necessary in interpreting literary texts. The analysis here is a good example of how one can go about putting the two together. Using both the linguistic analysis of the poems and the Lexomics digital tool, one can offer a literary interpretation of why the anthologizer might have chosen this particular order for these poems within the manuscript. Admittedly, this interpretation would be stronger with an analysis of the non-elegies of this section of the manuscript. However, since

---

12 *The Seafarer* and *Deor* also share this pattern.

13 Analysis of the non-elegies for the purposes of connecting the section of the manuscript as a whole is beyond the scope of this study but is certainly open to future analysis and expansion.
these four elegies appear together and are similar in their style, they can begin to tie the section of the manuscript together and validate the use of my particular methodology.

In the manuscript, these poems appear in the cluster of twelve poems between the groups of riddles.\(^{14}\) They appear in Conner’s third booklet, so if he is correct, they are likely a self-contained unit (Conner 1986). However, Znojemská’s assertion that the poems are meant to be read in apposition to each other also seems to make sense here (Znojemská 1999). The other poems in this section of the manuscript—Judgment Day I, Descent to Hell, Alms-Giving, Pharaoh, Lord’s Prayer I, Homiletic Fragment II, and Riddle 30b—are all highly religious poems, with the exception of Riddle 30b. However, one possible solution to Riddle 30b is a wooden cross, so it contains the religious connotations the rest of this section of poems overtly displays.

The elegies themselves surround this group of religious poems; The Wife’s Lament follows Riddle 59 and begins this group. Judgment Day I comes between The Wife’s Lament and Resignation, but Karma Lochrie (1986) has suggested that Judgment Day I and Resignation can be grouped as a set of three poems centered thematically around the human condition and the concept of *wyrd*.\(^{15}\) Even if this is not the case, Resignation contains a large amount of religious language. So it seems that the anthologist of this booklet has begun with a strictly secular poem, The Wife’s Lament, followed by two poems which transition into the religious poetry. At the end

\(^{14}\) *The Ruin* appears in this cluster as well but does not share these characteristics.

\(^{15}\) She splits Resignation into two parts. I am operating under the assumption that they are one since the beginning is linguistically similar to the ending (see my discussion of the connections made apparent in a Lexomics analysis earlier in this chapter), but her argument makes sense.
of this section, Riddle 30b, Riddle 60, and The Husband’s Message fit together in theme; the object in Riddle 30b is something wooden while the object in Riddle 60 is made from wood, and finally The Husband’s Message begins by the poet announcing he will speak about the nature of the wooden object. With its subtle reference to a cross, Riddle 30b transitions back out of the religious poetry and into more secular themes of separation. The elegies provide a frame around the religious poetry.

There also seems to be a theme that moves one poem to the next. The section begins with a wife exiled from her husband; the poem contains a great deal of earth imagery. The next poem, Judgment Day I, outlines the ending of the world. Resignation then calls on God for help. It ends with the standard elegiac imagery of exile to transition into Descent to Hell, where help comes in Jesus’ harrowing of Hell. In this poem, those in Hell are referred to as thanes of the Lord. One could interpret them as exiles that the Lord has come to rescue. The next poem, Alms-Giving, is instruction to be generous and give alms to heal sin – one way of avoiding Hell; Pharaoh’s main concern is the number of troops in Pharaoh’s army (600,000) that were destroyed by the wave, but it seems a reminder that anyone who stands up against God’s people will be destroyed. The Lord’s Prayer I offers a reminder to look toward the Lord and ask for his guidance. Alms-Giving, Pharaoh, and The Lord’s Prayer I all have standard Christian themes. The Homiletic Fragment II begins to move back into the realm of elegy, though not as an elegy itself, by claiming that the world is uncertain but also claiming the Virgin Mary saved it by bearing Christ. Riddle 30b then describes what could be interpreted as a cross on which Christ saved the world again. The next two poems, Riddle 60 and The Husband’s Message, speak of (a) message(s). Riddle 60 seems to be describing a reed pen which could write a message. The Husband’s Message starts by referencing a message and asks a wife to come to her exiled husband and he will be happy. The
Church is often called the “Bride of Christ,” so Riddle 60 and The Husband’s Message can be interpreted as Christ requesting the Church to join him again. “The feud” that exiled Him might refer to the eternal struggle with the Devil over the souls of humanity. Granted, some of these interpretations are open to debate, but this progression inevitably leads back to a wife separated from her husband and is reminiscent of The Wife’s Lament, which could be the anthologizer’s subtle hint that the wife in that poem needs Christ as a solution to her lamenting.

