

## Paper of the Year Award

### Ælfric's Shifting Mode of Speech: Postscript on *Wite Ge* in the Peter and Paul Homily

---

OGAWA Hiroshi

---

#### I

In a recent *RES* article on Ælfric's homily on Peter and Paul (*Catholic Homilies*, First Series, xxvi *Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*), I noted in passing a problem that may affect our understanding of the homilist's use of the imperative *wite ge* 'know ye' and the direct speech it opens in a passage towards the end of the hagiographical narrative. I wrote:

The passage in question reads: *ÆCHom* I. 26.276 *comon wlitige weras 7 uncude ... 7 sædon þam folce þæt hi micclum blissian mihton for þan ðe hi swilce mundboran on heora neawiste habban moston; wite ge eac þæt ðes wyrsta cyning nero rice æfter cweale þisra apostola healdan ne mot*. Here Ælfric made remarkable changes to the Latin text, converting the latter's direct speech of the strangers into indirect speech and then ending it half way while the direct speech continues in the Latin: *Ipsi ... dixerunt ad omnem populum: 'Gaudete et exultate, quia patronos magnos meruistis habere et amicos domini Iesu Christi. Sciatis autem hunc Neronem regem pessimum post necem apostolorum regnum tenere non posse'*. Ælfric's shift to direct speech with *wite ge* would mean that the *ge* no longer refers to the people (*þam folce*) but the audience (or readers) whom Ælfric the homilist now turns to address, as both Clemoes' and Thorpe's texts obviously imply, starting a new paragraph with *wite ge*. This would be the most plausible interpretation, not least because it would then show Ælfric introducing another of his characteristic homiletic interjections in the hagiographical narrative. On the other hand, the interpretation has a difficulty in that the present tense *mot* in the last clause does not make sense as a word Ælfric would have used to refer to the past event—a difficulty which Thorpe dismisses by translating *ne mot* as 'could not'. Alternatively, it might be possible to see mixture of direct and indirect speech in Ælfric's rendering,

assuming that he did not after all alter the sense of his source. However, as far as I am aware, no evidence of such mixed construction has been found in his writings. For an example in other prose, see *Apollonius of Tyre* (ed. Peter Goolden) 22.3–4.<sup>1</sup>

As I wrote this, I did not fully grasp the problem and was inclined to dismiss it and follow the standard reading of the *wite ge* sentence promulgated by the two editors of the *Catholic Homilies*.<sup>2</sup> However, I have since become aware of evidence which would allow me to withdraw what was then my main reason for such a dismissal and reconsider the ‘alternative’ reading that now calls for full discussion.

## II

The ‘mixed construction’ (as I called it in the *RES* footnote) embraces two types of shift between direct and indirect speech. The first type is illustrated by the passage from *Apollonius of Tyre* referred to in the footnote: *ApT* 22.2 *Ða cwæð se cyngc: ‘Ga rædlice and sege him þæt se cyngc bit ðe þæt ðu cume to his gereorde’*.<sup>3</sup> Here King Arcestrates orders one of his men to go, on his behalf, and tell Apollonius to come to him. This complex construction of ordering an order has probably caused ‘[a] mixture of indirect and direct speech’,<sup>4</sup> with *ðe* in the first *þæt*-clause and *ðu* in the second both referring to Apollonius, the ultimate addressee of the king’s order who is not yet present in the scene. It is a result of ‘confusion’, understandable though illogical, made on the Old English author’s part in translating the corresponding passage of his Latin source, which has a passage of direct speech embedded in the king’s order without a subordinating conjunction: *Rex ait: ‘Vade celerius et dic ei, “rogat te rex ut venias ad cenam”*’.<sup>5</sup>

Now, something similar might possibly be detected in Ælfric’s prose. In a passage from the homily on the Assumption of St John the Apostle (*Catholic Homilies*, First Series, iv), Ælfric describes how the Apostle, responding to the challenge of the chief idolater Aristodemus to prove what he says about his God, orders him to go and tell

<sup>1</sup> Hiroshi Ogawa, ‘Hagiography in Homily—Theme and Style in Ælfric’s Two-part Homily on SS Peter and Paul’, *Review of English Studies* 249 (2010), 167–87 (p. 176, n. 30).

