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For over a century, critics have worked toward a more detailed characterization of the work of Aelfric and, to a lesser extent, of Wulfstan. The homilies and other writings of these two authors have been examined for a wide variety of characteristics, from their use of classical rhetoric to specific criteria such as the use of alliterating qualifiers. However, these studies have been carried out almost without exception either in a vacuum or in the context of Latin sources. In 1950, Karl Jost showed that several of Wulfstan's homilies are based on homilies of Aelfric, and made an extensive comparison of their vocabularies. Yet not since this seminal work have these two greatest prose writers of the Anglo-Saxon age been considered in any detail together.

Furthermore, considerations of Aelfric and Wulfstan have focused almost exclusively on style. A stylistic approach to Aelfric's and Wulfstan's prose, however, does not examine the construction of the homilies as coherent wholes. The stylistic excellence of the two homilists is independent of context; thus, an exclusive examination of style and related topics such as use of rhetorical figures disregards the purpose of Aelfric's and Wulfstan's work. While fluency and elegance of phrasing are certainly assets to the two writers, a thorough consideration of their work must address the homilies as material for religious instruction, not merely as general works of prose.

A structural approach to the writings of Aelfric and Wulfstan demonstrates the ability of each not only as a writer of prose but specifically as a homilist. By examining
the development of arguments and the overall architecture of
the homilies, a clearer picture can be gained both of the in-
tent and of the success of each homily.

A consideration of homilies of Aelfric alongside their
rewritings by Wulfstan illuminates aspects of each writer's
homiletic method which would otherwise be less evident. This
paper is not a source study of Wulfstan's work. Neither homi-
list, of course, wrote independently, and a too-detailed
examinagion of the changes Wulfstan made in Aelfric's sermons
would necessarily focus on the smaller points of his prose.
Rather, the treatment of identical subjects by Aelfric and
Wulfstan provides an ideal opportunity for detailed compari-
son of the two homilists' methods and aims.

For this comparison, three pairs of homilies have been
selected. They are a general teaching homily on Biblical
history (Aelfric's De initio creaturae, CH I.1, and Bethurum
VI), a homily for a specific occasion, the dedication of a
church (Aelfric's In dedicatione ecclesiae, CH II.40, and
Wulfstan's De dedicatione ecclesiae, Bethurum XVIII), and an
eschatological homily based on Gospel lessons (Aelfric's De
die iudicii, Pope XVIII, and Wulfstan's Secundum Marcum,
Bethurum V). 4

The homily pair dealing with Judeo-Christian history is
of interest because of the great difference in the two homi-
lists' treatment of a relatively straightforward subject.
Though both are teaching homilies, Wulfstan seems to have
borrowed from Aelfric little more than the idea of writing such a homily, and some details of the narration. While Aelfric's homily presents detailed historical and theological explanation, Wulfstan's provides a compact summary of Christian history whose purpose is to emphasize God's power and mercy and the necessity of "rihtes geleafan." Aelfric values detailed knowledge as a means of reinforcing and deepening belief; according to Wulfstan, "nis aefre aeniges mannes maed þaet he þa godcund- ness asmeagan cunne; ac us is þeah mycel þearf þaet we aa habban rihtne geleafan on God aelmihtigne þe us ealle gescop 7 geworhte" (149-153). A comparison of the structure of these two homilies clarifies the importance each homilist attaches to a knowledge of Biblical history.

Several studies have examined Aelfric's knowledge and use of the precepts of classical rhetoric. In particular, Larry G. Best concludes that Aelfric adheres fairly closely to the fourfold division of the oration: \textit{exordium, narratio, confirmatio, and peroratio}. Yet an examination of \textit{De initio creaturae} alongside Bethurum VI shows that any such partitioning of Aelfric's homily is misleading, and that Wulfstan's work accords far better with the classical \textit{partitiones orationis}.

Instead of the four parts dictated by classical rhetoric, \textit{De initio creaturae} is composed of at least six, and these cannot be labeled \textit{exordium}, \textit{narratio}, \textit{confirmatio}, or \textit{peroratio}. Instead of making a fairly strict separation between narration and explanation, Aelfric alternates between these two homiletic modes from sentence to sentence and even from phrase to phrase;
at other times, sections whose foci are distinct merge for 10 or 15 transitional lines. In addition, like many early English homilies, De initio creaturae has a short formulaic closing rather than a peroration.

The first few lines of the homily fit the classical criteria for an exordium.

An angin is ealra þinga, þæt is God Aelmihtig. He is ordfruma and ende: he is ordfruma, forði þe he waes aefre; he is ende butan aelcere geendunge, forðan þe he bif aefre un-geendod. He is ealra cyninga Cyning, and ealra hlaforða Hlaford. He hylt mid his midte heofonas and eordan, and ealle gesceafhta butan geswine, and he besceawad þa niwel-nyssa þe under þyssere eordan sind. He awecð ealle duna mid anre handa, and ne maeg nan þing his willan widstandan (8:24-10:1).

The sonority and rhythm of the introduction both capture the audience's attention and, by their suggestion of majesty, set the tone for the rest of the speech. From here, though, the partitio breaks down. The transition from the introduction to the beginning of the narration is made not with a definite break, but in 16 lines dealing with the angels (10:5-20) which are too general to be narrative and too specific to be introductory. It is not clear until the statement that "Þa waes þaes teoðan werodes ealdor swide faeger and wlitig gesceapen" (10:27-28) that a narrative section has been reached.

This section continues, except for a few short explanatory passages, through the story of the fall of the angels, the creation of Adam, God's prohibition of the Tree of Knowledge, and the creation of Eve. Here, at the end of the creation story, Aelfric steps back from the narrative to examine the nature of creation and created beings, and in particular the human soul.
The end of this passage, a discussion of the origin of evil, leads directly into the next narrative section, the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve. The skins with which God clothes Adam and Eve are interpreted as a symbol of mortality, which leads to a discussion of free will. Aelfric returns to the theme of the personal creation of Adam, first mentioned in the previous explanatory section, to emphasize the individual choice of each human being. The remaining material -- nearly a third of the homily -- is almost entirely narrative, outlining Old and New Testament history up to the Judgement, and ending with the formula "Men þa leofestan, smeagad þysne cwyde, and mid micelre gymene forbugad unríht-wysynsse, and geearniþ mid godum weorcum þæt ece lif mid God sǽle ana on ecnysse rixad. Amen" (28:20-24).