While I have not done a thorough linguistic analysis of the non-elegiac poems of this section, there are clear lexical connections among all of them. For a start, images of fire and water pervade the non-elegies in this section, appearing in Judgment Day I, Descent into Hell, and Pharaoh, just to name a few. Vocabulary associated with these images appears throughout the poems. It would be interesting to conduct a complete linguistic analysis on these poems to compare their use of Themes, processes, parts of speech usage, and other SFL clausal analyses.

The poem that does not seem to fit this section is The Ruin. It has neither the lexical connections nor the linguistic elements of the elegies in this section, and after three poems connected by the thematic element of wood, it seems to stand out with its references to stone. However, stone structures are unmoving and presumably stronger than wood. The stone ruins have withstood time and may act as a reminder that strong foundations will weather anything. Therefore, it is important to have a firm foundation in faith that will last through tough times.

The Husband’s Message ends with water imagery and sea imagery, including sailing on a ship, presumably made from wood. So an immediately following poem about ruined stone structures that also contains water imagery is a shift in direction, but that shift in direction is meant to draw attention to the difference.

In another interpretation, William Johnson (1980) argues that The Ruin is actually a
riddle; he analyzes its unique vocabulary combined with its location in the manuscript. He claims the language can be metaphorical and allegorical to represent the human body. Time destroys the body as it does the city. If this is the case, The Ruin’s location still fits the general progression of this section of poems because it functions as a transition leading out of this section of poems and into the last section of riddles. It uses riddling language to remind the reader that time passes, and if the reader, through The Husband’s Message, was just reminded that the wife from The Wife’s Lament needed to find Christ, The Ruin could possibly be a reminder that the reader needs to keep a firm foundation in his/her faith, or he/she needs to turn to the Church before it is too late.

My linguistic analysis of the subjunctive mood directed me down this path of literary exploration. To return to it, the subjunctive clauses also provide somewhat of a frame. The subjunctive clauses in these poems begin in lines 7b-8 of The Wife’s Lament: “hæfde ic uht-ceare / hwær min leod-fruma londes wære.” The verb were is in the subjunctive because of the clause before it. The anxiety of “hæfde ic uht-ceare” affects the next verb “wære” because that verb and clause are the reason for the anxiety; the narrator is concerned because she does not know where her lord is. In the first subjunctive clause of The Husband’s Message, the end of this section, the verb in the subjunctive is hycge: “ond nu cunnan scealt / hu þu ymb mod-lufan mines frean / on hyge hycge” (lines 9b-11a). The messenger instructs the wife that she must discover how she might think about his lord’s love. So the first poem in this section contains its first subjunctive clause related to anxiety. The first subjunctive clause in the last poem of this section is expressing love. As the poems progress from secular to needing Christ, the subjunctive clauses frame the progression from anxiety to love.

The lack of the use of the subjunctive mood within the rest of the elegies is surprising. In
poems generally speaking about lament, one would expect the interpersonal meaning expressed through mood to be more evident. Since the subjunctive is largely absent, the poems become more objective in terms of relationship between the speaker/writer and the audience. These four poems use the first-person singular Theme more often, though not in the subjunctive clauses, so perhaps these four poems are more personal reflections and less concerned with an outside audience than the other six poems.

IV. Lexical Categorization

Coding each word of the elegies into categories produced some expected results. For example, *The Ruin* was among the poems that used words associated with “place” more than any of the other poems (see Figure 26 in Chapter 4). Some of the more general categories such as death/destruction, time, amount, and protection/togetherness are ideas that can appear almost anywhere in any text and are not specifically associated with any previous definitions of the elegies. However, a general topos emerged that seems to fit all ten poems to one degree or another. Overall, the lexical patterns in the elegies are focused on three key terms: exile, emotion, and nature. Specifically, Emotion can be broken down into joy and sorrow, and Nature can be broken down into three subcategories: water/sea, earth, and weather.

