Master's Theses   Graduate College

12-2019

Reconsidering 'Soul and Body II': Who is Culpable for Their Combined Fate?

Sarah Jaran

Recommended Citation

RECONSIDERING 'SOUL AND BODY II': WHO IS
CULPABLE FOR THEIR COMBINED FATE?

by

Sarah Jaran

A thesis submitted to the Graduate College
in partial fulfillments of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
The Medieval Institute
Western Michigan University
December 2019

Thesis Committee:

Jana K. Schulman, Ph.D., Chair
Robert Berkhofer III, Ph.D.
Kevin J. Wanner, Ph.D

RECONSIDERING 'SOUL AND BODY II': WHO IS
CULPABLE FOR THEIR COMBINED FATE?

Sarah Jaran, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 2019

Soul and Body II has been considered for many years by scholars to be a less doctrinally complex poem compared to later versions of the topos. Superficially, the poem seems to blame the body fully for the shared doomed fate of the body and soul because the majority of the poem is a speech by the soul claiming that much. I propose in this study, however, that the poet created a dual message for the audience of *Soul and Body II*. While the easy and more superficial message is that the body is at fault for the damnation of both entities, I argue that the poet crafted the poem with a deeper message that places the blame on the soul as much as the body. Through rhetorical devices involving repetition, both within the poem and across multiple poems, and by repeatedly blurring the distinctions between traditional dichotomies, the poet created an underlying message that blames both soul and body equally. Furthermore, the poet used the poem to serve as a dire warning to his audience so that each audience member may learn from the mistakes of the "bad" body and soul. If the listeners were wise, they would pay attention to the cautioning of the poem and they would live with both intent and actions expected of a proper Christian.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Discussions about the nature of the soul, and how the soul relates to the body, have been fascinating people for millennia. Many philosophers tend to agree that the soul is immortal and the body is mortal, but beyond that is a mystery. There seems to be less mystery when the natures of both body and soul are put into Christian terms. Certainly most Christian texts, either scripture, homilies, or poetry, depict the natures of body and soul as concretely known. Thus the description of life after death can be extremely vivid, especially in religious poetry. As poets attempt to expound upon the events that their audience may expect after death and describe those supposed events vividly, the poets risk heterodox ideas creeping into the text because they are filling in their own answers to unknowable questions. On occasion, the author only relies on orthodox sources, but when the monastery or cathedrals do not have many accepted texts describing the afterlife, as was the case in most areas during the Middle Ages, then the author must use his imagination. In early medieval England, especially during the Benedictine Reform, more and more texts were denounced as heterodox, and so were unavailable as source material for the poets' works. Old English poets, therefore, would use all that was available to them, including secular poetic techniques, so that their religious poems were more compelling.

Soul and Body II is one such poem, having been considered for many years by scholars a less doctrinally complex poem compared to later versions. Superficially, the poem seems to blame the body fully for the combined doomed fate of the body and soul because the majority of the poem is a speech by the soul claiming that much. In this thesis, I propose, however, that the poet created a dual message for the audience of *Soul and Body II*. While the easy and more superficial message is that the body is at fault for the damned of both entities, I argue that the poet crafted the poem with a deeper message to place the blame on the soul as much as the body and for the poem to serve as a dire warning to his audience to learn from the mistakes of the

"bad" body and soul. Through rhetorical devices involving repetition and by repeatedly blurring the distinctions between traditional dichotomies, the poet created an underlying message that blames both soul and body.

Soul and Body II would have been accessible to a lay audience, which is perfect for the purpose of convincing readers to change their ways while they are able, because it is found in the Exeter Book. The Exeter Book is one of the four extant literature codices of Old English,[1] and was considered one of the "world's principal cultural artefacts" by UNESCO in 2016.[2] The official manuscript nomenclature is Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3501, but more colloquially the anthology is called the Exeter Book, or in Latin Codex Exoniensis. Compiled sometime around 970, the Exeter Book is the largest surviving collection of Old English literature. The anthology is composed of various poems and riddles, which are found in 131 folia. The Exeter Book as it exists currently comprises about 77 percent of the original number of leaves. It is believed that the first eight leaves were replaced with other leaves to complete the 131 folia. Considered a miscellany, the Exeter Book raises two major questions: first, why did the compiler put these poems and riddles together and, second, for what purpose? Since the anthology was rediscovered in the nineteenth century, scholars have puzzled over such questions, with many dedicating many years to finding an answer. One such scholar is Patrick Conner, who examined the Exeter Book in the 1980s and published a book on his findings in 1993.[3] In his book, Conner posits that the codex was created in three separate "booklets": the first is from folio 8r to 52v, the

---

[1] "The Exeter Book," Exeter Cathedral, 2017, accessed June 17, 2019, https://www.exeter-cathedral.org.uk/history-heritage/cathedral-treasures/exeter-book/.
[2] Alison Flood, "Unesco lists Exeter Book among 'world's principal cultural artefacts'," The Guardian, June 22, 2016, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/jun/22/unesco-lists-exeter-book-among-worlds-principal-cultural-artefacts.
[3] Patrick W. Conner, Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth-Century Cultural History (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993).

second from 53r to 97v, and the third from 98r to 130v.[4] He argues that these booklets were not

created in the order that they were bound, proposing that the second booklet was created, then

the third, and then the first.

An order of second, third, first arises when Conner analyzes the connecting theme that

runs through each booklet's contents, as well as how the paleographical and codicological

elements seem to steadily advance and improve in such an order. According to Conner, the

poems in the second booklet may derive from pre-Benedictine Continental monastic models,

written before the reform affected Exeter.[5] Due to Exeter's fringe position in the reform

movement,[6] the community most likely did not begin its reformation until after 950, which is the

earliest date that Conner gives for the manuscript.[7] He then argues that the third booklet[8] was

started when the Reform first began in England, but that it was revised and finished as the impact

of the movement took full effect. With a core of religious and secular riddles, the third booklet

includes poems most likely in the Continental model. The scribe also added monastic poems that

were combinations of the techniques of earlier models with the strict approach and subject matter

of the Reform.[9] Consequently, I believe, based on Conner's assertion that the third booklet was

made during the Benedictine Reform, that this booklet has poems that were improved and

adjusted to better accord in style and content with the emphasis of the reform movement. Finally,

he believes the Reform movement heavily influenced the poems in the first booklet, but that this

was the last one to be made.[10] In summary, he believes the codex was created as three different

---

[4] Conner, *Anglo-Saxon Exeter*, 111.

[5] The poems range from *Azarias* to the first eight words of *The Partridge*.

[6] The English Benedictine Reform traditionally is said to begin between the years of 940-6, and finish by the end of Aethelred's reign in 1016.

[7] Richard Gameson, "The Origin of the Exeter Book of Old English Poetry," in *Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. 25, ed. Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 139.

[8] The poems range from the second part of *The Partridge* to the end of the riddle section.

[9] Conner, *Anglo-Saxon Exeter*, 162.

[10] The poems include the three *Christ* poems and the two *Guthlac* poems, all considered rhetorically complex.

booklets that improve compositionally, codicologically, and paleographically and over time. This argument is relevant to this thesis as *Soul and Body II* is part of the third booklet and, therefore was much improved compositionally in response to the Benedictine Reform. This improvement may have resulted in a reworking of the original message of *Soul and Body II*, which put the full blame on the body, to the more reformed orthodox message of a shared blame between the body and soul.

A poem with 121 lines, *Soul and Body II* opens with a narrator setting the scene.[11] The soul must visit her dead body once a week until Judgment Day.[12] When she visits her decaying body, she gives a speech blaming the body for the sins he committed while alive. She uses various tactics to hurt and shame the body, such as detailing what sinful acts he performed while living and the ways in which he wasted the opportunity of his life. Even though the soul rebukes the body so thoroughly, the body may give no speech in response. After the soul's speech, she leaves and the narrator graphically details the destruction of the body by the worms in the ground. He ends the short poem with a warning for his listeners to be mindful of the example presented of a "bad" soul and body so that they might avoid such a fate.

Soul and Body II is not the only poem on the subject of the soul and body after death in Old English, as the name given by editors implies. *Soul and Body I* is found in the *Vercelli Book*, one of the other four major Old English codices.[13] Of the two poems, *Soul and Body II* is shorter because it ends after 121 lines. Those first 121 lines are close to identical, save for slight

---

[11] For this thesis, I rely on Bernard J. Muir, ed., *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: An Edition of Exeter Dean and Chapter MS 3501*, vol. 2 (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2000); Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3501. The manuscript is 12.5 in. x 8.6 in., which is a bit larger than a standard piece of paper.

[12] For the purposes of this thesis, the soul will be referred to with a feminine pronoun because soul is feminine grammatically in Latin and Old English. Following the example of other scholars, the body will be referred to with a masculine pronoun, in order to differentiate. Usually in Latin and Old English the word for body is masculine, but in *Soul and Body II* most Old English words the poet uses for the word body are neuter.

[13] Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS CXVIII, better known as the *Vercelli Book*. The major difference between the *Exeter Book* and the *Vercelli Book* is that while the *Exeter Book* is an anthology of religious and epic poetry and riddles, the *Vercelli Book* is a compilation of homilies, a *vita*, and poems.

variations in spelling, word choice, and skipped lines in the manuscript of *Soul and Body I*. *Soul and Body I* continues the narrative by presenting a "good" soul congratulating her decaying body on the good deeds performed during their life. *Soul and Body II* only discusses a "bad" soul and body. Consequently, the poem focuses solely on the soul's chastising of the body, characterized by worms eating the body. No matter what one does in life, the body will be eaten by worms and decay in the earth as is highlighted by *Soul and Body I*'s addition that both good and bad deeds during life lead to the same ending: a body's destruction by the earth. Meanwhile, *Soul and Body II*'s concentration on the bad body encourages the reader to have more agency in the fate of his body and soul.

Although both of these poems have received most of the scholarly attention in relation to the soul and body topos in Old English,[14] most scholars tend to treat the two poems as one. Some of the most prominent scholars to do this are George Philip Krapp, Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie, Douglas Moffat, Bernard Muir, and most recently, Claudio Cataldi. The focus is usually on how each poem illuminates errors, and editors use one to crosscheck problematic areas in the other version. Such a treatment of the poems is cursory and insufficient.

Some scholars focus on other religious poetry and texts because they view the poets of *Soul and Body I* and *II* as less compositionally and rhetorically skilled. Many perceive the poems to be simple, one of the reasons being the one-sidedness of the debate they present, and thus unworthy of further examination. Many later versions of the soul and body topos contain an actual debate where the body is able to respond to the soul, an interaction that some scholars believe exhibits more technical skill on the part of the poet. Other contemporaneous versions of the "Soul and Body" theme present good and bad souls praising or rebuking their bodies in more

---

[14] Claudio Cataldi, "A Literary History of the 'Soul and Body' Theme in Medieval England," PhD diss., (University of Bristol, 2018), 12 and 65.

interesting settings, or the two entities receiving judgment with more compelling events.[15] Those

other versions seem more compelling to study, especially when scholars can argue for the piece

to be included in the corpus of the soul and body theme. Furthermore, later Middle English

versions of the soul and body topos, chiefly poetic debate renditions, appear more rhetorically

and doctrinally complex because both body and soul raise arguments for their own innocence.[16] I

argue, however, that these Old English versions are just as doctrinally complex as their later

counterparts.

I focus the argument of my thesis on *Soul and Body II* since the example of the good soul

and body in *Soul and Body I* was a later addition. By adding the good soul and body, the author

hearkens back to earlier examples of the soul and body topos, which may have existed

concurrently with the circulation of the *Redactions* of the *Visio Sancti Pauli*,[17] for the purpose of

creating a stronger incentive for each listener to reevaluate his life.[18] In his dissertation, Claudio

Cataldi posits that including an example of the two good entities comes from the earliest texts

with the soul and body topos, which seemed to have a resurgence in popularity with the *Vercelli*

scribe. Cataldi's claim is supported by multiple scholars' observation that the final twenty or so

lines of *Soul and Body I* seem to provide a way to balance the poem's structure.[19] This difference

in the two poems is significant because, even though the early English were aware that their

bodies would end up in the ground, the addition of a good soul and body undermines the reader's

motivation to change his life. In *Soul and Body II*, the focus on the negative repercussions of the

---

[15] A more interesting setting is Judgment Day itself, as it is portrayed in *Vercelli Homily IV*, while more compelling events include the body changing colors or devils dragging the soul to Hell.

[16] One such Middle English example is *Als I Lay In A Winteris Nyt*. Early Middle English versions also do exist, such as *De Sancto Andreo* in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.52.

[17] The *Redactions* are the Latin version of the Greek apocryphal third-century text that was popular throughout the Middle Ages. The different versions explain the journey of the Apostle Paul as he wanders Heaven and Hell, bearing witness to the judgment of the righteous and wicked.

[18] Cataldi, "A Literary History of the 'Soul and Body' Theme," 50.

[19] Scholars such as Peter R. Orton, Douglas Moffat, Justin J. Brent; in Cataldi, "A Literary History," 72.

bad soul and body urges the reader to take control of the place to which his soul will journey after death.

This poem also reveals quite a bit of interplay between the soul and body, even though upon first reading, the body appears passive and silent. Upon deeper analysis, the silence of the body speaks volumes, as Marie Nelson and Mary Ferguson have discussed.[20] In this thesis, I demonstrate how the poet suggests the underlying complicity of the soul in its fate through contrasts and parallels, like the silent speech of the body. These parallels and contrasts create tension not only by balancing each other, but also by their application to both body and soul. Bernard J. Muir has argued that the *Exeter Book* has a didactic purpose and I agree with his conclusion.[21] Given this premise, I argue that the poet crafted the poem to bring his audience to understand that the intent of the soul must be in tune with the actions of the body for a person to be a good Christian.

Before demonstrating how the poet crafted the poem to both place blame on the soul and exhort the reader to live a better life, it is necessary to explore the theological doctrine and philosophical background underpinning the poem. In chapter one, I explain the roles assigned to soul and body as they changed in writings from Late Antiquity to the early medieval English period. I also detail the changes in theological thought on the place where the soul rests in the interim period between death and Judgment Day from the patristic fathers through to English Benedictine leaders. Highlighting this train of thought reveals that this issue is one of the more complex and unknowable aspects of religious doctrine, given how often it has been discussed

---

[20] Marie Nelson, "The Paradox of Silent Speech in the Exeter Book Riddles," *Neophilologus* 62, no. 4 (1978): 609-615; Mary H. Ferguson, "The Structure of the Soul's Address to the Body in Old English," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 69 (1970): 72-80.

[21] Bernard J. Muir, "Watching the Exeter Book Scribe Copy Old English and Latin Texts," *Manuscripta* 35, no. 1 (1991), 12. The didactic purpose of the text is also revealed when examining physical aspects of the codex, such as its large size, the paleographical aspects, the doodles in the margins, the content of the poems and riddles, and the fact that the *Exeter Book* was used to store gold leaf when Exeter had a scriptorium.

and debated over hundreds of years. Tracing this change in thought also gives a platform from which to argue for the poem's didactic purpose. Since positing the soul's resting place after death is so enticing, the poet had a reason to put forward this depiction of life after death for his audience. He needed to show what could happen after death, especially because he must spread the message that each man should reevaluate his life to ensure a place in heaven.

I argue that the *Soul and Body II* poet consciously crafted the poem to place blame on the soul as well as the body for their combined doomed fate. In chapter two, I focus on how the poet implicitly suggests the soul's culpability by making the audience more conscious of time. He uses rhetorical devices involving repetition to slow time down in the poem for the reader so that the reader focuses on what the poet deems important. Additionally, the poet uses interval markers, including temporal and spatial markers, as a way to create not only distinct timelines but also contrast between either the past and present or the present and future. These contrasts and greater awareness of time make the reader feel tension and a sense of urgency about the upcoming Judgment Day. By instilling in the reader a feeling that the end times are coming, the poet intimates that the reader needs to reflect on his life and change his ways to be more doctrinally correct before it is too late.

Another way that the poet crafts the poem to implore the reader to think about his life and to change his ways is through the "aesthetics of familiarity," a modern nomenclature for the way that Old English poetics function. The aesthetics of familiarity name the propensity for Old English poets to find beauty in composing poems with phrases and images already familiar to them. I explore in chapter three the multiple examples of this in *Soul and Body II* and the images to which the phrases are attached. These examples include the devouring-the-dead theme that Heather Maring explains in her book *Signs that Sing*, as well as common phrases such as *deaf*

ond dumb (deaf and dumb)*, wordum wrixlan* (to exchange words), and *gifre ond grædig* (eager and greedy). When using such familiar phrases and images, the poet capitalizes on the connotations of previous occurrences of those phrases that deepen and create a richer understanding of the images for the reader. Each of the phrases that I explore in the chapter evoke further images associated with previous occurrences that the poet uses to convince the reader that now is the time to consider whether he is living his life in the correct manner.

The poet also pushes the reader to consider if he is living correctly by heightening the tension between traditionally binary concepts in the poem, as I discuss in chapter four. Old English poets tend to enjoy inverting binaries and playing with ambiguity in their poems. In the same way, the *Soul and Body II* poet purposefully blurs the lines between metaphorical dichotomies like interior and exterior or body and soul, rather than separating binaries and creating clear distinctions between such ideas. Each of these metaphorical dichotomies has a point that acts as an in-between zone where the line blurs, especially when in the physical realm. One of the main liminal points on the body is the mouth, where tension is created through the violence that occurs when binaries meet. Through the tension created from the violent union of two traditionally separate ideas, greater tension arises in the reader because of further unknowns produced by such breaking down of dichotomies. It is difficult for the audience to separate the ideas, which then produces more tension and an accompanying anticipatory feeling that an important event will happen soon. The upcoming important event, according to the poet, is Judgment Day when the bad souls and bodies will be reunited and judged by God. The poet knows that the judgment will not be good for those entities, and so tries to warn his audience by forcing each member to reconsider how each lives his own life.

Each of these chapters explores a different way that the poet constructed the poem to place blame for the combined damned fate on both body and soul, if not giving more culpability to the soul. Through his creation of a greater consciousness of time, his use of familiar phrases and their associated meanings, and his blurring of binaries, the poet crafted *Soul and Body II* to blame the soul and, even more importantly, to bring a sense of urgency to his audience. Each technique that he uses imparts the necessity to reflect on one's own actions and how those actions may affect one's future. Each reader must use his own agency to evaluate his life, and then alter his life to be aligned with Christian doctrine. Yet, the poet does not want his audience to simply perform the necessary pious actions. For the reader to truly earn his place in heaven, he must have pious intent along with his pious actions. As such, the audience members should be mindful, and ponder the warning given in the poem, so that they may live forever after death in bliss.

One of the major ways that the poet can influence his audience to ponder his message the way that he wishes is to capitalize on the strict rules of Old English poetics. It is only through the creativity demonstrated by working within those rules that the skill of a poet can be determined. While Old English poetry was written in a singular line across the manuscript page, that is, in a format that modern audiences would tend to recognize as suited to prose, the meter and form of the text is poetry. Modern editors, as a result, tend to reorganize the text into lines that are split into half-lines called verses. The first half-line is on the left side of the caesura and is designated as the a-verse. Logically then, the right half-line is called the b-verse. One of the most important guiding principles of Old English verse is alliteration. According to the rules of Old English poetry, the first stressed syllable in the a-verse must alliterate with the first stressed syllable in the b-verse. There can be multiple syllables that alliterate across the line, but most often only one

in each verse alliterates. Consequently, this need to alliterate across the line drives the poet to think ahead about the words he chooses and which other synonyms he could use. In purposefully crafting his poem with possible synonyms in mind, he uses variation in tandem with alliteration to impress the audience by incorporating new and unexpected words for emphasis.[22] The author, or poet, then, had a variety of ways to express his creativity, including compounding words, and which affect his choice between possible words for entities in his poem.

For the *Soul and Body II* poet, he describes three separate entities: the body, soul, and narrator. Of these three, only two speak in the poem. The anonymous speaker, or narrator, introduces the subject matter and sets up the speech of the next important entity, the soul. The body never physically speaks, but as chapter four demonstrates, the body's silence "speaks" volumes. When the soul finishes her speech, the anonymous speaker wraps up the poem with a proverbial phrase to encourage a change in the audience. In early medieval England, an audience could consist of members who listened to or read the poem, and thus, I use the terms "audience member," "listener," and "reader" interchangeably.

In this thesis, I argue that *Soul and Body II* deserves recognition for the poet's rhetorical and compositional skill, which has been overlooked by many scholars when studying the poem. I explore the poet's skill in three thematic groupings: the repetition of familiar phrases within various genres, the rhetorical strategies within the poem itself that rely on repetition, and the blurring of traditional binaries so that parallelism between body and soul is created. I examine each of these groups in individual chapters to understand how the poet may have been using these techniques to reach his audience. The poet uses these strategies, I claim, to imply that both body and soul deserve the shared fate they receive in the poem. This message is not made

---

[22] I base my explanation of the Old English poetic rules of alliteration heavily on Donald Scragg's article, "The Nature of Old English Verse," in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 54-5.

explicit by the poet, but can only be understood when the reader questions the impression of spiritual innocence that the soul's speech suggests. A deeper message of an equally blameworthy body and soul reveals an orthodox reading of *Soul and Body II*. [23] Unlike most scholars, I argue that the poet knew that orthodox thought allowed for multiple views about the interim period and the places that a soul might reside, and so presented his own belief in his poem. While presenting another orthodox view of the interim resting places for souls, the author also used rhetorical strategies involving repetition to convince his listeners to change their ways before Judgment Day arrives and to persuade them to clearly demonstrate Christian values in outward actions and with inward intent.

---

[23] Scholars, such as Benjamin Kurtz or T. A. Shippey, claim the poem's theology is not first rate. Cyril Smetana and Thomas D. Hill argue that the theology is not necessarily wrong, but that the theology is of the popular rather than learned tradition. Many claim that *Soul and Body I* is the more doctrinely correct. This discussion is found in Allen J. Frantzen, "The Body in 'Soul and Body I'," *The Chaucer Review*, vol. 17, no. 1 (Summer, 1982), 77.

1. Interim Places and Worldly Roles: Historical, Theological, and Philosophical Background

Early medieval people's beliefs about the soul's and body's fates after death were not simple. An early English response to a question about the place in which souls reside before Judgment Day would depend not only on where and when he lived, but also upon which ecclesiastical culture he most participated in. Scholars tend to divide the ecclesiastical cultures into two main groups: the culture of the great minsters and monasteries and the small, local churches.[24] The people participating in both of these ecclesiastical cultures contributed, either consciously or not, to the evolution of thought about various tenets of the faith. In this study, I investigate the evolution of thought about a certain tenet of faith, the interim period between death and the Last Judgment. Delineating this evolution between the tradition of the minsters and monasteries against the small, local churches involves understanding the thought of Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine of Hippo, Gregory the Great, Julian of Toledo, Bede, and Ælfric of Eynsham. Writing in either Latin or Old English, these thinkers influenced many early English beliefs about the soul's journey after death, and so are the most orthodox introduction into the culture of the great minsters and monasteries, or the "Great Tradition."[25]

In this chapter, then, I track early English thought about the interim period between the moment of death and Judgment Day, the moment when all souls are judged and sent either to Heaven or Hell. My purpose in pursuing this avenue is to argue for the orthodoxy of *Soul and Body II* as well as to provide the reader with enough historical, theological, and philosophical background to follow my analysis of the poem. In terms of the Great Tradition, this will entail

---

[24] Victoria M. Thompson, *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), 44.
[25] Henceforth this culture is referred to as the "Great Tradition," a term borrowed from Richard Firth Green, *Elf Queens and Holy Friars: Fairy Beliefs and the Medieval Church* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016). The other culture is the "Little Tradition," which consists of the small, local churches where there is a participatory aspect to the culture between the rural community and the priests. I will not be discussing this culture, however, because it could be a whole other study in itself.

explaining the views of Patristic Fathers, which provided source material for early English authors. Significantly, the Great Tradition does not always have one unified belief about what constitutes orthodoxy. Victoria Thompson mentions that "rival, even incompatible, interpretations of Christian practice and doctrine could and did co-exist, long before the Reformation."[26] One of the most striking examples of this kind of diversity in beliefs can be seen in *Homily IV* in the *Vercelli Book*,[27] where the homilist presented Christian ideals in a fashion that appealed to the local Germanic population and their values. Part of this attempt to influence his audience was that the homilist wrote in Old English instead of Latin. The multiple accepted traditions of belief about the interim period between death and Judgment Day explains why the *Soul and Body II* poet thought he could add to the conversation.

Additionally, I explore the religious duties of both body and soul during life. In other words, I delve into the theological and philosophical arguments for who guides whom while the two entities dwell in this world. Sprinkled throughout the chapter is this theological aspect along with general historical background. Both will help contextualize the beliefs, orthodox or heterodox, that led to the creation of the poem.

The most basic philosophical and theological concept necessary to this thesis is how soul and body relate to one another during the early medieval period. For this understanding, a look at Gregory of Nyssa's (335-94) thought is essential because he contributed greatly to the idea that the logical outcome of Platonism must be Christianity.[28] In his writings, he outlines various perspectives on the relationship between body and soul. One perspective is that a person's whole being is made as a reflection of the Trinity; thus the mind, body, and soul reflect, respectively,

---

26 Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 26.
27 *Vercelli Homily IV* is found in the *Vercelli Book*. It presents one good and one bad soul and body on Judgment Day in front of Jesus as judge, and the resulting effects of the deeds they performed while living.
28 Kevin Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory: Mind, Soul, and Body in the 4th Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 47.

the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[29] Later in early English thought, the reflection of the Trinity on the soul will also be equated to memory, understanding, and will.[30] Another perspective, and the most important to this study, is that a human is constituted of both body and soul. Kevin Corrigan succinctly explains, "the body is not an afterthought, or inferior to the soul, but its expression, *logos*."[31] Gregory, however, also believes that there must be a separation of soul from body. This is not a physical separation of body and soul, but rather a separation from "external additions," the base passions, that rule the body.[32] If this separation from the passions of the body does not occur, then the soul can undergo a kind of death.

Overall, Corrigan characterizes the relationship between body and soul in Gregory's writing as "a dynamic co-extensive continuum of different potential relations or configurations, a continuum in which it is not always easy to tell where one stops – if at all – and another starts."[33] This late antique into very early medieval understanding of the relationship between soul and body is essential because it underlies future early English beliefs about the nature of soul and body, and how those beliefs are expressed. Furthermore, such an understanding permits multiple views of the relationship between soul and body.