Yet even this six-part division of De initio creaturae is artificial, and useful only to gain an overview of the homily's structure. Within each narrative section there are explanations, some as long as 12 lines (12:12-23); within each explanatory section there is narration. To assume that Aelfric consciously divided his homily into an introduction, three narrative sections, and two explanatory sections would call the interspersed passages digressive, which for the most part they are not. A few examples will suffice to show that most of Aelfric's departures from the homiletic mode of a section serve to strengthen the main theme of De initio creaturae: the role of modern humankind within God's scheme of creation, and the importance of right action in this role.
In the first narrative section, Aelfric comments on the justice of Lucifer's damnation. Rather than simply stating "And swide rihtlice him swa getimode" (10:31-32), however, Aelfric makes clear the reason for the fall: "he wolde mid modignysse beon betera ponne he gesceapen waes" (10:32-33). Lucifer refuses to accept the place allotted him in God's creation, and therefore is damned. Rather than digressing from the narrative, this comment brings the section into sharper focus by making explicit the point of the story. The same is true of the long explanatory passage at 12:12-23. The discussion of free will is spurred by the narrative statement that the nine loyal hosts of angels were strengthened by God; Aelfric explains the meaning of this fact while it is still fresh in the audience's minds.

Likewise, the statement of God's reaction to the fall of Adam (18:34-35) is essential to this otherwise explanatory passage. There has been no previous mention of the possibility of salvation, and the doctrines of free will and the damnation of the disobedient have been twice expounded. It must therefore be made clear that every sinner is not irrevocably damned. The information is properly presented in the narrative mode here because it deals at least as much with the nature of God as it does with the lot of humankind. Had Aelfric simply remarked, here or elsewhere, that redemption has been accomplished, it would signify only that there is now a means of intercession between God and sinful humankind. Stated as a thought and not a later action of God (that is, as God's imme-
diately reaction, not his calculated response, to Adam's fall), redemptive mercy becomes an attribute rather than an act. God "wiste . . . paet he [Adam] waes forlaered" -- that is, that while Adam's action was free, his thought was not entirely so -- "and smeade hu he mihte his and ealles mancynnes eft gemiltsian" (18:34-35).

This is not, of course, to deny that some passages of De initio creaturae are digressive -- the list of names of the nine hosts of angels (10:12-14) is an obvious example. Yet, for the most part, Aelfric's shifts of mode are appropriate and even necessary to the overall thematic structure of this homily. Except in the most general terms, De initio creaturae cannot be divided into distinct sections of narratio and confirmatio, and even then there is not a single narrative and explanation, but rather repeated sections of each. Aelfric adapts his mode to produce a homily which will fit his audience's need for clear explanation and logical sequence -- not the rules of rhetoric he was taught.

Wulfstan's revision of this homily, on the other hand, is written in more or less monolithic blocks of narration and explanation. In accordance with his relatively single-minded purpose, the historical material is arranged to emphasize God's retributive justice; the explanations rarely illuminate more than what "is us micel þearf."

In order to analyze this homily, one must first establish its precise purpose. Unlike Aelfric's De initio creaturae, which even without the rubric is clearly ad populum, the first
20 lines of Bethurum VI obscure the nature of its intended audience. According to Bethurum, "Wulfstan's [homily] begins with a paragraph addressed to the priests, and it is likely that he intended his sermon to serve as a model, and in this sense it is also addressed to the people." This seems a logical conclusion, but it perhaps needs some expansion. It is troubling that Wulfstan should run the introduction and the model together without some language to the effect of "puss sculon ge secgan." What seems most likely from the tone is that Wulfstan intends this homily's structure as a model for teaching, but its content as a jog to the priests' memories. It is clear from the first sentences of the post-introductory section that this, too, is for the priests: "Hit is lang to areccenne þaet we on bocum . . . raedæf" (22-23). This "we" clearly includes the audience, since Wulfstan uses "ic" in the preceding and following sentences, and would have used "man" had he wished to exclude them. Furthermore, Wulfstan presents the narrative in a manner that suggests that his audience is acquainted but not conversant with it (e.g., "Heora bearna an gedyde sydan eac þurh deofles lare deoflice daede, þaet waes Cain" [53-54]). It thus appears that the homily is a review for the priests, intended to improve their teaching ability -- and in this sense, as Bethurum notes, it is intended for the people.

After the first 20 lines, which state (for whatever audience) the purpose of the homily, Wulfstan makes a plea for
patience and a promise of brevity -- more elaborate than Aelfric's usual brevity formulas, in accordance with the greater urgency of his point. There follows a 50-line account of Biblical history from the Creation through the idol-worship after the Flood (which Aelfric takes 245 lines to narrate and explain). The relevance of these stories to modern humankind is established only by two comments about our direct descent from the Biblical characters: "of heom twam [Adam and Eva] is eall mancynn cumen" (52), and "eall þaet nu is, eall hit com of þam mannun þe on þære arce generede waeron" (66-67). Theological points like those made by Aelfric are ignored, as are personal attributes of all characters. God's mercy is established only (if at all) by the repetition of "aet nyhstan" in the Flood story.

Not until the story (or, more properly, the mention) of the idolaters does Wulfstan break the pace of his narrative. Even here (77-95) the material is not explanatory, but rather is discursive over the deceptiveness and utter evil of the devil. The passage is relevant in that it relates Biblical paganism to modern heathen practices; yet the transition to the discursive mode ("Hwaet, þa yrmingas nyston na hu lytelice hy þonne deofol bepaehete, þe ma þe þa witan þe gyt on þa wisan deofles willan dreogað" [77-79]) is sudden and unexpected. Even Wulfstan seems somewhat disoriented by this passage, and returns to his narrative with "Leofan men" (a sign of a major break in the homily's continuity), "þe þa þaet waes þaet deofol folc swa mistlice dweledede, swa ic eow aer rehte" (96-97). It should be noted that this point in the narrative is not one at
which Aelfric leaves the narrative mode.

After an account of the descent through Shem of the Hebrew people, Wulfstan relates an incident not in Aelfric's homily, the captivity of the Jews during the reign of King Zedekiah. This passage closely parallels Wulfstan's account of the Flood. Where the Flood passage reads

\[ \ldots \text{deofol ma and ma manna forlaerde 7 getihte to heora agene unpearfe swa aet nyhstan ðaet hy to Gode naefdon naper ne lufe ne ege, ac on aelce wisan hy þurh heora synna God to ðam swyðe gegremedon þaet he let aet neðstan flod gan ofer ealne middangeard 7 adrencan eal þaet on worulde waes butan þaem ðe on ðam earce waeron (57-62),} \]

the description of the captivity begins

\[ \text{Sume hy wurdon aet nyhstan swa þurh deofol ahyrde þaet hi naefdon to Gode naðer he lufe ne ege swa swa hy scoldon, ac durh deofles lære unriht lufedon ealles to swyðe. And aet nyhstan þaet folc ða wearc swa wið God forworht þaet he let faran hæpenne here 7 forhergian eall þaet land (112-117).} \]

The intent of these passages is no doubt the same as that of similar passages of the *Sermo ad Anglos*: to illustrate God's vengeance upon entire nations.

