



Australian
National
University

THESES SIS/LIBRARY
R.G. MENZIES LIBRARY BUILDING NO:2
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
CANBERRA ACT 0200 AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE: +61 2 6125 4631
FACSIMILE: +61 2 6125 4063
EMAIL: library.theses@anu.edu.au

USE OF THESES

This copy is supplied for purposes
of private study and research only.
Passages from the thesis may not be
copied or closely paraphrased without the
written consent of the author.

THE STYLE AND STRUCTURE
OF
WULFSTAN'S SERMONS

by

Stephanie J. Dien

This thesis was submitted in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy in The
Australian National University.
January, 1974

This thesis is my own original work.

Stephanie J. Dien.

Stephanie J. Dien

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Part I WULFSTAN AND ÆLFRIC: A COMPARISON	22
Chapter I INTRODUCTION	23
II DE TEMPORIBUS ANTICRISTI	39
III DE DEDICATIONE ECCLESIAE	87
IV INCIPIUNT SERMONES LUPI EPISCOPI	101
V WULFSTAN'S TRANSLATION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER	135
VI THE REVISED TEXTS	153
Part II THE BIBLICAL PARAPHRASES	214
Chapter I SECUNDUM MATHEUM AND VERBA EZECHIEL[I]S PROPHET[A]E	215
II DE VISIONE ISAIE PROPHETAE AND VERBA HIEREMIAE PROPHETAE	232
III BE GODCUNDRE WARNUNGE	267
Part III THEMATIC VARIATIONS	300
Chapter I SECUNDUM MARCUM AND SECUNDUM LUCAM	301
II SERMO AD POPULUM	320
III SERMO LUPI AD ANGLOS	337
CONCLUSION	377
APPENDIX: SERMO LUPI AD ANGLOS—THE DATE AND ORDER OF THE THREE VERSIONS	389
LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED	402

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors, Mr G.W. Turner of the University of Adelaide, Mr L. J. Downer of the Australian National University and Professor G. H. Russell, now at the University of Melbourne, for their encouragement and helpful criticism.

My thanks are due also to the Trustees of the British Museum, The Keeper of Western MSS. at the Bodleian, and the Librarian of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge for access to and permission to quote from MSS. Cotton Nero A. i, Hatton 113, and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 201 respectively.

SYNOPSIS

Previous studies of Wulfstan's sermons, conditioned by the requirements of establishing the canon by defining "characteristic" features, have produced a distorted and restricted view of his work as a sermon writer. It is argued that his sermons are unified and consistent expositions of a theme. Their content is not negligible, and he is not significant merely as a forceful orator. In reworking his sources, he was not concerned with bringing them into accord with his "characteristic" modes of expression, but with the clear and persuasive exposition of a theme, and his full achievement as a sermon writer emerges from a study of the development of his themes and the techniques employed to instruct and persuade. It is from a comprehensive study of his reworking of Ælfric's compositions, instead of one which concentrates on isolated alterations considered to reveal "characteristic" features, that it can be seen that he was not engaged in a stylistic transformation, but in reshaping his sources into sermons unified by his chosen theme and in accord with his own didactic method. Few of the changes he makes are purely stylistic ones, for in altering the style, he alters the meaning in order to make the details of his source consistent with his alterations to the theme and organization. His sermons, then, are not derivative, or his alterations random, as is suggested by the description of his non-stylistic alterations to his sources as additions or omissions dictated by his "characteristic" interests. Only by considering the "characteristic" features of Wulfstan's compositions and handling of his sources which have been enumerated in the context of his didactic aims does their significance emerge, and it is evident that the "characteristic" features of his style, which have been presented as mannerisms, are intimately related to the expression of his themes and his didactic purpose. Since his themes, didactic aims, and handling of his sources vary considerably, it is questionable whether the description of

The characteristic features of Wulfstan's style have been isolated by the full documentation of correspondences between sentences and phrases in his sermons and those in other compositions.¹ Compositions considered to be closely related in substance to Wulfstan's sermons and to contain a number of verbal parallels with his work have been assumed by all researchers to be his immediate sources. There are two main types of texts that Wulfstan is thought to have followed in composing his sermons, Latin compilations for which he was responsible, and works in Old English. Jost demonstrated that, in addition to the biblical extracts preceding Bethurum II, XI, and XIX in the manuscripts, Wulfstan's Latin sources included VIIIa, Xb, and XVIa.² These are collections from various authorities, recorded in manuscripts connected with Wulfstan,³ on which he based VIIIb and c, Xc, and XVIIb respectively. To the list of Latin sources, Bethurum adds Ia, stating that "the relationship between Ia and Ib is exactly like that between VIIIa and c and between Xb and Xc."⁴ (There are, of course, many individual passages which Bethurum traces to a Latin source in the Notes to her edition of Wulfstan's sermons: the sources I refer to here are those which served him as an outline for an entire sermon, or a major part of one, and from which he is thought to have worked directly.) Most of the Old English works accepted as immediate sources are compositions by Ælfric: Bethurum IV, VI, IX, XII, and XVIII are all held to be based on homilies or treatises written by him. Another probable

¹See particularly Jost, Wulfstanstudien and Anglia, LVI, 265-315; Dorothy Bethurum, "Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book," PMLA, LVII (1942), 916-29, and Homilies, Notes, pp. 278-365.

²See Anglia, LVI, 265-315, and Wulfstanstudien, pp. 63-69.

³See Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 98-101, and her remarks on Xc, pp. 18-19.

⁴Homilies, p. 29.

Old English source is the translation of Abbo of St. Germain's homily appearing in some of the manuscripts designated Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book" by Bethurum, which Jost and Bethurum consider he consulted in composing XV.¹

The status of the Latin compilations appears to be beyond reasonable doubt, but the validity of the assumption that the Old English compositions similar to Wulfstan's were his direct source is in some cases open to question. I am inclined to concur with the general consensus of opinion regarding Wulfstan's Old English sources, with the exception of Ælfric's Sermo de Initio Creaturae, which seems to me to have been accepted as a source for VI on insufficient grounds. I shall deal at length with this matter in Part I, but I wish first to outline the nature of previous scholarship, and I shall describe it in its own terms where qualification would prove cumbersome.

The most fruitful means of determining the characteristics of Wulfstan's style has been the comparison of his sermons with the Ælfric compositions held to have been sources. McIntosh compared Wulfstan's revisions of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu with the treatises by Ælfric from which they derive in order to demonstrate the difference in the prose rhythm of the two writers. He expressed the opinion that Wulfstan's alterations were intended to transform Ælfric's prose into the rhythmical and alliterative patterns which he considered to be characteristic of Wulfstan, and that they revealed the "relentless thoroughness" with which Wulfstan adhered to a distinctive form of prose rhythm.² Jost made a study of the comparable expressions in the works of Wulfstan and Ælfric, as well as the verbal parallels

¹See Wulfstanstudien, pp. 150-51, and Homilies, p. 345.

²Wulfstan's Prose, pp. 13-16, 31, n. 20.

between Wulfstan's Latin compilations and the sermons based on them, pointing out the frequency with which Wulfstan introduced certain stylistic devices in his reworking of his sources. A number of the stylistic devices shown to appear regularly only in the Wulfstan sermons Jost studied, such as alliterative and rhyming word pairs, intensives, and set phrases, had already been described as characteristic of Wulfstan.¹ Jost argued, however, that Wulfstan's work could not only be distinguished by obvious stylistic idiosyncrasies, but by his pronounced lexical and grammatical preferences, which he substituted almost invariably for those of his Old English sources.² The studies of these two scholars have exerted considerable influence on descriptions of Wulfstan's style,³ and their findings have been accepted as an essential part of the criteria for determining authorship and as the basis for rejecting claims that texts are the work of "Wulfstan imitators."⁴

Because the need for a stylistic criterion of authorship has provided the impetus for comparison of Wulfstan's sermons with their assumed sources, differences in substance have not received much attention; but when comparisons of non-stylistic aspects have been made, they too have been undertaken with the intention

¹ See the works cited on p. 1, nn. 2 and 4 which appeared before Wulfstanstudien.

² See Wulfstanstudien, pp. 117-68.

³ Both upon those which appear in general literary histories of the period, such as C.L. Wrenn, A Study of Old English Literature, London, 1967 and S.B. Greenfield, A Critical History of Old English Literature, London, 1966, as well as upon the more specialized studies, such as Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., pp. 17-19; Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 27-29, 87-98; O. Funke, "Some Remarks on Wulfstan's Prose Rhythm," English Studies, XLIII (1962), 311-18; R.G. Fowler, "Some Stylistic Features of the Sermo Lupi," JEGP, LXV (1966), 1-18.

⁴ See particularly Bethurum, Homilies, p. 27, n. 1; Whitelock, op. cit., p. 19.

of establishing distinctive features of his work. The differences between Wulfstan's sermons and the works with which they have been compared have been described almost entirely in terms of additions or omissions which reveal his characteristic interests or method of handling his sources. Particular attention has been given to the divergences considered indicative of a "typical" lack of interest in theology or exegesis which distinguishes him from Ælfric. In some cases, his failure to include material from the works he consulted has been seen merely as a desire for brevity.¹ The prevailing view of the relationship between Wulfstan's sermons and the Old English compositions on which they are believed to have been based is summarized by Pope. Wulfstan, he states, rewrote other men's English sermons

characteristically abridging detailed expositions and especially narratives, elaborating passages of moral instruction and exhortation, and bringing the movement of the whole into closer accord with his own habitual rhythms and modes of expression.²

In addition to this, Bethurum draws attention to Wulfstan's "habit of making the concrete general," and, in commenting on his biblical sermons, she describes his "usual method of translating" as a close rendering of the text in the first part of the sermon and a freer translation in the latter part.³

The parallels in phrasing and content within Wulfstan's compositions have been as extensively documented as the correspondences between Wulfstan's sermons and the sources posited in

¹Wulfstan's non-stylistic alterations to his sources are discussed by Jost, *Anglia*, LVI, 265-315, and *Wulfstanstudien* (particularly pp.152-55); Bethurum, *Homilies* (particularly pp. 97-98, 306, 333), and *PMLA*, LVII, 921, 926; Wrenn, op. cit., p. 239.

²J.C. Pope, Review of Dorothy Bethurum, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, *MLN*, LXXIV (1959), 335.

³*Homilies*, pp. 348, 355 (note to 48).

order to provide evidence of common authorship.¹ From the abundance of parallels it has been concluded that his characteristic method of composition was to reformulate his material in increasing stages of elaboration and that he frequently incorporated passages from early compositions into his more mature sermons in an expanded form.² Where variations in the form of passages cited as parallel have been noted, they have been interpreted as alterations made to improve upon the expression and indications of the order in which the sermons were written.³

From the studies which have been made of Wulfstan's sermons, particularly those which have defined the characteristic features of Wulfstan's style, criteria of authorship have gradually evolved, and reasonably close agreement has been reached upon the sermons to be admitted to the canon.⁴ The characteristic features of Wulfstan's style employed as the primary criteria of authorship are summarized by Professor Whitelock as follows:

¹Particularly by Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, pp. 32-59; Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 117-270; Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., pp. 36-37 and in the Notes to her edition; Bethurum, Homilies, Notes, pp. 278-365.

²See Jost, Anglia, LVI, 265-315; Pope, loc. cit.; Bethurum, Homilies, 101-4. This conclusion is also evident in many of Bethurum's notes to her edition, particularly in her frequent references to the parallels between the sermons, e.g., p. 309 (note to 96-end), pp. 331-32, p. 364 (note to 190-end).

³See, for example, Bethurum, Homilies, p. 102; Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 55 (note to 62).

⁴In his review of Bethurum's edition, N.E. Eliason, Anglia, LXXVII (1959), 79-82, observed that "the area of disagreement [concerning the canon] is not large nor is it of much significance so far as the homilies are concerned, where most of the unresolved--and unresolvable--differences arise over whether a given piece is a homily or not." Two other reviewers, Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 338 and J.M. Ure, Medium Ævum, XXVIII (1959), 113-14, considered that Bethurum had omitted passages from sermons which should have been accepted as authentic on the basis of the criteria of authorship employed.

He had pronounced preferences in vocabulary, using, for example, lagu and not æ, beorgan, not arian, gesælig, not eadig, dryhten, not hælend, lac, not onsægdnes, &c. He uses some words frequently, e.g. fadian, afyllan, forfaran, forrædan, while others occur rarely, if at all, outside his writings, e.g. sibleger, ægylde, fes(i)an, læw 'injury' and its derivative læwan, aweodian 'to root out'. He is fond of compounds beginning with worold or peod, in an intensitive sense, such as woroldscamu, woroldstrudere, peodscada, peodlicetere, peodloga. He has also peculiarities of syntax, e.g. gebugan with a direct object, deofol without a definite article, ænig, not nænig, in negative sentences, fela (manna, &c) with a singular verb. More obvious is his excessive use of intensitives, like mid ealle, georne, to wide, ealles to swyþe, ealles to gelome, oft 7 gelome, and of other tags, elles, nyde, mid rihte, &c. Certain set phrases occur again and again in his work, as gime se þe wille, swa hi betst mihton, us selfum to þearfe, gecnawe se þe cunne, swa hit þincan mæg, swa swa man scolde. Such words and phrases are often added by Wulfstan when he revised the work of others, and the purpose was often to bring the passage into line with his own rhythmical patterns. For the same end he makes tautological additions, and he was fond of arranging words in ¹ pairs, sometimes linked by alliteration, or rhyme.

To this list, Bethurum adds a number of other features, including "parallelism of word and clause, exclamations and rhetorical questions."² Theoretically, the criteria employed in establishing the canon is not completely satisfactory. Many of the features described as characteristic of Wulfstan are not exclusively characteristic. He is, for instance, by no means the only Old English prose writer to use intensifying words and phrases, and the rhetorical figures Bethurum mentions are common literary property. As Stuart pointed out in his examination of the occurrence of Leofan men in Wulfstan's compositions and manuscripts not connected with him, "there is need for caution in determining the precise context within which a given stylistic feature is associated with Wulfstan."³ As Wulfstan studies stand, it is the

¹Op. cit., pp. 17-18.

²Homilies, p. 28.

³C.I.J.M. Stuart, "Wulfstan's Use of 'Leofan Men,'" English Studies, XLV (1964), 39-42.

frequency with which particular stylistic devices occur which is considered characteristic of Wulfstan. Since the frequency with which a stylistic device appears must depend at least in part on the subject and purpose of a composition, there is in fact considerable variation in the number of times that features associated with Wulfstan are to be found in the sermons which have been admitted to the canon.¹ To take an example, intensifying phrases are abundant in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, but few appear in De Falsis Deis. Some degree of subjectivity must therefore be involved in determining the canon according to such a stylistic criterion. Furthermore, Sheets' recent examination of the unstated theoretical assumptions underlying McIntosh's definition of the distinguishing characteristics of Wulfstan's prose rhythm calls its validity into question,² and, as I shall indicate in a later chapter, the difficulties involved in attempting to apply McIntosh's description to Wulfstan's prose are such that it is doubtful that it could have served as an effective means of distinguishing Wulfstan's compositions from those of his contemporaries.

It is not, however, my primary intention to take issue with the means by which the canon has been established, for the stylistic tests of authorship have been supported by non-stylistic evidence, such as literary relations between the sermons and similarities with the material contained in Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book," and there appears to be no reason to deny Wulfstan's authorship of the sermons unanimously accepted as his. What I do

¹Bethurum, Homilies, p. 89, notes that Wulfstan adjusted his style to different purposes and occasions, but does not appear to consider that this has bearing upon the description of the characteristic features of his style.

²L.A. Sheets, "Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration," Unpubl. Diss. (Ohio State University), 1964.

wish to suggest is that the study of Wulfstan's sermons, conditioned by the requirements of determining their characteristic features, has produced a distorted and restricted view of them and of Wulfstan's achievements as a sermon writer.

Although it is as a stylist that Wulfstan has enjoyed a reputation,¹ no satisfactory account of his style has emerged from the cataloguing of its characteristic features. Many of the syntactic features listed as characteristic of him, and probably some of the vocabulary preferences, are peculiarities of linguistic usage rather than aspects of literary style. That is to say, minute grammatical preferences, such as the use of gebugan with a direct object² and fela with a singular verb, do not usually have an expressive significance, because they are not usually the result of conscious artistic choice. The same is probably true of Wulfstan's habitual preference for certain synonyms, such as lagu instead of æ, since the habitual use of a synonym suggests that a writer may once have exercised a conscious choice, but may not have done so in relation to its appearance in a given work. Descriptions of Wulfstan's style have also concentrated on features of his literary style which are superficially obvious, and, in many cases, of no considerable linguistic significance, such as his frequent use of intensives or compounds beginning with peod and worold. Even Bethurum's account of Wulfstan's rhetoric, though it penetrates deeper than the catalogues and describes features of greater magnitude, adopts the methodology employed in defining a criterion of Wulfstan's authorship, and is primarily a definition of the frequency with which the most striking rhetorical

¹See Whitelock, TRHS, XXIV, 28.

²Choice is involved in this instance in the sense that a writer may or may not choose to use gebugan with a direct object.

figures appear in his work. While the peculiarities of Wulfstan's usage may be the most significant features for the purpose of determining the canon, and while the frequency with which immediately obvious stylistic devices appear in the corpus may have some bearing upon problems of authorship, the enumeration of such features contributes little to an understanding of the manner in which a sermon such as Sermo Lupi ad Anglos makes its undeniably impressive effect, or an appreciation of Wulfstan's literary achievements.

A more serious deficiency is the failure to study his style with reference to the themes developed in the sermons and their didactic purpose, since studies of literary style in general assume that a full description of style and an understanding of the significance of the most outstanding details emerges only from a consideration of style in relation to the meaning and function of a composition. Certainly Fowler's study of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, which is by far the most detailed analysis of Wulfstan's style available, shows that extensive description of style is possible without reference to meaning and purpose;¹ but his analysis seems less illuminating than it might have been, by virtue of the fact that he deliberately excludes these matters from consideration. From the manner in which Wulfstan's style has been described by other writers, however, it would appear that the salient characteristic of the distinctive features of his style is precisely their irrelevance to the meaning expressed. Whitelock, for instance, refers to Wulfstan's "excessive use of intensitives ... and of other tags" and to "tautological additions"² and Bethurum refers to his "redundant phrases,"³ and explains the frequency with which

¹JEGP, LXV, 1-18.

²See quotation above.

³Homilies, p. 31.

stylistic devices are employed as Wulfstan's "fondness" for them.¹ The catalogues of Wulfstan's style, then, have not only failed to provide a comprehensive account of his style, but give the impression that it was a collection of mannerisms with which he embellished his compositions, or functional only in so far as it was designed to "impress an audience that got everything through the ear."²

The studies of Jost and McIntosh, because they were chiefly concerned to demonstrate the consistency with which Wulfstan altered his source material in order to bring it into accord with his characteristic mode of expression, have given rise to the view that Wulfstan was primarily engaged in impressing the characteristic features of his style upon the material he worked into sermons, and that the communication of ideas was of secondary or negligible importance to him. McIntosh, for instance, comments on Wulfstan's revisions of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu as follows:

It is one of the curiosities of literature, this relationship between Ælfric and Wulfstan, and the finicky technical transformation that Wulfstan makes of the writing of the other....

Here is a curious situation in a troubled age; one man produces a special kind of rhythmical writing with a distinct and recognizable texture, then another, heavily burdened with the cares and duties of an enormously responsible position, takes the trouble to dissect all this and reconstruct it according to the rules governing his own rhythmical practice. I do not wish to suggest, of course, that he was merely pre-occupied with the metrical transformation. He is almost always concerned primarily with expanding the text, with adding his own material, though he is also careful from time to time to change words or phrases which happen to be alien to his own usage. But whenever he makes expansions or alterations it is in such a way that the prose emerges reshaped into his own rhythmical mode, and many of the minor changes he makes seem to be purely on account of the rhythm.³

¹Homilies, pp. 28.

²Ibid., p. 94. See also Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, p. 32.

³Wulfstan's Prose, p. 15.

Although McIntosh makes important qualifications to the view that Wulfstan's reworking of his sources was a purely stylistic transformation, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, both from this passage and others in his discussion,¹ that Wulfstan's attachment to a particular form of prose rhythm motivated and dictated the nature of his revisions, and was of more basic importance than the precise meaning being communicated. Those who have followed Jost and McIntosh have made fewer qualifications to the view that Wulfstan's handling of his assumed sources, particularly compositions by Ælfric, was a purely stylistic transformation.² Wrenn, describing Wulfstan's revision of De Falsis Diis, remarks:

Keeping the matter, and even the wording, unchanged for the most part, Wulfstan adds intensifying adverbs to adjectives here and there, and replaces some verbs with more forceful equivalents. On the one hand, as a bishop making a public declaration Wulfstan sometimes tones down or makes more dignified Ælfric's occasionally very homely vocabulary; but on the other, he substitutes his own speech-rhythm for Ælfric's, and reinforces the drive and vigour of the language by a choice of more emphatic words.³

Of Wulfstan's paraphrases of selections from Isaiah and Jeremiah, Bethurum writes:

Characteristic parallelisms of phrase and clause, often with alliteration, appear in the manipulation of the translation.... Wulfstan's favourite phrases appear in gime se ðe wille, 99; 188; on unriht, 135; swa swa ge scoldan, 166; and in the frequent intensives. Several passages, notably 178-9, are carefully arranged to secure alliteration. This translation is quite a close one by old English standards, its deviations from literalness being almost

¹ Wulfstan's Prose, pp. 16-17, 31, n. 20. N.B. "A study of [Wulfstan's] word-order might have to reckon with certain aberrations, ... the choice of words ... may sometimes have been dictated by the [rhythmical] system."

² Jost frequently notes Wulfstan's omissions and additions of source material in Wulfstanstudien.

³ Wrenn, A Study of Old English Literature, p. 239. See also Bethurum, Homilies, p. 333 and Greenfield, A Critical History of Old English Literature, pp. 56-57.

entirely the additions and rearrangements of the kind I have mentioned.¹

Her comments on Wulfstan's handling of his sources often give the impression that he translated or reformulated almost mechanically. She remarks, for instance, "the familiar marks of his style appear, elaborating even these texts"² (Pater Noster and Creed), and:

The habit of writing alliterative and rhyming pairs of words, often tautological, became so ingrained that when he rewrote another person's composition, whether Ælfric's Old English ... or a Latin text which he translated into English ..., the substitution of two words for one is almost invariable.³

Such concentration on Wulfstan's stylistic alterations to his assumed sources not only appears to be based on the assumption that he was chiefly concerned with details of style, but virtually limits his contribution to assimilating the expression of his sources to his characteristic mode, a contribution of dubious value if many of the characteristic features of his style involve tautology or redundancy. Even when an attempt has been made to show that Wulfstan's sermons differ in substance from the works he probably consulted, the method of approach has made little allowance for originality or independence. The derivative nature of his sermons has been emphasized because it has been assumed that he followed closely Latin or Old English compositions, and departed from these only by omitting or expanding material found in his sources. It is perhaps not surprising that no examination has been made of the manner in which the meaning and import of his sermons differ from the compositions assumed to be sources. The comparisons drawn between his compositions and the assumed Ælfric sources suggest that the content of his sermons is of negligible

¹Homilies, p. 32.

²Ibid., p. 301.

³Ibid., p. 90.

interest, since it has been concluded that Wulfstan's divergences reveal a lack of interest in theology. The general comparisons of the two writers present Wulfstan as a preacher rather than a teacher, a practical moralist unconcerned with complexities or finer shades of meaning, who directed his energies to arousing the emotions of his audience.¹

The view that Wulfstan reworked other compositions by expanding or omitting as his characteristic interests or the need for brevity dictated also suggests that he was not concerned with a unified and consistent exposition of a theme or subject. The assumption that he composed in a somewhat piecemeal fashion without thought for thematic unity appears, for instance, in Bethurum's description of his incorporation of a passage headed "De captivitate iudeorum" in his "Commonplace Book" into one of his sermons:

This was one of the ways of Providence of which Wulfstan never tired of finding examples, and he has not neglected this one. Homily II [Napier], which is a brief survey of Hebrew history through the life of Christ, is based on Ælfric's "De Initio Creatur[ae]" (Thorpe, C.H., I, 8-28), which Wulfstan follows fairly closely in outline, though he condenses some material and omits some. On p. 14²⁻⁹ is a statement that, on account of their sins, in the days of Zedechiah God permitted the Jews to be taken captive by heathen people and their leaders to be slain. There is no mention of Zedechiah in Ælfric's homily.... Wulfstan had apparently collected passages on this subject, as one takes notes on passages pertinent to the subject on which one is writing, and when he found² a place for this sentence in his homily he worked it in.²

¹See Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, p. 60; Fehr, Hirtenbriefe, p. cix; A Literary History of England, ed. A.C. Baugh, London, 1948, p. 103; Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 152, 171-72; Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 87, 91-92, 96; Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 336; Wrenn, A Study of Old English Literature, p. 238; Bethurum, "Wulfstan," Continuations and Beginnings; Studies in Old English Literature, London, 1966, pp. 210, 215.

²Bethurum, PMLA, LVII, 921. Cf. her remark in a discussion of a passage in Sermo ad Anglos based on an extract from one of Alcuin's letters: "The interpolation is rather awkwardly made It is possible that Wulfstan discovered this letter of Alcuin's late, or discovered it in his notes ... and thought it an apt addition." (Homilies, p. 23.)

The assumption is more obvious in the enumeration of Wulfstan's "borrowings" from his own sermons. Whitelock writes of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos:

To a fair amount of material from Ethelred's codes Wulfstan added an introductory passage made up of phrases from his eschatological sermons, especially XIII [Napier], and this homily supplied also his passage on the decay of kinship and some isolated phrases elsewhere. There is also a general similarity between the list of calamities in the Sermo ad Anglos and that in XXVIII [Napier], a free translation and expansion of Leviticus xxvi....¹ Finally, he has added a normal homiletic conclusion.

Such a description implies not only that Wulfstan's sermons lack unity or significant organization of the material to develop a theme, but that they lack variety as well. This is supported by the view that his sermons, particularly the eschatological ones, represent stages of gradual elaboration of his subject matter, from which it is concluded that Wulfstan concentrated on a "severely limited range of topics" and "constant hammering at essentials."²

This study attempts to show that Wulfstan conceived his sermons as unified and consistent didactic expositions of a theme,³ and examines the manner in which he developed his themes in a number of sermons and the means he employed to instruct and persuade his audience. A consideration of Wulfstan's sermons from the point of view of their meaning and didactic function reveals

¹Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 1st ed., p. 17. It should be added that the alterations to the wording of this passage in the 3rd ed., p. 36, slightly modify the suggestion of pastiche composition. But cf. p. 47 (note to 4-8).

²Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 335-36.

³It is for this reason that "sermons," instead of the more usual "homilies," is employed to describe Wulfstan's didactic compositions, since "a homily is an elaboration of a text, a sermon, with or without a text, an elaboration of some subject." (Homilies, p. 96.)

more clearly his achievements as a sermon writer than does the definition in isolation of the characteristic features of various aspects. It can also reveal the broader significance of his divergences from his assumed sources which earlier scholars have noted and of the stylistic devices he frequently employs.

In Parts I and II an examination is made of some of the Wulfstan sermons for which a direct source has been postulated. Part I is a comparison of Wulfstan's sermons with the compositions by Ælfric on which he is believed to have based his works (Bethurum IV, VI, IX, XII, and XVIII). Part II deals with the relationship of Wulfstan's compilations of scriptural verses and Bethurum II, XI, XVIb, and XIX. I have not attempted to examine in this study, then, all of the Wulfstan sermons which are considered to be based on a Latin or an Old English source, since I have not discussed XV, which is thought to be based on an Old English translation of a Latin homily, and I have not dealt with Ib or the sermons on baptism and the Christian life (VIIIc and Xc), which are based on Wulfstan's collection of excerpts from various authorities. My aim is to demonstrate an approach which makes possible a more favourable assessment of Wulfstan as a sermon writer than that which has emerged from the approach adopted by previous scholars. Had space permitted, this aim would undoubtedly have been furthered by an examination of all the sermons for which an immediate source has been assumed, but the basis for a re-assessment of Wulfstan can at least be indicated, I feel, by a discussion of a sizeable body of his sermons. Since the contingency of space has imposed a choice, I have selected for discussion sermons which, on the basis of their assumed sources, constitute two clearly defined groups, those believed to be based on Ælfric's compositions, and the biblical sermons. XV, Ib, VIIIc, and Xc are, I feel, less interesting than

the sermons I have chosen to discuss, in terms of both their content and the conclusions which can be drawn from them concerning Wulfstan's thought and his skill as a preacher. The failure to include these sermons in the discussion does not perhaps constitute a very significant omission, for Ib is very short and follows Ia only for a few sentences at the beginning, and the general conclusions drawn from the comparison of XVIII and Ælfric's homily on the dedication of a church are applicable to XV, which is thought, like XVIII, to have been based on an exegetical composition. Xc and VIIIC, unlike the sermons based on Wulfstan's collections of biblical quotations, have received substantial attention, since Jost discussed them at length in his article on Wulfstan's sources.¹ Jost, it may be noted, pointed out that Xc made use of Wulfstan's translation of a chapter of De Regula Canoniorum (Xa) as well as the Latin outline in Xb, and that VIIIC draw upon an earlier sermon on baptism (VIIIB) as well as the Latin in VIIIA, so that it is at least generally accepted that no simple relationship exists between VIIIC and Xc and their immediate Latin sources.

In Part I, it is argued that, if Wulfstan did refer to Ælfric's compositions when he composed his sermons, he did not merely follow the outline of Ælfric's compositions, adding or omitting as his interests or the need for brevity dictated, and that he was not engaged in making purely stylistic alterations to his source. I have tried to show that, although Wulfstan's material is, in varying degrees, similar to that of certain Ælfric compositions, he shaped the material into sermons unified by the thematic significance he discerned in it and presented it in accordance with his own didactic mode. I would claim, then, that the differences in substance between the two writers are not explicable in terms of somewhat random alterations made to the compositions

¹Anglia, LVI, 265-315.

which are assumed, rightly or wrongly, to be his sources. It is Wulfstan's creation of sermons unified by a theme of his choosing, and differing from Ælfric's compositions in didactic purpose, which gives rise to dissimilarities in substance. Where there are parallel passages in the works of the two writers, close examination usually reveals that the differences are not superficial stylistic ones: the differences in style are usually attended by dissimilarities in meaning, and such differences in meaning can be related to the overall differences in the didactic aims and methods of Wulfstan and Ælfric. Even the characteristic features of Wulfstan's style which have been described as tautological or redundant often prove on examination to be functional when considered in the context of the themes of his sermons and his desire, not simply to move his audience, but to provide clear and unambiguous instruction which could be assimilated in the process of an oral delivery of his sermons.

From a comprehensive study of the relationship of Wulfstan's and Ælfric's compositions, instead of one undertaken for the purpose of discerning characteristic differences, it can be seen that Wulfstan's sermons are less derivative than has been supposed. De Septiformi Spiritu (IX) and De Falsis Deis (XII) bear such a close resemblance to Ælfric's compositions of the same name that Wulfstan's dependence on Ælfric seems certain (one could hardly argue that Ælfric borrowed from Wulfstan, since Ælfric is closer to the Latin sources.)¹ But if, in composing IV, VI, and XVIII, Wulfstan drew on the Ælfric compositions generally believed to have been his sources, he reworked Ælfric's material so thoroughly and extensively that the three sermons can be described as original, because they differ so greatly in theme and structure from Ælfric's compositions. The differences which emerge from close

¹See Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 304-6, 333-340.

comparison are, indeed, so considerable as to cast doubts on the assumption that Ælfric's compositions did serve as sources for IV, VI, and XVIII: as I have already intimated, my examination leads me to conclude that it is unlikely that VI, at the very least, is indebted to Ælfric's work.

In Part II, the general line of argument pursued in Part I is continued in the examination of the four sermons dealing with scriptural admonitions, Bethurum II, XI, XVIIb, and XIX. The nature of Wulfstan's sources for these four sermons is not in doubt, for the compilations of scattered excerpts from the scriptures which bear a close relationship to Wulfstan's sermons would surely have been brought into existence only because Wulfstan intended to refer to them in composing his sermons. Although there is a close relationship between Wulfstan's biblical sermons and the Latin compilations, he did not, I would argue, merely translate, deviating from literalness to secure characteristic stylistic effects. Detailed comparison of the biblical sermons with their sources reveals that the departures from literalness often represent changes to the meaning, and his alterations to his sources are indicative of an attempt to mould the scriptural extracts into thematically unified sermons which fulfill Wulfstan's didactic purposes. It can be said, then, that Wulfstan's handling of his biblical sources--and his handling of Ælfric's compositions, if they were his sources--was governed by his didactic aims, not his characteristic interests or a desire to impose stylistic mannerisms on his material. Comparison of the biblical sermons with their sources also provides further evidence of Wulfstan's theological interests and views which emerge from a comparison of his compositions with Ælfric's.

In Part III, an examination is made of the relationship between the sermons which are not considered to be directly based on some

other composition, but which are held to represent successive stages of Wulfstan's elaboration of commonplace material, or material which he derived ultimately from a variety of patristic authorities. Once again, it has been necessary to select a group of sermons for discussion, since an examination of the complex inter-relation of the sermons would require a full-length study. I have selected for discussion two of the eschatological sermons considered to be among Wulfstan's earliest compositions,¹ Bethurum III and V, and two later sermons which have been described as containing a considerable proportion of material similar to that appearing in other compositions, Sermo ad Populum (XIII) and Sermo Lupi ad Anglos (XX).² Each of these four sermons can be seen to be unified according to the particular theme it develops. The occurrence in a Wulfstan sermon of numerous passages which are comparable with those appearing in other compositions by him is, therefore, not indicative of pastiche composition. The eschatological sermons do not simply represent stages of Wulfstan's gradual expansion of his subject matter, because they differ in theme and structure. In his later sermons, he did not merely expand or polish up the expression of passages which appear in his earlier compositions: he frequently altered the meaning to make the passages he re-used consistent with the overall changes in the theme, style, and organization of his later sermons. I would claim, then, that if Ælfric's compositions did serve Wulfstan as sources, his reworking of them illustrates a process of thorough assimilation of derived material to a new context which can also be observed in his reworking of material from his earlier sermons.

¹Bethurum argues convincingly that I-V are among Wulfstan's earliest compositions (see particularly Homilies, pp. 101-4).

²See particularly Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 339-44, 355-64; Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 1st ed., p. 17 (quoted above).

By studying the development of the themes in sermons II, V, XIII, and XX, it is possible to observe the variety which exists among Wulfstan's compositions, and the care with which he composed. A study of the development of the themes in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos can also assist in determining the authenticity of some of the variant readings and the relationship between the three main versions.

Although Wulfstan will always be overshadowed by his more subtle and sophisticated contemporary, Ælfric, he gains in stature if attention is focused not on the details of his style and his auditory impressiveness, but on the intellectual content of his sermons and the nature of his thought. From this point of view, he appears to be more concerned with the communication of meaning than with purely stylistic matters, for his style can be seen to be intimately related to the development of his themes and his didactic purpose. He emerges as a more substantial figure than is suggested by the description of him as a forceful orator rather than a teacher or thinker¹ or as "the great fore-runner of the modern evangelist."² His achievement as a sermon writer is not limited to the qualities of his style or his force as an orator. It extends to the manner in which he presents, disposes, and develops his material, but this has been largely obscured by the form which descriptions of the relation of his sermons to his sources and the relation between his compositions have taken. To his contemporaries, the manner in which he developed his themes was perhaps as significant as his oratorical talents, for we find him praised in a letter from an anonymous cleric, pro dulcissimam eloquii (uestri) considerans sagacitatem, decenterque dispositae narrationis prolixitatem, simulque profunditatem.³

¹See p. 14, n. 1.

²Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, p. 60.

³The letter appears in MS. Vespasian A. xiv (Bethurum, Homilies, p. 377).

PART I

WULFSTAN AND ÆLFRIC: A COMPARISON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Comparison of Wulfstan's sermons and the Ælfric compositions considered to be their sources has formed the basis of the definition of the characteristic features of Wulfstan's style, as was noted in the Introduction. But the marked dissimilarity of the two most distinguished homilists of the late Old English period¹ has also prompted comparisons of a more general nature. Sweet, for instance, introducing Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, refers to Wulfstan's "fiery, impassioned, half-poetical language, which forms a complete contrast to the calm elegance of Ælfric's classic prose,"² and it has been noted that he had a preference for verborum exornatio in contrast to the abundance of figurae sententiarum which appear in Ælfric's work.³ Wrenn remarks that

Wulfstan preferred to address his sermons to the widest possible public and therefore to deal with large general topics.... He preferred to make his sermons exhortatory rather than instructional in what was often Ælfric's narrower sense. Whereas Ælfric wrote homilies to be used by rural priests especially, Wulfstan carefully made his general exhortations to the nation so phrased and worded as to be most apt for actual delivery.⁴

Bethurum notes other differences in subject matter, such as:

¹ Ælfric and Wulfstan, engaged in the same enterprise and pursuing their aims with equally serious intent, were as different as two devoted clergymen could well be."
(Bethurum, Continuations and Beginnings, p. 210.)

² H. Sweet, Anglo-Saxon Reader, 14th ed. revised by C.T. Onions, Oxford, 1962, p. 82.

³ Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, pp. 19-20, 59-60; Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 91-92; Wrenn, A Study of Old English Literature, p. 239.

⁴ Ibid., p. 238.

Commentary on scripture, which makes up so much of patristic writing, did not move him to his best efforts, largely because he was not interested in hermeneutics; and here he stands in marked contrast to Ælfric, who practised so well in his own homilies the skill at interpretation he had learned from Gregory and Bede.¹

Such contrasts are summarized in the sharp dichotomy, "the sermons of Ælfric were written to instruct; those of Wulfstan, to move."²

The contrast, as Bethurum points out, is one which is generally favourable to Ælfric:

Ælfric is to most readers a more attractive writer, for his interests were in theological orthodoxy and spiritual insight, his learning more easily recognizable. His play of thought over an idea, his homely similes evoke a readier response from scholars than do Wulfstan's passion for order and his stern kind of morality.³

Consistent with these observations are Jost's remarks:

Neben dem überbetonten Gesetz^{es}gehorsam tritt in Wulfstans Christentum das gefühlsmässige Element stark zurück. Während Ælfric immer wieder von jener religiösen Ergriffenheit spricht ... die den Gläubigen mitreisst und ihn Mühsal, Marter und Tod überwinden lässt, findet sich bei Wulfstan nichts Entsprechendes. Sogar die Liebe zu Gott, die er so häufig in seinen Predigten fordert-- sie ist ja das vornehmste und höchste Gebot --, wird bei ihm zu einer Form der Gesetzesfrömmigkeit.⁴

The general dissimilarities between the writings of Ælfric and Wulfstan, then, as well as the details of their differences in linguistic usage and rhythm, have been elaborated. As I shall

¹ Homilies, p. 96. She notes also that he does not deal with lives of the Saints, legendary material, or include picturesque detail. Cf. Jost, Wulfstanstudien, p. 152.

² Baugh, A Literary History of England, p. 103. Cf. Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, p. 60, "Wulfstan is first of all a preacher: Ælfric is teacher and then preacher."

³ Continuations and Beginnings, p. 215. Cf. Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 337.

⁴ Wulfstanstudien, pp. 171-72.

indicate, the obviousness of the dissimilarities between the two writers encourages contrasts which are somewhat extreme, especially if Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is taken to be wholly representative of Wulfstan. As Jost indicates in the passage quoted above, Ælfric is also concerned to move his audience, and it can be seen from a close study of Wulfstan's sermons that he too is concerned to instruct, though there is certainly a difference in the relative importance of the two aims and the methods by which they are implemented. Again, the difference does not lie in Ælfric's learning and Wulfstan's lack of it but in their respective opportunities for displaying it, as Bethurum implies in the passage quoted above from Continuations and Beginnings. While "das gefühlsmässige Element" is not in evidence in Wulfstan's work as it is in Ælfric's, an examination of some of his divergences from Ælfric's texts reveals that Wulfstan's God was not the stern legalistic Judge created in Wulfstan's own image as Jost's remarks may suggest. Furthermore, the two writers are closely related by virtue of the fact that the Benedictine Revival provides the impetus for their work. But even with qualifications, the contrast between Wulfstan and Ælfric is remarkable, and the recognition and elaboration of it in a number of studies raises two related questions: what are the reasons for the striking differences between the two contemporary writers of religious prose, and what significance do they have? For the dissimilarities seem to call for an explanation, just as the divergences in details of style and usage seem in need of a definition of direction, a clarification of the principles being established.

Ultimately one must resort for an explanation to the difference in the respective personalities of Wulfstan and Ælfric, nebulous as it is, and to the difference in their didactic aims

resulting from their dissimilar positions in life and the audiences with which they were concerned. It is perhaps not necessary to feel reluctance in introducing personality into a discussion of the compositions of two poorly documented figures: le style est l'homme même, and the style and preoccupations of Wulfstan and Ælfric suggest two distinct personalities consistent with the little that is known of their activities and manner of life. The forceful rhetoric, the concern with morality and the social and historical aspects of Christianity, are an expression of a man involved in secular affairs and responsible for the formulation of a number of law codes as well as the Institutes of Polity, just as the "calm elegance" of Ælfric's prose and his interest in the subtleties of the Christian mysteries reflect the scholarly monk. Their aims also provide a general explanation of the differences between their compositions. Possibly they were faced with dissimilar kinds of audiences, and this may have influenced the content, techniques, and style of their sermons. Wulfstan's connexion with the more recently Christianized North may explain to some extent his emphasis upon the essentials of Christianity rather than abstruse theological points, and Ælfric may have intended his sermons more for private reading than public delivery.

The point I wish to make in putting forward these general explanations is that the various differences between Wulfstan and Ælfric need to be seen as a totality. To some extent this point is anticipated by Bethurum when she states:

The practical puritan moralist and administrator appears in everything he does and in everything he fails to do, in the able direction of his church, and in his lack of interest in theology or poetry As a churchman he was learned and devoted; and if he left the subtleties of his religion to a monk in relative retirement at Eynsham, he

fulfilled with dignity the duties of a metropolitan, which seem at times to be those of Prime Minister,¹ though I feel that she over-states the contrast. Whitelock, too, notes that Wulfstan wrote "with a vehemence and intensity as suited to his denunciatory sermons as Ælfric's calm reasonableness is to his logical expositions."² But these recognitions of the connexion between various aspects of the compositions of the two writers which have been contrasted do not appear to have been accompanied by the recognition that the differences between Wulfstan's sermons and the Ælfric compositions assumed to be their sources are indicative of two contrasting and unified didactic methods. It is therefore less profitable to enumerate Wulfstan's divergences from Ælfric's compositions than it is to view Wulfstan's sermons as representative of a different didactic mode and apprehension of the significance of a given subject, and to observe the close inter-relation which exists between Wulfstan's divergences from Ælfric in meaning, organization, manner of presentation, and style.

Bethurum remarks that IV "exhibits Wulfstan's customary method of reworking Ælfric's material."³ Leaving aside, for the moment, the question of whether Wulfstan did borrow from Ælfric, it is in fact difficult to generalize about the relation of Wulfstan's sermons to Ælfric's compositions. Almost all of the information contained in the homily version of Ælfric's Preface to the Catholic Homilies appears in some form in IV, but, whereas the Ælfric homily is an exegetical interpretation, IV is an exhortatory sermon. The two compositions differ in import and significance as well as in their organization and mode of presentation, and comparison provides the clearest illustration of the way in which Wulfstan,

¹Homilies, p. 87.

²The Beginnings of English Society (Pelican History of England, : II), London, 1952, p. 221.

³Homilies, p. 30.

working with much the same material as Ælfric, but guided by different didactic aims, produced a sermon completely different in kind from his assumed source. De Falsis Deis (XII) and De Septiformi Spiritu (IX), on the other hand, are virtually identical to Ælfric's compositions, and there seems no reason to doubt his indebtedness to Ælfric. Wulfstan's revision consists of numerous small alterations to the expression, but, although the changes in meaning are not considerable, I would argue that his revision was motivated by didactic considerations, and not by a desire to bring Ælfric's compositions into accord with the style thought to be characteristic of him. Different again is the relation of VI and XVIII to their respective sources. XVIII, like Ælfric's homily on the dedication of a church, is an interpretation of a narrative based on the scriptures. However, while the two compositions are similar in technique, Wulfstan's approach to the interpretation is markedly dissimilar to Ælfric's, and only a small proportion of his interpretative material is comparable with Ælfric's. The relation between VI and Sermo de Initio Creaturae is somewhat tenuous, for there are few similarities in phrasing, and, although both sermons narrate the history of Creation, the didactic purposes underlying the two narrations are so dissimilar that Wulfstan's selection and presentation of material has little in common with Ælfric's.

As I have already had occasion to remark, my study raises the question of whether certain of Ælfric's compositions were in fact the sources for IV, VI, and XVIII, because comparison reveals that Wulfstan's sermons display a high degree of independence of the works generally accepted as sources. The question of sources for VI is complicated by Jost's belief that it was based on Pirmin's Scarapsus as well as on Ælfric's Sermo de Initio Creaturae, and it

is more convenient to discuss the issue at length in the chapter devoted to VI. In brief, I do not think that there is any need to postulate a source for VI, for Wulfstan could simply have relied on commonplace material, and VI's resemblance to Ælfric's Sermo de Initio Creaturae seems too slight to warrant the assumption that Wulfstan drew upon Ælfric's sermon. It will be evident from my discussion of IV and XVIII, however, that I am inclined to agree with other researchers that Wulfstan made use of his knowledge of Ælfric's compositions in these two sermons. There has, certainly, been a tendency to assume unquestioningly that any resemblance between the compositions of Wulfstan and Ælfric is attributable to Wulfstan's reliance on the works of his contemporary. This is understandable, in view of the fact that Ælfric is held in much higher esteem as a scholar and a thinker, and Wulfstan's revision of three of Ælfric's compositions (De Falsis Diis, De Septiformi Spiritu, and one of the Pastoral Letters)¹ together with Ælfric's reply to a letter requesting his opinion on various topics,² are evidence of Wulfstan's respect for Ælfric and indebtedness to him. It is part of my purpose to modify to some degree the current estimation of the relative abilities of Wulfstan and Ælfric by demonstrating the extent of his independence of Ælfric. I nevertheless think that the differences between IV and XVIII and the Ælfric compositions which are believed to be sources do not constitute sufficient grounds for urging the view that Wulfstan composed IV and XVIII completely independently of Ælfric's work.

¹The D version of Ælfric's Second Pastoral Letter. The case in favour of Wulfstan's revision of the Letter was first argued by Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 133-48.

²See Fehr, Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics, pp. 222-27. Fehr, p. cix, considered that Ælfric's reply implies considerable ignorance on Wulfstan's part, but cf. Whitelock, TRHS, XXIV, 34-35.

It is of course quite possible, as Dr Mitchell has pointed out to me, that Wulfstan could have written IV and XVIII completely independently of Ælfric, and that both writers drew on material which was commonplace--I think it highly likely that VI was composed in this fashion. But a consideration of what this view entails seems to me to inhibit argument that Wulfstan did compose IV and XVIII in the manner suggested. Commonplace material, I take it, refers to ideas with which a writer is familiar because they have general currency, as opposed to ideas he is conscious of deriving from a specific source. If we believe that Wulfstan composed XVIII independently of Ælfric, using commonplace material, we must first accept that interpretation of the account of the dedication of Solomon's temple for a homily on the dedication of a church was a commonplace idea. (I assume that it cannot have been Wulfstan's original idea because he is not the only writer to use it.) The idea may well have been commonplace, though I know of only one other homily--also attributed to Ælfric--which makes use of it.¹ On the other hand, the existence of an anonymous Old English sermon for the dedication of a church which is purely exhortatory (that is, lacking both narrative and allegorical interpretation)² suggests that Wulfstan's decision to interpret the biblical narrative when he came to compose an address for the occasion was not inevitable. We must then accept that Wulfstan was acquainted with a tradition of interpreting the dedication of Solomon's temple, which suggested

¹The homily is referred to by Jost, Wulfstanstudien, p. 173, and has been edited by R. Brotanek, Texte und Untersuchungen zur ae. Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte, Halle, 1913.

²The sermon has been edited by Brotanek, Texte und Untersuchungen. Jost states that there is "not the slightest reason" to suppose that Wulfstan made use of this sermon in XVIII, but suggests that a few of his expressions in XVIII may have been influenced by the OE sermon's Latin source, also edited by Brotanek (see Wulfstanstudien, p. 150 and n. 3).

to him the idea for his homily, but that he did not know, or was not influenced by, the Ælfric homily which, as far as I can ascertain, is the principal representative of the tradition in Old English. This means that we must also assume that it was possible for Wulfstan to be ignorant of a homily by a respected contemporary which is based on the same idea as his own and contains some similar interpretative material, or that, having read it, he put it from his mind when he composed his own homily. We must also accept that Wulfstan chose to write an address consisting of an interpretation of a scriptural event without consulting any specific exegetical composition, despite the fact that symbolic interpretation is not his usual mode of preaching and there is evidence that a purely exhortatory sermon could have been preached for the occasion, and despite the fact that the only other entirely exegetical composition he is known to have written (XV) appears to be based on a homily which is found, both in Latin and Old English, in the manuscripts which Bethurum describes as representatives of his "Commonplace Book."¹

These propositions seem to me more difficult to accept than the view that Wulfstan consulted Ælfric's homily, and they do not seem to be consistent with what is known of his habits and mode of composition. Bethurum's study of the manuscripts she believes to represent Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book" shows that he compiled whole works or extracts from various sources which he used directly or indirectly in his sermons and other compositions.² Not all of Wulfstan's sermons have a direct source, it is true, but Jost's research shows that he compiled Latin extracts specifically to serve as a basis for a number of his compositions,³ and much of his

¹See Bethurum, Homilies, p. 345 and PMLA, LVII, 925-26.

²PMLA, LVII, 916-29.

³See Anglia, LVI, 265-315 and Wulfstanstudien, pp. 63-69.

material can be traced to works he had copied out. All of this suggests to me, as it presumably does to those who unquestioningly accept Ælfric's compositions as Wulfstan's sources, that Wulfstan was not a man likely to write in complete independence of relevant works, or to rely on his recollections of ideas he had read or heard in various places, particularly when he was writing on a somewhat esoteric topic in an unfamiliar mode. Everything we know of his use of sources indicates that he felt--perhaps to an extreme degree--a need to write within the confines of authoritative formulation, and that he preferred to have as much as possible of the material he was going to use in a given composition gathered together in one place for easy reference.

In order to argue that IV and the assumed source were written independently and drew on commonplace material, it would not be sufficient to establish that all of the material which the two compositions have in common would have been familiar from a variety of other sources. There is a large and diffuse tradition relating to the reign of Antichrist.¹ Thus, if we do not accept that Wulfstan made use of his knowledge of Ælfric's discussion of the Last Days, we must either accept that, from a large amount of available material, each of the two writers selected by coincidence roughly the same topics and illustrations and combined them into a single work, or we must assume the existence of an established type of sermon on the reign of Antichrist which combines the material which is common to Ælfric's and Wulfstan's compositions.² We must also accept, despite the fact that the assumed source, the homily version of Ælfric's Preface to the Catholic Homilies, appears in one of the manuscripts which are believed to represent

¹ See Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 278-82.

² Even Adso's Libellus Anticristi does not contain all of the material common to IV and the Preface. It lacks certain significant details; notably, the allusion to Job, the comparison to gold, and the reasons for God's permission. (For Wulfstan's connexions with this work, see Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 42, 281-82.)

a collection of material drawn up under Wulfstan's direction for his own use,¹ that Wulfstan ignored it when he wrote IV, and drew instead on his knowledge of various works or a hypothetical tradition of sermons on the reign of Antichrist. Again, the view that Wulfstan made use of Ælfric's compositions seems to me easier to accept than the theory that he drew on commonplace material, and it accords with what can be surmised concerning his method of composing a sermon.

It is, of course, possible to advance other theories concerning the nature of Wulfstan's sources, as alternatives to reliance on commonplace material. He may, for instance, have based IV and XVIII on compositions similar to Ælfric's, or almost identical to his own, or he may have had more than one direct source for the two sermons. We can never be certain that such compositions did not exist: Ælfric's compositions, on the other hand, do survive, and could have been known to Wulfstan. But even if we accept that the most feasible theory is that Wulfstan drew on Ælfric's homily on the dedication of a church for the general conception of XVIII, and that the homily version of the Preface suggested to him his selection of material, the question still remains concerning the extent and nature of his reliance on Ælfric. That is to say, he may have relied on his memory of Ælfric's compositions, or he may have had them before him as he wrote; the likeness of specific details and the verbal similarities may have arisen because he was referring to Ælfric's work, or he may have been influenced at certain points by a work which also influenced Ælfric. If we accept that he derived the general idea for his compositions from Ælfric's, it seems logical to assume that similarities of detail are also attributable to Ælfric's influence. It also seems more likely that, if he had a specific source, he would have referred

¹MS. Junius 121. See Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 98-101 for a list and account of the manuscript collection.

to it directly--it is unlikely that he would have had extracts from various works copied out, or compiled quotations from the scriptures to be worked into sermons, if he was not in the habit of referring directly to his sources. It is obviously clear, however, that we can never be sure of the procedure he adopted when composing a sermon.

I would conclude, then, that while it is impossible to be reasonably certain that Wulfstan did depend on Ælfric's compositions, unless, like De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu, they are substantially the same as his own, there is no means of proving that he did not do so. There would seem, however, to be more to be said in favour of the view that he made use of Ælfric's compositions in composing IV and XVIII, though, in the last analysis, acceptance or otherwise of the view that Wulfstan referred to Ælfric's compositions depends largely on one's general opinion of the way in which Wulfstan is likely to have worked, and whether one's assessment of the resemblance leads one to question his reliance on Ælfric's compositions.¹ It seems to me that the resemblance of VI to Ælfric's sermon on the history of Creation is too slight to justify the opinion that he might have referred to Ælfric's composition, and I do not think that the considerations I have put forward with regard to IV and XVIII are relevant to the question of whether Wulfstan referred to Ælfric's sermon when he composed VI. Even so, I would not assume that he was totally unacquainted with his contemporary's sermon. Since my conclusion regarding VI is at odds with the established view, I have advanced arguments in my chapter on VI in favour of the opinion that Sermo de Initio Creaturae was not Wulfstan's source. I have not, however, attempted to argue for or against his use of Ælfric's compositions in my discussion of IV and XVIII, since the nature of

¹Most telling, are the resemblances involving expressions which Jost considers alien to Wulfstan. Only direct influence by another writer, if we accept the theory advanced in Wulfstanstudien, satisfactorily explains the appearance of such expressions in a genuine Wulfstan composition.

Wulfstan's sources cannot be established definitely and I am not inclined to reject the established view. For the sake of convenience, though, the comparison of IV and XVIII with Ælfric's compositions is expressed on occasions in terms which suggest that Wulfstan relied on Ælfric's compositions.

I may, of course, be quite wrong about all three sermons, but it does not seem to me that my conjectures concerning the nature of Wulfstan's sources greatly affect the general thrust of my analysis and the conclusions drawn from it. My point is that the nature and extent of the differences between Wulfstan's sermons and the Ælfric compositions generally assumed to be the sources have been misunderstood because the method of study has been determined by the need to establish criteria of authorship. If a comprehensive comparison is made, it can be seen that divergences in substance and in the expression of apparently similar passages can be related to the differing didactic purpose and mode of the two writers. It appears too that Wulfstan was not interested in style for its own sake. His style is inseparably related to the meaning and purpose of his compositions, and comparison reveals that he sometimes expressed an idea with greater precision than Ælfric, and in a form more suitable for oral delivery. Comparison also reveals the nature of his theological views and interests. It is in order to demonstrate his careful formulation of theological concepts, and the manner in which characteristic features of his style function in the communication of meaning, that a comparison of Wulfstan's and Ælfric's translations of the Lord's Prayer is included.

If, then, Wulfstan did make use of Ælfric's compositions in IV and XVIII, as I am inclined to think he did, it can be concluded that he assimilated his borrowed material with extreme care in

order to make it consistent with his own views, themes, and didactic mode. If he did not, the comparison still supports the view that he conceived his sermons as unified wholes and that his achievement as a sermon writer can best be understood by examining the nature of his themes and his didactic aims. Unless we know the nature of his sources, the extent of his originality cannot be gauged, but it can be said that, if he did rely on Ælfric's compositions, he reshaped them in an original manner. If, instead, he relied only on his acquaintance with commonplace material, he displays much greater independence and originality in the composing of his sermons than he is customarily credited with.

One final comment must be made regarding the point that Wulfstan's various divergences from Ælfric's compositions are related to his didactic purposes. Many of Wulfstan's minute grammatical peculiarities and his lexical preferences, particularly the habitual choice of certain synonyms, which have been included in catalogues of his style, do not appear to have any semantic or stylistic significance. I would take such features, as I have explained,¹ to be aspects of linguistic usage, since it does not seem likely that they involve conscious artistic choice--a knowledge of Wulfstan's grammatical and lexical preferences, as Jost pointed out, is the most useful means of determining the canon precisely because the user is scarcely conscious of his preference.² The habitual preference for certain synonyms and certain constructions, such as the use of deofol without an article, or fela with a singular verb, was, presumably, either peculiar to regions or groups of speakers

¹See above p. 9.

²Wulfstanstudien, pp. 127-28.

that Wulfstan belonged to, in which case the individual speaker cannot really be said to have made a choice, or Wulfstan's preferences were personal mannerisms, and their appearance in a given work probably does not involve choice.¹

Since I am concerned with Wulfstan's sermons as unified expressions of meaning and a consideration of his style in the context of his didactic aims, I have not noted minute differences in the grammar of Wulfstan and Ælfric, or Wulfstan's preference for a different word denoting the same concept, unless it is possible to suggest that they have a semantic or stylistic significance. Most of Wulfstan's divergences from Ælfric are conveniently listed by Jost,² and the divergences for which I can postulate no semantic or stylistic explanation are few in number. The existence of such divergences does not, I think, suggest that it is basically inaccurate to consider that the distinctive features of Wulfstan's style are inseparably related to the meaning and purpose of his sermons, since they are not likely to be the result of conscious choice and would, therefore, not be classified as aspects of literary style by linguists.³ The divergences which seem to me merely to illustrate the differences

¹It is clear, however, that no simple explanation can account for Wulfstan's linguistic peculiarities. As S. Potter remarks in his review of Bethurum's Homilies, RES, New Ser., X (1959) 297, "It remains remarkable that this eminent statesman and ecclesiastic, whose upbringing and connexions were Anglian, should have expressed himself in a form of late West Saxon almost as conventional as Ælfric's, but in choice of word and turn of phrase sufficiently different from his to warrant close and separate investigation."

²See Wulfstanstudien, pp. 117-68.

³See G. W. Turner, Stylistics, forthcoming in Penguin Books, which I have been able to consult in manuscript.

in Wulfstan's and Ælfric's linguistic usage constitute, of course, exceptions to the view that, if Wulfstan did rework Ælfric's compositions, he was motivated by didactic considerations rather than a desire to bring Ælfric's material into accord with his customary mode of expression. However, if Wulfstan's minute grammatical and lexical preferences were largely unconscious, as Jost holds, it is probable that they were not, to Wulfstan, a significant aspect of his revision.

CHAPTER II

DE TEMPORIBUS ANTICRISTI

Ælfric's Preface to the Catholic Homilies (Thorpe, I, 2-8)¹ was first postulated by Becher² as the source of De Temporibus Anticristi (IV, pp. 128-32).³ The Preface was turned into a homily by the omission of the opening and concluding justification for undertaking the composition of a homily collection. The homily consists of 2.28-6.34 (beginning Menn h̅ahofia̅ð godre lare, ending For swylcum bebodum), to which has been added a short homiletic peroration.⁴ Wulfstan's sermon contains much the same kind of information as the homily version of the Preface, but he organizes the material to provide a more forceful and orderly presentation of the subject matter, the reign of Antichrist, and creates a sermon which differs in structure and didactic purpose. Both in style and in import, Wulfstan's sermon is more directly exhortatory and emotionally stirring than the Preface, and his style and method of presentation are more suitable for oral delivery. The contrast between the two writers which emerges from a comparison of IV and Ælfric's homily is a little more extreme than is generally found, since the Preface from which the homily derives is not addressed to a popular audience, and would not have been intended for oral delivery.⁵ However, the style and technique

¹All subsequent references for Ælfric's compositions, unless otherwise stated, are to The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church, ed. B. Thorpe, 2 vols., 1844-46.

²Wulfstans Homilien, p. 54.

³All subsequent references for Wulfstan's sermons, unless otherwise stated, are to The Homilies of Wulfstan, ed. Dorothy Bethurum, Oxford, 1957.

⁴The homily is described by N.R. Ker, A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon, Oxford, 1957, pp. 69, 401, 416.

⁵That the homily post dates the Preface and was originally contained in it, is indicated by K. Sisam's study of Ælfric's revisions of the homilies, "MSS. Bodley 340 and 342: Ælfric's Catholic Homilies," in Studies in the History of Old English Literature, Oxford, 1953, pp. 148-98.

of the Preface does not differ essentially from that adopted in Ælfric's exegetical homilies--the section which circulated separately as a homily was, in fact, also added by Ælfric to his homily for the First Sunday in Advent.¹ It can be said, then, that comparison of these two compositions on the reign of Antichrist throws into relief the differences in the characteristic didactic mode of Ælfric and Wulfstan. If Wulfstan did rework the section of the Preface which circulated separately as a homily when he composed his sermon, comparison reveals the thoroughness and skill with which he transformed his source into his own oratorical mode.

Ælfric's Preface and Wulfstan's De Temporibus Anticristi demonstrate two distinct types of organization. The function of the Preface is to justify the homily collection, and the point made by the section which circulated separately is that men have need of instruction to preserve them in faith in the Last Days. It is on this note that the extract begins and ends, and the paraphrase of biblical verses is followed by the assertion:

Gehwa mæg þe eaðelicor ða towardan costnunge acuman,
 ðurh Godes fultum, gif he bið þurh boclice lare
 getrymmed; forðan ðe þa beoð gehealdene þe oð ende
 on geleafan þurhwuniað. (4.7-10)

The exposition is not, however, ordered about this theme: it is the opening paraphrase of biblical verses which provides the organizing principle. The verses paraphrased are Matt. xxiv.21, 22, and a conflation of vs. 5 and 25. The Vulgate text of the relevant verses is as follows:

21 Erit enim tunc tribulatio magna qualis non
 fuit ab initio mundi usque modo, neque fiet.

22 Et nisi breuiati fuissent dies illi, non
 fieret salva omnis caro: sed propter electos
 breuiabuntur dies illi.

24 Surgent enim pseudochristi, et pseudoprophetae:
 et dabunt signa magna, et prodigia, ita ut in errorem
 inducantur si fieri potest etiam electi.

¹See Sisam, Studies in the History of Old English Literature, p.178.

5 Multi enim venient in nomine meo dicentes:
Ego sum Christus: et multos seducent.

Ælfric's paraphrase gives a slightly shortened version of v. 21, and the conflation of vs. 5 and 24 is inserted between vs. 21 and 22, presumably in order to place the details in chronological order:

"Ðonne beoð swilce gedreccednyssa swilce næron næfre ær fram frymðe middangeardes. Manega lease Cristas cumað on minum naman, cweðende, 'Ic eom Crist,' and wyrcað fela tacna and wundra, to bepæcenne mancynn, and eac swylce þa gecorenan men, gif hit gewurþan mæg: and butan se Ælmihtiga God ða dagas gescyrte, eall mennisc forwurde; ac for his gecorenum he gescyrte þa dagas." (2.31-4.7)

Ælfric first takes each point of the paraphrase of scriptural verses in turn (in 4.10-20), briefly explaining and interpreting--the tribulations are explained symbolically, the false Christs are then interpreted as Antichrist and his nature is defined, and the remainder of the paraphrase is rephrased in one sentence, omitting reference to the elect and elaborating on the shortening of Antichrist's days. Each of the three points in this last sentence (4.16-20), which incorporates the bulk of the quotation, is then dealt with again in the same order as it appears in the quotation with greater detail and elaboration. The interpretation concludes with the exemplum of Job's tribulations which summarizes the main ideas (4.20-6.18).

The development of the piece is a twofold cumulative growth from the quotation, which determines the ordering of the material. As a result of this, there is little close connexion between sentences which treat separate aspects of the quotation except that which exists in the quotation itself. The first three sentences have chronological links:

Fela gedreccednyssa and earfoðnyse becumað.... þonne cymð se Antecrist And se gesewenlica deofol þonne wyrcoð ungerima wundra (my italics)

The sentences which elaborate on the same aspect of the quotation are more closely connected. The two sentences in 4.20-27 are roughly parallel, since both are tripartite in structure, and the contrast between the first two clauses of each is marked by the syntactic similarity. Of the four sentences in 4.29-6.6 which have the same topic, the first two are linked by their initial lexical items (Se Ælmihtiga God geðafað God geðafað). The second two are roughly parallel and elaborate an antithesis made in the first of these four sentences:

þa ofslihð se deofol ðe him wiðstandað, and hi þonne farað mid halgum martyrdome to heofenan rice. þa ðe his leasungum gelyfað, þam he arað, and hi habbað syððan þa ecan susle to edleane heora gedwylde (6.3-6)

is comparable with the earlier statement:

hi wel wyrðe beoð þære deoflican ehtnyse, to ecum forwyrde þam ðe him onbugað, and to ecere myrhðe ðam þe him þurh geleafan wiðcweðað. (4.33-35)

The relationship between the adjacent and roughly parallel sentences is only a semantic one; that is, they are not linked closely by lexical or syntactic repetition. Three of the sentences in 6.6-16 are linked by the initial lexical items which all refer to the same subject.

Since the passage is an explanation of the biblical paraphrase, the measure of relevance which operates in Ælfric's composition is different from Wulfstan's. Subjects introduced in the process of interpreting the text can be elaborated upon if it is considered that the information is of value to the reader. Wulfstan's sermon develops a particular subject, the reign of Antichrist, and adherence to this theme restricts the inclusion of material. Consistent with the explanatory purpose of the Preface is the frequent use of parenthetical modifying phrases and clauses beginning with an explanatory connective (particularly swa swa, se, and forðan ðe). Because Ælfric is concerned to explain and because he is not writing a homily to be preached, he makes no direct

appeal to his auditors. Three sentences refer to the ultimate didactic purpose of his explanation of the scriptural verses:

menn behofiað godre lare swiðost on þisum timan þe is geendung þyssere worulde, and beoð fela frecednyssa on mancynne ærðan þe se ende becume (2.28-30)

Gehwa mæg þe eaðelicor ða towardan costnunge acuman, ðurh Godes fultum, gif he bið þurh boclice lare getrymmed; forðan ðe þa beoð gehealdene þe oð ende on geleafan þurhwuniað (4.7-10)

Bið nu wislicor þæt gehwa ðis wite and cunne his geleafan, weald hwa ða micclan yrmðe gebidan sceole. (6.18-20)

The application is general (menn, gehwa), and no sense of urgency is communicated, because the sentences are not imperative but explanatory, and because Ælfric does not assert emphatically, particularly in the second two sentences, that men must be prepared to meet terrible tribulations. In the last of the three sentences, he states that it is wiser to be prepared, and adds weald hwa ða micclan yrmðe gebidan sceole, and in the second, he states that if men have knowledge they can more easily survive the trials of the Last Days (which are described only as toward). Even the first sentence, despite its reference to fela frecednyssa, is suggestive of calm acceptance rather than a sense of danger, possibly because the first reference to the ending of the world is contained in a relative clause, and Ælfric states that the ending is on þisum timan before he mentions the fact that the end of the world is preceded by fela frecednyssa.

The first thirteen lines of De Temporibus Anticristi differ considerably from the homily version of the Preface in their mode of expression and organization of material (3-15 can be compared with 2.28-4.16). The opening sentence of the homily version of the Preface reads:

menn behofiað godre lare swiðost on þisum timan þe is geendung þyssere worulde, and beoð fela frecednyssa on mancynne ærðan þe se ende becume. (2.28-30)

Wulfstan's sermon begins:

Leofan men, us is mycel þearf þæt we wære beon
 þæs egeslican timan þe towerd is. (3-4)

In its employment of the first person and its focus upon the actual response which men must make to the Last Days, Wulfstan's sentence is in effect a dramatization of Ælfric's words. Instead of explaining that men need instruction to protect them against tribulation, Wulfstan warns directly, and his use of us is mycel þearf þæt we wære beon instead of menn behofiað godre lare indicates at the outset that it is not simply teaching about the end of the world which is to be imparted but an attitude towards it. Ælfric describes the Last Days, saying that they are

on þisum timan þe is geendung þyssere worulde, and
 beoð fela frecednyssa on mancynne ærðan þe se ende
 becume....

Wulfstan refers to the Last Days only as þæs egeslican timan þe towerd is. By the avoidance of lengthy description of the Last Days, his opening sentence is effectively abrupt, and it emphasizes the emotional potential of the subject, for egeslican timan refers to the perception of the phenomenon which Ælfric denotes by fela frecednyssa. The reference to the terrors of the Last Days receives extra emphasis in Wulfstan's introduction because it is placed at the end of the sentence. No specific mention is made in Wulfstan's introductory sentence of the end of the world, but the phrase þe towerd is suggests a future threat to be met, which is consistent with the warning tone, whereas Ælfric assumes calmly that the Last Days have already been reached (on þisum timan).

Wulfstan opens, then, with an effective exhortation, which is consistent with his treatment of the remainder of the material for his sermon. From the very beginning of his sermon, he adopts a hortatory manner, both the syntactic structure and the vocabulary demanding an emotional response from the audience, and the

overall dissimilarity in the meaning of his opening sentence and the first sentence of the homily version of the Preface indicates the dissimilarity of Wulfstan's didactic purpose, which governs the style and presentation of the whole of his sermon. The differences between the two introductory sentences epitomise the differences between the two compositions on the subject of the Last Days.

Ælfric supports his assertion, that many tribulations will befall men before the end, by the paraphrase of the verses from Matt. xxiv:

"Ðonne beoð swilce gedreccednyssa swilce næron næfre ær fram frymðe middangeardes. Manega lease Cristas cumað on minum naman, cweðende, 'Ic eom Crist,' and wyrcað fela tacna and wundra, to bepæcenne mancynn, and eac swylce þa gecorenan men, gif hit gewurþan mæg: and butan se Ælmihtiga God ða dagas gescyrte, eall mennisc forwurde; ac for his gecorenum he gescyrte þa dagas." (2.31-4.7)

The tribulations are explained symbolically as bydelas þæs ecan forwyrdes on yfelum mannum, and the many false Christs are silently emended, in the first interpretation Ælfric gives of his paraphrase, to Antichrist, who is described as chronologically successive to the tribulations (þonne cymð se Antecrist):

Fela gedreccednyssa and earfoðnyse becumað on þissere worulde ær hire geendunge, and þa synd ða bydelas þæs ecan forwyrdes on yfelum mannum, þe for heora mandædum siððan ecelice þrowiað on ðære sweartan helle. Þonne cymð se Antecrist, se bið mennisc mann and soð deofol, swa swa ure Hælend is soðlice mann and God on anum hade. (4.10-14)

Wulfstan, however, gives prominence to the subject of his sermon by introducing Antichrist in the second sentence of the sermon. He also identifies Antichrist with the manifold tribulations mentioned in the scriptures:

Nu bið swyðe raðe Antecristes tima ... 7 þæt bið se egeslicesta þe æfre gewearð syððan þeos woruld ærost gescapen wæs. (4-6)

The identification of Antichrist with the future terror is

emphasized by the repetition which links his first two sentences (þæs egeslican timan þe towerd is Antecristes tima ... bið se egeslicesta). Wulfstan does interpret the tribulations mentioned in the gospels as a prelude to the advent of Antichrist in some sermons,¹ but the identification of the two disasters in this one ensures that the sermon focuses exclusively upon Antichrist and the terror of his reign. The omission of any reference to the Manega lease Cristas in Wulfstan's sermon also gives greater prominence to Antichrist as the sole cause of terror, and it illustrates Wulfstan's tendency, which is discussed in later chapters, to sharpen the conflict between good and evil by reducing the protagonists to one representative of each force.

In the comparison of the first sentence of the homily version of the Preface and Wulfstan's sermon, it was observed that Wulfstan appears to be concerned to impress the terror of the Last Days upon his audience, rather than to communicate abstract information. In keeping with this aim, he describes the tribulations of Antichrist's reign in superlative terms, as the most terrible since the creation of the world (se egeslicesta þe æfre gewearð syððan þeos woruld/^{ærost} gescapen wæs), whereas Ælfric, in paraphrasing the reference to the tribulations of the Last Days, emphasizes the fact that there have never before been such tribulations (swilce gedreccednyssa swilce næron næfre ær fram frymðe middangeardes). There is nothing in Wulfstan's sermon which is comparable with Ælfric's interpretation of the eschatological tribulations as a harbinger of eternal torment of the damned (4.10-14). Wulfstan's failure to make this point could be viewed

¹Particularly in II. 46-52 and VI. 196-204. It is implicit in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, in which the afflictions suffered by the English are presented as indications of the approach of Antichrist (see further Pt. III, ch. III).

as an additional instance of the lack of interest in symbolic interpretation considered to be typical of him,¹ if we assume that Ælfric's composition was his source, or that he had the same information available to him. However, since Wulfstan's sermon is organized according to a theme, and is not an interpretation of the scriptures, the symbolic significance of the tribulations is not relevant to his composition, and its inclusion would weaken the emotional force of his exposition of the literal fulfilment of the prophetic words. The phrases Nu bið swyðe raðe and þæs ðe we wenan magan 7 eac georne witan in the second sentence, which have no parallel in Ælfric's reference to the coming of Antichrist and tribulation, do not, I think, merely represent characteristic intensification or rhetorical inflation, for they have a function which is consistent with the nature of the sermon and its didactic purpose. The first of the phrases continues and intensifies the note of urgency introduced in the first sentence, and the second is a rhetorical assertion addressed to the audience which demands its involvement in the exhortation.

Having introduced Antichrist and mentioned the unprecedented terror of his reign, Wulfstan continues in the third sentence with a definition of his nature which is comparable with the one Ælfric gives. Ælfric's definition of Antichrist, it may be noted, is separated from his first reference to the unprecedented tribulations of the Last Days by some twelve lines. Ælfric defines Antichrist as follows:

Ðonne cymð se Antecrist, se bið mennisc mann and
soð deofol, swa swa ure Hælend is soðlice mann and
God on anum hade (4.14-16)

Wulfstan has two sentences on the nature of Antichrist:

¹See, for instance, Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 96, 354 (note to 112-14).

He byð sylf deofol 7 ðeah mennisc man geboren. Crist
is soð God 7 soð mann, 7 Antecrist bið soðlice deofol
7 mann. (6-8)

The second of Wulfstan's sentences contains a comparison of Christ and Antichrist which is similar to the one Ælfric draws. Wulfstan's sentence reverses the order of the comparison, and the dual nature of Antichrist gains greater emphasis by its final position in the sentence.¹ Wulfstan presumably uses soð to describe Christ instead of Antichrist because the word to him meant "true" in the sense of "righteous," or "the opposite of falseness."² As Wulfstan stresses the falseness and deceptiveness of the devil in a number of his sermons, and frequently contrasts the soð of Christianity with the unsoð of the devil, it is understandable that he avoids describing Antichrist as soð devil and man in his definition.³

The most obvious difference between Wulfstan's second sentence defining the nature of Antichrist and Ælfric's description is that the antithetical significance is heightened by parallelism. The second of Wulfstan's defining sentences falls into two parts, in contrast to the threefold division of Ælfric's sentence. The structure of both his main clauses is closely similar, whereas Ælfric does not employ syntactic repetition, though it is clear from the repetition of mann and soð that he intends to emphasize the basic opposition involved. Each of the lexical items in the first main clause of Wulfstan's comparison has a parallel in the second, the use of Crist instead of Hælend strengthening the contrast with Antecrist. The repeated adjective soð is

¹I am indebted to Professor Liggins for drawing attention to this point.

²For instance, he explains that Crist ælmihtig lærde georne soð-fæstnysse ... 7 Antecrist lærð unsoðfæstnysse (IX. 129-31).

³See further pp. 207-10.

paralleled by soðlice, so that the pattern is varied slightly by an instance of word-play of a kind which is not uncommon in Wulfstan's compositions.¹ Ælfric, of course, also contrasts soð and soðlice, but the word-play is less noticeable in his sentence because he couples mennisc mann with soð deofol.

The tightly patterned sentence Wulfstan constructs in Crist is soð God 7 soð mann, 7 Antecrist bið soðlice deofol 7 mann enables the contrast between the nature of Christ and Antichrist to be more directly apprehended than it is in the comparison Ælfric draws:

Ponne cymð se Antecrist, se bið mennisc mann and
soð deofol, swa swa ure Hælend is soðlice mann and
God on anum hade. (4.14 -6)

A strong feeling for the contrasts and antitheses inherent in Christianity appears to be a distinguishing feature of Wulfstan's thought. One often finds that, when a contrast or comparison is involved, Wulfstan clarifies it by the employment of appropriate rhetorical figures. (It is even possible that certain of his verbal preferences, such as the fact that he rarely uses hælend for the second person of the Trinity, normally Crist and dryhten,² reflect his world view, insofar as Crist contrasts explicitly with Antecrist).³ On the other hand, Ælfric's concern with explanation and elaboration necessitates sentence structures which tend to blur the essential point. The corollary of Wulfstan's tendency to emphasize contrasts by tight verbal patterning is that his sentence comparing Christ and Antichrist consists of two statements, which contributes to the general impression that

¹See Bethurum, Homilies, p. 28.

²See Jost, Wulfstanstudien, p. 118.

³Further to this point see pp. 203-12, 235.

the tone of his sermon is more forceful and direct, in contrast to the leisurely elaboration suggested by Ælfric's longer sentence which employs the connectives bonne se, and swa swa.

Comparison of the two sentences which contrast Christ and Antichrist also reveals the different measure of relevance operating in the two writers' compositions, for Wulfstan is concerned to define the nature of Antichrist, and so pares the opposition down to its essentials, where Ælfric, by the addition of on anum hade, goes beyond the basic contrast to convey an extra piece of information. If one takes the prevailing view of the difference between Ælfric's compositions and Wulfstan's, Wulfstan's failure to draw attention to the unity of the Trinity is simply indicative of a lack of concern with theological subtleties. If, however, one views Wulfstan and Ælfric as writers with different aims which are reflected in dissimilar sentence structures, it can be seen that inclusion of any reference to the Trinity in the Wulfstan sentence under discussion would destroy the close parallelism by which he emphasizes the contrast. His failure to mention the unity of the Trinity, if we assume that he was reworking Ælfric's composition, also indicates his tight control of his material, which leads him to exclude all information in his source not immediately related to his theme.

It is not possible to deduce with certainty Wulfstan's reason for elaborating the definition of Antichrist's nature in two sentences by prefixing the contrast to Christ with the statement He byð sylf deofol 7 ðeah mennisc man geboren, which duplicates the information contained in Antecrist bið soðlice deofol 7 mann. The additional sentence defining Antichrist does help to maintain the prominence of Antichrist as the subject of the sermon, and it prepares for the contrast Wulfstan draws between Christ and Antichrist, which might otherwise seem a somewhat abrupt transition

from the second sentence of the sermon. The repetition of information concerning the dual nature of Antichrist could also have been motivated by a desire to ensure greater comprehension during oral delivery: a similar kind of development can be seen in the first two sentences of the sermon, in which the initial warning is stated simply and then elaborated upon.

It could be, however, that Wulfstan's intention was to expound the dual nature of Antichrist more precisely than Ælfric does. Patristic authorities differed on the question of whether Antichrist was a man filled with the spirit of the devil or the actual child of the devil born of a virgin and therefore the exact antithesis of Christ. The latter view was firmly rejected by Adso in Libellus Anticristi,¹ presumably on the grounds that the virgin birth was a miracle that only God could perform:

He [Antichrist] bið acenned of fæder and of meder
flæsclicum gemanan, swa swa oðre men, and na, swa
lease men sæcgað, þæt he beo acenned of mædene anum.
ac he bið mid synnum begyten and mid synnum acenned
and eall on synnum afedd.²

Ælfric's explanation leaves the exact nature of Antichrist's duality ambiguous, for, though the addition of on anum hade to the definition of Christ as God and man suggests that an actual identity between the two aspects exists in the nature of Christ but not in Antichrist, mennisc mann and soð deofol is open to either of the two possible interpretations. Wulfstan's He byð sylf deofol 7 ðeah mennisc man geboren is a much clearer definition of the nature of Antichrist in accordance with Adso's

¹Cf. Bethurum, Homilies, p. 288 (note to 6-7). Adso's Libellus Anticristi, both in Latin and in OE translation, appears in MSS associated with Wulfstan. (See Bethurum, pp. 281-82).

²OE translation of Libellus Anticristi, in Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit, ed. A. [s.] Napier, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1966, p. 193, ll. 1-5.

formulation.¹ Mennisc man geboren, it may be noted, gains extra emphasis by its final position in the sentence, and is more explicit than Ælfric's mennisc mann. If my hypothesis is correct, comparison of Ælfric's and Wulfstan's definition of the nature of Antichrist suggests that Wulfstan's interest in the finer points of theology is in some instances greater than Ælfric's, and that evidence for this must be sought in the details of his expression, because the didactic mode of his sermons usually precludes the extended and explicit discussions of theological matters found in Ælfric's homilies. The greater precision of Wulfstan's definition is all the more remarkable if he was reworking Ælfric's composition when he composed his sermon.

After the comparison of the nature of Christ and Antichrist, Wulfstan adds a sentence comparing the result of Antichrist's appearance with the effect of Christ's coming, which has no parallel in the Preface:

Ðurh Crist com eallum middanearde help 7 frofer,
7 ðurh Antecrist cymð se mæsta gryre 7 seo mæste
earfoðnes þe æfre ær on worulde geworden wearð. (8-11)

The comparison Wulfstan draws here looks forward to his later remark concerning the contrasting nature of the miracles wrought by Christ and Antichrist (53-56). The comparison echoes the antithetical pattern of the sentence preceding it, though the two main clauses in which the comparison is made are less exactly balanced. The two clauses begin with a similar phrase (Ðurh Crist com ... 7 ðurh Antecrist cymð) and help 7 frofer in the first clause is paralleled by se mæsta gryre 7 seo mæste earfoðnes in the second.