One might expect the category of words associated with Christianity or fate to be more important to the elegies. However, these words were not a persistent theme in all of the poems. For example, *The Wife’s Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* contained no words associated with religion. In line 33 of *The Wife’s Lament*, the word *frean* appears, but while this word can mean “the Lord,” in this context it refers to the wife’s husband, “her lord.” The verb *sculan* also
appears four times in the poem. Its sense is “must” or “be fated to,” which is why it appears in this category; however, while it can carry a sense of fate, it is not associated with Christian obligation. Likewise, in both The Wife’s Lament and Wulf and Eadwacer, the word giedd is used to refer to “a song” or “poem” or “tale.” This noun is related to the fate of the two narrators because it refers to their stories and what happens to them, but it is not associated with Christianity or religion. In addition, this category is very general and the topos of Christianity is the primary focus of a majority of Anglo-Saxon poems. For these two reasons, it is not instructive to include Christianity as a useful category in connecting the poems together. The categories of death/destruction and protection/togetherness have the same problem.

The first category that can be used to connect the poems together is exile and separation, as might be expected (see Figure 27 in Chapter 4). Themes of being alone and solitary appear at least once in all ten poems. Wulf and Eadwacer has only one word associated directly with separation and that is seldcymas, or “rare visits.” However, the sense of separation is found in line 4: “Wulf is on iege, ic on oþerre.” The word iege could be categorized as separation, but I have categorized it as part of Nature since that is its essential makeup. The rest of the poems have at least one word directly associated with exile or being alone and solitary.

Emotion is the second category which can connect all but one of the poems. At first, this category may seem too general, like death and Christianity. However, the emotions of joy and sorrow both appear in nine of the ten poems (see Figure 29 in Chapter 4 and Table 6 in Appendix A). The fact that words for both of these emotions appear in each of the poems is what is significant. The appearance of words for both sorrow and joy creates the feeling of lament that has traditionally defined the elegies. Riddle 60 is the one poem that has no emotion words in it. This could mean either that the poem is not an elegy or that it is part of The Husband’s Message.
The third important category which connects the poems is Nature. Within the category, the three largest subcategories are words associated with the earth, the sea or water in general, and the weather; two thirds of the weather words refer specifically to icy weather (see Figure 30 in Chapter 4 and Table 7 in Appendix A). Taken individually, these subcategories are missing in some of the poems. Deor and Riddle 60 have no words associated with the earth. Deor and Wulf and Eadwacer have no words associated with the sea or water, though Wulf and Eadwacer uses iege, which indirectly references the sea or water since islands are surrounded by water. Finally, Riddle 60 and The Husband’s Message do not have words associated with weather. Deor only uses one weather word: wintercealde. However, all ten poems use nature imagery from at least one of the three subcategories.

Therefore, as a lexical pattern, elegies seem to have words associated with all three themes: (1) exile, (2) joy and sorrow, and (3) the earth, the sea or water, and/or the weather. These are patterns than cannot stand alone in defining elegies since other Old English poems also contain these three themes. In order for it to be a defining element of the elegies, it must be combined with other patterns.

While these three lexical categories are the defining categories for elegies, another interesting trend in the Speech category appears. Words associated with speech appear in every poem except Wulf and Eadwacer and The Ruin (see Figure 28 in Chapter 4). This is to be expected in The Ruin because the poem contains no reference to people, and while it could use the metaphor of the ruined buildings speaking, it does not do so directly. In Wulf and Eadwacer, the narrator is forcibly separated from her husband and since no words for speech appear in the poem, she is silenced as well. In the other eight poems, some of the words associated with speech are nouns such as beot, gielpes, aþe, or word. However, the majority of the speech words are
verbs, indicating verbal action and therefore verbal transitivity processes. This is reminiscent of Bakhtin’s idea of speech genres: speech, the primary genre, is transformed into something else, the secondary genre; in this case, speech is transformed into a stylized poem.

In the case of *Wulf and Eadwacer*, since no Speech words exist, there are no verbal transitivity processes. The poem uses [BE] in relational and existential processes, which make up the majority of its clauses combined. The only indication of some kind of speech would be the exclamation, “Wulf, min Wulf!” in line 13. Even though that could be an internal exclamation, it is still an expression of emotion that indicates an outburst of some sort. This half line gives *Wulf and Eadwacer* the feel of vocal expression without the poem using actual Speech words or verbal processes.

Speech words, like words related to Christianity, are not a definitive measure of a genre characteristic because other non-elegy poems use Speech words. However, in the Old English elegies, the verbal processes are interesting. There is at least one clause that uses the first-person singular nominative pronoun *ie* with a verb for “say, tell” somewhere in every poem that uses Speech words. These verbal processes are indicative of the recognized trope in the elegies that identifies them as “first-person laments.” As a trope, it also appears in other Anglo-Saxon poetry reinforcing the oral nature of the poetry and the connection to Bakhtin’s speech genres that allow for a deeper level of interpretation, so while verbal processes are not definitive of the elegies, they do reinforce their general nature.