As Gregory of Nyssa's work demonstrates, early English knowledge of the soul cannot be considered without also taking into account the body. In early medieval England, there was "a cultural world in which the decay of the human body was perceived as rapid and inevitable."[34] Death, as well as the physical decomposition of the body, was well known, which is seen throughout the Old English corpus. Exploring aspects of death, such as the point of view of the

---

29 Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory*, 46.
30 Malcolm R. Godden, "Anglo-Saxons on the Mind," in *Old English Literature: Critical Essays*, ed. M. R. Liuzza (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 291.
31 Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory*, 47.
32 Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory,* 47.
33 Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory,* 47.
34 Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 21.

restless ethereal soul or the decaying body, in poetry was popular because death was such an everyday experience. With poems detailing events such as the horrific defeat of an early English army at the Battle of Maldon, death was a common theme in poetry. The prevalence of the theme of death was not limited to poetry; in fact, priests commonly mentioned death in homilies. Indeed, the "Dry Bones Speak" theme in certain homilies has a similar pattern to the soul and body topos, except that the amount of time between the death and speech is lengthened. As J. E. Cross mentions, "the striking portrayal of the skeleton's speech was of most value to [the Old English homilists] in their admonitory sermons."[35] The early English used this knowledge of death, and its effects, not only to entertain but also to edify, as is clear by the wide range of texts that focus on the subjects of death and dying. Even though the body may decay, the souls of the dead were not forgotten or thought of as being far away from the people. In addition to intercessional actions, such as almsgiving and prayers, it was the duty of the living to remember the dead and to uphold their rights because the dead had an ever-changing and reciprocal relationship with the living.[36] Similar to the multiple views of the relationship between body and soul, the relationship between the living and dead could be understood in a multitude of sometimes conflicting ways.

Likewise, the Great Tradition has conflicting views about the interim between death and the Last Judgment. The most orthodox and general view is that the body and soul separate at death only to be reunited on the day of the Last Judgment when they are sent to Heaven or Hell.[37] However, there is no Biblical description of the place that the soul rests while the body decays waiting for this reunification. The introduction of an interim place for souls arises over

---

[35] J. E. Cross, "'The Dry Bones Speak': A Theme in Some Old English Homilies," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56, no. 3 (1957), 435.
[36] Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 22.
[37] Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 27.

four centuries, as can be seen from the fact that Augustine (354-430) is still wrestling with it in his works. Augustine specifically mentions a division of three sorts of souls: *boni*, *mali*, and *non ualde boni*.[38] These are, respectively, the perfect souls ready to be accepted into Heaven, the damned souls ready to be sent to Hell, and the souls in-between. Those "in-between" souls are neither entirely good nor entirely evil, and may potentially go to Heaven or Hell. Augustine mentions that certain acts will help *non ualde boni* souls, such as almsgiving and a mediator's sacrifice here on earth.[39] However, as Ananya Jahanara Kabir remarks, Augustine revises his position on intercession for *non ualde boni* souls and "the possibility of a non-heavenly, post-mortem existence other than hell."[40] Kabir claims that Augustine changes his position due to his need to debunk Neo-Platonic and lax theories concerning salvation,[41] but then he reluctantly admits "the possible existence of a purgatorial fire between death and Judgment Day (*City of God*, ch. 26)."[42] Augustine refuted many of what he considered incorrect beliefs held by other people about the time after death in *The City of God*, Book XXI. Chapter 24, though, is titled "Refutation of the view that the guilty will be spared through the intercession of the saints,"[43] and Augustine continues here to hold his previous position about *non ualde boni* souls. As the title implies, Augustine is refuting the claim that *mali* souls, or the guilty, can eventually reach Heaven through the prayers of saints. He still delineates between *mali* and *non ualde boni* souls when he posits the necessary circumstances for a soul to be saved through intercession. Such

---

[38] Ananya Jahanara Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 28; Ernest Evans, ed., *St. Augustine's Enchiridion or Manual to Laurentius concerning Faith, Hope, and Charity* (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), XXIX, ch. 110, p. 108.

[39] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 28

[40] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 29.

[41] Neo-Platonism can be defined in two major ways: any person following Plato's thought after his death or Plotinus' synthesis of Christian beliefs with Platonic philosophy. For the purposes of this study, I am focused on the latter.

[42] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 30.

[43] St. Augustine, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*, trans. Henry Bettenson (London: Penguin Books, 1972), 1002.

souls must have been reborn in Christ during life and must have "not been so evil that they are judged unworthy of such mercy, and yet not so good that they are seen to have no need of it."[44] These souls are the ones with the possibility of salvation after death, and so go to a specific resting place. For Augustine, this place cannot be equated to paradise and so this interim state must be "infernalised through purgatorial flames" because "the kingdom of heaven remains the only definitive place of rest, peace and joy after death."[45]

Augustine also discusses the death of the soul in relation to the death of the body and determines that the two are separate. In Book XIII, chapter two, Augustine concludes that the death of the soul is when "it no longer derives life from God," while the body "derives life from the soul when the soul is alive in the body."[46] The death of the body occurs when the soul leaves him. By presenting these two circumstances for the death of each entity, however, Augustine creates a problem in his logical argument. He says the soul can die, but has already previously stated that the soul is immortal. There is apparent contradiction in his claim, but Augustine defines death, in relation to the soul, as God abandoning the soul. Since God is all goodness in the world, separation from Him signifies the loss of a good life. Yet Augustine uses a much more poignant word than "separation," which is the verb "abandon" (in Latin: *desero, deserere*). The soul is not simply separated from God, but rather God abandons the soul because of her refusal to perform good deeds. Using the verb *desero* suggests that the soul is culpable for God's disavowal of her, since God is choosing to actively separate Himself from the soul who cannot live a good life, and so metaphorically dies without God in her life. Augustine also discusses a "first" and "second death" of the body. When God abandons the soul and the soul leaves the

---

[44] Augustine, *City of God*, XXI, ch. 24, p. 1003.
[45] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 30.
[46] Augustine, *City of God*, XIII, ch. 2, p. 511; the Latin: "mors igitur animae fit, cum eam deserit deus, sicut corporis, cum id deserit anima."

body, then the whole person dies and Augustine considers this the first death.[47] He is saying that if a soul will die, it will happen before the first death of her body by God's abandoning of her. The second death, then, is when soul and body are reunited on Judgment Day and the two travel to their final resting place. While the first death is a temporary state until Judgment Day, the second death is permanent and lasts for all of eternity. Augustine explicitly says that the second death does not happen for the *boni*.[48] Consequently, Augustine's discussion presents a theological basis for the soul's culpability in *Soul and Body II*. If the soul were one of the *boni*, she would not be finding excuses for herself, and the body's behavior, while waiting for Judgment Day.

Moreover, Augustine explicates the importance of a soul in relation to her body in *The City of God*, Books XII and XIII. The way that God created man in His own image was by giving man a soul, but according to Augustine the soul has a specific function. Essentially, God gave man a soul "of such a kind that because of it he surpassed all living creatures… in virtue of reason and intelligence."[49] Derived from Platonic thought,[50] Augustine places reason and intelligence in the metaphorical hands of the soul. Therefore, Augustine's placement of these two attributes in the soul is not novel. The surprising element of Augustine's theology surfaces when he refutes the Platonic theory that angels created men's bodies. Apparently, in attempting to connect Platonic thought to Christian teaching, Patristic authors claimed angels created human bodies. Augustine refutes this because the Bible states God created bodies.

---

[47] Augustine, *City of God*, XIII, ch. 2, p. 510.
[48] Augustine, *City of God*, XIII, ch. 2, p. 511.
[49] Augustine, *City of God*, XII, ch. 24, p. 503.
[50] Plato believed in a tripartite soul: appetitive, spirited, and logical. Augustine's reliance on Plato does not seem to focus on the parts of the soul and what they are, but rather if the soul is immortal; see discussion of Platonism/Neo-Platonism on p. 97-8.

Augustine's most surprising claim, however, is that *mali* souls, whose bodies were created by angels according to Neo-Platonists, are sent back down into a new body that also was created by angels. Following the introduction of Christianity, thinkers such as Augustine tried to combine Platonist philosophy with Christian ideals, and continued the contrasting descriptions of the body and soul that emerged in Classical Greek philosophical thought. In these descriptions the body was typically associated with the earth, lust, desire, and base needs while the soul was linked with the heavens, superior desires, intellect, and purity. When Augustine decides to call the body to which the soul returns blessed, the statement can be shocking relative to the tendency of Classical philosophers to associate bodies with base desires. This occurs in Book XII, chapter 27, when Augustine rebuts the theory that *mali* souls are sent back down to earth into a new body, either of an animal or human, as a punishment by asking, "how can it be a punishment to return to bodies which are God's blessings?"[51] For Augustine to call a body blessed is not unusual since he considers each creation of God a blessing. In this instance, the strange aspect is that Augustine does not blame the body for the soul's misdeeds because he says that a soul's punishment is not the return to a new body. The punishment cannot be this return because all bodies created by God are blessed. Therefore, punishment for the soul must occur in a different way.

Gregory the Great (540-604), not to be confused with Gregory of Nyssa, the first pope of his name, was one of the most prolific popes, and is most well-known for sending the first major conversion mission from Rome to the early English. As such, Gregory had direct influence on Christianizing England. Furthermore, Gregory the Great's text *The Dialogues* is foundational for the early medieval understanding of the fate of the soul.[52] Kabir views Gregory the Great's

---

[51] Augustine, *City of God*, XII, ch. 27, p. 507.
[52] Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 20.

eschatology in his *Dialogues*, specifically Book IV, as a reaction against the apocryphal *Visio Sancti Pauli*.[53] While the *Visio* presents its eschatology through Paul's "distancing and non-participatory" perspective, Gregory provides a rationale for each visionary's experience and he actively engages with the world after death.[54] Also significantly, Gregory transforms the vertical nature of the soul's journey found in Augustine and the *Visio* into a horizontal one across a bridge.[55] Such a transformation drastically alters the audience's eschatological understanding taken from the text. Instead of imagining that the soul can move upwards after death through intercessional prayer and almsgiving, Gregory conveys the idea that each soul must reach Heaven by crossing the bridge or climbing out of the purgatorial flames through her own power. Additionally, Gregory avoids terms such as "Heaven," "Hell," and "paradise," due to his "interest in what happens to the soul rather than where it happens."[56] In this specific instance, Gregory's influence on early English thought is visible. Instead of focusing on the place where the soul and body exist during the interim period, most extant examples of the soul and body debate focus on what actions the two entities performed during life and what punishments or rewards they receive after death. This shift in focus directly mirrors Gregory's focus on the deeds of soul and body and his avoidance of describing the soul's resting place. A lack of specific reference to the place where the soul might rest allows Gregory to avoid being accused of heterodoxy while at the same time promoting the importance of deeds over words that is prevalent in orthodox writing. In both ways, he aligns his writing with the views present in the orthodox patristic writings.

---

[53] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 78.
[54] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 79.
[55] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 79.
[56] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 80.

Julian of Toledo (642-690), another major yet less direct source for early English thought,[57] also struggles with the concept of an interim place for souls. Much of Julian's thought derives from Augustine's; however, there is debate over whether Julian discusses two interim places or a singular one.[58] Kabir proposes that Julian in his *Prognosticum futuri saeculi* discusses two interim places for the *non ualde boni* souls: "the earthly Garden of Eden, and a celestial interim paradise which is equated to the paradise of the Good Thief."[59] Indeed, Julian has no qualms about positing multiple paradises or multiple levels of Heaven.[60] In Book II, chapters 1 and 2, Julian discusses "the different paradises," demarcating the two that Kabir mentions.[61] He also considers three levels of Heaven, supporting his claim with evidence from Augustine, who explains the Apostle Paul's words in II Corinthians.[62] Using two layers of patristic authority, Julian then outlines that Paul was taken to the Third Heaven, "in which the souls of the blessed who have departed their bodies abide."[63] Helen Foxhall Forbes argues against Kabir's claim that Julian believed in a fourfold division of souls in the interim period, noting that his celestial interim must be that Third Heaven, because, if not, "then there is no discussion of heaven in his

---

[57] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 94; Kabir explains why she, and many other scholars, believe that Julian was hugely influential and most likely widely copied in early medieval England around the time of Alcuin (c. 735-804).

[58] Augustine posits a sixfold interim theology: three Heavens, one purgatorial interim, and two levels of Hell while Julian proposes a sevenfold: three levels of Heaven, two interim paradises, and two levels of Hell.

[59] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 93.

[60] The authors that I discuss, like Julian and Augustine, discuss the afterlife but do not specifically count the various interim places that they mention. Modern-day scholars have counted these interim places and decided to call the way that they count the places as "x-fold" divisions, which can become extremely confusing.

[61] Julian of Toledo, *Prognosticum Futuri Saeculi*, trans. Tommaso Stancati (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2010), II, ch. 1-2, p. 400.

[62] Cor. II (English Standard Version [ESV]); the book of the bible is a letter from Paul to the Corinthians detailing that his meekness is not from a lack of authority, but that he has suffered for his faith and he has received revelations from God.

[63] Julian, *Prognosticum Futuri Saeculi*, II, ch. 1-2, p. 400.

entire work."[64] Furthermore, Forbes notices that Kabir claims the celestial interim paradise is for the *non ualde mali*,[65] which it cannot be if the celestial interim is Heaven.

Another reason Forbes puts forward as to why Julian cannot have a fourfold division of the interim is because of the nature of Julian's work. According to Forbes, Julian's work relies so heavily on his source material that it can almost be considered "a patchwork of their writings."[66] Whole chapters of Julian's work are comprised solely of quotes from earlier authors, such as Augustine and Isidore of Seville. Therefore, Forbes claims, Julian could not have a fourfold division of the interim period because he does not contribute many of his own thoughts. That argument, however, undermines Julian's ability to synthesize previous writers' thoughts and reach his own conclusions. His own writing poses the existence of multiple interim paradises as well as multiple levels of Heaven.[67] It is impossible for his celestial paradise to contain souls of the blessed when the blessed are supposed to reside in the Third Heaven. If the celestial interim paradise is the Third Heaven, this problem is solved. Yet it is not logical for Julian to separate his discussion of the paradises in chapter one from his discussion of Heaven in chapter two unless he defines the two as distinct, non-overlapping categories. Clearly, Kabir is correct in her acknowledgment of Julian's multiple interim paradises, which is also a distinct shift from his source material in Augustine. Kabir's claim that Julian's celestial interim paradise is for completely perfect souls, however, falls short.[68] This cannot be since their place is in the Third Heaven, as Julian mentions in Chapter 2. Instead, Julian seems to be separating the locations of *non ualde mali* into multiple destinations: the interim location for the less righteous and the

---

[64] Helen Foxhall Forbes, "'*Diuiduntur in Quattuor*': The Interim and Judgment in Anglo-Saxon England," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 61, no. 2 (2010), 664.

[65] Change made in Julian's translation of Augustine from *non ualde boni* to *non ualde mali*.

[66] Forbes, "'*Diuiduntur in Quattuor*'," 662.

[67] Julian uses the term "paradise" to describe the interim place used to hold souls. For him, paradise does not equate to Heaven; however, this will not hold true for everyone.

[68] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 93.

celestial paradise for the more righteous. Not only did Julian purposely change the *non ualde boni* souls to *non ualde mali*, but he also shifted the belief in an interim place from purgatorial to paradisacial. This demonstrates that Julian's work is not solely a "patchwork" of previous authors' thoughts, but that he includes his own input as well. Thus, his work must be explored since he contributed to the Great Tradition discussion of the interim places for souls.

Perhaps Julian was aware of the *Visio Sancti Pauli*, in which Paul is taken to the Third Heaven, and so wove these ideas into his writing. Augustine, one of Julian's main sources, clearly outlined the incorrect way to represent the Third Heaven and paradise in his *De Genesi ad litteram*. Though there is no direct reference in the text to the *Visio*, it is plausible that Augustine wrote *De Genesi* to correct the representation of both the Third Heaven and paradise in the *Visio*.[69] The text about the Apostle Paul was extremely popular throughout the Middle Ages, and especially in early medieval England, with multiple copies existing of the long and short versions. For instance, the Supplemental Series Ælfrician homily, *Sermo ad populum in octavis pentecostem dicendus*, expounds upon its heterodoxy.[70] Whether Julian incorporated the *Visio* into his *Prognosticum* because he relied heavily on Augustine's *De Genesi* or it was incorporated into early English thought during a later period, the text had an influence on the Great Tradition.[71]

Mali souls also have a waiting place for the interim between death and Judgment Day, similar to the Third Heaven for the *boni*. This is the bosom of Abraham, according to Augustine.[72] The bosom of Abraham is an upper level of Hell where *mali* souls are sent once their bodies die to await Judgment Day. Unsurprisingly, Julian agrees with Augustine about the

---

[69] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 24.
[70] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 45.
[71] Forbes, "'*Diuiduntur in Quattuor*'," 665.
[72] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 26.

placement of the bosom of Abraham in Hell, but does not distinguish it as existing at an upper level.[73] Instead, Julian delineates the two Hells mostly by quoting Augustine, but adds that before the coming of Christ "two hells probably exist, one in which the souls of the just were at rest, and in the other the souls of the ungodly are tormented."[74] This addition of multiple layers to Hell creates an even more complex eschatology for Julian, even though he continues to rely on patristic sources. Though Julian agrees with Augustine's belief about two levels of Hell, he seems to be more skeptical about claiming where they may be situated. Especially interesting about Julian's comment is that he states that the "souls of the just" remain in one of Hell's layers. This area cannot be the same celestial interim paradise that he discussed previously. So it either must be separate from the three levels of Heaven and two interim places, or it must be the non-celestial interim paradise he mentioned for the righteous. If this is the case, it is strange that he explains it both in the paradise chapter and the Hell chapter, unless he intends for the levels of Hell to be distinct from the levels of paradise and levels of Heaven. Consequently, Julian must mean to have three levels of Heaven, two interim paradises, and two levels of Hell, in contrast to what Augustine posits, i.e., three Heavens, one purgatorial interim, and two levels of Hell.

Returning to Gregory of Nyssa's thoughts about the soul and body, Julian agrees with Gregory's idea that through resurrection of the saved body the same body is united with the soul without the body's sinful additions.[75] Julian may agree with Gregory that the two entities are reunited and both perfected, but there is a significant difference in what the two claim. Gregory asserts the body leaves all sinful aspects behind while Julian believes there is a physical as well as spiritual change in both body and soul, where the soul changes into an angel and the body

---

[73] Julian, *Prognosticum*, II, ch. XXXII., p. 419.
[74] Julian, *Prognosticum*, II, ch. IV., p. 402.
[75] Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory,* 47.

becomes a spiritual entity.[76] Once again Julian accepts the basic belief of his forefathers, but he also alters the theology to leave his own imprint.

Julian once more diverges from the theology of Augustine, who does not focus on the role of the soul of governing the body, when he explicitly describes for what the soul must strive. The soul has a "natural desire to govern the body," which "constrains the soul to reach with all [her] strength toward that highest heaven" and the soul attempts to force the body to follow her example "until [she] is now reunited to the body so that [her] desire to govern the body is satisfied."[77] Notice the use of the verb "govern" (Latin: *administro, administrare*), which Julian uses three times in as many sentences.[78] There is a noticeable emphasis on the innate desire of the soul to govern the body *quodammodo* (in a certain way) in Julian's work, which did not exist in Augustine's. Julian is certain of the "difficult and tiresome" behavior of the body when the body does not follow the governing of the soul.[79] As a result, Julian states that it is necessary for the soul to "be torn from the senses of the same flesh so that it could be shown how to reach it."[80] This is exactly how the author of *Soul and Body II*, as well as many of the texts that are representative of the soul and body topos, views the job of the soul. Even though the soul and body in the poem are doomed to eternal torment, as the soul repeatedly declares, every week the soul journeys to the body to berate him so that he may understand his misdeeds while they lived. While this exercise is more beneficial to the audience of the poem, there seems to remain an

---

[76] Julian, *Prognosticum*, II, ch. XI., p. 405. It is not clear in the Latin what kind of spiritual entity that Julian meant, but the more important aspect is that the body is upgraded to a spiritual entity.

[77] Julian, *Prognosticum*, II, ch. XI., p. 404; the Latin: "quia inest ei naturalis quidam appetitus corpus **administrandi**; quo appetitu retardatur quodammodo, ne tota intentione pergat in illum summum coelum, quamdiu non subest corpus, cuius **administratione** appetitus ille conquiescat." Emphasis added.

[78] Although I have split the sentences with the three variants of *administratro* into two footnotes due to how I incorporate the translated text into my paragraph, the variants occur in three sentences in a row in the original Latin.

[79] Julian, *Prognosticum*, II, ch. XI., p. 404; the Latin: "cuius sit difficilis et grauis **administratio**," "who is difficult and hard **to govern/manage**." Emphasis added.

[80] Julian, *Prognosticum*, II, ch. XI., p. 405; the Latin: "Vnde necessario abripienda erat ab eiusdem carnis sensibus, ut ei quomodo capere possit illud ostenderetur."

inkling of hope that the soul's speech can save the two entities in some way. This hope is also depicted in Julian's description of the reunification of the soul and body once the soul becomes "identical to the angels" while the body "is no longer animal but spiritual."[81] Once both entities have transformed into their refined selves, their natures will be perfected as well. Important to note in this study is the fact that Julian does not state whether this soul is one of the *boni*, *non ualde mali*, or *mali*, though it is reasonable to assume the fate of the soul which he describes is for one of the *boni* or *non ualde mali*.

In early English thought, there seems to be no consensus about when a soul is created so that it can join with a body.[82] Throughout the Old English corpus, the word for soul, *sawol*, refers to the entity that joins the body at the beginning of life, departs the body at death, and participates in an afterlife.[83] Another word for soul, *gast*, leads to a larger set of semantic meanings in addition to signifying *sawol*.[84] Whichever word an author chose to use, though, the corpus of Old English does not agree on when a soul is created. In the *Soul and Body* poems, the author seems to suggest a Creationist view, that is, God created a new soul to animate the body. When the soul in the poem says, "I was a spirit sent into you by God (43),"[85] God's intervention is clear in that the soul was created for her body, even though this is never stated outright.[86]

Now, an important figure of the early medieval English period is the Venerable Bede (672-735), who contributed to orthodox early English thought about the interim between death and Judgment Day. Bede shapes his eschatology in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* with the "Vision of

---

[81] Julian, *Prognosticum*, II, ch. XI., p. 405.
[82] Leslie Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), 20.
[83] Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies*, 19.
[84] Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies*, 19.
[85] "ic wæs gæst on þe from gode sended;" all translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own. I would like to sincerely thank my advisor Dr. Jana Schulman for her invaluable help, and detailed corrections, and without whom I would not have nearly as polished or correct Old English translations.
[86] Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies*, 21.

Dryhthelm,"[87] attempting to edit out any visionary qualities that were inserted in the time

between Gregory the Great and himself.[88] He achieves this by deleting any details that are not

strictly related to a tour of the otherworld.[89] Although a tour of the otherworld is visionary,

writers after Gregory the Great attempted to make the story even more captivating by steadily

adding more and more visionary aspects. Bede is the first to successfully elucidate the "four

categories of the souls: the perfect, the not completely perfect, the bad, and the not completely

bad."[90] Unlike Julian, Bede is willing to divide the interim souls into two groups so that the

division of souls aligns with the division of the interim places. Bede's fourfold division is much

simpler than Julian's sevenfold or Augustine's sixfold.[91] Bede also whittles the eschatology of

Augustine, Gregory, and Julian down to a four-fold division of the interim period, dividing these

into groups: two pleasant regions and two purgatorial.[92] These contrasting regions are paralleled

in Dryhthelm's vision, where the interim paradise is juxtaposed with the area where souls dwell

in pits and the Heavenly City with the region below the pits, Hell.[93] For both of the interim

regions, the souls contained within will be released on Doomsday to ascend to Heaven, and for

both of the permanent regions, naturally, the souls within will remain in their respective dwelling

places. In between the two interim regions, the paradise and penal area, is a bridge, like in

Gregory's version, but instead of it being used punitively, it is used as a way to purify the souls

heading toward their heavenly destination.[94] As a result, "Bede's description of the meadow

---

[87] The "Vision of Dryhthelm" is a text describing a monk's celestial tour of the afterlife through Hell, a form of purgatory, and Heaven, although he is not allowed to enter Heaven truly.
[88] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 87.
[89] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 86.
[90] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 90.
[91] There is some debate because Augustine usually has either a threefold or fourfold division, based on the count of Kabir or Jacques Le Goff respectively. I, however, say for the purpose of this study that it is a sixfold division due to his multiple layers of Heaven and Hell.
[92] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 87.
[93] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 88.
[94] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 100.

manages, on the whole, to be both 'theologically correct' and 'descriptively rich,' which is important to a clerical and lay audience alike."[95]

Conversely, in tenth-century England the thinkers of the Great Tradition focused on being "theologically correct" rather than "descriptively rich." A major orthodox thinker, Ælfric of Eynsham, was a product of the Benedictine Reform, and, therefore, it is necessary to delve into what the reform entailed. Early medieval England had a history of Church and secular authority working together in governing, beginning at least with Augustine of Canterbury's mission to the island.[96] King Alfred's focus on Latin learning helped propel the beginning of the reform, which began with the appointment of Dunstan as abbot of Glastonbury by King Eadmund some time between 940 and 946.[97] The result of Dunstan's appointment was a major reorganization of the Glastonbury abbey as well as the definition of a claustral layout and the "reform of the communal life on the model of the Rule of St. Benedict."[98] Practically, as this reform movement spread across England, it meant a more rigorous monastic regime, still with the flexibility for slight regional differences, than previously existed; a regime largely based on the tradition of Carolingian reforms during the ninth century. This resulted in a clear distinction between Benedictine monks and the secular clergy, who followed a different rule.[99] In fact, one goal of the reform was that monks more focused on contemplation and prayer would replace the married secular clergy.[100]

---

[95] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 102.
[96] Susan Irvine, "Pre-Benedictine Reform Period" in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, eds. Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2008), 137.
[97] Joyce Hill, "The Benedictine Reform and Beyond" in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, eds. Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2008), 151.
[98] Hill, "The Benedictine Reform," 151.
[99] Hill, "The Benedictine Reform," 152.
[100] Hill, "The Benedictine Reform," 158-9; John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005), 351-3.