¹The definition in V confirms that Wulfstan adhered to Adso's view: He bið mennisc man geboren, ac he bið þeah mid deofles gaste eal afylled (66-68).

The syntax and length of the two clauses, however, are dissimilar, the remaining parallel being between eallum middanearde and þe æfre ær on worulde geworden wearð. The lack of exact balance results in greater prominence being given to Antichrist, and the use of superlatives and hyperbole to describe his effect upon mankind, but not that of Christ's coming, continues the heightening of the terror of his reign, which the sermon warns against from its very first sentence.

The concluding words of the sentence in 8-11, þe æfre ær on worulde geworden wearð recall the conclusion of the second sentence of the sermon, se egeslicesta þe æfre gewearð syððan þeos woruld ærost gescapen was. Wulfstan continues from this point with two sentences concerning the termination of Antichrist's reign by God, which are in substance comparable with Ælfric's paraphrase of Matt.xxiv.22. Wulfstan states:

And eall mancynn forwurde forðrihte gif God his dagas
ne gescyrte. Ac God gescyrt his dagas for ðæra þingan
þe him gecorene syn 7 he gehealden habban wile. (11-14)

Again, Wulfstan's ordering of information differs considerably from Ælfric's. The first reference to the termination of Antichrist's reign in the homily version of the Preface is separated from the first reference to the unprecedented nature of the terror of the Last Days and the coming of false Christs by details concerning the deeds of the false Christs. That is to say, the paraphrase of scriptural verses which follows immediately after the sentence with which the homily version of the Preface opens reads:

"Ðonne beoð swilce gedrecednyssa swilce næron
næfre ær fram frymðe middangeardes. Manega lease
Cristas cumað on minum naman, cweðende, 'Ic eom
Crist,' and wyrcað fela tacna and wundra, to
bepæcenne mancynn, and eac swylce þa gecorenan men,
gif hit gewurpan mæg: and butan se Ælmihtiga God
ða dagas gescyrte, eall mennisc forwurde; ac for
his gecorenum he gescyrte þa dagas." (2.31-4.7)

Wulfstan, on the other hand, begins with a warning about the terror of the Last Days (3-4), then refers to the coming of Antichrist (4-6). Allowing for the fact that he speaks only of Antichrist, not many false Christs, his ordering of information is, to this point, similar to that found in the Preface. But he then goes on to define the nature of Antichrist, which appears in the interpretation of the paraphrase in ^{the} homily version of the Preface, and, after a second reference to the unprecedented terror of Antichrist's reign, he comes to the termination of Antichrist's reign. There is, then, no reference to the miracles of Antichrist's reign and his deception of mankind in the opening lines of Wulfstan's sermon. Wulfstan tends to deal only with one topic at a time: the opening section (3-15) presents the terror of Antichrist's reign, and his miraculous deeds and deceptions are reserved for treatment later in the sermon.

I would describe 3-15 as a rhetorical unit, by which I mean a passage consisting of sentences devoted to one aspect of the subject of the sermon which are unified by connectives such as and and ac, and various kinds of lexical and syntactic repetition. The first and second sentences of 3-15 are linked by the occurrence of egeslican timan and tima ... se egeslicesta, and the repetition of mann and deofol links the third sentence to the fourth, which also contains the contrast mann and God. The fourth and fifth sentences are both antithetically patterned. The seventh sentence, which begins Ac God gescyrt his dagas, picks up the end of the sixth sentence, gif God his dagas ne gescyrte. There is also a kind of refrain running through the passage, which is formed by þe æfre gewearð syððan þeos woruld ærost gescapen wæs (6), þe æfre ær on worulde geworden wearð (10-11), and swa næfre ær ne gewearð (15). A rhetorical unit, then, is equivalent to, though more highly formalized than, a modern paragraph. As I shall

attempt to demonstrate in my examination of other sermons, Wulfstan appears to compose fairly consistently in units larger than a sentence.¹ The existence of lexical and syntactic repetition as a basis of rhetorical units in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is noted by R.G. Fowler,² and I am therefore indebted to his study for the recognition of units larger than a sentence in Wulfstan's other sermons. Fowler does not appear, however, to consider that the whole of a Wulfstan sermon can be divided into rhetorical units, and he does not relate the stylistically defined units to divisions of subject matter, or comment upon the aid afforded to the comprehension of Wulfstan's audience by the various types of sentence linking.

To return, then, to Wulfstan's sentences on the termination of Antichrist's reign near the conclusion of his first rhetorical unit. The Vulgate version of Matt. xxiv.22 reads:

Et nisi breviati fuissent dies illi, non
fieret salva omnis caro: sed propter electos
breviabuntur dies illi.

Alfric gives a reasonably close translation of this verse:

and butan se Ælmihtiga God ða dagas gescyrte,
eall mennisc forwurde; ac for his gecorenum he
gescyrte þa dagas. (4.5-7)

Wulfstan's sentences on the termination of Antichrist's reign read:

And eall mancynn forwurde forðrihte gif God his
dagas ne gescyrte. Ac God gescyrt his dagas for
ðæra þingan þe him gecorene syn 7 he gehealden
habban wile. (11-14)

His divergences from Alfric are consistent with those which have already been noted. His reversal of the order of the phrases found in the Preface gives rise to the figure anadiplosis, verbal repetition linking the end and the beginning of two sentences, which is a more emphatic and obvious device (to an auditor) than

¹See further pp. 227-31, 270-74, 287, 304-19, 323-36, 350-52, 393-95.

²See "Some Stylistic Features of the Sermo Lupi," JEGP, LXV (1966), 1-18.

Ælfric's chiasmus. The terror of the Last Days is emphasized by the initial placing of And eall mancynn forwurde which follows immediately after se mæsta gryre 7 seo mæste earfoðnes þe æfre ær on worulde geworden wearð. Because Wulfstan re-orders the constituent elements of the biblical sentence from which his reference to the termination of Antichrist's reign ultimately derives, the verse has implications in his sermon which differ slightly from the implications of Ælfric's translation in the Preface. The implication conveyed by Wulfstan's version is that complete destruction is the fate of mankind from which it is fortunately rescued by the intervention of God. Ælfric's version draws more attention to the fact that God's intervention prevents the destruction of mankind by preserving the order of the original. Wulfstan's addition of the intensifying forðrihte is consistent with the heightening of the terror of the Last Days which informs his sermon.

Bethurum compares the sentence in this sermon on the termination of Antichrist's reign with passages in other sermons which derive from Matt. xxiv.22:

And eal hit forwurde gyf God ne gescyrte þæs
 þeodscaðan lifdagas þe raþor þurh his mihta. Ac
 for þæra gebeorge þe him syn gecorene 7 ðe he
 habban wyle gehealden 7 geholpen, he forðeð þane
 þeodfeond 7 on helle grund þananforð besenceð mid
 eallum þam gegenge þe him ær fyligde. (V. 108-13)

7 eal hit forwurde gyf God his hwile ne scyrte. Ac
 Godd hine fordeþ þe raþor, forðam þe he wile gebeorhgan
 þam ðe him sylfum syn gecorene 7 gecweme. (VI. 205-7)

She suggests that these versions of Matt. xxiv.22 provide internal evidence for the order in which the sermons were written because there is a gradual progression in IV, V, and VI in the facility with which propter is rendered into English, the rendering in VI being the "clearest and most idiomatic English."¹ Whether or not

¹Homilies, p. 102.

it is valid to assume that Wulfstan required practice in order to express himself clearly and idiomatically is difficult to determine, but in any case there are other dissimilarities between the various versions, which have a significance apart from the development of an idiomatic translation. The versions in V and VI are so phrased that emphasis is given to the rapidity with which God destroys Antichrist and his desire to protect the elect. Neither of these aspects is given prominence in the version of v.22 in De Temporibus Anticristi because to give prominence to them would be inconsistent with the emotional effect and the general thrust of this particular sermon.

A comparison of the parallels which exist between Wulfstan's sermons is illuminating because it reveals that the construction of a sentence reflects the stylistic and thematic context of the sermon in which it appears. Wulfstan's description of the shortening of Antichrist's days in De Temporibus Anticristi contains a rhetorical figure, anadiplosis, which is lacking in the other two versions. This is consistent with the immediate context, since the opening section of De Temporibus Anticristi makes considerable use of formal patterning and repetition to bind the sentences together into a larger rhetorical unit.¹ Though Wulfstan gives prominence to God's protection of the elect in the other two paraphrases, which appear in sermons concerned with God's control of the universe,² such prominence in the first paragraph unit of De Temporibus Anticristi would be superfluous. It would also appear to conflict with the explanation given later in the sermon that God permits Antichrist to afflict the righteous in order that they may be purged of sin when the Last Judgement

¹See above p. 54.

²See further pp. 131-32, 314-15.

takes place. The inclusion of phrases indicating the rapidity with which God destroys Antichrist in V and VI (gescyrte þæs beodscaðan lifdagas þe rapor ðurh his mihta and Godd hine fordeþ þe rapor) is appropriate to the respective themes of these sermons, since V and VI are concerned with the comparative superiority of God's power to the devil's, but Wulfstan's intention in De Temporibus Anticristi is to impress upon his audience the fearfulness of Antichrist's reign, and this would be diminished by the assertion that this is to be of short duration.

In the comparison made above between Ælfric's and Wulfstan's rendering of Matt. xxiv.22, it was observed that Ælfric gives greater weight to God's intervention to prevent the destruction of man. His rendering therefore has less emotional force than Wulfstan's, which implies that complete destruction is the fate of mankind, from which it is fortunately rescued by God's intervention. The terror of the Last Days is minimized further in Ælfric's interpretation of his text by the assignment of a definite time limit to the reign of Antichrist:

Se Ælmihtiga God geðafað þam arleasan Antecriste
to wyrçenne tacna, and wundra, and ehtnysse, to
feorþan healfan geare. (4.29-31)

The biblical verse is also rephrased as:

ac his tima ne bið na langsum; forþan þe Godes grama
hine fordeð, and þeos weoruld bið sibban geendod. (4.18-20)

Exposition is therefore inimical to an emotionally stirring treatment of the subject, particularly as Ælfric wishes to demonstrate that the power of God is greater than that of his antagonist.¹ Wulfstan's sermon contains no mention of the short period of Antichrist's reign, and he minimizes the relief promised by God's intervention in the paraphrase of Matt. xxiv.22

¹See 4.20-27 and 6.13-18.

by a sentence which follows the account of the destruction of Antichrist and has no parallel in the Preface, And ðeah on þam fæce þe^{he}/bið he gedeð swa mycel to yfele swa næfre ær ne gewearð (14-15). The very shortness of Antichrist's reign is therefore used to demonstrate further its enormity.¹ This final hyperbole completes the introductory description of Antichrist and leads naturally to the summary of Antichrist's deeds and God's reason for permitting these, which is the subject of the second rhetorical unit.

The second rhetorical unit begins:

Ælcne mann he wile awendan of rihtan geleafan 7 of
cristendome 7 bespannan to his unlarum gif he mæg;
7 God hit gepafað him sume hwile for twam þingum, (15-18)

and is parallel to Ælfric's words:

He neadað þurh yfelnyse þæt men sceolon bugan fram
heora Scyppendes geleafan to his leasungum, seðe is
ord ælcere leasunge and yfelnyse. Se Ælmihtiga God
geðafað þam arleasan Antecriste to wyrçenne tacna,
and wundra, and ehtnyse, to feorðan healfan geare,
forþan ðe (4.27-32)

Wulfstan's sentence, in keeping with the didactic purpose of his sermon, intensifies the threat which Antichrist represents, by its use of Ælcne mann instead of just men and the addition of gif he mæg, suggesting Antichrist's determination. Other divergences from the Preface illustrate Wulfstan's tendency to compose sentences which are simpler in content than Ælfric's, because they deal with only one main point, the peripheral issues being reserved for later treatment. Wulfstan employs hit instead of the descriptive tacna, and wundra, and ehtnyse, which are the subject of later paragraphs in Wulfstan's sermon. Ælfric speaks of Antichrist's use of compulsion (He neadað þurh yfelnyse), and refers to his ehtnyse as well as the tacna and wundra mentioned in his paraphrase of the scriptural verses. Wulfstan, however, does not

¹Probably influenced by Apoc. xii.12.

mention compulsion in this sentence, only inducement, for Antichrist's use of force against those who resist him forms a separate topic in Wulfstan's sermon--in the second rhetorical unit he is not concerned with Antichrist's deeds as such, but with God's reasons for permitting them. Wulfstan's sentence is also simpler because he has nothing similar to purh yfelnyse and seðe is ord ælcere leasunge and yfelnyse, phrases which add to the characterization of Antichrist, but are extraneous to the central issue.

Stylistic divergences from Ælfric again reflect the nature of the sermon's organization. Wulfstan's sermon develops a single topic in each of its rhetorical units and the sentences are restricted accordingly. The style and organization of the sermon are appropriate to a composition for oral delivery, for Wulfstan's comparatively simple sentence in 15-18, containing little subordination and lacking elaboration of the nominal items, is more readily apprehended than Ælfric's two sentences in which elaboration and subordination multiply the amount of information to be assimilated and distract attention from the main point. Wulfstan's added specification, for twam þingum, adds to the clarity of his explanation.

This clarifying device is continued in Wulfstan's explanation, in an is ærest þæt ... oðer is þæt (18-24). Ælfric does not specify so clearly that God has a dual purpose in permitting the deeds of Antichrist--his first sentence begins Se Ælmihtiga God geðafað forþan ðe on ðam timan, and the second begins God geðafað eac þæt (4.29-6.3). His explanation reads:

Se Ælmihtiga God geðafað þam arleasan Antecriste to wyrçenne tacna, and wundra, and ehtnyse, to feorþan healfan gear; forþan ðe on ðam timan bið swa micel yfelnyss and þwyrnys ðetwux mancynne þæt hi wel wyrðe beoð þære deoflican ehtnyse, to ecum forwyrd eac þæt ðe him onbugað, and to ecere

myrhðe ðam þe him þurh geleafan wiðcweðað. God
geðafað eac þæt his gecorenan þegenas beon aclænsade
fram eallum synnum þurh ða ormatan ehtnyssa, swa swa
gold bið on fyre afandod. (4.29-6.3)

His first reason appears to be that the deeds of Antichrist are a form of punishment, since he states that men are so sinful that hi wel wyrðe beoð þære deoflican ehtnysse. Presumably he does not merely mean that men are punished in this world by the torments Antichrist inflicts, since he adds that the deoflican ehtnysse is to ecum forwyrde þam ðe him onbugað, and to ecere myrhðe ðam þe him þurh geleafan wiðcweðað. In view of this addition, the implication of the sentence would seem to be that the "diabölical persecution" is a means of testing who will follow Antichrist and who will resist him, and that evil men resist him less and therefore suffer less in this world, but are punished by eternal damnation, whereas the righteous suffer more in this world because they resist him but, are granted eternal joy because they are purged of sin. The point, then, is not so much that men deserve to be persecuted because of their sins, but that they deserve to be exposed to Antichrist's attempt to gain followers which is ultimately just, even though the good and the evil suffer disproportionately for their sins in this world. If this is the meaning of Ælfric's first reason, it is expressed in such a compressed and elliptical fashion that it would be difficult to grasp the significance of the sentence containing the first reason when the homily version was read aloud. The point is, in fact, not spelt out anywhere in the Preface: the probable meaning of Ælfric's first reason emerges only if one draws one's own conclusions from reading the two reasons in conjunction with the two sentences which follow them:

Þa ofslihð se deofol ðe him wiðstandað, and hi þonne
farað mid halgum martyrdome to heofenan rice. Þa 7e
his leasungum gelyfað, þam he arað, and hi habbað
syððan þa ecan-susle to edleane heora gedwyldes. (6.3-6)

Oral delivery, however, scarcely allows sufficient time to reflect on the unstated implications of groups of sentences.

While God geðafað eac, in the second of Ælfric's sentences explaining God's reasons for permitting the deeds of Antichrist, implies that Ælfric is giving two separate reasons, the first reason overlaps with the second, that God allows the elect to be purified of sin, since Ælfric states in the first reason that the persecution which men deserve for their sins is to ecere myrhðe ðam þe him þurh geleafan wiðcweðað. The comparison to the refinement of gold in fire suggests that Ælfric may be thinking, in his second reason, of Antichrist's attempts to compel men to follow him, whereas deoflican ehtnyse in the first reason refers more to deception and temptation--but, in the absence of explanation, the use of ehtnyse to denote two different aspects of Antichrist's attempts to gain followers is confusing. It may also be noted that Ælfric does not state explicitly in his second reason that the elect suffer ormatan ehtnyssa because they resist Antichrist through faith, though the point is made clear in the sentence which follows the second reason:

Pa ofslihð se deofol ðe him wiðstandað, and hi þonne farað mid halgum martyrdome to heofenan rice. (6.3-4)

Wulfstan formulates his explanation of why God permits Antichrist's deeds in a different way. The two reasons he gives are distinct from one another, and their meaning is immediately clear. He explains:

an is ærest þæt men beoð þurh synna swa forð
forworhte þæt hi beoð þæs wel wyrðe þæt deofol
openlice þanne fandige hwa him fullfyligean wille;
oðer is þæt God wile þæt ða þe swa gesælige beoð
þæt hi on rihtan geleafan ðurhwuniað 7 ðam deofle
anrædlice wiðstandað, he wile þæt þa beon raðe
amerede 7 geclansode of synnum þurh ða myclan
ehtnesse 7 ðurh þæne martirdom ðe hy þonne þoliað. (18-24)

Instead of stating that man's sins merit deoflican ehtnysse, Wulfstan uses a clause explaining the nature of the devil's action, þæt deofol openlice þænne fandige hwa him fullfyligean wille. He therefore makes it clear that the first reason for God's permission is that men are punished for their sins by being exposed to the devil's attempts to gain followers. This point is, then, made more clearly in Wulfstan's sermon than it is in the Preface, and the explanation does not involve the additional complexity of ultimate justice, which Ælfric introduces by his reference to the eternal fate of those who submit to Antichrist and those who withstand him. Wulfstan treats the elect's disproportionate suffering in this world in relation to the suffering of those who submit to Antichrist as a separate point later in his explanation (24-29), and states the issue clearly at the beginning of his third rhetorical unit (37-43). The absence of any reference to eternal fate in the first reason he gives also means that his first reason is quite distinct from the second, which is basically the same as the second of Ælfric's reasons. The notion of an elect which is to be purified in order to achieve eternal reward is, however, prepared for by hwa him fullfyligean wille, since this implies that some men will not follow Antichrist even though all are sinful and therefore deserve to be exposed to his attempts to gain followers.

Wulfstan does not speak of gecorenan þegenas in his second reason, as Ælfric does, but refers to

ða þe swa gesælige beoð þæt hi on rihtan geleafan
 ðurhwuniað 7 ðam deofle anrædlice wiðstandað.

As a result, the nature of the elect, which emerges only gradually from a reading of the homily version of the Preface, is immediately comprehensible. Instead of stating that the elect are purged of sin by ormatan ehtnyssa, Wulfstan states that the elect are purged þurh ða myclan ehtnesse 7 ðurh þæne martirdom ðe hy þænne þoliað.

By the use of the descriptive noun phrase explaining the nature of the elect, and by explaining the nature of the persecutions they suffer, Wulfstan makes it clear that the persecution of the elect is a direct consequence of their faith, and that the persecution by which the elect is purified is the force which the devil brings to bear on those who resist his attempts to gain followers. Ælfric, it was noted above, does not state explicitly that the suffering of the elect is a direct consequence of faith when he gives his second reason, and it is not clear whether the ormatan ehtnyssa which purges the elect is the same as the deoflican ehtnysse which all men merit by their sins.

In general, Wulfstan's second reason gives greater emphasis to the suffering of the elect, where Ælfric's emphasizes their purification. The difference in emphasis results in part from Wulfstan's elaboration of the means by which the elect is purified. The martyrdom of the elect to which he refers in his second reason is mentioned by Ælfric only in the sentence which follows his explanation of God's reasons (þa ofslihð se deofol ðe him wiðstandað ... (6.3-4)). The difference in emphasis also results from the fact that the comparison to the refinement of gold which appears in Ælfric's second reason is lacking in Wulfstan's explanation (swa swa gold bið on fyre afandod). In Wulfstan's sermon, the comparison appears instead in the rhetorical imperative which concludes the second unit (33-36). Wulfstan's failure to utilize the comparison at this point provides a further illustration of his tendency to compose sentences which present a single concept, and to deal separately with information contained in comparable Ælfric sentences, if it is extraneous to the point he is making in a sentence. The formal structure of Wulfstan's sentence containing the second reason for

God's permission would not, in any case, easily accommodate an explanatory clause such as swa swa gold bið on fyre afandod.

Wulfstan creates a balanced form by the consistent employment of grammatical doubling, which would be disrupted by a clause containing the comparison at the end of a sentence:

God wile þæt ... he wile þæt
 on rihtan geleafan ðurhwuniað 7 ðam deofle anrædlice
 wiðstandað
 amerede 7 geclænsode
 þurh ða myclan ehtnesse 7 ðurh þæne martirdom

The restriction of content and the creation of a formally balanced sentence appear to be interdependent.

Four sentences explaining further the necessity for the devil's persecution of the righteous follow after the statement of God's reasons for permitting Antichrist's deeds:

Forðam nis nan man þæt ne sy synful, 7 ælc man sceal sar ðolian oðþon her oðþon elleshwær be ðam þe he þurh synna geearnað. And ðy bið seo ehtnes þonne godum mannum swa stið, forðam þe hy sculon beon raðe geclænsode 7 amerode ær se mycle dom cume. Ða ðe wæron forðferede for hund gearum oððon gyt firnor, wel þa magan beon nu geclænsode. We motan nyde þæt stiðre þolian, gyf we clæne beon sceolan þonne se dom cymð, nu we þæne fyrst nabbað þe þa hæfdon þe wiðforan us wæron. (24-33).

These have no parallel in the Preface. Whether or not they are derived from an undiscovered source, as Jost postulates,¹ their style and method of presentation are perfectly consistent with the remainder of the sermon. The explanation unfolds gradually: each sentence presents only one point, and the fourth sentence completes the explanation by summarizing the significance of the preceding three sentences. Verbal repetition is not as marked in the second rhetorical unit as it is in the first, but it does serve to link the four sentences in this passage to one another

¹Wulfstanstudien, p. 189.

and to the other sentences in the unit.¹ The use of the first person in the fourth sentence of the passage reintroduces the warning note on which the sermon begins and prepares for the admonitory conclusion to the rhetorical unit.

The content of the passage is also consistent with the remainder of the sermon. The first sentence develops the implications of the earlier statement that men deserve to be exposed to the devil's attempts to gain followers because of their sins (18-20), by explaining that all men are sinful and must suffer oðþon her oðþon elleshwær as their sins merit. It also looks forward to the contrast Wulfstan draws in the third rhetorical unit:

Leofan men, God geþafað þam deofle Antecriste þæt he mot ehtan godra manna, forðam þe hi sculon, swa ic ær cwæc, ðurh ða ehtnesse beon geclænsode 7 syððan clæne faran to heofona rice. Þa þonne þe his leasungum gelyfað 7 him to gebugað, þam he byrhð her for worulde 7 ða he weorþað her; ac hy sculon raþe æfter ðam ecelice forweorðan 7 aa wunian syððan mid him on þære sweartan helle grunde. (37-43).

The use of raðe (23) in Wulfstan's explanation that God permits Antichrist's deeds in order that the elect may be purified by suffering prepares for the explanation that the intensity of the elect's suffering is necessary to purge them of sins before the Last Judgement. The speed with which the elect are purified is not mentioned anywhere in the Preface (cf. Ælfric's second reason for God's permission in 4.29-35). The introduction of the Last Judgement to explain the great suffering of the elect results in a fuller and more satisfactory account than Ælfric affords, for God's reason for allowing the elect to be purged of sin by Antichrist's persecution is not directly stated in the Preface. It

¹The phrase amerede 7 geclænsode (23) is repeated in 28, and geclænsode (30) and clæne (31) appear, as well as clæne amerede and clænost amerod (35). Synn is repeated in various forms throughout (18, 23, 25, 26, 35). Stið appears twice (27 and 31) and þolian three times (24, 25, 31). Roughly parallel are ær se mycle dom cume and þonne se dom cymð.

is implied in :

pa ofslihð se deofol ðe him wiðstandað, and hi þonne
farað mid halgum martyrdome to heofenan rice. (6.3-4)

That is, the elect must be purged of sin in order that they may go immediately to heaven when they are martyred by Antichrist. Ælfric's unqualified assertion that Antichrist slays those who withstand him does not seem entirely consistent with his translation of Matt. xxiv.22 in 4.5-7, which states that God cuts short Antichrist's days for the protection of the elect (forwurde in butan se Ælmihtiga God ða dagas gescyrte, eall mennisc forwurde could refer to either moral or physical destruction, but the point still holds). It also conflicts with the traditional view of the Last Judgement as a time when all mankind is divided according to the eternal fate pronounced on it at the Judgement¹ (if those who withstand Antichrist are slain and enter heaven, it remains only for Christ to condemn the living to hell). Wulfstan's explanation that the elect must suffer greatly in the Last Days in order to be purged rapidly of sin before the Last Judgement, however, is not in conflict with his earlier allusion to the protection of the elect by the termination of Antichrist's reign (11-14). It may be noted that Wulfstan indicates quite clearly his belief in a purgatorial state for those who are to be saved (Ða ðe wæron forðferede for hund gearum oððon gyt firnor, wel þa magan beon nu geclænsode).² The suggestion that the Last Judgement is close at hand (because the elect must be purged rapidly for it) increases the emotional force of Wulfstan's sermon, and the prominence given to the great suffering of the elect in this passage also magnifies the terror of Antichrist's reign.

¹The view derives ultimately from Matt. xxiv.31 and xxv.32.

²M. McC. Gatch concludes that Anglo-Saxon conceptions of purgatory are usually ambivalent and undefined. See "Eschatology in the Anonymous Old English Homilies," Traditio, XXI (1965), 117-65.

Irrespective, then, of whether these four sentences derive from another source, or were composed by Wulfstan, they are closely integrated with the sermon as a whole and with his explanation of God's reasons for permitting the deeds of Antichrist. Wulfstan not only gives a more extended discussion of God's reasons than Ælfric does: he states the reasons more clearly and simply, and avoids the apparent inconsistencies and difficulties of interpretation which are found in Ælfric's compressed exegesis.

The second rhetorical unit, like the third and fourth, concludes with a rhetorical warning:

Beþence gehwa hine sylfne be ðam þe he wille,
ne cymð ure æfre ænig to Godes rice ær we beon
æfre ælcere synne swa clæne amerede swa æfre
anig gold mæg clænost amerod weorðan. (33-36)

The conclusion contains the comparison of the purification of sin to the refinement of gold, which is ultimately scriptural in origin.¹ The comparison appears in Ælfric's Preface in the second of the reasons he gives for God's permission:

God geðafað eac þæt his gecorenan þegenas beon
aclænsade fram eallum synnum þurh ða ormatan
ehtnyssa, swa swa gold bið on fyre afandod. (4.35-6.3)

In Wulfstan's sermon, the comparison is contained in an imperative construction in which the first person plural is employed, so that the comparison is not merely a statement of fact, as it is in Ælfric's composition, but is included in order to stress the implications for the audience of the information given in the explanation of God's reasons, and the response which must be made to it. Wulfstan's comparison does not explicitly refer to the fire in which gold is purified, which is equated in Ælfric's sermon with ormatan ehtnyssa. In keeping with the space he devotes to the need for men to be purged of sin before the Last Judgement in 24-33, he puts the emphasis on the degree of purity

¹See Bethurum, Homilies, p. 289 (note to 35).

which men must attain if they are to enter heaven.

Wulfstan's use of ær we beon æfre ælcere synne swa clæne amerede swa æfre ænig gold mæg clænost amerod weorðan instead of aclænsade fram eallum synnum ... swa swa gold bið on fyre afandod illustrates the tendency to intensification which is said to be characteristic of his style. The intensification is not, I would think, simply a stylistic mannerism, for the magnitude of purification which is indicated accords with the heightening

of the terror of the Last Days throughout the sermon. In general, it can be said that Wulfstan's use of intensifiers is intimately related to his preoccupation with extreme situations and states.¹ Intensification also occurs in ne cymð ure æfre ænig to Godes rice, a phrase in which Wulfstan extends the application of the simile to all men, instead of simply referring it to the elect as Ælfric does, and which asserts the inescapability of the purifying terror.

In the Preface, the comparison of the purification of sinners to the refinement of gold is followed by two sentences which deal with the eternal fate of those who withstand Antichrist and those who follow him:

Ða ofslihð se deofol ðe him wiðstandað, and hi þonne farað mid halgum martyrdome to heofenan rice. Ða ðe his leasungum gelyfað, þam he arað, and hi habbað syððan þa ecan susle to edleane heora gedwyldes. (6.3-6)

Wulfstan begins his third rhetorical unit with a similar kind of contrast:

Leofan men, God geþafað þam deofle Antecriste þæt he mot ehtan godra manna, forðam þe hi sculon, swa ic ær cwæð, ðurh ða ehtnesse beon geclænsode 7 syððan clæne faran to heofona rice. Ða þonne þe his leasungum gelyfað 7 him to gebugað, þam he byrhð her for worulde 7 ða he weorþað her; ac hy sculon raþe æfter ðam ecelice

¹See pp. 155, 278-80, 285-89, 359-61.

forweorðan 7 aa wunian syððan mid him on þære
 sweartan helle grunde. (37-43)

As I noted above, the contrast between the earthly suffering and heavenly reward of the faithful on the one hand, and the freedom from persecution and eternal suffering of those who follow Antichrist on the other, which is suggested in Ælfric's two sentences, is implied in his explanation of the first reason for permitting Antichrist's deeds: namely, that men wel wyrðe beoð þære deoflican ehtnyse, to ecum forwyrðe þam ðe him onbugað, and to ecere myrðe ðam þe him þurh geleafan wiðcweðað. Wulfstan, in his explanation of God's reasons, leaves out of account the contrast which demonstrates the ultimate justice of exposing good and evil men alike to the devil's attempts to gain followers, and concentrates instead on the necessity for the great suffering of the elect, though he does prepare for the contrast by stating that all men must suffer here or elsewhere (25-26). Wulfstan's treatment of this point, then, is a further illustration of the way in which he avoids presenting his audience with too much material to assimilate as it listens.

Wulfstan's sermon spells out, more clearly than the Preface does, the point that good and evil men suffer disproportionately in this world during the reign of Antichrist but receive their deserts in eternity. The first of Wulfstan's sentences assists the comprehension of his auditors by its verbal echoing of the information given in the second rhetorical unit, and is quite different from the first of Ælfric's sentences in its form. Wulfstan's more explicit concern with justifying the disproportionate suffering of good and evil is reflected in his reference to "good men" instead of "those who withstand the devil." Whereas Ælfric states that Antichrist martyrs the faithful and they then journey to the heavenly kingdom, Wulfstan draws

attention to the suffering of the faithful in this world by referring to the fact that they suffer persecution in order to be purified. He gives greater prominence to the contrast between their fate in this world and the next by stating that they go to heaven afterwards (syððan: cf. Ælfric's þonne). In his second sentence, he does not say merely, concerning those who believe Antichrist, þam he arað, but þam he byrhð her for worulde 7 ða he weorþað her. He therefore calls attention to the fact that the evil benefit in this world from Antichrist's attempts to gain followers, and the repetition of her in this sentence recalls Wulfstan's statement in the second unit:

Forþam nis nan man þæt ne sy synful, 7 ælc man sceal
sar ðolian oðþon her oðþon elleshwær be ðam þe he þurh
synna gearnað. (24-26)

Where Ælfric states, in his sentence on those who believe Antichrist, and hi habbað syððan þa ecan susle to edleane heora gedwyldes, Wulfstan has ac hy sculon raþe æfter ðam^{ecelice}/forweorðan, and so calls attention to the sudden reversal of fortune. Instead of referring to ecan susle to edleane heora gedwyldes, which emphasizes the punishment of Antichrist's followers, Wulfstan states that those who believe Antichrist live with him eternally on þære sweartan helle grunde, a phrase which recalls sweartan helle used by Ælfric near the beginning of the homily version of the Preface (4.13). By using the phrase/sentence, Wulfstan indicates a further contrast between those who follow Antichrist and those who are persecuted: that is, his followers live with him in darkness, whereas those who resist him clæne faran to heofona rice.

The second of the Wulfstan sentences quoted above¹ is similar in form to the second of Ælfric's sentences, but has grammatical doubling throughout:

¹See pp. 69-70.

Ælfric

Wulfstan

þa ðe his leasungum gelyfað,
 þam he arað,
 and hi habbað syððan þa ecan
 susle to edleane heora
 gedwyldes. (6.5-6)

þa þonne þe his leasungum
 gelyfað 7 him to gebugað,
 þam he byrhð her for worulde
 7 þa he weorþað her;
 ac hy sculon raþe æfter ðam
 ecelice forweorðan 7 aa wunian
 syððan mid him on þære sweartan
 helle grunde. (40-43).

Such doubling of sentence elements to produce formal patterning occurs elsewhere in the sermon, and has been noted as a characteristic of Wulfstan's style.¹ There is no doubt that Wulfstan was particularly fond of parallelism of all types; he recognized presumably that it was a useful device for clarifying related concepts for his audience and that the doubling of elements within a sentence lessens the speed with which information must be assimilated as the period mounts to its resolution. The parallelism is not simply a stylistic embellishment employing synonymous or tautological expressions,² for the paired phrases are not identical in meaning, but present successive stages of deterioration. This is particularly marked in the last pair, "But they shall be undone eternally soon after that and afterwards live eternally with him in the black abyss of hell." The parallelism of this sentence reflects the careful step-by-step organization of the sermon as a whole.

After describing the fate of those who believe Antichrist's lies, Wulfstan gives an account of Antichrist's attempts to gain followers (43-49). He begins with the words Se gesawenlica deofol wyrcð fela wundra 7 segð þæt he God sylfa beo, which resemble the opening of a sentence near the beginning of Ælfric's interpretation, se gesewenlica deofol þonne wyrcð ungerima wundra,

¹Particularly by Bethurum, Homilies, p. 90, Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 18, and Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, p. 21.

²Cf. Bethurum and Whitelock, loc. cit.

and cwyð þæt he sylf God beo (4.16-17). Ælfric gives differing pieces of information concerning Antichrist's attempts to gain allegiance. In the portion of Matt. xxiv.24 which Ælfric translates, it is said that Antichrist works miracles to deceive mankind and the elect if possible:

Manega lease Cristas: cumað on minum naman, cweðende,
'Ic eom Crist,' and wyrcað fela tacna and wundra, to
bebæcenne mancynn, and eac swylce þa gecorenan men, gif
hit gewurþan mæg. (4.2-5)

It appears from Ælfric's paraphrase of the scriptural verses that Antichrist's failure to convert all mankind is attributable to God's timely intervention to protect the elect and not to their enduring faith, since Ælfric continues with a paraphrase of Matt. xxiv.22:

and butan se Ælmihtiga God ða dagas gescyrte, eall mennisc
forwurde; ac for his gecorenum he gescyrte þa dagas. (4.5-7)

In his interpretation of the paraphrase in 4.16-20, however, he describes Antichrist as compelling mankind to heresy (and wile neadian mancynn to his gedwylde). He also speaks of compulsion, not deception, in 4.27-28 (He neadað þurh yfelnysses þæt men sceolon bugan from heora Scyppendes geleafan), and states that God allows the devil to work ehtnysses as well as the tacna and wundra mentioned in his translation of Matt. xxiv.24. The extension of Antichrist's activities to include compulsion seems logical, since the elect are presumably those who cannot be deceived by Antichrist, and Ælfric does state in 4.35 that some him þurh geleafan wiðcweðað. But although Ælfric speaks of Antichrist's use of compulsion in 4.16-20, he does not dispel the impression created by his paraphrase of the biblical verses that the elect are those who are saved from falling prey to Antichrist by God's intervention, not those whose faith is unassailable:

And se gesewenlica deofol þonne wyrcoð ungerima wundra, and cwyð þæt he sylf God beo, and wile neadian mancynn to his gedwylde; ac his tima ne bið na langsum; forþan þe Godes grama hine fordeð, and þeos weoruld bið siððan geendod. (4.16-20)

In 6.3-4, however, he says that Antichrist slays those who withstand him, which suggests that the elect are those who persist in withstanding Antichrist through faith:

þa ofslihð se deofol ðe him wiðstandað, and hi þonne farað mid halgum martyrdome to heofenan rice.

In view of the fact that Ælfric states that God cuts short Antichrist's reign to preserve the elect, it would appear that Ælfric leaves it up to his readers to conclude that not all who withstand Antichrist are slain by him.

In Wulfstan's account of Antichrist's attempts to gain followers, the three actions which Ælfric mentions (deception, coercion, and martyring of the faithful) are presented as separate stages of Antichrist's increasing determination to subject mankind. The first stage is his success in deceiving mankind, indicated in 7 mid his gedwimerum mæst ælne man beswicð (44-45). The existence of an elect which cannot be deceived is acknowledged by the qualification of ælne man. The second stage is the transition to coercion:

7 þa þe he elles beswican ne mæg, þa he wyle neadunga genydan, gyf he mæg, þæt hi Godes ætsacan 7 him to gebugan. (45-47)

The incompleteness of Antichrist's success in converting mankind which is indicated in the scriptures (si fieri potest) is attributed here to the faith of the elect and not to God's timely intervention. Ælfric's reference to the persecution and to the martyrdom of those who resist Antichrist is paralleled by Wulfstan's description of the third stage of Antichrist's attack:

Gyf hi ðonne þæt nellað, þonne sculan hi ehtnessa mycle 7 eac earmlicne deað geðolian. (47-49)

Wulfstan's statement does not imply that Antichrist slays all who resist him (ehtnessa mycle 7 eac earmlicne deað), and he clarifies the matter in the last sentence of the third rhetorical unit, by asserting that there will be all too few þe he ne beswice, oðþon þurh his searucræftas oðþon ðurh þæne gryre þe he on mancynn set (50-52).

Wulfstan's sermon, then, contains all of the information which Ælfric gives on the subject of Antichrist's attempts to gain allegiance, but he is able to draw together related ideas and provide a consistent explanation because he organizes his sermon according to topics. The form of Ælfric's composition, on the other hand, inhibits to some extent the resolution of apparent contradictions, because his explanations emanate from interpretations which follow the order of the biblical paraphrase. In any case, Ælfric probably did not feel it was necessary to explain his information in precise detail, since he did not originally intend the Preface to be preached to a popular audience, and was perhaps attempting to keep his interpretation brief, because it constitutes only a part of the Preface. Wulfstan's explanation also stresses the threat which Antichrist poses to every individual, and the terror of his reign, by demonstrating the progressive violence of his attempts to subject mankind, so that his account of Antichrist's deeds serves as a more specific warning to the audience than the Preface does.

The exclamation which concludes the third rhetorical unit summarizes the result of Antichrist's attacks, and its pessimism concerning the endurance of mankind in the face of Antichrist's attempts to gain followers conveys an oblique warning:

Eala, gesælig bið þeah se ðe to þam anræde bið þæt he forðam ne awacað; ac witodlice þara bið ealles to lyt þe he ne beswice, oðþon þurh his searucræftas cōþon ðurh þæne gryre þe he on mancynn set. (49-52)

The reference to Antichrist's searucræftas and gyre prepares for the description of the miracles he works in healing the sick and sending fire from heaven in 53-66. Ælfric's account of these matters in 4.20-27 and 6.6-18 is all that remains of the homily version of the Preface which can be paralleled with Wulfstan's sermon--Ælfric's reference to the scriptural exhortations concerning the necessity for spiritual guardians to instruct their charges in 6.18-34 is not directly related to his discussion of the Last Days, but to the justification for composing the homily collection.

Ælfric gives the following account of Antichrist's healing:

Crist ure Drihten gehælde untrume and adlige, and þes deofol þe is gehatan Antecrist, þæt is gereht, ðwyrlic Crist, aleuað and geuntrumað ða halan, and nænne ne gehælð fram untrumnyssum, buton þam anum þe he sylf ær awyrde. He and his gingran awyrdað manna lichaman digellice þurh deofles cræft, and gehælað hi openlice on manna gesihðe; ac he ne mæg nænne gehælan þe God sylf ær geuntrumode. (4.20-27)

A set of related contrasts is presented in these lines. The first sentence states that Christ healed the sick and Antichrist enfeebles the healthy, and the second contrasts the secrecy with which Antichrist enfeebles and the openness with which he works. A further contrast is presented in the last two clauses of the first sentence and the last clause of the second sentence: Antichrist can only heal men he has injured previously; Antichrist cannot heal men previously stricken by God. The contrast in the first two clauses of the second sentence is presented in statements which are roughly similar in syntactic structure, but Ælfric does not emphasize the contrast between the two opposed powers by formal parallelism. In the first sentence, his predilection for informative digression leads him to contrast Crist ure Drihten with þes deofol þe is gehatan Antecrist, þæt is gereht, ðwyrlic Crist. In the second sentence, he does not refer to Antecrist but to He and his gingran, since he is interpreting a text which speaks of Manega lease

Cristas (4.2), and he refers to God, not Christ. In his description of Antichrist's healing, Wulfstan emphasizes the contrast between the force of good and the force of evil by syntactic and verbal repetition: Ure D.rihten Crist is contrasted with se deofol Antecrist in his first sentence (53-54). A similar kind of difference in Ælfric's and Wulfstan's descriptions of the contrasting natures of Christ and Antichrist was noted above. No mention is made by Wulfstan of the followers of Antichrist, since these detract from the opposition of two single protagonists which Wulfstan tends to emphasize in his sermons (particularly in IX, XII, and VI).

Ælfric's account of the deeds of Antichrist in 4.20-27 is part of his explanation of the text concerning those who pretend to be Christ, so that his account is a factual one which demonstrates the limitations of Antichrist's power to perform miracles. Wulfstan's account of Antichrist's deeds in 53-62 draws attention to the effect which his deeds have upon his observers, and it demonstrates the delusive nature of Antichrist rather than his inability to perform miracles. Thus, where Ælfric deals with a somewhat abstract issue in an explanatory interpretation of his text, Wulfstan's account of the deeds of Antichrist sets out for those who will endure the Last Days the implications of the biblical prophecy of deceptive signs and wonders, because his sermon is intended to warn his audience in preparation for the coming reign of Antichrist. By virtue of its general thrust, Wulfstan's passage on Antichrist's deeds is in close accord with its immediate context, for the previous rhetorical unit of the sermon deals with the success of Antichrist in deceiving mankind, and the account of his deeds is devoted to illustrating the manner in which this is accomplished.

The details of Wulfstan's divergences from Ælfric's account of the deeds of Antichrist, most of which reflect their differing didactic aims, are as follows. Ælfric's account begins:

Crist ure Drihten gehælde untrume and adlige, and þes deofol þe is gehatan Antecrist, þæt is gereht, ðwyrlic Crist, aleuað and geuntrumað ða halan, and nænne ne gehælð fram untrumnyssum, buton þam anum þe he sylf ær awyrde. (4.20-25)

Wulfstan's account begins with a similar contrast, but, as I noted above, he emphasizes verbally the contrast between Christ and Antichrist. He also emphasizes the contrast between the working of the two powers by lexical and syntactic repetition, stating that Christ healed fela þara on life þe unhale wæron and Antichrist harms þa ðe ær hale wæron. This use of explanatory noun phrases, combined with the syntactic and lexical repetition, enhances the clarity of his first sentence:

Ure Drihten Crist gehælde fela þara on life þe unhale wæron, 7 se deofol Antecrist gebrocað 7 geuntrumað þa ðe ær hale wæron; 7 he nænne gehælan ne mæg buton he hine ærest awyrde. (53-56)

Wulfstan concludes his sentence by saying that Antichrist cannot heal anyone butan he hine ærest awyrde, whereas Ælfric states that Antichrist cannot heal anyone buton þam anum þe he sylf ær awyrde. Ælfric's use of þam anum and sylf reflect his preoccupation with the limitations of Antichrist's power, and the conclusion of this sentence looks forward to the contrasting assertion at the end of his second sentence, that Antichrist ne mæg nænne gehælan þe God sylf ær geuntrumode. The conclusion of Wulfstan's sentence, however, serves only as a warning and an introduction to his second sentence, for his sermon contains nothing comparable with the final clause in Ælfric's second sentence, and Ælfric's contrast between Antichrist's ability to heal only those he has afflicted himself and his inability to heal those afflicted by

God forms no part of his account of Antichrist's deeds. I would see this omission as an indication of the differing purpose to which Wulfstan puts his account of Antichrist's deeds; but, in any case, an examination of other sermons suggests that he preferred not to attribute mankind's sufferings directly to God.

The second sentence of Wulfstan's account has no parallel in the Preface, and is a comment on the deceptiveness of Antichrist's deeds:

Ac syððan he þæne mann gebrocod hæfð, syððan he mæg don swylce he hine gehæle, gyf he geswicð þæs þe he ær þam men to yfele dyde. (56-58)

This sentence makes it clear that Antichrist's healing is merely a delusion made possible by the concealment of his infliction of sickness. The same notion is implicit in Ælfric's account, but the point is not pursued, because Ælfric is interested in Antichrist's lack of power to perform miracles. The second sentence is followed by one of the short exclamations drawing attention to Antichrist's cunning which punctuate Wulfstan's account, He bið eal unwrenca full (58). (The other exclamation, Ælc yfel he mæg don, 7 ælc he deð (62), occurs at the end of the account.)

Wulfstan's fourth sentence, like Ælfric's second sentence, contains a contrast between the secrecy of Antichrist's infliction of sickness and the public nature of his healing:

He bið eal unwrenca full. Ðonne beswicð he swyðe fela manna þurh þæt, þæt he gebrocað mænige man dihlice 7 gehælð eft ætforan mannum þær hy on lociað, þonne geseoð hy hwæt he þonne deð 7 nytan na hwæt he ær dyde. (58-62)

The use of ætforan mannum þær hy on lociað, instead of openlice on manna gesihþe may be a purely stylistic difference, though Wulfstan's expression is more suggestive of deliberately public staging. His use of gebrocað instead of awyrdað can be related

to the verbal repetition which links his sentences on the deeds of Antichrist--the second and fourth sentences repeat the verbs gebrocān and gehælan which appear in the first sentence, and the fourth sentence has beswicð, which picks up geswicð in the third sentence. The use of the same verbs throughout the account makes it easier to follow the progression of actions described. Finally, Wulfstan's sentence differs from Ælfric's because it opens with a clause referring to the effect of Antichrist's deeds, the deception of many men, and concludes with two clauses which draw attention to the manner in which Antichrist deceives mankind, instead of a clause explaining Antichrist's inability to heal men afflicted by God.

Wulfstan's account of the fire sent from heaven in 62-66 is considerably shorter than Ælfric's and is included for a different purpose. Ælfric's description of the fire is part of his exposition of the scriptural quotation pertaining to Antichrist's claims to be Christ, and he is primarily concerned in 6.6-18 with the nature of Antichrist's power. He states:

Se arleasa deð þæt fyr cymð ufan swilce of heofonum
on manna gesihðe, swilce he God Ælmihtig sy, ðe ah
geweald heofenas and eorþan. (6.6-9)

Ælfric compares Antichrist's sending of fire from heaven with the temptations of Job, the implication presumably being that it is by means of fire that the devil tests man's faith but that he is able to contrive this with God's permission and not by his own power (6.9-13). He then goes on to explain why the devil could not send down fire from heaven, and concludes that Antichrist also cannot have the power to do this, and only pretends to do so. Ælfric's sentences are, as usual, tightly packed with information conveyed both by implication as well as various tangential explanations. He narrates, for instance:

He gemacode ða þæt fyr come ufan swilce of heofenum,
and forbærnde ealle his scep ut on felda, and þa hyrdas
samod, buton anum þe hit him cyðan sceolde. (6.11-13)

It was noted above that Wulfstan's sentences tend to be simpler than Ælfric's, and, accordingly, his description of the fire sent from heaven is brief and illustrates only one point. In Wulfstan's sermon, the fire sent from heaven is significant, not in terms of the power of Antichrist, as it is in Ælfric's Preface, but as an indication of the terror of his reign. The passage is therefore closely integrated, for in the preceding rhetorical unit (in 35-52), Wulfstan explains that Antichrist attempts to force all who are not seduced by his deceptions to follow him, and concludes the unit by stating that most men will be converted oðpon þurh his searucræftas oðpon þurh þæne gryre þe he on mancynn set. Just as his account of Antichrist's healing is used to illustrate the deception of mankind, the fire sent from heaven illustrates the use of terror to gain adherents.

Wulfstan's description begins with a phrase similar to the one used by Ælfric, which repeats he deð from the preceding sentence, He deð þæt fyr cymð ufene, swylce hit of heofonum cume (62-63). Ælfric has Se arleasa deð þæt fyr cymð ufan swilce of heofonum. The fire is briefly compared to that which burnt Job's possessions, in 7 he mid þam fela forbærnð, ealswa he hwilum ær Iobes ahta dyde. He includes none of the narrative details Ælfric has in 6. 12-13. Wulfstan then draws a moral conclusion in which the terror of Antichrist's reign and the punishment of hell are neatly linked:

Ac se ðe for þæs fyres ege him to gebihð, he
sceal aa on helle on ecan bryne wunian. (64-66)

The emphasis on the terror which accompanies Antichrist's reign is continued in the statement that no more is to be said of it and in the assertion that there is a great need to pray to God

for protection against it:

Ne can ic ne æfre ænig man oðrum asecgan for eallum
pam egsan þe ðurh þane deofol on worulde geweorðan
sceal. Þonne age we mycle þearfe þæt we God ælmihtigne
 georne biddan þæt he us gescylde wið þane egsan 7 us
 gestrangie swa his willa sy. (66-70, CE reading)

As the Note following this chapter explains, I am of the opinion that the peroration of De Temporibus Anticristi originally followed immediately after 66-70. The remainder of the text following this rubric is in no way similar to Ælfric's Preface. Injunctions to prayer (often accompanied by exhortations to repent) commonly, though not invariably,¹ form the conclusion to Wulfstan's sermons. In the sermons in which they appear, the concluding injunctions to prayer are the culmination of Wulfstan's didactic purpose, and the emotionally orientated exposition of his subject matter is designed to give force to his exhortation to prayer and repentance in the peroration.

On the basis of this comparison between De Temporibus Anticristi and the homily version of Ælfric's Preface, a number of observations can be made concerning the differences between the didactic modes of the two writers. Ælfric's composition is organized in accordance with the scriptural paraphrase he is interpreting, Wulfstan's is organized around a theme. Because Ælfric follows the order of the paraphrase he is interpreting, most of his sentences are loosely connected. Wulfstan, however, composes in units larger than a sentence, groups of sentences related in sense being linked by connectives and various kinds of syntactic and lexical repetition. The use of repetition to unify sentences

¹Bethurum's reference to Wulfstan's "customary conclusion" (Homilies, p. 23), and her inclusion of a peroration beginning with Uton don as a criterion of authorship (p. 29), does not appear to take account of this.

related in subject, and the gradual accretion of meaning in the rhetorical units, often achieved by simplifying the content of sentences to a greater extent than Ælfric does, reveal Wulfstan's awareness of the form of presentation most suitable for oral delivery. In Ælfric's Preface the transition between sentences is more abrupt and there is less repetition of words and phrases. It is possible that the homily version of the Preface is ^{not entirely} typical because it was not originally written to be preached, for Clemoes notes the existence of "sense paragraphs" in Ælfric's homilies which are similar in kind to the rhetorical units I have discussed.¹ I am inclined to think that "sense paragraphs" are usually found in Ælfric's homilies when the interpretation contains extensive discussion of a single subject, but that close linking of groups of sentences is proportionately less frequent in his homilies than in Wulfstan's sermons, though I do not claim to have studied all of the homilies.

The differences in organization are reflected in the differences in style. The explanatory nature of Ælfric's composition is reflected in the appearance of sentences which are normally longer than those in Wulfstan's sermon and contain a larger number of expanding and elaborating phrases and clauses. Wulfstan's sentences are statements rather than explanations, the main device for linking clauses is and, and the rather formally balanced structure of his sentences tends to limit the nature and number of lexical items in a sentence. Both the nature of his sentences and his organization of his sermon into units which deal with separate aspects of a subject in some cases prohibits the inclusion of phrases and material similar to Ælfric's. Furthermore, Wulfstan's

¹P. Clemoes, "Ælfric," Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature, ed. E.G. Stanley, London, 1966, pp. 195-99.

divergences in expression, as well as his selection of material, reveal that he is concerned to emphasize the emotional potential of the Last Days and their significance for his audience, which is precluded by Ælfric's more leisurely style and his intention to impart knowledge of various kinds.

The comparison also makes it possible to see Wulfstan's originality and achievement as a sermon writer. Lines 3-70 of De Temporibus Anticristi constitute a closely unified sermon, and, if Wulfstan did rework Ælfric's composition, he integrated his source material with great care to produce a consistent exposition of the subject. Nor did he merely change the expression of his source, if he drew material from it, for his stylistic divergences from the Preface are, in most cases, accompanied by changes in meaning which are related to the development of his sermon as a whole. His style is more rhetorical and emotionally stirring, but this too furthers his didactic aims, for it ensures that his moral exhortations are more readily accepted. Although he addresses his sermon to the emotions of his audience, he is not a rhetorician in the modern pejorative sense, or unconcerned with fine shades of meaning. It is clear from the manner in which he adjusts his style and method of presentation to the oral mode, that he is concerned to teach, to impart information in such a manner that it will be easily understood. His concern with clear and precise expression of theological points, as well as his independence of Ælfric, emerges clearly from a comparison of De Temporibus Anticristi with its assumed source, and is manifested particularly well in his definition of the dual nature of Antichrist and his account of Antichrist's attempts to gain followers.

NOTE

The Conclusion of IV

The words 7 us gestrangie swa his willa sy (70) are followed in MSS. E and I by "a translation of a portion of the Acts of Peter and Paul" (Bethurum, p. 132) and a conclusion concerning the reign of Antichrist. Bethurum considers that only the conclusion, which she prints as 71-96, was written by Wulfstan. Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 191-94, and Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 338-39, accept all of the composition under the heading of De Temporibus Anticristi as genuine. Bethurum states as her reason for omitting the passage based on the Acts of Peter and Paul (printed in Napier, pp. 98-101) that it "shows no marks of Wulfstan's style" (p. 30), and Pope agrees that it is "without clear signs of Wulfstan's composition."¹ Jost, however, concluded from his examination of the passage that "sehr viel für und wenig gegen Wulfstans Verfasserschaft spricht" (p. 194). While the parallels between the exemplum and other compositions by Wulfstan which Jost adduces as evidence of Wulfstan's authorship are slight, the linguistic evidence of Wulfstan's authorship he amasses is sufficient to support the contention that the exemplum was written by Wulfstan. It is true that the passage contains none of the stylistic features, such as alliterating word pairs, considered to be characteristic of Wulfstan (though to swybe appears once), but linguistic evidence is more reliable than stylistic, since style normally varies according to subject matter, and the exemplum, which is a straight-forward narrative of events, is atypical of Wulfstan's compositions which are extant.

If the exemplum contains no overwhelming evidence of Wulfstan's authorship, there is no strong reason for rejecting it, and its position in the MSS, between two passages which were undoubtedly composed by Wulfstan, makes it at least possible that he did write it. I think it unlikely, however, that most, if any, of the composition following Bethurum IV.70 formed part of the original sermon. Two sermons appear to have been combined because they deal with the miracles performed by the devil. The assertion that no more can be said of the terror of Antichrist's reign and the exhortation to prayer (66-70) strongly suggest that a peroration followed. A satisfactory peroration is not provided by Bethurum, 71-96. The transition is too abrupt, particularly in view of the close unity of the remainder of the sermon, and only 86-96 constitute a peroration in substance and have the utan construction which Wulfstan usually employs in the conclusion of his hortatory sermons. The rest of the passage deals with the deception practised by Antichrist, which conflicts with the assertion that no more is to be said of him. Bethurum also considers that 66-70 indicate that the sermon originally concluded at this point, but she explains the abrupt transition which results from taking 71-96 as the conclusion by pointing out that Wulfstan "might have added 71-96 with no more disruption to the thought than occurs in a late revision of XX when 176-90

¹ McIntosh, Wulfstan's Prose, p. 36, n.32, noted that "all except the very end [the passage Bethurum prints as 79-96] is in a shakier rhythm than normal." Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 20, is substantially in agreement with Bethurum.

was added to the text" (p. 30). I am unable to accept this explanation because the analogy does not seem to me valid. As I shall attempt to demonstrate in my discussion of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 176-90 do not represent a "disruption to the thought" and there is evidence for concluding that 176-90 were part of the original sermon and not a later addition.

While 71-96 lack connexion with 3-70, the exhortation thought to be based on Ælfric's Preface, they are closely related to the exemplum, for, as Pope notes, the heavy demonstrative in the first sentence depends on distinctions made at the close of the exemplum. For this reason, I consider that two sermons have been combined and that the original conclusion of a sermon which is substantially preserved in 3-70 has been removed in order to facilitate the transition. It is noteworthy that MS.H does not contain the exemplum and includes only 87-96 of Bethurum's conclusion, but since it omits 66-70, which are closely related to the foregoing text, it is more likely that it represents an abridged form of the EI version than "the homily as Wulfstan originally wrote it" (Bethurum, p. 14). In substance, the peroration given by H is not incongruous with 3-70, but the reference to hæðenscipe relates it more closely to the second half of the composition under the heading De Temporibus Anticristi, which I consider to be a separate sermon consisting of an exemplum and a concluding exposition.

CHAPTER III

DE DEDICATIONE ECCLESIAE

De Dedicacione Ecclesiae (XVIII, pp. 246-50), like De Temporibus Anticristi, is generally thought to have been based on an exegetical composition by Ælfric.¹ De Dedicacione Ecclesiae contains a few sentences and phrases which bear some resemblance to those appearing in Ælfric's In Dedicacione Ecclesiae (Thorpe, II, 574-94), but much of Wulfstan's sermon has no parallel in Ælfric's composition, and the two works cannot therefore be extensively compared as Ælfric's Preface and De Temporibus Anticristi can.² Both Wulfstan and Ælfric give a summary of the account of Solomon's dedication of his temple which is found in I Kings viii, and both writers employ the technique of symbolic interpretation, though the text is only one of three which Ælfric interprets in his sermon. In Dedicacione Ecclesiae might possibly have suggested to Wulfstan the general conception of his address for the dedication of a church, but I would conclude that, if Wulfstan did refer to Ælfric's composition, the address bears few traces of its influence. Bethurum states that the relationship of the two works is "rather like" that of VI and Sermo de Initio Creaturae,³ which, she remarks, "Wulfstan follows fairly closely in outline, though he condenses some material and omits some."⁴ I wish to show that De Dedicacione Ecclesiae is no mere summary of Ælfric's composition which omits the more subtle theological exposition, but a different kind of sermon, unified and consistent,

¹ See particularly Kinard, A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies, p. 58; Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 148-50; Bethurum, Homilies, p. 35. Jost assumes another source besides IDE (p. 150), but, as Bethurum remarks, the parallels are not striking (see Homilies, p. 35, n. 1).

² For the verbal parallels, see Jost, loc. cit., and Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 353-54.

³ Homilies, p. 35.

⁴ PMLA, LVII, 921.

with a different didactic purpose and mode.

The differences in the didactic aims of the two writers emerge from a comparison of their prefatory remarks. Ælfric begins:

Mine gebroðra þa leofostan, we wyllað sume tihtendlice spræce wið eow habban be ðyssere cyrclican mærsunge, and eow læran þæt ge sylfe beon Godes tempel gastlice, nu ge his eorðlice tempel wurðiað. (574.20-23)

Wulfstan opens his sermon as follows:

Leofan men, ic wille eow nu cyðan ymbe cyricmærsunge, þæt ge þe geornor understandan magan hu man cyrican weorþian scyle, þe Gode sylfum to lofe and to wurðmynte gehalgod bið. (3-5)

Wulfstan's symbolic interpretations do not provide the comprehensive description of the nature of the church which Ælfric's composition affords, and, as the differences between the opening sentences indicate, he is not concerned to explain the metaphysical existence of a church. That is, there is nothing in Wulfstan's opening sentence comparable to eow læran þæt ge sylfe beon Godes tempel gastlice: he draws attention to the occasion of his sermon and the sanctity of the church building, and his sermon gives practical instruction concerning the conduct to be observed in God's house in order to gain his favour, and man's relation to the church. His more directly exhortatory approach to his subject is manifested in his use of ic wille eow nu cyðan ... þæt ge þe geornor understandan magan instead of we wyllað sume tihtendlice spræce wið eow habban ... and eow læran.

The conclusion of his sermon is in keeping with the didactic aim announced in the opening sentence. The exhortation which frequently appears in his perorations is linked to the didactic theme of the necessity to honour the church:

Don we nu eac georne swa swa us þearf is, secan we gelome þa cyrican þe we nu lichamlice gesecan magan, 7 geearnian þurh þæt þæt we cuman motan to þære ecan þe us behaten is on heofena rice. (131-34)

The threat of the Last Judgement is invoked to give force to this

adjuration in the neat twist which is given to the traditional metaphor of Christ as the head of the Church and Christians as his limbs:¹

Leofan men, ealle cyrican belimpað to anre, ealswa we ær cwedan, forðam ealle cristene men belimpað to Criste anum, 7 he is heora ealra heafod, 7 hy synd his lima. And þonne se dom cymð, þonne weorðað ealle men gesomnode to anum Godes dome, 7 halige men 7 cristene saula weorðað þonne gegæderede to heora heafde anum þæt is, to Criste sylfum, 7 a syððan wuniað on ecre myrhøe mid him on hefenlicre cyrican.
(124-31)

The sermon concludes with an exposition of the unity of faith pertaining to the church (134-49). Such thematic unity, with the integration of even the conclusion, is not found in Ælfric's sermon, for only the words Nu bidde we ðone Ælmihtigan Hælend þæt he us ... gelæde to ðære ecan gelaðunge heofenan rices (594.5-8) link the peroration to the subject of the sermon.²

Wulfstan's symbolic interpretations are more compact and unified than Ælfric's because the restricted nature of his theme circumscribes the significance of symbols, whereas Ælfric's predilection for comprehensive instruction leads him to include explanations of subjects loosely related to his interpretations. Ælfric interprets the gifts offered at the dedication of Solomon's temple as the praises sung daily in God's church by his servants:

Þa menigfealdan lac, ðe Salomon geoffrode Gode
æt þære ealdan cyrc-halgunge, hæfdon getacnunge
þara gastlicra offrunga þe dæghwomlice beoð nu
geoffrode on Godes cyrcan, swa swa Crist sylf hit
astealde and tæhte. (582.26-29)

He then quotes a text in support of his assertion that it is

¹The metaphor appears in a number of Wulfstan's sermons, but the eschatological application is peculiar to this sermon.

²Cf. Ure, Medium Ævum, XXVIII, 114. "Wulfstan's perorations are frequently very general in character, and could often be transposed from one homily to another without detriment."

fitting for God's house to be honoured in such a manner

(582.29-34). He then explains:

Swa-ðeah ne magon manna herunga Godes mārða gemicclian,
ac ða halgan lofsangas fremiað us to ecere hælðe.
Godes cyrce is ure gebedhus, ac swa-þeah on ælcere
stowe se geleaffulla mot hine gebiddan to ðam
Ælmihtigan, þe on ælcere stowe is andwerd him to
clipigendum. (584.1-6)

Wulfstan gives the same interpretation of the gifts as Ælfric does. The sentence containing the interpretation is similar to Ælfric's sentence in 582.26-29, though the reiteration of the subject possibly makes it a little more forceful:

Leofan men, ða lac þe Salomon cyning geofrode Gode
æt þære ealdan cyrichalgunge, þa getacnedan þa
gastlican offrunga þe nu dæghwamlice geoffrode beoð
on Godes cyrican, swa swa Crist sylf hit astealde
7 gebysnade. (91-94)

Wulfstan, for his part, converts the interpretation to an adjuration to all men to seek out the church and offer their prayers (94-104), so that the interpretation accords with the didactic theme announced in his opening statement. Instead of continuing with an explanatory digression such as Ælfric has in 584.1-6, Wulfstan adds an exhortation concerning the conduct required of those who wish to receive the benefits of the church (104-7). Ælfric's assertion that the faithful may pray to God anywhere because he is omnipresent, it may be noted, would strike a discordant note in Wulfstan's sermon, because he asserts the importance of honouring the church building.

Like Ælfric, Wulfstan interprets Solomon as Christ, though the similarity is, of course, not necessarily evidence of Ælfric's influence, since the interpretation is such an obvious one. In this instance too, Wulfstan's interpretation is more circumscribed than Ælfric's. He does not include any of the texts Ælfric quotes to support and elaborate his interpretation (578.31-580.9), but simply states Leofan men, se eorðlica cyning Salomon

getacnað þane heofenlican cyning, þæt is, Crist sylfne (66-67).

If Wulfstan did refer to In Dedicatione Ecclesiae when he composed his sermon, he would presumably have omitted Ælfric's elaboration because it was irrelevant to his theme, for Ælfric is concerned to show that Solomon and Christ are both representative of peace. Similarly, his interpretation of the building of the temple as the establishment of the spiritual church consists of a brief statement, whereas Ælfric deals with the point at some length.

Wulfstan states:

7 þæt an hus þe he arærde Gode to lofe of eorðlican antimbre, þæt getacnað þa halgan ecclesiam þe Crist getimbrode of gastlicum andweorce. (67-69)

Ælfric states:

Se gesibsuma Salomon arærde þæt mære hus of eorðlicum antimbre Gode to wurðmynte, and se gesibsuma Crist getimbrode ða gastlican cyrcan, na mid deadum stanum, ac mid lybbendum sawlum, swa swa se apostol Petrus awrat to geleaffulre gelaðunge: he cwæð, "Genealæcað to ðam lybbendum stane, seðe is fram mannum aworpen, and fram Gode gecoren and gearwurðod; and beoð ge sylfe ofer ðam stane getimbrode, swa swa lybbende stanas on gastlicum husum." (580.10-18)

Ælfric's elaboration of the point is entirely consistent with the aim he announces in his opening sentence, but, in view of the fact that Wulfstan is concerned with the manner in which the church building is to be honoured, it is understandable that he does not give comparable emphasis to the establishment of a spiritual church or even mention the contrast between dead stones and living souls which Ælfric refers to in the first of his sentences.

Ælfric's interpretation of the building of the temple continues with an intricate description of the metaphysical existence of the church. He first states that the single temple Solomon built signifies the unity of all God's churches:

Ealle Godes cyrcan sind getealde to anre cyrcan, and seo is gehaten 'gelaðung,' ða getacnode þæt an tempel ðe Salomon arærde on ðære ealdan æ. (580.21-24)

He then states that all Christian men are called God's house, and, quoting from Paul, he explains that the Holy Ghost dwells in righteous men (580.24-34). He then returns to his point concerning the unity of God's churches, and elaborates, explaining that though his churches are many they are united by one faith (580.34-582.6). He concludes by stating that the manifold churches decay but the spiritual church continues for eternity (582.6-9). The two main points of Ælfric's interpretation are found in Wulfstan's sermon, but they are presented in a simplified and more exhortatory form. He first gives the basic information contained in 580.21-24 and 580.34-582.6, adding the didactic explanation, þurh ænne geleafan ealle we gelyfað on ænne God þe ealle þing gesceop 7 geworhte:

And ealle Godes cyrican syn getealde æfter gastlicum andgyte to anre cyrican, 7 seo is ecclesia genamad, forðam eal cristen folc is þurh anfealdne geleafan geleafful worden. (70-73)

Wulfstan's statement is prepared for by his reference to þæt an hus in his sentence interpreting the building of the temple (cf. Ælfric, þæt mære hus). In 78-82 he explains that Christians are the dwelling place of the Holy Ghost--the passage is, as I shall indicate below, similar to 580.28-34--but the rest of Ælfric's interpretation has no parallel in his sermon. In Wulfstan's sermon, the second point is closely related to the occasion of his address, in two sentences which elaborate on his earlier statement that Solomon erected the temple Gode to lofe (cf. Ælfric, Gode to wurðmynte):

And soþ is þæt ic secge, miclum fremed se him sylfum þe Gode to lofe cyrcan gegearwað. And ealra getimbra huru is Gode gecwemast þæt se man hine sylfne getimbrige to ðam þingum þæt he sylf sy gecweme hus 7 Gode licwurðe on to wunianne. (74-78)

Wulfstan does not state, then, as Ælfric does, that all Christian men are called God's house (580.24), but exhorts every man to

become a temple worthy of God, and in 82-90 he explains the means by which this is to be accomplished.

Because Wulfstan's interpretations are restricted by his didactic theme, his sentences are not involved and packed with information as Ælfric's are and the sentences which constitute a complete interpretation of a symbol are more closely linked together. The comparative simplicity of Wulfstan's sentences and the lexical repetition which connects them reflects his awareness of the form of presentation most suited to oral delivery. This point can best be illustrated by comparing 78-82 and 580.28-34, since 78-82 is the only passage in Wulfstan's interpretation of the narrative which contains consecutive sentences resembling a section of Ælfric's interpretation. Ælfric states:

Fram ðære tide ures fulluhtes wunað se Halga Gast on us, and ealle englas and ealle rihtwise men sindon his tempel; forði sceolon cristene men þa fulan leahtras forseon þe se swicola deofol tæcð, þæt hi moton beon wurðe þas Halgan Gastes onwununge, seðe ða clæn-heortan lufað, and ða manfullan forbihð. (580.28-34)

Wulfstan's explanation, with the verbal repetition linking the sentences underscored, reads:

And of þam timan ærest þe se man fulluht underfehð, him wunað on se Halga Gast, gif he hine sylfne mid rihte gehealt. And gif he þonne þurh deofles lare hine sylfne wið God forsyngað 7 leahtras lufað, þonne forlæt se Halga Gast þa onwununge, 7 þær sona wyrð deofol inne. (78-82)

Naturally, the two passages have a different emphasis, since Ælfric's passage continues his explanation of why Christians are called the house of God, and Wulfstan is expounding the didactic point introduced in 74-78, that men must labour to become temples worthy of God. But granted the difference of emphasis, both passages make the same basic point, that the Holy Ghost enters at baptism, and men must resist the teaching of the devil in order to remain worthy dwelling places. Wulfstan's sentences do not contain all of the information which is found in the Ælfric passage:

he does not, for instance, refer to angels, or describe the Holy Ghost as seðe ða clæn-heortan lufað, and he does not say that the devil is deceitful (swicola) and his teaching foul (fulan). He confines his sentences to the basic point, and the verbal repetition assists his auditors' comprehension, because it marks clearly the separate stages of the contrasting processes he describes.¹

Wulfstan's handling of the technique of symbolic interpretation is more methodical than Ælfric's, for he interprets all the main details contained in his description of Solomon's temple and no others, whereas Ælfric interprets three different texts in In Dedicacione Ecclesiae.² As a result, his sermon is more closely unified than Ælfric's, and more precisely related to the occasion for which one assumes it was intended to be preached. Ælfric describes the people who attended the dedication of Solomon's temple in his opening narrative (578.17-30), but they do not figure in his interpretation, and he introduces the Queen of Sheba in a separate narrative later in his sermon as a symbol of mankind drawn to the universal church (584.7-588.15). Wulfstan, however, interprets the people who attended the dedication of the temple as representatives of congregations throughout the world (108-23), and he incorporates the narrative details pertaining to the people in his interpretation: that is, their joy during the ceremony represents the frame of mind in which prayers are to be offered to God, and their joyful departure represents the bliss of those who leave the church after offering prayers acceptable to God. Wulfstan's sermon also relates Solomon's dedication to the

¹It is characteristic of Wulfstan's essentially antithetical outlook that he adds that the devil takes possession of those who are forsaken by the Holy Ghost. See further pp. 207-10.

²Wulfstan also summarizes Ælfric's lengthy narrative of the events preceding Solomon's dedication (574.25-578.16): he provides a historical background to the action he interprets symbolically instead of informative narration which is only relevant in the context of Ælfric's very general topic.

actual ceremony of dedicating a church (34-37)--the dedication is another significant aspect of the narrative which is not mentioned in Ælfric's interpretation. The two dedications are related by simple comparison, not by interpretation:

Donne do we ealswa þonne we cyrican halgiað. Gode we hy
betæcað to ðam þingum þæt cristene menn þærto faran magan
7 þær heora neode to Gode mænan 7 synna forgifenesse biddan.
(34-37)

In accordance with the didactic aim announced in the opening sentence, the statement is followed by a lengthy passage in which Wulfstan instructs his audience concerning the ways in which the sacred building is to be honoured.

Bethurum remarks, with reference to Ælfric's interpretation of the Queen of Sheba and Wulfstan's interpretation of the people present at the dedication:

In Ælfric's sermon the Queen of Sheba was a type of all Christians who seek the church. Wulfstan's change here indicates how foreign to his thinking were allegory and hermeneutics in general, for, while the Queen of Sheba can easily be a symbol of the whole church, the people attending the dedication of the temple cannot be.¹

Bethurum's meaning, if I understand her rightly, is that Wulfstan attempts to give the people attending the dedication the significance which the Queen of Sheba has in Ælfric's sermon, that they cannot function as a symbol of the meaning with which Ælfric endows the Queen of Sheba, and that the attempt to make them do so reveals Wulfstan's inexpert handling of symbolic interpretation. Wulfstan does not, however, attempt to interpret the people as Ælfric interprets the Queen of Sheba--the two interpretations are different in substance. Ælfric's interpretation of the Queen of Sheba relates to his concern with the metaphysical existence of the church, for he interprets her journey as the church built in men's hearts by their conversion to Christianity and as the soul's entry to heaven (584.7-588.15), whereas Wulfstan interprets the

¹Homilies, p. 354 (note to 112-14).

people present at the temple dedication as a "betokening" of Christians throughout the world who seek out the church building to honour God:

And þæt folc getacnod ealle þa cristenan men þe nu ofer ealne middaneard cyrican secað. And ealswa hy þær on blisse wæron þa hwile þe hy þær wæron, swa scylan cristene men eac mid bliðre heortan nu cyrican secan. (112-16)

The two interpretations are, however, of a different order, which is presumably the general point of Bethurum's remark. That is: Ælfric's interpretation is unquestionably a symbolic one, since he bestows a conceptual significance on the Queen of Sheba--she stands for something which, literally, she is not; Wulfstan's interpretation, on the other hand, is more in the nature of an equation, since he relates a congregation which attended a historically unique dedication to congregations throughout the world who seek out the church building, which has been dedicated just as Solomon's temple was (see 34-37). The difference seems to me to be symptomatic of the two writers' dissimilar approaches to interpretation of the text. Ælfric views the various elements of the narrative as having an abstract and complex significance which requires explanation. Wulfstan, however, seems to regard the historical actions as a "betokening" of the conduct of later generations, or, to put it another way, as models of conduct to be imitated.¹ His conception of the narrative as an authoritative precedent for men's conduct is indicated by his first comment on Solomon's dedication, and by the statement he makes concerning the joy of the people who attended the dedication of the temple:

Donne do we ealswa þonne we cyrican halgiað. (34)

¹The same conception of the significance of scriptural events is evident in his reworking of an OE translation of Abbo of St. Germain's homily on the reconciliation of penitents (XV, pp. 236-38), particularly in XV. 29-33, 39-45.

And ealswa hy þær on blisse wæron þa hwile þe hy
 þær wæron, swa scylan cristene men eac mid bliðre
 heortan nu cyrican secan . (114-16)

It is also suggested by his transition from interpretation to exhortation in his discussion of the significance of the gifts offered and the building of the temple: he asserts the necessity to offer prayers to God in the church (100-4), and the desirability of creating, internally, a dwelling which is pleasing to the Holy Spirit (74-78). The fact that Wulfstan's interpretation tends to exhortations to honour God's church which are drawn by analogy from the narrative is in keeping with the aim which he states in his first sentence. His intention, he tells his audience, is to

cyðan ymbe cyricmærsunge, þæt ge þe geornor understandan
 magan hu man cyrican weorþian scyle, þe Gode sylfum to
 lofe and to wurðmynte gehalgod bið. (3-5)

To return, then, to Bethurum's remark. It may be true that Wulfstan's interpretation of the people attending Solomon's dedication reveals that allegory and hermeneutics in general were foreign to Wulfstan's thinking: certainly his surviving corpus gives no encouragement to the belief that symbolic interpretation was his métier. I would be inclined, however, to put the matter somewhat differently. Wulfstan's interpretation, I would suggest, does not indicate that he was unfamiliar with symbolic interpretation--and, by implication, that he handles it clumsily--but that he adapted the mode of symbolic interpretation in De Dedicacione Ecclesiae to suit didactic purposes which are different from Ælfric's. For there is a consistency in his aim and methods, and his aim would not be furthered by symbolic interpretation explaining the mysteries of the faith. If we accept that his conception of the nature and function of his composition is different from Ælfric's, we will see, I think, that he is not inexpertly imitating Ælfric in interpreting the people present at Solomon's dedication, but is applying the formulae on which his sermon is

based to yet another of the details mentioned in his narrative ymbe cyricmærsunge, and drawing from it a significance which provides further instruction in the manner in which the church is to be honoured. The interpretation is not, strictly speaking, symbolic, but it is roughly in keeping with his other interpretations. I would not, of course, suggest that his aims and methods are as intrinsically valuable as Ælfric's, but I think we may grant that he does at least create a unified and coherent sermon according to his own lights.

The differences which emerge from a comparison of Ælfric's account of Solomon's dedication of the temple with Wulfstan's opening narrative can be related to Wulfstan's divergences from Ælfric's interpretations. Of the people assembled at the dedication Ælfric says:

He [Solomon] astod ða and þæt folc gebletsode
and þæt folc syððan, mid bliðre heortan, on ðam
eahteoðan dæge ham gewende, ðancigende þam Ælmihtigan
ealra his goda. (578.23-30)

Solomon's blessing, which has no bearing on Wulfstan's interpretation of the people as congregations throughout the world, is not mentioned in his account. His description of the emotions of the people, And eal þæt folc þe ðærto gesamnod wæs/on mycelre myrhðe^{wæs}
7 on fulre gesibsumnesse (24-25), which has no parallel in Ælfric's narrative, looks forward to the exhortation contained in his interpretation of the people present at the dedication:

And ealswa hy þær on blisse wæron þa hwile þe
hy þær wæron, swa scylan cristene men eac mid
bliðre heortan nu cyrican secan, forðan se
ðe þider mid niðe oððon mid ænigum gramam færð
ne weorðað his lac þær Gode andfenge ne his gebeda
fram Gode gehyrede ær he nið 7 gramam mid ealle
alæte. (114-19)

Where Ælfric has ðancigende þam Ælmihtigan ealra his goda,
Wulfstan has Gode ælmihtigum þanciende þære mærdæ þe þurh his
fultum þær geforðad wearð (27-28). Wulfstan's expression relates

his narrative more closely to the explanation he gives later:

Ac se ðe þyder mid clænum mode færð 7 þær bliðe
bið for godcundre þearfe 7 to Gode georne þencð
7 clypað, his bena beoð Gode gecweme, 7 he ðæs
mæg georne Gode þancian 7 þe bliðra mæg mid sibbe
7 mid some syððan hamwerd eft gewendan. (119-23)

Ælfric's account of the gifts which were offered includes the specific details given in I Kings viii.5:

and þær geoffrode Gode menigfealde lac, þæt wæron
getealde twa and twentig þusend oxena, and hund-
twelftig þusend sceaþa. (578.18-20)

Wulfstan states only that Solomon swyðe micle lac 7 unlytle ælnessan þær Gode betæhte (23-24). Wulfstan's description may be an instance of his "habit of making the concrete general,"¹ but it is possible that he does not give precise details because they are irrelevant to his interpretation. His reference to unlytle ælnessan relates the account to his interpretation of the offerings, for he mentions the material gifts which men offer to God as well as the spiritual ones (94-99).

The parallel Wulfstan draws between Solomon's dedication of the temple and contemporary consecrations is also prepared for. He emphasizes the great ceremony with which the church was dedicated, stating 7 hit þa mærlīcost Gode betæhte þe æfre ær ænig gewurde, where Ælfric says only and þæt mære hus Gode betæhte (578.21). In Ælfric's account, the prayers Solomon offered in dedicating the church are described near the beginning of the narrative. Wulfstan places his description at the end, so that the explanation of the ceremony follows smoothly from it. He does not describe the manner in which the king knelt at the altar, which Ælfric mentions in 578.20-21, and he omits the words of Solomon's prayer, for neither of these details are of significance for Wulfstan's interpretation as they are for

¹Bethurum, Homilies, p. 355 (note to 49).

Ælfric's. In place of Ælfric's statement that Solomon dedicated the temple to trymminge, and to gescyldnysse wið ælces yfeles onscyte (578.22-23), Wulfstan has:

þa wæs he wilniende to Gode sylfum geornlice 7
 manigfealdlice þæt he þurh his miclan mildheortnesse
 æghwylcum þara gemildsode þe æfre to ðam on Godes
 naman gebæde, 7 þæt he æt æghwylcre neode on helpe
 wære ælcum þara þe his þearfe þerto sohte. (29-33)

Wulfstan's statement gives greater prominence to the role of the church in the relationship of God and man and is closely related in substance to his exposition of the conduct befitting those who enter the church.

Wulfstan's sermon, it would appear, bears little specific resemblance to In Dedicacione Ecclesiae, and, if he did refer to Ælfric's composition when he wrote it, he was not deterred from adhering to his own aims throughout his sermon. We can never ascertain whether Wulfstan did employ the technique of symbolic interpretation under the influence of Ælfric's composition, but even if he was indebted to Ælfric's work for the suggestion, the technique assumes different characteristics in his hands, because his sermon is a unified exposition of a specific theme and is more directly exhortatory than Ælfric's. It is primarily Wulfstan's opening sentence and his description of Solomon's dedication of the temple which have been considered to bear a marked resemblance to In Dedicacione Ecclesiae, and even these passages can be seen to differ considerably from Ælfric's composition, in a manner which is consistent with Wulfstan's didactic aims and mode.

