

A Grammar of Elicitation for Old English Homilies

Eugene GREEN
Boston University

Old English homilies, like those of Ælfric and Wulfstan, often serve parenetic purposes in seeking, through exhortation and admonishment, to elicit commitments from auditors, whether lay or clergy. A reading of these homilies also reveals that although many of them encourage righteousness and a strengthened faith, they do not mirror one another in their methods of elicitation. This difference in eliciting responses suggests that homilists had available to them a range of grammatical choices to help induce commitments, especially those associated with what Halliday (1985: 334-9) calls modulation.

In Halliday's view, modulation is integral to a system of modality, a system concerned with interpersonal exchanges that typically involve auditors' contingencies in response to speaker's utterances. In this system, modulation specifically concerns those exchanges that entail the proposals of speakers, who expect some resistance to commitments sought from auditors. So modulation presupposes that since speakers need to accommodate contingency and to overcome resistance, their proposals are likely to exemplify grammatical patterns designed, not to demand, but to win commitment. In all likelihood, a speaker's proposals, say a homilist's urging communicants to reform, will show, on review, a reliance on grammatical patterns that encourage thought and a change of heart. Modulation, then, does not include, in principle, utterances expecting direct yes or no responses, utteran-

ces often framed, say, in the grammar of the imperative. To sum up, the grammar typically appropriate for modulation comprises clauses that encompass the probabilities of modality, particularly as it pertains to the making of proposals.

Halliday's grammar as a model for analysis assumes, as Winograd says (1983: 273), that «the structure of *linguistic behavior potential* [manifests itself] as a property of a speech community, not an individual». This emphasis on community speech, in his view, differs from grammars that examine «language as a *cognitive process*», addressed to «the knowledge structure and processes of the individual language user». Now the grammatical study of Old English homilies plainly benefits from their incontrovertible function as texts designed for speech communities. Yet to adopt Halliday's grammar and specifically his system of modulation is less to endorse it uncritically than to determine how effectively it elucidates the relevant data of the homilies. As the analysis to follow shows, some distinctions that Halliday makes within the system of modality, as in the immediate contrast between imperative utterances and proposals, require adjustment. Moreover his discussion of value requires redesigning to accommodate Old English structures, a topic that the analysis presented here discusses below.

The issue to explore, then, is whether Halliday's framework for modulation provides an effective structure in categorizing the proposals of Old English homilies. That his framework for modulation offers promise is due to its evident suitability to preaching, a genre that urges, rather than orders, compliance with doctrine and faith in God. Further, Halliday outlines two systems intrinsic to the properties of modulation, both also relevant to proposals in homiletic preaching: these are systems of orientation and value. A brief introduction to these systems precedes a review and analysis of Ælfric and Wulfstan's homiletic proposals.

The system of orientation includes the subjective and the objective. A subjective orientation is one that expresses the speaker's opinion; an objective orientation is one attributable to a belief (in homiletic preaching, a belief identified with church doctrine or God). Further, each orientation, subjective and objective, has features of delicacy that Halliday identifies as explicit and implicit. Orientations are explicit if they make plainly manifest through grammatical forms either the source responsible for the view expressed in an utterance or the general appropriateness of a proposal. So the first person singular pronoun for the homilist as subject of his proposal is one example of a subjective orientation made explicit; the use of an impersonal verb, say *gedafenað*, 'it is fitting', for projecting a proposal instances an explicit, objective orientation. Implicit orientations rely on the use of grammatical subjects in the third person. Should such a subject appear with a modal auxiliary like *sceal*, 'ought to', then the orientation is implicit and subjective, for the emphasis conveyed by the verb is the speaker's. Should a third person subject

appear in a proposal that has no overt sign of emphasis or intensity, then the orientation is implicit and objective.

