CrossMark

Legends and liturgy in the Old English prose *Andreas*

BILL FRIESEN

ABSTRACT

This article examines liturgical language and motifs potentially interwoven with the Old English prose account of 'St Andrew amongst the Cannibals', located in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198. The article traces in detail the possible parallels between the liturgy of the Mass and the language of the account, and then considers explanations for liturgical elements in the saintly legend and what this may contribute to our aesthetic understanding of that account.

The pronounced intertextuality of Anglo-Saxon literature is one of its fundamental aspects,[1] and as a consequence a nuanced understanding of Anglo-Saxon textual relations is a precondition for perceiving this literature's artistry relative to the contexts which gave it rise; these two facts have in the past presented Anglo-Saxon studies with a vast array of avenues for particular investigations.

Moreover, as Michael Lapidge, amongst others, has pointed out, in this literary culture two particular modes of writing which are fundamental to the daily imagination of literate Anglo-Saxons are hagiography[2] and the liturgy of the

[1] For example, see A. Doane, 'Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History', *Oral Texts, Intertexts, and Intratexts: Editing Old English*, ed. J. Clayton and E. Rothstein (Madison, 1991), pp. 75–113; N. Wright, *History and Literature in Late Antiquity and the Early Medieval West: Studies in Intertextuality* (Aldershot, 1995); E. Stanley, 'Linguistic Self-Awareness at Various Times in the History of English from Old English Onwards', *Lexis and Texts in Early English*, ed. K. Christian, S. Michaels and L. Sylvester (Amsterdam, 2001), pp. 237–53; A. Wollmann, 'Early Christian Loan-Words in Old English', *Pagans and Christians: the Interplay between Christian Latin and Traditional Germanic Cultures in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. T. Hofstra (Groningen, 1995), pp. 175–210.

[2] No comprehensive overview of Anglo-Saxon hagiography presently exists, though M. Lapidge provides a useful introduction in 'The Saintly Life in Anglo-Saxon England', *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. M. Godden and M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 243–63; also of considerable value here is *Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of Saint-Germain des Prés, Acta Sanctorum*, Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture, vol. 1, ed, F. M. Biggs, T. D. Hill, and P. E. Szarmach (Kalamazoo, 2001); S. Ridyard, *The Royal Saints of Anglo-Saxon England: a Study of West Saxon and East Anglian Cults* (Cambridge, 1988); G. Whatley, 'An

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mass.[3] Through weekly and sometimes daily contact with homilies, sermons and liturgical language, Anglo-Saxons across all levels of society would have as much, if not more, contact with these texts than they would with secular literatures more commonly considered by scholars. It seems likely, therefore, that if an understanding of intertextuality is vital to comprehending Anglo-Saxon literature at large, and if hagiography and liturgy are key components of the Anglo-Saxon world-view, then an investigation of the influence of Anglo-Saxon liturgy and hagiography upon one another, and how these influences transmit to or import borrowing tendencies from other literatures, seems likely to reward effort. That is the aim of this article.

Borrowing, of course, is a fundamental aspect of the ecclesiastic literary tradition which Anglo-Saxons inherited. Hagiography prior to the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons already had a long-established tradition of borrowing; indeed, as most scholars of hagiography know, it is deliberately generic, as works borrow on authoritative precedents by using the same motifs, narrative trajectories, figurative methods, character types and typological machinery.[4] Most saints' passions and legends gesture by means of this borrowing back to the stock traditions of hagiography in general, which in its turn echoes scripture, especially the gospels.[5] Likewise, liturgy borrows from scripture, but also across liturgical tradition, such as between the Gallican and Roman Rites, or from Church Fathers. In light of both these borrowing traditions, it is quite possible that hagiography and liturgy should also borrow from one another.

Introduction to the Study of Old English Prose Hagiography: Sources and Resources', *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Saints' Lives and their Contexts*, ed. P. E. Szarmach (Albany, 1996), pp. 3–34.

[3] The literature of the Anglo-Saxon mass has recently been surveyed by R. Pfaff, 'Massbooks', *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. R. Pfaff and A. Correa (Kalamazoo, 1995), pp. 7–33; and H. Gneuss 'Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology', *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. H. Gneuss and M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 91–142; for a sense of the structure of the medieval liturgy itself, see K. Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1933), pp. 15–43; for the liturgy's Anglo-Saxon context, see H. Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (University Park, 1991), pp. 168–190; and M. Gatch, 'Old English Literature and the Liturgy: Problems and Potential', *ASE* 6 (1977), 237–47.

[4] The most rigorous overview of early western hagiography's nature and development is by R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie: ses Sources, ses Méthodes, son Histoire* (Brussels, 2000). Again, Lapidge's 'Saintly Life' affords a useful introduction to this literature, as does his and R. C. Love's 'The Latin Hagiography of England and Wales', *Hagiographies*, ed. G. Philippart (Turnhout, 2001). Also helpful, though dated, are B. Colgrave's 'The Earliest Saints' Lives Written in England'. *PBA* 44 (1958), 35–60; and Hippolyte Delehaye's *Legends of the Saints* (1962, repr., Dublin, 1998).

[5] On this aspect, see R. Boyer, 'An Attempt to Define the Typology of Medieval Hagiography', *Hagiography and Medieval Literature: a Symposium* (Odense, 1981), pp. 27–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Of particular interest to this investigation are the various Anglo-Saxon versions of 'Saint Andrew amongst the Cannibals', and these constitute the central material of this article. There are numerous versions of the legend extant: in Old English prose and verse, as well as foreign analogues in Greek, Latin and Old Norse, and this lays a broad foundation for comparison and analysis.[6] The scholar who has perhaps given the Andrew-tradition the most extensive treatment is Robert Boenig, tracking in his earlier work the Anglo-Saxon author's intentions and the models of intentionality which inform this, and in his later work restricting himself to tracking parallels of content between various Greek, Latin and Old English versions.[7] Boenig has lead the way into much new and useful literary territory around the Andrew-legend. However, I want to concentrate on one specific version of this legend: the Old English prose version of the tale, since the presence of borrowing between liturgical and hagiographical contexts is more pronounced and clear in this often overlooked version than in others. The Old English prose version is found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198, 386r–394v, which is thought by Neil Ker to date from around 1050.[8]

