VI

Religious Poetry: Csedmon and His School

English religious poetry begins with a sharpness unusual in the history of literature. An elderly illiterate farmhand of Yorkshire, Caedmon by name, who had never learned how to make verses and would flee for shame when, at entertainments, his turn came to sing, suddenly began to compose poems of a kind hitherto not known in English: religious narrative verse on themes drawn from Holy Writ. The story of Caedmon is told in Bede;[1] it is so familiar that we need not tell it again here. Caedmon served as lay brother and, later, as monk in a monastery at Strenaeshalc (Whitby?) under the abbess Hild; his literary activity thus falls between the years 657 and 680 (Hild's term as abbess). Bede gives a Latin paraphrase of Caedmon's first poem, the so-called *Hymn,* and texts of the poem in a dialect of the Northumbrian English native to the poet have come down to us in MSS of Bede's work. The following translation into modern speech is based on the Moore MS text, printed in A. H. Smith's edition: [2]

Hymn

> Now [we] shall praise the heaven-realm's Keeper,
> God's might and his mood-thought,
> the work of the glory-Father, as he of each wonder,
> the eternal Lord, the beginning ordained.
> He first made to the children of men
> heaven for roof, the holy Creator.
> Then the middle-yard mankind's Keeper,
> the eternal Lord, afterwards created
> for men, the earth, the Ruler almighty.

This poem obviously belongs to the early stage of the classical run-on style (see above, p. 27); every line but the eighth ends with a pause, and every sentence ends with a line. The poet made use of a fully developed system of variation. He adapted the technic of the scops to his own purposes neatly enough: royal epithets like *ruler, lord, peeper* became epithets for God by qualification with *almighty, eternal, mankind's* and *heaven-realm's.* To speak more generally, Csedmon took God for his theme and sounded his praises much as a scop would sound the praises of his royal patron. And just as the scop celebrated the heroic deeds of the prince he served (or of that

---

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* iv. xxiv.
[2] *Three Northumbrian Poems* (1933), pp. 38, 40. But the editor's punctuation might be improved. For the history of the text, see E. V. K. Dobbie, *Columbia Univ. Stud, in English and Comp. Lit.,* No 128 (1937), pp. 10-48.

prince's forefathers), so Caedmon celebrated the glorious works of the prince *he* served: namely, God. As Bede informs us,

he sang about the creation of the world, and the,origin of mankind, and the whole tale of Genesis; about the exodus of Israel from Egypt and entry into the Promised Land; about many other tales of Holy Writ; about the incarnation, passion, resurrection and ascension into heaven of the Lord; about the coming of the Holy Ghost and the work (doctrina) of the apostles. He made many songs, too, about the terror of doomsday to come and the horror of hell-fire but the sweetness of the kingdom of heaven; but also many others about divine benefits and judgments.

Thereby the pious poet provided the body of monks with entertainment suitable for the monastic refectory, though modeled after the worldly entertainment with which the scops had long regaled the body of retainers in the royal beer-hall.[3] Like the scops again, Caedmon could not read or write, and learned by word of mouth the stories he put into verse. But his poems, in virtue of their matter, were deemed highly edifying, and scribes took them down from the first. The poems of Caedmon make a bridge between speakings and writings: they were composed as speakings, but at once became writings too.

We cannot point to any particular source of Caedmon's *Hymn,* other than divine inspiration and Christian tradition.[4] [5] There exists, however, in the Bodleian library at Oxford, a famous MS called Junius 11 and made up of verse obviously based, for the most part, on Holy Writ? This verse was long attributed to Caedmon, although nowadays it is customary to put the poems of the Junius MS under the head "school of Caedmon"—a label which denies their Caedmonian authorship. We take up these and related poems here. The MS as it stands is divided into two books: the first given over to verse dealing with Old Testament story; the second, to verse about Christ and Satan. According to Gollancz (p. xviii),

Junius

MS

The writing of Book 1 belongs to the last quarter of the tenth or the early years of the eleventh century. No long interval divided the writing of Book n from that of the earlier portion.

Book 1 was done by one scribe, who had no hand in the copying of Book 11, carried out by three scribes "less than a generation" [6] later. Many leaves have been lost from Book 1, which therefore has come down to us markedly incomplete; in Book 11 no such losses took place. Book 1 is profusely il-

---

[3] But worldly poems composed by scops were still being sung in refectories long after Caedmon's day, as we learn from Alcuin's letter (see above, p. 53). The performer of such a song might be a scop turned monk, or a scop who was spending the night at a monastery. We do not know to what extent (if at all) court poets, or others who followed the courtly tradition, gave performances for the general public (at markets and like places).

