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1. Introductory chapter

1.1 Consideremus sacri fontem baptismatis.¹

Those words by Ratramnus of Corbi are indeed a fitting opening for a discussion of ‘the holy fount of baptism.’ The present discussion will not be about the nature of the sacrament primarily, as Ratramnus’, but will have a rather more linguistic character. At the time of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons during the 7th and 8th centuries, many new faithful were baptized. The nature of baptism as the initiatory sacrament made it one of the first elements of Christianity converts would come into contact with. As baptism was a completely new phenomenon to the Anglo-Saxons, the OE language had not previously possessed words for it.

The new words that eventually filled this lacuna shall be the focus of the present project. The objective of this study will be to discover and describe the origins, changes in contextual meaning and use (frequencies) of these words, as well as examining their interrelationship within the diachronic lexical field of baptism in OE. This means that after having established the (diachronically articulated) structure of individual word-fields, it will become possible to answer questions such as: did fulwian and cristnian in fact designate the two distinct components of the baptismal liturgy, and which parts of the liturgy did they pertain to?² The diachronic perspective on the lexical and semantic developments of the individual lexemes will be supplemented with extra linguistic evidence where relevant. Historical and archeological sources will provide the backdrop for this study. Even more importantly, liturgical and theological information will be used to interpret correctly the contextual meaning of individual words. Thus, it will become possible to draw conclusions about the functioning of these words, as well as the nature of baptismal practice in Anglo-Saxon England.

The OE vocabulary of baptism has not received more than a passing interest in previous scholarship. The relevant lexemes, fulwian, dyppan, and cristnian, were identified, and questions were raised about their origin and meaning, but not answered.³ As Christopher Jones states in the conclusion of his examination of a small part baptismal vocabulary: “A

¹ Jan Nicolaas Bakhuizen van den Brink, De Corpore et Sanguini Domini: Texte original et Notice Bibliographique (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1974), 47.
² Different arguments were put forward, for a brief overview see: Helmut Gneuss, Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglishen (Berlin: Schmidt, 1955), 64.
³ Ibid.
thorough study of Old English terminology in all periods would be most welcome." Moveover, the exceptional status of OE, in comparison with the other Gmc languages, warrants attention. OE fulwian, and its derived noun fulwiht, are unique to OE; no cognates exist in the other Gmc languages of the time. What may have prompted the formation of this verb?

To locate and subsequently examine the relevant lexemes in context the Dictionary of Old English Corpus has been used. Occasionally, this material has been supplemented with attestations found in editions of sources not included in this dictionary. The method of lexical field theory has been adopted to gain answers to the question raised above. The introduction to the method (§ 1.2-3) will be followed by a discussion of medieval theologies of baptism and Anlgo-Saxon baptismal practice (§ 1.4-5). Then the following lexemes will be analyzed: fulwian (§ 2.1), cristnian (§ 2.2), and dyppan (§ 2.3). Before moving on to the conclusions based on this analysis in § 3, the OE vocabulary for baptismal water (§ 2.4) and the lexemes *gefuntan and apwéan will receive attention (§ 2.5).

1.2 Lexical field theory and lexical borrowing

As this essay aims to examine the semantic field of baptism in OE, a description of lexical semantics and structuralist semantics is in place here. Lexical semantics has been characterized by several approaches through time. From about 1850 to 1930 historical-philological semantics dominated the field. This type of research is firmly based in the tradition of comparative philology, and therefore much concerned with the history of words and their meaning. Etymology (finding out cognates, and the historical development of words) was deemed paramount to discovering their meaning. In addition, historical-philological semantics aims at reconstructing the cultural background of the primarily dead languages it is concerned with. The discipline entertains a psychological conception of meaning, which means that the historical lexicographer tries to recover and understand the original worldview of a text. This method, however, has an ‘extrinsic’ character, as the

5 The name ‘historical-philological semantics’ was given by Dirk Geeraerts, Theories of Lexical Semantics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010).
6 Also see Victor L. Strite, Old English Semantic-Field Studies (New York: Lang, 1989), 14-15.
7 Geeraerts, Theories of Lexical Semantics, 10.
context of the words receives little attention in comparison with etymologies and historical information external to the source-text(s).\textsuperscript{8}

The dawn of structuralist semantics was marked by Leo Weisgerber in 1927, who contested the methods of lexical semantics in his day in his article “Die Bedeutunglehre: Ein Irrweg der Sprachwissenschaft?”. Instead of supporting the more prevalent historical-psychological conception of meaning, Weisgerber proposes the idea that language is a symbolic system, as the starting-point of any search for meaning.\textsuperscript{9} The term \textit{Bedeutungsfeld} had been introduced by G. Ipsen in 1924, to describe a group words with a related meaning.\textsuperscript{10} The first widely influential publication defending and applying structuralist semantics is Jost Trier’s \textit{Der Deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes: Die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes}. Here Trier sets out the theoretical framework which is now known as lexical (or semantic) field theory. It is based on the theoretical basis provided by Weisgerber and the ideas of structuralist linguistics introduced introduced by Saussure. The basic assumption of Trier’s theory is that every language is a system of signs that creates a self-sufficient picture of reality. Meaning does not exist independently in this system; the meaning of each linguistic component is derived from its function and relative position to other items. Words acquire meaning in relation to their conceptual cognates in a lexical field, as well as neighboring fields.\textsuperscript{11} Trier uses the image of a mosaic of signs in which the position of each stone determines its meaning.\textsuperscript{12} All this is best summed up by Dirk Geeraerts: “A lexical field, then, is a set of semantically related lexical items whose meanings are mutually interdependent and which together provide conceptual structure for a certain domain of reality.”\textsuperscript{13}

Although the idea that meaning is generated by relative positions in the system of language was highly innovative, Trier’s method still very much relied on etymology and was mostly aimed at tracing diachronic developments. In reaction to this, scholars like Faiss and Lounsbury emphasized the importance of context for determining meaning in the late 1960’s. Not only the a word’s conceptual cognates produce its meaning, but also the situational context of each occurrence of the word. This notion was followed by almost all scholars in the

\textsuperscript{8} Strite, \textit{Old English Semantic-Field Studies}, 18.
\textsuperscript{9} Geeraerts, \textit{Theories of Lexical Semantics}, 47.
\textsuperscript{10} The concept of the field did not play a major role in Ipsen’s work, however. See Strite, \textit{Old English Semantic-Field Studies}, 18, and Geeraerts, \textit{Theories of Lexical Semantics}, 54.
\textsuperscript{12} Geeraerts, \textit{Theories of Lexical Semantics}, 54.
\textsuperscript{13} Geeraerts, \textit{Theories of Lexical Semantics}, 52.
field, which resulted in a common method of locating all the occurrences of a word and examining the contexts closely.\textsuperscript{14}

Structuralist semantics does not only manifest itself in the shape of lexical field theory alone: it was supplemented by componential analysis and relational analysis. Componential analysis was practiced on the continent in the 1960s and is represented by German and French scholars such as Coseriu, Pottier, and Greimas. It aims at describing the internal structure the lexical field in more detail.\textsuperscript{15} Coseriu felt that the lexical field of Trier and Weisgerber was too much founded on intuition; he therefore sets out to identify and define the oppositions that structure these fields. To do so, Coseriu introduces the concept of \textit{archi-lexeme}, \textit{lexeme}, and \textit{seme}. The archi-lexeme encompasses the entire lexical field, and may or may not be realized in the shape of a lexical item in a particular language. Lexemes are the units that function within the lexical field. Semes are the content-differentiating features that can be ascribed to lexemes. An example given by Pottier illustrates the structuring of the lexical field according to this theory: the archi-lexeme \textit{siège} heads the field that contains the lexemes \textit{chaise}, \textit{fauteuil}, \textit{tabouret}, and \textit{canapé}. The content of \textit{fauteuil} can then be analyzed by the semes ‘avec bras’, ‘sur pied’, ‘pour 1 personne’. A further innovation is the clear demarcation between conceptual and lexical fields, whereas in the work of Trier \textit{Begriffsfeld} and \textit{Wortfeld} are not clearly differentiated yet. In Coseriu’s view lexical fields are always part of a conceptual field, but not all concepts can be realized by one single lexeme; in that case longer phrases containing, for example, adjectives can be employed.\textsuperscript{16}

Relational semantics, like componential semantics gained impetus in the 1960’s. Both disciplines were incorporated into mainstream theoretical linguistics via generative linguistics. Relational semantics aims at describing the internal structure of semantic fields even further than its componential counterpart, but uses a highly restricted theoretical vocabulary for this. The British scholar John Lyons was the first to gain a wide attention for relational semantics.\textsuperscript{17} In Lyons’ view, it is essential that the relations within the lexical field are described according to a theory of meaning grounded in philosophical theory.

\textsuperscript{15} Geeraerts, \textit{Theories of Lexical Semantics}, 52-3.
\textsuperscript{17} Geeraerts, \textit{Theories of Lexical Semantics}, 52-3.
‘meaning-relations’ Lyons recognizes are incompatibility, antonymy, hyponymy, converse terms, consequence, and synonymy.18

Building on the foundations of structuralist semantics, generativist, neo-structuralist and cognitive semantics subsequently came into practice and added a wealth of new semantic theory to what was already there.19 For the scope of the present paper, however, it does not seem necessary go into the particulars of the multitude of theoretical frameworks that were recently put forward.

Here, it is sufficient to note that the lexical field theory as introduced by Trier will be applied to the field of baptism in OE, with reference to the componential and relational modification to that theory by Coresiu and Lyons, where appropriate. Somewhat unconventionally, this study will focus on verbs rather than nouns. The modern English verb ‘to baptize’ can in this case be used to represent the archi-lexeme of this field because OE offers no archi-lexeme in this case. The lexemes that are active within this field are fulwian, cristnian, dyppan, dépan, apwéan, and *gefuntan.

The choice to work with the verbs, rather than nouns, is motivated by the fact that there are more OE verbs for ‘to baptize’, than there are nouns for ‘baptism’. A lexical field study of the nouns in the lexical field for ‘baptism’ would have to focus on one lexeme almost exclusively: fulwiht (or fulluht).20 A study of the sixs verbs surrounding baptism in OE, on the other hand, provides us with a better insight in the field, and its cultural backgrounds.. The predominance of verbs in this field may be explained by that fact that the power of this initiatory rite lies in the performance of a physical action. Such actions are usually denoted by verbs. Certainly in the early days of Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England, the administration of baptism was probably deemed more urgent than the more abstract theological concept of baptism. Although the verbs for ‘to baptize’ will be the primary focus of the present study, the nouns of action derived from the verbs fulwian and cristnian, fulwiht21 and cristnung, will also receive attention.

Apart from the lexical field demarcated above, the OE lexical field for ‘baptismal water’ will also receive attention. No discussion of baptism in Anglo-Saxon England is complete without attention to this unique group of words and collocations. The very existence

---

19 See Geeraerts for a good introduction to the fields of generativist, neo-structuralist and cognitive semantics: chapters 3, 4, and 5 in *Theories of Lexical Semantics*.
20 “In cristnunge” glosses “in baptizando” once (see nr. 43 appendix cristnian), otherwise there are no nouns denoting baptism other than fulwiht.
of this word-group attests to a certain understanding of the sacraments; indeed, it is a treasure of information about Anglo-Saxon theologies of baptism.

All of the lexical items under discussion in both fields were borrowed into OE from Latin, the language of the Church. When exactly this happened is often hard to determine. However, three major periods of borrowing from Latin are commonly recognized for OE. The first group was borrowed on the continent, before the migration to England (before c. 400 AD), the second entered English by the influence of Celtic mission and runs from the settlement (c. 450) up to Christianization. The final set of loans form Latin occurred after c. 600-650, in connection with the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. When and where exactly the words for baptism and confirmation entered the OE language is hard to determine. The third period of borrowing in connection with the conversion seems the most likely; in this period most religious loan words were introduced.²²

1.3 Borrowing sense from a foreign language

Baptism is a Christian ritual for which, in all likelihood, the OE language did not posses words, prior to the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. With the advent of Christianity, new words were needed to describe this foreign phenomenon, and this lacuna in the OE vocabulary was filled up through lexical and semantic borrowing. This means that a sense which did not exist in a language was transferred to it from another, either by incorporating a foreign lexeme into its vocabulary (lexical borrowing: for example OE sacerd from Lat. sacerdotus) or by rendering the new sense by the means available in the native tongue (semantic borrowing).

The methodological foundation for analyzing this type of language contact was laid by Werner Betz, in Der Einfluss des Lateinischen auf den althochdeutschen Sprachschatz in 1936. In this study of Old High German glosses Betz introduced a new framework of terminology to distinguish between different types of loans. Apart form the straightforward Lehnwort,²³ which consists of an entire foreign lexeme being absorbed into the native vocabulary, Betz recognizes various other types of loans grouped under the heading Lehnprägungen, which can be broken up into Lehnbedeutungen and Lehnbildungen (to be

²³ This term refers to what is called a ‘lexical loan’ in the English rendering of the terminology by Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact: Finding and Problems (The Hague: Mouton, 1968) 48-52.
subdivided in the categories *Lehnübersetzungen*, *Lehnübertragungen*, and *Lehnschöpfungen*).\textsuperscript{24}

This method of analyzing lexical and semantic borrowing was first applied to OE by Helmut Gneuss in his doctoral thesis on OE glosses in the Vespasian Psalter. His description of Betz’s terminology will serve as the basis for the account below.\textsuperscript{25} The following graph, inspired by Gneuss’ visual representation,\textsuperscript{26} gives a good impression of the structure of the terminological framework.

As the graph shows, the first major division is between *Lehnwörter* and *Lehnprägungen*: the borrowing of entire lexemes or the sense of foreign lexemes only. The *Lehnprägungen* are then subdivided in *Lehnbedeutungen* and *Lehnbildungen*.

The *Lehnbedeutung* is a very common type of loan in OE, and consists of a native word taking on the meaning of a foreign word. Gneuss gives the example of OE *synn* for Lat. *peccatum*, also to illustrate the difficulties surrounding *Lehnbedeutungen*. It is possible, for example, that *synn* retained nuances of meaning that do not correspond with *peccatum*. Furthermore, it is impossible to know what a glossator had in mind when he chose to use a certain *Lehnbedeutung*, and also whether his choice would be understood. All *Lehnbedeutungen* are subject to what Gneuss calls *Bedeutungswandel*, which is to say that the original meaning of the native word never remains completely intact. Two main types of *Lehnbedeutung* can be recognized: the first type is characterized as ‘analogous’ and the second as ‘substituting’. A *Lehnbedeutung* can be described as analogous when the native and foreign words already have one or more meanings in common. Analogy motivates the process

\textsuperscript{24} See for example Werner Betz, *Der Einfluss des Lateinischen auf den althochdeutschen Sprachschatz* (Heidelberg: Winters, 1936), 2-6.
\textsuperscript{25} Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenlischen*, 2-37.
\textsuperscript{26} See the image in Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenlischen*, 3.
of borrowing; however, both words may have additional dissimilar meanings, which may give rise to *Bedeutungswandel*. In the case of a substituting *Lehnbedeutung* a new sense is added to the old native word, while the original sense(s) are retained. The example given by Gneuss is OE *cniht* for Lat. *discipulus*; *cniht* still means ‘boy’, ‘servant’, ‘military attendant’ etc., but also ‘disciple of Christ.’ Sometimes it is not possible to say whether a *Lehnbedeutung* is of analogous or substituting type; words may have similar analogous meaning *and* present a new added sense.\(^{27}\)

The second major type of *Lehnprägung* is the *Lehnbildung*. This type of loan renders foreign word by means of the native language, without using an already existing word. As can be seen in the graph there are three types of *Lehnbildung*. *Lehnübersetzungen* consist of morpheme-by-morpheme translations of prefixes, root, and suffixes of words.\(^{28}\) The rarer type of *Lehnübertragungen* is similar to that of *Lehnübersetzungen*, but follow the foreign mould less closely. A *Lehnübertragung* is a newly built compound or derived form in which the foreign inspiration can still be recognized. Finally, the most rare type of loan is the *Lehnschöpfung*, a newly-built word, whose individual parts do not have anything in common, semantically speaking, with the example. It is difficult to identify *Lehnschöpfungen*, because it is hard to prove that these words were not in existence before Christianization. An example of a OE *Lehnschöpfung* given by Gneuss is *fagwyrm* for Lat. *basilicus* (basilisk). A final observation to be made about *Lehnbildungen* is that they can be of a hybrid character, combining a native pre- or suffix and a *Lehnwort*,\(^ {29}\) and that *Lehnübersetzungen* and *Übertragungen* can go hand in hand with *Lehnbedeutung*.\(^ {30}\) Although some have attempted to translate Betz’s terminology into English, the German terms will be used here, as the English renderings used by different scholars vary and thus may create confusion. For example, Weinreich speaks of ‘loan-adaption’ in the case of a *Lehnübertragung*, while Kastovsky calls the same phenomenon a ‘loan-rendition.’\(^ {31}\)

\(^{27}\) Gneuss gives the example of OE *dryhten* for the Latin appellation *dominus* for the God.


\(^{29}\) For example OE *bisceophad* for Lat. *episcopatus*.

\(^ {30}\) The example of OE *dælnimend* for Lat. *particeps* is given.

\(^ {31}\) Kastovsky, “Semantics and Vocabulary,” 313.
1.4 Medieval theologies of baptism

To fully understand the OE lexical field of baptism, knowledge of Anglo-Saxon theologies and liturgies of baptism is needed. Any discussion of the medieval theologies of baptism must start with the writing of Augustine of Hippo, whose ideas were fundamental to it. Other Church Fathers wrote on the subject as well; however, the work of Tertullian, Ambrose, and Cyprian on baptism never acquired as wide a currency and influence in the Middle Ages. Augustine has left a double legacy when it comes to baptism. In his earlier works he emphasizes the importance of baptism as a personal turning point, a conversion that is the start of a life-long *peregrinatio* in which man must try to remember how to return to God, from whom he originated. In this conception of baptism, education and personal reflection play a fundamental role, with a view to establishing a dialogue and meeting with the divine.

This ethical account of baptism, put forward in *City of God* and *On Catechizing*, is almost completely forgotten in Augustine’s later teachings. After c. 406 he developed his ideas about original sin: how mankind inherited the sin of Adam. The child’s sinful state at birth led Augustine to advocate baptism of children *quamprimum*, ‘as soon as possible’. As a result, the chance that a child would die unbaptized, and under the influence of original sin, could be minimized. This take on things changes the nature of baptism as a sacrament and as a rite. It is turned into a passive cleansing from original sin, an exorcism, instead of a personal conversion followed by an ethical journey.\(^{32}\) Augustine’s later teachings on baptism caught on widely in the early Middle Ages. What can be called the ‘reflective sacrament of the fathers’ was largely forgotten in this period.

Whereas Augustine was not very much interested in the specific forms of the rite of baptism, early medieval writings on baptism are very much so. Speaking of early medieval theology in general, and baptism specifically, Angenendt states: “Das frühe Mittelalter als eine Epoche ohne große Theologie gibt dem Ritus ein besonderes Gewicht, so daß dessen rechte Form sogar als heilsentscheidend angesehen wird.”\(^{33}\) While one is hard pressed to discover any theological writing on the nature of sacrament, the forms of the rite received much attention. In the 8th century the idea of baptism as a conversion was raised again, for


example by Alcuin in the context of the Carolingian mission to the Saxons, but even then the shape of the rite is a principal theme.\(^{34}\)

Examples of this concern for the right forms are Boniface’s outrage at a priest baptizing \textit{in nomina patria filia et spiritu scientia} and the story of Herebald and Bishop John of Beverley related by Bede. Boniface charged Bishop Vergilius of Salzburg with heresy because the latter still considered baptism in name of the fatherland, daughter and wisdom valid, as long as the priest was of good intention.\(^{35}\) The episode related by Bede betrays the same concern for the correct forms: the monk Herebald had been imperfectly baptized, and when he has received injury and is about to die, the correct administration of baptism by Bishop John miraculously heals him.\(^{36}\)

The great importance that was attached to the rite led to a belief in the efficacy of the ceremony, if performed correctly. Whereas in early Christian times the convert had played a more active part in baptism due to the ethical character of his or her conversion, baptism now became a rite which was performed on a passive recipient. This was in great part owing to the rule of infant baptism. The practice entered Christian tradition in the second century. By Augustine’s time infant baptism already was quite common, and by 6th century Easter was not always considered the proper season for baptizing anymore, due to a desire for baptism \textit{quamprimum}. After earliest phases of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons in the 7th century were completed, baptism of newborn babies became the norm.\(^{37}\) At the end of the century the laws of king Ine already impose a fine of thirty shillings for parents who failed to have their child baptized within thirty days after birth, whilst if it died unbaptized, they would lose all of their possessions.\(^{38}\)

As a result of the practice of infant baptism, not only the nature (a passively undergone cleansing) but also the form of baptism changed. In ancient times catechumens were educated in the Christian faith for several years, culminating in a final preparation during Lent, during which they were examined in several sessions called scrutinies, before they were deemed worthy of receiving the sacrament of baptism at Easter. During the Middle Ages this

\(^{34}\) Cramer, \textit{Baptism and Change}, 130.
\(^{36}\) The story of Herebald will receive more attention below.
protracted period of preparation was eventually condensed into one single rite, to be performed all year round. The emphasis moved from catechesis and ethical conversion to passive purification. A sponsor would now utter the ancient formulas for triple renunciation of the devil and triple professions of faith (speaking for the child); exorcisms in the liturgy gained a stronger foothold. This led to a strong sense dualism: before baptism man is under the devil, afterwards he belongs with God: an internal change of lords. Angenendt sums up: “Von der reichen Tauftheologie der Patristik kennt Alkuin, immerhin einer der führenden Theologen der karolingischen Renaissance, allein noch den Antagonismus von Teufel und Christus: Das Reich Satans steht gegen das Reich Gottes.”

Perhaps the statement above may be softened and nuanced a bit by looking at Alcuin’s indignant remonstrance of Charlemagne, for force-baptizing great multitudes without proper instruction in the faith. In a letter to the emperor, Alcuin states “nihil prosit sacri ablutio baptismi in corpore, si in anima ratione utenti catholicae fidei agnitione non praecesserit.” Perhaps Charlemagne eventually took his counselor’s objections to heart, for almost two decades later he sent out a questionnaire to all the archbishops in his realm, asking how they taught their bishops, priests and people on baptism. This questionnaire led to the genesis of a whole new genre called the ‘Carolingian baptismal instruction’ by Keefe. These texts are part of the Carolingian reform which aimed Christianization of the people, through the education of the lower clergy. Generally speaking the texts set out how baptism should be celebrated, and what the individual parts of the liturgy symbolize, so that every priest may know enough to instruct and baptize effectively.

These baptismal instructions are the bulk of what was written on baptism in the early Middle Ages. With the rise of scholastic theology in the high Middle Ages, the focus of the debate shifted away from liturgy again. Scholars sought to establish a more defined theology of the sacraments in this period; the characterization ‘a sign of a sacred thing’ was no longer generally accepted. In this context the heated debate between Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours took place, about whether transubstantiation occurs in the Eucharist during mass. Berengar held on to a symbolical interpretation, while Lanfranc resolutely believed in

39 Arnold Angenendt, Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2000), 463-469.
40 Angenendt, Geschichte der Religiosität, 468.
41 “The washing of sacred baptism profits nothing in body, if knowledge of the catholic Faith does not precede in the mind of one having to use reason.” (translation by Keefe) Susan Keefe, Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire (Notre Dane [Indiana]: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 4.
42 Keefe, Water and the Word, 3-9, 41.
transubstantiation. Their positions on the nature of baptism, another important sacrament, can be paralleled: Berengar sees a metaphor while the real transformation is in the mind, while Lanfranc stresses the key role of the Church in distributing salvation through the rite. The main issue in the theological debate on baptism in this period is about the status of baptism as a ‘sacrament of necessity.’ The Augustinian idea that unbaptized children who died would be eternally damned was widely disputed. Unbaptized martyrs and people who died before their desire to be baptized could be carried out also continually featured in this debate. ‘Baptism of blood’ and ‘baptism by intention’ were sometimes thought to occur through a conferral of the res sacramentum independently of the outward rite or sacramentum. The same could be argued for diseased unbaptized children.

Above, the theological background for the sacrament of baptism in Anglo-Saxon England has been outlined. Before moving on to the liturgy in practice in England during the OE period, it seems appropriate to also sketch the political aspects of baptism especially in contexts of conversion. Returning to Charlemagne and his campaigns to convert great masses and entire people, we must note that his motivations were not purely pious. There were strong political incentives to have foreign rulers and peoples baptized, as the change of lords understood in baptism was also seen as a worldly one by Charlemagne. He considered everyone he had baptized his vassal. Similar connections between baptism and fealty or political loyalty through sponsorship relations can be detected during the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. Since the 5th century a sponsor would vouch to be a ‘spiritual parent’ to a baptizand. In the case where one ruler sponsored another newly converted one, this tie was not only spiritual but also political. In answer to this mechanism the Anglo-Saxons kings seem to have been more open to Roman than to Merovingian mission. Furthermore, when a king and his retainers converted, a royal son would often remain unconverted, to minimize political risks. In case a revert to paganism would suddenly become more advantageous, the unbaptized son could be advanced.

44 Cramer, Baptism and Change, 249-50.
46 For a good overview of this debate and its participants, as well as other concerns about baptism in high scholasticism, see: Marcia L. Colish, Peter Lombard (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 532-48.
47 Keefe, Water and the Word, 3.
1.5 Medieval Anglo-Saxon liturgies of baptism

The rites of baptism that were practised in pre-reformation Western Europe are by no means uniform. Especially in the early Middle Ages there several distinct families to be recognized: the Visigothic, Milanese, Gallican, and Roman rites. As a result of Charlemagne’s attempts to establish liturgical uniformity in his empire a hybrid type of Romano-Germanic rite came into being and eventually supplanted other uses.\(^{50}\) The Roman rite is represented by a letter by John the Deacon (c. 500 AD), the Old Gelasian Sacramentary (c. 750), and the Hadrianum (c. 775).\(^{51}\) The Frankish rites are represented by the Missale Gothicum (c. 7th century), the Missale Gallicanum Vetus (c. 700), the Bobbio Missal (8th century), and of course (some of) the Carolingian baptismal instructions. This is not the place to go into the convoluted matter of the differences between the families Roman and Gallican rites, not to mention internal differences and later hybrid forms. Let us observe only very generally, that the Frankish rite included a *pedilavium*, or washing of the feet, where the Roman one did not,\(^{52}\) and that the Roman rite included two post-baptismal anointings where the Gallican practice used only one.\(^{53}\)

What type of liturgy was used in early Anglo-Saxon England cannot be established with any certainty. Although no liturgical texts survive from that period, scholars have attempted to reconstruct the situation using circumstantial evidence. As the mission to the Anglo-Saxons came directly from Rome, some have been led to presuppose Roman practice.\(^{54}\) St. Augustine of Canterbury is said to have been tolerant of local customs as long as Easter would be celebrated at the correct time, the Anglo-Saxons would take part in the Roman mission to the heathens, and complete the sacrament of baptism according to Roman custom. Which part of the local way of celebrating baptism Augustine found objectionable has been the subject of much speculation. It could be that single instead of triple immersion was practiced, or that the Roman practice of a second post-baptismal anointing and laying on of hands was omitted. Several attempts by eighth-century councils to instate Roman liturgy in all churches suggest that in reality there was much local variation.\(^{55}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Sprinks, *Early and Medieval Rituals*, 109.