[6] On the cult of Saint Andrew in Anglo-Saxon England, see both M. Walsh, 'St. Andrew in Anglo-Saxon England: the Evolution of an Apocryphal Hero', *Annuale Mediavale* 20 (1981), 97–122; and V. Ortenberg, *The English Church and the Continent in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Cultural, Spiritual and Artistic Exchanges* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 169–72. The closest Latin analogue is thought to be the version found in the so-called Casanatensis manuscript: F. Blatt, 'Praxeis Andreou kai Mattheia eis ten Polin ton Anthropophagon', *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Mattiae apud anthropophagos: Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der ältenen Kirche* 12 (Copenhagen, 1930), 96–148. More, generally on the relationship between all early versions of this legends, see C. Schaar, *Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group*, Lund Stud. in Eng. 17 (New York, 1967), 12–24; and D. MacDonald, *The Acts of Andrew and the Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Cannibals* (Atlanta, 1990), pp. 55–9. There is also a verse Old English version edited by K. Brooks, *Andreas and Fates of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1961), and a fragmentary prose Old English analogue: *The Blickling Homilies* ed. R. Morris (London, 1967), which is a more popular object of study. However, the CCCC 198 version is complete, and therefore seems a more reliable witness to this legend's prose tradition in Old English. On the prose legends, see again, *The Apocrypha*, ed. F. M. Biggs, T. D. Hill and P. E. Szarmach, Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture (Kalamazoo, 2007); and S. Degregorio, '*Þegnlic* or *flæsclic*: the Old English Prose Legends of St Andrew', *JEGP* 104 (2003), 449–64. Throughout this discussion, on the other hand, it is not my intention to focus centrally upon textual sources for this version's liturgical elements, but rather concern myself mainly with literary, performative and pastoral reasons for the presence of these elements in this legend.

[7] R. E. Boenig, *The Acts of Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals: Translations from the Greek, Latin, and Old English*, vol. 70b (London, 1991); R. E. Boenig, *Saint and Hero: Andreas and Medieval Doctrine* (London, 1991); R. E. Boenig, '*Andreas*, the Eucharist, and Vercelli', *JEGP* 79 (1980), 313–31.

[8] The current critical edition is by J. Bright, Bright's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, ed. F. Cassidy and R. Ringler (New York, 1971), pp. 113–28. For N. Ker's overview, see his *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), p. 76.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Anglo-Saxons in the tenth and eleventh centuries, in both lay and ecclesiastical cultures, often heard hagiography and liturgy together, at the point in the Mass when the homily or sermon would have been read, though strictly speaking a hagiographic tale is neither of these.[9] Because the homily was usually read in the vernacular, amidst a Latin liturgy, there was considerable opportunity for interplay upon already established levels of ecclesiastical and literary syncretism.[10] Three other possible reading contexts which concerns of brevity force me to pass over here are during Matins of the Divine office,[11] during the *lectio* read at meal-times,[12] and privately, to oneself.[13] In this article I will restrict the discussion to language and motif parallels between the hagiographic tale of Saint Andrew and the liturgy of the High Mass. In order to be defined as a parallel, language collocations are restricted to a distinct verbal element of the liturgy, such as the Prayer for the Dead or the Priest's Greeting, and are usually located in a single sentence. For language parallels in the liturgy's scriptural readings, these are restricted to a single verse, or multiple, but sequential verses if the parallel is lengthier and consistently sequential in both the legend and the liturgy. Motif parallels are less distinct, but where they are clear, their subject matter alone may speak to their relationship with concordant motifs in the legend, and where they are merely suggestive, I have tried to tie the motif parallel into the language parallels around it in either the legend or the liturgy, and both if possible.

[9] According to D. Scragg, a homily in a strict sense is an explication of a passage of scripture (the *pericope*), while a sermon is a more general exhortation. Clearly a saintly narrative fits neither of these descriptions a precise way: 'Homilies', *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes and D. Scragg (Oxford, 1999), pp. 241–2.

[10] Young, *The Drama*, I, 28. The presence of a vernacular legend amidst a Latin liturgy is made all the more striking if one considers the particularly strict adherence to Latin as the ecclesiastical language advocated by Rome, to which the Anglo-Saxon church expressed a marked adherence. This is in sharp contrast to traditions in the Orthodox Christianity: Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity*, p, 174.

[11] For the presence of such legends in the recitation of the Divine office, see again, Young, *The Drama*, I, 47–51. However, because in this the legend was broken into lections, interspersed at certain points, and the structure of this particular legend does not lend itself well to being broken up in such a manner as certain others do, it seems a less likely venue, though by no means entirely unlikely.

[12] Alcuin, in the prologue to his *Life of Willibrord*, suggests this as the proper context for the prose half of his work. In that respect, this relatively simplified, lucid version of the legend, when compared to other versions, recommends itself well to such a context, and the liturgical language in it could have served to set the liturgical tone for upcoming celebrations of Saint Andrew's Mass: Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi archiepiscopi Traiectensis auctore Alcuino*, ed. W. Levison, MGH SRM 7 (Hanover, 1919), 117.

[13] While this too is a possible reading venue for the legend, Alcuin's distinction mentioned above, insisting that his prose text is for public reading, while the verse half is for private reading, make private contemplation for this version of the legend less likely.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It seemed best here to present motif and language parallels intermingled as they occur, since parallel sequences, as well as individual language and motif collocations, constitutes part of the evidence for a relationship. Even so, the evidence by its nature stops short of offering logically necessary conclusions for an unambiguous relationship between the liturgy and the legend, and this is not the aim of the article; rather, the case made here is cumulative and hypothetical. In other words, since the collocations of language and motif are so numerous and striking that a relationship between the two texts seems a very safe guess, it is the aim of this article to clarify some of the substantive details of that relationship, investigate how the influence of either text functions upon the other, and look into some of the motives which may have explained potential borrowings. The investigation breaks into two parts: the first part traces out in some detail the correspondences between the two texts; the second considers in light of this tracing what may have been the aims and effects of such interweaving.

Before proceeding, however, I have had to reconstruct as best I can a representative liturgy for the mass as it might have been used by Anglo-Saxons around the time when this Andrew legend was recorded.[14] This is a vexed task. The liturgy consists of two parts: the Ordinary and the Proper. The Ordinary contains all the parts that remain consistent from service to service, while the Proper insinuates at various points parts which change depending on the date, pastoral need or particular figure being celebrated.[15] The Ordinary of the Anglo-Saxon mass presents fewer problems for reconstruction, since early English liturgy follows Roman practices quite closely. Roman practices have remained relatively stable and changes are comparatively well documented. In fact, much of this early medieval liturgy reads like a Pre-Tridentine mass. The Proper for Saint Andrew's Mass, however, must be derived from surviving liturgical manuscripts contained in sacramentaries or missals, of which five survive from the late Anglo-Saxon period.[16] The most comprehensive of these is the *Leofric Missal*, whose main elements were written *c.* 900 in Lotharingia, to

[14] The date of composition is less certain than the date of transcription. Because I am more concerned with the use of the text (though by no means indifferent to the various factors which informed its composition), I use the date of transcription to guide the dating of the liturgy I reproduce.

[15] The legend of 'Saint Andrew amongst the Cannibals' in the Corpus Christi College 198 manuscript collection occurs in the proper sequence, along with the sixty-eight other entries, for the liturgical calendar. In other words, this legend, as the sixty-fourth entry, appears between the Quadragesima and Saint Bartholomew's mass. Saint Andrew's mass occurs on 30 November: N. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts*, pp. 76–82. This seems to make clear that this legend had a liturgical function. Other versions, such as the Old English verse, have no such liturgical context.