[4] But see Sir Israel Gollancz, facsimile ed. *Ccedmon MS* (Oxford, 1927), pp. lxi-lxii.

[5] Edition of MS: see Krapp-Dobbie I. Editions of individual poems: F. Holthausen, *Die dltere Genesis* (Heidelberg, 1914); B. *J.* Timmer, *The Later Genesis* (Oxford, 194^)≯ F. A. Blackburn, *Exodus and Daniel* (Boston, 1907); M. D. Clubb, *Christ and Satan* (New Haven, 1925). See also Clubb, *MLN,* XLIII (1928). 304-306.

• Clubb, *ed. cit.,* p. xii.

lustrated, though the artists did not finish their work, leaving many pages blank; Book 11 is written solid except for the lower half of two pages. We set the second book aside for the moment. The MS text of the first book is divided into 55 fits. With fit 42 the tale shifts from Genesis to Exodus; with fit 50, from Exodus to Daniel. Modern philologists accordingly divide the book into three independent poems. *Genesis,* the first of these, is by far the longest; it comes to 2936 lines.

Genesis

The poem opens with a few lines in praise of God, lines which lead naturally to a short passage in which is depicted the happy lot of the angels in heaven. Next we are told of the discontent and rebellion of Satan and his crew, God's wrath, the creation of hell to house the rebels, their overthrow and expulsion from heaven, and God's design to make the world as a means of filling with "better people" (95) the space left empty in heaven by the transfer of the wicked angels to their new abode.

The better people were presumably the souls of the blessed, the elect of the seed of Adam (as yet uncreated). The world was to be made as a breeding-place for these. Pope Gregory the Great gave a like interpretation to the story of the fall of the angels, and our poet doubtless got his ideas on the subject, directly or indirectly, from Gregory's writings. With line 103 the story of the world and man begins, a story based on the biblical narrative; more specifically, the poet's source was St. Jerome's Latin translation of the Scriptures, commonly called the Vulgate. This the poet follows faithfully from its beginning to Gen. 22:13; here the poem breaks off. We do not know whether it was left unfinished or once had a continuation now lost.

Genesis A *and* B

Through loss of MS leaves our text has gaps in several places. Lines 235-851 do not belong to the poem at all, but make a great interpolation taken from a later poem on the same subject; this poem was an English version of a Low German (more precisely, an Old Saxon) original. We therefore distinguish between the *Earlier Genesis* or *Genesis A* (lines 1-234 and 852-2930) and the *Later Genesis* or *Genesis B* (lines 235-851). Of the later poem only that part survives which was interpolated into *Genesis A;* of its original, three fragments survive, one of which answers to lines 790-8173 of the interpolation. The beginning of *Genesis B* is lost, but the interpolated verses from it dealt with the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve: Gen. 2:16-17 and 3:1-7. Into this story the German author had inserted an account of the fall of the angels, and our text therefore gives us two versions of this event: the rather short and simple version at the beginning of *Genesis A,* and the long, striking version in *Genesis B.* Of the two Genesis poems, the later has great poetic power; indeed, the speech of Satan to the fallen angels bears comparison with *Paradise Lost* in vigor if not in finish. The poet of *Genesis A* outdid his German fellow in craftsmanship but lacked his genius, and the poem is hardly what one would expect of Caedmon. It is worthy of particular note that Bede's list of Caedmon's poems begins, not with the fall of the Angels, but with the creation of the world. From Bede's list

and discussion one gathers, further, that Caedmon's poems, like those of the scops, were many and short, not few and long. By its shortness the *Hymn,* Caedmon's authorship of which is certain, lends support to this interpretation of Bede's words. Moreover, the *Hymn* belongs to the early, *Genesis A* to the middle stage of the run-on style. We conclude that Caedmon hardly composed the latter poem, though its author may well have been inspired by Caedmon's songs to undertake a metrical para-phrase of Genesis which would differ from Caedmon's work by reproducing the sacred text in detail. Such a reproduction would of necessity make a long poem, and long poems of this kind would win favor among the clerics, at the expense of short poems, because of their completeness—little or nothing said in Holy Writ, however trivial or by the way, was left out. Again, though both short and long poems were composed for didactic entertain-ment in refectory, the long poems presumably followed the pattern tradi-tional for monastic meals: they were meant to be read aloud, not sung to the accompaniment of the harp. Certainly the middle and late stages of the run-on style do not go well with musical performance. Ecclesiastical authority might be expected to favor poems for reading, as against poems that were performed after the secular courtly fashion; the latter, though not worldly in theme, had at least a touch of worldliness in performance. It was the practice of reading aloud, we may add, which made possible the rapid development of the run-on style in Old English poetry, freeing the poet as it did from the limitations imposed by musical performance. And die taste for long poems, aroused by the metrical paraphrasts and nourished by study of the *Åineid,* led to extended treatment of secular themes like those of *Beowulf* and IPaAZere.

