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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the literary reception and treatment of the twelve apostles in Anglo-Saxon England with an emphasis on the cult of St. Andrew. The dissertation is presented in two parts. Part I, entitled “Apostleship, Apostolicity and the Twelve in Anglo-Saxon England,” focuses on the notion of apostleship and how it was understood in Anglo-Saxon England with regard to the various essential aspects of the office such as missionary zeal, witness, right teaching, spiritual healing, ascetic living, and intercession. Part II, “The Cult of St. Andrew in Anglo-Saxon England,” offers a history and survey of St. Andrew as he appears in the Anglo-Saxon literary tradition across a variety of genres including historical, exegetical, calendrical, martyrological, liturgical, devotional and apocryphal narrative or verse. Incorporating evidence from both Anglo-Latin and Old English traditions, the study offers a well-rounded examination of the twelve apostles as they were venerated collectively and the first thorough survey of an apostle cult in the Anglo-Saxon Period.
The preceding quote, found in variant forms in the “Proverbs of Alfred” and the “Old English Distichs of Cato,” has long played in the back of my mind during work on this dissertation. Translated roughly as, “It is less risky to be in a small ship on a small body of water than in a large ship on a large body of water,” this bit of wisdom is good advice for any young scholar beginning in the field. If anything, I embarked with this dissertation on an immense ocean, and the subsequent process has been one of trying to find smaller, more manageable lakes to navigate. The doctoral research represented here is part of an ongoing, larger project to survey the cults of all twelve apostles in the literary evidence of Anglo-Saxon England, both Anglo-Latin and Old English. In its nascent stage, the dissertation began as a comparison between Anglo-Saxon and Irish traditions about all twelve apostles. The subject was understandably too vast, and, to my everlasting shame, the Irish were quickly jettisoned overboard. I hope to swing back and pick them up some day. Having acquired a smaller boat and setting out on a smaller body of water, I set out to survey the apostle cults in Anglo-Saxon England alone. Once again, finding myself lost at sea, all but Andrew were thrown overboard. Andrew has proven good company along the way, though both the boat and the body of water likely remain too large for a scholar just starting out. One could work one’s entire life on any one of the apostles and still feel that there is much left to say.
The idea for the dissertation was born out of my initial forays into the study of Anglo-Saxon hagiography in its various forms ranging from epic verse narrative to homiletic renderings of apocryphal passiones. While reading such texts as the Old English Andreas or Ælfric’s numerous homilies, I was constantly drawn to questions regarding concepts of authority, apocryphal source materials, literary adaptation, and the rhetorical application of these various legends. More often than not, I found it difficult to quickly locate answers to my questions, particularly with regard to universal saints. Within the growing field of Anglo-Saxon hagiographical studies, much academic emphasis has been placed on peculiarly English saints such as Oswald, Swithun, Cuthbert and Guthlac. While the study of these more localized cults has produced both productive and enlightening discourse, it has so far eclipsed research into Anglo-Saxon participation in the cults of those saints more widely revered throughout Christendom. To a certain extent, such a trend is understandable, for local saints offer a vast deal of insight into the veneration and practices of individual religious communities, help scholars trace the development of regional or national identities, and prove invaluable in establishing provenance for liturgical manuscripts. As my interests began to focus increasingly on the more theologically significant Twelve, however, I found that the vital scholarship was prohibitively diffuse and oftentimes esoteric in emphasis. Upon reading Mary Clayton’s erudite book on the cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England, I longed for a similar source for the apostles; one that could help the uninitiated trace the background, both orthodox and apocryphal, of the apostles’ cults and elucidate the nature of their reverence as found in the Anglo-Latin and Old English literary traditions. The production of a work that introduces the Anglo-Saxon understanding of apostles and traces one of the more significant apostles, St. Andrew, as he appears in all manner of genres represents a first step on the way to filling that desideratum.
The dissertation here is presented in two parts. Each part is rather self-contained and very different in both focus and aim, though attempts have been made to highlight salient points that tie them together wherever possible. Part I, entitled “Apostleship, Apostolicity and the Twelve in Anglo-Saxon England,” focuses on the notion of apostleship and how it was understood in Anglo-Saxon England. It is divided into sections based on various essential aspects of the office of apostle such as missionary zeal, witness, right teaching, spiritual healing, ascetic living, salvation, etc. Each section explores how the Anglo-Saxon Church interpreted a characteristic of apostleship and how the apostles influenced Anglo-Saxon life and thought by exemplifying that particular quality of their office. By and large, Part I focuses on the collective veneration of the Twelve and how they embodied each of these individual aspects. Consequently, a great deal of specific information about the employment and interpretation of individual apostles has been tabled for later research focusing on their respective cults.