[16] Scragg, 'Liturgical Books', *The Blackwell Encyclopedia*, ed. Lapidge *et al.*, p. 290.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which elements were added during the time of Bishop Leofric (1050–72).[17] I depend upon this missal for the Proper of Saint Andrew's Mass, as well as the canon of the mass and elements of the Asperges.[18]

The opening of this legend immediately touches on two motifs shared with the liturgy of Saint Andrew's Mass, though in an indirect manner. The first connects with the epistle reading of the mass, for when the apostles in the tale are sent out to preach, the lot that falls to Matthew is Mermedonia, a land at the end of the world. Similarly, in the epistle reading for Saint Andrew's Mass, from Romans X.10–18, it reads 'sed dico numquid non audierunt et quidem in omnem terram exiit sonus eorum et in fines orbis terrae verba eorum'.[19] This tenuous parallel is made stronger by the fact that this correspondence is found in an element of the Proper, which therefore belongs more distinctively to the cult of Andrew, rather than the Mass in general from the Ordinary. On the other hand, The opening of the legend also makes clear that the Mermedonians are cannibals, stating specifically that 'segð þonne þæt þa men þe on þære ceastre wæron þæt hi hlaf ne æton, ne wæter druncon, ac æton manna lichaman and heora blod druncon'.[20] The eating of a human's flesh and blood shares obvious, if uncomfortable, affinities with the Eucharist, which is of course the central focus of the Mass in which Anglo-Saxons would have heard this tale, and as will be seen, it is a parallel rich with narrative opportunities: parallels which are strengthened by the fact that they are soon exploited to considerable depth by the legend's author.

Parallels with the epistle reading continue, for the cannibals are said to gouge out the eyes of all who come to their city and feed them a drink which causes their victims' wits to wander, becoming like beasts. Matthew receives this same treatment, but he refuses to imbibe the drink, and 'for þon his heorte næs tolesed, ne his mod onwende'.[21] This aligns both with the first verse of the epistle reading and the *Munda cor meum* of the liturgy's Ordinary: 'corde enim creditur ad iustitiam ore autem confessio fit in salutem';[22] in the legend, this cry by Matthew for justice and salvation is just what follows immediately after the line above. It is the paralleling of the two elements in both the liturgy and legend which is interesting. In the *Munda cor meum*, which precedes the gospel

[17] *The Leofric Missal*, ed. N. Orchard, 2 vols. (London, 2002) I, 6. The current critical edition is the same.

[18] In the above edition, these entail pp. 310–11, pp. 101–4 and p. 407 respectively.

[19] 'but I say: have they not heard? Yes, truly, their sound has gone out into all the earth, and their words to the ends of the whole world,' X.18.

[20] 'It is then said the men who were in that city did not eat bread or drink water, but ate the bodies of men and drank their blood', F. Blatt, 'Praxeis Andreou', p. 113, lines 5–8.

[21] 'Therefore his heart was not dissolved, and his spirit was not altered', *ibid.* p. 113, lines 17–18.

[22] 'For with the heart we believe in justice; but with the mouth, confession is made for salvation'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reading of the Proper for this day, it reads 'Munda cor meum ac labia mea, omnipotens deus, qui labia Isaiae prophetae calculo mundasti ignito.'[23] In the legend, it is specifically God who cleanses the pollution from Matthew's heart. Like the Eucharistic echoes, this cleansing of the heart is a point to which the author of the tale will return later.

After the *Munda cor meum* in the liturgy, the celebrant moves directly into the gospel reading, and also directly after this cleansing sentiment in the legend the author moves directly into a motif which has a precedent in that same gospel reading, which derives from the book of Matthew, IV.18–22.[24] In this passage of scripture, Jesus calls to Simon and Andrew while they fish, they immediately abandon what they are doing, leaving all behind, and follow him: 'Ambulans autem iuxta mare Galilaeae vidit duos fratres Simonem qui vocatur Petrus et Andream fratrem eius mittentes rete in mare erant enim piscatores. Et ait illis venite post me et faciam vos fieri piscatores hominum. Et illi continuo relictis retibus secuti sunt eum.'[25] Likewise, in the tale, Matthew refers back to this incident, saying 'Min drihten hælend Crist, for þon we ealle forleton ure cneorisse, and wæron þe fylgende . . . beheald nu and geseoh hu þas men þinum þeowe doð.'[26]

Throughout these opening details of the apocryphal tale, it is not only the concatenation of concordant motifs and language which is striking, but the fact that in both the liturgy and the legend they follow so much of the same order; it falls well short of certain proof of a relationship, but the alignment is surely striking.

In response to Matthew's plea, God reassures him that help, in the form of Andrew, is on the way. This particular version of the legend then inserts an extra and seemingly pointless piece of dialogue, as God adds 'Sib si mid þe, Matheus',[27] as he departs. This has a parallel in the priest's greeting, uttered at numerous points throughout the beginning of the liturgy, as either the *pax vobis* or *pax vobiscum*. It is also echoed in the Prayer for Holy Communion: 'Domine Iesu Christe, qui dixisti apostolis tuis: pacem relinquo vobis, pacem meam

[23] 'Cleanse my heart and my lips, almighty God, who cleansed the lips of the prophet Isaiah with a burning coal.'

[24] It is perhaps coincidence that the Gospel reading for St. Andrew's feast derives from the book of Matthew, who in the legend is the apostle Andrew is sent to rescue, but if it is coincidence, then it is a striking one.

[25] 'And [Jesus] walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea (for they were fishers). And he said to them: Come you and follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they immediately leaving their nets followed him.'

[26] 'My holy lord Christ, since we left all our kin and followed you . . . behold now and see what these people do to your servant,' p. 118, line 23–p. 114, line 2.

[27] 'Peace be with you, Matthew,' p. 114, line 22.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

do vobis, ne respicias peccata mea.'[28] Mention in this prayer of the apostles alongside the *pax vobis* sentiment is also noteworthy, considering that in the legend it is the apostles who are its central focus. The liturgical tenor of this passage is strengthened further by Matthew's behaviour immediately after God leaves: 'He þa þurhwuniende mid gebedum wæs Drihtnes lof singende on þam carcerne.'[29] This in a more general sense invokes the sense of the liturgy's interwoven prayer and music – the Kyrie, Credo, Agnus, Introit and other similar aspects – with the *pax vobis* language.

