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ABSTRACT

The interaction of Germanic and Latin Christian influences on Old English literature has long interested scholars. This study examines one instance of this interaction -- the effect of the Germanic genre of flyting on the depiction of the Christian war of words in Old English religious prose and verse. I argue that Anglo-Saxon authors re-analyzed the adversarial dialogues found in Scripture and in Latin hagiographies as examples of flyting, and that this re-analysis led to the development of a new and sacred sub-genre of flyting in the Old English Christian epic.

To prove my thesis, I begin in chapter one by reviewing the scholarly definitions of Germanic flyting and discussing exemplary secular flyting texts, emphasizing that in Germanic flyting quarrels, words act as weapons. In chapter two, I examine the Latin Christian literary traditions influencing Old English religious adversarial dialogues (particularly the conceit of spiritual and verbal battle found in Saint Paul's exhortation to the faithful in Eph. 6.11-17) and show that the Christian war of words had some features in common with flyting.

I then turn my attention to Old English religious prose. In chapter three I show the persistence of the trope of verbal battle in Old English translations of Scripture, as well as in some scripturally dependent homilies found in the Vercelli and Blickling homiliaries and in Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. In chapter four, I compare adversarial dialogues found in a selection of Old English prose saints' lives to their Latin counterparts in order to show that in their own work Anglo-Saxon hagiographers altered the Latin dialogues in order to increase their resemblance to flyting.

In the final three chapters, I discuss Old English religious verse. In chapter five, I analyze Exodus and Daniel, and show that the conceit of spiritual struggle as verbal battle persists in these poems. In chapter six, I
concentrate on Satan's verbal confrontations with God and mankind in *Christ and Satan* and *Genesis B*, and in chapter seven, I analyze the disputes of saint and devil, and saint and pagan found in *Juliana*, *Elene*, *Andreas* and *GuPlac A*, showing that in these poems the war of words is treated as sacred flyting. I conclude with a brief recapitulation of the characteristics of sacred flyting and note its prominence in the Old English Christian epic.
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INTRODUCTION

The effects of Germanic and Latin Christian literary traditions on OE verse have long interested scholars. Critics such as Blackburn, Robertson, and Cabaniss discerned Christian influences in the epic Beowulf, while other scholars found evidence of secular Germanic conventions in OE religious verse. Unfortunately, this second discovery sometimes produced condemnations of AS poets whose work was therefore judged to be excessively literal-minded in its heroic depiction of spiritual topics. More recent efforts to understand the forces acting upon OE religious verse eschew such harsh conclusions, however, and recognize that the task of determining these influences is more complex than may have originally been supposed. For example, Frank argues that the use of the phrase, "Germanic influence," to denote a pre-literate substrate underlying all AS texts is rather misleading, and conceals continuing literary influences originating in Scandinavia and impinging on literate Anglo-Saxons. In addition, other critics recognize that while OE religious verse may have been shaped in part by a martiality of Germanic provenience, its heroic tone is also a reflection of the metaphoric martiality already inherent in Latin Christian literature. Given this more complex view of the interaction of Germanic and Christian influences, it seems likely that we have more to learn about how AS authors combined their native literary legacy and the literary traditions imported with Christianity.

The adversarial dialogues found in OE religious prose and verse provide an excellent opportunity for the student of OE literature to learn more about the effects of Germanic and Latin Christian traditions on AS texts. Scholars have often identified these adversarial dialogues as examples of Germanic flyting. Bridges calls both Judas Cyriacus' exchange with the devil in Elene and Andrew's quarrel with Satan in Andreas flyting. Likewise, Calder considers
Juliana's interrogation of the devil in *Juliana* to be flyting, and Kurtz says that Guþlac addresses the fiends of Crowland "in fine flyting style." None of these scholars, however, explains exactly what they intend by this label, nor do they consider whether the secular genre of Germanic flyting is in any way changed to suit its new sacred context. This is scarcely surprising, however, for even in secular contexts, the denotation of the noun *flyting* remains frustratingly elusive, in part because there remain few extant examples of the genre in Old English literature from which to infer its defining characteristics. Thus, critics agree that Germanic flyting is a verbal battle in which mutual vituperation figures prominently, but beyond this there is little consensus. This study will address these issues, defining flyting and examining its influence on the adversarial dialogues found in a variety of OE religious prose and verse texts.

I begin with two chapters which deal with problems of definition and with antecedent traditions -- topics which would usually be included in an introduction, but whose complexity here demands lengthier treatment. In chapter one, I review flyting scholarship, examine a selection of adversarial dialogues drawn from classical as well as Germanic literatures, and propose a definition for flyting. In chapter two, I study a variety of Latin Christian texts, including Scripture, patristic commentaries, and some examples of the *acta*, *passiones* and *vitae* of the early martyrs and saints, in order to show the importance of the word in the Christian religion and to introduce the Christian conceit of verbal battle.

The remainder of this study concentrates on OE religious prose and verse. In chapter three, I examine scripturally dependent prose texts, including passages from OE translations of the Bible and examples of homiletic exegesis drawn from the Vercelli and Blickling homiliaries as well as from Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. These texts show that
Anglo-Saxons were familiar with the metaphoric spiritual warfare of the Latin Christian tradition, and knew that spiritual battles could be fought with the weaponry of devout discourse. In chapter four, I turn my attention to OE hagiographic prose which like its Latin counterpart depicts the verbal battles of saint and demon or saint and pagan. In this chapter, I examine first the adversarial dialogues found in OE texts which are translations of earlier Latin works (for instance, Warferp's translation of Gregory's Dialogues), comparing the OE dialogues to their Latin sources. I then discuss dialogues found in texts derived from Anglo-Latin rather than Latin sources and which are therefore more reflective of AS sensibilities.

In chapters five, six and seven, I discuss the Christian war of words as it occurs in a selection of OE religious verse. Following the pattern established in chapters three and four, I consider scripturally dependent works first. In chapter five, I discuss OE Exodus and Daniel, for although these poems do not contain adversarial dialogues, they nonetheless show that AS poets, like the authors of OE religious prose, recognized the importance of the word in Christianity, and were familiar with its role in spiritual battle. In chapter six, after a brief examination of Genesis A's account of the heavenly revolt, I focus on the lengthier accounts of Satan's verbal battles with God and mankind found in Christ and Satan and Genesis B. Finally, in chapter seven, I examine OE verse hagiographies in which the saint uses verbal weapons to combat pagan magistrates and demons alike. Again, I consider first those hagiographies which are most dependent on Latin sources, comparing Juliana and Elene to their Latin analogues in order to discover what changes the AS poet makes in his treatment of the war of words. I then examine works more clearly reflective of AS sensibilities, beginning with Andreas and concluding with GuPlac A, a poem whose relative independence from Latin
Christian sources makes it a good witness to the effect of AS sensibilities on accounts of the Christian war of words.

An overview such as this study attempts cannot be exhaustive. I have chosen to limit my analysis to OE texts which either reflect the commonplaces of AS Christianity (texts such as OE scriptural translations, homiletic exegesis and Caedmonian verse) or contain examples of Christian verbal battle (chiefly the prose and verse hagiographies), hoping that this limited study will encourage further examination of sacred flyting in other examples of OE religious prose and verse.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION


9 I do not discuss GuElac B, since in this narrative GuElac does not engage in a struggle with either Satanic or pagan forces.
CHAPTER ONE

SECULAR GERMANIC TRADITIONS OF FLYTING

The phenomenon of verbal dueling is widespread in both spoken and written discourse. In the former, it denotes dialogues as diverse as the free-wheeling give and take of an ordinary quarrel, the scurrilous abuse of Black American "sounding" exchanges, or the rule-constrained argument of formal debate. In literary discourse, verbal dueling is likewise widespread, but one of its forms, flyting, is of special interest to students of AS literature. Flyting, according to the OED, is "the action of the verb flite; contention, scolding, rebuking." For many critics this suffices: they understand flyting as a simple synonym for quarrel, "an extended and vigorous verbal exchange ... mutual abuse in verse." Other scholars, dissatisfied with the definition, have examined flyting exchanges in Germanic secular literature in greater detail, and their work reveals a complex genre about which there is much disagreement. Several interrelated issues emerge as contentious: Can flyting be identified by commonplace topics, or a distinctive rhetorical form? Are the allegations made by flyters necessarily true? Must flyting be followed by a battle?

For the student of AS hagiography in particular, these questions are made more interesting and more urgent by the possibility of a connection between the secular genre of flyting and the metaphoric war of words prominent in OE religious verse. This connection, hinted at in OE Vainglory where the devil's "arrows of envy" are initiators of a possible flyting exchange, may have reached fruition in AS hagiography, where representatives of good and evil engage in a verbal war with cosmic implications. Once again, however, there is little critical consensus about this possibility. Parks argues that adversarial dialogues in OE religious verse "such as that between Elene and the Jew, between the fiend
and Andreas or Juliana, or between Solomon and Saturn ... do not constitute flytings of the heroic type," but Calder and Bridges disagree and call these quarrels flyting. While Olsen concurs with Calder and Bridges, and calls Andrew's dispute with the devil in Andreas a flyting, she qualifies her classification with the observation that "the 'flytings' of the hagiographic poems do not ... derive simply from Germanic tradition, for they are adaptations of dialogues found in the original versions of the legends." If Olsen is correct, the application of the term "flyting" to these religious debates is imprecise, and conceals a rhetorical innovation by AS hagiographers who may have created a new kind of debate from two earlier quarrel genres of differing provenience. The issue can hardly be resolved in the absence of a clearer understanding of the Germanic and Latin textual antecedents of these religious disputes. Accordingly, I shall begin my study of sacred flyting with an examination of its secular parent, Germanic flyting.

Although dispute about the exact nature of flyting is long-standing, the cruces of interpretation have remained remarkably consistent. Over thirty years ago, in The Art of Beowulf, Brodeur argued that flyting was either a "rough game" or a prelude to battle. Since the quarrel between Unferp and Beowulf (Beowulf, vv. 499-606) was neither of those things, he judged this exemplary AS flyting text to be something other than "mere flyting" (p. 144). Eliason disagreed with Brodeur, and countered that although flyting, particularly in AS literature, was more than a slanging match it did not necessarily lead to a fight. Instead, he agreed with Irving that flyting was "a notable display of heroic wit" and added that its contents were not intended by the participants to be taken literally because flyting statements were "whopping lies." For Eliason, then, flyting was a sophisticated linguistic game which was won neither by force nor by truthfulness, but by eloquence alone. He added that
in *Beowulf*, the exchange was important because it allowed the poet to demonstrate his hero's native wit.

Brodeur and Eliason's dispute is significant because it raises basic issues of definition which, as already noted, vex the study of flyting today: Is flyting rhetorically sophisticated? Do flyters lie? Does flyting necessarily entail a fight? A glance at *BT* shows that disagreement about the denotation of flyting is scarcely surprising considering the ambiguity of the noun's OE cognates: the glosses of *geflit* and *flitan* suggest a polysemy which could encompass both quarrel and physical fight. According to *BT*, the noun *geflit* in OS and in OE meant "contention, dispute (scandalum, contentio)," a gloss quite close to its modern meaning. To this Ælfric adds two additional glosses in his Grammar. In his enumeration of some third declension nouns, he translates *scisma* as *geflit*, and in his examples of the genitive plural, he glosses *lis* as *geflit*. In Vercelli 20, the homilist lists *geflit* as an evil like heresy or boasting and suggests that truth will conquer it:

Se forma heafodleahter ys ofermodignes ....Of þære byþ soplice acenned wælc unhyrsumnes ond geþristlœcung ond geflit ond gedwyld ond gyþp ond oþere manegu yfelu. Ac þæs mæg seo soþe eadmonnes ealle oferswipan.

The related OE verb, *flitan*, meant "to strive, contend, dispute, rebel; contendere, certare, disputare, jugare." The contention denoted by both noun and verb could be linguistic and sapiential, as it is in *Solomon and Saturn* ("ic flitan gefrægn on fyrdnægum modgleawe men, middangeardes ræswan, gewesan ymb hyra wisdom" [vv.179-181] and "we on geflitum sæton" [v. 432]) and in Bede's description of the debate between Augustine and the Celtic clergy about the date of Easter ("Pa heo Pa hæfdon longe spræc ond geflit ymb Pa þing").
On other occasions, the contest was physical. Thus, in *Beowulf*, Beowulf and Breca compete in a nautical endurance test ("'Eart pu se Bewoulf, se Pe wiþ Brecan wunne/ on sidne sæ ymb sund flite,'" vv. 506-7), and the exuberant Danes race their horses on their way back from Grendel's mere ("Hwilum heapeorofe hleapon leton / on geflit faran fealwe mearas" [vv. 864-5] and "Hwilum flitende fealwe stræte/ mearum mæton," [vv. 916-7]). The translator of Bede uses the noun, *gefliht*, in a similar fashion to describe a horse race proposed by the young followers of Wilfrid.\(^{18}\) In addition, the verb *flitan* could denote outright warfare, as it does in the Laud Ms. Chronicle entry for 777: "Her Cynewulf and Offa geflyton ymb Benesingtun." Significantly, the corresponding entry in the Parker Chronicle is "Her Cynewulf ond Offa gefuhton ymb Benesingtun."\(^{19}\) That the nominal cognate of *flyting* probably had similar associations is suggested in *Beowulf* when the poet says that Unferþ begins his famous quarrel with Beowulf as if loosing a war-speech ("Unferþ mapelode ... onband beadurune," vv. 499-501)\(^{20}\) thereby implying that this exchange is both quarrel and battle. The use of *flitan* in Eadwine's *Canterbury Psalter*, Psalm 63, also suggests a connection between flying and fighting, for here "fliton" corresponds to the Latin "disputaverunt," and denotes the behaviour of the psalmist's enemies who use their tongues like swords and aim their words like arrows:

\[
\begin{align*}
[63.4] &\text{Forþæn hy hwetten swæ sweord tungen heora hy } \\
&\text{onþenedon ond beheoldon bogæn þing biter [63.5] pet } \\
&\text{hy scotigen ond strelion on dygelnesse þa unwemme } \\
[63.6] &\text{Ferlice scotigen hine ond ne ondredon hy } \\
&\text{trymedon him word yfel hy getældon ond fliton þæt } \\
&\text{hy hyddon grino hy cweþon hwylc gesihþ hie.}\(^{21}\)
\end{align*}
\]

These glosses certainly suggest a connection between flying and fighting, but the exact nature of the fight -- whether it is actual or metaphoric -- remains unspecified and problematic. Furthermore, we learn nothing from these
glosses about either the truth or fictionality of flyting utterances, or about the formal constraints (if any) which govern the exchange.

Despite the tantalizing ambiguity of these glosses, critics of AS literature have only recently begun detailed examinations of the convention. An early exploration of flyting, Anderson's 1970 dissertation, "Verbal Contests in OE Literature," provides a lucid introduction to this puzzling genre. Anderson classifies flyting as a kind of "verbal contest." "Verbal contests," he explains, are dialogues which are characterized by four particular "stylistic features": "conflicting frames of reference between speakers," "modulation of tone from one speech to another," "the use of verbal echoes" which often become ironic in the context of conflicting frames of reference, and an "ethical proof" usually marked by the phrase, "so π ic secge" (pp. 18-19). The purpose of verbal contests is to "emphasize the discourse as a clash of wills between two characters" (p. 20). Flyting as a species of verbal contest is realized in two forms: "battle flyting" and "court flyting." Anderson defines the former as "an exchange of challenges, insults or invective between two warriors preceding physical combat" (p. 28). Battle flyting not only possesses the four defining stylistic traits of verbal contests, but in addition is identified by the presence of two "motifs." The first of these, the "identity motif," consists of the flyter's assertion of his worth through a rehearsal of illustrious ancestry, and the second, the "settlement motif," refers to the offer of some alternative to combat as a resolution of the quarrel (p. 29). Anderson cites quarrels in Hildebrandslied, Waltharius, Maldon and Guðlac A as examples of battle flyting.22 "Court flyting" on the other hand, is a quarrel which "interrupts the festivity or ceremonial dignity of the court" (p. 66) and consists of insults and taunts intended to test either the stranger newly arrived at court, or the court itself. Lokasenna, the green knight's quarrel
with Arthur and Gawain in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, and Unferth's dispute with Beowulf are all examples of court flyting (see Anderson's chapter three).

Anderson's study is important for two reasons. First, he suggests some distinguishing features easily discerned in a text (such as verbal echoes, changing frames of reference, and motifs of identity and settlement) which help to identify flyting. Second, while he clearly establishes the agonistic nature of flyting, Anderson recognizes that not all flytings express this implicit aggression in actual violence or battle. Indeed, his identification of "battle" and "court" variants of flyting suggests that flyting may be composed of two differing sub-genres. This is an important perception for it suggests a solution to the Brodeur/Eliason impasse, as I shall show below.

There are, however, difficulties with Anderson's treatment. Some of the features which he uses to identify flyting are too general to be very useful: speakers' changes of tone and assertions of truth are the commonplaces of many kinds of quarrel and thus seem inadequate to distinguish flyting from other forms of debate. In addition, by insisting that flyting is a narrative device (p. 67) Anderson excludes Scandinavian flyting texts like *Arrow-Odd* and *HarbarPsliop* from the flyting genre. Finally, Anderson does not address the issue of truth and deceit in flyting speech.

In her analysis of flyting in "The Germanic Context of the Unferth Episode," Clover amplifies Anderson's list of the commonplace motifs of flyting. Flyting, she says, usually occurs either outdoors near water or indoors within a hall (p. 447). Flyters may be male or female, and on occasion secondary figures or delegates, speaking "on behalf of or instead of major figures" (p. 450). Not surprisingly, they are usually eloquent (p. 451). She, like Anderson, notes the importance of identifying statements in flyting, especially when the participants are unknown to each other:
Flytings ... between unknown or unrecognized persons open with an exchange of stylized questions and answers which establish name, paternity, and credentials. Although the greeting may be polite ... it more typically takes the form of a baiting provocation (p. 450).

Recitations of genealogy are followed by "boasts and insults ... with an admixture of threats, curses or vows" (p. 453). Flyters typically boast about physical, military or sexual prowess, and insult their opponents with allegations of cowardice, various species of "heroic failure" (for example, defeat in battle, p.453), sexual peculiarities, or fratricide. Threats include the promise of physical violence, or perhaps more specific curses like "'Go where the devils shall have you!'" Vows, on the other hand, promise "positive action" (p. 453). The flyting is resolved when one of the participants is silenced (p. 459).

Clover also enumerates additional rhetorical features of flyting, which like Anderson's "conflicting frames of reference" and "verbal echoes" give flyting its distinctive martial tone by creating a linguistic equivalent to the exchange of blows. For instance, Clover discerns in flyting an overall structure of accusation, defense and counter-accusation in which claims and accusations consisting of "insults and boasts" coupled with "threats, vows or curses" are parried by defensive replies which use balanced concessive clauses to initiate a counter-attack of additional insult and threat. This reciprocity of attack and counter-attack is further reinforced on the syntactic level by "questions and answers, counterposed speeches, recurrent phrases and symmetrical reasoning" (p. 453). The use of direct address and "emphatic pronoun contrasts" (p. 453) also contributes to flyting's combative tone. Clover argues that this insistent verbal reciprocity, coupled with the martial terminology often used to describe flyting, transforms this kind of quarrel into a verbal war:
the use of martial terms and images (apparent even 
in the homiletic Vainglory) and the emphasis on winning and losing make it clear that the flyting is not just a prelude to violence but itself the oral equivalent of war (p. 452).

For Clover, then, flyting is "a verbal combat complete in itself" (p. 459) in which the only weapons used are words.

Inevitably, other critics advance differing views of flyting structure. Parks, for example, argues that Clover's paradigm of claim, defense and counterclaim is too general, and he seems to discount her more specific discussion of the verbal features of flyting. He proposes instead a "grammar" of flyting speech which includes typical kinds of speech, and typical purposes underlying these speeches:

the flyter (1) identifies his adversary, (2) "retrojects" or refers back to some past event or fact, (3) projects some future claim of actions or state of affairs, (4) evaluates and / or attributes (implicitly evaluative) qualities to himself or his adversary, (5) compares himself with his adversary, and (6) intends through his speech to act upon his adversary ("Ritual and Narrative," p. 161).

The first three elements of Parks' "grammar" are particularly helpful because they are characteristics of flyting speech which are potentially discernible within a written discourse, and therefore give us an additional linguistic means of distinguishing flyting speech from that found in other dialogues and debates. They also suggest that flyting may be profitably examined according to the premises of Speech Act Theory, a topic which I shall explore shortly. However, Parks' paradigm, as he himself admits, is no more generally applicable than is Clover's model.

Other efforts to define a universal flyting form have encountered similar difficulties. Harris, for example, proposes that senna, a Scandinavian variant of flyting, is an exchange consisting of at least four speeches:
there is a Preliminary, comprising an Identification and Characterization, and then a Central Exchange, consisting of either Accusation and Denial, Threat and Counterthreat, or Challenge and Reply or a combination; these structural elements are realized through a more or less regular alternation of speakers, first in question and answer, then comment and reply.\textsuperscript{32}

Although this pattern is a good general description of flyting, it is not true for all flyting, as Harris recognizes.\textsuperscript{33} Another scholar, Francelia Clark, bases her analysis of flyting upon the Unferp / Beowulf flyting. This leads her to conclude that each flyting speech "breaks into distinct rhetorical subdivisions: an address, an insult, a story, the significance of the story in the past, a conclusion for the present" ("Flyting in Beowulf," p. 177). This analysis, too, is not valid for all flyting.

Clearly, then, although there is little doubt that flyting is an agonistic dialogue, there is considerable doubt about the genre's more specific attributes. This is scarcely surprising, for flyting is neither a mathematical formula nor a scientific principle, but a literary artefact, and therefore, almost by definition, resists precise description and classification. In such a situation, Clover's assessment of the genre seems best. She is able for the most part to resist dogmatic prescriptions and yet to provide a portrait of flyting in both general and specific terms which allows us to distinguish flyting speech from the speeches found in other adversarial dialogues.

Clover is less convincing when she addresses another question posed at the beginning of this chapter: is flyting speech true or can it be deceitful? On the one hand, Clover argues that flyting charges are factual:

far from being 'unfounded taunts,' flyting charges are, at least in the hands of the chief practitioners, deadly accurate: the art of the boast lies in creating, within the limitations of the facts, the best possible version of the event;
and the art of the insult lies in creating, within the limitations of the facts, the worst possible version of the event ("Germanic Context," p. 459).

On the other hand, when she provides an extensive catalogue of commonplace topics, Clover also seems to be arguing that boasts and insults are conventional (pp. 445-6). Certainly, Clover is correct in asserting the truth of some flyting utterance. It is doubtful, however, that all flyting utterance is factual. For instance, Davidson observes that in his flyting with the Danish bully, Grep, Erik Disertus wins by replying to personal insult with "proverbial sayings." Such maxims represent the received truths valued by society, and as such are closer to cliché than to factual statement. The conventionality of many other flyting utterances cannot be disputed, for some boasts and insults occur again and again in flyting texts, and the very fact of their recurrence coupled with their sometimes bizarre content suggests that they are formulaic rather than factual. Certainly it would strain credulity to believe the truth of the many instances of human and equine sexual congress alleged by ON flyters. It seems likely therefore that flyting boasts and insults may be a blend of fact and fiction.

Most recently, Parks has devoted his dissertation, several articles and a book to the study of flyting. Although he uses the noun "flyting" in a more general sense than I do, he nonetheless has some interesting points to make about the genre which are relevant to my discussion. Unfortunately, however, he, too, fails to resolve satisfactorily the persistent cruces of flyting's relationship to fighting and to truth.

In his dissertation, Parks analyzes the different components of flyting discourse according to the constraints of Speech Act Theory. Simply put, this theory assumes that any statement or utterance has a behavioural dimension. According to one model proposed:
the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining ... etc.\textsuperscript{40}

This speech act can be subdivided into as many as three parts. Pratt gives a description, explaining that

to make an utterance is to perform an act. A person who performs a speech act does at least two and possibly three things. First, he performs a locutionary act, the act of producing a recognizable grammatical utterance in the given language. Second, he performs an illocutionary act of a certain type. 'Promising,' 'warning,' 'greeting,' 'reminding,' 'informing,' or 'commanding' are all kinds of illocutionary acts.\textsuperscript{41}

The third act performed by the speaker is "perlocutionary." That is, a speaker

by saying what he says ... may be achieving certain intended effects in his hearer in addition to those achieved by the illocutionary act. By warning a person one may frighten him, by arguing one may convince, and so on (Towards a Speech Act Theory, p. 81).\textsuperscript{42}

Perlocutionary effects may also include consequences unintended in the original illocution.\textsuperscript{43}

Although the success of any illocution is dependent on its fulfillment by perlocutionary consequences,\textsuperscript{44} the exact nature of this fulfillment varies with the type of illocution. For instance, the act of saying\textsuperscript{45} is successful to the extent that the stated proposition conforms to truth. The speech acts of permitting and commanding,\textsuperscript{46} however, require the hearer's obedience, while the acts of predicting and promising\textsuperscript{47} may require in addition that events in the external world beyond either the speaker's or hearer's
control conform to the contents of the utterance if the illocution is to be successful.

From the perspective of flyting analysis, the most important consequence of this theory is that an utterance must achieve some kind of extra-linguistic fulfillment or confirmation either in the events of the real world or in the deeds of the speaker. AS poets' disdain for the false or unfulfilled boast (idel gyLP) suggests that they, too, recognized that speech which lacked behavioural validation was somehow deficient. Parks suggests that a recognition of this behavioural dimension of speech is central to an understanding of flyting. He observes that the utterances which comprise flyting are speech acts of particular types, demanding their own particular kinds of fulfillment. Using Searle's taxonomy of speech acts (or illocutions) Parks argues that flyting consists chiefly of "assertives," or speech acts which "commit the speaker ... to something else being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition;" of "directives" which "try 'to get the hearer to do something';" and of "commissives" which "commit the speaker to some future course of action." He classifies narration and some forms of insult as assertives; inquiries, pleas and some threats as directives; and boasts, promises and other threats as commissives. The most interesting consequence of Parks' analysis is that when boast, an acknowledged staple of flyting, is examined according to the illocutionary patterns which he proposes, it is transformed into two distinct illocutions or speech acts -- "retrojective" boast and "projective" boast. The former, which includes the recitation of genealogies and past achievements typical of the flyting identity motif is really narration, and therefore subject to propositional and historical validation rather than behavioral validation, while "projective" boast, which anticipates future events, must be fulfilled by deeds or future circumstance, as befits both commissive and directive illocutions (pp. 170-1). We might anticipate, then, that
quarrels in which speakers omit projective boast and directive utterance, and concentrate instead on self-aggrandizing recitations of past glories and retrojective insults are less vulnerable to behavioral tests of truth than are quarrels which contain chiefly vows, promises and threats, whose accuracy can be easily measured against future events.

The fact that a boast may be either assertive or commissive suggests a possible solution to the flyting/fighting and flyting/truth dilemma which plagues flyting criticism, for as I have already hinted above, we might extrapolate from the two forms of boast, two corresponding forms of flyting, depending on which kind of boast predominates in the exchange, and whether any directive utterance is aimed at either participant. One variant of flyting then would consist largely of retrojective utterances. This form of flyting would be game-like, awarding victory to wit rather than truth, and freed from the constraints of behavioral validation would cause no physical fight. Co-existing with this game-like flyting would be another kind of flyting composed chiefly of projective boasts and directives whose truth can be tested by deeds.

The hypothesis that there is a game-like version of flyting in heroic Germanic literature gets some support from Scandinavian literature. As I have already noted, Clover refers to two kinds of quarrel found in Northern Germanic texts -- senna and mannaafnapr -- which she believes are implicit in flyting ("Germanic Context," p. 445). The mannaafnapr or "comparison of men" is a verbal contest based on boasts. It is intended to determine in an entertaining fashion, which of the participants is the better man. Senna is also a verbal contest, but here the competition is more serious, and resembles a legalistic dispute about some impersonal truth, even if it still contains a large dollop of personal insult. Most significant for my argument, however,
is the fact that neither mannjafnafn nor senna is directly associated with subsequent fight, for both quarrels replace physical combat with either linguistic wit or gnomic wisdom. Indeed, Pizarro argues that if a fight does follow one of these exchanges, it is a sign that the quarrel has degenerated into yet another and more vicious form of dialogue -- the abusive and illegal nip contest, renowned for precipitating violence (pp. 3-5). Although, beyond these general distinctions, the exact parameters of senna and mannjafnafn have proven difficult to ascertain (partly because, as Clover observes, "neither category has a pure representative") there seems little disagreement that many extant flyting texts are a combination of senna and mannjafnafn, and thus are game-like contests which require no validation in deeds.

Parks, however, does not use the presence of retrojective boast or projective boast as a means of classifying flyting. Indeed, he denies that there are two versions of flyting in heroic literature. He describes flyting as a "verbal disputation with an ad hominem orientation" comprised of "mental operations" which usually include the identity motif (similar to that described by Anderson) and insults, coupled with retrojective and projective boasts (pp. 287-91). Parks uses a version of the settlement motif to establish the connection between flyting and fighting:

... the link between the flyting and the fighting consists in the contract that the flyting produces. To recapitulate: flyting is defined as an adversative verbal exchange in which the heroes, even as they contend with each other for kleos or glory, are contracting on some future course of action from a range of possibilities at least one of which entails a trial by arms.

Clearly, this serious form of flyting does exist, as many other critics recognize. Elsewhere, however, Parks
acknowledges a "ludic" form of flyting and includes this kind of flyting, as well as "heroic" flyting and other forms of verbal contest, in a classification scheme which categorizes these dialogues according to four variables: subject matter, referential mode, locus of resolution and context. A given contest, then, may contain subject matter which ranges from the personal to the intellectual; it may have a referential mode (or intention) which is either serious, truthful and literal, or ludic and fictional; it may find its resolution in deeds external to the contest, or within the verbal exchange itself; and finally, it may reflect a conflict within a single society or between societies ("Flyting, Sounding, Debate," pp. 445-50). The subject matter of heroic flyting is "contestant-oriented," its referential mode is serious, its locus of resolution is "external" and its context is "inter-social." Ludic flyting differs from its heroic counterpart in its referential mode, which is clearly fictional and in its locus of resolution which is internal (pp. 450-2).

Although this analysis suggests useful distinctions between the two forms of flyting, Parks argues that "ludic" flyting does not occur in heroic literature:

Flyting, as it appears in early traditional heroic narrative, designates an exchange of insults and boasts between two heroes .... Exchanges of this kind are usually charged with military overtones and frequently preface some kind of a trial of arms .... In fact, we should probably distinguish this kind of serious or 'heroic' flyting from the more playful or 'ludic' type of exchange represented, for example, in William Dunbar's 'The Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie' (1979), or Alexander Montgomerie's 'Polwart and Montgomerie's Flyting' (1887) ("Flyting, Sounding, Debate," p. 441).

This elimination of "ludic" flyting from heroic literature produces some puzzling results. For instance, if Parks eliminates game-like flyting from Germanic literature by insisting that the flyting exchanges found there are serious
and heroic (or in other words contain only truthful utterances, and are resolved by combat) what is he to do with Beowulf's quarrel with Unferþ? Parks may assert that the Beowulf/Unferþ flyting is, in his terminology, both serious and heroic (pp. 450-1), but many scholars would disagree. Eliason, as we have seen, considers the whole dispute to be a collection of "whopping lies," and together with Silber and Clover believes that the flyting is won verbally without a fight, while Frank proposes that the flyting includes a skaldic word game. However, because Parks has excluded ludic flyting from heroic literature, his taxonomy is unable to accommodate such an interpretation. Two other exemplary flyting texts, Harbarþsliðr and Lokasenna, (as I shall show below) are also resolved within the contest and therefore present a similar challenge to Parks' taxonomy. It seems clear, then, that although Parks provides a good description of game-like flyting, he is incorrect in excluding this kind of flyting from heroic Germanic texts.

What tentative conclusions can be drawn from this review of the critical literature on flyting? Certainly, flyting is a protean convention which eludes precise definition. This elusiveness appears to stem from a double nature, for it seems that depending on the kind of utterance it contains, flyting may be either a witty game composed of fictions and exaggerations, or it may be a serious quarrel which will end in bloodshed. Accordingly, distinctions between types of flyting may be better embodied by Parks' terminology, which potentially distinguishes flyting types according to the seriousness of their utterances, than they are by Anderson's taxonomy, which distinguishes "court" from "battle" flyting according to non-linguistic features such as setting and participants.

Second, each form of flyting may favour particular motifs. Thus, although the identity motif may be found in both kinds of flyting, it will be especially significant in ludic flyting because this motif is usually expressed in
retrojective utterances like genealogies and self-agrandizing histories ("Ritual and Narrative," p. 164) which lend themselves to verbal games of "mirroring" and "surpassing." The settlement motif, on the other hand, seems likely to be more prominent in serious or battle flyting because it is usually uttered in conjunction with a commissive threat.

Is there anything which unites these two sub-genres of flyting? Both are usually concerned with issues of fame and reputation, but both can also sometimes discuss more impersonal issues. Both are also characterized by the persistent verbal reciprocity described by Clover. Ad hominem insults delivered in direct address, emphatically contrasted personal pronouns, parallel syntactic structures, and verbal repetitions all endow boasts, insults and threats with an acrimony and aggression which transforms flytings of both types into verbal battles. Indeed, it is this association with warfare, whether actual or metaphoric, which finally seems to define flyting and to separate it from other milder forms of debate.

What textual evidence is there to support these claims? The literary tradition of adversarial dialogues is an old one, finding its earliest written expression in the classical epic. Bowra describes one form of these quarrels:

Two warriors are somehow separated from the general throng and confront one another. They hold a parley asking each other about their names and families and after this they fight.

A brief examination of the parley between Achilles and Aeneas in Book Twenty of the Iliad shows that such exchanges resemble serious or battle flyting in that the implication of a projective boast helps to turn the quarrel into a fight. Achilles addresses Aeneas in the midst of battle, suggesting that he is a fool fighting not for the prestige of ruling a
kingdom but for the trivial reward of governing an acre of farmland:

'...Does the desire in your heart drive you to combat in hope you will be lord of the Trojans, breakers of horses, and of Priam's honour? And yet even if you were to kill me Priam would not because of that rest such honour on your hand. 

...Or have the men of Troy promised you a piece of land ... fine ploughland and orchard for you to administer if you kill me?' (Bk. XX, vv. 179-86)

Having thus challenged Aeneas' motivation, Achilles relates his view of Aeneas' skill in fighting in a retrojective utterance:

'Another time before this, I tell you, you ran from my spear. Or do you not remember when, apart from your cattle, I caught you alone, and chased you in the speed of your feet down the hills of Ida headlong, and that time as you ran you did not turn to look back' (vv. 187-90).

Achilles concludes with a projective boast about his own capacity to injure the would-be farmer, Aeneas, adding for good measure that if Aeneas does not see the danger he is in, then he is a fool:

'... I myself urge you to get back into the multitude, not stand to face me, before you take some harm. Once a thing has been done, the fool sees it' (vv. 196-8).

Aeneas answers Achilles' attack by emphasizing that Achilles' boast requires the confirmation of deeds. He himself indulges in a safer retrojective boast, identifying himself as the son of a goddess:

'Son of Peleus, never hope by words to frighten me as if I were a baby. I myself understand well enough
how to speak in vituperation and how to make insults.
You and I know each other's birth,
....
I ... claim I am the son of great-hearted Anchises
but that my mother was Aphrodite' (vv. 200-9).

Aeneas concludes his speech with the assertion that Achilles
has lied, and a prediction about his own behaviour -- he
promises that no amount of talk will deter him from combat:

'But what have you and I to do with the need for
squabbling
and hurling insults at each other, as if we were two
wives
who when they have fallen upon a heart-perishing quarrel
go out into the street and say abusive things to each
other,
much true, and much that is not ...
You will not by talking turn me back from the strain of
my warcraft' (vv. 251-6).

The two heroes begin to fight, each hoping to enhance his
reputation by confirming with deeds what he has already
asserted with words.

A similar combination of boast, insult and self-
congratulatory genealogy is implicit in some Roman accounts
of Germanic battle practice and suggests roots for flyting
may lie in an historical version of the classical epic
parley. Tacitus provides one such anecdote in his account of
the "praise and calumny" exchanged by Vitellius and his
German supporters with Otho at Placentia:

illi ut segnem et desidem et circo ac theatris
corruptum militem, hi peregrinum et externum
increpabant. Simul Othonem ac Vitellium
celebrantes culpantesve uberioribus inter se
probris quam laudibus stimulabantur.75

Although it is impossible to infer from this what was
actually said, the passage is certainly evidence of "mutual
abuse" similar to that exchanged in both epic parley and
flyting. Once again, battle provides the resolution of the
dispute.
Opland suggests that such Germanic pre-battle exchanges may also have had a "eulogistic" ingredient (p. 47) akin to the genealogical claims of Aeneas, and to the identity topos of flying as well. Opland finds evidence of such eulogistic performances among Germanic peoples in Ammianus Marcellinus' reference to Goths' pre-battle praise of their ancestors:

Barbari veto [sic] maiorum laudes clamoribus stridebant inconditis, interque varios sermonis dissoni strepitus, leviora proelia temptabantur (Opland, p. 49).

Projective boast seems also to have occurred in these Germanic battle parleys, for Ammianus describes the Goths' custom of swearing anticipatory oaths before battle ("barbari postquam inter eos ex more iuratum est").

Most of the features of the battle parley in classical literature and in historical anecdote reappear in literary flying, for as we have seen, critics judge genealogies, boasts and insults to be commonplaces of flying. These are certainly evident in the early Germanic lay Hildebrandslied, which describes the ill-fated encounter between Hadubrand and his father, Hildebrand, at the head of their opposing armies:

Hildebrand spoke ... he was the older man, wiser in life. With few words he began to ask who the other's father might be .... 'If you tell me one [name], youth, I will know the others in the kingdom. The whole race is known to me.' Hadubrand spoke, Hildebrand's son: 'Our people, old and wise ... told me that my father was called Hildebrand; I am called Hadubrand. Long ago he went off to the east .... He was always at the head of the army; fighting was very dear to him; he was known ... to bold men. I do not think he is still alive.'

'I call to witness,' [said Hildebrand.] '... that never before have you come to an encounter with such a closely-related man!' Then he wound from his arm twisted rings .... 'Now I give this to you as a token of good favor.'

Hadubrand spoke, the son of Hildebrand: 'With a spear should a man receive [such] gifts ... Old Hun, you are very cunning ... you have practised
Here, the conventional flyting recitation of genealogy becomes the ironic centre of the poem because Hadubrand although boasting of his illustrious ancestry fails to recognize that the father he praises now confronts him. Hildebrand cannot convince Hadubrand of his identity and his settlement offer of a ring is reciprocated with the point of a spear, a threat, and an insult (Hatto, p. 168). Hildebrand responds to his son's threats with an anticipation of the grim alternatives before him:

'... now shall my own child hew me with a sword, lay me low with his blade, or I will become his slayer. However if your strength is sufficient, you may now easily win the armour, seize the booty from such an old man, if you have any right to it' (p. 149).

The two men, impelled by the insults and challenges of flyting, fall tragically to fighting.

Flyting is central to much of the tenth-century Waltharius, a Germanic text written in Latin. Here, I shall limit my discussion to two examples. Waltharius, a hostage to Attila, escapes, and sets out for his home with fellow hostage, Hildgunde. Unfortunately, on their journey they are trapped in a cave by the greedy Frankish king, Gunther, who is eager to wrest from Waltharius the treasures that he and Hildgunde have taken from Attila's court. One by one, Gunther sends his warriors to Waltharius' cave where they fight after exchanging insults and threats.

In the first of these exchanges the warrior, Gamalo, inquires about Waltharius' identity, then boastfully asserts his own merits by emphasizing the power of his lord, Gunther. This identity motif, although expressed in Latin, has some of the rhetorical features of flyting: the participants
address each other directly, there are signs of intentional pronoun contrast, as well as some verbal repetition:

'Dic, homo, quisnam sis. Aut unde venis? Quo pergere tendis?' Heros magnanimus respondit talia dicens 'Sponte tua venias an hoc te miserit ullus, scire velim.' Camalo tunc reddidit ore superbo 'Noris Guntharium regem tellure potentem me mississe tuas quaesitum pergere causas' (vv. 587-93).\(^{82}\)

Although Waltharius says his identity is none of Gamalo's concern, he nonetheless answers Gamalo, apparently reading none of Bax's "pragmatic" implications in the request (see n. 54 above). Gamalo in turn replies with a directive utterance commanding Waltharius to accept a settlement:

'Tibi iam dictus per me iubet heros ut cum scriniolis equitem des atque puellam. Quod si promptus agis, vitam concedet et artus' (vv. 601-3).\(^{83}\)

Waltharius responds with an insult, observing that Gunther's words have no power over him because they are not matched by deeds:

'Sultius effatum me non audisse sophistam arbitror. En memoras, quod princeps nescio vel quis promittat, quod non retinet nec fors retinebit. An deus est, ut iure mihi concedere possit vitam? Num manibus tetigit? Num carcere trusit' (vv. 605-9).\(^{84}\)

He then proposes an alternative settlement ("'armillas centum de rubro quippe metallo/ factas transmittam, quo nomen regis honorem,'" vv. 613-4) which Gamalo refuses after consultation with his king. A second exchange consisting of insults, threats and another settlement offer ensues (vv. 646-63). The flyting ends in violence when Gamalo issues a directive backed up with a projective threat:
'Amplificabis' ait 'donum, dum scrinia pandis. Consumare etenim sermones nunc volo cunctos. Aut quaesita dabis aut vitam sanguine fundes.' Sic ait et triplicem clipeum collegit in ulnam et crispans hastile micans vi nititur omni ac iacit (vv. 665-70). 85

Waltharius' subsequent flyting with Ekivrid also contains an identity topos coupled with insult and is cast in flyting's adversarial rhetoric of direct address, pronoun contrast and verbal echo or mirroring, and ends in combat. Ekivrid initiates the exchange:

'Dic' ait 'an corpus vegetet tractabile temet sive per aerias fallas, maledicte, figuras. Saltibus assuetus faunus mihi quippe videris.' Illeque sublato dedit haec responsa cachinno 'Celtica lingua probat te ex illa gente creatum, cui natura dedit reliquas ludendo praeire. At si te propius venientem dextera nostra attingat, post Saxonibus memorare valebis, te nunc in Vosago fauni fantasma videre.' 'Attemptabo quidem quid sis' Ekivrid ait ac mox ferratam cornum graviter iacit (vv. 761-71). 86

A similarly serious flyting occurs in the OE "Battle of Maldon." 87 The poem recounts a battle between invading Viking raiders and AS forces led by Byrhtnoþ, a thane of King ÆGPelred. Whether the poem conforms to historical fact has been much debated by scholars, as has its expression of a secular or a sacred ethic. While these questions are important, they are peripheral to my argument, and I shall therefore pass over them in order to concentrate on the features of the flyting itself. 88

The flyting in "Maldon" begins with the Viking messenger's subtle boast that he and his companions are superb warriors ("se on beot abead ... 'Me sendan to þe sæmen snelle,'" vv. 27-9). He follows this self-serving identification with a particularly demeaning settlement offer in which he gives Byrhtnoþ and his men permission to placate the Vikings with treasure ("þu most sendan ... beagas," vv. 27-9).
Lest the Anglo-Saxons miss the thrust of his remarks he adds that it would be better for them to offer treasure than risk a fight against such a powerful enemy:

'... pu most sendan raðe
beagas wið gebeorge; and eow betere is
pæt ge pisne garræs mid gafeole forgylædæ
pon[ne] we swa hearde [hi]lde deælon.
Ne purfe we us spillæn gif ge spedæp to ðam;
we willæp wið ðam golde grip fæstnian.
Gyf pu ðæt geraedæst þe her ricost eart,
pæt pu pine leoda lyan wille,
syllæn sæmannæ on hyra sylfra dom
feoh wið freode and niman frið æt us,
we willæp mid ðam sceattæm us to scype gægan,
on flot feræn, ond eow friðæs healdæn' (vv. 30b-41).

As the passage shows, the Viking is an able rhetorician and uses the devices of flyting to good effect. Not only does he contrast first and second person pronouns to emphasize the implicit opposition of Viking and AS positions, he sometimes couples these pronouns with auxiliary verbs which suggest the weakness of the Anglo-Saxons. Thus the demeaning "pu most ... sendan" is implicitly contrasted with the more forceful "we willæp ... fæstnian" and "we willæp ... gægan," in which the auxiliary implies not only futurity, but also volition, and thus emphasizes the Viking determination to obtain AS wealth. On the other hand, the Viking implies, the only exercise of will available to Byrhtnoð is the wish to redeem his people from the Viking threat by subservience to Viking demands ("Gyf ... pu pine leoda lyan wille"). Finally, it should be noted that although this speech contains no overt commissive boast or directive utterance, its import is that if no appeasing treasure is offered, the Vikings will attack. The stage is thus partially prepared for the behavioral validation of combat.

Byrhtnoð prefices his reply with a gesture which indicates his eagerness to fulfill words with deeds ("Byrhtnoð mapæloðæ, bord hafenode, wand wæcne æsc," vv. 42-
3)³¹ then begins a flyting speech containing direct address ("sælida," "Brimmanna boda"), pronoun contrast and verbal echoes which at once mirror the Viking's utterance and redefine its terms, making it plain to the invaders that any treasure they receive will not consist of peaceful tribute, but rather, will consist of weapons embedded in Viking wounds:

'Gehyrst þu, sælida, hwæt þis folc segeþ?
Hi willaþ eow to gafole garas syllan,
ættrynne ord and ealde swurd,
þæa heregeatu þe eow æt hilde ne deah.
Brimmanna boda, abeoð eft ongean,
sege þinum leodum miccie laþre spell,
þæt her stynt unforcþ eorl mid his werode,
þæ þe wile gealgean eþel þysne,
Æþelredes eard, ealdres mines
folc and foldan' (vv. 45-54).

Here Byrhtnœþ counterposes "hi willaþ" to the messenger's "we willaþ," echoes the phrase "þinum leodum," this time to refer to the Viking raiders who must hear Byrhtnœþ's bad news, and provides a variant of "ge þisne gæræs mid gafole forgylæon ... [hi]lde dælon," which reveals the deadly nature of the treasure which the Anglo-Saxons are prepared to give the Vikings.³² For good measure, he adds a short descriptive boast about his own and his troops' merits ("her stynt unforcþ eorl mid his werode").

Byrhtnœþ's speech continues with a complex series of verbal echoes (often coupled with emphatic pronoun contrast) which emphasizes the reciprocity of the quarrel, and the differing view each participant has about the means to acquire treasure ("urum sceattum," "to scype ganggan," "gegangan," and "we gofol syllan" in vv. 54-61 echo words used by the Viking messenger in vv. 30b-41). Like the Viking, he, too, concludes with an ambiguous future auxiliary, sculan, which with its denotation of prediction,
obligation and compulsion transforms Byrhtnoþ's utterance into a projective boast:

'... Feallan sceolon hapene at hilde. To heanlic me þinceþ þæt ge mid urum sceattum to scype gongan unbefohtene, nu ge þus feor hider on urne eard in becomon. Ne sceole ge swa softe sinc gegangan: us sceal ord and ecg æþ geseman, grim guþplega, æþ [w]e gofol syllon' (vv. 54-61).

The concluding words of the exchange, then, seem to demand behavioral validation, and deeds are soon marshalled to support words. The outcome of the battle is not, however, what we might at first anticipate, for Byrhtnoþ and his soldiers suffer a disastrous defeat, and it seems therefore that he may have been guilty of idel crylp, but closer reading of Byrhtnoþ's words shows that the Anglo-Saxons do fulfill their boast. Byrhtnoþ has said only that he and his men will let battle arbitrate between Viking and Anglo-Saxon interests, and that pagans must die in battle. Byrhtnoþ has therefore won his flyting, not only by demonstrating his superior linguistic wit through his mirroring and surpassing of the Viking's utterance, but also by fulfilling his projective boast with his deeds: combat determines the disposition of treasure, and Vikings do die in that combat. In certain circumstances, then, it is possible to win a flyting, even if one loses the battle.

As I have already suggested, this kind of serious pre-battle exchange is not the only form of flyting found in AS and Germanic literature. There is a second kind of flyting less wedded to actual violence than the quarrels discussed thus far, which has affinities with the classical epic exchange called taunting. In taunting, the instigator of the quarrel is a court spokesman or taunter. The taunter could function as a straightforward entertainer ("Taunter," p. 3), but he could also be a source of painful knowledge:
within the comitatus circumstances usually required the taunter to move beyond the role of entertainer ... revealing the 'nihilistic truth,' which is either not grasped by others, or which all might be thinking but dare not voice ("Taunter," p. 4).

This truth could be easily transformed into a "stinging attack" directed at an adversary (often a stranger newly arrived at court) whose verbal response to the taunter's harsh words served as a measure of his merits and coincidentally advanced the plot. Fortunately for the taunter, his activities were sanctioned by the court and he therefore enjoyed immunity from serious reprisal, although as Thersites' fate shows he could not always escape a humiliating beating.

The exchange between Thersites and Odysseus in the Iliad, Book Two, is an example of taunting. Thersites is set apart from his fellows by "his uncommon ugliness." As one "who knew many words" (v. 213) he is accustomed to amuse people with his insults and accusations (vv. 214-5). Thersites introduces into the council of the Greeks the painful truth that Agamemnon's co-opting of Briseis is greedy and that Achilles' lack of response to the insult dishonours him:

'My good fools, poor abuses, you women, not men, of Achaia, let us go back home in our ships, and leave this man [Agamemnon] here by himself in Troy to mull his prizes of honour that he may find out whether or not we others are helping him. And now he has dishonoured Achilleus, a man much better than he is. He has taken his prize by force and keeps her. But there is no gall in Achilleus' heart, and he is forgiving. Otherwise, son of Atreus, this were your last outrage'(vv. 235-42).

Odysseus replies on behalf of both Agamemnon and Achilles, insulting Thersites:
'Fluent orator though you be, Thersites, your words are ill-considered. Stop, nor stand up alone against princes. Out of all those who came beneath Ilion with Atreides I assert there is no worse man than you are' (vv. 246-9).

For good measure, Odysseus threatens Thersites with a humiliating public stripping if he persists in his obnoxiousness, beating Thersites with his sceptre in the meantime.

Another instance of taunting occurs in the Odyssey, Book Eight. Odysseus, a stranger to the Phaecian court, participates in a feast during which he is asked to demonstrate his athletic skills. When he declines, he is rudely challenged by Euryalus:

'... you never learned a sport, and have no skill in any of the contests of fighting men. You must have been the skipper of some tramp that crawled from one port to the next, jam full of chaffering hands: a tallier of cargoes itching for gold -- not, by your looks, an athlete' (vv.160-5).

Odysseus replies with a lecture on the misleading nature of appearances. Only a fool would be so deceived, says Odysseus, adding the insult that his taunter's fine appearance obviously hides an empty head:

'That was uncalled for, friend, you talk like a fool. The gods deal out no gift, this one or any -- birth, brains, or speech -- to every man alike. In looks a man may be a shade, a specter, and yet be master of speech so crowned with beauty that people gaze at him with pleasure ....

A handsome man, contrariwise, may lack grace and good sense in everything he says. You now, for instance, with your fine physique -- a god's indeed -- you have an empty noodle,' (vv. 166-86).
Odysseus, having verbally bested his opponent with the clever use of a truism, goes on to belie his own unprepossessing appearance by outperforming the Phaecians at discus throwing. Alkinoos considers this has resolved the quarrel without ill-will (vv. 236-8).

A comparison of the taunting and parley in classical epic shows that while these adversarial dialogues are both constructed largely from boast and insult, they differ in their connection to actual combat. Unlike the parley, taunting can sometimes be dissociated from subsequent battle. Thus although he is threatened by Odysseus, Thersites remains passive and the beating he receives scarcely approaches the level of warfare, nor does it alter the truth of Thersites' claims about the situation in which the Greeks find themselves. Similarly, the taunter Euryalus emerges unscathed from his dispute with Odysseus. In taunting, then, the emphasis can be on a verbal rather than a physical struggle, and although issues of personal honour may be involved, platitudes such as those recited by Odysseus in reply to Euryalus' insult can win the day.

The final dialogue between Hagen and Waltharius in Waltharius has affinities with such taunting exchanges, as well as with the game-like sub-genre of flyting. After much mayhem and bloodshed initiated by the greed of Gunther, Waltharius and Hagen finally resolve their differences over a cup of wine ("post varios pugnae strepitus ictusque tremendos/ inter pocula scurrili certamine ludent" [vv. 1424-5]). Although this scurrile certamen contains flyting features like direct address and repetition or mirroring, it merits the label of flyting largely because the injuries each warrior has sustained provoke a balanced exchange of insults, as each participant -- one without a hand, the other without an eye -- gleefully anticipates for his opponent the rigors and embarrassments of the life he must now lead, thus maimed:

Francus ait 'Iam dehinc cervos agitabis, amice
Unlike the other flytings in Waltharius, this exchange does not provoke a fight -- Hagen and Waltharius peacefully go their separate ways. A close reading of the two speeches suggests that the difference between this ludic contest and the earlier flytings may lie in the kind of utterance each contains. In this final flyting, even though both Waltharius and Hagen playfully speculate about the future, neither utters either the commissive boasts and threats or the directive illocutions which require the confirmation of deeds. The flying therefore is sufficient unto itself, and the two warriors can part without further bloodshed.

This kind of bloodless flying, often called *senna* or *manniafnapr* by Germanic scholars, can be found in several other texts. Pizarro provides an example of a brief version of this kind of flying, conducted by representatives of Church and state at the doors of a tyrant's palace. The deacon, Thomas, emissary of Bishop Damian, is sent to the tyrant, Alahis, to deliver the bishop's benediction (pp. 36-7). On the threshold of the palace, he is stopped and compelled to enter into an exchange of insults with a messenger of the king. Not only is the setting typical of "court" flying, the dialogue also contains rhetorical
elements of flyting as each speaker echoes the other's utterance:

Nuntiatum est Alahis, Thomam diaconem ante fores adstare benedictionemque ab episcopo detulisse. Tunc Alahis, qui, ut diximus, omnes clericos odio habebat, ita inquit ad suos: 'Ite, dicite illi, si munda femoralia habet, intret; sin autem aliter, foris contineat pedem.' Thomas vero cum hos sermones audisset, ita respondit: 'Nuntiate ei, quia munda femoralia habeo, quippe qui [sic] ea Hodie lota indutus sum.' Cui Alahis ita iterato mandavit: 'Ego non dico de femoralibus, sed de his quae intra femoralia habentur.' Ad haec Thomas ita respondit: 'Ite, dicite illi: Deus solus potest in me in his causis reprehensionem invenire; nam ille nullatenu potest'" (p. 36).

Although, as Pizarro observes, the nature of the insult is obscure (p. 42) it is clearly personal. Thomas, however, replies with an utterance which seems to reconstrue the insult as a statement of a general truth -- perhaps that only God has the right to reproach a man for his physical nature. Whatever the exact implication of Thomas' words, they are sufficient in themselves to win him entry, and involve him in no behavioral validation of his utterance.

Arrow-Odd contains a similar flyting, in that the verbal contest between Arrow-Odd (disguised as Barkman) and the brothers Sjolf and Sigurd at King Herraud's court precipitates no violence. The competition is intended to resolve a wager made by Barkman's friends, Ottar and Ingjald, who bet that Barkman can outdrink Sjold and Sigard. Although the terms of the bet are potentially serious ("'We'll have a bet on it,' said Sjold, 'This twelve ounce bracelet against your heads'"), no harm results. Instead, Barkman's true identity and his natural abilities are revealed to all in an entertaining fashion. The flyting itself is elaborately game-like, with rules which require that each contestant recite in a stanza of a predetermined form ("a boast about a heroic deed followed by an accusation that the opponent was
doing something dishonourable at the same time," [Lönnroth, p. 103]), and consume the contents of one drinking horn for each stanza recited. Of particular interest is the fact that these rules seem to exclude commissive illocutions as well as settlement offers from the contest. Sigurd begins the exchange, saying:

'Odd, you've never split mail-coats in battle when the helmed warriors took to their heels. The war was raging, fire raced through the town when our king won victory over the Wends.

You weren't there, Odd [Barkman] at the clash of weapons when we let the great king's men taste death. From there I brought home fourteen wounds, while you were out begging food from the farmers.'

and Odd [Barkman] replies:

'Listen to my song, you seat-warmers, Sigurd and Sjolf; time to repay you for a nasty piece of knotty poetry, you pair of milksops.

You, Sjolf were flat on the kitchen floor not a single deed, one mark of courage had you dared, when from those four men in Aquitaine I took their lives' (pp. 86-7).

Several features of these lines suggest the verbal equivalent of blow and counter-blow, even though no actual violence is intended. Direct address, emphatic pronoun contrast, and the repeated comparison of deeds accomplished, all contained
within the parallel double stanza format of claim and counterclaim, create the illusion of swordplay. Barkman eventually wins the contest when Sjolf and Sigurd collapse and fall asleep, leaving only Barkman to continue his retrojective boasts according to the decorum of the contest:

\[ 'Now I have listed all the exploits we performed so long ago; rich in victories we returned home to the high-seat. Let Sjolf speak now!' (p. 93). \]

Sjolf, of course, is beyond replying and Barkman's eloquence in recounting his own heroism wins the day.

Harbarpsliod\textsuperscript{104} is another example of a flyting text in which superior wit and not superior strength is at issue. Here Thor, the "good-natured, mighty-thewed, and impetuous but somewhat simple god" (Poetic Edda, p. 74) returns from troll-slaying, and asks the ferryman, Harbarpr, to carry him across the water and thus speed his journey (Harbarpr unbeknownst to Thor, is his own father, Odin, in disguise). Their exchange includes mutual insults and boasts, and is won by the ferryman, Odin/Harbarpr. The encounter begins when Thor demands that the ferryman identify himself:

1. Thor called out: 'Who is the fellow there by the ferry who stands?'

2. The ferryman said: 'Who is the fellow there over the firth who calls?'

Thor provides an identifying genealogy but like Hadubrand, in Hildebrandslied, he fails to recognize that it is the father of whom he is so proud who now confronts him.\textsuperscript{105} Harbarpr, however, keeps his identity secret and provokes Thor with insult and boast, often comically distracting Thor from complying with the rhetorical rules of the contest:
15. Thor said: 'That Hrungnir I fought thou hast heard aright, the stout hearted who a stone bore as a head; yet I did him to death and he bit the dust. What didst thou meanwhile, Harbarth?'

16. The ferryman said: 'Was I with Fjolvar full five winters on that island which is Algren hight There war we waged and waded in blood, tried many deeds, and maidens lured.'

17. Thor said: 'Did you win the love of the women?'

Here, Thor is distracted by the mention of women so that he forgets not only the topics of the exchange (heroic boasts), but also its stanzaic pattern:

What the audience expects is not a single line, but a full stanza; not a question (the form precludes ingenuous questions) but a declarative statement (Denial and Counterclaim); and, of course, poetry not prose ("Harbarpsljóp," p. 131).

The dialogue continues with more insulting exchanges:

23. Thor said: 'In Eastland was I and slew etins wanton wenches who warred on mountains ... What didst thou meanwhile, Harbarth?'

24. The ferryman said: 'In Valland was I and waged battles, urged on the athelings, nor ever made peace. Gets Othin all earls slain by edge of swords but Thor, the breed of thralls.'

Eventually, an exasperated Thor accuses Harbarp of lying:

49. Thor said: 'With wicked words sayst thou what worst would seem to me; but, craven knave, I know that thou liest.'

50. The ferryman said: 'No lie I tell thee. Full late are thou now far hadst thou been had I ferried thee over.'
The fact that the accusation seems not to have been taken too seriously -- Harbarp merely denies it, and does not use it as an excuse to fight -- seems to confirm that more relaxed standards of veracity are applied to retrojective utterances than are applied to projective boasts.

Shortly after this, the flyting ends. Harbarpr wins the contest and refuses to let Thor cross the water, telling him to go away, and effectively silencing him ("'Get thee gone now where all trolls may take thee!'"). Once again eloquence and wit are sufficient to win the verbal war of words.

Erik Disertus' first encounter with Grep, the court bully, on the shores of Denmark is also a flyting which is resolved without a fight. Erik wins the flyting by apparently eschewing the ad hominem insults favoured by Grep, replying instead with "proverbial or gnomic utterances" ("Riddles and Insults," p. 35). Indeed, it seems as if Erik's maxims reach some higher plane of flyting which disdains even a linguistic martiality, for Erik avoids not only combat, but also the use of direct address and emphatic pronoun contrast. Some verbal echoes, however, are still apparent, and, close examination shows that Erik's maxims are apt responses to Grep's insults:

Grep:
'Sulte, quis es? quid inane petis? dic, unde iter aut quo?
Quae via, quod studium, quis pater, unde genus?
Praecipuus vigor iis regumque domesticus est lar,
qui proprias numquam deseruere domos.'
....
Erisus:
'Regno mihi pater est, habitus facundia linguæ
 cui solum virtus semper amata fuit.
Optavi sapere tantum discrimina morum
lustravi, varium perloca nactus iter.
In rebus mens stulta modum deprendere nescit,
turpis et affectus immoderata sui.'
....
Grep:
'Ut gallus caeni, sic litis plenus haberis,
sorde gravis putes nec nisi crimen oles.
Adversum scurram causam producere non est, qui vacua vocis mobilitate viget.
Ericus:
Hercule, ni fallor, ad eum, qui protulit ipsum, editus ignave sermo redire solet.'

...:
Grep:
'Dictorum temere poenas, puer improbe, solves, bubo viae vacuus, noctua luce carens.
Quae nunc ructaris demens, emissa dolebis interituque tui dicta profana lues.
Exanimis corvos exsanguis corpore pasces, esca feris, avidae praeda futurus avi.'

Ericus:
'Auritium timidi pravique assueta voluntas numquam se digno continuere loco.'

...:
Grep:
'Non ego reginam, sicut tu rere, fefelli, sed tenerae tutor condicionis eram.'

Ericus:
'En te cura premit culpae rea, tutior huic est libertas, cui mens intemerata manet' (pp. 112-3).

Grep finally crumbles under Erik's barrage of platitudes, loses his temper and admits defeat, "unable, either through anger or ignorance, to produce the proverbial wisdom needed to counter Erik's charges." Grep's subsequent threat "to avenge his misfortune in the vocal contest by force" ("Insults," p. 128) occurs after the flyting and retroactively confirms Erik's victory in the certamen uocis.

In all these flytings, which like the parley contain insult, boast and identification statements, the exchange resembles a contest or game in which victory is verbal, and silence identifies the loser. Winning here means producing the Wittiest account of one's merits, or the best collection of self-promoting truisms within the constraints of an agreed-upon linguistic format. Thus, Sjold and Sigurd fail to best Barkman because they become too drunk to compose their stanzas; Thor loses because he drifts off-topic and cannot match the ferryman's linguistic skill; and Grep is beaten because he cannot produce a stream of truisms in reply to Erik. But even though outright violence is in abeyance in
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these exchanges, the usual structure of challenge and reply, or claim and counter-claim, augmented by parallel syntax, pronoun contrast, direct address, verbal repetition and the like, insures that these competitions mimic the parry and thrust of actual swordplay.

The flyting between Unferþ and Beowulf (Beowulf, vv. 499-606) may well be another example of such ludic flyting, for it does not end in a fight. There is, however, controversy about this quarrel's truthfulness. Eliason, it will be recalled, argued for the fictionality of the claims made by both Unferþ and Beowulf while Brodeur took Beowulf's accusation about Unferþ so seriously that he invented a fiction to explain the remark:

he [Unferþ] had not shrunk from the murder or betrayal of his brothers; and later ... was to have some part in the conspiracy of Hrothulf (Art, p. 149).112

Eliason and Brodeur differed in their understanding of the flyting's purpose as well. Eliason believed that the function of the episode was to show Beowulf's verbal skill, while Brodeur thought that the flyting established Beowulf's credentials as slayer of water-monsters (p. 145). It may be that there is no single correct solution to these crucibles of interpretation -- the events of the poem neither confirm nor deny the truth of each flyter's claims -- however, the flyting seems to have much in common with the ludic contests of senna and mannjafnæþr, and this suggests that although the flyting may coincidentally show Beowulf's fitness to fight Grendel, it is also a game of linguistic skill in which the accuracy of an utterance is less important than its wit.

What is the testimony of the quarrel itself? In language and organization, it clearly exemplifies flyting.113 Although there are only two speeches, their parallel structure reflects the agonistic reciprocity typical of flyting. Each flyter begins by insulting his opponent (vv.
506-10, vv. 530-1). After his initial insult, Unferp describes Beowulf and Breca's contest (vv. 510-24) and concludes with a contemptuous prediction:

(v. 525) 'ponne wene ic to pe wyrsan geþingea,
peah pu heæporæsa gehwar dohte,
grimre guþe,  gif pu Grendles dearest
nihtlongne fyrst  nean bidan' (v. 528).

Beowulf refutes Unferp's claim with his own account of the Breca contest (vv. 535-81), concluding his defense with a sequence of insults and accusations (vv. 581-601) and a promise to show Grendel the strength of the Geats (vv. 601-603).

Both Unferp and Beowulf are skilful in marshalling the stylistic devices of flyting to suit their rhetorical purposes. For instance, each uses direct address and emphatic pronoun contrast to sharpen his insults. Indeed, in his reply Beowulf manages to counterpoise the first person dual pronoun wit to Unferp's earlier git, all within a larger verbal echo:

Unferp: (v. 506) 'Eart þu se Beowulf,  se þe wit
Brecan wunne,
on sidne sæ  ymb sund flite,
þær git for wlence  wada cunnodon
ond for dolgilpe  on deop water
(510) aldrum neþdon?' Ne inc ænig mon,
ne leof ne lap,  belean mihte
sorhfullne sip,  þa git on sund reon'(v. 512).

Beowulf: (v. 530) 'Hwæt, þu worn fela,  wine min
Unferp,
beore druncen ....ymb Breca spræce, (v. 531)
.....
(v. 535) Wit þæt gecwæden  cnihtwesende
ond gebeotedon -- wæron begen þa git
on geogþfeore ---- þæt wit on garsecg ut
aldrum neþdon,  ond þæt geæfnodon swa.
Hæfðan swurd nacod,  þa wit on sund reon' (vv. 530-539).
Other examples of emphatic pronoun contrast abound. For instance, Unferp's amplification of his insulting query includes a sequence of second person pronouns (pu and git, vv. 513, v. 516, v. 523) emphatically concluded with the vehement ic of his final prediction ("ponne ic wene to be wyrsan geþingea, / þeah pu heþorósa gehwar dohte" vv. 525-6). Beowulf plays this game even more effectively. Not only does he insert ic and wit into his discourse to correspond to Unferp's pu and git (vv. 540, 543, 544, 545 etc.), he re-introduces both second person pronouns at a crucial juncture to imply that it is Unferp and Breca rather than Beowulf who stand convicted of physical and perhaps moral inadequacy:

(v. 583b) 'Breca neþre git
æt heþolace, ne gehwær ðer incer,
swa deorlice ðæd gefremede
fagum sweordum --no ic þæs [fela] gylpe --,
þeah pu þinum broþrum to banan wurde' (v. 587).

Beowulf's speech provides other examples of his skill at rhetorical games. For instance, he sometimes appropriates Unferp's vocabulary to refute Unferp's claims (compare for example, vv. 506-16 and vv. 532-40114) and on other occasions invents elaborate variations on portions of Unferp's speech in order to enhance his own deeds. Thus, Unferp's reference to morgentid (v.518) is amplified by Beowulf into celestial celebrations of his own prowess (vv. 569-72 and vv. 603-6).115

If this rhetorical play suggests a ludic flyting, so, too, do the insults and boasts contained in the exchange, for they are frequent in other flytings ("Germanic Context," p. 453), and thus may be more conventional than accurate. Unferp's derogatory remarks, for example, accuse Beowulf of two common stereotypes of heroic failure -- lack of physical strength (vv. 516-24) and frivolity of character.116 Beowulf's counter-assertion that Unferp is a fratricide is likewise sufficiently commonplace to seem conventional ("Germanic Context," p. 453).117 Unfortunately, we have no
way of judging the reliability of these claims from the
evidence provided by the epic itself. There may, however, be
a way around this impasse. If we apply Parks' insights about
the differences between assertive, commissive, and directive
illocutions to this flyting, it becomes apparent that neither
Unferp’s nor Beowulf’s claims are expressed as commissive or
directive utterances. Instead, they are for the most part
propositional assertions about the past which cannot be
validated by future behavior. The only utterances in the
flyting which predict the future lack the strong sense of
commitment or compulsion typical of the projective boasts and
directives found in battle flyting. Thus, Unferp says only
that he expects Beowulf may have difficulty with Grendel on
account of his past performance (vv. 525-8), and Beowulf,
although not reluctant to portray himself in glowing terms,
restrains himself from predicting that he will actually kill
Grendel, and says instead that he will show him Geatish
strength and courage (vv. 601-6).\textsuperscript{118} The speech acts in this
flyting, therefore, do not seem to need the physical
validation required in more serious battle flytings. Indeed,
like Hagen’s and Waltharius’ final dialogue, it ends
peacefully, and the feasting continues without either man
finding it necessary to fulfill his words with deeds. It is
likely, then, that this quarrel is an example of the ludic
sub-genre of flyting in which victory is awarded to the
wittiest rhetorician rather than to the strongest soldier.

The linguistic martiality of flyting can also be used
by poets to express conflicts of a metaphysical nature. We
have seen signs of this capacity in Paul the Deacon’s account
of Thomas’ flyting with Alahis. In her dissertation, “Verbal
Duels and the Heroic Self,” Swenson develops this idea,
arguing that in sannur

the participants do not assess 'manliness' against
an agreed upon standard; they are not members of
the same social group; they do not share ... a
definition of 'good behavior' (p. 108).
Instead, the hero debates issues of cosmic significance with an often monstrous opponent. In such an exchange, the hero "strives for knowledge, power and order within and against the mysterious context of human life and death" (p. 79; p. 131).119

Considering all the difficulties attendant on proving the separate existence of senna and manniafnapr, we may be rightly suspicious of Swenson's belief that senna alone can convey this metaphysical debate. What is most significant for the purposes of my argument, however, is her recognition that such cosmic issues can find a place in flyting-like contentions. Swenson considers Loki's quarrel with the gods in Lokasenna120 to be a senna with metaphysical import. Loki, a being bizarre even in a gathering of gods, "loathes all living things" (stanza 19, p. 94) and attempts with insulting challenges to bring discord to the gods' feast and to thereby assert the rule of chaos over order121:

Loki said: 'In I shall, though into Aegir's hall --
fain would I see that feast;
brawls and bickering I bring the gods,
their ale I shall mix with evil.'

Similarly in the Helgisagan,122 Swenson argues that Helgi's nocturnal flyting with Hrimgerpr "establishes the hero as destroyer of the monstrous" (p. 116). Here, the orphaned giantess, Hrimgerpr, at first bests Helgi's companion, Atli, in a nip- like insult match which concludes thus:

20. [Hrimgerth said:] .... 'Thou would'st gambol and neigh if gelt thou were not,
now Hrimgerth tosses her tail;
I ween thy heart in thy hinder part be,
though strong like a stallion's they whinny.'

21. [Atli said:] 'A stallion in strength, if I stepped on land,
and frisky, thou would'st find me;
I would beat thee so, if but I wished,
thou would'st lower thy tail in a twinkling.'
22. [Hrimgerth said:] 'On land step then, if thy strength thou trustest:
in Varinsfirth I'll wait thee;
I shall stave thy ribs, steersman Atli,
if thou comest within reach of my claws.'

23. [Atli said:] 'I may not go ....'¹²³

Helgi, not so timorous, defeats the monster by refusing to bandy conventional insults, thereby "placing Hrimgerpr firmly outside the boundary within which one must exist in order to engage in such social conventions" (p. 124):

24. [Hrimgerth said:] 'Awake, Helgi, and to Hrimgerth atone
for felling Hati, her father;
if one night she slept with the warder-of-men
she would hold her harm made good.'

25. [Helgi said:] 'Lothin shall wed thee, hag loathly to men,
the thurs that in Tholl Isle dwells,
that wisest etin and worst of trolls:
there is mate who is meet for thee.'

Helgi's linguistic victory gains him access to privileged cosmic information about his guardian valkyrie (pp. 124-5) but for Hrimgerpr the outcome is less happy. Delayed too long above ground by this exchange, she is exposed to the dawn's light and, like all trolls caught in the sun, is turned into stone.

This discussion of secular flyting texts and their antecedents suggests some tentative resolutions to the problems enumerated at the beginning of this chapter, for although flyting can be identified most reductively as an exchange of boasts, insults, and threats, and can be recognized by a pervasive linguistic reciprocity which mimics the exchange of blows,¹²⁴ the genre is sufficiently various to embrace adversarial dialogues ranging from battle parley in which honour and fame are at issue, to sena's metaphysical debate.¹²⁵ This variety suggests that both Brodeur and
Eliason were correct in their assessment of flyting: some flytings do indeed cause a fight, but other flytings are primarily verbal contests in which physical prowess is less an issue than wit is. The difference seems to depend upon the kind of speech act flyters use: flytings which are chiefly retrojective in outlook for the most part contain assertive utterances (often about the speaker's illustrious genealogy and past accomplishments), and the propositional truth of such illocutions cannot always be readily ascertained. Therefore in these flytings, the contest is one of wit, rather than of veracity or of physical strength. On the other hand, the felicity of commissive illocutions like projective boast is easily tested: the speaker can fulfill his words with his deeds. Flytings which contain a preponderance of commissive utterances, therefore, require a fight to prove the truth of the participants' remarks.

What are the implications of this analysis for OE religious prose and verse? It is clear that despite their differences both forms of flyting can occur in heroic verse, and that both are associated with fighting: ludic flyting is a linguistic war, while serious or battle flyting precipitates actual combat. This association with battle, together with flyting's ability to conduct metaphysical discussions suggests the genre may have been perceived by AS authors as an apt vehicle for the expression of the Christian war of words.126

Do flyting exchanges in fact occur in AS texts which have a sacred rather than a secular provenience? If so, are these disputes mere duplications of secular flyting, or are they changed to suit their new devout context? The remainder of this study will address these two questions, but first I shall examine briefly some early Latin Christian examples of adversarial dialogue which also impinge upon the later Anglo-Latin and OE texts.


3 Clover suggests that the quarrel described in vv. 13-44 of *Vainglory* may be flyting (Carol Clover, "The Germanic Context of the Unferp Episode," *Speculum* 55 [1980], pp. 448-9). *Vainglory* is found in ASPR vol. 3, and the relevant lines are "Bif past æfponca eal gefylled/ feondes fligelpilum facenscearwum" (vv. 26-7, p. 147). Clover does not discuss the relevance of this passage to the Christian war of words.

4 Ward Parks, *Verbal Dueling in Heroic Narrative: The Homeric and Old English Traditions* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990, p. 7). Parks' exclusion of these dialogues is based upon their doctrinal content and the fact that he believes they "do not bring with them the same kind of martial entailments that we will find in Beowulf and the Iliad" (p. 188).

5 Calder refers to the dispute between Juliana and a devil in Juliana, as flyting (Daniel Calder, "The Art of Cynewulf's Juliana," *MLQ* 34 [1973], p. 366), and Bridges agrees, also calling Judas' interaction with the devil in Elenæ, a flyting (Margaret Bridges, *Generic Contrast in Old English Hagiographical Poetry* [Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1984], p. 199 and p. 242).


soundings between strangers the obvious fictionality of an insult is intended to ensure that the utterance will not be interpreted as truthful, and therefore will not provoke a fight (p. 335, p. 339, and p. 341). I shall explore the relationship between truth in flyting speech and subsequent violence later in this chapter.

12 There is no record of any OE noun flyting, so its meaning must be inferred from cognates.


14 Paul Szarmach, ed., Vercelli Homilies: IX–XXII (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1981), 11. 50-5, p. 78. In the twelfth homily in Assmann's collection, the homilist also suggests a pejorative denotation, juxtaposing "idelum geflite" and "woruldlicum spræcem," (Bruno Assmann, ed., Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben, [1889; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964], 1. 12, p. 144). In another homily, however, the noun loses its pejorative connotation, and denotes simply "discussion": "Hio ða mid mycelum ege ut eodon fram ðara cwena and heom betwionan geflit hæfdon and geornlice fohten hwæt seo axung been mihte" (Mary-Catherine Bodden, The Old English Finding of the True Cross [Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1987], l. 116, p. 75). The corresponding Latin is "dicebant intra se" (Finding, p. 74).

15 The Microfiche Concordance to Old English also notes that flitan glosses discipitare, and in the OE Heptateuch (EETS 160), Deut. 9.7, "fliton" and "wunnon" gloss "provociris".


17 Thomas Miller, ed. and trans., The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History (London: EETS o.s. 95/96, 1896) II, 2, l. 21, p. 98. (Hereafter the OE text will be abbreviated OE EH, and all citations will be from Miller). The corresponding Latin is "qui cum longa disputattonem habita ..." (Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors, eds. Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People [Oxford at the Clarendon P, 1969] II, 2, p. 136). A similar use of the noun occurs in Bede's account of another synod which debated whether or not Wilfrid should be appointed bishop: here, conflictus is glossed by geflit (compare OE EH, V, 17, l. 13, p. 464 and Colgrave and Mynors, V, 19, p. 528.

18 OE EH V, 6, pp. 398-400, "ða ongunnan ða/ geongan biddan ... þat he him alefde þat his ærnan moste ond geccunnian, hwelc heora swiftest horns hefde ... Cwaþ þe: Doþ swa gif we gillan: ond hwæþre þat Herebald ... from þæm geflit ahebbe." The relevant lines in the Latin are "... ut Herebald ab illo se certamine funditus abstinat!" (Colgrave and Mynors, V, 6, p. 466).


20 See abridged BT and Klaeber, Beowulf, who translates even more aggressively as "commenced fight." See, too, Eliason, and Clover
21 RSV, Psalm 64. The citation is from Fred Harsley, ed., Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter (London: EETS o. s. 92, 1889). The Latin text is "Quia exacuerunt ut gladium linguas suas intenderunt arcum rem amaram ut sagittent in occultis inmaculatum. Subito sagittabant eum et non timebunt firmaverunt sibi verbum malum disputaverunt ut absconderent laqueos dixerunt quis videbit eos."
22 I omit Anderson's discussion of these texts as they will be examined below. At the risk of anticipating my argument, however, I want to note at this juncture that GuPlac A is the only saint's life to contain a dialogue which Anderson identifies as flying. He calls other adversarial dialogues found in OE verse hagiographies either Wettkampf (portions of Elene, pp. 184-5, and pp. 195-203) or simply verbal contests (Juliana, Genesis B, other portions of GuPlac A, and portions of Elene). As will become clearer, I disagree with this classification for a variety of reasons, but chiefly because it ignores the obvious similarities between the metaphoric martiality of Christian verbal conflict in which God's word functions as a sword (see my chapter below) and the certamen uocis as flying.
23 These manniaafnaPr quarrels probably represent a sub-genre of flying and will be discussed below.
24 These two settings are also mentioned by Anderson. Pizarro agrees and emphasizes that for senna (another Scandinavian sub-genre) these settings can include any threshold -- perhaps a doorway or a cliff-top (Joaquin Martinez Pizarro, "Studies in the Function and Context of the Senna in Early Germanic Literature," Diss., Harvard, 1976, p. 2, p. 11 and p. 101).
26 Clover treats the role of concessive clauses briefly, "The Defense typically involves concessive clauses ('that may be, but')" (p. 452). Bjork also notes that concessive clauses can contribute to a speech's agonistic tone: "clauses of concession set up relatively balanced oppositions in a sentence .... The dynamics of such clauses can therefore become syntactic analogues of a conflict" (Robert Bjork, The Old English Verse Saints Lives [Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1985], p. 39).
27 In her discussion of OE hagiographic verse, Bridges observes that other forms of adversative syntax (such as contrasting clauses of affirmation and negation) create a similar antithetical effect (Generic Contrast, p. 97).
28 Clover cites such martial phrases as altercationum athleta ("champion in argument") and certamen uocis from Saxo. See pp. 451-2 for more examples. Swenson shares her view. Describing Olafsdrapa, she says "the poet depicts words spoken at the 'senna of weapons' as forces which affect the outcome of battle, which shape battle's reality as do the spears" (Karen Swenson, "Verbal Duels and the Heroic Self: Genre Definition in Old Norse Literature," Diss., Cornell, 1987, p. 75).
She reiterates the point in another article, "the flying ... is conceived as a certamen uocis ....The equation between physical and verbal combat with language the equivalent to ammunition is the working metaphor of flying" ("Harbarpsljop," as Generic Farce," Scandinavian Studies 55 [1979] pp. 126-7). Bawcutt shares Clover's view, saying that flying is language intended to hurt and that it is "a kind of sportive warfare" (Priscilla Bawcutt, "The Art of Flying," Scottish Literary Journal 10 [1983], p. 5 and p. 10). 

Hatto, too, provides evidence that flying need not be followed by fighting. He describes the flying-like exchanges which occur in Germanic lays as "bursts of tense dialogue in which words had the status of deeds" (A.T. Hatto, "Medieval German," Traditions of Heroic and Epic Poetry, I [London: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1989], p. 166). Lonnroth reaches a similar conclusion in his study of ON texts. He equates flying with the ON *senna* quarrel (which I shall discuss at greater length below) describing it as "a competitive exchange of boasts and insults ... a party game" (Lars Lonnroth, "The Double Scene of Arrow-Odd's Drinking Contest," Mediaeval Narrative: A Symposium, ed. Hans Bekker-Nielsen, Peter Foote et al. [Odense: Odense U P, 1979] p. 97). 

This view is shared by Silber, who argues that in the Unferf / Beowulf flying which inspired all this controversy, the issues are verbal rather than physical with the participants contending "over ready wit, eloquent speech and telling allusions" (Patricia Silber, "Rhetoric as Prowess in the Unferf Episode," TSLL 23 [1981], p. 473). Finally, Irving, commenting on "The Battle of Maldon," says the "barbed words of the Viking" addressed to the AS nobleman Byrnhnoþ are like spears "deftly caught, ironically accepted, and sent back," (Irving, "Heroic Style", p. 460).


The remaining elements of the grammar "relate to the use of this material (what is intended)" (p. 162). However, this inferred purpose may reside more in the reader's mind rather than in the author's text.

"The typical flying speech will develop by these parameters, performing some and sometimes all of these acts" ("Ritual and Narrative," p. 161).

"The Senna," p. 66.

Parks observes that the Unferf/ Beowulf flying consists of only two speeches and therefore would not comply to these rules (p. 154). The flying in "Maldon" would suffer a similar fate. Harris recognizes the problem, " ... the actual sennur contain more elements than the schema accounts for, omit parts and manifest various gradations into other genres" ("The Senna," p. 66).

Some of these have already been alluded to above, and include general topics such as "cowardice... heroic failure ... trivial or irresponsible behavior" as well as more specific accusations of breaking dietary taboos, of "sexual irregularities ... incest .... slaying of a father or brother" ("Germanic Context," p. 453).

Indeed, Clover herself acknowledges that "there do exist numerous fantastic insults in Norse" ("Germanic Context," p. 458).


See Pizarro, "Studies,", pp. 3-5 and p. 101. Harris says "the contents of senna are threats, insults, challenges and the appropriate replies; and the insults at least tend to be traditional" ("The Senna," p. 66).

In his dissertation and in his articles, Parks calls the adversarial dialogues found in Homeric epic as well those found in Germanic literature, "flyting." As he does not trace any historical relationship connecting the two, it is clear that his usage actually redefines flyting making it part of a general critical lexicon, rather than a denotation of a specific Germanic genre as I intend the noun. (See, too, his "Flyting and Fighting," p. 293). This is confirmed in his latest examination of flyting in Verbal Dueling, p. 6, where he says that flyting, "will serve us best if we take it as a general designation for verbal contesting with an ad hominem orientation, as distinct from dispute whose subject matter is nonpersonal." This definition would automatically exclude the doctrinal quarrels of OE religious prose and verse from the genre of flyting.


"The perlocutionary act always includes some consequences ... some of which may be 'unintentional'" (Austin, How to Do Things With Words, p. 107). See, too, Straus ("Women's Words as Weapons: Speech as Action in 'The Wife's Lament,'" TSSL 23 [1981], p. 269 and p. 283), Cohen ("Illocutions and Perlocutions," Foundations of Language 9 [1973], p. 493 and p. 495) and Traugott (A History of English Syntax [New York: Holt, 1972], p. 49) who also suggest that perlocutionary effects may include consequences unintended by the speaker.


Formerly classified as "constative" utterance (that is utterance which is not performative but is merely descriptive), this kind of speech has been re-analyzed as an illocution by virtue of an hypothesized performative preface ("I say," "I assert," or "I affirm") in its deep structure (Traugott, History of English Syntax, pp. 50-1 and Culler, On Deconstruction, p. 112).
Traugott (pp. 51-5 and pp. 67-74) notes that the illocution of permitting is usually identified by the presence of some equivalent of NE (modern English) *I permit*, or the auxiliaries *can* or *may* (in OE, *al-*, or auxiliaries *metan* or *megan*) while the act of commanding is identified in NE by some equivalent of *I command* or the imperative (in OE by some form of *bidd-*, *beod-*, or *hat-*, or the imperative).

The illocution of prediction is distinguished from other speech acts by the presence of some equivalent of NE *I predict* or the future auxiliaries *shall* or *will* (in OE by *gif* clauses, by "non-past tense" marked by some "adverb of future time," by *beo-* rather than *wes-* if the verb to be is involved or, rarely by *willan* or *sculan* in first, second or third person) while the act of promising is expressed by NE *I promise* or the future auxiliaries (in OE by "non-past tense," *beo-* or *scul-*).


Thus, Parks observes in his dissertation that heroic warriors must fulfill their words with deeds (pp. 112-114).

For a discussion of *idel qylp* and the performative features of boast, see Barbara Nolan and Morton Bloomfield, "Beotword, Gilpcwidas, and the Gilphleden Scop of Beowulf," *JEGP* 79 (1980), 499-516, who note the important connection between words and deeds in *Beowulf*, and Dwight Conquergood, "Boasting in Anglo-Saxon England: Performance and the Heroic Ethos," *Literature in Performance*, 1 (1980), 24-35. Conquergood sees boast as a one-dimensional performative utterance, chiefly concerned with the prediction of the future. The recapitulation of the past, often part of boast, he considers to be a non-performative, or constative utterance (p. 29). Parks, as I shall show, has a more comprehensive view of boast.


Here the ability of the flyter to produce responses of superior "tactical merit" which "mirror" and "surpass" the claims of his opponent is more important than veracity of utterance (Bax and Padmos, "Two Types," pp. 153-5, p. 165). The rhetorical device of verbal echo is well-suited to this kind of balanced comparison.

Occasionally, assertatives such as those found in the retrojective utterances of the identity motif can have a significance beyond the merely propositional and acquire the force of a deed. In "Rules of Ritual Challenges: A Speech Convention Among Medieval Knights," *Journal of Pragmatics* 5 (1981), p. 429 and p. 434, Bax observes that in Middle Dutch romance knightly challenges which ask an opponent's identity are often not so much requests for information as they are attempts to exert dominance over the opponent. In such circumstances, a straightforward reply would not only convey information, it would also acknowledge the speaker's subservience to his interlocutor.

"Germanic Context," p. 444. Pizarro argues that it is "mainly a social formality" ("Studies," p. 139, p. 9, p. 59 and p. 138). Lönnroth
gives a similar interpretation of manniafnafpr, calling it a formalized
version of senna or "a 'party game,' ... a battle of wits, in which the
contestants take turn in making boasts and insulting each other
according to certain formal rules" ("Double Scene," p. 97).

55 "Studies," pp. 1-2. There is an etymological association of the ON
noun senna with 'truth.' While the ON verb, senna, means "to argue,
quarrel," it could also mean "to prove, give evidence" (Harris, "The
Senna," p. 71. See, too, Clover, "Germanic Context," p. 444, where she
asserts senna was intended to prove guilt). Somewhat confusingly, both
Pizarro ("Studies," p. 2) and Harris ("The Senna," p. 66) also use senna
as a synonym for flying.

56 More recently, Pizarro reiterates the point and says that flying
"almost never leads directly to violence" ("Woman to Man Senna," Poetry
in the Scandinavian Middle Ages, ed. Teresa Paoli (Sopoleto: The Seventh

("Two Types"), and Swenson ("Verbal Duels and the Heroic Self") all
argue for two genres but their arguments founded on the lack of extant
textual evidence. Perhaps because of this, critics seem unable to agree
on the categorization of those texts which do exist. For example,
Harris calls the Beowulf/Unferf quarrel a senna, Lönroth calls it
manniafnafpr and Pizarro argues it is some combination of the two (see
"Germanic Context," p. 445, n. 5). There is similar confusion about the
quarrel between the queens in Nibelungenlied. Pizarro calls it a
manniafnafpr even though it is more usually called a senna ("Studies," p.
12, n..2) or a "court flying," (Anderson, "Verbal Contests," p. 70).

Undeterred by such disagreements, Bax and Padmos provide an extensive
analysis of HarbarPsliop based on a hypothetical rhetoric of both senna
and manniafnafpr in "Two Types."

58 See Clover, "Germanic Context," "HarbarPsliop." Also Pizarro,
"Studies," p. 139.

59 Recently, Parks has altered his view slightly and admits that the
often fictional claims of game-like flying can occasionally occur in
texts like HarbarPsliop: "Poems like the Eddic HarbarPsliop may be
generically 'mixed' on this point, proposing some of its claims
'seriously' and some 'ludically'" (Verbal Dueling, p. 168). However,
this stops short of acknowledging the possibility of a completely
"ludic" exchange in an heroic context.

60 "Flying Speech in Traditional Heroic Narrative," Neophilologus 71

61 "Flying and Fighting: Pathways in the Realization of the Epic
Sounding, Debate: Three Verbal Contest Genres," Poetics Today 7 (1986),

62 Parks' view that flying and fighting are necessarily connected is
shared by other critics. Harris, substituting the noun senna for
flying, says "the senna ... is a stylized battle of words; the two
principals are usually prevented by some circumstance, at least for the
moment, from converting words to blows," he adds however that although
"no standard pattern emerges for the ending of a senna ... most are
resolved into a physical fight" (Harris, "The Senna," p.66). Likewise,
although Lapidge acknowledges that flying can embody a riddling quality
which sometimes makes the contention sapiential rather than physical,
he, too, emphasizes that the "violence and intensity" of flying is most
often dispelled by a fight: "The vernacular flytings consist in
exchanges of personal abuse and invective, often with the intention of provoking mortal combat" (Michael Lapidge, "Three Latin Poems From Æthelwold's School at Winchester," ASE 1 [1972], p. 98).

63 "Flyting, Sounding, Debate," p. 445 and Verbal Dueling, chapter five. Parks acknowledges, however, that verbal contests do not always adhere to his taxonomy.

64 This is surprising given Parks' emphasis on the martial entailments of flyting, for the Beowulf/Unferþ flying does not lead to violence.


66 As I have already noted, Parks has recently adopted a less dogmatic classification which allows heroic flyting to include some game-like elements (Verbal Dueling, pp. 42-3, p. 168). However, Parks still excludes quarrels between saints and devils from his taxonomy on account of their lack of "martial entailments" and their concern with impersonal doctrine rather than personal topics (pp. 187-8).

67 By "seriousness" I intend a projective truthfulness of utterance which can be tested by future behavior, rather than the "ludic" quality inherent in assertives and retrojective boasts which cannot be validated by deeds.

68 I have appropriate Parks' terminology. My view of ludic flyting, unlike Parks', includes heroic dialogues.

69 See genna's etymological connection with truth, discussed above (p. 18). Lapidge also observes that flying can also contain riddles ("Three Poems," pp. 98-9), and, as already noted, Frank argues for riddling skaldic word play in the Beowulf/Unferþ flying ("Skaldic Tooth," pp. 344-7). A different kind of impersonal utterance occurs in Erik Disertus' flying with Grep, as I shall show below.

70 See Anderson, "Verbal Contests," chapter two. Some critics equate two genres of epic debate -- parley and taunting -- with flyting (see Parks, "Flying Speech in Traditional Heroic Narrative" and Feldman, "The Taunter in Ancient Epic: The Iliad, Odyssey, Aeneid and Beowulf," PLL 15 [1975], 3-16) while others, like Clover, do not. I agree with Clover and do not intend here to imply that such classical conventions are identical to flyting. They are, however, similar, and it is that similarity which I wish briefly to explore.


72 Bowra, pp. 286-7. Bowra cites Hildebrandslied as another example of the pre-battle parley. The exchange between father and son contained therein has also been called flyting (Anderson, "Maldon"). Again, a close connection between the two conventions is apparent.

73 This insult, which implies that the opponent desires a "soft life" away from fighting is also a typical flyting insult (Clover, "Harbarþljoþ," p. 127).

74 The translations of The Iliad are from Richard Lattimore, trans., The Iliad of Homer (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1951).

75 "The Vitellians assailed their opponents [sic] as lazy and indolent, soldiers [sic] corrupted by the circus and the theatre; those within the town attacked the Vitellians as foreigners and barbarians [sic]. At the same time, while they thus lauded or blamed Otho and Vitellius, their mutual insults were more productive of enthusiasm than their praise." Both the original and the translation are from Clifford Moore, trans., Tacitus: The Histories, I (London: Heinemann, 1956), pp. 194-5. (It
ought to be noted here that a more felicitous translation of this passage would recognize that the Latin says that Otho and Vitellius are vilified, not their troops. For a discussion of this and other Roman reports of Germanic parleys, see Jeff Opland, Anglo-Saxon Oral Poetry: A Study of the Traditions (New Haven: Yale U P, 1980), pp. 40-57. 76

Opland provides a translation: "But the barbarians sounded the glories of their forefathers with wild shouts, and amid the discordant clamour of different languages skirmishes were first tried" (p. 49).

Opland believes that this boasting is likely "related to references in later OE poetry to boasting or vaunting before battle" (p.49).


A humorous version of this situation is found in Harbarfrøllop when Thor fails to recognize that it is his father, Odin, with whom he quarrels. A recitation of genealogy also precedes battle in the Finnsburg Fragment when Sigfrø, Hnæf's doorkeeper, replies to Garulf the Jute's query "hwæ pa duru heolde" (vv. 24-7).


82 "'Say, who are you, man? Where do you come from? Where are you heading?' The great-souled hero answers, saying this: 'I wish to know, do you come on your own, or did someone dispatch you here?' Gamalo states with haughty tongue, 'Then know that Gunther, mighty king within the land, sent me to come and to inquire about your business'" (p. 31).

83 "'Through me the forenamed hero orders you that you give up the horse and coffers and the girl. If you comply at once, he grants you life and limb'" (p. 31).

84 "'I do not think that I have heard a smart man speak more stupidly. You claim some prince or other offers what he does not possess and likely never will. Is he a god, that he can by his power grant me life? Has he laid hands on me? Thrust me in prison?'" (p. 31).

85 "He said: 'You'll raise your gift by opening those coffers, for now I wish to end all talk, and you will give the things I seek or pour your life out with your blood.' He speaks and places on his arm his three-plyed shield, and brandishing his flashing spear hurls it with all his might" (pp. 33-5).
"Now tell me, is your body solid, living flesh? Or, devil, are you tricking us with airy phantoms? Indeed, you seem just like a woodland sprite to me."

With raucous laughter that man gave his answer thus:

'Your Celtic accent shows you are descended from that race whom nature made supreme in verbal play; but if our right hand touches you as you come closer, you will be able afterward to tell the Saxons that now you see a woodsprite's phantom in the Vosges. 'I will test what your are,' called Ekivrid at once. He roughly threw his iron-pointed spear (p. 39).

All citations are from Donald Scragg, ed., The Battle of Maldon (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1981).