CHAPTER IV

INCIPIUNT SERMONES LUPI EPISCOPI

Ælfric's Sermo de Initio Creaturae (Thorpe, I, 8-28) was first postulated as a source for Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi (VI, pp. 142-56) by Becher.¹ Jost expressed agreement with Becher on this point,² but stated that Pirmin's Scarapsus had exerted a more significant influence on Wulfstan's sermon, and that Wulfstan had "followed first one, and then the other of his two sources."³ His tabulation of the verbal parallels showed that parts of Wulfstan's introductory address to the clergy (1-20) were comparable with the opening of Scarapsus, and that his account of events from the creation to the post-diluvian rebellion against God, though it contained a few expressions similar to Ælfric's sermon, bore a closer resemblance to Pirmin's account than Ælfric's. He considered, however, that Wulfstan's account of Christ's descent from Shem was derived from Sermo de Initio Creaturae.⁴ Jost found no verbal similarities between the latter half of Wulfstan's sermon and Ælfric's composition, and only one sentence in Wulfstan's narrative of the events after the idolatry following the Flood, which, in his opinion, resembled an expression in

¹Wulfstans Homilien, p. 42.

²Becher also suggested that Wulfstan had made use of Ælfric's Preface in his digression on the power of the devil (77-95). As Jost pointed out, there is no more than a general similarity of subject matter (Wulfstanstudien, pp. 59, 55, n. 2).

³Ibid., p. 55.

⁴Ibid., pp. 55-59.

Scarapsus.¹ He concluded

Von [VI. 128] bis zum Schluss der Predigt finde ich seltsamerweise kaum mehr einen Satz, den ich mit Bestimmtheit aus Pirmin oder Ælfric ableiten möchte. Wohl deckt sich der Stoff noch vielfach, aber nicht mehr der Wortlaut. Während also im ersten Teil von [VI] die Übereinstimmungen mit Pirmin und Ælfric so gross sind, dass Wulfstan bei der Abfassung seiner Predigt diese Vorlagen ständig neben sich gehabt haben muss, kann er sie von [VI. 128] an bestenfalls nach dem Gedächtnis verwendet haben. Wahrscheinlicher ist mir freilich, dass er einer noch nicht ermittelten Quelle folgte.²

Bethurum's view of the relation of Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi to Sermo de Initio Creaturae and Scarapsus is less fully stated. In her article on Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book," published before the appearance of Wulfstanstudien, she described Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi as

a brief survey of Hebrew history through the life of Christ ... based on Ælfric's "De Initio Creaturae" (Thorpe, I, C.H., 8-28), which Wulfstan follows fairly closely in outline, though he condenses some material and omits some.³

In the Notes to her edition of the sermons, however, she states that VI is

an outline of Christian history, based on Ælfric's similar homily, 'De Initio Creaturae,' and, as Jost discovered (pp. 45-47, 55-61), upon a tract by St. Pirmin.⁴

This may mean that she concurs with Jost, and considers that Wulfstan first followed closely each of his sources in turn, but abandoned them in the second half of his sermon for another source or relied on his recollections of their substance. Alternatively, it may mean that she holds substantially the same view of the relation of VI to Sermo de Initio Creaturae as she did in 1942,

¹Wulfstanstudien, p.60 and notes.

²Ibid., p. 60.

³PMLA, LVII, 921.

⁴Homilies, p. 293.

but accepts Jost's claim that the passages for which she cites a parallel in Scarapsus were influenced by Pirmin. The fact that she does not refer to Jost's belief that the influence of Scarapsus was more significant and that the latter part of the sermon may have an undiscovered source, whereas she does remark later in the Notes that "Wulfstan follows" Sermo de Initio Creaturae,¹ and states in her introduction that the relation of XVIII to In Dedicacione Ecclesiae is "rather like that of VI and Ælfric's sermon,"² perhaps suggests that, in her view, Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is more heavily dependent on Sermo de Initio Creaturae than Jost considered it to be.

I am less inclined to accept Sermo de Initio Creaturae as a source for Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi than to entertain the possibility that Wulfstan may have made use of his knowledge of Ælfric's compositions in IV and XVIII. There are few similarities in phrasing, despite the fact that both sermons are relatively long: Jost notes only eleven, mostly short, phrases and sentences in Sermo de Initio Creaturae which are comparable with expressions in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi. The passages he compares seem to me to bear even less resemblance to one another than do parts of IV and Ælfric's Preface or XVIII and In Dedicacione Ecclesiae. He remarks, concerning Wulfstan's account of Christ's descent from Shem, that Wulfstan "übernimmt ... wörtlich einige Sätze aus Ælfrics Schöpfungspredigt,"³ and lists the following parallels:

Wulfstan

Ða wæs þeah an mægð ðe æfre weorðode þone soðan Godd,
7 seo asprang of Seme se wæs Noes yldesta sunu. (97-99)

¹Homilies, p. 293.

²Ibid., p. 35.

³Wulfstanstudien, p. 59.

Ælfric

Da wæs hwæðere an mægð þe næfre ne abeah to nanum deofolgyldre, ac æfre wurðode þone soðan God. Seo mægð asprang of Noes eltstan suna, se wæs gehaten Sem. (24. 5-7)

Wulfstan

And of ðam mæran Abrahame comon heahfæderas, and of his mæran cynne eac coman þa witegan þe cyddan Cristes tocyme. (100-2)

Ælfric

and of þam cynne comon ealle heahfæderas and witegan, þa ðe cyðdon Cristes tocyme to þisum life. (24.12-14)

Wulfstan

7 ðam sylfan cynne God sylf sette lage (102-3)

Ælfric

And þyssere mægðe God sealde and gesette ae (24.16)

Wulfstan

7 of his [David's] cynne eft com Sancta Maria, Cristes modor (108-9)

Ælfric

forþan ðe he wolde of þyssere mægðe him modor geceosan. (24.19-20)

This section of Wulfstan's sermon, together with his account of the creation and fall of Lucifer, contains most of the passages Jost considered to be similar to parts of Sermo de Initio Creaturae. The parallels he noted between the accounts of the creation and fall of Lucifer are as follows:

Wulfstan

Da wearð þær an þæra engla swa scinende 7 swa beorht 7 swa wlitig þæt se wæs Lucifer genemned. (27-29)

Ælfric

Da wæs þæs teoðan werodes ealdor swiðe fæger and wlitig gesceapen, swa þæt he wæs gehaten Leohtberend. (10. 20-22)

Wulfstan

Þa þuhte him þæt he mihte beon þæs efengelica ðe hine gescop 7 geworhte. (29-30)

Ælfric

Da began he to modigenne...and cwæð on his heortan,
þæt he...mihte beon his Scyppende gelic. (10.22-24)

Wulfstan

7 heom wearð hyll gegearwod (32-33)

Ælfric

Pa hwile gearcode se Ælmihtiga Scyppend him and his
geferum helle wite. (12.1-3)

Wulfstan

And to ðam hy gesceop God ælmihtig, þæt hy 7 heora
ofspring scoldan gefyllan 7 gemænigfyldan þæt on heofonum
gewanad wæs (36-38)

Ælfric

Da wolde God gefyllan and geinnian þone lyre þe
forloren was of þam heofenlicum werode (12.23-25)

Even at first sight, I think, the similarities in phrasing seem no greater than those which might be expected to occur in two sermons dealing with the same events, and certainly not striking enough to warrant the conclusion that Wulfstan must have worked with a copy of Sermo de Initio Creaturae "ständig neben sich." Close comparison of the passages reveals that there are significant differences in style. It can also be seen that the passages do not convey the same information (compare, for example, an þæra engla ... se wæs Lucifer genemned and þæs teoðan werodes ealdor ... wæs gehaten Leohtberend); and the verbal similarities appear negligible if the scattered excerpts which Jost quotes are viewed in the context of the two writers' differing presentation of an entire event.

Furthermore, a comparison of the two sermons reveals that, in substance, Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi differs more considerably from Sermo de Initio Creaturae than is suggested by Bethurum's statement that Wulfstan follows Ælfric's sermon fairly closely in outline. Superficially, the overall resemblance of the two compositions is more marked than that of IV and Ælfric's Preface,

because IV and the Preface, as I have shown, are dissimilar in organization. There is an immediately apparent similarity in outline between XVIII and In Dedicatione Ecclesiae, because Wulfstan summarizes the same text as Ælfric and, with one exception, interprets symbolically the same details, but Ælfric's discussion of Solomon's temple constitutes only one part of In Dedicatione Ecclesiae, and the interpretations, I have argued, are different in kind. It is at least possible, however, to make a detailed comparison of IV and Ælfric's Preface, because a parallel can be found in the Preface for most of the information contained in IV. Much of the narrative detail and exposition in Sermo de Initio Creaturae, on the other hand, has no parallel, even in general substance, in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi. Bethurum does, certainly, make it clear in her earlier description that she considers Wulfstan's sermon to be an abridged version of Ælfric's, but the two sermons also differ because Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi contains a high proportion of material not found in Sermo de Initio Creaturae. There is, for instance, as Jost points out, nothing in Ælfric's sermon comparable with Wulfstan's reference to the murder of Abel, his account of the Babylonian captivity, and his digression on the power of the devil. Jost's comparison, in fact, even though he accepts Ælfric's sermon as a source for Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, makes very little allowance for similarity in substance. If we agree with Jost, as I think we must, that the first half of Wulfstan's sermon has more in common with Pirmin's more compressed narrative, and that the second half is so tenuously related to Sermo de Initio Creaturae and Scarapsus as to make direct reference to these works unlikely, we can only deduce that the unacknowledged implication of Jost's study is that Wulfstan's reliance on Ælfric is indicated solely by a few verbal similarities he claims to discern.

The two sermons do, of course, bear a general resemblance to one another because they both rehearse the history of Creation from its inception to the Last Judgement. But, as Bethurum points out, the exposition of Christian history was a type of sermon which was "at least as old as Augustine."¹ Neither IV nor XVIII appears to be representative of a traditional type of sermon.² The fact that Wulfstan's sermon on the Last Days contains much the same material as Ælfric's Preface suggests, then, that Wulfstan may have based IV on Ælfric's work, since there was a sizeable body of information and speculation pertaining to this topic. His choice of the same text and method as Ælfric in his sermon on the dedication of a church also suggests that he may have been influenced by Ælfric, because symbolic interpretation is not his usual mode of preaching. But since Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi belongs to a well-established homiletic tradition, the mere fact that Wulfstan's sermon bears a general resemblance to one of Ælfric's compositions is not sufficient reason for postulating a direct connexion between the two sermons.

The possibility that Wulfstan had read Sermo de Initio Creaturae, and that it provided the impetus for his sermon, cannot of course be ruled out. He may, for that matter, have read two of Ælfric's other treatments of the history of Creation,³ Dominica II. Post Aepiphania Domini (Thorpe, II, 58-72) and Libellus de Ueteri

¹Homilies, p. 293.

²See above pp. 30-33.

³Ælfric also dealt with the history of Creation in his translation and rewriting of Basil's Hexameron, but its resemblance to Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is remote, because it is concerned primarily with the six days of Creation and the Incarnation. See Exameron Anglice (Bibliothek der ang. Prosa, X), Hamburg, 1921.

Testamento et Nouo.¹ I do not wish to argue in favour of this, but it is perhaps worth noting in considering the validity of the assumption that Wulfstan based Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi on Sermo de Initio Creaturae, that, although Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi resembles Sermo de Initio Creaturae more closely than Ælfric's other two treatments of the history of Creation, because they are concerned with the six ages of the world, they both refer to the murder of Abel and the Babylonian captivity, and there are points at which the phrasing of Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is closer to Libellus de Ueteri Testamento et Nouo than Sermo de Initio Creaturae.² There is no external evidence to suggest that Wulfstan was acquainted with any or all of these compositions--that is, none of them appears in the manuscripts associated with him, as the homily version of Ælfric's Preface does--but I do not think, as I have already had occasion to state, that we should assume that Wulfstan wrote in ignorance of his contemporary's works.³ Nevertheless, there is no particular reason, in this instance, why Wulfstan should have referred to Ælfric's compositions. It is conceivable that he might have consulted Ælfric's Preface when he wrote on the reign of Antichrist in order to ensure that he included only material which had authoritative sanction, and that he might have referred to Ælfric's writings when he dealt with a somewhat esoteric subject such as the symbolic interpretation of Solomon's dedication of the temple. But even if we accept Fehr's estimation of Wulfstan as a scholar far inferior to Ælfric,⁴ we surely need not suppose that the Archbishop required

¹See The Old English Version of the Heptateuch ..., ed. S.J. Crawford (EETS, Orig. Ser. 160), London, 1922, 15-75.

²See below.

³See pp. 30-35.

⁴See Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics, p. cix.

other compositions to furnish him with material for a sermon on the significant events of Christian history.

I would conclude, then, from my preliminary examination, that there is insufficient evidence to support the view that Wulfstan based his sermon on Sermo de Initio Creaturae, and that there is no real need to assume that he had a specific source. If Wulfstan's decision to write a sermon on the history of Creation is attributable to his knowledge of a specific work, it seems more likely that Scarapsus provided him with the idea for his sermon, since Jost argues convincingly in his examination of Xb and c (pp. 194-210) that Wulfstan was acquainted with Pirmin's tract.¹ I cannot agree with Bethurum, however, that Jost has demonstrated that Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi was directly influenced by Scarapsus. His claim would carry more weight, I feel, if it could be shown that Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi was closely related in substance to Scarapsus, but, as Jost himself points out, the second half of the sermon bears no closer resemblance to Scarapsus than it does to Sermo de Initio Creaturae, and the reference to Cain, the account of the Babylonian captivity, and the digression on the devil's power, which Wulfstan cannot have derived from Sermo de Initio Creaturae, have no parallel in Scarapsus either.² I would agree with Jost that the passages from the first half of the sermon he quotes have more in common with Scarapsus than Sermo de Initio Creaturae, but I do not think that this proves that Wulfstan was influenced by Pirmin. It is only to be expected that parts of Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi bear a closer resemblance to Scarapsus than Sermo de Initio Creaturae, because the narrative in Wulfstan's sermon and Scarapsus is more condensed than it is in Elfric's sermon, but, as I hope to show, Wulfstan's narrative

¹Wulfstanstudien, pp. 45-55.

²Ibid., pp. 59-60.

differs from Pirmin's in style as well as substance. Pirmin's influence on the introductory address to the clergy appears less marked if it is borne in mind that the resemblance is largely a matter of the scriptural admonitions cited, and such admonitions, according to Bethurum, "appear frequently in patristic writing."¹

The following chapter attempts to establish Wulfstan's independence of Ælfric's Sermo de Initio Creaturae. Since evidence for Pirmin's influence depends on the existence of close verbal parallels, I shall compare only passages from Scarapsus and Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi which Jost cites, in order to suggest that he has exaggerated the similarities between the two compositions. A further reason for the absence of detailed comparison of Scarapsus and Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is that I am concerned in this section with the relation of Wulfstan's compositions to Ælfric's, and, whereas Jost does not claim that Wulfstan relied on Scarapsus for the material for his entire sermon, Bethurum's descriptions, particularly her earlier one, suggest that he relied heavily on Ælfric, because she states that Wulfstan follows fairly closely the outline of Ælfric's sermon, though he condenses some material and omits some.

Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi and Sermo de Initio Creaturae both recount the salient events of Christian history, but the significance which is given to the history of Creation by the two writers, and the pattern which they discern in it, is not the same. For Ælfric, the significance of the history of Creation is the revelations it affords men of the marvels of the nature of God and his works. The attitude which his sermon is intended to inculcate is similar to that expressed in one of his sermons which gives a partial recapitulation of Christian history:

¹Homilies, p. 294 (note to 3-20).

Hwa mæg æfre on life ealle gereccan Godes mærlīcan
mihta, ðe he mannum cydde fram Adames anginne oð
þisne andweardan dæg? (II, 224.13-15)

His only explicit reference to the moral import of his sermon occurs in the closing lines, which are an exhortation to smeagað þysne cwyde, and mid micelre gymene forbugað unrīhtwysnyse (28. 20-21), and his account of the history of Creation does not attempt to instil this moral. Ælfric's topic is characteristically a very broad one, and it necessitates extensive narrative and exegetical interpretation of events to illustrate the power and the glory of God. He begins with praise of the all-creating, ineffable Trinity, and describes in considerable detail the creation of heaven, angels, earth, and mankind; the temptation of man; the Flood; the erection of the tower of Babel and the punishment which befell the builders; and the Incarnation of Christ and the Redemption of man. He digresses continually from the narrative to explain God's motives and justifications, and the theological import of events. In particular, the account is informed by the apprehension of the history of Creation as the manifestation of God's providence.

For Wulfstan, the significance of the history of Creation is the practical moral lessons it gives concerning the punishment of sin and the reward of righteousness. The didactic aim which informs his outline of history is stated in his opening sentence:

Leofan men, us is deope beboden þæt we geornlice
mynegian 7 læran sculan þæt manna gehwylc to Gode
buge 7 fram synnum gecyrre. (3-5)

It is Wulfstan's usual practice to announce the theme of his sermon in the opening sentence,¹ although this sermon differs from most, because it was probably intended to serve as a model, and the introductory lines are addressed only to priests:² in the opening

¹See further pp. 88, 200, 268, 318, 343ff.

²See Bethurum, Homilies, p. 294.

to the sermon proper, he states that he will speak ymbe Godes wundra (21-24). In his account of the birth of Christ, Wulfstan dilates, as Ælfric does, upon the mystery of the Trinity, but in his narrative of events previous to this, the selection of material and description of events is consistent with his single moral aim. In his narrative can be discerned a pattern of revolt against God inspired by the devil which is met by punishment, and the reward of occasional instances of righteousness. The benevolence of God is emphasized by Wulfstan's description of Christ's sacrifice to redeem mankind which follows his account of a series of defections from true faith.

To illustrate that Ælfric is concerned with the abstract theological import of events and Wulfstan with the moral lessons is to illustrate only a difference in the preoccupations of the two writers which has frequently been remarked upon. What I wish to add to this perception is that the didactic aims of the two writers dictate the selection of material for their respective sermons, and that, although they deal with roughly the same events, the manner in which these are presented differs according to the significance which is discerned in the history of Creation. I would argue, therefore, that Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is not merely a summary of the events Ælfric recounts which lacks the explanations he gives of their philosophical significance, but an independent composition which embodies Wulfstan's own conception of Christian history.

Since Wulfstan's sermon divides into two contrasting sections, it is convenient to compare first his narrative of the events prior to the birth of Christ with Ælfric's, and then the descriptions of the Incarnation and the Last Judgement, in order

to illustrate that his selection of material and presentation of events differs from Ælfric's and evinces a dissimilar conception of the significance of the history of Creation. A comparison of the two sermons, together with an examination of certain features of Wulfstan's style, also reveals something of the nature of Wulfstan's theological interests and views.

Ælfric's account of the creation and fall of the angels contains a description of the nine orders of angels and a discussion of their free will and obedience to God. It also includes a description of the tenth host and Lucifer, and a commentary on their revolt (10.17-12.17). Wulfstan gives only a brief, general account of the creation of the angels (24-27), and he treats only the fall of Lucifer and his companions, which alone exemplifies his moral point (27-33).

In his account of the creation of the angels, Wulfstan does not enumerate and describe the ten orders, but merely acknowledges the existence of various hosts by stating that God created engla weredu mycle 7 mære (27). This detail is not found in the sentence in Scarapsus which Jost held to be Wulfstan's source:

Cum fecisset deus in principio caelum et terram, in illa caelesti habitatione fecit spiritalis creaturas, id est angelus (sic). (35.1)¹

Wulfstan characterizes Lucifer as follows:

Da wearð þær an þæra engla swa scinende 7 swa beorht 7 swa wlitig þæt se wæs Lucifer genemned. (27-29)

Ælfric's description of Lucifer, which Jost considered to be closely parallel to Wulfstan's reads:

¹References for Scarapsus are to G. Jecker, Die Heimat des hl. Pirmin, des Apostels der Alamannen (Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens, XIII), Munich, 1927.

Da wæs þæs teoðan werodes ealdor swiðe fæger and
 wlitig gesceapen, swa þæt he wæs gehaten Leohtberend.
 (10.20-22)

Since Wulfstan does not refer to the various orders of angels in his account of their creation, his description of Lucifer is dissimilar to Ælfric's because he does not state that Lucifer was the leader of the tenth host. Wulfstan mentions Lucifer's companions only in his account of the fall into hell (31-33), where he describes them as eall þæt him hyrde. He therefore identifies the fallen angels with the sinners he later describes, for both angels and men are shown as rebels against God because they are seduced by the teaching of the devil. In this respect, his description differs from Pirmin's and Ælfric's, for Pirmin and Ælfric present the fallen angels as Lucifer's co-partners in evil. Pirmin describes the fallen angels as those qui illi consenserunt (35.4), and Ælfric states:

Þa gefæstnode he þisne ræd wið þæt werod þe he
 bewiste, and hi ealle to ðam ræde gebugon. Ðaða
 hi ealle hæfdon þysne ræd betwux him gefæstnod, þa
 becom Godes grama ofer hi ealle, and hi ealle wurdon
 awende of þam fægeran hiwe, þe hi on gesceapene
 wæron, to laðlicum deoflum. (10.26-31)

In contrast to Ælfric's leisurely detailing of cause and effect in this account of the fall of the angels (10.26-12.5), Wulfstan compresses his description of the whole action to a few clauses which could constitute a single sentence, and employs the construction sona swa ... þa ..., which heightens the immediacy of Lucifer's punishment:

Þa þuhte him þæt he mihte beon þæs efengelica ðe
 hine gescop 7 geworhte, and sona swa he þurh
 ofermodignysse þæt geðohte, þa hreas he of heofonum
 7 eall þæt him hyrde, 7 hy gewurdan of englum to
 deoflum gewordene, 7 heom wearð hyll gegearwod, 7
 hi ðær wuniað on ecan forwyrðe. (29-33)

Although Jost believed that Wulfstan's description of the fall of the angels was one of the passages he derived from Scarapsus, Wulfstan's choice of construction cannot have been influenced by

Scarapsus, for the relevant passage reads:

et pro hac superbia cum aliis pluribus angelis,
qui illi consenserunt, de illa caelesti sede in
aere isto, qui est sub caelo, deictus est et ...
factus est diabolus. (35.4)

The account of the creation of Adam and Eve and the Fall, which in Ælfric's sermon includes most of the scriptural details, symbolic interpretation, and discussion of a number of theological issues (12.23-14.26 and 16.10-20.20), is restricted in Wulfstan's sermon to a short account of God's reason for creating Adam and Eve, their disobedience to God's commandment at the instigation of the devil, and the expulsion from Eden (34-52). The construction sona swa ... þa ... is again employed to emphasize the rapidity with which punishment follows sin:

And sona swa þæt wæs þæt hi [Adam and Eve] swa gedon
hæfdon, þa hæfdon hy forworhte hy sylfe 7 wurdon of
þære myrhðe aworpene þe hy ær on wæron, 7 on þis
wræclice lif bescofene 7 her syððan on earfoðan 7 on
geswince wunedon. (48-51)

The same construction is also employed to emphasize the malice of the devil:

Ac sona swa deofol ongeat þæt mann to ðam gescapen
wæs, þæt he scolde 7 his cynn gefyllan on heofonum
þæt se deofol forworhte ðurh his ofermodignesne, þa
wæs him þæt on myclan andan. (39-43)

None of the passages in Scarapsus and Sermo de Initio Creaturae which Jost cites as parallel to these two passages of Wulfstan's account of the Fall is stylistically similar. Ælfric correlates his clauses describing the devil's decision to seduce mankind by þa ... þa ... (16.27-31). Pirmin employs an absolute construction in his description of the devil's envy (35.16), and his account of the expulsion from Eden reads:

pro qua offensa iactatus est homo de paradiso in
exilio mundi istius, ubi multas labores et dolores
patiretur. (35.24)

Wulfstan's account of the Flood, like his account of the punishment of Adam and Eve, compresses the description of the main event to a one sentence statement, whereas Ælfric gives a description of the Flood which incorporates most of the narrative details mentioned in Genesis and extends to the covenant of the rainbow (20.21-22.16). In his sentence which deals with the Flood, Wulfstan again describes affliction as the corollary of sin. In this sentence, however, he presents the Flood as God's reluctant response to extreme provocation, instead of emphasizing the rapidity with which punishment follows disobedience as he does in the sentences describing the fall of Lucifer and the fall of man:

And syððan aa swa heora ofspringes 7 mancynnes mare wearð, swa deofol ma and ma manna forlærde 7 getihte to heora agenre unþearfe swa æt nyhstan þæt hy to Gode næfdon naper ne lufe ne ege, ac on ælce wisan hy þurh heora synna God to þam swyðe gegremedon þæt he let æt nehstan flod gan ofer ealne middaneard 7 adrencan eal þæt on worulde wæs butan þam ðe on ðam earce wæron. (56-62)

Ælfric explains in his account of the Flood that the sins which angered God were wide-spread and numerous:

Ða wearð þa hrædlice micel mennisc geweaxen, and wæron swiðe manega on yfel awende, and gegremodon God mid mislicum leahtrum, and swiðost mid forligere. Ða wearð God to þan swiðe gegremod þurh manna mandæda þæt he cwæð þæt him ofþuhte þæt he æfre mancynn gesceop. (20.21-25)

The iniquity of mankind which was punished by the Flood is magnified to even greater proportions in Wulfstan's narrative (cf. ac on ælce wisan hy þurh heora synna God to þam swyðe gegremedon and gegremedon God mid mislicum leahtrum, and swiðost mid forligere); and the murder of Abel, which is not mentioned in Scarapsus or Sermo de Initio Creaturae, is added to the account as a further illustration of the enormity of mankind's sins:

Heora bearna an gedyde syððan eac þurh deofles lare deoflice dæde, þæt wæs Cain. He ofsloh Abel, his

agenne broðor, 7 ða wæs Godes yrre þurh ða dæde
ofer eorðan yfele geniwod. (53-56)

Both in the account of the Flood and in his description of Cain's murder, Wulfstan attributes mankind's unrighteousness to the influence of the devil, but there is no reference to the devil's influence on mankind before the Flood in Sermo de Initio Creaturae or in Pirmin's description of the Flood in 36.3, which Jost includes in his list of the passages Wulfstan followed when he composed his sermon. Nor does Ælfric refer to the devil's influence on post-lapsarian man before the Flood in his other major treatments of the history of Creation.¹ Yet some mention of the devil's instigation would be apposite in Ælfric's accounts of history which include Cain's murder. Ælfric explains in Dominica II. Post Aepiphania Domini (58.24-31) and Libellus de Ueteri Testamento et Nouo (175-78) that the murder of Abel prefigures Christ's death at the hands of the Jews, and the current view of the Crucifixion was that the devil inspired the Jews to kill Christ (in Sermo de Initio Creaturae, for instance, Ælfric states that the devil gehwette and tihte ðara Iudeiscra manna heortan to Cristes slege (26.31-32)).² Even in Dominica II. Post Aepiphania Domini, however, where Ælfric demonstrates Christ's fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, he says only that Cain slew Abel þurh andan and that se mægslaga Cain getacnode þara Iudeiscra geleafleaste, ðe Crist mid niðe acwealdon: there is nothing comparable to Wulfstan's explicit statement that Cain murdered Abel þurh deofles lare.

¹See Libellus de Ueteri Testamento et Nouo, 145-56, and Dominica II. Post Aepiphania Domini, 58.24-35.

²Pre-scholastic views of the devil's role in the Crucifixion are discussed by Rosemary Woolf, "Doctrinal Influences on The Dream of the Rood," Medium Ævum, XXVII (1958), 137-53.

Every instance of evil-doing that Wulfstan refers to in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, in fact, is described as having been instigated by the devil, and his insistence on this point is related to his conception of the moral import of the history of Creation. Of the sins which multiplied after the Flood he says:

Da dyde deofol þa gyt, ealswa he a deð, mannum mycle dare; he gedwealde eft mænigne man to þam swyðe þæt hy ofergeaton 7 forgyndon æt nyhstan heora Drihten 7 wurðedon þurh deofles lare mistlice gedwolping 7 worhton fela gedwimera on anlicnessum 7 ðærto abugan Swa hy dwelode deofol 7 adwealde. (70-76)

Ælfric mentions in Sermo de Initio Creaturae that men worshipped idols because they were deceived by the devil, but the influence of the devil does not figure prominently in his description of the heathen practices of the descendants of Noah, whereas it does in Wulfstan's description in 70-76. Ælfric's account reads:

Da siððan wearð mancynn þurh deofol beswicen, and gebiged fram Godes geleafan, swa þæt hi worhton him anlicnyssa, sume of golde, sume of seolfre, sume eac of stanum, sume of treowe, and sceopon him naman, þara manna naman þe wæron entas and yfel-dæde. Eft ðonne hi deade wæron, þonne cwædon þa cucan þæt hi wæron godas, and wurðodon hi, and him lac offrodon; and comon þa deoflu to heora anlicnyssum, and þæron wunodon, and to mannum spræcon swilce hi godas wæron; and þæt beswicene mennisc feoll on cneowum to þam anlicnyssum, and cwædon, "Ge sind ure godas and we besettað urne geleafan and urne hiht on eow." (22.27-24.2)

Wulfstan reiterates that those who worshipped idols were led astray by the devil when he picks up the narrative again after an explanatory digression on the delusions originated by the devil:

Leofan men, þa þa þæt wæs deofol þæt folc swa mistlice dwelede, swa ic eow ær rehte (96-97)

He also attributes the evil which flourished among the Jews before they were conquered to the influence of the devil:

Sume hy wurdon æt nyhstan swa þurh deofol ahyrde þæt hi næfdon to Gode naðer ne lufe ne ege swa swa hy scoldan, ac ðurh deofles lare unriht lufedon ealles to swyðe. (112-15)

Ælfric, on the other hand, in his description of the Jewish nation

prior to captivity in Libellus de Ueteri Testamento et Nouo, attributes the Jews' iniquities to the influence of their wicked kings:

Nu standaþ manega cyningas on þæra Cininga Bocum, be þam ic gesette eac sume boc on Englisc.... Sume wæron arlease 7 swiþe yfele ferdon, þonne hi Godes ne gimdon, ne God him ne fylste; 7 amyrdon heora folc þurh heora mandæda 7 on bysmore leofdon þurh geleafleaste, 7 yfele geendodon on heora unhlisan, swa swa Sedechias, se ungesæliga kining, þe mann gelædde on bendum to Babilonian birig (507-15)

Wulfstan also states in his description of the Crucifixion that Judeisc folc þurh deofles lare hine [Christ] forrædde (181), although in this particular instance, as I have already noted, it was a commonplace notion that the devil incited the Jews to evil actions.

In Wulfstan's view, then, history from the time of Lucifer's revolt consists of a series of rebellions against God inspired by the devil; it is noteworthy that Ælfric's account of the Flood is followed by the statement Da wæs þa sume hwile Godes ege on mancynne (22.17), but Wulfstan presents the worship of idols as the immediate sequel to the Flood. The conception of history which informs Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is consistent with Wulfstan's tendency to view the universe as the battle-ground for a continuous struggle between God and the devil.¹ Wulfstan is concerned to demonstrate that the deceptions practised by the devil are responsible for contemporary as well as past evil: his insistence upon the devil's continual efforts to seduce mankind in his account of the worship of idols after the Flood (Da dyde deofol þa gyt, ealswa he a deð) is in marked contrast to Ælfric's purely descriptive account of heathen customs, which has no contemporary relevance (22.27-24.5). For this reason, the verbal similarities between Wulfstan's and Ælfric's account of the idolatry after the

¹See particularly pp. 200-1, 207-12.

Flood which Jost discerned are very slight. Jost considered that Wulfstan followed Ælfric in the following passages:

Wulfstan

Ða dyde deofol þa gyt, ealswa he a deð, mannum mycle dare

Ælfric

Ða siððan wearð mancynn þurh deofol beswicen

Wulfstan

7 worhton fela gedwimera on anlicnessum 7 ðærto abugan 7 hy ðærto gebædon.

Ælfric

swa þæt hi worhton him anlicnyssa, sume of golde, sume of seolfre, sume eac of stanum, ... and wurðodon hi, and him lac offrodon.

In the first of these parallels, Wulfstan generalizes the devil's activities where Ælfric records a past action: in the second, Ælfric describes the idols, whereas Wulfstan merely characterizes them as fela gedwimera. The explanatory digression in 77-95, which describes the devil as the author of all evil and explains the manner in which he deceives mankind, makes explicit the moral which informs Wulfstan's narrative of events preceding the Incarnation: there is no need, I think, to regard it, as Bethurum does, as a late addition which interrupts the narrative flow.¹

After his account of the idolatry of mankind, Ælfric gives the details of Christ's genealogy from Shem to Erber, and explains that he was descended from a race which always worshipped the true God and which was loved and favoured by God because he intended to choose a mother from it (24.5-20). Jost notes a number of similarities between this section of Ælfric's sermon and Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi. I do not think that the appearance of 7 ðam sylfan cynne God sylf sette lage (102-3) in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi and And byssere mægðe God sealde and gesette æ (24.16) in Sermo de Initio Creaturae shows that Wulfstan was

¹Homilies, p. 296 (note to 77-95).

following Ælfric's sermon: two plain statements of the same fact could hardly differ more in vocabulary. Nor does 7 of his [David's] cynne eft com Sancta Maria, Cristes modor (108-9) bear much resemblance to forþan ðe he wolde of þyssere mægðe him modor geceosan (24.19-20): Wulfstan gives a concrete genealogical detail, whereas Ælfric describes an instance of God's providential fore-sight. The resemblance between the two remaining pairs of passages Jost compares is more marked, although, in the second pair, Wulfstan appears to be attempting to distinguish more clearly between patriarchs and those who prophesied the coming of Christ than Ælfric does:

Wulfstan

þa wæs þeah an mægð ðe æfre weorðode þone soðan Godd,
7 seo asprang of Seme se wæs Noes yldesta sunu. (97-99)

Ælfric

Ða wæs hwæðere an mægð þe næfre ne abeah to nanum
deofolgyldre, ac æfre wurðode þone soðan God. Seo
mægð asprang of Noes eltstan suna, se wæs gehaten
Sem. (24.5-7)

Wulfstan

And of ðam mæran Abrahames comon heahfæderas, and of
his mæran cynne eac coman þa witegan þe cyddan Cristes
tocyme. (100-2)

Ælfric

and of þam cynne comon ealle heahfæderas and witegan,
þa ðe cyðdon Cristes to-cyme to þisum life. (24.12-14)

Although there are verbal similarities, the resemblance between the two sermons seems less noteworthy if the passages Jost singles out are considered in context. In Sermo de Initio Creaturae, the first of the passages quoted above is followed by an account of the descendants of Shem down to Erber. Wulfstan does not include the genealogical details which Ælfric gives, for they serve only as an indication of historical continuity. He does, however, give a description of Abraham (99-100) after his reference to Shem, and a description of Moses and David (103-8) after his reference to the descendants of Abraham. Ælfric, on

the other hand, does not give any details of the heahfæderas and witegan who descended from Erber. By including these descriptions, Wulfstan stresses the point that Christ came of a righteous and illustrious race. His reference to Abraham and David might also have been influenced by his knowledge of the division of history into seven ages, for Abraham and David were traditionally regarded as the initiators of the third and fourth ages respectively, and they were, like Moses, considered to be types of Christ.

With greater accuracy than Ælfric, Wulfstan does not depict the race from which Christ sprang as one which always found favour with God, but explains that some were led astray by the devil, with the result that the nation was conquered and the people led into captivity:

And swa þeahhwæðere sume þa ðe his [David's] cynnes wæron 7 æfter him ðæs rices weoldon mishyrðan Gode swyðor þonne hy beþorftan. Sume hy wurdon æt nyhstan swa þurh deofol ahyrde þæt hy næfdon to Gode naðer ne lufe ne ege swa swa hy scoldan, ac ðurh deofles lare unriht lufedon ealles to swyðe. And æt nyhstan þæt folc ða wearð swa wið God forworht þæt he let faran hæþenne here 7 forhergian eall þæt land; 7 ðone cyningc Sedechiam þe þa wæs on Iudea lande man geband, 7 ealle þa duguðe þe on þam earde wæs man ofsloh oðþon gebende 7 lædde hi ut of earde, 7 fullice .lxx. wintra syððan on an wæs se ðeodscype eall geðeowod under heora feonda gewealde, swa forð hy wæron wið God þa forworhte. (110-22)

Wulfstan ingeniously affirms the view that Christ sprang from a righteous race, by explaining that the Jews reverted to obedience as a consequence of the affliction that befell them, so that the best of all men was born of their race:

Se [Cyrus] gefreode, ealswa God wolde, eal þæt Iudeisce folc þe þa on life wæs 7 let^{by} faran ham to heora earde, 7 hy ða syððan geornlice agunnan rædes gyman, 7 hit agann mid heom godian georne, 7 of heora cynne syððan geboren wearð ealra bearna betst þe æfre geboren wurde. (124-28)

It is not, of course, surprising that Wulfstan should mention the defeat of the Jewish nation in his account of the history of

Creation. It was, after all, a significant event, because the Babylonian exile marked the transition to the fifth age of the world, and, although Ælfric does not mention it in Sermo de Initio Creaturae, since the sermon is primarily concerned with God's miracles, it appears in his descriptions of the seven ages of the world.¹ But in Wulfstan's account of the event, Christ is shown to be the culmination of a purified and righteous race and God's providence is revealed (ealswa God wolde) in such a manner that the moral of punishment for sin and reward of righteousness is reiterated. His description of the capture of the Jews and their return to their homeland is not, then, a passage based on an entry in his "Commonplace Book" for which he was able to find a convenient place in a summary of Ælfric's Sermo de Initio Creaturae.² It is an integral part of a sermon which embodies Wulfstan's particular conception of the history of Creation.

In Wulfstan's narrative of the events preceding the Incarnation, there is one particularly striking stylistic feature. Although acts of creation or favour are attributed directly to God, retribution for sin is either expressed in constructions which do not require mention of God's agency, or expressed as a restrained reaction to extreme provocation. Jost considers that Wulfstan's description of the fall of the angels and the expulsion of Adam and Eve was influenced by Scarapsus, and cites the following parallels:

Wulfstan
and sona swa he þurh ofermodignysse þæt geðohte,
þa hreas he of heofonum 7 eall þæt him hyrde, 7 hy
gewurdan of englum to deoflum geworden. (30-32)

¹Libellus de Ueteri Testamento et Nouo, 511-31; Dominica II. Post Aepiphania Domini, 64.32-66.17.

²Pace Bethurum, PMLA, LVII, 921.

Pirmin

et pro hac superbia cum aliis pluribus angelis, qui illi consenserunt, de illa caelesti sede in aere isto, qui est sub caelo, deiectus est et ... factus est diabolus. Similiter et illi angeli ... facti sunt demones. (35.4)

Wulfstan

And sona swa þæt wæs þæt hi swa gedon hæfdon, þa hæfdon hy forworhte hy sylfe 7 wurdon of þære myrhðe aworpene þe hy ær on wæron, 7 on þis wræclice lif bescofene 7 her syððan on earfoðan 7 on geswince wunedon. (48-51)

Pirmin

pro qua offensa iactatus est homo de paradiso in exilio mundi istius, ubi multas labores et dolores patiretur. (34.24)

Pirmin, like Wulfstan, attributes neither the fall of the angels nor the expulsion from Eden directly to God. However, even if Wulfstan did refer to Pirmin's account in composing his sermon, as Jost believes, the absence of God's agency in his descriptions is not the accidental result of following the Latin closely. The syntax of his sentences is not modelled upon Pirmin's (e.g. þa hreas he is not the equivalent of deiectus est)¹ and he is not attempting to reproduce exactly the meaning of the Latin. The phrases in Wulfstan's description which have no parallel in Scarapsus do not attribute punitive actions directly to God either. He does not say that God condemned Adam and Eve, but that þa hæfdon hy forworhte hy sylfe,² and he employs a passive construction in heom wearð hyll gegearwod, whereas Ælfric's description of the establishment of hell, which Jost lists as one of the expressions comparable to Wulfstan's, has þa hwile gearcode se Ælmihtiga Scyppend him and his geferum helle wite (12.1-3). It appears,

¹Libellus de Ueteri Testamento et Nouo does not describe Lucifer's fall as the result of God's action, but has he feoll ða adun to deofle awend (104-5), which is similar to Wulfstan's description.

²In Libellus de Ueteri Testamento et Nouo, the passive is employed in part of the description of the Fall (120-23).

then, that although Wulfstan's description of the fall of the angels and the expulsion from Eden could have been influenced by Pirmin's composition, he deliberately framed his description to exclude implications of active vengeance.

Wulfstan's narrative does attribute the Flood and the invading army to God, but his descriptions minimize God's role of wrathful avenger:

on ælce wisan hy þurh heora synna God to þam swyðe
gegremedon þæt he let æt nehstan flod gan ofer ealne
middaneard 7 adrencan eal þæt on worulde wæs. (59-62)

And æt nyhstan þæt folc ða wearð swa wið God
forworht þæt he let faran hæþenne here 7 forhergian
eall þæt land. (115-17)

Here too, the form of Wulfstan's descriptions could have been influenced by Latin compositions, if Jost is correct in assuming that Wulfstan referred to Scarapsus. Scarapsus has Pro qua re [the sins of mankind] inmisit deus diluuium perdidit omnes (34.3), and the description of the conquest of Judea in Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book," reads:

Vere priusquam pagani deuastauerunt totum regnum
iudeorum / domino permittente pro peccatis populi¹

Neither of the putative Latin sources assigns a distinctly active role to God. If let in Wulfstan's descriptions means "allowed" instead of "caused," and if inmisit is assumed to have its weakest possible meaning in Pirmin's sentence, Wulfstan's choice of verb in his account of the onset of the Flood and the appearance of the heathen army could have been suggested by the Latin passages. However, it is primarily by means of the emphasis given to the iniquities of mankind and the extent to which retribution is delayed that Wulfstan avoids depicting God as a wrathful avenger, and this aspect of his descriptions cannot be attributed to the influence of the Latin passages Jost and Bethurum postulate

¹Quoted from Bethurum, PMLA, LVII, 921.

as sources.

The role assigned to God in Wulfstan's narrative is in marked contrast to the essentially active one attributed to him in Sermo de Initio Creaturae, which stresses his power and control of the universe. The extent and nature of God's responsibility for the afflictions and temptations suffered by mankind appears to have been a matter with which Wulfstan was particularly concerned,¹ and, since he does not continually digress to explain and justify God's actions as Ælfric does, he employs expressions such as those noted above which avoid the implication that God actively or vindictively visits disasters upon mankind. In his explanation of the manner in which the devil deceived mankind, he adopts a virtually Manichean position (Ælc yfel cymð of deofle 7 ælc broc (82-83)), though he does point out that the actions of the devil are permitted by God in 79-82. It is probably because Wulfstan views the devil as the author of all evil that he is reluctant to attribute an actively punitive role to God. His view of the origin of evil is completely different from that expressed in Sermo de Initio Creaturae, for Ælfric asserts that the devil can create nothing, and that everything in the world that is evil is a punishment for man's sins (16.19-26). Although the range of Wulfstan's interests is indisputably much narrower than Ælfric's, he is not indifferent to theological problems, as has frequently been asserted, or dependent on Ælfric for his views. His interest in theological issues appears to be negligible because he so rarely deals explicitly with them, but an examination of some of the aspects of his style reveals that he was not exclusively pre-occupied with "a settled fear of the Lord in a doomed world,"²

¹See particularly pp. 138-45, 247-49, 281-83.

²Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 337.

and that he endeavoured to express theologically significant points in a manner which did not confuse or mislead his audience.

Wulfstan's description of the life of Christ and the means by which he redeemed mankind, like his narrative of Old Testament events, differs from Ælfric's in its import. Ælfric, in keeping with his desire to impress upon his audience the omniscience of God, presents the Incarnation as a fulfilment of God's design:

Da æt nextan, þa se tima com þe God foresceawode, þa asende he his engel Gabrihel to anum mædene of þam cynne God Fæder geworhte mancynn and ealle gesceafta þurh ðone Sunu, and eft, ðaða we forwyrhte wæron, þa asende he ðone ylcan Sunu to ure alysednesse. (24.21-33)

In Wulfstan's sermon, the Incarnation, taking place after the series of defections to the devil he has recounted, is a manifestation of God's great mercy in sending his Son to die for the sins of man, and it is God's benevolence, not his fore-knowledge, which he stresses in the rhetorical question introducing his account of the Incarnation:

La, hu mihte God ælmihtig wið manncynn mildra gewurðan þonne he wæs þa þa he asende his agen bearn of heofonum nyðer to eorðan 7 her wearð man geboren, to þam þingum þæt he mid his agenum feore mancynn alyside of deofles gewealde 7 of helle wite? (154-58)

Wulfstan's rhetorical question marks the beginning of a new phase in his description of the relations between man and God, and the second section of his sermon, in its emphasis upon the mercy shown to man by God, is in marked contrast to the first, which emphasizes the enormity of man's sins and the retribution which befell them. Wulfstan's direct address to the audience and his insistence upon the magnitude of God's mercy in his introductory sentence (cf. his agen bearn; his agenum feore) is an attempt to evoke an

emotional response from the audience to the event.¹ Ælfric's introductory sentence, which is a plain statement concerning the operation of providence, reflects his more abstract conception of events.

Consistent with Wulfstan's attempt to encourage an emotional response to the Incarnation in his opening sentence is the prominence he gives to the human aspect of Christ's nature. Ælfric stresses the divine nature and power of Christ and describes his death as a victory over the devil (24.21-28.3), whereas Wulfstan's description of Christ emphasizes the great compassion and condescension Christ showed in his assumption of humanity. Ælfric's only comment on the Incarnation is that Christ was "twice born," once of God and once of man (24.27-31),² but Wulfstan explains:

Ac wundorlice swyðe geeadmedde Crist hine sylfne
 þa he for ure neode menniscnesse underfeng, 7 swa on
 þære menniscnesse wæs seo godcundnes bediglod þæt
 he þurh eadmetta on his menniscnesse eal adreah þæt
 mann deð butan synne anre. (160-64)

In his account of the life of Christ, Ælfric deals only with the divine aspects of his ministry, his teaching and the miracles he performed in order to manifest that he was the Son of God (26.1-20). Wulfstan adds a description of the experiences which Christ suffered in common with other men to his account of Christ's

¹Bethurum remarks that "One authentic mark of [Wulfstan's] composition is the pause that often comes in the development of the sermon, usually in the second half, to reflect upon some ethical or religious truth that has struck him. This usually takes the form of a rhetorical question or an exclamation, sometimes leading into the next division of the sermon, sometimes recapitulating what has gone before" (*Homilies*, p. 95). The rhetorical question in VI, as in other sermons, not only introduces a new division, but draws attention to a significant aspect of the theme of the sermon in which it appears. Cf. pp. 314-15, 328-30, 355.

²Wulfstan incorporates this point in a discussion of the Trinity earlier in his sermon (134-53).

ministry (164-171).

Ælfric's treatment of the Crucifixion reflects the major themes of his sermon, for he explains that Christ could die only of his own free will, and indicates that God's will was accomplished by his death (26.25-33). Wulfstan states:

And syððan æfter þam þa se tima com þæt he for eall manncynn þrowian wolde, þa sæde he his ðegnum fore eal hu hit gewurðan scolde, 7 hit sona æfter þam ealswa aeode. Iudeisc folc þurh deofles lare hine forrædde, 7 an his agenra cnihta hine belæwde to deaþe. Hit was ðeah eall geworden for ure neode, swa he sylf wolde. (178-83)

Wulfstan gives particular attention to Christ's fore-knowledge of his death, as Ælfric does, but, in addition to this, he reminds his audience that Christ died for the sake of mankind and indicates his suffering in his reference to the manner in which he was betrayed.

Ælfric explains the manner in which Christ's death redeemed man as follows:

[Christ] nolde geniman us neadunge of deofles anwealde, buton he hit forwyrhte; þa he hit forwyrhte genoh swiðe, þa ða he gehwette and tihte ðæra Iudeiscra manna heortan to Cristes slege. (26.29-32)

The view of the Redemption which Ælfric expresses here is the one which prevailed until the end of the eleventh century. As Southern explains:

They [theologians until the end of the eleventh century] argued that, by sin ... man had voluntarily withdrawn himself from the service of God and committed himself to the service of the Devil.... God could not fairly use His omnipotence to deprive the Devil of the rights he had acquired over Man by Man's consent The only hope for Man therefore lay in some breach of the rules by the Devil himself.

It was this which God brought about by a great act of strategy: God became Man, and the Devil failed to realize it. He failed to see the Divinity beneath the human form. He claimed Him as his own and subjected Him to Death. But in doing this he committed that great act of lawlessness--that extension of his authority over One who had made no diffidatio, no surrender¹ of Himself to the Devil--and this lost him his empire.¹

¹R.W.Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages, London, 1962, pp. 243-44.

The view, as Southern points out, was concomitant with the accentuation of the divine aspect of Christ's nature.¹

Wulfstan's outlook, evinced by the emphasis he lays upon the humanity of Christ and the suffering he endured for the sake of man, is closer to that which was more common in later centuries, when it was held that God became man in order that man might redeem where man had sinned and full recognition was accorded to Christ's humanity rather than his divinity.²

Wulfstan's account of the Ascension and Christ's appearance at the Last Judgement is consistent with his attempts to evoke gratitude for the sufferings and benevolence of Christ. In Ælfric's sermon, Christ's ascension to heaven in triumph invests him with the right to judge mankind:

Drihten ða on ðam feowerteogoðan dæge his æristes astah to heofenum, ætforan heora ealra gesihðe, mid þam ylcan lichaman þe he on þrowode, and sitt on ða swiðran his Fæder, and ealra gesceafta gewylt. He hæfð gerymed rihtwisum mannum infær to his rice, and ða ðe his beboda eallunga forseoð beoð on helle besencte. Witodlice he cymð on ende þyssere worulde mid micclum mægen þrymme on wolcnum, and ealle ða ðe æfre sawle underfengon arisað of deaðe him togeanes; and he ðonne ða manfullan deofle betæcð into ðam ecan fyre helle susle; þa rihtwisan he læt mid him into heofonan rice, on þam hi rixiað a on ecnysse. (28.9-19)

Wulfstan does not emphasize Christ's majesty as Ælfric does, but the fact that he enabled mankind to enter the kingdom of heaven (185-92). He describes Christ as appearing at the Last Judgement, not as a mighty judge, but to ask men how they have requited his great suffering (194-96). Ælfric follows eschatological tradition in depicting Christ consigning the unrighteous to the fires of hell, but even this retributive gesture is softened by Wulfstan:

¹R.W. Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages, pp. 244-47.

²Ibid., pp. 245-47.

On þam dome witodlice sceal manna gehwylc habban swylc edlean swylc he on life ær geearnode: 7 ða þe Godes willan her wyrcað, þa sculan þonne habban ece blisse on heofona rice; 7 ða þe her nu deofle fyligað 7 his unlarum, þa sculon þonne mid deofle faran on ece forwyrd helle wites. (209-13)

Just as retribution in Wulfstan's narrative of Old Testament events is accomplished, for the most part, without God's agency, he contrives a description of the separation of the good souls from the bad which does not include any reference to Christ's action.

Wulfstan's sermon also differs from Ælfric's in its slightly more extended treatment of the Last Judgement and the inclusion of details concerning the reign and destruction of Antichrist. The differences cannot be attributed solely to Wulfstan's pre-occupation with eschatological matters,¹ and his concluding description is not unrelated to the sermon as a whole. The depiction of God's ultimate destruction of the devil is a satisfactory conclusion to Wulfstan's portrayal of a struggle between God and the devil throughout history in which the devil is the victor. His account of the Last Days furthers the didactic aim of his sermon. While Ælfric states merely that the Last Judgement comes on ende byssere worulde, Wulfstan asserts that the time at which men will be rewarded according to the repayment they have made to Christ for his suffering is rapidly approaching (193-96). His conclusion is an attempt to persuade his audience to make amends for Christ's sacrifice by impressing upon it that it has only a short time in which to do this if damnation is to be avoided. In all Wulfstan's eschatological sermons he asserts that the end of the world is close at hand, but the point is made with particular insistence in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi. In

¹Cf. Bethurum, Homilies, p. 280.

most of his eschatological sermons, he attempts to persuade his audience to repent by asserting that the tribulations of the Last Days will be occasioned by its sins, so that the signs preceding Antichrist's reign are referred to as future events.¹ In Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, however, he states that we habbað gecnawen fela þara fortacna þe Crist sylf foresæde (197-98). In De Temporibus Anticristi, it was noted earlier, Wulfstan does not stress the shortness of Antichrist's reign, because this would diminish its terror, but in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, he emphasizes the rapidity with which God destroys Antichrist (204-7). The concluding description of Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is not one which "summarizes Wulfstan's treatment of the Last Days in the eschatological homilies Ia, Ib, II, III, IV, V,"² but a different treatment of the topic designed for a sermon with a different didactic import.

Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is unified by Wulfstan's didactic aim, which is, as he states in the opening sentence, to ensure that his audience to Gode buge 7 fram synnum gecyrre. In order to further this aim, he presents the events in the history of Creation before the Incarnation as instances of disobedience to God followed by retribution which illustrate the devil's unceasing attempts to seduce mankind, and he endeavours in the remainder of his sermon to evoke gratitude for the benevolence of God. His sermon can therefore be described as an independent composition, not a summary of Sermo de Initio Creaturae, for the unifying principle of the two sermons is not the same. Wulfstan's conception of the significance of the history of Creation, which

¹Particularly in V. 97-108.

²Bethurum, Homilies, p. 298 (note to 193 ff.).

governs his selection of material and the manner in which he presents events, has little in common with that which informs Ælfric's sermon. Since the two sermons on the history of Creation do differ so greatly in overall design, and the verbal similarities prove negligible on examination, it would seem unlikely that Sermo de Initio was one of Wulfstan's sources. Wulfstan may have derived the idea for his sermon from Scarapsus--the matter does not admit of proof either way--but there do not appear to be grounds for believing that he was influenced by Pirmin's tract in any significant way.

A comparison of the two sermons confirms the view that Wulfstan was concerned with moral instruction whereas Ælfric's interests were more general and philosophical, but it cannot be said that Wulfstan was indifferent to abstract theological matters. Although he rarely deals explicitly with theological issues, his treatment of the events of the history of Creation and the expressions he employs reveal something of his theological views and interests, particularly his preoccupation with the origin of evil. Wulfstan presumably admired Ælfric, but his views are not derived from Ælfric's works. His apprehension of the nature of Christ and the means by which Redemption was accomplished is particularly interesting, for it differs not only from Ælfric's view but from that of most of his contemporaries. The prominence he gives to the human sufferings of Christ is somewhat unexpected, in view of Jost's remark, that "neben dem überbetonten Gesetzesgehorsam tritt in Wulfstans Christentum das gefühlsmässige Element stark zurück."¹ It is surprising, too, that he should fail to present the Redemption as having been achieved by the victory of Christ over the devil, since he

¹Wulfstanstudien, p. 171.

presents history before the Incarnation as a conflict between God and the devil. His accentuation of God's mercy and benevolence in the latter part of his sermon is, however, consistent with his attempts, in the narrative of Old Testament events, to modify the harshness of God's anger by minimizing the active part which God has in the punishment of sin, and by intensifying the sinfulness of mankind throughout history in order to justify God's actions. His reluctance to associate God with the disasters that befall mankind illustrates his concern to show that it is the devil who is the author of all evil, and his tendency to emphasize the antithetical natures of God and the devil.

CHAPTER V

WULFSTAN'S VERSION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER

Wulfstan's version of the Lord's Prayer appears in To Eallum Fōlke (VIIa, pp. 166-68). It is perhaps symptomatic of the extent to which Wulfstan is believed to have relied on Ælfric's learning and inspiration that Bethurum finds it worthy of note that "Ælfric's [translation] apparently contributed nothing to Wulfstan's version."¹ Wulfstan's version, in fact, differs not only from the translation Ælfric gives in his collection of prayers (Thorpe, II, 596), and at the beginning of De Dominica Oratione (Thorpe, I, 258), but from the versions found in the three Old English Gospels as well. The Gospel versions do differ from one another and from Ælfric's translations--chiefly because a variety of grammatical forms are employed in rendering some of the petitions, and the syntax differs at some points²--but they are sufficiently closely related for Cook to assume the existence of a "typical or standard form of the Lord's Prayer in Old English."³ The existence of a standard Old English form of the Lord's Prayer is arguable, because, in a few cases, the differences in grammatical forms and syntax are indicative of dissimilar interpretations: but it can be said that, when placed beside Wulfstan's version, Ælfric's translations and the various Gospel versions have the appearance of a homogeneous group. Wulfstan's version of the Lord's Prayer is remarkable, then, not because it reveals his

¹Homilies, p. 301.

²The differences arise mainly because the Lindisfarne and Rushworth versions are glosses instead of translations, and tend to follow the Latin word order as closely as possible.

³See A.S. Cook, "The Evolution of the Lord's Prayer in English," American Journal of Philology, XII (1891), 59-66. Wulfstan's version is not included in his discussion.

independence of Ælfric, but because it deviates markedly from a discernible norm of translation.

Many of the differences between Wulfstan's version of the Lord's Prayer and those of his contemporaries can, I believe, be accounted for by Wulfstan's concern to express its meaning clearly and precisely in accordance with his knowledge of commentary on the prayer. I should therefore like to examine it in detail with reference to Ælfric's De Dominica Oratione (I.258-74). I do not wish to claim that Wulfstan was influenced by De Dominica Oratione. Wulfstan may have read the homily--Bethurum believes that he borrowed some phrases and ideas from it in De Fide Catholica (VII, pp. 157-65).¹ However, the possibility that Wulfstan was indirectly influenced by Ælfric's homily can only be the most tentative of hypotheses, and I would argue, in any case, that Wulfstan's reliance on Ælfric has been exaggerated because there has been a tendency to assume, on no better grounds than his known connexions with Ælfric, that any knowledge or material Wulfstan has in common with Ælfric must be attributable to Ælfric's influence. My analysis rests only on the assumption that Wulfstan was acquainted with an exegetical tradition pertaining to the Pater Noster which influenced his paraphrase of the prayer, and that this tradition is embodied in Ælfric's De Dominica Oratione. Whether Wulfstan derived his knowledge from Ælfric's homily or some other interpretation does not affect my conclusions, unless future research uncovers an interpretation which includes a translation of the Lord's Prayer similar to Wulfstan's.

The examination of Wulfstan's version of the Lord's Prayer is, in a sense, a digression, because the prayer constitutes, of

¹Homilies, p. 301.

course, only a small part of one of his sermons, and Bethurum has specifically exempted it from Ælfric's influence, whereas my primary purpose in this section is to suggest Wulfstan's independence of Ælfric by demonstrating the manner in which the differing didactic aims of the two writers are reflected in their sermons. A close study of Wulfstan's version of the Lord's Prayer can, however, contribute to an understanding of Wulfstan's thought and style, for it appears to provide further support for the view that he was not indifferent to theological subtleties and that evidence of his interest is to be found in the details of his expression. Bethurum states:

The familiar marks of his style appear, elaborating even these texts [Pater Noster and Creed]: a, ecelice,¹ and symble in ll. 8 and 9; ealles to swyðe in l. 13.¹

The stylistic features she notes have been considered to be redundant or habitual mannerisms,² but it is particularly noteworthy that they can be seen, in the light of Ælfric's interpretation, to be essential to a precise rendering of the meaning. Wulfstan's version, I would suggest, represents a successful solution to a difficult problem of translation, for he contrives, unlike the authors of the contemporary prose versions, to produce a paraphrase which is intelligible and accurately based on exegetical tradition, while retaining the brevity of the original and roughly the same form. Even Ælfric was unable to reconcile the competing claims of interpretation and reasonable fidelity to the original: the extensive exposition in De Dominica Oratione serves as a corrective to the misconceptions which may arise from

¹Homilies, p. 301.

²See Bethurum's remarks on the Lord's Prayer, Homilies, p. 31, and Whitelock's comment in TRHS, XXIV, 28, n. 3. Whitelock lists ealles to swyðe as an instance of Wulfstan's "excessive use of intensives" in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 18.

the translation with which he opens the homily.

Wulfstan's translation of the seventh petition is identical to the translation given in the majority of contemporary prose versions, and his version of the opening apostrophe and the third petition are dissimilar to other versions only because the word order is slightly different.¹ (He has ure fæder instead of fæder ure, and ðin willa gewyrðe, whereas all other versions have the imperative verb in initial position.) His version differs most from other contemporary versions in its rendering of the sixth petition (which normally reads Et ne nos inducas in tentationem) as 7 ne læt ðu us costnian ealles to swyðe (12-13)--"and do not let us be tempted too greatly." The West Saxon and Lindisfarne versions of Luke and Matthew, the Rushworth version of Luke, and Ælfric's translations, all follow the Latin closely, and have And ne læd ðu (na) us on costnunge or a slightly variant form of this.² There are variations in the spelling, the form of the plural pronoun, and the word order (the object precedes the verb in versions which adhere to the order of the Latin). The only variation among these versions which could affect the meaning is the appearance of verbal prefixes in some versions: gelæd occurs in the West saxon Matthew, inlæd in the Lindisfarne Matthew, and onlæd in the Rushworth and Lindisfarne Luke.

Because Ælfric and the Gospel versions give a word-for-word translation, the meaning of their petitions is problematical, since there are two alternative meanings they could have, and it

¹ Ælfric's division of the prayer into seven petitions, as explained in De Dominica Oratione, is adopted for convenience.

² The Gospel versions and Ælfric's translation of the prayer are collated by Cook, American Journal of Philology, XII, 62-65. All Gospel texts in this chapter are quoted from Cook. The Gospel versions of Matthew only are collated by Minnie Cate Morrell, A Manual of English Biblical Materials, Knoxville, 1965, p. 206.

is difficult to make theological sense of either of the two possible meanings. The difficulty is inherent in the Latin, but it is compounded by the differing resources of the two languages. Tentationem can mean "trial, proof, attack," and, in ecclesiastical Latin, "temptation," whereas costnung can also mean "tribulation" (BT), and appears to have been most commonly used to mean "temptation."¹ If the sense of the Old English versions listed above is "Do not lead us into temptation" or "Do not lead us into trials," they are somewhat puzzling, for it is the function of the devil, not God, to tempt man, and trials are surely to be accepted as a means of purifying the soul.

Alternatively, it is possible that the Gospels employ costnung in the sense of "tribulation" and that it is the punishment of hell which is referred to. Although Ælfric's translations are open to an eschatological interpretation, he rules out the possibility that the sixth petition refers to the torments of hell, by stating in his explanation that the last four of the petitions belimpað to ðisum life, and mid þisum life geendiað (270.26-27). The metrical paraphrases designated Lord's Prayer II and Lord's Prayer III, however, reveal that such an interpretation may have been current.² Since costnung has a variety of meanings, some form of clarification, such as ecelice, seems to be required in order to indicate that it is to be taken as a reference to the torments of hell. Some such indication may have been provided by the glossators who employ gelæd, inlæd, and

¹Most of the occurrences of costnung which BT cites, and all of those cited by L.H.Dodd, A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies (Yale Studies in English, XXXV), New York, 1908, p. 38, are in descriptions of the devil's activities. (None of the works Dodd cites under costnung is now accepted as Wulfstan's.)

²The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems, ed. E. van K. Dobbie (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, VI), New York, 1942, pp. 70-74 (LP II), and 77-78 (LP III). All quotations from LP II and III are from this edition.

onlæd: the glosses in BT do not offer any support for this hypothesis, but our knowledge of the ways in which an affix could modify the basic meaning of a verb is presumably incomplete. Even if some or all of the glossators did employ costnung to mean "eternal punishment" and it was understood in this sense by their readers, however, the notion that God leads mankind into the torments of hell is disconcerting, as the author of Lord's Prayer II seems to have realized, for he employs læt instead of læd:

And na us þu ne læt laðe beswican
 on costunga, cwellan and bærnan
 sawla ure, þeah we sinna fela
 didon for ure disige dages and nihtes,
 idele spræce and unrihte weorc,
 þine bodu bræcon. We þe biddað nu,
 ælmihtig god, are and gifnesse;
 ne læt swa heanlice þin handgeweorc
 on endedage eal forwurðan. (104-12)

The affixes ge-, in-, and on-, may modify the usual meaning of læd in the Gospel versions, but as far as can be ascertained from BT, gelædan differs from lædan only because it is more suggestive of leading out: inlædan, and presumably onlædan (which does not appear in BT), can mean "to introduce," so that it could perhaps be extended to mean "to induct." If costnung does refer to eternal punishment, "induct" would be preferable to "lead", but such a reading does not alter the somewhat doubtful theological import of the petition, unless we wish to interpret the versions which have inlæd and onlæd as a plea for the reversal of God's ultimate judgement, which lacks real point. There may be other ways in which the prefixes modified the meaning of lædan, which are no longer recognized, but unless they imparted a meaning which is radically different from those listed in BT, it does not appear that the use of gelæd, inlæd, and onlæd in the Gospels could obviate the problems presented by a word-for-word translation of the Latin.

Only one surviving prose version is similar in meaning to

Wulfstan's 7 ne læt ðu us costnian ealles to swyðe. The Rushworth gloss of Matthew reads And ne gelæt us gelæde in costnungæ. The peculiar form of the Rushworth version of the sixth petition is attributable to the Latin text it glosses. This contains numerous Irish readings, one of which is Et ne patiaris nos induci in tentationem, in Matt. vi.13.¹ It is possible that Wulfstan's work in the North familiarized him with the Irish variants of the Vulgate,² and that his translation was influenced by his knowledge of the variant form, although such evidence as there is for the type of bible with which Wulfstan was familiar points to the York Gospels, which have a Continental text.³ I am more inclined to believe that Wulfstan's version reflects his knowledge of commentary on the prayer, because he does not give a literal translation of the Irish variant, and it is not only the sixth petition of his prayer which differs from contemporary versions.

Ælfric translates the sixth petition as And ne læd ðu na us on costnunge at the beginning of De Dominica Oratione (258.23), but he indicates his awareness of the difficulties and misconstructions which a literal translation could produce by reinterpreting the prayer later in his homily as Ne geðafa, ðu God, þæt we beon gelædde on costnunge (268.6-7). The significance of Wulfstan's departure from the usual translation is revealed by Ælfric's exposition of the theological import of the sixth prayer. In view of the nature of Ælfric's remarks, it is probable that Wulfstan would have been particularly careful to formulate a

¹See Morrell, A Manual of Old English Biblical Materials, pp. 175, 206.

²The various types of texts and their distribution are discussed by Morrell, pp. 154-55.

³See Dorothy Whitelock, "Wulfstan at York," Franciplegius? Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honour of Francis Peabody Magoun, Jr., ed. J.B. Bessinger, Jr. and R.P. Creed, New York, 1965, pp. 216-17.

translation of the sixth prayer which would preclude misconceptions. Ælfric explains that God does not tempt man, but that the spiritual trials initiated by the devil are necessary:

Oðer is costnung, oðer is fandung. God ne costnað nænne mannan; ac hwæðere nan man ne cymð to Godes rice, buton he sy afandod: forði ne sceole we na biddan þæt God ure ne afandige, ac we sceolon biddan þæt God us gescylde, þæt we ne abreoðon on ðære fandunge. Deofol mot ælces mannes afandigan, hwæðer he aht sy, oððe naht; hwæðer he God mid inweardlicre heortan lufige, oððe he mid hiwunge fare. Swa swa man afandað gold on fyre, swa afandað God þæs mannes mod on mislicum fandungum, hwæðer he anræde sy. Genoh wel wat God hu hit getimað on þære fandunge; ac hwæðere se man næfð na mycele geðincðe, buton he afandod sy. Ðurh ða fandunge he sceal geðeon, gif he þam costnungum wiðstent. (268.7-19)

Considered in relation to Ælfric's explanation, Wulfstan's version of the sixth petition is an ingenious compromise between translation and interpretation. The petition does not depart radically from the Latin, but Wulfstan makes it clear, by replacing the reference to God's action by a plea for protection, that it is not God who tempts man. The distinction Ælfric makes between the role of God and that of the devil would have been important to Wulfstan, because in other compositions (notably, in De Falsis Deis, De Septiformi Spiritu, Be Godcundre Warnunge, and De Visione Isaie Prophetæ), he demonstrates a concern with the problem of God's responsibility for the tribulations man suffers, and emphasizes that the devil is the antithesis of God.¹

Wulfstan's addition of ealles to swyðe to the sixth petition is of particular interest. Intensifying phrases such as this have been regarded as redundant "fillers," characteristic of his style, but Ælfric's explanation suggests that the addition of ealles to swyðe is necessary for a precise interpretation. Ælfric emphasizes that men should not pray that they will not be tested, but that they should pray that they will not succumb during the

¹See the chapters dealing with these sermons.

testing. By employing a syntactic structure which differs from the Latin in his rephrasing of the petition in the homily, Ælfric is able to incorporate this concept ("Permit not, God, that we be led into temptation"). The meaning of Wulfstan's petition without the intensive is "Do not let us be tempted/tried." Some kind of modification is therefore required to obtain an interpretation which is accurate according to Ælfric's conception of the significance of the prayer, and this is provided by the addition of ealles to swyðe. "Do not let us be tempted/tried too greatly" makes perfectly good sense as a prayer, and takes account of the points which are raised in Ælfric's interpretation. It recognizes that temptations (or trials) will occur, and in asking that these shall not be too great to be resisted, it is an implicit plea for God's assistance.

Wulfstan's careful phrasing of the sixth petition provides evidence in support of the opinion that he was not the author of the metrical paraphrase, Lord's Prayer III, which is incorporated in the Benedictine Office. Wulfstan's authorship of Lord's Prayer III is rejected on the grounds that the paraphrase is metrically dissimilar to the verses in the Chronicle attributed to him, and because there is "something anti-poetic in Wulfstan's temperament."¹ Perhaps more telling than this evidence is the fact that the author of Lord's Prayer III appears to interpret the Latin as a plea for protection against the torments of hell, and makes no attempt to resolve the problem of whether it is God or the devil who is the agent of man's perdition:

Ne læd þu us to wite in wean sorge
 ne in costunge, Crist nerigende,
 þy læs we arlease ealra þinra mildsa
 þurh feondscipe fremde weorðan. (27-30)

¹Bethurum, Homilies, p. 48. See also J.M. Ure, ed. The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text (Edinburgh University Publications, Language and Literature, No. 11), Edinburgh, 1957, pp. 44-45.

Nor does Wulfstan's version bear any resemblance to Lord's Prayer II, which Ure considers was connected with the Benedictine Office, for this also gives an eschatological interpretation,¹ and if De Dominica Oratione is wholly representative of learned commentary, an eschatological interpretation is not strictly accurate, since Ælfric states that the last four prayers belimpað to ðisum life, and mid þisum life geendiað (270.26-27).

Only Lord's Prayer I (Ne læt usic costunga cnyssan to swiðe),² which has never been associated with Wulfstan's work, is similar to his in form and in the employment of an intensive. Except for this paraphrase and the Rushworth gloss of Matthew, Wulfstan's version of the sixth petition has no parallel among the Old English translations of the Lord's Prayer. Even these, it may be noted, are not identical to Wulfstan's version. Ne læt usic costunga cnyssan to swiðe, in Lord's Prayer I, is followed by the words:

ac þu us freedom gief, folca waldend,
fram yfla gehwa, a to widan feore. (10-11)

This suggests that the author was unaware of the implications of the sixth petition, since he interprets the seventh petition as a plea for freedom from all harm, and the sixth petition appears, in context, to be a negative form of the same plea. Wulfstan's version is dissimilar to the Rushworth gloss of Matthew, because

¹LP II, 104-12, quoted above. The connexion of LP II with the Benedictine Office was suggested by Ure in "The Benedictine Office and the Metrical Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer in MS. C.C.C.C.201," RES, New Ser., IV (1953), 354-56. He advanced the theory that LP II was written as an alternative version to LP III and that the two poems had a common origin. The differing degree of competence with which LP II and III handle the interpretation of the sixth petition is evidence in support of L. Whitbread's contention that they are unrelated (see "The Old English Poems of the Benedictine Office and some Related Questions," Anglia, LXXX (1962), 37-49.)

²The Exeter Book, ed. G.P. Krapp and E. van K. Dobbie (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, III), New York, 1936, p. 224, l. 9.

the Rushworth version is a literal translation of Et ne patiaris nos induci in tentationem. Although there are parallels, then, it can be said that Wulfstan's version of the sixth petition is unique in the sense that it is verbally distinctive, and its exact conformity to Ælfric's definition is not the result of literal translation; and it reveals, I believe, that Wulfstan was concerned with the finer points of theology, particularly those which pertain to the contrasting natures of God and the devil.

There are two other petitions in Wulfstan's version of the Lord's Prayer which appear to have been influenced by his knowledge of commentary such as Ælfric provides in De Dominica Oratione. These are, the first petition, a sy ðin nama ecelice gebletsod (8), and the second petition, 7 ðin ricedom ofer us rixie symble (9). Both petitions, as Bethurum notes, contain intensives (a, ecelice, and symble), and these do not appear in any of the other Old English versions. The Gospel versions of the first petition, Sanctificetur nomen tuum, are almost identical to Ælfric's translation, Sy pin nama gehalgod--there are slight variations in word order, and the Rushworth Gospel employs beo and bið instead of sy. The Gospels employ a variety of verb forms to render the second petition, Adveniat regnum tuum, but most versions are similar to Ælfric's Cume ðin rice.

Ælfric's explanation of the significance of the first petition, Sy pin nama gehalgod, suggests that Wulfstan added a and ecelice to his translation, not because he habitually embellished his compositions with intensives, but because they were essential to his interpretation of the petition. In his discussion of the first petition, Ælfric explains:

"Sy ðin nama gehalgod." Nis þæt na swa to understan-
denne, swylce Godes nama ne sy genoh halig, seðe æfre
wæs halig, and æfre bið, and he us ealle gebletsað
and gehalgað: ac þis word is swa to understandenne,
þæt his nama sy on us gehalgod, and he us þæs
getiðige, þæt we moton his naman mid urum muðe
gebletsian, and he us sylle þæt geðanc, þæt we magon
understandan þæt nan ðing nis swa halig swa his
nama. (262.24-31)

Later in the homily, he states:

Seofon gebedu, swa swa we ær sædon, beoð on ðam
Pater noster. Ða ðreo forman gebedu beoð us ongunnene
on ðysre worulde, ac hi beoð a ungeendode on þære
towardan worulde. Seo halgung þæs mæran naman Godes
ongann us mannum þaþa Crist wearð geflæschamod mid ure
menniscnysse; ac seo ylce halgung wunað on ecnysse,
forðan ðe we on ðam ecan life bletsiað and herigað
æfre Godes naman. (270.17-23)

Wulfstan's translation, a sy ðin nama ecelice gebletsod, is in
close accord with Ælfric's interpretation. The addition of a
and ecelice economically clarifies the meaning of a petition
which is, as Ælfric recognizes, cryptic and liable to misinter-
pretation, since it implies that God's name is not sufficiently
holy, when it is to be understood that it is eternally holy.
Wulfstan's choice of gebletsod instead of gehalgod, the verb em-
ployed in all other versions, both prose and verse, also produces
a translation which is accurate in Ælfric's terms, because Ælfric
explains that God's name does not need to be made holy and the
meaning of the petition is that men should apprehend its sanctity
and bless it always. Bletsian can mean "to hallow;" but is
usually used to mean "to bless;" whereas halgian is used to mean
"to bless" only in the sense of endowing a thing with special
virtue (BT)--Ælfric makes a clear distinction between the two
verbs (cf. sy on us gehalgod and we moton his naman mid urum
muðe gebletsian).

Wulfstan's translation of the second petition as 7 ðin ricedom
ofer us rixie symble is another instance of his clarification of
the Latin text in accordance with interpretation. Adveniat regnum

tuum is highly suggestive, but cryptic, and the glossators who adhered to the form of original text failed to provide an intelligible meaning for the petition. The Lindisfarne Matthew and Luke and the Rushworth Luke employ tocuman in the present/future-tense as a gloss to Adveniat (Tocymeð rice ċin). It is reasonably clear from the glosses that the arrival of the kingdom is to be understood as the coming of the millennium, but clarity is achieved by converting the petition to a statement. The West Saxon Gospels (Tobecume þin rice and Tocume þin rice) and the Rushworth Matthew (Cume to þin rice) retain the subjunctive form, but the meaning of the glosses cannot be ascertained. They may refer to the millennium (though prayer for its advent seems superfluous), to the reign of Christ in men's hearts, or even to eternal reward after death. The glosses are also puzzling because the petition for the advent of God's kingdom is inherently paradoxical. As Ælfric points out in his explanation of the second petition, Æfre wæs Godes rice, and æfre bið (262.33-34).

In interpreting Cume ðin rice, his translation of the second petition, Ælfric explains:

hit is swa to understandenne, þæt his rice beo ofer us, and he on us rixige, and we him mid ealre gehyrsumnyse underþeodde syn, and þæt ure rice beo us gelæst and gefylled, swa swa Crist us behet, þæt he wolde us ece rice forgyfan. (262.34-264.3)

Consistent with Ælfric's discernment of a temporal and eternal significance in this petition (i.e., the kingdom is established in the hearts of men and is the reward of heaven) is his later statement at 270.17-23 (See p. 146).

Neither the Gospel glosses nor Ælfric's translations incorporate the multiplicity of meaning which Ælfric considers to reside in the second petition. With the exception of the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Rushworth Luke, which employ a present-tense verb instead of a subjunctive, thereby limiting the import of the petition to the approach of the millennium, the prose renderings of the second petition are ambiguous rather than pregnant with meaning. Their close adherence to the form of the Latin precludes the resolution of the paradox inherent in the petition. Lord's Prayer II and Lord's Prayer III both give an unambiguous meaning to the petition, because they paraphrase at length, but Lord's Prayer II interprets the petition only as a plea for heavenly rewards (27-34), and Lord's Prayer III limits it to a plea for the establishment of God's kingdom in men's hearts (6-9). Lord's Prayer I has Cyme þin rice wide (4): this could refer to the temporal and eternal reign of God, though the choice of adverb suggests that the petition is interpreted as a plea for the establishment of God's kingdom on earth, and the petition remains a paradox. In contrast to the other Old English versions, Wulfstan's paraphrase of the second petition, 7 ðin ricedom ofer us rixie symble, is a highly ingenious formulation which, though brief, incorporates the substance of Ælfric's interpretation, and is immediately comprehensible. By the addition of symble and by departing slightly from the Latin construction, Wulfstan makes it clear that God's kingdom exists perpetually and incorporates the temporal and eternal significance, since his petition asks that God reign over mankind both in this world and in the world to come.

Wulfstan's divergences from other Old English versions in the fourth and fifth petitions are less marked than those which have been discussed. These may also have resulted from his knowledge of learned commentary on the Lord's Prayer. Wulfstan translates

the fourth petition as Geunn us to þissum dæge dæghwamlices fostres (11-12). Ælfric and the Gospel versions, except Lindisfarne, recurred to the Lucan version of the fourth petition, and translate it as Syle us todæg urne dæghwamlican hlaf, or employ the same vocabulary with a different word order. The Lindisfarne Matthew has Hlaf userne oferwistlic sel us todæg, translating Panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis hodie, and the Lindisfarne Luke has Hlaf userne dæghwamlice sel us eghuelc dæge. All of the prose translations, then, as well as the metrical versions, have hlaf, where Wulfstan has fostres. His choice of the abstract term extends the meaning of the petition beyond a plea for bodily sustenance. De Dominica Oratione suggests that learned opinion favoured such an interpretation.¹ Ælfric states:

Se hlaf getacnað ðreo ðing An is þæs lichaman bigleofa; oðer is ðære sawle; ðridde is þæs halgan husles ðygen. (266.15-17)

Wulfstan's use of geunn instead of a form of syllan, which all other versions have, follows from his choice of foster--Jost points out that one of the idiosyncrasies of Wulfstan's usage is the rarity with which he employs syllan with an abstract object.² The appearance of to þissum dæge in Wulfstan's version is interesting as a deviation from the usual translation which has a parallel in the Modern English version. The addition of þissum may not be redundant, for Wulfstan may have felt the emphasis was necessary. Ælfric, in rephrasing the petition in his homily, has Syle us nu todæg (264.30).

Ælfric translates the fifth petition, Et dimmitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris, as And forgyf us ure gyltas, swa swa we forgyfað ðam þe wið us agyltað, and

¹Cf. the 16th Century debate on the translation of panem referred to by R.F. Jones, The Triumph of the English Language, Stanford, 1966, pp. 109-10.

²Wulfstanstudien, p. 121.

most other versions employ a similar vocabulary. Wulfstan's translation of the petition reads, And us gemildsa swa swa we miltsiað þam ðe wið us agyltaþ. He may simply have felt that a reference to mercy instead of forgiveness gave a more apt translation, but he may have considered, as Ælfric appears to, that forgiveness could imply unqualified acceptance of others' failings. Ælfric remarks:

We sceolon don swa swa we on ðisum wordum behatað;
 þæt is, þæt we beon mildheorte us betwynan, and,
 for ðære micclan lufe Godes, forgyfan ðam mannum þe
 wið us agyltað Is hwæðere getæht, æfter Godes
 gesetnyse, þæt wise men sceolon settan steore dysigum
 mannum, swa þæt hi þæt dysig and ða unðeawas alecgan,
 and þeah ðone man lufigan swa swa agenne broðor.
 (266.22-268.4)

Wulfstan's version of the Lord's Prayer suggests that his primary concern was to express himself clearly and unambiguously, and not to embellish his work with the "characteristic" features of his style. In a number of instances, his vocabulary and syntax are not the nearest English equivalent of the Latin, and the import of the sixth petition in particular is altered. Because Wulfstan's numerous divergences from other contemporary versions produce a version of the Lord's Prayer which accords with Ælfric's interpretations in De Dominica Oratione, I do not think that his divergences can be viewed as random idiosyncrasies. His sole divergence from the usual translation which is explicable only in terms of the peculiarities of his usage is his use of geunn instead of a form of syllan. In translating the Lord's Prayer, I believe, Wulfstan deliberately contrived to render the Latin meaningful without departing from the brevity of the original, and the ingenuity of his compromise between translation and interpretation emerges from comparison of his version with the Gospel versions and Ælfric's translations. The addition of intensives is one of the ways in which his version differs from

other contemporary versions, but these can be seen to be an essential part of the meaning.

