Architecture as Authoritative Reader: Splitting Stones in *Andreas* and *Christ III*

Hannah Bailey

A patristic trope which appears in a number of texts that were known in Anglo-Saxon England contrasts the hard-heartedness of man to the perceptiveness and responsiveness of insensate created things. For example, a story related in the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great concerns a flood that affected the lands belonging to a church: the bishop, Sabinus, orders his deacon to instruct the flood to recede in his name, but the deacon just laughs; Sabinus then writes the command and sends his servant to cast the written message into the flood waters, which immediately obey and recede. Gregory concludes the story by asking (in the words of the Old English translation):

> In þære wisan, Petrus, hwæt oðres magon we ongytan, buton þæt þær wæs onscynded manna heortena heardnes & heora unhyrsumnes, þa þæt unandgytfulle gesceaft þæs wætres wæs hyrende þam halgan were in his mægne?[1]
>
> In that manner, Peter, what else may we understand, except that there was put to shame the hardness of the hearts of men and their disobedience, when that unintelligent creation, the water, was obedient to the holy man in his power?

The Old English poems *Andreas* and *Christ III* both make use of a specific subset of this trope, contrasting the blindness of the Jews who failed to acknowledge Christ with the perceptiveness of created things that miraculously display their understanding of Christ's divinity. Both poems include architectural features among the natural 'unintelligent creation' that miraculously responds to Christ, and both poems invest these miracles with an eschatological subtext beyond anything present in their source material. In their treatment of architectural features, both poems engage with patristic discourses on the (First and Second) Temple to a far greater extent than their sources or analogues, particularly with symbolism relating to the extension of God's covenant to Gentile peoples and to apostleship and teaching. This may be understood as part of the legacy of Bede's fascination with the Temple and Tabernacle, which has been discussed by Conor O'Brien:

[1] Book 3 Chapter 10 of *Bischof Waerferths von Worcester Uebersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*, ed. by Hans Hecht, Bibliothek Angelsächsischen Prosa, 5, 2 vols (Leipzig: Wigand, 1900–07), I, 194, ll. 5–8. The Old English is faithful to the Latin here (Book III Chapter 10 of *Grégoire le Grand: Dialogues*, ed. by Adalbert de Vogüé, trans. by Paul Antin, Sources Chrétiennes 251, 260, 265, 3 vols (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978–80), sc, 289–90). Translations of Old English texts are my own unless otherwise specified. Diacritics and typographical

> No previous Christian author devoted the same degree of sustained focus to the image as Bede did; unsurprisingly, his works on the topic were to prove influential in England and throughout Europe long after his own time.[2]

Where the poems differ from one another in their treatment of this trope is that whereas *Christ III* simply folds architecture into the same category as natural features such as rocks and seas on the basis that it is similarly inanimate and insensate, *Andreas* uses the ambiguity of architectural features being simultaneously the creation of God and the creation of man to comment on the danger of exclusively literalist approaches to textual interpretation and to demonstrate how the creative works of man can be animated by God's will to a deeper meaning than their human authors intended.

Christ III, a Doomsday poem which draws directly or indirectly on a wide range of biblical and patristic sources, is the last in the series of three poems about Christ which appear at the beginning of the Exeter Book. *Andreas*, which tells the story of the Apostle Andrew's mission to rescue Matthew and convert the Mermedonian cannibals, is recorded in the Vercelli Book.[3] The immediate source for *Andreas* is unknown, but certain prose narratives of the Acts of Andrew in Greek, Latin, and Old English are close analogues to the poem.[4] The most significant way in which *Andreas* differs from its analogues is in the degree to which it emphasizes narrative parallels — both across different sections of the poem and between the poem and other texts. The *Andreas* poet develops and signals typological readings that are only passing or implicit in the analogues, as well as adding new scriptural references.[5]

As is the case with most Old English poetry, we have no absolute date of composition for either *Andreas* or *Christ III*, though Richard North and Michael Bintley have recently made a case that *Andreas* was composed between 888 and 893, under the patronage of King Alfred.[6] Even in the absence of exact verifiable dates it is possible to suggest a relative

markers of emendation are silently omitted.

2 Conor O'Brien, *Bede's Temple: An Image and its Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 3. See also his article above.

3 In the poem, the form of the name 'Andrew' used is 'Andreas'. I use 'Andreas' in all subsequent references to the character in the Old English poem, but 'Andrew' when discussing other texts.

4 These are translated in *The Acts of Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals: Translations from the Greek, Latin, and Old English*, trans. by Robert Boenig (London: Garland, 1991).

5 Scholarship on this subject includes: Thomas D. Hill, 'Figural Narrative in Andreas: The Conversion of the Mermedonians', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 70 (1969), 261–72; Joseph Trahern, 'Joshua and Tobias in the Old English Andreas', *Studia Neophilologica*, 42 (1970), 330–32; Penn R. Szittya, 'The Living Stone and the Patriarchs: Typological Imagery in Andreas, lines 706–810', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 72 (1973), 167–74; John Casteen, 'Andreas: Mermedonian Cannibalism and Figural Narration', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 75 (1974), 74–78; Constance B. Hieatt, 'The Harrowing of Mermedonia: Typological Patterns in the Old English "Andreas"', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 77 (1976), 49–62; Marie Michelle Walsh, 'The Baptismal Flood in the OE "Andreas": Liturgical and Typological Depths', *Traditio*, 33 (1977), 137–58; James W. Earl, 'The Typological Structure of Andreas', in *Old English Literature in Context*, ed. by John D. Niles (Cambridge: Brewer, 1980), pp. 66–89; Lisa J. Kiser, 'Andreas and the Lifes Weg: Convention and Innovation in Old English Metaphor', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 85 (1984), 65–75; Frederick M. Biggs, 'The Passion of Andreas: Andreas 1398–1491', *Studies in Philology*, 85 (1988), 413–27; Robert Boenig, *Saint and Hero: Andreas and Medieval Doctrine* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1991); Daniel Anlezark, *Water and Fire: The Myth of the Flood in Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 210–40, 346–67; Shannon Godlove, 'Bodies as Borders: Cannibalism and Conversion in the Old English Andreas', *Studies in Philology*, 106 (2009), 137–60; Alexandra Bolintineanu, 'The Land of Mermedonia in the Old English Andreas', *Neophilologus*, 93 (2009), 149–64.

6 *Andreas: An Edition*, ed. by Richard North and Michael D. J. Bintely (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016), pp. 97–115.

chronology of the two poems. Colin Chase has argued that Cynewulf wrote *Christ II* as a bridge linking the poems *Christ I* and *Christ III*; if this is correct, *Christ III* must have been written before or during Cynewulf's lifetime.[7] *Andreas*, on the other hand, must have been written during or after Cynewulf's lifetime. Andy Orchard has argued that *Andreas* borrows language from the poems of Cynewulf, including *Christ II*;[8] North and Bintley propose additional allusions to the works of Cynewulf, and also discuss the metrical evidence that supports this chronology.[9] Even allowing for the slim possibility that all three poets were more or less exactly contemporaneous, the balance of probabilities is that *Christ III* was written before *Andreas*.

Whether the *Andreas* poet had knowledge of *Christ III* cannot be determined on the current evidence, but there are a handful of compounds and half-lines that appear either uniquely in these two poems or in these two poems and one other: the compounds *hellfus* and *þeodbealu* are unique to these two poems, *æþelcyning* and *modblind* to these two poems and *Elene* (which is by Cynewulf), *swegeldream* to these two poems and *Guthlac B* (which may be by Cynewulf), and *heafodgim* to these two poems and *Maxims I*.[10] Kenneth R. Brooks notes a handful of similarities of lexis or phrasing between *Andreas* and *Christ III*, of which the most striking is the resemblance between *Andreas*, ll. 33–34, and *Christ III*, ll. 1437–38:

> Syððan him geblendan bitere tosomne
> dryas þurh gedwolcræft drync unheorne[11]
>
> Afterwards magicians bitterly mixed together a horrible drink for them through sorcery.
>
> Swylce hi me geblendan bittre tosomne
> unswetne drync ecedes ond geallan.[12]
>
> So they bitterly mixed together an unsweet drink for me of vinegar and gall.