The critical literature on these topics is abundant, and a brief summary must suffice. It seems most likely that while "Maldon" reflects a general state of affairs in tenth-century AS England, the poem is not an accurate record of a specific battle. Scragg provides a discussion of some of the historical discrepancies (pp. 8-23). Bessinger, too, emphasizes that fictional elements are present, and that "Maldon" is a historical poem "from a markedly artificial tradition" (J. B. Bessinger, "Maldon' and the Olafssdrapa: An Historical Caveat," CL 14 [1962], p. 24). For similar views about the poem's accuracy, see Irving, "The Heroic Style in 'The Battle of Maldon,'" SR 58 (1961), p. 458 and p. 460 and Heather Stuart, "The Meaning of 'Maldon,'" Neophilologus 66 (1982), 126-139. The poem certainly contains several conventional elements including a setting typical of flying, a standard theme (the struggle against great odds) and "the exchange of battle speeches ... too formal, balanced and lengthy for realistic utterances" (Bessinger, "Maldon' and Olafssdrapa," p. 27). Pizarro cites a similar account of another battle in Widukind of Corvey's Res Gestae Saxonicae ("Studies," pp. 94-100) and the resemblance between the two battles also suggests that "Maldon" is not mimetic. Locherbie-Cameron, however, disagrees, and asserts that even the flying "must have been historical fact" (M. A. Locherbie-Cameron, "Byrhtnoθ, His Noble Companion and His Sister's Son," Med Aev. 59 [1988], p. 161). Opinions about Byrhtnoθ are also varied. Some scholars believe Byrhtnoθ suffers from a fatal pride and achieves an "inglorious" end (Stuart, "Meaning," p. 137, and Michael Swanton, "The Battle of Maldon: A Literary Caveat," JEGP 67 [1968] p. 448). Cecily Clark calls Byrhtnoθ selfish ("Byrhtnoθ and Roland: A Contrast," Neophilologus 51 [1967], p. 289). Cross is less harsh and considers Byrhtnoθ to be a secular hero (J. E. Cross, "Oswald and Byrhtnoθ: A Christian Saint and A Hero Who is Christian," ES 46 [1965], 93-109).


I translate this verb phrase "you may send." For this sense of the auxiliary motan, see Traugott, A History of English Syntax, pp. 71-2. Nelson, however, appears to translate the auxiliary as the equivalent of MnE must (Marie Nelson, "'The Battle of Maldon' and Juliana: The Language of Confrontation," in Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature, pp. 138-9. Diamond's translation follows a similar path, "you must [lit. may] ... send," (Robert Diamond, Old English Grammar and Reader, [Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1970], p. 121). I believe that both these translations miss the depth of the Viking insult.
90 Traugott observes that in OE willan can function as a future auxiliary, but that it is most commonly a main verb meaning "intend, want" (History of English Syntax, p. 69). Both senses seem implicit in the Viking's utterance.
91 Irving in "Heroic Style," p. 460, says "a central theme of the poem is words and deeds, and there is an ultimate point where they become almost indistinguishable." McNamara would push Irving's observation even further. He asserts that in "Maldon" deeds become adjuncts to words so that Byrhtno’s "physical movements become themselves 'speech acts' ... they become parts of the general act of linguistic signification being performed" ("The Rhetoric of Speech Acts in 'The Battle of Maldon,'" OEN 19 [1986], A44).
92 This observation, as well as my general discussion of verbal echoes in "Maldon" is indebted to Anderson's excellent analysis of Byrhtno's speech in "Flyting in 'The Battle of Maldon,'" NM 71 (1970), 197-202.
93 Traugott, History of English Syntax, p. 69 and 70, "As a main verb, scul- basically expresses obligation, necessity or compulsion." Later, she adds that the phrase "feallan sceolon" may imply a promise (p. 71). See also Stuart, "Meaning," p. 128, who also argues that Byrhtno's sculan implies obligation.
94 Nelson also observes that Byrhtno's deeds fulfill his words ("'The Battle of Maldon' and Juliana: The Language of Confrontation," pp. 140-2).
95 Feldman, "Taunter," p. 3 and pp. 6-8 calls Unferp a taunter.
96 My discussion is indebted to Feldman who also provides other examples -- Drances' provocation of Turnus in Aeneid 2, and the quarrel between Unferp and Beowulf. The fact that the latter exchange is usually called flyting by OE scholars shows how much these two traditions resemble each other in function and form.
97 "... he is misshapen" ("Taunter," p. 9). Some physical flaw coupled with a love of discord and an unusual verbal fluency often characterizes the taunter.
98 The translations are again from Lattimore, The Iliad of Homer.
99 See also Irving's analysis of this episode in A Reading of Beowulf, pp. 67-8. Anderson calls this same episode "court flyting" ("Verbal Contests," p. 68). My analysis is indebted to Irving and the translation is from Robert Fitzgerald, Homer: The Odyssey (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1963).
100 "The Frank: 'From now on, friend, you will go hunting stags to make gloves without number fashioned from their hides. But my advice is, stuff the right glove with soft down, and use this phantom hand to fool the ignorant. Ah! How will you explain your breach of social custom when you are seen to gird your sword on your right thigh. Or when the wish comes over you, will you then hug your wife -- good Lord! -- with a perverse embrace, left-handed?' .... Walter gives him this answer: 'And why do you poke so much fun, I wonder, one-eye? If I go hunting stags, you will avoid boar meat, and you will squint when giving orders to your servants ....when you come home now and approach your hearth, prepare a gruel of milk and grain, and cooked in grease. This will give you both nourishment and medicine'" (Waltharius and Ruodlieb, p.69).
101 Although the involvement of the church in the quarrel might suggest this text would be better suited to the discussion of religious works in a later chapter, I have included it here because it occurs in Paul the
Deacon's secular history, Historia Langobardorum. The work was composed sometime during the eighth century (see The Concise Oxford History of the Christian Church). Pizarro cites and translates the text in "Studies," pp. 35-7.

Pizarro provides this translation: "It was announced to Alahis that Thomas the deacon stood before the door and had brought the benediction from the bishop. Then Alahis, who as we said, held all churchmen in hatred, thus spoke to his servants: 'Go, say to him if he has clean breeches he may come in but if otherwise let him keep his foot outside.' Thomas, indeed, when he had heard these expressions thus answered: 'Say to him that I have clean breeches, since I put them on washed today.' Alahis sent word to him again as follows: 'I do not speak of the breeches, but of the things that are inside the breeches.' To these things Thomas thus made answer: 'Go, say to him God only can find blame in me for these causes, but that he [Foulke translates 'man'] can by no means do so'" ("Studies," p. 37).

The medieval Icelandic text of Arrow-Odd is translated by Paul Edwards and Hermann Palsson in Arrow-Odd: A Medieval Novel (New York: New York U P, 1970). All citations are from this translation. Arrow-Odd recounts the adventures of an extremely long-lived hero and the events discussed here occur in the course of his extensive wanderings. Lonnroth says that although the extant text of Arrow-Odd was recorded in the fourteenth century, composition was probably much earlier ("Double Scene," pp. 98-9).

The text of Harbarpíslióp is found in the Codex Regius and is presumed to be of tenth-century origin. See Hollander, The Poetic Edda, 2nd ed. (Austin: U of Texas P, 1962), p. 74. My citations are from his translation and my discussion in indebted to Clover, "Harbarpíslióp." The similarity of the exchange in Harbarpíslióp and Hildebrantslied may indicate parody (see Clover, "Harbarpíslióp," p. 139).

The account of Erik Disertus' adventures at the Danish court is found in J. Orlik and H. Raeder, eds., Saxonis Gesta Danorum, I (Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard, 1931). My citations are from this edition. Davidson and Fisher provide a translation in Saxo Grammaticus: History of the Danes, I, Book Five, and this is the translation which I use. Davidson notes that although Saxo wrote in the twelfth century, he drew on earlier Danish sources for his history ("Insults," pp. 32-3). In this flyting, Erik is the last to speak, and although Grep threatens violence, the threat forms no part of the flying (Saxonis Gesta Danorum, p. 114, Saxo Grammaticus, p. 128). Both Davidson ("Insults," p. 36) and Pizarro ("Studies," p. 168) interpret this threat as a sign of Grep's defeat.

Although here Grep provides an anticipation of future events, he does not identify himself as the agent accomplishing them, as is usual in commissive utterance. His remarks seem roughly equivalent to the conventional "Go to hell."

Grep: 'Who are you, you fool? Whence and whither are you bound? Those men have special strength, their guardian deity royal, who have never strayed away from their own dwellings....' Erik: 'Regner is my father, my characteristic a fluent tongue, and prowess ever my life-long love. Wisdom was my only desire, and so I scanned the different manners of men as I travelled through many lands. A blockhead, unrestrained and unseemly in his emotions, cannot conduct his affairs with due
moderation.' Grep: 'You are crammed full of disputes, they say, as a cock with filth, stinking of low breeding and accusations. It is hard to bring a case against a buffoon, who thrives on a dance of words without expressing a meaning!' Erik: 'By heaven, brainless talk unless I am much mistaken, often rebounds on the head of him who uttered it ....' Grep: 'Impudent lad, night-owl, who have lost your way in the darkness, you shall pay the price for such indiscretion of speech. These unhallowed words, which you belch out in your madness, you shall grieve for when your death makes expiation. Your lifeless, bloodless body shall provide a feast for the crows, a morsel for the beasts, the carrion of ravenous birds.' Erik: 'The predictions of the coward and the hardened cravings of the vicious were never contained within their proper bonds....' Grep: 'I never, as you believe took advantage of the queen, but protected her when she was young and vulnerable....' Erik: 'See! Your pressing anxiety indicts you. Independence is safer where the mind remains untainted'" (p. 127).

109 Davidson, "Insults," p. 36.
110 "At ubi domum pervenit, tumultuoso clamoris impetu regiam complet verbisque se victum vociferans omnem in arma militem concitabat, tamquam manu infaustum vocis certamen ulturus" (Saxonia Gesta Danorum, p. 114).
111 Likewise Bax and Padmos suggest that Thor's threat of violence to HarbarPr ("'to Hel I would send thee, / if but over the sound I could reach'" [Hollander trans., stanza 27, p. 79]), shows "that HarbarPr's counter-attack has been successful" ("Two Types," p. 162). Beowulf, using a more impersonal version of the wish to see an opponent damned (""Pra in helle scealt/ verhPo dreogan,"" vv. 588b-9a), achieves better results.
112 This view is shared by Irving, A Reading of Beowulf (New Haven: Yale UP, 1968), pp. 75-6.
114 In addition to the echoes already noted, Beowulf borrows the nouns vP and garsecg from UnferP, as well as the first element of the compound, merestraet.
115 Frank, "Skaldic Tooth," pp. 344-7, proposes a more complex skaldic word game revolving around the ambiguity of the noun sund, which allows Beowulf to show his prowess at riddle solutions (p. 347).
116 In vv. 508-12, UnferP accuses Beowulf of empty boasts and trivial behavior. The AS disdain for the empty boast has already been noted, and Clover lists trivial behavior as a common insult in flying ("Germanic Context," p. 453-4).
117 I have already noted, that although Clover considers this and other accusations to be commonplaces of flying, she regards Beowulf's remarks as truthful. The view that the statements contained in the flying are truthful has also recently been espoused by Baker in "Beowulf the Orator," JEngL 21 (1988), p. 13. I argue that Clover and Baker are incorrect, and that insults and accusations of the Beowulf/UnferP flying are unlikely to be true.
118 Likewise, Beowulf's prediction to UnferP that on account of his behavior ""Pu in helle scealt/ verhPo dreogan'"" (vv. 588b-9a) precipitates no validating deeds.
119 Pizarro also hints at senna's affinity with supernatural mysteries, linking it tentatively to gate-keeping exchanges in the Eleusian mysteries ("Studies," pp. 253-7; and pp. 276-7). The monstrous opponent
resembles the taunter in his deformity and Swenson notes that in
hagiography, the demon is such an opponent (p. 131).
120 Lokasenna is found in the Codex Regius. It is probably of
Norwegian provenience and was composed in the second half of the tenth
century (Hollander, The Poetic Edda, p. 90). My citations are from
Hollander.
121 Swenson provides a detailed analysis of Lokasenna, pp. 141-53.
122 Also in the Codex Regius, (Poetic Edda, p. 168). My citations are
from Poetic Edda, pp. 174-5.
123 Swenson observes that at this juncture "Hrimgerþr has control; she
has effectively unmanned the hero" (p. 123). In his discussion of the
influence of bridal quest on man/woman sennur, Pizarro observes that
Hrimgerþr here deviates from the man to man senna pattern of "horse
invective" in which the normal course is to deride one's opponent as a
mare. Being female (albeit monstrous) Hrimgerþr "must present herself
as a mare, and attack Atli with the less common charge of being gelded," "Woman-to-Man Senna," pp. 343-4.
124 This linguistic reciprocity arises from the rhetorical devices of
flying enumerated above, such as agonistic pronoun contrast, verbal
echoes (which can include "mirroring," and "surpassing," and which often
reflect flyters' conflicting frames of reference), and an adversative
syntax.
125 Swenson's is not the only analysis to suggest that some forms of
flying revolve around impersonal topics. It will be recalled that
Pizarro ("Studies," pp. 1-2) and Harris ("The Senna," p. 71) emphasize
senna's etymological connection with truth and proof, while Lapidge
observes that flying quarrel can sometimes involve the presentation and
126 Pizarro implies that such a re-analysis of Latin/Christian
dialogues occurred in Norse literature ("Norsemen used the term senna
very broadly, eventually applying it even to translated Latin dialogues
of religious and moral-didactic argument" ["Woman-to-Man Senna," p. 349]).
CHAPTER TWO

THE LATIN CHRISTIAN CONTEXT: SPIRITUAL BATTLE AND THE WAR OF WORDS

How can flyting, an acrimonious verbal exchange often associated with either pagan feasts or epic battle, find a secure place in AS religious texts? In order to answer this question, I shall first examine briefly some features of Christian discourse prior to the AS period. My discussion will show that although at first glance the verbal animosity of flyting might seem incongruous in the context of the long-suffering charity of Christianity, secular flyting and Christian doctrine are by no means incompatible. Christian texts written before and during the early Middle Ages habitually use the conceit of war to express the relationship between good and evil. The effect of this metaphor is to depict the events of the New Testament and the subsequent travails of the Church on earth as stages of a cosmic war waged by God against the machinations of the devil and his allies. This metaphor arises first in Scripture, then is taken up by the early Church and persists in OE texts, as I shall show in later chapters. Two points which are especially relevant to a study of pious flyting may be made about the martial metaphor. First, the demonic opponent against whom this spiritual warfare is waged resembles the epic taunter and the senna flyting antagonist in both his monstrosity and his quarrelsome nature. Second -- and this is scarcely surprising in a religion which describes God as the Word\(^1\) -- the conflict between good and evil allegorized in the metaphor is often, like flyting, a war of words. These points deserve some further examination and in this chapter I shall discuss first the martial metaphor in general, then the nature of the enemy engaged, and finally the war of words itself.\(^2\)

The martial metaphor is inscribed on the very heart of Christianity and probably derives from the militarism
implicit in the O.T. psalms. The psalmist asserts that God is a shield for the righteous ("quoniam tu benedices iusto Domine ut scuto bonae voluntatis coronasti nos," Ps. 5.13; "scuto circumdabit te veritas eius non timebis a timore nocturno," Ps. 90.5) and that his name alone surpasses the power of the chariots and horses of those who oppose him:

Exaudiat te Dominus in die tribulationis
protectat te nomen Dei Iacob
...  
nunc cognovi quoniam salvum fecit Dominus christum suum
exaudiet illum de caelo sancto suo
in potentatibus salus dexterae eius
hii in curribus et hii in equis
nos autem in nomine Domini Dei nostri invocabimus
ipsi obligati sunt et ceciderunt
nos vero surreximus et erecti sumus (Ps. 19.1, 7-9).³

In the Gospels, Jesus himself uses the language of martiality to describe his mission:

'Nolite arbitrari quia venerim mittere pacem in terram non veni pacem mittere sed gladium. Veni enim separare hominem adversus patrem suum et filiam adversus matrem suam et nurum adversus socrum suam' (Matt. 10.34-35).

Jesus' arrest (facilitated by the devil's suborning of Judas recounted in Luke 22.3-4 and John 13.2), his death and his resurrection are construed as engagements in a war with Satan, the prince of the temporal world.⁴ Indeed, Jesus reminds his disciples before his passion that his ordeal is to be interpreted as a physical struggle with his worldly foe⁵:

'nunc iudicium est mundi nunc princeps huius mundi eicietur foras et ego si exaltatus fuero a terra omnia traham ad me ipsum' (John 12. 31-32).

A graphic description of Jesus' subsequent encounter with "the ruler of this world" is provided by the writer of the Latin B recension of the apocryphal Acts of Pilate in the
Gospel of Nicodemus. In this text, Satan's frantic preparations for Jesus' arrival in hell take on the aspect of military logistics:

Then came Satan the prince of death, fleeing in fear and saying to his ministers and unto the hells: O my ministers and all the hells, come together, and shut your gates ... and fight boldly and withstand, that we that hold them be not made captive in bonds (Acts of Pilate, II, p. 124).

Satan's frenzy is justified, for the "voice of the Son of the most high Father" causes hell's fortifications to crumble when the assault on Satan begins:

... Hell did quake, and the gates of death and the locks were broken small, and the bars of iron broken ... and all things were laid open. And Satan remained in the midst and stood put to confusion and cast down, and bound with a fetter about his feet. And behold, the Lord Jesus Christ ... bearing a chain in his hands bound therewith the neck of Satan (VIII, pp. 134-5).

The war between good and evil reaches its climax in the Parousia after Christ's angelic cohorts have defeated Satan in heaven (Rev. 12.9-11), bound him in hell (Rev. 20.1-3) and then released him to his final defeat on earth. He and his army are destroyed attempting to besiege "the camp of the saints and the beloved city." Until the victory of the Last Day, however, the earth remains a battlefield where "the children of light struggle against the children of darkness."9

It is in this context that Paul gives his famous exhortation to the ordinary Christian to fight like a soldier by using the passive virtues of faith and piety as armour and the doctrine of Christianity as a sword:

Induite vos arma Dei ut possitis stare adversus insidias diaboli. Quia non est nobis conluctatio adversus carnem et sanguinem sed adversus principes et potestates adversus mundi rectores tenebrarum harum contra spiritalia nequitiae in caelestibus.
Similarly, in 1 Tim. 1.18, he urges the faithful to fight the good fight ("hoc praeceptum commendo tibi ... ut milites in illis bonam militiam"), in 2 Tim. 2.3 to "share in suffering as a good soldier of Christ" ("labora sicut bonus miles Christi Iesu") and in Rom. 13.12, to "put on the armor of light" ("induamur arma lucis").

Later writers also exploited the image of the earth as battlefield in order to enliven their discussions of the relationship between good and evil. Augustine of Hippo, in his instruction to baptismal candidates in De Catechizandis Rudibus, asserts that the devil is "a foe to be vanquished" and that the struggle with the devil is like a continuous war waged by the city of the just against the city of the wicked. He enlarges on this theme in his description of mankind in Book XV of De Civitate Dei:

From the earthly city, itself enslaved by its own lust for conquest, come the enemies of the City of God ("Ex hac namque existunt inimici aduersus quos defendenda est Dei ciuitas," Book I, cap. i, 11. 1-2, CCSL XLVII, p. 1). Like the author of Revelations, Augustine sees the ultimate conflict between good and evil at the end of time in these terms:
ac per hoc ubicumque tunc erit, quae in omnibus gentibus erit, quod significatum est nomine latitudinis terrae, ibi erunt castra sanctorum, ibi erit dilecta Deo ciuitas eius, ibi ab omnibus inimicis suis, quia et ipsi in omnibus cum illa gentibus erunt, persecutionis illius inmanitate cingetur, hoc est, in angustias tribulationis artabitur urguebitur conclutetur, nec militiam suam deseret, quae uocabulo est appellata castrorum (Book XX, cap. xi, ll. 36-41, CCSL XLVIII, p. 721).  

Paradoxically, however, the metaphor is most vividly realized not in a description of the battles of the Church Militant, but in an account of the internal struggle between good and evil which occurs in the privacy of the individual soul. In his Psychomachia, Prudentius uses gruesome details which are usually associated with epic battles to describe how the soul must fight until "strage multa bellicosus spiritus/ portenta cordis servientis vicerit." In this war, Chastity pierces Lust's throat ("tunc exarmatae iugulum meretricis adacto/ transfigit gladio; calidos uomit illa uapores/ sanguine concretos caenoso," vv. 49-51) and Faith defeats Worship-of-the-Old-Gods by trampling the eyes underfoot ("et pede calcat/ elisos in morte oculos," vv. 32-3). The worst fate, however, is reserved for Discord (or Heresy) whose intellectual blandishments may tempt the otherwise righteous soul into error. Once her covert attack on Concord is discovered by the virtues, they compel her to confess her disruptive purposes and to identify her Satanic teacher (vv. 705-14). Then Faith attacks Discord by driving a spear through Discord's tongue:

uirtutum regina Fides, sed uerba loquentis inpedit et uociis claudit spiramina pilo pollutam rigida transfigens cuspide linguam (vv. 716-18, CCSL CXXVI, p. 175)

The virtues eagerly dismember the corpse:
Carpitur innumeris feralis bestia dextris.
Frustatim sibi quisque rapit, quod spargat in auras,
quod canibus donet, coruis quod edacibus ulter
offerat, inmundis caeno exhalante cloacis
quod trudat, monstris quod mandet habere marinis.
Discissum foedis animalibus omne cadaver
diuiditur, ruptis Heresis perit horrida membris (vv.
719-25, p. 175).

In a less graphic form the martial metaphor also
penetrated the ritual of the early Church. Daniéloú observes
that "one of the themes of baptismal theology [is] the
conflict with Satan" and that "the double aspect of struggle
with Satan and of conversion to Christ will be found in the
whole baptismal liturgy."\(^1\) Indeed, in the fourth century,
John Chrysostom compared the baptismal candidate to a
wrestler who must learn to fight during his candidacy:

So also for you, these thirty days are like the
practice/ and bodily exercises in some wrestling
school. Let us learn during these days how we may
gain the advantage over that wicked demon. After
baptism we are going to strip for the combat
against him; he will be our opponent in the boxing
bout and the fight. Let us learn, during this time
of training, the grips he uses, the source of his
wickedness, and how easily he can hurt us. Then,
when the contest comes, we will not be caught
unaware or frightened, as we would if we were to
see new wrestling tricks; because we ... have
learned all his artifices, we will confidently join
grips with him in combat.\(^2\)

(The grips or weapons in this particular combat, as I shall
show below, were the instructive words of catechesis and the
defensive words of credal confession and exorcism).

Clearly, then, by medieval times, the martial metaphor
was firmly entrenched in Christian discourse. Furthermore,
the expression of this metaphor was not limited to the
relatively pallid language of Paul, but also could include
graphic descriptions of combat replete with the grisly
details associated with actual bloodshed. With this
militaristic tone, Christian discourse began to encroach on the territory of secular epic and thus, at the same time, on the territory of flyting.

Christian discourse and secular flyting share more than a common context of violence, however. An examination of the enemy reified in the Christian conceit shows that Satan, the enemy of Jesus the Word, has affinities with both the epic taunter and the senna flyting instigator. One of the obvious points of similarity is appearance. Christian writers, perhaps taking the hint from the hideous O.T. representations of disaster and chaos, Behemoth and Leviathan,\textsuperscript{19} or perhaps borrowing from non-canonical Hebrew tradition\textsuperscript{20} endow Satan with increasingly frightening and repulsive qualities. In Revelations, he becomes "draco ille magnus serpens antiquus qui vocatur Diabulus et Satanas" (Rev. 12.9) and in apocryphal texts, he acquires the nightmarish appearance which he retains to this day in the popular Christian imagination. For example, in the Acts of Philip he is depicted as "a black man on a throne with two serpents about his loins, and eyes like coals of fire and flame coming from his mouth" (Apocryphal New Testament, p. 451). The Satan of the Gospel of Bartholomew is even more formidable:

...the earth shook and Beliar [sic] came up, being held by 660 angels and bound with fiery chains. And the length of him was 1,600 cubits and his breadth 40 cubits, and his face was like a lightning of fire and his eyes full of darkness .... And out of his nostrils came a stinking smoke; and his mouth was the gulf of a precipice, and the one of his wings was four-score cubits (Gospel of Bartholomew, 12-13, p. 174).

Monstrosity or physical deformity, albeit on a lesser scale, can be a characteristic of the epic taunter like the "loathsome hunchback ... Thersites"\textsuperscript{21} and is also typical, as we have seen, of the senna opponent like the giant female troll, Hrimgerpr, or the god Loki, progenitor of monsters.\textsuperscript{22}
The kinship between Satan and the instigators of taunting and flyting does not stop here, however. Feldman notes that the taunter

... seems to have fallen to his role by virtue of his querulous, combative nature ... he is ... shrewd, quick, fluent but very envious .... and ... thrives both in the bitterness of his own gall and that which he stirs up in others.23

The purposes of the flyting initiator are equally malign and disruptive. In the milder form of ludic flyting affiliated with mannjafnapr or court flyting, the quarrel is about the relative merits of the flyters and is triggered by personal envy and animosity. In the more serious form of ludic flyting which is associated with genna, the quarrel is motivated by the instigator's malevolent wish not merely to attack a reputation but to rend the very fabric of human society by challenging the assumptions upon which it is based.24 This envious, disruptive nature is typical of the Christian personification of evil as well. In the second century, both Irenaeus and Tertullian argued that Satan had lost his place in heaven because he envied God. This envy not only disrupted the celestial order, it also fed Satan's enmity towards mankind and promoted his vengeful desire to pervert God's cosmos.25 Thus, Satan, who was occasionally ready to dissimulate on God's behalf in the O.T. (Kings 20.22), was transformed in the N.T. into the father of lies ("mendax est et pater eius," John 8.44) who was plotting the overthrow of both man and God.

Satan, the taunter and the flyting instigator are alike in one other way: their contentiousness tries the mettle of their opponents. Like accusing lawyers, the taunter and flyting instigator act as inquisitors whose words are designed to test their enemies' version of the truth.26 Their interrogation may clarify relatively trivial truths, like the accuracy of a hero's reputation (Thersites vs. Odysseus or
Arrow-Odd vs. his opponents) or it may explore more cosmically significant issues like the legitimacy of a particular social order or ideology in a chaotic universe (Loki vs. the gods). Satan's discourse also tests the truth of both reputation and doctrine. In Job, where Satan is first given his etymologically suggestive name, he demonstrates its aptness by opposing, obstructing and accusing. Like the epic taunter, he is here a court official who speaks the suspicions which others may find unpalatable and therefore suppress. Like the instigator of *mannjafnapr*, he questions his enemy's reputation.27 Challenging the received opinion of Job's righteousness, Satan asserts that Job's piety springs from an easy life rather than from any deep spiritual conviction:

*dixitque Dominus ad eum numquid considerasti servum meum Iob quod non sit ei similis in terra homo simplex et rectus et timens Deum ac recedens a malo. cui respondens Satan ait numquid frustra timet Iob Deum? Nonne tu vallasti eum ac domum eius universamque substantiam per circuitum operibus? Manuum eius benedixisti et possessio illius crevit in terra. Sed extende paululum manum tuae cuncta quae possidet nisi in facie tua benedixerit tibi (Job 1.8-11).*28

This challenge precipitates Job's painful torments, but ultimately allows his righteousness to be vindicated.

The Christian Satan is also an accuser and a tester but his challenges are typically directed against doctrine rather than reputation and thus they most closely resemble the attacks which the *senna* flyter launches against his opponent's ideology. Paradoxically, these ill-intentioned verbal assaults, like the attack on Job, do not undermine faith but strengthen it instead. By the time of Jerome in the fourth century it was believed that

*God permits the Devil to exercise power in this world so that we will be obliged to exercise our*
powers and so that the saints may confound Satan by their miracles (Satan, p.188).

Augustine shared this belief and in De Civitate Dei used it to justify the unbinding of the devil (the "accusator" of Rev. 12.10) during the Last Days:

Si autem numquam solueretur, minus appareret eius maligna potestia, minus sanctae civitatis fidelissima patientia probaretur (Book XX, cap. viii, 11. 41-3, CCSL XLVIII, p. 713). 29

Not surprisingly, Augustine had a similar view of the function of heretical doctrines promulgated by the devil's allies. 30 Heresies, too, exist "so that through their opposition the church might be more and more tried and both her teaching elucidated and her long-suffering tested." 31

The fact that words (such as Satan's challenge to Job or the heresies mentioned by Augustine) were often Satan's chief means of testing the faithful suggests another important similarity between Christian tradition and secular flyting. Just as the secular flyter engages in a war of words, so, too, the faithful Christian assaults the devil with the sword of the word of God (Eph. 6.17) 32 and uses it to attack the "strongholds" which are "arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge of God" (2 Cor. 10.4-5). 33

The capacity of God's word to attack and defend in this way arises from its extraordinary perlocutionary power, for Scripture showed that God's speech was the equivalent of deed. In Gen. 1.3, for example, command and fulfillment appear to be simultaneous ("dixitque Deus fiat lux et facta est lux"). Divine words and deeds are also inextricably linked in John 1.1-3:

In principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat Verbum (2) hoc erat in principio apud Deum (3) omnia per ipsum facta sunt et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est.
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Paul recognizes the perlocutionary power of God's word in Hebrews 4.12:

\[ \text{vivus est enim Dei sermo et efficax et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti et pertingens usque ad divisionem animae ac spiritus conpagum quoque et medullarum et discretor cogitationum et intentionum cordis.} \]

In Luke 21.15, Jesus, who embodies this conjunction of word and deed, promises that the performative power of divine discourse will strengthen his followers' speech: "ego enim dabo vobis os et sapientiam cui non poterunt resistere et contradicere omnes adversarii vestri."

Scripture also provided models for verbal battle. In the Gospels, for instance, Jesus defeats demons with a word (Matthew 8.16, Mark 1.23-7 and Luke 4.33-41) and dismisses Satan himself with equal ease:

\[ \text{Tunc dicit ei Iesus vade Satanas scriptum est Dominum Deum tuum adorabis et illi soli servies. Tunc reliquit eum diabolus (Matt. 4.10-11).} \]

Jesus promises that his verbal powers will be transmitted to his disciples: "'signa autem eos qui crediderint haec sequentur in nomine meo daemonia eicient'" (Mark 16.17). Even at the end of time, God's word will still attack Satan, the prosecutor, and cause his eternal defeat:

\[ \text{et audivi vocem magnum in caelo dicentem nunc facta est salus et virtus et regnum Dei nostri et potestas Christi eius quia proiectus est accusator fratum nostrorum qui accusabat illos ante conspectum Dei nostri die ac nocte et ipsi vicerunt illum propter sanguinem agni et propter verbum testimonii sui (Rev. 12.10-11).} \]

Examples of this verbal warfare are not limited to Scripture. The writer of the apocryphal Acts of Pilate records that Jesus' words alone are sufficient to make the gates of hell crumble:
And again there was a cry without: Lift up, ye princes, your gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. And again at that clear voice Hell and Satan inquired, saying: Who is this King of glory? and it was said unto them by that marvellous voice: The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory. And lo, suddenly Hell did quake, and the gates of death and the locks were broken small (Acts of Pilate, Latin B, VII - VIII, pp. 132-4).

Likewise in the apocryphal Gospel of Bartholomew, Bartholomew dismisses Satan with a word, re-enacting Jesus' treatment of the devil in Matthew (Gospel of Bartholomew, 60, p. 179).

Written words could also be weapons. By the sixth century, the cloistered monk had been conscripted into the metaphoric army. The Prologue of the Benedictine Rule urged each monk to take up spiritual arms:

Ad t(e) ergo nunc meus sermo dirigitur quisquis abren(un)tians propriis voluptatibus domino christo vero regi militaturus oboedientie fortissima atque precla(ra) arma assumis. 34

At about the same time, Cassiodorus specified exactly what the weapons of the monkish scribe were. His task was

... to fight against the illicit temptations of the devil with pen and ink. Every word of the Lord written by the scribe is a wound inflicted on Satan. 35

If the word of God was the weapon of the devout, the faithful Christian who participated in the verbal battle with Satan had to know Church doctrine in order to wield the sword of God's word effectively. Such was the purpose underlying the extensive catechesis of baptismal candidates in the early Church. This process of indoctrination and initiation was likened to the trial of a martyr with catechesis "strengthening faith against the attacks of error." 36 The catechesis itself varied in its detail. For instance, in the
fourth century, Cyril of Jerusalem seems to have emphasized Christ's mission, while Augustine included "a narratio of the mighty acts of God from creation to the present." 37

Once the catechumen had learned from this instruction about the weapon of the word, he could demonstrate his ability to wield this metaphoric sword when he recited the creed as the culmination of his education. 38 Originally, this formulaic confession may have been simple, but even in Scripture where its prototypes are found, its content varies. For example:

Quia si confitearis in ore tuo Dominum Iesum et in corde tuo credideris quod Deus illum excitavit ex mortuis salvus eris (Rom. 10.9)

nobis tamen unus Deus Pater ex quo omnia et nos in illum et unus Dominus Iesus Christus per quem omnia et nos per ipsum (1. Cor.8.6). 39

Gradually, however, credal confession increased in complexity 40 so that the faithful were armed with a verbal sword which could range from a single statement recognizing Jesus' divinity and resurrection to the lengthier doctrinal proclamations of conciliar creeds. 41 Of particular importance from the perspective of this study, is the fact that these longer credal confessions often included not only recitations of past events in Church history, but also predictions about future events, and in this preoccupation with the future as well as the past, such confessions resembled the similarly retrospective and anticipatory boasts of flyters. 42

Beyond the overall significance of the baptismal liturgy as a training ground for soldiers who would fight the Christian war of words, two additional features of the rite ought to be noted here. First, baptismal creeds were not always declaratory, but could be interrogatory as well. In some liturgies the priest questioned the candidate about key articles of faith to which the candidate gave his assent:
Credis in Deum Patrum omnipotentem?
Credis et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, dominum nostrum, natum et passum?
Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem? \(^{43}\)

Similar interrogatory dialogues penetrated extra-baptismal education as well. Catechisms of question and reply, deriving perhaps from an earlier classical tradition, \(^{44}\) were a sufficiently commonplace means of instruction to constitute a sub-genre of Christian literature. \(^{45}\) Even the penitential ritual used a similar format of question and reply in order not only to assign penance, but also to instruct. \(^{46}\) The interrogatory creed, together with these educative dialogues may have prepared the way for the more aggressive but equally instructive dialogues of the Christian hero and his opponents in the *passiones, vitæ* and *acta*. \(^{47}\)

Second, the baptismal rite contained several demonstrations of an especially effective verbal sword stroke. To aid the candidate in his struggle with Satan, the priest not only educated the catechumen about the word of God, he also repeatedly exorcized the catechumen, driving the devil from his soul with the word of God:

\[
\text{Ergo, maledicte diabole, recognosce sententiam tuam et da honorem Deo vivo et vero, et da honorem Jesu Christo Filio ejus et Spiritui sancto; et recede ab his famulis Dei quia istos sibi Deus et dominus noster Jesus Christus ad suam sanctam gratiam et benedictionem fontemque baptismatis dono vocare dignatus est. Et hoc signum sanctae crucis frontibus eorum quod nos damus, tu, maledicte diabole, numquam auedes violare.} \(^{48}\)
\]

As I show in chapter one, p. 12 and p. 17, similar imperatives are part of the verbal arsenal of a flyter, and thus exorcistic utterances constitute another potential link between the Christian war of words and secular flyting. \(^{49}\)
Fortunately for the initiated Christian, the enemy against whom he must direct his confessional\textsuperscript{50} and exorcistic weaponry was armed with an ill-designed sword, for as "father of lies" (John 8.44) and disrupter of the heavenly order, Satan holds a seriously flawed view of the universe. Because he is unable himself to perceive God's nature and creation accurately, his assertions are usually false and his promises and threats alike fail to accomplish his aims.\textsuperscript{51} His chronic incapacity to fulfill his promises is evident in the Gospel of Bartholomew's account of Satan's abortive rebellion in heaven:

and Michael saith to me: Worship lest God be wroth with thee. But I said to him: God will not be wroth with me; but I will set my throne over against his throne, and I will be as he is. Then God was wroth with me and cast me down (Gospel of Bartholomew, 55, p. 178).\textsuperscript{52}

Satan's subsequent forays against mankind are equally ineffective. For instance, his attack on Adam and Eve precipitates the redemption of all humanity and the heresies intended to promote dissension within the Christian community serve instead to test and strengthen faith. This chronic inability to translate words into deeds aligns Satan with the incompetent flyter who is equally unable to fulfill his projective boasts.

Paradoxically, even on those rare occasions when Satan does speak the truth, its articulation does not help his cause, for at these times he is joining the Christian chorus in its confessional celebration of God's merits. Confronted by an opponent whose righteousness is unassailable, the devil is compelled to utter an approximation of the catechumen's confession and thus metaphorically to impale himself on the sword of the word of God. Instances of this verbal suicide occur in both Mark and Luke when demons confess to Jesus ("scio qui sis Sanctus Dei" [Mark 1.24], "quia tu es Filius Dei" [Luke 4.41]) and in the Gospel of Bartholomew when
Bartholomew forces Satan to acknowledge his disruptive role in the history of the cosmos (Gospel of Bartholomew 4.22-60, pp. 175-9). 53

Scripture and patristic discourse together with Church ritual, then, had predisposed Christians of the early medieval period to see the practice of their religion as a kind of military operation. Armed with the sword of doctrinal confession, they became soldiers contending with the troops of Satan. Such metaphoric martiality had much in common with the heroic context of secular flyting. Both the devout Christian apologist and the epic hero who engaged in flyting were waging a war of words. Both were fighting an antagonist whose aim in inciting the wrangle was to promote some form of disruption ranging from personal calumny to cosmic chaos.

The close association between the Christian war of words and secular flyting is perhaps most dramatically apparent, however, in the acta of the early Christian martyrs, for here history seems to have conspired with trope to produce a situation in which Christian confession did in deed become a weapon. 54 Originally, the noun martyr denoted a witness who provided an accurate legal testimony of some event. 55 Such an individual was an etymologically appropriate foil for an accusing satan. In the Gospels, this sense of the noun martyr is maintained (Mark 14.56-59 and 14.63) and the martyr is defined by his confession of faith. 56 With the advent of the Roman persecutions, however, the legal connotations of the definition of martyr became horribly reified, for the martyr was now obliged to testify in an actual judicial setting before a prefect or a magistrate whose intent was to make him recant his belief under the threat of death. While an early meaning of martyr was thus reinforced, a new dimension was added to the word, for now to testify and to wield faithfully the sword of the word of God meant to die as well. However, in his death the martyr achieved a victory over his enemy by showing that his words, unlike those of his
enemy, corresponded to his deeds. Thus, while Satan's ally, the pagan magistrate was unable to fulfill his threats to make the martyr recant (Roads, p. 34), the martyr, whose speech shared some of the perlocutionary power of divine discourse, was able to "do by saying" ("Power," p. 39; Roads, p. 35), making his deeds conform to his words so that as long as he lived he remained firm in his testimony and his faith.57

To recapitulate, then, there are several similarities between the martyr/magistrate dialogue and secular flyting: both exchanges are verbal wars and both, as the etymologies of martyr and senna suggest, have affinities with judicial debate. Like serious or battle flyting, these dialogues contain identity motifs, threats, and end in violence.58 The winner of both verbal contests is the individual who can fulfill his promise or perform his boast, thereby earning glory.59 A brief examination of some verbal exchanges found in the acta will show that such dialogues have a formal resemblance to flyting as well.

In "Acta Marcelli,"60 the Roman soldier, Marcellus, confesses his faith in the midst of a pagan celebration, declaring himself to be God's soldier and asserting that Roman idols are powerless because they are mute61:

clara uoce testatus est: Iesu Christo regi aeterno milito; amodo imperatoribus uestris militare desisto, sed et deos uestrros ligneos et lapideos adorare contemno, quia sunt idola surda et muta ("Acta," 11. 7-10, p. 250).62

Unlike the pagan gods, however, Marcellus is not mute, and his ensuing dialogue with his pagan interrogator shows him fighting with the sword of the word of God. This verbal warfare has elements of both credal confession and secular flyting. The question and answer format suggests the interrogatory creeds of the baptismal ritual, while the frequent repetition of words in enquiry and reply hints at the verbal reciprocity of secular flyting:

The affinity of the martyr's verbal sword play with secular flyting is even more apparent in the testimony of Bishop Carpus. Ordered by the Proconsul Optimus to sacrifice to pagan gods, Carpus is engaged by the Proconsul in a verbal battle containing elements of both credal confession and of flyting:


Here an overall structure of challenge and reply mimics the thrust and parry of sword play as verbs are repeated in command and response with alternation of imperative and indicative mood (for instance, "sacrificate"/"sacrificant" and "misere"/"misereor"). Personal pronouns ("tibi"/"mihi")
emphasize the opposition between magistrate and martyr, and like verbal repetition are a stylistic feature of secular flyting. Carpus' concluding declaration ("Christianus sum ... possum") suggests the kind of simple credal confession which was probably familiar to anyone who had undergone the ritual of baptism.\textsuperscript{66}

In the exchange between Veteran Julius and his interrogator, Maximus, in "Passio Iuli Veterani," additional stylistic features of flyting, coupled with credal confession, can be found:


Although in this exchange imperatives and interrogatives are not especially prominent, Maximus concludes his address to Julius with two aggressive commands ("audi" and "sacrifica") coupled with a threat that would not be out of place in secular flyting ("ne te, sicut promisi, occidam"). Contrastive use of personal pronouns ("tibi"/"mihi", "nobiscum"/"uobiscum") and frequent repetition of words ("pro ... legibus"/"pro legibus," "patereris"/"patior") enhance the verbal reciprocity of the exchange. In addition, the implicit presence of the Christian paradox that life begins
in death ("condolens tibi ... uiuas nobiscum," "uixero uobiscum, mors mihi erit") frequently endows these recurring words with an ironic import suggestive of the "conflicting frames of reference" which Anderson finds typical of secular flyting, and which I have discussed in chapter one. The dialogue also contains a credal form of the sword of the word of God ("Ille mortuus est ... perpetua").

Dialogues between the martyr and his judicial antagonists are also central to the longer passiones. Indeed, Elliott argues that in these accounts of martyrdom "discourse becomes the most significant action" (Roads, p.29). For example, in his account of the martyrdom of Vincent in Peristefanon V, Prudentius makes the exchange between the miles Dei Vincent (v. 117) and his antagonist, the governor Dacian, central to his account of Vincent's martyrdom. Like the exchanges in the acta already discussed, this dialogue employs the pronoun contrast of secular flyting together with direct address to create the illusion of blow and counter-blow which enhances Vincent's confession:

(v. 29) Exclamat hic Vincentius leuuita [sic] de tribu sacra, minister altaris dei, septem ex columnis lacteis:

'Tibi ista praesint numina, tu saxa, tu lignum colas, tu mortuorum mortuus fias deorum pontifex;

nos lucis auctorem Patrem, eiusque Christum filium qui solus ac uerus deus, Datiane, confitebimur' (vv. 29-40, p. 295).

In addition, in these later works there is often a tendency to generalize the conflict between the martyr and judge so that the audience witnesses less a particular quarrel than an elemental collision of moral polarities. Thus, in describing Vincent's martyrdom Prudentius removes
"specific geographic and personal references" from his account in order to emphasize that this verbal contention between the martyr, Vincent, and the governor, Dacian, "is a figuration of the cosmic conflict between good and evil." To this end, Prudentius also endows Dacian with increasingly repulsive physical traits and increasingly aberrant behavior. We are told, for instance, that Dacian's initially mild words mask the rapaciousness of a wolf(1)(w. 17-20) and his own speech soon demonstrates the truth of this assertion when, in a fit of anger at Vincent's steadfastness, Dacian orders him to be tortured:

(v. 109) 'Vinctum retortis brachhis sursum ac deorsum extendite, conpago donec ossuum diuulsae membratim crepet.

Posthinc hiulcis ictibus nudate costarum abdita, ut per lacunas ulnern rectectum palpitet' (vv. 109-16, p. 298).

Dacian shows his gradual degeneration by hissing like a snake ("praetor ore subdolo/ anguina uerba exsibilat," vv. 175-6), provoking Vincent to threaten:

'Exemplar hoc, serpens, tuum est, fuligo quem mox sulphuris bitumen et mixtum pice imo inplicabunt tartaro' (vv. 197-200, p. 301).

Wounded by Vincent's words, Dacian becomes so enraged that he becomes more demonic than human:

His persecutor saucius pallet, rubescit, aestuat insana torquens lumina, spumasque frendens egerit (vv. 201-4, p. 301).

Thus, in addition to its coincidental exploitation of some of the formal features of flyting, the passio shares the senna
flyting's preoccupation with cosmic struggle and transforms the conflict between martyr and magistrate into a more general struggle between good and evil.

The cosmic aspect of the war of words is also emphasized in the Bollandist version of Juliana's passion. Again, the writer alters the personality of the saint's antagonist until he becomes more monster than man. Eleusius, Juliana's persecutor and would-be fiancé, begins his attack innocuously:


Juliana's recalcitrant replies infuriate Eleusius and he orders increasingly painful torments (including stretching, scourging, hanging, imprisonment, incinerating and stewing) to be administered to Juliana. Their failure to achieve her capitulation makes him roar like an animal and tear his clothes in an hysterical display of rage (Sources and Analogues, p. 131; ASS February 16, cap. III, 18, p. 878). The writer of this passio, however, introduces a second device to emphasize the generality of the conflict he describes. While Juliana is in Eleusius' prison, she engages in another verbal battle, but this time her enemy is not a man but a demon. By making his heroine argue with a demon, the hagiographer transforms Juliana's passion into an example of the faithful Christian's struggle not only with a magistrate but with evil itself. The demon's reluctant confession confirms Juliana's verbal victory and coincides with his physical defeat, for the saint not only conquers him with words, she also seizes him, binds him and beats him. Indeed, this is the climax of the account and after this verbal warfare, we have no fear that Juliana's weaponry will fail her at the end.
This kind of verbal warfare between the Christian hero and a reification of evil persists in the vita as well although it is no longer the structural centre of the account. Once the persecutions had ended in the early fourth century (and with them the possibility of literal martyrdom), the anchorite was sometimes substituted for the martyr as another hagiographic ideal. His struggle, however, was a spiritual one, and concerned his ability to maintain an abstemious and devout life in the wilderness far from creature comforts and the diversions of human companionship. This fight to resist temptations to both body and soul, although conducted within the confines of the monk's own mind, was expressed by hagiographers as an external conflict with demons or with Satan himself. Thus, although the gradual progression of the Christian monk from good man to saint was the structural centre of the vita, this sub-genre of hagiography still retained elements of the verbal war of the passio now expressed as a dialogue with demons:

Diametrical patterns of opposition are ... always inherent in one of the traditional stages marking the confessor's progress towards spiritual perfection and involving a third group of dramatis personae, the diabolic antagonists .... the temptations which assail the hermit in the form of more or less recognizable projections of psychological conflict when he first takes up his retreat. During this psychomachia, in which physical aggression is countered by superior spiritual strength, there is much reciprocal invective resembling the dialogue between the martyr and his judge in the passio.

Thus, although Athanasius' influential vita of St. Anthony is chiefly concerned with the story of Anthony's remarkable life beginning with his earliest manifestations of merit until his miraculous foreknowledge of his own death (PL LXXIII, cap. lvi-lx, cols. 165-8; Deferrari, pp. 212-215), it also
incorporates within its narrative the saint's struggles with temptation personified as the devil or his demon henchmen:

Dum haec gereret Antonius quibus omnium in se provocaret affectum, inimicus nominis Christiani diabolus, impatien ter ferens tantas in adolescent e virtutes, veteranis eum aggressus est fraudibus. Et primo quidem tentans, si quo modo posset ab arrepto eum instituto detr ahre, immittebat ei memoriam possessionum, sororis defensionem, generis nobilitatem, amorem rerum, fluxam saeculi glori am, escae variam delectationem, et reliqua vitae remissor is blandimenta; ... prorsus maximam ei cogitationem caliginem suscitabat, volens eum a recto proposito revocare (PL LXXIII, cap. iv, col. 129).86

Anthony's resistance to these arguments provokes the devil to renew the attack and he reappears to the saint as a black boy. Anthony still resists and his resistance is expressed in an adversarial dialogue which includes the demon's confession:

Quem cum interrogaret Antonius quisnam esset, qui talia loqueretur, ait: Ego sum fornicationis amicus, ego multimoda advers um omnes adolescentes turpitudinis arma sus cepi: hinc et spiritus fornicationis vocor .... Ego sum qui te ipsum saepe tentavi, et semper repulsus sum (PL LXXIII, cap. iv, col. 130).87

Employing insults evocative of flyting Anthony, the soldier of Christ, dismisses the tempter, defeating him with the word of God:

Cum hoc Christi miles audisset, gratias agens Deo, et largiore adversus inimicum confortatus audacia, ait: Multum ergo despicabili s, multumque contemptibilis es; nam et obscuritas tua et aetas infirmar um signa sunt rerum. Nulla mihi jam de te cura est. Dominus mihi adjutor est et ego exsultabo super inimicos meos. Et statim ad vocem cantantis, phantasma quod videbatur, evanuit (PL LXXIII, cap. iv, col. 130).88
This brief examination of Latin Christian discourse, then, shows that the early Christian Church reified the polarities of good and evil as mutually hostile entities, with the result that God and Satan were often construed as military commanders standing at the head of opposed armies. In keeping with this metaphoric martiality, devout writers of the period depicted the pious individual as a soldier of Christ, engaged in battle with Satan or with his demonic and mortal cohorts. Most important from the perspective of this study, however, the battle with evil was sometimes depicted as a dispute in which the word of God acted as a sword which could defeat the corrupting discourse of Satan and his allies. This sacred war of words resembled Germanic flyting in several ways. Not only did some forms of flyting deal with the cosmic struggle of good and evil which were central to the Latin Christian debates, both kinds of dialogue also raised wrangle to battle, both contained utterances which were predictive as well as retrospective, both occasionally used the same rhetorical devices to heighten the agonistic quality of the exchange, and both implicitly recognized that speech was close to act and awarded victory to the speaker whose words were fulfilled by deeds. In the next two chapters, I shall argue that shared features such as these caused AS prose writers to reinterpret Latin Christian adversarial dialogues as variants of Germanic flyting.
NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO


2 These three topics are not, in fact, discrete but are inter-connected aspects of a single trope. I separate them for ease of discussion.


4 Jeffrey Burton Russell provides a succinct summary of the traditional Christian view of the devil: "Satan is the prime adversary of Christ. He tried to tempt Christ but failed. He sought Christ's death, yet at the same time tried to avert the act of redemption. Following the death and ascension of Christ, the Devil tries to thwart the Lord's victory by attacking and perverting humanity" (Satan: The Early Christian Tradition [Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981], p. 27). The Epistle of Barnabas identifies Satan as "the ruler of the present time of iniquity" (The Epistle of Barnabas, 18.2. All translations are from Kirsopp Lake, The Apostolic Fathers I [London: Heinemann, 1930]. See, too, Satan, p.39).


6 There is one Greek version and two Latin accounts of the Acts of Pilate. The Latin A and Greek recensions are similar, but the Latin B recension is shorter, and differs in some details (Montague R. James, trans., The Apocryphal New Testament [Oxford: at the Clarendon P, 1975], pp. 117-18). I shall postpone discussion of the Latin A recension until the next chapter, for it is the exemplar of the OE translation. In this chapter I cite portions of James' translation of the Latin B recension. The translations of the other apocryphal N.T. texts which appear in this chapter (i.e. the Gospel of Bartholomew, the Book of John the Evangelist and the Acts of Philip) are also from James.


8 "Et ascenderunt super latitudinem terrae et circumierunt castra sanctorum et civitatem dilectam et descendit ignis a Deo de caelo et devoravit eos et diabolus qui seducebat eos missus in stagnum ignis et sulphurus" (Rev. 20.8-9).

9 Satan, p. 39. The Epistle of Barnabas describes "two ways of teaching and power, one of light and one of Darkness" (18.1).


12 "I classify the human race into two branches: the one consists of those who live by human standards, the other of those who live according to God's will. I also call these two classes the two cities, speaking allegorically. By two cities I mean two societies of human beings, one of which is predestined to reign with God for all eternity, the other doomed to undergo eternal punishment with the Devil" (City, p. 595).

13 "Unde etiam de terrena ciuitate, quae cum dominari adpetit, etsi populi serviant, ipsa ei dominandi libido dominatur, non est praeterundum silentio quidquid dicere suscepti huius operis ratio postulat si facultas datur" (Book I, "Praefatio," 11. 20-3, CCSL XLVII, p. 1).

14 "... wherever the Church is at that time, and it will be among all the nations -- which is the meaning of 'over the breadth of the earth' -- there the camp of the saints will be, and there God's beloved City. There it will be surrounded by all its enemies -- for they also will be present along with that City, among all nations -- in the savagery of that persecution. That is, the City will be hemmed in, hard pressed, shut up, in the straits of tribulation, yet it will not abandon its warfare" (City, p. 920).

15 For a more detailed discussion of Psychomachia, see John Hermann, *Allegories of War: Language and Violence in Old English Poetry* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1989), pp. 9-20. Russell notes that the idea of the individual mind being the site of the struggle between good evil is also found in Jerome and Ambrose (Satan, p.188-9).


19 See Job 40.15-24 for Behemoth and Job 41.1-8 for Leviathan.


21 See Feldman, "Taunter," p. 6. Her observations are discussed in more detail in chapter one, pp. 31-32.

Thus in *Lokasenna*, Loki insults the gods and disrupts their feast, hoping to force them to identify "with himself and with the monstrous abject or extra-societal in general" ("Verbal Duels and the Heroic Self," p. 146).


The legal connotations of *senna* as a debate about truth are discussed in chapter one, p. 18.

Opposition, obstruction and accusation are signified by the Hebrew root from which *satan* is derived. For the etymology of *satan* see *Devil*, p. 189, *Satan*, p. 27, and The *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, ed. C.T. Onions (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1966). A similar denotation underlies another demonic appellation, *devil*. Feldman notes that this derives from the Greek *diabolo* (cognate with OE *deofol*) meaning "slanderer" and is itself derived from *diaballein* meaning "to overthrow ... a man's reputation by calumny, " ("A Comparative Study of *Feond, Deofol, Syn* and *Hel* in Beowulf," *NM* 88 [1987], p. 159 and p. 163).

Certainly this seems to be the sense of the name in Job 1.6, for in Job the role of Satan is to challenge the truth of Job's reputation and Wright and Fuller argue that in the O.T., Satan "is a lawyer in good standing in the heavenly court of God, whose job it is to try and test the motives of men" (G. Ernest Wright and Reginald H. Fuller, *The Book of the Acts of God* [Garden City: Anchor Books, 1960], p. 196). The notion that the struggle between good and evil is akin to a trial continues in the N.T. Here, Jesus himself is tried (Matt. 26-27), but is also called mankind's defense attorney ("si quis peccaverit advocatum habemus apud Patrem Iesum Christum iustum," 1 John 2.1). In addition, the final day is construed as one of judgment (Richard Penn, *Liturgies and Trials* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982], p. 45).

"And the Lord said to Satan, 'Have you considered my servant Job, that there is none like him on the earth, a blameless and upright man, who fears God and turns away from evil'? Then Satan answered the Lord, 'Does Job fear God for nought? Hast thou not put a hedge about him and his house and all that he has, on every side? Thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his possessions have increased in the land. But put forth thy hand now, and touch all that he has, and he will curse thee to thy face'" (Job 1. 8-11). See, too, *Devil*, pp. 200-2 for a discussion of Satan in Job.

"But the Devil will be unloosed .... If he had never been unloosed his malign power would not have been so clearly seen, and the endurance of the Holy City would never have been so clearly proved in its utter faithfulness" (City, p. 911).

All those who oppose the teachings of Christianity, whether they were pagans or heretics, were believed to be part of Satan's troops. For instance, Russell observes that in the second century, Bishop Polycarp in his letter to the church at Philippi, contrasted Christians who were the "first-born of God" with heretics who were "the first-born children of Satan" (*Satan*, p. 42) while Tertullian said that demons promoted paganism (p. 98). An account of the death of Veteran Julius identifies his pagan tormentor as *minister diaboli* (see Herbert Musurillo, ed. and trans., "Passio Iuli Veterani" in *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* [Oxford: Clarendon P, 1972], pp. 264-5 and Alison Elliott, *Roads to Paradise: Reading the Lives of the Early Saints*
Likewise in the later passiones, the magistrate who persecuted the martyr was described in demonic terms, as I shall show below.

31 Christopher, The First Catechetical Instruction, p. 76, p. 79, and p. 142.

32 References to words as a weapons are not limited to the N.T. For example, in Isaiah 49.2, the prophet says of God that "posuit os meum quasi gladium acutum."

33 "Nam arma militiae nostrae non carnalia sed potentia Deo ad destructionem munitionum consilia destruentes et omnem altitudinem extollentem se adversus scientiam Dei et in captivitatem redigentes omnen intellectum in obsequium Christi" (2 Cor. 10.4-5).


36 Daniélou, Bible and Liturgy, pp. 23-5.


38 The recitation, or redditio symboli, occurred on Palm Sunday (Bible and Liturgy, p. 25 and "Development of Catechesis," p. 73).

39 Some versions of the Vulgate include a confessional creed in Acts 8.37, when Philip replies to the eunuch's request for baptism, "Si credis ex toto corde, licet. Et respondes ait: Credo Filium Dei esse Iesum Christum" (Biblia Sacra, iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam [Milwaukee: Bruce, 1955]).

40 In The History of the Creeds (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1938), p. 3, Badcock suggests that the earliest creeds were simple baptismal confessions of faith, such as "I believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Lord," but that by the fifth or sixth century these confessions had expanded into a creed similar to today's Apostles' Creed (see, for instance, the hypothetical Jerusalem creed cited in "Development of Catechesis," p. 62).

41 Conciliar creeds like the Nicene Creed were designed to combat specific heresies (History of the Creeds, p. 15).

42 The utterer of the Nicene Creed not only attests to his belief in God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit, he also asserts the truth of the historical events of Jesus' life (a retrospective assertion similar to a flyer's testimony of his ancestry or past deeds) and predicts Jesus'
return at the end of time as judge of the living and the dead (a projective illocution which resembles flyters' boasts about future conquests).


45 Lapidge discusses these "didactic dialogues" in "Three Latin Poems," pp. 95-8, and Anderson distinguishes "expository" from "magisterial" dialogues ("Verbal Contests," pp. 100-2). However for the purposes of my argument, it is the dialogic nature of this instruction which is important. Bardy testifies to the abundance of these dialogues, observing that they were popular with Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine ("Littérature patristique," p. 221, p. 336 and p. 515). See, for example, Julian of Toledo's "Antikelimenon," cited by Lapidge on p. 97, and found in PL XCVI, cols. 595-9. Julian poses questions and provides the appropriate response to elaborate the meaning of Scripture (Interrogatio IX: "Cum in Genesi scriptum sit: In septimo die requievit Deus ab omni opere suo, quomodo e contra Christus in Evangelio dicit: Pater meus usque modo operatur et ego operor? Responsio: Requievit die septimo, quia deinceps nullam creaturam novam fecit. Usque nunc operatur, quia omnia ex eis facit, quae in illis sex diebus mysticis fecit: quia quae tunc primordialiter condidit, nunc potentialiter administrata regit" [col. 599]).


49 Although exorcistic utterances performed by a priest are declaratives, they contain imperative verbs, and thus resemble flyting directives.

50 For the remainder of this study, I shall use "confession" to denote not only credal statements either explicitly or implicitly prefaced by "I believe," but also pious recitations of salvation history or Church doctrine.

51 Elliott makes a similar point about the discourse of the martyr's opponent in her "Power of Discourse," p. 45.

52 The Book of John the Evangelist gives another account of Satan's misjudgment. Here, too, his promises to the rebel angels remain unfulfilled and his followers are rewarded with exile rather than elevation (Apocryphal New Testament, pp. 188-9).

53 The verb confess here is polysemous. By giving his witness to the Christian truth Satan is also admitting his sin.

54 The scriptural model for the martyrs' verbal battles may have been Jesus' dialogue with the Jewish and Roman authorities during Holy Week, especially as it is recounted in Matt. 26-27, but the power of their utterances ultimately derived from the extraordinary perlocutionary force inherent in divine discourse and described in Gen. 1.3 and John 1.1-3. I also ought to note here that the remainder of my brief discussion of Latin Christian hagiography is indebted to Elliott,
especially her analysis of the role of speech acts in the acta and of Prudentius' Peristephanon in Roads, pp. 16-36. However, observations concerning the similarity of these pious adversarial dialogues and flyting are my own.

55 For an etymology of martyr, see New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. J. Douglas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) and Elliott, Roads, p. 22.

56 Roads, p. 187. His claim to be a Christian is close to the statement of identity found in secular battle flyting (see chapter one, p. 10).

57 Elliott makes a similar point: "The saint confesses his faith, then translates words into actions. The tyrant cannot carry out his threats, but it is not for the lack of trying. There is, then, no conflict between word and deed. In fact the hero might be defined in this context as the actor capable of achieving his expressed goals, his opponent as the one who is impotent" ("Power," p. 45).

58 There is, as I have noted, one important difference between the martyr/magistrate dispute and flytings which end in violence: the martyr, unlike the secular flyter, can win by dying. This paradox of spiritual warfare (which is also observed in another context by Hermann in Allegories, p. 44) is an important part of sacred flyting and will be explored in a later chapter.

59 Elliott observes that in the passiones, this glory is acquired for the benefit of the audience of the faithful, rather than for the martyr himself. On the other hand, in secular flyting, glory is sought by the flyter for himself (Parks, "Flying Speech and Traditional Narrative," p. 286).

60 Musurillo, Acts of the Christian Martyrs, pp. 250-9. All Latin citations of early acta, as well as translations, are from Musarillo.


62 "He bore witness in a loud voice: 'I am a soldier of Jesus Christ, the eternal king. From now I cease to serve your emperors and I despise the worship of your gods of wood and stone, for they are deaf and dumb images'" (Acts, p. 251).

63 "After the letter was read, Agricolanus said: 'Did you say the things that are recorded in the prefect's report?' 'Yes, I did,' answered Marcellus. 'You held the military rank of centurion, first class?' asked Agricolanus. 'Yes,' said Marcellus. 'What madness possessed you,' asked Agricolanus, 'to throw down the symbols of your military oath and to say the things you did?' Marcellus replied: 'No madness possesses those who fear the Lord.' 'Then you did say all of those things,' asked Agricolanus, 'that are set down in the prefect's report?' 'Yes, I said them,' answered Marcellus.
Agricolanus said: 'You threw down your weapons?'
Marcellus replied: 'Yes, I did. For it is not fitting that a
Christian, who fights for Christ his Lord, should fight for the armies
of this world' (Acts, p. 253).

64 See "Idus Aprilis sanctorum martyrum Carpi episcopi et Pamfili
diaconi et Agathonicae" (Acts, pp. 29-31, and p. 35).
65 "Sacrifice,' said the proconsul. 'This is the emperor's order.'
Carpus said: 'The living do not sacrifice to the dead.'
The proconsul said: 'Do the gods seem dead to you?'
Carpus said: 'Yes and learn why this is so. They look like men but
they are unfeeling.' [sic. The Latin says that the pagan gods are
motionless.]

The proconsul said: 'You must sacrifice.'
'What you ask is impossible,' replied Carpus.
'I have never before sacrificed to images that have no feeling or
understanding.' [sic. The Latin says that the images are deaf and have
no feeling.]
The proconsul said: 'Have pity on yourself.'
'I do have pity on myself,' answered Carpus, 'Choosing as I do the
better part.'
After this exchange, the proconsul ordered him to be hung up. And when
he was in torment he said: 'I am a Christian, and because of my faith
and the name of my Lord Jesus Christ I cannot become one of you' (Acts,
p. 31).

66 Indeed, the connection between baptism and martyrdom is implicit in
the writer's description of Carpus' fellow martyr, Pamfilus, as a fortis
athleta (1. 3, p. 32) -- an epithet suggestive of Chrysostom's image of
the baptismal candidate as wrestler.
67 '*You are being offered advice,' said Maximus.
'For if you endured this for the sake of the civil law, you would have
eternal glory.'
Julius replied: 'I surely suffer for the law -- but it is the divine
law.'
Maximus said: 'You mean the law given you by a man who was crucified
and died? Look how foolish you are to fear a dead man more than living
emperors!' 'It was he who died for our sins,' answered Julius, 'in order to give us
eternal life. This same man, Christ, is God and abides for ever and
ever. Whoever believes in him will have eternal life; and whoever
denies him will have eternal punishment.'
'I counsel you out of pity,' said Maximus, 'that you sacrifice and
continue to live with us.'
'To live with you,' answered Julius, 'would be death for me. But, in
God's sight, if I die I shall live for ever.'
'Listen to me and offer the sacrifice,' said Maximus, 'lest I put you to
death as I promised.'
'I have chosen death for now,' said Julius, 'that I might live with the
saints for ever' (pp. 263 and 265).
68 The early lists of martyrs gave way to historically less accurate
but literarily more vivid accounts of the martyrs' ordeals called
passiones (see Rosemary Woolf, "Saints' Lives," in Continuations and
Beginnings, ed. E.G. Stanley [London: Thomas Nelson, 1960], p. 43,
Bridges, Generic Contrast, p. 12 and Elliott, "Power", p. 41, for the
historical inaccuracy of the passio). By the second half of the fourth
century after the persecutions had ended, these passiones were joined by
a less combative form of hagiography, the *vita*, which I shall discuss below. For a list of the sub-genres of hagiography, see Bridges, *Generic Contrast*, pp. 11-12.


70 "Hereupon Vincent, a Levite of the sacred tribe and servant of the altar of God ... cries aloud: 'let these powers by your masters; you may worship stones and wood and become the dead priest of dead gods. As for us, we shall confess the Father who is the author of light, and Christ his Son; He is the true and only God, O Datianus' (Thomson, p. 171). See also Elliott, *Roads*, p. 30 for further discussion of this passage, and *Peristepanon V*, vv. 54-60, p. 296 for a similar exchange.

71 *Roads*, p. 29. Later (vv. 213-6) the martyr and his judge represent the abstractions, Hope and Cruelty, respectively (*Roads*, p.32).


73 "Tie him with his arms behind and rack him upwards and downwards till the joints of his bones in every limb are rent asunder with a crack. The with cleaving strokes lay bare his ribs of their covering, so that his organs shall be exposed as they throb in the recesses of the wounds" (Thomson, pp. 175-7).

74 "This is the pattern of you, serpent; one day sulphurous soot and mingled bitumen and pitch will enwrap you deep in hell" (p. 181).

75 "Stricken with these words the persecutor turns first pale, then red, and in the heat of his passion rolls his eyes frantically this way and that grasping his teeth and foaming at the mouth" (Thomson, p. 181). See, too, Elliott's discussion of this passage in *Roads*, pp. 29-32.


77 "The prefect ordered her to be led before his tribunal at dawn. When he saw her beauty, he addressed her with the/ gentlest words, 'Tell me, my sweetest Juliana, why you mocked me for so long?'" (pp. 123-4)

78 Juliana's exchange with Eleusius, like other verbal wars discussed above, has a rhetorical format which suggests the reciprocity of blows. Personal pronouns are important in achieving this effect, as is personal insult (Juliana says that the Roman emperor "sits on a dunghill," *Sources and Analogues*, p. 124 [*in stercore sedentem,* ASS February 16, cap. I, 3, p. 875]).

79 "While I [the demon, Beliar] did all these evils, nobody dared to torture me as much as you. None of the apostles even gripped my hand, but you have bound me. None of the martyrs beat me..... And you destroy me with torments like this? Virginity, why are you armed against us?" (p. 128). The corresponding Latin is: "Et cum omnia mala fecerim, nemo ausus fuit me torquere, quantum tu. Nemo Apostolorum manu meam tenuit: tu autem et ligasti me. Nemo Martyrum me cecidit ... et tu me sic tormentis consumis? O Virginitas, quid contra nos armaris?" (ASS February 16, cap. II, 11, p. 877).
For the structure of the vita, see Charles Altman, "Two Types of Opposition and Structure of Latin Saints' Lives," Med et Hum 6 (1975), p. 3.


Athanasius' Vita Antonii, composed c. 356, was instrumental in establishing this shift from physical martyrdom to spiritual ordeal, for in the desert, Anthony "erat ibi cotidie martyrium dicens conscientiae et certans certaminibus fidei ..." ("and he was there martyring himself ... in his conscience and struggling in contests of faith," Roads, p. 45).

"Ce qui est essentiellement une lutte contre le moi y devient une lutte contre les demons" (Festuguere in Les Moines d'orient, cited in Roads, p. 91. Hunter Blair, World of Bede, p. 273, expresses a similar view. See, too, Satan, pp. 166-7). Indeed, Evagrius, in his version of Athanasius' vita, has St. Anthony acknowledge that evil thoughts are the devils' snares: "'Hostile illis contra omnes Christianos, maxime vero contra monachos et virgines Christi, odium est. Eorum semitis laqueos praetendunt, eorum mentes impiis atque obscenis cogitationibus nituntur evertere'" ("Vita Beati Antonii Abbatis," PL LXXIII, cap. xv, cols. 137-8. All subsequent citations of Evagrius' vita will be from this edition). In his translation of this passage, Deferrari says the devils attack "by putting snares in the way. Their snares are evil thoughts" (Roy Deferrari, trans., "Life of St. Anthony," in Early Christian Biographies, XV [New York: Fathers of the Church Inc., 1952], p. 156).

All translations of the Vita Antonii will be from Deferrari). Jerome also reminded the faithful that even though the persecutions were over, "the Devil, the enemy, never ceases to persecute by tempting us" (Satan, p. 188) while Ambrose asserted that "inside us is the adversary" (Satan, p. 189).

Bridges, Generic Contrast, p. 16. On the same page, Bridges also notes that another sub-genre of hagiography, the conversion legend, also contains elements of the passio. "The antagonism between the protagonist and his pagan adversaries is marked by the same diametrical oppositions characterizing the theomachia and tortures of passio."

The boy, with the wisdom of an old man, avoids companions, eschews material comforts and is devout (PL LXXIII, cap. i-iii, cols. 127-9; Deferrari, pp. 134-5).

"The Devil, however, in his envy and hatred of the good, could not bear to see such steadfastness in a young person and attempted to use against him the methods in which he is skilled. He first tried to draw him away from the ascetical life by suggesting the memory of his property, anxiety about his sister, intimacy with his kindred, greed for money and for power, the manifold enjoyment of food, and the other pleasures of life .... In a word, he gathered up in his mind a great dust cloud of arguments" (Deferrari, p. 138).

"Anthony then asked: 'Who are you who say such things to me? And at once he uttered a contemptible speech: 'I am a lover of fornication; I have undertaken to ensnare the young and entice them to it, and I am called the spirit of fornication .... I am he who often troubled you, but whom you as often overthrew'" (Deferrari, p. 140).
"But Anthony thanked God and, taking courage against his adversary, said: 'You are, then, thoroughly despicable, for your mind is black and you are as weak as a child. Henceforth, I shall have no concern about you, for "the Lord is my helper and I will despise my enemies." At this the Evil One immediately fled, cringing at his words, fearing even to approach the man again" (Deferarri, p. 140). Anthony later tells his followers the story of another encounter with Satan. This exchange incorporates the formal features of the interrogation of the baptismal candidate, only here it is Satan and not the candidate who confesses. His defeat is completed by Anthony's mention of Jesus' name (PL LXXIII, col. 145; Deferarri, pp. 172-3).
CHAPTER THREE

CHRISTIAN MARTIALITY, THE WAR OF WORDS, AND ITS RE-ANALYSIS AS FLYTING: THE TESTIMONY OF A MISCELLANY OF NON-HAGIOGRAPHIC OR RELIGIOUS PROSE, INCLUDING TRANSLATIONS OF SCRIPTURE AND NON-CANONICAL TEXTS AND SOME SCRIPTURALLY DEPENDENT HOMILIES

Did AS writers, heirs to the traditions of both Ingeld and Christ, recognize the kinship of their native flyting genre and the imported Latin Christian adversarial dialogues? This, as I have noted, is my contention, and in this chapter, I shall begin to support my claim by showing that the conceit of spiritual warfare and the associated trope of verbal battle found in Latin Christian discourse persists in non-hagiographic OE religious prose, and produces Christian and demonic speech which resembles some forms of flyting utterance. Next, I shall show that writers of OE religious prose recognized that these utterances could have a performative dimension, and that the most effective utterances in the Christian war of words (like the most effective flyting utterances) were those which were fulfilled by deeds. I shall then analyze three OE accounts of adversarial dialogues found in the N.T. to show how closely they resemble flyting, and will conclude with a brief examination of some usages of geflit and flitan which suggest that the resemblance of sacred and profane quarrel discussed here provoked a re-analysis of the Christian war of words as a kind of flying.

An obvious place to search for written evidence of AS knowledge of the Christian martial metaphor and the war of words is in OE translations of scriptural and related non-canonical texts, for the Bible and apocryphal material, as I have shown in chapter two, pp. 64-69, was the source of the notion that Christian life was a moral war. A reading of some of these OE translations together with related homiletic passages, shows that their authors faithfully preserved the
militarism of earlier Christian discourse. For example, like its Latin counterpart, the OE gloss of Psalm 3.7-9 found in the Stowe Psalter describes God as a powerful warrior who has no hesitation in destroying the psalmist's enemies:

(3.7) ne ic ondræde þusenda folces ýmbsyllende me arís drihten gehæl me god min (8) forþon þu ofsloge ealle þa wiþriende me butan intingan teþ synfulra þu tobyrryttest (9) drihtne is hæl ond ofer folce þine bleþsung þin.2

The martial metaphor persists in the N.T. and is preserved in OE translations of the gospels.3 Thus Jesus says "ne com ic sybbe to sendanne ac sweord. Ic com soplice man asyndrian ongean hys fæder. And dohtor ongean hyre moder" (Matt. 10.34-36, Grünberg, p. 68) and explains that his crucifixion and resurrection are, in fact, battles with the prince of this world ("nu ys myddaneardes dom. Nu byþ þyse myddaneardes ealdor ut aworpen," John 12.31, p. 225).4

Non-canonical sources also contributed to the martial tone of OE religious prose. The writer of Vercelli XIX incorporates into his sermon martial explanations for the origin of good and evil which suggest the influence of Hebrew apocalyptic tradition.5 He tells how a greedy angel, eager for power and territory, rebels against his lord ("ac he ... him þrymsetl on norþdæle heofonarices [sic] getimbrian wolde"), and as a result is consigned to hell.6 The homilist emphasizes that this defeat does not end the influence of Satan, however, for the rebel angel, now transformed into a devil, still wages war against God and mankind.7 The weapons which clash in the battle are the intangibles of faith and disbelief, pride and humility, lust and chastity:

Se deofol dæges ond nihtes winnþ ongean us mid his geleafleste. Uton we winnan ongean hine mid geleaffulnesse. He winnþ mid ofermodnesse. Uton we ongean mid eaþmodnesse. He us gegearwæþ galnesse. Uton we ongean cleanness. He gegripþ
manfulnesse. Uton we ongean rihtwisnesse (Szarmach, p. 70).

The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus with its militaristic description of Jesus' Easter triumph over Satan was also an influential text in AS England. The version of the Harrowing of Hell found in this gospel transforms an intangible moral and perhaps verbal victory over evil into an actual raid on the fortress of hell:

Ac amang þam þe hig þus spræcon, þær wæs stefen and gastlic hream swa hlud swa þunres slege, and wæs þus cweþende ... 'Ge ealdras tonymâp þa gatu, and up ahebbâþ þa ecan gatu þæt mêge in gan se Cyng þæs ecan wuldres'

Þæt to becom se wuldorfulla Cyning on mannes gelycynysse ... and þær þa ecan þystro ealle geondlyhte, and þær þa synbendas he ealle tobræc, and he ure ealdfæderas ealle geneosode þær þær hig on þam þystrum ær lange wunigende wæron. Ac seo hell and se deap and heora arleasan þenunga, þa ... hig ðæringa Cryst gesawon on þam setle syttan þe he him sylfum geahnod hæfde ... hig wæron clÿpigende and þus cweþende, 'We syndon fram þe oferswyþde' (Hulbert, pp. 133-5).

The influence of this text is apparent in the seventh Blickling homily, "Dominica Pascha," where Jesus' wuldorfaest gast acts like an invading army which shatters the gates of hell, binds the demons and conquers the darkness itself with his scinendan leoht:

he [Jesus] þa onsende his þone wuldorfaestan gast to helle grunde and þær þone ealdor ealra þeostra and þæs ecan deapes geband and gehynde and ealne his geferscipe swyþe gedrêfde, and helle geatu and hire þa ærenan scyttelas he ealle tobræc, and ealle his þa geCOREnan he þonon alædde, and þæra deofla þeostrô he oforgeat mid his þam scinendan leohte.

Ælfric, too, employs a martial lexicon to describe the contest between virtue and vice. In "Passio Machabeorum,"
for instance, he urges Christians to fight sin with spiritual weaponry:

we sceolon winnan wip pa wælreowan fynd
pæt synd pa ungesewenlican and pa swicolan deofla
pe willæ ofslean ure sawla mid leahtrum
wip pa we sceolon winnan mid gastlicum weapnum
and biddan us gescyldnysse simle æt criste
pæt we moton oferwinnan pa wælreowan leahtras
and þæs deofles tihtinge pæt he us derian ne mæge.
þonne beop we godes cempan on þam gastlican gefeohte.\textsuperscript{13}

In "Dominica In Media Quadragesime," Ælfric compares the sins which attack the faithful Christian to an actual army, comprised of Pharaoh and the seven nations which opposed Joshua:

Witodlice Iosue and israhela folc oferwunnon seofon ðeoda, eahtoe wæs pharao pe ær mid his leode
dranæc, and he siþpan sigefæste þone behatenan eard
him betwynan dældon: Swa sceolon eac Cristene men
þa eahta heafodeleahtras mid heora werodum ealle
overwinnan.\textsuperscript{14}

The spiritual war could also be fought in the private arena of the individual conscience. In "Dominica III In Quadragesima," Ælfric combines both external and internal struggles in a single powerful image. Explaining the pericope in which Jesus describes the mechanics of exorcism (Matt. 12.22-30),\textsuperscript{15} Ælfric uses martial language which evokes the Harrowing of Hell to transform the act of exorcism into the equivalent of an armed siege:

'Þonne se stranga healt his [in]burh fæste
þonne beop on sibbe þa þing þe he sylf hæfp.
Ac gif sum strenga cyme and hine oferswiþ,
ealle his wæpna he gewiþ þonne
on þam þe he truwode, and todæþ his herereaf.'
Deofol is se stranga þe ure Drihten embe spræc,
þe hæþde eall manncynn on his andwealde þa
purh Adames forgægedynsse, ac Godes Sunu com,
strenga þonne he, and hine gewylde,
and his wæpna him ætbræð and tobræc his searocræftas,
and his herereaf todælde ðe he mid his deasp alysdæ.\textsuperscript{16}

Whether the spiritual war was conducted against Satan, pagans, or temptations in the private conscience, in the OE texts, as in their Latin antecedents, it was often fought with words. For instance, since O.T. times, deceitful speech had been considered an attribute of God's enemies. The OE translation of Psalm 5 preserves this view:

\begin{verbatim}
(5.7) pu hatudest ealle ða ðe wircap unrihtwisynsse
pu forspillest / ealle ða ðe sprecaþ leasunga (8)
wer blod ond facnfulne onscuniaþ drihten ....(10)
forpam nis on muþe heora sopfæstynys heorte heora
idel is (11) byrgen opnigende is brace heora mid
tungan heora facenfullice dydon dem pu heom god
(Stowe Psalter, pp. 7-8).\textsuperscript{17}
\end{verbatim}

In John 8.44-45, Jesus places the murderer, Satan, in the forefront of these lying enemies:

\begin{verbatim}
he was fram frymþ man slagæ and he ne wunode on
sopfæstynysse. forpam ðe sopfæstynys nys on hym.
ponne he sprycþ leasunga he sprycþ of hym sylfum
forpam ðe he ys leas and hys fæder eac (Grunberg,
p. 219).\textsuperscript{18}
\end{verbatim}

For humanity, his lies prove a dangerous weapon, sufficient to make Adam and Eve break God's commandment:

\begin{verbatim}
ða was him þæt on myclan andan ongann ðe beswican
and gelæræn þæt se man abraþc Godes bebod .... ða
beswac deofof and forlærde his wif ærest and heo
hine syppan þæt hy abraþcon Godes bebod.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{verbatim}

Such passages may well have been on the mind of the Blickling homilist in "Dominica V in Quadragesmia" (BH 5) when he warns his audience about the effects of demonic teaching on the spiritually vulnerable ("sægd is þæt se ilca wiperwearda þe
him ær þa synna lærde, þæt se hi mote eft midmycclum witum
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witnian," Morris, p. 61)\textsuperscript{20} and asserts that slander is tantamount to murder:

Manige men wena\textsuperscript{p} \textit{pæt} mor\textsuperscript{p}or syn mæste synne; ac us is to witenne \textit{pæt} preora cynne syndon mor\textsuperscript{pr}as, \textit{pæt} is \textit{ponne} \textit{pæt} ærest, \textit{pæt} man to òprum læppe hæbbe/ and hine hatige and tæle behindan him sylfum; forpon seo synn bi\textsuperscript{p} swipe mycel \textit{pæt} man òperne hatige and tæle; sægd is \textit{pæt} hit sy wytruma ealra òperra synna (Morris, pp. 63-5).\textsuperscript{21}

Clearly, then, in OE religious discourse lies are considered to be the equivalent of deadly weapons.

Yet if deceitful words were weapons, Scripture also taught that God's word could function as both shield and sword, and OE translations preserve this conceit. For example, in the OE translation of Psalm 90.5-6 (Vulgate; RSV 91), the psalmist declares that God's truth protects the faithful from the arrows of the enemy ("on scylde ymbsyly\textsuperscript{p} \textit{pe} sopfæstnys his na \textit{pu} ondrædst from ege nihtlicum from flane fleogendre on ðæge"),\textsuperscript{22} and in Psalm 19 (Vulgate; RSV 20) that God's name alone surpasses the might of chariots:

[19.8.] \textit{pa} hi on wænum ond creatum ond hi on horsum we soplice on naman drihtnes godes ures we geceg\textsuperscript{p} ond cleopia\textsuperscript{p} [19.9] hig ofergytende wæron ond hi feollon we soplice arison on arehte we synd.\textsuperscript{23}

No doubt the most famous call to verbal arms in Scripture, however, is Paul's exhortation to the Ephesians (Eph. 6.11-17), to which Ælfric alludes in his mid-Lent homily, "Dominica In Media Quadragesime"\textsuperscript{24}:

Cristene men sceolon gastlice feohtan ongean leahtrum swa swa Paulus \textit{peoda} lareow us tähte pisum wordum; ymbscryda\textsuperscript{p} eow mid godes wæpnunge \textit{pæt} ge magon standan ongean deofles syrwungum for \textit{pon} \textit{pe} us nis nan gecamp ongean flæsc and blod ac togeanes deofellicum ealdrum and gastlicum yfelnyssum (Godden, p. 123).
At the conclusion of this homily, Ælfric not only exhorts his audience to use spiritual means to fight the sins reified as Joshua's enemies (p. 123), he also singles out verbal opposition (wipcwePan) as a significant spiritual weapon which can conquer (oferwinnan) the deadly sins just as the Israelites defeated Egypt:

\[
\text{pisum heafodaleahtrum we sceolon symle on urum peawum wipcwePan} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{purh godes fulum mid gastlicum wæpnum ealle oferwinnan gif we pone heofonlican eard habban willa} \] (p. 125).

The importance of words as spiritual weapons is recognized by the Vercelli homilist as well. In Vercelli IV, after dwelling on the horrors of the Last Judgment, he catalogues the devil's arsenal. Among its contents are the arrows of sins such as deceit and heresy:

\[
\text{ponne hæf} \quad \text{pæt dioful geworht bogan ond stræla. Se boga bi} \quad \text{geworht of ofermettum ond } \text{pa stræla bi} \quad \text{swa manigra cyngra swa-swæ mannes synna bi} \quad \text{Sumu stræl by} \quad \text{geworht of nipe ond of æfste ... sumu of ... se ligre ... ond of gedweollcæftum ... sumu of giferwer ... ond of morpor-cwale (Forster, p. 103).}^25
\]

By using the shield of God's wisdom and the sword of the Holy Spirit, however, the pious may deflect these weapons:

\[
\text{ponne is mycel pærf, men } \text{pa leofestan, pæt we hæbben } \text{pa scyldas pær ongean } \text{pe Dryhten us hæf} \quad \text{gesett mid to scyldanne; ærest is an scyld wisdom ond wearscipe ond fæstradnes on godum weorcum ... ond } \text{pæs halgan gastes sweord } \text{pe men singa} \quad \text{ond starul-fæstnesse scyld on godum weorcum. Ond } \text{pone scyld nimen us to wige wip } \text{pam awyr/ gedan deofle, } \text{pe lufu hatte (Forster, pp. 105-6).}
\]

The word of God, or the "sweord pe men singa\text{,}"\textsuperscript{26} is also part of the arsenal which attacks hell on Easter Saturday. Although the verbal ingredient of the battle is suppressed, a
close reading of portions of the OE translation of the Harrowing in the Gospel of Nicodemus suggests that the fortress of hell succumbs as much to the power of words as to any physical agent. Hearing the thunderous cry, "'Ge ealdras tonymæp ða gatu ðæt mæge in gan se Cyning ðæs ecan wuldræs'" (Hulbert, p. 133) David interprets the attack as the fulfillment of a prophetic statement:

\[ða cwæþ Dauid ða gyt, "Ne forwitegode ic eow, ða ða ic on eorþan lyfigende wæs, 'Andetæþ Dryhtne hys myldheortnyssé, for ðam ðæ he hys wundra wyle manna bearnum gecyþan, and ða ærenan gatu and ða ysenan scyttelæs tobreæc, and he wyle genymæn hig of ðam wege heora unryhtwysnyssé?'" (p. 134)\]

No sooner are these words uttered than Christ himself suddenly appears, having apparently penetrated the gates, and breaks the bonds of hell ("Dauide ðæ ðus gesprecænum, ðæþ to becom se wuldorfulla Cyning ... and ðæ þæ synbendas he ealle tobræc," p. 135). His means of entry remain obscure, however, and the writer's reluctance to provide a description of the actual invasion, coupled with his emphatic repetition of the command "'Ge ealdras tonymæp eowre gatu'" (p. 133 and p. 134) emphasizes the connection between command and consequence, and minimizes the unspecified physical activity which may have precipitated hell's destruction.

Two other suggestions of verbal conflict occur in the narrative, and although I shall discuss both more fully below, they deserve brief mention here. First, the juxtaposition of David's prophetic words with their fulfillment in the conquest of hell suggests that this particular speech has shaped events, and by its utterance in the O.T. has somehow contributed to hell's destruction in the Harrowing. Second, by including in the narrative Satan's recollection of Jesus' boast that he is God's son, the author encourages his audience to compare this boast, ultimately fulfilled, with Satan's empty claim that he will subdue Jesus
The contrasting efficacy of the two utterances is another sign of Satan's defeat.

In his two accounts of Job's trials, Ælfric also implies that the battle fought is linguistic as well as physical. For instance, in "Sermo de Memoria Sanctorum," Job's victory consists of his refusal to utter foolish words against God despite the devil's provocations:

\[
\text{se anræda Iob nolde næfre abugan fram godes lufe} \\
\text{ne nan dyslic word ongean god ne cwaþ} \\
\text{and he leofode ða gesælig forþan ðe he ofer-swipde ðone deofol (Skeat 1, p. 339).}
\]

In Ælfric's second account of Job's ordeal in "Dominica I In Mense Septembri," Job describes man's life on earth as a battle ("Mannes lif is campdom ofer eorþan," Thorpe 2, p. 454) which Job wins by refusing to curse God ("on eallum þisum þingum ne syngode Iob on his welerum," p. 452).

As these passages show, AS translators and homilists incorporated into their work both the overall martial trope of Christianity, which construed the pursuit of good as a military operation, as well as the corresponding conceit that in this moral war, words had the status of weapons. But exactly what kind of verbal weapons were available to the pious Christian? Again, Scripture provided illustrations of several kinds of swords with which the faithful could arm themselves. The first of these was prayer. Its efficacy had already been implied in the O.T. when, for instance, Moses' prayerful stance enabled Joshua to defeat Amalek (Exo. 17.9-11):

\[
\text{þa cwaþ Moyses to Iosue: Ceos geferan, ond feoht ongean Amalech: ic stande to morgen uppon þis beorge ond hæbbe Drihtnes gyrdon handa (10) ond Iosue dyde eal swa Moyses him bebead, ond feaht ongean Amalech; witodlice Moyses ond Aaron ond Vr stigon uppon ðone beorh (11) ðonne Moyses his handa}
\]
In his "De Oratione Moysi," Ælfric retells the incident, specifically identifying prayer as the force which determines victory:

Iosue pa ferde and feaht wip amalech
and moyses pa astah to pam sticolan munte
mid aarone and hurpone aelmightigan to biddenne.
Pa ahefde moyses his handa on gebedum
and Iosue hæfde sige and sloh pa heapanan (Skeat 1, p. 284).

Ælfric adds in this homily that prayer is a weapon especially feared by the devil for it destroys his own armaments:

Nu habbe we gewinn wip pone hetelan deofol
ond he winp on us forpan pe he walthrown is
....
Nis nan pincg swa lap pam geleafleasum deofle
swa pe hine man gebidde bealdlice to gode
forpan pe [se] swicola wat pe his wæpen sceolan
purh halige gebedu toberstan swipost
and he bip ofer-swipod simble purh gebedu (p. 286).

The demonic arsenal thus endangered includes, of course, the verbal weaponry of lies.

Prayer was not the only form the sword of the word of God could take. As already noted in chapter two, Scripture provided two alternatives to prayer -- exorcism and confession -- and these coincidentally shared some features with flyting.²² Like some flyting utterances, scriptural and liturgical exorcism usually contained an imperative, commanding the devil to leave.²³ OE references to exorcistic speech treat it as if it were a weapon (in the OE translation of Matt. 8.16, for instance, words expel the devil from a possessed man: "and he ut adrefde pa unclænan gastas myd his worde," Grünberg, p. 58), and suggest that it consists of directive illocutions (the OE translation of Mark 1.25
includes two directives: "'Adumba ond ga of pyssum men'". AS writers may therefore have recognized that the imperatives of exorcism were akin to the imperatives of flyting.

The sword of God's word could also include confession, and, as I show in chapter two, pp. 74-6, such confessions were varied and assumed several forms, ranging from Jesus' own confessions of divinity and predictions of future events, to a variety of credal confessions uttered by the devout. This variety is faithfully preserved in OE translations of Scripture and the creeds. For example, in the OE translation of Matthew 26.64, Jesus uses confession as a defense when he is brought before the Sanhedrin, turning his prosecutors' words ("pu secge us gif pu sig cryst godes sunu") into a confession of his divinity: "pa cwæp se hælend hym to 'paet pu sædest.'" He follows this confession of identity with an utterance which, like projective boast, anticipates future events: "'Soo ic eow secge æfter pysum ge gesæþ mannes sunu syttende on pa swypean healef godes mægenpyrrymes'" (Grunberg, p. 130). OE religious prose also preserved the variety of credal confessions available to the faithful. In Vercelli V, the homilist recapitulates Peter's brief confession in Luke 9. 20: "'pu eart crist, lifiendes godes/ sunu'" (Forster, p. 130), while in his "Her is Geleafa and Gebed, and Bletsung, Lawedum Mannum ðæt ne Cunnon," Ælfric translates the longer Nicene Creed which not only includes assertions about the past, but also predictions about the future:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ic gelyfe on ... ænne Crist, Hæland Drihten ... acennedne na geworhtne ... se for us mannum and for ure hæle niþerastah of heofenum, and wearþ geflæschamod ... he prowode ... and he aras on þam þriddan daeg ... and eft/ cymp mid wuldre to demenne þam cucum and þam deadum, and his rices ne bieþ nan end.}
\end{align*}
\]

Clearly, then, non-hagiographic OE religious prose preserved both the retrospective and the predictive quality
of Christian confessional utterance. That AS writers explicitly recognized confession's kinship to the profane boasts of flyting which also looked forward as well as backward is implicit in the Blickling homily, "Dominica Pascha." Here, Jesus' confessional predictions about his impending death and resurrection are described as a boast which he fulfilled:

he geendode þæt he lange to þæm awergdum gastum gebeotod hæfde, and he mannum gecypde on þæs ondweardan tid ealle þæs æfre ær from witgum gewitgode wæron, be his prowunga and be his æriste, and be his hergunga on helle, and be his wundra manegum þæs ær gesægde wæron, eall he þæt gefylde (Morris, p. 83).

In his translation of Boethius' De Consolatione Philosophiae, Alfred also refers to the praise of God, which is often a part of confession, as boasting: "Ac gif þu gilpan wille, gilp Godes." Significantly, the deceitful utterance which opposed such speech was Germanicized as idel gyld.

In both Scripture and its OE textual offspring, confession and exorcism sometimes fought side by side in the metaphoric war of words. For instance, in the OE translation of the Lenten temptation in the wilderness (Matt. 4.10-11), Jesus defends himself with a confession which recapitulates scriptural truths, then banishes Satan with an exorcistic imperative:

þæs cwæþe he hælend to him gang þu sceucca onbæc somlice hit ys awritten to drihtne þinum gode þu geeadmedest and hym anum þeowast. þa forlet se deofol hine (Grünberg, p. 44).

The verbal weapons of exorcism and confession also occur in Mark 1.23-26. Here, however, it is the devil who bears witness, confessing Jesus' divinity and thus acknowledging his own defeat before Jesus dismisses him with the imperatives of exorcism:
and on heora gesmnunge wæs sum man on unclænum
gaste. and he hrymede and cwaep .... Ic wat þu eart
godes halga.  þa cidde se hælend hym and cwaep
adumba and ga of þyssum men. And se unclæna gæst
hyne slytende and mycelre stefne clypiende hym of
eode (Grünberg, p. 143). 40

Evidence that AS homilists as well as AS translators of
Scripture incorporated the verbal weapons of confession and
exorcism into their own pious works can be found in BH 3,
"Dominica Prima in Quadragesima." Here, the homilist
explicitly characterizes the Lenten temptation as a battle
("and forþon he pyder com þæt he wolde gecompian wip pone
awerigdan gast;" "he [Jesus] wolde deofol gelapian to campe
wip hine," Morris, p. 29) 41 in which Jesus defeats the devil's
lies with an exorcistic imperative which includes Jesus'
confessional recapitulation ("þisse cyþnesse") 42 of the
consequences of Satan's initial boast at the beginning of
time:

ac se forhwyrfda gast spræc forhwyrfedlice word....
He [Jesus] cwaep 'Ga þu onbæcling, and gemyne þe
sylfne hu mycel yfel þe gelamp for þinne gitsunga
and oforhydo, and for þinne idlan gilpe; and forþon
ic þe ne fylyge, forþon on þyssum þrim þu eart
oforswipde' .... swa Crist oferswipde þæt deofol
mid þisse cyþnesse ....
þonne he þone awyrghan gast oferswipþe [sic] and þone
wælhrowan feond þisse menniscan gecynd; forþon
hine mæg nu ǣc mon oforswipan .... purh cristes
sige ealle halige waeran gefreolsode (p. 31). 43

This miscellany of texts shows, then, that the Christian
war of words flourished in non-hagiographic OE religious
prose, and that it was waged with the sword of the word of
God which, in addition to prayer, could include confessional
statements resembling boasts and exorcisms akin to the
directive illocutions frequent in flyting. These utterances
were opposed by the devil's discourse which like the speech
of the incompetent flyter included lies ("Sermo De Initio Creaturae," Vercelli IV), false boasts ("Dominica Prima in Quadragesima") and heresies (Vercelli IV).

A final feature of the Latin Christian war of words is relevant to this study, and must now be considered. In Latin Christian verbal battle, the performative quality of speech which links utterance to act was understood to be particularly important: early Christian writers, like Germanic flyters, recognized that to win verbal battles, one must fulfill one's promises, boasts and threats with deeds.44 Ælfric's comments on divine, Satanic and mortal discourse suggest that he and other AS prose writers were also aware that in the Christian war of words, as in serious or battle flying,45 the speaker who fulfilled his words with deeds was the victor.

