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This dissertation investigates through the paradigms of the opus geminatum genre the relationship of the Old English verse Andreas to its potential exemplars, influences and subsequent renderings. The study focuses specifically upon the ways in which inherited textual dynamics of the opus geminatum—a pair of texts, one in verse and one in prose, which ostensibly treat the same subject—contribute to substantive and stylistic parallels or deviations between Andreas and these other texts.

The first chapter positions the paradigm of the opus geminatum alongside the ongoing discussions about the relationships both of internal elements within Andreas, and between Andreas and its Latin or Old English analogues. It provides a detailed overview of the opus geminatum as this grows out of late antique traditions of paraphrase and into the distinctive and highly nuanced genre which Anglo-Saxon authors made their own. It argues that amidst the debates about Andreas’ relationship to other texts, the opus geminatum affords both an historically appropriate and potentially very productive paradigm.

The second chapter considers within this paradigm the interplay of content and style between Andreas and what is often thought to be its closest Latin exemplar found in the Casanatensis manuscript, for I contend here that the shift in style, from Latin prose to Old English verse, bears a necessary, dramatic and consistently
overlooked influence upon the content of the Old English *Andreas*, changing not only how one reads that content, but the very substantive nature of the content itself.

In Chapter Three the discussion shifts to the relationship *Andreas* has with an indigenous work, *Beowulf*, for which a number of recent studies have laid a new groundwork which suggests exciting possibilities for analysis, most significantly at the formulaic level, exploring the tension between explicit oral and literary indebtedness between the two poems.

Finally, in Chapter Four the focus shifts to a comparison between the verse *Andreas* and its Old English prose version of the legend, in MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198, fols. 386r–394v, allowing one to explore in concrete detail the assertions which *opus geminatum* writers like Alcuin made about the difference and affinities between prose and verse treatments of *opus geminatum* texts.

My conclusion draws together the broad tendencies mapped throughout this inquiry and considers the intrinsically relational nature of a text like *Andreas*. It argues in light of uncovered evidence for the efficacy and flexibility of the methods intrinsic to the *opus geminatum* as a highly appropriate analytical lens and explores from the broad perspective how this paradigm opens numerous horizons of engagement, such as with the embedded language of the liturgy in MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198, or the self-conscious investment of secular literary traditions in *Beowulf* with Christian literary projects, such as *Andreas*. 
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Chapter I

Andreas and the Opus Geminatum

For scholars of Old English literature, the concept of pairing or twinning is very familiar; at the level of prosody, lines of verse are divided into their a- and b-components; compounds constitute an essential part of this literature’s diction; its kennings depend upon the interplay between a pair of verbal elements; its alliteration in and between lines doubles, and then often plays off that doubling for effect. At a broader level, characters and their characteristics are portrayed relative to one another, incidents repeat, and are simultaneously varied, stages of life or plot are presented in light of one another. Intertextually, texts and their components gesture significantly towards other texts, providing their audiences with an often methodical, complex and pervasive web of allusions, an understanding of which is requisite to the appreciation of such literature.

A substantial amount of modern scholarship surrounds aspects of this twinning. What is less clear, however, is how wide-ranging the dynamics of twinning

---

were to the Anglo-Saxon authors themselves and, in the case of this inquiry, just how they relied upon such dynamics in activities which touch upon textual relationships. Around these questions, and just how at the practical level twinning works, circle numerous debates. For instance, from which prior texts does a given text derive, and in turn, what subsequent texts are based upon the given text? Is the text of mixed literary heritage between, for instance, Latin and vernacular backgrounds? Is a particular poem meant to be read against a prose version or another verse composition? Do the author’s intentions for a text relate to a similar or contrasting set of intentions in another text?

The Old English verse Andreas affords scholars a rich example of these pairing dynamics and thereby opens for us a range of evidence with which to frame responses to questions such as those above. The poem employs all the familiar prosodic aspects of twinning, through kennings and compounds, the use of double alliteration to highlight key passages, incremental repetition and envelope patterns. At the level of plot and characterization, situations repeat and are varied, characters play off of one another, contrasting and paralleling for effect, and both protagonists and

---

5 The second chapter will discuss at length the history of this debate, particularly as it touches upon the formulaic relationship between Old English poems, both secular and Christian.
antagonists shift from one state to its diametric opposite. However, it is with *Andreas*’ relationship with the texts and contexts outside itself that this discussion is ultimately concerned, though a treatment of these intertextual relationships necessarily entails to considerable depth the internal prosodic and substantive elements of twinning also.

Moreover, *Andreas* seems a particularly apt text for comparative studies at this intertextual level, for though we do not possess the specific version from which it derives, a considerable number of prior Latin and Greek texts which manifest its main constituent components—some of them quite closely—are available to us. Likewise, two Old English prose versions exist, not to mention other prose and verse versions in Old Icelandic. This means that a comparative basis for study across linguistic and literary cultures obtains between *Andreas* and its Mediterranean and North Sea contexts. Simultaneously there is a foundation for comparative studies within Anglo-Saxon England between prose and verse or oral and written analogues. This is not to mention the strong stylistic and formulaic affinities between *Andreas* and other works, such as those by Cynewulf, or *Guthlac B*; however, the scope of this thesis does not

---


11 The Icelandic versions are as follows: MS. Reykjavik, Hið Íslenska bókmenntafélag, 165 4to (36v-42r); MS. Reykjavik, Hið Íslenska bókmenntafélag, 76 8vo (88r-117v); MS. Reykjavik, Landsbókasafn, 326 4to (151r-191v); MS. Reykjavik, Landsbókasafn 776 4to(27v-35v); MS. Reykjavik, Landsbókasafn 1582 4to (47r-57r); MS. Reykjavik, Landsbókasafn 1947 4to (107r-130r).

presently allow for a treatment of these poems, nor of the Old Norse analogues, and so will restrict itself to three texts which have traditionally been associated much more closely with Andreas.

This study will begin by investigating within the broad framework of twinning the differing treatments of both content and style between Andreas and what is often thought to be its closest Latin exemplar, found in the so-called Casanatensis manuscript. The sense of ‘content’ here takes its lead from Aristotle’s On the Art of Poetry, where it denotes the constitutive elements of the plot. To this sense must be added descriptive or metanarrative commentary, which Andreas employs more than the Casanatensis version. Aristotle’s discussion, especially in terms of ‘the simple plot,’ will become more important in the fourth chapter, though it is still in many ways of underlying importance in the second. Style, on the other hand, is understood to mean the various cues in the narrative’s presentation which direct the reader to translate that content in particular ways—in terms of diction, figuration and similar elements. It should be noted that this influence upon the reader’s ‘intentionality’ aligns interestingly with recent developments in Reader Response criticism, and though much which is said in this thesis shadows what is maintained amongst such critics, the scope of this discussion does not allow for an extended and explicit treatment of Reader Response criticism throughout, though it does suggest potentially rich and helpful parallel approaches to the highly vexed relations between content and style in Andreas, where scholars have often arbitrarily ‘bracketed off’ one from the other.

Scholars who study Andreas have used a number of paradigms to engage Andreas’ relationship to potential source texts such as the Casanatensis manuscript. These paradigms will receive detailed examination in Chapter II, but are briefly summarised here. At the most prosaic level is the tracking of content, though not style, between the Casanatensis manuscript’s version and Andreas by Robert Boenig, Ellen Baumler and Milton Reimer, who note some of the more substantial plot or descriptive changes in footnotes. Content has been tracked more recently, in greater detail and with a stronger critical framework by Alison Powell. Much more popular are approaches to Andreas’ relational dynamics using typological and allegorical perspectives, and these have yielded many significant insights. Edward Irving, however, voices the opinion that such figurative approaches are often problematically conceived and have actually become a hindrance, and so produces what might be described as a New Critical reading of the poem, in self-referential isolation. Stanley Greenfield, on the other hand, adopts a historical perspective, investigating the understanding of Christian sainthood in Andreas as this is reconfigured against the backdrop of Germanic heroism and the figure of the saint in Andreas’ possible source

15 See note 9 for details.
16 Powell, “Verbal Parallels.”
texts. Finally, Brian Shaw employs a rather vague Post-Structuralist paradigm, arguing that the Andreas-poet alters his text so that the ability of the word to rival the letter is foregrounded. In all of these approaches productive work to a greater or lesser degree has been done, though there is a sense amongst scholars like Calder, Greenfield, Powell and Anita Riedinger that these relational paradigms have in most cases run their course.

Next, the discussion will shift to the relationship Andreas seems to have with an indigenous work—Beowulf. Again, this will be examined in detail in Chapter III, but approaches which consider oral and literary indebtedness between the two texts might be summarised here as dividing into three main camps: those scholars who reject outright any possibility of formulaic influence of Beowulf upon Andreas; those who employ paradigms which assume a general or non-specific formulaic influence between the texts; and those who hypothesize direct and deliberate appropriation of Beowulf’s formulae (or even more basic verbal collocations) by the

---

22 Discussed most recently at the formulaic level in Reidinger, “The Formulaic Relationship” and “The Poetic Formula,” See also Carol Funk, “History of Andreas and Beowulf: Comparative Scholarship,” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Denver, 1997); and once more, Powell, “Verbal Parallels.”
Andreas—poet.\textsuperscript{25} Once more, many of these scholars are beginning to suggest either directly or implicitly that the authority afforded absolute binaries of orality and literacy between the two texts seems largely exhausted, and that other intertextual relational paradigms need to be found if we are to get a clearer view of Andreas’ relative artistry.

Finally, I will address the relationship between the verse Andreas and an Old English prose version of the legend, in MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198, fols. 386r–394v. Presently, comparisons between these two legends employ no cogent paradigms whatsoever, with the exception of Mary Swan,\textsuperscript{26} who has recently dealt with the relationship from a purely philological perspective. Other than her brief analysis, this prose version is seldom mentioned, either relative to Andreas or other Anglo-Saxon texts. On those rare occasions when it is considered, it is usually as an aside and background to another text which is the main focus of study. Once more, the scholarship surrounding this prose version’s extratextual ‘situatedness’ will be laid out in much more detail in Chapter IV.

What is reasonably clear at this point, however, is that when considering relational dynamics between Andreas and the texts which have in the past been associated with it, traditional scholarly paradigms for thinking about these relations

\textsuperscript{25} For example, Andy Orchard, “Oral Tradition,” \textit{Reading Old English Texts}, ed. K. O’Brien O’Keeffe (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997): 101–123; Claes Schaar, \textit{Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group} Lund Studies 17 (Lund: Gleerup, 1949); David Hamilton, “Andreas and Beowulf: Placing the Hero,” \textit{Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation for John C. McGalliard}, eds. L. Nicholson, D. Frese and J. Gerber (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 1975): 81–98. To this group of scholars might be added those listed above in note 20 who have laid out so much of the most recent groundwork for an explicit relationship between the poems. In addition, brief mention should be made of theories which posit that the line of formulaic influence runs the other way, that Beowulf borrows from Andreas, though this theory has not been afforded much currency by other scholars: see especially, again, Carol Funk, “History of Andreas.”

seem to have exhausted some of their most promising avenues. If so, then a reconceptualisation of relational paradigms might prepare the ground for new insights about how *Andreas* was both composed and received.

One reconfiguration which may open new critical horizons upon *Andreas* is the sense of twinning intrinsic to the early medieval genre of the *opus geminatum*, a genre with which a number of Anglo-Saxon authors were familiar, which seems to have exercised an influence upon a considerable number of their texts, and which affords us a conceptual framework which overlays modern enquiries with a contemporary paradigm for engaging *Andreas*’ intertextual relationships.

For purposes of this discussion, I will follow Peter Godman and Gernot Wieland, who in turn are influenced by Alcuin, and offer as a working definition of the *opus geminatum* a pair of texts, one in verse and one in prose, which ostensibly treat the same subject. The definition does not require that the same writer must compose both halves, nor in what order they are to be either written or read. Nor again must this form be confused with *prosimetrum*, which alternates between prose and verse throughout a single work. The first use of the term *opus geminatum* derives from Bede’s (673–735) *Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum* (731), where he writes concerning Aldhelm’s twin work on virginity that “scripsit et de virginitate librum eximium, quem in exemplum Sedulii geminato opere, et versibus exametris et prosa composuit” (“he wrote an excellent book concerning virginity, which he composed

---


after the example of Sedulius’ twin work, in both hexameter verses and in prose”).

Thus Bede perhaps picks up on the idea of a twin or double work implied earlier in Sedulius’ *Carmen paschale* (c. 440), wherein Sedulius writes: “quod placuerit [the *Carmen*] ideo geminari volueris” (“that it might please, for the reason that it shall be recited as a pair”).

Though general knowledge of this literary mode is not uncommon amongst Anglo-Saxonists, scholarship which focuses on it explicitly is relatively sparse and the phenomenology of the *opus geminatum* remains incomplete, unclear and in many ways vexed. For instance, no comprehensive work on the its evolution exists, out of antique traditions of paraphrase and into its fullest and most refined realization amongst Anglo-Saxon writers as the *opus geminatum* about which scholars presently speak, though with varying degrees of coherence.

Articulating a conception of the *opus geminatum*’s entire history, and arguing for the validity of that history, is a task too fraught and cumbersome to include in this thesis’ agenda. With this consideration in view, I, again like Wieland and Godman, will restrict myself to laying out heuristically aspects of the *opus geminatum* primarily in early medieval England, and only as these aspects potentially touch upon features of *Andreas*’ relations to the texts mentioned above.

However, for a scholar who is familiar with both *Andreas* and the *opus geminatum* tradition and then takes the step of explicitly considering one in light of the other, the tremendous potential of the latter as a critical paradigm with which to

---

29 Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave and R. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991): v. 18. The unity of the verse and prose texts is directly implied by the fact that Aldhelm never calls his work *haec opera*, but always *hoc opus*; for more details, see page 19. I use *opus geminatum* in preference to *geminus stilus* (which is employed by Gernot Wieland), simply because the term *opus geminatum* seems more common to the Anglo-Saxon hagiographers. Wieland, on the other hand, borrows from Hrabanus Marus for reasons necessary to the topics of his article.
illuminate the former seems immediately apparent, for it is certain that the Andreas-poet and the authors of the other three texts—of the Casanatensis manuscript, Beowulf and MS. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198—were thinking intently and, to varying degrees, critically about textual relationships as they wrote. For instance, the Andreas-poet, relative to any potential source text available to us, cuts out large portions of the story, shifts the emphasis in other parts, and expands considerably on certain episodes throughout. Likewise, as will be detailed presently, numerous scholars have commented upon the degree and nature of the Andreas-poet’s shift from hagiographical and Virgilian to Old English heroic diction, remarking at length upon his motives and the value of his re-imagining of the legend in these new terms. This is to say nothing of his casting what was most likely a Latin prose source text into an Old English verse form. For all such intertextual engagements, and a considerable range besides (which will be discussed in the following chapters), one of the more articulate and pervasive paradigms available to Anglo-Saxons would seem to be the opus geminatum, though in exactly what form and at what remove remains unclear. Moreover, intertextual dynamics which appear in other literary traditions, such as in the Anglo-Saxon homiletic or riddling literature, must also be borne in mind, for it seems more than plausible that these sets of intertextual dynamics exist not in isolation, but as a family of diverse but interconnected paradigms. Likewise, the influence of the opus geminatum mode is not entirely dominant in all ways and in all texts under consideration here; for instance, the assertions of writers like Alcuin, about the performative contexts for the halves of an opus geminatum seem intensely problematic when considering Andreas, and in some ways, in MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198, the tendencies of the opus geminatum have been modified, overlooked or defied with what seems a fair degree of critical autonomy; in fact, the
distinctions seem to break down if one compares later Old English prose and verse versions. Both of these evolutionary considerations, and a number of lesser ones, shall receive detailed treatment in Chapter IV and the conclusion.

However, in spite of this often problematic understanding of the opus geminatum’s dynamics, enough might be discerned either implicitly, in the opera geminata of Bede or Aldhelm, or in explicit and programmatic statements by Alcuin, to conclude that the genre offers a useful set of insights to us about how the Andreas-poet himself might have conceived of this literary transmission at some of its prose, prosodic and substantive levels, and which in turn allows us to remodulate, in ways which are comparatively fresh, our thinking about these literary relationships and so the relative artistry of the poem itself.

Though a full history of the opus geminatum’s evolution is too unwieldy for this discussion, in order to speak cogently about the influence of the opus geminatum in Anglo-Saxon England, a brief synopsis of the genre’s historical context is necessary here. The opus geminatum evolved out of classical traditions of paraphrase or conversio and consequent practices surrounding the production of scriptural epic paraphrases in late antiquity. The former paraphrased verse texts into prose forms, prose forms into verse, as well as verse to verse and prose to prose. Most surviving information available about classical paraphrase comes down to us from Cicero, Theon and Quintilian. It is vital to note that there exists no evidence that Anglo-Saxon authors knew the works of these authors on rhetorical practices, such as the conversio, first hand, no matter how consistently their comments and judgments match up with Anglo-Saxon practices in their opera geminata. See Michael Lapidge, The Anglo-Saxon Library (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006): 126.
upon that subject. It is also from Cicero that we learn that the paraphrasing student is
to memorize the sections of text which he then carries over, rather than writing text
beside text, an observation which is interesting in light of Andreas’ possible
connection Beowulf, with its mnemonic machinery.31 Finally, it is from Cicero that we
learn that paraphrase and translation are in the mind of Greek and Roman writers
closely related practices, which once more seems important to Andreas as this draws
upon potential Latin and Greek source texts.32

Theon, about whom very little is known, is likely a contemporary of Quintilian
(35–95 AD). He took issue with the idea that there exists such a thing as a perfect
expression of an idea. Rather, he insisted there were potentially a multiplicity of
excellent expressions of a single idea and moreover that the practice of paraphrasing
builds up in one a certain stylistic versatility.33

Quintilian also, in Institutio oratoria, insisted that the practice is of great
practical value, enhancing as it does one’s stylistic acumen, and he goes on to stress
that prose ought to use clear, restrained, though not necessarily economical language.
He too, like Cicero, says that passages are to be memorized and possibly recited aloud
before they are paraphrased.34 Later, Quintilian articulates a distinction which
manifests pervasively and dramatically in later scriptural paraphrases and Anglo-

31 Anita Riedinger suggests that this text beside text approach is the method by which the Andreas-poet
borsows numerous formulae from Beowulf: 287.
aspects of Cicero’s rhetoric, see particularly Karen Fredborg, “Ciceronean Rhetoric and the Schools,”
Learning Institutionalized: Teaching in the Medieval University: Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval
sprachliche Variation-Sprachgeschichte-Sprachtypologie; Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu, 3, ed.
Heinemann, 1936): 118.
Saxon *opera geminata* as a distinctive feature which differentiates between prose and verse, insisting that verse raises inspiration to sublime levels of style, while prose makes good his diffusion treatments and omissions of content, and that there is a complementary relationship between verse’s metaphorical concision and prose’s literal comprehensiveness, between elegance and eloquence respectively.\(^35\)

Scriptural paraphrase, which paraphrases scripture into verse forms, grew out of these antique rhetorical traditions.\(^36\) In taking up this form, however, Christian paraphrasers needed to overcome two particular doubts which would exercise considerable influence upon Anglo-Saxon literary practices: anxieties about collaborating with pagan literature, and concerns about fidelity between scripture (and later holy writings) and its paraphrases.

Christian authors’ concern about collaborating with pagan literature has been discussed by numerous modern scholars, and these scholars for the most part agree that many of the Western Fathers, such as Lactantius, Cyprian or Augustine,\(^37\) accepted the utility of pagan literary training for Christian rhetorical and literary


\(^37\) Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, CCSL 32 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1958), IV. 2.3 and. 4.6.
undertakings. However, if the Fathers allowed that Christian paraphrasers draw upon this pagan literature, it was to be done as a secular means to a Christian end, and not as an end unto itself; this subordination of pagan literatures to Christian agendas is a tendency to keep in mind as this thesis later turns to the ways in which Andreas might be indebted to Beowulf, for the Andreas-poet too would have had to wrestle with strikingly similar anxieties about availing himself of diction and conventions drawn from what was perhaps a ‘pagan classic’ of his own Anglo-Saxon culture.

There is also the question of what motivated Christian paraphrasers to pursue this method. Lactantius gives us some idea when he says:

Haec in primis causa est cur apud sapientes et doctos et principes huius saeculi scriptura sancta fide careat, quod prophetae communi ac simplici sermone ut ad populum sunt locuti.40

[This is a chief reason why the Scriptures lack belief among the wise, both the learned, and the secular rulers: because the prophets spoke in an everyday, simple language as if to the people].

Augustine also suggests this anxiety in De doctrina christiana, specifically in Book IV, where he attempts to undermine learned criticisms of the Bible’s simple style.

The pioneer of these biblical paraphrasers was Juvencus, an Iberian priest of noble family (fl. early fourth century), who in either 329 or 330 wrote the Evangelia, a verse paraphrase of the life of Christ, based upon the four gospels and depending especially on the Gospel of St. Matthew from the Greek New Testament. In book four of his text he explains how his paraphrase clothes the glory of divine truth in the

---

40 Lactantius, Divinae Institutiones, ed. Samuel Brandt, CSEL 19 (Vienna: Tempsky, 1890): 401.
ornament of terrestrial language in order that it might be more appealing to literarily educated readers.\textsuperscript{41} Part of this appeal is the prestige extended to \textit{Evangelia} by its use of heroic hexameter and Virgilian diction, thus connecting it with the epic classics of pagan culture, such as the \textit{Aeneid}, the text most quoted by the Church Fathers.\textsuperscript{42}

Again, if \textit{Andreas} relies upon \textit{Beowulf’s} diction and Old English prosodic conventions, then this impulse would align once more with that same late antique Christian tactic elicited by Juvenecus, of making the text more appealing to its audiences by reifying it in a conventional epic form known and respected by that audience. Juvenecus’ \textit{Evangelia}, after receiving Jerome’s blessing, became one of the most popular texts of the early middle ages, and seems to have had a considerable presence in Anglo-Saxon schools, amongst other places.

The author who establishes the form of the \textit{opus geminatum} proper is Caelius Sedulius (\textit{fl.} first half of the fifth century, in Italy), who first wrote his \textit{Carmen paschale} on the miracles of the four Gospels in hexameter, with an introductory book on miracles in the Old Testament. He then wrote a second prose work, the \textit{Opus paschale}, based upon the \textit{Carmen}. Thus, by one author producing two works, one in verse and one in prose, ostensibly unified by the same subject, Sedulius hands on to posterity the basic form of the \textit{opus geminatum}. His motives in producing such a work are already familiar to Christian authors, as observed above. Sedulius explains in his first letter to his patron, Macedonius:

\begin{quote}
Multi sunt quos studiorum saecularium disciplina per poeticas magis delicias et carminum voluptates oblectat. Hi quicquid rhetoricae facundiae perlegunt, neglegentius adsequuntur, quoniam illud haud diligunt: quod autem versuum
\end{quote}

[There are many for whom the special delight of secular education lies in the charms of poetry and the pleasures of verse. These men are inattentive to whatever they read in rhetorical prose because they take no pleasure in it. However, what they see in the honeyed allure of verse, they receive with such eagerness of heart that by its more frequent repetition they establish and store it up deep in their memory].

Again, like Lactantius and Juvencus, the joy or pleasures (voluptates) of verse serve for Sedulius a useful or practical end: overcoming educated, secular reservations about the crudeness of Christian prosaic material by transferring it into a refined verse with which they were familiar and by which they might be delighted. Again, if this impulse were carried over to Andreas, it would present a plausible and much more cogent motivation for the Andreas-poet’s undertaking than those recent scholarly accounts which too often arise largely in vacuo or without a context in Anglo-Saxon literary history. In pursuit of this aim, Sedulius follows Juvencus’ tactic, so that the Carmen also relies heavily upon Virgilian diction.

**England and the opus geminatum**

The evolving paraphrase tradition found particularly fertile ground amongst the English, and its practitioners were amongst the luminaries of Anglo-Latin literature: specifically Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin. Among such writers, traditional objectives and concerns intrinsic to the burgeoning mode of the opus geminatum developed new facets which synthesized many earlier aspects. The first of these

---

writers was Aldhelm (c. 639–709/710), Abbot of Malmesbury and Bishop of Sherborne.

Aldhelm’s *opus geminatum, De virginitate*, rather directly implies a dichotomy of ‘useful’ prose and ‘pleasurable’ verse, and this communicates much about how Anglo-Latin authors treat the sensibilities they inherited when taking up the *opus geminatum*. The verse is composed of 2904 hexameter lines and is preserved in twenty manuscripts. The prose version exists in twenty-three manuscripts. Strikingly, not a single manuscript contains both a prose and verse version of the work; indeed, they seem to have usually circulated separately. Near the end of his prose version, Aldhelm mentions that he will also attempt a verse version; the metaphor suggests an interesting dichotomy:

\[
\text{Iactis iam rethoricis fundamentis et constructis prosae parietibus, cum tegulis trochaicis et dactilicis metrorum imbricibus firmissimum culmen caelesti confisus suffragio imponam.}
\]

[The rhetorical foundation stones were now laid and the walls of prose were built, so, trusting in heavenly aid, I will build a solid roof with trochaic slates and dactylic tile of metre].

Thus, Aldhelm claims, he has built up a solid lower work, foundations and walls, in prose, while the roof above, elevated as it is, will be made of the trochees and dactylys of verse. To this vertical dichotomy he adds a connotation of stylistic values: “metrica

---

47 Ehwald, 224–225 and again 349. This separate circulation certainly problematises the claims made by these writers for the *opus geminatum*’s dual nature, though a distinction needs to be made here between the production and transmission of *opera geminata*, and this discussion is in the first instance interested in the theory which underlies production and how this sheds light on *Andreas*, and by necessity adopts the perspective afforded by these authors; the thesis must therefore consider the dissemination *a posteriori* to this prior concern.
leporis elegantia et rethericae disertitudinis eloquentia tantum altrinsecus discrepent, quantum distat dulcis sapar a merulento temeto” (“the elegance of metrical beauty and the eloquence of rhetorical discourse differ as much from each other as sweet new wine is different from heady mead”).

The ascription of elegance to verse or eloquence to prose is perhaps problematic, but what seems more clear from this statement is that elegance is understood primarily as an aesthetic quality, whereas eloquence focuses on speech which is “well done,” conveying a sense of linguistic competence through its replete articulateness. Thus, necessarily but implicitly, the former is enjoyed, while the latter is useful, and each is admirable in these capacities and collaborates with its opposite from within these presuppositions; this distinction turns out to be informative when comparing the Casanatensis manuscript’s account and Andreas, for the prose Latin version communicates much information which, though often lurid and dramatic, seems primarily concerned to render an articulate, clear account of that information. In other words, it seeks to be an effective, a useful, communication of the legend. Andreas is much more concerned to entertain, and its concision, diction, and critical rigor align it much more with an impulse towards contemplative enjoyment (an alignment which Alcuin’s later writings shall reiterate).

However, Aldhelm’s prose, like Sedulius’, is much more complex than his verse, while the opposite situation obtains in the twinned works of Bede and Alcuin. This begs the question of just how useful the prose could be to a general audience who did not possess the in-depth training to de-code Kunstprosa, as Curtius calls it,

---

49 Lapidge, Aldhelm, 131.
50 See pages 25–26 for details.
whether or not such complexity conduces to the eloquence of the work. This specialized and so exclusive prose ‘usefulness’ is renegotiated by Bede and influences many later Anglo-Saxon writers. As observed at the beginning of this introduction, Bede makes the connection between Aldhelm’s work and Sedulius’ explicit, but even if we did not have his association, the connection is well attested; there are over thirty-eight verbal parallels between the Carmen de virginitate and the Carmen paschale, and Aldhelm explicitly quotes the Carmen paschale in at least six instances. In addition, both Sedulius’ and Aldhelm’s works divide their treatment into Old and New Testament segments and share the same, previously mentioned dichotomy of complex prose against (comparatively) simple verse. Again, all this emphasises the power and pervasiveness of the tradition of borrowing verbal aspects, as a common practice in the literary culture Anglo-Saxons inherited and developed; certainly it offers a useful context into which the recent work by Riedinger and Powell on the relationship between Beowulf and Andreas fits and does much to undercut the exclusivity of oral-formulaic approaches to questions of textual indebtedness.

Another work which seems to colour Aldhelm’s works significantly is Prosper of Aquitaine’s epigrams; these Prosper paraphrased from Augustine’s Sententiae. They are quoted by Aldhelm, and this suggests that he was also familiar with Prosper’s stated motives for paraphrasing Augustine, though at what remove is more difficult to say:

\[
\text{Dum sacris mentem placet execere loquelis,} \\
\text{Coelestique animum pascere pane iuvat:} \\
\text{Quosdam, ceu prato, libuit decerpere flores,}
\]

51 A useful introduction to this aspect of early medieval prose is offered by Curtius, 149–50.
52 Orchard, The Poetic Art, 164–165.
53 The debates surrounding matters of textual indebtedness in Anglo-Saxon literature will be covered extensively in Chapter III.
Distinctisque ipsos texere versiculis.\textsuperscript{54}

[As long as it was pleasing to exercise the mind with holy maxims, and as long as we took delight in feeding the heart with celestial bread, it pleased us to pick some flowers, as if from a field, and to weave them together into separate, tiny verses].

Thus Prosper indicates that the prose of Augustine’s \textit{Sententiae} is an exercise and a sustenance, which in turn seems to imply that it is useful and practical. The verses, on the other hand, are like flowers woven into (perhaps) a garland: a beautiful but ultimately “useless” object. The former is designed to pragmatic ends, while the latter affords enjoyment.\textsuperscript{55}

In Bede’s commentary upon \textit{De virginitate}, the two works are seen as being essentially unified segments of a larger, single construct: they are together for Bede a \textit{liber}, whereas to Sedulius they are consistently \textit{libelli}. Aldhelm makes this symbiotic relationship clear, for he refers his reader to the prose text (at line 2200) for the name of three martyrs about whom he is speaking, and his metaphorical dichotomies in both works speak always of two elements of a single whole, such as the previous example of the two parts of a dwelling. Moreover, he calls \textit{De virginitate hoc opus}, not \textit{haec opera}.\textsuperscript{56} In light of this, it seems likely that Aldhelm expected the two portions to be read in close proximity to one another.

However, two facts undermine confidence in this union. First, the subjects of the verse and prose have very little to do with one another. They are ostensibly about virginity, but though this makes up the initial part of the discussion in the prose, it soon diverts to discussions about women as the \textit{athletae Christi}. The verse expands upon the second subject and then moves into a \textit{denouement} upon the eight vices: a

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{55} Cf. Wieland, “\textit{Geminus Stilus},” 121.
\textsuperscript{56} Aldhelm, MGH AA 15, 469.
\end{flushright}
sort of *psychomachia* in miniature. One is not likely to guess simply by reading the
verse alone that it might have the title of *De virginitate*.

The second doubt is raised by the simple fact that, as noted before, one never
encounters in the extant manuscript tradition the prose and verse together. They
circulated separately, despite Aldhelm’s assumptions and Bede’s descriptions of unity
for *opera geminata*. However, though there is a difference between the ‘theories’ of
unity espoused by Bede or Aldhelm, and the textual practices we can track, this thesis
is in the first instance interested in that theory; whether it proved authoritative, or
functioned as a point of departure in actual practice, is, though important, less
important here than whether these theories prove relevant to throwing the
characteristic aspects of the *opus geminatum* tradition into more cogent relief.
In a similar fashion, one may also note that it seems unlikely that *Andreas*, the
Casanatensis manuscript’s version, *Beowulf* and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College,
MS. 198 account were expected to be read in direct relation to one another. However,
it is one question whether the audience of *Andreas* was familiar with *Beowulf* or an
exemplar of *Andreas* similar to the Casanatensis manuscript’s version, and another
whether the author was; obviously he must have been intimately familiar with the
latter, and it is the contention of this thesis that his familiarity with the former seems
more likely than not. Again, it is production, not dissemination, which is of primary
interest here.

Bede’s first involvement with the *opus geminatum* manifested as a prose
version of Paulinus of Nola’s verse *Vita S. Felicis*,\(^57\) which Bede wrote somewhere

---

\(^{57}\) Paulinus of Nola, *Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Carmina*, ed. W. V. Hartel, CSEL 30: 2
between 700 and 705. In the prologus, Bede made immediate note of the familiar dichotomy:

Placuit nobis ob plurimorum utilitatem eandem sancti confessoris historiam planioribus dilucidare sermonibus eiusque imitari industrium, qui Martyrium beati Cassiani de metrico opere Prudentii in commune apertumque omnibus eloquium transtulit.

[For the use of many, it pleased us to elucidate the history of that same holy confessor in plainer speech, imitating his same industry, with which the blessed martyr Cassian translated in entirely ordinary and open speech the metrical works of Prudentius].

Taking rather direct issue with the claims of authors like Aldhelm and Sedulius about the eloquence of fabricata latinitas, Bede reversed his account into simplex prosa. Thus, for Bede (and later for Alcuin), the eloquence or articulateness of prose, and thus its usefulness, seems to depend centrally upon it being clear or direct, which thereby made it accessible to a wider audience. So influential was his association upon later writers and modern scholars that it is easy to assume that the bulk of Anglo-Latin prose’s virtue, of eloquence, resolves in particular instances into direct, plain speech, while verse’s elegance depends upon a complex but apt figurative periphrasis. However, as a comparison of Aldhelm’s and Bede’s prose or verse makes clear, these were later associations of quality, often counter to prior circumstances which emphasized instead the comprehensiveness of prose and sublimity of verse.

Quite simply, the impression given is that Bede’s prose was useful because of its brief clarity, while Aldhelm’s or Sedulius’ prose was useful because it was expansive and minutely detailed. In both cases these authors seem to consider these respective qualities to conduce directly to eloquence. However, the dichotomy of use to prose and pleasure to verse still apply, so it seems that, in these particular literary

59 Bede, Ibid., 789.
fields and amongst these particular authors at least, a sense of what was useful and what was pleasurable was changing. Bede’s next engagement with the *opus geminatum* would consolidate his particular vision of use and pleasure in prose and verse.

Bede wrote his *Vita Sancti Cuthberti* some time between 705 and 716. This constitutes the first known Anglo-Latin *opus geminatum* on a hagiographic subject. Bede’s text draws upon the anonymous Lindisfarne Life of Cuthbert, as well as the testimony of those familiar with Cuthbert’s tradition. The Lindisfarne Life was written some time between 699 and 705. Bede wrote the elaborate, highly metaphorical verse text first, and as if following the dictates of Quintilian, he consistently eschews particular details in favour of a rather baroque allusiveness. Godman refers to Bede’s elaborate form of verse as his *recherché* form, and that in this he had abandoned traditional claims to verse’s ‘charm,’ producing instead a work of “sententious style” which elicited “a distaste for the particular.” However, these judgements seem an awkward fit with earlier paraphrasers’ claims about verse; it is not clear how the ‘baroque’ nature of Bede’s verse precludes its ‘elegance’ and ‘sublimity,’ which traditionally were the fundamental traits of its ‘charm.’ If one transposes Godman’s description to the verse *Andreas*, one finds that though the work

---

62 As Bede himself maintains in his prologue to the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*.
may be thought of as sententious, it elicits no distaste for particular details: in fact, quite the contrary. However, because Bede intended the prose to accompany the verse, a key to ambiguous portions of the verse would be, in theory, ready-to-hand; the verse did not invite only the cultured and erudite reader, though through a comparative reading, Bede’s *opus geminatum* may have been in a position to turn the less refined reader into a (somewhat more) cultured one. In this sense, as earlier paraphrases of Christian works had been designed to remodulate Christian matter to reach up to cultured readers, so here Christian matter is remodulated to reach down to the comparatively unlearned reader, and certainly this might have been the end result of paraphrasing the prose Latin version of *Andreas* into Old English verse.

Perhaps modern assertions about early medieval verse’s esoteric nature derive in part from anticipating Alcuin’s later influential distinctions concerning the form: that his prose was for public reading to the community at large, while the verse was for private reading. However, if this is the case, then to impose Alcuin’s distinction upon Bede is anachronistic; Bede says nothing about the exclusivity of his verse. What he does say in the verse prologue, echoing the sentiments of Sedulius, is that he hopes to add to a later prose life that which he must pass over now in verse. In other words, as is the tradition from antiquity, the prose will make good the diffusions and omissions of verse. Rather, it is just how Bede’s prose will do this that is different.

In the prologue to his prose Bede writes: “sicque ablatis omnibus scrupulorum ambagibus ad purum, certam veritatis indaginem simplicibus explicitam sermonibus commendare membranulis” (‘and so, I made it my business to put down on parchment the outcome of my vigorous investigation of the truth, expressed in simple language,
free from all obscurities and subtleties’). From this one might infer that Bede considers qualities of transparency and directness more useful than the quantity of detail and nuance provided by authors like Aldhelm and Sedulius. Yet Godman interprets this as an aesthetic, rather than pragmatic, decision, noting that Bede would have inserted material, which was discovered by him after the text were written, “si non deliberato ac perfecto operi nova interserere, vel supradicere minus conguum atque indecorum esse constaret” (“if it had not seemed scarcely fitting and proper to insert new matter or add to a work which was planned and complete”). Thus, Godman states, “the prose part of the opus geminatum might have aesthetic value other than fullness.” This consists in not only what may be added, but what may be trimmed away. This balancing between expansiveness and directness manifests Bede’s “emphasis upon the utility, clarity and beauty of the prose part of the opus geminatum.” There is no doubt that Bede lays great emphasis upon this economical style of prose and that his style is enormously influential upon later Anglo-Latin writers, but to conflate clarity, utility and beauty in a single impulse seems to fly in the face of both the inherited opus geminatum tradition and the textual evidence which Bede provides. If one turns to the Old English prose versions of Andreas, such as that found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 198, this conflict of sought-after virtues become abundantly clear, for in this prose version there are few rhetorical efforts other than those which conduce to clarity; as the final chapter shall illustrate, prose versions are arrestingly curt.

67 Bede, Vita sancti Cuthberti, 144.
68 Bede, Ibid. 144.
70 Godman, Ibid, 223.
This is not to say that practical, didactic purposes were not thought to be aided or supplemented by pleasurable qualities. The aesthetically pleasing character of texts was considered, as observed above in the comments of Sedulius or Lactantius, a powerful incentive by which readers could be induced to engage more productively, more efficiently, with the useful aspects of textuality. Thus in actual rhetorical practice, pleasure is useful. However, none of these Anglo-Latin authors ever states, or even implies, that usefulness, on the other hand, contributes to the beauty of the text; aesthetic concerns which contribute to the pleasure of reading the text do not depend upon that text’s usefulness: in other words, to these Anglo-Latin authors, the phrase ‘usefully beautiful’ could make sense, but the ‘beautifully useful’ would seem, on the evidence and within this context, flatly counter-intuitive.

Bede’s insistence upon the unity of these two works carried somewhat more currency than Aldhelm’s; of the thirty-eight manuscripts which contain the prose life, eight also contain the verse.\footnote{Colgrave, \textit{Vita sancti Cuthberti}, 54.} Alcuin (735–804) followed up on this focus on unity by presenting simultaneously the two texts of his \textit{opus geminatum}, the \textit{Vita S. Willibrordi} (written between 785 and 797),\footnote{Alcuin, \textit{Vita Willibrordi archiepiscopi Traiectensis auctore Alcuino}, ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH SRM 7 (Hannover, 1919): 81–141 (prose only).} as a single whole to Beornrad, Abbot of Echternach and Archbishop of Sens (792–298). Thus, through Alcuin’s project, one author produced one text of two works at one time. Furthermore, his pretensions to unity seem initially to have been taken more seriously, for of the five manuscripts which contain both the prose and verse, four are of an early date.\footnote{Levison, \textit{Vita Willibrordi}, 97.} Alcuin’s primary source was a now lost anonymous life written, according to Theofrith, Abbot of Echternach...
(1083–1100), by an “unlearned Irishman” in a ‘rough, unpolished style.’ Alcuin’s motives for writing this life are much debated, but the simple fact that Willibrord was both English and likely a kinsman must have made him an appealing subject to an expatriate like Alcuin. Theofrith also wrote an opus geminatum on the life of Willibrord, and a later life based upon Alcuin’s text was written by a presbyter called Echebert.

Though Bede was the first to lay out the new theories of how the verse and prose dichotomy of the opus geminatum was to facilitate use and pleasure, it was Alcuin who prescribed how these theories were to meet the pragmatic necessities of every-day use. He made a statement in the prologus which has since become a touchstone for scholars who study the opus geminatum, for both assenting and dissenting voices, and shall be central to the final chapter of this thesis:

```
[...]
```

[I have obeyed your command, Holy Father, and have set down two books: one, walking along in prose, can be read publicly by the brothers in church, if it seems worthy to your wisdom, the other, running with the muse of poetry, your pupils ought to ruminate over and over again in their cells].

From this it seems that Alcuin has, for the most part, two audiences in mind, and this implies that there is for him a growing tension. On the one hand, Alcuin has brought the opus geminatum to a new level of theoretical unity, by presenting both halves, simultaneously, by a single author. At the same time, however, this strongly unified

---

75 Egbert, La vie de saint Willibrord par le prêtre Egbert, ed A. Poncelet, Analecta Bollandiana 22 (1903): 419–422.
76 Alcuin, Vita Willibrordi, 117.
work demands in its own text that its two halves be deployed in fundamentally
different settings in fundamentally different ways. This tension, at face value, is
irreconcilable, and scholars have either instinctively or deliberately tried, by moving
past its face value, to find a graceful way to circumvent this tension. The most cogent
attempt suggests that the key lies in the verb, *ruminare*. As Jean Leclercq suggests,
the metaphor of ‘ruminating’ upon a text is borrowed from exegetical practices with
scripture. From this observation, it has been concluded that Alcuin intended the
readers of the verse to ruminant upon the text in order to commit the text to memory
so that they might learn a broader Latin vocabulary, cultivate a more replete facility
with its grammar, and apprehend a wider range of poetic style. Such an assertion,
however, would proceed upon both an assumption and an oversight.

It is true that Alcuin did recommend the reading of poetry for just this reason,
and thus he was availing himself of a learned tradition extolled as far back as
Quintilian. However, there is no explicit or necessary link between this sentiment and
Alcuin’s use of the verb, *ruminare*, in the *prologus*; it is speculation, albeit learned
and suggestive. On the other hand, as Leclercq makes abundantly clear, one must take
note of the distinction between the ruminations of monks and the ruminations of
scholastics, for their objectives are quite different. The scholastic ruminates upon
the text in order to attain *scientia*, and if scholastics, in some form, were the audience
of Alcuin’s *opus geminatum*, then *ruminare* might indeed imply that the verse was for
the cultivation of useful knowledge. However, Alcuin’s audience is not composed of
scholastics (at the first remove), but monks. These, according to Leclercq, though they

78 Leclercq, Ibid, 75.
utilize knowledge of grammar, vocabulary and prosody, subordinate this *scientia* to their textual search for wisdom and as a way to fulfill ‘their desire for heaven.’ As the context of the *opus geminatum* has thus far made clear, desire and wisdom are the domain of pleasure, not use. The poet of the verse *Andreas* almost certainly intended his audience to take pleasure in his poem—and not merely find it useful—and that this pleasure would conduce to a desire for heaven and things holy. It is a point again in keeping with the sense of *ruminare* here, with the explicit comments of Lactantius and Sedulius, and the coalescing dichotomy of use and pleasure encountered in the developing genre of the *opus geminatum*.

However, another distinction needs to be made; Alcuin’s stated audience were certainly monks, contemplating the Trinity through the lens of the saint, but again the textual evidence differs with claims and stated intentions. Alcuin’s *opus geminatum*, and also the *opera geminata* of Aldhelm and Bede, frequently became part of the students’ curriculum. An argument for this employment has been made by both Ehwald and Robinson, based upon lexical and syntactical glosses in manuscripts of these works. This is not surprising, considering that the use of the texts were likely following on in their own manner with the traditional employment of the paraphrase from antiquity. On the other hand, neither Bede nor Aldhelm mentions anything about scholastic impulses informing their compositions. Their stated aim remains consistently to enact in literature in some way or another both the audience’s and author’s ‘desire for heaven.’

By the late eighth and early ninth century, the modes, methods and objectives of either verse or prose were blurring under the strain of tensions implicit in the *opus

79 Leclercq, Ibid, 75.
geminatum form. Wieland makes the attractive suggestion that one of the ways this may have subsequently played out was in Ælfric’s rhythmic prose:⁸¹ the tensions between prose and verse modes engaged by Ælfric’s rhythmic prose handing on a ‘sibling tension’ to modern editors of his saints’ lives, who publish his works sometimes as prose, sometimes as verse. Moreover, David Townsend examines the ways in which the opus geminatum’s implicit vexations are perpetuated, tracing the manners in which the Monumenta Germaniae Historica has undermined the claims of opus geminatum authors, for a fundamental unity of these texts, through ignoring or obscuring their distinctly literary aspects in order to enact certain political and cultural sensibilities. For instance, Townsend traces in considerable detail how the MGH has compartmentalized opera geminata such as Alcuin’s Vita Willibrordi, publishing verse and prose separately in a way which masks deliberate decisions of literary presentation and thereby de-emphasizing a number of potent political implications conditioned by textual modes in which their authors chose to promulgate.⁸²

Since the date of composition for Andreas seems to leave it in the wake of most of the developments which are germane to the opus geminatum, and considering the nature of the poem itself in light of these literary traditions, it seems likely that the methods of the opus geminatum exerted an important influence upon the Old English poem, and it is the aim of this thesis to mine the relationships between Andreas and the three texts mentioned earlier for the vein of this influence: to lay bare both the nature and the methods of textual interplay in these works.

⁸¹ Wieland, “Geminus Stilus,” 126; for the most recent treatment of Ælfric’s rhythmic prose, see Thomas Bredehoft, Early English Metre (Toronto: Toronto UP, 2006): 81–90.
Specifically, to add to what was laid out earlier, Chapter II considers within the paradigm of the *opus geminatum* the interplay of content and style between *Andreas* and the account found in the *Casanatensis* manuscript, for I shall contend in this chapter that the shift in style, from Latin prose to Old English verse, exerts a necessary, dramatic and consistently overlooked influence upon the content of the Old English *Andreas*, changing not only how one reads that content, but the very substantive nature of the content itself.

In Chapter III, the discussion will shift to the relationship *Andreas* has with an indigenous work, *Beowulf*, for which a number of recent studies have laid a new groundwork which suggest exciting possibilities for analysis, most significantly at the formulaic level, exploring the tension between explicit oral and literary indebtedness between the two poems.

Finally, in Chapter IV, the focus will shift to a comparison between the verse *Andreas* and its Old English prose version of the legend, in MS. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198, fols. 386r–394v, allowing us to explore in concrete detail the assertions which *opus geminatum* writers like Alcuin posit about the difference and affinities between prose and verse treatments of sacred texts, and observe some of the ways in which traditional assertions about the respective nature of prose and verse seem to break down.

By means of these explorations, the thesis aims to articulate a clearer, more systematic understanding of the *opus geminatum*’s methodological influence upon and between all four texts, and thereby, in turn, afford scholars a more powerful paradigmatic tool with which to elucidate other potentially related works, not only amongst the prose and verse texts of Anglo-Saxon England, but perhaps also among
those which bear some relationship to it in other literary cultures, such as Middle-
English, Old Norse or Continental Latin.
Chapter II

Andreas and The Legend of Saint Andrew

The Old English verse Andreas contains a set of tropes and themes common to much Greek and Latin hagiography: tropes and themes which are nevertheless clothed in the diction and formulaic phrasing of vernacular poetry. For instance, Andreas employs numerous typological allusions found in the hagiography of late antiquity, such as point to the Eucharist, the crucifixion, or Christ in the grave; there are numerous ‘standard’ hagiographical motifs upon which it draws, such as the impotent executioner’s blow or combat with demons in the tomb or dungeon; the plot follows many of the usual patterns, specifically for confessiones or passiones, though strictly speaking, Andreas is neither of these. On the other hand, the poem depends to a striking extent upon the formulaic diction common to Anglo-Saxon poets, and much of its style draws heavily upon indigenous literary traditions, such as ‘formulaic themes’ and distinctive Germanic motifs: for example, the theme of the exile or recurrent beach scenes of greeting and funeral.

As the Andreas-poet paraphrases the antique content into an indigenous style, he retains some aspects of the original legend, but excises others. This begs a number of key questions: for instance, is excised material rejected knowingly and strategically or subconsciously and instinctively, and in either case, why? Is retained content affected by what replaces, overlays or adds to it in the new text, and again, how? By

---

1 A confession entails the saint’s entire spiritual life, while Andreas covers only one episode, and a passion involves the martyrdom of the saint, while in this poem the saint survives. For details, see again Lapidge, “The Saintly Life.”
2 Exile, for instance, as it is explored in The Wanderer or The Seafarer, and beach scenes such as in Beowulf, lines 229–300.
contrast, is the new style or content affected by traces of the original legend which linger? Can we determine whether for the Andreas-poet the rejected content or style afforded a clear, binary contrast to what his poem is, or is the nature of the new text non-specific? In other words, is Andreas ‘this text specifically in relation to that text,’ or is it ‘nothing other than this text here.’

All such questions, however, beg for a clearer understanding of notions such as content or style, and the clear bracketing off of one from another has been problematised in literary circles by theoretical developments in areas such as Reception or Reader Response theory, where the intentions with which a reader's consciousness reads (or the style in which a text can be read) reifies the essential matter of that text (the text's material 'aboutness'); in other words, style constitutes content, and content dictates style. Though this thesis has no pretensions to a Reader Response analysis, recent discussions from such a perspective cast, though here from a distance, a distinctive light on distinctions between content and style; in that light, what comes clear is that the boundaries between where content and style ground themselves cannot be taken for granted, and as we shall see, this negotiable location is one area which the Andreas-poet takes full advantage of, and which renders his account much more imaginatively fertile than the Casanatensis version.

Though subtler questions like these have remained largely ignored, Andreas has and continues to receive considerable scholarly attention. Robert Boenig does track variations of content, though inconsistently, in the footnotes to his text, while

---

Edward Irving and Brian Shaw examine these consistencies and deviations in sections, and in these, selectively. Such treatments are sufficient for their purposes, but, even so, no comprehensive study of the Andreas-poet’s habits of paraphrase in relation to his putative exemplar currently exists, nor have any of the scholars mentioned above framed a consistent methodology for comparisons between Andreas and possible exemplars. By necessity, their inquiries are grounded to a significant extent in functional concerns—subordinate to discussing other aspects of Andreas besides differences and similarities in content—and though some important aspects of Andreas’ functional relationship to potential exemplars have been studied, comprehensive examinations of just how a dynamic between content and style actually operates or functions in this poem remain neglected. Clearly this interplay between content and style is part of a wider dialogue between literary cultures: between the Andreas and Greek or Latin versions of the legend or between Andreas and Old English poems such as Beowulf. Such interplay fits both gracefully and—this discussion argues—productively into the paradigms of the opus geminatum.

Thus, the aim of this chapter is to understand to some extent how according to the traditions of the opus geminatum antique content and Anglo-Saxon style inter-relate in Andreas to produce the text we now have: to ask—functionally and practically—how a conscious interplay of affinity and alterity between this text and the hagiographic tradition from which it arises communicates the Andreas legend to its Anglo-Saxon audience. In these matters of variation, between Latin and Old English, between verse and prose, one may locate a replete and articulate context in

---

the twinned-work, and though one must be careful to note that its invocation in these texts is not explicit, as an explicatory metaphor, few could seem more apt.

    The verse Andreas is found in the Vercelli Book (Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS. CXVII, fols. 29v–52v), consisting of 1722 lines, which is thought by its most recent editor to date from the second half of the tenth century, to be of Kentish origin, and to be written in one hand (Cameron A 2.1). Donald Scragg observes that there are numerous scribal errors, which reduces “still further the intelligibility of material that was often already corrupt.” The Vercelli Book contains a mixture of prose and verse; the prose consists of twenty-three homilies, primarily on penitential themes, while the verse consists of six poems, two of which are often attributed by means of his signature and habitual locutions to Cynewulf: Elene (fols. 121r–33v) and Fates of the Apostles (fols. 52v–54r). The other four are Soul and Body I (fols. 101v–3v), Dream of the Rood (fols. 104v–6r), and Homiletic Fragment 1 (fol. 104r–v). Andreas is followed by Fates of the Apostles and then, after a gap on the manuscript page, a thirty-five line passage which spells out the runic signature of Cynewulf. Although there is an allusion to the Vercelli Book in a letter written by Giuseppe Bianchini of Verona, in 1748, the book seems not to have been the object of scholarly study until its ‘discovery’ by Friedrich Blume, somewhere between 1821 and 1823. A transcript of the poem, as well as the rest of the Vercelli book, was made by C. Maier (who, N. R. Ker thinks, damaged the manuscript with reagent) in 1833–34. Benjamin Thorpe edited a text of Maier’s manuscript which was printed in 1836,

7 Scragg, lxxiii.
8 Such locutions are also found in Juliana and Christ B, which also bear his autograph; for a detailed catalogue of such parallels, see again Andy Orchard, “Both Style and Substance,” 271–305.
9 Brooks, xiii.
but not made available until 1869. The first to publish *Andreas* was Jacob Grimm (who depended upon the Maier and Thorpe text) in 1840, and his text was quickly followed by John Kemble’s in 1843. Thereafter, Christian Grein published it in 1857, his edition being revised by Richard Wülker in 1883, and appearing yet again in 1885 by William Baskerville. George Krapp edited the poem twice (1906 and 1932). Kenneth Brooks’ edition is the most recent edition (1961).

Because of their arrangement, thematic similarity and shared dependence upon Latin source material, *Andreas* and *Fates of the Apostles* have often been grouped together, but upon stylistic grounds there is now a wide-spread consensus that there exists no convincing reason to ascribe *Andreas* to the author known as Cynewulf.

While absolute dating of Cynewulf’s work, especially the two poems in the Exeter Book, and *Andreas* is in either case problematic, relative dating is more important to this study. The dates of the Vercelli and Exeter books afford us *terminus ad quem* in
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10 Benjamin Thorpe, “The Legend of Saint Andrew,” *Appendices to a Report on Rymer’s Fœdera intended to have been made, to the Late Commissioners on Public Records, by Mr. Charles Purton Cooper*, 3 vols. (London, 1869): 47–138.
11 Jacob Grimm, ed., *Andreas und Elene* (Kassel, 1840).
17 The earliest collocation of this nature is Gregor Sarrazin’s “Beowulf und Kynewulf,” *Anglia* 9 (1886): 515–50. An analysis of these two poems contextualized in the modes and methods of the *opus geminatum* also promises to be productive.
both cases of the second half of the tenth century.¹⁹ Most scholars accept an early
ninth century date, or late eighth century, for Andreas,²⁰ while suggestions from 750
to the tenth century have been posited for Cynewulf’s floruit.²¹ However, if one notes
the spelling of the poet’s name at the end of Fates of the Apostles (Cynewulf, rather
than Cyniwulf), then one has a terminus ad quem of c. 750 if he lived south of the
Humber River, or c. 850 if he lived north of it.²² This means that Cynewulf either
lived prior to the writing of Andreas or during it. Both Anita Riedinger and Kenneth
Brooks suggest that Andreas was written after Cynewulf’s signed works.²³ On the
other hand, there does exist strong evidence that Cynewulf’s works and Andreas were
written in close authorial proximity—that the former had some influence on the
latter—and that Andreas may be largely indebted to ‘Cynewulfian’ influence,
especially in terms of its poetic diction and formulaic phrasing. As Andy Orchard
observes, after reviewing the considerable confluence of formulae between Andreas
and Cynewulf’s poems, most likely the works of Cynewulf “were known to and

116 and 394; Paul Szarmach, Vercelli Homilies IX–XIII, Toronto Old English Series 5 (Toronto:
Toronto UP, 1981): xx; for a dissenting voice, see Kenneth Sisam, Studies in the History of Old
²⁰ Stanley Greenfield and Daniel Calder eds., A New Critical History of Old English Literature (New
²¹ Robert Fulk, “Cynewulf: Canon, Dialect and Date,” Cynewulf: Basic Readings, ed. Robert Bjork
²² Sisam, 6–7; Fulk, 16; Patrick Conner, “On Dating Cynewulf,” Cynewulf: Basic Readings, ed. Robert
Bjork (New York: Garland, 1996): 24–26; Godfrid Storms, however, suggests that the spelling changed
more gradually, and so places the spelling in the late seventh century, “The Weakening of Old English
Unstressed i to e and the Date of Cynewulf,” English Studies 37 (1956): 105–6.
²³ Brooks, xxii; “Cynewulf was most probably a Mercian who wrote at the end of the eighth or in the
first half of the ninth century, although the evidence for this is not quite conclusive. Since the date of
the manuscript gives the terminus ante quem as the latter half of the tenth century, and the linguistic
evidence suggests the middle of the ninth century as the terminus post quem, it is probable that Andreas
is later than the signed poems of Cynewulf.” Also see Riedinger, “The Poetic Formula,” 306.
borrowed from by the poet of Andreas in precisely the same spirit of homage and imitation that the Andreas-poet also employed with regard to Beowulf.\(^\text{24}\)

This brings the discussion directly to Beowulf, where one may observe also a striking resemblance of diction and phrasing. There are, in fact, about one hundred and fifty points of formulaic correspondence between the two works, and it is at this level that the relationship between the texts is most conspicuous.\(^\text{25}\) Less convincing are the thematic parallels between the poems. It is true that both treat the travelling hero and the redemption of a foreign people, and that they share many motifs: the journey over water, the danger of cannibalism, and chthonic encounters. However, as Leonard Peters points out, the plot of Andreas conforms first and foremost to the plot of its Greek and Latin exemplars, not to Beowulf.\(^\text{26}\) To this observation Greenfield and Calder add a qualification: “we cannot altogether discount the possibility that the Andreas poet knew the Beowulf and was attracted to the story of Andrew because of the resemblance.”\(^\text{27}\) However, the simple fact remains that, excepting the saint’s sea-voyage home,\(^\text{28}\) there is no major plot development in Andreas which is not in the Greek and Latin, and yet there are many which are not, in any form, in Beowulf.

\(^{24}\) Andy Orchard, “Both Style and Substance,” 287.
\(^{26}\) Leonard J. Peters, “The Relationship of the Old English Andreas to Beowulf,” PMLA 66 (1951): 844–63, at 846–7. However, Peter’s generalisation should be qualified by saying that the ends of Andreas and the Greek versions differ at numerous points in ways not simply stylistic, but as affect the fundamental plot.
\(^{27}\) Greenfield and Calder, A New Critical History: 104.
\(^{28}\) The only other occurrence amongst the textual ancestors of Andreas is in the Vaticana recension, discussed below, though this scene in Andreas bears striking resemblances to a similar scene in Beowulf.
Furthermore, of those scholars who compare verbal parallels between the two texts, nearly all regard *Beowulf* as the earlier text.\(^{29}\)

Moreover, Robert Bjork points out a shared fascination of both Cynewulf and the *Andreas* author in typological, and more broadly, allegorical treatments.\(^{30}\) This has proven a popular point of critical departure for *Andreas* scholarship.\(^{31}\) However, no matter how vigorously scholars have pressed allegorical and typological approaches to the poem, none have convincingly sustained an allegorical or typological reading throughout any extended portion of the narrative. Rather, the numerous allegorical and typological references are interspersed at strategic points throughout the text, often functioning in different ways and towards different referents. According to Alvin Lee, this means that though we may comfortably consider such Old English poems highly symbolic, their lack of sustained semantic reference prohibits a compelling classification as allegories.\(^{32}\)

Thus, in light of strong phrasing parallels and seemingly contingent content or tropological parallels, it seems wisest to consider the relationship between *Andreas, Beowulf* and the Cynewulf poems—between *Andreas* and other vernacular
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texts—at the level of style: at the level of distinctive vernacular phrasing, diction and motifs, and that as Andreas seems to be written in explicit imitation of Cynewulf’s style, so too does it seem to be written in conscious imitation of Beowulf’s. Matters of style, one may recall, devolve in the opus geminatum tradition into the particularities of eloquence and elegance, concentration and diffuseness, allusiveness and concreteness. These sorts of dichotomies in this chapter afford a framework in which to conceive of the style of Andreas. On the other hand, as will become apparent, the distinction between style and content is very porous, and this distinction affords only a starting point for more in-depth analysis.

The Old English verse Andreas is ultimately based upon an apocryphal Greek legend of Saint Andrew of which there are nine extant copies, and though the Greek was originally assumed to be the source of the Andreas, since the discovery of Latin traditions of the legend, none of the nine copies have been considered the immediate source for the Old English poem. The five discovered Latin recensions are of differing value: 1) the “Bonnet” fragment, which coincides with lines 843–954 of Andreas;33 2) the Recensio Vaticana (BHL 0429b);34 3) the compressed account in MS 1576 at the University of Bologna, which coincides with lines 1–339; 4) an even shorter section from the Pseudo-Abdias collection;35 5) and the Recensio Casanatensis (Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, 1104, fols. 26–43; BHL 0429d).36 There are numerous

---

33 Reproduced in George Philip Krapp, eds., Andreas (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1906), as well as in Brooks, Andreas: 177–178.
narrative differences between the Greek recensions and *Andreas*; for instance, the Greek sources do not mention the consecration of a bishop for the *anthropophagoi*, nor do they talk about Andrew’s departure by sea. It was suggested by Julius Zupitza\(^\text{37}\) that there may be a lost Latin version between the Greek tradition and the Old English poem, and later the eleventh-century “Bonnet” palimpsest was discovered in Rome, giving more credence to his suggestion. Furthermore, the extant Latin versions of the legend, such as found in the Casanatensis or Vatican manuscripts, share numerous narrative and typological elements with *Andreas* which are not found in Greek legends. However, whether a Latin or Greek version is the actual source of *Andreas* is, upon the present evidence, impossible to determine, and all versions differ from the Old English to some extent. Of these versions, the text with the fewest narrative discrepancies seems to be that of the Casanatensis manuscript.