When Christ appears to Andrew in Achaia, his behaviour is in sharp and direct contrast to the command in the above epistle reading for Saint Andrew's Mass, as well as the Gospel reading for this particular celebration, presenting a strong counterpoint to his former, scriptural alacrity in following Christ's request to drop his nets and follow him. The relevant passage from the epistle builds up the need for obedience to the command, to go and preach, through a sequence of rhetorical questions: 'Quomodo ergo invocabunt in quem non crediderunt? Aut quomodo credent ei quem non audierunt? Quomodo autem audient sine praedicante? Quomodo vero praedicabunt nisi mittantur? Sicut scriptum est quam speciosi pedes evangelizantium pacem evangelizantium bona.'[30]

This is one of the central thematic structures of this saintly legend, for to go and preach is just what Andrew does not wish to do, and hereafter much revolves around obeying God's often hazardous command to go and preach in faith and that one shall not be forsaken by God while doing it. Andrew equivocates and complains, saying it is too far for such a quick journey, that he does not know the way, that it would be better to send an angel. Christ tolerates none of it and chastises him for malingering, which is, as mentioned above, in contrast to his earlier readiness to follow Christ as recorded in the Gospel reading in the liturgy. Andrew quickly acquiesces, and once more this version of the legend adds a final line of dialogue as Christ departs: 'Sib mid þe and mid eallum þinum discipulum' (115, 18–20), echoing again the *pax vobiscum* language of the greeting and Prayer for Holy Communion.

In another parallel, while walking on the shore, Andrew does indeed encounter three men in a boat (Christ and two angels, all in disguise), just as in the liturgy's Gospel reading Jesus encounters Andrew and Simon in their boat

[28] 'Lord Jesus Christ, who said to your apostles, peace I leave you, my peace I give you, do not regard my sins.'

[29] 'He then continued in prayers and was singing the Lord's praises in the prison,' p. 114, lines 22–4.

[30] 'How then shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they are sent? As it is written: How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

while he is walking along the shore; it is a reversal of roles which is therefore in imitation of Christ. After negotiating passage to the land of the cannibals, and while sailing through a storm, the disguised Christ suggests that Andrew tell Gospel narratives to calm his followers. This comes at a moment rich with Christian iconography and symbolic import, for they are tossed about on stormy seas while in a boat, huddled together under a mast, hearing homilies from their master, while all the time, though they do not perceive him, they are watched over by Christ, who guides the vessel. The association of stormy seas with the Christian's fate in the world, the storm-tossed ship with the Church (the main body of a church building is called the nave after *navis* by means of this association), the mast with the cross and Christ with the guiding of his Church (many early Christian lamps exist shaped like boats with Christ as a handle–helmsman) are all brought into a nexus here as Andrew begins his homilies about his time with Christ.[31] Amongst other things, this means that we are reading in a homily (in CCCC 198) about a homily (that which Andrew recounts). Thus one has a homily about homilies. This seems to indicate that the author was thinking more that usual about the nature, aims and contexts of homilies, about their pragmatic and programmatic function, and this would in turn align well with the systematic scaffolding of liturgical language and motifs one encounters in the legend; in other words, the author seems on this evidence conscious and therefore more concerned with how to make the homily function more efficiently as a homily.

When Andrew is delivered to the shores of Mermedonia, Christ again appears to him, this time as himself, warning Andrew that he shall suffer much, but that He is pleased with his apostle because Andrew has turned from his earlier disobedience and come out to preach here at the ends of the earth so that the cannibals might hear the word of Christ: 'gehiere me, Andreas, and aræfna þas tintrego, for þon manige synt on þisses ceastre þa sculon geleofan on mine naman'.[32] Compare this again with the latter part of the epistle reading

[31] The ship as a metaphor for the *polis* or *ecclesia* is implied in non-Christian settings as early as Archilochus, *c.* 660 BC: Archilochus, 'Selections 7, 8, 22 and 23,' *Greek Lyrics*, trans. R. Latimore (Chicago, 1960); Alcaeus treats the metaphor as familiar enough to carry numerous allusions and subtle shades of meaning, *c.* 600 BC: Alcaeus, 'Selections 1 and 2,' *Greek Lyrics*, trans. Latimore. The first Christian writer to make the connection is Tertullian, in 'De Baptismo,' *CCSL* 1, ed. J. G. Borleffs (Turnhout, 1954), 275. Soon hereafter it is common in a number of other literary contexts, such as *The Apostolic Constitutions*, where the bishop of a church is referred to as the helmsman of the 'vessel': J. W. Grisbroke, *Apostolic Constitutions* (Bramcote, 1990), p. xlvii; or by Clement of Alexandria, who recommends the ship running before the wind as a symbol of the Church for signet rings: Clement of Alexandria, *Pædagogus*, ed. M. Marcovich (Boston, 2002).

[32] 'Listen to me, Andrew, and endure these sufferings, because there are many in this city who should believe in my name,' 120, 1–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for this particular mass: 'Sed non omnes oboedierunt evangelio. Isaias enim dicit Domine quis credidit auditui nostro. Ergo fides ex auditu auditus autem per verbum Christi. Sed dico numquid non audierunt et quidem in omnem terram exiit sonus eorum et in fines orbis terrae verba eorum.'[33] In the saintly legend, the point Christ makes is that the apostle has obeyed, and the cannibals shall now hear the Word of Christ here at the edge of the known world.

Andrew proceeds into the city and reaches undetected the dungeon where Matthew is kept. Andrew prays, the guards fall dead, he makes the sign of the cross before which the door collapses. He encounters Matthew down in the prison, still singing, as if in a liturgical celebration in a chapel rather than a dungeon.[34] They greet one another and kiss, and considering the proximity of this narrative detail to the repetition of Matthew's singing, the kiss seems broadly similar to the liturgical Kiss of Peace, which is exchanged at this point in the liturgy between the priest and the deacon and which is also preceded by singing (the *Agnus Dei* in this case). Matthew explains how he came to be here, and then the two pray for those in the prison, again in terms rich with thematic connections to the mass in chapel, for they lay hands on the other prisoners' eyes, and they can see, and they lay their hands on the prisoners' hearts, and their understanding is restored; this phrasing is consonant with the effects of preaching the word of God to those 'in the world', where spiritually the blind can see and understanding is communicated to those living in 'darkness'. As Robert Boenig points out, these are also the liturgical gestures and language used to ordain a bishop. The point, however, is that this passage too is replete with liturgical motifs and language.

After freeing Matthew and those with him, Andrew proceeds into the heart of the city and eventually allows himself to be captured. The cannibals put a rope about his neck and drag him through the streets. By the second day of this treatment, Andrew begins to break down. He calls out to God for help, saying 'beheald, Drihten, and geseoh hu hie me doð.'[35] The Devil, who oversees all this, tells the cannibals 'swingað hine on his muð, þæt he þus ne sprece'.[36] This aligns once more with the liturgical epistle reading mentioned earlier, where verse 10 reads 'ore autem confessio fit in salutem',[37] and again verse 13

[33] 'But all do not obey the gospel. For Isaiah says: Lord, who has believed our report? Faith then comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ. But I say: Have they not heard? Yes, truly, their sound has gone out into all the world, and their words to the ends of the whole world.'

[34] This also has an analogue in Acts XVI.24–6, where Paul, also in prison, sings hymns and Psalms, and is also miraculously freed.

[35] 'Behold, Lord, and see what they do to me,' 123, 17.

[36] 'Strike him on the mouth, so that he does not speak out this way,' 123, 19.