With Bradley [7] we think that the author of *Genesis A* was a clerk who, as he wrote, had before him a copy of the Vulgate. But he had other sources besides. Gollancz has noted (p. lvii) that

in the poet's treatment of *Genesis* generally, one can trace the use of com-mentaries and legendary additions, as for example, the story that the raven sent out from the ark perched upon the floating bodies of the dead and so did not return,

and we saw above that the poet began with the fall of the angels, a story which he did not find in Genesis. Moreover, he drew freely from the tra-dition of the scops, not indeed for matter but for stylistic motifs and devices, and phraseology in general. Thus, the battles of Genesis are described after the manner of the scops. We quote the following passage by way of illus-tration :

---

[7] *Collected Papers of Henry Bradley* (Oxford, 1928), p. 248. In *DNB,* vm. 200, Bradley put the matter thus: "a servile paraphrase of the biblical text can only have proceeded from a writer who was able to read his Latin Bible; to a poet who, like Caedmon, had to depend on his recollection of extemporised oral translation, such a performance would have been abso-lutely impossible."

> There was hard play there,
> exchange of deadly spears, great roar of batde,
> loud war clamor. With hands they drew,
> the heroes, from sheaths the ringed swords,
> the strong-edged [swords]. There it was easy to find
> booty for the fighter who had not had
> enough of combat, (lines 1989-95)

Typical here is the description of the victor: the one who wins booty (i.e., the battle) is the one who is not willing to stop fighting. Dogged does it— such was the spirit of the English then, even as now. The earlier *Genesis,* whether by Caedmon or not, is commonly reckoned a product of the Northumbrian school of poets which Caedmon brought into being, and is commonly dated *c.* 700. The later *Genesis* cannot be earlier than its German original, a poem of the ninth century, and cannot be later than the Junius MS. We know nothing of the translator.

Exodus   The second poem of Book 1 is known as *Exodus;* it has no name in the MS. It is 591 lines long by the reckoning of Blackburn, who in his edition rightly followed the pointing of the MS; earlier editors printed the poem in 589 lines.

We divide the text into the following parts: an introductory period on the Mosaic law (1-7); an epitome of the career of Moses (8-29); a sketch of events in Egypt that led up to the departure of the Hebrews (30-55); the march of the Hebrews to the Red Sea (56-134); the Egyptian pursuit and the rearguard set by the terrified Hebrews (135-246); the passage of the Red Sea and the destruction of the Egyptian army (247-515); conclusion (516-591).®

A digressive or episodic passage of more than 80 lines (362-446) on Noah and Abraham follows the description (310-3532) of the order of march of the Hebrew tribes; a short passage (353^361) on the common ancestry of the tribes serves to tie the digression, loosely enough, to the main story. Through loss of MS leaves the text has two serious gaps: one between lines 141 and 142 and one (fit 48) between lines 446 and 447. The poet's theme is not Exodus as a whole but the passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites, or, better, the heroic leadership of Moses in this passage. Noteworthy are lines 208 ft., in which the despair of the fugitives at the approach of the Egyptian host changes to courage when Moses bids them "make up their minds to perform deeds of valor" (218b). Unluckily the battle-scene (fit 48) is lost. The poet gives much space to speech-making by his hero; the speeches are reported now in direct, now in indirect discourse. In general, the poet follows English heroic tradition: Moses answers to a Germanic king and the picked fighters of the Hebrews answer to a Germanic dright. For his story the poet relies chiefly on chapter 14 of Exodus. A few verses elsewhere in Exodus are used too, and some use is made of other books of Moses, notably Genesis. But the author goes much further afield. Modern

---

.[8] The conclusion makes problems too involved for discussion here; see Gollancz, pp, lxxv-lxxix, whose conjectural rearrangement of the lines cannot surmount the obstacle of *stua* 549.

