Claudia Di Sciacca*

Grendel, Guthlac, and the Gulping Hell-Mouth Again

The imagery of the devouring evil monster can be said to be immemorial and cross-cultural, being rooted in the universal experience of the ruthlessness and rapaciousness of death and of its underworld realm. Elaborations of this imagery – itself widespread and common – ultimately coalesced into the monstrous mouth of hell, a highly syncretistic creation which has predominantly been traced to pre-Conquest England (Galpern, 1977; Sheingorn, 1992; Schmidt, 1995; Bradley, 2008: 235-236). In particular, it has recently been argued that what triggered the coalescence of diverse iconographic and textual motifs into the zoomorphic mouth of hell[1] may well have been the special currency enjoyed in early medieval England by the apocryphal cosmology and eschatology of the Seven Heavens, with their swallowing dragons, and of the Gospel of Nicodemus, especially the *Descensus ad Inferos* (Di Sciacca, 2019a; 2023a). Indeed, the Harrowing of Hell represents the most typical setting of the hell-mouth in early English manuscript art, especially in illustrated psalters from the mid-eleventh century onwards (Di Sciacca, 2019a: 60-64)[2]. This iconographic evidence ties in with the textual evidence chiefly afforded by Old English homilies and hagiographies – largely dateable from the tenth century onwards (Scragg, 2001: 73-74) – featuring the motif of the swallowing demonic monster[3].

* Università degli Studi di Udine.

1 This should be distinguished from the earlier anthropomorphic mouth of hell: see below, 323-324.

2 Two of the earliest visual attestations of the bestial hell-mouth feature in one of the four major manuscript witnesses of Old English poetry, the Junius Book or Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11, *s.* x/xi and xi[1], South England (Canterbury Christ Church?): see Gneuss & Lapidge (2014: no. 640); Ker (1990: no. 334). The two illustrations of the mouth of hell are found at pp. 3 and 16; see the digitisation of the codex at <https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/inquire/Discover/Search/#/?p=c+8,t+Junius%2011,rsrs+0,rsps+10,fa+,so+ox%3Asort%5Easc,scids+,pid+d5e3a9fc-abaa-4649-ae48-be207ce8da15,vi+>.

3 On the imagery of the devouring dragon in the homilies of Ælfric of Eynsham (*c.*

The late dating of the illustrated Psalters and of the vernacular homilies and saints' lives admittedly challenges the identification of pre-Conquest England as the place of origin of the zoomorphic hell-mouth. Indeed, it has been pointed out that supposedly earlier evidence, such as the mid-eighth-century *Vita S. Guthlaci* famously featuring some *tartari fauces*, 'Tartarean jaws' (see below, 331-333), is problematic because *fauces* could just as well mean 'chasm' or 'abyss', and it has been argued that the text that follows «[does not explore] a metaphor of indigestion» (Neuman de Vegvar, 2008: 177).

Metaphors will indeed be key to the following discussion. In particular, I will try to reassess the earliest English attestations of the monstrous hell-mouth – both textual and figurative –, arguing that a distinctively English element that contributed to the emergence and evolution of this imagery can be pinpointed in the cognitive and rhetorical processes of metaphorical substitution and hybridization typical of both literary languages of pre-Conquest England, Anglo-Latin and Old English, especially in poetry, as well as of early English visual art (Clemoes, 1995: 68-116). Following up on Peter Clemoes's characteristically perceptive prompt, it will be proposed that the syncretic invention of the monstrous hell-mouth may have resulted from the early English ingrained use of «narrative analogy» to make sense of the world and of «metaphors, hybrids and combinations of the two» to encode and convey this epistemological endeavour since the earliest phases of English literary and visual culture (Clemoes, 1995: 100). While the monstrous hell-mouth proper would first emerge in the iconographic and textual production from the late tenth-century onwards (see above, nn. 2 and 3), its very premises can be traced to the earliest literary attestations of both Old English and Anglo-Latin, such as *Beowulf* and the *Vita S. Guthlaci*, as well as to the earliest artifacts of English figurative culture, such as the Repton Stone[4].

950 – *c*. 1010), ultimately drawing on *exempla* by Gregory the Great, see Di Sciacca (2023b). See also the conclusion of Ælfric's vernacular version of Pseudo-Basil, *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* (Locherbie-Cameron, 1998: 122–141, esp. 141 ll. 450-452). On the devouring monster of hell in the anonymous Old English homiletic and hagiographic prose corpus, see Di Sciacca (2019a: 71-103; 2019b). See further the anonymous homily *The Transience of Earthly Delights* or Irvine vii (Irvine, 1993: 197-202, at 199, ll. 47-51), and an anonymous homily for Tuesday in Rogationtide, *Feria Tertia De letania maiore* or Bazire and Cross xi (Bazire & Cross, 1982: 140-143, at 141, ll. 54-55).

[4] I here follow the dating of *Beowulf* to the first half of the eighth century proposed, amongst others, by Clemoes (1995: 3-67) and Lapidge (2000); see also the studies

1. *Unusual Transfers: Metaphorical Substitutions and Hybridizations*

According to Clemoes, the distinctive mode of interaction between the system of thought and the highly conventionalised literary languages of pre-Conquest England was «narrative analogy [or] one being acting like another», which often played out in «unusual transfers of, or between, actors» (Clemoes, 1995: 100 and xiii). These transfers typically consisted of actor-for-actor substitutions, as with metaphors such as *hilde-* or *beado-leoma* 'battle-flame' for 'sword' or *yð-mearh* 'wave-horse' for 'ship'. In both instances, the second element of the compound replaces the simplex by analogy: both 'flame' and 'sword' can flash, and both 'horse' and 'ship' can carry men or things on them with a riding motion. At the same time, the first element of the compound bestows an additional potential or an extension upon a given being, with the metaphorical substitution ultimately resulting into hybridization: a flame, being like a sword, belongs in battle, and a horse, being like a ship, can ride the sea, that is an element different from its natural land environment (Clemoes, 1995: 99-100 and 138). Obviously, any reader of Old English poetry will be familiar with compounds of the kind of *beadoleoma* and *yðmearh* as kenningar, traditionally defined as figurative compounds or two-member noun-phrases used in lieu of ordinary simplexes (Malone, 1967: 29-30; Meissner, 1921: 2; Battaglia, 2021: 85-90; Fulk, 2021). However, it should be noted that Clemoes deliberately avoided the term kenning to define such compounds or any similar binary structures or expressions, preferring instead to name them «two-element symbols», in that they are first of all «units of primary thought [rather than] periphrastic embellishments seeking to vary meaning» (Clemoes, 1995: xii-xiv and 128-129, quotation at 128, n. 12).

Hybrid beings or amalgamations intersecting traditionally discrete categories (animate/inanimate, animal/vegetable, articulate/unvocal, etc.) were common in both the literary and figurative production of pre-Conquest England. One of the most widely practised literary genres in both Old English and Anglo-Latin, riddles, precisely revolves around the attribution to a given creature (or a set of creatures) of metaphorical features by analogy with (an)other creature(s), this combination ultimately resulting in (a) hybrid being(s) (Clemoes, 1995: 183-188)[5].

collected in Neidorf (2014). For an overview of the vexed question of the dating of *Beowulf*, see Fulk *et al.* (2008: clxiii-clxiv). On the dating of the *VSG* and the Repton Stone, see below, 331 and 334-336.

[5] On the early English riddle corpus, see the two-volume edition, translation, and

Both individual riddles and riddle collections are made up of an intricate fabric of associations and/or contrasts, as they try to establish analogies between objects or beings belonging to different categories and to convey them via polysemic words (Rudolf, 2012: 499-500)[6]. A perfect case in point is Aldhelm's *Aenigma* 91, where the solution 'palm tree' gradually emerges only after the reader has worked through the analogies and differences between the meanings of the polysemic Lat. *palma*: 'palm (of the hand)' > 'hand,' 'palm tree,' 'leaf of the tree' > 'wreath of victory (made from the leaves),' the latter meaning in turn interpretable in both a secular and a Christian sense, as the palm leaf is the distinctive attribute of worldly as well as spiritual fighters, that is, martyrs (Orchard, 2021a: 76-77 and 670; Orchard, 2021b: 94-95; Howe, 1985: 44-45).