The *Andreas*-poet responds to the particular conceptions of Andrew’s legend he encounters in his exemplar, and to a considerable extent these conceptions circumscribe the range and nature of revisions he can make to his version of the legend. In other words, the poet revises so that what he retains, excises or reworks depends for its particular nature upon a dynamic relationship, of affinity or alterity, with the exemplar, and the terms in which these here are most coherent and articulate are those already framed by the *opus geminatum* tradition which is so pervasive in Anglo-Saxon literary culture. One hypothesis that follows from this is that what the

---

poet shares an affinity with is the Latin content, while his sense of althery is manifested by the Anglo-Saxon style he employs, and that he has self-consciously brought these two into deliberate interaction. Such a hypothesis is implicitly but inextricably bound up in those traditions of the opus geminatum, since in this it was illustrated that content is the particular provenance of prose, while style is a level of concern necessarily germane to verse. The interest, then, is to examine how the affinity of content and the althery of style dynamically play off one another to constitute the Old English poem. Because, as mentioned above, it is more likely that the author worked from a Latin exemplar than a Greek, the Latin will provide the basis for this comparison with Andreas. Moreover, because the closest analogue amongst Latin exemplars is thought to be the Casanatensis manuscript’s account, I will follow Boenig, Shaw and Irving in using this version as the comparative text from which I work, though as Chapter IV explains, this relative status is by no means certain. 38

**Andreas and the Casanatensis Version’s Tradition**

A comparative reading of the opening passages immediately demonstrates the different tone between the two texts. The introduction of the Casanatensis account is quite economical (Casanatensis, I, 1–5):

*In illo tempore erant apostoli simul in unum congregati, et dividebant inter se regiones, mittentes sortes, quatenus agnoscerent unusquisque, qualis pars ad eum ad predicandum devenirent. Devenit namque beati Mathei in sortem provincie que dicitur mermedonia, in qua conmorabantur iniqui et pessimi viri.*

[At that time all the apostles were gathered together and they divided the regions among themselves, casting lots to see which area each was to be assigned for preaching. The province called Mermedonia, which is inhabited by wicked, very evil men, fell in the lot to blessed Matthew].

38 Brooks notes: “[Casanatensis] fulfills more of the conditions [of resemblance] than any other”: xviii.
Andreas agrees with this information in all its details, but adds extensive extra-narrative material (italics indicate points of congruence) (Andreas, 1–21a):

So, we have heard in days of old of twelve famous heroes here beneath the constellations—the thanes of the Lord. Their glory in the conduct of the fight, when battle-standards came into collision, did not cease even after they split up according as the Lord himself, heaven’s high King, ordained their lot. They were men of renown upon the earth, bold leaders of the people and eager for the campaigning life, brave warriors when shield and hand defended the helm on the field of battle, the fateful arena. One of them was Matthew, the one who first among the Jews undertook with miraculous skill to write the gospel in words, whose lot holy God ordained to be abroad on that island where still at that time no foreigner was able to enjoy the happiness of his homeland, for frequently the hand of murderous men did him violent injury on the field of battle. That marchland, the tribal territory of those people, the native land of those men, was utterly bewoven with murder and devilish evil.

The initial impression here is that though the Anglo-Saxon author has added numerous stylistic elements, he has not changed the essential details of plot: that between the two passages, the who, what, where and when are essentially the same, and it is only the matter of how this is apprehended which changes. Consequently, this view seems to sanction the notion that if the extra-narrative material were excised, it
would not significantly affect the plot. However, as will become apparent, this impression is not accurate. More immediately, one finds here that the differences between verse and prose outlined by the paraphrasers surveyed in the introduction, such as Quintilian, Cicero or Aldhelm, clash with what one sees between these two introductions; for instance, it is the verse version, not the prose, which is more expansive and detailed.

Both texts next supply a brief overview of Mermedonian cannibalism, from which the Casanatensis manuscript’s version moves into a detailed description of the cannibals’ butchering facilities and how they were used (Casanatensis, I, 6–11):

Habebantque clibanum in medio civitatis edificatum, insuper et lacus iusta eodem clibani. In quo lacus homines interficiebant, ut sanguis illud ibi colligerent. Alioque lacu iusta ipsum lacum, in quo sanguis illud que in ipso priore laco spargentur . . . et quasi purgatus discurret . . . bibendum.

[In the middle of the city they had built an oven and also a tank next to the oven. They put men to death in the tank in order to collect the blood. Near by this tank was another and in it they sprinkled the blood from the first tank, . . . and it flowed out, purified as it were . . . for drinking].

This description is missing from Andreas, perhaps because it was not in his source or because it appealed to a taste with which the Andreas-poet did not agree, or again because it did not contribute in any direct way to the plot as he conceived it, for throughout Andreas the poet tends to cut content which is not necessary to the exploration of his themes.

On the other hand, the dehumanizing mechanization of Mermedonian cannibalism, whereby people are transformed into food, certainly does change how the reader approaches Matthew’s, and later Andreas’, apprehension by the Mermedonians, for plainly there is something disturbing about treating human beings as mere consumer products. Thus, a priori to what one might speculate about the Andreas-poet’s intentions in avoiding this scene, one can nevertheless observe that by
changing the text’s content, or what one reads, he has changed the style in which it is read, or how one is able to read it: that is, with a sense of dread or disgust. Thus, the Andreas-poet’s exclusion problematises the neat, critical delineation between vernacular style and antique content; at what point does the addition or subtraction of narrative and non-narrative content change how one reads the legend in detail and as a whole? It may seem a somewhat straightforward question, but as recent treatments of content and/or style in Andreas demonstrate, there persists a strong tendency to assume that either aspect can be dealt with without taking the other into account. ³⁹ For example, Jonathan Wilcox states that “[t]hrough a reading of stylistic features that create humor, I want to steer a critical path between the Scylla of too thorough a turn towards typology and the Charybdis of a preoccupation with the literal that leads only to horror or annoyance.” ⁴⁰

Both versions then supply overviews of Mermedonian torture practices, disfigurement, drugging and the transformation of the victims’ minds into a bestial state. Having thus set up the fate that awaits Matthew, both legends then dutifully render a report of the apostle’s apprehension, torture, blinding and drugging.

Afterwards, Matthew offers up an extensive prayer which foregrounds his faith and the inexorable nature of God’s will, asking further that his blindness be taken from him (in the Casanatensis version so that he can see his flesh torn). On the other hand, the two texts vary in their treatment of the poison draught, though both of


⁴⁰ Wilcox, “Eating People,” 204.
them are somewhat ambiguous. In the Casanatensis account, the drink simply does not work: “Cum autem illum pessimum bibisset potum, nichil eum nocuerat, set neque mens neque sensus eius fuerat abstultus, neque mutatus” (“But when he drank the harmful draught, it did not hurt him: neither his mind nor his sense were harmed nor taken away,” Casanatensis, II, 6–8). In Andreas, Matthew laments that nu durh geohða sceal / dæde fremman swa þa dumban neat (“now in sadness, even as mute cattle must I do my deeds,” Andreas, 66b–67). In the expansive forty-nine line response, God assures him that all shall be well, but, significantly, says nothing directly about the effects of the draught; in this deviation, the Andreas-poet begins a narratological tendency of culling the explicit, divine reassurances which are found in the Latin tradition, and seeding in their place numerous occasions for doubt and anxiety. As a consequence, the doubts and anxieties of the saint are potentially afforded a very present parallel in the doubts and anxieties fostered in the reader, since according to hagiographic textual traditions the reader is likely to sympathise with the experiences and sentiments of the saint.41 Plainly this requires a much higher level of critical engagement from Andreas’ audience, and this is consonant with what one expects from a verse version of the legend, especially if Alcuin’s earlier comment in his prologue to the Vita Willibrordi are taken into account, where he says that verse is to be read contemplatively, over and over again in the privacy of the cell.

In the Casanatensis version, the author explains that Matthew closes his eyes to hide the fact that they are whole again (he does not mention that his prayer for healing has been successful). In Andreas, on the other hand, it is only Matthew’s

41 See, for instance, Sulpicius Severus’ prologue, where he explains the objectives of saintly narratives: Vita sancti Martini, ed. C. Halm, CESL 1 (Vienna: Tempsky, 1866).
response to developments which makes plain that his vision is restored (and his wits recovered), though his restored sight might be implied in a richly figurative passage which follows God's vague reassurance to his lament (Andreas, 122–124a):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dægrewoma.} & \quad \text{Leoht æfter com,} \\
\text{Lungre leorde.} & \quad \text{Nihthelm toglad,} \\
\text{Niwan stefne.} & \quad \text{Miclum onbryrded} \\
\text{Da wæs Matheus} & \quad \text{Then, once more, was Matthew greatly inspired. The veil of night glided away, quickly vanished. After it came light, token of the dawning day].}
\end{align*}
\]

In this case, such variations, between explication in the Casanatensis and implication in Andreas, between literal and figurative, do seem to be variations only between how the story is told. The essential details remain the same: in either text, Matthew is apprehended, blinded and drugged; he faithfully asserts the goodness and omnipotence of God's will, and prays for aid; his humanity and mind remain intact, and his sight is restored.

However, to this a key qualification needs to be added; though in the Casanatensis account the substantive elements are identical to Andreas, it is the text which supplies these—that the effects of the draught will turn out well, that Matthew's eyes are healed—while in Andreas, to the greater extent, it is the reader who must supply such elements, by means of the text's figural implication and suggestions. In other words, the 'gaps' in the narrative need to be filled by the reader's consciousness, and so one might say that it is the reader's 'intentionality' which supplies key aspects of the plot. Moreover, in this specific case, it is the stylistic changes affected by the Andreas-poet which seem to incline considerations of content to be grounded primarily in the reader and not in the text. More specifically, the inferential and figural style of the text forces the content to relocate out of its textual setting and into the imaginative capacities of its reader. As mentioned earlier, this
form of expression by the *Andreas*-poet seems to invite a modern Reader Response
treatment of the text, at points where the content becomes a phenomenological
project, or intention of the audience's consciousness and defies attempts to bracket off
neatly the content from the style. Moreover, one may recall that this figural
allusiveness is a distinctive element of verse, according to Quintilian, one of the
things which sets it apart from prose, and figuration depends upon a reader to supply
missing content or style. In this manner, verse’s allusive figuration operates by
necessity through authorising its reader to collaborate in the constitutive experience of
the poem. Prose, on the other hand, seems to retain more authority to supply content
(or more rarely style) for itself. Thus, it follows that *Andreas* anticipates a much more
active reader, to whom is offered far greater compositional authority which thereby
blurs the boundary between the reader and writer of the text. It is a license which the
Casanatensis version will seldom grant, and then seemingly only by accident.

Thereafter both legends state that God promises to send Andreas, who will
rescue Matthew. The time for this turns out to be short, for the authors tell how there
are tablets assigned to each prisoner on which are tallied thirty days, at which time the
holder is slaughtered and devoured; Matthew has only three days left.

The following scene of Andrew’s recalcitrance in effecting the rescue is
rendered more or less faithfully by the *Andreas*-poet, though in the Casanatensis
account he is commanded both to preach to the cannibals, as well as to rescue
Matthew and all those imprisoned with him: “Ibique mittam te ad eos, ut et lucri
verbum predices, et eruas de carcere matheum quem ante te ibi missum habui, etiam
et ceteros homines, qui cum ipso sunt conmorantes vineti carcere” (“I shall send you
to them [the cannibals] to preach the saving word and to rescue from prison both
Matthew—whom I sent there before you—and the rest of the men who dwell bound
in the prison with him,” Casanatensis, IV, 5–7). By contrast, in Andreas, he is only
ordered to rescue, and then only Matthew (Andreas, 174–177a, 185b–188):

Du scealt feran ond frið lædan,
siðe gesecan, þær sylfætan
eard weardigâð, edel healdâþ
morðorcraeftum.

he on þære þeode sceal
fore hæðenra handgewinne
þurh gares gripe gast onsendan,
ellorfusne, butan ðu ær cyme.

[You are to go and commit your being to a journey to visit a place where self-eaters
inhabit the country and rule the land with murderous customs . . . He [Matthew] will
be forced at the point of the spear there among that people to send forth his soul, eager
for another place, unless you get there first].

Andrew’s response also varies somewhat, for in the Casanatensis version he claims to
be ready, but then explains why he is not ready: he does not know the way and the
time is too short; such counter-intuitive statements are quite common in the
Casanatensis account. In Andreas the saint simply says he does not know the way and
that the time is too short, though to this he adds that he knows nobody amongst these
alien people.

God’s rebuke is swift. He relates that He may move the whole city of
Mermedonia into his presence if he so pleased. In Andreas, though, God adds a
further and direct rebuke of Andreas’ lack of faithfulness, and further foretells that
Andreas shall undergo a bitter struggle amongst the Mermedonians (Andreas, 211–
219):

Ne meaht ðu þæs siðfætes sæne weordan,
ne on gewitte to wac, gif ðu wel þencest
wið þinne waldend ðære gehealdan,
treowe tacen. Béo ðu on tid gearu;
ne mæg þæs ærendes ylding wyrðan.
ðu scealt þa fore geferan ond þin feorh beran
in gramra gripe, þær þe guðgewinn
þurh hæðenra hildewoman,
beorna beaducræft, geboden wyrðedæ.
[You cannot be wavering about the journey, nor too weak of conscience, if you honestly mean to keep faith and true token with your Ruler. Be ready at the proper time: there can be no delaying of this task. You are to go on this journey and commit your life to the grasp of cruel adversaries, where battle and the martial strength of warrior will be offered you among the war-clamour of the heathens.]

In this addition, the *Andreas* poet offers far greater psychological complexity than the author of the Casanatensis version, for God first chastises Andreas’ lack of faith, and then mentions a future which will test far more strenuously just that thing which has been found lacking in the present; if the apostle hesitates now to go to the battle, what shall transpire in the battle itself, which God says is inevitable? God’s rebuke of Andreas’ faithlessness inspires in the apostle a sense of guilt and penitence, and through empathy with the protagonist, this guilt is transmitted to the audience. Furthermore, the rebuke also has the power, once again, to communicate to the reader a sense of the apostle’s dread about his future. In all this, the *Andreas* poet anticipates again a far more active, critical and inquisitive reader.

Thus, as was seen in the *Andreas* poet’s earlier omission of the Mermedonian butchering facilities, what is lacking from or added to the content does have a clear relationship to how we read this legend, and here again the author’s decisions of fidelity, addition or omission upon his source material conditions the style in which the reader is able to engage the plot. In other words, the plot encroaches upon the style, the ‘what’ intrudes upon the ‘how.’ Moreover, just where one locates the legend’s content and style becomes, yet again, dynamic; in this particular inclusion it is the content *the poet manipulates* which touches upon the style *the reader employs*; so, whereas earlier, when the *Andreas* poet chose to imply Matthew’s restored sight and sanity rather than explicitly treating them, thereby locating the style in the text and the content in the reader, in this case, the content is in the text and the style is in the reader. By anticipating the reader’s realization of the implications, the *Andreas-
poet allows that reader to generate his or her own mood of reading the passage. Neither of these particular relocations are possible in the Casanatensis, for as the source of both content and style in the verse proves fluid, so in the prose authority over its content and style remain solidly grounded in the text itself. Thus one sees here a pattern beginning to emerge in which style and content are being manipulated in the Old English text A) in a way which affects both so that content and style speak in very direct, conscious ways to thematic concerns, such as overtones of anxiety in relation to the faith the apostle must exercise in the commission of God’s will, and B) in engaging the readers to ‘write in’ under their own authority style and content rather than passively accepting the authority of the text’s style and content, as in the Casanatensis account. In either case, the Andreas-poet seems thus far to differ with his exemplar primarily in terms of offering alternative narrative strategies, and ones which seem at this point to require a considerably more sophisticated, forward-thinking and critical reader.

In both accounts, Andreas offers no more equivocation, but goes as directed to the beach with his disciples to find the boat which he is told will await him there. They find the vessel, manned by Christ and two angels who are disguised as sailors, and they ask them where they come from. At this point the two texts diverge again. In the Casanatensis version, the sailors say they come from Mermedonia, the land “in quo sunt homines qui similes suis homines conmedentes” (“in which there are men who eat men like themselves,” Casanatensis, V, 15–16). In Andreas, the sailors also claim that they come from Mermedonia, but mention nothing about cannibals, saying rather that they have been driven here by the dictates of wind and sea currents (Andreas, 265a–269):

&emsp;Us mid flode bær
&emsp;on hranrade
&emsp;heahstefn naca,
snelic sæmearh,         snude bewunden,
oðþæt we þissa leoda         land gesohton,
wære bewrecene,         swa us wind fordraf.

[The high-stemmed ship, the swift sea-horse, wound about with speed, carried us with
the tide upon the whale-road until, swept on by the ocean, we reached the land of this
people, just as the wind drove us].

In the Latin, Andreas then says that they wish to go there and asks if they might be
given passage. In the Old English, he says that though he has little by way of wealth,
they would like a passage to Mermedonia, and that instead of monetary payment, the
reward for granting this passage will be with God. Only then does Christ relate that in
this place they kill all foreigners and He asks why they wish to throw their lives away.
Again, however, he makes no mention of cannibalism.

In response to Christ’s warning in the Casanatensis account, Andreas simply
says “parvulum negotium habemus ibi agere, et necesse est nobis implere eum” (“we
have a little business to do there and we have to finish it”), adding rather petulantly
that “tantum si vultis nos levare dicite nobis obsecro citius, sin autem imus forsitan
invenimus aliam navem” (“if you want to take us along, I ask you, tell us quickly;
otherwise we shall go and perhaps find another boat,” Casanatensis, V, 5–7). In
Andreas his reason is quite different: *Usic lust hweteð on þa leodmearce, / mycel
modes hiht, to þære mæran byrig* (“Longing, great desire of heart lures us on to that
country, that infamous city,” *Andreas*, 286–7). In both versions, Christ then agrees to
take them on board, but immediately demands payment, in the Casanatensis version
after the apostle has boarded, and in *Andreas* while he still stands on the strand. In the
Old English, this seems nonsensical, since Andreas has already told the captain that
he had no wealth and that the reward will be with God. It does, however, lessen the
sense of potential trickery which Andrew in the Casanatensis version anticipates:
“forsitan putas me quod per superbiam, aut aliquam machinationem ingeniosam”
(“perhaps you think it was either pride or an ingenious trick,” Casanatensis, VI, 17–18). Ingenious or not, in both texts this affords the saint an opportunity speak on the rule of apostolic poverty. Christ responds that if they are faithful to such rules, then they are welcome. At this point in the Latin version Andreas feels the need to apologize for his earlier touchiness.

Thereafter follows a long congruence between the two texts, from VI, 19 to XII, 6 in the Casanatensis account and lines 352 to 705 in Andreas. Christ orders the angels to feed the disciples and a terrifying storm arises. The saint thanks Christ, but the disciples are too frightened to eat. Christ offers to take the disciples ashore, but they, in dismay, refuse. However, in the Casanatensis version their stated motive is self-serving: because they will be defenceless and so preyed upon by a hostile world. In Andreas, by contrast, they chose to remain because they would appear to all men despicable, without honour; they refuse precisely because they would appear self-serving. Again, Andreas seems to anticipate a reader who has considered the implications of statements and the motives which subtend them; this same sort of critical revision will recur only a few lines further on. At this point, however, in both accounts, Christ acknowledges their faithfulness, and then, in a moment which seems rich with metanarrative overtones, suggests that Andreas, if he is a true follower of Jesus, comfort his disciples by telling them a holy story of his time with Christ. This he does, recounting how Christ calmed the waves and thus the disciples during a storm upon the Sea of Galilee.

The Casanatensis account relates that thereafter Andrew told many other scriptural tales, while Andreas says simply that the saint goes on reassuring them. However, in the Old English, it is Andreas’ reassurances which puts the disciples enough at ease that they are able to sleep, while in the Latin, it is Andrew’s secret
prayers which cause this. Again, this divergence indicates, as the above mentioned offer to put the disciples ashore, that the Andreas-poet is far more critical and engaged by the moral motives in his tale, for this is the Casanatensis version’s first of several clear incidents of deception by one of its Christian characters, and such incidents are consistently excised by the Andreas-poet, who is much more conscious and deliberate about motives and consequences. If one then considers that the prose is meant by writers like Alcuin to be read publicly to a group of persons, this becomes much more problematic, since the nature of prose in the opus geminatum tradition retains for itself constitutive authority and critical engagement, and yet, perhaps exactly because of this authoritarian stance, it offers as authoritative a text which is much more suspect at the moral, not to mention the rational, level. By anticipating a more critical reader, the Andreas-poet has laid out a context in which he himself is forced to be more critical about his adaptation, and thus the Old English avoids the rather pervasive undertone of mendacity which attaches to the heroes in the Latin. Simultaneously, by excising, he once more changes the manner in which the audience reads.

In both texts, the saint then asks Christ to show him how He navigates with such skill, though in Andreas he first asks for friendship, despite the fact that he has no wealth with which to reward the mariner, and only then does he ask for seafaring advice. In the Casanatensis account, Christ simply explains away His ability by saying that it only seems his sailing is skilful, because he has done it so much, but then adds that it is evident Andrew is a true disciple because the storm cannot overwhelm them (Casanatensis, IX, 18–23):

Non est ita ut vidisti, tantum meam talis gubernatio modo quod tibi conparuit bona esset, quia iam nos frequentius navigavimus, et in mare periclitavimus, sed modo dum tu es discipulus illius salvatoris qui dicitur christus. Ideo cognovit mare te iustus, et discipulus summe potestatis, propterea non potuerunt unde maris insurgere super nos.
[It is not as it seem to you. Steering like mine only seems skillful to you because we have sailed more often and been exposed to dangers at sea. But since you are a disciple of the Saviour called Christ, the sea knew you were a righteous man and a disciple of the Highest power; therefore its waves could not overwhelm us].

The *Andreas* account is more logically integrated and implicitly figurative; Christ observes how often we are beset by storms, but they cannot overwhelm us against the will of God, and so it is plain that Andreas is a thane of God, since the waters could not prevail against him (*Andreas*, 514–18, 526–32a, 534–35a):

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Hwilum us on yðum earfodlice} & \text{þeh we sið nesan,} \\
\text{gesæleð on sæwe,} & \text{Flodwylm ne mæg} \\
\text{frecne gefaran.} & \text{manna ænigne ofer meotudes est} \\
\text{lungræ gelettan:} & \text{ah him lifes geweald,} \\
\hline
\text{Forþan is gesyne,} & \text{soð orgete,} \\
\text{cuð oncnawen,} & \text{þæt ðu cyninges eart} \\
\text{þegen geþungen,} & \text{þrymsittendes,} \\
\text{forþan þe sona} & \text{sæholm onceow,} \\
\text{garsecæs begang,} & \text{þæt ðu gife hæfdes} \\
\text{haliges gastes.} & \text{Hærn eft onwand,} \\
\text{aryða geblond.} & \hline
\text{. . . hie ongeton} & \text{þæt ðe god hæfde} \\
\text{wære bewunden} & \text{wære bewunden} \\
\end{array}
\]

[Sometimes it goes hard with us among the waves upon the raging waters, even though we survive and carry through with the perilous journey. The ocean flood’s uproar cannot suddenly impede any man against the will of the ordaining Lord; he reserves to himself power over life . . . Therefore the plain truth is manifest, known and recognized, that you are the excellent thane of the King, dwelling in majesty, because the sea, the ocean’s expanse, at once acknowledged you and that you possessed the grace of the Holy Spirit . . . They understood that God had wound you about with his safekeeping].

Thus, once more, the semantic framework of ‘why and to what effect’ informs the Old English legend. Thereafter, in both the Casanatensis version and *Andreas*, Christ asks the saint to explain why the Jews did not believe, suggesting that perhaps the miracles were performed secretly, to which Andrew responds with a list of miracles done publicly. Christ then asks if the miracles were only done amongst commoners, and not amongst the priests, but this too Andrew contradicts. *Andreas* then deviates slightly
by having Christ ask again whether any miracles were done in secret. The texts intersect once more, at XI, 7 in the Casanatensis rendition and line 695 in Andreas, as the saint asks why the mariner interrogates him so vigorously, to which Christ responds that his spirit is exalted by the apostle’s response. Reassured, Andrew proceeds to tell Him about when Christ came to the temple in Jerusalem and was there mocked by the chief priest, who claims that Christ is not the son of God, but rather is born of mortal and well-known parents. The Casanatensis account will echo this misgiving when Andrew later begs forgiveness for not having recognized Christ in the vessel, thinking him a mere man. This, however, is not the aspect of faith with which Andreas is concerned (or distracted), concentrating rather on faith in the present, pragmatic and dangerous operations of God’s providence in which his agent, the saint, presently finds himself.

In either text, rather than respond to the chief priest, Christ goes to the desert. In the Old English, He goes only with His disciples and there performs unidentified miracles in secret, while in the Latin, the chief priests follow along to observe what he does, though again just what he does is not mentioned. Once more, however, it should be noted that in the Old English the secrecy which surrounds those miracles is explicit and deliberate, while in the Latin one’s ignorance about the miracles seems again like an oversight by the author. Christ then returns to the temple where he sees two statues. In the Casanatensis version, these are referred to as sphinx, made to look like angels, while in Andreas they are simply called angels, perhaps because the sphinx reference is strange to the author or would be confusing to the audience. Christ commands one of these to come down and speak. It leaps down and reprimands the priests, identifying Jesus as God, He who figures typologically throughout the priests’ scriptures and is, as such, He whom they in ignorance venerate. The Latin text then
proceeds to emphasize the idolatrous nature of the priests’ present practices, insisting that the Jews worship the stone statues for their own sake, and through rituals anticipate miraculous signs from them.

However, the Old English version insinuates its own extensive addition, specifically that after encountering the priests’ persistent scepticism, Christ orders the statue into the streets and to the land of the Canaanites, to preach the Gospel, and when it reaches the city of Mamre to raise Abraham, Isaac and Jacob from where the patriarchs are hidden in their graves (*Andreas*, 773–785):

\[
\text{Da se þeoden bebead þryðweorc faran,}
\text{stan on stræte of stedewange,}
\text{ond forð gan foldweg tredan,}
\text{grene grundas, godes ærendu}
\text{larum lædan on þa leodmearce}
\text{to Channaneum, cyninges worde}
\text{beodan Habrahame mid his eaforum twæm}
\text{of eorðscræfe ærest fremman,}
\text{lætan landreste, leóðo gadriðegean,}
\text{gaste onfon ond geogoðhade,}
\text{edniwinga andweard cuman,}
\text{frode fyrmweotan, folce gecýðan,}
\text{hwylcne hie god mihtum ongiten hæfðon.}
\]

[Then the Prince commanded the mighty artifact, the stone, to go from that place into the street and to set out to walk the earth and its green plains, to carry God’s news by preaching into the land of the Canaanites, and by word of the King to command Abraham with his two descendants first to come forth out of the grave, to leave their earthly resting-place, to gather their limbs and receive their spirit and their youth, and wise witnesses from long ago alive once more, to make known to the people what God they had acknowledged for his powers].

This being done, the patriarchs set out, preaching how Jesus is he who created all creation. The people are understandably terrified (*þa þæt folc gewearð / egesan geaclod* (‘then the people were seized with terror,’ 804b–805a), until Christ orders the patriarchs back to grave. The episode of the undead, preaching patriarchs and ‘pseudo-golem’ is a considerable departure from the Latin, both in terms of content
(an additional thirty-seven lines) and style. Its effect, however, is familiar to what we have observed in *Andreas* earlier.

In the *Andreas*-poet’s preceding insertion of God’s reprimand of the apostle’s recalcitrance and His foretelling of great hardships awaiting the saint in the future (lines 203–224), the author added content rich with the potential to communicate anticipatory dread to the audience. The same is true of this insertion. The anecdotes which Andreas has been relating to the mariner up to this point have been foregrounding, among other things, the scepticism of the priests about whether Jesus is God, and consequently suggesting a lack of God’s dread presence. This episode recuperates that aspect of Jesus’ nature, combining the antithetical qualities of His serene humility, by becoming human, and his awful power, as the God of Life and Death. However, like the priests, the apostle does not know the dread power of the person beside him, though the audience does. Thus, this moment is suffused with dramatic irony, and by means of illustrating in a fresh setting with fresh players the motif of the man ignorant of the presence of the awful and transcendent god, the *Andreas*-poet has made new the weary, clichéd drama of the ignorant priesthood in the presence of the Christ, which the audience doubtless knew from gospel readings.\(^42\) This is a point made also in the Casanatensis account, but it is drawn out more, and more explicitly in *Andreas*. Moreover, in the conventional pattern of saints’ lives, of the *imitatio Christi*, the saint himself will follow the Christological pattern related in the anecdote, along with its eschatological resonances, suffering in humility at the

---

\(^{42}\) The god disguised as mortal or at least someone less ‘awful,’ in the company of those ignorant of his identity, is a common motif in surviving Germanic pagan literature; for example, in *Grimnismål*, *Prymskviða*, *Hárbarðsljóð*, all in *Edda Sæmundar*, II. ed. Ursula Drönke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), or again in the *Völsunga Saga*, ed. Uwe Ebel (Frankfurt: Haag & Herchen, 1983), while the disguised, divine visitor is also found in saints’ lives like the *Vita Cuthberti*. 
hands of the cannibals, but finally wielding upon those same torturers the dread powers of Life and Death (and in the Latin a key vehicle for this will again be a statue, though what issues from its mouth is not speech, but acidic water). Thus, the Andreas-poet has once more changed the style of how one reads the text by the addition of what is read, and furthermore, has done this, again, by grounding the content in the text and the style in the reader, for the dread aspect of Jesus’ identity must be supplied by the audience from the inferences they draw from the episode while looking forward to the coming action of the plot (obviously this anticipates that the audience is familiar with the legend, knowing how it will end, but this is not unlikely, given the cyclical nature of the daily lectio within the liturgical calendar and the limited number of texts likely to be available for those readings).

In both legends, the apostle then falls asleep, though in the Old English he does so because exhaustion overwhelms him: oððæt hine semninga slæp ofereode on hronrade heofoncyninge neh (‘until suddenly sleep overwhelmed him on the whale-road, at the side of the King of Heaven,’ Andreas, 820–21). In the Latin, by contrast, Christ pretends to sleep and Andrew follows suit (Casanatensis, XVI, 3–7):

Cum hoc dominus diceret, inclinato capite super unum ex ipsis angelis suis, quasi obdormiente capud suum posuit. Videntes autem beatus andreas, hec taliter iesu fecisset, putavit se vere eum fuisset obdormitus. Et continuo similiter, et ipso posito capite super discipulum suum, graviter est a sompno soporatus.

[After the Lord had said this, He leaned on one of His angels and inclined His head, pretending to be sleeping. Blessed Andrew seeing this, started to do the same as Jesus, thinking Jesus was truly asleep; Having inclined his head on his disciple, he was instantly overcome by a deep sleep in the same manner].

The Andreas-poet’s alteration of this point seems an improvement, since not only does the Old English seem more logical (namely, if the mariner who is so skilfully sailing the ship though a life-threatening storm falls asleep, is the passenger’s first inclination to nod off likewise?), but also, once more, he removes potentially
mendacious undertones which so consistently inhabit the Latin version, for in the Casanatensis version Andrew first gets his disciples to fall asleep by secretly asking God to make them do so, and then Christ through pretence deceives the apostle into doing the same. The method by which the Andreas-poet operates is also familiar, for he has again excised content—the pretending—that affects the tone of how the audience reads, and, once more, this tone obtains (or in this case fails to obtain) in the form of the reader’s response to content, and not in stylistic features of how that content is communicated in the text.

In both versions, the sleeping saint and his disciples are transported to the shores of Mermedonia by the angels, and upon waking, the apostle realizes in dismay that it was Christ in the vessel. This he reveals to his disciples, who tell him in turn that upon falling asleep, their souls were lifted aloft by eagles so that they saw God in glory surrounded by singing patriarchs and Jesus’ disciples while David played his lyre (in the Old English, Andreas is specifically mentioned among them, attended by arch-angels). In the Casanatensis account, the saint prays Christ’s forgiveness for failing to recognize Him, while in Andreas he asks for benediction and offers his thanks.

In this variation, once more, the Andreas-poet alters the style of communication, and therefore tone, by altering the content, for Andreas was not allowed to know that it was Christ in the vessel, so how can he be forgiven for what was not within his agency, whereas in the Casanatensis version, he declaims “obsecro te, ut indulgeas mihi, quoniam tunc quando tecum locutus fui in nave, sicut hominem te putavi, et utique tecum locutus fui, unde peto nunc domine, ut indulgeas mihi servo tuo quia ignorans peccavi” (“I beseech you, forgive me for thinking you were a man when I talked with you in the boat and for speaking to you accordingly. I ask you
now, Lord, to forgive me, your servant, since I sinned in ignorance,” Casanatensis, XVIII, 1–4). In defence of the Casanatensis-author, one may suggest that this plea is perhaps a follow through upon the earlier motif of sinful men (represented by the chief priests) believing that Christ is a mere mortal, though this remains mere speculation. Even so, the Old English version avoids all this awkwardness and thus allows the saint to proceed in a positive vein, with his dignity more or less intact, asking for blessings and thanking God for those already received. In fact, the Andreas-poet is often at pains to recover the dignity of the saint from what is likely encountered in his exemplar, again pointing up his inclination to seek out vexations in the text and adjust them in light of hagiographic traditions.43

Christ appears to the apostle, saying in the Latin only gaudeas, andreas noster (‘rejoice, our Andrew,’ Casanatensis, XVIII, 6), but promising in the Old English to keep the saint safe in all that will transpire. The Casanatensis-Andrew again effusively begs forgiveness for his ignorance (Casanatensis, XVIII, 7–16):


[Forgive me, Lord Father. Forgive me, Lord Jesus Christ, because I thought you a man. Spare those who are ignorant; spare those who didn’t believe; spare your servant’s soul. My lips sinned when my spirit did not recognize you; my tongue sinned when my eyes did not recognize you. Therefore I spoke to you as a man; I

---

dealt with you in my simplicity as someone confronting a man. So I pray you to forgive me; I implore you to spare me; I beg you to pardon me. I am the servant, you the Lord. I am the disciple, you the Master. I am a man, you are God. I was created by you; you are the Creator. I am the one who listens; you are the one who commands].

The saint in *Andreas* does not grovel so, nor does the author engage in such immoderate isocolon and tautology, but rather treats the passage laconically, and then only to refute its main impulse (*Andreas*, 920–924):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Hu geworhte ic } \theta\text{et,} & 920 \\
&\text{waldend fira,} & \\
&\text{synnig wið seolfne,} & \text{sawla nergend,} \\
&\text{\(\theta\text{et ic } \theta\text{e swa godne}\)} & \text{ongitan ne meahte} \\
&\text{on wægfære,} & \text{\(\theta\text{ær ic worda gespræc}\)} \\
&\text{minra for meotude} & \text{ma } \theta\text{onne ic sceolde?}
\end{align*}
\]

[Ruler of men, Saviour of souls, how, sinning against your person, did I bring it about that I was unable to recognize you, one so good, on the sea-voyage—where I spoke more words of mine in the presence of the Creator than I should have?].

To this Christ responds (*Andreas*, 926–35):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{No } \delta\text{u swa swiðe} & \text{synne gefremedest} \\
&\text{swa } \delta\text{u in Achaia} & \text{ondsæc dydest,} \\
&\text{\(\delta\text{et } \delta\text{u on feorwegas}\)} & \text{feran ne cuðe} \\
&\text{ne in } \theta\text{a ceastre} & \text{becuman mehte,} \\
&\text{\(\theta\text{ing gehegan}\)} & \text{\(\theta\text{reora nihta}\)} & 930 \\
&\text{fyrstigemearces,} & \text{swa ic } \theta\text{e feran het} \\
&\text{ofer wega gewinn.} & \text{Wast nu } \theta\text{e gearwor} \\
&\text{\(\theta\text{et ic eæc mæg}\)} & \text{anra gehwylcne} \\
&\text{freman ond } \theta\text{yrpran} & \text{freonda minra} \\
&\text{on landa gehwylc,} & \text{\(\theta\text{ær me leofost bið.}\)} & 935
\end{align*}
\]

[You never sinned so much as when you made protest against me in Achaia, that you could not fare upon distant ways nor come to the city, nor achieve this thing in three nights’ space of time, as I commanded you to fare over wearisome ways. Now you are more thoroughly aware that I can easily support and advance any one of my friends in any land, wherever it most pleases me].

Thus, the *Andreas*-poet returns both the apostle’s and the audience’s attention to the theme introduced earlier: that of faithfulness to God’s inexorable will, seeming thereby to demonstrate that the poet has a clear and consistently realized theme in mind which informs deviations such as this. The Casanatensis version also returns to this theme, though it gets there by a non-sequitur and contingently; Christ in the wake
of Andrew’s prayer calls him friend and forgives his ignorance, but says he does so because the apostle has been faithful, even though he has behaved erroneously (raising the question of how one can faithfully do what one ought not to have done). The inconsistency with which the Casanatensis account realizes its themes, however, falls once more perfectly in line with its prose focus on content, since it is the quantitative communication of information which is said to be at the core of a prose version of a saint’s life—the solid foundation of Aldhelm’s earlier metaphor—while the elevation of theme, of the meaning of that content, is a more sublime level of concerns, the tiles of Aldhelm’s metaphor, the loftiness which Quintilian says is a distinctive aspect of verse alone.

In either version, Christ then commands the apostle to enter the city, where he must rescue Matthew and all those with him. In the Latin, He tells Andrew that he will be killed, though he comforts him by reminding him that his soul cannot be harmed. In the Old English, Christ simply says that the apostle will endure great physical violence, but that the saint must be mindful of winning renown: *Wes a domes georn* (*Andreas*, 959b). Both texts in their divergent assertions are somewhat problematic, for as it turns out, Andrew will not be killed, so either Christ’s assertion in the Casanatensis version is, yet again, mendacious, or this is an inconsistency on the author’s part. In *Andreas*, as is conventional in most texts which treat the deeds of saints, the greater glory of God is clearly the conventional objective, and the usual method is to pursue this through rendering both saint and author to a greater or lesser degree transparently and generically.44 Though winning personal renown is a

---

44 See here again Sulpicius Severus’ prologue to the *Vita Martini*, a text which exerted considerable influence upon Anglo-Saxon approaches to hagiography, or again, in Old English, in Ælfric, *Lives of the Saints*, ed. W. Skeat, EETS os 76 (London: Trübner, 1900).
commonplace in much secular Anglo-Saxon literature, it is not a topos particularly
germane to antique hagiographical writings (it may be suggested that this topos is
something renegotiated by many Old English and Anglo-Latin saints’ lives).
Furthermore, as before, the Andreas-poet has excised explicit reassurances that doing
the will of God will turn out well for the saint; it will not necessarily turn out well for
Andreas, and the course of his fate remains veiled (a common motif throughout the
secular literature of Early-Germanic literature). Nevertheless, in both texts Christ goes
on to reassure the apostle by reminding him of how he too suffered torture on others’
behalf, and what is more, he did so first and for all humanity; this last assertion will
prove a counter-point to Andreas’ later accusations on the third day of his suffering
(Andreas, 1401–1428). In the Latin, Christ says that this is the seminal example of
how the martyr wins eternal life: “quoniam sic oporate erat pati, ut vobis ostenderem
qualiter sustineatis, et ita introeatis in vitam eternam cum palma martirii fructumque
deo offerentes” (“I had to suffer like that to show you how to endure and so how to
enter eternal life with the martyr’s palm, offering fruit to God,” Casanatensis, XVIII,
4–6). Christ then returns to heaven while the apostle proceeds into the city.

In the Latin, the apostle is shielded, invisible, from the gaze of the
Mermedonians as he goes into the city hidden in a cloud, but this is treated more
circumspectly in the Old English, for he is simply said to advance so that none
observe him, that he is, somehow, protected throughout his advance by God (Andreas,
985–89):

\begin{verbatim}

stop on stræte, stig wisode,
swa him nænig gumena ongitan ne mihte,
synfulra geseon. Hæfde sigora weard
on þam wangstede were betolden
leofne leodfruman mid lofe sinum.
\end{verbatim}
[he advanced along the street—the path pointed his way—so that none of those sinful
men might notice or observe him. The Lord of victories through his love had cloaked
the beloved leader of his people with protection inside that place].

This phrasing again affords a greater potential sense of anxiety to the Old English
construction of the episode, for there is nothing concrete or tangible about the
apostle’s protection; it is entirely abstract, and the reader must proceed in faith upon
this abstraction, and so once more the Andreas-poet employs greater psychological
complexity by aligning emotional tones in both protagonist and reader.

The next scene presents the death of the prison guards and the apostle’s entry
into the prison. In the Casanatensis account, when Andrew perceives the wardens, he
prays, makes the sign of the cross, and they all die (Casanatensis, XIX, 11–16). In
Andreas, the saint is not portrayed as the killer; rather, as he approaches, the seven
guards simply die (they are not yet numbered in the Latin), and only then does
Andreas pray, this time in thanksgiving. Though the Andreas-poet removes the taint
of homicide from the apostle, he does indulge a different violent impulse, namely that
of goriness (Andreas, 992–999a, 1002b–1003):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Geseh he hǣdenra} & \quad \text{hloð ætgædere}, \\
\text{fore hlindura} & \quad \text{hyrdas standan}, \\
\text{seofone ætsomne.} & \quad \text{Ealle swylt fōrnam,} \\
\text{duron domlease.} & \quad \text{Deāðræs fōrfeng} \\
\text{hæleð heorodreorige.} & \quad \text{Da se halga gebæd} \\
\text{bilwytnæ fæder,} & \quad \text{breostgehygdum} \\
\text{herede on hehðo} & \quad \text{heofoncyninges þrym,} \\
\text{godes dryhtendom.} & \quad \text{daðawang rudon.}
\end{align*}
\]

[He saw a group of heathens, the guards, standing together in front of the door of the
prison, seven in a group. Death carried all of them off. They died without honour;
death’s assault surprised the blood-drenched men. Then the saint prayed to the
gracious Father and in his heart’s thoughts he praised the Heaven-King’s power and]
his lordly judgement . . . The heathen were sleeping, drunk with blood; they stained that place of death].

Whether the gore is a result of the life they have lead or the death they have encountered is somewhat ambiguous. However, the pervasiveness of gore throughout the Old English version is very pronounced, at least in contrast to potential Latin and Greek exemplars, so much so that Holly Jagger describes its treatment as “an almost burlesque extravagance.” The replacement of homicidal content with gory content points up yet another way in which the Andreas-poet recalibrates the style of reading, namely transforming the antique versions’ rather sadistic appeal into a revulsion toward cruelty.

There is also a pervasive mendacity which regularly intersperses the Latin text, and which is uniformly removed by the poet of the Old English version. First the disciples, and then Andrew himself, are deceived into falling asleep (Casanatensis, VII, 7–7 and XVI, 3–10). Since the reader is privy to the deception, he or she is in on the trickery, made at the expense of the deceived, and at the very least, this affords one the satisfaction of being in a position of superiority over those who are ignorant of the deception. In other words, their misfortune has the potential to communicate a positive impression. This also points one back to the first major excision from the Casanatensis account, where in Book I the text includes a description of the slaughter facilities which is deleted from Andreas. We may safely conclude that this was not excised by the Andreas-poet because of a revulsion for

---


46 The ambiguity in this episode is discussed by Calder, A New Critical History, at 137, and also more generally by Hieatt, “Envelope Patterns,” 58–62.

gore. We may also (less safely) conclude that the Casanatensis-author, or the author upon whom he drew, made a deliberate choice to include this description in his version, since he often adds or removes content which is found in other, earlier versions. For example, this description is missing from the Greek legends. These two conclusions narrow the range of speculation for why it is found in the Casanatensis version, but not in *Andreas*.

As suggested earlier, it is possible that the *Andreas*-poet’s consistent sense of restraint and concision (ironically, traits which are described by paraphrasers and writers in the *opus geminatum* tradition as germane to prose, not verse) caused the poet to excise this description, since it does not contribute directly to the plot. This, however, does not preclude a simultaneous possibility that its sadistic appeal may have been in some sense troubling to the *Andreas*-poet. The relatively detailed description given in the Latin version coalesces necessarily out of a fascination with an instrument of slaughter. However, it must be said that the Casanatensis-author might not have particularly felt the appeal of his exemplar’s sadism, but simply invested more authority in the legend’s tradition, and therefore retained more consistently that which he discovered there. The *Andreas*-poet, on the other hand, was paraphrasing on far more and far more involved levels his exemplar, carrying over the tradition by means of indigenous language, forms, conventions and styles. It seems reasonable to speculate that the sheer increase in the number of levels being negotiated by the *Andreas*-poet tended to increase concomitantly the sense that the content too was negotiable, particularly in regards to aspects which seem, by Protestant standards, morally questionable, such as mendacity and sadism. In contrast to sadism, the cruelty in the Old English version does not necessarily anticipate pleasure, but is predicated upon a lack of passion entirely: one might argue that to do
the horrific and feel nothing is the very essence of cruelty. Towards the conclusion of 
the Casanatensis account, the sadistic impulse continues in even more exaggerated 
terms, and at that point I will return to the impulse in the Latin and its consistent 
excision from the Old English.

On the other hand, as the grisly content of Andreas makes plain, the excisions 
the poet makes certainly do not derive from squeamishness. Rather, the poet employs 
gory content when he wishes to elicit a negative response from his audience, whether 
this be disgust or pity, and not, as in the Latin, when a positive response is desired, 
such as delight and satisfaction. The guards are cast in a negative light (domlease), 
they do just the things guards ought not to do (swafon, druncen, and part of the 
concatenation of disparagement is their description as heorodreorige, 48 and drunk on 
blood (perhaps a foreshadowing of the later ‘deadly mead-feast’ metaphor, 1526b– 
1539). It seems reasonably clear from this collocation of disparaging imagery that we 
are to focus negatively upon the slain guards, and not positively on their death, and 
that the cultivation of this negative impulse utilizes gore.

In both texts, after the guards die, the door springs open and, in the 
Casanatensis version, the chains of the prisoners melt (apparently, the prisoners in 
Andreas are not chained). The apostle catches sight of Matthew who, in the Latin, is 
“sitting quietly by himself in the silence,” but in the Old English, ðær ana sæt / 
geohðum geomor in þam gnornhofe (‘sat there alone and melancholy over his troubles 
within that dismal building,’ Andreas, 1007b–8). Matthew also sees Andreas, and so it 
becomes explicit here that his vision has been restored: . . . gode þancade / þæs ðe hie

48 The use of the word, heorodreorige, has been discussed in some detail by Karl W entersdorf, in “On 
the Meaning of Old English heorodreorige in the Phoenix and other Poems,” Studia Neophilologica 45 
onsunde æfre moston. / geseon under sunnan . . . (‘[Andreas] thanked God that they had ever been allowed here beneath the sun to see each other unharmed,’ Andreas, 1011b–1013a). They embrace and celestial light shines about them both. Andreas begins speaking, saying *nu is þis folc on luste, / hæleð hyder on*—(*Andreas*, 1023b–1024a), but at this point, between the Vercelli Book’s present folios 42 and 43, a full leaf is missing. I will briefly summarize the Casanatensis’ account until *Andreas* picks it up again.

Andrew is dismayed that Matthew has only three days left before he is eaten, but Matthew reassures him, saying that God has promised rescue and here now is Andrew. Andrew looks about and sees that the other prisoners have become bestial and are eating hay. He laments (yet again, secretly in his heart) being a sinner and thus being associated with a humanity who is created in God’s image but at Satan’s instigation reverts so easily to mere animal nature. He begins chastising the Devil, and launches an extensive expositional tirade about the history of Satan’s useless war against God (a scene like this may be the inspiration for the later flyting scene between Satan and the saint in *Andreas*). The two apostles then pray together and lay hands on the prisoners, returning to them sight and sense. Andrew tells them to go to the lower part of the city where a fig tree grows which will miraculously feed all 309, 49 there they are to wait for him. They, however, refuse to go without him because they may be seized again, to which Andrew responds that not even the dogs will sense their passing (as before during the Casanatensis’ account of the storm, the motives for his followers refusal to abandon the apostle are self-interested). At this point, *Andreas* seems to pick up the thread again, though the convergence is by no means clear.
A piece of dialogue runs over from the missing page, saying *gewyrht eardes neosan* (‘... deed, to visit earth,’ *Andreas*, 1025). *Andreas* then recounts how Matthew prays for courage before he falls in martyrdom against the heathen: a prayer which is missing from the Casanatensis version. From the gaol Matthew leads the prisoners who number in the Latin ‘about’ 248, ‘not including’ a further forty-nine women, but in the Old English are tallied at 240, adding that forty-nine women are also liberated. In both texts a cloud draws over them, and in the Casanatensis account this lofts them, along with Andrew’s disciples, up to a mountain where they wait with Saint Peter. Again, this is an inconsistency, since they were just told to wait in a lower part of the city by the fig tree. In *Andreas*, Matthew and Andreas take this final opportunity to encourage one another, and then all except Andreas depart, the cloud guarding them from the violence of the Mermedonians; whether they go to the fig tree in the lower city or the mountain with Saint Peter is not mentioned. Likewise, and again, no explicit mention is made of Andreas’ disciples, though it is implied that they are no longer present, since he afterwards proceeds through the city alone.\(^{50}\)

However, this deviation again differentiates the Old English verse from the Latin prose, since once more the reader must supply this substantive element of the plot on the basis of hints in the text. In either event, the disciples ‘abandonment’ of the saint, in both versions, in light of their earlier vehement refusals to leave the apostle during the storm, though for different reasons, is problematic. Nor does the apostle’s command that they wait for him (which thus implies that he will be fine),

---

\(^{49}\) Andrew is the disciple most directly associated with the miracle of the feeding of the 5500 (John 6: 1–14).

\(^{50}\) In fact, no mention is made of Andreas’ disciples after he proceeds from the Mermedonian beach into the city.
alleviate this breach between what they vowed and what they did, for they were also
told that they could await their lord on the shore until his return: _gebidan beornas pine /
aras on earde, hwæne ðu eft cyme_ (‘ask your men to alight on land until you come
again,’ _Andreas_, 399–400). This they repudiated, and so it may seem that as they did
then, so should they do now. However, what may or may not have been said on the
missing leaf of _Andreas_ renders uncertain all such claims, and these suggestions must
at this point remain speculative.

Afterwards, the apostle walks about the city, finally resting near a column. In
_Andreas_, the monument besides which he stops is a brass pillar, while in the
Casanatensis account, it is a marble column with a statue on top. The Latin phrases
his waiting as if it derives from a lack of anything better to do: “expectantem autem
quid accideret” (“there he waited for something to happen,” Casanatensis, XXII, 17).
In the Old English, this is framed in the more positivistic language of Germanic
‘battle-fatalism’: _ece upgemynd engla blisse; / ðanon banode under burhlocan /
hwæt him guðweorca gifeðe wurde_ ([_Andreas_ possessed] ‘eternally-exalted
consciousness of the favour of the angels, from which he expected whatever battle-
achievements might be granted him down in the stronghold,’ _Andreas_, 1064–1066).

In both texts, the Mermedonians discover that the prisoners are missing and
mean to devour the dead guards in lieu of the foreigners. At this point the
Casanatensis version adds that there are seven dead men. At line 1269, the _Andreas-
poet again anticipates an assertion made much later on in the Casanatensis account
when he includes three days of torture long before the Casanatensis version will
mention this number of days in its plot. On the other hand, if the legend which he
paraphrased differed from the Casanatensis account, for the assertion that it was in
this tradition is merely the best guess of scholars, then it may simply be that the
sequence of the exemplar from which he worked differed from that of the Casanatensis rendering.

The Old English text then once again insinuates a familiar stylistic element by infusing gore into its rendering of the scene (*Andreas*, 1080–1088a):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sægdon þam folce} & \quad \text{þæt ðær feorrcundra,} & 1080 \\
\text{ellreordigra,} & \quad \text{ænigne to lafe} & \\
\text{in carcerne} & \quad \text{cwicne ne gemetton,} & \\
\text{ah þær heorodreorige} & \quad \text{hyrdas lagan,} & \\
\text{gæsne on greote,} & \quad \text{gaste berofone,} & \\
\text{fægra flæschaman.} & \quad \text{Da wearó forht manig} & 1085 \\
\text{for þam færspelle} & \quad \text{folces raeswa,} & \\
\text{hean, hygegeomor} & \quad \text{hungres on wenum,} & \\
\text{blates beodgastes}. & 
\end{align*}
\]

[They (Mermedonian warriors) told the people that they had found not one living being from among the strange-speaking foreigners left behind there in the prison, but the guards were lying there soaked with blood, dead on the floor, the bodies of doomed men, robbed of their spirit. Then on account of that catastrophic news many a leader of the folk grew fearful, abject, melancholy in his mind, in anticipation of hunger, that pale guest at the table].

This stylistic inclusion once more falls in line with association of verse with style (and in contrast, of content with prose), for in this the *Andreas*-poet adds nothing to the content which necessarily forwards the plot. It is also again consistent with previous observation that verse legend seem to anticipate a more active and critical reader, since here, as before, the purpose of this gore is not to elicit the positive tone of sadism (in satisfaction or delight), but the negative tone of cruelty (and thus pity). The *færspelle* is for the Mermedonians overwhelmingly grim, leaving them *hean* and *hygegeomor*. The cause of their melancholy wears once more the adjective of gore used in the previous passage: *heorodreorige*. Moreover, the collocation of gory content with negative impressions again employs feast imagery; previously the guards were drunk with blood, now hunger, personified, sits at the table. Certainly the situation for the Mermedonians is cruel, but there is no evidence in the content or
style of the Old English poem that the reader is meant to enjoy their cruel fate, but on
the contrary to pity the state to which their depraved habits have brought them.

The Latin text mentions nothing about dismay, but merely states the food
shortage as a practical problem, instantly solved: “ecce defecit nobis escam, quid
nobis videtur, non habentes aliquid ut conmedamus, et nullum nobis remansit victum?
Set ite maxime ex illis septem custodes, nobis aliquid preparate ut reficiamur”
(“Behold, it has come, for now we have no food left. What should we do, since we
have nothing left to eat and no food left? Go quickly and prepare something for us to
eat from the seven guards,” Casanatensis, XXII, 9–11).

The Latin contains also a didactic speech on the part of the Mermedonian
elders, who wonder if this development portends that the world is changing (XXII, 8),
an arresting statement which, for a moment at least, inclines the reader to adopt the
villains’ cultural perspective, seeing the daily routines of the Mermedonians, no
matter how grisly, as normative, in which these elders have grown comfortable; to
them, as their way of life is undermined, their very world seems to tilt, shifting
dangerously. The elders couch their command, that the guards be eaten, by saying that
the previously mentioned blood tank is empty. On the rim of this they make to slit the
dead guards’ throats, to drain them of blood, but Andrew in dismay prays that they
might be prevented, and the butchers’ sword-hands wither and the weapons fall to the
ground. The motif of the impotent sword strike is very common through-out the genre
of saints’ lives. At least as early as 203 AD, in the *Passion of Saint Perpetua*, the
motif appears, though in that text it is relatively unmiraculous; it is simply a killing
blow which, in a rather grisly turn of events, does not quite do the job. The motif
occurs time and again in various lives, such as Severus’ *Vita Martini*, and Alcuin’s prose *Vita Willibrordi*. The leaders lament that magicians must be in their midst, thwarting all their efforts to sustain themselves.

*Andreas* avoids all this; the text (again by rather direct implication) relates that the guards were devoured (*Andreas*, 1088b–1092):

\[
\text{Nyston beteran ræd,} \\
\text{þonne hie þa belidenan him to lifnere} \\
\text{deade gefeormedon. Duruþegnum wearð 1090} \\
\text{in ane tid eallum ðeomsne} \\
\text{þurh heard gelac hildbedd styred.}
\]

[They did not know any better course than that they should feed off those blood-soaked dead men for their sustenance: within one hour the deathbed of the doorkeepers, all of them together, was disturbed at the hands of the ruthless mob].

Once more, a negative response seems to be anticipated, and again, gory imagery enhances the disgust in which this response manifests. However, more is required.

In the Casanatensis version they bring together their old men, who number 207, and a casting of lots designates seven of these for slaughter. In *Andreas*, on the other hand, the Mermedonians use a divining rod which points out only a single old man. Upon being bound, in the Old English, the old man volunteers his son to stand in his place, and this is happily accepted. The boy begs for mercy, but his pleas are ignored. In the Latin, the father’s conduct, in terms of content, is treated more extensively. One of the seven offers up his son, and the cannibals agree to this exchange, provided the boy weighs more than his father. He does not, so the father also adds his daughter to the bargain. These two finally out-weigh him, and though

---

51 Severus, *Vita sancti Martini*, XV.
52 Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi*, XIV.
they beg for a little time in which to grow larger, the crowd is adamant and the executioners prepare to kill them.

At all points of this episode, the Casanatensis account is eminently pragmatic. It is from amongst the old that the condemned are chosen, most likely because they have the fewest years left and so have the least to lose by being killed now. Furthermore, they are all men, perhaps because they are larger. The old man offers his son and his daughter in order to overcome concerns about amount of meat, and apparently these are more attractive to the cannibals; they do, ultimately, outweigh the old man, which means more to eat, and are undoubtedly more tender. In turn, the appeal the children make is also based upon reason, since they beg for more time, which will mean, for the cannibals, that they shall grow larger and thus provide more food when they are slaughtered: “dimictite nos aliquantulum, maxime ut crescamus, et tu[n]c nos interficite” (“spare us for a little while, so we can grow bigger, and then kill us,” Casanatensis, XXIII, 22). In short, everything proceeds in this passage according to a gruesome but relatively sound logic, and thus the content embodies a particular style, or tone of address, and the emotional response arises from a rational play between the substantive, rational elements. This pragmatism of the prose compares predictably with the much more affectively grounded verse treatment.

In the Old English, this episode contains a similar amount of text, at least when translated into prose. However, the bulk of it is composed of extra-narrative stylistic material which I will discuss here for the sake of contrast with the Casanatensis version’s pragmatic content. The “young men,” “a multitude of warriors,” come “riding on horses, intrepid on their mounts, conferring together [and] proud of their spears” (Andreas, 1094b–1097a):

Beornas comon,
wiggendra þreat, 1095
wiegum gengan,
When one considers that the foe of these fearsome warriors is a little boy (described below as an *eafor geong*), and that they fail to slay even such an ‘enemy,’ the heroic language seems to beg for ironic interpretation rather than reading it as mindless plagiarizing or the banal exploitation of vernacular poetry’s popularity (as, for instance, Irving, Brooks, Greenfield or Calder would have it). This seems confirmed by an even more egregious disjunction between what is said and what is meant only a few lines further on, about the conduct of the old man (*Andreas*, 1108–1111a):

```
Cleopode þa collenferhð cearegan reorde,
cwæð he his sylfes sunu syllan wolde
on æhtgeweald, eaforan geongne, 1110
lifes to lisse . . .
```

[Then, brave-hearted man, he began to cry out in an anxious voice and declared that he would hand over his own son, a young child, to their disposal, to spare his life].

When a collocation like *collenferhð* and *cearegan* occurs, alliterating side by side in the same line, as the ‘hero’ trades his son’s life for his own, the irony seems flatly deliberate: that the author is plating the venal and parsimonious actions of an old man discovered in the antique tradition with the venerable and respected vernacular heroic language. The result, inevitably, is excruciating bathos.

Once the reader has thus been conditioned to look for irony, it begins to appear everywhere in the passage. The old man *wæs uðweota eorla dugode, heriges on ore . . .* (‘was a respected councilor of the elite body of earls, in the foremost rank of the war-band,’ *Andreas*, 1105–6a), yet the decision he makes after being announced thus is profoundly perverse and (by Anglo-Saxon standards, at least)

---

extremely ill-advised. Likewise, though he is described as one who is habitually in
the forefront of the fighting, he acts here with breath-taking cowardice. Once more, as
the Mermedonians mill about in general agitation, there approach the youth rinc
manig, / guðfrec guma (‘many a warrior, [many] a man greedy for a battle,’ Andreas,
1116b–17a). Yet their adversary is still a child, bound in chains. The point of tracing
out this consciously ironic interplay between antique and vernacular traditions is to
make clear that in spite of allegations of clumsy naivété which so many modern critics
level at the Andreas-poet, he often seems demonstrably aware of the tension and
disjunction between what he says and how he says it, between Latin and vernacular,
between saintly and heroic, and this accords very well with the traditional distinctions
between verse and prose which he likely inherited. According to this tradition, highly
affective irony is well within the realm of what one could expect of an ‘allusive,’
‘elegant’ and ‘lofty’ work which is meant to be unravelled and read over time and
again in private: to be the subject of ‘rumination.’

In the Casanatensis version, Andrew again prays that the sword strikes might
come to nothing, and the sword melts in the killers’ hands. In Andreas, the apostle is
dismayed by what is about to happen (earmlic þuhte), for the youth seems guiltless
(unsyldig) to him (Andreas, 1137a). However, it is God, not the saint, who
intervenes, and the swords melts ‘like wax.’ Certainly one effect of the Andreas-
poet’s shift of agency, from the saint to God, is to return emphasis to the inexorable
action of God’s will in the realm of men. Andreas’ will in this matter diminishes by
comparison; in this we may again observe, relative to the Casanatensis account, the

54 Typologically, this is also a keen counter-point to God’s sacrifice of his son for mankind or
Abraham’s near sacrifice of Isaac. I will return to the Andreas-poet’s very distinctive exaggeration and
nuancing of typological features in the section on Cynewulfian parallels.
thematic consistency interwoven by the *Andreas*-poet, of the saint’s fatalism and God’s sovereignty.