[37] 'But with the mouth confession is made for salvation.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'omnis enim quicumque invocaverit nomen'.[38] It is precisely the mouth that the Devil is concerned to shut up just as Andrew calls upon God for help. The line of lament which precedes Andrew's call for help also seems close to the epistle reading, though not actually from it. Andrew complains: 'and eall ic hit aræfnie for þinum gebode þe þu me sealdest, and þu cwæde, ne do æfter hiora ungeleafulnesse'.[39] This idiosyncratic sentiment aligns with chapter XI, verse 20 of Romans, which reads 'bene propter incredulitatem fracti sunt tu autem fide stas noli altum sapere sed time'.[40] The fact that one finds these two sentiments side by side in the legend, and likewise side by side in Romans, anchored by the epistle reading in this mass, is striking, though not conclusive. This passage in the legend also introduces the motif of the mouth, which will be revisited frequently hereafter, as it is also in the liturgy of this particular mass.

On the third day of torture, Andrew cries out that God has forsaken him,[41] and that he has betrayed his promise that if the apostles followed him, not a hair on their head would be harmed. But Andrew now says 'Beheald, Drihten, and geseoh for þi min lichama and loccas mines heafdes mid þisse eorðan synd gemenged'.[42] This mingling of blood and earth is similar to the mingling of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Mass, especially if we consider that the body is often associated with earth: 'Haec commixtio et consecratio Corporis et Sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi fiat accipientibus nobis in vitam aeternam.'[43] Even so, this parallel would be very nebulous if it were not that such mingling of body (or earth) and blood in either text were not conducive to bearing fruit, in the legend in the highly symbolic form of a fruit-bearing tree (geblowen treow wæstm berende) and in the liturgy of salvation. This image of the Tree of Life is also of a piece with the earlier 'fruitful tree' language from Romans XI, from which those with unbelief were broken and to which the faithful were grafted. The author will return to this motif yet again at the end of the legend. What is key, however, is that throughout the legend, and in this part of the liturgy, such mingling is always conducive to the 'fruit of eternal life'.

[38] 'For whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved.'

[39] 'And I suffer it all for the commandment you gave me when you said, do not according to their unbelief,' p. 123, lines 15–17.

[40] 'Well, on account of their unbelief, they were broken off [from the Tree of Life], but you remain by faith; do not be high-minded, but fear.'

[41] The alignment of this language with Christ's, as he suffers on the cross, is part of the wider emphasis by the author upon making more explicit how Andreas suffers in imitation of Christ. For a more detailed discussion, see F. M. Biggs, 'The Passion of Andreas: *Andreas* 1398–1491', *SP* 85 (1988), 413–27, especially 413–15.

[42] 'Behold, Lord, and see, for my body and the hairs of my head are mingled with this earth,' p. 124, lines 24–6.

[43] 'May this comingling and consecration of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be to us who receive it effectual unto eternal life.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There then begins a series of ironic parallels between the 'baptism' of the cannibals – where the cleansing waters of Christ are conducive to the death, not life, of those partaking in them – and the language or motifs of the liturgy. Andrew is healed by God, and commands a statue on a pillar in his prison to issue forth water from its mouth, which bursts out of the building in which the holy man is kept so that all who reside in this city may be destroyed. This has a minor echo at the end of the Credo: 'Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.'[44] Ultimately, this is exactly the effect of this 'baptism,' as the entire city converts in the face of this terrible doom, but the next line of the liturgy aligns it more closely with the action in the legend, as the Credo follows by saying 'et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum'.[45] This also is just what Andrew does in the wake of the flood, as he raises all those killed in the waters which 'cleansed' the city.

However, there is a second parallel in the rite of Asperges which precedes High Mass. Here it reads 'vidi aquam egredientum de templo, a latere dextro, alleluja: et omnes ad quos pervenit aqua ista salvifacti sunt, dicent: alleluja, alleluja'.[46] In this case, there is a point of both parallel and direct antithesis, for cleansing water issues from either building (in the Asperges it is also associated with the water issuing from the wound in the right side of the crucified Christ, the living temple), but while these are conducive to life in the Asperges, they are again conducive to death in Mermedonia. It is also perhaps noteworthy that in both cases, it is the spilling of blood of the holy, in one case Christ himself, and in the other a saint who lives in imitation of Christ, which contributes to the cleansing floods issuing from the buildings. The ironic association of liturgy and legend are drawn still closer by the next paragraph in the saintly tale; the cannibals attempt to flee, but Andrew prays that Christ send an angel to surround the city with a wall of fire: 'Min Drihten Hælend Crist, ne forlæt me, ac send me þinne engel of heofonum on fyrenum wolcne, þæt he embgange ealle þas ceastre þæt hie ne magen geneosian for þæm fyre.'[47] Boenig notes that this bears similarities with the fiery angel who excludes Adam and Eve from the garden of Eden and the Tree of Life (Gen 3: 24).[48] However, considering the proximity of the earlier parallels to the Asperges, what one encounters only a few lines further on in this rite seems to make it a more likely source for such details, as it says 'exaudi nos, Domine, sanctae Pater, omnipotens aeterne

[44] 'I confess in one baptism for the remission of sin.'

[45] 'And I look for the resurrection of the dead.'

[46] 'I saw water issuing forth from the Temple from the right side, alleluja. And all those were saved to whom that water came, and said: alleluja, alleluja.'

[47] 'My Lord Jesus Christ, do not forsake me, but send me your angel from heaven on a fiery cloud to encircle all this city so they may not go on account of the fire,' p. 125, lines 26–9.

[48] R. Boenig, *Anglo-Saxon Spirituality: Selected Writings* (New York, 2000), p. 282.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Deus: et mittere digneris sanctum angelum tuum de caelis, qui custodiat, foveat, protegat, vistet, atque defendat omnes habitantes in hoc habitaculo.'[49] If this is a conscious parallel by the author of the legend, then its sentiment is again antithetical to that encountered in the Asperges, but such antithesis is exactly of a piece with that encountered earlier in the cleansing flood of Christ motif, which uses both images and processes analogous to that found in the Asperges to realize exactly antithetical ends: salvation in the Asperges and destruction in the legend. Finally, it should be noted once more that here not only are there parallels with the liturgy, but that those parallels cluster in not one, but both texts.

There is yet another parallel with the legend's fiery angel which is, perhaps significantly, from the liturgy's Prayer of Cleansing, and which is just what is happening to Mermedonia; in the prayer, it reads 'Per intercessionem beati Michaelis Archangeli, stantis a dextris altaris incensi, et omnium electorum suorum, incensum istud dignetur Dominus bene dicere.'[50] That Saint Michael stands to the right side of the altar as the water flows from the right side of the temple enhances further the connection between this prayer and this motif in the Asperges.