Often the metaphorical transference between different actors involves the distinctively human ability of speech conferred upon objects or beings that do not possess it naturally and in their new hybrid, humanized form they use it to address and challenge the audience; hence the demand frequently concluding riddles, *Saga hwæt ic hatte*, 'Say what I am called' (Clemoes, 1995: 98-99 and 183-188)[7]. Similarly, inanimate objects are often transformed into animate beings, the technique of personification and the figure of prosopopoeia being favourite rhetorical devices among the early English, from poetry in general, especially riddles, to epigraphy (Schlauch, 1968; Orton, 1980; Niles, 2006: 53–54 and 211, esp. n. 6; Chaganti, 2010; Edlich-Muth, 2014). Indeed, ambiguity and hybridization had been essential elements of early English figurative art from the merging of animal and human features in the square-headed brooches produced in Kent in the late fifth and the first half of the sixth century (Leigh, 1984), to the fusion of animal- and plant-elements in the interlace of manuscript art (Wilson, 1984: 64), metal work (Hinton, 1974: pl. 1*d*, panel 26), and

commentary by Orchard (2021a; 2021b). It has been argued that riddles can be considered a microcosm of the macrocosm of early English poetry, in that the latter has been attributed a fundamentally enigmatic quality, as it «relies on its audience's ability to decipher metaphorical language, to fill out many details that remain unexpressed, and to savour whatever satisfaction resides in the solving of upscale crossword puzzles» (Niles, 2006: 4).

[6] On the thematic groupings of *aenigmata* collections, see Salvador-Bello (2015: 88-283).

[7] Translation by Clemoes (1995: 98). Unless otherwise specified, translations from Old English and Latin are my own.

ivory carvings (Beckwith, 1972: plates 11-12) of the eighth and ninth centuries, up to early Romanesque art (Backhouse *et al*., 1984: 207). This visual ambiguity has been considered to «exactly mirror what we know of the poetic tradition which relies so heavily on literary devices conveying multiple meanings, such as metaphors, kennings and riddles» (Leigh, 1984: 40).

2. Os *and* Ostium

What underlies the hell-mouth is the time-honoured conceptual analogy linking doors and mouths. In the *Etymologiae* XI.i.49 Isidore of Seville explains *os* 'mouth' by associating it with *ostium* 'door':

> Os dictum, quod per ipsum quasi per ostium et cibos intus mittimus et sputum foris proicimus, uel quia inde ingrediuntur cibi, inde egrediuntur sermones. (Gasti, 2010: 37)
>
> 'The mouth (*os*) is so called, because through the mouth as if through a door (*ostium*) we bring food in and throw spit out; or else because from that place food goes in and words come out'. (Barney *et al*., 2005: 234)

Although the (folk) etymology proposed by Isidore is characteristically baseless, the metaphorical function of the mouth as a door or gate for food, spit and/or speech can be considered commonplace and is attested in both classical and Christian sources, such as Cicero, Tertullian, and Lactantius (Gasti, 2010: 36-37, n. 86). In both classical antiquity and the Bible the hereafter was conceived as an underworld realm, the perception of which often oscillated between a local denotation proper and a personal one, implying a personification or deification of death (Mackauer, 1939; Barstad, 1998; Bremmer, 1998; Healey, 1998). Hence the entrance to the realm of death could be pictured as a door (the Virgilian *ianua Ditis* and *ostia Ditis* or Plautus's *ianua Orci*), or as a deep pit (Ps 88:4-6), but also as the greedy jaws of an enemy (cf. the Virgilian *fauces Orci* with Hb 2:5 and Is 5:14)[8] (Mackauer, 1939: 927-928; Schipp, 1960: 154 and 157).

[8] Abbreviations for the books of the Bible follow the Chicago Style. The Vulgate text consulted is Weber (2007).

The process of personification or deification of death and/or its realm meant that its jaws, ravenous though they might be, were still anthropomorphic. Significantly, however, the Bible also employs the mouth-door metaphor about the Old Testament monster *par excellence*, Leviathan (Di Sciacca, 2019a: 58-60 and 65-66). In the most detailed and formidable description of Leviathan provided in the Scriptures (Jb 41:6-12), the monster is depicted as a gigantic, fanged, scale-covered and fire-spitting reptile, something in between a crocodile and a dragon (Di Sciacca, 2019a: 54 and 65-66). This description is introduced by two (rhetorical) questions, allegedly uttered by Yahweh to convey Job's, that is man's, inability to stand up to Leviathan: «in medium *oris* eius quis intrabit / *portas* vultus eius quis aperiet per gyrum dentium eius formido» (Jb 41:4-5) ('Who can go into the midst of his *mouth*? Who can open the *doors* of his face? His teeth are terrible round about'; Douay-Rheims version, my emphasis).

Germanic mythology also features cruel, greedy beasts ready to destroy and devour men and even gods, although it is unclear to what extent such animal figures and the episodes of monstrous consumption of which they are protagonists reflect a pagan cosmology or whether they betray Judaeo-Christian influences or are, finally, common to both traditions (Pluskowski, 2003: 157; Turville Petre, 1964: 281-285; Orchard, 2002: s.v. *Ragnarök*; Adams, 2015). At Ragnarök, the most vicious of all Germanic wolves, Fenrir, will devour Oðinn himself, and another two wolves, Sköll and Hati Hródvitsson, will devour the sun and the moon (although it is possible that all these different wolves are ultimately just one, namely Fenrir, as the relevant sources are not unambiguous in this regard) (Turville Petre, 1964: 60 and 280-285; Orchard, 2002: ss.vv. *Garm*, *Hati Hródvitsson*, *Hel*, *Ragnarök*, *Sköll*, and *Tyr*). That this Norse imagery must have been current in early medieval England is attested by the reliefs on a number of stone crosses, such as the ninth-century Rothbury Cross (Cramp, 1984), the tenth-century Great Clifton Cross (Cramp, 1988) and Gosforth Cross (Bailey, 1988), and the Thorvald Cross, dated from the mid-tenth to early eleventh century (Steinforth, 2021).

In the Scriptures the act of gulping down or swallowing is often used figuratively to signify the forceful removal or utter domination of one party by another, which often results in the swift, brutal destruction of the former by the latter (Schüpphaus, 1973; Ryken *et al.*, 1998: s.v. *swallow*). Generally, the swallowing is carried out against the righteous

or innocent who is persecuted without just cause, such as Israel oppressed by its enemies (Hos 8:8; Is 49:19; Lam 2:16; Ps 124:3), or the inhabitants of Jerusalem attacked by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 51:34), or, in general, the devout overcome by the wicked (Hb 1:13; Prv 1:12; Ps 35:25). Indeed, Yahweh Himself can be the devourer, swallowing Israel's adversaries (Ps 21:10) or, alternatively, having the earth open up and swallow the foolish Pharaoh and his army (Ex 15:9-12) or those who have rebelled against Him (Nm 16:30, 32, 34, and 26:10; Dt 11:6; Ps 106:17), or testing His righteous servant (Jb 2:3, 8:18, 10:8, 37:20). Finally, the Messiah's ultimate triumph is described in terms of His swallowing up (Is 25:7-8) or biting (Hos 13:14) death in eternal victory.

In Old English, the verb *swelgan* 'to swallow, take in, drink; (fig.) to take into the mind, to accept' (Bosworth & Toller, s.v.; Orel, 2003: s.v. **swelȝan*; Scardigli & Gervasi, 1978: s.v. *swallow*[2]) could also have, and indeed often had, especially in poetry, a connotation of violence or destruction, 'to devour, to consume' (Bosworth & Toller, s.v. *swelgan* III; Orchard, 2022a: s.v. *swelgan*), even more so in combination with the intensive or pejorative prefix *for-* (*DOE*, s.v. *for-swelgan*; Orchard, 2022a: s.v. *for-swelgan*). Notably, *for-swelgan* often occurs in glosses or in Old English translations of Latin texts, including the Scripture, to render Latin verbs such as *deuorare* 'to swallow, gulp down, devour', *urere* 'to burn, destroy by fire', and *uorare* 'to swallow up, devour' (*DOE*, s.v. *for-swelgan* 1.c). Particularly pertinent is the use of the present participle of *for-swelgan*, *forswelgend*, as *interpretamentum* of Lat. *grassatrix* 'one who destroys', itself used adjectivally in a passage of the prose treatise *De uirginitate* by Aldhelm of Malmesbury († 709 or 710) which describes the resurrection of a corpse, ravaged by the Parches's devastating atrocity (*grassatrix atrocitas*), from the *door* of death (*de porta mortis*) (*De uirginitate. Prosa* XXVI, Ehwald, 1919: 261 ll. 4-7; Gwara, 2001: 328; Goossens, 1974: 2171; Napier, 1900: 1, 2209). It is also interesting that the related noun (*ge-*)*swelg*/*-swelh*, 'abyss, gulf, chasm, whirpool', clearly signifies an underground setting (Bosworth & Toller: ss.vv. *geswelg* and *swelg*).