The story of the Jews' captivity and release is followed immediately by the story of the birth of Christ and the sentence "And þa ða ðaet waes þaet Crist geboren weard, þa waes agan geargerimes fram þam timan þe Adam aerest gescapen waes anni .iiii. milia & .c. lx.iii., þaes ðe bec secgad" (130-133). From this follows a general explanation of how the Creator could be born so late.

Like the previous one, this departure from the narrative is rather forced. Without the sentence quoted above, which already seems out of place, the transition to this section would be even more clumsy. Whereas Aelfric's handling of this
problem is smooth and graceful, Wulfstan explains the Incarnation only in the most general terms, and without immediate connection to the narrative.

The next section is a description of Christ's life on earth. The emphasis upon Christ's humanity (perhaps intended to balance the previous passage's emphasis on his divinity) leads Wulfstan to a surprising richness of general detail:

\[ \text{He cild waes, eall hine man fedde swa man ofre cild feded. He laeg on cradole bewunden eal swa ofre cild dof;} \]
\[ \text{hine man baer of he sylf gan mihte . . . Him byreste hylum 7 hwilum hingrode. He aet 7 dranc, 7 aegder he bolode ge cyle ge hatan (164-169).} \]

Wulfstan concludes the history with a brief account of the Passion. The final 24 lines of the homily deal with the approach of Antichrist's time and the need for obedience to God's will. The conclusion, like Aelfric's, is formulaic.

With this general outline of Bethurum VI in mind, some observations can be made as to its structure and purpose. First, although Wulfstan's homily by no means fits perfectly into the classical \textit{partitiones orationis}, it does so much better than Aelfric's \textit{De initio creaturae}. The \textit{exordium} is clear and well-defined; most of the rest of the homily is \textit{narratio}. Wulfstan apparently sees no need (or possibility) for \textit{confirmatio}: "nis aefre aeniges mannes maeð þaet he þa godcundnesse asmeagan cunne" (149-150), and thus the historical material leads directly into the discussion of Antichrist's reign and the Judgement (192-213).

This concluding section could be called \textit{narratio} because of its status as "future history." However, its hortatory
tone is undeniable, and I am more inclined to call it peroratio. Although stylistically this passage resembles the other historical material, with its omission of detail and extreme compression of facts, its purpose is different.

Donne is us mycel ðearf þæt we eac þæt understandan þæt hit to þæm dome nu georne nealaecþ þe he [Crist] sylf to cymð; forðan þonne he wile æt us witan hu we hine geleanod habban eall þæt he for us þolode. And, gelyfe se þe wille, we witan to sode þæt hit þæerto georne nealaecþ (193-197).

For the first time in the homily, Wulfstan explicitly describes the "rihtne geleafan" which "is us mycel þearf." In Wulfstan's estimation, awareness of the approaching doom, and a life in accordance with this awareness, is the unum necessarium of Christian faith; the Judgement is the end to which the homily, as well as the world, "georne nealaecþ."

The eschatological focus is apparent throughout the homily in the selection and narration of the historical material. Indeed, the homily is little more than a list of human (or angelic) crimes and divine retribution. After a three-line account of the Creation, Wulfstan launches into the story of the fall of the angels. Each of the following stories deals with human sin, and almost always with God's punishment.

It is likely that this focus is what necessitated the awkward insertion of the passage on the power of the devil (which Bethurum regards as a later addition9) at 77-95. Since he saw no immediate historical retribution for the Old Testament idolatry, and since he felt that this story was directly relevant to his audience, Wulfstan adds this paragraph to underscore the absolute evil of idolatry. The passage on the Incar-
nation (134-153) is less easily accounted for. One can only assume that Wulfstan felt that misunderstanding of the Incarnation was common, and that it was necessary to repeat that Christ "is æagder ge sod Godd ge sod mann" (148-149).

Although Aelfric leaves the narrative mode far more often than Wulfstan in this homily pair, his changes of mode are smooth and almost imperceptible to a casual reader, whereas Wulfstan's are awkward and obvious. This is due in large part to their placement in the homily. Aelfric inserts his explanatory material at junctures in the narrative. Natural pauses in the story allow him to summarize and clarify what has gone before. Wulfstan, on the other hand, does not use the narrative structure of his historical material as a foundation for the structure of his homily. Changes of mode occur where they are thematically suggested, not, as in Aelfric, where they are stylistically and logically appropriate. To an extent, this homily's structural limitations in comparison with those of De initio creaturae are due to its thematic limitations: Wulfstan whittles his narrative down to a series of crime-and-punishment stories, and departs from it only to insert material which is directly and immediately relevant to his audience's "rihtum geleafan." Aelfric sees a basic knowledge of theology and Biblical history as an integral part of Christian faith. To Wulfstan, the Bible stories are germane only as types and predecessors of the Last Judgement, awareness of which is the single most important facet of right belief. The material Wulfstan adds to Aelfric -- Cain and Abel and the Jews' captivity
-- serves only to reinforce his eschatological point; anything of Aelfric's which does not further this point is discarded.

The homily pair on the dedication of a church is also noteworthy for several reasons. Again, the homilists diverge widely in their treatment of a common theme; again, Wulfstan omits much of Aelfric's material to produce a more thematically focused homily. Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of these two homilies is that their audiences can be assumed to be quite similarly composed. At the dedication of a church there is likely to have been a substantial number both of clergy and of laity -- Aelfric's uncharacteristic mention of the "ungelaered" at 131-133 is a sure sign that he is also speaking to someone besides them. Thus, each homilist is faced with the problem of producing a segment suitable for both segments of his audience. As a result, as we shall see, Aelfric takes on in this homily pair some of the features which characterized Wulfstan's work in the previous homily pair, and Wulfstan's composition is somewhat more like Aelfric's. The two homilists reach similar conclusions, but in rather different ways.

Unlike De initio creaturae, Aelfric's In dedicatione ecclesiae begins with only a brief introduction and proceeds immediately to the body of the sermon. This introduction is interesting, however, because it explicitly states the homily's intent:
The reasons for the difference between this introduction and that of *De initio creaturae* are apparent. Here, the audience already knows in general what the theme of the homily will be. In a sense, by putting them in mind of the solemnity of hallowing a new church, the ceremony preceding the sermon has prepared the congregation in the same way that the opening lines of *De initio creaturae* suggest the tone and subject of the homily.