Furthermore, one of the defining features of this reform movement in early English monastic foundations was the ideal of uniformity of observance, albeit with regional differences. Thus, the English Benedictine Reform focused on a key text, the *Regularis Concordia*, a standard reform manual created at a council held in Winchester by King Eadgar between the years 970 and 973, to create the desired uniformity.[101] Similar to what happened with the Benedictine Reform in Carolingian Francia under Louis the Pious (778-840), this flexible uniformity only came about once developments in the monasteries were already underway and local customs were already established. Diverging from the Carolingian Benedictine Reform, though, English Reform cultivated Old English as well as Latin literature. This linguistic flexibility generated a strong reformist and didactic impulse, as the corpus of Ælfric demonstrates.[102] However, the Benedictine Reform did not continue for long. By the end of Aethelred's reign (978-1013, 1014-16) in the early-eleventh century, "the Benedictine Reform can be said to have played itself out."[103]

The Benedictine Reform was very influential on Ælfric, as can be seen in his prolific corpus, written in both Latin and Old English. In addition to the volume of his corpus, Ælfric was affected by the Benedictine Reform in his need for rigorous orthodoxy in his writings. Ælfric wrote many of his surviving texts because he thought that both clergy and laymen had become lax in their understanding of Church doctrine. He wrote so copiously in order to differentiate the orthodox from the heterodox. Moreover, Ælfric believed that the clergy's job was to not only know Church doctrine, but to also teach their constituents the doctrine. According to Ælfric in his pastoral letters, "great stress was placed on the necessity of teaching

---

[101] Hill, "The Benedictine Reform," 153.
[102] Hill, "The Benedictine Reform," 155.
[103] Hill, "The Benedictine Reform," 164.

the people."[104] Most literary historians agree that Ælfric also dedicated his *Catholic Homilies* to his archbishop for dissemination, a fact that attests to his intention for clergymen to use the homiliary to preach to the laity.[105] Ælfric is the quintessential orthodox English thinker and teacher of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

In most of his work, Ælfric avoids using the term "paradise"[106] in an attempt to bypass any unorthodox connotations that the term conveys. Instead he equates Heaven, paradise, and the bosom of Abraham in his *Life of St. Martin* when he deviates from his Latin source material.[107] Perhaps this is due to his knowledge of another anonymous Old English *Life of St. Martin* that also equates the bosom of Abraham with Heaven,[108] or perhaps it represents an attempt to be consistent with an earlier explanation that he wrote for the Second Series of Homilies. Ælfric's homily *Sermo ad populum in octavis pentecostem dicendus* in the Supplementary Series is actually his most discursive exploration of the interim period, albeit the homily is "supremely evasive" and has many "circumlocutions and digressions" that show "his anxieties rather than his convictions about the subject."[109] In this homily, Ælfric suggests a fourfold-interim period, in which he seems to be heavily influenced by Augustine as well as Julian of Toledo.[110] The first three places mirror Augustine and Julian relatively closely: the good go to Heaven with God, the sinners go to Hell forever, and the not completely good are sent to tortures.[111] Ælfric's fourth interim place "muddies the waters" because its relationship to the other interim places is vague. The good souls go to *reste* (rest) implying that although the souls are not in Heaven, they also

---

104 Mary Clayton, "Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England" in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, eds. Paul E. Szarmach and Deborah A. Oosterhouse (New York: Garland Publishing, 2000), 165.
105 Clayton, "Homiliaries and Preaching," 178.
106 As Kabir demonstrates, Ælfric avoids using the Old English equivalent for "paradise," *neorxnawang*.
107 Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 39.
108 There are three anonymous accounts of the *Life of St. Martin*, but only Junius 85/86, fols. 62-81 uses the term "bosom of Abraham." *Blickling Homily XVII* and *Vercelli Homily XVII* avoid it.
109 Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 43.
110 Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 43.
111 Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 43. *To witum* used for "as tortures"

will not be tortured. Kabir claims that the souls *to reste* are meant to be in parallel with the souls *to witum*.[112] This fourfold division of the interim period relies heavily on Augustine and Julian's *boni, mali, non ualde boni/mali* division of the souls, but with both *non ualde boni* and *non ualdi mali* souls having distinct destinations for the interim period. As such, Ælfric's belief about the interim period seems to be a compromise between two major patristic and early medieval thinkers, with a concerted effort to regulate the use of the term "paradise" to only refer to Heaven.

While Ælfric focused on writing his homilies in a "theologically correct" way, other homilists preferred to be "descriptively rich." Since a "descriptively rich" text is compelling to an audience, homilists packaged orthodox values in expressions that may seem to be heterodox to convey lessons that are essential to know. As a result, homilies like *Vercelli Homily IV* integrated enough dramatic flair and familiar tropes to capture an audience's attention.[113] One of the most prominent, and effective, orthodox rhetorical devices the author uses is the dichotomy between the present on earth and the future in Heaven. Most of the first hundred lines consist of this contrast between a person's life here on earth opposed to the life he will have in Heaven. This is a common motif in Old English texts used to inspire people to live a more religiously correct life, and it is also found in *Soul and Body II*. A contrast created by juxtaposing different time periods, in this instance between past and present rather than present and future, is also found in *Vercelli Homily IV*'s use of the *ubi sunt* motif.[114] Though a small section of this homily in the middle of the *mali* soul's address to the body, the *ubi sunt* motif is highly personalized and effective. As Claudia Di Sciacca mentions, two aspects of the homily cause the rhetorical

---

[112] Kabir, *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday*, 43.
[113] Donald G. Scragg, ed., *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), xix.
[114] The *ubi sunt* motif was a common medieval literary trope to signify nostalgia for the transience of life, deriving from the Latin phrase "ubi sunt qui ante nos fuerunt?"; "where are those who came before us?"

questions of the *ubi sunt* passage to become extremely personal: the repeated usage of personal pronouns and possessive adjectives as well as the motif being used by the soul to berate her body for his misdeeds.[115] This personalization "naturally imparts greater forcefulness and didactic effectiveness to the *ubi sunt* motif."[116] Another orthodox aspect of the homily is the introduction of two separate souls, one of the *boni* and one of the *mali*. In this way, the audience is able to understand the two paths that they can take. Either they can focus on the present and worldly riches or they can focus on the future and heavenly riches.

Since the homilist sought to convince his audience to choose heavenly riches and to focus on the future, he used some less conventional methods to achieve that goal. A preacher would intermix popular rhetorical techniques with orthodox views so that he could reach his audience. For example, this can be seen through characteristics such as the anonymous nature of the homily, its patchwork composition, and the fact that it is written in the vernacular. First, during the addresses of the *boni* and *mali* souls to their bodies, there is an emphasis on the body's physical alterations. For the *boni* soul, her body "breaks into various colors: first he is in the form of a moderate-sized man, then next in the fairest form of a man; so next he [has] a hue similar to gold and to silver and also to the most precious gemstones" (156-60).[117] When Gregory the Great and Julian of Toledo discussed what happens to the *boni* souls on Judgment Day, they posited that the body and soul were spiritually perfected. Julian made an even bolder claim by saying that the soul became an angel while the body became a spiritual being.

This Old English description veers significantly from the perfecting of the soul by linking a perfect body to a man of the fairest form as well as to the colors of gold, silver, and precious

---

[115] Claudia Di Sciacca, "The 'Ubi Sunt' Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend in Old English Homilies: Sources and Relationships," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105, no. 3 (2006), 373-4.
[116] Di Sciacca, "The 'Ubi Sunt' Motif," 374.
[117] Scragg, ed., *Vercelli Homily IV*, trans. Jana Schulman.

gems. No longer is the change purely spiritual, but now the body is physically changed into colors that suggest the body is made of gold, silver, or precious gems. Introducing this coloring, the poet appeals to the Germanic cultural value focused on gift giving through metonymy; the poet alludes to this by focusing on the materials of the gifts to be given since gift giving was so integral to a Germanic society. For instance, the Sutton Hoo burial demonstrates that gold, silver, and precious gems were used to create jewelry, bracelets, helmets, and silver dishes.[118] The body's coloring not only indicates Germanic values, but Christian ones as well, which the poet capitalizes on to entice his reader to understand the importance of living a proper Christian life. One of the three gifts of the magi to Jesus in Nazareth is gold, and so the color already has princely and precious connotations. In the syncretic poem *Dream of the Rood*, the rood is also described as being decorated with precious gems because of its strength in carrying Jesus on the cross and, in turn, becoming a great symbol in Christianity. Consequently the preacher's audience could plainly understand that by demonstrating loyalty to their ultimate *hlaford* (lord), they would receive the highest reward, which is that their bodies become precious and a gift themselves, in both a Christian and Germanic context.

Finally, *Vercelli Homily IV* uses the literary trope of the "beasts of battle" to signal to the audience impending eternal death. The beasts of battle is a motif found in eight Old English poems, and is one that shifts from being presented as a result of battle to a portent of death and great battle. Usually the three animals in this group are wolves, eagles, and ravens. [119] For the purposes of this homily and *Soul and Body II*, they include worms, wolves, and birds.[120] The

---

[118] "Sutton Hoo (Suffolk)," in *The Companion to British History, Routledge*, by Charles Arnold-Baker, 2nd ed. (Routledge, 2001); Martin O. H. Carver, "The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Sutton Hoo: An Interim Report," in *Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England*: 7, ed. Catherine E. Karkov (1999): 279–315.
[119] Thomas Honegger, "Form and Function: The Beasts of Battle Revisited," *English Studies* 79, no. 4 (1998), 293.
[120] Scragg, ed., *Vercelli Homily IV*, line 266.

addition of worms suggests a modification of the trope for the purposes of a Christian context

because worms are not present at battle, unlike the typical three animals in the beasts of battle

trope. Instead, worms typically are associated with the decomposition of a body, as the animals

nearly always accompany the description of a decaying body.[121] Furthermore, the phrase *wyrmas*

gifl (food for worms) appears in conjunction with *mali* bodies with regularity.[122] This connection

between one of the *mali* bodies with the descriptor *wyrmas gifl* implies that the body deserves his

fate, even though it is natural for worms to eat a body.[123] This implication changes how the

audience would understand the beast of battle trope in *Soul and Body II*, from seeing it as

representing a violent death by battle to a violent and deserved death. The preacher uses the

definitively Old English motif of the beasts of battle, with the addition of worms, to impart the

necessity for the audience to repent and change their ways. Through this alteration, and the

introduction of the coloring of precious metals and gems to the body, the homilist could grab his

audience's attention and direct each one to a more purposeful life.

    In this chapter I have outlined the theological, philosophical, and historical backgrounds

to the *Exeter Book* poem *Soul and Body II*. I explained the change in beliefs about the place

where the soul exists during the interim period between death and Judgment Day, looking at the

views of such men as Gregory of Nyssa, whose writing elucidates late antique and early

medieval ideas concerning the relationship between body and soul, as well as Augustine of

Hippo, Gregory the Great, Julian of Toledo, the Venerable Bede, and Ælfric of Eynsham. Each

---

[121] The injection of worms eating a bad body as a literary trope is discussed further in the article by Haruko Momma, "A Literary History of Worms in Early Medieval England," in *Textual Reception and Cultural Debate in Medieval English Studies*, eds. Maria José Esteve Ramos and José Ramon Prado-Perez (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018); see discussion on p. 93.

[122] According to the Brepolis Cross Database Searchtool, there are only eleven examples of *cibus vermium* (food for worms) in the medieval period, with two in the modern (1501-1965). There are no pre-medieval occurences.

[123] Augustine discusses the Biblical reference to the worms of Hell in Chapter 9 of Book XXI of *The City of God*, and he allows two options: worms refer, in the literal sense, to the bodily punshment or worms refer to the punishment of the soul, allowed due to a transference from the material to the immaterial (p. 985).

of these men contributes to the discussion about the interim period that informs the *Soul and Body II* poet. Without their new and varied ways of splitting the interim resting places or of altering the way in which the body and soul reunite and change on Judgment Day, the poet may not have felt able to join in the conversation about what happens to the soul and body during the interim period. I also explained that *Vercelli Homily IV* focused on "descriptively rich" images about the terrors of Hell and wonders of Heaven to tell the audience that both soul and body must work together in order to enter Heaven. Certain thinkers in the Great Tradition, like Augustine, allow for the soul, during the interim period, to mitigate bad deeds done in life to deserve Heaven eventually. Although the soul in the *Soul and Body II* poem has this ability to earn a place in Heaven during the interim period, she is too focused on chastising the body for all the bad actions he performed during life. Therefore, the soul is wasting her opportunity to earn a new place for herself because she focuses too much on herself, her problems, and placing the blame somewhere else during the time she has left.

2. Cyclical or Linear: Time and How to Create it

People are keenly aware of time. In spite of time's inherently imprecise nature, people continually attempt to organize and mark its passage. This endeavor to organize time reveals itself through literature, especially when the subject matter focuses on death. *Soul and Body II* is one such piece of literature where the poet tries to organize time. Through focusing on Judgment Day and how one must live in order to spend eternity in heaven, the poet asks his audience to keep in mind the past, present, and future from the perspective of the audience, narrator, and body/soul. When the poet reminds his audience of these timelines, he also expresses a greater awareness of the passage of time.[124] More importantly, he uses this sense of impending time to exhort his audience to a better life; such a life cannot be achieved solely through pious actions, but must be pursued in conjunction with pious intent. A life led with both pious actions and intent should be blameless on Judgment Day and there will thus be no need to question who is at fault for the person's fate because both body and soul worked together for good.

In *Soul and Body II*, the poet purposefully crafts the poem to suggest that both body and soul are culpable for their combined doomed fate, even though the soul explicitly states that the full blame rests on the body. The soul's culpability forces the listener to understand that empty pious actions mean nothing without the faith behind them. Through rhetorical strategies like anaphora and chiasmus, compositional elements like variation and envelope, as well as a purposeful use of interval markers, [125] the poet organizes time in the poem to create a sense of the impending doom of Judgment Day.

---

[124] Although not a timeline in the traditional sense, for the sake of simplicity I refer to the distant past, near past, present, and future moments in time, according to the perspectives of various entities relative to the poem, as a "timeline."

[125] Interval markers can be split into two major groups: temporal markers and spatial markers.

My discussion of how the poet organizes time relies heavily on what Marie Nelson outlines in her article, "Time in the Exeter Book Riddles." She posits that the *Exeter Book* riddles are distinct from their Latin counterparts because there exists a "greater consciousness of time" in the Old English versions.[126] She argues that the riddler was able to convey this sense of time without the language having the future verb tense through three poetic devices that occur regularly in Old English. Specifically, she defines and discusses anaphora, variation, and envelope. Anaphora "occurs when the same word is used at the beginning of two or more verses," as defined by Bede.[127] For the purposes of this study, I narrow this definition to repetition usually found in the a-verse. For variation and envelope, Nelson relies on Whitney F. Bolton's definitions, citing that variation is "repetition in grammatical apposition of a member or members of a phrase" while envelope is "any logically unified groups of verses bound together by the repetition at the end of (1) words or (2) ideas or (3) words and ideas which are employed at the beginning."[128] All three poetic devices are characterized by repetition. In order to indicate the passage of time, poets also used interval marker words such as *nu* (now), and *þonne* (then), *ær* (before), and *siþþan* (after), and *sona* (soon).[129] Although there is no future verb tense in Old English, the verb *beon* (to be) often signifies futurity when used in an auxiliary compacity. How the *Soul and Body II* poet uses *beon* as well as these poetic devices to convey futurity reveals his preoccupation with the consciousness of the passing of time in his poem.

---

126 Marie Nelson, "Time in the Exeter Book Riddles," *Philological Quarterly* 54 (1975), 511.

127 Nelson, "Time," 511.

128 Nelson, "Time," 511.

129 Nelson uses the term "time marker" in her article, but I revise the term to include a greater range of words with similar meanings. Nelson's "time markers" are what I call "temporal markers" and can be understood to be part of the larger umbrella term "interval markers."

According to the *Oxford Dictionary*, time is "the indefinite continued progress of existence and events in the past, present, and future regarded as a whole."[130] Yet that definition does not explain the concept in enough detail, especially in regards to what must be known to understand the medieval conception of time. One of the reasons why that definition must be so vague is because of the nature of time. Time itself is "a social construct related to other aspects of social life."[131] Therefore, the way that time is defined, experienced, and perceived changes based on the society's spatial and chronologic position. Time can even be defined, experienced, and perceived in multiple ways in a singular society. As R. M. Liuzza puts it, in early medieval England, "different methods were used [for indicating the year in which something occurred], often simultaneously, and each may be said to have its own implications for the way one imagines time."[132] He supports this by mentioning that thanks to the Venerable Bede, the *Anno Domini* system of reckoning time from a specific point in time, in this case the supposed birth of Christ, became common. This system of reckoning, however, is only one of many, as Liuzza enumerates by stating the common practice of reckoning time from the beginning of the reign of a certain ruler. Bede, in his *De temporum ratione*, explains the ability for time to be so changeable because, even though God "sideribus caelo inditis praecepit ut sint in signa et tempora et dies et annos,"[133] the ways that humans measure and describe time reflect their own conventions.

Medieval society regularly viewed time as a cyclical concept with slight forays into the linear, especially when discussing the apocalypse. Early medieval society was mostly agrarian so

---

[130] *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (London: BCA, 1991), s.v. "time."

[131] Richard Lock, *Aspects of Time in Medieval Literature* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 5.

[132] R. M. Liuzza, "The Sense of Time in Anglo-Saxon England," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 89.2 (2012/13), 8.

[133] "commanded that the stars which He had set in the Heavens should be the signs of seasons, days, and years," translation is Liuzza's, from "The Sense of Time," 7.

time was not as precise. Farmers relied on natural phenomena to tell time, such as the sun, moon, or seasons. The former two move in a cyclical motion and the latter recur annually, which meant that time was perceived both ways as well. Since time was imprecise in this early society, seasons were named based on the crops. This meant that each Germanic group of people would name one season the "month of tilling," but the month, as we would call it now, could range from August to March depending on where the group was located.[134]

Conversely, linear time is perceived to constantly move forward and is strictly divided into precise categories. These categories include, but are not limited to, year, month, day, hour, minute, second, and millisecond, each defined by their own specific duration of time. In linear time, past events are far removed from the present, which is why objectivity is believed to be more achievable for events in the past. While the past becomes objectified and studied, the future is ever looming; the approaching future must either be anticipated or dreaded. For a society conceiving of linear time, there is a sense that time passes irretrievably. Therefore, people tend to equate the passing of time with progress and believe that what came before was not as advanced as what exists now. This focus on the future, especially the belief that society will be better or more advanced, is heavily influenced by Christian thought. Always looking toward the future, leaders in Christianity taught, and still teach, the hope and bliss to be found in Heaven, if one is pious enough. As Christianity is introduced into early medieval society, there is a shift in the conception of time because of these teachings, which is intimately linked to the transition from illiterate to literate culture.

To understand this shift in society's perception of time, we must look to how people in illiterate cultures, or oral societies, remember history. Richard Lock presents an interesting example to demonstrate how an oral culture changes history to explain the conditions of the

---

[134] A. J. Gurevich, *Categories of Medieval Culture* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), 94-5.

present. During the early twentieth century, a state in northern Ghana that was divided into seven

chiefdoms had an origin legend where the founder, named Jakpa, conquered the local people and

had seven sons who eventually became the seven chieftains. After sixty years, though, when a

neighbor had absorbed one chiefdom and another disappeared due to British administrative

practices, the myth was told with Jakpa having had five sons.[135] As such, Lock concludes that

oral tradition "is flexible enough to adapt to changing conditions and reflects the structure and

attitudes of the contemporary society rather than being an accurate record."[136] In oral cultures,

being illiterate does not impede social development. Thus the word "illiterate" in this study is not

used derogatorily; actually, the poor connotations associated with the word only occur due to the

modern association of literacy with a lack of learning.

Since the nineteenth century there has been a shift to equating literacy with education and

the growth of literacy with expanding civilization, in addition to the belief that literacy flourished

in urban settings rather than rural ones. In fact, medieval literacy has been accepted in recent

years as simply being able to understand Latin. Viewing English and European cultural

development before the nineteenth century in this way, however, is inaccurate and

anachronistic.[137] Understanding Latin, in addition to having the ability to read and write it, limits

literacy to a select few people who were lucky to be born into a class where learning Latin was

possible. Fortunately, scholars have identified other forms of literacy because there are other

ways to communicate and learn that go beyond reading and writing. For instance, medieval

peasants observed the natural world to gain knowledge about their environment in order to

survive. People also learned in a passive auditory way that took place during various events like

---

[135] Lock, *Aspects of Time*, 15.
[136] Lock, *Aspects of Time*, 16.
[137] M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*, 3 ed. (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 8-9.

sermons, feasts, and other instances where written texts, read aloud, helped directly and indirectly educate peasants about the world around them.

Furthermore, literacy in the premodern sense originated in the "great aristocratic households" after the disappearance of the Roman schools by the middle of the seventh century.[138] This tendency continued in parallel with the rise of cathedral schools and, later, universities from the early to the high Middle Ages. It was not until the humanist schoolmasters that the idea of literacy began to shift from the more public auditory learning to more private and formalized schooling.[139] Previously, priests were the ones who helped the masses become literate "because the Middle Ages had irreversibly established Christianity as a religion of a book: that is, the Bible and the mass of explanatory writings which stemmed from it."[140] This is also where, as Julia M. H. Smith aptly distinguishes it, literacy can be participatory rather than personal. According to Caesarius, bishop of Arles (502-42), "illiteracy was no impediment to the spiritual profit of reading the Bible."[141] Instead of relying on personal literacy to read and understand the Bible, Caesarius urges his flock to "seek out for a fair price someone to read Holy Scripture to you so that you can gain the rewards of heaven through them."[142] This participatory literacy was common during the Middle Ages, as can be seen by the number of manuscripts and codices created specifically for auditory reading, like the *Exeter Book*.

For most of early medieval Europe, however, the written language was almost exclusively Latin. England, then, "was exceptional in developing a written Anglo-Saxon

---

[138] Dag Norberg, "Latin in Pre-Carolingian Gaul," in *Manual Pratique de Latin Médiéval*, trans. Rand Johnson (Paris, France: A & J Picard & C., 1980), 2.

[139] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 15.

[140] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 14.

[141] Julia M. H. Smith, *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History 500-1000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 42.

[142] Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, 6, ed. G. Morin, 2 vols., CCSL 103-4 (Turnhout, 1953), i. 31. Cf. the translation by Mary Madeleine Mueller, *Saint Caesarius of Arles: Sermons*, 3 vols. Fathers of the Church, 31, 47, 66 (Washington, 1956-73).

vernacular which functioned alongside Latin or independently of it."[143] As Smith explains, most continental vernacular languages were spoken, while Old English had a long history of being written down as well.[144] Early medieval England, though exceptional in having an early written vernacular, still relied heavily on a participatory kind of literacy through auditory reading to mass audiences. Because of such a long standing mixture of written and oral tradition, viewed solely through the medium of writing, the shifts from oral to written, illiterate to literate, and cyclical to linear time are not clear cut. Instead, each of these binaries intermingle and make it difficult to definitively claim that at a certain point in time the oral tradition passed away.

Traditionally, the written tradition, and a literate culture, is associated with linear time, whereas an oral tradition, illiterate culture, is associated with cyclical time. Before the introduction of Christianity, the early English perceived time as mostly cyclical. The cyclical nature of time means that the early English did not focus on the progression of time or the future, but instead on the reoccurrence of natural events. This does not mean that cyclical and linear time are antithetical, though. Both ways of perceiving time could, and did, exist together. Even though the early English perceived time as linear, the introduction of Christianity into early medieval England still affected how the people viewed time. On the one hand, Christianity can be considered cyclical due to the religious calendar dependence on annual feast days. Lock even mentions that "the cyclical idea of time is frequently connected to religious observances."[145] On the other hand, Christianity more solidly introduced the concept of linear time to early medieval England. Much of Christian thought focuses on the linear conception of time because the Catholic Church wanted to stress that Judgment Day will come. Every person is encouraged to

[143] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 23.
[144] Smith, *Europe After Rome*, 42.
[145] Lock, *Aspects of Time*, 8.

look forward and anticipate Judgment Day with dread or joy, depending on his or her earthly deeds.

Christianity, however, was not the only medium through which linear time emerged. With the advent of a literate culture, meaning "the acquisition of writing," "an accurate calendar becomes possible" because "writing also makes possible the reckoning of time from a fixed point in the past."[146] Having both cyclical and linear conceptions of time in a society becomes a catalyst for new ways to record history. For example, the orally-composed poems and stories of the early English began to be disseminated through a new medium: the written word. This suggests that the early English would eventually compose new works in writing, but with the lingering mindset of one participating in an oral tradition. When linear time, and consequently the written tradition, is introduced into an oral society with a cyclical view of time, the conversion from one conception of time to the other is not easily demarcated. The resulting synthesis of the two pairs of conceptions and traditions means that society relies less on the memory of oral tradition and focuses more on the written record as evidence, allowing the substitute for memory to be more permanent.

The early English, however, were not writing stories relative to a fixed point in the past. For people in early medieval England, "concepts of time are related to natural cycles, and to ritual events that pertain to these cycles."[147] This view manifests itself in Old English writing by relative time references. Philippa J. Semper notes that "there are many references that define a part of the day, or refer to an unspecified period, rather than a fixed moment."[148] These references in *Apollonius of Tyre* include "sum dæge on ærne mergen," "binnon anum dæge," or

---

[146] Lock, *Aspects of Time*, 11.

[147] Philippa J. Semper, "Going Round in Circles? Time and the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*," in *Time and Eternity: The Medieval Discourse*, International Medieval Research, 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 298.

[148] Semper, "Going Round in Circles?," 298.

"binnon feawum tidum."[149] *Soul and Body II* attests to Semper's observation, as will be demonstrated in this chapter. Finally, these conceptions of time are integral to distinguishing how the poet organizes time in the poem so that he can engage the audience, and also exhort each audience member to ruminate on the deeds done in his or her own life.

To engage the audience, the author uses what Nelson referred to in her article as "time markers" to establish an awareness of time. In the poem there are a total of thirty occurrences of her time markers.[150] These do not include instances of the verb *beon*, which usually indicates futurity, or words that could indicate time, like *ærest* (first). Nelson's use of the term is a good starting point for my own discussion; however, I revise the term to include all words that denote time. This larger overall category, which I call an "interval marker," is further broken down into two types of markers: temporal, which relate to societal conceptions of cyclical or linear time, and spatial, which convey distance and space. The concepts of space and time tend to exist together in the human mind because as one travels any distance, he necessarily moves forward in his own experience of time. Even the modern general public's obsession with time travel unites the two concepts into one idea, where someone moves physically and temporally through time. In total, forty interval markers, such as *fyrn* (long ago), *ærest* (first), *oft* (often), *þær* (there), *æfre* (ever), and *her* (here), appear in the poem, with an additional four phrases denoting periods of time. Though the poem is reflecting on the bad deeds of the body while he lived, and that is definitely where the soul is focused, there is an underlying concentration on the future due to the repetition of interval markers indicating things to come. Obviously the author wants his audience members to contemplate what will come based on what has been done in their lives, as the body demonstrates in the poem. Early Englishmen, however, regularly capitalized on the association

---

[149] Semper, "Going Round in Circles?," 298; translation: "one day in the morning," "within one day," "within a few hours."

[150] These time markers include *þonne* (then), *ær* (before), *siþþan* (afterwards), *nu* (now), and *sona* (soon).

of space with time to highlight the differences between the past and the present or the present and the future.