In sum, in a literary and visual culture with a keen and «pervasive sense of analogy» (Clemoes, 1995: 94) such as that of pre-Conquest England, the time-honoured mouth-door metaphor, as well as the imagery of the devouring monster in an eschatological setting, whether Christian or pagan, unsurprisingly paved the way to the hybridisation or amalgamation between a monstrous maw and an entrance, a devouring

monster and a hellish locale. Furthermore, the mouth is not just a means and/or a place of torment, but it also suggests the activity of speaking and story-telling[9]: «narrative, in the form of bodies, texts, and voices, emerges from [the hell-mouth], rumbling up from the belly of hell, anatomy also strongly suggestive of one of the places where one holds memory» (Novacich, 2017: 136-160, esp. 147). Significantly, two of the earliest literary attestations of the demonic devouring monsters are in two of the earliest narrative texts of pre-Conquest England, the foundational Old English epic poem *Beowulf* (see above, n. 4) and the Anglo-Latin *Vita S. Guthlaci*, the corner-stone of arguably the most prolific hagiographic tradition of an early English saint both in Latin and the vernacular (Gordon Whatley, 2001; Di Sciacca, 2022).

3. *Beowulf vs the* mūð-bona

Being swallowed and then spat out by a monster is a form of initiation ritual which has been transposed in numerous myths (Propp, 1984: 131; Radermacher, 1906). Influential tales of classical mythology feature heroes that feed themselves to their monstrous opponent in order to kill him from within. Such is the case with Perseus and Heracles in their strikingly similar feats to free Andromeda and Hesione from their respective sea-monster (Ogden, 2008: 67-99; 2013: 118-129). Other possible classical antecedents include Jason confronting the Serpent of Colchis to gain the Golden Fleece or Menestratus tearing apart the dragon that plagued the city of Thespiae thanks to the fishhooks covering his breastplate (Ogden, 2008: 63-65; 2013: 58-63 and 65-66).

In *Beowulf* the swallowing imagery occurs five times. In three occasions, it refers to fire as a potential threat to the magnificence and firmness of Heorot, the hall of the Danes («nymþe līġes fæþm / swulge on swaþule», ll. 781b-782a: ‘unless the embrace of fire should swallow it in swathing flame’)[10], or as a ravaging element engulfing the bodies of the dead warriors on the funeral pyre («lāðbite [līġes]; [līċ] eall

[9] Cf. above Isidore’s definition of *os*, 323. It has been pointed out, however, that Old English poetry mostly specifies the chest as the source of utterance and as the centre of verbal activity, rather than the mouth (Jager, 1990).

[10] All quotations of *Beowulf* are from Fulk *et al.* (2008); translations are adapted from Tolkien (2014).

forwealg», l. 1122[11]: ‘the hateful bite of fire swallowed up the whole body’). Once again the image occurs in a funeral scene, the very one concerning the eponymous hero and concluding the poem, only this time it is the sky that swallows the smoke billowing from Beowulf’s pyre («Heofon rēċe swealg», l. 3155b: ‘heaven swallowed the smoke’).

The swallower *par excellence* of *Beowulf*, however, is Grendel, the first major monster of the poem, whose cannibalism is his most distinctive mode of attack[12], as well as his most terrifying trait (Lapidge, 1993; Orchard, 2003a: 189-191). In particular, in his final attack on Heorot before the fatal encounter with Beowulf, Grendel’s carnage climaxes in his greedily swallowing up the blood of his victims in gargantuan (or sinful: Robinson, 1993: 143-144) gulps: «blōd ēdrum dranc / synsnædum swealh» (ll. 742b-743a, ‘drank blood from veins, swallowed great/sinful gobbets’). The drinking of blood must have been considered as the ultimate form of cannibalism, as blood was reckoned to be the seat of the soul; hence, the «almost obsessive concern with [the] drinking of blood» in pre-Conquest England (Robinson, 1993: 144-146, esp. 144; Orchard, 2003a: 140-142). Grendel’s blood-tooth (*bona blōdiġtōð*, l. 2082a, ‘murderer with bloody tooth’) contributes to the definitely heathen and devilish connotation of his monstrosity, which is repeatedly expressed by epithets such as *Godes andsaca* (ll. 786b and 1682b, ‘adversary of God’) and *fēond mancynnes*/*mancynnes fēond* (ll. 164b and 1276a, ‘fiend of mankind’), which equate Grendel with the devil, since the devil can first and foremost be denoted as the adversary *par excellence* of God and mankind (Di Sciacca, 2018: 219-221). Indeed, Grendel is also forthrightly called *deofol* (l. 1680, ‘devil’), itself ultimately a loanword from Greek διάβολος ‘slanderer, enemy’ (Liddel & Scott, 1996: s.v.), with his minions referred to as *dēofla ġedræġ* (l. 756a, ‘throng of devils’). Moreover, Grendel is also explicitly said to be a creature of hell, that is *fēond on helle* (l. 101b, ‘a fiend of hell’)[13], *helrūn*[*a*] (l. 163a, ‘sorcerer of hell’), *helle hæfton* (l.

[11] I am here following Tolkien’s emendation (Tolkien, 2014: 117-118).

[12] On cannibalism in early medieval English literature and in the texts of the *Beowulf* manuscript in particular, see Blurton (2007: 15-58). Interestingly, cannibalism is also the most distinctive monstrous trait of the Mermedonians, the antagonists of St Andrew in *Andreas*, the Old English poem which demonstrably shares the most parallels with *Beowulf*: see at least Powell (2002) and Orchard (2022b: 213-233).

[13] It has been suggested, however, that here *hell* should be emended to *healle*: Bammesberger (2006: 20-22).

788a, ‘hell’s captive’), and *helle gāst* (l. 1274a, ‘spirit of hell’)[14]. And to hell Grendel returns when he dies («þær him hel onfēng», l. 852b: ‘there hell received him’).

This hellish creature in his rage tears open the door of Heorot, metaphorically described as the mouth of the building («onbræd þā bealohydiġ, ðā (hē ġe)bolgen wæs, / reċedes mūþan», ll. 723a-724a: ‘then the evil minded, because he was enraged, wrenched wide the mouth of the house’). What is more, Grendel will eventually be presented by Beowulf, reporting about his Danish exploits to the Geatish king Hygelac, as the mouth-slayer swallowing up the whole body of Hrothgar’s beloved thane Hondscioh («him Grendel wearð, / mærum maguþeġne tō mūðbonan, / lēofes mannes līċ eall forswealg», ll. 2078b-2080b: ‘to him [Hondscioh], the famous young thane, Grendel became the mouth-slayer, swallowed up the whole body of the dear man’). The compound *mūð-bona* is even more significant in that it is a hapax legomenon. The head of the compound, *bana*/*bona* ‘bane, killer, slayer’, occurs around 50 times in the Old English corpus, with a disproportionate frequency in poetry (*DOE*: s.v.; Orchard, 2022a: s.v.); in particular, exclusive of poetry is the meaning ‘the Devil’ or ‘devil’, and around a third of the poetic occurrences are in this sense (*DOE*: s.v. *bana* a).

In *Beowulf*, *bana*/*bona* occurs in total twelve times. Twice it denotes Grendel, that is at line 158b and at the above-mentioned line 2082a (*bona blōdiġtōð*). Once it denotes another major monster of the poem, namely the dragon (l. 2824b), and once it signifies what in Hrothgar’s sermon (Orchard, 2003a: 155-162) may be taken as the Devil or a devil that shoots tempting arrows at a man when the guardian of his soul (*sāwele hyrde*) is asleep (ll. 1741b-1744b) (North, 1991: 20-21; Di Sciacca, 2023c: 280-286). Otherwise *bana*/*bona* signifies *human* slayers, both named and unnamed human characters of the poem (ll. 587b, 1102b, 1968a, 2053a, 2485b, and 2613b; see below, 329-330). Finally, twice *bana*/*bona* means the inanimate objects, namely swords, that cause death (ll. 2203b and 2506b).