Halliday's system of values, within the framework of modulation, focusses on the degree of commitment –high, median, low– that a speaker wants his auditor to make. For Modern English, he suggests that the form *required* carries high value, *allowed* relatively low, and *supposed* median. The Old English counterparts for these forms are not isomorphic. For example, the verb *biddan* means in some contexts «to require», in others, «to ask»; *wenan* has as one gloss «to expect», but very often «to think»; and *ðafian* varies between «to allow» and «to endure». What an Old English system of values in a framework of modulation is and whether the homilists employ them in proposals require analysis.

As a whole, the properties of modality, insofar as Halliday defines them (his exposition covers «the broad outlines») constitute a framework manifestly useful for appreciating homiletic proposals in Old English. His articulating this framework, centered here on the category of modulation and the related systems of orientation and value, also invites a test of its explicatory power. So the aim of the following analysis is to address four questions: first, do the proposals in Ælfric and Wulfstan's homilies fit effectively in Halliday's framework; secondly, does his framework help to identify systematically similarities and differences in the grammatical properties of the homilists' proposals; third does the study of the homiletic proposals suggest ways of further elaborating the framework. A fourth question has to do with the potential receptivity of Old English audiences to the homilies of Ælfric and Wulfstan. In the presentation of homilies preachers may hope to win their parishioners' commitments, but experience teaches otherwise. As Fiumara says (1990: 43), «One of the first "cognitive" effects of listening suggests that there is not much that can really be seen from one point of view, and that parallel perspectives on the same "object" may actually reveal different worlds...» Her recognition of multiple modes of interpreting the «same "object"» argues that homilists' audiences need hardly respond to proposals with uniform assent. So what the study of the homiletic data with the Hallidayan framework seeks to determine is whether it is robust enough to identify utterances likely to encounter varieties of interpretation. The attention given to auditors' views in the analysis below does not pretend exhaustiveness; it is enough to indicate how the grammatical features of utterances potentially elicit divergent responses.

Since these questions overlap, the method adopted for examining them is to lay out and analyze proposals in accord with the Hallidayan framework. The sequence of presentation therefore begins with the concept of modality, followed by modulation, orientation, and value.

Although modality distinguishes between linguistic constructions demanding firm responses –yes or no, compliance or refusal– and proposals

that recognize contingency, the homilists override the difference. In fact, the practice of Ælfric and Wulfstan illustrates their use of imperatives as part of a proposal:

Imperative as projected in direct speech-

- (1) Ic bidde eow, men ða leofestan, ne forseo ge Godes ðearfan, ðeah ðe hi tallice hwaet gefremman... [I urge you, dearest men, do not despise God's needy, although they perpetrate what is reprehensible...]

(Ælfric: 332)

Imperative as projecting clause in direct speech-

- (2) An la, leofan men, doð swa ic bidde, butan gebelge hlystað hwæt ic secge. [And lo, dear men, do as I urge, without anger listen to what I say].

(Wulfstan: 245)

Both utterances (1) and (2) contain imperative clauses in proposals that also have the verb *bidde*, associated with modality. In (1) the first person pronoun subject is the theme of the projecting clause; in (2) the reverse occurs, and the imperative precedes clause complexes, one containing *bidde*. Despite the occurrence of the imperative in both, neither takes direct compliance for granted, yet (2) more readily than (1) aims for an unconditioned response. What (1) and (2) demonstrate, to begin, is that the imperative is not uniformly a structure that demands a polar response, a firm yes or no. Secondly, when grammatical forms like *ic bidde* appear with the imperative, modality takes precedence. Thirdly, the contrastive structuring of (1) and (2), although both contain an imperative and *ic bidde*, conveys a different sense of expectation. Finally, the expression *doth swa ic bidde* exemplifies a limited pattern (*doth* as a pro-verb) and is scarcely productive.

As a category integral to the structure of modality, modulation admits of considerable variety. What is surprising, moreover, is that in addition to proposals overtly designed to gain commitments from auditors, both Ælfric and Wulfstan have utterances that are ambiguous in intent. The following utterances distinguish between overt and potential proposals:

Overt-

- (3) We sceolon don swa swa we on þisum wordum behatað; þæt is, þæt we beon mildheorte us betwynan... [We ought to do as we promise by these words; that is, that we be charitable to one another.]