V. Transitivity Clause Types

Transitivity is linked to Halliday’s experiential meaning for language – what the text is
about. One might expect the Old English elegies to exhibit a lot of mental or behavioral processes overall, but that is not the case.\textsuperscript{16} There does not seem to be one particular pattern that stands out among the transitivity processes (see Figure 25 in Chapter 4 and Table 5 in Appendix A). However, I include this section because of a curiosity in the behavioral processes.

In the poems, the material transitivity process is the most common, followed by the relational and mental. These are the most common types of processes found in general language. \textit{Riddle 60} and \textit{The Husband’s Message} stand out in the verbal process (see Figure 44 in Appendix A). This is not particularly surprising, since the two poems are about sending messages. The behavioral processes appear in \textit{The Wanderer}, \textit{The Wife’s Lament}, \textit{Wulf and Eadwacer}, and \textit{The Husband’s Message} – all poems where the narrator exhibits human behavior (see Figure 45). In the other poems involving people, the processes are specific actions rather than human behavior.\textsuperscript{17} However, what is interesting about the behavioral process is that the Themes are all personal pronouns, mostly \textit{ic} and one \textit{þu}, which suggests behaviors by specific individuals rather than “men” in general. For example, in \textit{The Wanderer}, the first behavioral process occurs in lines 8-9a: “oft ic sceolde ana uhtna gehwylce mine ceare cwīþan.” This is the first use of the first-person nominative \textit{ic} within the poem and it is being used to express the behavior of lamenting. As the first potential elegy in the manuscript, \textit{The Wanderer} sets the

\textsuperscript{16} Material processes are physical actions. Mental processes show perception, cognition, affection, or desire. Verbal processes are related to communication. Relational processes show possession, equivalence, or attributes. Behavior processes are human behaviors, and Existential processes begin with the dummy subjects \textit{here, there}, or \textit{it}.

\textsuperscript{17} The difference between material and behavioral processes is the difference between performing an action and performing a human behavior. For example, human behaviors are processes such as laughing, crying, breathing, hearing, etc. I considered lamenting a behavior rather than a verb process since its connotations are emotional and could include a behavior such as crying.
behavioral tone of first-person narrators immediately. Two of the other behavioral processes use *ic* as their Theme. In *The Wife’s Lament*, line 38, the personal lamenting continues: “þær ic wepan mæg mine wræc-siðas.” In *The Husband’s Message*, line 49, the poet claims “gehyre ic ætsomne” about the runes at the end of the poem. The other behavioral process in the poems is found in *Wulf and Eadwacer*, line 16: “Gehyrest þu, Eadwacer?” So of the four clauses, two are about lamenting and two are about hearing. The fact that the only four behavioral processes in the poems complement each other (hearing to lamenting) is curious, though lamenting behavior is not unexpected.

VI. Conclusions

The Old English elegies are a diverse group of poems. Their language is related, as the dendrograms show; however, to define them as a genre is still a complex issue. In Fowler’s terms, in order to be a *kind*, they must have similar content and structure. There are possibilities of *subgenres* within the kind if the poems have a slight shift in content but keep the same structure. In terms of the Old English elegies, each poem shares characteristics with other poems both in content and structure, but it is difficult to pinpoint characteristics that apply to *all* of the poems. Instead, we must look at the characteristics first and then work backwards to apply them to the poems rather than trying to find a pattern that fits them all. Returning to Greenfield’s and Klinck’s definitions, there are elements that can be combined and redefined.

First, Greenfield’s length and type fit the poems. They are all “relatively short,” the longest being *The Seafarer* at 766 words, and each is a “reflective or dramatic poem.” This structural description could define a *kind*, but it is too vague and broad to be of much use. As to
content, both Greenfield and Klinck include some form of loss or separation, and the lexical patterns in the poems support this. An Old English elegy should include themes of exile. The definitions also contain some element of emotion. For Greenfield, that emotion is embedded in his “contrasting pattern of loss and consolation” along with “expressing an attitude towards that experience.” For Klinck, the emotion is located in the movement “from disquiet to some kind of acceptance.” Lexically, emotions are exhibited in emotion words of joy and sorrow. While Klinck does not address the “specific personal experience” that Greenfield does, she calls the group of poems a “discourse” that is exhibited through the alternation of first- and third-person clausal Themes. Klinck is not specific in her “characteristic words and themes” that make up an Old English elegy, but lexical patterns indicate that water/sea imagery occurs often.