\(^{51}\) The Hadrianum is a copy of the Gregorian Sacramentary sent to Charlemagne by Pope Hadrian I.

\(^{52}\) Sprinks, *Early and Medieval Rituals*, 109-123.


\(^{54}\) Sprinks, *Early and Medieval Rituals*, 127.

\(^{55}\) Foot, “By ater in the Spirit,” 174-5.
A number of liturgical books survive from the 10th and 11th centuries. Among these are the Leofric Missal, the Missal of Robert de Jumieges, the Wincombe Sacramentary, a copy of the Romano-Germanic Pontifical, and the Red book or Darley. Gneuss lists nine sacramentaries surviving from this period in all. Of the liturgy used in those days he says: “there is abundant evidence for the strong influence exercised by the Continental reforms of the ninth and tenth centuries on the liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England.” This means that the influence of the Roman Hadrianum and hybrid Romano-Frankish rites were strongly felt at this time. To give an idea of all the elements involved in such a baptismal liturgy, the elements in the rite in the Red Book of Darley (CCCC 422) will be provided below. The unique quality of this eleventh-century text is that it is supplied with interlinear glosses in OE. An extended liturgy for baptism, a shortened order for the sick, and exorcisms and benedictions for the salt and water are given.

This liturgy is as follows. First, the priest blows on the child to exorcise it. Then the sign of the cross is made on the forehead and breast; the child receives a benediction, and the priest utters a prayer. The salts are exorcized, the child’s name is asked and the salts put in its mouth. Again the priest says a prayer, and then following different orders for boys and girls, the forehead is signed and more prayers uttered. A second exorcism of the child follows, now by signing. The priest says the collect, sings the pater noster and credo, and signs the right hand of the child. Subsequently, the priest recites a litany and the font is consecrated. The priest makes the sign of the cross over the water three times, blows on it, and drips into it with a wax candle. The child, priest and bystanders are then sprinkled with the water. Oil and chrism are added to the water, and then the priest proceeds to the Effeta, the opening of the

---

56 Sprinks, Early and Medieval Rituals, 127.
61 The liturgy does not specify how the child is signed. It could either be by the priest’s hand or thumb, or with an object like a cross.
nose and ears. Spittle\textsuperscript{66} is applied to the child’s nostrils and right ear to accomplish this.\textsuperscript{67} The godfather then speaks for the child, forsaking the devil, his works and his pomps.\textsuperscript{68} Next he is questioned about his belief in God the Father, Jesus Christ his Son, and Holy Ghost, to which the godfather answers with \textit{credo}, I believe, each of the three times. After having ascertained the child’s wish to be baptized through the godfather,\textsuperscript{69} the actual baptism takes place. The child is dipped into the font thrice in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and then left in to font to be picked up by the godfather. The collect is uttered again, chrism is put on the child’s head,\textsuperscript{70} and the burning wax candle put in the child’s right hand. Finally the child is made to partake in the Host. A ‘lesser baptism’ for sick children follows, which dispenses with almost all pre-baptismal ceremonies, and proceeds straight to triple dipping. To recapitulate, the most important elements in this liturgy are:

- Exorcism of the child ($\textit{exsufflatio}$)
- Signing of the child
- Exorcism of the salt
- Placing of the salt in the child’s mouth
- Prayer
- Exorcism of the child by signing
- Prayer, litany
- Consecration of the font
- \textit{Effeta}, opening of the ears and nose
- \textit{Abrenuntio} dialogue
- Examination of the faith
- Triple dipping into the font
- Application of chrism to the head
- Vesting in white robes (here only verbally represented)
- Partaking of the Host

\textsuperscript{66} The liturgy does not specify whose spittle is applied to the child’s nose and ear.

\textsuperscript{67} “Do her se preost mid his spatle on þæs cildes nostyrlum and cweð. \textit{Effeta quod est adaperire}.” Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 153.


\textsuperscript{69} “\textit{Vis baptizari}. Donne cweðe se godfæder. Volo.” Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 154.

\textsuperscript{70} “\textit{accipe vestem candidam}.” Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 155.
Here and there, the liturgy in the Red Book of Darley is very explicit as to how the rite should be understood.\textsuperscript{71} However, the three homilies on baptism written by Wulfstan do much more to complete our appreciation of how baptism and its liturgy was understood in Anglo-Saxon England.\textsuperscript{72} The first, homily 8a, is in Latin, while the other two are in OE. homily 8a, headed “\textsc{incipit de baptisma}”, relies heavily on the genre of the Carolingian baptismal instruction. Jesse of Amiens’ \textit{Epistola de Baptismo}, Theodulf of Orléans’ \textit{De Ordine Baptismi} and Amalarius of Metz’s \textit{De Ecclesiasticis Officiis} have been identified as sources by Bethurum.\textsuperscript{73} An additional important source is the widely copied Baptismal instruction by Alcuin.\textsuperscript{74} This \textit{ordo} is a very brief text which was included in two letters by Alcuin, one to monks in Septimania, and the other to a priest named Odwin.\textsuperscript{75} Alcuin’s \textit{ordo} represent a primarily Roman liturgy consisting of fourteen parts: \textit{caticuminus et renuntiatio},\textsuperscript{76} \textit{exsufflatio}, \textit{exorcismus}, \textit{sal}, \textit{traditio symboli},\textsuperscript{77} \textit{scrutinia},\textsuperscript{78} \textit{nares},\textsuperscript{79} \textit{pectus},\textsuperscript{80} \textit{scapulae},\textsuperscript{81} \textit{trina mersio}, \textit{alba vestimenta}, \textit{caput mysticum uelamen}, \textit{corpus et sanguine domini},\textsuperscript{82} \textit{imposito manus a summo sacerdote}.\textsuperscript{83} Each action in the liturgy is supplied with an explanation of the effect it is to have; for example: “\textit{exsufflatur etiam, ut, fugato diabolo, christo deo nostro paretur introitus. Exorcizatur, id est coniuratur malignus spiritus, ut exeat et recedat, dans locum deo vero. Accipit caticuminus salem, ut putrida et fluxa eius peccata sapientiae sale divino munere mundentur.”\textsuperscript{84}

In homily 8a, as well as the OE homilies 8b and 8c, Wulfstan enumerates the important parts of the liturgy as he knew it, and adds similar explanations of its significance.

---

\textsuperscript{71} For example, in the case of the \textit{exsufflatio} is it made very clear that this is an exorcism designed to drive out the devil and prepare room for the Holy Ghost: “\textit{bonne blawe se preost on jet cild and cwe[e]. exi ab coelea spiritus immunde et da locum spiritui sancto paraclito.”} Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 150.

\textsuperscript{72} They were edited and named 8a, 8b, and 8c by Bethurum, see Dorothy Bethurum, \textit{The Homilies of Wulfstan} (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998), 169-184.

\textsuperscript{73} Bethurum, \textit{The Homilies of Wulfstan}, 311-13.


\textsuperscript{76} The pagan is made catechumen by renouncing the devil.

\textsuperscript{77} The Apostle’s Creed is delivered to the baptizand, so that a dwelling place is prepared for God.

\textsuperscript{78} Triple renunciation of Satan, and examinations of faith.

\textsuperscript{79} Touching of the nostrils.

\textsuperscript{80} Anointing of the breast.

\textsuperscript{81} Anointing of the shoulder blades.

\textsuperscript{82} Partaking of the Eucharist directly after baptism is a common feature of many baptismal liturgies.

\textsuperscript{83} Here, confirmation is referred to. In Anlgo-Saxon practice it was most probably a separate rite, celebrated later on. See below, ….

\textsuperscript{84} ‘He is exsufflated so that, the devil having fled, an entrance is created for Christ our God. He is exorcized, that is to say the evil spirit is purged, so that it departs, giving room to the true God. The catechumen receives salt, so that his foul, depraved sins are washed away by the divine salt of wisdom.’ For the Latin text: Keefe, \textit{Water and the Word}, Vol. II: 240-1.
The aim here is not to investigate the source relations of Wulfstan’s homilies, but merely to show how he employs the genre of the Carolingian baptismal instructions, which were originally meant for the education of the clergy. Wulfstan has a similar, expressly educational purpose in his OE homilies on baptism. In 8b he states that the clergy have a duty to teach the lay population to help them understand baptism rightly. Wulfstan’s reworking of the Carolingian instruction follows, together with an exposition about how all baptized Christians are part of the Body of Christ. The same set up is followed in homily 8c. By using the format of the Carolingian baptismal instruction to teach about baptism, Wulfstan betrays an early medieval ritualistic take on the sacrament. A further interesting feature of homily 8c is its emphasis on the minimal knowledge of the faith every person needs to have. Wulfstan explains the meaning of the Latin words abrenuntio and credo so that they may not be uttered voidly at baptism. If the child is unable to speak at baptism, its sponsor may speak for it, but as soon as it can speak it must learn the pater noster and credo.

This concern fits in very well with the early medieval picture of the Ritualisierung and Klerikalisierung that can be detected in the practice of baptism. During the Carolingian mission a growing need was felt to ensure, for adult converts, at least a rudimentary knowledge of Christianity and what baptism meant. Both Boniface and Alcuin emphasize the absolute need of this minimum of knowledge, for baptism to have effect. As a result the part of baptismal liturgy in which the devil is forsworn was translated into the vernacular several times, in the shape of the OS and OF Taufgelöbnissen. Knowledge of the pater noster and the credo was also highly recommended for every adult; consequently, these prayers were often translated in to the vernacular in non-Romanic regions. The earliest of the surviving

---


86 Homily 8c: “Ac utan understandan hwæt ða twa word mænan, abrenuntio 7 credo, þæt man æt fulluht-þenunge on gewunan hæfð. Abrenuntio, þæt is on Englisce, ic wiðsace heononforð æfre deofles gemanan. Credo, þæt is on Englisce, ic gelyfe on God ælmihtigne þe ealle ðing gescop.” Bethurum, The Homilies of Wulstan, 181.

87 Homily 8c: “And ðeah þæt cild to þam geong sy þæt hit specan ne mæge, þonne hit man fullað, his freonda forsræc forstent him eal þæt sylfe swycle hi þæt sylf spæce, […] And æfre swa þæt cild radöst ænig ðing spectan mæge, tece man him sona ealla þinga ærest pater noster 7 credan.” Bethurum, The Homilies of Wulstan, 181-2.

88 Angenendt, Geschichte der Religiosität, 465.

89 The OS Taufgelöbnis is a well-known example, which includes forswearing of Woden for extra clarity: “Forsachistu diobolae? et respondeat: ec forsacho diobolae. end allum diobolgeldae? respondeat: end ec forsacho allum diobolgeldae. end allum dioboles uercum? respondeat: end ec forsacho allum dioboles uercum and uercum thunaer ende woden ende saxnote ende allum them unholdum the hira genotas sint. gelobistu in got alamehtigan fadaer? ec gelobo in got alamehtigan fadaer, gelobistu in crist godes suno? ec gelobo in crist gotes suno. gelobistu in halogan gast? ec gelobo in halogan gast.” Angenendt, Geschichte der Religiosität, 470-1.

90 Angenendt, Geschichte der Religiosität, 469-71.
translations can be dated to the 8th century. Wulfstan conforms with the Carolingian concern for the bare essentials of religious teaching: an understanding of what it means to forswear the devil, profess faith and knowledge of the pater noster and credo.

The theology of baptism current in late Anglo-Saxon England was still that of the early medieval church. Indeed, Wulfstan relies heavily on Carolingian sources and ideas on baptism in his three sermons on baptism. An additional witness of this can be found in one of the homilies of another great scholar of the later Anglo-Saxon period: Ælfric. In a homily on the Ascension he remarks that during the rite of baptism the priest drives out the devil from a child, for each pagan is of the devil, but he can become God’s through baptism. This assertion conforms with the early medieval understanding of baptism as a change of lords; a decisive event in the struggle between the devil and Christ.

All in all, we may conclude that the Anglo-Saxons utilized a Roman or a hybrid Roman-Frankish liturgy in the 10th and 11th centuries. Furthermore, the Anglo-Saxon understanding of baptism is essentially an early medieval one, also extending to the later Anglo-Saxon period. Baptism was appreciated as a necessary cleansing from original sin, to be effected on newborn infants as soon as possible. The sacrament was also understood as a means to accomplish an instant change of lords, from the devil to Christ. This idea had political repercussions, not only in the Carolingian empire, but also in early Anglo-Saxon England. By whom one was converted and who stood sponsor for one at baptism was of the highest political importance. From Wulfstan’s homilies on baptism we learn that a (essentially early medieval) ritualistic take on the sacrament, combined with a bare minimum of lay understanding, was still generally accepted in the later Anglo-Saxon period.

---

91 Angenendt, Liturgie im Mittelalter, 40-3.
2. Analysis of the relevant lexemes in the lexical field of baptism

Having set the scene of baptism in Anglo-Saxon England, we can now proceed to the analysis of the lexemes that are active in the lexical field of baptism in OE: *cristnian*, *dyppan*, and *fulwian*. Nouns such as *cristnung* and *fulwiht* will also receive attention. The individual discussion of the lexemes will consist of a chart showing the frequency of the lexeme, a section on the etymology of the lexeme, a section on the *status quaeotionis* of its meaning, and finally my own analysis of the contextual meaning of the lexeme and any other observations. Finally, OE *gefuntan*, *apwéan*, and the lexical field of baptismal water in OE will receive attention.

2.1 Fulwian

2.1.1 Frequency

- Fulian, fullwian: 175
- Gefullian, gefullwian: 100
- Gefulluhtan: 1
- Gefulluhtned: 1
- Fulluhtan, fulluhtnian: 3
- Fulluht, fulwiht: 600

(For a number of selected occurrences see appendix.)

2.1.2 Etymology

The verb *fulwian* (also *fullian*) is commonly identified as a *Lehnschöpfung*: a newly built word, whose parts have semantically nothing in common with the foreign model. In the case of *fulwian* Lat. *baptizare* is supposed to have been the inspiration for the loan. This *Lehnschöpfung* is unique to OE; it does not occur in the other Gmc dialects. The etymology

---

93 See the relevant lemmata in the *DOE*.
commonly given for this verb is represented by, for example, Holtausen: “fulwian ‘taufen’, < *-wihan “voll weißen”.95 The verb is thus a combination of the (OE) adverb full ‘full’96 and the pGmc verb *wihan ‘to consecrate’. Independent use of the verb *wihan is not attested in OE sources; however, fulwian testifies to it presence in OE pre-history. Furthermore, words such as OE wih ‘idol’ and wígbed (also wéofod) ‘altar’ attest to the presence of *wíh- ‘holy’97, from which the verb *wíhan derives.

It is interesting to note that the words containing wíh are very rare in OE. The adjective hálig ‘holy’ is much more pervasive. In pGmc both stems existed alongside each other; however, in OE hálig is used almost exclusively, while the Gothic Gospels, for example, exclusively use weihs. The choice for one of the two available Gmc words for holiness by each language was most likely motivated by which elements of pagan religion were deemed most reconcilable with Christianity.98 In Das Heilige im Germanischen Baetke studies exactly these two Gmc words which he identifies as Gmc *wíhaz and *hailagaz.99 He comes to the conclusion that *wíhaz and *hailagaz both present a different approach to religion. *wíhaz referred to the awe-inspiring otherness of sacred things and places, in pagan cult. It pertained to the more numinous, sacrosanct side of religion, whereas *hailagaz referred to “das Heil, das von der Gottheit ausgeht, die in die Welt hineinwirkende Segenkraft.”100 The words thus represent two different approaches to religion and holiness.

Baetke infers that Gothic employs weihs solely because the Wulfila’s mission was profoundly dependant on teaching and doctrine. Anyone converted on these terms is less likely to be very much influenced by the connotations of pagan cult in weihs, while Goth. hailags may have still carried a strong pagan Lebensgefühl.101 The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, on the other hand, was more deeply founded on the salvation-bringing properties of Christianity and its sacraments as administred by the Church. What Baetke calls “Heilsgedanke” was one of the most important links between the old and the new religion in this line of thinking. Within this ideology, the ecclesiastical Lat. word sanctus, central to this

96 From pGmc *frollo-, *fullo-. See “full adv.” OED.
99 Walter Baetke, Das Heilige im Germanischen (Tübingen: Mohrn, 1942).
100 Baetke, Das Heilige, 213-5.
101 Baetke, Das Heilige, 224.
type of mission, was best rendered by OE hálig. Wiht, with its close association with sacrosanct places, idols and cult, was considered more dangerous by the Church.102

2.1.3 Meaning: The status quaestionis

Early definitions of fulwian tend to take the etymology of the word as the main clue to its meaning. Etymologically speaking, the parts of the verb should mean something like ‘voll weihen’ in German or ‘to consecrate fully’ in English, so the completion of something is often sought after. Grein, following Grimm, connects fulwian with the rite of confirmation, which completes the sacrament of baptism.103 MacGillivray takes it to refer to the completion of what was begun at cristnung,104 “to consecrate fully.”105 The OED follows the same line of thought as MacGillivray, describing baptism as ‘the full consecration’.106 However, the OED does give the meaning ‘to baptize’ for the verb. The DOE nowhere speaks of ‘full’ or ‘complete consecration’, but bases its understanding of the meaning of fulwian on how the verb is used, and not on its etymology. The senses given by the DOE are:

1. to baptize (someone acc., in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, on and acc. / dat.; also in constructions without expressed object)
   a. fullod beon ‘to be baptized (by someone, fram and dat.)’

2. to cleanse, purify (someone acc., of sins, fram and dat.) through baptism
   a. figurative: to hallow, consecrate, purify (as in baptism, someone acc., with the Holy Spirit, fire, etc., on / mid and dat.)107

The use of fulwian in context does not lead to a definition that has to do with the completion of something. BT gives “to baptize; baptizáre.”108 In the same dictionary the derived noun fulluht is defined as follows: “Baptism; baptismus”;109 again, no mention of completion of something or other. For fulluht/ fulwiht the DOE gives as first three meanings: “1. Baptism. 2

---

102 Baekte, Das Heilige, 223-4.
103 “fulwian.” Sprachsschatz der Angelsächsischen Dichter.
104 Crisnung denotes a pre-baptismal rite that afforded entry into the catechumenate. Originally this rite was separate from the baptismal ceremony, however in the Anglo-Saxon period it already had been integrated into the baptismal liturgy. For more information see the chapter on cristnian.
105 Hugh Swinton MacGillivray. The influence of Christianity on Old English (Halle: Niemeyer, 1902), 19-22, 21, 57.
106 “to full.” OED.
107 “fullian, fulwian.” DOE. The lemma for “gefullian, gefullwian” gives exactly the same meanings; for “fulluhtan” the meaning ‘to baptize’ is simply given.
108 “fulwian.” BT.
109 “fulluht.” BT.
in expression for receiving baptism, being baptized. 3. in expression for turning / submitting to baptism i.e. converting to the Christian faith.”^110 In the eleven following senses the DOE gives common constructions and compounds in which the word is often used.^111

2.1.4 Discussion

Due to the extremely high frequency of fulwian and its derived forms (around 275 occurrences for forms of fulwian, and 600 occurrences for the derived noun fulluht/fulwiht^112), it will not be possible in the limited scope of the present project to examine each and every one of these occurrences individually in context. For the contextual meaning of fulwian and fulluht we must trust to the definitions given by the DOE.

Instead, I will attempt to account for the exceptional properties and uses of fulwian by looking at the socio-cultural background of baptism in Anglo-Saxon society, and sketch the semantic development of fulwian over time.

Although fulwian is the most common word for ‘to baptize’ in OE, it does not occur in the other Gmc dialects. OE dépan and cristnian, which only very rarely mean ‘to baptize’in OE, are the common words for ‘to baptize’ in these languages. How can the exceptional situation in OE be explained? What could have led to the formation of fulwian? Which other options could have been available, and why were these not adopted? To answer such questions it is necessary to return to the etymology of the word fulwian. First of all, Gmc *wihaz is only marginally represented in OE by wih ‘idol’ and wígbed (or wéofod) ‘altar’,

---

^110 “fulluht, fulwiht.” DOE.

^111 Additional senses given by the DOE:

4. fulluht(e) þenian ‘to administer baptism (to), to baptize (someone dat.)’
5. æt fulluhte onfon / to fulluhte niman ‘to receive (i.e. stand sponsor ro) someone ( dat. / gen. / acc. ) at baptism’
6. fulluhte(s) bæþ ‘the immersion of washing of baptism’(cf. OED2 bath n. sense 2); i.e. ‘(the rite of) baptism’(f. forms may alternatively be read as the first element of a compound with – e – in composition; cf. fulluhtbæþ)
7. fulluhtes gescead ‘baptismal argument’, i.e. the catechesism learned by candidates befor baptism
8. fulluhtes stow ‘place of baptism
9. Cristes / dryhtnes fulluhtes day / þæs dryhtenlican fulluhtes day ‘the day of baptism of Christ/ the Lord’i.e. ‘Epiphany’(cf. fulluhttid eces dryhtnes s.v. fulluhttid)
10. glossing baptisma, here ‘cleansing, washing, purification’ (of objects; see Blaise s.v. baptisma sense 1)
11. glossing exorcismus ‘purification’ (in context, ref. to the rite of baptism)
12. used metonymically, to designate the condition or contract into which a baptized person has entered: fulluht (ge)healdan ‘to uphold the terms of one’s baptismal covenant’(cf. fulluhthadas gehealdan s.v. fulluhthad)
13. used metonymically, of baptism as symbolic for Christian faith/ Christianity
14. glossing phantasia ‘vision; imagination’, perhaps through corruption of an original gloss yfelwiht ‘evil spirit, demon.’(…)

^112 See the DOE for estimations of these numbers.
words associated with pagan cult, or sacrosanct places. OE *wíhian is not attested independently, while the adj. hálig and the verb hálgian are omnipresent.

Apparently, the association of *wihaz with the numinous, awe-inspiring, cultish side of religion, deemed inappropriate in a Christian context elsewhere in OE, was thought proper with regards to baptism.\textsuperscript{113} Dépan and cristnian never really caught on for ‘to baptize’, while their cognates did on the continent. Nor was a Lehnschöpfung including hálgian created. At an early stage in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, full-wíhian was somehow deemed most appropriate for ‘to baptize’. Perhaps, during this early syncretistic phase *wíhian was not felt to be offensive everywhere. In that case, however, more witnesses to the use of wih and *wíhian would have survived into the written sources. It seems more likely that fulwian somehow fulfilled certain requirements better than other words could.

Indeed, the attitudes to baptism in the early medieval Church fit in very well with the connotations of *wíhian. The ritualistic interpretation of the sacrament of baptism, as a sacred rite that needed to meticulously executed by a well-instructed, virtuous priest, can be described as cultish. The extended sets of exorcisms to be performed on newborn infants, make baptism quite an awe-inspiring rite. With such a strong emphasis on keeping the devil at bay with mystical rites more than on bringing salvation, *wíhian does seem a more suitable candidate for the job than hálgian.

The prefixation of full- could then have lessened the unsavoury pagan flavours attached to the verb somewhat.\textsuperscript{114} The softening qualities of full- deserve to be considered here, against the more common assumption that full- refers to a completion of some kind. MacGillivray defines fulluht and fulwian as “the full or complete consecration, to consecrate fully.”\textsuperscript{115} He explains the idea of completion with reference to what was begun at cristnung.\textsuperscript{116} Grein, following Grimm, thinks that full- in fulwian refers to the completion of baptism at confirmation.\textsuperscript{117} It is improbable that Grimm’s suggestion is correct. The vocabulary of confirmation in OE is quite separate from that of baptism proper, and fulwian never figures in

\textsuperscript{113} One could also image a process in which wih and *wíhian initially were accepted (at least in some regions), but became unacceptable later on. By that time, fulwian could have already gained such a firm footing in OE vocabulary that is stayed on nonetheless. However, in that case we would at least expect a few more attestations of the use of wih and *wíhian; furthermore, the fact that fulwian was not replaced with for example full-hálgian at this point bears witness to the suitability of fulwian (including dark connotations) for baptism.
\textsuperscript{114} “Um die kirchliche Bedeutung von der rechtlichen, zauberischen usw. zu unterscheiden, gebrauchte man Komposita wie Voll-, Tat-, oder Überbusse.” Joseph Weisweiler, Busse: Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1930), 224.
\textsuperscript{115} MacGillivray, The Influence of Christianity, 21.
\textsuperscript{116} MacGillivray, The Influence of Christianity, 57.
\textsuperscript{117} “fulwian.” Sprachschatz der Angelsächsischen Dichter.
This, taken together with the fact that all recorded occurrences of *fulwian* are concerned with baptism proper, makes it highly unlikely that the formation of the verb was prompted by the rite of confirmation.

Turning to MacGillivray’s proposal, one may note that it is in fact possible that *fulwian* was suggested by the completion of what was begun at *cristnunc*. This presupposes an arrangement in which these two rites are apart. However, the catechumenate never consisted of an extended period of time in Anglo-Saxon England. Almost immediately after the conversion infant baptism became the norm, and the catechumenate mainly consisted of a series of exorcisms in the baptismal liturgy which lasted only a few moments. During the initial phases of conversion mass baptisms were common, and *cristnunc* and *fulwiht* were never far apart, if indeed they were apart. When Bede relates the conversion and baptism of the Northumbrians in 627 AD at the hands of Paulinus, he more or less paints the typical picture of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. King Edwin and his household convert, and his other subjects must follow as a matter of course. In a period of 36 days Paulinus has all the people in the neighbourhood of the royal seat ‘christened’ and baptized. Although Bede reports Paulinus was at it day and night during this period, there could not have been long periods of time between *cristnunc* and baptism. It seems most likely from a practical point of view that once someone seemed to grasp the rudiments of Christian faith, both rites were performed in one go, without delay. In this context it seems quite unlikely that baptism was seen as the completion of *cristnunc*. The distinction must have only existed in the minds of learned men (like Bede) or in the case of the conversion of royalty: the period of preparation Edwin himself underwent may have been more extended; he built a timber church for the purpose of his baptism in York.

Whether baptism was once seen as the completion of *cristnunc* is a question which it is impossible to answer securely. However, there are no indications for this except the word *fulwian* itself. If this interpretation of baptism did indeed exist at one point, the prefix *full-* could be thus explained. However, this explanation leaves the adoption of *fulwian* instead of...
*full-hálgian unaccounted for. If the sense ‘to consecrate fully’ needed to be caught in a verb, *full-hálgian would have been the more obvious candidate. Yet, it was hálgian’s more dark, numinous counterpart *wíhian who got the job. This can be accounted for by the terrifying character of baptism and its rite, as was discussed above. Full- in this context may very well have served to soften the shocking overtones of *wíhian.

2.1.5 Fulwiht

Certain uses of *fulwiht, the noun of action derived from *fulwian, also attest to a particular understanding of the sacrament. In the will of an earldorman named Alfred *fulwiht is used metonymically for the Christian faith. To two of the provisions in the will the following stipulations are added: “þa hwile þe *fulwiht sio” and “ða hwile þe *fulwihtes sio on Angelcynnnes ealonde.” When the same ealdorman Alfred, together with his wife Wærburh, donated the *Codex Aureus, retrieved from Vikings, to a religious community, the inscription also included two similar provisions: “ða hwile ðe God gesegen haebbe ðæt *fulwiht æt ðæosse stowe beon mote” and “ða hwile ðe *fulwiht <stondan><mote>”.