In dedicatione ecclesiae begins with the story of the construction and dedication of Solomon's temple. This narration includes much detail which is irrelevant to the homily's theme. Aelfric describes how David had wished to build the temple and how Solomon received his wisdom and wealth, and spends twenty lines expanding on the magnitude of Solomon's fortune, the extent of his wisdom, and the size and magnificence of the temple. No doubt the immensity of Solomon's riches reinforces Aelfric's later argument that "He haefde getacnunge ures haelendes cristes" (77); yet the feeling that Aelfric has got a bit carried away with his list of how much food Solomon's household consumed in a day is only confirmed by his statement a few lines later that "Us is langsum to gereccenne ealle ða bletstunga and ðancunga. ðe salomon ða gode saede" (70-71). Aelfric is sensitive to what sort of narration will interest or impress his audience and what will not; still, it is clear both here and in the sheer volume of Aelfric's work that he enjoys telling the tales at least as much as his
audiences enjoy hearing them.

After this narration, Aelfric explains its spiritual meaning. His analysis has three main points: that Solomon is a figure for Christ; that the temple signifies the whole congregation of the faithful; and that the church must be treated with reverence. Each of these arguments is supported by additional Scriptural citation, and the three points are expertly integrated. Solomon's peacefulness betokens the Peace of God; "Se gesibsuma Salomon arærdæ ðæt maere hus of eordlicum antimbre gode to wurðmynte. and se gesibsuma Crist getimbrede ða gastlican cyrcan. na mid deadum stanum. ac mid lybbendum sawlum" (85-88). This leads to a discussion of the ways in which God's people are God's living temple: each believer is a dwelling-place for the Holy Spirit; all the churches have one faith and are thus parts of one Church; God's household is his house; each Christian, like a stone in a wall, bears and is borne by others, and Christ, the living stone, is the foundation.

This explanatory passage, at 60 lines, is much longer and more complex than Aelfric's usual exegeses. This, as well as Aelfric's reinforcement of his arguments with additional Scriptural quotations, is probably a direct response to the presence of high-ranking clergymen in his audience. Preaching to an audience of both clergy and laity, Aelfric is no doubt painfully aware that "ða gelaeredan ne bedurfon þyssere boca. for ðan ðe him maeg heora agen lår genihtsumian."11 The homily must be scholarly enough to appeal to the learned segment of the audience and yet not so erudite as to lose the attention of the
laity. Thus, Aelfric concludes his explanation of the Church by saying "Gif we deoplicor ymbe ðis sprecað. ponne wene we þaet hit wile ðincan ðam ungelaeredom to menigfeald" (131-133). The section ends with an explanation of the meaning of Solomon's sacrifice and a statement of the sanctity of the earthly church.

The second part of In dedicatione ecclesiae deals with the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon. The narrative here is much more focused than the story of the temple's construction, and Aelfric can, in the next explanatory section, explain the "gastlican getacnunge" of each part of the story. This analysis also uses Scriptural quotation to show that the Queen of Sheba represents the Bride of Christ, the church.

The rest of the homily is a peroratio of nearly 100 lines, far longer than is customary in Aelfric's work. With another quotation from St. Paul, Aelfric alters his initial theme of building to apply to the individual as well as to the whole church.

We wyllæf eac secgan hu se apostol paulus spræc be þaere getimbrunge. þaere geleaffullan gelaðunge; He cwæð be ðam grundwealle; Fundamentum aliuð nemo potest ponere. preter id quod positum est quod est christus iesus; Þaet ðis. ne maeg nán man lecgan operne grundweall on ðaere halgan gelaðunge. buton ðone þe ðaer geled ðis. þaet is hælend críst; He is se grundweall þaere gastlican cyrcan. swa swa we eow aer saedon; Se apostol cwæð; Swa hwa swa getimbræf ofer ðisum grundwealle gold oðde seolfor. oðde deorwurde stanæs. oðde treowa. streaw. oðde ceaf. anes gehwilces mannes weorc bid swutel; Godes daeg hí geswutelað. for ðan þe hí bid on fyre aeteowed (223-234).

Aelfric professes reluctance ("micelre fyrhte," 239) to treat this text -- perhaps because of the danger inherent in distinguishing the cardinal sins from the venial. This hesitancy notwithstanding, Aelfric spends the next 50 lines explain-
ing what is meant by "gold odde seolfor. odde deorwurde stanast. oppe treowa. strew. odde ceaf" and the differences in the nature and punishment of "lytelra gylta" and "heafodleahtra."

Yet this is not simply exegesis, but the "tihcendlic spraece" promised in the introduction. Aelfric outlines a doctrine of purgatory, yet is careful to warn against reckless commission of venial sins: "Nu us dinoc swide teart wite þaet án ure fingra on fýre become. and hwaet bid þonne eal se lichama and seo sawol samod dròwiað on þam bradum fyre. þe ealne middaneard ofergæð" (272-275)? Furthermore, after the description of the cardinal sins, Aelfric says "Is nu for di micel neod gehwilcum men þaet he his gyltas aegðer ge da laessan ge da maran sylfwilles gebete . . . þaet hé ne durfe becuman to þam teartum bryne . . . ac geearnige swidor þaet ece lif mid gode" (288-293). The rest of the homily concerns proper respect for a church; the concluding lines are a prayer for purification and acceptance into the heavenly congregation.

As in the previous homily pair, Wulfstan's version of the homily for the dedication of a church has a much more limited approach than Aelfric's. The difference in length between these homilies is even greater than that of the previous pair: where Bethurum VI has about two-thirds as many lines as De initio creaturae, Wulfstan's dedication homily is less than half as long as Aelfric's. Here, however, Wulfstan does not simply omit most of Aelfric's explanations, but rather uses only the first part of Aelfric's narrative and provides adequate explanatory material for his text.
Like Aelfric's homily, Wulfstan's *De dedicatione ecclesiae* begins with an explicit statement of the homily's intent, which is, however, different from Aelfric's.

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

The ensuing narrative follows Aelfric's format but leaves out the superfluous detail. However, this is by no means such a stark listing of events as Wulfstan presented in the historical homily. Wulfstan omits little of the substance of Aelfric's narration; he simply chooses to say "*[naes] aenig eordial cyning maerra 7 mihtigra þonne he weard þuruh aeghwylcne woroldwelan*" (13-14) where Aelfric enumerates the extent of Solomon's household down to the number of chariots, and Wulfstan makes similar reductions elsewhere.