Bitere does double duty in these passages — strictly speaking, it qualifies the intentions of the mixers, but it may also suggest a quality of the mixture. While anything that causes harm can be described as 'bitter' in Old English verse (as Paul Battles has pointed out), the primary literal meaning of the word nevertheless is the quality of taste.[13] Edward B. Irving identifies

[7] Colin Chase, 'God's Presence through Grace as the Theme of Cynewulf's *Christ II* and the Relation of this Theme to *Christ I* and *Christ III*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3 (1974), 87–101. R. D. Fulk puts the composition of *Christ III* at 'a relatively early date, perhaps in the same period as the "Caedmonian" poems' on metrical grounds. R. D. Fulk, *A History of Old English Meter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), p. 399.

[8] See Andy Orchard, 'Both Style and Substance: The Case for Cynewulf', in *Anglo-Saxon Style*, ed. by Catherine E. Karkov and George Hardin Brown (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), pp. 271–305 and '*The Dream of the Rood*: Cross-References', in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. by Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), pp. 225–53.

[9] *Andreas*, ed. by North and Bintley, pp. 58–62, 98.

[10] *Hellfus* ('bound for hell'): *Andreas* 50a, *Christ III* 1123a; *þeodbealu* ('grievous ill'): *Andreas* 1136a, *Christ III* 1267a; *æþelcyning* ('noble king'): *Andreas* 1679a, *Christ III* 906a, *Elene* 219a; *modblind* ('spiritually blind'): *Andreas* 814a; *Christ III* 1187a, *Elene* 306a; *swegeldream* ('heavenly joy'): *Andreas* 720a, *Christ III* 1348a, *Guthlac B* 1125a; *heafodgim* ('jewels of the head'): *Andreas* 31b, *Christ III* 1330a, *Maxims I* 44a. I am grateful to Andy Orchard for drawing my attention to these compounds.

[11] Quotations of *Andreas* are from *Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles*, ed. by Kenneth R. Brooks (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961). On comparisons to *Christ III* see Brooks' notes on ll. 33, 43, 552, 616, 661, 792, 810, 968–69, 1145, 1169, 1171, 1380, 1436.

[12] Quotations of *Christ III* are from *The Christ of Cynewulf*, ed. by Albert S. Cook (Boston: The Athenæum Press, 1909).

[13] Paul Battles, 'Dying for a Drink: "Sleeping after the Feast" Scenes in *Beowulf*, *Andreas*, and the Old English Poetic Tradition', *Modern Philology*, 112 (2015), 435–57.

a Latin sermon attributed to Caesarius of Arles as the immediate source of both *Christ III* ll. 1379–1523 and a portion of Vercelli Homily XIII.[14] The words spoken by Christ in both the poem and the sermon allude to Matthew 27.34, where Christ is offered vinegar and gall while dying on the cross. In *Andreas*, the bitterly mixed drink is the potion the Mermedonians give to their captives to make them behave like cattle. Neither the Latin or Greek analogues to *Andreas* mentions mixing or blending in relation to the potion, and more importantly, none of the analogues (including the Old English prose) uses lexis of bitterness. If the *Andreas* poet's description of the magicians mixing a bitter drink does borrow language from *Christ III*'s description of Christ's suffering, the implication is that Matthew's suffering is like Christ's, and the Mermedonians are like the people who crucified Him; this would be entirely in keeping with the typological programme of the poem. If the parallels between the poems do not constitute sufficient evidence in themselves to argue for direct borrowing, they at least suggest that *Christ III* and *Andreas* belong to closely related literary traditions.

Christ III: Mute Creation

The section of *Christ III* which has the most in common with *Andreas* is Fitt XIII, which runs from l. 1081 to l. 1198. This section contrasts the blindness of sinful men with the perceptiveness of mute created things, which mourned Christ at the Crucifixion. In Fitt XIII, a temporal shift from the Crucifixion to end times is facilitated by a metaphor that conflates the Jews who crucified Christ with sinful men who denied Christ in their thoughts and so (figuratively) placed the crown of thorns on his head. The Fitt describes how at the end of time these sinful men will be able to see 'open, orgete' ('openly, clearly', l. 1116a) that Christ suffered for mankind. Albert Cook draws attention to the appearance of an identical half-line at l. 759a in *Andreas*, in a scene (discussed in more detail below) where a statue in the Jewish temple that Christ calls to life addresses the priests and tells them that they *should* be able to 'open, orgete' ('openly, clearly') see the divinity of Christ (though in fact they will not perceive it until Judgement Day).[15] The Jews are referred to in this section of *Christ III* as 'modblinde menn' ('spiritually blind men', l. 1187a); the same phrase is applied to the Jews in *Andreas* (l. 814a). (The compound *modblind* is also applied to the Jews in its only other appearance in the corpus: Cynewulf's *Elene*, l. 306.)

The label that *Christ III* applies to the things that respond to Christ when the Jews do not is 'dumban gesceaft' ('mute creation', l. 1127b). The items grouped into this category are nearly all things we might categorize as 'nature' today — the list includes the sun, the earth, the sea, stars, stones, and trees. However, there are also architectural features included under the heading 'dumban gesceaft': walls, and the veil of the Temple. They are inanimate and mute, so they are counted in the same category as earth and stones and trees, regardless of human moulding of them. The veil is described in more detail than the walls; it is referred to as 'godwebba cyst' ('best of costly fabrics' l. 1134b), but also by the unique metaphor 'temples segl' ('sail of the Temple', l. 1138).[16] Between the veil and the walls, *Christ III* spends nine and

[14] Edward B. Irving, Jr., 'Latin Prose Sources for Old English Verse', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 56 (1957), 588–95 (p. 594).

[15] *The Christ of Cynewulf*, ed. by Cook, p. 195.

[16] See Megan Cavell, 'Sails, Veils, and Tents: The *Segl* and Tabernacle of Old English *Christ III* and *Exodus*', in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles 12*, ed. by Robin Netherton and Gail R. Owen-Crocker (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), pp. 27–39.

a half sequential lines discussing architectural features under the heading 'dumban gesceaft' (ll. 1133b–42a):

> Þa sio þeod geseah
> in Hierusalem godwebba cyst,
> þæt ær ðam halgan huse sceolde
> to weorþunga weorud sceawian,
> ufan eall forbærst, þæt hit on eorþan læg
> on twam styccum. Þæs temples segl,
> wundorbleom geworht to wlite þæs huses,
> sylf slat on tu, swylce hit seaxes ecg
> scearp þurhwode. Scire burstan
> muras ond stanas, monige æfter foldan.[17]
>
> Then in Jerusalem the people saw the best of precious cloths, which previously the troop had to examine reverently in the holy house, burst all apart from above so that it lay on the earth in two pieces. The sail of the temple, wrought with wondrous colour to the beauty of that house, itself slit in two, as though the sharp edge of a knife sliced through it. Brightly burst walls and stones, many throughout the earth.