(Ælfric: 266)

- (4) Mid þysan mægenan we us sculon werian 7 ðurh Godes fultum deofol oferwinnan 7 his unþeawan fæste wiðstandan. [With these powers we

ought to defend ourselves and overcome the devil through God's help and firmly withstand his sins].

(Wulfstan: 203).

Potential-

- (5) Seðe understandan ne mæg, he hit sceal gelyfan, þæt he hit understandan mæge... [He who is unable to understand, he ought to believe it, that he may understand it...]

(Ælfric: 280)

- (6) Dhyder sculan mannslogan, 7 ðider sculan manswican; ðider sculan æwbrecan 7 ða fulan forlegenan... 7, hrædest to secganne, ealle þa manfullan þe ær yfel worhton 7 noldon geswican ne wið God ðingian.

[Thither shall murderers, and thither shall traitors; thither shall adulterers and the foul fornicators... and, quickly said, all the wicked who have ever don evil and would not cease nor conciliate with God].

(Wulfstan: 163).

Although all four citations contain different forms of **sculan*, those labelled overt are more inclusive. Thus the first person plural pronouns in (3) and (4) are subjects that together with the modal auxiliaries are expressive of proposals for all auditors. So both exemplify overtly the category of modulation. The subjects of (5) and (6), however, need not be inclusive. If an auditor in response to (6) regards himself as one who actually understands, then the utterance does not urge him to believe, but makes a statement about others. If an auditor in response to (6) believes that he has never sinned, then he need not regard it as a warning to reform and seek reconciliation.

Just as the categories of polarity and modality have fuzzy borders, so proposals within the category of modulation and statements can bear some resemblance. Yet the mechanisms are different, for the inclusion of a speech act verb like *ic bidde* in an utterance is enough to affect the usual force of an imperative: one can respond, keeping contingencies in mind. The relation between proposals and statements depends, however, much more directly on the auditor's response. Auditors need not regard utterances that have third person subjects, even if accompanied by a modal auxiliary of obligation like **sculan*, as proposals. What utterances (1) through (6) demonstrate is that Halliday's modality structures have affinities with other systems and that analysis in functional grammar, like that of modulation, uncovers revealing, semiotic patterns.

Contributing to modulation as a category of modality structure are two systems outlined above, those of orientation and value. Orientation, in turn, is itself systemic, classifiable as subjective and objective. Utterances (1) through (4) exemplify in their use of first person pronouns as subjects a sub-

jective orientation. Utterances (5) and (6), for those auditors who respond to them as proposals, also exemplify a subjective orientation. The modal auxiliary is the verbal group of (5), *sceal gelyfen*, is indicative of *Ælfric's* deontic emphasis in eliciting a commitment of belief. *Wulfstan's* (6), too, with its series of clauses reiterating *sculan* has an even more pronounced deontic emphasis. As for objective orientation, utterances (7) through (10) illustrate some of the possibilities:

Impersonal Verb-

- (7) *Pam spedigum gedafenað þæt he spende and dæle; ðam wædlan gedafenað þæt he gebidde for ðane dælere.* [It is befitting for the successful that he spend and distribute; it is befitting for the poor that he pray for the almsgiver].

(*Ælfric*: 256)

- (8) *Pær man sæcð foroft ymbe fela þinga; 7 þær ne gebyrede þæt thær ænig man sace gehyrde.* [There one wrangles much too often about many things; and in that respect it is not fitting that anyone encourage conflict there.]

(*Wulfstan*: 247).

Subjunctive-

- (9) *Do eac swa se cristena man; beo him unsceaðþig and bilewite, and lufige annysse, and broðirrædene betwux cristenum mannum...* [Let the christian man do so likewise; let him be innocent and gently, and let him love unity and fellowship among christian men].

(*Ælfric*: 142).

- (10) *Se the wære leassagol, weorðe se wærsagol.* [He who was false, let him be cautious in speech.]

(*Wulfstan*: 207).