There are another four compounds in *bana*/*bona* featuring in *Beowulf* which are relevant to this discussion. The first is *ecg-bana* ‘slayer with

[14] On the apparent ambiguity between a corporeal and incorporeal or spiritual Grendel, see Kaske (1971: 424-426). Sometimes, however, *gāst* ‘spirit, ghost’ as an epithet for Grendel is attested with the spelling *gæst* (see ll. 102a, 2073b, and 2312a), which could either stand for ‘spirit’ (with long root vowel) or for ‘guest’ (with short root-vowel), as both are metrically equivalent: see Hoops (1931: 29-30).

the sword' (*DOE*: s.v.; Orchard, 2022a: s.v.); it occurs at l. 1262a and like *mūð-bona*, denoting Grendel, it is a hapax legomenon which refers to Cain as the slayer of his own brother. Secondly, *feorh-bona* 'life-slayer, killer, murderer' is a rare word, occurring in total seven times in the corpus, exclusively in poetry and glosses (*DOE*: s.v.; Orchard, 2022a: s.v.); in *Beowulf* it occurs once (l. 2465) and signifies Hæthcyn, a Geatish prince and brother of king Hygelac, who accidentally kills his own brother Herebeald. Thirdly, *gāst-bona* 'soul-slayer, devil' (l. 177a) (*DOE*: s.v.; Orchard, 2022a: s.v.) is a hapax, like *ecg-bona*, meaning Cain, and *mūð-bona*, meaning Grendel, and signifies the Devil. Finally, *hand-bona*/*hand-bana* 'hand-slayer, killer' is unique to *Beowulf*, where it occurs three times in total, referring to Ecgtheow, Beowulf's father (l. 460b), Grendel's mother (l. 1330b), and Beowulf himself (l. 2502a) (*DOE*: s.v.; Orchard, 2022a: s.v.).

Notably, *bana*/*bona* and its compounds can be said to have a definite negative denotation, as they signify the three major monsters of the poem, Grendel (*bana/bona*, ll. 158b and 2082a; and *mūð-bona*, l. 2079b), his mother (*hand-bana*, l. 1330b), and the dragon (*bona*, l. 2824b), as well as Cain (*ecg-bana*, l. 1262a) and the Devil (or a devil) (*bona*, l.1743b, and *gāst-bona*, l. 177a). However, they also refer to humans. Admittedly, at least twice *bana* refers to two somewhat shady characters of the poem. The former is Unferth (*bana*, l. 587b), a senior thane of Hrothgar's who provocatively questions Beowulf's prowess upon the hero's arrival at Heorot, but is effectively rebuffed by Beowulf who reminds Unferth of the fratricide he has committed (Nagy, 1996). The latter is Hygelac (*bona*, l. 1968a), king of the Geats and Beowulf's own maternal uncle, whose personality, deeds, and indeed very name have come across as ambiguous and been subject to divergent interpretations (Di Sciacca, 2023d: 84-90). In another two instances, *bana*/*bona* and its compound *hand-bona* signify two characters both associated with Beowulf, namely Ecgtheow, Beowulf's own father (*hand-bona*, l. 460b), and Wēohstān (*bana*, l. 2613b), the father of Wiglaf, Beowulf's nephew and devoted retainer who will prove crucial in his ultimate fight against the dragon. If for no other reason than their familial relationship with the very eponymous hero of the poem, these two figures should have a positive allure. In fact, however, they both commit murders that risk to drag the Geats into bloody and lengthy feuds with neighbouring tribes. Ecgtheow slays a member of the Wylfingas and is exiled by his own people, scared of the war he triggered, until Hrothgar comes to help and settles the feud by paying the wergild. As to Wēohstān, he kills

Eanmund, a nephew of the Swedish king Onela, who, however, chooses not to pursue the feud. Ultimately, Beowulf himself, in his capacity as avenger of Hygelac's killer, is styled as *hand-bona* (l. 2502a).

In sum, *bana*/*bona* and its compounds signify both the human and the monster, the hero and his antagonists. Such an ambivalent usage further shows the permeability between these categories, which is one of the most distinctive, if disturbing and insightful, traits of the representation of monstrosity in *Beowulf* (Orchard, 2003a: 187-202; 2003b: 28-57). This permeability also signals the ever impending threat of human degeneration into the monstrous. In particular, what brings about monstrous deformity – both moral and physical – of humankind is murder, the most heinous crime that rekindles the primaeval feud initiated by Cain with his murder of Abel, significantly evoked at the beginning of the poem (ll. 104b-114b) (Clemoes, 1995: 38-39). Such a feud is twofold, that is it is a feud between God and mankind (or the depraved part of it), as well as one within humankind itself, because after God's outlawing of Cain, he and his kin – his fellow murderers – were exiled from human society and «in a murderous state of feud with [it] (ll. 151b-154a)» (Clemoes, 1995: 38).

Thus, the Danish thane Unferth and the Geatish prince Hæthcyn are, albeit implicitly, part of this ongoing feud and ultimately associated with Cain, since all three of them are fratricides, as well as *bana*s (*bana*, *feorh-bona*, and *ecg-bana*, respectively), so much so that Beowulf explicitly predicts that Unferth will end up in hell for his killing («þæs þū in helle scealt / werhðo drēogan», ll. 588b-589a: 'for that you shall suffer damnation in hell'). As to Grendel, the *bana* and *mūð-bona*, his association with both Cain, the *ecg-bana* (Orchard, 2003a: 137-140), and the Devil, the *bona* and *gāst-bona*, is made unequivocally and repeatedly explicit.

In sum, a number of factors about Grendel – his descent from Cain, his demonic nature and hellish associations, his cannibalism, and last but not least his being styled as a *mūð-bona*, 'mouth-slayer', and *bona blōdiġ-tōð*, 'blood-toothed slayer' – all contribute to make him a veritable literary precursor of the devouring hell-mouth.

4. *Guthlac and the* tartari fauces

A devouring hell-mouth apparently features in the *Vita S. Guthlaci* (*VSG*) (BHL 3723; CPL 2150; Colgrave, 1956), a text which seems to be contemporary with *Beowulf* and to share with the poem a similar context of composition, as the origin of both texts has been associated with Mercian royal circles in the first half of the eighth century (see below, 334-336).

The *VSG* is the comprehensive account of the life of St Guthlac (*c*. 674-714), attributed to the elusive Felix and dated to 713×749 (Sharpe, 2001: 296; Di Sciacca, 2022: 184-187). Guthlac was a successful Mercian warlord of aristocratic descent, who eventually joined the double monastery of Repton, Derbyshire. After two years of monastic training there, Guthlac finally withdrew to Crowland, a demon-infested islet (in fact, a promontory linked to the mainland by a gravel ridge), in the fenland marking the border between the Mercian and East Anglian kingdoms. In Crowland Guthlac spent the last fifteen years of his life as an anchorite, attracting attention from the most prominent ranks of society, as well as becoming the subject of rapidly growing popular devotion. Like the Desert Fathers, whose hagiographies have been ranked among the vast array of sources underlying the *VSG* (Downey, 2004: 25-66; Di Sciacca, 2022: 186-187), Guthlac suffers manifold attacks from demons, the most fearsome of which is when a throng of devils carries him through the skies to the gates of hell and threatens to throw him in until St Bartholomew comes to his rescue (*VSG* xxxi, Colgrave, 1956: 100-107).

Now, the gates of hell that threaten to swallow Guthlac are defined as «nefandae tartari fauces», ‘the abominable jaws of hell’ (Colgrave, 1956: 104, l. 14) and the throng of devils surrounding the saint tries to terrify him by pointing out to him the bowels of Styx, eager to devour Guthlac, and the hot gulfs of Acheron agape with fearful jaws («nunc Stigiae fibrae te vorare malunt, tibi quoque aestivi Acherontis voragines horrendis faucibus hiscunt») (Colgrave, 1956: 106, ll. 6-8)[15]. Thereby the metaphor of indigestion is indeed employed in the text (cf. above, 320). Notably, the same tableau is also attested in three texts of the Old

[15] Earlier on in the *VSG*, Guthlac’s arrival at Crowland and his taking up eremitic life there is described as his leaving ‘the black jaws of this declining world to the struggle for eternal bliss’ («de atris vergentis mundi faucibus ad perpetuae beatitudinis militiam»): Colgrave (1956: § xxvii, 92, ll. 11-12, trans. at 93).

English Guthlac corpus, namely the poem *Guthlac A* (Roberts, 1979: 83-107) and the two prose texts Vercelli Homily xxiii (Scragg, 1992: 381-394) and the so-called *Vespasian Life* (Gonser, 1909), all derivative, though not always straightforwardly, from the *VSG* (Roberts, 2014; Gordon Whatley, 2001: 246-247; Hall, 2007: 208-210). However, in these three vernacular versions, the entrance to hell is not couched in any oral or gastric metaphor but literally defined as 'hell-door' (*heldor*: *Guthlac A*, l. 559b[16]; *helle duru*: *Vespasian Life*, § 5, ll. 185 and 217, and Vercelli Homily xxiii, ll. 122 and 134). In the Old English poem *Guthlac B*, which deals with Guthlac's illness and final moments (roughly corresponding with § l of the *VSG*) (Roberts, 1979: 108-124), and does not include the scene of the devils' threat to plunge Guthlac into hell, the moment of death is described as that cruel time when the door to the otherworld suddenly opens to man («ac him duru sylfa / on þa sliðnan tid sona ontyneð, / ingong geopenað», ll. 991b-993a: 'in that cruel moment the door suddenly opens itself to him, showing its entrance').