In his homily, "Sermo De Initio Creaturae," Ælfric explains that God's word is sufficiently powerful to create something out of nothing: "Ealle ping he geworhte buton ælcum antimbre. He cwæp 'Geworfe leoht,' and þærrihtæ wæs leoht ge/worden" (Thorpe 1, pp. 14-6). In "Dominica III. Post Epiphania Domini," Ælfric returns to this theme, and says that God's command is the equivalent of a deed:

God's word as described by Ælfric, then, has unique perlocutionary force, because everything that God intends in his speech ultimately comes to pass. Not only are God's statements descriptively (and constatively) truthful, his performative utterances are instantly actualized: "He bebead, and hi wæron gesceapene" ("Dominica III. Post Epiphania"). For Ælfric's God, then, word is deed.46

If God's utterance approaches the level of deed, the discourse of Satan, prince of liars, fails at the simple
level of descriptive accuracy unless he is confessing under duress.\textsuperscript{47} On account of this, Satanic utterances either completely lack perlocutionary force\textsuperscript{48} or produce effects quite contrary to Satan's intention. \AE{}lfric seems to recognize this perlocutionary weakness in the devil's speech. For example, in "Sermo De Initio Creaturae," Satan boasts to his angelic troops that he is God's equal, and could easily control a portion of heaven:

\begin{quote}
[he cwæp] ðæt he wolde and eape mihte beon his scyppende gelic ... and habban andweald and rice ongean God \AE{}lmihtigne. ðæ gefæstnode he ðisne ræd wippæt werod ðe he bewiste (Thorpe 1, p. 10).
\end{quote}

As soon as Satan has made his rash speech, events take a contrary turn, and the auxiliaries wolde and mihte fail in their modal force, for no fulfilling confirmation of the boast emerges from the real world. Instead of being exalted, Satan and his followers are transformed ("wurdon awende" from beautiful god-like beings into monstrous devils:

\begin{quote}
ðæ pa ðæ pa hi ealle hæfdon ðysne ræd betwux him gefæstnod, ðæ becom godes grama ofer hi ealle, and hi ealle wurdon awende ... to laplicum deoflum (p. 10).
\end{quote}

Thus, the perlocutionary effect of Satan's boast is not what he had intended, and his words have all the force of idle chatter.

Portions of the OE Harrowing of Hell also suggest an AS recognition of the importance of the performative dimension of speech. When hell is besieged by Jesus, the disjunction between Satan's words and truth cripples the power of his speech, and makes it impossible for his words to be fulfilled by deeds. His boast that he will subjugate Jesus in hell is based on a fatal misinterpretation of his role in Jesus' passion, for Satan believes that Jesus' trial, crucifixion
and death are the result of his evil machinations, rather than of a divine salvatory plan. Thus, he confides to Hel:

ic hys costnode, and ic gedyde hym þæt eal þæt Iudeisce folc þæt hig wæron ongean hyne myd yrre ... and ic gedyde þæt he wæs myd spere gesticod ... and ic dyde þæt man hym treowene rode gegearwode and hyne þæt on aheng.49

Satan's subsequent boast that "nu æt nextan ic wylle his deaj? to þe lædan" (p. 132) like the ēdel gylp of an ineffectual flyter,50 does not come to pass, for it is based on this misconception of his strength. In reality, Satan lacks the prowess to fulfill his rash prediction. Thus, in the Harrowing, he is defeated verbally as well as militarily.

In "Sermo De Initio Creaturae," Ælfric also attributes Satan's inability to pervert those who resist him to the performative weakness of his discourse:

Nu cwædon gedwolmen þæt deofol gesceope sume gesceafte, ac hi leogap; ne mæg he nane gesceafte gescyppan, forþæn þe he nis na Scyppend, ac is atelic sceocca, and mid leasunge he wile beswican and fordon þone unwaran; ac he ne mæg nænne man to nanum leahtre geneadian, buton se mon his agenes willes to his lare gebuge (Thorpe 1, p. 15).

For Ælfric, then, Satan's discourse is the opposite of God's in terms of its perlocutionary power. Because the devil is incapable under his own volition of uttering even the simplest declarative truth,51 his words inevitably have no impact. In the absence of man's acquiescence, they cannot persuade, nor, unless God wills it, can they approach the level of deed.52

Where does mortal speech belong in this model of discourse? Again, Ælfric provides a clue in his "Sermo De Initio Creaturae," by suggesting that after the fall, human language no longer shares the absolute power of divine
discourse, for Eve has chosen to distrust God's word and to align herself instead with the devil's lies:

\[ \text{æc wæp wæt wif, 'God us forbead pæs treowes wæstm, and cæw pæt we sceoldan deape swealtan, gif we his on byrigdon.' } \]

\[ \text{æc wæp se deofol, 'Nis hit na swa } \]

\[ \text{pu segst' (pp. 16-18).} \]

Undermined by this lie, Eve's own speech becomes deceitful, and she encourages Adam likewise to reject God's command in favour of the new language of duplicity which she has learned from Satan:

\[ \text{wearp ðeah wæt wif pæ forspanen pæh ðæs deofles làre, and genam of pæs treowes wæstm, and geæt, and sealde hire were, and he geæt (p. 18).} \]

Their punishment is a direct consequence of this linguistic folly, as God explains to Adam:

\[ \text{'Forpan } \text{pæ pe wære gehyrsum pines wifes wordum, and min bebob forsawe, } \text{pu scealt mid earföpnyssum pæ metes tilian, and seo eor } \text{pæ is awyrged on } \text{pinum weorce, sylp } \text{pæ pornas and bremblas' (p. 18).} \]

In adhering to Satanic doctrine, Adam and Eve have exiled themselves not only from the innocent land of Eden, but also from the perlocutionary power of divine discourse. Much more recently, Fenn makes a similar observation:

the Eden myth suggests that the origin of evil lies in the serpent's inquiry, 'Did God say ...?,' an early reminder that man is in trouble when testimony on the intentions of God becomes unreliable hearsay. 

.... the Eden myth concerns the human condition in which speech is always open to challenge and reinterpretation. Interpretation is itself an act that estranges man from a paradise in which words are serious, unambiguous and have the force of deeds.53
Ælfric's account of the destruction of the tower of Babel (again, in "Sermo De Initio Creaturae") charts the continuing decline of human language. Mimicking Satan's desire for self-exultation, the descendants of Adam and Eve begin to build a tower which will reach to heaven. To punish their arrogance, God further undermines human speech by completely destroying its communicative ability, and turning it into nonsense:

God ... sealde aelcum men þe þær wæs synderlice spræce. þa wærón þær swa fela gereord swa þær manna wærón; and heora nan nyste hwæt oþer cwæþ (p. 22).

If human language were to remain in this state, even the most devout Christian would have a difficult time deflecting the arrows of Satanic discourse, and all verbal wars would be lost. Fortunately for humanity, however, God repairs mortal language through the agency of his son, the Word. In "Nativitas Domini," Ælfric uses John 1.1-14 to emphasize that Jesus' incarnation is the means of returning perlocutionary power to human speech:

... On angynne wæs Word, 
and þæt Word wæs mid Gode, and þæt Word wæs God.
þis wæs on anginne mid þam almihtigan Gode.
Ealle þing syndon gesceapene þurh þæt Word, 
ond butan þam Worde nis geworht nan þing.

And þæt Word is geworht flæse (and hit wunode) on us (Pope 1, pp. 198-9).

Although the spiritual mechanics of this conflation of God and word, so transparent to faith, are likely to remain opaque to reason, it is at least clear that one consequence of this union is the restoration of language to its prelapsarian state, for just as God's word becomes deed in creation, so, too, in Jesus' temporal life and resurrection.
word becomes deed. Jesus explains this aspect of his mission to the apostles in Luke 24.44-46:

\[\text{If your word were spoken and you were speaking in the Name of God, faith would come to you.}\]

Of course, Jesus' own utterance, emanating from one who is God as well as man, has the same power as God's word. The Vercelli homilist recognizes that Jesus' word has the force of deed when, commenting on John's account of Jesus' capture in Gethsemane (John 18.1-11) he says: "he [Jesus] hi ealle mid ane worde on ece forwyrd sendan miht, gif he wolde."55 Jesus' confessional utterances are equally powerful: his retrospective assertions of his identity are true (for instance, John 18.37, "\(\text{pu segst}\) \(\text{pæt}\) ic eom cyning. On \(\text{pam}\) ic eom geboren," Grunberg, p. 233) while his confessional predictions inevitably come to pass (Matt. 26.64, "\(\text{so}\) ic eow secge after \(\text{pysum}\) ge geseop mannes sunu syttende on \(\text{pæt}\) swypran healfes gode mægenprymmes," Grunberg, p. 130). Likewise, Jesus' commands (for example, "\(\text{Gang pu sceucca onbæc,}\)" Matt. 4.10) are instantly fulfilled.

This restoration of perlocutionary power extends beyond the person and discourse of Jesus to the written gospel as well, for in "Nativitas Domini," Ælfric emphasizes that in writing his gospel, John defeats Arius' heretical claim that the Son was not co-eternal with the Father:

\[\text{se godspellere oferdrifp pyllice gedwolan pus awritende 'On aginne wæs Word and pæt Word wæs mid Gode, and pæt word wæs God' (Pope 1, p. 204).}\]

Indeed, Jesus himself taps the power of Scripture by using the moral imperatives contained within it (Matt. 4.10, "hit
ys awritten") as a defensive weapon against Satan in the wilderness.

The power of the word of Scripture and of Jesus' spoken word is evident in the OE account of the Harrowing as well. Here, Jesus' utterance is sufficient to raise the dead, for Hel recounts how he was powerless to restrain Lazarus after Jesus' command:

\[
\text{pa ic gehyrde } \text{pat word hys bebodes, ic wæs myd myclum ege afyrht, and ealle myne arleasan penas wæron myd me gedrehte and gedrefede, swa paet we ne myhton Lazarum gehealdan (Hulbert, pp. 132-3).}^{56}
\]

Likewise God's word manifested in both Isaiah's and David's recapitulation of their scriptural prophecies (as well as in the thunderous cry)\(^ {57}\) is more than a match for Satan's flawed verbal weaponry and appears instrumental in the destruction of the fortress of hell.

In his homily for Ascension Day, Ælfric explains that a portion of Jesus' ability to transform words into deeds is given to the apostles who, as a result, are also able to use Jesus' name as a weapon to drive out devils ("on minum naman hi adrefap deoflu; he sprecap mid niwum gereordum").\(^ {58}\) At Pentecost, the incoherence of Babel is corrected:

\[
\text{se Halga Gast com ofer pa apostolas on fyrendum tungum, and him forgeaf ingehyd ealra gereorde; forpan pe se eadmoda heap gearnode at gode } \text{pat in } \text{ær } \text{pat modige werod forleas ("In Die Sancto Pentecosten," Thorpe 1, p. 318).}
\]

Such potent language does not belong exclusively to the apostles, however, but is also bequeathed to all Christians whose faith is steadfast. Thus, the early Christian martyrs who persisted in their testimony of faith even in the face of death were sharing in the perlocutionary power of divine utterance. By dying rather than recanting, they fulfilled
their boasts to remain loyal to God, and won their verbal battles with words which had become deeds.\textsuperscript{59}

Not all Christian discourse, however, needed death to validate its perlocutionary power: some forms of Christian utterance shared the extraordinary power of divine utterance through their association with liturgy. According to Penn:

> the liturgy is as close as humans ordinarily come to re-entering the closed linguistic garden of paradise (Liturgies and Trials, p. xv).

He adds:

> In everyday life, words are not eventful, they are 'mere words,' whereas religious speech either makes things happen or fulfills them (p. 78).

Since, as I have shown above, some of the confessional and exorcistic statements spoken by AS Christians approximated phrases found in the baptismal rituals of the early Church, such utterances may well have also acquired the special perlocutionary force of liturgical speech in the eyes of the AS faithful.

This analysis of Ælfric's statements about the powers of divine, Satanic and human discourse, then, suggests that for AS homilist and audience alike, the conceit of Eph. 6.17 -- that God's word was a sword against evil -- had in it more than a grain of truth. The devout Christian's expressions of witness, his prayers and perhaps even his exorcistic statements were construed by the AS Church as weapons not only on account of a rhetorical trope, but also because Scripture and doctrine taught that these utterances were indeed capable of accomplishing goals and altering reality.\textsuperscript{60}

To AS homilists and their devout audiences, familiar with both the devout war of words and with the verbal battles of secular Germanic flyting, the adversarial dialogues found in Scripture may well have seemed like variants of flyting quarrel. An analysis of two OE translations of N.T.
adversarial dialogues, and of a homiletic passage derived from one of these exchanges, will show that these dialogues have much in common with secular Germanic flyting.

Jesus' dialogue with the High Priest (Matt. 26.62-8) resembles flyting in many ways. First, like manni afnæpr and many ludic flytings, the exchange takes place in a court-like setting ("and hig genamon þone hælend and læddon hyne to Caiphan þære sacerda ealdre þær þa boceras and þa ealdras gesamnode wæron," Matt. 26.57). Like serious or battle flyting, however, this debate is a prelude to an attack, for it precedes Jesus' passion and crucifixion.

The dialogue itself is introduced by a summary of the testimony against Jesus. Like Satan, or like incompetent flyters, Jesus' accusers are liars, and their testimony proves inapposite:

\begin{align*}
elall \ pæt \ gemot \ sohton \ lease \ saga \ ongean \ þone \ hælend \\
pæt \ hig \ hyne \ to \ deape \ sealdon \ and \ hig \ ne \ myhton \ nane \ fyndan \ þa \ þa \ manega \ myd \ leasum \ onsagum \ genealæhton \ (Matt. 26.59-60, Grünberg, p. 130).
\end{align*}

Finally, two witnesses are found who transform Jesus' own words (Matt. 24.2) into an accusation:

\begin{align*}
\ þa \ æt \ nehstan \ comon \ twegen \ þæra \ leogera \ and \ cwædon \ þes \ sæde \ ic \ ðæge \ toworpan \ godes \ tempel \ and \ æfter \ þrym \ dagum \ hyt \ eft \ getymbrian \ (Matt. 26.60-1).
\end{align*}

At this juncture, Caiaphas speaks, and attempts to establish Jesus' identity. This preoccupation with an opponent's identity is, as I show in chapter one, p.10, a characteristic of flyting exchanges. In addition, the ensuing dialogue is organized according to a question and answer format frequent in flyting, and, like flyting, repeats a key phrase ("þæt þu seege"). The agonistic tone of the exchange is enhanced by the occasional opposition of first and second person pronouns, another rhetorical device favoured by flyters:
Jesus then adds a prediction akin to a flyter's projective boast, beginning with another echo of Caiaphas' "pat pu secge" which juxtaposes "ic" and "eow":

Sop ic eow secge aefter pyssum ge geseop mannes sunu syttende on pa swypran healfe godes maegenpryrmes and cumendne on heofenes wolcnum (Matt. 26.64, Grünberg, p. 130).

Because of the unique perlocutionary force of divine speech in which word becomes deed (Gen. 1.3, John 1.1-3), this utterance has the behavioural weight of a fulfilled boast. An enraged Caiaphas responds by tearing his robes ("Pa para sacerda ealdor slat his agen reaf," Matt. 26.65) and uttering a false accusation ("Pys ys bysmorspræc," Matt. 26.65). He then abandons discourse, relying on violence to accomplish what his words cannot (Matt. 26.67).

The OE translation of Jesus' temptation in the wilderness found in Matt. 4.1-11 also resembles flyting. For instance, like a flyter, Satan addresses Jesus directly with an insulting challenge to his reputation, demanding that he prove his identity: "Gyf pu godes sunu sig, cwep pat pas stanas to hlaf geweorpon" (Matt. 4.3, Grünberg, p. 42). To this Jesus replies by recapitulating a moral directive found in Scripture, echoing the noun hlaf in his reply: "hit ys awritten ne leofap se man be hlafe anum ac be ælcum worde pe of godes muþ gæp" (Matt. 4.4, Grünberg, p. 42). In his second verbal assault, Satan borrows "hit ys awritten" from Jesus, but Jesus hurls the phrase back at him, addressing him
directly, and successfully deflecting his attack with another
scriptural directive:

\[ \text{pa gebrohte se deofol hine on pa halgan ceastre and}
\text{asette hyne ofer pas temples heahnysse and cwaep to}
hym gif pu godes sunu eart asend pe ponne nyper.}
\text{Soplice hyt ys awritten pat hig his englum beead be}
\text{pe pae hig pe on [hyra] handum bæron pylæs pe pin}
fot æt stane ætsporne. pa cwaep se hælend eft to
hym. hit ys awritten ne costan pu na drihten pinne
god (Matt. 4.5-7, Grünberg, pp. 42-4).}

In the third temptation, Satan proposes a settlement offer to
which Jesus responds with an exorcistic imperative which
includes an insulting epithet, and another recapitulation of
Scripture this time echoing the verb, "geadmedest." Because
of the superior perlocutionary power of divine utterance,
Jesus' command is fulfilled, and Satan leaves:

\[ \text{Eft se deoful hine genam and laedde hyne on swipe}
heahne munt and ætywde hym ealle middangeardes rici}
and heora wuldor and cwaep. Ealle pas ic sylle pe
gif pu feallende to me geadmedest. pa cwaep se}
haelend to him. gang pu sceucca onbac. Soplice hit
ys awritten to drihtne pinum gode pu pe geadmedest
and hym anum peowast. pa forlet se deofol hine
(Matt. 4.8-11, Grünberg, p. 44).}

In "Dominica Prima in Quadragesima" (Morris, pp. 27-39)
the wilderness temptation is retold, and, for the most part,
the homilist faithfully translates Matthew's text. He makes
one slight change, however, and omits the phrase "hit ys
awritten" in the first two exchanges:

\[ \text{Se costigend pa eode to him ond him to cwaep, 'Gif}
pu sie Godes sunu, cwaep pæt stanas to hlafum}
geweorðan.' Hælend him pa ondswarode, and him to
\text{cwaep, 'Ne bip on hlafan anum mannes lif, ac of}
eallum pæm worde pe gap of Godes mupe.' pa genam
hine se awyrgda gast and he hine laedde on pa halgan
ceastre, and he hine asette ofer pas temples scylf,
and him to cwaep, 'Gif pu sy Godes sunu, send pe}
nyper of pisse heanesse; forpon pe awritten is pæt}
pine englas þe on hondum habban, þe leas þin fot oðsporne.' Hælend him þa eft ondswarcðe and cwæþ, 'Ne costa þu þinne Drihten God' (Morris, p. 27).

As a consequence of this omission, the devil's tentative subjunctives contrast directly with the more forceful negative imperatives of Jesus' speech ("gif ..." "Ne costa ...") and not only emphasize the relative impotence of Satan's utterance, but also heighten the animosity of the exchange. Such animosity is also an important characteristic of flyting.

In his comment on this pericope, the homilist makes two remarks which further strengthen the temptations' connection to flyting. First, as I mention above, he calls Satan's ridiculous settlement offer ("pas ealle ic þe sylle," p. 27) an idel gylp (p. 31), thus linking it to the boast of flyting. Second, he emphasizes throughout that, like flyting, this dialogue is a war ("he [Jesus] wolde deofol gelapian to campe wiþ hine," Morris, p. 29) which Jesus wins with words ("swa Crist oferswipde þat deofol mid þisse cyþnesse," p. 31; "mid þon worde þæs godcundan gewrites he hine oforswipde," p. 33).

This analysis, then, shows that OE depictions of scriptural verbal battles contain several features which are also found in flyting. Did this similarity provoke a re-interpretation of the Christian war of words as a new kind of flyting? The Blickling homilist's description of Satan's speech as idel gylp, and his emphasis on the agonistic nature of the temptation hint at a re-analysis. The fact that some writers of OE religious prose use the flyting cognates flitan and geflit to denote the Christian war of words is also suggestive. For instance, Ælfric uses flitan to describe the behaviour of the heretic, Arius, toward his bishop: "Arius hatte an gedwolman, se flat wiþ þonne bispoc."63 Arius' chief means of attack, however, are not physical blows, but the words of heretical doctrine. The association here of
Christian verbal contention and OE *flitan* implies a readiness to recognize Christian quarrel as *flyting*. Also suggestive is the OE translation of a passage in Lev. 24.10-11. In this passage, a man of pagan ancestry disputes with one of God's people, and even involves God himself in the quarrel through his use of blasphemy:

> sum Egyptisc man gestrynde sunu be Israheliscan 
> wife onmang Israhela folce. pa flat he wiþ ænne 
> Israheliscne man and hyrwde godes naman and wirigde 
> hine.64

Here, "flat" corresponds to the Latin "iurgatus est", a finite form of the verb *iurgare*, to quarrel,65 and suggests that this verbal contention, too, may have been judged a *flyting*.66 In his discussion of Num. 16.41-3 in "De Populo Israhel," Ælfric uses *flitan* to gloss *murmurare* (Pope 2, p. 653). The verbal interaction thus described is sufficiently violent to precipitate Moses' and Aaron's retreat to the tabernacle:

> On pam æftran daege pe pis gedon waes 
> ongan eall pat folc flitan wiþ moysen, 
> and wiþ pone Aaron pe we ær embe spræcon, 
> mid mylcre ceorcunge, sædon [pat] hi hæfdon 
> Godes folc ofslagen, and gremedon hi swyþpe, 
> and mid micclum gehlyde macodon pa ceaste, 
> oppat hi begen flugon binna Godes getelde (Pope 2, p. 653).67

The OE translation of Matt. 12.18-9 which recapitulates a prophecy from Isaiah describing the speech of the servant of the Lord before "he brings justice to victory"68 uses *flitan* to describe what seems to be a verbal battle:

> Ic asette mynne gast ofer hyne and dom he bodap 
> þeodum, ne flit he ne he ne hrymp ne nan man ne 
> gehyrþ hys stemna on strætum (Grunberg, p. 74).69
In his glossary of Old Northumbrian gospels, Cook also notes that in the OE translation of Luke 22.24, the Latin *contentio* is glossed *geflit*. This OE noun is also used in John 9.16 to denote the Latin *scisma*, and in John 10.19 to denote *dissensio*.\(^{70}\)

Cognates of the noun *flyting* are not found only in scripturally dependent texts, however. In his description of the difficulty in establishing a date for Easter agreeable to both the Roman and Celtic churches, Bede's AS translator refers to this dispute about Christian doctrine as a *geflit*:

\[\text{pa heo pa hæfdon longe spræce ond geflit ymb pa ping, ne heo Agustines larum ne his benum ne his peawum ond his geferena ãnige pinga gepafian woldon ... pa se halga fæder Agustinus pisses gewinnesfullan geflites ende gesette.}\(^{71}\)

Two passages drawn from separate accounts of the visions of Furseus also use either the verb *flitan* or the cognate noun *geflitu*, to refer to the Christian war of words. The first passage is found in the OE translation of Bede's Anglo-Latin *Ecclesiastical History*, Book III, chapter 19. Here, the verbal attack launched against Furseus by the accusing demons is described:

\[\text{pa fliton him on pa wergan gastas ond pa mid gelomlicum oncunnissum teoledon pæt heo him pone heofonlican weg forsette ond fortynde; ne heo hwædre owiht in pam fremedon (Miller, p. 212).}\(^{72}\)

In his version of the story of Furseus found in "In Letania Maiore Feria Tertia," Ælfric uses the cognate noun *geflitu* to describe the verbal battles of psychopomp and devil:

\[\text{On eallum pisum geflitu wæs pæra deofla gefeoht swipe stiþlic ongean pa sawle and pa halgan englas, oppæt purh godes dom pa wiþerwinnan wurdon gescyne} (\text{Thorpe 2, p. 340}).\]
This repeated denotation of the Christian war of words as *gelflit* suggests that not only writers of non-hagiographic OE religious prose, but also writers of hagiographic prose may have considered the sacred war of words to be a special form of flyting. In the next chapter, I shall pursue this notion, and examine the evidence for re-analysis provided by the lengthier verbal battles found in many OE prose saints' lives.
NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE


4 The corresponding verse in the Vulgate is "nunc iudicium est mundi nunc princeps huius mundi eicietur foras."

5 The notion of a heavenly revolt is found in ancient Hebrew texts such as The Book of the Secrets of Enoch. See Russell, The Devil, pp. 174-220, and my discussion in chapter two, p. 77.


7 Like their early Christian predecessors, AS writers described the postlapsarian Satan as a monster: "he hine ætywe micelne Sigelhearan ðæm waes seo onsyn swearetre þonne hrum ond se beordon þet feax him warron on þa gef side, ond þa egon warron swylce fyren ired, ond him sprungon spearcan of þæm mupe, ond ful rec him eode of þæm næþryllum" ("August 25, Saint Bartholomew," George Herzfeld, ed., Old English Martyrology [London: EETS o.s. 116, 1900], p. 152). A similar portrait can be found in Ælfric's *Passio Sancti Bartholomei Apostoli* (Thorpe 1,
In his monstrosity, the AS Satan (like the devil of Latin Christian tradition) resembles the antagonist of the senna flyter.

8 Di Paolo Healey argues that the presence of the OE translation of the Gospel of Nicodemus in the same manuscript in which the synoptic gospels are found implies the popularity of this apocryphal text ("Apocryphal Gospel," p. 95). In the discussion which follows, my citations of the Harrowing are from the OE translation of this gospel in James R. Hulbert, ed., Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader (New York: Holt, 1949), pp. 129–41.

9 The role of words in the Harrowing will be discussed below.

10 The OE Harrowing is a translation of the Latin A recension of the Gospel of Nicodemus (see chapter two). The Latin text I cite is from Kim, The Gospel of Nicodemus: "Et cum haec ad inuicem loquerentur Satan princeps et Inferus, facta est uox ut tonitrum et spiritalis clamor: 'Tollite portas, principes, uestras et eleuamini portae aeternales, et introibit Rex Glorie ... aeternas tenebras inlustrauit, et insoluta uincula disrupit. Inuictae uirtutis auxilium uisitauit nos sedentes in tenebris delictorum et umbra mortis pecuatorum. Haec uidentes Inferus et Mors et impia officia eorum cum ... dum Christum repente in suis sedibus uiderunt, et exclamauerunt dicentes: 'Uicti sumus a te'" (pp. 41-2).


14 Malcolm Godden, Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series Text (London: EETS, s.s.5, 1979), p. 123. (Hereafter all citations from this edition will be abbreviated Godden). Ælfric mentions the war with sin again in "Homilie Über Ioh. XVI," reminding his audience of Paul's promise of a better life "gif we her nu swincaþ fechtende mid geleafan wiþ leahtras ond synna" (Assmann, Homilien und Heiligenleben, p. 77).

15 Jesus, having cast out a devil, is accused by the Pharisees of being in league with Beelzebub, but Jesus explains in Matt. 12.28–9 that he casts out the devil through the spirit of God: "Gyf ic soplice on godes gaste awurpe deoflu witodlice/ on eow becymp godes rice. Oppe hu maeg man in gan on stranges hus and his fata hyne bereafian buton he gebynde ærest Pone strangan and Ponne his hus bereafige" (Griinberg, pp. 74–6). The corresponding Latin is "si autem ego in Spiritu Dei eicio daemones igitur pervenit in vos regnum Dei aut quomodo postest quisquam intrare in
"Domum fortis et vasa eius diripere nisi prius alligatorit fortem et tunc domum illius diripiat."


17 (5.7) "Odisti omnes qui operantur iniquitatem perdes omnes qui loquuntur mendacium (8) Virum sanguinum et dolosum abominabitur dominus ... (10) Quoniam non est in ore eorum veritas cor eorum vanum est (11) Sepulchrum patens est guttur eorum linguis suis dolose agebant iudica illos deus" (Stowe Psalter, pp. 7-8).

18 The corresponding Latin in the Vulgate is "ille homicida erat ab initio et in veritate non stetit quia non est veritas in eo cum loquitor mendacium ex propriis loquitur quia mendax est et pater eius." In Matthew's account of the temptation in the wilderness in Matt. 4.6, Satan dares to pervert the purposes of Scripture, specifically Ps. 90.11-12, from a celebration of God's power into an invitation to sin. Ælfric's homily on the Lenten pericope in "Dominica Prima in Quadragesima" also acknowledges Satan's deceitful use of Scripture in the wilderness temptation: "Her begann se deofol to recanne halige gewritu, ond he lean mid pasre race" (Thorpe 1, p. 170).


20 Ælfric also asserts in "Sermo De Initio Creaturae" that "mid leasunge he wile beswican ... Pone unwaran" (Thorpe 1, p. 16).

21 Marcia Dalbey in "Themes and Techniques in the Blickling Lenten Homilies," The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds p. 239, observes that the homilist is unique in calling slander the worst sin.

22 (90.5) "Scuto circumdabit te veritas eius non timebis a timore nocturno (6) a sagitta volante in die a negotio perambulante in tenebris ab incursu et daemonio meridiano" (Stowe Psalter, p. 176).

23 (19.8) "Hi in curribus et hi in equis nos autem in nomine domini dei nostri inuocabimus (9) Ipsi obligati sunt et ceciderunt nos autem surreximus et erecti sumus" (Stowe Psalter, p. 34).

24 See, too, Hermann, Allegories, pp. 30-2.


26 Forster, p. 105, n. 184, provides a substantial variant ("sweord þæt syndon godes word, þæt men singaþ") which makes clear the verbal nature of the "sweord þæt þæt men singaþ."

27 "Et exclamauit Daud dicens: 'Nonne cum essem ulius in terris praedixi uobis, 'Confiteantur Domino misericordiae eius et mirabilia eius fillis hominum, quia contriuit portas aeras et uectes ferreos confrigiet. Suscepit eos de ui iniquitatis eorum? ' (Kim, pp. 40-1).

28 Satan reminds Hell of Jesus' claim to divinity, "'Gegearwa pe seulf þætu mæge Cryst onfon, se hyne sylfne gewuldrod harþþ, and ys Godes suunu and eac man and eac se deap ys hyne ondraedende,'" p. 131 ("Prepara temet ipsum suscipere Iesum qui se gloriatur Christum Filium Dei esse et homo est timens mortem," Kim, pp. 38-9), and then boasts that he will conquer Jesus nonetheless, "and nu æt nextan ic wylle his deap to þæþ"

29 The Blickling homilist also notes the significance of fulfilled boast and prophecy in the events occurring in hell, "swa se witga Dauid be pisse tide witgade ... and he [Christ] geendode þæt he lange to þæm awergdum gastum gebeotod hefde" ("Dominica Pascha," p. 83).

30 AS writers of religious prose working in non-scriptural contexts also treat prayer as a weapon, and although this topic will be discussed in a later chapter, I shall anticipate my discussion and provide a few brief examples here. In Dialogue I of Waerferth's translation of Gregory's Dialogues, Fortunatus uses prayer to defeat troops of devils: "Ond he waes geornfull mid teolone his singalra gebada pern angaen gesettum deofla maenigum, þe wip him teolonge wunnon, þæt he hit oferswyðe" (Bischof Waerferths von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen. ed. Hans Hecht [1900; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965], p. 71. Subsequent citations of the OE translation of Gregory's Dialogues will be from Hecht's edition). The corresponding Latin is "qui ... continuae orationis studio intentus, objectas contra se eorum multitudines superaret" (PL LXXVI, col. 200). Likewise in Dialogue III, Sanctulus defends himself with "his agnum waspnum haligra gebeda" (Hecht, p. 254. The Latin is "ad sua arma statim cucurrit," PL LXXVI, col. 312).

31 S.J. Crawford, ed., The Old English Version of the Heptateuch (London: EETS, o.s. 160, 1922), p. 256. The corresponding lines from the Vulgate are: (17.9) "dixitque Moses ad Iosue elige viros et egressus pugna contra Amalech cras ego stabo in vertice collis habens virgam Dei in manu mea (10) fecit Iosue ut locutus ei erat Moses et pugnavit contra Amalech Moses autem et Aaron et Hur ascenderunt super verticem collis (11) cumque levaret Moses manus vincebat Israhel sin autem paululum remisisset superabat Amalech."

32 Prayer, exorcism and confession are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Confession, for instance, can be a part of prayer.

33 See my discussion of exorcism in chapter two, p. 76, and of directive illocutions in flyting, in chapter one, p. 17.

34 The corresponding Latin is: "Iesus dicens obmutesce et exi de homine."

35 Indeed, Crawford suggests that for the AS Christian, confessional statements could include "the whole moral history of man from creation to the Redemption and the Last Judgement" ("The Casdmon Poems," Anglia 49 [1926], p. 280), and in an abstract appearing in OEN 19 (1986), A42-43, Thomas Hill agrees that medieval Christians were exposed to many different forms of credal confession.

36 "Dicit illi Iesus tu dixisti. Verumtamen dico vobis, amodo videbitis Filium hominis sedentem a dextris virtutis" (Matt. 26.64). Jesus' dialogue with Caiaphas contains other commonplaces of flyting, as I shall show later in this chapter.

37 Thorpe 2, pp. 596-8. Once again, the fact that confession can contain projective illocutions as well as retrojective assertions about the past makes it akin to boast and links it to flying.


39 See BH 3, "Dominica In Media Quadragesima" (Morris, p. 31). In his "De Virginitate," Ælfric calls the ostentatious displays of piety
despised by Jesus in Matt. 6.1-8 false boast: "And se þe for ēdelum gylpe his ēlmesan dælp/ he dælp witodlice mid þære wynstran handa" (Pope 2, p. 806).

40 Writers working in non-scriptural contexts also recognized the power of confession. In his "Epistola ad Ecgbertum Antistitem," Bede, referring particularly to the credal form of confession, says: "sic enim fit, ut coetus omnis fideliorem quomodo fidelis esse, qua se firmitate credendi contra immundorum spirituum certamina munire atque armare debeat discat" (J. E. King, Baedae: Opera Historica II [London: Heinemann, 1930], p. 454). King translates these lines thus: "For by this means it cometh to pass that the whole body of believers shall learn how they should believe, and fortify and arm themselves by steadfast beliefs against the assaults of unclean spirits" (p. 455). Ælfric also argues in "In Natale Unius Confessoris" that those who confess thereby conquer heretics: "Pa gedwolmen oferswipdon" (Thorpe 2, p. 558).

41 Dalbey also notes the martial character of this homily ("Themes and Techniques," p. 227).

42 The homily also recapitulates other confessional statements found in the wilderness episode in Scripture, although it does not preface these declarations with the phrase, "hit ys writen," found in the gospel account (p. 27). I shall discuss the significance of this omission when I consider this exchange again later in this chapter.

43 See, too Dalbey, "Themes and Techniques," pp. 224-5. The homilist repeats his point, "ac mid þon worde þæs godcundan gewrites he [Jesus] hine oforswipde" (p. 33).

44 In Latin Christian adversarial dialogues, devout speech is always fulfilled by deeds. As I observe in chapter two, pp. 78-9, Elliott emphasizes the significance of this performative dimension of speech in her discussion of the efficacy of the martyr's testimony in the acta and passiones, and argues that the martyr is victorious because his witness is the equivalent of deed. The martyr says that he will die rather than recant, and his subsequent death confirms the truth of his assertion so that his word approaches the status of deed ("Power," p. 45). In its connection to deed, the martyr's discourse also resembles God's utterance in which word and deed are indistinguishable. See, for example, Gen. 1.3 and John 1.1-3.

45 It will be recollected that in chapter one, pp. 17-21, I distinguish two broad categories of secular Germanic flyting -- serious or battle flyting and ludic or court flyting, which can be further subdivided into manniafaxpr and senna -- depending on whether or not flyters' utterances must be fulfilled by subsequent deeds.

46 Recently, critics studying OE secular verse have suggested that AS poets were well aware that words, at their most efficacious, could approach the level of deed. Nelson, for instance, argues that the speeches of "Maldon" show "that to say something can be to do something" ("The Battle of Maldon' and Juliana: The Language of Confrontation," p. 142). Other critics agree, and observe in addition that in secular contexts, mortals' words, like God's words, can be so closely connected to deeds that they, too, become metaphoric weapons. Thus, Eric Jager in "Speech and the Chest in Old English Poetry: Orality or Pectorality?" Speculum 65 (1990), pp. 850-1, argues that the Beowulf poet's description of his hero's voice travelling "under harne stan" (v. 2553) to penetrate the dragon's lair implies that "Beowulf's word is thus reified into a weponlike object ... The vocal exchange, like the boasting (gilp) between warriors on the battle field is tantamount to an
In a similar vein, Straus says that the speaker in "The Wife's Lament" "acts through her use of words" and that for her, words become weapons ("Women's Words," p. 268 and p. 281).

Satan's dishonesty spreads to the discourse of his demonic henchmen, as well as to his mortal allies, the tyrants of the passiones (Elliott, "Power," p. 57).

Pratt says that to have power, speech acts must be "correctly or felicitously performed." (Toward a Speech Act Theory, p. 81). Thus, for example, a promise insincerely given will not be fulfilled. Not surprisingly, then, Satan's promises, boasts and threats usually go unrealized.

Hulbert, "Harrowing of Hell," p. 132. The corresponding Latin is "ego enim temptau illum, et populum meum antiquum Iudiacum excitau zelo et ira aduersus eum. Lanceam exactui ad persecutionem eius ... et lignum preparau ad crucifigendum" (Kim, p. 39).

For Anglo-Saxons' disapproval of idel gilp, see Conquergood, "Boasting in AS England," p. 27; "The Wanderer," ASPR III, vv. 65-72 and Unferp's claim that Beowulf competes with Breca for dolgilpe (Beowulf, v. 509). For the phrase's application to the devil's speech, see BH 3, above.

Sometimes in OE hagiographic verse (as I shall show in a later chapter) the devil's statements seem to be obtuse and literal-minded misconstructions of spiritual truths, rather than conscious deceptions. However, such remarks are just as inaccurate as the devil's lies, and therefore they, too, have little perlocutionary force.

Even when the devil appears to accomplish his own goals, he is really accomplishing the aims of God, as Jesus' trial and crucifixion show.

Richard Penn, Liturgies and Trials, p. x and p. xii. See, too, Jager, who observes in his discussion of speech and Genesis B that "the Fall of Man is correlative with a fall of language and specifically of speech" ("Speech and the Chest," p. 857).

See, too, Bjork, who observes the "coincidence of words and deeds in the person of Christ" and that in the N.T., "the logos becomes God, the creative Word" (OE Verse Saints' Lives, p. 18).

Vercelli I, Forster, p. 2.

When he first sees the heavenly light penetrating hell, Isaiah says, "eall swa ic foresære ... Pa ic cweç and forewiltege paet ... paet folc paet on [sic] pam pystrum saet sceoldon mere leocht geseon and pa pe on [sic] dymnum ryce wunedon, ic witegeode paet hig leocht/ sceoldon onfon" (Hulbert, pp. 129-30). David's prophecy is already cited above, and the reference to the thunderous voice is found on Hulbert, p. 133: "paer wæs stefen and gascile hream swa hlud swa punres slege, and wæs þus cwewende 'Tollite portas principes uestras et eleuamini porte eternales et introibit rex glorie.'"

"Sermo in Ascensione Domini," Thorpe 1, p. 304.

Elliott makes a similar observation about the passiones. "The world of hagiography is black and white. Words mean what they say; what men say corresponds to what they do" ("Power of Discourse," p. 45). The perlocutionary power of the martyr's discourse in OE hagiographic texts will be discussed in later chapters.
Colish agrees that for medieval thinkers, words had special power in the Christian cosmos: "having taken on human nature and having expiated man's sin, Christ had restored man to God ... the human faculty of speech could now participate in the Incarnation by helping spread the word to the world" (The Mirror of Language: A Study of the Medieval Theory of Knowledge [Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1983], p. ix. See, too, p. 3 and p. 26). Colish does not, however, relate this observation to Alfric's comments, to speech act theory, to the liturgy or to secular flyting. Bjork, too, emphasizes the importance of "the words-deeds theme ... to a people who viewed words as acts, who considered the best as a reflection of self-knowledge" (OE Verse Saints' Lives, p. 18). His approach differs from mine, however, in that he sees the connection between words and deeds in hagiography arising from the participation of the saint in the body of Christ, rather than from the re-invigorated language of post-Pentecostal discourse (pp. 18-20).

The OE translation which I discuss here is faithful to its Latin exemplar, as is the translation of Matt. 4.1-11 which I discuss next. Because of this and in the interests of brevity, I do not quote the corresponding passages from the Vulgate.

The impersonality of the phrase "hit ys awritten" is sometimes found in ludic flyting reply. For example, Erik Disertus defeats Grep with similarly impersonal utterances in their flyting in Gesta Danorum, as I show in chapter one, pp. 40-1.

"De Fide Catholica," Thorpe 1, p. 296.


The corresponding passage in the Vulgate is: "Ecce autem egressus filius mulleris israhelitis quem pepererat de viro aegyptio inter filios Israhel iurgatus est in castris cum viro israhelite cumque blasphemasset nomen et maledixisset ei."

There are other reasons for inferring such a categorization. Even though we do not learn the contents of the quarrel, one ingredient is clearly insult, a component of secular flyting. In addition, like many flytings, this debate precedes violence: the initiator of the quarrel is stoned for his blasphemous speech (Lev. 24.13-23).

The corresponding passage from the Vulgate is, "Murmuravit autem omnis multitudo filiorum Israel sequenti die contra Moysen et Aaron, dicens: Vos interfecistis populum Domini. Cumque oriretur seditio, et tumultus incresceret, Moyses et Aaron fugerunt ad tabernaculum foederis."

RSV, Matt. 12.20. The corresponding passage in the Vulgate is "donec eliciat ad victoriam iudicium."

Grünberg provides the corresponding Latin text: "Ponam spiritum meum super eum et iudicium gentibus nunciabit. Non contendet neque clamabit" (p. 75).


Miller, EH, p. 98. The corresponding Latin shows that geflit glosses both disputatio and certamen: "Qui cum longa disputatione habita neque precibus neque hortamentis neque increpationibus Augustini ac sociorum eius adensum praebere uoluisse ... sanctus pater Augustinus hunc laboriosi ac longi certaminis finem fecit" (Colgrave and Mynors, II, 2, p. 136).

The corresponding Anglo-Latin is "[Furseus] uidit non solum maiora beatorum gaudia, sed et maxima malignorum spirituum certamina qui
crebris accusationibus improbi, iter illi caeleste intercludere contendebant" (Colgrave and Mynors, III, 19, p. 270).
I have shown in the preceding chapters that the metaphoric battles between good and evil found in the Bible and in the patristic texts of the early church persisted in scripturally dependent OE prose. Although these verbal wars were of Latin Christian provenience, they had many characteristics which were also typical of Germanic flyting: both kinds of debate were combative and acrimonious, both used similar rhetorical devices to achieve their ends, and both awarded victory to the speaker whose words were fulfilled by deeds. These similarities, together with the fact that AS homilists sometimes used cognates of the noun flyting to describe the Christian debates, suggest that the examples of Latin Christian verbal warfare found in these texts were being re-analyzed by AS audiences familiar with flyting as a variant of that Germanic convention.

Scripturally dependent prose was not, however, the only kind of religious discourse popular in AS England. There was also considerable interest in the lives of saints, which was expressed in prose works ranging from full-fledged vitae to shorter homiletic texts delivered on the anniversary of a saint's birth or death. Although these narratives about the heroes of the Church were often influenced by Scripture, they were chiefly dependent on Latin vitae, acta, and passiones, and preserved the episodes of verbal warfare central to early hagiography. Despite this reliance on early Latin texts, however, AS hagiographers were not afraid to see these works through AS eyes, and to alter their sources to suit their countrymen's aesthetic and intellectual predispositions. Ælfric, discussing his compositional methods in the preface to his own collection of saints' lives, acknowledges the importance of tailoring discourse to suit its audience:
Did this readiness to accommodate audience taste extend to a re-analysis of Christian debate as flyting? To answer this question, it is necessary to answer three additional questions. First, do verbatim OE translations of Latin texts contain verbal battles with sufficient resemblance to flyting to provoke re-analysis? Second, when comparison with a source text is possible, can we discern any signs that the OE version has departed from its source in order to enhance a quarrel's resemblance to flyting? Finally, in AS hagiographies which seem to be original, are there debates which look like flyting? This chapter will examine several hagiographic texts in an attempt to answer these questions.

Paul's conceit that words were weapons in the war with evil was central to AS hagiography. Ælfric, in his "Passio Beati Stephani, Protomartyris," for instance, says that Stephen's enemies wish to conquer the martyr's teachings with their lies, but they are defeated by the power of the Holy Spirit which informs the saint's speech:

\[
\text{pa ungeleaf fullan Iudei ... woldon mid heora gedwylde pæs eadigan martyres lare oferswipan; ac hi ne mihton his wisdome wipstandan, ne pam Halgum Gaste, pe ðurh him spræc" (Thorpe 1, p. 44).}
\]

The war of words is also central to Ælfric's "Natale Sanctorum Quadraginta Militum." Here, forty Cappadocian soldiers commanded to renounce their faith defend themselves against their persecutors, both temporal and spiritual, by singing the psalms which in the past had guaranteed their victory in battle:

\[
\text{Nu is ure wiper-winna pæs wæl-hreowa heretoga oper is se dema and se deofol pridda}
\]
Two Anglo-Latin *vitae* of later saints show that when AS authors were composing their own hagiographies, they also included in them the war of words. For instance, in chapter XIII of his *Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, Eddius Stephanus provides a description of Wilfrid's encounter with the South Saxons which includes two episodes of verbal warfare. First, when Wilfrid and his companions make an accidental landfall in the territory of the hostile South Saxons, they are accosted by a pagan priest who subjects them to a threatening harangue similar to that described by Tacitus in his account of Germanic battle practice:

{\textit{Stans quoque princeps sacerdotum idolatriae coram paganis in tumulo excelsa, sicut Balaam, maledicere populum Dei et suis magicis artibus manus eorum alligare nitebatur.}}

Although we do not learn the priest's exact words, it is apparent that they are rather feeble weapons, lacking in perlocutionary force, for not only do his threats not come to pass, the priest himself is killed by a stone thrown by one of Wilfrid's men.

While pagan words cannot harm Wilfrid, Christian utterance is not so innocuous: the second stage of this confrontation shows that such utterance is a weapon capable of annihilating whole armies. When Wilfrid and his band are attacked by the South Saxons, Wilfrid follows the example of Moses (Exo. 17.9-11) and fights with prayers:
Igitur sanctus Wilfrithus episcopus cum clero suo, flexis poplitibus genuum et iterum elevatis manibus ad coelum, Domini auxilium perpetravit. Sicut enim Moyses, Hur et Aaron sustentantibus manus eius, Iesu Nave cum populo Dei adversum Amalech pugnante, frequenter Domini protectionem implorans triumphavit, ita et hic isti pauci christiani feroces et indomitos paganos tribus vicibus in fugam versos strage non modica obruerunt, quinque tantum viris, quod mirum dictu est, ex sua parte occisis (Bishop Wilfrid, p. 28).

Wilfrid's supplications, like Moses', effect a victory, for the out-numbered Christians defeat their attackers. Once again the martial power of devout words is proven superior to the arsenal of Satan and his pagan cohorts.

In chapter XXIV of the vita, Wilfrid fights another verbal battle for lands and treasure. This time, however, he must contend with fellow Christians. The episode begins with a reminder that Satan, the concealed enemy soldier (insidiatore) is always searching for a way to conquer God's bravest warriors:

insidiatore ... circumsuit ovile Dei, quaerens introitum ... primum militem fortissimum vincere concupiscens, ut timidi facilius superentur (p. 48).

To attack Wilfrid and to gain control of his goods and lands, this demonic soldier uses the poisoned arrows of Queen Iurmenburg's words:

Nam regis Ecfrithi regina nomine Iurmenburg, suadente diabolo, invidia tunc temporis tortuabatur .... Iamiamque de faretra sua venenatas sagittas venifica in cor regis ... per auditum verborum emisit, enumeraris ei eloquenter sancti Wilfrithi episcopi omnem floriam eius secularem et divitias .... Talibus itaque iaculis cor regis vulneratum, ambo callide quaerentes sanctum caput ecclesiae in suum interitum contempnere donaque regum pro Deo a se audaciter fraudare (p. 48).
As a result of the queen's venemous words, Wilfrid is expelled from his own diocese by the king and his bishops. Before his departure, however, Wilfrid counter-attacks with his own verbal weapons, saying, "'Hoc anniversario die, qui nunc ridetis in meam pro invidia condemnationem, tunc in vestram confusionem amare flebitis'" (p. 50). The laughter indeed turns to bitterness a year later when the death of the king's brother testifies to the perlocutionary force of Wilfrid's speech, and implies the saint's ultimate victory in this war of words.

Bede's prose account of Cuthbert's contention with the demons of Farne Island contains another example of verbal warfare. Although Bede's source, the anonymous "Vita Sancti Cuthberti," composed at Lindisfarne ca. 705,8 treats this incident very briefly ("ubi prius pene nullus potuit solus propter uarias demonum fantasias aliquod spatium manere, ille quippe intrepida mente fugauit eos"),9 Bede specifically alludes to the Pauline conceit of Eph. 6.11-17, suggesting that it is the sword of God's word which enables this soldier of Christ to defeat the demons of Farne:

Nullus hanc facile ante famulum Domini Cuthbertum solus ualebat inhabitare colonus, propter uidelicet demorantium ibi phantasias demonum. Verum intrante eam milite Christi armato galea salutis, scuto fidei, et gladio spiritus quod est verbum Dei, omnia tela nequissimi ignea extincta et ipse nequissimus cum omni satellitum suorum turba porro fugatus est hostis (Two Lives, p. 214).10

The suggestion that words are weapons seems implicit also in Ælfric's later account of Cuthbert, for although Ælfric does not allude specifically to Cuthbert's verbal arsenal, he does suggest that the devils' weapons are threatening words:

Ferde pa to Farne ... pæt igland ... ær pæm fyrste, mid sweartum gastum was swiðe afylled, swa pæt men ne mihton pa moldan bugian, for þeowracan swearta deofla; ac hi ealle pa endemes flugon, and pæt
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igland eallunge geryndon pam ðægelan cempan (Thorpe 2, p. 142).

These passages show that the original Latin Christian conceit which made words into swords flourished in the hagiographic texts of AS England. When the various verbal blows exchanged in these metaphoric battles are related in direct discourse, it becomes evident that they resemble flyting not only in their shared martial context, but also in their adherence to a similar combative rhetoric. Some of these flyting elements are already present in Latin source texts. For instance, the rather fragmentary recapitulations of verbal battle found in Wærferth's translation of Gregory's Dialogues contain signs of flyting. Dialogue I contains a verbal skirmish in which words achieve the status of deeds. Bishop Fortunatus, attempting to free two boys from a marauding band of Goths, offers treasure in exchange for the boys. Such appeasement offers are typical of flyting. In this brief dialogue, both speakers also contrast second and first person pronouns and adjectives in the manner of flyters:

'hwylc weorð willaþ ge þæt ic sylle eow, ond ge me agyfan þa cnihtas, þe ge on minum lande namon, ond gegearwicþ me þæt to gife eowre þances?' þa se þe þær yldost wæs him ondswarode ond þus cwæþ, 'Swa hwæt swa þu elles bebeost, we syndon gearwe þæt to done. Witodlice þas cnihtas we nateshwon ne gifaþ.'

Fortunatus does not give up, but instead replies as a flyter might, with a boastful threat again including pronoun contrast:

þa se arwyr þa wer wæs beotigende swiþe licelice to þam ond þus cwæþ: 'þu me unrotast nu þu nyht hyran þinum fæder. Ac nylle þu me ma unrotsian þþ læs hit þe eft ofþynce' (Hecht, p. 80).
The leader of the Goths chooses to ignore Fortunatus' threat, and is subsequently injured in an accident which he rightly attributes to the power of Fortunatus' words. He wisely accepts defeat and releases the boys, telling Fortunatus' deacon, "Ga ond sæge minum hlaforde þam biscope, þæt ic eom nu geslægen, forþon he me wyrgde" (p. 82).\textsuperscript{15}

Words also play a significant role in Benedict's ongoing war with Satan. In Dialogue II, we are given a glimpse of the devil's verbal weaponry in a harangue which also has some of the features of flyting. Benedict, after seizing a temple sacred to Apollo, begins to preach to his new neighbours in order to extend God's territory even farther:

\begin{quote}
ond eac þær ylcan Apollones weofod wæs, he getimbrede gebedhus þæs halgan Iohannes. Ond þa þær þa wuniendan manigu/ his ymbsittendra he [Benedict] gecigde daga gehwylce to þam rihtan geleafan mid his þære singalan lære (pp. 121-2).\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Satan's response to the assault of Benedict's lar is a verbal counter-attack which combines insult with curse:

\begin{quote}
Ærest he [Satan] gecigde þone halgan man be his naman, ond se halga wer nolde geondswarian. Þa sona eft him to teonan he upp ahof his stefne ond Þa cleopode ond þus cwæp: 'Benedicte! Benedicte!' Þa þuhte him þa gyt, þæt he nane þinga him ondwyrdan nolde. Þa swīpe hræpe geycet he his spræce ond þus cwæp: 'Maledicte, non Benedicte! þæt is on Englisc, 'þu awyrgda, nalæs þu gebletsoda' .... Hwæt hafast þu wiþ me gemæne, oppe for hwon ehtest þu min?' (p. 122).\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

Several features of this passage might well have suggested flyting to an AS audience. First, the passage contains several examples of the pronoun contrast. Although this contrast is probably a product of the periphrastic nature of the OE language as compared to Latin rather than a sign of purposeful alteration, these pronouns nonetheless make the exchange look like flyting.\textsuperscript{18} Second, Satan appears before
Benedict in a form whose monstrosity evokes the instigator of *senna* contentions. The overall intent of Satan's speech (to establish Benedict's identity and the reasons for his aggressive behaviour) as well as its insulting and threatening tone ("Maledicte ... ḫu awyrgda") are features of flyting, too. Furthermore, Satan's transformation of Benedict's name into its opposite, "Maledicte", suggests a strategy of verbal echo, popular in flyting speech. Finally, the effect of Satan's hostile words is as inconsequential as the speech of the defeated flyter. Benedict, who does not deign to answer the devil's queries, continues to oppose Satan, ultimately defeating him with words of prayer ("he ḫa hrape onsænde his bene to urum drihtne hælendum Criste ond sona ut adraf ḫone ealdan feond of ḫam ofsetenan men," p. 135).

In *Dialogue III*, Bishop Datius also uses words to conquer new territory for God. While looking for lodging in Corinth, the bishop discovers a house reputedly inhabited by a devil, and decides to live there in order to evict the demon. The subsequent verbal *gewin* (p. 184) shares with flyting more than just a martial context. First, the devil's speech is like the defeated flyter's in its lack of perlocutionary power, for it fails to meet even the most rudimentary standards of performative utterance. Instead of reasoned speech, he emits the incomprehensible squeaks and grunts of beasts:

\[
\text{̓pa gelamp hit in ̓̃hare nihte, ̓̃pa ̓̃̃a seo ̓̃maste/}
\text{stilnes ond swigung wæs, ond se Godes wer reste,}
\text{̓̃wat se ealda feond ongan onhyrgian mid unmætum}
\text{stefnum ond mid mycculum cleopungum leona grymetunge}
\text{ond hryþra ond eosola gehlyd ond næddream}
\text{hwistlunge ond swyne grununge ond musa hwicunge}
\text{(pp. 184-5).}^{19}
\]

Awakened by this cacophony, Bishop Datius, like a flyter, directly addresses the devil with an insulting epithet, then
reminds the devil of his empty boast that he could rule heaven as God's equal:

se halga wer Darius ... ongan mid mycclum stefnum clypian ond þus cwepan: 'wel is þe gelumpen, þu earma, þe mi cwêde: 'ic sette min heahsetl to norþdæle heofona rices, ond ic beo þam hehstan Gode gelice' (p. 185).

The bishop adds that the devil's roarings, bleatings, and hissings are more apt than this boast, because the devil more closely resembles a wild beast than he does the ruler of heaven.20 Here, Darius' use of þu in direct address intensifies the insult:

Geseoh nu, þæt þu for þinum oferhigde eart geworden swynum ond musum gelice, ond þu þe ware unwyrþe ond hwyrþe woldest þinne drihten onhyrgian, nu, swa swa þu wyþþe eart, þu onhyrest wildeor' (p. 185).21

In this way, Darius denigrates Satan on both the linguistic and the heroic front, for the insult not only points to the weakness of the devil's boastful speech, but also, in its allusion to the abortive heavenly revolt, implies the devil's martial inadequacy. Such imputation of "heroic failure" is also a staple insult of flyting.22 The devil, apparently obeying Darius' imperative "geseoh", takes stock of himself and recognizes that he is no match for God and the words of the bishop: he leaves the house to the victorious Darius.

Verbatim translations were not the only OE prose hagiographic texts to include adversarial dialogues reminiscent of flyting. Many OE prose hagiographies less closely tied to an exemplar also include adversarial dialogues which resemble flyting. The fragmentary OE Life of St. Christopher, for example, occasionally deviates from its Latin source, and taken together these deviations, although individually relatively insignificant, make the link between
Latin Christian adversarial dialogue and flying more apparent.\textsuperscript{23}

The first complete dialogue extant in the OE account begins after the tyrant Dagnus has had Christopher tied to an iron bench and put into a roaring fire because he refuses to abandon his faith.\textsuperscript{24} From the midst of the flames, Christopher, who in the OE is described as \textit{godes cempa},\textsuperscript{25} launches his own verbal counter-attack. He taunts the king, threatens him, and boasts that he fears neither the king's tortures nor his anger. The aggressiveness of these illocutions is enhanced in both the OE and the Latin by personal pronoun contrast:

\begin{quote}
\textit{pas tintrego \textit{pe pu} on me bringan hehst to \textit{pinre gecyndnesse} \& to \textit{pinre forwyrdre becuma\textit{p}} \& ic me n\texttextit{afre} \textit{pine tintrego ne ondræde ne \textit{pin yrre} (Rypins, ll. 9-12, p. 69).}\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

In both the OE and the Latin accounts, Dagnus replies like a flyter with an insult ("\textit{pu wyrresta wilddeor}," "fera mala") followed by a question intermittently punctuated by first and second person pronouns, again creating a sense of agonistic pronoun contrast:

\begin{quote}
\textit{pu wyrresta wilddeor hu lange dyrstlæcest \textit{pu pæt pu pis folc fram me tyhtest swa pæt him nis a lyfed [sic]} pæt hi minum godum onsecgen (ll. 5-7, p. 70).}\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

Christopher's reply in the OE \textit{Life}, however, capitalizes on verbal echo to a greater extent than its Latin counterpart. Christopher responds to Dagnus' question by transforming the phrase which Dagnus uses to refer to his pagan gods ("\textit{minum godum}") into a reference to "minne drihten hælende crist." He also contrastively echoes the phrase "\textit{folc fram me}" with "\textit{folc ... purh me}," and "\textit{alyfed}" with the phonologically similar, but semantically distinct "\textit{gelyfæp}." In Christopher's speech, however, these words are transformed
from an expression of anger into a Christian boast as the saint proclaims that through him, all Dagnus' people as well as Dagnus himself will believe in the Christian God:

nu git micel folces mænio þurh me gelyfæp on minne drihten hælende crist & æfter þon þu selfa (ll. 9-11, p. 70).²⁸

Dagnus' reply in both the Latin and the OE includes agonistic pronoun contrast, threat and directive illocutions:

Numquid et me vis in tuis maleficiis adducere ....Sic mihi faciant dii mei, et sic mihi reddant, si non crastina ista hora perdidero animam tuam, et ad exemplum omnium te faciam pervenire ....Jam sacrificia diis et intellige verba mea, ut non per multa tormenta pereas (l. 30, p. 108; ll. 1-8, p. 109).

is þæs wen þæt ic þone god gebidde & minum widsace wite þu þonne þæt þys mergenlican dæge æt þisse sylfan æ[i]d[e ic wrece minne teonan on þe & ic gedo þæt þu byst forloren & þin nàm of þys gemynde & of þyssum life adilgod & þu scealt wesan ealra bysen þar þe þurh þe on þinne god gelyfæp ....ongit mi[n word & onsaga minum godem þæt þu on swa manegum tintregum ne forweorþe swa þe gear wzode synt (ll. 12-20, p. 70; ll. 1-3, p. 71).

Comparison of these two passages shows, however, that the OE account again includes verbal echoes which are not present in the Latin, for Dagnus transforms the noun "selfa" used by Christopher into the adjective "sylfan," and includes it in his threat. He also incorporates an echo of Christopher's "þurh me gelyfæp" into the minatory "þu scealt wesan ealra bysen þar þe þurh þe þinne god gelyfæp." The AS hagiographer also expands the Latin in this passage, substituting "þys mergenlican dæge æt þisse sylfan tide" for the briefer "crastina ista hora," and this substitution, as I shall show below, is also instrumental in increasing the verbal echoes present in the OE dialogue.
Christopher replies to Dagnus with his own threat which includes an echo of Dagnus' ominous words ("ic wrece minne teonan," "ic gedo"/"ic ...teonan do") not found in the Latin:

symle þine goda ic lapette & him teonan do for þon þe minne geleafan ic unwemne geheold þone þe ic on fulwihte onfeng (ll. 4-6, p. 71).29

After this exchange, in both Latin and OE accounts, Dagnus orders his soldiers to tie Christopher to a tree, and to shoot arrows at him. These arrows do not touch the saint, but, thanks to God's intervention, merely hang in the air about his body. Dagnus, however, is unable to see the arrows,30 and taunts Christopher, believing him to be in agony ("hwær ys þin god f[or hwon ne com he & þe gefreolsode of minum handum & of þyssum egeslican strælum," ll. 4-6, p. 72).31 In response to Dagnus' arrogant jeer, two of the arrows hovering about Christopher strike the king's eyes, making him blind. At this juncture, the saint addresses Dagnus directly, and although his speech is not entirely antagonistic, it is still reminiscent of flyting reply, for it consists of insult ("þu wælgrimma & þu dysega;" "tyranne stulte"), predictive illocutions which resemble projective boasts ("ic onfo," "men cumap;" "veniunt," "accipiunt"), and directive illocutions ("cum," "wite þu;" "tu ... veni ... et fac"). In the OE, however, verbal echo is especially prominent, and arises from the AS hagiographe's expansion of Dagnus' Latin phrase "crastina ista hora" noted above:
Here, Dagnus' earlier threat, "wite ḫu ḫonne ḫat ḫys mergenlican dæge æt pisse sylfan tide ic wrece minne teonon on þe" (itself containing an echo of Christopher's "Þu selfa" in l. 11, p. 70) becomes part of Christopher's pious boasts about his coming death and victory ("wite ḫu ḫæt ... dæges," "sylfan tide," "wite ḫu ḫæt seo tid"). That Christopher can thus transform Dagnus' hostile words into a description of his own spiritual triumph suggests that the saint's discourse has overpowered the speech of the king.

A final sign of Christopher's verbal triumph occurs after the adversarial dialogue of saint and king, but it is linked to this earlier exchange by verbal echo. Christopher asks God that he be allowed to die, and that afterwards all who pray in either God's name or in the name of Christopher be healed:

\[ gif þær neah syn untrume men & hig cumon to þinum þam halgan temple & hig þær gebiddon to þe of ealre heortan & for þinum naman hi ciggen minne naman ge hæl þu þone drihten fran swa hwylcere untrumnesse swa hie forhæfde (11. 13-16, p. 73). \]

God responds, telling Christopher that:

\[ swa hwyllice geleaffulle men swa þines naman on heora gebedum be þep gehælede fram hyr[a synnum & swa hwæs swa hie rihtlice biddaþ for þinum naman ... hyt onfoþ (11. 2-6, p. 74). \]

In both the Latin and the OE, Dagnus is the beneficiary of this dispensation, for after following Christopher's directions and smearing his eyes with earth mixed with the martyr's blood, he prays "on naman cristoforus" (ll. 3-4, p. 146).
75; "in nomine Dei Christophori," l. 19, p. 110), and is healed. In the OE, however, the description of Dagnus' miraculous cure also contains an echo of his earlier threat, reminding us that the king's promise that "ic gedo þæt þu byst forloren & þin nama of þys gemynde & of þyssum life adilgod" does not come to pass. Ironically, his other threat, "þu scealt wesan ealra bysen fara þe on pinne god gelyfæp," is fulfilled (but in a fashion quite unintended by the erstwhile materialistic and pagan Dagnus) for Christopher's spiritual victory, not his temporal defeat, makes the saint an example for the faithful. Unlike Dagnus' utterances, Christopher's illocutions, like those of a successful flyter, are all fulfilled exactly as he intended - not only is Dagnus cured of his blindness, he also becomes a Christian (pp. 75-6, p. 110) as Christopher promised in the earlier stages of their dialogue.

This analysis of the adversarial dialogue in OE Life of Saint Christopher, then, suggests that while the Life's Latin source already contains a dispute which coincidentally resembles flyting, the AS hagiographer inserts additional flyting features, chiefly added verbal echoes, which make the exchange seem more like flyting. Other OE prose hagiographies which are not verbatim translations contain similar flyting-like debates, and also suggest the beginnings of a concurrence of Latin and Germanic traditions. In his "Passio Sanctae Cecilie Virginis," Ælfric relates a tale of persecution in which the heroine's only weapons are words. Of particular interest are two dialogues found in Ælfric's passio which correspond to similar quarrels in Mombritius, for Ælfric's occasional alteration of the Latin text enhances their resemblance to flyting. In the first exchange, Cecilia defends her virginity by persuading her husband, Valerian, to accept the Christian faith. In Mombritius' account Cecilia seems timid and a little reluctant to begin her revelation to Valerian. Her speech, although minatory in intent, also
lacks the kind of graphic threat we might expect from such discourse ("et amittis florem tuae gratissimae iuventutis"): 

'O dulcissime atque amantissime iuvenis, est mysterium quod tibi confitear, si modo, tu iuratus asseras tota te illud observantia custodire.' Turat Valerianus sponsus se illud nulla prodere ratione nulla necessitate detegere. Tunc illa ait: 'Angelum Dei / habeo amatorem qui nimio zelo corpus meum custodit; hic si vel leviter senserit quod tu me polluto amore contingas, statim suum furorem circa te exagitat et amittis florem tuae gratissimae iuventutis.'

Although in addition to the threat, this passage contains some other devices also found in flyting (pronoun contrast, direct address), a comparison with Ælfric's text shows that Cecilia's discourse is at once more aggressive and more rhetorically complex in the OE account than it is in the Latin. She begins her verbal defense without lengthy preamble, and makes her threat specific, telling Valerian right away that she is protected by an angel who will kill him if he attempts to consummate their marriage. The dire consequences awaiting Valerian should he disregard her warning are made more dramatic by a series of chiastic and paronomasic verbal echoes ("leofa ... lufe ... lufe ... ne leofast") in which love, misdirected, is shown to culminate in death:

Eala pu min leofa man ic ðe mid lufe secge
Ic habbe godes engcel ðe gehylt me on [lufe]
and gif ðu wylt me gewemman he went sona to ðe
and mid gramum ðe slihp ðet ðu sona ne leofast (Skeat 2, ll. 31-5, p. 358).

Having made this succinct yet graphic threat, she then proposes a settlement, phrasing her proposal in the gif/ponne clausal structure typical of many flyting utterances. The paronomasic echo of "lufe" is further developed when Cecilia repeats the "gehylt" of line 32 in conjunction with "lape"
rather than the almost homophonous "lufe" to suggest a resolution in which love and not death will prevail when evil ("lape") is renounced:

Gif þu þonne me lufast and butan lape gehylst
on clænum mægþade crist þonne lufþ þe
and his gife geswutelade þe sylfum swa swa me (ll. 35-7, p. 358).

In the OE, Valerian replies with a counter-threat which begins with varied repetition of Cecilia's concluding "sylfum," and also employs command, pronoun contrast (here all three persons are contrasted) within a syntax which echoes the *gif/þonne* clausal structure of Cecilia's threat, although in this case the *þonne* is elided:

Do þæt ic geseo sylf þone engel
gif þu wylt þæt ic gelyfe þinum wordum be þam
and gif þe ober cniht cuþre is þonne ic
hine ic ofslea and þe samod mid him (ll. 39-42, p. 358).

Here, too, comparison with the Latin text shows that the OE version of Valerian's reply is more aggressive:

'Si vis ut vere credam sermonibus tuis, ostende mihi ipsum angelum; et si probavero quod vere angelus Dei sit, faciam quae hortaris. Si autem virum alterum diligis et te et illum gladio feriam' (Delehaye, p. 197).

Where the OE account begins emphatically with an imperative ("do"), the Latin uses a conditional clause, making the command less forceful by delaying the imperative until later in the sentence ("si ... tuis"). In addition, only in the OE version does Valerian use a comparative adjective ("cuþre" corresponding to "virum alterum diligis"). Comparison is of course a staple of flyting, and the adjective here emphasizes the implicit competition between husband and angel.
Cecilia answers with another settlement offer ("gif pu on crist gelyfst/ and pu gefullood bist ... pu miht sona geseon," ll. 43-5, p. 358) and this time Valerian accepts her terms (ll. 47-8, p. 358). Cecilia seals her verbal victory with words of confessional instruction ("seo fæmne pu lærde swa lange ðone cniht/ op þæt he gelyfde," ll. 49-50, p. 358).41

The passio concludes when the martyr confronts the evil prefect, Almachius, and the two "campodon mid wordum" (l. 320, p. 374). This final verbal battle also resembles flyting in more than its metaphoric martiality because both participants use verbal echoes, pronoun contrast, insult and threat as their weapons. For example, after Almachius threatens Cecilia with his temporal power, she demonstrates her disdain for his worldly strength by turning his own words against him in an insult which gains much of its force from the repetition of "mihte". The prefect asks "nast pu mine mihte?" (l. 313, p. 374) and Cecilia replies:

Ic secge gif pu hæst hwilce mihte pu hæst
Ælces mannæ mihet þe on modignyssæ færþ
is soplice þæt gelic man siwige
ane bytte and blawe hi fulle windes
and wyrcæ sippan an þyrþ þonne heð toþunden biþ
on hire greatnysse þonne togæþ seo miht (ll. 314-19, p. 374).

Almachius replies with a restatement of his threat which contains a combination of insulting direct address, pronoun contrast and the continued echoing of "miht", this time in conjunction with an allusion to Cecilia's use of "modignyssæ" (l. 315, p. 374):

Hwæt þu ungesælīge nast þu þæt me is geseald
anwæald to ofsleanne and to educigenne
and þu spræcst swa modelice mine mihta tælende (ll. 321-3, p. 374).
Cecilia denies that she is proud ("ic anrædle spræc/ na modelice," ll. 325-6, p. 374) then, more alert to the implication of Almachius' words than Almachius himself, she accuses him of deceit because his words assert not only that he has the legal power to decide whom to kill and whom to spare, but also that he can revive the dead. Again she includes the verb miht in her answer:

\[ pu \ cwæde \ pæt \ pu \ hæfdest \ to \ acwellene \ anweald \ and \ to \ educigenne \ ac \ ic \ cwæpe \ pæt \ pu \ miht \ pa \ cucan \ adydan \ and \ pam \ deadan \ pu \ ne \ miht \ eft \ lif \ forgifan \ ac \ pu \ lyhst \ openlice \ (ll. \ 328-31, \ p. \ 374). \]

As a liar, Almachius cannot hope to have his utterance fulfilled by deeds. Like both Satan and an incompetent flyter, therefore, he is no match for one who wields the sword of God's word. Defeated by words he resorts to physical means to compel the saint's obedience. His efforts, however, do not have their intended effect, for instead of harming Cecilia, his cruelties allow her to fulfill her words with deeds by maintaining her faith in the face of death. Thus Almachius' actions inadvertently cause Cecilia to win the war of words, and speed her to her heavenly reward.

A comparison of the OE version of this final debate between Cecilia and Almachius, and the corresponding passage in Mombritius is instructive, for it shows Ælfric sometimes translating word for word and sometimes abbreviating his Latin source in order to strengthen the agonistic tone of the whole exchange. The initial lines of the debate with Almachius (ll. 313-19), for example, follow the Latin closely:

Almachius dicit: ignoras cuius potestatis sim?
Caecilia respondit: Tu ignoras cuius/ potestatis sis. Nam et ego si me interroges de tua potestate:
ueris tibi assertionibus manifestabo. dicit ei Almachius: Dic si quid nostri. Caecilia respondit: Omnis potestas hominis sic est: quasi
uter uento repletus: Quem si acus pupugerit: omnis rigor ceruicis eius euanescitet quidquid in se rigidum habere cernitur incuruatur (Gerould, pp. 682-3).

Almachius' reply in Mombritius is also similar to Ælfric's version (ll. 321-3) but where Ælfric alludes briefly to verbal warfare (l. 320) Mombritius includes thirty more lines of dialogue which makes the quarrel more discursive and less dramatic (p. 683). His treatment of the passage in which Cecilia accuses the prefect of lying is equally verbose:


A comparison of this passage and Ælfric's (ll. 328-31) suggests that Ælfric's omissions are designed to maintain the terse, combative tone of the exchange, heightening its resemblance to flyting.

Ælfric's "Sanctorum Alexandri, Eventii, et Theodoli: Pars Prima" also contains a verbal battle derived from an earlier Latin text, the Acta Alexandri Papae. Although the Latin version of the dialogue contains hints of flyting, Ælfric modifies his source slightly to intensify the acrimonious tone of the exchange and to heighten its resemblance to flyting. The debate begins when the pagan emperor Aurelian accuses his adopted son Quirinus of mocking
him by accepting the Christian faith, and aligning himself with Pope Alexander:


Maintaining the pronoun contrast found in his Latin source, Ælfric further emphasizes the aggressive tone of the exchange by calling Aurelian "cwellere":

 piss wearp Ṩa gecydd Ṩam cwellere Aureliane, and he het him gelangien Ṩone gelyfedan Quirinum, and cwarp him sona to, ic hæfde Ṩe for sunu, and Ṩu me gebysmrodest, nu Ṩu gebogen eart purh Alexander to oprum bigenge (Pope 2, 11. 161-5, p. 744).

Quirinus' reply to the emperor's accusation is a confession which combines a Christian version of the flying identity motif ("Ic eom Cristen") with a predictive boast ("wylle Ṩu ... ne beo ic nan Ṩoper") and a retrojective boast ("ic dyde ...."). There is also a formal similarity to flying in the varied repetition and contrast of the phrases "ic eom" and "wylle Ṩu":

 Ṩa cwarp Quirinus him to, ic eom Cristen on eornest; wylle Ṩu beswingen, wylle Ṩu ofslean wylle Ṩu adrencean, wylle Ṩu adydan, wylle Ṩu forbærnan, ne beo ic nan Ṩoper Witodlice ic dyde Ṩæt Ṩa gewurdon Cristene ealle Ṩe in Ṩam cwarterne beclysoðe wærøn, and ic he calle gescrydde mid eall-hwitum reafe, and ic let hi frige faran gif hi woldon (11. 166-73, p. 744).
The verbal duel concludes when the irate Aurelianus, perhaps recognizing that Quirinus' verbal weaponry is superior to his own, orders Quirinus' tongue cut out. Quirinus replies with an insult and a threat:

Hwæt pa Aurelianus mid yrre him cwæp to,
Ic hate nu forceorfan pine scearpan tungan,
for pon pe pu dorstest pus dyrstelice sprecan.
Quirinus him andwyrde, Eala pu erming,
and pu ugesæliga, alys pine sawle,
pæt pa ecan wita pine sawle ne gelæccan (ll. 184-9, p. 745).

A comparison with the Latin text shows that not only has Ælfric altered the original slightly in order to abbreviate the exchange, he has also added the adjective "scearpan" to modify tongue, thus reinforcing the connection between words and swords essential to flyting.46

Ælfric's second homily on these martyrs, again entitled "Sanctorum Alexandri, Buentii et Theodoli,"47 continues the acta narrative, describing the confrontation between Alexander and Aurelian. Even in the Latin, this quarrel resembles flyting, for it includes direct address, question and answer, insult, repetition, personal pronoun contrast, and ends in violence. Once again, however, Ælfric makes slight changes to the dialogue which further emphasize its kinship to flyting. Aurelian initiates the battle:

'Exquiro a te prius, ut omnia sectae vestrae mihi mysteria manifestes, ut sciam cur pro Christo, nescio quo, occidi quam vinci optetis' (ASS May 3, cap. IV, 1, p. 378).

Ælfric follows the Latin fairly closely. However, pronoun contrast is more prominent in the OE version, which unlike the Latin, also contains direct address:

Alexander papa, ic sece ærest æt pe, pæt ðu me ardllice secge hwæt se intinga sy pæt ge wyllæ
sweltan sylfwilles for Criste, ær þan þe ge æfre
his geleafan wipsacan (Thorpe 2, p. 308).

Alexander replies with an insult, saying that like a
dog, Aurelian is unworthy of the knowledge of Christian
mysteries:

S. Alexander dixit: Quod quaeris sanctum est, et
non permittimur a Christo sanctum dare canibus.
Aurelianus Comes dixit: Ergo ego canis sum? S.
Alexander respondit; [sic] Utinam canis esses, sed
quod tibi pejus est, etiam cane deterior: canis
enim pro factis malis in ignem aeternum non
mittetur, sed semel mortuus, et corpore simul
moritur et flatu. Homo autem, qui ad Dei
similitudinem factus est, si per iniqua opera a Dei
cultura recesserit, aeternis suppliciis subjecet:
sicut ille reus est tibi, qui similitudinem
imaginis tuae sive statuae tuae ausus fuerit
inquinare. Sed et tu, dum temporalis es homo,
temporales hominibus infers poenas; Deus autem,
qui aeternus est, aeternas peccantibus paenas [sic] et
aeterna infert incendia (ASS May 3, cap. IV, 15, p.
378).

While the Latin dialogue contains frequent second person
pronouns and adjectives, and comparative adjectives ("pejus,"
"deterior") as well as the verbal echo of "canis," it loses
some of its agonistic force in Alexander's rather discursive
explanation of the fate awaiting Aurelian. Ælfric's version,
on the other hand, preserves the initial insult, but makes
the threat of damnation more dramatic by the contrast of "ne
þrowþ" and "æfre þrowian":

'þæt þæt þu axast is swipe halig þing; ac Crist us
forbead þæt hundum to syllan.' þa cwaþ Aurelianus,
'Eom ic hund geþuht?' Alexander þa wiscte, 'Eala
gif þu ware hund! Hund is sawulleas, and on helle
ne þrowþ. Se man þe forsiþ þis Scyppend on life
sceal æfre þrowian on ecum tinctegrum' (p. 308).

In both accounts, Aurelian responds to Alexander's
remarks with threats of violence, but Alexander is secure in
his faith and remains undaunted, countering Aurelian's threats with insult emphasized by pronoun contrast: "pu dwelast, casere, purh drystignysse, gif pu buton gelefan at us leornian wylt pa halgan gerynum purh heardan swinglum" (p. 308). Aurelian's reply, however, differs slightly in the two accounts. In the Latin, there is a second short exchange which includes some pronominal adjective contrast associated with variations of the phrase "potentia ... gloriari":


Ælfric condenses this passage into a single boastful counter-threat, made emphatic by Aurelian's echoing of portions of Alexander's speech ("sawulleas ... sceal ... tinctegrum," "drystignysse") and by the juxtaposition of contrasting personal pronouns ("ic/pe"): 'Ic ana gewealde ealles middaneardes, and pu sprecst pus drystiglice swilce to sumum deman; ac pin sawul sceal, swipe getintregod, gewitan of pam lichaman ær ic pe forlæte' (p. 308).

This threat does not terrify Alexander, however, for like any devout Christian he eschews worldly power, and is unafraid of death. In the Latin account he says:

'Nihil novum facturus es: quis enim innocens manus tuas evasit? Soli illi apud te vivunt, qui negaverunt se servos esse Domini Jesu Christi. Ego autem, quia certus sum me Dominum meum numquam negaturum, necesse est ut a te interficiar, sicut Hermes vir sanctus, qui modo vere illustres est' (ASS May 3, cap. IV. 16, p. 378).
When the Latin is juxtaposed with Ælfric's text, several slight but significant changes can be discerned:

'Hwæt dest pu niwes me? ða ane ætwundon þinum wælhræwum handum, þe for þinum tintregum heoræ Drihten wiþsacan. Ic soplice sceal æt þe sweltan deape forðan þe ic nelle næfre Crist wiþsacan' (p. 308).

First, Alexander's refusal to recant is made more emphatic in the OE version both by his repetition of key words from earlier speeches ('tintregum,' 'wiþsacan') and his continued use of pronoun contrast. Second, Ælfric adds an insulting adjective, 'wælhræwum,' to describe the tyrant's hands, then rephrases the second sentence of the Latin passage quoted above ('soli ... Christi') in order to maximize the effect of pronominal adjective contrast ('for þinum tintregum heoræ Drihten wiþsacan'). Finally, he replaces the impersonal "necesse est ut a te interficiar" with a straightforward projective boast ('ic ... sceal æt þe sweltan deape'). The aggregate effect of these individually small changes is to increase the dispute's resemblance to flyting.

Eventually, Aurelian is defeated by Alexander's persistent verbal resistance, and resorts to physical means to subdue his prisoner. Ironically, however, torture and death do not accomplish the tyrant's aims, but instead serve only to demonstrate the truth of Alexander's boast that he will die before he recants. Thus Aurelian unwittingly brings about Alexander's victory in the war of words, and hastens his receipt of the reward of eternal salvation which this victory earns him. Such perlocutionary incompetence is, of course, typical of all defeated flyters.

In Ælfric's "Passio Beati Laurentii Marytris," Bishop Sixtus and the Emperor Decius fight a verbal duel when Decius tries to force Sixtus to renounce his faith. Their dialogue
includes several features of flyting, as the following passage shows:

Se casere Decius him cwæp to, 'Geoffra píne lac pám undealdlicum godum, and beo þu þæra sacerdã ealdor.' Se eadiga Sixtus him andwyrde, 'Ic symle geoffrode, and gytt offrige mine lac þam Ælmihtigum Gode, and his Suna, Hælendum Criste, and þam Halgum Gaste, hluttre onseagednysse and ungewemmede.' Decius cwæp, 'Gebeorh þe and pinum preostum, and geoffra. Soplice gif þu ne dest, þu scealt beon eallum oprum to bysne.' Sixtus soplice andwyrde, 'Hwene ær ic þe sæde, þæt ic symle geoffrige þam Ælmihtigum Gode' (Thorpe 1, p. 416).

Decius begins with an imperative ("Geoffra") which is repeated with variation throughout the ensuing speeches. The noun lac is also repeated, often in conjunction with contrasting pronominal adjectives ("pine lac .... mine lac"). In addition, the noun god recurs modified either by the adjective undealdlic (ironically appropriate for an inanimate idol which is neither living nor dead) or by the adjective Ælmihtig. Personal pronouns are contrasted throughout (pu/ic). When Decius offers Sixtus the position of high priest as an incentive to recant, he is also proffering the conventional settlement offer of flyting.

Many of these features persist in the second portion of the quarrel:

He [Decius] wearp þa gehathyrt ongean þone halgan bisscop, þus cwæpende, 'Witodlice we beorgþ pinre ylde: gehyrsuma urum bebodum, and geoffra þam undealplicum godum.' Se eadiga bisscop him andwyrde, 'þu earmig, beorh þin sylfum, and wyrc dædbote for þæra halgena blode/ þe þu agute' (pp. 418-20).

Here, Sixtus counters the commands of Decius ("gehyrsula," "geoffra") with his own imperatives ("beorh þin sylfum," "wyrc") and adds to them an insult typical of secular flyting ("þu earmig"). Both speakers continue to emphasize their
mutual antagonism with contrasting personal pronouns (we/pu). Their adversarial relationship is also emphasized by the alternation of speeches, and by the bandying back and forth of key verbs ("beorgap ....beorh" as well as the reiteration of "geoffra"). Decius, like Almachius, is no match for his Christian opponent. Enraged, he orders that the bishop be killed, paradoxically allowing Sixtus to demonstrate the power of his utterance by fulfilling his boast to die rather than recant.51

Another verbal duel closely related to flyting occurs in Ælfric’s "Natale Sancte Agathe Virginis."52 The immediate source of Ælfric’s homily is uncertain,53 so it is impossible to know to what extent this dialogue is an Ælfrician invention rather than a simple translation. Whatever its provenience, however, the similarities between it and flyting are sufficiently arresting to merit discussion. Like Cecilia, Agatha has had the misfortune to excite the lust of a pagan suitor. Throughout her struggle with her would-be lover, Quintianus, Agatha defends her virginity with words in the manner of a flyter. Although the entire verbal battle is over 130 lines long, an analysis of its opening lines shows its character, and its connection to flyting:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pa yrsode quintianus and het hi ardlice feccan} \\
\text{befran hi pa æt fruman be hyre gebyrdum} \\
\text{Agathes pa cwæp ic eom æpelborenre lægpe} \\
\text{swa swa eall min lægpe me is to witan.} \\
\text{pa cwæp se dema Hwi dest pu pe sylfe} \\
\text{purh wace ðeawas swilce pu wyln sy} \\
\text{Agathes andwyrdæ ðic eom godes ðinæn} \\
\text{and mycel æpelborennyse bið paet man be cristes þeow.} \\
\text{Quintianus cwæp to þam cristes mædene} \\
\text{Hwæt la næbbe we nane æpelborennyssse} \\
\text{forþan þe we forseop þines cristes þeowdom} \\
\text{Agathes andwyndæ þam arleasan and cwæp} \\
\text{Eower æpelborennyse becyrpe to swa bysmerfullum hæftnedæ} \\
\text{þæt ge beþþ þeowan synne and stanum (Skeat 1, ll. 39-52, p. 198).}
\end{align*}
\]
Quintianus' initial query about Agatha's ancestry is a stereotype of flyting speech. Here it precipitates a series of verbal echoes which reflect the conflicting temporal and spiritual frames of reference of Quintianus and Agatha.\textsuperscript{54} Agatha's reply addresses both the secular and sacred implications of the question, for she identifies herself not only as noble woman in the temporal sense ("Æpelborennre mægpe") but also as a Christian ("godes þinen") for whom true nobility lies in God's service. The paradox of nobility's dependence on "cristes þeowdom" fills the remainder of the passage, and is expressed in phrases which variously repeat, or echo, the nouns æpelborennys and þeowdom often in conjunction with contrasting first and second person pronouns or adjectives. Like a flyting, this portion of the debate concludes with an insult ("eower ...stanum").

Flyting's influence is even more pronounced in OE texts whose sources reflect AS rather than Latin Christian sensibilities, and this conjunction of a strong flyting influence and AS provenience argues persuasively for the AS re-analysis of Christian verbal battle as flyting. AS provenience and flyting influence are linked in this way in Ælfric's "Passio Sancti Eadmundi Regis et Martyris" -- a work which is dependent on a passio composed in England and which celebrates the martyrdom of an AS saint.\textsuperscript{55} Indeed, Anderson treats the confrontation of King Edmund and Hinguar's envoy in Ælfric's account as a "battle flyting" (p. 53). Like the flyting between Byrhtnoþ and the Viking messenger in "Maldon," the dialogue between King Edmund and the envoy is a verbal joust preliminary to a fight. As Anderson observes, the exchange has many of the characteristics of flyting, including an identity motif, a settlement motif (p. 54) and a changing frame of reference arising from the opposition between the Viking's temporal militarism and the king's steadfast adherence to spiritual values (pp. 55-6).

How many of these features are derived from Ælfric's source, Abbo's Passio Sancti Eadmundi? In Abbo, Hinguar's
messenger begins his speech with a recitation of his leader's prowess ("Terra marique metuendus dominus noster Hinguar, rex inuictissimus, diuersas terras subiciendo sibi armis," Winterbottom, 11. 8-9, p. 74). The envoy demands tribute to assure his king's comfort in his chosen AS wintering grounds ("noster Hinguar ... mandat ut cum eo antiquos thesauros et paternas diuitias sub eo regnaturus diuidas," 11. 11-12, p. 74) and supports his demand with an arrogant threat:

\[
\text{Cuius si aspernaris potentiam, innumeris legionibus fultam, tuo praesidicio et vita indignus iudicaberis et regno. Et quis tu, ut tante potentiae insolenter audeas contradicere? (Winterbottom, 11. 12-15, p. 74).}
\]

Ælfric's version follows the sense of the messenger's speech, but again a few slight changes bring the OE account closer to flyting:

\[
\text{He [Hinguar] sende ... to þam cyninge beotlic ærendende ....} \\
\text{and hinguares ærendende him ardlice ahead} \\
\text{Hinguar ðe cyning cene and sigefæst} \\
\text{on sæ and on lande hæþ fela þeoda gewyld} \\
\text{and com nu mid fyrde færlice her to lande} \\
\text{...} \\
\text{Nu het he þe dæulan þine digelan gold-hordas} \\
\text{and þinra yldrena gestreon ardlice wiþ hine} \\
\text{and þu beo his underkyning gif þu cucu beon wylt for-þan þe þu næfst þa mihete þæt þu mage him wiþ-standan} \\
\text{(Skeat 2, 11. 43-54, pp. 316-8).}
\]

The adjective "beotlic," for instance, suggests that the messenger possesses the boastful aggressiveness of a flyting instigator. Like Abbo, Ælfric includes the identity motif implicit in the messenger's boastful recitation of his leader's accomplishments, as well as a settlement offer.Ælfric, however, makes the Viking's threat more blunt than it is in Abbo. In addition, the increased presence of pronouns, more natural to OE than to Latin, emphasizes the contentious and condescending tone of the speech.
Edmund’s response to Hinguar’s envoy is lengthy in Abbo’s account, and Ælfric omits most of it. The first portion of Edmund’s reply, however, is retained in a slightly altered form in Ælfric, and therefore deserves comment. In Abbo’s text, Edmund insults the messenger in a threatening fashion, asserting that his allegiance to Christ restrains him from harming the envoy, and also ensures that he does not fear Viking threats:

'Madefactus' inquit 'cruore meorum mortis supplicio dignus extiteras; sed plane Christi mei exemplum secutus, nolo puras commaculare manus, qui pro eius nomine, si ita contigerit, libenter paratus sum uestris telis occumere. Ideo pernici gradu redens festinus, domino tuo haec responsa perfer quantotius: Bene filius diaboli patrem tuum imitaris qui superbiendo intumescens caelo corruit et, mendacio suo humanum genus inuoluere gestiens, plurimos suae poenae obnoxios fecit. Cuius sectator praecipus me nee minis terrere praebetes nec blandae perditionis lenociniis illectum decipies, quem Christi institutis inermem repperies (Winterbottom, ll. 2-13, p. 76).

Edmund’s reply concludes several lines later with his assertion that he will not serve under Hinguar unless Hinguar becomes a Christian:

unde noueris quod pro amore ultae temporalis Christianus rex Eadmundus non se subdet pagano duci, nisi prius effectus fueris comos nostrae religionis, malens esse signifer in castris aeterni regis (11. 39-42, p. 78).

Ælfric reorganizes these lines into a shorter speech, and in doing so makes Edmund’s reply less vicious, but more emphatic. He transforms Edmund’s assertion that he is reluctant to shed blood, into a dramatic insult (“ic nelle afyllan on pinum fulum blode mine claenan handa”). Hinguar himself does not escape insult, and is described as “Pinum repan hlaforde”. Ælfric also couples pervasive pronoun contrast with a juxtaposition of proper names in order to
emphasize succinctly the conflict between the two leaders ("eadmund hinguare"). Next, he makes Edmund's initial declaration of his allegiance to Christ brief, and adds a predictive boast ("ic ... wille beon ofslagen ... gif hit swa god fore-sceawap"), then omits the next part of Edmund's reply in Abbo, and jumps to a counter-offer which in its replication of finite forms of gebugan emphasizes the fundamental opposition of Edmund to the invaders ("ne abihp ...
...buton he ...
... gebuge")

Witodlice pu ware wyrpe sleces nu
ac ic nelle afyllan on pinum fulum blode
mine clænan handa forpan-pe ic criste folgie
pe us swa ge-bysnode and ic blipelice wille beon
ofslagen purh eow gif hit swa god fore-sceawap.
Far nu swipe hrape and sege pinum repan hlaforde
ne abihp næfre edmund hingware on life
hapenum here-togan buton he to hælende criste
ærrest mid ge-leafan on pyssum lande gebuge
(Skeat 2, 11. 85-93, p. 320).

Like an enraged prefect confronting a martyr, Hinguar responds to Edmund's message not with words, but with violence. Yet even though Hinguar tortures and finally kills Edmund, the king remains steadfast in his determination to avoid violence for Christ's sake, fulfilling his words with his deeds, and thus ultimately winning the verbal battle.

Three AS accounts of St. Alban's martyrdom contain a verbal battle which resembles flyting. Significantly, like Edmund's confrontation with the envoy, this verbal fight appears to be without the Latin Christian textual antecedents which lie behind many other OE hagiographies. Bede's Anglo-Latin account where this verbal battle first occurs seems to have as its only source a brief allusion rather than an extended vita or passio. It is probable, then, that Bede's Anglo-Latin account, like Ælfric's account of Edmund, is the product of an exclusively AS sensibility, and that the two later AS versions dependent on it (one an OE translation of
Bede, the other a homily by Ælfric) likewise reflect AS predispositions. In such a context the presence of flyting elements in the obligatory war of words again strongly suggests an AS re-analysis of the Latin Christian conceit.

In his Ecclesiastical History, Bede easily adapts the contents of Christian confession to the constraints of flyting:

At sanctus Albanus ... nequaquam minas principis metuit; sed accinctus armis militiae spiritualis, palam se iussis illius parere nolle pronuntiabat (Colgrave and Mynors, I, 7, p. 30).

Here, Bede not only clothes Alban in the armour of spiritual warfare ("accinctus armis militiae spiritualis") but by placing this phrase amidst references to the prefect's threatening speech and Alban's own brave reply, Bede also implies that in this passio as in flyting, words will function as weapons.

Diocletian's prefect begins his verbal assault by asking the saint to identify himself. Alban's view of identity, like Cecilia's, is not the same as the prefect's. For Alban spiritual identity is more important than temporal ancestry, and he answers by reluctantly giving his temporal name, then devotes the remainder of his reply to an elaboration of his spiritual identity and allegiance, thus conflating an almost credal confession with the "identity motif" of flyting. The form of the exchange is also reminiscent of flyting, for it includes some pronoun contrast and one instance of verbal echoing ("generis," "genitus"): 

'Cuius,' inquit, 'familiae vel generis es?' Albanus respondit: 'Quid ad te pertinet qua stirpe sim genitus? Sed si ueritatem religionis audire desideras, Christianum iam me esse ....' Ait iudex: 'Nomen tuum quaero, quod sine mora mihi insinua.' At ille 'Albanus' inquit 'a parentibus uocor, et Deum uerum ac uiuum qui uniuersa creauit adoro semper et colo'" (Colgrave and Mynors, I, 7, p. 30).
The judge is irritated at Alban's intransigence and threatens him:

\[\text{Tum iudex repletus iracundia dixit: 'Si uis perennis uitae felicitate perfrui, diis magnis sacrificare ne differas' (I, 7, p. 30).}\]

To this, Alban answers with a defiant combination of insult and threat, saying pagan sacrifices are not offerings to God but to devils, and that they result in the supplicants' damnation. The reply is also notable for its nominal echo of the verb *sacrificare* used in the judges' threat:

\[\text{Albanus respondit: 'Sacrificia haec quae a uobis redduntur daemonibus, nec auxiliari subjicitis possunt, nec supplicantium sibi desideria uel uota complere. Quin immo quicumque his sacrificia simulacris obtulerit, aeternas inferni poenas pro mercede recipiet' (I, 7, p. 30).}\]

Enraged, the judge resorts to violence to do that which "uerbis non poterat" (p. 30).