In both texts the people lament their state. In the Latin they exclaim that *iam mortui sumus* (“now we are dead men,” Casanatensis, XXIV, 10), and, on cue, the devil appears in the image of an old man. In the Casanatensis, Satan says that a pilgrim, not a noble foreigner, is the cause of their troubles, so they must find him and eat him, for he has let their prisoners go (the text mentions that the cannibals have never raised sheep or cattle). The Mermedonians agree, first fortifying themselves by devouring the dead guards where they lay and then, searching about, find the saint: “Interea nullus hominum qui ab hoc seculo exiebat sepeliebatur, sed omnes conmedebant” (“In the meantime, none of the dead men who departed this world were buried, but they devoured them all,” Casanatensis, XXIV, 24–5). When they try to seize Andrew, however, the sign of the cross appears on his forehead and they fall back in dismay. The devil rebukes their cowardice, but they retort bitterly that if he is so eager to kill the saint, he should try to do it himself. Satan admits that he cannot.

In the Old English, the Devil’s appearance is called forth by the people’s cry for wisdom in the face of the crisis; here he appears hideous and black: *wann ond whitleelas, hæfde weriges hiw* (‘dark and without beauty, he had the aspect of one accursed,’ *Andreas*, 1169). The Old English devil gets straight to the point, saying that a noble foreigner has made things difficult for them, and that they should kill

---


56 It is common, in saints’ lives like Athanasius’ *The Life of Saint Anthony* or Gregory’s *The Life of Saint Benedict*, to portray the Devil’s initial appearance is as a small, black boy; small, because he is weak as a child, and black because he is evil (cf. *The Life of Saint Anthony*, Section VI).
him.\textsuperscript{57} This sets up a flyting scene between the apostle and Satan.\textsuperscript{58} As seen, the Casanatensis version has again, as in the old man’s sacrifice of his children, predicated this confrontation upon a rhetoric of pragmatism; Satan identifies the problem of starvation, designates a cause, suggests a solution which both pre-empts more difficulties of a similar nature and which goes some little way to alleviating their present distress (eat the cause of your hunger). The Mermedonians, in turn, agreeing with the sound sense of all this, first take the practical step of fortifying themselves for the search by eating the guards. Throughout the entire search and apprehension scene, Andrew says not a word, even explicitly refusing to respond to taunts; there is, in a sense, no real conflict. Thus, if the scene in the Latin is compelling, it is so because it is eminently rational. In all this, the Casanatensis account aligns once more with prose’s traditional concern with pragmatism. Flyting, however, is not compelling because it is pragmatic, but because it is affectively moving, conuding to an emotional response, appropriate to confrontations, which is the source of its narrative effectiveness and which in contradistinction to the prose is again, according to the \textit{opus geminatum} tradition, appropriate to verse.

The saint in the Old English accuses the devil of inciting the Mermedonians to deeds which will draw down the very punishment with which he himself is so familiar, and that his unavailing quest for victory only brings more misery for him \textit{(Andreas, 1185–1194)}.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{57} There is no basis for calling Andreas noble, but it would tie the apostle into Germanic tradition of (the anachronistically designated) \textit{adelsheiligkeit}, or ‘noble holiness,’ which is so prevalent in German hagiography.

\textsuperscript{58} Flyting is a relatively formal exchange of abuse and intimidation which either precedes or stands in for battle. It differs, in this case, from traditional hagiographic exchanges between Satan and saint (e.g. in \textit{The Life of Saint Anthony}, Books VI or IX, or again in \textit{The Life of Saint Martin}, Books VI or XVII) by depending upon abuse and threat rather than deceit and reasoning.

\textsuperscript{59} Cf. the Casanatensis Versions’ earlier treatment of this sentiment in Chapter XX of its account.
[Behold, shamelessly you incite the people and encourage them to battle. You know for yourself the agony of the hot fire within hell and you are inciting a crowd, this band, to a confrontation. You are hostile towards God, Judge of the people. Listen, you devil’s javelin, you are adding to your anguish. The Almighty conquered you in humiliation and hurled you into darkness where the King of kings fettered you about with a chain, and ever since, those who knew how to regard the law of the Lord have called you Satan].

In this revision, the Andreas-poet has changed the content, though the scene in which this particular plot material, of confrontation, remains largely the same (this habit recurs when the poet adds the much discussed meoduscerwen scene; the context of consumption is retained from the Latin, but again it is populated with Anglo-Saxon commonplaces [1526b–1539]). By means of qualified shifts in content like this, the Andreas-poet continues one of his most pervasive remodulations in the style of how this text may be read: from a pragmatic set of expectations to an affective set. Daniel Calder has previously identified this distinct affectivity by typifying it as a form of Anglo-Saxon ‘expressionism,’ validating this designation through pointing out that the consistent figurative modes of Andreas distinguish it from other Old English heroic texts, like Beowulf, by grounding it in a necessarily unreal, non-rational, frame of reference.60 This, argues Calder, contributes directly to Andreas’ surreal and affective style, which, because of inappropriate comparisons with more ‘realistic’

texts like *Beowulf*, and because of ignorance about the dynamics and expectations of figurative modes in these hagiographical texts, has licensed disparagement of its apparent irrationality and melodrama. To this one might add that more specifically, the verse mode in which the *Andreas*-hagiographer wrote was couched in a particular tradition which stipulated a more affective style as normative. Regardless of modern readings and misreadings of the poem, most scholars can agree that the affectivity of *Andreas* is markedly enhanced over any of its possible exemplars; the interest here is to trace how and why this enhancement occurs.

Satan dares not respond directly to the saint, but tells the people that the response they are hearing comes from their oppressor. God speaks to Andreas, urging him to reveal himself and do courageous deeds, informing him that he is about to be enchained and tortured, but that they will not be able to kill him. In light of the saint’s earlier hesitation upon the strand to undertake God’s mission for him, the phrasing here is significant, since he again receives from God freedom of will to conform his will to the will of God or not. He does, and by this the *Andreas*-poet once more retains his focus on the theme of will.

At this point in the Latin, the Mermedonians begin mocking Andrew and vaunting over him. While this is happening, Satan assumes the voice of God, urging the saint to limit his hardships and not exacerbate the situation by doing anything excessive. Andrew reveals that he recognizes the impostor by saying he will die before he betrays the will of God, and that when the time of judgement comes upon the city, he, in his turn, will punish Satan (Casanatensis, XXVII, 24–3):

> etsi me nunc interficitis, non facio voluntates vestras, set voluntatem patris et domini mei qui in celis est Iesu Christi; set tunc quando placuerit domini mei, visitare hanc civitatem, tunc ego vobis disciplinam talem imponam, qualem ipsius domini mei fuerit voluntas
[“even if you kill me now, I’ve not done your will, but the will of my Father and Lord who is in heaven, Jesus Christ. However, at the time it pleases my Lord to visit this city, I will impose on you the sort of punishment He demands”].

In this passage, the Casanatensis-author depends upon a hagiographical commonplace, thereby relying upon a quantitative or substantive means of communicating the scene well,61 Andreas skips the scene entirely. Being thus refuted, the devil and his minions flee. At this point the chapter in the Latin ends abruptly and the next starts by simply saying “another day.”

Andreas, by contrast, carries on by relating how, immediately after he taunts the devil and is revealed, the apostle is seized by the crowd, who directly begin to torture him, dragging him about the city and its environs until the sun sets, at which point he is thrown back in the dungeon. Again, gory imagery is used to enhance the tone of pity for which the scene calls: Wæs þæs halgan lic / sarbennum soden, swate bestemed, / banhus abrocen. Blod yðum weoll, / hatan heolfre (‘The body of the saint was soaked from the wounds, drenched in blood; the house of his bones was broken; blood welled out in waves of hot gore,’ Andreas, 1238b–1241a). Each day of torture interweaves such gory content (1275b–1278a and 1404–1406a), adding poignancy to the piteous tone which these scenes anticipate. Andreas remains stoic in the face of the suffering through-out the first day and cheerful amidst the freezing conditions throughout the first night. The next day he is again dragged out and onward, tortured as before, but this time his stoic demeanour begins to show signs of strain; he calls for God to consider his plight, though he goes on to restate his faith in God’s protection and asks Him to keep the mockery of Satan in check (Andreas, 1281–1295):

Geseoh nu, dryhten god, drohtað minne,

61 The motif of Satan pretending to be the voice of God, and being detected by the saint occurs, for instance, in Severus’ Vita Martini, XXIV, or in Athanasius’ Vita Beati Antonii Abbatis, ed. J. Migne, PL 73 (Paris, 1845): 126–170, at XXXV,
weoruda willgeofa.  Du wæst ond const
anra gehwylces  earfeðsiðas.
Ic gelyf to ðe,  min liffruma,
ðæt ðu mildheort me  for þinum mægenspedum,
nerigend fira,  næfre wille,
ec ælmihtig,  anforlætan,
swa ic ðæt gefremme,  þenden feorh leofað,
min on moldan,  ðæt ic, meotud, þinum
larum leofwendum  lyt geswine.
Du eart gescyldend  wið sceâdan wæpnum,
ece eadfruma,  eallum þinum;
ne læt nu bysmrian  banan manncynnes,
facnes frumbearn,  þurh feondes crafte
leahtrum beleegan  þa þin lof berað.

[Look on my state now, Lord God, Rewarder of the hosts. You are aware and know of the misfortunes of each single creature. I trust in you, my Creator, that you, the Saviour of men, eternal, almighty, by reason of your abundant virtues, will never, being merciful of heart, abandon me—provided that while my life on earth lasts I so manage it that I fall only a little short of your loving precepts, Lord. You are a protector against the enemy’s weapons, eternal Source of well-being, for all your people: do not now let the enemy of mankind, the first-begotten off-spring of evil, mock and, with the cunning of the fiend, heap defamation upon those who maintain your praise].

God remains silent, but Satan does not and has someone strike Andreas on the mouth to silence him. Once more the apostle is cast into prison, and here Satan appears, along with six other demons. He asks what the saint hoped to achieve by his expedition to Mermedonia, since the glory he sought has now apparently ended in ignominy. He boasts that as he humiliated and killed Christ, so too shall he humiliate and kill Andreas. He then orders his demons to attack, but they are repulsed, in the same manner as were the cannibals in the Casanatensis account, by the sign of the cross on Andreas’ forehead, and when the devil chastises them for their failure, they again retort sulkily that if he is so eager, he should have a go himself. He refuses.⁶²

⁶² In the Casanatensis account, the sign of the cross is consistently used against the pagans, first to kill the guards (XIX, 11–16), then to drive back the mob (XVII, 1–2). The Andreas-poet alters its depiction so that it is used, more in line with tradition, to drive back demons. On the present evidence, however, it remains unclear whether the Latin author is demonising pagans or the Old English author is redeeming heathens.
They retreat and consider what they ought to do next. They decide to taunt him yet a second time and another flyting scene ensues. They accuse the apostle of practicing monstrous arts and deceiving the multitudes but promise that he shall be punished for this with torture and death, for none are mighty enough to free him now from his fate. Andreas responds that He Who fastened them in the fetters of hell and threw them down into exile for their crimes against God has power to free him from their grasp, not the other way round, and that furthermore, their present torment shall never see an end, while his shall. Thus rebuked, Satan flees: 

\[
\text{da weard on fleame se de da fehdo iu / wið god geara grimme gefremede} \quad (\text{“Then he fled, he who once long since perpetrated that fierce feud against God,” Andreas, 1386–7}).
\]

Two points are worth noting here. First, the flyting again occurs in the proximity of the shining cross motif—in the initial case flyting replaces the relocated motif, and in the second, it is laid directly alongside. Second, the two days of torture recounted in Andreas are not in the Casanatensis version, which relates only a single day of torture, though later on three are mentioned obliquely. Moreover, this unique Old English expansion is neatly ‘book-ended’ by flyting scenes. This careful structuring and the rhetorical complexity employed by the verse legend compare strikingly, but by now predictably, with the relatively stark, simplified account in the prose.

As the sun rises, a third day of torture begins and continues until the sun sets. The Casanatensis version, as mentioned, contains only one day of torture, and then its plot converges once more with Andreas. Clearly the desire for psychological realism in Andreas, wherein the process by which the saint is broken, is illustrated gradually

63 The three days of torture suggest rather immediately a typological association with Christ’s three days in the tomb, especially in light of all the other Christological associations which cluster about this portion of the text. I will treat this more extensively in the section on Cynewulfian influences.
and causationally, is not shared by the Casanatensis account. However, at the end of the day, in both texts, the apostle begins to lament. In the Latin, he realizes that all which God foretold has transpired, and he exclaims that he has had enough. Andrew calls out, reminding Christ how He suffered until He cried out on the cross, asking His Father why He had abandoned Him. Plainly, the parallel is that the apostle too has suffered, and he also feels forsaken (though in the Latin his reasons for feeling forsaken are not very explicit, while in the Old English the author has implicitly set up this complaint when, as mentioned previously, Satan, not God, responded to his prayers for protection on the second day of torture). In the Casanatensis version, Andrew carries the parallel further, saying everything *esse consummatum* (‘has been fulfilled,’ *Casanatensis*, XXVIII, 10), echoing in imitation of Christ scripture’s account of Christ’s last words on the cross (John 19: 30), and that nothing remains save that God accept his spirit into his keeping, for the apostle’s spirit fails.

In *Andreas* the saint takes a much more aggressive line, saying that this is the most that he has ever had to suffer on Christ’s behalf, and reminding Christ that after only a single day of torture He cried out, asking why God had forsaken him, while the apostle has had to endure three days of torture; he desires death and asks God to grant this. In phrasing the saint’s argument thus, one finds again that the verse is much more complex than the prose, which is perhaps unexpected in light of the prose account’s focus upon pragmatism; the point is that between these two texts, pragmatism should not be confused with logical rigour. In both texts, the apostle then laments, saying that Christ promised that no part of their body would be harmed (this is not strictly true), but that now his flesh, blood and hair are mingled all over into the landscape. The impression communicated by these laments is that the saint is truly breaking, and this is enhanced in the Old English, since it not only suggests, as the
Latin does, that God is breaking his promise, but that Andreas has also suffered more than Christ had to, and that Christ ‘broke’ after only a single day. Moreover, this questioning of God’s providence once more maintains the consistent focus upon the Old English version’s theme of faith and will. It is also interesting to note that the two scenes are relatively balanced in their placement within the 1722-line text; the first scene occurs 190 lines into the poem, while the latter occurs 294 lines from the end, though the missing leaf potentially deprives this balance of much suggestiveness which it would otherwise possess.

In either text God now responds to the saint (in the Casanatensis account he is said to reply in Hebrew). He says that the world will pass away before his promises break, and he tells the saint to look back at what has become of his scattered flesh, blood and hair, for these appear now to the apostle as trees, flowering and bearing fruit. In *Andreas*, this miracle consoles the saint, and he exclaims that clearly God has not abandoned him. In both texts, he is then thrown back in the dungeon; in the Latin, the Mermedonians consider his wounds and wonder if he will die in the night, while in the Old English, they state that they remain intent on breaking his resolve.

In either version, as the saint lies in the dungeon, God appears to him and restores his body to perfect health. In the Casanatensis version, God appears as a bright light, and his hand reaches out from this to pick the apostle up. At this point, the action moves very abruptly; with a quick word of thanks, Andrew turns to another marble column with a statue on top, this one apparently and rather strangely in his

64 At least two other saints’ lives involve dragging as a means of torture. One is the Severus of Al-Ushmunain’s *Life of Saint Mark the Evangelist*, and the other is the *Passion of Saint Tryphon*, now preserved only in an account by Theodric of Fleury, which dates from about 1005; in addition to being dragged to death, Saint Tryphon is the Greek Orthodox patron saint of gardeners and all growing things. An elaborate and pervasive ritual still persists in Bulgaria by which Saint Tryphon is invoked to aid the fertility of vineyards.
prison, and, making the sign of the cross, commands it in Christ’s name to give forth water so that the whole city might be flooded. This it does, issuing water which “salsa erat, ad conmedendum, carnes humanas, uti, et ipsi prius fuerant conmedentes” (“it was salty, so it would eat men’s flesh, just as the men themselves had done before,” Casanatensis, XXIX, 20–21). This torrent kills many people and beasts of burden.

The *Andreas*-poet, on the other hand, recognizes that this moment is the climax and accordingly imposes a fascinating mixture of vernacular and antique stylistic *topoi* to demarcate the moment. In essence, he starts the tale again, saying (*Andreas*, 1478–1489a):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hwæt, ic hwile nu} & \quad \text{haliges lare,} \\
\text{leoðgiddinga,} & \quad \text{lof þæs þe worhte,} \\
\text{wordum wemde,} & \quad \text{wyrd undyrne} \\
\text{ofer min gemet.} & \quad \text{Mycel is to secganne,} \\
\text{langsum leornung,} & \quad \text{þæt he in life adreag,} \\
\text{call æfter orde.} & \quad \text{þæt scell æglæwra} \\
\text{mann on moldan} & \quad \text{þonne ic me tælige} \\
\text{findan on ferðe,} & \quad \text{þæt fram fruman cunne} \\
\text{call þa earfeðo} & \quad \text{be he mid elne adreah,} \\
\text{grimra guða.} & \quad \text{Hwæðre git sceolon,} \\
\text{lytlum sticcum,} & \quad \text{leoðworda dæl} \\
\text{furður reccan . . .} &
\end{align*}
\]

[Listen, for a while now I have been proclaiming in words of poetry the story of the saint, the praise of what he achieved, a matter of revealed fact exceeding my capacity. It is a great task and a time-demanding discipline to tell what he performed in his lifetime, everything from the beginning. It needs a man better versed in tradition than I consider myself, to find it within his intellect to know from the start all the hardships and the grim struggles which he performed with courage. But nevertheless a certain further amount of poetry must be narrated in short episodes].

The author has begun with the conventional vernacular introduction which calls the audience to attention and recollects in a general sense the glory of great deeds done.

---

65 For Harbus, this passage signals a narratological intrusion designed primarily to showcase his extensive knowledge of other apocryphal *Andreas* legends: 137–8.

66 For instance, in the introductions of religious poems such as *Juliana*, *Exodus*, or *Daniel*, or secular works like *Beowulf*. 
However, it then integrates the modesty topos so common to Christian and pagan antique literature: that the tale’s greatness exceeds the ability of the teller to do it justice.\textsuperscript{67} However, the Andreas-poet does not follow up in the usual manner by justifying why he must tell the story anyway. This often involves some mention of the priority of obedience over humility (since the author was commanded to tell it),\textsuperscript{68} or that the possession of knowledge entails the obligation to share it.\textsuperscript{69} All the author says is that, in spite of his shortcomings, he must tell it. However, that such well-known topoi from either literary culture are here woven together in such bold relief in the service of a single, clear literary objective again argues persuasively in favour of the author’s conscious utilization of the two traditions as they play off one another, rather than in parallel but isolated proximity or in a non-dynamic and uncritical accident of plagiarism. In short, it might indicate that the poet is aware of a dichotomy between literary cultures and that a method is required to synthesize them.

However, as a result of this interweaving of literary traditions, it is difficult to determine if one is listening to a lector or a scop; it seems plausible that in some circumstances, if the audience were listening while at a feast in the hall, they might hear in this echoes of the sermons heard on Sundays, while if they were hearing it in the dining-hall of the monastery, it might suggest the song, drink and conviviality

\begin{footnotes}
68 Found as widely as Severus’ prologue to the \textit{Life of Saint Martin} to Virgil’s \textit{Georgics}, III, 41.
69 For instance, in Seneca’s \textit{Epistulae}, VI, 4, while Christian writers adapted this inherited topos by referring it back to biblical strictures, such as in Ecclesiasticus, 20: 32: “Wisdom that is hid, and treasure that is hoarded up, what profit is in them both?”
\end{footnotes}
familiar in their secular native culture. Furthermore, this instance makes clear that the vernacular style of the poet cannot be considered in isolation from the antique content to which it is applied, even if the author depends primarily upon antique prose traditions of the legend for this content and upon verse vernacular, literary contexts for this style. The two must be taken into account together.

After this extra-narrative passage, the Anglo-Saxon author returns to the story. The pillar to which Andreas turns is, in this case, fixed firmly under a roof. The apostle calls out the waters from the stone and the flood begins. In the Latin, the author phrases this by means of ironic parallelism, stating that the salt-water devoured the flesh of those people who once devoured the flesh of others. The rough justice and fitting irony of this description again seems to depend upon a fundamentally sadistic impulse; there is a witty pleasure to be had from their pain. In contrast, the Andreas-poet answers with his own ironic comparison, but again falls back upon vernacular allusions to construct it (though again the context, of consumption, is retained). The author announces the arrival of the flood in terms of the mead of the feast:

*Meoduscerwen wearð / æfter symbeldæge, slæpe tobrugdon / searuhæbbende* (‘after the day of feasting came the bitter dregs of the mead; the warriors shook off sleep,’ *Andreas*, 1526b–1528a). He presses the irony of the metaphor further, saying

---


71 A similar motif exists in *Guðlac* B (980), and in *Beowulf* (769a). This is also a very extensive bibliography of criticism upon this motif, such as Alfred Bamshesburger, “Old English *Ealuscerwen* in *Beowulf* 769a,” *Review of English Studies*, 53 (2003): 469–74; Thomas Hall, “A Gregorian Model of
[Andreas, 1532b–1535):

\[ \text{þæt wæs sorgbyrþen,} \quad \text{biter beorbegu,} \]
\[ \text{byrlas ne gældon,} \quad \text{ombehtþegnas.} \]
\[ \text{dær wæs ælcum genog} \quad \text{fram dæges orde} \quad \text{drync sona gearu.} \]

[It was a brewing of sorrow, a bitter beer-drinking: cup-bearers and serving men did not delay, and right from the start of the day there was drink enough for everyone].

Once more, the author has altered what he encountered in the original by discarding content and replacing it with a style, for how the Andreas-poet describes the flood is as a Germanic drinking-binge. It is not literally a drinking-binge, this is just the metaphorical method by which what actually happens is described, by means of an extra-narrative, non-content based association. In the Latin, on the other hand, the flood is, manifestly, literally and substantively, flesh-devouring salt-water; in other words, the Old English episode is highly figurative, and thus seems to emphasize style, as is traditionally appropriate to verse lives, while the Latin is literal, and seems more concerned with content, as might be predicted of a prose legend in the opus geminatum tradition. Furthermore, the irony of the Latin arises from an observation of extraneous, objective facts; it arises from the apprehension of what is already implicit in the transpiring of literal events in the text—the unlikely development of the ‘eaters’ now being eaten. The irony of the Old English version, on the other hand, arises from an observation made by, produced by, the Andreas-poet and concurrently his reliance upon the audience’s understanding, based on their shared cultural context (the knowledge that ‘mead-feasts’ are supposed to conduce to joy, not sorrow). In other

---

words, irony arises from the Casanatensis version as an objective fact, a thus a substantive noun, while it arises from Andreas as an individual association, and thus a subjective verb. So, once more, the verse lifts the primary emphasis in the episode (upon irony) out of the text and places it under the agency of the reader.

In the Casanatensis version, the Mermedonians try to flee, but the saint prays that they be prevented, and in response an angel appears who surrounds the city with a wall of flames. In Andreas, the angel does this without the saint’s intervention. The people, caught between fire and water, lament that this fate has come upon them because of what they have done to the apostle. In the Old English, it is again a single old man who states this, while it is a general outcry in the Latin. They go on to exclaim “sed volentes nolentes credamus ei et verbis eius . . . forsitan deus recogitet de nobis, et auferat a nobis hoc malum ne pereamus” (“whether we want to or not, let us believe in him and his words . . . Perhaps God will change his mind about us and remove this evil so we may not perish,” Casanatensis, XXX, 8–11). In Andreas, this (rather awkward) sentiment is avoided; the Mermedonians take a more direct approach to their problem. The old man suggests that they run to the prison and free the apostle, hoping in appreciation that he will spare them. Their change of attitude is made apparent to Andreas and he stops the flood. He walks out of the prison as the waters recede back from his steps. The cannibals are initially joyful, but a great chasm opens, into which the waters rush, taking along the fourteen worst sinners in the city. The survivors’ happiness turns to dread as they anticipate the worst. Only at this point do they declare that the God of Andreas is omnipotent.

In the Casanatensis account, the people run to the prison and beg the saint’s mercy. He tells the statue to cease its outpouring. The old man who tried to exchange his children’s lives for his own begs for forgiveness, but Andrew will have none of it,
saying that as the old man had no mercy, so he will be shown no mercy; he will be swept into the abyss along with Mermedonia’s fourteen executioners, where he will be imprisoned until judgement day (Casanatensis, XXXI, 22–5). Though this approach to mercy certainly has biblical precedent, it is excised by the Andreas-poet,\(^\text{72}\) perhaps because it sets up the reprimand of the apostle found near the end of the Casanatensis version, and so would undermine the dignity and so legitimacy of the saint; as was seen in the ‘request for passage episode’ (Andreas, 271–342) and the ‘apology on the strand episode,’ (Andreas, 920–949) the Andreas-poet consistently excises content which erodes the dignity of his subject. This concern for the saint’s honour, as noted earlier, is one which other hagiographers such as Ælfric are interested to recuperate. Furthermore, the positive appeal, of satisfaction that justice has been done, presents the condemnation and subsequent death of the old man as something which gratifies the audience. In other words, a possible taint of sadism once more enters the narrative through this rough justice. In the Latin version, Andrew marches to the mound where the Mermedonians once killed their victims, the earth opens, and the condemned, along with the water, are swept into the depths. As in Andreas, the people become terrified, seeing the apostle’s dreadful powers of retribution, but he reassures them, saying that these things are done for their sake, so that they might know the power of God. The Old English goes on to say that the vengeance they saw wrought upon the old man and the executioners will be withheld from them, if they mean well (raising the rather distressing question, what ought one to mean in order to mean well)?

In both versions, the apostle takes pity on the people and raises, in the Casanatensis account, all those men who had died in the initial flood, though it is implied that the slain women, children and beasts of burden were also raised: “minime valuerunt eos defferre, quoniam populus multus erat mortuus, etiam mulieres, et infantes, et iumentas” (“they could not carry them in, since a great many people had died, including women, infants and beasts of burden,” Casanatensis, XXXII, 25–27).

In *Andreas*, only the men are mentioned. Once these are raised, they are instantly baptized. Thereafter, Andreas commands a church to be built by the brass column and the people swear to accept baptism, abandon idolatry and their ancient temples. Finally the church is consecrated and a bishop named Platan is chosen from among the Mermedonian princes. Andreas commands them to continue to obey his teachings, for he is eager to be gone.

In the Latin, after the dead are raised, Andrew builds “a makeshift church” over the place the abyss had opened, teaches them the precepts of the Church, and baptizes them in the name of the Trinity. He ordains one of their princes to be bishop, though this prince is not named. He tells them to remain faithful to what he has taught, for he is going to return to his disciples “and to Him who sent me.” That this latter phrase indicates that he is speaking obliquely about his upcoming martyrdom in Achaia is unlikely, since, when they beg him to stay, he tells them he really must go, but will soon return; however, his demonstrated comfort with mendacity may erode the reader’s confidence in such claims. In either event, the apostle leaves as the Mermedonians continue to weep bitterly. God, however, appears and chastises him for his hard-heartedness, saying “quare flentes et obsecrantes te non exaudisti, ut scias, tu eos non exaudisti rogantes, exaudivi enim ego eos flentes, quia clamor eorum usque ad me pervenit” (“why didn’t you listen to them when they wept and besought
you? As you must realize, you didn’t hear them when they begged; but when they wept I heard them, for their cry reached up to me,’ Casanatensis, XXXIII, 16–19). He tells Andrew to return to the people for seven days in order to instruct them, for much which has been prepared in their hearts at such great cost will wither and come to nothing if he does not remain to confirm it. Moreover, Andrew’s lack of mercy toward the Mermedonians, and his subsequent chastisement by God, sound much like the old father’s lack of mercy toward his son and subsequent chastisement by Andrew mentioned only a short time earlier: a parallel considerably emphasized by what God commands next. He tells the apostle to raise all the men he condemned to the abyss. Andrew returns to teach the people for a further seven days, at which point he leaves amidst great rejoicing. They return to the city exclaiming their gratitude for the apostle who has shown them the one true God.

In Andreas, as he leaves, God appears to him and tells him to stay for seven days so that the Mermedonians may be confirmed in their new faith. This the apostle does, though the author changes the nature of this confirmation, for not only does the apostle instruct the people in the ordinances of the faith, but swylce se halga herigeas þreade, / deofulgild todraf ond gedwolan fylde (‘thus the saint attacked the heathen temples, drove away devil-worship and overthrew error,’ Andreas, 1687–8). When the saint sets out a second time, the text explicitly mentions his martyrdom, and this melancholy observation throws a pall over the remainder of the account which is in sharp contrast to the Casanatensis versions’ joyful departure scene. In a scene which bears striking resemblance to an Anglo-Saxon ship burial, the people weep on the shore as they bid him farewell. They exclaim God’s greatness and oneness, ending the speech and the entire poem with a declaration that echoes a resonant phrase in
Beowulf (11): þæt is æðele cyning (Andreas, 1722), perhaps hinting at a formulaic correspondence between this verse life and a secular analogue.

This examination of the coincidence and divergence between the two texts evidences a number of ways in which the Andreas-poet knowingly utilizes a dynamic relationship between indigenous content and style, on the one hand, and antique content and style, on the other, to compose a text which is considerably more consistent, affective and logically critical while reifying its themes than the prose accounts. As observed in this chapter, these qualities consistently align with the qualities posited by earlier of the verse halves of an opus geminatum, a mode of transmission with which the Andreas-poet was likely familiar. Thus, though one certainly sees, as Peters insists, that the author depends predominantly upon the antique legend for the content of his poem, concerns of style nevertheless intrude upon this level of the Andreas-poet’s reworking of the text, just as the respective natures of prose and verse are said, by writers as far back as Quintilian, to touch upon one another. In this study, these considerations appear most prominently in two ways: A) his decisions to omit or include content occurs so that these decisions have a pronounced, distinctive influence upon the particular styles in which the audience is able to read the text. Specifically, these influences play out in terms of heightened anxiety, irony and cruelty; B) the author’s destabilizing of the grounding of the content and style, for sometimes the content must be derived from the text, and at other times, it must be supplied by the reader, and likewise, the style is often based in the poem, and at other times, it is relocated to the reader. These two tendencies set Andreas apart from potential exemplars like the Casanatensis account.
As this examination has demonstrated, the *Andreas*-poet often adds, excises or retains content from the tradition of the legend so that the style in which it can be read is modulated in particular ways. For instance, the poet consistently culls traditional reassurances and insinuates numerous implications of danger so that a pervasive undertone of anxiety subtends one’s engagement with the content; for the reader, this promotes doubt in the text’s ‘providential’ outplay—in the development of its plot—in a manner similar to how the saint, about whom he or she reads, also doubts the outplay of God’s providence. Furthermore, he seems to deliberately add to or enhance the disjunction between the nature of the content and the nature of its style so that an ironic relationship manifests between what is said and what is meant. Finally, he uniformly removes questionable behaviour which would afterwards leave a questionable moral taint upon characters, such as lying or delighting in others’ suffering: so that the moral style, or tone, in which the saint is portrayed is somewhat redeemed from the image cast by the Casanatensis version. In each of these, it is the *Andreas*-poet’s unique decisions to include, revise, or excise content which dictates the style in which the reader reads, and this accords with the reading context which Alcuin recommends for verse lives, to be read again and again—for the reader *ruminare*, as he says—the text, in a way which seems to invite a much more critical, subjectively involved understanding of the text’s of irony.

Moreover, the *Andreas*-poet’s shifting of content and style variously between text and reader forces individual readers, by necessity, to contextualise what they read in their own, personal consciousness, using their particular contexts to supply at different times both the content of the text and the style of its engagement. More specifically, the reader is invited to apprehend the text in the specific idiom and values of their own, personal meaning-making systems, and thus, both *what* the text is
and how it obtains is to a significant extent what the reader ‘is’ and how he or she reifies that which their consciousness takes as object. However, because both the content and the style are not only in the reader, but also in the text, the reader may be inclined (like the poet) to acknowledge the actuality of the text and to enter into negotiations with the codex; what and how the text is, and what and how the reader imagines it to be, must in Andreas collaborate, even, in a sense, as this verse version seems to have collaborated with prose exemplars; in other words, the relationship between both the verse and the prose as well as the reader and the text are in strikingly similar ways dialogical.

More generally, the effect of shifting the authority which influences content and style between reader and text is to make Saint Andrew more relevant to Anglo-Saxon audiences. The saint originally was a construct of antique Mediterranean literary culture, and specifically its hagiography, along with the usual features of these texts: the hagiographical topoi and motifs, the antique tropes and schemes, the Latin or Greek language, and a host of Mediterranean cultural conventions which feed into the shaping of antique saints’ lives. Aspects like these constitute the originary text, and through these features it has the potential to signal its otherness to Andreas’ Anglo-Saxon audience. The Andreas-poet enters both directly and by proxy into negotiations with this originary text by writing the legend so that his audience must negotiate with it, but within the author’s literary framework, forcing this audience in numerous places, by the dynamics mentioned above, to supply both the text’s content and style. Thus, in a sense, the Anglo-Saxon audience, at the behest of the poet, must write back to the tradition of the saint, and these two authorities—text and reader—
must produce a synthetic work. In this manner then, one might also add to the two
dialogic processes above another between Latinate and vernacular cultures, where in
this case, using the metaphor of the *opus geminatum*, Anglo-Saxon culture takes upon
itself the verse role of the *opus geminatum*, and so the style, the critical acumen, the
affectivity which are ascribed to it by an inherited literary tradition, entering into
conversation with a Latin culture which in turn assumes the prose role of the *opus
geminatum*, along with its focus on content, pragmatism and rationality. This inbuilt
dynamic does much to explain the “rather uncomfortable mixture of ‘Germanic’ and
Latinate ideas’ in the poem. The mixture, comfortable or not, is a necessary outplay
of forcing a portion of the content and style out of the text’s provenance and into the
reader’s; it is the cost of making *Andreas* more pertinent to Anglo-Saxons by means
of necessary synthesis: by bringing the ‘thesis’ of the Latin account into contact with
the ‘antithesis’ of the Anglo-Saxon literary culture into the synthesis of what reifies as
*Andreas*.

It has long been plain to most scholars that when the *Andreas*-poet wrote this
poem, he was not merely translating languages and form, trying to carry over by these
as close a rendition of the exemplar as possible, but that he had revisions more
fundamental and unique in mind. However, what has often been overlooked is how
his critical engagement with the exemplar seems likely to have produced a work
which is not merely a new text which treats its tradition incidentally or contingently,
but as a work which answers back in some specific ways to that tradition. In other

---

73 This potential response by the audience perhaps opens in some interesting ways upon the wider
discussions surrounding the traffic between literary cultures as articulated in Post-Colonial studies; for
elements of such traffic, see, for instance, Bill Ashcroft, *The Empire Writes Back* (New York:
Routledge, 1989).
words, on numerous levels, the text seems not designed as ‘nothing other than this text here,’ but as ‘this text specifically in relation to that text,’ a relation which the context of the *opus geminatum* would lead one to anticipate, though it should be stressed that this does not limit *Andreas*’ frame of reference to that exemplar alone.

Thematic consistency is one of these levels of specific relation. As we have seen, the Casanatensis account often shifts its own thematic focus, or in places even contradicts it; for all the focus upon pragmatism and the appearances of rationality which are thought germane to prose accounts, the Casanatensis version legend, by any measure, embodies some deeply flawed logic. When one compares the two texts, the most prominent thematic shift, at least relative to *Andreas*, is during the Mermedonian beach scene, when the Latin Andrew violently laments his inability to recognize Christ, and considers this his (new) primary sin. This shifts focus from what had previously been the central thematic concern: the apostle’s lack of faithfulness. This lack of faithfulness had been heavily emphasized previously, both when Andrew is first called to rescue Matthew and again on the beach from which he sets out for Mermedonia. The dialogue in these scenes is involved, the reasoning deliberate, and the imagery is evocative. Nor does God in the Latin respond to this new thematic focus in Mermedonia with similar detail and careful reasoning, but answers briefly and unconvincingly.

In *Andreas*, by contrast, the second scene is totally reworked to re-conform it to the prior thematic scene. The saint apologizes not at all about his inability to recognize Christ, but asserts, in line with the earlier thematic focus on faithfulness to God’s will, that all has transpired even as God said: that God’s providence ought to be followed in spite of anxiety about it. Building on the apostle’s proclamation, God then explains the nature of Andreas’ previous lack of faithlessness, affirms his present
faithfulness, and then reminds the apostle that He has promised to be faithful also to Matthew, rescuing that apostle from the prison, and Andreas is His agent in this faithfulness. This, like other revisions we have seen, become, under the Andreas-poet’s hand, well integrated, thematically consistent episodes (consider again the difference between the Casanatensis account and Andreas’ dialogue between Christ and the saint about sailing skill, Christ’s responses to the apostle on the first/third day in the gaol, or Matthew attitudes upon being blinded and imprisoned). In nearly every case where the Casanatensis-author seems to show signs of thematic inconsistency, we see that the Andreas-poet has revised in the manner described above. Thus, though this verse version of the legend is, as a verse version may be expected to be, more affective than pragmatic, this here does not preclude the fact that it seems to be also more concerned with its reasoning and what it implies.

Moreover, though the Latin version emphasises information, or content, over, in this case, Andreas’ affective style, and though an affective response may or may not develop out of this information, this still tends, relative to Andreas, to be a contingent concern. Consider, for instance, the differences between how the Casanatensis account and Andreas handle the offering of the Old Man’s children/child, or how the appeal of flyting replaces the compulsion of pragmatism.75 This empirical, content based approach of the Latin legend may be part of what impels scholars like Calder to typify its phrasing as “functionally bland language,” especially if ‘bland’ is understood here to mean something like emotionless.76 Thus,
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75 Cf. pages 73–75 and 77–79.
decisions of the Casanatensis-author to retain, add or excise content certainly change what one knows, but have a comparatively diminished effect upon how one knows it.

Relative to this tendency, the manipulation of content in *Andreas* has a considerably enhanced influence upon the style in which it is perceived. Likewise, when it is not employing conventional figurative modes, such as typology or symbolism, the Casanatensis version presents its material in a very direct, literal way; what is to be sought is found ultimately in the literal levels of the text. As has been seen, this too is exactly in line with characteristics attributed to the prose version of a legend. *Andreas*, on the other hand, often depends upon non-figurative implication (such as with Matthew’s restored vision and wits). This means that much more content must be supplied by the reader of the Old English version (which nevertheless also depends heavily upon conventional figurative machinery). Moreover, the Latin version’s comparative indifference toward rhetorical adornment, and even description, shifts focus away from the affective effect the legend may have upon a reader; in fact, when the author does add adornment, it is expressed (by modern standards at least) with a distinct lack of poise and elegance, such as during Andrew’s apology to God on the Mermedonian beach; it reads rather like a stiffly self-conscious rhetorical exercise, with little sense of balance, control or moderation. Likewise, on the few occasions when he may be cultivating a particular attitude, or style of reading in his reader, what the Casanatensis-author seems to anticipate is frequently mere rational acquiescence: that how the plot, the content, proceeds is reasonable (consider, again, the execution scene of the Old Man’s children).

However, as the consistency of the *Andreas*-poet’s implications or excisions of content has evidenced, he relies fundamentally upon his audience’s perception of what is or is not implied, and upon their response to that, for a particular imaginative
and emotional posture towards the poem. On the other hand, he also attempts by the hints supplied in his text to guide the intentionality of the reader, and so enters into a symbiotic relationship whereby content and style intermingle between them. For instance, as we have seen, the tensions between faith and doubt are interwoven with great consistency throughout the entire text, and this tension must be fundamentally supplied by the reader in response to hints and implications in the content; thus, the style (namely, reading in a mood of heightened anxiety) becomes a symbiotic element of the theme; one cannot divorce the affective style from the raw content.

Finally, we have observed that the *Andreas*-poet is far more critical about the causality which gives rise to the content and style of the legend. We have already noted that the poet of the Old English version focuses consistently and consciously upon aspects of mendacity, anxiety and irony in his revision. However, to do so implies necessarily both an author and a reader who adopt an active, critical stance in regards to content and style, rather than a passive one: that both look back at motives and forward to implications in order to generate their sense of what the text is, and this critical activity can explain many of the revisions in *Andreas*. For instance, when the Old Man offers his son up in his own place, the language in the Old English is incongruous with the sentiment it conveys; so explicit and consistent is this disjunction that to assume it is mere ineptitude on the part of the author, as so many scholars have done, while the author has shown himself so consistently astute in so many other revisions of the poem, seems unconvincing. Rather, it seems far more plausible that the author might have wanted, in some way, for his audience to wonder whether the style in this scene is appropriate for the content? Since this seems more likely than not, a tone of the irony undercuts the narrative.
Again, the *Andreas*-poet culls or revises incidents of mendacity found in earlier versions, which seems to demonstrate that he is thinking ahead to how the plot will develop. For example, when in the Latin God tells Andrew he will be killed, it turns out ultimately that he will not. The *Andreas*-poet removes this statement, saying instead that Andreas will suffer greatly, which is true. The poet has thought ahead, and so it is not unlikely that he would have expected his audience to as well. Finally, the *Andreas*-poet revises God’s chastisement of Andreas’ initial recalcitrance toward this mission so that God implies that the lack of faithfulness which the apostle’s present hesitation make so clear will be tested far more severely when the real suffering begins. The entire added dialogue is without point unless the reader, by actively drawing conclusions which are not stated in the legend, supplies the necessary point: if A, and if B, then, necessarily C; that is, if he becomes unfaithful in situations of little distress now, and if the future holds vastly greater distress, then, necessarily, he will be even more unfaithful in that situation. It further implies that the saint, if he wishes to remain faithful to God’s will, must find a new source or method of remaining faithful. At neither this point nor at any other in the Casanatensis version is such a vigorous contemplation required to understand the text, while in *Andreas* such active and critical stances are ubiquitous and pronounced. This critical stance extends to other revisions as well.

For example, the *Andreas*-poet revises the portrayal of the saint as the killer of the seven guards, so it seems that he has thought about the questionable moral implications this has for the saint. Following this impulse, he alters the plot so that an angel, without Andreas’ request, surrounds the city with a wall of fire which traps and so kills numerous Mermedonians, for the saint’s request would again imply that he is an active agent in the suffering and killing of the cannibals. He changes the text so
that God, not Andreas, makes the butchers’ weapons melt, demonstrating that he recognizes that the Latin version has in this episode given the agency to the saint, not God, and that God’s will, and so agency, are central to the theme: to displace this agency is to displace the theme. On the other hand, the poet of the Old English changes the text so that the saint reveals himself to the cannibals, instead of merely being found, for this implies that the saint has brought himself voluntarily into accordance with God’s will and his willing self-revelation thus contributes to the theme. Again, the Andreas-poet modifies the exemplar so that the waters, without the saint’s command, sweep the fourteen worst sinners into the abyss, confirming that the poet has once more understood that this might imply questions about the saint’s morality, and likewise with his removal of the incident wherein the saint refuses to forgive the old man who sacrificed his son. The distinctiveness of this Anglo-Saxon perspective is also implied by the fact that none of the above revisions are in any of the other fourteen prior versions of the legend.

Such a distinct perspective appears distinct precisely in light of this poem’s dialogic relationship with its potential Latin exemplars, framed strikingly in the genre of the opus geminatum: in the tension between verse and prose, style and content, affectivity and pragmatism or subjective and objective sourcing. However, the Casanatensis account is not the only text with which Andreas shares a relationship. The largely ignored prose account of the legend found in MS. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 198 bears remarkable affinities with both the Latin prose and the Anglo-Saxon verse versions analyzed here, and yet is simultaneously a radically different text, especially at the level of content. The textual relationships which exercise such an important influence upon Andreas would be incomplete without adding this level of consideration, for which, again, the opus geminatum paradigm
affords an extremely productive lens. However, before coming to that discussion, we must first turn away from all prose traditions of *Andreas* and toward its early medieval indigenous relationship, grounded most solidly in the formulaic correspondences between itself and *Beowulf.*
Chapter III

Andreas and Beowulf: Family Resemblances


Beowulf has long afforded scholars a critical background against which Andreas might be read, and if we now turn from the interplay between the Anglo-Saxon and Latin texts, one may observe, against Beowulf, a method by which the Andreas-poet potentially naturalizes the saint: by apparently borrowing from Beowulf’s formulae and their connotative resonances. The questions of whether, to what degree and to what purpose the Andreas-poet depends upon formulae drawn specifically from Beowulf have a long and fractious history amongst scholars of Old English, and a brief summary of that history is necessary here.1

As mentioned earlier,2 an initial scholarly view was that Andreas had been written by Cynewulf, but in 1879 this was challenged by Arthur Fritzsche, who suggested that the Andreas-poet was significantly indebted to Beowulf.3 The response to this suggestion ignited a debate which continues to the present. George Krapp, in his critical edition, found Fritzsche’s proposal compelling, and added that the overall plot of Andreas also seemed to conform generally to that of Beowulf.4 However, Peters’ much later response, that all major plot developments of Andreas are found first and foremost in the Greek and Latin tradition, has since shifted the focus of Krapp’s claim towards the Latin source text’s interaction with the traditions and
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1 This has recently been summarised eloquently and at great length by Alison Powell, “Verbal Parallels.”
2 See above, 34–35.
4 Krapp, Andreas, lv–lvi.
influence of *Beowulf* as these reify in *Andreas.* On the other hand, claims of verbal borrowing from *Beowulf* have proven more durable.

Approaches to verbal parallels range from outright rejections of any direct influence, through an influence arising from the *Andreas*-poet’s general or subconscious familiarity with *Beowulf,* to theories of direct and deliberate appropriation. Gregor Sarrazin insisted that verbal similarities between *Andreas,* the four ‘Cynewulfian poems,’ *Beowulf,* *The Phoenix,* both Guthlac poems, and *The Riddles* were due to shared authorship, since they had all been written by Cynewulf. However, Sarrazin made no distinctions between unique parallels and those occurring more generally, nor considered their frequency, nor accounted for the difference between verbatim parallels and those with varying verbal elements. Friedrich Klaeber, along with recognizing verbal borrowing, adopted Krapp’s position that the plot of *Beowulf* provided a sort of template according to which *Andreas* was written. Klaeber, however, offered another idea along with this position which has proven productive: that the phrases shared between the two poems point up the specificity of their relationship, as well as the direction of borrowing, by means of the often awkward fit in *Andreas* of phrases which are unproblematic in *Beowulf.* Stopford Brooke, on the other hand, laid the groundwork for the more persistent view that the *Andreas*-poet borrowed directly and explicitly from both the work of Cynewulf and from *Beowulf.* Charles Kennedy likewise echoed that there was considerable evidence of familiarity
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7 Klaeber, *Klaeber’s Beowulf,* cxi.
between *Andreas* and *Beowulf* and suggested further that the imitation is deliberate and explicit.⁹

In 1948, however, a shift in critical views began. Kemp Malone insisted that the existence of a general stock of Old English poetic formulae undercut claims of specific borrowing between *Andreas* and *Beowulf*.¹⁰ Dorothy Whitelock added weight to this uncertainty, positing that “[o]ne can make a case for the influence of *Beowulf* on *Andreas* . . . but it stops short of proof.”¹¹ On the other hand, and simultaneously, Claes Schaar published an article which continued to assert that the *Andreas*-poet drew directly upon *Beowulf*, but added a critical judgement which would become prevalent in subsequent treatments of *Andreas*: that in lifting the phrases out of their context in *Beowulf*, the *Andreas*-poet shifted from an original mode of composition to ‘mere’ imitation. This manifested, to Schaar’s thinking, into errors not only of grammar and meter, but more damningly into errors of aesthetic judgement and stylistic sense.¹²

The vital catalyst for the shift away from theories of specific borrowing, however, came in 1953, when Francis Magoun brought Milman Parry’s and Albert Lord’s oral-formulaic theories to bear upon Old English verse.¹³ Parry and Lord, by comparing repeated phrases in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* with the phrasing of early twentieth-century Serbian oral poets, located a dynamic of composition which
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enabled considerable memorization and improvisation skills in the performance of traditional poems. Magoun borrowed Parry and Lord’s definition of formula, ‘a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea,’ and sought out formulaic elements in Beowulf, discovering that about 70% of the first twenty-five lines of Beowulf is also found scattered in various poems elsewhere in the corpus of Old English poetry. He suggested that if more poems had survived, much of the remaining 30% would appear. Two years later, Magoun and Greenfield went on to also apply Parry and Lord’s theory of ‘formulaic themes’ to Old English verse. This involved what Lord called a ‘subject unit’ or group of ideas regularly employed by the poet across a broad range of poems. These subject units Parry and Lord distinguished from motifs and topics, motifs being composed of a single idea rather than a network of ideas, and the topics consisting more generally of those concepts upon which ‘subject units’ spoke. Subsequently, Donald Fry’s definition of a formula has become the most prevalent in Old English studies: “a recurring concatenation of details and ideas, not restricted to a specific event, verbatim repetition, or certain [verbal] formulas, which forms an underlying structure for an action or description.” Magoun identified and explicated the

---


formulaic theme of the ‘beasts of battle,’\textsuperscript{18} while Greenfield explored the theme of ‘exile.’\textsuperscript{19} As with Magoun’s earlier article, these discussions became the seminal works for numerous later avenues of scholarship in the study of Old English poetry, though as shall be discussed presently, these avenues were not without dissenting voices.

An immediate advantage was that many poorly substantiated parallels which had been previously posited between \textit{Andreas} and \textit{Beowulf} were called into question, for they could now be more convincingly explained as arising from access to a common tradition of formulae. In addition, oral-formulaic theory afforded scholars a mode of engagement which could situate individual poems more clearly and convincingly in their overall literary culture. However, to some extent, the theory also became a victim of its own success.

A warning to this effect was already raised by 1966, when Larry Benson proposed that the pervasiveness and utility of the theory was so ascendant that it was no longer applied nor invoked critically, but was accepted arbitrarily as dogma.\textsuperscript{20} Both Fry\textsuperscript{21} and Orchard\textsuperscript{22} have since reiterated this warning.

More serious, however, is the persistence of Magoun’s supposition, that an appreciable number of formulae in a poem indicates the oral composition of that poem: “oral poetry . . . is composed entirely of formulas, large and small, while

Whether the *Andreas*-poet borrows formulae from a manuscript,\textsuperscript{31} memory of a specific recitation (in this case, of *Beowulf*), or from a general knowledge of formulae, there is no doubt that he is borrowing from a source, and a competent engagement of the poem requires that we try to the best of our ability to locate and understand this source.

Kenneth Brooks’ response, writing in 1961, was indicative of both this critical imperative and the new-found caution which subtended its pursuit. Brooks suggested that it is unwise to posit clear lines of borrowing between texts in light of their dependence upon conventional formulae, but that between *Andreas* and *Beowulf* there exists such a preponderance of shared formulae, which are unique to these two poems alone, and that so many of these formulaic congruencies are metrically and grammatically unproblematic in *Beowulf*, but flawed in the same senses in *Andreas*, that the theory of explicit borrowing becomes difficult to ignore.\textsuperscript{32}

Five years later, Rosemary Woolf argued more boldly that the *Andreas*-poet borrowed from *Beowulf*’s formulae “for the sake of allusion rather than for their propriety in the new context.”\textsuperscript{33} Thomas Shippey took issue with this assertion on two points: first, it presumes that *Beowulf* was familiar enough for allusions, and specifically formulaic allusions, to be recognizable to the audience. Second, that instances of formulaic correspondences are too sporadic and random to convincingly


\textsuperscript{32} Brooks, *Andreas*, xxiii–xxiv, and again, xxv–xxvi.

demonstrate much literary purpose. Shippey’s doubts seem prudent, but to these some qualifications should be added.

The sporadic nature of formulaic parallels may not necessarily be due to Anglo-Saxon compositional conventions, but to modern deficiencies of understanding and discerning them. As I will presently discuss, recent years have produced considerable scholarship which locates a much more pervasive, systematic and deliberate approach to the selection of formulae by Anglo-Saxon authors than has previously been assumed; in regards to the formulaic relationship between Beowulf and Andreas, it has at least had the virtue of showing that we did not know what we thought we knew. Since the assumption that there was nothing cogent and verifiable to be seen has been itself called into question, one cannot say with confidence that there is no ‘literary point’ to the relationship between the two poems’ formulae. Moreover, numerous Old English poems make frequent allusions, explicit and implicit, to characters who do not play any part in them, but who by the very obliqueness and brevity of mention are plainly expected to be recognized. In other words, they depend consistently upon grounding themselves not only in the tradition of inherited formulae, but also inherited content. Given this tendency, is it implausible that Andreas gestures not only, by means of its content’s tradition, to its antique exemplars, and by means of typology, to scripture, but also, by means of formulaic echoes, to secular and vernacular texts? The inability to deny a ‘literary point’ is

35 The focus of this thesis doesn’t permit an exhaustive discussion of all such references made in Old English literature, but a few representative examples include Beowulf’s mention of Sigemund and Fitela (874–97), who also figure prominently in Scandinavian works like the Völsunga saga, Eormenric (1201), who is mentioned also in Deor and Widsith, or Weland (455), who figures so prominently in the Völundarkviða. Weland is also inserted incidentally in King Alfred’s translation of Boethius’ Consolation of Philosophy (Book X).
36 For the new, very extensive scholarship on typological resonances in Andreas, see note 17, in Chapter II.
further underwritten by a growing awareness of our ignorance about how these echoes might have been used. Finally, even if the allusions to other texts in Andreas may or may not have been unclear to its audience, are we similarly certain that they must be unclear, or unclear in the same way, to its author? If the Andreas-poet did borrow formulae, surely it is more likely that these were learned from specific texts rather than a general, disembodied tradition, and if so, then the allusiveness of a given, borrowed formula back to the source from which it was learned would necessarily be plain to the author, if not the audience. All these points will be taken up in this chapter, but suffice it to say at this point that though oral-formulaic theory has shown that arguments for formulaic correspondence between Andreas and Beowulf must forego assertions of absolute verity and reconcile themselves rather to hypothetical claims, so too must denials of those formulaic congruencies acknowledge their conjectural character; as Whitelock had asserted that the formulaic relationship between the two poems stops short of proof, so too, we must admit, does the denial that there is one. In other words we must doubt wisely. Thus, both opposing views must explicitly admit their hypothetical or speculative nature, and since the question of correspondences cannot be ignored, it follows that it is not fundamentally important whether, first and foremost, these claims surrounding the issue are hypothetical or not, but which hypotheses seem more or less convincing. As it presently stands, the case for borrowing between Beowulf and Andreas is a good one.

37 A further point is that if, as Woolf points out, Beowulf may be in some degree indebted to hagiographical conventions, motifs and even ‘subject units,’ (review of Andreas and Fates of the Apostles, ed. Kenneth Brooks, Medium Aevum 32 (1963): 135) as Andreas certainly is, then conventional parallels, or allusions, become not only likely, but almost necessary. A fascinating study of the relationship between hagiography and Beowulf has recently been undertaken by Christine Rauer, Beowulf and the Dragon: Parallels and Analogues (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000).
This was also the sense of Arthur Brodeur, who held reservations about the approach used by Peters to deny a correspondence between *Beowulf* and *Andreas*, since Peters considered formulaic parallels in isolation and selectively. However, Brodeur also felt that Peters was correct to maintain that there was no consistent, conscious imitation of the secular text by the *Andreas*-poet. Rather, Brodeur suggests, the author of *Andreas* was simply so familiar with *Beowulf* that its particular formulae occurred to him subconsciously and unbidden as he composed his poem.38 Following in this vein, Michael Cherniss insisted that echoes of *Beowulf* which resonate throughout *Andreas* are not conscious, since this would anticipate that such brief allusions could be recognized by his audience, an idea which, he claimed, would be difficult to credit.39 This claim, however, seems wrong-headed, since even now, when mnemonically rich apprehensions of poetry are far less common than during the Anglo-Saxon era, brief, distinctive phrases still remain sufficient to point a competent reader or auditor toward other, specific texts; ‘rosy-fingered dawn’ or ‘April is the cruelest month, breeding,’ all maintain a distinctive register capable of gesturing back to the individual texts of our literary tradition. More convincing is the view of David Hamilton, who agreed with Woolf to argue that the resemblance between formulae in either text is deliberate and full of allusive purpose, that the poet “cultivated ways of marking departures from the epic, or from the old heroic tradition that *Beowulf* best conveys for us.”40 Moreover, he insisted that the *Andreas*-poet manipulates this

relationship so that a deliberate strain, often ironic, obtains between the two uses of particular formulae.\(^{41}\)

Derek Pearsall also noted the tension in this relationship, but hearkened in his assessment back to the disparagement of Schaar, suggesting that the composition of *Andreas* demonstrates an infatuation with *Beowulf* which exercises such a powerful effect that the *Andreas*-poet’s obsession with eliciting the power of ‘Beowulfian’ language displaces any true engagement with his content.\(^{42}\) Robert Fulk, on the other hand, evaded most of the controversy by simply stating that *Andreas* seems to allude to *Beowulf*.\(^{43}\) Since then, Fulk’s studied ambivalence towards questions of verbal or structural borrowing between the two texts has become a common, politic approach to these issues.

A number of scholars went further, insisting that dwelling upon the relationship between *Andreas* and *Beowulf* was becoming unproductive, and so called for a treatment of *Andreas* in isolation from potentially unhelpful comparisons. Edward Irving suggested that the criteria for assessing *Beowulf* were different than those for assessing *Andreas*, and simply because the latter could not, by any criteria, match the former, did not mean that *Andreas* was necessarily a bad poem, since no Old English poem could readily equal *Beowulf*. Rather, he called for a reading of the poem for its own sake.\(^{44}\) Calder also sought a less rigid reading of *Andreas*, noting that though there were indeed strong parallels with *Beowulf*, there were also numerous


\(^{43}\) Robert Fulk, ‘Dating *Beowulf*,’ 345.

\(^{44}\) Irving, “*Andreas*,” 215.
parallels with other Old English poems, such as Cynewulf’s work, and a great deal of originality as well: that all these levels of comparison ought to be kept in mind.\textsuperscript{45}

However, after a period of indifference or aversion to specific relationships between \textit{Andreas} and \textit{Beowulf}, the discussion has been forcefully reopened. Anita Riedinger, in 1985 and again in 1993, using Jess Bessinger’s \textit{A Concordance to the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records}, suggested a direct relationship between \textit{Beowulf} and \textit{Andreas}. Riedinger had been drawn to this debate by the point noted earlier from Brooks, who observed that the sheer quantity of shared, unique formulae between these two texts made their direct association difficult to deny. Riedinger found the argument for sharing compelling by way of not only idiosyncratic and particular borrowing, but the overall “shared formulaic diction, including non-identical members of sets.”\textsuperscript{46} By using \textit{Beowulf}, rather than \textit{Andreas}, as her base text, Riedinger noted that the correspondence of formulae between the two texts tend to cluster around specific passages in \textit{Beowulf}; because previous scholarship had used \textit{Andreas} as the base text, this clustering had remained unnoticed. This suggested that if there is a relationship between the two texts, then the \textit{Andreas}-poet is borrowing either from particular passages of \textit{Beowulf} which he has memorized or, as Riedinger asserted, from a manuscript where he copies formulae from his favourite passages.

Thus, for example:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Bwf} 721b \hspace{1cm} Dura sona onarn \hspace{1cm} (The door opened at once) \\
\item \textit{And} 999b \hspace{1cm} Dura sona onarn \hspace{1cm} (The door opened at once) \\
\item \textit{Bwf} 730b \hspace{1cm} Þa his mod ahlog \hspace{1cm} (Then his spirit laughed)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{45} Calder, “Figurative Language,” 119.

\textsuperscript{46} Anita Riedinger, “The Poetic Formula in \textit{Andreas}, \textit{Beowulf} and the Tradition” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1985): 183. By sets, Riedinger means “a group of verses usually sharing the same function and system in which one word, usually stressed, is constant, and at least one stressed word may be varied, usually synonymously, to suit the alliterative and/or narrative contexts . . . all the verses in a set constitute the same formula—whether or not they repeat one another verbatim.”
These three in *Beowulf* all occur within 11 lines, and what makes this clustering even more fascinating is that the first two of these collocations are, like so many others, unique to *Beowulf* and *Andreas* alone. The uniqueness of their shared formulaic diction, its sheer quantity, and the striking clusters of borrowing in what is, according to relative chronology, a repository of formulae upon which the *Andreas*-poet drew, inclined Riedinger to conclude that the *Andreas*-poet has consciously drawn upon formulae and clusters of formulae from *Beowulf* to remodulate the values with which they are traditionally associated.  

Unfortunately, Riedinger’s work did not inspire as much attention as it warranted. In 1997, Carol Funk’s dissertation considered the relationship anew, but though she did a thorough job of reviewing the previous research and studying the analogues, there was little critical assessment of the findings and no clear conclusion to her work. In 2002, however, Alison Powell addressed the issue more productively.