Parallel expressions about the hoped-for endurance of *fides catholica, *Christiana fides, and *christianitas in contemporary Latin Charters, confirm moreover that *fulwiht is used for ‘christian faith’. This metonymical use of *fulwiht attests to the absolute centrality of baptism in ninth century conceptions of Christianity: having baptism was the defining feature of being Christian, as opposed to pagan.

In exorcisms for participants of ordeals in the Iudica Dei texts we find synecdochic use of *cristenesse for ‘baptism’. Liebermann translates *cristenesse with “Christentaufe” here, probably directed on the modifying clause “ðe ge underfenge”. In the case of another text with this type of exorcism, Iudicum Dei VIII, we see *cristendom used in exactly the same way, now translated by “Christenthum”. Liebermann was not sure it seems. Iudicium Dei VII may perhaps shed some light on the matter; here both *fulluht and *cristendom

---

121 “fullought.” OED.
122 See nrs. 9 &10.
123 See nrs. 11 & 12.
125 See nrs. 13 &14 and the lemata “cristennes” and “cristnes” in the DOE (BT gives ‘christianity’ for both cases)
127 See nr. 13.
128 See nr. 16.
are used: “þurh þæne fulluht & Cristendóm, þe þu underfangen hæfست”. The words are very closely associated it appears: to receive baptism is to receive Christianity. Most likely, baptism was also being alluded to where *cristennes* is mentioned in the other pre-ordeal exorcisms discussed above. Concluding a one-to-one correspondence between *fulluht* and ‘Christianity’ is perhaps not warranted; however, the fundamental role of baptism in Christianity in Anglo-Saxon perception is very clear.

Another notable use of *fulwiht* reflects the awe-inspiring quality of baptism as a sacred rite. In the OE glosses to Aldhelm’s *De Laude Virginitatis* the Lat. word *exorcismus* is twice glossed with with “full”, in all probability short for *fulluhte*. It is not at all inconceivable that baptism was sometimes seen as a manner of exorcism.

Indeed there are many indications that one of the prime functions of the sacrament was to cleanse man from evil and sin. In the baptismal liturgy in the Red Book of Darley, a distinction is made between ‘lesser’ and ‘greater’ baptism. The text states: “and Swa her beforan awritan is on þisum maran fulluhte. Nys on þisum lytlan fulluhte na mare gescryrt buton seo cristnung and seo wæterhalgung.” The abbreviated order for sick infants reduces *cristnung* and the consecration of the water to a few words, and then proceeds right to triple immersion:

Her onginð þ[æt] les[se] fulluht to untrumum cildum. Cristnige hit man nu ðisum wordum (...) Halge þ[æt] wæter mid þisum wordum. (...) Fullige þonne se preost þæt untrume cild on þus gehalgegon wætere swa man oðre deð nime þæt cild and dippe hit on þus gehalgedum wætere.

This shortened order is clearly directed at newborn children who might die any second. It reduces baptism to an exorcism, essentially. The child could neither have sinned nor converted; removing of original sin and exorcizing the devil were the only purposes of the order.

Several early law texts attest to the same concern for baptism *quamprimum* on account of its exorcizing quality. In the laws of King Cnut priests are pressed to fulfill the needs of the lay community well by readiness in performing the first two sacraments: “Mycel is seo
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130 See nr. 15.
131 See sense eleven under “fulluht, fulwitht.” in the *DOE*.
132 See nr. 4.
133 See nr. 3.
halsung & mære is seo halgung, þe deofla afyrsað & on fleame gebringeð, swa oft swa man fullað oððe husel halgað.”

Putting to flight the devil that lives in every child as soon as possible is a major concern. The laws of King Ine impose a fine of thirty shillings if a child is not baptized within thirty nights of its birth; the Northumbrian priest’s laws state that every child needs to be baptized within nine nights, on pain of a fine of six ore. The same text imposes a fine of twelve ore for the parents, if the child should die unbaptized after nine nights (before that ultimatum penance before God suffices). If a priest failed or refused to perform baptism, it would cost him twelve ore. The laws of King Ine insist that the parents of a child who dies unbaptized must pay for that offense with all their possessions.

2.1.6 Conclusions

My discussion of OE *fulwian* differs from those on *cristnian* and *dyppan*. Instead of examining each attestation of the verb in context, I selected noteworthy uses of *fulwian*. The derived noun *fulwiht* has been discussed to provide more insight into the different shades of meaning and historical background.

First of all, the exceptional nature of *fulwian* as a *Lehnschöpfung* was examined. None of the other Gmc dialects posses a cognate word, while cognates of OE *cristnian* and *dépan* are common. Even within the context of early Anglo-Saxon England the adoption of *fulwian* may be considered surprising, when the etymology of the word is taken into account. OE *wíhian* (unattested in independent use) was shunned in Christian contexts in favour of *halgian*. As rare traces of pGmc *wíhaz*, OE *wíh* and *wíhbed*, *wíhaz* confirm this association with the numinous side of pagan cult. Therefore, it is remarkable that *wíhian* was used for a *Lehnschöpfung* rendering *baptizare* ‘to baptize’, beyond doubt a verb of fundamental importance to Christianity, especially in missionary contexts. The use of *wíhian* cannot be ascribed to plain meaningless coincidence, because of the clear avoidance of this word in all other contexts. Baptism must have been seen as a numinous, dark rite, during which one was passively exorcized from the devil. This view of baptism corresponds well to early medieval understandings of the sacrament, which were strongly ritualistic, dualistic and bent on

134 See nr. 7.
135 ‘Ore’ is a monatary unit of Scandinavian heritage. “ore, n.” *OED.* See nr. 6 & 8.
137 See nr. 5.
exorcism. Rather than referring to some kind of completion, the prefix *full-* must have served to lessen unwanted pagan associations.

Secondly, the centrality of baptism in Anglo-Saxon perceptions of Christianity, as well as its exorcistic properties, are demonstrated in the uses of *fulwiht*. The metonymical use of *fulwiht* for ‘the Christian faith’ (along with parallel use of *fides catholica* in Latin texts) attests to the the absolutely fundamental importance of baptism; having *fulwiht* is seen as a defining feature of a Christian. Several law-texts about ordeals also use *cristennes* in a way that comes very close to, but is not quite, ‘baptism’. From all this we may gather that the initiatory sacrament of baptism was deemed so essential, that it came close to meaning ‘Christianity’ itself. The fact that *fulwiht* can be found to gloss for *exorcismus* highlights another aspect of Anlgo-Saxon perceptions of baptism. This sacrament, so central to Christianity, must also be understood as an excorsism. Several law-texts attest to this fact by insisting on the baptism of very young infants, so as to put the devil to flight and prevent eternal damnation in case of early death. Note the sinister overtones in this view in the nessecity of baptism, and how well they fit with those of *wihian*.

The semantic development that can be distilled from this analysis is one that entails the loss of certain connotations. In the early OE period *fulwian* must still have carried a strong sense of the numinous, dark, occult side of religion, associated with Gmc *wihaz-*.

Following this early period, *fulwian* and *fulwiht* must have slowly lost their original, cultish connotation. This loss of meaning is reflected in the later spellings of *fulwian*, often: *fullian*. The /w/ in *fulwian* could be assimilated and forgotten only because *wian* stopped being an intelligible morpheme. Gradually *wihian* and its negative connotations were forgotten, which also resulted in the loss of the semantic colouring it gave to *fulwian*. In later use *fulwian*, or rather *fullian*, simply meant ‘to baptize’ without a strong associations with the sacramant.

Perhaps, this loss of meaning is what enabled the gradual decline of *fulwian* in the ME period. Another factor may have been the introduction from of a new member of the field:

---

138 See “fulwen,” “fulhtnen,” and “fullehten/fulhten,” MED.A (non-exhaustive) search of the Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse gives 119 matches that refer to baptism, based on the following search terms: “fulwen” 1 match in 1 record; “ifulled” 20 matches in 6 records of which 3 refer to baptism (rest ‘to fill’ or ‘fulling’); “yfulled” 10 matches in 4 records of which 8 refer to baptism (rest ‘to fill’); “fulled” 50 matches in 16 records of which 15 refer to baptism (rest ‘to fill’ or ‘fulling’); “folled” 41 matches in 3 records of which 39 refer to baptism (rest ‘to fill’ or ‘fulling’); “follwn” 1 matches in 1 record; “yfolled” 5 matches in 2 records all of which refer to baptism; “yfolled” 10 matches in 2 records all of which refer to baptism; “volled” 1 matches in 1 record; “volled” 1 matches in 1 record; “volled” 18 matches in 1 record all of which refer to baptism; “folwen” 120 matches in 24 records, none of which refer to baptism; “fullhtne” 3 matches in 1 record (Ormulum); “fullhtnede” 5 matches in 1 record
baptisen. This verb seems to be the most frequent in the ME period. At the same time, cristnian move into the sphere of fulwian as well; cristnen for ‘to baptize is quite common.

As by this time the various forms and spellings of fulwian retained no visible reminders of *wíhian, the verb was destined to lose ground to its competitors in the lexical field. Baptisen very clearly derives from biblical Lat. baptizare, so there could be no question as to why this word should be used to denote ‘to baptize’. Furthermore, cristnen, the descendant of OE cristnian, with its Christ and the Christian faith, carried the connotation ‘to be made a Christian’ by association.
2.2 Cristnian

2.2.1 Frequencies

A. Verse: 1
B. Prose Early: 5
C. Prose Late: 24
   - Ælfric Saint’s Lives: 6
   - Ælfric Homilies: 4
   - Wulfstan Homilies: 3
   - Blickling Homilies: 5
   - Vercelli Homilies: 5
   - Red Book of Darley: 1
D. Glosses: 7
   Total attestations cristnian: 37
E. Derived Forms: 8
   - past participle as substantive: 1\(^{141}\)
   - cristnung: 6
   - cristnere: 1

(For the attestations of cristnian in context, see the appendix.)

2.2.2 Etymology

For the meaning of the verb cristnian in OE we need to go back to Hebrew māshīax, messiah, which means ‘anointed.’ This word was translated into Greek as Χριστός, which also means ‘anointed one’ (a Lehnbedeutung). This Greek work was loaned into Latin as Christus, from which OE Crist was loaned.\(^{142}\)

So much is certain; however, the development from Greek Χριστός to the OE verb (ge)cristnian is less clear cut. The OED does not give a clear etymology for the verb. It does

\(^{141}\) Also see nrs. 9, 24, and 29.
\(^{142}\) “Christ.” OED.
state that Latin *christianus*, ‘christian,’ derivest from Greek χριστιανός.\textsuperscript{143} MacGillivray, taking it one step further, believes that Lat. *christianus* was loaned into OE as *cristen*; from this word the verb *cristnian* formed.\textsuperscript{144} Gneuss and Holthausen seem to agree with this etymology.\textsuperscript{145}

Gneuss, referring to MacGillivray, identifies *cristnian* as a hybrid *Lehnschöpfung* that is occasionally confused with *fulwian* (to baptize) but which actually means ‘to catechize.’\textsuperscript{146} D.H. Green, however, takes a completely different stand. He poses the unattested Latin form *christian(z)are*, from which he thinks OFr. *chrestiener*, MDu. and MLG *kerstenen* and OE *cristnian* all derive. On the basis of geographical and historical information he concludes that it must have been a Christian loanword of the Merovingian period, radiating out from northern Gaul.\textsuperscript{147} In a note to his text, MacGillivray also tentatively seems to suggest such an origin, but he does not quite follow the reasoning through: “Note 1. ‘Cristnian’ is undoubtedy a formal imitation of such verbs as Lat. *episcopare, monachare* (from *episcopus, monachus*) = O.E. *biscopian, munecian*.”\textsuperscript{148}

To sum up, *cristnian* can be traced back to Lat. *Christianus*; it was formed either from OE *cristen*, or via unattested Lat. *christian(z)are*. It is hard to say which route is most plausible. The case for *christian(z)are* is weakened by its being unattested, which does seem odd for a word that must have been of prime importance for the Church in an age of rapid expansion.

### 2.2.3 Meaning: The *status quaestionis*

There are different views about the exact meaning of OE *cristnian*. Green sees the vernacular words *chrestiener, kerstenen, and cristnian* all as derivatives of *christian(z)are*, a verb which denotes the act of baptizing.\textsuperscript{149} Of course, it is very difficult to prove what a reconstructed word may have meant: ‘to make Christian’ could also have been the meaning. This, indeed is the first definition of *cristnian* that the *OED* lists: “To convert to Christianity, make Christian, christianize. *Obs. or arch.*”\textsuperscript{150} The first attestation of this meaning is dated to

\textsuperscript{143} “Christian.” *OED.*

\textsuperscript{144} MacGillivray, *The influence of Christianity on Old English*, 19-22.

\textsuperscript{145} “cristen,” “cristere,” and “cristian.” *Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.*

\textsuperscript{146} Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen*, 86.

\textsuperscript{147} Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*, 333.

\textsuperscript{148} MacGillivray, *The influence of Christianity*, 21.

\textsuperscript{149} Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*, 333.

\textsuperscript{150} “christen.” *OED.*
c 890 (the OE Bede). The earliest use of the second meaning “To admit or initiate into the Christian Church by baptism; to baptize; administer baptism to,” is dated to the Middle English period (c. 1200 Ormin). The following meanings listed in the OED also belong to that period.

Turning to sources that are more interested in the meaning of cristnian in the OE period specifically, we find a different picture. MacGillivray equates cristnian with Lat. catechizare, defining it as “to prepare a candidate for baptism.” Furthermore, he also holds that cristnian pertains to the ritual of prima signatio set before actual the baptism. However, cristnian could also signify infant baptism, and was rarely confused with fulwian (to baptize). Cristnung, a noun that is a derivative of the verb, must have meant ‘the act of catechizing,’ according to MacGillivray. Gneuss follows MacGillivray in his conclusions.

Holthausen, on the other hand, translates cristnian with “firmen,” performing the ritual of confirmatio after baptism. Cristnere he then somewhat inconsistently defines as “Katechet”. On the whole we can say Holtausen had the satellite rituals of baptism in mind, when he evaluated these words. From BT and the DOE the same picture emerges of a word that is associated with, but not quite, baptism.

The first meaning of cristnian in the DOE is “to perform the antebaptismal rite (including catechesis); this rite preceded, sometimes by years, the sacrament of baptism.” It is not clear what specific antebaptismal rite is meant, or how this rite incorporated catechesis. The second meaning given for cristnian is “to perform the antebaptismal and baptismal rites,” which could perhaps also be interpreted as ‘to perform baptism.’ The definition of cristnung is more specific: “antebaptismal rite (including catechesis and the anointing of the breast and shoulders with holy oil).” Gecristnod receives the meaning “of a catechumen: catechized” and “past participle used as substantive: catechumen.”

BT translates cristnian with “to christianize, catechize; catechizare”, and with 1. “to instruct in the Christian religion previous to (adult) baptism, to catechize”, 2. “to perform the ritual that precedes baptism”, and finally “to baptize (?) cf. cristnung.” The following is

153 Gneuss, Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen, 86.
155 “cristnian.” DOE.
156 “cristnung.” DOE.
157 “gecristnod.” DOE.
158 “cristnian.” BT.
added to the separate lemma for *gecristnian*: “the rite was introductory, and preceded, sometimes by years, that of baptism. The person who had undergone the rite became a Catechumen.” For *cristnung* “performing the ritual that precedes baptism,” and “baptizing” are given, while *cristnere* is translated as “A catechist” and “one who performs the rite of *cristnung*."

Lynch also gives a definition of *cristnian* and its derivatives: “The Anglo-Saxon clergy had an Old English vocabulary for the catechumenate. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, the verbs *cristnian/gecristnian* designated entry to the catechumenate, and the noun *cristnung* named the ceremony itself. A person who was a *catechumenus* or a *catechizatus* was designated by the Old English past participle *gecristnod*.”

Apart from the views given by Green (to baptize) and the OED (Christianize/convert), most sources tend to agree more or less in connecting *cristnian* to a ritual or period associated with, but prior to, baptism. However, there seems to be some disagreement on the exact meaning of the word. Were MacGillivray thinks of the *prima signatio* and infant baptism, the DOE sticks to the rather unspecific ‘antebaptismal rite including catechesis’, while BT emphasize catechesis more.

2.2.4 Analysis based on the attestations of *cristnian* and its derivatives

2.2.4.1 Verse and early prose

The only attestation of *cristnian* in a verse-text means ‘to baptize’, although the word is used somewhat figuratively. Water is referred to as the agent of ‘cristnað’; it seems plausible that the act of baptism is meant.

Turning to early prose, represented solely by the OE version of Bede’s *HE* in this case, the picture is somewhat different. Where Bede uses the verb *catechizare* in his Latin text, it was translated with OE *cristnian*. The *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* 
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159 “gecristnian.” BT.
160 “cristnung.” BT.
161 “cristnere.” BT.
163 “Ne mot on dæg restan, neahtes neðyð, cæfte tyð, cristnað and clænsað cwicra manigo, wuldre gewlittigað.” See nr. 1.
164 For example: “Baptizatus est autem Eburaci die sancto paschae pridie iduum Aprilium, in ecclesia sancti Petri apostoli, quam ibidem ipse de ligno, cum cathecizaretur atque ad percipiendum baptisma imbueretur, citato opere construxit. In qua etiam ciutate ipsi doctori atque antistiti suo Paulino sedem episcopatus donauit.”
only lists one meaning for *catechizare*: “to instruct in religion, catechize,” also quoting an example of Bede’s use of the term.  

However, can we be sure that the word did indeed have such a meaning, at this time? Did it really mean ‘to catechize’ in the modern sense of instruction in the elements of the Christian faith? Bede’s phrase: “Itaque euangelizante illo in praefata prouincia, cum rex ipse cathecizatus fonte baptismi cum sua gente ablueretur, …” was translated into OE as follows: “Ond he ða swa dyde: lærde þær godcunde lære & þone cyning to Cristes geleafan gecerde, & hine gecristnade, & hine eft æfter fece mid fulwihtes bæðe æþwoh mid his þeode Westseaxum.” The translator seems to have regarded teaching the doctrine and the subsequent ritual of *cristnian* as separate events.

In *HE* III. vi, where Bede relates the story the unfortunate accident of the young monk Herebald, it seems even more unlikely that *catechizare* pertained to religious instruction. Disobeying Bishop John, young Herebald participated in a horse race, fell of his horse and hurt his head. He was in very bad shape, and expected to die when the bishop asked whether he had been baptized. Herebald replied he was sure of this. Bishop John then said that the officiating priest had been too dimwitted to ever perform the ritual correctly: “novi namque eum, et quia cum esset presbyter ordinatus, nullatenus propter ingenii tarditatem potuit cathecizandi uel baptizandi ministerium discere,” translated into OE as “to cristienne oðþe to fulwienne.” Having related the inadequacy of that particular priest, the bishop proceeds to set things right: “Quibus dictis, eadem hora me cathecizare ipse curauit; factumque est ut, exsufflante illo in faciem meam, confestim me melius habere sentirem.”

‘Cathecizare’ is translated with ‘cristnade’, and it does not consist of a lesson but an exsufflatio, a ante-baptismal exorcism: the priest blows in the face of the candidate. Herebald feels better instantly, having been exorcized of evil. As Herebald is a monk, later to become abbot, a lesson in the doctrine would have been nothing new to him, let alone it would have cured him. All in all, it seems safe to conclude that where Bede used a form of *catechizare*...
and it was translated into OE as a form of *cristnian*, the act of performing an ante-baptismal rite is referred to.

2.2.4.2 Late prose

Later prose texts in which we find forms of *cristnian* are Ælfric’s lives of St Martin, St Eustace, and four of his homilies; Wulfstan’s OE homilies on baptism; and the life of St Martin related in the Blickling Homilies and in the Vercelli Homilies.

In Ælfric’s life of St. Martin of Tours (a form of) the verb *cristnian* occurs five times. As Ælfric follows his source Sulpicius Severus relatively closely, it becomes possible to evaluate what *cristnian* may have meant to him. For example, in Sulpicius’ version, Martin goes to church and asks to be made a catechumen when he is ten years old. Ælfric renders this as follows: “Þa ða he wæs tyn wyntra þa wearð he ge*cristnod* his maga unþa*nces*.”

Another example of Ælfric’s use of *cristnian* can be found in the episode about Tetradius: “Tetradius ða sona þa he þæt geseah, gelyfde on urne Drihten, and let hine *cristnian*, and æfter lytlum fyrste he wearð gefullod, and Martinum wurðode mid <wundorlicre> lufe, forþandðe he wæs ealdor witodlice his hæle.” Again, *cristnian* translates ‘to be made a catechumen’.

The renderings of the life of St. Martin in the Blickling and Vercelli homilies also go back to Sulpicius’s text, and in each version the verb is used five times. However, in the Vercelli version the need is felt to explain what *cristnian* means the first time it is used: “Þæt bið sio onginnes & se æresta dæl þære halgan fulwihte.” Unconscious of Sulpicius’ original text, the copyist gives the contemporaneous significance of the word. The attestation of the verb in the life of St. Eustace confirms that *cristnung* and catechism were distinct phenomena:

---


173 See nr. 8.

174 See nr. 7.


177 See nr. 26.
“And he hi þa gecristnode, and tæhte hi þa geryna þas halgan geleafan, and gefullode hi on naman fæder and sunu and þæs halgan gastes, …”

All of the examples above except one refer to historical situations in the distant past. In those cases ‘to be made a catechumen’ is the meaning of cristnian. However, in the one instance where Ælfric uses the word with reference to the contemporaneous situation, it should be interpreted differently: “Ðonne se preost cristnað þæt cild. þonne adræfð he þone deofol of þam cilde: for þan ðe ælc hæþen man bið deofles: ac þurh ðæt halige fulluht he bið godes gif he hit gehylt.” Here, as MacGillivray notes, there is a comparison of two equal parts, and although it seems as if cristnian and fulluht are confused, this is not the case because in the first case infant baptism is meant and in the second adult baptism. There are no other indications to be found anywhere that cristnian denotes infant baptism as opposed to adult baptism, and in this particular case there is no need to interpret it this way either. The exorcism in the baptismal rites of the Anglo-Saxon Church is referred to, and this is then used to illustrate the state of the baptized and the un-baptized in general. Cristnung and baptism are perhaps not equated in this case, but they are considered to be very close together in meaning.

2.2.4.3 Cristnian and baptismal liturgy

Which part of baptismal liturgy cristnian (or cristnung) must have pertained to, becomes clearer in Wulfstan’s homilies on baptism. Forms of cristnian occur three times, and the noun cristnung three times as well. Both homilies enumerate the subsequent components of cristnung in baptismal liturgy, and explain the meaning of each liturgical act. Wulfstan emphasizes that the cristnung that is performed before baptism is of great importance: the priest blows on the child three times and signs a cross on its forehead, to exorcise it from the devil; blesses it to remove the original sin, puts holy salts in its mouth, to make its soul perceive the sharpness of wisdom; and touches the nose and ears with spittle to open them for holy truths; then the breast and shoulders are smeared with chrism, to shield it from the devil’s guiles. When cristnung is completed one can hasten to proceed to baptism, but first the
font needs to be consecrated (also including an *exsufflatio*). Finally the child is dipped in the water trice, signifying the holy trinity.  

In the glosses to the baptismal liturgy in the Red Book of Darley the word *cristnung* also appears. What it refers to becomes clear in what seems to be a note following the regular order of baptism and the order for sick infants: “*and* Swa her before awritan is on þisum lytlan fulluhte na mare gescryrt buton seo cristnung and seo wæterhalgung.” The ‘lesser’ baptism, consist of triple immersion and praying of the collect, and is preceded by only this:

>  “Her onginð þ[æt] les[se] fulluht to untrumum cildum. Cristnige hit man nu ðisum wordum. Medelam tuam ... baptismi tui. per dominum. Halge þet wæter mid ðisum wordum. Exorcizo hanc creaturam ... omnium peccatorum in nomine eiusdem domini nostril ihesu. cristi qui.”

The opening of the ears and nose, and the forswearing of the devil and professions of faith are left out altogether. These comments on *cristnung* and consecration of the font in the order for the sick tell us to which part of the liturgy *cristnung* refers exactly. It corresponds to the exsufflation, application of the salt, and final exorcism through signing, and anointing of the breast and shoulders, prior to the consecration of the font in the normal order. This agrees exactly with Wulfstan’s description of *cristnung*. It has been suggested that the now damaged heading to this first part of the baptismal liturgy in the Red Book of Darley may indeed have said “cristnunge.”

### 2.2.4.4 Derived Forms

The past participle of (*ge-*)cristnian receives a separate lemma in the *DOE*, so *gecristnod* will also be treated separately here. The meaning gives for the word is “of a catechumen: catechized.” The associations with catechizing (in the sense of religious instruction) must be based on the examples listed of the use of Bede of *catechizare*, and a few glosses that give *gecristnod* for the past participle *catechizatus*. However, there is no need to interpret

---

183 Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 156.
186 “gecristnod.” *DOE*. 

catechizatus as ‘catechized’ in the modern sense. For one attestation of gecristnad\textsuperscript{187} the original context is given: “/Cyprian/ actutum ecclesiastico exorcismo catacizatus et parturientis gratiae vulva in baptisterio regeneratus.”\textsuperscript{188} The context could be translated as follows: ‘instantly ‘catechized’ through ecclesiastical exorcism, and reborn in the baptistery through the uterus of regenerating grace’. This source citation points unambiguously to the exorcisms in the rite of cristnung, and begs for a revision of the early meanings of catechizare, not cristnian.

For the substantive use of the past participle the DOE gives ‘catechumen’.\textsuperscript{189} There are indeed several glosses that support this, giving gecristnad for the Latin catechumenus.\textsuperscript{190} In the Confessionale Pseudo-Egberti were are told: “Ne mot gefullad mid þæne gecristnodon etan ne hine cyssan, swa mycele ma swa he ne mot mid þæne hæðenan.”\textsuperscript{191} In the original Latin text we find catecumeno for gecristnodon.\textsuperscript{192} This all suggests that, having undergone the rite of cristnung, one has become a catechumen. Any associations with catechism in the sense of religious instruction seem to be unfounded.

Now turning to the remaining derivatives of the verb cristnian: cristnung, cristenes, and cristere, we again see that a ritual is being referred to. An interesting case of the use of cristnung is not given by the DOEC, but can be found in MacGillivray\textsuperscript{193} and the BT Supplement.\textsuperscript{194} in what is called the ‘Confessionale Ecgberti’ by MacGillivray in baptizando is rendered in cristnunge. This is an indication that cristnung could also refer to baptism proper. Finally, cristnere is found in the context of the OE Martyrology; the heading of a passio speaks of “Sancte Marcellines þæs mæssepreostes ond sancte Petres ðæs cristneres”\textsuperscript{195} These two saints who share the same dies natalis, June 2, can only be Marcellinus Presbyter and Petrus Exorcista.\textsuperscript{196} The strong element of exorcism in the cristnung rite has clearly prompted this translation.

\textsuperscript{187} See nr. 32: catechizatus doctus <gehealgod> gecristnad.