The OE translation of this battle preserves the topics of identity, confession, and threat, but expresses them in language which capitalizes on the rhetoric of flyting to a greater extent than Bede's original Anglo-Latin. Once again, there is a strong suggestion that Alban is a verbal warrior who does not fear threats, and who is ready to counterattack with his own words:

\[\text{he ne wæs ondredende þa beotunge þæs ealdormannes, ac he begyrðed wæs mid wæpnum þæs gastlican camphades; and he openlice sæde þæt he his bebudum hyrsunian ne wolde (Miller, I, 7, l. 10-13, p. 36).}\]

Not surprisingly, then, when the pagan judge interrogates Alban about his ancestry, Alban answers him with a speech made more combative by repeated pronoun contrast
throughout, and by an extended echo of the prefect's question, "hwylces cynnes pu si." Again, Alban's view of his identity differs from that of his interrogator:

\[
pₐ \text{ cwæp} ... \text{ se dema him to Saga me hwylces hiredes and hwylces cynnes pu si. And } pₐ \text{ andswaredede him Sanctus Albanus: Hwæt limpe } pₐs to } pₐ \text{ of hwylcum wyrtruman ic acenned si? Ac gif } pu \text{ wylle gehyran pₐt sop minre æfestynysse, Ponne wite } pu \text{ me cristene beon: and ic cristenum } pₐnungen } pëowian wylle (Miller, I, 7, ll. 13-18, p. 36).
\]

The judge rephrases his question still using emphatic pronoun contrast, and again the martyr replies with a confessional recitation of God's power which resembles the retrojective boast of the secular flyter validating his own merits through his connection to an illustrious and powerful ancestor:

\[
pₐ \text{ cwæp he se dema: Gesaga me } pinne naman, hwæt pu haten sie. pₐ \text{ cwæp he: Albanus ic eom geciged fram minum yldrum; and } pₐ \text{ sopan God and } pₐ \text{ lifigendan, se gescop heofon and eorpan and ealle gesceafa, ic symble bigange and me to him gebidde (I, 7, ll. 18-22, p. 36).}
\]

The OE translation of the final exchange of threats between judge and martyr preserves the verbal echoes found in the original Anglo-Latin text ("onsecge" and "onsægdnyssse" correspond to "sacrificare" and "sacrficia") as well as Alban's insulting assertion that pagan gods are really nothing more than impotent devils. The judge again emphasizes his antagonism to Alban with personal pronoun contrast:

\[
pₐ \text{ wæs he se dema yrre geworden; cwæp him to: Gif } pu \text{ wille } pỳsses lifes gesælignysse mid us brucan ne yld } pₐ \text{ pæt } pu \text{ pam myclan godum mid us onsecge. } pₐ \text{ andswaredede Sanctus Albanus: } pₐ \text{ onsægdnyssse } pₐ \text{ pe fram eow deoflum wæron agoldene ne magon hi } pₐ \text{ underþeoddum gefulltumian, ne heora lustas ne heora}
\]

166
Diocletian's prefect is too enraged to reply to Alban, and turns to physical violence to accomplish "pa he mid wordum ne mihte" (1. 33, p. 36), thereby signaling his defeat at the war of words.

For the most part, Ælfric's "Passio Sancti Albani Martyris" follows Bede's text and its OE translation closely. Its few variations from these texts, however, tend to heighten the dialogue's similarity to flyting, particularly in the final portion of the dispute. Like Bede and his translator, Ælfric portrays Alban as a brave Christian soldier who attacks his enemy's threats with words:

albanus næs afyrht for his feondlicum þeow-racan for þæs he wæs ymb-gyrð mid godes wæpun

to þæm gastlicum gecampe and cwaþ þæt he nolde

his hæsum gehyrsumian ne to his hæþengilde bugan

(Skeat 1, 11. 49-52, p. 416).

Unlike Bede and his translator, Ælfric reminds us of Alban's warrior status before the saint's final verbal duel with the prefect, calling Alban "godes cempa" (1. 61, p. 418). The epithet evokes the metaphoric martiality of Christianity, but also reminds us of the heroic context of secular flyting. The final speeches of the two antagonists are also changed slightly to increase their aggressive tone, and perhaps to bring them closer to flyting. The judge, now called the killer ("cwellere") rather than "iudex" or "dema," responds to Alban's confessional declaration of identity with a final ultimatum demanding that the saint humble himself ("mid mycelre under þeodnyssse") before pagan gods:

se cwellere andwyrde þam arfæstan were
Gif þu þæs ecan lifes gesælþe habban wylt
þonne ne scealt þu elcian þæt þu offrige
Here the repetition of variant forms of "offrige" and the contrastive use of personal pronouns create an antagonistic tone typical of flyting. However, Ælfric has added a few touches of his own to this recension. He preserves the notion of eternal reward and eternal punishment found in the Anglo-Latin ("si uis perennis vitae felicitate perfui," "aeternas inferni poenas pro mercede recipiet") with the adjective "ecan" in lines 66 and 72. This repetition introduces an ironic verbal echo arising from the conflicting temporal and spiritual perspectives of the prefect and Alban, for although the reward for idol worship may well be eternal, from Alban's point of view, it is eternal pain which will be won, not eternal happiness. Ælfric also emphasizes the mutual animosity of Alban and his persecutor by transforming Bede's and his translator's rather impersonal description of the pagan idols' incapacity ("nec auxiliari subjectis possunt, nec supplicantium sibi desideria uel uota complere," I, 7, p. 30; "ne magon hi ... ne heora willan gefyllan," I, 7, l. 27, p. 36) into a direct address which more closely implicates the prefect and his followers in the impotence of the devils they worship ("Eowre godas ... ac ge underfop ... helle," Skeat 1, ll. 69-72, p. 418). These changes all strengthen the quarrel's ties to flyting.

Perhaps the strongest evidence to suggest that the Christian war of words was being re-analyzed as flyting comes from dialogues which not only contain thematic and formal features of flyting, but also include speeches specifically called boasts. Even more suggestive, some of these dialogues are denoted by cognates of the noun flyting. In Ælfric's "Passio Sancti Iuliani et Sponse Eius Basilisse," the wicked
Martianus calls the saint's claim that he will heal the wound of one of his persecutors, a boast, urging Julian "pæt he his gebeot gelæste" while in "Natale Sancti Mauri Abbatis" the devil's threat to injure Maurus' fellow monks is called gylp. In the Blickling homily, "Spel Be Petrus and Paulus," the quarrels between the apostles and the magician also contain at least one boast, for Peter says of his opponent Simon's speech:

\[
\text{me ðyncep wundor mid hwylcere yldo þu sceole beforan cininge gyłpan þurh þinne dryrcraft pæt þu mæge Cristes ðegnas oferswipon (Morris, p. 175) .}
\]

Such usage suggests that portions of the Latin Christian verbal war were being construed as Germanic boast, an essential ingredient in flyting.

Some of the religious disputes found in OE hagiographies are also called geflit. I have already mentioned that both Ælfric and the translator of Bede use flyting cognates to denote the verbal sparring of demon and psychopomp in their accounts of the dream vision of Furseus, and I shall now treat these passages in greater detail. In Book III of the Anglo-Latin text of his Ecclesiastical History, Bede describes the third of these visions in which Furseus "uidit ... maxima malignorum spirituum certamina, qui crebris accusationibus inprobi iter illi caeleste intercludere contendebant" (Colgrave and Mynors, III, 19, p. 270). Significantly, this aggressive behavior which uses accusation as a form of attack is glossed by Bede’s OE translator with the verb flitan: "þa fliton him on þa wergan gastas and þa mid gelomlicum oncunnissum teoledon pæt heo him þone heofonlican weg forsette ond fortwynde" (Miller, III, 19, 11. 14-16, p. 212). Later in the chapter, Bede gives us a closer look at this verbal fight. A demon seeking to prevent Furseus' passage, hurls at the saint the flaming soul of a sinner, and accuses Furseus of colluding in the man's sin:
Dicebatque hostis malignus: 'Nolite repellere quem ante suscepistis: nam sicut bona eius peccatoris suscepistis, ita et de poenis eius participes esse debetis.' Contradicens angelus 'Non' inquit 'propter auaritiam, sed propter saluandam eius animam suscepit'(Colgrave and Mynors, III, 19, p. 274).

There is a hint here of flyting in the angel's echoing of the verb *suscipere*. This suggestion is slightly emphasized in the OE version by the addition of the noun *god*:

*Cwæp he se werga feond: Ne willap la wiþscufan ðone, pe ær onfengon forpon swa ge ær his synfullan gode onfengon, swa ge sculon dælneomende beon his wiita. Pa wiþcwæp him se engel: Nese, cwæp he, ne onfeng he his godum gitsiende, ac forþon pe he wolde his sawle gehælan* (Miller, III, 19, 11. 2-6, p. 216).

In his homily, "In Letania Maiore: Feria Tertia," Ælfric treats the incident of the flaming soul briefly (p. 345) but devotes considerable space to the recounting of a lengthy quarrel between Furseus' psychopomp and Satan concerning the Scriptures relevant to Furseus' salvation. A comparison of Ælfric's homily, Bede's Latin and OE texts, and an earlier anonymous life suggests that Ælfric probably rejected Bede as a source for his homily in favour of the anonymous *vita* which gives particular emphasis to the war of words. In this early Latin life, psychopomp and Satanic forces re-enact the verbal war of Eph.6.11-17. Their quarrel occurs in the midst of battle, so that the devils' missiles seem reifications of their accusations, and the angel's counter-argument seems like a shield deflecting this attack:

*Bellantia vero daemonia ignitas sagittas jactabant contra illum, sed Angelico scuto omnia tela nequissima extinguebantur. Cadebant vero adversarii ante conspectum pugnantis Angeli: qui quasi rationem posuit cum eis quando dixit: Nolite tardare iter nostrum; quia hic homo non est*
particeps perditionis vestrae. Contradicente adversario ac blasphemante, injustum esse Deo, hominem peccatoribus consentientem, nihil damnationis habere, cum scriptum sit: Non solum qui faciunt, sed etiam qui consentiunt facientibus, digni sunt morte. Pugnante vero Angelo, existimabat vir sanctus clamorem pugnae, et e [sic] vociferantium daemoniorum in omnem terram audiri.66

Ælfric follows the Latin closely, juxtaposing accusation and reply with the unleashing of arrows and the defensive actions of the armed angel, thus maintaining the close association of words and war:

\[\text{pa deoflu feohtende scuton heora fyrenan flan ongean pa sawle, ac pa deofellian flan wurdon pærrihte ealle adwæscete purh pæs gewæppnodan engles scyldunge. pa englas cwædon to pam awirigedum gastum, Hwi wille ge lettan ure sipfæt? Nis ðes man dænimende eoweres forwyrdes. pa wiperwinnan cwædon, pæt hit unrihtlic ware, pæt se man ðe yfel gepæfode sceolde butan wite to reste faran ðonne awritten is, pæt ða beop ealswa scyldige ðe unriht gepæfiþ, swa swa ða ðe hit gewyrcaþ. Se engel ða feahht ongean ðam awyrigdum gastum to ðan swepe, pæt ðam halgan were wæs gepæht pæt ðæs gefeohthes hream and ðara deofla gehlyd mihte beon gehyred geond ealle eorþan (Thorpe 2, p. 336).}\\]

In both accounts, this martial introduction to the debate is followed by a lengthy dispute. In the Latin, the repetition of "nisi" and "scriptum est" or "non scriptum est," together with the occasional repetitions natural to an exchange of questions and answers, reinforce the impression that this debate is the verbal equivalent of warfare67:

Cumque victus Satanas, sicut contritus coluber, caput relevasset venenosum, dixit: Otiosos sermones saepe protulit; et ideo non debet illaessus vita perfui beata. Sanctus Angelus dixit: Nisi principalia protuleris crimina, propter minima non peribis.

Accusator antiquus dixit: Scriptum est: Nisi remiseritis hominibus peccata eorum, nec Pater vester coelestis dimittet vobis peccata vestra.

In his homily, Ælfric for the most part recapitulates these disputes which, already similar to flyting, gain the added ingredient of pronoun contrast (he/ge) by virtue of their translation into OE. He makes a few more small changes, however, increasing the force of the devil's accusation slightly by substituting the adjective "yfele" for "otiosos," and emphasizing the agonistic quality of the quarrel by omitting a portion of the exchange ("Sanctus ....Judice") in order to better oppose the devil's ge, eowerum and eow to the angel's us:

\[ \text{\textit{pa deofla eft cwædon: Yfele spellunge he beeode: ne sceal he ungederod paes ecan lifes brucan. Se halga engel cwæp, Buton ge \textit{pa} heafod-leahtras him on befæstnian, ne sceal he for \textit{pa}m læsan losian. Se ealda wregere cwæp, Buton ge forgifon mannum heora gyltas, ne forgifp se Heofonlca Fæder eowere gyltas. Se engel andwyrde, On hwam awræc ðes man his teonan? Se deofol cwæp, Nis na awritten ðæt hi wrecan ne sceolon, ac, Buton ge forgyfon of eowerum heortum \textit{wiþ} eow agyltendum. Se engel cwæp, Us \textit{biþ} gedemed ætforan Gode (Thorpe 2, p. 336).} \]

This war of scriptural citation continues throughout many lines in both narratives as the devils repeatedly attack Furseus with accusations based on Biblical texts, prefacing their indictments with the phrase "scriptum est" or "hit is awritten." The battle finally ends when the angel counter-attacks by metaphorically striking the devils with their own phrase:

Se ealda wregere eft cwæþ, Hit is awritten, Buton þu gestande þone unrihtwisan, and him his unrihtwyse sege, ic ofga his blodes gyte æt pinum handum. þes mann nolde cyðan þam syngigendum heora synna. Se engel cwæþ, Hit is writen be þam yfelum timan, þæt se snotera sceal suwian, þonne he gesihþ þæt seo bodung næþ nynne forþgang (Thorpe 2, p. 340).

Fittingly, then, the most apt scriptural citation wins this war of words. Given the many attributes of flyting found throughout the dispute and discussed above, it is scarcely surprising that Ælfric applied the noun geflitu (p. 340) to these quarrels.

The Blickling homily, "Spel Be Petrus and Paulus," contains debates called geflitu which not only resemble flyting, but also seem to be without a Latin source. The homilist uses the noun gefliht to describe the apostles' disputes with Simon the magician ("Æfter þyssum wæron manegu geflitu," Morris, p. 187). This denotation is particularly significant because, as far as I know, these debates are not treated elsewhere. Like Ælfric in his homily on the greater litany, the Blickling homilist specifically associates these quarrels with physical contention, saying he will recount how the apostles "wip Simone þæm dry fæstlice gefliton and gewunnon" (Morris, p. 173). The debates themselves have several features found in flyting in addition to the martial association. For instance, on one occasion Simon, although
addressing Nero, insults Peter, calling him an illiterate fisherman and, ironically, accuses him of verbal incompetence. He then threatens them with his army of angels, emphasizing his point with the purposeful contrast of *ic* and *hie*:

\[
\text{\textit{pu goda casere! to hwon \textit{pu} sceole for owiht \textit{ypsne} man habban ungelæredne fiscere \textit{pone} leasostan, and n\textit{aw}\textit{per} ne on worde ne on gebyrdum mid \textit{mæ}\textit{nigre} mihte gewelgode? ponne nelle ic \textit{pyssum} fynd leng ari\textit{an}, ac nu ic bebeode minum englum \textit{pæt} hie cuman and me ...}}
\]

Peter replies that Simon is a liar, and the apostle's use of pronoun contrast (first, second and third person pronouns are emphatically juxtaposed) gives his speech the aggressive tone typical of flyting:

\[
\text{\textit{Ne ondræde ic me \textit{pine} englas, ac hie magon him me ondræ\textit{don}, for \textit{pon} mæ\textit{gene} mines Drihtnes \textit{pe} mid me is and for \textit{pære} byldo \textit{pe} ic to him wat, on \textit{pone} \textit{pu} leogende sagast \textit{pæt} \textit{pu} sie \textit{pæt} he is (p. 179).}}
\]

Like the speech of a successful flyter, the apostles' words also have a perlocutionary force entirely lacking in Simon's discourse. Thus, when Simon's magical tricks create flying serpents, Peter demonstrates the superior power of God's word to exorcize and heal:

\[
\text{\textit{he [Simon] \textit{purh} dreocraeft worhte æ\textit{rene} næddran ... and ongean \textit{pam} Petrus [portion of line missing in ms.] mid anum worde, and blinde men mid his bedum gehælde ... and deoflum bebead \textit{pæt} hie of deofolseocum mannun utferdon (p. 173).}}
\]

Indeed, Simon inadvertently acknowledges the power of the apostles' words, complaining to Nero that "\textit{pis is pæt} mennisc \textit{pe} ealle mine dæda heora wordum onwendan" (p. 175). The disputes end with another demonstration of the strength of
Peter's utterance when he commands the devils who support Simon to abandon the magician:

'Ic eow halsige scucena englas ge þe hine on þære lyfte beræþ ... þat þu hine ... anforlætan.' ... and hie þa sona hine forletan, and he gefeel on þone stocc be þære stænænan stræte ... and tobarst on feower dælæs (p. 189).

The special perlocutionary force of Peter's speech, then, suggests another link with flyting, for like the utterance of the victorious flyter, Peter's words are fulfilled by deeds, allowing the apostles to conquer their enemy.71

The author of the Cotton Tiberius Life of Saint Margaret72 also repeatedly identifies the martyr's fight, which as I have shown is chiefly verbal, as geflitu:

Heo gehyrde martyra geflitu forþon þe mænig blod waes agoten on þam tidum on eorðan for ures dryhtnes naman, hælendes Cristes (Herbst, ll. 33-5, p. 63)

... ond ic sah eþþryl[e] eal hire geflit þe heo hæfde wip[e] arleason deofle, ond ic wrat eall hire gebed (ll. 148-50, pp. 69-70)

... ond ic gesæh eall hire geflit þe heo hæfde wip þone arleasan deofla (ll. 376-7, p. 81).

These geflitu, as I shall shortly show, have several characteristics of flyting, and an examination of the history of this passio suggests that some of these may be the product of an AS sensibility. This is an important point, and I shall therefore begin my discussion of OE accounts of Margaret's martyrdom with a brief recitation of their textual history. There presently exist two OE variants of Margaret's passio: one, already noted, is found in Ms. Cotton Tiberius A.III, and the other in Ms. Corpus Christi Cambridge College 303.73 According to Gerould these eleventh-century texts are the oldest vernacular accounts of Margaret's trials, each arising from a different ultimate source.74 Unfortunately,
the identification of these sources is problematic, for the OE passiones are not sufficiently similar to the extant Latin texts (these include several variants of a Mombritius passio of which Harley Ms. 5327 is representative and a second passio found in Ms. Cotton Caligula A.VIII)\textsuperscript{75} to be derived exclusively from either of them. We cannot, therefore, be certain whether variations from the Latin reflect originality or whether they are simply the translation of another, though unknown, source.\textsuperscript{76}

Nonetheless, the Latin texts have something to tell us about the OE accounts. Both Latin passiones are similar in that they relate how Margaret unwittingly inspired the love of the prefect, Olibrius, and how, despite a variety of torments including visitations by both dragon and devil, she remained steadfast in her faith. As Francis notes, however, they differ in their treatment of the quarrels between Margaret and Olibrius, and between Margaret and the devil:

The difference is perceptible in the manner in which the struggle between the Saint and the tyrant is treated. In the 'Mombritius' version the antagonism is reflected in vehement altercation, expressing righteous indignation on the one side and vindictive cruelty on the other; in the 'Caligula' version the attitude of the tyrant is conveyed by a more indirect method ("Unprinted Version," p. 92).

A comparison of the two texts supports Francis' observation. Before Margaret's incarceration with the dragon and the devil, for instance, Ms. Harley has her engaged for approximately fifty lines in a spirited and acrimonious dispute with her persecutors. The same material is given only thirty lines in Ms. Caligula. A similar situation occurs in the saint's quarrel with the devil: Harley gives the episode 75 lines, while Caligula gives it 30 lines.\textsuperscript{77} It might be argued that these discrepancies reflect nothing more than the differing lengths of the two passiones,\textsuperscript{78} but a comparison of the two texts shows other significant
variations in their treatment of these quarrels, which are unlikely to be a reflection solely of text length. In Harley, for example, there is a greater emphasis on the verbal echoing and pronoun contrast which are characteristic of flyting than there is in Ms. Caligula. Furthermore, in the Harley account, Margaret attacks the devil directly with an imperative typical of flyting, while in Ms. Caligula, her prayers cause his disappearance in a more indirect fashion. These differences between the two Latin passiones are significant, for although neither OE version is a direct descendant of either Harley or Caligula, the OE texts adhere more closely to Harley, with its extended acrimonious debates, than they do to the Caligula passio. Thus, even though we do not know the ancestry of the OE accounts, and therefore cannot with certainty distinguish the original from the derivative, the prominence of verbal battle in both OE passiones indicates that AS writers preferred those versions of the saint's martyrdom which emphasized the war of words.

Is there any other information relevant to flyting to be gleaned from these texts? A comparison of adversarial dialogues in Harley, Cotton Tiberius and CCCC 303 shows that although the relationship between the three accounts is far from consistent, some version of all Harley dialogues is included in the OE passiones, and that these dialogues often resemble flyting. For instance, in Olibrius' speech to Margaret on the second day of her ordeal, the Harley text (ll. 84-7, cited above) contains purposeful pronoun contrast, an insulting direct address ("Vana puella") and an offer of settlement ("multam ... mean"). The corresponding passage in Cotton Tiberius lacks the insult, but adds a threat ("min swurd ... tobrysige") and more contrasting pronouns:

Se gerefa hire to cweþ, 'Gif þu ne gebiddest þe on min god, min swurd sceal fandian þin lichama ond ealle þine ban ic tobrysige. Gif þu me gehyrest ond on minne god gelæfæst, ætforan eallum þissum folce ic þe to cweþ þat ic þe onfo me to wife, ond
There is another hint of flyting in this passage. Olibrius' remark that if Margaret will accept his offer of settlement she will be "swa wel swa me is" has the kind of inadvertent irony which, as I have already noted, sometimes arises from the differing frames of reference of opposing flyters, 81 because for Margaret and the devout Christian audience, Olibrius' state of well-being is tantamount to damnation. Not surprisingly, Margaret rejects the offer of such happiness, preferring instead that her body suffer in order that her soul be saved, "'forpon ic sylle minne lichoma in tintego pæt min sawle mid soþfæstum sawlum gereste[p]'" (Herbst, 11. 83-85, p. 66). 82

While the corresponding passage in CCCC 303 text differs from Cotton Tiberius in some respects, Olibrius' speech still resembles flyting. Like the Latin Harley version, the passage begins with a combination of direct address and insult, employing emphatic pronoun contrast to suggest the continuing breach between the representatives of God and the devil, even when a settlement offer is advanced:

\[ pæt earma fæmna, læt beon þin mycela mod, þe þu to me hæfstan and gemiltse þinum fægran lichaman ond gebide þe to minum gode and ic þe gife ælc god genoh and þu scealt eal mines godes wealdon mid me selfum (Assmann, 11. 97-100, p. 173). \]

Margaret's spirited response to Olibrius' offer is worthy of both a martyr and a flyter in its combination of a confessional defense ("And ic eom gear ... nihtes") and an emphatic pronoun contrast which repeatedly links Olibrius ("þu") with incapacity ("ne miht"): 

\[ 'Drihten hit wat, pæt ic min mægþad wel þurh him gehealdan habbe, and ne miht þu me beswican, ne þu ne miht me becyrran of minum rihtan geleafan, ne fram minum rihte hlaforde. And ic eom geara,' cwaþp \]
hi 'on drihten to gelefanne, þe gesceop heofonas
and eorpæn, and he sæ bedraf, þær þe heo wrohtæp
dæges and nihtes' (Assmann, ll. 101-6, p. 173).

In Ms. Cotton Tiberius, the quarrel ends here for a
time, but both Harley and CCCC 303 add two new speeches.
Although the speeches found in both mss. are similar to
flyting, those in the OE account, CCCC 303, are the more
akin to the genre. In Ms. Harley, Olibrius incorporates
pronoun contrast and repetition into a second and more
frightening offer of terms:

'Si non adoraveris deos meos , gladius meus
dominabitur carni tuae et ossa tua dispergam super
ignem ardentem. Nam si oboedieris mihi et
adoraveris deos meos, corpus tuum puella, erit mihi
in amorem. Ecce, ante omnes tibi dico: Accipiam te
in coniugium et bene tibi erit tibi sicut et mihi'
(Herbst, ll. 92-6, p. 131).

Margaret again refuses the prefect's offer with a profession
of faith in the resurrection:

'Ego trado corpus meum, ut cum iustis virginibus
requiescam. Christus semet ipsum pro nobis
traddidit in mortem, et ego pro ipso non dubito
mori, quia ipse suo signaculo sibi me consignavit'
(ll. 97-9, p. 131).

CCCC 303 duplicates much of the Latin text of Olibrius'
speech, including its use of contrasting personal pronouns in
conjunction with the varied repetition of a key phrase ("to
minum gode þe gebiddan") and its initial threat and
settlement offer. In the OE account, however, Olibrius'
description of the torments he has planned for Margaret is
more graphic than it is in the Harley account. Such
aggressive malevolence is typical of flyting speech:

'Gif þu nylt to minum gode þe gebiddan, min swyrd
sceal þinne þone fægran lichaman eall to styccan
forcyrfan and þine lieman ealle tosindrian, and
Margaret also uses flyting rhetoric in her reply. She appropriates the noun “lichaman” from Olibrius, then makes what may be a pun on Olibrius’ “gebiddan,” saying she has offered (“bebodan”) herself to God, and not to Olibrius or his idols. She corrects Olibrius' notion that she is nothing more than a body made of limbs and bones by emphasizing that she also has a soul which she offers to God as well. Like a flyter, Margaret echoes Olibrius' adverb eall, using it to summarize and quickly dismiss his blood-thirsty rantings (“and wij? eallum ... gewitum”) and transforms Olibrius' phrase "me selfan" so that it becomes part of her confessional statement of allegiance to Jesus "hine selfne." Her concluding play on the verb willan and the noun willa transforms Olibrius' ominous "Gif þu nylt" into a defiant predictive boast which her deeds will fulfill:

'Íc habbe minne licchaman [sic] and mine sawla gode bebodan, for he is min hlaford and min help and min werigend and min fultum wiþ þe and wiþ eallum þinem leasum gewitum. Crist hine selfne to þan geadmedde, þæt he for mancynne micle prowunge gêprowode and na for his gewyrhtum, ac for ure alesednesse; and ic wille, cwaþ hi, for his leofan wille bliþelice prowian' (Assmann, ll. 111-7, p. 173).

These differences from the Latin text, like the other differences already discussed, emphasize the antagonistic and violent tone of the quarrel.

Another passage in the OE Cotton Tiberius passio shows even greater signs of AS innovation. In recounting Margaret's conversation with the devil, the writer condenses about sixty lines of rather discursive dialogue found in Harley (Herbst, ll. 245-303, pp. 137-40) into a shorter, but
more heated exchange, which includes a repetition of the
identity motif typical of flyting:

Se halga fæmne him to cwaep, 'Saga me þin cynn ond
hwa þe cende.' [þat] deofol hire to cwaep, 'Sæcg
me, Margareta, hwanon is þin life ond þin lichama,
hwanon is þin sawul ond þin geleafa, oppe hu wæs
Crist wuniend on þe; sag[a] me þis, þonne secge ic
þe ealle mine dæde.' Se halga fæmne him answarode
ond cwaep, 'Nys me alifed þæt ic þe to secga, forþon
þu ne eart wyrþe mine stefne to gehyrenne. Godes
bebodu ic wille gehyran ond þæt gecypan, ond þu,
deofol, adumbe nu, forþon þe ic nelle nan word ma
of þinum muþe gehyran.' Ond hraedlice se eorþe
forswalg þone deofol grimlice (Herbst, 11. 228-38,
p. 74).

The clash of speakers is embodied once again in pronoun
contrast, and the refrain "saga me" in conjunction with the
repeated interrogatives of the first few lines ("Saga me ...
hwa," "sæcg me ... hwanon ... hwanon ... hu") suggests the
exchange of blows. Like Benedict, Margaret refuses to be
enticed into any more conversation, and insures her conquest
of the fiend with an exorcistic imperative ("adumbe") which
like a victorious flyter's directive utterance is fulfilled,
and the devil is swallowed up by the ground.84

The foregoing analysis might be easily extended, for
like many passiones, the story of Margaret's martyrdom
consists chiefly of dialogue. The passages examined here,
however, are sufficient to show that the verbal battles found
in the OE Margaret passiones resemble flyting in form and
content, and are likely, therefore, to have been regarded by
AS audiences as examples of flyting. Further, there is some
evidence that particular speeches (for example, Cotton
Tiberius, 11. 228-38) may have been altered by AS
hagiographers to emphasize their affinity with flyting.

What conclusions can be drawn from this analysis of
adversarial dialogues found in OE hagiographic prose? First,
it is clear that these dialogues have both a Latin and a
Germanic provenience, for while faithful vernacular translations of Latin texts contain verbal battles remarkably similar to flyting, OE hagiographic texts which are less dependent on Latin sources, and therefore presumably more reflective of AS and thus Germanic predispositions, seem purposely to enhance the resemblance of the Christian war of words and Germanic flyting. That the similarity between the two genres of debate, whatever its source, provoked a re-analysis of the Christian war of words as flyting seems implicit in AS writers' occasional use of the noun geflitu to describe the verbal battles of Christian heroes and their pagan or demonic enemies.

If we concede that these texts suggest an AS re-analysis of the Christian war of words as a species of flyting, can we also infer from them anything about the nature of the emerging sacred flyting? Although each dialogue is unique in some respect, all are preoccupied with spiritual issues, and thus like the scripturally dependent debates already discussed in chapter three, replace the temporal topics of flyting with their spiritual equivalents. The flyting identity motif may thus become an opportunity for credal declarations, the retroactive and projective boasts of temporal fame and prowess may become occasions for the confessional recitation of God's deeds throughout history and into the future, flyting commands may be transformed into quasi-liturgical exorcistic utterances, and secular flyters' differing frames of reference may be embodied in the differing theological perspectives of Christian and non-Christian.

The performative dimension of speech central to serious or battle flyting is also important in sacred flyting, for each quarrel awards victory to the individual who is able to fulfill the perlocutionary implications of his speech. In sacred flyting, however, superior verbal prowess always belongs to the Christian who fights with God's word. Pagans and other allies of the devil cannot defeat their Christian
opponents because their discourse, closely akin to Satan's, is founded on misperceptions (they commonly mistake devils for gods) or outright lies, and therefore either fails to achieve its intended perlocutionary goals, or is incapable of influencing the external world at all. In sacred flyting the perlocutionary weakness of demonic or pagan speech is often signalled by the speaker's resort to violence which ironically allows the saint or martyr to fulfill his confessional boasts of steadfast faith. Do these patterns persist in the adversarial dialogues found in OE verse? I shall begin to answer this question in the next two chapters by examining some scripturally dependent OE poems.
NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1 It is a commonplace of OE scholarship that medieval authors did not share modern doctrines of originality, but were instead predisposed to borrow, often silently, from the work of earlier writers. This tendency to be derivative was strengthened by the character of medieval religious discourse which favoured recapitulation over invention, and was especially pronounced in hagiography where "the deeds of all saints exemplify the same spiritual and universal values and may be freely interchanged at the hagiographer's wish" (Clinton Albertson, Anglo-Saxon Saints and Heroes [New York: Fordham U P, 1967], p. 26).


3 The immensity of the task of determining the sources of OE texts is evident in the size of the Fontes Anglo-Saxonici project and in The Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version, ed. Frederick Biggs, Thomas Hill and Paul Szarmach (SUNY: CMERS, 1990). (Hereafter referred to as SASLC). Ælfric's sources are especially problematic, and even today are incompletely known. Zettel, for instance, has recently argued that the Cotton-Corpus legendary, a ms. as yet unpublished, is a hitherto unidentified source for some of Ælfric's texts ("Saints' Lives in Old English: Latin Manuscripts and Vernacular Accounts: Ælfric," Peritia 1 [1982], 17-37).

4 Fulgentius' earlier homily on St. Stephen implies a spiritual battle against the "saevitiam Judeorum" fought by a "miles de tabernaculo" (PL LXV, cols. 729-30).

5 Likewise St. Vincent defeats the prefect, Datus, with confessional words ("Passio Sancti Vincentii Martyris," Skeat 2, especially pp. 172-5).

6 Although it is somewhat paradoxical to use Anglo-Latin texts in this study of OE prose, two Anglo-Latin works are included here because their subjects are AS saints, and therefore we can be reasonably certain that the allusions to verbal warfare found in these texts represent AS invention rather than translation.

7 All citations are from Bertram Colgrave, The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus (1927; rpt. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985) p. 28. According to Albertson, the work was composed some time between 710 and 720 (AS Saints and Heroes, p. 87).

8 AS Saints and Heroes, p. 31.


10 Bede is not the only AS hagiographer writing in Anglo-Latin who evokes the martial imagery of Eph. 6.11-17. The AS monk, Felix, uses a similar introduction to Guplac's encounter with the demons of the Crowland wilderness in his Vita Sancti Guthlacii, and then devotes five chapters to a description of a battle between the saint and his demonic enemies which is fought for the most part with words. An OE homily is
also devoted to this episode, but I shall postpone discussion of these prose texts until I examine Guflac A in chapter seven.

11 I have enumerated the numerous characteristics of flyting in chapter one, pp. 10-14. Chief among them and most relevant to the analysis provided in this chapter are an overall verbal reciprocity characterized by pronoun contrast, echoing or repetition of words and phrases, parallel syntax, question and answer, claim and counter-claim, if ...

Ponne clauses; issues of identity; offers of settlement; threats; insults; and in the speech of the victorious flyter, fulfilled performative utterances.

12 Hecht, Bischof Wauerferths von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen, p. 80. All additional references to the OE translation will be from Hecht. The corresponding Latin text is, "Quale vultis pretium dabo, et puerulos quos abstulisti reddite, mihique hoc gratiae vestrae munus praebete. Tunc is qui prior eorum esse videbatur, respondit dicens: Quidquid allud praecipis, facere parati sumus, nam istos puerulos nullatenus reddemus" (PL LXXVII, col. 205).

13 The infinitive beotian is glossed in BT as the act of threatening, promising or boasting, perhaps because these commissives often denote very similar actions. Elmarsson, however, argues for a semantic shift transforming promising into boasting and boasting into threatening ("OE boat and Old Icelandic heitstrekna," PMLA 49 [1934], p.980). Such shifts, however, are difficult to identify with precision, and, in any case, Wauerferth's use of beotian here, while it is clearly threatening, contains within it the boastful implication of most threats -- that is, that the speaker is strong enough to fulfill his unpleasant words with deeds. As boast, then, Fortunatus' speech fits into part of the paradigm of secular flyting.

14 "Cui venerandus vir blande minatus est, dicens: Contristas me, fili, et non audis Patrem tuum: noli me contristare, ne non expediat tibi" (PL LXXVII, col. 205).


16 The corresponding Latin text is "... ubi vero ara ejusdem Apollinis fuit, oraculum sancti Joannis construxit, et commorantem circumquaque multitudinem praedicatione continua ad fidem vocat" (PL LXVI, col. 152).

17 "Prius enim hanc vocabat ex nomine. Cui cum vir Dei minime responderet, ad ejus mox contumeliae erumpebat. Nam cum clamaret, dicens: Benedicte, Benedicte, et eum sibi nullo modo respondere conspiceret, protinus adjuengebat: Maledicte, non Benedicte, quid mecum habes? quic me persequeris?" (PL LXVI, col. 152). Ælfric's homily "KL Aprilis: Sancti Benedicti Abbatis" is an abbreviated version of Gregory's Dialogue II, and includes a similar account of the devil's verbal attack on Benedict: "At fruman he hine clypode be his naman, 'Benedicte,' Pet is, 'Gebletsod.' Pa suwade se halga wer, and se deofol þærrihte eft clypode, 'Maledicte, non Benedicte, þu awyrigeda, and na gebletsod, hwæt wist þu me, hwi ehtst þu min?" (Thorpe 2, p. 164).

18 This observation applies to many of the dialogues discussed below. It is often difficult to know when this kind of alteration is authorial, or when it is merely a function of the differing natures of the Latin and OE languages. Whatever its motivation, however, the effect is clear: it enhances the agonistic tone of the dialogues where it occurs, and thus increases the likelihood that an AS audience would construe these exchanges as flyting.
The corresponding Latin is "Itaque intempestae noctis silentio, cum vir Dei quiesceret, antiquus hostis immensis vocibus magnisque clamoribus coepit imitari rugitus leonum, balatus pecorum, ruditus asinorum, sibilos serpentium, porcorum stridores et soricum" (PL LXXVII, col. 225).

Such bestiality also aligns the devil with the inhuman creature who engages the hero in *sennik*.

"Tunc repente Datus tot bestiarum vocibus excitatus surrexit, vehementer iratus, et contra antiquum hostem magnis coepit vocibus clamare, dicens: Bene tibi contigit, miser, tu ille es qui dixisti: Ponam sedem meam ad Aquilonem, et ero similis Altissimo (Isai. XIV, 14); ecce per superbiam tuam porcis et soricibus similis factus es; et qui imitari Deum indigne voluisti, ecce, ut dignus es, bestias imitaris," PL LXXVII, col. 225).


All citations of the OE Life and of the Vita Sancti Christophori (an edition based on the ASS vita for July 25) are from Stanley Rypins, ed., Three Old English Prose Texts in Ms. Cotton Vitellius A xv (London: EETS o.s. 161, 1924), pp. 68-76 and pp. 108-10. Although the OE version is not a verbatim translation of the Latin, it is sufficiently similar for Frederick to identify the ASS text the AS hagiographer's source ("'His Ansyn Wses Swylce Rosan Blostma': A Reading of the Old English Life of St. Christopher," Proceedings of the PBR Conference 12/13 [1987-88], p. 138).

It seems likely that an acrimonious exchange precedes this incident, for just before this in both the Latin and the OE accounts, Christopher insults the king ("tu autem stultus es," l. 2, p. 108; "pu dysig & unsnotor," ll. 1-2, p. 68).

See Rypins, l. 10, p. 68. The corresponding passage in the Latin account lacks the martial epithet and calls Christopher *famulus Dei* instead (l. 7, p. 108).

The corresponding Latin is: "Haec tormenta tua, quae mihi facis in tua turpitudine, et dis tuuis consumentur. Ego semel tibi dixi: quia non timebo tormenta tua, nec iram tuam" (ll. 16-8, p. 108).

The Latin contains a similar insult, as well as pronoun contrast: "Fera mala, non tibi sufficiunt peccata animarum, quas errare fecisti, et non permisiisti sacrificare dis; sed omnem populum meum traxisti ad te" (Rypins ll. 15-27, p. 108).

Although the boast is retained, the echoes are less pronounced in the Latin: "Adhuc multae animae per me credere habent [in] Dominum Jesum Christum, et tu ipse" (ll. 27-9, p. 108).

In this speech, Christopher also combines contrasting pronominal adjectives with verbal echoes, replying to Dagnus' "minum godum" with "pine god" and using "minne geleafan" in response to "pinne god gelyfap." The Latin echoes "dei mei" in "diis tuis": "Sanctus Christophorus dixit: Ego diis tuuis abominationem feci; quia fidem meam habeo, quam in baptismo accepiv" (ll. 7-8, p. 109).

Frederick observes that Dagnus' obtuseness here represents his spiritual blindness which is soon transformed into actual blindess ("'Swylce Rosan Blostma'," p. 139, p. 145).

The corresponding Latin is: "Ubi est Deus tuus? Veniat et liberet te de manibus meis, et de sagittis his" (ll. 13-15, p. 109).

The corresponding passage in the Latin also contains verbal echo ("crastino, ora octava"), but it is less pronounced: "Tibi dico, tyranne stulte, si credis: ego crastino, ora octava, accipio mean

33 Frederick notes that the echo is reinforced by the parallel syntax of the introductory "wite pu" in both Dagnus' and Christopher's speech. She also provides an excellent discussion of the thematic significance of these echoes within the OE Life, arguing that they are part of "the idea of definition which runs through the Life" ("'Swylce Rosan Blostma,'" pp. 142-4). She does not, however, discuss the role of verbal echo in flyting. 34 The Latin is: "Domine Deus meus ... quod te rogo, praesta mihi ... et in civitate illa, et in illis locis, si fuerint ibi malefici, aut daemoniaci, et veniunt et orant ex toto corde, et propter nomen tuum nominant nomen meum in suis orationibus, salvi fiant" (11. 1-7, p. 110).

35 "Christophore, famule meus ... commemorantur autem in oratione sua nomen tuum; quidquid petierint, accipiant, et salvi fiant" (11. 7-10, p. 110).

36 The Latin version of Dagnus' threat has no equivalent of the phrase, "pin nama," which occurs in the OE.

37 Frederick observes, "Dagnus is completely caught up in the web of the material world and cannot see through to the world of the spirit" ("'Swylce Rosan Blostma,'" p. 143). Such conflicting literal and spiritual frames of reference are typical of the martyr/tyrant dialogues of the passiones. They are also akin to the more personal conflicts of perspective found in secular flyting and characterized by Anderson as conflicting frames of reference.

38 All citations are from Skeat 2, pp. 356-77. Waterhouse calls this passio "remarkable" for its reliance on direct discourse, and adds that the "cut-and-thrust of argument and verbal exchange" generates much of the drama of Ælfric's account ("Ælfric's Use of Discourse," p. 96). The source of Ælfric's text is not known for certain. Waterhouse argues it is "something like either the Legenda Aurea or the version of Mombritius" (pp. 96-7) but Moloney proposes Mombritius' version as the one most similar to Ælfric's source ("Another Look at Ælfric's Use of Discourse in Some Saints' Lives," ES 63 [1982], p. 14). I follow Moloney and use Mombritius' text as a basis for my comparison of Latin and OE accounts.


40 In Mombritius, Cecilia also provides a settlement offer and continues to use pronoun contrast. The passage also contains a verbal echo, but it is less complex ("polluto amore" cited above is replaced by "immaculato amore" and the verb, "diliges" echoed in "diligit": "Si autem cognoverit quod me sincero et immaculato amore diliges et virginitatem meam integram illibatamque custodias, ita te quoque diligit, sicut et me, et ostendit tibi gratiam suam" (p. 197).

41 "Tunc beata Caecilia dicit ei: 'Si consiliis meis promittas te acquiescere et permittas te fonte perenni et credas unum Deum esse in caelis vivum, et verum, poteris eum videre'" (p. 197).

42 My citations of the second portion of Mombritius are from Gerould's edition, found in "The Second Nun's Prologue and Tale" in Sources and
"Almachius dixit: infelix ignoras quoniam interficiendi et uuiificandi mihi ab inuictissimis principibus potestas data est? Vt quid cum tanta superbia loqueris?" (Gerould, p. 683).

Pope 2, pp. 737-46. All citations of the homily will be from this edition.

The acta, "De Sanctis Martyribus Romanis Alexandro Primo, Pontifice, Eventio et Theodulo Presbyteris," is found in ASS, May 3, pp. 375-9. All citations are from the ASS text.

"Tunc fecit ei linguam abscindi, dicens: Linguam tuam aufero, quia non timuisti sic audacter tua mihi pandere secreta ut tacentem te torqueri iubeam in eculeo. Quirinus dixit: Miser et infelix, libera animam tuam, ne aeternae te poenae suscipiant" (ASS May 3, cap. III, 14, p. 378).

Thorpe 2, pp. 308-13.

Again, the Latin is a little longer, but also includes insulting direct address and emphatic pronoun contrast: "S. Alexander dixit: Aureliane tyranne, quid est quod talia temerario ausu perquiris? et hoc a me, qui praeter Regem meum, qui est in coelis, alterum omnino non timeo? Erras, si te putas, non credendo, sed discutiendo a Christianis hominibus erudiri" (ASS May 3, cap. IV, 15, p. 378).

Elliott observes that this is a typical feature of a martyr's discourse (see my discussion in chapter two, pp. 78-9).

Thorpe 1, pp. 416-37. Prudentius' version of Laurence's martyrdom in Peristefanon II contains only brief mention of Sixtus.

Similar adversarial dialogues occur later in the passio when Laurence contends with his pagan opponents. See, for instance, his quarrel with Valerianus about actual treasure and spiritual treasure (p. 422 and p. 424). Some other verbal battles contain signs of flyting but will not be discussed here. See, for example, "Passio Sancti Bartholomei Apostoli" (Thorpe 1, pp. 454-77, especially p. 458 and p. 462-4, where the apostle contends with a devil and p. 468, where he quarrels with the pagan king, Astryges), in "Natale Sancti Apollonaris, Martyris" (Skeat 1, especially ll. 203 to 222, p. 464), in "Natale Sancti Georgii, Martyris" (Skeat 1, especially ll. 8-40, p. 308), and in "Natale Sancte Agnetis, Virginis," (Skeat 1, especially ll. 98-140, pp. 176-8).

Skeat 1, pp. 194-209. All citations will be from Skeat's edition. In "Verbal Contests," Anderson analyzes this text and describes it as "one of the few examples of verbal echoing in the saint's passion" (p. 218). While my analysis of the debate is indebted to Anderson's, I disagree with his assertion that such echoing is rare. My own discussion of these texts suggests the opposite.

through her steadfast faith ("Fide, qua credit, omnia tormenta/ Fortiter vincet") but we do not learn here what verbal weapons she employs in her defense.

54 Anderson makes the same point ("Verbal Contests," p. 218).
55 All citations of Ælfric's text will be from Skeat 2, pp. 314-35.
57 Anderson also notes the significance of "beotlic" ("Verbal Contests," p. 56).
58 Edmund's reply in Abbo's account occupies 42 lines, compared to 8 lines in Ælfric's version.
60 All citations will be from Skeat 1, pp. 414-25.
61 See, too, "Verbal Contests," p. 217. As I show in chapter one (see for example, pp. 10-11 and p. 30) verbal echo in flying is often associated with flyters' conflicting frames of reference.
62 Skeat 1, p. 100. The importance of boasts and their fulfillment in Germanic tradition is evident in Unferp's praise of Breca in Beowulf, vv. 523b-5, "Breca burh hupe, sunu Beanstanes sceap gelaste."
63 Skeat 1, pp. 148-69.
64 Thorpe 2, pp. 332-49.
65 There are at least two early vitae extant, according to ASS. In the first (ASS January 16, pp. 401-8) a word war is prominent. In the second (ASS January 16, pp. 408-18) the saint's life rather than his dream vision is emphasized.
67 The dispute between psychopomp and devil occupies over 90 lines in Ælfric's homily, and about 120 lines in the vita. I discuss a small but representative portion of the debate.
68 Perhaps because the N.T. fails to mention these contests (Acts 8.9-13, 18-24) homilists seem also to have ignored the verbal battles with Simon. See Bede's "Homelia 20" in Bedae Venerabilis: Homiliarum Evangelii, CCSL CXXII, pp. 141-7, Ambrose's "Sermo LIII" in PL XVII, cols. 736-8 and "Sermo LIV," PL XVII, cols. 738-9. Although Prudentius includes "Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli" in Peristephanon XII, he, too, omits the debates with Simon.
69 Simon himself uses the verb flitan to describe his verbal interaction with Paul, "Paulus ... lærep, and wip me flitep and pæt ... spræçeþ and mid him [Peter] bodæþ" (Morris, p. 175).
70 The ms. is damaged. Morris provides the following reading: "... but I will now bid my angels to come and avenge me [on these men]" (p. 178).
71 For a similar vernacular account of these events, see Ælfric's "De Passione Apostolorum Petri et Pauli," Thorpe 2, pp. 370-85, where he relates the ræstig cæmp (p. 374) waged by the sigefæste apostles against the evil Simon.


73 The Corpus Christi Cambridge College passio is edited by Assmann in Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben, pp. 170-80, and my citations are from this edition. Hereafter the ms. itself will be abbreviated CCC 303.


75 For a discussion of the Mombritius version, see Gerould, p. 525 and Elizabeth Francis, "A Hitherto Unprinted Version of the Passio Sanctae Margaritae with Some Observations on Vernacular Derivatives," PMLA 42 (1927), p. 90, where she refers to a Ms. Harley 5337. Assmann and Herbst, however, are both agreed that the designation is Harley 5327. Francis includes an edition of the Caligula version in her article, and both Assmann and Herbst edit the Harley passio. Francis argues that these Latin texts are probably themselves recensions of still earlier Greek accounts ("Unprinted Version," p. 97).

76 Gerould, "A New Text," p. 546. This is a frequent circumstance in OE hagiographic prose and verse.

77 My comparison is based on the text of Harley provided by Herbst (which does not differ substantially from Assmann's version) and the Caligula text provided by Francis.

78 The Harley passio is 425 lines long while the Caligula passio is about 200 lines long.

79 Harley's reliance on varied repetition or echoing can be seen in Margaret's first quarrel with Olibrius, where Margaret says "'Ego invoco Deum ... Iesum Christum'" and Olibrius replies, "'Ergo invocas nomen Christi ...'" (Herbst, ll. 73-6, p. 130). In Ms. Caligula the repetition is lacking (Francis, p. 99). Harley's emphasis on pronoun contrast is apparent in Olibrius' first speech to Margaret on the second day of her ordeal: "'Vana puella, miserere corpori tuo et pulchritudini et teneritatii tuae, et consenti mihi et adora deos meos et multam tibi dabo pecuniam et bene tibi erit super omnem familiam meam'" (Herbst, ll. 84-7, p. 130). In Ms. Caligula, pronoun contrast is not emphasized: "'Quid' inquit 'transacte noctis spatio boni consilii captasti tue saluti? Vis ne libamina dis adhuc immortalibus litare, an pro Christi tui nomine cum dedecore mori?'" (Francis, p. 99).

80 In the Harley version, Margaret dismisses the devil saying, "'Vade post me, Satanas'" (Herbst 1. 302, p. 140) and in Ms. Caligula she addresses God in a prayer, "'Jesu Christe redemptor bone .... Rogo qu te ut hic iniquissimus demon perpetui in presenti plectatur penis, nec tuos amplius seducat cultores'" (Francis, p. 101).

81 Anderson's observations on flyters' differing frames of reference are discussed in chapter one, p. 10. In sacred flyting, as is evident in some of the adversarial dialogues discussed thus far, flyters' differing perspectives are theological rather than merely personal.

82 In Ms. Harley, Margaret's reply is longer and includes a brief confessional recitation of God's power: "'Cognoscit Deus, qui virginitatem consignavit meam, quia mihi non suadebis, nec poteris me movere de via veritatis, quam ego coepi ambulare. Nam ego illum adoro,
The portion of the Latin which most closely resembles the OE passage includes a single repetition of "dic mihi" and a few examples of pronoun contrast (Herbst, ll. 282-7, p. 139).

The CCCC 303 version of this dialogue combines elements of both the Harley and the Cotton Tiberius texts. The passage (Assmann, ll. 250-70, p. 177) is too extensive to cite here, except to note that again the command "sege me" is uttered by the devil (followed by a series of interrogatives, "hwanen ... hwanan ... hwu ... hwilce") and negated by Margaret ("Nelle ic hit þe secgan"). Here, the devil also confesses that God's strength is working through the saint ("forþon ic geseo, þat god is mid þe," l. 263), but Margaret nonetheless delivers the verbal coup de grace, ordering the fiend, "Gewit þe heonan on weig and sea eorþe þe forswelge" (ll. 269-70). Defeated, the devil vanishes.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONNECTIONS BETWEEN FLYTING AND THE SPIRITUAL STRUGGLE IN OE EXODUS AND DANIEL

The evidence of the OE religious prose texts discussed in the preceding chapters suggests that the homilists and hagiographers who composed these works were interpreting the examples of verbal warfare found in early Latin Christian literature as a species of Germanic flyting. Did AS poets also treat the Christian war of words as a kind of sacred flyting? In his edition of "Altercatio Magistri et Discipuli," Lapidge argues that secular flyting influenced late tenth-century Anglo-Latin verse, creating a new genre of medieval poetry which

combines the form of the interchange between magister and discipulus found in the didactic dialogues with the violence of invective found in the vernacular flytings.¹

Since flyting was sufficiently well-known in the late tenth century to affect Latin verse, it seems likely that its impact would have been even more strongly felt in the earlier Christian vernacular poetry.² The remainder of this study will explore this hypothesis by searching for signs of flyting's influence in scripturally dependent OE verse as well as in OE verse hagiography. In this chapter, I begin with a brief discussion of some Germanic influences impinging on OE scriptural verse in general, then I turn my attention to two scripturally dependent poems, OE Exodus and Daniel. Although neither Exodus nor Daniel contain explicit flyting exchanges, both are important to the thesis argued here because they testify to AS poets' recognition of the importance of the word in the Christian religion and in the metaphoric spiritual warfare waged by the devout Christian against Satan and his allies. Since word and warfare are also linked in flyting, this recognition of a similar
connection in Christian spiritual battle is an important precursor to flyting's presence in other OE religious poetry.

The notion that Germanic flyting influenced AS poets' treatment of Christian adversarial dialogues gets some support from Bede who alludes to the presence of general Germanic influence in Cædmon's poetry:

\[
\text{quicquid ex divinis litteris per interpretes disceret, hoc ipse post pusillum verbis poeticis maxima suavitate et compunctione compositis, in sua, id est, Anglorum lingua proferret.}
\]

Although today few would assert that Cædmon is the author of the Junius poems, it is a commonplace of AS literary criticism that both Exodus and Daniel, like the other poems in the Junius Ms.,\(^5\) combine Christian content with the conventions of Germanic poetic expression in the manner of Cædmon's verse. A familiar product of this Germanicization of Christian subject matter is the portrait of God as a Germanic warrior-king, surrounded by a court of angelic thanes.\(^6\) A less familiar example of Germanic influence is AS poets' tendency to describe sinful behavior in terms of discourse, calling it either oath-breaking\(^7\) or false boast. This conception of sin can be readily seen in GA, vv. 2408-2412a.\(^8\) Here, the poet has God describe the discourse of the wicked inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah as foolish, drunken boast ("ealogalra gylp") uttered by pledge-breakers (werlogan):

\[
(Ic on pisse byrig beartm gehyre, synnigra cyrm swipe hludne, ealogalra gylp, yfele spræce werod under weallum habban. Forpon wærlogona sint folce firena hefige) (v. 2412a).
\]

This equation of sin with oath-breaking and false boast has no counterpart in the GA poet's source, for Latin equivalents of \textit{gylp} and \textit{werloga} do not occur in the corresponding passage.
of the Vulgate. Instead, God speaks of the outcry (clamor) which the behavior of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah produces:

dixit itaque Dominus clamor Sodomorum et Gomorrah multiplicatus est et peccatum earum adgravatum est nimis (Gen. 18.20).

The GA poet's use of the nouns gylp and werloga has two important implications. First, by describing sin in terms of faithless utterance, he suggests a view of sin and righteousness in which words become just as important as deeds. This view, also implicit in Eph. 6.11-17, paves the way for the transfer of theological and moral struggles to a verbal arena. Second, and equally important from the perspective of this study, the Germanicization of sinners as werlogan and utterers of "ealogalra gylp" suggests that they resemble incompetent flyters who also utter oaths and boasts which cannot be fulfilled.

This connection of sin with performatively inadequate discourse persists in OE Exo. Here, spiritual struggle has an implicit verbal dimension. Like the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, the Egyptians are associated with covenant violation and with false boast, while the Jews whom they pursue adhere to the covenant and draw strength from God and his word. Although there is no verbal battle between the covenant-keepers and the covenant-breakers in OE Exo (the Jews rely on God's intervention for both their deliverance and Pharaoh's destruction), there are suggestions throughout the poem that the Jews' escape and the Egyptians' death are in part the consequence of the differing performative strength of their illocutions, and thus have some similarity to flyting. Since this allegation depends on the prior assumption that Exo depicts a spiritual as much as an historical conflict, I shall begin my analysis of discourse in Exo by briefly defending allegorical readings of the poem.
Although scholars seldom agree on the interpretation of OE Exo (Earl says that "the only critical judgment concerning the OE Exodus which has not been debated is that it is an extraordinarily difficult poem"), the occasional mimetic infelicity caused by apparently inapposite martial diction, or by a sometimes digressive narrative betrays the presence of allegory underlying literal history, and suggests that the poem's major concerns are spiritual rather than literal or historical. Perhaps the most important occasion on which mimesis falters, and the occasion which also has the most significance for this study is the Exo poet's account of the crossing of the Red Sea. Although Scripture hints at a tentative connection between the crossing and battle, the Exo poet's description of Moses' people advancing across the sea floor far exceeds the martiality of the biblical account:

(v. 319) Hæfdon him to segne, ða hie on sund stigon, ofer bordhreopan beacen aræred in ðam garheape gyldeonne leon, drihtfolca mæst, deora cenost. Be ðam herewisan hynþo ne woldon be him lifigendum lange ðolian, þonne hie to guþe garwudu raerdon, þeoda ænigre. Praca wæs on ore, heard handplega, hægsteald modige, wænpa wælslíhtes, wigend unforhte, bilswaþu blodige, beadumægnes ræs, grimhelma gegrind, þær Tudas for (v. 330).

However, this stirring description of armed troops marching to battle arouses expectations of combat which the narrative does not fulfill, for even though the poet tells us that there is an attack at the head of the column ("Praca wæs on ore") followed by "hard handplega," these bold troops encounter no visible enemy. Instead, followed by equally war-like contingents of their compatriots (vv. 331-61), they merely walk to the far shore. Even more confusing to modern readers, once the description of the Hebrews' crossing is
complete, the poet temporarily abandons the chronological thread of his narrative, and embarks on a long discussion of the relationship of Noah and Abraham to the covenant (vv. 362-446). At this point, a lacuna in the ms. adds a further complication: the fitt in which we would expect to learn about the completion of the crossing and Moses' recalling of the waters is missing. When the narrative resumes, the Egyptians are discovered in the midst of their crossing, and the poet again departs from his source to reassert the martial tone of earlier passages by describing the inundation of Pharaoh's army as if it were a battle-field massacre, with troops more awash in blood than in water:

(v. 447) Folc was ofōred; flodegsa becwom
gastas geomre, geofon deape hweop.
Wæron beorhhliþu blode bestemed,
holm heolfre spaw, hream was on yþum,
waetor wæpna ful, wælmist astah (v. 451).

A few lines later, the poet calls the towering waves of the Red Sea, shield-walls (v. 464 and v. 467), and attributes their collapse upon the Egyptians to a blow struck by an ancient sword (vv. 494b-7a):

(463b) Flod blod gewod:
randbyrig wæron rofene, rodor swipode
meredepa mæst. Modige swulton,
cyningas on corþre. Cyrm swipode
wæges æt ende; wigbord scinon.
Heah ofer hælepum holmweall astah (v. 468)

....
(490b) garsecg wedde,
up teah, on sleap (egesan stodon,
weollon wælbenna), witrod gefeol
heah of heofonum handweorc Godes,
famigbosma; Flodweard gesloh
unhleowan wæg alde mece,
pæt þy deaþdrepe drihte swefon,
synfullra sweot (v. 497a).18
What justification is there for this persistent militaristic diction? Certainly the martial lexicon clothes the undignified flight of the Israelites with the trappings of epic battle, transforming a beleaguered people into an army of heroes. Mimetically, however, the diction is excessive. To make sense of the militaristic tone, we must follow the poet's advice and search for spiritual keys with which to unlock this puzzle (vv. 523-6), for only in the context of Christian exegesis does the purpose of the diction become clear.

Christian commentators, taking their lead from Paul, interpreted the crossing of the Red Sea as an allegory for baptism:

Nolo enim vos ignorare fratres quoniam patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt et omnes mare transierunt et omnes in Mose baptizati sunt in nube et in mari....haec autem omnia in figura contingebant illis scripta sunt autem ad correptionem nostram in quos fines saeculorum devenerunt (1.Cor. 10.1-2, 11).

The rite of baptism allegorized in the crossing ritualized the conceit that the spiritual life of a Christian consisted of a continuous fight with the devil.19 Ælfric makes the connection between the crossing, baptism and the struggle with Satan explicit in his "Dominica in Media Quadragesimae":

Seo Reade sæ hæfde getacnunge ures fulluhtes, on þære ædranc Pharao and his here samod; swa eac on urum gastlicum fulluhte biþ se deofol forsmorod fram us, and ealle ure synna beþ adylegode, and we þonne sigefæste, mid geleafan Godes lof singþ (Thorpe 2, p. 200).20

The crossing could also represent the life-long struggle of the professed Christian who was obliged to conquer sin in order to obtain salvation. In this context, Pharaoh was understood to be a reification of sin:
Witodlice Iosue and Israhela folc oferwunn on seofon peoda: eahtope wæs Pharao, pe ær mid his leode adranc; and hi sippan sigefæste pone behatenan eard him betwynan dældon. Swa sceolon eac cristene men pa eahta heafodleahtras mid heora werodum ealle oferwinnan, gif hi æfre sceolon to pam epele becuman, pe him on frympe se Heofenlica Fæder gemynste, gif hi his bebodum blipelice gehyrsumiaþ (Thorpe 2, p. 218).

From the perspective of Christian exegesis, then, the Red Sea crossing is an allegory of the spiritual struggle with evil both within the sacrament of baptism and throughout Christian life. The poem's martial diction seems clearly intended to evoke this spiritual battle.

Close reading of Exo suggests in addition that this underlying spiritual conflict has a verbal dimension. This is scarcely surprising in the light of the passage cited above, for Ælfric's description of the eight sins' companions as a troop or werod evokes that noun's near-homonym, word, suggesting that the forces of sin are verbal. Signs of a link between words and war begin in Exo with the poet's recapitulation of Moses' heroic deeds in vv. 1-27. In these lines, he depicts Moses as a military leader who uses words as well as weapons:

(v. 1) Hwæt, we feor ond neah gefrigen habbaþ ofer middangeard Moyses domas, wærclicico wordriht, wera cneorissum -- in uprodor eadigra gehwam æfter bealusipe bote lifes, lifigendra gehwam langsumne ræd -- hælepum seccgan.(v. 7a)

....

(12) He wæs leof Gode, leoda aldor, horesc ond hreþergleaw, herges wisa, freom folctoga. Faraones cyn, Godes andsacan, gyrdwite band (v. 15)

....

(19) Heah wæs þæt handlean ond him hold Frea, gesealde wæpna geweald wiþ wæþra gryre; ofercom mid þy campe cneomaga fela, feonda folcriht. Pa wæs forma sip
As these lines suggest, Moses in many ways epitomizes the secular hero. Indeed, vv. 1-2 virtually duplicate the *Beowulf* poet's introductory paean to Scyld Scefing.²¹ Like Scyld, Moses protects his people's interests: he is a valiant chief ("freom folctoga") who subjugates his enemies because God has granted him superiority of weapons (vv. 14-15, vv. 19-22).²² Like the ideal Germanic king he is also alert and prudent ("horsc" and "hreþergleaw," a "herges wisa").²³ The poet adds, however, that Moses' words form an important part of his fame. The triple variation of vv. 1-7 which celebrates his ordinances ("domas"), his wonderful laws ("wraeleclico wordriht"), and his enduring counsel ("langsumne ræd")²⁴ suggests that Moses' renown arises not only from his ability to wield a sword, but also from his utterance of devout words, empowered by God.²⁵ Perhaps coincidentally, the significance of speech is also emphasized in Exo vv. 1-7 by the poet's use of verbs which denote discourse of various kinds. Thus, where the *Beowulf* poet employs fremman, ofteon, and egsian to describe Scyld's accomplishments (*Beowulf*, vv. 1-6), the Exo poet's catalogue of Moses' utterances is framed by the verb phrase "gefrigen habbap" and the infinitive seccan. Consequently, Exo vv. 1-7 seems to concentrate as much on speech acts as on aggressive behavior. Finally, there is a hint in this passage that God's word contributes to Moses' military success. The adverb pa in v. 22b connects God's first utterance to Moses ("pa ... nægde," vv. 22b-3b) to the time when God gives Moses the "wæpna geweald" (v. 20a) which ensures Israel's victory over her neighbours (vv. 20-1). Thus it appears that God's speech confers on Moses the "wæpna geweald." Taken as a whole, then, the Exo exordium depicts Moses as a military leader famous for his pious words
as well as for his deeds, and attributes his successes on the battlefield in part to the influence of God’s word.\textsuperscript{26}

The idea that words play an important role in Moses’ struggles is not limited to the poem’s opening lines, for by associating the verb “ahof” with shield in v. 253, and the verb “hof” with voice in v. 276, the \textit{Exq} poet may be implying that shield and speech share a similar defensive function\textsuperscript{27}:

\begin{quote}
(v. 252) Ahleop \textit{p}a for \textit{h}ale\textit{p}um hildecalla, bald beodohata, bord up ahof heht \textit{p}a folctogan fyrde gestillan (v. 254)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(v. 276) Hof \textit{p}a for hergum hlude stefne lifgendra \textit{p}eoden, \textit{p}a he to leodum spræc (v. 277).\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

The speech framed by these phrases provides a glimpse of the kinds of utterance which will protect Moses and his people:

\begin{quote}
(v. 259) ’Ne beop ge \textit{p}y forhtran, \textit{p}eah \textit{p}e Faraon brohte sweordwigendra sige hergas, eorla unrim. Him eallum wile mhtig Drihten purh mine hand

to daege p\textit{s}sum dælean gyfan,
\textit{p}æt hie lifigende leng ne moton ãgnian mid yrm\textit{p}um Israhela cyn (v. 265).
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(269b) Ic on beteran ræd,
\textit{p}æt ge gewur\textit{p}ien wuldræ Aldor, ond eow Liffrean lissa bidde
sigora gesynto, \textit{p}ær ge sipien.
\textit{pis} is se ecea Abrahames God, frumsceaf\textit{a} Frea, se \textit{pas} fyrd w\textit{e}r\textit{e}p,
modig ond mægenrof, mid \textit{p}ære miclan hand’ (v. 275).
\end{quote}

In vv. 269b-72, for example, Moses urges his people to rely on prayer as a means of ensuring their victory over the Egyptians. His own utterance combines Christian content with boast. Although the boastful quality of this speech has been somewhat obscured by editors’ emendation of the ms. “beohata” (v. 253a) to “beodohata” rather than “beothata,” or promiser of vows,\textsuperscript{29} a glance at the speech itself shows its similarity
to boast. Moses' claim that he will deliver his people through his own hand (vv. 262-5) conforms to the paradigm of projective boast which I have described in earlier chapters. His admission that he depends on God's help to accomplish his goal (vv. 261b-5), however, makes his speech a prediction of God's victory rather than his own, and thus transforms the illocution into a "Christianized boast."  

The effects of Moses' boast deserve some attention. As Nolan and Bloomfield observe, his utterance has extraordinary perlocutionary powers, for it accomplishes a miracle:

| Here beot is actually accompanied by a miracle: in secular situations, the promise-speech can effect well-nigh miraculous results, but not super-natural wonders ("Beowulf, Gilpinwidas," p. 500). |

Yet even though Moses' boast that he will save his people "þurh min hand" (v. 262b) is indeed fulfilled when the sea retreats and later returns to destroy the Egyptians (v. 280 and v. 480), the ultimate cause of the miraculous movement of the waters remains somewhat obscure on account of the lacuna in the ms. mentioned above, and we must rely on Moses' interpretation of the event. In vv. 278-83, he says that by striking of the sea with a "grene tacne," he will cause the waters to retreat:

(v. 278) 'Hwæt ge nu eagum to on lociþ folca leofost, ðærwundra sum nu ic sylfa sloh ond þeos swiþre hand grene tacne garsecges deop. ðþ up færþ, ofstum wyrceþ wæter on wealfæsten' (v. 283).  

This grene tacn, sometimes understood to be a rod or virga with which Moses strikes the waters (Exo. 14.16), was also interpreted by early commentators as "the knowledge of the law and Scriptures."  Moses' boast that he will save his people through his own hand, then, appears to be fulfilled
not only by his striking of the wave, but also as a consequence of his knowledge of God's law and word. Thus, although the poet does not specifically attribute the retreat of the sea to either God's or Moses' word, he nonetheless implies that both are indirectly responsible for the miracle. The puzzling reference to the "alde mece" noted above (v. 494b) may be susceptible to similar explanation, for in some ways the account of the waters' return almost parallels that of their departure. Moses' hand somehow precipitates both events (v. 262b and v. 480a),33 and in the account of the sea's return, the old sword occupies the place of the grene tacen:

(v. 478) Brim berstende blodegesan hweop
sæmanna siþ, oppæt sop Metod
þurh Moyses hand mod gerymde,
wide waþde, waelfæpmum sweep,
flod famgode (fæge crungon),
lagu land gefeol – lyft was onhrered (v. 483)

(494b) Flodweard gesloh
unhleowan waþ alde mece,
þæt þy deadredepe drihte swæfon,
synfullra sweot (v. 497a).34

Like the grene tacen, the "alde mece" may well have had verbal associations for in this context it seems clearly to evoke Paul's famous exhortation of the faithful to resist evil with the "gladium Spiritus quod est verbum Dei" (Eph. 6.17). Vv. 278-83 and vv. 478-97 suggest, then, that the miracle of the crossing is in part a consequence of God's word empowering Moses' boastful utterance as well as his gesture.

Do these observations have any implications for the re-analysis of Christian adversarial dialogue as flyting in OE scripturally dependent verse? Although their significance for this study is limited by the fact that Exo does not contain an explicit verbal battle -- Moses does not dispute with Pharaoh, nor do Pharaoh and God dispute with each other
-- features of the passages discussed above suggest a readiness on the part of AS poets to give spiritual struggle a verbal dimension. Some other features of these passages are also found in flyting. For example, as I have already observed, Moses is described as a warrior who resembles a flyter in that he fights with words as well as with swords. In addition, the poet's probable designation of Moses' speech as boast (v. 253a) transforms Christian utterance into a speech act which also occurs in flyting.

There is, however, another link between spiritual struggle in Exo and flyting, alluded to briefly at the beginning of this chapter, but not especially evident in the passages cited above, and that is that the poet uses the performative capacity of their discourse to distinguish the Egyptians from the Jews. In vv. 305-6, after describing the parting of the waters which fulfills Moses' boast (vv. 252-77), the poet observes that the Hebrews are a people who also fulfill their words and keep their covenant:

\[
\text{Wæs seo eorla gedriht anes modes,} \\
\text{fæstum fæþmum frefowære heold (vv. 305-6).}^{35}
\]

Next, the poet describes the rewards of past loyalty in the Noah and Abraham digression (vv. 362-446), specifically equating Noah's excellence as war-chief ("prymfæst þeoden") with his ability to keep the covenant:

\[
\text{(v. 362) Niwe flodas Noe oferlæþ,} \\
\text{prymfæst þeoden, mid his ðræm sunum,} \\
\text{þone deopestan drencefloda} \\
\text{para þe gewurde on woruldrice.} \\
\text{Hæfde him on hreþpre halige treowa} \\
\text{forþon he gelædde ofer lagustreamas} \\
\text{mæþmhordæ maþst (v. 368a).}
\]

In preparing to sacrifice Isaac (vv. 406-10) Abraham, too, fulfills his covenant with God,\(^{36}\) and as God's angel explains,
Abraham's adherence to his promise to God ensures that his people will prosper:

(v. 419) 'Ne sleh pu, Abraham, pin agen bearn, sunu mid sweorde. Sop is gecyped, nu pin cunnode Cyning alwihta, pat pu wi Waldend were heolde, faeste treowe se pe freode sceal in lifdagum lengest weorpan awa to aldre unswiciendo (v. 425)

(432) He pe ap swere engla peoden wyrd Waldend ond wereda God sofæst sigora Purh His sylfes lif (435) pat pines cynnes ond cneomaga randwiggendra rim ne cunnon yldo ofer eorpan' (v. 437a).

As preface to the account of the crossing, this digression urges the audience to recognize that Moses' projective boast is fulfilled and the Hebrews make their escape in the metaphoric war of the Red Sea because they, like their forefathers, fulfill their covenant promises (or, in the terminology of speech act theory, their commissive illocutions) with deeds. After the crossing, Moses reminds his people that if they continue to adhere to their covenant promises, they will assure themselves of future military triumphs:

(v. 558) wile nu gelæstan pat he lange gehet mid apswere, engla drihten, in fyrdagum fæderyncynne, gif ge gehealdap halige lare, pat ge feonda gehwone forp ofergangap, gesittap sigerice be sæm tweonum, beorselas beorna (v. 564a).

Thus, the Hebrews as covenant-keepers resemble battle flyters who are victorious because their commissive illocutions are fulfilled.

The Egyptians, on the other hand, are characterized by deceitful utterance. The aggression of Pharaoh, God's enemy
(vv. 14b-5a, v. 503b), is clearly linked to broken promises (v. 140b), for his historical pursuit of the Hebrews is a direct consequence of his violation of his predecessor's pledge that Israel would have authority in Egypt, as well as his own promise to let the Israelites leave Egypt unmolested:

Not surprisingly, in Exo as in many OE religious prose texts, those who utter such deceitful speech are no match for the word of God: Pharaoh and his army are defeated by both the grene tacn and the ald mece, and drown in the Red Sea.

There is a second link between the Egyptians' speech and the discourse of flyters. When the poet recounts the death of Pharaoh and his troops, he associates them with utterers of false boast. The defeat of these covenant-breakers, he tells us, is an occasion when boast is not only undermined, it pours from its utterers like blood from fatal wounds:

This analysis of Exo shows, then, that even though the poem contains no adversarial dialogue, its portrait of the
Jews, the Egyptians, and the crossing of the Red Sea emphasizes the importance of words, and characterizes the discourse of the participants in the crossing in terms equally applicable to secular flyters. In OE Dan, the influence of flying is more easily seen.

Although verbal warfare is a trope which is not much discussed in relation to OE Dan, portions of the O.T. Daniel have long been associated with the war of words. The early Church incorporated Dan. 3.1-24 -- a passage which relates how three young Israelites resist Nebuchadnezzar with the weapons of prayer and confession -- into the liturgy of Holy Saturday, as an example to catechumens of the kind of battle they might be required to fight as professed Christians:

From the history of the three young men that were cast into the fiery furnace the catechumens are ... instructed in the heroism of the martyr, in the severities of the Christian warfare. 42

Not surprisingly, then, the author of OE Dan, like the Exo poet, associates words and war in the first few lines of his poem. He amplifies his biblical source 43 by ascribing the Hebrews' military victory over the Egyptians, together with their material well-being (v. 2b), to the fulfillment of their covenant with God (vv. 10-11) 44:

(v. 1) Gefraegn ic Hebreos eadge lifgean in Hierusalem, goldhord daelan, cyningdom habban, swa him gecynde wes, sippan purh metodes mægen on Moyses hand wearp wig gifen (v. 5a)

... (v. 10) penden pæt folc mid him hiera fæder weare healdan woldon, wes him hyrde god, heofonrices weard, halig drihten, wuldres waldend (v. 13a).

Failure to fulfill covenant promises brings military disaster upon their enemies:
Unfortunately, military disaster also awaits the Jews themselves when they are enticed by temporal pleasures ("hie langung beswac/ eorpæan dreams," vv. 29b-30a) and turn away from God toward apostasy ("pa geseah ic pa gedriht in gedwolan hweorfan," v. 22). Their failure to adhere to covenant promises is expressed in an abandonment of God's laws ("hie æcræftas ... forleton," v. 19, and "hie ... forleton/ drihtnes domas," vv. 31b-2a), and earns for them military defeat and the destruction of Jerusalem:

(v. 57a) pa ic epan gefrægn ealdfeonda cyn winburh wera. pa wigan ne gelyfdon, bereafodon pa receda wuldor readon golde, since and seolfræ, Salomones templ. Gestrudan gestreona under stanhlipum, swilc eall swa pa eorlas agan sceoldon, oppæat hie burga gehwone abrocen hæfdon, para pe paam folce to fripe stodon (v. 64).

In addition to associating fulfilled illocution with military victory and unfulfilled illocution with defeat, the Dan poet, like the Exo poet, also specifically connects the unfulfilled illocution which produces such disastrous consequences with the Germanic illocution of boast. For example, when briefly recapitulating Israel's defeat at the hands of the Babylonians later in the poem, the Dan poet specifically attributes Israel's fall to the deception of drunken boast ("hie gylp beswac/ windruncen gewit," vv. 751-2a). Likewise Nebuchadnezzar makes God his enemy by uttering a great boast ("purh gylp micel," v. 598b) and for this utterance is attacked by God:

(v. 612) pa for paam gylpe gumena drihten forfangen wearp and on fleam gewat, ana on offerhyd offer ealle men
Balthazzar's sin is also fierce boast ("gylp grome," v. 694a, "gealp gramlice," v. 715a), and it, too, produces a military defeat which this time includes the destruction of Babylon (vv. 680-3).

This readiness to connect sin, covenant-breaking, foolish boast and military disaster may reflect the poet's familiarity with the structure of battle flyting, in which boastful illocutions are counterposed and the perlocutionary superiority of one utterance over another is often determined on the field of battle.45

There are other signs of flyting's possible influence on OE Dan. Like both the miles christi and the flyter, the heroes of this poem fight with words. In the first of the poem's three verbal battles Hananias, Azarias and Michael refuse to worship Nebuchadnezzar's golden idol (OE Dan vv. 170-485; O.T. Dan. 3.1-24) and are thrown in a fiery furnace for their stubbornness. The Dan poet, in his version of the episode, is careful to depict the three young men as verbal warriors. Thus, although their chief virtues are a steadfast adherence to God's word ("Pa wæron æpelum god Abrahames bearn, / wæron wærfaste," vv. 193-4a), their wisdom (they are "gleawost ... boca bebodes," vv. 81b-2) and their knowledge of Scripture (they are "gode in godsæde," v. 90), the poet nonetheless calls Hananias, Azarias and Michael fierce ("hearde and higepancle," v. 94a) and bold ("modhwætan," v. 356b and "dædhwætan," v. 352b). Where the secular hero fights bravely, they speak bravely ("hie ... balde gecwædon," v. 200), resisting Nebuchadnezzar and the flames of the fiery furnace with a succession of speech acts rather than with sword play:
(v. 421b)  Hie god herigap anne ecne, and ealles him be naman gehwam on neod spreca. panciap pryrmes pristum wordum, cwestap he sie ana ælmhhtig god, witig wuldorcyning, worlde and heofona (v. 426).

These "hælep geonge" (v. 433a), then, fight Nebuchadnezzar and survive their fiery ordeal by using conventional Christian discourse of praise and confession as their weapon. The Dan poet makes the connection between speech and armament even more clear when he has Nebuchadnezzar himself praise the prowess of the young men's words and the God who empowers their discourse:

(v. 473b)  'We gesawon
pæt he wip cwealme gebearh cnihtum on ofne, lacende lig, pam pe his lof bærôn;
forpam he is ana ece drihten,
dema ælmhhtig, se pe him dom forgeaf, spowende sped, pam pe his spel berap' (v. 478).

Here, as in Exo, the juxtaposition of nouns of speech with verbs of martial connotation emphasizes the military nature of the discourse. The phrases "lof bærôn" and "spel berap" (like the Exo poet's "hof ... hlude stefne" and the "Maldon" poet's "beot ahofon") echo the martial collocations "sweord beran" and "scyldas bærân" found in heroic verse, and suggest that utterance can be a weapon of deliverance.

A closer look at the verbal weapons of lof and spel as wielded by the three young men shows that these Christian weapons rely on many of the conventions of flyting to achieve their aggressive edge. For example, when Nebuchadnezzar raises an idol on the plains of Dura, and commands all his subjects, including the captive Jews, to worship the golden statue (vv. 170-7), Hananias, Azarias and Mishael, like good Christians and like good flyters, continue to fulfill their promises to God with their deeds: they remain "wærfaeste," (v. 194a), and refuse to worship the idol. The poet then
enlarges on the biblical text, reorganizing the young men's words in order to suggest the agonistic reciprocity of command and rebuttal typical of flyting speech⁴⁹:

(v. 196) Cnihtas cynegode cup gedydon,
þæt hie him þæt gold to gode noldon
habban ne healdan, ac þone hean cyning,
gasta hyrde, þe him gife sealde.
(200) Oft hie to bote balde gecwædun
þæt hie þæs wiges wihte ne rohton,
ne hie to þam gebede mihte gecwædan
hæpene heriges wisa, þæt hie þider hweofan wolden,
guman to þam gyldnænan gylde, þe he him to gode geteode
(v. 204).⁵⁰

Here, the repetition of negatives ("noldon," v. 197b; "ne healdan," v. 198a; "ne rohton," v. 201b; and "ne hie ...gædan ... þæt hie wolden," v. 203b) act like sword-strokes delivered in response to the herald's initial command. Although a lacuna in the ms. makes it impossible to know what Nebuchadnezzar's herald has actually said, it seems likely that his announcement would contain the imperatives which this passage negates. Such counterposed statements are typical of flyting.⁵¹ A slightly different form of agonistic reciprocity occurs in the contrastive juxtaposition in v. 202 of gebed (prayer) and gædan (to force)⁵² when the youths assert that no one will be able to compel them to pray to the idol.⁵³

The passage also uses the rhetorical device of verbal echo, frequent in flyting, to express conflicting frames of reference.⁵⁴ The juxtaposition of the near-homonyms gold and god (v. 197) succinctly emphasizes the contrast between the Babylonian view of God as material wealth or gold, and the Israelites' view of God as the ultimate spiritual good. This contrast is further developed when gyld (idol) and gylden (golden) are juxtaposed with god to emphasize again that the Three will not worship gold as God ("ne hie ... wolden ... gyldnan gylde, þe he him to gode geteode," vv. 202-5).
Nebuchadnezzar's answer to the defiant young men also combines features found in secular flyting and in Christian adversarial dialogue. Called "wulfheort" by the poet, Nebuchadnezzar acquires an air of bestiality and monstrosity evocative of a senna flyter, while simultaneously displaying the characteristically irascible temperament of the martyr's persecutor:

(v. 209) ða him bolgenmod Babilone weard yrre andswarode, eorlum onmælde grimme ðam gingum, and geocre oncwæp, ðæt hie gegnunga gyldan sceolde opp ðrowigeæn þreamiæd micel, frecne fyres wyfæ, nympe hie fripest wolde wilnian to ðam wyrrestan, weras Ebrea, guman to ðam golde, þe he him to gode teode (v. 216).

Like the pagan judge of the passiones, Nebuchadnezzar is enraged ("bolgenmod," v. 209a and "yrre," v. 210a) by the resistance of the young men and replies fiercely and violently ("grimme ... and geocre oncwæp," v. 211), issuing a directive ("ðæt hie gyldan sceolde," v. 212) accompanied by a threat (vv. 213-6). This aggressive and minatory tone is typical of flyting, as is Nebuchadnezzar's near duplication of v. 204 ("guman to ðam gyldnan gylde, þe he him to gode geteode") in v. 216 ("guman to ðam golde, þe he him to gode teode").

The youths, like loyal soldiers, reply that they will not desert their lord, but will continue to adhere to his law. Again borrowing from the rhetorical arsenal of flyting, they use a succession of negatives and a varied echo of Nebuchadnezzar's threat in vv. 214-5b to emphasize that they will not seek the help of an evil thing ("facne") to escape Nebuchadnezzar's fierce fire ("frecne fyres wyfæ"):

(v. 217) Noldon þeah þa hyssas hyran larum in hige hæþnum. Hogedon georne þæt æ godes ealle gelæste, and ne awacodon wereda drihtne,
Faced with their intransigence, Nebuchadnezzar attempts to compel the young men's acquiescence with deeds, but the Three fight off his attack with the Christian weapon of prayer, employing discourse which would have been familiar to an AS audience not only because it resembles a portion of the Vulgate Daniel, but also because it echoes a canticle found in the Christian liturgy. In vv. 283-332, Azarias begins the petition of the three young men by first celebrating God's power (vv. 283-90), then acknowledging Israel's sin. He concludes his prayer by reminding God that he and his companions have fulfilled their words with deeds, remaining warest in the face of Nebuchadnezzar's verbal and physical attacks. Azarias therefore urges God to fulfill his part of the bargain, and to save them:

(v. 315) pu him sæt gehete þurh hleoporçwyde
þæt þu hyra frumcyn in fyrndagum
ican wolde (v.317a)
....
(325) Fyl nu frumspraéce, þeha heora fea lifigen!
wilíga þinne wordcwýde and þi wuldor on us!(v. 326).

As a result of their adherence to the covenant, and as a result of Azarias' prayer, God fulfills his promise, and sends an angel to protect Azarias, Hananias and Mishael (vv. 335b-44). The youths celebrate their deliverance in another quasi-liturgical utterance (vv. 362-408), and Nebuchadnezzar admits his defeat in this verbal battle by praising God for His salvatory deeds on behalf of those who carry his praises and his message:

'he is ana ece drihten,
dema ælmihtig, se þe him dom forgeaf,
spowende sped þam þe his spel beræ' (vv. 476-8).
Considered as a whole, then, the Dan poet's treatment of the confrontation between the king and the three young Jews represents an imaginative combination of Christian prayer, liturgical utterance, and the agonistic rhetoric of Germanic flyting.

Two other verbal skirmishes occur in OE Dan. Shortly after confessing God's supremacy in vv. 476-8, Nebuchadnezzar is motivated by pride to recant his confession and exalts himself above his creator:

\[v. 488b\] No þy sel dyde,  
ac þam apelinge oferhygd gesceod,  
wearþ him hyrra hyge and on heortan geþanc  
mara on modsefan þonne gemet ware,  
oppææt hine mid nyde nypor asette  
metod ælmihtig (v. 493a).

Although Daniel warns Nebuchadnezzar that this pride will make him God's enemy ("Nis þe wiþerbreca/ man on moldan, nyme metod ana," vv. 565b-6), Nebuchadnezzar persists in his arrogant renunciation of his earlier confessional testimony. Instead of heeding the prophet's warning, the king utters a foolish speech which the Dan poet Germanicizes as a "gylp micel," (v. 598b),\(^6^1\) retrojectively taking credit for God's deeds and projectively claiming that he will rule in Babylon for the rest of his life:

\[v. 608\] 'þu eart seo micle and min seo mare burh  
þe ic geworhte to wurþmyndum,  
rume rice. Ic reste on þe,  
eard and eþel, agan wille' (v.611).

As Daniel predicts, this boast turns God into Nebuchadnezzar's enemy. God attacks the king, demonstrating the emptiness of the king's projective boast by depriving him of his kingdom:

\[v. 612\] pa for þam gylpe gumena drihten  
forfangen wearþ and on fleam gewat,
ana on oferhyd ofer ealle men.
Swa wod wera on gewindagum
geocrostne sip in godes wite,
Para pe eft lifigende leode begete,
Nabochodonossor, sippan him nip godes,
hrep of heofonum, hete gesceode (v. 619).

The association here of pride, ill-advised boast and disaster again evokes the paradigm of secular flyting, and suggests that this genre of Germanic dialogue influences this AS poet's portrayal of the war between good and evil.

A final verbal engagement is initiated by Nebuchadnezzar's grandson, Balthazzar, who also offends God with his arrogance. Significantly in his account of this incident, the Dan poet changes the initial cause of the conflict from the profanation of sacred temple vessels to boastful utterance. He begins his account of Balthazzar's fall with a description of the military consequences of his pride:

(v. 676) Wæs Baldazar burga aldor,
weold wera rices, oppæt him wlenco gesceod,
oferhyd egle. Pa wæs endedæg
pæs pe Caldeas cyningdom ahton.
(680) Pa metod onlah Medum and Persum
aldordomes ymb lytel fæc,
let Babilone blaed swiprian,
ponge pa hælep healdan sceoldon (v. 683).

The Dan poet then says that this angry response was provoked by Balthazzar's boast (" ... Baldazar/ Purh gylp grome godes frasade," vv. 693b-4). He elaborates on this offensive behavior by briefly alluding to the profanation of the holy vessels (vv. 703-8), and then by relating the boast itself:

(v. 712) Pa wearp blipemod burga aldor,
gealp gramlice gode an andan,
cwæp þæt his hergas hyrran wæron
and mihtigran mannum to fripe
ponge Israela ece drihten (v. 716).
It is this projective boast, and not the desecration of temple vessels which provokes the enigmatic written reply which appears on the wall of Balthazzar's palace. In addition, the OE poet reorganizes Daniel's remarks to Balthazzar so that they resemble a flyter's response to an opponent's boast. For instance, in O.T. Dan., the prophet initially addresses Balthazzar politely (Dan. 5.18), but in OE Dan the prophet speaks with the insolence of a flyter, directly addressing the king as pu, castigating him for arrogance, and then insulting both the king and his court by calling them devils ("ge deoflu," v. 749a). He reminds them that their dissolute behavior is like the boasting which caused the fall of Jerusalem, and he threatens them with a similar fate:

(v. 747) 'pu for anmedian in æht bere
huslfatu halegu, on hand werum.
On um ge deoflu drincan ongunnor,
Pa ær Israela in æ hæfdon
æt godes earce, oppæt hie gy lp beswac,
windrunce gewit, swa pe wurpean sceal' (v. 752).

Threat and insult are not the only features of Daniel's speech which suggest flyting's influence. In OE Dan, after this combination of direct address, insult and threat, the prophet begins a recapitulation of the deeds of Balthazzar's grandfather, but instead of recounting Nebuchadnezzar's sins as does the biblical writer, he lists the reformed Nebuchadnezzar's good deeds. These good deeds are then contrasted with Balthazzar's dissolute behavior so that it seems almost as if Nebuchadnezzar himself were verbally attacking Balthazzar. A close look at this portion of Daniel's speech shows that the agonistic tone is the product of the familiar rhetorical devices of flyting:

(v. 753) 'No paet pin aldor æfre wolde
godes goldfatu in gy lp beran,
ne py hrapor hremde, peah pe here brohte
Here, two negatives (v. 753 and v. 755) comprise part of a verbal echo which contrasts Balthazzar's misuse of the holy vessels ("... in æht bere," v. 747b) with Nebuchadnezzar's more restrained behavior ("no ... in gylp beran," vv. 753-4b and "ne ... in his æhte geweald," vv. 755-6b). The agonistic tone inherent in these negatives is reinforced by the purposeful contrast of second and third person pronouns throughout the passage, as well as by the use of the comparatives "hraþor" and "oftor." All of these rhetorical ploys are typical of flyting speech, and together they transform Daniel's encounter with Balthazzar into a kind of battle flying which precedes the military defeat of the Babylonians.

To recapitulate, then, even though there is no explicit verbal battle in OE Exo, the righteous Jews and their Egyptian enemies are distinguished, like flyters, by the perlocutionary effectiveness of their discourse. To an even greater extent in OE Dan, the righteous are depicted as opposing and defeating their boastful enemies by fulfilling their performative utterances (specifically, their covenant promises to God) and by wielding Christian weapons such as prayer and confession. In addition, portions of Dan use rhetorical devices found in flying to heighten the agonistic tone of the discourse. These flying characteristics are not evident in the poems' scriptural sources and this suggests that the Exo and Dan poets' descriptions of spiritual conflict are shaped at least in part by the poets' knowledge of their own native genre of verbal battle, Germanic flying.
NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

2 Although the exact composition dates of OE verse are notoriously difficult to ascertain, there is general agreement that, for the most part, extant OE religious poems were composed before the late tenth century. Greenfield and Calder propose a late ninth-century date for Andreas (New Critical History, p. 159), and place the Cynewulfian saints' lives in the first half of the ninth century (p. 164). Proposed composition dates for the Junius Ms. poems range from early eighth century for Genesis A and Exodus (p. 207 and p. 225) to mid-ninth century for Genesis B (p. 207).
3 The phrase "Germanic influence" is a simplification of an increasingly complex perception of the forces impinging on OE religious verse. Although "Germanic influence" has long been acknowledged (see, for instance, F.A. Blackburn, "The Christian Coloring in the Beowulf," PMLA 12 [1897], 205-25; B.J. Timmer, "Heathen and Christian Elements in Anglo-Saxon Poetry," Neophilologus 29 [1944], 180-5; or more recently, T.A. Shippey, Old English Verse [London: Hutchinson University Library, 1972]; Alvin Lee, The Guest Hall of Eden [New Haven: Yale UP, 1972] and Michael Cherniss, Ingeld and Christ [The Hague: Mouton, 1972]), today's scholars are reluctant to apply the adjective "Germanic" to all instances of heroic diction, for the martiality of OE religious verse is not only Germanic in origin, but is also, as I have shown, inherent in the imported Latin Christian tradition (see, too, Eric Jager, "A Miles Diaboli in the OE Genesis B." ELN 27 [1990], 1-5). In addition, Frank objects to the adjective "Germanic" because it is imprecise and obscures the Scandinavian provenience of some elements of OE verse ("Skaldic Verse and the Date of Beowulf," in The Dating of Beowulf, ed. Colin Chase [Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1981] 123-39). My own use of the adjective "Germanic" is intended primarily to distinguish native secular elements of AS literary tradition, including flyting, from the imported theological and doctrinal content of OE religious verse.
4 Colgrave and Mynors, Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People, p. 414. According to Bede, Caedmon sang "de creatione mundi, et origine humani generis, et tota Genesis historia, de egressu Israel ex Aegypto ... de incarnatione dominica, passione, resurrectione et ascensione in caelum, de Spiritus Sancti adventu ... item de terrore futuri iudicii et horrore poenae gehennalis ac dulcedine regni caelestis" (Colgrave and Mynors, p. 418). These topics, Crawford asserts, "were derived from the moral history of man from the creation of the universe to the Day of Judgement which formed the subject of the creed" ("Caedmon Poems," p. 284). The OE version of Bede's Hymn can be found in Miller, EH, p. 344. For a brief recapitulation of the effects of this "Caedmonian revolution" see J.M. Evans, "Genesis B and Its Background," RES n.s. 14 (1963), pp. 116-7.
5 Junius 11 consists of Genesis A, Genesis B, Exodus, Daniel, and Christ and Satan (hereafter GA, GB, Exo, Dan, and XSt). Exo, as I have already noted, was probably composed in the early eighth century, and Krapp argues that Dan may predate Beowulf (ASPR I, p. xxvi).
6 The celestial court will be examined in more detail in the next chapter.
implied a "vassal treaty" in which "the more powerful partner promised to protect the weaker one ....An oath created solidarity between the partners: God would be faithful to his promises: the people undertook to observe the stipulations" (see, for example, Gen. 15.18, 17.2-4, and Ex. 19.5-8). In the N.T., Paul emphasizes that the covenant is a promise: "Abrahae dictae sunt promissiones et semini eius" (Gal. 3.16). In the comitatus society of AS England an oath was equally important for it bound thanes to their lord. Those who violated their oath were despised and punished with exile (see, for example, Wiglaf's castigation of Beowulf's treowlogan in Beowulf, vv. 2864-72, as well as L. Laing, and J. Laing, Anglo-Saxon England [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979], p. 116 and Klaeber, Beowulf, p. xxix). AS poets' designation of the scriptural covenant with nouns such as waer and treowa not only places this religious pact in the context of a Germanic political system familiar to an AS audience, but also suggests a recognition of the importance of the perlocutionary fulfillment of utterance also found in flyting.

9 As I show in chapter one, pp. 17-21, serious or battle flyting is won by the flyter whose speech has the greater performative power, and who can therefore fulfill his words with deeds.
11 This view is not shared by all critics, as a brief rehearsal of the controversy provoked by Exo will show. Irving is an early and vehement proponent of the view that Exo is mimetic. His vehemence caused him to assert that "no sane reader would be likely to call Exodus a poem about baptism" (The Old English Exodus, Yale Studies in English 122 (1953), p. 15). While Shippey does not deny the presence of allegory (OE Verse, p. 140) he, too, reads the poem primarily as historical narrative. Howe agrees and concludes that "through its energy of language and imagery, Exodus distances, perhaps even disables, allegory and forces the reader to confront it as a narrative of history" (Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England [New Haven: Yale U P, 1989], pp. 106-7). Most recently, in her Old English Poetry in Medieval Christian Perspective (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1991), pp. 11-12, Garde argues that the salvation history found in religious instructional material was far more relevant to AS audiences than either typology or patristic allegory. She asserts that Junius in general is "an OE epic of redemption" devoted to the incidents of sacred history recounted in Augustine's De Catechizandis Rudibus. However, such instructional material was particularly important in the Lenten season of catechumen education, and thus Garde's point tends also to strengthen allegorical interpretations of Exo which allege a connection with Lent and Holy Week through the rite of baptism.

Cross and Tucker do not agree that Exo is a literal narrative. Although Cross and Tucker acknowledge the historical dimension of Exo, they emphasize the importance to the poet of "allegorical equations" ("Allegorical Tradition and the OE Exodus," Neophilologus 44 [1960], p. 123). They show that a variety of allegorical meanings are present in
Exo (pp. 123-4), but they find that the martial tone of the Red Sea crossing implies a specific connection to baptism. This connection was also noticed by Bright in the early twentieth century in "The Relation of the Caedmonian Exodus to the Liturgy," MLN 27 (1912), pp. 97-103. He observes that several incidents in Exo, such as the account of the deluge (Gen. 6,7,8), the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22), and the emphasis on the covenant (Gen. 9.8-17 and Gen. 22.15-18) form part of the liturgy for Holy Saturday, the day on which the catechumens were baptised (pp. 98-100). More generally, Hermann asserts that in Exo vv. 516-25 the poet himself invites an allegorical reading of the poem (Allegories, p. 58), and Lucas concurs (Exodus [London: Methuen, 1977], p. 142). My judgment that Exo is for the most part allegorical is based in addition on an assumption articulated by Rollinson, that literal nonsense or a "riddling inadequacy" is often an indication of a change from mimetic narrative to allegory ("The Influence of Christian Doctrine and Exegesis in Old English Poetry: An Estimate of the Current State of Scholarship," ASE 2 [1973] p. 283). Earl applies this thesis to Exo: "the puzzling details which have defied understanding on the literal level beg for an allegorical ... interpretation" ("Christian Traditions," p. 543).