In her dissertation, by means of a detailed comparison between formulae in Cynewulf’s poetry, *Beowulf* and *Andreas*, Powell amasses very considerable support for the hypothesis that the *Andreas*-poet borrowed from particular texts. The framing of her hypothesis is informed by four considerations: 1) that the general stock of formulae which an Anglo-Saxon poet learned would more likely be acquired from

---

49 Carol Funk, “History of *Andreas* and *Beowulf*: Comparative Scholarship,” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Denver, 1997).
specific poems, not a general, decontextualized tradition of formulae; 2) unless oral composition is assumed, highly formulaic poets (like the Andreas-poet) are more likely to borrow because their poetry employs existing verse; 3) because Anglo-Saxon poets possessed refined mnemonic skills, they would be likely to recall what they had heard, and thus employ it in their own work; 4) in a context in which poems were heard more often than read, and whose poems were seldom ascribed to particular authors, a sense of common ownership, and so borrowing between poets, seems more likely.

Powell goes on to locate 344 formulaic parallels between the two poems, of which 89 are unique to these two poems, and discovers that the “sheer density of parallels argues persuasively that the perceived influence of Beowulf . . . on Andreas is real.” Amongst other things, her research finds that one in five lines of Andreas finds at least a partial parallel in Beowulf, and that one line in every 19 is unique to these two poems. Detailed analysis of these parallels reveals that there is a curious congruence whereby the borrowings share idiosyncratic uses of meter, sense and syntax. Often this manifests, as mentioned more generally by previous scholars, as incongruous or incorrect usage in Andreas when it is not so in Beowulf. Also, taking her lead from Riedinger, Powell traces out, albeit in more detail, the tendency of the Andreas-poet to borrow from particular passages of Beowulf. On the other hand, she notes of the nature of borrowing that there are numerous, non-verbatim collocations of verbal elements which seem to indicate that the Andreas-poet is recalling combinations of words (or even just sounds), rather than a particular semantic

In sum, Powell’s argument for specific borrowing has assembled considerably more evidence, across a considerably wider range, employing considerably stronger logic, than previous investigations of the relationship between *Andreas* and *Beowulf*.

As a consequence, it affords current scholars enough concrete grounding for the hypothesis of specific relations to ask contingent questions: in this case, how do potential importations of connotative resonances from *Beowulf* inform one’s sense of sainthood as this is conceptualized in *Andreas*? Clearly the dynamics of twinning, of the *opus geminatum*, figure prominently in such a question, and the concerns intrinsic to the genre discussed in the introduction transfer here to levels of prosody, motif and connotation as these subsist between the two texts, though of course *Beowulf* is not a ‘twin’ to *Andreas* in the same, explicit mode that *Andreas* is a twin to a source text in the Casanatensis tradition; rather the forumulae of *Beowulf* facilitate at the prosodic and semantic levels that twinning between *Andreas* and the saintly legend upon which it is based. These levels must here take the foreground of the discussion, but are subtended throughout by those same questions germane to twinning to which I shall return during the conclusion.

Moreover, as in the previous chapter, the interest here is to discern the functional rather than the substantive or the intentional relationship between the two texts: in other words, it is not the aim of this discussion to merely catalogue exhaustively all instances of connotative or thematic similarity between the poems, nor try to discern the intentions of the *Andreas*-poet as he considers his work in
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52 Powell, Ibid, 234.
relation to text like *Beowulf*, but to consider rather, how resonances between poems work to change one’s apprehension of the saintly legend.

To make such an undertaking practical, this examination will employ a number of filters in order to increase the specificity and probability of the formulaic relationship, and thus the distinctiveness of the connotative imprint they import. Since the range of formulaic parallels between the two poems is vast, some 344, according to Powell, this chapter will only review those which are unique to these two texts, which brings the number down to 89. However, in consideration of the general tradition upon which the *Andreas*-poet might or might not have drawn, and the amount of the formulaic corpus lost, I will narrow this further by considering only those unique parallels which cluster together in *Beowulf*. This brings the number down to 36 instances in ten clusters. I define as a cluster three or more lines of which the first three are within fifteen lines of one another, plus whatever more are within ten lines thereafter. In these, in order to address the misgivings and condemnation of Schaar and Pearsal about the awkward contextual fit of formulae in *Andreas* which are well-integrated in *Beowulf*, I will first examine each cluster in *Beowulf* with a discussion of that cluster’s prosodic aspects, then investigate the

---

53 Powell, Ibid, 111.
54 See Appendix II.
overall semantic and connotative texture of that cluster, and finally analyze each individual parallel as this is then situated within *Andreas*. Following Riedinger, I will use *Beowulf* as the base text, and view the borrowing from that poem’s perspective. Thus, *Beowulf* will dominate the initial part of each discussion which prefaces the analysis of individual clusters. One final qualification is required. The connotative parallels traced between clusters in *Beowulf* and passages in *Andreas* may initially give the appearance of mere opportunism, since both poems might by coincidence share numerous connotations deriving from their shared Anglo-Saxon world-view: that such connotative parallels could be drawn between any portion of either text by means of close readings. However, as will be demonstrated, both the specificity, in terms of repetition and antithetical variation, and the quantity of connotative parallels argues strongly away from circumstantial affinity and toward a much more deliberate relationship.

**Cluster I.**

The first cluster of formulae consists of five ‘Beowulfian’ lines: 218a–b, 222b, 228b, 229a and 238b. This group derives from the account of Beowulf’s sea-voyage to Denmark, reading from the vessel’s cast-off thus (217–240a, correspondences in bold):

```
Gewat þa ofer wægholm,         winde gefysed,
flota famiheals         fugle gelicost,
oðþæt ymb antid         oþres dogores
wundenstefna         gewaden hæfde                                220
þæt ða liðende         land gesawon,
brimclifu bican,         beorgas steape,
```

---

side sænæssas; þa wæs sund liden, eole[tes] æt ende. þanon up hraðe
Wedera leode on wang stigon, sæwudu sældon (syrca hrysedon, guðgewædo), gode þancedon
þæs þe him yblade eaðe wurdon. Þa of wealle geseah weard Scildinga, se þe holmcifu healdan scolde, beran ofer bolcan beorhtes randas, fyrdsearu fuslicu; hine fyrwyt bræc modgehýgdum, hwæt þa men wæron. Gewat him þa to waroðe wiege ridan þegn Hroðgares, þrymmum cwehte mægenwudu mundum, meþelwordum frægn: “Hwæt syndon ge searohæbbendra, byrnum werede, þe þus brontne eol ofer lagustrate lædan cwomon, hider ofer holmas?”

[Then over the ocean (of) waves, driven by the wind, went the foam-necked floater (or ship), most like a bird, until in due time of the next day the curved prow had traveled so that the mariners sighted land, gleaming sea—cliffs (and) steep crags, broad headlands; then was the sea crossed (and) the voyage at an end. Briskly from there the people of the Weder—Geats landed upon the beach, secured the sea—timbers—chain—mail shirts jingled, war—attire—they thanked God, for the fact that the sea—voyage had been easy. When from the embankment the warden of the Scyldings, he who must guard the sea—cliffs, saw carried down the gang—plank bright shields (and) readied war—gear, questions broke upon him in his mind—thoughts: who were these men? Then, riding a horse, he went (down) to the shore, the thane of Hrothgar, mightily shook (in) his hands a massive spear (and) asked with words (of) speech: “Who are you, armour—wearers, clad in chain—mail, who come thus leading (the) tall keel over sea—paths?”]

The first portion of this segment (to 228) appears to be a set—piece description; for instance, compare its sequence of imagery with Beowulf’s return journey, from lines 1903 to 1913. This introduces the scene once more with A) gewat, B) notes the vessel is wind-driven: (1905–1908a): þa wæs be mæste merehægla sum, / segl sale faest;

sundwudu þunedæ. / No þær wegflotan wind ofer yðum / siðes getwæðde . . . C)
describes it as foam-necked (1909): *famigheals*, D) insinuates a prow image (1910): *bundenstefna ofer brim-streamas*, E) mentions that the sailors sight land (1911): *þæt hie Geata clifu ongitan meahton*, F) recounts the imagery of headlands (1912): *cuþe næssas*, and G) ends with the landing. This sequence of images follows the first scene precisely.57 Since lines 217 to 228 do seem a set-piece scene, at least two conjectures in regards to questions of transmission dynamics may be suggested. First, the unity of this segment greatly increases the likelihood that when these lines were memorized, they would be memorized as a coherent group, not individually or sporadically. Thus, if another poet were searching his memory for formulae, and had memorized this scene, a significant selection of his borrowed formulae would naturally cluster in the antecedent text—in that set-piece episode—as they might have here in *Beowulf*, and thereby emphasize, in addition to individual borrowed formulae, the explicit relationship between the two texts. Second, and on the other hand, it is possible that the *Andreas*-poet had, as Riedinger suggests, a manuscript by his side, and when he sought formulae which spoke to a particular subject, in this case sea-voyages, he turned to the portions of *Beowulf* which described such subjects. The first sea-voyage he would have encountered in the *Beowulf* manuscript would have been 217 to 228. However, if the opus *geminatum tradition* is a prevalent mode by which authors create new versions of old legends, especially when exercised upon such a loose revisioning of the legend as *Andreas*, then it seems more plausible, though not absolutely so, that the *Andreas*-poet is memorizing portions of text before he draws

upon them in his written composition. The nature of oral-formulaic Anglo-Saxon poetry also inclines us to prefer the notion of a memorized source to a written one.

In either case, this passage would have offered the Andreas-poet a rich selection of language, for as Orchard observes, the Beowulf-poet deploys a great deal of variation in this section, potentially presenting the Andreas-poet with a wide array of terms with which to describe a range of nouns: ships (flota, wundenstefna, sæwudu); the sea (waeholm, sund, eoletes); land (land, brimclifu, beorgas, sænessas, wang). As he also notes of the compounds here, only one is found elsewhere. In fact, in the 23 line passage, there are 14 compounds, meaning that on average there is a compound every 1.6 lines. Arthur Brodeur counts 903 compounds in Beowulf’s 3182 lines. Thus the poem overall averages one compound every 3.52 lines, an average which will be important to keep in mind as we proceed. Here, clearly, the selection of compounds is much more replete. Similarly, many scholars have noted that the Beowulf-poet often uses double alliteration to highlight particular passages; slightly under half of its lines, or 47%, employ it. Here this aspect, though somewhat above normal, is not particularly noteworthy, since only 12 lines, or 52%, use double alliteration. Due to the piece’s verbal richness and verbal uniqueness, not to mention

---

61 Arthur Brodeur, The Art of Beowulf: 1–38
its prosodic unity, it suggests itself strongly as a passage to be memorized and thus
drawn upon.63

The next portion of the text concerns the coast-warden’s perception of the Geatish landing and his initial challenge. It is introduced by a line whose anaphoric echoes (a feature also known as incremental repetition) derive not from a repeated word or phrase, but from a shared alliteration, on ‘w,’ with line which opened the sea voyage just above, thereby both associating this passage with the previous set-piece, but also signaling a new beginning (Pa of wealle geseah weard Scildinga and Gewat pa ofer wegholm, winde gefysed).64 The first line adds consonance (on geseah and Scildinga) to its simple alliteration, the second line employs double alliteration and both have b-lines which are rhythmically identical (/xx/x).65 When read aloud, the echo of the line above is aurally striking. However, aligning sense with sound, the anaphoric echo, like the warden’s actions it describes, becomes both explicit and decisive as he starts down the bank to challenge the Geats, for this portion once more begins with gewat, places this in very close proximity with its earlier mention, only seventeen lines above, like the set-piece line, alliterates, on the ‘w,’ integrates consonance on the ‘r’ and again employs double alliteration (Gewat him pa to warode wiege ridan). Individually, these points of association are not decisive, but when considered together—the proximity of repetition, the alliterative parallels, and the

64 Of interest here is Constance Hiett, “Envelope Patterns.”
rhythmic resemblance—the deliberate unity of the piece becomes considerably more pronounced.

The reason for pointing out these anaphoric echoes and the associations they suggest is to stress the unity which the prosodic framework in this section of the text insinuates and in which the *Andreas*-correspondences cluster. As with the set-piece above, it renders more plausible the idea that if a poet memorized portions of *Beowulf*, he would likely select and demarcate what he memorized by the prosodic signals which sets a section of the poem off from the text around it. This pervasive, structural anaphora is one such signal. Thus, this cluster of borrowings appears already to cluster together prior to the unity suggested by *Andreas*’ echoes (assuming, with the general consensus of scholarship, that *Beowulf* precedes *Andreas*) and independent of any external comparisons, by means of its own internal, formalistic architecture; in other words, the formulae cluster together on many levels first on their own in *Beowulf*, but then again in the fact that they all are employed by the *Andreas*-poet. Therefore, it considerably reduces the likelihood that the clustering of *Andreas*’ formulaic correspondences in *Beowulf* is coincidence. It clusters there for a reason.

In addition, if one follows the text up to line 240, following the final shared formula to the end of its sense in the next line, the variation upon the concepts mentioned in the passage above affords a potential borrower even more synonyms upon which to draw: *ceol*, bringing the number of terms in this section for ship to
four; *lagustræte, holmas*, up to five for sea; *holmclifu, wealle*,\(^{66}\) *waroðe*, to eight for land. Likewise, as before, both of the above compounds are unique to *Beowulf*.

This brings the discussion around to the connotations of the cluster. The general sense is one of movement and dynamism, along with the resonance of excitement and potentially rashness which these imply; Beowulf is moving into action and the doing of deeds, a point which will be underscored, nuanced and made explicit at the far end of the voyage by the Coast-Warden.\(^{67}\) The diction and imagery amply contribute to the sense of movement. *Gewat* opens two passages in this section, and ship does not simply sail, but is *winde gefysed*, so that the foam of its velocity—the bone in its teeth—builds up about its prow (*famiheals*); it is *fugle gelicost*, soaring towards its destination. Upon arrival, the iconography and context of a sea-raid—one of the most typical and dynamic ‘deeds’ of heroes—is pervasive. The poet wastes no time on commentary, but moves straight into description; the voyage is at an end and the Geats *hraðe* leap out onto the shore, their *syrkan hrysedon*, their *guðgewædo*, and they secure their vessel which just before had been sailing along so swiftly. With its impetus arrested, the emphasis of action shifts by means of the war attire to battle.

This impression is confirmed and reinforced by the Coast-Warden, who sees with understandable alarm the shields and war-gear being brought down the gangplank.\(^{68}\) He wastes little time deliberating about what he sees, but instead matches their activity with his own, for the *gewat* of the Geats is met now with the *gewat* of

---

\(^{66}\) *Wealle* is often translated as wall (cf. Seamus Heaney’s, John Porter’s or Howell Chickering’s translations). However, it is known now and would have been implausible to an audience then to think that the Danish peninsula was surrounded by a wall (the suggestiveness of the Danevirk would have been by most accounts anachronistic). Thus I translate *wealle* in the same figurative sense that we might describe an embankment as a ‘wall of rock’ or a ‘rock face.’

\(^{67}\) Martin Puhvel, *Cause and Effect in Beowulf: Motivation and Driving Forces behind Words and Deeds* (Lanham: UP of America, 2005).

the Warden, and he both goes, like the Geatish ship, and rides in a single line. He shakes his own war-gear, a massive spear, and then shifts from deeds to words, as he challenges them. The Warden’s challenge and expression of admiration is met by Beowulf’s identification of himself and his purpose, to *ræd gelæran* about how Hrothgar may deal with Grendel. Thus, the action of the Geats is met by the action of the Warden, and then the words of the Warden are met with the words of Beowulf. Then, pulling both levels of the narrative—of either deed and either set of words—explicitly and symmetrically together in a complex and multi-layered, gnomic statement, the Warden responds to Beowulf’s offer of advice thus (286–289):

```
Weard mæbelode,      ðær on wiege sæt,
ombbeht unforht:      “æghwæþres sceal
scearp seyldwiga      gescad witan,
worda ond worca,      se þe wel þenced .”
```

[The) Warden spoke (as) there (he) sat on horseback, a retainer unafraid: “a sharp shield-warrior who thinks well must know the difference (between) words and deeds”].

Does the Warden mean to register his disapproval that Beowulf has rushed into action with such commendable decisiveness only in order to offer, ironically, mere *worda* at the far end of the journey, just when and where *worca* are most needed? Does he mean more simply that boasts are easy to make, but turning them into deeds is quite a different matter, especially with Grendel? Is he speaking, on the other hand or

---

simultaneously, about the distinction between words and deeds not specifically in
relation to Beowulf and the matter at hand, but generally and universally, for surely
there is a riddle of sorts here which the sharp shield-warrior needs to solve; is not the
speaking of words about deeds itself a deed, or is such speech merely an echo of
deeds, the image of a deed, prior to the time of the deed in the form of boasting,\footnote{Dwight Conquergood, “Boasting in Anglo-Saxon England: Performance and the Heroic Ethos,”
gilpcwidas, and the gilphlædan Scop of Beowulf,” \textit{Journal of English and Germanic Philology} 79
(1980): 499–516.} and in the wake of the deed in the telling of legends? Finally, is it possible that the
Warden is acknowledging that Beowulf’s eloquence matches his purported valour.\footnote{Orchard, \textit{A Critical Companion}, 210; See also Lenore Abraham, “The Decorum of Beowulf,”
Still, there seems no reason why the Warden’s gnomic declaration could not be
polysemous, and if so, it is an especially eloquent and complex summation of all the
deeds and words which have gone before.\footnote{Cf. Robert Creed, “The \textit{Andswarode-System} in Old English Poetry,”
\textit{Speculum} 32 (1957): 523–528.}

The first borrowed formula is \textit{flota famiheals fugle gelicost} (218). As already
noted, it echoes in the return voyage: \textit{fleat famigheals forð ofer yðe} (1909).\footnote{A number of scholars have been struck by the similarity of these lines between \textit{Beowulf} and
\textit{Andreas}, and have noted that it argues strongly for an explicit relationship; cf. Brodeur, “Study,” 99;
Riedinger, “Formulaic Relationship,” 302–3; Claes Schaar, \textit{Critical Studies}, 243. For a dissenting
view, see Leonard Peters, “Relationship,” 861.}

\textit{Famiheals} is found only the Old English corpus of poetic diction. \textit{Gelicost}, on the
other hand, repeats three other times in \textit{Beowulf}: \textit{ligge gelicost leoht unfæger} (727a);
\textit{stiðra nægla gehwylc style gelicost} (985b); \textit{þæt hit eal gemealt ise gelicost} (1608b). It
also repeats 68 times in Old English literature overall, and occurs twice in \textit{Andreas}
(497b and 1145b). The variation of \textit{gelicost} demonstrates the formulaic flexibility of
the \textit{Beowulf}-poet, using a similar grammatical, semantic and metrical structure to
communicate a multitude of ideas: most like a flame, most like steel, most like ice.\textsuperscript{75}

In addition, the poet uses the repetition of the ‘gel’ sound systematically: in 727 as simple alliteration; in 985b a pattern of consonance is built upon the ‘gel’ sound; in 1608b, the echoes on the ‘l’ occur in three of the six words, linking again the a-line and b-line. Furthermore, just above 218, in line 217b, one encounters once more another such repeated structure, in \textit{winde gefysed}, echoing this grammatical, semantic and metrical structure in 630b (\textit{guþe gefysed}), 2309a (\textit{fyre gefysed}), and 2561b (\textit{heorte gefysed}). The \textit{Beowulf}-poet appears to have a compositional tactic explicitly in mind in this section.\textsuperscript{76}

When the formula repeats in line 497 of \textit{Andreas}, the apostle is praising the seamanship of the disguised Christ, describing how, in spite of the tempest raging about them, the \textit{fiereð famigheals fugole gelicost} (‘the sojourner [or ship] foam-necked, most like a bird’) surges onward. It is surely striking that not only does the \textit{Andreas}-poet use \textit{fugole gelicost}, but also uses the latter word of the a-line in \textit{Beowulf} in identical sequence; to borrow a half-line formula may be considered noteworthy, but to discover elements of both half-lines together in these two texts, in the same order, and in these two texts alone, argues more strenuously for an explicit relationship.

Moreover, as Powell notes, the strange description of ship with an equally

\textsuperscript{75} On alliterative variation, see Mariann Reinhard, \textit{On the Semantic Relevance of the Alliterative Collocations in Beowulf}, \textit{Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten} 92 (1976).

peculiar simile is extremely idiosyncratic; there is nothing quite like it in the extant corpus.\textsuperscript{77} Strengthening the association still more is the figurative nature of the synonym, \textit{færeð}. Both \textit{færeð} and \textit{flota} are metonyms for, or qualitative allusions to, ships, describing on the one hand its ability to travel and on the other hand, its ability to float. This sets these two terms off from other, more common terms for ships found in the \textit{Beowulf}-passage, which are consistently synecdoches, alluding to the whole (ship) by reference to a part: \textit{wundenstefna, sæwudu}, or \textit{ceol}. That the \textit{Andreas}-poet chose to proceed by metonymy rather than synecdoche again reinforces the specificity of the relationship between the two lines. One may also observe that the line in \textit{Andreas} seems entirely germane to its context, not only in terms of imagery and content, but in its prosody, since the next line picks up the play on ‘g’ and ‘ge,’ turning these echoes into framework of consonance (\textit{Andreas} 497–8): \textit{færeð famigheals, fugole gelicost / glideð on geofone. Ic georne wat.} It seems clear in spite of what Schaar and Pearsall accuse that here at least the \textit{Andreas}-poet is in full command of his craft.

As mentioned earlier, the line in \textit{Beowulf} connotes a sense of velocity and dynamism. The \textit{Andreas}-poet differs somewhat from the connotations of this sentiment when in his passage (471–509) Andreas expresses wonder and admiration at the disguised Christ’s ability to steer the vessel with such craft and assurance through heavy seas.\textsuperscript{78} The apostle himself wishes to win the friendship and learn this skill from the mariner. So obvious are the narrative components’ symbolic aspects, so appropriately do they inter-relate, and so extensively does the poet dwell upon them,

\textsuperscript{77} Powell, \textit{Ibid}, 128.
\textsuperscript{78} For contextual variations between possible borrowed formulae, see Thomas Gardner, “How Free was the \textit{Beowulf} Poet?” \textit{Modern Philology} 71: 2 (1973): 111–127.
that a figurative interpretation is indispensable to an understanding of the passage; Christ is steering a ship across a stormy ocean and one of his apostles desires to earn that sailor’s good will and steer such vessels in a similarly skilled manner. In early Christian art the Church is often represented as a ship, the image decorating signet rings or coins and the design being utilized in the design of Christian ‘ship-lamps,’ with Christ-at-the-rudder as a handle, and the flame emerging from the prow. In such art, the mast is often depicted as the cross and the anchor as a symbol of its stability in the storm. So pervasive was this metaphor that the tradition by which the wings of a church are called ‘naves’ takes this term from navis. Thus, at the literal level the disguised Christ safely transports the apostle and his disciples across the stormy seas—a skill Andreas, perhaps as a fisherman, wishes to acquire—while at the allegorical level, Christ guides the Church through even the direst of straits, a skill which Andreas, as an apostle, wishes to acquire. This set of connotations locates an echo towards the end of the Beowulf cluster (at 227–228), and it seems that if the Andreas-poet is picking up a connotative reverberation from Beowulf, he takes its from the final lines of the Beowulfian sea-voyage.

The next line in question is Beowulf 222, brimclifu blican beorgas steape. It is a fairly simple line, built around double alliteration. Brimclifu, as mentioned earlier, is a compound unique to Beowulf, though it is echoed again in the second, set piece voyage as clifu (1911). None of the other words in this formula are repeated anywhere else in the poem, demonstrating again the considerable word-hoard at the Beowulf-poet’s command. The line’s b-line is reproduced entirely in Andreas, while blican is echoed in Andreas just two lines above the borrowed b-line, thus (Andreas 838–840): hardor heofonleoma, ofer hofu blican / Onwoc þa wiges heard, wang sceawode, / fore burggeatum. Beorgas steape. This concatenation is made more intriguing by the fact
that two other geographic terms occur simultaneously in the immediate vicinity of both the _Andreas_ and _Beowulf_-lines; in _Beowulf_, three lines after _beorgas steape_, the Geats _on wang stigon_ (225). In _Andreas_, only one line above _beorgas steape_, the apostle _wang sceawode_ (839). In _Beowulf_, seven lines after the parallel formula, the Warden observes the Geat’s unloading their ship _of wealle_ (229). In _Andreas_, three lines after the parallel formula, the apostle observes the _windige weallas_ of Mermedonia (843).

As in _Beowulf_ the connotations of this passage suggest the dynamism and animation of a raid, of going into action, so also in _Andreas_ the apostle prepares to ‘raid,’ to go into action, though now in a radically and even paradoxically Christianized sense. He has landed upon the Mermedonian strand and contemplates the foreigner’s ramparts which he must breach, not in order to kill, but to save (and as the previous chapter observed, the _Andreas_-poet consistently revises potential exemplars so that Anglo-Saxon saint does not kill). Moreover, the presence of the saint on the beach clearly demonstrates that the apostle has overcome his earlier hesitation to undertake the _worca_ commanded of him, and is now deeply committed to deeds, and God’s deeds specifically. The saint’s now manifest dynamism is confirmed, emphasized and sanctified when God now appears to the saint. God praises Andreas’ faithful deed (the journey) and the _Andreas_-poet underscores even further the focus upon deeds when he revises potential exemplars so that in his version God adds an extensive correction to the apostle’s penitence, about his lack of
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79 Again, for a fuller discussion of the _Andreas_-poet’s subversion of common early Germanic motifs through antithesis, see again Hamilton, ‘_Andreas and Beowulf_.’
recognition, discovered in, for instance, the *Casanatensis*, and rather admonishes him precisely in terms of his lack of faith and the action this negated.

The third shared formula in this cluster is *þæs þe him yþlade eaðe wurdon* (*Beowulf* 228). This finds an echo in *þæt ic æfre ne geseah ofer yðlade* (*Andreas* 499). Again, the line from *Beowulf* shows its poet’s craft to good effect; a framework of fricatives binds the line together, through three thorns, and then an eth. The vocal distance between the ‘th’ sound in ‘yþ’ and the ‘l’ of ‘lade,’ from a fricative formed in the top front of the mouth to the postalveolar lateral approximant at the middle-back of the mouth, creates a delay between the two syllables. This delay lays a much heavier stress on *yþ*- than would otherwise be the case. This would be important for two reasons. First, it reflects an aspect of its content, since the ending of the line’s sense, which talks about the end of the voyage, is itself delayed, building up the tension at that point of the sentiment, upon that syllable, before completing it in a b-line whose final fricative elides smoothly to the completion of the thought, in *wurdon*, the third plural preterite verb in three consecutive lines; it is a tactic which produces increased satisfaction through delayed gratification or completion, as with the voyage to which it refers. The second reason why an emphasis upon *yþ*- is important is because it may be a pun upon *eað*-, connecting the a-line and b-line semantically exactly at the syllable of aural disjunction by means of emphasizing *yþ*- and thereby the pun which connects the two halves. Finally, both the a-line and b-line end with a syllable starting with ‘d’ and which is long, again aligning the two lines.

The line in *Andreas* is not as complex. It also alliterates using vowels, though

---

80 Some scholars, such as Powell, are troubled enough by the thorn in *Beowulf* to emend it to *yðlade*, regardless of how it may raise the salience of the pun: 276. She, accepts Christian Grein’s emendation of *yðlafe* in *Andreas* to *yðlade*, which makes more sense.

81 Orchard, *Critical Companion*, 75.
in this case the poet commits a possible solecism, depending upon one’s critical views of Old English prosody, by having the final, stressed syllable vocalically alliterate with the prior ones, though it might also be argued that the weight of pronunciation in the *Andreas*-line has shifted to ‘la.’ in *yðlade*. On the other hand, he does weave into the line a framework of labiodental and dental fricatives, on ‘f’s and eth, which end three of the stressed syllables: ðef-, of-, yð-.

This line occurs in *Andreas* only two lines after the earlier borrowing in 497 (. . . *famigheals fugole gelicost*), and though it is noteworthy that potential borrowings should cluster in one text, when those same formula cluster in both texts, the case for and the nature of that potential borrowing is thrown into a considerably sharper relief.

Moreover, because this formula (*Andreas* 499) occurs so closely to the previous potential borrowing (*Andreas* 497), its connotative register is largely the same; in other words, the *Andreas*-passage overall affords the contextual sense of the individual formula’s connotations here, though in this formula, the emphasis upon relief and gratitude is emphasized somewhat more. The same cannot be said of *Beowulf* 218 and 228; in the 218, more weight is placed upon the dynamism, the performance of deeds, while in 228, more is placed upon relief and thankfulness; the Geats are relieved and thankful that God has assisted them, and by implication their ‘hall-redeeming hero,’ to safely cross the treacherous waters of the Kattegat Strait. This connotation of gratitude to God and relief at their safe arrival bears a strong resemblance to *Andreas’* gratitude to the disguised Christ for faring them safely
across the seas to Mermedonia and relief that the vessel might be so surely guided by
this most-skilled of mariners. Moreover, the literal connotations in *Beowulf* align
equally well with the figurative connotations in *Andreas*; in both texts, at both literal
and figurative levels, connotations of gratitude redound for God’s munificent
providence and guidance afforded wayfarers upon dangerous ways.

The next borrowing in the cluster is *Beowulf* 229: *þa of wealle geseah weard
Scildinga*. Its prosodic structure and its echoes by means of these, of 217 and 234,
have already been discussed and so require no repetition here. The *Beowulf*-poet
echoes this formula again at 2542 (*Geseah ða be wealle se ðe worna fela*), and
possibly again at 2716 (*pæt he bi wealle wishycgende*). It corresponds to *Andreas*
1492: *He be wealle geseah wundrum fæste*. The ‘h’ of the initial pronoun echoes the
double alliteration on ‘h’ in the line before, and it is possible that the repeated ‘s’ of
the line is echoed in the subsequent line, which also ‘book-ends’ the line with
assonance on ‘un’: *heardra hilda, in þære hædenan byrig. / He be wealle geseah
wundrum fæste / under sælwage sweras unlytl* (1491–1493). Beyond this, the line is
unremarkable.

What is more remarkable is that in *Andreas*, alone among all the versions of
the legend, the water issues from the stone itself, while in other versions it issues from

---

83 Cf. pg. 125.
84 For a fuller discussion, see Powell, 139–141, who notes the collocation of extensive diction shared between the initial *Beowulf* passage and numerous other passages in both *Beowulf* and *Andreas*. 
a statue before the wall.\textsuperscript{85} Certainly the passage is heavy with the connotations of wonder and the sense of enigma which always surrounds miracles, and the diction of the passage contributes to this; the \textit{sweras unlytle} (1493) are \textit{wundrum fæste} (1492) beneath the wall, \textit{storme bedrifene} (1494); they are the \textit{eald enta geweorc} (1495). Still, the question remains, what might this miracle among the works of giants in \textit{Andreas} have to do with the alarm of the Warden watching a strange band of men land upon the beach beneath him in \textit{Beowulf}? Four connotative similarities exist, though their connection is conjectural. The first is that in both cases, the audience is presented with a circumstance which demands an answer—in short, there is, as Irving contends, a riddle to be answered. In \textit{Andreas}, the question is how can water come from stone, while in \textit{Beowulf}, the question is who are these men and what do they intend: \textit{hine fyrywt bræc / modgehygdum, hwæt þa men wæron} (\textit{Beowulf} 232b–233). Second, the context of both formulae connotes wonder. In \textit{Andreas}, the ancient work of giants surrounds an act which seems impossible.\textsuperscript{86} In \textit{Beowulf}, the Warden quickly demonstrates, by means of his solicitous and even fawning speech, his admiration for Beowulf’s purported deeds and artful words; he is lost in wonder. Third, there is a connotation of the dynamism, of deeds done, for in \textit{Andreas}, the columns and walls are noted specifically as \textit{worca} of giants, of great things achieved, and more to the point, Andreas has at this point of the plot moved into action, to deeds, after passively enduring the tortures of the Mermedonians. On the other hand, the sense of dynamism and deeds in the \textit{Beowulf}-formula, as the Geats hit the beach and begin to off-load

\textsuperscript{85} Irving notes the riddle-like quality of calling for water from stone itself, rather than the ‘somewhat more plausible’ statue, \textit{Andreas}, 234. On the other hand, or simultaneously, it seems just as likely that this is another typological allusion inserted by the \textit{Andreas}-poet, in this case to Moses calling forth water from the stone or the great flood of Noah.

\textsuperscript{86} See especially Emily Thornbury, “\textit{Eald enta geworc} and the Relics of the Empire: Revisiting the Dragon’s Lair in \textit{Beowulf},” \textit{Quaestio} 1 (2000): 82–92.
war-gear, is plain. Finally, in both passages, the sense of imminent violence is palpable. In *Andreas*, the waters which will rage out of the stone shall destroy the strong-hold of the Mermedonians, and those same walls which the apostle before had contemplated breaching (838–843) will now, ironically, kill those within precisely because they shall not be breached, thereby keeping the water within and rising. In *Beowulf*, the arrival of a war-band, with all the iconography of raid and violence, also suggest to the Warden that the strong-hold of his people is threatened, though of course Grendel already controls the heart of it, and so, paradoxically, violating Grendel’s claims to it, by means of these ‘raiders,’ is what will restore its integrity to the Danes. In this sense, both strong-holds require breaching in order for the inhabitants to be saved.

The final formula to be considered in this cluster is *Beowulf* 238: *byrnum werede þe þus brontne ceol*. It is a conventional line, with simple alliteration. The only other point of prosodic interest seems to be the back-linked alliteration with the subsequent line, on ‘c’: *ofer lagustræte lædan cwomân*. In *Andreas*, it is reproduced thus (273): *þæt ðu us gebrohte brante ceole*. This line also employs simple alliteration, though the extended sound-play between –*brohte* and *brante* is striking.

In *Beowulf*, this formula is included in the Warden’s initial challenge as he demands to know who the armoured mariners are and what they intend. In *Andreas*, the saint is asking whether the disguised Christ will grant him passage to Mermedonia, though he cannot compensate the sailors with monetary reward. As before, both formulae connote that the protagonists are in the realm of deeds, of dynamism, whose impetus has in either case been arrested at the edge of the sea, in the former case by the words of the Warden, and in the latter case, by the words of the apostle. Moreover, in both passages, those words take the form of a question which
arrests this impetus; Beowulf is stopped by the Warden who asks the all-important question of who Beowulf is: a point upon which Beowulf will dwell at great length.\(^{87}\) In *Andreas*, the saint asks for passage, though since the audience already knows that it is the disguised Christ in the vessel, the pressing question which the audience knows the apostle ought to ask is, again, ‘who are you?’ A question which is figuratively answered a great length during the voyage, not only by the Mariner’s comportment and skill, but also by Andreas’ tales of his time with Christ. Finally, both heroes, at the point this formula is used in their respective passages, are standing at the edge of a sea-borne crossing, with all the symbolic implications that may entail.\(^{88}\)

This brings us to the end of the cluster, and though the parallels between the two texts stop short of affording absolute proof of an explicit relationship, they do offer a great deal of quantitative and qualitative evidence for that relationship. Furthermore, they potentially provide a means of considerably enriching the meaning and aesthetic complexity of *Andreas* by means of reference to the earlier. Riedinger, Funk and Powell have produced impressive evidence through formulaic parallels that the case for borrowing is strong. This impression seems confirmed here. Also, as Riedinger and Powell have shown, the fact that the potential borrowings cluster in the proposed source-text points up a specific affinity between the texts, and as we see in this cluster, this seems especially striking in light of the inherent and prior unity of

---


that cluster in *Beowulf*. Finally, if we look at the passage in *Beowulf*, we can see that
of the lines from which the *Andreas*-poet might have drawn, all, with the possible
exception of 238, are lines whose prosodic structure is more complex and artful than
those around them.

However, and moreover, the connotative correlations are particularly striking.
For example, the formulae in the *Beowulf*-cluster and in *Andreas* both connote a sense
of enigma (*Beowulf* 229, 238; *Andreas* 1492, 273), of wonder (*Beowulf* 229; *Andreas*
1492), of gratitude and relief (*Beowulf* 228; *Andreas* 497, 499), of violence (*Beowulf*
222, 229; *Andreas* 840, 1492), and, above all, dynamism (*Beowulf* 218, 222, 229, 238;
*Andreas* 497, 840, 1492, 273). As shall be seen, even if the vagaries of interpretation
and the shared literary culture are taken into account, the consistency of these five
particular connotations between either text shall prove remarkably consistent. In
addition, in this cluster these parallels are further strengthened by means of analogous
invocation of particular motifs: of the raid (*Beowulf* 222, 229, 238; *Andreas* 840,
1492), of God’s providential guidance (*Beowulf* 228; *Andreas* 497, 499), or the
dichotomy which obtains between words and deeds (*Beowulf* 218, 222, 229, 238;
*Andreas* 497, 840, 1492, 273).89

Nor can it be said that the formulae which the two texts have in common by
means of their own, independent nature, explain the connotations in these texts; it is
true that some phrases include the above connotations (for instance, *flota famigheals*),
but as the discussion shows, the overwhelming bulk of connotative tone arose not
from decontextualised formulae, but from the context of the cluster from which the

formulae were likely drawn in *Beowulf*. This point is further underscored by the often radically different contexts in which the *Andreas*-poet fits the formulae, which nevertheless carry the same connotation, often from a new perspective or towards new ends. If anything, this renegotiation ought to obscure or obliterate shared connotations, when in fact, as we have seen, just the opposite occurs.

Not only does the explicit relationship between the two texts in this cluster seem likely, but if a relationship does exist, then this fact considerably enhances the complexity of *Andreas*’ meaning and aesthetic richness. The shared prosodic tendencies in which we find the formulae in either text situated, albeit at a higher level in *Beowulf*, suggest how the *Andreas*-poet may have used the *Beowulf*-poet’s craft to good effect in his own poem. Moreover, the ways in which connotation (or motifs) are echoed and renegotiated offers the audience a far more nuanced and sophisticated understanding of *Andreas* than would be the case if those formulae were used in isolation, in reference only to a general tradition of common formulae. Such intertextual allusions are common in modern literature, but they seem, if anything, more likely in Old English verse, precisely, as Powell notes, because that literary culture by its very nature was inclined to borrow, at the most basic level, formulae, but also at the level of formulaic themes. In addition, at a functional level, the dynamics of repetition and variation were an intrinsic part of this literary culture and how it produced meaning and value, not merely at the verbal level, but at the level of ‘formulaic themes, and so if one suspects that one is hearing in one Old English poem echoes of another, previous Old English poem, this contextual consideration—of a tendency towards repetition and variation—lends the idea much greater credence.

**Cluster II.**
The next cluster is found in the well-known passage which describes Grendel’s approach to Heorot. The passage overall extends, for the purposes of this discussion, from 702b to 734a, while the cluster entails 721, 728 and 730:

Com on wanre niht
seriðan sceadugenga. Sceotend swæfon,
þa þæt hornreced healdan scoldon,
ealle buton anum. þæt wæs yldum cup
þæt hie ne moste, þa metod nolde,
se seynscaþa under sceadu bregðan;
ac he wæccende wraþum on andan
bad bolgenmod beadwa geþinges.
Da com of more under misthleoþum
Grendel gongan, godes yrre þær;
mynte se manscaða manna cynnes
sumne besyrwan in sele þam hean.
Wod under wolcnum to þæs þe he winreced,
goldsele gumena, gearwost wisse,
fættum fahne. Ne wæs þæt forma sið
þæt he Hroþgares ham gesohte;
næfre he on aldordagum ær ne siþðan
heardran hæle, healðegnna fand.
Com þa to recede rinc siðian,
dreamum bedæled. Duru sona onarn,
fyrbendum faþt, syþðan he hire folmum æðran;
onbœræ þa bealoþdyg, þæt he gebolgen wæs,
recedes muþan. Raþe æfter þôn
on fagne flor feond treddode,
eode yrreþmod; him of eagum stod
ligge gelicost leoht unfæger.
Geseah he in recede rinca manige,
swefan sibbegediht samod ætgædere,
magorinca heap. Pa his mod ahlog;
mynte þæt he gedælde, æþþon dæg cwome,
atol aglæca, anra gehwylces
lif wið lice, þa him alumpen wæs
wistfylle wen

---

[(Then) in the black night came stalking the shadow-walker. The spear-men who ought to hold that horned hall slept—all save one. It was known to men that without the desire of the Creator the sin-destroyer (or fiend-destroyer) could not drag them into the shadows; but he waited in rising wrath, watching, enraged, for the foe, for the battle’s outplay. Then from the moor, under mountains of mist, came Grendel approaching, bearing God’s fury. The man-killer meant to catch one of man’s kin in that high hall. He forged on under the fog until he could most clearly see the wine-hall, the gold-hall of men, gleaming with ornament. That was not the first time he sought Hrothgar’s home. He never found in days-of-life, neither before nor after, harder fortune nor hall-thanes. Then to the hall the warrior came creeping, cut off from joys; soon the door, strengthened with iron straps, gave way when he laid his hands upon it. Then the one mindful of death ripped open the mouth of the hall; now he was enraged. Swiftly thereafter the enemy strode over the glossy floor, went furious in spirit. From his eyes emanated a ghastly glow, most like a flame. He saw many warriors, the sleeping band of kin, huddled together, a heap of retainers. Then his spirit laughed. Before dawn he, that grisly monster, meant to tear life from every man, now that the opportunity for a feast-meal had befallen him.

As with the previous passage, the episode in which this cluster is found also appears to be a set-piece, indicated by its echoes elsewhere and its highly regularized structure. For instance, the technique of its tripartite repetition of the verb for advance (com) occurs similarly in Judith, as the Jewish army approaches, repeating stopon three times and in similar proximity to one another (200, 212b, 227a) as in Beowulf (702b, 710a, 720a). Likewise, as both Niles and Orchard point out, this scene (and somewhat more hereafter) embodies a pattern of events which is repeated in miniature during Grendel’s mother’s attack. Finally, its diction and formulae cluster not only in other portions of Beowulf around similar concatenations of ideas (oðþe nipende niht ofer eall, / scaduhelma gesceapu scrīdan cwoman, / wan under wolcnum, lines

91 I prefer here the original, synscæha, since it is repeated at 798b, and it is also familiar to the Juliana-poet, who employs it at line 671a. This translation, however, is against scholarly consensus. Cf. Brodeur, “The Art of Beowulf,” 88–94.
92 Orchard, Critical Companion, 191.
649–651a), but also in at least two other texts: Dream of the Rood (scirne scinan, sceadu forðeode, / wann under wolcnum . . . , lines 54–55a) and—perhaps predictably—Andreas ( . . . nihtlangne fyrst, / oðþæt dryhten forlet dægcandelle / scire scinan. Sceadu sweðerodon, / wonn under wolcnum . . . , lines 834b–837a). It seems worth noting that both these latter poems are found in the Vercelli Book.

Likewise, the passage is regulated by a very systematic structure. This has been noted numerous times, so it requires only brief reiteration here; its three, initial anaphoric formulae link com with a preposition and then an adjective of motion (scriðan, gongan, siðian). This is followed in the first two sub-sections by some mention of the humans he intends to kill (703b–704, 712–713), while in the third sub-section he varies by having Grendel rip off the door between him and those same humans; only then does the poet mention those men the monster intends to kill (728–729). The swelling rage of Beowulf, waiting in the dark for the Grendel at the end of the first sub-section is matched, by means of anadiplosis, with the rage which Grendel bears as he advances upon the hall. There may also be an echo of this rage, by means of paranomasia, in the formula, wod under wolcnum, upon wod (714). This sense of pent-up fury occurs a third time in the third sub-section (ða he gebolgen wæs, line 723b), is brought to an extreme pitch as he crosses the floor to his victims (eode yrremod, line 725a), and then receives a striking and antithetical variation into which the trajectory of emotion resolves: Pa his mod ahlog, lines 730a). Similarly, a sense of obscurity is invoked twice in the first two sub-sections, first as darkness (niht 702b and sceadu 707b), then as mist (mishleophum 710b and wolcnum 714a). The Beowulf-poet then varies this once more in the third sub-section by another antithetical variation, mentioning first the ghastly light of Grendel’s eyes (him of eagum stod / ligge gelicost leohf unfaæger, lines 726b–727), and finally how the creature does not
intend to leave a single warrior alive to greet the day (mynte þæt he gedælde, ærþon dæg cwome / . . . anra gehwylces / lif wið lice . . . , lines 731–733a).

As before, the reason for noting the passage’s unity is to stress that it recommends itself as a discrete portion of text for memorization, and due to its systematic structure is easy to memorize, and so as before it provides a more likely repository of formulae upon which a later poet might draw. Not only does its unity make it a likely section upon which to draw, but once more its verbal richness would provide a poet a greater than average array of words for key concepts (though it should be observed that with one exception, the poet does not actually draw upon these concepts in potential borrowings); predictably, the passage is replete with terms for monster (sceadugenga, synscaþa, manscaða, rinc, feond, aglæca) and wrath (wraþum, bolgenmod, yrre, wod, bealohydig, gebolgen, yrremod). In addition, the poet varies his terms around ‘hall’ (hornreced, sele [hean], winreced, goldsele, [Hroðgares] ham, recede [x3]) and ‘warrior’ (sceotend, healðengas, rinca, sibbegedriht, magorinca). Moreover, of the sixteen compounds, nine are unique to Beowulf, and of these nine unique compounds, four are repeated at other points in the poem (manscaða [x3], winreced [x2], goldsele [x4], and sibbegedriht [x2]). Also, the density of compounds is greater here than usual, averaging one every 1.93 lines instead of the average of one every 3.52 lines, while double alliteration is only slightly greater than usual: eighteen lines or 58%. In sum, this passage would clearly be a considerable resource for a later poet.

As the prosodic unity and verbal richness of the passage again suggest it, a priori, as a likely resource for borrowing, so also do the connotative parallels suggest a posteriori evidence for a relationship. Once again, the dominant connotation is a sense of dynamism. This is the moment to which all the prior words have pointed, to
which all the preparation and effort has been made; it is the culminaition and
resolution of both Beowulf’s and the poet’s words into action. The passage is heavy
with verbs: 30 out of 180 words. This sense of action increases further if we consider
the number of gerunds, participles and nominalizations in the passage: another 17,
bringing the verbally based components to 47 out of 180 words. For a noun intensive
language, this sense of activity is remarkable. In addition, the connotation of activity
is further intensified by the prevalence among these 47 verbal components of words
connoting actual motion; the entire passage is built around the three initial iterations
of com, but we also find scriðan, bregdan, gongan, wod, sidian, treddode, eode, and
cwome. Finally, the dichotomy between intentions and their outplay is again
interwoven with the sense of dynamism, for words which connote intent are
insinuated everywhere amongst the action words which are their reification: scoldon,
nolde, mynte (x2), alumpen.

Likewise, there is once more an intense connotation of enigma. Darkness and
mists overlay all the action and its players: wanre niht, sceadugenga, sceadu,
misthleopum, and wolcnum. This is exacerbated by the fact that only Grendel, as he
discerns the hall and then those who sleep within it with his illuminated eyes, is able
to penetrate the cloak of night, but the victims with whom we sympathize cannot; they
must wait, as does Beowulf, in the darkness for developments, for answers. In turn,
Grendel has in mind traps and ‘catchings,’ things to be hidden by the hunter and
discerned by the prey: under sceadu bregdan, sumne besyrwan. In all of this, one is
concerned with outcomes, with answers to how the action will go, but this answer is
here, time and again, excruciatingly deferred: sceotend . . . healdan scoldon (703b–
704b), þa metod nolde (706b), bad . . . beadwa gepinges (709), mynte se manscaða
(712), næfre he . . . heardran hæle, healðegnas fand (718–719), mynte þæt he gedælde (731a), and þæt he gedælde (733b–734a).

We also encounter again intimations of wonder, for the hall is not only a horned hall, and a wine hall, but goldsele gumena which is fiettum fahne, with a fagne flor. Likewise, Grendel’s eyes glow in the dark; all we see of the monster is him seeing us.

Finally and unsurprisingly, the passage fairly crackles with connotations of imminent violence. Like the previous cluster, a raid seems impending, and in this case it actually will manifest. This builds through the echoes of rage and violence which are strewn everywhere (wraþum, bolgenmod, beadwa, yrre, manscaða, besyrwan, wod, onbraed, bealohydig, gebolgen, yrremod). More broadly, Beowulf here is described as awaiting the outcome of battle, while we are told that Grendel means to indulge in the slaughter of men and to tear the life from the bodies of those warriors.

Two qualifications are necessary here. The first is that in an epic like Beowulf, in a culture centred largely upon war, we might expect connotations of violence and wonder around a majority of formulae and in its passages. This expectation lowers the uniqueness of the relationship between the two texts, and so the significance of the connotative parallels. On the other hand, though we may still expect connotations of wonder in Andreas, a holy legend, and though we may be sensible to the appeal of violence and wonder which the Andreas-poet may have been seeking to infuse into his text in order to make it more attractive to his culture, these connotations are still peculiar enough in Andreas to excite comment among the numerous scholars mentioned above, who find them incongruous and worthy of remark. Moreover, connotations of riddling and dynamism are less common, and when these considered in combination with the previous two connotations, the sheer quantity of parallels
begins to make it seem more likely than not that an explicit relationship of some sort exists between the two poems. The second qualification is that one of the previous connotations is absent, namely that of gratitude and relief. However, it should come as no surprise that perfect consistency does not exist between the two passages; as the Andreas-poet might be selecting some formulae and leaving aside others, so too might he be invoking some connotations and leaving others. The argument here is that the Andreas-poet draws upon Beowulf not arbitrarily, but selectively, insofar as he finds elements useful to his own endeavors, and, whether aware of it or not, certain broad connotative combinations, in particular passages of Beowulf, seem consistently more attractive to him than others, for there are a considerable portions of Beowulf which lack these connotations upon which the Andreas-poet seldom draws.

The first formula of this passage which is found in both poems is Beowulf 721b: *dreamum bedæled. Duru sona onarn*. This is paralleled by Andreas 999b: *godes dryhtendom duru sona onarn*. The Beowulf-line overall employs double alliteration, and it is worth noting that the a-lines of both poems, which share no verbal elements, nevertheless utilize peculiar and arresting internal sound play upon ‘d.’ The Beowulf line adds a ‘d’ at the end of the a-line, setting up a three stroke rhythm upon the dental, while in Andreas the a-line’s first syllable ends with ‘d’ and its last syllable begins with it. In both cases, the aural effect is complex.\(^94\) In Beowulf, it is also a comparatively well-crafted line in relation to the lines around it: more artful than the simple though effective line above, for instance (*Com pa to recede rinc sidian*), or the rather tangled line after it, whose anacrusis is very drawn out (*fyrbendum fæst syþdan he hire folmum æthran*).
The connotative register of the shared formula in *Beowulf* has already been discussed; the invading monster has arrived at the door and it proves unable to withstand the power of the one intent on slaughter. In *Andreas*, as the apostle arrives at the dungeon in which Matthew is held, the door also proves unable to withstand the invader, who in this case is a saint, not a monster. Likewise, this formula in *Andreas* also relates to the drawn out advance of this invader upon a stronghold of his enemies; as Grendel, famously in this highly-wrought scene, enters the realm of men and advances upon the hall, so too Andreas, in a carefully drawn out description, enters the city of the cannibals and advances upon the dungeon. Moreover, in both scenes, death is in the offing, for Grendel intends murder and is himself gruesomely slain, while Andreas has his approach cleared for him by the blood-drenched killing of the seven guards. The repetition of motifs between the scenes however, is also, and once again, qualified not merely by variation, but, more pointedly, by antithetical variation, for Grendel means to kill those in the hall, while Andreas intends to save those within the dungeon. Likewise, Grendel is nothing if not a killer, while, as mentioned in the previous chapter in relation to this scene, Andreas is clearly not a killer. Throughout, the congruent repetitions of contexts, and the antithetical variation of motifs hints at a strong affinity between the two episodes.

The second parallel occurs at line 728b of *Beowulf*: *geseah he in recede rinca manige*, which is echoed in line 1116 of *Andreas*: *reow ricsode þa wæs rinc manig*. This parallel is strengthened when one considers the repetition of the formula in *Beowulf* 399: *aras þa se rica ymb hine rinc manig*, which not only echoes the *rinc manige*.

---

94 *Dreame bedæled* is also used in line 1275a to describe Grendel, and Heremod in line 1720a. cf. Orchard, *Critical Companion*, 113.

95 Though it exceeds the scope of this discussion, it is interesting to note that in Andreas’ potential exemplars, the advance of the saint also bears some resemblance to Aeneas’ advance through Carthage (*Aeneid*, I, 41—440).
manig of the b-line, but also the ric of the ricsode in Andreas’ a-line. However he has come by it, the Andreas-poet seems to have the ric-rinc-manig collocation in mind as he composes his own line.

In Andreas, this formula is part of the scene in which the Mermedonians discover their prisoners missing, select an old man to devour who then offers up his son in his stead. Three parallels in the Andrean context are worth noting. First, in both passages, the antagonists mean to devour men. This parallel is further enhanced if, as the kin of Cain, we consider Grendel in some way human, for this would mean that both episodes address not just man-eating, but cannibalism specifically. Moreover, in both texts, the devourers are deprived of their anticipated meal. Furthermore, it was noted in line 721a that Grendel is described as deprived of joy, while in lines 1113b–1114a of Andreas, the poet describes the cannibals in similar terms: . . . næs him to maðme wynn, / hyht to hordgestreonum . . . (‘for them there was no joy in wealth or hoarded treasure’). Finally, as was observed in the previous chapter, in this passage of Andreas, there is a heightened irony in the poet’s description of this parsimonious old man as a brave warrior, even as he whines and buys his own life back with the life of his son; the hero turns out to be a monster. A few lines further on, we discover the cannibals described as brave warriors, as rinc, even as the throng of them turns their hunger for battle upon a helpless boy. The ironic discrepancy between their description as brave warriors and the description of the circumstances of their battle is impossible to miss. Likewise, in this formula in Beowulf, the word rincæ finds a preceding echo in line 720b–721a, where Grendel is described as a rinc siðian, / dreamum bedæled. That the two appellations—the first for the ‘cannibalistic’ monster and the second for his human victims—should occur only eight lines apart is surely no mistake; the Beowulf-poet seems intent on highlighting a relationship which certainly
seems ironic, especially in light of the cannibalistic connotations in which *rinca* eats *rinca manige*. This sense of ironic conflation, between noble and monstrous, is reinforced by the *Beowulf*-poet’s description in this passage first of Beowulf, then of Grendel, in largely the same terms; Beowulf waits in the dark, *bolgenmod*, and in *wrapum*, and thereafter the poet immediately begins his description of Grendel as full of wrath, ire or frenzy; wrath is a defining feature of both. Moreover, the episode begins by speaking of Grendel, but in line 708 the pronoun’s reference is somewhat ambiguous until considered in context: *ac he wæccende wrapum on andan*. The result is a disorientation about who is the wrathful one in the dark. Later, Grendel goes on to bite asunder the *banlocan* of a warrior (742a), and soon thereafter Beowulf will burst the *banlocan* of Grendel (818a); both tear their victims limb from limb. That both passages should depend so heavily not just upon irony, but an irony which obtains between men in their noblest sense (as warriors in *Andreas* and the heroes in *Beowulf*) and monsters in their worst sense (as cannibals in *Andreas* and the man-eating kin of Cain in *Beowulf*) is surely suggestive.

The third and final formula between both texts is the striking *magorinca heap pa his mod ahlog*, of *Beowulf* 730b. This is matched by *Andreas* 454b: *merestreama gemeotu*. *Da ure mod ahloh*. In the *Beowulf* line, the simple alliteration is interwoven with consonance upon ‘h’. In addition, at the interlinear level the alliteration on ‘m’ in 730 is picked up at the beginning of the next line, on *mynte*. The *Andreas* line uses double alliteration, while the ‘s’ of –*streama* ornamentally alliterates with both the ‘s’ of the line above and also of the line below: *sæ sessade, smylte wurdon / merestreama gemeotu*. *Da ure mod ahloh / syðdan we gesegon under swegles gang* (453–455).

In terms of connotations, the contexts of the formulae may initially seem flatly contrary. In *Andreas* the saint and his disciples cower in the boat during a terrible
storm. The saint, at Christ’s urging, tells a story from the Gospels which parallels their own circumstances, of how Christ once calmed the Sea of Galilee and thereby saved them, at which point, the saint recounts of Christ’s disciples, *da ure mod ahlog*. Thus, comparatively, in *Beowulf* Grendel’s laughing spirit is full of menace and perverse delight, while in *Andreas*, the disciples in the inset story are laughing with relief at the sudden and miraculous calm. The former is overwhelmingly full of dread, and the second is full of relief at the new-found serenity.

However, there are again a large number of pressing parallels. The formula in both passages occurs in proximity to the looming presence of immanent danger and violence. In the first, this derives from Grendel, while in the latter from the storm. In both passages, on the other hand, an unanticipated saviour awaits to meet the danger. In the *Beowulf* passage, the hero, he who shall redeem the hall for the Danes, resides within the enclosure, the hall, which will contain the focus of dramatic action; Beowulf will save them from the imminent danger of the monster. In *Andreas*, the saviour, he who will redeem them from imminent danger of the storm, resides also within the enclosure, within the boat, which again contains the focus of the story’s action.

Furthermore, in both episodes, the saviour is in some way unexpected. Grendel has no idea that his conqueror is within, nor do the Danes know if Beowulf will fulfill his boast. In *Andreas* the saviour of the disciples sleep, as Beowulf seems to, unanticipated; his action as a saviour from the storm will catch the disciples entirely by surprise. In addition, Andreas and his disciples are ignorant that the helmsman, the saviour in the framing story, is both the saviour, writ large, and their immediate saviour from the storm they presently endure.
Reinforcing the parallel further is the peculiar turn as the fearsome danger itself becomes fearful of the saviour. In *Beowulf*, shortly after this passage, Grendel encounters the appalling power of Beowulf’s grip and his confident malice turns to panic: *he on mod wearð / forht on ferhðe: no þy ær fram meahte* (‘he in [his] heart became frightened in spirit: could not get away none the sooner,’ *Beowulf* 753b–754). In an arresting parallel, *Andreas* relates *ða ure mod ahloh / syððan we gesegon under swegles gang / windas ond waegas ond waetebrogan / forhte gewordne for frean egesan* (‘then our spirit laughed when we saw under the sky’s expanse winds and waves and the terror of the water grown frightened before the awesomeness of the Lord,’ 454b–457). In both episodes, the source of terror has become terrified before a saviour. The *Andreas*-passage concludes with a gnomic sentiment now invariably associated with *Beowulf* and the ‘Beowulfian ethos’: *Forþan ic eow to soðe secgan wille, / þæt næfre forlæteð lifgende god / eorl on eorðan, gif his ellen deah* (‘therefore I will tell you in truth that never will the Living God forsake a man on earth if his courage holds,’ 458–60). Compare this to *Beowulf* 572b–573: *wyrd oft nereð / unfægne eorl, þonne his ellen deah* (‘Fate often spares the undoomed man when his courage holds’). Moreover, the *Andreas*-sentiment could locate a closer, parallel maxim in the episode of Grendel’s approach when the *Beowulf*-poet again indulges the gnomic impulse, saying . . . *þæt wæs yldum cuþ / þæt hie ne moste, þa metod nolde, / se scynscapa under sceadu bregdan* (705b–707). In these parallels, it seems worth at least entertaining the notion that though the *Andreas*-poet may have had the original *Beowulf*-axiom in mind, at 572–573, the proximity of an analogous echo in the vicinity of this cluster of shared formulae could be the catalyst which prompts the *Andreas*-poet to echo the earlier sentiment in *Beowulf*. Again, any one of these parallels itself would be inconclusive, but taken all together, the likelihood of an
explicit relationship at this point between these texts, and the consequent enrichment of the latter because of this repetition and variation upon the former, seems very likely indeed.

Thus one discovers here as in the cluster before not only that many of the broad connotations carry over to Andreas, of dynamism, violence, wonder, enigma and gratitude, but also that a replete, pronounced web of associations connect individual formulae, both by repetition and direct antithesis of particular concepts. Likewise, the formulae drawn upon are relatively artful ones and the passage overall is heavy with synonyms.

Cluster III.

This cluster contains four shared formulae (922b, 926, 931a, 934b) and is located in the passage which relates the arrival at dawn of Hröðgar and his retinue at the hall to view the arm of Grendel (Beowulf 920b–935):

```
searowundor seon;     Swylce self cyning                             920
of brydbure,         beahhorda weard,
tryddode tirfæst       getrume micle,
cystum gecyþed,         ond ond his cwen mid him
medostigge mæt         mægþa hose.
Hroðgar maþelode       he to healle geong,
     stod on stapole,   geseah steapne hrof,
golde fahne,           ond Grendles hond:
“Disse ansynæ         alwealdan þæc
lungre gelimpæ.       Fela ic laþes gebad,
grynna æt Grendle;     a mæg god wyrcan
wunder æfter wundre,       wuldres hyrde.
Dæt wæs ungeara       þæt ic ænigra me
weana ne wende to widan feore
bote gebidan,         þonne blode fah
husa selest         heorodreorig stod”;
```

[So also the king himself, the ring-hoard’s guardian renowned for (his) qualities, with many retainers and his queen amidst her maidens, walked in majesty from the women’s quarters (upon) the mead-path. Hrothgar went to the hall, stood on the step, gazed on the steep roof adorned with gold, upon Grendel’s hand, and spoke: “For this sight may thanks be made to the Almighty without delay. Much spite, many griefs have I suffered from Grendel; forever may God, Glory’s Guardian, work wonder upon wonder. It was not long ago that I (had) no hope for myself throughout my life, to see
recompense, when that most magnificent house stood blood-spattered (in) sword-gore”].