\textsuperscript{188} “gecristnod.” DOE.

\textsuperscript{189} “gecristnod.” DOE.

\textsuperscript{190} See nr. 31 and 33 (edition Aldhelm Glosses Goossens) and nr. 36 and 37 (edition Aldhelm Glosses Napier)

\textsuperscript{191} See nr. 38.

\textsuperscript{192} See Lynch, Christianizing Kinship, 66. or “gecristnian,” BT.

\textsuperscript{193} MacGillivray, The influence of Christianity on Old English, 20.

\textsuperscript{194} “cristnung.” BT.

\textsuperscript{195} See nr. 45.

\textsuperscript{196} See BHL 5230-1.
2.2.5 Conclusions

The earliest use of *cristnian*, in the OE Bede, employs the word to translate Lat. *catechizare*. It designates the performing of a rite, including *exsufflatio*, that affords entry to the catechumenate. The same meaning can be detected in later uses of the word, for example in the life of St Martin by Ælfric, and the versions in the Vercelli and Blickling Homilies. In these texts *cristnian* is used to render the sense ‘to be made catechumen’ in the *vita* by Sulpicius Severus to which they all go back.

However, the meaning ‘to make/be made catechumen’ belonged to the distant past for the writers of these sources. The Vercelli scribe does not know the older significance pertaining to the catechumenate, and explains it as the beginning and first part of baptism. With reference to his own day and age, Ælfric speaks of a ritual including exorcism that is to him very closely associated with baptism itself. Wulfstan in his homilies on baptism uses *cristnian* and *cristnung* to describe the first part of the baptismal liturgy. Here, there is no mention of the catechumenate, which seems reasonable, because it would only last a few minutes. From the liturgy in the Red Book of Darley it becomes clear that *cristnung* and *cristnian* pertain to the exsufflation, application of the salts, exorcism through signing, and anointing of breast and shoulders. In the substantive use of the past participle *gecristnod* ‘catechumen’ the tie with the catechumenate is retained, however. The exorcism in the rite of *cristnung*, perhaps came to be associated with *cristnian*. Hence, it suggested the title *cristnere* for Petrus Exorcista.

The final development in the meaning of *cristnian* and its derivatives consists of a move in the direction of the territory of *fulwian*. In OE Solomon and Saturn (verse), it means ‘to baptize,’ and in the Confessional Ecgberti *in cristnunge* glosses *in baptizando*. This gloss was probably suggested by the inclusion of both rituals in one single ceremony, and must have cause a shift in meaning for *cristnian* towards baptism proper. In Middle English the shift seems to have been completed, where the primary meanings of *cristnen* and *cristning* are ‘to baptize’197 and ‘baptism.’198

With the above in mind, let us review the *status quaeestionis* again, revising it were necessary. The *DOE* and BT both have a rite preceding baptism in mind, but seem intent on including catechesis (instruction) in the picture, however awkwardly. For example, *cristnung*

197 “cristnen.” MED.
198 “cristning.” MED.
in the *DOE* is defined as follows: “antebaptismal rite (including catechesis and the anointing of the breast and shoulders with holy oil).”\textsuperscript{199} This definition is vague, incomplete as to the elements of *cristnung*, and made unclear by associations with the modern significance of ‘catechisis’. The early meaning of Medieval Lat. *catechizare* should be modified because it seems to have less to do with lessons and instruction than commonly supposed. Mistaken understandings of *catechizare* should not be allowed to cloud the significance of *cristnian*. The views given by Green (to baptize) and the *OED* (Christianize/convert) seem to belong to Middle English, not so much to the earlier phase.

All in all, we can conclude that the data available confirms Lynch’s definitions of *cristnian* (entry to the catechumenate), *cristnung* (the ceremony itself) and *gecristnod* (catechumen).\textsuperscript{200} He discusses all the relevant sources and the ritual in great detail. However, Lynch’s preoccupation with the catechumenate blurs the meaning of the words here and there, as the catechumenate only existed nominally by this time, in the minds of well-educated scholars. The confusion with catechesis, gratuitously suggested by *catechizare*, is wholly absent from Lynch’s analysis, except for his discussion of the OE Bede.\textsuperscript{201}

\textbf{2.2.5.1 Semantic and liturgical development}

The overall semantic development of *cristnian* consists of three phases. The earliest phase is recorded in written sources that speak of a distant past. Here, *cristnian* applies to the ancient ceremony that afforded entrance to the catechumenate. One can imagine that this rite suggested this *Lehnbildung* inspired on Lat. *christianus*. The etymology of the verb makes it tempting to suppose the sense ‘to make christian’. This sense perhaps reflects the sparsely informed Anglo-Saxon perspective at the earliest stages of conversion; to the un-trained eye, the rite through which one enters the catechumenate is easily confused with the actual initiatory rite (baptism). The association between Lat. *catechizare* and *cristnian* is probably founded on metonymical use of Lat. *catechizare* of the whole of the rite of entry to the catechumenate; it does not warrant definitions of *cristnian* including catechesis.

In the second phase of the semantic development *cristnian* loses the sense ‘to be made catechumen/Christian’ due to liturgical developments. The rite of *cristnung*, originally a separate rite, becomes an integral part of baptismal liturgy. In the OE Bede already, only a

\textsuperscript{199} “cristnung.” *DOE*.
\textsuperscript{200} Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship*, 61-2.
\textsuperscript{201} Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship*, 56-68.
nominal distinction is made between the rites of *cristnung* and baptism; it is likely the two rites were performed directly following each other. The evidence from Wulstan’s homilies on baptism and the liturgy in the Red Book of Darley establishes beyond doubt that in the later OE period *cristnian* and *cristnung* referred to the first part of the baptismal liturgy including exsufflation, the giving of salt, a final exorcism through signing, and anointing of the breast and shoulders. In this phase the association with the catechumenate is only retained in *gecristnod* ‘catechumen’.

The final phase in the development of *cristnian* is a change in meaning to ‘to baptize’. This can be explained by the liturgical proximity of *cristnung* and baptism. As the ceremony of baptism presented a coherent order performed in one go, it must have gradually become unclear to which specific part *cristnian* referred. Because of this, it was ultimately taken to refer to the whole of the ceremony (semantic broadening). Use of *cristnian* in the sense ‘to baptize’ is extremely rare in the OE period. However, we may be sure that this change did take place some time at the end of the OE period. The common ME verb *cristnen* for ‘to baptize’ attests to this fact.

---

202 See for example *HE* III.vi, and II. xiv.
2.3 Dyppan and Dépan

2.3.1 Frequencies

**Dyppan**

A. Various prose texts: Law codes, riddles and medical texts: 9
B. Verse: 1
C. Prose: 28
   - Ælfric
   - The *OE Martyrology*
   - OE Gospel texts
   - The OE version of the *Heptateuch*
   - Bishop Waerferð’s translation of Gregory the Great’s *Dialogues* )
D. Glosses: 24
   - The Rushworth Gospels
   - Aldhelm
   - Monastic Canticles
   - Ps 67: 24

Total attestations *dyppan*: 68

**Dépan**

A. Prose: 1
   - OE gospel texts
B. Glosses: 11
   - The Rushworth glosses
   - Aldhelm
   - Ps 67: 24

Total attestations *dépan*: 12

(For the attestations of *dyppan* and *dépan* in context, see the appendix.)
2.3.2 Etymologies

The OE weak verb *dyppan* derives from Gmc *dupp-ja-*, a geminated derivative of (strong) Gmc *dúb-a*: ‘to dive’ (OE *dúfan* descends form this root). Another verb that derives from Gmc *dupp-ja-* is OHG *tupfen*,\(^{203}\) which means ‘to wet,- wash’, and glosses *laváre*.\(^{204}\)

According to Seebold, Gmc *dúb-a-* may be traced back to proto-Gmc *dheu-*, a root to which Gmc *deup-a-* ‘deep’ (OE *déop*) and Gmc *daup-eja-* ‘dip, immerse’ also go back.

OE *dépan* is a very distant relative of *dyppan*, too distant for the two to be considered Germanic cognates. *Dépan* goes back to Gmc *daup-eja-*, just like its cognates in other Gmc languages: Goth. *dáupjan*, OHG *toufen*\(^{205}\) (Mod. *taufen*), OS *dopian*,\(^{206}\) Ofr. *depa*,\(^{207}\) and MDu.(and Mod.) *dopen*.\(^{208}\) The figure below gives an overview of the relationships between all the words that were just mentioned:

Given the relationships visualized above, it seems clear that *dyppan* is not cognate within

---


\(^{205}\) Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*, 314.


\(^{207}\) “dopen.” *Etymologisch Woordenboek van het Nederlands*.

\(^{208}\) “dopen.” *Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal*. 
Germanic with either dépan or the common Gmc verbs for ‘to dip’ given above. Instead, they are three ablaut variants of the same IE root. However, dictionaries like the OED and Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands persist in treating dépan and dyppan as Germanic cognates, and hence treat dyppan and the other Gmc verbs for ‘to dip, baptize’ as cognates.\(^{209}\) By extension, this is more or less justified, as all go back to IE *dheu-; however, reference to a distant common ancestor alone does not contribute to a correct understanding of the interrelationships between the verbs.

Dyppan and dépan do not have an identical etymology; however, the verbs must have had a similar meaning. Both dyppan and dépan acquired the additional meaning of ‘to baptize’ after conversion to Christianity. This type of loan can be characterized as a Lehnbedeutung in the terminology of Betz: a previously existing word takes on the (additional) meaning of a word from another language.\(^{210}\)

At which point exactly the sense ‘to baptize’ was added to the meanings of the verbs dépan and dyppan in OE, and which foreign word may have suggested these loans, is hard to determine. The same difficulty exists in the case of the cognates of dépan on the Continent: Goth. dáupjan, OHG toufen, OS dopian, Ofr. depa, and MDu.(and Mod.) dopen also incorporated ‘to baptize’ after conversion, but how and when is subject to controversy.

In his article “Gotische Lehnworte im Althochdeutschen” Kluge puts forth an argument for Got. dáupjan (from Greek baptízein) having suggested OHG toufen. As the Anglo-Saxons had fulwian and ‘Niederdeutschland’ adopted kristenen, the OHG word was unlikely to be an independent loan. Assuming that a knowledge of Greek would have been impossible in Germany that time, and considering that Lat. baptizare is an unlikely candidate for suggesting toufen, Kluge concludes that toufen in the sense ‘to baptize’ was loaned form Got. dáupjan.\(^{211}\) Use of dépan in the sense ‘to baptize’ is sometimes attributed to Continental Gmc influence, as a result of OHG toufen.\(^{212}\)

Green challenges Kluge’s argument by posing that knowledge of Greek would have been available through Greek-Latin glossaries, Isidore’s Etymologiae, and patristic texts; furthermore, Green indicates that Lat. (in)tingere may have suggested OHG toufen. Moreover, Green believes the practice of baptism by immersion as described in the Bible would suggest

\(^{209}\) See “dopen,” and “diep.” Etymologisch Woordenboek van het Nederlands. And “to dip,” “depe,” and “deep.” OED.

\(^{210}\) Gneuss, Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen, 20.


\(^{212}\) Gneuss, Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen, 64.
the use of a Gmc word meaning ‘to dip.’ Furthermore, Green believes that the loans of the sense ‘to baptize’ into several Gmc languages were probably independent, as tenth-century use of OE dépan/dyppan\textsuperscript{213} could hardly be attributed to the influence of earlier use in Continental Gmc.\textsuperscript{214}

Although Gneuss toys with the idea of Continental influence, he identifies dépan\textsuperscript{215} as a Lehnbedeutung from Lat. baptizare, that only occurs in Mercian (the Rushworth Glosses). He is followed in this by Lynch, who speaks of “the verb [singular] dyppan or dépan”. Lynch goes on to say, incorrectly, that dyppan is cognate with the Continental forms dópian, dopen, and taufen.\textsuperscript{216} Gneuss does not think that this bi-partite word is older than fulwian, or that it was replaced by that word, but believes that the words were simply used alongside each other.

In short, OE dyppan and dépan both ultimately go back to the same ancient root *dheu-. Nevertheless, from that point onwards their etymologies differ: dépan derives from Gmc *daup-eja- (*daup-), while dyppan goes back to *dupp-ja- (*dúb-a-). Therefore, it does not seem right to treat the two as variants of one and the same verb. Below, dépan and dyppan will be treated as separate verbs, because of their different etymologies. As both attained the additional meaning ‘to baptize’ at some point during the conversion to Christianity their meanings must have been very similar. Which foreign word suggested these loans, or whether they were suggested by the practice of immersion itself alone, is hard to say for sure. Nonetheless, it will be attempted to identify possible model below, by examining the words dépan and dyppan gloss.

2.3.3 Meaning: The status quaestions

The primary sense of “to dip” (traced back to dyppan) given by the OED is “To put down or let down temporarily or partially in or into a liquid, or the like, or the vessel containing it (usually with the notion of wetting, or of taking up a portion of the liquid, etc.); to immerse; to plunge (but with less implication of force and splashing, the sound of the word expressing a

\textsuperscript{213} Green speaks of dépan and dyppan as if it we are really dealing with one verb, referring to the verbs like this: “OE dépan/dyppan”. Of course, for the etymological reasons given above it would be better to take the two apart. However, Green’s argument seems sound all the same.

\textsuperscript{214} Green, Language and History in the Early Germanic World, 315-6.

\textsuperscript{215} Dyppan is referred to offhandedly as if it were a variant of the same verb.

\textsuperscript{216} Joseph Lynch, Christianizing Kinship, 82.

\textsuperscript{217} Gneuss, Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altinglischen, 64.
light though decided act).”

The second sense listed in this dictionary is “To immerse in baptism; to baptize by immersion (now usually contemptuous). Note the emphasis on immersion. Both senses are documented by examples ranging from the OE to the Modern English period. For a definition of dépan in the OED we must turn to the lemma “† depe, v.” The first sense of this verb is “to immerse as a religious rite, to baptize” and the second “to immerse, submerge, plunge deeply, dip.” Examples also range from the OE to the early modern period.

BT has lemmata for dyppan, dépan, and diápan; all three are said to be cognate with Goth daupjan, and are treated as variants of the same verb. For dyppan it gives: “To DIP, immerge; baptize,” specifying that it glosses the Latin verbs immersere, intingere, tingeire, and baptizare. For diápan it gives “to dip, immerse; to baptize,” and glosses intingere and baptizare. Dépan is defined as “to dip, baptize: baptizare.” In short, dyppan and diápan can mean both ‘to dip, immerse’and ‘to baptize’, according to BT, while dépan solely means to baptize.

Moving on to the DOE, we find two separate lemmata for dypan and dyppan, as well as two for gedypan and gedyped. There is no lemma for dépan; instead dépan is treated as a variant form of dypan. Citations containing dépan can be found under dypan, and gedyped. The senses given for dypan and dyppan are identical (and examples cited from the same texts in some cases): “1. to dip, lower into, or immerse in liquid […] 2. to baptize.” Dypan has the added sense, based on one occurrence, of “to deepen, increase of extend.” Gedyped repeats the same meanings in the past tense, while gedypan is said gloss for impiguet ‘to smear.’

All in all, there seems to be a general agreement that dyppan (plus diápan and dypan) means “to dip, immerse” primarily, but may also mean “to baptize.” BT says that dépan solely means ‘to baptize’, while the DOE implicitly gives it the same meaning als dypan. Dypan and its variant without gemmination, dypan, will be treated as different shapes of the same verb here. Unlike dépan, they have an identical etymology. Furthermore, there does not seem

---

218 “to dip.” OED.
219 Ibid.
220 “depe.” OED.
221 “dyppan.” BT.
222 “dipan.” BT.
223 “dépan.” BT.
224 “dypan,” and “dypan.” DOE.
225 “dypan.” DOE.
226 “gedyped.” DOE.
227 “gedypan.” DOE.
to be any difference in use and meaning of *dypan* and *dyppan*. It seems to be the case that loss of gemmination did not lead to loss of meaning; therefore, *dyppan* and *dypan* may be treated as variants of one and the same verb.

2.3.4 Analysis based on the attestations of *dyppan* and *dépan*

2.3.4.1 ‘To dip, immerse’ and ‘to baptize’

The occurrences of *dyppan* in *DOEC* certainly confirm the two senses ‘to dip, immerse’ and ‘to baptize’. The meaning ‘to dip immerse’ without any connection with baptism occurs by far the most often, thirty-nine out of sixty-eight occurrences.\(^{228}\) The sense ‘to baptize’ can only be assigned with absolute certainty to *dyppan* in four cases.\(^{229}\)

Three of these four cases where *dyppan* is incontestably used in the sense ‘to baptize’ are to be found in the glosses to the Rushworth Gospels.\(^{230}\) Here, they gloss forms of Lat. *baptizare*. In the OE gloss to Sedulius’ *Carmen Paschale* the verb *dyppan* is also used in the sense ‘to baptize’.\(^{231}\) The word *baptisma* from the line 141-2: “Mutait natura uiam, mediumque per aequor/ Ingrediens populus rude iam baptisma gerebat,”\(^{232}\) must have been glossed by “<dypte>” according to the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* (<> = damaged or incomplete MS). The *DOE* gives “dy(? for some form of *dypan* or *dyppan*;”\(^{233}\) Meritt interprets the gloss “dy” for “baptisma” as “a partial gloss for *dypte* rendering *baptisma gerebat*.”\(^{234}\) Apart from a form of *dyppan* in this place, which is by all means plausible, it is also interesting to consider the possibility of a noun for baptism; as *dy*- glosses the Lat. noun *baptisma*, there might have been a noun of action derived from *dyppan* there. However, in line with scholarly consensus on this subject, this gloss will be counted as an occurrence of *dyppan* in the sense ‘to baptize’.

\(^{228}\) See nrs. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, and 69.

\(^{229}\) See nrs. 40, 41, 44, and 53.

\(^{230}\) See nrs. 40 (double gloss), 41 (double gloss), and 44.

\(^{231}\) See nr. 53.


\(^{233}\) “*dypan.*” *DOE.*

The verb dépan is used in the sense ‘to dip, immerse’ four times out the total of twelve occurrences. A further eight attestations of dépan all found in the Rushworth Gospels gloss baptizare. Nrs. 40 and 41 are double glosses; baptizo and baptizabit are glossed depu uel dyppe and depið uel dyppeþ respectively. In the case of nr. 47 the part of the Lat. line “depte” glosses has been lost. It concerns Mt 3.6, of which only “confitentes peccata sua” has been retained; the previous part of the line “et baptizabantur in Iordane ab eo” has been lost. As the OE reads: “<werun> depte in <iordane> from him ondente heora synne,” we can be sure that <werun> depte glossed for baptizabantur, and that the sense “they were baptized” was intended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total attest.</th>
<th>to dip, immerse</th>
<th>to baptize</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyppan</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39 (57 %)</td>
<td>4 (6 %)</td>
<td>25 (37 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dépan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (33 %)</td>
<td>7 (58 %)</td>
<td>1 (8 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.4.2 Dyppan in the context of baptism

Apart from the attestations of dyppan that incontestably refer to the performance of baptism, there also are thirteen cases where the verb appears in the context of baptism. In these cases it is sometimes difficult to decide whether dyppan means ‘to baptize’ or ‘to dip, immerse,’ as truth most likely lies somewhere in the middle. These instance of dyppan shall be analysed below.

In “The Seasons for Fasting” dyppan is used in the context of the baptism of Christ and his subsequent fast in the desert: “He hine dyppan let deorum þweale, fullihtes <bæðe>, fyrena bedæled, and he feowertig daga <firsude><mettas>, eac nihta swa feala naniuht gyltig, leodum to lare, þæt hie on lengten sceolan efen feowertig daga fæsten hewan.” One can translate the beginning of this passage with: ‘He let himself be baptized in a precious bath, the bath of baptism, freed from sins’. But it could also be translated as follows: ‘he let himself be immersed/dipped in a precious bath.’ The exact meaning of dyppan here, is hard to

---

235 See nrs. 30, 67, 68, and 78.
236 See nrs. 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, and 47.
238 Nrs. 10, 11, 12, 24, 54, 55, 56, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77.
239 See nr. 10.
determine. However, the action of baptism (dipping) goes together with conferral of the sacrament of baptism; this is a metonymical use of *dyppan* in the sense ‘to baptize’.

We will now turn to the OE glosses to the Durham Hymal and the hymns in Cotton Julius A. vi and Cotton Vespasian D. xii. The gloss to the Durham hymnal is to “Ut queant laxis”, a hymn to John the Baptist. The line: “Non fuit vasti spatium per orbis sanctior quisquam genitus Iohanne, qui nefas saeculi meruit lavantem tingere limphis” is glossed word-for-word with: “næs widgilles fæc geond embhwerftes haligre ænig acenned se man worulde geearnode þweandne bedyppan on wæterum.” Thus, “bedyppan on wæterum” glosses “tingere limphis.” The sense of *bedyppan* in this context depends entirely on how *tingere* is interpreted here: it could mean ‘to wet, moisten, dye’, ‘to baptize’, and ‘to immerse, dip.’ Dictionaries of Medieval Latin often assign the primary meaning “to baptize.” As we are dealing with a passage about John the Baptist, this translation is likely.

The line found in the hymn called *Antra Deserti* sung on the June 24, the Nativity of John the Baptist, is very similar to that in *Ut queant laxis* and may have a reworking of it for a new context. It clearly is the same line, but the order of the words is slightly different; it gives “qui meruit tingere limphis lavantem nefas seculi.” Again, the OE is a word-for-word gloss, and “bedypan on wæterum” glosses for “tingere limphis.” Again, everything depends on the interpretation of *tingere* in this context; its meaning may well be ‘to baptize’. Again, the act of baptizing goes together with the sacrament of baptism; therefore, this is metonymical use of *dyppan* in the sense ‘to baptize’.

Another occurrence of *dyppan* is to be found in *Iesus Refulsit*, a different hymn. Again, John the Baptist is referred to: “Tremescit felix Iohannes mergere illum flumine, qui est potens tergere peccata cosmi suo sanguine,” the word-for-word gloss goes as follows: “Forhtode se gesæliga bedypan hine on flode se þe is mihtig adrygan syna middaneardes mid

---

240 Under “dyppan” in the DOE this citation is listed under “to dip, lower into, immerse in liquid,” however it is accompanied by the remark “perh. to be taken in more specific sense ‘had himself baptized’.”


242 See nr. 54.


244 *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (ed. Du Cange) gives ‘baptismus’ for “tinctio” and lists ‘baptizare’ as the primary meaning of “tingere”. In *Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandicæ Mediiævi* gives “actus intingendi de baptismate” for as first meaning for “tinctio”, and ‘baptizare’ for “tingere”. In *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* ‘baptism’ and ‘to baptize’ even are the sole meanings given for “tinctio” and “tinguere”.


246 See nr. 56.

his halgan blode.”

Here, bedypan glosses mergere, and the baptism of Christ is evidently referred to. Apart from the meanings “to plunge, dive” or “to immerse,” mergere could also be used with reference to baptism. In the present context, this connotation, if not denotation, is likely.

A form of dyppan is also used in the context of baptism in the OE Martyrology, in the entry for St. Christina. The sentence in which it appears speaks of Christina’s baptism: “Ond he þa dypte hi þriwa on ðære sæ ond cwæð: Cristina, ic þe fullwie on minne godfæder ond on mec, ond on þone halgan gast.” In this sentence “dypte” must be interpreted as “immersed”: ‘and then he immersed her three times in the sea and said: ‘Christina, I baptize you (...)’ Baptistism is only performed once on a single person, never thrice.

In the baptismal liturgy of the Red Book of Darley dyppan is used six times in total, figuring in the long and the short order for baptism the text gives. Here we have a practical description of the rite, focused on the physical actions that need to be completed for the performance baptism. The use of dyppan in this text seems to mean ‘to dip, immerse’ more than ‘to baptize.’ To baptize a child one must dip it into the water, the text seems to say: “Donne nime se preost þæt cild and dippe þæt cild on þæt wæter and cwæþe. Et ego te baptizo in nomine patris.” Dyppan is used three times in the directions for triple immersion in the rite. As a child is not baptized three times, but is immersed or dipped three times, we may assume that ‘to dip, immerse is the meaning of dyppan here. The same reasoning may be applied to the use of dyppan as in the entry for St Christina in the OE Martyrology.

In one Ælfric’s homilies, the use of dyppan in the context of baptism also tends towards the meaning ‘to dip, immerse.’ As mentioned before, connotations that have to do with baptizing can never completely be left out of the question, but here it does seem probable that “to lower into, immerse” is the primary intended sense. This is made very likely by the contrast between a lowering into and a bringing up from the font, which Ælfric sketches twice: “Du gesyxt hine bedyppan on þam sciran wætere, and eft up ateon mid þam ylcan hiwe

---

248 See nr. 55.
249 “mergere.” Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources.
250 See nr. 24.
251 Re-baptism is a danger greatly feared by medieval theologians. See § 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 for example of Ælfric’s concerns on this score.
252 See nr. 72.
253 It does not seem to be supplementary homily 13, as the Dictionary of Old English Corpus specifies, nor can the text have been titled Dominica I Post Pentecosten as this homily does not exist among Ælfric’s work. However, despite the exact provincance of this sentence, the meaning of “bedyppan” and “bedyped” can still be analysed.
Reviewing the occurrences of *dyppan* in the context of baptism, it seems hard to draw very definite conclusions about the exact semantic colouring of the word. The use of *dyppan* in the Seasons for Fasting and the hymns is somewhat ambiguous. Dipping a child into the font is not the same as dipping your pen in ink, especially as *dyppan* does mean “to baptize” elsewhere. In the case of the OE glosses to the hymns, the Latin words are ambiguous themselves, which leaves the exact meaning of the OE words in the same grey zone. However, in these cases, the action of immersing and the sacrament of which the immersion is part go together. Therefore, we are dealing with metonymical use of *dyppan* for ‘to baptize’. In the baptismal liturgies of the Red Book of Darley and in the entry for St Christian in the *OE Martyrology* ‘to dip, immerse’ is the intended sense; the evidence also tends that in the homily by Ælfric quoted above. Below, a revised table with the number attestations of *dyppan* and *dépan* in is various senses and contexts, based on the findings discussed above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total attest.</th>
<th>to dip, immerse</th>
<th>to baptize</th>
<th>context of baptism</th>
<th>remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dyppan</em></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39 (57 %)</td>
<td>4 (6 %)</td>
<td>13 (19 %)</td>
<td>12 (18 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dépan</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (33 %)</td>
<td>7 (58 %)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (8 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Of the 13 occurrences in the context of baptism 4 are metonymical use in the sense ‘to baptize’ and 9 mean ‘to dip, immerse’.)

### 2.3.4.3 Further meanings

In the table above, we can see that the meanings of fifty-six out of seventy-three occurrences of *dyppan* have been accounted for, and eleven out of twelve in the case of *dépan*. Now we will turn to the remaining seventeen cases of *dyppan* and single case of *dépan* the meaning of which is still unaccounted for. Two instances of *dyppan* are discussed in the *DOE*. The third sense of “dypan” in this dictionary is: “3. to deepen, increase, or extend (cf. deopian),” of an

---

254 See nrs. 11 & 12.
256 See for example nr. 69.
oath in this case. Dypte glosses augeatur in this case. 

Under the lemma “gedypan” it says about “gedipèd:” “glossing impiguet ‘smear’.”