In Old English Christian writing, there is a tendency to contrast the past with the present, or the present with the future. Often the contrast between past and present, or present and future, gains a spatial aspect, instead of remaining purely temporal. This especially happens in homilies or religious texts that are exhorting the audience to live a more doctrinally correct life here on earth so that they will have true rewards and joy in heaven. For instance, the first fifty-six lines in *Vercelli Homily IV* portray these contrasts, specifically using spatial markers to delineate differences between this life on earth and the next. The homilist says, "**Her** syndon lytle wynlustas, ac **þær** syndon þa ecan tintrego [þon] forworhton. **Her** bið unglædlic hleahter, ac **þær** is se ungeendoda heaf þa[m] þe her mid unrihte gytsiaþ" (25-7).[151] Notice the contrast between *her* and *þær* with regards to what the audience can expect in each place. Also, notice how there is an aspect of time connected to distance. *Her* indicates that the present state implies no movement in distance or time, or in other words *her* means the homilist is discussing what is happening right now. This is the present time, whereas *þær* denotes a distance far away from here in space and time. The actions which the homilist discusses are events that will come to pass in the unspecified future.

In order to stress the doomed fate of the body and soul, the *Soul and Body II* poet uses contrasts with interval markers. Part of this can be explained by the fact that most of the poem is the soul berating the body. The soul, as an entity not entirely pleasing in God's eyes herself since she is doomed, would not exhort the body to be better for two reasons. First, the soul is neither a homilist nor a preacher, and so cannot be expected to use the same language as one of those

---

[151] Old English taken from Scragg, *The Vercelli Homilies* (Oxford University Press, 1992): "**Here** are little sensual pleasures, but **there** are the eternal torments because they sinned. **Here** is cheerless laughter, but **there** is the endless mourning for those who here unjustly covet." Emphasis added.

people would. The soul might have picked up some techniques about how to inspire doctrinally

correct living from her interactions with the Church since homilies and sermons focus on the

temporal and spatial contrast between this life and the next. Yet it is unlikely she spent much

time paying attention to these techniques because she spends most of the poem scolding the body

for being more interested in feasts than attending church. Second, the body has no hope to

change his fate. The soul does not need to scare the body into changing his ways because his

actions have already determined where he will end up, which is the whole reason the soul is so

upset.

One of the most explicit contrasts in the poem appears before the soul ever speaks,

between the speaker's use of the time markers *siþþan* and *ær*. The narrator says, "Long <u>bið</u>

siþþan/ þæt se **gæst** nimeð æt gode sylfum/ swa wite swa wuldor, swa him in **worulde ær**/ efne

þæt **eorðfæt ær** <u>geworhte</u>" (5-8).[152] In this sentence, the poet copies the rhetorical ploy of the

homilists: the events of the future are starkly contrasted with the events of the past. There is this

insistence that the *woruld* was worked in the past through the repetition of the time marker *ær*

twice next to these two words. The construction of this sentence also sets at odds the soul and the

body. On one hand, the soul, *gæst*, is linked with the future temporal marker, *siþþan*, by

appearing next to it,[153] which creates a connection in the audience's mind between events of the

future and the soul. On the other hand, the word for body, *eorðfæt*, is placed next to the past

temporal marker, *ær*, which links the past with the body.[154] This association between past and

body suggests that the body is the cause of the future soul's pain. The body itself is also

connected with the *ær woruld* by the word chosen to represent the body, *eorðfæt*. Translated

---

[152] "It <u>is</u> long **afterwards** that the **soul** takes either torment or glory before God Himself, just as the **body** <u>earned</u> exactly for them **before** in the **world**." Emphasis added. The verbs are underlined to show the contrasting tenses.

[153] I have highlighted this connection by bolding both *gæst* and *siþþan*.

[154] I have highlighted this connection by bolding both *eorðfæt* and *ær*, as well as *woruld* and *ær*.

literally, the word means earthen vessel, but is more colloquially rendered as "body."[155]

Although alliteration can put certain constraints on the poet, the poet still chose *eorðfæt* for a

certain effect. In both *Soul and Body I* and *II* the alliteration of the line is completed through the

presence of *efne* (exactly) in the a-verse and *ær* (before) in the b-verse, and so the only constraint

for the poet is to use a disyllabic word, and many for the body exist.[156] Using *eorðfæt* places the

stress and the focus on that word because it is the second alliterating syllable in the a-verse. In

Old English meter, it is only necessary to have one alliterating syllable across the half-line, so the

poet's use of two, especially of the same vowel, was for emphasis. This purposeful choice for

representing the body is significant because it creates a direct link between the body and the

world of before. Unlike many of the other words for body, this word focuses on the body's

connection to the earth as an object that carries something within it, made from earth. Most other

words for the body focus on other aspects, like it being made of flesh, *flæschom* (flesh-home).

Since both instances of the word *eorðfæt* in the corpus appear in the *Soul and Body* poems, the

poet must have consciously chosen the word to focus on the earthen connection. Biblically, the

phrase "earthen vessel" is used to symbolize the frailty and commonness of man's body.[157] Not

only is the body frail and common, but the reader understands the past world is just as frail and

common through the link between *eorðfæt* and *ær woruld*. By selecting *eorðfæt* the author

associates the body, the earthen vessel, with the *ær woruld* and the two become one singular

idea, that of the past.

---

[155] Joseph Bosworth and Thomas Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), reprinted 1964 with *Supplement* by T. N. Toller (Oxford, 1921), reprinted 1955, s.v. "eorðfæt." All subsequent references to this dictionary will use the abbreviated title, *Bosworth-Toller*.

[156] Words likes *banfæt, banhus, bodig, feorhbold, feorhhus, flæschom, flæschord, foldærn*, etc.

[157] 2 Cor. 4:7, Lam. 4:2 (ESV)

Another example of the contrast created between past and future temporal markers occurs about thirty-five lines into the soul's speech. The soul says,

> "**siþþan** ic ana of þe <u>ut</u> *siþade*
> <u>þurh</u> þæs sylfes hond þe ic **ær** *onsended wæs* (52-3)."[158]

Differing from the previous example, this instance of contrasting temporal markers focuses on the soul alone. Besides the soul's concentration on herself, which as I demonstrate in chapter four indicates the pride and selfishness of the soul, this sentence also explains the soul's two major journeys. The first journey was *þurh þæs sylfes hond* (by/through His own hand) into the body while the second was when she *ut siþade* (journeyed out) from the body. Using chiastic structure, the poet explains these two journeys.[159] With the placement of *ut siþade* in the b-verse, the words mirror the soul's action of journeying out of the body and the placement of *þurh þæs sylfes hond* in the following a-verse mirrors the soul being sent into the body by God's hand. The double use of *ic* draws the two verbs into comparison with each other while the active *siþade* contrasts the passive *onsended wæs*. The contrast between the two verbs is deliberate because both verbs are in the final position of their line's b-verse, leading a reader to notice their opposing nature.[160] Furthermore, the double use of *ic* highlights how the poet inverted the a-verse of 52 in the b-verse of 53 (53b). Closest to the caesura in both 52a and 53b is *þe* with *ic ana of* before the *þe* of 52a and *ic ær onsended* following the *þe* of 53b; the two phrases form a sandwich around the two instances of *þe*. The half-lines are composed to be mirrors of one another, even down to the verbs' placement in initial (52a) and final position (53b). More than

---

[158] "**After** I alone *journeyed* <u>out</u> from you/ <u>by</u> His own hand from whom I *was sent* **before**." Emphasis added. The bolding is to highlight the contrast of the temporal markers *siþþan* and *ær*, the underlining highlights the contrast between *ut* and *þurh*, and the italics contrast the two verbs *siþade* and *onsended wæs*.

[159] Chiastic structure is a rhetorical strategy where words and ideas across lines exist in an "x" pattern to highlight the contrast between those two ideas. I would like to sincerely thank Dr. Rand Johnson for his willingness to discuss the chiastic structure of these lines with me, and the strategy in general.

[160] Technically *wæs* is in the final position of line 53, but the passive is formed with both *onsended* and *wæs* so I consider the two words one unit.

just parallelism, the phrases are designed to demonstrate antithesis, which is also shown through

contrasting time markers, because they designate opposite actions.[161] The time marker *siþþan* is

used in line 52a, which is contrasted chiastically by the use of *ær* in 53b. Likewise the adverb *ut*

(out), in 52b, is contrasted by the preposition *þurh* (by/through) in 53a. Introducing this chiastic

structure produces a starker contrast between the soul's state "before" and "after" as well as how

she journeyed "through" and "out." Through this technique, the author imparts to the audience

the difference between where the soul came from and where she now is. In a sense, the contrast

between the soul's previous and current fortunes parallels the word placement of "before" and

"after," similar to the homilists contrasting both the present and past world with the future one.

This poet incorporates the rhetorical techniques of the homilists in order to exhort his listeners to

change their ways.

A final example of the contrasting temporal markers appears at the end of the poem. This

contrast sums up the plot of the poem: "þonne biþ þæt werge/ lic acolad þæt he longe **ær**/ werede

mid wædum, bið **þonne** wyrmes giefl,/ æt on eorþan" (117-20).[162] Not only do the past tense of

werede and the futurity of *bið* suggest temporal contrast, but the poet also heightens the

antithesis of the time before and the time after by explicitly adding the temporal markers *ær* and

þonne. With such methods, the narrator contrasts the body that before *werede mid wædum* ([was]

covered over with garments) with the corpse that then *bið wyrmes giefl* (will be food for worms).

The position of this contrast in the sentence before the parting admonition reveals the importance

of this sentence and its sentiment. These are the parting thoughts of the poet before he releases

---

[161] Antithesis is the "juxtaposition of contrasting words or ideas (often, although not always, in parallel structure)," Gideon O. Burton, "Antithesis," *Silvae Rhetoricae*, accessed April 8, 2019, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/A/antithesis.htm.

[162] "When the accursed body/ is grown cold that he long **before**/ covered over with garments, **then** he will be food for worms,/ food in the earth." The translation for *bið wyrmes giefl* can be "he will be" or "he is food for worms," but I think the meaning in this context is that the body is and will continue to be food for worms. The bolding highlights the contrast between the temporal markers, *ær* and *þonne*.

the attention of his audience, and as such have an important role in summing up what the poet wants his audience to remember from his poem. He wants this contrast between the clothed vivacious body on earth and the decaying piecemeal corpse in the earth to stay in his audience's minds. If the audience uses these images *to gemyndum* (as reminders, 121) to focus on the next life in lieu of this one, then the poet has been able to reach someone.

Other interval marker phrases that need to be discussed are those which refer to specific times of day or intervals. These temporal markers are *seofon niht* (seven nights, 10), *þreo hund wintra* (three hundred winters, 12), *þritig þusend wintra* (thirty thousand winters, 33), and *honcred* (cock-crow, 63). As Lock's study of time in literature has shown, techniques that derive from oral composition depict time in poems like the *Song of Roland* in such a way that establishing any specific sort of chronology is nigh impossible. This inability for modern people to construct timelines is a result of a difference in the way that medieval people perceived time and the details on which they focused, represented through techniques such as repeating scenes. In Lock's analysis of time in *Beowulf,* contrary to what he said about other early poems, he argues for a greater consciousness of linear time in the poem, especially in the ability to construct a chronology from it, albeit an imprecise one. Intervals of time occur in the poem to construct two separate timelines: one for the poet and one for the audience.[163] The poet of *Soul and Body II* also creates two parallel timelines of past and future for the listener and the narrator through interval markers and precise parts of the day. The body/soul timeline is simple: the far past is their life on earth, the near past is their death, the present is the soul's speech, and the future is Judgment Day. For the audience's timeline, the actions of the body and soul during their time on earth, which includes their death, exist in the distant past with the soul's speech in the near past. The audience hears the poem in the present and Judgment Day is in the indeterminate

---

[163] Lock, *Aspects of Time,* 53.

future. The narrator's timeline, for the most part, follows his audience's; the actions of the body and soul exist in the distant past and Judgment Day in the future. The soul's speech, however, is in the speaker's present, while it was in the near past for the audience. Since the soul's speech moves forward in time, from the narrator's perspective the audience hearing the poem is pushed from the present to the near future. Each of these timelines allows for different levels of knowledge about the fate of the soul and body. The poet presents each timeline in order to give his readers a choice: the timeline in which they would prefer to exist, if they know all three options. Both soul and body are culpable, as the narrator and audience are aware because they know what happens due to their respective timelines. Thus soul and body must change their ways to live correctly. Only the perspective of the person in the body/soul timeline believes the incorrect notion that solely the body is at fault.

The most intriguing interval marker in the poem is *honcred* (cock-crow, 63) because the word refers to a specific time period during the twenty-four-hour period called a day. The soul uses this word in her speech when she explains that she "eft sona from ðe/ hweorfan on honcred, þonne halege menn/ gode lifgendum lofsong doð" (62-4).[164] In this instance, the appearance of *honcred* places the audience in night and moving toward daylight, a specific part of the twenty-four hour day. We can also understand that the soul's speech, which is most of the poem, is happening at night due to another interval marker, *seofon niht* (10). Since the soul will be departing at cock-crow and the interval between each of her visits to the body is said to be every seven nights, the visit must be happening at night. Placing the interaction at night adds an element of the mysterious and supernatural to the poem because the darkness of night allows for more fantastical events to happen. For instance, in the epic poem *Beowulf*, Grendel's multiple attacks on Heorot only happen at night when the hall sleeps. Since night usually includes a lack

---

[164] "at once from you/ shall depart at cock-crow, when holy men/make praise songs to the Living God."

of light, the unusual and uncanny are more likely to happen. Thus the cover of darkness permits the occurrence of unexplainable events like a tormented soul visiting her decaying body. Additionally, in *Soul and Body II* the soul even states that she will seek the body *nihtes* (at night, 61), further demonstrating the string of time-conscious language throughout the poem.

This focus on time-conscious language, albeit rare in the poem, reflects the culture in which the poet is living as well. *Honcred* demonstrates the cyclical nature of time, echoing how an oral society views time. There is an agrarian connection in the use of *honcred* because the period of time relies on listening for a rooster to crow the start to every morning. Although the word refers to a more specific period of time than daylight or nighttime, it is less precise than a mechanical clock displaying six-thirty in the morning. Yet the poet's use of *honcred* can also be a manifestation of his immersion in literate culture and the linear time associated with Christianity. Using the term narrows down a time period existing within a twenty-four hour period, which is more time-conscious than placing an event at night. Therefore, the poet's use of *honcred* displays the complexities of how cyclical and linear time interact with both oral and literate culture.

Interestingly enough, the phrase *þreo hund wintra* (three hundred winters) appears in both *Beowulf* and *Soul and Body II* relating to the age of the dragon's hoard and the time that the soul has had to visit her body respectively. Both of these interval markers relate to the uncanny aspects of each poem and are durations that the poet could never know for certain. As I discuss further in chapter three, the "aesthetics of familiarity," the modern identification of Old English poets using the familiar in new and creative ways, helps explain the use of this phrase for both poems. The connotations the phrase most likely held for audiences could have produced a vague sense of a long duration of time, similar to the phrase "once upon a time" used in fairy tales.

Both poets would have used this phrase purposely so that their audiences would better understand the temporal distance between the present of the stories and either how old the dragon was or how long until Judgment Day will arrive.

Anaphora, the literary device used for emphasis by repeating words at the beginning of lines in the a-verse, has the distinct purpose in this poem of highlighting the ideas on which the readers should focus. Although the repetition of words in Old English poetry relies on alliteration, the poet also capitalizes on words in anaphoric structure to suggest that the poem's message relates to the soul and her fate. Through repeating two main thematic groups – that relating to the body and his worldly life,[165] and that relating to the future judgment of the soul[166] – the poet focuses the narrative on the actions and subsequent consequences of both body and soul. The use of the two thematic groups in anaphora creates a significant parallel between the destruction of the body because of his past deeds and the determination of the soul's final resting place on Judgment Day. Subtly this parallelism suggests the author wants his readers to question the verity of the soul's speech because she performed just as poorly on earth as her body. The body's destruction is important to understand, but the real conflict is between the soul's speech and the soul's actions. The focus is on deed and not words, just like how the author constructed the poem to subtly blame the soul using anaphora and interval markers.[167]

In what seems to be an odd choice in a poem focusing on the path to Heaven, the author uses the words *woruld*, *moldan*, *menn*, and *eorþan* in anaphoric pattern to concentrate on the soul's focus, even after death, on worldly rather than heavenly aspects. According to *Bosworth-*

---

[165] Words like *eorðfæt, lichoman, flæsc, seonwe, wyrm, wunde, tunge, lic, eorþ, woruld, mann, molde*, and their variants.

[166] Words like *sawol, god, gæst, ælmihtig, on þam miclan dæge, word, dryhten*, and their variants.

[167] Interestingly, the author brings the soul's fault to the forefront through words while the body is destroyed through the actions of worms expressed through words. I discuss this example of the poet playing with dichotomies in chapter four.

Toller, *woruld* is the material world, *molde* refers to dust, sand, or earth, and *eorþ* is simply the earth.[168] The poet uses these words in variation as well as anaphora, which I will discuss shortly, but it is significant that these words occur, frequently but not exclusively, in the a-verses during the soul's speech.[169] Contrary to looking heavenward as is the soul's purpose, the soul's focus is on the earth. She claims that she guided the body in the way that God called her, but there is no proof of that in her speech. She is obsessed with the past world in which she lived rather than the second life that she could have had in Heaven. Each of these words in her speech appear usually with the prepositions "on" or "in," signifying that her focus is on earth and that she wishes that she were back on the earth.[170] It would be generous to say she wishes she were on the earth to right her wrongs; however, she does not indicate such a desire because she uses, in anaphoric pattern, words associated with men and the earth over twice the number of times she uses words signifying God. If the soul actually wanted to return to earth to right her wrongs, she would have used the word God more rather than earthly words because her focus would be on pleasing God.

Notably, the final instance of anaphora suggesting worldliness in the poem, the word *eorþan*, connects to the author's message for all. Both *eorþan* and *æghwylcum* are in an anaphoric structure in line 102, copying other instances of similar words by being in the dative case and following a preposition. Although *eorþan* and *æghwylcum* are grammatically similar to other words relating to worldliness, they are set apart. The two words are not part of the same sentence, but by being in the same line they become linked. The only other example of two words in anaphora presented in the same line is line 70, with *moldan* and *monnum*, which

---

[168] *Bosworth-Toller*, s.v. "woruld," "molde," "eorþ."
[169] These words also appear in the b-verse throughout the poem, but I do not focus on that since anaphora is defined as repetition in the a-verse. This poem-wide repetition, though, only strengthens my claim that the soul's focus is on the earthly rather than heavenly world.
[170] Words in the soul's speech that show her desire to be on earth: *eorþan* (lines 18, 75), *on eorþan* (120), *in worulde* (40), *on moldan* (70, 80).

supports my argument of taking *eorþan* and *æghwylcum* together. Both pairs of words relate to the idea of men on earth, which means that these pairings could also be an example of variation.

Variation, in this poem, occurs almost exclusively when referring to God, the soul, the body, or the worms. In one way or another, each variation relates to one of these subjects. From this concentration on the four subjects, it is clear to see that the author wants his audience to focus on each subject's role in the story and how those roles fit into the poem's concept of time. For instance, the soul belittles the body and says that it would have been better if the body had been "fugel oþþe fisc on sæ,/ oððe eorþan neat ætes tiolode,/ feldgongende feoh butan snyttro,/ ge on westenne wildra deora/ þæt grimmeste, þær swa god wolde,/ ge þeah þu wære wyrmcynna þæt wyrreste" (74-9)[171] than the body that sinned as hers did in life. By presenting this subject through variation, the poet is slowing down the audience's movement from one idea to another in the poem. In essence, he is forcing the audience to take notice of the body, in this instance, and his actions through the repetition necessary to explain the subject of the action. This is one of the longest examples of variation in the poem because the poet wanted his audience to pause and ruminate about the soul's point. Giving six different examples of animals better than the body, the poet uses vivid imagery to demonstrate the body's worthlessness as a result of his indulgence throughout life. This example also pauses the rhythm of the speech for six whole lines because the soul uses six instances to drive this one point home rather than moving onto a new one. This moment can be considered as a point where the soul gives an aside to the audience, listing the many different animals better than the body, which traditionally should be better than all animals. The action stops and the audience must focus on how terrible the body was in the past.

---

[171] "a bird or fish in the sea,/ or a beast of earth worked for food,/ cattle roaming the field without wisdom,/ or in the wilderness the wildest of wild animals,/ wherever God wished,/ or even if you were the worst of serpentkind"

In relation to discussing the body, the poet uses this tactic of focusing on the body's horribleness for most instances of variation. This includes describing how the body is *dumb ond deaf* (60), claiming the body is "ban bireafod,/ besliten seonwum" (56-7),[172] which cannot be saved by "hyrste þa readan, ne gold ne sylfor ne þinra goda nan" (54-5).[173] The soul focuses on the negative acts of the body because she believes the body has disappointed God, and so the poet uses the poetic technique of variation to build this negativity. Notice how almost every single example relates to destructive action or has negative particles like *ne* in the phrase. There is thus a consistent theme of negativity relative to the description of the body in the soul's speech. Another instance of variation concerning the body, and including negative particles, appears about twenty lines before the last example: "Ne eart þu nu þon leofre nængum lifgendra,/ menn to gemæccan, ne medder ne fæder,/ ne nængum gesibbra, þonne se swearta hrefn" (49-51).[174] There are three phrases that are variations on the phrase *nængum lifgendra*, which are: *menn to gemæccan*, *ne medder ne fæder*, and *ne nængum gesibbra*. Now that the body is in the earth, the soul claims that he is no dearer than a raven to his mate, his parents, or any relatives. Choosing to say the body is no dearer than a raven is a significant choice because the raven is part of the literary motif of the beasts of battle.[175] The eagle, wolf, and raven came to be associated with battle and slaughter,[176] and so the usage of raven in this comparison associates images of violent death with the body. By presenting this comparison through variation, the poet is able to build anticipation for the claim of the body being no dearer than a raven. Each audience member is waiting for the end of that comparison, and must patiently accept the poet's pause in

---

[172] "bereft of bones,/ torn from the sinews"

[173] "these red trappings,/ neither gold nor silver nor any of your goods."

[174] "Now you are not dearer to any of the living ones,/ to man as a mate, neither to mother nor to father,/ nor to any relatives, than the dark raven"

[175] See discussion on p. 34.

[176] Thomas Honegger, "Form and Function: the Beasts of Battle Revisited," *English Studies* 79, no. 4 (1998), 293.

poetic time for roughly two lines to hear that the body is no better than a bird that feasts on carrion.

Since the body is no better than a bird feasting on carrion, the poet wants to use this image to direct his audience toward a better life. He does this through the compositional aspect of envelope. One of the most significant examples of envelope includes the presence of *æghwylc* (each) in the first line of the poem and the repetition in the second to last line. The placement of the word in the same position in the b-verse, in both instances, though in different grammatical cases, establishes an emphasis on a general admonition. In essence, the author of the poem establishes that this exhortation to live a better life is not directed toward a specific person, since the similar phrases, "ðæs behofaþ hæleþa æghwylc" (1) and "þæt mæg æghwylcum" (120),[177] serve as reminders of what happens when one does not live as Christianity dictates. The author intended this poem to reach each and every individual who interacted with it because each person has the ability to change his or her own life. By focusing on each member of the general audience together, the author creates a personal connection between the doomed body and soul of the poem with each of the possibly doomed bodies and souls of the auditors. The readers now can imagine the doomed body and soul as their own, creating pathos in the readers toward the fate of the two entities. Additionally, this pathos motivates the audience members to rethink their actions while alive because they can imagine the horror that will be inflicted upon their bodies if they continue living sinful lives. Furthermore, each reader feels a personal connection with the prideful soul and the gluttonous body because he can connect the actions of the soul's denial and the body's silent acceptance to situations in his own life. These entities are personified, or de-personified, in a way that highlights human reactions to punishment: blatant denial and spreading blame in the case of the soul, and resigned acceptance in the case of the body.

---

[177] "each of men have need of this" and "that may be for each man"

There are also quite a few examples of envelope relying on specific words. One of them is discussed in chapter four, that of *werga* being used for both body and soul. When *werga* is used to describe both body and soul, the poet connects the idea of being "accursed" to both entities, which supports my argument that the poet subtly constructs the poem to accuse the soul as well as the body of being at fault for their combined fate. Another is that of *wyrma gifl* (food for worms), which occurs twice in the poem (22, 119). This phrase neatly envelopes the poem and creates this sense of cyclical time in the text by reminding the audience that the body was, is, and will be food for worms. Although all bodies end up in the ground, the double use of "food/piecemeal for words" suggests that the body is indeed decaying and that, in fact, he has earned the state in which he exists now. At the beginning, the soul calls the body *wyrmas gifl* and the speaker calls the body *wyrmes giefl* at the end, which further supports the idea that the sinful body actually deserves to rot in the ground.[178] Also, for the timeline in both the perspective of the poet as well as the audience, this repetition indicates that the destruction is happening and will continue to happen to the body.

A shorter envelope occurs with the repetition of *lyt þu geþohtes* (19, 23).[179] These two phrases occur at the beginning of the soul's speech against the body and surround the introduction of the audience to the actions performed throughout life that led to the soul and body's punishments. The envelope of *lyt þu geþohtes* is more fully formed by the soul directly speaking to the body. By enveloping the causal relationship of the body and soul's damnation in the poem with "you thought little," the poet creates a link between the actions, the results, and the lack of thinking. Only because the body has little intention or thought does he stray into

---

[178] In chapter one, on p.35, I mentioned Augustine discussed the worms in Hell and one of the choices he offered was that the worms were literal. The body in *Soul and Body II* is not given a specific resting place, yet it may be assumed the body is on earth where worms naturally help to decompose the bodies in the ground.
[179] "you thought little"

sinful acts. Not only does the statement point out that not enough thinking led to the body's bad actions, but the statement also is used in an attempt to make the audience think as well. If each audience member can think about his or her own life and not worry about his or her fate matching the body's in the poem, then that person must be on the right path. In this way, the poet uses the poem as both a general admonishment for the world as a whole and one that seems to be personalized for each audience member, in a way similar to the use of the *æghwylc* envelope at both the beginning and end of the poem.

Throughout this chapter, I argued that the poet purposefully crafted the poem to place the blame of damnation on both soul and body. He does this through compositional strategies and rhetorical devices like envelope, anaphora, variation, and chiasmus. Each of these strategies also creates a sense of time that differentiates between the past and present as well as the present and the future. Similar to the early English homilists, the author highlights the differences between these times and places by placing them together. By creating timelines for the perspectives of the audience, the narrator, and the soul/body,[180] the poet allows the audience members to judge for themselves which present of the various timelines they would prefer to avoid. Not only does the soul depict a bleak outcome for the body, but the author also depicts a similarly bleak outcome for the blustering, culpable soul. The poet suggests that if the audience members decide to act like either soul or body, they will face the same damned end. In fact, the only way to avoid such a fate is to change their ways and to let the body and soul's actions serve as a reminder for wise ones.