Part II offers a history and survey of St. Andrew as he appears in the Anglo-Saxon literary tradition across a variety of genres including historical, exegetical, calendrical, martyrological, liturgical, devotional and narrative. Because not every single reference made to Andrew in Anglo-Saxon England can, of course, be discussed, the section follows two main lines of inquiry. First it seeks to explore Andrew’s presence in the canonical texts of the Bible and the exegetical commentaries that elucidate upon his appearances there. The second line of inquiry focuses on the appearance of apocryphal materials related to Andrew and seeks to establish their influence and gradual intrusion upon the literary corpus. While every attempt at thoroughness with regards to Andrew has been made, I make no claims for comprehensiveness.

Due to the central position occupied by the apostles within Christian faith and theology, the apostles are quite pervasive in the literature. Consequently, some comment about the scope
and parameters of the dissertation are necessary. With regards to inclusion, a conscious decision was made to incorporate both Anglo-Latin and Old English sources. Latinate and vernacular traditions did not thrive in a vacuum and there was certainly cross-pollination occurring between the two. As a result, any well-rounded survey of the “Anglo-Saxon” understanding of apostleship or a certain apostle must necessarily look to both traditions in order to arrive at an accurate assessment. By way of exclusion, this dissertation focuses on the persons of the apostles, that is, the biographical details about the apostles including their deeds in canonical scripture, apocryphal acts, missions, passions, burials, and translation of their relics. This means that I have largely eschewed epigrapha and pseudepigrapha attributed to the apostles. On occasion, where the Pauline or Catholic Epistles are necessary to arrive at a clearer understanding of apostleship, their evidence is brought to bear. This is more often the case in Part I than in Part II. The advantage of choosing Andrew to study is that there are no canonical epistles attributed to him and no pseudepigrapha that had any influence on Anglo-Saxon England. What we know of Andrew stems entirely from the Bible and the apocryphal acta and passiones that were in circulation during the early Middle Ages. These texts are, of course, more than enough. Andrew, as we shall see, was somewhat peculiar among the Twelve for his especial veneration in Anglo-Saxon England and the wealth of apocryphal traditions circulating about him, including but not limited to the only vernacular epic dedicated to an apostle—the Old English Andreas.

One last note should be made about the sources used in this study. The reader will doubtlessly notice, especially in Part I, the preponderance of evidence drawn from the venerable Bede and Ælfric of Eynsham. The reason for this is quite simple. These two authors, as exegetes and teachers, had the most to say about the apostles; hence their voices tend to rise to
the top. We also have the advantage with these two authors that the vast majority of their works have appeared in reliable editions and are, thus, readily available to a graduate student with a good library and limited travel funds. This does not negate the fact, however, that relying primarily on Bede and Ælfric is not without its dangers. The two scholars represent opposite ends of the Anglo-Saxon age (separated by nearly three hundred years) and there is always the risk that the era may be reduced into a single, homogenous period without recognition of variation over time. Bede’s England was certainly not the same as Ælfric’s. That said, the idea of apostolicity was a rather conservative concept, and Bede and Ælfric were both relatively conservative scholars. What continuity may be found likely has a lot to do with the subject matter and the Anglo-Saxon scholars’ traditional proclivities. Where possible, I have tried to include other voices as well, especially those of Alcuin and Boniface. Though their careers saw them working largely on the continent, they were both born and studied in England and may, therefore, be considered representative of an extension of Anglo-Saxon learning. Unfortunately, in the case of Alcuin, many of his works remain unedited and any reference to his thoughts must be considered but a small sampling.
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PART I