Further cases of dyppan and depan remain, their sense unaccounted for by the dictionaries. Among these are three instances of dyppan still close to the origin sense ‘to dip, immerse in liquid’. It concerns glosses to Aldhelm’s De Laudibus Virginitatis. Fundo (1st pers sg pres ind. of fundère) is glossed with “dypen” (inf.) and “dype”(1st pers sg pres ind).

Here, dyppan must mean something like “to pour (liquid from a vessel), pour out, spill,” maintaining the link with liquid. The same is true for the third gloss to Aldhelm: “rorantibus” is glossed with “effundentibus, bedyppendum, wætendum.”

The significance of rorare (to bedew, to become dew, descend as dew), taken together with those of effundere, and wætendum the use of dyppan in this instance points in to the direction of ‘to pour (out), to wet, moisten’. At the same point in the other MS rorare is also glossed with effundere and wætendum. However, what is different here is that the gloss also includes “tingentibus” and the curious form “bedeppendum” is used.

A further meaning of dyppan that has not been recorded as such before is ‘to dye’ (to dip-dye in a bath of colourant). It concerns three occurrences: two from manuscripts of canticles, and one in Ælfric’s Grammar. The verse in the canticles we are concerned with was taken from Isaias 63: “tinctis vestibus de Bosra”. These ‘dyed garments from Bosra’ are glossed as “bedyptum reafum” and “bedyptum hræglum.”

Ælfric implies a similar meaning for dyppan, specifying that tinguere is to be translated with dyppan and comes from

---

257 See nr. 1 and “dypan.” DOE
258 See nr. 71.
259 “gedypan.” DOE.
261 See nrs. 49 & 50.
262 “fundere.” Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources.
263 See nr. 48.
264 “roro.” Woordenboek Latijn-Nederlands.
265 “roro, are.” (torem fieri, modo roris descendere) Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandiae Medii Aevi.
266 “To pour out, shed, spill,” see “effundere.” Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, and “effundo.” Woordeboek Latijn-Nederlands.
267 “wætan.” BT.
268 See nr. 51 and Louis Goossens, The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650, 240.
269 Below, I will return to this interesting form of dépan.
271 See nrs. 57 & 58.
272 See nr. 57.
273 See nr. 58.
tinctura which he translates as deángung (dying, colouring). Of course, Ælfric is providing an etymology for tingere here; however, as dyppan is often used to translate tinguere and that verb may mean ‘to dye’ it is not wholly inconceivable that dyppan took on this sense. The glosses to the canticles attest to this, as well as later use of the verb.

The use of dyppan in Blickling Homily XV is somewhat different from ordinary use in that it means ‘to lower,’ not into a liquid but into hell: “Witodlice swa swiþe swa he weneþ sylf þæt he sceole to heofenum ahafen weorþan, swa swiþe he biþ bedyped on þa neoþemestan helle witu, þær biþ a wop & hrop & toþa gristbitung.” In later use, this sense becomes more common.

A rather unexpected use of dyppan is made in glossary which gives “bediped” for “inditus.” In all likelihood, the past participle of indere simply means ‘placed’ here. Perhaps, the aspect of lowering in the meaning of dyppan has suggested the use in the sense ‘to put, place.’

Finally, the two remaining occurrences of dyppan, the meaning of which still has to be accounted for, are two further uses in Ælfric’s Grammar. Directly following the entry in which Ælfric translates tingere with dyppan, and connects them to dying, he adds: “<intingo> ic on <bedype>.” The association with dying is therefore still present, but further possible senses are by no means excluded. Intingere and dyppan both are verbs that may have several meanings, and this entry in the Grammar is not conclusive. The same is true for “mergo ic besence oððe bedype, mersi, mersum,” although the aspect of ‘immersing’ or ‘sinking’ seems to be emphasized more. The table below presents the frequency of all these additional sense of dyppan and dépan:

---

274 “deángung.” BT.
275 See nr. 19.
276 See “dépen(v.)” MED, and “to dip.” OED.
277 See nr. 70.
278 “to dip.” OED.
279 See nr. 52.
280 “indere.” Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources.
281 See nrs. 18 & 20.
282 See nr 20.
283 See nr. 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remaining senses</th>
<th>Smear</th>
<th>Deepen</th>
<th>Pour out, spill</th>
<th>Pour, wet, moisten</th>
<th>Dye</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Put, place</th>
<th>Tinguere (unsure)</th>
<th>Sink, immerge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyppan</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dépan</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3.4.4 The Latin verbs glossed by dyppan and dépan

It has been suggested that *dyppan* in the sense ‘to baptize’ is a *Lehnbedeutung* loaned from a Latin (or Greek) verb. *Tinguere* and *baptizare* have been suggested as possible candidates.\(^{284}\) An analysis of the Lat. verbs glossed by *dyppan* may provide clues as to which Lat. verb may have been a model..

The *DOE* states that *dyppan* glosses *baptizare* and *intinguere*. However, it also draws the attention to occurrences of *dyppan* glossing *augére* and *impinguare*.\(^{285}\) The choice for *baptizare* and *intinguere* is only a general indication. In BT four Lat. equivalents are given: *immergere, intingere, tingere*, and *baptizare*.\(^{286}\) To the verbs mentioned before I would like to add *mersare, fundere, rofare, effundere*, and *indere*.

Of the eleven Lat. verbs glossed by *dyppan, intingere* occurs most often (17 x).\(^{287}\) *Dépan* glosses *tingere* four times.\(^{288}\) However, in none of these cases the sense ‘to baptize’ is intended. *Tingere* is glossed by *dyppan* twelve times,\(^{289}\) out of which two may mean to baptize.\(^{290}\) *Dépan* glosses *tingere* once.\(^{291}\) Next up is *baptizare*, glossed by a form of *dyppan* three times,\(^{292}\) and seven times by a form of *dépan*.\(^{293}\) In all of these cases the sense ‘to baptize’ is intended. *Mergere* is glossed twice,\(^{294}\) one of which might possibly mean ‘to baptize’.\(^{295}\) Now we are left with *augére, mersare, fundere, rofare, effundere*, and *indere*.
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284 See above (“Etymology”).
285 “dypan,” and “dyppan.” *DOE*.
286 “dyppan.” *BT*.
287 See nrs. 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 37, 38, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, and 68.
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indere,\textsuperscript{301} and impinguare;\textsuperscript{302} these verbs are rarely glossed by dyppan or dépan and never mean ‘to baptize’. Although it is not a verb, baptisma may also be included, as it is presumably glossed by a form of dyppan (see above).\textsuperscript{303} Below, these findings are presented in a table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin words glossed</th>
<th>Dyppan</th>
<th>Dépan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intingere</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tingere</td>
<td>12 (2 may mean ‘to baptize’)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baptizare</td>
<td>3 (all ‘to baptize’)</td>
<td>7 (all ‘to baptize’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mergere</td>
<td>2 (1 may mean ‘to baptize’)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>augere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mersare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rorare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effundere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impinguare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baptisma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all the Lat. verbs glossed by dyppan and dépan, baptizare is the only one that means ‘to baptize’ with complete certainty, while tingere and mersare may perhaps be taken as meaning ‘to baptize.’ So, was Gneuss right when he identified dépan (and dyppan) in the sense ‘to baptize’ as a Lehnbildung from baptizare?\textsuperscript{304} In a sense, yes, because all of the attestations of dyppan / dépan in the sense of ‘to baptize’ are glosses for forms of baptizare. Yet, these are few and are limited to two texts: the Rushworth Gospels and the OE glos to Sedulius’ Carmen Paschale.

One may wonder whether dyppan or dépan were ever widely used for ‘to baptize’ outside of these two texts. Indeed, in ME dippen does not mean ‘to baptize’. The MED does

\textsuperscript{297} See nr. 35.
\textsuperscript{298} See nrs. 49 & 50.
\textsuperscript{299} See nrs. 48 & 51.
\textsuperscript{300} See nrs. 48 & 51.
\textsuperscript{301} See nr. 52.
\textsuperscript{302} See nr. 72.
\textsuperscript{303} See nr. 53.
\textsuperscript{304} Gneuss, Lehnbildungen un Lehnbildungen im Altenglischen, 20.
give sense 1. (d) “to immerse (s.) as a part of baptism.” The primary weight is on the sense ‘to immerse’ here, *dippen* does not indepently mean ‘to baptize’ here. Forms of *cristnen*, *fulhtnen*, or the indication we are dealing with *baptym* (‘baptism’) or a *fount* (‘font’), make clear that it is indeed immersion in baptism we are dealing with. Although *dippen* is used in the context of baptism, it still simply means ‘to dip, immerse’.

### 2.3.5 Conclusions

Forms of the OE verb *dyppan* occur sixty-eight times in total. By far the largest part of those occurrences in the meaning ‘to dip, immerse’: thirty-nine times. The sense “to baptize” can only be assigned with absolute certainty to four cases. Twelve cases mean various things, such as: ‘to deepen an oath,’ ‘to smear, anoint,’ ‘to pour, spill, wet, moisten,’ ‘to dye,’ ‘to lower,’ ‘to place,’ and gloss the ambiguous *intingo* and *mergo*. The verb is used in the context of baptism thirteen times. Of these thirteen instances four are somewhat ambiguous; as the physical act of dipping goes together with the sacrament, this could be interpreted as metonymical use in the sense ‘to baptize’. The remaining nine out of the thirteen uses of *dyppan* in the context of baptism simply mean ‘to dip immerse’, increasing the number of uses of *dyppan* in this meaning to forty-eight.

*Dépan* occurs twelve times: four times in the sense ‘to dip, immerse’ and seven times in the sense ‘to baptize’ and once in the sense ‘to pour, wet, moisten’. In the table below a visual overview of the number attestations of *dyppan* and *dépan* in a various different meanings is given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total attest.</th>
<th>to dip, immerse</th>
<th>to baptize</th>
<th>context of baptism (metonymical)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dyppan</em></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48 (70 %)</td>
<td>4 (6 %)</td>
<td>4 (6 %)</td>
<td>12 (18 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dépan</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (33 %)</td>
<td>7 (58 %)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

305 “dippen (v.)” *MED.*
306 ?c1200 *Orm.* (Jun 1) 1551: Þurrh þatt tatt tu fulhtnesst hemm & unnderr waterr dippesst. *c1350(a1333) Shoreham Poems (Add 17376)* 10/275: And wannne hi *cristneh* ine þe *fount*, þe prestes so þries *duppeþ*, In þe honur of þe trinite. *?a1425 Mandev.(2) (Eg 1982)* 10/8: Paï make bot ane vncioun, when paï *cristen* childer, ne *dippes* þaim bot anes in þe *fount*. *(a1438) MKempe A (Add 61823)* 30/22: Þow seyst þe prest take þe chyld at þe *funt-ston* & *dyppe* it in þe watyr *a1500(a1460) Towneley Pl. (Hnt HM 1)* 199/148: Thou gyf me *baptym* or I go. And *dyp* me in this flume Iordan (see MED; my underlining)
In the case of _dyppan_ and _dépan_ we are dealing with two lexemes of different origin that have come to mean the same thing. The table above shows at a glance that this is an evident case of synonymy. This brings us to the crucial point that needs to be made about the relationship of _dépan_ and _dyppan_.

The etymology of _dépan_ goes back to Gmc *daup-eja- ‘to dip, immerse’, and is cognate with the other Gmc verbs on the Continent that mean ‘to dip, immerse’, such as for example Goth. _daupjan_ and OHG _toufen_. We can be reasonably sure the meaning of of _dépan_ was ‘to dip, immerse’ to begin with, even before written record began. After the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity the practice of partial or full immersion at baptism suggested the use of _dépan_ for performing this ceremony. Even biblical accounts of baptism would have been enough to suggest the loan.

Subsequently, _dépan_ was used to gloss _baptizare_ seven times in this sense in the Rushworth Glosses. Chances are small indeed that the glossator was at a loss for a OE word to render _baptizare_ and came up with _dépan_ because it conveniently meant ‘to dip, immerse’ just as _baptizare_ had in a distant past. Furthermore, _fulwian_ which is also used in the Rushworth Glosses would have been a fine alternative in such a case. All in all, we must conclude that _dépan_ originally meant ‘to dip, immerse’ solely, and underwent semantic change in the shape of broadening; it took on the additional sense ‘to baptize’ by suggestion of the practice or accounts of baptism. _Dépan_ for ‘to baptize’ is not a _Lehnbedeutung_ in sense that it was modeled on _baptizare_; nonetheless, it is a _Lehnbedeutung_ in the sense that it ‘borrowed’ a new sense from a new religious phenomenon: baptism.

A very important fact that can be noted about the use of _dépan_ is that the lexeme is extremely rare: only twelve occurances in total, out of which seven mean to baptize, and one strangely ‘to pour, wet’.\(^{307}\) This seems even more remarkable in comparison to the wide currency of the cognates of _dépan_ on the continent. What could have caused the relative scarceness of the verb?

For an explanation we must look to _dyppan_. This verb which goes back to Gmc *dupp-ja-, the geminated counterpart of Gmc *dúb-a- ‘to dive’, cannot have meant ‘to dip, immerse’ originally. Perhaps the closest cognate of _dyppan_, OHG _tupfen_, may shed some light on the matter. The verb _Tupfen_ glosses _lavare_, often in the sense “benetzen,” ‘to wet,

---

\(^{307}\) This unexpected denotation for _dépan_ will be explained below.
moisten’. This is the best indication we have towards the original meaning of dyppan. Already before OE began to be written down, dyppan had come to mean ‘to dip, immerse in liquid’ through a process of semantic narrowing. From ‘to wet, moisten’ the meaning of dyppan narrowed to ‘to wet, moisten by dipping or immersing’.

This change in meaning in dyppan made it move into the semantic field of dépan. The two became competing lexemes in a single field. This may explain the surprising rarity of dépan in OE: its place was by an largely usurped by dyppan. This also explains why dépan is so uncommon, while its cognates are not: OHG German toufen did not have to compete with tupfen, for example.

Looking at the frequencies of dépan and dyppan in the OE period, we see that dyppan was gaining the upper hand. The two had become synonyms and sometimes began to be confused as versions of the same verb. In the Rushworth Glosses this is clearly demonstrated in the double glosses “ic eowic depu uel dyppe” and “eowic depið uel dypphe,”. Although the synonymy is very evident here, there does not seem to be confusion about the fact that these are two different verbs. Elsewhere in the Glosses dépan and dyppan are used independently. Another double gloss gives “deped uel fullwihted” pointing to synonymy as well, not a confused use of two versions of the same thing.

An example of confusion between dyppan and dépan can be found by comparing the different manuscripts of the Glosses to Aldhelm’s De Laudibus Virginitatis. In one rorare is glossed with effundere and “bedyppendum, wætendum”. This points to the ancient original sense of dyppan: ‘to wet, moisten’. In the other, however, we find that rorare is glossed with effundere as well as tinge and “wætendum” and the curious form “bedeppendum.” This strange form of dépan spelled with double /p/ can only have emerged from confusion between dyppan and dépan. Indeed, in the ME period dépan ran together with depen [OE déopian] and dippen [OE dyppan] and disappeared from use altogether.

From the dynamics between dépan and dyppan, I would now like to turn to the question of whether dyppan was a Lehnbedeutung from baptizare, and afterwards to the

---

308 See “tupfen.” Althochdeutsches Glossenwörterbuch. and “dúb-a-.” Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen starken Verben. 
309 A confusion which lasted until the present day, looking at several secondary sources. 
310 See nrs. 40 & 41. 
311 See nr. 45. 
312 See nr. 48. 
313 See nr. 51. 
314 From Gmc *deub- → OE déop. 
315 “† depe.” OED. “depen,” and “dippen.” MED.
cultural background. As is the case with dépan, it seems unlikely that dyppan is a direct Lehnbedeutung from baptizare. Biblical narratives about baptism, or the practice of baptism itself, must have suggested the loan. The use of dyppan in the sense ‘to dye’, on the other hand, can be securely identified as a Lehnbedeutung from tingere. As dyppan often glossed tingere,317 which can also mean ‘to dye’, this suggested the uses of dyppan in this sense.

2.3.5.1 Dyppan, dépan and baptismal liturgy

The use of dyppan and dépan in the sense ‘to baptize’ may also provide some information about actual liturgical practice: the rite itself. For example, what can the use of dyppan for ‘to baptize’ tell us about the shape of the rite: was immersion, partial immersion, affusion, or aspersion most common? If dyppan perhaps still retained some of its earlier sense, ‘to pour, wet, wash’, similar to OHG tupfen, then the practice of affusion or aspersion could have suggested this loan. This concurs with the picture of the earliest baptisms in rivers by bishop Paulinus, as related by Bede. Although baptism in rivers has often been equated with immersion in modern historical writing, one does not necessarily follow from the other. Richard Morris concludes that aspersion of affusion are the most likely methods: “Rivers like the Swale and Trent have a strength of current sufficient to convert the prospect of a ritual death in to a real one.”318 When the conversion of Anglo-Saxon England was more or less complete, the practice of baptizing in rivers waned. However, this did not mean that baptismal fonts of stone took over this task. Only a handful of pre-conquest fonts survive, while in post-conquest England the font seems to have suddenly become a prized item of church furniture. This has led scholars to suppose that perishable wooden (household) vessels were used before 1066 AD.319 Full or partial immersion of an infant in a wooden tub would certainly be possible. The word dyppan remained in use while the nature of the ritual had changed; this may have even suggested change in meaning from ‘to pour, wet, wash’ to ‘dip, immerse.’

In the Rushworth Glosses “ego quiedem baptiszo vos” is glossed by “Ic eowic depu uel dyppe”.320 The use of the phrase attests to the use of depan and dyppan in baptismal liturgy, as vernacular alternatives for baptizare in the formula ‘I baptize you’ which is uttered by the priest. This Latin phase is very similar to the liturgical formula ego te/vos baptizo

---

317 Twelve times by tingere, and seventeen times by intingere, out of sixty-eight occurrences.
319 Foot, “By the Water in the Spirit,” 182-3.
320 See nr. 40.
found in medieval liturgies. \(^{321}\) Familiar use of *dépan* and *dyppan* in liturgy may even have suggested these verbs to the Rushworth glossator here, as he uses *fulwian* in many other instances. This use of *dépan* and *dyppan* in the Rushworth Glosses places these verbs in the register of vernacular liturgical language, a remarkable status for verbs otherwise used so rarely.

---

\(^{321}\) See for example Page, “Old English liturgical Rubrics,” 154-5.
2.4 The lexical field of baptismal water in OE

No discussion of the OE vocabulary of baptism is complete without attention to the exceptional OE vocabulary for baptismal water. The main reason for this is that this word-group demonstrates the very noticable effect of then current theologies of baptism on the OE language. The lexemes fulwian, dyppen, dépan, and cristnian may tell us much about certain aspects of Anglo-Saxon theologies and liturgies of baptism. However, the OE vocabulary of baptismal water throws light on another essential component of Anglo-Saxon perceptions of baptism. Thus, the picture of the position of baptism in Anglo-Saxon society can be completed.

This word-group consisting of fulwihtbeþ, fulwihtwæter, fant, fantbeþ, fantwæter, and a few collocations with wyll, may be treated as a lexical field of its own. The presence of such a lexical field points to the cultural significance of baptismal water in Anglo-Saxon society. The aim of this chapter is to prove that the OE vocabulary surrounding fons is a vocabulary of consecrated baptismal water. The word-group attests to a specific understanding of the sacrament: during consecration the Holy Ghost fulfills the water turning it into sacrament. Furthermore, the aim is to prove that the definition of fulwiht(e)s beþ as given by the DOE\textsuperscript{322} begs to be modified based on my findings.

2.4.1 Water as the sacrament

It has become clear in this study that the utmost importance was attached to the immediate baptism of newborn infants. This attests to a conception of baptism that is very close to a passively undergone washing from sin. Personal conversion is certainly not a consideration in this understanding of baptism. Indeed, we may assume that the sacrament was understood in a metabolic way, parallel to the metabolic\textsuperscript{323} view of the Eucharist in the shape of transubstantiation. This type of theology of the sacraments was already current in the early middle ages.\textsuperscript{324} According to Isidore of Seville, the baptismal water becomes the sacrament,

\textsuperscript{322} See “fulluh/fulwiht” sense 6 DOE.

\textsuperscript{323} In the theology of the sacraments, belief in transubstantiation in the Host is often called a ‘metabolic’ understanding of the sacrament; similarly, a metabolic understanding of baptism attaches much importance to the matter of consecrated baptismal water.

\textsuperscript{324} Although active debate on the nature of the Eucharist only started with early scholastics (see Cramer, Baptism and Change, 249-50), metabolic understandings of this sacrament were current long before that. Isidore of Sevilla already believed and wrote that the Host became the body of the Lord through sanctification and elevation (see Josef Rupert Geiselmann, Die Abendmalslehre an Wende der christlichen Spätantike zum
though sanctification. Consecration of the baptismal water turns it into the matter of baptismal grace, just as the elevation of the Host turns it into the body of the Lord.\textsuperscript{325} The water itself is the sacrament of baptism, in this conception of baptism.

In the early Middle Ages this notion of baptism was very common.\textsuperscript{326} Following the Augustinian maxim \textit{accedit verbum ad elementem et fit sacramentum}\textsuperscript{327} baptism was often defined in terms of ‘the water’. The Sententiae Atrebatenses, connected to the school of Anselm of Laon, define baptism as follows: \textit{sacramentum autem baptismi est aqua per invocationem Trinitatis consecrata}\.\textsuperscript{328} As we can see, the consecrated matter of water is understood as the sacrament. Apart from being defined as ‘the water’, baptism was also often defined as as ‘washing’\.\textsuperscript{329} Indeed \textit{ablutio} and \textit{lavacrum} were both commonly used in the meaning ‘baptism’ in ecclesiastical Latin.\textsuperscript{330}

Central to Isidore’s metabolic understanding of baptism is the concept of consecrated matter. In baptismal liturgy this gave rise to highly increased emphasis on rituals of consecration. The consecration of the baptismal waters, which transformed them into a sacrament carrying divine grace, became the main constructive event of the ceremony.\textsuperscript{331} Baptizands, on the other hand, acquired a passive role. Angenendt surmises that baptism turned into: “einer Austeilung zuvor bereiteter Heilsmaterie entleert wird: die Taufe ist Austeilung des heiligen Wassers.”\textsuperscript{332}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[326] Angenendt, \textit{Liturgie im Mittelalter}, 64.
\item[327] (Add the word to the element and it becomes the sacrament)
\item[328] (the sacrament of baptism is the water consecrated through the invocation of the Trinity) Arthur Michael Landgraf, \textit{Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik}. Vol III, no. 2 “Die Lehre von den Sakramenten (Regensburg: Pustet, 1955), 7.
\item[329] Landgraf, \textit{Dogmengeschichte}, 10-22.
\item[330] “ablutio” and “lavacrum” Latijn-Nederlands Woordenboek.
\item[331] Angenendt, \textit{Liturgie im Mittelalter}, 63.
\item[332] Angenendt, \textit{Liturgie im Mittelalter}, 64.
\end{footnotes}
2.4.2 The OE vocabulary of the sacrament of water

The metabolic understanding of Baptism as the sacrament of consecrated water is reflected in OE by a range of compounds and collocations. Ultimately this vocabulary of baptismal terms was inspired by the Latin *fons baptismi* and other Latin collocations. *Fons baptismi*, which came into use in the 4th century AD, almost always has the meaning ‘baptismal fountain’, or ‘the water of baptism’; the receptacle of the water is signified only by extension.333

The translation of *fons* in a baptismal context into OE is very complex. In the OE *Bede* *fons baptismatis*, *-baptismi*, *-fidei*, *-sacrosanctus*, *-salutaris*, *-salvatoris*, and *-sanctus* are all translated with the very frequent collocation *fulwiht(s) bæþ* and also the compound *fulwihtbaþ*. However, *fulwiht(s) bæþ* is not a *Lehnbildung* based on *fons baptismi*, as it translates for a whole range of collocations in the OE *Bede*. *Lavacrum baptismi*, *-baptismatis*, *-saltare*, *-saluis*, *-sanctae regenerationis*, and *-vitae* is also often rendered with *fulwiht(s) bæþ* or *fulwihtbaþ*. This should not be interpreted as carelessness on the part of the translator; rather, it seems that one group of collocations was replaced with another. The element *bæþ* captures the sense ‘water’ and ‘washing’ better than the more abstract *fulwiht* alone. In all the translations for baptismal *fons* and *lavacrum* in the OE *Bede*, the water of baptism, rather than its receptacle, is referred too.334 The same is true for OE *fant*, the loan from *fons*, used in baptismal contexts, which came into use in the mid 10th century, when *fulwiht(s) bæþ* started to disappear. *Fant* also primarily referred to the water of baptism rather than its receptacle.335

We seem to be dealing with the vocabulary of the water of baptism, rather than the receptacle of the baptismal water.

Instead, words for the receptacle of baptismal water are rare indeed. Ælfric uses *fantfæt* twice.336 Although *fontston* exists in Middle English,337 OE *Fantstan* is unattested. The OE *Bede* uses *fulwihtstow*, but this seems to refer to a place or building for baptism, rather than a container for the water. *Fulwihtstow* also glosses Lat. *Baptisterium* twice, an ambiguous word that may refer to both a font and a chapel.338 The near-absence of a term for the receptacle for baptismal water may perhaps be explained by the extreme rarity of pre-conquest fonts. As only a handful of these fonts survive (in constrast with the abundance of

333 Jones, “*Old English Fant,*” 144–156.
334 Jones, “*Old English Fant,*” 159–163.
335 Jones, “*Old English Fant,*” 164, 169. This is corroborated by the DOE, which also states that *fant* only referred to a container by extension. “*fant.*” DOE.
336 See nrs. 24 & 25.
337 “font-ston.” *MED*.
338 See nrs. 21, 22, 23.
fonts dating from the Norman period), the use of simple (household) vessels may be supposed. All in all, we may conclude that the whole array of OE terms inspired on fons baptismi was a vocabulary of baptismal water primarily.

About this group of terms Jones notes: “The growth of a vernacular word-group around the “font” constitutes an index not only to the status of baptism generally but also to its specific forms and regulation. It is therefore a matter of some historical interest …” It is certainly true that this part of the Anglo-Saxon vocabulary of baptism is of great historical (and theological) interest. The two major conclusions that Jones draws on this score are solely based on Ælfric’s use of the compound fantwæter in his second pastoral letter to Wulfstan. Firstly, Ælfric’s use of this term shows that the distinction between ‘holy water’ and ‘baptismal water’ began to be made in the 10th century. Secondly, the adding of oil during the benedictio fontis was the actual climax of the medieval rite. Ælfric emphasizes that after the holy chrism has been added to the fant during consecration, it is no longer allowed to sprinkle the bystanders with the water: “and man ne mot besprengan men mid þæm fantwætere, syðtan se crisma bið þæron gedon.” This is probably pointed out by Ælfric for fear of re-baptizing the crowd. A further remark about fantwæter forbids the adding of wine, common to some recipes for holy water.