It would seem, then, that Wulfstan's desire to expound unambiguously what ælc cristen man mid rihte cunnon sceall (VIIa. 5), led him to take liberties with a text, the sanctity of which, it might be imagined, would be highly revered as the exact prayer of Christ. Ælfric, it is true, despite his strict admonitions on the translation of the scriptures in his Preface to Genesis,¹ says merely, in De Penitentia, that Se lareow sceal secgan ðam læwedum mannum þæt andgit to ðam Pater nostre (Thorpe, II. 604.17-19), but his own translation of the prayer is a conservative one. A study of Wulfstan's sermons based on extracts from the Vulgate reveals that he frequently altered the form and import of the scriptural passages to bring them into accord with his own views.

The significance of Wulfstan's divergences from other contemporary versions of the Lord's Prayer, and the complex meanings with which the petitions were endowed, emerge from a reading of Ælfric's De Dominica Oratione. It is possible, in view of the evidence that can be gleaned from Wulfstan's sermons of his theological opinions and preoccupations, that he would have been acutely aware of the distinction Ælfric makes between the role of God and the devil in clarifying the meaning of Et ne nos inducas in tentationem, which appears to underlie Wulfstan's unusual translation of the sixth petition, and that, even without knowledge of learned commentary, his awareness would have reflected itself in his translation. It could, indeed, be argued that all his divergences from other contemporary versions reflect a knowledge of theology which he may not have derived from

¹See The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, pp. 76-80.

commentaries dealing specifically with the Lord's Prayer: it merely seems to me more inherently probable that Wulfstan was acquainted with interpretations of the prayer. Whatever the source of his knowledge, there is reason to believe that he brought to bear on his translation an awareness of theological issues and considerable skill as a translator.

CHAPTER VI

THE REVISED TEXTS:

DE FALSIS DEIS AND DE SEPTIFORMI SPIRITU

The previous chapters have attempted to establish Wulfstan's independence of Ælfric by demonstrating that Wulfstan shaped his material into sermons which differ in theme and structure from the compositions accepted as his sources by earlier researchers. It has been argued that, even supposing Wulfstan was indebted to Ælfric's work for ideas and material, he did not incorporate whole passages from his work with only minor stylistic alterations in order to impress upon them the mannerisms considered characteristic of his style. De Falsis Deis¹ (XII, pp. 221-24) and De Septiformi Spiritu (IX, pp. 185-91), however, resemble Ælfric's compositions of the same name so closely that Wulfstan's dependence on Ælfric is virtually certain.² In writing these two sermons, Wulfstan made none of the significant alterations to the theme and conception of his sources which he must have made in composing IV, VI, and XVIII, if he was in fact reworking Ælfric's compositions. De Falsis Deis consists of a passage derived from Ælfric's lengthy treatise which is sufficiently self-contained and short enough for a sermon,³ to which Wulfstan added a suitable introductory sentence and a conclusion. De Septiformi Spiritu consists of a passage which, in form, is identical to Ælfric's treatise on the subject,⁴ followed by a passage elaborating on its

¹"Dies" in the title giving in Bethurum's Homilies reproduces the spelling, presumably a scribal error, in Bodleian, MS. Hatton 113.

²For my remarks concerning the improbability of independent composition by the two writers or Ælfric's reliance on Wulfstan, see p. 18.

³Ælfric's De Falsis Diis has been edited by J.C.Pope, Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection, Oxford, 1968, II (EETS, No.260), 676-712. All quotations from De Falsis Diis are from this edition. The passage Wulfstan adapts is ll.72-165.

⁴Napier, pp. 56-60. All quotations from the work are from Napier's edition.

theme written by Wulfstan. In both sermons, apart from some alterations in syntax, Wulfstan's revisions of his source material are restricted to individual words and phrases.

The reason for this close adherence to the form and substance of his sources lies in the nature of these particular compositions. The passage which Wulfstan selects from Ælfric's De Falsis Diis gives a chronological account of some of the heathen gods which men once worshipped. Chronology here dictates the form, and tradition the substance. Evidently, Wulfstan accepts both as authoritative. His own Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi shows that the device of narrative with minimal explanatory digressions was congenial to Wulfstan. That he was concerned with the devil's attempts to seduce men to falsehood is attested by a number of his sermons, including Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi and De Temporibus Anticristi.¹ Ælfric's De Septiformi Spiritu shows the contrast between God and the devil by its parallel descriptions of the vices and virtues bestowed. Wulfstan, as I have indicated, tends to emphasize the contrast between the two powers. He makes no major alterations to De Septiformi Spiritu, then, because his source material is not only congenial in substance but also in form.

Although Wulfstan's revisions, considered individually, are minute, they are so numerous that not a single sentence of Ælfric's compositions remains unaltered. It is indeed remarkable that, since Wulfstan obviously considered his sources to be satisfactory in essentials, he did not reproduce them exactly. This is why his revisions have been viewed chiefly as "proof of how conscious Wulfstan was of his own rhythm and how insistent upon . . .

¹See further pp. 77-80, 116-20.

it."¹ Wulfstan scholars, who consider that a number of his sermons are based on Old English compositions, have also viewed them as examples of his tendency to substitute his own lexical and grammatical preferences for those of his sources,² and as illustrations of his habitual embellishment of his sources with characteristic stylistic devices, such as intensives and word pairs.³ In McIntosh's opinion such embellishments (especially intensives) also are intimately related to Wulfstan's primary concern with rhythm:

The common tags that Wulfstan uses ... either form a two-stress phrase in themselves (for example, ealles to gelome) or else they serve to fill out a phrase which would otherwise be too light rhythmically (for example, georne in beorgan us georne).

It is worth noting that intensification is not a particularly marked feature of Wulfstan's revisions of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu. Jost remarks in his discussion of De Falsis Deis:

Der Bearbeiter--ich nenne ihn wieder W--hat auch in diese Bearbeitung nur eine geringe Zahl von Wulfstanphrasen eingestreut: je einmal georne⁵ (W 105,21), oft and gelome (107,4) und agen (106,12).

I would relate the smaller number of intensives to the fact that De Septiformi Spiritu and De Falsis Deis are somewhat factual and learned pieces of instruction. The intensives proliferate when Wulfstan is dealing with extreme situations and states--such as the coming reign of Antichrist and the Last Judgement--and making an impassioned exhortation which culminates in an adjuration to repent.⁶ De Falsis Deis and De Septiformi Spiritu are not hortatory sermons as De Temporibus Anticristi, for instance, is. They

¹Bethurum, Homilies, p. 333.

²See particularly Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 117-33.

³See particularly Bethurum, Homilies, p. 333.

⁴Wulfstan's Prose, p. 11.

⁵Wulfstanstudien, p. 129; see also p. 118.

⁶See particularly pp. 69, 360-62.

have no equivalent to the conclusion beginning Uton don swa us bearf is which appears in many of his sermons and is the culmination of the moral instruction of the sermons, exhorting the audience to improvement in accordance with the particular teachings given. They conclude merely with a statement to the effect that those who heed the moral lesson implicit in the address will be blessed.¹

The view that Wulfstan's revision of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu was an attempt to bring the rhythm of his sources into accord with his own was first advanced by McIntosh, who commented on the revisions as follows:

It is one of the curiosities of literature, this relationship between Ælfric and Wulfstan, and the finicky technical transformation that Wulfstan makes of the writing of the other. It would be interesting to know whether he was aware of the carefully constructed form he was destroying when he did this, or what Ælfric in turn thought of these episcopal transmutations....

Here is a curious situation in a troubled age; one man produces a special kind of rhythmical writing with a distinct and recognizable texture, then another, heavily burdened with the cares and duties of an enormously responsible position, takes the trouble to dissect all this and reconstruct it according to the rules governing his own rhythmical practice. I do not wish to suggest, of course, that he was merely preoccupied with the metrical transformation. He is almost always concerned primarily with expanding the text, with adding his own material, though he is also careful from time to time to change words or phrases which happen to be alien to his own usage. But whenever he makes expansions or alterations it is in such a way that the prose emerges reshaped into his own rhythmical mode, and many of the minor changes he makes seem to be purely on account of the rhythm.²

¹See DSS, 149-50; DFD, 89-91. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 419 is the only MS in which DSS has an exhortatory conclusion (see Bethurum, p.191). As the MS is a late one, containing only part of the sermon, and the conclusion, with the exception of one word, is identical to III.74-80, it is unlikely that the exhortation originally formed part of the sermon.

²Wulfstan's Prose, p. 15.

As I remarked in the Introduction, McIntosh qualifies the view that Wulfstan's revision was merely a metrical transformation, but the general tenor of his remarks is that whatever other reasons Wulfstan may have had for altering Ælfric's compositions, they were subordinate to his desire to bring them into conformity with the rhythmical system which McIntosh considered he followed with "relentless thoroughness."¹

In the following discussion of De Septiformi Spiritu and De Falsis Deis, an attempt is made to show that other considerations weighed more heavily with Wulfstan in his revision of Ælfric's compositions than the transformation of the prose rhythm. The revisions emphasize the didactic themes of Ælfric's compositions and clarify the meaning to ensure that the sermons are immediately comprehensible when delivered. Wulfstan also makes alterations which reflect his theological preoccupations and his desire to express with precision matters pertaining to the theological issues in which he was interested. For the most part, the alterations which Wulfstan makes to Ælfric's texts are closely related to his didactic purpose and are accompanied by changes in meaning. The main exceptions are Wulfstan's substitutions of his lexical and grammatical preferences for those of his source and his omissions of words alien to his vocabulary, although not all of the revisions which Jost listed as instances of these² are attributable solely to Wulfstan's avoidance of unfamiliar vocabulary.

My examination of Wulfstan's revisions not only leads me to conclude that they are explicable in terms which do greater justice to him as a careful teacher and a thinker than does the view that transformation of the rhythm of his sources was a major concern, but that Wulfstan's revisions do not produce, and were

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 16.

²Wulfstanstudien, pp. 117-33.

not intended to produce, a prose rhythm of the kind which McIntosh described as characteristic of his compositions. I shall deal briefly with the validity of McIntosh's description before commenting on the nature of Wulfstan's revisions, for, if it can be established that his alterations to De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu were not intended to produce rhythmical prose of the kind which is accepted as characteristic of his work, the obstacle to accepting the revisions as illustrations of Wulfstan's preoccupation with clear and careful teaching is removed.

The validity or otherwise of McIntosh's theory also has bearing on my study of other Wulfstan sermons. I have discussed their style without reference to Wulfstan's prose rhythm, and I have argued that his handling of his sources (both the biblical extracts and Ælfric's compositions, if we concur with scholarly opinion) was motivated by didactic considerations, and not a desire to impose the characteristic features of his style on his material. If McIntosh's view is accepted, Wulfstan's choice of expression must be admitted to have been determined ultimately by its conformity to the rhythmical patterns he preferred, and a study of Wulfstan's style which fails to consider his prose rhythm has neglected an essential aspect. As McIntosh remarked, in his outline of the implications of his theory for the study of Wulfstan's prose:

It is perhaps worth noting that some attention to the rhythmical scheme should lead one to beware, in any investigation of Wulfstan's language, of accepting as normal prose usage something which may have been controlled by the shape of the phrase patterns he allowed himself. This means especially that a study of word-order might have to reckon with certain aberrations, and that the choice of words and even inflexions may sometimes have been dictated by the system.¹

Furthermore, if Wulfstan did habitually adhere to the rhythmical

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 17.

form described by McIntosh, his theory challenges the thesis that Wulfstan was motivated by didactic considerations in reworking his biblical sources and (arguably) the Ælfric compositions referred to in the preceding chapters. His theory has particular significance for the paraphrases in XI, because Bethurum believes them to be "an exercise in rhythmical composition" on a subject which interested Wulfstan, and states that

the two-stress pattern described by Professor McIntosh is so regular [in XI] and the prose dilution so slight that it comes much nearer to being verse than, to take a modern comparison, much of the free verse of the early part of this century came to conventional poetry.¹

In her view, then, considerations of rhythm are a major aspect of his reworking of his source in XI as well as his reworking of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu. But such is the nature of McIntosh's theory that, if it is accepted, a discussion of Wulfstan's reworking of any of his sources which does not take account of it distorts the nature of his revisions by failing to show that they are affected by his conformity to a particular kind of two-stress rhythm. McIntosh's recognition of this point is indicated in the two passages quoted above. A further implication of his remarks concerning the manner in which Wulfstan's mode of expression is shaped by his adherence to a particular form of prose rhythm is that the precise meaning Wulfstan communicates is subservient to rhythmical considerations, since the precise meaning a writer communicates depends on his mode of expression.

I do not, of course, wish to deny that Wulfstan's prose is in all probability rhythmically distinctive, or that his prose is "designed to impress an audience that got everything through the ear,"² for one cannot but conclude that Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, to

¹Homilies, p. 332.

²Ibid., p. 94.

take an obvious example, has an urgent and insistent rhythm which must have contributed much to its force. The fact that I have nothing to say concerning the rhythm of the sermons I have discussed (and little to say concerning features which would have contributed to the auditory effectiveness, such as assonance and intonation) merely reflects my belief that other aspects of his sermons, more important to the student of the literary output of the period, deserve greater attention than they have received, and that commentary on the declamatory effect is properly the province of those who are in a position to make well-founded assumptions about the nature of spoken Old English. I cannot agree, however, that McIntosh has given a description of Wulfstan's prose which makes possible the recognition of its distinctive features. Nor does there appear to be reason to believe that the rhythmical patterns of Wulfstan's prose are so restricted or his adherence to a particular form of prose rhythm so consistent that his syntax and vocabulary were affected and rhythmical considerations were of fundamental importance to him in his reworking of his sources.

I see no need to mount a full-scale theoretical attack on the assumptions which underlie McIntosh's definition of the distinctive features of Wulfstan's prose rhythm, since the dubious nature of McIntosh's assumptions has already been convincingly demonstrated by Sheets,¹ whose study reveals that an investigation of the nature of rhythm, particularly prose rhythm, is a necessary prolegomenon to such an undertaking. I quote from the summary conclusion to his analysis of McIntosh's theory:

The foregoing analysis of McIntosh's theory shows that he has become entangled in some of the problems of prose rhythm discussed in Chapter III. Those which occasion the greatest hesitation in accepting the theory are (1) the confusion of the rhythm of the part with the rhythm of the whole, a confusion which tends, in my opinion, to make

¹L.A. Sheets, "Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration," Unpubl. Diss., Ohio State University, 1964.

Wulfstan's prose seem more verse-like than it is; (2) the subsequent confusion of meter measured in lexical accents with rhythm measured in logical or rhetorical accents; (3) the choice and size of the unit to be measured; and (4) the phonological feature to be used as the standard of measurement.¹

My purpose is to confirm the general conclusion already substantiated by Sheets, by showing that the theory cannot be applied to an analysis of Wulfstan's prose, because it has no objective validity, and to show that the belief that Wulfstan's revisions were intended to produce a prose rhythm of the kind described by McIntosh is without foundation. I am concerned with "the assumptions which occasion^{the} greatest hesitation in accepting the theory" only to the extent to which they explain why it cannot be applied. The points at which my study coincides with and is indebted to Sheets will, I trust, be evident from the above summary and the footnotes to my discussion. I am not entirely in agreement with him, particularly in his handling of McIntosh's remarks on the syntax, and, whereas Sheets' study is theoretical in orientation, mine is an attempt to demonstrate the practical invalidity of McIntosh's theory.

McIntosh advanced the view that Wulfstan's prose

consists of a continuous series of two-stress phrases related in structure to the classical half-line, and severely restricted in somewhat the same fashion to certain rhythmical patterns,²

and that the two-stress phrases are "always small syntactic units."³ It was his opinion that the manuscript pointing offers "final and convincing proof of the reality of these two-stress units," because they were used to delimit the phrases which he had already isolated "on ordinary rhythmical and syntactic

¹L.A. Sheets, p. 119.

²Wulfstan's Prose, p. 8.

³Ibid., p. 10 (his italics)

grounds."¹ He considered that Wulfstan's two-stress phrases differ from other types, including Ælfric's, in the use of rhyme and alliteration to "join more intimately the two important elements within a single phrase," and that "there is therefore no equivalent in his writing of the whole line of the classical verse."² In his description of Ælfric's Lives of Saints, he stated that the style resembles classical and "debased" verse "in that it is made up of whole lines, composed of pairs of half-lines joined by alliteration," but that "in contrast with most of the classical verse, the main sense pauses are very rarely allowed to fall in the middle of the whole line."³ He also stated that Wulfstan's two-stress phrases differ from Ælfric's by virtue of the type of rhythmical patterns employed, and that they differ "in overall length and weight," being, on an average, slightly shorter.⁴ (It may be noted that McIntosh gives the minimum length of a Wulfstan phrase as four syllables, and the normal range as between six and eight. No maximum length is given, but none of the examples he gives from Sermo Lupi ad Anglos has more than nine syllables.)

Sheets concluded from his preliminary investigation into the nature of rhythm that any description of prose rhythm

will most probably be a statement of a possible, impressionistic organization of the material, inasmuch as the rhythm exists essentially in the mind of the reader, not in the text.⁵

The conclusion, he pointed out, is particularly applicable to the description of Old English prose, because "prose rhythm can only

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 12

²Ibid., p. 13.

³Ibid., p. 5.

⁴Ibid., pp. 14, 27ff. n. 19.

⁵"Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration," p. 88.

be a manifestation of speech rhythm," and there is a "total lack of auditory data from the Old English period."¹ McIntosh, however, furnished apparently objective evidence for his reading of Wulfstan's prose, in the form of manuscript pointing, relation to the syntax, and alliterative patterning. I shall deal in turn with each of these criteria.

McIntosh's claim concerning the support offered by the manuscript pointing cannot be entertained seriously. It is evident from the example he gave of the correspondence between his rhythmical units and the manuscript pointing, that the pointing does not afford "final and objective proof" of the validity of his theory. Part of his example,² in which he indicated the punctuation marks in the five manuscripts containing Sermo Lupi ad Anglos by alphabetical symbols, reads:

```

7 (us) ungylda B
swyðe gedrehtan BCEHI
7 us unwedera E foroft BCI
weoldon unwæstma BCEHI
forþam on bysan I earde wæs C
swa hit þincan mæg BCEI
nu fela geara
unrihta fela BCHI
7 tealte getrywða E
æghwær mid mannum BCEHI

```

Not one of the five manuscripts has a punctuation mark at the end of all of McIntosh's rhythmical phrases, and a punctuation mark occurs within two of his rhythmical phrases. Sheets, taking samples from the seventeen Wulfstan sermons found in MS. E,³ shows that, in all but four sermons, more than half of the punctuation marks delimit units which contain fewer than four syllables and more than eight.⁴ One example in addition to the extract from Sermo Lupi ad Anglos quoted above must suffice here

¹"Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration," pp. 88-89.

²Wulfstan's Prose, p. 25, n. 14.

³Bodleian, MS. Hatton 113.

⁴"Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration," pp. 128-45.

to demonstrate the lack of correspondence between the manuscript pointing and McIntosh's two-stress phrases. The passage quoted is the extract from De Septiformi Spiritu which McIntosh used to illustrate what he believed were "the rhythmical divisions as intended by Wulfstan."¹ The pointing is based on my transcription of MS. E, which is the only manuscript which contains this section of the sermon:

Ælc riht wisdom is cumen of Gode, forðam þe God sylf is. se soða wisdom. 7 ælc man bið gesælig 7 eadig. þe hæfð þane wisdom þe of Godes agenre gyfe cymð 7 ðurh þæt his agen lif gelogað mid wisdom. Se wisdom is swa we ær cwædon þæs halgan gastes gifu. 7 deofol sawð þartogeanes unwisdom and swicdom. 7 gedeð swa þurh þæt. þæt unsælig man wisdomes ne gymeð. ne wislice his lif ne fadað 7 gyt eac gedeð þæt forcuðre is. þæt he talað þeh hwilum hine sylfne wærne 7 wisne. 7 bið eac for oft swa gehiwod licetere swylce he wis sy. byð þeah smeagende oftor ymbe swicdom þonne ymbe wisdom.

The number of divisions which the manuscript pointing indicates is only about a third of the number indicated by McIntosh, and in almost every case the word groups contain far too many syllables to constitute phrases of the kind McIntosh described.

Because the punctuation of Wulfstan's sermons varies from manuscript to manuscript, it is in fact difficult to generalize about the nature and function of the pointing.² The issue is bound to be a complicated one, since there is no means of knowing how much allowance must be made for scribal carelessness and idiosyncratic notions of punctuation. That such factors must be taken into account is evident from the appearance in MS. C of two copies of XXI which do not have identical pointing.³ In view of

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 32, n. 20.

²The main differences can be summarized as follows. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 201 (C) is more heavily punctuated than Bodleian MS. Hatton 113 (E) and British Museum, MS. Cotton Nero A. i (I). C normally employs punctum instead of punctus elevatus, and both punctus elevatus and punctus versus occur more frequently in I than in C and E. (I have considered only the main and earlier MSS.)

³The statement is based on my transcription of the MS, CCCC, MS. 201.

the variations, Sheets' claim that the pointing provides "a clue, and a fairly reliable one, to the rhythmic rise and fall in Wulfstan's prose,"¹ seems overstated, though his interpretation of the function of the pointing is in line with Clemons' explanation that the symbols used indicated to the reader "inflections of the voice appropriate to the phraseological divisions recognized by ~~the~~ the Latin Grammarians."² One aspect of the pointing which does emerge from an examination of MSS. C, E, and I is that some form of punctuation normally occurs at the end of a clause. Where pointing occurs within a clause, it often appears when contiguous word groups have no direct grammatical relation,³ or when a predicate contains more than one phrase.⁴ It is probable, then, that the manuscript pointing at least indicated the pauses, if not the intonations, to be adopted in reading Wulfstan's prose, and its function, at least in part, I would suggest, is to draw the reader's attention to the syntactic relations to be clarified in an oral delivery of the sermons.⁵

It is clear, however, that the function of the pointing in the manuscripts containing Wulfstan's sermons is a matter awaiting further investigation, and that Clemons' outline of the liturgical influence on punctuation in the late Old English manuscripts can provide the starting point. It can be said, though, that the pointing frequently follows the syntactic shape of Wulfstan's

¹Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration," p. 149 (my italics).

²Liturgical Influence on Punctuation in Late Old English and Early Middle English Manuscripts (Occasional Papers: No. 1, The Department of Anglo-Saxon), Cambridge, 1952, p. 9.

⁴E.g. þe hit gewent to his Drihtnes willan. mid godum weorcum symle (DSS); An man was on geardagum eardiende. on þam iglande þe Creata hatte (DFD).

³E.g., And þonne is Godes ege. seo sefoðe gifu (DSS); 7 at wega gelætum. him lac offrodon (DFD).

⁵Similar conclusions concerning the function of the MS pointing in Ælfric's sermons were drawn by C.G. Harlow, "Punctuation in some Manuscripts of Ælfric," RES, New Ser., X (1959), 1-19.

sentences, and it tends to delimit clauses rather than phrases. McIntosh has overstated his case by asserting that the punctuation marks are "used to delimit the phrases which [he] had already isolated on ordinary rhythmical and syntactic grounds." Inevitably there is some correspondence between the manuscript pointing and his rhythmical phrases which he claims are "always small syntactic units." But it is clear that he distorted the relationship of the punctuation marks and his rhythmical phrases by adopting the scarcely sound procedure of conflating the pointing of all the available manuscripts of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. What relationship there is between the manuscript pointing and McIntosh's rhythmical units does not offer "final and convincing proof of the reality of these two-stress phrases."

We cannot of course assume, as McIntosh did, that the manuscript pointing reflects Wulfstan's intentions, though the employment by contemporary and near-contemporary scribes of punctuation which consists of a combination of punctum, punctus elevatus, and punctus versus, does suggest very strongly that they were aware of no rhythmical peculiarities which required recognition if the sermons were to be delivered effectively, since, according to Clemons, the symbols were originally used to indicate intonation contours that stretch over a much longer unit of language than the small syntactic units postulated by McIntosh as the basic unit of Wulfstan's prose. What is important is that McIntosh's theory is not supported by one of the pieces of objective evidence which he offered, and that his description of Wulfstan's prose requires objective evidence if it is to be regarded as anything more than a subjective reading.

McIntosh's claim that the rhythmical phrases he discerned were "always small syntactic units" is more difficult to dispute,

because he did not define what he meant by syntactic units. Sheets assumes in his refutation of McIntosh that he meant complete syntactic units,¹ which is certainly what one might expect from the general tenor of his remarks, particularly the distinction he draws between Wulfstan's prose and Ælfric's. However, McIntosh said nothing of completeness, and the nature of a syntactic unit must be defined before its completeness can be determined. The size of a syntactic unit can range between an entire clause and a single word--the definition of a syntactic unit, in other words, depends upon what Halliday called the "delicacy" of the analysis.² It is clear that McIntosh did not adhere consistently to any one level of analysis, for the size of his sample units varies between a single word and a clause.³ However, if we agree to accept as a syntactic unit any group of words which would, at some stage, present itself as a sentence constituent if we made a series of analyses of Wulfstan's prose which grew increasingly more "delicate," some of McIntosh's rhythmical phrases are syntactic units, but some are not. I take my example from the passage of De Septiformi Spiritu which McIntosh chose to illustrate "the rhythmical divisions as intended by Wulfstan."⁴

Ælc riht wisdom	(subject)
is cumen of Gode	(predicate)
forðam þe God sylf is	(object)
se soða wisdom	(object)
7 ælc man bið	(adjectival group)
gesælig 7 eadig	(adjectival group)
þe hæfð þæne wisdom	(relative clause modifying
þe of Godes agenre gyfe cymð	object)

¹See "Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration," ch. iv.

²See M.A.K. Halliday, "Categories of the Theory of Grammar," Word, XVII (1961), 241-92.

³It should be noted, however, that þærtogeanes, in McIntosh's analysis of DSS, is the only single word which he gives as a rhythmical phrase.

⁴Wulfstan's Prose, p. 32, n. 20.

7 þurh þæt his agen lif
gelogað mid wisdom. (predicate)

Lest it should be objected that the revised texts are not altogether typical, I take my second example from McIntosh's analysis of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos:

ne bearh nu foroft	(verb phrase)
gesib gesibban	
þe ma þe fremdan	(reduced comparative clause)
ne fæder his bearne	(reduced main clause)
ne hwilum bearn	
his agenum fæder	(predicate of reduced main clause)
ne broþor oþrum.	(reduced main clause)

The fact that a high proportion of McIntosh's rhythmical phrases are small syntactic units is hardly good enough (and I have deliberately chosen passages in which his rhythmical phrases show a high degree of correspondence to syntactic units). It is central to his theory that the whole of a text can be divided into two-stress phrases which are small syntactic units. He states:

What in fact is the justification for successively pulling a few consecutive words out of a continuous bit of writing in order to build up a series of what I shall from time to time refer to as two-stress phrases? Apart from the rhythmical satisfaction which I believe comes from the consistent application of this procedure, its first and most obvious justification is that these phrases are always small syntactic units.... A closely related justification is that the whole of a text can be divided in this way; it is not that embarrassing and untidy islands of one-stress or three-stress phrases are left isolated after we have put in our thumbs and pulled out the obvious two-stress plums.

McIntosh's justification, then, for "the cutting up of what most regard as prose"² is that an entire text can be divided into the phrases he described, and it is the basic distinction he perceived between Wulfstan's sermons and Ælfric's rhythmical prose. If Wulfstan's prose is "a continuous series of two-stress phrases" of the kind described by McIntosh, it should be possible to take

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 10 (his italics)

²Loc. cit.

any sentence and break it into units which conform in every way to his description of the distinguishing features of Wulfstan's sermons. It is true that he listed four categories of exceptions to the statement that "the whole of a text" could be divided into two-stress phrases. The list itself, which includes "expanded rhythmical phrases" and the occasional use of three-stress phrases at the end of a sentence,¹ casts doubt upon the validity of his theory. His categories, however, include only types of phrases which are deficient in the number of syllables or stresses required by a normal Wulfstanian rhythmical phrase. He made no exceptions to the statement that the rhythmical phrases are "always small syntactic units," but there are exceptions, as I have shown in the above examples taken from his sample analyses.

It may be objected that McIntosh did, in fact, define what he meant by a syntactic unit in saying that his rhythmical phrases were

not mere metrical motifs torn from the text by wilfully and arbitrarily cutting between two adjacent elements in a sentence which have an intimate syntactic connexion,² for instance, preposition and noun, or pronoun and verb.

If McIntosh merely meant that his rhythmical phrases did not involve cutting between two adjacent elements in a sentence which have an intimate syntactic connexion, it must be agreed that the type of grammatical description I have applied to his rhythmical phrases is not entirely appropriate. Although the phrase gesib gesibban in the above example, for instance, contains two syntactic units, it can be accepted that the division between this phrase and the one immediately preceding it, ne bearh nu foroft, does not involve cutting between elements which have an intimate

¹McIntosh listed the exceptions in n. 19 (5) of his work.

²Wulfstan's Prose, p. 10.

syntactic connexion, since gesib has no direct syntactic relationship with foroft. The same can be said of the division between ne hwilum bearn and his agenum fæder. At first sight, then, it would appear that McIntosh has provided a syntactic criterion for division according to which it is feasible to divide the text into segments which are not "small syntactic units" as the term is understood by modern linguists.

On inspection, however, the concept of "intimate syntactic connexion" proves to be unworkable as a criterion for division. It does not enable a reader to isolate for examination the two-stress phrases of which, it is alleged, a Wulfstan text is entirely composed. Any given word in a clause, after all, has some syntactic relationship with all the other words--there is only a difference in the degree of closeness with which they are related. On what principle then, does a reader determine the point at which division between the constituent elements of a sentence is not wilful and arbitrary? It is clear that, if we apply McIntosh's formulation rigidly--that is, if we divide the text wherever adjacent words do not have a direct syntactic relationship--we shall be left, in many instances, with units containing a single word. To draw upon the earlier examples: gesib gesibban contains a subject and an object, which are not directly related to one another but to the verb phrase which precedes them; if ne hwilum bearn his agenum fæder is accepted as two units because the subject and object have no immediate syntactic relationship, consistency requires that ne fæder his bearne and ne broþor oðrum be subdivided. Because Old English word order is freer than that of Modern English, the chances of finding adjacent words which have only the remotest syntactic connexion is increased. In swa þæt hi worhton wolice 7 gedwollice him hæbene godas, for

instance, which occurs in De Falsis Deis, the reflexive pronoun is separated from the subject and verb to which it is directly related, and placed between two words with which it has no immediate syntactic connexion.

The first three of McIntosh's rhythmical phrases in the passage from Sermo Lupi ad Anglos quoted earlier reveal that, in certain cases, where Wulfstan has separated words which have a direct syntactic connexion, there is no great need to confront the problem of defining the degree of syntactic intimacy which permits division--gesib gesibban is theoretically a problem, but the remaining divisions coincide with points at which there is a clear lack of direct syntactic connexion. The problem of definition becomes particularly acute, however, when one attempts to apply McIntosh's theory to sentences in which the constituent elements have not been separated from the word or group with which they have the most intimate syntactic connexions. To put my examples polemically, does it not seem arbitrary, on purely syntactic grounds, to separate the predicate groups from the subject and verb in the following clauses from De Septiformi Spiritu which I quoted earlier as an illustration of McIntosh's rhythmical phrases?

forðam þe God sylf is
se soða wisdom
7 ælc man bið
gesælig 7 eadig

Since direct word order in clauses containing a subject, verb, and predicate group dependent on the verb is by no means uncommon, the problem persists throughout an analysis of a Wulfstan text according to McIntosh's description. The following examples, taken at random, are from De Falsis Deis:

þæt man arærde ænig hæðengyld
þæt Nembroð 7 ða entas worhton þone wundorlican stypel
Gyt ða hæpenan noldon beon gehealdene on swa feawum godum
He aflymde his agene fæder

All of these segments are too long for a normal Wulfstanian rhythmical phrase, but the concept of "intimate syntactic connexion" does not provide a criterion for division. Nor is it merely clauses containing direct word order which confront us with the problem of definition. Relative clauses which modify a noun, for instance, are normally placed immediately after it, unless they are lengthy ones, and there is undoubtedly an intimate syntactic connexion between the two groups. Furthermore, indirect word order enables the Old English prose writer to place predicate groups, if there is more than one, next to the verb to which they are directly related, instead of in a sequence following it. In ða æt nyhstan wurdon hi bepæhte purh ðone ealdan deofol, which appears in De Falsis Deis, for instance, the subject is placed in the middle of the verb phrase, but although it is more closely related to wurdon than bepæhte, it has an intimate syntactic relationship with both, and æt nyhstan and purh ðone ealdan deofol are both adjacent to the verb phrase.¹

The immediate point to be made which arises from this admittedly incomplete survey of the difficulties involved in the application of McIntosh's theory, is that McIntosh's formulation of the relationship between his rhythmical units and the syntax is flexible enough to permit divisions other than those which would be made if one were to assume that "a small syntactic unit" meant a single and complete sentence constituent as it is normally defined (e.g., a noun phrase, an adverbial clause). On the other hand, his statement, that the rhythmical phrases do not involve "arbitrarily cutting between adjacent elements in a sentence which have an intimate syntactic connexion," does not provide a clear and consistent principle on which to base an analysis of Wulfstan's prose. The reader is left to determine for himself the point at

¹In this example, inversion of subject and verb is necessitated by the use of ða at the beginning of the main clause.

which there is a sufficient lack of syntactic intimacy between adjacent sentence elements to justify separating them, and there is no theory concerning degrees of syntactic relationships known to me which can logically account for the inconsistent (and surely arbitrary) divisions which must be imposed on the text in order to produce segments which contain the requisite number of syllables or stresses. Since there is no recognizable or consistent principle which operates as the basis for McIntosh's segmentation of Wulfstan's prose, and which can be adopted by the reader who attempts to apply McIntosh's theory, it must be concluded that his appeal to syntactic considerations for support of his theory does not constitute an objective criterion. If there is no objective criterion in the form of syntactic analysis which underlies the division of Wulfstan's prose into short units of the kind described by McIntosh, we have no justification for believing that Wulfstan intended his prose to be read as McIntosh recommended.

McIntosh was presumably aware of the fact that not all of a Wulfstan text could be divided into short units on syntactic grounds without resistance being offered, and as I have pointed out, McIntosh's theory stands or falls by the rigour with which it can be applied. If, as McIntosh suggested, there is

some peculiar psycho-physical attraction in the two-stress phrase which accounts if not for the origin at least for the persistence of the half-line of Old English poetry,¹

we must expect to find a large number of two-stress phrases in the work of any Old English prose writer: what McIntosh sees as distinctive in Wulfstan's prose is that "the whole of the text" can be divided into

a continuous series of two-stress phrases related in structure to the classical half-line, and severely restricted in somewhat the same fashion

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 11.

to certain rhythmical patterns.¹

When he enlarged on this statement, however, he added the claim that

some phrases are more obviously separable than others, as is true of half-lines in the classical verse, but on the whole Wulfstan's prose is easier to split up on the basis of natural speech pauses which delimit these small syntactic units² than the verse is, and this is saying a good deal.²

Against possible objections to this claim, he guarded himself by a qualification, which is immediately withdrawn with a significantly subjective reference to the happiness and ease of this particular reader:

I have said that the whole of the text can be divided in this way, but to this the objection could be made that there may be other equally acceptable ways of splitting it up, that it is possible but arbitrary. Thus it could be argued that given a sentence with six syllables bearing main stress, you may often divide it equally well into two three-stress or three two-stress groups. But this is not possible as often as one might believe, and if due attention is given to stresses and pauses as legitimately required by the sense, it will be found that most such sentences will divide naturally in only one of these two ways. Wulfstan's sentences divide most happily and easily into phrases of two stresses ... and it³ is clear that he intended them to divide in this way.³

(The same subjective bias, it may be noted, is evident in his reference to "embarrassing and untidy islands of one-stress or three-stress phrases" which are "left isolated after we have put in our thumbs and pulled out the more obvious two-stress plums.")⁴

McIntosh's reference to splitting up Wulfstan's prose "on the basis of natural speech pauses" is problematical. It is not clear whether he means that "natural speech pauses" determine his rhythmical divisions throughout the segmentation of a Wulfstan

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 8.

²Ibid., p. 10.

³Ibid., p. 10-11 (his italics).

⁴Ibid., p. 10.

text, or whether considerations of "natural speech pauses" are to be brought to bear on segments of the text which are not otherwise easily separable, in order to subdivide them. In any case, we cannot be certain that we know what the "natural speech pauses" of Old English were: we can assume that it is safe to draw an analogy between Old English and Modern English, but, because the word order of Old English is much freer, it is not always possible to draw an analogy. If we assume an analogy between Old and Modern English, we will conclude that pauses normally coincide with syntactic divisions, but that pauses required for logical or rhetorical emphasis may cut across the syntactic divisions. Thus, to take an earlier example from De Septiformi Spiritu, it may be conceded that forðam þe God sylf is se soða wisdom, which McIntosh divided into rhythmical phrases by splitting between the verb and the object, could have been delivered with a pause between is and se soða wisdom if the orator had wished to give, say, special prominence to sylf. Such a reading seems the most logical to me, because I consider that sylf needs to be emphasized in reading Ælc riht wisdom is cumen of Gode, forðam þe God sylf is se soða wisdom in order to bring out what I take to be the point: namely, that true wisdom derives from God alone because he is by nature the embodiment of wisdom. A pause after is enforces a recognition of the similarity between riht wisdom and soða wisdom. It may be noted that the manuscript pointing which, I suggested, represents oratorical pauses, offers support for a pause after is, because MS. E, the only manuscript containing the extract quoted earlier, has a punctum after is, and the punctum is one of the few instances of pointing which occurs within a clause. It would, however, be possible to make out a sound case for other readings, such as a pause before is instead of se soða wisdom, but I do not

propose to embark on a consideration of these. Suffice it to say that there are other logical alternatives, and that even adoption of the reading I have suggested, which makes sense of McIntosh's division, does not necessitate reading the clause immediately preceding forðam þe God sylf is se soða wisdom with the pauses required by McIntosh's rhythmical divisions:

Ælc riht wisdom
is cumen of Gode.

It seems to me that Wulfstan added riht to Ælfric's sentence in order to distinguish the wisdom bestowed by God from the unwisdom propagated by the devil, which Wulfstan mentions in the sentence immediately preceding Ælc riht wisdom is cumen of Gode. I therefore think that only riht, and probably Gode, should receive marked emphasis. Consequently, I am not tempted to pause between wisdom and is when I read Ælc riht wisdom is cumen of Gode, and there is no punctuation mark in the manuscript which might lead me to revise my opinion. I am nevertheless aware that one could adopt other rhetorical or logical pauses in reading the clause, or, to record my perceptions more accurately, I become aware that there are a number of other possibilities when I attempt to decide which two of the three words in Ælc riht wisdom McIntosh stressed when he read it as a two-stress phrase.

One could of course pursue this line of investigation almost indefinitely, but I trust that the conclusion I wish to draw emerges sufficiently clearly from the nature of my remarks. I can accept what I take to be the general point of McIntosh's reference to the splitting up of Wulfstan's prose "on the basis of natural speech pauses" (or "stresses and pauses as legitimately required by the sense," which I assume is much the same thing): namely, that logical or rhetorical considerations may lead an orator to pause on occasions when no division of the text is

required by the syntax. My acceptance of this point brings me no closer, however, to acceptance of McIntosh's theory as a valid criterion of the distinctive features of Wulfstan's prose. Our views of the pauses and stresses demanded by logical or rhetorical considerations must vary. The general sense of a sentence must guide our interpretation, but the limitations imposed by the sense are not rigid enough to preclude a subjective placing of pauses. It must be remembered, too, that our conceptions of the nature of spoken (and declaimed) Old English are based largely on assumptions and that our notions of the pauses which any given orator might have deemed effective are highly speculative. If we believe with McIntosh that Wulfstan intended his prose to be delivered as "a continuous series of two-stress phrases related in structure to the classical half-line," we must assume that he considered it appropriate to pause, for logical reasons or rhetorical effect, at every point where a segment of the text (such as a clause containing subject, verb, and a predicate group directly dependent on the verb, in that order) cannot be divided without separating elements which have an intimate syntactic connexion, but must be divided in order to produce phrases which contain the required number of syllables and stresses. There is no means of proving that the assumptions are fallacious. It must be strongly emphasized, however, that a reading of Wulfstan's prose as "a continuous series of two-stress phrases" relies heavily on assumptions concerning the pauses and stresses, which cannot be objectively verified. Far from providing a convincing exposition of precisely how Wulfstan intended his sermons to be read, McIntosh has merely described one of the possible ways in which they can be read.

Though McIntosh's assumptions cannot be proven fallacious, they can be shown to be highly improbable. To return to a point

which I raised earlier. Did McIntosh mean that considerations of "natural speech pauses" and "stresses and pauses as legitimately required by the sense" were to be brought to bear on passages which do not readily lend themselves to divisions into two-stress phrases on syntactic grounds, or did he mean to imply that the stresses and pauses of his rhythmical analysis invariably coincided with the "natural speech pauses" and the "stresses and pauses as legitimately required by the sense"? In other words, did McIntosh regard Wulfstan's sermons as metrical compositions in which a regular rhythm could be discerned by ignoring, for the most part, the pauses and stresses required by the sense, or did he regard them as compositions which, if read as prose, were found to be rhythmically regular? If he regarded them as metrical compositions, we are asked to accept that Wulfstan declaimed his sermons in a manner which seriously interfered with their intelligibility, since pauses and stresses play an important part in the communication of the meaning of an orally delivered text. I do not find this easy to accept, particularly as the manuscript pointing does not suggest that the sermons are to be regarded as metrical compositions, and a consideration of the syntax reveals that Wulfstan's sentences do not fall naturally into short units. If, on the other hand, McIntosh is claiming that the pauses and stresses of the prose are identical with those required by the metrical system, we are asked to accept an inherently improbable theory.

Old English poetry consists of a more or less continuous series of two-stress phrases, though as McIntosh pointed out, two or more half-lines are often syntactically unified. The half-lines of Old English poetry are not, however, normally sense units or syntactic units. The formation of a continuous series

of two-stress phrases with a particular form of alliterative patterning is achieved by divergences, and often considerable ones, from the word order normally followed in Old English prose. McIntosh's requirements for a typical Wulfstan two-stress phrase, it may be noted, are even more stringent than those for a classical half-line. A Wulfstanian two-stress phrase, as McIntosh describes it, must not only contain two stresses, it must be syntactically distinct from the adjacent phrases, it must normally be slightly shorter than the classical half-line (and, presumably, shorter than nine syllables), and alliteration, where it appears, must link the important elements within a phrase. While allowing for the appearance of rhythmical patterns not permitted in classical verse, McIntosh insists that Wulfstan's rhythmical phrases are "severely restricted in somewhat the same fashion to certain rhythmical patterns,"¹ and that seventy per cent of Wulfstan's rhythmical phrases are classifiable as Sievers' Type A (though he may have intended the latter remark to apply only to Sermo Lupi ad Anglos).² Whether the word order of Wulfstan's prose is "normal" is difficult to say--a systematic study of his word order is outside the scope of my study, and one would, in any case, be hard pressed to establish a definite norm. It is safe to say, however, that a reading of his sermons will confirm that his word order is closer, on the whole, to that of Modern English, than is the word order of classical Old English verse, and that instances of radical displacement of words which have a direct syntactic relationship are rare. If there were marked peculiarities of the word order, McIntosh might be expected to have noticed them, but all he remarked was that "a study of word-order might have to reckon with certain aberrations."³ It seems inherently improbable then, that

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 8.

²Ibid., p. 14 (cf. p. 27 ff. n. 19).

³Ibid., p. 17.

Wulfstan, employing word order which does not deviate markedly from that which we expect to find in ordinary prose, could produce compositions which could be simultaneously read both as prose, with the stresses and pauses required by the sense, and as a continuous series of two-stress phrases related in structure to the classical half-line, and severely restricted in somewhat the same fashion to certain rhythmical patterns.

Not only does the theory seem improbable, but it can be shown that a reading of Wulfstan's prose in the manner recommended by McIntosh conflicts with the stresses and pauses required by the sense, if it is valid to assume an analogy between Old and Modern English and to assume that words which are "stress words" in Old English verse would also have been stressed in the prose. I have already touched on this matter in my discussion of the difficulties encountered in applying McIntosh's theory to a reading of the texts, but I have not yet dealt with the stresses which are necessary if we are to read Wulfstan's sermons as rhythmically regular. This may seem perverse, since it was the regular two-stress pattern which McIntosh considered to be the essential distinctive feature of Wulfstan's prose, but my argument is that we must have some objective criterion which can be applied in order to divide the texts into short phrases before we can assume that they are rhythmically regular. McIntosh has not provided an objective criterion, and it would appear that he has assumed that a Wulfstan sermon is rhythmically regular and then sought objective confirmation for his reading.

The conflict between the pauses and stresses required by the sense and those required in order to read Wulfstan's sermons as rhythmically regular compositions emerges from an examination of some of his revisions of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu. An examination of Wulfstan's revisions of De Falsis Diis in relation to McIntosh's theory is particularly interesting, because

De Falsis Diis is similar in style to Ælfric's Lives of Saints which, McIntosh claimed, has a rhythmical structure which could be distinguished from the rhythmical structure of Wulfstan's prose. McIntosh stated that Ælfric's Lives of Saints ~~was~~ ^{was} "made up of whole lines, composed of pairs of half-lines joined by alliteration," and that, "in contrast with the classical half-line, the main sense pauses are very rarely allowed to fall in the middle of the whole line." De Falsis Diis is printed as whole lines by Pope, and the first complete whole line in the passage revised by Wulfstan reads:

Nu [ne] ræde we on bocum þæt man arærde hæþengyld.

On syntactic grounds, the line can be split into two, since þæt man arærde hæþengyld is directly related to the verb and not to on bocum, and each of the half-lines can be read, according to the principles governing the stressing of Old English poetry, as two-stress phrases. Wulfstan's version, with his additions underlined, reads:

Ne ræde we þeah ahwar on bocum þæt man arærde
ænig hæþengyld.

The addition of ænig makes Ælfric's half-line too long for a normal Wulfstanian phrase. It also introduces a third stress, for the verb must still receive some kind of stress, despite the addition of an adjective modifying the noun. The addition of ænig, then, necessitates the acceptance of ænig hæþengyld as a separate unit, which means that the object is divorced from the verb immediately preceding it on which it is dependent. In order to read þæt man arærde as a two-stress phrase, it is necessary to stress man, which is not normally a stress word and certainly does not require logical emphasis. It appears, then, that one can find parts of Ælfric's composition that can be read without difficulty as two-stress phrases, which have been revised

by Wulfstan in such a manner that the pauses and stresses required to read his sermon as a continuous series of two-stress phrases do not coincide with the sense. It cannot be said that he has revised Ælfric's composition in order to bring it into closer accord with the rhythmical patterns he preferred: the first of Ælfric's half lines can be classified as a variety of Sievers' Type A, and the addition of peah, which must be stressed and taken as the last word of a phrase in a reading based on McIntosh's theory, results in a rhythmical phrase ending in a stress, which McIntosh stated was so rare in Wulfstan's work as to occasion doubts concerning the authenticity of a text.¹

I will give one further example of Wulfstan's revisions of De Falsis Diis to illustrate a point which I believe to be generally true. Ælfric's composition reads:

ða þa hy toferdon fyr lenum landum
7 mancynn þa weox, þa wurdon hi bepæhte.

The first line is not easily separable, but the second consists of syntactically separate phrases, which contain less than the maximum number of syllables for a Wulfstanian rhythmical phrase. The first half line contains two stress words, and it would be logical to stress þa in the second half line (McIntosh noted that the alliteration in Lives of Saints does not always coincide with the main stresses). Wulfstan's version of these lines reads:

þa syððan toferdon hy wide landes, 7 mancyn þa sona swyðe weox; 7 ða æt nyhstan wurdon hi bepæhte.

The addition of sona swyðe does not produce a syntactic unit which is too long, but the sense surely requires a pause between sona and swyðe, because swyðe modifies weox, but sona does not modify swyðe. Swyðe weox, however, is too short by a syllable for a normal Wulfstanian rhythmical phrase. The addition of

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 29, n. 19 (3).

æt nyhstan necessitates a further subdivision of Ælfric's half-line, since it otherwise contains too many syllables, but it is difficult to be certain how wurdon hi bepæhte is to be stressed if it is to be read as a two-stress phrase. Either wurdon or hi could be stressed in Old English poetry, since the only word in the phrase which would receive a primary stress is bepæhte, but the sense does not require that either be emphasized.

Finally, I shall take an example from De Septiformi Spiritu. I have already discussed some of the problems which the following passage presents to the reader who attempts to apply McIntosh's theory:

Ælc riht wisdom
 is cumen of Gode
 forðam þe God sylf is
 se soða wisdom
 7 ælc man bið
 gesælig 7 eadig
 þe hæfð þæne wisdom
 þe of Godes agenre gyfe cymö.

The corresponding passage in Ælfric's composition falls neatly into syntactic units which, in terms of length, could be accepted as Wulfstanian phrases:

Ælc wisdom is of Gode
 forðam þe God sylf is wisdom
 7 ælc man bið eadig
 þe hæfð þæne wisdom.

Whether these units could be read as two-stress units, and which words are to be stressed, is open to argument, but the pauses required by the syntactic division are certainly more logical than those which we must adopt in order to read the Wulfstan passage as two-stress phrases. As I have pointed out, there are a number of ways in which one could stress Ælc riht wisdom--it would make perfectly good sense to stress any two of these three words, but I think that there is a strong case to be made out for giving a heavy stress to riht. If we agree, that, in context, the sense

requires that riht be heavily stressed, it is unlikely that we will stress either Ælc or wisdom (depending on our choice) with equal force. Much the same point can be made concerning þe hæfð þæne wisdom. Wisdom would receive a main stress if it appeared in Old English verse, but in order to read the clause with two stresses we must also stress either hæfð or þæne. If we do stress them, we do so on the assumption that the general sense of the sentence requires that they be given particular prominence, in which case, we will probably stress hæfð (or þæne, if that is our choice) with greater force than the other words in the clause.

My analysis of the stresses and pauses required in these passages by the sense on the one hand, and a rhythmical reading of Wulfstan's prose on the other, is certainly by no means exhaustive, but it does, I trust, indicate that there is a conflict between the two, and that Wulfstan's revisions, far from bringing Ælfric's compositions into accord with the rhythmical system McIntosh considered he followed with "relentless thoroughness," are responsible for the complications which attend an attempt to divide the text ~~into~~ two-stress phrases. In order to give two stresses to each segment of the text which contains less than nine syllables, it is necessary to stress words which are not normally stressed in Old English poetry, and which do not appear to require special emphasis. Further, it is not easy to determine which words are to be stressed, and, if we are giving "due attention" to "stresses and pauses as legitimately required by the sense," we will find that, even when there are two words in a phrase which can be stressed, the stresses required are often unequal. If the stresses and pauses required by the sense do not coincide with those which are necessary in order to read Wulfstan's sermons as rhythmically regular compositions, and if we cannot at times determine which words ought to be stressed, there seems

no justification for assuming that Wulfstan intended his sermons to be read with a regular two-stress rhythm.

O. Funke, who advanced a description of Wulfstan's prose rhythm which is basically a refinement of McIntosh's theory, recognized that the rhythmical stresses do not coincide with those required by the meaning. He asserted:

It must be kept in mind that stylized, oral recitation which we have to assume for Wulfstan's sermons, could and certainly did equalize differences of natural stresses.¹

In the absence of any evidence for assuming that Wulfstan's sermons were delivered in a highly stylized manner, his explanation is unconvincing. To return to a point which I made earlier in considering whether McIntosh regarded Wulfstan's sermons as metrical compositions or as prose which was also rhythmically regular, it seems hardly conceivable that Wulfstan would have adopted a mode of delivery which distorted and distracted attention from his teachings. If we have to choose between regarding the texts as metrical compositions or ordinary prose--and it is clear that we must, because they cannot be both--it seems more reasonable, and in accordance with the observable features of manuscript pointing and syntax, to regard them as prose, in which the basic unit of composition and delivery is the sentence, and not the phrase.

The third objective criterion which McIntosh offered in support of his theory was the alliterative patterning. The alliterative pattern is less important as evidence than the manuscript pointing and the syntactic grouping, since McIntosh did not state that the two-stress phrases invariably contained two alliterating words, merely that

¹"Some Remarks on Wulfstan's Prose Rhythm," English Studies, XLIII (1962), 314.

such alliteration and rhyme as Wulfstan has, and there is much of it, serves ... to join more intimately the two important elements within a single phrase.¹

Since I have shown that the manuscript pointing does not support McIntosh's theory, and that his description of the relationship between his rhythmical phrases and the syntax does not provide a clear and consistent principle on which to base an analysis of Wulfstan's prose, there is little to be gained by investigating the alliterative patterning of Wulfstan's prose. I shall, however, deal with the matter briefly for the sake of completeness, in order to show that his revisions of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu do not achieve the style which McIntosh considered to be characteristic of him.

In Ælfric's De Septiformi Spiritu, alliteration is employed only sporadically to link pairs of phrases, but the alliterative patterning of De Falsis Diis, as I have already implied, is similar to that of the Lives of Saints. One obvious feature of Wulfstan's revisions is that the addition, and occasionally the omission, of words or phrases destroys the alliterative pattern of Ælfric's compositions. The following examples occur in De Falsis Deis. (Wulfstan's additions are enclosed in square brackets.)

Ne ræde we [þeah ahwar] on bocum þæt man arærde
[ænig] hæðengyld

7 mancyn þa [sona swyðe] weox; [7] ða [æt nyhstan]
wurdon hi bepæhte

Hi namon [eac him] ða [þæt] to wisdome [þurh deofles
lare] þæt hi wurðedon him for godas

7 him lac [þa æt nyhstan þurh deofles lare] offrodon
7 forleton heora Drihten

us mannum to brice [7 to note] for his miclan godnesse
on swa feawum godum [swa hy ær hæfdan], ac fengon to
wurðienne

He aflymde his [agene] fæder [eft] of ðam [ylcan]
foresædan iglande

Þas manfullan men [þe we ymbe specað] wæron [getealde
for] ða mærostan godas

¹Wulfstan's Prose, p. 13.

ðe wæs swyðe facenfull 7 [ðeah full snotorwyrde] swicol
on dædum

Done macedon þa hæðenan [be heora getæle eac] heom to
mæran gode

ac þas synd þa fyrmestan [ðeh þurh hæðenscipe getealde],
þeah ðy hy fullice leofodon

Wulfstan's alterations to De Septiformi Spiritu also destroy the alliterative links between adjacent phrases. In the passage which McIntosh quoted to illustrate Wulfstan's transformation of Ælfric's prose, the following examples occur:

Ælc [riht] wisdom is [cumen] of Gode, forðam þe God
sylf is [se soða.] wisdom

Se wisdom is (halig),¹ [swa we ær cwædon], þas halgan
gastes gifu

and bið [eac for oft] swa gehiwod [licetere] swylce
he wis sy.

These examples, of course, support McIntosh's contention that Wulfstan's revisions destroy the form of Ælfric's prose. It is noticeable, however, that the ^{majority of}revisions do not produce phrases with internal alliteration. It would have been quite possible for Wulfstan to produce phrases with internal alliteration by conflating instead of expanding Ælfric's texts and by altering the word order: he could, for example, have written 'Ne ræde we þæt man arærde,' 'se was swyðe swicol,' and 'þone macedon heom to mæran gode.' A consideration of the effect which Wulfstan's revisions have on the alliterative patterning of Ælfric's prose, then, supports the point I made earlier, that there is no indication that Wulfstan's revisions of Ælfric's compositions were intended to bring his source into closer accord with a particular type of rhythmical prose. In view of the other revisions Wulfstan makes, which I will discuss in my summing up, it seems likely that Wulfstan was attempting to rid his sentences of Ælfric's insistent alliteration and produce a composition which resembled prose rather than verse.

¹ Parentheses indicate Wulfstan's omission.

I conclude, then, that McIntosh's theory has no objective validity. I do not wish to dismiss it out of hand, because I believe that Wulfstan's prose must in some way be distinctive and that McIntosh's subjective perception may yet prove to have pointed us in the right general direction for discovering its distinctive features--the fact that it has been accepted as a criterion of authorship suggests that this is the case. It must be stressed, however, that his reading is a subjective one, and that there is no possible justification for concluding that Wulfstan composed his sermons with the intention that they should be read in the manner recommended by McIntosh. To put this another way. A reading such as McIntosh's is not determined by observable features of the texts, but is based on assumptions concerning the spoken language. Any reading of Old English prose must, of necessity, make assumptions concerning the spoken language. A reading such as McIntosh's, however, is ultimately based on the belief that it is valid to assume that the basic unit of Wulfstan's prose is analogous to the basic unit of Old English verse. In view of the resistance offered by the syntactic patterns of Wulfstan's prose to the rhythmical divisions required in order to read it with a regular two-stress rhythm, and in view of the conflict between the pauses and stresses required by the sense and those required by a rhythmical reading, it is safe to conclude that the belief is untenable, and that, if we are to make assumptions about Wulfstan's intentions, we should assume that Wulfstan composed his sermons, and intended them to be read, as prose.

In all fairness to McIntosh, as Sheets points out, it should be noted that McIntosh did not presume to believe that his theory was a definitive statement about Wulfstan's prose. He concluded with a modest disclaimer and an Old English quotation which makes

one hesitate to refute his theory, let alone state categorically that it is invalid--ic gecende be ðam ðe ic cuðe; se ðe bet cunne, gecyðe his mare. It is, nevertheless, as a definitive statement that his theory has been received. It follows, however, from my conclusion that McIntosh has provided no objective means of testing the validity of his theory, that, as it stands, it cannot function as a criterion of authorship. His explanation of the relationship between the rhythmical phrases and the syntax is open to a variety of interpretations, and there is room for individual variations in the stressing of the allegedly rhythmical phrases. It would appear, too, from his revisions of Ælfric's compositions, that he did not invariably attempt to achieve the alliterative patterning which McIntosh considered to be a distinctive feature of his work. If McIntosh's theory does not offer an objective means of determining the distinctive features of Wulfstan's compositions, I cannot see how it enables us to distinguish rhythmical differences among the compositions accepted as his. I cannot, therefore, grasp the point of Bethurum's remarks on XI. She comments as follows:

The piece is unique also in the regularity of its rhythm and its approximation, in many lines, to regular heroic verse. Verse it is not, but it comes nearer than any other of Wulfstan's compositions to the form Einkenel described (Anglia, vii, Anzeigen, p. 200) when he said Wulfstan's Sermo ad Anglos was a poem. There are 55 lines in which the hemistichs are linked by alliteration, though four of these have three hemistichs instead of two. That is not, of course, the prevailing form. It is varied by alliteration that links line to line and by rhyme substituted for alliteration. Nor does the metrical pattern regularly fit Sievers' five types, or any other scheme of conventional Old English verse. But the two-stress pattern described by Professor McIntosh is so regular here and the prose dilution so slight that it comes much nearer to being verse than, to take a modern comparison, much of the free verse of the early part of this century came to conventional poetry. If Wulfstan made these translations when he was rather young, he may have ignored them later because his own characteristic rhythm took precedence over all other forms.¹

¹Homilies, p. 332.

I take her point concerning the alliterative patterning. But she appears to consider on the one hand that XI conforms to the two-stress pattern described by McIntosh, and, on the other, that Wulfstan did not make use of the paraphrases elsewhere because they are not written in his characteristic rhythm. Yet it is McIntosh's contention that the two-stress pattern he describes is characteristic of Wulfstan, and the essence of his theory, as I have pointed out, is that Wulfstan composed entirely in two-stress phrases. Her remarks cannot stem from a rejection of McIntosh's theory, since she states elsewhere that McIntosh's study "gives objective criteria for applying what is probably the most reliable test of authorship,"¹ and, accordingly, I find them puzzling. I assume that she means either that the paraphrases in XI are rhythmically different from Wulfstan's other sermons because they conform more readily to McIntosh's description of Wulfstan's prose, or that they are in some way rhythmically different from the style he normally employs. Either way, her perception of a rhythmical difference rests upon an acceptance of McIntosh's theory as definitive description of Wulfstan's prose-- in the latter case because, to my knowledge, McIntosh's theory is the only criterion of Wulfstan's normal style which has ever been accepted. Since I consider McIntosh's theory to be invalid, I can only conclude that a recognition of the rhythmical difference between XI and Wulfstan's other sermons must be based on subjective perceptions, and that, though there may be a difference, our present state of knowledge concerning Wulfstan's rhythmical intentions does not enable us to establish its nature. I have not, then, in my discussion of the paraphrases in XI, taken into account the possible effects which rhythmical considerations may have had on other aspects of Wulfstan's style.

¹Homilies, p. 27, n. 1.

As far as De Falsis Deis and De Septiformi Spiritu are concerned, it is clear that there is no support for the view that Wulfstan's revisions were an attempt to bring Ælfric's compositions into accord with a particular type of two-stress rhythmical prose. If his revisions were in any way guided by rhythmical considerations, I would suggest, his intention was to transform his sources, especially De Falsis Diis, into an approximation of normal prose. My suggestion is based on the fact that his revisions break down the alliterative pattern of Ælfric's work, and make it far more difficult to read his composition with a regular two-stress rhythm than Ælfric's. This hypothesis would account for the small group of alterations to De Falsis Diis, which are primarily slight syntactic alterations, that do not appear to alter or clarify the meaning of Ælfric's composition. In De Falsis Diis, a number of elliptical constructions appear, identical with those often used in Old English verse, which produce phrases with a distinct two-stress rhythm. In the passage Wulfstan follows, the divinities who are named are described in an appositional phrase:

Saturnus gehaten, swiðlic and wælhreow
 se wæs Iouis gehaten, hetol and þrymlic
 seo wæs gehaten Iuno, swiðe healic gyden
 seo wæs Ioues dohter, swa fracod on galnysse

In each case, where Ælfric has an appositional phrase, Wulfstan employs a co-ordinate construction:

se wæs Saturnus gehaten, 7 se wæs swa wælhreow
 se wæs Iouis gehaten, 7 se wearð hetol feond
 seo wæs genamod Iuno, 7 heo wearð swiðe healic gyden
 seo wæs Ioues dohter, 7 seo wæs swa ful 7 swa fracod on
 galnysse

He also employs relative clauses in place of Ælfric's compressed expressions in the following instances:

Ælfric	Wulfstan
þam fyrste ær Noes flode	þam fyrste þe was ær Noes flode
þam ilande Creta	þam iglande þe Creata hatte
An man ... Saturnus gehaten	An man ... se was Saturnus gehaten

The syntactic alterations Wulfstan makes multiply the number of unstressed syllables, with the result that the stresses fall less regularly, and a comparison of two lines of De Falsis Diis, to which two such alterations are made, with Wulfstan's revised version, reveals that the overall effect of Wulfstan's alterations is to produce a sentence which sounds like normal prose instead of verse. Thus:

Ælfric
An man was eardiende on þam ilande Creta,
Saturnus gehaten, swiðlic and wælhreow (104-5)

Wulfstan
An man was on geardagum eardiende on þam iglande þe Creata
hatte se was Saturnus gehaten, 7 se was ^{swa}wælhreow (39-41)

My suggestion is, of course, contentious, in view of the fact that there are passages in Wulfstan's sermons (notably Sermo Lupi ad Anglos) which approach rhythmical regularity and contain abundant alliteration (I am thinking chiefly of the lists of sins and sinners). On the other hand, Wulfstan's stylistic devices are normally appropriate to his subject matter and didactic purpose, and the subject matter of De Falsis Diis does not require a rhetorical style similar to that which Wulfstan employs in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos to stir the emotions of his audience. It is, indeed, slightly odd that Ælfric should have employed a style vaguely reminiscent of heroic poetry and similar to the style of his Lives of Saints, in describing the deeds of vicious men falsely assumed to be gods. Furthermore, although Ælfric obviously considered that his alliterative and rhythmical prose was a suitable form for instruction, it is possible that

Wulfstan, accustomed to an oratorical mode of his own devising, may have felt that the style called attention to itself instead of the didactic import.

DE FALSIS DEIS

If it is accepted that Wulfstan's revisions were not motivated by an attachment to a particular type of rhythmical prose, his alterations to his source can be taken as illustrating a pre-occupation with clear and forceful teaching, because they emphasize the didactic import of Ælfric's compositions and arise from Wulfstan's recognition of the fact that oral instruction must be immediately intelligible if it is to be effective. I have already referred to the two groups of revisions to De Falsis Diis, both quite small, which cannot be explained in these terms. The first group consists of substitutions or omissions of lexical items not normally employed by Wulfstan, which are listed by Jost.¹ I shall indicate the instances in which the avoidance of a word not normally used by Wulfstan does not constitute the sole reason for his divergence from his source. The second group consists of revisions, primarily the small syntactic changes listed above, which suggest that he attempted to break down the rhythmical form of the piece in order to make it sound more like normal prose.

¹Wulfstanstudien, pp. 129-33.

Even these alterations to the syntax could be related to Wulfstan's attempts to present Ælfric's material in the most immediately intelligible form, for the syntactic constructions he substitutes slow down the speed with which information must be assimilated. (Jost, it may be noted, lists the first two alterations to Ælfric's appositional phrases as instances of Wulfstan's substitution of his own vocabulary preferences, because brymlíc does not occur elsewhere in Wulfstan's canon, and nor does swiðlic with personal nouns.¹ Wulfstan's lexical preferences do not, however, necessitate the syntactic changes.)

Wulfstan accommodates Ælfric's texts more thoroughly to the oral mode by clarifying the relationship between the events narrated. Chronological relations are made more specific by the addition of þa (9), sona (11), syððan (11), iu (13), eft (46), and æt nyhstan (12, 19, 36). The chronological perspective of the narrative is indicated by the addition of on geardagum (40) and (þa) on ðam dagum (52, 55, 71), and the addition of æfter his forðsiðe and on life in the description of the deification of Mars (60-65). Wulfstan's main syntactic alteration to Ælfric's composition relates to the clarification of the chronology of events. The opening sentence of the passage which Wulfstan revises reads:

Nu [ne] ræde we on bocum þæt man arærde hæþengyld
 on eallum þam fyrste ær Noes flode,
 oðþæt þa entas worhtan þone [wundorlican] stypel
 æfter Noes flode, and hym swa feala gereorda
 God þar forgeaf swa þara wyrhtena wæs. (72-76)

¹Wulfstanstudien, p. 130.

In Ælfric's account, the relationship between man's first idolatry and the building of the tower of Babel is not entirely clear. The reference to the building is contained in a clause introduced by oðþæt, so that the sentence could mean that the building of the tower constituted the first instance of idolatry, or that idolatry first began after or concurrently with the building of the tower. We could be certain that Ælfric was equating the building of the tower with the origin of idolatry if it were possible to establish definitely that Ælfric was using arærde to mean literally "raised." On the other hand, the sentence immediately following could suggest that idolatry first began after the building of the tower:

Da þa hi toferdon to fyrleum landum,
and mancynn þa weox, þa wurdon hi bepæhte
þurh þone ealdan deofol þe Adam ær beswac,
swa þæt hi worhton wolice him godas,
and þone Scyppend forsawon þe hy gesceop to mannum. (77-81)

Wulfstan introduces the reference to the building of the tower with the words Ac syððan þæt instead of the subordinating conjunction oðþæt. His alteration does not clarify the conceptual relationship of the building of the tower and the origin of idolatry, but, because he emphasizes the narrative sequence, there is less encouragement to question the precise nature of the conceptual relationship in his version:

Ne ræde we þeah ahwar on bocum þæt man arærde ænig
hæðengyld ahwar on worulde on eallum þam fyrste þe
wæs ær Noes flode. Ac syððan þæt gewearð þæt Nembroð
7 ða entas worhton þone wundorlican stypel æfter Noes
flode, 7 him ða swa fela gereorde gelamp, þæs þe bec
secgað, swa ðæra wyrhtena wæs. (5-10)

Wulfstan's addition of æt nyhstan to the sentence immediately following makes it reasonably certain that idolatry finally originated as the climax to the sequence of events narrated in 7-10 (quoted above) and the sentence in which the phrase is added (10-16):

þa syððan toferdon hy wide landes, 7 mancyn þa
sona swyðe weox; 7 ða æt nyhstan wurdon hi bepæhte
þurh ðone ealdan deofol þe Adam iu ær beswac swa
þæt hi worhton wolice 7 gedwollice him hæþene
godas.

Wulfstan also adds explanatory details which enable the
audience to follow the narrative more easily. The addition of
swa hy ær hæfdan in

Gyt ða hæþenan noldon beon gehealdene on swa feawum
godum swa hy ær hæfdan, ac fengon to wurðienne æt
nyhstan mistlice entas 7 strece woruldmæn (35-37)

relates the account of the deification of mortals back to the
account of pantheism, from which it is separated by a digression
on the nature of God; and the addition of ealle butan anum to

he [Saturnus] abat hys suna, þa þa hi geborene wæron,
and unfæderlice macode heora flæsc him to mete (106-7)

prepares for the later statement that Saturn left one of his
children alive, which Ælfric does not take into account in his
description. This group of revisions also includes the addition
of þe we ymbe specað in þas manfullan men þe we ymbe specað
wæron getealde for ða mærostan godas (50-51). In Ælfric's
account, the description of Minerva and Venus, which follows
the description of Saturn, Jove, and Venus, reads:

Heora (ge)dohtra wæron Minerua and Uenus.
þa forlæg se fæder fu(l)lice buta,
and manege his magan ma[n]lice gewemde, (115-17)

so that it is clear in Ælfric's account that þas manfullan menn
wæron þa mæroston godas, which immediately follows his descrip-
tion of Minerva and Venus, refers to the whole family of gods men-
tioned in the narrative. Because Wulfstan omits the sentence
which follows Heora (ge)dohtra wæron Minerua and Uenus, the addition
of þe we ymbe specað is necessary to ensure that þas manfullan
men mentioned in the next sentence is understood to refer to all
the heathen deities who have been named, not only Minerva and
Venus.

Wulfstan's numerous additions of eac (added ten times) can also be regarded as revisions intended to help his auditors to follow the narrative. It is added primarily to mark the succession of deifications. It also indicates the relation between concepts expressed in separate sentences in Das gesceafta eac ealle doð swa swa him gedihte heora agen scyppend (27-29), and the stages by which the devil seduced mankind to worship false gods in Hi namon eac him ða þæt to wisdome þurh deofles lare (17).

The remainder of the revisions are changes in meaning which reflect the theological views which inform other sermons Wulfstan wrote. Particularly characteristic of Wulfstan is the alteration of hym swa feala gereorda God þar forgeaf swa þæra wyrhtena was (75-76) to him ða swa fela gereorda gelamp... swa ðæra wyrhtena was (9-10), for, as was noted in the discussion of VI, Wulfstan is reluctant to attribute punitive actions directly to God. Jost gives this revision as an example of Wulfstan's avoidance of unfamiliar usage, because forgifan is used in Wulfstan's work only to mean "forgive,"¹ but the verb could have been avoided without altering the syntax.

Broadly speaking, most of Wulfstan's revisions emphasize the contrast and opposition between God and the devil. He is particularly concerned to emphasize that there is only one true God, who governs all things. The peroration he adds to the passage from De Falsis Diis he revises consists of an assertion of this dogma (89-95), and additions are made within the sermon which serve the same purpose. Where Ælfric's account of the earliest idolatry states that men þone Scyppend forsawon (81), Wulfstan's states that men ðone soðan God 7 heora agenne scyppend forsawon (14-15), and in the digression on the nature of God, he refers twice to soð God (26, 33) where Ælfric speaks only of God,

¹Wulfstanstudien, pp. 129-30.

altering the word order in one instance from se is ana God (98) to the more emphatic se an is soð God (33). He also stresses God's omnipotence in the digression. The additions which illustrate this, together with further examples of his insistence that there is only one true God, are underlined in the passage below:

Das gesceafta eac ealle doð swa swa him gedihte heora agen scyppend 7 ne magon nan þing don butan ures Drihtnes þafunge, forðam þe nan oðer scyppend nis buton se ana soða God, þe we on gelyfað, 7 we hine ænne ofer ealle oðre þing lufiað 7 wurðiaþ mid gewissum geleafan, cweþende mid muðe 7 mid modes incundnesse þæt se an is soð God þe ealle ðing gescop 7 geworhte. (27-34)

Wulfstan's addition of georne in hy [the heathen] mihton georne tocnawan, gif hi cuðon þæt gescead, þæt se is soð God (25-26) is consistent with the emphasis he gives to God's supremacy over all things, and not merely an illustration of his "habitual" use of intensives. It may be noted, also, that both in the digression (32) and in the conclusion (90) Wulfstan adds that God is to be loved as well as worshipped, for, despite Jost's remarks,¹ love is significant in his conception of man's relation to God.²

Just as Wulfstan insists that there is only one true God, numerous revisions emphasize that the gods which the heathen worshipped were not gods in reality but only considered to be so by deluded men. Only three times in Wulfstan's sermon is god used to refer to a heathen divinity without some kind of addition to indicate erroneous belief, twice in the description of the worship of nature, which is explained as a heathen error in the digression which immediately follows it, and once in:

Gyt ða hæþenan noldon beon gehealdene on swa feawum godum swa hy ær hæfdan, ac fengon to wurðienne at nyhstan mistlice entas. (35-37)

In the account of Mars, the expression used by Ælfric, þisne

¹Wulfstanstudien, pp. 169-72.

²See further pp. 128-31, 276-78.

wurðodan þa hæðenan for healicne god (128) implies that Mars was only thought to be a god, and two revisions made by Wulfstan, the addition of æfter his forðsiðe (60) and the substitution of gedwolgode for gode later in the sentence (63), emphasize that Mars was only a mortal falsely assumed to be a god. He also substitutes gedwolgod for god in 70, and hæþene godas (14, 81) in his revisions twice replaces Ælfric's godas. Ælfric's halige gydenan is replaced by healice fæmnan (80), and hæþene gydena (83). Wulfstan presumably substituted healice for halige because halige has Christian connotations.¹ Where Wulfstan follows Ælfric in using god or gyden to describe a heathen deity, he adds phrases indicating that the deification is erroneous. Examples of this, with Wulfstan's additions underlined, are:

swyðe healice gyden æfter hæðenscype geteald (49)

þas manfullan men ... wæron getealde for ða mærostan godas ... ac se sunu wæs swaþeah swyðor on hæðenscype gewurðod (50-54)

7 he is geteald eac arwurðost ealra þara goda þe þa hæðenan on þam dagum for godas hæfdon (54-56)

Ðone macedon þa hæðenan be heora getæle eac heom to mæran gode (67-68)

In a few instances, Wulfstan even makes additions to the effect that the gods were worshipped in error, when the deities have already been specifically identified as heathen ones:

hi worhton wolice 7 gedwollice him hæþene godas (13-14)

se sunu wæs swaþeah swyðor on hæðenscype gewurðod ðone Denisca leoda lufiað swyðost 7 on heora gedwylde weorðiaþ geornost (53-57)

Manege eac oðre hæþene godas wæron mistlice fundene ... ac þas synd þa fyrmestan, ðeh þurh hæðenscype getealde. (81-84)

Wulfstan stresses that idolatry arose at the instigation of the devil, by the addition of the phrase þurh deofles lare (five times) throughout the sermon. The extract from De Falsis

¹The suggestion is made by Jost, Wulfstanstudien, p. 133.

Diis Wulfstan revises mentions near the beginning and at the end that the heathen were lead astray by the devil (78-80, 159-60), but there is no further reference to this in Ælfric's narrative. In the discussion of Incipiunt Lupi Sermones Episcopi, it was noted that Wulfstan's sermon on Christian history differs from Ælfric's in its insistence that the devil is the sole and ultimate author of evil, and that Wulfstan views the devil as the direct opposite of God, continually striving to gain from him the allegiance of mankind. That Wulfstan considered the extract from De Falsis Diis which he used as the basis of his sermon to be primarily an exposition of this theme, is revealed by the introductory sentence he adds to Ælfric's composition, for it is in his opening sentences that Wulfstan usually gives a clear statement of his didactic intentions.¹ Wulfstan begins:

Eala, gefyrn is þæt ðurh deofol fela þinga misfor, 7
þæt mancynn to swyðe Godemishyrde, 7 þæt hæðenscipe
ealles to wide swyðe gedereðe 7 gyt dereð wide. (3-5)

In revising De Falsis Diis, then, Wulfstan moulded Ælfric's composition to his conception of the universe as an epic battle between God and the devil. This vision of the universe is not, of course, peculiar to Wulfstan, for he lived in a period in which "the heroic view of human life being lived between the mighty opposites of external powers"² greatly influenced theological speculation.³ What is peculiar to Wulfstan is that the epic conception of the universe is central to his thinking, and its ramifications can be traced in some of the details of his style, such as the use of syntactic and verbal antithesis to emphasize the contrasting natures of God and the devil, and the

¹Cf. pp. 43-45, 88, 111-12, 268, 318, 323-24, 343ff.

²Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages, pp. 244-45.

³

See Southern, pp. 242-47, and Gatch, Loyalties and Traditions, pp. 136-44.

avoidance of expressions which attribute disasters or temptations directly to God because he views God and the devil as antithetical forces, the devil being responsible for all that is evil.

It is consistent with Wulfstan's essentially antithetical outlook that failure to follow the laws of God automatically entails embracing contrary laws derived from the teaching of the devil. This view is most clearly stated in De Septiformi Spiritu:

Crist ælmihtig lærde georne soðfæstnysse 7 anfealdnesse
7 þæt gehwa synnluste fæste wiðstode, 7 Antecrist lærð
unsoðfæstnysse 7 swicolnesse 7 þæt gehwa his luste georne
fulgange And soð is þæt ic secge, mid eal swylcan
laran Antecrist cwemeð 7 laðlice forlæreð ealles to manege.
Forðam nis æfre ænig lagu wyrse on worulde þonne hwa
folgie eallinge his luste 7 his lust him to lage sylfum
gesette. (129-47)

Two of the additions which Wulfstan makes to De Falsis Diis in the description of the heathen gods, heora agenum lustum fullice fulleodan (39) and heora fulan lust heom to lage sylfum gesettan (87-88), illustrate the consistency with which Wulfstan identifies all those who oppose God as adherents to diabolical laws.

There is one other group of revisions in De Falsis Deis which serve a didactic purpose. The depravity of the gods which the heathen worshipped is heightened, and they are more explicitly condemned in Wulfstan's version. Ælfric writes that the heathen

fengon to wurðianne
mislice entas and men him to godum,
þa þe mihtige wæron onworuldlīcum gepincðum. (100-2)

The gods mentioned in this sentence are described by Wulfstan as strece woruldmen (37) and the dignity of their lives is somewhat diminished by the substitution of woruldafelum (38) for woruldlicum gepincðum. (As Jost notes, the latter revision involves the substitution of a word peculiar to Wulfstan, but a semantic alteration is also involved.) Wulfstan adds the epithets yrming

(60) and yfelan (80) to the description of Mars and Venus respectively. In the description of Venus he adds that she was swa ful (78), thereby producing one of his alliterative word pairs (swa ful 7 swa fracod). In the description of Mars he adds that he was full snotorwyrde (66), and, while snotorwyrde is not invariably a pejorative word, it is obvious from the context that it is intended as such. The depravity of Jove is heightened by the addition of swyðe in swa swyðe gal (47), and that of Saturn, by attributing to him a reluctance to spare even one of his offspring--uneaðe in He læfde swaþeah uneaðe ænne to life (43-44) is lacking in Ælfric's account. The addition of agen also emphasizes the enormity of the heathen gods' crimes in:

þæt he fordyde his agene bearn (41-42)

He aflymde his agene fæder (45)

þæt he on his agenre swyster gewifode (48)

þæt hyre agen broðor wið hy gehæmde (78-79)

The addition of agen, then, can be said to serve a didactic purpose: it is not merely an instance of the "Wulfstanphrasen" with which the text is "eingestreut."¹ The magnification of the heathen gods' depravity is not consistent, however. Wrenn noted that

as a bishop making a public declaration Wulfstan sometimes tones down or makes more dignified Ælfric's occasionally very homely vocabulary.²

Jost also drew attention to this aspect of Wulfstan's revisions of De Falsis Diis, though he considered that the reviser "einige krasse Züge seiner Vorlage im Interesse seiner Hörer entweder mildert oder gänzlich tilgt,"³ and remarked, with reference to

¹ Wulfstanstudien, p. 129.

² A Study of Old English Literature, p. 239.

³ Wulfstanstudien, p. 131.

Sermo Lupi ad Anglos:

- 1 Derselbe Mann, der über pikante Histörchen diskret hinwegging, konnte die heikelsten Vorkommnisse in aller Öffentlichkeit anprangern, wenn es einem höhern Zweck diente. Ich sehe in diesem unterschiedlichen Verhalten keinen innern Gegensatz.¹

Yet though it is true, as Jost pointed out, that the heathen gods' incest and Saturn's infanticide is sufficiently established without the details Wulfstan omits or modifies,² they could surely have served a "higher purpose" in the same way as the additions Wulfstan makes to intensify the depravity of the heathen gods do. Wulfstan's decorum, it would seem, took priority over even his insistent didacticism, and the violation of this principle in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos suggests an extraordinary degree of indignation at the evils of the nation.

DE SEPTIFORMI SPIRITU

A number of Wulfstan's alterations to Ælfric's De Septiformi Spiritu, as Jost pointed out, illustrate Wulfstan's lexical and grammatical preferences,³ but the majority, like those made to De Falsis Diis, appear to have been made in order to facilitate the comprehension of his auditors and to be changes in meaning which afford more precise and extensive instruction than Ælfric's composition gives. There are few alterations which appear to have been made solely to modify the rhythmical and alliterative pattern of Ælfric's prose, as De Septiformi Spiritu is not written in the semi-poetical style Ælfric employs in De Falsis Diis.

One group of Wulfstan's revisions relates parts of the discourse more closely and recalls points which have been made

¹ Wulfstanstudien, pp. 132-33.

² These are listed by Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 131-32.