Apostleship, Apostolicity and the Twelve in Anglo-Saxon England

Whereas all words carry a certain weight of meaning, few shoulder the rich history, profound theological significance and sweeping diversity of associations as do the etymologically related terms: apostle, apostleship and apostolicity. As the various denominations and off-shoots of Christianity have evolved over the past two millennia, so too have the connotations and meanings connected with the word “apostle” changed to reflect the respective needs and beliefs of individual religious communities. For a Roman Catholic today, the term “apostle” doubtlessly conjures associations with the church’s nascent period, recalling Christ’s inner circle of the Twelve, the apostle Paul, and, perhaps, several other influential missionaries active during the first centuries of the Christian faith. Among certain denominations of the evangelical faithful in North America’s “Bible Belt,” however, the word “apostle” can take on greater immediacy, being applied to any number of contemporary preachers believed to have received spiritual charism or revealed wisdom directly from Christ. In some present-day religious communities, e.g. the New Apostolic Church or the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, the title “apostle” takes on a specific technical meaning of office, awarded to church leaders and denoting certain rights and responsibilities within the church hierarchy. While a central understanding of an apostle as a messenger or mouthpiece of God provides a common thread linking such disparate interpretations of apostleship, these religious communities nevertheless maintain both fundamental and nuanced differences.
regarding who may be called an apostle, who may confer the title, the direct source of apostolic authority, the requisite qualities of true witness, the tasks of office, the unity of a universal church, and the role of tradition in defining church doctrine. Consequently, an exploration of how any one particular religious community interprets the apostles and their office can lend important insight into both its theology and societal values.

This part of the dissertation will offer an evaluation of the surviving literary evidence, both Anglo-Latin and vernacular Old English, in an effort to ascertain just how the Anglo-Saxons viewed the apostles. We will seek to address such questions as: What did the Anglo-Saxons understand by the term *apostol*. Whom did they deem worthy of bearing the appellation? What were the defining characteristics that distinguished them as a group apart from the numerous other saints and martyrs of the Catholic Church? What qualities were expected in someone to fulfill the office of an apostle, i.e., apostleship? Where did the Anglo-Saxons fall on the issue of apostolic witness, which modern theologians have seen fit to divide between a more historically based, “Lucan” witness and the revelatory nature of “Pauline” witness? What was the theological significance of the apostles, both in terms of their witness to Christ’s teachings, passion and resurrection as well as to their soteriological role in salvation history for both Jews and Gentiles? How were the apostles employed as a rhetorical trope to address issues of potential heterodoxy? How did the Anglo-Saxon missionaries and monastic communities look to the apostles for inspiration and example when conducting their own evangelical missions to the European continent and instituting reform movements for the regularization of Christian learning and the ascetic life? How did Anglo-Saxon monks and religious scholars view themselves in

---

relation to the apostles? In what ways did the themes of apostolicity, i.e., the belief in the continual succession of witness and official authority passed from bishop to bishop in an unbroken chain dating back to the Twelve, serve to solidify Anglo-Saxon relations with the church in Rome? What was the special significance afforded to the Twelve, and how was their number interpreted both literally and figuratively by Anglo-Saxon exegetes? All of these questions are crucial when trying to arrive at a well-rounded assessment of the Anglo-Saxon understanding of these essential founders of the church.

The apostles were most certainly on the collective Anglo-Saxon mind. The nearly two-thousand hits accrued by a simple search of *apostol* and its etymologically derived terms in the online *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* attests to the pervasiveness of the apostles in vernacular Old English literature, not to mention the wealth of Anglo-Latin sources. That the Anglo-Saxons clearly thought in terms of the office of apostleship is evidenced by an anonymous homilist’s rendering of Latin *apostolatus* into OE *apostolhad* (i.e., the state of being an apostle) when adapting a passage from the apocryphal *Transitus Mariae* of Ps.-Miletus into a homily celebrating the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. According to the homilist:

And ða apostolas þa gesetton þone halgan lichoman in bære. And Iohannes cwæð to Petre: ‘Þe gedafenað þysne palman to beranne and þæt þu gonge beforan þas bære for ðon þe þu us ealle in geleafan þæs apostolhades forgæst.’