2.4.3 Sanctification through oil or wax?

The arguments for the differentiation between holy and baptismal water in Ælfric’s writings are convincing. However, whether the adding of oil to the water must be considered the apex of the rite of fanthalgung, rather than the calling down of the Holy Ghost (epiclesis), is subject to question. Ælfric’s warning about sprinkling the congregation after the adding of the oil, as well as in a letter to Wulfsgc: “Ne do man nænne ele to þam fante, buton mann þær cild on fullige” attest to the importance of adding oil.

The liturgy for the consecration of the fant in the Red Book of Darly is another witness to the importance of the adding of the oil, in the creation of baptismal water. Under the
heading “and halga fant þus” prayers are said, the water is divided in four by a movement of the priest’s hand, then the water is exsufflated, and is dripped into with a waxcandle while the Holy Ghost is being called down (epiclesis).\(^{347}\) However we are not dealing with baptismal water yet:

Hate her se preost helian þæt cild wið þæt halig wæter and sprengse se preost hine sylfne and þa men þe him onbuton standað. and nime man of þam wætere on anum fæte ham mid þam cilde and spreng þa hus and loc hwæt man wylle. and nime se preost ele and do on ðæt wæter. Adiuro te creatura aque ut sis mundatio et purification ad regenerandos filios suos deo patri omnipotenti. Qui vivit.\(^{348}\)

In the above, it seems to be very explicit that we are still dealing with holy water at this stage of fanthalgung: is it called halig wæter and everyone may be sprinkle-d with it; moreover, it may even be taken home for the sprinkling of various things. Only afterwards the oil or holy chrism is added to the water, in four stints. In the last two stints, the Latin utterances accompanying them speak of aqua baptismatis.\(^{349}\) This is the same collocation as Ælfric uses in the Latin version of his pastoral letter to Wulfstan, which is then translated with fantwæter.\(^{350}\)

The liturgy in the Red Book of Darley and the remarks on the subject by Ælfric point to the adding of the oil as a decisive moment in the rite of of fanthalgung. However, it is not possible to extend this conclusion to other medieval liturgies.\(^{351}\) The apex of the rite cannot be otherwise than epiclesis, the invocation of the Holy Ghost. This is the moment that the Holy Ghost is believed to descend into the water, transforming it from plain water into sacrament.\(^{352}\)

Wulfstan, the addressee of Ælfric’s pastoral letters, for one, does not seem to have taken the latter’s insistence on the importance of the adding of oil to heart. In his Latin homily on baptism (8a) Wulfstan does not even mention adding of oil, when discussing the


\(^{350}\) “Et non licet aqquam baptismatis spargere super homines, postquam crisma in eam missum fuerit, ne bis baptizentur.” Bernhard Fehr, Die Hirtebriefe Ælfrics: in altenglischer und lateinischer Fasschung (Hamburg: Grand, 1914), 59.


\(^{352}\) The presence of the Holy Ghost is fundamental to metabolic Sacrament-reality. Geiselmann, Abendmalslehre, 242.
consecration of the font, but he does emphasize the epiclesis and the simultaneous application of a candle to the water. This is the moment that water is turned into sacrament:

Clamante autem uoce sacerdotis, ut descendat uirtus spiritus sancti in aquam, cereus benedictus deponitur in aquam. Quare hoc, nisi ut demonstretur modo cereus significare spiritum sanctum? Legitur unam columnam fuisse in itinere filiorum Israel, quando egressi sunt ex Egipto per Mare Rubrum, que eis lux esset in nocte et protectio nubis in die. Habuit ergo mare formam aque, nubes vero spiritus sanctus. 353

The source for this passage is De Ecclesiasticis Officiis by Amalarius of Metz. 354 In cap. XXV ‘De Consecratione Baptistertii’, Amalarius discusses the consecration of the baptismal waters, concluding with the invocation of the Holy Ghost. 355 The priest is instructed to exclaim in a loud voice: “Descendat in hanc plenitudinem fontis virtus spiritus tui.” 356 The next chapter, cap XXVI ‘De Inmissione Cerei in Aquam’, is Wulfstan’s source for the portion of the homily cited above. In this chapter Amalarius explains at length why the application of the candle to the water, while the priest performs the epiclesis, signifies the descendence of the Holy Ghost into the water. 357 This part of the consecration of the waters clearly is the high point of the rite to Amalarius, and to Wulfstan as well. In his OE homily on baptism (8b) Wulfstan does not go into details as much as in his Latin one, but he is very explicit about this part of baptismal liturgy: “And þonne se sacerd on þæt wæt deð þone gehalgodon tapor, þonne wyrð þæt wæter samnunga mid þam halgan gaste þurhgoten.” 358

There are other texts that document the epiclesis and application of the candle as the apex of the consecration of the font. Sticking a candle into the font during the calling down of the Holy Ghost was already quite common during the 8th century, although not universal. The Hadrianum (also called Gregorian) and the Gellone Sacramentary are important witnesses to this fact. 359 Why and when exactly the candle became a part of the liturgy at epiclesis is difficult to say. Ancient Roman fertility rites have been suggested as the inspiration for it; the

356 Hanssens, Amalarii Episcopi Opera, 136.
357 Hanssens, Amalarii Episcopi Opera, 136-8
358 Bethurum, The Homilies of Wulstan, 173.
candle may have had a phallic significance originally, while the text of the epiclesis often calls for the Spirit in terms of conception, using the Lat. verb *fecundare*. Stommel put forth an elaborate argument combining the phallic silhouette of candles, the understanding of baptism as a rebirth, and the font as a uterus, to finally arrive at the conclusion that the Spirit causes an “Empfängnis” in the baptismal waters. He draws from widely different medieval sources to support parts of this argument, but no medieval source discusses the specific rite under scrutiny. Texts that do explicitly discuss the consecration of the font invariably associate the application of the candle with the descent of the Holy Ghost without any sexual connotations. An anonymous reworking of Hrabanus Maurus’ baptismal instruction *De Instititio Clericorum* says the following concerning the subject: “Interrogatio. Cur ponuntur cerei in fontem? Responsio. Ut per hoc ostendatur spiritus sancti gratiam in fontem descendere et ea regeneratione perfundere.”

The evidence for the adding of oil as the climax of the rite of *fanthalgung* in Anglo-Saxon England is implicit and not very extensive. As was shown above, the contemporaneous scholar Wulfstan did not share this opinion, and many sources document the epiclesis and its candle as the apex of the rite. The moment that the Holy Ghost was thought to descend into the waters must have been commonly considered the moment that plain *wæter* turned into *fant* and *fulwihtbaþ* (both terms for consecrated baptismal water).

### 2.4.4 The Spirit and the water

The OE word-group surrounding *fons* is tied up with the rite of *fanthalgung*; the Holy Ghost was thought to fulfill the waters at the epiclesis, turning them into sacrament by His presence.

Wulfstan expresses this idea concisely in the sentence following this discussion of the significance of the candle at episcopalis: “Aqua igitur baptismatis exhibet sacramentum forinsecus, et spiritus sanctus operatur intrinsecus beneficium gratie.” In OE homily 8b he insists again on the transformation wrought by the Holy Ghost in the water at

---


361 The Hadrianum-Gregorian for example gives: “Descendat in hac plenitudine fontis uirtus spiritus tui, totamque huius substantiam, regenerandi fecundet effectu. ” Deshusses, *Le Sacrementaire Grégorien*, 188.


364 “The sacrament of baptism appears to be water on the outside, but the Holy Ghost works the benefit of Grace from within.” (Homily 8a) Bethurum, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, 170.
fanthalgung: “and eall þæt se sacred deð þurh þa halgunge þenunge gesewenlice, eall hit fullfremeð se halga gast gerynelice.”

Gerynelice may be interpreted as ‘sacramentally’ as well as ‘mystically’. With other words: the Holy Ghost fulfills the water sacramentally; turns it into sacrament.

Wulfstan is not alone in emphasizing the importance of the Holy Ghost as the defining feature of the metabolic sacrament-reality of baptismal water. Ælfric, whatever his opinions about the importance of adding oil to he water, expresses the same kind of convictions concerning this issue. In CH II.15 he asserts the following about the nature of baptismal water:

Eac swilce þæt halige fantwæter þe is gehaten lifes wylspring, is gelic on hiwe oðrum wæterum, and is underþeod brosnunge, ac þæs halgan gastes miht genealæhð þam brosniendlicum wætere. ðurh sacerda bletsunge, and hit mæg siððan lichaman and sawle aðwean fram eallum synnum. ðurh gastlicere mihte.

This passage again demonstrates the view that baptismal water (called fantwæter in this case) is different from all other kinds of water, because of the living quality of the water acquired at consecration through the power of the Holy Ghost. The source for this passage is cap. XVII of De Corpore et Sanguine Domini by Ratramnus of Corbi. Ratramnus’ reputation as an early opponent of transubstantiation during Mass is well known. However, his views on baptism may still be considered metabolic. On two other occasions Ælfric expresses the same idea, which poses the presence of the Holy Ghost in the water as the quality that give this water its power to cleanse soul and body from sin.

It is emphasized time and again in several sources that although baptismal water may look like ordinary water, it is of a completely different order indeed. In reality the Holy Ghost is present in it, giving it the power to wash not only the body but also the soul. The examples given above conform to this picture. Another witness is an anonymous homily for Easter day,

---

367 The presence of the Holy Ghost after consecration is what gives the water its (metabolic) cleansing quality for body and soul: “Sed accessit sancti spiritus per sacerdotis consecrationem virtus, et effica facta est non solum corpora verum etiam animas diluere, et spiritales sordes spiritali potentia dimovere.” Jan Nicolaas Bakhuizen van den Brink, De Corpore et Sanguini Domini: Texte original et Notice Bibliographique (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1974), 47.
368 See nrs. 26 & 27.
also employing the word *fantwæter*: “Swa is eac þæt halige fantwæter oðrum wæterum on hiwe gelic ac þurh þæs sacerdes bletsunge genealæcð þæs halgan gastes miht and hit syðdan ðwyhþ þa sawle fram eallum synnum þurh gastlice mihte.”³⁶⁹ This water, with an invisible presence in it is said to work miracles in the same terms. Although a child may look the same after baptism, in reality it as been transformed, washed from all sins, within. The same homily for Easter Sunday states: “Hæðen cild þe man fullað ne bryt hyt na his hiw wiðutan ac hit bið swaðeah wiðinnan awend and ðaþ ðwogen on ðam fante fram eallum synnum.”³⁷⁰ The *fant* causes no outward changes in the child, but the inner transformation is very real.³⁷¹

The group of OE collocations surrounding *fons*, including *fulwihtbaþ, fulwihtwæter, fant, fantbaþ, fantwæter*, and a few collocations with *wyll*,³⁷² is a vocabulary of baptismal water, which comes into play after the transformation of water into sacrament. The OE life of Saint Margaret in CCCC 303 beautifully shows how the transformation in the water leads to a transformation in vocabulary. When the evil Olibrius is about to commit Margaret to a boiling cauldron of water, she prays to God: “Ic þe wille biddan, leofa drihten cyning, þæt þæt wæter gewurðe me to fulluhtes bæðe and to clænsunge ealra minum synnum.”³⁷³ Margaret’s request for the transformation of plain water into baptismal water, demonstrates the distinction between plain *wæter* and a different kind of water: *fulluhtes bæðe*, baptismal water.³⁷⁴ Directly after Margaret has uttered her plea help is sent down from above: “And þa þær com fleogan drihtnes ængel and he þa gehalgode þæt wallende wæter to fonte”³⁷⁵ As is shown here, consecration of the water transforms it to *fant*, the sacrament of baptismal water.

³⁷⁰ See nr. 28.
³⁷¹ Æfric expresses the same idea in Suppl. Hom. 13: “Du gesyxt hine bedyppan on þam sciran wætere, and eft up aton mid þam ycan hiwe þe he hæfde ægor, ær ðan þe he dufe, ac seo halige modor, þe is Godes Gelæpung, wæt þæt þæt cild bið synnfull bedypped into þam fante, and bið up abroden fram synnum ðwogen, þurh þæt halige fulluhte.” See nrs. 11 and 12 in the Appendix to *Dyppan*.
³⁷² Lat. *fons* is mostly translated with *wyll* in non-baptismal contexts, however, it does appear in baptismal context as well. See Jones, “Old English *Fant,*” 159-62.
³⁷³ See nr. 29.
³⁷⁴ The other OE life of St Margaret (in MS Cotton Tiberius A. iii) contains the move form water to *fulwihtes baþe*: “Se eadega Margareta locade on heofonum and cwæþ: ‘Drihten, God ealmihtig, þu þe eardest on heofonum, geunne me þæt þis wæter sy me to hielo and to lihtnesse and to fulwihtes heþe unaspringende þæt hit me æpwea to þam eacan life, and awyrp me from eallum mine synne and gehæl me on þinum wuldre, forþon þe þu eart gebletsod on weorulde.’” Mary Clayton and Hugh Magennis, *The Old English Lives of St Margaret* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 128-30.
³⁷⁵ Clayton and Magennis, *The Old English Lives*, 166.
At this point the OE life in CCCC 303 is reasonably independent from the Latin lives closest to it. The Passio S. Margaretae seems to be close to the OE life in Tiberius A. iii: *Fiatque mihi aqua ista sanctificatio et illuminatio salutis, et fiat mihi fons indeficiens.* Lat. *fons* is clearly translated with *fulwihtes bæþe* there. The very influential Latin version of the legend in Monte Cassino 52 does not correspond closely to either of the OE lives. The transformation of water into *fant* in CCCC 303 must be an addition by the OE translator of the legend. Both Latin versions simply have a *benedicat aquam (istam)* but do not speak of any transformation into anything else. At this point, it is very likely that we are dealing with an independent modification by the Anglo-Saxon editor of CCCC 303. The text clearly demonstrates that the OE word-group surrounding *fons* is a vocabulary of baptismal water, which comes into use after consecration of the water.

### 2.4.5 Fulwihtes bæþ

This idea is reflected in the very nature of the collocation *fulwihtes bæþ*. The element –*bæþ* captures the sense of ‘water’and ‘washing’(implicit to *fons baptismi, lavacrum salutionis* and the like) much better than OE *fulwiht* alone. The ‘watery’ quality of *fulwihtes bæþ* that becomes apparent in use is indeed what distinguishes it from *fulwiht* proper. The latter pertains to baptism in a rather abstract sense, while *fulwihtes bæþ* refers to water as the ‘concrete’ matter of the sacrament more. This distinction does not bear a rigid character, however. *Fulwihtes bæþ* may be used in ways that could be interpreted as coming close to *fulwiht* itself. The phrase ‘*aþwéan mid þa halwendan wylle fulwihtes bæþe*’, used several times in the OE Bede, places the water in *wyllan*, while *fulwihtes bæþ* could be interpreted as ‘baptism’. The DOE tries to solve the difficulty of the fluid nature of *fulwihtes bæþ* by speaking of ‘immersion’ or ‘washing’ or the rite of baptism here and there, but reverting to

---

376 No direct Latin source survives. The life in CCCC 303 is generally very close to BHL 5303 except for number of departures. It is impossible to be certain whether the peculiarities derive form a now lost Latin intermediary or must be attributed to the creativity of the Anglo-Saxon translator. Clayton and Magennis are more inclined to believe in the latter, due to the works literary merit. “The CCCC version, on the other hand, presents something of a reworking of the legend, with new emphasis and preoccupations.” Clayton and Magennis, *The Old English Lives*, 62-6.

377 Clayton and Magennis, *The Old English Lives*, 212.


379 See, for example, nr. 30.

380 See nr. 31.
baptism proper as well. However, instead letting the shades of meaning of *fulwihtes baþ* range from ‘baptism’ to ‘immersion/washing of baptism’, I would like to replace the latter end of the scale with ‘water as the sacrament’:

```
fulwihtes baþ/ fulwihtbaþ

baptism (abstract) water as the sacrament
```

In all events, the sense ‘immersion of baptism’ seems to be rather far out, as *baþ* does not really carry any connotations having to with dunking; that is only suggested by extension in ceremony of *fulwiht*. The association with immersion is offered rather gratuitously, while other shades of meaning in *fulwihtes baþ* receive little attention. The importance of the theological background against which *fulwihtes baþ* figured needs to be recognised: a metabolic conception of the sacrament as ‘the water’. This member of the OE word-group surrounding *fons* has a decidedly ‘watery’ connotation, just like *fant* and its compounds. The sense of ‘washing of baptism’ given by the *DOE* is completely warranted in the case of *fulwihtes baþ*. Indeed, the collocation often translated Lat. Collocations containing *lavacrum*; the last element clearly suggests the association with washing.

In terms of lexical development it must be noted that *fulwihtbaþ* and *fulwihtes baþ* belong to the early period up until the 10th century, while *fant* and its compounds only occur in the later OE period. The occasional use of *wyll* in baptismal contexts occurs throughout the OE period, always suggested by a literal translation of Lat. *fons*.

It is hard to date the actual loan of *fant*; however, the appearance of the word in the later OE period suggests that it came into the language not to long before. The reason why *fant* may then have more or less pushed *fulwihtbaþ* away in this period must be sought in the semantic development of *fulwihtbaþ* during the early OE period. *Fulwihtbaþ* was modeled on Lat. collocations such as *fons baptismi*, denoting the ‘water of baptism’ and rarely its place or receptacle (by extension). However, *fulwihtbaþ* came to be used in the sense ‘baptism’ (abstract) as well, suggested by ‘*fulwiht*’ in the compound *fulwihtbaþ* (and also the collocation *fulwihtes baþ*). The semantic broadening of *fulwihtbaþ* may have rendered it unclear and confusing. *Fant*, on the other hand, did not present the same problem, because it only signifies the water of baptism itself, and the receptacle only by extension.

---

381 “fulluht, sense 6: fulluhtes baþ,” and “fulluht-baþ,” *DOE*. 
2.4.6 Conclusions

The major insight of historical interest that can be gained from this lexical field in OE has to do with how the sacrament of baptism was understood in Anglo-Saxon society. The most important members of this group, *fulwihtbæþ* (*fulwiht(s) bæþ*), *fulwihtwæter*, *fant*, *fantbæþ*, and *fantwæter*, together constitute a vocabulary of baptismal water more than anything else. This must be understood against the background of the metabolic understanding of baptism prevalent in the early Middle Ages. Water was thought to transform into sacrament, aided by the presence of the Holy Ghost, who descended into it at consecration. This conception of baptism is inextricably tied up with the word-group quoted above. It is a vocabulary of baptismal water that comes into play after consecration of the font. Consecrated matter, baptismal water in this case, a concept so fundamental to a metabolic understanding of the sacraments, has its own specific vocabulary in OE.
2.5 *Gefuntan and Aþwéan

A further sign of the importance of consecrated water in baptismal theologies at the time is the OE verb *gefuntan, attested only once, which means ‘to baptize’.\(^{382}\) It is very telling that a verb which could literally be interpreted as ‘to commit to the font (e.a. baptismal waters)’ should be used for ‘to baptize’ proper. The importance of the metabolic sacrament-reality, the presence of the Holy Ghost in the water, caught in this term, emphasizes the belief that baptism is the water, once more.

A further verb closely associated with baptism is the OE verb aþwéan.\(^{383}\) It is often used in conjunction with fulwihtes bæþ, a collocation which clearly suggests the use of a verb for ‘to wash’. Figurative use of aþwéan frequently refers to the spiritual cleansing worked by baptism. However, aþwéan as a verb does not mean ‘to baptize’; in fact, it plays a similar role as dyppan: it often appears in a baptismal context, but without losing it primary sense. There is only one known instance where a form of aþwéan glosses baptizarentur, in the Gospel text in CCCC 140.\(^{384}\) It is perhaps even surprising that use of aþwéan in the sense ‘to baptize’ was not recorded more often. In view of the habit of defining baptism as a washing,\(^{385}\) this would have been likely.

\(^{382}\) “gefunted.” DOE.

\(^{383}\) ‘to wash’ or ‘to cleanse,’ see, “aþwéan,” DOE.

\(^{384}\) Lk (WSCp) B8.4.3.3 [0112 (3.12)] Da comon ða manfullan ðæt hig aþwegene wæron, & cwædon to him, lareow hwæt do we? See “aþwéan, sense B.1.a.” DOE.

\(^{385}\) Landgraf, Dogmengeschichte, 10-22.
3. Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to describe and analyze the diachronic lexical field of baptism in OE, to gain a better understanding of the functioning of these words, as well as gaining a better understanding of baptismal practice and theology in Anglo-Saxon England. Below the lexical development of the field and the semantic development of the individual lexemes will be discussed, based on my findings. Furthermore, we will see how our understanding of the words may influence our ideas about Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice.

3.1 Lexical development of the field

The lexemes in the lexical field of ‘to baptise’ are *fulwian, cristnian, dyppan, and dépan*. This field is almost exclusively dominated by *fulwian* in OE; there seems to have been little competition with other verbs during the entire OE period. Use of *dyppan, dépan, cristnian, apwéan*, or *gefuntan* in the sense ‘to baptize’ was extremely rare. *Dyppan* glosses *baptizare* in four cases, found in two texts; other meanings for *dyppan* are much more common. The same goes for *dépan*; it is found seven times glossing *baptizare* in the Rushworth Gospels. *Cristnian* pertains to the first part of the baptismal order, not baptism proper; use pertaining to baptism proper occurs only two times. *Apwéan* and *gefuntan* are both used in the sense ‘to baptize’ once. In the ME period hegemony of *fulwian* seems to have come to an end. In the late OE period, it can be noticed that *cristnian* is moving in to the sphere of *fulwian*, witnessed by two attestations in the sense ‘to baptize’. Furthermore, new member of the field was introduced: *baptisen*. As was noted before, *dippen* was not used in the sense ‘to baptize’. *Dépan* ran together with the descendent of *OE déopian* and *dippen* and disappeared from use altogether.

In the table below the development of the field is given in a schematic manner. In the OE period *fulwian* dominates throughout (bright blue), but fades in use in the ME period (soft blue). *Cristnian* is used some thirty-eight times (excluding eight derived forms) during the OE period, but almost never in the sense ‘to baptize’ (soft yellow); however, in the ME period it is the primary meaning of *cristnian* (bright yellow). *Baptisen* does not exist in the OE period, but does play a major role in the ME period (bright red). *Gefuntan, apwéan, dépan*, and *dyppan* are marked in soft tones, as they rarely occur in the OE period for ‘to baptize’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE period</th>
<th>ME period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>fulwian</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cristnian</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dyppan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dépan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>baptisen</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apwéan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gefuntan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gefuntan, apwéan, dépan, and dyppan* are marked in soft tones, as they rarely occur in the OE period for ‘to baptize’.
It is interesting to note that the OE field is dominated by the *Lehnschöpfung* fulwian, while in the ME period *baptisen* and *cristnian* dominate. Perhaps, the oppositions in the ME field may be used to explain the gradual decline of *fulwian* and its descendents. Already during the OE period –wian (OE *wíhian*) was no longer found to be an intelligible morpheme, which meant a loss of meaning for *fulwian* (often *fullian*). By the time of the ME period no visible reminders of *wíhian* or its meaning were retained,\(^{392}\) much less, clues as to why *fulhtnen* should be appropriate for ‘to baptize’. On the other hand, *baptisen* and *cristnen*, the lexemes it had to compete with, still retained clear associations with their origin and had an obvious link to baptism. *Baptisen* still preserved a very clear link with (biblical) Lat. *baptizare*, and *cristnen* still carried the connotation ‘to make Christian’ also appropriate for baptism. This may certainly have been a factor in the decline of the descendents of *fulwian*.

### 3.2 Semantic development of the individual lexemes

#### Fulwian

OE *fulwian*, which occurs around 275 times, certainly is the most commonly used verb for ‘to baptize’ in OE. The semantic development of *fulwian* consists of the loss of certain connotations. In the early OE period *fulwian* must still have carried a strong connotation of the numinous, dark, occult side of religion, associated with Gmc *wihaz*-\. Although *wih* and

---

\(^{392}\) “Fulwen” occurs once, and “folwen” twice in the sense ‘to baptize. Otherwise the /w/ is absent from the ME descendents of *fulwian.*
*wíhian* were avoided by use of *hálig* and *hálgian* in other contexts, it seems *wíhian* was deemed appropriate with regards to baptism. This corresponds to an early medieval conception of baptism: a mysterious and terrifying rite, primarily aimed at exorcizing candidates from evil. This is supported by the use of *fulwiht* gloss *exorcismus*, and the early law texts that contain provisions for baptism *quam primum* for very young infants.

The major change in meaning that can be recorded for *fulwian* has to do with the loss of this dark, cultish connotation. *Fulwian* and *fulwiht* must have slowly lost this frightening association with the sacrosanct. This loss of meaning is reflected in the later spellings of *fulwian*. Because –*wian* stopped being an intelligible morpheme, the /w/ in *fulwian* could be assimilated to this preceding /l/ without any problem. Therefore, we often see the spellings: *fullian* and *fulluht*. Once OE *wíhian* and its negative connotations were quite forgotten; this resulted in the loss of the semantic colouring *fulwian* described above. In later use *fulwian*, or rather *fullian*, simply meant ‘to baptize’ without any association with the sacrosanct.

![Diagram](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

**Cristnian**

In the semantic development of *cristnian* three phases can be recognized. The first one can be detected in uses of *cristnain* that refer to a distant past. In these cases it often glosses *catechizare* and *catechumenus facere*; *cristnian* denotes the performance of the ancient ceremony that afforded entrance to the catechumenate. It is not at all odd that this rite motivated a *Lehnbildung* inspired on Lat. *christianus* or its OE counterpart *cristen*. The sense ‘to make Christian’ can be explained quite easily for the verb denoting the performance of this rite. To the untrained eye, the rite through which one enters the catechumenate is easily confused with the actual initiatory rite (baptism). The sense ‘to make Christian’ reflects the sparsely informed Anglo-Saxon perspective at the earliest stages of conversion. The association between Lat. *catechizare* and *cristnian* is probably founded on metonymical use of Lat. *catechizare* of the whole of the rite of entry to the catechumenate; it does not warrant definitions of *cristnian* including catechesis.

In the second phase liturgical developments cause a semantic shift for *cristnian*. The verb loses the sense ‘to be made catechumen/Christian’. This is because the rite of *cristnung*, originally a separate rite, became an integral part of baptismal liturgy very early on. In the OE
Bede already, only a nominal distinction is made between the rites of *cristnung* and baptism; it is likely the two rites were performed directly following each other.\(^{393}\) During the later OE period it is possible to say with absolute certainty that *cristnian* and *cristnung* referred to the first part of the baptismal liturgy including exsufflation, the giving of salt, a final exorcism through signing, and anointing of the breast and shoulders. The evidence for this can be found in Wulstan’s homilies on baptism and the liturgy in the Red Book of Darley, which prove this fact beyond a doubt.

The final phase in the development of *cristnian* is a shift in meaning to ‘to baptize’. Again, the place of *cristnian* in liturgy motivates this change. The proximity of *cristnung* and baptism, or rather *cristnung* being a part of the baptismal order, creates confusion. It must have gradually become unclear to which specific part of the order *cristnian* referred. In a process of semantic broadening *cristnian* ultimately came to denote the whole of the ceremony. Use of *cristnian* in the sense ‘to baptize’ is extremely rare in the OE period; however, a wide use of ME *cristnen* attests to the fact that these rare cases are indeed the beginning of a shift to ‘to baptize’.