³ Ibid., pp. 117-29

earlier in the sermon. In the sentence concluding the account of gifts sent by God, Wulfstan reiterates that these are seven in number (cf. se man þe bið bedæled ealra ðissa seofan gifa (52) with se man, þe bið bedæled eallum þissum gifum (58.7-8)).¹ The addition of þe we herbeforan ymbe sædan (59) to the sentence introducing the account of the vices disseminated by the devil and the addition of swa we ær cwædon (71) later in the account of the vices remind the audience of the contrast between the vices described and the description of the virtues bestowed by God in the first part of the sermon. To each sentence which defines one of the seven virtues, Wulfstan adds þurh Godes gyfe, which ensures that the essential aspect of the virtue is born in mind, and, in each sentence defining the seven vices, Wulfstan reminds the audience that the vices are the exact opposite of the virtues by adding the phrase þe of Godes agenre gyfe cymð.

In Ælfric's composition, the description of the first vice reads:

se wisdom is halig, þæs halgan gastes gifu, and se deofol forgifð þærtogeanes dysig, þæt he wisdomes ne gyme ne wislice ne libbe, and gyt þæt forcubre is, þæt he telle hine sylfne wisne, and bið swa gehiwod, swylce he wis sy. (59.2-6)

Ælfric neglects to specify the nature of he--the referent of the pronoun is his [the devil's] mannum, þe him gehyrsumjað and godes gyfa ne gymað (58.12-13), which appears in the sentence preceding Ælfric's list of the Latin names of the vices and their English equivalent. This slip is rectified by Wulfstan, who refers to the devil's victims as þæt unsælig man (73), a description which recalls his earlier definition of those who heed the devil as þam mannum þe ungesælice him gehyrsumiað (60). It is only in the first of Ælfric's definitions of the seven vices that the phrase and gyt þæt forcubre is introduces the description of the illusion

¹Page and line numbers for Ælfric's De Septiformi Spiritu refer to Napier's edition.

of virtue which accompanies the vice, but Wulfstan adds a phrase similar to this (usually 7 eac gedeð þæt gyt wyrse is) to all seven definitions to impress upon his audience that the semblance of virtue is worse than vice itself.¹ The repetition of this phrase could also be classified as one of the revisions which give greater prominence to the didactic theme of the sermon, for Wulfstan's commentary on the significance of Ælfric's text begins:

Nis næfre nan wyrse yfel ne Gode laðre þonne þæt gehiwode yfel, forðan deofol sylf hit gefadað 7 gehywað to þam, þæt þæt ðincð foroft ærest ful þe eft wyrð full yfel 7 full biter on ende. (107-10)

This group of revisions which mark the connexions between ideas expressed in different parts of the sermon and emphasize the main points, illustrates Wulfstan's recognition of the form of presentation required in an oral address. The group can be extended to include his addition of And at the beginning of all the sentences defining the virtues and all those defining the vices, for this makes it clear to those hearing the sermon that particular groups of sentences are closely related in subject matter. Fowler remarks that Wulfstan uses and so frequently that it must be regarded as a sentence initiator, because if it is classified as a conjunction in analysing his syntax, the sentences are excessively long,² but and may also be regarded as one of the means by which Wulfstan links sentences related in subject matter to form larger oratorical units.³

Other revisions clarify or expand upon the instruction Ælfric gives. Ælfric's sentence introducing the description of the seven gifts of God reads:

¹He adds hwilum to the description of the two worst vices (75, 103), presumably to make it clear that not all vice is concealed under the appearance of virtue.

²JEGP, LXV, 14.

³See particularly pp. 54-55.

Ðas seofonfealdan gifa soðlice wunodon on urum hælende
 Criste eall be fullum þingum æfter þære menniscnysse
 swiðe mihtiglice, and se halga gast hy todælþ
 dæghwæmlice git godes halgum mannum be ðam, þe him
 gewurð, ælcum be his mæðe 7 his modes geornfulnysse.
 (57. 7-12)

Wulfstan alters this to:

Ðas seofanfealdan gyfa soðlice wæron on urum Drihtne be
 fullum ðingum, 7 se halga gast hi todælð dæghwamlice
 gyt cristenum mannum, ælcum be his mæðe 7 be his modes
 geornfulnesse, ealswa biscopas on biscpunge to Gode
 sylfum wilniað georne. (27-31)

Wulfstan adds the information that God's gifts require bishops
 as intermediaries. The alteration of godes halgum mannum to
cristenum mannum is presumably made because halig is normally
 only applied to those having particular sanctity (e.g., saints,
 prophets, clergy),¹ and æfter þære menniscnysse swiðe mihtiglice
 is possibly omitted to maintain the unity of the three Persons of
 the Trinity, for Ælfric's sentence could imply that they are
 separate.

It is primarily in the explanation of the virtues bestowed by
 God that Wulfstan makes alterations or additions. Wulfstan gives
 more specific instruction than Ælfric by the expansion of and se
ðe godes ege hæfð, ne forlæt he nan þing (58.7) to:

And se ðe Godes ege fulllice hæfð, ne forlæt he na
 fela þæs þe his sawle þearf bið to hæbbenne 7 to
 healdenne. (49-51)

He also adds ac bið aa gefædd on æghwylce wisan, swa þæt he ne
bið ne on gefean to fægen ne on wean to ormod (40-41) and ne mid
worde ne mid weorce (47-48) to make the definition of God's gifts
 more precise. Two other revisions made in the definition of the
 seven virtues emphasize the need for obedience to God's will, the
 addition of 7 symle smeað hu he Gode gecweman mæge (33) and the
 alteration of:

¹See Dodd, A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies, p. 116.

se man, þe bið bedæled ealum þissum gifum, nis he
na godes man ne to gode belimpð, butan he get
geearnige godes gife æt him (58.7-10)

to:

se man þe bið bedæled ealra ðissa seofan gifa, nis
he na Gode wyrð ne to Gode belimpð, ne he næfre Gode ne
geþyhð butan he ær his ende geearnige þæt betere 7
Godes willan þurh sum ðing gewyrce. (51-55)

Wulfstan's substitution of gewent for awent and the addition of
the adjective god to andgyt in the sentence se hæfð angit, þe
hit awent to gode and to his drihtnes willan mid godum/^{weorcum}symblye
(57.13-14) are also revisions which make the meaning of his source
more precise, for awent has associations with perversion (BT, "to
turn away or off, avert, remove, to turn upside down, turn, change,
translate, pervert") and is therefore more suitable to describe
the influence of the devil than that of God, and andgyt is morally
neutral (BT, "understanding, intellect, knowledge").

The most significant and numerous revisions are those which
relate to the main didactic theme of Wulfstan's sermon. The first
section of Wulfstan's commentary which follows his revision of
Ælfric's De Septiformi Spiritu emphasizes that the worst evil
of all is that which is disguised as virtue, for it is the func-
tion of the devil to make men believe that evil is good; in other
words, he brings about what may be called an inversion of values.
The commentary begins:

Nis næfre nan wyrse yfel ne Gode laðre þonne þæt
gehiwode yfel, forðan deofol sylf hit gefadað 7
gehywað to þam, þæt þæt ðincð foroft ærest ful god
þe eft wyrð full yfel 7 full biter on ende. (107-10)

Later he states:

And to fela manna eac is nu on ðissere swicelan worulde
þe ealswa to swyðe þurh hiwunge eal oðer specað oþer hy
þencað 7 lætað þæt to wærscype þæt hy oðre magan swa
swicollice pæcan; ac eal þæt cymð of deofle, ðeah hy
swa ne wenan. (120-24)

Wulfstan explains that Christ and Antichrist are directly opposed powers and that Antichrist's teachings are the exact reverse of those of Christ. The use of the syntactic parallelism and the use of the root words, soð and lust, in different compounds in the comparison heightens the sense that the two powers are in opposition and that Antichrist is the inversion of truth and goodness:

Crist ælmihtig lærde georne soðfæstnysse 7 anfealdnesse
7 þæt gehwa synnluste fæste wiðstode, 7 Antecrist lærð
unsoðfæstnysse 7 swicolnesse 7 þæt gehwa his luste
georne fulgange. (129-33)

Because Wulfstan conceives of the universe as a conflict between two antithetical forces, he views those who do not follow the laws of God as followers of the devil's laws, or, more specifically, as those who erect their desires to a moral code at the instigation of the devil:

And soð is þæt ic secge, mid eal swylcan laran Antecrist
cwemeð 7 laðlice forlæreð ealles to manege. Forðam nis
æfre ænig lagu wyrse on worulde þonne hwa folgie
eallinge his luste, 7 his lust him to lage sylfum gesette.
(143-47)

The net-work of ideas expressed in Wulfstan's commentary derive ultimately from II Thess. iii, in which it is stated that

the man of sin opposeth and exalteth himself above all
that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that
he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself
to be God,

and that Christ's coming follows

all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that
perish, because they received not the love of truth
that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall
send them a strong delusion that they should believe a
lie: That they might be damned who believe¹ not the
truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.¹

It represents Wulfstan's most explicit discussion of two of the preoccupations which inform his sermons, the antithetical nature

¹Authorized Version, vs. 4, 10-12.

of God and the devil and their struggle for the souls of men, and the deceptions practised by the devil.¹ The view implicit in his commentary in De Septiformi Spiritu, that the devil produces an inversion of values, is an extension of his insistence upon the deceptive nature of the devil and the contrast between the two powers, for if the devil is by definition the antithesis of God (especially as he is all falseness and God all truth) it follows that his teachings invert the tenets of Christianity and his influence brings about a state of affairs in which all things are the opposite of what they appear to be and ought to be.²

The views Wulfstan expresses in the conclusion he composed for De Septiformi Spiritu are reflected in the revisions he makes of Ælfric's text. Ælfric's composition gives an account of the seven virtues which are the gift of God and the seven vices propagated by the devil, and the parallelism of the two sections emphasizes the contrast between the two powers. Wulfstan heightens the parallelism between the two sections to emphasize the contrast and opposition between God and the devil. Among the revisions by which this is accomplished is the addition of þurh Godes gyfe to each of the definitions of the seven virtues and the addition of þe of Godes agenre gyfe cymð to each definition of the vices, and minor additions such as dæghwamlice in the statement that the devil distributes his ungifa to man (60), which results in a closer parallel between this statement and the earlier assertion that se halga gast hi [the gifts] todælo dæghwamlice (28). Wulfstan heightens the contrast between vice and virtue where ever possible by the use of the same root word for each, with a negative affix to indicate vice. Ælfric's

¹See further my discussion of II, IV, V, VI, XII, XX.

²Wulfstan develops this theme in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. See further pp. 370-74.

dysig oððe dwæsnys (58.15, 59.4), which is the opposite of wisdom, is consistently replaced by unwisdom (64, 72) and Wulfstan gives wacmodnys (66, 86) as the opposite of modes strencoðe instead of abroðennyss oððe nahtnyss (58.17, 59.12). Wulfstan follows Ælfric in giving stuntnys, the opposite of andgyt, as the English equivalent to stultitia (65), but in the detailed explanation he replaces it by andgytleste (78). In place of leas in can him gescead betwux soð and leas (58.1-2) Wulfstan has unsoðe (44): leas appears infrequently in Wulfstan's compositions, but his preference for unsoðe appears to be a reflection of his tendency to think in terms of antitheses, and not a peculiarity of usage.¹

The most extensive alteration Wulfstan makes to one of Ælfric's sentences is the expansion of nu hæfð se yfela gast and se ungesewenlica feond seofonfealde ungifa wiðerræde þissum gifum (58.10-11) to :

Nu hæfð se yfela gast 7 se ungesawenlica feond
herongean seofonfealde ungifa þæt syn unþearfa
manegra manna 7 ða syndan wiðerræde mid ealle on
ælce wisan þyssum godum Godes gyfum, þe we herbeforan
ymbe sædan. (56-59)

All the additions Wulfstan makes emphasize the opposition between God and the devil. The contrast between the two powers is also emphasized in the additions he makes to the definition of wisdom Ælfric gives. By replacing Ælc wisdom is of gode, forðam þe god sylf is wisdom (58.20) with Ælc riht wisdom is cumen of Gode, forðam þe God sylf is se soða wisdom (67-68), Wulfstan stresses that the wisdom which is sent by God is true wisdom, in contrast to the falsity of the devil and his unwisdom.

¹Cf. And swa doð þa peodlogan ... þæt man cunne ... mid unsoðe soð oferswiðan (133-35) later in the sermon. Bethurum Homilies, p. 321 (note to 64), notes that Wulfstan was "fond" of compounds with un- in a pejorative sense.

Wulfstan also emphasizes the falseness involved in the semblance of virtue which accompanies the vices disseminated by the devil in almost every definition he gives of the ungifa. Examples of this, with Wulfstan's additions indicated by underlining are:

bið eac for oft swa gehiwod licetere (75-76)
 se man þurh licentende hiwunge (79)
 se man þurh lease hiwunge (83)
 þæt he ðeah swicollice hiwige (99)
 sume men beoð swa gehiwode liceteras (104-5)

The deception which characterizes all that is associated with the devil is further emphasized by the combination of swicdom with unwisdom (72, 77). To all of Ælfric's descriptions of the vices which spring from the devil, Wulfstan adds a clause indicating the true nature of those who conceal evil under the appearance of virtue. The additions this involves are as follows:

byð þeah smeagende oftor ymbe swicdom þonne ymbe wisdom (76-77)
 þe lytel can to gerade 7 to gode on ænige wisan (80-81)
 þe rædes ne gymeð mid ænigum gerade (84-85)
 þe nah on his heortan ænigne cufscype (89-90)
 þe nat na mycel gescad æniges gerades (94)
 7 under þam leaslican hiwe swiðost gederige (100)
 7 bið eal heora ingeþanc mid fracode afylled (105-6)

By means of these additions which emphasize the contrast between the actual nature and the appearance of the followers of the devil, greater prominence is given to the deception practised by the devil and the impression that he produces a complete inversion of moral values is strengthened. Finally, the addition of ne Godes lage healdað, ac fyligeað heora luste 7 idelum gewille in the statement that the devil

dælð dæghwamlice þam mannum þe ungesælice him gehyrsumiað 7 Godes gyfa ne gymað ne Godes ege nabbað ne Godes lage healdað, ac fyligeað heora luste 7 idelum gewille (59-62)

connects Wulfstan's revision of Ælfric's text more closely to his commentary, for it indicates that those who follow the teachings of the devil have transferred their allegiance from the laws of God to those of his adversary, something which Wulfstan condemns strongly in the conclusion of his sermon (143-47).

CONCLUSION

Wulfstan's revision of De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu has been viewed as a metrical transformation and an illustration of the manner in which he imposed the characteristic features of his style and usage upon his sources. Bethurum, for instance, remarks:

In XII, as in IX, Wulfstan rewrote one of Ælfric's homilies, changing it by the addition of his characteristic intensives and tautological compounds, and by the omission of some parts, in the interest partly of condensation, partly of decorum.... Probably the most important alteration is the almost inevitable change in Ælfric's rhythm and alliterative pattern, for this is proof of how conscious Wulfstan was of his own rhythm and how insistent upon it.¹

A detailed examination of the revision, however, provides further evidence in support of the view that Wulfstan was concerned to impart instruction in a clear and intelligible form and that he was not primarily concerned with imposing his stylistic mannerisms upon his sources, as studies of his sermons have implied. The metrical transformation he makes of his sources is a transformation into an approximation of normal prose, not a particular kind of two-stress rhythmical pattern, but this was not the main reason for his revisions. The majority of his revisions reveal him to be a painstaking teacher, aware of the clarity and emphasis required to assist his auditors to follow his addresses. Many of the

¹Homilies, p. 333.

changes he makes are changes in meaning in order to give more comprehensive and precise instruction than that given in his sources, and in order to bring his sources into accord with his own theological views. There are, of course, revisions which illustrate his grammatical and lexical preferences, but even his lexical preferences can, in some instances, be related to his didactic purposes and theological views. So too can some of the characteristic features of his style: the intensives and word pairs often emphasize ideas which are given prominence by Wulfstan's other revisions (e.g., the addition of swyðe and georne and the word pairing in gescop 7 geworhte in De Falsis Deis, noted on p. 198).

Wulfstan's De Septiformi Spiritu and De Falsis Deis are not original compositions as the remainder of his sermons thought to have been based on compositions by Ælfric are. Both of the passages he revises, however, are transformed into sermons unified by the didactic significance he discerned in his source material. In De Septiformi Spiritu his revisions emphasize the didactic themes which he elaborates upon in the commentary he added, and in De Falsis Deis the passage Wulfstan selected from Ælfric's composition is made into a self-contained sermon which propounds a theme in which Wulfstan was particularly interested.

PART II

THE BIBLICAL PARAPHRASES

CHAPTER I
SECUNDUM MATHEUM AND
VERBA EZECHIEL[IS] PROPHET[A]E

The sermons which I classify as biblical paraphrases are as follows: Secundum Matheum (II, pp. 119-22); De Visione Isaie Prophetae and Verba Hieremiae Prophetae (XI, pp. 211-20); Verba Ezechiel[is] Prophet[ae] (XVIIb, pp. 240-41); and Be Godcundre Warnunge (XIX, pp. 251-54).¹ II and XI are preceded in the manuscripts by the verses which they paraphrase. In XIX, the Latin source, part quotation and part summary of Lev. xxvi, follows an exhortation in English which opens the sermon. XVIIb has no Latin prologue, but it paraphrases a Latin compilation which survives in a manuscript closely connected with Wulfstan (XVIIa, p. 239).² The compilation in XVIIa contains some sentences from a letter by Boniface,³ but the bulk of XVIIb consists of biblical paraphrase (5-26). In this preliminary chapter, I shall deal briefly with II and the portion of XVIIb which is based on biblical verses (XVIIa. 4-14).

The passage from Matthew on which II is based constituted the lesson for the third Thursday in Lent,⁴ so that Wulfstan need not necessarily have been responsible for appending the Latin quotation to his sermon. He must, however, have been responsible for inserting the Latin in XIX, since the English sermon explicitly refers to the quotation, and the Latin summary is presumably his work. The Latin compilation in XVIIa and the collection of verses drawn from various chapters of the prophetic books mentioned in the rubrics of XI is explicable only if one assumes that

¹The manuscript rubrics are abbreviated for convenience.

²See Bethurum, Homilies, p. 6.

³For a discussion of the sources from which XVIIa is drawn, see Jost, Wulfstanstudien, pp. 63-69.

⁴See Bethurum, Homilies, p. 286.

Wulfstan intended them to serve as the basis for his sermons.¹ It seems hardly probable that Wulfstan, having compiled Latin outlines specifically for these three sermons, would not have worked directly from them in composing his sermons. He would almost certainly have referred to his biblical source when he composed II also, for the sermon is a fairly close translation of the verses from Matthew quoted in the manuscripts at the beginning of it.

Wulfstan's method of presenting the teachings of the scriptures differs from the one most commonly employed by his contemporaries. In Ælfric's homilies, which best exemplify the technique of symbolic interpretation, a continuous passage of scripture (usually the lesson for the day) is normally translated more or less literally at the beginning. The full meaning of the passage is then explained by variously interpreting small segments of the quotation, any obscurities or misconceptions to which the literal translation may give rise being removed in the process of interpreting. Wulfstan's sermons consist almost entirely of paraphrases of scriptural passages, and there is virtually no explanation or interpretation. With the exception of II, his sermons are not based on a continuous passage of scripture--part of XIX is based on a highly selective summary of Lev. xxvi, and XI and XVIb are based on a selection of verses which are loosely related in subject.

All of the passages which Wulfstan selects as the basis of his biblical sermons are in the form of direct speech. XI, XVIb, and XIX are based on passages containing the warnings of God or his prophets to the people of Israel, and II paraphrases Christ's

¹For the argument in favour of XVIa as a compilation specifically designed for XVIb, see Jost, loc. cit.

warning to his disciples concerning the Last Days. In XI, XVib, and XIX, Wulfstan retains the form of direct speech, so that the words of the scripture which God spoke through his prophets to the people of Israel become in effect the words of God addressed directly to the English nation. The impression that Wulfstan speaks, like the prophets of old, inspired by God to turn a sinful nation on the brink of destruction from the error of its ways, is particularly strong in XIX, in which Wulfstan inserts he [God] cwæð only once, near the beginning of his paraphrase. Occasionally he adopts the words of the prophets as his own: in XVib, for instance, Gehyrað git, hirdas, Godes word georne (13) is a translation of Exech. xxxiv.9, but, since the imperative is not attributed to Ezechiel, it appears to be Wulfstan's own exhortation. It is clear from Sermo Lupi ad Anglos that Wulfstan found the role of prophet of doom to a sinful nation congenial as well as appropriate to the times in which he lived--the Liber Eliensis, it is interesting to note, records that he was frequently summoned to the highest affairs of the realm, as being the most learned of counsellors, in whom spoke the very wisdom of God, as if in some spiritual temple.¹ The form in which he presents the teaching of the scriptures in his Old Testament sermons is one which makes them immediately relevant to his audience, and their prophetic force would have been weakened by the insertion of explanations and interpretations of the meaning of the Vulgate verses.

The presentation of the words of Christ to his apostles in II is more varied than the presentation of the Old Testament passages. Wulfstan begins by rendering the direct speech of the Gospel as indirect speech (31-36), but in

¹Liber Eliensis, lib. II, cap. 87 (ed. E.O. Blake, Camden Third Series, Vol. XCII, London, 1962, p. 156).

Ða andwyrde he heom 7 cwæð þæt hy ðearfe ahtan
 þæt hi wære wurdan þæt hy ænig man to swicollice
 ne bepæhte mid leaslicre lare 7 mid egeslican
 gylpe; forðam, he cwæð, þæt mænig wyrð þe gyt
 cimeð on uferan tidan þe leaslice leogeð 7 egeslice
 gylpeð, namað hine sylfne 7 hiwað to gode, swylce
 hit Crist sy (37-42)

the second clause hovers between direct and indirect speech, for a construction such as "He said that this was because ..." is required for indirect speech. The sentence ends with direct speech in ac secge þæt he secge, he cwæð, ne gelyfe ge him æfre (42), despite the fact that the words have little in common with the last clause of the Vulgate sentence Wulfstan is translating, et multos seducent. The words of Christ in the two sentences which follow this are presented as indirect speech (43-48), but the application of Christ's warning is broadened by the use of the pronoun man instead of hi referring to the disciples. Wulfstan then reverts to direct speech in And þæt beoð þa angin, he cwæð, þara sarnessa þe mannum beoð towerd (48-49). After the sentence Wulfstan interpolates in explanation of the approaching sorrows, he omits the attribution of the Gospel paraphrases to Christ, so that the latter part of the sermon appears to be Wulfstan's own words addressed directly to the audience. The words of Christ to his disciples are even explicitly presented as Wulfstan's own exhortation to his audience in his translation of Matt. xxiv.14:

And an þing ic eow secge gyt to gewisse, þæt witod
 sceal geweorðan godspel gecyþed geond ealle woruld
 ær worulde ende, þæs þe bec secgað, 7 syððan wyrð se
 ende swa raðe swa þæt God wile. (57-60)

The change in the form of presentation towards the end of the sermon does not appear to result from a recognition of the inexactness with which the paraphrases represent the words of Christ, for, on the whole, the latter part of the sermon is closer to the Latin than the first half is. The uncertainty Wulfstan manifests in this sermon as to the most suitable form in

which to present the words of Christ to his disciples, and his final choice of direct address to the audience, together with the occasional lapses into direct speech in the first part of the sermon and the rather awkward attempts to give a more exhortatory tone to the warnings (e.g., cwæð þæt hy ðearfe ahtan þæt hi wære wurdan (37-38) in the paraphrase of Videte ne quis uos seducat), reveal that he felt direct speech to be the most effective form in which to present the prophetic warnings of the Vulgate and to convey that they were applicable to his own audience as well as the audience to which they were addressed historically.

Because Wulfstan prefers to present passages of scripture as direct exhortations to his audience and avoids digressive explanations, he translates very freely in some cases in order to avoid obscure or potentially misleading statements. The figurae sententiarum of the scriptures, in particular, are rarely reproduced in his biblical sermons. An instance of interpretative paraphrase instead of literal translation of a figurative expression occurs in XVIb, in which Wulfstan paraphrases sanguinem eius de manu tua requiram (Ezech. xxxiii.8)³ as þu scealt þa sawle bitere forgildan (11). Wulfstan's treatment of this verse is in marked contrast to Ælfric's, for in translating the same verse in the Preface he has "... ic wille ofgan at ðe his blod," þæt is his lyre.¹ Wulfstan not only interprets the figure but reformulates in order to suppress the implication of revenge exacted by God, this being a subject on which he appears particularly concerned to avoid misconceptions.² It is possibly his desire to avoid depicting God as a wrathful avenger which accounts for the fact that the opening words of the verse, Si me dicente ad impium Impie, morte morieris, are lacking in XVIa and the paraphrase in XVIb (9-11), despite the fact that it is this clause which gives

¹Thorpe, I, 6.27.

²See Pt. I, ch. IV, Pt. II, chs. II and III.

³See XVIa. 6-7. The Vulgate adds *autem*.

point to the injunction laid upon the messengers of God to make his words known.

Wulfstan frequently departs even more radically than this from the literal meaning of the Vulgate verses in his paraphrases, particularly in XI and XIX. In translating and interpreting, he alters, adds, and omits, bringing the words of the scripture into closer accord with his chosen theme, emphasizing teachings of particular importance, and making the warnings contained in the passages he paraphrases more persuasive and forceful. If Wulfstan did make use of Ælfric's compositions, he reworked them in much the same way as he reworked the scriptural extracts. His transformation of his biblical sources involves less substantial omissions and additions and less extensive reorganization than his putative reworking of Ælfric's compositions, since he had first selected biblical passages to serve as more or less satisfactory outlines for his four sermons.

In II, Wulfstan follows the biblical verses more closely than he does in XI, XVIIb and XIX but it is by no means a literal translation. The passage on which it is based (Matt. xxiv.1-14, 36, 42) describes some of the signs heralding the Second Coming¹ and concludes with a warning to prepare for Christ's reappearance. This selection of verses provides Wulfstan with an outline for a sermon with a theme and structure similar to Secundum Lucam (III, pp. 123-27),² and in II as in III, Wulfstan endeavours to impress upon his audience the imminence of the Last Days and the terrors and dangers they hold. This involves a number of alterations and additions to

¹The signs which are not included in II are dealt with by Wulfstan in Secundum Lucam (III, pp. 123-27) and Secundum Marcum (V, pp. 134-41).

²See pp. 318-20.

his source. In v. 6 it is stated that wars and rumours of wars are not to occasion distress, because these must come to pass and are not signs of the end of the world:

Audituri autem estis prelia et oppiniones preliorum.
Videte ne turbemini; oportet enim hec fieri, sed
nondum est finis.

Wulfstan's English version gives this a somewhat different meaning:

And he sæde þæt mycle gewin scoldan geweorðan ær
ðam ende wide on worulde, 7 lærde þeah þæt man to
wacmod þonne ne wurde 7 cwæð þæt se ende þonne gyt
nære eallunga gehende. (43-45)

The wars become a thing to be feared, because men are instructed not to be to wacmod, and the statement to the effect that they must eventuate but do not signify that the end is at hand is not offered in explanation of the instruction--oportet enim hec fieri is not included in the paraphrase, and the words 7 cwæð þæt se ende þonne gyt nære eallunga gehende constitute a separate point regarding the mycle gewin, not a reason for not being afraid. The addition of eallunga gehende emphasizes the speed with which the end approaches, as does the addition of swa raðe swa þæt God wile in the translation of v. 14:

And an þing ic eow secge gyt to gewisse, þæt witod
sceal geweorðan godspel gecyþed geond ealle woruld
ær worulde ende, þæs þe bec secgað, 7 syððan wyrð
se ende swa raðe swa þæt God wile. (57-60)

(There are also a number of additions throughout the translation which stress the fact that the world is to end: on uferan dagum (32), on uferan tidan (40), ær ðam ende (43), and ær worulde ende (48, 59).) V. 36, which reads:

Verumptamen diem illam et horam nemo scit, neque
angeli celorum nisi Pater solus,

is not entirely in keeping with the sermon's urgency regarding the imminent end. One could indeed derive some comfort from the statement that the hour of Christ's Second Coming is known

only to God. Wulfstan does not imitate the rhetorical emphasis of the Latin, but his translation does not alter the meaning:

And swa þeah hwæðere nis se man cn eorðan ne se encgel
on heofonan þe wite þæne andagan butan Gode sylfum. (60-62)

In the paraphrase of v. 42, however, which immediately follows the translation of v. 36, Wulfstan firmly dispels any encouragement to back-sliding which v. 36 might offer, by the clause he adds at the end of the paraphrase. V. 42 reads Quapropter uigilate, quia nescitis qua hora Dominus uester uenturus sit.

Wulfstan's paraphrase reads:

And ðy man sceal wacigean 7 warnian symle þæt man
gears weorðe huru to ðam dome, weald hwænne he us
to cyme, we witan mid gewisse þæt hit þærto nealæcð
georne. (62-64)

His paraphrase makes explicit the didactic point of this verse (in þæt man gears weorðe huru to ðam dome), and he adds a peroration reminding his audience of the question which must be answered when Christ delivers judgement (65-69).

Other additions and alterations are made to emphasize the dangers of Antichrist's reign, particularly the prevalence of deception, which Wulfstan forcefully warns his audience against in other sermons (notably Ib and IV). Vs. 4 and 5--

Et respondens Iesus dixit eis: Videte ne quis uos
seducat. Multi enim uenient in nomine meo dicentes:
Ego sum Cristus; et multos seducent--

are expanded to

Ða andwyrde he heom 7 cwæð þæt hy ðearfe ahtan
þæt hi wære wurdan þæt hy ænig man to swicollice
ne beþæhte mid leaslicre lare 7 mid egeslican gylpe;
forðam, he cwæð, þæt mænig wyrð þe gyt cimeð on
uferan tidan þe leaslice leogeð 7 egeslice gylpeð,
namað hine sylfne 7 hiwað to gode, swylce hit Crist sy;
ac secge þæt he secge, he cwæð, ne gelyfe ge him
æfre. (37-42)

It is noticeable that in dealing with these verses, which refer to a danger Wulfstan was particularly concerned to warn against, he appears to find indirect speech especially inadequate to

convey the significance of the gospel prophecy.

The only explicit interpretation of the translation Wulfstan gives in this sermon introduces a reference to the afflictions which precede the coming of Antichrist (49-52). This is followed by

Forðam þonne wyrð ehtnes grimlic 7 sorhlic cristenes
folces, 7 æghwar beoð laðe 7 to andsæte þa ðe God
lufiað, (52-54)

which represents vs. 9-10, if Wulfstan is still following the quotation:

Tunc tradent uos in tribulationem et occident uos,
et eritis odio omnibus gentibus propter nomen meum.
Et tunc scandalizabuntur multi et inuicem tradent
et odio habebunt inuicem.

Bethurum remarks:

If Wulfstan intends this [52-54] as a translation of the Latin in 19-20 [v. 10], as the order of the homily indicates,¹ he probably did not understand scandalizabuntur.

I take it that she is not suggesting that the Archbishop's knowledge of Latin was faulty, but that he was puzzled by the appearance of the word in v. 10, and his puzzlement prompted him to rephrase the verse. It would perhaps be more accurate to say that Wulfstan has altered the meaning of vs. 9-10 in order to bring them into accord with his didactic preoccupations: that is, he has interpreted the verses as a reference to the persecution of Christians by the fore-runners of Antichrist, which he mentions in other sermons which deal with the signs heralding the approach of the Last Judgement.² Although the persecutions are not specifically attributed to Antichrist's ministers in 52-54, it is clear from the context of these lines, which follow a reference to the afflictions that

¹Homilies, p. 286 (note to 52-54).

²See particularly *Ib.* 13-22.

take place before the reign of Antichrist, and which precede a description of the swiciende licceteras who deceive many, that the persecution and hatred of those who love God is the work of the false Christs who prepare for Antichrist's reign.¹

In II, then, Wulfstan transforms a passage of biblical scriptures into a sermon which conforms to his own didactic preoccupations and method. He adds a passage in order to bring his sermon to a hortatory conclusion (65-73). He also omits material which is irrelevant to his theme; II contains no parallel to v. 12 (Et quoniam habundabit iniquitas refrigescet caritas multorum), since Wulfstan is concerned with the concrete manifestations of the Second Coming in this sermon, and he omits the narrative details which have no significance in translating vs. 1 and 3. His alterations to his source are not extensive, but he changes and interprets the meaning of verses where necessary to make them consistent with his didactic aims.

In XVIIb, the alterations to the scriptural source are more considerable than those found in II. The opening sentence, which introduces the theme of the exhortation (Ezechiel se witega lærð Godes bydelas þæt hi beorgan heom silfum wið Godes yrre (5-6), is followed by a paraphrase of Ezech. xxxiii.7-8. XVIa quotes only Fili hominis, speculatorem posui te domui Israel from v. 7, but the sermon quotes Audiens ex ore meo sermonem adnuntiabitis eis ex me (7-8), and Wulfstan's paraphrase in 8-9 is based on these words. He states, Cyð swiðe georne, he cwæð, Godes word wide þe of Gode silfum æror asprungon. Wulfstan does not refer to the words heard at God's mouth, but the words þe of Gode silfum æror asprungon, and the exhortation directs that these words be made known wide. By a few slight

¹In IV. 43-49, Antichrist is said to use force as well as deception to gain the allegiance of mankind.

adjustments, then, the words from v. 7, which are God's instruction to Ezechiel to convey his warning to the people of Israel, are converted to an exhortation suited to the priests Wulfstan is addressing.

V. 8 appears in an abbreviated form in XVIa:

si non adnuntiaueris iniquo iniquitatem suam,
sanguinem eius de manu tua requiram. (5-7)

The Vulgate verse reads:

Si me dicente ad impium: Impie, morte morieris, non fueris locutus ut se custodiat impius a via sua, ipse impius in iniquitate ^{sua} morietur, sanguinem autem ejus de manu tua requiram.

Some of the features of Wulfstan's paraphrase of v. 8 I have commented on earlier in this chapter. Ælfric translates v. 8 in the latter part of his Preface to the Catholic Homilies as

"Gif þu ne gestentst þone unrihtwisan, and hine ne manast, þæt he fram his arleasnyse gecyrrre and lybbe, þonne swelt se arleasa in his unrihtwisnyse, and ic wille ofgan æt ðe his blod," þæt is his lyre. (6.24-27)

In the latter part of the Preface, Ælfric is expounding, as Wulfstan is in XVIb, the need for priests to instruct their flocks. In the comparison of De Temporibus Anticristi and the Preface, it was noted that Wulfstan's sentences, in contrast to Ælfric's, tend to be simplified to one main point, which is clearly and effectively stated. A similar contrast is evident in their paraphrase of v. 8. Wulfstan paraphrases only the words which have bearing on his exhortation to priests to beorgan heom silfum wið Godes yrre. He makes no reference to the fate of the souls lost through lack of instruction and the point he makes is emphasized by the creation of synonymous parallel clauses:

7 gif þu sinfullan nelt synna gestiran 7 þam manfullan mandæda cyþan, þu scealt þa sawle bitere forgildan.
(9-11)

The stylistic devices which Wulfstan employs in this paraphrase are in marked contrast to the subdued lexical repetition in Ælfric's translation, which neatly unifies the first three clauses of his sentence, but Wulfstan's lack of subtlety illustrates his greater awareness of the form of expression most suited to oral exhortation. The obvious stylistic contrast between the final clause of Wulfstan's sentence and the coordinate parallel clauses renders the meaning more immediately comprehensible than it is in Ælfric's lengthier sentence with its more involved grammatical relationships, and the threat of punishment has greater force in Wulfstan's paraphrase because it emerges clearly as the climax of the sentence.

In 13-17, Wulfstan gives an interpretation of Ezech. xxxiv. 9-10. The verses appear in XVIa as

Propterea pastores audite uerbum Domini. Hec dicit
 Dominus: Ecce, ego ipse super pastores requiram
 gregem meum de manu eorum, et cessare eos faciam
 ut ultra non pascant nec gregem nec semet ipsos. (10-13)

Wulfstan states:

Gehyrað git, hirdas, Godes word georne: nu ic silf
 wille, he cwæð, on his dome witan æt þam hirdum hwi
 hi mine heorde swa wace begimdon, and a hi sculon
 ðanonforð wurðscipes þolian 7 deore agildan eal
 þæt hi forgimdon. (13-17)

His paraphrase of these verses, like his paraphrase of Ezech. xxxiii.8, is limited to one main point concerning the punishment of negligent shepherds. In the paraphrase of Ezech. xxxiii.8, it was noted earlier in this chapter, Wulfstan modifies the active wrath of God indicated in the scriptural verse, and a similar modification is made in his interpretation of v. 10. Instead of presenting the verse as God's avowal that he will actively deprive negligent shepherds of their flocks, Wulfstan interprets the verse as God's reference to the question he will ask negligent shepherds, and he describes the punishment of the

shepherds without reference to God's agency.

In commenting on Wulfstan's interpretation of v. 10, Bethurum notes that "the honour referred to is probably rank as a thane,"¹ but since the adverb a appears in the reference to loss of wurðscipe and Wulfstan speaks of the Judgement in his version of the verse, it would seem that the honour which is lost is admission to heaven (BT cites "what is honoured or prized, an excellent thing, a good" as one of the meanings of wurðscipe). The Vulgate text certainly lends itself to interpretation as a threat of punishment in the present life as well as the life hereafter. It is possible that Wulfstan employs wurðscipe, which has predominately secular associations, in order to suggest the loss of secular honour as well as spiritual honour, since his method of presenting the scriptures as direct exhortation precludes explicit explanation of the multiple meanings residing in a verse, but his interpretation is primarily eschatological.

The general sense of Wulfstan's interpretation of Ezech. xxxiv.10 in 14-17 is much the same as his paraphrase of Ezech. xxxiii.7-8 at the beginning of the sermon (8-11). That is, both passages warn that God's representatives who fail to care for his people will suffer for their negligence. So too does the sentence in 11-13, which translates Ezech. xxxiv.2. Ezech. xxxiv.2 appears in an abbreviated form in XIVa, as Ve pastori-
bus qui pascebant semet ipsos et non gregem Domini (7-8). In his translation of these words, Wulfstan retains the pastoral metaphor, but employs expressions which are less obviously figurative than pascebant:

¹Homilies, p. 350 (note to 16).

And wa þam hirdum, he cwæð, þe estað heom silfum
 swa heom betst licað 7 godcundre heorde ne gimeð
 to nahte. (11-13)

The warning that negligent shepherds will be punished is presented most forcefully in the paraphrase of Ezech. xxxiv.10 in 14-17, because Wulfstan's interpretation makes the verse an explicit description of the punishment inflicted at the Last Judgement. The threat of punishment in 14-17 is also more forceful than the ones contained in the sentences preceding it, because it is presented as the words spoken directly by God, whereas the earlier threats are presented as the words spoken by the prophet. The change of speaker for the third and most forceful warning is produced by Wulfstan's reshaping of his source. That is, Audiens ex ore meo sermonem adnuntiabitis eis ex me in v. 7 is God's instruction to Ezechiel, but Wulfstan presents the words as Ezechiel's instruction to priests, and the words spoken by God in Ezech. xxxiv.2 are also attributed to Ezechiel (11-13). God's words in Ezech. xxxiv.10, however, are attributed directly to God, being introduced by the exhortation Gehyrað git, hirdas, Godes word georne (13-14).

The roughly similar warnings in 8-17 are stylistically related. The sentence in 13-17 continues the pastoral metaphor introduced in 11-13, and both sentences contain hird and heorde. The verb giman appears in the sentence in 11-13, and it is repeated with different prefixes in the sentence in 13-17 to produce an instance of word play. The paronomasia emphasizes the shepherds' failure to carry out their duty (begimdon "cared for": forgimdon "neglected"). The last clause in the sentence in 13-17, 7 deore agildan eal þæt hi forgimdon, echoes the last clause of the sentence in 8-11, þu scealt þa sawle bitere forgildan.

The sentences in 8-17, I have intimated, repeat the same idea in various forms, adding additional information in the process of reformulation. They therefore conform to the mode of presentation which, it was noted in the discussion of De Temporibus Anticristi, is typical of Wulfstan. His mode of presentation is not unlike the technique of variation employed in Old English poetry. Specifically, it bears some resemblance to the form of variation described as "incremental pattern" by Bartlett.¹ Variation in the poetry is primarily a means of artistic embellishment, but it is probable that the stylistic feature originally recommended itself to poets who composed their work for oral delivery because it ensured that the concentration of the audience was not taxed too greatly. Wulfstan appears to have recognized that repetition and the gradual accretion of meaning were suitable for preaching. In XVIB. 8-17, he reshapes and combines verses or parts of verses compiled in XVIa to produce a rhetorical unit² in which the development of the theme conforms to his usual practice. A slight rearrangement of the order of the compilation is involved, since, in XVIa, Isa. lvi.10, which is paraphrased in the second half of the sermon, intervenes between Ezech. xxxiv. 2 and Ezech. xxxiv.10.

The other two verses which Wulfstan paraphrases in XVIB are combined in a similar manner. The metaphor of Ve sacerdotibus qui comedunt peccata populi³ is expanded in

¹See Adeline Courtney Bartlett, The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry, New York, 1935, pp. 46-91. Bartlett notes that the incremental groups are logical units and usually have parallel structure as well as "other verbal echoes." Wulfstan's rhetorical units are not usually marked by parallel structure, but verbal repetition is common.

²For the definition of Wulfstan's rhetorical units, see pp.54-55.

³Not a Vulgate verse, but a combination of Ezech. xxxiv.2 and Osee 4.8 (see Jost, Wulfstanstudien, p. 64).

And wa þam hirdum, he cwæð, þe fretað 7 forswelgað
folces sinna; ðæt syndon þa gifran 7 þa heom geornan
þe worldþinga sindon ealles to georne, 7 folce ne
bisniað swa wel swa hi scoldon, ne rihtlice ne bodiað
swa oft swa hi scoldon, ac clummiað mid ceaflum þar
hi scoldan clipian (17-22)

to a condemnation of the greed of the shepherds and their failure to instruct their charges, both condemnations being linked in the final clause, ac clummiað mid ceaflum þar hi scoldan clipian (i.e., their mouths are so full of the worldly things for which they are greedy that they are able only to mumble the warnings which they should cry aloud). The reference to the messengers who mumble with their jaws links Wulfstan's interpretation of this metaphor to the verse he quotes immediately after it, Canes muti non ualentes latrare (Isa. lvi.10). The verse is not translated literally but paraphrased as Ealswilce he cwæde þæt gemidlede hundas ne beorcað to nahte (23-24) in order to connect it more explicitly with the mumbling of jaws. Wulfstan then elaborates the words of Isaiah, transforming the statement into a condemnation related to the theme of his sermon:

Dumbe beoð þa bydelas 7 to fæste gemidlede þe for
ege oððe lufe oððe ænigre worldscame eargiað 7
wandiað Godes riht to sprecanne. (24-26)

It can be seen from an examination of Wulfstan's handling of his biblical source in II and in XVIb, as well as in XI and XIX, which are discussed in the following chapters, that Wulfstan does not simply translate, deviating from literalness to secure "characteristic" stylistic effects.¹ His didactic aims

¹Cf. Bethurum's comment on XI: "Characteristic parallelisms of phrase and clause, often with alliteration, appear in the manipulation of the translation . . . Wulfstan's favourite phrases appear in gyrne se ðe wille, 99, 188; on unriht, 135; swa swa ge scoldan, 166; and in the frequent intensives. Several passages, notably 178-9, are carefully arranged to secure alliteration. This translation is quite a close one by Old English standards, its deviations from literalness being almost entirely the additions and rearrangements of the kind I have mentioned" (Homilies, p. 32).

lead him to take liberties with the words of the scriptures which Ælfric would surely have thought excessive, even though his own practice does not conform on all occasions to the principles of biblical translation he outlined in his Preface to Genesis:

we ne durren na mare awritan on Englisc þonne ðæt Leden hæfð, ne ða endebyrdnyse awendan, buton ðam anum, ðæt ðæt Leden 7 ðæt Englisc nabbað na ane wisan on ðære spræce fandunge.¹

Ælfric's insistence on the need for exact translation of the scriptures stems, of course, from the belief that they are divinely inspired and infinitely more profound in meaning than is superficially evident. While Wulfstan has not Ælfric's regard for the sanctity of the wording of the scriptures, it is clear from his biblical sermons that he was familiar with the techniques of non-literal interpretation, but he incorporates these directly into his paraphrases instead of giving separate explanations of a literal translation. His biblical sermons lack the imaginative ingenuity of Ælfric's exegetical homilies, but they constitute an original achievement, for, by his bold handling of the words of the scriptures, he transforms extracts from the Vulgate into unified sermons which bear the mark of his own didactic preoccupations and makes them directly relevant to his audience.

¹The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, p. 79, ll. 95-98.

CHAPTER II
DE VISIONE ISAIE PROPHETAE
 AND
VERBA HIEREMIAE PROPHETAE

The Old English section of XI consists of a paraphrase of extracts from Isaiah (pp. 214-19), followed by a passage based on verses from Jeremiah (pp. 219-20). Bethurum comments on it as follows:

The translation of passages from Isaiah and Jeremiah which make up this selection is unique among Wulfstan's papers, for it forms no well-rounded sermon, and, unlike XIX, which it otherwise resembles, it seems not to have been used elsewhere in his works, though some of the passages would have been appropriate in VIIIc and Xc. The most likely explanation for it is that Wulfstan early in his career selected these passages on various sins, because they offered him both a subject in which he was interested and an opportunity for an exercise in rhythmical composition. For the piece is unique also in the regularity of its rhythm and its approximation, in many lines, to regular heroic verse.¹

She then draws attention to the regular alliterative patterning of the piece, and explains her statement regarding the uniqueness of its rhythmical regularity:

Verse it is not, but it comes nearer than any other of Wulfstan's compositions to the form Einkenel described (Anglia, vii, Anzeigen, p. 200) when he said Wulfstan's Sermo ad Anglos was a poem. There are 55 lines in which the hemstichs are linked by alliteration, though four of these have three hemstichs instead of two. That is not, of course, the prevailing form. It is varied by alliteration that links line to line and by rhyme substituted for alliteration. Nor does the metrical pattern regularly fit Sievers's five types, or any other scheme of conventional Old English verse. But the two-stress pattern described by Professor McIntosh is so regular here and the prose dilution so slight that it comes nearer to being verse than, to take a modern comparison, much of the free verse of the early part of this century came to conventional poetry. If Wulfstan made these translations when he was rather young, he may have ignored them later because he found the poetic form inappropriate to sermons, and because his own characteristic rhythm took precedence over all other forms.

As I remarked in my discussion of McIntosh's theory, there appear

¹Homilies, pp. 331-32.

to be irreconcilable contradictions in Bethurum's remarks on the rhythm.¹ XI may or may not be rhythmically distinct from Wulfstan's other compositions, but I would conclude that the application of McIntosh's theory is not a satisfactory means of analyzing Wulfstan's prose rhythm. Even if XI was in some sense a rhythmical experiment, I do not think that we need assume that Wulfstan undertook the paraphrases primarily for the purpose of experimenting in rhythmical composition. If he had done so, he would surely have departed from his source only in cases where the nearest English equivalent to the Latin could not be shaped into rhythmical prose. In XI, as I shall show, Wulfstan alters the meaning of his Latin source, in some instances quite considerably, and he summarizes as well as adding passages which have no parallel in the Latin.

The considerable freedom with which Wulfstan translates his extracts from the prophets and the additions he makes are indications that he selected the passages for translation because he intended that they should serve a didactic purpose, and not simply because they dealt with a subject which interested him. It is true, as Bethurum remarks, that the translation of the prophets does not form a well-rounded sermon, but it has less of the appearance of an unfinished work if the selections from Isaiah and from Jeremiah are considered as two separate sections, as the ejaculatory perorations at the end of each, God us gehealde, amen (200) and He ure helpe 7 us geunne þæt we magan 7 motan his willan aredian, amen (232-34), suggest they should be. They are closely related by virtue of the fact that the prophecies to the Jewish nation of punishment for sin are delivered as a warning to the English nation, and it is this,

¹See pp. 189-90.

presumably, which explains their proximity in the manuscripts. They are not, however, identical in theme or technique, so that it need not be assumed that Wulfstan has grouped together passages from the two prophets which are similar in import, but failed to combine them into a single sermon.

From an examination of the relation of De Visione Isaie Prophetae and Verba Hieremiae Prophetae to the selections from the Vulgate which precede them, it can be seen that Wulfstan, by his additions and by reordering and altering the meaning, shapes his Latin source into two self-contained and consistent exhortations. The two pieces are probably not fully developed sermons, but the outline of a sermon similar in form to others he composed is clearly discernible in each, and Wulfstan may well have intended to expand them at a later date. It is not even entirely impossible that they were considered suitable for delivery in the form in which they appear in the manuscripts, though the paraphrase of verses from Jeremiah is certainly very short. The paraphrase of Isaiah seems fragmentary chiefly because it consists primarily of a series of apostrophes classified under separate rubrics, but these are all connected by the concluding refrain, Gyt Isaias forðor sæde ealswa hit aeode on forsyngodre beode, and Wulfstan may have felt this staccato warning to be an effective form of exhortation which approximated to the prophetic utterance.

I would see XI as stylistically somewhat different from other Wulfstan compositions because it contains a number of instances of conspicuous verbal repetition, such as:

God bereafað 7 reafian læteð (128)

þe taliað eow sylfe to ðeodwitan 7 witan þæt ge syndan
æbere manswican (152-53)

þæt hi ræd ne aredian (171-72)

þe ræreð unriht to rihte 7 undom demeð (177)

acsiað georne hu betst sy to farenne 7 farað
after þam wege (218-19).

As Bethurum remarks in her discussion of Wulfstan's style:

Wulfstan's homilies are the work of a skilled rhetorician and illustrate the teachings of the manuals of rhetoric which he must have studied.... All the figures of sound taught by the manuals of rhetoric appear in abundance.¹

It is noticeable, though, that prominent repetition is not common in his compositions, except in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, and there are few examples in his work of the figures which involve repetition of the same word or form in various combinations of initial, medial, or final positions in a clause or sentence: the example of gradatio which Bethurum gives, for example, we gelyfað þæt haligra gemana sy. Halige men habbað gemanan her on life,² is only an approximation to the classical figure, and this is typical of Wulfstan. He normally repeats the same root in various grammatical forms, and the examples of verbal repetition in XI given above differ from his usual practice only because the same root appears twice in a short phrase or at the end and the beginning of clauses. The dissimilarity of Wulfstan's verbal repetition and classical figures of sound reflects, to some extent, the differing resources of Old English and Latin, but his avoidance of elaborate and stylized repetition appears to be deliberate, for, in his paraphrase of Isaiah, coniungitis domum ad domum et agrum agro,³ is translated as lecgað togædere hamas 7 æhta (135) and the complex verbal patterning in Isa. v. 20, although perfectly feasible in Old English, is not reproduced. Isa. v. 20 reads:

¹Homilies, pp. 87-91.

²Ibid., p. 91.

³Biblical verses are quoted, in the following chapter, in the form in which they appear in the MSS compilation.

Vę qui dicitis bonum malum et malum bonum, ponentes
 amarum dulce et dulce in amarum, ponentes lucem
 tenebras et tenebras lucem.

Wulfstan paraphrases this as

Wa eow, he cwæð, þe taliað ungod to gode 7 god þing
 to yfele, biter ðing to swete 7 swete belæpað,
 hwyrfað niht to dæge 7 dægweorc to nihte. (157-60)

The verbal repetition in XI, together with features such as an instance of paronomasia more striking than most in Wulfstan's sermons, mægne 7 mænege (183), and the noticeable variation of word order in the second of the parallel clauses in oð þæt heora burga weorðan ælæte 7 weorðan heora eardas swyðe aweste (172-73), suggests to me a somewhat deliberate contrivance of stylistic effects. This does not appear to be the result of experimenting in the reproduction of Latin stylistic effects in English, for, despite the fact that rhetorical figures are comparatively numerous in Wulfstan's source, the influence of the Latin on his style is slight, most of the noticeable stylistic features being without parallel in the verses he paraphrases. A possible explanation is that Wulfstan considered a heightened style to be appropriate to the translation of the scriptures, for Bede seems to accord the style of the scriptures a special status in De Schematibus et Tropis. He states in the introduction:

But, my beloved child, in order that you and all who wish to read this work may know that Holy Writ surpasses all other writings not merely in authority because it is divine, or in usefulness because it leads to eternal life, but also for its age and artistic composition, I have chosen to demonstrate by means of examples collected from Holy Writ that teachers of secular eloquence in any age have not been able to furnish us with any of these figures¹ and tropes which did not first appear in Holy Writ.

It is Bede's belief, then, that the scriptures are superior to all other works in artistic composition, and he regards them as a

¹Translated by Gussie Hecht Tanrenhaus in "Bede's De Schematibus et Tropis: A Translation," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVIII (1962), 237-53.

storehouse of all possible figures. The style Wulfstan employs in II is a relatively plain one, but the Vulgate extract on which it is based lacks conspicuous rhetorical figures, and whereas II instructs and warns, Wulfstan attempts in XI to persuade his audience to act against its inclination, so that his purpose is one which Augustine described as requiring the "high" style.¹ Despite the fact that Wulfstan appears to be embellishing his paraphrases in XI more deliberately than he does in other compositions, however, the stylistic devices he employs are, as is usually the case in Wulfstan's compositions, primarily functional rather than ornamental, for they serve to give force and point to the meaning.

DE VISIONE ISAIE PROPHETAE

Wulfstan's introductory remarks in the paraphrase of the words of Isaiah, as in most of his sermons, give a clear statement of the didactic import of his address:

Fela is on bocum þæs ðe mæg to bysnan, gyne se ðe wille, him sylfum to ðearfe. An wæs on geardagum Gode wel gecweme, Isaias se witega þe Iudea folce fela foresæde, swa swa hit syððan soðlice aeode, 7 þæt mæg to bysne æghwylcere þeode. Isaias se witega geseah on gesyhðe, swa him God uðe, hu þære þeode for heora synnum scolde gelimpan. (99-104)

A similar interpretation of the scriptures as furnishing examples of the lesson that the sins of the nation are punished by the destruction of the land is found in Wulfstan's paraphrase of Lev. xxvi in XIX, in which an almost identical phrase appears, 7 eal hit mæg to bysne æghwylcere þeode, gyne se þe wille (83-84).

¹De Doctrina Christiana, IV. lxi. Wulfstan may not have read Augustine, but Rabanus Maurus' De Clericorum Institutione, which includes a résumé of De Doctrina Christiana, is among his sources.

It is characteristic of Wulfstan that he views the scriptures as moral exempla, for in VI and XVIII, which are based on biblical narrative, he is primarily concerned to impress the practical moral significance of the scriptures upon his audience, although he is clearly acquainted with other levels of interpretation.¹ Additional force is given to the threat to the nation contained in the prophecies of Isaiah by the reminder that they were fulfilled (cf. the refrain, Gyt Isaias furðor sæde, ealswa hit aeode on forsyngodre þeode). The same persuasive technique is employed in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, in which Wulfstan recalls the fulfilment of the prophecies of Gildas concerning the destruction of the land for the sins of the people (EI 176-86).²

For the first section of his address (106-17), Wulfstan selected Isa. i.2, part of 4, 7, and 15 (cf. 5-12) to serve as the basis of a clear and effective statement of Isaiah's prophecy of doom, without redundancies or digressions. Most of his hortatory sermons begin with an abrupt call for attention or an exhortation.³ Accordingly, the first of the verses in his extracts provides him with a striking imperative:

Gehyrað nu, he cwæc, heofonwaru 7 eorðwaru, hwæt
God sylfa sæde swytellicre segene. (106-7)

He does not attempt to reproduce in his translation the stylistic effects of the Latin, Audite, celi, et auribus percipe, terra, quoniam Dominus locutus est. The imperative is concentrated into

¹See Pt. I, chs. III and IV.

²Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, being the most topical of Wulfstan's addresses to the nation, is the only one which draws on national history for its exemplum, instead of scriptural. But Gildas' condemnation of the Britons in Liber Querulus de Excidio Britanniae is greatly influenced by the prophetic books, particularly Isaiah and Jeremiah, from which he quotes liberally. Among the passages he quotes are most of the verses which Wulfstan paraphrases in XI. Wulfstan's knowledge of Gildas was probably derived solely from Alcuin's letter to Æðelheard (see Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 363-64), but the preoccupations of the two writers are strikingly similar.

³Wulfstan's most effective opening is in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos (EI 7-11), Cf. IV. 3-4; VI. 21-22; XXI. 4-6.

a single word, and the parallelism is preserved only in the repetition of the second element of the compound in heofonwaru 7 eorðwaru, in which the metonymy of the source is replaced by literal description. In sum, the formal dignity of the Latin apostrophe is transformed to a direct and urgent imperative, both by the alterations to the construction and the addition of nu: the words of the prophet do not belong to the remote past, but are addressed to Wulfstan's immediate audience.

Wulfstan's only addition to the sentence is swytellicre segene. The addition is not redundant, for the scriptures in Wulfstan's view are not profoundly obscure as they are for Ælfric.¹ God's purpose is clearly evident, and it is only wilful blindness which prevents the nation from heeding such explicit warnings. The view is most fully and forcefully expressed in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos,² but it is also a significant aspect of the theme of De Visione Isaie Prophetae, and in both sermons repeated expressions such as gyrne se ðe wille³ do not appear to be rhetorical "set phrases" but a reflection of Wulfstan's preoccupation with the nation's blindness to obvious truth.⁴

In translating the remainder of the first verse in his compilation, Filios enutriui et exaltaui, ipsi autem spreuerunt me, Wulfstan alters only the style, employing a sentence which consists of three main clauses, the last of which contains a verb

¹A similar expression appears in the prefatory remarks to the paraphrase of Lev. xxvi in XIX, God sylf gedihte swutele bysne (6).

²See further Pt. III, ch. III.

³The phrase gyrne se ðe wille appears twice in XI, in 99 and 188. A variety of phrases such as gecnawe se þe cunne (EI 99) and gelyfe se þe wille (EI 85) appear in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.

⁴Cf. Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 18. Although phrases such as gyrne se ðe wille are listed as "characteristic" features of Wulfstan's style in her account of the criteria for determining his authorship, they rarely appear in compositions other than his addresses to the nation, XI, XIX, XX, and XXI.

phrase expansion:

Bearn ic afedde, he cwæð, 7 up hy arærde,
ac hi me forletan 7 swyðe ofersawan. (108-9)

The syntactic units are linked in pairs by the rhyme on the final unstressed syllables. In form, the sentence resembles Latin rhymed prose, since the identity of sound connecting pairs of short syntactic units in Latin rhymed prose could, according to medieval convention, be confined merely to the final unstressed endings of words.¹

Wulfstan's version of v. 4, which continues the description of the nation's abandonment of God (Dereliquerunt Dominum, blasphemauerunt sanctum Israel, abalienati sunt retrorsum) significantly alters both the style and the meaning of the Latin. The paraphrase reads:

Hy hyrwdan mid wordan þæt hy sceoldan herigean, 7
forletan on dædan þæt hy scoldan healdan, 7 naman
heom to ðeawan ælðeodige gewunan, 7 on bæc hwyrfdan
ealle heora wisan. (109-12)

The inflexional rhyme which Wulfstan introduces in his version of v. 2 is a noticeable feature of his paraphrase of v. 4: his sentence consists entirely of short syntactic units which end with the same sound, for the final ending of each main clause is -an, which also occurs midway in each clause before a noun phrase. The sentence could, then, be described as an instance of extended homoeoteleuton, which Bede describes as "a figure built on similar endings, that is, when the middle and final sections of a verse or thought end in the same syllable."² The first two main clauses of Wulfstan's paraphrase are linked by semantic and syntactic parallelism, which is more elaborate than the

¹See F.R. Lipp, "Ælfric's Old English Prose Style," SP, LXVI (1969), 702-3. For Wulfstan's approximation to Latin rhymed prose in XIX, see pp. 287-290.

²

Quoted from Tannenhaus's translation of De Schematibus et Tropis in Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVIII, 245.

parallelism found in the Latin version of v. 4. The parallelism is not merely a stylistic embellishment, for it gives expression to the two related aspects of faith to which Wulfstan frequently alludes, usually in the form of word 7 dæd. The two-fold rejection of righteousness described in this sentence also links it to the previous one and expands on the idea expressed in it (cf. hi me forletan 7 swyðe ofersawan).

Wulfstan's substitution of descriptive noun clauses for the name of God is indicative of his differing conception of the rebellion of the nation. The Vulgate accusation of rejection and contempt is transformed to a reference to the nation's inversion of values, for the contrast between hyrwdan and herigean and forletan and healdan is absolute, and the first of these semantic antitheses is emphasized by the alliteration. The clause which Wulfstan adds, 7 naman heom to ðeawan ælðeodige gewunan, makes it clear that he views the nation as having not simply rejected good but having embraced evil in its place. The metaphoric expression of the nation's abandonment of God in the final clause of v. 4 is given an abstract application in Wulfstan's paraphrase (7 on bæc hwyrfdan ealle heora wisan), so that it serves as a summary of the foregoing clauses and is an explicit statement of the view that the values of the nation are the direct opposite of what they should be.

The conception of the sins of the nation to which Wulfstan gives expression in the introductory section of his sermon largely determines the verses from Isaiah he selects and the form in which he paraphrases them in the indictment of specific sins which constitutes the body of the sermon. His view is not derived from his immediate source, though the Book of Isaiah as a whole may have influenced his view, since its general tenor is that evil has

become good and that all order is over-thrown. The significance which Wulfstan gives to Isa. i.4, however, is consistent with the theological views manifested in the compositions discussed in Part I. It can be seen from these that Wulfstan conceives only of moral extremes, of a choice between God and the devil who is in every way his exact opposite, so that to him the failure to love God and keep his laws is tantamount to idolatry, which is an inversion of truth and goodness attributed to the influence of the devil. Wulfstan's description of the sins of the nation may, then, be an application of his consistently-held view of the nature of evil.

It is in his paraphrase of Isaiah, it appears, that Wulfstan first formulated his conception of the essential nature of the nation's iniquities, for an expression similar to his version of Isa. i.4 appears in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos:

And þurh þæt þe man swa deð þæt man eal hyrweð þæt
man scolde heregian 7 to forð laðet þæt man scolde
lufian (EI 152-54)

There are a number of other instances of the use of verbal patterning to emphasize the replacement of good by evil in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, for Wulfstan's entire commination is permeated by this view.¹ A comparable expression, with the use of chiasmus to emphasize the inversion of the nation's values, also appears in XXI (pp. 276-77), which deals exclusively with this theme:

man oft herede þæt man scolde hyrwan 7 to forð
hyrweð þæt man scolde herian 7 laðette to swyþe
þæt man scolde lufian. (15-17)

XI is not, then, isolated from the main body of Wulfstan's work, as Bethurum suggests, for parallels in phrasing connect it to his other addresses to the nation, as well as to Polity.² The

¹ See further Pt. I, ch. III.

² The parallels are between: Polity IX. 86, IX. 91, X. 101; and XI. 177-78, 178-79, 122-23 respectively. (See Die "Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical," ed. K. Jost (Swiss Studies in English, XLVII), Bern, 1959, pp. 78, 80, 82.)

influence of the biblical paraphrase is not, however, confined to the adaptation of one of its sentences. Just as Wulfstan's paraphrase of Lev. xxvi in XIX provides a few specific details of the punishment of the nation for its sins in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, and there is a general similarity between God's threats to Israel in Lev. xxvi and the contemporary afflictions which Wulfstan describes in his best-known sermon, so, too, the paraphrase in XI provides some of the themes and motifs which occur in the indictment of the nation's sins in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, the Old Testament echoes giving a dire dimension to the contemporary details.¹

The paraphrase of v. 4 concludes Wulfstan's general description of the nation's iniquity. His next sentence in the first group of Vulgate extracts is a part of Isa. i.7--

Ideo terra uestra, ait Dominus, deserta, ciuitates uestre succense igni, regionem uestram coram uobis alieni deuorant--

which forms the basis of a threat of future punishment:

7 forðam sceal geweorðan, he cwæð, to soðe ic eow secge, eower eard weste 7 eac eowre burga mid fyre forbærnde. (112-14)

The Vulgate sentence lacks a verb, but it is clear from the context that the desolation of the land refers to an event of the past (cf. Isa. i.5-6, 8-9), for Isaiah's view is that

precisely because God's earlier blows did not succeed in their purpose of calling the nation to conversion ... there is now nothing² to look for but the penalty of total destruction.

Wulfstan therefore manipulates his source to serve his didactic purpose, since the threat of future destruction is parallel to

¹The parallels between Sermo Lupi ad Anglos and XIX are indicated by Whitelock in the notes to her edition and by Bethurum in her notes in Homilies. Only Jost remarks upon the relation of XI to Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, but the comparison is not pursued (see Wulfstanstudien, p. 202).

²W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. J.A. Baker, London, 1967, II, 433.

the contemporary English situation and is far more ominous than the statement of an accomplished fact.

Wulfstan, as is his custom, employs a passive verb to express the outcome of divine wrath: only once in the paraphrase (128) is a punitive action directly attributed to God, and even this is accompanied by a synonym which softens the action to permission (God bereafað 7 reafian lāteð). By the initial positioning of the verb in the paraphrase of v. 7, the stylistic effect of the Latin, with its compressed juxtaposition of subject and adverb, is preserved, and the threat of destruction is brought out with greater force, since it is suspended by the insertion of the phrase to soðe ic eow secge between the verb and the subjects. The addition of this phrase (cf. ait Dominus) contributes to the oratorical tone of the piece and emphasizes the immediate relevance of the words of the prophet.

In Wulfstan's paraphrase, the last clause of v. 7 is linked syntactically to v. 15, which concerns God's refusal to hear the prayers of the unrighteous. V. 15 reads:

Et cum multiplicaueritis orationem, non exaudiam,
manus enim uestre iniquitate sunt plene.

Wulfstan paraphrases:

Ælðeodige men eow sculon hergian, 7 ðonne ge
gebiddaþ 7 to me clypiað, nelle ic eow gehyran,
forðam þe ge syndon mid mane afyllede ealles to
swyðe 7 mid unrihte. (114-16)

In the context of Isa. i, v. 15 signifies only that God refuses to hear the prayers of the nation because its sinfulness makes them unacceptable, and the depredations of foreigners mentioned in v. 7 are referred to in the Vulgate as having already taken place. By linking the reference to foreign invasion to God's refusal to hear the nation's prayers, Wulfstan alters the connotations of the verse so that it implies that God will not protect

the nation from future invasions because of its iniquitous state. Here, as in the transformation of the reference to the desolation of the land to a threat of future destruction, Wulfstan shapes his source to a warning pertinent to the English nation.

In paraphrasing these verses, Wulfstan replaces the figurative expressions, regionem uestram coram uobis alieni deuorant and manus enim uestre iniquitate sunt plene, with literal statements. These may be described as instances of his "rejection of poetic imagery" and his "habit of making the concrete general,"¹ but the trait is a reflection of his desire to provide clear and immediately comprehensible instruction and his assimilation of his sources to his own didactic preoccupations, which often require generalizing specific points. A literal translation of manus enim uestre iniquitate sunt plene, for instance, is likely to be construed only as an indictment of murder. Wulfstan's interpretation extends the meaning of the verse so that it refers to the sins of the nation in their entirety.

As in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, the general statement that the sins of the nation are punished by affliction is followed by an indictment of particular sins. Although Isa. xlv.22, which consists of God's call to the nation to abandon its iniquity, is included in the first group of verses in Wulfstan's compilation (12-13), it is not incorporated in the introductory section of his sermon. He reorganizes his source in order to bring it into accord with the customary pattern of his sermons, by reserving the exhortation for the conclusion, for all of his hortatory sermons have as their climax a call for amendment which takes its force from the dire threats of destruction emphasized in the body of the sermon.

¹Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 97, 355 (note to 49).

Wulfstan's preoccupation with the antithesis of good and evil is reflected in the statement he prefixes to his conclusion, which contrasts it explicitly with the remainder of the sermon.

He states:

And ongean þas ðing þe beforan standað he lærde
þa þeode godcundre lare, þæt hy scoldan bugan georne
to rihte. (189-90)

The exhortation to repentance, though it does not employ the usual Uton don construction, consists, as in other sermons he wrote, of a series of imperatives:

Ælmihtig God soðlice þus cwæð: Aðweað eow, ic
lære, 7 clænsiað eow georne 7 afyrsiað of minre
gesyhðe þa ungeðanc eowra heortena. Geswicað eowra
misdæda 7 gewuniað to godan dædan. Spyriað æfter
rihtan lagan 7 rihtwisan doman. Helpað earmum 7
hæfenleasum. Beorgað steopcildum 7 weriað
wudewan. (193-98)

Wulfstan follows fairly closely the verses which he selects for his conclusion (Isa. xlv.22, i. 16-18). He retains the metaphorical expression of Lauamini, mundi estote, instead of replacing it with a literal one, since the association of repentance with purification is traditional, and appears elsewhere in his works.¹ His chief alterations are the addition of ic lære, which makes the exhortation more direct and forceful, and the translation of Quiescite agere peruerse; discite benefacere as Geswicað eowra misdæda 7 gewuniað to godan dædan, in which the idea of a conversion from evil to good is emphasized by the repetition of dæd at the end of the parallel clauses.

In substance, the verses which Wulfstan selects for his concluding exhortation are related to the remainder of the sermon, for they refer particularly to the corruption of the law and the oppression of the poor, the orphaned, and the widowed, which is especially condemned in the sermon (see 151-54, 176-79, 119-23). The peroration is further related to the remainder of the sermon

¹E.g., XX. EI 196.

by the addition of

7 biddað me syððan, cwæð ure Drihten, þæs þe ge
willan, 7 ic eow getiðinge þæs ðe eow ðearf bið.
God us gehealde, amen. (198-200)

This recalls the opening statement that God will not hear the prayers of the iniquitous nation when it is besieged by enemies. By contrast, the conclusion promises that the prayers of the people, if they repent, will be answered by the granting of all that is desired. The promise could be a reference to eternal salvation, but, in the context of the sermon, it could also refer to the protection of the land against invasion. If Isa. i.19, Si volueritis, et audieritis me, bona terrae comedetis is the source of these lines,¹ Wulfstan has altered its significance considerably to make it conform to the theme of his sermon. It is consistent with the theological views indicated in the sermons discussed in Part I that the final promise of salvation should be an expression of God's active benevolence, in contrast to the passive expressions or attributions to human agents which appear in the account of the punishments that befall the nation for its unrighteousness.

Wulfstan's assertion that the entire nation will be punished for the sins which abound, in this sermon as well as in XIX, XXI, and XX, represents an essentially Old Testament view of the relation between God and man and the nature of divine justice. The assertion is also at odds with the theology of the New Testament, which postulates a more personal relation between man and God, and the responsibility of the individual for his deeds. The social and legal climate of opinion of Wulfstan's time was to some extent favourable to the notion of the collective liability of the nation for sins committed, for acceptance of the corporate

¹The verse is not included in Wulfstan's extracts, but he may have recalled it in paraphrasing Isa. i.16-18.

responsibility of the community or family for the misdeeds of its members is inherent in some of the laws, particularly those which relate to breaches of the king's peace and those which govern the payment of wergild (though freedom from responsibility could be gained in the latter case, of course, by renouncing claims of kinship).¹ The prophets, however, particularly Isaiah, are not concerned only with collective guilt:

Because by their concrete demands the prophets confronted each individual member of the nation with a decision, they ruled out the possibility of evasion by appeal to the force of circumstances, or to the guilt of the community as a whole. Indeed, that involvement of the individual in the corporate guilt which they laid so heavily on the conscience of the people inevitably had quite the opposite effect, namely, to give the personal guilt of the individual its full seriousness by revealing it as an active participation in, and intensification of, the corporate anti-God attitude. The way in which priests and prophets, kings and leading politicians, and the upper class in general, are denounced and made responsible for the back-sliding of the people and then in turn the damage done by such leaders is presented to the common people as brought upon themselves by their own indifference and forgetfulness of God, intensifies the responsibility of the individual by directing his attention to the whole. This heightening of guilt by the combination of the sins of the individual with the enmity toward God of the community as a whole was felt, and given classic expression, by Isaiah in the words: 'I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips!' (vi.5).²

The same view of the sins of the nation informs Wulfstan's sermons, particularly the sermon based on extracts from Isaiah and Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. Wulfstan, perhaps, was concerned that

¹See Whitelock, The Beginnings of English Society, pp. 38-42, 52. As further instances, one could cite II Cnut 76.2, which refers to the penalty of slavery imposed on a man's family if he steals with its knowledge, and the creation of the "tithing," an artificial association brought into being when the kindred's responsibility for producing its members to answer a charge proved insufficient to bring men to justice.

²Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, II, 417-18. Wulfstan possibly echoes Isaiah's lament in vi. 5 in XVII. 76-79: Ic wat swyðe georne me sylfne forwyrhtne wordes 7 dæda ealles to swyðe, ealswa ma manna, ne dear þeah for Godes ege forswyrgan mid ealle fela þara þinga þe dereð bysse peode.

the punishment of the entire nation should be just (in sermons IV and V, which deal with the afflictions all men must suffer in the reign of Antichrist, he gives particular attention to the justification for the suffering of the righteous).¹ He may also have been directly influenced by the prophetic books, with which he seems to have been especially familiar.

It is in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos that the individual contribution and participation in the collective guilt of the nation is most fully expressed--the sins of both leaders and people are condemned, and there is an explicit statement of the culpability of each individual:

Eala, micel magan manege gyt hertoeacan eape
 beþencan þas þe an man ne mehte on hræðinge asmeagan
 And smeage huru georne gehwa hine sylfne 7
 þas na ne latige ealles to lange. (EI 169-73)

But in the sermon based on extracts from Isaiah, there is also an attempt, in the series of apostrophes, to establish the contribution of individuals to the collective guilt. Here the emphasis falls particularly on the guilt of those whom Wulfstan classes as ðeodwitan in Polity, that is, Cyningan and bisceopan, eorlan and heretogan, gerefan and deman, larwitan and lahwitan.²

The section entitled Be Swicdome (151-55) refers specifically to the guilt of the ðeodwitan and their perversion of the law, and the perversion of the law to oppress widows, orphans, and the poor is dealt with in Be Unlagum (176-80). Be Reaflacum (119-24) condemns those who despoil the poor, and in Be Gitsunge (134-39) there is a reference to the accumulation of possessions on unriht begytene (a phrase which has no parallel in the verse Wulfstan paraphrases in this section). In Polity, the outline of the duties of the various classes of ðeodwitan listed above

¹See IV. 15-36; V. 77-88.

²Polity V. 41 (Jost, p. 62).

includes mention of their obligation to provide righteous laws and justice and to protect the poor, widows, and orphans.¹

Wulfstan's condemnation of the sins of the leaders of the people in particular, and their oppression of the helpless, may have been influenced by the Book of Isaiah, for it gives particular prominence to the iniquities of the powerful. It is also consistent with the conception of society in Polity, for he emphasizes that the leaders of the people have a special responsibility for the temporal and spiritual welfare of the nation, stating, for instance, Ðurh cyninges wisdom folc wyrð gesælig, gesundful and sigefæst,² and

Cyningan and bisceopan, eorlan and heretogan,
gerefan and deman, larwitan and lahwitan gedafenað
mid rihte for Gode and for woruldre þæt hi anræde
weorðan and Godes riht lufian.³

Even Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, though it is devoted to expounding the culpability of all individuals, appears to be an indictment of the leaders of the nation especially, if read in the light of the responsibilities assigned to the ðeodwitan for the welfare of the nation. It may be concluded, then, that Wulfstan selected verses from Isaiah in order to give expression to a view of the nation's iniquity which is consistent with the social theory outlined in Polity and his indictment of the nation in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.

The most striking illustration of Wulfstan's attempts to involve the whole nation in the sins for which it is punished is his paraphrase of Isa. iii.16-19:

Pro eo quod eleuate sunt filię Sion, et ambulauerunt extenso collo et nutibus oculorum ibant et

¹See particularly Polity X (Jost, pp. 81-82).

²Polity II. 14 (Jost, p. 47).

³Polity V. 41 (Jost, p. 62).

plauderant et in pedibus suis incedebant composito gradu, decaluerunt Dominus uerticem filiarum Sion, et Dominus crinem illarum nudabit. In die illa auferet Dominus ornatum calciamentorum et lunulas et torques et monilia et armillas.

The literal significance of the verses is that the Lord will take away the adornments and the beauty of the daughters of the land because of their pride, but Isa. iii.26 indicates that these are symbols of Sion itself (cf. Et moerebunt atque lugebunt portae ejus, et desolata in terra sedebit). Besides substituting a general description for the details of apparel, which would be foreign to an English audience, Wulfstan alters considerably the significance of the verses in his paraphrase:

For ofermettan, he cwæð, 7 idelan rencan eowra leoda þe spiliað 7 plegað 7 rædes ne hedað, God bereafað 7 reafian læteð eowere dohtra heora gyrla 7 to oferrancra heafodgewæda, 7 andfexe weorðap ðara swyðe manege þe mid offerrence glengdan hy sylfe. (126-30)

Wulfstan states that the daughters of the land are bereft because of their vanity, but he incorporates this point into a broader assertion of guilt, for the affliction which is to befall the daughters of the land is said to be not merely the result of their own pride but a punishment of the vanity of the whole nation. While Wulfstan does not present the humbling of the daughters of the land as a metaphor for the destruction of the cities, then, he nevertheless interprets it as meaning that the entire nation will be punished for its pride. The addition of rædes ne hedað relates the condemnation to the opening assertion that the nation has abandoned the teachings of God (109-12) and reflects Wulfstan's didactic aim in this sermon, to persuade this audience to heed wisdom before destruction overtakes it.

It is only in this section, as was noted earlier, that affliction is directly attributed to God, and this is immediately altered to the action of a human agent in reafian læteð, since

Wulfstan normally eschews description of God as an active avenger. From the use of the phrase reafian læteð it may be concluded that Wulfstan interprets the Vulgate verses, albeit in characteristically reticent terms,¹ as a prophecy of the rape of the daughters of the land. Similar to this passage is the description given in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos:

And oft tyne oððe twelfe, ælc æfter oþrum, scendað
to bysmore þæs þegenes cwenan 7 hwilum his dohtor
oððe nydmagan þær he on locað þe læt hine sylfne
rancne 7 ricne 7 genoh godne ær þæt gewurde. (EI 113-17)

The reference to the thane who considered himself rancne 7 ricne 7 genoh godne ær þæt gewurde suggests that in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, as well as in XI, the ravages wrought by the enemies of the nation are presented as a humbling of its pride. The description of the weak helplessness of the thane in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos possibly illuminates the last, and somewhat puzzling, detail in Wulfstan's version of Isa. iii.16-19, 7 andfexe weorðað ðæra swyðe manege þe mid offerrence glengdan hy sylfe, which surely cannot refer to the despoliation of the daughters of the land. Wulfstan presumably interprets et pro crispanti crine calvitium² as meaning that the military power of the proud will be weakened, relying on the traditional association of hair and strength.

While Be Idelum Rencum presents the punishment of the daughters of the land as the result of the sins of the whole nation, Be Oferfylle deals with the responsibilities of the leaders for the nation's sins. This section, which is based on Isa. v.11-13 (quoted in 32-36), reads:

¹Jost notes that Wulfstan modifies or omits a number of the details in Ælfric's De Falsis Diis in the interest of decorum (Wulfstanstudien, p. 132).

²The reference to baldness is in Isa. iii.24, which is not included in Wulfstan's extracts.

Wa eow, he cwæð, þe lufiað untidfylla 7 ær on morgen oferdrenc dreogað 7 beotlice lætað, þæt ge mare magan þonne hit gemet sy. Hearpe 7 pipe 7 mistlic gliggamen dremað eow on beorsele; 7 ge Godes cræfta nan ðing ne gumað. And ðy is folces forfaren ealles to wide mare þonne scolde oððe þearf wære, 7 forðam hit wearð swa rædleas þe hit Godes beboda forgyrde to swyðe 7 wisdomes ne hedde swa swa hit scolde. (141-48)

The folc mentioned in the third sentence could refer only to those who indulge in untidfylla, but it signifies normally the people as a whole. Wulfstan's meaning, then, appears to be that the intemperance of the powerful has resulted in the people being without guidance and counsel. His interpretation was probably influenced by a part of v. 13 which is not included in his extracts, et nobiles ejus interiorunt fame, et multitudo ejus siti exaruit. His paraphrase is more explicit in its condemnation than his Vulgate source: þe lufiað untidfylla and þæt ge mare magan þonne hit gemet sy have no parallel in the Latin, and his concern with the nation's abandonment of the teachings of God is reflected in the expansion of quia non habuit scientiam to

7 forðam hit wearð swa rædleas þe hit Godes beboda
 . forgyrde to swyðe 7 wisdomes ne hedde swa swa hit
 scolde. (146-48)

In Be Swicdome, Wulfstan transforms a general condemnation, Ve qui sapientes estis in oculis uestris et coram uobismet ipsis prudentes (Isa. v.21), into an indictment of the leaders of the nation:

Wa eow, he cwæð, þe taliað eow sylfe to ðeodwitan
 7 witan þæt ge syndan æbere manswican. (151-53)

Wulfstan's version represents a considerable departure from the meaning of his source, for the condemnation of self-delusion is replaced by a condemnation of deliberate deception. Such a perversion of truth, the pretence of being the opposite of what one actually is, is particularly condemned by Wulfstan in IX

(pp. 185-91), and is attributed to the machinations of Anti-christ:

Nis næfre nan wyrse yfel ne Gode laðre þonne þæt gehiwode yfel, forðan deofol sylf hit gefadað 7 gehywað to þam, þæt þæt ðincð foroft ærest ful god þe eft wyrð full yfel 7 full biter on ende.... And swa gerade manswican þe on ða wisan swæslice swiciað oftost on unriht 7 ðurh þæt deriað for Gode 7 for worulde, þæt syndan forbodan 7 Antecristes þrælas þe his weg rymað, þeah hy swa ne wenan. (107-28)

Wulfstan's verbal repetition in Be Swicdome emphasizes his meaning, for the play on witan draws attention to the discrepancy between appearance and reality. (The verbal repetition in this sentence could be classified as an instance of the figure Bede calls anadiplosis, but Wulfstan repeats the same root in different parts of speech instead of the same word.) The assonance of -witan and -swican, which is largely a matter of identical final inflexions, also emphasizes the contrast between the assumed and actual states.