In one particular, Wulfstan expands Aelfric's narrative -- namely, in the content of the prayers Solomon said at the dedication of the temple. This is fully in line with Wulfstan's stated intent of impressing upon his audience the sanctity and importance of the earthly church. When Solomon dedicated the temple to God,

þa waes he wilniende to Gode sylfum geornlice 7 maenig-feedlice þaet he þuruh his miclan mildheortness aeghwylcum þaera gemildsode þe aefre to ðam on Godes naman gebaede, 7 þaet he æt aeghwylcre neode on helpe waere aelcum þaera þe his þearfe þaerto sohte (29-33).

These lines lead directly into the explanation, which makes up the remainder of the homily.

*Þonne do we ealswa þonne we cyrican halgarþ. Gode we hy betaecð to ðam pingum þaet cristene menn þaerto faran magan 7 þaer heora neode to Gode maenan 7 synna forgifenessse biddan (34-37).*
The next lines outline how Christians should honor a church.

Not until line 66 does Wulfstan take up the allegorical interpretation which is the backbone of Aelfric's homily. The statement that Solomon and the temple represent Christ and the Church is followed by two tangential explanations. All earthly churches are counted as one spiritual Church (Wulfstan does not, however, use the metaphor of building here, as does Aelfric); and each Christian is a dwelling-place for the Holy Spirit, "Đonne is micel þearf þaet manna gehwylc . . . his agen hus wel behweorfe; þaet is, þaet gehwa his heortan geclaensige" (82-84).

Following Aelfric almost word for word, Wulfstan explains Solomon's sacrifices as the spiritual offerings of prayer. Wulfstan also includes material offerings in this interpretation, emphasizing both the importance of offerings and that God does not require more than anyone is able to give. As Aelfric does elsewhere in his homily, Wulfstan supports his argument with additional Scriptural reference; yet his allusion to the parable of the widow's mite does not seem intelligible to the lay segment of his audience:

Ac be þam he hy leanad þe he hy on þaes mannes heortan gesceawað, ealswa he hwilum be sumre wudewan spaec: Amen, dico uobis quoniam uidua haec, et reliqua (97-100).

Finding himself on the subject of sacrifice, Wulfstan digresses, as he does in the previous homily, to emphasize the evil of paganism.

Next, Wulfstan makes a neat splicing of Aelfric's material. After Aelfric explains the sacrifices, it will be
recalled, he turns to the story of the Queen of Sheba's visit. Wulfstan, omitting this second narrative section, instead explains a part of the temple story which Aelfric disregards: the great crowd which Solomon summoned to the consecration of the temple. Wulfstan interprets this gathering as Aelfric interprets the Queen's visit: they represent the Gentiles who came to Christ from far lands and were delighted by what they found.

This homily also ends with an uncharacteristically long peroration. Wulfstan restates his previous point that all churches are one through their one faith, and uses this, along with an echo of the summoning of the crowds to Solomon's temple, to show that all people shall be summoned to the Last Judgement, and the faithful made part of the heavenly congregation. The homily ends with general admonitions -- with a more hopeful focus, however, than those of the previous homily.

The balance and close argument of Aelfric's *In dedicatione ecclesiae* are a bit misleading as to the skill of its construction; a comparison with Wulfstan's homily shows its flaws. The fundamental failure of Aelfric's homily is that Aelfric tries to say too much, and tends to lose sight of the direction of his homily. Aelfric has difficulty finding material which he believes suitable for both clergy and laity, and compensates by alternating between material directed toward the priests and passages intended primarily for the people. The first narrative section contains sensational detail and extraneous stories to capture and hold the laity's interest.
Aelfric then proceeds to a scholarly interpretation of the narrative, with occasional asides to explain less than transparent concepts to the people (e.g., "Nu smeac sum man. hu men magon beon godes hus; We cweac paet godes hired is godes hus" [118-119];). Concerned lest this analysis become "to menigfeald" for the unlearned, Aelfric gives a quick interpretation of one more facet of the narrative (i.e., the offerings), sums up the section with "Godes cyrcan gedafenac halignys" (137), remarks parenthetically that one need not be in church to pray, and proceeds to the next narrative section. The interpretation of this section is somewhat less "menigfeald" and more balanced; it is scholarly enough to hold the priests, yet not so intricate as to lose the people.

The next section, dealing with the different kinds of building upon Christ's foundation, seems to have been included in order to give a moral purpose to the homily. The narrative material in De initio creaturarum was important knowledge in its own right and also, for the most part, carried its own lesson. Here, however, Aelfric has taken a text directly relevant to his topic (the dedication of a church), interpreted it in a manner which he hopes will interest the clerical segment of his audience, and consequently found himself without a straightforward moral point for the laity -- who are, after all, the ones who most need the lessons contained in a homily.

Aelfric must therefore find a text which both fits his homily's theme of building and carries a fairly explicit moral point. Though the text he finds is one which he "ne [maeg]
buton micelre fyrhte trahtnian" (238-239), he feels that to do so is better than to leave the lay portion of his audience without moral instruction. This, then, is the reason for the length of this last section. Aelfric realizes that the first two-thirds of the homily have no direct moral message for the laity, and endeavors to correct this deficiency. The last lines of the homily finally make for the laity exactly the point which Wulfstan makes the focus of his homily: "hu man cyrican weorpian scyle" (Bethurum XVIII.4-5).

Wulfstan, on the other hand, takes this moral point as the center of his entire homily, and thus produces a more coherent piece of work. The task of writing a homily for an audience of both clergy and laity is, admittedly, easier for Wulfstan than for Aelfric for two reasons. First, as is evident in the historical homily and elsewhere in Wulfstan's work, the priests in his more sparsely populated northern archdiocese were often less educated than those of Aelfric's region. Secondly, we can infer from Wulfstan's archiepiscopacy and the fact that most of his sermons are *ad clericum* that most of the clergy present at the dedication have already heard him preach at York or Worcester, and Wulfstan can thus afford to turn his attention somewhat more toward the laity than can Aelfric.

Wulfstan presents the narrative as entirely new material (in contrast with the presentation of the *ad clericum* historical homily). He explains the text first by giving general instruction as to "hu man cyrican weorpian scyle" and then by giving a moral as well as an allegorical interpretation of each part
of the narrative. His exegesis proceeds in this manner: Solomon and the temple betoken Christ and the Church; each Christian is also a dwelling-place for the Holy Spirit; therefore we must, by purity of heart and right action, be acceptable houses for God. The sacrifices Solomon offered betoken the offerings of prayer which the Church makes daily; likewise, we must also make offerings to God, each as she or he is able. The people summoned to Solomon's temple for its dedication betoken the faithful throughout the world; "And ealswa hy ðær on blisse waeron þa hwile þe hy ðær waeron, swa scylon cristene men eac mid blidre heortan nu cyrican secan" (114-116).