<sup>2</sup> Benjamin Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholici, or Homilies of Ælfric*, 2 vols. (London, 1844–46; repr. New York, 1971), I, pp. 364–85; Peter Clemoes (ed.), *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies. The First Series*. EETS ss 17 (Oxford, 1997), pp. 388–99.

<sup>3</sup> Cited from Peter Goolden (ed.), *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre* (Oxford, 1958).

<sup>4</sup> Goolden, *The Old English Apollonius*, p. 53, note to 22, 3–4.

<sup>5</sup> Cited from Goolden’s parallel Latin text, p. 23.

the dead thieves to arise. The passage reads:<sup>6</sup>

*ÆCHom* I, 4.231 þa cwæð Iohannes; Aristodeme: Nim mine tunecan 7 lege bufon þæra deadra manna lic. 7 cweð; þæs hælendes cristes apostol me asende to eow. þ ge on his naman of deaðe arisan: 7 ælc man oncnawe þ deað 7 lif þeowiað minum hælende;

The possibility of a 'mixed construction' lies in the last clause ('7 ælc man ... minum hælende'). It is usually taken as a part of the speech Aristodemus is ordered to pass on to the dead, following the Apostle's imperative *cweð*. Thorpe, for example, clearly indicates this reading by using single quotation marks for three clauses including the one just mentioned, as: ... "*Aristodeme, nim mine tunecan, ... cweð, 'Þæs Hælendes Cristes apostol me asende to eow, þæt ge on his naman of deaðe arison, and ælc man oncnawe þæt deað and lif þeowiað minum Hælende.'*"<sup>7</sup> So do C. T. Onions' revised *Sweet's Reader* and J. R. Hulbert's revised *Bright's Reader*.<sup>8</sup> The three editors thus apparently agree in thinking that the idolater refers to the Apostle's Christian God as 'minum hælende'. This would seem logically improbable, unless one assumes that the idolater is made to take on the persona of the Apostle, even in the exact wording he is supposed to use when speaking on his behalf. This assumption sounds plausible but leaves unexplained the curious mingling of two personae for the idolater—his own persona as a messenger ('... apostol me asende') and the persona of the Apostle in whose voice he speaks ('minum hælende'). Hence the possibility I hinted at above of seeing the first type of speech shift in this passage by Ælfric. One feels tempted to

<sup>6</sup> Unless otherwise stated, citation from the *Catholic Homilies* is made from the EETS editions.

<sup>7</sup> Thorpe, I, pp. 72–74. Thorpe's base manuscript is Cambridge University Library, Gg. 3.28, fols. 13–17. Hence, there are a few minor spelling variations between the EETS text (based on British Library, Royal 7 C xii) and his. Otherwise, the two manuscript texts agree verbally and in punctuation, though the Cambridge text has a *punctus* instead of the *punctus elevatus* of the Royal text. On this point, see below. As is generally agreed, it is the Royal manuscript that is crucial as the closest we know of to Ælfric's original composition of the First Series; see Norman Eliason and Peter Clemoes (eds.), *Ælfric's First Series of Catholic Homilies* (EEMF XIII. Copenhagen, 1965), pp. 28–35, and Clemoes, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*, pp. 65–66.