It is Be Swicdome and Be Unlagum, both of which deal with abuses of the law, which reflect Wulfstan's opening description of the sins of the nation as an inversion of values. The obvious parallelism of his version of Qui iustificatis impium pro muneribus et iustitiam iusti auferetis ab eo (Isa. v.23) and the repetition of riht, with and without the negative affix, emphasizes the substitution of evil for good:

Ge fylstað on unriht oftost wið sceatte 7 nellað to rihte, butan man gebicge. (153-54)

Similarly, in Wa þam, he cwæð, þe rareð unriht to rihte 7 undom demeð (176-77), which paraphrases Ve qui condunt leges iniquas et scribentes iniustitiam scripserunt (Isa. x.1), he employs the same root word twice to accentuate the erection of evil as good.

The inversion of the nation's values is made explicit by

the paraphrase of Isa. v.20:

Wa eow, he cwæð, þe taliað ungod to gode 7 god
þing to yfele, biter ðing to swete 7 swete belæpað,
hwyrfað niht to dæge 7 dægweorc to nihte, 7 fyligeað
eowrum luste ealles to swyðe. (157-60)

Though he does not attempt to reproduce the exact verbal repetition of his source, he again employs the same root word with a negative affix in ungod to gode to indicate a moral antithesis. His addition of 7 fyligeað eowrum luste ealles to swyðe interprets the verse in a manner which is consistent with his theological preoccupations, for the failure to follow the law of God is presented, especially in IX, as equivalent to the erection of man's will as law, which is perversion stemming from the teachings of Antichrist:

Crist ælmihtig lærde georne soðfæstnysse 7 anfealdnesse
7 þæt gehwa synnluste fæste wiðstode, 7 Antecrist lærð
unsoðfæstnysse 7 swicolnesse 7 þæt gehwa his luste georne
fulgange, 7 mid swylcan unlaran he forlæreð 7 forlædeð
ealles to manege. (129-33)

In Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, Wulfstan depicts the nation as unable to recognize the truth or heed the wisdom which would profit it as a consequence of its belief that evil is good. The moral blindness of the nation and its perverse pursuit of destruction is stated explicitly in

Oft twegen sæmen, oððe þri hwilum, drifað þa drafe
cristenra manna ... us eallum to worldscame, gif we
on earnost ænige scame cuðe oððe a woldan ariht
understandan. Ac ealne þone bismor þe we oft þoliað
we gildað mid weorðscipe þam þe us scændað. (C 118-23)

In his sermon based on extracts from Isaiah, he also connects the moral blindness of the nation with its abandonment of righteousness. Audite audientes et nolite intelligere, et uidete uisionem et nolite cognoscere (Isa. vi.9) is incorporated as

Hlystað nu georne, he cwæð, 7 nytað na ðe mare; lociað
brade 7 nan þing gecnawað mid ænigean gerade þæs ðe eow
þearf sy, nu ge riht nellað habban ne healdan on eowran
heortan swa swa ge scoldan. (163-67)

Wulfstan's interpretation makes it explicit that the rejection of righteousness results in the inability of the nation to comprehend the means of its salvation. Similar in import is his interpretation of Isa. vi.10-11:

Ablend þisse þeode, he cwæð, andgyt mid ealle nu for heora synnum, þæt hi ræd ne areðian, oð þæt heora burga weorðan ælæte 7 weorðan heora eardas swyðe aweste. (170-73)

The Latin version of these verses reads:

Exceca cor populi huius et aures eius adgraua et oculos eius claude, ne forte uideat oculis et auribus suis audiat et corde suo intellegat et conuertatur et sanem eum. Et dixit: Usque quo, Domine? Et dixit: Donec desolentur ciuitates absque habitatore et terra relinquitur deserta.

Finally, Wulfstan incorporates two passages which suggest the imminent destruction of the nation for its sins. In both he alters the meaning of the Vulgate verses in order to bring them into accord with the didactic purpose of his sermon.

Isa. v.8-9 appears as an allusion to death, also suggesting defeat:

Wa eow, he cwæð, þe leogað togædere hamas 7 æhta on unriht begytene on æghwilce healfe. Wene ge þæt ge sylfe wealdan 7 wunian swa lange swa ge willan on ðam þe we nu syn? Ac soð is þæt ic secge, ge hit alætað þonne ge læst wenað. (134-38)

Wulfstan alters the rhetorical question of the source condemning the greed of the nation (Numquid habitabitis soli uos in medio terrae?) to one which suggests that the possession of the land will only be temporary, and his final sentence, which bears only a very general resemblance to nisi domus multae desertae fuerint, implicitly warns of the conquest of the land. In his final apostrophe (183-85), Wulfstan conflates the detail in Isa. xxxi.1 (Ve qui descendunt in Egiptum ad auxilium, etc.), which has no immediate relevance, to a general statement, Wa þam, he cwæð, þe ofertruwað mægne 7 mænege, and elaborates the nation's failure to seek the help of God. The implication of destruction awaiting those who put their trust in military power instead of

the assistance of God, contained in the final warning, constitutes another of the links between XI and Wulfstan's most accomplished address to the nation, for in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, in which Wulfstan attempts to persuade the nation to seek the help of God if it is to survive, the relation between the weakness of the English and their failure to find favour with God is made apparent throughout.¹

Although it appears that Wulfstan considered it appropriate to present the words of the prophets in a style more ornate than he usually employed, few of his departures from literalness are attributable solely to a desire for stylistic embellishment, or to an attempt to bring the style into accord with his "characteristic" mode of expression. Most of the alterations he makes, which are primarily alterations in meaning, are those necessary to shape his extracts from the Vulgate (clearly selected and organized with a specific didactic purpose in mind) into a coherent sermon in which the words of Isaiah, both in style and substance, become a direct address to the English nation. The form of the sermon is similar to that of most of the eschatological sermons and Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, in which Wulfstan describes at length the afflictions which will overtake mankind and then concludes with a promise of salvation in return for repentance.

Wulfstan's stylistic devices owe little to the rhetorical devices of his Latin source. A few of the stylistic devices in XI are similar to the figures of classical rhetoric, but he is not, for the most part, modelling his style on his Latin source, and his verbal repetition involves the same root instead of the same word. If the paraphrases in XI are among his earliest compositions, as Bethurum believes them to be, they provide an opportunity for

¹The point is emphasized particularly in EI 100-28.

observing his first steps towards the creation of stylistic effects by exploiting the resources of his native language, in order to give expression to his essentially antithetical vision and to emphasize and clarify his teachings.¹ The paraphrases also represent an important stage in his career because, influenced to at least some degree by the prophetic books, he appears to have begun to formulate in De Visione Isaie Prophetae the distinctive view of the sins of the nation which he develops in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, and his conception of the responsibilities of the leaders of the nation which underlies Polity.

VERBA HIEREMIAE PROPHETAE

Wulfstan's selection of verses for Verba Hieremiae Prophetae, like the extracts on which De Visione Isaie Prophetae is based, provides a contrast between the punishment which befalls a sinful nation and the benevolence God shows to those who repent. His method of reworking the selections from Jeremiah is similar to his handling of the verses from Isaiah. He alters the style and meaning of his biblical source, and makes additions, in order to produce the semblance of a unified sermon which expounds explicitly a specific didactic point. His alterations also give the biblical verses a more exhortatory tone, so that the words of the prophet seem to be directly addressed to his immediate audience. The two addresses differ in their emphasis, however, for De Visione Isaie Prophetae deals primarily with the sins of the nation, whereas the selections from Jeremiah give most attention

¹Wulfstan's independence of the influence of Latin rhetoric is noted by Bethurum, Homilies, p. 95. She remarks, "His style is his own, English and not Latin, exploiting to the full the possibilities for adornment^{that} his language afforded."

to the nature of repentance, and the salvation referred to could be eternal salvation as well as protection against invasion, as there is no specific threat of the destruction of the nation.

The first verse which Wulfstan selects for his paraphrase, Audite uerbum Domini domus Iacob et omnes cognationes domus Israel (Jer. ii.4), provides him with an imperative opening similar to that of De Visione Isaie Prophetae and a number of other sermons. Wulfstan's translation, Gehyrað, he cwæð, Godes word nu ða, Iacobes hired 7 eal Israhela cyn (204-5), by the addition of nu ða, lends to the words of the prophet the vigour of direct speech. The paraphrase of selections from Jeremiah contains no parallel to the introduction to De Visione Isaie Prophetae which explicitly states that the prophecies of the past constitute a warning for the present time (cf. 99-103), though Dus ure Drihten cwæð be us eallum (232) at the conclusion of the sermon makes this point plain. It is possible that the universal applicability of the words of the prophet is indicated in the translation of omnes cognationes domus Israel as eal Israhela cyn, since cyn can signify a relation other than that of blood (BT cites "every being of one kind" as one of its meanings), and Wulfstan's usual appellation for the Jewish race is Iudea folc.¹ Certainly the sentence which follows, God acað eow þises nu 7 ðus cwæð to eow eallum (205-6), which is Wulfstan's addition, emphasizes the immediate relevance of the extract from the scriptures.

The rhetorical question is based on Jer. ii.5:

Quid inuenerunt patres uestri in me iniquitatis,
quia elongauerunt a me et ambulauerunt post uanitatem
et uani facti sunt?

Wulfstan's paraphrase roughly reproduces the sense of this, but there are significant divergences:

¹See VI. 124, 181; XI. 101.

Hwæt onfundon eowre yldran þurh ænig ðing on me þæs
 ðe heom ðuhte þæt ful riht nære, nu hy swa swyðe
 awendan hy fram me 7 ferdon on unriht 7 unræde fyligdon
 7 unriht lufedon 7 unnytte wurdon nu lange him
 sylfum? (206-9)

Though the phrases þurh ænig ðing and ful riht may appear to be instances of a habitual use of intensives, it is probable that Wulfstan adds them to make it quite clear that there is no possible iniquity that mankind could have discovered in God, for he also adds þæs ðe heom ðuhte. The addition of nu lange is related to the didactic purpose of his address, for throughout the first section he stresses that unrighteousness has prevailed for a long time, in order to persuade his audience to repent immediately. His main alteration to the verse is his elaboration of the description of the nation's abandonment of God to a more specific account of its opposition, which is emphasized by the repetition of the negative affix. In elaborating the description, he preserves as far as possible the metaphoric depiction of moral choice as a physical act.¹ Wulfstan makes extensive use of this metaphor throughout the paraphrase, and it serves as an additional unifying factor in his sermon.

The metaphor is ingeniously continued in his paraphrase of Jer. ii.19 by the use of puns. Arguat te malitia tua, et auersio tua increpet te, appears as

Ðy ic ðe secge, he cwæð, þæt ðin agen þwyrnes þe
 sceal gepregean, 7 ðin frambige ðe sceal gederian. (209-11)

The word þwyrnes can mean "crookedness" or "opposition" in a physical sense, which expands upon the suggestion in 206-9 that the nation pursues a wrong and contrary direction, and can also mean "evil" or "perversity": frambige is literally "a turning away" and can also signify moral decline. The pun was presumably suggested by auersio, but it is elaborated in an original manner.

¹The verbs, awendan, ferdon, and fyligdon, all denote physical movement.

It is the remainder of v. 19 which undergoes the greatest change of meaning in Wulfstan's paraphrase. In context, the words:

Et uide quia malum et amarum est reliquisse Dominum
Deum tuum, et non esse timorem eius apud te,

signify the conclusion which is to be drawn from the affliction which befalls those who turn away from God. But in Wulfstan's paraphrase the verse becomes a threat of future punishment:

Ac beseoh mid gerade 7 gecnawað swyðe georne hu
biter þe sceal weorðan, butan þu gecyrre, þæt ðu
forlete to lange þinne Drihten 7 næfdest, swa ðu
scoldest, ege þines Drihtnes. (211-14)

Here, as in the paraphrase of selections from Isaiah, past afflictions are transformed to future in order to give point and force to the exhortation to repent, and Wulfstan prepares for God's call to the nation to return to him by the addition of butan þu gecyrre. The phrase recurs to the metaphor of motion, and the metaphor is sustained by the use of beseoh and forlete, since beseon means "to look about," as well as "to behold," and the literal meaning of forletan is "to leave."

Two of Wulfstan's minor alterations in his paraphrase of Jer. ii.19 are also of significance. The addition of to lange is one of the numerous alterations he makes to his source to persuade his audience that immediate repentance is necessary, and the insertion of swa ðu scoldest, like the addition of Ðy ic ðe secge (210) in the paraphrase of Jer. ii.5, gives the piece a more direct, hortatory tone, and suspends the words ege þines Drihtnes so that they emerge with greater force.

The paraphrase of Jer. ii.19 is followed by a sentence added by Wulfstan, He cwæð sona þæræfter froferlicum wordum þus to us eallum (214-15), which introduces the next point and makes explicit the contrast it involves. The transition from warnings of affliction to froferlicum wordum is achieved by

Wulfstan's alterations to his source. Conuertimini, filii reuertentes, dicit Dominus (Jer. iii.14) appears as Eala, leofan cild, cwæð ure Drihten, gecyrrað, ic lære, 7 wendað hider to me (216-17). Though Wulfstan sustains the unifying metaphor of his sermon by translating conuertimini as gecyrrað and by employing wendað in his addition, he does not translate reuertentes, but replaces it with leofan, which is affectionate instead of condemnatory. Consistent with this alteration is the softening of the Vulgate imperative by placing the vocative before the verb.

The remainder of the sentence, which is a loose paraphrase of part of Jer. vi.16, reads:

weorðað on rihtwege 7 beseoð to eowrum Drihtne, acsiað
georne hu betst sy to farenne 7 farað æfter þam wege.
(217-19)

Wulfstan refers to the "right path" instead of the "old ways", presumably in order to emphasize the moral issue involved, and to recall the contrast he makes earlier in his sermon between riht and unriht (cf. 206-9). Though Wulfstan alters the details of his source, he employs the same metaphor and draws attention to it by the verbal repetition of farenne/farað. The metaphor is also ingeniously extended by the use of beseoð, for its most likely meaning in the context of his paraphrase is "visit."

The last sentence of the first section of the sermon, bonne wyrðe ge geborgenne gyt, gif ge willað, þæt ge ne forweorðað (219-20), is only loosely related to the Latin on which it is based, et inuenietis refrigerium animabus uestris (Jer. vi.16). As in De Visione Isaie Prophetæ, Wulfstan formulates the general promise of prosperity in accordance with his specific didactic aims. The promise of protection is consistent with the paternal affection of God for the nation which Wulfstan emphasizes in his paraphrase of Jer. iii.14 (216-17), and the addition of gyt, in

the context of the exhortation's insistence upon the length of time evil has prevailed, serves to enhance the generosity of God's promise of protection. It also indicates that repentance must not be delayed, and the addition of þæt ge ne forweorðað is a reminder of the afflictions in store if the call to repentance is not heeded.

The call to repentance is followed by a specific description, in the words of Jeremiah, of the form which improvement must take, so that the piece is similar in outline to Wulfstan's hortatory sermons, in which a general statement of the need to make amends is followed by a series of exhortations. The concluding exhortation is introduced by two sentences added by Wulfstan which remind his audience of the many opportunities given to avoid disaster (220-23).

The verses Wulfstan selects for the conclusion describe conduct in terms of physical movement. Bonas facite uias uestras et studia uestra (Jer. vii.3) is translated almost literally as godiað georne eowre agene wegas 7 ealle eowre dæda (226): the addition of agene is presumably to distinguish the individual choice of direction from the rules of conduct referred to earlier as rihtwege (217). In the selection of Vulgate passages, Jer. vii.3 is prefixed with the words Audite uerbum Domini (89). This is paralleled in the sermon by Gehyrað, he cwæð, Godes word nu ða 7 doð swa ic lare (225-26), which gives greater force and directness to his concluding imperatives. The Vulgate extracts also include a part of Jer. vii.3 which promises continued possession of the land (cf. et habitabo uobiscum, et reliqua (90)), but Wulfstan does not reproduce the sense of this, since his conclusions always concentrate on the nature of the improvement required and refer to the rewards of righteousness only in

the final sentences. He adds instead an exhortation of his own, Lufiað rihtwisnesse 7 unriht ascuniað (227), indicating, by the repetition of the same root with a negative affix, that repentance requires a complete conversion from one mode of life to another.

The remainder of the conclusion is based on Jer. vii.5-7. Notable among his alterations to his source in this section is the paraphrase of et post deos alienos non ambulaueritis in malum uobismet ipsis as ne hæðenscipes gymað on ænige wisan eow sylfum to hearne (229-30), for, despite having sustained the metaphorical description of conduct as physical movement throughout the sermon, he does not imitate the figurative expression of his source. Perhaps he considered it could be misunderstood by being taken literally. Other alterations occur in his translation of si feceritis iudicium inter uirum et proximum eius as And gyf ge þonne swa doð 7 rihtlice demað 7 on unriht ne tregiað (227-28), in which the verbal repetition serves the same function as it does in the earlier exhortation, Lufiað rihtwisnesse 7 unriht ascuniað, and in his translation of nec sanguinem innocentem effuderitis in loco hoc,¹ which he appears to have considered an insufficiently clear condemnation of murder, since he has instead ne unscyldig blod ahwar ne ageotað (229).

His selection of verses concludes with a promise of continued possession of the land, habitabo uobiscum in terra quam dedi patribus uestris, a seculo et usque in seculum, which Wulfstan paraphrases as

þonne weorðe ic mid eow, cwæð ure Drihten, æfre
æt ðearfe 7 eow ne forlæte æfre æt neode. (230-32)

¹The Vulgate has in loco hoc, but it is omitted in Wulfstan's Latin (93-94).

In his paraphrase of this verse, as in his paraphrase of Jer. vi.16 in 219-20, he reformulates the promise so that it could refer to protection against the enemies of the nation or to eternal salvation, and the promise is phrased in such a manner that it constitutes a reminder of the need for protection.

Verba Hieremiae Prophetae is unusually brief, but it is highly probable, in view of the nature of the alterations which Wulfstan makes, that he looked on his paraphrase as an embryo sermon, for it forms a coherent and unified address, and many of the alterations he makes are designed to enhance the oratorical force of his biblical source and to clarify the meaning. One particularly interesting aspect of Verba Hieremiae Prophetae is the metaphorical description of moral choices as physical movement throughout the paraphrase which unifies the address. Extended metaphorical description as a means of unifying self-contained passages is considerably less frequent in Wulfstan's sermons than the repetition of thematically significant words, but part of XVIB is unified by the elaboration of a metaphor,¹ and instances of the same technique occur in XIII and Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.² Wulfstan's elaboration of this particular metaphor in Verba Hieremiae Prophetae, as well as his transformation of Conuertimini, filii reuertentes, dicit Dominus to a more gentle plea, may have been the result of his familiarity with the prophetic books. As Eichrodt explains:

[In the prophetic books] numerous new expressions are developed to describe really genuine turning to God It was the word sub, turn, however, which summed up all these descriptions of the right human attitude to God's saving action in a single pregnant phrase. The metaphor was an especially

¹See Pt. II, ch. I.

²See Pt. III, chs. II and III.

suitable one, for not only did it describe the required behaviour as a real act--'to make a turn'--and so preserve the strong personal impact, it also included both the negative element of turning away from the direction taken hitherto and the positive element of turning towards....

It is striking, nevertheless, that it should be in Hosea, and after him only in Jeremiah, that conversion becomes a theme of the prophetic preaching. This is entirely in keeping with the fact that the divine love which seeks and woos a return of love from Man is such a prominent feature of the message of these two men.¹

Although Wulfstan did not make direct use of his paraphrase of Jeremiah, the metaphor of conversion he employs in it perhaps finds an echo in expressions such as Utan gecyrran georne fram synnum (XIII. 99) and Utan ... fram unrihte gebugan to rihte (XXI. 6) which occur in a number of his sermons.²

¹Theology of the Old Testament, II, 466-68.

²See also: IV. 94; XV. 70-71; XIX. 77; XX. EI 190-91.

CHAPTER III

BE GODCUNDRE WARNUNGE

Be Godcundre Warnunge (XIX, pp. 251-54), like II and XI, is preceded by the Latin text on which it is based. It is clear, however, that the Latin in this case was delivered as part of the sermon, for it is prefaced by the exhortation Leofan men, utan spyrian be bocan georne 7 gelome ... (3-6), and is followed by the words:

Eala, leofan men, be pyllocan bysenan we us magan warnian, gif we willað smeagan ure þearfe, swa swa us þearf is. And se þe ne cunne þæt Leden understandan, hlyste nu on Englisc be suman dæle hwæt þæt Leden cwede. (41-44)

As Bethurum points out, it is "interesting to see this much Latin in a sermon," because the Latin "could hardly have meant anything to a popular audience."¹ It is possible, as she suggests, that Be Godcundre Warnunge was preached to the clergy as a model as Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi was. There is, though, a significant difference between the two sermons: Wulfstan's sermon on the history of Creation is self-contained and distinct from the prefatory injunctions concerning the duties of the clergy, whereas the opening exhortation of Be Godcundre Warnunge, in which the theme of the sermon is stated, is separated from the main part of the sermon by the Latin text. Perhaps, then, Wulfstan included the Latin when he preached to a lay audience as an impressive reminder that he was transmitting the words which God sylf gedihte (the expression occurs both at the beginning of the sermon (6) and at the end (83)).

Wulfstan's sermons, it has been noted, emphasize the contrasts and oppositions inherent in the Christian faith, and the Latin passage he compiled to serve as a basis for Be Godcundre

¹Homilies, p. 355.

Warnunge not only accords with his didactic preoccupation with the sins of the nation but has two contrasting sections as De Septiformi Spiritu and De Visione Isaie Prophetae do. Lev. xxvi presents a contrast between the prosperity accorded to the nation if it is obedient to God's commands and the afflictions which befall it if it disobeys. The first part of the contrast is contained in vs. 3-13, and is quoted in full by Wulfstan (8-25), with the exception of v. 13, which refers to the deliverance from bondage in Egypt, and is not immediately related to the promise of prosperity or directly relevant to an English audience. The threat of punishment in Lev. xxvi is considerably longer, and is reduced to a few summarizing points (25-34). In the Latin text, Wulfstan underlines the contrast by the addition of Et item Dominus dicit (25) after v. 12 and the addition of autem to v. 14 (Si autem non audieritis me neque feceritis precepta mea (25-26)). In the opening exhortation, the contrast presented in the sermon is emphasized by parallelism and verbal repetition:

Leofan men, utan spyrian be bocan georne 7 gelome
 hwæt þa geforan ða þe God lufedon 7 Godes lage heoldan,
 7 hwæt þa geforan ða þe God gremedon 7 Godes lage bræcan,
 7 warnian us be swylcan. (3-6)

Wulfstan further heightens the contrast in various ways in paraphrasing the Latin.

Wulfstan's summary of Lev. xxvi also includes a description of the repentance which follows affliction and God's subsequent recollection of his promise (34-38, based on vs. 39-42). It concludes with the words et terra recipiet sabbata sua. In the Vulgate, a similar expression appears in a description of the desolation of the land in v. 34 which is recalled in v. 43, and seems to refer to the rest the land enjoys only when its inhabitants have been destroyed or taken into captivity. Wulfstan's sermon, however, concludes with a promise of renewed prosperity

for those who repent. Be Godcundre Warnunge therefore contains the same elements as De Visione Isaie Prophetae, but elaborates the prosperity which is the reward of obedience, whereas De Visione Isaie Prophetae deals mainly with the consequences of disobedience, the contrast between the two states being peripheral.

Like De Visione Isaie Prophetae, Wulfstan's paraphrase of Lev. xxvi is intended to serve as a warning to the English nation to abandon its sins and repent: he tailors the threats of punishment to fit contemporary English conditions, and the admonitions he adds make his didactic purpose plain:

Eala, leofan men, be pyllocan bysenan we us magan
warnian, gif we willað smeagan ure þearfe, swa swa
us þearf is. (41-42)

7 eal hit mæg to bysne æghwylcere þeode, gyme
se þe wille. (84-85)

By virtue of the nature of its source, Be Godcundre Warnunge is a less direct exhortation than De Visione Isaie Prophetae. De Visione Isaie Prophetae is based on passages which attack sins already committed by the nation and call for repentance in a series of imperatives. In Lev. xxvi, however, the disobedience of the nation and the disasters which befall it as a consequence are expressed hypothetically (vs. 14-38), and no alteration to the form of presentation was possible if the contrast drawn in this chapter was to be preserved. Repentance is not urged in Lev. xxvi: it is described as the outcome of afflictions suffered (vs. 39-42). We shall see that Wulfstan's presentation of the nation's remorse differs from the Vulgate's, but without abandoning his source entirely, he could do no more than suggest implicitly the need for repentance.

In paraphrasing the Latin text in Be Godcundre Warnunge,

Wulfstan makes a number of significant changes in style and meaning, as he does in his other biblical sermons, interpreting and expressing his source in accordance with his didactic aims. The sermon consists of three sections, the promises of abundance, the warnings of disaster, and the repentance of the nation, each of which bears a different relation to Lev. xxvi. I shall discuss each of these three sections in turn, examining the nature and extent of Wulfstan's divergences from Lev. xxvi and his Latin outline, and then summarize the conclusions which can be drawn from the examination.

The words with which Wulfstan introduces the first section, Ure Drihten bead Moyse þam heretogan þæt he folc wissode 7 warnode georne, 7 him þus sæde (45-47), call the attention of the audience to the divine origin of his warning (cf. his conclusion Dis synd þa Godes word be God sylf gedihte (82-83)). In his paraphrase of vs. 3-12 (47-59), Wulfstan compresses the Latin considerably: he summarizes, omits redundancies, and conflates Latin sentences which deal with the same subject into one English sentence. The sentence boundaries of Wulfstan's prose are, of course, difficult to establish in some cases, because he frequently opens a main clause with a conjunction. In the paraphrase of vs. 3-12, doubts arise only over the grouping of the three main clauses in 49-52, which Bethurum punctuates as follows:

And ic welan 7 wista gife eow genoge, 7 ge orsorge
wuniap on lande on griðe 7 on friðe under minre munde.
And ic eow awerige wið hearma gehwylcne

Her divisions are the most natural ones: the first two main clauses seem too short to be considered as separate sentences, but if "and" in And ic eow awerige wið hearma gehwylcne is regarded as a conjunction instead of a sentence initiator, a long and unwieldy sentence results because there is a clause subordinated

to this one. Bethurum's punctuation is substantiated by MS. I. The manuscript is a very carefully punctuated one—capitals are heavily inked over, and regularly preceded by a punctus versus, which, Ker states, "began to be used commonly as punctuation at the end of a sentence" in the later tenth century.¹ I am assuming in my analysis of Be Godcundre Warnunge that MS. I represents the sentence divisions intended by Wulfstan with reasonable accuracy, since it is an early eleventh century manuscript and probably connected with Wulfstan.² The sentence divisions in MS. I, unless otherwise stated, are the same as Bethurum's.

God's promise of seasonal weather and abundant crops in return for obedience to his laws is described in the Vulgate in two sentences (vs. 3, 4, and part of 5):

Si in preceptis meis ambulaueritis et mandata mea
custodieritis et feceritis ea, dabo uobis pluuiam
temporibus suis, et terra gignet germen suum, et
pomis arbores replebuntur. Adprehendet messium
tritura uindemiam, et uindemia occupabit sementem.

Wulfstan summarizes the main point of this passage, welding the many compound clauses into one compact English sentence consisting of only one main and one subordinate clause (I view the relative clause as an instance of rank-shifting, not subordination):

Gif ge mine beboda, he cwæð, rihtlice healdað,
þonne sende ic ða gewideru þe ealle eowre wæstmas
7 eorþlice tilða fullice gebetað. (47-49)

Because Wulfstan summarizes, he necessarily expresses the point more generally and less figuratively than his source (the promise

¹A Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon, p. xxxiv. Clemons' monograph, Liturgical Influence on Punctuation in Late Old English and Middle English Manuscripts, gives a similar description of the use of the punctus versus.

²See Homilies, pp. 98-99.

of "rain in due season" is not, in any case, one which would be appreciated by an English audience).¹ The paratactic sentences in vs. 5 and 6 which deal with the peaceful enjoyment of prosperity—

et comedetis panem uestrum in saturitate, et
absque pauore habitabitis in terra uestra. Dabo
pacem in finibus uestris; dormietis et non erit qui
exterreat—

are summarized in one compound sentence:

and ic welan 7 wista gife eow genoge, 7 ge orsorge
wuniap on lande on griðe 7 on friðe under minre
munde. (49-51)

The promise of freedom from the incursions of man and beast in v. 6 (Auferam malas bestias, et gladius non transibit terminos uestros), is paraphrased in a separate sentence, which in grammatical terms is a complex one (51-53). In a similar manner, vs. 7-8, which consist of paratactic sentences describing victory over the nation's enemies, are paraphrased in a single complex sentence (53-55), and vs. 9-12, devoted chiefly to the establishment of a covenant, are moulded into a main clause with a number of expansions dependent on Ic (eow) wille:

Ic eow wille rædan 7 swybe aræran 7 freondscipe
cyðan mid rihtan getrywpan, wealdan eow blisse 7
micelre lisse, habban eow to þegan 7 beon eow for
mundboran. (55-58)

To a large extent, then, Wulfstan replaces the numerous paratactic sentences of the Vulgate with a few sentences which are more compressed, though not involved. To put this less impressionistically. The Vulgate passage consists almost entirely of simple main clauses—the only exception is the compound subordinate clause in v. 3. Wulfstan summarizes the meaning of a number of clauses in sentences which are, with the exception of

¹ Ælfric omits the expression in his translation of Leviticus. (See The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, p. 300.)

the one in 49-51, grammatically more complex than those of his source because they contain subordinate or rank-shifted clauses. Though the sentences are grammatically more complex, they are fairly short and not difficult to follow. Further, co-ordination is a prominent feature of the Latin passage, but there are few co-ordinate clauses in Wulfstan's paraphrase. The sentence in 49-51 contains only two co-ordinated clauses, and in 55-58 the clauses co-ordinated are reduced ones—I would regard these as stylistically different from the co-ordinated full clauses in the Latin.

Each sentence division in 47-59 corresponds to a separate promise, so that the instances of God's bounty are listed in separate sentences linked together by eac or and, and the section culminates in a sentence which heaps up instances of God's benevolence in rapid succession:

Ic eow wille rædan 7 swyþe aræran 7 freondscipe
cyðan mid rihtan getrywþan, wealdan eow blisse
7 micelre lisse, habban eow to þegnan 7 beon eow
for mundboran, gif ge me gehyrað, swa swa me
licað. (55-59)

Wulfstan's addition of gif ge me gehyrað, swa swa me licað to the last promise brings the relation of God's favours to an admonitory conclusion which recalls the initial statement that these are conditional upon the observance of his laws (Gif ge mine beboda, he cwæð, rihtlice healdað (47-48). Such a clear and careful indication of separate points, and the linking of sentences related in subject matter into a larger rhetorical unit is typical of Wulfstan's method of presentation.¹

The formation of a larger unit is achieved, not only by the use of conjunctions as sentence initiators and the repetition of the conditional clause at the beginning and end of the section,

¹See particularly pp. 54-55.

but also by beginning each sentence with ic. In each sentence, ic is followed, after the object or objects, by a verb denoting the action of giving. In order to achieve this parallelism, Wulfstan transforms the Vulgate sentences which describe the actions of those having God's favour into descriptions of benevolent actions performed by God: And ic welan 7 wista gife eow genoge (49-50) replaces et comedetis panem uestrum in saturitate (v. 5), and ic siges mihte 7 mægenstrengðe swa micle eow sylle (53-54) is substituted for the account of the nation's annihilation of its enemies in v. 7 (Persequemini inimicos uestros et corruent coram uobis). By these alterations, Wulfstan heightens the impression of God as a munificent giver.

The abundant prosperity which God bestows upon those who keep his commandments is also emphasized in two other changes which Wulfstan makes to his source. By generalizing Auferam malas bestias, et gladius non transibit terminos uestros (v. 6), Wulfstan converts it to a much more comprehensive promise of protection:

And ic eow awerige wið hearma gehwylcne þæt
eow bite ne slite, here ne hunger, ne feonda
mægen ahwar ne geswenceþ. (51-53)

In place of the detailed description of military victories in vs. 7-8—

Persequemini inimicos uestros, et corruent
coram uobis. Persequentur quinque de uestris
centum alienos, et centum ex uobis decem milia;
cadent inimici uestri in conspectu uestro gladio—

the sermon has:

Eac ic siges mihte 7 mægenstrengðe swa micle
eow sylle þæt ge eow to gamene feonda afyllaþ
oððe tofesiap swa fela swa ge reccað. (53-55)

Wulfstan may not have reproduced the details of his source because he thought the hyperbole would be taken literally—in

his description of the Viking victories won purh Godes þafunge in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, which echoes these verses, oft on gefeohte an feseð tyne 7 hwilum læs, hwilum ma (EI 112-13), he reduces the numbers to realistic proportions—but his version of Leviticus, though not obviously hyperbolic, promises even greater triumphs in battle than his source does. Both alterations involve the replacement of particular details with generalized statements, which Bethurum remarks upon in her commentary on XIX. I do not think, however, that his substitution of general promises for the concrete descriptions of his source need be viewed as "habit," or the reflection of a "Puritan fear ... that his audience will enjoy such details for their own sake."¹ His alterations are related to the didactic purpose of his sermon, for by generalizing his source, he magnifies the promises of prosperity, and so increases the incentive to repent and gain God's favour.

The promise of protection against here 7 hunger instead of "wild beasts," is, presumably, not substituted in the paraphrase of Auferam malas bestias, et gladius non transibit terminos uestros in v. 6 because the danger was one which was unknown to English audiences, for the Blickling Homilies number those devoured by wild beasts among the dead who will arise with their bodies restored on Doomsday.² By altering his source in this manner, Wulfstan unifies his sermon more closely. All the other promises in Lev. xxvi, except for this sentence in v. 6, refer to peace

¹Homilies, pp. 97-98, 355 (note to 49).

²Awecceap ealle þa lichoman of deape, beah þe hie ær eorþe bewrigen hæfde, ... oððe wildeor abiton (ed. R. Morris (EETS, Orig. Ser. 58) London, 1874, p. 95, ll. 14-16).

in the land and prosperity, and all of the disasters threatened as a result of disobedience in Wulfstan's sermon pertain to foreign conquest and famine. The paraphrase of Auferam malas bestias, et gladius non transibit terminos uestros is consistent, then, with Wulfstan's concentration on the two disasters which (judging from both Sermo Lupi ad Anglos and the Chronicle) would have most troubled a contemporary English audience. The ravages of wild beasts referred to in the verse are ingeniously suggested in the metaphoric use of bite and slite.

One of Wulfstan's most interesting departures from his source is his translation of et firmabo pactum meum uobiscum in v. 9 as Ic eow wille ... freondscipe cyðan mid rihtan getrywpan (56-57). This is clearly not the nearest English equivalent to the Latin, for Ælfric translates the same verse as ic fastnie min wed mid eow.¹ Wulfstan may have felt it inadvisable to speak of pledges made by God and later retracted, since the Anglo-Saxon social order was regulated by oaths, and, though it was not always practised, loyalty to pledges was greatly esteemed as an ideal of conduct. But it is also possible that he altered the meaning of the verse in order to indicate that the relationship of man and God is one of love as well as a purely legal one of covenants made and obedience to the laws, for he refers in his introductory sentence to the teachings of the scriptures concerning the fate of "those who loved God," not simply "those who kept his commandments" (3-6). Jost remarks in his consideration of Wulfstan's theology:

Für Wulfstan sind die beiden entgegengesetzten Pole, um die seine christlichen Ideen bewegen, nicht die Begriffe 'gut' und 'böse' Aber die eigentlichen Kernpunkte von Wulfstans religiösem Denken sind die Begriffe 'recht' und 'unrecht'. Was recht ist, wird bestimmt durch Gottes Willen, und dieser Wille gewinnt seine konkrete Form in Gottes Geboten und Lehren (Godes

¹See The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, p. 301.

beboda and lara) und in Gottes Gesetzen (Godes laga) Sogar die Liebe zu Gott, die er so häufig in seinen Predigten fordert—sie ist ja das vornehmste und höchste Gebot—, wird bei ihm zu einer Form der Gesetzesfrömmigkeit.¹

Although the contraposition of riht and unriht is only one aspect of the polarity of Wulfstan's thought, it is certainly of central importance in XIX, in which Wulfstan heightens the contrast between the consequences of obedience and disobedience to God's laws presented in his source. He is not concerned only with obedience to God in this sermon, however, nor is the love of God subsumed in obedience as Jost suggests. His introductory sentence describes love and obedience as two related but separate concepts (hwæt þa geforan ða þe God lufedon 7 Godes lage heoldan), and throughout his paraphrase he makes a number of alterations to his source which suggest that he intended to depict the relationship of man and God as a more personal one thanⁿ Lev. xxvi does.²

Wulfstan also transforms the relationship of God and man described in Leviticus in his paraphrase of vs. 11-12 as (Ic wille) ... habban eow to þegnan 7 beon eow for mundboran (55-58). The verses read:

Ponam tabernaculum meum in medio uestri, et non abiciet uos anima mea. Ambulabo inter uos et ero uester Deus, uosque eritis populus meus.

As Bethurum points out, Wulfstan substitutes English ideas of kingship for the Hebrew associations of Leviticus in this paraphrase.³ Alien as the associations are, though, the verses

¹Wulfstanstudien, pp. 169-72.

²Wulfstan's concern to portray the relation of God and man as one of love is also revealed by a comparison of VI with Ælfric's Sermo Initio Creaturae (see pp. 128-31.)

³Homilies, p. 355 (note to 55-59).

are intelligible without being put into Anglo-Saxon terms—Ælfric sticks fairly closely to the Latin with:

Ic sette mine halgan stowe tomiddes eowre, 7 ne
awurpe ic eow. Ac ic ga betwux eow, 7 ic beo eower
God 7 ge beoð min folc.¹

It seems likely, then, that Wulfstan's alteration is not merely clarificatory, but was motivated by the considerations^{which,} I am suggesting, prompted his translation of et firmabo pactum meum uobiscum as Ic eow wille ... freondscipe cyðan mid rihtan get-
rwypan, for while the thane-king relation entails the observance of formal obligations, it is a more intimate one than the one which is referred to in Wulfstan's source. Wulfstan's replacement of the promise contained in vs. 11-12 with a promise of protection is consistent with two of his other departures from literalness, the addition of under minre munde (51) in his paraphrase of vs. 5-6 and the use of awerige in paraphrasing Auferam malas bestias ... (51-53). His depiction of God as a protector is presumably intended to enhance the desirability of gaining God's favour in the eyes of a nation threatened by Danish conquest.

In the paraphrase of vs. 3-12, a number of intensives and alliterating or rhyming word pairs are employed. Wulfstan was undoubtedly fond of using synonymous pairs of words, but an examination of their occurrence in Be Godcundre Warnunge suggests that he did not employ them mechanically, as Bethurum implies when she states:

¹The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, p. 301.

The habit of writing alliterative and rhyming pairs of words, often tautological, became so ingrained that when he rewrote another person's composition, whether Ælfric's Old English ... or a Latin text which he translated into English ..., the substitution of two words for one is almost invariable.¹

In all but one case in XIX (bite ne slite, here ne hunger (52)), the word pairs parallel synonymous expressions in the Latin. Thus:

ic siges mihte 7 mægenstrengðe swa micle eow sylle (53-54)
Persequemini inimicos uestros, et corruent coram uobis (v. 7)

þæt ge eow to gamene feonda afyllað oððe tofesiap (54-55)
Persequentur quinque de uestris centum alienos ...
cadent inimici uestri in conspectu uestro gladio (v. 8)

Ic eow wille rædan 7 swyþe aræran (55-56)
Respiciam uos et crescere faciam, multiplicabimini (v. 9).

They are also employed when Wulfstan summarizes roughly similar promises: on griðe 7 on friðe (50-51) stands for the two promises of peace in v. 6; welan 7 wista (49) for the two promises of abundance in v. 5; and wealdan eow blisse 7 micelre lisse (57) replaces the somewhat cryptic Comeditis uetustissima ueterum, et uetera nouis superuenientibus proicietis (v. 10).² For the purposes of translation, word pairs are particularly useful, because they are general enough to serve as an adequate equivalent to detailed or obscure passages in the Latin, and they are an economical means of emphasizing—in Be Godcundre Warnunge, they emphasize the abundance of God's gifts. They are not, then, "fillers" with which Wulfstan habitually embellishes his compositions: the aim of his sermon is to persuade his audience to repent, and one of the means by which he attempts to accomplish this is to impress upon his audience, both by the use of word pairs and the alterations he makes to the meaning of his

¹Homilies, p. 90.

²V. 10 is clearly unsuitable for literal translation: Ælfric paraphrases it as Ge etað ealde mettas oð eow niwe cumon, so that his readers may take it as a figurative allusion to the old law and the new (The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, p. 301).

source, the abundant prosperity it could experience. The intensives too are employed to emphasize particular points briefly: rihtlice (48) appears with a single verb in the paraphrase of Si in preceptis meis ambulaueritis et mandata mea custodieritis et feceritis ea (v. 3), and swybe (56) is employed in the paraphrase of Respiciam uos et crescere faciam; multiplicabimini (v. 9).

The second section of Be Godcundre Warnunge (59-68), a description of the disasters attending rejection of God, is based on Wulfstan's summary of Leviticus in 25-34, which consists of vs. 14, 16-17, 19-20, 25, and 33, in that order, in an abridged form:

Si autem non audieritis me neque feceritis precepta mea, constituam in uos inopiam, famem, et pestem, et animam uestram tabescentem faciam, et persequentur uos inimici uestri, et fugietis nullo persequente; et ponam uobis celum ferreum et terram eream, et erit in uacuum uirtus uestra. Terra non dabit fructum suum, et arbores agri uestri non dabunt fructus suos. Adducam super uos gladium, et trademini in manus inimicorum uestrorum; et erit terra uestra deserta, et ciuitates uestre destructe.

The passages Wulfstan selects refer only to defeat in battle and natural disasters, particularly the failure of crops. He omits unusual instances of supernatural intervention in human affairs, such as Cadetis inter ruinas idolorum uestrorum in v. 30. Detailed descriptions of affliction are replaced by a generalized threat of loss of prosperity. V. 16, for instance, which reads:

Ego quoque haec faciam uobis. Uisitabo uos uelociter in egestate, et ardore, qui conficiat oculos uestros, et consumat animas uestras. Frustra seretis sementem, quae ab hostibus deuorabitur,

appears as constituam in uos inopiam, famem, et pestem, et animam uestram tabescentem faciam (26-28). Wulfstan's summary, then, is designed to heighten the contrast between the consequences of disobedience and the promises of peace and abundance in the first section of the sermon, and, by shaping the threats in Leviticus to

a description of the troubles experienced by the English nation and excluding references to supernatural occurrences, he is able to give the impression that the prophecies God made in the scriptures concerning the penalties of disobedience are currently being fulfilled.

Wulfstan's Latin summary also modifies considerably the portrayal of God as a wrathful avenger of wrongs in Lev. xxvi. He does not include any of the variations on et percutiam uos septies propter peccata uestra (v. 24), or the explicit threats of hostility or vengeance, such as ego incedam aduersus uos in furore contrario (v. 28). Of the threats of destruction of the land by God, only the most general and figurative, Adducam super uos gladium (v. 25) is incorporated, and the rest are subsumed under animam uestram tabescentem faciam (27-28). Wulfstan's summary of the threats in Leviticus must have been partly dictated by the need for brevity, but it is clear from his English version that he deliberately modified the description of God's active hostility to man, for none of the disasters described in the second section of the sermon are directly attributed to God. The destruction of the cities, which God threatens to accomplish in Lev. xxvi (cf. Wulfstan's summary, erit terra uestra deserta, et ciuitates uestre destructe (33-34)), is attributed to the nation's enemies in the paraphrase, Land hy awestað 7 burga forbærnað 7 æhta forspillað, 7 eard hy amyrrað (67-68). The remainder of the prophecies of disaster are expressed in the passive voice or in constructions which do not require mention of God's agency. Adducam super uos gladium (32) has no parallel in the sermon, and the second clause of the same sentence, et trademini in manus inimicorum uestrorum, is paraphrased as 7 ge beoð gesealde feondum to gewealde, þa eow geyrmað 7 swyþe geswencað (66-67). Wulfstan

does not translate ponam uobis celum ferreum et terram eream (29), but describes the inclemency of the elements as eow unwæstm burh unweder gelome gelimpeð (64-65), and he replaces et animam uestram tabescentem faciam (27-28) with 7 scylan eowre heortan eargian swybe (62). The sentence which introduces the threat of disaster is syntactically parallel to the one which introduces the promises, but, despite Wulfstan's predilection for strong contrasts, the parallelism is weakened because the afflictions are not directly attributed to God—the first section begins:

Gif ge mine beboda, he cwæð, rihtlice healdað, þonne sende ic ða gewideru þe ealle eowre wæstmas 7 eorþlice tilða fullice gebetað, (47-49)

whereas the sentence introducing the threats begins:

And gif ge þonne fram me hwyrfað eowre heortan 7 lara 7 laga mine forgymað oððe oferhogiað, þonne sceal eow sona weaxan to hearme wædl 7 wawa, sacu 7 wracu, here 7 hunger. (59-62)

Wulfstan's failure to attribute the disasters to God in this sentence is not due to the influence of the Latin, for the passage in his summary on which it is based reads:

Si autem non audieritis me neque feceritis precepta mea, constituam in uos inopiam, famem, et pestem. (25-27)

Although Wulfstan may have described the destruction of the cities as the actions of the nation's enemies in order to make his account of the disasters suffered because of disobedience a more concrete reflection of the contemporary situation, and Adducam super uos gladium may have been rejected as unrealistic, his other alterations and omissions indicate that he intended to avoid the impression that God actively avenges himself. Wulfstan's exclusion of any reference to divine agency in the second section of his sermon is in striking contrast to the emphasis he gives to the active benevolence of God in his account of the promises. It is as if, once God's favour is withdrawn,

the universe becomes immediately hostile, and the connexion suggested between gif ge þonne fram me hwyrfað eowre heortan (59) and scylan eowre heortan eargian swyþe (62) may be intended to convey a sense of the vacuum created by the rejection of God. Gif ge þonne fram me hwyrfað eowre heortan, it may be noted, is another of Wulfstan's alterations to his source which remind the audience that God is to be loved as well as obeyed: the Latin passage he paraphrases in 59-60 has only Si autem non audieritis me neque feceritis precepta mea (25-26).

Wulfstan's suppression of God's agency in the English version of the disasters which befall the nation that disobeys is consistent with his attempts to indicate that the relation of man and God is one of love. It illustrates further his reluctance to attribute punitive actions directly to God, which was remarked upon in Part I, a reluctance stemming from his tendency to think in terms of strong antitheses, which manifests itself in his presentation of the devil as the source of all evil and God as the source of all good. The Latin summary does, of course, portray God to some extent as an avenger, but since Wulfstan tones down the impression of active hostility in it, I would argue that traces of the Old Testament portrayal appear in the Latin preamble (which would, in any case, be unintelligible to a lay audience) only because he made the summary to serve as just a rough outline which was to be completely assimilated to his own views in the sermon proper.

The sermon version of Wulfstan's Latin summary of Lev. xxvi is an even freer translation than his rendering of vs. 3-12 is. Ultimately, his sermon bears only a general resemblance to the Vulgate chapter, so it is surprising that he asserts that he is rehearsing the words which God sylf gedihte. Unlike Ælfric

he does not appear to have regarded the exact wording of the scriptures as sacrosanct:¹ his insistent didacticism seems to have led him to the conclusion that the "actual" meaning of the scriptures was that which constituted an apposite warning.

In Be Godcundre Warnunge, as in De Visione Isaie Prophetae, Wulfstan formulates expressions which he echoes in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos in the process of shaping his biblical source into a sermon which serves his particular didactic purpose. Three of the alterations he makes to the style and meaning of his Latin summary in his paraphrase link the sermon to his most topical address to the nation. The words ge beoð gesealde feondum to gewealde, which paraphrase an expression taken from Leviticus, trademini in manus inimicorum uestrorum (32-33), are later recalled in ut of bysan earde wide gesealde ... fremdum to gewealde (EI 44-45). In Lev. xxvi, the phrase signifies the conquest of the nation by its enemies, but Wulfstan interprets it as a reference to the sale of slaves to the enemy,² and so brings the details of his source into accord with the contemporary English situation and converts a divine action to a human one, as he does in a number of the alterations mentioned above. The words eow unwæstm purh unweder gelome gelimpeð (64-65) also reappear in the catalogue of the nation's misfortunes in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos (EI 59). In Be Godcundre Warnunge, the expression economically renders Wulfstan's extracts from vs. 19 and 20:

ponam uobis celum ferreum et terram eream Terra non dabit fructum suum, et arbores agri uestri non dabunt fructus suos.

¹See The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, pp. 79-80.

²The verb gesealde can, of course, mean "given" as well as "sold," but Wulfstan normally uses it to mean "sold," except when referring to the payment of church dues, and the parallel passage in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, in which the meaning is clearly "sold," supports a reading of XIX. 66 as a reference to the sale of slaves.

By summarizing his source in this manner, Wulfstan heightens the contrast between the prophecy of disaster and the earlier promise of prosperity, þonne sende ic ða gewideru þe ealle eowre wæstmas 7 eorþlice tilða fullice gebetað (48-49), employing the same roots with a negative affix, which is a device he frequently uses in indicating contrasts. Similar in substance to a passage in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos describing the humiliations suffered by the English—

7 Engle nu lange eal sigelease 7 to swyþe geyrgde
þurh Godes yrre, 7 flotmen swa strange þurh Godes
þafunge þæt oft on gefeohte an feseð tyne 7 hwilum
læs, hwilum ma, eal for urum synnum (EI. 110-13)—

is his paraphrase of the Latin in 28-29 of Be Godcundre Warnunge:

7 scylan eowre heortan eargian swyþe 7 eowra feonda
mægen strangian þearle, 7 ge tofeseðe swyþe afyrhte
oft lytel werod earhlice forbugað. (62-64)

In both sermons, the contrast involved is emphasized by the syntactic parallelism. The description Wulfstan substitutes for et fugietis nullo persequente, which is derived from v. 17, transforms the unrealistic hyperbole of his source to a threat of disaster more likely to tally with the actual defeats experienced by the English.

In paraphrasing the threats of disaster, Wulfstan employs a number of word pairs, as he does in his version of the promises, and intensives are more numerous. Two of the word pairs, like most of those in the first section, provide an economical equivalent to synonymous expressions in the Latin, Si autem non audieritis me neque feceritis precepta mea (v. 14) being paralleled by gyf ge ... lare 7 lage mine forgymað oððe oferhogiað (60). The list of calamities, wædl 7 wawa, sacu 7 wracu, here 7 hunger (61-62), amplifies Wulfstan's summarizing catalogue in the Latin, inopiam, famem, et pestem (27). The other two word pairs, stalu 7 steorfa (65) and geyrmað 7 swyþe geswencað (67) have no parallel

in the Latin. Here, as in the sermon's first section, the word pairs are sufficiently general in meaning to encompass most of the multifarious events prophesied in the Vulgate, and their use heightens the impression of proliferation.

In the second section there is also extensive compounding of units other than adjacent single words: that is, as well as the doubling of nouns or verbs to form word pairs, there is doubling of the elements of full clauses in reduced clauses. Three of the four sentences in this section contain, in addition to a full clause or clauses, at least one reduced clause which repeats elements of a full clause. (Four sentences because 7 ge beoð gesealde ... (66-67) is, understandably, punctuated in MS. I as a separate sentence. I say understandably, because it has no semantic or stylistic connexions with the full clause immediately preceding it; it has direct word order as opposed to the indirect order of And eow unwæstm þurh unweder gelome gelimpeð (64-65), and it does not, for instance, employ a form of the same verb as do the full compound clauses in 60-63. This sentence is the only one which does not contain a reduced clause.)

In the first of these four sentences, there is a reduced clause repeating the object noun phrase and the verb phrase of the full subordinate clause:

And gif ge þonne fram me hwyrfað eowre heortan 7
lara 7 laga mine forgymað oððe oferhogiað.

To put this another way, the full clause is expanded by the addition of another object group and verb group, which are dependent on And gif ge þonne. Then follow two full main clauses and a reduced clause which repeats the subject noun phrase and part of the verb phrase of the second main clause:

þonne sceal eow sona weaxan to hearne wædl 7 wawa,
sacu 7 wracu, here 7 hunger; 7 scylan eowre heortan
eargian swyþe 7 eowra feonda mægen strangian þearle.

The sentence concludes with another full clause (7 ge tofesede swyþe afyrhte oft lytel werod earhlice forbugað). The second sentence contains one full and one reduced clause, again repeating the subject noun phrase and the verb phrase: And eow unwæstm þurh unweder gelome gelimpeð, 7 stalu 7 steorfa swyþe gehyneþ. The fourth sentence consists of two full and two reduced clauses which repeat the object and the verb: Land hy awestað 7 burga forbærnað 7 æhta forspillað, 7 eard hy amyrrað. (There is room for argument, in dealing with an inflected language, as to whether a clause which elides only a pronominal subject can accurately be described as reduced, but I think it justifiable in this instance, since hy re-appears in the final clause.)

The passage, then, consists mainly of short, grammatically simple clauses joined by "and," the exceptions being the subordination in 59-60 and the relative clause in 66-67. The paratactic style of the passage may have been influenced by the style of the Latin summary. It seems more likely, though, that Wulfstan employed this particular style to give the impression of rapid accumulation of disasters contrasting with the more leisurely pace of the first section which deals with a felicitous state. In the first section of the sermon, he also paraphrases a basically paratactic source, but co-ordination is not a prominent feature, and he appears to be deliberately increasing the number of short compound clauses by his additions to his source: et erit terra uestra deserta, et ciuitates uestre destructe (33-34), for instance, becomes Land hy awestað 7 burga forbærnað 7 æhta forspillað, 7 eard hy amyrrað.

The intensives, six in all in a short passage, also heighten the fearfulness of the disasters. Tentatively, it may be suggested that, in two instances in the sermon, the addition of

intensives assists in the creation of stylistic effects similar to Latin rhymed prose. I am not postulating any similarity between the rhythms of Wulfstan's prose and those of Latin rhymed prose. To do so would, in any case, be otiose, since Gerould, Bethurum, and Lipp have revealed, in their studies of Ælfric's prose rhythm, the immense difficulties attendant on tracing the relationship of Latin and Old English prose rhythm.¹ Lipp states that Latin rhymed prose is

simply prose in which the final words of syntactic units rhyme. The rhymes are usually in couplets, but are also found in longer sequences and occasionally in such patterns as abba or abab. In accordance with the medieval convention, the identity of sound may be only a matter of final unstressed endings, although more is sometimes involved. The rhyming units are characteristically short and are often, although not always, linked by other devices as well—almost invariably by syntactic parallelism, which gives rise to parallel grammatical forms, which in their turn provide the rhymes, or when they do not are sometimes used in their stead. Internal rhyme, alliteration, rhythm, and other stylistic adornments sometimes further reinforce the connection between the rhymed units.... The end rhymes of rhymed prose, whether in Latin or in Old English, serve not only to link together syntactic units, but also to emphasize the pause between them—especially when these rhymes are reinforced by parallelism.²

In Be Godcundre Warnunge, there are four passages in which there is a series of short syntactic units linked by end rhyme. The identity of sound usually involves only the final inflexional ending, but this, according to Lipp, was conventionally acceptable as rhyme. Instances of parallelism and the stylistic adornments which Lipp mentions also appear in the four passages:

¹See G.H. Gerould, "Abbot Ælfric's Rhythmic Prose," MP, XXII (1925), 353-66; Dorothy Bethurum, "The Form of Ælfric's Lives of Saints," SP, XXIX (1932), 515-33; F.R. Lipp, "Ælfric's Old English Prose Style," SP, LXVI (1969), 689-718.

²SP, LXVI, 702-3.

Ic eow wille rædan 7 swybe aræran 7 freondscipe cyðan mid
rihtan getrywþan, wealdan eow blisse 7 micelre lisse, habban
eow to þegnan 7 beon eow for mundboran, gif ge me gehyrað,
swa swa me licað. (55-59)

7 ge beoð gesealde feondum to gewealde, þa eow
geyrmað 7 swybe geswencað. Land hy awestað 7 burga
forbærnað 7 æhta forspillað, 7 eard hy amyrrað. (66-68)

þæt hy 7 heora yldran me swa gegremedan, þurh þæt hy noldan
mine lage healdan, ac me ofersawan on mænigfealde wisan. (71-73)

7 hy þonne clypiað 7 helpes me biddað 7 unriht forlætað
7 to rihte gebugað. (76-77)

If we assume some form of continuity between Old and Modern English intonation, the effect of the addition of swybe in Ic eow wille rædan 7 swybe aræran and in þa eow geyrmað 7 swybe geswencað appears to be the creation of a separate breath group. That is, one tends to pause before 7 swybe aræran and before 7 swybe geswencað, whereas one would be more likely to read Ic eow wille rædan 7 aræran and þa eow geyrmað 7 geswencað as continuous units. The addition of swybe also equalizes the length of contiguous groups. Perhaps then, since the addition of swybe in the first two passages quoted above seems to produce separate speech units roughly equivalent in length to the units on which they are grammatically dependent and to which they are linked by inflexional rhyme, the function of the intensives in these two cases is to contribute to the creation of passages comparable in style to Latin rhymed prose.

Syntactic units linked by rhyming final inflexions will, of course, inevitably appear in almost any passage of prose written in an inflected language, and pairs of rhymed syntactic units do occur sporadically in all of Wulfstan's sermons. It is much less usual, however, to find passages in which end rhyming is sustained beyond two or three units.¹ I would accept the stylistic effect of such passages as deliberately contrived:

¹See pp. 240-41.

a series of end rhymed syntactic units is much less likely to occur accidentally than couplets are, and if it does, the writer presumably becomes conscious of the rhymes and decides whether or not he wishes to retain them. I have suggested in my discussion of XI that Wulfstan may have felt some form of stylistic embellishment appropriate in presenting the words of the prophets: his approximation to Latin rhymed prose in Be Godcundre Warnunge may also have been prompted by the belief that his material called for the "high" style.

In the final section of his sermon (68-85), Wulfstan expands his Latin summary instead of compressing it, primarily because it deals with the repentance of the nation which his sermon is designed to evoke. The passage of the Latin summary on which the last section is based consists of one long sentence correlated with cum ... tunc, and the main clause and the subordinate clause are both compound ones:

Et cum deserta fuerit terra propter peccata populi,
et ipsi qui remanserint tabescentes pronuntiabunt
peccata sua et peccata patrum suorum quoniam des-
pexerunt me et precepta mea spreuerunt, tunc reuertetur
cor incircumcisum eorum, et clamabunt ad me, et memor
ero testamenti prioris, et terra recipiet sabbata
sua. (34-39)

Wulfstan paraphrases the first subordinate clause of the Latin in a compound subordinate clause, but the second subordinate clause is paraphrased in a main clause and three subordinate clauses.

Thus:

Et cum deserta fuerit terra propter peccata populi,
And þonne land wyrðeð for synnum forworden 7 þæs
folces dugoð swyþost fordwineþ,

et ipsi qui remanserint tabescentes pronuntiabunt
peccata sua et peccata patrum suorum quoniam des-
pexerunt me et precepta mea spreuerunt,

þonne fehð seo wealaf sorhful 7 sarimod geomrigendum
mode synna bemænan 7 sarlice syfian, þæt hy 7 heora
yldran me swa gegremedan þurh þæt hy noldan mine lage
healdan ac me ofersawan on mænigfealde wisan.

Each of the remaining Latin clauses is paraphrased in a separate sentence (if we accept the punctuation of MS. I).¹ All of the clauses, except the last one (et terra recipiet sabbata sua), are translated fairly closely, and provide a nucleus to which Wulfstan adds his own material. The parallels are as follows (Wulfstan's additions are enclosed in brackets):

tunc reuertetur cor incircumcisum eorum,

And þonne wyrð seo heardnes stiðmodre heortan, (þeah hit læt wære,) swyþe gehnexad (þurh grimlice steora 7 heardlice þreala þe ic on þæt mancyn sende for gewyrhtum).

et clamabunt ad me,

And hy þonne clypiað 7 helpes me biddað (7 unriht forlætað 7 to rihte gebugað).

et memor ero testamenti prioris,

And ic eac þonne sona weorðe gemyndig ærran behata (7 ealra þara þinga þe ic heora yldran iu ær geuðe).

All of the sentences in 68-80, as defined by MS. I, repeat þonne, including 7 heom ic þonne syððan ræde 7 ryme (79-80), which is either Wulfstan's addition or a loose reformulation of et terra recipiet sabbata sua.² The re-iteration of þonne marks clearly the separate stages in the process of repentance and the restoration of God's blessings.

Wulfstan's description of the nation's remorse and the renewal of God's favour differs from the account given in Leviticus in a number of ways. The Vulgate states in v. 38 that the Jews will perish among the nations and the hostile land will devour them, and it then continues, in vs. 39-41:

¹MS. I punctuates 7 hy þonne clypiað ... (76-77) and 7 heom ic þonne ... (79-80) as separate sentences. Sentence divisions in the MS are otherwise the same as Bethurum's.

²See below.

Quod si et de iis aliqui remanserint, tabescent in iniquitatibus suis, in terra inimicorum suorum, et propter peccata patrum suorum et sua affligentur: Donec confiteantur iniquitates suas, et majorum suorum, quibus praeuaricati sunt in me, et ambulauerunt ex aduerso mihi. Ambulabo igitur et ego contra eos, et inducam illos in terram hostilem, donec erubescat incircumcisa mens eorum: tunc orabunt pro impietatibus suis.

The general sense of these verses is that those who do not perish in foreign captivity will remain pining in the land of their enemies and will be afflicted until they repent. In reworking the chapter, Wulfstan expunges the Hebrew conception of exile as the most extreme form of divine punishment. His Latin summary does not refer to exile, it contains only the words Et cum deserta fuerit terra propter peccata populi, et ipsi qui remanserint tabescentes pronuntiabunt. Wulfstan brings this closer to a description of contemporary English experience by translating it as And þonne land wyrðeð for synnum forworden, and by adding 7 þæs folces dugoð swypost fordwineð (68-70). In his English version, then, "those who remain" (seo wealaf) are not those who survive in exile, but the inhabitants of the land who are not slaughtered by the nation's attackers. Although Wulfstan's Latin summary carries over from the Vulgate a reference to the survivors' languishing, his sermon contains no precise equivalent to this detail, and he does not follow the Vulgate in stating that the survivors will be afflicted until they repent. Instead, he depicts the survivors as languishing and afflicted by virtue of the fact that they do repent of their sins and the sins of their forefathers:

þonne fehð seo wealaf sorhful 7 sarimod geomri-
gendum mode synna bemānan 7 sarlice syfian, þæt
hy 7 heora ylðran me swa ǰegremedan þurh þæt
hy noldan mine lage healdan, ac me ofersawan on
mānigfealde wisan. (70-73)

Wulfstan's transmutation of the afflictions of the survivors to a description of the first stage of their repentance is but

one aspect of his divergence from the general import of vs. 39-41. The underlying significance of the Vulgate passage is that the Chosen People, no matter how long they may forsake God and therefore suffer, will inevitably be reconciled with him. The survivors' repentance is not in itself of significance: the vital point is that the Chosen People will ultimately pray for their sins. The sense of historical inevitability disappears from Wulfstan's version, because he expresses the response of the nation to affliction in a cum ... tunc construction in the Latin, and in a sentence correlated with bonne ... bonne in the English version, followed by two sentences which repeat "then"--in effect, he converts the parallel statements, Donec confiteantur iniquitates suas and donec erubescat incircumcisa mens eorum: tunc orabunt pro impietatibus suis, into a sequential description of the nation's repentance. Repentance in Wulfstan's sermon therefore assumes the aspect of an immediate result of affliction: in so far as it is inevitable, it is because it is a logical consequence. The effect of Wulfstan's change in presentation is to give greater prominence to the actual process of repentance. It is, presumably, his didactic concern with repentance which lies behind his departure from the Vulgate, since there appears to be no pressing reason why he could not have translated the passage in roughly the same manner as Ælfric does:

7 for eowrum agenum gilte ge beoð geswencte, oððæt
ge andettan eowre synna 7 eower yldrena, mid ðam hi
me gremedon 7 eodon ongen me. 7 ic ga ongean eow, 7
læde eow on feonda land, oþ eower lyðre moð ablysig; 1
ðonne gebidde ge for eowrum arleasnyssum.

He may perhaps have been influenced by other considerations.

Possibly, since the concept of historical inevitability would have been unfamiliar to an Anglo-Saxon audience, he may have preferred not to depict God's relentless persecution of the survivors.

¹The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, p. 303.

He may, too, have preferred to present repentance, not as a remote future event, but as the immediate response to the destruction of the nation, in order to suggest that the afflictions in store for the disobedient nation are so great that it will repent at once, and so it would be better for it to repent now and spare itself further afflictions. He appears to be calling attention to this implication in his expanded version of tunc reuertetur cor incircumcisum eorum:

And þonne wyrð seo heardnes stiðmodre heortan, þeah hit læt wære, swyþe gehnexad þurh grimlice steora 7 heardlice þreala þe ic on þæt mancyn sende for gewyrhtum. (73-76)

In the paraphrase of the response which is made by the disobedient nation to the disasters which overtake it, Wulfstan makes additions to his Latin summary which characterize more fully the nature of repentance, and so instructs his audience obliquely in the manner in which it must repent. The sorrow of the nation is magnified by the paraphrase of et ipsi qui remanserint tabescentes pronuntiabunt (35) as:

þonne fehð seo wealaf sorhful 7 sarimod geomrigendum mode synna bemænan 7 sarlice syfian. (70-71)

Wulfstan's exhortations to repentance do not usually refer to lamentation, though MS. C includes Uton creopan to Criste 7 bifigendre heortan clipian gelome in the conclusion of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos (167-68), and it is mentioned in his description of penance in Sermo de Cena Domini (XV, pp. 236-38).¹ The other addition which describes the nation's remorse, however, 7 unriht forlætað 7 to rihte gebugað (77), is similar to the definition of repentance in several other Wulfstan sermons.²

¹See XV. 51-54, 65-66.

²See XI. 195-96, 277; XX. EI 191; XXI. 6.

Wulfstan's alterations to the Latin summary also indicate, in keeping with his introductory sentence (3-6), that God is to be loved as well as obeyed. Both aspects of man's relation to God are mentioned in the final promise of prosperity:

Þæt land ic gefriþige, 7 þæt folc ic generige, 7 blisse
7 lisse ic sende on þa þeode þe me wile lufian 7 rihtlice
hyran. (80-82)

In the paraphrase of 35-37, which include the words peccata sua et peccata patrum suorum quoniam despexerunt me et precepta mea spreuerunt, he refers to both the rejection of God and the failure to keep his commandments:

þæt hy 7 heora yldran me swa gegremedan, þurh þæt
hy noldan mine lage healdan, ac me ofersawan on
mænigfealde wisan. (71-73)

Repentance is described as involving the softening of hard hearts:

And þonne wyrð seo heardnes stiðmodre heortan, þeah
hit læt wære, swyþe gehnexad þurh grimlice steora 7
heardlice þreala þe ic on þæt mancyn sende for
gewyrhtum. (73-76)

Wulfstan's metaphor, which recalls his earlier description of the rejection of God, gif ge þonne fram me hwyrfað eowre heortan (59-60), interprets cor incircumcism^u in his Latin summary (37), which is derived from v. 41. Whereas the Vulgate states that erubescat incircumcisa mens, and Wulfstan describes the "uncircumcised hearts" in his Latin summary as "reverting," he develops a metaphoric interpretation in his sermon which accords with the emphasis given to the need to love God.

The concluding section of the sermon magnifies the blessings granted the repentant nation which are referred to in Leviticus. Wulfstan expands et memor ero testamenti prioris (38), replacing the legal concept of a covenant with "former promises" and adding a phrase which emphasizes the abundance of God's gifts:

And ic eac þonne sona weorðe gemyndig ærran behata
7 ealra þæra þinga þe ic heora yldran iu aer geuðe. (78-79)

He also includes the promise 7 heom ic þonne syððan ræde 7 ryme (79-80), which has no parallel in the Vulgate chapter or Wulfstan's summary, unless it is a very loose and colourless rendering of et terra recipiet sabbata sua (39). The Latin phrase bears a much closer resemblance, however, to the sentence immediately following:

Ðæt land ic gefripige, 7 þæt folc ic generige, 7 blisse
7 lisse ic sende on þa þeode þe me wile lufian 7 rihtlice
hyran. (80-82)

Even if it is held that 7 heom ic þonne syððan ræde 7 ryme, and not this sentence, derives immediately from et terra recipiet sabbata sua, the possibility remains that Wulfstan's amplification of the promise of renewed prosperity in 80-82 was suggested by the pregnant Latin metaphor. As I have already had occasion to remark, the expression in v. 43 which is similar to et terra recipiet sabbata sua, like the comparable expression in v. 34, appears to refer to the rest which the land enjoys only when it is desolate. V. 43 speaks of the land

quae cum relicta fuerit ab eis, complacebit sibi in
sabbatissuis, patiens solitudinem propter illos.

Certainly Ælfric takes v. 43 as a reference to the condition of the land when it is deserted, for he paraphrases it as Ic gyme ðæs landes, þonne ge hit forlætað; hit licað me, þeah hit weste sy.¹ Ælfric's paraphrase attributes to God a more active role in the recovery of the land than the Vulgate does, but the general idea is the same as that expressed in vs. 34 and 43 of the Vulgate—when the inhabitants of the land are in exile it is free of their iniquities and able to recover. The land's return to prosperity after the exiles' repentance is therefore at most only implicitly suggested in v. 43. In Wulfstan's sermon, however,

¹The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, p. 303.

et terra recipiet sabbata sua is interpreted, either in 7 heom ic bonne syððan ræde 7 ryme or in 80-82, as a promise of the many blessings which God will grant to the nation after it has repented. Wulfstan's magnification of the promises of renewed prosperity, particularly in 80-82, may have been influenced by a phrase in v. 42 which is not included in his Latin summary, Terrae quoque memor ero.

Wulfstan's heightening of the favour God shows to the repentant nation in the concluding section of his sermon, like his magnification of the promises of prosperity in the first section, serves a didactic purpose, since it provides his audience with an additional incentive to love God and keep his commandments. Just as he adds to his description of the promises in 47-59 a reminder of the condition on which God's favour depends, so too, in the concluding section of his sermon, he makes additions which recall the conditional nature of the return to prosperity. He adds gif hy me willað hyran mid rihte (80), and he describes God's munificence in 80-82 as the bestowal of prosperity on the nation which loves and obeys him:

þæt land ic gefriþige, 7 þæt folc ic generige, 7 blisse
7 lisse ic sende on þa þeode þe me wile lufian 7 rihtlice
hyran.

This final promise, which summarizes God's benevolence and reminds the audience that prosperity is dependent on the nation's conduct, prepares for Wulfstan's exhortatory conclusion, 7 eal hit mæg to bysne æghwylcere þeode, gyme se þe wille (83-84).

Be Godcundre Warnunge, it may be concluded, is Wulfstan's most unified sermon based on a biblical passage. It illustrates particularly well his assimilation of his source to his didactic mode and the close relation between his individual departures from literalness and his broader didactic aims. He does not

simply translate and elaborate, though both Bethurum and Whitelock describe Be Godcundre Warnunge in these terms.¹ He shapes his source into a sermon illustrative of a particular theme of moral significance for his audience. It is his didactic purpose, clearly stated in the opening sentence of the sermon, which governs his selection of verses from Leviticus and the manner in which he paraphrases them. In particular, he limits the threats and promises to those concerning warfare and prosperity, and interprets the biblical passage in terms which reflect the situation in contemporary England. He also reformulates and expands the passage dealing with repentance and emphasizes the condition on which God's favour depends.

His paraphrase also reveals his awareness of the form of presentation most suitable for oral delivery. Each of his sentences is limited to one main point; they are not complicated in structure; and the stylistic devices employed (mainly parallelism, zeugma, and alliteration) make an immediate impression. Almost all of the sentences of the sermon are linked by "and," but three separate sections can be discerned, corresponding to the three different topics, which, like the sentences, are sufficiently limited in content to be easily apprehended when preached. The sentences of the first and last rhetorical units are linked by verbal repetition (ic in the first and ponne in the last), which in the first unit emphasizes God's munificence and in the last indicates the progressive stages of repentance.

The contrast Wulfstan presents is derived from his source, but it is clear from his opening sentence that he views the contrast as involving love as well as the obedience stressed in his source, so that he necessarily makes alterations and additions in

¹See Homilies, p. 36, and Whitelock Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 1st ed., p. 17.

order to incorporate this contrast in his sermon. He emphasizes the contrast by the use of formal parallelism in the first sentence and by magnifying the promises of prosperity and the threats of disasters in his alterations to the meaning of his source and his addition of intensives. The magnification not only serves to heighten the contrast, but has a didactic purpose, since it helps to persuade his audience of the value of loving God and keeping his commandments.

A particularly striking feature of Wulfstan's alterations to his source is his reluctance to depict God as a wrathful avenger, which is manifested both in his Latin summary and, to a greater degree, in his paraphrase. Only once in the sermon does he attribute afflictions directly to God, in purh grimlice steora 7 heardlice preala be ic on þæt mancyn sende for gewyrhtum (75-76), and even here, he emphasizes the fearfulness of the afflictions rather than the vengeful anger of God. His reluctance to describe God as the origin of evils is a reflection of his theological beliefs, but it is also, as it is in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, an aspect of his attempts to evoke love for God in his sermon.

PART III
THEMATIC VARIATIONS

CHAPTER I

SECUNDUM MARCUM AND SECUNDUM LUCAM

I turn now to the sermons which are not thought to have been largely based on a single source from which Wulfstan worked directly. With the exception of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos (Bethurum XX), the sermons which fall into this category have received little attention. (Besides the four sermons which I have selected for discussion, III, V, XIII, and XX, the group includes VII, VIIa, XIV, XVII, and XXI.) The comparative neglect of the sermons for which no single main source has been postulated is in part attributable to earlier researchers' preoccupation with determining criteria of authorship, since the comparison of Wulfstan's sermons with the Old English or Latin compositions on which they are assumed to be based has proved the most satisfactory means of defining the distinctive features of Wulfstan's style and method of composition. Such attention as the sermons which have no single known source have received has been concentrated chiefly on their similarities to other works by Wulfstan. Jost, in Wulfstanstudien, adduced numerous parallels between sermons he attributed to Wulfstan in support of his ascriptions, and the extensive research of Professor Bethurum has made available full documentation of the parallels in phrasing and substance found in Wulfstan's compositions, as well as his use of extracts in his "Commonplace Book."¹

Valuable as such documentation is for revealing the unity which exists within the established corpus, its effect is to give an exaggerated view of the lack of variety among Wulfstan's sermons, particularly as his method of composition is characterized as the "expansion" of passages which appear in his earlier works.² The

¹Homilies and "Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book," PMLA, LVII (1942), 916-29.

²Particularly in Homilies (e.g., pp. 101-4, 282, 288). See also Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 335-36.

concentration on similarities of phrasing and content in Wulfstan's compositions, it seems to me, has also fostered the belief that his sermons lack coherence, for both Sermo Lupi ad Anglos and Sermo ad Populum (XIII) have been described in terms of compilations of passages from earlier Wulfstan compositions.¹

Wulfstan's range of topics is undoubtedly narrower than Ælfric's and his persistent concern with certain subjects is evident, but, granted his restricted scope, a study of the themes of his sermons reveals that there is considerable variety among his didactic compositions. The present chapter and the two following trace the development of Wulfstan's themes in four sermons which have no single main source in order to demonstrate the manner in which the sermons are unified and the variety of themes. The existence of verbal parallels, I would argue, is not indicative of pastiche composition, for, in reusing passages from his earlier works, Wulfstan alters both the style and substance to assimilate them to a different context.² By examining the development of the sermons' themes, it is possible to observe the techniques Wulfstan employed to instruct and persuade, and to relate some of the features of his style which have been described as "characteristic" to the themes and didactic aims of his sermons.

The account of the themes and construction of the sermons which do not appear to be based on a single source is, of course, a partial one, since it is practically necessary to restrict the discussion to a selected group of sermons. The restriction is regrettable, for, with the exception of VIIa, which consists of brief remarks on the Creed and the Lord's Prayer paraphrased in it,

¹See Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 1st ed., p. 17 and Bethurum's remarks on Sermo ad Populum in Homilies, p. 339.

²Differences in style among the parallel passages have been noted, but have been viewed only as evidence of the order in which the sermons were written. See Introduction, p. 6.

the other sermons which fall into the third category I have defined do, in my opinion, support my claims concerning the thematic unity of Wulfstan's sermons--XXI is a particularly tightly integrated exhortation, and is an interesting development of the theme of national perversity which figures in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos and De Visione Isaie Prophetae. A discussion of two early and two late sermons¹ which fall into the third category, it is hoped, will at least suggest the outlines of Wulfstan's achievement by drawing attention to the intellectual content of sermons which might perhaps appear to have little more to recommend them than their rhetorical force.

It is particularly the sermons that deal exclusively with the Last Days, Ib-V, which have been considered to illustrate Wulfstan's practice of reworking basically the same material in increasing stages of elaboration. Bethurum remarks:

Ia and Ib are the first examples of Wulfstan's habit of excerpting Latin texts bearing on a given subject and then translating and elaborating them into an English sermon, but his use here is not exactly that of the later examples of this practice--VIIa, b, c; Xa, b, c; XI; XVIa and b; and XIX--for the material of Ia appears in all the other eschatological homilies. IV and V both depend on Ælfric, and there is little doubt that IV was written first and then elaborated by reference to Adso.²

Secundum Marcum (V, pp. 134-41) and Secundum Lucam (III, pp. 123-27) are the two sermons in this group for which no single direct source is postulated,³ and I shall deal briefly with them in this chapter. Much more could be said concerning the style of these

¹There seems no reason to dissent from Bethurum's suggestion that Ib-V were the first group written. Sermo ad Populum cannot be placed with any certainty, but it seems safe to assume that it borrows from other sermons, not vice versa. Sermo Lupi ad Anglos appears, on the evidence of its rubrics alone, to have been written late in Wulfstan's career (see Appendix for dating). For Bethurum's remarks on the order of the sermons see Homilies, pp. 101-4.

²Homilies, p. 282.

³Ib is substantially based on part of the Latin compilation in Ia, II is based on an extract from the Vulgate, and IV is generally thought to have been based on Ælfric's Preface.

two sermons than is to be found in my analysis, but I have curtailed the discussion in order to devote more space to the two later sermons, which are more complex in the development of their themes and contain a much higher proportion of material which is comparable with other Wulfstan compositions. It would also be possible to make a more detailed comparison of certain passages in these two sermons with their ultimate sources (mainly Adso's Libellus Anticristi and the Bible), but in this section I am concerned with the relationship between Wulfstan's sermons.

Secundum Marcum is Wulfstan's most comprehensive treatment of the Last Days (probably, as Bethurum suggests, the last of the five eschatological sermons to be written),¹ and it contains a number of elements in common with his other eschatological sermons. Like Ib, it mentions the precursors of Antichrist whose evil deeds are a fore-shadowing of his reign; it refers to the signs heralding the Second Coming, which are described at length in II and III; and it attributes the afflictions of the Last Days to the sins of mankind as III does. Its account of the deeds of Antichrist connects it with De Temporibus Anticristi (IV)-- Bethurum, it may be noted, commenting on the relationship of IV and Ælfric's Preface, remarks that "Wulfstan reworked the material from Ælfric in V, enlarging and developing it."² But although Secundum Marcum is in many ways comparable with the other eschatological sermons, it is not a mere elaboration of earlier material: the earlier material is integrated to a unified sermon which is unique in its presentation of the Last Days.

The first section of the sermon establishes that the terrors of the Last Days are the result of the sins of mankind. The main didactic point, that disasters will inevitably increase because of

¹See Homilies, pp. 103-4, 282.

²Homilies, p. 288.

man's sins, is twice repeated in a different form (in 9-15 and 23-26). The first assertion is followed by an indictment of specific sins (18-23), which is presumably based on 2 Tim. iii.1-5, and introduced by the words forðam nu is se tima þe Paulus se apostol gefyrn foresæde (15-16), which draw attention to the imminence of the Last Days. The biblical verses read:

Hoc autem scito, quod in novissimis diebus instabunt tempora periculosa:
 Erunt homines seipsos amantes, cupidi, elati, superbi, blasphemii, parentibus non obedientes, ingrati, scelesti,
 Sine affectione, sine pace, criminatores, incontinentes, immites, sine benignitate,
 Proditores, protervi, tumidi, et voluptatum amatores magis quam Dei:
 Habentes speciem quidem pietatis, virtutem autem ejus abnegantes.

Wulfstan emphasizes the didactic point of his introductory section by adding for manna synnum to his paraphrase of v. 1 (16-18). The scriptural verses are very loosely paraphrased, for Wulfstan brings them into accord with his conception of the influence of Antichrist's teaching. In Wulfstan's view, the influence of Antichrist's teaching is most clearly manifested in the period before his reign--in De Septiformi Spiritu (IX, pp. 185-91), for instance, he states:

And to fela manna eac is nu on ðissere swicelan worulde þe ealswa to swyðe þurh hiwunge eal oðer specað oþer hy þencað 7 lætað þæt to wærscype þæt hy oðre magan swa swicollice pæcan; ac eal þæt cymð of deofle, ðeah hy swa ne wenan, 7 ægðer hy deriað mid swa geradan dædan ge ærest him sylfum ge syððan to manegan. And swa gerade manswican þe on ða wisan swæslic swiciað oftost on unriht 7 ðurh þæt deriað for Gode 7 for worulde, þæt syndan forbodan 7 Antecristes þrælas þe his weg rymað, þeah hy swa ne wenan. (120-28)

In 18-19 and 22-23, he stresses the prevalence of falseness and treachery, which are associated in De Septiformi Spiritu and other Wulfstan compositions with Antichrist's influence,¹ and the variant

¹See particularly 77-80, 207-11, 222-23, 365-68.

reading in MS. H has:

7 þa ðe beoð swicoleste þa ðincgæð wærreste, 7
þa ðæ yfel cunnon hiwian to gode 7 unsoð to soðe
þurh lytigne listwrencg þa þuncæð wisæ.¹

Consistent with Wulfstan's view that the devil teaches men to love evil and hate righteousness² is the appearance of the words sume weorþað egeslice godcundnessa hyrwende 7 boclare leande 7 unriht lufiende in the paraphrase of the verses (21-22). The indictment of sin which follows the second statement that the world must grow worse as a consequence of sin elaborates on the wide-spread treachery among mankind, and the love of evil and the rejection of God (27-32). Wulfstan's repetition of the same idea, enlarging upon it and adding further details in the process, which has previously been remarked upon as a significant aspect of his mode of presentation, enables him to emphasize important points and ensures that his teachings can be easily assimilated by his hearers.