Below, the semantic development of *cristnian* is represented visually:

\[
\text{Dépan}
\]

We have found that *dépan* occurs twelve times in total, out of which four times in the sense ‘to dip, immerse’ and seven times in the sense ‘to baptize’ and once in the sense ‘to pour, wet, moisten’.\(^{394}\) In line with the etymology of *dépan* we can be reasonably sure that the verb meant ‘to dip, immerse’ even before written record began. *Dépan* and its cognates on the continent (such as Goth. *daupjan* and OHG *toufen*) all go back to Gmc *daup-eja-* ‘to dip, immerse’. When the Anglo-Saxons converted to Christianity the practice of partial or full immersion at baptism must have suggested use of *dépan* for denoting the performance of this ceremony. Biblical accounts of baptism could also have played a role in this.

---

\(^{393}\) See for example *HE* III.vi, and *HE* II. xiv.

\(^{394}\) It must be noted that the sense ‘to pour, wet, moisten’ should be ascribed to confusion with *dyppan*. 
In the Rushworth Glosses dépan was used to gloss baptizare seven times. As fulwian is also used to gloss baptizare in this text, it seems unlikely that dépan is a Lehnbedeutung modeled on baptizare in the strictest sense. If the glossator was looking for a OE word to render baptizare he could have used fulwian. Most likely dépan in the sense ‘to baptize’ was already current. All in all, we must conclude that dépan originally meant ‘to dip, immerse’ solely, but subsequently was subject to semantic broadening; it took on the additional sense ‘to baptize’ by suggestion of the practice or accounts of baptism. Dépan is a Lehnbedeutung in the sense that it ‘borrowed’ a new meaning from a new religious phenomenon: the practice of baptism.

Dyppan
Forms of the OE verb dyppan occur sixty-eight times in total. By far the largest part of those occurrences in the meaning ‘to dip, immerse’: forty-eight times. The sense “to baptize” can only be assigned with absolute certainty to four cases; an additional number of four is metonymical use for ‘to baptize’. Twelve cases mean various things, such as: ‘to deepen an oath,’ ‘to smear, anoint,’ ‘to pour, spill, wet, moisten,’ ‘to dye,’ ‘to lower,’ ‘to place,’ and gloss for the ambiguous intingo and merge.

Dyppan goes back to Gmc *dupp-ja-, the geminated counter part of Gmc *dúb-a- ‘to dive’; it cannot have meant ‘to dip, immerse’ originally. The closest cognate of dyppan, OHG tupfen, glosses lavare, and does so often in the sense “benetzen,” ‘to wet, moisten’. The original meaning of dyppan must have been something like ‘to wash, wet, moisten’. However, in OE written record dyppan means ‘to dip, immerse in liquid’. Therefore, we must suppose that a process of semantic narrowing had taken place in pre-history. ‘To wet, moisten’ specialized to ‘to wet, moisten by dipping or immersing’. As a result of this change in meaning dyppan and dépan became competing lexemes in the same field. This may also explain why dépan is so rare in OE, while its cognates on the continent are not: OHG toufen and tupfen did not move in the same spheres.

It seem unlikely that *dyppan* is a direct *Lehnbedeutung* from *baptizare*. Biblical narratives about baptism, or the practice of baptism itself must have suggested the loan. The use of *dyppan* in the sense ‘to dye’, on the other hand, can be securely identified as a *Lehnbedeutung* from *tingere*. As *dyppan* often glossed *tingere*, this suggested the use of *dyppan* in this sense. All in all we can say that *dyppan* underwent a process of semantic narrowing form ‘to wash, wet, moisten’ to ‘to dip, immerse, but afterwards its senses multiplied again:

![Semantic development diagram]

**Aþwéan and *gefuntan***

OE *aþwéan* and *gefuntan* both occur once in the sense ‘to baptize’. *Aþwéan* glosses a form of *baptizare* once. This verb, that usually means ‘to wash, cleanse’ is often used in baptismal context, but not to actually denote the sense ‘to baptize’. Use in baptismal context must have led to baptismal connotations in *aþwéan*, and this may have suggested use of *aþwéan* to gloss *baptizare*. The semantic development of *aþwéan* could be formulated as follows: ‘to wash’ \(\rightarrow\) ‘to wash in baptism(fig.)’ \(\rightarrow\) ‘to baptize’. However, it would be too much to speak of a process of semantic narrowing for *aþwéan*, since the sense ‘to baptize’ is attested only once. The primary sense of *aþwéan* remains ‘to wash, cleanse’ throughout the OE period.

It is hard to speak of a semantic development for *gefuntan*, because the verb occurs only once. In that one case it means ‘to baptize’, but one could also interpret the verb literally: ‘to commit to the font/ baptismal water’. The latter definition must be understood against the background of metabolic theology of the sacraments, as *gefuntan* puts the focus on the baptismal water itself.

**3.3 Theological, liturgical and cultural implications**

What can the use and meanings of the lexemes tell us? The fact that *fulwiht* was used metonymically to denote ‘Christianity’ several times demonstrates the absolute the centrality of this sacrament in the ninth century Anglo-Saxon England. The fundamental importance of baptism in not only shown by metonymical use of *fulwiht* in the sense ‘the Christian faith’.

---

396 Twelve times by *tingere*, and seventeen times by *intingere*, out of sixty-eight occurrences.
The other way around, synecdochic use of *cristennes* in a sense close to baptism confirms moreover that baptism was deemed so essential to Christianity, that it was nearly considered the same thing.

Furthermore, this *Lehnschöpfung*, unique to OE, has a surprising etymology that may say much about early attitudes to baptism. Otherwise unattested OE *wíhian* was not used in Christian contexts, because it had connotations having to do with the dark, cultic, numinous side of paganism. However, the verb was used in a *Lehnschöpfung* for the performance of the initiatory sacrament, a phenomenon central to Christianity, undoubtedly so in missionary contexts. The absolute evasion of *wíhian* in all but baptismal context, points to an understanding of baptism as a dark, scary rite. A rite aimed at exorcism and fending off the devil more than at conversion and salvation. This take on baptism fits very well with early medieval views on baptism, which were characterized by dualism (between Christ and the Devil) and a strong emphasis on forms, exorcisms, and a belief in the efficacy of the rite itself.

The fact that *fulwiht* glosses *exorcismus* confirms this understanding of baptism. Several law-texts confirm the interpretation of baptism as a manner of exorcism, by their insistence on baptism of very young infants. The explicit object of this is to put the devil to flight and to prevent infants dying unbaptized.

The verb *cristnian* also attests to the importance of the exorcisms in the first part of the baptismal liturgy (*cristnung*). In the *OE Martyrology* Petrus Exorcista is called “Petres ðæs cristneres,” which suggests that *cristnian* had strong connotations of exorcism. Ælfric states: “Donne se preost cristnað þæt cild. þonne adræfð he þone deofol of þam cilde.” He goes on to explain that it is necessary to drive out the devil in terms of dualism: “for þan ðe ælc hæþen man bið deofles: ac þurh ðæt halige fulluht he bið godes gif he hit gehylt.” Again, this confirms the enduring pre-eminence of early medieval theologies of baptism, in the later OE period as well.

Another important and interesting fact we may learn from *cristnian* it that during the earliest phases of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons there must sometimes have been a ceremony for becoming a catechumen, separate from baptism. If this had not been the case, there would have been no motivation to adopt this *Lehnbildung*. Therefore, we may suppose the existence of such a separate rite for a short period during the 7th century. However, uses of

397 See appendix *cristnian* no. 45.
398 See appendix *cristnian* no. 13.
crístnían that refer to such an initiatory rite, always speak of a distant past (for example: the OE lives St Martin of Tours). This independent rite cannot have enjoyed a very long existence in Anglo-Saxon England; it must have been absorbed into baptismal liturgy very early on. In sources that speak of contemporary situations, crístnían and crístnünng refer to the first part of baptismal liturgy including exsufflation, the giving of salt, another exorcism, and anointing of the breast and shoulders.

The use of dyppan and dépen in the sense ‘to baptize’ may also provide some information about actual liturgical practice: the performance of baptism itself. Dyppan, for example may provide information about the shape of the rite: was immersion, partial immersion, affusion, or aspersion most common? The earliest (unrecorded) uses of dyppan in the sense ‘to baptize’ may still have been closely associated with the verb’s original sense, ‘to pour, wet, wash’ similar to OHG tupfen. The practice of affusion or aspersion may have suggested the loan of dyppan for ‘to baptize’. The earliest baptisms in rivers by bishop Paulinus, as related by Bede, confirm this. Unlike what is commonly supposed in modern historical writing, baptism in rivers should not be equated with immersion. In fact, aspersion of affusion are the most likely methods because of the strong current and low temperature of many English rivers. After the initial phases of the conversion the practice of baptizing in rivers waned. After this, simple wooden (household) vessels must have been used; stone fonts do not enter generally until after the Norman Conquest. Full or partial immersion of an infant in a wooden tub would certainly have been possible. Perhaps, we may even suppose Dyppan continued in use while the nature of the ritual had changed from affusion/aspersion to immersion; this may have even suggested change in meaning from ‘to pour, wet, wash’ to ‘to dip, immerse.’

Another matter of liturgical interest is that both dyppan and dépan must have been part of a register of vernacular liturgical language. In the Rushworth Glosses the phrase “Ic eowic depu uel dyppe” attests to the use of dépan and dyppan in baptismal liturgy. The verbs must have functioned as vernacular alternatives for baptizare in the formula ‘I baptize you’. The phrase “ego quidem baptiszo vos” is glossed by “Ic eowic depu uel dyppe” in the Rushworth Glosses. The Latin phrase is extremely similar to the liturgical formula ego te/vos baptizo found in medieval liturgies. Interestingly enough, the glossator chose to use dyppan and dépan at this point, not fulwian. Therefore, it is likely that dépan and dyppan were

400 See nr. 40.
401 See for example Page, “Old English liturgical Rubrics,” 154-5.
commonly used in liturgy, and this must have suggested these verbs to the Rushworth glossator here, whereas he uses *fulwian* in many other instances.

Last but not least, the OE word-group surrounding Lat. *fons* provides invaluable information about what kind of theology of the sacraments, and especially of baptism, was current in Anglo-Saxon England. This word-group consisting of *fulwihtbæþ* (*fulwihtes* bæþ), *fulwihtwæter*, *fant*, *fantbæþ*, and *fantwæter* unquestionably testifies to widespread conception of baptism as a metabolic sacrament. These words and collocations may be considered as a lexical field in itself, grouped under the unrealized archi-lexeme ‘baptismal water’. The very existence of this field in OE demonstrates the absolute importance of consecrated matter, in the Anglo-Saxon conception of the sacrament. It bears witness to a metabolic understanding of baptism, which was very common in the early Middle Ages. Water was thought to transform into sacrament at consecration, and be fulfilled with the presence of the Holy Ghost, in a manner comparable to transubstantiation in the Eucharist.

3.4 Recommendations for future research

While carrying out the study above, two subjects particularly came forward as suitable topics for future research. The first presented itself during the phase of the examination of *cristnian*. This OE word often translates Lat. *catachizare*, for example in the OE Bede. *Catachizare* is commonly translated into Mod. English as ‘to catechize’. However, my analysis of the material in context demonstrated that in some cases *catechizare* may not have had much to do with instruction in the elements of the Christian faith. The performance of the ritual designated by OE *cristnung*, including several exorcisms and no lessons, seems to be more likely there. It may be the case that *catachizare* was sometimes used metonymically to signify entry to and other rites surrounding catechumenate, or even the sense ‘to exorcise’. A careful re-evaluation of Lat. *catachizare* in context, running from early Middle Ages up to the renaissance seems to be in place. If such a study were to be carried out on the basis of liturgical texts, it may be that many new insights could be gained concerning the shape of medieval pre-baptismal rites and the place of *catachizare* and catechesis in them.

A further subject that is very much deserving of more attention is the OE vocabulary of baptismal water. As was mentioned before, this word-group can be interpreted as a lexical field headed by the archi-lexeme ‘baptismal water’ and includes amongst others: *fulwihtbæþ* (*fulwihtes* bæþ), *fulwihtwæter*, *fant*, *fantbæþ*, and *fantwæter*. A thorough examination of the Lat. models (if any) and the varying shades of meaning among the members of this group,
would perhaps provide much additional knowledge about Anglo-Saxon perceptions of baptism and baptismal water. *Fant*, for example might range from ‘recepticle’to the water itself, while *fulwihtbaep* operates a scale between baptism proper and baptismal water. Let us return to the opening sentence of this paper, quoted from Ratramnus of Corbi: *Consideremus sacri fontem baptismatis*. Ælfric’s absolutely intriguing translation of this source in Catholic Homily number 15, 2nd series, must be a great incentive to carry out a study of this field:

\[\text{Eac swilce þæt halige fantwæter þe is gehaten lifes wylspring.}^{402}\]

### Appendices

### Fulwian

**Appendix of selected occurrences**

1. AldV 1 (Goossens) C31.1 [3962 (3968)] *exorcismo* <fulluhte>*obsecratione benedictione adiuratione*.

---

402 “Eac swilce þæt halige fantwæter þe is gehaten lifes wylspring. is gelic on hiwe oðrum wæterum. and is underþeod brosnunge . ac þæs halgan gastes miht genealæhð þam brosciendlicum wætere. ðurh sacerda blestunge. and hit mæg siðdan lichaman and sawle aðwean fram callum synnum. ðurh gastlicere mihte” Godden, Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The Second Series, 153. The beginning of the relevant passage form Ratramnus is: “Consideremus sacri fontem baptismatis. Qui fons vitae non immerito nuncupatur, quia descentes in se melioris vitae novitate reformat, et de peccato mortuis, viventes iustitiae donat.” Bakhuizen van den Brink, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, 47.
Red Book of Darley (not in corpus dictionary)\textsuperscript{403} “Her onginð þ[æt] les[se] fulluht to untrumum cildum. Cristnüge hit man nu þisum wordum (…) Halge þ[æt] wæter mid þisum wordum. (…) \textbf{Fullige} þonne se preost þæt untrune cild on þus gehalgegon wætere swa man oddre deð nime þæt cild and dippe hit on þus gehalgedum wætere

\textbf{Red Book of Darley (not in corpus dictionary)}\textsuperscript{404} and Swa her beforan awritan is on þisum maran fulluhte. Nys on þisum lytlan fulluhte na mare gescryt buton seo cristnung and seo wæterhalgung.

Law\textsuperscript{Ine} B14.4.5 (Laws: Alfred-Ine) \textsuperscript{[0005 (2.1)]} Gif hit donne sie dead butan fulwihte, gebete he hit mid eallum ðam ðe he age.

Law\textsuperscript{Ine} B14.4.5 (Laws: Alfred-Ine) \textsuperscript{[0004 (2)]} Cild binnan ðrítegum nihta sie gefulwad; gif hit ne se sie, XXX scillinga gebete.

Law\textsuperscript{ICn} B14.30.1 (Laws: Cnut) \textsuperscript{[0015 (4.2)]} Mycel is seo halsung & mære is seo halgung, þe deofla aýrsæd & on fleame gebridgeð, swa oft swa man fullað oððe husel halgað; & halige englas þær abutan hwearfiað & þa deda beweardiað & þurh Godes mihta þam sacerdon fylstað, swa oft swa hig Criste ðeniað mid rihte.

Law\textsuperscript{Northu} B14.32 (Norðhymbra preosta sīlu) \textsuperscript{[0014 (10)]} Æghwile cild sy, we lærað, gefullod binnon nigon nihton, be wite VI or. & gif hæþen cild binnon IX nihton þurh gimeisle forfareny sy, betan for gode buton worldwite; & gif hit ofer nigan niht gewurðe, beten for gode, & gilde XII or for ðare heorde, þe he ðæs hæþen swa lange.

Ch 1508 (Harm\textsuperscript{D} 10) B15.6.25 \textsuperscript{[0017 (36)]} Ond Sigulf geselle of ðem londe C pēninga to Cristes círican ond eghwyle þara ērfewearda þe eftir him to ðem londe foe, þonne ægeofen hio þa iclan elmessan to Cristes círican for Ėlfredes sawle, þa hwile þe fulwiht sio, & hit man on ðem londe begeotan mege.

Ch 1508 (Harm\textsuperscript{D} 10) B15.6.25 \textsuperscript{[0020 (44)]} Ond sio ðis lond gewritten & unbefliten eftir Eadredes dege in Aelfredes rehteodecynn ða hwile þe fulwiht sio on Angelcynnnes ealonde.

Rec 6.5 (Whitelock) B16.6.5 \textsuperscript{[0002 (3)]} Ond ðæt wit deodan for Godes lufan ond for uncre saule ðearfe, ond for ðon ðe wit noldan ðæt ðas halgan beoc lençg in ðære хаѐденесе wunaden, ond nu willað heo gesellan inn to Cristes círcan Gode to lœfe ond to wuldre ond to weordunga, ond ond hœwunga to ðoncuna, ond ðæm godecunda geferscipe to brucenne ðe in Cristes círcan dæghwæmlice Godes lof rærað, to ðæm gerade ðæt heo mon arede eghwelce monaðe for Aelfred ond for Werburge ond for Alhðryðe, heora saulum to ecum lecedome, ða hwile ðe God gesegen haebbe ðæt fulwiht æt ðæsost stowe ðeon mote.

\textsuperscript{403} See Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 155.

\textsuperscript{404} See Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 156.
(12) Rec 6.5 (Whitelock) B16.6.5 [0003 (13)] Ec swelce ic Aelfred dux ond Werburg biddað ond halsiað on Godes almaehtiges noman ond on alra his haligra ðæt nægig mon seo to þon gedystig ðætte ðas halgan beoc aselle oððe aðeode from Cristes circan ða hwile ðe fulwiht <stondan><mote>.

(13) LawIudDei VI B14.41.3 [0002 (1)] Ic eow ðe halsige on Fæder naman & on Suna naman ðæt is ure dryhten haelende Crist & on ðaes halgan Gastes & for ðære cristnessse, ðe ge underfenge ðu underfengan, & for ða haligan ðrinesse & fer ða IIII godspelleras Matheus & Marcus & Lucas et Iohannes & fer ealle ða halgan reliqiaes, ðe gind ealne middangeard sindon, haligra martyrba, & fer ealle ða halgan Godes ciricean, þe her on weorolde gehalgode sien, & fer naman ðære halgan faemnan sancta Marian.

(14) LawIudDei VI B14.41.3 [0006 (13A)] Ic halsige <þe> þurh þæne Fæder & Sunu & þæne halegan Gast & þurh <þine> cristennysse, þe <þu><underfenge>, & þurh þæne ancennedan sunu Godes & þurh þa halegan þrynnysse & þurh þet halige Godes spell & þurh þa halgan laua, þe innan þisre cyricean synt, & þurh þæne fulluht, þe se mæssepreost <þe> of geedcende.

(15) LawIudDei VII B14.41.3 Ic halsige þe þurh ealle halignyssa, þe synt on heófonan & on eorðan, & þurh þæne fulluht & Cristendóm, þe ðu underfangen hæfst.\textsuperscript{405}

(16) LawIudDei VIII B14.41.3 Ic eow halsie þurh ðonne Fæder & þone Sunu & þurh þone Halgan gast & þurh heowerne Cristendom, þe ðu underfangen.\textsuperscript{406}

(17) ÆLet 3 (Wulfstan 2) B1.8.3 [0006 (5)] Mid þam haligan ele ge scylan þa heðenan cild mearcian on þam breoste and betwux þæm <gesculdr> on middeweardan mid rode tacne, ærþanþe ge hit fullian on þam fantwætere.

(18) ÆLet 3 (Wulfstan 2) B1.8.3 [0009 (8)] And man ne mot besprengan men mid þæm fantwætere, syþþan se crisma bið þæron gedon.

(19) ÆLet 3 (Wulfstan 2) B1.8.3 [0138 (116)] Sume preostas mencgað win to þam fantwætere, swiðe unrihtlice.

(20) ÆLet 1 (Wulfsige X a) B1.8.1 [0138 (129)] Ne do man nænne ele to þam fante, buton mann þær cild on fullige.

(21) Bede 2 B9.6.4 [0304 (11.140.20)] <Forþon> þa gena ne wæron cyrican getimbrode ne fulwihtstowe in þæm fruman þære acendan cirican.

(22) ClGl 1 (Stryker) D8.1 [0712 (735)] Baptisterio fulwihtstowe.

(23) ClGl 3 (Quinn) D8.3 [0642 (642)] Baptisterio fulwihtstowe.

\textsuperscript{405} Could not extract this from the Corpus Dictionary, see Liebermann, \textit{Gesetze der Angelsachsen}, 413.
ÆCHom II, 2 B1.2.3 [0047 (15.114)] Þæt earme wif gelyfde his wælhtreowum geðæalht. and weard mid maran wodnyssse astyrord. eode þa to ðam fantfæte. and tolysde hire feax. and bedypte on ðam fante. and mid micelre hatheortnyssse ealle hire bearn manfullice wirigde;

ÆCHom II, 15 B1.2.18 [0043 (153.108)] Hit bið gebroht synfull þurh adames forgægdnýssse to ðam fantfæte. ac hit bið aðwogen fram eallum synnum wiðinnan. þeah ðe hit wiðútan his hiw ne awende;

ÆGenPref B8.1.7.1 [0020 (58)] Godes gast ys se Halga Gast, þurh þone geliøfæste se Fæder ealle þa gesceafta, þe he gesceop þurh þone Sunu, & se Halga Gast ðærþ geond manna heortan & sylð us synna forgýfnysse ærest ðurh wæter on ðam fulluhte & syððan ðurh dædbote; & gyf hwa forsyhð dæ forgýfnysse, ðe se Halga gast sylð, ðonne bið his syn æfre unmiltsigendlic on ecnysse.

ÆHom 13 B1.4.13 [0025 (98)] Ðis wæs geswutelod sona on anginne, þa þa God ærest gesceop gesceafta þurh his mihte: þa wæs Godes sylfes Gast, swa swa seo boc us secgð, gefered ofer wæterum, þæt ðurh fulluht wære ða iu getacnod mid toweardre mihte, and þæs wæteres gecynd wurde gehalgod þurh þone Halgan Gast, þe gehalgað ure fulluht, and þa sawle wiðinnan fram eallum synnum aþwyð.

HomS 27 B3.2.27 [0040 (107)] Æðen cild þe man fullað ne bryt hyt na his hiw wiðútan ac hit bið swaðealh wiðinnan awend and aþwogen on ðam fante fram eallum synnum.

LS 14 (MargaretCCCC 303) B3.3.14 [0122 (18.3)] And seo eadiga Margareta heo georne to Gode gebæd and þus cwæð: Ic þe wille biddan, leofa drihten cyning, þæt þær wæter gewurðe me to fulluhtes bæðe and to clænsunge ealra minum synnum.

Bede 4 B9.6.6 [0353 (18.308.22)] Ond he ða heo intimbrede & gelærde mid soðfestnesse worde & mid fulwihtes bæðe heo from synnum aðwoh: & heo gewisse gedyde & gelærde bi ingonge þæs ecanrices.

Bede 4 B9.6.6 [0307 (17.302.8)] Ond he ærest ealdormen þære mægðe & cyninges þegnas mid þa halgan wyllan þwôh fulwihtes bæðes; ond mæssepreostas Eappa & Peadda & Burghelm & Oidde þæt oðer folc ge þa ge æfterfylgendre tide fulwadon.

Cristnian

A. Verse
B. Prose Early
C. Prose Late
D. Glosses: 7
E. Derived Forms

Attestations Cristnian
A. Verse

**Solomon and Saturn**

(1) **MSol** A13 [0128 (395)] Ne mot on dæg restan, neahtes neðyð, cræfte tyð, **cristnað** and clænsað cwicra manigo, wuldre gewlitigað.

B. Prose Early

**The OE Bede**

(2) **Bede 2** B9.6.4 [0293 (11.138.22)] Siðþan he **gecristnad** wæs, swylce eac his lareowe & biscope Paulini bispcesdīl forgeaf.

(3) **Bede 2** B9.6.4 [0300 (11.140.7)] Is þæt sægd, þætte swa micel hætu & lust wäre Cristes geleafan & fulwihtbæðes in Norðanhymbra þeode, þætte Paulinus se bisp sumre tide com mid þone cyning & cwene in þone cynelican tun, se wæs nemned ætgefrin; & þær wunode syx & prittig daga, þæt he þær þær folc cristnade & fulwade.

(4) **Bede 3** B9.6.5 [0093 (5.166.31)] Ond he ða swa dyde: lærde þær godcunde lare & þone cyning to Cristes geleafan gecerde, & hine **gecristnad**, & hine eft æfter fæce mid fulwihtes bæðe aþwoh mid his þeode Westseaxum.

(5) **Bede 5** B9.6.7 [0132 (6.402.32)] Ða he ðis cwæð, sona in ða ilcan tid ða cristnade he mæc.

(6) **Bede 5** B9.6.7 [0130 (6.402.28)] Forðon ic hiene cuðe, þa he to mæssepreoste gehalgad wæs, & he næfre fram ungleawnesse & for his unscearpnisse þa ðenunge to cristienne oðþe to fullwienne on riht geleornian meahte.

C. Prose late

Ælfric

**Saint's Lives**

(7) **ELS (Martin)** B1.3.30 [0128 (522)] Tetradius ða sona þa he þæt geseah, gelyfde on urne Drihten, and let hine **cristnian**, and æfter lytlum fyrste he wearð gefullod, and Martinum wurðode mid <wundorlicre> lufe, forþanðe he wæs ealdor witodlice his hæle.

(8) **ELS (Martin)** B1.3.30 [0006 (23)] Þa ða he wæs tyn wyntra þa wearð he **gecristnod** his maga unþances, and on wundorlicem gemete sona to Godes þeowdome he wæs eall gehwyrfed; and þæ he he wæs twelf wintra he gewilnode to westene, and he hit eac gefremode gif he þa ylde hæfde.

(9) **ELS (Martin)** B1.3.30 [0054 (207)] Ða com an gecristnod man and gecuðlæhte to Martine, and wunode mid him, wolde his lare underfon, ac æfter feawum dagum he wearð færllice seoc, swa þæt he forðferde ungefullod sona, and se halga Martinus næs æt ham þa hwile. (substantive)
He eac ne wandode on þam widgillan felda þa hæþenan to cristnigenne þa þa hi on Crist gelyfdon, ac he hi ealle sona samtingas gecristnode.

And he hi þa gecristnode, and tâhte hi þa gerýna þes hálgan geleáfan, and gefullode hi on naman fæder and sunu and þes hálgan gastes, and nemde Placidam Eustachium, and his wif Theophistim, and his anne suna Agapitum, and oþerne Theofistum.


Ælfric: Homilies

Donne se preost cristnað þæt cild. þonne adrefð he þone deofol of þam cildæ: for þan ðe ælc hæþen man bið deofles: ac þurh ðæt halige fulluht he bið godes gif he hit gehylt.

Witodlice ða ða he tyn wyntre on ylde wæs. ða arn he to cyrcan buton his freonda foresceawunge fulluhtes biddende. and he wearð þa gecristnod. and on wunderlicum gemete gecyrred. smeagende symle ymbe godes cyrcan. and hu he on westene wunian mihte;

He bæd þa swa lange mid geleafan þone bisceop þæt he hine cristnode; and he clænli lyfode syððan of þam ðæte on swiðlicre forhæfdnysse, and ealle woruldþing forlet, and wunode mid þam bisceope.