The distressed cannibals, whose cries then echo antithetically the allelujas of the Asperges, discern that their destruction is caused by their abuse of Andrew, adding a jarring piece of dialogue to the traditional Andrew account: 'and uton we ealle cigean and cweþan for þon þe we geleofað on Drihten þyses ælþeodigan mannes; þonne afyrreþ he þas earfoðnesse fram us.'[51] Since indifference or contempt, not disbelief, was their attitude towards Andrew's god, their insistence on it here is a bit arresting. However, the concatenation of sentiments, of belief, of one who has travelled far to bring them the word of God (*ælþeodigan*), on belief specifically in this one God, is emphatically of a piece with the sentiments found in the epistle reading, which mentions the word 'belief' (*credere*) no less than five times in its brief space, and is at pains to insist that evangelists take the Word to the ends of the earth, to foreign parts, so that those foreigners might believe in the one true God; naturally, and in turn, this is just what Andrew is to the cannibals: a foreign man. Thus, if the two passages from the legend and the epistle are aligned, this collection of jarring sentiments in the legend would make considerably more thematic sense.

[49] 'Hear us Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God: and graciously send your holy angel from heaven to watch over, to cherish, to protect, to abide with and to defend all who dwell in this dwelling-place.'

[50] 'May the Lord, by the intercession of blessed Michael the Archangel, who stands at the right side of the altar of incense, and of all his Elect, agree to bless this incense.'

[51] 'And let us all cry and say, "Since we believe in the Lord of this foreign man; then he will free us from these troubles,"' p. 126, lines 9–11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The legend then enters its final act, echoing the eschatological elements found in the liturgy. There is also a consistent eschatological tone to the Greek and Latin versions of this tale, but it is enhanced in the Old English, which perhaps comes as no surprise considering the pronounced taste for eschatology evidenced in Anglo-Saxon literature more broadly.[52] In the legend, Andrew discerns that the destruction of their city by fire and water has wrought a change of heart amongst the cannibals and commands the waters to stop issuing forth. The cannibals gather and beg Andrew for mercy. He, in turn, opens a chasm in the earth into which the waters and the dead are all swept. Understandably, this terrifies the cannibals, but Andrew reassures them and raises all the dead. Andrew then establishes a church where the pillar stood. The narrative parallels here with the apocalypse and last judgement of scripture could hardly be more emphatic.[53] Obviously the legend's parallels with the Asperges mentioned above are extremely apocalyptic in nature. However, there are at least five other parallels with this particular mass in terms of shared eschatological elements which individually are not particularly strong, but taken together, seem more significant.

The first is mentioned in the Credo, where it notes of Christ 'et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos'.[54] This of course is just what we find Andrew doing as the legend draws to a close. The second parallel occurs at the end of the Credo, as the congregation recites 'Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum. Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum.'[55] Again, this resurrecting is just what we find Andrew doing after the recent 'baptism' of the cannibals.

The third similarity occurs just after the recitation of the Credo, during the Offertory's Prayer for the Bread and Wine, when the celebrant asks that God accept the bread as an offering for the sins of both the living and the dead. The bread represents the body of Christ, martyred for the sins of mankind, and likewise, Andrew too has been mortified (though not yet martyred) for the sake of bringing salvation to both the living and the dead cannibals at the end of the legend. In the fourth instance, the legend focuses on the raising and salvation of the dead and is also of a piece with the Prayer for the Dead in the liturgy,

[52] See here particularly M. Gatch, 'The Eschatology of the Anglo-Saxon Homilists' (PhD dissertation, Yale Univ., 1969); and also his *Eschatology and Christian Nurture: Themes in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Religious Life* (Aldershot, 2000).

[53] This would also align with the Anglo-Saxon tendency to conceive of Christ so that a fundamental, if not the fundamental emphasis, of his character is on his second coming. As Andrew operates in imitation of Christ, so here it is possible that his role as destroyer and judge is of a piece with Christ's role.

[54] 'And he shall come again with glory to judge the living and the dead.'

[55] 'I confess in one baptism for the remission of sins, and look for the resurrection of the dead.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where it reads 'memento etiam, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarem . . . ipsis, Domine, locum refrigerii lucis et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur'.[56] Finally, the fifth similarity to the liturgy is found in the brief communion prayer, which is part of the Proper for this mass drawn from Matt XIX:28, and so is distinctive to Saint Andrew's Mass: 'vos, qui secuti estis me, sedebitis super sedes, judicantes duodecim tribus Israel'.[57] One of the central themes of this legend has been how Andrew, in spite of his fallen nature, has followed Christ's will, and now on God's behalf does indeed stand in judgement on the masses.

In addition, in the middle of this falling action, Boenig points out another parallel with the liturgy, noting that in the legend, when the cannibals cry out for mercy amidst the destruction – 'gemiltsa us, God' – that this sounds very similar to the repeated pleas of the Kyrie Eleison, drawn in turn from the formula found throughout the Psalms, 'Miserere mei, Deus'.[58] Certainly this is true, though it should be noted that it occurs throughout liturgical language so often that this element is simply known as the *Miserere*. For instance, it occurs throughout the language of the Divine Office, during the mass for the dead (consider again the focus at this point in the story on the recently dead cannibals), over the consecration of cemeteries (again, the interment of the dead cannibals in the abyss Andrew opens), and once more during the consecration of churches (in the critical edition of the legend, Andrew commands a new church to be built only seventeen lines after this declaration). One or many of these connections to the liturgy might have been responsible for the author's choice to use this exact phrasing in his account. Moreover, it occurs in the Ordinary, in the Gloria, in the twice repeated cry of *miserere nobis*, and the Asperges 'Miserere mei, Deus, secundum magnam misericordiam tuam.'

At this point, Andrew abruptly informs them that he is leaving and will not listen to their pleas that he stay a little longer since they are so new to the faith. However, as he leaves, God appears to him and asks him why he has shown so little love and mercy to the Mermedonians: 'for hwan . . . þu forlete þa þe þe bædon, and þu nære miltsiende ofer heora cild þa þe þe wæron fyliende and wepende? þara cirm and wop to me astah on heofonas.'[59] This sentiment finds three parallels in the liturgy. Two are from the Prayer of Cleansing: 'Incensum istud a te benedictum ascendat ad te, Domine: et

[56] 'Remember also, Lord, your servants and handmaids . . . to these, Lord, grant a place of refreshment, light, and peace, we beseech you.'

[57] 'You who have followed me shall sit on seats judging the twelve tribes of Israel.'

[58] For example, Psalms IV.2; VI.3; L.3; LV.2; LVI.2.