Wulfstan's trimming of Aelfric's material in this homily pair is not always an improvement; for example, the statement that "ealle Godes cyrican syn getealde after gastlicum andgyte to anre cyrican" (70-71) comes more or less out of the blue, whereas in Aelfric's homily the corresponding statement (96-97) comes in a logical sequence of analyses of what is meant by the building. Wulfstan can also be unnecessarily obscure, as in his use of the Latin ecclesia where Aelfric says "gelaðung," and in the allusion to the parable of the widow's mite. Also, as has been noted, Wulfstan still cannot resist a digression on the evil of idolatry. Nevertheless, of these two homilies, Wulfstan's is by far the more successful at integrating materials intended for the clergy and those directed toward the laity. As a result, Wulfstan's De dedicatione ecclesiae is a neater and more cohesive whole.
The *Sermo de die iudicii* is one of Aelfric's later homilies, and it is characteristic of Aelfric's mature style. It is written in the rhythmical alliterative prose which Aelfric was only beginning to develop in the second series of *Catholic Homilies*. The exegesis follows, for the most part, the "commentary" format used in much of Aelfric's later work. He first translates the entire text, then quotes and interprets it line by line.

After a paraphrase of the lesson, the homily proper begins with an introduction which summarizes the ultimate point of this homily: that regardless of its time or circumstances, the Judgement is inevitable.

\[\ldots\text{we gelyfa}\ldots\text{gbet us alogen ne bid}\]
\[\text{gbet he [Crist] cym\text{\textit{\textdagger}} sodlice mid hys scinendum englum}\]
\[\text{on pissere worulde geendunge}\]
\[\text{us to demanne, aelcum be hys geearnungum (47-50).}\]

Aware that his audience will not understand the allusion in the Gospel, Aelfric sketches the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and the deliverance of Lot. This done, he explains the meaning of the text: "Eall swa bid\text{\textit{\textdagger}} on Domes-daenge" (75); the terrible fire shall purify the earth.

Aelfric next treats (one at a time) the three estates of humankind, and how there are good and evil persons in each. At the end of the explication of each of these verses, Aelfric gives a brief summary of the interpretation. The recapitulation of the comments on "twegen on \text{\textit{\textdagger}}num bedde" (86) will suffice as an example:

\text{Swa bid se \text{\textit{\textdagger}}n genumen and se o\text{\textit{\textdagger}}r forlaeten}\n\text{be on \text{\textit{\textdagger}}am bedde beof \text{\textit{\textdagger}}onne gemette --}\n\text{gbet is, on \text{\textit{\textdagger}}aere stilnysse heora stabolfaestan modes;}\n\text{na twegen menn \text{\textit{\textdagger}}na, ac on twa wisan gemodode,}\n\text{o\text{\textit{\textdagger}}re mid sodfaestnysse, o\text{\textit{\textdagger}}re mid hiwunge (105-109).}
When he reaches the verse about the two men in the field, Aelfric explains the metaphor and states the ideal for the clergy. Moved by his characteristic concern for the spiritual well-being of his flock, Aelfric "bursts forth in an eloquent complaint (169-88) against the priests of his own time." Recalling the martyrs of the early Church, he vents his outrage at those who will not preach God's Word.

After the synopsis of this passage, Aelfric sums up the three estates of humankind:

On þisum þrim endebyrdnyssum bið eal mancynn belocen:
þwegen on þam bedde, and twa æt þære cwyrne,
þwegen on þam æceræ, swa swa ge gehyrdon nu (200-202).

He concludes this section with an explanation of "Swa hwaer swa þæt hold bið, þider gaderiæð þa earnæs" (205). This interpretation gradually becomes a summary of the entire section; the holy persons shall be gathered to God like eagles; those who are left shall be damned forever.

Aelfric makes the transition into the second section by stating the contrast between the two Gospel texts:

We habbað nu gesaed hu ða Sundorhalgan
ahsodon þone Hælend be ende þissere worulde;
uu wille we eow secgan sceortlice, gif we magon,
uu hys agene leorningcnihtas hyne ahsodon be þam (222-225).

Aelfric takes this lesson primarily from Matthew, yet he "gives only the verses from Matth. xxiv that correspond to Marc. xiii. 14-24, and sometimes prefers the reading of the latter." (Thus, Wulfstan can borrow from this homily on Luke and Matthew in his own homily Secundum Marcum.)

The analysis of this text proceeds in much the same manner as the first part of the homily. Quoting the first few
lines of the lesson, Aelfric explains (with the help of a citation from St. Paul) that Antichrist will say that he is God and appropriate God's worship to himself. Aelfric quotes again from the Gospel ("'pa de on Iudea lande þonne libbende beod,'" et rel., 307-313), and, realizing that this text is fairly straightforward, says

We moton eow secgan swa swa ge magon understandan, hwilum anfealdlice be eowrum andgite, hwilum eow geopenian þa inran digolnyssé, for þam þe ge eadæ ne magon hyt eall understandan (314-317),

and proceeds to the next verse.

"Wa þam eacniendum on þam yfelum dagum" (318) makes little literal sense, and Aelfric asks "Hwaet agylta þa wif, þe be Godes haese tymaþ / and heora cild fedaþ on þære frecednyssé?" (320-321), then explains that the wicked are full of sins like sows in farrow. In the next verse, Aelfric explains the meaning of "winter" with a quotation from "odre stowe" (329 -- actually an earlier verse of the same chapter of Matthew): "Quia abundabit iniquitas, refrigerescet caritas multorum" (330, Matt. 24:12). Aelfric ends this explanation with an exhortation to prayer:

... we sceolan wilnian aefre, and æt Gode biddan, þæt we ne beon aemtige fram góðum weorcum, and on Godes lufan acolode, þonne us se endenyhsta daeg onsigende bið (341-344).

The last few verses are expanded in varying detail to illustrate the circumstances preceding and accompanying the end of the world. The homily ends rather abruptly with a passage which both explains the last verse of the text and summarizes the Judgement theme of the entire homily.

Wulfstan's homily Secundum Marcum is based loosely on
the second half of Aelfric's *Sermo de die iudicii*, as is immediately clear when Wulfstan prefaces the Gospel lesson with the same freely composed Latin introduction Aelfric uses: "Interrogatus Iesus a discipulis de consummatione seculi, dixit eis: . . ." (Pope XVIII.227-228, Bethurum V.3-4). Wulfstan's description of the end of the world does not proceed as a series of explanations of the Gospel verses, however, but treats the various sources of information on the Last Days with little or no distinction among them.