Therefore, a more accurate definition of an Old English elegy that combines both Greenfield’s and Klinck’s ideas might be the following: A relatively short reflective or dramatic poem, similar in style and content to other elegiac poems, that alternates between first- and third-person perspectives and includes (1) themes of exile; (2) imagery of water or the sea, the earth, and/or the weather; and (3) words expressing both joy and sorrow.

Under this definition, *Deor* is not an elegy. It has a sense of an elegy in its refrain, but it is consistently unrelated to the other poems in my Lexomics analysis and lacks earth and water or sea imagery. Assuming *Resignation* is one poem, it is not an elegy either, but it has an elegiac passage at the end and is similar to *Beowulf* in that respect. But it, too, is linguistically different since it contains more imperative clauses and uses the second person more than other poems; these uses group it together with itself more often in the Lexomics analysis. *Riddle 60* and *The Husband’s Message* are not elegies, but they are elegy-like. They end the series of poems between the riddles, and they have some of the elements that seem to define an elegy. However,
Riddle 60 does not contain any Emotion words. In addition, both Riddle 60 and The Husband’s Message contain words of separation that are not specifically related to exile.\(^{18}\) Last, The Ruin is not an elegy. It makes elegiac moves, but it lacks the personal pronoun usage of the rest of the poems and stands out within the section of poems in which it sits in the manuscript. It also lacks words specifically related to exile rather than just separation.\(^{19}\) The poem seems to be a different version of an elegy that does not refer to people.

Since Lexomics analysis places “The Lay of the Last Survivor” in Beowulf as closely related to The Seafarer and The Wanderer, it could potentially be considered an elegy. It has one word associated with the lexical category “earth” (hruse) and one word associated with “joy” (wyn), but there are none associated with “exile.” However, the poem is wholly concerned with the death of warriors, so death could be considered a form of exile. Even though it contains these characteristics, the poem itself is part of the larger Beowulf and therefore not a short poem on its own. In that way, it is reminiscent of Resignation: a small elegiac passage within a larger poem and not an “Old English elegy.” While all linguistically similar to the actual Old English elegies, the eliminated poems are not elegies, though they make elegiac moves; therefore, they are using the elegiac mode and are not elegiac in kind.

This leaves The Wanderer, The Seafarer, Wulf and Eadwacer, The Wife’s Lament, and The Rimming Poem as Old English elegies. Some scholars would dispute The Rimming Poem’s inclusion; however, it contains all of the characteristics of the other four and therefore must be included as one of this kind. Perhaps because of its unique rhyming structure, it is possible that

\(^{18}\) The separation words are anæde, anum, adraf, an, and gad.

\(^{19}\) The two words related to separation are gebad and sceaded.
the poet was using the Old English elegy genre to experiment with Latin rhyme schemes.20

VII. Limitations and Future Research

This methodology and data obtained from my analyses leave several avenues open for future research. For example, further study of *The Rimming Poem* in comparison to Latin rhyme schemes and Old English metrics might be able to make a strong case for what is happening in the poem. However, there are also some limitations to the methodology.

The first limitation involves human error. Coding every word and clause of ten poems, albeit short poems, leaves room for errors not only in content but in human scribal practice such as typos. Typing errors could affect the data minimally such as Microsoft Excel not counting an instance of the subjunctive use because the word identifying it as subjunctive was misspelled. I have been conscientious and careful in my data and proofread each, but there still remains the chance of human error. Along the same lines, the process of coding each word and clause can be long and tedious. Because these were relatively short poems, the time it took to code everything was significantly less than trying to code several poems the length of *Beowulf*, for example. Comparing lexico-grammatical elements across other Old English poems in the way I have would require a great deal of coding work.

The last limitation is a reliance on other people’s work. I used Klinck’s glossary to code the Old English words, and while I checked some words that I needed to clarify, I placed a certain amount of trust in her and her publishers to ensure that her glossary was correct.

Similarly, I placed my trust in the Lexomics program and its ability to measure accurately the stylistic similarities of the poems. I did a great deal of background research on the program before I used it, and I am confident that it does what it claims it does – as I am confident that Klinck’s glossary is as accurate as possible – but there are also limitations within the program itself. For example, I cannot change the way the program chunks the texts. I can set the parameters, but I cannot tell it to “rechunk” something if I do not like the way it separated the poem into sections. Specifically, the chunks of The Husband’s Message contained smaller word counts than I would have preferred; I would have preferred fewer chunks with greater word counts within those chunks.