Unlike the previous two clusters, this cluster is not contained within a set-piece passage, but rather overlaps with a discrete passage, for Hrothgar’s speech which begins halfway through this passage is enclosed by epanalepsis, beginning *Disse ansyne Alwealdan þanc / lungre gelimpe*, and ending . . . *Alwalda þec / gode forgylde swa he nu gyt dyde* (928–956). Thus it seems that here there is only proximity to the discrete passage of dialogue which unites the cluster overall. Likewise, in neither synonymous variation nor compounds does the verbal context of the cluster seem particularly replete. There are two terms for hardship (*laþes, grynna*), and three for God (*alwealdan, god* and *wuldres hyrde*). Moreover, there are only four compounds in this section (*brydbure, beahhorda, medostigge, heorodreorig*). On the other hand, double alliteration is considerably more common than usual, comprising ten lines or 67% of the passage. Finally, the formulae shared between *Andreas* and this passage are not distinctly more ornate or complex than those formulae around them.

Qualifications must be made to all of these prosodic points.

If the text immediately prior to it is not known, then Hrothgar’s speech begins with a rather enigmatic subject (*ðisse ansyne*). An interlocutor who is unfamiliar with the entire, original text may well ask just what ‘sight’ prompts such ebullient praise and relief? Clearly this is not a difficulty for those who have memorized the speech, but if they wish to use it out of context for other performative purposes, they might have kept that information in mind and therefore drawn upon it. Furthermore, while the quantity of repetition in this cluster might not be unusual, the same does not hold true for the quality of one synonymous focus: that upon God, a point a Christian reader/interlocutor would be unlikely to miss. Moreover, this focus here is presented in a particular set of connotative registers which accord well with the previously
observed tendencies shared between the two poems. We will return to these registers presently, but before leaving consideration of prosodic aspects, mention must be made of the few compounds located here. Of the four, only one is commonly found throughout the corpus: brydbure. On the other hand, beahhorda is particular to Beowulf alone, though it repeats here three times. Medostigge is likewise unique. The last compound, heorodreorig, occurs only in three texts: Beowulf, Andreas and The Phoenix. More interestingly, it occurs no fewer than four times in Beowulf, and twice in Andreas. Finally, though the shared formulae are not necessarily more or less artful than those around them, this should not be taken to mean that the shared formulae are not artful, since the passage overall is extraordinarily ornate; of its 16 lines, 11 contain double-alliteration (920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 926 929, 930, 931, 933, 934) and two, sequential lines include an anacrusis of consonance (on ‘h’) which inserts yet more complexity into the line (925, 926). The interlinear relationship is equally elaborate; lines 923 and 924 contain end-linked alliteration, on ‘h’ which is then taken up as the main alliterating component of the subsequent line: cystum gecyped, ond his cwen mid him / medostigge met maegpa hose. / Hroðgar mapelode he to healle geong. Then, following this final line, the next two (926 and 927) end-link once more on the ‘h,’ thereby ‘book-ending’ with two end-linked lines the line in which Hrothgar’s speech is introduced. Another case of end-linked alliteration occurs between 933 and 934. Compare this level of complexity with the 16 lines which precede this passage, in which we find ten cases of double-alliteration and two cases of unrelated, end-linked alliteration. Again, the 16 lines following this passage contain only seven cases of double alliteration and one case of end-linked alliteration. Thus, though the complexity of the shared formulae does not stand out from those around them, they are still very ornate formulae, and so the artfulness of the passage again makes it a
particularly rich portion of text on which to draw. However, in spite of these qualifications, it remains that the prosodic evidence linking these two texts is not as strong as in the previous two clusters.

Nor are the overall connotative parallels as compelling as the two previous clusters. Certainly a sense of dynamism is present, but here it is merely implied and contingent upon the spectacle which inspires the praise of Hrothgar, who speaks responsively in the wake of deeds. In other words, as prior to deeds we heard, upon the beach, words of boasting, now after deeds we hear, before the hall, words of praise. They are first and foremost praise not for Beowulf, but for God, a point to which, as mentioned before, the *Andreas*-poet could not have been insensible: . . . *nu scealc hafað / þurh drihtnes miht dæd gefremede* (939–941). Simultaneously, the connotations of violence are implied not by what happens, but, so to speak, by what happens in regards to what has happened: namely present praise of violent deeds just done. However, the praise Hrothgar pronounces connotes another, earlier register, namely that of gratitude and relief; Hrothgar makes explicit that God’s providence has provided for him here restitution, has brought him through the crisis safely, which he thought impossible. As we have already seen, the same tone of relief and gratitude resonates dramatically in the previous two clusters. Likewise, Hrothgar’s speech is heavy with wonder for this providence, for the hand of God in the affairs of men, which working through the mighty grip of one man in particular, has ripped from the enemy of those men, he who *godes yrre bær*, his own hand; the severed arm provides the grisly and wondrous spectacle which functions as a meditative cipher for Hrothgar’s praise of God: *Disse ansyne alwealdan þanc . . . a mæg god wyrca n / wunder æfter wundre . . .* (928–931). In fact, if there is one dominant connotation dominating this cluster, it is that of wonder, a point which the *Andreas*-poet will
invoke. Finally, this moment is for Hrothgar the dispersion of an enigma, for as he says, he thought himself doomed to endure the depredations of Grendel indefinitely, but now has been disabused of this assumption, much to his tremendous relief. Thus, the implicit but absent dynamism and violence work interdependently with the sense of gratitude, wonder and, to a minor degree, enigma to form the overall connotative texture of the passage, but though these connotations are broadly similar to the two earlier clusters, these parallels here are still not as pronounced.

The first shared formula occurs in line 922b of *Beowulf*: **tryddode tirfæst getrume micle**. It finds an echo in line 707a of *Andreas*: **getrume mycle, þæt he in temple gestod**. The a-line in *Beowulf* again puts great weight on the dentals, and the first stressed syllable of the b-line repeats the sound of the first stressed syllable in the a-line. Also, the ‘m’ at the end of the *getrume* elides elegantly into the ‘m’ of *micle*. The prosodic realization of the line in *Andreas* is not as refined; it also depends heavily upon dentals, but spreads these out more, diminishing their effect. Moreover, the anacrusis is extremely drawn out, creating a considerable lag in the middle of the line’s rhythm. On the other hand, the *Andreas*-poet links nicely the first and last stressed syllables by means of the prefacing ‘ge’ of *getrume* and *gestod*, thereby splitting the sounds of the first stressed syllable of the a-line between the first and second stressed syllables of the b-line.

In terms of shared motifs and connotations, there are at least three points of contact. The first is what might be termed (rather awkwardly) ‘the lord’s approach to the central locus.’ In other words, just as Hrothgar approaches Heorot, the most important locus in this part of *Beowulf*, so too does Christ approach the temple of Jerusalem, the most important locus in ancient Israel. Both lords then come to a standstill, Hrothgar before the building and Christ within, and make a speech. The
second point is broader, concerning the sequence of the episodes in either text; in *Beowulf*, prior to this scene, the hero has performed great and wondrous deeds by destroying the monster. Likewise, in the scene preceding this episode of *Andreas*, the hero, Christ, has performed great and wondrous deeds in the desert, enacting miracles, though in this latter case the hero and the speaker are the same person. Then, in both texts, the hero approaches the central locus, the hall and temple respectively, where he looks and speaks upon wondrous objects attached to the locus. This brings us to the third point. In *Beowulf*, the wonder is Grendel’s arm, whose grisly wondrousness is finely contrasted to the beautiful wondrousness which surrounds it, of Heorot’s gold and its artistry. In *Andreas*, Christ also sees a wonder, which is also ‘creaturely,’ or shall be, and which is also a decoration of sorts appended to the building: namely, the Cherubim. In both tales, the hero makes this creaturely wonder the focal point of his disquisition.

The second shared formula occurs in *Beowulf*’s line 926: *stod on stapole, geseah steapne hrof*. The a-line is spread out over an entire line in *Andreas*, 1062: *standan stræte neah stapul ærenne*. The first thing one notices about the line in *Beowulf* is not merely the repeated sibilance throughout, but its expansion into the ‘st’ sound. This sound is picked also in *Andreas*, where again it appears three times.

The connotative collocations between the two texts are numerous. First, the scene in *Andreas* where the formula repeats is introduced once more by the saint walking to a significant location—in this case a brass pillar—just as before Hrothgar walked to the hall. As noted in the previous chapter, the *Andreas*-poet has changed the Latin and Greek accounts in which this brass pillar is marble. For such an explicit change he doubtless had reason, and for an Anglo-Saxon, a pillar of brass is certainly more esoteric than an already rare marble one. Thus a minor degree of wonder is once
more injected. However, this wonder would be greatly exaggerated if this peculiar pillar were meant to represent the brass pillar mentioned in the apocryphal Book of Enoch and which was certainly known by Anglo-Saxons. It was a pillar designed by Enoch to withstand a flood, such as is coming upon the Mermedonians, upon which is inscribed all manner of arcane and wicked knowledge, such as the wicked Mermedonians would be inclined to covet. If this is so, then again an air of enigma surrounds the object, since its knowledge is forbidden. In legend it is often hidden, and its interpretation requires great erudition. This reference stops far short of certainty, but in light of its context, it is an intriguing possibility. Moreover, as in Beowulf Hrothgar at this moment expounds upon how divine providence has afforded him, Beowulf and the Danes favour in battle, so also does Andreas here anticipate, beside the wondrous pillar, the favour of angels, in light of which he awaits whatever 
guðweorcæ may be granted him in the stronghold. In both cases, divine providence affords battle-achievements. Finally, in Beowulf this scene celebrates the salvation of those who in the hall were to be devoured by the monstrous, and now the suffering of the monstrous is made manifest (the arm nailed to Heorot). Likewise, in Andreas, those who in the dungeon were to be devoured by the cannibals have been saved, and now the cannibals—the monstrous—make manifest their suffering as they lament the loss.

The third formula between the two poems is found in Beowulf at 931: wunder 
æfter wundre, wuldres hyrde, and at 620 in Andreas: wundor æfter wundre on wera gesiehðe. The Beowulf-line diminishes the repeated ‘wu’ sounds by varying the

96 For the most recent work on The Book of Enoch, see Fredrick Biggs, ed., Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007): 8–11.
ending of the three words which begin with it, but also runs a framework of dentals through the final syllable of every single word in the line. The *Andreas*-line is somewhat simpler, building its structure upon an unremarkable pattern of double alliteration.

Because of the manner in which a connotation of wonder runs through all four of the contexts around this shared formulae, I am inclined to think of this formula as embodying the core sentiment informing the entire cluster. Where we find the formula again in *Andreas*, the saint is recounting the performance of wonders by Christ before the temple. The *Andreas*-poet is at pains to emphasize the philanthropic impulse of Christ as he enacts these (618–622):

```
’Secge ic ðe to soðe         ðæt he swïðe oft
beforan fremede         folces ræswum
wundor æfter wundre         on wera gesiððe,         620
swylce deogollice         dryhten gumena
folcræd fremede,         swa he to friðe hogode.’
```

[I tell you in truth that very often He performed wonder after wonder in the presence of the people’s leaders, in the sight of men, just as He, the People’s Lord, acted (for) the good (of) the folk secretly, as He was bent upon peace].

In the contexts around this formula in both *Beowulf* and *Andreas*, the hero is not only celebrated for performing wonders, but they are both publicly celebrated for the fact that the wonders are performed out of sight (for Beowulf in the dark of the hall, and for Christ in his private wanderings) for public good. Related to this is the fact that these wondrous deeds are here brought to light, for in *Andreas* Christ the mariner interrogates the saint about what these secret deeds of Christ are, which implies that they ought to be (at least somewhat) public knowledge, and insofar as they are wondrous, ought to be celebrated. Likewise, in *Beowulf*, deeds done in the dark are here brought into the light, celebrated by the most exalted figure in the land, Hroðgar. Moreover, the sensibility which frames here both discussions concerns not only
wonders, but more precisely wondrous deeds, thereby infusing a sense of dynamism once more into the episode in *Andreas*. Finally, the wondrous deed performed in either text is performed not only for the public good, but against a common and named foe: in *Beowulf*, Grendel, and in *Andreas*, The Devil, who uses the high priests as proxies by which to work his will: *Deofles larum / hæleð hynfuse hyrdon to georne, / wraðum værlogan* (Too willingly those imminently damned men listened to the Devil’s instruction, to the savage miscreant, *Andreas* 611b–613a).

Lastly, both poems share the formula located in *Beowulf* thus: *bote gebindan, ponne blode fah* (934), and in *Andreas* as follows: *banhus blodfag, benne weallað* (1405). In *Beowulf*, the double alliteration is complemented by assonance through the ‘o’ sounds, and yet again there is considerable weight put upon dentals at the end of words. In *Andreas*, the line also employs double alliteration, but is undistinguished otherwise.

Connotatively what is immediately conspicuous between the *Andrean* and *Beowulfian* passages in which the formula occurs is that the hero, Beowulf and Andreas, have undergone great struggles, the former by inflicting suffering and the second by suffering, and by these struggles have achieved the long-anticipated victory. This antithetical variation continues as we see in *Beowulf* that the hall, that which represents the community of men, is stained with the blood of that struggle, of the men the monster has therein slain. In *Andreas*, it is the man who is blood-stained, which would tie in aptly with the Christian narrative, in which the blood of one man, Christ, atones for the blood of all men, such as those who died in the hall. The saint, because he functions in imitation of Christ, points rather directly to this blood-stained Christ figure. In addition, the blood-stains of the saint are not upon his literal body, but to his *banhus*, drawing the association closer to the blood-stained hall. Following
even further upon this direct, antithetical variation is the description of the saint in
terms similar to the slaughtered Grendel, for his body is gashed, and more strikingly,
he describes his limbs as disjointed, which accords poorly with the form of his torture,
but well with the image of Grendel’s disjointed arm.

However, though all the parallels, both around this formula in *Andreas* and
around the rest which it shares with *Beowulf*, are suggestive, it is still true that they
are not as explicit and apt as in the previous two clusters.

**Cluster IV.**

As before, this cluster possesses four formulae in common with *Andreas*
(1222–3, 1224a, 1226a and 1235b). It extends from 1215 to 1237a, entailing
Wealhtheow’s gifts, the speech in which she entreats Beowulf’s guardianship for her
sons and the foreshadowing of betrayal:

[Wealhtheow spoke, said before the assemblage: “Take pleasure in this ring, Beowulf,
beloved warrior, with good fortune, and this garment use, (this) nation’s treasure;]
thrive well. Be known through might, and to these youths be in counsel kind. I will give you its reward. You have performed so that men will praise you, far and near, all and forever, even as widely as the sea, home of the wind, surrounds the cliff-walls. Be joyful while you live, æþeling; I wish you the best of wealth-treasures. May you be in deeds considerate of my sons, possessed of joy. Here every man is true to the other, merciful of spirit, loyal to the lord of men. The thegns are united, the people alert, (and) the drink-gladened company does as I direct.

Thereafter (she) went to seat. There was the finest (of) feasts, (and) men drank wine; they did not know fate, grim (and) ancient destiny, as it had happened to many heroes. Then evening fell and Hrothgar went to his quarters, the ruler to rest].

Unlike the previous cluster, this collocation of formulae is contained entirely within a discrete speech. Also, as might be expected of an oration, its prosody is quite complex; 16 of its 22 lines contain double alliteration (72 %), and the remaining four, which employ simple alliteration, all entail striking but anomalous consonantal ornamentation. In addition, the passage weaves about two particular concepts a range of synonyms. The first is the idea of well-being (bruc, hæle, geþeoh, eadig, tela and dreamhealdende) and the second is the notion of wealth (beages [metonymically], peodgestreona, lean and sincgestreona). Moreover, both of these collocations occur in the first half of the passage, where Wealththeow wishes Beowulf well and enjoins him to be a protector of her sons; the discretion of this passage is marked out by the envelope pattern formed by the synonymous peodgestreona and sincgestreona, immediately after which the connotations of wealth and well-being are infused through foreshadowing with a grim, antithetical pathos, for both wealth and well-being are cast as ephemeral interruptions in an essentially entropic world. Finally, the passage contains no fewer than eight compounds (peodgestreona, wideferhþ, windgeard, sincgestreona, dreamhealdende, mandrihtne, ealgears and geoscean), the first five of which (around the part of the speech contained within the envelope pattern) are unique to either Beowulf, or Beowulf and Andreas (sincgestreona) alone. Thus, as with the previous clusters, both the passage’s discrete nature and its prosodic
and verbal abundance strongly recommend it as a valuable resource from which to draw formulae.

We also find many of the same connotations here as before, of dynamism, gratitude, violence, wonder, and, in a manner, enigma. These connotations arise largely from ironic juxtapositioning and resolve into the passage’s haunting pathos. The dynamism is unexpected, since Wealhtheow’s speech praises deeds of the past and looks to the future, but involves no present, direct action. However, the connotative ambience of the passage (as opposed to its denotative nature) is coloured by Wealhðeow’s barrage of imperatives, demanding action, and from this there arises an urgent sense of ‘things to be done,’ in spite of the relaxed, celebratory atmosphere. In the enveloped, initial portion of the speech, there are no fewer than seven imperatives (bruc, neot, geþeoh, cen, wes, wes and beo). These imperatives for the future are interwoven with the gratitude and wonder she feels concerning great needs fulfilled in the past: namely the slaying of Grendel. Thus, in a manner, Wealhtheow’s thankfulness for deeds already done implies an anticipatory thankfulness for deeds which may yet be done: specifically the patronage of her sons. Her gifts to Beowulf are a conventional materialization of this thankfulness. In another sense, however, her gratitude and its rewards seem undercut by venality and vulgarity, for Beowulf has just performed one wondrous and dangerous deed for the Danes and another is immediately requested. Not only this, but Wealhtheow asks explicitly (even crudely), not allowing Beowulf the dignity of volunteering his patronage which would make it a counter-gift with all the benefits this would entail. Had she merely mentioned her concern for the future of her sons in such a public oration, a listener as astute and

---

subtle as Beowulf would be sure to discern the invitation to aid; how he responds is his business, but this is just the point. Instead, an awkward and chilling silence is the only response she gets from the hero, and not even Hroðgar replies (himself perhaps embarrassed by such heavy-handed tactics). This is in sharp contrast to the usual speech patterning of the poem, of articulation and response. The silence permits the passage’s air of pathos to bleed in, for things shall indeed be done, but not the things Wealhþeow desires, nor by those she desires to do things; for all her dynamism, Wealhþeow will be helpless before the outplay of fate. For the audience, who knows that the line of the Scyldings is doomed, and soon hereafter doomed, the irony must have been immediate, and the feast in which this speech is couched, celebrating victory over the monster in the darkness and the laudable state of social affairs at Heorot, makes that irony poignant; ignorantly, they rejoice, celebrate and hope, even as Wealhþeow in her speech strains towards a permanence for such a state of affairs. She takes the thought, and so the irony and its consequent pathos, further, declaring “The þegns are united, the people alert, (and) the drink-gladdened company does as I direct.” Such vaunting is unsupportable in her entropic world, for the þegns shall not be united, the people shall be caught unawares, and the drink-gladdened company shall pass out of her power forever. For the audience, who knows the outturning of events, this implies violence, for the world of Beowulf is not merely a world of decay, where if one is not dynamic the natural decay shall reassert itself, where passivity facilitates the rot of the social fabric. Rather the entropy of this world is itself full of a dynamism which manifests as endemic violence, in this case the destruction enabled by Hrothulf’s action. What Beowulf and Hrothgar do not do here, on this night, is

---

98 Her name is often translated as ‘foreign slave’; cf. Orchard, Critical Companion, 221.
juxtaposed by what the audience knows Hrothulf will do later. This is the case throughout the poem, where the natural state of entropy arises from the violent dynamism of characters like Hengest, Grendel, Grendel’s mother, and the dragon itself; the splendid equilibrium which Heorot celebrates this night is the aberration, not the norm which Wealhtheow seems to anticipate. She shall soon be disabused of this ignorance as the mystery, the enigma, of her and her sons’ future is illuminated in the internecine destruction to come. The Beowulf-poet cannot resist driving the point to its ironic culmination, explicitly aligning their celebration (Þær wæs symbla cyst; / druncon win weras, 1232b–1233a) with a universalising declaration which finds an instance in the doom of the Scyldings: Wyrd ne cuþon / geosceaf grimme, swa hit agangen wearð / eorla manegum (1233b–1235a). Then he shifts the audience’s gaze to the external, material world, as darkness falls over the hall and the lord goes to his rest.

The first shared collocation in this passage is 1222–3, which is notable for its breadth of correlation in Andreas. In Beowulf it runs thus: ealne wideferhþ weras ehtigad, / efne swa side swa sæ bebugeð. Both lines employ simple alliteration but utilize some curious architecture. For instance, the two swa give a sense of double alliteration, except that the stress does not fall on them, though the exaggerated sibilance of the line does much to imitate the sound of the sea upon the strand about which the line speaks. Finally, if any doubt remains about the ‘book-ending of sound within and between these two lines, the ‘th’ sound with which the second line ends makes this untenable; the first and last words of the first line begin with the same sound, the first words beginning either line begin with the same sound, and the last syllable of either line ends in the same sound (‘th’). Because of this strong relationship between the two lines, it comes as little surprise that in Andreas, not a
formula, nor even a full line, but elements of both lines together should reappear. In Andreas 332–3, nearly all the prosodic effects from Beowulf are lost: *farað nu geond ealle eordan sceatas / emne swa wide swa water bebugeð*. In addition, the alliterating syllables of the first line (and these are precisely the two words shared with its analogue in Beowulf) come dangerously close to alliterating on the same vowel, though this turns out merely to be a trick of proximity to the ‘a’ and ‘o’ upon which they really alliterate. The second line seems unremarkable except for its arresting dactylic rhythm.

The details and connotations shared between the passages of either poem again depend largely, but not entirely upon antithesis. One aspect which is not antithetical is the peculiarity of the locution, which takes measure of geographic space and which is particular to these two poems alone. This alone is enough to imply a relationship, but this sense of affinity is enhanced further by the fact that in both passages where the lines are found, it is the spreading fame of an individual which is overlaid upon this measuring of the earth, for the passage where we find this locution in Andreas is where the saint tells the disguised Christ, upon the beach, that he has been commanded as an apostle to spread the fame of Christ, the gospel, throughout the earth. In both passages, this fame anticipates a degree of wonder and awe. More specifically, in both texts the spread of this fame travels not only by land, but rather crosses seas, just as Andreas himself must now do. Finally, in either passage, the fame of both Beowulf and Christ imparts hope, in the first case for salvation of the Danes from Grendel and in the second for salvation of the soul entire; in either case, gratitude is the anticipated response. At this point, however, antithesis again begins to interweave the context.
As mentioned above, the hope celebrated in Heorot is notable because it shall be disastrously disappointed. This is emphatically not the case for the Andreas-poet as he speaks of the hope in Christ: an antithesis difficult to over-emphasize. Concurrent with this hope, both heroes offer a form of safety, one corporeal, the other soteriological. Again, however, the thematic point both at this point and throughout *Beowulf* is that all such safety is merely temporary, putting of the inevitable judgement of *Wyrd*, whereas the safety offered by the Word which Andreas brings transcends all mere corporeal concerns and shall not disappoint. Finally, the wealth by which Wealhtheow acknowledges and socializes this hope and safety is eschewed by Andreas on the strand, where in sharp contra-distinction to the remarkable treasures heaped upon Beowulf, the apostle declares that they travel the world without treasures, depending rather upon God to provide for their needs.

The next shared formula is found in *Beowulf* 1224: *windgeard, weallas. Wes pendun þu lifige*. Its structure utilizes double alliteration, and the unstressed, initial syllables of *penden* and *þu* in its b-line are linked by consonance, (in fact, this habit of consonance is considerably more pronounced in this passage than in most other parts of the poem). Its analogue in *Andreas* also uses double alliteration and the final syllable of the overall line ends in a ‘w’ sound which echoes the main alliterating sound: *windige weallas. Þa se wisa oncneow* (843).

In the two connotative contexts in which we find these formulae, the renown of both Christ’s and Beowulf’s deeds have reached the edge of the sea and arrived before walls upon which the wind breaks. As with the previous shared formulae, the deeds connote dynamism and gratitude, but what is more intriguing is that yet again this particular relationship mirrors the direct antithesis and irony of the *Beowulf* passage overall and the previous formulaic correlation in particular. For instance, the
walls in *Beowulf* are the work of God, while in *Andreas* they are the work of men. Moreover, the walls in *Andreas* are the work of evil men, while plainly the walls in *Beowulf* are made by God, who is goodness Himself. This aligns well with other connotative dynamics between the two contexts; there is a sense in the *Beowulf*-passage that the winds are held inside or contained within the *windgeard*, while in *Andreas* precisely the opposite obtains, for the wind is held out of Mermedonia by the walls, which makes metaphorical sense, since they are built by evil men and it is vital in this story that good men, and the word they communicate (one is almost tempted to say breathed), be able to break in; in other words, in contrast to the sense of inclusion in *Beowulf*, there is in *Andreas* a sense of exclusion. The moral texture of the passage is reified by the fact that in *Beowulf* it may be considered a bad development should the hero’s fame be kept with a space, rather than spreading without limiting ‘walls,’ while in *Andreas* it may be considered a good development should the hero’s fame be kept out. Throughout all of this, the connotative matrix of parallel and antithetical relations between the two passages is remarkably consistent.

The third shared formula runs as follows: *sincgestreona. Beo þu suna minum* (*Beowulf* 1224). This finds repetition in *Andreas*, at 1656: *secga seledream ond sincgestreon*. In *Beowulf*, in addition to double alliteration, there is an echo of assonance in the ‘eo’ sound in *streona* nearby in *beo*; this helps to link aurally the a-line and b-line. Also, in the b-line the poet dwells upon the ‘u’ sound which is fronted and backed in all instances by nasals. Some of these peculiar prosodics find reproduction in the *Andreas* line. This too employs double alliteration, but the vowel sound it reproduces is an ‘e,’ not the ‘u,’ inserting it no fewer than six times throughout the line. Likewise, as the *Beowulf* line aurally linked the a-line and b-line by means of anadiplosis on ‘eo,’ so the *Andreas* line does the same by means of
epistrophe, in this case reproducing the sound much more extensively in the ‘ream’ of *seledream* and the ‘reon’ of *sincgestreon*.

In addition to the distinctive prosody shared between the two lines, the connotative correlation between the two passages in which we find these formulae is very distinctive. The formula in *Andreas* occurs as the apostle attempts to leave the converted Mermedonians as quickly as he can, eager to return to Achaia. The first point of contact is the heavy air of doom which overlays both passages, a doom which in either case depends upon the audience’s knowledge of other tales for its register; in *Beowulf*, great weight is placed upon the ruin which looms over the dynasty of the Scyldings, the end of which the *Beowulf*-poet can gesture to obliquely, as he does to so many other tales throughout this poem, knowing that his audience knows how this will turn out. Likewise, the *Andreas*-poet alludes to the saint’s imminent martyrdom in Greece, the knowledge of which suffuses the final scene of the poem with its idiosyncratic pathos and melancholy. The *Andreas*-poet takes it for granted that his audience knows the tale of this martyrdom also, and so his references to this outcome is also oblique. The second point of contact manifests as the lack of concern both *Andreas* and *Beowulf* have for persons for whom they might be considered responsible. This ‘neglect’ in *Beowulf* draws no criticism upon the hero, since the appeal for aid was crudely proffered and, moreover, its importance requires that *Beowulf* know the course of fate: that these sons were at even higher risk than most kings’ sons. *Andreas* has no such excuses and he is roundly chastised by God for his lack of ‘patronage’ for the recently converted and for his spiritually self-serving eagerness to achieve the martyr’s palm. Concomitantly, this implies another layer of correspondence, which is that in both cases the doom and the necessity of patronage suggest imminent violence. Likewise, in both passages there is again an emphasis...
upon what the hero of the tale does not do, rather than what he does, and so, once
again by antithesis, connotations of dynamism appear. On the other hand, a point of
antithesis appears between the references to wealth and gratitude in either passage, for
sincgestreona in Beowulf refers back to the treasure which the gratitude of
Wealhtheow bestows, while in Andreas, sincgestreon is precisely (and yet again, cf.
pg. 65) what the apostle wishes to leave behind. Following this antithesis, the saint’s
avoidance of wealth leads directly to a sense of impoverishment and beseeching, for
the Mermedonians beg the man to stay, desperate not to lose him; the man is the
wealth they seek. In Beowulf, in sharp contrast to the Mermedonians’ dissatisfaction,
no connotation is expected to follow from the acquisition of sincgestreona other than
the usual gratitude.

The final formula common to the two clusters is found in line 1235 in Beowulf
and line 1245 in Andreas. In Beowulf it reads eorla manegum, syððan æfen cwom,
while in Andreas it is phrased as swa wæs ealne dæg oððæt æfen com. The simple
alliteration of the Beowulf-line is perhaps complicated by the fact that both the a-line
and the b-line end in a back-vowel/’m’ combination: another case of consonance. The
Andreas-line also uses simple alliteration and contains a considerable number of ‘æ’
throughout both a-line and b-line, unifying the sound of the line by assonance.

Predictably, in the context of evening’s arrival, both passages speak about a
key figure going to his rest, but here the similarity ends and a number of point by
point antitheses erupt. With the death of Grendel, Hrothgar may gratefully anticipate
peace and rest this night, but he will not get it; in the night, Grendel’s mother will
strike, carrying off his dearest advisor, Æschere. Sorrow is what Hrothgar shall
receive from this night. In contrast, Andreas is cast down in the dungeon, anticipating
(correctly) yet another night of taunting and torment; both peace and rest shall be
denied him. Likewise, as Hrothgar receives from the night only sorrow, so Andreas in
the darkness was leohht sefæ / halig heortan neh, hige untyddre (was light in heart / the
holy spirit, firm in purpose, 1251b–1252). Hrothgar’s optimistic expectations are
disappointed, and sorrow results, while Andreas’ grim expectations come true, and he
is joyful amidst these. Related to this antithesis is the treatment of dynamism. Clearly,
all the action Wealhtheow takes (cf. her barrage of imperatives and heavy-handed
entreaty) are pointed out to be tragically futile before the workings of Fate. On the
other hand, it is precisely Andreas’ striving here, suffering in imitation of Christ in
Mermedonia, which proves ultimately effective, not only to the glory of God and the
salvation of the cannibals, but to the reflected glory which shines down from these
deeds upon the saint; this is not dynamism in vain. Finally, the celebration and
striving in Heorot will prove unable to withstand the imminent violence, while the
saint’s praise and hope proves adequate to the violence he presently endures. In other
words, the celebrated hope in *Beowulf* is untested, and when it is, it fails, while the
celebrated hope in *Andreas* is tested, and does not fail.

Thus this cluster, as the others, displays a richness of vocabulary and prosody,
occurs in a relatively discrete passage, contains a framework of the usual
connotations. Moreover, the peculiar admixture of irony, antithesis and pathos which
infuses the *Beowulf*-passage is echoed with remarkably consistency in the individual
contexts in which we encounter the shared formulae in *Andreas*. As always, the
correlations stop short of certain proof, but the peculiarity of the parallels and their
sheer quantity seem to render a relationship considerably more plausible than not. As
the above analysis indicates, such a relationship would do much to enrich and enliven
a reading to the hagiographic poem.

Cluster V.
This collocation of shared formulae occurs in a passage which extends from 1408 to 1424. The exact correlations are 1413–15, 1422–3 and 1424. These correspond to Andreas 836b–41, 1240–41 and 591 respectively. The Beowulf-passage reads as follows:

Ofereode þa æþelinga bearn
steap stanhlíðo, stige nearwe,
enge anaðas, uncuð gelad,
neowle næssas, nicorhusa fela.
He feara sum beforan gengde
wisra monna wong sceawian,
opþæt he færinga fyrgenbeamas
ofer harne stan hleonian funde,
wynleasne wudu; wæter under stod
drecorig ond gedrefed. Denum callum wæs,
winum Scyldinga, weorce on mode
to geþolianne, þegne monegum,
oncyð eorla gehwæm, syðþan Æschere
on þam holmlife hafelan metton.
Flod blode weol, hatan heolfre. Horn stundum song
fusilc fyrdleod. Felba eal gesæt.

[Then the hero’s son passed over steep stone slopes, narrow paths, constricted one-man trails, unknown ways, towering headlands, many monsters’ lairs; with a few wise men he went ahead, scouting the terrain, until suddenly he found the joyless mountain forest overhanging hoary stone; the water below was roiling and bloody. For all Danes, friends of the Scyldings, it was a pain at heart to suffer, a grief for every hero, for many a thegn, when Æschere’s head they found at the water(‘s) cliff. The mere surged with hot gore, bloody, (and the) people gazed at (it). The (war)-horn intermittently sang its urgent war song. The troop all sat down].

Predictably, the cluster occurs in a set-piece, which describes tracking the trail of the monster to its mere and the discovery of the head. On the other hand, it is very short on synonyms (most of these are attached to the concept of a path). Likewise, it contains very few compounds, none of which are very distinctive (stanhlíðo, anaðas, nicorhusa, fyrgenbeamas and fyrdleod), and only nine of its lines use double alliteration (52%). Finally, the prosody of the passage overall is not particularly ornate. From the perspective of such broad concerns—excepting that it is a set-piece—it seems less promising than earlier passages as a resource upon which an
Anglo-Saxon poet might have drawn. There are a number of details, however, which make these doubts less certain.

One is that the first two of the three shared collocations entail not just single a-lines or b-lines, nor even full lines, but multiples lines (three and two respectively). Even more arresting is that the correlations span a similar number of lines in *Andreas* as well (again, three and two respectively). Moreover, the individual formulae follow, in both texts and throughout lines, the same order, even though their location in a-lines and b-lines varies (all this will be detailed more meticulously in the following discussion of individual parallels). In addition, though the passage overall is not particularly ornate, the groupings of lines in which one finds shared formulae are extremely complex, more so even than most of the lines surveyed thus far. Finally, the nature and patterning of imagery and motifs in the *Beowulf*-passage are highly reminiscent of Christian literature other than the verse *Andreas*, specifically Blickling Homily XVI and *Visio S. Pauli*. This *Beowulf*-passage follows Hrothgar’s earlier description of Grendel’s lair, though here the imagery is much more detailed.

Hrothgar’s description is as follows (1361b–1379a):

\[
\text{Nis þæt feor heonon} \\
\text{milgemearces þæt se mere standed;} \\
\text{ofer þæm hongiað hrinde bearwas,} \\
\text{wudu wyrtum fæst wæter oferhelmað.} \\
\text{þær mæg nihta gehwæm niðwundor seon,} \\
\text{fyr on flode. No þæs frod leofað} \\
\]

---

It is not far from here by the measure of miles where the mere stands, over which hang frozen woods, a forest deeply rooted overshadows the water. There every night one can see a deadly wonder, fire on the waters. No one lives who is wise enough amongst men’s sons to know the bottom. Though the heath-walker, the hart mighty with horns, pursued by hounds might seek the forest, chased from afar, he prefers to give up his life, his breath on the bank, rather than plunge in to save his head; that is no pleasant place. From there water’s waves rise up to the dark clouds when the wind raises awful storms, until the sky turns grim and the heavens weep. Now again the remedy belongs to you alone. You do not yet know the region, the ghastly place where you might find the very sinful creature.

This description bears a striking resemblance to the description of hell we encounter in the Blickling homily:


[Thus Saint Paul was looking at the northern part of this middle-earth where all the waters go down, and he saw there over the water a certain hoary stone, and there had grown up a very frosted forest north of that stone, and there were dark mists, and under that stone was a home of water monsters and wolves, and he saw that on that cliff there hung in those icy forests many blackened souls tied by their hands, and their enemies in the shape of water monsters were gripping them like hungry wolves, and the water was dark beneath that stone, and between that cliff and the water was a]
drop of twelve miles, and when the branches broke, the souls who hung on those branches went down and the (water) monsters seized upon them].

Ultimately, the Blickling description is indebted to the apocryphal *Visio S. Pauli*, which exists in fragmentary form in Old English, but whether the *Beowulf*-poet drew upon the Blickling text, the Blickling-author drew upon *Beowulf*, or both drew upon some Old English or Latin version of the *Visio* is still unclear. In *Beowulf*, however, both descriptions are divested of their explicitly eschatological register, even though the sequence of images remains the same. This is largely achieved by shifting them out of symbolic or allegorical modes and into literal ones (for instance, the *Beowulf*-passage is entirely without metaphors or similes). This intertextual nexus of hellish motifs is made all the more fascinating by the fact that Blickling Homily XIX constitutes one of the two Old English prose versions of *Andreas*. Had the Christian *Andreas*-poet been familiar with *Beowulf*, it seems unlikely that he would have been unaware of the homiletic and apocalyptic language, not to mention the long heritage of this inverted *locus amoenus* which fetches up in the *Beowulf*-passage here, and surely this point of literary and religious affinity would have engendered a sympathy with the passage. Detailed investigation of the particular correlations seems to confirm this sympathy.

Before this, however, the connotative nature of the passage needs to be overlaid upon the above points. In this cluster, the most salient connotations are enigma and wonder. The hero follows difficult, hidden and dangerous paths to places unvisited in pursuit of dual objectives: the fate of Æschere and positive knowledge of the monster’s lair. By careful scouting, he finds both; Æschere is dead and the mere lays below them. Sorrow for Æschere overcomes the Danes and the uncanny nature of

---

the monster’s abode fills them with a terrible awe. This awe is enhanced further if the intertextual echoes of Saint Paul’s hell informs one’s apprehension of the scene. Also, and plainly, the roiling blood and gore, not to mention Æschere’s severed head, fill the scene with the detritus of violence. Finally, though it is comparatively muted, the vanity of Beowulf’s dynamism, his vigorous action to save Æschere, proves once more in vain, in a thematic impulse which is by now becoming familiar.

Thus, at the technical level, the length and artfulness of individual correlations in this cluster, as well as a configuration of images shared with two Christian texts, recommend the passage as an attractive source for the Andreas-poet, while the familiar network of connotations fits in well with the clusters of formulae already observed.

The first collocation of shared formulae occurs from 1413 to 1415: *wisra monna wong sceawian, / ofþæt he faeringa fyrgenbeamas / ofer harne stan hleonian funde*. This corresponds with *Andreas* 836b to 841:

> Sceadu sweðerodon
> wonn under wolcnum. þa com wederes blæst
> hador heofonleoma, ofer hofu blican.
> Onwoc þa wiges heard, *wang seawode*,
> fore burggeatum. Beorgas steape,
> hleoðu hlifodon, ymbe *harne stan*,

[Dark shadows beneath the clouds melted away. Then came the torch of the sky, the clear lamp of the heavens, shimmering over the dwellings. Then the man, unrelenting in the fight, woke up, gazed upon the landscape. Before the city gates steep slopes and cliffs rose, all about the grey rock (stood)].

All three *Beowulf*-lines use simple alliteration, but the first line insinuates not one, but two internal half-rhymes, the first on the ‘wi’ of *wisra* with the ‘wi’ of *sceawian*, and the second on the ‘on’ of *monna* with the ‘on’ of *wong*. Together, the internal rhyme pattern forms what one might call cross-rhyme, of an ABBA pattern. When read aloud, the aural effects of this are immediately apparent. The next line uses the same
tactic, aligning the consonants of the alliterating syllables in a-line and b-line throughout, but varying the vowels, so that we have a parallel sound in the ‘fær’ of færinga and the ‘fyr’ of fyrgenbeamas. This play on the fricatives is further enhanced if we take into account the thorns in the first word of the line, oppæt. Finally, in the third line we find four syllables which end in ‘n,’ and that the entire line is bookended by an ‘f’/backvowel combination; again: ofer harne stan hleonian funde. In addition to this structuring, the poet has also linked the second and third lines by means of ending the third line with the alliterating syllable of the second (on ‘f’), and by beginning the third line with an ‘o’/fricative combination just as the line above does (oppæt / ofer). Thus, the exaggerated craftsmanship of this small passage sets it dramatically apart from the lines immediately around it and make it a tempting resource for other oral poets. Predictably, the prosody in Andreas is not as complex.

Its first line in which we find a shared formula relies on double alliteration, but adds a further play upon the ‘w’ in sceawode. The second line is more complicated, using simple alliteration, but connecting a-line with b-line by means of a large collocation of sound in last and first words respectively, upon a vowel/’rg’/vowel collocation, adding a double vowel to the final a-line syllable and the first b-line syllable, thus: burggeatum / beorgas. The final line again utilises double alliteration and, expanding the sound of the first two alliteration syllables (‘hle’ and ‘hli’). There is no inter-linear sound play.

It should also be pointed out that in the lines just above, one can’t help but hear the well-known wod under wolcnum in Beowulf (714a) echoed in wonn under wolcnum (837a), and that the peculiar heofonleoma (838a) occurs here in Andreas just as only a short way on from the Beowulf passage that the Andreas-poet seems to be borrowing from here, as the hero fights Grendel’s mother, he seizes the sword which
shines like *rodores candel* (1572a). Moreover, as noted earlier, the line-breadth of correlation between the two texts and the order of shared formulae argue, via two levels of consistency, for an explicit relationship. Throughout all these points, the *Andreas* passage points dramatically and distinctly back to *Beowulf*.

At the levels of connotation and motif, the parallels are also strong. After a difficult journey, Beowulf has come to the home of the man-eating monster located near the waters (underneath, in this case), while Andreas has also come, after a hard journey, to the lair of man-eating monsters, the city of Mermedonia, which is beside the waters. The proximity of both heroes to the monsters obviously connotes a sense of imminent violence; in *Beowulf* this is emphasised by its detritus, of blood and severed head, while in *Andreas* the martial language reasserts itself; the saint is here described as *wiges heard*, who awakes his *beornas beadurofe* and *wigend*. Their proximity to the monsters is further highlighted by the *hara stan*, a common boundary marker in Old English charters and consistently used in Beowulf to demarcate the territory of monsters. In addition, there is an antithetical relationship here between the outplay of dynamism, for as the remedy fell to Beowulf alone, as Hrothgar noted, so we have seen that for Æschere at least, that remedy has failed; the hero’s dynamism has been in vain. For Andreas, moving the saint to action proved one of mediating conflicts of the entire plot, and here the end of that conflict, the imminent dynamism of the saint as he engages the cannibals, is explicitly signalled, for the saint acknowledges that God’s hand has moved him into movement: as it turns out, this dynamism does not prove in vain (ultimately, it does not belong to the saint). Finally,

---

101 This pattern is repeated again in *Beowulf* in the encounter with the dragon, perhaps a collocation of plot developments and imagery indebted to hagiographical traditions: cf. Christine Rauer, *Beowulf and the Dragon: Analogues and Parallels* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000).  
there is a sense of wonder, not only in the surveying of wondrous landscapes in either text (the windswept walls of the infamous cannibal city and the mere of monsters seldom seen by men and feared by all beasts), but also in the shared formula *wond sceawian / wang sceawode*, for in Beowulf *sceawian* tends to show up (19 occurrences) in proximity to the idea of *wundor* (either it or its cognates occur 23 times in the poem). The usage of the verb is mostly limited to references to things uncanny and otherworldly (for instance, the monster’s trail, the reading of omens, Grendel’s hand, the trail of Grendel’s mother, the hilt of the ‘sword of the flood,’ the plundered dragon cup, the dragon itself, his hoard of treasure and, interestingly, Beowulf himself. One gets the distinct impression that in *Beowulf*, to survey (*sceawian*), is necessarily to survey the wondrous. It is thus little wonder that in *Andreas* the verb occurs yet again as the saint and his apostles stand before this most eerie of cities and then fall to wondering at the marvellous and uncanny nature of their trip here.

The next set of formulaic parallels here involves 1422–1423: *Flod blode weol folc to sægon / hatan heolfre. Horn stundum song*. These parallels recur as the saint in *Andreas* suffers torture at the hands of the cannibals and is then thrown into the dungeon, 1240–1241: *banhus abrocen. Blod yðum weoll / haton heolfre. Hæfde him on innan*. In *Beowulf*, between the earlier collocation of shared formulae and this, the lines have been prosodically straight-forward, but here again the poet employs a wide range of internal rhymes and complex sound plays, much of which echoes the earlier tactics (and this is just where the *Andreas*-poet seems to borrow again). The first line uses simple alliteration, but fills this line with internal rhyme depending on ‘o’ and ‘l’ combinations (four occurrences) and further weight is placed on the ‘o’ sound in other syllables (for a total of six occurrences in a nine syllable line): *flod blode weol, folc to*
The next line employs double alliteration and again insinuates internal rhyme on vowel/nasal combinations as did 1415 above, and which onomatopoeically catches nicely the sound of the horn about which it speaks: *hatan heolfre. Horn stundum*

Finally, both lines end in words beginning with ‘s,’ as does the next line down in which we find yet another formula shared by *Andreas*. The analogous lines in *Andreas* both use double alliteration, and save for an extra alliterating, unstressed syllable in 1241b, they are unremarkable.

Also, as in the previous parallel, there are notable similarities between the connotations and motifs of the two texts. For instance, as in *Beowulf* the hero tracks the monster over rough, wild and mountainous terrain to a haunted place, so also in *Andreas* the saint is dragged by cannibals over rocky screes, through mountain gorges and ancient roads of giants (1232–1236a):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Drogon deormodne} & \quad \text{æfter dunscæfum,} \\
\text{ymb stanhleoðo,} & \quad \text{stærcedferþne,} \\
\text{efne swa wide swa} & \quad \text{wegas to lagon,} \\
\text{enta ærgeweorc,} & \quad \text{innan burgum,} \\
\text{stræte stanfage} & \quad \text{1235}
\end{align*}
\]

[They hauled the courageous and stubborn-spirited man through mountain ravines and round rocky slopes as widely as to where roads, stone-paved highways, stretched, the former work of giants, from within the city].

The sense of violence here is brutally immediate. The description of the suffering saint also accords well with the suffering of sinners who are described in the hellish landscapes of the Blickling Homily XVI and the *Visio S. Pauli*. On the other hand, those who suffer in the Blickling Homily and the *Visio* do so without hope because they deny Christ, while *Andreas* does so in hope because he professes Christ. This seems in keeping with a broader impulse throughout *Andreas* which is at pains to point up the hopelessness of striving in the heroic world of *Beowulf* by means of a series of parallels in the hagiographical legend which afford a basis for points of sharp
eschatological antithesis. In other words, the active dynamism of Beowulf contrasts distinctly with the passive dynamism of Andreas, for Beowulf’s striving (in this scene and others) affords either only temporary respite from the depredations of Fate or none at all, while Andreas’ striving ends triumphantly, if less convincingly.

The final parallel follows the second Beowulfian set immediately, at 1224b:  
\textit{fuslic fyrdleoð ðeþa eal gesæt}. Once more, internal rhyme combines with the line’s double alliteration. In the a-line, this centres upon a rhyme pattern in which an ‘f’ is followed by a closed, back vowel, a front vowel, and then beginning the next syllable with an ‘l’/vowel combination: \textit{fuslic fyrdleop}. The first syllable of the b-line continues the ‘f,’ but shifts the vowel to the middle front ‘e,’ and again, the following syllable contains an ‘l’/vowel combination, though the order is now inverted. Finally, the weight placed on the fricatives is further enhanced if one takes the eth and the thorn into account. In \textit{Andreas}, this formula occurs as the apostle recounts Christ’s miracles to the mariner-Christ, dwelling specifically on one miracle: the feeding of the five thousand, which is precisely where this shared formula occurs. The line reads \textit{fif ðusendo feðan sæton}. One sees again that there is, predictably, a heavy emphasis placed upon fricatives (five instances, which is the same number as the line in \textit{Beowulf}), and this is perhaps noteworthy, since the \textit{Andreas}-line uses simple alliteration instead of the double employed by the \textit{Beowulf} line.

Moreover, as the previous two parallels seem to rely at some remove upon a third, intermediary text, so too does this parallel: in this case the gospel account of the feeding of the five thousand. It thus becomes increasingly difficult to deny some sort of dependence by the \textit{Andreas}-poet upon both his and the audience’s knowledge of extraneous texts to nuance the reading of the one he composes. For instance, as mentioned in the previous chapter, this particular miracle is the one most commonly
associated with Andrew, and is conventionally interpreted as illustrative of his key characteristic: faith; it deserves special prosodic treatment, and it is exactly upon mention of this miracle in the text’s list of miracles that the author seems to borrow upon a third text, thereby forming a triad of associations, between *Beowulf*, the gospels, and *Andreas*; the reference to the gospel text, moreover, is explicit, decreasing one’s scepticism that he might refer to others also since the precedent is set out precisely in this passage (as at so many other points).

There are also grounds for discerning in the *Andreas*-passage a metanarrative, since Andreas recounts a story—in the story—of which his audience, the Mariner-Christ, already has a copy in memory. Likewise, this forms a sort of *opus geminatum* for the audience of this poem, because we too already have the original (prose) version in mind when we read here of the saint’s version (in verse); like Christ, we ‘already know this one,’ which thus enriches and complicates our reading.

This also affords the reader a more legitimate comparisons of connotations between texts. The *Andreas*-poet adds to the biblical account the assertion that the five thousand sat down, dispirited; there are no grounds for this. But though there is no analogue in the Book of John, it is of a piece with the configuration of sentiments in this *Beowulf*-passage, for the Danes are described as disconsolate just as the five thousand. If the *Andreas*-poet has an explicit formulaic comparison in mind between the Danes and five thousand, and he adds here that the five thousand are disconsolate, does this imply a sympathy (on the author’s part, not his intended audience) for the Danes similar to that which he invokes on behalf of the five thousand? The miracle of the five thousand is often interpreted as Christ feeding both the physical and spiritual needs of the masses, and because they are starving at both levels, he has compassion on them. The Danes, on the other hand, are starving at only one level; at the spiritual
level, for they have not yet heard the gospel and so are damned. This also aligns well with the complex of imagery in the *Beowulf*-passage referring to hell and the punishments of the damned, for the Danes who sit down lamenting at the edge of the cliff are damned to suffer the fate of those whom the writers of the *Visio S. Pauli* and Blickling Homily XVI, describe as hanging from that cliff.

Finally, we find here once more a considerable number of the connotative notes struck in earlier clusters of shared formulae. For example, once more the passage in *Andreas* involves Christ doing deeds, miracles, such as he has been performing in previous clusters, thereby implying Christian dynamism. In addition, this contrasts with the dynamism which has proven in vain for Beowulf, for God’s will is realised through these miracles. Likewise, and plainly, miracles connote wonder, such as is rife throughout the *Beowulf*-passage, though of a positive nature which deviates from the negative sense surrounding wonder in this passage in *Beowulf*. Moreover, the miracle in the gospel serves to elucidate to the Jews who Christ really is, while the apostle’s account of it to the Mariner-Christ has the same intention, and so once again divine mysteries, divine enigmas, are being illuminated. Finally, for their miraculous food the five thousand are clearly full of gratitude.

However, throughout all these points of contact, the proof of an explicit parallel between texts stops well short of certainty, no matter how consistently it seems to enrich readings of *Andreas*. Nevertheless, the parallels certainly seem to make the possibility considerably more likely than not.

**Cluster VI.**

The sixth cluster is located in a passage which extends from 1545 to 1569, encompassing the second half of Beowulf’s battle with and triumph over Grendel’s mother:
Then she bestrode the hall-guest and drew her sax, broad and bright-edged; (she) wanted to avenge her son, her only child. From his shoulders hung a braided breast-net that guarded life; against point and edge it withstood inroads. Then would have the son of Ecgtheow, the Geats’ champion, perished under yawning depths save that his war-byrnie, hardened battle-net, provided aid, and Holy God controlled the war-victory; the Wise Lord, Heaven’s Ruler, easily decided it aright. Then, when he again stood up, he saw amongst the armour a blade blessed by victory, an ancient blade (of) giants, with mighty edges, the honour of warriors; it was a weapon most exquisite, but it was bigger than any other man was able to bear in battle, good and finely wrought, a giant’s craftmanship. Then he, hero of the Scyldings, seized the ring-hilt, bristling and grim in battle, heaved the ring-sword, struck wrathfully (but) despairing of life, so that it bit sharply into her neck, broke the bone-rings; the blade ran clear through the doomed flesh-cloak; she collapsed to ground, sword was bloody, the man rejoiced in deed.

The unity of the excerpt in which one encounters this cluster is weak, though the patterns of content are still suggestive of a carefully integrated passage. For instance, it starts with blade imagery (1545b), the employment of blade (1546b–1547a), and its encounter with armour (1547b–1549); next, the hero encounters amidst the armour (1557a) another ancient blade (1557b–15559a), and decides to
employ it also; finally, as he seizes it, the blade imagery repeats (1563–1564), the hero employs it (1565), and it encounters the monster who, notoriously, was armoured against all weapons save this one (1566–1568a).

Along with the careful patterning of content, we find again a higher than usual degree of prosodic artfulness. Of the passage’s 24 lines, 19 use double alliteration (which is 79%, compared with an average of 59.4% of the lines overall); Likewise, though this section only contains two concepts around which it weaves a web of synonyms, the web itself is nevertheless impressive; significantly, these are two of the three concepts which constitute the patterning discussed above: armour and blade. For armour we find *breostnet*, *heaðobyrmie*, *hereney* and *srearwum*. For blade the poet offers *seax*, the metonyms *ord* and *ecg*, *bil*, *sweord*, *wapna*, *geweorc* and *hringmael*. Also, if we include the preceding portion of this episode (starting line 1518), the number of synonyms for blade increases considerably (five more instances). Moreover, the passage here is ponderous with compounds, containing fifteen overall: one compound for every 1.6 lines.

In addition and as before, we find here in *Beowulf* again an explicit and lengthy treatment of God’s sovereignty over the ‘battle-fate’ of heroes. The influence of the divine upon the course of battles is a *topos* which runs deep and complex roots throughout the literature of early Germanic literature, as it does in so many other literary cultures, and the elaborate mechanisms by which this influence operates are at least as rich in Anglo-Saxon literature as in others, though here it is often Christianised and so overlooked. Evidently, the *Andreas*-poet possesses the affection for this *topos* also, for it echoes throughout his text, and if this passage is the site of explicit borrowing, it seems doubtful that this would not constitute a significant part of his sympathy with it, since it fits his deliberately Christian agenda.
Finally, the connotative character of this passage signals once more nearly all the usual points of contact. As one of this heroic poem’s three great victories, this scene represents the very apogee of the doing of great deeds and so could hardly connote more the poem’s emphasis upon dynamism and its situation in Beowulf’s heroic world. Furthermore, the dynamism here differs from that deployed by the hero in several earlier, albeit less important, undertakings in that it does not prove in vain, at least at the immediate level. This, the Beowulf-poet implies, is because of God’s intervention, without which the hero must have here once again and finally failed in his heroic deed. The deed is also, of course, intensely violent, though the imagery is somewhat more abstract than previous treatments; the scene is replete with wrestling and sexual language (1545a, 1556b), the verbs are of a piece with these connotations (forstod, forsiðod, astod, gefeng, gebred, sloh, grapode, bræc, ðurhwod, gecrong and gefeh) and the concluding imagery is particularly grisly (hire wið halse heard grapode, / banhringas bræc, bil eal ðurhwod / fægne flæschoman). On top of connotations of dynamism and violence, there is also, clearly, a connotation of gratitude and relief which centre upon the sword of giants, and from this follows an exaggerated sense of wonder, one which Hrothgar’s later dilation upon its marvellous hilt makes much of. The necessity of Hrothgar’s interpretation also hints at an air of enigma surrounding its uncanny ecphrasis and its implications in the death of Grendel’s mother. Thus, overall, there seems much here to attract a borrowing poet.

The first formulaic parallel is found in Beowulf 1552: nemne him heaðobyrne helpe gefremede. This line’s alliteration is complicated by an exaggerated sound play upon nasals (five) and ‘e’ (nine), and the fact that alliteration upon ‘h’ continues in the subsequent line. In Andreas this line occurs in the passage in which the disguised Christ suggests to the apostle that he tell his disciples gospel tales to comfort them
amidst the stormy seas; the shared line itself reads *headoliðendum helpe gefremman* (426). This is again a less artful line than its *Beowulf* analogue, using simple alliteration without any noteworthy prosodic effects. More interesting in terms of architecture is that the lines of either poem share diction across both their a-lines and b-lines; if one formula is shared by two texts, an advocate of the oral-formulaic school could simply explain this as both poets accessing a decontextualized corpus of formulae, but when this sharing entails verbal elements in both a-line and b-line, the advocate of oral-formulaic theory must then explain the verbal pattern as a coincidence, which seems extraordinarily unlikely considering the sheer number of formulae extant in relation to the number of extant lines of Old English poetry. Yet here as in the collocations we have previously surveyed, and as with a number of lines we shall yet encounter, such a coincidence between texts is just what one finds.

Furthermore, the sharing of elements between the two texts occurs not merely in two passages which invoke the sovereignty of God’s providence in the fate of all heroes, but in exactly the same lines, rendering as a consequence the relationship considerably more explicit. In addition, the *Andreas*-passage notes that in the midst of this crisis and danger, the floor of the depths is stirred up, while plainly in *Beowulf*, there is great and dramatic agitation upon the depths of the deep, in the grotto, as the hero and monster struggle.

The connotative flavour of the collocation is also of a piece. Christ the mariner insists of the hero that in the midst of danger he take action, that he do something, namely tell tales (perhaps a degree of self-justification on the part of the *Andreas-scop*). In other words, Andreas is expected to be dynamic in the face of life’s hardships, though here again, his deeds are words. Likewise, comforting his disciples clearly anticipates relief and gratitude. This comforting takes the form of relating the
revelations, the mysteries, of Christ and his deeds on earth, thus connoting wonder at
the divine. Finally, the language the Andreas-poet uses here is often jarring and
incongruous, for instance calling the disciples seafaring warriors, while the disciples
describe themselves, just above, as fearful of humiliation when others gather to boast
of their loyalty in the clash of shield and sword, on the field of battle (408–414). Not
only does this integrate the expected tone of violence, but it also points up how in
spite of its inappropriateness, it is harmonious with the Beowulf-passage in which we
find twin formulae and connotations.

The second collocation is upon a single word which occurs only in these two
texts: beadulace. In Beowulf this occurs at 1561a thus: to beadulace ætheran meahte.
It is an unremarkable line, using simple alliteration. In Andreas it occurs as the
cannibal-warriors surround and prepare to ‘do battle’ with the enchained child whom
the cannibal-father has given up in order to save his own life. The line itself reads
thus: breostum onbryrde to þam beadulace (1118). In this case, the Andreas-line is
more complex than the line in Beowulf, using double alliteration.

As with the previous Andreas-passage, we find here also a bizarre intrusion of
martial language into a scene for which it is most inappropriate. As pointed out
before, the irony of the bound child’s would-be killers being described in such
overwrought battle-language is palpably (and as I have argued, deliberately) absurd.
However, like the previous collocation, this violent language is still of a piece with its
analogue in the Beowulf-cluster. Also, as in Beowulf, the sympathetic character here is
like the hero chained, indeed pinned, before an exhalant slaughterer. Finally, a
plethora of sword imagery, upon which the Beowulf-poet has lavished so many
synonyms, concludes the passage in either text, adding yet more weight to the martial
impulse of the potential source: hæfdon æglæcan / sæcce gesohte; sceolde sweordes
ecg, / scerp and scurheard of sceadgan folme, / fyrmælum fag, feorh acsigan (‘the terrible ones had decided on their violent purpose; the sword’s razored edge, sharp and hard-tempered, marked with the patterns of the forge, must make its demand from out the enemies’ fist for his [the boy’s] life,’ 1131–1134).

Clearly the martial language and sword imagery connote once again the violence of the passage, while the heavy irony infusing the battle intents of the cannibals lays simultaneously a heavy irony upon the nature of their deeds, their dynamism, their beadulace. In addition, there is a diametric weight placed upon the sense of relief and gratitude, since the author feels the need to point out how precisely this one thing the child cannot expect (this seemed plain without his observation): ne mihte earmsceapan are findan, / freoðe æt þam folce, þe him feores wolde, aldres geunnan . . . (‘the wretched one could find no favour, no reprieve at the hands of that folk by which they would be willing to spare his life and being,’ 1129–1131a). On the other hand, these correlations are qualified by the fact that there seem to be no hints of wonder or enigma.

The final shared formula arises in lines 1567–1568 of Beowulf: banhringas brecc. Bil eal dūhwod / fægne flæschoman; heo on flet gecrong. The double alliteration of the lines is perhaps in 1567a ornamented by a gruesome onomatopoeic play of sound upon ‘b,’ ‘r’ and ‘c,’ to develop the crunching, cracking sound of the severing of the spine, while 1567b and 1568a shift to ‘f’ s and ‘l’ s to establish the slicing sound of the blade going through flesh. The ‘fl’ sound is echoed again by the meaty flop of her falling body in the second half of 1568 (flet). The Andreas-poet seems to have been sensible to the grisly mastery, of concatenation of sound upon content, for the matrix of formulae occurs during the Andreas-poet’s description of the fate the Mermedonians intend for Matthew, and though such formulae imply the
grotesque by their very nature, the beginning of *Andreas*, and scenes like this in particular, are consistently by the internal standards of the poem itself even more gruesome than usual. The collocation occurs over the space of five lines (150–4):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{þæt hie banhringas} & \quad \text{abrecan þohton} \\
\text{lungr} & \quad \text{tolysan} \\
\text{lic on sawle} & \quad \text{þonne todælan} \\
\text{þu} & \quad \text{duguðe ond geogoðe} \\
\text{werum to wiste} & \quad \text{ond to wilðege,} \\
\text{fæges flæschoman.} & \quad \text{Feorh ne bemurndan}
\end{align*}
\]

[After that they intended, to break his bone-rings, swiftly part body and soul and then share out the doomed man’s corpse to veteran and youthful warriors, as sustenance and desirable food for the men].