<sup>8</sup> *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, Twelfth Edition, Revised by C. T. Onions (Oxford, 1950), p. 65; *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, Revised and Enlarged by James R. Hulbert (New York, 1935), p. 83. Both editions are based on the Cambridge manuscript; see further n. 9. The Assumption homily is deleted in the current fifteenth edition of *Sweet's Reader*, revised by Dorothy Whitelock. Magoun and Walker, based on the Hulbert's text, translate the passage as: "Aristodemus, take my tunic ... and say 'Let the Apostle of the Saviour Christ send me (i.e. Aristodemus) to you (criminals) so that in His name you may rise from death and (so that) everybody may recognize that ...'" (Francis P. Magoun, Jr. and James A. Walker, *An Old-English Anthology: Translations of Old-English Prose and Verse* (Dubuque, Iowa, 1950), p. 45). The translators follow Hulbert in construing the *and*-clause as part of Aristodemus' direct speech but gives an incorrect translation of the preceding *asende* as 'Let ... send', mistakenly taking the verb as a present subjunctive.

wonder if the phrase ‘minum hælende’ in the idolater’s direct speech can be a misplaced use of the first person pronoun, in place of the third person *þæs apostles* (followed by an appropriate word the idolater would have used for the Apostle’s God), which Ælfric might have overlooked in rendering the chain of subordinate clauses of the Latin *Passio* text (for details, see n. 11 below). If this is really the case, then the passage would be a case of a ‘mixed construction’ that, like the *Apollonius* passage quoted above, was more likely than not caused by the complex structure of dictated ordering where a passage of direct speech is embedded in the ultimate addresser’s direct speech and has a *þæt*-clause within itself.

However, it remains disputable whether the punctuation which the three editors mentioned above agree in using is the only way of reading the last clause in the Apostle’s speech, not least because they, all following Thorpe, do not go beyond their common base manuscript, CUL, Gg. 3.28,<sup>9</sup> which has a *punctus* instead of the *punctus elevatus* of the Royal manuscript text, as shown above in the EETS text (‘... ge ... of deaðe arisan; 7 ælc man oncnawe ...’). The *punctus elevatus* of this latter text is noted in *Bright’s Reader*, third edition. The completely revised text, now based, like the EETS text, on the Royal manuscript, reads: ‘... 7 cweð. þæs hælendes cristes apostol me asende to eow, þ ge on his naman of deaðe arisan; 7 ælc man oncawe þ deað 7 lif þeowiað minum hælende’.<sup>10</sup> Here the editors replace the manuscript punctuation with modern punctuation, using a semicolon for the *punctus elevatus* (and a comma for the *punctus*) but add a marginal gloss to the effect that the semicolon before ‘7 ælc man’ should be deleted (thereby implying the same reading of the last clause as the three editors quoted earlier). But this special plea itself speaks for the importance of the *punctus elevatus*, which cannot and should not be dismissed so casually.

The *punctus elevatus* suggests a larger transition than a *punctus* would imply, both in meaning and sentence structure, between what precedes and follows it in the EETS text. Indeed, if this punctuation is intended to complement the earlier *punctus elevatus* immediately following *Aristodeme* (in the first line of the quotation), the two may form what is in effect a near manuscript counterpart to modern quotation marks, indicating where the order the Apostle directly addresses to the idolater begins

<sup>9</sup> The prefatory note in Onions’ *Sweet’s Anglo-Saxon Reader* (p. 57) states that its text ‘is based on a comparison’ of the Cambridge text, which ‘has been followed in the main’, with the Royal text (and another one in a Bodleian manuscript)—a statement that comes almost verbatim from Sweet’s own last edition of the *Reader* (8th ed.). But Sweet does not appear to have taken cognizance of the evidence of punctuation in the Royal manuscript.