---

[180] Body/soul timeline: far past is their life on earth, near past is their death, present is the soul's speech, and future is Judgment Day. Audience timeline: distant past includes the actions of the body/soul on earth, near past is the soul's speech, present is the audience hearing the poem, and Judgment Day is the future. Narrator timeline: distant past includes actions of the body and soul, present is the soul's speech, future is the audience hearing the poem and Judgment Day.

3. "AESTHETICS OF FAMILIARITY": WHETHER 'TIS NOBLER TO RE-PURPOSE PHRASES OR FIND UNIQUE WORDS

Beauty, similar to time, is a concept that is very elusive. Both concepts have flexible meanings, depending on the society and time period in which they are used. The range of meanings for beauty, though, is even more subjective. As the old adage states, beauty is in the eye of the beholder. If a viewer finds the object aesthetically pleasing, then said viewer usually considers the object beautiful. For example, new and original ideas in writing and literature tend to be aesthetically pleasing, and thus beautiful, to many people, but not all, in modern audiences. Some scholars, however, claim beauty inspires "representation and reproduction" deriving from "centuries of Platonic and Neoplatonic thought on aesthetics."[181] Similarly, early English audiences preferred repetition. The more different ways in which an author could present the idea or phrase, the more impressive his skill was. As each poet participated in this multi-layering of images and meaning, the repetition of certain phrases occurred across numerous poems. In this chapter, I explore patterns of repetition across multiple poems that help position *Soul and Body II* within the larger corpus of Old English.

Elizabeth M. Tyler calls this preference for repetition across various works the "aesthetics of the familiar."[182] Although a modern phrase, aesthetics of the familiar retroactively designates that the early English had an affinity for what was familiar to them already.[183] Authors capitalized on this affinity for the familiar by repeating certain phrases. Essentially, the poet would choose a phrase to construct an image in the audience's mind. As the poem was repeatedly performed and disseminated, the image would become linked with that phrase. When

---

[181] Peter Ramey, "The Riddle of Beauty: The Aesthetics of *Wrætlic* in Old English Verse," *Critical and Historical Studies in Literature, Medieval through Contemporary* 114, no. 3 (2017), 457.

[182] Elizabeth Tyler, *Old English Poetics: The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006), 2.

[183] Tyler names the convention "aesthetics of the familiar," and so I use her version of the term, but I use later, and more often, the version "aesthetics of familiarity." As Heather Maring mentions in her index, the convention is known by both terms, and I prefer the second.

other authors composed their own poems, they would be aware of the phrase and associated image. If they wished to convey a similar image, then they would borrow the phrase, adjusting the use to better create the image they wanted. This reworking of the original phrase would connect the new example of the phrase with the old, and the old image with the new variant, allowing for multiple layers of meaning.

This multi-layering of images attached to certain phrases would be familiar to the author's listeners. When the performer said the specific phrase, the audience might remember the various other poems where the phrase is used. In turn, the listeners would recall the images associated with the previous usages and they would attach them to the new image. This creates a deeper and more vivid picture of whatever image the author wished to convey. Such a method of multi-layering imagery allows for an audience to continuously receive new and stronger associations as each person hears the phrase used in different texts. For example, if the poet uses the half-line *gifre ond grædig* in *Soul and Body II* in relation to the worms eating the body, then the listeners may connect that image with all the other familiar uses of the phrase.

In this chapter, I explore three important phrases in the poem that can be considered through the lens of the aesthetics of familiarity. These phrases are *gifre ond grædig*, *deaf ond dumb*, and *wordum wrixlan*. I also examine two examples in the Old English corpus of *þreo hund wintra*, the interval marker already mentioned in chapter two. Finally, I explain the significance of the poet using rare words for the body, specifically two: *flæschord* and *eorþfæt*. These words are each found in the Old English corpus only two times; the occurrences are found in *Soul and Body I* and *II*. Although alliteration and syllabic count limit the words from which the poet could choose, he must have a reason for choosing unique words. I argue that the concept of the aesthetics of familiarity had an influence on those choices because the poet wished to send a

certain message. Through negative and drastic images evoked by the phrases, the poet leads the listeners to the conclusion that now is the time to reflect on their lives and change their ways.

Tyler, in her book *Old English Poetics: The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England*, characterizes the "stability of the stylistic conventions of Old English poetry" as remarkable because of the longevity of the early English period.[184] Since the publication of Tyler's book, and consequently the rise of the idea of studying poetics through the lens of the aesthetics of familiarity, there has been an increased interest in studying the conventions of Old English poetry, as Heather Maring's recent book *Signs that Sing: Hybrid Poetics in Old English Verse* demonstrates. Their studies, which use a similar method to explore repetition in the wider Old English corpus, provide useful models for my study of *Soul and Body II*.

Tyler's study introduces the concept of the aesthetics of familiarity and so she must explain why her new method of understanding Old English poetics is important in a larger discussion of the field. To accomplish this, Tyler reminds her reader of a few key points in relation to Old English poetics. First, readers must think of tradition and convention as choices actively made by poets.[185] Second, while "the dividing line between composition and reception is indistinct," each scribe or reciter is still actively participating in the composition of the poem, even if the composition is occurring over centuries.[186] Finally, language and convention were not simply vehicles for ideas, but they could also be a creative source for poetry. Old English poets reveled in word play as well as in using poetic tradition in new and exciting ways.[187] These starting points in Tyler's study are essential for my own exploration of the aesthetics of

---

184 Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, 1.
185 Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, 5.
186 Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, 6.
187 Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, 6.

familiarity in *Soul and Body II* because they determine the limits of this chapter. As Tyler so

aptly puts it:

> Both intellectually and practically, it is hard to historicize poems which lack dates and locations, and which we understand as the outcome of a long process, the stages of which we cannot identify. But this situation does not call for the acceptance of a model which gives tradition an active role in the composition of poetry. Rather we need to recognize that the stability of Old English poetic convention and the related invisibility of Old English poets is a striking historical phenomenon which must be accounted for rather than simply assumed. This conventionality is a consequence of the roles assigned to Old English poetry, the context in which it was cultivated, especially in a written form, and social expectations of poetry – at specific times, in specific places and by specific people, even if they are unknown to us. It is not always possible, nor desirable, to approach the style of Old English verse historically.[188]

Consequently, I refrain from discussing many, if any, of the historical aspects of either

the phrases or the texts that I examine in this chapter. Contextualization is necessary, but the

composition date and authorship of many Old English poems, including *Soul and Body II*, is

difficult to confirm. While not impossible to date relatively, for the purposes of this study, I

avoid any real attempt to date the poem because it is not necessary in order to appreciate the

poetic skill of the poet shown through his use of the aesthetics of familiarity. In addition, as

Tyler mentions, Old English poetics thrives on the very timelessness of the tradition.

Heather Maring delves further into the tradition of Old English poetics by arguing that

the poetics of early medieval England are purposefully hybrid. In her monograph, Maring claims

that "authors writing in Old English create a rich interweaving of oral, written, and ritual

traditions, which showcases their skill and pleases and informs their audiences."[189] By crafting

poems through oral, written, and ritual traditions, Old English poets could capitalize on strategies

such as "heroic diction and idioms with metonymic signification from oral tradition; the practice

of allegorization and finding metaphors in literal description from written, literate tradition; and

---

[188] Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, 7.

[189] Heather Maring, *Signs that Sing: Hybrid Poetics in Old English Verse* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2017), 8.

– in parallel with oral-traditional metonymy – metonymic signification of words, gestures, bodily postures, images, and concepts from ritual tradition."[190] Whereas Tyler focused on repetition throughout the Old English corpus and how each poet used the word or phrase relating to treasure that she chose to analyze, Maring moves a bit further into literary analysis to highlight the effect rhetorical devices had when paired with one of the three traditions. Since the poets combine the three traditions while composing poems, Maring must focus on how the authors take known images from each tradition and infuse them into poems together. She claims, "skilled poets 'come equipped' with a shared, culturally valued poetic resource and the knowledge that their compositions could reach a broad audience when read aloud."[191] Therefore, Old English poets worked in an environment where most of the audience knew and understood the allusions the poets made to various traditions, just as a modern writer could allude to the lyrics of a famous rock band like Led Zeppelin and most of the audience would understand the reference.

In order to tease out which phrases and images would have this kind of resonance, both Tyler and Maring use similar techniques. The first step is to choose specific phrases or themes on which to focus. While Tyler focuses on words relating to treasure, Maring breaks her study into various themes: for example, Poet-Patron, Devouring-the-Dead, and Retainer-Lord. I follow Tyler and Maring's method in determining how poets used the aesthetics of the familiar in their poems for the benefit of increasing the images they wish to convey. This includes researching how many times each phrase occurs in the Old English corpus, examining the semantic range of each phrase, and analyzing the collocations associated with certain words. For my study, I concentrate on four phrases: *gifre ond grædig*, *deaf ond dumb*, *þreo hund wintra*, and *wordum wrixlan*. Each phrase exists in multiple Old English texts, and I used the *Dictionary of Old*

---

[190] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 11.
[191] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 19.

English Corpus to search for these variants after having identified the phrases in *Soul and Body II*. These are familiar and known images for an early English audience, but authors demonstrate their skill by finding new ways to use such known phrases. Consequently, the only way to understand the images connected to each phrase is to find each occurrence and analyze the way that it works in the various poems to discover which connotations would appeal to an early English audience.

The first phrase that I focus on is *gifre ond grædig*,[192] which is explored by Maring while she discusses what she coined the "devouring-the-dead theme." As Maring explains in her study, the two words *gifre* and *grædig* appear in a half-line together seven times in the poetic corpus, with the eighth alliterating across the half-line.[193] Each of the seven examples occur in the a-verse, which is significant because alliteration only needs to occur across the half-line once in both the a- and b-verse. To place two alliterating words in the a-verse emphasizes the flexibility of the alliteration, especially since both *gifre* and *grædig* can bear the alliteration. Whichever word the poet wished to emphasize would be placed in the first position. The eighth instance alliterates *gifre* and *grædig* across the half-line in a poem and the ninth appears in a gloss.[194] Maring, though, does not account for the last example of the phrase in the Old English corpus. Out of the seven half-line examples in the poetic corpus, one stands alone because *grædig* is used as an adverb rather than in the phrase *gifre ond grædig*.[195] Four of the remaining half-line appearances have *gifre* in the first position[196] whereas the last two occurrences have *grædig* in

---

[192] When looking at the individual words that make up the phrase *gifre ond grædig*, *gifre* appears in the nominative thirty-seven times while *grædig* appears forty-five times in the Old English corpus.
[193] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 40; she mentions eight, but I do not explore *gifrost ond grædgost* (Riddle 84, 30) and the *Soul and Body* poems are two individual examples, so I explore nine examples in total.
[194] The half-line example is in *The Phoenix* while the gloss is in *The Six Ages of the World*: Förster, 1925 191-2; Max Förster, "Die Weltzeitalter bei den Angelsachsen," in Fr. Wild, ed., *Neusprachliche Studien, Festgabe Karl Luick zu seinem sechzigsten Geburtstage* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925): 183-203.
[195] *Guthlac A/B*
[196] *Christ and Satan*, *Soul and Body I*, *The Seafarer*, and *Soul and Body II*.

the first position, including a difference in spelling from *grædig* to *gredig*.[197] As I explore how these two words function in each of the poems and the gloss, I argue that the poet of each poem, but especially *Soul and Body II*, capitalizes on the aesthetics of familiarity in order to capture the attention of each poet's audience. Furthermore, I claim that the use of the lexeme *gifre ond grædig* in *Soul and Body II* is proof of the poet not only profiting from such an aesthetic, but also further developing the images associated with the phrase *gifre ond grædig* to create deeper, more complex images for his readers.

For Maring, the lexeme *gifre ond grædig*, which only exists in verse, connotes "an obliterating, destructive force with the potential to tear apart the body."[198] The occurrence of *gifre* and *grædig* being used as a gloss for the Latin words *consumptor* and *deuorator*, meaning "consumer," "destroyer" and "glutton," "devourer" respectively,[199] reinforces Maring's claim. Both *gifre* and *grædig*, in that order, are used to gloss the two Latin words. For a glosser to use these words together to define the Latin words portrays an instance where a scribe pulls a poetic trope out of the realm of verse. Since eight out of the nine examples where the words collocate are in verse, this phrase, and hence metaphorical image, must be a distinct theme in poetry. Thus the connotation of extreme hunger as an all-consuming destructive force was common enough that the glosser believed his audience would understand that the two Latin words were equivalent to the image conjured with the use of *gifre* and *grædig*. Although Maring does not mention this example of *gifre* and *grædig* appearing next to each other in a gloss, the existence supports the multiple layers of images known to the glosser and, possibly, the audience.

As for the poetic examples of *gifre ond grædig*, Maring explores the main examples of the half-line well enough that I rely on her study to explain how three are used. She claims the

---

[197] *Genesis A/B* and *Christ and Satan*; the spelling change from *grædig* to *gredig* occurs in *Christ and Satan*.
[198] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 44.
[199] William Whitaker, WORDS (University of Notre Dame, 2006), s.v. "consumptor," "deuorator."

formula *grædige ond gifre* reliably includes the adjective *gifre* (ravenous, eager), "a word whose idiomatic associations color every instantiation."[200] The first of the eight poetic occurrences that Maring explores is in *Genesis A/B*.[201] In Adam's question to Eve, he asks, "Gesyhst þu nu þa sweartan helle/ *grædige and gifre*?"[202] Through attaching the phrase *grædige ond gifre* to *helle* (Hell), Adam alludes to the common medieval motif of the mouth of Hell as an animal greedy and hungry for as many *mali* souls as it can devour. Connecting that specific phrase to the word "Hell" allows a picture to be painted in the audience's minds of a Hell mouth gobbling soul after bad soul, just as various manuscript illuminations depict.[203] Furthermore, Maring argues that this connection "implicitly condemns Eve's greed for knowledge," which led to her own hunger for the fruit of the forbidden tree, and consequently, her fall into sin.[204] Maring, then, extrapolates by saying that Adam's question "highlights the parallel relationship between the greed of the body and its fate after death."[205] Essentially, because Eve was greedy and gluttonous for knowledge during life, she physically became greedy for the fruit that would give her such knowledge. Thus, the punishment for her sin was to be one of the *mali* souls intended for the greedy and ravenous Hell mouth after her death. Since she sinned by greed, her punishment was to be consumed by the ultimate greedy entity, Hell.

---

[200] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 40.

[201] *Genesis B* is an Old Saxon poem translated and inserted into the Anglo-Saxon poem *Genesis*, otherwise known as *Genesis A*, found in the Junius Manuscript. *Genesis B* describes the fall of Satan and the fall of Man while *Genesis A* details, relatively faithfully, the biblical book of *Genesis*.

[202] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 40; lines 792b-93a: "Do you now see that black hell, *greedy and ravenous*?" Translation and italics are Maring's.

[203] The activeness of the Hell mouth depends on whether it is depicted in an image or text. Usually when a Hell mouth is described in a text, it is more active while illustrations tend to make the Hell mouth more passive. More information can be found in Catherine E. Karkov, *Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England: Narrative Strategies in the Junius 11 Manuscript* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Also, I must thank Dr. Jill Hamilton Clements for her help in understanding how Hell mouths are depicted in the Old English corpus.

[204] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 40.

[205] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 40.

Likewise, the examples of the half-line in *Christ and Satan* are used in relation to discussions about Hell.[206] The first example of *gredige ond gifre* describes "the flaming hell that God established deep under the cliffs (31a; *niðær under nessas*)" while the second occurrence describes the inhabitants of Hell as *gifre ond grædige* (*Christ and Satan*, 192a).[207] Although the second use of the phrase inverts the two words, similar to what occurs in *Soul and Body II*, Maring assures her readers that the lexemes are "no less menacing or potent"[208] with *gifre* in initial position.[209] By using the same two descriptors for Hell and the souls residing there, the poet creates an image of not only the greedy and ravenous Hell mouth, but also the souls devoured by that Hell mouth because of their own greed during life. This double image, as Maring explains, conflates "mental greed with physical hunger, uniting them in a state of manifest sin."[210] While being devoured by Hell because of their own mental greed during life, the new residents become part of the mouth physically and, then, help the mouth gobble more bad souls. As such, the second occurrence of the half-line purposefully recalls the earlier usage and suggests that the residents of Hell have physically copied the attributes of Hell. This tactic of referring to an earlier example of the lexeme allows for a broader and more profound set of images to be disseminated to the poem's readers.

In the poem *The Seafarer*, the use of the half-line *gifre ond grædig* occurs in a problematic passage. [211] Peter Orton offers a convincing reading of the passage, and poem in general, suggesting that the poem has three distinct sections. In the first part, the seafarer is voyaging on the sea during the winter, describing snow, frost, and hail, while longing for and

---

[206] *Christ and Satan* is a poem in the Junius manuscript, traditionally divided into three narrative parts. The first focuses on Satan and his followers complaining to Christ, while the second describes the Resurrection, Ascension and Last Judgment, and the third discusses how Christ was tempted by Satan in the desert.
[207] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 40-41.
[208] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 41.
[209] I will discuss the significance of the switch later in this chapter, on p. 71.
[210] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 41.
[211] I.L. Gordon, ed., *The Seafarer* (London, UK: Methuen Publishing, 1960), 58-64a.

praising the warmth and society present on land.[212] In the second section, there is a shift in the seafarer's attitudes toward the sea and land. Where in the previous section the poet praised life on land and the heroic values extolled by men, the land no longer holds any sway over the seafarer. He, instead, is repelled from land by the coming of summer and is called to journey on the sea by, as Orton argues, the cuckoo (*anfloga*).[213] The half-line *gifre ond grædig* appears at the end of Orton's second section of the poem to describe the seafarer's wandering mind, or as Orton prefers, the "absent-minded" seafarer, that "cymeð eft to me," eager and greedy to be out on the sea once more.[214] Then, in Orton's final section, the Christian lesson appears. The seafarer has become a Christian and finds rejecting life on land parallel to the life of an ascetic. This example of a seafarer finding Christian awareness in his secular pursuits is the poet's way of turning his audience toward the message of Christianity. In his excitement to advise his audience to change their ways, *The Seafarer* poet attempts to make an analogy between the immortality that a *scop* (poet) gives to heroes in poems to the immortal life after death earned through Christianity. As Orton states, "what we see here is the poet attempting to show his audience of secular laymen how they too may, like the seafarer, turn secular experience to advantage rather than simply reject it, by using it as an intellectual foundation for Christian awareness."[215] *The Seafarer* poet asks his audience to change their ways while they are able, promoting a similar message to *Soul and Body*, albeit packaging the message differently.

---

[212] Peter Orton, "Form & Structure of *The Seafarer*," in *Old English Literature: Critical Essays*, ed. R. M. Luizza (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 362.

[213] Peter Orton, "'The Seafarer' 58-64a," *Neophilologus* 66, no. 3 (1982), 454; literally *anfloga* is translated "lone flier," but Orton argues that the word refers to the cuckoo mentioned earlier in the poem.

[214] Orton, "'The Seafarer' 58-64a," 452; "comes often to me"

[215] Orton, "Form & Structure of *The Seafarer*," 370.

Most relevant to this study, the poet places *gifre* in initial position and *grædig* in final position of the half-line in *The Seafarer* to describe the wandering mind of the title character.[216] In most instances where *gifre* and *grædige* exist together in a half-line to describe a subject, if *gifre* occurs first, the subject is animate, and if *grædige* comes first, the subject is inanimate. This switch is quite significant and purposeful by each poet since each word works within the alliterative rules and does not affect syllabic count for the half-line. For example, while the phrase connected to the Hell mouth of *Christ and Satan* has *grædig* in initial position, the phrase connected to both the mind of *The Seafarer* and the denizens of Hell in *Christ and Satan* has *grædig* in final position. Just as for *Christ and Satan* and *The Seafarer*, the poets of *Soul and Body I* and *II* seem to associate *gifre* in initial position with a living subject. More explicitly connecting *gifre* with an animate subject, the poets alter the noun into a proper noun that many editors translate as "Gifer (Glutton) the Worm" elsewhere in the poem.

In both versions of the *Soul and Body* poems, the half-line *gifre ond grædig* is used to describe the *moldwyrmas* (earthworms) in variation. Not only are these worms greedy and ravenous, but they also are *swearte wihte* (black creatures) ready to slit the sinews of the body. The use of the color black hearkens to examples of the "bad" body changing colors on Judgment Day in texts like *Vercelli Homily IV*. While changing color and size, the body *wannað*, *doxaþ*, and *bið collsweart*.[217] Similarly, in *Genesis A/B*, the Hell connected to the half-line *grædige ond gifre* is also called *sweartan* (black, 792b). The color black has a clear relationship to beings considered bad and destined for Hell.[218] Using both the color black and the descriptors of greed and eagerness, the poets combine the words into one complex and multi-layered image of the

---

[216] The Old English words to designate the mind/heart are *hyge* and *modsefa*, while *sawol* designates soul.

[217] Scragg, ed., *Vercelli Homily IV*, line 293; trans: "grows black, darkens, and is coal-black."

[218] "using the color black, in the new Christian ideology, as a sign of a sinful nature;" in Dorothy Hoogland Verkerk, "Black Servant, Black Demon: Color Ideology in the Ashburnham Pentateuch," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31, no. 1 (2001), 60.

physical manifestation of the darkness found in the eager and greedy subjects. The mirroring

between the description of the worms and Hell also suggests that the worms are from Hell, at the

same time as Hell appears on earth in the form of worms. Both allude to the other in the

similarity of their syntax:

"sweartan helle/ *grædige and gifre*" (*Genesis A/B*, 792b-3a).

"swearte wihte /*gifre ond grædge*" (*Soul and Body II*, 68-9).

The parallelism in these lines is remarkable, even though *gifre* and *grædig* switch

positions in the half-line in each of the two poems. This similarity suggests that one of the poets

was aware of the other, or that this set up occurred with a traditional poetic image. Therefore,

when the audience imagines the worms devouring the body, each person has a secondary image

of the worms' mouths like the Hell mouth consuming the *mali* souls with a tenacity that was

meant to instill fear in the listeners. If the audience members were not willing to reevaluate how

they lived their lives, they too could have black worms gnawing on their bodies. These worms

chewing the bodies echo the way that their souls will be swallowed by the Hell mouth.

The last two examples of the words *gifre* and *grædig* found in the same line relate the

words to each other in new ways. In the poem *The Phoenix*,[219] the words have a "concatenation

across an entire line" that helps describe the fires of Judgment Day: "lig eal þigeð/ eorðan

æhtgestreon, æpplede gold/ *gifre forgripeð, grædig swelgeð*/ londes frætwe."[220] Similar to the

half-line instances of the two words, this example alliterates the two words in their respective

half-lines across the caesura in an adjective plus verb format. Placing the two related half-lines

right next to one another heightens the image that the poet tries to create. Not only does the fire

---

[219] The first part of the poem *The Phoenix* describes a paradisical garden in the east, the Garden of Eden, where a phoenix resides, while the second part takes on an allegorical aspect by corrolating the bird with Christ's death and resurrection.

[220] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 43; 505b-508a: "Flame utterly consumes the treasure of the earth, *æpplede* gold, *ravenous it devours, greedy it swallows* the ornaments of the land." Italics mine, translation is Maring's.

ravenously devour the gold of this world, but furthermore, it swallows the treasure greedily in a

way that alludes to the manner by which the fiery Hell mouth of *Christ and Satan* gobbles

sinners. Once more there is a relationship between greedy ravenous hunger and earthly goods,

especially in this instance with fire as one of the "nonhuman forces of destruction."[221] These

separate images blend together because of the use of the descriptive adjectives *gifre* and *grædig*

across the full line.

Meanwhile, in *Guthlac A/B* the two words appear once more in a half-line, except with

grædig as a dative plural noun used adverbially and depending on the nominative *gifre*.[222] Both

are used to charaterize the hunger of the birds as *grædum gifre* (greedily voracious)[223] while

Guthlac feeds them. Guthlac physically feeds the birds, but the poem clearly also suggests an

allegorical aspect where Guthlac is the holy man spiritually feeding the birds, representing the

people of the Church. These flying birds consume the food given to them by Guthlac just as the

poet hopes the listeners devour the word of God found in Guthlac's life. Additionally, the fierce

hunger of the birds, who *gefegon* (rejoiced) in his help, inspire Guthlac to turn away from the

evils of the world and take to the *wildeorum wynne* (joys of wild beasts).[224] The most interesting

facet of this usage of the lexeme is that the descriptors are used positively. Instead of the

connotation of a greedy and ravenous Hell mouth, soul, fire, or worm, the eagerness of the birds

for Guthlac's food motivates Guthlac to reject worldly goods and delights for the joys of wild

beasts. This inversion of the lexeme used for Maring's devouring-the-dead theme is radical,

especially in a society that finds the familiar aesthetically pleasing. Such a radical shift can be

---

[221] Maring, *Signs that Sing*, 41.
[222] *Guthlac A/B* are a pair of poems found in the *Exeter Book* that explain the glorious deeds and death of the Mercian saint, Guthlac of Crowland.
[223] *Dictionary of Old English: A to I online*, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. (Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2018), s.v. "grædum."
[224] Muir, ed., *Guthlac A/B*, 740-1.

most obviously explained by the nature of the poem: that is, as a poem detailing the miraculous

events of a saint's life. It would not do for such a hopeless image as the all-consuming Hell

mouth to be associated with the miraculous deeds. Therefore, the poet inverts the negative

connotation of the lexeme by shifting how the two words are used in a half-line, distinctly

marking this example of the theme as different from other instances. In doing so, the poet creates

a parallel between the greedy, eager hunger of the doomed men for the food of the world and the

greed of the birds for the spiritual food of Guthlac. This parallel reinforces, albeit ironically, the

voracious hunger of the birds for goodness by contrasting their greed with the damning hunger of

the *mali*.

Usually signifying infirmity in a practical and spiritual sense,[225] the half-line *deaf ond

dumb* is quite common. There are fifty examples of *deaf* and *dumb* appearing within eight words

of each other, while there are twenty-two occurrences of the *deaf ond dumb* lexeme.[226] Normally

used with a religious connotation, the half-line signifies that a person is unable to understand the

importance of an important tenet of Christianity, and therefore, usually, the significance of the

religion as a whole. The phrase, on occasion, is used concretely to describe someone as

physically deaf and mute. This combination of words, deriving from biblical use,[227] appears most

often in homilies, translations or poetic renditions of the Bible, which is not remarkable. On

occasion, however, a poet uses the image in a non-religious text, such as the poet of Exeter

Riddle 49.[228] Scholars posit many answers for this riddle, such as oven, beehive, falcon cage,

---

[225] *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. "deaf"; "dumb."