As with the first set of shared formulae in this cluster, we find again not one, but two formulae which are not only reproduced in *Andreas*, but in the same order, making ‘coincidental’ explanations for the collocation even less convincing than before. Moreover, as with the first shared set, God’s sovereignty in the fates of heroes is again here signaled explicitly in the description of Matthew *bidan beadurofne hwæs him beorht cyning, / engla ordfruma, unnan wolde* (‘awaiting, the battle-renowned one, waiting for whatever the Bright King, Creator of angels, willed to grant,’ 145–146). Also, the physical location in which the shared formulae occurs is once more down in the depths, in *under heolstorlocan* (144).

In addition, there are several points of antithetical connotative contact, for here Matthew seems, pointedly, to have no reason for gratitude or relief; it is precisely the hopelessness of his situation which is foreshadowed in the previously mentioned waiting upon God’s providence and is played out at length in the divine intervention which immediately follows this passage. Furthermore, as in the previous shared formula, Matthew here also is chained, pinned helplessly to endure any fate the cannibals may contrive. That fate, of course, is extraordinarily violent, but whereas in *Beowulf* it is the hero who inflicts the decisive violence, here it is the monsters who
intend *banringas abrecan*. Fortunately for Matthew, this deed will prove beyond the ability of these monsters, but at present point, it is the thwarted dynamism of the saint which is highlighted.

So about this cluster also we find a prosodically rich passage upon which the *Andreas*-poet might draw and which fits well, both overall and in the individual points of sharing with *Andreas*, with a favorite theme of the *Andreas*-poet, of God’s sovereign providence, and the usual connotative registers, though these latter are in places patchy.

**Cluster VII.**

The next grouping which the poems have in common is located in a passage which runs from 1671–1699. Here, Beowulf, having informed Hrothgar that he has defeated Grendel’s mother, assures the king that Heorot is now safe from them, and turns over the hilt of the giants’ sword. Hrothgar inspects the hilt before he launches into one of the poem’s ‘sermons’:
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“*Ic hit þe þonne gehate, þæt þu on Heorote most sorheas swefan mid þinra secga gedryht ond þegna gehwylc þinra leoda, *

*duguðe ond iogoþe,* þæt þu him ondrædan ne þearft, þeoden Scyldinga, on þa healfe,

*aldorbealu eorlum,* swa þu ær dydest.”

*Da wæs gylden hilt* gamelum rince,

*hærenda hildfruman,* on hand gyfen,

*enta ærgeweorc;* hit on æht gehwearf

*æfter deofla hryre* denigea frean,

*wundorsmiga geweorc,* ond þa þas worold ofgeaf

*gromheort guma,* godes ondsaca,

*morōres scyldig,* ond his modor eac,

*on geweald gehwearf* woroldcyninga

*ðæm selestan be sæm tweonum* 1685

*ðara þe on scedeninge sceattas dælde.*

*Hroðgar maðelode,* hylt sceawode,

---

ealde lafe, on ðæm wæs or writen
fyrngewinnes, syðtan flod ofsloh,
gifen geotende, giganta cyn
frecne geferdon; þæt wæs fremde þeod
cean dryhtne; him þæs endelean
þurh wæteres wylm waldend sealde.
Swa wæs on ðæm scennum sciran goldes
þurh runstafas rihte gemearcod,
geseted ond gesæd hwam þæt sweord geworht,
irena cyst, ærest wære,
wreþenhilt ond wyrmfah. Da se wisa spræc
sunu Healfdenes swigedon ealle:

[“Then I promise it, that you, Lord of the Scyldings, may sleep without sorrow in Heorot with your retinue of warriors and all the thegns of your people, veterans and youths, that you need not fear for them on that account, for the life—evils (of) earls, as you did before.” Then the golden hilt, the ancient work of giants, was laid in the hand of the aging man, of the hoary battle-leader. It, the wondrous work of smiths, passed after the fall of devils into the possession of the Danish lord. And then this world gave over God’s enemy, the grim—hearted one, guilty of murder, and his mother also. (The hilt) passed into the keeping of the best of worldly kings between seas, those who in the land of the Danes dealt out treasures. Hrothgar spoke; he examined the hilt, the ancient heirloom; on it was incised the source of former strife, when the ocean, the rushing seas, slew the kin of giants (who) fared fatally. That people were foreign to the Eternal Lord; in the end, the Ruler granted them reward through the rolling waters. Also set down and declared on the hilt of gleaming gold, in correctly inscribed rune staves, (was) for whom the sword had first been wrought of the finest irons, in writhing hilt and serpent-pattern. Then the wise son of Halfdane spoke and all fell silent].

Though it would be unusual to consider this passage a set-piece, a certain degree of discretion is imposed by its dialogic structure; it runs from the beginning of Beowulf’s conclusion of his speech through to the beginning of Hrothgar’s disquisition on the hilt. However, it is possible that the Andreas—poet could have borrowed duguðe ond iogoþe from a number of sources, either from Beowulf or elsewhere (it occurs again at 160 and 621), which would then mean that the bulk of this cluster is actually grounded in the exegesis of the hilt itself (doubtless a notable passage for any Christian poet). As the passage is not particularly unified, so also is it not particularly ornate; 14 of its 28 lines contain double alliteration (50% here, compared to the average of 47%). On the other hand, the passage contains 16 lines
linked through interlinear alliterations, mostly end-linked or back-linked (1673–74–75, 1677–78, 1679–80, 1686–87, 1688–89, 1693–94, 1697–98–99). In addition, there are three concepts which are surrounded by synonymous words and phrases: retainer (secga, þegna, eorlum); hilt/sword (hilt, enta ærgeweorc, wundorsmīþa geweorc, ealde lafe, scennum, sweord, wreoþenhilt); and lord (peoden, gamelum rince, harum hildfruman, frean, woroldcyninga, dryhtne, waldend). Finally, there are eleven compounds in the passage (aldorbealu, hildfruman, ærgeweorc, wundorsmīþa, gromheort, woroldcyninga, scedenigge, fyrngewinnes, runstafas, wreoþenhilt, wyrmfah), averaging one compound every 2.54 lines. Thus, though the passage in which this cluster is contained is not as appealing a source as the previous one, it is still prosodically richer than normal.

What would have made this passage more enticing to a Christian author is, again, the explicit and dramatic inclusion of Christian material in a secular text. The narrative of the flood from the hilt has received extensive treatment by scholars, and there is little doubt that if the Andreas-poet had read or heard the poem, the eschatological ekphrasis here would have caught his attention; it is one of three mentions in the poem of the kin of Cain and their destruction in the flood (also 104b–114 and 1258b–1267a), though this episode overall is the most expansive treatment.

104 See Appendix II for averages of prosodic elements.
Their relationship to Grendel has also been accorded considerable attention by scholars.\(^\text{106}\)

As for the connotative register, one finds much here which is familiar. Clearly Beowulf’s reassurances at the beginning of the passage invite gratitude and relief over the death of Grendel and his mother. Likewise, the hilt which is the focus is an object of great wonder (\textit{wundorsmiþa geweorc}). The wondrousness of the hilt derives in part from its well wrought runes, which ‘wise’ Hroðgar shall presently explicate, thereby connoting through the revelation of this ‘holy mystery’ a sense of enigma. What it describes, in turn, is the destruction of the race of giants, insinuating again an air of violence. The only missing connotation is that of dynamism, though once more if one considers this connotation in light of the interplay of word and deed, it is perhaps not so distant, since if the hilt is a work of art and lore, arising from the deed of an artist who tells a story, then one can see in both the hilt and the tale which tells of that hilt the mark, the word, of a deed. Even so, this may be something of a stretch.

The first parallel, in line 1674a, reads \textit{duguðe ond iogoðe þæt þu him ondreaðan ne þearft}. It occurs also at line 160 (\textit{deorc deápscuða duguþe ond geogoþe}) and at 621 (\textit{duguþe and geogoþe ðæl æghwylcne}). The formula has two instances in \textit{Andreas}, at 152 (\textit{ond þonne todælan duguþe ond geogoðe}) and at 1122 (\textit{duguðe ond eogoðe ðæl onfengon}). As mentioned above, it is not unlikely that a closer relationship exists between the \textit{Andreas}-formulae and one of the other \textit{Beowulf}-formulae, since the other shared formulae in this cluster all occur where one might more easily anticipate them being borrowed for a Christian work, in the preface to

Hrothgar’s exegesis of the ‘flood-hilt,’ while at the level of structure, the inclusion of *dei* in both *Andreas*-lines and only one of the three *Beowulf*-lines (621) contributes to the sense that the borrowing is from elsewhere. On the other hand, since the *Andreas*-poet may have heard the formula three times in the telling of the tale, it may have been from repetition, not specific quality, that he was inspired to borrow. Not only this, but the formula here occurs in a very complex line, much more than the other two instances: the rhyme between ‘guðe’ and ‘goþe,’ the repetition of ‘ond’ in a-line and b-line, the piling up of end-fricatives in the a-line against the front-fricatives of the b-line and the elaborate overall rhythm. For these reasons, it still seems worthwhile to trace the points of contact between 1674a and its recurrences in *Andreas*.

It has been argued that the mention in *Beowulf* of the old and young together in Heorot echoes in a threatening key hints of future strife, between Hrothgar and Hrothulf, uncle and nephew, and then in turn between Wealhtheow’s sons and Hrothulf.¹⁰⁷ Though this is extremely speculative (and in Shippey’s defence, this is how he presents it), a tale of future strife does accord with Hrothgar’s exegesis of the hilt which relates a tale of former strife between God and Cain’s kin. It also aligns somewhat with both instances of the formula in *Andreas*, where at 152 the Mermedonians anticipate devouring Matthew, who now only has three days before his time is up, and at 1122 where the Mermedonians rush upon the bound boy, anticipating here also their gruesome meal. In both cases the young and old are the cannibals, while in the latter instance, the old (the innocent boy’s father) betrays the young (his son) just as Hrothulf shall betray his nephews. Perhaps the *Andreas*-poet

discerned some telling antithesis of the divine relationship of young and old, of the Son and the Father, which culminates in both Christ’s and then Andreas’ cry, of the ‘youth’ asking the ‘old’ why he has forsaken him to death. However, I, like Shippey, must frame this set of parallels as mere speculation, even though the connections are remarkably consistent.

The connotative resemblances are likewise muted. Clearly both passages in *Andreas* are fraught with imminent violence. However, there is certainly no cause for gratitude or relief, nor is there any dynamism or agency allowed either of the victims; Matthew is imprisoned and the boy is enchained. God, eventually, through his agent, Andreas, will end up supplying the dynamism which rescues both victims, though this occurs much later for Matthew and several passages on for the boy. Nor is there anything particularly wondrous in these passages; the cannibals merely wait upon their perverse bureaucracy for their grisly meal, while the cannibal-mob is driven by hunger and paranoia: the context of either passage is decidedly mundane. Finally, beyond the question, will they be eaten, there is little enigma which attaches. Thus, overall, though there exist some connection between prosodic and thematic elements between the formula in *Beowulf* and in *Andreas*, the connotative connections are much less convincing.

The second parallel at 1679, which occurs after Beowulf concludes his speech, has much more in common with its analogue in *Andreas* than does the previous parallel, reading *enta ærgeweorc hit on æht gehwearf*. The extended rhyme between *ærgeweorc* and *gehwearf* is particularly striking, as is the play between the three unvoiced, glottal fricatives in the b-line (*hit on æht gehwearf*). In *Andreas* 1235, the formula recurs in the passage previously discussed at cluster IV, as Andreas is dragged over rocks and roads before begin flung back into his dungeon, the line itself
reading *enta ærgeweorc innan burgum*. Once more, the line is decidedly simple, save perhaps for a sound-play on the initial alliterating syllable of a-line and b-line, on a vowel/nasal similarity.

The *enta ærgeweorc* in *Andreas* refers to the stone-paved roads which lead out of the cannibal city and upon which the Mermedonians drag the apostle. The fact that they are not merely the work of giants, but specifically the former work of giants, points up that the giants are no more. Consequently, the watery demise of the giants, who are the kin of Cain, is implied, gesturing to the wrath and vengeance of God upon the wicked and monstrous. Moreover, since the giants’ roads lead into and out of the cannibal city, it suggests directly that the cannibals live in the former abode of Cain’s kin, along with a vast web of other arresting associations thus insinuated. For instance, the giants, the *eotan*, and specifically the antediluvian giants, are often connected by Anglo-Saxon commentators with the sin of devouring both flesh and blood (consuming blood being explicitly forbidden);\(^{108}\) Bede in his commentary upon Genesis is typical of this connection:\(^{109}\)

> Ferunt autem quod in hoc maxima fuerit preuaricatio gigantum, quia cum sanguine carnem comederent; ideoque Dominus, illis diluuo exstinctis, carne quidem uesci homines concesserit, sed ne id cum sanguine facerent prohimuerit.

[They say what has been in this matter the greatest collusion of the giants, that they consumed flesh with blood; and so the Lord, once he had obliterated them by the flood, permitted men to eat flesh, but forbade that they eat it with blood].

As devourers of unclean flesh and blood, their affinity with the Mermedonians could hardly be more plain, and so the fact that the cannibals also live in the giants’ city

\(^{108}\) Orchard, *Critical Companion*, 141.

seems strikingly of a piece. Furthermore, as the unclean devourers of flesh and blood were formerly annihilated by God’s great flood, so too are these new residents of the giants’ city threatened with annihilation for their unclean habits of devouring flesh and blood as, at the end, the apostle unleashes the waters of destruction from the pillar. Considering all these collocations between the antediluvian giants and the cannibals, it is hardly shocking to also find a large cluster of parallel formulae and phrases in *Beowulf* as the poet describes the destruction of these giants while gazing upon one of their ‘former works’ in his hand. Nor is this merely a collocation of motifs—that *Andreas*, *Beowulf* and Scripture just happen to talk about the same subject—but a very precise series of contacts on exact formulae, and more strikingly, a cluster of exact formulae, at just this point in *Beowulf*. Such collocations argue very persuasively for an explicit relationship between the two texts. As for the connotative nature of the *Andrean*-passage in which this parallel occurs, it has already been extensively discussed in treating Cluster IV, and so needs no reiteration here.110

Predictably, the nexus of antediluvian giants, cannibals and the hilt of the giants’ sword continues in the next instance of shared formulae. In *Beowulf* the line reads *morðres scyl̂dig ond his modor eac* (1683). Between a-line and b-line there is a general concatenation of sound upon ‘mo’/‘or’ and nasal/’o’ collocations (‘mo’ and ‘on’). In addition, a general sibilance runs regularly through the line which aligns nicely with sense. In *Andreas* it the line reads *syððan mane faa morðorscryldige* (1599). The sibilance still carries over from the *Beowulf*, though here it is muted.

What is more interesting about the *Andreas* line is that it occurs in a passage which concerns the seemingly imminent destruction of the man-devouring

---

110 Cf. pgs. 175–177.
Mermedonians, who are about to be swept into the abyss by the flood unleashed by God’s outraged apostle. Moreover, the shared formula is not one which explicitly denotes Christian flood imagery, but the guilt of murderers, so its connection in *Andreas* also with God’s watery retribution against ‘devourers’ aligns strikingly with the same narrative structure in *Beowulf*, and even more so in light of the previous parallel’s nexus of scriptural motifs. The correlations between the hilt’s ekphratic depiction of the destruction of Cain’s kin, the destruction of the man-eating Grendel clan, and the threatened destruction of the cannibals, all in (if not by means of) the waters God unleashes upon the earth, is simply too consistent and clear to posit, again, mere coincidence.

Also, and once more, this correlation operates in the familiar framework of connotations. The violence is immediate, as fourteen of the ‘worst sinners’ are swept by the flood into the abyss, and the dynamism, God’s vigorous deed as he enacts his retribution upon them, is made grimly manifest; this is not a distant, abstracted or indifferent God but present and terribly active. As the Mermedonians gaze into the yawning abyss and persons from amongst them are swept by the raging waters into perdition, a sense of horrified wonder and awe are obvious. They wonder if they are next into this abyss, implying an air of desperate questioning, and when the apostle reassures them that the fourteen have been slain for their sake and they are safe, this fearful questioning turns to overwhelming relief and gratitude. In light of these connections, between flood motifs and familiar connotations, there exist again in this parallel considerable grounds for positing an explicit relationship between texts.

Parallel four in *Andreas* once more focuses on death by water and God’s providence over this. In *Beowulf* the formula is found in line 1691, though additional shared diction in 1689 ought also to be taken into account: *fyrngevinnes, syðpan flod*
ofslōh / gifen geotende, giganta cyn / frecne geferdon; hæt wæs fremde beod (1689–1691). The final line in which one finds the shared formula is again extremely ornate; the poet works into the double alliterating syllables a rhyme which in the first instance depends upon the ‘fre’ sound, then chiastically reverses the order of the same sound in the next stressed syllable, on ‘fer,’ then shifts back to the original ‘fre.’ There is also considerable weight put on the ‘e’ sound throughout the line and as the first three stressed syllables rhyme, so also the final three end in ‘d’ (this sound being echoed perhaps in the dental at the end of hæt). Of course, in Andreas 516 the ‘fre’/‘fer’ sound play carries over into the a-line which this formula constitutes, though this is where the rhyme ends: frecne geferan flodwylm ne mæg. On the other hand, one also finds here flod, in flodwylm, which occurs three lines above the analogous Beowulf-formula. It is perhaps coincidence; doubtless the Andreas-poet is casting about for synonyms for ocean, since this is where the disguised Christ enters the gnomic mode, implicitly comparing the difficulties of seafaring men in storms with the metaphorical storms of life undergone by all people. Still, it is yet another coincidence in a long line of such formulaic coincidences.

As mentioned, the Andreas-poet here makes reference again to death by water and God’s providence over it, though throughout the passage there is no mention of nor allusion to sin, giants or the kin of Cain. On the other hand, the violence is again obvious, for the waves rage about them and threaten the travellers with death. Likewise, dynamism is implicit in the Mariner-Christ’s assertion that God’s sovereignty overshadows all that happens, and that no danger can claim the man not doomed by God (an echo again, perhaps, of the Beowulfian motif that Fate spares the undoomed). The Andreas-poet takes this impulse further, illustrating that none know the riddle of their fate save God, though it is now manifest that the apostle has God’s
favour, since the waves which obey only God stilled their raging about Andreas (this typological association with Christ on The Sea of Galilee is blurred in the Old English as it is not in the Latin or Greek versions of the legend); this adds again an air of enigma to the passage. It also implies a sense of wonder, since it is a divine intrusion upon a mundane reality. Finally, an overtone of gratitude and relief attaches through God’s redemption of these men/all humanity from the fury of the storm. Overall then, the ornate nature of the Beowulf line points up the by now familiar a priori attractiveness of the formula, while both the sovereignty of God over the death-dealing flood, as well as the usual connotative nexus offers evidence a posteroiri that an explicit relationship exists between the two formulae.

Parallel five has one instance in Beowulf and two in Andreas. In Beowulf the formula is situated in the line as follows: *gifen geotende giganta cyn* (1690). Once more the line is more artful than those around it; in addition to its double alliteration the Beowulf-poet has built into every word a vowel/’n’ sound which adds a ringing tone to the sentiment, emphasising this further by ending each word with a long syllable. The first instance of this formula in Andreas is at 393, as the saint thanks the disguised Christ for affording them bread and drink upon the stormy seas: *geofon geotende grund is onhrered*. Here the Andreas-poet has also woven the vowel/’n’ sound into both lines also, though the three dentals at the end of all but the first word and *is* cut down the resounding tone of the line. The second instance of the formula is at 1508, in the passage where Andreas praises stone before he calls the waters forth from it to drown the cannibals: *geofon geotende hwæt du golde eart*. Again, the double alliteration of the line is complemented by a profusion of dentals, and again they are all located in the final syllables of the words in which they occur, though in
both cases, considering the aural structure of the shared formula, this is not that surprising.

What is more surprising is that not in one, but both instances in *Andreas*, the biblical flood motifs of *Beowulf* in some form recur, and since the borrowed formulae in this cluster which touch upon that flood themselves never denote specifically this flood, nor sometimes even oceans or water (parallels two and three, for instance), the fact that they all allude explicitly or implicitly to the flood is surely remarkable. In *Andreas* 393, for example, it is not merely a ‘rushing ocean’ upon which the seafaring apostle and his disciples are sustained by the bread and drink of Christ, but one which threatens to kill them and so terrifies them; it is again the deadly fury of the waters and the authority God has over these that is foregrounded. In addition, one of the images that the poet uses to illustrate the power of the waves is that there is in this storm a great disturbance on the floor of the deep, and when comparing the passages in *Andreas* with its analogue in *Beowulf*, one may be reminded of the savage submarine battle between the hero and Grendel’s mother which resulted in the wondrous flood-hilt being handed over to Hrothgar in the first place. Finally, it is interesting to note in light of the first parallel that *duguð* occurs in the line immediately after this formula (394).

In 1508 also the parallels to the biblical flood is striking, for *geofon geotende* occurs in exactly in the passage where Andreas, locked in the dungeon of the cannibals, in the former abode of the giants, or Cain’s kin, rises and addresses a stone pillar as he prepares to destroy the Mermedonians, the devourers, by means of a divine flood. Andreas invokes the fearsome aspect of God as he calls out these waters, and describes stone as more precious than gold or gift of treasure, since it was upon stone that God chose to reveal his divine mysteries, his ten commandments. Once
more, when comparing this passage with that from which the Beowulf-formula derives, one may be struck by the fact that Beowulf has just handed Hrothgar exactly what Andreas derides, a golden gift of treasure, the giants’ hilt. Moreover, as the stone is precious because of what is inscribed on it, so too does the Beowulf-poet dwell upon how the well-wrought runes on the hilt contribute to its wondrous worth.

Likewise, in both Andreas-passages, the connotative markers are clear, complete and perfectly consistent. At 393, Andreas expresses his gratitude to the Mariner-Christ for sustenance upon the ocean, though he does not know who he thanks for bread and drink amidst the storm, which implies the usual sense of enigma. The violence is present in the form of the storm, in response to which the saint asks what he must do for his frightened disciples, what action is he called to, connoting dynamism. Finally, the imagery of the thundering ocean and disturbances down to the very depths leaves one with a sense, perhaps not so much of wonder as of awe and dread, though how distinct these two connotations were to the Anglo-Saxon imagination is hard to say.

In the passage surrounding 1508 the apostle is clearly relieved and grateful that his torture at the hands of the cannibals is at an end and that the time for justice (or vengeance) has finally come. Likewise, the Andreas-poet describes the stone as precious precisely because the inscriptions on it have revealed divine mysteries, clearing away humanity’s sense of the enigma which attaches to the divine. The connotations of violence arise, of course, from the imminent destruction of the Mermedonians, and the dynamism is supplied by the fact that the apostle is released from his passive suffering and now is empowered to strike back in righteous anger at the wicked (at this point, the saliency of the saint’s eschatological parallels to the first and second coming of Christ could hardly be more emphatic). Finally, the wonder
emanates from the fact that water springs from stone, and as this miracle was life-sustaining for the people of Israel when Moses performed it (and to which the Andreas-poet directly alludes), so here it is life-destroying.

Taken all together, these Andreas-passages in both their connotative consistency and their allusions to the great flood tie in well to the already high level and degree of congruity between the rest of the cluster and their parallels in Andreas.

The sixth and final formula derives from line 1699 of Beowulf: *sunu Healfdenes; swigdon ealle*. Again the structure of the line is complemented by two internal rhymes, both of which tie a-line and b-line together: the first is the ‘eal’ sound of *healf* and *ealle*; the second is the den/don sound of *-dennes* and *swigdon*. It might also be worth noting that the shared b-line has been cited by Jack Niles as the strongest evidence of Vergilian influence upon Beowulf, arising from the Aeneid II, 1, though as Orchard points out, it has two more analogues in the Brot af sigurðarkviðu, XV, 1, and Sigurðarkvida in skamma, both in the Poetic Edda, (*þögþu allir*), pointing perhaps to a much wider currency of the phrase, which might have derived through extensive mediation in intermediary texts. The formula also appears at line 762 of Andreas as follows: *geond þæt side sel swigodon ealle*. It occurs at the point where Christ has made the statue leap down from the wall and chastise the Jewish elders for their wilful disbelief in Christ’s divinity, and the subsequent and unrepentant accusations of magic by those elders. In this line dentals end a large number of the words, and there seems to be some sort of sound play upon
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112 Orchard, Critical Companion, 133.
‘g’/vowel and vowel/‘l’ collocations which becomes more noticeable when the line is read aloud.

The relationship of motifs and connotations between these passages is certainly less pronounced than in the previous parallels. However, some grounds for comparison still exist. Though it must remain speculative, the obstinately wicked Jewish elders align well in their wickedness with those whom the flood destroyed. Moreover, after destroying the kin of Cain, God establishes a covenant with Noah and his descendants. The configuration of these developments might have suggested to the Andreas-poet a similar set, in the rejection of Christ by the Jews and the new covenant he then establishes with all believers thereafter. As for these Jews in the past, and not unlike the Mermedonians in the immediate future, they are for their disobedience “imminently doomed” (hæleð hynfuse, 612a); for nu hie lungre sceolon, / werige mid werigum, wræc prowian, / biterne byrne, on banan faðme (‘now they are accursed amongst the accursed, they must soon suffer punishment, cruel fire, in the grasp of their destroyer,’ 614–616). Certainly such an alignment of the unconverted Jews with the kin of Cain would tie in well with the Andreas-poet’s pervasive anti-semitism. However, it is a point likely to remain in the realm of conjecture.

Likewise, though the usual combination of connotations which the Andreas-poet seems to share with the Beowulf-poet are all to some degree present, a couple of these also are not particularly well realised. Certainly the speaking statue is a wonder of the first order, and it announces the news for which the Jews have waited for many generations, which clearly suggests an air of gratitude and relief (one whose manifestation is obviously disappointed). Likewise, its words call them to deeds, to believe, in light of the divine mystery it reveals. The response of the elders, however,
is a hateful rejection and condemnation. Thus, one encounters respectively, though in moderated form, wonder, gratitude, dynamism, enigma and violence.

The cluster overall, on the other hand, entails a great deal of evidence for direct borrowing. There is a degree of episodic discretion imposed by the ‘speech to speech’ structure, which would make it easier to discern and so memorise, and the profusion of synonyms and compounds make this passage again comparatively rich compared to most others. Also, though the writing in general is not overly ornate, one sees that the lines themselves are almost all quite artful. Moreover, it is just at this point of clustering that the Beowulf-poet avails himself of a Christian subject again, and not only does the Andreas-poet seem to pick up on this register, but pursues as various levels of allusion the details of this subject, the great flood, as he employs the same formulae at many disparate points in his text with remarkable consistency. Finally, the complex of connotations continues with its usual level of consistency.

Cluster VIII.

Cluster eight occurs in a passage in which Beowulf reports his deeds in Denmark and his impressions of the Danish court, speculating presciently upon the future responses of the Heathobards to their lord Ingeld’s marriage to Freawaru, the daughter of their enemy, and specifically about how trouble at this wedding feast may be stirred up by some battle-scarred Heathobard (2041–2046):

Þonne cwið æt beore se ðe beah gesyhð,  
eald æscwiga, se ðe eal geman,  
garcwealm gumena (him bið grim sefa)  
onginneð geomormod geongum cempan  
þurh hreðra gehygd higes cunnian,  
wigbealu wecccean, ond þæt word acwyð.

[Then he who sees a ring, he who remembers everything—the spear-death of fighters—speaks out at the beer-feast, an aged spear-warrior (in him is a grim heart); sad of mind, he begins to provoke the courage of some young champion through thoughts of heart, to awaken the ruin of war, and speaks these words].
The craftsmanship of this small passage is considerable, as is the artfulness of Beowulf’s speech in which this passage is couched. The oration overall is well-unified, and the passage within is also emphatically demarcated from the text around it through epanalepsis, beginning þonne cwið æt beore and ending on þæt word acwyð. This similarity is further strengthened by the repetition of the ‘æt’ sound in both lines, on æt and þæt, and by the fact that the repetition occurs only six lines on from its first instance. Moreover, the lines themselves are very rich, consisting of five double-alliterating lines out of six (83%). Likewise, there are four compounds in these six lines: æscwiga, garcwealm, geomormod, wigbealu (one every 1.5 lines). There are two synonyms for spear (asc and gar), three for warrior (wiga, gumena, and cempan), and three for spirit (sefa, gehygd and mod); this all in six lines (though it ought to be said that the brevity of the passage might exaggerate certain aspects, since it is more difficult to establish the consistency of prosodic patterns in such a short passage). The interlinear alliteration is also very elaborate: the first and second line both end words beginning with the ‘ge’ sound, and this expands into full alliteration on ‘g’ in the next line, which then, in turn, is continued in the fourth line. The fourth line (2044) ends in a word beginning with ‘c,’ which then continues in the next two end-words. As if all this were not enough, the poet also links the b-lines of the first and second lines by repeating se ðe at the beginning, expanding the ‘he who’ apprehends a ring into the flood of memories this unleashes, the eal, the everything. Also, the wiga of æscwiga is echoed in the last line, in wigbealu, as the ‘spear-battler’ personifies through his instigating the ‘battle-ruin’ which shall follow from him. Finally, the poet generates a pervasive and sinister murmuring sound throughout the three middle lines (2043–2045) by means of nasals: no less than 16 in three lines. In sum, if the Andreas-poet
were looking for sheer prosodic craftsmanship upon which to draw, there are few richer veins to tap than this one.

The motif which the Beowulf-poet accesses here is not uncommon to medieval Germanic literature: the ‘ironic feast,’ where the anticipated joy and fraternity of the feast becomes sorrow and strife. In Beowulf itself the poet gestures towards this motif on multiple occasions, where Grendel is a grim guest seeking a grim feast (733–737, 755–757, 791–792), or where after celebrating two feasts, the Danes fall asleep only to lose one of celebrants to the monsters of the night whose very downfall they had been celebrating. The motif can also be found, for example, in Das Nibelungenlied (XXX–XXXI), Egils saga SkallaGrimssonar (XXXIV),\(^{113}\) Hrólfs saga kraka (XXVII),\(^{114}\) as well as in numerous Icelandic poems, such as Vafbrúðnmál, Grímnismál, Æðskvitha or Lokasenna, just to name a few. It should come as no surprise, then, that the first parallel from this passage occurs in Andreas in reference to exactly that same ironic motif. Before this, however, a quick overview of the passage’s connotative nature is necessary.

The connotative aspects of the passage do not accord very well with the overall pattern surveyed in clusters thus far, and if a relationship exists between formulae in this passage and their analogues in Andreas, then it seems more plausible that these were inspired by the craftsmanship of the passage and the familiar motif of the ironic feast. Even so, there are still some connotative points of similarity. This passage, for instance, seems again fascinated with dynamism, since the old warrior urges the young warrior to do something: that there is a pressing need for action, or
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\(^{113}\) Egils saga SkallaGrimssonar, ed. Sigurður Nordal, Islenzk fornrit 2 (Reykjavik: Hið islenzka fornritfelag, 1933).

more specifically reaction. As the audience is likely to know, the young warrior will do something, and something notoriously violent, though as Beowulf recounts it, the instance of this violence has not yet manifested. Finally, there is an antithetical focus upon gratitude, for Beowulf notes just before this passage that the Heathobards will notice that many of their guests, the Danes, wear chainmail shirts and other heirlooms which ought to have been passed down from father to son. Moreover, the old spear-warrior points out the sword of Withergyld, the father of the young warrior, on a Dane, presumably the one who killed him. Plainly this would be an intolerable state of affairs for the young cempan, and clearly he has presently little to be thankful for. However, it is still a blunt fact that the connotative similarities between this passage and others is muted, and this inconsistency will continue in the individual parallels.

The first of these is from line 2042, reading eald æscwiga, se ðe eal geman. The double alliteration is enhanced by the extended rhyme of eald and eal. However, a great deal of the line’s craft depends upon its previously discussed relationship to those around it: A) the relative construct, se ðe ties into the b-line above; B) the ‘ge’ sound which aligns this line with that above; C) the echoing in 2046 of æscwiga, in the form of wigbealu. In Andreas, the correlating formula is found in the climactic passage in which the waters burst forth from the stone and begin to drown the Mermedonians: ealde æscherend was him ut myne (1537). Beyond double alliteration, there is nothing prosodically unusual about the line.

115 As Orchard points out, Beowulf tends to focus to a remarkable degree not merely upon action, but reaction, and this passage seems no exception: Critical Companion, 174–175.
What is unusual is the high level of similarity between either passage’s motifs. For example, in Beowulf, the hero here alludes to the fiery future destruction of Heorot and the slaughter of all those within, the seeds of which are being planted by the old spear-warrior. In Andreas, the cannibals are also trapped in their vaunted dwelling, here also to be killed amidst fire and water (the city is surrounded by flames). More specifically, a sense of irony arises in Beowulf from the fact that this fiery destruction has its roots in this most convivial of settings, a beer-feast. In Andreas, the formula also occurs amidst a beer-feast, here taken to considerable ironic extremes by the poet, who portrays the flood as supplying the drink to be drunk; in other words, both formulae are found in feast-scenes, both phrase this as a type of beer-feast, and both feasts lead to slaughter. The Andreas-poet takes this further by saying that it is specifically the young men who will be swept off by battle’s rush (... 
fege swulton / geonge on geofone guðræs fornam, 1530a–1531), an incongruously martial image unless one compares it to what has become imminent in the Beowulf-passage, for the young warrior there shall soon renew the deadly cycles of killing, and is himself unlikely to live long. Likewise, for the old spear-warrior in either passage this is a bitter beer-feast, for the old æscwiga in Beowulf, in light of past tragedies, is sad of spirit and grim of heart over these present affairs, and so he begins to lament this state of affairs to the young warrior. The old æscberend in Andreas also are in a grim state of mind while at this ‘feast,’ for which reason they also lament (weras cwanedon, / ealde æscberend, 1536b–1537a). Thus, in both passages, we have old spear-warriors who attend a bitter beer-feast at which they lament. Bradley’s translation offers yet more similarity between the passages by including the phrase
'because of the man's voice, a battle-charge swept off the young men.'\textsuperscript{116} However, there are no grounds for the inclusion of this phrase, and the Kennedy translation, for all its idiosyncrasies, is more accurate.

As already mentioned, the connotative cross-over is weak. Certainly the violence of the \textit{Beowulf} passage shows up also in the \textit{Andreas} passage as the Mermedonians are drowned in great numbers, and also the episode is rich in a sense of dynamism, as previously pointed out, since the apostle is freed from his passive suffering and moves (like the young warrior, doubtlessly) into a violent act of reciprocity. Finally, as with \textit{Beowulf} passage, the old men who lament clearly are the last people who have anything for which to be thankful. One might also argue that the wonder of the miraculous, divine flood carries over from the previous passage (1498–1521). However, the connotative configuration here still does not accord well with that discovered in other analogues. On the other hand, perhaps this is just the point; the missing connotative elements in this passage are, for the most part, just the same missing elements as in the \textit{Beowulf} passage.

The second parallel is found in line 2044, reading \textit{onginneð geomormod geongum cempan}. In many ways this is an extraordinary line: it contains no fewer than nine nasals; the ‘on’ sound of the a-line’s first syllable is echoed in the second syllable of the b-line; the entire ‘geo’/nasal sound is echoed between \textit{geomormod} and \textit{geongum}; all the syllables of the b-line are long. The admixture of the nasals and long syllables lend to the line its sonorous and sinister murmuring tone. Its interlinear artistry is also complex, entailing continued alliteration on ‘g’ and ending on a word which begins with ‘c,’ and which is then picked up in the two subsequent end-words.

\textsuperscript{116} Bradley, 146. Compare the same in Kennedy, 29.
As might be expected, the line in which its analogue is found in *Andreas* is not as complex: *ongan þa geomormod to gode cleopian* (1398). The poet here repeats the ‘eo’ sound in *geomormod* and *cleopian*, and the large number of ‘o’ sounds accord nicely with apostle’s sense of woe and sorrow at his suffering, for this line occurs as he is tortured yet again throughout the third day.

The passage in *Andreas* mentions that, as the apostle refuses to break under the torture of the cannibals, their hatred is renewed (*ða wees niowinga nið onhrered, / heard ond hetegrim*, 1394–1395a), and certainly this finds an parallel in the old spear-warrior’s attempts to renew the hatred and strife between Heathobards and Danes. Also, the *Andrean* passage begins with a motif which resonates with numerous Germanic raid episodes: *Com þa on uhtan mid ærdæge / hæðenra hloð haliges neosan / leoda weorude*, (1388–1390a). The enemy approaches the dwelling (albeit a dungeon), at the break of day (pre-dawn light), to whose occupant they mean to do violence. This pattern of imagery is repeated most famously in the *Finnsburh Fragment* (3–6). In the *Fragment*, as at the feast of the Heathobards, a convivial occasion undergoes a transformation to its opposite, an occasion for violence, and it is worth asking whether the outplay of the latter’s violence, which might have lead to the burning of Heorot, suggested to the *Andreas*-poet similar imagery here.

Likewise, as in the previous parallel, the connotative structure is imperfect; the torture of the saint provides the violence, and likewise, the apostle here bemoans his deed of suffering and, simultaneously, his impotence before his oppressors. He demands to know why he has had to suffer so much which Christ himself suffered
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117 In fact, it is unclear if the falling out between Hrothgar and Ingeld leads directly to the destruction of Heorot, or even if Hrothgar himself, since *Widsið* states that Hrothgar and Hrothulf defeated Ingeld, while in Norse sources, Hrothgar moves to Northumbria (*Hrólf’s saga kraka*), is killed by his half-brothers (*Skjöldunga saga*), or killed by the Swedish king, Hrothborrd (*Gesta Danorum*).
only for one day. In other words, it is once again an egregiously thankless task. On the other hand, and as with the previous parallel, the connotative tones which are missing are again just those which are missing from the *Beowulf* passage. Still, this is anything but conclusive.

The third and final parallel is in line 2046: *wigbealu weccean, ond þæt word acwyð*. Here there is a sound-play upon the ‘ea’ sound in the a-line, similar to that found in 2042, with which it also shares the word, *wig*, and the ‘w’ sound is echoed in *acwyð*, though the ‘c,’ which aligns with the final word of the line above, fulfils the necessity, according to Sievers, of having a final stressed syllable which does not alliterate with the others. The broad structure of the line is reproduced in line 850 of *Andreas*, where the apostle wakes up on the shores of Mermedonia, surveys the city and awakens his followers. As with a number of other lines, what is most striking about this line is that the shared diction runs through the entire line, not merely one half, which ought to be overwhelmingly the case if the poet were borrowing from an amorphous tradition of formulae: *wigend weccean, ond þæt worde cwæð*. In addition to the ‘w’/vowel of the double alliteration, the aural unity of the line is reinforced by a play on ‘end’/‘ond’/‘ord,’ and an alignment between ‘æt’ and ‘æð.’

There are at least three points of congruence between either passage, though they are all somewhat muted. The *Andreas*-poet describes the waking apostle not merely as a man, but specifically a severe, hardened or resilient warrior (*Onwoc þa wiges heard, 839*). Once more, the marital language is rather incongruous, though it makes much more sense if viewed in parallel with the old spear-warrior in the *Beowulf*-passage, who also, plainly, is severe and unrelenting. Moreover, Andreas realises then that he has done the dangerous deed just as the Father has bidden him (*swa him sylf bebead, / þa he him fore gescraf; fæder mancynnes, 845b–846*). Clearly
the eald æscwiga of Beowulf, himself a fatherly authority figure, is also bidding the young man to do dangerous deeds. Finally, as the saint looks about, he sees about him all his disciples, sleeping on the beach. However, the poet again imposes the awkward martial language on the image, calling them not only gingran, which seems not inappropriate, but beornas beadurofe, then proceeding to the line under scrutiny here, where he calls them wigend. In juxtaposition, the old spear-warrior of Beowulf is in that passage mindful of the dead, of the dead comrades upon the battlefield. Certainly one could see in the Andreas-image a conflation of two scenes: one of the gingran, peacefully sleeping on the beach as the sun rises, and another of the beornas beadurofe, scattered about on the strand abound the saint who still stands. Granted, none of these points of contact by themselves are particularly persuasive, but taken all together, along with a line which shares the language of an analogue in Beowulf across both a-lines and b-line, and the relationship becomes much more striking.

Because of the martial imagery, connotations of violence certainly do linger about the Andreas passage, and as the apostle recalls that he has now done the deed upon which so much of the plot turns, the episode’s dynamism is not hard to discern. However, though in the next two passages Andreas and his disciples will fall to wondering at their miraculous and mysterious journey, and turn as a consequence in praise and thanksgiving to God, none of these connotations are intrinsic to the passage here.

Overall, then, this cluster’s relationship to its parallels in Andreas seem to derive most convincingly from the artistry of the passage in Beowulf, less so, though not inconsiderably, from the shared motifs, and least convincing from its accordance to the usual pattern of connotations. However, the artistry of Beowulf’s lines supply only a priori evidence, while the shared motifs, though always
circumstantial, are remarkably consistent, and for the greater part, the connotations which are missing from one parallel are missing from all, both in Andreas and in Beowulf, and surely this is not besides the point.

Cluster IX.

The second to last cluster occurs as the dragon’s poison takes hold of Beowulf and he begins his final speech, extending from 2711b–2733a:

\[
\begin{align*}
&
\text{The unity of the passage is problematic, since the first half concerns the lethal epilogue to the fight, as the poison takes hold of Beowulf, while the second half}
\end{align*}
\]
entails the conventional approach to a speech-scene, beginning with the familiar *pa
mapelode*. Because the passage is bisected through its conventional structure and
differing content, and because the first two parallels, which are vastly more extensive,
elaborate and semantically consistent with the analogues in *Andreas*, occur in the first
half, there seems good reason to suspect that the clustering here depends primarily
upon these first two parallels, while the third is incidental to this cluster. However, so
extensive and striking are these two parallels that a study of them (and, incidentally,
the third, by way of contrast) is still potentially illuminating.

Both portions of text are crafted which considerable intricacy, though this
intricacy takes rather different forms. In the former half the poet builds a complex
pattern of sound and sense; the first half of *eorðraca*, who has infused the poison
*innan* Beowulf, aligns with the *eordreced* which Beowulf realises he shall soon be
*innan*, due to that poison.\(^\text{118}\) It is a pattern of cause and effect; in other words, because
of the poison in him, both he and the dragon shall soon be creatures who dwell in the
earth, once again deliberately intermingling through implication the hero with the
monsters he masters.\(^\text{119}\) In addition, there is a consistent paranomasia on the ‘wel’
sound, as in four lines we find *swelan*, *swellan*, *weoll*, and *wealle*, always ending or
beginning an a-line or b-line.

Furthermore, we find in this passage twelve compounds in 21 lines (the two
half lines establishing one complete), giving an average of one compound every 1.75
lines. The count of synonyms, on the other hand, is not particularly notable. However,

\(^{118}\) That is to say what remains from the fire—his ashes—shall inhabit the howe: 3160–3162.
\(^{119}\) Stanley Greenfield, “A Touch of the Monstrous in the Hero, or Beowulf Re-Marvellized,” *English
in *Beowulf*,” (unpublished Ph.D. Diss., University of Wisconsin, 1961); Doreen Gillam, “The Use of
because of the artful alliteration, pervasive patterning and plethora of compounds, one finds that this cluster again occurs in a richer than usual portion of the text; this richness would be even more pronounced if the first half, with its two very complex parallels, were considered in isolation. As shall be seen, this richness extends deeper yet as we survey those first two parallels. Before this, however, the connotations need to be considered.

Once more and unsurprisingly, an air of violence hangs over the scene as the poison infused in the fight does its deadly work. Moreover, the audience is now in the wake of Beowulf’s third and final great deed, as he considers the legacy of an entire life lofted up by great deeds. As he stares at the wondrous and mouldering works of giants, and considers the futility of his own legacy (having no heir nor any hope for his Geatish people), an overtone of wonder and enigma weave into his thoughts: a recurrence of the ubi sunt qui ante nos fuerunt motif. Finally, he begins to think back upon his fortunate, famous but ultimately futile career, and it is difficult to discern whether he is filled with gratitude or brooding frustration. Certainly a contemplation upon ‘the way of all flesh’ and the fruitlessness of investment in earthly fame would be a familiar motif for the Andreas-poet, and one which doubtless would strike a sympathetic chord. These familiar connotative concerns, along with the prosodic opulence of the passage, would make it a very attractive source for the author of Andreas.

The first parallel of the passage involves lines 2714–2715: 

_þæt him on breostrum bealoniðe weoll / attor on innan. ða se æðeling giong_.

Beyond the structure already noted, the line contains somewhat similar sounds at the beginning and ends of both a-line (þæt/attor and –strum/innan), while the first line puts considerable emphasis upon diphthongs. Its analogue in Andreas, which occurs in the
passage in which the Jewish Elders reject the message of the golem, reads thus: *geond beorna breost, brandhata nið / weoll on gewitte, weorm blædum fag, / attor ælfaele.*

*Þær orcnawe wearð* (768–770). The first line contains the same emphasis upon diphthongs, and the ‘b’/’r’/vowel collocation connects the a-line to the b-line. The second line connects the initial syllables of a-line and b-line through the ‘weo’ sound. The third line employs a profusion of ‘a’ sounds, while containing a number of other parallel sounds, such as ‘or,’ ‘æl’ and vowel/’r’: *attor ælfaele. Þær orcnawe wearð.*

As with a number of other parallels, one finds that the shared diction extends beyond a single formula, in a single a-line or b-line, and even beyond a full line, but in this case over two and three lines respectively. Not only this, but the diction in Andreas follows, exactly, the same order as in Beowulf, which is surely striking. In fact, not a single parallel yet observed amongst the clusters ever varies its order from Beowulf, which is one of the most powerful prosodic arguments for explicit borrowing (cf. the order of elements in Cluster IV: line 1; V: 1, 2; VI: 3; VII: 4).

The passage in which this collocation is found in Andreas has already been discussed in part during the treatment of Cluster VII, parallel six. It bears a number of resemblances to this portion of Beowulf also. Like the Beowulf-passage, it concerns the brewing of a deadly poison within a speaker who is about to speak, though in the Andreas-passage, the poison is metaphorical. Likewise, as Beowulf considers what the artfully wrought but mouldering stonework communicates to him, so too the Elders consider what the *scyna stan* has said to them (766b); in this case it is Beowulf which employs the allusive power of metaphorical treatments. Furthermore, in both passages, those who suffer the poison and, after considering the beautiful stonework, are about to speak, are the most senior and respected members of their respective societies. A final point of interest is that though a mention of poison may imply to the
Andreas-poet things ‘serpentish,’ there seems no need of one as he describes the poison of hatred flowing into the veins of the Elders, nor is a wyrm mentioned in the Beowulf-passage. Yet in both texts, it is explicitly a wyrm which has infused the aged speakers with venom, which means that there is either once more a coincidence of diction or that the Andreas-poet was broadly familiar with either Beowulf, in some form, or at least the motif of the serpent/hero battles so common in Germanic myth and legend.

The connotative framework entails, without too much straining, the usual features: the Elders intend violence to the Jesus in Andreas’ anecdote, and what they intend to do is relative to what they refuse to do, which is believe as the golem has called them to believe. That the statue should speak is clearly a wonder which reveals a divine, or even the divine, mystery, for which all humanity ought to feel, literally, sublime gratitude.

The second parallel covers three full lines in Beowulf, from 2716–2718:  

\[ \text{he bi wealle wishycgende / geset on sessse; seah on enta geweore, / hu ða stanbogan stapulum fæste.} \]

As mentioned earlier, wealle in the first line of this segment aligns with the accumulation of ‘w’/vowel ‘l’ sounds in the previous three lines, while the weight on ‘w’ locates a repetition in the final syllable of the next line. In that line (2717), there is a hint of transverse alliteration as the double alliteration of the line is book-ended by the initial, unaccented syllable ‘ge’ sound at the beginning of the first and last words. The last of the three involves a chiastic sound play, as the final word of the a-line begins with ‘sta’ and ends in a nasal, while the first word of the b-line begins with the same ‘sta’ sound and also ends with a nasal. The analogous collocation in Andreas is found where the poet in essence renews his tale, the saint rises from his great deeds of suffering to his great deeds of vengeance, and calls the
water from the stone pillars (1489–1499); the exact portion of text in which it is found reads *he be wealle geseah* wundrum fæste / under sæ; wage sweras unlytle, / *stapulas* *standan*, storme bedrifene, / eald *enta geweorc*. *He wið ane þære* (1492–1495).

Prosodically, there is little of note here; the third line continues the alliteration from the second and scaffolds its syllables with a mass of dentals. The final word of the line above and the first word of the line below also end with dentals. What is more noteworthy is that this parallel follows in *Beowulf* directly from the previous parallel (2714–2715 and 2716–2718), though they occur far apart in *Andreas*. This will become more important when we turn to the next parallel. Also, as before, the array of diction extends not only over a-line into b-line, but across several lines, though for the first time, there is a variation in the order of this array, when in *Andreas* *enta geweorc* and *stapulas standum* are inverted, line for line.

In *Beowulf* the hero at this point realises that he has acquired a deadly wound and turns his gaze upon his legacy; this legacy involves a number of levels, from material possessions and the wellbeing of the Geatish people to the legends amongst whom he soon will be numbered and the state of his soul. However, as is his habit, the *Beowulf*-poet leaves eschatological matters, in any sense, implicit and thus more allusive; the state of his soul is typically ambiguous. It is arresting then, that in *Andreas* the passage phrases its concerns in very much the same terms. As Beowulf the man looks towards becoming *Beowulf* the legend, which is as we encounter it specifically an ancient legend, so also does the *Andreas*-poet insist that the saint of whom he tells is here becoming an ancient legend (*þæt is fyrnsægen*, 1489b). The rub for Beowulf is that while he may remain present to posterity in his legend and the

---

120 For the poem’s précis of this soteriological ambiguity, see especially lines 3058–3075.
howe upon the headland, the legacy of his soul is deeply in doubt, while the legend of Andreas is merely a contingent outworking of the right to be eternally present in the presence of God; as the apostle prepares to die and does not, this is the legacy he has in view, while Beowulf hopes perhaps yet to live and does not, and knows only that he does not know what his legacy, on any level, shall be. For both heroes, their legacy is contingent upon the battles they wage in life; as the Andreas-poet makes clear, this is the case for saints as it is for pagan heroes: *he weorna feala wita gedolode, / heardra hilda, in þære hæðenan byrig* (1490–1491). Moreover, the saint’s contemplation of the ancient stonework, the legacy of giants, affords him also an opportunity for contemplation, but while in Beowulf the decaying architecture implies the mutability of all earthly works, in Andreas this stonework’s history, in the city of giants who are long past, is compared to stonework’s history as recorded in scripture, as the apostle says to the stone “*on ðe sylf cyning / wrat, wuldres God, wordum cyðde / recene geryno, ond ryhte æ / getacnode on tyn wordum*” (1509a–151512). Finally, the passage in Andreas introduces a speech by the hero, but, following in the pattern of eschatological antithesis, it is by a character who has suffered what he thought were deadly hurts and now is done and still lives, while in Beowulf, the speaker has suffered deadly hurts and now dies. Keeping these three points of eschatological antitheses in mind, one might conclude that if there is an explicit relationship between the two texts, it might fall under the appeal that, so to speak, so much has Ingeld to do with Christ. It is a point which even the Beowulf-poet makes (and which might have foregrounded the concern for the Andreas-poet), juxtaposing the hope of heathens
(179a) with the hope of their Christian ancestors, between fyres fieþm and fæder fieþmum, 185a and 188a).\textsuperscript{121}

Again, the connotative register is quite consistent. In Andreas the saint is both in the wake of having undergone great violence and is now about to inflict even greater violence. Moreover, the Andreas-poet phrases both the saint’s suffering and God’s retribution through him as the great deeds, the central dynamism, which constitutes the apostle’s legend. Andreas begins his address to the giants’ stonework, itself and wonder, as a prelude to a greater wonder: an echo of both Moses’ drawing water from the stone and the great flood which destroyed the same giants as who made this stonework. As the saint’s identity is moved by God from victim to aggressor, a sense of relief and gratitude is clearly anticipated. Lastly, the audience here finally sees how God’s plan for both Andreas and the Mermedonians comes together, revealing the outplay of God’s providence; it is an apocalypse in both the traditional and the popular sense: of an eschatological revelation and an end of a world, thereby dispersing the enigma that hung over the plot.

The final parallel derives from line 2732a of Beowulf: lice gelenge. ic ðas leode heold. Once more, it is a well-crafted line, with a rather dactylic character. The four ‘e’s of the a-line form a sort of basso ostinato, along with the alliterating syllables, around which the consonants arrange themselves, while the b-line repeats ‘eod’ sound in either syllable, setting it off from the previous sentence which this a-line ends, even as the rhythm and alliteration bind them together. The line in Andreas, at 1474, repeats the dactylic character, though this rhythm ends much more abruptly. It is also perhaps noteworthy that the collocation of vowels, ‘l’ and ‘d’ in Beowulf’s

\textsuperscript{121} Cf. Orchard, Critical Companion, 152.
heold is repeated in Andreas’ dael: lic[fe] gelenge ne laðes dael. However, more interesting is that, as the first and second parallels are adjacent to one another in Beowulf (2714–2715 and 2716–2718), so also are the second and third parallels adjacent to one another in Andreas (1492–1495 and 1474). That the first two should be contiguous might be coincidence, but coincidence seems a considerably less plausible explanation when such proximity occurs a second time in a comparatively small cluster in the second text under consideration.

The shared formula by itself means simply to ‘belong to body.’ However, in Andreas it is used in a context identical to that in Beowulf, referring to the wounds inflicted in the conflict and which in Andreas God now heals: næs him gewemmed wlite . . . // ne ban gebrocen, ne blodig wund / lic[fe] gelenge, ne laðes dael (1471a, 1473–1474). Again, the contrast between God’s healing of these wounds, which is tantamount to restoring the saint to life, and the deadly and poisonous wounds Beowulf has received, and which shall be his death, is not merely different, but directly antithetical; the saint will not simply get better, but is restored to life, while Beowulf doesn’t simply suffer battle-wounds, but by these is fated to die. This antithesis is of a piece with the same polemical point made repeatedly in the other two parallels: that the old model of heroism, which depends necessarily upon the legends left in its wake, conduces only to death, no matter how much the hero may be admired, while the new model of heroism conduces to life, contingently leaving behind saintly legends, though these are not strictly necessary to the objective of that heroism. Both passages also foreground the providential hand of God in this matter; it is God who heals and saves Andreas, while it is God who has not given Beowulf an heir to live on after him, even if He cannot blame Beowulf for any misdeeds as a ruler (2741–2743a). Once more, the antithesis between models of heroism, and their
results, is evident. Fame and life, and ultimately eternal life, shall be Andreas’, while Beowulf’s line, and even his people, die with him. Yet again, in Beowulf the hero recounts the glory of his reign which arise significantly from his might, while in Andreas it is the hero who gives praise for that glorious might deriving from God, even though it seemed to require something more akin to fortitude and perseverance. Finally, as Beowulf mentions the battle-garments he would give to an heir if only God had granted him one, so too does the Andreas-poet mention, rather incongruously, that not a single tatter hung from his formerly torn garments. Overall, and once more, none of these parallels by itself is strong evidence of an explicit relationship, but the sheer quantity of such idiosyncratic similarities, again, lends vastly more gravity to the suspicion.

The connotations are familiar. The gruesome description of the Andreas’ wounds keep the violence he has suffered at the forefront of the audience’s imagination, while God’s miraculous intervention, the ending of the saint’s passive suffering, and his rising to his feet (aras pa maegene rof, 1469a), lend the passage a sense of the usual dynamism, one which shall play out dramatically in the following passages. The miracle of God’s sudden and spectacular healing of Andreas’ dire and grotesque wounds injects an air of wonder, and from this gratitude and relief are expressed by the apostle. One would have to strain rather hard, however, to discern much by way of enigma, unless one were concerned to ask after the mystery of God’s ways upon how he here manages the fate and wounds of Andreas.

In sum, then, this cluster is couched in the usual contexts which bind these Beowulf-passages to the Andreas-passages. It is relatively unified, richer in language and prosody than usual, shares, parallel by parallel, a host of very unique motifs and
topoi, and ascribes in the main to the anticipated connotative register which seems to attract the Andreas-poet to other passages in Beowulf.

**Cluster X.**

The final cluster is found in a passage extending from 2873 to 2891, as Wiglaf castigates the retainers who abandoned Beowulf in the battle with the wyrm, and in doing so, perhaps offers an implicit critique of Beowulf himself and those upon whom he relied:

> [“In no manner needed the king of the folk to boast about war-companions; yet God, Ruler of Victories, permitted that he alone should avenge himself with the sword when valour’s necessity was in him. I could grant him little life-protection in the battle, but began beyond my strength-measure to help (my) kinsman; always I was the weaker when I struck the deadly enemy with sword; fire less fiercely welled from the head. Too few defenders crowded around the leader when the crisis came. Now shall cease treasure-getting, sword-giving, comfort for your kin, all home-joy. Every man of your kin-clan shall be deprived of land-rights when distant æðelings learn of your flight, of your inglorious deed. For every man, death is better than shame-life.”]

This portion of text is drawn from a somewhat larger speech by Wiglaf (starting at 2864), and by virtue of this context is relatively bracketed off from the text around it. Though the passage as reproduced here is short on synonyms, and contains
only 11 lines out of 19 which employ double alliteration (57%), it does utilise 12 compounds, which is one every 1.58 lines. Furthermore, the poet insinuates considerable amounts of assonance (for instance, 2873 or 2883) and rhyme (2882, 2885, 2888 or 2889) to join a-lines and b-lines. Finally, as we shall see, the individual lines which this passage shares with *Andreas* again tend to be more ornate than usual.

Most of the potentially significant motifs remain speculative, though once more their sheer number and the precision of their alignment with motifs central to *Andreas* are striking. For instance, the *Beowulf*-poet repeats his mention of God as the providential bestower of victories: an idea in which the *Andreas*-poet has shown a consistent and marked interest. Moreover, if the *Andreas*-poet, who is undoubtedly a learned Christian, is accustomed to reading (or hearing) texts through the typological tradition, then a number of analogies could, without too great a strain, have suggested themselves from this passage in *Beowulf*. Wiglaf denounces the faithless retainers for abandoning their lord when the time of violence and danger came. In a similar manner Christ is abandoned by his disciples, his retainers one might say, at the time of violence and danger, when he is arrested at the Garden of Gethsemane. It is perhaps not incidental that Andreas too must face the violence and danger of his great trial bereft of companions and disciples, and it is in just these terms that he finally reprimands God, in Christ’s agonised question—why have you abandoned me?—when the trial seems too great. Likewise, as Beowulf is defended by only one of his retainers, who strikes in defence of his lord with the sword, so also is Christ at his arrest defended by only one of his disciples, Peter, who also strikes with a sword; both sword blows are described as availing little, and the lord, in either case dies in spite of the retainer’s/disciple’s defence. However, even though both lords are alone at the lethal hour, both achieve victory alone: Christ, as his final cry to God makes famously
clear, and Beowulf, who is granted his victory by God (*þæt he hyne sylfne gewræc ana mid ecge, þa him wæs elnes þearf*, 2875b–2876). Lastly, Wiglaf sums up his speech with a ringing axiom, that for all men death is better than a shameful life. For a religion whose core tenets stress the continual need to die to the world, to die to the self, an axiom which prefers death to living an iniquitous life must have resonated.

The connotative character of this final cluster also is of a piece with previous clusters. What Wiglaf says here concerns violence, is a direct result of violence, and speaks about future violence. It is also precisely because of the retainers’ lack of action, or rather the wrong action, fleeing instead of fighting in the midst of this violence, which affords Wiglaf his central theme. Gratitude and relief are connoted through direct antithesis; Beowulf’s gifts and patronage were ill bestowed, since he got nothing back for them when the time for fighting came. In other words, he had nothing to be thankful for (*nealles folccyning fyrdgesteallum / gylpan þorfte*, 2873–2874a). Consequently, Wiglaf presciently unveils the future fate of the Geats, revealing deprivation and destruction. The wonder, albeit muted, arises from the mythological foe who has been catalyst to this doom, a fire-breathing *wyrm*, and the seer-like revelation of Fate’s unravelling panoply.