[59] 'For what reason did . . . you forsake those who appealed to you and were not merciful to their children who followed you weeping? Their cry and lamentation has ascended to me in heaven,' 127: 21–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

descendat super nos misericordia tua.'[60] The second similarity is from the closing of this prayer: 'Accendat in nobis Dominus ignem sui amoris, et flammam aeternae caritatis.'[61] It is just this charity which Andrew has lacked towards the Mermedonians, and which God here kindles in him. The final similarity is from the Asperges. This sentiment from the legend is woven throughout this rite in a general sense (Miserere mei, Deus; ostende nobis, Domine, misericordiam tuam), but there is also an analogue in the Asperges whose wording is extremely close to that of the legend: 'Domine, exaudi orationem meam, et clamor meus ad te veniat.'[62]

Andrew returns, instructs them for seven days and then leaves again amidst rejoicing. As Boenig once more points out, this rejoicing contains a phrase similar once more to elements of liturgy, though in this case not Christian, but Jewish liturgy, and specifically the Shema Prayer at the opening of the synagogue service, where the Rabbi prays, from Deuteronomy VI.4, 'Hear, Israel, the Lord our God is one God,' or in Latin 'Audi Israhel Dominus Deus noster Dominus unus est.' This aligns with the line from the legend, 'an is Drihten God'. This is one of the national services of Judaism, which is only celebrated in Jerusalem at the temple, and this bears some resemblance to the facts that all the Mermedonians recite this (*eall þæt folc*) and the national church of Mermedonia has just been founded by Andrew.

However, a more striking nexus of motif and language exists between the final passage of the legend, riddled with paranoimasia, and the Post Communion Prayer. In the legend it reads: 'And eall þæt folc hine læde mid gefean, and hie cwædon: "an is Drihten God, se is Hælend Crist, and se Halga Gast, þam is wuldor and geweald on þære Halgan Þrynnysse þurh ealra worulda woruld soðlice a butan ende, amen."'[63] Compare this with the Post Communion: 'Oremus. Sumpsimus, Domine, divina mysteria, beati Andreae festivitate laetantes: quae sicut tuis Sanctis ad gloriam, ita nobis, quesumus, adveniam prodesse perfícias. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum. Qui vivis et regnas cum Deo Patri in unitate Spiritus Sancti, Deus, unum Deum. Per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.'[64]

[60] 'May this incense [traditionally a symbol for prayers], which you have blessed, Lord, ascend to you, and may your mercy descend upon us.'

[61] 'May the Lord kindle within us the fire of his love and the flame of everlasting charity.'

[62] 'Lord, hear my prayer, and let my cry come to you.'

[63] 'And all the people led him [out] with joy and they said: "The Lord God is one; he is Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit to whom be wonder and power in the Holy Trinity through the age of all ages without end, Amen,"' 128, 10–14.

[64] 'Let us pray. Rejoicing, Lord, on the feast-day of blessed Andrew, we have taken part in Your divine mysteries, and may You make them, we beseech You, redound to our forgiveness as they do to the glory of Your saints. Through our Lord Jesus Christ, Who lives and reigns, with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, one God through all the age of ages. Amen.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In both cases, all those present pray the prayer, and specifically they do so while rejoicing. Likewise, though the 'one-god' motif is in the Jewish Shema prayer, it is also here (*unum Deum*), amongst a concatenation of other shared motifs and language, making this liturgy a more likely source than the Shema. Also, the passages both invoke the Trinitarian list, though in a different order: in the legend, God, Christ and the Spirit, and in the liturgy, Christ, God and the Spirit. Moreover, both passages stress the unity of these, in the legend by explicitly grounding the power and wonder in *Halgan Þrynnysse*, and in the liturgy by simply contextualising the first two in *unitate Spiritus Sancti*. Finally the two texts end in the lesser doxology, of *saecula saeculorum, amen* and *worulda woruld, amen*.[65] In addition, it seems unlikely to be a mere coincidence that the location of this prayer in the liturgy and its analogue in the legend are in either case the concluding pieces of text, and that the first declares and the second has sought to demonstrate the honour of Saint Andrew. The point that in both it is Saint Andrew who is honoured also highlights the fact that the Post Communion is part of the Proper for Saint Andrew's Mass, not the Ordinary, and is therefore more striking and idiosyncratic.

Overall, then, one finds that while some of these correspondences are highly speculative and others are extremely close, the sheer quantity of parallels, the often distinctive character of them, and tendency often to manifest in the same order and in clusters in both texts make the likelihood of a relationship considerably more probable. As mentioned previously, hagiography already had an established tradition of borrowing. Adding to this borrowing tendency, however, is the fact that ecclesiastical syncretism is a central component of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. Pope Gregory (*c.* 540–604), who initiated the mission to convert England (*c.* 597), contributed at a basic level to the striking and systematic Anglo-Saxon tendency towards syncretism in matters both theological and literary;[66] it was Gregory who insisted to his missionary to the English, Augustine of Canterbury (d. 604), that all things local which could safely be turned to the use of the Church be integrated into the character of Anglo-Saxon Christianity, including pagan temples, festivals and other indigenous customs.[67] Furthermore, Theodore (*c.* 602–90), England's eighth archbishop, who had a considerable influence upon the development of Anglo-Saxon literature through his educational programs, might have reinforced this

[65] For a detailed overview of the Doxology and Amen in Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical culture, see S. Keefer, 'In Closing: Amen and Doxology in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie* 121: 2 (2003), 210–37.

[66] For an overview of Gregory's influence upon Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical culture, see R. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge, 1997).

[67] Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, Venerablis Bedae Opera Historica, ed. C. Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1946) I, 65.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tendency at the explicitly textual level, since the Eastern Church in which he had been educated was very much in favour of using the vernacular not only for holy writings, homilies and sermons, but often elements of the liturgy also.[68] Moreover, this ties into a wider concern, since, compared with its continental counterpart, Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical literature was vastly more open to vernacular engagement.[69] Thus, because of this ingrained tendency towards syncretism, Gregory did not hesitate to tell Augustine to use whatever elements of the Roman and Gallican liturgy he saw fit for English usage, giving no arbitrary preference to either.[70] At a number of removes from its original English source, this blended liturgy of the mass, along with many local usages, is just what surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscripts communicate to us; for instance, in the Leofric Missal, one encounters Gallican and Roman elements, as well as aspects of local rites, such as the Northumbrian Rite.

All of these contexts – Gregory's ecclesiastical syncretism, Theodore's grounding in vernacular liturgical culture, the borrowing traditions of hagiography and liturgy – all communicate an environment in which one might expect borrowing between hagiography and liturgy, and this, taken alongside the particular and explicit evidence of similarities between this mass and this legend incline me to think intertextual reliance quite likely. If so, then one is in a position to consider the aims and outcomes of such interweaving in the performative contexts of the celebration of the mass itself.

A number of related reasons for this interweaving are possible. First and most simply of course, the writer of this saint's legend would have availed himself of the conventional tradition by which one wrote and adapted new holy writings, though here he seems to have drawn upon the liturgy also; the author seemed conscious of the need to make his text conform to a literary and

[68] P. Wormald, 'Anglo-Saxon Society and its Literature,' *The Cambridge Companion*, ed. Godden and Lapidge, pp. 1–22, at 8; and also more generally M. Lapidge, "The School of Theodore and Hadrian', *ASE* 15 (1986), 45–72.

[69] P. Wormald, 'Bede, *Beowulf* and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy', *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. R. T. Farrell (London, 1978), pp. 32–95.