[226] Individually, the word *deaf* occurs 123 times and *dumb* is used 236.

[227] Mark 9:25 (ESV): "You *deaf and mute* spirit…"; in Old English: "eala *deafa & dumba* gast"

[228] There is another instance where *dumb* and *deaf* are used in a non-religious text, the Laws of Alfred, cap. 14: "Gif mon sie **dumb** oððe **deaf** geboren, þæt he ne mæge synna onsecggan ne geandettan, bete se fæder his misdæda;" "If a man were born mute or deaf, that he may neither renounce nor confess sins, let the father compensate for his transgressions." This example, however, is still used as a poetic motif in a religious context and so is not relevant to this study.

bookcase, pen and ink, barrow, sacrificial altar, or millpond and sluice.[229] In this instance, *deaf*

and *dumb* are used to modify the answer after the object has already been described as standing

firmly on earth by the word *eardfæst* (earth fast, established in a place).[230] If the image of *deaf*

and *dumb* in this riddle did not have religious connotations, their use could simply characterize

the object as inanimate. The poet, though, must be alluding to the religious image because he

depicts the object as firmly grounded and then immediately describes it as both *deafne* and

dumban. Integrating this phrase into the riddle suggests that the object, by being attached to the

earth, must necessarily be *deaf* and *dumb* to be content with an earthly life rather than a more

spiritual one. Choosing an earthly life over a spiritual one demonstrates the lack of thinking

inherent in the inanimate object, even though the riddler brings it to life. Similarly, the use of the

phrase by the soul in *Soul and Body II* paints the body as physically dead as well as spiritually

dead because he refused to listen or speak the word of God during life and was too content with

his earthly life. Even more striking in the use of *deaf ond dumb* in the *Soul and Body* poems is

that they are the only two instances where the lexeme is used in direct address. When the soul

uses these words about the body directly to the body, the soul's choice demonstrates her own

shortcomings. She herself is *deaf* and *dumb* because she does not realize, or does not care, that

the body is dead and thus, unable to hear her speech. Furthermore, she was *deaf* and *dumb* to the

various homilies and preaching that she should have heard during life, which would have

explained the body and soul's situation after death. Repeatedly she chose, and continues to

choose, to be *deaf* and *dumb* to the solutions available to her.

---

[229] Megan Cavell, "Riddle 49 (or 47)," The Riddle Ages, April 10, 2017, accessed May 20, 2019, https://theriddleages.wordpress.com/2016/02/02/riddle-49-or-47/. This riddle has also been numbered by various editors as 47, but I will refer to it as Riddle 49.

[230] *Bosworth-Toller*, s.v "eardfæst." *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. "eard-fæst": under "b. of things: fixed."

Since Old English poets prefer repetition aesthetically, the double occurrence of a word in related poems across the entire corpus is significant and necessary to explore. Both *flæschord* and *eorþfæt* are words denoting the body and each only occurs twice in the Old English corpus. I discussed associations that exist with the use of *eorþfæt* in chapter two, so the focus here is on *flæschord*. As a kenning that is defined as "flesh-hoard, body, corpus, carnis," it is much more common for poets to use the similar word *flæschom/am* (flesh-home, flesh-dwelling) for designating the body based on the appearances in the corpus.[231] Consequently, the *Soul and Body* poets could have chosen a more common kenning for the body that would have matched the necessary alliterative and syllabic rules. The poets purposefully chose this word, *flæschord*, because it signifies two major points being made. First, the flesh-hoard after death mirrors the gluttonous body during life by being a treasure for the black worms. These worms also include another image, that of the mouth of Hell on earth consuming the body that devoured all wine and food during life. Second, *flæschord* is used in the half-line, "Firenaþ þus þæt flæschord (97),"[232] which is spoken by the anonymous narrator. He states the fact that the soul will revile the body, even though immediately after she does so she must go seek the depths of Hell and not the joys of Heaven. By using *flæschord*, the poets inject irony into the situation because the soul also will be devoured by the Hell mouth while worms consume the body, but she has the audacity to rebuke the body. Once again the poets are demonstrating the soul's delusion that she is blameless for the two entities' combined fate. Likewise, as discussed in chapter two, the poets use the word *eorþfæt* to create a link between the before world and the body, demonstrating both to be frail and common and stuck in the past.

---

[231] *Bosworth-Toller*, s.v. "flæschord," "flæschom," "flæscham." The *Dictionary of Old English* states that *flæschama* occurs 16 times, mainly in poetry, while *flæschord* occurs twice, only in poetry.

[232] "thus [the soul] reviles the flesh-hoard"

The temporal interval marker *þreo hund wintra* (three hundred winters) occurs seven times throughout the Old English corpus, which was mentioned in the discussion of temporal markers in chapter two.[233] I only explore one of these examples outside the appearance in *Soul and Body I* and *II* because the example in *Beowulf* is the most germane to understanding how the phrase functions in the *Soul and Body* poems. In *Beowulf*, the phrase *þreo hund wintra* is used to establish the length of time that the dragon lived peacefully guarding his treasure until a man in pride angered him.[234] Although it is certainly possible that the dragon, after gathering his hoard for years, lived another three hundred years in his treasure room, I argue that the phrase was chosen to represent a long, but vague, period of time. Similar to the phrase "once upon a time," *þreo hund wintra* seems to mark the fact that the dragon ruled over his hoard for a very long time. In *Beowulf*, a text written by a Christian scribe, the religiously significant number three, signifying the Holy Trinity, suggests a purposeful inclusion, or interpolation, of the number to align with Christian symbolism. Furthermore, in an Old English translation of nine Latin texts, the scribe changes the Latin numerals for the years between Noah and Abraham from *CCC XCVII* (397) to *þreo hund wintra* (300 years).[235] In a different Old English translation of the same text, the translator keeps the number as 397, so the previous translator must realize there is a poetic sense to the phrase. Thus, this phrase must have been an idiomatic expression meaning a

---

[233] One example actually uses the word *geara*, but I include it because both *wintra* and *geara* usually are translated as "years."

[234] R.D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, ed., *Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, 4th ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), line 2278: "Swa se ðeodsceaða *þreo hund wintra*/ heold on hrusan hordærna sum,/ eacencræftig, oððæt hyne an abealch mon on mode." Italics mine.

[235] "*Secunda Noe usque ad Abraham fuerunt anni CCC XCVII* ðonne is seo oðer yld fram Noe oð Abraham, þæt is þonne *þreo hund wintra*." From *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, compiled by Antonette diPaolo Healey with John Price Wilkin and Xin Xiang. (Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project 2009). "*Next, there were 397 years all the way from Noah up to Abraham,* then the other age is from Noah to Abraham, that is then 300 years." The first part, which is italicized, is the Latin text while the second part is the Old English translation with the number changed from 397 in Latin to 300 in Old English.

great amount of time.[236] In a similar manner to its use in *Beowulf*, I would argue that the *Soul and Body I* and *II* poets' use of *þreo hund wintra* has an idiomatic meaning that parallels the modern phrase "once upon a time." Using the phrase does not change the story into a fairy tale, but rather it serves as a short hand for suggesting that people or events are quite removed from one another, but not so much so that the older can be considered foreign. There is a sense of temporal distance in the use of the phrase, which would have been understood by the audiences of all three poems.

There are six examples of the phrase *wordum wrixlan* (to exchange words) throughout the Old English corpus.[237] Two of the six appear in *Beowulf* and the third occurs in Riddle 60 (Reed) of the *Exeter Book*.[238] The fourth example occurs in *Vainglory*, and is the only instance where the verb in the phrase is conjugated.[239] Finally, the last two appearances occur in *Soul and Body I* and *II*.[240] Thus, four of the six appearances of the phrase in the poetic corpus are in the *Exeter Book* while the other two are in *Beowulf*. Both the *Exeter Book* and the Nowell Manuscript, the manuscript in which *Beowulf* was preserved, have a likely provenance of southern England and were written around the turn of the eleventh century. I think, therefore, that it is very likely that this phrase was colloquial and had a special relevance to scriptoria in southern England. As such, this phrase may not have the same far-reaching idiomatic significance as *gifre ond grædig*, although there still may be a shared local referential knowledge with the use of *wordum wrixlan*.

---

[236] There are other high numbers that have similar idiomatic meanings and are used in a similar manner, like *sex hund wintra*, which all refer to ages of the earth.

[237] *Wordum* in the specific form occurs 1149 times while the word *word* appears 6555. Meanwhile, the infinitive *wrixlan* occurs six times and there are forty examples of the form *wrixle*.

[238] Riddle 60 has also been designated as Riddle 49 in other scholarly editions. For the purposes of this study, I will only refer to the riddle, whose answer is reed, as Riddle 60.

[239] *Vainglory*, preserved in the *Exeter Book*, is a homiletic text in which the poet uses the contrast between the life of a sinful man and the life of a virtuous man to exhort his audience to live a Christian life.

[240] *Soul and Body I* spells the verb *wrixlian* while *Soul and Body II* spells it as *wrixlan*. Only one other text in the Old English corpus spells the infinitive as *wrixlian* so I prefer to use *wrixlan*.

The first example of *wordum wrixlan* in *Beowulf* is perhaps the most famous example, and is used when Beowulf arrives by ship to the kingdom of Hrothgar.[241] Wulfgar, herald for Hrothgar and chief of the Wendels, welcomes Beowulf to the court of Hrothgar and tells Hrothgar of Beowulf's wish *wordum wrixlan* (to exchange words) with the king.[242] This exchange has a ritual aspect that allows the king to determine the merit of the person seeking an audience through the way in which he presents himself. Though the exchanging of words to prove the worth of a warrior to enter a neighboring kingdom has an important ritual aspect in early English society, there is more to the use of the phrase in this scene.[243] Wulfgar, who uses the phrase *wordum wrixlan* when doing so, presents the distant Beowulf to Hrothgar. Known for his wisdom, Wulfgar, then, advises the king to accept Beowulf into the court by exchanging words with him. Beowulf and his fourteen men have already impressed Hrothgar's level-headed *þegn* (thane) and so the king immediately responds by presenting a story that connects him to Beowulf through kinship ties. He exchanges a story that displays his willingness to accept Beowulf into his court. This example of reciprocity hinges on the use of the word *wrixlan*, which demands a response in either the affirmative or negative. For Wulfgar and Hrothgar, the wisest path would be to exchange words with Beowulf because he is a worthy warrior and has already proven himself. In this instance, the poet's use of the phrase *wordum wrixlan* suggests that the wisest choice for Hrothgar is to participate in this ritual.

In the next occurrence of the phrase *wordum wrixlan* in *Beowulf*, the poet's use refers to the interweaving of three stories. On the trip back from defeating Grendel's mother, the warriors ride on the beach, race their horses, and praise Beowulf for defeating the monster. While this is

---

[241] Fulk, Bjork, and Niles, ed., *Klaeber's Beowulf*, p. 366.

[242] The phrase can also be translated as "have an exchange of words," to be more grammatically correct.

[243] John M. Hill, "Beowulf's Sudden Arrival and Danish Challenges: Nothing Said is Merely A Formality," in *The Narrative Pulse of Beowulf: Arrivals and Departures* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 28-9.

happening, the poet composes a poem about the event. Hrothgar's *scop* (poet) *wordum wrixlan* when he interweaves three stories: those of Sigemund, Heremod, and Beowulf. This structure imitates the "interlace design [of] early Anglo-Saxon art," demonstrating a connection of such techniques in poetry with other pieces of art.[244] Echoing the interlace design in art that is famously insular, the verb *wrixlan* is markedly appropriate because the word can be translated as "interchange."[245] *Bosworth-Toller*, however, defines this occurrence of *wrixlan* as "of words to lend," or more figuratively, "to speak."[246] This definition loses the colorful image of interlace design, though, and does not agree with the structural interlace that the *scop* creates by combining the three stories. Therefore, I prefer the translation "to interchange words" in order to properly understand the image the poet presents of interlace patterns. Both examples of *wordum wrixlan* in *Beowulf* enrich their respective scenes by paralleling the aesthetically pleasing nature of interwoven design in insular art.

While Riddle 60's instance of *wordum wrixlan* appears to agree with *Bosworth-Toller*'s definition of the verb *wrixlan* as a variation of *sprecan* (to speak), there is a connection between this use and that of the first example in *Beowulf*. Many scholars agree the answer to this riddle is most likely a reed pen. The job of the reed pen is to exchange words between a sender and a receiver, just as Wulfgar's job was to exchange words between Beowulf and Hrothgar, although the reed pen's recipient is not always known ahead of time. By using these two words, the riddler capitalizes on the associations to be made with the scene between Wulfgar and Hrothgar to help his audience discover the answer as the reed pen, which sends messages. Moreover, the riddler uses the paradox of silent speech, saying "muðleas sprecan,/ *wordum wrixlan* (9-10)," to point

---

[244] John Leyerle, "The Interlace Structure of *Beowulf*," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (Oct. 1967), 4.
[245] Leyerle, "The Interlace Structure of *Beowulf*," 4.; *Bosworth-Toller*, s.v. "wrixlan."
[246] *Bosworth-Toller*, s.v. "wrixlan," definition IV.

his audience to the answer.[247] For the riddler, exchanged words do not have to be spoken, even though his use of *wordum wrixlan*, and its implicit association with the Wulfgar scene, certainly implies that it is often the case that words are exchanged out loud.

When *wordum wrixlan* appears in *Vainglory*, the associations with the lexeme become negative. The lexeme, the only example with a conjugated verb, exists in line sixteen where the aged counselor speaking to the narrator harangues worldly men who are *wordum wrixlað*, "changing up their words," during their feasts.[248] Using this phrase, the poet directly parallels the previous lexeme *wordhord onwreah* (uncovered the word-hoard) in line three.[249] These phrases are similar because they both alliterate on the *w*, they convey the idea that someone spoke, and they rely on words being described as physical objects. Although very similar, the poet differentiates the two phrases by attaching *wordhord onwreah* to the virtuous and *wordum wrixlan* to the sinful so that the audience may feel the contrast more keenly. The two phrases are very similar, but the ways in which they differ are the most important aspects to the poet and audience. When someone exchanges words with another person in celebration, he participates in a worldly diversion. Meanwhile, when someone uncovers a word-hoard, he is discovering some "revelation of theological truth either about God or about how life ought to be led."[250] Through this contrast, the poet creates negative, worldly associations with the lexeme *wordum wrixlan*, which can also be seen in its use in *Soul and Body I* and *II*.

---

[247] Explained and translated in Nelson's article "The Paradox of Silent Speech in the Exeter Book riddles," 4-5; "mouthless speak/ *exchange words*." Emphasis added.

[248] Muir, ed., Aaron K. Hostetter, tran., "Vainglory," Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry Project (Rutgers University, June 3, 2016), https://anglosaxonpoetry.camden.rutgers.edu/news/page/11/). Translation could also be "exchanging their words."

[249] While the poet parallels the lexeme *wordum wrixlan* with *wordhord onwreah*, he also adeptly capitalizes on how *wordhord* works in phrases. As Tyler explains on p.58 of *Old English Poetics*, "the poet of *Vainglory* has skillfully combined *onwreon* with the *wordhord onleac* formulaic system in a manner which shows him building on the inherited word-hoard but also controlling that diction."

[250] Tyler, *Old English Poetics*, 58.

The final examples of the phrase *wordum wrixlan* appear in *Soul and Body I* and *II*, and are enhanced by understanding how the phrase exists in the other four examples. The narrator uses the lexeme to discuss how the tongue may not exchange words readily with the accursed soul (109-10).[251] This scene hearkens primarily to the scene between Wulfgar and Hrothgar, where the literal ritual consists of an unknown visitor, Beowulf, meeting with the transmitter of the request for a visit, Wulfgar, who advises the recipient, Hrothgar, to accept this visitor. Hrothgar acts wisely in this ritual because he listens to his advisor, Wulfgar, who realizes that Beowulf is worthy. In this worldly ritual, there exists a hierarchy of proving one's worth in order to approach the king and there exists an exchange of information, which is signaled by the lexeme *wordum wrixlan*. The *Soul and Body* poets use this phrase to signal a figurative ritual between the soul and body that attempts to recreate the literal, worldly ritual, but the figurative ritual is disrupted in two major ways. The first major disruption is the soul playing two roles: that of a known visitor, another smaller disruption, and the transmitter of information to the body, the recipient. This reduction from three players to two, with the soul playing two roles, forces the soul to present herself, although already known, to the body. This breaks down the purpose of the ritual; that is, an unknown visitor proves his worth, in each instance through meeting and impressing successively higher status people before being able to approach the king himself. The ritual is only further disrupted by the orthodox belief that in the Church's hierarchal order the soul is higher than the body.

The second major disruption is the tongue, since the tongue would be the part in a living body that did the exchanging of words. Rather than actively choosing to shun the worldly early English ritual, the tongue must be silent, similar to the reed in Riddle 60, because it is torn into ten parts by worms in a dead body. It has no choice in whether it is silent or not. The feeding of

---

[251] "Forþon heo ne mæg horsclice/ *wordum wrixlan* wið þone wergan gæst." Emphasis added.

the worms causes the tongue's further silence, which forces the tongue to unwillingly disrupt the ritual. Representing the greedy, ravenous Hell mouth here on earth, the worms devour the body because the body consumed too much and was too greedy on earth. Furthermore, the tongue is described as not able to exchange words *horsclice* (readily) with the accursed spirit. Adding the adverb implies that there is a desire to exchange words and participate in the introductory ritual, but because the tongue is no longer whole, or in a living body, it is impossible. When the poet then uses the adjective *wergan* to describe the soul, he blatantly states that the soul is not a worthy visitor to participate in the exchanging of words because she disrupts the social order. Therefore, the entities on both sides of the action fail to be worthy of the ritual. In this way, the use of the phrase *wordum wrixlan* suggests that both the tongue, and thus the body, and the soul are to blame for the inability to complete the wise action because neither acted wisely during their life. Conversely, the poem's audience can be wiser than both those entities if each would only live in a way that pleases God by participating fully in rituals, specifically Christian rather than worldly ones.

The *Soul and Body II* poet creates strong images and associations of damnation for both soul and body when they fail to participate in Christian rituals through each of the lexemes and word collocations that he incorporated into the poem, capitalizing on the poetic convention of the aesthetics of familiarity. Through idiomatic associations and slight alterations, each poet adds more meaning to his use of the phrases, which allows other poets to purposefully create deeper and more colorful images for their listeners. The repetition across poems only serves to enhance each image, as this chapter explored. Because of poetic convention and repetition in multiple poems, the *Soul and Body II* poet is able to impart his message of the importance of his listeners to change their ways. This includes depicting a soul-consuming Hell mouth that is manifested in

worms on earth eating the body, the wisdom of following a Christianized ritual so that one may not be deaf and mute, and not allowing one's body to be associated with the fragile past or a hoard of flesh. Instead, each reader has the ability to avoid these fates, and should be quick to make sure these never become reality. In chapter four, I move away from repetition across poems to repetitive dichotomies in the poem: silence and speech, fast and feast; each theme reoccurs in the poem multiple times, and I demonstrate how these dichotomies eventually break down and meet physically, with the mouth as intermediary.

4. The Mouth as Intermediary: Silence and Speech, Fast and Feast

Due to the nature of the subject of *Soul and Body II*, namely the dichotomy between body and soul, the audience of the poem believes "truths" exist in the juxtaposition of the two entities. In this instance, I mean the truth that the body is the physical object in which a person exists and the soul is the entity that oversees the moral and spiritual motivations of the person during life. The issue with these beliefs of truths in the poem is that they quickly break down when one closely examines them. Michelle Hoek rejects the idea that body and soul are concrete and absolute truths for this poem, and instead considers them as cultural concepts in a constant state of flux.[252] Each entity is defined in terms of the other, which creates ambiguity around both. The poet capitalizes on the ambiguity surrounding the terms "body" and "soul" to construct a poem that has more to say the more one studies it. Supposedly, the poem presents a clear message about who is at fault for the combined fate of the body and soul. As the soul states so plainly, the body is completely at fault and there is no explicit refutation by the body. Yet the poet is able to sow seeds of doubt about the culpability resting solely on the body. He does this by tinkering with binary views of opposing subjects, which heightens the ambiguity found in the poem. The two major binaries found in the piece are between silence and speech and fast and feast. At first glance, these pairings appear straightforward: the soul embodies speech while the body displays silence; and the soul fasted spiritually while the body feasted physically during life, which causes the worms to feast on the body after death. In fact, these binaries are some of the most complex and ambiguous aspects of the poem. The poet not only deliberately avoids the restrictions that arise from the nature of binaries,[253] but also breaks them down in order to create a multifaceted

---

[252] Michelle Hoek, "Violence and Ideological Inversion in the Old English *Soul's Address to the Body*," *Exemplaria* 10, no. 2 (1998), 272.

[253] Marie Nelson, "The Paradox of Silent Speech in the Exeter Book Riddles," *Neophilologus* 62, no. 4 (1978), 614.

discussion about who is to blame for the combined fate of body and soul. In some instances, the soul takes on traditional characteristics of the body, thereby blurring the lines between the two entities so that they seem to become one. For example, the soul chides the body for being proud at banquets, but she herself exhibits pride in her speech, as I explore later in this chapter.

Much of the inspiration for this chapter derives from articles written by Marie Nelson, Jordan Zweck, and Michelle Hoek. Hoek's article, "Violence and Ideological Inversion in the Old English *Soul's Address to the Body*," supports how I explain the breaking down of binaries. Hoek states that scholars have traditionally not seen much worth in studying the poem because its meaning and value system appear straightforward.[254] In actuality, she believes that the opposite is true. She argues that the relationship between soul and body, or any concepts "divided by a metaphorical slash like this- soul/body," is problematic.[255] Hoek explains that many questions arise because the two terms are usually discussed in terms of each other, making it more complicated and difficult to separate out discourse on the body from discourse on the soul. Another main argument in her article is that the place where these two concepts meet becomes one of extreme violence. Exploring the violence between soul and body, as well as the other hierarchical dualities that we associate with body and soul, is the aim of Hoek's article.[256] One of the major hierarchical dualities that Hoek discusses is between the interior and exterior. There are many ways to define interior and exterior, but for the purposes of this thesis, I follow what Hoek has outlined. She explains that the boundary between interior and exterior, when referring to the physical human body, "may be said to be formed by the skin" since there can be contact, and therefore violence, between the interior and exterior if the skin breaks.[257] In the

---

[254] Hoek, "Violence," 273.
[255] Hoek, "Violence," 274.
[256] Hoek, "Violence," 274.
[257] Hoek, "Violence," 278-9.

poem, the listener is treated to explicit descriptions of the breakdown between interior and exterior as the body decays and worms eat him. Therefore, when I use the word "interior," I mean everything that is beneath the skin; and when I use the word "exterior," I am referring to everything that is above or outside of the skin. For example, the heart or blood would be considered parts of the interior and the fingernail, hand, or skin would be parts of the exterior.

This delineation between the interior and exterior realms demonstrates how to understand the duality of speech and silence and conveys the complexities present in these metaphorical binaries. Since there are many ways to define words like "interior," "exterior," "speech," and "silence," my discussion of speech and silence in this study relies on the methods found in articles written by Jordan Zweck and Marie Nelson. In Zweck's article "Silence in the Exeter Book Riddles," she expands upon the subject of silence that Nelson discussed in her article, "The Paradox of Silent Speech in the Exeter Book Riddles." Whereas Nelson focuses on how the subjects of different riddles are able to speak through their silence, Zweck concentrates on the provocative silences in the riddles.[258] Nelson argues that through the paradox of silent speech, the poets of the riddles deliberately choose to "avoid certain binary choice requirements" in order to make the audience's decoding of the message more enjoyable.[259] She supports her argument by explaining how speech can be silent in Riddle 85 (Fish and River), Riddle 48 (Chalice), and Riddle 60 (Reed Pen), among others. Nelson analyzes how the themes of silence and speech appear in variation in the riddles. Similarly, Zweck explores how silence, a subject to which she felt Nelson did not give enough attention, appears in the four riddles that "resist being given voice."[260] These four riddles are Riddle 7 (Swan), Riddle 47 (Bookworm), Riddle 49 (Bookcase), and Riddle 65 (Onion). For each of these riddles, Zweck outlines the sonic play that is present in

---

[258] Jordan Zweck, "Silence in the Exeter Book Riddles," *Exemplaria* 28, no. 4 (2016), 319.
[259] Nelson, "Paradox," 614.
[260] Zweck, "Silence," 319.

order to call attention to how "stubborn silences are in fact celebratory."[261] Zweck posits through these examples that silence has a "much more complex set of associations" than previously thought, such as showing "active resistance,"[262] presenting proper behavior, and connecting destruction with new creation. Unlike what most scholars seem to think, silence does not need to be associated with death, or a lack of sound.

For the early English, silence is not the antithesis of sound.[263] It is, instead, the beginning of listening, and can happen while speech occurs. Just because there is an inability to hear the sound does not mean that the sound is not there. When characters are silent, they draw our attention and lead us to think in new ways precisely because the act of silence is deliberate. Being silent is not passive, as has traditionally been thought. Characters can choose to be silent in order to convey emotions like extreme anger or sadness, which express their strength by not revealing their pain at perceived loss, or to hide suffering. This deliberate choice of the characters colors how we can think about early English views of loss and memory.[264] The silence of the body, then, is occurring simultaneously with the speech of the soul, but is just as active as the soul's speech. Old English authors purposefully drew attention to silence; in this instance the poet does so through explicit vocabulary for silence and muteness as well as by implying a lack of sound.[265] The body is explicitly described as *dumb ond deaf* (dumb and deaf, 60), but also is tacitly described as silent with descriptors such as *dust(e)* (dust, 11, 16, and 99), *drug(u)þu dreorga* (bloody dust, 17), *eorþan fylnes* (foulness of the earth, 18), *lames gelicnes* (likeness of clay, 19), *werga(n)* (accursed, 20), and *wyrma(s) gi(e)fl* (food for worms, 22 and 119). Calling the body these various names removes any agency, or personhood, from the entity because each

---

[261] Zweck, "Silence," 319-20.
[262] Zweck, "Silence," 320.
[263] Zweck, "Silence," 321.
[264] Zweck, "Silence," 320.
[265] Zweck, "Silence," 322.

name characterizes the body as an inanimate and silent object. In a way, the body is being "de-personified" by these comparisons that are made by both the anonymous speaker and the soul. Due to such de-personifying comparisons, the body becomes less than human, rendering him silent and missing one of the defining traits of being human: that is, the body having speech. This is only one of the ways that the poet demonstrates the body's silence.