<sup>10</sup> Frederic G. Cassidy and Richard N. Ringler (eds.), *Bright’s Old English Grammar and Reader*, Third Edition (New York, 1971), p. 236.

and ends. One may then claim that the *and*-clause that follows the second *punctus elevatus* is independent of the immediately preceding clause; it is coordinate not to that clause but to the preceding one—the Apostle's imperative *cweð* (and the two preceding imperatives)—implying a relation which can be translated as '(Take ... and lay ... and) tell the dead ..., and then (*or* in that way) let everyone know ...'. In other words, the *and*-clause is not part of the idolater's speech to the dead but of the Apostle's speech to the idolater. Using *and* together with the *punctus elevatus* in this way, Ælfric slightly modifies the Latin text he draws upon. He uses the *and*-clause to replace the second of the two *ut*-clauses in the Latin text (probably intended as a clause of purpose), thereby clarifying the complication of the consecutive subordinate clauses in the source.<sup>11</sup> Seen in this light, Ælfric's *and*-clause may not be a case of simple coordination to what immediately precedes it, let alone a 'misplaced' use of personal pronouns that has been overlooked, as in the earlier *Apollonius* passage. It is rather the product of a literary style, showing Ælfric deliberately shifting modes within a speech—from the embedded direct speech back to the framing direct speech.

### III

A more distinct type of shifting the mode of speech, which is the second of the two types falling under the aforementioned term 'mixed construction' (see Section I), can also be seen in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. I am now aware of one such passage, which occurs in the life of Cuthbert (Second Series, x *Depositio Sancti Cuthberhti Episcopi*). Towards the middle of this hagiographical homily, Abbess Ælffæd, visiting Cuthbert on the Island of Farne, ventures to express her conviction that he prefers to remain on

<sup>11</sup> The Latin text of *Passio Iohannis Apostoli* edited by Mombricitus, as cited in the EETS commentary (M. R. Godden (ed.), *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*. EETS ss 18 (Oxford, 2000), p. 37, note to lines 231–43), uses double quotation marks and other punctuation, indicating the same reading of how far Aristodemus speaks as the three editors of the Old English text mentioned above. But this punctuation is apparently editorial, and the same problem remains as in the Old English text. The 1910 edition of Mombricitus, using no other punctuation than the colon-shaped mark, shows the passage in question as such: *Apostolus : uade : et mitte eam ... : et dices ita : Apostolus domini nostri Iesu christi misit me : ut in nomine eius exurgatis : ut cognoscant omnes : quia uita et mors famulantur domino meo Iesu christo* (B. Mombricitus, *Sanctuarium, seu Vitae Sanctorum*. 2 vols. (2nd ed. Paris, 1910), II, p. 60). Another unmodernized text (J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 2 vols. (Hamburg, 1719, digitalized for Google Books at [http://books.google.co.jp/books?id=1NE7AAAACAAJ&source=gbs\\_navlinks\\_s](http://books.google.co.jp/books?id=1NE7AAAACAAJ&source=gbs_navlinks_s)), p. 620) is similar in punctuation but has *et* ('&') instead of the second *ut* in the Mombricitus text, pointing to a version closer to what Ælfric might have used as his source text. On this point, see Godden, *Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 28–29, and Cassidy and Ringler, *Bright's Reader*, p. 223. In any way, it is not necessary to think that Ælfric always says exactly as his Latin source text says.

the island rather than leaving it to be consecrated a bishop. The saint then replies to her, prophesying about himself in a unique mixture of indirect and direct speech:

*ÆCHom* II, 10.231 Ða cwæð se witega þæt he wurðe nære. swa miccles hades. ne ðæs heahsetles. ac swa þeah nan man godes mihte ne forflihð. on nanum heolstrum. heofenan. oþþe eorðan. oþþe sæ ðriddan; Ic gelyfe swa ðeah. gif se ælmihtiga me hætt þæs hades beon. þæt ic eft mote ðis igland gesecan. æfter twegra geara ymbrene. and ðyses eðeles brucan; Ic bidde þe ælfæd. þæt ðu uncre spræce. on minum life. nanum ne ameldige;