[70] Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, p. 58: 'Nouit fraternitas tua Romanae ecclesiae consuetudinem, in qua se meminit nutritam. Sed mihi placet ut, siue in Romana, siue in Galliarum, seu in qualibet ecclesia aliquid inuenisti, quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, et in Anglorum ecclesia, quae adhuc ad fidem noua est, institutione praecipua, quae de multis ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas. Non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt.'
(You know, my brother, the custom of the Roman church in which you remember you were bred up. But it pleases me, that if you have found anything, either in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and wisely teach the church of the English, which as yet is new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

performative context found ready to hand.[71] Thus this writer relied not only upon the Greek and Latin traditions, but also, based on what was observed above, seems to have gone to some lengths to fit his version of the legend more deliberately and thoroughly for its performative context in the mass by infusing it with greater amounts of liturgical language and motifs in many of the same ways a hagiographer might draw upon established hagiographic elements.

This parallel with the performative context of liturgy points up another effect of insinuating liturgical motifs and language into the legend;[72] namely the potential for the sacred and profane to shift free of their conventional loci. Clearly this fluidity was the source of considerable anxiety, but it should not be overlooked that it could also be used in a deliberate, systematic and constructive sense. This tendency relates strikingly to the distinction between missionizing and Christianizing which Ian Wood has noted in discussions surrounding Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical engagement with pagan and lay cultures.[73] In this version of the legend, the congregation can see the abstractions of the liturgy turned into living concerns, expressed in the vernacular, obtaining in a spectacular but nevertheless familiar setting outside the Church's usual space and time. On the other hand, the intermingling of sacred and profane also has a troubling effect, which tends to attract the attention of both contemporary churchmen and later scholars. This concern certainly threatens towards the end of the Andrew legend, as humour and irony begin to infuse the narrative when the Mermedonians are threatened with watery extinction.[74] In a carnivalesque turn, once again similar to dramatic developments in the later middles ages, prayers for the dead, for the safety of all in a dwelling place, for baptism and its effects, are all inverted; in the Old English verse version, the baptismal waters become a beer feast in which the drinkers have so much to drink that they themselves are swallowed in the waters, and in this version, those who ate others are themselves eaten by the very 'waters of life.'

Another possibility which might have informed the insinuation of liturgical language and motifs into this legend is the possible need to lend it more legitimacy, authority and orthodoxy. While Anglo-Saxon literary culture made

[71] Cf. H. Magennis, *Images of Community in Old English Poetry* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 4–5.

[72] For one approach to this subject, see D. Dumville, 'Liturgical Drama and Panegyric Responsory from the Eighth Century: a Re-Examination of the Origin and Contents of the Ninth-Century *Book of Cerne*', *JTS* 23 (1972), 375–406.

[73] I. Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelization of Europe 400–1050* (New York, 2001), p. 84.

[74] An insightful discussion of this tendency is provided by H. Magennis, 'A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to Heaven: Humorous Incongruity in Old English Saints' Lives', *Humour and Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. J. Wilcox (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 137–57; and also J. Wilcox, 'Eating People is Wrong: Funny Style in *Andreas* and its Analogues', *Anglo-Saxon Styles*, ed. C. Karkov (Albany, 2003) pp. 201–22.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

frequent use of texts which now may be considered apocryphal, there is evidence that 'Saint Andrew amongst the Cannibals' excited more anxiety among some Anglo-Saxon clergy than usual. For instance Ælfric, who as Frederick Biggs has pointed out, decided when he came to the tradition of Andrew to work with the more orthodox account of the apostle's martyrdom in Achaia rather than the much more canonically problematic Mermedonian legend.[75] Also, the Old English verse version of the legend makes numerous and significant changes to the Greek and Latin accounts to correct a wide array of their less orthodox aspects. One of the ways in which the borrowing of liturgical language and motifs might have imparted a greater degree of this orthodoxy and legitimacy to the prose legend is through the sheer antiquity of the Saint Andrew's Mass. Both Blatt and Boenig believe the earliest Greek versions, in which most later liturgical elements are already found, to date from late antiquity.[76] This, and the pervasive inclusion of Saint Andrew's Mass in the liturgical calendars of both Eastern and Western Christendom from a very early date, point up this mass's venerable status and regular performance since that time. Thus, this mass had a well established tradition across a wide geographic area which would have been conducive to its legitimacy and orthodoxy, and borrowing from it could have transmitted some of that status to a legend which was otherwise much more suspect. In addition, while a certain amount of this borrowing comes from the Proper of Saint Andrew's Mass, even more comes from the Ordinary. Though this mass itself is well established and trusted (it has not changed significantly for the last 1500 years), the Ordinary is, by the early eleventh century even more so. If Anglo-Saxon writers were inclined to draw upon an authoritative body of Christian text other than scripture,[77] and if the Ordinary is firmly located within this body of canonical Christian literature, then articulating aspects of this suspect legend in the language of the Ordinary might have undergirded the former's legitimacy.

In sum, then, evidence indicates that Ælfric, the poet of the Old English version, and the writers of the Old English prose accounts held reservations about the orthodox content of the legend to a sufficient degree that they changed or removed substantial elements of its plot, or in the case of Ælfric, avoided the Mermedonian version of the legend entirely. In addition to revising much of the legend's content, such anxiety could have been somewhat allayed in the prose version by echoing an ancient mass and availing itself of the mass' universally accepted element (the Ordinary).

If such literary motives are accepted, then a number of avenues open for

[75] F. M. Biggs, 'Ælfric's Andrew and the Apocrypha', *JEGP* 104 (2005), 475–96.
[76] Blatt, *Actae Andreae et Mattiae*, p. 1; Boenig, *The Acts of Andrew*, p. 3.
[77] Biggs, 'Ælfric's Andrew', p. 474.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

further investigation. For instance, one may ask what is the range of 'legitimacies' sought for other Anglo-Saxon literature, such as in a number of the so-called *Metrical Charms*, which manifest as what seems an uncomfortable blend of Christian and pagan rite.[78] Likewise, does the legitimizing impulse inherent in the borrowing methodologies of pagan and secular literary cultures, in Anglo-Saxon England, also point up the possibility of the interdependent borrowing of methodologies between them? In other words, do they borrow aspects of each other's borrowing methods?[79] The manner in which this Old English prose version of 'Saint Andrew amongst the Cannibals' affords a particular avenue into such questions seems to be rich with potential insight and illumination for those questions.

[78] See here J. Vaughan-Sterling, 'The Anglo-Saxon Metrical Charms: Poetry as Ritual', *JEGP* 82 (1983), 186–200; L. Weston, 'The Language of Magic in Two Old English Metrical Charms', *NM* 86 (1985), 176–86; L. Bragg, 'The Modes of the Old English Metrical Charms', *The Comparatist: Jnl of the Southern Comparative Lit. Assoc.* 16 (1992), 3–23.

[79] Again, see both E. Stanley, 'Linguistic Self-Awareness', pp. 237–53, and A. Wollmann, 'Early Christian Loan-Words', pp. 175–210.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675114000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press