14 All citations here are from Lucas' edition of Exodus. Because there is disagreement on the merits of the various editions of the poem, however, I shall indicate in a note when Lucas' text varies substantially from Krapp's text or from the ms.
15 Hermann also notes the apparent infelicity: "... the tribe of Judah marches into the Red Sea to do battle with a nonexistent foe" (Allegories, p. 69).
16 According to Lucas (p. 131) the lost material probably dealt with the subject matter of Ex. 14.23-6: "persequentesque Aegyptii ingessi sunt post eos omnis equitatus Pharaonis currus elus et equites per medium maris (24) iamque advenerat vigilia matutina et ecce respiciens Dominus super castra Aegyptiorum per columnam ignis et nubis interfecit exercitum eorum et subvertit rotas curruum ferebanturque in profundum dixerunt ergo Aegyptii fugiamus Israelem Dominus enim pugnabit pro eis contra nos (26) et ait Dominus ad Mosen extende manum tuam ut revertantur aquae ad Aegyptios super currus et equites eorum." Scriptura is less militaristic: "reversae sunt aquae et operuerunt currus et equites cuncti exercitus Pharaonis qui sequentes ingessi fuerant mare ne unus quidem superfuit ex eis ... et viderunt Aegyptios mortuos super litus maris" (Exo. 14. 28-31). The Exo poet's militaristic interpretation of these verses is not reflected in later OE prose accounts of the crossing. In his "Dominica in Media Quadragesimae," for instance, Ælfric follows Scripture more closely than does the Exo poet: "Moyses Pa astrehhte his hand ongean þære saæ, and heo oferarn Pharao, and ealle his crætu and riddan mid þum oferwreah, swa
pet par nas furpon an to lafe ealles pes heres pe him filigde" (Thorpe 2, p. 194).
18 up teah, 491] up ateah, ms., Krapp; witrod, 492], Krapp, wit rod, ms.; flodweard, 494] flod wearde sloh, ms.; flodwearde, Krapp.
19 Daniérou emphasizes that contention with the devil is central to baptism: "the baptismal rites constitute a drama in which the candidate, who up to this time has belonged to the demon, strives to escape his power" (Bible and Liturgy, p. 21). For a more detailed discussion of baptism, exorcism and confession, see chapter two, pp. 74-6.
20 Ælfric, of course, writes long after the Exo poet, and I do not intend here to imply here that a later work influences an earlier one. However, Ælfric's homilies express the received doctrine of the medieval Church, and therefore it is likely that his remarks on the crossing reflect an exegesis familiar to the Exo poet and to his audience as well.
21 Compare, for instance, the first two lines of Exo to Beowulf vv. 1-2: "Hwaet, we Gardena in geardagum/ þeodcyninga þrym gefrunon."
22 God helps Scyld and the Danes, too: "þam eafera waes æfter cenned/ ... Pone God sende/ folce to frofre" (vv. 12-14a).
24 See Lucas, p. 75 for the relative uniqueness of this "complex type of parallelism." In Beowulf vv. 1-7, Prym and ellen are emphasized and variations amplify either martial terminology ("sceapena þreatum," "monegum maegpum") or aggressive deeds ("meodosetla ofteah," *egsode eorlas*).
25 Not only does Moses acquire his "domas" from God (O.T. Exo. 20), God also endows Moses with miraculous powers which help him to make his case to Pharaoh in O.T. Exo. 4, and this is probably alluded to in Exo vv. 8-11.
26 Hermann also notes that the Exo poet emphasizes the importance of words in the poem's exordium (Allegories, p. 62).
27 Although this connection cannot be pushed too far (for example, Modern English connects the verb "raise" with the noun "voice" without intending any martial meaning), the Exo poet often associates the verbs hebban and ahebban with war-like subjects and objects (thus, "modes rofan/ hebban herebyrnan," vv. 98a-9a, and the "herecyste" raise "hwitelinde," v. 301). Such usage may predispose an audience to recognize that in the context of the poem, the act of raising a voice is a martial act. A similar conjunction of word and martial deed occurs in "Maldon" vv. 42-3 and v. 213 (see my chapter one, pp. 29-30 as well as McNamara, "The Rhetoric of Speech Acts in 'The Battle of Maldon,'" an abstract of a paper given at the Fourth Symposium on the Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture, CRN 19 (1986), A-43 to A-44). Hamilton ("The Diet and Digestion of Allegory in Andreas," ASE 1 (1970), p. 148) also notes a similar technique in Andreas where phrases like "feorh beran" acquire a martial significance from their resemblance to collocations like "sweord beran" (Beowulf, v. 2518b), "scyldas baeran" (Beowulf v. 2850b) and "garholt bere" (Beowulf v. 1834b).
beodahata, 253] beodahata, ms., Krapp; peoden, 277] peod, ms.; leod, Krapp. There is another possible reading of the passage which suggests an even closer connection between shield and speech. If Shippey is correct in assuming that in these rather ambiguous lines it is Moses who is the hildecalla and beodahata who calls for quiet (OE Verse, p. 138), the verb "heht" may be understood as an explanatory amplification of the phrase "bord up ahof."

This emendation is admittedly contentious. Nolan and Bloomfield argue that "beohata" is a mistranscription for "beothata" ("Beotword, Gilpcwidas," p. 500). Lucas glosses "beothata" as "promiser of vows," but says that such an epithet is inapposite because in his translation of vv. 252-5, the "hildecalla" who is also called a "beothata" is not Moses but another unnamed individual (p. 111). However, as I have already observed, vv. 252-4 are ambiguous, and a reading which regards "hildecalla," "beothata/beodohata" and "rices hyrde" as references to Moses seems equally legitimate.

Nolan and Bloomfield explain that in this "Christianized boast ... the traditional heroic address has been suitably transformed to emphasize divine power" (pp. 499-500).

nu, 280] hu, ms., Krapp.

Alllegories, pp. 61-62. Hermann also observes that the translation of tacn as "rod" rather than "sign" may depend on the assumption that "tacne" was mistakenly transcribed instead of "tane." If Hermann's argument is correct, the passage clearly reflects the combative nature of God's word. For a different view, see Thomas Hill, "The virga of Moses and the Old English Exodus," Old English Literature in Context, ed. J.D. Niles (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1980), pp. 57-65.

"Flodweard" (v. 494b) may refer to God or to Moses. Whichever denotation is intended, there is no doubt, however, that vv. 479-480 imply that Moses' hand plays a significant role in precipitating the waters' return.

The significance of promises or covenants in Exo (as well as in the Lenten season and in the baptismal liturgy) has been noted by many critics. See for example, Farrell, "A Reading," p. 403, Shippey, OE Verse pp. 141-2, and Earl, "Christian Traditions," p. 563.

Farrell makes a similar point: "the/ faithfulness of Abraham was the cause of the magnificent promise of God to Abraham, which had as some of its results ... the crossing of the Red Sea and the destruction of the Egyptians" ("A Reading," pp. 411-12). The faithfulness of Moses' people also ensures future victories (vv. 558-64).

See Gen. 41.39-41: "dixit ergo ad Ioseph ... tu eris super domum mean ... dicens quoque rursum Pharao ad Ioseph ecce constitui te super universam terram Aegypti," and Exo. 14.5: "Et nuntiatum est regi Aegyptiorum quo fugisset populus inmutatumque est cor Pharaohis et servorum eius super populo et dixerunt quid voluimus facere ut dimitteremus Israhel ne serviret nobis." Farrell finds that "in the OE Exodus poem, the Egyptians are evil precisely because they act in bad faith (manum treowum) and break their pledge" ("A Reading," p. 408). See also Lucas, pp. 62-3: "the Egyptians break their covenant with the Israelites ... and for this unethical action the Egyptians are severely pun-/ished by God, who thus simultaneously fulfils His covenant with the Israelites."
Most editors sense a gap in the ms. between v. 141 and v. 142 (see Lucas). *ær geselade, 141* *ær ge, ms., Krapp; ymb antwig* *Pa, 146b* an twi *Pa, ms.; antwig / Pa, 146b-147a, Krapp.

Lucas translates "ageat" as "destroyed," but adds that *ageotan* more usually means, "to pour out." Thus, Lucas adds, "men's vows are poured out of the wounded and dying like drops of blood" (p. 141). This image, together with the earlier figure of a covenant devoured strengthens the connection between utterance and violence which is central to Germanic flyting.

Lucas translates "ageat" as "destroyed," but adds that *ageotan* more usually means, "to pour out." Thus, Lucas adds, "men's vows are poured out of the wounded and dying like drops of blood" (p. 141). This image, together with the earlier figure of a covenant devoured strengthens the connection between utterance and violence which is central to Germanic flyting.

See, too, Hermann, *Allegories*, p. 64.

Dan retells the story of the fall of Jerusalem and the captivity in Babylon recounted in O.T. Dan. 1-5. All citations of OE Dan will be from Krapp's ed., *ASPR* I, pp. 111-32. In the past, OE Dan has had a poor critical reception based in large part on paleographic claims that the text was incomplete and contained a large section of interpolated matter ineptly joined to the narrative. (See Farrell, "The Structure of Old English Daniel," *NM* 69 [1968], p. 534 and Shepherd, "Scriptural Poetry," p. 31 for a summary of the unfavourable reactions). In *Daniel and Azarias* (London: Methuen, 1974), Farrell provides a good general discussion of the poem's alleged incompleteness (especially pp. 5-6 and pp. 32-3) and the issue of interpolation (pp. 22-32). He finds insufficient paleographic evidence to prove that Dan is unfinished (p. 212) and argues that the controversial prayer of Azarias and related narrative material (vv. 279-361) were probably in the poet's Latin source (pp. 25-6). See, too, "The Unity of Old English Daniel," *RES* 18 [1967], pp. 123-4).

Bright, "Relation of the Caedmonian Exo," p. 101. Bright also argues that O.T. Dan. 3.1-24 was the last of the twelve prophecies recited on Holy Saturday (p. 101). Farrell is more cautious and observes that the exact liturgy used on Holy Saturday in the early church is difficult to ascertain, but he agrees that "a large section from the third chapter of the Vulgate Daniel would have held a very important place in the service" ("Unity," pp. 132-3).

OE Dan vv. 1-78 treats the material summarized in Dan. 1.1-2: "Anno tertio regni Joachim regis Iuda venit Nabuchodonosor rex Babylonis Hierusalem et obedit eam (2) et tradidit Dominus in manus eius Joachim regem Iudaet et partem vasorum domus Dei et asportavit ea in terram Sennaar domum dei sui."

Bjork also notes the importance of covenant-keeping, ("Oppressed Hebrews and the Song of Azarias in the Old English Daniel," *SP* 77 [1980], pp. 220-1).

In battle flyting, military victory confirms the projective boast of the successful flyter.

Although OE Dan rarely includes direct discourse, the poet's account of the various speeches found within Dan is sufficiently detailed to make these indirect accounts seem like verbatim quotations. Accordingly, I treat these indirect speeches as appropriate subjects for analysis and comparison with flyting, even though they are not, strictly speaking, dialogue.

I here assume that AS poets compose poems about O.T. events because of their Christian implications. I therefore call the three young men, adopted by the early Church as models of Christian heroism, Christian heroes rather than Jewish heroes, and I assume that they fight with the Pauline weapons available to the *miles christi*.
The OE auxiliaries "noldon" (v. 197b), "wolden" (v. 203b) and "willan" (v. 207) identify the young men's refusal as commissive utterance (for the role of OE auxiliaries in such utterances, see Traugott, *A History of English Syntax*, pp. 69-70 as well as my discussion in chapter one, p. 54). Such illocutions demand perlocutionary fulfillment. The capacity of the three young men to fulfill their words with deeds (in this case, with the stoic act of failing to recant) determines their victory, just as the flyter's ability to perform projected feats of valour determines his success in the flying contest.

OE Dan vv. 205-8 corresponds to the Chaldeans' report on the Three in Dan.3.12: "sunt ergo viri iudaei quos constituisti super opera regionis Babyloniae Sedrac Misac et Abdenago viri isti contemserunt rex decretum tuum deos tuos non colunt et statuum auream quam erexisti non adorant," but Dan vv. 196-204 has no equivalent in the Vulgate.

Farrell notes that BT glosses "to bote" (v. 200) as "to beote" or "in boast." He disagrees with this emendation because "in Dan, boasting is not a heroic virtue, but a pagan and prideful fault" (Dan and Azarias, p. 58). Although the ms. phrase "to bote" ("in addition") does not seem infelicitous, and therefore BT's emendation seem unnecessary, the basis for Farrell's dismissal of "to beote" is unjustified, for as I have shown in Exo, boast is not necessarily a pejorative term, and the evidence for pejoration in Dan is insufficient to support Farrell's contention.

Krapp (p. 221) argues that the lacuna between Dan v. 177 and v. 178 probably represents a substantial loss of text, including the herald's command (Dan. 3.4-6) which would otherwise have been the initiating speech of the exchange. For the role of "counterposed" speeches such as negatives in secular flyting, see chapter one, p. 12. It is likely that were the herald's speech extant, the combative reciprocity of this reply would be explicit rather than conjectural. There is certainly abundant evidence of the device in Ælfric's treatment of this episode in *Nativitas Domini,* Thorpe 2, pp. 218-20.

Farrell notes that "gebædon" is an infinitive in -on (Dan and Az. p. 58).

The adverb "wihte" (v. 201), with its suggestion that Hananias, Azarias and Misheal find both Nebuchadnezzar's wishes and his golden idol equally trivial, adds to the reply an insulting tone typical of flying speech.

The terminology is Anderson's. See chapter one, p. 10.

The epithet occurs three times (vv. 116, 135 and 246). Although in his edition of *Dan and Azarias,* Farrell glosses the adjective as "fierce, brave," BT and Bradley (Anglo-Saxon Poerty [London: Dent, 1982], pp. 70-1 and p. 73) give it a more pejorative meaning, translating wulfheort as "cruel" and "wolf-hearted" respectively. The pejorative sense seems the more likely as Nebuchadnezzar was commonly understood to be an O.T. type of Satan. For a description of the monstrous senna flyter, see chapter one, pp. 45-6.

Nebuchadnezzar's reply in the Vulgate (Dan. 3.13-15) is equally intemperate and threatening, but lacks the repetition noted above perhaps because the Vulgate places the speech of the Three after Nebuchadnezzar's threat rather than before (Dan. 3.16-18).

Shippey (OE Verse, p. 138) suggests that the collocation "gehat gelæston" (GA v. 2388b) refers to a military oath. The phrase "æ... gelæste" (Dan v. 219) seems likely to have a similar implication, and
thus strengthens the connection between words and battle already implicit in the poem by suggesting that fulfillment of oath constitutes a military defense.

58 The interpretive difficulties which cluster about the poet's description of the fiery ordeal in OE Dan vv. 224-408 are daunting. The major crux is an apparent chronological disjunction between the prayer of Azarias (vv. 279-361) and the narrative as a whole (see Farrell, "Unity," pp. 121-3 for a lengthier discussion of these problems). As already noted above, Farrell has shown that the peculiar chronology is inherent in the OE poet's probable Vulgate source. For example, the Vulgate Dan. 3.19-24 contains an account of the oven's overheating, the Babylonians' injury, and the joyous praises of Hananias, Azarias and Mishael which is later recapitulated in Dan. 3. 46-51 ("Unity," p. 127). To this the poet adds some of his own repetitions (see, for instance, vv. 238 and vv. 261-4 in which the young men are saved twice, and vv. 250-1 and vv. 265-7 in which the Babylonians are injured twice) which may be intended to make the audience recognize that a single event is being re-described in a variation typical of AS poetry. Solo suggests that the judgment that the prayer is chronologically misplaced depends on the translation of Pa (v. 279a) as when rather than when ("The Twice-Told Tale: A Reconsideration of the Syntax and Style of the Old English Daniel, vv. 254-429," PLL 9 [1973], pp. 348-50). He argues that this is a misreading reinforced by editors' punctuation of the ms., and that the correct translation of vv. 277b-80 is "it was the God of glory who protected them against that enmity when Azariah prayed in his heart." Traugott's analysis of OE syntax (A History of English Syntax, pp. 107-8) supports his contention, for she shows that when Pa means then it is usually marked by subsequent VS word order, but when Pa means when it is followed by SOV word order, as is the case in Dan vv. 279-80: "Pa Azarias ingepancum/ heloprade halig purh hatne lig." Thus Solo's reading would turn the prayer into an amplification of the praises and prayers uttered by the Three as they walk through the flames (vv. 255-61).

59 The canticle was composed of "parts of 'Benedictus es' [Dan. 3.26-56] and 'Benedicte opera omnia' [Dan. 3.57-90]," (Farrell, "Unity," p. 133). The former corresponds to the prayer of Azarias (Dan vv. 283-332), and the latter to the praises sung by the Three (Dan vv. 362-408).

60 The angel not only protects the Three from the flames, he turns the fire upon the Babylonians. The incident is first described in vv. 259-61.

61 The Vulgate does not call Nebuchadnezzar's speech a boast: "responditque rex et ait nonne haec est Babylon magna quam ego aedificavi in domum regni in robore fortitudinis meae et in floria decoris meli" (Dan. 4.27).

62 Dan. 5.3-5: "tunc adlata sunt vasa aurea quae asportaverat de templo quod fuerat in Hierusalem et (4) biberunt in eis rex et optimates eius uxores et concubinae illius bibeant vinum et laudabant deos suos aureos et argenteos et aerros fereos ligneosque et lapideos (5) in eadem hora apparuerunt digitii quasi manus hominis scribentes contra candelabrum in superficie parietis aulae regiae."

63 O.T. Dan. 5.1, on the other hand, begins with an account of Balthazzar's feast.

64 There is not mention of boast in the corresponding passage in the Vulgate, Dan. 5.1-4.

65 I translate "deoflu" as a nominative plural in apposition to "ge." Bradley translates the noun as dative plural. Bradley's reading (AS
Poetry, p. 86) may be based on the Vulgate: "et tu et optimates tui et uxor tuae et concubinae vinum bibistis in eis deos quoque argenteos et aureos et aereos ferreos ligneosque et lapideos qui non vident neque audiant neque sentiun laudasti" (Dan. 5.23). Considering both the aggressive tone of the speech in OE Dan. and the commonplace exegesis of Nebuchadnezzar as a type of Satan, it seems legitimate to construe his grandson and Babylonians in this usage as devils.

There is no equivalent passage in Scripture.

In Scripture, Daniel emphasizes the similarity of Balthazzar's and Nebuchadnezzar's arrogance (Dan. 5. 18-21), and tells Balthazzar that he, too, will therefore suffer an equally unpleasant fate (Dan. 5.22-23).

The extant text of OE Dan ends here. Although many critics argue that the ending is abrupt and probably indicates a lacuna in the ms. which might have included events up to the end of O.T. Dan. 5 (see Raw, "The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11," ASE 13 [1984], pp. 187-8), features of both Christian and Germanic dialogue suggest that the work may be complete as we have it. This third verbal conflict in Dan contains a commissive utterance which predicts the fall of Babylon (v. 752). In the conflict which immediately precedes it, Daniel's commissive utterance, like the word of God, is shown to have extraordinary perlocutionary powers -- what he says comes to pass. In this context, it is perhaps not necessary for the poet to show the rout of Balthazzar, for the power of Daniel's word has in effect already made it so.
CHAPTER SIX

THE CHRISTIAN WAR OF WORDS IN GA vv. 1-134, "VAINGLORY," "SOLOMON AND SATURN II," XST, AND GB, AND ITS CONNECTION TO SECULAR FLYTING

I have already argued in chapter five that Dan, and to a lesser extent, Exo, contain spiritual struggles which have a verbal dimension and which possess some features characteristic of secular flyting. An examination of Satan's assaults on God the Word, and on mankind in GA, vv. 1-134, in portions of "Vainglory" and "Solomon and Saturn II," in XSt and in GB shows that in these poems, spiritual struggles are almost entirely verbal, and frequently resemble secular flyting.

I shall begin my analysis of flyting's influence on the verbal battles found in these poems by examining the GA poet's treatment of the primal spiritual conflict, the fall of angels. The story of Satan's rebellion against God was borrowed by the early Church from Hebrew apocalyptic texts in order to account for the origins and behavior of the N.T. Satan. Despite its non-canonical status, this martial explanation for evil seems to have appealed to AS writers for it is found in OE prose as well as in verse. Certainly, the idea that evil arose from a battle between celestial armies was particularly well-suited to the traditional rhetoric of OE verse, for AS poets had at their disposal a large supply of martial phrases and collocations tailor-made for such description. In GA, the poet begins what for the most part is a verse paraphrase of Scripture, with his own version of the apocalyptic tale of heavenly revolt. Even though his account does not include any adversarial dialogue, the first two fitts of GA (vv. 1-134) suggest that the poet wishes to contrast the power of divine and demonic discourse. Indeed, the significance of utterance is suggested in the poem's opening lines, for GA begins with a complex play on the near-homonyms, weard, werod, word, and geworden:
As Frank observes, the effect of this paronomasia is not only to validate the poet's own pious endeavour embodied in the verse paraphrase of GA itself, but also to allude through the phonetic similarity of weard, word, werod and geworden to the miraculously powerful word of God manifested in the temporal creation, as well as in Scripture:

His triple paronomasia seems to be trying to persuade us that the poet's literary and Christian purposes are one, that nothing could be more natural or right in English than that the weard, king of weroda, should be praised in wordum. Moreover, this English sound-correspondence would have seemed to the poet to reflect a theological reality, the mysterious identity of Deus and Logos, weard and word, as formulated in John 1.1: 'In principio erat verbum, et verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat verbum.'

The connection between God and word is reasserted in the second fitt in vv. 103-11, where the GA poet explains that God's word transformed the darkened cosmos into the created world: "Ne was her pa giet, nympe heolstersceado/ wiht geworden... oppæt peos woruldgesceaft/ purh word gewearp wuldorcyninges." Between these two passages which emphasize the power of divine discourse, the poet inserts an account of Satan's revolt which treats this first sin as a speech act whose perlocutionary incompetence contrasts markedly with the force of God's word.
Before the poet recounts the actual conflict he shows the importance of words in heaven by describing the behaviour of God's prelapsarian court as a series of speech acts:

(v. 15) *pegnas þrymfaeste þeoden heredon, ságdon lustrum lóf, heora líffrean demdon: drihtenes dugepum waron swipe gesælige* (v. 18a). 8

While the rebel angels are called an army of enemies (they are a "here" [v. 51], a "læpwendne here" [v. 68a] and "gesacan" [v. 59a] who contend with God [v. 77b]), they, too, are characterized by the quality of their utterance. Like the Egyptians of Exo, they are boastful adversaries ("gielpsceapan," v. 96b) and oath-breakers ("werlogan," v. 37b). When these angels, persuaded by evil council ("unraed," v. 30a), endeavour to overthrow the government of heaven, their aggression consists solely of boastful utterance. 9 Like the speech of other false boasters, however, the rebels' *gielp* produces unanticipated consequences, for the GA poet suggests that it is an unreliable weapon, rebounding upon its users, and causing them pain (v. 28b):

(v. 25b) *hæfdon gielp micel pæt hie wip drihtne dálan meahton wuldorfæstan wic werodes þrymme, sid and swegltorht. Him þær sar gelamp, æfost and oferhygd and þæs engles mod (30) þe þone unraed ongan ærest fremman, wefan and wecccean* (v. 31a).

The initial *unraed* which provokes the rebels' foolish talk is Lucifer's own arrogant prediction that he will possess heaven:

(v. 31a) *þa he worde cwæþ, nipes ofþyrsted, pæt he on norþdæle ham and heahsetl heofena rices agan wolde* (v. 34a). 11
This claim, like the rebel angels' boast, is undermined by its own untruthfulness and produces disastrous consequences for its utterer. Rather than gaining a larger share of the heavenly kingdom, Lucifer acquires instead a kingdom of misery and torment:

(v. 34b) pa wearp yrre god
and pam werode wræp pe he ær wurpode
wite and wuldre. sceop pam werlogan
wræclincne ham weorce to leane,
helleheafas, hearde nipæs (v. 38).

The poet's description of God's counter-attack suggests that it, too, is accomplished by verbal means. Hell is constructed and Lucifer is thrown from heaven, the poet tells us, by the perlocutionary force of God's utterance alone:

(v. 39) heht paet witehus wræcna bidan,
deep, dreama leas drihten ure (v. 40)
......
(v. 44b) heht pa geond paet rædleæse hof
weaxan witebrogan. Hæfdon hie wrohtgeteme
grimme wip god gesomonod (v. 46b).

At this juncture, the poet reminds us of the comparative weakness of the rebels' verbal assault by recapitulating their boast, now shown to be empty:

(v. 47) cwaedon paet heo rice, reÐemode,
agan woldan and swa eaÐe meahtan (v. 48).

After giving more details about the unpleasant fate awaiting the rebels (vv. 51b-69a), the poet summarizes the consequences of the revolt in a way which again emphasizes the role of words in the conflict:

(v. 65) Sceop pa and scyrede scyppend ure
oferhidig cyn engla of heofnum,
wærleas werod (v. 67a).
......
(v. 69b) was him gylp forod,
Here the poet reinforces the verbal nature of the rebellion by once again playing on the noun *word*. By modifying *werod*, a near-homonym of *word*, with the adjective *wærleas* in v. 67a, he manages not only to suggest that the rebels are a faithless *comitatus*, but also that they represent faithless words. In vv. 69-70, he equates the rebel aggression with boast ("gylp," "beot"), and furthermore implies that boast is a weapon in that like a sword or spear it can be broken and destroyed ("forod," v. 69b, "forborsten," v. 70a). The terrible response which such boastful utterance provokes is once again related in detail, and the proposition that the rebels' pride and boast constitutes warfare is reasserted ("heo ongunnon wip gode winnan,"

Once the rebels have been expelled from heaven, God begins creating the temporal world. By delaying this account of creation until after he has told the story of the angelic revolt, the author of *GA* forces the reader, by now familiar with the emptiness of the rebels' boasts, to compare such fatuous remarks to the superior perlocutionary force inherent in God's word:

(v. 103) Ne waes her þa giet nymþe heolstercseado
wiht geworden ac þes wida grund
stod deop and dim (v. 105b)

(v. 110b) oppæt þeos woruldesceafh
þurh word gewearþ wuldorcyninges
her ærest gesceop ece drihten,
helm eallwihta heofon and eorþan (v. 113)

(v. 121b) metod engla heht
lifes brytta leoht forþ cuman
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These verses emphasize the creative power of God's word in a variety of ways. The participle "geworden" (v.104a) continues the play on homonyms of \textit{word}, suggesting that nothing has been created because as yet nothing has been spoken by God. Vv. 110-2 specifically link speech and the act of creation. The verbs "heht" (v. 121) and "bebead" (v. 125) together with the poet's comment that "ra\textit{pe wæs gefylled heahcinininges hæs}" (vv. 123b-4a) reinforce this link by construing the material universe as the perlocutionary fulfillment of God's commissive utterance. This perception is repeated in vv. 128-31a.\textsuperscript{14} As already noted, the effect of this extended celebration of God's verbal prowess is to continue the characterization of God in terms of his discourse, and to emphasize once again the comparative weakness of the rebels' boast.

Even in the absence of dialogue, then, the war between good and evil as it is fought in the first two fitts of \textit{GA} contains conventions found in both Christian and Germanic genres of debate. For instance, the \textit{GA} poet's description of the heavenly revolt implies an acceptance of the idea central to both Eph. 6.11-17 and to Germanic flyting, that words can act like weapons. The designation of the rebel army as "gielpsceapan" (v. 96a) and their revolt as "gielp" (v. 25b), however, suggests that here Germanic influence predominates. The \textit{GA} poet's denotation of the rebel angels as "warleas" (v. 67a) and "werlogan" (v. 36a) is also the product of Germanic and Christian influence, for as I show in my discussion of OE \textit{Exo} and \textit{Dan}, these words on the one hand associate the rebels...
with the covenant-breakers who are God's enemies in Scripture, but on the other hand, connect them to treacherous thanes and incompetent flyters whose deeds do not live up to their words. Finally, the poet's emphasis on the creative power (or perlocutionary force) of God's utterance as opposed to the perlocutionary impotence of the boast of the "warleas werod" (v. 67a) reflects not only a Christian tenet, but also a premise central to Germanic flyting -- that to be effective, words must be fulfilled by deeds. In GA vv. 1-134 then the fall of angels is construed as a verbal contention, shaped by both Christian and Germanic convention.

Do other OE verse accounts of the fall of Satan treat the subject in a similar fashion? Portions of OE "Vainglory" and "Solomon and Saturn II" include brief recapitulations of the fall of the angels which suggest that these poets may have construed the celestial conflict as a kind of flyting. The "Vainglory" poet's account of a quarrel in which words replace weapons and "wigsmiþas" (war-smiths) search for a battlefield ("æcestede") within the hall is generally accepted as a description of court flyting:

(v. 13) ponne monige beop maþpelhegendra, wlonce wigsmiþas winburgum in. sittap at symble, sopgied wrecap, wordum wrixlap, witan fundiap hwylc æcestede inne in raecede mid werum wunige (v. 18a).16

This quarrel does not occur in a moral vacuum, however, for the poet suggests that flytings such as this are the weapons of Satan's off-spring in the temporal world. He does this by associating the act of boasting ("boþ," v. 28b)17 not only with contentiousness ("word ut faran/ præfte pringan," v. 41b-2a), aggression ("prymme pringæp," v. 24a, "prymme gebyrmed," v. 42)18 and actual weaponry ("hygegar letep/ scurum sceoteþ," vv. 34b-5a), but also with the devil's
arrows (v. 27a) shot apparently by Satan's own children (v. 47b):

(v. 23b) Sum on oferhygdo prymme pringeþ, printep him in innan ungemedemad mod; sindan to monige þæt. Bip þæt æfponca eal gefyllod feondes fligepilum, facensearwum; bredop he ond bålceþ, bop his sylfes swipor micle þonne se sella mon (v. 29b) ....

(v. 40) Siteþ symbolwlonc, searwum lætep wine gewæged word ut faran, præfte pringan prymme gebyrmed, æfestum onæled, oferhygda ful, nipum, nearowrencum. Nu þu cunnan meaht: gif þu þyslicne þegn gemitted wunian in wicum, wite þe be þissum feawum forþspellum þæt þæt bip feondes bearn flæsce bifongen (v. 48a).

The poet then links the verbal behaviour of these latter-day servants of the devil to the behaviour of the rebel angels whose "gewin" with God also includes utterance ("wroht ahofan," v. 59b). In addition, the poet says, both the rebels and the arrogant boaster will suffer the same fate:

(v. 52) Se þe hine sylfne in þa slípnan tid purh oferhygda up ahlænþ, ahefeþ heahmodne, se sceal hean wesan (55) æfter neosiþum niper gebiged, wunian witum fæst, wyrnym beþrungem. Þæt was ðæs geara ðu in godes rice ðatte mid englum oferhygdstag, widmære gewin; wroht ahofan, heardne heresip, heofon widledan, forsawan hyra sellan (v. 61a).

In this brief allusion to the angelic revolt, then, the "Vainglory" poet seems to imply that the incident constitutes a heavenly parallel to the secular flyting he describes in vv. 23-48.
In "Solomon and Saturn II," Saturn poses a series of questions to which Solomon replies. Shippey says of this didactic dialogue that "from its opening upon the contending champions of middle-earth, the poem is instinct with a sense of violent oppositions." Not surprisingly given this sense of conflict, the poet characterizes the entire exchange as a flyting in which the loser will be the contestant who lies:

(v. 1) Hwæt, ic flitan gefrægn ... on fyrndagum
modgleawe men, middangeardes ræswan,
gewesan mid hira wisdom. Wyrs deþ se þe liehþ
oppe þæs sopes ansæcep (v. 4a).

Saturn identifies fate as the source of discord in the temporal world, operating through "fyrena geflitu" (v. 271) -- a phrase which suggests not only "evil" but also ancient disputes -- and asks Solomon to explain why fate torments mankind in this way:

(v. 265) 'Ac hwæt witeþ us wyrd seo swipe
eallra fyrena fruma fæþþo modor (v. 266)

(v. 269b) Ac tohwan drohtap heo mid us?
Hwæt, hie wile lifigende late æpreotan,
þæt heo þurh fyrena geflitu fæþþo ne tydre' (v. 271).

Solomon answers that the heavenly revolt is the source of these wicked disputes (or, if the homophony of fyren and fyrn is recognized, perhaps the original and ancient dispute itself) which plague mankind with violence. In his description of the revolt, Solomon juxtaposes the trappings of actual warfare (such as banners and armour) with a speech which although brief, manages nonetheless to be, like flyting utterance, both boastful and threatening. Using a preterite form of the future auxiliary willan which often marks OE commissives, Satan proposes here that he will ravage heaven, and rule in his own portion of God's kingdom, apparently
populating his new land with the offspring of angelic procreation:

(v. 274b) oper him ongan wyrcan purh dierne cræftas
segn and side byrnan, cwap pat he mid his gesipum
wolde
hiðan eall heofona rice and him ponne on healfum
sittan,
tydran him mid þy teopan dæle, oppæt he his [to]r[ne]s
gewæpe
ende purh insceafte (v. 278a).

Like the empty boast of the flyter, this ill- advised utterance produces consequences which are far removed from those the devil anticipates. Instead of allowing the angel to overrun his kingdom, God replies to this arrogant speech by throwing the rebel out of heaven, and ordering His angels to bind him in chains. God's orders are obeyed, and the perlocutionary superiority of divine discourse is demonstrated once again:

(v. 278b) pa weerþ se æpela þeoden
gedrefed purh þæs deofles gehygd; forlet hine pa ofdune
gehreosan,
afieldæ hine pa under foldan sceatas, heht hine þær
fæste gebindan (v. 280).

By identifying the heavenly revolt as the ultimate source of "fyrena geflitu," and by depicting evil's primal onslaught as a boast, the author of "Solomon and Saturn II," like the author of "Vainglory," suggests that the heavenly revolt is a verbal war whose beginning resembles the initiation of a flyting exchange.

XSt, the final poem in the Junius Ms., also includes an account of the fall of angels. Although the XSt poet's description of the angelic revolt contains no dialogue, his portrait of Satan could easily be the portrait of a flyter. For instance, although Satan is a military opponent of God (he is "godes andsaca" [v. 190a, 268b, 279b, etc.] and an
"aldorpegn" [v. 66a] who leads a "preat" [v. 324b] of "hellescealcas" [v. 132b]), he is also a monstrous being ("werega gast" [v. 125a], "atol aglæca" [v. 160a]) of vile appearance (vv. 149-51a) who when he speaks spits flames and poison like a dragon ("he spearcade þonne he spreocan organ/ fyre and atre," vv. 78-9a). The conjunction of the martial and the monstrous in the person of Satan, coupled with the fact that the poisonous nature of his words transforms them into dangerous weapons, makes Satan resemble the supernatural antagonist of senna flyting who also fights with words.

The similarity of Satan and the senna flyter may not be accidental, for like the GA poet, the XSt poet treats the fall of angels as an insurrection which has a verbal dimension. The importance of words is emphasized early. Like the prelapsarian court of GA, the heaven of XSt is full of songs of praise, as Satan himself recollects:

(v. 44) Hwæt, we for dryhtene iu dreamas hefdon, song on sweagle selrum tidum, þær nu ymb þone ecgan æple ele stondæþ, heleþ ymb hehseld, herigæþ drihten wordum and wercum (v. 48a).

(v. 153) þær we ymb hine utan ealle hofan, leomu ymb leofne, lofsonga word drihtne sædon (v. 155a).27

For Satan, this happy state ends when his pride causes him to suppose that he is God's equal ("þuhte him on mode þæt hit mihte swa, / þæt hie weron seolfe swegles brytan, / wuldres waldend," vv. 22-4a). His revolt is not a simple boast, however. Instead, the poet suggests that Satan's words constitute false teaching, for the devils attribute their fall to Satanic instruction ("þu us gelærdæst þurh lyge þinne," v. 53).28 Satan confirms that his words were boastful ("ic ær gecwæþ/ þæt ic were seolfa swegles brytta," vv. 122b-3), but when he recapitulates his actual utterance it takes the form of a homiletic parody:
Like a preacher Satan here promises to teach his audience sound counsel if they will believe in him (vv. 248-9). He then uses the first person subjunctive of witan, a form frequently employed in homiletic exhortation, to urge his audience to scorn God (vv. 250-1a) whose power he mistakenly calls "idel gylp." These teachings, of course, are blasphemous ("womcwidum" v. 281b), and like the poison of a viper (vv. 78-9 and vv. 161b-2) can injure. The XSt poet's version of the primal conflict, then, treats it as a verbal attack launched by an individual who resembles a senna flyter but speaks like a preacher.

Although they are not always reported verbatim, demonic words continue to be a malign force elsewhere in XSt. For instance, Adam and Eve become prisoners of the feonda aldor because they, too, attend to Satan's false teachings ("Gelærde unc se atola," v. 411; "se balewa het," v. 482) rather than to God's word ("þæs git ofergyndon/ hælendes word," v. 484). The poet also numbers the taunts of "deofles spellunge" (vv. 634-9a) among the torments of hell.

Two other examples of demonic discourse in XSt are especially significant from the perspective of flyting. The discord of hell, embodied in the devils' complaint to Satan, mentioned briefly above, resembles the speech of a flyting initiator, for it includes pronoun contrast (pu/we), insult ("Atol is þin onson," v. 61a), accusation (vv. 61b-2) and threat ("Hafustu nu mare susel!" v. 64b):

(v. 53) 'Þu us gelærðast þurh lyge þinne
paet we helende heran ne scealdon.
(55) puhte pe anum paet pu ahtest alles gewald
heofnes and eorpæn, waere halig god,
sçypend seolfa. Nu earttu sceapana sum
in fyrlocan feste gebunden.
Wendes pu purh wuldor paet pu woruld ahtest,
(60) alra onwald, and we englas mid peç.
Atol is pin onseon! Habbaþ we alle swa
for pinum leasungum lypre gefered.
Segdest us to sœpe paet pin sunu waere
meotod moncynnes. Hafustu nu more susel!' (v. 64).

More significant, however, is the XSt poet's account of
the temptations in the wilderness, for even though his
version is now truncated by ms. loss,30 the portion of the
text which remains suggests that this Christian war of words
is strongly influenced by Germanic flyting. That the two
dialogue genres would come together in an account of the
desert struggle with Satan is not surprising, for although
the scriptural versions of Jesus' encounter with the devil
consist of conversation rather than combat, the incident was
sometimes described by AS homilists as a fight.31 This
association of speech with battle is, as I have shown,
central to both Christian adversarial dialogue and Germanic
flyting. Close reading of the XSt text suggests in addition
that while the poet bases his account on Matt. 4.1-11,32 he
gives particular emphasis to those features which the
biblical exchange shares with flyting.33 Because of these
modifications, the struggle in the wilderness resembles a
Christian variant of secular flyting, as I shall now show.

Despite its brevity, the first temptation in XSt
contains hints of flyting. Satan brings stones to Jesus and
challenges him to transform them into bread:

(v. 670) Brohte him to bearne brade stanæs,
bæd him for hungre hlaufæs wyrocan --
'gif ðu swa micle mihte hæbbe.'
þa him andswarode ece drihten:
'Wendest ðu, awyrðda, paet awiten nære,
nymþe me ænne' (v. 675a).34
In vv. 670-2, the **XSt** poet follows his scriptural source quite closely. What we have of the poet's version of Jesus' reply, however, differs from Scripture, perhaps conflating Jesus' final command to Satan with His earlier response to the challenge of the stone. The added pronoun contrast ("pu ... me ænne," vv. 674-5) and insult ("awyrdda," v. 674) increase the aggressiveness of the speech and may well reflect flyting influence.

Following this reply, and after the break in the ms., there is another departure from Matthew's text. The poet gives Matt. 4.8 ("Eft se deoful hyne genam ond lædde hyne on swipe heahne munt," Grunberg, p. 44) an extremely literal interpretation, saying that Satan grabs Jesus, and carries him to the top of the mountain across his shoulders:

(v. 679b) pa he mid hondum genom
atol þurh edwit, and on esle ahof,
herm bealowes gast and on beorh astah (v. 681).

Although we cannot be certain of the purpose of this deviation from Matthew because of the loss of text, the increased violence of the devil's behaviour may be a sign of the physical aggression which sometimes accompanies flyting defeat.

In the next temptation, features of both Christian and Germanic verbal warfare are also evident. In the scriptural account, Satan already has some kinship with flyters in that he offers a settlement as an alternative to quarrel. In **XSt** this settlement offer (vv. 685-7a) is accompanied by a variant of another flyting convention, the identity motif (vv. 687b-8):

(v. 683) 'Loca nu ful wide ofer londbewende.
Ic þe geselle on þines seolfes dom
(685) folc and foldan. Foh hider to me
burh and breetone bold to gewealde,
rodera rices, gif þu seo riht cyning
In these lines, as in the flytings of *Hildebrandslied* and "Habarpsljóp," the identity motif becomes the centre of contention. Here, Satan tries to deflect the Christian verbal weapon of confession by rather illogically suggesting that Jesus' acknowledgement of His divinity will confirm Satan's superiority ("Foh hider to me ... gif þu seo riht cyning"). Other features of Satan's speech are also evocative of flying. Like a flyter, Satan addresses his opponent directly, employing second person pronouns and adjectives (v. 684, v. 687, v. 688) as well as imperatives ("loca," v. 683, "foh," v. 685), emphatically contrasting first and second person pronouns ("ic þe geselle," v. 684a, "foh hider to me ... gif þu seo riht cyning," vv. 685-7).

A comparison of Matthew's version of Jesus' reply with that found in *XSt*, vv. 690-709, shows the extent of the *XSt* version's debt to Germanic flying. In Matt. 4.10-11, Jesus dismisses the devil, saying, "Gang þu sceucca onbæc. Soplice hit ys awritten to drihtne pinum gode þu þe geeaemdest ond hym anum þeowast" (Grunberg, p. 44). In *XSt*, Jesus also banishes the devil with exorcistic imperatives ("Gewit þu, awyrgda," v. 690a; "Cer þe on bæcling!" v. 697b; "Gong ricene to," v. 707b), but these are incorporated into a reply whose overall structure and stylistic features are derived from flying quarrel:

(v. 690) 'Gewit þu, awyrgda, in þæt witescraf, Satanus seolf; þe is susl weotod geara togegnes, nalles godes rice. Ah ic þe hate þurh þa hehstan miht þæt þu hellwarum hyht ne abeode, (695) ah þu him secgan miht sorga mæste, þæt þu gemettes meotod alwihta, cyning moncyynnes. Cer þe on bæcling! Wite þu eac, awyrgda, hu wid and sid helheçpo dreorig, and mid hondum amet. (700) Grip wiþ þæs grundes; garn þonne swa oppæt þu þone ymbhwyrft alne cunne,
and ærest amet ufan to grunde,
and hu sid seo se swarta epm.
Wast pu þonne þe geornor þæt þu wip god wunne,
(705) seoppan þu þonne hafast handum ametene
hu heh and deop hell innweard seo,
grim græfhus. Gong ricene to,
ær twa seondon tida agongene,
þæt þu merced hus æmeten hæbbe' (v. 709).

As is the case in many flyting exchanges, the identity motif is again prominent here. Having begun with an exorcistic command characteristic of Christian adversarial dialogue (v. 690), Jesus responds directly to Satan's challenge that He reveal His divinity, and confesses that he is "meotod." The epithet introduces a series of puns on the cognate verb, ametan (to measure), and its homophone, aemetan (to meet) which culminates in Jesus' command that Satan now measure hell (v. 702a). This command together with the imperatives which surround it ("wite þu," v. 698a; "grip," v. 702a; "wast þu," v. 704a) parallels and rebuts Satan's earlier command that Jesus recognize the devil's power by looking over the vastness of Satan's earthly kingdoms ("Locaþ nu ... folc and foldan," vv. 683-5), for now it is Satan who must survey his true kingdom, "helheopo dreorig" (v. 699a). Lest his audience miss this parallel, the poet provides a coda to the incident which ironically echoes Satan's words in v. 683, and in vv. 724-5a describes Satan, his task now complete, looking over his vile home just as he had urged Jesus to survey the kingdoms of the earth: "Locade leas wiht geond þæt laþe scræf,/ atol mid egum."

Parallel structure is not the only similarity between Jesus' speech and flyting reply, for other commonplace features of flyting can be found in this passage as well. For instance, Jesus addresses Satan directly with an insulting epithet ("awyrädæ," v. 690). Throughout his speech he frequently uses second person pronouns, sometimes with imperatives ("wite þu," v. 698; "grip þu," v. 700; "wast þu," v. 704), sometimes with insult (v. 698a) and sometimes in
contrast with first person pronouns ("ic þe hate," v. 693). All these stylistic features are a familiar part of flyting rhetoric, and they heighten the combative tone of Jesus' speech. In addition, Jesus' speech contains the flyting device of verbal echo (compare, for example, Satan's "on þines seolfes dom" [v. 684b] to Jesus' "Satanus seolf" [v. 691]; Satan's offer of "rodera rices" [v. 687a] to Jesus' reply that Satan's realm is "nalles godes rice," [vv. 691b-2]; Jesus' echo of Satan's "wide" [v. 683] in vv. 698-9; and Satan's taunt "gif þu swa micle mihte hàbbe" [v. 672] to Jesus' "purh þa hehstan miht" [v. 693b]).

To recapitulate briefly, the XSt poet treats the heavenly insurrection and the temptation in the wilderness as verbal battles. In his account of the fall of angels, the influence of flyting is limited to the portrait of Satan and to the idea that his words can cause injury. In the temptation exchange, however, the influence of flyting seems sufficiently pronounced to suggest a purposeful conflation of Christian and secular genres into a sacred variant of flyting.

Like GA, "Vainglory," "Solomon and Saturn II" and XSt, GB\(^{40}\) treats the fall of angels as the consequence of a speech act. Doane says:

to fall, Satan must struggle against things as they naturally are, not least against language .... he strives to turn lof into hitetespræce (Saxon Genesis, p. 119).

He adds that

despite his boasts, the only activity available to Satan is talk: indeed, the one proper power given to him was the power of lof, a power he uses to ratify his sin in Hell with his/ tirades against God (pp. 120-1).\(^{41}\)
Not surprisingly, then, the GB poet connects war and words early in his work. He describes the prelapsarian Satan as an heroic individual who like the ideal Germanic king is strong ("swipne," v. 252b), intelligent ("mihtigne on his modgepohte," v. 253a) as well as physically magnificent ("hæfde he hine swa hwitne geworhtne,/ swa wynlic .../ gelic wæs he pam leochtum steorrum," vv. 254b-6a). Like an ambitious warrior he also seeks a "strenglicran stol ... heahran on heofonum" (vv. 273-4a) aided by a warlike comitatus:

(v. 254b) 'Bigstandap me strange geneatas, pā ne willap me at pām stripe geswican, hælepās heardmode. Hie habbaþ me to hearran gecorene, rofe rincas; mid swilcum mæg man ræd gepencean, fon mid swilcum folcgesteallan' (v. 287a).42

The battle or strip to which Satan here refers, however, seems to consist solely of his own discourse, for the poet repeatedly characterizes this discourse as a fight ("he ... ongan him winn up ahebban/ .... ahof hine wip his hearran, sohte hetespræce,/ gylpword ongean," vv. 259b-64a; "he wann wip heofones waldend," v. 303b). Indeed, when God hears this speech, he treats it as a deed which must be repaid (v. 295a)43:

(v. 284) 'Pa hit se allwalda eall gehyrde
pæt his engyl ongan ofermede micel
ahebban wip his hearran and spræc healic word
dollice wip drihten sinne, sceolde he pæa dæd ongyldan,
worc pæs gewinnes gedælan (v. 296a).

The aggressive tone of Satan's boast as it is reported in GB helps to cement the connection between words and war, for even though it is a monologue, Satan's utterance has an agonistic quality suggestive of verbal battle. This pugnacious tone is largely the consequence of the GB poet's inclusion of flyting features in the speech.44 To maximize
their effect, and to create a sense of the parry and thrust of adversarial dialogue within a monologue, the poet has Satan use a question and answer format:

(v. 278) 'Hwæt sceal ic winnan?' cwæp he. 'Nis me wihtæ pearf hearran to habbanne. Ic mæg mid handum swa fela (280) wundra gewyrcean. Ic hæbbe geweald micel to gyrwanne godelecran stol, hearran on heofne. Hwæ sceal ic æfter his hyldo þeowian, bugan him swilces geongordomes? Ic mæg wesan god swa he. Bigstandæþ me strange geneatas, þa ne willæþ me æt þam stripe geswican, (285) hæle þas heardmode. Hie habbaþ me to hearran gecorene, rofe rincas; mid swilcum mæg man ræd geþencean, fon mid swilcum folcgesteallan. Frynd synd hie mine georne, holde on hyra hygesceaftum. Ic mæg hyra hearra wesan, rædan on þis risc. Swa me ðæt riht ne þinceþ, (290) ðæt ic oleccan awiht purfe gode æfter gode ænegum. Ne wille ic leng his geongra wurpæn' (v. 291).

Here the repetition of the modals sculan and magan within the contrasting contexts of interrogative and declarative word order ("sceal ic ... ic mæg," vv. 278-9 and vv. 282-3; "ic mæg," v. 288b) suggests a spiritual conflict between a sense of moral duty ("sceal ic?" ) and Satan's preoccupation with his own prowess ("ic mæg").45 This kind of contrastive repetition is a commonplace of flyting attack and reply, and here the question and answer format allows it to occur within a single speech. The battle of modals concludes, however, outside Satan's speech in the poet's own comments which follow. This time, the poet uses the verb sculan not to imply Satan's moral obligations (as he does in vv. 256b-8), but instead to echo ironically Satan's "sceal ic?" in a description of the consequences of Satan's arrogance. The repetition of the phrase "sceolde he" suggests both the
inevitability of Satan's dreadful fate, as well as the perlocutionary impotence of the devil's boastful "ic mæg":

(v. 295b) sceolde he pa daed ongyldan
....... and sceolde his wite habban (v. 296b)
....
(v. 302b) Forpon he sceolde grund gescecean.

The contrastive repetition of modals is not the poet's only means of suggesting conflict within Satan's speech. When Satan says that he needs no master ("nis ... habbanne," vv. 278-9), that he need not flatter ("ne þinceþ ... ænegum," vv. 289-91) and that he will not be a disciple ("ne wille ic ... wurPan," v. 291), his negatives automatically evoke their corresponding positives, which are the morally correct alternatives that Satan disdains. Although the conflict here is implicit, it is closely related to the overt counter-position of negatives and positives often found in flyting exchanges. The agonistic quality of Satan's speech is further enhanced by the familiar flyting device of personal pronoun contrast ("ic," "his," "him," "ic," "he," vv. 282b-3 and "ic," "his," v. 291b), while comparisons such as Satan makes between his own and God's respective prowess are also typical of flyting speech ("swa fela," v. 279b; "hearran," v. 282a; "swa he," v. 283b). The poet's use of flyting rhetoric here, then, allows him to recreate within a single boastful monologue a sense of the spiritual conflict which divides heaven.

Although God does not reply in direct discourse to Satan's words, the poet treats Satan's exile as a consequence of a divine speech act ("Acwæþ hine pa fram his hyldo and hine on helle wearp," v. 304). Divine utterance also plays a role in Satan's transformation from angel to devil, for God creates a new name for him and orders him to hell:

(v. 342b) Wearp hine on þæt morþer innan,
niþer on þæt niobedd, and sceop him naman siþpan,
cwæþ se hehsta  hatan sceolde
The GB poet also incorporates flyting devices into his account of the temptation and fall of mankind. In the OE translation of Scripture, the incident is treated quite straightforwardly. No particular emphasis is given to speech acts, nor is the temptation depicted as an attack:

(345) Satan sippan, het hine pære sweartan helle grundes gyman, nales wip god winnan (v. 346).

In GB, on the other hand, the Tempter's beguiling words become part of a much enlarged exchange in which deceit and demonic doctrine challenge truth and God's lar. Thus, although in GB the Tempter initially claims that he is visiting Adam and Eve simply to convey God's message that they eat the fruit ("Laeste pu.../ his ambyhto, nim pe pis ofæt on hand,/ bit his and byrige," vv. 517b-9a), his ultimate goal is that they follow his teaching ("laestes mine lare," v. 614a) and "pæt hie word godes/ lare forlæten," (vv. 428b-9a). Unfortunately, the Tempter accomplishes his goal, and Adam and Eve fall because they "accept the false lar of Satan rather than the true lar of God."
As part of this doctrinal assault, the Tempter also attacks human discourse by infecting it with a semantic confusion which originates in Satan's often ambiguous words. Thus, the disrespect for accepted semantic associations evident in both Satan's attempt to divorce the name of God from the concept of good (Satan says that he will not look to "gode æfter gode ænegum," v. 291), and the Tempter's efforts to create a semantic association where none exists (he repeatedly urges Adam and Eve to "pisses ofætes æte," v. 500, 564, 599),® culminate in a complete distortion of sense in human discourse. Appropriately this corruption of language is manifested immediately after Eve has put her trust in the Tempter's words and lar ("heo ongan his wordum truwian,/ læstan his lar," vv. 649b-50a). She then calls the bitter fruit, "swete," and the demonic Tempter, "godes engel god," (vv. 655-7).®

The most cursory glance at the text of GB confirms that speech acts and their interpretation are central to the temptation. The Tempter speaks to Adam ("ongan hine þa frinan forman worde," v. 495), Adam replies ("Adam mapelode," v. 522a), the Tempter addresses Eve ("he ... cwaþ," v. 548-9; "se forhatena spræc," v. 609) and Eve speaks to Adam ("þa heo to hire hearran spræc," v. 654b). While this is not extraordinary, and represents no significant deviation from the scriptural account, the contents of the various speeches are another matter, for each speaker is preoccupied with words and their perception. For example, in his speech to Adam, the Tempter repeatedly refers to God's ostensible speech acts, and once to their perception ("het he me," v. 499b; "cwaþ paþ," v. 500b and v. 503b; "ic hyrde hine þine dæd and word lofian ... ymb þin lif sprecon," vv. 507b-8; "he his gingran sent to þinre spræc," vv. 515b-6a; "Nu he þe mid spellum het/ listas læran," vv. 516b-7a). Adam's reply also refers to divine discourse and his perception of it, as well as his opinion of the Tempter's words ("ponne ic sigedrihten ... mæþlan gehyrde," v. 523b-4; "me her stondan het," v. 247
525b; "he cwæp," v. 529b; "ic wat hwæt he ... bebead," v. 535; "pæ mid ligenum fare," v. 531b; "ic þe hyran ne cann," v. 542b; and "he het me his word weorpian and wel healdan,/læstan his lare," vv. 537-8b).

Collocations of lar, læran, and læstan which are associated with the acts of instructing and obeying instructions also recur throughout the discourse in GB, turning this version of mankind's fall into a dispute about the nature of divine utterance.

In addition to emphasizing discourse in this way, the GB poet draws on the martiality inherent in both Germanic and Christian adversarial dialogues to transform the Tempter's promulgation of demonic doctrine and semantic nonsense into the verbal equivalent of an assault. He begins by prefacing his account of the temptation and fall with the explanation that Satan, like a defeated Germanic warrior, hungers for revenge:

(v. 393b) 'Ne magon we pæs wrace gefremman geleanian him mid læpes wihte pæt he us hafap pæs leotees bescyrede (v. 395a) ....

(v. 397b) ...We pæs sculon hycgan georne pæt we on Adame, gif we æfre mægen, and on his eafrum swa some, andan gebetan' (v. 399).

To accomplish this revenge, and also out of jealous hatred for mankind, Satan plans to deprive Adam and Eve of their rightful territory, so that instead of resettling heaven as God had intended ("'he [God] hæfþ mon geworhtne/ .... Mid þam he wile eft gesettan/ heofona rice mid hluttrum saulum,'" vv. 395b-7a), Adam and Eve will be exiled from heaven ("'Uton opwenden hit nu monna bearnum,/ þæt heofonrice, nu we hit habban ne moton,'" vv. 403b-4). At the same time, if Satan has his way, they will forfeit God's favour ("hyldo"), and be transformed from God's disciples into captive retainers of Satan ("'ponne moton we hie giongrum habban,/ fira bearn on þissum fæstum clomme,'" vv. 407b-8a). These militaristic goals, however, will not be accomplished by physical means.
Instead, the instrument of Satan's revenge will be the Tempter's deceitful discourse:

(v. 427b) 'Gif hit eower ænig mæge gewendan mid wihte þæt hie word godes lare forlæten, sona hie him þe laþran beþep. (430) Gif hie brecap his gebodscipe, þonne hie him abolgen wurþep; sipþan bip him se wela onwended and wyþþ him wiþt gegarwod' (v. 431).

In such a context, the Tempter's words become a "fyrde" (v. 408b, v. 689a) launched by a power-hungry king who wishes to deprive a rival of his comitatus, to reduce his enemies' territory, and to augment his own power by acquiring captives in battle.

Having introduced a connection between words and war by drawing on Germanic heroic tradition, the GB poet borrows from Christian tradition to describe the Tempter as a verbal warrior:

(v. 442) Angan hine þa gyrwan godes andsaca, fus on frætwum, (hæfde fæcne hyge), hæleþhelm on heafod asette and þone full hearde geband, spenn mid spangum; wiste him spræca fela, wora worda (v. 446a).

Like a perverted version of the miles christi who arms himself with the Pauline "galeam salutis" and the "gladium Spiritus quod est verbum Dei," "godes andsaca" dresses himself in armour ("frætwum") which includes not only a "hæleþhelm," but also speeches made from evil words ("spræca fela/ wora worda").

A closer look at the Tempter's actual "wora worda" and "ligenum" shows that the poet enhances the martial tone of the temptation by employing the rhetoric of flyting speech, for not only do the Tempter's words reflect the deceit and simple-minded materialism of many demonic statements found in Latin Christian texts, they also resemble the speech of a
flyting instigator. For example, the Tempter begins with an identity motif, albeit a deceitful one, using his erstwhile angelic status to validate his role as spokesman for God:

(v. 496b) 'Langaþ þe awuht,
Adam, up to gode? Ic eom on his ærenda hider feorran gefered, ne þæt nu fyrm ne wæs
þæt ic wif hine sylfne sæt' (v. 499a).

The Tempter then explains his errand: God wishes Adam to eat the formerly forbidden fruit. To this the Tempter adds his own version of the conventional settlement offer found in flyting, promising Adam the temporal rewards of increased intelligence, greater beauty as well as riches if Adam follows this new command:

(v. 499b) 'Pa het he me on pysne sip faran
het þæt þu þisses ofætes æte, cwæþ þæt þin abal and
creft
and þin modsefa mara wurde,
and þin lichoma leohtra micle,
þin gesceapu scenran, cwæþ þæt þe æniges sceattes
pearf
ne wæro on worulde' (v. 504a).

The straightforward opposition of first and second person pronouns found in many flytings evolves here into a more complex contrast, as the Tempter manipulates first, second and third person pronouns to suggest an illusive alliance between himself and Adam, and an illusive conflict between Adam and God. He carefully places first person pronominal references to himself near third person pronominal references to God, often setting these slightly apart from second person pronominal references to Adam ("het he me ... þæt þu ... þin ... þin ... þe") thereby suggesting that he is aligned with God, while Adam stands on his own. In subsequent lines, the Tempter abandons the first person altogether, calling himself God's "boda" (v. 510a) or "gingra" (v. 515b). As a consequence, only third and second
person pronouns remain to be contrasted, making it appear that the conflict is between God and Adam rather than between Adam and the Tempter ("he þe," v. 516b):

(v. 515b) 'ac he his gingran sent to þinne spræce. Nu he þe mid spellum het listas læran. Læste þu georne his ambyhto, nim þe þis ofæt on hand, hit his and byrige. þe weorp on þinum breostum rum, wæstm þy whitegra' (v. 520a).

If the Tempter's speech organizes the lies and simple-minded materialism typical of demonic utterance according to the template of secular flyting, Adam's counter-attack consists of a similar rearrangement of confessions of belief and exorcistic utterance. For example, like a flyter, Adam repeats some of the Tempter's words in his own recollection of God's command:

(v. 523b) 'þonne ic sigedrihten, mihtigne god, næþlan gehyrde (525) strangre stemne, and me her stondan het, his bebodu healdan, and me þas bryd forgeaf, whitecienne wif, and me warnian het þæt ic on þone deapes beam bedroen ne wurde, beswicen to swipe, he cwæp þæt þa sweartan helle (530) healdan sceolde se þe bi his heortan wuht laþes gelæde' (v. 531a).

Adam's "ic ... gehyrde," "het," and "he cwæp" echo a similar succession of verbs in the Tempter's speech (vv. 499b-507b), and this parallel helps to make more striking the differences between Adam's view of events and the Tempter's deceitful report.

Flyting's influence is also apparent in Adam's response to the Tempter's claim that he is an angel:

(v. 531b) 'Nat þeah þu mid ligenum fare ðurh dyrne geþanc þe þu drihtnes eart boda of heofnum. Hwæt, ic þinra bysna ne mæg, worda ne wisna wuht oncnawan,
Here the flyting device of verbal echo allows the poet (and thus Adam) to play on the ambiguity of polysemous words. For instance, the Tempter's claim that "nu he þe ... het/ listas læran. læste þu georne," (vv. 516-17) is refuted by Adam's similarly worded reply that "he het me ... læstan his lare" (vv. 537-8a). Here the duplication of "het" and "læstan" emphasizes an important change: teaching (lær) replaces the ambiguous noun, list. Giving Adam's words a certainty lacking in the Tempter's discourse. Another example of homophony concealing an important shift in meaning occurs earlier in vv. 531-2. Here Adam borrows the noun "geðanc" (favour) and the adjective "dyrne" (precious) from the Tempter's speech (vv. 506-7), but uses them to imply the secret malignity of the Tempter's purpose: "Nat þeah þu mid ligenum fare/ þurh dyrne geðanc þu drihtnes eart" (vv. 531-2). The flyting device of verbal echo, then, is an important part of Adam's speech.

Vv. 531b-42a contain other flyting devices as well. The counter-claim and contradiction which Clover judges essential to flyting reply are evident in the series of negatives Adam uses to refute the Tempter's earlier assertions ("Nat," "ic ... ne mæg," "þu ... ne bist," and the like). Adam, like a flyter, also insults his interlocutor, not only by calling him a liar ("þu mid ligenum fare"), but also by implying that he is monstrous, perhaps even physically repulsive ("þu gelic ne bist/ ænegum his engla þe ic ær geseah," vv. 538b-9). Vv. 538b-9 also represent an attack on his opponent's identity, a ploy used in the flying exchanges in Hildebrandslied and "Harbarþsljoþ." Finally, vv. 531b-42a
include a straightforward contrast of first and second person pronouns (*ic, *pu, and related pronominal adjectives occur throughout and in v. 533b and v. 540a are contrastively juxtaposed) which shows that Adam is not deceived by the Tempter's subtle pronoun usage, but recognizes that he and the Tempter are enemies.

At the conclusion of his speech, Adam confesses his faith in God (vv. 543b-5a) after dismissing the Tempter with an exorcistic imperative typical of Christian adversarial dialogue (v. 543a):

(542b) 'py ic āe hyran ne cann, ac pu meaht āe forp faran. Ic hæbbe me fæstne geleafan up to pam ælmihtegan gode āe me mid his earmum worhte, her mid handum sinum. He mæg me of his hean rice geofian mid goda gehwilcum, þeah he his gingran ne sende' (v. 546).

Here confession and exorcism are expressed in the rhetoric of flyting. The poet again uses pronoun contrast,¹ as well as negations which correspond to the Tempter's assertions (compare "ic ne cann hyran" to "ic gehyrde hine," v. 507, and "he his gingran ne sende" to "he his gingran sent," v. 515) to heighten the sense that these are verbal blows which parry specific elements of the Tempter's attack. Adam's exorcism, "pu meaht āe forp faran" (v. 543a) includes the varied repetition of another phrase found in the Tempter's speech ("ic ... hider feorran gefered," vv. 497b-8a, and "het he me ... faran," v. 499b). This kind of ironic verbal echo, of course, is typical of flyting speech.

This analysis of Adam's confrontation with the Tempter shows that although Adam, like a *miles christi,*⁶⁴ both confesses and exorcizes, these conventional Christian utterances occur in the context of flyting rhetoric. This union of both Latin Christian and Germanic secular conventions, familiar from OE prose texts discussed in earlier chapters, produces a dialogue whose aggression and
acrimony transforms the debate on God's word into an exciting flying battle fought by the soldier of the devil and the soldier of God.

When the Tempter, bested for the moment, turns his attentions toward Eve, intending to persuade her that his pernicious lar is the lar of God, his monologue continues to include some of the commonplaces of flyting, suggesting that the GR poet may have considered the entire temptation episode (including Eve's lack of reply as well as her subsequent parroting of the Tempter's words) to be a flyting battle. Jager's analysis of the similarities between the Tempter's and Eve's discourse provides some support for this conjecture, for although Jager does not connect these speeches to flying, he argues that:

the Tempter's entire proposition ... moves significantly from the idea of Eve herself speaking to Adam ("Gif þu him ... sægst," [v. 570]) to the idea of their speaking to him together ("swa wit him [butu] ... spræcæp," vv. 574-5] -- a transition suggesting the Tempter's appropriation of Eve's voice.

The idea of "appropriation" suggests a verbal invasion similar to flying attack, this time launched against Eve's thought and "voice." On account of her "wacran hige" (v. 590b), however, Eve is incapable of mustering a verbal counter-attack. Like a defeated flyter, she acquiesces, and so this portion of the verbal battle appears to be a monologue.

What flying devices can be discerned in the Tempter's speech to Eve which sustain the impression of a continuing verbal battle? Like many flying speeches, the Tempter's words include a threat whose malevolence is heightened by pronoun contrast:

(v. 551b) 'Ic wat, inc waldend god
abolgen wyrþ, swa ic him þisne bodscipe
selfa secge, þonne ic of þys sipe cume
Here, as Hall observes, the Tempter orchestrates his pronoun reference to suggest that Eve has colluded with Adam ("inc," v. 551b and "git," v. 554b) and that they both oppose him ("ic ... inc," v. 551b; and "ic ... git," vv. 553b-4b) and therefore are in danger of becoming the enemies of God ("he inc abolgen wyrp," v. 558b).

Like a flyter, the Tempter again proposes a settlement, saying that if Eve will listen to his words, she will be able to persuade Adam to relent and to accept the Tempter's message. She will thus be able to save herself and Adam from God's anger:

(v. 559b) 'Gif þu þeah minum wilt, wif willende, wordum hyran, þu meahte his ponne rume ræd gepencan. Gehyge on þinum breostum þæt þu inc bam twam meaht wite bewarigan, swa ic þe wisie' (v. 563).

This offer is followed by the now familiar refrain, "Æt þisses ofetes!" (v. 564a), after which the Tempter proposes yet another settlement, promising that he will conceal Adam's injurious words from God if only Eve will do as the Tempter asks. Despite this ostensible attempt at reconciliation, the Tempter is unable to resist another accusation and he complains that "me hearmes swa fela/ Adam gespræc, eargra worda" (vv. 579b-80). He then directs a counter-accusation at Adam, calling him a liar (vv. 581-2), and restating his initial claim that he, the Tempter, is an angel (vv. 583-7):

(v. 581) 'Tyhp me untryowþa, cwyrp þæt ic seo teonum georn, gramum ambyhtsecg, nales godes engel. Ac ic cann ealle swa geare engla gebyrdo,
heah heofona gehlið; wæs seo hwil þæs lang
þæt ic geornlice gode þegnode
þurh holdne hyge, herran minum,
drihtne selfum; ne eom ic deofle gelic' (v. 587).

Eve's silence testifies to her defeat in this war of words. Like an inept flyter, she can produce no response, for the Tempter's superior intellect and rhetorical skills have completely conquered her mind:

(v. 589b) hire on innan ongan
weallan wyrmes geþeaht . . . þæt heo hire mod ongan
lætan æfter þam larum; forþon heo æt þam laþan onfeng
ofor drihtnes word deþes beames (v. 592).

Believing the Tempter's lar rather than God's word, she eats the fruit: "heo pa þæs ofætes æt alwaldan bræc/ word and willan" (vv. 599b-600a).

The Tempter has not yet finished with Eve, however. Having in effect consumed the Tempter's words with the forbidden fruit, she must now absorb his final commands. The Tempter continues his indirect attack on Adam through Eve with a combination of flyting imperatives ("Sæge ... cræfta") and another settlement offer ("Gif ... hæbbe"), followed by the veiled threat that Adam really does not deserve to be pardoned ("peah ... spræc"):

(v. 617) 'Sæge Adame hwilce þu gesihþe hæfst
þurh minne cime cræfta. Gif giet þurh cuscne siodo
læst mina lara, þonne gife ic him þæs leochtæs genog
(620) þæs ic þe swa godes gegired hæbbe.
Ne wite ic him þa womcwidas, peah he his wyrþe ne sie to
alætanne; þæs fela he me laþes spræc' (v. 622).

Eve heeds this advice (again without reply) and prepares to spread the Tempter's pernicious lar. In doing so, she becomes the Tempter's flyting delegate, joining in the verbal assault on Adam, sometimes contrastively echoing Adam's words and sometimes speaking with the Tempter's words. For example, Eve echoes and contradicts Adam's insulting
assertion to the Tempter that "pu gelic ne bist/ ænegum his engla þe ic ær gesæah" (vv. 538b-9). Instead, Eve says to Adam:

(v. 656b) 'and þes boda sceæne,
godes engel god, ic on his gearwan gesea
þæt he is ærendseæg uncræs hearran,
heofoncyninges' (v. 659a).

Another echo occurs a few lines later, when Eve claims that she and Adam need the protection of God's messenger ("'Hwæt scal þæs swa laplic striþ/ wiþ þines hearran bodan? Ænc is his hyldo pearf,'" vv. 663b-4). Once again, she is parroting the Tempter who also uses the nouns hearra and hyldo to flatter Adam in vv. 504b-6, and to trick her in vv. 565-7:

(v. 504b) 'Nu þu willan hæfæst,
hyldo geworhte heofoncyninges,
to þanc geþenod þinum hearran' (v. 506)

(v. 565) 'Þu meað swa wiða wiðer woruld eall
geþeon sippan, and selifes stol
herran þines and habban his hyldo forþ' (v. 567).

Adam, too, uses hearra and hyldo, but his usage reflects his clearer understanding of God's careful attitude toward his human creations:

(v. 540) 'Ne þu me opiewdest ænig tacen
þæs he me þurh treowe to onsende,
min hearra þurh hyldo' (v. 542a).74

Verbal echoes play an important role in Eve's description of the miraculous properties of the forbidden fruit and the goodness of the Tempter:

(v. 671b) 'Hwa meahtæ me swelc gewit gifan,
gif hit gegnunga god ne onsende,
heofones waldend? Geþyan mæg ic rume
and swa wiða geseþ on woruld eall
(675) ofer þas sidan gesceæft, ic mæg scwægæþ gamen
geþyan on heofnum' (v. 676a).
Here, Eve's naive assertion that her enhanced consciousness must come from God (v. 672) resembles the Tempter's earlier claim that he is sent from God ("he his gingran sent," v. 515) and contradicts Adam's more astute recognition that the Tempter is not God's emissary ("he [God] his gingran ne sende," v.546b). Similarly, Eve's claim that she can not only hear more acutely, but now can hear the sounds of heaven (v. 673b, vv. 675b-6a) echoes and contradicts Adam's statement that he is unwilling to listen to the Tempter ("ic pe hyran ne cann," v. 542b), while her assertion that she can see over all the world (vv. 674-5a) echoes the Tempter's words ("Pu meaht swa wide ofer woruld ealle/ geseon," vv. 565-6a) and shows how completely she has been duped by the devil's discourse.

Eve's manipulation of personal pronouns also suggests the influence of flyting. Although she begins her speech with first person singular and dual pronouns which link her to Adam ("ic on his gearwan geseo/ paet he is ærendsecg uncres hearran," vv. 657b-8), she is not reluctant to use pronouns in a more aggressive fashion in order to suggest that it is Adam's behaviour and not her own which has caused all the trouble ("... wit him geongordom/ læstan willaþ. Hwæt scal pe swa laplic striþ/ wiþ pines hearran bodan?" vv. 662b-4a). This pronoun usage, together with the abundance of verbal echoes in Eve's speech indicates that she unwittingly continues the sacred flyting begun by the Tempter in v. 496b. Deceived by her words, Adam puts his trust in the wrong lar, and like a defeated flyter succumbs in silence:

(v. 704) Heo spræc pa to Adame idesa sceonost ful piclice, op pam þegne ongan his hige hweorfan, paet he þam gehate getruwode Þe him þat wif wordum sægde (v. 707).

This analysis suggests, then, that the GB poet uses the rhetorical commonplaces of secular flyting to portray the
fall of man as a verbal battle in which conflicting doctrines strive. While the debt to secular flyting is most apparent in the early stages of the conflict, particularly in Adam's heated reply to the Tempter, it nonetheless persists in the later stages of the temptation as well, for rhetorical devices typical of flyting can be found in the Tempter's speeches to Eve, as well as in Eve's words to Adam.

To recapitulate, then, the devil's various assaults on God and on mankind recounted in apocryphal and biblical texts are usually treated by AS poets as verbal struggles which have characteristics of Christian adversarial dialogue and of Germanic flyting. I have shown, for example, that the primal conflict between Satan and God in GA, XSt and GB, although not reported as dialogue, is nonetheless a spiritual battle with some of the attributes of flyting speech, and that the "Vainglory" and "Solomon and Saturn II" poets liken this heavenly conflict to flyting. The most obvious conflation of Christian and Germanic debate genres, however, occurs in the account of Jesus' temptation in the wilderness in XSt, and in the GB poet's story of Adam and Eve's fall. Indeed, in both these accounts the conflation of genres is so complete it suggests the creation of a hybrid of Christian and Germanic dialogue -- a sacred form of flyting. In the next chapter I shall show that this sacred flyting is central to OE hagiographic verse.
NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

1 Hebrew apocalyptic texts include stories of fallen angels and, in "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," the tale of an angelic insurrection: "Here Satanail with his angels was thrown down from the height. And one from out of the order of angels, having turned away with the order that was under him, conceived an impossible thought, to place his throne higher than the clouds above earth, that he might become equal in rank to my power" (Doane, ed., The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Vatican Genesis [Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991], p. 98. See, too, Russell's summary in "Hebrew Personifications of Evil," The Devil, pp. 174-220, and Doane, GA: A New Edition, pp. 227-8). Russell argues that in the N.T., Satan and his demons assume a greater importance than they do in the O.T. In the N.T., they are no longer an aspect of God or of the heavenly court (as in Job 1.6-12), but have become God's enemies. The myth of the fall of angels explains the origins of Satan's new status as well as his antagonism to Jesus and to mankind.

2 For example, OE prose accounts of Satan's fall can be found in Vercelli XIX (Szarmach, p. 69), in Alfred's version of Gregory's Pastoral Care (H. Sweet, ed., King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care [London: EETS o.s. 45, 1871], pp. 111-3), and in Ælfric's "De Initio Creaturae" (Thorpe 1, p. 10).


4 Doane says of GA vv. 18b-81, that although the events depicted recur in other texts "the arrangement and narrative movement are the poet's own" (GA, p. 227). This comment is especially applicable to the first two fitts of the poem.

5 As I have already noted in chapter five, all citations of GA will be from Doane's edition.

6 Frank, "Some Uses of Paronomasia in OE Scriptural Verse," Speculum 47 (1972), p. 212. The verbal echoes of word are actually more extensive than Frank notes. For instance, the phrases "or geworden" (v.6a) and "gasta weardum" (v. 12a) seem also to play on the noun word, as do other recurrences of the near-homonym werod (v. 27b and v. 67a below). A comparison of the GA exordium with Gen. 1.1-2 in the OE Heptateuch shows the extent of the GA poet's innovation here: "(1) On angynne gesceop God heofonan and eorpan (2) Seo eorpe soplice wass idel and æhti, and peostra wæron ofer þære mywelnsse bradynnysse and godes gast waes geferod ofer waeteru" (Crawford, The OE Version of the Heptateuch, p. 81).

7 It will be recalled that the Dan poet also describes the prowess of the three young Jews who contend with Nebuchadnezzar in terms of their speech acts (see chapter five, pp. 208-10).

8 Doane glosses "demdon" as "they praised" (GA, p. 227).

9 Indeed, their own assertion that they will divide heaven with the power of troops ("werodes þrymme," v. 27b) ironically recalls the earlier puns on werod and word. Unfortunately for the rebels the power of their words is insufficient to defeat a God who is also Word.
Doane notes that vv. 28b-31 constitutes "a difficult sentence ... which appears to express the idea that the sins of the angels are 'pains' or 'torments'" (GA, p. 228). He translates the passage thus: "Pain came upon them, envy and pride and the special pride (mod) of that angel (i.e. Lucifer) (came upon them), who first began to do evil plan(s), wove (them) and aroused (them)." Bradley, on the other hand, translates "sar" as wound: "thereupon the wound took effect in them, the envy and the presumption and the pride of that angel who first forwarded, contrived and encouraged that folly" (AS Poetry, p. 13). Whichever translation one prefers, the GA poet's use of "sar" implies a causal relationship between the "gielp" and the pain, torment or wound of pride.

The boast is repeated in vv. 47-8: "cwædon þæt heo rice, reþemod, / agan wolde and swa eape meahtan."

This kind of ironic consequence is a commonplace of demonic locutions. See above, p. 71, p. 77 and pp. 111-13.

Christian versions of the fall of angels and of mankind have varying chronologies. Tertullian and Irenaeus, for example, believe that Satan fell after the creation of Adam and Eve (Russell, Satan, pp. 93-4). The GA poet uses the more commonplace chronology (also found in GB) in which mankind is created to fill the gap left by the exiled rebels (GA, p. 231). Although this chronology is not invented by the poet, he chooses the sequence which best suits his thematic purposes.

Doane makes a similar observation in his edition of the poem, arguing that vv. 128b-31a in particular reflect "the Augustinian doctrine that the thing was created through the Word by the very act of conceiving (naming) it" (GA, p. 234).


All citations of "Vainglory" are from Shippey, Poems of Wisdom, pp. 54-6.

Both Krapp (ASPR III, p. 299) and Shippey (p. 55) gloss "boþ" as "he boasts."

Shippey translates "þrymme" as "violently" (p. 55). Even if "þrymme" is glossed as "strongly" the connotation of physical conflict remains.

BT glosses wroht not only as "strife," but also as "accusation" and "slander." Shippey emphasizes the verbal element and translates "wroht" as "quarrel" (p. 57).

I am here indebted to Pizarro who compares the hall quarrel in "Vainglory" to manniafnapr, and adds "in lines 57-65a, such behavior is likened to that of the rebellious angels before their fall from heaven" ("Studies," p. 204).

Poems of Wisdom, p. 28.

In vv. 253b-5a, Saturn calls a second dispute about knowledge, flying.

All citations will be from Shippey, Poems of Wisdom, pp. 86-102.

Shippey translates the phrase as "evil disputes" (p. 99). According to BT, the noun fyren denotes crime, and the adjective fyren means wicked. These words closely resemble another adjective, fyran meaning ancient.
For the role of commissives in flyting, see chapter one, p. 17.

All citations of XSt will be from Finnegan, Christ and Satan: A Critical Edition (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1977). XSt, like many of the works already discussed here, has received its share of bad reviews. Thus, while Krapp, for instance, acknowledges that the poem is a unified whole, he adds that it is also a "rough draft" (ASPR I, p. xxxv), and Shepherd finds in the poem a "steady loss of intelligibility" ("Scriptural Poetry," p. 35). These reactions arise from XSt's unorthodox chronology (the poem saves the incident of the wilderness temptation until after the account of the Last Day -- a violation of historical as well as liturgical chronology), and have had specious support from the ms.'s paleographic peculiarities (see Finnegan, XSt, pp. 12-36; Krapp, ASPR I, pp.ix-xxiv; and Raw, "The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11," ASE 13 [1984], 187-207, for descriptions of Liber I and Liber II, and the distinguishing characteristics of the transcription of XSt in Liber II). Recent critics are more favourably disposed toward the poem, however, and argue persuasively for its unity. Finnegan, for example, argues that the poem's structure is based on homiletic rhetoric (pp. 17-21). See, too, Charles Sleeth's assessment in Studies in Christ and Satan (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1982), p. 111. Detailed discussion of these problems is peripheral to my topic here, however. I shall limit myself to an analysis of the role of utterance in the various conflicts recounted in XSt, but my analysis will assume that the poem is a coherent whole.

See also vv. 220-1, "halige heofenpreatas herigap drihten/ wordum and weorcum."

The introduction of the idea of the devil posing as instructor here, and later in v. 248a and in v. 411a, transforms lies and boasts into the more theologically significant concept of false doctrine. This view of the devil's discourse recurs in OE as I shall show below.

A comparison of these lines with Satan's words in two OE prose texts suggests that the homiletic tone is the XSt poet's innovation. In Ælfric's version of Gregory's Pastoral Care, Satan says, "Ic wille wyrcean min setl on norþdæle, ond wielle bion gelic þam hiehstan" (King Alfred's West Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care, p. 111). In "De Initio Creaturae," Satan's words are reported in indirect speech: "Pa began he to modigenne for þære fægernysse þe he hæfde, and cwæp on his heortan þæt he wolde and eaþe mite beon his Scyppende gelic, and sittan on þam norþ-dæle heofenan rices, and habban andweald and rice ongean God Ælmhaigne" (Thorpe 1, p. 10).

Krapp notes that between vv. 674-6 "syntact and meaning indicate a considerable loss in the ms." (ASPR I, p. 246). Finnegan, too, says that in vv. 675-8 there is "a considerable gap in the Ms." (XSt, p. 119) which probably included "most of Christ's response" (p. 34), and that the lines following the gap (i.e. vv. 676-8) are probably misplaced (p. 34 and p. 119). Thus the extant text of XSt greatly abbreviates the initial temptation, omits the second temptation, and treats only the final temptation fully. A comparison of this final temptation with scriptural and homiletic accounts shows that the XSt version is the most detailed, and suggests therefore that had we the complete text of the poem, the earlier temptation or temptations might be more detailed as well.

It will be recollected that in the Blickling homily, "Dominica Prima in Quadragesima," the homilist says that Jesus retreats to the desert
"forpon þe he wolde deofol gelatian to campe wip hine" (Morris, p. 29).

For further discussion of this homily, see chapter three, p. 110 and p. 122. In XSt v. 704b, Jesus also treats debate as fight when he tells Satan that "pu wip god wunne."

32 Mark's account is very brief (Mk. 1.12-13) and the sequence of temptations in Luke 4.1-13 differs from that found in Matthew and in XSt. This suggests that Matthew is the XSt poet's source (see also Finnegan, XSt, p. 34).

33 Comparing the XSt versions of the temptations with Matthew's account, Finnegan observes that the extant account of the first temptation in XSt "falls within the bounds of the Matthew tradition," but adds that in XSt the third temptation "makes significant expansions" (p. 34). In his analysis of the third temptation, Finnegan suggests that the poet's treatment of the final temptation may well be original, and notes especially the increased violence evinced in Satan's manhandling of Jesus and "the violent response of Christ" manifested in "the imperatives in which he [Christ] speaks" (p. 35. For a discussion of other OE prose treatments of the temptations and their affinity with flying, see chapter three, pp. 120-2). Another account of the temptation occurs in the early ninth-century Old Saxon Heliand, XIII, vv. 1059-1115 (Otto Behaghel, ed., Heliand und Genesis, 9th ed. [Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984], pp. 44-5). Although Heliand's account introduces martial epithets to the scriptural text (Satan is "gerfiund" [v. 1064] and "thioscapon" [v. 1095]), the changes in the dialogue do not suggest flying influence. For example, Jesus' first reply is expanded to include a Christian gnome: "'that is gumono lif/luidoe so huilicon, so that lestean uuili,/ that fon uualdandes uuorde gebluidid'" (vv.1072-4, p. 44. Scott provides a translation: "'that is a good man's life, / For the kinfolk all, that they accomplish/ What they are bidden by the word of the Wielder,'" The Heliand [Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1966], p. 35), while Jesus' reply in the third temptation disappears altogether (vv. 1106-8, p. 45).

34 There is a gap in the ms. after v. 675a.

35 "Ond pa genealæhte se cœstningend ond cwæþ. Gyf þu gode's sunu sig. cwæþ ðæt þæst stanas to hlæf geweorþon" (Matt. 4.3-4, Grunberg, p. 42).

36 Compare Jesus' words in Matt. 4.4-5: "hit ys awritten. ne leofaf þe man be hlæfe anum. ac be álcum worde þe of Godes muþe gap" (Grunberg, p. 42) to his final response in Matt. 4.10-11: "gang þu sceucca onbæc. Soplice hit ys awritten. to drihtne þinum gode þu þæs gæeadmedest" (Grunberg, p. 44).

37 "Eft se deofol hyne genam. Ond lædde hyne on swiþæ heahne munt. Ond ætywde hym ealle middangeardes ricu ond heora wulrod ond cwæþ. Ealle þæs ic sylle þæs gif þu feallende to me gæeadmedest" (Matt. 4.8-9, Grunberg, p. 44).

38 The line suggests that Satan is a king, rewarding his thane, Jesus. Not surprisingly, this attempt to deflect the Christian weapon of confession fails, as I shall show below.


40 GB is a fragment of a poem no longer extant in its entirety. Krapp argues on the basis of evidence presented by Sievers that GB is a translation of an early ninth-century Old Saxon poem by the author of
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He Hand, interpolated into GA, between v. 234 and v. 852 (ASPR I, p. xxv). Although this has long been the received opinion about the provenience of GB, recently scholars are questioning Sievers' and Krapp's conclusions. Both Jager ("Speech and the Chest," p. 854) and Doane (Saxon Genesis) argue that GB is not a translation. Indeed, Doane suggests that because West Saxon and Old Saxon "were mutually intelligible dialects" (p. 49), translation would not be necessary. Doane also disagrees with Krapp's claim that GB is an interpolation and asserts that the AS scribe was copying an exemplar "that contained the same texts in the same order, including GB, but probably not Christ and Satan" (p. 34). Accordingly, there are new reasons to follow customary critical practice and treat GB as an AS composition. (This has been the practice of Rosemary Woolf who includes GB in "The Devil in OE Poetry," RES n.s. 4 [1953], 1-12; of Joyce Hill who discusses GB in "Figures of Evil in OE Poetry," Leeds Studies in English, n.s. 8 [1975], 5-19; and of J.M. Evans who suggests that GB is part of the "Cædmonian revolution" ["GB and Its Backgrounds," pp. 116-7]). This custom has additional historical justification, for both Cherniss and Doane argue for a prior AS influence on OS poetic texts (Ingeld and Christ [The Hague: Mouton, 1972], p. 153 and Saxon Genesis, p. 95). I shall therefore continue the practice of treating GB as a poem whose features, whatever their ultimate provenience, are typical of AS verse. All citations of GB will be from Krapp's edition in ASPR I, pp. 9-28.

Doane says that Satan's rebellion "was a vocal gesture only" (p. 133).

For characteristics of the ideal Germanic king, see Schücking, "The Ideal of Kingship in Beowulf." That the GB Satan has much in common with the Germanic warrior-king has been frequently noted. For example, John Gardner calls the GB Satan an "enemy king ... out to steal God's gingran (v. 458b) and make them his slaves" The Construction of Christian Poetry in Old English (Carbondale: South Illinois UP, 1975, p. 32; Finnegan, in "God's Handmaiden versus the Devil's Craft," ES in Canada 7, 1981, p. 6, calls the GB Satan "heroic"; Woolf in "The Devil," p. 6, also discerns "the application of the heroic code to the devil in GB," while Evans says "the attempt to overthrow God is pictured as a trusted retainer's intent to supplant his lord ... with the help of his own comitatus" (["GB and Its Backgrounds," p. 119]). Satan's kinship with the Germanic warrior or king is apparent throughout GB. He is called "se ofermoda cyning" (v. 338a) who although confined to hell remains an enemy ("se feond mid his geferum," v. 306a; and one of "pam andsacum," v. 320a) bent on revenge (vv. 393b-9).

Jager notes the overall martial tone of the poet's account of the heavenly revolt, including its denotation as a "winn" and "stripe" ("Miles Diaboli," p. 1). Although he uses these observation to support his argument that the Tempter wages a verbal war on mankind, he does not touch upon the related implication that the primal conflict between God and Satan is also a verbal battle.

A comparison of the GB text with Satan's boast in "De Initio Creaturae" (see n. 29 above) shows the extent of flyting's influence on this passage.

The ground for this contrast of modals is prepared in vv. 256b-8 where the poet lists the moral obligations of Satan ("Lof sceolde he ... dyran sceolde he ... sceolde ... ðancian").

Doane glosses "acwepan" as "proclaim" or "banish by proclamation."
The fall of mankind has other moral dimensions not touched upon here, but which are also implicit in GB. See, for example, Thomas Hill ("The Fall of Angels and Man in the OE Genesis B" in Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation, ed. L.E. Nicholson and D.W. Frese [Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1975], pp. 279-90) who argues that man falls as a consequence of a "subversion of hierarchy" (p. 282); Vickrey ("Selfsceaft in Genesis B," Anglia 83 [1965], 154-171) who suggests that man's sin lies in his subversion of the intellect (represented by Adam) by the senses (represented by Eve), and Evans, who argues that according to the GB poet, man falls because he is deceived rather than because he is tempted ("GB and Its Backgrounds," p. 120). Dubs also finds GB's Adam and Eve relatively blameless because they fall on account of natural human limitations rather than Satanic pride ("Genesis B: A Study in Grace," ABR 33 [1982], 47-64).

The Tempter's substitution of demonic lar for God's lar is treated in detail by Margaret Ehrhart in "Tempter As Teacher: Some Observations on the Vocabulary of the Old English Genesis B." Neophilologus 59 (1975), pp. 435-46. I have already noted on p. 236 that the XSt poet suggests that the heavenly revolt is a consequence of deceitful teaching.

"Tempter as Teacher," p. 435. See also Jager who says that the attack on mankind in GB represents "a diabolic attempt to displace God's spoken word from man's heart and mind" ("Speech and the Chest," p. 853).

Frank says that the presence of "ste" in "ofste" is intended "to prove to Adam and Eve that God must have meant the apple for eating." She adds that "the rebellious angel consistently inverts and denies apparent etymological ties ... preferring instead to twist language to fit his own view of things" ("Some Uses of Paronomasia," pp. 225-6). Such word play is widespread in GB. Another example relevant here is noted by Chance in Woman as Hero in Old English Literature (Syracuse UP, 1986), p. 68-9. Chance argues that while the Tempter uses the noun wasstm to denote "form" when he tells Eve that "pe weorp ... waestm by wlitegra" (v. 519b-20a) his use in v. 611-4 is ambiguous and may mean either "form" or "consequences" ("pe meaht nu pe self seon .../ Eue seo gode, peet pe is ungelic/ wite and waestmas, sippan pu minum wordum getruwedest,/ lastes mine lar"). Ironically, consequences for Eve have indeed changed since she accepted the Tempter's lar, although not in the way she imagines.

Jager observes that in calling the fruit of the tree which bears much bitterness (vv. 477-9b) "swete", Eve's speech violates accepted meaning and reflects "the corruption of discourse" ("Tempter as Rhetoric Teacher: The Fall of Language in the Old English Genesis B." Neophilologus 72 [1988], p. 444).

The Tempter also emphasizes speech acts in his address to Eve, repeating that he is a messenger (v. 557b, v. 558a), suggesting that she should "minum ... wordum hyran" (vv. 559b-60), that Adam will trust "pinum wordum" (v. 569b) if she "him to sope sægst" (v. 570a) that she "gebod godes lare læstes" (v. 572), etc. Eve also focuses on utterances in her conversation with Adam, characterizing his reaction to the Tempter as harmful speech (v. 661b) and repeatedly referring to the Tempter's speech (vv. 679b-83).

Lar, læran and læstan recur separately or in collocations in the Tempter's speeches (v. 517, v. 572, v. 576, v. 614, and v. 619), in Adam's reply (v. 538), and in Eve's speech (v. 663).
See Jager, "Miles Diaboli," pp. 1-2 for a similar explanation of Satan's motivation in attacking mankind.

Hall discusses mankind's progress from God's "hyldo" to "unhyldo" in "Geongordom and Hyldo in Genesis B: Serving the Lord for the Lord's Favour," PLL 11 (1975), 302-307. While the relationship denoted by "geongordom" is one of master and disciple rather than king and peon, it presupposes a fealty similar to that which exists between secular lord and retainer. Satan's wish to disrupt this relationship, therefore, suggests the efforts of a secular ruler attempting to acquire for himself members of a rival comitatus.

Evans recognizes that the portrait contained in GR vv. 442-6 is that of "a warrior rather than a tempter" (GR and Its Backgrounds," p. 119), and attributes the martial portrait to Germanic influence. More recently, Jager ("Miles Diaboli") argues that while this passage may reflect Germanic influence, it is also clearly a parody of Paul's famous metaphor (Eph. 6.11-17).

The Tempter's settlement offer reflects not only a literalism typical of Satan and his devils, but also a materialistic system of values shared by secular flyters.

Other signs of flyting influence can be found in this passage. For instance, the Tempter like a flyter issues a series of commands ("laeste ... nim ... bit ...byrige," vv. 517-9), and repeats his settlement offer (vv. 519b-20a).

Anderson also notes the parallel series of verbs ("Verbal Contests," pp. 228-30).

According to BT, the meanings of list range from wisdom to deceit. Although Anderson notes the parallels between vv. 516-7 and vv. 537-8 ("Verbal Contests," p. 228-9) he does not comment on the ambiguity of list.

The Tempter flatters Adam that he "to pance geþenod þinum hearran, / hæfst þe wiþ drihten dyrne geworhtne" (vv. 506-7). "Geþenoc" can also denote mind or thought, while in the accusative the adjective, dyre (precious) becomes a homophone for the adjective dyrn, meaning secret or hidden. In "Verbal Contests," pp. 226-30, Anderson provides a similar analysis of verbal echoes in GR vv. 491-546, but he does not discuss the identity and settlement motifs, or pronoun contrast in connection with this passage, nor does he treat the exchange as a sacred variant as I do.

Adam's words also suggest that the Tempter is a monstrous being who resembles the instigator of senna flyting. Although in the past, critics have disagreed about the Tempter's appearance (Woolf, for example, suggests that the Tempter looks like an angel in "The Fall of Man in Genesis B and the Mystère d'Adam," in Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield [Eugene: U of Oregon P, 1963], pp. 130-2), GR v. 491 says that he "wearp hine pa on wyrmes lie," and this seems to amply justify Adam's remark that the Tempter is no angel, and is perhaps a monster.

Adam begins by juxtaposing first and second person pronouns ("ic Pe"), but in vv. 544b-5 he appears to take a leaf from the Tempter's rhetorical book and associates himself with third person references to God ("me ... his ... sinum ... he ... me ... his").

See also Jager, "Miles Diaboli," who says, "Adam rejects his opponent's 'word' by wielding God's word: 'he het me his word weorþian and wel healdan" (p. 3).
Ehrhart traces the inroads of demonic lar ("Tempter as Teacher," pp. 440-1). To recapitulate briefly, the Tempter at first calls his lies "godes/ lare" (v. 571-2), then Eve's lar ("pine lar," v. 576), and finally acknowledges them to be "mine lar," (v. 614, v. 619).


The implications of the phrase "wacran hige" have been discussed frequently. See, for instance, Hill's "The Fall of Angels and Man" and Vickrey's "Selfscraft in GB." Unlike these critics, Renoir suggests that the phrase does not compare Eve to Adam, but rather to the Tempter ("Eve's I.Q. Rating: Two Sexist Views of Genesis B" in New Readings of Women in Old English Literature, ed. Helen Damico and A.H. Olsen [Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990], pp. 262-72). This attribution of Eve's fall to the fact that her mental strength is not as great as that of the Tempter seems to presuppose an antecedent intellectual and verbal contest such as I suggest above.