Opening with the first person pronoun *Ic*, the second half of the passage (after the first *punctus versus* to the end) is clearly to be interpreted as direct speech by Cuthbert and is thus indicated by a set of double quotation marks in Thorpe's edition.<sup>12</sup> There is every reason to believe that this transition to direct speech is anything but accidental. Ælfric starts the direct speech at a critical point, where the saint turns from a general statement of Christian truths to a prophecy about his destiny. The direct speech is more vivid and forceful. Ælfric, one assumes, has chosen to bring in the forcefulness of direct speech to enhance the dramatic effect of Cuthbert's prophecy which would otherwise have largely been lost.<sup>13</sup> The need Ælfric apparently felt to enhance the prophecy is also seen in his emphasis on the saint's virtuous gift of foreknowledge when he refers to him as *se witega* 'the prophet' at this particular point in the story of the saint's encounter with the abbess (in the first line quoted above). Prior to the exchange with her as examined here, the saint makes prophetic statements about the demise of King Ecgfrith and his would-be successor. But on both of these occasions (lines 217 and 223), Ælfric prefers to call the saint by a plain phrase *se halga (wer)* 'the holy (man)', which is the usual epithet he uses for the saint throughout the homily, as when he begins 'Cuthberhtus se halga biscop' (line 1). The contrast to this undifferentiated mode of reference clearly shows that the choice of *se witega* at this point is functional. The magnitude of this affective term together with the narrative technique of the shifting mode of speech may be more readily appreciated if we note that it all belongs to Ælfric's own language, with nothing that would have prompted it in his source text for this part of the homily, Bede's *Vita Cuthberti Metrica*. The

<sup>12</sup> It is similarly marked in Henry Sweet's edition (*Selected Homilies of Ælfric*, Second Edition (Oxford, 1901), p. 71), though his printed text has no opening quotation mark to go with the closing single quotation mark.

<sup>13</sup> For an important study of Ælfric's manipulative use of direct and indirect speech, see Ruth Waterhouse, 'Ælfric's use of discourse in some saints' lives', *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976), 83–103.

Latin text uses direct speech for all of Cuthbert's reply to the abbot from the very beginning. Moreover, it does not have any specific reference, let alone the use of a word for 'prophet', to refer to the saint except the usual third person verb form *respondit*.<sup>14</sup>

There may possibly be more examples of this kind of transition in the *Catholic Homilies* and Ælfric's other works. For the moment, however, I can only cite one passage from the former offered by Bruce Mitchell as an example of the 'intermingling of dependent and direct speech'.<sup>15</sup> The transition occurs in God's words that Peter quotes to refute the Jews in the Acts (2:17–19), as Ælfric recounts the story of Pentecost in a homily from the First Series (xxii *In Die Sancto Pentecosten*):

*ÆCHom* I, 22.57 ða andwyrde petrus; Hit is underntid: hu mihte we on þyssere tide beon fordrencte? Ac þæs witegan cwyde ioheles is nu gefylled; God cwæð þurh ðæs witegan muð. þæt he wolde his gast asendan ofer menniscum flæsce: 7 manna bearn sceolon witigian. 7 ic sylle mine forebeacn ufon of heofonum. 7 mine tacna nyðer on eorðan; wite ge soðlice þæt crist aras of deaðe. 7 on ure gewitnysse astah to heofonum. 7 sit æt his fæder swiðran swa swa dauid be him witegode þus cweðende;

The transition to direct speech is again made in the context of prophesying, as God reveals His will through the prophet Joel (*God cwæð þurh ðæs witegan muð. þæt he wolde ...*, in the second line). But it is more difficult to know why Ælfric makes the transition where he does (with the present *sceolon* and the *ic* referring to God, in the third line), since there is no change of topic to prompt it here as there was in the previous passage from the Cuthbert homily. Presumably, in quoting from the Acts, the second person pronoun in the phrase *filii vestri et filiae vestrae* was difficult to render in indirect speech.<sup>16</sup> To avoid this problem, Ælfric perhaps chose the simpler and a more general phrase *mannas bearn* 'children of men'. This change in turn led him to depart from the initial mode of indirect discourse, continuing now in direct speech to the end of God's quoted words (... *on eorðan*, in the fifth line), trailing off

<sup>14</sup> See Godden, *Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, p. 425, note to lines 226–38. Bede's *Vita*, though, uses the words *vates* and *propheta* earlier in this episode and elsewhere. I hope to discuss Ælfric's Cuthbert homily in comparison with the Latin *Vitae* in full detail in a separate study.