The primary source-text behind Fitt XIII of *Christ III* has long been known to be Pope Gregory's *Homilia X in Evangelia*. In this homily, Gregory catalogues various ways that nature showed its understanding of Christ's divinity through miracles that occurred throughout Christ's life and at the Crucifixion:

> Deum hunc caeli esse cognoverunt, quia protinus stellam miserunt. Mare cognouit, quia sub plantis eius se calcabile praebuit. Terra cognouit, quia eo moriente contremuit. Sol cognovit, quia lucis suae radios abscondit. Saxa et parietes cognoverunt, quia tempore mortis eius scissa sunt. Infernus agnouit, quia hos quos tenebat mortuos reddidit.[18]
>
> The heavens knew He was God, for they sent a star immediately; the sea knew, for it offered itself for His feet to tread on; the earth knew, for it trembled when He died; the sun knew, for it hid the rays of its light; the walls and stones knew, for they were rent at the time of His death; and hell knew, for it surrendered the dead in its possession.[19]

The *Christ III* poet borrows Gregory's list but shifts the temporal focus firmly onto the Crucifixion, while also emphasizing miracles from that time that prefigure the signs of Judgement Day. For example, the poet takes Gregory's allusion to the Star of Bethlehem and embeds the reference within a description of the dimming of the stars at the Crucifixion, which prefigures the fall of the stars at end times (ll. 1147–52a):

> Ge on stede scynum steorran forleton
> hyra swæsne wlite. On þa sylfan tid
> heofon hluttre ongeat hwa hine healice
> torhtne getremede tungolgimmum;

[17] Here I follow Mary Clayton's punctuation of this passage rather than Cook's. *Old English Poems of Christ and His Saints*, ed. and trans. by Mary Clayton, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), pp. 51–52 (ll. 267–76 by her numbering).

[18] Gregory, *Homilia X: Lectio Sancti Euangelii Secundum Matthaeum*, in *Gregorius Magnus. Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. by Raymond Étaix, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 141 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), pp. 65–72 (ll. 25–30).

[19] Translation from *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry: The Major Latin Texts in Translation*, trans. by

> forþon he his bodan sende þa wæs geboren ærest
> gesceafta scir Cyning.
>
> And shining in their place, the stars gave up their sweet beauty. At that same time, heaven clearly recognized who trimmed it on high, bright with star-gems, for it sent his messenger, when the bright king of creation was first born.

The poet also adds to the list three further items that were not in the homily: the rending of the veil of the (Second) Temple, bodily resurrection, and bleeding trees. The rending of the veil of the Temple is derived from Matthew's account of the Crucifixion (Matthew 27.51), while the bleeding trees may derive ultimately from the apocryphal Apocalypse of Ezra (2 Esdras), where they are a sign of end times.[20] Bodily resurrection is the link between the two images. Like the bleeding trees, the rising of the dead features in the Apocalypse of Ezra, but in the context in which the poet employs the image it works simultaneously as an allusion to the resurrection of holy people at the Crucifixion as described in Matthew 27.51–53:

> [51] et ecce velum templi scissum est in duas partes a summo usque deorsum Et terra mota est et petrae scissae sunt [52] et monumenta aperta sunt et multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierant surrexerunt [53] et exeuntes de monumentis post resurrectionem eius venerunt in sanctam civitatem et apparuerunt multis.
>
> [51] and, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in two from the top even to the bottom; and the earth quaked and the rocks were rent. [52] And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints that had slept arose, [53] And, coming out of the tombs after his resurrection, came into the holy city and appeared to many.

The poet's addition of the rending of the veil to Gregory's list is probably inspired in part by the proximity of the image to the splitting of stones and the waking of the dead in Matthew 27, but also in part by Gregory's statement that the Jews do not wish to 'scindi' ('be rent apart') for the sake of repentance. The introduction of the rending of the veil within a section of the poem that uses the Jews to illustrate the difficulty and necessity of perceiving spiritual truths also suggests that the poet is familiar with the commentary tradition which interprets the rending of the veil as signifying the passing from the Old Law to the New: because the Jews have failed to understand the prophetic and spiritual truths in their secret and sacred texts, those texts are now opened up and made available to anyone who can read them spiritually. Jerome discusses this in his commentary on Matthew: 'Velum templi scissum est et omnia legis sacramenta quae prius tegebantur prodita sunt atque at gentilium populum transierunt' ('The curtain of the Temple was torn, and all the mysteries of the Law that were previously woven together were made known and passed to the Gentile people').[21]

This is a reading that was known in Anglo-Saxon England; it was taken up by Bede in his commentary on Luke.[22] Michael Lapidge counts three surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscripts

Michael J. B. Allen and Daniel G. Calder (Cambridge: Brewer, 1976), p. 99.

[20] Frederick M. Biggs, 'The Sources of *Christ III*: A Revision of Cook's Notes', *Old English Newsletter Subsidia*, 12 (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1986), p. 24.

[21] Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum Libri IV*, IV, in *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri opera. Pars I: opera exegetica, 7*, ed. by D. Hurst and M. Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 77 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1969), p. 275. Translation from *Commentary on Matthew*, trans. by Thomas P. Scheck (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), p. 320.

[22] Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, VI, in *Bedae Venerabilis opera. Pars II: opera exegetica, 3*, ed. by D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 120 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1960), pp. 1–425 (pp. 406–07). I am grateful to Conor O'Brien for bringing Bede's use of Jerome to my attention.

that contain Jerome's commentary on Matthew, plus one surviving manuscript likely to be connected to the Anglo-Saxon missions on the Continent, and notes clear allusions to the commentary on Matthew in the writing of Theodore/Hadrian, Aldhelm, Bede, Ælfric, and Byrhtferth.[23]

Christ III takes this notion — that the rending of the veil signifies that the Jews were poor 'readers' of Christ's divinity, and so also of scripture — and builds upon it by characterising the veil as a good reader. This not only expressed through the inclusion of the veil among the 'dumban gesceaft' that responded to Christ when 'modblinde men' did not, but by the reversal of agency in the Old English text: whereas the Vulgate says that the veil 'scissum est' ('was torn'), the Old English says that the veil 'sylf slat on tu' ('itself slit in two', l. 1140a). The shift from a passive construction to an active construction transforms the miracle of the rending of the veil from an effect of Christ's death to the veil's active response to it.

Gregory mentions walls incidentally, in the expression 'saxa et parietes' ('stones and walls'), and says nothing about them that does not apply just as well to raw stone; when Ælfric borrows the passage from Gregory, he uses only the word 'stanas' ('stones') and omits any reference to walls.[24] The fact that *Christ III* retains the reference to walls when translating 'saxa et parietes' isn't significant in itself, but the poet gives the word new connotations through its context and position. The placement of the description of the rending of the veil immediately before the line about splitting stones suggests that the poet has interpreted Gregory's 'saxa et parietes' as an allusion to Matthew 27.51 (as Cook notes).[25] However, there is more going on than the reference to Matthew in ll. 1141b–43a. The manner in which the poet alters the context and order of Gregory's 'saxa et parietes' transforms the function of the walls in this passage from a near-synonym for 'stones' to an allusion to the destruction of the Temple. There is no equivalent to the word 'scire' in the Gregory or Matthew. Cook suggests that in this context 'scire', which normally means 'clear, bright', or 'clearly, brightly', could be read as 'entirely', but there is no need for an alternative definition here; brightness is a common poetic shorthand for themes of sanctity and covenant.[26] If 'scire' is the adverb, the phrase conveys that the walls and rocks are breaking in a holy manner; if it is the adjective, 'scire burstan muras' can be read connotatively as 'holy walls burst'. The impact of these words is amplified by the poet's inversion of Gregory's 'stones and walls' to 'walls and stones': when seven and a half lines on the rending of the Temple veil are followed (with no punctuation or extra spacing in the MS that might signal a change in subject matter or even a new sentence) by the words 'scire burstan muras', the initial impression is that the walls in question are the walls of the Temple. Even if a reader or listener adjusts and widens their interpretation of the walls as they encounter the phrase 'monige æfter foldan', this does not negate the initial impact.[27] This could be taken as a (slightly anachronistic) reference to the later destruction of the Temple (predicted, for example, in Matthew 24.1–2). However, given the Fitt's themes of the access and responses the Jews and Gentiles have to Christ, it may be that this is intended as an allusion to Ephesians 2.14, in which the overthrow of the Old Law and the Gentiles' new access to God through

[23] Michael Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 314.