And the apostles then set the holy body [of Mary] upon a bier. And John spoke to Peter: It is fitting for you to carry this palm and that you should go before that bier, because you precede us all in the faith of this apostleship.

---

The homilist goes on to translate: *Paulus cwæd, for þon þe ic eower ealra gingest eom in þan apostolhade ic bere þa bære mid þe* (“Paul spoke: Because I am the most recent of all of you in this *apostleship*, I shall carry the bier with you”).

Thus, the narrative asserts Paul’s place among the apostles, while simultaneously recognizing that Paul did not himself witness the life and crucifixion of Christ, only coming into the office later after his revelation on the road to Damascus. To some extent, this passage may reflect Paul’s own statement in 1 Cor. 15:9 that he should be counted least among the apostles. By drawing attention to Peter’s seniority relative to Paul, the anonymous homilist provides some insight into how the Anglo-Saxons may have inherited certain views regarding the relative status of the individual apostles within their office; i.e., Peter is considered chief among the apostles (he gets to carry the palm at the head of Mary’s funeral procession), whereas Paul, though included among their ranks, is to be interpreted as possessing some lesser stature in comparison to Peter and apart from the Twelve.

OE *apostolhad*, however, was not always used in the broadest possible sense to refer to the office of apostleship, but rather could appeal to certain qualities associated with the apostles. At the conclusion of the epic poem *Andreas*, after the eponymous hero Andrew has converted the apostles, approaching, set the holy body upon the bier. It is fitting that you should carry this palm and go before us, [you] who rightly deserved to precede us all in the apostleship of the faith.”

3 Unless otherwise noted, translations are my own.


5 1 Cor. 15:9 *ego enim sum minimus apostolorum qui non sum dignus vocari apostolus quoniam persecutus sum ecclesiam Dei* (“For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God”). All scriptural citations in Latin are taken from R. Weber & R. Gryson, ed., *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, 5th edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007). Translations of the Vulgate are based upon that of the Douay-Rheims version with occasional liberties taken to enhance clarity or emphasize sense.
cannibalistic Mermedonians to the Christian faith, the apostle orders a church be established and
consecrates a certain Plato as their first bishop:

\[\text{þær se ar Godes anne gesette} \]
\[\text{wisfæstne wer, wordes gleawne,} \]
\[\text{in þære beorhtan byrig bisceop þam leodum,} \]
\[\text{ond gehal gode fore þam heremægene} \]
\[\text{þurh apostolhad, Platan nemned,} \]
\[\text{þeodum on pearfe; ond þriste bebead} \]
\[\text{þæt he his lare læston georne,} \]
\[\text{feorhræd fremedon}.^6 \]

There the messenger of God appointed a certain
learned man, wise of word,
in that radiant city as bishop for the people(s),
and consecrated before that mighty host,
through [his] apostleship. [the one] named Plato,
for the need of the people(s); and earnestly bade
that they readily follow his teaching
[and] achieve the life-benefit [i.e. salvation].

In this instance, the word *apostolhad* might be translated more appropriately as “apostolic
authority” as opposed to simply “apostleship.” Here the author is clearly alluding to the belief
that Andrew, as an apostle of Christ and member of the Twelve, is imbued with the special
power to consecrate bishops, and that Plato’s subsequent authority over the newly established
Mermedonian church derives from the direct succession of his knowledge about Christ and his
teachings from Andrew himself. Thus, *apostolhad* is used in *Andreas* to refer more specifically
to the doctrine of apostolic succession.