<sup>15</sup> Bruce Mitchell, *Old English Syntax*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1985), II, §1946. Mitchell gives in the same section a few more examples of this type from poetry and prose not by Ælfric and some examples of 'gradual and often partial transition from dependent to non-dependent speech' in §1947.

<sup>16</sup> The Vulgate is cited from Robertus Weber (ed.), *Biblia Sacra. Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, Third Edition (Stuttgart, 1983).

into the present tense *wite ge*, whereby he returns to Peter's own words to the Jews; on this use of *wite ge*, see below, Section IV. Alternatively, one might possibly think of the substituted subject *manna bearn* as a result of conflated text Ælfric might have made of the relevant words of verses 17 (*et prophetabunt filii vestri, et filiae vestrae*) and 18 (*et prophetabunt*, with no expressed subject).<sup>17</sup> This conflation might have given him the impetus to make the shift to direct speech. In either event, Ælfric registers his sense of the resultant unusual syntax by using a *punctus elevatus* before 'ȝ manna bearn' as a part of the shift. Another difference from the Cuthbert passage is the presence of *and* ('ȝ') introducing the shift. But the effect of the transition is essentially the same; 'the words of the speaker are vividly presented', as Mitchell says of this example and others,<sup>18</sup> with as much dramatic force as in the previous Cuthbert passage.

#### IV

To return to the problem of Ælfric's *wite ge* in the Peter and Paul homily with which I began this essay, what do we make of it in light of the examples I have given in the preceding two sections? The evidence of the two examples discussed in the last section (*ÆCHom* II, 10.231–38 and I, 22.59–62) allows us to establish Ælfric's use of a narrative pattern—of shifting from indirect mode to direct mode halfway through a speech by one and the same speaker—of which the *wite ge* sentence in the Peter and Paul homily can then be seen as a third example, analogous to the previous two. One may safely assume then that what I called the 'alternative' reading in the *RES* footnote is in fact the more probable one: the phrase *wite ge* does not mark the beginning of a speech by a different speaker but rather a shift, though not with a *punctus elevatus* but with a *punctus versus*, to the direct mode, continuing the speech by the *wlitige weras* 'beauteous men'<sup>19</sup> which had begun a couple of lines earlier ('*wlitige weras ... sædon þam folce þæt ...*'; see Section I). There is now no reason to think that since the shifting is not paralleled elsewhere in Ælfric's works, we may not accept this 'alternative' reading, which would otherwise be much preferable. The present tense

<sup>17</sup> Godden, though, identifies only verse 17 as the source text of Ælfric's *ȝ manna bearn sceolon witigian* and excludes verse 18 (*Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, p. 177, note to lines 56–74). So does Albert S. Cook in *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers*, 2 vols. First Series (London, 1898; repr. Folcroft, Pa., 1971), pp. 228–29.

<sup>18</sup> *Old English Syntax*, §1946.

<sup>19</sup> By this phrase, rendering the Latin *virī sancti*, Ælfric seems to mean the angels sent from heaven, as I argued in the *RES* article; see 'Hagiography in Homily', p. 185, n. 52.