[24] 'VII Idvs Ianvarii Epiphania Domini', in *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, ed. by Peter Clemoes, Early English Text Society, s. s., 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 235, ll. 92–104.

[25] *Christ of Cynewulf*, ed. by Cook, p. 197.

[26] *Christ of Cynewulf*, ed. by Cook, p. 275.

[27] For an example of wordplay which causes a similar reorientation, see Susan Irvine, 'Adam or Christ? A Pronominal Pun in *The Dream of the Rood*', *Review of English Studies*, 48 (1997), 433–47.

Christ is expressed as Christ's tearing down the 'medium parietem maceriae' ('middle wall of partition') which is understood (as O'Brien notes) as a reference to 'the barrier separating the court of the gentiles from the rest of the Temple complex'.[28]

The references to the Temple in this Fitt develop the poet's themes through complex scriptural allusion, but the premise on which they are included is simple: architecture is nature. It is insensate creation that nevertheless demonstrates perception and agency. Architectural lexis is employed once more towards the end of Fitt XIII. The poet is no longer following Gregory closely at this point, but underscores the irony of the homily's central trope by contrasting the 'frod gewit' ('wise understanding') that humankind possesses with the 'ferðgewit' ('spiritual understanding') that 'deade gesceaft' ('lifeless creation') lacks (ll. 1176b–86a):

> Þæt asecgan ne magun
> foldbuende þurh frod gewit,
> hu fela þa onfundun þa gefelan ne magun
> Dryhtnes þrowinga, deade gesceafte.
> Þa þe æþelast sind eorðan gecynda,
> ond heofones eac heahgetimbro, —
> eall fore þam anum unrot gewearð,
> forht afongen. Þeah hi ferðgewit
> of hyra æþelum ænig ne cuþen,
> wendon swa-þeah wundrum, þa hyra Waldend for
> of lichoman.
>
> Earth-dwellers cannot say, through wise understanding, how much lifeless creation, which cannot feel, then experienced the Lord's suffering. Those of earth who are of the noblest kind, and the high-structures of heaven also, all became sorrowful, gripped by fear, before that one alone. Though they did not know any spiritual understanding by their nature, nevertheless they miraculously perceived when their ruler left his body.

The compound *heahgetimbru* literally means 'high buildings' or 'the high-built things', but as I have argued elsewhere, its referent is always the heavens.[29] The term figures heaven as a physical, created space, that is literally up. It refers to an architecture of celestial bodies, not the community of the saved, and it is used in l. 1181b to underscore that this reference to heaven is not a metonym for saints or angels — these lines are about the noblest *things* in heaven (i.e., the sun and stars), not the noblest *beings* in heaven. The application of architectural lexis to designate something that is self-evidently not made by human hands also underscores the poet's indifference to the artificiality of architecture. The Temple is 'dumban gesceaft', and heavenly architecture is 'deade gesceafte' ('lifeless creation', l. 1179). They are both the creation of God, each as much as the other.

[28] O'Brien, *Bede's Temple*, p. 35. The architectural imagery of Ephesians 2.14 is developed further a few verses on (Ephesians 2.20), in the metaphor of Christ as the cornerstone and the apostles and prophets as the foundation of a new temple.

[29] Hannah M. Bailey, '*Heahgetimbru*: A Reassessment of *Christ III* ll. 972–976', *Notes and Queries*, n. s., 63 (2016), 346–51.

Andreas and the Temple

Like *Christ III*, *Andreas* engages with discourses of the Temple in its development of scriptural allusions. Where *Andreas* differs from *Christ III* is in its self-conscious commentary on the process of revising source texts so as to draw out such allusions and typological meaning. The *Andreas* poet uses the architectural features in the narrative to comment on textual production.

While Andreas and his followers are travelling by boat to Mermedonia to rescue Matthew from the cannibals' prison, Andreas tells the Ship's Captain (who the reader knows is Christ in disguise, though Andreas is prevented from perceiving this) stories about Christ's miracles. More particularly — and ironically, given Andreas' failure to recognize his interlocutor — Andreas tells him about the Jews' failure to recognize Christ's divinity despite witnessing these miracles. This episode forms the core of a series of parallels that equate the cannibalistic Mermedonians, with their excessive literalism and strict dietary rules, with the unbelieving Jews.[30]

Human beings repeatedly fail as 'readers' of Christ in this poem — the Jews fail to recognize Christ's divinity, the Mermedonians fail to recognize that Andreas is the servant of Christ, and Andreas fails to recognize Christ while engaged in a prolonged conversation with him. Nature, by contrast, repeatedly demonstrates that it understands that Andreas is the servant of Christ: the blood Andreas sheds while being tortured by the Mermedonians becomes blooming trees (ll. 1448–49), and the stormy seas grow calm because they recognize that Andreas is the servant of Christ (ll. 534b–35a).

Architectural features also respond positively to Andreas and to Christ. The poem contrasts the disbelief of the Jews with the swift obedience of a statue of a seraph in the Jewish temple, and later contrasts the disbelief of the Mermedonians with the swift obedience of a stone pillar in the Mermedonians prison. In both episodes, a stone architectural feature which should not be able to see, hear, or speak, demonstrates that it has superior understanding to men who have eyes and ears but do not believe.

The story of the statue is related by Andreas, who tells the Ship's Captain that the Jewish priests did not believe that Christ was the son of God, but insisted on interpreting his lineage literally — to them, he was the son of Mary and Joseph, and nothing more (ll. 676–91). Andreas says that Christ returned to the temple, where he commanded a statue of a seraph to come to life in order to preach to the assembled priests and then fetch the resurrected patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to corroborate its message (ll. 706–810). References to the blindness of the priests who fail to believe form an envelope pattern enclosing most of the episode. When he begins his narrative, Andreas says that the sinful men did not accept Christ's teaching 'þeah he soðra swa feala | tacna gecyðde þær hie to segon' ('though he revealed so many true signs in their sight' ll. 710b–11), and at the end he reiterates the same idea (ll. 811–15a):

> Nu ðu miht gehyran, hyse leofesta,
> hu he wundra worn wordum cyðde,
> swa þeah ne gelyfdon larum sinum
> modblinde menn.

[30] Many of these parallels were first catalogued by Hieatt in 'The Harrowing of Mermedonia'. See also Earl, 'Typological Structure', p. 73, and David Hamilton, 'The Diet and Digestion of Allegory in *Andreas*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1 (1972), 147–58 (p. 149).

> Now you may hear, dearest of men, how he revealed a multitude of wonders with words, although spiritually-blind men did not believe his teachings.

The inanimacy of the statue before it springs to life is emphasized by repeated references to the human craftsmanship that brought it into being: it is a 'wrætlice wundor agræfene' ('marvelously carved wonder', l. 712), an 'anlicnesse' ('likeness', l. 713a), 'torhte gefrætwed' ('brightly adorned', l. 715b), 'wlitige geworhte' ('beautifully wrought', 716a), a 'hiw' ('form' or 'shape', l. 725a) that is 'amearcod […] þurh hand-mægen' ('marked' or 'depicted' [...] 'by hand-power', ll. 724b, 725b), and 'awriten' ('written', l. 726a). Penn R. Szittya observes that once the seraph statue comes to life, it is no longer referred to as a seraph or angel or statue, but only as 'stan' ('stone'), and argues that this creates new typological resonances by engaging with the motif of the Church as 'living stone'.[31] It also introduces the motif of splitting stone. When the statue comes to life, it 'of wealle ahleop' ('leapt off the wall', l. 736b), 'stan fram stane' ('stone from stone', l. 738a). This should not be taken as the graceful leaping down from a pedestal of a free-standing form. The stone sculpture an Anglo-Saxon poet or reader is likely to have been familiar with would primarily be relief carving; until that moment, wall and statue would have been one and the same stone.[32] This is a violent rending apart like the rocks splitting at the Crucifixion.