investigators have emphasized his learning and his originality, as reflected in style and in sundry details of the text.[0] The freedom with which he treated his main source finds extreme illustration in lines 447-515, based on a single Bible verse: Exod. 14:28. The half-line *flod blod gewod* "blood filled the flood" (463b) reveals a fondness for striking metrical effects. Now and again the poet's wording seems fanciful or even strained, as when he calls the Hebrews seamen (333) because they were crossing the Red Sea (on foot). But it would be a mistake to reckon the poem precious; [9] [10] it departs somewhat from the classical mean characteristic of most Old English poetry, but remains traditional on the whole. The difficulties which the text makes come chiefly from its faulty transmission, and for this the poet cannot rightly be blamed. Date and authorship are unsolved problems. Gollancz was so impressed by the poet's learned preciosity (as he took it) that he suggested authorship "if not by Aidhelm, then by one of his school, and certainly by a kindred spirit" (p. lxix), but he admitted that the text bore marks of Anglian origin. The scanty evidence points to a Northumbrian clerk of the Age of Bede, when learning was at its height in Old England. Since the poem belongs to the middle stage of the run-on style, it can hardly have been composed earlier than *c.* 700.

The third and last poem of Book 1 is that called *Daniel.* It has no title Daniel in the MS. By Blackburn's count it comes to 764 lines; earlier editors wrongly made two lines of line 224.

Author or scribe divided the text into six fits. The first of these falls into two parts: an introduction, on Hebrew history down to the war with Nebuchadnezzar (i-4ia); and the story of that war, with its consequence, the Babylonian captivity of the Jews, to which is added an account of the three Hebrew children, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, with their training for Nebuchadnezzar's service (41b-103). The second part of the fit is based on the first chapter of Daniel, much of which, however, the poet leaves out; in particular, he fails to mention Da'niel. The next fit likewise falls into two parts: it begins with a condensed paraphrase (104-167) of Daniel 2, in which we learn of Nebuchadnezzar's first dream (about the image) and Daniel's success with it after the Chaldean wise men had failed; then comes a versification of Dan. 3:1-18, the story of the golden image which the king sets up and which the three Hebrew children refuse to worship, though the king threatens to cast them into a fiery furnace (168-223). Through loss of a MS leaf the poet's paraphrase of Dan. 3:2-6 is wanting here. The third fit falls into three parts: first, a paraphrase of Dan. 3:19-27, telling how the king carried out his threat and how an angel came down into the furnace and saved the children (224-278); next, the apocryphal prayer of Azariah (279-332); last, a repetition of the rescue story, the angel's coming being represented

---

[9] Obviously he knew his way about in a monastic library, with its Latin classics, Church fathers, martyrologies, commentaries and miscellanies. In particular, he has been credited with knowledge of Avitus, Sedulius, Jerome, Josephus, Augustine, Bede, and Ealdhelm. The following studies are worth listing: L. L. Schiicking, *Untersuchungen,* etc. (Heidelberg, 1915);
S. Moore, *MP,* ix (1911). 83-108; J. W. Bright, *MLN,* xxvn (1912). 13-19 and 97-103; R. Imclmann, *Porschungen* etc. (Berlin, 1920).

[10] Imelmann, *op. cit.,* pp. 390-408, gives a needful corrective for the extravagances of Schiicking and his followers.

as in answer to Azariah's prayer (333-361). The fourth fit too falls into three parts: it begins with the apocryphal Song of the Three Youths in praise of God (362-408), continues with a paraphrase of Dan. 3:24-29, in which the story of the angel is told a third tirtie (409-485), and ends with a passage of transition to the next fit (486-494). The fifth fit versifies Daniel 4, telling of Nebuchadnezzar's second dream (about the tree) and Daniel's interpretation (495-674). The last fit versifies Daniel 5, on Belshazzar's feast (675-764); through loss of a MS leaf the end of this fit is missing. The poet seems not to have versified the story of Daniel in the Lions' Den (Daniel, 6).

Daniel
A *and* B

The second and third parts of the third fit make an interpolation into our poem. We therefore distinguish *Daniel A* (1-278 and 362-764) and *Daniel B* (279-361). The former poem belongs to the early stage of the run-on style. This may mean that it was composed early, but its author may have lived later and used the older style simply because he preferred it. The poem is no masterpiece, but shows good workmanship; the transitions especially are well done. The old link between fits three and four is lost, replaced by the interpolation. The repetitious treatment of the angel in *Daniel A* makes problems too knotty for this history. The poet does not follow his source slavishly; he leaves much out, and sometimes puts things in, as when he has Nebuchadnezzar wake up from a drunken sleep (116). He expands freely when he likes, and even includes a lyric piece: the Song of the Three Youths. His source here was not the Vulgate, but a canticle the Latin text of which is preserved in the so-called Pes/Ktfftu? *Psalter.*[11] We have no evidence, however, that the poet's English version of the Song once existed free of its setting in *Daniel A*. The Song does not fall into five-line stanzas, as some have maintained. *Daniel A* presumably goes back to early Northumbria (c. 700?).