Projectig clauses with such impersonal verbs as *gedafenian* and *gebyrian*, utterances (7) and (8), often introduce a precept understood to have general, objective application. Typically, too, the verbs in the projected clause take the subjunctive mood, as in the instances of *spende*, *dæle*, *gebidde*, and *gehyrde*. Yet many proposals that have the force of a precept, see (9) and (10), do not begin with an impersonal verb. That these utterances, their verbs in the subjunctive mood, could readily have an initial projecting clause with an impersonal verb accounts for their status as also objective in orientation.

As with the contrasts between polarity and modality, between modulation and statement, so, too, with subjective and objective, *Ælfric* and *Wulfstan* have proposals that are hybrid. Consider the following utterances:

- (11) Seo is soð lufu, þæt gehwa his freond lufie on gode, and his feond for gode. [It is true love, that everyone love his friend in goodness and his enemy for the sake of goodness.]

(Ælfric: 528).

- (12) and smeage huru gehwa georne hine sylfne 7 paes na ne gelatige ealles to lange. [And let everyone zealously consider himself and by no means delay altogether too long.]

(Wulfstan: 265).

Utterance (11) presents a double ambiguity, first between modulation and statement, secondly, between objective and subjective orientation. Auditors may regard (11) as a statement on love, the initial clause elaborated by the following clauses, or as a proposal eliciting, through deictic *gehwa* and subjunctive *lufie*, universal obligations. If taken as a proposal, then together deictic *gehwa* and *lufie* as desiderative subjunctive have the attributes of a precept, characteristic of objective orientation. Yet Ælfric's use of *soð* as a qualifier of *lufu* suggests a subjective orientation, one that conveys his attitude toward the love he is both presenting and proposing. Wulfstan's utterance (12), containing the modal adjuncts *huru*, *georne*, and *ealles to lange*, expresses more emphatically than Ælfric's a subjective orientation. Yet (12), like (9) and (10), is readily capable of having appended an introductory clause with an impersonal verb such as *gedafenað*, an indicator of objective orientation. The combining of subjective and objective orientation in (11) and (12) has the effect of a homilist's manifestly investing a proposal with his own endorsement, as he elicits commitments.

That intensifying qualifiers and modal adjuncts contribute to a converging of the subjective and objective in (11) and (12) does not explain their status. In relation to the defining features of modality, modulation, and orientation, these qualifiers and adjuncts are not determinants. What is helpful, however, is Halliday's proposing that the system of subjective and objective orientation has an inherent contrast between the explicit and implicit. Implicit, subjective orientations generally have a modal auxiliary as part of their verbal group—see the potential proposals (5) and (6). Objective orientation also distinguishes between the explicit and implicit. Proposals that have impersonal verbs are explicit—see (7) and (8); they are implicit if, like (9) and (10), their subjects have indefinite reference, and the mood of the verbs is subjunctive. Now although Halliday does not anywhere discuss intensifying qualifiers and modal adjuncts under modality, their functions in the grammar make them germane to the pattern of the implicit and explicit. For modal adjuncts «express the speaker's judgment» and qualifiers may reveal a «speaker's subjective attitude» (Halliday, 1986: 49 and 163). The argument here is that modal adjuncts and intensifying qualifiers, as defined,

are expressive of subjective orientation. They are also implicit because they are elements that are subordinate, typically embedded in nominal and verbal groups. Unlike explicit, first person subjects, modal adjuncts and intensifying qualifiers do not usually function as heads of groups in a clause. In sum, modal adjuncts and intensifying adjectives influence proposals in two ways: they heighten proposals that are subjective; they create implicit, subjective effects in proposals that are objective.

How pervasive modal adjuncts are in homiletic proposals is quickly apparent from their thematic functions in projecting clauses with impersonal verbs:

- (13) *witodlice forði gedafenað þam bearnum þæt hi heora Fæder geefenlæcon.* [Truly, therefore, it is fitting for the children that they imitate their Father.]

(Ælfric: 552).