The first parallel is situated in line 2879a: *ofer min gemet mæges helpan*. As mentioned above, the line is a very well-crafted one. Not only does it use double alliteration, but also builds its euphony through arranging a mass of nasals in a near perfect trochaic pattern. Its analogue in *Andreas* is found in line 1481a, as the *Andreas*-poet renews the telling of the tale at its climax with an elaborate and formal metanarrative in which the line in question reads *ofer min gemet mycel is to secganne*. In the b-line, the *Andreas*-poet lets slip the trochaic pattern into something more dactylic, though the smooth sound of nasals continues.
The location of the *Andreas*-parallel is also fascinating, for it occurs precisely between the two parallels from the previous cluster, and so the patterning of adjacent parallels tracked earlier continues here also; in other words, the clustering continues to happen in both texts. In *Andreas*, this is just where the poet is being most self-consciously artificial, and so perhaps it comes as no surprise that he might feel the need to draw upon a text which he respects for its literary sophistication and power. Keeping with this concern of literary self-consciousness, it is interesting that even outside the shared formula the *Andreas*-poet continues to echo Wiglaf’s despairing sentiment, for as Wiglaf ‘could grant him little life-protection in the battle, but began beyond my strength-measure to help (my) kinsman,’ so also does the *Andreas*-poet declare this his task: *scell æglæwra / mann on moldan þonne ic me teelig / findan on ferðe, þæt fram fruman cunne /eall þa earfeðo þe he mid elne adreah / grimra guða* (*‘needs a man upon the earth more learned in tradition than I consider myself, to find it within his mind from the beginning all the trials and grim battles which he with courage endured,’* 1484b–1487a). Yet further, the *Andreas*-poet resolves, like Wiglaf, to continue to struggle anyway; this is a jarring conclusion in the *Andreas*-passage which seems not to follow the emphatic declaration of the modesty topos, but it aligns quite well with the sequence of reasoning in *Beowulf*.

On the other hand, since the passage in *Andreas* is not part of the narrative itself, but rather part of its framework, it is unlikely that the usual connotative configuration shall appear, and this is just the case, for the poet speaks of speaking about *Andreas*, and though this may be a struggle, no sense of violence can attach to this, and his decision to continue striving hardly betrays an ethos of dynamism. He clears up no significant mysteries nor has reason to express any gratitude or relief. It is a decidedly mundane passage, though by the absence of the usual connotative
aspects, it does throw into sharp relief the peculiarity of the connotative patterns in other parallels.

The second parallel occurs in line 2882a: *weoll of gewitte weregendra to lyt.* The double alliteration is complemented by two sets of rhymes, between the ‘ge’ sounds and then the ‘it’ and ‘yt’ sounds. Likewise, the rhythm, especially in the a-line, combines well a sequence of long and short syllables which elides into the b-line. In line 769 of *Andreas,* where this formula repeats, most of this ornamentation is lost: *weoll on gewitte,* *weorm blædum fag.* The rhythm of the a-line, of course, remains the same, but it breaks down in the b-line. Likewise, though there is an internal rhyme on *weoll* and *weorm,* it does little to pull the sound and sense of the two halves together, perhaps because of the sharp end-stop forced upon the a-line in the dentals of *gewitte* which the *Beowulf*-poet actually turns to his advantage through rhyme. This parallel occurs at the previously discussed point where the Jews and the Elders are addressed by the golem (clusters VII, 6 and IX, 1).

Of course this means that once again the clustering shared between both texts, encountered twice in cluster IX and again in the previous parallel in this cluster has repeated once more, there being three parallels in the *Andreas*-passages 761–772 and another three in the section which extends from 1469 to 1497, and five of these six parallels are found in clusters IX and then X. It suggests strikingly the possibility that at certain points in the writing of *Andreas* the poet turned to or recalled certain portions of *Beowulf.* However, textual patterns such as these cannot provide proof, but only plausibility, though here the plausibility begins to seem very compelling. The similarity of motifs also seems very expressive of a relationship.

Both *Beowulf* and the Elders shall die because of the poison in their breast which a *wyrm* has injected; *Beowulf* shall die physically, and perhaps spiritually,
while the Elders shall die spiritually, and perhaps physically. Likewise, because of the treacherous behaviour of a small, respected band, both peoples, the Geats and the Jews, shall, as both audiences know, lose their homeland, their ‘comfort of kin, all home-joy. Every man of your kin-clan shall be deprived of land-rights.’ The Geats shall be destroyed, and the survivors assimilated, by the victorious Swedes, while the Jews shall face the destruction of the Temple and The Second Diaspora (circa 135 AD). The concatenation of language continues as Beowulf dies, says Wiglaf, because he was not hemmed in at the moment of crisis by retainers, while the Andreas-poet states that the Elders are misled to their ultimate undoing because they are hemmed in by sin: þær (waes) orcnawe / þurh teoncwide tweogende mod, / mægcga misgehygd morðre bewunden, 770b–772. As for the connotative nature of the passage, this has of course been discussed at length previously in cluster VII and IX, being found there consistent with the usual configuration.

The final parallel arises from line 2890, extending over the length of the line: domleasan deed dead bið sella. Again this parallel occurs in one of the passage’s double alliterating lines, and is reinforced by a concatenation of ‘d’ s, ‘l’ s and ‘ð’ s, not to mention and ‘ea’ sound in either half. In Andreas this arrangement of diction is found where the saint approaches the prison and the guards fall dead; the line itself reads druron domlease deadraes forfeng, (995). The line is better crafted than usual, for the poet builds up, like the Beowulf-poet, a series of sounds which contribute to sense, upon the ‘r’ and alliterating ‘d,’’ and also upon fricatives in the b-line. In addition, the resonating sense of the sentiment is assisted by the dominance of long syllables throughout.

The passage in Andreas is one treated previously, in cluster II, 1. As in Beowulf, the narrative speaks of a group of armed men who fail to guard a good and
heroic man: in the former case, Beowulf, and in the latter, the imprisoned Matthew. Moreover, in Beowulf Wiglaf condemns the cowardly retainers who preserved their lives by sacrificing their honour, while in Andreas, the poet condemns the guards whose lives are not preserved and who still die without honour; the guards have the worst of both possible worlds. What is important, however, is that the Andreas-poet chooses to articulate this scene in exactly the same terms and amongst just the same dynamics as Wiglaf employs: of an armed band, life and death, honour and dishonour. Finally, in both passages, it is God’s providence which is stressed, in Beowulf’s vengeance upon his killer and Andreas’ prayer of thanks. As with the previous parallel, the connotative combination has been explored in detail, and requires no repetition here save to say that it is what one has come to expect of the Andreas-poet’s predilections.

This chapter has considered three questions: A) Most simply, what sort of prosodic and connotative evidence is there that an explicit relationship between Andreas and Beowulf exists? B) If this seems likely to exist, then, in detail, what is the nature of that relationship? C) Finally, how does this inform one’s reading of Andreas in light of a relationship to Beowulf? The evidence for the existence of an explicit relationship turns out to be quite strong. At the a priori level, most passages in which one finds clusters of shared formulae either are set-pieces or are primarily constituted of set-pieces. In both the oral-formulaic tradition and in the methods of opus geminatum paraphrasing, versifiers are expected to memorize portions of text before reproducing them, and these portions would most naturally be delimited by natural divisions in the architecture of the text itself. Though it could be argued that Beowulf largely consists of such set-pieces, one seldom finds that the clusters overlap these,
and likewise they seldom occur in the long, sprawling passages of the tale which
would be harder, and so less likely, for later poets to memorize. Moreover, the
clustering tends to occur where the plot of *Beowulf* reaches many of its most dramatic
or insightful pitches. This clustering of *Andreas’* formulae in *Beowulf’s* shorter and
more dramatic, set-pieces implies reasons for this location—that they cluster here
because these portions of *Beowulf* are easier and more likely to be memorized than
other portions, and because these dramatic scenes would be more likely than others to
be retained and valued by later poets; both these reasons argue away from
coincidental sharing.

More *a priori* evidence is supplied by the fact that these passages are for the
most part prosodically very rich. As the survey shows, synonyms abound, but more
significantly, the number of compounds in these portions of text is very considerably
higher than average. The 36 parallels occur in passages which amount to 207 lines,
and in which 107 compounds occur, giving an average of one compound every 1.93
lines, as opposed to the poem’s average of one compound every 3.52 lines. In
addition, while the average of double alliteration is 47% of lines, in these passages it
is 59.4%. The final and very key point which came clear through the line by line
prosodic analysis is that in terms of sheer versifying skill and detail the lines upon
which the *Andreas*-poet seems to draw are time and again extremely well-crafted; as
Quintilian might have observed, the very fact that the *Andreas*-poet was seen *never* to
match the *Beowulf*-poet’s skill while versifying merely makes plain the excellence of
the latter’s poem, thereby reinforcing its likelihood as an appropriate source for
borrowing. All these reasons—the intrinsic unity, the exaggerated significance, the
verbal and prosodic richness of the passages in which we find shared formulae
clustering—point towards the likelihood of an explicit relationship.
Moreover, the *a posteriori* evidence is at least as strong. The *Andreas*-poet seems to elicit a taste not merely for a limited set of connotative registers, but in over half the passages for that set as a complete group, with all five connotations occurring together. As noted earlier, when one considers their shared cultural and literary worldview, this may not seem that surprising, but when one considers that they tend to happen time and again as a comparatively unified set, this seems more noteworthy. In addition, while all five connotations, of dynamism, wonder, violence, gratitude and enigma, seem quite natural to *Beowulf*, they are often a much more awkward fit in *Andreas*, enough so that, as we saw in the introduction to this chapter, numerous scholars like Schaar and Pearsall feel this worth disparaging comment. A theory of explicit borrowing goes some way to explaining these awkward connotations. Thus, both the unity of connotative similarities and their awkward presence in *Andreas* suggest borrowing.

Just as striking are the very considerable number of parallels at the level of motifs. These are extremely varied in nature, from overt invocations of God’s providence and munificence, to an array of conflations between the destruction of giants or monsters and cannibals, just to name two examples. Not only does one observe these parallels singly, but it was often found that the associations worked in either text as part of a broader matrix of ideas: that is, not only did single ideas associate one with the other in either text, but a structure of ideas in one text associated with an analogous structure of ideas in the other. By observing the nature of connotations and motifs shared in such detail and so pervasively between the two poems, an explicit relationship seems very probable indeed, though it needs to be stated here again that all such evidence falls short of absolute proof; the aim in this
chapter has been rather to prove that such a relationship is simply more likely than not.

If so, then in *Andreas* what one is left with is a poem which is vastly richer and more nuanced at the level of motif, connotation and prosody because of its relative relationship with *Beowulf*. The broader context of literary traditions germane to Anglo-Saxon authors certainly affords a basis for such a relative relationship, in the realms of typology, the indigenous communality of Old English poetry or the inherited practice of writing *opera geminata* which Anglo-Saxon authors developed so extensively.

It seems natural when considering the composition of *Andreas* that the methods of the *opus geminatum* should be implicit, for the *Andreas*-poet was almost undoubtedly engaged in an act of translation, which was held since antiquity to be an undertaking twinned with paraphrase, and moreover one sees both from the tone and the content that the *Andreas*-poet was engaged in something much more radical than a translation, but that he was carrying the legend of Andrew over into not only new words, but into an entirely new literary culture. Thus, by any standards, the *Andreas*-poet is not merely translating, but paraphrasing, and for this we know of only one deliberate and conventional methodology available to him: the mode of the *opus geminatum*. Again, as this touches upon *Beowulf*, this does not imply that it and *Andreas* are anything which together could be described as an *opus geminatum*. Rather, what seems to emerge from this analysis is that that the *Andreas*-poet very likely drew upon the indigenous prosody, connotations and motifs he found in *Beowulf* to facilitate and enrich aspects of the composition of an *opus geminatum* between the Old English poetic *Andreas* and a source text which might have been in the Casanatensis tradition.
As observed in the first chapter, the result is a poem which in many key ways is different than the Casanatensis, which is much more ‘English’ at some of its most fundamental thematic and stylistic levels. Yet according to the *opus geminatum* tradition, this should not come as a surprise, since neither verse nor prose versions should be considered to be necessarily dependent upon the other, but that both should equally vie for the better claim to the ultimate meaning of the legend. This is an aim which *Beowulf* seems here in many ways to help *Andreas* achieve, even if an explicit comparison between the two works points up in detail the inferior quality of *Andreas*. In spite of that inferiority, the *Andreas*-poet has still composed something which considerably exceeds the grammatical and interpretive paraphrases often produced by the antique and medieval tradition of paraphrase, producing instead a text which can safely be considered its own literary work; as Irving had observed, simply because it does not equal *Beowulf*, does not necessarily mean it is a bad poem. On the other hand and as Irving’s article also makes plain, its status as an independent literary work has in recent years divorced it from being considered relative to other works, such as *Beowulf*: works upon which *Andreas* seems to depend for much of its depth and significance.

Such a use of *Beowulf* would also fit well with concerns observed both in Anglo-Saxon and antique literary communities about Christian literature collaborating in sympathy with pagan literature. It has already been observed how Alcuin expresses exasperation and dismay over his monks’ affection for pagan tales; in this case he might have asked just as readily what has *Beowulf* to do with *Andreas*? It is a concern which must be touched upon again in the next chapter. But as has also already been observed, Alfred in his version of the *Consolation of Philosophy* and Aldhelm on the bridge are both willing to use pagan literary material to communicate a Christian
message. There seems no good reason to think that the *Andreas*-poet could not do likewise, and even take the tactic to its most logically effective conclusion by availing his composition of formulae of the finest pagan epic he knew, not as an end in itself, but, following writers like Alfred and Aldhelm, as a facilitator, at the functional level, of a traditional Christian work. This is also of a piece with the treatment of pagan literature by Christian paraphrasers, who in their turn draw time and again upon verbal elements of the finest pagan epic available to them: the *Aeneid*. As the first chapter points out, Sedulius, Proba, Juvenecus and a host of other Christian writers use Virgil’s epic in just such a way, and it is again a point of which the *Andreas*-poet seems probably aware.\(^{122}\) In either instance, and likely in both, the *Andreas*-poet would seem predisposed to cannibalize, so to speak, these verbal elements from a text like *Beowulf*. The motivation for this would certainly have come as no surprise to a writer like Sedulius, for clearly he would have agreed that turning to this familiar verse form would make the aesthetic value of its divine truth more accessible to its audience, and would thereby incline them to memorize, sympathize and internalize the legend more readily.\(^{123}\) It is also accords well with the general precepts articulated by Pope Gregory the Great, who in the *Libellus responsionum* urged his missionary, Augustine of Canterbury, to use indigenous customs, festivals and conventions to communicate Christian truths to the Anglo-Saxons.\(^{124}\) The prevalence of the *Libellus*, not to mention numerous instance of this precept’s implementation, such as the Christianizing of pagan temples and festivals, makes clear that later Anglo-Saxons

\(^{122}\) Cf. pages 14–16.

\(^{123}\) Cf. page 16.

took this precept to heart. Clearly this too gives licence and thorough precedent to how the *Andreas*-poet seems to have used *Beowulf*.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, some of these assertions in some sense and to some degree have already been made by scholars, but in these instances what this chapter has hopefully done is add considerably more substance to such assertions, which had too often been made *in vacuo*, and added new evidence to scaffold them.

Likewise, as also observed in the introduction to this chapter, the functional communality of indigenous literary traditions has over the last fifty years been explored and occasionally tested to a considerable extent by investigations grounded in oral-formulaic theory, but functional aspects of intertextual relationships at the level of typology or the traditions of the *opus geminatum*—in other words, at the level of inherited Latin literary cultures of intertextuality—have been comparatively neglected. Certainly *Andreas* must be seen as containing elements of both indigenous and Latin literary cultures, but what has appeared to be implicit throughout this chapter is that *Andreas* is more than merely an admixture of either of these cultures, but also a new thing, growing in this particular instance, as did the general forms of hagiography and the traditions of paraphrase overall, out of the interstices between these two cultures, neither purely an oral-formulaic construct, nor a Latin literary work, but a creature thriving between the two.
Chapter IV

The Old English Verse and Prose Andreas

The final chapter of this inquiry focuses on the prose Andreas homily found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 198, fols. 386r–394v (also know as Cameron B3.3.1.1, which is a alphanumeric code assigned by the Dictionary of Old English of one letter, followed by a series of numbers designating specific texts), hereafter CCCC 198, and seeks to ascertain in this homily the presence, nature and implications of the distinctions made between prose and verse hagiography, especially as traced out by Alcuin in the prologue of his Vita Willibrordi. It will do this by again using a comparative approach, in this case primarily between constitutive elements of the verse Andreas and the prose homily; however, it will also be necessary throughout to make continual reference to the Casanatensis version of the legend in order that the parallels and deviations of the Old English versions may be thrown into a more cogent relief. More specifically, the chapter will test within the hagiographical dichotomy spoken of earlier, of efficiency and beauty, or perhaps more appropriately, the impulses docere and movere, whether and how the account of the Andreas legend in CCCC 198 aligns, relative to Andreas and the Casanatensis, with the public reading contexts suggested for such prose texts by Alcuin.

As noted at the end of Chapter II, the current critical edition for the CCCC 198 version is found in James Bright’s Anglo-Saxon Reader.1 This edition derives from a manuscript which contains a collection of homilies, some of which are early eleventh

---

century (fols. 1–149, 160–217, 248–87), others which have been inserted at a later
date, from the late eleventh century (fols 321v, 322–27, 367–77), and some of which
are likely contemporary with the production of the manuscript, circa 1050 (fols. 150–
9, 218–47, 288–321r, 328–66, 378–94). The last of these is the homily on Andrew
among the cannibals, in the proper liturgical position for his feast day, on November
30th, suggesting strongly that this prose account was meant as lectionary material,
perhaps for the daily lectio during meal-times which precede celebration of the saint’s
feast day.

Though a manuscript date circa 1050 must been seen as speculative, if it is
accurate, it would make CCCC 198 account up to 100 years younger than Andreas,
which most likely dates from the last half of the tenth century; the real point,
however, is that the verse is earlier than the prose by a considerable period. The
Andrea- homily was first edited by Charles Goodwin, in 1851, and subsequently by
Bright, for the first time in 1891, though his edition has undergone a number of
revisions, the last of which dates from 1971. The CCCC 198 version has a parallel in
Blickling Homily XIX, and though this is fragmentary, about one third the length of
CCCC 198 account, it is a more popular object of research and editing. The
Cambridge homily is glossed in what W. P. Ker describes as the tremulous hand, in

---

2 The liturgical year starts on December 1st and ends on November 30th.
4 The Blickling fragment starts at CCCC 198, 113, 10 and continues to 119, 6.
5 Richard Morris, ed, The Blickling Homilies (London: Oxford UP, 1967). I select the CCCC 198 version because it is complete, while Blickling Homily XIX is only a fragment. The text of this fragment matches CCCC 198’s account nearly exactly, and many translators have produced versions of Blickling Homily XIX, in compendiums of the Blickling Homilies, by filling in the majority of the homily from CCCC 198, often without mentioning that most of the text is not from Blickling XIX. This chapter here, however, will operate from the full, though less popular, account, with only brief recourse to Blickling XIX.
Latin, and because this version is slightly more compact than the Blickling, Bright concludes, perhaps problematically, that it is earlier. A comparative study between the CCCC 198 version and the Blickling XIX account has recently been undertaken by Mary Swan, and the CCCC 198 version often receives passing mention in treatments which survey Andreas literature overall or another specific version the Andreas legend, either in Old English, Latin or Greek. Nearly all of these have been cited in previous chapters and add little to what has been said above.

The reason the CCCC 198 version has attracted so little attention might in large part be due to its comparative plainness. Much of the dialogue and description found in the other texts, especially of a more wondrous or fantastic nature, has been cut. What remains is delivered in a stark account that explains away problematic issues, erases typological connections and downplays most subjective psychological aspects. Yet at some point or another, an author in the tradition which resulted in the CCCC 198 account made a deliberate decision, for deliberate reasons, to render it as he has, and the question which then dominates this chapter is why he did so. Alcuin’s insistence that prose works of hagiography were primarily appropriate for public reading venues—that is, read to the monks from the prose version and by the monks

---

6 Over half of these have been recently edited by William Schipper, “English Annotations in CCCC MS 198,” in Geardagum: Essays on Old and Middle English Language and Literature 10 (1989): 1–17.
7 Bright, 205.
9 A qualification is necessary here. There are two potential reasons for variations between the CCCC 198 account and other Andreas legends; either its author knew of or even worked from a source text whose story he himself edited in various ways for particular reasons, or he simply copied from a version to which such changes had already been made. In either event, however, this discussion focuses on the variations communicated by the CCCC 198 version, the putative work or stemma of works which ultimately resulted in the CCCC 198 account. Thus, the CCCC 198 version manifests to modern scholars a version of the legend which varies substantially from its other forms such as one finds in the verse Andreas or the Casanatensis version. By working out from these variations, this chapter seeks to better understand the literary contexts which explain those variations, whether or not the CCCC 198 account represents their first instance in this form or if it simply echoes earlier editorial work.
in the verse version—may afford this inquiry a starting point for answering this
question, especially if those works aimed at the pragmatic end of communicating
information in preparation for the the feast-day of the saint in question. On the other
hand, what one encounters in the CCCC 198 version is a prose version which defies
the classical and late antique distinctions between prose and verse versions of an *opus
geminatum*, in that the prose here is less, not more, expansive.\(^{10}\) However, what we
encounter in the CCCC 198 account does conform rather well with developments in
prose versions of *opera geminata* after Bede exerted his influence upon the mode,
making his prose halves more literal and concise, and his verse version more allusive
and sophisticated.\(^{11}\)

The initial text of CCCC 198 follows, up to 113, 13, the main details of
*Andreas*’ plot, through the casting of lots for regions of preaching, the falling of
Mermedonia’s lot to Matthew, and the description of Mermedonian cannibalism. Both
*Andreas* and the CCCC 198 version contrast the eating of bread and drinking of water
with the consumption of human flesh and the drinking of human blood. The
Casanatensis version, on the other hand, mentions only the devouring of human flesh
and blood. In the Old English, this double association has Eucharistic overtones to
which the verse in particular will consistently return. The CCCC 198 account and
*Andreas* are also similar in that they both omit the description of slaughter facilities
found in the Casanatensis version (I, 6–11). Thus, rather surprisingly, one finds that
the plot of the CCCC 198 version and *Andreas*, up to lines 13 and 36a respectively,
actually have more in common than the CCCC 198 account has with the Casanatensis

\(^{10}\) Cf. pages 12–16

version, which often is identified as having the closest plot to the CCCC 198 legend. However, at this point, the CCCC 198 version varies from both other versions, for though it describes like the two other legends how the cannibals maim and drug their victims, it omits the observation about how the drugged prisoners become like cattle and crave grass; of course this also eliminates the typological references the observation contributes to the Casanatensis version and Andreas.

If, on the other hand, the purpose of the CCCC 198 account is simply to communicate its basic information as efficiently as possible, then typological allusions, calling for active contemplation on the part of the audience to connect the allusion to its scriptural source, in order to throw the primary plot into a richer, comparative relief, would potentially impede the speed, clarity and so efficiency with which the CCCC 198 version could be communicated to its audience; in such a case, the audience would not be meant to contribute actively to the phenomenology of the legend, but passively to ingest it, for the greater effort required in the pursuit of a given literary goal by one text when compared to another seems to indicate less efficiency, at least as conceived in the opus geminatum context implied by Alcuin. Furthermore, typologically accessing an extraneous text more likely arises from an aesthetic, not useful, impulse, for if it had been the purpose of the CCCC 198 account’s author to communicate this information efficiently, it would have been much more efficaciously achieved through actually supplying it in his text rather than

---

12 The most recent editors of Bright’s reader disagree with both him and Boenig and insist that the Bonnet Fragment is closer to the CCCC 198 version than the Casanatensis account, and Baumler suggests that there might have been more than one model for both CCCC 198 and Blickling Homily XIX (71).
13 This is at least implied in Alcuin’s suggestion that the prose life is appropriate to public reading, where quick, lucid delivery would be more important than a text which invites complex contemplation and critical engagement.
forcing the audience themselves through allusions to track down the scriptural counterpoint. Likewise, the authority supplied by scripture to information in the legend could again be far more efficiently injected by explicit reference to that scriptural passage in the text of the CCCC 198 version itself. In short, if the prose text aims to be useful, then typology seems to impede this. As we shall see, this is more often than not just what the CCCC 198 account does. Moreover, as authors in the *opus geminatum* tradition from Quintilian to Bede insist, if prose is to supply the details, clarify the diffusions, and expand upon what is condensed in verse versions, then, the CCCC 198 version defies those expectations, for here it is the verse which supplies more information, while the CCCC 198 account supplies more clarity by stripping away detail.

Afterwards, the Matthew of the CCCC 198 version is, as in *Andreas* and the Casanatensis account, apprehended, tortured and prays that his sight might be restored. The CCCC 198 version follows the Casanatensis version, however, in omitting Matthew’s lament and vow nevertheless to follow God’s will. Again, this makes sense in that an aspect of the story is taken away which might have otherwise forced the audience to engage more critically with the legend, for the complaining Matthew is dissatisfied with God’s plan (else why complain?) and must struggle to follow God’s wishes (else why the polemical assertion that he will nevertheless follow?) On the other hand, these developments in *Andreas* deliberately introduce many key questions, including its central theme upon the interaction between human will and divine providence.

Next one comes to Matthew’s encounter with the infamous draught of the Mermedonians which all three versions treat differently. In the Casanatensis version the drink simply does not affect Matthew, and so the author does not have to supply
an explanation for how the apostle is either saved from the drink’s effects or cured, though it does raise the question about why the potion does not work, for no explicit mention of divine intervention is made. In *Andreas* the poet says nothing about the draught’s effects whatsoever, perhaps thinking that either these effects are evident from what has been said before, or wishing to avoid an awkward or difficult explanation which he himself could not supply, or again just forgetting to mention this detail of the plot as he composed. In the CCCC 198 version, all such vexations are avoided, for Matthew simply refuses to drink and this is an end of it; no explanation is required and no questions remain to be asked save why the cannibals could not compel him by force. Once more the CCCC 198 account has reduced the audience’s critical engagement by explaining away problematic aspects of the legend, thereby producing a more efficient version of the text.

Thereafter, in all three versions, God appears to the saint to reassure him that all shall be well and to foretell the future. The CCCC 198 version pre-empts the rather involved ways in which the other two versions communicate Matthew’s restored vision, for in *Andreas* this is implied by what Matthew eventually shall see when Andreas opens the door, though perhaps this is incidental and the *Andreas*-poet has once more simply forgotten an element of the plot. In the Casanatensis account, this restored vision is implied when Matthew, after his prayer for sight, has to hide it from his captors. Implications like these, however, call for critical engagement and so subjective investment by the audience; in other words, in both versions gaps are left in the narrative which the audience then needs to explain. This the CCCC 198 account avoids by having God respond to Matthew’s prayer for sight by telling him to look upon Him, in response to which “Matheus þa lociende he geseah drihten crist” (“Then Matthew, looking, saw the Lord Christ,” 114, 12). The CCCC 198 version follows
this up later, like the author of the Casanatensis version, by having Matthew hide his
restored vision from his captors. The Old English prose then inserts a separate and
seemingly pointless line of dialogue, as God restarts the conversations to say “sib si
mid þe, Matheus” (‘Peace be with you, Matthew,’ 114, 22). This seems a relatively
clear echo of the liturgy, from the priest’s greeting (pax vobis), which insinuates into
this episode liturgical undertones, a point which will be consistently followed
hereafter, though it must also be pointed out that the Old English prose version
certainly does not introduce these liturgical elements, but simply enhances them much
more than the other two versions. Then the CCCC 198 version again follows his
impulse for efficiency and eliminates another scene which threatens to complicate the
transmission of the legend. Both the Casanatensis version and Andreas relate how the
‘systematic’ Mermedonians track their victims by means of date-tablets which the
prisoners obligingly hold for them, and that according to these twenty-seven days
have elapsed for Matthew and only three days remain. This is all too complicated for
the CCCC 198 account, which eliminates the chronological apparatus by having God
declare, for no apparent reason, that Matthew should remain in prison for twenty-
seven days, after which he will send Andreas to save him. God later tells Andreas that
only three days remain. The CCCC 198 version does not supply reasons why the
timing should be arranged thus.

This revision affords an opportunity to speak in more detail about Alcuin’s

---

14 For the dialogue of the liturgy as it compares with the CCCC 198 version, I depend upon *The Leofric Missal*, though a number of other missals, such as the Sarum, Hereford or York Missals, could serve equally well. Though Pre-Tridentine liturgical practices varied somewhat, the Anglo-Saxon liturgy is notable for its consistency and its adherence to the liturgical practice of Rome, and usually differences, especially in the Ordinary, upon which this comparison focuses, are minor. The most recent edition of this missal has been edited by Nicholas Orchard, *The Leofric Missal* (London: Boydell, 2002).
suggestion, that prose versions of saints’ legends ought to be read publicly to the
brothers, perhaps in preparation for the saint whose day it is. If this reading were to
refresh the monks’ memory of the saint whose day they were to celebrate, then this
reading seems more likely to stress a quantitative communication of information, in
the most efficient form possible, leaving potential aesthetic concerns to the actual
liturgical celebration which was to follow. If the audience is trying to come to grips
with things like the mechanisms of Mermedonian slaughtering schedules, then it is
possible that they will not simultaneously listen carefully to the reading which
immediately follows the complicated or controversial sections.

Thereafter, in all three versions, God visits Andreas in Achaia to tell him that
he must rescue Matthew. The CCCC 198 account confuses the timing somewhat,
saying that after “se eadiga Matheus þa gefelde xx daga” (115, 5), God visited
Andreas in Achaia, where he then tells the apostle that Matthew has only three days
left. In the Casanatensis version, he orders Andreas also to preach to the cannibals,
while both the CCCC 198 version and Andreas omit this command (the CCCC 198
account will add this impulse later as an aside). Andreas equivocates as in the other
two versions, saying he can’t make it in time and that he does not know the way,
while in Andreas the saint also complains that he knows no one there. At this point,
the verse enters fully into one of its main themes: that of subordinating the will in
faith to God. The CCCC 198 version avoids all such struggle and conflict with a
rather dismissive response: “Drihten him to cwæð: ‘Andreas, geher me, for þon þe ic
þe geworhte, and ic þinne sið gestaþelode and getrymede’” (‘The Lord said to him:
‘Andreas, listen to me, for I made you and I have established and ordained this
journey for you,’ 115, 18–20). This suffices to allay Andreas’ concerns, though it is
an appeal to arbitrary authority, not reasoning such as God employs in the other two
versions; here at least the Andreas of the CCCC 198 account is plainly meant to do, not think, which might also serve as a metanarrative prescription for the audience of the CCCC 198 version.

In all three versions of the legend, God commands Andreas to go to the shore where he shall find a boat waiting for him and his disciples. This is where the dialogue ends in both other versions of the legend, but in the CCCC 198 account the author once more starts up the conversation in which God adds “sib mid þe and mid eallum þinum discipulum” (‘Peace be with you and with all your disciples,’ 115, 24–25), emphasizing again the overtones of liturgy. In Blickling XIX the scribe then forgets himself and copies the next line in Latin, showing that he was not paraphrasing at all, but translating, writing “tunc sanctus andreas surgens mane abiit ad mare cum discipulis suis, et vidit naviculam in litore, et intra nave sedentes tres viros” (‘then blessed Andrew, rising early, went to the sea with his disciples, and he saw a boat upon the shore, and sitting within the vessel three men,’ 230). The Blickling-scribe then gives us the same sentence in Old English: “se halga andreas þa aras on morgen and he eode to þære sæ mid his discipulum, ond he geseah scip ond þæm warþe on þry weras on þæm sittende.” This differs considerably from the Latin of the Casanatensis version: “mane autem facto beatus andreas una cum suis discipulis descendit, et cepit ambulare secus litus maris, uit preceperat ei dominus. Cum autem ambularetur intendens mediis fluctibus, et vidit perambulantem per medium fluctibus maris parvam naviculam, tres tantum viros in ea sedentes” (‘when morning came, blessed Andrew went down together with his disciples and began to walk along the shore of the sea, as the Lord had commanded him. While he was walking along looking intently across the waves, he saw a little boat riding through the middle of the waves of the sea. Only three men were sitting in it,’ 5, 5–9). In light
of the Casanatensis accounts’ more expansive treatment, its greater dependence upon participles, its heightened use of adjectives and adverbs and its differing syntax, it would seem that the scribe of Blickling XIX is unlikely to be the author responsible for the variations from a Latin to this Old English version, and his is likely the first Old English version in that stemma, in spite of what Bright insists. On the other hand, as the Casanatensis version demonstrates, a very free paraphrase at some point certainly does separate the CCCC 198 version and Blickling XIX from the Casanatensis account. Moreover, since the CCCC 198 account is so close to the Blickling version, it is equally unlikely that its author is responsible for the changes to the text. However, his version is still a manifestation of that now lost, variant text, and it seems exceedingly likely that the original variations were produced in Latin, not the vernacular, thereby setting aside differing linguistic cultures as a primary cause of the differing forms of the legend one finds in Old English.

In all three versions Andreas then finds the disguised Christ, as promised, and his two angels in a boat: a detail which sets them apart from the nine Greek versions in which the boat is occupied by three angels. In the CCCC 198 version, as in the Casanatensis version and Andreas, he asks for passage to Mermedonia and is warned by Christ about the cannibals. At this point in the verse, Andreas warns that he has no money, a point which does not come up in the other two until Christ invites the apostle to board and give him money for the passage, for which he is remonstrated and even mocked by Christ in the Casanatensis account and Andreas; in the Latin, for instance, it reads “et respondens dominus dixit ad eum, quid est hoc frater, quod talia locutus es, aurum nec argentum non habes, unde nobis dareis transitoria, set neque sitarciam cum consumptibus, ergo quomodo hic intrastis” (‘and responding the Lord said to him, what is this, brother, that you have said; you don’t have gold or silver to
give us for the crossing, nor even provisions and supplies: why then did you board?’
6, 14–17). Andreas then launches into his speech on apostolic poverty. In both other
versions he adopts an extremely defensive tone throughout the elaborate speech, in
the verse chastising Christ for his sarcasm, while in the Casanatensis version he testily
offers to find another boat if the mariner will not help him. All this, however, seems
unnecessarily vexing in the CCCC 198 account; this version once again streamlines
the plot, removing awkward aspects which call for explanation and argument. It is
also beginning to become clear at this point that the CCCC 198 version is not only, as
might be expected, more laconic and less involved than the Old English verse version,
but also, once again, and by a considerable margin, less diffuse than the earlier Latin
versions, perhaps suggesting a shift in the understanding of prose’s nature such as
traced out by classical and late antique writers, moving from an expansive, articulate,
replete form to one which is laconic, lucid and simple, such as employed by Bede.

Thereafter, the CCCC 198 account differs yet again from the other versions; in
the Latin prose and Old English verse, in a clear Eucharistic allusion, Christ feeds the
passengers of the boat. This is simply omitted from the CCCC 198 version.
Considering the way in which the CCCC 198 account interweaves the language of the
liturgy, this is a bit surprising, but if one anticipates that the CCCC 198 version will
avoid the effort and potential controversy of typological, or in this case, symbolic
allusions, then its omission is less surprising. Furthermore, it is of a piece with the
text’s earlier omission, where the mention and alignment of bread and wine to human
flesh and blood was dropped, thereby eliminating those Eucharistic overtones also.
On the other hand, if the symbolic references to the Eucharist were considered at
some point to be controversial, then it would likely be excised from a text like the
CCCC 198 account, for as shall be seen, the more fantastic apocryphal elements of the legend are more often than not removed from this version.

Both other versions then explicitly mention that a storm arises and that all become fearful. The CCCC 198 version, however, moves straight to Christ’s offer to put the disciples ashore, since they are fearful, thus implying that it has grown stormy. They refuse for the same reasons as in the Casanatensis account, saying “gif we gewitað fram þe, þonne beo we fremde fram eallum þam godum þe þu us gearwodes,” (117, 11–12), indicating again that their motives for loyalty are self-serving. In all three then, Christ suggests that in order to calm them Andreas tell his disciples about the miracles he saw while with Christ, and Andreas recounts Christ’s calming of the storm upon the Sea of Galilee. Considering the context of this story within a story, and its complex web of allusions, it is a bit surprising that it survived the emendations which produced the CCCC 198 account, though perhaps these allusions are so easily supplied that they were not considered serious critical complications or, more troublingly, these complications were simply missed during an editorial process.

However, as shall become clearer, though the CCCC 198 version eliminates typological allusions in general, Christological allusions, in the tradition of hagiography, are retained. In sharp contrast to these Christological aspects, the patterns and methods by which Andreas and his party fall asleep and the complex, apocryphal tales which are shared by the saint with Christ clearly did not match with the editorial sensibility behind the CCCC 198 account.

---

In the Casanatensis version, Andreas pretends to sleep and his disciples follow suit, and after the saint speaks for a time with Christ, Christ too pretends to fall asleep, which inclines Andreas to drift off. In Andreas, it is the telling of stories which, less problematically, puts the saint’s disciples to sleep, and then after discussing further tales with Christ, Andreas himself drifts off. However, in the CCCC 198 version, after telling of the storm on the Sea of Galilee, Andreas lays his head against one of his disciples and falls asleep (note the parallel of this found in Andreas, where Andreas falls asleep against ‘the side of heaven’s king’). No mention is made of his disciples, though when he his transported to the shores of Mermedonia, his disciples are there with him; they mention nothing about the dreams they have had, as they do in the other two versions, and so one cannot say with certainty whether they have been sleeping at all. By having Andreas fall asleep when and how he does, however, the CCCC 198 account avoids telling the apocryphal tales which are in the other two versions, along with Christ’s seemingly jejune questions about them. These omissions might either stem from concerns about implausible and unorthodox elements in these fantastic apocryphal tales or from the highly involved and problematic questions they imply for the audience. More simply, the author might have spotted a portion of the plot which, to adopt the Aristotelian distinctions mentioned in the first chapter, did not contribute in a necessary way to the plot’s movement, offering him a chance to shorten his legend by cutting it. In any event, these elements do not seem to belong

---


17 Cf. page 4.
to the ‘core meaning’ of this text which, as we saw, antique and medieval paraphrasers insisted ought to constitute the focus of both verse and prose forms.

The CCCC 198 version rejoins the plot of both other versions as Andreas wakes up on the shores of Mermedonia and declares to his disciples that he now recognizes that it was Christ with them in the boat, who appeared there in order to tempt them (language which the CCCC 198 account has in common with the Casanatensis version, though the Andreas version side-steps it). As mentioned above, the disciples say nothing about dreams (which, it should be noted, also contain fantastic, unorthodox and complex symbolic elements). Andreas prays that God reveal himself, and he does, appearing in a faægeres cildes hiwe (fair shape of a child, 119, 1). This compares curiously with the form in which God appears at this point in the other two, for he is in the Casanatensis account a pulcerrimum iuvenis, and a puer (‘a beautiful youth, a boy,’ XVIII, 5), while in Andreas he has cnihtes had (912b). The Devil’s later appearance in the CCCC 198 version is also as a child (122, 4), while in the Casanatensis version he at that same point in the plot is an old man (XXIV, 11), and in Andreas he appears here as ‘black and unlovely’ (1169a). That both God and the Devil should appear in the CCCC 198 account as children is perhaps ironically appropriate, though it may be only a coincidence fostered by the traditions of hagiography, for it seems plausible, if not even likely that this has much to do with Athanasius’ putative description mentioned in Chapter Two,\(^\text{18}\) where the Devil appears as a black child, because, according to Athanasius in The Life of Saint Anthony, he is black of heart and, before the righteous, as weak as a child. The Casanatensis account contrasts the two, aligning, perhaps incidentally, beautiful youth

\(^{18}\) Cf. page 78.
with divine goodness and old age with infernal evil. Andreas varies in that God is a youth, though not necessarily beautiful nor fair, and the Devil is black and hideous, but of no particular age. Thus in these three versions of the Andreas-legend, the elements of Athanasius’ ‘Satanic Child’ motif seem to have fragmented and sought out numerous antitheses, though the basic elements of the motif here are in one form or another remarkably consistent with hagiographic traditions from late antiquity.

In the CCCC 198 version, Andreas declares three times that he has sinned because he spoke to Christ as a man (118–119, 20–4). This thrice repeated and dramatic declaration aligns well with the introduction of the Confiteor of the liturgy, where the leader says “quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, verbo et opera” (‘at which point he strikes his breast three times’), “mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa.” This declaration is qualified when God responds that Andreas did not sin at all, and that it was merely a demonstration (119, 6–11):

‘Andreas, nænig wuht þu gefirnodest, ac for þon ic swa dyde, for þon þu swa, cwæde þæt þu hit ne meahtes on ðrim dagum þider geferan; for þon ic þe swa æteowde, for þon ic eom mihtig mid worde swa eall to donne, and anra gehwilcum to æteowenne swa hwæt swa me licað.’

[‘Andreas, you did not at all sin, but because you said that you could not travel here in three days, I therefore appeared like this, because I am capable to do all this with a word and appear to each just as I please’].

In the Casanatensis version, in contrast, God forgives Andreas, thereby implying that he did sin, but God then says that his faithfulness has redeemed him. As noted in the first chapter, the apostle in the verse version is much more careful about this scene; Andreas notes his ignorance, God does not mention forgiveness, explains how the saint has been faithless, and tells him he shall see recompense for his present faith. Thus, amongst these three forgiveness scenes, the CCCC 198 account again employs
by a considerable margin the simplest, though by no means the least problematic reasoning.

In both prose versions, God then order Andreas into the city to rescue Matthew, while in the verse, God adds a quick chastisement for the saint’s lack of consideration of Matthew, who suffers in prison while they delay on the beach. Since such consideration calls for one to think about what has not been presented, rather than what has, it is perhaps fitting that the prose versions, and especially the CCCC 198 version, should gloss over it. In the CCCC 198 account, God then tells Andreas that he shall be tortured, but not killed. In the Casanatensis version God says that the saint shall be both tortured and killed (though it turns out that this is untrue). As might be expected of a verse versions composed in the tradition of the *opus geminatum*, Andreas’ treatment is the most subtle. God says that the apostle shall be horribly tortured, saying nothing at all about whether he shall survive; Andreas shall have to trust God, which, in light of God’s admonishment about the saint’s recent lack of faith and present faithfulness, is appropriate. In all three versions, God then articulates a hagiographical commonplace by reassuring Andreas that he too has suffered, as an example to all martyrs.\textsuperscript{19} Even so, adds the CCCC 198 version, there are many in Mermedonia who must believe in his name. This addendum fills in incidentally the evangelizing impulse which the CCCC 198 account omitted earlier.\textsuperscript{20}

In both prose versions, God then ascends to heaven, this time without uttering the benediction, and Andreas proceeds into the city with his disciples cloaked in invisibility. More unsettlingly, in the verse Andreas moves through the city without

\textsuperscript{19} This is the point at which text of Blickling XIX ends.
\textsuperscript{20} Cf. page 249.
any mention of invisibility, but, as noted earlier, this is once more appropriate, since it requires more faith by the apostle. It also anticipates that the audience will be more critically engaged, since it clearly means to pass the apostle’s sense of dread (or lack thereof) on to the reader/listener by means of inferring his vulnerability through exactly what it does not say: a method thus far absent from the CCCC 198 version.

When Andreas comes to the prison, in both the Casanatensis and CCCC 198 accounts, it is his actions which kill the guards; in the Latin, he makes the sign of the cross and they die, while in the CCCC 198 version, he utters a prayer to achieve this. In Andreas, where one would anticipate that the audience is being more morally critical, the saint kills no one; the guards simply fall dead. In the CCCC 198 version, Andreas then makes the sign of the cross in order to open the door, while in the Casanatensis version the iron melts on its own. In Andreas, the door, seemingly in an echo of Beowulf and less wondrously, springs open at the touch of the apostles’ hand.

As in the Casanatensis account, the Andreas of the CCCC 198 account sees Matthew sitting alone, but the CCCC 198 version adds that he is singing, while in Andreas, Matthew is not necessarily sitting alone, and is speaking praises to God. Here their embrace is suffused with heavenly light. The addition of what are likely hymns in the mouth of Matthew could perhaps once more point towards the upcoming veneration of the saint for which the CCCC 198 account might have prepared the celebrants, and at which hymns would have been sung.21 At this point in Andreas, as Andreas begins to speak, we encounter the lacuna mentioned in Chapter I. In the other

21 As Boenig points out, this is also one of the activities in which St. Paul engages while in prison, and it seems extremely plausible that Matthew’s imprisonment is modeled on this; Robert Boenig ed, “Blickling Homily XIX,” Anglo-Saxon Spirituality, ed. Robert Boenig (New York: Paulist Press, 2000): n. 55.
two versions Andreas laments Matthew’s state and Matthew reassures him that God’s rescue has materialized just as promised. At this point in the Casanatensis-Andreas breaks off into an expansive excursus, lamenting the beast-like state of the other prisoners, the Devil’s role in this, and then amplifying from this into a universalizing monologue where he parallels the Devil’s role played out in miniature here with that he has played amongst all humanity, and how this shall prove in vain before God’s providence. The CCCC 198 version leaves out this entire speech. As before, this is an element which contributes in no necessary way to the movement of the plot, nor supplies anything absolutely necessary to understanding its action. This excursus might have been anticipated by the antique and late antique practitioners of paraphrase, for whom the prose is to expand upon, make good the diffusions of, and elaborate in an eloquent manner upon what is compacted and allusive in verse forms. However, the prose of Bede or Alcuin almost never indulges in these sorts of excursi, and so again, as comparison with the Casanatensis version makes plain, it is not necessarily because the CCCC 198 account is a prose version of the legend that it opts to cut unnecessary plot matter, but, as mentioned in the first chapter, because some writers, perhaps of a later period, have a different understanding of prose.22

When Andreas returns to ‘practical’ matters, in this case healing the other prisoners, the CCCC 198 version picks up the plot once more. This detail is produced in the Casanatensis account, as is Andreas’ command that the prisoners wait for him under a fig tree in the lower part of the city. When they complain that they shall be recaptured, Andreas tells them nothing will trouble them (in the Casanatensis version,

he says even the dogs will not note their passing). In the Casanatensis rendering he suggests that Matthew and his disciples are to wait there too, though afterwards, as they depart with the prisoners, he commands the clouds to lift them onto the mountain on which Saint Peter waits. In the CCCC 198 account, Andreas commands Matthew separately with his disciples to go to this mountain, and they do so simply by going east, though Andreas is still said to set them there (and asetten on pa dune þeer, 121, 16–17). Thus the CCCC 198 version again removes potential confusion, along with some elements of the miraculous, and thereby stream-lines the plot. It is also at this point that the verse-Andreas starts again, and here, though it is less complicated than the Casanatensis version, the wondrous is still a key element, as Matthew, both sets of disciples and the prisoners also all depart hidden in a cloud. No mention is made of mountains, fig trees or Saint Peter, but what may have been in the verse’s lacuna problematises any assertions one may make on these elements.

In all versions Andreas then walks through the city until he comes to a pillar, besides which he awaits, in both CCCC 198 and the Casanatensis versions, whatever should befall him (anbidente hwæt him gelimpan scolde, 121, 23). In Andreas, however, the saint awaits more expansively whatever battle-achievements God should ordain. Likewise, the pillar in all three is treated differently. In Andreas, it is simply a brass pillar, while in the Casanatensis account, it is a marble pillar with a statue on top. In the CCCC 198 account, the pillar is capped by a bronze likeness (ærne onlicnesse, 121, 22). As noted in the first chapter, it is difficult to say why these portrayals should differ, but as we shall see, the variation of pillar imagery is consistent; none of the versions ever produces the same rendering of the imagery as the others. In all versions, as Andreas waits, the Mermedonians arrive to slaughter some victims and discover that the prisoners are gone. They are dismayed and
consider how this may have happened. At this point in the CCCC 198 version a lengthy series of significant omissions begin to occur.

In the Casanatensis version, the cannibals speculate upon what sort of wonders are underway, and ask if some great change is at hand. The CCCC 198 account, along with *Andreas*, omits this declaration. Both *Andreas* and the Casanatensis account, however, include the decision of the cannibals to eat the dead guards. In *Andreas* this is just what they perfunctorily do, while in the Latin, this decision merely sets up an opportunity for hagiography’s ubiquitous ‘thwarting of the executioner’s blow’ motif. The Elders in the Casanatensis version, seeing this thwarted, lament and suspect a magician of being behind their frustration. Obviously *Andreas* has no reason to include this exclamation. In both the verse and the Latin, they then decide to eat their aged, designating in the Casanatensis account seven old men for this purpose by means of casting lots and one in *Andreas* by means of a divining rod. The first old man of the group in the Casanatensis version and old man by himself in *Andreas* respectively offer their sons in lieu of themselves. When, in the Casanatensis account, the boy proves too insubstantial, the old man offers his daughter also. *Andreas*, as the discussion of Chapter II notes, keeps the offer of son by father as it is, perhaps to conserve the typological association between this and God the Father’s offer of Christ the Son or Abraham’s offer of Isaac, in a parallel and antithesis relationship. When the cannibals attempt to kill the children and child, the sword melts, as is the tradition with the motif. Finally, after passing over a section of the plot which amounts to 53 lines in the Casanatensis version and 75 lines in *Andreas*, the CCCC 198 version begins again, but only to note that as the Mermedonians lament, the Devil appears as a child. As already mentioned, he is an old man in the Casanatensis account and is black and unlovely in *Andreas* (in the Latin, his aged appearance also may align him
with the old man who sacrifices his child’s young life so that he can live out his own, few remaining years). In the Casanatensis version, the Devil says that a pilgrim (peregrinus) prevents them from doing their will. The CCCC 198 account is closer to Andreas, however, where the Devil says that a foreigner (ælþeodigne and elþeodigra respectively, 122, 6 and 1175) who is named Andreas has done this. In all three versions, he enjoins the Mermedonians to find and kill the saint. In the Latin, the Devil goes on to say that because of Andreas, they cannot do what they will, and the cannibals, agreeing with his advice, finally eat the dead guards and then set about searching. Save for the search, the Old English texts again both omit these points. Before the search, however, in both English legends, Andreas is allowed a comeback.

In the poem, he reminds the Devil that his struggle against God is vain, that Christ has cast him into hell and the outer darkness, calling him a deofles stræl, and noting that thereafter he has ever been called Satan (1189b). The prose version is very close to this declaration; Andreas calls the Devil an arrow hardened against all unrighteousness (pu heardeste stræl to æghwilcre unrihtnesse, 12210–11) and remarks that always he (the Devil) has fought against mankind but that Christ has lowered him into hell. the Devil responds that he cannot see Andreas, to which Andreas remarks that the Devil is blind, and so cannot see God’s saints (this last point perhaps aligns with the comment in the verse about how the Devil dwells in the outer darkness). Both Old English version are also parallel in that though neither the cannibals nor the Devil can find the saint, Andreas upon God’s exhortation reveals himself. In the Casanatensis version, the Mermedonians simply search for Andreas and find him. Also in the Latin, when they make to seize him, they fall back from the glowing sign of the cross which suddenly appears on his forehead. Once more, neither Old English version contains this detail, and so they also do not contain the Devil’s
chastisement of them for their lack of wherewithal and the crowd’s sarcastic response that if he considers this easy, he should have a go at the saint himself. Finally they are driven to the assault again—this time to torture rather than kill—and this time are able to seize the apostle. In the CCCC 198 version and Andreas, it is by God’s and Andreas’ permission that the saint is seized. In the Latin, they throw him in prison where the Devil pretends to be the voice of Christ, urging the saint to relent, but he is recognized by Andreas and chastised yet again. In what has throughout this portion of the legend become a pattern, both Old English versions skip this scene also. They instead go straight to the scene of torture by dragging, after which the frequency of omissions returns to its former level. However, before going further, this large number of omissions, of no less than sixteen major points, according to appendix I, requires more analysis.

These sixteen points cover in the Casanatensis version 98 lines of Blatt’s edition, or in Andreas 146 lines. In Bright’s edition of the CCCC 198 account, this takes up only 37 lines. At the most pragmatic and banal level, it might be said that if the CCCC 198 version was meant to be read in public, as Alcuin suggests, most likely as the lectio during meals, then scenes in which the cannibals attempt to eat old men and children, and in which they actually do eat the dead guards, would be less than appetizing entertainment. However, since the prose does not shrink from such details in other portions of the text, even though it does not engage in the sort of gore found in Andreas, this does not seem a particularly plausible reason for the extensive omissions. The portions which are eliminated, however, are again full of miraculous details: the shining cross motif, the withering hand and melting sword. Up to this point, aspects of the plot which might cause the audience of the CCCC 198 account to be in wonder at the legend, in either sense of the word, have been consistently
extracted, and the numerous omissions here follow that pattern again. Likewise, in *Andreas* one encounters a very strong typological allusion in the old man’s sacrifice of his son, both to God the Father’s sacrifice of Christ the Son and to Abraham’s aborted sacrifice of Isaac. As has been seen, these require critical engagement by the audience, a liberty the CCCC 198 version has seemed thus far disinclined to allow, and so like most of the other typological allusions, has been culled; this is qualified by the fact that in the following torture scenes, some typological framework remains. Finally, it could be said of these particular omissions here, as of those earlier, that every single detail which the CCCC 198 account passes over are details which do not contribute in a necessary sense to the progress of the plot. Thus, in the earlier Aristotelian sense, one might say that the way in which the CCCC 198 version preserves the essential meaning of the legend—about which classical authors speak—is by distilling it down to only those elements necessary to the movement of the plot; all else is trimmed away.

A further point of interest through this series of omissions is that again, contrary to the assertions, and so anticipations, of scholars like Boenig, Morris or Kelly, the prose the CCCC 198 account, in terms of what is omitted, what is shared, and how what is shared is expressed, is very much closer to the verse *Andreas* than the Casanatensis version, or for that matter, any Latin or Greek version. This seems to suggest that both Old English versions at some remove derive from an exemplar which, in the case of the CCCC 198 version at least, and as the Blickling-author’s slip into Latin indicates, was written in Latin prose which differed significantly from the Casanatensis account.

23 Cf. note 12, this chapter.
As noted earlier, both Old English versions again differ from the Casanatensis version in that the torture scenes are distributed over three days, while the Latin condenses this down to two nights which book-end a single day. While the cannibals in the Latin throw Andreas directly into prison, the Old English versions have him dragged about the landscape. The verse speaks extensively about the progress of this torture and about the inner state of the saint throughout, but the CCCC 198 account distils this to a single sentence: “mid þi þe se eadiga Andreas wæs togen, his lichama wæs gemenged mid þære eorðan, swa þæt blod fleow ofer oræan swa wæter” (‘and then when the blessed Andreas was thus dragged along, his flesh was mixed with the earth so that his blood flowed upon the earth like water,’ 123, 6–8). Likewise, Andreas recounts at length the psychological state of the apostle after the Mermedonians have thrown him into the dungeon. Again, this psychological portrait is not in the prose, which seems almost entirely disinterested in the inner states of the saint, saying only that he was bound and cast into the prison and that his body was disjointed; this last is a detail missing from the verse. On the other hand, the single day of torture in the Casanatensis begins by saying alia vero die presides civitatis . . . (XXVIII, 5), which is, since this is not another day of torture, as in the other versions, but perhaps after the saint has arrived in the city. However, this phrasing does contribute to the sense that the Casanatensis has rather hastily abbreviated the original three days we find in the Old English versions. Strengthening this impression is an echo of the phrase in the CCCC 198 version, in which it makes more sense, as one reads “swilce oþre dæge þæt ilce hie dydon” (123, 10–11), following as a conjunctive phrase the previous day’s torture. Andreas, as one might anticipate, expands upon the arrival of the new day, speaking about the dawn, the arrival of the cannibals, their intentions and state of mind, the beginning of more torture and then finally Andreas’ lament (1268b–1280);
however, at no point does it use the introductory phrase which one finds in the two
prose versions. The Casanatensis version also gives here some description of the
saint’s torture in which the mingling of flesh and blood with earth echoes a similar
description from the first day of torture found in the CCCC 198 account. Moreover,
this seems the description from which the Andreas-poet takes his inspiration for his
rambling, Beowulfian landscapes discussed in the previous chapter.24 However, the
CCCC 198 version skips the scene entirely, saying only that they did this day as
before, at which point Andreas begins his lament scene.

The Casanatensis version compresses the three days of torture into one by
synthesizing into that one day details from all three found in the two Old English
versions, and as this day used the mixing of flesh and blood with earth image, so now
does it blend the short lament from the other two versions’ second day with the long
lament which they include on the third.25 Andreas recognizes that what God foretold
is now fulfilled, and declares that he has had enough. This parallels the CCCC 198
account, where he implores that God come in order to see what is done to him. The
saint says that he suffers all this because he follows God’s command not to do
according to their unbelief; but it is unclear what faithless or unbelieving thing he
could have done, and has not, which has contributed to the trials he now laments. One
might suggest that perhaps this is a tangled reference to the journey he undertook in
faith to save Matthew, which, if he had followed the promptings of his initial
incredulousness, he would not have undertaken and so would not now be suffering

24 Pgs. 175–178.
25 A pressing question at this point is whether the Old English versions of the legend are expanding
upon a previously condensed version closer to the tradition of the Casanatensis account, or if the
Casanatensis version is compacting and synthesizing a version which the Old English legends maintain
in its fuller state.
torture by cannibals. This seems unlikely, though, since it is not ‘his’ unbelief which he has overcome so that he now suffers, but ‘their’ unbelief (hiora ungeleafulnesse, 123, 16–17). Once more, it could be countered, that hiora refers generally to all unbelievers, such as he himself was, in a sense, when he first received the command in Achaia to rescue Matthew. This, however, is becoming so speculative that it is difficult to afford it much currency.

On the other hand, both the nature of what he request (God’s attention to his plight), and his repetition of it soon thereafter again seems to align this form of the legend with the language of liturgy for which it might have been preparing its audience: specifically the Judica Me, and again, Confiteor of the Ordinary, which at this point of the plot would seem poignantly appropriate. For instance, Andreas’ cry for God’s help and attention parallels both in nature and to a lesser degree in sequence the Confiteor’s dialogue: Priest: “ostende nobis, Domine, misercordiam tuam”; Server: “et salutare tuum da nobis”; Priest: “Domine, exaudi orationem meam”; Server: “et clamor meus ad te veniat.” This cry for God to regard one’s suffering is also appropriate in terms of the logic of the plot, since the Devil then has the Mermedonians strike him, specifically on the mouth, so that he cannot call out for God’s salvation. This detail of the mouth is even more interesting in light of even the earliest Proper of the saints in the Roman rite, where the traditional epistle read during the feast of Saint Andrew is Romans 10: 9–18, which reads “quia si confitearis in ore tuo Dominum Iesum et in corde tuo credideris quod Deus illum excitavit ex mortuis salvus eris. Corde enim creditur ad iustitiam ore autem confessio fit in salutem” (‘For if you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in your heart that God has raised him up from the dead, you shall be saved. For, with the heart, we believe in justice; but, with the mouth, confession is made for salvation,’ verses 9–10). In light
of this, it is vital that the Devil prevent Andreas confessing with his mouth, since this will afford him salvation. The concatenation of language and detail between this and the liturgy continues, for the Judica Me also contains at this point the prayer: “Judica me, Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta: ab homine iniquo, et doloso erue me” (‘judge me, O God, and discern my cause from the unholy nation, rescue me from the unjust and deceitful man’). As Andreas here calls out to God, his cry is most certainly and explicitly against an unholy people, and the cannibals are undoubtedly unjust and deceitful men. Throughout all these images and this language, the sense is, as will become explicit on the third day of his torture, that in imitation of Christ God has forsaken Andreas as God forsook Christ on the cross: that God will not hear his prayer.  

In this later cry of forsakenness, the lament yet again echoes the Judica Me. Of course, this also begs for typological connections by the audience of the sort which the CCCC 198 version seems for the most part to excise, but it is difficult to see how, both here and more fundamentally during Andreas’ lament on the third day this parallel to Christ’s suffering could be omitted without doing irreparable damage to the necessary causality of the plot; in other words, this hagiographical tendency of Christological allusion has been written into this legend so deeply that removing it (and the other parallels between Christ and Andreas) would make nonsense of much of that plot. The retention of Christological parallels with the saint also seems to be a sacrifice which the CCCC 198 account is willing to make in order to enhance the connection of the legend with the liturgy.

Andreas, by way of contrast, aligns better with the treatment of the lament in the Casanatensis version. In the verse, the saint acknowledges through his weeping

---

26 Cf. pg. 84–86 for detailed discussion.
that God is with him in all things, thereby perhaps problematising the need for God to come and see what is done to the saint. Instead of calling for notice, Andreas prays that God silence the vaunting of the Devil. It is for this request for God’s censoring of the Devil, not to silence the saint’s appeal for God’s attention, that the Devil tells the cannibals to hit the apostle on the mouth. Also, in Andreas, as in the Casanatensis version, there are no direct echoes of liturgical language such as one finds, and finds extensively, in the CCCC 198 version. In both Old English versions, Andreas is then thrown back in prison, while the Casanatensis account moves directly into the extended lament of the saint which occurs on the third day in the CCCC 198 account and Andreas.

In both Old English legends, Andreas’ return to prison sets up a scene which parallels the episode of the shining cross already encountered in the Casanatensis account when the Mermedonians initially rushed to seize the saint, though here in both Andreas and the CCCC 198 version instead of cannibals the crowd is composed of seven demons who are directed by the Devil. In the prose, the seven demons are said to be those whom Andreas had cast out there (“þa þe [se] haliga Andreas þanon afliemde,” 123, 22–23). This seems to assume that the audience knows about this exorcism, but the prose account has said nothing previously about it, and because the plot has moved in such an economical and necessary manner, one can assume no unspoken opportunity in the happening of events since the apostle arrived, at which time he could have done this. One might speculate that the seven demons in some way align with the seven guards who Andreas slew by prayer, and certainly the tradition of the legend allows for this blurring of demon and cannibal, for the Casanatensis version displaces the demon onslaught in this scene with the earlier cannibal onslaught, and both groups of attackers are driven back by the sign of the cross on the
saint’s face. Likewise, the monstrous demons found in both prose versions seem deliberately related by the *Andreas*-poet to the Mermedonians by means of the monstrous, *Beowulf*-terms and contexts in which he portrays the cannibals (described in a manner similar to the cannibalistic Grendel and the giant-kin, the *eotan*). In other words, in both Old English works, there are enough grounds to wonder if the saint is not in some sense and at some time converting something more akin to demons than people. Still, such a conversion is an inductive, not deductive connection, and must on this evidence remain a speculation.