Wulfstan begins this homily by paraphrasing two of the Gospel verses in English:

\[\text{"Da saede he heom þaet swilce earfoðnessa 7 swylce gedrecednessa sculan on worulde aer þam unde gewerðan swylce naefre aer ne gewurdan ne naefre eft ne gewerðæ. And þaet godspell cwaed: Wa þam wifum þe þonne tymæd 7 on þam earmlican timan heora cild fedæ (9-14).}\]

Wulfstan next quotes several lines from 2 Timothy (not in Aelfric) describing how the sins of humankind will increase until the Last Days, then points out the profusion of sins now in the world. And, says Wulfstan, "daes hit is þe wyrse wide on worulde, ealswa þaet godspell cwaed: Quoniam abundabit iniquitas refrigerescet caritas multorum" (25-27).

The next paragraph describes how Antichrist is Christ's exact opposite. Wulfstan concludes, based on Revelations 20:7, "Post mille annos soluetur Satanas" (42-43), and the great evil in the world, that Antichrist's time is very near.

Following Aelfric's explanation of "Þonne beod witodlice swylce gedrecednyssa swylce naefre aer naeron, ne eft ne gewurðæ" (Pope XVIII.345-346), although without reference to
this verse, Wulfstan compares the persecutions of the early Christians to those in Antichrist's time. The latter shall be more horrible, and whereas the first martyrs could work miracles, the last martyrs, powerless themselves, will see Antichrist working miracles and "maenigfealde gedwimera" (69) through the Devil's power. Wulfstan continues to parallel Aelfric's explanation of the next verse regarding the length of Antichrist's reign and the many ways in which he will convert or compel humankind to his evil teaching.

Wulfstan next notes that God will permit Antichrist to do these things because of human sinfulness, and that those who keep God's laws despite the great persecution shall earn eternal comfort. He mentions in a rather roundabout manner that Enoch and Elias shall appear again on earth to protect the people with their teaching:

La, hwylc wunder bi ä þeah se mennisca deofol synfullum mote heardlice derian, þonne God gepafað þaet he mot on his agenum halgum swylc wundor gewyrcan þaet Enoh 7 Elias þurh þone þeodfeond gemartrode weordæð, þe God sylfa fela hund wintra mid saule 7 lichaman geheold aer to þam anan, þaet hi þonne scoldan mid heora lare folce gebeorgan, þaet hit eal ne forwurde endemes aetgaedere þurh þone deofol þe ealle men bregeð 7 ealle woruld drefed (88-96)?

A list of the horrors of Antichrist's reign follows this section. Wulfstan mentions the signs that shall appear in the heavens, and says that God will cut short Antichrist's time in order that all not be lost. The homily ends with general remarks on the Judgement.

Comparison of Wulfstan's Secundum Marcum with Aelfric's Sermo de die iudicii immediately shows the disorganization of
the former. Whereas Aelfric follows a straightforward pattern of analyzing one verse at a time, drawing on other Biblical material when necessary, Wulfstan follows neither the order of the lesson nor the chronological order of events of the Last Days. He quotes in English only two verses of the lesson; one of these and the additional verse quoted in Latin are not dealt with at all in the homily. In the body of the sermon, material taken from the lesson in Mark, other Biblical material, and miscellaneous traditions concerning Antichrist are mixed together as if they were of equal merit; after the first lines of the homily, information drawn from the Gospel lesson is never identified as such.

Aelfric concentrates for the most part on the future. Only three times does he leave the descriptive focus of the homily to relate the lessons to present conditions: in his protest against the priests, in the exhortation to prayer at lines 341-344, and after he notes that those who resist Antichrist will be saved:

He [Crist] gewarnode þa, swa swa þis gewrit us segf, 
hys halgan apostolas, and eac us þurh hi, 
þæt we georne healdan hys geleafan æfre, 
and ure lif syllan aer we hyne widsacon (393-396).

Thus, Aelfric gives in this homily a detailed description of the end of the world and draws from this knowledge guidelines for present conduct. Wulfstan, on the other hand, speaks of the present only as it appears to foretoken the Judgement. Rather surprisingly, Wulfstan fails to draw his usual moral conclusions in this homily. Not once does he tell his audience what "is us micel þearf." The eternal bliss of the elect
is noted without an exhortation to earn it with good works and right belief.

This homily pair differs from the others in that narration and explanation often overlap. Since all of the narration is prophecy, some of the explanation must outline in more detail the predicted history. Yet a comparison of the genuine explanations in each homily is revealing.

Two of Aelfric's explanations in the second part of his homily compare ancient evils to those of the Last Days. He relates ancient idolatry with the ultimate paganism of taking Antichrist for God (281ff), and compares the persecutions of the first Christians and the last (347ff). Two more are clarifications of the metaphors of winter and pregnancy, along the lines of explanation in the other homilies. The last is the reminder quoted above that we must hold fast to our faith (393-396).

The explanations in Wulfstan's homily follow no such pattern of direct relevance to the text. Wulfstan spends most of lines 14-52 showing that the end of the world is imminent -- then drops this point completely in his description of the Last Days. Inexplicably, he does not make the obvious moral connection. Like Aelfric, Wulfstan compares the ancient persecutions to those of Antichrist's time (53-64). The next explanation is a remark that God will permit Antichrist's evils because of the sins of humankind (71-77) -- yet this note does not appear in a passage dealing with the depravity of the people of Antichrist's time, but follows a description of the terrors of Antichrist's
reign. The final "explanation" is the question mentioning Enoch and Elias, whose purpose is at best ambiguous.

In fact, Wulfstan's aim throughout this homily is unclear. Whereas Aelfric both teaches his audience Christ's foretellings of the Last Days and draws clear moral directives from them, Wulfstan offers a less than coherent review of the events preceding the Judgement, and leaves his audience without a conclusion regarding their own action.

From this comparison of Aelfric's and Wulfstan's treatment of identical subjects, some characteristics of the two homilists' work emerge which are not as apparent in individual considerations of each writer. Throughout the three homily pairs discussed above, a pattern is discernible in the ways Wulfstan's rewritings differ from Aelfric's homilies.

The quality which distinguishes Aelfric's writing from Wulfstan's on almost every level of consideration is awareness. This functions primarily in two aspects of the homilies: awareness throughout each homily of its overall structure, and sensitivity to the needs of the audience.

Aelfric's sense of the architecture of his homilies is apparent in several facets of his writing. First, although Aelfric alternates between the narrative and explanatory modes far more often than Wulfstan, he is always aware of which mode he is using, and why. In De initio creaturae, it has been shown that explanatory material is inserted at junctures in the narrative where some clarification is needed. The same
is true of the other two homilies. The text for *In dedicatione ecclesiae* is most readily assimilable in large chunks. In fact, these "chunks" are little longer than the narrative sections of *De initio creaturae*; however, as the purpose of the former homily is not to teach the audience about Solomon but rather to interpret this text as it relates to the dedication of a church, the explanatory sections are much longer and more detailed. In the *Sermo de die iudicii*, the text is not a story, but a series of prophecies which often are meaningless in their literal sense; thus, a verse-by-verse analysis is warranted.