Despite these limitations, I am confident that my results represent a true picture of the “Old English elegy” genre. The methodology uses a variety of methods to examine the data and, most importantly, supports previous scholarship. Therefore, I feel comfortable applying the methodology to future studies. For example, one avenue of future research is an analysis of the use of second person within the poems. Voyant can measure collocations, so examining which words appear around second-person pronouns may offer insight into how a poet addresses his audience directly.

This methodology can also produce literary interpretations. I gave a sample as I discussed the subjunctive mood: in order to provide a thorough argument for the connections made there between The Wife’s Lament and The Husband’s Message, I can linguistically analyze the nonelegies that appear in this group. This may also produce an argument for an organization of poems within the Exeter Book. Expanding outward to the entire manuscript, there are clear lexical connections between water and fire imagery in several poems, so a deeper analysis of all poems within the Exeter Book – with a specific emphasis on fire, water, earth, and air imagery –
could lead to interesting claims about connections and organization of the manuscript. A second literary interpretation could explain the differences in *The Ruin*. Specifically, a closer analysis of *The Ruin* as compared to the Exeter Book riddles may provide a reason for its difference as well as its position in the manuscript. It would also support William Johnson’s (1980) claim that *The Ruin* is a riddle.

The largest area for expansion of the methodology would be an analysis of the syntax and word order within the poems. The syntax of Old English poetry is a little looser than that of Old English prose because of the alliterative meter; therefore, a study of syntax would necessarily require a study of the poetic meter. Part of SFL’s claim is that we make meanings through the choices we make not only in our lexicon but in our grammar as well. Therefore, an analysis of the syntax and meter through the lens of SFL may produce interesting results about the choices scribes make and what those choices mean for an audience. It may also specifically explain the lack of subjunctive mood that one would expect to appear within the elegies. This syntactical analysis would also aid in arguing that *Resignation* is one poem, not two.\(^1\) The dendrogram produced by Lexos seems to suggest that the accepted *Resignation A* is similar to *Resignation B*. A closer linguistic analysis of that poem specifically could add to scholarship on that poem by suggesting the poem is unified.

It is almost overwhelming how much can be accomplished using these methods. In fact, Appendix B includes information I did not use in this particular study but that may suggest additional study in more general topics such as language change that may use different methodologies. A description of those potential studies can be found in the introduction to

---

\(^{21}\) See Bliss and Frantzen (1976).
Appendix B. Overall, my methodology in this study can be expanded and adapted to produce other linguistic and literary analyses leading to a deeper understanding of the poems and how we think about the genre of Anglo-Saxon texts, or texts of other time periods, in general.
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APPENDIX A

INFORMATION USED DIRECTLY IN DISSERTATION BODY
Figure 31: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Outliers.

Figure 32: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—First clade of large middle clade.
Figure 33: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Second clade of large middle clade.

Figure 34: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Third clade of large middle clade.
Figure 35: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Far right clade.

Figure 36: Word trends of *ic* and *he* in *The Seafarer*. 
Figure 37: Word trends of *ic* and *he* in *Wulf and Eadwacer*.

Figure 38: Word trends of *ic*, *he*, and *þu* in *The Husband's Message*.
Figure 39: Word trends of *ic* and third-person Themes in *The Riming Poem*.

Figure 40: Word trends of *ic* and third-person Themes in *Deor*.
Figure 41: Word trends of *ic*, *he*, and third-person clausal Themes in *The Wife’s Lament*.

Figure 42: Word trends of *ic* and third-person pronouns in *Resignation*. 
Figure 43: Relative frequency of second-person Themes.

Table 5: Relative Frequency of Transitivity Processes for All Poems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wan</th>
<th>Sea</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Deor</th>
<th>Wulf</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Rid60</th>
<th>Husb</th>
<th>Ruin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
<td>22.03%</td>
<td>19.08%</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>37.78%</td>
<td>24.55%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>40.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>63.56%</td>
<td>71.76%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>42.22%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>54.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Number of Words Associated with Emotion, Subdivided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wan</th>
<th>Sea</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Deor</th>
<th>Wulf</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Rid60</th>
<th>Husb</th>
<th>Ruin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stubborn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorrow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Number of Words Associated with Nature, Subdivided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wan</th>
<th>Sea</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Deor</th>
<th>Wulf</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Rid60</th>
<th>Husb</th>
<th>Ruin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bird</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flora</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather/ice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 44: Relative frequency of the verbal transitivity process.