In GB, the device of pronoun contrast becomes a central weapon in the Tempter's linguistic arsenal. I have touched on some examples of the Tempter's skilful use of pronouns, but Hall provides a more thorough discussion of the intricacies of pronoun warfare in GB in "Duality and the Dual Pronoun in GB," PLL 17 (1981), 139-145.


The Tempter later suggests that this conflict will be avoided if Eve "gebod godes/ lare lasstes" (v. 571b-2a) for then the Tempter will join with Eve to save Adam ("swa wit him be tu/ an sped spreca," v. 574b-5a).

In saying this the Tempter is acknowledging that here words act like weapons, and can cause injury.


For the role of delegates in flyting, see Clover, "Germanic Context," p. 450 and my chapter one, p. 11.

Hall provides an excellent analysis of the role of geongordom and hvilde throughout the temptation and fall in his "Geongordom and Hvilde."

Eve has already made a similar claim in v. 666b-7a: "'ic mæg heonan geseon/ hwær he sylf sitep.'" This does not exhaust the occurrences of the verbs hyran and seon in the temptation discourse. Other instances can be found in Adam's speech (v. 524b and v. 536b), in the Tempter's speech, (vv. 559b-60 and v. 611a) and in Eve's speech (v. 669a). The nouns bysen and boda also participate in the pattern of echoes. They can be found in Adam's speech (v. 533-4), in the Tempter's speech (vv. 571-2), and in Eve's speech(v. 680).

See Hall, "Dual," p. 142.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE INFLUENCE OF SECULAR FLYTING ON CHRISTIAN ADVERSARIAL DIALOGUES IN OE JULIANA, ELENE, ANDREAS, AND GUDPLAC A

The notion that AS verse hagiographers considered the verbal conflicts found in the Latin passiones to be closely related to flying is implicit in their occasional use of the flying cognates geflit or flitan to describe these linguistic battles. In Elene, for example, Judas Cyriacus' father, Symon, anticipates Judas' confrontation with Elene about the location of the cross, and calls the exchange a "geflitu":

(v. 440) 'Gif þe þæt gelimpe on lifdagum
þæt þu gehyre ymb þæt halige treow
frode frignan ond geflitu rœran

(446b) þonne þu snude gecyphalt
min swæs sunu, ær þec swylt nime' (v. 447).

When this confrontation actually occurs, it, like battle flyting, precedes physical violence (Ele vv. 685-96a). Later in the same poem, Cynewulf calls the quarrel between Judas Cyriacus and Satan "geflitu" as well:

(v. 952b) Elene gehyrde
hu se feond ond se freond geflitu rœdon
tireadig ond trag on twa halfa,
synnig ond gesælig (v. 955a).

In Andreas, the devil uses the verb "flitep" to describe Andreas' verbal resistance:

(v. 1197) 'Nu ge gehyræþ hæleþa gewinnan,
se þyssum herige mæst hearma gefremede;
þæt is Andreas, se me on fliteþ
wordum wrætlicum for wera menigo' (v. 1200).

These glosses are certainly suggestive, but more evidence is needed to confirm that in OE verse hagiography
the Christian war of words is construed as a sacred variant of flyting.\(^3\) I shall begin my search for additional signs of flyting's impact on these texts by comparing the adversarial dialogues found in Cynewulf's *Juliana*\(^4\) with those found in the poem's Latin analogue, the first *acta* in *ASS* February 16, 873-77.\(^5\) This comparison will assume that differences in the Latin and the OE accounts of Juliana's ordeal are reflections of an AS sensibility interacting with Latin Christian material, and modifying it according to AS literary predispositions.\(^6\)

Juliana's story is a familiar one to students of early Christian literature, for it resembles accounts of other female martyrs such as Cecilia, Agatha, and Margaret who strove to maintain their virginity and their faith in the face of pagan persecution. Except for interludes of torture, action in such *passiones* usually consists of direct discourse as the physically defenseless but articulate saint argues with her opponents, defending her faith with words rather than with swords.\(^7\) The story of Juliana is no exception to this pattern, for in both Latin and OE accounts, speech is Juliana's chief means of defense against mortal and immortal alike.\(^8\) Thus, in common with other *milites christi* memorialized in the *passiones*, Juliana might be said to fight with the "gladium Spiritus quod est verbum Dei" (Eph.6.17).\(^9\) Although this metaphor is never explicitly invoked in *Jlna*, comparison of the Latin and OE accounts shows that only the latter places the speeches of the saint and her opponents in a martial context and embellishes their discourse with the aggressive rhetoric of flyting.\(^10\)

The difference between the two accounts is apparent from the outset. The author of the *acta* begins his account by alluding only briefly to the Emperor Maximian's persecution of the Christians, then he moves quickly to begin his story:

\[
\text{Denique temporibus Maximiani Imperatoris, persecutoris Christianae religionis, erat quidam}
\]
Cynewulf, on the other hand, begins by devoting considerable space to a graphic description of the violence of Juliana's times, explaining that Maximian is a cruel king who destroys churches and encourages his rampaging pagan troops to slaughter the Christian community:

(v. 1) Hwæt! We þæt hyrdon hældþæt eahtian, deman dæðhwaet, þætte in dagum gelæmp Maximianes, se geond middangeard, arlea cyning, eahtynsse ahof, cwealde Cristne men, circan fylde ....

(10) Foron æfter burgum, swa he biboden hæðe, þegnas þryþfulle; oft hi þrace ræðdon, dæðum gedwolene, þa þe Dryhtnes æ feodon þurh firencrafþ; feondscype ræðdon, hofon hæþengield, halge cwelmdon, breetun bocrcrafþige, bærndon gecorene, gæstþon godes cempan gare ond lige (v. 17).

These lines invest the persecution of the Christians with a violent immediacy lacking in the Latin, but this is not their only function. Although Cynewulf's focus is on an evil king performing despicable deeds rather than on a good king enhancing the reputation of his people, this account of Maximian's behaviour is nonetheless reminiscent of the exordium of Beowulf in its phraseology and in its recollection of a powerful leader's battles. The effect of this evocation of Beowulf is to place the struggle between "godes cempan" and "þegnas þryþfulle," which anticipates the conflict of Juliana and her pagan opponents, firmly within the context of the fights and battles of AS heroic literature, so that Juliana as a Christian also becomes by implication a soldier in the war with evil -- an implication which is not duplicated in the acta. This alignment of Juliana's world with the world of AS epic creates a martial atmosphere which is accompanied by a second Germanicization -
- the re-analysis of the *acta* dialogues as examples of a sacred version of the flyting quarrels of Germanic warriors.\(^\text{14}\)

Simple computation shows that Cynewulf alters the adversarial dialogues of *ASS* Feb. 16 in *OE Jlna*. A tally of the number of lines of dialogue and the number of speeches in each account shows that in his poem Cynewulf drastically reduces the number of speeches while increasing their length.\(^\text{15}\) An examination of some of Juliana's exchanges with her opponents shows that many of Cynewulf's changes bring the adversarial dialogues of the Latin closer to flyting speech.\(^\text{16}\)

In *ASS* Feb. 16, Juliana's first utterance is not only brief, it is also curiously misdirected. She refuses Eleusius, to whom she is already affianced,\(^\text{17}\) not for theological reasons, but rather because he is not a prefect: "Nisi dignitatem praefecturae administraveris, nullo modo tibi possum conjungi" (*ASS* Feb. 16, 1, p. 875).\(^\text{18}\) Only after Eleusius becomes a prefect does Juliana mention her religious scruples in a settlement offer which lacks the aggressive tone of flyting speech:

\[
\text{Si credideris Deo meo, et adoraveris Patrem et}
\text{Filium et Spiritum sanctum, accipiam te maritum.}
\text{Quod si nolueris, quaere tibi alliam uxoralem (*ASS*,}
\text{Feb. 16, 1, p. 875).}
\]

Cynewulf's version of Juliana's speech to Eleusius is much longer than it is in the Latin, and takes advantage of the agonistic rhetoric of flyting to suggest the initiation of verbal battle\(^\text{19}\):

(v. 46) "Ic pe mæg gesecgan ðu eþ ðu sceal sylfe ne
dearfe
swiþor swencan; gif ðu sopne God
lufast ond gelyfest, ond his lof rærest,
ongiestest gæsta ðleo, ic beo gearto sona
(50) unwaclice willan þines.
Swylce ic þe scege, gif ðu to sæmran gode
þurh deoþegild þæde bipencest,
hatþ þæfenfeoh, ne meaht þu habban mec,
ne gepreatian þe to sinhigan,
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Clearly, this passage varies substantially from the *acta*. Two deviations have particular significance and ought to be noted at the outset. First, the OE Juliana, unlike her counterpart in the *acta*, makes the issue of her marriage subordinate to the religious warfare described in *Jlna* vv. 1-17. Thus, she displays no interest in the niceties of Eleusius' social status which briefly preoccupy her in the *acta*, and in vv. 51-7 she recognizes that if Eleusius persists in his pagan beliefs, he will eventually attack her with the same ferocity which Maximian's "pegnas pryffulle" have already unleashed on "godes cempan." Second, Juliana's placement of "ic þe mæg secgan" and "swylce ic þe sece" at the beginning of the two sentences she addresses to Eleusius suggests that the act of speech will play a prominent role in the impending conflict. Juliana's concluding words reinforce this suggestion, for her final boast is not that she will never marry Eleusius, but rather that she will not be turned from her words (vv. 55-7). As a whole then, vv. 46-57 imply a connection between words and religious warfare lacking in the Latin.

Not surprisingly, given its suggestion that the impending conflict will be in part verbal, vv. 46-57 resemble the initial verbal blow of a flyter. Here, however, the syntactic parallelism and contrastive verbal echoes characteristic of flying are contained within a single speech, and anticipate the antagonism to come. The parallel phrases "ic þe mæg secgan" and "swylce ic þe sece," followed by the contrasting "gif" clauses (vv. 47b-8a; vv. 52b-3a) clearly delineate the alternative courses of action -- worship of the Christian God or worship of pagan idols -- which will be debated throughout the rest of the poem. That these alternatives are mutually antagonistic is suggested by

(55) næfre þu þæs swiplic sar gegeearwast,
þurh hæstne niþ, heardra wita,
þæt þu mec onwende worda þissa' (v. 57).
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the adversative relationship of the clause "næfre ... wita" (vv. 55-6) to "Pæt ... þissa" (v. 57), as well as by the contrast of positive "ic beo" (v. 49b) with the negative "ne meaht þu" (v. 53b), "ne þreatian" (v. 54a) and "næfre þu" (v. 55a).

Juliana's speech contains other features typical of flyting. For example, although first and second person pronouns are introduced in vv. 46-9 in a settlement offer which emphasizes cooperation, the second and more aggressive portion of Juliana's speech uses these pronouns contrastively (v. 53, v. 57a) in order to enhance the potential antagonism of Juliana's relationship to Eleusius. The speech also contains comparison and insult: Juliana uses the phrase "sæmran gode" to insult Eleusius' god by implying that her "sopne God" is better than his pagan deity. Finally, like a flyter, Juliana concludes with a projective boast (vv. 55-7).

Eleusius' response to the saint's speech in OE Jlna also differs significantly from his reaction in ASS Feb. 16. ASS Feb. 16 includes no direct discourse: the hagiographer tells us only that "audiens haec Praefectus, vocavit patrem ejus, et dixit ei omnia verba quae ei mandaverat Juliana" (ASS Feb. 16, 2, p. 875). Cynewulf, however, elaborates in order to strengthen the link between words and war. He describes both the angry Eleusius ("yrre gebolgen," v. 58b) and Juliana's father, Affricanus, as warriors ("hildeþremman") who consult while they ominously lean on their spears:

(v. 62b) Reord up astag,
simpan hy togædre garas hlændon,
hildeþremman (v. 64a).

Cynewulf also prefaces Eleusius' words with a brief allusion to the prefect's ferocity (v. 67b). He follows this with the participle, "daraphæbbende" (v. 68a) which not only reminds us that Eleusius is armed, but also invites us to connect the
act of speech denoted by the verb "reordode" with the act of carrying a spear:

(v. 66)  pa reordode rices hyrde
wip paere fæmnan fæder frecne mode,
daraphæbbende (v. 68a).

The speech which follows this in Jlna has no counterpart in the Latin. In it, Eleusius addresses Affricanus, but his words are clearly aimed at Juliana, and closely resemble a flyter's reply to her speech. At the same time, however, as Cynewulf's introduction and Eleusius' own words show, the prefect is prepared to attack Affricanus as well:

(v. 68b) 'Me pin dohtor hafa
geywed orwyrpu; heo me on an saqap
(70) paet heo mæglufan minre ne gyme,
freondrædenne. Me pa fracepu sind
on modsefan mæste weorce,
pæt heo mec swa torne tæle gerahte
fore pissum folce; het me fremdne god,
(75) ofer pa opre pe we ær cupon,
welum weorpian, wordum lofian,
on hyge hergan, oppe hi nabbant' (v. 77).

Like many flyting utterances, this speech consists chiefly of accusation. Eleusius argues that Juliana has dishonoured him ("geywed orwyrpu," v. 69b), and implies that her insulting words have caused him pain ("Me pa fracepu sind ... mæst weorce," vv. 71b-2b). This implication is repeated in v. 73 when he calls Juliana's Christian version of a settlement offer (here ironically denoted by the noun, "tæle," or blasphemy) an attack ("heo mec ... tæle gerahte," v. 73) even though, as he himself admits, this attack consists only of the request that he worship God ("het me fremdne god ... welum weorpian," vv. 74b-6a). Like a flyter, then, Eleusius equates Juliana's words with weapons, and answers her attack with his own accusations.

Three other features of flyting are present here and deserve comment. The first is the now perhaps overly
familiar rhetorical device of pronoun contrast. Even though
he is speaking to her father, and not to Juliana herself,
Eleusius maintains throughout his speech a purposeful pronoun
contrast typical of flyting discourse. His deployment of
these pronouns shows that although he is prepared to extend
his animosity to Affricanus ("me þin," v. 68b), his real
target is Juliana ("heo me," v. 69b; "heo ... minre," v. 70b;
"heo mec," v. 73a).

While pronoun contrast is an important part of the
verbal arsenal of flyting, its effect is limited to the
rhetorical enhancement of aggressive tone. Eleusius' speech
suggests two additional and, from the Christian perspective,
potentially more significant characteristics of flyting
speech -- flyters' conflicting frames of reference, and the
ironic verbal echoes which they provoke.25 That Eleusius'
pagan frame of reference conflicts with Juliana's Christian
one is apparent in his claims that Juliana has ordered him to
worship a "fremþne god" (v. 74b) and that in doing so, she
has committed blasphemy ("tæle," v. 73b). Such assertions
violate the accepted Christian sense of these words,
perversely construing Juliana's true God ("sopne God," v.
47b) as an alien divinity, and her piety as blasphemy.
Similar violations of received Christian semantics occur
throughout pagan discourse in Jlna. For instance in v. 121a,
Affricanus, too, claims that Juliana worships alien gods; in
v. 104a, he mistakenly calls Eleusius' aggressive affection,
"ece eadlufan,"26 a phrase usually reserved for divine love;
and in v. 129b, he applies to Eleusius the epithet "hlafor
durne" which in a Christian context usually denotes God.27
Juliana combats such bizarre usage with the insults which
Christianity customarily deploys against non-Christian
divinities, calling the pagan gods deceitful things
("leasinga" v. 149b, v. 179b) and devils (v. 221). Sometimes
the conflicting pagan and Christian frames of reference, like
the conflicting frames of reference of secular flyters,
precipitate ironic verbal echoes. For example, Affricanus
and Eleusius continue to call their idols "sop godu" (v. 80, v.194) and sop gield (v. 174), echoing Juliana's words in v. 47b and in v. 150b, while Juliana calls their religion heresy (gedwola, v. 138) in a kind of synonymous echo of Eleusius' claim that she spreads blasphemy (v. 73b). Eleusius includes the noun gedwola when he restates his accusation in v. 202.

In Jlna, the verbal echoes of flyting have greater thematic significance than they would usually have in a secular dispute, for Cynewulf uses them to show that embedded within the theological quarrel of pagan and saint, there is an equally important semantic conflict in which Christian denotation contends with pagan misinterpretation. From the perspective of Christianity, this semantic struggle is more than a rhetorical figure, for medieval Christian linguistic theory posited a fixed connection between the husk of the word and its kernel of divine sentence. Once this connection was broken, as it is in the discourse of Affricanus and Eleusius, speech lost its connection to truth as well, and began therefore to align itself with the perennially deceitful discourse of Satan. The phrases "fremdne god" in v. 74b and "tæle" in v. 73b, then, represent the first blows in an important battle of denotation which occurs within the larger framework of the quarrel between pagan and saint.

Affricanus declines to defend his daughter in a flyting with Eleusius ("gif þas word sind sop, ... ic hy ne sparige, ac on spild giefe, ... þe to gewealde," vv. 83b-6), and instead joins him in a verbal assault on Juliana. This aggression is not immediately apparent in the acta, however, for Affricanus' speech is brief and unaggressive:

Filia mea dulcissima Juliana, lux oculorum meorum, quare non vis accipere Praefectum sponsum tuum? En vero volo illi complere nuptias vestras (ASS Feb. 16, 2, p. 875).

In OE Jlna, Affricanus' speech has several ties to flyting:
It is evident from v. 97a and v. 99a that Affricanus considers Juliana's speech (like flyting speech) to be tantamount to war. He also hurls a conventional flyting barb at his daughter, claiming that she is behaving foolishly (v. 96b). Like a flyter he uses comparison to enforce his point ("betra," "ægelra," "æhtspedigra"), and like a flyter he espouses material rather than spiritual measures of merit (vv. 101b-2a). I have already noted that "ece eadlufan" is a misuse of Christian terminology typical of flyters' conflicting frames of reference: v. 102b shows that sometimes the subtleties of verbal echo arising from this war of denotation escape Affricanus' rhetorical control. The phrase "to freonde god" which Affricanus intends as an admiring comment is almost homophonous with Eleusius' earlier "fremdne god" (v. 74b). For a devout audience, this near homophony might well connect Eleusius himself with the "fremdne god." Finally, Affricanus' manipulation of personal pronouns is characteristic of flyting. He begins with straightforward direct address ("pū" and "pīn" in vv. 96b-100a), then injects third person pronouns to contrast with these second person pronouns ("se ... pū," v. 100b, and "he....pū," v. 102b-3) in order to emphasize the mutual antagonism of Juliana and the prefect.

A comparison of Juliana's reply to her father in the Latin and the OE shows similar alterations. In ASS Feb., Juliana restates her initial position to Affricanus:
Si coluerit Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, nubam illi: quod si noluerit, non potest me accipere in conjugium (ASS Feb. 16, 2, p. 875).

In OE Jīna, the saint's reply uses flyting rhetoric to transform the Latin text's settlement offer into a vigorous counter-attack:

(v. 108) 'Næfre ic þæs þeodnes þafian wille mægædende, nemne he mægna God (110) geornor bigonge þonne he gen dyde, lufige mid lacum þone þe leocht gescop, heofon and eorþan and holma bigong, eodera ymbwyrfte. Ne mæg he elles mec bringan to bolde. He þa brydlufan (115) sceal to ðeperre ähtgestealdum idese secan; nafaþ he ænige her' (v. 116).

Here, the adversative syntax of vv. 108-13a ("næfre ... nemne") maintains an argumentative tone consistent with flyting discourse. In addition, Juliana replaces the verbs "coluerit" and "potest" with a projective boast made emphatic by the auxiliary willan (v. 108), and then reinforces her vow with two other predictive illocutions directed at Eleusius ("ne mæg ... bolde," vv. 113b-4a; "nafaþ he ænige her," v. 116b). Pronoun contrast ("ic ... he," vv. 108-9, and "he ... mec," v. 113) once again enhances the sense of conflict implicit in the speech. The passage also contains some straightforward verbal echoes, linking this speech to Affricanus' speech. Juliana repeats the initial elements of the compounds, "byrdguman" and "æhtspedigra" (vv. 100-1) in the nouns, "brydlufan" and "æhtgestealdum" (vv. 114-5), in effect throwing Affricanus' words back at him. She also corrects Affricanus' misuse of Christian terminology by echoing the second element of "eadlufan" in the verb "lufige" (v. 111a), making it plain that the only love which she values is the love of God. If Eleusius cannot transform his lust for her into this correct form of love, he must search elsewhere for the satisfaction of his desires ("brydlufan").
Finally, Juliana appropriates the noun *eorpe* from Affricanus' speech where it is associated with the celebration of material wealth (vv. 100b-2a), and places it in the context of a brief confessional utterance which celebrates God's creative might (vv. 111b-3a). This combination of conventional Christian utterance with a rhetorical staple of secular flyting is, as I have shown in earlier chapters, a characteristic of sacred flyting.

Affricanus' next speech in *Jlna* vv. 119-29, and in the saint's reply in vv. 132-9 correspond to three short speeches and a reply in indirect discourse found in the *acta*. In the OE account Affricanus begins:

(v. 119) 'Ic *þæt* gefremme, *gif* min feorh leofaf, *gif* þu unraðes ær ne geswicest, and *þu* fremdu godu forþ bigongest, and *þæt* forlætest þæt us leofran sind, þæt þissum folce to freme stondæp, *þæt* þu ungeara ealdre scylldig (125) þurh deora gripe deþe sweltest, *gif* þu geþafian nelt þingrædenne, modges gemanan. Micel is *þæt* ongin and þreaniedlic þinre gelican, *þæt* þu forhycge hlaford urne' (v. 129).

Once again, Cynewulf amplifies a single example of pronoun contrast in the Latin ("me tibi") with a succession of first and second person pronominal forms. As already noted, he continues the war of denotation with the epithets "fremdu godu" and "hlaford urne." In addition, Affricanus' inclusion of "gefremme" in his threat (v. 119a) emphasizes, by virtue of its homophony with "fremdu," that his threat is inextricably connected to Juliana's loyalty to her supposedly "fremdu" God. V. 126 contains another verbal echo: "*gif* þu geþafian nelt" connects Affricanus' threat with Juliana's boast, "Næfre ic *þæs* peodnes þafian wille/ mægenrædenne" (vv. 108-9a).

Juliana's reply also shows signs of flyting's influence:
Juliana's claim that "ic þe to soþe secgan wille" is close to the Latin ("verum dico et non mentior"), but as in v. 46a, the speech act is given added emphasis because it occurs at the beginning of her speech. Like a flyter, Juliana contrasts first and second person pronouns throughout, twice juxtaposing them (v. 132, v. 139), as a pronominal analogue of her antipathy to her father. She also includes in her vow a purposeful echo of Affricanus' threat which enhances the agonistic reciprocity of their speeches (like v. 119, v. 133 contains forms of the verbs libban and fremman). Finally in this passage, Juliana continues to challenge the pagan misuse of the Christian lexicon by correctly calling Affricanus' religion a heresy (v. 138b).

In the acta, the quarrel concludes with two brief speeches. After ordering his daughter to be tortured, Affricanus asks, "Quare non adoras Deos?" and Juliana reiterates her defiance:

Non credo, non adoro, non sacrificco idolis surdis et mutis: sed adoro Dominum Jesum Christum, qui vivit semper et regnat in coelis (ASS Feb. 16, 2, p. 875).

In Jlna, Affricanus' query is transformed into a threat:

(v. 144) 'Onwend þec in gewitte, ond þa word oncyr þe þu unsnyttrum ær gespræcæ, þa þu goda ussa gield forhogdest' (v. 146).

Although brief, his speech is clearly indebted to flyting. It contains the conventional flying insult of foolishness.
(v. 145), pronoun contrast (v. 146), as well as an echo of
Juliana's initial boast (compare v. 144 and vv. 55-7).

Juliana's reply is also altered, and she responds to
Affricanus at greater length in the OE account than she does
in the acta:

(v. 149) 'Næfre þu gelærest þæt ic leasingum,
dumban ond deafum deofolgieldum,
gæste geniþlum gaful onhate,
þam wyrrestum wites þegnum,
ac ic weorþie wuldres Ealdor
middangeardes ond mægenþrymnes,
(155) ond him anum to eal bipence,
þæt he mundbora min geweorþe,
helpend ond hælend wip hellsceapum' (v. 157).

Once again, Juliana treats her struggle with Affricanus as a
war of speech acts. Here she opposes the acts of deceitful
instruction which the pagans perform ("þu gelærest") with her
own acts of pious worship ("ic weorþie"). The contrast
between the two is enhanced by the saint's use of an
adversative syntax coupled with pronoun contrast ("næfre þu
... ac ic"). Like a flyter, Juliana links her reply to
Affricanus' speech through verbal echo ("gield," v. 146,
reappears in the compound "deofolgieldum," v. 150b), and
incorporates Christian designations for pagan idols into a
string of insults ("leasingum," "deofolgieldum," "gæste
geniþlum," "þam wyrrestan wites þegnum," "hellsceapum"). She
concludes with the projective boast that she will remain
faithful to her God (vv. 153-7). Defeated by her words,
Affricanus gives her to Eleusius to torture (vv. 158-60a).

This rather detailed analysis of Juliana's debate with
Affricanus shows that the OE version of their exchange
repeatedly deviates from the Latin account, and that these
deviations usually increase the quarrel's resemblance to
flyting. Cynewulf makes similar alterations in Juliana's
quarrel with Eleusius so that it becomes a second flyting.

In the first portion of their dispute, Cynewulf
maintains a hostile tone by omitting two speeches found in the Latin which imply a weakening of Eleusius' resolve, and by condensing the remaining four speeches into two. Although the *acta* dialogue has several of the characteristics of flyting speech, \(^{34}\) Cynewulf's condensed version is the more forceful:

\begin{quote}
(v. 166) 'Min se swetesta sunnan scima,
Iuliana! Hwart, pu glæm hafast,
ginfæste giefe, geoguþhades blæd!
Gif pu godum ussum gen gecwemest,
(170) and þe to swa mildum mundbyrd secest,
hyldo to halgum, beþ þe ahylded fram
wræþe geworhtra wita unrim,
grimra gyrna þe þe gegearwad sind,
gif þu onsecgan nelt sopum gieldum' (v. 174).
\end{quote}

These lines retain the direct address, pronoun contrast, settlement offer (vv. 169-71) and threat (vv. 172-3) found in the Latin. Here, however, an echo of Juliana's original boast that pain will not weaken her resistance is added to the threat.\(^{35}\) The speech also uses verbal echo to continue the pagan/Christian war of denotation which I have already discussed in my analysis of the Juliana/Affricanus debate. For example, Eleusius' description of his idols as "sopum gieldum" not only contradicts Juliana's claim that his religion is *deofolgield* (v. 150), it also perverts the sense of the collocation "soþne God" (v. 47b) by applying the adjective *sop* to a manifestly false god. Likewise, Eleusius misuses the adjective *halig* by applying it, too, to his pagan idols. His claim that these idols can provide protection ("mundbyrd") ironically echoes Juliana's assertion that the Christian God is her sole protector ("mundbora," v. 156a).\(^{36}\)

Juliana's response to Eleusius' speech also shows signs of flyting influence:

\begin{quote}
(v. 176) 'Næfre þu geþreatast þinum beotum,
ne wita þæs fela wræþra gegearwast,
þæt ic þeodscype þinne lufie,
\end{quote}
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In this vv. 176-8, Juliana answers Eleusius' attack with a projective boast and a settlement offer. Her boast echoes a portion of her original speech to Eleusius (vv. 55-7) as well as portions of her subsequent boast to Affricanus in vv. 134-7. Like Eleusius, she addresses her opponent directly throughout, repeating various forms of the second person pronoun, once in agonistic contrast with "ic" (v. 178). Finally, Juliana attacks Eleusius' misuse of Christian terminology with an insult which describes his "sopum gieldum" (v. 174b) as deceitful rather than true gods ("leasinga," v. 179b).

In ASS Feb. 16, the remainder of the quarrel between Eleusius and Juliana consists of five more speeches (the fifth is a brief prayer which I omit from my discussion). Even though these speeches already resemble the discourse of flyters, Cynewulf's version is closer to flyting. In OE Jlna, Cynewulf turns the four speeches found in the acta into two, but retains the basic structure of threatening settlement offer (vv. 191-5; vv. 196-200 and vv. 201b-6) and intransigent reply (vv. 210-24) which is typical of flyting. Cynewulf initially emphasizes the violent context of the debate by describing Eleusius as a "hererinc" (v. 189a) and associating his speech with rage and aggressive physical action (vv. 184-8). Speech and violence are linked in subsequent lines as well, for Eleusius calls his quarrel with Juliana a struggle or battle (gewin, v. 190b), a contention (sacu, v. 200b), and a hostile strife ("laþ leodgewin," v. 201a).

Although both Latin and OE dialogues contain insult, insult is more prominent in OE Jlna. In Cynewulf's version
of this dialogue, Eleusius' final settlement offer contains several affronts:

(v. 191b) 'Gen ic feores pe
unnan wille, peah pu ær fela
unwarlicra worda gespræce,
onsoce to swipe pæt pu sop godu
(195) lufian wolde. pe pa lean sceolan
wiperhycgendre, witebrogan,
æfter weorpan, butan pu ær wip hi
gepingige, ond him poncwyrpe
æfter leahtorcwidum lac onsecge,
sibbe gesette' (v. 200a).

Here, Eleusius utters a version of the conventional flyting insult of foolish behaviour, telling Juliana that she has spoken incautious words ("pu ... unwarlicra worda gespræce," v. 193) and behaved rashly ("pu ... onsoce to swipe," v. 194). He also implies that she is perverse ("wiperhycgendre," v. 196a), but despite these faults holds out hope for reconciliation if Juliana makes the appropriate sacrifices.

Juliana replies to Eleusius' affronts with her own insult, calling him an accursed evil doer ("awyrged womsceapa," v. 211a). Then, in an obvious departure from the Latin, she directs her barbs at Eleusius' gods, saying that they are devils who lack all goodness (v. 216), that they are useless and unprofitable ("idle, orfeorme, unbipyrfe," v. 217) and that they are incapable of bestowing true peace upon anyone:

(v. 216) 'pa sind geasne goda gehwylces,
idle, orfeorme, unbipyrfe,
ne pær freme mete>p fira ænig,
sophe sibbe peah pe sece to him
freonrædenne; he ne findep pær
dugupe mid deoflum' (v. 221a).

Throughout both speeches (vv. 190-207 and vv. 210-24) Eleusius and Juliana, like flyters, use first and second
person pronouns to emphasize their mutual hostility. Of more importance from the Christian perspective is the fact that Eleusius and Juliana continue the semantic struggle which arises from their conflicting frames of reference. As already noted, Eleusius perverts accepted Christian usage when he appropriates the adjective "sop" which Juliana has earlier used to denote the Christian God, and applies it to his false gods ("onsoce to swipe þæt þu sop godu/ lufian wolde," vv. 194-5a). He again misconstrues Juliana's piety as blasphemy ("leahtorcwidum" v. 199a; "godscyld," v. 204, "teoncwide" and "tælnissum," v. 205 are variations of a similar claim advanced in v. 73b), and accuses her of heresy ("þu ... gedwolan fylgest," vv. 201a-2). Finally he restates the preposterous claim that his gods, which from the evidence of the narrative thus far seem to revel in bloodshed, are "þa mildestan þara þe men witen" (v. 207).

In vv. 210-24, Juliana echoes Eleusius' words, but corrects his abuse of Christian terminology. She borrows the adjective, "mild," from his speech, correctly applying it to the merciful Christian God who is "mildne Mundboran" (v. 214a). She also repeats portions of Eleusius' threat, "on þe þa grimmestan godscyld wrecan" (v. 204), re-organizing his words into a confident assertion of her God's ability to protect her from the predations of Eleusius' gods ("se mec gescylde wiþ þinum scinlace/ of gromra gripe þe þu to godum tiohhaust," vv. 214-5). She adds a paronomasnic play on the noun "godu" (v. 194b) saying that the idols which Eleusius calls gods ("þu to godum tiohhaust," v. 215b), lack all goodness ("þa sind geasnæ goda gehwylces," v. 216), and finally, she concludes with a description of the power of her God "se ofer maegna gehwylc/ walde wideferh" (vv. 222b-3a) and who therefore is the "sop Cyning" (v. 224). Her speech is sufficiently powerful to cause Eleusius to abandon words in favour of physical means of persuasion.

Having thus bested her mortal enemies in verbal battle, Juliana next confronts a supernatural opponent: Belial, a
devil, accosts her in the prison where she is confined and proposes that she accede to Eleusius’ demands and apostatize (ASS Feb. 16, 6, p. 876 and Jlna vv. 246-57 and vv. 261-6). Juliana defends herself with prayer (ASS Feb. 16, 6, p. 876, Jlna vv. 270-82a) and receives guidance from a heavenly voice. Following its advice, she grips the devil firmly, then interrogates him about his ancestry, his evil mission, and the ways in which he tempts other Christians to abandon their faith in favour of sin. Like Affricanus and Eleusius, the devil is no match for Juliana’s words. After revealing his origins, and confessing his crimes and strategies, he admits that Juliana has defeated him.

This summary suggests that Juliana’s encounter with Belial is a verbal confrontation. Examination of the exchange in both the acta and Jlna shows, however, that much of the discourse here is more akin to confessional monologue than to quarrel. Although the influence of flyting is therefore less pronounced in this portion of Juliana’s ordeal than it is in the earlier debates, OE Jlna still shows signs of its effect.

Cynewulf, unlike the author of the acta, puts great emphasis on the role of speech in the battle with evil. For example, in Jlna, Belial repeatedly acknowledges that he relies on instruction (a speech act whose efficacy is demonstrated in GB) to pervert his victims (vv. 297b-8, vv. 304b-6, vv. 369-76, vv. 378b-81, and vv. 499b-501a). He tells Juliana that Simon the Magician, one of his pupils, used insolent words to attack the apostles (“he sacan ongon wip ... Cristes pegnas ... hospe gerahte,” vv. 298-300), and he specifies the role played by words in the decapitation of John the Baptist (“ic Herode/ in hyge bisweop þæt he Iohannes bibead/ heafde biheawan,” vv. 293b-5a). He also explains that he instructed Egias to kill Andrew (v. 307), and admits that words were instrumental in causing Andrew’s death (“þæt he ... andreas het/ ahon haligne on heanne beam,” vv. 308-9). Then, drawing on the Christian martial metaphor, in vv.
382-417 Belial describes the devout Christian as a soldier of God whose prayerful discourse has sufficient power to rout attacking devils (vv. 382-90), and later admits that Juliana is such a soldier (vv. 430a-4b, vv. 461-5a, vv. 518b-22a, vv. 546b-51a). In OE Jlna, then, discourse is explicitly treated as an integral part of spiritual warfare. This connection of words and war is also typical of flyting.

Of additional interest from the perspective of flyting, is Belial's admission in Jlna that he encourages geflit as a way of advancing his evil cause ("sume ic larum geteah, / to geflite fremede," vv. 483b-4). Not only does this geflit occur in the feast hall, like many secular flyting exchanges, it also ends in violence (vv. 487b-90). Belial's remark, then, seems to be a reference to flyting quarrel. As I have already suggested, there are some other signs of flyting's influence on this portion of Jlna.

In the acta, Belial first accosts Juliana with a settlement offer which includes both threat and command:


In OE Jlna, Belial also makes a settlement offer which includes threat (vv. 249b-52, vv. 255b-56a) and command (v. 253a):

(v. 247) 'Hwæt dreogest ṣu, seō dyreste, ond seo weorpèste Wuldorcyninge, Dryhtne ussum? Pe pes dema hafæ (250) Pa wyrrestan witu gecgearwad, sar endeæas, gif ṣu onsecgan nelt, gleawhycgæne, ond his godum cweman. Wes ṣu on ofeste, swa he pec ut heonan lædan hate, pæt ṣu lac hrapæ (255) onsecge sigortihe, ær pec swylt nime, dead fore dugupe: ṣpy ṣu ṣæs deman scealt, eadhrepig mæg, yrre gedygan' (v. 257).
This speech capitalizes on verbal echo to a greater extent than the corresponding passage in the acta,55 and these echoes make Belial's discourse an extension of that sacred flyting. For example, "lac ... onsecge" (vv. 254b-55a) repeats Eleusius' words in v. 199b. In addition, Belial echoes Eleusius' "gif þu godum ussum gen gecwemest" (v. 169) in v. 252; "wita ... gegearwad" (vv. 172b-3) reappear in v. 250b; and "gif þu onsecgan nelt" (v. 174a) recurs in v. 251b. These echoes imply that despite the pleasant tone of his words, Belial's discourse is allied with that of Juliana's enemies. Moreover, since these echoes also contain repetitions of Juliana's words ("wita" and "gegearwast" occur in her boasts in vv. 55-7 and in v. 177), they initiate a reciprocal verbal antagonism between Belial and Juliana which is typical of flyting quarrel.

Both the acta and Jîna treat the saint's initial reaction to Belial in a similar fashion. In each she asks who he is. He replies that he is an angel, and tries to convince her to apostatize (ASS Feb. 16, 6, p. 876; JÎna vv. 258-66). Cynewulf, unlike the author of the acta, however, specifies that it is the devil's words which particularly terrify Juliana:

(v. 267) þæ wæs seo fæmme for þam færspelle
egsan geaclad, þæ hyre se aglæca,
wuldres wiðbercreca, wordum sægde (v. 269).56

In both the acta and Jîna, the saint resorts to prayer as her defense, and is told by a heavenly voice that she must seize the devil in order to learn his true identity (ASS Feb. 16, 6, p. 876 and JÎna vv. 270-86). Heeding these words, Juliana grabs Belial, and under duress he begins to list the wicked deeds which his instruction has encouraged (ASS Feb. 16, 7, p. 876 and JÎna vv. 289-315). In JÎna, however, the devil interrupts his confession with a brief show of verbal
resistance, uttering a contrastive echo of Juliana's earlier "ic þe mæg secgan," (v. 46a):

(v. 311b) 'þus ic wræþra fela
mid minum broðrum bealwa gefremede,
sweartra synna, þe ic asecgan ne mæg' (v. 313).

Not only does this echo suggest that Belial is continuing the pagans' flyting with Juliana, it also ironically testifies to the limited prowess of his discourse which he here admits is unequal to the task of recounting his evil deeds.58

At this juncture in OE Jlina, the saint responds by throwing Belial's words back at him. She echoes his "ic asecgan ne mæg," transforming the clause into a threat ("þu scealt ... secgan"). She adds for good measure an insult ("feond moncynnes") and a hint of agonistic pronoun contrast:

(v. 317) 'þu scealt furþor gen, feond moncynnes,
sipfæt secgan, hwa þec sende to me' (v. 318).

Unable to resist, Belial continues his confession (vv. 321-44).

Cynewulf makes another change in his version of Juliana's next interruption. In both the acta and the poem, Belial concludes this portion of his confession with the protestation that he has been compelled to perform his evil deeds by Satan (ASS Feb. 16, 8, p. 876 and OE Jlina vv. 341b-4). In the acta, Juliana's response is a command that Belial now tell her which he attacks ("Ad quae opera justa proficiscimini, narra mihi," ASS Feb. 16, 8, p. 876). Her response in Jlina is closer to a flying reply:

(v. 347b) 'þu me furþor scealt
secgan, sawla feond, hu þu sopfæstum
þurh synna slide swipast sceþpe,
facne befongen' (v. 350a).
Once again, she emphasizes the importance of words in this conflict by beginning with a reference to a speech act (vv. 347-8a). The verb secgan also echoes Belial's use in v. 313, and her own in vv. 317-8. Like a flyter she also juxtaposes first and second person pronouns (v. 347a) and couples insult with direct address ("pu ... sawla feond," "pu ... facne bifongen").

The devil replies in both the Latin and the OE with a lengthy recitation of his evil deeds,\(^{59}\) and as I have already noted, Julna vv. 382-417 represent a significant martial addition to the Latin which confirms Juliana's status as a soldier of Christ engaged in warfare with God's enemies.

Cynewulf's treatment of Juliana's next interruption also differs from that found in ASS Feb. 16. In the Latin, toward the end of her dialogue with Belial, Juliana asks him to explain how he presumes to involve himself with Christians: "Immunde Spiritus, quomodo praesumis Christianis te admiscere?" In Cynewulf's version, the saint's speech is strongly reminiscent of flyting dialogue:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(v. 418)} & \quad \text{"Saga, earmsceapen, unclæne gæst,} \\
& \quad \text{hu pu pec ge\text{\textipa{312}}} \text{yde, } \text{\textipa{311}ystr}a \text{ stihtend} \\
& \quad \text{(420) on clænra gemong? pu wip Criste geo} \\
& \quad \text{wærleas wunne ond gewin tuge,} \\
& \quad \text{hогdes wip halgum; pe wear\text{\textipa{327}}} \text{ helle seap} \\
& \quad \text{niper gedolfen pu nydbysig} \\
& \quad \text{fore ofrhygdum eard gesohtes.} \\
& \quad \text{(425) Wende ic pat pu py \text{\textipa{327}} wærra weor} \text{\textipa{328}an sceolde} \\
& \quad \text{wip sopfæstum swylces gemotes} \\
& \quad \text{ond py unbealdræ, pe pe oft wipstod} \\
& \quad \text{\textipa{302}hurh Wuldorcyning willan pines'} \quad \text{(v. 428).}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, Juliana begins with the imperative "saga" which again emphasizes the verbal nature of this contention. The phrase "Immunde Spiritus" is translated as "unclæne gæst," and Juliana compares Belial unfavourably with his "clæne" victims. Then she amplifies the insult by calling him an "earmsceapen," a prince of darkness ("\text{\textipa{327}ystra stihtend"}), and by claiming that he is one of the faithless ones ("wærleas")
who initiated the heavenly revolt. This last is an affront which implies the conventional flyting insult of disloyalty. Like a flyter, she also provides an unflattering recitation of her opponent's past deeds (vv. 420b-4), and suggests that these early failures ought to have made him more wary of undertaking his present assault (vv. 425-9).

There is one more important alteration in the OE account of Juliana's encounter with the devil. When Belial replies to her final query in \textit{Jlna}, he suggests that he has been defeated by Juliana's eloquence alone:\footnote{There is no direct parallel in the OE account.}

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 461) 'Nu ic \textit{pæt} gehyre \textit{purh} \textit{pinne hleoporcwide},
\textit{pæt} ic \textit{nyde sceal}, \textit{nipa} \textit{gebæded},
mod meldian, \textit{s}wa \textit{pu} \textit{me beodest},
\textit{preaned} \textit{polian}; \textit{is} \textit{peos} \textit{prag} \textit{ful strong},
(465) \textit{preat ormaete}. \textit{Ic} \textit{sceal} \textit{pinga gehwylc}
\textit{polian} ond \textit{pfafian} on \textit{pinne dom},
\textit{womdæda onwreon,} \textit{Þe ic wideferg}
\textit{sweartra gesyrede'} (v. 468a).
\end{verbatim}

The passage also contains an example of the verbal echo of flyting. Belial repeats a portion of Juliana's command ("\textit{pu scealt}," v. 456a), tacitly admitting his defeat by saying "\textit{ic sceal}" (v. 462, v. 465). This repetition of the auxiliary \textit{sculan}, however, is part of a larger repetition, for v. 462 virtually duplicates the first portion of Eleusius' disingenuous claim in v. 203-4 that Juliana's behaviour will force him to torture her ("\textit{ponne ic nyde sceal ni\textit{pa} gebeaded/}
on \textit{Þe} \textit{pa} \textit{grimme}stan \textit{godscyld} \textit{wrecan}"). In the devil's speech, however, this line is ironically transformed from a boastful threat into an admission of defeat.

The devil continues his confessional monologue, emphasizing near its conclusion that Juliana, whose deeds consist mostly of words, has confronted him more boldly, and caused him more misery than anyone else (vv. 518b-21). As Belial completes his confession, Juliana is called before the prefect. She drags the devil with her, and he testifies to
her verbal prowess a final time, begging her to injure him with insulting words no longer:  

(v. 539) 'Ic þec halsige, hlæfdige min,  
Iuliana, for Godes sibbum,  
þæt þu furþur me fræcþu ne wyrce  
edwit for eorlum, þonne þu ær dydest,  
þa þu oferswipþest þone snotrestan  
under hlinscuan, helwarena cyning' (v. 544). 

Juliana releases him and he flees into the shadows (vv. 553b-6a). She, however, goes on to fulfill her boast, and dies firm in her faith.

In OE Jlna, then, the saint's struggle with Belial, like her conflict with Affricanus and Eleusius, has a substantial verbal ingredient. Although their exchange includes large chunks of monologic confession heavily influenced by Christian doctrine, it also shows signs of flyting influence. This union of Christian subject matter and flyting form suggests that Cynewulf is here interpreting the Christian war of words as a sacred variant of Germanic flyting.

Cynewulf's Elene recounts the story of Constantine's battle-field conversion and his mother's subsequent search in Jerusalem for the remains of Jesus' cross and its nails. Two incidents in the poem -- Elene's interrogation of the Jews and Judas Cyriacus' quarrel with the devil -- are especially interesting from the perspective of this study. When these dialogues are compared to their counterparts in Ele's Latin analogue, their debt to flyting is clear, as I shall show.

Although many critics recognize that Elene's interrogation of the Jews is a battle of doctrines, the episode violates the usual pattern established for such debates in other acta and passiones. For instance, the confrontation begins as a monologue, and only gradually turns into a dialogue which culminates in a brief verbal skirmish between Elene and Judas Cyriacus. In addition, the debate, once it begins, reverses the roles of non-Christian tormentor
and Christian victim, making the cruel interrogator a Christian, and her helpless victim, a non-Christian. Because of these deviations from the hagiographical norm (and perhaps also because of a devout audience's familiarity with Judas' eventual transformation into Christian bishop and martyr) the bi-polarity of the exchange is reduced in both the *Acta* and *Ele*, and much of the mutual abuse and animosity usual in such debates is eliminated. Yet despite these anomalies, Elene's interaction with the Jews and with Judas in the *Acta* still retains some of the features of the combative *passio* debates, and in OE *Ele* this combativeness is enhanced by the occasional addition of flyting convention and rhetoric.

When Elene first addresses the Jews, her words are conciliatory. In the *Acta*, she says, "Cognovi de sanctis libris propheticis, quia fuistis dilecti Dei" (Bodden, p. 72), and in the OE she also displays her familiarity with the O.T., admitting that she has learned from "Godes bocum" that in the past the Jews were a people precious to God (vv. 288-292). There are signs, however, that this pleasant interlude will be brief, for the author of the *Acta* mentions that Elene arrives in Jerusalem "cum exercitu magno" (Bodden, p. 70), and Cynewulf amplifies this remark, calling Elene a "guþcwæn" (v. 254a and v. 331a), and treating her voyage to Jerusalem as a military expedition (vv. 246b-71a). In addition, Cynewulf introduces Elene's flattering words to the Jews with an ominous description of the queen standing in the midst of "corþra mæste," surrounded by "guþreofe hlæþ" and "eorlas æscrofæ" (vv. 273-5).

This aggressive atmosphere quickly penetrates the ensuing discourse. Although as Elene admits, she has learned about the Jews' special relationship to God through her reading of Scripture, this is the extent of their common exegetical ground. Because she is a Christian, Elene's interpretation of the O.T. is influenced by her knowledge of the life and death of Jesus. Not surprisingly, therefore,
she moves from her initial acknowledgement of a common scriptural heritage to a violent castigation of the Jews for their treatment of Jesus (vv. 293-305). In both the Latin and the OE, her speech contains a succession of verbal echoes, sometimes accompanied by second person pronouns, which functions as a linguistic equivalent to the spiritual conflict described:

sed quia repellentes omnem sapientiam, eum qui volebat de maledicto vos redimere maledixistis ... et eum qui mortuos vestros vivificabat in mortem tradidistis (Bodden, p. 72).

(v. 293) 'Hwæt ge ðære snyttro unwislice, wræpe wiþweorpon ða ge wergdon ðane þe eow of wergþe þurh his wuldres miht, fram ligcwale lysan þohte (v. 296)

(v. 302b) Ge deape þone
deman ongunnon þe þe of deape sylf woruld awehte (v. 304a).

Comparison of the speeches, however, shows that Cynewulf makes two changes which may reflect the influence of flyting rhetoric. First, he adds to "repellentes omnem sapientiam" the insult that the Jews were foolish in this rejection of wisdom ("ge ... snyttro/unwislice ... wiþweorpan").  

Cynewulf also places second person pronouns at or near the head of their clauses in order to enhance the accusatory tone of the speech.

Before Elene dismisses her audience in the Acta, she adds a final criticism, juxtaposing opposites to create a linguistic equivalent to the Jews' stubborn resistance to Christian truth in her explanation of their accursed state:

... lucem tenebras existimastis et veritatem mendacium, pervenit in vos maledictum quod est in lege vestra scriptum (Bodden, p. 72).
Cynewulf preserves these contrasts in v. 307 and the curse with its echo of v. 294 in vv. 309b-10a, but adds a series of insults which suggest flyting influence:

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 306) 'Swa ge modblinde mengan ongunnon
lige wip sope, leoht wip pystrum,
aefst wip are, inwitpancum
wroht webbedan; eow seo wergpu forpan
(310) sceppep scyldfullum. Ge Pa sciran miht
deman ongunnon, on gedweolan lifdon
peostrum gepancum oP pysne dêg' (v. 312).
\end{verbatim}

Here Elene begins with an insult, addressing the Jews directly as "modblinde." She then extends the contrast of lie and truth, light and shadow to include envy and honour (v. 308a). She also accuses the Jews of maliciously plotting slander (vv. 308b-9), adding that their beliefs are heretical (v. 311b) and that they are preoccupied with dark thoughts (v. 312a). Such malice, deceit and darkness are attributes of the devil and his followers. Cynewulf's association of these qualities with the Jews is therefore significant not only because the insults suggest the influence of flyting rhetoric, but also because by implying a connection between the Jews and the devil, Cynewulf associates them with the demonic and pagan spokesmen with whom the devout Christian wages verbal battle.

Next, Elene addresses a crowd of one thousand Jews and attacks their interpretations of the O.T. by advancing her own Christian understanding of specific prophetic texts (vv. 333-363). While in both accounts her long speech is mostly lecture, this attempt to replace the Jewish understanding of the O.T. with a Christian interpretation concludes in the OE on a combative note. In the Latin, Elene says, "Qui sciebatis legem errastis" (Bodden, p. 74), but in the OE she accuses the Jews of finding God's laws irksome and of falling into heresy:

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 368b) 'Bow Pâs lungre apreat
\end{verbatim}
ond ge þam ryhte wiþproten hæfdon, onscunedon þone sciran, scippend, ealra dryhten, ond gedwolan fylgdon ofer riht Godes' (v. 372a).

The OE Elene's aggressiveness is also evident in her speech to a smaller group of five hundred Jews. Although in the Acta, she insults the Jews ("vos quam stulti estis") and accuses them of following their fathers' blindness, she concludes that their behaviour is a manifestation of misunderstanding rather than wilful deceit:

Vos quam stulti estis filii Israel secundum Scripturas, qui patrum vestrorum caecitatem secuti estis, qui dicitis Jesum non esse filium Dei, qui legisistis legem Prophetas et non intellexistis (Bodden, p. 74).

Cynewulf's version of her speech is longer, chiefly because it contains insults and accusations typical of secular flyting:

(v. 386) 'Oft ge dyslice dæd gefremedon, weerge wræcmæcggas ond gewritu herwdon, fædera lære næfre furþur þonne nu þa ge blindnesse bote forsegon (390) ond ge wiþsocon soppe ond rihte, þæt in Bethleme bearn wealdendes, cyning anboren cenned wære, æþelinga ord; þeah ge þa æ cuþon, witenæ word ge ne woldon þa, synwyrcende sop oncnawan' (v. 395).

Comparison of this speech with its Latin counterpart shows that Cynewulf replaces the accusation of stupidity with two conventional flyting insults, calling the Jewish behaviour foolish ("ge dyslice dæd gefremedon") and the Jews themselves, wretched exiles (v. 387a). An adjective from the Christian repertory of insults is added in v. 395a when Elene calls the Jews sinful. Also significant is the number of accusations in vv. 386-95. In the Latin passage cited above,
Elene makes only one accusation against the Jews (that they deny the divinity of Jesus), but in the OE, she accuses them not only of foolish behaviour (v. 386), but also of despising both Scripture and the notion of repentance (vv. 387b-9), and of wilfully striving against truth and right (v. 390). The sense of conflict is reinforced by the adversative syntax of the two clauses in vv. 393b-395 ("peah ge ... cupon ... ge ne woldon").

Not surprisingly, this speech provokes a reply from the Jews which in the OE version especially displays some of the verbal reciprocity of flyting exchange. In the Acta, the Jewish response contains some verbal echoes, but these are rather mechanical (finite forms of legere and intelligere occur in Elene's speech and the Jews' reply). Like flyting, this speech also contains first and second person pronouns, but here they suggest cooperation rather than the antagonism which is characteristic of flyting discourse:

Nos quidem et legimus et intelligimus, pro qua causa talia nobis dicis, Domina, manifesta nobis, ut et nos cognoscentes respondeamus de his quae a te dicuntur (Bodden, p. 74)

Cynewulf makes some important changes in his version of the Jews' speech:

(v. 397) 'Hwæt we Ebreisce æ leornedon ða on fyrdagum fæderas cupon æt Godes earce ne we eare cunnon
(400) Purh hwæt ðu þus hearde, hlæfdige, us eorre wurde; we þæt æbylgþ nyton þe we gefremedon on þyssse folcsctere, þeodenbealwa wiþ þæc æfre' (v. 403).

Like flyting reply, this speech is linked to Elene's by verbal echo. The phrases "fædera lare" (v. 388a) and "æ cupon" (v. 393b) are re-arranged and echoed in "æ leornedon" and "fæderas cuþon," and part of Elene's initial accusation ("ge ... gefremedon," v. 386) is echoed in v. 402a ("we ...
These echoes contribute to a refutation of Elene's charges, for they form part of the Jews' assertion that they do know their fathers' laws, and that they have not behaved foolishly. As in the Acta, first and second person pronouns occur throughout this reply, but in vv. 399b-401a and vv. 401b-3, they create a tone of wronged innocence, implicitly accusatory and agonistic. From the perspective of a Christian audience, there may also be an insult implicit in the Jews' mention of Elene's fierceness and anger in vv. 400-1a, for such rage, as I show in chapter two, is a commonplace attribute of the pagan tyrants who tormented early Christians. Finally, unlike the Jews in the Acta whose speech implies an eagerness to correct a misunderstanding, the Jews in Ele oppose the queen with a firm assertion that they have done no wrong (vv. 401b-3).

Dissatisfied with their reply, Elene sends the five hundred away, demanding that they find someone more learned for her to interrogate. The Jews in desperation consult Judas Cyriacus who confesses to them his knowledge of his father's and grandfather'slar (vv. 419-531). In OE Ele, Judas adds that the revelation of these facts to Elene will precipitate the destruction not only of the Law (vv. 430b-432a), but also of the power of Israel (vv. 432b-435). From the Jewish perspective, this warning, albeit misguided, transforms their interrogation into a political fight, and they now become Elene's enemies ("torngeniplan," v. 568a), and refuse to tell her what they know (vv. 565-8a).

In Ele, then, the lines of a doctrinal and political battle are drawn by the end of Judas' confession to the Jewish elders. The connection of dispute with combat is strengthened when Elene proceeds to the next stage of the interrogation, for here Cynewulf expands on the Latin text, emphasizing the war-like circumstances of the exchange. For example, in the OE, a "pegna heap" comes to the Jews, who are now called aheremepel or "war-like assembly," (vv. 549-50). Significantly, the command addressed to this war-like
assembly is uttered by heralds, and the phrase Cynewulf uses here ("hreopon friccan," v. 550) echoes his earlier description of the pre-battle behaviour of Constantine's troops ("werod wæs on tyhte;/ hleopon hornboran, hreopan friccan," vv. 52-3), suggesting a prelude to war. Cynewulf adds that the Jews, now called princes ("leodebyrgean," v. 556a), go to the queen "gearwe" (v. 555a), an adjective used earlier to describe the prepared state of soldiers before battle (v. 23) or before a military expedition (v. 227). In addition, as already noted, Cynewulf calls the Jews enemies ("torngeniplan," v. 568), and he also uses the phrase "wipersæc fremedon" (v. 569b) to give their verbal resistance an active rather than a passive quality.

At this juncture one of the OE poem's most emphatic expressions of verbal warfare occurs, for Elene threatens that the Jews will be cast into the fire if they do not stop lying. She contrasts the truth of her threat ("ic ... to sopæ secgan wille") with the deceit of the Jews' words ("pissum lease"), and thus brings the dispute about scriptural interpretations into the realm of the verbal battles of the passiones in which Christian truth fights demonic or pagan deceit. There are also signs that the speech is influenced by flyting:

(v. 574) 'Ic eow to sopæ secgan wille
ond pæs in life lige ne wyrpæp
gif ge pæssum lease leng gefylgap,
mid facne gefice, pe me fore standæp
pæt eow in beorge bæl fornimep,
hattost heapowelma ond eower hra bryttæp,
(580) lacende lig pæt eow sceal pæt leas apundrad
weorpæn to woruldgedale. Ne magon ge pæ word gesæpæn
pe ge hwile nu on unriht
wrogon under womma sceatum; ne magon ge pæ wyrd bemipæn,
bedyrnan pæ deopæn mihte' (v. 584a).

Several features of this speech combine to suggest flyting. First, and perhaps most obvious, first and second person pronouns give the speech an aggressive tone. The initial
The Jews are terrified by Elene's words, and in an effort to save themselves, they turn to Judas, introducing him in terms which suggest his kinship with secular flyters. They tell Elene that he is not only "wordcraeftes wis," but also "bald in meple" (vv. 592-3), and distinguished by a noble ancestry ("he is for eorpan æpeles cynnes," v. 591).

In both the Latin and the OE, Elene addresses Judas with a threatening settlement offer. She tells him that he has two choices -- life or death:

(v. 605b)  'Þe synt tu gearu,
swa lifu swa deap swa þe leofre brip
to geceosanne;  cyþ rican ne
hwæt þu þæs to pingan þafian wille' (v. 608).
In the Latin, Judas signals his unwillingness to cooperate with Elene by responding to her words with his own question, "Et quis in solitudine constitutus, panibus sibi appositis, lapides manducat?" (Bodden, p. 82). In Ele, Judas also answers with a question, but his query differs from the Latin:

(v. 611) 'Hu meæ pæm geweorþan þe on westenne meþe ond meteleas morland tryþep, hungre gehæfted ond him hlaþ ond stan on gesiþþþe bu geweorþþþ
(615) stearc ond hnesce, þæt he þone stan nime wip hungres hlæo, hlaþes ne gime' (v. 616).

The storm of scholarly controversy which these lines have provoked testifies to their difficulty. Bridges (Generic Contrast, p. 79) observes that the lines are ambiguous, and Campbell tries to solve the puzzle by suggesting that the speech is an ineffective attempt by Judas to excite Elene's pity. Whatley takes a different approach, and argues that Judas' question is derived from Matt. 7.9, "aut quis est ex vobis homo quem si petierit filius suus panem numquid lapidem porriget ei." From this, he infers that the choice before Judas is "a choice between caritas, symbolized by the bread, and duritia cordis, symbolized by the stone." Whatley adds that "by choosing to suffer martyrdom rather than reveal the Cross, Judas ... chooses the stone" (p. 550). Unfortunately, Whatley's interpretation ignores the fact that Cynewulf adds to his version of the speech the phrases "on westenne" and "morland tryþep" which clearly evoke the temptation in the wilderness (Matt. 4.3). The identification of the specific allusion is not the only difficulty here, however, for even if Judas' words are accepted as a reference to Matt. 4.3, the reason for the reference is not immediately obvious. Hill proposes that the connection thus established between Judas' plight and Jesus' ordeal in the desert is intended to align
the former with the purifying process of the latter ("Sapiential," p. 172). It is equally possible, however, to infer that Judas wishes Elene to compare him favourably to Jesus, or that Cynewulf intends the allusion to anticipate the difference between Jesus and Judas, for unlike Jesus, Judas will weaken and ultimately choose bread (vv. 699-701a).

For the purposes of this study, however, the resolution of the crux is less important than the fact of the lines' obscurity, since similarly terse and puzzling replies can sometimes be found in flyting discourse. For example, in *Gesta Danorum*, the "proverbial or gnomic utterances," which allow Erik Disertus to defeat Grep in their first flyting occasionally possess a similarly enigmatic quality. In addition, Frank reminds us that "disjunctions, silent riddles, and obliqueness" are characteristics of Norse flyting, and she finds evidence of such purposeful obscurity in Beowulf's flyting with Unferp. In his puzzling question of Jlna vv. 611-6, Judas, too, seems to rely on a Christian version of skaldic obscurity to deflect Elene's threatening settlement offer.

In both the *Acta* and in *Ele*, the queen rephrases her question in order to avoid misunderstanding. In the Latin, she says, "Si ergo in coelo et in terra vis vivere, dic mihi ubi absconditum est lignum praetiosae Crucis" (Bodden, p. 82). She puts the choice in similarly straightforward terms in the OE ("gif pu in heofonrice habban wille/ ... ond on eorpan life,/ ... saga ricene me/ hwar seo rod wunige," vv. 621-4a), but adds that the Jews have hidden the cross on account of the sin of murder ("purh morpres man," v. 526a). This ascription of the Jews' behaviour to the wish to conceal murder, carries with it the implication that the Jews have colluded in Jesus' death. The accusation gives her speech a hostile tone reminiscent of flyting, which is lacking in the *Acta*.

In the Latin, Judas replies with another question. He asks Elene how he could know about an event which occurred so
long ago ("Quemadmodum habetur in gestis, sunt jam anni
ducenti plus minusve: et nos cum simus juniores, quomodo
possumus haec nosse?" Bodden, p. 82). In Ele, he also
responds initially with a question, but instead of posing a
second question, he answers his own query with a digression
about the length of time elapsed since Jesus' death (vv.
633b-5), then follows this with an outright lie (vv. 640b-1):

(v. 632) 'Hu mæg ic pæt findan pæt swa fyrn gewearp
wintra gangum? Is nu worn sceacen
tu hund oppe ma geteled rim;
(635) ic ne mæg areccan nu ic pæt rim ne can;
....
(640b) ic ne can pæt ic nat
findan on fyhrpe pæt swa fyrn gewearp' (v. 641).

Flyting influence is apparent here in the agonistic tone of
this speech. The contrastive echo of "hu mæg ic" (v. 632a)
in the phrase "ic ne mæg" (v. 635a), followed by a series of
negatives ("ic ... ne can" v. 635b and v. 640b; "ic nat")
shows that here Judas is engaged in conflict rather than
cooperation. His obduracy is further emphasized by the
almost identical question and answer which frame his speech
(v. 632 and vv. 640b-1).

In the Latin, Elene replies with her own question:

Quomodo ante tantas generationes in Ilio et Troade
factum est bellum, et omnes nunc commemorantur qui
ibi sunt mortui: et monumenta eorum et loca
scriptura tradit (Bodden, p. 82).

In the OE, Elene echoes Judas' interrogative hu, and enhances
the aggressive tone of her speech with second person
pronouns. These pronouns replace the impersonality of the
Latin with something closer to personal attack:

(v. 643) 'Hu is pæt geworden on pysse werpeode
pæt ge swa monigfeald on gemynd witon
(645) alra tacna gehwylc swa Troian[a]
purh gefeohht fremedon?
Elene’s use of second person pronouns is not the only sign here of flyting’s influence. In the OE, Elene also dwells on the slaughter of the Trojan war (vv. 649b-52a), and by echoing her own “morpres man” (v. 626a) in “manrime morporslehtes” (v. 650), retrospectively equates this violence with the Jews’ treatment of Jesus. Her speech echoes some of Judas’ words as well. For example, “hu is pæt geworden” (v. 643a) is similar to Judas’ query “hu maeg pæm geweorþan” (v. 611). In contrast to the obscurity of Judas’ query, however, Elene’s words begin a straightforward question. She also answers Judas’ claim that “ic ne maeg areccan,” and “ic ... ne can,” (v.635) with the positive “ge ... cunnon ... gereccan” (vv. 648b-9a), contradicting his plea of ignorance with her own claim that he knows more than he admits.\textsuperscript{94}

Judas’ attempts to justify his ignorance in the Acta by seizing on the difference between oral and written knowledge ("Vere, Domina: quia conscripta sunt: nos autem non habemus haec conscripta," Bodden, p. 82). In the OE, Judas also distinguishes between oral and written knowledge, but moves beyond this quibble into open deceit. He admits that the Jews are familiar with the Trojan war because it is written ("we ... pæa wiggþæce on gewritu setton," v. 658b),\textsuperscript{95} but instead of arguing that the Jews lack records of the crucifixion, he lies and maintains that the Jews have never heard of the events which interest Elene:

(v. 659b)  \textit{‘pis næfre
purh æniges mannes mup gehyrðon
hæleþum cyþan butan her nuþa’ (v. 661).}
In the Acta, Elene is now plainly suspicious. Indeed, she seems to have overheard Judas' conversation with his fellow Jews, for she asks: "Quid est quod paulo ante confessus es a te ipso, quia sunt gesta?" (Bodden, p. 82). In the OE, she is much more aggressive, and accuses Judas of lying and of attacking truth and right:

(v. 663) *'Wiæsæcest þu to swiþe scipe ond rihte ymb þæt lifes treow ond nu lytle ær sægdest soplice be þam sigebeame leodum þinum ond nu on lige cyrrest'* (v. 666).

Here, Elene uses a second person pronoun (this time the singular) to direct her attack specifically at Judas. She accuses him of deceit, and refutes his claim of ignorance by ironically echoing the adverb, "nu," which is central to Judas' lie, reminding him that a little while before now ("nu lytle ær") he spoke the truth, but that now he lies ("nu on lige cyrrest").

In both the Acta and Ele, Judas replies that he spoke in doubt (Ele v. 668; Bodden, p. 82). The two texts differ, however, in their account of Elene's next speech. In the Latin, she replies to Judas' attempt to separate written from spoken knowledge by saying that the "beata vox Evangeliorum" will guide her to the cross. By alluding to the "voice" of the gospels, Elene suggests that God's word is transmitted by spoken as well as by written means. Thus, she undermines Judas' assertion that he knows nothing about Jesus because "nos autem non habemus haec conscripta."

A similar but more aggressive version of the same point is made by Elene in the OE:

(v. 670) *'Hwæt we þæt hyrdon þurh halige bec hæleþum cyðan þæt ahangen wæs on Calvarie cyninges freobearn, Godes gastsunu; þu scealt geagninga wisdom onwreon swa gewritu secgæþ"*
Here, Elene also refutes Judas' claim that a lack of written records justifies his ignorance about the contents of the gospels (vv. 656-61), by twice insisting that the written text also speaks ("we ... hyrdon purh halig bec" and "gewritu secgap"). These assertions also repeat portions of earlier speeches. The verb "hyrdon" and the phrase "halepum cypan" are a positive echo of Judas' earlier denial, "nafre/ purh æniges mannes mup gehyrdon,/ halepum cypan" (vv. 659b-61a), and "gewritu ... stow" (vv. 674b-5) reiterates two nouns which occur in Elene's earlier insistence that the Jews must possess a written record of the crucifixion (vv. 653-4). In the OE, Elene's speech also contains suggestions of an agonistic contrast of "we," "pu" and "pec" as Elene juxtaposes the knowledge that she as a Christian has, with the information which she orders Judas ("pu") to reveal before death takes him ("pec"). Unlike the Latin, the OE passage suggests that Judas' failure to cooperate will result in his death (vv. v. 676b-7a). Because all of these features -- Elene's detailed response to one of Judas' arguments (the quibble about spoken and written knowledge), the verbal echoes, the pronoun contrast and the implicit threat -- are characteristics of flyting, and because all are either missing in the Latin or given less emphasis, their presence in the OE suggests flyting's influence.

In the Acta, Judas' final answer to Elene is brief and deceitful: "Neque locum novi; quia nec eram tunc" (Bodden, p. 84). His response in Ele ("'Ic pa stowe ne can/ ne pæs wanges wiht ne pa wisan cann,'" vv. 683b-4) is equally brief and deceitful, but nonetheless manages to repeat a portion of his earlier denial ("'ic ne can,'" v. 640b) in conjunction with echoes of "stedewange" and "stow" (v. 675) which link
this speech to Elene's, and thus suggest the verbal reciprocity of flyting speech.

In both the Latin and the OE, Judas' stubborn resistance provokes a threat from Elene, yet once again Cynewulf's version of her speech has the greater resemblance to flyting. In the Latin, the queen's threat is quite brief: "Per Crucifixum, fame to interficiam, nisi dixeris veritatem" (Bodden, p. 84). In the OE, Elene begins her threat with the phrase "ic pæt swerige," and thus emphasizes the potential connection between words and violence which is central to many flytings. The conflict between truth and deceit is also made more explicit in Ele by the addition of another reference to "soþ" and "leasunga" (vv. 689-90; compare vv. 574-5 and vv. 665-6). The alternation of first and second person pronouns creates a more aggressive tone than is evident in the Latin:

(v. 686) 'Ic pæt swerige þurh sunu meotodes,  
þone hangan god pæt þu hungre scealt  
for cneomagum cwylmed weorþan  
butan þu forlæte þa leasunga  
donð me sweotollice soþ gecyþe' (v. 690).

Judas does not reply, and Elene, fulfilling her words with deeds, has him thrown into a pit where he remains for seven days without food. Unlike a martyr, he cannot endure the consequent physical torment, and he begs Elene to release him, promising that he will tell her what he knows. In the Latin, his plea is brief: "Obsecro vos, educite me, et ego ostendam vobis crucem Christi" (Bodden, p. 84). In the OE poem, however, his speech is longer, and includes a confession which in its echo of his own and Elene's earlier speeches suggests the influence of flyting:

(v. 701b) 'ic pæt halige treo  
lustum cyþe nu ic hit leng ne mæg  
helan for hungre; is þes hæft to þan strang,  
þreanyd þæs þealr ond þes þroht to þæs heard
Not only do the negatives "ic ... ne mæg helan" and "ic adreogan ne mæg" found in this passage echo and contradict Judas' earlier assertion that "ic ne mæg areccan" (v. 635a), they also evoke and fulfill Elene's remark to the Jews in v. 583 that "ne magon ge pa wyrd bemipan." In addition, Judas confirms Elene's judgment of his behaviour with the phrase "mid dysige" which echoes her insulting accusation that the Jews behaved "dyslice" (v. 386). These echoes of Elene's speech not only link Judas' speech to hers, but also suggest that Elene's discourse, as well as her actions, has completely overpowered Judas, and that he now speaks with her words rather than his own.

Two important points emerge from the analysis of Ele thus far. First, the question of the location of the cross is clearly part of a more general attack on the Jewish interpretation of the O.T. initiated by Elene. In this attack, Elene's Christian understanding of the O.T. Messianic prophecies represents truth, and the Jewish interpretation of these same texts is presented first as heresy, then as outright deceit. Thus, what appears at first glance to be a search for knowledge is actually another example of the Christian war of words. Second, as my comparison of the relevant passages of OE Ele and the Acta shows, Elene's interaction with the Jews is far more hostile in Cynewulf's poem than it is in the Latin Acta, and this is frequently a consequence of flyting influence on the OE text.

A second dispute, which Cynewulf also calls a "geflitu" (v. 953b), begins with the appearance of Satan, disgruntled by the discovery of the cross:

Quis iterum hic est, qui non permittit me suscipere animas meorum? O Jesu Nazarene; omnes traxisti ad
te: ecce et lignum tuum manifestasti adversum me (Bodden, p. 92).

In the OE, the first sentence of Satan's speech is expanded, and made more aggressive as Satan blames his loss on Judas:

(v. 902) 'Hwæt is pis, la, manna þe minne eft þurh fyrngeflit folgæþ wyrdeþ, iceþ ealdne niþ æhta strudeþ?
(905) pis is singal sacu; sawla ne moton manfremmende in minum leng æhtum wunigan; nu cwom elþeodig þone ic ær on firenum fæstne talde, hafaþ mec bereafod rihtæ gehwylces, feohgestreona' (v. 910a).

Here, the devil accuses Judas of renewing old conflicts ("niþ," v. 904a; "singal sacu," v. 905a), and treats the Christian repossession of the cross as an event equivalent to a victorious warrior's appropriation of his opponent's treasure (v. 904; vv. 907b-10a). The devil also adds an insult which is not found in the Latin when he calls Judas "elþeodig," and thus associates him with the stranger and exile distrusted by AS society. From the perspective of flying study, however, it is also important to note that these martial suggestions describe a fight which is chiefly verbal, for not only has Judas' contribution to the "niþ" and "sacu" consisted solely of prayers, the devil himself calls the dispute a "fyrngeflit" (v. 903a).

In the OE, the devil's second sentence is expanded into a diatribe against Jesus in which Satan ascribes to Jesus his own selfish motives:

(v. 911) 'Feala me se hælend hearma gefremede, niþa neæricla, se þe in Nazareþ afeded weæs; syþpan furþum weox of cildhade symle cirde to him æhte mine' (v. 915a).
The force of Satan's antagonism to Jesus is here embodied in the contrast of first and third person pronominal forms ("me ... se þe," "to him ... mine") and once in the juxtaposition of "me" and "se hælend". This pronoun contrast continues (with another juxtaposition of "se hælend" and "me") when Satan compares the dimensions of their respective kingdoms, then blames Jesus for the narrow dimensions of his new home:

(v. 916b) 'is his rice brad
offer middangeard, min is geswitpræd,
raed under roderum; ic þa rode ne þearf
hleahtre herigean; hwæt, se hælend me
in þam engan ham oft getynðe' (v. 920).

In the remainder of his speech in the Acta, the devil identifies a new Judas as the source of his troubles: "Nonne prius ego per Judam traditionem perfeci, et populum concitavi impie agere? Ecce nunc per Judam ego hinc ejicior" (Bodden, p. 92), then attacks him with a threat made more menacing with pronoun contrast:

Inveniam et ego quid faciam adversum te: suscitabo
alium Regem, qui derelinquet Crucifixum, et mea
exequetur consilia, et immittet in te iniqua
tormenta: et tunc cruciatus negabis Crucifixum
(Bodden, p. 92).

In the OE, the devil also turns his attention to Judas, using the parallel syntax frequent in flyting speech ("purh Iudas," v. 921b and 923b) in conjunction with the contrast of "ær," "nu" "eft" to emphasize the difference between the two Judases:

(v. 921b) 'Ic purh Iudas ær
hyhtful gewearþ ond nu gehyned eom
goda geasne purh Iudas eft,
fah ond freondleas' (v. 924a).

He then utters his threat, but unlike his counterpart in the Acta, he treats words as weapons and suggests that he will
accomplish his vengeful ends through slanderous reports ("wrohtstafas"). The pronoun contrast of the Latin is also heightened in the OE:

(v. 924b) 'gen ic findan can
purh wrohtstafas wipercyr wip pan
of pam wearhtreafum; ic awecce wip pe
geberne cyning se ehtep pin
ond he forlatetp lare pine
ond manpeawum minum folgap
(930) ond pec bonne sendep in pa sweartestan
ond pa wyrrestan witebrogan
pat pu sarum forsoht wipsercest feste
pone ahangnan cyning pam pu hyrdest ar' (v. 933).

In the Acta, Judas' reply is brief, and consists of a curse, the ultimate verbal weapon: "Qui mortuos suscitavit Christus, ipse te damnet in abyssum ignis aeterni" (Bodden, p. 92). Judas' reply in Ele is longer. Cynewulf prefaces it with a description fit for a flyter, calling Judas both wise and war-like ("gleawhydig," v. 934a, "hælep hildedeor," v. 935a, and "wigan synttro," v. 937b). Not surprisingly given this introduction, Judas' response has many of the characteristics of flyting speech:

(v. 939) 'Ne pearft pu swa swipe synna gemyndig
sar niwigan ond sace rærar, morpres manfrea; [ec] se mihtiga cyning
in neolnesse nyper bescufep
synwyrcende, in susla grund, domes lesane, se pe deadra feala
(945) worde awehte; wite pu pe gearwor
pat pu unsnytttram anforlete
leolta beorhtost ond lufan dryhtnes,
pone fægran gefean ond on fyrbæpe
suslum beprungen sypppan wunodest,
(950) ade onæled ond par awa scealt,
wiperhycgende, wergpu dreogan,
yrmpu butan ende' (v. 952a).

When Judas begins his reply, he addresses Satan directly, insulting him with the epithets "morpres manfrea" (v. 941a),
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Like a secular flyter, Judas also attacks Satan's reputation, saying that he is without fame ("domes leasne," v. 944a). Next, he accuses the devil of being preoccupied with sin ("synna gemyndig," v. 939b) and of behaving foolishly ("pu unsnytttrum anforlete/ leohta beorhtost," vv. 946-7a). This last is a conventional flying insult. Although there is no pronoun contrast here, Judas' insults and accusations are usually prefaced by "pu," and this intensifies the force of these verbal barbs.

Judas' speech also contains several echoes of the devil's words which both link and contrast the two speeches. For example, he echoes Satan's accusation, "pis is singal sacu" (v. 905), with his own counter-accusation that it is Satan who renews the "sæce" (v. 940b). In addition, as Anderson observes "sæce" and "sar" (v. 940a), echo Satan's threat in vv. 932-3 ("pu sarum forsoht wipəæcest fæste"). Anderson discovers other echoes as well. "Cyning" (v. 941) echoes "operne cyning" (v. 927a), "anforlete" (v. 946b) echoes "forlætep" (v. 928a), and "fägran" (v. 948a) echoes "fæger" in v. 910. Judas also appropriates the verb awecan from Satan's speech in order to emphasize that unlike the devil's words which can only stir up trouble ("purh wrohtstafas ... ic awecce wiþ pe/ operne cyning," vv. 925-7a), God's word can resurrect the dead ("se pe deドラ feala feala worde awehte," vv. 944b-5).

Judas concludes his speech with an utterance which is both an exorcism and a conventional flying threat, telling the devil that he must live forever in the "fyrbaþe" of hell (vv. 948b-52a). The devil offers no reply, and indeed disappears from the narrative -- a clear indication that Judas' words have defeated him (vv. 956b-7a).

This examination of Judas' dispute with the devil in the Acta and in Ele shows that Cynewulf alters this dialogue just as he alters Elene's exchange with the Jews. Furthermore, because the additional verbal echoes, insults and
accusations, as well as the heightened pronoun contrasts evident here and in the earlier dispute with the Jews are all features of flyting, they suggest that in Ele, Christian dialogue and secular flyting are conflated, creating a new species of quarrel which might aptly be called sacred flyting. For the poet, the advantages of this conflation of secular and pious genres are clear. The verbal echoes of flyting allow the participants greater scope in their utterance than the mechanical repetitions found in the Latin, while the adversarial rhetoric of flyting (including its insults and accusations) raises the emotional temperature of the exchanges, and thus encourages greater audience engagement with debates which might otherwise prove impersonal, abstract, and tedious.

Words are also the saint's weapons of choice in OE And, and analysis of the adversarial dialogues found in And shows that the saint's fighting words are deployed according to the patterns of secular flyting speech. As with Jlne and Ele, however, analysis of the OE text alone is insufficient to prove flyting's influence: it must also be shown that the characteristics of flyting found in And are not mere duplications of features already present in the poem's analogues.

Although three extant OE texts deal with Andrew's adventures in the land of the cannibal Mermedons, the two prose homilies, BH 19 and Ms. CCC 198, differ significantly from And, and are considered by Schaar to be derived from a group of texts distinct from those upon which And depends. The accounts which are generally believed to be the closest analogues of And are Praxeis Andreou kai Matheian eis ten Polin ton Anthropophagono, a ninth or tenth-century Greek recension of a tale originally composed in the second century, and a Latin account found in the twelfth-century Codex Casanatensis. These accounts differ from each other and from And, but they have enough in common to make a comparison of the three instructive.
Like Jlna, And begins with a martial passage lacking in its analogues which transforms the apostles into simulacra of actual warriors fighting enemy forces. They are "tireadige hæleþ" (v. 2b) whose glory does not fail them in battle (vv. 3b-4), as well as "frome folctogan" (v. 8a) and "rofe rincas" (v. 9a) whose bravery is evident when shield, hand and helmet clash (vv. 8b-11a). One of these warriors is the apostle, Matthew. His brave deeds, however, are the brave deeds of the scribe described by Cassiodorus (see chapter two, p. 74) for Matthew is identified not as an expert swordsman, but rather as one "se mid Iudeum ongan godspell ærest/ wordum writan" (vv. 12-13a). To Matthew falls the task of travelling to the land of the horrific Mermedons (vv. 14-18) whose custom it is to torment, and then to dine upon, any who visit their shores (vv. 23b-28).

The first few lines of And, then, treat the spiritual struggles of the early Church as actual battles, and in doing so create an atmosphere of violence akin to the circumstances in which many secular flytings occur. In addition, by describing the warrior, Matthew, as a gospel writer, the And poet suggests that this spiritual warfare can be fought with words. A similar connection of speech act and combat is, of course, central to flyting. This connection is not made in the analogues, for as I have shown, P and C eschew martial diction, and do not mention that Matthew is a gospel writer.

In his description of Matthew's experiences in Mermedonia, the And poet continues to connect spiritual conflict, actual warfare, and speech acts. Thus, while he portrays the Mermedons as a people so depraved that they seem to be reifications of evil rather than human beings (they are "morþre bewunden/ feondes facne," vv. 19b-20a, "manfulra hloþ/ fordenera gedæg," vv. 42b-43a, "deofles þegn" v. 43b and "hæleþ hellfuse," v. 50a), he also describes them as actual warriors and treats their seizure of Matthew as if it were part of a military campaign:
These evil warriors do not rely exclusively on an arsenal of sword and spear. They also compel their prisoners to drink a potion which deprives them of speech (Matthew is fearful that "nu þurh geohþa sceal/ dæde fremman swa þa dumban neat!" vv. 66b-67). Fortunately for Matthew, he is immune to the poisoned drink, and can still utter words of prayer. The linguistic effects of the Mermedons' assault continue to concern him, however, for he begs God to spare him not from the Mermedons' spears (vv. 70-75), but instead from their cruel and scornful speech ("hearmcwide," v. 79a and "edwitspræce," v. 81a). Matthew's prayer is answered, and God promises to send Andrew to rescue the beleaguered apostle, but before the narrative shifts to Andrew's adventures, the poet (like the authors of P and C) mentions that the Mermedons' murderous behaviour is determined by a written schedule ("swa hit wælwulfas awritten hæfdon,/ þat hie banhringas abrecan pohton," vv. 149-150). Thus, once again, words are associated with violent deeds.

From the perspective of this study, the differences between the And poet's account of Matthew's capture and the accounts found in P and C have two important consequences. First, in describing the Mermedons as an army, the And poet maintains the martial metaphor established in the poem's exordium. Second, by mentioning the linguistic effects of the potion, and by treating the Mermedons' assault on Matthew as partially verbal, the And poet prepares his audience for additional conflicts which will have a verbal dimension.

In anticipation of impending verbal conflict, the And poet also makes explicit the power of divine speech acts. Shortly after the passages discussed above, for example, the And poet gives us a glimpse of the power of God's word. When
God accosts Andrew in Achaia, ordering him to travel to Mermedonia to save Matthew (vv. 174-88). Andrew is reluctant, and suggests that God's angel would be better suited for the task (vv. 194-8a). In P and C, God replies that His words could command the winds to blow Mermedonia away. In And, the poet endows divine discourse with even greater power, for here God says that His word alone is sufficient to move the city:

(v. 205) 'Nis þat uneape eallwealdan Gode
to gefremmanne on foldwege,
þat sio ceaster hider on þas cneorisse
under swegles gang aseted wyrþe,
breogostol breme mid þam burgwarum,
gif hit worde becwip wuldres agend' (v. 210).

The conflict for which the poet thus prepares his audience consists in And (as well as in P and C) of two verbal battles in which God's spokesmen and the representatives of evil clash. The first of these skirmishes occurs during Jesus' lifetime and is related by Andrew to the pilot of the craft which takes him to Mermedonia. Andrew tells the pilot (who, ironically, is Jesus in disguise) how Jesus ordered a stone angel to dispute on His behalf with the Jewish High Priest. This dispute is important because it not only depicts God's word in action, it also foreshadows elements of the second verbal skirmish -- Andrew's struggle with Satan in the land of the Mermedons. A comparison of these adversarial dialogues in And, P, and C shows that And often deviates from P and C, and that these deviations transform the OE dialogues into sacred flyting.

Before I discuss the first verbal battle, however, I shall examine its prelude, for prior to relating Andrew's account of Jesus' quarrel with the High Priest, the And poet prepares for the transformation of Christian dialogue into pious flyting by once again emphasizing the connection between apostle, soldier and fluent speaker. In a passage
whose counterpart in P and C contains no martial diction,\textsuperscript{121} the poet calls Andrew a "halig cempa" and an "eadig oreta," even though his deeds consist chiefly of didactic utterance which strengthens his followers\textsuperscript{122}:

\begin{verbatim}(v. 461) Swa hleoprode halig cempa
peawum gepancul; pegnas lærde
eadig oreta, eorlas trymede
oppæt hie semninga slæp ofereode,
mepe be mæste (v. 465a).
\end{verbatim}

The And poet is also careful to align the "hearmcwïde" which the pilot says the Jews raised against Jesus (vv. 559-61a)\textsuperscript{123} with the devil's discourse, for the pilot ultimately attributes their behaviour to the influence of the heretical teachings of Satan, the treaty-breaker ("wærlogan")\textsuperscript{124}:

\begin{verbatim}(v. 609b) 'Me paet pincep,
pæt hie for æfstum inwit syredon
purh deopne gedwolan; deofles larum
hælep hynfuse hyrdon to georne,
wræpum wærlogan' (v. 613a).\textsuperscript{125}
\end{verbatim}

Having cast Andrew in the role of a warrior whose most conspicuous deed is speech, and having implied that the Jews are mouthpieces for the deceitful teachings of the devil, the And poet introduces the first skirmish of the verbal war between the forces of God and the forces of the devil as if it were a court flyting.\textsuperscript{126} While all three texts provide a similar account of Jesus' and his disciples' entry into the temple,\textsuperscript{127} only in And is the Jewish priest described as an individual who, like Unferp, is ready to unleash slanderous and harmful words upon visitors to his territory\textsuperscript{128}:

\begin{verbatim}(v. 669b) 'us[i]c worde ongan
purh inwitpanc ealdor sacerd
herme hyspan; hordlocan onspeon,
wroht webbade (v. 672a)
....
(v. 674b) he lungre ahof
wope wiþerhydig, wean onblonden' (v. 675).\textsuperscript{129}
\end{verbatim}
Shortly after this, the High Priest calls Jesus foreign ("ellpeodiges," v. 678a). The remark is puzzling in the light of the priest's subsequent assertion that he knows the identity of Jesus' parents (vv. 682b-8). However, from the context of court flying, the charge that Jesus is elfreodig makes more sense, for it reinforces the parallel between this meeting at the temple door and the court flying exchange on the threshold of the hall, by casting Jesus in the role of the newly-arrived stranger confronting society's spokesman.

Comparison of the And poet's account of the priest's speech with that given in the analogues shows that the AS poet alters his version of the priest's discourse in order to augment similarities to flying already inherent in the analogues. In C, the High Priest couples insulting direct address with an implicit accusation of deceit, and ridicules Jesus' claim to divinity:

O vos miserrimi quare sequimini et ambulatis cum ipso qui dicit quia dei filius sum, et quis est qui dicitur quia deus filium habet? Quis enim vidit eum aliquando cum muliere loquentem? Nonne hic est filius ioseph phabri, et mater illius maria, et fratres eius iacob, et alius qui dicitur symon (C 12, 11. 12-17, p. 55).

And retains the direct address and unpleasant tone of the speech found in P and C, but the poet's treatment of the initial insult gives it a Germanic twist as the following passage shows:

(v. 676) 'Hwaet, ge syndon earme ofer ealle men! Wadaþ widlastas, weorn geferan earfopsiþa; ellpeodiges nu butan lecdrihte larum hyraþ, eadiges orhlytte' (v. 680a).

Here, the poet translates "miserrimi" with the adjective "earme," then follows this adjective, which is conventionally
associated in AS poetry with the state of exile, with other conventional attributes of exile, such as the wandering of difficult paths (vv. 677-8a), allegiance to a foreigner (v. 678b), landlessness (v. 679a), and joylessness (v. 680a).\footnote{133} This Germanicization of the brief insult found in P and C makes the High Priest's speech in \textit{And} sound like the opening salvo of a flying battle. Significantly, the military incompetence, disloyalty, cowardice and criminality which were usually believed to precipitate exile were also the staples of flying insult.\footnote{134}

This alteration not only increases the speech's similarity to flying initiation, it also gives the OE dialogue a complexity lacking in the analogues. This complexity arises from an ambivalence in the secular view of exile, as well as from the noun's unique connotations for a Christian audience. Although, as I have noted, in a secular context an exile was usually an individual whose statelessness originated in some disgrace, the noun could occasionally refer to an heroic individual such as Beowulf who leaves his home in order to perform brave deeds.\footnote{135} This positive connotation of exile fits well with devout notions of Jesus, for not only does Jesus' salvatory mission on earth have heroic overtones,\footnote{136} his divine nature can easily be construed as the ultimate expression of the hero's innate superiority. Furthermore, a pious audience was probably already predisposed to see exile in a favourable light, since the AS missionary \textit{peregrinus} spent much of his life wandering far from home. From the Christian perspective this was not a condition to be despised, for as Campbell explains (using the example of Andrew as "missionary \textit{par excellence}") AS Christians saw the \textit{peregrini}'s exile as "a new kind of warrior adventure in the service of their Heavenly Lord."\footnote{137} This positive attitude toward the cluster of characteristics which denote exile is confirmed by the \textit{And} poet himself. For example, in vv. 1-18, he praises the exilic missions of the apostles; in vv. 230-4, he describes Andrew's mission to a
foreign land as an heroic enterprise; and in vv. 323-9, he has Andrew attest that the itinerant and impoverished state of Jesus' comitatus is an honourable condition.

This inherent ambivalence in the connotations of exile endows vv. 676-80a with an irony lacking in the analogues, for although the High Priest acts as an effective flyting initiator by saying that Jesus (like a disgraced exile) is homeless and lacks the possessions and land which in a profane world testify to an individual's merit, from a devout perspective, the High Priest is demonstrating his own incapacity to distinguish the materialistic values of the temporal world from the spiritual values of Christianity, while at the same time unwittingly testifying that Jesus is both hero and God.\textsuperscript{138}

The And poet unites Christian and secular convention with equal effectiveness in the second portion of the High Priest's speech. The sarcastic interrogatives of P and C are omitted (see n. 132, above), and instead the High Priest, like a flyter, challenges his opponent's reputation by attacking his genealogy.\textsuperscript{139} He begins by repeating the disciples' claim that Jesus is the Son of God:

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 680b)  'æpeling cyæp,
secgaæ soplice  þæt mid suna meotudes
drohtigen dæghwæmllice!'  (v. 682a).
\end{verbatim}

The High Priest then treats this, his own utterance, as if it were an opponent's speech and attacks it, using not only the familiar device of pronoun contrast (third person pronominal forms are contrasted with a first person plural), but also the word-play and verbal echoes of conventional flyting:

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 682b)  'þæt is dugum cuþ,
hwanon þam ordfruman  æpelu onwocan;
he wæs afeded  on þyssse folcscearc,
(685) cildgeong acenned  mid his cneomagum.
þus syndon haten  hamsittende
fæder ond modur,  þæs we gefrægen habbæp
\end{verbatim}
Here, the High Priest alters the phrase "aepeling cyrap" (v. 680b) slightly, uttering the nearly homophonous "cup ... aepelu" (vv. 682b-3) and echoing the noun aepeling again in "aepelum," (v. 689a). In this way, the High Priest attempts to turn his version of the disciples' words against them by responding to the claim that Jesus is God (and thus a champion, prince or "aepeling") with the revelation that He has a human family (aepelu). The High Priest emphasizes his point with syntactic parallelism, implying Jesus is not "suna meotudes" (v. 681b) but like Simon and Jacob is "suna Iosephes" (v. 691a).

This attack is not as misdirected as the High Priest's charge of exile, for the assertion that an individual's genealogical claims are incorrect is an unambiguous insult from secular and sacred perspectives alike. In the comitatus society of AS England, an attack on an opponent's ancestry was tantamount to an attack upon his honour.\textsuperscript{140} For AS kings in particular, the insult had a special significance, for a king's claim to regal office depended upon his birth.\textsuperscript{141} From the Christian point of view, the implications of the insult are even more profound. Not only does the High Priest's assertion that Mary and Joseph are Jesus' parents attack Jesus' status as heavenly king ("wulorcyning," v. 418a, v. 801a, v. 1447b etc.), it also calls into question the most basic tenet of the Christian faith -- that Jesus is the Son of God, not the son of Joseph. Of almost equal importance, the suggestion that Jesus has lied about his parentage carries with it the additional implication that all Jesus' lar which the disciples follow (v. 679b) and which constitutes the core of Church doctrine is also a lie.

In all three texts, Jesus does not respond at once to the High Priest's words, but instead travels to the desert to
perform miracles. There are several differences between P and C's account at this point, but for the most part they are trivial. One difference ought to be noted, however. In C the disciples' faith remains unshaken despite the priest's words ("Nos autem audientes hec [sic] verba incredulitatis, nichil eorum respondentibus, set cor nostrum perseveravit in verbo veritatis eius," 12, 11. 17-18, p. 55). In P, on the other hand, the High Priest seems to have won the first round of the verbal skirmish, for the disciples' "hearts turn weak" (p. 8). Not surprisingly given his initial description of the apostles as "tireadig hæleþ" who are not lacking in valour (vv. 2-6), the And poet follows C and omits any mention of the disciples' doubt.

In P, C, and And, Jesus chooses a statue to act as his flyting delegate, and orders it to speak. In both P and C, Jesus' command to the stone figure has no particular rhetorical connection to the High Priest's speech:

```
```

In And, on the other hand, verbal echoes link Jesus' speech to the stone figure to the discourse of the High Priest:

```
(v. 729) 'Nu ic bebeode  beacon ætywan,
  wundor gewesorpán  on wera gemange,
  þæt þeos onlicnes  eorpán sece
  wlitig of wage,  ond word sprece,
  secge sopcwidum,  þy sceolon [sel] gelyfan
  eorlas on cypphe,  hwæt min æpelo sien' (v. 734).
```

In these instructions to the stone angel, Jesus borrows key words and phrases from the High Priest, telling the stone figure to "secge sopcwidum" (echoing the High Priest's sarcastic "secgap soplice," v. 681a) in order that men may
know his true lineage ("on cyppe ... min aipel") rather than
the false genealogy propounded by the High Priest in similar
language ("aipeling cyrap," v. 680b; "cup ... aipelu," v. 683b
and "aipelum," v. 689a). These echoes make Jesus' speech seem
part of the flying even though Jesus is not speaking
directly to the High Priest, and delegates His counter-
assault to the stone angel.

Compelled by the unique power of God's word, the stone
angel addresses Jesus' enemies. In P and C, it begins with
insults, saying that the Jews are stupid and blind.\textsuperscript{145} In \textit{And}
v. 744, like a flyter, the statue hurls one of the High
Priest's own insults back at him in a speech whose first line
closely resembles v. 676 (compare "ge syndon earmra" and "ge
synd ... earmra gepohta"), adding that the priest is wicked
("unlaede"), deceived by treachery (v. 745a), and confused (v.
746a):

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 744) 'Ge synd unlaede, earmra gepohta
searrowum beswicene, opfe sel nyton,
mode gemyrde' (v. 746a).
\end{verbatim}

Once these introductory insults are completed, in all
three accounts the stone angel replies to the High Priest's
claim that Jesus is a mere mortal with a confessional
recitation of Jesus' creative power. Here, \textit{And} follows P and
C quite closely:

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 746b) 'ge mon cigap
Godes ece bearn ond pone pe grund ond sund,
heofon ond eorpan ond hreo wagas,
sealte sastreamas ond swegl uppe
amearcode mundum sinum' (v. 750).
\end{verbatim}\textsuperscript{146}

In P and C, the statue continues its defense of Jesus by
explaining that Jesus is the God of the Jewish patriarchs:

\begin{verbatim}
Hic est qui locutus est cum abraam, qui dilexit
filius [sic] eius isaac, qui convertit iacob in
terram suam, et apparuit ei in eremo, fecitque ei
\end{verbatim}
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multa bona, hic est qui eduxit et dedit eis aqua [sic] de petra fluenti. Ipse est ergo, qui preparavit iudicium, et ornamenta, et non crediderunt in eum (C, 14, 11. 9-13, p. 59).  