In the *VSG* the dramatic attack of the devils' throng on St Guthlac is preceded by a detailed description of the demonic creatures, very impressionistic both visually and aurally (Colgrave, 1956: 102, ll. 6-17):

> Erant enim aspectu truces, forma terribiles, capitibus magnis, collis longis, macilenta facie, lurido vultu, squalida barba, auribus hispidis, fronte torva, trucibus oculis, ore foetido, dentibus equineis, gutture flammivomo, faucibus tortis, labro lato, vocibus horrisonis, comis obustis, buccula crassa, pectore arduo, femoribus scabris, genibus nodatis, cruribus uncis, talo tumido, plantis aversis, ore patulo, clamoribus raucisonis. Ita enim inmensis vagitibus horrescere audiebantur, ut totam paene a caelo in terram intercapedinem clangisonis boatibus inplerent.
>
> 'For they were ferocious in appearance, terrible in shape with great heads, long necks, thin faces, yellow complexions, filthy beards, shaggy ears, wild foreheads, fierce eyes, foul mouths, horses' teeth, throats vomiting flames, twisted jaws, thick lips, strident voices, singed hair, fat cheeks, pigeon breasts, scabby thighs, knotty knees, crooked legs, swollen ankles, splay feet, spreading mouths, raucous cries. For they grew so terrible to hear

[16] Note that the swallowing up imagery in the poem does not concern hell or the devil(s), but fire (ll. 192b-193b: «byrnan sceolde / 7 his lichoman, lig forswelgan» 'and the flame would burn his body, swallow it up'), or it signifies the absorption of wisdom on the part of men (ll. 763a-764a: «Wile† se waldend þæt we wisdom a / snyttrum swelgen», 'The Ruler wishes that we always and prudently swallow up his wisdom').

> with their mighty shriekings that they filled almost the whole intervening space between earth and heaven with their discordant bellowings'. (Colgrave, 1956: 103)

Notably, among the many graphic details, quite a few concern the deformed and grotesque maw of the devils, although no explicit mention is made of any voraciousness on their part. Indeed, their abnormal and terrifying jaws rather than swallowing putative victims are depicted as vomiting flames. In turn, the description of the Latin source-text is rendered quite closely in the two prose vernacularisations of the *VSG*, the *Vespasian Life* (§ v; Gonser, 1909: 128 ll. 111-128) and Vercelli Homily xxiii (Scragg, 1992: 388-389 ll. 92-101). In particular, both Old English versions attest to the details of the devils' horrible mouths, with equine teeth and flame-emitting throats. Interestingly, in the *VSG*, Guthlac coolly rebuffs the devils' threats by calling their bluff about their supposed power to deliver him to hell and addressing them as *semen Cain*, 'seed of Cain' (Colgrave, 1956: 106, l. 11, and 186)[17], thereby echoing Grendel's genealogy.

5. *The Repton Stone*

An iconographic parallel to the *tartari fauces* and hybrid devilish monsters of the *VSG*, as well as to the cannibalistic Grendel, has been pinpointed in the carving on face B of the Repton Stone. This is the upper shaft of what must originally have been a standing cross stone sculptured on all four faces, unearthed at Repton in 1979 (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985). Today only the broad front face (A) and the right-hand narrow face (B) show discernible carvings. Whereas face A represents a high-status warrior, riding a stallion (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 241-246 and 254-273), face B shows a hybrid monster, with the body of a coiling snake and a big human head intent on devouring the (smaller) heads of two humans locked in an embrace (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 246-250 and 273-279). As it stands, the B-face monster looks like a hybrid creature consisting of two elements. Above, the prominent head, located centrally at the top of the stone, has been traced to «a Celtic (or celticizing) penchant for placing a human head high on the decoration of a pillar, stela or manuscript

[17] This detail seems unparalleled in the Old English Guthlac texts.

panel» (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 274-275, 277, 280, and 286-287, esp. 277). Centrally and below, the reptile coil can be put down to the early English «delight into plant-scrolls, interlace and interlocked faunal ornament» (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 277). (Notably, in the last demonic assault on St Guthlac as described in the *VSG*, a host of devils storm into the saint's barrow taking up the shape of various beasts, including that of a serpent rearing its scaly neck: «Coluber quoque, squamea colla porrigens» [Colgrave, 1956: § xxxvi, 114, ll. 17-18, and 186-187])[18].

According to Biddle and Kjølbye Biddle, «the most likely interpretation» of the Repton Stone B-face monster seems to be that it represents the hell-mouth swallowing the damned (1985: 278). While this interpretation has been challenged on the grounds that it has no iconographic parallels (Neuman de Vegvar, 2008: 177), it would instead be corroborated by the analogues between the Repton Stone devouring monster and the *VSG*, a text which features the *tartari fauces* and which seems to share the same milieu of composition as the Repton carving. Although much is unknown about Felix, he must have been a monk and spent at least a substantial portion of his life in England, presumably in East Anglia, since the *VSG* is dedicated to the East Anglian King Ælfwald (*c.* 713-749), whom Felix addresses as *dominus meus* (Colgrave, 1956: 16 and 60, l. 1; Grossi, 2020). According to *VSG* §§ xlviii and l, Ælfwald's sister, the abbess Ecgburh, was in touch with Guthlac, and this familial connection with the saint may have been the reason of Ælfwald's commission to Felix (Colgrave, 1956: 146-149 and 150-161)[19]. Guthlac himself, a Mercian aristocrat, took his vows at Repton, a Middle Saxon royal foundation with links also to the Mercian royal house (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 2014), and Crowland, the site of his hermitage, lay in the fenland area between the Mercian and East Anglian kingdoms.

As to the Repton Stone, the historical context to which it has been traced is that of eighth-century Mercia, in particular the height of the reign of Æthelbald (716-757) (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 279-290; Keynes, 2014a), who represents yet another important *trait d'union* between Guthlac and Repton. Æthelbald was a devotee of the saint,

[18] On the late antique and early medieval understanding of the devil as a shape-shifting, proteiform creature, see at least Almond (2014: 111-117).

[19] According to the twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis*, Ecgburh was abbess of Repton, Guthlac's own motherhouse, but this is «probably pure guess-work»: Meaney (2001: 30-31); cf. Roberts (1979: 5; 2001: 70).

visiting him at Crowland and eventually embellishing Guthlac's shrine (Colgrave, 1956: 6-7, 15-16, 19, 40, 131, 139, 176, and 188; Roberts, 2001: 76)[20], and, on the other hand, the king was buried at Repton, itself not a Mercian foundation, but then Æthelbald can be considered as a sort of Southumbrian overlord, whose authority extended well beyond his own Mercian kingdom (Keynes, 2014a)[21]. The dating of the Repton Stone to Æthelbald's reign would make it contemporary with the *VSG* (713×749), as well as the earliest English attestation of the hell-mouth in the visual arts[22]. Thus the combined evidence of the B-face monster of the Repton Stone and the *tartari fauces* of the *VSG*, the foundational hagiography of a Repton (and Mercian) saint, suggests that «a devouring mouth was probably a familiar image of hell in Reptonian [Mercian?] circles in the first half of the eighth century» (Clemoes, 1995: 65).

Indeed, besides the cannibalistic monster on face B of the Repton Stone, also the riding figure on face A has been associated with Guthlac in that the triumphant Repton warrior might be identified with the aristocratic warlord turned into the exemplary *miles Christi*, fully embodying the antagonistic route to salvation outlined by St Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians 7:11-17 (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 272-273 and 284; Colgrave, 1956: §§ x and xxvii, 78-79 and 90-91). However, it has been concluded that the A-face carving more likely represents a lay figure of royal status, who has been identified with the above-mentioned Mercian king Æthelbald (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 279-290). The A-face rider is a complex, syncretic creation, resulting from the blend of diverse traditions, such as those which might

[20] Æthelbald's interaction with Guthlac is the subject of much of the so-called Guthlac Roll (Roberts, 1970: 208).