In his *Fates of the Apostles*, the poet Cynewulf uses *apostolhad* in a slightly different
manner. Immediately after relating how Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom under the emperor
Nero, he writes: *is se apostolhad | wide geweordod | ofer werbeoda* (“That *apostleship* is
honored widely among nations”).^7 Here Cynewulf hits on another aspect of apostleship, i.e., the
ability of the apostles to bear witness to Christ’s passion through their own suffering and
martyrdoms. Thus, the literal intent is that Peter and Paul’s martyrdoms are revered throughout
the Christian world. Yet the use of *apostolhad* here draws upon the added significance that
martyrdom belongs to the office of apostleship (excepting John, of course) and further stresses

---


that it is the martyrs’ ability to fulfill that office, even in its grimmest capacity, that has become renowned. Hence a translation such as Bradley’s “apostolic dignity” may best get to the sense of the passage in that Cynewulf implies that Peter and Paul’s passions dignify their office and ensure that their entire mission, not just their deaths, achieve recognition throughout Christendom.⁸

The fact that apostolhad can be used in Old English to reference different aspects constituting the apostolic office rather than as a rote translation for Latin apostolatus should serve as a warning about the complexity of associations that underlie Anglo-Saxon notions of apostleship. Unfortunately, Anglo-Saxon writers rarely sought to distinguish specifically what was meant by apostolhad. No theological tractates have survived from the Anglo-Saxon period in which the nature of apostleship is itself the primary subject of definition or scrutiny. As a result, we are forced to peruse the corpus of Anglo-Latin and Old English learning in an effort to glean some approximate understanding of those conceptions regarding the apostles current in early medieval England. Milton McC. Gatch has broadly summed up the character of Anglo-Saxon theology with the word “conservative,” meaning that the early English church relied heavily on the orthodox doctrines of the Roman Church to provide form to their theological and ideological outlook.⁹ Given the “conservative” proclivities of Anglo-Saxon religious writers, it should come as little surprise to find that their idea of apostleship should align closely with that of the Roman church. Indeed, contemporary scholars and students well-versed in the teachings and hagiographical traditions of the Roman Catholic faith will doubtlessly find much familiar

---


⁹ M. McC. Gatch, Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Wulfstan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), p. 4. “If a single word were to be chosen to characterize early medieval theology, it would probably have to be conservative.”
within these pages. That said, Anglo-Saxon religious houses engaged with the apostles on a
daily basis, and it would be naïve to suppose that they brought nothing of their own when
interpreting the apostles and their sacred office. This part of the dissertation, by highlighting the
Anglo-Saxon writers’ own words rather than simply those of Rome, will help delineate early
medieval England’s contribution to the understanding of apostleship.
1. The Apostolic Mission and Missionary Zeal

Ultimately derived from ancient Greek ἀπόστολος, the very word “apostle” (OE apostol or less frequently postol) remains influenced by the original term’s meanings of “messenger,” “ambassador,” or “envoy.”¹ In contrast to more contemporary Christian notions of apostleship, however, the earliest attestations of the Greek word are largely devoid of religious associations and tend to appear in secular contexts.² For instance, the historian Herodotus (fifth century BCE) uses the term ἀπόστολος twice to describe envoys dispatched with the authority to negotiate truces or alliances on behalf of their respective leaders.³ The Attic orator Lysias (mid fifth to early fourth century BCE) uses the accusative singular ἀπόστολον to refer to a naval envoy tasked with securing a marriage alliance between Dionysius, ruler of Syracuse, and

---


³ Herodotus, Persian Wars I.21 (Alyattes II, king of Lydia, sends an envoy to make peace with Thrasybulus, the tyrant of Miletus); V.38 (Aristagoras of Miletus, after deposing several despots in Ionia, sends an envoy to make an alliance with the Spartans)
Evagoras, king of Salamis in Cyprus, against the Spartans.⁴ In his seminal contribution to the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, K. H. Rengstorf has noted where the verb ἀποστέλλειν (“to send forth”), even in its earlier, secular contexts, carries with it “the significance that the sending implies a commission bound up with the person of the one sent.”⁵ In other words, the one sent is primarily to be identified by virtue of his commission, appearing not strictly as himself but as a proxy imbued with the monarch’s authority.⁶ Rengstorf further points to the use of ἀποστέλλειν (often with the variant ἐξαποστέλλειν) over seven hundred times in the Septuagint to render the Hebrew root ἰליש (“to send”) when translating the Old Testament, cautioning that the verb has still not taken on an exclusively religious significance:

Even in the accounts of the sending of the prophets we do not have a purely religious use. In such contexts the word simply denotes sending; it acquires a religious connotation only to the extent that the situation is religiously conditioned and the obedience of the one to be sent is seen as a self-evident attitude before God as the One who sends—an obedience not to be distinguished in its practical results from that which might be rendered, e.g., to a king.⁷

Stemming from this lexical correspondence between ἰליש in the Hebrew Old Testament and ἀποστέλλειν in the Septuagint, a great deal of debate has arisen over the extent to which the juridical Hebrew shaliah-concept (_idleš: “envoy, agent”) informed the Christian apostle-concept and whether the former institution gave immediate rise to the latter.⁸ To this day, there remains little consensus on the matter.

---


⁵ Rengstorf (1964), p. 398. While noting that ἀποστέλλειν and ἀπόστολος appear primarily in secular contexts, Rengstorf does draw attention to early Hellenic usages where the terms refer to “the impartation of full religious and ethical power.” For example, the Stoic philosopher Epictetus operates under the presupposition that true Cynics possess an “awareness of being divinely sent.” Cf. Rengstorf (1964), pp. 399-400, 408-13.


⁸ The conceptual similarities between ἀπόστολος and shaliah were first proposed by J. B. Lightfoot in 1865. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, Classic Commentary Library, 2nd reprint edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1957), pp. 92-101. For the debate surrounding the Christian apostle-concept’s indebtedness to the
Regardless of the term’s exact pedigree as derived from either Hellenistic or Jewish emissarial notions, the spiritual and religious connotations of ἀπόστολος became increasingly dominant via the word’s employment in the New Testament. Of the seventy-nine fully attested occurrences of the word in the Greek New Testament, Rengstorf has ascertained that ἀπόστολος never refers simply to the act of sending or the object being sent, rather, “It always denotes a man who is sent, and sent with full authority.”9 On occasion, ἀπόστολος denotes a “commissioned representative of a congregation,” as is the case when Paul requests that several of his disciples accompany him to Jerusalem in 2 Cor. 8:23, referring to his selected followers as ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν (“apostles of the churches”).10 In this instance, the “apostles of the churches” are also described by the appositive phrase δόξα Χριστοῦ (“the glory of Christ”), thereby alluding to the fact that their calling is, in fact, the Lord’s commission and essentially religious in nature.11 More frequently, ἀπόστολος serves as a “comprehensive term for bearers of the N[ew] T[estament] message,” initially referring to the Twelve (the original apostles including Matthias) and later to other early Christian missionaries such as Paul, Barnabas, James, brother of the Lord, and others.12 Thus, by the time the Latinate world encountered the holy scriptures in

---

Greek, the word ἀπόστολος had undergone a dramatic semantic narrowing from its initial secular sense of “envoy” to the religiously charged, Christian meaning of “God’s messenger on earth” and “purveyor of the gospel.” In some cases, especially within legal circles, Roman usage would continue to preserve the secular usage. For example, the Corpus iuris civilis, a sixth-century legal code commissioned by Justinian I and heavily influenced by Byzantine Greek traditions, glosses apostoli as “letters of dismissal” sent in order to appeal a case.13 Outside of the rather esoteric terminology of Roman legalese, however, Latin writers tended to adopt the word apostolus into religious contexts and the term appears largely in conjunction with its Christian meaning “messenger of Christ.”

When rendering Greek ἀπόστολος and Latin apostolus into the vernacular as Old English apostol, Anglo-Saxon scholars were not ignorant of its more general meaning as messenger or one sent. In his commentary on Lk 6:13, where Christ elects twelve of his disciples into his inner circle, calling them “apostles,” the venerable Bede translates the meaning of the Greek term into Latin, stating: Apostoli Graece Latine missi dicuntur (“Apostles in Greek are called the ones sent in Latin”).14 While this translation leaves open the possibility that the word could be used in secular contexts, Bede quickly moves on to cite the gospels of Mark and John in order

---

13 Digesta 50, 16, 106: ‘Dismissoriae litterae’ dicuntur, quae volgo apostoli dicuntur. Dimissoriae autem dictae, quod cause ad eum qui appellatus est dimittitur (“They are called ‘letters of dismissal,’ those which are commonly called ‘apostles’ [i.e. appeals]. Moreover, they are called letters of dismissal because by [their] means one is sent off to him to whom an appeal is made”). Cf. P. Krueger & T. Mommsen, ed., Corpus iuris civilis: Volumen Prius; Institutiones. Digesta (Berlin: Weidmann, 1872), p. 861.