- (14) *Eala, rihte gedafenað cristenum mannum þæt hi Crist sylfne geefenlæcan gorne...* [Alas, it is rightly fitting for christian men that they earnestly imitate Christ himself.]

(Wulfstan: 202).

The two proposals are exemplars of objective orientation, except for the presence in both of modal adjuncts, implicit indicators of the homilists' subjectivity.

Another form of convergence between the explicit and the implicit occurs in contingent proposals address directly to auditors:

- (15) *Gif ðu þonne þinum cristenum breðer dederest, þonne hæfð he sum þing ongean ðe, and ðu scealt be Godes tæcunge hin gegladian, ær ðu ðine lace geoffrige.* [If you han have injured your christian brother, then he has something against you, and you are obliged to gladden him, according to God's teaching, before you offer your gift.]

(Ælfric: 54).

- (16) *Gyf ðu þonne þæt ne dest ac forsuwast hit 7 nelt folce his þearfe gecyðan, þonne scealt þu ealra þæra sawla on domesdæg gescead agyldan þe þurh þæt losiað, þe hy nabbað þa lare 7 ða mynegunge þe hy beðorfton.* [If you then do not do that but pass over it and will not tell the people of their needs, then you must render an account of all their souls on doomsday, who are to perish in that they do not have the instruction and the admonishments that they needed.]

(Wulfstan: 142-143).

These utterances, unlike (5) and (6), do not exhibit attributes applicable to statements. Although the force of (15) and (16) is plainly that of a proposal, neither in itself identifies those who are to take heed. At least two mechanisms, the initial conditional clause and the concomitant indefinite scope of the pronoun *ðu*, help auditors to decide how to respond to utterances like (15) and (16). An auditor's decision, too, determines whether *ðu* is explicit or implicit. The pronoun is explicit if auditors decide that the homilist is addressing them; it is implicit, if (15) and (16) are no more than warnings in form. So an auditor who hears (15) and (16) as putative warnings is likely to acknowledge their pronoun *ðu*, from his perspective, as implicitly directed at others. In short, explicitness and implicitness in regard to *ðu* is due primarily to the auditor, not to the speaker.

A last variable in the system of modality, as Halliday explicates it, concerns value, the force that a proposal carries, whether, high, median, or low. The challenge in examining this variable to Old English homilies is, first, to determine what semantic or grammatical pattern, if any, corresponds to Halliday's three levels of value. As already noted, the fors that he uses to illustrate a scale of value under modulation —*required, supposed, allowed*— have no direct counterpart in Old English. Instead, what appears workable for a scale of value related to modulation is a pattern that entails the modal auxiliary **sculan*, the subjunctive mood, and the verbal *uton*, «let us». The headings high, median, and low accompany the following examples of utterances with these forms:

High--

- (17) *Ure yfelan gedohtas oððe weorc we sceolan alysan mid fif scyllum; þæt is we sceolon ure yfelnesse behreowsian mid urum fif andgitum, þæt sind gesihþ, and hlyst, and swæc, and stenc, and hrepung. [We ought to redeem our evil thoughts and work with our five senses, that are sight, and hearing, and taste, and smell, and touch.]*

(Ælfric: 138).

- (18) *þas bedoda 7 fele hertoecan we sculan healdan, be þam þe us Cristes bec gelomlice lærað, gif we Gode willað rihtlice hyran, swa swa us þearf is... [These commandments and many others besides we ought to observe, in accord with that which Christ's books repeatedly teach us, if we wish rightly to submit to God, as it is needful for us...]*

(Wulfstan: 201).

Median-

- (19) *gif we hwaer alidon, arisan eft þærrihte, and betan georne þæt ðær to-brocen bið. [If we anywhere slide down, let us rise up again straightway, and earnestly mend what is broken there.]*

(Ælfric: 170).

- (20) Don we nu eac georne swa swa us þearf is, secan we gelome þa cyrican þe we nu lichamlice gesecan magan, 7 geearnian þurh þæt þæt we cuman motan to þære ecan þe us behaten is on heofena rice. [Let us now also do zealously what is needful for us, let us seek out the church frequently which we are able bodily now to seek out, and thereby so merit that we are allowed to come to the eternity which is promised us in the kingdom of heaven.]