[21] During its history, the boundaries of Mercia shifted considerably; in particular, during the so-called Mercian supremacy of the eighth century, the toponym 'Mercia' came to be loosely applied to the greater part of midland England: Keynes (2014b: 312). On the Mercian supremacy, see the classic study by Stenton (1918); see also Brown & Farr (2001); Hill & Worthington (2005) and Naismith (2017).

[22] In view of Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle's dating of the Repton Stone, the B-face devouring monster would predate the late-eighth- or early-ninth-century ivory panel (now in the Victoria and Albert Museum) carved with the earliest known representation in the West of the Last Judgement and, more relevantly for this discussion, featuring the profile of a head swallowing the head of one of the damned. This carving has been alternatively considered of English (Beckwith, 1972: 22-24, ills. 1 and 16) and Continental origin (Goldschmidt *et al*., 1914: 85; Alexander, 1999: 48 and 61, n. 17). However, the hell-mouth of the carving has unanimously been recognised as anthropomorphic, that is a personification of Hades (Beckwith, 1972: 22; Neuman de Vegvar, 2008: 177-178).

be expected to have circulated in the composite milieu of eighth-century Mercia (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 279-287; see also above, n. 21). In particular, the influences detectable in the Repton rider are at least three, namely the late Roman imperial iconography, revealed in the general pose of the riding warrior; Celtic elements detectable in the moustache and the shield; last but not least, Germanic aristocratic fashion evident in the mount, mail-shirt, and, especially, the offensive weaponry (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 241-246, 254-273, and 284-286). The latter consists of a distinctive two-item set: a broad, two-edged sword, which the rider wields in his right hand, and a *seax* or *scrama-seax*, a single-edged short sword or dagger, hanging on his left hip. The sword-*seax* combination «seems […] to represent an aristocratic, Germanic, perhaps specifically Frankish, fashion, adopted [by the English aristocracy under Continental influence] at the earliest in the second half of the seventh century and probably not before the eighth» (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 271). Eventually, the *seax* of the kind carried by the Repton rider may have been out of fashion already in the ninth century (Biddle & Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 282).

Besides its import as a dating element, the sword-*seax* set is also relevant to this discussion for its echoes of *Beowulf*. In the poem the hero's offensive gear in his ultimate confrontation with the dragon consists of the sword *Nægling* and a *wæl-seax*, 'slaughter-knife, deadly blade' (a hapax: Bosworth & Toller, s.v.; Orchard, 2022a, s.v.), which will indeed prove decisive in the dragon-fight as it is by this *seax* that Beowulf will dispatch his last monstrous antagonist (ll. 2702b-2705a) (Brady, 1979: 95). Thus, if *Beowulf* can really be dated to the first half of the eighth century in Mercia and therefore be considered contemporary with both the *VSG* and the Repton Stone – admittedly a rather big 'if' –, «the correspondence of Beowulf's weapon-set to the arms of the Repton rider is of more than passing interest» (Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle, 1985: 282) and would suggest a shared milieu, apparently to be located in early eighth-century Mercia. In this literary and iconographic context, both military kingship, as embodied by Beowulf and the Repton rider, and militant sanctity, as embodied by Guthlac, seem to have implied physical and/or spiritual confrontation with monstrous antagonists. And being devoured by blood-thirsty, deformed mouths seems to have been a typical act of such a confrontation, while its ultimate destination seems to have been a hell snatching and swallowing both monsters and monstrous humans alike.

6. *Conclusions*

The success of the hell-mouth imagery can be put down to what we may call its conceptual accessibility, given the immemorial connection between doors and mouths, on the one hand, and between the act of swallowing and violent destruction or gory torture, on the other. The medieval zoomorphic hell-mouth was to take many forms – gaping, toothy, fiery, located on a face that may be *kētos*-like, feline, lupine, but monstrous anyway –, and was to be represented through many media – manuscripts, stone reliefs or ivory carvings, eventually in frescoes, pieced in glass or as dramaturgical device in mystery plays. Whatever the form and the medium, however, the hell-mouth opens a threshold between this world and the next, the living and the dead, the present and the past or the future, suggesting the porous relationship between these categories, just as porous and shifting is the relationship between the human and the monstrous in *Beowulf* or between the secular aristocratic warriorship of the past and the Christian militancy of the present and future in the *VSG* (Weston, 2016).

Indeed, the very milieu which has been put forward as the original cradle of the monstrous hell-mouth is that of a transitioning culture, balancing «the accumulated intelligence, wisdom, sympathies and values [of] Germanic forerunners of centuries past [with] the "new" intellectual learning of the church» (Clemoes, 1995: 67). The coming together of such diverse traditions and influences can be consistent with eighth-century Mercia, with which all the three works of art discussed in this paper, *Beowulf*, the *VSG*, and the Repton Stone, can be associated.

All of the above does not necessarily imply an absolute English primacy and exclusivity, which would be hazardous to push for, given the long-standing and commonplace character of the hell-mouth imagery. As has been demonstrated, early medieval Ireland was home to one variant of the mouth-of-hell iconography, the lionhead with a human head in its teeth[23], which, first attested in eighth-century Irish metalwork, especially door handles, will eventually spread widely on the Continent

[23] For a convenient survey of the lion in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, see Neuman de Vegvar (2008: 181-182) and Di Sciacca (2019a: 58-60). Interestingly, the monstrous hell-mouth in the Harrowing of Hell scene of the Tiberius Psalter (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. vi; *s.* xi$^{3/4}$, prob. mid-1060s, Winchester, OM?) has pronounced leonine traits: see Gneuss & Lapidge (2014: no. 378). The illustration of the Harrowing of Hell is at fol. 14*r*: see Openshaw (1989: 19-22) and Bradley (2008: 237-238).

and in the British Isles in the Romanesque period (Neuman de Vegvar, 2008). Rather than advocating a priority of England or Ireland, the two parallel but distinct articulations of the hell-mouth formulated in the two countries should be seen as further testimony to the highly syncretic and imaginative eschatology and cosmology of the Insular world in the early Middle Ages, as well as of their impactful contribution to the visualization of the afterlife in the medieval West and beyond (Wright, 1993). While «a critical mass of textual [and] iconographic source material was available in Ireland by the eighth or ninth century to permit the evolution of leonine hell-mouth imagery» (Neuman de Vegvar, 2008: 186), in pre-Conquest England the syncretic blending of diverse elements – antique, Germanic, Celtic, pagan and Judaeo-Christian – into the monstrous hell-mouth imagery was ultimately underlain by the distinctive interaction between the early English thought-world and the linguistic system. That is to say, the interaction between the «way of perceiving and understanding the make-up of the individual and of the outside world» (Clemoes, 1995: 66) and the way of encoding such an understanding by means of metaphorical substitution and hybridization ultimately facilitated the coalescence of different components into what was to become a veritable literary and figurative topos of the Western Middle Ages. Indeed, as the literary, lexical, and iconographic evidence discussed has hopefully shown, such an innate mode of interaction produced the first literary and figurative specimens of the monstrous mouth of hell already in eighth-century England, that is much earlier than previously thought on the basis of the iconographic evidence afforded by the illustrated Psalters or of the literary evidence provided by the Old English homiletic and hagiographic prose.

References

Adams, N. (2015). Between Myth and Reality: Hunter and Prey in Anglo-Saxon Art. In M.D.J. Bintley & T.J.T. Williams (eds.), *Representing Beasts in Early Medieval England and Scandinavia*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 13-52.

Alexander, J.J.G. (1999). The Last Things: Representing the Unrepresentable. The Medieval Tradition. In F. Carey (ed.), *The Apocalypse and the Shape of Things to Come*. London: British Museum, 43-98.

Almond, P.C. (2014). *The Devil: A New Biography*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Backhouse, J., Turner, D.H., & Webster, L. (eds.). (1984). *The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art 966-1066*. London: British Museum Press.

Bailey, R.N. (1988). Gosforth 01. In *The Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*, vol. 2. <https://chacklepie.com/ascorpus/catvol2.php?pageNum_urls=90>

Bammesberger, A. (2006). Eight Notes on the *Beowulf* Text. In J. Walmsley (ed.), *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*. Oxford: Blackwell, 19-37.

Barney, S.A., Lewis, W.J., Beach, J.A., & Berghof, O. (trans.) (2005). *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barstad, H.M. (1998). Sheol. In K. van der Torn, B. Becking & P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (2nd ed.). Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 768-770.

Battaglia, M. (2021). *Snorri Sturluson: Edda*. Testi del medioevo germanico, 4. Milano: Meltemi.

Bazire, J., & Cross, J.E. (eds.). (1982). *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*. Toronto Old English Series, 7. Toronto/Buffalo, NY: University of Toronto Press.