*mot* in the *wite ge* sentence is exactly what is required by this reading of the sentence as a prophecy; it does not need to be taken as a loose substitute for the grammatically correct past tense *moste*, as in Thorpe's (and, by implication, Clemoes') reading of the *wite ge* sentence as an after-the-event report by Ælfric the homilist (see Section I). No less important is the fact that, as I have just implied, here, as in the passages from the Cuthbert homily and, with a slight difference, the Pentecost homily, Ælfric makes the shift to direct speech at a point where the speaker goes on to make a prophecy. The speech is thereby endowed with dramatic force, which is no less appropriate to the context than in the previous two passages, since it marks the climactic moment of announcing a miserable death to come upon the evil emperor as a well-deserved punishment for what he had done to the two saints. This close parallelism makes Ælfric's pattern more distinct and significant. Together the three parallel passages allow us to see Ælfric using the shift in mode of speech as a narrative technique, presenting the relevant part of the speech more vividly and effectively as a way to express special emphasis in narrating the hagiographical events. The technique is Ælfric's own in the Peter and Paul passage (and also in the other two; see Section III), for, as I pointed out in the *RES* footnote, the corresponding passage in the Latin hagiography on which Ælfric draws has the *virī sancti* speaking all the way in direct speech, congratulating the townspeople and then informing them about the emperor's impending doom. It is after all this rhetorical form of speech that Ælfric reverts to his own words of narration, telling his audience that it did come to pass as prophesied, starting with the narrative formula 'Hit gelamp ða þæt ...' (line 282).

There is yet another aspect of Ælfric's use of the phrase *wite ge* which seems to speak in favour of the reading just presented of the Peter and Paul passage. Using the Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus,<sup>20</sup> we see that there are eight examples, besides the one in the Peter and Paul homily, of this phrase being used in the *Catholic Homilies*. Remarkably, Ælfric never uses the phrase to address his own audience except once but puts it in the mouth of whomever he happens to be quoting as saying, mostly in the Bible: *ÆCHom* I, 22.62 (Peter speaking to the Jews on Pentecost; see above), 36.273 (Christ speaking to the Apostles, in John 15:18), 39.28 and 39.36 (Paul in Romans 13:11), 40.15 and 40.106 (Christ teaching the people, in Luke 21:30; *wite* is indicative), and II, 9.178 (the Pope speaking to Augustine and the

<sup>20</sup> *The Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey, with John Price Wilkin and Xin Xiang. 2009 Release. Web site ISBN 0-472-00277-5 (at <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/>).

other monks going with him, in the homily on Gregory). The one exception occurs in the homily on the Creed (First Series, xx *De Fide Catholica*, line 164). In this homily, there is no room for reference to narrative characters, since Ælfric the teacher and the taught, addressed as *ge*, are all the personae involved.<sup>21</sup> If this feature of a catechetical homily explains the exception, it is unlikely that our example from a hagiographical homily is a second similar exception. When directly addressing the audience to teach a Christian truth, Ælfric often uses the phrase *wite gehwa* ‘let everyone know’ instead, as in *ÆCHom* I, 9.244, 17 (App).77, 20.257, II, 13.63, 30.95, 31.45, and 40.293.

## V

In conclusion, I must withdraw the reference I made in the *RES* footnote to the ‘remarkable changes’ which Ælfric made to the Latin text of the hagiographical narrative. It finally appears that Ælfric has not, after all, changed the content of the speech of the *viri sancti*, though he has given it a new form, making rhetorical use of the shift from indirect speech to direct speech halfway through, as he also does in at least two other passages so far identified as such in the *Catholic Homilies*. Accordingly, the new paragraph in the EETS edition for the relevant part of the Peter and Paul homily should not be opened before the *wite ge* sentence but after it (at line 282, in the current numbering). Thorpe’s edition should similarly be re-paragraphed. Thorpe could have seen that Ælfric makes rhetorical use of discourse here again, much as in the passage in the Cuthbert homily for which he gave the correct reading.

Showa Women’s University

Received August 11, 2012

---

<sup>21</sup> In addition, there are six examples in the *Lives of Saints* (*ÆLS* 17.105, 174; 31.1422, 1455, 1466; and 35.341) and two in a homily not included in the *Catholic Homilies* (*ÆHomM* 11.9, 90). The usage is not so obvious here as in the *Catholic Homilies* but seems to be essentially the same.