In *De initio creaturae*, where the primary focus of the homily is narrative rather than interpretive, Aelfric realizes the potentially intrusive nature of explanation, and shifts of mode are carefully accomplished. Often, he uses word-play to ease the transition between sections. For example, on page 20, a discussion of the nature of the soul, which ends in a remark about free will, precedes the story of the Flood. The shift of mode hinges on the word "geweaxan:"

\[
\text{[God] forgyf\ddot{e} cildum sawle . . . and he laett hi habban agenne cyre, bonne hi geweaxene beo\ddot{e}, swa swa Ad\ddot{a}m haefde. Pa weard pa hraedlice micel mennisc geweaken, and waeron swy\ddot{e} manegra on yfel awende (20:17-22).}
\]

A similar transition between explanatory sections in *In dedicatione ecclesiae* depends on a play on the word "menigfeald" (133). Throughout, Aelfric changes mode or subject only when it is both thematically and structurally fitting.

Wulftan, on the other hand, shifts modes apparently without such careful consideration. As has been remarked, his changes of mode in the historical homily are awkward and abrupt.
When Wulfstan feels that a point must be made, he inserts it without regard to the structure of his narrative material, and without the grace of Aelfric's transitions. In the homily *Secondum Marcum*, again, the relevance of explanatory material to the text at hand is often inadequately demonstrated, and shifts among sources of varying reliability are made without comment. The neatly-constructed *De dedicatione ecclesiae*, in which all the narrative is placed at the beginning, and the explanations are elegantly balanced, is an exception to this rule.

Aelfric's sensitivity to the needs of his audience is demonstrated throughout these three homilies. In *De initio creaturae*, Aelfric presents to an unlearned audience an outline of Christian history from the Creation to the Judgement, along with various theological points. Where the meaning of a story is unclear or warrants expansion, Aelfric explains it clearly and methodically. He consistently follows a logical sequence which facilitates the audience's assimilation of the material presented. In *De dedicatione ecclesiae*, as we have seen, it is precisely an overzealous attempt to write a homily responsive to the needs of both the clergy and the laity which results in this sermon's organizational weakness. Aelfric's conscientiousness in meeting his audience's requirements is made most explicit in the *Sermo de die iudicii*. He takes the time to explain the allusion in the Gospel to Sodom and Gomorrah, saying "eower fela nát / hu hyt waes be Lōde; ac we wyllā f eow secgan" (63-64); yet when a verse is straightforward enough to need no explanation, Aelfric notes this and continues with the next verse (314-317).
Moral directives are inserted as necessary, without losing the instructional focus of the homily.

Wulfstan's homilies, on the other hand, show a consistently less developed ability to adjust his homilies to the level of education of his audience. In the historical homily, whatever its intended audience, a congregation which does not know the basic facts of Biblical history is not likely to know why an angel who is "beorht 7 . . . wlitig" (28) should be named Lucifer, nor does an audience of priests need a harangue on the evils of idolatry. In De dedicatione ecclesiae, although this homily is much more balanced in its response to the audience's needs, Wulfstan again makes references which would probably be incomprehensible to a lay audience, and again comments on idolatry in a tone which would seem excessively heavy to the clergy. As has been noted, Secundum Marcum neither meets a clerical audience's need for stimulating exegesis nor a lay audience's need for moral instruction. The contrast between the two homilists' sensitivity to their audiences can perhaps be shown most strikingly by comparing Aelfric's explanation of the allusion to Lot in De die iudicii with Wulfstan's obscure reference to the parable of the widow's mite in De dedicatione ecclesiae.

Thus, it can be seen that Aelfric's true genius does not lie in the style for which he is best known. Wulfstan is at least as good a stylist and as adept in the use of rhetorical figures. Rather, it is the tailoring of each homily to the text and to the audience which distinguishes Aelfric as by far the more skilled homilist of the two.
Notes


6Bethurum, p. 294.

7De initio creaturae, 24:27-33.

8It should be noted that the corresponding statement in Aelfric's homily is "Ne maeg nan gesceaft fulfremedlice smeagan ne understandan ymbe god" (10:2-3). The key word here, of course, is "fulfremedlice."

9Bethurum, p. 296.

10A schematic diagram of these homilies is given as the Appendix.

11"Oratio," CH II (Godden) p. 345.

12See Best, pp. 202ff.

13Pope, p. 585.

14Ibid., p. 589.

15Ibid., p. 600n.
Appendix: Schematic Diagram of the Historical Homilies

DE INITIO CREATURAE (Aelfric)

Introduction: God's omnipotence and eternity
nature of the angels
Fall of the Angels
free will
that Satan was not created devil
Creation of Adam
Prohibition of the Tree
why such a little thing was forbidden
Adam names the animals
Creation of Eve
summary of Creation; nature of the soul; origin of evil
Satan knows that humankind is to take his place
Temptation and Fall of Adam and Eve
God expels them from Paradise and clothes them in skins
skins betoken mortality;
Adam fell of his own free will
(God remembers his mercy)
the soul's immortality, individual creation, and free will
The Flood
The Tower of Babel
Idolatry
Faithfulness of the Hebrews

"INCIPIUNT SERMONES LUPI EPISCOPI"

Introduction (a): that priests must instruct their flocks
Introduction (b): plea for patience
Creation; Fall of the Angels
Creation of Adam
Satan knows that humankind is to take his place, and tempts them
Prohibition of the Tree
Fall of Adam and Eve
that all humankind is descended from them
Cain and Abel
The Flood
Idolatry
the Devil's power and deceptiveness
Faithfulness of the Hebrews
Captivity of the Jews
The Incarnation
explanation of Incarnation

God's great mercy in sending his Son to redeem us

Christ's life and Passion

that Christ gave himself for our redemption

Christ's Resurrection and Ascension

Need for readiness for Antichrist's reign and the Judgement

Formulaic close
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READING LIST: SUE HAAS

Aelfric
De initio creaturae (CH I.1)
In dedicatione ecclesiae (CH II.40)
De die iudicii (Pope XVIII)
Life of St. Oswald

Augustine
Sermon XXIV, On Matt. xiii, "Therefore every Scribe instructed in the kingdom of God, &c."

Caesarius of Arles
Sermon 115, "Joshua Bids the People . . ."

Wulfstan
Incipit sermones Lupi Episcopi (VI)
De dedicatione ecclesiae (XVIII)
Secundum Marcum (V)
Sermo Lupi ad Anglos (XXI)