(Wulfstan: 249).

Low-

- (21) Mine gebroðra, uton we geoffrian urum Drihtne gold, þæt we andettan þæt he soð Cyning sy, and æghwær rixige. [My brothers, let us offer our Lord gold, in that we acknowledge that he is the true King and rules everywhere.]

(Ælfric: 116).

- (22) Uton creopan to Criste 7 bifigendre heortan cliþian gelome 7 geearnian his mildse. [Let us grovel to Christ and cry repeatedly with hearts astir and merit his compassion.]

(Wulfstan: 265).

That the forms chosen for the scale seem disparate does not count against their appropriateness, for, in fact, they are alike inasmuch as each is inflected in a verbal phrase. Even though **sculan* is a modal auxiliary, the subjunctive mood is possible for nearly all Old English verbs, and *uton* is a single form, their use makes a clause finite. What makes them candidates for a scale of value is their semantic and syntactic properties.

In regard to semantic properties, **sculan*, ranked high, suggests obligation, while the subjunctive mood, ranked as median, emphasizes desire, and *uton*, ranked lowest, does little more than mark the imperative. One way to test whether these semantic properties are scalar is to examine Ælfric and Wulfstan's practices in intensifying them. The utterances listed above, for example, reveal that the homilists intensify the subjunctive mood as in (19) and (20) with such words as *þærrihte*, *gelome*, and *georne*. The clause *swa swa us þearf is* in (18) intensifies the verb *hyran*, inflected as a subjunctive. Although utterances (17) and (18) do not have an instance of **sculan* intensified by an adjunct, examples like the following are easy to find:

- (23) þæt tacen þe se engel ðam hyrdum sæde we sceolon symle on urum gemynde healdan... [The sign that the angel uttered to the shepherds we ought always keep in our remembrance...]

(Ælfric: 36).

The form *uton*, however, does not itself attract intensifiers, although the infinitive forms that follow it often do, as in the example of *clipian* in (22). Even in the utterance *utan don swa us þærƿ is, gelæstan hit georne*, [let us do what is needful for us, perform it earnestly] (Wulfstan: 181), the intensifying clause is an expansion of the pro-verb *don*. If **sculan* and verbs in the subjunctive mood draw intensifiers and help to heighten the force of a proposal, *uton*, without intensifiers, is ranked low on the scale of values.

More flexible than *uton* and **sculan*, the subjunctive mood has syntactic properties of sequence that accord with its median value. As in utterances (19) and (20), this mood occurs in principal and dependent clauses; in (18) it appears in a dependent clause that is an enhancement of a principal clause with a form of **sculan*. Dependent clauses with verbal phrases in the subjunctive mood also after *uton*, as in this proposal:

- (24) Ac uton niman þone earfoðran weg, þæt we her sume hwile swincon, to ðy þæt we ecelice beon butan geswince. [And let us take the more difficult road, so that we labor here for some time, in order that we may be eternally without burdens.]

(Ælfric: 164).

In contrast, neither Ælfric nor Wulfstan have a dependent clause with a finite form of **sculan* following *uton*. Moreover, the occurrence of **sculan* in a clause that enhances a principal clause with a verb inflected for the present, subjunctive mood is indeed infrequent in the homilies. Here is one:

- (25) Wite gehwa eac þæt geset is on cyrclicum þeawum, þæt we sceolon on ðisum dæge beran ure leoht to cyrcan, and lætan hi ðær bletsian... [Let everyone know who is chosen for ecclesiastical observances, that we must bear our light to church on this day and let them there be blessed...]

(Ælfric: 150).

The occurrence of **sculan*, moreover, after a verb in the present subjunctive mood seems restricted to a small group, *witan* among them. The form *uton*, of course, does not appear in a dependent clause to initiate a proposal.