In the analogues, the statue that leaps down from the wall of the temple is not a seraph but a sphynx. Technically, the seraphim are an anachronism — the temple in the narrative would have to be the Second Temple, not the First Temple of Solomon, which featured carvings of seraphim. The conflation of the temples may be accidental or deliberate, but the effect is the same; the poet's replacement of the sphynx with a seraph multiplies the potential for typological reading, as Szittya has explained:

> The poet's change of the traditional sphinxes to Christian angels transforms an otherwise merely fantastic description into a typologically significant allusion to Solomon's temple, the Temple of the Old Law. […] The Temple of the Old Law [is] a figure for the Church of the New Law, which in turn is a figure for the Celestial Church.[33]

In fact, the seraph in itself invokes these relationships between the Old Law and the New in ways that have not previously been acknowledged. The poet does not specify how many seraph statues there are, though the phrase 'on twa healfe' ('on either side', l. 715a) certainly makes it clear that there is more than one. It is likely that the poet and the poem's original audience would have understood implicitly that seraphim come in sets of two. Thomas Ohlgren identifies the six-winged angels in six illuminations and one jewelled binding of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts as seraphim; in every instance they appear in pairs.[34] It can be difficult to distinguish seraphim from other orders of angels, particularly cherubim, so these identifications are not certain; Richard Sowerby interprets the six-winged angels on p. 2 of Junius 11 as one cherub and one seraph and it may be that other pairs of angels Ohlgren reads

[31] Szittya, 'Living Stone', p. 172.

[32] For the depiction of angels in Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture, see Richard Sowerby, *Angels in Early Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 50–61 and Warwick Rowdell et al., 'The Lichfield Angel: A Spectacular Anglo-Saxon Painted Sculpture', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 88 (2008), 48–108.

[33] Szittya, 'Living Stone', p. 169.

[34] London, British Library, MS Harley 603, fol. 9^{r}; New York, Pierpont Morgan, MS M. 869, fol. 13^{v}; New York, Pierpont Morgan, MS M. 708, jewelled binding; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11, frontispiece, pp. 2, 17, 66. Thomas H. Olgen, *Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1992).

as two seraphim are also one seraph and one cherub.[35] However, the fact remains that six-winged angels tend to appear in pairs in visual culture, and the distinction between a cherub and a seraph doesn't appear to be important to the *Andreas* poet — the ambiguous slipping between the singular and plural in ll. 717–20 suggests that the poet thinks of them as essentially the same thing:

> Ðis is anlicnes engelcynna
> þæs bremestan þe mid þam burgwarum
> in þære ceastre is; Cheruphim et Seraphim
> þa on swegeldreamum syndon nemned.
>
> This is a likeness of the most illustrious class of angels that is among the inhabitants of that city; there in heavenly joys they are named Cherubim and Seraphim.

In Scripture, seraphim are mentioned by name only in Isaiah. Given Helen Appleton's recent demonstration of the poem's extensive use of imagery from Isaiah (discussed further below),[36] it is highly likely that the poet had Isaiah's vision of two seraphim in mind (Isaiah 6.2): 'Seraphin stabant super illud sex alae uni et sex alae alteri duabus velabant faciem eius et duabus velabant pedes eius et duabus volabant.' ('Upon it stood the seraphims: the one had six wings, and the other had six wings: with two they covered his face, and with two they covered his feet, and with two they flew'). Jerome interprets the two seraphim in Isaiah's vision as embodiments of 'vetus et novum Instrumentum' ('the Old and New Testaments').[37] In *De Templo* Book I, Chapter 13, Bede reads the two carved cherubim in Solomon's Temple (1 Kings 6.23–28) in the same terms; he says that they stand for the Jews and the Gentiles, and for the Old and New Testaments, and says that although there are two, they 'opus unum erat' ('formed one work'), thus signifying the typological relationship between the two Testaments.[38] These are precisely the truths that the statue in *Andreas* is tasked with attempting to demonstrate to the Jewish priests who can't see what the son of Mary and Joseph has to do with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Bede also explains the access the Jews and Gentiles have to the truth of the relationship between the Old Testament and the New in terms that encompass several of the major themes of *Andreas*, including the salvation of Israel at the end of time, the present displacement of the Jews by gentile peoples, and seeing and reading spiritually:

> Omnis Israhel circa finem saeculi saluandus esse credatur, plurimi tamen fidelium huius temporis de gentibus congregantur ad evangelii suscipienda sacramenta quibus hoc etiam diuinitus donatum est ut reuelatis oculis sui cordis manifeste cognoscant litteram ueteris testamenti euangelicae gratiae plenam esse mysteriis.
>
> One may believe that all Israel is to be saved near the end of the world, nevertheless the majority of believers of this age are drawn from the gentiles to receive the mysteries of the Gospel, and to them God has also given this gift, namely, that the eyes of the heart

[35] Sowerby, *Angels in Early Medieval England*, pp. 17–20.

[36] Helen Appleton, 'The Book of Isaiah as an Influence on *Andreas*', *Notes & Queries*, n. s., 62 (2015), 1–6.

[37] Jerome, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Commentariorum in Isaiam Prophetam Libri Duodeviginti*, in *PL*, xxiv, col. 95a.

[38] Bede, *De templo*, I, in *Bedae Venerabilis opera. Pars II: opera exegetica, 2A*, ed. by D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 119A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), pp. 141–234 (esp. pp. 178–83, quotation from p. 182). Translations of *De Templo* are from *Bede: On the Temple*, trans. by Seán Connolly (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995), p. 51.

> have been unveiled so that they can recognize clearly that the letter of the Old Testament is full of the mysteries of the grace of the Gospel.[39]

Constance B. Hieatt first identified a series of lexical and narrative links between the section of the poem where Andreas tells stories from the life of Christ and the section dealing with Andreas' actions in Mermedonia, and demonstrated that these links signal that that Andreas is enacting the role of Christ.[40] Among these is the strong parallel between the scene where Christ addresses the statue and the later scene where Andreas asks a stone pillar in the prison where he is held to pour forth water to flood the city (ll. 1492–1526a). In releasing the flood, the pillar demonstrates its 'ondgitan' ('understanding', l. 1521a) of God. The use of this term also links this watery miracle to another earlier one — the cognate verb, 'ongitan' ('to understand'), appeared earlier in the explanation the Ship's Captain gave Andreas for the quietening of the waves: 'hie ongeton þæt ðe God hæfde | wære bewunden' ('they understood that God had wound protection around you', ll. 534–35a). This understanding displayed by nature and architecture stands in implicit contrast with the blindness of the Mermedonians, who not only fail to acknowledge Andreas' message but are at first literally blind to his presence ('hine nænig gumena ongitan ne mihte, | synfulra geseon'; 'none of the men could perceive him, (none of the) sinful ones (could) see him', ll. 986–87a).