Quite often the loss of human identity occurs when there is an inability to communicate. For instance, the body is literally said to not be able to give any answer to God, "ne mæg him ondsware ænige secgan" (100), and the tongue is not able to exchange any words with the soul, "heo ne mæg horslice/wordum wrixlan" (109-10). The characterization of the body's inability to speak is extremely significant because it differs from how most silent animals, usually in riddles, are characterized.[266] For many characters that are silent, it is a choice made consciously or subconsciously. Usually the verb *swigan* (to be silent) is used in explicit description to signify active silence, rather than any passiveness.[267] The body in the poem is not characterized in this way, but instead the verb *magan* is used with infinitives such as *secgan* or *wrixlan*. Pairing a conjugated auxiliary verb with the negative particle *ne* followed by an infinitive verb of speech emphasizes the idea that being voiceless is not normal, especially for a human.[268] By explaining the body's silence through grammar, the anonymous speaker demonstrates the constraints of the body. The body does not actively choose to stay silent, but is forced to listen and is not allowed to answer. On the one hand, this is explained physically, as the body is dead and his mouth is being torn apart and eaten by worms. On the other hand, the body's silence is explained logically because the soul is too busy speaking. The soul's speech makes up roughly 80 lines of the total 121, which is close to two-thirds of the poem. Meanwhile, the remaining 41 lines of *Soul and*

---

[266] Nelson, "Paradox," 610.
[267] Zweck, "Silence," 322.
[268] Zweck, "Silence," 322.

Body II are the narrator's speech to the audience. Both soul and anonymous speaker fill the poem with their own words and thoughts, leaving the body without room to speak, regardless of whether he wanted or was able to.

According to the Church, both excessive speech and excessive silence were dangerous. Gregory the Great urges a balance between speech and silence in the thirty-eighth chapter of the Alfredian translation of his *Pastoral Care*.[269] In monastic communities, this focus on the right balance between speech and silence existed as well. Specific times of the day were set aside for silence, although the silence was not total and communication was not completely halted.[270] Through hand signals monks could express what they wanted by miming an action related to the desired item with a specific body part.[271] For instance, the Old English translation of the Latin *Monasteriales Indicia*[272] describes how to ask for beer: "Beores tacen is þæt þu gnide þine hand on þa oþre."[273] In a similar way, the wounds on the surface of the body in *Soul and Body II* mimic the gestural language of the monks because the body is communicating his fate while staying silent, similar to how monks communicated their needs during periods of silence. Essentially, the deeds the body performed during life will be written on the flesh of the corpse so that all who may see it will know what his crimes were until Judgment Day.[274] As the body is inflicted with these wounds, the body suffers in silence and in obedience, knowing that he deserves the punishment and that he cannot give any response to the soul's tirade. The body will be judged by his surface wounds on Judgment Day by God, as the poem explicitly states "þonne eallum monnum beoð/ wunde onwrigene, þa þe in worulde ær/ firenfulle menn fyrn geworhton"

---

[269] Zweck, "Silence," 323.
[270] Monks were well acquainted with silence, since it was used commonly in monastic settings and often related to obedience.
[271] Zweck, "Silence," 323.
[272] Cotton Tiberius A.iii; Robert Hasenfratz and Thomas Jambeck, *Reading Old English: A Primer and First Reader*, Revised Edition (Morgantown: West Virginia Univ. Press, 2011), 248.
[273] "The token for beer is that you grind your hand in the other."
[274] Hoek, "Violence," 276-8.

(83-5).[275] As Hoek explains, "people believe the evidence of their own eyes more than a vocal argument,"[276] and so the body remains silent in order to allow true speech, his wounds, to rise to Heaven. The soul, however, throws her words at the body. This, though in different ways, demonstrates that both entities are acting incorrectly, one by speaking too much and one by being too silent.

In the common silence of the monks, ambient noise still occurred, just as in the silence of the body, sound occurs. The worms, Glutton (*Gifer*, 111) and his minions, create signal noise, which can be understood as static on a television screen, when they eat and break down the body into its many parts.[277] Through its own creation, signal noise disrupts the transmission of a message. It is hard to properly characterize signal noise in writing, but it can be heard.[278] The poet uses verbs such as *tohliden, tohleoþode* (103), *toginene, toslitene* (104), *asogene, bicowen* (105), *reafiað* (106), *totogen* (108), to describe the worms as actively splitting, dismembering, opening, tearing asunder, sucking, gnawing, robbing, and tearing the body to shreds. These are not silent actions, but rather are quite loud. Many of these verbs include the prefix "to," which is used to intensify the action of the verb, and which creates a sense of something being entirely "in pieces, apart, asunder."[279] Even when speaking these lines of the poem, the repetition, not bearing alliterative stress, of the *t* is harsher and louder than most other letters. Sonically these lines recreate the noise made by the worms with their munching on the body. As the worms devour the body, they destroy, erase, and silence the body through the physical destruction of the body's mouth. The author very specifically focuses on the breaking down of body parts relating

---

[275] "When to all men are/ revealed wounds those which before in the world/ sinful men committed long ago."
[276] Hoek, "Violence," 284.
[277] Zweck, "Silence," 329.
[278] Zweck, "Silence," 329.
[279] Bruce Mitchell, *On Old English Syntax* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 20; Wiktionary, under prefixes.

to communication, including *heafod*, *honda* (head, hands, 103), *geaflas*, *goman* (jaws, gums, 104), *sweora* (neck, 105), *rib* (ribs, 106), and *tunge* (tongue, 107). The only body part thus treated which is not obviously related to communication is *seonwe* (105), which according to *Bosworth-Toller* can have the meaning of "sinew, nerve, or tendon."[280] According to the *Cambridge English Dictionary*, a sinew is a strong tissue connecting either muscle to bone or bone to bone, just as a tendon attaches muscle to bone. A nerve transmits impulses of sensation.[281] The physical construction of a mouth includes tissues, nerves, membranes, and muscles.[282] Therefore, *seonwe* actually does relate to the fundamental creation of communication. For the rest, the *heafod* contains the *geaflas*, *goman*, and *tunge*, and it is where the physical action of speaking occurs. In a more indirect way the *rib* aid a person to speak by protecting and expanding with the lungs as they take in breath to create sound, which travels through the *sweora* to be let out by the mouth. Using *honda* to communicate refers back to the gestural language of the monks. This physical dissection of the individual body parts by the worms not only signals that the body has become a prisoner to the earth but also displays the destruction of traditional boundaries between the interior and exterior.

A mouth can be seen as a gateway between the interior and exterior of a body since it allows food to enter the body and words to leave it.[283] Since the worms clearly demolish this gateway, the barrier between interior and exterior blurs. As a result, Glutton is able to *geneþeð* (venture, 112) from the grave and *þurhsmyhð* (bore, 114) into the teeth through to the rest of the body. The rest of the worms follow Glutton's example, feasting on the many body parts. It is due to the feasting of the worms that the body is divided into separate segments; yet, the soul blames

---

[280] *Bosworth-Toller*, s.v. "seonu."

[281] *Cambridge English Dictionary* (New Delhi: Pankaj, 1986), s.v. "sinew."

[282] Tim Barclay, "Explore Human Anatomy, Physiology, and Genetics," ed. Stephanie Curreli, MD, Ph.D. Innerbody, accessed August 14, 2019, https://www.innerbody.com/htm/body.html.

[283] Hoek, "Violence," 280.

the body for their current state. The author seems to agree with the soul's verdict by suggesting a parallel between the body's feasting during life with the worms' feasting after death. This is not a remarkable parallel, and is one of the more obvious in the poem. The trope of worms eating a wicked body can be traced back to Latin literature of Late Antiquity in a text from the abbey of Nonantola in Italy. Significantly, the text has two Old English translations, which suggests that this trope entered Old English literature from the Late Antique Nonantolan text.[284] Thus the poet accepts this Late Antique trope and intensifies it by paralleling the feasting of the worms on the body with the feasting of the body in life. This parallelism seems to support the soul's argument. The soul claims that the body during life "wære… wiste wlonc ond wines sæd" (36).[285] Through "firenlustas" (41)[286] the body rejected the Lord while the soul "ofþyrsted wæs/ godes lichoman, gæstes drinces" (37-8).[287] Similar to the body, the worms are "gifre ond grædge" (eager and greedy, 69) for the nourishment the body provides.

Hoek posits a much more specific comparison of the worms' feasting in relation to Christian practice. She parallels Glutton with a priest, the worms with a congregation, and the body with the Eucharist. In this way, the refusal of the body during life to actively participate in the Eucharist celebration means that worms will engage in a perverse version of the Eucharist celebration with the body.[288] This explains why the worms *drincað* (drink, 107) and the division of the tongue becomes *hungrum to hroþor* (hungrily as a comfort, 109). In fact, the worms are performing much better than the body seems to have done with its own Eucharist celebration. The point of celebrating the Eucharist is to ingest food that will connect all members of the

---

[284] Haruko Momma, "A Literary History of Worms in Early Medieval England," in *Textual Reception and Cultural Debate in Medieval English Studies*, eds. Maria José Esteve Ramos and José Ramon Prado-Perez (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018), 179.
[285] "was proud at feast and sated with wine"
[286] "lusts," "desires," or "wantonness"
[287] "was exceedingly thirsty/ for the body of God, for the drink of the spirit."
[288] Hoek, "Violence," 281.

congregation because they agree to believe in the same tenets. It is a way for people to declare similar beliefs through actions and to create a unified community. In order for this community to be built properly, what is ingested must also be accepted and become part of each person. The worms are able to do this, while the body seems to have rejected the food for its soul, the teachings of Christ, which is manifested in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Throughout the poem, the worms are described acting as the body should have during life, albeit with the perverse subject of the body instead of God. Thirsty for blood (*heolfres þurstge*, 107), the worms are comforted by the blood they drink from the body. Not only do the worms take in the blood, but they also accept and become more like the body; that is, they are personified with a named leader, Glutton. Additionally, the worms feast on the body and take all their nourishment from it. This communal feeding creates a unity among the worms, as, except for Glutton, they are known as a singular unit, *moldwyrmas* (earthworms, 67). As the worms feed, they work together as a singular unit directed by their leader Glutton to break down the body. Similar to a military operation, Glutton and his minions destroy the body piece by piece in what can only be described as a logical fashion. In this instance, the worms have more logical thought than the body or soul because the worms follow the example of their leader while the soul and body are both acting illogically. Traditionally, in the hierarchy dictated by God, the soul is the closest being to Heaven with the body, and then animals, being considered baser; however, in the poem the soul thinks better of a *fugel*, *fisc* (bird, fish, 74), or a *neat* (beast, 75) than the body. This can be explained from ideas found in Platonic thought, where the soul is divided into three parts: appetitive, spirited, and logical. While humans have all three and are characterized by having reason, plants and animals lack the logical part, placing them a step below humans.[289]

---

[289] Christopher Shields, "Plato's Divided Soul," in *Plato's 'Republic': A Critical Guide*, ed. Mark L. McPherran (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 151-2.

The body, then, is demoted to a status lower than animals, which is bizarre since the body, traditionally, is seen to be a step above animals due to his ability to speak. While the body is downgraded and de-personified, the worms are upgraded and personified. There is a role reversal between the body and the worms because the worms take their nourishment from the body, slowly becoming more and more like their food source. Comparable to how the worms are depicted as a whole, the body is depicted in pieces. The word *gifl* (22) can even mean "food" or "piece of meat;" this sense highlights the deconstruction of the body.[290]

The worms do not have a solely destructive nature, though. Similar to the bookworm in Exeter Riddle 47, Glutton eats through the body's different parts and reconnects the various deteriorating sections through negative space.[291] Specifically, Glutton "þa toþas þurhsmyhð/ ond þa eagan þurhiteð ufon on þæt heafod/ ond to ætwelan oþrum gerymeð" (114-6).[292] Glutton crawls from the grave into the body's mouth, over the tongue and through the teeth, until he moves from the eyes into the head itself. He creates a route that links the mouth, the eyes, and the head, and one which will be followed by all the worms. These pathways reconnect the body segments that previously are described as torn asunder because of the communal effort of the worms to feed. Therefore, through the communal sociality of the worms the body is rejoined, even as the body's own silence suggests separation from his community. The silence of the body implies a deliberate refusal to engage in communal sociality, in which the worms participate so fully.[293] As a result of this refusal, the reader sees the silence of the body as a separation, because the body rejects community and communication.

---

[290] *Bosworth-Toller*, s.v. "gifl."
[291] Zweck, "Silence," 330.
[292] "bores through the teeth/ and eats through the eyes from above into the head/ and he makes room for the others to feast."
[293] Zweck, "Silence," 326.

Breaking the body into separate segments is one of the distinctive aspects of this poem. Most Old English literature never deals with such specific deconstruction of the body.[294] The anonymous speaker goes into explicit detail about the destruction of each body part, which highlights corporeal anxiety in early medieval England. Much of what is known about early English views on medicine comes from four extant medical texts,[295] in which preserving the body is a major concern.[296] There are examples not only of ways to heal physical ailments, but also, and more significantly, techniques focused on how to protect body parts. For instance, the author of Leechbook III writes, "wið lusum sele him etan gesodenne cawel on neaht nestig gelome he biþ lusum bowered."[297] Notably this protection from lice occurs when the person eats during a period he normally does not. Essentially, the idea is that the person ingests an herb through the mouth, which as a nutrient will fortify and slowly become part of the person. The lice are not deterred due to an external change but rather an internal one. A similar concept is applied in regards to the salvation of the body and soul. If the body during life took in the necessary nutrition guided by the soul, then salvation after death could be achieved. This nourishment includes the body of Christ, Christian teaching, and spiritual drink. As the soul claims, however, her body did not take the necessary steps to protect them by taking in such sustenance.

The early English preoccupation with protection does not rest solely on the head, but is applied to the body generally. Corporeal anxiety is present in much of the Old English corpus, but especially so in medicinal texts. Many of these texts deal with preserving and restoring the

---

[294] Glenn Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety in *Soul and Body II*," *Philological Quarterly* 87, no. 1-2 (2008), 33.
[295] Bald's Leechbook, Leechbook III, Lacnunga, and the Old English Herbarium.
[296] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 34.
[297] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 35: "Against lice: give him boiled colewort to eat during night fasting, frequently; he will be protected from lice." Translation is Davis'.

health of their readers, but a small group also describes preventive measures.[298] All of these

medicinal texts, though, discuss the body in a manner similar to *Soul and Body II* – that is, they

offer extreme detail about the decomposing corpse. This focus on the distinct parts of the

decaying body exposes the early English anxiety "about preserving the state of their bodies in

ways that were purely physical."[299] Another way that people could protect their bodies was

through prayer. There were specific prayers the early English created that focused on asking God

to defend the various parts of their bodies; these prayers containing the itemization of body parts

emphasize the differences between the interior and exterior of the body.

One such example of a prayer is the Hiberno-Latin Lorica of Laidcenn.[300] The Lorica of

Laidcenn is an unusual prayer for protection since the focus shifts from a plea for general divine

protection to specifically showing corporeal anxiety by providing a fleshed out list of body parts

in need of defense. In total 119 separate body parts are listed, from eyes to teeth to gums to neck

to breast, and so on.[301] In an attempt to account for all circumstances, the speaker breaks down

the parts of the body in the prayer, ensuring that each portion of the body is protected against

whatever may happen. The author obviously took painstaking care in making this list because of

the detail provided for each body part named. Furthermore, the creation of such a comprehensive

catalogue blurs the line between that which is interior and that which is exterior. The list itself

does not differentiate between body parts of the interior and exterior, but rather details them

together. The painstaking care taken to create the list and the lack of differentiation between

interior and exterior body parts, in addition to the precautions given in medical texts, suggest

---

[298] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 34.

[299] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 36.

[300] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 36.

[301] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 38.

corporeal anxiety in the early English who created these pieces.[302] Unsurprisingly, the segments

of the body enumerated in *Soul and Body II* are included in the prayer's list, which expresses an

almost society-wide anxiety about the destruction of the body.[303]

Although the early English used prayer and preventive measures like herbs in order to

protect their bodies physically, penance through fasting and prayer were the only ways to save

their bodies from Hell after death.[304] The body in *Soul and Body II* continues these penitential

habits even as worms tear him apart, albeit in a more non-traditional way. Since the body can no

longer speak, he must conduct his prayers for forgiveness in silence just as monks would during

periods of silence. The author calls attention to this silence by explicitly describing the body as

no longer able to speak. Additionally the body is physically broken apart in an imitation of the

spiritually broken state needed for penitential prayer. Fasting for the body seems unavoidable

since he is dead; however, there is more than one way to fast. Physically, the body is fasting in

two fashions. He cannot eat anything since his mouth is destroyed and he also does not need to

eat anything since he no longer lives. Spiritually, the body fasts in this poem because the soul is

no longer within the body, and so cannot guide him, even though the soul did not direct the body

during life.

Although the soul is the only entity to speak in this poem, she repeatedly places the duty

of responding to God's questions upon the body who is described as silent. She does this in

threefold variation: "þonne þu for unc bu ondwyrdan scealt/ on þam miclan dæge" (82-3),[305] "Ac

hwæt wilt þu þær/ on domdæge dryhtne secgan?" (88-9),[306] and "ac hwæt do wit unc?" (93).[307]

---

[302] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 33-49.
[303] Davis, "Corporeal Anxiety," 33.
[304] Hoek, "Violence," 280.
[305] "Then you shall answer on account of both us two/ on the great day"
[306] "But what will you say there/ on Judgment Day before the Lord?"
[307] "But what do we two do for ourselves?"

In her first statement, she uses *ondwyrdan* (answer) to highlight how the body must respond for both entities on Judgment Day, whether communicating with his wounds or his mouth. The next section of the trifold variation becomes a question and more specific when the soul uses *secgan* (say), which implies a need for verbal response. She can be using *secgan* in two ways: sarcastically, because she knows the body cannot speak, or genuinely, because she does not want to answer for crimes she feels she did not commit. The most interesting aspect of this part of the variation is that the body physically cannot speak any longer, which the soul knows because she is seeing and describing the body's destruction. Therefore, the soul is either as *dumb ond deaf* (60) as the body because she cannot understand what she says and sees, or she purposefully ignores the body's inability to speak because she does not want to answer for her own sins, which include not properly strengthening the body during life. The final part of the variation changes the verb to *don* (do, make, or cause). This verb choice the soul makes shows a progression in how active the body is imagined to be: the sequence moves from the body passively answering the Lord, to the activity of the body's mouth giving a response to the Lord, to the body actively in a physical sense doing something for the Lord. In this way the soul creates a progressive call to action for the body, even while the body cannot vocally or physically respond. Interestingly, the soul changes the subject from second person singular to first person dual. By doing this, she finally eliminates the separation grammatically between her and the body. Instead of placing all the blame on the body by using the second person singular, the soul groups herself with the body in the final question by using the first person dual. This could demonstrate that she realizes she is equally blameworthy but still refuses to admit it; or possibly, she uses this personalizing tactic to inspire the body to answer her call to action. By joining herself to the body grammatically, she implies that she and the body are the same,

sharing their sins, and so together they must do something for themselves. Either way, the soul uses this threefold variation to appeal to the body because she wants him to accept full blame, even though the body cannot do much of what she asks of him, except display his wounds, because he is dead, being eaten, and destroyed.

Indeed, the soul is quite the opposite of the body because she speaks too much and blames too fiercely. As Gregory the Great's admonishment in his *Pastoral Care* states, excessive speech and silence should be avoided. He explicitly states that excessive silence leads to pride, but I would argue that excessive speech also leads to pride.[308] Excessive speech indicates that the soul has a high view of her own thoughts, believing that they need to be heard. Similarly, in *Genesis B*,[309] Satan is characterized as being too preoccupied with himself. His fatal flaw is that he thinks too highly of himself and the compound word to describe his selfishness is *ofermod*, "pride." The compound word connects "too much" with "thought" to signify that the person has too much esteem for the thoughts in his mind, and consequently, there is this association between having too high a regard of one's own mind with selfishness. Through metonymy, the meaning of *mod* can extend from "mind" to "courage" or "pride."[310] As such, Soon-Ai Low claims "the word denoting passion is extended to refer to the site of that passion and thereby acquires a meaning different in kind from that whence it was derived."[311] Another example Low uses to demonstrate how a word becomes pejorative is through the change from "self" to "selfishness." The process must move from the self as subject to the interests of self as an object, which creates the pejorative sense of the word. As such, similar to pride consisting of too much consideration

---

[308] Zweck, "Silence," 323.

[309] *Genesis B* is an Old Saxon poem translated and inserted into the Anglo-Saxon poem *Genesis*, otherwise known as *Genesis A*. *Genesis B* describes the fall of Satan and the fall of Man while *Genesis A* details, relatively faithfully, the biblical book of *Genesis*.

[310] Soon-Ai Low, "Pride, Courage, and Anger: The Polysemousness of Old English Mōd," *Verbal Encounters*: *Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Studies for Roberta Frank*, eds. Antonina Harbus and Russell Poole (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 86.

[311] Low, "Pride, Courage, and Anger," 86.

of one's own mind, selfishness is too high regard of self. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines "selfishness" as "excessive regard for one's own advantage or welfare to the exclusion of consideration for others."[312] The soul perfectly embodies selfishness in the poem because of her excessive speech, which reveals her pride and high regard for her own mind.

Due to her pride, the soul feels she has the right to berate the body for his actions since she is supposedly blameless in the actions taken during life. She states, "næfre þu me swa heardra helle wita/ ned gearwode þurh þinra neoda lust" (44-5).[313] Clearly, she asserts that fault lies solely on the body "þurh þinra neoda lust." There is contradiction in her speech, though, which suggests she is lying. While claiming that she strengthened the body during life, she also claims that she was forced to remain silent while the body acted and was guided by lusts. In one line, the soul explains that the body was "gestaþelad þurh me" (42),[314] while in another the body is "þurh flæsc ond þurh firenlustas/ stronge gestyred" (41-2).[315] In line forty-two, the verbs *gestyred* (guided) and *gestaþelad* (strengthened) are placed next to each other to create contrast between the two verbs and the statements each verb completes. This arrangement, more than just being used for alliterative stress, forces the reader to notice the contradiction between the soul's supposed strengthening of the body and the body's being guided by lusts. Both were supposed to be happening at the same time, but the soul claims that the lusts were stronger than her. If that is so, the soul was not very adept at strengthening the body against those desires. She failed in her sole mission on earth, though whether that was due to laziness or weakness is unclear. Earlier in the poem, however, the soul asserts that the body "me… gebunde/ ond

---

[312] *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English,* s.v. "selfishness."
[313] "never did you prepare me for the necessity of the so harsh torments of Hell/ by the lust of your desires."
[314] "strengthened by me"
[315] "by flesh and by sinful lusts/ guided strongly."

gehæftnadest helle witum" (28-9),[316] and the body has "flæsce bifongen" (31) the soul.[317] Furthermore, the soul felt that she is "no… þe of meahte" (30).[318] Not only does the soul feel unable to go from the body, but she feels as if she is a captive or prisoner. Since the soul is in a position of power over the body, she is allowed to speak out against the deeds of her underling. The soul explicitly says that she felt unable to do that or berate the body for his vices while alive. Yet this was the reason that God sent her into the body: "ic wæs gæst on þe from gode sended" (43),[319] to be a moral compass and to speak out when the body erred. In much of western thinking the soul is seen as the more elevated entity and the part of humans closer to the divine, but in this poem the soul does not act in ways that accord with these views. Though she must soar from Hell, or some sort of purgatory, to the body every seven days for 300 years, she is not any closer to Heaven or God than the body rotting in the ground. In fact, she is much more like the body than she wishes to admit, and it can be difficult to distinguish between the two entities.

In fact, the two entities are connected to each other in the poem with the adjective *wearg* (accursed). The soul first uses this term, *werga* (20), at the beginning of her rant against the body. While calling attention to the body, the soul says, "hwæt, wite þu me, werga" (20),[320] and immediately after this statement, the soul uses *hwæt* again. There are three *hwæts* in six lines of poetry, signifying that the soul is angry and needs to be heard. She uses *werga* in the midst of calling the body a variety of derogatory names such as "likeness of earth," "food for worms," and "dust." This litany of de-personifying terms is used by the soul to show not only how angry she is with the body, but also how utterly removed the body is from being human anymore. When *wearg* is used again at the end of the poem, the narrator describes how the body will not

---

[316] "has bound and taken me captive into the tortures of Hell"
[317] "enveloped in flesh"
[318] "not able [to go] from you," addressing the body.
[319] "I was a soul sent into you from God"
[320] "What, you understand me, accursed one."

be able to converse promptly with the *wergan gæst* (accursed soul, 110). The anonymous speaker uses the word for a significantly different purpose than the soul did, that is to connect the body and soul as both accursed because the name purposefully recalls the soul's earlier usage. Additionally, the narrator uses the adjective once more at the end of the poem to describe the body as *werge* (117). This usage comes a mere seven lines after the soul is called *werga* and clearly connects the two entities with the adjective describing their fates as one.

I introduced this chapter by raising the concept of binaries, or metaphorical dichotomies, traditionally used to discuss poems like *Soul and Body II*. Though people perceive the meaning of terms like "soul" and "body'" to be concrete and absolute, this is not the case. Instead, these terms' meanings, and the definitions of other similar binaries like speech and silence, and fast and feast, are malleable, a fact on which Old English poets capitalized. Throughout this chapter, I analyzed the ways in which these terms are used to argue that they have complicated, and often interchangeable, roles in the poem. For instance, I discuss how silence can be passive, but also active, and how a lack of speech can prove someone's pride, or, even more importantly, how excessive speech can show someone to be proud.

Old English poets reveled in the ambiguous and liminal to develop more interesting texts. The *Soul and Body II* poet is no exception to fiddling with binaries and using the ambiguities to his advantage. For instance, his triple use of *wearg* keeps the reader from being able to label only one entity as accursed. Instead, the use of the label "accursed" for body and soul by soul and narrator displays this disconnect between reality and the soul's reality, the latter reality being the one to which the reader has access in the poem. In this one term, "accursed," the audience makes the connection between soul and body, that they deserve one and the same fate. Both are

responsible for their combined fate, no matter how much the soul protests and the body acts as a

silent martyr.

CONCLUSION

Soul and Body II deserves to be recognized as a complete and doctrinally complex poem in its own right. The poet frames the narrative in a way that superficially places fault on the body for the combined doomed fate of body and soul. This is the message that most people receive when perusing the poem because critics have not tended to delve into the structure and rhetoric of the poem. It is assumed that the anonymous speaker and the soul are reliable narrators because those two are the only voices to tell the story. The body, though a major focus of the poem, has no speech and can only defend himself through his wounds, similar to the gestural language of the monks. As a result, readers dismiss much about the body, except that he rots in the ground, because they rely on the story told by soul and speaker. Another message emerges when a reader digs deeper into the construction, rhetorical devices, and syntax of the poem.