In *Andreas* it is the Devil himself who taunts the apostle, while in the CCCC 198 version the mocking is done by the group of demons. The individuated taunting by the Devil is more appropriate to the flyting in which *Andreas* indulges so extensively, while the communal disparagement of the prose aligns it more closely with gospel accounts of Christ’s suffering.\(^{27}\) The verse continues the naturalizing impulse of its indigenous battle motif as the saint is mocked not only for how low he has been brought, but also for presuming that he is a conqueror, as was Christ. In the Old English prose it is only for the futility of his mission that Andreas is ridiculed. In *Andreas*, the flyting is followed, appropriately, by the battle-rush, at which point the demons are repelled by the sign of the cross, while in the CCCC 198 account the Devil says “mine bearn, acwellað hine, forðon he he us gescende and ure weorc’ (‘my children, kill him, for he has humiliated us and our works,’ 123, 29–30), at which point the demons blow (*blæston*) upon the saint, but dare not approach him, as they explain to the perplexed Devil, because of the sign of the cross. Just why the demons decide ‘to blow’ upon Andreas is hard to say—it is a curious mode of assault—but

\(^{27}\) For example, Matt. 27: 27–41.
here the battle imagery is comparatively muted.\textsuperscript{28} The CCCC 198 account also simplifies the demons’ response to the Devil, saying that they will not obey the Devil in this matter, but that, if he can, the Devil should try to attack the saint. This eliminates the sarcasm in the analogous episodes in the other two versions. Likewise, the CCCC 198 version supplies a straight-forward, explicit and practical reason for their reticence when the demons say that, before this, Andreas was their master, and that if God frees him their punishments as demons may become even worse. The Casanatensis version supplies no such reason, and there the Devil is baffled by their failure, asking them why so many could not prevail against one; but the cannibals do not answer, instead saying that if he is so confident, then he should try. In the same manner in \textit{Andreas} the demon respond to the Devils chastisement by saying that they could not injure him by cunning, but the Devil should try if he can. The audience of the CCCC 198 version, however, need not wonder why they can’t harm the apostle, and so again an avenue of critical contemplation is cut off. The Old English prose then finishes off the dialogue by having the saint state that he will not do their will even if they kill him. In the verse, on the other hand, they highlight how a recourse to words often points up an inadequacy in deeds, for since they cannot actually attack Andreas, they decide to give him another scolding; in other words, words are what one must fall back upon if one is incapable of anything else. Andreas’ response to this might owe something to the sentiment in the CCCC 198 account where the demons fear a worse punishment than they already bear, for, in the verse, Andreas promises

\textsuperscript{28} It is possible that an assault by blowing owes something to the traditions of secular Germanic myth, in which \textit{wyrmr} creatures blow poison upon their victims (e.g. as in the account of Thor’s demise in the \textit{Snorra Edda, Gylfaginning}, where twice the Middle-Earth serpent is said to blow poison on Thor [\textit{blæss á hann}]). \textit{Snorri Sturluson, Edda: Prologue and Gylfaginning}, ed. Anthony Faulkes (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).
the Devil that hereafter punishment shall be heaped upon punishment, at which point
the Devil and the demons flee. In both Old English versions morning arrives and
Andreas is tortured again.

In the prose, this is very laconic, after which it cuts straight to his final lament:
“on mergen þa geworden wæs eft hie tugon þone halgan Andreas, and he cigde mid
mycle wope to drihtne” (‘in the morning of the next day it came to pass that they
dragged forth the holy Andreas, and he cried out with a loud voice to The Lord,’ 124,
13–14). The verse is again much more expansive, describing the torture, the inner
state of Andreas and that also of the cannibals, covering 13 lines before getting to his
lament (1388–1400). Once more, the verse, not the prose, provides more detail about
content and action, more contemplation of psychological states and struggles, and
invites by means of portraying these struggles and the motives behind them the
speculation and engagement of its audience. In the CCCC 198 version, Andreas
begins the lament with an assertion, saying that he has had enough of the torture and
is tired; he wishes to die. In Andreas, on the other hand, he provides an argument,
saying this is the worst he has ever suffered, describing in gruesome detail the wounds
of his body, and then explicitly comparing this suffering with Christ’s suffering,
which leads into his accusation that Christ could take no more after only one day of
torture. This kind of critical debate, and the fallibility it implies about both the saint
and Christ, is just the sort of thing the prose version seems at pains to avoid. Instead,
it says not ‘only’ but ‘once’ (ane tid) Christ suffered on the cross before he asked why
God had forsaken him; no mention is made of how many days he suffered, while
Andreas phrases this as on dæges tid (1407b). Another point is that this phrasing once
more echoes the opening of the Judica Me, which has thus far seems echoed so
frequently, especially by CCCC 198; in this Andreas repeats Christ’s words on the
cross as follows: “Fæder, for hwon forlete þu me . . . Hwær syndon þine word, Drihten, on þam þu us gestrangodest” (“Father, why have you forsaken me . . . Where are your words, Lord, with which you encouraged us,” 124, 18–22). Compare this with the prayer in the *Judica Me*, which occurs directly after the prayer cited on page 25: “quia tu es, Deus, fortitudo mea: quare me repulisti, et quare tristis incedo, dum affligit me inimicus” (“For You, O God, are my strength, why have You forsaken me? And why do I go about in sadness, while the enemy afflicts me”). The proximity of this prayer to the earlier prayer, not only in the *Judica Me*, but also in the CCCC 198 account (only 28 lines on in Bright’s edition), and also the parallel sequence of sentiments, re-emphasizes the explicit gesturing towards the liturgy.

In the CCCC 198 version, Andreas then goes on to say that it is now three days since for him the torture started. This is still an implicit complaint, but it falls well short of the open accusation Andreas makes in the verse. Andreas in the prose version continues to downplay the wrangling accusations found in the verse, saying that God knows how frail man is, so receive his spirit, while in the verse, it is clear that compared with Christ, Andreas has suffered more than enough, and therefore it is high time that God accept his soul. the CCCC 198 account then also slips into a somewhat more accusatory tone, as the saint asks where the works are with which God said they would be strengthened, and what has become of the promise that not one hair of his head would come to harm if they followed Christ, for his body and hair are now mingled with the earth. In essence, *Andreas* communicates the same idea, but again in considerably more detail, itemizing all the parts of his body which were promised to be safe, and then cataloguing in detail what elements of his body are scattered where. Throughout, the prose refines the content down to its barest facts, excises controversial material and removes grounds for critical contemplation. In
many ways, this is the opposite the nature which classical and antique paraphrasers ascribe to prose when it is compared to its verse versions, though it ties in well with what was observed of the changes Bede made to the style of his prose halves of *opera geminata*.  

The treatment of this scene in the Casanatensis version blends aspects of the CCCC 198 version and *Andreas*. As noted above, it follows on directly from his first night in prison, after he is tortured and recognizes that things have transpired as God foretold. This is broadly in line with the other two legends, but in the Latin Andreas does not here call upon God to come and see his sorrows. Rather he says that he has had enough, that he has fulfilled all which God required of him and that his spirit weakens. There is no talk of death at this point, and when Andreas hereafter declares that God knows all which has been done to him, he implicitly refutes the ignorance of God about the sufferings of his saint which is implied in the CCCC 198 account when Andreas calls repeatedly upon God to come and see. Andreas then reminds Christ that He too suffered, while on the cross, and cried out asking why God had forsaken Him. Andreas makes no mention of the single day Christ suffered, nor does he make any explicit comparison with the three days which the saint then says he has suffered, even though the account has only described one day. In other words, there is no accusation in this version, nor any argument. Like the verse, however, Andreas does itemize his scattered and mangled body before saying that nothing now remains but

---

Though the scope of discussion does not allow for it in the present inquiry, it is also interesting to compare the nature of the CCCC 198 account with other prose versions of verse saints’ lives, such as Alcuin’s *Vita Willibrordi*, which maintains much of the expansive, involved and controversial aspects of prose ascribed to it in the *opus geminatum* tradition. In light of this, it seems that there are two relatively antithetical conceptions of prose’s nature and objectives in the hagiographical tradition during this latter part of the early middle ages, and this seems to call for a detailed study.
for God to receive his soul. In contrast to *Andreas*, however, the saint in the prose version adds that his death should be allowed only if it is God’s will, whereas in the verse he demands death, since in the saint’s view he has suffered over-much. On the other hand, Andreas then aligns himself more closely with the saint in *Andreas* as he echoes the accusation that Christ promised that not a hair on his head would be harmed if he followed him, and now, moreover, he does not understand why God does not show himself. It seems important to note that this does not imply in the Casanatensis version that God does not know what is happening to his saint, as it does in the CCCC 198 version. Thus, throughout this lament, the nature of the Casanatensis account’s prose is much closer to what one would expect in light of the assertions antique and early medieval paraphrasers make; it is expansive, detailed and critically engaging, though it stops short in all these aspects of what one finds in *Andreas*. However, it contrasts sharply with the brief, austere and simplified prose of the CCCC 198 account.

In both prose versions, God then responds, echoing Matt 5: 18, that the world will pass away before his word of safe-guarding for his people is broken, and it seems worth wondering whether there is also in this sentiment an echo once again of the liturgy, of the *Judica Me*: “spera in Deo, quoniam adhuc confitebor illi: salutare vultus mei, et Deus meus . . . . sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper: in in sæcula sæculorum” (hope in God, for I will still praise Him, the salvation of my countenance, and my God . . . . as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end). Both also mention that this particular communication comes in Hebrew. *Andreas* says essentially the same thing, though at much greater length, and adds rather grimly that the truth of this shall be confirmed on judgement day. The verse says nothing about Hebrew. On the other hand, *Andreas* and the Casanatensis version
are more alike with each other than with the CCCC 198 version in that when God tells
the saint to look back at what has become of his scattered flesh and hair, he sees these
have become flowering trees, whereas in the Old English prose, sees a single tree,
flowering and bearing fruit (geblowen treow wæstm berende, 125, 4–5); the language
in the latter is perhaps more apostolic. Both Old English versions say that then the
saint knew that God had not forsaken him, while in the Latin, he then knows that God
is not far from him. The Casanatensis and CCCC 198 versions also add that the
cannibals believe that he will die in the night, while in Andreas they are said to
remain intent on warping his mind.

In the Old English prose versions, there is another analogue in imitation of
Christ, as Andreas, whom the cannibals shut up in the dungeon for the third night and
whom they expect will be dead by morning, is in fact raised up by Christ, not unlike
Christ himself rose on the third day from the tomb. Because in Andreas the cannibals
do not mention that they expect the saint to be dead in the dungeon on the third
morning, this parallel is less evident. In all three versions, God then appears to
Andreas, healing him. In both prose legends, he also raises him up literally, while in
the verse God promises that his afflictions are at an end. In Andreas, the saint
responds with a quick thanks to God and the poet then describes as some length how
completely he has been healed. This superfluous description is, predicatably, cut from
both prose versions, in which the apostle simply falls down in thanks before God. The
verse now breaks into an expansive metanarrative, commenting on the difficulty of
recounting the tale. This too is in neither prose versions. Through these two
omissions, what takes the Andreas-poet 26 lines to traverse is covered by the CCCC
198 account in seven lines and the Casanatensis in four.
Andreas then turns to release the flood. The prose versions are remarkably consistent in their imagery and their sequence. The saint turns to find a pillar in the prison with a statue on top. He makes the sign of the cross and commands it to fear Christ and to pour out a flood from its mouth. In the Casanatensis version he also orders it to fill the city to its very top, while in the CCCC 198 account he orders it, with more explicit cruelty, “swa þæt sien gewemede ealle þa on þisse ceastre syndon” (‘So that all may be destroyed who are in this city,’ 125, 20–21). In Andreas, the pillar is fixed fast against the side of the building, and therefore has no statue on top; the flood bursts rather from its base. The saint here also mentions the fearsomeness of God, but adds an extensive praise of stone, since upon such material was written the ten commandments. A great stream issues forth, and as was previously observed, the Casanatensis version takes the opportunity to add a sadistic and ironic detail, making the water salty so that it eats at the flesh of the cannibals as they once ate others. The CCCC 198 account, if anything, adds further sadism, observing that the salt-water eats not only men’s bodies, but kills their children and beasts (125, 24–25). In the verse, while the poet says nothing about salt-water, he also takes the opportunity to add a grimly whimsical detail, with his well-known comparison of the flood to a bitter mead-feast for the cannibals, not to mention insinuating possible parallels with the great flood of Noah and the destruction of the giants. In addition to all this, as was observed in the first chapter, there is also very possibly, in all three versions, an ironic reference in this flood to baptism: one which kills rather than saves. If so, then another ironic parallel needs to be noted here, which touches once more upon the presence of the liturgy in the text, in this case with the Asperges which precedes High Mass. This ritual, in which holy water is sprinkled upon persons for their cleansing and purification, includes a phrase which says “vidi aquam egredientem de templo, a
latere dextro, alleluja: et omnes, ad quos pervenit aqua ista, salvi facti sunt, et dicent, alleluja, alleluja” (‘I saw water coming from the Temple on the right side, alleluja: and all those were saved to whom that water came, and they shall say: alleluja, alleluja’). Thereafter, the antiphon repeats the phrase once more. The water flowing from the side of the temple (that is, from the side of the crucified Christ) is clearly similar to the water now flowing from the prison, and in Andreas literally from the side of the building, and it certainly is cleansing the place of evil. Moreover, the second part of the phrase is of a piece with the irony which all three renderings of the legend elicit at this point around the flood, for the joyful allelujas of the cleansed in the Asperges contrast with the ensuing horrified screams of the ‘cleansed’ in Mermedonia. The sense that a gruesome, ironic reference to the Asperges subtends this part of the legend continues in what is said next, for in all three Andreas asks for an angel to come down and surround the city with fire so that guarding it thereby the cannibals cannot flee. Once more, this detail aligns closely with a phrase from the Asperges which occurs just before the one reproduced above: “Exaudi nos, Domine sanctus, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus: et mittere digneris sanctum angelum tuum de cælis; qui custodiat, foveat, protegat, visitet, atque defendat omnes habitants in hoc habitaculo . . .” (‘Hear us Lord, Holy Father, almighty and eternal God; and graciously send Your holy angel from Heaven to watch over, foster, safeguard, abide with and defend all who dwell in this house’). The inclusion of the angel who guards all who live within is an unnecessary inclusion to the plot (especially according to the sensibilities of the CCCC 198 version), but its presence makes much more sense if it
is reinforcing at the practical level aspects of the rituals to come after the reading of the legend.30

In the Casanatensis version, they recognize that their suffering is due to what they have done to Andreas and decide to believe him, his words, his doctrine and his God, ‘whether they want to or not.’ In Andreas, the people also recognize that it is their persecution of the saint which has brought this affliction upon them, but the poet avoids the rather awkward second sentiment, along with its ‘credo-like’ statement. Rather, they decide simply to go to the prison and of him help and peace (1566b–1567a). In the CCCC 198 account, having ascertained that they are in their suffering being held accountable for what they have done to the saint, they run to the prison and “uton we ealle cigean and cweþan for þon þe we geleofað on Drihten þyses ælpeodigan mannnes” (‘let us all cry and say that we believe in the Lord of this stranger,’ 126, 9–11). In both Old English versions, Andreas perceives this change of heart on his own, while in the Latin it is the cannibals who make this known to the saint. In regards to the CCCC 198 account, this seems rather out of step with the earlier inclination to eliminate problematic material, though it does once more reduce considerably the length of the episode.

In the Casanatensis version, Andreas commands the waters to stop pouring from the mouth of the statue and walks out of the prison. The water recedes before him in what seems a rather plain typological reference to the parting of the Red Sea

30 It is also perhaps a reference to the fire which destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19: 24), or, as Robert Boenig points out, a reference to the angel who guards the Garden of Eden against man’s re-entry by means of a flaming sword, though again the association would have to be antithetical (that is, the un-clean are being kept out, not in): Robert Boenig ed, “St. Andrew,” Anglo-Saxon Spirituality (New York: Paulist, 2000): n. 71.
before Moses (Exodus 14:21–22). The Mermedonians prostrate at his feet beg him not to exact retribution. In Andreas, the saint also commands the torrent to stop—though of course no mention is made of this issuing from the statue’s mouths—he walks out of the prison, and the water again withdraws before his steps. In contrast, the Mermedonians here are exultant at being saved rather than terrified of retribution. In the CCCC 198 version, the command for the waters to stop follows the Casanatensis version in that the statue’s mouth is mentioned again. Andreas goes out and in what is perhaps an adaptation of the Latin’s image of prostrate Mermedonians, who are not yet mentioned as being present, the waters which recede before him are said to do reverence before his feet (per se ferit hic water gehunung gearwode beforan his fotum, 126, 17–18). This personification of the waters also tends, as has by now become the pattern, to mute the typological tones of the scene. Only at this point do the Mermedonians come before Andreas, where they beg gemiltsa us, god (126, 20). Again this seems an adaptation of something in the Casanatensis-tradition, where they beg “miserere nostri, apostole domini nostri iesu miserere nobis” (XXX, 19–20). Boenig convincingly suggests that this repeated sentiment in the Old English is a deliberate echo of the Kyrie Eleison, which here seems to have been enhanced and clarified in the Old English, though more muted aspects of it are also in the Latin. However, it could also be an echo, once more, of the opening phrase of the Asperges, where the priest intones, following Psalm 50:3, “miserere mei, Deus, secundum magnam misericordiam tuam” (“have mercy on me, God, according to your great mercy”), or the opening of the Gloria, where twice is repeated the phrase, miserere nobis. In any event, the point is that the opening of the liturgy is replete with this sentiment and phrase. In the verse, however, the Mermedonians are not begging for mercy, but rejoicing over their salvation. This the saint interrupts by opening the earth
and sweeping therein the waters and the fourteen of the worst sinners. Only then do the Mermedonians show the appropriate fear before Andreas, not begging for mercy, but affirming that in the face of such deadly power it is right that they obey the apostle. The legitimacy they accord to power in this scene in the Old English is contrasted by the overtones of studied cruelty found in the Latin, as the Old Man who had tried to sacrifice his son begs for mercy and is denied. He, along with fourteen grievous sinners amongst the crowd of Mermedonians who presently pray to the saint for forgiveness, will be swept into the abyss which Andreas shall open. The apostle adds before they are swept away, “tu simul ibis cum illis aliis quattuordecim carnificibus, qui occiderunt homines per singulos dies, maneabis in infernum usque ad diem iusti iudicii. Nunc ergo ite in abyssum in quo moriemini, in loco occisioniis vestre” (‘you will die, together with the other fourteen executioners who slaughtered men every day, and you will remain in hell until judgement day, So go now to the abyss where you will die, to your place of execution,” XXXI, 1–5). He commands all to come and watch as he marches the crowd to where the Mermedonians once slaughtered their victims. Here before the audience he opens the earth and the accused are swept away with the waters. In contrast, and surprisingly, the CCCC 198 account now alters its tone, eliminating the unexpected brutality of the verse, and the vaunting cruelty of the Latin, for here Andreas simply opens the earth, into which the waters and the dead are swept. This is sufficient to awe the Mermedonians, who now reiterate their fear of his retribution.

Andreas immediately comforts them, saying that those who died in the water shall be raised, and that all this thus far has been done for their sake. In the Casanatensis, however, the Mermedonians lament exhaustively what the saint now does to them and what doubtless he will do to them. Here also Andreas says, less
convincingly, that this was all done for their sake, and he commands that all the dead people and beasts be brought to him. These he raises, and there is much rejoicing. In the CCCC 198 version, on the other hand, he raises the dead where they lay. As noted, though very briefly, in Chapter II, this scene is treated entirely differently in *Andreas*. Here the saint says the dead men got what they deserved, but those who live will be fine provided they mean well. He then prays to Christ that the dead men be raised, and this is phrased explicitly as a prayer of saintly intercession, at which point the dead are raised. It seems worth considering at this point whether the inclusion of Andreas’ saintly intercession might not suggest that this version of the legend was meant for a lay audience, intending to promote the cult of the saint at a particular location as many other saints’ lives do. This, once more, would place it at variance with the use Alcuin suggests for verse versions of such lives, which are to be read in private, probably by a monk, in his cell. Clearly it serves no practical purpose to dramatise the saint’s powers of intercession to this audience, but if it is presented as were Aldhelm’s secular poems, on the bridge to a lay audience, the point of this inclusion would very much align with one of the recognized aims of saints’ lives: promotion of his or her cult. Certainly neither prose version phrases the resurrection scene in these terms, and this seems to suggest in this detail at least that the vernacular verse form might be serving a popularising impulse here, rather than Alcuin’s contemplative aim, by using familiar, accessible and popular forms to promote pragmatic ends.

---


32 For a short and yet detailed overview of this aspect of hagiography, see again Lapidge, “The Saintly Life.”
In the Latin, Andreas builds a church on the hill where the Mermedonians slaughtered their victims and where he opened the abyss. He teaches them basic Christian laws and baptises them in the name of the Trinity. He appoints a bishop and tells them to guard the mysteries. In *Andreas*, the church is built by the pillar from which the flood sprang. They declare, perhaps alluding to the earlier ‘anti-baptism’ which came from here, that they are willing to accept baptism. Then the verse insinuates a section on idolatry and heathen practices; Andreas tells them that they must leave off worshipping at ancient temples and abandon idolatry. He appoints a bishop, named here as Platan, and consecrates the church. This portion in the CCCC 198 version, on the other hand, is extremely laconic; he has them build a church by the pillar, consecrates a bishop and baptises them. There is no mention of teaching, nor of consecration, nor again the dangers of heathen practices. In this the Old English prose is markedly less ‘missional’ than the verse or even the Casanatensis version, pointing once more perhaps to a monastic or clerical, not lay, audience.

In all three texts the saint then tells the Mermedonians that he wishes to depart, and in all three the people beg him to stay, since they are so new in the faith. In the verse, Andreas’ desire to leave is expressed in distinctly eremitical terms, for he wishes to quit the rich city, the conviviality of people, the wealth, the noble hall and the giving of rings, and wishes to be by himself. This might point back to Alcuin’s monastic audience, for this sentiment is certainly one with which they would be familiar and towards which they would likely be sympathetic. On the other hand, it would also valorize the sacrifice a holy man makes by staying in a community in order to build up its faith, as Andreas eventually does for the Mermedonians, and this sentiment too would doubtless find sympathy with many ecclesiastical readers of such a tale before a lay audience.
Andreas is also the only account in which the saint leaves as he came: by sea. As mentioned earlier, in Chapter III, this might be in order to facilitate closer parallels of language, motif and imagery with Beowulf. In the prose versions, he leaves by a road. The Mermedonians weep and beg him to stay a little longer, and in the Casanatensis version he says that he just wishes to visit his disciples, and then he will return; whether he means this or not is hard to say, though as Chapter II discusses, the Casanatensis-author seems at times mendacious. Certainly the impression in both Old English accounts is that he intends to leave and never return, and in the Latin the people continue to lament as if they know that the apostle is lying and that he in fact does not intend to return. In all three, the saint is then confronted, as he departs, by Christ. In the CCCC 198 account, he appears again “on ansine fægeres cildes” (127, 20–21). In the other two accounts, it is not said in what form Christ appears. In the verse, Christ says that even though Andreas has not listened to their lamentation, He has, and that the saint cannot leave a people so recently converted, otherwise the entire work shall be fruitless. He orders Andreas back for seven days to confirm them, and He too phrases the environment in which the saint must stay in explicitly worldly terms, contrasting sharply with eremitical ideals: wuna in þære winbyrig, wigendra hleo, / salu sinchroden, seofon nihta fyrst (protector of warriors, remain in the joyous city, in the treasure laden halls, for seven nights, 1672–1673). In the Casanatensis version, he also orders Andreas to raise the dead who were swept into the abyss. Every one of these details is stripped from the CCCC 198 version, nor when Christ ascends once more into heaven does it include as it always did at the beginning Christ’s separate blessing of ‘peace be with you.’

In both prose versions Andreas gives thanks to God because He wants all souls to be saved, and in the CCCC 198 account he also gives thanks that God did not
let him leave this city because of his hot heart (“hatheortan of þisse ceastre,” 128, 4–5), a curious phrase which perhaps implies that the saint has been in some sense too ‘ardent’ for martyrdom or too quick of temper with the Mermedonians. Whatever the exact meaning, the saint seems to be acknowledging an emotional failing towards God and the cannibals, and for a time hereafter Andreas stays rejoicing with the people, teaching and confirming them in Christ. In the verse, however, Andreas gives no thanks whatsoever, but simply returns, teaching and confirming the Mermedonians. He is said to have thereby destined many for eternal happiness, and the poet emphasises the Trinity’s centrality in this: *paer faeder ond sunu ond frofre gast / in prinnesse pryymme wealdeð / in woruld worulda wuldrogestealda* (there Father and Son and Holy Spirit in the majesty of the Trinity dwell in an age of ages [over] the realm of glory, 1684–1686). Its echo of the *Judica Me* is obvious: “Glory Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto / Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sæcula sæculorum” (‘Glory be to the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without End’).33 He goes on to say that in addition, Andreas spent much effort destroying heathen shrines, attacking idolatry and overthrowing error, and that Satan is dismayed that the Mermedonians have turned from his temples. Not only does this align the verse once more with pastoral concerns particular to popular audiences, but, along with the proximity of the seemingly unnecessary credo-like invocation of the Trinity just above, sounds very much like the catechism recited by the exorcist, or more appropriately to this legend, a

---

33 At the end of the eighth century the Credo was added to the western or Roman mass in order to combat heresy. Heresy, in Anglo-Latin missionary literature is often conflated with heathenism. This addition to the mass was part of a broader program of liturgical reform promulgated by Boniface, Pepin, and ultimately Charlemagne, combining also elements of monastic liturgical practice and from the Gallican rite.
baptising, missionary priest, for as Margaret Deanesly explains, it was in late
antiquity and the early middle ages the specific job of the exorcist to cast out evil
spirits, and especially those of heathenism; in the exorcism of the eighth century, the
exorcist asks ‘do you forsake the Devil and all Devil-worship?’ He would then
demand specific renunciation of the local deities which were likely to be worshipped,
concentrating in England especially on Woden. The first part remains (to this day) a
part of the catechism which precedes Catholic and Anglican baptism, along with the
initiates recitation of the credo, involving the declaration of belief in the Trinity, such
as which is found just above the eradication of heathen practices amongst the newly-
baptised Mermedonians here in Andreas. It is surely a striking concatenation of
sentiments and phrases.

The language of the credo which emphasises the unity of the Trinity is also in
both prose versions, at their very end as a celebratory declaration as the apostle
leaves, though here it occurs without any connection to heathenism or heresy. In the
Latin the cannibals declare “‘unus deus, quem nobis manifestavit beatus Andreas
apostolus eius dominum nostrum iesum christum, cui est honor et Gloria, in secula
seculorum, amen’” (“there is one God, Him whom the blessed apostle Andrew has
shown to us. He is our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be honour and glory and, world
without end, amen,” XXXIII, 16–18). The connection of this language with the liturgy
could hardly be stronger. The same liturgical imprint holds also for the CCCC 198
version: “An is Drihten God, se is hælend Crist, and se Halga Gast, þam is wuldor and
geweald on þære Halgan þrynnysse þurh ealra worulda worulda worulda soðlice a butan ende.

Amen” (“there is one Lord God, he is Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, to whom is glory and power, in the holy Trinity, everlastingly, age of ages truly without end, amen,” 128, 11–14). In the verse, by contrast, as previously discussed, he leaves amidst grief, not joy, and his martyrdom in Achaia is explicitly mentioned. The Mermedonians cry out here a repetition of the familiar liturgical refrain (1716–1722):

\[\text{‘An is ece god eallra gesceaf}ta!} \\
\text{Is his miht ond his æht o}fr middangeard \\
\text{breme gebleast, ond his blæd ofer eall} \\
\text{in heofonþrymme halgum scineð,} \\
\text{wlitige on wuldre to widan ealdre,} \\
\text{ece mid englum. } Þæt is æðele cyning.’

[One alone is He, the everlasting God of all created things. His right and his power are gloriously blessed throughout the world, and over all the celestial majesty his splendour shines upon the saints, radiantly in glory, forever and even eternally among the angels. That is a noble King].

Here, this sequential repetition of the Trinitarian sentiment follows more accurately the sentiments in the order of the liturgy, the first aligning with the phrasing of the \textit{Judica Me} (especially when the phrase \textit{woruld worulda} is taken into account), and the second echoing the traditional language of the \textit{Credo}. With this liturgical assertion of faith, the Old English verse \textit{Andreas} also draws to a close.

Ultimately, then, does the paradigm of the \textit{opus geminatum} illuminate significant aspects of the CCCC 198 version as these are compared to the other two legends, and specifically as these touch upon matters around the public reading of hagiographical material which Alcuin suggests? In this analysis it would certainly seem so, and these aspects as discovered here can be divided into four broad tendencies: A) the CCCC 198 account elicits, either deliberately or incidentally, an inclination to distil its articulation of the legend down to its core meaning by eliminating all dialogue and description which does not, in Aristotelian language,
contribute in a necessary sense to the movement of the plot. This is not to say that
these excisions derive explicitly from Aristotle’s prescription, or a prescription which
follows from this Aristotelian tradition; it merely observes that there is a consistent
parallel between Aristotle’s description of an efficient (and so ‘virtuous’) plot, and the
e amendments which in the tradition of the opus geminatum contribute to a similar
efficiency in the CCCC 198 account’s plot. Undoubtedly, as a next step, there is a
pressing need to research and so trace out in concrete detail the lines of textual
transmission by which such parallels may be explained or dismissed; B) Though it is
impossible to eliminate all fantastic and wondrous material from a legend like
Andrew amongst the cannibals, one observes here that nearly all such material which
could be taken out of this account, without reducing the plot to incoherence, has
indeed been cut. As noted earlier, Ælfric, among others, both expressed and
demonstrated grave misgivings about both apocryphal material and legends which
implied fallibility of that saint. Though the CCCC 198 version still manifests the
willingness to reproduce this apocryphal tale, the way that it plays down the more
fantastic apocryphal elements, as well as muting or cutting out scenes of saintly
fallibility, seem to betray a deep and consistent anxiety about these aspects of the
legend; C) Moreover, the ability of an audience to engage actively and critically with
the Old English prose version of the legend is radically reduced. A very considerable
number of episodes or details which are enigmatic, problematic or simply nonsensical
in the other two versions of the legend are in the CCCC 198 account either explained
away (often rather simplistically) or cut out entirely; D) Consonant with this impulse
is the pervasive tendency to excise or mute scenes or developments of the legend
which in the other two texts embody clear typological references. Active rather than
passive engagement with the text, in both problematic and typological episodes,
seems to be studiously discouraged by means of this excision or revision. In these four aspects at least, the paradigm of the *opus geminatum* has afforded concrete bases for the numerous previous assertions suggested or implied throughout this thesis, that prose versions of saints’ lives often are more stream-lined, laconic and austere.

On the other hand, though the CCCC 198 version does not introduce the focus upon liturgical language, it works very hard to enhance or add to what is already implicit in the other two, with the result that entire passages are entirely dominated by the language of liturgy, especially that of the Ordinary. To the best of my knowledge, this tendency has not been traced out in any detail by previous analyses of the Old English *Andreas*, and though this analysis here makes no claims to be exhaustive, it is hoped that it has at least been representative and can point the way to further, more comprehensive studies, for the pervasive presence of liturgical language throughout a text like the CCCC 198 account seems rich with the potential to tell us a great deal about the contexts in which such legends were produced, disseminated and read.

The analysis also suggests that on the level of what is excised, what is retained, and how what is retained is articulated, the Old English prose is at many, if not most, points more similar to the Old English verse than it is to Latin prose versions like the Casanatensis version (or, for that matter, the *Bonnet Fragment*). In light of previous comments, that Old English prose versions of *Andreas* have as their closest exemplar the Latin versions, this is somewhat surprising, though it should also be pointed out that these similarities of content and phrasing do not take into account many linguistic aspects, such as already noted in Baumler or Boenig. On the other hand, I have here attempted consistently to select the most salient and least controversial details of content and style possible, thereby reducing such aberrations
to a minimum; to assume one could completely eradicate such aberrations, however, would be unrealistic.

Finally, comparison with the verse *Andreas* also made apparent that in spite of what Alcuin insists in his prologue to the *Vita Willibrordi*, the verse version seems better designed for a lay rather than ecclesiastical audience. In fact, in light of what has become apparent here, not to mention in other sources such as William of Malmsbury’s account of Aldhelm’s preaching on the bridge, Alcuin’s insistence, that verse lives are for private reading and prose lives are for public readings, seems enormously vexed. In Anglo-Saxon secular culture, poetry, and especially oral poetry, by its nature seems meant to be publicly heard, not privately read; as the beginning of Chapter III discusses, one might assume that as oral poetry was copied down, it was more and more often read, either publicly and aloud or privately and in silence. Traditionally, however, indigenous culture would be accustomed to hearing, not reading, poetry in social settings centered upon feasts, in a manner not dissimilar from the readings which monks and clergy would hear holy tales while eating in the refectory. In light of this, Alcuin’s suggestion that verse be read in private and silence flies in the face of the practice of indigenous literary culture. Rather, it is prose, imported as it is from Latin, ecclesiastical culture, which seems more likely to be read privately and in silence, though the presentation contexts of the *lectio*, homilies and the liturgy qualify this point. Even so, Alcuin has in a single, albeit influential, paragraph, challenged the entire indigenous literary context, though versions of the legend like *Andreas*, not to mention other holy tales, like *Judith* or *Elene*, implicitly take issue with Alcuin’s claims, seeming to offer wondrous, fantastic and expansive verse forms for public, lay performance. Compared with these, the CCCC 198 version is flatly dull, but the fact that the practitioners of literary culture in Anglo-Saxon
England would and could take a tale as fantastic as *Andreas*—of a holy man’s struggles with a city of cannibals in a city which is beyond the edge of the known world—and by means of certain traditional, hagiographical conventions make it comparatively dull is itself surely not uninteresting.
Chapter V

Conclusion

To a significant degree, the Old English verse Andreas is what it is relative to a constellation of other texts. This point has been underscored over the last century by a wide range of scholars, and of late with increasing particularity and stronger logic, as evidenced in the work of Reimer, Riedinger and Powell, amongst others. This thesis engages with the work of such scholars by considering through the modes and methods of the opus geminatum the nature of these relationships and how they play out upon the Old English poem, aiming not only to describe those relations, as has so often been the case, but to understand to a greater degree both how and why these relationships reify as they do. By uncovering and testing various dynamics according to which such literary interactions manifest, this inquiry seeks to illuminate methods which both facilitate broader studies of influences between Anglo-Saxon texts and to contribute to a deeper and more detailed field of understanding around Andreas itself.

In this endeavour, the relational models afforded by the opus geminatum accord strikingly with what is discovered in the various texts treated in this dissertation.

For instance, compared to the prose version of the legend found in the Casanatensis manuscript, the verse Andreas strikes a much more critically astute, consistent and affective tone. Both its content and style have received more careful thought from its writer, not only as a narrative unto itself, but often in seemingly direct, meaningful relation to the content and style of putative prose exemplars. This parallels with remarkable uniformity what the overview of the opus geminatum tradition would have led one to expect; Andreas is concise where the Casanatensis version is expansive, allusive where the prose is literal, insightful where the other is
informative, and elegant where the other is eloquent. Such dichotomies, which were very likely, in some articulation or another, ready-to-hand for the Andreas-poet, allow a reworking of the legend which runs much deeper than merely rendering the traditional content in an indigenous style, which as we have often seen is the conventional scholarly perspective when approaching the poem. Rather, the style changes not only how the traditional content is perceived, but what it actually is. Conversely, additions, omissions or revisions of that content in the poem change at the root the ways—the styles—in which the audience is able to read the legend: a legend through which now runs a rich strain of irony, anxiety, honesty and cruelty. Not only does the Andreas-poet attend to the composition of his text in a more critical manner, but he seems to anticipate, either implicitly or explicitly, the same active engagement on the part of his reader, for at numerous points throughout the story, the reader, in collaboration with the tale, must become the source of content or style. Thus, there obtains a three-way rapport between dichotomies: between the content and style of the prose, of the verse, and of the audience. This cross-fertilization accounts for much of the apparent fruitfulness, as well as many vexations, of this poem’s reception amongst scholars. These relationships must be considered methodically in order to apprehend just what the Andreas-poet has done, and in many ways this is what the lens of the opus geminatum has offered. Moreover, the paradigms afforded by the opus geminatum tradition open up a number of horizons when one considers the pervasive echoes of Beowulf’s formulae in Andreas.

The sheer quantity and consistency of Beowulf’s formulae in Andreas has led a number of scholars to examine the likelihood of borrowing and trace out in detail possible shared elements. The treatment of such elements here sought to analyse levels of consistency not at the linguistic level of shared formulae, which has most
recently been done by Powell, but at levels of prosody, connotation and motif, and in this has attempted to test the suggestiveness of these correspondences by restricting the analysis to clusters of possible borrowings and using *Beowulf* as the base text. The aim was to answer three related questions: A) how much prosodic, connotative and topical evidence for a relationship exists; B) of what nature is this relationship; C) how does this relationship inform a reading of *Andreas*? At these levels, both the consistency and shared nature of the formulae which the two poems held in common turned out to be quite striking.

As in linguistically based studies, the case for explicit borrowing in this treatment was strong. In regards to *a priori* evidence, the clusters of borrowing derive with remarkable consistency from within single set-piece episodes of *Beowulf* and seldom overlap beyond these discrete sections, and these set-pieces were not only among the most dramatic episodes of *Beowulf*, but were prosodically much richer than usual, containing a vast array of aural and semantic effects, along with measurably higher levels of double-alliteration, synonyms and compounds. In addition, if the *Andreas*-poet did draw upon these portions of *Beowulf*, he would be following in the established tradition of late antique paraphrasers and early medieval practitioners of the *opus geminatum* who drew upon the phrases and language of the poems they most admired, especially the *Aeneid*. This was a tactic explicitly recommended by writers like Sedulius, and it is difficult to believe on the evidence here that the *Andreas*-poet was entirely insensible to these recommendations, though at what remove remains uncertain.

Likewise, the *a posteriori* evidence for a relationship was compelling. Not only did the *Andreas*-poet often draw time and again upon the same general collocation of connotations, but it was seen that whereas these sets of connotation
were quite appropriate to *Beowulf*, they were often a very awkward fit in *Andreas*, pointing thus to an origin outside the traditional legend of Andrew: that they were not organic to it. Even more conspicuous were the parallels between not only individual motifs, but structures of motifs. In this the *Andreas*-poet seems to display a tendency to draw upon sections of *Beowulf* which deal with similar motifs: for example, God’s munificence, hellish landscapes or cannibalistic monsters. As seen, insinuating *Beowulf’s* motifs as a backdrop against which *Andreas* is read or heard has the effect of making the latter’s plot immensely more complex and nuanced, especially in light of the semantically significant points at which they occur. Ultimately, the analysis seems to indicate that it is extremely likely that by following in some form of the traditions of paraphrase and the *opus geminatum*, the *Andreas* poet drew not only upon linguistic elements, but also on prosodic, connotative and topical elements of indigenous poetry to enormously enrich his adaptation of his putative source.

The precedence for tactics such as these are well established, not only according to the *opus geminatum* tradition and the documented cases of borrowing from Latin sources in Anglo-Latin texts which were likely, in some manner, a reification of that tradition, but also the tendency, often amongst those very same borrowing authors, to depend upon indigenous poetry to supplement their work: the most notable author in this vein being Aldhelm. The desire of the *Andreas*-poet to compose as refined and elegant work as possible is made explicit in his narratological intrusion which introduces the ‘second start,’ at the climax of the story as Andreas calls forth water from stone (1478–1491); in fact, this introduction, with its strange blend of traditional antique topoi, such as the modesty topos, and Anglo-Saxon literary conventions, such as the *Hwæt* introduction, invocation of ancient legend (*fyrnsægen*), and the *enta geweore*, is itself a blend in miniature of the poem’s
methodology as a whole, one which welds the antique to the medieval, the Latin to the Old English, and the Christian to the ‘secular.’ It is also a reproduction in miniature of Anglo-Saxon tendencies in regards to hagiography or even Christian faith overall, for it is widely acknowledge that Anglo-Saxons remade hagiography into many of their own distinctive forms which they then exported, and their approach to mission narratives and methods had no European analogue. Andreas seems a poignant and nuanced representative of this more general tendency.

Comparisons with Old English prose analogues to Andreas do much to throw these conscious, explicit and deliberate tendencies of literary naturalisation into sharper relief, and these tendencies once more are just what the comments and practices of the opus geminatum tradition would lead one to expect from a prose rendering. For instance, a comparative analysis of Andreas and the prose versions of the legend found in the Casanatensis version and CCCC 198 manuscripts revealed a consistent tendency to mute or excise typological material in the Old English prose. This is part of a broader inclination in the CCCC 198 account to either cut out or explain away portions of the story which invite active, critical engagement by the audience, and this has the effect of producing a saint’s life which is considerably more pragmatic, which seems much better suited to practical reading contexts such as suggested by Alcuin, as a lectio, for the prose version of his opus geminatum on Willibrord. This concentration upon ‘useful assertions’ about the saint is further
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enhanced by the elimination of wondrous or fantastic elements, such as the inset apocryphal tales which the saint tells to Christ while traveling with him. In fact, the author of the legend produced, or more likely reproduced, in the CCCC 198 version of the legend goes on to remove nearly every element of the plot which does not contribute in a direct and necessary way to the movement of the plot, thereby demonstrating a criteria by which paraphraser could possibly engage with the core meaning of any given legend: a core meaning which had proved so nebulous and problematic in both the comments about and examples of late antique and early medieval paraphrases. On the other hand, this simplification must be distinguished from the simplification in Andreas; as was seen, the CCCC 198 account removes material which calls for one to actively question or speculate upon the text, thereby reducing the critical engagement, while Andreas tends to repair potentially problematic assertions, supply necessary information and cut the irredeemably fallacious elements. In other words, Andreas simplifies by fixing problematic aspects, while the CCCC 198 version simplifies by avoiding as many critically engaging aspects as possible; the former seeks an effective engagement, the latter avoids it.

Though much is excised from the Old English prose version of the legend, and which is found in the verse Andreas, there are also enhanced or added elements, most notably liturgical elements. Though echoes of the liturgy, especially of the Ordinary of the Mass, are found in both the Latin prose and the Old English verse, these are greatly increased in the CCCC 198 account and much is added to them. Moreover, they are arranged and structured much more deliberately than in the other two examples of the text. This again seems to concur with what Alcuin implies about the uses and contexts of a prose version: that as a lectio to be read during mealtimes, it might be a preparation for the celebration of the that saint’s feast-day. The location of
both Old English prose versions of the *Andreas*-legend in their manuscript collections, in the position for his feast-day on November 30th, the last day of the liturgical year, seem to corroborate this impression, though inconclusively.

On the other hand, the CCCC 198 version illustrates a tendency to introduce or develop aspects to the tale, such as explicit promotion of intercessionary powers or warnings against heathen practices, which seem to fit it better for public performances, and specifically lay audiences. This is at variance with what one would expect if Alcuin’s designation, of prose for public performance and verse for private reading, is to be afforded general currency. It does, however, align with what one may expect from early Germanic literary culture, since amongst lay audiences oral poetry was traditionally for public performance at feast settings or sermons. It raises the question whether Alcuin, in formulating this distinction between prose and verse reading contexts, was attempting to reverse an inherited, Germanic and secular dichotomy which is of a piece with his attempt to reverse their preference for ‘Ingeld over Christ.’ If it is a rejection of these traditional preferences, then it is one which the nature of the Old English verse *Andreas* undermines, belonging as it does to that primitive Anglo-Saxon missional strategy advocated so influentially by Gregory the Great in his response to Augustine of Canterbury, of assimilating and synthesizing indigenous with foreign, Latin with Old English, and secular with Christian.\(^3\) In this assimilating, the tendencies of *Andreas*, not Alcuin, seem more normative.

Throughout, this thesis has tried to articulate not what is different between *Andreas* and other version of the legend, which has already been done and often done

well by other scholars, but rather why. In this undertaking, the traditions, methods and assumptions intrinsic to the opus geminatum mode of paraphrasing seem not only an apt paradigm with which to approach the question, but, in actual practice here, in relation to the other forms of this tale, to be richly suggestive. From what is found in this inquiry stem a series of intriguing questions: is the dearth of verse versions of this legend and the abundance of prose versions—an imbalance which increases over time—an indication of shifting literary or hagiographical values, or merely incidental? Is there a shift in hagiographers’ sense of what affords respective prose and verse legends their aesthetic value, or if aesthetic value is even an appropriate criterion by which to evaluate certain forms of spiritual literature? If so, then of what nature is this shift and why? Is there an increasing focus upon literary utility at the expense of literary beauty? Does an Anglo-Saxon church increasingly engaged by extraneous missionary agendas or internal Viking depredations ascribe literary value differently under such pressures, and again, why and with what aims in view?

Though scholarly discussion about Andreas’ peculiar relations to other texts has waxed and waned numerous times in recent academic history, and though this fluctuation of interest is likely to continue, it seems reasonably certain in light of this study that whenever scholars do return to the text, it will continue to offer up a wealth of insight on a plethora of literary and cultural matters, and perhaps, simply as a poem unto itself, no little pleasure.
Appendix I: Respective Plots of the Casanatensis Account and Andreas

Casanatensis

4. Their practices of torture and drugging. I, 12–17.
7. Draught does not affect Matthew. II, 6–8.
10. Description of the time tablets and their purpose. III, 9–18.
11. Via the tablets, it is revealed that Matthew has three days left (and he hides his restored vision from them). III, 18–26.
12. God visits Andrew in ‘Greece,’ and orders him to rescue Matthew and the prisoners, and to preach Christ to the cannibals. IV, 1–9.
13. Andrew equivocates, wondering how he shall reach there. IV, 9–16.
14. God tells him to have faith in his power. IV, 16–1.
15. Tells him he will find a boat waiting for him and his disciples. IV, 1–4.

Andreas

1. As Casanatensis. 1–18.
3. No slaughter facilities.
4. As Casanatensis. 26–32.
5. As Casanatensis. 33–39.
6. As Casanatensis. Laments his state, but vows his willingness to follow God’s will in this. 40–87.
7. No mention of Draught’s effect.
9. As Casanatensis. 110–121.
10. As Casanatensis. 122–142.
11. As Casanatensis, but no mention of vision. 143–160.
12. Description of God’s OT rescues and opposition of Jewish magical practices. He orders Andreas to rescue only Matthew. No preaching. 161–188
13. As Casanatensis. Adds that he knows nobody in Mermedonia. 189–201.
16. Finds a boat with three sailors, are identified as God and two angels. V, 5–11.

17. Asks for passage; warns of little money; is warned of their hostility. 254–291.

18. Pilot asks for money. VI, 9–11.

19. Andrew remarks that they are commanded to possess nothing. VI, 11–19.

20. As Casanatensis. 352–368.

21. Storm arises and all are fearful. VII, 7–14.
21. As Casanatensis. 369–381.

22. As Casanatensis. 382–414.


25. Expresses admiration for the Pilot’s seamanship. IX, 8–2.
25. As Casanatensis. 469–554.


27. Andrew tells how Jesus performed secret miracles in the deserts. XII, 8–6.
27. As Casanatensis. 696–705.

28. He tells of the miracle of the speaking statues. XIII, 7–XV, 2.
28. As Casanatensis. Christ orders the statues to call the patriarchs from the earth, who then preach the gospel. 706–817.

29. Jesus pretends to sleep and Andrew follows suit. XVI, 3–10.

30. Wakes up on the shore before Mermedonia. XVII, 11–2.
30. As Casanatensis. 822–50.

31. Andrew recognizes that it was Christ in the boat. XVII, 3–9.
31. As Casanatensis. 851–58.

32. The disciples relate their dream about the eagles and patriarchs praising Christ. XVII, 9–18.
32. As Casanatensis, minus the patriarchs. 859–91.
33. Andrew apologizes for his ignorance, seeing how God’s promise was fulfilled. XVIII, 19–4.
34. Christ appears to Andrew, praising him for his ultimate faith and calls him friend, not slave. XVIII, 4–16.
36. Informs him that he will be tortured and killed. XVIII, 26–8.
37. Reminds him that he suffered likewise, as an example to all martyrs. XIX, 9–8.
38. Andrew and the disciples pass invisibly through the city. XIX, 8–11.
39. He makes the sign of the cross and the guards die, the doors spring open and the iron melts. XIX, 11–16.
40. Andrew and Matthew are reunited. XIX, 16–22.
41. Matthew remarks that the rescue has materialized just as God promised. XIX, 22–29.
42. Andrew laments the beast-like state of the other prisoners. XX, 1–7.
43. Andrew rebukes Satan, recounting how he has contributed to man’s fallen state. XX, 7–23.
44. Extols how God shall not abandon man, but promises to redeem him. XX, 23–25.
45. Andrew and Matthew pray and restore the prisoners to health. XXI, 26–29.
46. Andrew tells the prisoners to wait under the fig tree. XXI, 29–6.
47. Matthew, Andrew’s disciples, and the prisoners depart in a cloud which lofts them to a mountain, where they wait with Peter. XXI, 6–13.
48. Andrew sits beside marble column with a statue on top. XXII, 14–17.

49. They discover the prisoners gone. XXII, 17–4.

50. The elders wonder what change this may portend. XXII, 4–8.

51. They decide to devour the guards. XXII, 8–14.

52. Andrew prays that they may not dismember the guards’ bodies. XXII, 14–21.

53. The swords fall from butchers’ hands, and the hands wither. XXII, 21–22.

54. The Elders suspect a magician and they all fear starvation. XXII, 22–3.

55. They cast lost and so designate seven old men to slaughter. XXIII, 4–7.

56. The first offers his son in his place, and they agree, if the son is heavier. XXIII, 7–15.

57. He offers his daughter when the son proves too light. XXIII, 15–2.

58. Andrew prays and the sword of slaughter melts again. XXXIII, 2–8.


60. He says they cannot kill who they will, nor offer sacrifices. XXIII, 17–20.

61. They eat the guards. XXIII, 20–21.

62. They search for and find Andrew. XXV–XXVI, 1–3.

63. They fall back from the sign of the cross on his forehead. XXVII, 1–2.

64. Satan asks them why they retreat, and they tell him to go get Andrew himself, if he is so sure of himself. XXVII, 2–9.

65. At Satan’s instigation, the seize Andrew. XXVII, 9–18.
66. Satan pretends to be Christ, answering Andrew’s prayers. XXVII, 18–24.
68. On ‘another’ day they drag Andrew about town. XXVIII, 5–9.
69. Andrew feels he is near his limit. XXVIII, 9–14.
70. Reminds God how bad the torture is by comparing it to Christ’s on the cross. XXVIII, 14–16.
71. Complains they have tortured him for three days (though this day is initially presented as the first). XXVII, 16–19.
72. Asks God to take him, for he can bear no more. XXVIII, 19–26.
73. God reminds him that his promises are inviolable. XXVIII, 26–3.
74. His flesh and hair become flowers and trees. XXVIII, 3–9.
75. God appears out of a light in the prison and restores his body. XXIX, 10–13.
76. Andrew commands a column in his cell to expel water so as to fill the city. XXIX, 13–20.
77. The water is said to be salt, so that it might eat their flesh as they ate others. XXIX, 20–21.
78. Many people and beasts are killed. XXIX, 22.
79. Andrew asks for an angel with fire to surround the city so that none escape. XXX, 23–3.

66. Omitted.
67. Omitted. A scene of torture and suffering in the dungeon is added. 1238–1268.
68. A second day of torture; at the end, Andrew affirms his faith in God. Satan and demons mock him in the dungeon that night; demons attack but are driven back by sign of cross on his head. Satan chastens them but they tell Satan to attack the saint himself. Satan threatens, but is rebuked by saint. 1269–1387.
69. A third day of torture: then as Casanatensis. 1389–1406a.
70. As Casanatensis. 1406b–1413.
71. As Casanatensis. 1414–1427a.
72. As Casanatensis. 1427b–1428.
73. As Casanatensis. 1429–1440.
74. As Casanatensis. 1441–1462a.
75. God appears and comforts Andrew, restoring his body. Narrator intrudes, complaining of the hardship of recounting the tale. 1462b–1488.
76. As Casanatensis. 1489–1526a.
77. The water is said to be like a bitter mead-feast. 1526b–1539.
78. Omitted.
79. Angel shows up without Andrew’s summons, surrounding the city with fire. 1540–1553.
80. The Mermedonians recognize that these woes are the product of their actions towards Andrew. XXX, 4–8.

81. They decide to believe Andrew’s teaching, whether they ‘want to or not.’ XXX, 8–11.

82. They free the saint implore him to save them through God’s power. XXX, 11–14.

83. Andrew orders the water to stop and it recedes. XXX, 15–21.

84. The old man who offered up his children begs for mercy. XXXI, 22–23.

85. Andrew refuses, sending both he and the fourteen executioners to the abyss with the receding waters. XXXI, 23–12.

86. This justice terrifies the people, and they fear retribution. XXXI, 12–19.

87. Andrew consoles them, saying it was done for their sake. XXXI, 19–23.


89. Andrew builds a church over the abyss. XXXII, 31–1.

90. He teaches them the holy precepts and appoints a bishop. XXXII, 2–8.

91. He makes to leave, but the people implore him to stay. XXXII, 8–11.

92. He promises to return after he meets with his disciples. XXXII, 11–13.

93. God commands Andrew to stay with them seven days and raise up those he cast into the pit. XXXIII, 14–3.

94. Andrew stays for seven days, then leaves; the people rejoice in liturgical terms. XXXIII, 4–18.

95. Andrew sets out for Achaia and martyrdom, and imprecations are heaped upon his slayer. 1695–1705.

96. In great sorrow, the Mermedonians see Andrew off from the headland and the seal’s path. 1706–1716.

97. They leave off praising God in terms made familiar by the preceding text. 1717–1722.\footnote{All *Andreas* line references drawn from Kenneth Brooks’ edition, *Andreas and Fates of the Apostles*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.}
Cluster Index: Beowulf and Andreas

Cluster I

23 line passage: double alliteration, 12 lines (52%) / avg. 47%; 14 compounds (one every 1.64 lines) / avg. one every 3.52 lines.

Beowulf 218 flota famiheals fugle gelicost
Andreas 497 færeð famigheals fugole gelicost

Beowulf 222 brimclifu blican, beorgas steape
Andreas 840 fore burggeatum. Beorgas steape

Beowulf 228 þæs þe him yþlade eade wurdon
Andreas 499 þæt ic æfre ne gesah ofer yðlade

Beowulf 229 þa of wealle gesah weard Scilding,
Andreas 1492 He be wealle gesah wundrum feaste

Beowulf 238 þærnum werede, þe þus brontne ceol
Andreas 273 þæt ðu us gebrohte brante ceole

Cluster II

31 lines: dbl. allit. 18 (58% / 47%); 16 compounds (1.93 / 3.52).

Beowulf 721 dreamum bedæled duru sona onarn
Andreas 999 godes dryhtendom duru sona onarn

Beowulf 728 gesah he in recede rinca manige
Beowulf 399 aras þa se rica ymb hine rinc manig
Andreas 1116 reow ricsode þa wæs rinc manig

Beowulf 730 magorinca heap þa his mod ahlog
Andreas 454 merestreama gemeotu ða ure mod ahloh

Cluster III

15 lines: dbl. allit. 10 (67% / 47%); 4 compounds (3.75 / 3.52).

Beowulf 922 tryddode tirfaest getrume micle,
Andreas 707 getrume mycle, þæt he in temple gestod

Beowulf 926 stod on stapole, gesæh steapne hrof
Andreas 1062 standan stræte neah stapul ærenne

Beowulf 931 wunder æfter wundre, wuldres hyrde.
Andreas 620 wundor æfter wundre on wera gesiehðe
Beowulf  934  bote gebidan, ðonne blode fah
Andreas  1405 banhus blodfag, benne weallað

Cluster IV

22 lines: dbl. allit. 16 (72% / 47%); 10 compounds (2.2 / 3.52).

Beowulf  1222–3  ealne wideferhþ    wasa ehtigað,
Efne swa side    swa sæ bebugeð
Andreas  332–3  farað nu geond ealle    eorðan sceatas
Emne swa wide    swa wæter bebugeð

Beowulf  1224  windgeard, weallas.    Wes þenden þu lifige
Andreas  843  windige weallas.    þa se wisa oncneow

Beowulf  1226  sincgestreona.    Beo þu suna minum
Andreas  1656  secga seledream    ond sincgestreon

Beowulf  1235  eorla manegum,    syððan æfen cwom
Andreas  1245  Swa wæs ealne deæg    ðoddæt æfen com

Cluster V

17 lines: dbl. allit. 9 (52% / 47%); 6 compounds (2.8 / 3.52).

Beowulf  1413–15  wisra monna    wong sceawian,
oþþæt he færinga    fyrgenbeamas
ofær harne stan    hleonian funde
Andreas  839–41  Onwoc þa wiges heard,    wang sceawode,
fore burggeatum.    Beorgas steape,
hleoðu hlifodon,    ymbe harne stan,

Beowulf  1422–3  Flod blode weol    folc to sægon
hatan heolfre.    Horn stundum song
Andreas  1240–41  banhus abrocen.    Blod yðum weoll
haton heolfre.    Hæfde him on innan

Beowulf  1424  fuslic fyrdleoð    feða eal gesæt
Andreas  591  fif ðusendo    feðan sæton

Cluster VI

24 lines: dbl. allit. 19 (79% / 47%); 15 compounds (1.6 / 3.52).

Beowulf  1552  nemne him headobyne    helpe gefremede
Andreas  426  headolidendum    helpe gefremman
Beowulf 1561  to beadulace ætberan meahte
Andreas 1118  breostum onbryrded  to þam beadulace

Beowulf 1567–8  banhringas bræc.  Bil eal ðurhwod
  faeges flæschoman;  heo on flet gecrong.
Andreas 150–4  þæt hie banhringas  abrecan þohton
  lungre tolysan  lic on sawle
  ond þonne todælan  duguðe ond geogoðe
  werum to wiste  ond to wilðege.
  faeges flæschoman.  Feorh ne bemurndan

Cluster VII

28 lines: dbl. allit. 14 (50% / 47%); 11 compounds (2.54 / 3.52).

Beowulf 1674  duguðe ond iogoðe  þæt sceall feorhgedal
Beowulf 160  deorc deaspucua  dugupe ond geogoðe
Beowulf 621  dugupe ond geogoðe  dael æghwylcne
Andreas 152  ond þonne todælan  duguðe ond geogoðe
Andreas 1122  duguðe ond eogoðe  dael onfengon

Beowulf 1679  enta ærgeweorc  hit on æht gehwearf
Andreas 1235  enta ærgeweorc  innan burgum

Beowulf 1683  morðres scyldig  ond his modor eac
Andreas 1599  syððan mane faa  morðorsclydige

Beowulf 1690  gifen geotende  giganta cyn
  syðban flod ofsloh  frecne geferan;
  gifen geotende,  þæt wæs fremde þeod
Andreas 516  frecne geferan  flodwylm ne mæg

Beowulf 1699  sunu healfdenes  swigedon ealle
Andreas 762  geond þæt side sel  swigodon ealle

Cluster VIII

6 lines: dbl. allit. 5 (83% / 47%); 4 compounds (1.5 / 3.52).

Beowulf 2042  ealde æscberend  was him ut myne
Andreas 537  eald æscwiga  se ðe eall geman

Beowulf 2044  onginneð geomormod  geongum cempan
Andreas 1398  ongan þa geomormod  to gode cleopian
Cluster IX

22 lines: dbl. allit. 7 (31% / 47%) + 7 cross allit; 12 compounds (1.8 / 3.52).

Beowulf 2714–2715  þæt him on breostrum bealonde weoll attor on innan. Da se ædeling giong
Andreas 768–770  geond beorna breost, brandhata nið weoll on gewitte, weorm blædum fag, attor ælfæle. Þær orcnawe wearð

Beowulf 2716–2718  þæt he bi wealle wishycgende gesæt on sesse; seah on enta geweorc, hu ða stanbogan stapulum fieste
Andreas 1487–95  grimra guða. Hwæðre git sceolon lytlum sticcum leodworda dæl furður recan. Þæt is fyrsægen, hu he weorna feala wita gedolede, heardra hilda, in þære hæðenan byrig. He be wealle geseah wundrum fieste under sæ; wage sweras unlytle, stapulas standan, storme bedrifene, eald enta geweorc. He wið ane þæra

Beowulf 2732  lice gelenge ic ðas leode heold
Andreas 1474  lie|e| gelenge ne laðes dæl

Cluster X

19 lines: dbl. allit. 11 (58% / 47%); 12 compounds (1.58 / 3.52).

Beowulf 2879  ofer min gemet mæges helpan
Andreas 1481  ofer min gemet mycel is to secganne

Beowulf 2882  weoll of gewitte wergendra to lyt
Andreas 769  weoll on gewitte, weorm blædum fag

Beowulf 2890  domleasan dæd deað bið sella
Andreas 995  druron domlease deaðraes forfeng

Cumulative Average of Prosodic Features:

207 lines
123 Double Alliterating Lines (59.4%)
107 Compounds (one every 1.93 lines)
Median Per Cluster

Double Alliteration: 61.1%
Compounds: one every 1.97 lines.
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