Azariah

The interpolator took *Daniel B* from a poem which the philologists call *Azariah*[12]. A copy of this poem has come down to us in the Exeter Book. More precisely, the compiler of that MS miscellany included part of a poem on the third chapter of *Daniel,* presumably the part he liked best; certainly he left out the beginning, for his text begins, abruptly enough, with the introduction to the prayer of Azariah. The part preserved in the Exeter Book comes to 191 lines. Of these, lines 28-29 make what is left of a defective passage that answers to *Daniel,* 307-312; the missing words were recorded on the lost part of folio 53.

The poem as we have it consists of the introduction to the prayer of Azariah (1-4), the prayer (5-48), the rescue by the angel (49-673), the introduction to the Song of the Three Youths (676-72), the Song (73-1613), the outcry of the heathen at the miracle (1616-165), the report of the miracle, made to Nebuchadnezzar by his *eorl* (166-1793), and the king's reaction: he went to see the miracle

[11] H. Sweet, *Oldest English Texts* (EETS, 83). pp. 414-415. The canticle was drawn from the Roman Breviary.

[12] Ed. W. Schmidt, *Bonner Beitrage,* x̄xm (1907). 40-48. See also editions of the Exeter Book. The latest of these is Krapp-Dobbie, in.

with his own eyes and then told the youths to come to him, whereupon they left the furnace in triumph (1796-191).

Daniel B is so like *Azariah,* 1-72 that wc cannot speak of two poems but must reckon the two texts mere variants of the same original. The likenesses of *Daniel A* to the corresponding parts of *Azariah* need another explanation. The evidence indicates that the *Azariah* poet had before him, not only the Vulgate text but also a copy of *Daniel A.* This copy he drew upon freely at the beginning of the Song of the Three Youths, but less and less as he proceeded; in making his version of the Song he followed the Canticle text but took the Vulgate text into account as well. He expanded his sources with reflective and devotional matter much more freely than did the *Daniel* poet. We reckon the report of the *eorl* to Nebuchadnezzar a piece of conventional English heroic machinery; it may have been suggested by die speech of the counselor in *Daniel A* (416 ft.), but bears little likeness "o that speech. Azariah belongs to the middle stage of the run-on style. It was composed later than *Daniel A,* and earlier than the time of compilation of the Exeter Book. Its author followed in the tradition set going by Caed-
mon, and may well have been a Northumbrian clerk, but of this we cannot be sure. If he was Northumbrian, his poem can hardly have been composed later than *c.* 875.

Another poem based on Old Testament story is *Judith;* it has come down Judith ' to us in the Nowell codex, BM Cotton Vitellius A xv, 2d MS (late tenth century).[13] The poet had for source the Vulgate text of the apocryphal book of Judith. Unluckily only the last part of the poem survives: 348 lines and 2 half-lines, making a little more than three fits. If we go (as we
must) by the MS numbering, the complete poem made at least 12 fits; the fragment we have begins toward the end of the ninth fit, and versifies Judith 12:10 to 16:1. We cannot tell whether the poet stopped here or composed a thirteenth fit, answering to the canticle of thanksgiving in Judith, 16. If such a fit 13 ever existed, it has been lost.

The tenth fit (15-121) deals with the feast at which Holofernes became drunk and with his death at the hands of Judith. The eleventh fit (122-235) deals with the return of Judith and her maid to Bethulia, bringing the head of Holofernes; the joyous welcome Judith got from the Hebrews; her speech exhorting them to go forth to battle; and their attack upon the Assyrian host. The twelfth fit (236-350) deals with the hesitation of the Assyrians, though under attack, to wake Holo-fernes; their terror and flight when at last one of them ventured into the general's tent and found his headless body; the slaughter the Hebrews made and the booty they took; finally the spoils awarded to Judith and the praise she gave to God.