In P and C, the stone figure then concludes with a lengthy criticism of Jewish religious practices.  

Although in And the stone angel also uses the testimony of Scripture to parry the High Priest's verbal thrusts, the And poet makes some important changes in his version of the statue's speech which heighten its resemblance to flyting:

(v. 751) 'pis is se ilca ealwalda God,  
pone on fyrndagum fañeras cupon;  
he Abrahame ond Isace  
ond Iacobe gife bryttode,  
(755) welum weorpode, wordum sægde  
ærest Habrahame æpeles gepingu,  
pæt of his cynne cenned sceolde  
weorpan wulures God. Is seo wyrd mid eow  
open orgete, magan eagum nu  
geseon sigores God, swegles agend' (v. 760).  

Here, the And poet Germanizes Jesus' attributes as good leader. Where P and C say that Jesus does "good things" for his followers, the And poet interprets this behaviour as the gift-giving which binds the Germanic comitatus to its chief ("he ... gife bryttode,/ welum weorpode," vv. 753-5a).  

In this way, the stone angel deflects the conventional Germanic insult that Jesus is an exile with no land (vv. 676-9a) with an equally conventional Germanic encomium of Jesus as a good leader who gives treasure. Furthermore, in response to the High Priest's deliberate misinterpretation of Jesus' ancestry, the statue paraphrases a portion of Jesus' royal genealogy found in the N.T. (compare vv. 755b-8b with Matt. 1.1-2150), again fighting for Jesus with the word of God. Neither the mention of gift-giving nor the correction of Jesus' genealogy occur in either P or C, so these specific refutations of the High Priest's calumnies which suggest the
agonistic reciprocity of flyting attack and reply seem likely to be the And poet's own invention.

This agonistic reciprocity is not limited to the subject matter of the two speeches, but extends to their formal features as well, for the link between claim and counter-claim is also reinforced by the repetitions and echoes of flyting rhetoric. For example, the stone angel identifies Jesus in vv. 751-5a as the God whom the "fæderas cuþon" (v. 752b), thus contrasting the patriarchs' spiritual wisdom in recognizing Jesus as God with the misunderstanding of Jesus' nature which the High Priest promulgates and maintains is known to all ("duguþum cuþ," v. 682b). As I have already shown, the statue then responds to the High Priest's insistence that Joseph is Jesus' father with the reminder that Jesus' human lineage includes the patriarch Abraham (vv. 756-8). In making this statement, the statue echoes the noun æpælu, which the High Priest intends as an insult to Jesus' divinity (v. 683 and v. 689) in the nearly homophonous, but semantically ameliorative adjective æpæla (v. 756), thus reasserting something close to the disciples' claim (mockingly recapitulated by the High Priest in v. 680a) that Jesus is "æþeling." God's promise to Abraham (related by the statue in vv. 757-8a) that "of his cynne cenned sceolde/weorþan wuldres God" likewise contrastively echoes the verb "acenned" used by the High Priest in his attack on Jesus' claims to divinity in v. 685b.

Despite the marvellous display of the perlocutionary power of Jesus' words implicit in his animation of the statue, as well as the stone angel's own verbal expertise, the High Priest and the elders remain unconvinced, and accuse Jesus of sorcery (And vv. 761-67a and P, p. 10). In a second effort to persuade them, Jesus commands the stone angel to travel to the burial place of the patriarchs, and to resurrect Abraham, Isaac and Jacob so that they, too, may confess Jesus' divinity (vv. 773-785, and vv. 796b-802a). In neither P nor And do the hagiographers report the
patriarchs' words directly, but *And* poet tells us through Andrew that the patriarchs' speech terrifies the Jewish audience:

(v. 804b) \[ 'pa \ pæt \ folc \ gewearp \]
\[ egesan \ geaclod, \ paer \ pa \ æpelingsas \]
\[ wordum \ weorðodon \ wuldres \ aldor' \ (v. 806). \]

There is no further response from the High Priest except the silence which signals flying defeat.\(^{153}\)

Shortly after Andrew finishes telling the pilot this story, the apostle falls asleep, and is carried by angels to Mermedonia (vv. 822-8a) where he is reunited with his *comitatus* of disciples (vv. 847-91) and meets Jesus again (vv. 910-17).\(^{154}\) At this point in all three texts, Jesus reveals himself to Andrew, and warns him of his impending ordeal. In *And* alone, the martial metaphor continues, and Jesus describes the apostle's mission as if it were a battle:

(v. 950) \[ 'Nu \ \p, \ Andreas, \ scealt, \ edre \ geneðan \]
\[ in \ gramra \ gripe. \ Is \ \p \ guþ \ weotod \]
\[ heardum \ heoruswengum' \ v. 952a).\(^{155}\)

In all three accounts, Jesus explains to Andrew that the coming hardships will be like His Easter Passion. Although in P and C, the hagiographers hint that words play a part in this event,\(^{156}\) the *And* poet gives greater attention to the role of speech acts in Jesus' ordeal:

(v. 960) \[ 'læt \ \p \ on \ gemynudum, \ hu \ \p \ manegum \ wearp \]
\[ fira \ gefrege \ geond \ feala \ landa, \]
\[ \p \ me \ bysmredon \ bennum \ fæstne \]
\[ weras \ wansalige, \ wordum \ tyrsgdon, \]
\[ slogan \ ond \ swungon. \ Synnige \ ne \ mihton \]
\[ þurh \ sarcwode \ scþ \ gecyþan \ (v. 965) \]

....

(v. 970b) \[ wolde \ ic \ eow \ on \ þon \]
\[ þurh \ bliþne \ hige \ bysne \ onstellan \]
\[ swa \ on \ ellþeode \ ywed \ wyrþep' \ (v. 972). \]
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The fact that in this passage "bysmredon," and "wordum tyrgdon," are followed by the verbs "slogon" and "swungon" suggests that insult and "sarcwide" are as much a part of the scourging as are the actual physical blows. Moreover, since Jesus' Passion is the model for Andrew's spiritual "guþ" (vv. 970b-2), it is clear that Andrew, too, must endure a similar combination of verbal and physical abuse. Andrew will not lack verbal weapons to counter slander and insult, however, for Jesus tells Andrew that the apostle will redeem the Mermedons (and thus win his spiritual battle) by means of Jesus' name:

(v. 973) 'Manige syndon in ðysse mæran byrig
para þe þu gehweorfest in heofonleohte
purh minne naman' (v. 975a).

Compared to the authors of P and C, then, the And poet is careful to imply a link not only between the coming spiritual struggle and actual "guþ," but also between spiritual "guþ" and a verbal battle in which harmful words are endured, but the name of God ensures victory. The And poet reinforces the first link in this chain of association by describing the apostle setting out toward the city of Mermedonia as if he were an epic warrior preparing to join battle:

(v. 981) þa wæs gemyndig modgeþyldig,
beorn beaduwe heard; eode in burh hraþe
anræd oretta, elne gefyrþred,
maga mode rof, meotude getreowe (v. 984).158

This "Cristes cempa" (v. 991a) and "hæle hildedeor" (v. 1002a) swiftly fulfills the first part of his mission, freeing Matthew and the other captives from their prison.159

Enraged at the loss of their food supply, the starving and desperate Mermedons turn to the devil for help, and in all accounts, the devil is quick to respond. In P and C, he appears in the innocuous guise of an old man.160 The And
poet, however, describes him in language which links Christian epithets for Satan ("deofol," "morpres brytta") with adjectives and nouns which suggest both the deformity characteristic of some epic taunters, and the monstrosity of the supernatural contender of 

senna flying ("wann ond whiteleas," "weriges hiw," "helle hinca"). The poet also reasserts the connection between speech and aggression, characterizing Satan's discourse as accusations with hostile intent ("ongan pā meldigan ... wiþerhycgende," v. 1170-2a):

(v. 1168) pā for pære dugoðe deoful ætywde
wann ond whiteleas; hæfde weriges hiw.
(1170) Ongan pā meldigan morpres brytta,
helle hinca, Pone halgan wer
wiþerhycgende (v. 1172a).

Comparison shows that to a greater extent than in either C or P, And treats the devil's words as flyting speech. In C, the devil laments the depletion of the Mermedonian food stores, identifies Andrew (whom he calls a peregrinus) as the cause of the Mermedons' wretchedness, and exhorts the Mermedons to kill the apostle. Significantly, the devil adds that Andrew is dangerous because of his speech ("enarrat omnia opera nostrā"): ve nobis quia iam perimus non invenientes victum.
Quid facimus? nec oves neque boves habemus, ut
sufficere nobis possint. Sed tantum si me vultis
audire, inquirite diligenter, quoniam hic est unus
de peregrinis nomine andrea, tenete et occidite
eum. Nam si illum non occiditis, nullatenus ipse
dimictet vos facere quod vultis, quibus in carcere
tenebamus, et enarrat omnia opera nostra. Ipse est
qui dimisit victos nostros per cunctis locis, vicos
et civitates, proptererea extraneus hic inveniuntur
ut manducemus (C, 24, ll. 11-19, p. 79).

Although in And, the devil's first words are also addressed to his Mermedon allies, his speech from the outset has some of the characteristics of flyting. For instance, he eschews the initial lament of C and P, and instead turns his
attention immediately to Andrew whom he rather deviously insults:

(v. 1173) 'Her is gefered ofer feorne weg æapelina sum innan ceastre ellpeodigra, Þone ic Andreas nemnan herde' (v. 1176a).

In this passage, the devil identifies Andrew not as a Christian *peregrinus* (as in C), but rather as one who is *elpeodig*. The change in appellation is significant because, as I have shown, the adjective *elpeodig* is part of the cluster of attributes assigned to the despised secular exile, and thus constitutes an insult. This adjective retrospectively alters the usually positive connotations of the noun *æpelining*, making the title a sarcastic taunt similar to that uttered by the High Priest. Indeed, comparison of this passage with the High Priest's speech in vv. 678b-80, shows that the poet is making Satan echo the priest's words. The linkage created by this verbal echo sugests that in *And*, Satan is continuing the earlier flyting.

The next portion of Satan's speech in the OE is more militaristic than it is in P and C:

(v. 1176b) 'he eow neon gesceod Þa he aferede of fæstenne mancynnes ma Þonne gemet wære. Nu ge magon eape oncyrdæda (1180) wrecan on g[e]wyrhtum, lætæp [wæpnes] spor, iren ecgheard, eadorgeard sceorran, fæges feorhhound. Gap fromlice, Þæt ge wiþperfeohtend wiges gehnægan!' (v. 1183).

Here, Satan calls Andrew an adversary ("wiþperfeohtend," v. 1183a), accuses him of injuring the Mermedons with harmful deeds (v. 1176b, v. 1179b), and urges the Mermedons to attack Andrew with weapons (vv. 1180b-1a). The aggressiveness of Satan's speech is further enhanced by a pronoun contrast which juxtaposes "he" and "eow" in a pronominal analogue of
the antagonism which the devil wishes to promote. Thus, even though Satan is not addressing his opponent directly, his words display many of the features of flying speech.

As I have already observed, C ends the dialogue here, and Andrew waits passively for discovery. In P, however, the exchange continues in a series of brief speeches. Andrew's replies include a threat ("My Lord Jesus will lower you into the abyss"), an accusation ("rebel"), and the insulting assertion that the devil is blind. These topics are treated rather briefly, however, and the dialogue includes no martial diction. The And poet chooses to prolong the dialogue and follows the narrative of P. He alters the exchange, however, to increase its resemblance to flying. For example, in the OE account, the apostle recognizes the devil's utterance as a prelude to attack ("'Pu lærest, bældest to beadowe!'" vv. 1185b-6a), and addresses the devil directly with a speech which also includes insult, accusation and threat as well as some other features of flying discourse:

(v. 1185) 'Hwæt, pu pristlice þeode lærest, bældest to beadowe! Wast þe bæles cwælma
hatne in helle, ond þu here fysest,
feþan to gefeche; eart þu fæg wiþ God,
duþoþa demed. Hwæt, þu deofles stræl,
(1190) icest þine yrmpo! þe se ælmihtiga
heanne gehnægede ond [on] heolstæor besceaf,
þær þe cyninga cining clamme belegde;
ond þe sþpppan a Sata[n] nemdon,
þa þe dryhtnes æ deman cuþon' (v. 1194).

The aggressive tone of this speech surpasses that of P. Here, Andrew hurls a series of accusations at Satan, claiming that the devil incites violence (vv. 1185-86a; 1187b-8a), is hostile to God (v. 1188b), and is so wedded to discord that he himself has become little more than a weapon (v. 1189b). Andrew's speech also reasserts the connection between words and war, for the apostle says that the devil teaches battle
(vv. 1185-6a), then adds the act of naming to the catalogue of deeds which God performs to subdue Satan ("gehnægde," "besceaf," "belegde," and "nemdon," vv. 1191-3). The familiar flyting slander of foolish behaviour also recurs here, for Andrew claims that the devil acts rashly ("pristlice"). After this, like a flyter, Andrew counters the devil's assertion that it was Andrew who injured the Mermedons (v. 1176) by arguing that the devil started this fight (vv. 1186b-9a). Andrew then threatens the devil with an increase of pain (vv. 1189b-90a), and concludes with another conventional Germanic insult aimed at the devil's martial expertise, saying that the devil has already been defeated by God, and bound in chains (vv. 1190-2).

This passage also contains several examples of flyting rhetoric. For instance, second person pronouns occur throughout the speech and ensure that Andrew's verbal barbs are aimed at Satan. In addition, although there is no contrastive juxtaposition of first and second person pronouns, "pe" and "se ælmíhtiga" as well as "pe" and "cyninga cining" are juxtaposed, and act as verbal analogues of the antagonism between God and Satan (v. 1190b and v. 1192a). Like a flyter, Andrew also borrows words from Satan's speech and turns them against him. For example, he transforms Satan's earlier exhortation to the Mermedons to conquer Andrew ("ge wiþerfeohtend wiges gehnægæn," v. 1183) into a statement of Satan's own defeat (vv. 1190b-1a). Likewise, in "pe ... Satan nemdon," (v. 1193b), Andrew counter-attacks with an echo of the devil's "pone ic Andreas/nemnan herde," (v. 1175b-6a). This conjunction of flyting identity motif and verbal echo provides yet another agonistic link between Satan's and Andrew's speeches which increases their resemblance to flyting.

Like a defeated flyter, Satan does not reply to the apostle. Instead, he speaks to the Mermedons, telling them that the voice they have heard belongs to their enemy:
(v. 1197) 'Nu ge gehyraþ hæleþa gewinnan,
se ðyssum herige mæst hearma gefremede;
þæt is Andreas, se me on fliteþ
wordum wraetlicum for wera menigo' (v. 1200).

The passage contains an important deviation from P. Where the author of P has Satan say, "Now look around for the one speaking to me" (P, p. 17), the And poet has Satan identify the apostle as "Andreas se me on fliteþ/ wordum wraetlicum." The alteration is important, for it suggests that the poet considers the exchange to be a flyting.

At this point in both P and And, there is a pause in the verbal joust while the Mermedons search for Andrew. God orders the apostle to show himself, promising Andrew that he will not be killed by these savages (And vv. 1215-8; P, p. 17). A grisly interlude follows in which both hagiographers describe the apostle's capture, and the torments he endures at the Mermedons' hands (And vv. 1219-52; P, p. 17). Significantly from the perspective of verbal battle, the And poet begins his account of Andrew's ordeal by calling some of the attacking Mermedons a shield-bearing troop of lying doctrine-makers ("werod unmaete,/ lyswe larsmeoþas mid lindgecrode," vv. 1219b-20), and thus once again connects warfare and speech acts.172

After two days of torture, Andrew prays for help. In P he says: "'Do not forsake me, my Lord Jesus Christ; for I know that you are not far from your/ servants'" (pp. 17-18). In the OE, however, he pleads not for a release from blows, but, like Matthew before him, for a release from the insults which he must endure and which he associates with the "sceapan wæpnum":

(v. 1291) 'þu eart gescylded[en]d wiþ sceapan wæpnum,
ece eadfruma, eallum þinum;
ne laet nu bysmrian banan mannecynnes,
facnes frumbearn þurh feondes cræft
leahtrum belecgan þa þin lof beradþ!' (v. 1295).
In both *And* and *P*, provoked by the apostle's words, Satan reappears and orders Andrew to be struck on the mouth. The fact that the blow is directed at Andrew's mouth suggests that in both accounts, the devil recognizes that words of prayer can act like weapons, and therefore require an aggressive response. Compared to *And*, however, *P* treats the incident briefly:

> And while he prayed, the Devil was walking behind him, and he said to the crowds, 'smite his mouth so he does not speak' (*P*, p. 18).

The *And* poet, on the other hand, prefaces Satan's speech with another description of the devil as a monstrous supernatural being (he is an "atola gast" [v. 1296b] as well as a "helle dioful/ awerged in witum" [vv. 1298b-9a]) whose words are unreliable because he is a treaty-breaker ("warloga," v. 1297a). This description of Satan aligns him not only with the grotesque and inhuman *seenna* contender, but also with the incompetent flyter who like the *warloga* is unable to keep a promise or to fulfill his words with deeds. Although Satan's actual words in *And* are quite close to his speech in *P*, the devil in the OE account adds an insult which has no equivalent in *P*, attributing his own sinful nature to Andrew:

> "'slef synnige ofer seolfes mup, / folces gewinnan, nu to feala reordap,'" vv. 1300-1). After this, the author of *P* tells us:

> When evening came, they led him again into the prison, bound his hands behind, and constrained him again until the morrow (p. 18).

In *And*, however, like the discourse of many flyters, Satan's speech precedes battle ("Pa waes orlege eft onhrered/ ... nip upp aras" vv. 1302b-3).

In *P*, after this episode, Satan is joined by seven demons who taunt Andrew before attempting to kill him:
And the demons said to Andrew, 'Now you have fallen into our hands; where is your glory and your loftiness? You lifted yourself up against us and did not honor us and ignored our works among those in this place and country, and you made our butcher shop and temple empty so they could not pour forth sacrifices among themselves. Because of this, therefore, we ourselves will kill you as also we did your teacher, the one called Jesus, and also John whom Herod killed' (P, p. 18).

In C, a similar taunting episode takes place, although in C it is the Mermedons rather than the demons who mock Andrew, and they do so only after they have been thwarted in their attempt to kill him by the sign of the cross on his forehead (C 27, ll. 1-2, p. 83). Together with the devil they then say to Andrew:

O inquid [sic] andrea, quid est hoc quod venisti hic in derisum nostrum? si adicimus tibi universa et orribilia tormenta, quis enim est qui te possit eruere de manibus nostris? (C 27, ll. 14-16, p. 83).

Unlike the authors of both P and C, the And poet enhances the inherent drama of this encounter by prefacing his version of the taunting with another description of Satan as a monstrous and evil being. Although joined now by six demons, this "lord of evil" continues his verbal assault alone ("ongan ... hospword sprecan", v. 1315b). Analysis shows that his speech has much in common with flyting:

(v. 1316) 'Hwæt horgodest þu, Andreas, hidercyme þinne on wæþra geweald? Hwær is wuldor þin, þe þu oferhigdum upp ærærdest, þa þu goda ussa gilp gehnægdest?' (v. 1319).

Here, the And poet retains features of P and C which conform to the flyting paradigm, such as direct address ("þu" and "þinne") and pronoun contrast (v. 1319a). He also preserves the mocking tone of P and C, but has Satan imply that Andrew's pitiable state is a consequence of arrogance ("þu
This is a slight but significant change, for it suggests that Andrew's mission is a reckless undertaking, and thus an example of the foolish behaviour which a flyter frequently alleges of his opponent. This is not the And poet's only deviation from P and C. In v. 1319 (which has no equivalent in P or C) Satan says that Andrew has conquered the boasting ("gilp") of the Mermedon gods. This line makes the struggle between the apostle and the Mermedon gods seem like a flyting because it construes Andrew's spiritual struggles as an attack on the boasts of his enemies. In addition to this, v. 1319 continues the war of verbal echoes begun in v. 1183 and vv. 1190-1.

Satan next claims that Andrew and Jesus have been defeated in battle:

(v. 1320) 'Hafast nu pe anum eall getihhad
land ond leode, swa dyde lareow pin;
cyne Prym ahof, pam wæs Crist nama,
ofer middangeard, pynden hit meahte swa.
pone Herodes ealdre besnypede,
(1325) forcom æt campe cyning Tudea,
rices beradde, ond hine rode befealg,
pæt he on gealgan his gast onsende' (v. 1327).

Here, the And poet turns the devil's characteristic misunderstandings of Christian truths into the conventional flyting insults of martial incompetence and criminality. For example, Satan interprets the spread of the gospel as the militaristic acquisition of new territory (vv. 1320-1), and suggests that Jesus' and Andrew's ambitions have exceeded their military competence (vv. 1324-6a) -- a version of the flyting insult of "heroic failure." For good measure, he adds the insult of criminality, adding that Jesus died on a gallows (v. 1327). However, these verbal bars, like the insults spoken by the High Priest in the temple at Jerusalem, confuse the spiritual and the temporal in a fashion typical of demonic discourse. For example, Satan's reference to
"cynePrym" (v. 1322a) implies that both Jesus and Andrew conquer new lands in order to gain earthly power and fame for themselves. This represents a serious misunderstanding of the caritas motivating Jesus and his apostle, and reflects instead Satan's own selfish nature and desires. Likewise, Satan's claim that Herod defeated Jesus in battle and deprived him of his kingdom (vv. 1324-6a), misrepresents the spiritual victory of the crucifixion as a temporal defeat. Similar misunderstandings occur in other examples of Satanic discourse found in the Latin Christian literature of the early Church (see, for example, p. 77 above) but here they are transformed into flyting insult.

After this stream of abuse, Satan, like a flyter who doubts the efficacity of his own words, threatens Andrew with physical violence, exhorting his demonic allies to attack:

(v. 1328) 'Swa ic nu bebeode bearnum minum, pegnum pryPfulum, pat hie pe hnaegen, gingran at guPhe. Latap gares ord, earh attre gemael, in gedufan in fæges ferP; gap fromlice, pat ge guPfrecan gyLP forbegan!' (v. 1333).

Like a flyter, Satan repeats the verb hnaegan, continuing the war of the verbal echoes found in v. 1183, vv. 1190-1 and v. 1319. He also describes the goal of his discourse -- to subdue Andrew's boasting ("ge ... gyLP forbegan") -- in language which evokes his earlier interpretation of Andrew's behaviour as an attack on the boast of the Mermedon gods (v. 1319). Satan also uses pronoun contrast in vv. 1328-9 to emphasize his and the demons' opposition to Andrew ("ic ... minum," "hie pe").

In both P and And, the demons are unable to obey Satan's command, for they are driven back by the sign of the cross on Andrew's forehead (And vv. 1337-40; P, p. 18). Although in all three accounts the subsequent exchange is not part of the sacred flyting between Andrew and Satan, the And poet's
treatment of the incident compared to that of P and C suggests a readiness to construe demonic discord as potential flyting material. In P, Satan asks his followers, "Why do you flee from him, my children and not kill him?" The demons reply, "We are not able to kill him, but if you are able, do it" (P, p. 18). In C, however, there is a hint of animosity, for Satan accuses Andrew's attackers of cowardice ("Quid timidi estis, tantum vos plures irent ad unum") and they reply, "Vade tu ipse qui nos tantum adortas" (C, 27, ll. 6-8, p. 83). In both P and C, Satan answers that he is powerless to harm Andrew, and all resort to further taunting instead (P, p. 18; C 27, ll. 8-12, p. 83). In And, the exchange is transformed into a single lengthy speech whose belligerent tone is only one of the features which suggest the initiation of flyting:

(v. 1347) 'Ne magan we him lungre lap ætfæstam, swilt purh searwe. Ga þe sylfa to; þær þu gegninga guþe findest, (1350) frecne feohtan, gif þu furþur dearst to þam anhagan aldre geneþan! We þe magon eaþe, eorla leofost, at þam secgplegan seirre gelæran ær þu gegninga guþe fremme, wiges woman, weald hu þe sæle æt þam gegnslege' (v. 1356a).

Comparison of this speech with earlier speeches reveals several verbal echoes characteristic of flyting speech which emphasize the animosity of the demons towards their leader. For example, in the phrase "ga þe sylfa to," not only is "þe sylfa" contrasted with the "we" of v. 1347a, the imperative also evokes Satan's two earlier commands to both his mortal and demonic allies ("Gaþ fromlice," v. 1182b and v. 1332b). The echo of vv. 1332b-3 is further enhanced in vv. 1349-50, for the constituent elements of the compound "guþfrecan" (v. 1333a) are echoed in the noun "guþfrecan" and the adjective "frecne." In addition, the devils' claim that they can
easily give Satan advice on how to fight ("we pe magon eaæp.../æt Ƿam secgplegan selre gelæran") ironically evokes Satan's exhortation to the Mermedons that they may easily get revenge ("nu ge magon eaæp oncyðæda/ wrecan," vv. 1179-80a). Like flyters, the devils also make effective use of personal pronouns, directing their attack at Satan by repeating second person pronouns, and emphasizing their opposition to him by occasional contrast of these pronouns with first person pronouns (vv. 1347a and 1348b, v. 1352a). As in P and C, the devils conclude by proposing speech acts as an alternative to actual assault:

(v. 1356b) 'Utan gangan eft,
Ƿæt we bysmrigen bendum faestne,
opwitan him his wraesip; habbaþ word gearu
wig Ƿam æglæcan eall getrahtod!' (v. 1359).

Here, the demons' application of the defamatory noun æglaeca to Andrew reaffirms their alliance with Satan against the apostle, and ends the embryonic flying.186

Satan accepts the demons' proposal, and in all accounts a final exchange begins. In P and C, the initial portions of the final exchange between Andrew and Satan are alike. Satan disguises his voice and asks Andrew why he weeps:

Diabolus vero transmutatus est, quasi de celo advenisset vos, et dixit ad eum, quid est quod ploras andreas? Andreas respondit, flevi plane. Cum recordatus sum verbi domini mei iesu christi, qui precepit nobis omnia sufferre mala que nobis inferuntur (C, 27, 11. 18-22, p. 83).187

Differences emerge, however, as the dialogue continues. In P, the concluding portion of the exchange is rather weak.188 In C, Andrew is more aggressive, and his speech has some features which might suggest flyting to an AS poet:

Ait autem diabolus ad eum, audi me andrea, quid tibi utile videtur, hoc age tantum consula, ne invanum recipias maiora tormenta. Andreas
respondit, etsi me nunc interficitis, non facio voluntates vestras, set [sic] voluntatem patris et domini mei qui in/ celis est iesu christi; set tunc quando placuerit domini mei, visitare hanc civitatem, tunc ego vobis disciplinam talem imponam, qualem ipsius domini mei fuerit voluntas. Hoc cum audisset diabolus cum suis satellites, habierunt ab eo (C 27, 11. 22-25, p. 83, 11. 1-4, p. 85).

Here Andrew recognizes that the voice belongs to an enemy and replies with a threat ("tunc ... voluntas"). In addition to this aggressive tone, the speech also contains purposeful pronoun contrast and verbal echo evocative of flyting.

In And, the final dialogue is organized into two long speeches. As in P and C, the devil addresses the apostle directly, but here the resemblance to P and C ends, for in And, the devil has not admitted any inability to harm Andrew, and his words therefore have the potential force of deeds. He abandons disingenuous persuasion in favour of a flyting attack:

(v. 1362) 'pu pe, Andreas, aclæccræftum lange feredes; hwæt, pu leoda feala forleolce ond forlærdest! Nu leng ne miht (1365) gewealdan py weorce; pe synd witu þæs grim weotud be gewyrhtum. pu scealt werigmod, hean, hroþra leas, hearm prowigan, sare swyltcwale; seccgas mine to þam guþplegan gearwe sindon, (1370) þa pe æninga ellenweorcum unfyrn faca feorh æþringan. Hwylc is þæs mhihtig ofer middangeard, þæt he þe alyse of leopubendum, manna cynnes, ofer mine est?' (v. 1374).

Satan begins his attack with false accusations, saying that Andrew practices witchcraft ("pu aclæccræftum ... feredes") and that he purposefully misleads his followers (vv. 1363b-4a). Unlike the devil of C, Satan here proposes no resolution to the conflict, but instead like a flyter, utters a series of threats (vv. 1366b-71). Displaying a
characteristic arrogance, the devil concludes with a provocative question, asking who is strong enough to save Andrew.

The speech has other similarities to flyting in addition to its belligerent tone. As already noted, the devil begins with direct address and uses second person pronouns to ensure that his words are aimed at Andrew. Once, he uses purposeful pronoun contrast to emphasize his opposition to Andrew ("pe ... mine"). More significant, however, is the fact that one of Satan's threats repeats a similar claim made by Andrew.\(^{191}\) In v. 1191a, Andrew reminds Satan that God conquered him, making him "heanne" and binding him in chains ("clamme belegde," v. 1192b). In v. 1367, Satan responds in kind, uttering the threat that Andrew will be "hean," and bound in chains ("leopubendum," v. 1373).

Andrew's reply to this speech makes it clear that the apostle wins not only the spiritual battle, but the verbal battle as well, for he skilfully employs the devices of flyting rhetoric to throw Satan's threats back at him. He begins by answering Satan's concluding question\(^{192}\):

(v. 1376) 'Hwæt, me eape ælmihtig God, nipa neregend, se pe in niedum iu gefæstnode fyrum clommum, ðær pu syþpan a susle gebunden (1380) in wræc wunne, wuldræs blunne, syþpan pu forhogedes heofoncyninges word. ðær wæs yfles or, ende næfre ðines wræces weorðep. pu scealt widan feorh ecan ðine yrmpu; ðe biþ a symble of dæge on dæg drohtap strengra' (v. 1385).

Throughout this passage, there are signs of flyting's influence. For example, in v. 1376, Andrew borrows the adjective "mihtig" from Satan's rather foolish interrogative, and includes it in his retort that "ælmihtig God" will save him. Andrew also boasts that this rescue will be easy for God ("me eape ælmihtig God" [alyseþ]),\(^{193}\) repeating an adverb
found in two earlier, empty boasts uttered by Satan and his
demons ("eape," v. 1179 and v. 1352). Unlike those
unfulfilled illocutions, however, Andrew's boast, like that
of a successful flyter, comes to pass, for Andrew is
eventually released from his torments.

Andrew's answer resembles flyting in other ways. Like a
flyter, he counters Satan's threat that he, Andrew, will
always remain in bondage ("leopubendum," v. 1373b) with a
reassertion of his earlier claim that it is Satan who will be
eternally bound ("fyrnum clommum," v. 1378b is synonymous
with "clamme belegde," v. 1192b). In a related passage,
Andrew throws Satan's own words back at him by echoing in v.
1379b ("susle gebunden") a homophone of one element of
Satan's "leopubendum" in v. 1373b. The apostle uses a
similar ploy a little later, when he promises Satan that he,
rather than Andrew, will be an exile (v. 1380a-3a). Andrew's concluding threat ("Þu scealt ... ecan þine yrmpu")
reiterates his words in v. 1190a ("icest þine yrmpo") and thus
links this final speech to the earlier stages of the flyting.
Ironically, this last threat also echoes the High Priest's
insincere recapitulation of the disciples' claim that they
live daily with the Son of God (v. 682), although with rather
different effect. According to Andrew, Satan will live day
by day, not with the Son of God, but with increasing agony
(v. 1385).

The devil's misinterpretations cannot compete with this
combination of devout discourse and flyting expertise. Like
a defeated flyter, Satan flees in silence (vv. 1386-7). Andrew,
on the other hand, endures his torment and goes on to
win more victories with the extraordinary perlocutionary
powers of the word of God. He compels a stone pillar to obey
his orders (vv. 1498-1526), commands flood waters to recede
"purh haliges hæs" (v. 1586a), revives the drowned with his
prayers (vv. 1613-5a), and eventually converts the entire
Mermedon nation (vv. 1630-58), thus conquering this violent
and blood-thirsty people by verbal means alone.
This comparative analysis of the adversarial dialogues found in And, P and C shows that in the OE, the poet repeatedly deviates from the text of the analogues in order to emphasize the connection between words and war, and to transform the resulting verbal combat into a sacred version of flying. Far from being a slavish duplication of AS poetic practice, this transformation of Christian dialogue into sacred flying represents an enrichment of the Christian text.

L.K. Shook notes the prominence of words over deeds in GuPlac A, and says that the poem "is much less narrative than debate." Kurtz goes a step further and refers to GuPlac's "fine flying style," which consists of boasts, vilification, and taunts. More recently, other scholars have provided detailed analyses of the dialogues of GuPlac A which reveal features relevant to flying. Bjork, for example, observes the importance of the conjunction of words and deeds in the dialogues of GuPlac A, and also discusses the balanced oppositions created by concessive clauses in these dialogues. However, he relates neither discussion to flying. Bridges recognizes that in GuPlac A, "the conflicts tend to be verbal rather than physical," and examines the various contrasts operating throughout the dialogue and the poem as a whole (pp. 117-46), but alludes to the dialogue's status as flying only in passing (p. 141). Anderson, however, not only calls vv. 190-322 a battle flying, he also supports his claim with a detailed analysis. Although my discussion of the dialogues in GuPlac A is indebted to Anderson's analysis of verbal echoes, our assessments of the defining characteristics of flying differ, and thus so do our analyses. While Anderson identifies only the first skirmish (vv. 190-322) as flying, my examination of the poem will show that all GuPlac's dialogues with the devils belong to a single sacred flying.

GuPlac A, unlike Jlna, Ele, and And, is not concerned with the exploits of heroes of the early Roman Church, but
instead recounts an eighth-century AS anchorite's battles with the demons of his wilderness retreat.\textsuperscript{201} Although like most hagiographies, \textit{Gup A} includes themes and topics found in the earliest Latin \textit{vitae}, \textit{passiones} and \textit{acta},\textsuperscript{202} its closest analogues are three texts written by Anglo-Saxons -- Felix's Anglo-Latin \textit{Vita sancti Guthlaci}, especially chapters 28-33,\textsuperscript{203} and its two OE prose translations. One of these is a full life, and is found in Ms. Cotton Vespasian; the other is a translation of Felix's chapters 28-33, found in the twenty-third homily of the Vercelli collection.\textsuperscript{204} Although the exact relationship of the \textit{Vita} and the two OE texts to \textit{Gup A} is debated,\textsuperscript{205} these accounts are the only analogues of \textit{Gup A} extant, and therefore I shall compare the adversarial dialogues found in the poem with those portions of the \textit{Vita} and the OE translation in Vercelli 23 to which they most closely correspond.\textsuperscript{206} My analysis will show that in \textit{Gup A}, the prose accounts of the saint's conflicts with demons are transformed into an extended sacred flyting in which Gu\textit{plac fights with both the sword of the word of God and the verbal weapons of secular flyting.}\textsuperscript{207}

The idea that Gu\textit{plac's struggle with the devil and his demons can be construed as a verbal battle is implicit in chapter 27 of the \textit{Vita}, for here Felix describes how the saint undertakes eremetic life as a soldier of God, and, armed with a spiritual arsenal which includes the arrows of psalmody, launches himself against the devil's troops:

\begin{quote}
Erat ergo annorum circiter viginti sex, cum se inter nubilosos remotioris heremi lucos cum caelesti adiutorio veri Dei militem esse proposuit. Deinde praecinctus spiritualibus armis adversus tetrernimi hostis insidias scutum fidei, loricam spei, galeam castitatis, arcum patientiae, sagittas psalmodiae, sese in aciem firmans, arripuit. Tantae enim fiduciae erat, ut inter torridas tartari turnas sese contento hoste iniecerit (Colgrave, p. 90).\textsuperscript{208}
\end{quote}
The notion that the word of God can function as a weapon in spiritual warfare pervades the next few chapters of the *Vita*.

In the first skirmish of this spiritual war, Guplac's hymns and psalms easily defeat the bestial discourse of the devil, and break his arrow of despair. The battle begins after Guplac establishes a hermitage for himself on an earthen mound:

Erat itaque in praedicta insula tumulus agrestibus glaebis coacervatus, quem olim/ avari solitudinis frequentatores luceri ergo illic adquirendi defodientes scindebant, in cuius latere velut cisterna inesse videbatur; in qua vir beatae memoriae Guthlac desuper inposito tugurio habitare coepit (Colgrave, pp. 92-4)

Perhaps provoked by Guplac's pious psalms and hymns ("vir ... heremitare initiavit, cum quodam die adsueta consuetudine psalmis canticisque incumberet," p. 94), the devil, whose discourse consists of roars ("antiquus hostis prolis humanae ceu leo rugiens," p. 94), exercises his wicked powers, shooting a poisoned arrow of despair ("venenifluam desperationis sagittam," chapter 29, p. 94) into Guplac's mind ("in Christi militis mentis umbone," p. 96). Guplac, a "validissimus miles Christi" (p. 96), resists and responds with one of his arrows of psalmody:

Die autem tertio sequenti nocte, cum validissimus miles Christi robusta mente pestiferis meditationibus resisteret, velut prophetico spiritu psallere coepit: 'In tribulatione invocavi Dominum' (p. 96).209

Guplac is rewarded by the reassuring presence of Bartholomew, his angelic guardian. Thus Guplac, "like a soldier fighting in the serried ranks,"210 uses words drawn from Scripture to conquer his diabolically-inspired doubts, metaphorically breaking the devil's "desperationis arma" (p. 98) and winning this first battle:
Nam/ ex primi certaminis triumphali successu spem futurae gloriae et victoriae robusto pectore firmabat. Ex illo enim tempore numquam zabulus adversus illum desperationis arma arripuit, quia ab illo semel infracta contra illum ultra praevalere nequiverunt (pp. 96-8).

A similar account of the first encounter of saint and devil occurs in Vercelli 23. Although the homily does not include Felix's chapter 27, and therefore lacks his evocation of Eph. 6. 11-17, it nonetheless retains much of Felix's martial tone, and gives this conflict a verbal dimension. The devil attacks after Guþlac has established himself on an earthen mound in the Crowland wilderness:

Wæs þær in þam sprecenan iglande sum mycel hlæw of eorþæn geworht, þone ylcan hlæw iu geara men bræcon ond dulfon for feos þingum. þa wæs þær on ðære sidan þæs hlæwes gedolfoþ swylce mycel seapt. On þam seahræ ufæn se eadiga wer Guþlac him hus ond eardungstowe getimbrode (Szarmach, ll. 1-4, p. 97).

Once again, Guþlac's devout discourse ("he þæ gewunelican þeowdome his sealmas sang ond his gebedum ætfealh," ll. 9-10, p. 97) provokes the devil who, passing by and roaring like a lion ("se ealda feond mancynnes gengde geond þæt græswang swa grymetende leo," ll. 10-11, p. 97), shoots an arrow of despair, wounding Christ's soldier:

þa semninga swa he of gebendum bogan wæs his costunge þa he þa þam earhwinnendan stræl on þam mode gefæstnode þæs Cristes cempan. þa se eadiga wer mid þære stræłe gewundod wæs þæs werigan gastes, þa wæs his mod ... swipe gedrefed (Szarmach, ll. 12-16, p. 97).

Against this assault, Guþlac defends himself with the verbal weaponry he uses in the Vita, and utters a portion of Psalm 17 to dispel his despair:

he witedomlice muþe sang ond þus cleopode to Gode ond cwæþ: 'Min Drihten, mid minre geswencendnesse
Bartholomew arrives, and in a slight departure from Felix, strengthens the saint with his words ("PREFREDE HINE Pa sanctus Bartholomeus ond hine mid wordum trymede ond strangode," 1. 28, p. 97). Thereafter, the devil refrains from attacking with the weapon of despair ("syppan seo tid wæs pæt næfre pæt deoful eft wiþ hine pære ormodnesse weapnum on hine sceotode," ll. 33-34, p. 98).

In GUP A, the saint's enemies eschew roars in favour of comprehensible discourse, and GuÞlac defends himself with the sword of God's word, sharpened by the devices of flyting. Although unlike Felix, the GUP A poet does not specifically evoke Eph. 6. 11-17, he nonetheless hints that words can participate in spiritual warfare, for he observes (through a psychopomp) that the verbal acts of instructing and praising allow the righteous to defeat evil spirits ("pa þe her Cristes æ/ lærap ond læstap ond his lof lærap/ oferwinnap þa awyrgdan gæstas," vv. 23b-5a). The poet also describes angels as tested warriors ("gecostan cempan," v. 91) who are armed with "gæsta wæpnum" (v. 89a), and again reinforces the connection between words and warfare by providing an example of a "gewin" fought by such a warrior and a demon (vv. 114b-35). In this struggle, the only conflict is a conflict of doctrines, and the only aggressive deeds are speech acts.

Spiritual conflict, actual warfare and verbal battle are likewise conflated in the GUP A poet's account of the saint's struggles in the Crowland wilderness. The poet begins by deviating from the prose accounts in order to construe spiritual conflict as a battle for territory. Unlike Felix and the homilist, he populates GuÞlac's hermitage with a rabble of demons whom GuÞlac, like a conquering warrior, evicts so that he can claim the beorg for his lord:

(v. 148b)  
Pa se bytla cwom  
se þær haligne  ham arærde;
These demons, however, do not accept eviction without resistance, and it is against their attacks that Guplac must defend himself. Accordingly, this blessed soldier arms himself with spiritual weapons:

(v. 174b)  
par he mongum wearp  
bysen on Brytene  
sippan biorg gestah.  
Eadig oretta, ondwiges heard,  
gyrede hine georne  
mid gastlicum  
wæpnum [ond wædum],  
wong bletsade,  
him to ærstælle  
ærest æræde  
Cristes rode;  
par se cempa oferwon  
frecnessa fela (v. 181a).

Thus armed, Guplac engages in verbal battle.

In Guplac, the first skirmish begins after the devils attempt to dislodge the saint with temptations ("to Guplaces gæste gelæddun/ frasunga fela," vv. 188-9a). When these efforts prove unsuccessful, they resort to words, substituting speech acts ("hweopan" v. 190b, "cwædon" v. 191a, v. 206a, and "yrsade" v. 200a) for the poisoned arrow of despair, initiating a verbal battle which occupies over 100 lines of verse. Although the poet reports their first words as indirect discourse, the devils' speech displays several features which suggest that it is the initial verbal blow of a sacred flyting exchange.

Like flyters, the devils threaten physical violence, telling Guplac that he will be incinerated on the beorg (vv. 192-3) and that his kindred will suffer (vv. 194-5) if he refuses to abandon the fight ("orlege" v. 196a). They add a commonplace flyting barb, suggesting that Guplac has been delinquent in fulfilling his kinship obligations. He should, they say, attend to "sibbe ryht" with "maran crafte" (vv. 197-8) and abandon the strife at the beorg. These verbal
blows, however, spring from a frame of reference which prizes the material values of the temporal world, rather than the spiritual values of the devout Christian, for to a \textit{miles christi} the threat of physical pain and death is tantamount to a promise of salvation, while the accusation of failure to fulfill kinship duties is rendered meaningless by Jesus' injunction to his followers to choose faith over family.\textsuperscript{223}

Like the threats of Eleusius in \textit{Jlna} and the taunts of the High Priest in \textit{And}, therefore, the devils' words miss their target.

After a brief pause, the devils attack again, and this time their aim is better. They disingenuously accuse Gu\textit{plac} of arrogance ("he for wience on westenne/ beorgas bræce," vv. 208-9a),\textsuperscript{224} and in doing so, make a charge which is potentially as damaging to a soldier of Christ, who wishes to avoid the sin of pride, as it is to a secular warrior and flyter, who does not wish his deeds to be ascribed to arrogant whim.\textsuperscript{225} The devils conclude this assault with the claim that the \textit{beorg} is theirs (vv. 209-14).

At this juncture, the poet intrudes. He explains that the devil's claim is a lie (vv. 215-25), reasserts the connection between words and blows central to flyting, and emphasizes that the devils cannot harm Gu\textit{plac}:

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 226) ne mostun hy Gu\textit{places} gæste sce\text{ppan}
ne þurh sarslege sawle gedælan
wip lichoman ac hy ligesearwum
ahofun hearstafas (v. 229a).\textsuperscript{226}
\end{verbatim}

When the devils raise their harmful words again, they, like secular flyters, utter another threat, promising Gu\textit{plac} that if he does not leave the \textit{beorg}, they will return with a multitude of demons and kill him:

\begin{verbatim}
(v. 234b) swipe geheton
\text{pat} he deap\text{a} gedal dreogan sceolde
gif he leng bide la\text{p}ran gemotes
hwonne hy mid mengu maran cwome
\end{verbatim}
However, because God will not permit Guplac to be harmed (vv. 226-8a), this threat (and similar threats which recur throughout the devil’s discourse in the extended sacred flyting) remains empty and harmless.

Guplac’s response to the demons is as aggressive as their attack. Instead of the relatively disengaged recitation of Psalm 17.7 which he utters in the prose accounts, the saint in Gup A combines Christian subject matter with secular flyting illocutions and rhetoric to create a reply whose emotional force and doctrinal complexity far outweighs that of the terse prose response. For example, in vv. 240b-3a, Guplac, like a flyter, implies that the devils’ boastful threats are little better than dolgilp. However, he constructs this insult from commonplaces of Christian doctrine, reminding the devils that they are controlled by God ("se pe eowrum nydum wealdep," v. 241b) and that God is omnipotent ("An is ælmhita God," v. 242a). He then informs the devils that this omnipotent God will protect him ("mec wile wiþ pam nipum genergan," v. 241a and "se mec mæg eaþe gescyldan, / he min feorg freoþełp," vv. 242b-3a), thus making it clear that their threats of death are the empty boasts of incompetent flyters.

Given this divine protection, Guplac can respond to the devils’ dolgilp with truthful boasts of his own ("ic eow fela wilie/ soþa gesecgan," vv. 243b-4a), and he proceeds, like a warrior engaged in flyting before battle, to announce that he will easily keep the territory which he has acquired (vv. 243b-5, vv. 250-1). This conventional secular flyting boast, however, has a spiritual rather than a temporal foundation, and comes from Guplac’s knowledge of divine mysteries (vv. 247b-9) and heavenly doctrine (vv. 251b-2a).

The sacred and the profane are likewise conflated in the final lines of Guplac’s reply, for although he utters a command and another series of boasts, these flying
Illocutions again contain material of mixed provenience. Guþlac's derisive dismissal of the devils in v. 255a ("Gewiþnu awyrge"), for instance, is a conventional exorcism, but the addition of "awyrge" gives it the insulting tone typical of secular flying response. Conversely, his boasts that he will obtain peace from God (vv. 257b-8a) and that he will avoid heresy (vv. 258b-9a) clearly reflect sacred rather than profane values, but they are followed by another boast -- that Guþlac will remain on the beorg (vv. 260b-1) -- which expresses the consequences of these spiritual values in terms of the materialistic goal of territorial acquisition.

Fyling's influence on the saint's reply is not limited to the transformation of Christian topics into insult and boast, but also extends to Guþlac's rhetoric, as a closer look at vv. 240b-52a will show:

(v. 240b) 'Peah þe ge me deaþ gehaten, mec wile wiþ pam nimum genergan se þe eowrum nydum wealdþ þeþ.
An is ælmihtig God se mec mæg eapþ gescyldan, he min feorg freopþ þeþ. Þæt eow fela wille
soþa gesecgan: mæg ic þis setle on eow
(245) butan earþ þum ana geþringan;
ne eam ic swa fealog, swa ic eow fore stonde,
monna weorudes ac me mara dæl
in godcundum gastgyrnum
wunaþ ond weaxeþ se me wraþe healdeþ.
(v. 250) Ic me anum her eapþ getimbre
hus ond hleonaþ; me on heofonum sind
lare gelonge' (v. 252a).

Vv. 240b-41 contain the balanced opposition of clauses frequent in flying speech. Guþlac begins with a recapitulation of the devils' threats, phrased as a concessive clause ("peah ... gehaten") which is contradicted by the subsequent main clause ("mec ... wealdeþ"). The adversative quality of the opening lines is reinforced in v. 243a and v. 240b by the contrast of life (protected by God) and death (threatened by the demons). In addition, the initial concessive clause contains verbal echoes of the
devils' threat (compare v. 240b and "swipe geheton/ pæt he deapæ gedal dreogan sceolde," vv. 234b-5). 232 Another verbal echo follows. Guþlac borrows the adjective an from the devils' claim in vv. 206-7 that on his own, Guþlac has caused them more misery than anyone else except God ("cwædon pæt him Guþlac eac Gode sylfum/ earfeþpa mæst ana gefremede"), and incorporates it into his brief confession of his lord's omnipotence, ascribing the quality of an-ness to God rather than to himself (v. 242a). In v. 245, Guþlac uses the adjective an again, this time as part of a double echo: "earfeþum" and "ana" repeat the devils' words in vv. 206-7 ("him Guþlac .../ earfeþa mæst ana gefremede"), but transform them from a complaint about the hardships which Guþlac has caused the devils into a proclamation of the ease with which Guþlac, sustained by God's power, will defend the beorg. 233 In this way, Guþlac, like a skilled flyter, defeats his opponents with the ammunition provided by their own words.

Throughout vv. 240b-52a, Guþlac also manipulates personal pronouns in order to heighten the agonistic tone of his speech. He addresses the devils directly, but intersperses the second person pronouns of direct address with the first person pronouns of his boasts and assertions, occasionally juxtaposing them to enhance the contrast (v. 243b, v. 246b). This usage, typical of flying, begins a pronominal battle which continues throughout Guþlac's confrontations with the demons.

Guþlac's concluding series of boasts in vv. 257b-61 is also influenced by flying rhetoric:

(v. 257b) 'Ic me friþ wille
æt Gode gegyrnan; ne sceal min gæst mid eow
gedwolan dreogan ac me dryhtnes hond
mundæp mid mægne. Her sceal min wesan
eorplic epel, 'nales eower leng' (v. 261).

Here, first and second person pronominal forms are again manipulated to enhance the speech's hostile tone: "ic me"
and "min" contrast agonistically with "eow" (vv. 257b-8) as do "me" and "min" with "eower" (vv. 259b-61). These lines also contain an adversative syntax typical of flyting speech (the affirmative "ic ... wille" is opposed by the negative "ne sceal ... dreogan," itself opposed by "ac me ... mundap"). The parallel phrases "ne sceal min" (v. 258b) and "her sceal min" (v. 260b) further enhance the sense of balanced opposition inherent in this syntax.

Like flyters, the devils reply to Guþlac in vv. 266-91 with accusations, insults and threats. However, because the devils still value the literal and the material rather than the intangible and the spiritual prized by the soldier of God, their words once again have little impact on Guþlac. Ignoring Guþlac's humble insistence that his individual strength depends on God, the demons again accuse Guþlac of pride (vv. 269-70). They also pay no attention to his claim that he is more formidable than he appears (v. 246), and derisively call him God's wretch ("eart pe [sic] Godes yrming," v. 272b). Still focusing on the temporal and the tangible, and apparently ignorant of the pious Christian's love of exile, the devils insultingly liken Guþlac's behaviour to that of a wild animal (v. 276), and threaten him with hunger and thirst if he remains on their beorg, "ana from eþele" (v. 277a). After these misdirected accusations and threats, the demons counter Guþlac's exorcistic imperative (v. 254) with one of their own ("Geswic pisses setles," v. 278a). Perhaps aware of the impotence of their words, they conclude with a settlement offer (v. 280), but tie this offer to an empty threat based on a serious misunderstanding of their power over Guþlac:

(v. 280) 'We pe beop holde gif pu us hyran wilt
oppe pec ungearo eft gesecap
maran mægne peat pe mon ne pearf
hondum hrinan ne pin hra feallan
wæpnum wundum; we pas wic magun
fotum afyllan: folc inpricep
The literality which often undermines demonic discourse is here taken to extremes. Misunderstanding the limited nature of their power over the saint (vv. 226-8a), the devils appear to believe that they can harm Guþlac as long as they do not use hands and weapons to do so. They therefore summon trampling feet and horses' hooves to accomplish what hands and weapons cannot ("we pas wic magun/ fotum afyllan: folc inpricep/ meara þreatum," vv. 284b-6a).

A closer look at vv. 266-91 shows that the devils not only include the insults, accusations and threats typical of flyting in their response, but that they also employ the devices of flyting rhetoric:

(v. 269) ‘no we oferhygdu anes monnes
geond middangeard maran fundon.
þu þæt gehasted þæt þu ham on us
gegan wille: eart þe Godes yrming.
Bi hwon scealt þu lifgan þeah þu lond age?
Ne þe mon hider mose fedep (v. 274)

...gif þu gewitest swa wilde deor
ana from eþele' (v. 277a).

Here, the demons address Guþlac directly, and like flyters continue the pronominal war initiated by Guþlac, contrasting first and second person pronouns ("we," "þu," "þu," "us," "þe," etc.). They also continue the war of verbal echoes begun in Guþlac's reply. In v. 269b, for instance, they reclaim the adjective an from Guþlac's speech (v. 242, v. 245, v. 250), and incorporate it into a new version of their earlier accusation that the saint occupies their beorg because he is arrogant (vv. 206-9a). In v. 270b they appropriate the adjective "maran" from Guþlac (who uses it in v. 247b to describe his increasing spiritual wisdom), and use it instead to measure the saint's ostensible pride, which
they claim surpasses that of any other man. In addition, in v. 271a, the devils reply to Guþlac's paraphrase of their threat ("ge me deap gehaten," v. 240b) with a paraphrase of Guþlac's threat ("pu part gehatest ... wille"). The repetition of the verb gehatan here helps to reconstrue this spiritual battle as a war of commissive illocutions in which one gehat, or promise, attacks another. The phrase "ana from epel" (v. 277a) also echoes Guþlac's words. The devils alter the connotations of an so that the adjective suggests neither the divine omnipotence nor the devout self-confidence intended by Guþlac in v. 242a, v. 254b and vv. 250-1, but instead implies isolation and loneliness. They also borrow the noun epel from Guþlac, but use it to emphasize that instead of finding a home on the beorg (as Guþlac boasts in v. 261a) the saint's continued occupation of the beorg will result in his homelessness.236

Another collection of verbal echoes occurs in vv. 281-4a:

'... þec ungearo eft gesecap
maran mægæn þæt þe mon ne þearf
hondum hrian ne þin hra feallan
wæpna wundum.'

Here, the devils again throw Guþlac's words back at him. They borrow the nouns mægæn and hond, which the saint uses to celebrate God's might ("me dryhtnes hond/ mundaþ mid mægne," vv. 259b-60a), as well as the adjective "maran" (which as I have already observed Guþlac uses to measure his spiritual strength in v. 247b), and incorporate them into their promise that a throng with troops of horses ("folc ... meara þreatum," vv. 285b-6a) will harm the saint with feet rather than hands or weapons (vv. 284b-9a).

As I have already shown in my analysis of vv. 269-77a, the devils manipulate pronouns to enhance the agonistic tone of their discourse. Another good example of such
manipulation occurs in conjunction with verbal echo in vv. 287-91:

(v. 287) ‘Beop pa gebolgne pa pec breedwia$p$, tredap pec ond tergap ond hyra torn wrecap, toberap pec blodgum lastum; gif pu ure bidan pencest we pec nip$a gen$a cap. Ongin pe generes wilnian far par pu freonda wene gif $p$ines feores recce’ (v. 291).

Here, the devils repeat the second person pronoun "pec" to emphasize that Gu$\text{plac}$ is the object of their threats, then contrastively juxtapose first and second person pronouns ("pu ure," "we pec," vv. 289b-90a) in a pronominal epitome of their conflict with the saint. The agonistic tone of their discourse is further enhanced in v. 290 by a threat and an imperative which echo and contradict Gu$\text{plac}$'s boast in v. 241 ("mec wile wip $\text{pa}$ nipum genergan se $\text{pe}$ eowrum nydum wealde$p$"). They conclude with a quasi-exorcistic imperative.237

Before recounting Gu$\text{plac}$'s response, the poet is careful to associate Gu$\text{plac}$'s speech with the strength and courage usually manifested in battle by describing the saint as one who is "on ondsware ond on elne strong" (v. 293). Having thus tacitly reasserted the connection between words and warfare central to flyting, the poet relates Gu$\text{plac}$'s reply.

Like a flyter, Gu$\text{plac}$ begins with an insult, calling the devils' reinforcements a rabble of wretched and treacherous spirits, exiled to unwholesome dwellings:

(v. 296) 'Wid is $\text{p}$es westen, wræcsetla fela, eardas onhæle earmra gæsta; sindon wærlogan pe pa wic bugap' (v. 298).

Next, in a concessive clause typical of flyting, he addresses the demons directly, recapitulating their final threat, then refuting it, by deriding their military prowess with the
prediction that regardless of their numbers, their assault will fail:

(v. 299) 'Peah ge pa ealle ut abonne
ond eow eac gewyrce widor sæce
ge her ateop in pa tornwræce
sigeleasne sip' (v. 302a).

Guplac then boasts that he will hold the beorg against the demons without weapons:

(v. 302b) 'No ic eow sweord ongean
mid gebolgne hond opberan ðence,
worulde wæpen, ne sceal ðes wong Gode
þurh blodgyte gebuen weorpán
ac ic minum Criste cweman ðence
leofran lace nu ic ðis lond gestag' (v. 307).

Here, Guplac again skilfully combines a Christian notion with a commonplace insult of secular flying. In eschewing the sword in this boast, he expresses the conventional Christian view that spiritual strength outweighs temporal shows of might. At the same time, however, he aims a serious secular flying insult at the devils, for his boast also implies that the devils are so militarily inept that they can be beaten without swords. To enhance the agonistic quality of his discourse, Guplac not only manipulates personal pronouns, he also throws some of the devils' own words back at them in this boast. In vv. 303-4a, he borrows "gebolgne," "hond," and "wæpen" from their blood-thirsty threats (vv. 283-4 and v. 287a), and makes these words express his disdain for physical combat.

Guplac continues to insult his opponents, insisting again on the emptiness of their words ("Fela ge me earda þurh idel word/ aboden habbaþ," vv. 308-9a). Then, like a flyter, he defends himself with boastful counterclaims. He demonstrates his verbal expertise, however, by making these
utterances equally effective from both secular and sacred perspectives:

(v. 309b) 'nis min breostsefa
forht ne fæge ac me fripe healdep
ofer monna cyn se pe mægna gehwæs
weorcum wealdep; nis me wiht æt eow
loefes gelong ne ge me læpes wiht
gedon motun: ic eom dryhtnes peow' (v. 314).

In these lines, Guplac claims that he is not afraid. While such a claim is not unexpected from a warrior facing actual combat, it is equally appropriate coming from a miles christi who is "on ondsware ond on elne strong." Guplac's next remark, that his bravery arises from the strength of his lord (vv. 310b-2a), is also a good defense from a secular perspective, for loyalty to the comitatus leader is an important part of the heroic ideal. In vv. 310b-2a, however, that loyalty has a religious basis, and is expressed in a quasi-confessional assertion of God's supremacy over all things. Finally, in v. 314b, Guplac contradicts the devils' derisive claim that he is God's wretch (v. 272b) with the boast that he is God's servant.240

Another sign of flyting's influence is evident in vv. 309b-14, for the combative tone of Guplac's reply is heightened in this passage by an adversative syntax, arising here from the opposition of negative and affirmative clauses ("nis min ... ac me," "nis me ... ne ge me ... ic eom"). In vv. 312b-3, the resulting sense of balanced opposition is augmented by agonistic pronoun contrast ("me ... eow," "ge me"). In fact the pronouns of vv. 309b-314 are more agonistic than the format of my analysis allows me to suggest, for in the dialogues of Gup A, as in secular flyting, agonistic pronoun contrast extends across speech boundaries so that one speaker's repetition of accusatory second person pronouns is often countered by his interlocutor's boastful first person pronouns. This
particular form of pronoun contrast becomes apparent when opposed speeches are juxtaposed. For example, the agonistic effect of pronoun usage in vv. 309b-14 becomes even more apparent when the first person pronouns found in these lines are understood as a response to the second person pronouns of vv. 287-91, cited above.

Guplac concludes by confessing his faith in God and his disdain for the wealth of the temporal world. Yet even this devout utterance is influenced by flyting rhetoric:

(v. 318b) 'Is min hyht mid God
ne ic me eorþwelan owiht sinne
ne me mid mode micles gyrne
ac me dogra gehwam dryhten sendeþ
purh monnes hond mine þearfe' (v. 322).

Here, the adversative syntax of flyting enhances the agonistic quality of Guplac's words. The two affirmative clauses in which he proclaims his faith ("is min ... God," v. 318b and "ac me ... þearfe," vv. 321-2) enclose two negative clauses which simultaneously evoke and deny the materialistic and selfish values which he abhors and which underlie the devils' threats and blandishments ("ne ic ... sinne," "ne me ... gyrne," vv. 319-20). Like a flyter, Guplac also uses verbal echo incorporating the nouns mon, hond and þearfe found in the devils' threat in vv. 281-4b into his confession of faith.

The devils' discourse is no match for the saint's devout speech, and they silently retreat:

(v. 323) Swa modgade se wip mongum stod
awrþped weorþlice, wuldres cempe,
engla mægne. Gewat eal þonan
feonda mengu (v. 326a).

The poet concludes the exchange with a gnomic utterance, proposing the saint's steadfast faith, manifested in his devout words, as a model for all spiritual warriors:
In the Vita, the second assault upon the saint is conducted by two devils who claim to have renounced their conflict with Guþlac and attempt to instruct him in the rules of fasting ("te antiquorum heremitarum conversationes erudiemus," p. 98). This instruction, however, is not edifying, but instead is a subtle verbal attack designed to transform the abstinence of Guþlac's eremetic life into an expression of pride ("Nam cum in ieiunio prostratus iacueris, tunc/ excelsius coram Deo elevaris," pp. 98-100). Ignoring such perverse doctrine, Guþlac once again uses an arrow of psalmody to rout the demons, and to win the second battle.

In Vercelli 23's account of the second attack, the devils call Guþlac unconquered, and acknowledge that he has successfully resisted their weapons. They then promise to refrain from terrorizing the saint with their discourse ("we þe furþor ne wyllan leng swencan ne þe mid brogan bysmrian," Szarmach, l. 39, p. 98). Instead, they tell Guþlac about others who inhabited the wilderness ("We þe eac wyllap secgan be þam eallum þe iu geara westen geardodan," ll. 41-2, p. 98). Yet despite their ostensible goodwill, the devils' covert intent remains hostile, for their speech is designed to promote pride rather than humility ("þonne byst þu ahafen for Godes eagen," l. 51, p. 98). As in the Vita, Guþlac is not fooled by this verbal ambush: he defeats the devils with a paraphrase of Psalm 55.10 (ll. 59-61, p. 98). The homilist makes a slight change in the conclusion of this second skirmish, however. In the Vita, Guþlac despises the demons themselves as "inmundorum spirituum fantasmata" (see note 242) but in Vercelli 23, he despises their insults ("he se eadiga wer swa gesigeðæst þa bysmornesse ealle forhogode..."
Although the change is small, it emphasizes the verbal nature of the conflict.

The assault of demonic instruction found in the *Vita* and in Vercelli 23 appears to have no exact counterpart in *Gup A*. It is likely, however, that a second verbal skirmish with the *beorg* demons does occur in the poem immediately after v. 368, although owing to a lacuna in the ms. between v. 368 and v. 369 it is impossible to know for certain. All that remains of the exchange is a fragmentary speech by Guplac, but analysis of this fragment suggests that it is a flyting reply connected to both the first verbal skirmish and to some more immediate verbal assault no longer extant.

One of the features of vv. 369-89 which suggests that the speech continues the sacred flyting begun in vv. 192-322 is the recurrence in this speech of topics debated in the first skirmish. For instance, Guplac again emphasizes that he is impervious to the pains and pleasures of the temporal world (vv. 374-7, vv. 380-3, vv. 386-9), and that regardless of any torments which the devils may devise he will not retract his profession of faith ("næfre ge mec of þissum wordum onwendaþ," v. 376a).

Guplac's speech also contains words and phrases found in the first skirmish. In v. 372, Guplac echoes portions of the devils' earlier threat that he "deap geal dreogan sceolde" (v. 235), substituting *gedreosan* for its near-homophone, *dreonan*. This substitution transforms a personal threat of death into a calm acceptance of temporal change, evocative of Ecclesiastes:

(v. 371) 'Ne maeg min lichoma wiþ þæs lænan gesceafet
deaþ gedælan æc he gedreosan sceal
swa þeos eorþe eall þe ic her on stonde' (v. 373).

In addition to verbal echo, vv. 369-89 also contain examples of the adversative syntax frequent in flyting. For example:
Here, the introductory concessive clause "peah ... lege" which paraphrases the demons' threat in vv. 192-3, is contradicted by a boast ("naefre ... gelæste") and another concessive clause paraphrases a second threat ("peah ... forsæcen") and is contradicted by "ne ... gretan" and "ac ... gebringap." (vv. 377b-8a). The sense of balanced opposition inherent in this syntax is reinforced by the flyting device of agonistic pronoun contrast ("ge minne," v. 374a; "ge mec ... mec min," v. 376; "ge ... ge min," v. 377; and "ge ... ic me," vv. 378-9).

The final portion of Guþlac's speech also shows signs of flyting influence. In vv. 383b-9, Guþlac uses negation, comparison, and parallel syntax to construct what appears to be a reply to a demonic settlement offers no longer extant:

(v. 383b) 'Nis pisses beorges setl meodumre ne mara þonne hit men duge

(v. 386b) ne sceal se dryhtnes þeow in his modsefan mare gelufian eorþan ætwelan þonne his anes gemet þat he his lichoman lade hæbbe' (v. 389).

Since the devils' response is clamour ("cirm," v. 393a) rather than rational discourse, it seems clear that Guþlac has won another verbal victory.

Chapter 31 of the *Vita* and 11. 67-115 of Vercelli 23 describe a third assault conducted by a troop of demons who suddenly infest Guþlac's hermitage ("subito tetterimis/inmundorum spirituum catervis totam cellulam suam inpleri conspexit," pp. 100-2), and torment the saint in an effort to
drive him from the Crowland wilderness.\textsuperscript{253} In Gu\textsuperscript{P A}, this single assault which in the \textit{Vita} and in Vercelli concludes with a flyting-like exchange at hell's doorway is treated as two separate verbal skirmishes. For ease of comparison, I therefore divide the prose accounts of the final assault into two parts.

In the first portion of the third encounter in the \textit{Vita}, the demons, after invading the hermit's cell, attack Gu\textsuperscript{P lac} with open mouths and raucous shouts ("ore patulo, clamoribus raucisonis," Colgrave, p. 102). This auditory assault, however, bears little resemblance to human discourse, let alone flying:

\begin{quote}
Ita enim inmensis vagitibus horrescere audiebantur, ut totam paene a caelo in terram intercapedinem clangisonis boatibus inplerent (p. 102).
\end{quote}

Perhaps realizing their deficiencies as rhetoricians, the devils follow these vocalizations with a violent physical attack. They drag the saint through marshes and brambles, then order him to leave the wilderness ("imperantes sibi, ut de heremo discedisset," p. 102). Gu\textsuperscript{P lac} replies with another metaphorical arrow of psalmody, this time borrowed from Ps. 15.8: "Dominus a dextris est mihi/ ne commovear" (pp. 102-4). The devils, however, are not deterred, and the attack continues in the \textit{Vita}.

Vercelli 23 provides a similar account of the first portion of the devils' final attack, emphasizing the horrendous and irrational nature of the demonic utterance:

\begin{quote}
\textit{pa on pære nihte stilnesse gelamp semninga pæt pær com micel mænego ðara werigra gasta ond hie eal pæt hus mid heora cyrne gefyldon ....Wæron hie [on] onsyn egeslice ... ond has hrymedon on heora cleopunge. Ond hie swa ungemetlice hrymdon ond foran mid forhtlicum egesum ond unge\textit{þærenessum pæt hit þuhte pæt hit eall betweoh heofone ond eornan hleoþrode þam egeslicum stefnum (Szarmach, ll. 68-78, p. 98).}
\end{quote}
After this, the devils begin the torments described by Felix, and Guðlac again replies with a verse from Ps. 15 ("Dryhten me is on pa swipran hælfe forpam ic ne beo oncyrred," 11. 87-8, p. 99). These words apparently have little effect on the devils, however, for they take the saint to hell's door, and there continue to attack.

In Guð A, the devils of the beorg also resort to violence at this juncture. They abduct the saint and compel him to fly through the air with them in order to see examples of monastic corruption (v. 412-19a). When these efforts fail to sway Guðlac, the devils, now denoted as scoffers on account of their derisive discourse, threaten the saint not with the meaningless roars found in the prose accounts, but rather with grievous taunts:

(v. 446) Hwaepre him pa gena gyrna gemynnde
edwitsprecan ermpu geheton
tornum teoncwidum (v. 448a).

Once again their abusive discourse conforms to the template of flyting speech, but comparison with the earlier and later verbal skirmishes shows that the exchange is becoming unbalanced, for the length of the devils' speech is reduced, presaging the eventual silence of defeat.²⁵⁴

The devils launch their attack by addressing Guðlac directly. Perversely, they blame him for their cruelty, reminding him of their earlier settlement offer, and asserting that if he had obeyed their instructions, they would not now torment him:

(v. 452) 'No we pe pus swipe swencan porfton
par pu fromlice freonda larum
hyran wolde' (v. 454a).

Then, like flyters, the devils insult Guðlac. They borrow the adjective earm from v. 297 of Guðlac's speech,²⁵⁵ and call
the saint "hean ond earm" (v. 454b), implying once again that
Guplac's condition is that of a wretched exile. As I have
already noted, such a barb is usually harmless when it is
aimed at a soldier of Christ. Here, however, it is more
dangerous, for it introduces a rather devious attack on the
integrity of Christianity itself. Unable or unwilling to
discern the spiritual strength which lies beneath Guplac's
unprepossessing appearance, the materialistic devils
attribute Guplac's power to the outward and visible signs of
his faith, and allege that Guplac himself has admitted in
his earlier boasts that his strength is derived from these
signs:

(v. 454b) 'pa pu hean ond earm
on pis orlege ærest cwome
pa pu gehete þæt þec halig gæst
wip earfeþum eaþe gescilde
for þam myrcelse þe þec monnes hond
from þinre onsyne ðæþelum ahwyrfde' (v. 459).

This misinterpretation of Guplac's boasts allows the devils
to attack what they believe to be the source of Guplac's
strength by asserting that this same myrcels aligns the saint
with religious hypocrites. Not surprisingly, the devils
again use the devices of flyting rhetoric to make their
accusation more effective:

(v. 460) 'In þam mægwlite monge lifgæþ
gyltum forgiefene, naþes Gode þigæþ,
ac hy lichoman fore lufan cwemæþ
wista wynnum: swa ge weorþmyndu
in dolum dreame dryhtne gieldæþ.
Fela ge fore monnum miþþr þæþe þe ge in mode gehycþæþ' (v. 465).

Here, the devils manipulate personal pronouns to focus their
charges specifically on Guplac. In addition, they echo the
saint's own words, as a comparison of the above citation with
vv. 386b-9 shows:
Despite the common vocabulary, the difference between the two passages is profound. In vv. 386b-9, Guþlac reminds the devils that God's servant eschews earthly wealth beyond the simple necessities of survival, while in vv. 460-5, the devils twist Guþlac's words into the contradictory claim that God is served by dissolute followers who hypocritically pursue physical pleasure.

The devils conclude their attack with a cynical echo of Guþlac's claim that "'ic eow fela wille sop a gesecgan'" (vv. 243b-4a), disingenuously protesting that they torment Guþlac so that he may know the truth ("We pec in lyft gelæddun ... pat we pe sop onstældun," vv. 467-8).

Before relating Guþlac's reply, the poet describes the saint in language which could apply equally well to the secular warrior engaged in battle flyting. Like such an individual, Guþlac faces his foes emboldened by courage ("elne gebylded," v. 475b), and in his speech predicts their defeat ("hy sigelease/ ðone grene wong ofgiefan sceoldan," vv. 476b-7). As one might expect given this introduction, analysis of his lengthy reply shows that it is influenced not only by Christian doctrine, but also by the commonplaces of secular flyting.

This conflation of the secular and sacred is evident at the outset in v. 478:

'Ge sind forscadene! On eow scyld sitep!'

Here, like a flyter, Guþlac uses direct address. In v. 478a, he also utters an insult equally effective from profane and sacred perspectives, for in alleging that the devils are "forscadene" or scattered, he implies not only the flyting
insult of heroic failure, but also states what was probably the devout AS's opinion of Satan and his devils. The second insult -- that sin rests upon the demons -- is derived from Christian doctrine, but here it is used like a flyting counterclaim, contradicting the devils' accusations (vv. 460-6) by reassigning the guilt which they attribute to lax monks to the real offenders, the devils themselves.

Vv. 479-82 also conflate the sacred and the secular:

(v. 479) Ne cunnon ge ōdryhten ὑγιῆ biddan
ne mid eamedium are secan
peah pe eow alýfde lytle hwile
pæt ge min onwald agan mosten' (v. 482).

Guplac here insults the demons by attacking their behaviour, but instead of alleging (as a secular flyter might) that they cannot fight, Guplac maligns their capacity for prayer -- a more felicitous insult from the Christian perspective. Guplac is careful, however, to increase the aggressiveness of his words by including agonistic pronoun juxtaposition in his diatribe (*ge min,* v. 482a).

After describing how the devils' torments succeeded paradoxically in giving him a clearer view of "swegles leoht" (vv. 481-7), Guplac turns his attention to the devils' insinuation that he has colluded in monastic laxity and sin. He paraphrases their charge (vv. 488-90), then counterattacks by reciting some commonplace beliefs of Christianity, telling the devils that their allegations reflect the demonic preference for evil over good (vv. 492-3a), and that the faults which they criticize are the venial faults of youth, for which God provides a remedy in the fullness of time (vv. 492-504):

(v. 492) 'sohtun þa sæmran ond þa sellan no
demandæfterdædom. Ne beop þa dyrne swa þeah.
Ic eow sop wip þon secgan wille:
(495) God scop geogþe ond gumena dream;
ne magun þa æfterylð in þam ærestan

366
Analysis of this passage shows that in addition to its Christian message, it contains several verbal echoes characteristic of secular flyting. For example, earlier in vv. 462-5, the devils associate *lufu*, *wynn* and *dream* with sinful behaviour. Guþlac, however, uses these words (or their cognates) to denote legitimate joys sanctioned by God (vv. 495-9). A more complex echo occurs in v. 493. Here, Guþlac throws back at the devils their earlier claim that "ne beop eowre dæde dyrne þeah þe ge hy in dygle gefremme" (v. 466), rearranging their words into his own rather different claim that the devils will not acknowledge good deeds even though they are not secret. Guþlac also prefaces his recapitulation of God's creative plan (vv. 495-500) with another echo. In asserting that "ic eow sop ... secgan wille," he not only restates his boast that he speaks the truth (v. 243b-4a), but also contrastively echoes and contradicts the devils' insistence that "we þec sop onstældun" (v. 468b).

Flyting's influence persists throughout the remainder of the speech, for Guþlac continues to transform relevant portions of the Christian message into the accusations and threats which are the staples of flyting discourse, accusing the devils of delight in sin (vv. 505-8), and refuting their claim that they speak the truth with the charge that devils never praise the virtues of those who are truthful ("sópfæstra no/ ... mæran willaþ," v. 506b-7). Guþlac then threatens the devils with the eternal equivalent of the temporal exile with which they have repeatedly threatened him ("frofre ne wenþ/ þæt ge wræcsipþa wyrpe gebiden," vv. 508b-9). Guþlac uses the rhetoric of secular flyting to give this threat a final fillip of personal animosity. Using agonistic pronoun contrast ("ge ... stondþ," "me ... sendeþ,"
vv. 510-11), and echoing the devil's onstælan (v. 468b) in the cognate noun gestal (v. 510a), the saint tells the demons that although they often accuse, they will be punished, and that he will be the one to administer that punishment:

(v. 510) 'Oft ge in gestalum stondæþ; þæs cymerp steor of hæofonum; me þonne sendæþ se usic semon mæg, se þe lifa gehwæs lengu wealdeþ' (v. 512).

The devils do not respond, and their silence testifies to Guþlac's victory, ending this third verbal skirmish.

The fourth confrontation in Guþ A corresponds, as I have already noted, to the final portion of Guþlac's third encounter with his demonic opponents in chapter 31 of Felix's Vita. Having taken Guþlac to the portal of hell, the devils begin a flyting-like exchange. They address the saint directly, uttering both a threat ('nobis .. commissum est') and an accusation ('quern accendisti in delictis tuis'), emphasizing their hostility to Guþlac throughout with agonistic pronoun contrast:

1 Ecce nobis/ potestas data est te trudere in has poenas, et illic inter atrocissimarum gehennarum tormenta variis cruciatibus nobis te torquere commissum est. En ignis, quern accendisti in delictis tuis, te consumere paratus est' (Colgrave, chapter 31, pp. 104-6).266

Like a flyter, Guþlac deflects the demons' fighting words with a curse (the exorcistic, "vae vobis") as well as with insults ("filii tenebrarum, semen Cain," p. 106), including one drawn from Scripture (Job 30.19) which, with the specificity typical of flyting retort, aptly counters the devils' fiery threat by calling them dust and ashes ("favilla cineris," p. 106). He then dares the demons to do their worst:
This portion of Guþlac's reply also capitalizes on flyting rhetoric, for it contains pronoun contrast, verbal echo (compare "me tradere poenis" with the demons' homophonous "te trudere in has poenas," above), as well as insult (Guþlac characterizes the devils' discourse as empty threats from lying throats). The saint's steadfastness in utterance and in spirit is rewarded by the reappearance of Bartholomew, who orders the demons to return Guþlac to his home. The devils comply, and Guþlac "adepto de hostibus triumpho" thanks God for his deliverance while the devils attest to their defeat, then vanish.

The Vercelli 23 account of the final stage of this encounter is similar to the Vita's. The devils take Guþlac to the doorway of hell and, like flyters, threaten and accuse him, emphasizing their animosity by contrasting an initial "us" with a succession of second person pronominal forms:

'Us is miht seald þe to scufanne on þas witu þysse neowolnesse; ond her is þæt fyr þæt þu sylfa in þe bærndest, ond for þinum synnum helleduru ongen þe openaþ' (Szarmach, ll. 103-105, p. 99).

Guþlac's reply in the homily is also very close to that found in the Vita. He utters a curse, as well as insults which include a quotation from Job ("Wa ... acsan," ll. 107-8, p. 99), and adds that the devils' threats are lies (l. 110, p. 99). There are, however, some differences. Vercelli 23 contains an extra insult (Guþlac calls the devils wretches, l. 108, p. 99), and in the homily, the opposition of first and second person pronominal forms is more pronounced than it is in Felix, perhaps in part because of the periphrastic nature of OE. As a consequence of these changes, the passage's resemblance to flyting, already
evident in the Anglo-Latin, is increased slightly in Vercelli:

\[ 'Wa eow ðystra bearnum ond forwyrdre tuddre ge syndon dustes acsan! Hwa geaf eow yrmingum ðæt, ðæt ge min geweald ahton in ðas witu to sendanne? Hwæt ic eom her ondweard ond earo, ond bide mines Dryhtnes willan. Forhwan sceolon ge mid eowrum leasum beotingum me bregean?' \] (11. 107-10, p. 99).

As in the Anglo-Latin, Guþlac's truthful discourse is more than a match for the demons' deceitful threats. His words precipitate the arrival of Bartholomew, and the devils are once again defeated (11. 111-15, p. 99).

The suggestion of flying evident in the Vita and Vercelli 23 is fully developed in Guþ A. The poet treats the dispute at hell's doorway as a fourth verbal skirmish, separating it from the preceding quarrel about monastic hypocrisy by interjecting over 40 lines of authorial comment (vv. 512-56) which reassert that Guþlac is a Christian soldier ("halig cempa," v. 513b), strengthened by God (vv. 530-1a), but assailed by the threatening words of fierce enemies ("Þrea wæron ðeare, þegnas grimme/ ealle hy þam feore fyl gehelton," v. 547-8). In the ensuing verbal struggle, the devils' increasing weakness is reflected in the brevity of their speech (vv. 579-89), while Guþlac's growing strength is manifested in a speech over 80 lines long in which he bludgeons the devils with a combination of Christian doctrine and secular flying rhetoric.

The confrontation begins when the devils, despite their awareness that they cannot harm Guþlac (vv. 553-5a), drag the saint to the doorway of hell, and there initiate a verbal skirmish, hoping that their empty threats will cause him to despair:

\[ (v. 569) Óngunnorn gromheorte Godes orettan in sefran swencan, swiþe gehelton ðæt he in ðone grimman gryre gongan sceolde (v. 571) ... \]
Like flyters, the devils begin by addressing Guþlac directly, derisively attacking his claim to be God's loyal retainer ("ic eom dryhtnes þeow," v. 314b) in a series of negative clauses:

(v. 579) 'Ne eart þu gedefe ne dryhtnes þeow clæne gecostad ne cempa god wordum ond weorcum weal gecyped, halig in heortan' (v. 582a).

Their words are potentially damaging from both secular and sacred perspectives, for the devils insist that Guþlac will not have "spowende sped spreca ond dæda" about which he boasts in v. 254 not only because he lacks the words and deeds which befit a warrior (vv. 580b-1), but also because he lacks the holiness required of God's servants (v. 582a).

In vv. 582b-6, the devils utter a threat which is commonplace in secular flyting,269 but which illustrates their failure to understand the Christian context of the dispute in which they are engaged:

(v. 582b) 'nu þu in helle scealt deope gedufan, nales dryhtnes leohht habban in heofonum, heahgetimbru, seld on swegle, forþon þu synna to fela facna gefremedes in flæschoman' (v. 586).

In promising Guþlac that he will go to hell, the devils are conducting a fruitless parody of exorcism. Since exorcistic utterances can, by definition, be fulfilled only when they are spoken by the devout to evil spirits or devils, the devils' threat is inapposite and empty. Moreover, as is usual in demonic discourse, this botched exorcism is founded on lies, for not only do the devils insist that Guþlac merits this terrible fate on account of sinful behaviour (vv. 585b-
6), they also know full well that they have no capacity to harm the saint (vv. 553-5a).

The devils have more success with the flyting device of verbal echo. In this same passage they borrow leohht, swegl and the second element of heahgetimbru from Guplac's earlier insistence that in raising him to see "londa getimbru" the devils inadvertently showed him "swegles leohht" (v. 486b). Here, however, the devils turn Guplac's words against him, threatening that such a vision will be forever denied him. They conclude with a threat which contains an example of the agonistic pronoun contrast characteristic of flyting:

(v. 587) 'We pe nu willap womma gehwylces lean forgieldan par pe lapast bi, in pam grimmestan guestgewinne' (v. 589).

Guplac replies to this relatively brief attack at length, and once again his reply is a skilful amalgam of flyting rhetoric and Christian doctrine. Addressing the demons directly, he dares them to fulfill their threats, but adds that this can happen only if Christ, the "weroda waldend," permits (vv. 592-5).270 He then recites Christian teachings concerning the devils' defeat and eviction from heaven, but like a flyter he does so in a particularly insulting fashion, describing the devils as humbled captives who are driven to their fetters by a conquering king (v. 596b). Guplac uses agonistic pronoun juxtaposition ("se eow") to give these words an added hostility:

(v. 596) 'pæt is in gewealdum wulddorcyninges se eow gehynde ond in hæft bidraf under nearone clom, nergende Crist' (v. 598).

Having maligned the devils' martial prowess by recounting this ignominious defeat, Guplac counters their accusation that he is fit neither to be God's servant nor God's warrior (vv. 579-80) with a boast which echoes and
reasserts his earlier claim to be God's servant (compare vv. 599-600a and v. 314b). Gu płac supports his claim with a series of commissive illocutions which corresponds to the secular warrior's projective boasts of loyalty to his lord. Appropriately, in Gu płac's sacred version of these boasts, he promises to repay the gifts of the lord with the pious speech acts of thanksgiving, blessing and praising, rather than with the more violent deeds vowed by secular comitatus members.²⁷¹ Moreover, unlike the devils' boasts in this extended flyting, or even the boasts of a secular warrior, Gu płac's words represent their own fulfillment, for throughout the extended sacred flyting, as well as in this speech, he celebrates God's nature and prowess, just as he here vows that he will²⁷²:

(v. 599) 'Eom ic eaðmod, his ombiehthera,  
þeow geþyldig. Ic geþafian sceal  
æghware ealles his anne dom

(v. 605b) ond him þoncian  
ealra þara giefena þe God gescop  
englum ærest ond eorþwarum,  
ond ic bletsige bliþe mode  
lifes leochtfruman ond him lóf singe  
þurh gedefne dom dæges ond nihtes,  
herge in heortan heofonrices weard' (v. 611).

These lines have more in common with flyting than their boastful nature, however. Like a flyter, Gu płac manipulates personal pronouns, contrasting first person pronouns with a series of second person pronouns (vv. 592-7) and following them with another series of second person pronouns (vv. 612-5).²⁷³ In addition, the first person pronouns of vv. 599-608 respond to the devils' the accusatory "þu ... þu ... þu" in vv. 579-85, and exemplify the agonistic contrast of personal pronouns across speech boundaries discussed above. Gu płac also uses verbal echo in this passage. He borrows leoht, heorte and gedefæ from the devils' insults and threats in vv.
579-83, and incorporates these words into his own pious boasts.

Having boasted of his devout deeds, Guplac next utters a series of threats, shifting, as I have already noted, from the first person pronouns of vv. 599-610, to second person pronouns:

(v. 612) 'pæt eow æfre ne biþ ufan alyfed
leohes lissum  pæt ge lof moten
dryhtne secgan  ac ge deaþe sceolon
(615) weallendne wean  wope besingan,
heaf in helle,  nales herenisse
halge habban  heofoncyninges' (v. 617).

Analysis of these lines shows that the pronoun contrast inherent in the shift from "ic" to "eow" and "ge" is not the only flying device present. Guplac also turns the demons' own words against them. He borrows leoht from the devils once again, this time to emphasize that it is they, not he, who will be deprived of heavenly light. Instead, he then promises them the miseries of hell, echoing in v. 614 portions of their own threat in v. 235 that "he deaþa gedal dreogan sceolde". A little later, in vv. 616-7, Guplac appropriates hell, nales, halig, habban and heofon from the devils (vv. 581-4), and uses these words in his own prophesy that the devils will lament in hell, and will not share in the holy praise of the heavenly king (vv. 616b-7). In addition, vv. 614b-5 are syntactically parallel to vv. 608-9, and this parallelism creates a balanced opposition typical of flying discourse.274

Perhaps still stinging from the devils' derisive (and deceitful) claim that he is inadequate in deeds and discourse ("ne dryhtnes þeow/ ... ne cempa god/ wordum ond weorcum wel gecyped," vv. 579-81), Guplac asserts his competence in word and deed in vv. 618-20a with a boastful rebuttal which contains an echo of the devils' words, as well as his own275:

(v. 618) 'Ic þone deman  in dagum minum
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wille weorpian wordum ond dædum
lufian in life. Swa is lar ond ar
to spowendre spræce ge læded
þam þe in his weorcum willan ræfnæp' (v. 622).276

In vv. 623-8, Guþlac continues to address the devils
directly, and to insult them by calling them traitors and
exiles, drawing on conventional AS Christian notions of hell
(see, for example, XSt and GB) to describe the wretchedness
of their exiled state:

(v. 623) 'Sindon ge wærlogan: swa ge in wræcsipæ
longe lifdon, lege biscencetæ,
swearte beswicene, swegle benuæme,
dreamæ bidroæne, deæpe bifolæne,
firenum bifongæ, feores orwæna,
þæt ge blindnesse boæ fundon' (v. 627).

Comparison of these lines with earlier speeches, however,
shows that individual ingredients in this particular portrait
of hell can also be found in the devils' threats, for the
nouns lig, sweæl, deæp and feorh figure in the devils'
discourse in v. 193b ("lig forswelgan"), vv. 583-5a ("nales
dryhtnes leoæt ... on sweæle"), v. 235 ("deæpa gedreogan
sceolde,") and v. 291b ("gif þu þines feores recce"). Here,
then, conventional Christian description includes the verbal
echo of flyting.

Verbal echo occurs again in vv. 632-5, when Guþlac
reminds the devils that they must endure eternal fire, death
and darkness on account of their pride. Portions of this
threat are constructed from v. 235 ("he deæpa gedal dreogan
sceolde") and vv. 269-70a ("ne we oferhydgu anes monnes ...
maran fundon"): 

(v. 632) 'Ne mostun ge a wunian in wyndagum
ac mid scome scylædim scoæene wurdon
fore oferhygædim in eææ fyr
þær ge sceolol dreogan deæp ond þystæro' (v. 635).
In v. 637a, Guplac uses a credal formula to re-introduce confession into the verbal battle ("ic þæt gelyfe"), and testifies at some length to the faith in God which sustains him (vv. 637-51). He concludes this Christian confession on an aggressive note worthy of flyting, however, for he couples pronoun contrast ("ic," "ge mec," "mine"), verbal echo (compare v. 648 and v. 290a), and insult (vv. 650-la) to assert that the Trinity will protect him from the devils' attack:

(v. 645) 'Forpon ic getrywe in þone torhtestan
þynesse þrym se geþeahtingum
hafþ in hondum heofon ond eorpan
þæt ge mec mid niþum næfre motan
tormode teon in tintergu
mine myrþran ond mansceþan,
swearte, sigeleas' (v. 651a).

In the remainder of his speech, Guplac juxtaposes boasts of his own devotion to God and its rewards (which include residence in "pam betran ham," vv. 651b-7), with threats of darkness and accusations of sinful pride and false boasting directed at the demons (vv. 661-2). The agonistic quality of his words is enhanced by pronoun contrast as well as adversative syntax. Guplac continues to address his opponents directly with an accusatory recitation of the devils' past deeds and their consequences (vv. 665-72). He concludes by telling the devils that they cannot shove him into hell, because that is their destination:

(v. 673) 'ne þurfun ge wenan wuldre biscyrede
þæt ge mec synfulle mid searocæftum
(675) under sceð sconde scufan motan
ne in bælblasan bregdon on hinder
in helle hus, þær eow is ham sceapen,
sweart sinnehte, sacu butan ende,
grim gæstcwalu, þær ge gnornende
(680) deaþ sceolon dreogan ond ic dreama wyn
agan mid englum in þam uplican
rodera rice' (v. 682a).
Examination of the passage shows that here, too, the saint fights with both the weapons of devout discourse and the weapons of secular flyting. For example, in a theological amplification of a flyting curse,\textsuperscript{279} he attacks the devils with Church doctrine concerning the fruits of sin, reminding them that their true home is not on the beorg as they suggest in v. 271, but in hell (v. 677). He also sharpens the edge of his metaphoric verbal sword with the pronoun contrast and verbal echoes of flyting. A series of accusatory second person pronouns is interrupted in v. 674 by agonistic juxtaposition, and concluded with an emphatic "ic." Verbal echoes include the reference to hell (compare v. 582b and v. 677a), to cruel death of the soul (compare "grimmestan gæstgewinne," v. 589 to v. 679a) and the redirected threat of v. 235 in v. 679-80a ("ge ... deap sceolon dreogan").

This skilful combination of flyting rhetoric, Christian confession, and fulfilled boasts easily defeats the materialistic misinterpretations, the lies and the empty boasts and threats characteristic of the discourse of the demons. As in the Vita and Vercelli 23, Guplac's steadfast expression of his faith is rewarded by the appearance of Bartholomew whose words compel the devils to carry Guplac safely back to his hermitage (vv. 684b-9; vv. 722-32a), thus fulfilling the saint's earlier boasts that "Her sceal min wesan/ eorplic epel, nales eower leng" (vv. 260b-1a). The devils, on the other hand, are bound by Bartholomew (vv. 692b-6), forbidden to fulfill their threats, and ordered to leave the beorg to Guplac (vv. 698-702). Using words alone, Guplac has won the battle of the beorg.

To recapitulate, then, the Guþ A poet, like the authors of Jlne, Ele and And, alters the confrontations between the saint and his enemies found in the prose analogues, transforming their interactions into a sacred species of flyting. In these sacred flytings, devils (or pagans) assault the soldier of Christ with conventional flyting.
insults and threats enhanced by the devices of flyting rhetoric, while the saint replies by transforming Christian subject matter into similarly boastful, accusatory and threatening utterances whose aggressive force is also enhanced by the verbal echo, pronoun contrast, and adversative syntax which are the rhetorical staples of flyting. Unlike secular flytings, the outcome in sacred flytings is inevitable -- the devils and pagans always lose. They are defeated not only because their words confront a divine discourse of superior perlocutionary force, but also because they are inept flyters. Their literal and materialistic cast of thought prevents them from understanding their opponents' spiritual frame of reference, and this misunderstanding makes them utter insults and threats which have no meaning for the saint, and therefore leave him unharmed. Their reliance on deceit further compromises their discourse, for as I show in chapter one, projective illocutions based on lies cannot be fulfilled by deeds, and therefore fatally undermine the utterance of flyters engaged in serious, rather than ludic, flyting. The saint, on the other hand, is not only armed with a discourse whose words have the status of deeds, he also possesses the rhetorical flair of a successful flyter, easily conquering the flawed utterance of his demonic enemies.
NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

1 All citations of Elene (hereafter Ele) will be from P.O.E. Gradon, ed., Cynewulf's Elene (London: Methuen, 1958).
3 I shall omit Guflac B from the discussion which follows. Although the Guflac B poet refers to the demons' attacks on the saint as loud and senseless utterance (ASPR III, vv. 894b-5a and 898b-900a), his treatment of their confrontation with Guflac is brief. The more significant struggle in Guflac B is between the saint and death, reified as an enemy warrior who attacks Guflac with arrows of pain and illness (vv. 864b-5a and vv. 1135b-44a) rather than with verbal weaponry.
4 Hereafter, Julina. All citations will be from Woolf, ed., Juliana (London: Methuen, 1955).
5 The ultimate source of all accounts of Juliana's ordeal is a martyrdom probably first recorded in the reign of Constantine (Woolf, Juliana, p. 11). From this account come several later Latin narratives, one or more of which may have been the immediate inspiration for Cynewulf's Julina. While Garnett argues that Cynewulf based his poem on the text now preserved in ASS February 16 ("The Latin and the Anglo-Saxon Julina," PMLA 14 [1899], p. 285), Allen and Calder qualify this claim, saying that this text is similar to Cynewulf's source, but not the source itself (Sources and Analogues, p. 121). It is, however, "the closest surviving analogue to Cynewulf's poem" (Calder, Cynewulf [Boston: Twayne, 1981], p. 75), and thus remains the best text against which to compare the OE Julina. Hereafter references to this ASS text will be denoted either ASS Feb. 16, followed by section and page, or acta.
6 Although Schaar warns that a comparative analysis of Julina and its Latin analogue must be made with caution on account of gaps in the OE ms. after v. 288 and v. 558 (Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group, Lund Studies in English 17, p. 28), Boenig makes a good case for such an analysis: "If we can identify either a work's source or -- if that is not strictly possible -- at least a tradition from which an exact source came we can then compare and contrast the author's treatment of the same materials, making along the way some valid comments about why he changed certain things" (The Acts of Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals: Translations from the Greek, Latin, and the Old English [New York and London: Garland, 1991], p.i).
7 For a discussion of the passio narrative and its connection to the metaphoric war of words, see my chapter two, pp. 78-9. For accounts of the verbal and physical struggles of Cecilia, Agatha, and Margaret, see my chapter four, pp. 147-52, pp. 159-60 and pp. 175-81 respectively. For more general discussions of the martial metaphor in OE religious literature, see Hill, "Soldier of Christ," 57-80, and Hermann, "Some Varieties of Psychomachia in OE I and II," ABR 34 (1983), 74-86 and 188-222.
8 Woolf ("Saints' Lives," Continuations and Beginnings, ed. E.G. Stanley [London: Thomas Nelson, 1960], p. 44) calls Juliana's interaction with Affricanus and Eleusius a "verbal battle," as does Bridges (Generic Contrast, p. 26). Although Anderson finds in these
dialogues some of the characteristics which I treat as definitive of flyting, including conflicting frames of reference and ironic verbal echoes (*Verbal Contests,* p. 227), he does not call such saint/pagan dialogues flyting, but argues instead that they are "verbal contests." I discuss Anderson's taxonomy in chapter one, pp. 10-11.