As in the earlier episode with the speaking statue, the poet has made significant changes to details of the scene. In the analogues, St Andrew calls forth a flood from the mouth of a statue, not from a pillar. The alteration allows the poet to draw upon the conventional symbolism of pillars as Christian leaders, including, possibly, the specific symbolism of the pillars of the Temple; Bede says (in Book II, Chapter 18) that the two pillars in the Temple 'apostolos […] et doctores cunctos spiritales significant' ('signify the apostles and all spiritual teachers').[41]

The shift from statue to pillar also emphasises material, rather than form. This not only recalls the patristic motif of insensate creation's responsiveness to Christ, but also facilitates typological connections that are predicated on the poem's emphasis on the pillar's nature as stone: Andreas' words in lines 1509a–19 draw an explicit parallel between the pillar and the stone tablets on which the Ten Commandments were written, and Marie Walsh has argued that the scene also creates a typological link with the rock of Horeb, which released water for the Israelites to drink (Exodus 17.6).[42] Both these Old Testament scenes also specifically feature the *splitting* of stone — Moses splits open the rock of Horeb with his staff and smashes the stone tablets.

[39] Bede, *De Templo*, I, p. 183; *Bede: On the Temple*, trans. by Connolly, p. 52.

[40] Hieatt, 'The Harrowing of Mermedonia'.

[41] Bede, *De Templo*, II, p. 198; *Bede: On the Temple*, trans. by Connolly, p. 74. On pillars as symbols of spiritual leaders, see O'Brien, *Bede's Temple,* p. 35, and Laura Varnam's discussion of later use of this symbolism in her article above. Given that narrative and lexical parallels encourage the equation of the seraph in the temple and the pillar in the prison (as Hieatt has demonstrated), and given that the poet's introduction of references to Joshua and Tobias in this scene seem to signal an 'Old Law/New Law contrast' (as Hieatt has argued), we might also read the ambiguously plural pillars of the Mermedonian prison (ll. 1492–95a) in the light of Bede's reading of the two brazen pillars in the (First) Temple as alluding to the dual mission of preaching to the Jews and to the Gentiles. Hieatt, 'The Harrowing of Mermedonia', p. 50.

[42] Walsh, 'Baptismal Flood', p. 141. Daniel Anlezark has taken this even further, demonstrating that the columns both 'evoke a series of Old Testament types', and contribute to the resonances between this scene and the one leading up to the dragon fight in *Beowulf.* Anlezark, *Water and Fire*, pp. 215, 352.

Andreas: They have eyes, but they see not

Like the veil and walls in *Christ III*, the seraph and pillar in *Andreas* work simultaneously within the discourse of the Temple and within the discourse of nature's responses to Christ. But unlike the walls and Temple veil in *Christ III*, the statue and pillar in *Andreas* are not 'mute creation'; they speak. The statue literally preaches, and Waugh has written persuasively about the stone pillar in Mermedonia as a speaker. Drawing on the common analogy of bodies and buildings in Old English texts, she interprets the flood that emanates from the pillar as analogous to speech, and sees the flood not only as an enactment of Old Testament justice but as a speaking aloud of that text.[43] However, the pillar is not only reading in the sense of 'giving voice to a text' but in the sense of 'interpreting'. Andreas asks the stone pillar to remember that it was a stone on which God 'ryhte æ | getacnode on tyn wordum' ('betokened his righteous law in ten statements', ll. 1511b–12). The verb *(ge)tacnian* is used here in the relatively uncommon sense of 'make a mark on a material object'.[44] There are only a handful of occurrences of any sense of this verb in poetry (this is the only time it occurs in *Andreas*), but it is often employed in prose in discussions of figural — especially typological — signification. The poet may be deliberately drawing upon the lexis of typological reading because Andreas' address to the stone effectively asks the stone itself to think in typological terms. In this, the poem is distinct from its analogues. In the Latin *Casanatensis*, Andreas simply makes the sign of the cross and the statue obeys. The Greek *Praxeis* version does allude to the Ten Commandments as an example proving that a stone is not unworthy to praise God, but there Andrew does not ask the statue to demonstrate memory, recognition, or understanding — only to obey, out of fear of the Cross.[45] The pillar in *Andreas* is not vaguely fearful, sorrowful, or perceptive of Christ's suffering of God like the 'dumban gesceaft' of *Christ III*, but specifically presented as a capable typological reader. It is tasked with recognizing precisely the connections between Andreas and Moses that the poet is guiding the reader towards.

These scenes that contrast the blindness of unbelieving humans with the perceptiveness of nature and architecture are components of the poem's larger exploration of the paradoxes of sighted people being blind and blind people seeing. (Andreas has nothing wrong with his eyes, but he fails to recognize Christ; Matthew is physically blinded by the Mermedonians, but spiritually the most clear-sighted character in the poem.) The theme of blindness in *Andreas* has frequently been remarked upon, often to relate the Mermedonians' physical blinding of their enemies to their own spiritual blindness, or in relation to the parallels the poet constructs between the Mermedonians and the Jews.[46]

However, it has not been noted previously that the poet's treatment of the Mermedonians and their Jewish counterparts is governed to a considerable extent by engagement with a specific motif drawn from Scripture: 'oculos habent et non videbunt' ('they have eyes, but they see not', Psalm 134.16). This motif appears several times in Scripture: twice in the Psalms, four times in three books of the Latter Prophets, and twice in the Gospels. In Psalms 113 and

[43] Waugh, 'City as Speaker', esp. pp. 260 and 264.

[44] See T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921), s.v. *getácnian* I.1.

[45] *Acts of Andrew*, trans. by Boenig, pp. 51 and 20.

[46] Most recently by Godlove, 'Bodies as Borders'. Some other approaches to blindness include Hieatt's commentary on the purpose of the allusion to Tobias in l. 1516b ('Harrowing of Mermedonia', p. 51), and Kiser's commentary on the connections between Andreas' concealed approach along the road to Mermedonia, Isaiah 42.16, and Jerome's commentary on Isaiah ('Lifes Weg', pp. 69–70).

134 it is the idols of the Gentiles, and by extension, the Gentiles themselves, who have eyes but see not. Psalm 113 reads:

> [12] simulacra gentium argentum et aurum, opera manuum hominum [13] os habent et non loquentur oculos habent et non videbunt [14] aures habent et non audient nares habent et non odorabuntur [15] manus habent et non palpabunt pedes habent et non ambulabunt non clamabunt in gutture suo [16] similes illis fiant qui faciunt ea et omnes qui confidunt in eis.
>
> [12] The idols of the Gentiles are silver and gold, the works of the hands of men. [13] They have mouths and speak not: they have eyes and see not. [14] They have ears and hear not; they have noses and smell not. [15] They have hands and feel not: they have feet and walk not: neither shall they cry out through their throat. [16] Let them that make them become like unto them: and all such as trust in them.[47]

In Isaiah 6.10 and 42.20, Jeremiah 5.21, and Ezekiel 12.2 the motif is repurposed as criticism of the Israelites, who are implicitly compared to the Gentiles and their idols. Jeremiah 5, for example, reads: '[20] adnuntiate hoc domui Iacob et auditum facite in Iuda, dicentes [21] audi, populus stulte, qui non habes cor qui habentes oculos non videtis et aures et non auditis' ([20] Declare ye this to the house of Jacob and publish it in Juda, saying: [21] Hear, O foolish people, and without understanding: who have eyes and see not, and ears and hear not'). In Mark 8, the motif is again repurposed as a criticism of the apostles. Mark 8.1–9 recounts the miracle of the loaves and fishes. The verses that follow relate how the disciples found they had only one loaf in their boat during a journey they took shortly afterwards. Jesus rebukes the disciples for becoming anxious over the shortage of bread:

> [17] Quo cognito Iesus ait illis quid cogitatis quia panes non habetis nondum cognoscitis nec intellegitis adhuc caecatum habetis cor vestrum [18] oculos habentes non videtis et aures habentes non auditis, nec recordamini [19] quando quinque panes fregi in quinque milia et quot cofinos fragmentorum plenos sustulistis dicunt ei Duodecim [20] quando et septem panes in quattuor milia, quot sportas fragmentorum tulistis et dicunt ei septem.
>
> [17] Which Jesus knowing saith to them: Why do you reason, because you have no bread? Do you not yet know nor understand? Have you still your heart blinded? [18] Having eyes, see you not? And having ears, hear you not? Neither do you remember? [19] When I broke the five loaves among five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took you up? They say to him: Twelve. [20] When also the seven loaves among four thousand, how many baskets of fragments took you up?" And they say to him: Seven.