The poem belongs to the last stage of the run-on style (see above, p. 27). Its author shows himself a master of his medium. Indeed, he has produced *a tour de force.* In spite of the many swollen lines (nearly *a* fifth of the

---

13   This codex, better known as the *Beowulf* MS, is now available in facsimile: *Early English XfSS in Facsimile* XII (Copenhagen, 1963), ed. K. Malone.

whole), the long periods, the frequent variations and descriptive details, we find the tempo swift, the action sharp and straightforward. An elaborate and sophisticated style, made for epic breadth and leisure, is here seized upon and forced to yield effects akin to those of the scops, though without that singing quality which the gleeman's older and simpler art had kept. The heroic tone of *Judith* goes without saying. The battle scenes have rightly been praised, but owe less to the poet than to tradition. The scene of drunken revelry (15 ff.), however, stands unmatched in Old English. The poet has not hesitated to depart from his source when his art is served thereby. His fondness for rime is worthy of note. We take him to have been an Angle (Mercian) of the tenth century, though Saxon authorship is possible.

Christ
and Satan

The second book of the Junius MS is given over to some 733 lines of verse, a poem which Grein aptly called *Christ and Satan;* it has no name in the MS.

The text is divided into 12 fits. The first of these begins with a brief account of Creation (attributed to the Son) and the fall of the angels (1-33); then come a lament by Satan (34-50), a reproachful reply by his crew (51-64), and a homiletic passage (65-74). Satan's second lament makes the second fit (75-125). The third fit gives us two more laments of Satan: the third (126-159) and the fourth (160-189). The fourth fit is a short homily inspired by the fate of the fallen angels (190-224). With the next fit (225-255) Satan begins a fifth lament, which* he finishes in the first part (256-279) of the sixth fit. The rest of this fit (280-315) and the whole of the seventh (316-365) make a kind of homily on the sorrows of hell and the joys of heaven. The eighth fit repeats in résumé the story of the fall of the angels (366-3793) and begins the story of Christ's harrowing of hell (379^442). This story is finished in the ninth fit (443-469), which ends with Christ's speech to the souls he has rescued from hell and taken up to heaven (470-513); in this speech Christ tells of the creation and fall of man, of his resolve to save man, and of his incarnation and earthly life. The tenth fit is devoted to the Resurrection (514-557)* The eleventh fit tells of the Ascension, Pentecost, the fate of Judas, and Christ's kingdom in heaven, to which men too may come (558-597). The twelfth fit goes on to Doomsday (598-643), gives yet another reminder of the joys of the saved (644-664), and adds an account of Christ's temptation in the wilderness (665-710); the fit ends with Satan's return to hell and to the curses of his followers after his failure to tempt Christ (711-733).

This poem makes many problems which cannot be taken up here.[14] Apart from the faulty transmission of the text, we must reckon with a scheme of presentation anything but straightforward. The sequence, chronological in the main, does great violence to chronology on occasions. Thus, the temptation of Christ comes at the end of the poem, and the fall of man is not spoken of until long after the event (410-421 and 481-488). In telling the story of Christ from Creation to Doomsday, the poet plays action down and situation up. His interest lies, not in the narrative but in the punishments and rewards of the life to come, and he pictures these over and over, using

[14]   See the discussions in the editions of Clubb and Gollancz cited above (p. 61).

all the devices at his command, and constantly hammering home the moral: we should follow Christ, not Satan. The laments put in Satan's own mouth make clear in dramatic fashion the folly of choosing such leadership as his. The Satan of this poem is not the defiant and indomitable leader of *Genesis B,* but a leader broken by defeat, who must swallow the curses of his own dright. The fate of Satan and his crew serves as the supreme object-lesson by which mankind may take warning. On the positive side, Christ's rejection of Satan's lordship in the temptation scene serves as the supreme example which all men should follow when faced with the temptations of earthly life. This scene therefore makes a fitting end for the poem, and we cannot accept the view of Gollancz that the poet after finishing his poem tacked the temptation on by way of afterthought. No immediate sources have been found for this remarkable work. The author drew on Christian tradition, as known to him from the Bible and elsewhere. He handled his material with a freedom which suggests that he wrote without having any books before him; he seems to have relied on his memory of the events and to have given rein to his fancy. His verses have power and vividness, but too much should not be made of their originality: the poet combines lyric, dramatic, and epic in typical Old English fashion. We reckon the poem Anglian in origin, and of the ninth century, but we do not set even so loose a date as this with confidence. We agree with all recent authorities that Caedmon did not compose *Christ and Satan.* The clerk who made the poem belonged to Caedmon's school, but learned from another school as well: that of Cynewulf. The work of this school will be considered in the next chapter.