Contrary to the protestations of the soul, she is very much to blame for both the soul and body's damnation on Judgment Day. Although the body shares culpability, the soul must bear the brunt of the blame because she was tasked as overseer of the body, her role being established since the days of Augustine of Hippo. Scholars agree that the poem is unorthodox because the body superficially carries the fault, but that conclusion can only come from a lack of investigation into the composition of the poem. The soul's rant against the body reflects neither the anonymous speaker's nor the poet's view on who is at fault for the combined fate, but only the soul's opinion. In crafting his poem, the poet understands the roles for both body and soul according to the orthodox Christian tradition. To believe otherwise is to do a disservice to the poem and the person who crafted it. My thesis is a small attempt to rectify this relatively overlooked religious poem by exploring further the structure and rhetorical devices that the author used to send his message. Even though the poem is not as baffling or mysterious as some other well-researched Old English poems, there is skill apparent in the composition of the poem

as the poet attempts to send the orthodox message that the soul deserves to be blamed more than the body because she was supposed to guide him toward heavenly rewards rather than sinful desires. Thus, through further analysis, it is clear that the text has more to offer to our understanding of how authors of religious poetry can use careful structure and rhetorical devices to present an important message. This message reveals how and why the poet places the blame on the soul.

By shirking her duty, the soul forfeits her ability to blame another entity. She also demonstrates that she has not learned her lesson because the soul's speech directed at the body reveals the pride that she still carries. If she truly wished to repent for her wicked ways, she would accept the blame for dooming herself and the body for which she should have spiritually cared. While she accuses the body of thinking little during life, similarly she was not and still is not thinking enough about the road that led her to this predicament. Instead of searching for forgiveness and looking to be better, the soul obsesses over what she considers is the body's betrayal and weakness. She has not learned her lesson and grown from her mistakes, but has decided to ignore the role she played in her fate. If she were considered one of the *non ualde/mali* souls that Augustine and Julian of Toledo discussed, there is the chance that she could become one of the *ualde* during the interim period. This possibility, however, is removed by the soul's own refusal to accept fault. By being too obsessed with denying any responsibility, she loses the opportunity to improve her fate. Augustine and Julian's theological tenets about the interim period allow souls that have not properly guided their bodies during life to atone for their mistakes between death and Judgment Day. If the soul in *Soul and Body II* moved her focus from her own problems to wanting to please the Lord, she could have improved their doomed fate. Perhaps this means that the poet believes the soul to be one of the *mali*, who has no hope for

redemption and must serve as a warning to the audience members that they should not focus on the riches of earthly goods or their own selves.

The poet understands the tragedy that arises from the soul's inward focus, which has kept her from being able to solve the problem she is bemoaning. In framing the poem so that the audience explicitly hears the soul's position while implicitly understanding that it is the soul's own fault, the poet invites his audience to delve more profoundly into the story. The superficial message that the damnation of both is the sole fault of the body is unorthodox and unsatisfactory, but with a little extra work the listener finds a more orthodox and revealing message. In fact, the poet urges his readers to understand the poem in a way that mirrors how he suggests they live their lives. If his audience decides to live easy and sinful lives, the outcome will be unorthodox and unsatisfactory. Conversely, if his readers work at living orthodox lives, their lives and subsequent afterlives will be satisfactory. An orthodox life, though, is not simply performing the proper actions according to the Church. Instead, each person must have both soul and body live correctly. This means having the intent and proper focus as well as demonstrating the actions of a proper Christian.

In this poem, the author uses many avenues to impress this idea upon his audience. Each compositional aspect that he implements is meant to convince the listeners that they should have the proper intent and demonstrate proper actions in their lives. Whether the poet uses familiar terms and phrases or repeated words and ideas or interval markers, he has one goal with these various methods. If he can reach a few of his audience members and help them to realize that they need to alter how they live, the poet has succeeded. The readers learn this lesson on how to live, which means that the poem has accomplished its didactic goal. The lesson, however, is not

one that the audience is supposed to learn easily. Since the moral requires contemplation, the readers must work to uncover the poet's message, just as they must work to have a good life.

The author codes his message in ways that are familiar to the audience, so that the task is a challenge but not impossible. Capitalizing on the nature of Old English poetry, the poet makes understanding the message a difficult, but possible, mission for his listeners. The "aesthetics of familiarity," although a modern phrase, describes the early English aesthetic preference for repeated and familiar phrases. As a phrase is repeated, it gains new and varied meanings with each use. The poet was aware of this and used certain phrases like *dumb ond deaf* in order to impress on his audience members the danger of deciding not to reevaluate their lives. Furthermore, the author exploited the repetitive nature of Old English poetry by having the soul say one message while repeating words and phrases in the poem that point the audience to a different underlying message. Using rhetorical devices like anaphora, variation, and envelope, the poet urges the audience toward making the connection between the soul and her culpability. Then, by creating a greater consciousness of time in the poem, the author instills a sense of urgency in the listeners for the impending Judgment Day. While using techniques common in homilies, such as focusing on the contrast between the present world and the past or the present and future punishment, he links his message of changing one's ways to the message of homilies that were preached in churches of the "Great Tradition" and the "Little Tradition." This connection brings a sense of orthodoxy to his deeper message that mirrors the messages of the homilists; that is, the listeners must change their ways while living, and while they still have the chance, in order to enter Heaven after death.

Overall, an audience perceives *Soul and Body II* differently than *Soul and Body I* because the focus remains on the "bad" soul and body. With the addition of a "good" soul and body, the

rhetorical devices and aesthetics of familiarity are less powerful in sending the underlying message. The good soul and body lessen the impact of the message that the poet crafts compositionally. Giving another example suggests that the bad soul was correct in placing the full blame on the body since the good soul's body was able to resist temptation. It no longer is an issue of the bad soul's pride and inability to accept fault, but instead the bad body's fault for being too weak. *Soul and Body I* may be a misunderstanding of the original purpose of the dual message, which has led to readers overlooking and misunderstanding the orthodoxy of *Soul and Body II*'s point. *Soul and Body II* is the compositionally better poem, the more effective at disseminating its message, as well as the more orthodox version of the poem, a fact that should no longer be overlooked or underappreciated. The poet creating *Soul and Body II* was neither lax nor uninspired, but rather he put thought and effort into disseminating a message he thought important to share. It is now our turn to appreciate his work and investigate the poem for its underlying meaning, its inherent orthodoxy, and its literary merit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Caesarius of Arles. *Saint Caesarius: Sermons, Volumes I-III (1-238)*. Translated by Sister Mary Madeleine Mueller, O.S.F. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1964.

Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3501.

Julian of Toledo. *Prognosticum Futuri Saeculi*. Translated by Tommaso Stancati. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2010.

Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg, 4th ed. Edited by R.D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Muir, Bernard J. *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: An Edition of Exeter Dean and Chapter MS 3501*. Exeter, UK: University of Exeter Press, 2000.

The Seafarer. Edited by I.L. Gordon. London, UK: Methuen Publishing, 1960.

The Six Ages of the World. In *Neusprachliche Studien, Festgabe Karl Luick zu seinem sechzigsten Geburtstage*. Edited by Max Förster, 183-203. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, G. Braun, 1925.

St. Augustine of Hippo. *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. London, UK: Penguin Books, 1972.

St. Augustine of Hippo. *Enchiridion or Manual to Laurentius concerning Faith, Hope, and Charity*. Edited and translated by Ernest Evans. London, UK: S.P.C.K., 1953.

The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts. Edited by Donald G. Scragg. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1992.

"Vainglory." Translated by Aaron K. Hostetter. Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry Project. Rutgers University, June 3, 2016. Accessed September 15, 2019. https://anglosaxonpoetry.camden.rutgers.edu/news/page/11/.

Secondary Sources

Barclay, Tim. "Explore Human Anatomy, Physiology, and Genetics." Edited by Stephanie Curreli, MD, Ph.D. Innerbody. Accessed August 14, 2019. https://www.innerbody.com/htm/body.html.

Blair, John. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bosworth, Joseph. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*. Edited by Thomas Northcote Toller. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1898.

Burton, Gideon O. "Antithesis." *Silvae Rhetoricae*. Accessed April 8, 2019. http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/A/antithesis.htm.

Carver, Martin O. H. "The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Sutton Hoo: An Interim Report." In *Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. 7, edited by Catherine E. Karkov, 279–315. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1999.

Cataldi, Claudio. "A Literary History of the 'Soul and Body' Theme in Medieval England." PhD diss. University of Bristol, 2018.

Cavell, Megan. "Riddle 49 (or 47)." The Riddle Ages, April 10, 2017. Accessed May 20, 2019. https://theriddleages.wordpress.com/2016/02/02/riddle-49-or-47/.

Clanchy, M. T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*, 3 ed. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Clayton, Mary. "Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England." In *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach and Deborah A. Oosterhouse, 151-198. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Conner, Patrick W. *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth-Century Cultural History*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 1993.

Corrigan, Kevin. *Evagrius and Gregory: Mind, Soul, and Body in the 4th Century*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009.

Cross, J. E. "'The Dry Bones Speak': A Theme in Some Old English Homilies." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56, no. 3 (1957): 434-439.

Davis, Glenn. "Corporeal Anxiety in *Soul and Body II*." *Philological Quarterly* 87, no. 1-2 (2008): 33-50.

Dictionary of Old English: A to I online, edited by Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto, Canada: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2018.

Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus. Compiled by Antonette diPaolo Healey with John Price Wilkin and Xin Xiang. Toronto, Canada: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2009.

Di Sciacca, Claudia. "The 'Ubi Sunt' Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend in Old English Homilies: Sources and Relationships." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105, no. 3 (2006): 365-387.

"The Exeter Book," Exeter Cathedral. Accessed June 17, 2019. https://www.exeter-cathedral.org.uk/history-heritage/cathedral-treasures/exeter-book/.

Ferguson, Mary H. "The Structure of the Soul's Address to the Body in Old English." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 69 (1970): 72-80.

Flood, Alison. "Unesco Lists Exeter Book among 'World's Principal Cultural Artefacts.'" *The Guardian*, June 22, 2016. Accessed April 3, 2019. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/jun/22/unesco-lists-exeter-book-among-worlds-principal-cultural-artefacts.

Forbes, Helen Foxhall. "'*Diuiduntur in Quattuor'*: The Interim and Judgment in Anglo-Saxon England." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 61, no. 2 (2010): 659-684.

Frantzen, Allen J. "The Body in 'Soul and Body I'." *The Chaucer Review*, vol. 17, no. 1 (Summer, 1982): 76-88.

Gameson, Richard. "The Origin of the Exeter Book of Old English Poetry." In *Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. 25, edited by Michael Lapidge, 135-185. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Godden, Malcolm R. "Anglo-Saxons on the Mind." In *Old English Literature: Critical Essays*, edited by M. R. Liuzza, 284-314. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002.

Green, Richard Firth. *Elf Queens and Holy Friars: Fairy Beliefs and the Medieval Church*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Gurevich, A. J. *Categories of Medieval Culture*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.

Hasenfratz, Robert and Thomas Jambeck. *Reading Old English: A Primer and First Reader*, Revised Edition. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2011.

Hill, John M. "Beowulf's Sudden Arrival and Danish Challenges: Nothing Said is Merely A Formality." In *The Narrative Pulse of Beowulf: Arrivals and Departures*, 21-42. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Hill, Joyce. "The Benedictine Reform and Beyond." In *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, edited by Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, 151-169. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2008.

Hoek, Michelle. "Violence and Ideological Inversion in the Old English *Soul's Address to the Body*." *Exemplaria* 10, no. 2 (1998): 271-285.

Honegger, Thomas. "Form and Function: The Beasts of Battle Revisited." *English Studies* 79, no. 4 (1998): 289-298.

Irvine, Susan. "Pre-Benedictine Reform Period." In *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, edited by Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, 135-150. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2008.

Kabir, Ananya Jahanara. *Paradise, Death, and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Karkov, Catherine E. *Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England: Narrative Strategies in the Junius 11 Manuscript*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Leyerle, John. "The Interlace Structure of *Beowulf*." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (Oct. 1967): 1-17.

Liuzza, R. M. "The Sense of Time in Anglo-Saxon England." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library 89.2* (2012/13): 131-153.

Lock, Richard. *Aspects of Time in Medieval Literature*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1985.

Lockett, Leslie. *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Low, Soon-Ai. "Pride, Courage, and Anger: The Polysemousness of Old English Mōd." In *Verbal Encounters: Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Studies for Roberta Frank*, edited by Antonina Harbus and Russell Poole, 77-88. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Maring, Heather. *Signs that Sing: Hybrid Poetics in Old English Verse*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2017.

Mitchell, Bruce. *On Old English Syntax*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Momma, Haruko. "A Literary History of Worms in Early Medieval England." In *Textual Reception and Cultural Debate in Medieval English Studies*, edited by Maria José Esteve Ramos and José Ramon Prado-Perez, 177-189. Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018.

Muir, Bernard J. "Watching the Exeter Book Scribe Copy Old English and Latin Texts." *Manuscripta* 35, no. 1 (1991): 3-22.

Nelson, Marie. "The Paradox of Silent Speech in the Exeter Book Riddles." *Neophilologus* 62, no. 4 (1978): 609-615.

Nelson, Marie. "Time in the Exeter Book Riddles." *Philological Quarterly* 54 (1975): 511-518.

Norberg, Dag. "Latin in Pre-Carolingian Gaul." In *Manual Pratique de Latin Médiéval*. Translated by Rand Johnson. Paris, France: A & J Picard & C., 1980.

Orton, Peter. "Form & Structure of *The Seafarer*." In *Old English Literature: Critical Essays*, edited by R. M. Luizza, 353-380. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002.

Orton, Peter. "'The Seafarer' 58-64a." *Neophilologus* 66, no. 3 (1982): 450-459.

Ramey, Peter. "The Riddle of Beauty: The Aesthetics of *Wrætlic* in Old English Verse." *Critical and Historical Studies in Literature, Medieval through Contemporary* 114, no. 3 (2017): 457-481.

Scragg, Donald G. "The Nature of Old English Verse." In *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, edited by Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge, 55–70. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Semper, Philippa J. "Going Round in Circles? Time and the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*." In *Time and Eternity: The Medieval Discourse*, edited by Gerhard Jaritz and Gerson Moreno-Riaño, 297-308. International Medieval Research, 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.

Shields, Christopher. "Plato's Divided Soul." In *Plato's 'Republic': A Critical Guide*, edited by Mark L. McPherran. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Smith, Julia M. H. *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History 500-1000*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Thompson, Victoria M. *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2012.

Tyler, Elizabeth. *Old English Poetics: The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2006.

Verkerk, Dorothy Hoogland. "Black Servant, Black Demon: Color Ideology in the Ashburnham Pentateuch." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31, no. 1 (2001): 57-77.

Whitaker, William. WORDS. University of Notre Dame, 2006.

Zweck, Jordan. "Silence in the Exeter Book Riddles." *Exemplaria* 28, no. 4 (2016): 319-336.

APPENDIX
SOUL AND BODY II: TRANSLATION

Bernard J. Muir, ed., *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: An Edition of Exeter Dean and Chapter MS 3501*, vol. 2 (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2000).[321]

1. Indeed, all men have need of this,
   that he care for the course of his own soul.
   How grievous it must be when death comes
   and puts asunder the kinship between body and soul,
5. those which were together before.
   It is for a long time
   that the soul receives from God Himself either punishment or glory,
   just as that body earned exactly for them before in the world.
   The soul shall come loud with anxieties
10. to find the body of the soul, always after seven nights,
   for three hundred years,
   the body which she wore long before,
   unless the everlasting Lord,
   Almighty God, may make the world's end before.
15. When the anxious one calls out with cold speech,
   the soul speaks cruelly to the dust,
   "What, you bloody dust! For what have you tortured me,
   foulness of the earth? You are entirely decayed,
20. likeness of clay! You thought little for what
   the condition of your soul would be
   after she was led from the body.
   What! You understand me, accursed one? What, indeed, you food for worms!
   You thought little how long this is hither
   and the Lord Almighty sent forth the soul to you,
25. from His great might through His own hand
   by an angel from the Heavens above,
   and the Lord Almighty then bought for you with the Holy Blood.
   And you have bound me into harsh hunger,
   and you have taken me captive into the tortures of Hell.
30. I was within you, nor am I able to go from you,
   enveloped in flesh, and your sinful lusts
   oppressed me. It seemed to me very often
   that there were thirty thousand years
   until your deathday. What! I awaited our separation
35. with difficulty, now the end is not too good.

[321] Although I use Bernard Muir's edition for this translation, I also worked with the original *Exeter Book* for four days. As such, I translated the text sometimes relying on Muir's edition and other times relying on the original manuscript itself. In the manuscript, the poem has no long marks over vowels. Long marks clarify the word in which they appear, how to translate it, and they appear in editions. This lack of long marks creates confusion over certain words, such as *gode* (6).

You, who were proud at feast and sated with wine,
illustrious you were proud while I was exceedingly thirsty
for the body of God, for the drink of the soul.
40. There then you might consider here in life,
that you were guided strongly by flesh and by sinful lusts
while I should dwell in the world with you,
and you were strengthened by me,
and I was a soul sent into you from God.
You never prepared me for the necessity of such harsh
45. torments of Hell by the lust of your desires.
Now you shall, however, suffer the disgrace of my shames
when on the Great Day the only-begotten one
gathers all the kin of men together.
Now you are not more dear to any of the living ones
than the dark raven; not to man as a mate,
50. neither to mother nor to father, nor to any relatives,
after I alone journeyed out from you
through His own hand from whom I was sent before.
55. Now these red trappings, neither gold nor silver
nor any of your goods, may set you free hence,
but here they shall remain (in the grave where you are) bereft of bones,
slit in the sinews, and your soul shall
often seek them unwillingly.
The soul shall revile the body with words as you did to me.
60. You are dumb and deaf, your joys are nothing.
I, afflicted by sins, must seek you nightly
out of necessity and I shall turn at once from you
at cock-crow when holy men
sing praise songs to the Living God.
65. I shall seek the abodes and the impious dwelling places
that you appointed for me before
and the many earth-worms shall gnaw you,
the black creatures, eager and greedy,
shall slit your sinews. Your luxuries are nothing at all,
70. which you demonstrated to men here on earth.
Therefore, it would be very much better for you,
than if all the riches of earth were for you
unless you had shared them with the Lord Himself,
that at creation you should have become a bird, or a fish in the sea,
75. or a beast, worked for food, of the earth.
It would have been better if you were cattle roaming the field without wisdom,
or the wildest of wild animals in the wildness,
or even if you were the worst of the serpents,
whatever God wanted,
80. than you should have ever become man on earth
or you should ever receive baptism.

Then you shall answer on the Great Day
on account of both us two when wounds are revealed
to all men, those wounds which sinful men
committed long ago before in the world.
85. Then the Lord Himself wants to hear from all men,
from the voice from each mouth, of the deeds
as a recompense for wounds. But what will you say there
90. before the Lord on Judgment Day?
Then there is nothing that you shall not pay,
what is right for each of them singly, for the little joint grown in the limb,
when the Lord is cruel
at Judgment. But what do we two do for ourselves
95. when He has caused us to be born again a second time?
Then we two shall enjoy together such misery
afterwards as you before ordained for us both."
Thus the soul reviles that body, and then it must travel on its way
to seek the depths of Hell and not at all the joys of Heaven.
The dust, afflicted by those deeds, lay there where it was.
100. It may not speak any answer to Him,
nor any refuge be promised there
for the sad soul, as comfort or consolation.
The head is split apart, the hands are dismembered,
the jaws gape, the gums are torn asunder,
105. the sinews are sucked out, the neck is gnawed into pieces.
Fierce worms rob the ribs,
worms thirsty for blood drink the corpse for spoils.
The tongue is torn into ten parts
hungrily as a comfort, therefore the tongue will not be able to
110. exchange words promptly with the accursed soul.
The worm is named Glutton, whose jaws
are sharpers than needles. He ventures also
into the grave first of all.
He tears to pieces the tongue and bores through the teeth
115. and he makes room for the others to feast,
and eats through the eyes from above into the head,
the body as a feast for worms. When the accursed body
is grown cold that he long before
covered over with garments, then he is food for worms
120. from in the earth that may serve for any one
of the prudent-minded as reminders.

SOUL AND BODY II: OLD ENGLISH

1. Huru, ðæs behofaþ   hæleþa æghwylc
   þæt he his sawle sið   sylfa bewitige,
   hu þæt bið deoplic   þonne se dead cymeð,
   asundrað þa sibbe,   þa þe ær somud wæron,
5. lic ond sawl(e).   Long bið siþþan
   þæt se gæst nimeð   æt gode sylfum
   swa wite swa wuldor,   swa him in worulde ær
   efne þæt eorðfæt   ær geworhte.
   Sceal se gæst cuman   gehþum hremig,
10. symle ymb seofon niht   sawle findan
   þone lichoman   þe heo ær longe wæg,
   þreo hund wintra,
   butan ær wyrce   ece dryhten,
   ælmihtig god,   ende worlde.
15. Cleopað þonne swa cearful   caldan reorde,
   spriceð grimlice   gæst to þam duste:
   "Hwæt, drug þu dreorga,   to hwon dreahtest þu me,
   eorþan fylnes   eal forweornast,
   lames gelicnes!   Lyt þu geþohtes
20. to won þinre sawle sið   siþþan wurde,
   siþþan heo of lichoman   læded wære!
   Hwæt, wite þu me, werga!   Hwæt, þu huru wyrma gifl
   lyt geþohtes,   hu þis is long hider,
   ond þe þurh engel   ufan of roderum
25. sawle onsende   þurh his sylfes hond,
   meotud ælmihtig,   of his mægenþrymme,
   ond þe þa gebohte   blode þy halgan,
   ond þu me þy heardan   hungre gebunde
   ond gehæftnadest   helle witum!
30. [Eardode] ic þe in innan.   No ic þe of meahte,
   flæsce bifongen,   ond me firenlustas
   þine geþrungon.   þæt me þuhte ful oft
   þæt wære þritig   þusend wintra
   to þinum deaðdæge.   Hwæt, ic uncres gedales bad
35. earfoðlice.   Nis nu se ende to god.
   Wære þu þe wiste wlonc   ond wines sæd,
   þrymful þunedest,   ond ic ofþyrsted wæs
   godes lichoman,   gæstes drinces.
   þær þu þonne hogode   her on life,
40. þenden ic þe in worulde   wunian sceolde,
   þæt þu wære þurh flæsc   ond þurh firenlustas
   stronge gestyred   ond gestaþelad þurh mec,
   ond ic wæs gæst on þe   from gode sended,
   næfre þu me swa heardra   helle wita

45. ned gearwode   þurh þinra neoda lust.
 Scealt þu nu hwæþre minra gescenta   scome þrowian
 on þam miclan dæge,   þonne monna cynn
 se ancenda   ealle gegædrað.
 Ne eart þu nu þon leofre   nængum lifgendra,
50. menn to gemæccan,   ne medder ne fæder,
 ne nængum gesibbra,   þonne se swearta hrefn,
 siþþan ic ana of þe   ut siþade
 þurh þæs sylfes hond   þe ic ær onsended wæs.
 Ne magon þe nu heonan adon   hyrste þa readan,
55. ne gold ne sylfor   ne þinra goda nan,
 ac her sculon abidan   ban bireafod,
 besliten seonwum,   ond þe þin sawl sceal
 minum unwillan   oft gesecan,
 wemman mid wordum,   swa þu worhtest to me.
60. Eart þu dumb ond deaf,   ne sindan þine dreamas wiht.
 Sceal ic þe nihtes seþeah   nyde gesecan,
 synnum gesargad,   ond eft sona from ðe
 hweorfan on honcred,   þonne halege menn
 gode lifgendum   lofsong doð,
65. secan þa hamas   þe þu me ær scrife,
 ond þa arleasan   eardungstowe,
 ond þe sculon moldwyrmas   monige ceowan,
 seonowum beslitan   swearte wihte,
 gifre ond grædge.   Ne sindon þine geahþe wiht,
70. þa þu her on moldan   monnum eawdest.
 Forþon þe wære selle   swiþe micle
 þonne þe wæran ealle   eorþan spede –
 butan þu hy gedælde   dryhtne sylfum –
 þær þu wurde æt frumsceafte fugel   oþþe fisc on sæ,
75. oððe eorþan neat   ætes tiolode,
 feldgongende   feoh butan snyttro,
 ge on westenne   wildra deora
 þæt grimmeste,   þær swa god wolde,
 ge þeah þu wære wyrmcynna   þæt wyrreste,
80. þonne þu æfre on moldan   mon gewurde,
 oþþe æfre fulwihte   onfon sceolde.
 þonne þu for unc bu   ondwyrdan scealt
 on þam miclan dæge,   þonne eallum monnum beoð
 wunde onwrigene,   þa þe in worulde ær
85. firenfulle menn   fyrn geworhton,
 ðonne wile dryhten sylf   dæda gehyran,
 æt ealra monna gehwam   muþes reorde
 wunde wiþerlean.   Ac hwæt wilt þu þær
 on domdæge   dryhtne secgan?
90. þonne ne bið nænig to þæs lytel lið   on lime geweaxen,

þæt þu ne scyle for æghwylc   anra onsundran
ryht agieldan,   ðonne reþe bið
dryhten æt dome.   Ac hwæt do wit unc,
þonne he unc hafað geedbyrded   oþre siþe?
95. Sculon wit þonne ætsomne   siþþan brucan
swylcra yrmþa,   swa þu unc ær scrife."
Firenaþ þus þæt flæschord,   sceal þonne feran on weg,
secan helle grund,   nales heofondreamas,
dædum gedrefed.   Ligeð dust þær hit wæs,
100. ne mæg him ondsware   ænige secgan,
ne þær edringe   ænge gehatan
gæste geomrum,   geoce oþþe frofre.
Biþ þæt heafod tohliden,   honda tohleoþode,
geaflas toginene,   goman toslitene,
105. seonwe beoð asogene,   sweora bicowen;
rib reafiað   reþe wyrmas,
drincað hloþum hra,   heolfres þurstge.
Bið seo tunge totogen   on tyn healfe
hungrum to hroþor.   Forþon heo ne mæg horsclice
110. wordum wrixlan   wið þone wergan gæst.
Gifer hatte se wyrm,   þam þa geaflas beoð
nædle scearpran.   Se geneþeð to
ærest ealra   on þam eorðscræfe;
he þa tungan totyhð   ond þa toþas þurhsmyhð,
115. ond to ætwelan   oþrum gerymeð,
ond þa eagan þurhiteð   ufon on þæt heafod[322]
wyrmum to wiste,   þonne biþ þæt werge
lic acolad   þæt he longe ær
werede mid wædum.   Bið þonne wyrmes giefl,
120. æt on eorþan.   þæt mæg æghwylcum
men to gemyndum   modsnotterra.

---

[322] In Muir's edition, he switched lines 115 and 116 from the way that they appear in the *Exeter Book*. I have retained here how they appear in the manuscript.