Beckwith, J. (1972). *Ivory Carvings in Early Medieval England*. London: Miller & Medcalf.

Biddle, M., & Kjølbye-Biddle, B. (1985). The Repton Stone. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 14, 233-292.

Biddle, M., & Kjølbye-Biddle, B. (2014). Repton. In M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes & D. Scragg (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 401-403.

Blurton, H. (2007). *Cannibalism in High Medieval English Literature*. The New Middle Ages. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bosworth & Toller = *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of Joseph Bosworth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1881-1898. With a *Supplement by T. Northcote Toller with Revised and Enlarged Addenda by Alistair Campbell*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921.

Bradley, J. (2008). *'You Shall Surely Not Die': The Concepts of Sin and Death as Expressed in the Manuscript Art of Northwestern Europe, c. 800-1200* (2 vols.). Library of the Written Word, 4. The Manuscript World, 2. Leiden: Brill.

Brady, C. (1979). 'Weapons' in *Beowulf*: An Analysis of the Nominal Compounds and an Evaluation of the Poet's Use of Them. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 8, 79-141.

Bremmer, J.N. (1998). Hades. In K. van der Torn, B. Becking & P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (2nd ed.). Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 382-383.

Brown, M.P., & Farr, C.A. (eds.). (2001). *Mercia: An Anglo-Saxon Kingdom in Europe*. Studies in the Early History of Europe. London/New York, NY: Leicester University Press.

Chaganti, S. (2020). Vestigial Signs: Inscription, Performance and *The Dream of the Rood*. *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 125 (1), 48-72.

Clemoes, P. (1995). *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo Saxon England, 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Colgrave, B. (ed. & trans.). (1956). *Felix's Life of St. Guthlac*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cramp, R. (1984). Rothbury 01. In *The Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*, vol. 1. <https://chacklepie.com/ascorpus/catvol1.php?pageNum_urls=458>

Cramp, R. (1988). Great Clifton. In *The Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*, vol. 2. <https://chacklepie.com/ascorpus/catvol2.php?pageNum_urls=97>

Di Sciacca, C. (2018). Talk of the Devil: OE *Unhold* and Its Germanic Cognates. In C. Di Sciacca, C. Giliberto, C. Rizzo & L. Teresi (eds.), *Studies on Late Antique and Medieval Germanic Glossography and Lexicography in Honour of Patrizia Lendinara* (2 vols). Pisa: ETS, vol. I, 219-253.

Di Sciacca, C. (2019a). Feeding the Dragon. The Devouring Monster in Anglo-Saxon Eschatological Imagery. *SELIM – Journal of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*, 24, 53-104.

Di Sciacca, C. (2019b). The Old English Life of St Margaret in London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii. Sources and Relationships. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 118 (3), 354-388.

Di Sciacca, C. (2022). Felix Croylandensis mon., Vita sancti Guthlaci. In L. Castaldi & V. Mattaloni (eds.), *La trasmissione dei testi latini nel Medioevo / Medieval Latin Texts and Their Transmission*. Te.Tra VII. Millennio medievale, 123. Strumenti e studi n.s., 47. Firenze: SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 184-202.

Di Sciacca, C. (2023a). Feeding the Dragon: A Foreword. In C. Di Sciacca & A. Meregalli (eds.), *Feeding the Dragon: An Eschatological Motif in Medieval Europe*. di/segni, 44. Milano: Ledizioni, 19-37.

Di Sciacca, C. (2023b). *efne her is cumen an draca þe me sceal forswelgan*: Ælfric's Take on Gregory the Great's Swallowing Dragons. In C. Di Sciacca & A. Meregalli (eds.), *Feeding the Dragon: An Eschatological Motif in Medieval Europe*. di/segni, 44. Milano: Ledizioni, 57-104.

Di Sciacca, C. (2023c). *Beowulf* and St Michael: The Not-So-Odd Couple. In D. Bullitta (ed.), *Il culto micaelico nelle tradizioni germaniche medievali*. Bibliotheca Germanica, 58. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 245-300.

Di Sciacca, C. (2023d). *Liber monstrorun de diuersis generibus*. In L. Castaldi (ed.), *La trasmissione dei testi latini nel Medioevo / Medieval Latin Texts and Their Transmission*. Te.Tra VIII: *Opere anonime e pseudoepigrafe*. Millennio medievale 126. Strumenti e studi n.s. 49. Firenze: SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 67-116.

Di Sciacca, C. & Meregalli, A. (eds.). (2023). *Feeding the Dragon: An Eschatological Motif in Medieval Europe*. di/segni, 44. Milano: Ledizioni.

DOE = Cameron, A., Amos, A.C., diPaolo Healey, A. *et al.* (eds.). (2018). *Dictionary of Old English: A to I online*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project. <https://doe.artsci.utoronto.ca/>

Downey, S. (2004). *Intertextuality in the 'Lives of St Guthlac'*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto.

Edlich-Muth, M. (2014). Prosopopoeia: Sharpening the Anglo-Saxon Toolkit. *English Studies*, 95, 95–108.

Ehwald, R. (ed.). (1919). *Aldhelmus, De virginitate. I: Prosa*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores Antiquissimi, 15. Berlin: Weidmann, 229-323.

Fulk, R.D. (2021). Kennings in Old English Verse and in the Poetic Edda. *European Journal of Scandinavian Studies*, 51 (1), 69-91.

Fulk, R.D., Bjork, R., & Niles, J.D. (eds). (2008). *Klaeber's Beowulf and The fight at Finnsburg* (4th ed). Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Galpern, J. (1977). *The Shape of Hell in Anglo-Saxon England*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Gasti, F. (ed. & trans.). (2010). *Etimologie. Libro XI, de homine et portentis*. Auteurs latins du moyen âge, 20. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Gneuss, H., & Lapidge, M. (2014). *Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series, 15. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Goldschmidt, A., with Hübner, P.G., & Homburger, O. (1914). *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen aus der Zeit der karolingischen und sächsischen Kaiser*. Denkmäler der deutschen Kunst, 2. Sektion Plastik, 4. Abteilung. Berlin: Cassirer.

Gonser, P. (ed.) (1909). *Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des hl. Guthlac*. Anglistische Forschungen, 27. Heidelberg: Winter.

Goossens, L. (ed.). (1974). *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650 (Aldhelm's De laudibus virginitatis)*. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren, 74. Brussel: Paleis der Academiën.

Gordon Whatley, E. (2001). Guthlacus, Vita. In F.M. Biggs, Th.D. Hill, P.E. Szarmach & E. Gordon Whatley, with the assistance of D.A. Oosterhouse (eds.), *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture. Volume I: Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of Saint-Germain-de-Prés, and Acta Sanctorum*. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications. Western Michigan University, 244-247.

Grossi, J. (2020). Felix and His Kings. In J. Roberts & A. Thacker (eds.), *Guthlac: Crowland's Saint*. Donigton: S. Tyas, 157-179.

Gwara, S. (ed.). (2001). *Prosa de virginitate cum glosa latina atque anglosaxonica. Textus*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 124A. Turnhout: Brepols.

Hall, A. (2007). Constructing Anglo-Saxon Sanctity: Tradition, Innovation and Saint Guthlac. In D. Higgs Strickland (ed.), *Images of Sanctity: Essays in Honour of Gary Dickson*. Visualising the Middle Ages, 1. Leiden: Brill, 207-235.

Healey, J.F. (1998). Mot. In K. van der Torn, B. Becking, & P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (2nd ed.). Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 598-603.

Hill, D., & Worthington, M. (2005). *Æthelbald and Offa: Two Eighth-Century Kings of Mercia*. BAR British Series, 383. Oxford: BAR Publishing.

Hinton, D.A. (1974). *A Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork 700-1100 in the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum*. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum.

Hoops, J. (1931). *Beowulfstudien*. Anglistische Forschungen, 74. Heidelberg: Winter.