Denne ðe mon bið icristnod, and me him tæcð his ileafan, þonne beoð his eagan ismirode; ac he ne isihð swa ðæah, ær þam þe he beo ifullod mid fulle geleafan on þæs Hælendes namæ, þe hider asend wæs.

Wulfstan Homilies 8 (three homilies on baptism)

Denne ðæt þæt se sacerd ðam on muð de þonne he cristnað, þæt sealt þæt se sacerd þam men on muð de þonne he cristnað, þæt getacnað godcundne wisdom, & ealswa se lichama þonne gefelð þæs sealtes scearpnesse, swa sceal seo sawul ongytan wisdomes snotornesse.

(Cristnung also appears 3 times in these homilies on baptism)
LS 17.1 (MartinMor)  B3.3.17.2 Saint Martin
(20)  [0010 (16)]  Þa he wæs tywnintre, & hine hys yldran to woruldfolgæ tyhton ond lærdan, ða fleah he to Godes ciricean, & bæd þæt hine mon ge\textit{cristnode}, þæt se æresta dæl his onginnes & lifes to geleafan & to fulwithe gecyrred.
(21)  [0017 (33)]  & ðeah he þa gyt nær fullice æfter oþerre endebyrdnesse gefulwad, ah he wæs ge\textit{cristnod}, swa ic ær sægde, hwaðere he þæt geryne þære halgan fulwithe mid godum dædum heold & fullade.
(22)  [0032 (75)]  \textit{Mox angelorum circumstantium multitudinem} ; ða geseah he myccle mengeo engla emb hine Drihten sylfne mid swa cuðre stefne to ðæm englum cweðendne, Martinus, nu ðu eart ge\textit{cristnod} ær þinum fulwithe, mid þys hrægle ðu me gegyredest. \textit{\textemdash; \ldots adhuc catechumenus” MacGillivray.}
(23)  [0036 (90)]  Ða he þa hæfde twæm læs þe twentig wintra, þa gefullode hine mon on ðære ciricean endebyrdnesse; wæs he beforan ær þa þreo gear ge\textit{cristnod}, swa ic ær sægde.
(24)  [0042 (104)]  Þa gelamp sume siðe þæt þær com sum ge\textit{cristnod} man to him, þæt he wolde mid his lare & mid his lifes bysene beon ontimbred. (Substantive)

\textit{Vercelli Homilies} (Life of St Martin)

LS 17.2 (MartinVerc 18)  B3.3.17.3 Saint Martin
(25)  [0011 (17)]  & þa he wæs X wintra, þa tihton hine his yldran to woruldfolgæ, & þa fleah he to Godes cirican & bæd þæt hine man þær ge\textit{cristnode} (þæt bið sio onginnes & se æresta dæl þære halgan fulwithe), & þæt he wæs wundorlice nu on eallum his life on Godes þeowdome gecyrred.
(26)  [0018 (32)]  & ðeah de he þa gyt ne were fullice æfter cierican endebyrdnesse gefullad, ac he wæs ge\textit{cristnod}, swa ic ær foresægde, hwaðere he þæt geryne þæs halgan fulwites mid godum dædum heold & lufade.
(27)  [0037 (73)]  Martinus nu iu, <he> cwæð þus, ge\textit{cristnod} ær his fulwithe, he mid þysse hrægle me gegyrede.
(28)  [0042 (84)]  Wæs he ær beforan þa þreo gear ge\textit{cristnod}, swa ic ær sægde.
(29)  [0048 (96)]  & þa gelamp sume siðe þæt þær cwom sum ge\textit{cristnod} man to him þæt he wolde mid his lare & mid his bysenum beon ontimbred. (Substantive)

D. Glosses

(31)  \textit{AldV 1 (Goossens)  C31.1}  [2779 (2785)]  \textit{caticuminos gecristnade Catecuminus gecristnade} ðarhestendras.
(32)  \textit{AldV 1 (Goossens)  C31.1}  [3963 (3969)]  \textit{catechizatus doctus} <gehealgod> gecristnad.
(33)  \textit{AldV 1 (Goossens)  C31.1}  [2163 (2169)]  \textit{caticumini audientis geleafhlestendes ðecristnodes}.
(34)  \textit{ClGl 1 (Stryker) D8.1}  [1221 (1244)]  \textit{Catecizatus gecristnad}.
(35)  \textit{ClGl 3 (Quinn) D8.3}  [1115 (1115)]  \textit{Catacizatus gecristnad}.

\textsuperscript{407}  See Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 155.
E. Derived forms

Past participle used as substantive: see glosses and nrs. (9)(24)(29)

(38) Conf 1.1 (Spindler) B11.1.1 Confectionale pseudo-Egberti [0053 (99)] Ne mot gefullad mid þæne gecristnodon etan ne hine cyssan, swa mycel ma swa he ne mot mid þæne hæðenan.

Cristnung

(39) Conf 1.1 (Spindler) B11.1.1 Confectionale pseudo-Egberti [0050 (95)] In cristnunga and on ðam fulluhte an fæder mæg beon, gyf hit nyðearf bið.

(40) WHom 8b B2.2.4 [0003 (14)] On þære cristnunge þe man deð ær ðam fulluhte is swiðe micel getacnunge.

(41) WHom 8c B2.2.5 [0008 (29)] Leofan men, on ðære cristnunge þe man deð ær ðam fulluhte is mycel getacnung.

(42) WHom 8c B2.2.5 [0021 (69)] & ðonne þis gedon bið eal fulllice wel swa to ðære cristnunge gebyreð, þonne is æfter eallum þisum mid rihtum geleafan to efstanne wið fontbæðes georne.

(43) BT and MacGillivray also give the following passage (not in Corpus Dictionary):

MacGillivray: “The second case refers to the substantive “cristnung”: Papa romanus ... statuuit si presbyter uel quicumque fuerit qui baptizaverit peccator esset, ministerium Spiritus Sancti esse nihilominus in gratia baptismi haudqueaquam hominis in baptizando, “... In ðære 3ife ðaes fulluhte ... neales ðaes mannes in cristnunge.” Confectionale Ecgberti. 1 p. 348 (MS X) 408

Bostworth-Toller: Pápa gesette . . . þæs Halgan Gastes þenung wære in þære gife þæs fulluhtes, nalæs þæs mannes in cristnunge (in baptizando), Ll. Th. ii. 140, 17. 409

(44) Red Book of Darley (not in corpus dictionary) 410 and Swa her beforan awritan is on þisum maran fulluhte. Nys on þisum lytlan fulluhte na mare gescryt buton seo cristnung and seo wæterhalgung.

(45) Mart 5 (Kotzor) B19.5 OE Martyrology [0552 (Ju 2, B.1)] On ðone ilcan dæg bið þara eadigra weora tid Sancte Marcellines þæs mæssepreostes ond sancte Petres ðaes cristneres.

Dyppan

---

408 MacGillivray, The influence of Christianity on Old English, 20.
410 See Page, “Old English Liturgical Rubrics,” 156.
Appendix of Attestations

A. Various prose texts

B. Verse

C. Prose

D. Glosses

E. Liturgical texts

LawBlas  B14.34 (Blaseras: Laws; to dip into boiling water)
(1)  [0002 (1)] We cwædon be þam blaserum & be þam morpslyhtum, þæt man dypte þone aþ be þryfealdum & myclade þæt ordalysen, þæt hit gewege þry pund, & eode se man sylf to, þe man tuge.

Rid  3 A3.22.3 (Exeter Book: Riddles; dip into liquid)
(2)  [0005 (19)] Famig winneð wæg wið wealle, wonn ariseð dun ofer dypte; hyre deorc on last, eare geblonden, ofer fereð, þæt hy gemittað mearclonde neah hea hlincas.

Lch I (Herb)  B21.1.1.2 (Pseudo-Apuleius: Herbarium; dip into liquid)
(3)  [0386 (32.1)] Gyf ðu hy þonne grene næbbe genim hy drige & dype on wearnum wætere swa þu eaðelicost hy brytan mege; Smyra þonne þærmid.
(4)  [0392 (32.3)] Gyf ðonne seo wyrte drigge sy dype hy on wearnum wætere.
(5)  [0683 (76.4)] Wið blodryne of nosum genim þyssse ylcan wyrte wos & dype anne linenne clað & forsete þa næsðyrlu þærmid.

PeriD  B21.6 (Peri Didaxeon: recipes; dip into liquid)
(6)  [0047 (19.13.21)] Panne sceal hy man þus lacnian: Gif seo unhælþe cymþ of þare drigan hætan, þanne niman man ane clæþ and waxen þa eagan mid þan clæð, dyppe hine on watere and gnide þa eagean mid; and gif hi beþ toswollene oððer blodes fulle, þanne sceal mann settan horn aþ þunwangan.
(7)  [0158 (61.41.27)] Nim þanne an feðere and dyppe on ele and stynge on hys muþe, ofær his fingers do on hys muf, þæt he þane spæudrenc astrye.
(8)  [0207 (66.53.1)] Nim þane an feþere and dyppe þaron and smyra þann þa stowe mid.
(9)  [0092 (41.25.3)] Nim þanne wylle and dype on þare scealfe and bind þa wulle to þare ceolan.

B. Verse

Seasons  A31 “The Season for Fasting” (to dip in the context of baptism)
(10)  [0025 (154)] He hine dyppan let deorum þweale, fulwihtes <bæðe>, fyrena bedealed, and he feowwertig daga <firsude><mettas>, eac nihta swa feala nanuht gyltig, leodum to lare, þæt hie on lengten sceolan efen feowwertig daga fæsten hewan.

C. Prose Late: Ælfric, The OE Martyrology, OE Gospel texts, the OE version of the Heptateuch, Gregory the Great: Dialogues (Bishop Waerferð).

Ælfric
ÆHom 13  B1.4.13 (context of baptism)

(11) [0032 (127)] Du gesyxt hine bedyppan on þam sciran wætere, and eft up ateon mid þam ylcan hiwe þe he hæfde æxor, ær ðan þe he dufe; ac seo halige modor, þe is Godes Gelapung, wat þet þæt cild bið synnfull

(12) bedypped into þam fante, and bið up abroden fram synnum aðwogen, þurh þæt halige fulluht.

ÆCHom I, 23  B1.1.25 (dip into liquid)

(13) [0010 (365.13)] Ðu fæder abraham. gemiltsa min. & send to me lazarum. þæt he dyppe his finger on wætere. & gecele mine tungan. for þan ðe ic eom on þysum lige þearle gecwylmed.

ÆCHom II, 2  B1.2.3  (dip into liquid, but with font)

(14) [0047 (15.114)] Þæt earme wif gelyfde his wælhreowum geðeahte. and wearð mid maran wodnysse astyrod. eode þa to ðam fantfæte. and tolysde hire feax. and be dypte on ðam fante. and mid micelre hatheortnysse ealle hire bearn manfullice wirigde;

ÆCHom II, 10  B1.2.11 (dip into liquid)

(15) [0100 (89.277)] Sum eawfæst wer. wæs eac yfele gehæfd. and læg æt forðsi his freondum orwene. þa hæfde heora sum. Haligne hlaf. þone se eadi ga wer. ær gebletsode. and he ðone þærrihte. on wæter be dypte. and his adligum mæge. on þone muð begeat. and he ðærrihte þæt adl gestilde;

ÆCHom II, 14.1  B1.2.16 (dip into liquid)

(16) [0016 (138.42)] Se ðe be dyptide on disce mid me his hlaf on læpeldre. he is min læwa;

ÆCHom II, 14.1  B1.2.16  (dip into liquid)

(17) [0123 (146.269)] Eft ða cwæð se hælend. þæt him hearde ðyrste. ða arn to ðam ecede. sum arleas cempa. and be dypt e ane spincgan. and bær to his muðe;

ÆGram B1.9.1 (mergo)

(18) [1073 (172.6)] mergo ic besence oððe bedypp, mersi, mersum; spargo ic geondstrede, sparsi, sparsum; tergo ic wipige, tersi, tersum; mitto ic asen, misi on anum esse, missum <on> twam essum; eallswa of ðam gefegede <inmitto> ic <on> besende, innisi, innissum; commisi, commissum; permitto ic geþafige; dimitto and <omittio> ic forlæte; transmitto ic ofersende; admittio ic agylte; amitto ic forleose; submitto ic nyðer alæte; praetermitto ic foresende; promittio ic behate; praetermitto ic forlæte; emittio ic asende; remittio ic ongean <sende>; and ealle hi habbað ænne PRAETERITVM and ænne SOPINVM.

ÆGram B1.9.1 (tinguo & intinguo)

(19) [1077 (174.4)] extinguo ic acwence, extinxii, extinctum stinguo nis na on gewunan; ango ic geangsumige, anxi, anctum and of ðam is <anxietas> <angsumnys>; linguo ic <licige>, linxi, linctum; ninguo ic sniwe, ninxi, ninctum of ðam is nix snaw; tinguo ic <bedypp>, tinxi, tinctum of ðam is tinctura deagung;

(20) [1077 (174.4)] <intingo> ic on <bedypp>; pungo ic pricige, punxi oððe <pupugi>, punctum.

ÆLet 3 (Wulfstan 2)  B1.8.3  (dip into liquid)

(21) [0077 (68)] Gif hwa win næbbe ofer ealne þone gear, he nime lynen hrægl, þe to note ær ne com and bedypp on wine, þæt he þurhwæt sy.

(22) [0078 (68)] Dryge hine ðonne on sunnan and dype hine oþre syþan, dryge hine eft and
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(23) [0078 (68)] dyppe þryddan syþe, dryge hine þonne eft on þære hatan sunnan, and healde hine clænllice and on clænum wætere wæte of þam clæde and wringe on his calic.

The OE Martyrtology

Mart 5 (Kotzor)  B19.5 (dip in context of baptism)
(24) [0720 (Jy 19, A.21)] Ond he þa dypte hi þriwa on ðære sæ ond cwæð: Cristina, ic þe fullwie on minne godfæder ond on mec, his efenecne sunu, ond on þone halgan gast.

OE Gospel Texts

Jn (WSCp)  B8.4.3.4 (dip into liquid: intinctum, Io 13, 26)
(25) [0654 (13.26)] Se Hælend him andswarode & cwæð, he ys se þe ic ræce bedyppedne hlaf; & þa þa he bedypte þene hlaf he sealde hyne Iudas Scariothe.

Jn (WSCp)  B8.4.3.4 (dip into liquid: intinxisset, Io 13, 26)
(26) [0654 (13.26)] Se Hælend him andswarode & cwæð, he ys se þe ic ræce bedyppedne hlaf; & þa þa he bedypt þene hlaf he sealde hyne Iudas Scariothe.

Lk (WSCp)  B8.4.3.3 (dip into liquid: intinguet, Lc 16, 24)
(27) [0685 (16.24)] Da hrymde he & cwæð, eala fæder Abraham, gemilsa me, & send lazarum þæt he dyppe his fingres lið on wætere, & mine tungan gehæle, forþam þe ic eom on þis lige cwylmed.

Mt (WSCp)  B8.4.3.1 (dip into liquid: intingit, Mt 26,23)
(28) [0943 (26.23)] And he andswarode & þus cwæð, se þe be dypde on disce mid me dys hand se me belæwð.

Mk (WSCp)  B8.4.3.2 (dip into liquid: intingit, Mc 14,20)
(29) [1057 (14.20)] Þa sæde he him, an of eow twelfum me sylð se þe his hand on disce mid me dypð.

LkGl (Li)  C8.1.3 (dip into liquid: intinguat, Lc 16, 24; gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels)
(30) [0752 (16.24)] et ipse clamans dixit pater abraham miserere mei et mitte lazarum ut intinguat extremum digiti tui in aquam ut refrigeret linguam meam qui crucior in hac flamma & he cliopade cuoeð fæder abraham gemiltsa me & send lazarum þætte indepe þ lhrinæ utaweadringeres ðines in wætere þætte geceola tunga min þe ic ðrouigo in ðisser lego.

The OE Version of the Heptateuch

Lev  B8.1.4.3 (dip into liquid: tincto, Lv 4.15-17)
(31) [0036 (4.15)] & setton þæs folces ealdoran hyra handa uppan his heafod, & þonne þæt cealf geoffrod sy, nime se sacerd his blod, & dyppe his finger þæron & spreng seofon syðon on þæt wahrift.

Gen (Ker)  B8.1.2 (dip into liquid: tinxerunt, Gn 37,31)
(32) [0032 (37.31)] Þa namon hig an ticcen & ofsnidon hit & bedipton his tunecan on þam blode.

Gen  B8.1.4.1 (dip into liquid: tinxerunt, Gn 37, 31)
(33) [0771 (37.31)] Da namon hie an ticcen & & ofsnidon> hyt, & bedypton hys tunecan on þam blode.

Exod  B8.1.4.2 (dip into liquid, tinguite, Ex 12, 22)
(34) [0267 (12.22)] & dyppað isopan sceaf on ðam blode ðe is on ðam ðrexwolde, & sprengap on ðæt oferslege & on ægðer gedyre; ne ga eower nan ut of his huse ær on mergen.

Gregory the Great
Dialogues, Bishop Waerferth

GD 1 (C) B9.5.2 (dip into liquid: mersa, Lib I, ch X, § 4)
(35) [0467 (10.73.23)] Heo wæs gelæded to anre ea & bedypped in þæt wæter, & hi þær þa dryas ongunnon ferian geond þæt wæter & mid langum onsamgum hi golon on, oð þæt se deofol of hire uteode, þe hi ær in gefor.

GDPref and 4 (C) B9.5.6 (dip into liquid (3x about lazarus): 3x intinguat)
(36) [0425 (30.304.16)] Witodlice hit gelamp, þæt syþþan of ðære tide se ilca rap wæs ælce dæge be dyppe d in þam wætre & swa þeh nane gemete næs he tobrocen, forðon þe se rap gehran þæ re racenteage þæs Godes weres, þe he hæfde on him swa myccle strengðe to adreoganne þa byrde.

D. Glosses

Rushworth Glosses

MtGl (Ru) C8.2.1 (baptizare)
(40) [0052 (3.11)] Ego quidem baptiszo uos in aqua in penitentiam qui autem uenturus est fortior me est cuius non sum dignus calciamenta portare ipse uos baptizabit in spiritu sancto et igni ic eowic depu ldyppe in wætre in hreunisse seþe þonne æfter me cymeð se ðe is me strængra þæt ic næm wyrþe scoas to beranne se eowic
(41) depi̇o ̵ ldyppėp in ðæm halgan gaste & fyre. (baptizabit)
(42) [0054 (3.13)] Tunc uenit iesus a galilea in iordanen ad iohannem ut baptizaretur ab eo þa cuom from galilea in iordane to iohanne þætte he ware depið from him.
(43) [0924 (26.23)] At ipse respondens ait qui intinget mecum manum in parabside hic me tradet & he ondswarade cwaeþ se ðe depið mid me honde in þas parabside se mec sellaþ.
(44) [1060 (28.19)] euntes ergo nunc docete omnes gentes baptizantes eas in nomine patris et filii et spiritu sancti geþ forþon nu læreþ alle ðœode dyppende hie in noman fæder & sunu & þæs halgan gastes.
(45) [0055 (3.14)] prohibebat autem eum iohannis dicens ego a te debeo baptizari et tu uenis ad me iohannes þonne werede him cweþende ic sceal from þe beon f ðwesa deped ðifullwihted & ðu cymest to me.
(46) [0057 (3.16)] baptizatus est autem iesus confestim ascendit de aqua et ecce aperti sunt ei caeli et uidit spiritum dei discendentem sicut columbam uenientem super se
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Aldhelm Glosses

AldV 13.1 (Nap) C31.13.1
(47) [0047 (3.6)] confitentes peccata sua <werun> depe in <iordane> from him ondentende heora synne.

AldV 1 (Goossens) C31.1
(48) [1416 (1414)] rorantibus, i.e. effundentibus bedyppendum, wætendum.

AldV 13.1 (Nap) C31.13.1
(49) [4640 (4647)] fundo dypen.

AldV 1 (Goossens) C31.1
(50) [4775 (4767)] fundo dype.

AldV 1 (Goossens) C31.1
(51) [1442 (1443)] rorantibus tingentibus effundentibus be depp endum łwætendum.

The Latin-Old English Glossary in MS. Cotton Cleopatra A.III'

CIGl 1 (Stryker) D8.1
(52) [3392 (3416)] Inditus bediped.

SedGl 3 (Meritt) C97.3 (gloss to Sedulius: Carmen paschale, baptism!)
(53) [0093 (92)] baptisma <dypte>.

HyGl 2 (Milfull) C18.2 (Glosses Durham Hymnalbaptize?: tingere)
(54) [0441 (86.2.4)] Non fuit vasti spatium per orbis sanctior quisquam genus Iohanne, qui nefas saecli meruit lavantem tingere limphis nes widgilles fec geond embhwerftes haligre ænig acenned se man worulde geearnode þweandne bedyppan on wæterum.

HyGl 3 (Gneuss) C18.3 (mergere& tingere)
(55) [0204 (43.5)] Forhtode se gesæliga bedypan hine on flode se þe is mihtig adrygan synna middaneardes mid his halgan blode Tremescit felix Iohannes mergere illum flumine, qui est potens tergere peccata cosmi suo sanguine.

(56) [0408 (86.2.4)] Næs ænig acenned haligre geond faec brades ymbhwyrftes se geearnode bedypan on wæterum aðwean mann weorulda Non fuit quisquam genus sanctior Iohanne per spatium vasti orbis, qui meruit tingere limphis lavantem nefas seculi .

Glosses to Monastic Canticles

MonCa 1 (Korhammer) C12.1 (Durham Cathedral Library B. III. 32; dyed, tinctis)
(57) [0093 (13.1)] Quis est iste qui venit de edom. Tinctis vestibus de bosra; Iste formosus in stola sua. Gradiens in multitudine fortitudinis suae; Ego qui loquor iustitiam. Et propugnator sum ad salvandum La hwilc is þes se ðe com of <edom> bedyptum reafum of <bosra> þes wlig on gyrlan his gangende on micelnsse strængðe his ic þe sprece rihtwisnyssa & forefeofht comet to hælenn.

MonCa 3 (Korhammer) C12.3 (London, BL, MS Cotton Vespasian D. XII; dyed, tinctis)
(58) [0092 (13.1)] Quis est iste qui venit de edom tinctis vestibus de bosra. Iste est formosus gradiens in sua stola in multitudine suae fortitudinis. Ego sum qui
loquor iustitiam. Et sum propugnator ad salvandum La hwæt is þes man se þe com of edom bedyptum hræglum of <bosra> þes is wlitig gande on his gyrlan on mycelnyssse his strængpe ic eom ic þe sprece rihtwisnysse & ic eom forefeohtend to gehælanne.

Glosses to Psalters, for Ps 67: 24, intinguatur (dip into liquid)

PsGlJ (Oess) C7.5 (gloss to Arundel Psalter)
(59) [0985 (67.24)] Oþ þæt sy bedypped fot þin on blode tunga handa þïnra of feondum fram him Ut intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

PsGlF (Kimmens) C7.10 (gloss to the Stowe psalter)
(60) [0985 (67.24)] Bið dypped fot þin on blode tunga hunda þïnra of feondum fram him Ut intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

PsGlI (Lindelöf) C7.11 (gloss to Lambeth Psalter)
(61) [0974 (67.24)] Þæt si bedypt þin fot on blode tunge þïnre harra of feondum fram him Vt intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

PsGlE (Harsley) C7.3 (gloss to Eadwine’s Canterbury Psalter)
(62) [0984 (67.24)] Þæt bið gesweten f ðypped fot ðin on blode tunga hundæ þïnra of feondum from him donec intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

PsGlH (Campbell) C7.6 (gloss to Tiberius Psalter)
(63) [0978 (67.24)] Vt intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine; lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso þæt biþ gedypped fot þin on blod tunge hunda þïnra of freondum fram him.

PsGlG (Rosier) C7.8 (gloss to Vitellius Psalter)
(64) [0986 (67.24)] Þæt bið gedypped fot þin on blode tunge hunda þïnra of freondum fram him Ut intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

PsGlD (Roeder) C7.9 (gloss to Regius Psalter)
(65) [0984 (67.24)] Oð bið dyped fot ðin on blode tunge hunda ðïnra of feonda of him donec intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine, lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

PsGlK (Sisam) C7.13 (gloss to Salibury Psalter)
(66) [0951 (67.24)] Oþþæt bið gedypped fot þin on blode tungan hunda þïnra of feonda of him Ut intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

PsGlA (Kuhn) C7.7 (gloss to the Vespasian Psalter)
(67) [0984 (67.22)] Cyð dryhyðlof basan ic gecerru ic biom gecered in grud sæs oð ðæt sie bideped fot ðin in blode Dixit dominus ex basan convetam conveterat in profundum maris donec intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine .

PsGlB (Brenner) C7.12 (gloss to the Junius Psalter)
(68) [0974 (67.24)] Oð ðæt sie bideped fot ðin on blode tunge hunda ðïnra of feondum fram him donec intinguatur pes tuus in sanguine lingua canum tuorum ex inimicis ab ipso .

Notes 2 (Kluge) B24.2 (Monasterialia indicia, to dip in ink)
(69) [0120 (18.117)] Fipere tacen is, þæt þu geþeode þine þri fingras tosomne swilce þu feþere hæbe and hi dype, and styre þine fingras swilce þu writan wille.
LS 32 (Peter & Paul)  B3.3.32
(70)  [0113 (237)] Witodlice swa swipe swa he weneþ sylf þæt he sceole to heofenum ahafen weorðan, swa swipe he bìþ bedyped on þa neoþemestan hellæ witu, þer bìþ a wop & hrop & toþa gristbitung.

PsGlE (Harsley)  C7.3
(71)  [2280 (140.5)] Gegripe me sóðfest on mildheortnesse & ofercideþ me ele sóðlice firenfullæ ne gedipeð heæfod min forðæn nu gio is gebed min on hiræ wellicungum hiræ Corripiet me iustus in misericordia et increpabit me oleum autem peccatoris non inpinguet caput meum quoniam adhuc est oratio mea in beneplacitis eorum.

E. Liturgical Texts

The Red Book of Darley (not in corpus dictionary)411
(72)  Ðonne nime se præost þæt cild and dippe þæt cild on þæt wæter and cweþe. Et ego te baptizo in nomine patris.
(73)  and dippe þæt cild oðre syðe on ðæt wæter. and cweðe. et filii.
(74)  and dyppe hy(t) ðriddan side. and cweðe. Et spiritus sancti. Amen.
(75)  Fullige þonne se præost þæt untrume cild on þus gehalgegon wætere swa man oðre deð nime þæt cild and dippe hit on þus gehalgedum wætere. and cweðe. Et ego baptizo te. in nomine patris.
(76)  And dyppe hit oþre side. and cweðe. Et filii.
(77)  And dippe h[i]t ðriddan side and cweðe. Et spiritus sancti.

Rushworth Gospels (intingit)
(78)  MtGl (Ru)  C8.2.1  [0924 (26.23)] At ipse respondens ait qui intiget mecum manum in parabside hic me tradet & he ondswarade cwæþ se deð deið mid me honde in þas parabside se mec sellæþ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Napier, A.S. *Contributions to Old English Lexicography*. Hertford: Austin, 1906.