Figure 45: Relative frequency of the behavioral transitivity process.
Figure 46: Relative frequency of the subjunctive mood.
Figure 47: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Elegies and first ten sections of *Beowulf*.

Figure 48: Zoomed-in image of boxed section in Figure 47.
Figure 49: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Elegies and lines 2247-2266 of Beowulf (“The Lay of the Last Survivor”) in 2 chunks.

Table 8: Number of Words in “The Lay of Last Survivor” When Chunked According to 100-word Chunks and 50% Threshold for Last Chunk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay of Last Surv</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 50: Zoomed-in image of boxed section in Figure 49.
Figure 51: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Elegies and lines 2247-2266 of *Beowulf* (“The Lay of the Last Survivor”) as one chunk.

Figure 52: Zoomed-in image of boxed section in Figure 51.
Figure 53: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Elegies and *Maxims I*.

Figure 54: Zoomed-in image of boxed section in Figure 53.
Figure 55: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Elegies and Guthlac $A$ and $B$.

Figure 56: Zoomed-in images of boxed section in Figure 55.
Figure 57: Dendrogram with 100-word chunks and 50% threshold for last chunk—Elegies and Dream of the Rood.

Figure 58: Zoomed-in images of boxed section in Figure 57.
APPENDIX B

INFORMATION COLLECTED BUT NOT USED DIRECTLY
The data that appears in this appendix is extra data that I collected but did not use directly in my dissertation. However, the data is suggestive of future research. In this brief introduction to Appendix B, I will discuss the sets of figures and outline some of the possible areas of research.

Figure 59 is a chart of the total number of words in each poem (tokens), the number of unique words (types), and the type to token ratio (TTR). This information may be interesting to compare to other texts. The TTR can sometimes be used for author identification in conjunction with other tools. While it is nearly impossible to determine authorship of Old English texts, a similar lexical density may determine a similarity in the poem as a whole. For example, both *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife’s Lament* have the same lexical density, and these are the two poems with a female narrator. *The Husband’s Message* is one percentage point higher, and there may be a correlation between the lexical density and poems about male/female relationships. However, more tools and analysis would be needed to determine the relationship.

Figures 60-69 are results from my clausal analysis. Producing these same results for other poems and then comparing their use to the elegies may suggest the internal focus of certain poems. For example, poems with a large number of mental transitivity processes or interrogative and imperative moods could be focused around thinking, questioning, and/or commanding rather than action, and this may suggest a purpose for the poem. *The Wanderer* contains the second highest level of mental processes along with some questions. *Resignation* uses the imperative mood more than the other ten poems. Neither of these are surprising because *The Wanderer* is an introspective poem, and *Resignation* is a plea to God for help. However, analyzing clauses in other poems may produce surprising results that could aid in interpretation.

In a grammatical study of the history of the English language, comparison of these types of clauses and moods to Middle English lyrics of a similar type could perhaps be useful in
analyzing the breakdown of the subjunctive in English. Figures 70 and on are from the spreadsheet of individually coded words. These may also provide interesting evidence for changes in the English language. For example, Figure 71 is a breakdown of the parts of speech within the poems. There are more strong verbs located in classes 1, 3, 5, and 7. This could be suggestive of the move toward the collapse of strong verbs into smaller categories in Middle English. It may also suggest that the reason the third-person verb conjugation was the only one to remain in the language was because it was used more often than first and second person (see Figure 73, which identifies inflections across all ten poems). A similar study on the breakdown of the gendered system could also be conducted, as well as the breakdown of the case system using Figure 73. An analysis of Middle English texts, especially an early Middle English text like the Peterborough Chronicle, would be necessary to confirm this evidence.

A general study of Old English poetry could also use these linguistic analyses. For example, Figure 70 shows a larger use of nouns and verbs rather than adjectives and adverbs; this noun and verb use may suggest that Old English poetry functions differently from later poetry which uses more modifiers and descriptive phrases. Figure 72 is a breakdown of the number of words in each category for all ten poems. The largest category is People, which may suggest that personal relationships are more important in Old English poetry than fighting and swordplay. In singular and plural identification, I found what I expected: the poems are focused on individuals and singular objects. Had it been the other way around, I would have addressed it, but it would be interesting to see if certain poems do use more plural words and what that usage might mean.
The remainder of the figures are the same information for each individual poem. The methodology conducted in this study produces a large amount of data, but still more work is needed in order to thoroughly understand the significance of what some of these data suggest.