The opening of Secundum Marcum immediately distinguishes it from De Temporibus Anticristi, the sermon with which it has most in common. Wulfstan's didactic purpose in De Temporibus Anticristi is to warn against the terrors and delusions of Antichrist's reign. This aim is stated at the beginning of the sermon, and the warning is given greater force by the assertion that his reign is close at hand:

Leofan men, us is mycel þearf þæt we wære beon
þæs egeslican timan þe towerd is. Nu bið swyðe
raðe Antecristes tima, þæs ðe we wenan magan 7
eac georne witan, 7 þæt bið se egeslicesta þe
æfre gewearð syððan þeos woruld ærost gescapen was. (3-6)

In Secundum Marcum, he does not present the reign of Antichrist as a trial for which men must prepare themselves; his didactic aim

¹See Homilies, p. 135.

²See particularly pp. 241-42, 370-74.

is to show that the afflictions of the Last Days are a consequence of mankind's sins. He therefore begins by asserting that great disasters must follow from the iniquities of the present time, and alludes to the coming of Antichrist later in the sermon in order to indicate the world's steady progression to disaster. The introductions to the two sermons differ also in that Secundum Marcum lacks the warning exhortation of De Temporibus Anticristi. Wulfstan simply describes the afflictions of the Last Days in Secundum Marcum (8-14), though in more hyperbolic terms than he does in De Temporibus Anticristi, and his comment on them in 14-16 consists only of a statement that they are inevitable. The absence of exhortation in the introduction reflects the development of the eschatological theme in the sermon as a whole, for in Secundum Marcum the assertion that the terrors of the Last Days are the result of mankind's sins does not culminate in a call to repent before it is too late, as it does in III, or in order to postpone the advent of Antichrist, the ultimate punishment, as it does in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos.¹ In its failure to allow for the possibility that the world's progression to destruction may be modified by an improvement in man's moral condition, and its absence of exhortations to repent or prepare, Secundum Marcum is the most pessimistic of Wulfstan's sermons, for it appears to embody a conviction that warnings are futile because mankind is confirmed in evil and will inevitably be destroyed. Influenced by Mark xiii.20--

Et nisi breviasset Dominus dies, non fuisset salva
omnis caro: sed propter electos elegit, breviavit dies--

it comes closer than any of Wulfstan's other sermons to expressing a belief in the doctrine of predestination.

¹See further Pt. III, ch. III.

Having established that the world will grow worse because of the sins of man, Wulfstan deals with the imminence of Antichrist's reign (33-52), emphasizing its approach by the repetition of nu throughout the account.¹ As in the first section, he proceeds by repeating a single point in various forms and gradually expanding its implications. He begins by contrasting the advent of Christ with that of Antichrist, first in two sentences linked by verbal repetition (cf. þa wæs mycel blis 7 bot seo betste mannum towerd and mycel is seo þwyrnes þe nu is towerd), and then in a sentence which draws together the first two and emphasizes the antithetical nature of the two powers by syntactic parallelism and verbal repetition:

Crist wæs ealra bearna betst geboren þe æfre
geboren wurde, 7 Antecrist bið ealra þara bearna
wyrst on þas woruld geboren þe ær oððe æfter
æfre gewurde oððe geweorðe. (37-40)

Here, as in 9-12, the terror of the Last Days is magnified by hyperbole even greater than in the comparable passages in other eschatological sermons.² The words gebide ðære yrmðe se þe hit gebide (36-37) in the reference to the coming of Antichrist--

And mycel is seo þwyrnes þe nu is towerd,
gebide ðære yrmðe se þe hit gebide, þæt
Antecrist geboren beo--

illustrate particularly clearly Wulfstan's abandonment of his usual hortative mode in favour of the belief that only God's chosen few will survive the persecutions of Antichrist's reign.

After contrasting the advent of Christ and Antichrist, Wulfstan restates the earlier assertion that the world must grow worse (cf. 14-16), referring this time specifically to the reign of Antichrist:

Nu sceal hit nyde yfelian swyðe, forðam þe hit
nealæcð georne his timan, ealswa hit awriten
is 7 gefyrn wæs gewitegod: Post mille annos
soluetur Satanus. (40-43)

¹The word appears in 36, 40, 44, 45, 50.

²Cf. Ib. 20-22, IV. 8-11.

He then explains at greater length that the time of Antichrist's coming is close at hand, reiterating the assertion of the introductory section, that the afflictions of the Last Days are a consequence of sin (43-48). It is at this point that he introduces the persecution of the righteous in the reign of Antichrist, which is expounded in greater detail in the third section, and he concludes with a description of the deeds of Antichrist's precursors, also mentioned in the next section, which stresses the closeness of Antichrist's advent and the terror of his reign:

7 huru hit sceal hefegian heonanforð þearle
rihtwisan þearfan 7 ðam unbealafullum. Nu
ða yfelan 7 ða swicelan swa oferlice swyðe
brædað on worulde ongean þæt mæste yfel þe
mannum is towerd; ðæt is se þeodfeond
Antecrist sylfa. (49-52)

From the account of Antichrist's coming in the second section of the sermon, Wulfstan moves to an account of his deeds in the third, which begins with a consideration of the persecution of the righteous. The magnitude of the persecution suffered is emphasized by comparing it with earlier persecutions:

Eala, mycel wæs seo ehtnes þe cristene þoledon
iu ær on worlde oft 7 gelome þurh wælhreowe
manswican wide 7 side, 7 huru hit sceal heonanforð
mænigfealdre weorðan, nu deofol sylf his mægnes
mot wealdan, 7 deofles bearn swa swiðlice motan
cristene bregean. And oft ær wæs mænigfeald
ehtnes, næfre þeah þam gelic þe æfter ðysan
gyt bið. (53-58)

In the two sentences containing the comparison, the first main clause in each sentence deals with the enormity of former persecutions. These two main clauses are linked by verbal repetition (that is, ehtnes, ær, and oft reappear in the first clause of the second sentence), and the distinction between mycel persecution and mænigfeald persecution is emphasized by the different positioning of the adjective. The second main clause in each sentence refers to the approaching persecutions of Antichrist's reign,

and mænigfeald in 7 huru hit sceal heonanforð mænigfealdre weorðan is repeated in the first clause of the second sentence, And oft ær wæs mænigfeald ehtnes. In explanation of his assertion that the imminent persecutions will be unlike those of the past, Wulfstan states that the righteous will be unable to work miracles through God's power as they once were:

Forðam hit was oft ær þæt Godes halgan fela wundra þurh
Godes mihta openlice worhtan on gemang þam þe hy ehtnesse
þoledon, 7 ðurh þæt mænigne man gebettan. Ac hit ne bið
na swa on Antecristes timan. (58-62)

The repetition of oft ær in the first of these sentences links it to the sentence which precedes it. As the two sentences comparing former and approaching persecutions balance a clause referring to future conditions against one referring to conditions in the past, so, in a somewhat similar manner, the two explanatory sentences in 58-62 consist of a sentence referring to the future situation which is opposed to one describing the situation in the past. To this explanation, Wulfstan adds two sentences to the effect that the righteous must suffer all that is inflicted upon them, deprived of the power to perform miracles, and God will not reveal his power but allows Antichrist to rage for a time:

Ne magan þonne halige men on þam timan ænige tacna
openlice wyrcan, ac sculan þolian eal þæt heom man
to deð. Ne God þonne ane hwile his mihta ne his
wundra sylf nele cyðan, swa he oft ær dyde, ac læt
þone deofol Antecrist rabbian 7 wedan sume hwile 7
þa ðe him fylstað. (62-66)

These two sentences are linked to the two preceding sentences by the repetition of a number of lexical items (particularly halig, wundor, miht, openlice, tima, and the verb wyrcan). Here too, clauses containing opposing ideas are balanced against one another: the first two main clauses of each sentence are negative ones referring to the lack of miracles, and the second main clause in each sentence begins with ac and refers to the suffering inflicted in Antichrist's reign. Wulfstan's account of the persecution of

the righteous, then, presents the reign of Antichrist as the triumph of evil contingent upon the suspension of God's power. The explanation unfolds gradually, and is unified by the repetition of lexical items and a loose kind of syntactic patterning which helps to clarify the chronological perspective.

The allusion to God's permission for the reign of Antichrist introduces the account of his deeds (66-77), which is similar to the one given in De Temporibus Anticristi (43-47). Throughout Secundum Marcum, Wulfstan describes the terrors of the Last Days more hyperbolically than in any of his other eschatological sermons, and, accordingly, the account of Antichrist's deeds is inflated in this sermon. Thus:

- IV Se gesawenlica deofol wyrçð fela wundra
 V se gesewenlica feond wyrçð þurh deofles cræft
 fela wunderlicra tacna 7 þurh drycræft
 mænigfealde gedwimera.
- IV 7 mid his gedwimerum mæst ælcne man beswicð;
 V And feorðehealf gear he ricsað ofer mancynn
 7 mid his scincræftum mæst manna beswicð þe
 æfre ðurh ænig ðing beswicen wurde.
- IV 7 þa þe he elles beswican ne mæg, þa he wyle
 neadunga genydan, gyf he mæg, þæt hi Godes
 ætsacan 7 him to gebugan.
- V And þa ðe he elles mid his lotwrencum bepæcan.
 ne mæg, þa he wile þreatian 7 ægeslice wyldan 7
 earmlice pinian on mænigfealde wisan 7 neadunga
 nydan, þæt hy gebugan to his unlaran.

The description in Secundum Marcum differs from that in De Temporibus Anticristi because it gives the exact duration of Antichrist's reign. The inclusion of this detail in Secundum Marcum reflects the dissimilar didactic aims of the two sermons. The period of Antichrist's reign is specified in Ælfric's Preface to the Catholic Homilies, the assumed source of De Temporibus Anticristi, but Wulfstan does not mention it in his sermon because it would minimize the terror of the Last Days, which he emphasizes in order to persuade his audience to seek God's protection.¹

¹See further pp. 58-59.

In Secundum Marcum, however, he is not concerned to exhort his audience to prepare for the evil times ahead, but to demonstrate the superiority of God's power to Antichrist's. He therefore emphasizes the speed with which Antichrist's reign is terminated in Secundum Marcum, both in the passage quoted above and in the peroration. The passage also reflects the pessimistic view of mankind which characterizes the sermon as a whole, for it does not contain the qualifying phrases, gyf he mæg (46) and Gyf hi ðonne þæt nellað (47-48), which appear in the description of Antichrist's attempts to gain adherents in De Temporibus Anticristi.

The account of Antichrist's deeds is followed by an explanation of God's reason for permitting Antichrist to reign, which is similar to a passage in De Temporibus Anticristi. Two reasons are given for God's permission in De Temporibus Anticristi; the sinfulness of mankind, and God's intention that those who withstand Antichrist should be rapidly purged of all sin before the Last Judgement:

God hit geþafað him sume hwile for twam þingum:
 an is arest þæt men beoð þurh synna swa forð
 forworhte þæt hi beoð þæs wel wyrðe þæt deofol
 openlice þanne fandige hwa him fullfyligean wille;
 oðer is þæt God wile þæt ða þe swa gesælige beoð
 þæt hi on rihtan geleafan ðurhwuniað 7 ðam deofle
 anrædlice wiðstandað, he wile þæt þa beon raðe
 amerede 7 geclænsode of synnum þurh ða myclan
 ehtnesse 7 ðurh þæne martirdom ðe hy þonne þoliað. (17-24)

Wulfstan's concern to warn his audience to prepare for the reign of Antichrist in De Temporibus Anticristi leads him to explain the necessity for the sufferings of the righteous in greater detail than his assumed source does, in order to exhort it to remember that heaven is attained only by those who are purified of all sin (24-36). In Secundum Marcum, the only reason given for God's permission is the sinfulness of man:

And God him geðafað þæt for manna gewyrhtum þæt
 he sume hwile mot swa wodlice derian, forðam þe
 men beoð þurh synna swa swyðe forwyrhte þæt deofol

mot openlice þonne heora fandian hu fela he
forspanan mæge to ecan forwyrde. (77-81)

No separate justification is offered for the persecution of those who do not follow Antichrist: the implication is that they too are involved in the iniquities of the Last Days, which are so great as to constitute the sole and adequate justification for Antichrist's persecutions. In keeping with Wulfstan's implicit assumption that all who have not been chosen by God are doomed, he makes no attempt to warn or urge his audience in his account of the persecution of the righteous (81-88), but simply describes their sufferings and states that they will receive eternal joy immediately. The divergences from De Temporibus Anticristi, then, are consistent with Wulfstan's conviction of the extremity of man's sins, which informs the whole of Secundum Marcum, and his assertions that the afflictions of the Last Days are a consequence of sin. Even minor changes in expression reflect his belief that few will be saved: in De Temporibus Anticristi he states that the devil is permitted to discover hwa him fullfyligean wille, but in Secundum Marcum he speaks of the devil finding out hu fela he forspanan mæge to ecan forwyrde.

The third section of the sermon is brought to a conclusion by a rhetorical question in which Wulfstan justifies further God's permission for Antichrist's persecution of mankind by demonstrating that he withdraws his protection in the Last Days from even those he most favours:

La, hwylc wunder bið þeah se mennisca deofol
synfullum mote heardlice derian, þonne God
gepafað þæt he mot on his agenum halgum swylc
wundor gewyrcean þæt Enoh 7 Elias þurh þone
þeodfeond gemartrode weorðað, þe God sylfa fela
hund wintra mid saule 7 lichaman geheold ær to
þam anan, þæt hi þonne scoldan mid heora lare
folce gebeorgan, þæt hit eal ne forwurde endemes
ætgædere þurh þone deofol þe ealle men bregeð
7 ealle woruld drefeð? (88-96)

In this rhetorical question, Wulfstan recalls all the main aspects of his theme before launching into his peroration: he reiterates the earlier assertion that the afflictions of the Last Days are a punishment for man's sins; he demonstrates that the righteous can work no miracles in Antichrist's reign, but must suffer martyrdom; and he shows that Antichrist reigns supreme in the Last Days because God suspends his power. In addition, he reveals God's concern that all mankind should not be destroyed, which is dealt with in greater detail in the conclusion. His presentation of the elect as unable to withstand Antichrist without the assistance God affords in sending Enoch and Elias, is indicative of the change in his conception of the Last Days, for in De Temporibus Anticristi the righteous are described as surviving the persecutions of Antichrist primarily through their enduring faith.

The final section of the sermon describes in detail some of the terrors of the Last Days and concludes with an account of the Last Judgement. It opens with a reference to the indescribable nature of the approaching afflictions:

Nis se man on life þe mæge oððe cunne swa yfel hit
asecgan swa hit sceal geweorðan on þam deoflican
timan. (97-98)

A similar kind of disclaimer appears in a number of Wulfstan's sermons, and it helps to emphasize the enormity of the evils he describes.¹ All the disasters he enumerates are signs of the Second Coming which are mentioned in Mark (cf. xiii.8, 12, 19, 24). The description of God's termination of Antichrist's reign which follows is based on Matt. xxiv.22. In De Temporibus Anticristi, Wulfstan's version of this verse occurs near the beginning and is included in order to demonstrate the terror of Antichrist's reign (cf. 11-15). Secundum Marcum deals not simply

¹The disclaimer appears in II. 60-62; III. 70-72; IV. 66-67; VII. 152-55; XIII. 89-91; XX. EI 169-72.

with the deeds of Antichrist, but with the Last Days in their entirety, beginning from the evil times preceding his advent, so that the account of God's destruction of Antichrist is placed at the end of this sermon. The paraphrase of Matt. xxiv.22 in Secundum Marcum gives greater emphasis to God's desire to protect the elect and the speed with which he terminates Antichrist's reign:¹

And eal hit forwurde gyf God ne gescyrte þæs
 þeodscaðan lifdagas þe raðor ðurh his mihta.
 Ac for þæra gebeorge þe him syn gecorene 7
 ðe he habban wyle gehealden 7 geholpen, he
 forðeð þæne þeodfeond 7 on helle grund
 þananforð besenceð mid eallum þam gegenge þe
 him ær fyligde 7 his unlarum to swyðe gelyfde. (108-13)

Wulfstan's description of the speed with which God despatches his antagonist contrasts strikingly with his earlier depiction of the reign of Antichrist as a time during which God's protection is withdrawn. The ultimate superiority of his power and the rapidity with which he vanquishes evil is enhanced by the conflation, peculiar to this sermon, of the termination of Antichrist's reign and the punishment of the unrighteous at the Last Judgement to a single action (cf. on helle grund þananforð besenceð mid eallum þam gegenge þe him ær fyligde). In the sentence which follows, he explains, Donne wurð Godes dom rihtlice toscaden (113-14), and the sermon is brought to a conclusion with a description of the eternal reward enjoyed by the elect.

It would seem, then, that although Secundum Marcum may appear, as Bethurum's comment perhaps suggests,² to be an elaboration of the material in De Temporibus Anticristi, it proves on examination to be different in its theme and structure. Whereas De Temporibus Anticristi concentrates on the terror of Antichrist's

¹See further pp. 55-58.

²See Homilies, p. 282 (quoted earlier in this chapter).

reign for which men must prepare themselves, Secundum Marcum deals with the progression of the Last Days from the signs of Antichrist's coming to the Last Judgement, and it treats, as Sermo Lupi ad Anglos does, the theme of increasing afflictions suffered throughout the Last Days as a consequence of man's sins. The dissimilar conception of the Last Days which underlies Secundum Marcum necessitates the reorganization and reinterpretation of the material derived from De Temporibus Anticristi.

In its style and mode of presentation, Secundum Marcum is similar to Wulfstan's other sermons. Each section of the sermon deals with one main point, which is repeated a number of times with additional information added in the process, and the connection between sentences relating to the same topic is clearly marked by verbal repetition and similarity of syntactic structure. It differs from the majority of his sermons, however, because it does not balance fear and hope as incentives to repentance. The descriptions of the terrors of the Last Days are more horrific than in the other eschatological sermons, but there are no exhortations to repent in order to gain eternal joy. Wulfstan's failure to urge his audience to amendment and to instruct it in the means of attaining heaven is symptomatic of the pessimistic view of mankind's capacity for righteousness which informs the sermon. Secundum Marcum, probably the latest of the eschatological sermons, may be seen as the product of a belief, born of bitter experience, that nothing was to be achieved by admonishing the morally degenerate inhabitants of the world's last age,¹ and that it remained only to offer some form of consolation to the few God had chosen. It may also be viewed, though, as a variation

¹Wulfstan's adherence to the contemporary belief in the deterioration of man in the sixth age is pointed out by J.E. Cross, "Aspects of Microcosm and Macrocosm in Old English Literature," Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur, ed. S.B. Greenfield [Eugene], 1963, pp. 1-22.

of Wulfstan's usual techniques for persuading his audience to repent. That is, the means by which salvation may be obtained are implicit in the sermon, and the heightened descriptions of the terrors of the Last Days, which are said to be the consequence of sin, constitute an oblique, but powerful, persuasion to repent.

Such ambivalence is not in evidence in Secundum Lucam, in which Wulfstan makes a concerted effort to persuade his audience to repent immediately. Like Secundum Matheum (II, pp. 119-22), it deals with the signs heralding the end of the world, but it concentrates on the disturbances in heaven and on earth, which are not mentioned in Secundum Matheum; and whereas Secundum Matheum enumerates the various signs of Christ's coming in order to warn men to prepare for the question he will ask,¹ the treatment of the signs in Secundum Lucam is more complex and they are described within a wider thematic and didactic context.

The sermon begins, as Secundum Marcum does, with a description of the terrors of the Last Days based on the scriptures, which introduces the main subject of the sermon, the signs in the heavens and on earth:

Dis godspel segð 7 swutelað þæt fela fortacna
 sculon geweorðan wide on worulde, ægðer ge on
 heofonlicum tunglum ge on eorðlicum styrungum,
 ær ðam þe se dom cume þe us eallum wyrð gemæne. (3-7)

Secundum Lucam is the only one of Wulfstan's eschatological sermons which refers to the Last Judgement in the introduction, for it is the imminence of the Judgement rather than the terror of Antichrist's reign to which Wulfstan directs his audience's attention in this sermon. In the introductory section of the sermon, as in that of Secundum Marcum, Wulfstan repeats in various forms the assertion that the afflictions of the Last Days are the result of man's sins, emphasizing the shortness of time left by

¹See further Pt. II, ch. I.

the refrain, 7 ðærto hit nealæcð nu swyðe georne (8-9, 13-14). He also emphasizes the imminence of the world's end by interpreting the ravages of the Vikings as the fulfilment of Christ's prophecy:

7 ælþeodige men 7 utancumene swyðe us swencað,
ealswa Crist on his godspelle swutollice sæde
þæt scolde geweorðan. (21-22)

The description of strife among mankind in the closing lines of the first section (20-26) provides a microcosmic parallel to the contention of the elements depicted in the second section.

The assertion that the afflictions of the Last Days are a punishment for man's sins is elaborated in metaphoric terms in the second section. Wulfstan begins with an allusion to the world's decline from its Golden Age, describing the sins of man as a defilement of its purity (27-29), and then explains the disturbances in heaven and on earth as the retaliation of outraged creation:

And forðy us eac swencað 7 ongean winnað manege
gesceafta, ealswa hit awriten is: Pugnabit pro
Deo orbis terrarum contra insensatos homines. Ðæt
is on Englisc, eal woruld winneð swyðe for synnum
ongean þa oferhogan þe Gode nellað hyran. Seo
heofone us winð wið þonne heo us sendeð styrnlice
stormas 7 orf 7 æceras swyðe amyrreð. Seo eorðe
us winð wið þonne heo forwyrneð eorðlices wæstmas
7 us unweoda to fela asendeð. (34-41)

The metaphor of Creation striving against mankind, which Wulfstan derives from Sapientiae, is ingeniously extended, and serves to link the chaos of the universe to the assertion that the afflictions of the Last Days are a punishment for sin. In the remainder of the second section, Wulfstan gives an account of other disturbances in the heavens, explaining them symbolically in order to give an account of the reign of Antichrist (41-53).

In the third section he returns to the imminence of the Last Judgement, with the statement:

And raðe æfter þam syððan astyred wyrð þurh
 godcunde mihte eal heofonlic mægen 7 eorðwaru
 aræred of deaðe to dome. (61-63)

This is followed by a highly rhetorical account of the torments of hell (65-73). The account contains an assertion that the torments of hell are indescribable (70-73). A similar assertion appears towards the end of Sermo ad Populum, and in both sermons it gives force to the concluding call for repentance.¹ The closing exhortation is, as usual, closely related to the main theme of the sermon, for in keeping with the sermon's insistence that the Last Judgement is close at hand, it consists of a warning to avoid the terrors of hell before it is too late (74-78).

The theme of Secundum Lucam is a simple one, but like all of his eschatological sermons, it illustrates the skill with which he varies his presentation of roughly the same, somewhat limited material, to produce a sermon which is unique in form and in theme. Though in this sermon, as in most others, he plays upon the fears of his audience, his art does not lie in sheer rhetorical force, but the care with which he constructs his sermons and the manner in which he develops his themes.

¹See further pp. 333-34.

CHAPTER II

SERMO AD POPULUM

The prologue to Sermo ad Populum (XIII, pp. 225-32) in MS. C identifies it as a pastoral letter:

Wulfstan arcebisceop greteð freondlice þegnas
on ðeode, gehadode 7 læwede, ealle gemanelice
þa ðe him betæhte sindon for gode to wissianne.
And ic bidde eow for Godes lufan þat ge þises
gewrites giman 7 on hwiltidum hit on gemynde
habban, forðam þeah ðe hit leohtlic minegung
þince, hit is þeah þearflic, gime se þe wille.¹

Its style, however, suggests that it was intended primarily for oral delivery, and its appearance in three other manuscripts without the prologue,² and the fact that it is addressed to "lay thanes" (many of whom may have been unable to read), support the view that it was preached as a sermon.³ The prologue reflects Wulfstan's preoccupation with the responsibilities of his office, which finds expression in a number of his sermons.⁴ The words þeah ðe hit leohtlic minegung þince, hit is þeah þearflic may constitute a modest disclaimer of ability, but they can be otherwise interpreted. Besides meaning "an exhortation," minegung can also mean "a demand for payment of what is due, a claim" (BT), and part of the sermon concerns the payment of church dues (70-82).

¹See Homilies, p. 225.

²The full text appears without the prologue in MSS. B, E, and K (Bethurum's sigla).

³Bethurum suggests that XIII "may have been composed for delivery at a meeting of the Witan, where Wulfstan is known to have preached, and then sent to the principal noblemen of the York and Worcester dioceses" (Homilies, p. 339).

⁴The responsibilities of bishops are the subject of sermon XVII, and Wulfstan also refers to them in IX. 30-31, XV. 27-29, and XX. EI 182-84.

The connotations need not be specifically monetary, for one of the meanings of the related verb, mynegian, is "to bring a duty to the mind." The reading of minegung as a pun is supported by the extensive use Wulfstan makes of commercial imagery to describe moral obligations in the sermon, and by the use of leohtlic, which can mean "light" as well as "of little value," and bearflic, which means both "profitable" and "necessary." The sermon also contains paradoxes which are similar in kind to "Though it seems a valueless demand for payment/a trivial exhortation, it is nevertheless profitable/necessary."

Bethurum remarks of Sermo ad Populum:

It is made up of parts of other [Wulfstan] homilies and is a general admonition to good works, and, except that it begins and ends with a warning about eternal punishment, has not much unity. It lists the dues of the church more definitely than is done elsewhere in the homilies, though not so clearly as the laws. Its main force is in the description of evils to be avoided, ll. 179-end.

The sources are sentences from Defensor's Liber Scintillarum, passages from Homilies VII, Xc, VIIIc, VI, and V, and VI Ethelred. In every case the passages parallel to parts of other homilies are less logical and appropriate in this combination than in their other setting.¹

A close examination of Sermo ad Populum and the parallels postulated reveals, however, that it is not simply a collection of passages from other compositions. The sermon is unified by the theme of the transitoriness of life and the eternal reward, and, in incorporating passages from earlier works, Wulfstan reformulates them in order to integrate them into his exposition. The sermon is also unified by metaphors and puns similar to those appearing in the prologue, which elaborate the theme of the sermon. Wulfstan does not normally make extensive use of puns to unify his

¹Homilies, p. 339.

sermons,¹ but the technique is similar to that of Verba Hieremiae Prophetiae and passages of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, such as the opening lines in which bot is used to mean "repentance," "remedy," and "mending," in order to emphasize that repentance may effect an improvement in the nation's fortunes.²

The first sentence of Sermo ad Populum is a general introduction, which is, as Bethurum notes, comparable with the opening sentence of De Fide Catholica (VII, pp. 157-65), but it is not identical, nor is it "less logical and appropriate" in this context. De Fide Catholica begins:

Leofan men, doð swa eow mycel þearf is, understandað
þæt ælc cristen man ah micle þearfe þæt he his
cristendomes gescead wite, 7 þæt he cunne rihtne
geleafan rihtlice understandan, (3-6)

whereas Sermo ad Populum has:

Leofan men, understandað þæt ærest cristenra manna
gehwyrc ah ealra þinga mæste ðearfe þæt he cunne Godes
riht ongytan þurh lare 7 lage 7 gelyfan anrædlice on
God ælmihtigne, þe is waldend 7 wyrhta ealra
gesceafta. (3-6)

The sentence introduces the key word of Sermo ad Populum, þearf, which is repeated throughout with various meanings, and it is closely connected to the sentence following it by verbal repetition (And syððan is eac þearf þæt gehwa understande (6-7)). It differs chiefly from the opening sentence of De Fide Catholica in its reference to God ælmihtigne, þe is waldend 7 wyrhta ealra gesceafta, which looks forward to Wulfstan's remarks on the transitoriness of life (Of eorðan gewurdan ærest geworhte þa ðe we ealle of coman (8-9)) and his later reminder

¹Wulfstan's fondness for puns is noted by Bethurum (Homilies, p. 28), but they normally occur only sporadically in his sermons.

²See further p. 347.

that all things belong to God (70-73). God's creative activity is only mentioned in the second sentence of De Fide Catholica (þæne þe hine gescop 7 geworhte (7-8)), and there is no reference to his controlling power (cf. waldend 7 wyrhta). The inclusion of Godes riht also reflects the theme of the sermon, for riht means both "what properly belongs to a person" and "what is in accordance with the law," and the whole sermon describes man's relation to God in commercial terms.

The main theme of the sermon is outlined explicitly in the second and third sentences (6-11). In indicating the contrast of the transitoriness of life with the eternal reward which follows it, Wulfstan employs parallelism and verbal repetition to clarify and emphasize, as he does frequently in his sermons. Though a commonplace in homiletic literature, the transitoriness of life is rarely referred to in Wulfstan's sermons:¹ in Sermo ad Populum, it replaces the imminence of the Last Judgement as an incentive to immediate repentance. The Last Judgement is not mentioned at all in this sermon, except perhaps in

an tima cymð ure æghwylcum þæt us wære leofre
þonne eal þæt we on worulde wiðæftan us læfað,
þær we a worhton, þa hwile þe we mihtan, georne
þæt God licode. Ac þænne we sculan habban anfeald
lean þæs þe we on life ær geworhton. (80-84)

But even these lines probably refer to death rather than the common Judgement.²

¹See Homilies, pp. 339-40 (note to 8-14).

²M. McC. Gatch, "Eschatology in the Anonymous Old English Homilies," Traditio, XXI (1965), 117-65, concludes from his examination of the Blickling and Vercelli homilies that the conception of an interim existence for the soul between death and resurrection at the Last Judgement in the pre-scholastic period is ambiguous and undefined, because "the question of individual destiny did not weigh on [the Anglo-Saxon homilists] as it would on their successors."

Having outlined his theme, Wulfstan elaborates on the transitoriness of life, contrasting the value placed upon it with the speed with which it is lost, and then exhorts his audience to strive for eternal rewards:

Eala, lytel is se fyrst þyses lifes, 7 lyðre
 is, þæt we lufiað 7 on wuniað, 7 for oft hit
 wyrð raðost forloren þonne hit wære leofost
 gehealden. Ac utan don swa us mycel þearf
 is, tylian þæs ðe us ne næfre ateorað, lufian
 Godd eallum mode 7 eallum mægne 7 wyrcan georne
 his willan. (12-16)

In these lines he develops the metaphor of profit and loss introduced in swa hwæðer swa we on life ær geearnedon (11), since leofost can mean "precious" in either emotional or monetary evaluation, and though þearf, which appears in the phrase utan don swa us mycel þearf is, can mean "need" or "duty," it can also mean "profit" in the context of the call to "labour for that which never fails." In the sentence following, which explains the nature of God's will, þearf is also used to mean "profit," and the commercial imagery is continued by the use of geearnian:

His wylla is þæt we aa æfter ure agenre þearfe
 geornlice winnan 7 þæt geearnian þæt we to
 gelaðode syn, þæt is heofona rice ðæt he hæfð
 gegearwod ælcum þara þe his willan gewyrcoð her
 on worulde. (16-19)

The assertion that it is God's will that man should labour for his own profit and earn what he is invited to is one of a number of the paradoxes presented in the sermon.

The repetition of þearf links together the sentences in 3-19. By playing on its various meanings, Wulfstan identifies duty with profit as the commercial imagery emerges to prominence. Puns on the meaning of þearf and the description of the attainment of heaven as a gain occur elsewhere in Wulfstan's sermons. Secundum Matheum (II, pp. 119-22), for instance,

concludes:

Leofan men, utan ... don swa us þearf is, lufian
 God ofer ealle oðre þing 7 his willan wyrcan swa
 we geornost magan. Þonne geleanað he hit us swa
 us leofast bið. (69-72)

The notion of earning the rewards of heaven is, of course, a commonplace, but in Sermo ad Populum the metaphor he elaborates by puns in his earlier sermons is most fully and originally developed.

The opening lines are also linked by other types of verbal repetition. The third and fourth sentences are connected by the repetition of lif , and an instance of the figure Bede calls anadiplosis occurs in 16, in which his willa(n) is repeated at the end of the fifth sentence and the beginning of the sixth. In the fourth and fifth sentences, the verb lufian is employed to emphasize the contrast of the attachment to transitory life with the cultivation of eternal reward. Wulfstan's use of verbal repetition and grammatical connectives to join together sentences dealing with the same subject has previously been remarked upon, and the creation of stylistic units larger than a sentence by repeating the most significant words in his exposition is particularly marked in the sermons which are not influenced by the compositions of other writers. Together with the exhortation in 19-31, the sentences in 3-19 form a clearly defined rhetorical unit. Also characteristic of Wulfstan's method of presentation is the gradual development of his theme in these lines.

Having established that the reward of heaven is to be earned, Wulfstan explains the manner in which this is to be accomplished in an exhortation to good works, which is linked to the opening lines by the repetition of þearf, used in this instance to mean "need":

Utan don eac swa we þearfe agan, beon mildheorte 7
 ælmesgeorne 7 eadmode 7 soðfaste 7 unswicole 7
 rihtwise þæs þe we magan on eallum ðingum. (19-22)

This is followed by an exhortation concerning the promises made at baptism (22-29), the concept of promises made to God being one which is developed later in the sermon. The passage contains expressions similar to those appearing in VIIIc and Xc,¹ but is nevertheless a logical exposition, and closely unified by verbal repetition. Basically, the passage repeats the same idea, the words

geðencan hwæt we behetan þa we fulluht
 underfengan, oðþon þa ðe æt fulluhte ure
 foresprecan wæran, (22-23)

being elaborated in the sentence following in order to emphasize that promises made by proxies are equally as binding as those made on one's own behalf (26-29). Wulfstan also explains the nature of the promises made at baptism:

þæt is, þæt we woldan a God lufian 7 on hine
 gelyfan 7 his bebodu healdan 7 deofol ascunian
 7 his unlara georne forbugan. (24-25)

This contrast of faith in God with rejection of the devil is reiterated in the concluding summary, Twa word behealdað mycel: Abrenuntio 7 credo (30-31). The word þearf appears again in the conclusion of the first rhetorical unit, in Is þeah ma manna þonne þearf wære þe þises behates gescad ne cunnan (29-30), with a meaning different from the earlier usages (that is, "good," or perhaps, "a desirable thing.")

The second rhetorical unit introduces a new subject, the death and resurrection of Christ. The word þearf is repeated in the opening sentence, Leofan men, for ure ealra þearfe Crist com on þis lif 7 for ure neode deað þrowode (32-33). There are

¹The parallels are listed in Homilies, p. 340 (notes to 22-31).

two possible meanings which the word could have here. It could mean "profit" in the sense of "good" or "advantage," but it could also be synonymous with neode, and so mean "need" in the sense of "distress." The word is used again later in the passage, in mycel gebolode ðurh his mildheortnesse Crist for ure bearfe (36-37). In this phrase, too, bearf could mean either "profit" or "need." The first sentence in the description of Christ's passion contains a semantic contrast, that of lif and deað, and the same contrast appears in the sentence which concludes the rhetorical unit:

Ac he geswutelode swaðeah þy ðriddan dæge þa he
of deaðe aras þæt he ægðres geweald hæfð ge
lifes ge deapes. (39-41)

As Bethurum notes, there are similarities in phrasing between this passage and sermons VI and VII,¹ but it is not a pastiche, for it is internally unified by verbal repetition, and the account of Christ's passion it contains is related to the main theme of the sermon in the rhetorical unit following.

The third rhetorical unit of Sermo ad Populum explains the implications for mankind of Christ's sacrifice, and begins with two antithetical sentences:

Leofan men, hwa mæg æfre oðrum furðor freond-
scype gecyðan þonne he his agen feorh gesylle 7
ðurh þæt his freond wið deað ahredde? Ealle,
we scoldan forweorðan ecan deaðe, nære þæt
Crist for us deað þrowode. (42-45)

The first of the sentences is derived from John xv.13, but Wulfstan expands the verse in order to introduce a contrast of feorh gesylle and wið deað ahredde, which is similar to the contrasts between lif and deað emphasized in the preceding rhetorical unit. Unlike the verse on which it is based, the

¹Homilies, p. 340 (notes to 33-41).

sentence in Sermo ad Populum is cast as a rhetorical question.

Bethurum remarks:

One authentic mark of [Wulfstan's] composition is the pause that often comes in the development of the sermon, usually in the second half, to reflect on some ethical or religious truth that has struck him. This usually takes the form of a rhetorical question or exclamation, sometimes leading into the next division of the sermon, sometimes recapitulating what has gone before.¹

Wulfstan's rhetorical questions enhance the immediacy of his expositions, and they are not simply reflections on "some ethical or religious truth that has struck him:" they normally draw the attention of the audience to a particularly significant aspect of the theme of the sermon in which they appear.² In Sermo ad Populum, the rhetorical question calls for recognition of mankind's indebtedness to Christ for gaining eternal life, which is of central importance to the development of the sermon's theme, and it reintroduces the commercial imagery which unifies the sermon, since gesylle in Wulfstan's sermons means "exchange for a price," as well as "gave." A comparison of the rhetorical question in Sermo ad Populum with the passage in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi (VI, pp. 142-56) that Bethurum cites as a parallel provides further illustration of the manner in which Wulfstan reformulates sentences in earlier compositions in order to assimilate them to a different context instead of merely repeating them. The passage reads:

La, hu mihte God ælmihtig wið mancynn mildra
 gewurðan þonne he wæs þa þa he asende his agen
 bearn of heofonum nyðer to eorðan 7 her wearð
 man geboren, to þam þingum þæt he mid his agenum
 feore mancynn alyse of deofles gewealde
 7 of healle wite? (154-58)

¹Homilies, p. 95.

²See also my remarks on the rhetorical questions in VI and V.

This contains neither the contrast between feorh and deað which relates the rhetorical question in Sermo ad Populum to the preceding rhetorical unit, nor the verb gesylle which sustains the metaphor developed throughout Sermo ad Populum.

The imagery of commerce is further developed in the description of Christ's redemption of mankind from the inevitability of hell-torment:

Ac he gebohte us þa ealle mid his deorwurðan blode
of helle wite 7 hæfð nu þurh his gyfe manna gehwylc,
gif he geearnian wylle, heofona rice. (45-47)

The description of Christ's passion as "he bought us with his precious blood" is conventional, but is particularly appropriate to this sermon. Wulfstan presents Christ's sacrifice paradoxically, as the bestowal of a gift which must be earned, for þurh his gyfe can signify the granting of heaven as well as the giving of Christ's blood. The assertion that the reward of heaven is to be earned is repeated in the next sentence, for Wulfstan is presumably referring to the granting of eternal bliss when he speaks of þa ðing ealle þe he us ... gyt don wile, þær we betst beðurfan, gyf we sylfe þæs geearnian wyllað (50-52). The entire sentence reads:

Donne ne þince us æfre to mycel, ac us mæg aa
to lytel, þæt we Godes þances to Gode gedon, forðam
ne cunne we næfre him geleanian þa ðing ealle þe he
us gedon hæfð 7 dæghwamlice deð 7 gyt don wile,
þær we betst beðurfan, gyf we sylfe þæs geearnian
wyllað. (48-52)

The account of Christ's passion is brought to a conclusion by propounding the immensity of man's indebtedness to God—no matter how grateful man is, he cannot recompense God for his many favours. The contrast of the infinite deserts of God and man's limited capacity to repay him is emphasized by syntactic parallelism in ne þince us æfre to mycel, ac us mæg aa to lytel.

The fourth rhetorical unit begins with the sermon's most complex pun on the meaning of bearf, Leofan men, utan don swa us bearf is, beon geornfulle ure agenre bearfe (53-54). Ure agenre bearfe appears earlier in the sermon meaning "our own profit" (17). In the second clause, then, bearf probably means "profit," referring to the many favours God grants for a small return, so that it can mean "need" or "duty" in the first clause. By this pun, Wulfstan makes explicit the identification of moral necessity with profit, which is suggested in the opening lines of the sermon. The sentence could also be interpreted as "Let us do as we have need, be mindful of our own dire straights," since bearf is possibly used in the latter sense in for ure ealre bearfe Crist com (32) and mycel gebolode ... Crist for ure bearfe (36-37). The interpretation equating duty and profit offers itself more immediately because it is consistent with the theme of the sermon and the earlier appearance of ure agenre bearfe in His wylla is þæt we aafter ure agenre bearfe geornlice winnan (16-17), but the possibility of a double meaning for this sentence need not be ~~out~~ ruled out.

The introductory sentence is followed by an exhortation concerning brotherly love (55-65), the theological commonplaces being unified by the repeated use of the imperative construction and the repetition of beode and misbeode. A reminder of the repentance necessary to avoid eternal punishment, which is emphasized in the sermon's peroration, is incorporated in 59-62. The summary which concludes the exhortation reiterates the theme of the sermon, the eternal joy which men may earn, and recalls the earlier reference to man's limited capacity to repay God for his goodness:

Ac utan gladian georne God ælmihtigne, habban
 us soðe sibbe 7 some gemæne, 7 don a to gode
 þæne dæl þe we magan 7 geearnian us mid þam ece
 blisse. (63-65)

The admonition in 65-69 consists of a list of Christian duties, not unified by any particular theme and connected with the passage on brotherly love only by its imperative form, but in 70-79 Wulfstan restates the theme of his sermon in its most complex form. The passage deals with the payment of church dues. Exhortations of this kind are not uncommon in Wulfstan's compositions, especially the laws, and it is perhaps pertinent to recall that early historians accused him of alienating church property.¹ Although the passage contains expressions similar to those used elsewhere in his works, "the legalistic lists," as Bethurum notes, "are broken by homiletic phrases,"² and it is these additions which relate the exhortation to the theme of the sermon. The passage begins with the words [Utan] gelæstan bliðum mode Gode þa gerihta þe him to gebyrian (70-71). This could be interpreted as an exhortation to behave towards God in a fitting manner, but Wulfstan's explanation reveals that the words are to be taken literally as meaning "pay to God the dues which belong to him," for he defines God's gerihta as

se teoða dæl ealra þæra ðinga þe he us on ðysum
 lænan life to forlæten hæfð, 7 ure frumgripan
 gangendes 7 weaxendes. (70-73).

Wulfstan's paradoxical description of the payment of tithes as the return to God as part of his own possessions recalls his earlier reference to the small return which man makes for the

¹The matter is discussed by Bethurum (Homilies, pp. 65-68). She states that "the charge is first made by William of Malmesbury in the Gesta Pontifica (1125), or perhaps by the unknown chroniclers of the Annals of Worcester."

²Homilies, p. 341 (note to 70-78).

great gifts of God (48-52). It also recalls his exposition of the transitoriness of life in the opening lines of the sermon (6-16). The phrase ðysum lænan life, which Bethurum describes as "rather old-fashioned in his time,"¹ may have been used because it is particularly appropriate to his definition of tithing, since the primary meaning of læne is "lent."

The paradox is further developed in the concluding words of the same sentence, 7 geearnian us mid þam lytlum mycel mare us sylfum to þearfe (73-74): the return to God of part of his own possessions becomes the means of earning a profit. The words echo Wulfstan's earlier reminder of man's inability to repay God for his goodness, ne þince us æfre to mycel, ac us mæg aa to lytel (48), and the statement is related to the contrast of the low value of earthly life with the eternal reward which may be earned (12-16).

In the sentence which follows, Wulfstan lists other payments due to the church and repeats that such payments are profitable, reminding his audience that promises made on one's behalf are binding, as he does in the passage on the promises made at baptism (26-29):

Donne is þartoeacan gyt to understandenne þæt
we eac eadmodlice eal gelæstan on geargerihtan
þæt ure yldran hwilum ær Gode behetan; ðæt is
sulhælmessan 7 rompenegas 7 cyricsceattas 7
lehtgescota; 7 se ðe þæt deð þæt ic ymbe spece,
he deð him sylfum mycle ðearfe. (74-79)

It is the passage on the payment of church dues, then, which explains the validity of the pun in the prologue, "Though it seems a valueless demand for payment/a trivial exhortation, it is nevertheless profitable/necessary." The passage draws together the various aspects of the sermon's theme and expounds

¹Homilies, p. 342 (note to 72).

in concrete terms the debt which man owes to God referred to in the exposition of Christ's passion (48-52). The explicitly material context in which the themes of the sermon are recalled heightens the significance of the use of commercial imagery in the earlier accounts of spiritual and moral obligations.

The paragraph unit concludes with a highly rhetorical account of the torments of hell and the sinners who will be consigned to them. The passage bears a close resemblance to part of De Fide Catholica,¹ but it is integrated by the sentences which introduce it:

And þæt is witodlice ful soð, gelyfe se ðe wylle, an tima cymð ure æghwylcum þæt us wære leofre þonne eal þæt we on worulde wiðæftan us læfað, þær we a worhton, þa hwile þe we mihtan, georne þæt God licode. Ac þanne we sculan habban anfeald lean þæs we on life ær geworhton. (79-84)

In both Sermo ad Populum and De Fide Catholica, the description of eternal damnation is preceded by a reminder of the shortness of time left before man's eternal fate will be decided, for in both sermons the description is included in order to give force to the concluding call for repentance. In De Fide Catholica, Wulfstan refers to the imminence of the Last Judgement, but the reference to a future reckoning in Sermo ad Populum, in keeping with its insistence on the transitoriness of life, is a reminder of the inevitability of death. The sentences introducing the description of the torments of hell reiterate the main theme of the sermon by asserting the superior value of eternal reward to transitory life. The earlier exhortation "to earn with a little much more as a profit" (73-74) is given an ingenious twist in the assertion that the single reward of heaven is more precious than eal þæt we on

¹See Homilies, p. 343 (note to 84-97).

worulde wiðæftan/læfað^{us}. The metaphoric description is continued in the first sentence of the account of hell's torments, Wa ðam þonne þe ær geearnode helle wite (84), which replaces Wa þam þe þær sceal wunian on wite (124) in the passage in De Fide Catholica from which the account is derived.

The peroration consists chiefly of a series of imperatives beginning with Utan. Such perorations are common in Wulfstan's sermons, but their form varies according to the content of the sermon in which they appear.¹ The first imperative reflects upon the description of hell which immediately precedes it, and the second, which enumerates the sins to be avoided, is similar to the lists of sinners who merit the punishment of hell. The call to repentance echoes phrases which appear elsewhere in the sermon:

Utan andettan ure synna urum scriftan þa
hwile þe we magan 7 motan, 7 betan 7 a geswican
7 don to gode swa mycel swa we mæst magan. (103-5)

Similar to this reminder of the shortness of time which remains is þa hwile þe we mihtan (82). The words don to gode swa mycel swa we mæst magan recall the inability of man to repay the goodness of God, which is a significant aspect of the sermon's theme, and echo don a to gode bæne dæl þe we magan (64). The sermon concludes with yet another reference to earning the eternal reward (þonne beorge we us sylfum wið ece wite, 7 geearniað us heofona rice (105-6)).

Numerous as the similarities of Sermo ad Populum to other compositions by Wulfstan are, then, it is not merely a

¹Cf. Ure, Medium Ævum, XXVIII, 114. "Wulfstan's perorations are frequently very general in character, and could often be transposed from one homily to another without detriment."

collection of passages written earlier in his career. By his alterations and additions, Wulfstan relates the passages from earlier works both to their immediate context and to the theme of the sermon. The theme of the sermon is developed in three stages: the worthlessness and transitoriness of life is contrasted with the eternal reward of heaven, the profit which it is God's will that men should earn; the gift of heaven and Christ's purchase of man are described as instances of God's goodness which man is unable to repay fully; and the audience is exhorted to gain the great profit of heaven by paying to God a part of the earthly goods he has given. These three expositions unite the concepts of profit and duty, and their identity is further emphasized by the repetition of þearf, used to mean "profit" and "duty" as well as "need." It is chiefly by the repetition of þearf that the exhortations to good works, the duties by which the profit of heaven may be gained, are integrated into the sermon.

The elaborate puns and paradoxes of Sermo ad Populum and its ingenious application of a conventional metaphor distinguish the sermon from Wulfstan's other compositions. Though his theme is certainly a solemn one, and his ingenuity witty rather than humorous, Sermo ad Populum is the prophet of doom's closest approach to a "light exhortation." It is tempting to conclude, on the basis of the deprecatory prologue and the nature of the metaphor, that the injunction to pay church dues (which is withheld until the latter half) constitutes Wulfstan's motive for composing the sermon. Judging by Wulfstan's insistence on the need to pay church dues in his other sermons and in his law codes, this may not have been the only "demand for payment of what is due" that he made, and it may be that it was his doubts as to

the reception such a demand would meet which underlie the uniquely witty presentation of his theme and his happy discovery that an appeal for the payment of church dues could be presented as an appeal to self-interest.

CHAPTER III

SERMO LUPI AD ANGLOS

Sermo Lupi ad Anglos has attracted far more attention to its subject matter than other Wulfstan sermons, because its apparent topicality is of interest to students of the Old English period. Like all of Wulfstan's sermons, though, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos has been chiefly esteemed for its forceful oratory--it is this sermon, indeed, which is responsible for his reputation as a fiery orator in the Old Testament vein. Most readers have praised it more enthusiastically than Stenton did, when he stated that it "makes its effect by sheer monotony of commination."¹ But even its admirers have regarded it as little more than a stringing together of the nation's sins and tribulations which impresses by the horrific accumulation of detail.² Such a view, it will be argued, drastically oversimplifies the sermon. Sermo Lupi ad Anglos presents a number of closely related themes, and the catalogues are but one aspect of the development of these themes. Certainly the seemingly inexhaustible fashion in which Wulfstan heaps up specific instances of the nation's iniquities and misfortunes contributes much to the force of his indictment, but the sermon is neither formless nor repetitive. On the contrary, it is of all his sermons the most skilfully and tightly constructed.

The intellectual coherence and thematic complexity of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos has been obscured not only by a too exclusive concentration on its oratorical force but also by the currently accepted analyses of its composition. Whitelock has

¹F. M. Stenton, Anglo-Saxon England, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1947, p. 454.

²See particularly Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 355-56 and Wrenn, A Study of Old English Literature, pp. 240-41.

described it largely in terms of a haphazard compilation and adaptation of earlier material:

To a fair amount of material from Ethelred's codes Wulfstan added an introductory passage made up of phrases from his eschatological sermons, especially XIII [Napier], and this homily supplied also his passage on the decay of kinship and some isolated phrases elsewhere. There is also a general similarity between the list of calamities in the Sermo ad Anglos and that in XXVIII [Napier], a free translation and expansion of Leviticus xxvi. For his other additions, Wulfstan seems to have drawn on his experience of conditions in England Finally, he has added a normal homiletic conclusion.¹

Bethurum regards the EI version as the end product of a series of revisions incorporating Wulfstan's after thoughts (like Whitelock, she considers BH, the shortest version, to be the earliest):

The revised homily as represented in C was again revised by the addition of E I 65-67, 85-91, 145-6, 160-73, and 176-90. The first passage contains an echo of VII and, like the second, is a strong rebuke to lust. Both of these additions may have been occasioned by a particular event which came to Wulfstan's attention.... The long list of sinners in 160-73 is reworked from earlier homilies, and Wulfstan may have seen its appropriateness after he had written the first draft of his sermon. The last passage is on the responsibility of the English for their plight ... and was suggested by a passage in one of Alcuin's letters It is possible that Wulfstan discovered this letter of Alcuin's late, or discovered it in his notes ... and thought it an apt addition.²

In my view, the EI version is the most satisfactory exposition of the sermon's themes. The superiority of the EI version might, in itself, appear to favour acceptance of the theory that it represents the final stage of a process of gradual expansion. But EI differs principally from BH by the inclusion of two passages referring to the Danish attacks (100-28 and 176-90), and, as I understand the sermon, these two passages are crucial to the development of its themes. Their

¹Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 1st ed., p. 17. Cf. 3rd ed., pp. 36-37.

²Homilies, pp. 22-23.

absence in BH also destroys the structural pattern discernible in EI. Further, a consideration of the verbal linking in the sermon suggests that these two passages and certain others which are lacking in BH formed part of the original sermon (that is, EI 65-67, 160-73, C 49-56, together with a number of short phrases to which I shall refer in my discussion). It is my belief, then, that an examination of the themes and structure of the EI version calls into question the theory that it represents the latest of the three versions written by Wulfstan.

Support for the view that BH and C are abridgements of EI is afforded by the three versions' differing relationships to the political events of Wulfstan's time. It is generally accepted that the I rubric is accurate in stating that the sermon was composed in 1014, not 1012 or 1009, the two dates given by MS. C, because the phrase 7 Æbelred man dræfde ut of his earde, which appears only in BH, must have been contained in the original version. BH does not look like a sermon which was written, as the I rubric points out, "at the height of the Danish persecutions," because, lacking both EI 100-28 and 176-90, it contains no indication that the nation was struggling for survival against its enemies. C, while it contains the passage in EI 100-28 which gives an account of the humiliations suffered at the hands of the Danes, lacks the passage in EI 176-90, which Cnut's accession would have rendered superfluous, because it implies that conquest by the Danes is the punishment awaiting the nation. Thus, the EI version is the only one which is entirely appropriate to the time at which the sermon is held to have been composed, and the omission of first one, then both, of the passages referring to Danish attacks produces versions which accord with the changing political conditions.

The close relationship of the EI version to the events of the year accepted as the original date of composition is not limited to its reflection of the perilous military situation of England. Its themes are reminiscent of the agreement reached between Ethelred and his advisers at the time of the king's recall. The agreement, as it is recorded in the Chronicle, indicates hope of future improvement, which is dependent on adherence to pledges.¹ The pledges involve the restoration of just government on the part of the king and the abandonment of treachery by the nation. All versions of the sermon stress the prevalence of injustice and treachery and hold out hope of future improvement. Only the EI version, however, indicates abhorrence of Danish rule, which completes the correspondence between the agreement and the sermon. I regard Sermo Lupi ad Anglos as a fundamentally eschatological sermon, and consequently see Wulfstan's account of injustice and treachery primarily as an intimation of the approaching reign of Antichrist, which the EI version equates with the victory of the Danes. I think it not unlikely, however, that Wulfstan may have emphasized these failings and included the exhortation utan ... að 7 wed wærllice healdan 7 sume getrywða habban us betweonan butan uncræftan with the agreement in mind, to which, as one of the king's advisers, he was presumably a party. I would suggest, then, that Wulfstan originally wrote the sermon at the time of Ethelred's recall. Such a date accords well with the I rubric's statement that the sermon was written "at the height of the Danish persecutions," for the Danish attacks, according to Stenton, were suspended shortly after Ethelred's return until August 1015.² Full presentation

¹Laud MS., 1014. (See Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, ed., C. Plummer and J. Earle, Oxford, 1892, I, 145.)

²Anglo-Saxon England, pp. 381-82.

of the arguments regarding the date and order of the three versions of the sermon will be found in the Appendix, which contains my article on the subject shortly to appear in Neuphilologische Mitteilungen.

My discussion of the sermon in this chapter is based on the version recorded in MS. I which, it will be evident from the foregoing remarks, I regard as substantially representative of the earliest version. I do not consider, however, that MS. I reproduces the sermon exactly as it was first written. There is good reason, as the Appendix explains, for believing that the version of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos in MS. I is a copy of the earliest version to which Wulfstan had added EI 79-83 and 85-91. MS. I may also contain other minor revisions which Wulfstan made to the original, but there appears to be no evidence on which an argument could be based. On the basis of my examination of the sermon's themes and style, I would accept as part of the original sermon certain readings peculiar to manuscripts other than MS. I. All of these are short phrases, with the exception of C 49-56, and the category includes, of course, the phrase 7 Æbelred man dræfde ut of his earde which appears only in BH. Readings accepted as part of the original which do not form part of the version recorded in MS. I are enclosed in square brackets in the quotations.¹ It must be stressed that the establishment of a definitive text lies well beyond the scope of this study: my remarks regarding the textual variants are intended only to demonstrate that an examination of the themes and style of the sermon can help to establish the status of the variants. In cases where there is merely a substitution of vocabulary, such as ic an (C 159) for an man (EI 170), I accept the reading in

¹The three versions, BH, C, and EI, are printed in Bethurum, Homilies, pp. 255-75, from which all quotations are taken.

MS. I, and I reserve judgement on the expansions in BH 39-40, and C 75, 110, 112, and 160-61.

The themes of the sermon can be summarized as the nation's progression to disaster. This theme is outlined, as is usual in Wulfstan's work, in the opening sentence.¹ The opening sentence describes a process of dual deterioration. It begins with a categorical statement that the world is rapidly moving to its end:

Leofan men, gecnawað þæt soð is: ðeos worold is
on ofste, 7 hit nealæcð þam ende. (7-8)

The swift passage of time is immediately and inseparably linked to the deterioration of the world, in 7 þy hit is on worolde aa swa leng swa wyrse. Wyrse can be applied either to sins or afflictions. Hence, the deterioration referred to could be either the increase in tribulations, described in the scriptures as signs of the Last Days, or the moral degeneration of man, traditionally believed to accompany the deterioration of the macrocosm in the sixth age.² The two types of deterioration are shown to be causally connected in the clause which follows:

7 swa hit sceal nyde for folces synnan ær
Antecristes tocyme yfelian swyþe. (9-10)

It may be objected that, since wyrse is ambiguous, the clause is simply a description of the growth of sin. I interpret it as meaning that the accumulation of afflictions gathers momentum from the nation's sins, because BT states that yfelian with an impersonal pronoun subject applies only to the deterioration of "things or circumstances." Further, the culmination of the process is described in the final clause as 7 huru hit wyrð

¹Cf. pp. 88, 111-12, 200, 237, 268, 317, 322-23.

²See Cross, Studies in Old English Literature in Honour of Arthur G. Brodeur, pp. 1-22.

bænne egeslic 7 grimlic wide on worolde. This must be a reference to the afflictions of Antichrist's reign, because egeslic 7 grimlic is inappropriate to the description of sin.

The opening sentence echoes certain parts of other eschatological sermons Wulfstan wrote, but I would not describe it as "made up of phrases almost identical with some in the eschatological sermons."¹ None of the sentences cited by editors contains expressions comparable with the first and final clauses, but this is a mere quibble. The description is misleading, because the opening sentence of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is the only single sentence in Wulfstan's work which gives a complete and dramatically realized account of the process of deterioration. The sentence (excluding the opening imperative) consists of a series of main clauses, all of which have subject/verb word order, the subject of all but the first being hit. The series of similarly constructed clauses linked by "and," each advancing the argument or the chronology by one stage, gives an impression of steady accumulation. The clause lamenting the terror of Antichrist's reign, the culmination of the process described, is felt to constitute a climax, because it is the last of a number of clauses having the same pattern. It is also marked as an oratorical climax by the exclamatory huru. The BH and C versions give an incomplete and stylistically less effective account of the process, because they omit the final clause lamenting the ultimate disaster which overtakes the world.

The complete and dramatic description of the process of deterioration in the opening sentence of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos marks the advance in Wulfstan's conception of the Last Days.

¹Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 47 (note to 4-8). Cf. Bethurum, Homilies, p. 356 (note to 7-10).

In his early eschatological sermons, particularly Secundum Marcum and Secundum Lucam, he asserts that the unprecedented tribulations of the Last Days are a punishment for immense sins.¹ In Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, the retributive process is conceived dynamically. Antichrist's reign is presented in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, not as the ultimate horror for^eshadowed by manifold tribulations, but as the climax of a progressive growth of afflictions which is proportionate to the increasing quantity of sin. That this was in Wulfstan's mind in his opening sentence is borne out by an analysis of the sermon as a whole.

It is also borne out by the inclusion of the phrase [fram dæge to dæge] in the E version, which I would accept as an authentic reading. The phrase echoes a sentence in De Anticristo (Ib, pp. 116-18):²

And us þincð þæt hit sy þam timan swyðe gehende,
forðam þeos woruld is fram dæge to dæge a swa leng
swa wyrse. (22-24)

Here also it evidently does not only mean "daily" but involves the idea of a progression, more particularly an increase. In Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, [fram dæge to dæge] can be taken to refer either to the increase in afflictions, or to the increase in sins. This ambiguity of reference, I would claim, is intentional, in line with the ambiguity of reference to which I have drawn attention, contained in the word wyrse. Because the central emphasis of this sermon is on a cumulative process, when Wulfstan uses dæghwamlice in referring to the sins of the nation a few lines later, he immediately adds ihte yfel æfter oðrum (15-16). The link between the two references to the cumulative

¹See further Pt. III, ch. I.

²Other parallels are listed by Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 47 (note to 4-8).

process in the first few lines is enforced by the verbal repetition of both dæg and yfel (cf. yfelian swybe in the first sentence).

Ultimately, since it is an essential part of God's fixed plan for the universe, the deterioration of the world which ends in the reign of Antichrist and the Last Judgement is inevitable. Wulfstan's opening sentence states this categorically (ðeos worold is on ofste, 7 hit nealæcð þam ende ... 7 swa hit sceal nyde ... yfelian swybe). If, however, punishments accrue in proportion to the sins of man, the reign of Antichrist may also be postponed by a diminution of man's sins. It follows from this that the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Last Days is contingent upon the actions of mankind. There is therefore a remedy.

This, however, is not immediately mentioned. The opening sentence is followed by a description which demonstrates the validity of the assertion that the world grows worse because of mankind's sins. Whereas in Secundum Marcum and Secundum Lucam Wulfstan draws attention to current iniquities and refers chiefly to future tribulation in establishing that tribulations are the result of sin, in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, he indicts the sins of the past and refers to disasters already experienced:

Understandað eac georne þæt deofol þas peode
 nu fela geara dwelode to swybe, 7 þæt lytle
 getreowþa wæran mid mannum, þeah hy wel spæcan,
 7 unrihta to fela ricsode on lande. And næs
 a fela manna þe smeade ymbe þa bote swa georne
 swa man scolde, ac dæghwamlice man ihte yfel
 æfter oðrum 7 unriht rærde 7 unlaga manege ealles
 to wide gynd ealle þas peode. And we eac forþam
 habbað fela byrsta 7 bysmara gebiden. (11-18)

The causal connexion is insisted on in And we eac forþam (17).

To Wulfstan, then, there is historical evidence of the operation of the principle which determines the nation's destiny. Both the

sins and the punishments are described in extreme terms ((to fela, manege, ealles to wide gynd ealle þas þeode). By stressing the immensity of the sins already committed and asserting that these have accumulated over a long period of time, Wulfstan keeps before his audience the warning that the end of the world is close at hand, since the first sentence indicates that the proximity of Antichrist's reign is measurable in terms of both the amount of sin and the amount of affliction.

In the process of demonstrating the nation's progression to ultimate disaster, Wulfstan introduces the possibility of ameliorating the situation. The concept is first introduced in a negative form, And næs a fela manna þe smeade ymbe þa bote (14-15), constituting one of the sins of the past. It then appears in a conditional clause attached to the statement that punishment has resulted from sin, the play on the meaning of gebidan ("endured" and "expected") emphasizing the contrast between the afflictions of the past and the improvement which could eventuate:

And we eac forþam habbað fela byrsta 7 bysmara
gebiden, 7 gif we ænige bote gebidan scylan,
þonne mote we þæs to Gode earnian bet þonne we
ær þysan dydan. (17-20)

In the sentence following, the relation between sin and affliction described in 11-18 is summarized in one clause, which is balanced by another dealing with repentance. A conditional clause referring to improvement completes the sentence:

Forþam mid miclan earnungan we geearnedan þa
yrmða þe us onsittað, 7 mid swyþe micelan
earnungan we þa bote motan æt Gode geræcan gif
hit sceal heonanforð godiende weorðan. (20-23)

An entire sentence is then devoted to the concept of improvement:

La hwæt, we witan ful georne þæt to miclan
bryce sceal micel bot nyde, 7 to miclan bryne
wæter unlytel, gif man þæt fyr sceal to ahte
acwencan. (23-25)

In this manner, the emphasis of the opening lines gradually moves from the inevitability of progression to culminating disaster to the conditional possibility of improvement (note the conditional clauses in 18, 22-23, and 25). The sentence in 23-25 forms the rhetorical climax of the introduction, the exclamatory La hwæt and the unusually figurative expression giving stylistic prominence to this didactically important point. The play on the meaning of bot in these lines is thematically significant, for it unifies the concept of repentance with the improvement in the nation's fortunes it could effect. It is first used to mean "repentance," in næs a fela manna þe smeade ymbe þa bote, but the context of the next two occurrences suggests that it means "remedy" in the sense of "assistance" (18 and 22). In to miclan bryce sceal micel bot nyde (23-24), bryce may mean either "fracture" (since the parallel clause following is obviously figurative) or "violation," so that bot in this instance may signify both "cure" and "recompense."

The opening lines present the relation between sin and repentance, as well as the relation between sin and punishment, in terms of progressive intensification. In his first reference to remedy, Wulfstan indicates that efforts to obtain it must increase (þæs to Gode earnian bet þonne we ær þysan dydan (19-20)). He elaborates as follows:

Forþam mid miclan earnungan we geearnedan þa
 yrmða þe us onsittað, 7 mid swyþe micelan earnungan
 we þa bote motan æt Gode geræcan gif hit sceal
 heonanforð godiende weorðan. (20-23)

The exact balancing of the constituent elements of the two main clauses, violated by the addition of swyþe in the second, to emphasize that efforts to improve must exceed the nation's sins, suggests that repentance is capable of cancelling out the sins and bringing about the amelioration described in the conditional

clause. The point is restated in the next sentence:

La hwæt, we witan ful georne þæt to miclan bryce
 sceal micel bot nyde, 7 to miclan bryne wæter
 unlytel, gif man þæt fyr sceal to ahte acwencan. (23-25)

Whereas the sentence preceding this one employs parallel main clauses to equate sin and repentance, parallel noun phrases within a noun clause are employed to repeat the equation in this exclamation (to miclan bryce sceal micel bot nyde, 7 to miclan bryne wæter unlytel). The grammatical compression heightens the antithetical nature of the two concepts and the power which repentance has to cancel out sins, especially in to miclan bryne wæter unlytel, in which opposites are directly opposed by the reduction of the verb and adverb.

In sum, the opening sentence of the sermon asserts that disasters multiply in time and culminate in the reign of Antichrist as a result of the daily growth in sins. The fixity of this pattern of events is illustrated by reference to past experience, but the possibility of improving the situation gradually achieves prominence (7-25). Repentance is therefore shown to be urgently necessary, for it assumes the aspect of the sole factor capable of modifying the rapid progression to ultimate disaster. It is on the need for repentance that the remainder of the first section turns, that is, 25-52.

In Wulfstan's view, repentance must take the form of the restoration of lagu and riht. The swift onward movement to destruction can be turned back only by a reversal of the course of action which, he states early in the sermon, the nation is currently pursuing:

And næs a fela manna þe smeade ymbe þa bote
 swa georne swa man scolde, ac dæghwamlice man
 ihte yfel æfter oðrum 7 unriht rærde 7 unlaga
 manege ealles to wide gynd ealle þas peode. (14-17)

In 25-27, he asserts the need for repentance, echoing lagu and

riht which appear with negative affixes in 16:

And micel is nydbearf manna gehwilcum þæt he
Godes lage gyne heonanforð georne [bet þonne
he ær dyde] 7 Godes gerihta mid rihte gelæste. (25-27)

The addition of [bet þonne he ær dyde], found only in MS.E, is in line with the continuing insistence on the need for a renewal of righteousness. The need for repentance is also asserted in 37-38, Ac soð is þæt ic secge, bearf is þære bote, which repeats bearf found in the earlier assertion (cf. nydbearf in 26, which also picks up nyde from the exclamatory sentence equating sin and repentance in 23-25).

The need for repentance is evident because of the apocalyptic nature of the corruption. Christians have become worse than heathens (27-37). The emphasis of the Old Testament prophets on the oppression of the poor, widows, and orphans¹ is echoed here to signalize the definitive nature of the nation's corruption (42-47).² Instead of righteousness and the rule of law (both secular and divine) Wulfstan finds in his people the rule of unriht and unlagu--the words riht and lagu, on their own, in compound words, and with negative prefixes, are repeated constantly throughout this indictment of the nation's sins. God's judgement, perhaps God's ultimate judgement of the people, is inevitable. This Wulfstan states in a sentence which, in its reference to bysmor and byrst, echoes his earlier sentence insisting upon the causal connexion of sin and punishment (17-18):

¹It is perhaps stretching a point to interpret the cradolcild mentioned here as a reference to orphans, though this brings the passage into accord with the three categories of people which the prophetic books list as needing special protection. But perhaps, with the prophetic books in mind, it would be appropriate to recall that the child sold into slavery would probably be separated at some stage from one or both of its parents.

²See also my remarks on XI, pp.249-56.

And þæs we habbað ealle þurh Godes yrre bysmor gelome,
gecnawe se ðe cunne, 7 se byrst wyrð gemæne, þeh man
swa ne wene, eallre þysse þeode, butan God beorge. (49-52)

The last words, however, emphasize God's grace (butan God beorge). Not only has God established the pattern, with which the sermon is concerned, of an inevitable deterioration of the world and an inevitable disastrous end, but God has also established a pattern of individual redemption and national atone-^{ment} for sin. These last words of the introductory section suggest that [Uton creopan to Criste 7 bifigendre heortan clipian gelome 7 geearnian his mildse], apparently so unlike Wulfstan, and recorded only in the peroration of the C version, may well be authentic (see C 167-68).

In 7-52, then, we have a sustained exposition of the sermon's themes, linked by verbal repetition, of which the thematically significant instances have been noted. The section could be subdivided after the sentence in 23-25, because there is a shift of emphasis at this point. This exclamatory sentence marks the climax of Wulfstan's remarks on the possibility of improvement, and is followed by a consideration of the need for repentance. But the division is blurred by the sentence initiator And which enforces the continuity of sense, and the repetition of nyd- and micel in the two adjacent sentences at this point. The section could be further subdivided at Ac soð is þæt ic secge, þearf is þære bote in 37-38, which demarcates the end of the series of comparisons in 27-37 supporting the assertion that there is need for every man to Godes lage gyne heonanforð georne [bet þonne he ær dyde] 7 Godes gerihta mid rihte gelæste (25-27), and introduces the catalogue of various transgressions against riht and lagu. The repetition of riht and lagu which is prominent in the passage in 37-49, however, begins in the

sentence in 23-25, which is itself an echo of 16, unriht rærde 7 unlaga manege. It is the repetition of riht and lagu in combination which suggests that C 49-56 formed part of the original sermon, for, without it, the introductory indictment concludes with a reference to lagu only, in hrædest is to cweþenne, Godes laga laðe 7 lara forsawene (48-49). If, however, C 49-56 is admitted, the summing up phrase is immediately preceded by a reference to both lagu and riht. The passage in C concludes forðam unriht is to wide mannum gemæne 7 unlaga leofe. The last words of C 49-56 provide, not only a satisfactory completion of the verbal patterning begun in unriht rærde 7 unlaga manege (16), but a clear statement of one of the sermon's themes. This theme is the nation's perverse preference for evil instead of good, which is hinted at in the sentence in 14-17:

And næs a fela manna þe smeade ymbe þa bote
 swa georne swa man scolde, ac dæghwamlice man
 ihte yfel æfter oðrum 7 unriht rærde 7 unlaga
 manege ealles to wide gynd ealle þas peode.

I take the sentence in 49-52 to conclude the introductory section not merely because it is a rhetorically effective climax, but because it completes the exposition, returning the argument to the point reached in 17-18 (And we eac forþam habbað fela byrsta 7 bysmara gebiden), taking up once more the words byrst and bysmor, and coming to rest in the reference to God and his grace. At the same time, however, it serves as a bridge passage, because, as is evident from Forþam in 53, it is the inception of the account of the nation's sins in 53-59. Here, as in later passages, occurs what is characteristic of this particular sermon. Normally it is possible to isolate units of sense, unified by a verbal or syntactic patterning peculiar to each. This is ordinarily accompanied by linking sentence initiators

such as "and."¹ Here, however, though separate rhetorical units can be distinguished, these clear demarcations are blurred. It is a characteristic stylistic feature of this sermon because of the forward-carrying nature of its theme.

The introductory section is a paradigm of the sermon as a whole. In very general terms, the sermon consists of passages describing the sins of the nation alternated with accounts of tribulation, which are linked together by statements which draw attention to the cause and effect relationship. Towards the end of the sermon the possibility of improvement is gradually re-introduced, and an exhortation to repent brings it to a conclusion. The dynamic historical pattern the sermon describes is reflected in the dynamic structure of the sermon. The same pattern structures historical time and the time it takes to deliver the sermon. In the sermon, punishment follows sin inexorably, and the catalogues of the nation's sins grow longer, and the accumulation more rapid, as the afflictions described grow more terrible. The passages dealing with the nation's afflictions are 53-59, 100-28, and 174-89. The sentence in 189-90 links the latter section to the exhortatory peroration. The passages dealing with the nation's sins, after the introductory section, are found in 59-99 and 129-73. I shall examine first the accounts of afflictions.

The opening section of the sermon, as I have intimated, refers to the nation's afflictions simply as fela byrsta 7 bysmara in 18, and to bysmor gelome in 49-52, which also threatens that byrst wyrð gemæne. The first account of afflictions (53-59) gives a detailed catalogue of the tribulations which the nation has suffered. Wulfstan begins the account by reiterating the point that the afflictions suffered by the nation are the

¹See particularly Pt. I, ch. II, pp. 54-55 et passim.

result of its sins:

Forþam hit is on us eallum swutol 7 gesene
 þæt we ær bysan oftor bræcan þonne we bettan, 7
 by is bysse þeode fela onsæge. (53-54)

The reference to the nation's sins, which is reminiscent of the metaphor to miclan bryce sceal micel bot nyde, calls attention to the fact that the nation has accelerated, instead of slowed down, its course to destruction (we ær bysan oftor bræcan þonne we bettan). Consistent with this is the statement that the nation has not prospered, but has suffered many afflictions:

Ne dohte hit nu lange inne ne ute, ac wæs here
 7 hunger, bryne 7 blodgyte, on gewelhwylcan ende
 oft 7 gelome. (55-56)

The next main clause in this stylistically integrated account also contains a subject consisting of a series of paired nouns. Pairs of nouns occur sufficiently frequently in Wulfstan's work to be described as "characteristic" of him, but the compounding here, because it is suggestive of rapid accumulation, is particularly appropriate to the sermon's theme:

And us stalu 7 cwalu, stric 7 steorfa, orfcwealm
 7 uncoþu, hol 7 hete 7 rypera reaflac derede swyþe
 þearle. (56-58)

The pattern Object/Subject/Verb is repeated in the main clause which follows. This clause, however, has a single noun for its subject (7 us ungylda swyþe gedrehtan). The next main clause also begins with us followed by a subject noun (7 us unwedera foroft weoldan unwæstma), but us here is the indirect object, because there is a variation of the syntactic structure in the final clause.

As editors have noted, the passage is similar to the descriptions of punishment which befall the disobedient nation in Be Godcundre Warnunge and the list of calamities occurring during the Last Days in Secundum Marcum.¹ Though a number of

¹See Bethurum, Homilies, p. 360 (note to 55-61) and Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., pp. 53-54 (note to 56 ff.).

the details in these lines transform the description to a more specific reflection of contemporary ills, its significance for Wulfstan, and possibly for his audience, may have resided in the intimation it gives of the approaching end of the world, for strife among nations is a sign of the Second Coming, and disease and unfruitfulness a symptom of the earth's decline in its last age.¹ In the light of the sermon's themes, the reference to the duration and extent of the afflictions (nu lange inne ne ute, on gewelhwylcan ende), and the insistence on their intensity and frequency of occurrence (oft 7 gelome, swybe, swybe pearle, foroft) are also intimations of the proximity of Antichrist's reign.

The second account of afflictions (100-28) is concerned with one particular kind of affliction. In this section, Wulfstan depicts the degraded state to which the English people as a whole and the leaders of the nation in particular have been reduced by their enemies. He begins with a rhetorical question calling attention to the extent of the humiliations suffered by the English:

And la, hu mæg mare scamu þurh Godes yrre mannum
gelimpan þonne us deð gelome for agenum gewyrhtum?
(100-1)

The extent of the humiliations, so excessive that nothing beyond it could be conceived, is suggestive of the impending conquest and possible destruction of the nation. The magnitude of degradation is manifested in various ways. The Vikings' exaction of wergild for a thrall by unjust application of the law, and the powerlessness of an English thane's kinsmen to avenge injuries received from a thrall, reveals the unnatural supremacy of thrall over thane:

¹See Cross, Studies in Old English Literature in Honour of Arthur G. Brodeur, pp. 1-22.

Deah þræla hwylc hlaforde ætleape 7 of cristendome
to wicinge weorþe, 7 hit æfter þam eft geweorþe þæt
wæþengewrixl weorðe gemæne þegene 7 þræle, gif þræl
þæne þegen fulllice afylle, licge ægyld ealre his
mægðe; 7 gif se þegen þæne þræl þe he ær ahte fulllice
afylle, gylde þegengylde. (101-6)

This injury at the personal level is linked, both in substance
and by verbal repetition with the reference to the Vikings'
exaction of tribute at the national level. What follows
immediately after is:

Ful ealhlice laga 7 scandlice nydgyld þurh Godes
yrre us syn gemæne, understande se þe cunne. (106-8)

Similarly, the description of the thrall who his hlaford cnyt
swyþe fæste 7 wyrco him to þræle (117-18) is parallel to the
description of the Vikings leading the English into captivity,
particularly if we take gewelede togædere to refer not to þas
þeode but to þa drafe cristenna manna, so that the Christians,
like the captured thane, are bound:

Oft twegen sæmen oððe þry hwilum drifað þa drafe
cristenna manna fram sæ to sæ ut þurh þas þeode
gewelede togædere. (120-22)

The powerlessness of the English thane is equally manifest when
he has to witness without interfering the humiliation of his
womenfolk:

And oft tyne oððe twelfe, ælc æfter oþrum, scendað
to bysmore þæs þegenes cwenan 7 hwilum his dohtor
oððe nydmagan þær he on locað þe læt hine
sylfne rancne 7 ricne 7 genoh godne ær þæt gewurde.
(113-17)

The passage culminates with:

Ac ealne þæne bysmor þe we oft þoliað we gylðað
mid weorðscipe þam þe us scendað. We him gylðað
singallice, 7 hy us hynað dæghwamlice. Hy hergiað
7 hy bærnað, rypaþ 7 reafiað 7 to scipe læðað; 7 la,
hwæt is ænig oðer on eallum þam gelimpum butan Godes
yrre ofer þas þeode, swutol 7 gesæne? (123-28)

The continual insult, instead of being avenged on the offender,
is compounded by the payment of tribute.

This passage recounting the nation's afflictions is preceded,

like the first account of afflictions (53-59), by an explicit statement of the causal relationship between sin and punishment.

The first account is preceded by:

And þæs we habbað ealle þurh Godes yrre bysmor gelome,
gecnawe se ðe cunne; 7 se byrst wyrð gemæne, þeh man
swa ne wene, eallre þysse þeode, butan God beorge. (49-52)

The second is preceded by the words:

7 þæt is gesyne on þysse þeode þæt us Godes
yrre hetelice onsit, gecnawe se þe cunne. (98-99)

Both of these sentences contain the phrases gecnawe se ðe cunne and þurh Godes yrre. The latter phrase is picked up in the sentence introducing the second account of afflictions (Ac la, hu mæg mare scamu þurh Godes yrre) and is repeated throughout the passage.¹ The repetition of the phrase is in line with the passage's insistence on the sinfulness of the English as the cause of their military weakness. Even the references to the numbers of Vikings and English in 112-13 and 120-22 serve a didactic purpose by revealing that the defeats of the English are attributable to moral rather than numerical deficiencies, a point which is emphasized by including the detail þe læt hine sylfne rancne 7 ricne 7 genoh godne ær þæt gewurde (116-17) in the account of the humiliations of the English thane.

The third passage referring to afflictions (174-189) draws a historical parallel with the English conquest of the Britons, which is meant to make Wulfstan's audience see that the present perilous fate of the nation is unprecedented. He cites Gildas' explanation for the destruction of the Britons, and then states:

Ac utan don swa us þearf is, warnian us be swilcan;
7 soþ is þæt ic secge, wursan dæda we witan mid Englum
þonne we mid Bryttan ahwar gehyrdan. (186-89)

If for the magnitude of their sins, the Britons were exterminated, the fate of the English nation, whose sins, Wulfstan

¹The phrase appears in 100, 107, 111, 118-19, 120, 128.

insists, are immeasurably greater than any reported of the Britons, must also be immeasurably worse. What he has in mind must be the imminent reign of Antichrist, a fate far worse than national extermination.

The drawing of this historical parallel becomes possible because of the principle, pervasive in the sermon, that punishment is proportionate to sin. The imminent historical event is the conquest of England by the Vikings, which for Wulfstan coalesces with the eschatological event. The coming of the Vikings is the coming of the reign of Antichrist, predicted in the opening sentence (7-11). Wulfstan's presentation of the Vikings as antichrists whose victory establishes the reign of the Arch-enemy appears to be without parallel in Old English homiletic literature, but to him the equation of Viking rule with the reign of Antichrist would have been a logical inference.¹ He asserts frequently in his work that heathenism is the worship of the devil,² and, because he views the king as Christ's representative on earth, the similarities between the reign of a heathen king and that of Antichrist would have been obvious to him.³

The equation of Viking victory with the rule of Antichrist in 174-89 is prefigured earlier in the sermon. In the account of the humiliations suffered by the English in 100-28, the Vikings are depicted not simply as the enemies of the English nation, but as the opponents of cristendom and the oppressors

¹His depiction of Danish rule as the reign of Antichrist puts his later association with Cnut in a somewhat odd light: but there are, doubtless, charitable interpretations which can be placed on the apparent change in his opinions.

²See particularly XII, and VI. 70-95.