In both the poem and the analogues, Andreas similarly takes no provisions for his journey, but is fed by the Ship's Captain. Later, when the captain asks about the miracles of Christ, Andreas says that Christ made the deaf hear and the dumb speak (cf. Mark 7.37), and the blind in the cities see (cf. Mark 8.22–26). He then relates the story of the loaves and the fishes. In the context of Andreas' failure to recognize that the captain is Christ, this seems calculated to bring to mind Christ's rebuke to his disciples in the Gospel of Mark.[48]

However, for an educated Anglo-Saxon reader, the most familiar iteration of the scriptural motif 'oculos habent et non videbunt' may have been Psalm 134. Susan Gillingham identifies this as one of a group of sixteen psalms which 'became more prominent than others through

[47] Some editions of the Douay-Rheims number this psalm differently, restarting at 1 after verse 8. I have followed the numbering of the Vulgate for clarity.

[48] Fred Biggs has discussed some of the ways that the *Andreas* poet engaged with Gospel narratives (including some specific turns of phrase). Biggs, 'Passion of Andreas'; see also Gayle Henrotte, 'Jesus Asleep in the Boat:

liturgical use'.[49] Psalm 134 begins by enjoining praise of the Lord (verses 1–3) for the reason that he has chosen Jacob (verse 4). The psalmist then enumerates several examples of the Lord's greatness: his command over heaven, earth, sea, and weather, his slaying the firstborn in Egypt and sending signs to Pharaoh, and his smiting nations and giving their land to Israel (verses 5–12). The psalmist addresses the Lord ('Domine nomen tuum in aeternum': 'Thy name, O Lord, is for ever') then states that the Lord will judge his people (verses 13–14). The following verses are almost identical to Psalm 113's verses on the idols of the Gentiles:

> [15] simulacra gentium argentum et aurum opera manuum hominum [16] os habent et non loquentur oculos habent et non videbunt [17] aures habent et non audient neque enim est spiritus in ore eorum [18] similes illis fiant qui faciunt ea et omnes qui confidunt in eis.
>
> [15] The idols of the Gentiles are silver and gold, the works of men's hands. [16] They have a mouth, but they speak not: they have eyes, but they see not. [17] They have ears, but they hear not: neither is there any breath in their mouths. [18] Let them that make them be like to them: and every one that trusteth in them.

The psalm concludes with three verses enjoining blessings on the Lord (19–21).

The psalm shares many thematic links with *Andreas* (particularly with section of the poem in which Andreas speaks with the Ship's Captain) and these connections are more compelling in light of Cassiodorus' commentary, which could well have been known to an educated Anglo-Saxon like the *Andreas* poet.[50] For example, Cassiodorus states that the psalm's reference to wind is an allusion to the apostles, whose preaching he equates to lightning and rain (with baptismal connotations), which resonates with the poem's depiction of an apostle's preaching bringing about a fiery flood.[51] This strengthens the connection between the psalm's reference to God's power over sea and weather and the explorations of this motif in *Andreas*.[52]

Cassiodorus sees the reference to Jacob in verse 4 as an allusion to the replacement of the Jews by Gentile nations incorporated into the Church (he says that the name means 'supplanter').[53] He also reads the verses on the displacement of the Gentile nations by Israel as alluding to the later displacement of the Old Law by the New, and 'quia iudicabit Dominus populum suum' ('for the Lord will judge his people') in verse 14 as an allusion to the 'detestabili obstinantione' ('accursed obstinancy') of the unbelieving Jewish people who witnessed Christ's

A Thrice-told Tale', in *De Gustibus: Essays for Alain Renoir*, ed. by John Miles Foley, J. Chris Womack and Whitney A. Womack, Albert Bates Lord Studies in Oral Tradition, 11 (London: Garland, 1992), pp. 250–65.

[49] Susan Gillingham, *Psalms Through the Centuries: Volume One* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), p. 53. See also George Brown, 'The Psalms as the Foundation of Anglo-Saxon Learning', in *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages*, ed. by Nancy Van Deusen (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), pp. 1–24.

[50] The presence of Cassiodorus' *Expositio psalmorum* in Anglo-Saxon England is attested by its appearance in two inventories, four manuscripts, and citations by seven different authors. Bede's use of the *Exposito psalmorum* is particularly extensive. Among psalm commentaries that circulated in Anglo-Saxon England, there is more evidence for Cassiodorus' than for any other apart from Augustine's. See Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, pp. 288 and 296. For a history of Cassiodorus' influence on Western Churches, see Gillingham, *Psalms Through the Centuries,* pp. 57–58.

[51] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmum CXXXIV*.7, in *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori. Expositio Psalmorum*, ed. by M. Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 97–98, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958), II, 1216–17.

[52] Boenig points out that 'the storm is absent in both the Greek romance and the Old English homily'. There is a storm in the Latin analogue, though it is not described with such relish as the storm in *Andreas*. Boenig, *Saint and Hero*, pp. 50, 33.

[53] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmum CXXXIV*.4, p. 1215.

miracles.[54] These are the concerns of *Andreas*: how a new, inclusive covenant supplants an old, exclusive one, and how an unbelieving Gentile people are eventually incorporated into the assembly of the Church and so supplant the Jews as members of the elect.

Both the psalm and the poem emphasize paradoxes of seeing: the superiority of spiritual sight to literal sight, and the blindness of people who only see carnally. Cassiodorus sees this theme throughout the psalm and explains that the psalmist's knowledge of the greatness of God comes from spiritual sight, 'non aliqua uisione carnali' ('not through any vision of the flesh').[55] This theme is most readily apparent in the four verses — almost a fifth of the psalm — that describe the insensate idols of the Gentiles and the blindness of those who worship them. However, it is also implicit in verses 8 and 9, which allude to Pharaoh's persistent hard heartedness (as the slaughter of the first-born was a direct result of Pharaoh's failure to respond to prior signs). Cassiodorus relates the signs in Egypt to those that appeared at the Crucifixion and discusses the role that signs play in conversion.[56] Compared to its analogues, *Andreas* expands the storm imagery and strengthens the analogy between the Jews and Mermedonians, so it has a slightly tighter fit with the psalm, especially in light of Cassiodorus' identification of themes of apostleship and displacement. However, like the allusion to Mark 8, the basic framework of the analogy to Psalm 134 is also present in the narrative of the analogues. Where it is most clear that the *Andreas* poet is making a new connection is in the transformation of the sphynx into a seraph. Nancy Porter has argued that the specific half-line 'Cheruphim et Seraphim' (l. 719b) is of liturgical origin,[57] but the function of the seraph in the poem must now also be understood in light of Appleton's recent findings on the extensive use of the Book of Isaiah as a major source of the imagery in *Andreas*, including her assessment of the parallel functions of the seraph in each text:

> The seraph of Isaiah brings a hot coal to cleanse the prophets' lips to allow him to preach to the people, but they will neither heed him nor believe the vision (Isaiah 6:5–10). The stone seraph of *Andreas* takes a similar role, berating the priests of the temple who refuse to recognize the miracle.[58]

It now seems clear that the seraph in the poem is inspired by the seraph in Isaiah 6. This chapter relates Isaiah's vision of the Lord enthroned in the temple, flanked by seraphim. Isaiah laments his unclean lips; one of the seraphim flies down to him and touches his lips with a burning coal, cleansing him and rendering him a fit messenger. The Lord asks 'quem mittam et quis ibit nobis' (Whom shall I send, and who shall go for us?) and Isaiah answers 'ecce ego sum mitte me' (Lo, here am I. Send me') (Isaiah 6.8). The motif 'oculos habent et non videbunt' appears in the following verses:

> [9] et dixit vade et dices populo huic audite audientes et nolite intellegere et videte visionem et nolite cognoscere [10] excaeca cor populi huius et aures eius adgrava et oculos eius claude ne forte videat oculis suis et auribus suis audiat et corde suo intellegat et convertatur et sanem eum.