If this scale of values is tenable, it also helps to contrast the homiletic styles of Ælfric and Wulfstan. An approximate count indicates that in his set of homilies Ælfric has more than two hundred proposals containing forms of **sculan*, at least half taking the subject *we*. His preference suggests a reliance on the semantic force of **sculan*, highest in the scale of values, joined to a subjective orientation, to elicit commitments. Wulfstan has fewer than one hundred proposals containing forms of **sculan*, fifteen of which have *we* as subject. Wulfstan's preference, instead, is for the subjunctive mood in the

principal clauses of his proposals, nearly three hundred of them as opposed to Ælfric's twenty. Median in the scale of values, the subjunctive mood lends itself to an implicit, objective orientation yet frequently appears with modal adjuncts as intensifiers. The effect that Wulfstan achieves, then, is that his proposals assume the quality of orthodox teachings, sanctioned by doctrine and God, which he as homilist embraces. Further, Wulfstan has more than a hundred instances of proposals, particularly at the close of homilies, that contain *uton*, twice as many as those found in Ælfric's exhortations. Since *uton* has the sense of «let us», inclusive in scope, it suggests a subjective orientation. A chi-square analysis of these differences in usage results in a significant finding: $p \geq .001$ ($X^2=261.61$, $df=2$). This combination, then, of many proposals instancing the subjunctive mood and a large number beginning with *uton* provides Wulfstan with extraordinary rhetorical power. For in the body of his homilies he zealously expresses what seems to be doctrinal exhortation, while in closing he invites subjects responses in agreement with his. Summed up, Ælfric aims to elicit from his auditors a view of God's world complementary to his, whereas Wulfstan regards himself as a proselytizer.

This contrast in the rhetorical force of Ælfric and Wulfstan's homilies, as implied by the significant difference in their use of **sculon*, the subjunctive, and *uton*, comports with traditional criticism. Thus Frantzen's study (1983: 157-8) of the homilies as penitential texts finds «[p]ublic penance . . . often discussed in Wulfstan's homilies, but not in Ælfric's where the greatest concern is with the interior aspects of repentance». Wulfstan urges his parishioners to engage in public rituals of penance, whereas Ælfric's approach is «extensive, allusive, and compelling», encouraging auditors to think through his homilies before embracing them. Thus Frantzen's attention to penance as a theme and the values identified here in Ælfric and Wulfstan's use of verbal phrases have a reinforcing correspondence.

That the two homilists use a system of modulation extensively also makes the study of their texts germane to the framework that Halliday's grammar outlines. As a test of that framework, the results of this analysis support the structure developed as applicable to Old English. What is more, the analysis provided offers two issues for further consideration. One issue concerns the relation of the modality structure as a whole to other systems within the grammar, in particular the system of polarity. A second issue, already recognized by Halliday as an instance of grammatical metaphor, centers on the relation of proposals and statements. Both issues, furthermore, embrace aspects of intention. For if all the examples in this study illustrate an intention to elicit commitments, there is also some awareness of resistance on the part of auditors. so the use of third person subjects as in utterances (5) and (6) enables auditors to hear an admonishment without supposing that they stand exposed. What such utterances do is to identify a space for

reflection, so that auditors can determine the relevance of an admonishment and decide for themselves how to respond. In effect, matters of intention, both on the part of speakers and auditors, affect the structures of modality and of grammar as a whole. Such a perspective, the bonds between semiotic intention and linguistic structure, centrally commands the undertakings of functional grammar.

REFERENCES

- Ælfric (1983). *Sermones Catholici*. Volume 1. Ed. Benjamin Thorpe. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Fiumara, Gemma Corradi. (1990). *The Other Side of Language: A Philosophy of Listening*. London: Routledge.
- Frantzen, Allen J. (1983). *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Mitchell, Bruce (1987). *Old English Syntax*. 2 Volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Winograd, Terry (1983). *Language as a Cognitive Process*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Wulfstan (1957). *The Homilies of Wulfstan*. Ed. Dorothy Bethurum Oxford: Clarendon Press.