³See Polity I. 1-2 (Jost, p. 40).

of cristenra manna (see 102, 121). Their supremacy is presented as an inversion of order, for, as I have noted, instances of the humiliations suffered by the English Christians at the hands of the heathen Vikings are juxtaposed with instances of the reversal of social roles. This association of the rule of Antichrist with an inversion of order is characteristic of Wulfstan, for Antichrist is depicted elsewhere in his sermons as the inverter of all that is true and right.¹ The theme of inverted order can be traced even further back in the sermon, for the employment of parallelism to demonstrate the superiority of the Vikings in 102-6, 110-12, and 125-26, recalls the series of antithetical sentences near the beginning of the sermon (27-37), which contrast the heathens' scrupulous observance of religious duties with the sacrilegiousness of the English Christians. The inversion of expected order in the early passage is brought out particularly clearly in the use of Godes beowas to refer to Christian clergy and gedwolgoda penan to describe heathen priests, for the terms emphasize the unnatural pre-eminence of those who adhere to falsehood.²

It is the passages lacking in the BH version, then, EI 100-28 and 176-90, which provide an indication of accumulating disaster. Without them, there is no intimation in the body of the sermon of the coming reign of Antichrist which is referred to in the opening sentence as the culmination of the process of deterioration. Support for the

¹The view is most fully expressed in XI (pp. 185-91).

²Wulfstan's usual term for priests is Godes penas, but Godes beowas is a more inclusive term (see Whitelock, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 50 (note to 32)). He would have been particularly conscious of the irony of the term gedwolgoda penan, since he attempted to "improve the standing of the clergy by awarding thane's rank to celibate priests" (Bethurum, Homilies, p. 357 (note to 34)).

view that these passages were included in Wulfstan's original conception of the sermon is afforded by their close links with the surrounding text. The passage in 100-28, as I have noted, is linked to the preceding unit by the repetition of purh Godes yrre, and to the unit which follows it by the repetition of the root word limp-:

7 la, hwæt is ænig oðer on eallum þam gelimpum
butan Godes yrre ofer þas þeode, swutol 7 gesæne?
. Nis eacnan wundor þeah us mislimpe, forþam we witan
ful georne þæt nu fela geara men na ne rohtan foroft
hwæt hy worhtan wordes oððe dæde. (127-31)

The end of the passage in 176-90 is linked to the exhortatory peroration by the repetition of þearf. The beginning of the passage has no close verbal links with the sentence in 174-76, but this exhortation to guard against complete destruction is supported only if we admit the threat of conquest contained in 176-90:

Ac la, on Godes naman utan don swa us need is,
beorgan us sylfum swa we geornost magan þe læs
we ætgædere ealle forweorðan. (174-76)

When one looks at the passages that are concerned with the nation's sins (59-99 and 129-73) one finds that, though they are distinguishable in terms of their subject matter, the progressive accumulation of sins is indicated predominantly by stylistic devices. What is stressed is the magnitude of evil, both qualitatively and quantitatively, and the length of time during which it has prevailed. This emphasis is in line with the introduction of the sermon which establishes that the approach of the end of the world can be measured by the passage of time and the increase in man's sins. The sermon refers constantly to the sins of the past as well as those of the present,¹ and the frequency with which words such as oft, foroft, and gelome appear, make it

¹See 11-17, 37-40, 53-54, 59-85, 129-38.

clear that the process of deterioration is already far advanced. On numerous occasions he describes sins as having been committed by all or almost all members of the nation, and a number of phrases such as gynd ealle þæs beode, innan bysse beode, on æghwylcan ende, æghwær mid mannum, and ealles to wide, draw attention to the extent to which unrighteousness has spread throughout the nation. The employment of a hyperbolic style throughout the sermon is an index of the extremity of the nation's sins; the treachery in the land, for instance, is described as ealra mæst hlafordswice se bið on worolde (73). The extremity of the nation's sins is also underlined when Wulfstan asserts in 70, at the end of his preliminary indictment of the nation's treachery, do mare gif he mæge, and in 95-96, when he states at the end of the long recital of sins in 61-99, And git hit is mare 7 eac manigfealdre þæt dereð bysse beode.

The intensifying words and phrases which appear in abundance in the accounts of the nation's sins (and afflictions) can be seen, not as mannerisms, but as one of the stylistic devices employed to give expression to Wulfstan's conception of the approach of Antichrist. Intensifiers such as swyþe, ealles to gelome, georne, and to fela occur, of course, in sermons which are dissimilar in theme to Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. It is noticeable, however, that they occur only sporadically in purely expository sermons like De Falsis Deis. They are a prominent stylistic feature only in sermons which, like the early eschatological ones and Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, deal with extreme situations.

The first account of the nation's sins (59-99) deals with treachery. More precisely, it could be described as an indictment of faithlessness, since it is informed by Wulfstan's consciousness that men have broken faith with God as well as with

their fellow men. The passages in 79-83 and 85-91, which I regard as later additions by Wulfstan, appear to be tangential elaborations on the religious aspect of faithlessness. The second account (129-73) reveals the total perversity of the nation's values. In both passages, Wulfstan employs cumulative and repetitive grammatical structures to suggest the rapid proliferation of the nation's sins. In the first account, word pairs, one of the features of Wulfstan's style most frequently remarked upon, occur as infrequently as they do in the introductory section.¹ Here, as well as in the introduction, it is primarily sentence and clause structures which are repeated and compounded, and each sentence or clause is normally limited to the description of only one particular sin. For instance, Wulfstan begins his account of treachery with a sentence describing the decay of kinship. The sentence opens with a full clause, followed by another three, which, with the exception of the second which adds hwilum, are reduced to conjunction, subject, and object:

Ne bearh nu foroft gesib gesibban þe ma þe fremdan,
ne fæder his bearne, ne hwilum bearn his agenum
fæder, ne broþor oþrum. (61-63)

The next sin is also described in a full clause followed by reduced clauses containing further instances:

ne ure ænig his lif ne fadode swa swa he scolde,
ne gehadode regollice, ne læwede lahlice. (64-65)

The second passage dealing with sins (129-73), however, unlike the first, contains main clauses which consist almost entirely of lists of the names of sins and sinners, most of which are linked in pairs (or occasionally larger groups) by alliteration and rhyme of various kinds and joined by conjunctions. Three consecutive main clauses near the beginning of the sermon introduce long catalogues of this kind (131-46). Thus, the

¹See 66, 69, 70-71, 78, 95-96, 99.

introduction of a new main clause (or sentence) in And eac syndan wide (138) and And eac her syn on earde (141-42) does not mark, as one might expect, a respite from the relentless catalogues of sins, but marks a further advance in the accumulation of the nation's evil-doing. The more expository style of 147-59 provides a welcome relief from the seemingly endless compounding of the nation's iniquities, but, in the EI version, the lull serves only to enhance the force of the climactic indictment in 160-66:

Her syndan þurh synleawa, swa hit þincan mæg,
sare gelewede to manege on earde. Her syndan
mannslagan 7 mægslagan 7 mæsserbanan 7 mynster-
hatan; 7 her syndan mansworan 7 morþorwyrhtan;
7 her syndan myltestran 7 bearnmyrðran 7 fule
folegene horingas manege; 7 her syndan wiccan 7
wælcyrrian; 7 her syndan ryperas 7 reaferas 7
woroldstruderan 7, hrædest is to cwepenne, mana
7 misdæda ungerim ealra.

In this passage, the last detailed indictment, various kinds of repetition and compounding occur. The five main clauses following the introductory sentence (Her syndan þurh synleawa ...) each begin with the words Her syndan. The five clauses have the same syntactic structure, and the repeated conjunction "and" links them. The catalogues reappear, for the subject of each clause consists of lists of nouns denoting sinners. In these catalogues too, there is repetition of sound, the nominal groups being linked by verbal repetition and rhyme of various kinds.

In the sermon as a whole, then, the growth of sin is indicated by stylistically varying the accounts. The theme of aa swa leng swa wyrse is embodied in the development of the sermon, because it progresses from a gradual accumulation of sins to the rapid enumeration of a multitude. In crudely didactic terms, the development of the sermon is highly effective, for an emotionally stirring climax is reached in the account of the nation's sins shortly prior to the culminating threat of destruction and the

concluding call for repentance. The catalogue of sinners in 160-66, which is peculiar to the EI version, is essential to the sermon's effectiveness, for it constitutes a climactic "lift" after the description in 147-59. The catalogue of sinners in this passage is similar to the list of those condemned to hell in other Wulfstan sermons, particularly Sermo ad Populum,¹ and its associations for those who were familiar with Wulfstan's work would be entirely appropriate to this sermon, concerned as it is with the apocalyptic quality of the nation's sins.

The passage in 160-73, which includes the catalogues of sinners, is among the passages held to have been added after Wulfstan first wrote the sermon, because it is lacking in BH. The passage's close verbal links with the surrounding text suggest that it may have been part of Wulfstan's original conception. The repeated Her syndan echoes sentence openings earlier in the section (And eac syndan wide and And eac her syn on earde), and the words synleawa and gelewede in the first sentence of the passage provide a verbal link with the sentence immediately preceding it (lewe nellað beorgan (159)), in which the figure of speech is introduced. Conversely, it could be urged that the passage has been skilfully grafted on to the original version, and the fact that the omission of the passage in BH gives two adjacent sentences containing beorgan lends support to this view (see BH 115-18).² It is highly probable, as the Appendix explains, that Wulfstan made additions to his original version, and the passage in 160-73 may be one of the additions. It must be stressed, however, that the authenticity of the passage is called into question only by acceptance of BH as the earliest version. There is no scribal evidence

¹XIII. 92-96.

²This verbal link in BH came to my notice only after the article contained in the Appendix was completed.

in the case of 160-73 for arguing that the original text has been expanded, and the passage, as I shall explain further in discussing 166-73, contributes to the structural superiority of the EI version.¹

Both passages dealing with sins demonstrate the devil's influence on the nation, which appropriately foreshadows his imminent reign as Antichrist. The accounts of the nation's sins, then, reveal the devil's corruption of the land from within, just as the accounts of tribulations reveal that it is besieged from without by the powers of darkness. The account of the nation's tealte getrywða (61) in 59-99 elaborates the assertion contained in the second sentence of the sermon, namely, that the devil has deluded the nation for many years and the absence of getreowþa is widespread:

Understandað eac georne þæt deofol þas
þeode nu fela geara dwelode to swyþe, 7
þæt lytle getreowþa wæran mid mannum, þeah
hy wel spæcan, 7 unrihta to fela ricsode on
lande. (11-14)

Faithlessness and untruthfulness are stated to be tenets of Antichrist in De Septiformi Spiritu (IX. 130-33), and the concealment of evil under fair appearances is particularly associated with the influence of the Arch-deceiver (IX. 107-28). It is the pretence and deception which attend treachery that Wulfstan emphasizes in his indictment of the nation's tealte getrywða:

ne ænig wið oþerne getrywlice þohte swa rihte
swa he scolde, ac mæst ælc swicode 7 oprum derede
wordes 7 dæde, 7 huru unrihtlice mæst ælc oþerne
aftan heawep mid sceandlican onscytan, do mare gif
he mæge. (67-70)

As Whitelock remarks, "The frequency of references to treachery is one of the most striking features of the records of this period,"² but Wulfstan's allusions to the prevalence of treachery are not

¹See below pp. 369-70.

²Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed., p. 55 (note to 73).

simply a reflection of the contemporary situation. They are a significant aspect of the presentation of his eschatological theme, for they reveal that the influence of Antichrist is already clearly discernible. The verses from 2 Tim. which Wulfstan paraphrases in Secundum Marcum, it may be noted, speak of wide-spread treachery and faithlessness in the Last Days.¹

Most of the instances of treachery Wulfstan cites in the first account of sins involve the betrayal of kinsmen:

Ne bearh nu foroft gesib gesibban þe ma þe fremdan, ne
fæder his bearne, ne hwilum bearn his agenum fæder, ne
broþor oþrum (61-63)

fæder gesealde bearn wið weorþe 7 bearn his modor, 7
broþor sealde oþerne fremdum to gewealde (92-94)

And godsibbas 7 godbearn to fela man forspilde wide
gynd þas þeode. (78-79)

To these examples of lack of faith among kinsmen may be added cristenes folces to fela man gesealde ut of bysan earde (83-84), since the brotherhood of Christians is frequently referred to in Wulfstan's sermons. The first two of the examples listed above provide an illustration of Wulfstan's alteration of biblical verses in order to bring them into accord with the theme of his sermon. The passage 61-63, in echoing Mark xiii.12, omits the reference to death, and places the emphasis on betrayal and lack of fidelity where it would most be expected, particularly by the addition of þe ma þe fremdan. In the paraphrase of the same verse in 92-94, the sale of kinsmen to foreigners is substituted for betrayal to those who pronounce the death sentence, so that the biblical prophecy of treachery in the Last Days is assimilated to the contemporary situation.

Wulfstan's account of the nation's faithlessness does not merely contain instances of the violation of social order arising from the flagrant disregard of human loyalties. It includes

¹See further pp. 305-6.

deeds which are directly contrary to the will of God which is, ideally, reflected in the laws which govern social order.¹

There is, as he states, ungetrywpa micle for Gode 7 for worolde (71-72), for kings, who are representative of Christ on earth, have been betrayed in various ways (71-78), and men who are "bought with Christ's blood" are sold to the nation's enemies (83-84 and 93-94).² The indictment of the nation's faithlessness, then, is an indictment of a specific instance of the pervasive unriht in the land, which, in combination with the prevalence of unlagu, is described in the introductory section (25-49). The equation of treachery and unriht is made in the sentence which opens this account of the nation's sins:

forþam on þysan earde was, swa hit þincan mæg, nu fela geara unriht fela 7 tealte getrywða æghwær mid mannum. (59-61)

The nation's opposition to the will of God is established at the very beginning of the sermon as a manifestation of the workings of the Arch-enemy, for the second sentence mentions unriht in connexion with the influence of the devil:

Understandað eac georne þæt deofol þas þeode nu fela geara dwelode to swyþe, 7 þæt lytle getreowþa wæran mid mannum, þeah hy wel spæcan, 7 unrihta to fela ricsode on lande. (11-14)

Elsewhere in his sermons, Wulfstan expresses the view that Antichrist turns men to his contrary law from the teachings of God.³ Here, in the use of the verb ricsode, there is a suggestion that the nation has not simply abandoned riht but is already governed by evil. A suggestion of rule by unjust and wicked laws, an

¹The view that secular law should correspond to God's law is evident in the enumeration of the duties of the king in Polity, as well as in sermon XXI. See also Homilies, pp. 74-76.

²The passage in 85-91 concludes with an echo of the canonical prohibition (see Homilies, p. 359 (note to 45)). The wish to emphasize the "ties of blood" between man and God which are betrayed may have been part of Wulfstan's motive in adding this passage.

³See particularly IX. 107-end.

inversion of order comparable to the reign of Antichrist himself, is contained also in unriht ræde 7 unlaga manege, a few lines further on (16). The suggested erection of a law contrary to the law of God is made apparent in the account of the nation's treachery only in the EI version. In 65-67 of this version, Wulfstan states:

Ac worhtan lust us to lage ealles to gelome, 7
 naþor ne heoldan ne lare ne lage Godes ne manna
 swa swa we scoldan.

The phrase worhtan lust us to lage identifies the contrary law to which the nation adheres as Antichrist's, for it is he who teaches, in opposition to Christ, that gehwa his luste georne fulgange.¹

The total perversion of the nation's values, depicted in the second account of sins (129-73), is the logical outcome of acceptance of the devil's teaching. The opening sentence of the section states:

Nis eac nan wundor þeah us mislimpe, forþam we witan
 ful georne þæt nu fela geara men na ne rohtan foroft
 hwæt hy worhtan wordes oððe dæde, ac wearð þes þeodscipe,
 swa hit þincan mæg, swyþe forsyngod þurh mænigfealde
 synna 7 þurh fela misdæda.... (129-33)

The assertion that considerations of morality have been abandoned in favour of the proliferation of sin, contained here in a clause with a negative verb followed by a main clause beginning with ac, recalls the opening of the first account of sins. The same point is made in that passage (61-70), in a series of negative clauses followed by a main clause beginning with ac, which are themselves, stylistically, an echo of the opening of the first account of tribulations (55-56). This too is constructed on the pattern ne ... ac ..., the main clause beginning with ac containing an account of the proliferation of

¹See IX. 129-33.

tribulations, comparable with the list of sins in the opening of the second account of sins. But the opening of the second account of sins also recalls the first reference in the sermon to repentance (14-17). In his first reference to repentance, Wulfstan shows the extent of the devil's success in deluding the nation, because it has rejected the means of remedying its perilous situation and instead accelerated the progression to disaster through sin:

And næs a fela manna þe smeade ymbe þa bote swa
georne swa man scolde, ac dæghwamllice man ihte yfel
æfter oðrum 7 unriht rærde 7 unlaga manege ealles to
wide gynde ealle þas þeode.

With this allusion to the nation's disregard of morality in the second account of sins, Wulfstan reintroduces the notion of a course of action counter to the accumulation of sin, a notion which figured in the introductory section, but gradually disappeared, being subsumed in the juxtapositioning of evil and its consequences. The notion of repentance slowly attains prominence throughout the description of the climactic extent of the nation's sins. The first catalogues of sins (131-46) are followed by the assertion that men are more ashamed of good deeds than evil ones, in 147-48, and Wulfstan elaborates on the point in 149-59. In the EI version, he returns to it again, in 166-68, after a further recital of the nation's iniquities (160-66). In this version, the rhetorical unit containing the indictment of the nation's sins is not followed, as others in the sermon are, by a detailed description of retribution. Before he deals with the imminence of the nation's defeat, Wulfstan exhorts the nation to consider its ways and guard against destruction, alluding only in passing to the great disasters which have eventuated as a consequence of sin:

Eala, micel magan manege gyt hertoeacan eape
beþencan þas þe an man ne mehte on hrædinge
asmeagan, hu earmlice hit gefaren is nu ealle
hwile wide gynd þas þeode. And smeage huru

georne gehwa hine sylfne 7 þæs na ne latige
ealles to lange. (169-73)

This is Wulfstan's first direct call for improvement. Having shown that the process of deterioration, both of man and his world, is already far advanced, he here emphasizes the shortness of time which remains and the magnitude of repentance which is required. After a last reminder of the need for haste in the words concluding the reference to the destruction of the Britons, wyrsan dæda we witan mid Englum þonne we mid Bryttan ahwar gehyrdan (187-89), which imply that retribution is already long overdue, repentance finally becomes the subject of a lengthy passage consisting of imperatives instructing the audience in the form amendment must take (190-202).

One finds, then, that within the rigid structural pattern of the sermon, which alternates accounts of sins and punishments, a modification is suggested in the increasing prominence attained by the notion of repentance. The pattern is finally broken by the exhortations to repent. The sermon as a whole provides a conceptual framework which is intended to persuade its audience that repentance is urgently necessary and desirable, for the structure embodies the relentless progression of events to ultimate disaster, and repentance emerges as the sole means of altering the course of events. Thus, the exhortatory peroration, though an almost standard feature of Wulfstan's sermons, is an essential structural element of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos and the culminating point of the themes developed in the sermon.

It is the references to repentance in the second account of sins, however, which contain the clearest depiction of the nation's total perversity. Its perverted morality is indicative

of the approaching triumph of Antichrist, for it has accepted evil as good. Wulfstan states twice that the nation is repentant of good deeds instead of evil ones:

And þy is nu geworden wide 7 side to ful yfelan
gewunan, þæt menn swyþor scamað nu for goddædan
þonne for misdædan. (147-48)

And þæs us ne scamað na, ac us scamað/^{swyþe}þæt we bote
aginnan swa swa bec tæcan, 7 þæt is gesyne on þysse
earman forsyngdon þeode. (166-69)

The repetition of the same root word in the first of these sentences, and the faint parallelism and repetition of the verb in the second, emphasizes the point that righteousness has been replaced by its direct opposite. This perverse attitude to repentance, Wulfstan states, stems from the multitude's hatred and ridicule of God's followers:

forþam to oft man mid hocere goddæda hyrweð 7
godfyrhte lehtreð ealles to swyþe, 7 swyþost man
tæleð 7 mid olle gegreteð ealles to gelome þa þe
riht lufiað 7 Godes ege habbað be ænigum dæle. And
þurh þæt þe man swa deð þæt man eal hyrweð þæt man
scolde heregian 7 to forð laðet þæt man scolde lufian,
þurh þæt man gebringeð ealles to manege on yfelan
geþance 7 on undæde, swa þæt hy ne scamað na þeah
hy syngian swyðe 7 wið God sylfne forwyrcean hy mid
ealle. (149-56)

The inversion of values is forcibly underlined by the use of parallelism and repetition in the second of the sentences quoted above. The passage clearly reveals what is implicit in the introductory section: namely, that evil men have power over the nation.¹ The nation is beset within, as well as without, by the fore-runners of Antichrist, the antichrists whom in De Anticristo (lb, pp. 116-18), Wulfstan defines as those men who lead others into sin, or the "limbs" of Satan who, in large numbers, usher in the reign of Antichrist by persecuting and seducing the righteous. In view of the fact that Wulfstan reveals here that the nation is in the grip of antichrists, it

¹See above pp. 367-68.

seems highly probable that the phrase [Godes wiðersacan], which occurs in BH and C at the beginning of the third sentence in this section, (And eac her synd on earde [a Godes wiðersacan] apostatan abroðene (C 140)), is an original reading. This phrase, which clearly underlines the presence of God's opponents, is given as the translation of Antichrist in De Anticristo: Anticristus is on Læden contrarius Cristo, þæt is on Englisc, Godes wiðersaca (7-8).

Wulfstan's presentation of the nation's attitude to repentance involves more than a demonstration of moral blindness, the acceptance of good as evil. Repentance, as the introductory section establishes, particularly by the play on bot, is the means of remedying the nation's situation. By being ashamed to repent of evil deeds, the nation rejects the available remedy, and continues on its path to inevitable destruction. Such a wilful pursuit of destruction involves blindness to the full enormity of the consequences. The foolish perversity of the nation is revealed by a comparison of those who shun penance with those who refuse to seek a cure for their injuries before it is too late:

ac for idelan onscytan hy scamað þæt hy betan heora
misdæda, swa swa bec tæcan, gelice þam dwæsan þe for
heora prytan lewe nellað beorgan ær hy na ne magan,
peah hy eal willan. (157-59)

The figurative equation of a state of sin with injury (or disease) is carried over into the next sentence, which indicates an urgent need for remedy:

Her syndan þurh synleawa, swa hit þincan mæg, sare
gelewede to manege on earde. (160-61)

Wulfstan's demonstration of the foolish perversity of the nation's position in 157-59 is a summing up, in religious terms, of the view of English policy which he expresses in his account

of the humiliations inflicted by the Danes:

Ac ealne þæne bysmor þe we oft þoliað we gyldað.
mid weorðscipe þam þe us scendað. We him gyldað
singallice, 7 hy us hynað dæghwamlice. Hy hergiað
7 hy bærnað, rypaþ 7 reafiað 7 to scipe lædað. (123-27)

Here, the exact parallelism of the second sentence, and the initial placing of the object in the first sentence so that it divides naturally into two halves, enforce a recognition of the contrast between the insult received and the response made to it. The full absurdity of the nation's policy is evident in these lines, for they show that it perversely follows a course of action which benefits only its enemies and contributes to the furthering of its own destruction. The passage is preceded by an explicit statement of the nation's moral blindness:

Oft twegen sæmen oððe þry hwilum drifað þa drafe
cristenra manna fram sæ to sæ ut þurh þas þeode
gewelede togædere, us eallum to woroldscame, gif we
on eornost ænige cuþon [oððe a woldan] ariht
understandan. (120-23)

The phrase added in MS. C and MS. E may well be authentic, for the imputation of wilful refusal to see the truth, added to the imputation of inability to distinguish good and evil, accords with Wulfstan's castigation of the moral perversity of the nation in his second account of sins.

Wulfstan's depiction of the nation as blind to the realities of its moral and political situation has similarities to the description of the Last Days in 2 Thess. ii.9-11, in which the Second Coming is said to take place after

operationem Satanae, in omni virtute, et signis, et prodigiis mendacibus, et in omni seductione iniquitatis iis qui pereunt; eo quod charitatem veritatis non receperunt ut salvi fierent. Ideo mittet illis Deus operationem erroris, ut credant mendacio, ut judicentur omnes qui non crediderunt veritati, sed consenserunt iniquitati.

It is Wulfstan's belief that the nation has been blinded to the truth by the influence of the devil which accounts for the

appearance of expressions such as gecnawe . . . se ðe cunne, gelyfe se þe wille, and þeh man swa ne wene,¹ and his insistence that what he speaks is the truth (gecnawað þæt soð is (7), soð is þæt ic secge (37, 187)), and that what he recounts is plain to see (swutol 7 gesæne).² Expressions such as these are customarily described as "set phrases" characteristic of Wulfstan's style. Nowhere else, however, are such expressions used as abundantly as in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, where they are particularly appropriate to the theme; and a belief in the moral obtuseness of mankind in the Last Days may underlie their use elsewhere.³

For all its topicality, it may be concluded, Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is essentially an eschatological sermon in which Wulfstan presents his most fully developed view of the Last Days. It incorporates elements of his earlier treatment of the Last Days, such as the increase in calamities which had figured in Secundum Marcum and Secundum Lucam. The eschatological daily increase in sins which he elaborates in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos has a scriptural basis and can be seen as relating to contemporary conceptions of the microcosm and macrocosm, but, by causally relating the increase in calamities to the increase in sins, Wulfstan achieves a highly schematized conception of a twofold deterioration. The reign of Antichrist becomes, not a prophecy fulfilled at a fixed time according to God's will, as it is in other sermons, but the culmination of a process for which mankind is responsible. For this reason, Wulfstan does not simply warn his audience to prepare for the Last Judgement, but to repent in order to stave off the terror of Antichrist's reign.

¹See 50, 51, 84-85, 95, 99, 107-8.

²See 53, 98, 128, 168.

³See also p. 239 and notes.

The incentive to repentance inherent in Wulfstan's presentation of the Last Days in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is a particularly powerful one, since the reign of Antichrist is identified with the conquest of the nation by its enemies.

Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is unique, not only in its conception of the nature of the Last Days, but because its structure is such an ingenious embodiment of its theme. The sermon has an intellectual structure as well as a rhetorical one. It enforces recognition of the truth of Wulfstan's opening assertion that the world is progressing inexorably to disaster, for the accounts of retribution are so organized that there is a progression from a general catalogue of calamities to a threat that the conquest of the nation is imminent. The growth of sin is indicated by the hyperbolic style employed, the insistence on its spread throughout the nation, and a cumulative listing of sins whose pace accelerates towards the end of the sermon. Within this framework, repentance is made to appear urgently necessary and desirable, for it can modify the process of deterioration, which the sermon shows is already far advanced. The call for repentance has particular force, because it follows the most emotionally stirring sections of the sermon, the threat of destruction by the nation's enemies and the highly rhetorical lists of sinners in 133-47 and 160-66.

It is not simply by verbal impressiveness and impassioned catalogues of the nation's sins and afflictions, then, that Wulfstan endeavours to persuade his audience to repent in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. It is the thematic framework in which the recital of the nation's iniquities and sufferings are placed, and the manner in which the theme is developed and embodied in the sermon's structure, which constitute its didactic force,

and reveal Wulfstan's skill and originality as a sermon writer. The "horrific accumulation of vivid detail," it might be noted, although the most obvious feature of his commination,¹ is by no means the only technique he employs to describe the nation's woes and offences. Considering the limited nature of his immediate subject matter, the variety of styles and techniques in the sermon is not the least of Wulfstan's achievements. His indictment of the nation's sins ranges from the antithetical sentences contrasting Christian and heathen religious observances in 27-37, to alliterating and rhyming word pairs in 133-47 and 160-66. In recounting the afflictions of the nation, he employs an exemplum as well as alliterating word pairs, and describes the humiliations of the English in more concrete detail in 100-28.

Besides indicating that the reign of Antichrist is close at hand, by demonstrating that the process of intensification of sin followed by a proportionate increase in affliction is far advanced, Wulfstan suggests the approach of his reign by pointing to the perversions of the nation's values and its deluded pursuit of a course which leads to destruction instead of that which leads to salvation. It is true, of course, that Wulfstan refers only once in the sermon to Antichrist, and that some of the details which have been remarked upon in the discussion of the development of the sermon's themes may be too minute to have been noticed by an audience only hearing the address. The prominence which is given to the coming of Antichrist in the opening sentence of the sermon, however, prepares the audience for allusions to the influence of Antichrist, and it is not unlikely that audiences would have been sufficiently familiar with the

¹See Wrenn, A Study of Old English Literature, p. 241.

tradition of thought on which Wulfstan draws to have been able to recognize that the deceit and perversity referred to stem from the machinations of the devil.

CONCLUSION

Because the lives and work of Wulfstan and Ælfric differed considerably in many ways, they inevitably invite comparison. Beside Ælfric's prolific output, Wulfstan's corpus appears extraordinarily small, and if the twenty-one sermons in Bethurum's edition represent substantially his contribution as a preacher during his long career, it would seem that the production of sermons was not an object of particular concern to him as it was to Ælfric. His claim to our attention, as Whitelock and Bethurum have shown, is founded on his many and varied activities as an archbishop and statesman, and not on his sermons alone.¹ Given his involvement with the welfare of the nation at a critical period of its history, it is not surprising that his sermons cannot match the range, the philosophical profundity, the intricacy and the elegance which characterizes Ælfric's work.

As a writer and a thinker, Ælfric's stature is undoubtedly greater than Wulfstan's. The comparisons which have been drawn between the two writers have not, however, fully done Wulfstan justice. So greatly has the contrast between them been emphasized that their interests and abilities have been conceived of as diametrically opposite. Wulfstan has been viewed primarily as a forceful orator and a stern puritanical moralist, indifferent to abstract theological issues, and obsessively narrow in his preoccupations, while Ælfric has been admired as a teacher, for the skill with which he presents and develops his material, and the breadth and depth of his learning. This unfavourable view of Wulfstan has been supported by comparison of specific compositions by the two writers. The method of study adopted,

¹See particularly TRHS, XXIV, 25-45 and Homilies, pp. 54-87.

in my opinion, distorts our estimation of Wulfstan. It has been assumed that Wulfstan referred closely to certain Ælfric compositions when he composed his sermons, and comparisons have been undertaken for the purpose of defining the characteristic features of his style and method of composition. Such an approach tends to isolate only divergences of the type sought. As a result, comparative studies have stressed Wulfstan's dependence on Ælfric, and suggested that he was more concerned with impressing the mannerisms of his style upon his borrowed material than with the communication of meaning. The comparisons have suggested also that he handled his sources in a somewhat haphazard manner, and have emphasized his lack of interest in theology and exegesis, and his rejection of concrete detail. A similar method has been applied to the study of his biblical sermons, with similar results.

We are probably right to conclude from the surviving evidence of Wulfstan's correspondence with Ælfric, as well as his revision of one of Ælfric's Pastoral Letters and two of his treatises,¹ that Wulfstan recognized Ælfric's superiority. It has been too readily assumed, however, that any resemblances between the two writers' compositions are indications of Wulfstan's reliance on Ælfric. If Wulfstan's divergences from the compositions of Ælfric generally accepted as his sources are examined in full, it can be seen that his independence of Ælfric in De Temporibus Anticristi, De Dedicacione Ecclesiae, and Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi is so marked as to cast serious doubts on the assumption that he made use of Ælfric's compositions. Though he deals with roughly the same events as Ælfric in these sermons, the didactic significance he discerns in

¹See p. 29 and notes.

his material differs considerably. Unlike Ælfric, he was concerned to impress upon his audience the immediate relevance of his expositions, and he adopted a more directly exhortatory form of address in order to persuade his audience to make amends. One finds, then, that De Temporibus Anticristi and the homily version of Ælfric's Preface represent two different types of didactic compositions, because the material is selected, organized, and formulated with dissimilar aims in mind. Thus, even if it is assumed that Wulfstan derived his basic information for De Temporibus Anticristi from Ælfric's composition, his sermon must be regarded as an original composition. Ælfric's In Dedicacione Ecclesiae may have suggested to Wulfstan the general conception of his sermon on the same subject, but, if it did, he employed the technique of symbolic interpretation to produce a sermon dissimilar to Ælfric's in theme and structure. Ælfric's composition may also have influenced certain passages of Wulfstan's sermon which bear a faint verbal resemblance to his work, but such passages can be shown to have been brought into accord with Wulfstan's own didactic aims and methods. Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, on the other hand, appears to owe nothing to Ælfric's work. The two sermons resemble one another only in so far as they both belong to a well-established sermon tradition, for Wulfstan's sermon is designed to express his particular conception of the didactic import of the history of Creation. Even where Wulfstan follows Ælfric's compositions closely, in De Septiformi Spiritu and De Falsis Deis, he imparts his own didactic preoccupations.

Just as a full examination of the relationship between Wulfstan's sermons and Ælfric's compositions reveals that his sermons are not simply summaries of the work of his more learned

contemporary, a close comparison of his biblical sermons with their sources reveals that he did not merely translate. He selected passages from the scriptures dealing with a subject with which he was especially concerned, and in rendering them into English, he reorganized and freely altered the meaning of the verses. By this means, he shaped his sources into a unified exhortation which contained a warning explicitly relevant to his audience and which bore the impress of his distinctive outlook. Though he departed considerably from the literal meaning of the scriptures, he retained the form of direct address employed in the original, and emphasized that he transmitted the words spoken by God himself, in order to give his warnings greater force and immediacy. His handling of the scriptures is an index both of his originality and the overriding urgency of his didactic concerns, for his contemporaries translate the scriptures with greater consideration for the fidelity befitting their divine origin, and they incorporate passages of scripture for the purpose of illustration and interpretation, rather than using them as the basis for entire sermons.

Wulfstan's reworking of his sources, then, was determined by the nature of his didactic aims, and not by a desire to "bring the movement of the whole into closer accord with his own habitual rhythms and modes of expression."¹ Though McIntosh's study of Wulfstan's prose rhythm suggests that stylistic considerations played an essential part in his reworking of his sources, it is clear from an analysis of Wulfstan's revisions of Ælfric's De Falsis Diis and De Septiformi Spiritu that he was not attempting to transform his sources into a two-stress rhythmical prose of the kind which McIntosh claimed

¹Pope, MLN, LXXIV, 335.

was his habitual mode. In view of the invalidity of McIntosh's theory, there seems no reason to believe that rhythmical preferences influenced his reworking of any other compositions which served as his sources, whether Latin or English. For the most part, his stylistic divergences from the works which are assumed, rightly or wrongly, to have been his sources, can be related to his larger didactic aims. (The exceptions are the presumably unconscious peculiarities of usage referred to in my introductory remarks.)¹ Except in De Falsis Deis and De Septiformi Spiritu, there are few sentences which Wulfstan could have taken over from Ælfric's compositions with only minor stylistic alterations, and, in all the sermons concerned, his stylistic divergences from his assumed source normally represent changes in meaning or connotation which reflect the dissimilar conception of his sermons. By the same token, he does not depart from literalness in his biblical sermons in order to secure "characteristic" stylistic effects.² It is true that he appears to have considered some form of stylistic embellishment proper to the translation of holy writ, but his apprehension of the need for pertinent warnings to preserve the nation from temporal and spiritual perdition was surely too great for him to have been particularly concerned with tricks and mannerisms of style.

Nor was Wulfstan's reworking of his biblical sources--or Ælfric's compositions, if he did in fact refer to them--a process of randomly adding or omitting as his "characteristic" interests or the need for brevity dictated. Unlike Ælfric, he conceived his sermons as tightly unified expositions of a theme

¹ See pp. 9, 36-38.

² Cf. Bethurum, Homilies, p. 32.

and not as vehicles for imparting the maximum of information within a loose exegetical or chronological framework. Because he includes only material which is strictly related to his didactic theme, he necessarily omits much of the concrete detail, the philosophical speculation, and the allegorical interpretation which Ælfric includes. The contrast between his conception of relevance and Ælfric's is certainly a reflection of their contrasting interests and personalities, and reveals the relative narrowness of Wulfstan's range. To his credit, however, it may be said that his failure to include material contained in the works generally accepted as his sources indicates his tight control of his subject matter, and that his sermons compare favourably with the somewhat rambling compositions in the Vercelli and Blickling collections. Furthermore, his divergences from the Ælfric compositions which deal with the same subject matter are indicative of the differing nature of his didactic mode rather than of his abilities and interests: it need not necessarily be concluded from a comparison of the two writers' compositions that Wulfstan was unfamiliar with hermeneutics, completely uninterested in abstract theology, or possessed of a "Puritan fear ... that his audience will enjoy [concrete] details for their own sake."¹

It is clear from an examination of De Temporibus Anticristi and De Dedicacione Ecclesiae that Wulfstan found exegesis, which is essentially explanatory, digressive, and abstract, uncongenial to his preference for a closely integrated exposition of a given subject. Had he employed the technique of symbolic interpretation in his biblical sermons, the prophetic force and the immediacy of his exhortations would have been lost. His paraphrases of the scriptures do show, however, that

¹Bethurum, Homilies, p. 97.

although he was primarily concerned with historical and moral significance, he was by no means unacquainted with other levels of interpretation. As for the paucity of concrete detail in his work, there is ample evidence in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos that he supplied concrete details when his didactic purpose required it, but the abundance of detail Ælfric tends to give was rarely appropriate to the kind of instruction his sermons were intended to provide. His failure to reproduce the details of his source in his biblical sermons is equally understandable in the light of his didactic aims. By generalizing, he was able to make the scriptural warnings comprehensible and to give the impression that the prophecies of disaster clearly corresponded to contemporary experience, without departing too radically from the general sense of his text.

His didactic mode precluded also the discussion of abstract matters and fine theological points, but there are indications that he was not exclusively preoccupied with the essentials of Christianity. His version of the Lord's Prayer, an ingenious formulation which is not least among his achievements, and unique because the entire paraphrase conforms with exegetical interpretation, shows particularly clearly that his interest in theology is evinced in the care with which he expresses himself rather than in explicit discussion. In some respects, he reveals a more acute awareness of theological subtleties than Ælfric. In De Temporibus Anticristi, for instance, his definition of the nature of Antichrist is more precise than the one Ælfric gives in his Preface, and he avoids the inconsistencies in Ælfric's presentation of Antichrist's attempts to gain followers.

"Man wird von Wulfstan keine neue Lehrmeinung oder ein

theologisches System erwarten," as Jost remarked.¹ Nevertheless, a distinctive and consistent conception of Christianity emerges from a close examination of his style and his divergences from the works accepted as his sources. Clemoes' comment on theology in the Old English period, that "the sense of orthodoxy, uncomplicated by heresy, encouraged, not original thinking, but a strong feeling for pattern,"² is especially applicable to Wulfstan, for the essence of his world-view is the intensification of the contrasts and oppositions inherent in his religion. His tendency to think in terms of antithesis is manifest in his treatment of every topic, and in the structure as well as the style of his sermons. Of particular significance is his conception of the devil as the exact opposite of God, continually striving to win mankind from his allegiance. The view is presented most explicitly in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, De Falsis Deis, and De Septiformi Spiritu, but its ramifications can be traced throughout his sermons. For Wulfstan there exist only moral extremes: the failure to keep the laws of God is tantamount to idolatry, which is the worship of the devil and adherence to a contrary law. Consistent with this is his presentation of evil as a negative form of righteousness and his description of repentance as a complete reversion. Since he apprehends God and the devil as antithetical forces, representing truth and falsehood respectively, he depicts the devil as bringing about an inversion of order--a state of affairs in which all things are the opposite of what they seem and ought to be, and men, believing evil to be good, are blind to the destruction they court. It is within the context of Wulfstan's world-view that his frequent use of verbal and syntactic

¹Wulfstanstudien, p. 168.

²Continuations and Beginnings, p. 189.

parallelism and word-play involving the repetition of the same root word with different affixes is significant: like many of the stylistic devices and "set phrases" described as characteristic of Wulfstan, parallelism and word-play do not appear in his work merely because of his "fondness" for them, but because they embody his theological outlook.

Related to Wulfstan's conception of God and the devil as diametrically opposed forces, is his interest in the nature and extent of God's responsibility for the temptations and tribulations experienced by man. Because he views the devil as the author of all evil and God as the incarnation of goodness, he handles instances of disaster emanating from God with extreme care. His desire to show God's punitive actions to be just is evident: it is in treating God's reasons for permitting the persecution of the elect in De Temporibus Anticristi that he diverges most from his assumed source, and in his addresses threatening the punishment of the entire nation he draws attention to the culpability of all individuals. His concern with the problem of evil originating from God is most strikingly manifested in his reluctance to attribute to God even the afflictions which he demonstrates are the inevitable consequences of sin. Especially in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi and Be Godcundre Warnunge, it is noticeable that he portrays the disastrous consequences of sin as actions of the nation's enemies or describes them in terms which require no mention of God's agency. In the few instances that punishment of sin is ascribed to God, he emphasizes the extremity of the provocation. He appears at times to adopt a virtually Manichean position, or to hold the view that evil is the automatic adjustment of a hostile universe which follows upon the suspension of God's

protection. Even in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, his most concerted effort to convince the nation that its afflictions are the result of angering God, there is no reference to divine intervention: the prophecies of the Last Days are fulfilled by the actions of mankind in accordance with an abstract principle, aa swa leng swa wyrse.

Despite the fact, then, that Wulfstan's task as a preacher was above all to inculcate the moral that punishment inevitably follows sin, God is not presented as a wrathful avenger. Nor is Wulfstan's conception of Christianity the purely legalistic one that Jost suggested:

Aber die eigentlichen Kernpunkte von Wulfstans religiösem Denken sind die Begriffe 'recht' und 'unrecht' Sogar die Liebe zu Gott, die er so häufig in seinen Predigten fordert--sie ist ja das vornehmste und höchste Gebot--, wird bei ihm zu einer Form der Gesetzesfrömmigkeit.¹

The cast of mind which helped to make Wulfstan the chief legislator of his age is certainly evident in his sermons, but a comparison of his sermon on the history of Creation with Ælfric's, and of Be Godcundre Warnunge with its source, reveals that he endeavours to portray the relation between man and God as one of love as well as obedience, and that he did not see love as subsumed under obedience. It is his attempt to evoke love for God which underlies one of his most noteworthy divergences from Ælfric; that is, his emphasis of the human aspect of Christ's nature rather than the divine in Incipiunt Sermones Lupi Episcopi, and his presentation of the Redemption in terms of Christ's suffering instead of the "devil's rights."

Limited though his theological speculation appears to have been, it can at least be said that he was by no means uninterested in theology, and that he was an independent thinker

¹Wulfstanstudien, pp. 169-72.

with a distinctive world-view. It is perhaps easy to underestimate the extent of his speculation, because he confines himself to such a narrow range of topics. But although he deals frequently with the Last Days, his conception of them is not static. There is a striking difference in his view of the subject in Secundum Marcum and in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. Whereas he presents the Last Days as an inevitable consequence of sin in Secundum Marcum, envisaging the salvation of the elect alone, and making no attempt to exhort all men to repent, in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, he depicts the reign of Antichrist as the culmination of disasters increasing in proportion to sin, which mankind has the power to postpone by repentance. Even in Sermo ad Populum, in which he deals with the duties of a Christian, previously enumerated in many of his compositions, his treatment of the subject is enlivened by his meditation on the significance of pearf. In view of his changing conception of the topics he deals with, it is somewhat misleading to describe his method of composition as a gradual elaboration of his subject matter. The verbal similarities among his compositions are certainly numerous, but close examination reveals that when he uses passages from earlier works, he does not merely expand them, he reshapes and alters their meaning in accordance with the variations in his themes.

If the view that Wulfstan lacked interest in theology exaggerates the contrast between him and Ælfric, so does the image of Wulfstan as a forceful preacher rather than a meticulous teacher. Even if, in most of the sermons, he aims at moving his audience to repent, he does not do so by mere force of oratory or by relying on the intrinsically terrifying nature of his subject matter. Each sermon provides a coherent exposit-

ion of a particular theme, and he makes sure that his audience is able to follow the development of his theme by repeating the same idea in various forms while gradually adding new information, clarifying the relation between sentences by verbal and syntactic repetition, and indicating the divisions of his sermon into separate topics. His style as well as his manner of presentation shows him to be a painstaking teacher. Comparison of his sermons with some of Ælfric's compositions suggest that he had a clearer understanding than Ælfric of the style most suited to oral instruction. He makes his sentences simpler and more restricted, emphasizes by employing prominent rhetorical figures, and avoids expressions likely to confuse or mislead.

As a sermon writer, Wulfstan compares less unfavourably with Ælfric if his divergences from the works assumed to be his sources are examined in full, and not in order to define the characteristic features of his style and method of composition. The fuller examination attempted here shows that his divergences manifest the attempt to produce sermons unified by his chosen theme and shaped by his didactic mode. Such an examination makes one aware also of the variety of themes and treatment in the different sermons, of the skill with which each theme is presented and developed, of a distinctive mode of thought, and of a certain originality. Only from a full examination does the significance of the features listed as "characteristic" emerge. In view of the fact that Wulfstan's stylistic devices are closely related to his themes and didactic aims, and there is considerable variety in his work, it is perhaps questionable whether the description of certain features as "characteristic" is accurate, and whether such description provides a satisfactory basis for determining Wulfstan's canon.

APPENDIX
SERMO LUPI AD ANGLOS

The Order and Date of the Three Versions

Versions of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos appear in five manuscripts (B, C, E, H, and I).¹ The earliest of these, I, was written during the first quarter of the eleventh century, and is thought to contain revisions in Wulfstan's hand.² B and C are dated as first quarter of the eleventh century and mid eleventh century respectively, and E as third quarter of the same century. H was compiled in the second half of the twelfth century.³ The five manuscripts represent three distinct versions of the sermon (EI, BH, and C), which differ primarily in length.⁴ Of the minor textual variations, the most significant as evidence for dating and the relationship between the manuscripts is the omission in E, I, and C of a clause referring to Ethelred's exile.⁵ The longest version, EI, contains a number of passages not found in BH or C, the most substantial being an analogy drawn between the sins of the English and those of the Britons which, according to Gildas, brought about the destruction of the Britons by their enemies (EI 176-190). BH also lacks the description of the humiliations suffered by the English at the hands of the Danes which appears in C (97-126) as well as in EI (100-128). Both Bethurum and Whitelock, the most recent editors of the text, consider that the shortest version, recorded in B and H, is the earliest, and that C and EI represent successive stages of Wulfstan's expansion of the sermon.⁶ I should like to examine here the evidence for the dating and order of the three versions of the sermon, for it suggests, I would argue, that it is I, the longest version, which is closest to the original, and that BH and C are later abridgements.

The rubric of I states that Sermo Lupi ad Anglos was composed in 1014, and there appears to be no reason to doubt its accuracy. The rubric of C gives the date of composition as 1009, and the words bis wæs on Æðelredes cyninges dagum gediht, feower geara fæce ær he forðferde are inserted in the text (C 9-11), but C is obviously less reliable than I, because its indications of dating are inconsistent, and the addition assigning the sermon to 1012 identifies it as a copy made some time after the sermon was originally composed, whereas I is a contemporary manuscript. It is possible that the C scribe mistook MXIIII for MVIIII in the rubric and that feower geara is an error for feaw(e)ra geara,⁷ but in any case, as Whitelock notes: "If one wished to accept a date of 1009 or 1012, one would have to postulate an original version lacking the sentence which contains or requires a reference to Ethelred. There is not the slightest evidence for such a version."⁸ If the BH version is the earliest, then, its failure to mention the Danish invasions is puzzling. It refers to here 7 hunger, bryne 7 blodgyte (BH 50-51), but one would expect something more specific and detailed than this in a sermon addressed to the nation on the subject of retribution for its sins at a time which was, as the I rubric points out, "the height of the Danish persecutions."⁹ By the same token, it is difficult to believe, as one must if one is to accept Bethurum's arguments in favour of the EI version as the latest, that it did not occur to Wulfstan that the threat of destruction by the Danes implicit in EI 176-190 would be an "apt addition" until he had written two drafts of the sermon and discovered a reference to Gildas' indictment of the Britons.¹⁰ Since the EI version is the only one which adequately reflects the perilous situation

of the English in the year accepted as the original date of composition, it seems more probable that EI is the earliest, and that the references to the Danish invasions were gradually excised because they were no longer appropriate.

Bethurum does note that it would be possible to reverse the line of reasoning she follows in claiming that BH represents the first draft, and to argue that EI is the earliest version and later revision took the form of excision.¹¹ Her reason for rejecting the alternative theory is that the incomplete sentence resulting from the omission of the clause concerning Ethelred's exile "clearly proves that the full version of BH was original," and that the passage referring to Gildas in EI 176-190 is "imperfectly joined" to the remainder of the sermon and must therefore be an interpolation. In further support of her view, she states: "Since I preserves in [Homilies] Xc what is surely the finished work on that homily and appears here also to have rejected Y's reading in favour of Z's, and in view of Mr. Ker's idea that the corrections in the margin of I are Wulfstan's own, it is fairly certain that E and I represent the final version."

It is convenient to deal first with the objection that EI 176-190 is "imperfectly joined," since the incomplete sentence and the likelihood that MS. I was in Wulfstan's possession are related issues. Bethurum considers that EI 176-190 is an "awkwardly made" addition because "what sounds like the customary conclusion begins at 174, and uton don swa us bearf is is repeated at the end of the interpolation."¹² This is not quite accurate, because the phrase which appears at 174 is utan don swa us need is, and Wulfstan's "customary conclusion" begins with utan don swa us bearf is.¹³ In any case, the exhortation to "do what is necessary" does not invariably signal

the conclusion of Wulfstan's sermons, for in Sermo ad Populum (Homilies XIII) the words utan don swa us bearf is occur several times in the fifty lines preceding the peroration. Furthermore, the omission of EI 176-190 results in a sentence beginning Ac la, on Godes naman utan don swa us neod is followed by one beginning And utan don swa us bearf is in BH 117-119 and C 163-165, which is somewhat awkward, particularly as the ominous imperative, beorgan us sylfum swa we geornost magan be læs we ætgædere ealle forweorðan (EI 174-176), seems to require the threat of destruction contained in EI 176-190 to support it.

The fact that the clause concerning Ethelred appears only in BH proves merely that its archetype was almost certainly not the same as that of EI and C. As Whitelock points out, the reference to Ethelred's exile must have been contained in the original because it is obviously required to complete the sentence, so that the omission is not in itself evidence that the BH version is the earliest. She nevertheless agrees with Bethurum that it is, stating: "Since there seems a strong likelihood that I, one of the manuscripts which omits this clause, is connected with Wulfstan himself, one would not expect the short version to retain it if this were a later curtailment by Wulfstan."¹⁴ It is by no means certain, however, that MS. I was in Wulfstan's possession, or that he deliberately deleted the reference to Ethelred's exile because, according to Bethurum and Whitelock, it would have been impolitic to mention it in Cnut's reign.¹⁵ The handwriting in the margins cannot be positively identified as his,¹⁶ and as Pope notes, if MS. I was corrected by Wulfstan, it is surprising that he did not tidy up the rest of the sentence, since Ethelred's exile is clearly implied by the words 7 ful micel hlafordswice eac bið on worolde þæt man his hlaford of life forræde oððon of lande

lifiendne drife: 7 ægber is geworden on bysan earde.¹⁷ It is hard to imagine, without being unduly cynical, that the man who spoke with such scorn of bishops who "mumble with their jaws when they should cry out"¹⁸ would omit this instance of the nation's treachery in order to avoid offending Cnut. It is, indeed, unlikely that the sermon as it appears in I and E would have been preached at all in Cnut's reign, for the threat of Danish conquest towards the peroration would have been entirely without point.¹⁹

Even if it is held that the corrections in MS. I are in Wulfstan's hand, and that the omission of the words 7 Æpelred man dræfde ut of his earde is a scribal error which escaped his attention, evidence to support the view that EI is the latest version is still lacking. The passage in EI 85-91 does not appear in C or BH, and is preceded in I by the words eac we witan georne hwær seo yrmð gewearð, which have been deleted, these words being the opening of the sentence immediately following the lines in C and BH which correspond to EI 84-85. It is therefore reasonably certain that I is a copy of a text which has undergone revision at this point, but there is no means of determining whether the text MS. I followed was similar to the short version represented by BH or essentially the same as EI.

The internal evidence points to a version closely resembling EI. In his analysis of the style of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, R. J. Fowler notes the existence of formal units larger than a sentence, established by "assembling sets of sentences based on the same grammatical structure" and the repetition of lexically related items.²⁰ The whole of the sermon, in fact, can be divided into units of the kind Fowler describes, and such units correspond to divisions in subject matter.²¹ It is noteworthy

that most of the longer passages which appear in C and EI but not in BH are closely linked to the surrounding text by verbal repetition. The description of the humiliation suffered by the English in EI 100-128, for instance, is defined as a unit by various kinds of lexical and syntactic repetition, the most obvious being the repetition of the phrase purh Godes yrre. The phrase is introduced at the end of the unit immediately preceding EI 100-128 (7 þæt is gesyne on bysse þeode þæt us Godes yrre hetelice onsit, gecnawe se þe cunne) and appears in the first sentence of the description (And la, hu mæg mare scamu purh Godes yrre mannum gelimpan). The description concludes with the words 7 la, hwæt is ænig oðer on eallum þam gelimpum butan Godes yrre ofer þas þeode, swutol 7 gesæne, and the root limp- is repeated at the beginning of the next unit (Nis eac nan wundor þeah us mislimpe). Similarly, the opening sentence of the passage found only in EI 160-173, Her syndan purh synleawa, swa hit þincan mæg, sare gelewede to manege on earde, repeats lewe which appears at the end of the unit it follows and continues the figure of speech introduced in gelice þam dwæsan þe for heora prytan lewe nellað beorgan, ær hy na ne magan, þeah hy eal willan (EI 158-159).²² The only point in the EI version at which unity of subject matter within a division is not maintained and at which there is an absence of lexical and syntactic repetition to link sentences together is in EI 78-95. The subject of the unit in EI 61-99 is tealte getrywða (61). The passage in EI 80-83 (BH 73-75 and C 84-87) does not constitute an instance of this, and nor does the passage in EI 85-91 which, it has already been noted, must be a later addition. Neither of these passages has conspicuous verbal connexions with the surrounding text: but if they are omitted,

together with the only words added to I in the hand thought to be Wulfstan's (toeacan oðran ealles to manegan þe man unscyldige forfor ealles to wide), there emerges a passage closely unified in the manner characteristic of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos:²³

And godsibbas 7 godbearn to fela man forspilde wide gynd þas þeode 7 cristenes folces to fela man gesealde ut of bysan earde nu ealle hwile. And eal þæt is God lað, gelyfe se þe wille.... Eac we witan georne hwær seo yrmð gewearð þæt fæder gesealde bearn wið weorþe 7 bearn his modor, 7 broþor sealde oþerne fremdum to gewealde. 7 eal þæt syndan micle 7 egeslice dæda, understande se þe wille.

An examination of the style, then, supports the theory that the EI version, in view of its content, represents most faithfully the sermon as Wulfstan originally wrote it in 1014. Moreover, it is possible to deduce the precise occasion of the composition of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. The sermon cannot have been written before Ethelred's return, because the original reading, 7 Æþelred man dræfde ut of his earde, refers to his exile in the past tense: and his return was followed by a marked improvement in the nation's fortunes. Stenton states: "Before the end of April, he [Ethelred] was in command of an expedition against the Danes in Lindsey. It gained its object without fighting a battle.... The English army was in motion before the Danish preparations were complete; and Cnut ... decided to withdraw his men from England. From the end of April 1014 until the end of August 1015 the Danish attack on England was suspended."²⁴ It is therefore highly probable that Wulfstan composed his sermon at the time of Ethelred's return, and there are a number of parallels between Sermo Lupi ad Anglos and the conditions of Ethelred's return as they are recorded in the Chronicle:

Ða geræddan þa witan ealle ge hadode ge læwede þæt man æfter þam cyninge Æðelrede sende. 7 cwædon þæt him nan leofre hlaforð nære þonne heora gecynde hlaforde. gif he hi rihtlicor healdan wolde þonne

he ær dyde. Ða sende se cyng his sunu Eadward mid his ærendracan hider. 7 het gretan ealne his leodscipe. 7 cwæð þæt he heom hold hlaford beon wolde. 7 ælc þæra þinga betan þe hi ealle asunedon. 7 ælc þæra þinga forgifan beon sceolde þe hi mid gedon oððe gecweðen wære. wið þam þe hi ealle anrædlice; buton swicdome to him gecyrdon. 7 man þa fullne freondscipe gefæstnode mid wordæ 7 mid wædde on ægðere healfe. 7 æfre ælcne Denisc[n]e cyning utlagede of Engla land gecwædon.²⁵

Like Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, the agreement reached between the king and his advisers indicates abhorrence of Danish rule and a hope of future improvement.²⁶ The improvement is dependent upon the adherence to pledges, which involve the restoration of just government and the nation's abandonment of treachery. Both treachery and bad laws are given particular prominence in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, as well as injustices and the oppressions of the church (for whose welfare, Wulfstan states in Polity, the king is responsible).²⁷ Wulfstan's descriptions of the prevalence of treachery and injustice serve primarily as indications of the imminence of Antichrist's reign,²⁸ but it is not impossible that he emphasizes the treachery and injustice in the land and includes the exhortation utan ... að 7 wed wærllice healdan 7 sume getrywða habban us betweenan butan uncræftan in order to communicate to the nation the substance of the agreement reached between the king and his advisers and to remind those who were parties to it of their obligations.²⁹

To sum up the internal evidence for the dating and relationship of the five manuscript copies, the textual history of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is perhaps as follows. About the time of Ethelred's return, Wulfstan wrote his first draft of the sermon, which was roughly the same as the version appearing in I, and later added the passages in EI 79-83 and 85-91. The reference to Ethelred's exile was lacking in the text from which MS. I

was copied, owing to scribal carelessness,³⁰ and the error was reproduced in the archetype of E and C. After the accession of Cnut, when the ravages of the Danes were still in living memory,³¹ Wulfstan or some other redactor, recognizing that the threat of conquest contained in EI 176-190 had lost its original force, deleted it, and added a covert reminder that the nation had indeed suffered the defeat implied as its fate (particularly in the description of its humiliations in C 97-126): þis was on Æðelredes cyninges dagum gediht, feower geara fæce ær he forðferde. Gime se ðe wille hu hit þa wære 7 hwæt siððan gewurde (C 9-12). At a later date, a version of the sermon containing the reference to Ethelred's exile was also revised, and the account of the humiliations of the English in EI 100-128 was omitted as well as the concluding threat of defeat in EI 176-190, because both passages were felt to be without contemporary relevance.³² The resulting version, represented in B and H, was an eschatological sermon which retained currency as long as its language remained intelligible, for only EI 100-128 and 176-190 are of limited application--the sins and retributions listed elsewhere are those traditionally associated with the Last Days, and are so generally described that they would be appropriate to virtually any period. In E, however, the full text of the sermon was copied, for in the later part of the eleventh century in the northern half of England, Wulfstan's description of humiliations suffered at the hands of the Danes and his intimations of conquest by a foreign enemy would have regained some of their earlier applicability.³³

FOOTNOTES

1. The sigla are those adopted by Napier and most other editors for C.C.C.C. 419 (B), C.C.C.C. 201 (C), Bodleian Hatton 113 (E), Bodleian 343 (H), and B.M. Cotton Nero A i (I).
2. The suggestion that the marginalia in I are in Wulfstan's hand was first made by N. R. Ker in "Hemming's Cartulary, Studies in Medieval History presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke (Oxford, 1948), pp. 49-75.
3. The dating of the MSS is that given by N. R. Ker in A Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon (Oxford, 1957).
4. E and I are not identical, but are independent copies of a common exemplar. The same is true of B and H.
5. 7 Æpelred man draefde ut of his earde (BH 71). All references are to Dorothy Bethurum's edition of the three versions, The Homilies of Wulfstan (Oxford, 1957), pp. 255-275.
6. See Homilies, pp. 22-24 and Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, 3rd ed. (London, 1967), pp. 3-5.
7. See Whitelock, Sermo Lupi, p. 6. The suggestion that feower is an error for the gen. pl. of fea was also made by J. C. Pope in his review of Bethurum's edition, MLN, LXXIV (1959), 338.
8. Sermo Lupi, p. 6.
9. The I rubric reads: SERMO LUPI AD ANGLOS QUANDO DANI MAX-
IME PERSECUTI SUNT EOS QUOD FUIT ANNO MILLESIMO.XIIII.AB
INCARNATIONE DOMINI NOSTRI IESU CRISTI.
10. See Homilies, p. 23.
11. See Homilies, pp. 23-24.
12. Homilies, p. 23.
13. Cf. Homilies II. 70, III. 74, VI. 214, VII. 165-166, VIIa, 44-45, VIIc. 174-175, XV. 69-70, XVII. 63-64, XVIII. 131.
14. Sermo Lupi, p. 5.
15. See Homilies, p. 22 and Sermo Lupi, p. 6.
16. The MSS annotated in the hand thought to be Wulfstan's are listed in Ker's Catalogue, p. 211 (see also p. lvi and his comments on the individual MSS). All that can be said with certainty is that several MSS connected with Wulfstan contain corrections in a single handwriting, "not so much a professional as a scholar's hand" ("Hemming's Cartulary," p. 71), and that the person who made the corrections was familiar with Wulfstan's work and took an interest in bringing the Wulfstan texts in MS. I into agreement with

- the final version (see Sermo Lupi, pp. 29-30 and Homilies, pp. 18-19). The evidence strongly favours the identification of the annotator as Wulfstan, but it does not exclude other possibilities.
17. See MLN, LXXIV, 338-339.
 18. The indictment of bishops who clumedan mid ceaf lum þær hy scoldan ƒlypian appears in Homilies XVIIb and in Sec. VI of Polity as well as in Sermo Lupi ad Anglos (EI 181-184).
 19. EI certainly cannot have been written after the accession of Cnut, as Bethurum appears to assume when she states that the omission of the words 7 ƒpelred man draegde ut of his earde "was probably political in nature, for if the homily was revised after Cnut's succession, it might have been unwise to refer in such a context to Ethelred's exile" (Homilies, p. 22). Whitelock, though accepting the EI version as the latest, notes that "it is obvious that the passage only in C, E, and I at 102-32 [Homilies C 76-126 and EI 100-128] was written before Cnut's accession in 1016; it does not fit later conditions" (Sermo Lupi, p. 5, n. 3). The remark is surely even more pertinent to EI 176-190, as Pope appears to have realized, for, in drawing attention to the apparently contradictory evidence for the dating of the three versions, he comments: "There are passages peculiar to the third, fullest version which can hardly have been composed after Ethelred's time" (MLN, LXXIV, 338).
 20. "Some Stylistic Features of the Sermo Lupi," JEGP, LXV (1966), 1-18.
 21. The units correspond to the paragraphs in Bethurum's edition of EI, except that Ne bearh nu foroft (61-62) begins a new unit (a description of the nation's perfidy), which includes 92-99, printed as a separate paragraph. The first unit may be subdivided at On hæbenum beodum (27) and Ac soð is þæt ic secge (37), the last at And utan don swa us þearf is (190), and the unit in 129-159 at And by is nu geworden (147), since a new topic is introduced at each of these points and is dealt with in a stylistically distinct passage.
 22. The other passages extending beyond one or two lines which do not appear in BH are EI 176-190 and C 49-56. (It is possible to adduce stylistic evidence in favour of accepting or rejecting minor variants as original, but as this requires a detailed examination of the sermon's style and themes, a discussion of the minor variants is beyond the scope of this article.) The opening of EI 176-190 is not linked by verbal repetition to the unit immediately preceding it, but the last sentence of the passage begins And by us is þearf micel and is followed by the words And utan don swa us þearf is. With Whitelock, I would accept C 49-56 as authentic. Wulfstan states in EI 25-27: And micel is nydþearf manna gehwilcum þæt he Godes lage gy me heonanforð georne 7 Godes gerihta mid riht gelæste and riht and lagu are repeated in a number of compounds and with a variety of affixes throughout the indictment in EI 27-48. Earlier in

the sermon he says of the nation's sins that unriht rærde 7 unlagu manege, for the theme introduced in the opening section is the nation's preference for evil instead of good (see particularly EI 14-16). The conclusion of the indictment in EI refers only to lagu, whereas the last words of C 49-56 bring the verbal patterning to its completion and provide a clear statement of the nation's perversity (for-ðam unriht is to wide mannum gemæne 7 unlagu leofe.)

23. It is possible to gauge Wulfstan's motive for destroying the symmetry of this passage by the addition of EI 85-91, for the addition provides an illustration of an assertion near the beginning of the unit, Ac worhtan lust us to lage ealles to gelome (65-66), which is otherwise unsubstantiated. The appropriateness of the addition in EI 80-83 might emerge if the meaning of this circumlocutory passage could be satisfactorily explained.
24. Anglo-Saxon England, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1971), pp. 381-382.
25. Two Saxon Chronicles Parallel, ed. C. Plummer and J. Earle (Oxford, 1952), I, 145.
26. Wulfstan's abhorrence of Danish rule (which lends considerable interest to his later support of Cnut) is not only revealed by his assumption that defeat by the Danes is the worst fate with which the nation could be threatened, but by the implicit identification of the triumphant heathen enemy with the coming of Antichrist, referred to in EI 7-11. Though Wulfstan begins Sermo Lupi ad Anglos by asserting that the reign of Antichrist is a prophecy which must inevitably be fulfilled and threatens dire retribution for the nation's iniquities, it is clear that he envisages an improvement in the nation's situation provided that it repents. The purpose of Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is in fact to persuade the nation to repent in order to effect an improvement in its fortunes, rather than to convince it that retribution is close at hand (see particularly EI 17-23). Jeremiad though Sermo Lupi ad Anglos appears to be, it is the most optimistic of Wulfstan's eschatological sermons--his conviction of mankind's obdurate sinfulness and the imminence of Antichrist's reign in Homilies V is such, that he does not even include his "customary conclusion" exhorting his audience to repent.
27. See Sec. II of Polity. Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is undoubtedly a condemnation of the entire nation, but it appears, if read in the light of the duties assigned to the king and the beodwitan in Secs. II and V of Polity, to be primarily an indictment of the leaders of the nation, especially the king. The list of sinners in EI 160-166, for instance, corresponds to the evils to be suppressed by the king which Wulfstan catalogues in Polity.
28. Though Bethurum remarks that Sermo Lupi ad Anglos is "the most topical of all his sermons and deals almost exclusively with concrete abuses of the day," (Homilies, p. 355) it is, as the opening sentence makes plain, essentially an eschatological sermon, and Wulfstan's depiction of the state of the nation is shaped by his eschatological preoccupations. Treachery is attributed elsewhere

in his work to the influence of Antichrist and its prevalence is described as an indication of his imminent appearance (see particularly Homilies IX. 107 ff.). Wulfstan's belief that the abandonment of God's laws (traditionally a feature of the Last Days) gives rise to injustice and oppression, is most clearly stated in his paraphrase of extracts from Isaiah (Homilies XI).

29. Since Wulfstan was one of Ethelred's advisers, he was probably among þa witan ealle ge hadode ge læwede who negotiated the king's return.
30. 7 Æþelred man dræfde ut of his earde could easily have been omitted inadvertently, because the incomplete sentence in EI consists of a series of short phrases beginning with 7. The error, it may be noted, if one wished to maintain that MS. I was corrected by Wulfstan, is of the kind which is least likely to be picked up by someone familiar with the text.
31. Both Ker and Whitelock date C as mid eleventh century, but cf. L. Whitbread, "MS. C.C.C.C. 201: A Note on its Character and Provenance," Phil. Qu., XXXVIII (1959), 106-12. Whitbread considers that the Wulfstan material in C was first assembled in Cnut's reign, and Whitelock's objection that "the manuscript does not contain the full version of Cnut's code, but only the first draft, which was probably no later than 1018," (Sermo Lupi, p. 2, n. 6) does not invalidate, and possibly supports, Whitbread's hypothesis. In any case, the version represented in C need not have originated at the time the MS was written.
32. Even in 1014, England had of course been under Danish rule, but as Swein's rule was so brief, it probably made little impression. The warning in EI 176-190 is not inconsistent with an earlier Danish rule, since Wulfstan suggests only that retribution will be more terrible than that which befell the Britons.
33. Whitelock states in her description of E that a Worcester origin "seems certain" (Sermo Lupi, p. 2). The Scandinavian raids in the later part of the eleventh century were concentrated on York. C, as Whitelock intimates (loc. cit.), may well have originated at York, so that there is no obstacle to regarding its transcription of a sermon containing a passage describing Danish ravages as explicable in the light of contemporary events, but the retention of the same passage in a Worcester copy is more difficult to account for. One must assume either that the person responsible for the E copy at Worcester was aware of the renewal of Scandinavian attacks or that Wulfstan's description of the humiliations of the English was felt to be comparable with William's devastation of the midlands and the north. The retention of the passage in EI 176-190 presents no problem: fortuitously, Wulfstan's un-specific intimations of destruction at the hands of the nation's enemies could hold good for post-conquest England.

LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED

MANUSCRIPTS

Bodleian, MS. Hatton 113.
 British Museum, MS. Cotton Nero A. i.
 Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 201.

OLD ENGLISH AND LATIN TEXTS

(i) Wulfstan

The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text, ed. J.M. Ure.
 Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1957. (Edinburgh
 University Publications, Language and Literature, No. 11.)
The Homilies of Wulfstan, ed. Dorothy Bethurum. Oxford,
 Clarendon Press, 1957.
Die "Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical," ed. K.
 Jost. Bern, A. Francke, 1959. (Swiss Studies in English,
 XLVII.)
Sermo Lupi ad Anglos, ed. Dorothy Whitelock. 3rd ed. London,
 Methuen & Co., 1963. Reprinted 1967. (Also Introductions in
 1st ed., 1939 and 2nd ed., 1952.)
Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst
Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit, ed. A.[S.] Napier. 2nd ed.,
 with a Bibliographical Supplement by K. Ostheeren. Berlin,
 Weidmann, 1966.

(ii) Others

Anglo-Saxon Reader, ed. H. Sweet, rev. C.T. Onions. 14th ed.
 Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962.
The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems, ed. E. van K. Dobbie. New York,
 Columbia University Press, 1942. (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic
 Records, VI.)
The Blickling Homilies of the Tenth Century, ed. R. Morris. 3
 vols. London, N. Trübner, 1874-80. (EETS, Orig. Ser. 58, 63,
 67.)
Bryhtferth's Manual, ed. S.J. Crawford. London, Oxford Univer-
 sity Press, 1929. (EETS, Orig. Ser. 177.)
De Clericorum Institutione, in Patrologia Latina, ed. J.P. Migne.
 Vol. CVII.
De Doctrina Christiana, in Patrologia Latina, ed. J.P. Migne.
 Vol. XXXIV.
The Exeter Book, ed. G.P. Krapp and E. van K. Dobbie. New York,
 Columbia University Press, 1936. (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic
 Records, III.)
Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen, ed. F. Liebermann. 3 vols. Halle,
 M. Niemeyer, 1903-16. Reprinted Aalen, Scientia, 1960.
Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer
Fassung, ed. B. Fehr. Hamburg, Henri Grand, 1914. (Bibliothek
 der ang. Prosa, IX.) Reprinted, with a Supplement to the
 Introduction by P. Clemons, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche
 Buchgesellschaft, 1965.
Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection, ed. J.C. Pope.
 2 vols. London, Oxford University Press, 1967-68. (EETS, 259,

260.)

The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church: The First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholica, or Homilies of Ælfric, ed. B. Thorpe. London, The Ælfric Society, 1844-46. Reprinted New York, Russell & Russell, 1971.

Liber Eliensis, ed. E.O. Blake. London, Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1962. (Camden Third Series, Vol. XCII.)

Liber Querulus de Excidio Britanniae, in Six Old English Chronicles, ed. J.A. Giles. London, H. Bohn, 1848. (Bohn's Antiquarian Library.)

The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, Ælfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament, and his Preface to Genesis, ed. S.J. Crawford. London, Oxford University Press, 1922. (EETS, Orig. Ser. 160.)

The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne, ed. and trans. W.S. Howell. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1941. Reprinted New York, Russell & Russell, 1965.

Rhetorica ad Herennium, ed. and trans. H. Capalan. London, W. Heinemann, 1954. (Loeb Classical Library)

Scarapsus, in Die Heimat des hl. Pirmin, des Apostels der Alamannen, ed. G. Jecker. Munich, Beck, 1927. (Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens, 'XIII.)

Two Saxon Chronicles Parallel, ed. C. Plummer and J. Earle. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1892-99. Reissued, with a Bibliographical Note by Dorothy Whitelock, 1952.

Die Vercelli-Homilien, ed. M. Förster. Hamburg, Henri Grand, 1932. (Bibliothek der angls. Prosa, XII.) Reprinted Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

The West-Saxon Gospels: A Study of the Gospel of St. Matthew with Text of the Four Gospels, ed. Madeleine Grünberg. Amsterdam, Poortpers, 1967.

STUDIES RELATING PARTICULARLY TO WULFSTAN

Bateson, Mary. "A Worcester Cathedral Book of Ecclesiastical Collections made about 1000 A.D.," English Historical Review, (1895), 712-31.

Becher, R. Wulfstans Homilien. Diss., Leipzig, 1910.

Bethurum, Dorothy. "Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book," PMLA, LVII (1942), 916-29.

_____. "A Letter of Protest from the English Bishops to the Pope," Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies, ed. T.A. Kirby and H.B. Woolf, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1949, pp. 97-104.

_____. "Six Anonymous Old English Codes," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XLIX (1950), 449-63.

_____. "Wulfstan," Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature, ed. E.G. Stanley, London, Thos. Nelson & Sons, 1966, pp. 210-46.

Clemoes, P. "The Old English Benedictine Office, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 190, and the Relations between Ælfric and Wulfstan: A Reconsideration," Anglia, LXXVII (1960), 256-83.

- Dodd, L.H. A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1908. (Yale Studies in English, XXXV.) Reprinted Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 1966.
- Eliason, N.E. Review of The Homilies of Wulfstan, Anglia, LXXVII (1959), 79-82.
- Fowler, R.G. "Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book and the Canons of Edgar," Medium Ævum, XXXII (1963), 1-10.
- _____. "A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor," Anglia, LXXXIII (1965), 1-34.
- _____. "Some Stylistic Features of the Sermo Lupi," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LXV (1966), 1-18.
- Funke, O. "Some Remarks on Wulfstan's Prose Rhythm," English Studies, XLIII (1962), 311-18.
- Jost, K. "Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen," Anglia, LVI (1932), 265-315.
- _____. "Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik," Anglia, XLVII (1923), 105-23.
- _____. Wulfstanstudien. Bern, A. Francke, 1950.
- Kinard, J.P. A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies: Their Style and Sources. Baltimore, John Murphy & Co., 1897.
- Levin, S.R. "On the Authenticity of Five 'Wulfstan' Homilies," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LX (1961), 451-59.
- Liebermann, F. "Wulfstan und Cnut," Archiv für neuere Sprachen, CIII (1899), 47-53.
- Menner, R.J. "Anglian and Saxon Elements in Wulfstan's Vocabulary," Modern Language Notes, LXIII (1948), 1-9.
- McIntosh, A. Review of Wulfstanstudien, English Studies, XXXII (1951), 163-68.
- _____. "Wulfstan's Prose," Proceedings of the British Academy, XXXV (1949), 109-42. Separately printed, London, George Cumberlege, 1950.
- Napier, A.[S.]. Über die Werke des altenglischen Erzbischofs Wulfstan. Diss., Göttingen, 1882.
- Pope, J.C. Review of The Homilies of Wulfstan, Modern Language Notes, LXXIV, (1959), 333-41.
- Potter, S. Review of The Homilies of Wulfstan, Review of English Studies, New Ser., X (1959), 294-97.
- Sheets, L.A. "Wulfstan's Prose: A Reconsideration." Unpubl. Diss., Ohio State University, 1964.
- Strang, Barbara M.H. "Two Wulfstan Expressions," Notes and Queries, New Ser., VIII (1961), 166-67.
- Stuart, C.I.J.M. "Wulfstan's Use of 'Leofan Men,'" English Studies, XLV (1964), 39-42.
- Ure, J.M. Review of The Homilies of Wulfstan, Medium Ævum, XXVIII (1959), 112-15.
- Whitelock, Dorothy. "Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th Ser., XXIV (1942), 25-45.
- _____. "A Note on the Career of Wulfstan the Homilist," English Historical Review, LII (1937), 460-65.

- _____. "Two Notes on Ælfric and Wulfstan," Modern Language Review, XXXVIII (1943), 122-26.
- _____. "Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut," English Historical Review, LXIII (1948), 433-52.
- _____. "Wulfstan and the so-called Laws of Edward and Guthrum," English Historical Review, LVI (1941), 1-21.
- _____. "Wulfstan at York," Franciplegius: Medieval Studies in Honour of Francis Peabody Magoun Jr., ed. J.B. Bessinger and R.P. Creed, New York, New York University Press, 1965, pp. 214-31.
- _____. "Wulfstan's Authorship of Cnut's Laws," English Historical Review, LXIX (1955), 72-85.
- Wrenn, C.L. Review of The Homilies of Wulfstan and The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text, English Studies, XXXIX (1958), 120-25.

GENERAL

- Bartlett, Adeline Courtney. The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry. New York, Columbia University Press, 1935. Reprinted New York, AMS Press, 1966.
- Baugh, A.C. (ed.). A Literary History of England. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1948.
- Bethurum, Dorothy. "The Form of Ælfric's Lives of Saints," Studies in Philology, XXIX (1932), 515-33.
- Bosworth J. and T.N. Toller. An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1898. Reprinted 1964. Supplement by T.N. Toller. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1921. Reprinted 1955.
- Bolton, W.F. A History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 597-1066. 2 vols. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1967-. (Vol I: 597-740.)
- Brodeur, A.G. The Art of Beowulf. Berkley, University of California Press, 1959.
- Bousset, W. The Antichrist Legend: A Chapter in Christian Jewish Folklore. Trans. A.H. Keane. London, Hutchinson & Co., 1896.
- Campbell, J.J. "Knowledge of Rhetorical Figures in Anglo-Saxon England," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LXVI (1967), 1-26.
- Clemons, P. "Ælfric," Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature, ed. E.G. Stanley, London, Thos. Nelson & Sons, 1966, pp. 176-209.
- _____. Liturgical Influence on Punctuation in the Late Old English and Early Middle English Manuscripts. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1952. (Occasional Papers: No. 1, The Department of Anglo-Saxon.)
- Cook, A.S. "The Evolution of the Lord's Prayer in English," American Journal of Philology, XII (1891), 59-66.
- Cross, J.E. "Aspects of Microcosm and Macrocosm in Old English Literature," Studies in Old English Literature in Honour of Arthur G. Brodeur, ed. S.B. Greenfield [Eugene], University of Oregon Books, 1963, pp. 1-22.

- Eichrodt, W. Theology of the Old Testament. Trans. J.A. Baker. 2 vols. London, SCM Press, 1961-67. (Old Testament Library.)
- Funke, O. "Studien zur alliterierenden und rhythmisierenden [sic] Prosa in der älteren altenglischen Homiletik," Anglia, LXXX (1962), 9-36.
- Gatch, M.McC. "Eschatology in the Anonymous Old English Homilies," Traditio, XXI (1965), 117-65.
- _____. Loyalties and Traditions: Man and his World in Old English Literature. New York, Pegasus, 1971.
- Gerould, G.H. "Abbot Ælfric's Rhythmic Prose," Modern Philology, XXII (1925), 353-66.
- Glunz, H.H. A History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1933.
- Greenfield, S.B. A Critical History of Old English Literature. London, London University Press, 1966.
- Halliday, M.A.K. "Categories of the Theory of Grammar," Word, XVII (1961), 241-92.
- Harlow, C.G. "Punctuation in Some Manuscripts of Ælfric," Review of English Studies, New Ser., X (1959), 1-19.
- Jones, R.F. The Triumph of the English Language: A Survey of Opinions Concerning the Vernacular from the Introduction of Printing to the Restoration. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Ker, N.R. A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957.
- _____. "Hemming's Catulary," Studies in Medieval History presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke, ed. R.W. Hunt et al., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1948, pp. 49-75.
- Leclercq, J. The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture. Trans. Catharine Misrahi. New York, Fordham University Press, 1961.
- McKeon, R. "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Speculum, XVII (1942), 1-32.
- Morrell, Minnie Cate. A Manual of Old English Biblical Materials. Knoxville, Tennessee University Press, 1965.
- Oakley, T.P. English Penitential Discipline and Anglo-Saxon Law in their Joint Effect. New York, Columbia University Press, 1923. (Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, CVII.)
- Smalley, Beryl. The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages. 2nd ed. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Southern, R.W. The Making of the Middle Ages. London, Arrow Books, 1962.
- Stenton, F.M. Anglo-Saxon England. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1947. (Oxford History of England, II.) A third edition appeared in 1971.
- Tannenhaus, Gussie Hecht. "Bede's De Schematibus et Tropis: A Translation," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVIII (1962), 237-53.
- Toor, S.D. "Euphuism in England before John Lyly." Unpubl. Diss., University of Oregon, 1965.

- Ure, J.M. "The Benedictine Office and the Metrical Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer in MS. C.C.C.C. 201," Review of English Studies, New Ser., IV (1953), 354-56.
- _____. Review of The Homilies of Wulfstan, Medium Ævum, XXVIII (1959), 112-15.
- Whitbread, L. "MS. C.C.C.C. 201: A Note on its Character and Provenance," Philological Quarterly, XXXVIII (1959), 106-12.
- _____. "The Old English Poems of the Benedictine Office and Some Related Questions," Anglia, LXXX (1962), 37-49.
- Whitelock, Dorothy. The Beginnings of English Society. London, Penguin Books, 1952. (Pelican History of England, II.)
- Wrenn, C.L. A Study of Old English Literature. London, G.G. Harrap, 1967.
- Wanley, H. Librorum Veterum Septentrionalium Catalogus, in G. Hicke, Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus, Oxford, 1705, Vol. II.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

(REVISED VERSION)

- Lipp, F.R. "Ælfric's Old English Prose Style," Studies in Philology, LXVI (1969), 689-718.
- Sisam, K. Studies in the History of Old English Literature. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Wolf, Rosemary. "Doctrinal Influences on The Dream of the Rood," Medium Ævum, XXVII (1958), 137-53.