Figure 59: Voyant tokens, types, and vocabulary density ratios.
Figure 60: Relative frequency of other third-person Themes, excluding masculine singular, relative, and indefinite pronouns.

Figure 61: Relative frequency of referential pronoun Themes (relative and indefinite).
Figure 62: Relative frequency of the relational transitivity process.

Figure 63: Relative frequency of the existential transitivity process.
Figure 64: Relative frequency of the mental transitivity process.

Figure 65: Relative frequency of the material transitivity process.
Figure 66: Relative frequency of the interrogative mood.

Figure 67: Relative frequency of the imperative mood.
Figure 68: Relative frequency of the indicative/declarative mood.

Figure 69: Relative frequency of non-clauses.
Figure 70: Number of parts of speech in all poems.

Figure 71: Number of specific parts of speech in all poems.
Figure 72: Number of words in each category in all poems.

Figure 73: Number of words in each inflection in all poems.
Figure 74: Number of singular and plural words in all poems.

Figure 75: Number of parts of speech in *The Wanderer*. 
Figure 76: Number of parts of speech in *The Seafarer*.

Figure 77: Number of parts of speech in *The Riming Poem*. 
Figure 78: Number of parts of speech in *Deor*.

Figure 79: Number of parts of speech in *Wulf and Eadwacer*.
Figure 80: Number of parts of speech in *The Wife’s Lament*.

Figure 81: Number of parts of speech in *Resignation*.
Figure 82: Number of parts of speech in *Riddle 60*.

Figure 83: Number of parts of speech in *The Husband’s Message*. 
Figure 84: Number of parts of speech in *The Ruin*.

Figure 85: Number of specific parts of speech in *The Wanderer*.
Figure 86: Number of specific parts of speech in *The Seafarer*.

Figure 87: Number of specific parts of speech in *The Riming Poem*.
Figure 88: Number of specific parts of speech in *Deor*.

Figure 89: Number of specific parts of speech in *Wulf and Eadwacer*.
Figure 90: Number of specific parts of speech in *The Wife’s Lament*.

Figure 91: Number of specific parts of speech in *Resignation*. 
Figure 92: Number of specific parts of speech in *Riddle 60*.

Figure 93: Number of specific parts of speech in *The Husband’s Message*.
Figure 94: Number of specific parts of speech in *The Ruin*.

Figure 95: Number of words in each category in *The Wanderer*. 
Figure 96: Number of words in each category in *The Seafarer*.

Figure 97: Number of words in each category in *The Riming Poem*.
Figure 98: Number of words in each category in Deor.

Figure 99: Number of words in each category in Wulf and Eadwacer.
Figure 100: Number of words in each category in *The Wife’s Lament*.

Figure 101: Number of words in each category in *Resignation*. 
Figure 102: Number of words in each category in *Riddle 60*.

Figure 103: Number of words in each category in *The Husband’s Message*. 
Figure 104: Number of words in each category in *The Ruin*.

Figure 105: Number of words in each inflection in *The Wanderer*.
Figure 106: Number of words in each inflection in *The Seafarer*.

Figure 107: Number of words in each inflection in *The Riming Poem*. 
Figure 108: Number of words in each inflection in *Deor*.

Figure 109: Number of words in each inflection in *Wulf and Eadwacer*. 
Figure 110: Number of words in each inflection in The Wife’s Lament.

Figure 111: Number of words in each inflection in Resignation.
Figure 112: Number of words in each inflection in *Riddle 60*.

Figure 113: Number of words in each inflection in *The Husband’s Message*.
Figure 114: Number of words in each inflection in *The Ruin*.

Figure 115: Number of singular and plural words in *The Wanderer*.

Figure 116: Number of singular and plural words in *The Seafarer*. 
Figure 117: Number of singular and plural words in *The Rimming Poem*.

Figure 118: Number of singular and plural words in *Deor*.

Figure 119: Number of singular and plural words in *Wulf and Eadwacer*.

Figure 120: Number of singular and plural words in *The Wife’s Lament*.
Figure 121: Number of singular and plural words in *Resignation*.

Figure 122: Number of singular and plural words in *Riddle 60*.

Figure 123: Number of singular and plural words in *The Husband’s Message*.

Figure 124: Number of singular and plural words in *The Ruin*. 