Howe, N. (1985). Aldhelm's *Enigmata* and Isidorian Etymology. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 14, 37-59.
Irvine, S. (ed.) (1993). *Old English Homilies from MS. Bodley 343*. Early English Text Society o.s., 302. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jager, E. (1990). Speech and the Chest in Old English Poetry: Orality or Pectorality? *Speculum*, 65 (4), 845-859.
Kaske, R.E. (1971). Beowulf and the Book of Enoch. *Speculum*, 46 (3), 421-431.
Ker, N.R. (1990). *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (original work published 1957)
Keynes, S. (2014a). Æthelbald. In M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes & D. Scragg (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 13-14.
Keynes, S. (2014b). Mercia. In M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes & D. Scragg (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 311-313.
Lapidge, M. (1993). *Beowulf* and the Psychology of Terror. In H. Damico & J. Leyerle (eds.), *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period: Studies in Honor of Jess B. Bessinger, Jr*. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications. Western Michigan University, 373–402.
Lapidge, M. (2000).The Archetype of *Beowulf*. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 29, 5-41.
Leigh, D. (1984). Ambiguity in Anglo-Saxon Style I Art. *Antiquaries Journal*, 64, 34-42.
Liddel, H.G., & Scott, R. (1996). *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Locherbie-Cameron, M.A. (ed.). (1998). *Ælfric's Old English Admonition to a Spiritual Son: an Edition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bangor University.
Mackauer, W. (1939). Orcus. In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung*. Stuttgart: Metzler, vol. XVIII (1), 908-928.
Malone, K. (1967). The Old English Period. In A.C. Baugh (ed.), *A Literary History of England* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 3-105.
Meaney, A.L. (2001). Felix's Life of St Guthlac: Hagiography and/or Truth. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, 90, 29-48.
Meissner, R. (1921). *Die Kenningar der Skalden. Ein Beitrag zur skaldischen Poetik*. Bonn/Leipzig: Schroeder.

Nagy, M.S. (1996). A Reassessment of Unferð's Fratricide in *Beowulf*. *Proceedings of the Medieval Association of the Mid-West*, 3, 15-30.
Naismith, R. (2017). The 'Mercian Supremacy' in the Age of Offa and Coenwulf. In R. Naismith (ed.), *Medieval European Coinage, vol. 8: Britain and Ireland c.400–1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 128-145.
Napier, A.S. (ed.). (1900). *Old English Glosses, Chiefly Unpublished*. Anecdota Oxonensia, I.11. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Neidorf, L. (ed.). (2014). *The Dating of* Beowulf*: A Reassessment*. Anglo-Saxon Studies, 24. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
Neuman de Vegvar, C. (2008).The Doors of His Face: Early Hell-Mouth Iconography in Ireland. In C.E. Karkov & H. Damico (eds.), *Aedificia Nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp*. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications. Western Michigan University, 176-197.
Niles, J.D. (2006). *Old English Enigmatic Poems and the Play of the Texts*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 13. Turnhout: Brepols.
North, R. (1991). *Pagan Words and Christian Meanings*. Costerus n.s., 81. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Novacich, S.E. (2017). *Shaping the Archive in Late Medieval England: History, Poetry and Performance*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ogden, D. (2008). *Perseus*. London/New York, NY: Routledge.
Ogden, D. (2013). *Drakōn: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Openshaw, K.M. (1989). The Battle Between Christ and Satan in the Tiberius Psalter. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 52, 14-33.
Orchard, A.P.M. (2002). *Cassell's Dictionary of Norse Myth and Legend*. London: Cassell.
Orchard, A.P.M. (2003a). *A Critical Companion to* Beowulf. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
Orchard, A.P.M. (2003b). *Pride and Prodigies*: *Studies in the Monsters of the Beowulf Manuscript*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. (original work published 1995)
Orchard, A.P.M. (ed. & trans.). (2021a). *The Old English and Anglo-Latin Riddle Tradition*. Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, 69. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
Orchard, A.P.M. (2021b). *A Commentary on the Old English and Anglo-Latin Riddle Tradition*. Supplements to the Dumbarton Oaks

Medieval Library. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

Orchard, A.P.M. (2022a). *Word-Hord: A Lexicon of Old English Verse, with a Particular Focus on the Nominal and Adjectival Compounds*. Consolidated Library of Anglo-Saxon Poetry (CLASP) Ancillary Publications, 1. Oxford: CLASP.

Orchard, A.P.M. (2022b). Parallels Between *Beowulf* and Some Old English Narrative Poems. In A.P.M. Orchard, *The Craft and Cunning of Anglo-Saxon Verse and Other Studies*. Consolidated Library of Anglo-Saxon Poetry (CLASP) Ancillary Publication, 3. Oxford: CLASP, 211-284.

Orel, V.E. (2003). *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden: Brill.

Orton, P. (1980). The Technique of Object-Personification in *The Dream of the Rood* and a Comparison with the Old English Riddles. *Leeds Studies in English*, 11, 1-18.

Pluskowski, A. (2003). Apocalyptic Monsters: Animal Inspirations for the Iconography of Medieval North European Devourers. In B. Bildhauer & R. Mills (eds.), *The Monstrous Middle Ages*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 155-176.

Powell, A.M. (2002). *Verbal Parallels in* Andreas *and its Relationship to* Beowulf *and Cynewulf*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Cambridge.

Propp, V. (1984). Ritual Laughter in Folklore (A Propos of the Tale of the Princess Who Would Not Laugh [Nesmejána]. In V. Propp, *The Theory and History of Folklore* (A. Liberman, ed.; A.Y. Martin & R.P. Martin, trans.). Theory and History of Literature, 5. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 124-146.

Radermacher, L. (1906). Wahlfischmythen. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 9, 248-252.

Roberts, J. (1970). An Inventory of Early Guthlac Materials. *Mediaeval Studies*, 32, 193-233.

Roberts, J. (ed.). (1979). *The Guthlac Poems of the Exeter Book*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Roberts, J. (2001). Hagiography and Literature: The Case of Guthlac of Crowland. In M.P. Brown & C.A. Farr (eds.), *Mercia: An Anglo-Saxon Kingdom in Europe*. Studies in the Early History of Europe. London/New York, NY: Leicester University Press, 69-86.

Roberts, J. (2014). Guthlac, St. In M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes & D. Scragg (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 227-228.

Robinson, F.C. (1993). Lexicography and Literary Criticism: A Caveat. In Id., *The Tomb of Beowulf and Other Essays on Old English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 140-152. (original work published 1970)
Rudolf, W. (2012). Riddling and Reading: Iconicity and Logogriphs in Exeter Book *Riddles* 23 and 25. *Anglia*, 130 (4), 499-525.
Ryken, L., Wilhoit, J.C., & Longman III, T. (eds.). (1998). *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Leicester/Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.
Salvador-Bello, M. (2015). *Isidorean Perceptions of Order: The Exeter Book Riddles and Medieval Latin* Enigmata. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press.
Scardigli, P., & Gervasi, T. (1978). *Avviamento all'etimologia inglese e tedesca*. Firenze: Le Monnier.
Schipp, G.P. (1960). Orcus. *Glotta*, 39,154-158.
Schlauch, M. (1968). The 'Dream of the Rood' as Prosopopoeia. In J.B. Bessinger Jr & S.J. Kahrl (eds.), *Essential Articles for the Study of Old English Poetry*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 428-441. (original work published 1940)
Schmidt, G.D. (1995). *The Iconography of the Mouth of Hell: Eighth Century Britain to the Fifteenth Century*. Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna Press / London: Associated University Presses.
Schüpphaus, J. (1973). Bāla. In G.J. Botterweck (ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testament*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, vol. I, 658-661.
Scragg, D.G. (ed.). (1992). *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. Early English Text Society o.s., 300. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Scragg, D.G. (2001). The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric. In P.E. Szarmach (ed.), *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*. Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England, 5. New York, NY: Garland, 73-150. (original work published 1979)
Sharpe, R. (2001). *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540 with Additions and Corrections*. Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin, 1. Turnhout: Brepols.
Sheingorn, P. (1992). 'Who Can Open the Doors of His Face?': The Iconography of the Hell Mouth. In C. Davidson & T.H. Seiler (eds.), *The Iconography of Hell*. Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series, 17. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications. Western Michigan University, 1-19.
Steinforth, D.H. (2021). *Thorvald's Cross: The Viking-Age Cross-Slab 'Kirk Andreas MM 128' and Its Iconography*. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Stenton, F.M. (1918). The Supremacy of the Mercian Kings. *English Historical Review*, 33 (132), 433-452.

Tolkien, J.R.R. (trans.). (2014). Beowulf: *A Translation and Commentary, Together with* Sellic Spell (C. Tolkien, ed.). London: Harper Collins.

Turville-Petre, E.O.G. (1964). *Myth and Religion of the North: The Religion of Ancient Scandinavia*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Weber, R. (ed.). (2007). *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (5th ed.). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Weston, L. (2016). Guthlac Betwixt and Between: Literacy, Cross-Temporal Affiliation, and an Anglo-Saxon Anchorite. *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures*, 42 (1), 1-27.

Wilson, D.M. (1984). *Anglo-Saxon Art from the Seventh Century to the Norman Conquest*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Wright, C.D. (1993). *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.