[54] See Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmum CXXXIV*.14, pp. 1219–20; translation from *Cassiodorus: Explanation of the Psalms Vol. III, Psalms 101–150*, trans. by P. G. Walsh, Ancient Christian Writers: The Works of the Fathers in Translation, 53 (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Press, 1991), p. 348.

[55] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmum CXXXIV*.5, p. 1215; *Cassiodorus*, trans. by Walsh, p. 344.

[56] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmum CXXXIV*.8–9, pp. 1217–18; *Cassiodorus*, trans. by Walsh, pp. 345–46.

[57] Nancy A. Porter, 'Wrestling with Loan-words: Poetic Use of "engel", "seraphim" and "cherubim" in *Andreas* and *Elene*', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 89 (1988), 155–70 (pp. 159–60).

[58] Appleton, 'The Book of Isaiah', p. 2.

> [9] And he said: Go, and thou shalt say to this people: Hearing, hear and understand not: and see the vision, and know it not. [10] Blind the heart of this people, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes: lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their heart and be converted, and I heal them.

Isaiah asks: 'usquequo Domine?' ('How long, O Lord?') and God answers, 'donec desolentur civitates absque habitatore' ('Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant') (Isaiah 6.11). As well as the analogy between Isaiah and the statue as disregarded prophets that Appleton identifies, there is a more immediate analogy of movement in the two texts: the downward movement of the seraph which leaps from the wall to approach Christ mirrors the downward movement of the seraph who approaches Isaiah, who not only prophesied but prefigured Christ. There are also further general thematic parallels between *Andreas* and Isaiah chapter 6. Like Isaiah, Andreas is a messenger to an 'unclean' people, and as Isaiah must be purified with the burning coal to become God's messenger to the Jews, so Andreas becomes a messenger to the Mermedonians through physical torment. The state of the blinded Jews of Isaiah 6, who are prevented from seeing their errors and seeking salvation until after their cities have been wasted, has an analogue in the Mermedonians, who remain blind to the mounting evidence of the miracles performed in their city, and therefore unable to convert and seek salvation, until their city is wasted. The Jews' blindness in Isaiah is part of God's plan; similarly in *Andreas* the blindness of the Mermedonians is necessary to create the conditions for Andreas to undergo suffering in the manner of Christ and to call up the fiery flood which enacts the mysteries of baptism.

The last half-century of scholarship on *Andreas* has established that the poem is dense with scriptural allusion, so in itself, the fact that the poet alludes to Isaiah 6 (or the Psalms, or the Gospels) is not especially significant or surprising. What is significant is the way that Isaiah 6 functions as the bridge that connects use of the motif 'oculos habent et non videbunt' in the Psalms to its use in the Gospels. The use of this motif as a criticism of the Jews by latter prophets such as Isaiah is the intermediate step between the Psalms' criticism of the Gentiles and Mark's criticism of the Apostles. By introducing allusions to Isaiah 6, the poet connects the allusions to Mark and affinities to Psalm 134 that were most likely already present in the source material. What is more, the function of the seraph in the poem is not just an allusion to Isaiah, but to Isaiah as read through Matthew. In Matthew 13.13–14 Jesus answers the disciples' question about why he speaks in parables with an allusion to Isaiah 6.9–10:

> [13] Ideo in parabolis loquor eis quia videntes non vident et audientes non audiunt neque intellegunt [14] et adimpletur eis prophetia Esaiae dicens auditu audietis et non intellegetis et videntes videbitis et non videbitis

> [13] Therefore do I speak to them in parables; because seeing they see not and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. [14] And the prophecy of Isaias is fulfilled in them, who saith: By hearing you shall hear and shall not understand: and seeing you shall see, and shall not perceive.

When the seraph leaps down from the wall it not only recalls Isaiah's vision but typologically fulfils it, since Isaiah has been replaced by Christ. When the same seraph preaches and is not believed, it enacts the very points of Matthew 13.13–14 and so becomes parable embodied.

Scripture's own interpretation of Scripture through these chains of quotation and reinterpretation, in which Isaiah and then Mark and Matthew *discover new meaning within* the Psalmist's words rather than adding new meaning to them, model and authorize the very rhetorical devices and interpretive techniques the *Andreas* poet employs. It validates the

legitimacy and profitability of textual adaptation and typological reading and offers a model for the *Andreas* poet's own methods of meaning-making.

The *Andreas* poet uses the fact that the statue is an architectural feature shaped by human hands to comment on these processes of reading and composition. In coming to life, the seraph statue signifies in a way its sculptor could never have predicted. In describing the statues on the temple walls, the poet specifies that they are made by human 'handmægen' ('hand-power', l. 725b), and describes their creation through the lexis of writing: they are 'amearcod' ('marked', l. 724b) — a verb commonly used in the context of writing, though it is also used with reference to a marble sculpture in *The Phoenix* (l. 333a) — and 'awriten on wealle' ('written on the wall', l. 726a).[59] The poet's casting the statues as 'written' things alludes to the way that texts can reveal spiritual truths beyond the author's knowledge or intention.

This is a comment on the reading of Scripture, but it is also a comment on the composition of the poem. The writing of *Andreas* will necessarily have been a process of adaptation of one or more source texts. This went beyond the conversion of Latin to Old English and prose to verse; scenes were transformed through adjustments made to narrative details, to the identity of speakers, even to the words spoken by Christ. Those alterations are not intended to 'correct' the source text but to probe its parables. The new text is the old text freshly animated, like the seraph leaping down from the wall to preach.

Conclusions

Old English poets often develop and expand upon potential typological and eschatological significance latent in their source texts; to this end, *Andreas* and Fitt XIII of *Christ III* each employ a similar technique of using stones that split under their own agency to combine a patristic trope of creation as authoritative reader with imagery of the Temple. The manner in which the two poems engage with ideas about the Temple is, if not directly influenced by Bede, at least indirectly indebted to his 'sustained' interest in the image.[60]

It is possible, though not certain, that the *Andreas* poet knew *Christ III*; if not, the number of unique or near-unique phrases and compounds they share at least suggests that the poems draw upon a common literary tradition, so a comparison of how each poem uses this same patristic trope can help elucidate what is distinctive about each poet's engagement with it. In the patristic motif of creation responding to Christ's divinity where human beings fail to acknowledge it, 'creation' includes the insensate things in the lowest categories of the Chain of Being: things that are not living (e.g., water) and living things that do not move independently (e.g., trees). In combining this motif with Temple imagery, both poets are compelled to consider how artificial objects, shaped by human hands, relate to examples of creation that are drawn from the natural world. The *Christ III* poet emphasizes the muteness and lifelessness of architecture, and makes no distinction between walls and stones as examples of 'creation'. The *Andreas* poet takes a different approach, using the ambiguity of architecture's being sub-creation — it is made by human beings, but both maker and material are made by God. In depicting architectural features which read in themselves symbolic values and spiritual truths

[59] *Dictionary of Old English: A–H online*, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonina diPaolo Healey, and others (Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2016), http://www.doe.utoronto.ca [accessed February 2017], s.v. *ā-mearcian*.

[60] See footnote 2.

which their makers and custodians could not have foreseen, the *Andreas* poet comments upon human creativity and the process of adapting authoritative textual sources.