9 Hill's analysis of the *miles christi* in OE literature shows that although Juliana is not described by any of the martial epithets usually applied to the soldier of God in OE verse, she nonetheless "conforms to the warrior-martyr type within the *miles christi* tradition who 'fights' by enduring a physical passion and who, by that faithful endurance, wins victory in death" ("Soldier of Christ," p. 69). I shall discuss Juliana's status as warrior in greater detail below.

10 Throughout the remainder of this chapter, my comparison of OE texts and their Latin analogues will be limited for the most part to an examination of their treatment of adversarial dialogue. The relative increase in the martiality of Cynewulf's text, however, is often apparent in passages which are not directly connected to adversarial dialogue. For example, the first section of *ASS* Feb. 16, p. 875 implies a less aggressive relationship exists between Juliana and Eleusius than does the corresponding portion of the OE. For a more detailed comparison of the two works than I provide, see Garnett, "The Latin and AS *Jlna,*" pp. 288-98 and Bridges, *Generic Contrast,* pp. 23-35. Bridges concludes that in general Cynewulf's deviations from *ASS* Feb. heighten contrasts which are often only implicit in the Latin (p. 34).

11 Marie Nelson observes that Cynewulf alters the text of the analogue in order to emphasize "the conflict of might and right" as well as Juliana's heroism (*Judith, Juliana, and Elene: Three Fighting Saints* [New York: Peter Lang, 1991], p. 102). She provides no detailed analysis of the passage, however, nor does she associate it with the martial context of flyting. It ought to be noted here that not all critics interpret the martiality of *Jlna* as a straightforward allegorization of spiritual warfare. For example, Schneider argues that "Cynewulf deliberately contrasts traditional heroic values with a Christian standard of behaviour" ("Cynewulf's Devaluation of Heroic Tradition," *ASS* 7 (1978), p. 108). As my analysis will show, I disagree with Schneider's interpretation.

12 The controversial *Beowulf* borrowings found in *And* testify to the possibility of such inter-textual allusion in OE verse (see, for example, Brodeur, *A Study of Diction and Style in Three Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poems,* Nordica et Anglica: Studies in Honor of Stefan Einarsson, ed. A.H. Orrick, [The Hague: Mouton, 1968], pp. 97-114, and Hamilton, *Andreas and Beowulf: Placing the Hero,* *AS Poetry: Essays in Appreciation,* pp. 81-98. Schaar [Critical Studies] provides a list of collocations and half-lines which Cynewulf's poems share with *Beowulf.* *Jlna* vv. 1-17 suggest the connection at several points. Both *Jlna* vv. 1-4 and *Beowulf* vv. 1-3 ("Hwæt, we Gardena in geardagum, / ðæocyninga þrym gefrunon, / hu þæs æþelingas ellen fremedon!") introduce descriptions of an ancient king's martial deeds with a prefatory comment about how the rumour of these deeds has been preserved through the ages, and both couple this with a brief description of the extent of each king's power. In both poems, this introduction is followed by a description of specific martial deeds. Cynewulf's catalogue of bloodshed, however, is longer than that provided by the *Beowulf* poet (Scyld upsets mead benches [v. 5b] and terrifies men with his troops
[vv. 4b-6a] while Maximian's rampage includes murder, the destruction of churches, and the burning of the faithful).

13 Not all critics agree with this reading. For example, Cherniss (Ingeld and Christ, p. 196) and Olsen (Speech, Song, p. 83) argue that the purpose of the exordium in Jlna is to criticize the Germanic warrior ideal. Hermann ("Language and Spirituality in Cynewulf's Jlna," TSLL 26 [1984], p. 269) goes further and asserts that martial terms such as cempa, hererinc and pegn are used to connect Juliana's mortal opponents with the Satanic comitatus. However, other critics support a reading similar to the one advanced above. Nelson, for instance, argues that the purpose of the exordium of Jlna is to establish the "metaphor of war for spiritual conflict" (Structures of Opposition in Old English Poems [Amsterdam: Edition Rodopi, 1989], p. 107). She notes that this metaphor is implicit in the devil's description of Juliana as "wigprist," or "bold in battle" in v. 432a (p. 111). Bridges shows that the phrase "godes cempan" (v. 17) links the metaphorical soldiers of God with Juliana who is called "ellenrofne," "modigne" and "Metodes cempan" in vv. 382-3 (pp. 85-7), and Hill argues that v. 395b also implies that Juliana is a cempa ("Soldier," p. 69). Indeed much of the devil's description of spiritual warfare in vv. 382-417 (which has no counterpart in the acta) carries a similar implication.

14 In an abstract of a paper given at the 27th International Conference on Medieval Studies, Symposium on the Sources of AS Culture in May, 1992 (published in OEN 25 (3), p. A-8), Swenson proposes a similar interpretation: "The long verbal battle between Juliana and the fiend ... may be analyzed as mannjafrnafpr, or a formal competitive comparison of men. Aspects of the oral mannjafrnafpr structure also pervade the text as two cultures -- pagan and Christian -- each use standards of strength and truth to assert the superiority of their rival lords. The two cultures use similar techniques (assertions, boasts, insults)."

Although I maintain that sacred flyting is a more appropriate label for these debates (see my chapter one, pp. 18-19 for the difficulties inherent in distinguishing mannjafrnafpr and senna), I agree with Swenson that the dialogues in Jlna contain assertions, boasts and insults which originate in a Germanic debate genre.

15 In ASS Feb. 16, the quarrel between Juliana, Affricanus and Eleusius is about 85 lines long, and consists of 22 individual speeches. In OE Jlna, on the other hand, the debate is lengthened to about 180 lines, but the number of speeches is reduced to 13. A similar situation occurs in Juliana's confrontation with the devil, which is about 160 lines long and contains 24 speeches in the acta, but is over 300 lines long in Jlna (the OE version would be even longer, if a leaf were not missing from the ms. between v. 288 and v. 289.), and contains only 14 speeches. As I have shown above, there is an abundance of dialogue in ASS Feb. and in OE Jlna. Therefore, to avoid excessive repetition, I have elected to confine my discussion to those exchanges which are most altered in the OE.

16 "Eleusius vero sponsus ejus nuptiarum completre festinebat festivitatem" (ASS Feb. 16, 1, p. 875). There is no sign in the Latin that Juliana has objected to this initial tie with Eleusius, and thus she seems to be less intransigent in the acta than she does in Jlna.

17 Calder notes that there is nothing which corresponds to this in Jlna, and argues that while Cynewulf's alteration makes the character of Juliana less believable, it heightens the antagonistic relationship of the saint to her opponent (Cynewulf [Boston: Twayne, 1981], p. 79).
Anderson agrees that the change develops "a moral contrast between Juliana and her foes" (Cvnewulf: Structure, Style and Theme in His Poetry [London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1983], p. 88).

For a comparison of Juliana's and her opponents' speeches in terms of their relative stylistic efficacy, see Bjork, OE Verse Saints' Lives, pp. 45-61. While Bjork's analysis is both informative and important, it is peripheral to my purpose here which is to examine the rhetoric of mutual aggression contained in the dialogues of OE verse hagiography, rather than to evaluate the relative aesthetic merits of speakers' utterances.

Bridges likewise recognizes that Juliana's speech establishes that her disagreement with Eleusius is not "amorous," but is a "theomachia" in which pagan and Christain contend (Generic Contrast, p. 93).

Nelson argues that phrases such as this imply performative utterance ("The Battle of Maldon and Juliana: The Language of Confrontation," Modes of Interpretation in OE Literature, pp. 143-5).

I am indebted to Bridges for this observation (Generic Contrast, p. 97). She notes that such "syntactic antithesis" is typical of the discourse of saint and pagan throughout Jīna (in vv. 195a-7a; 124-5; 171b-3; 249b-51a; 134-9, 176-7, 210-11), but she does not discuss the significance of this feature as an indication of flying influence.

Nelson notes that this participle suggests "a potentiality for violent action," but she does not appear to associate that violence with the verb "reordode" ("The Battle of Maldon and Juliana," p. 144).

Flyting initiators frequently challenge their opponent's honour, and Eleusius here construes Juliana's refusal to marry him as such a challenge. Later, the devil will claim that her discourse has a similarly injurious effect upon him (vv. 539-45a).

Flyters' conflicting frames of reference often cause them to echo their opponent's words while intending a contradictory meaning (see my discussion of Anderson's taxonomy in chapter one, p. 10). Such echoes contribute to the irony inherent in many secular flying exchanges, and are central to the religious warfare of sacred flying.

Calder says that this use of "ece eadlufan" would probably provoke "ironic, religious laughter" as would Affricanus' opinion expressed in v. 96b that the saint whom the poet calls "gleaw" (v. 131a) is foolish (Cvnewulf, p. 81). Affricanus' poor judgment arises from his pagan frame of reference. See also Anderson, Cvnewulf: Structure, Style and Theme, p. 93.

Bridges recognizes that lines such as these show that the discourse of Affricanus and Eleusius not only attacks Juliana's usage, but also Christian usage in general, including that of the poet and his devout audience (Generic Contrast, pp. 95-6, p. 118 and p. 263). See, too, Björk (OE Verse Saints' Lives, pp. 54-5).


Anderson also observes that Cynewulf repeats "certain words variously in good and evil contexts to reveal contrasting moral impulses" (Cvnewulf: Structure, Style and Theme, p. 93).

Affricanus calls Juliana's refusal "pin orlegu", and says that she "wipseccest ... Pinum brydguman." Although Woolf glosses orleg as "hostility" and wipsec as "refuse, renounce," Clark Hall defines orleg as "strife, war," and BT includes "slaughter, battle." Wipsec likewise has another more martial denotation than Woolf provides. Clark
Hall adds "strive against" and BT glosses the verb as not only "refuse, deny" but also "contend against." The glosses provided by Clark Hall and BT, then, suggest that Africannus considers Juliana's utterance an assault on Eleusius.

31 A little later, as I have noted above, the poet seems to enter the flyting exchange himself, replying to Africannus' accusation of foolishness with his own assertion that the saint is "gleaw" (v. 131). Likewise, the authorial voice in v. 175 and v. 209a contradicts Africannus' insinuation that Juliana is insufficiently noble (v. 101a). Such echoes not only testify to the truth of Bridges' view that pagan discourse is aligned against the author's as well as the saint's voice (Generic Contrast, pp. 95-6, p. 118), they also confirm that in Jlna flyting quarrel has a tendency to spread from the confines of the quasi-historical events recounted in the poem to the belief system of Christianity as a whole.

32 In his single-minded pursuit of his own gratification, Eleusius like Satan alienates himself from the true God and allies himself with a god of selfishness. Bridges discovers an additional complexity: "to freonde god" is ironically echoed a few lines later in the poet's introduction to Juliana's reply to the prefect. Cynewulf says not that Eleusius is a good friend for Juliana to have, but that her affection is rooted instead in God: "hio to Gode hæfde/ freondrædenne fæste gestæpelad" (vv. 106b-7. See, too, Generic Contrast, p. 114).

33 In the Latin, Africannus tells Juliana that if she does not change her mind about the marriage, he will feed her to wild beasts: "Per misericordes Deos Apollinem et Dianaam, quod si permanseris in his sermonibus, feris te tradam." Juliana replies that nothing, not even the threat of being burned alive, will make her change her mind: "Noli credere, pater, quia te timere habeo, per Filium Dei vivi, quod si viva habeo incendi, nunquam tibi consentiam." Africannus' request is repeated in indirect discourse, and once again Juliana tells him she will not change her mind. This time she focuses almost exclusively on the religious basis of her objection: "Eia pater, non intelligis quae a me tibi dicuntur. Verum dico et non mentior, quia omnem quaestionem et omnia judicia gratanter sustineo, nec recedam a Domini mei Jesu Christi praecepto" (ASS Feb. 16, 2, p. 875).

34 The Latin dialogue includes direct address, threat, settlement offer, pronoun contrast, some verbal echo, and a concluding insult. The first two speeches in ASS Feb. 16 restate familiar positions: "Dic dulcissima mea Juliana, quomodo me tanto tempore delusisti? Quis te persuasit colere alienum Deum? Convertere ad me et declina omnes cruciatus, qui tibi parati sunt, si sacrificare nolueris. Beata Juliana respondit: Et tu si consenseris mihi, ut addres Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, accuescam tibi: si vero nolueris, non mihi dominaberis" (ASS Feb. 16, 3, p. 875). The next speech, which Cynewulf omits, introduces a new element into the quarrel for here Eleusius appears to weaken, and offers to become a Christian after Juliana marries him: "Praefectus dixit: Domina mea Juliana, consenti mihi et credo Deo tuo." Juliana responds in her usual fashion: "Accipe Spiritum Dei, et nubam tibi." In another speech which Cynewulf omits, Eleusius complains that it is fear of Maximian and not religious conviction which makes him reluctant to convert: "Non possum, Domina mea, quia si fecero, audiet Imperator, et successorem mihi dans caput meum gladio amputabit. Sancta Juliana respondit: Et si tu times istum Imperatorem mortalem, et in stercore sedentem, quomodo me cogere potes immortalem Imperatorem negare?" (ASS Feb. 16, 3, p. 875).
"Wita" and "gegearwad" (vv. 172-3) echo "sar gegearwast ... heardra wita" (vv. 55-6).

Calder also notices the echoes of mundbora which occur in v. 213a, v. 266b and v. 276 (Cynewulf, p. 88). However, he does not discuss these echoes as features of flyting rhetoric.

In vv. 55-7 she says, "Naefre pu ... sar gegearwast,/ ... heardra wita," and in vv. 134-7, "Naefre ic me ondræde ... witebrogan ... pe pu ... to me beotast." The syntax of vv. 176-7 ("naefre ... buton") like that of vv. 55-7 is antithetical or adversative, and as such is well-suited to flyting exchange.


Eleusius is certainly a dangerous enemy in ASS Feb. 16, but a comparison of Julina vv. 184-8 with the corresponding portion of the Latin (see above) shows that the author of the acta is more restrained in his treatment of violence than is Cynewulf.

Gewin clearly denotes some form of conflict. Woolf glosses the noun as "strife, struggle" and BT adds "battle." Considering the potential violence of the situation, an AS audience might well have understood the noun to have a martial connotation.

In the acta, Juliana is the only one to utter insults, and she aims them exclusively at Eleusius.

He later adds that through foolishness, she has become a heretic ("purh pin dolwillen gedwolan fylgest," v. 202). Eleusius' use of gedwola is of course inapposite from the Christian perspective.

By using the adjective "unbiPyfre," Juliana here returns an insult which Affricanus directed at her in v. 97.

The insulting accusation in vv. 218-9a, ironically recalls Eleusius' insistence that Juliana "lac onsecge,/ sibbe gesette" (w. 199b-200a).

This is especially evident when portions of Eleusius' threat are juxtaposed with Juliana's response:

(Eleusius, v. 201b) 'Gif pu leng ofer pis
purh pin dolwillen gedwolan fylgest,
ponne ic nyde sceal, nipa gebasded,
on pe pa grimmestan godscyld wrecan,
torn teoncwide, pe pu taillnissum
wip pe selestan sacan ongunne
ond pa mildestan para pe men witen' (v. 207).

(Juliana, v. 210) 'Ne ondræde ic me domas pinne,
awyrged womsceapapa, ne pinra wita bealo;
As already noted, in v. 138b, Juliana's discourse provides an example of the correct usage, for she calls Eleusius' pagan religion "gedwolan pinne."

This also echoes and corrects the homophonic phrase, "mildum mundbyrd," uttered earlier by Eleusius when he advises Juliana to seek protection from his supposedly merciful gods (vv. 169-71a).

In the Latin account, she grabs the devil: "Tunc Sancta Juliana ... tenuit Belial daemonem et dixit ei: Dic mihi, quis es tu?" (ASS Feb. 16, 7, p. 876) then later binds him and strikes him: "tunc Sancta Iuliana ligavit illi post tergum manus, et posuit eum in terram, et apprehendens unum e vinculis de quibus ipsa fuerat ligata, caedebat ipsum daemonem" (ASS Feb. 16, 10, p. 877). That a martyr might thus follow her words with blows may have suggested to Cynewulf that the exchange resembled flyting. In Cynewulf's poem she also seizes the devil ("Heo past deofol genom," v. 288b), but what happens next is uncertain for after the verb "genom" there is a gap in the OE ms. When the narrative resumes the devil is in the midst of a reply.

In the Latin, the devil asks "Patrem meum superasti, me vinxisti, quid adhuc vis?" (ASS Feb. 16, 12, p. 877). In Jīna vv. 518b-525, he admits that he has never before encountered an opponent as strong as Juliana.

While in "The Art of Cynewulf's Jīna," MLO 34 (1973), 113-33, Calder calls the exchange a flyting, he observes in Cynewulf, p. 95 that it is also reminiscent of the catechumen's interrogation before baptism except that the confession elicited in Jīna focuses on the strategies and secrets of hell rather than on the doctrinal truths of Christianity and thus is "a parody of a Christian confession." The fact that Calder finds evidence of both flyting and confession here suggests that the exchange contains conventions characteristic of both Christian and Germanic dialogue, and might aptly be described as a sacred flyting.

The similarity of methods of attack is apt, for Juliana's devil, Belial, claims that it was he who tempted Adam and Eve (Jīna, vv. 494b-505 and ASS Feb. 16, 7, p. 876).

Although in the acta, the devil admits that he launched a verbal attack on Peter and Paul through Simon the Magician ("Ego sum qui per Simonem locutus sum quia magi essent Petrus et Paulus," ASS Feb. 16, 7, p. 876), he prefaches most of his other admissions with the phrase "ego sum qui feci." For example: "Ego sum, qui feci Adam et Evam in paradiso praevaricari: ego sum, qui feci ut Cain interficeret Abel fratrem suum ... ego sum, qui feci ab Herode Joannem decapitari ... ego sum, qui ad Neronem Imperatorem ingressus sum, ut Petrum crucigeret, et Paulum decapitaret: ego sum qui Andream feci tradi in regione Patras" (ASS Feb. 16, 7, p. 876). Olsen also recognizes the heightened importance of speech acts in this portion of Jīna (Speech, Song, pp. 100-8).

Vv. 382-417 appear to be Cynewulf's addition, for no equivalent passage exists in the Latin.

Compare, for example, Jīna vv. 484b-8a and "Vainglory" vv. 23-44.
55 The Latin also contains repetitions of Eleusius' words ("Accede et sacrifica ... et liberaberis de tormentis," ASS Feb. 16, 4, p. 875), but these are fewer than the OE, and rather mechanical.
56 The Latin does not specify any reason for her terror: "Juliana autem ingemiscens amarissime exclamavit ad Dominum, et oculos suos levans ad coelum cum lacrymis dixit" (ASS Feb. 16, 6, p. 876).
57 In ASS Feb. 16, the devil is more tractable and responds without demur to a series of brief questions (ASS Feb. 16, 8, p. 876). There is, therefore, no equivalent to the exchange in Jlna vv. 313b-8 in the Acta.
58 He makes a similar admission in vv. 494b-7.
59 This recitation resembles the flyter's catalogue of retrojective boasts. Because it occurs in both texts, however, it is not indicative of Cynewulf's imposition of the flying paradigm on the exchange.
60 Juliana here plays on the homophony of the noun waer meaning covenant which is the first element in the compound adjective "waerleas," and the adjective waer which means "cautious."
61 As I observed at the beginning of my discussion of Jlina, there is little indication in the OE text that the saint physically torments the devil in order to compel his confession. Belial's reference here to punishing affliction ("preaned"), a time of distress ("prag"), and excessive punishment ("preat ormæte") therefore seems likely to show the effect which Juliana's words rather than her deeds have upon him.
62 The corresponding passage in the Latin does not specify the role of insults in Belial's defeat: "Domina mea Juliana dimitte me, jam amplius noli hominibus me ridiculum facere: non enim potero postea homines convincere" (ASS Feb. 16, 12, p. 877).
63 Belial's sudden mention of Juliana's conquest of the "helwarena cyning" (which also occurs in the Latin) suggests to some scholars that here Juliana represents Jesus in the harrowing of hell (see Bjork, OE Verse Saints' Lives, p. 61, and Wittig, "Figural Narrative," pp. 45-6).
64 The devil makes a brief reappearance in vv. 614-34, in which he complains about Juliana's harsh treatment and encourages her enemies to torment her (vv. 619-27a). This time Juliana's glance is enough to make him vanish.
65 The ultimate source of Ele is a Syrian legend about the invention of the true cross (Calder, Cynewulf, p. 104; Allen and Calder, Sources and Analogues, p. 59). This legend was sufficiently popular to have inspired a number of Latin recensions, but none of those extant today duplicates the text of Ele exactly. There is, therefore, some disagreement about which of the existing Latin analogues is closest to Ele. Olsen, for example, prefers Mombritius' fifteenth-century account ("Cynewulf's Autonomous Women," New Readings on Women in OE Literature, p. 223), Campbell prefers the Inuentio Sanctae Crucis edited by Holder in the nineteenth century ("Cynewulf's Multiple Revelations," Med et Hum n.s. 3 [1972], p. 258), and Gardner argues that Cynewulf used a variety of sources ("Cynewulf's Elena: Sources and Structure," Neophilologus 54 [1970] p. 65). Allen and Calder, however, argue that the Acta Cyriaci, Pars Una found in ASS May 1, pp. 450-2, hereafter Acta, is closest to Ele. Accordingly, I shall compare Ele to the Acta in the discussion which follows, using the edition provided by Bodden in The Old English Finding of the True Cross (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1987). I do not include any detailed comparison of Ele and the OE prose account of her adventures in Jerusalem here because, for the most part, the OE prose
follows the Latin account. The only occasion when its deviation from the Latin clearly suggests flyting influence occurs before Elene begins to question Judas. In the Latin, her threat is reported indirectly in the narrative. In the OE account, it is rendered as a direct speech which includes agonistic pronoun contrast (Compare: "Tunc beata Helena jubet illos omnes igni tradi," Bodden, p. 80, and "Soplice ic sece ge pat ic eow ealle on fyre hate forbarnan buton ge me soplice gecypan pa halgan Cristes rode," Bodden, p. 81). Once again the point ought to be made that Ele's deviations from the Latin analogue need not necessarily be a consequence of Cynewulf's invention, for as Gardner observes, Ele may have other sources unknown to us whose influence is responsible for differences between Ele and the Acta. Nonetheless, the decision to add or to omit text remains an authorial one, and in OE Ele, therefore, these changes may be assumed, at the very least, to reflect an AS sensibility.

66 Several scholars have observed that the queen's conversation with the Jews is a doctrinal dispute. For instance, Calder discerns in the exchange a conflict between the letter of the Law as understood by the Jews, and the spirit of the Law as understood by Elene (Cynewulf, p. 113. See, too, Thomas Hill, "Sapiential Structure and Figural Narrative in the OE Ele," Traditio 27 [1971], p. 165 for a similar view). Indeed, Van der Wurff's analysis of Elene's first speech to the Jews in OE Ele shows that even at this early stage there are threatening overtones to the dispute, and that these are enhanced by Cynewulf's manipulation of his "source-material" ("Cynewulf's Elene: The First Speech to the Jews," Neophilologus 66 [1982], 301-312). Not all critics find the exchange so combative, however, and some treat it instead as an exchange of ideas. Olsen, for example, says "the dialogue between Elene and Judas is neither an argument nor a discussion, but a formalized exchange of speeches" (Speech, Song, p. 60), and Anderson calls the dialogue a Wettkampf, or "a contest in which the contestant matches his knowledge with another's often for some heavy stake" ("Verbal Contests," pp. 184-5). Yet the fact that the dialogue is about abstract issues does not imply that it is not combative, for both Clover and Lapidge argue that there is often a sapiential dimension to combative exchanges like secular flyting (see "Germanic Context," p. 446 and "Three Latin Poems," p. 99). In addition, as I shall show, the dialogue of Ele is adorned with the rhetorical trappings of verbal battle.

67 Indeed, Bridges suggests that the initial confrontation between Elene and the Jews varies sufficiently from the usual patterns of the passio debate to be an intentional parody (Generic Contrast, pp. 77-9). Woolf also observes that Ele "is, as it were, an inverted passion, in which the ruler is the Christian and the prisoner the pagan. The reader or hearer who has grown accustomed to the simple distribution of sympathies required of him by the passion may well become confused in Ele" ("Saints' Lives," p. 47). Doubleday describes one example of such confusion, noting that as a consequence of alterations to the format of the passio debate, Elene herself is in danger of emerging as a king of spiritual bully ("The Speech of Stephen and the Tone of Ele," AS Poetry: Essays in Appreciation, pp. 116-23). In an effort to make Judas' situation more palatable to a modern audience, Hill advances a "figural" reading of the poem in which Judas is "presented as a typal figure representing the Jewish nation outside the Church rather than simply as an individual Jewish wise man who was forcibly converted" ("Sapiential," p. 164). While Hill's assertion may well be true, analysis of Judas'
dialogue with Elene provides another and perhaps more economical justification for his ill-treatment, for in his exchange with Elene, Judas lies (Ele vv. 656-61, and Anderson, "Verbal Contests," p. 195). In doing so he aligns himself and his discourse with the devil. Bridges also observes that the dialogue lacks the abusiveness of many tyrant/martyr quarrels (Generic Contrast, pp. 77-9). Nelson also notes the increased prominence of military imagery in Ele (Three Fighting Saints, p. 198 and p. 200).

Van der Wurff ("First Speech to the Jews," pp. 307-8) observes that a similar insult is implicit in Elene's order that this group of Jews seek wiser individuals to consult with her ("snyttro ge\penca\p/ weras wis\fa\ste," vv. 313b-4a). He also notes that this echo of v. 293 (which he calls "chiming") is lacking in the Latin ("Nunc autem eligite ex vobis viros, qui diligenter sciunt legem vestram, ut respondeant mihi de quibus interrogavero eos" [Bodden, p. 72]). Van der Wurff's analysis of Elene's first speech to the Jews produces other examples of the OE account's deviation from the Latin which enhance the threatening tone of her speech. He does not, however, associate these changes with flyting rhetoric.

Because of its periphrastic nature, OE inevitably gives pronouns greater emphasis than does Latin. The initial position of "ge" seems, in addition, to reflect authorial manipulation. In Ele, Jewish interpretation of Scripture is called "gedwolan" (v. 311b, v. 371b). Although gedwola's most basic meaning is error, in a religious context it usually acquires the connotation of doctrinal error, and thus of heresy. In the Acta, the accusation is the milder, "errastis."

Gradon glosses wipsacan as "deny, refuse, renounce." BT adds, "to contend against." Considering Elene's accusatory tone, this stronger sense of opposition seems implicit here.

In the Acta, Elene says, "Adhunc euntes eligite meliores legis doctores" (Bodden, p. 74), and likewise in the OE, she says, "Ge nu hrape gengap/ ... asecap Pa \p/ snyttro mid eow/ ... maeste haebben" (vv. 406b-8). Although the two speeches are similar, the lines which frame them differ slightly. In the Latin Elene's words are prefaced by "Ipsa autem dixit iterum ad eos" (Bodden, p. 74) while in Ele, Cynewulf replaces "dixit" with "mapelade, " "spræc," and "reordode" (vv. 404-5). Furthermore, in the OE account, Elene's speech is followed by a description of her as "sio rice cwen, / bald in burgum" (vv. 411b-2a). There is also the implication in Ele that the Jews believe Elene is accusing them of political treachery rather than heresy, for they attempt to discover "hwæt sio syn wære/ Pe hie ... gefremed hæfdon/ wip \p/ \pam cæsere" (vv. 414b-6a). No comparable statement occurs in the Acta. Although individually these variations from the Latin may seem to have little significance, taken as a whole they suggest an increased emphasis on speech as act or deed, accompanied by an increased martiality of context, and thus they prepare the way for the transformation of interrogation into verbal fight.

Strictly speaking, Judas' confession is not part of the quarrel between the Jews and Elene, accordingly, I shall treat it briefly. Two points additional to those I shall make below are also significant. First, as I note at the beginning of this chapter, the OE text specifically refers to Elene's interrogation of the Jews as "geflitu" (v. 443b; in Latin, "quaestionem," p. 74), a usage discussed at the beginning of this chapter, which suggests a connection between Christian
verbal battle and secular flyting. Second, at the conclusion of Judas' speech in *Ele*, the elders leave the decision whether or not to reveal the truth about the crucifixion up to Judas (vv. 541b-43a). In the Latin, on the other hand, they order him to remain silent ("si ergo inquisitio facta fuerit de hoc, vide ne ostendcas" [p. 80]), and thus relieve Judas of some of the responsibility for the ensuing deceit.

Ironically, in proffering this advice, Judas is confirming Elene's opinion of Jewish behaviour, and is misunderstanding the "faderlyc lar" taught him by Zacheus and Simon, for Zacheus, Judas' grandfather, says that when Judas hears "ymb paet halig treo . . . gef litu raeran," he must confess what he knows (vv. 441-7), and Simon, Judas' father, concurs (vv. 522-5).

Likewise Calder observes, "For purely racial and political purposes Judas counsels resistance to Elene and Christ" (*Cynewulf*, p. 119). In the Latin, Judas is concerned only with the preservation of the more intangible Law and tradition, "videte ergo nemo/ ei confiteatur: nam vere destruentur paternae traditiones, et lex ad nihilum redigetur" (Bodden, pp. 74-76).

In *Ele*, five lines of Latin text are expanded into forty lines of OE verse. The Latin is: "ecce veniunt milites ad eos dicentes, Venite, vocat vos Regina. Illi autem dum venissent judicabantur ab ea; et nihil verum volebant dicere de hoc unde percunctabantur. Tunc beata Helena jubet illos omnes igni tradi. Qui cum timuissent, tradiderunt ei Judam" (Bodden, p. 80).

While Gradon ignores the first element of the compound and defines the noun simply as "assembly," BT glosses *heremepel* as "war-like assembly."

Gradon glosses *wifersac* as "contradiction," but BT glosses it as "contention."

The *Acta* says only, "Tunc beata Helena jubet illos omnes igni tradi" (Bodden, p. 80).

The power of her discourse is implicit in its almost instantaneous fulfillment. Her terrified audience tacitly admits defeat by giving Judas to Elene, saying that he is the son of a wise man (v. 592b), and that "he pe mæg sce gecypan/ onwreon wyrdra geryno swa pu hine wordum frignes" (vv. 588b-589). Even though their speech in vv. 588b-597 is not agonistic in tone, it is connected to the ongoing quarrel by verbal echo. For example, "he pe mæg" is a positive variant of "ne magon ge," and *scēp*, "wyrdra" and "wordum" echo words which Elene uses.

The translation of the verb "apundrad" in v. 580b is problematic, but Gradon suggests "be accounted."

Even though their speech is not adversarial, it nonetheless contains verbal echoes of Elene's words ("wrigon" and "wyrd," v. 583 are echoed in "onwreon wyrdra," v. 589a).

In the *Acta*, Judas' boldness and noble lineage are not mentioned: "Hic viri justi et prophetae filius est, et legem novit cum actibus suis" (Bodden, p. 80).

The corresponding passage in the *Acta* is similar: "Vita et mors propositae sunt tibi: elige tibi quod vis, vitam an mortem" (Bodden, p. 82).

Nelson argues that the fact that Judas replies with a question indicates his continued resistance (*Structures of Opposition*, p. 114).

"Cynewulf's Multiple Revelations," p. 269. Campbell judges the ambiguity of Judas' speech to be a sign of the superficiality of his verbal skill.

See Thomas Hill, "Sapiential," p. 172 and "Bread and Stone Again" El 611-618," *NM* 81 (1980), 252-7. In the context of Matt. 4.3, the spiritually correct choice is the stone. There is another problem with Whatley's interpretation, for it seems unlikely that Judas would characterize the choice before him in the terms which Whatley proposes.

Anderson calls the passage "gnomic and enigmatic" ("Verbal Contests," p. 199). By comparison, the Latin (see above) seems clear in its implication that Judas is eager to choose bread and life.

Davidson, "Insults and Riddles," p. 35. Davidson cites as an example one of Erik's replies to Grep: "'A blockhead, unrestrained and unseemly in his emotions,/ cannot conduct his affairs with due moderation./ Oars cleave the wave, falsehood the land; the latter/ is vexed by men's mouths.'" For a general discussion of the use of proverbs in flyting, see Bax and Padmos, "Two Types of Verbal Dueling," p. 161. See also my chapter one, pp. 40-1, for a brief discussion of Erik's flying with Grep.

Frank argues that riddling (here, a complex play on similar expressions for rowing and swimming) may underlie Unferp's words in *Beowulf* vv. 512-15, and that part of Beowulf's victory lies in his ability to solve the puzzle ("Skaldic Tooth," especially pp. 344-7).

Although the echo is not thematically significant, Elene's "wintergerim" (v. 654a) combines "wintra" and "rime" (vv. 633-4), and provides an additional link between her discourse and Judas' typical of the mutual reciprocity of flyting speeches.

The sentence contains an echo of Elene's assertion that the Jews must have recorded the details of the crucifixion ("on gewritu setton" v. 654b).

Once again, I use BT's definition of *wipscan* (i.e. "contend against") rather than Gradon's gloss.

The contrast of *sop* and *licre* in vv. 665-6 echoes a similar contrast in Elene's speech in vv. 574-5.

"Ego quidem habeo beatam vocem Evangeliorum, in quo loco crucifixus est ipse Dominus;/ tantum ostende mihi, qui vocatur Calvariae locus; et ego faciam mundari locum; forsitan inveniam desiderium meum" (Bodden, pp. 82-4).

Anderson notices the echo of "stow" in conjunction with "gewritu," as well as another echo of "stow" in v. 683b, and rightly argues that the echo "emphasizes the clash between characters" ("Verbal Contests," p. 203).

The fact that this is a war of words about words is evident from the frequency with which nouns denoting some aspect of speech or writing (such as the noun *word* itself, variants of the phrase "witgena wordgeryno" [v. 289], *lar*, *boc*, *fyrngewritu* and the like) are bandied about by Elene and her Jewish opponents.

Not all contemporary scholars agree with Cynewulf's description. Although Campbell calls the quarrel "verbal combat" and a "fliting" ("Multiple Revelations," pp. 270-1), Anderson calls it a "verbal contest" ("Verbal Contests," p. 219).

No comparable accusation occurs in the Latin.

Hill suggests that Judas' reply "seems patterned on the renunciation of the devil in the baptismal liturgy" ("Sapiential," p. 175), and cites Daníélu's *Bible and Liturgy*, pp. 20-34 to support this claim. Daníélu discusses renunciation formulae in pp. 26-30, and two
examples will show how they vary. The formula provided by Cyril of Jerusalem is brief and addressed to Satan himself: "'I renounce you, Satan, and all your pomp and all your worship.'" Theodore of Mopsuestia's version is longer and is not addressed to Satan: "'I renounce Satan, and all his angels, and all his works, and all his worship, and all his vanity, and all worldly error; and I bind myself by vow to be baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit'" (pp. 26-7). Although neither version is particularly close to Ele vv. 939-52a, this does not necessarily mean that Hill is incorrect, for initiation liturgies varied considerably in the early Church, and there may have been a renunciation formula which more closely resembles this portion of Ele. Certainly, as I have shown, conventional Christian utterances such as confession and exorcism are frequent in sacred flyting, and there is no reason to suppose that a renunciation formula could not also find a place in this war of words. 104 Anderson, "Verbal Contests," p. 220 and p. 224. 105 Calder (Cynewulf, p. 128) uses this echo to show that the devil's speech and Judas' reply are parallel and "antithetical." He finds another antithesis in God's casting down of the strife which the devil raises up (vv. 941b-4a). 106 Bridges observes that "the phenomenon of bysonrian, or slander ... plays an important part in And" (Generic Contrast, p. 211). In her discussion of And in Structures of Opposition, pp. 83-104, Nelson also emphasizes that speech acts function as heroic deeds in And, and that Andrew is involved in a "war of words" with Satan (p. 93). Neither critic, however, analyzes the verbal combat in terms of the paradigm of secular flyting. 107 Schaar argues that the homilies are more closely connected to the textual tradition represented by the Recensio Vaticana than they are to "the detailed and fantastic" texts usually judged to be analogues of And (Critical Studies, p. 15). Brooks adds that "neither of these OE prose versions can be the immediate source of the poem, for they omit certain episodes common to And, P, and the Latin versions" (Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles, p. xvi). Boenig, however, compares BH 19 rather than the Latin Casanatensis (which I shall discuss below) to OE And, and in doing so implies that And and BH 19 are more closely related than Schaar and Brooks suppose. Unfortunately, Boenig's reasons for preferring BH 19 to Casanatensis are not completely convincing. He justifies his choice by claiming that BH 19 is "a tenth-century translation of the lost Latin intermediary" (Saint and Hero: Andreas and Medieval Doctrine [London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1991], p. 26). Since we have no way of knowing the exact nature of any hypothetical "intermediary" which is "lost," it seems unwise to assume that the homily is a translation of that missing text. My own reading of BH 19 supports Schaar's and Brooks' contention that the homily represents a different textual tradition from that of Casanatensis, Praxeis and And. BH 19 lacks the pervasive martiality of And, and omits important material (the debate with the High Priest, the animation of the stone figure) which is found in the other analogues as well as in And. Since, in addition, BH 19 does not display any substantial debt to flyting (perhaps because of the differing rhetorical constraints which impinge upon homily and Christian epic), I omit it from my comparison. 108 See Schaar, Critical Studies, p. 13, Brooks, Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles, pp. xv-xvii and Boenig, Andrew in the Country of the
Cannibals, p. ii and p. v. Schaar (p. 23) proposes a Latin text similar to both Praxeis and Casanatensis as the immediate source of And, and Brooks (p. xviii) as well as Allen and Calder (Sources and Analogues, pp. 14-15) tentatively concur, but add that Casanatensis is closer to And's source than Praxeis is. Once again, Boenig differs. He believes that And is often closer to Praxeis than to Casanatensis (p. viii), and in his Saint and Hero, p. 23, he dismisses Casanatensis' influence outright. For a more detailed discussion of the interrelationship of OE, Greek and Latin accounts of Andrew's adventures, see Brooks, pp. xv-xviii; Boenig, Andreas in the Country of the Cannibals, pp. i-viii; as well as Bridges, Generic Contrast, pp. 56-68; and Schaar, Critical Studies, pp. 12-24 (Schaar includes in his analysis an extensive comparison of individual passages drawn from Praxeis, Casanatensis and And). My own comparison of the adversarial dialogues in And, Praxeis and Casanatensis suggests that the And poet sometimes relies on Praxeis and sometimes on Casanatensis, depending on which best fills his poetic needs.

In the analysis which follows, I shall refer to Praxeis as P and Casanatensis as C. My citations of P are from Boenig's translation in Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals, pp. 1-23. The text of C which I cite is from Franz Blatt, Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der 'Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos' (Giessen and Copenhagen, 1930). Passages from C are cited by chapter, line and page.

The corresponding passage in P is: "In that time, all the apostles were gathered together in the same place and were dividing the nations among themselves by throwing lots so each would travel into his allotted portion" (P, p. 1.) C says, "In illo tempore erant apostoli simul in unum congregati, et dividebant inter se regiones, mittentes sortes, quatenus agnoscerent unusquisque, qualis pars ad eum ad predicandum devenirent" (C 1, 11. 1-3, p. 33).

For a more detailed, but rather unsympathetic analysis of the much debated martial diction of And, see Hill, "Soldier of Christ," pp. 71-3. See, too, Shippey, who finds the "heroic vocabulary" of And incongruous (OE Verse, p. 117). Such harsh judgments have increasingly given way to a recognition that the martial diction is an apt expression of spiritual warfare (see, for example, Hamilton's "The Diet and Digestion of Allegory in Andreas," ASE 1 [1972], 147-58 and his "Andrews and Beowulf: Placing the Hero," AS Poetry: Essays in Appreciation, pp. 81-98. See, too, Earl, "The Typological Structure of And," OE Literature in Context, pp. 66-89; and Hieatt, "The Harrowing of Mermedonia: Typological Patterns in the OE Andreas," NM 77 [1976], 49-62). My discussion of martial diction in And is indebted to these critics.

In C, Matthew travels to Mermedonia: "Devenit namque beati mathei in sortem provincie [sic] que dicitur mermedonia" (C 1, ll. 3-4, p. 33). However, P sends Mathias and not Matthew to Mermedonia, "According to lot, therefore, it was appointed that Mathias should go into the country of the cannibals" (P, p. 1). Boenig argues that the introduction of Matthew in C and other later accounts is the result of his being mistaken for the less familiar Mathias (Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals, p. 1). It is important to note, however, that even though C transforms Mathias into Matthew, the author of C does not enumerate Matthew's literary accomplishments. This appears to be the And poet's own addition and suggests his preoccupation with the role of words in spiritual battle.
All three accounts mention that the Mermedons are cannibals (see And vv. 21b-25a; C says: "nichil aliud preter hominis carnem edebant, eosque sanguinibus bibebant," C 1, 11. 5-6, p. 33 and P says: "The people of that city, indeed, neither ate bread nor drank wine, but were accustomed to eat men's flesh and drink their blood," P, p. 1). Beyond this, P, C and And differ. P does not specifically say that the Mermedons are evil. C, on the other hand, calls them "iniqui et pessimi viri" (C 1, 1. 5, p. 33). Of the three texts, however, only And specifically links the Mermedons with the devil and hell.

Again, P and C lack the martiality of the OE. P says: "the men of that city thus grabbed him and cast out his eyes" (P, p. 1), and C says: "statim ab iniquissimis viris civitatis illius comprehensus est" (C 2, 11. 2-3, p. 35).

In And, the potion also causes dementia ("se onwende gewit, wera ingeðanc ... hyge wæs oncyrrred," vv. 35-36) as it does in P ("when their victims drank the potion, their hearts were changed and mind transformed," p. 1) and C ("quisquis eam bibebat a suo sensu, exiebat, menteque iam non habentes, retrusi in carcere, fenum ut boves vel pecora conmmedebant [sic]," 1, 11. 16-17, p. 33). Only in And, however, is the side-effect of muteness mentioned.

In both P and C, Matthew prays instead to have his sight restored ("Therefore grant me, Lord, the light of my eyes," P, p. 2; "concedas mihi maxime lumen oculorum meorum," C 2, 11. 15-16, p. 35). In And, the unpleasant effects of "hearmcwide" are not limited to Matthew's experience, for the And poet later says that "pa arleaan inwilþancum/ Iudea cynn wiþ Godes bearne/ ahoft hearmcwide" (vv. 559-61a).

In P (p. 3) and C (chapter 3, p. 37) each prisoner is given a tablet upon which is recorded the date thirty days after his capture when he will be executed. The And poet omits mention of the individual tablets, but is careful to include the fact that the schedule is written.

P: "Obey the one who made you, the one able to say the word and that city would be taken away from there with all the people in it; for I command the horns of the winds, and they could blow it away" (P, p. 3). C: "Amen, amen dico tibi quoniam si iubeo verbum producere/ ut iuubeat his qui conmiscunt venti, statim eum defert coram me" (C, 4, 11. 18-1, pp. 39-41).

Andrew's eventual obedience in all three versions is yet another testimony to the power of God's word.

Neither BH 19 nor Ms. CCC 198 mentions this exchange. In these homilies Andrew's shipboard conversation is limited to a recounting of Jesus' calming of the waters.

P and C say only that Andrew prays for his disciples to fall asleep (P, p. 6; C, 8).

Vv. 462b-3 equate the act of teaching with the act of strengthening, and thus imply that God's word (with which Andrew instructs his disciples) acts like armour.

The Mermedons also use "hearmcwide" to attack their victims (v. 79a).

The noun wærloga identifies Satan as a speaker whose words and actions do not coincide. This feature of demonic discourse ultimately assures Satan's defeat in any verbal battle, for like incompetent flyters, he and his followers cannot fulfill their promises, boasts and threats with deeds. See chapter one, pp. 17-18, for a discussion of the
relationship between words and deeds in flyting and pp. 77-8 and pp. 111-113, for a discussion of demonic discourse in particular.

125 Although in P and C the pilot interrogates Andrew about Jesus' interactions with the Jews, and calls the Jews "faithless" ("infides iudei," C, 10, l. 6, p. 53; P, p. 7), he does not ascribe their behaviour to the devil's instruction (see C, 10-11, pp. 53-55 and P, pp. 6-8).

126 The term is Anderson's and is discussed in chapter one, pp. 10-11. In court flyting, a stranger arriving in a foreign land must endure the insulting challenges of a hostile spokesman for the native society. The quarrels of Beowulf and Unferp, Odysseus and Euryalus, and Grep and Erik Disertus are all examples of court flyting. Court flyting can occur in a religious context, too. See, for example, Thomas the Deacon's confrontation at the threshold of King Alahis' palace (chapter one, pp. 35-6).

127 See And, vv. 666-9a; P, p. 8; C, 12, 11. 9-10, p. 55.

128 Unferp, motivated by envy of Beowulf's superlative nature (Beowulf, vv. 503b-505) attacks this new arrival to Hrothgar's court with fighting words ("onband beadurune," v. 501a).

129 The corresponding passage in C is: "Videntes enim nos principes sacerdotum, sequentes ipsum dominum nostrum iesus christum, magistrum et deum nostrum uno ore clamantes et dicentes nobis ..." (C 12, 11.10-12, p. 55). Boenig's translation of P is similar: "the high priest saw us following Jesus and said to us ....," (P, p. 8). Neither passage focuses on the malign power of the High Priest's words.

130 There is no equivalent epithet in P or C.

131 "Ellpeodiges" also evokes the condition of exile, as I shall show below.

132 P is similar: "O miserable ones, why do you walk with the one saying, "I am the Son of God"? Now, God does not have a son, does he? Who of you ever yet has seen God consorting with a woman? Is not this one the son of Joseph the carpenter and his mother Mary and his brothers James and Simon?" (P, p. 8).

133 In "The Formulaic Expression of the Theme of 'Exile' in Anglo-Saxon Poetry," Speculum 30 (1955), pp. 200-6, Greenfield identifies these as part of the conventional AS poetic expression of exile. Bridges also notes that these lines introduce the theme of exile, and observes that from a Christian perspective, the term is misapplied, for it is the devil whom Christians regard as an exile since he was evicted from heaven. She also notes that Andreas himself corrects this usage in vv. 1377b-83 (Generic Contrast, pp. 198-200). Bridges does not, however, examine the topic of exile as a staple of secular flyting, nor does she discuss its occasional positive connotations for a secular audience.


135 Winfred Lehmann observes that an individual might leave his own society not only on account of shame or criminality, but also to seek "favor and fortune" ("On Reflections of Germanic Legal Terminology and Situations in the Edda," in Old Norse Literature and Mythology, ed. Edgar C. Polomé [Austin: U of Texas P, 1969], p. 229).

136 Like many heroes, Jesus displays his special nature not only in his unusual birth, but also by being a puer senex (Luke 2.46-47). Like Beowulf, Jesus leaves his home (heaven) to save a people in distress.
(mankind), and must fight and defeat a formidable enemy (Satan) to accomplish his goal.


The issue is not quite as straightforward as Campbell suggests, however, for AS poets rightly treat the banished postlapsarian Satan as an exile, and thus the term is neither consistently ameliorative nor consistently pejorative. As I shall show, however, other passages in And support Campbell's view.

138 The materialism and literality reflected in the High Priest's insults are also typical of demonic speech, and thus indicate to a Christian audience that although the High Priest appears to be an adept flyter, he is on the losing side of this verbal battle. For a discussion of the inefficacity of Satanic and demonic discourse in Latin Christian literature, see pp. 77-8.

139 For the role of genealogy and identity motif in flyting, see Clover, "Germanic Context," p. 450, Anderson, "Verbal Contests," p. 29 and my chapter one, p. 10. In P and C, the High Priest also addresses the issue of Jesus' birth, but treats it more briefly, and does not use the repetitions of flyting rhetoric.

140 Munro Chadwick, The Heroic Age (Cambridge at the UP, 1912), p. 327.

141 "There can be no doubt ... that the all-important qualification, without which no claim to the title of king could be upheld, was that the claimant should be born to his office ... a king's genealogy came to be regarded as one of the most important of his possessions" (Hunter Blair, An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2nd ed., 1977], p. 196).

142 In C, only the disciples accompany Jesus, but in P a group of Jewish priests also follows him into the wilderness (C 12, ll. 1-6, p. 57; P, p. 8). In C, Jesus performs several unspecified miracles, then returns to the temple where he animates a statue (C, 12-13, pp. 55-7). In P, Jesus' desert miracles consist of the animation of a sphinx, and the sphinx continues the quarrel on Jesus' behalf (pp. 8-9). And vv. 696-705 is closer to C, but the And poet omits a distracting description of the temple interior which C includes (14, pp. 59-61).

143 For the role of delegates in flyting, see Clover, "Germanic Context," p. 450.

144 P is similar: "'I say to you who are modeled after the one in Heaven, you that the hands of artists carved, jump out of your place and come down, and answer and speak to the high priests and show them whether I am God or man'" (P, pp. 8-9).

145 C says: "quare insipientes estis filii stultorum, quod non vos sufficit cecitatem cordis vestri, sed et alios concupiscitis cecos facere sicut et nos sumus" (C 14, ll. 4-6, p. 59). Similarly, P says: "'O the stupid sons of Israel -- not only was the blindness of their hearts hardened, but they also wished to blind others even as themselves'" (P, p. 9).

146 C says: "quia dicitis istum dominum nostrum iesum christum hominem tantum esse et non deus [sic], ipse enim deus est qui fecit celum et terram, et hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam, seu et omnia fundamenta terre" (C, 14, ll. 6-9, p. 59), and in the corresponding passage in P the statue accuses the Jews of "'saying that God is only a man, the one who formed man from the beginning and gave his breath to all, the one who moved all immovable things'" (P, p. 9).

147 P resembles C: "This one is the one who called Abraham, the one who loved Isaac his son, the one who enclosed his beloved Jacob in his earth. This one is the judge of the living and the dead; this is the
one who prepared great and good things for those who obey him and who is preparing punishment for those not believing in him" (P, p. 9).

149 The leader of a comitatus was expected to reward his followers "with the spoils of war as well as their daily sustenance" (Hunter Blair, *As England*, p. 209. See, too, Brooke, *The Saxon and Norman Kings*, [Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1963], p. 55, and *Beowulf* vv. 20-4a).

The good things which Jesus gives to his followers, however, are of a spiritual rather than a material nature.

150 Jesus' genealogy in Matt. begins: "Liber generationis Iesu Christi filii David filii Abraham (2) Abraham genuit Isaac" (Matt. 1.1-2). See also Luke 3. 34. Since David (Jesus' most immediate ancestor cited) is a king, this genealogy implies that Jesus, too, is royal. Although the *And* poet's claim is not so straightforward (he does not allude specifically to David) he does say that the "wuldræs God" will come from Abraham's descendants, and thus suggests a link between Jesus, Abraham and King David. As already noted, at this point P and C concentrate on a criticism of Jewish worship.

151 In C, the debate ends here with the statue returning to the wall and the Jews still unconvinced (C 15, pp. 61-3).

152 P's account is digressive and includes a longer version of the speech in which Jesus orders the stone angel to address the patriarchs. P also includes a brief passage in which the twelve patriarchs ask the statue whether they all must endure this premature resurrection (P, p. 10).

153 In P the Jewish audience is neither terrified, nor convinced (p. 10). In *And*, the Jews appear to be persuaded, although the poet adds that other "modblinde menn" do not believe (vv. 813-4a).

154 Similar events are related in P, pp. 11-12 and C 16-18, pp. 63-7.

155 P refers to "the things necessary for you to suffer" (P, p. 12), and C says: "multa enim et universa passurus es propter nomen meum in caro tua" (C, 18, 11. 27-8, p. 67).

156 In C the hagiographer has Jesus concentrate on the physical nature of his ordeal. Jesus adds, however, that Andrew will endure all this on account of Jesus' name: "Recordare mei, quoniam ego prior tui passus sum, tunc quando in faciem meam spuebant, et alapis cedebant, et in beelzebub princeps demoniorum me deputabant eicere demonia. Etiam et plurima[m] propter vos sustinui, simul et nota feci vobis, ut quemammodum ego passus fui pro vobis, vos autem ne formidetis pati propter nomen meum" (C, 18, 11. 32-37, p. 67). In P, the author does not mention that in this struggle, Andrew will be defending Jesus' name, but instead alludes briefly to insults as part of the torment: "'They will scatter abroad your flesh in the streets and alleys, and your blood will flow upon the ground, but they will not be able to kill you. But endure, since you know they struck, insulted, and crucified me, for there are some who are about to believe in this city''" (P, p. 12).

157 There is nothing comparable in the analogues. C says: "Andreas vero confortatus nimis verbi[s] domini, cum discipulis suis ingressus est civitatem per medium illorum ibant, oculi eorum tenebantur, ne viderent eum" (C 19, 11. 9-11, p. 69). P says: "But Andrew went into the city with is disciples, and no one saw him" (P, p. 12).

158 These lines are followed by a verse which closely resembles a portion of the *Beowulf* poet's description of Beowulf's journey to Heorot, the hall where he will fight Grendel (compare "stop on stræte (stig wísode)" *[And* v. 985] and "stræt was stanfah, stig wísode" *[Beowulf* v. 320]). This evocation of *Beowulf* in the context of the
metaphoric martiality of And is completely appropriate, and together
with the passage I have cited, as well as with the later references to
Andrew as "Cristes cempa," and "hæle hildedeor" (v. 991a and v. 1002a),
augment the portrait of the apostle as soldier of Christ.

In doing so, Andrew causes the guards' death. P and C's account of
their death is a rare example of a verbal attack which does not occur in
And, for in P and C, the guards die on account of Andrew's prayers (C
19, p. 69; P, p. 12). In And, the door to the prison opens after Andrew
prays (v. 996b-9b), but the cause of the guards' death remains
unspecified (vv. 994b-5).

C says: "Apparuit eis diabolus statim in similitudinem hominis
canuti" (23, 11. 10-11, p. 79). The devil adopts a similar form in P
(p. 16).

Feldman argues that the epic taunter (a figure who closely
resembles the instigator of court flyting) can be distinguished from his
fellows by physical deformity. She notes that Thersites, for example,
is a hunchback ("The Taunter," p. 6. See also my chapter one, pp. 31-
32). The OE noun hincan implies some physical deformity, but Satan's
dark ugliness and his hellish origins also suggest an unattractive,
supernatural entity like the troll, Hrimgerpr who debates with Helgi in
Halsigasgan.

P and C do not describe Satan's discourse in this way. P says "he
began to speak" (P, p. 16), and C says simply "dixit" (C 24, 1. 11, p.
79).

P's version is similar to C, but lacks any suggestion that Andrew's
speech is harmful to the Mermedons (P, p. 16). After the passage cited
above, C describes Andrew's capture ("Persuadante diabolus,
insurrexerunt omnes adversus beatum andream ut interficerent illum,
however, prolongs the exchange between Andrew and the devil. It is
significant that out of these two differing accounts, the And poet
retains those passages which suggest verbal battle. Thus, he includes a
version of the adversarial dialogue found in P, as well as a reference
to the injurious effect of Andrew's words similar to that implied in C
(compare "enarrat ... nostra" with the devil's accusation in vv. 1195-
1200).

Boenig also notes the added militarism of the dialogue with the
devil in And (Saint and Hero, p. 80).

This antagonism is also implicit in he (v. 1177a) and ge (v.
1179a).

"Then Andrew said to the Devil, 'O hated Belial, rebel ruling all
creation, my Lord Jesus Christ will lower you into the abyss.' And the
Devil heard these things and said, 'I hear your voice, and I know your
voice, but I know not where you stand.' And Andrew answered the Devil,
'Why then have you been called Amael, since you are blind, not seeing
all the saints?' And hearing these things, the Devil said to the
citizens, 'Now look around for the one speaking to me, that one is he,'
(P, pp. 16-17).

Although critics sometimes recognize that Andrew's struggle with
the devil is a flyting, they provide no detailed definition of flyting,
nor do they show the specific features of flyting which occur in
Andrew's and Satan's speeches. Olsen, for example, calls the exchange a
flyting, but defines the genre only briefly as "a verbal competition
that is a substitute for action" (Speech, Song, p. 151). Likewise,
Boenig observes that in vv. 1184-94, Andrew uses "the bold language of Germanic flyting" (Saint and Hero, p. 89), but adds no elaboration.

Nelson puts the case even more strongly, and in her discussion of this passage and of vv. 1175-6 argues that names act like weapons: "Each of the two combatants uses the most formidable weapon this type of contest affords -- the name" (Structures of Opposition, p. 93).

This insult is a variant of the popular flyting insult described by Clover as "heroic failure" (Germanic Context, p. 453).

Nelson puts the case even more strongly, and in her discussion of this passage and of vv. 1175-6 argues that names act like weapons: "Each of the two combatants uses the most formidable weapon this type of contest affords -- the name" (Structures of Opposition, p. 93).

This insult is a variant of the popular flyting insult described by Clover as "heroic failure" (Germanic Context, p. 453).

See Nelson, Structures of Opposition, p. 93. Anderson suggests that vv. 1175-6 and v. 1193 contain the only verbal echoes in And ("Verbal Contests," p. 214). Although this echo is important, as my analysis shows, it is not unique.

The speech also combines accusation and threat in a play on words reminiscent of flyting echo, but here the echo is contained in a single speech. Capitalizing on the homophony of "baeldest" and "baeles" (v. 1186) Andrew contrasts Satan's wish to incite battle ("pu ... baeldest to beadowe") with his own knowledge of the consequences of such battle ("baeles cwealm").

In P, the Mermedons are called simply a "crowd" (p. 17).

For ease of discussion, I here compare similar passages in C, P, and And as if they occurred at the same point in the each narrative. Unfortunately, this is not the case, for this portion of C follows an order all its own and, although the resulting differences in narrative sequence are not especially relevant to flyting, they ought to be noted to avoid confusion. In C, as described above, Satan exhorts the Mermedons to attack Andrew. The Mermedons fail, and then engage in a dialogue with Satan. After this, Andrew is thrown into prison and the Mermedons and devil taunt him. The episode concludes when Satan disguises his voice, pretending (like Belial in Jlna) to be a heavenly messenger, in hopes of persuading Andrew to apostatize. Andrew is not deceived, and Satan vanishes. In P and And, the taunting of Andrew occurs after the apostle is struck on the mouth. After this, the demons attack Andrew in prison, but defeated by the sign of the cross, they withdraw and converse with Satan, who then initiates a final exchange with Andrew (in P, as in C, Satan disguises his voice). After this dialogue, the devil disappears (see C, 27-38, pp. 83-7; P, pp. 17-19; And vv. 1296-1387).

Satan is an "atol æglaca," (v. 1312a), "deoful deapreow," (v. 1314a) and "morpres manfrea" (v. 1313a) who is devoid of virtue ("dugupum bereafod," v. 1314b) and evil-minded ("yfela gemyndig," v.1312b). Andrew, on the other hand, is an "ætele cempa" (v. 230b), a "halig cempa" (v. 461b) who is "anraed ... heard ond higerof" as well as "priste on gepance" (vv. 232-37a) and "peawum geðancul" (v. 462a).

P says only "you lifted yourself up against us," while in C Andrew is asked to explain his behaviour, and his deeds are not specifically attributed to pride.

From a Christian perspective, the change is equally significant, for Satan is here accusing Andrew of his own sin of pride. Patently false accusations such as this are typical of demonic discourse and undermine the power of Satan's words.

The translation of "gilp" as boasting is admittedly controversial. Krapp emends "gilp" to "gild," or worship, apparently to conform more closely to P. Brooks, on the other hand, retains the ms. reading because it "makes satisfactory sense" (Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles, p. 110), but he glosses "gilp" as pride. While pride is one
of the meanings of this noun, "gilp" also means boast or boasting (see Klaeber's glossary to his ed. of Beowulf, BT, and Clark Hall).

Considering the emphasis on verbal conflict in And thus far, as well as the fact that BH 19 uses "gilp" at this juncture (Morris, p. 243), this gloss seems the more appropriate.

178 For the role of boast in flyting, see chapter one, p. 12 and pp. 17-18.

179 In v. 1183, Satan urges the Mermedons to subdue Andrew ("ge wiperfeohtende wiges hnaegan") and in vv. 1190-1, Andrew retorts that God has already subdued Satan ("pe se aelmihtiga heanne gehnasgde").

180 There is nothing similar in C, and although in P the demons ask "Where is your glory and loftiness?" they do not attribute its loss to failed territorial ambitions. For the insult of "heroic failure," as well as other conventional flyting insults, see Clover, "Germanic Context," pp. 453-4).

181 The demons of P take credit for the death of Jesus and attribute the death of John to Herod.

182 Ironically, although the form of Satan's "ic nu bebeode" virtually duplicates Jesus' words to the stone angel in v. 729a, Satan's command does not have a similar effect. The differing consequences of each speech act testify to the superior power of Jesus' word.

183 In C, the incident occurs earlier, as I have already noted.

184 In P and C, Satan's admission of his inability to harm Andrew divests the subsequent taunting of any perlocutionary force. Not surprisingly, a similar admission does not occur in And.

185 Significantly, Andrew, who is under greater duress than the devils, does not turn on his leader, but endures steadfastly, praising God in the midst of his torments: "he ... dryhten herede/ weorPade wordum" (vv. 1267b-8a)

186 Because the narrator uses aglea to denote both the Mermedons (v. 1131) and Satan (v. 1312), the demons also seem to be throwing his words back at him.

187 P says: "... there came to him a great voice saying, 'Andrew, why do you weep?' But it was the voice of the Devil changed. And Andrew answered, 'I weep because God commanded me, saying, 'Be long suffering among them.'" (P, p. 18).

188 "And the Devil said, 'If you are able to do something, do it.' And Andrew answered, 'Why then do you do these things to me? But let it not happen to me that I/ misunderstand the command of my Lord; for if the Lord should make me bishop in this city, I will teach you how to be holy.' And after hearing these things, the Devil fled" (P, pp. 18-9).

189 In P, Satan says: "'We are not able to kill him, but ... let us chuckle at him in the tribulation of his humiliation'" (p. 18). In C, he says: "ego autem sine vos non prevaleo adversus eum" (27, 1. 9, p. 83).

190 The accusation echoes the demons' insult to Andrew (v. 1359a) as well as the narrator's description of the Mermedons (v. 1131b) and Satan (v. 1312a).

191 Satan also ironically echoes God's discourse. His assumption that no man is strong enough to release Andrew against Satan's will ("ofer mine est," v. 1374b) repeats God's promise to Andrew that no one will harm the apostle against God's will ("ofer mine est," v. 1215b).

192 The inherent reciprocity of question and answer make them a frequent part of flyting exchanges. See Clover, "Germanic Context," p. 453.

Bridges also notes the recurrence of the theme of exile, and observes that here it corrects the High Priest's insinuation that the disciples are exiles in vv. 676-8a (Generic Contrast, p. 200).

Nelson, *Structures of Opposition*, p. 97 observes that Jesus' animation of the stone angel and resurrection of the patriarchs are precursors of Andrew's own verbal deeds.


OE Verse Saints' Lives, pp. 28-44.

Generic Contrast, p. 117.

"Verbal Contests," pp. 56-9 and pp. 221-6.


The relationship of the *Vita* to GuP A is far from clear. Indeed, many argue that there is no relationship at all. Kurtz, for example, opts for an oral tradition, rather than any specific text, as the source for GuP A, ("From St. Antony to St. Guthlac," p. 144). SASLC proposes "some lost literary sources" (p. 12). Schaar (Critical Studies, pp. 39-41) as well as Allen and Calder (Sources and Analogues, p. 108) also argue against Felix's influence on the poem. Olsen does not agree, however, and says that that GuP A is "undoubtedly" based on Felix and that the poet purposely chooses "to compose a poem on that portion of the legend that substitutes speech for action" (Speech, Song, p. 119). Although Roberts is more cautious, and in her edition of the poem concludes that there is no single source for GuP A (p. 28), she, too, suspects that Felix's *Vita* had some influence on the poet, and asserts that he "must have known the *Vita*," noting that much of GuP A resembles Felix's chapters 28-33 (p. 19). The segments of prose and verse which I analyze are sufficiently similar to support Roberts' contention, but they also contain substantial differences which suggest that like the authors of Jlna, Ele and And, the GuP A poet freely altered earlier accounts to suit his own purposes.

I compare the homily rather than the Vespasian *Life* to GuP A because the OE text of the homily is more readily available to me than
is the OE text of the Life. However, when I cite a passage from Vercelli 23 which differs substantially from the Life, I include Swanton's translation in a note. (For the argument that the homily is the older of the two translations, and that it is the vehicle through which Felix's influence operates, see Roberts, "The Old English Prose Translation of Felix's Vita sancti Guthlaci," Studies in Earlier Old English Prose, ed. Paul Szarmach [Albany: SUNY P, 1986], pp. 363-79, especially pp. 363-5 and p. 376. Unfortunately, there are no texts extant to confirm the stemma which Roberts proposes).

This extended sacred flyting is composed of four shorter disputes. While each of these disputes blends Christian content with flying rhetoric and therefore according to my definition can be called a sacred flyting, their interconnections are sufficient to suggest that they are part of a single verbal battle (for example, the same participants debate in each confrontation, each dispute contains similar subject matter, and each dispute is linked to the other disputes by recurrent verbal echoes). Accordingly, for the most part, I use the term sacred flyting here to denote the extended war of words fought by Guplac and the demons, rather than any one of the four shorter verbal skirmishes which make up that war.

Bede includes a similar allusion to metaphoric weapons in his description of Cuthbert's struggle with the demons of Farne: "Verum intrante eam milite Christi armato galea salutis, scuto fidei, et gladio spiritus quod est uerbum Dei" (Colgrave, Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert [Cambridge, 1940; rpt. New York: Greenwood P, 1960], p. 214). See, too, my discussion in chapter four, p. 138. As Kurtz observes, however, "the arming of the Christian soldier ... is a stock 'property' in the lives of the hermits" ("From St. Antony to St. Guthlac," p. 107), and its presence in Felix may reflect the influence of Eph. 6. 11-17, as much as the influence of Bede.

Colgrave identifies Guplac's words as Psalm 17.7: "In tribulatione mea invocabo Dominum et ad Deum meum clamabo."

This is Colgrave's translation of "veluti miles inter densas acies dimicans" (pp. 96-7)

The Vespasian Life, which as I have noted translates the complete text of Felix, also contains an evocation of Eph. 6. 11-17, : "Then straightway, in order that he might shield himself against the darts of the wicked spirits with spiritual arms, he took the shield of faith in the Holy Spirit, and dressed himself in the mail of heavenly hope; and he put on his head the helmet of pure thoughts; and he continually shot and fought against the accursed spirits with the arrows of holy psalms" (Swanton, p. 45).

The corresponding passage in Felix puts less emphasis on the fortifying power of Bartholomew's discourse: "Exin sanctus Bartholomaeus, coram eo persistens illum praecptis spiritualibus confortare coepit" (Colgrave, p. 96). The Vespasian Life follows Vercelli: "And the heavenly visitor, St. Bartholomew, comforted him and confirmed and strengthened him with words" (Swanton, p. 46).

The corresponding passage of the Vespasian text eschews martiality, and says only that Guplac "was filled with spiritual bliss, and confirmed and fixed his faith fast on God himself" (Swanton, p. 46).

For a more detailed discussion of the martial lexicon in Gup A, including the poet's treatment of Guplac as a miles christi, see Hill, "Soldier of Chirst," pp. 65-69, Hermann, "Some Varieties of Psychomachia
The poet says that the angel and the devil "nælas hy him gelice lære bæron" (v. 116), and adds that the angel espouses heavenly values while the devil advocates selfish materialism (vv. 119-32).

The poet says that the angel "sægde" (v. 119b) and "herede" (v. 121a) and that the demon "scyhte" (v. 127a). Roberts argues that "scyhte" is a finite form of scyccan, meaning "urge, egg on" (Guthlac Poems, p. 31).

Bridges also observes that in Guplac A, the plot is organized "around the topographical centre of the Saint's retreat," and describes the poem as a "story of territorial strife" (Generic Contrast, pp. 129 and p. 131).

The exact nature of Guplac's retreat is the subject of much critical debate. In Guplac A, the tumulus of the Vita (chapter 28, p. 92) and the hlaw of Vercelli 23 (l. 1, p. 97) become a beorcg or beorgaspel (v. 140a, 148a etc.) In her edition of Guplac A, Roberts glosses the latter as "hill-dwelling" and the former as "hill, mound." Shook, however, argues that the beorcg is a grave ("Burial Mound," p. 4), and Wentersdorf agrees, observing that pagan grave sites were popularly believed to be the haunts of ghosts, and thus seem an ideal habitat for demons as well ("Guplac A: The Battle of the Beorg," Neophilologus 62 [1978], p. 136). Other critics interpret the beorcg as a symbol of "interior spiritual achievement" (Reichardt, "Guplac A and the Landscape of Spiritual Perfection," Neophilologus 58 [1974], p. 331) or of "the perfect soul" which Guplac builds ("Guplac A and Guplac B: Some Discriminations," AS Poetry: Essays in Appreciation, p. 77). As Greenfield and Calder observe, however, the exact denotation of the noun is perhaps best left unresolved, for its ambiguity allows the poet to depict a conflict which is at once spiritual and actual (New Critical History, p. 177). As I suggest above, it is the actual dimension of this conflict which helps to link it to flyting.

In the Vita and Vercelli, Guplac is first attacked by a single devil (perhaps Satan himself) who has no specified connection to the saint's hermitage (see above). It is not until the third confrontation in the prose accounts that Guplac must contend with a multitude of demons, and even these, although they infest his home, are not described as its previous tenants (see below).

By describing the conflict as orlega or battle, the poet emphasizes that the demons construe Guplac's habitation of the beorcg as an act of aggression.

Clover lists "crimes of kinship" and "hostile relations with kinsmen" as conventional flyting insults ("Germanic Context," p. 453). Although the demons do not quite accuse Guplac of crimes and hostility, they misinterpret the saint's spiritual firmness as a guilty negligence of family duties.

"Veni enim separare hominem adversus patrem suum et filiam adversus matrem suam et nurum adversus soorum suam" (Matt. 10. 35).

In making this charge, the devils are projecting their own pride onto Guplac. Although their claim is false, its deceitfulness is not subject to refutation by deeds because it refers to past rather than future events (see my discussion of boasts and behavioural validation in
chapter one, pp. 17-18). However, the devils, like incompetent flyters, also utter lies which are subject to future verification (for example, their threat in vv. 192-3 that they will burn Guplac if he remains on the borg is shown to be deceitful in vv. 226-8a, in vv. 553-5a and at the conclusion of the flyting in vv. 692b-702). Such utterances cannot be fulfilled with deeds, and therefore they fatally undermine the power of the devils' discourse.

225 See my discussion of the impact of the accusation of pride on Andrew, earlier in this chapter, pp. 334-5. For the impact of the charge on a secular flyter, see Clover, "Germanic Context," p. 453, and Beowulf v. 508, where Unferp claims that Beowulf and Breca "for wience wada cunnodon."

226 Roberts glosses ligesearu (v. 228b) as "lying art" and hearstef (v. 229a) as "affliction, grief." BT, however, glosses stef as "letter," and hearstaf as "a writ of evil." Since Roberts glosses sarstef as "bitter word," and since this compound which also has stef as its second element is used to denote demonic speech ("Godes ondsacan/ sterdon sarstafum, swip geheton/ Fht he deapa gedal dreogan sceolde," (vv. 233-35), it seems likely that hearstaf also refers to a particular kind of speech which causes affliction and grief, and not simply to "affliction" or "grief."

227 See, for example, vv. 281-9a, and vv. 582-6.

228 The hostility of Guplac's reply is hinted at before he speaks in the phrase "him ongean pingode" (v. 239a). Here, the preposition onqean, glossed by Roberts as "against," emphasizes the agonistic nature of the act of speech (compare, for example, Beowulf v. 681b, "he me ongean slea," or Gup A vv. 302b-3, "No ic eow sweord ongean/ ... ooberan pence").

229 The charge of false boast is a staple of secular flyting. Unferp, for example, directs the accusation of dolgıl at Beowulf during their flyting (Beowulf, v. 509a). The poet's remark in vv. 226-8a testifies to the accuracy of Guplac's accusation.

230 In addition, this humble confession of dependence on a superior indirectly refutes the devils' accusation that he is proud (vv. 208-9a).

231 Clover discusses the role of concessive clauses in secular flyting defense ("Germanic Context," p. 452), and Bjork comments on their effect in Gup A: "clauses of concession set up relatively balanced oppositions in a sentence ....The dynamics of such clauses can therefore become syntactic analogues of a conflict such as that between Guthlac and the demons," (OE Verse Saints' Lives, p. 39). Bridges also observes that such adversative syntax (sometimes arising from concessive clauses and sometimes from the alternation of negative and affirmative clauses) is frequent in the dialogues of Gup A (Generic Contrast, pp. 144-5). For examples of similar syntax in Jlna, see pp. 272-3 and p. 278 above.

232 Guplac echoes and refutes portions of this same threat again in when he says, "ne sceal min gest mid eow/ gedwolan dreogan" (vv. 258b-9a).

233 An again expresses the saint's self-confidence in v. 250.

234 For the devout, homelessness in God's service was not a condition to be feared, but rather one to be sought out. See my discussion of exile in And, pp. 318-20 and p. 329, as well as Bridges' discussion of the theme of exile in And, and in Gup A (Generic Contrast, pp. 198-200 and pp. 129-34).

235 I shall discuss demonic attempts at exorcism again below.
The debate about the location of the saint's and the devils' respective homes acquires an eschatological dimension in the final verbal skirmish in which Guplac boasts that his destination is "Jam betran ham ... ec an earde" (vv. 654b-6a) while the devils' home is in hell ("in helle hus, per eow is ham sceapen," v. 677). See, too, Bridges' discussion of the "motif of habitat" in Gup A (Generic Contrast, pp. 129-34).

The devils do not tell GuPlac to go to hell at this juncture, but they do tell him to leave, just as Jesus says to Satan, "Vade Satanas," (Matt. 4.10).

Guplac devotes comparatively little space to the devils' threat that he will starve alone in the Crowland wilderness (vv. 274-7a), dismissing it by saying, "mec longepas lyt gegretap, sorge sealdun" (vv. 316-7a).

"Ic" and "eow" are juxtaposed in v. 302b, and followed by a series of first person pronouns which contrast agonistically with the second person pronouns of vv. 299-302a.

See, too, Anderson's discussion in "Verbal Contests," pp. 56-8 and pp. 221-3. Similar statements of identity are a staple of secular flying.

The devils say: "'Nos experti sumus te, et fidei tuae valitudinem conperimus, perseverantiamque patientiae tuae invincibilem probantes, variarum artium adversus te arma suscepsimus. Propertia insultare tibi ultra desistere conamur'" (Colgrave, p. 98). Felix's use of the infinitive insultare, which means both "to leap on" and "to taunt, insult" suggests that the arms and arts alluded to here have a verbal dimension. Colgrave, however, emphasizes the more literal gloss, and translates the verb as "assaulting" (p. 99), rather than as insulting or mocking. I shall discuss this translation again below.

The devils may also be encouraging license on the seventh day, but the sense of their advice in this regard is rather contradictory (p. 100).

This time, Colgrave notes (p. 100), Guplac quotes Psalm 55. 10: "tunc convertentur inimici mei retrorsum." When the devils hear these words, they vanish like smoke, and Guplac wins the second fight ("Exin vir Dei inmundorum spirituum fantasmata, percepto ubique certandi bravio contempsit," p. 100).

"We syndon gewisses pines lifes, ond pines geleafan trumnesse we witon, ond pin gePyld eac we cunnon nu unoferswiPde; Per we pin cunedon ond kostadon pat we mid manifestalum crafte ussa warPna stræla wip Pe sendan" (Szarmach, ll. 37-40, p. 98).

The homilist here chooses to gloss the Felix's insultare with the OE verb bysmrian which according to ET means to deride, reproach, revile. This gloss suggests that the homilist, unlike Colgrave (see n. 241 above) understands the devils' assaults to be at least partly verbal. Swanton's translation of the Vespasian passage is closer to Colgrave's: "Now henceforth we will no longer trouble nor irritate you" (p. 46).

The rest of the devils' advice on fasting is as ambiguous in Vercelli as it is in the Vita (see Szarmach, ll. 51-7, p. 98).

Clark Hall glosses bismernes as "insult." The translation of the corresponding passage in the Life specifies impious utterance: "And the blessed man was so triumphant that he scorned the blasphemy of their doctrines" (Swanton, p. 47). Both OE prose accounts, then, seem to emphasize that GuPlac's triumph is over some form of demonic discourse.
See Roberts, Guthlac Poems, p. 94.

Juliana makes a similar vow to remain true to her words in Jlna vvv. 55-7. Such remarks help to give words the weight of deeds.

For example, "Generatio praeterit et generatio advenit terra vero in aeternum stat" (Eccl. 1.4), "Omnia tempus habent et suis spatiis transeunt universa sub caelo: tempus nascendi et tempus mordendi" (Eccl. 3.1-2).

I use Krapp's punctuation of this passage in ASPR III, p. 60, in my citation. Roberts provides no punctuation at the end of v. 376, and introduces a colon after "forsæcnen" in v. 377a. This punctuation violates the succession of concession and contradiction which extends from vv. 374-83a.

Similar syntax also occurs in vv. 380-3 ("Peah ... eacan, min ... brucep").

Some features of this attack suggest that it may have been the inspiration for the Gup A poet's reification of the saint's spiritual struggles as a battle for territory. For example, here a group of demons attacks Guplac, and their goal -- to remove the saint from the wilderness -- is similar to the goal of the Gup A demons. However, as I note earlier in this chapter and in chapter four, Bede's prose account of Cuthbert's habitation of Farne Island is also a spiritual war in which Cuthbert puts the island's indigenous demons to flight (Two Lives, chapter 17, p. 214). It is equally possible, therefore, that the poet's inspiration is Bede's account.

While the first flyting episode (vv. 191-322) is fairly evenly balanced in terms of speech length (including indirect discourse, the devils' speeches occupy 52 lines and Guplac's 47 lines), the third exchange is quite unbalanced, with Guplac speaking for 34 lines, and the devils speaking for only 18 lines. This gradual decrease in the length of the devils' speeches relative to Guplac's speeches suggests a corresponding decrease in their verbal prowess which the fourth and final skirmish confirms.

Unlike the devils, Guplac uses the noun correctly, for as exiles from heaven, the devils are truly earm (see Bridges, Generic Contrast, p. 198, and pp. 131-4 for the devils' status as exiles).

Although scholars dispute the exact meaning of myrcels, (see Roberts' note in her edition, p. 146), it seems clear that it is some visible badge of Christianity, perhaps the tonsure.

The devils continue to use the devices of flyting rhetoric here. Not only do they address Guplac directly and insult him, their distorted repetition of Guplac's boast contains verbal echoes of the first exchange in which Guplac says that God "mec mæg eaþe gescyldan" (v. 242b), and that he will hold the beorg "butan earfoþum" (v. 245a). "Gehete" (v. 456a) also continues the war of promises begun in the first skirmish (v. 240b and v. 271a). These echoes suggest that the first and third disputes with the demons are part of a single extended sacred flyting.

Roberts treats vv. 460-6 as the poet's aside rather than a continuation of the devils' accusation (see her note, pp. 146-7). The sense of the passage does not demand this reading, however. Moreover, as I shall show below, Guplac echoes portions of these lines in his reply to the devils, and this suggests that vv. 460-6 are part of the flyting exchange, and not authorial comment. Accordingly, in my
citation, I follow the example of Krapp's edition, and punctuate the passage as if it were a continuation of the devils' speech.

Although they initially use a third person plural pronoun to refer to the monastic transgressors (v. 462a), in vv. 463b-6 the devils replace it with a series of second person pronouns which quickly shift the monks' alleged sins onto Guplac.

The presence of these echoes of vv. 386b-9 in vv. 460-5 also suggests that the fragmentary speech found in vv. 369-89 is part of the extended sacred flying.

The scattering of a *comitatus* usually implies cowardice, disloyalty or military incompetence. For example, Beowulf's *comitatus* disintegrates in the presence of the dragon, with all but Wiglaf fleeing to the forest (*Beowulf* vv. 2596-8). Byrhtno's army is likewise scattered. Loyal followers remain to fight the Vikings down to the last man, but the less faithful turn and run (*"The Battle of Maldon,"* vv. 185-201). In both situations, the behaviour of those who flee is despised by those who remain (*Beowulf* vv. 2864-74a; *"The Battle of Maldon"* vv. 220-4, vv. 237b-8, vv. 249-53a).

In *GA, GB* and *XSt*, for example, Satan and his retainers are disloyal to their lord and are driven from heaven.

Guplac simultaneously implies in v. 480 that the devils lack humility. This throws back at the devils' their earlier assertions that Guplac is arrogant (v. 208, vv. 269-70).

Beowulf also uses the excuse of youth in his flyting with Unferp, saying that he and Breca had their contest "cnihwesende" (v. 535b) and "on geogopfere" (v. 537a).

The devils enumerate the temporal consequences of exile if Guplac remains "ana from epele" in vv. 273-7a. Guplac's threat, unlike the devils' threat, is based on Christian truth (the devils are exiles from heaven), and therefore is an illocution which will be fulfilled.

The devils continue to threaten Guplac for a few lines more, enriching their grisly text with allusions to classical portraits of hell (p. 106).

This is close to the secular flyting accusation of *dolgrilp* uttered by Unferp in *Beowulf* v. 509a. The saint makes a similar charge in *GUPA*, as I shall show below.

*"Vires nostras ubique per te fractas lugemus, et inertiam nostram adversus valetudinem tuam ploramus; non enim te tangere aut propinquare audemus."* Haec dicentes, velut fumus a facie eius evanuerunt" (Colgrave, p. 108).

Beowulf utters this threat in his flyting with Unferp (*"pas pu in helle scealt/ werhopo dreogan,"* vv. 588b-9a). See also Clover, "Germanic Context," pp. 452-3.

No counterpart of the martial epithet "weroda waldend" or of the later *wuldcyning* (v. 596b) occurs in the corresponding portion of the prose accounts, nor do these accounts include any description of the devils' defeat at Jesus' hands (*GUPA*, vv. 596-8). The martial tone of the poetic account reminds us once again of the close connection between words and war in *GUPA*.

The gifts given by the leader to his followers were the glue which held the secular *AS comitatus* together (Hunter Blair, *Introduction to AS England*, pp. 209-11). *Comitatus* members receiving material rewards from their leader would vow to repay him with brave deeds in battle, and were expected to fulfill their boasts with deeds should the need arise (see
Ælfwine's exhortation of Byrhtnoþ's comitatus in "Maldon," vv. 211-5). Byrhtnoþ's retainer, Leofsunu, also proclaims his loyalty by promising not to flee, but to avenge his fallen lord with his sword ("The Battle of Maldon" vv. 246-53a). Not all secular warriors repay their leaders' gifts, however. In "Maldon," for example, Godric flees from battle despite the horses his lord has given him (vv. 187-8), and Beowulf's comitatus notoriously fails to repay his gifts of treasure with their deeds (Beowulf vv. 2864-72).

In this conflation of words and deeds, the saint's utterance resembles divine discourse in which word is deed (see chapter three). The devil's projective illocutions, on the other hand, are rendered impotent either by their fatuous literality, or by their deceitful nature (see, for example, And or GB).

Similar blocks of first and second person pronouns occur in agonistic contrast throughout Guplac's speech. For example "ic ... minum" in v. 618 is followed by a series of accusatory "ge ... ge" (vv. 623-8). Second person pronouns then persist until the confession in vv. 637-47. The series concludes in v. 648 with the contrastive juxtaposition of "ge" and "mec." This pronoun manipulation which continues throughout Guplac's reply, is typical of flyting speech.

Appropriately, Guplac describes the differing outcomes of this verbal battle for himself and for the demons in terms of speech acts ("ic ... him lof singe ... ge ... wope besingan" (vv. 614-5). Guplac says, "Me engel to ealle gelædeþ/ spowende sped spreca ond dæda" (vv. 253-4).

Once again I follow the punctuation of ASPR III, p. 67, which treats vv. 620b-2 as part of Guplac's speech, rather than as a parenthetical aside by the author, as Roberts' punctuation suggests (see Guthlac Poems, p. 101).

This confession also represents another fulfillment of Guplac's boast that he will praise his lord (vv. 605-11).

First person boasts of vv. 651-7 contrast with second person accusations in vv. 658-62. In vv. 651-62 an initial affirmative clause ("ecm ic ... wuldre") is opposed by the negative "þær eow næfre ... swıþe").

CONCLUSION

As I show in my first chapter, Germanic or secular flyting is a verbal battle which includes a variety of dialogues distinguished from other quarrels by their insulting and aggressive tone, and by a rhetoric which emphasizes the reciprocal relationship of challenge and reply. These verbal skirmishes can be further subdivided into serious or battle flyting and ludic flyting, which includes court flyting, manniæfnapr and senna flyting. In serious flyting, the truth of an utterance is tested by the flyter's subsequent behaviour, usually in battle, but in ludic flyting the exchange remains a game of wit, focusing on participants' past deeds or other propositions not immediately subject to subsequent behavioural validation, and therefore requiring no testament of actual violence.

In the Latin Christian literature of the early Church, the conflict between good and evil was also often expressed as a verbal battle in which the devout Christian followed Paul's advice in Eph. 6.11-17, and fought with the sword of the word of God. These adversarial dialogues had much in common with Germanic flyting: both forms of debate were either metaphorically or metonymically associated with combat, and both could be conducted by supernatural beings as well as by mortals.

Analysis of a selection of OE religious prose texts suggests that the similarity between these Germanic and Latin Christian forms of debate was not lost on AS writers. When AS homilists encountered adversarial dialogues in their Latin sources, not only did they usually emphasize in their own work those features found in the Latin which were characteristic of flyting (such as agonistic pronoun contrast, insult, verbal echo, and the like), they would also add flyting features to their own dialogues when these were not present in their Latin sources. In OE hagiographic
prose, these signs of re-analysis were sometimes accompanied by more substantial alterations, such as the omission or addition of several lines of dialogue, and these changes were designed to heighten the agonistic nature of the exchanges, and to further increase their resemblance to flyting.\textsuperscript{1} The fact that this conflation of Christian verbal battle and flyting is most apparent in OE hagiographic prose derived from Anglo-Latin rather than Latin sources suggests that in OE religious prose, AS sensibilities provoked this re-analysis of Christian verbal battle as flyting.\textsuperscript{2}

Scripturally dependent OE verse was also influenced by Germanic flyting. In OE Exo, the poet repeatedly associates the Jews and the Egyptians with the speech acts characteristic of competent and incompetent flyters respectively, and in OE Dan, the author deviates from Scripture to depict the Jews' conflicts with the Babylonian kings as verbal encounters with debts to flyting. In both GA, vv. 1-134 and "Vainglory," Satan's heavenly revolt is described as a verbal battle, while in "Solomon and Saturn II," Saturn calls this conflict "geflitu" (v. 271). In addition, the XSt poet's account of the temptation in the wilderness clearly shows flyting's influence, and the GB poet treats the Tempter's attack on Adam and Eve as an extended flyting battle.

Flyting's influence is most apparent, however, in the OE verse hagiographies where the saint engages in lengthy verbal combat with the devil and with his mortal allies. For example, a comparison of Jlna and Ele with their Latin analogues shows that the adversarial dialogues found in these poems differ substantially from the Latin, and that this difference arises from the emphasis or insertion of features which link the saint's verbal battles to flyting. Flyting's influence is also apparent in OE And -- a poem less closely tied to Latin antecedents. Finally, in GuþA (whose closest ancestor is an earlier vita composed by an Anglo-Saxon) flyting becomes the centre of the narrative as Guþlac fights
the Crowland demons with the word of God in order to win both territory and salvation. Thus in OE religious verse, as in OE religious prose, AS sensibility precipitates the re-analysis of Christian verbal battle as sacred flyting.

What are the distinguishing features of this sacred flyting? Like secular flyting, sacred flyting is acrimonious and contains insults, accusations and counter-accusations, as well as boasts and threats. Like secular flyting, it uses pronoun contrast, verbal echo and parallel or adversative syntactic patterns to create a verbal reciprocity which mimics the exchange of blows and makes these dialogues the linguistic equivalent of actual warfare. Beyond this common ground, however, there are significant differences between secular flyting and its pious counterpart. For instance, in sacred flyting the features which distinguish serious flyting from ludic flyting are combined. Like the senna variant of ludic flyting, sacred flyting deals with disputes which have metaphysical and theological consequences rather than with the more personal issues of reputation and physical prowess which preoccupy flyters engaged in battle flyting, court flyting or manniafnap. Thus Adam and the Tempter contend about the nature of God's command, while Juliana, Affricanus and Eleusius quarrel about which gods ought to be worshipped. Yet even though sacred flyting is concerned with the intangible and the spiritual rather than with the tangible and temporal, it, like battle flyting, is nonetheless often associated with actual violence. Indeed, with the exception of Jesus' dispute with the High Priest in And, the sacred flytings discussed in this study include some dire physical consequence for the Christian hero. Judas Cyriacus, for example, starves in a pit, Juliana is martyred, and Eve brings death upon herself and Adam. In sacred flyting, however, this physical suffering and death do not usually signal its victim's defeat, as they do in serious or battle flyting. Instead, by enduring hardship, the saint confirms his words with deeds, and by enduring death, fulfills his
boasts and earns his salvation. In either circumstance, physical suffering is linked with spiritual victory in sacred flyting.

Some lesser distinctions between secular and sacred flyting are also important. For instance, although the speech acts of secular flyting recur in sacred flyting, they are constructed from conventional Christian utterances, for the Christian hero fights with God's words -- a verbal arsenal which includes confessional recitations of Scripture and doctrine, as well as prayer and exorcism. Thus, the secular flyter's retrojective boasts about his own ancestry or his comitatus leader's merits are replaced in sacred flyting by the Christian spokesman's confessional statements attesting to God's creative prowess and Jesus' divine lineage, and the secular flyter's projective boasts are replaced by quasi-credal predictions of the dire fate awaiting the devil and his sinful followers, as well as of the heavenly rewards awaiting the saint. Similarly, the insults directed at Satan and his cohorts in sacred flyting consist of recapitulations of the Church's teaching about the origin of evil which allege a supernatural equivalent of heroic failure. Sacred flyting also sometimes substitutes exorcistic imperatives for the directive illocutions of its secular counterpart.

Not surprisingly, the speech of the devil and his allies undergoes no corresponding spiritualization in pious versions of flyting. As a consequence, on the rare occasions when it is not deceitful, the devil's discourse is mired in the literal and materialistic perspective implicit in the conventional insults, threats and settlement offers of secular flyting. Such materialism is quite foreign to the spiritual outlook of the Christian hero, and its persistence in demonic speech ensures that the verbal barbs of the devil and his allies are launched at the wrong targets, for the saint's lack of interest in the tangible and the temporal
makes him immune to these insults, threats, and blandishments.\textsuperscript{12}

Sacred flyting also heightens the thematic significance of the contrastive verbal echoes found in secular flyting, making them participants in religious lexical battles in which the devil or his representative repeats the saint's words, but wrenches them from their customary Christian denotations and assigns them new and perverse meanings.\textsuperscript{13} The irony which arises from this battle of denotation gives sacred flyting a semantic complexity which is usually lacking in the more mechanical repetitions frequent in the Latin Christian adversarial dialogues.

A final important distinction remains to be made about the role of secular and sacred flyting in heroic narrative. In the secular epic, flyting is secondary to action. Thus in\textit{Beowulf}, the Beowulf/Unfer\textsuperscript{p} flyting is less important, and consequently is treated at less length, than Beowulf's battles with Grendel, Grendel's mother and the dragon. In the Christian epic, however, sacred flyting becomes the action: Adam, Juliana, Andrew and Gu\textsuperscript{plac} do not perform heroic deeds, they talk. This represents a major shift in the paradigm of the heroic story and one which allows the epic to adjust to the didactic requirements of devout Christian narrative by including within it lengthy recitations of Christian doctrine. This shift is possible, however, because sacred flyting allows the poet to enhance potentially tedious doctrinal discourse with the aggressive rhetoric of secular flyting. Adam, Juliana, Andrew and Gu\textsuperscript{plac} can hold their audience's attention during their recitations of doctrine because their pious utterances occur within exchanges enlivened by the vilification, ominous threats and rhetorical ploys of secular flyting. Moreover, in addition to making religious doctrine more palatable, the agonistic tone arising from these stylistic devices acts as an effective substitute for physical violence. AS writers' application of the template of Germanic flyting to the
adversarial dialogues found in Latin Christian texts, then, suggests that they recognized the wisdom of Pope Gregory's advice to the English clergy, for by Germanicizing the Christian war of words, and making it an exciting substitute for physical action, these poets were, in their own way, converting pagan temples into the shrines of Christian devotion. ¹⁴
FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION

1 See, for instance, my analysis of the OE Life of Saint Christopher, Alfric's "Passio Sanctae Ceciliae Virginis," and the OE Life of Saint Margaret in chapter four, pp. 142-7, pp. 147-52, and pp. 175-81.


3 Jesus' dispute with the High Priest in And v. 666-810 is concerned chiefly with the truth of Jesus' genealogy. This flying is not validated by violence, but rather by Jesus' animation of a stone figure who speaks on his behalf.

4 Sometimes, the violent consequences occur before the flying ends. Thus, the suffering of Andrew and GuPlac punctuates, but does not terminate the flying (see And vv. 1229-36a; vv. 1261b-79a and GuP A vv. 405-26; vv. 515-20).

5 Even Judas and Eve are not permanently conquered. Judas' agony precipitates his conversion and allows him to join the ranks of victorious Christian flyters as he demonstrates in his subsequent confrontation with Satan, while according to Christian doctrine (expressed, for instance, in XSt's account of the Harrowing) Eve is ultimately redeemed, making the Tempter's victory temporary.

6 GuPlac endures both mental and physical torment (although the former predominates in GuP A, vv. 405-11 suggest that the saint also suffers physical hardship) and in doing so fulfills his boasts that he will not be removed from the beorg (GuP A vv. 244b-45, vv. 250-1a, v. 314b).

7 Likewise, the devils' and the Mermedons' assaults on Andrew allow him to demonstrate the strength of his faith and the accuracy of his belief that God will not forsake him (And vv. 1284-90).

8 Juliana repeatedly boasts that she will not apostatize regardless of the torments she must endure (Jlna vv. 132-9, vv. 149-57, vv. 176-83, vv. 210-15) and her death validates her vows.

9 See, for example, Jlna vv. 108-13a, And vv. 746-60, GuP A vv. 242-3, vv. 599-611.

10 The saint frequently threatens Satan and his demons with eternal confinement in hell (And vv. 1383-5, Ele v. 950b-2a, and GuP A vv. 612-7, vv. 623-7, and vv. 673-82). In GuP A vv. 651-7, GuPlac describes his heavenly rewards.

11 The saint often attacks Satan with descriptions of his ignominious defeat and subsequent exile from heaven (see, for example, And vv. 1190-4, vv. 1376-85, Ele v. 941b-45a, and GuP A vv. 596-8).

12 See, for example, XSt vv. 690-1a, GR v. 543a, and GuP A v. 255a.

13 Thus, the High Priest's allegation in And that Jesus and his disciples are exiles, Eleusius' threats of death in Jlna, and Affricanus' suggestion that Juliana's apostasy will earn her wealth all have little effect on the Christian hero. The devils' lies, of course, are equally ineffective, for illocutions which are false have no performative force (see for example, p. 77 and pp. 111-13 above).

14 I am indebted to Hermann, "Some Varieties of Psychomachia in Old English II: The Middle Ages," ABR 34 (1983), p. 221 for his reference to Gregory's letter to Abbot Mellitus in which he advises the abbot to destroy pagan idols, but not pagan temples: "uidelicet quia fana
idolorum destrui in eadem gente minime debeant, sed ipsa quae in eis sunt idola destruantur, aqua benedicta fiat, in eisdem fanis aspergatur, altaria construantur reliquae ponantur. Quia, si fana eadem bene constructa sunt, necesse est ut a cultu daemonum in obsequio ueri Dei debeant commutari, ut dum gens ipsa eadem fana sua non uidet destrui, de corde errorem deponat, et Deum uerum cognoscens ac adorans, ad loca quae consueuit familiarius concurrat" (Colgrave and Mynors, eds., Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People [Oxford: 1969], p. 106).
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