14 Bede, In Luc., Bk. II, Ch. 6, p. 132, ll. 1263-64. The passage from Lk 6:13 reads: et cum dies factus esset vocavit discipulos suos et elegit duodecim ex ipsis quos et apostolos nominavit (“And when day came, he summoned his disciples and chose twelve of them whom he also named apostles”). Bede’s translation of the Greek term likely represents a condensation and paraphrase of Isidore of Seville’s etymology: Apostoli missi interpretantur. Hoc enim eorum nomen indicat. Nam sicut Graece ἄγγελοι, Latine nuntii vocantur, ita Graece Apostoli, Latine missi appellantur (“‘Apostles’ is interpreted as the ones sent. Their name indicates this. For just as Greek ἄγγελοι are called ‘those announcing’ in Latin, so too are ‘apostles’ in Greek called ‘the ones sent’ in Latin.”). Isidore Etym. VII.9.1 As is often the case, this source is overlooked in Hurst’s edition of Bede’s Ex. in Luc. A thorough sourcing of Bede’s exegetical works remains a major desideratum in the field.
to draw attention to the word’s peculiarly Christian definition, writing: *Cuius sacramentum nominis exponens evangelista Marcus ait: ‘Et fecit ut essent duodecim cum illo et ut mitteret eos praedicare evangelium;’* (Mk 3:14) *et ipse dominus dicit: ‘Sicut misit me pater et ego mitto uos’* (Jn. 20:21) (“Expounding upon the sacred charge of this name, Mark the Evangelist spoke: ‘And he made that twelve should be with him, and that he might send them to preach the gospel,’ and the Lord himself said: ‘Just as the Father sent me, so too do I send you.’”). By observing the “sacred charge” associated with the name “apostle,” Bede effectively delimits the use of the word to denote those chosen by Christ to be purveyors of the gospel.

The potential ambiguity of the Greek term can also be recognized in the frequent translation of *apostolus* into Old English by the word *ǣrendraca*. Derived from the noun *ǣrende* (“errand”) and the verb *wrecan* (“to make, achieve”), *ǣrendraca* can be used to denote any type of messenger regardless of secular or religious context. In his account of the life of St. Edmund, king and martyr, Ælfric employs *ǣrendraca* in a strictly secular sense when referring to the messenger sent by Hingwar, the pagan leader of the invading Danish forces, to King Edmund, asking the Northumbrian king to either do homage or meet his death. Whereas Hingwar’s envoy represents a pagan *ǣrendraca*, Ælfric also uses the term when referring to specifically

---

15 Note that Bede offers a variant reading slightly at odds with the standard Vulgate by including the word *euangelium* after *praedicare* in Mk 3:14. The inclusion of *euangelium* is noted by Weber as a variant Vulgate reading attested in the *Codex Amiatinus* and the *Codex Sangermanensis*. In citing scriptural authority, Bede diverges somewhat from Isidore, though Isidore himself defined the apostles as those sent by Christ to preach the gospel, stating: *Ipsos enim misit Christus evangelizare per universum mundum, ita ut quidam Persas Indosque penetrarent docentes gentes, et facientes in nomine Christi magna et incredibilia miracula, ut adtestantibus signis et prodigiis crederetur illis in his quae dicebant et viderant* (“For Christ sent them to evangelize throughout the whole world so that several of them penetrated into Persia and India, teaching the peoples and performing great and unbelievable miracles in the name of Christ in order that, through those corroborating signs and wonders, it might be made believable in them, those things which they did say and see.”). Isidore, *Etym.* VII.9.1.

16 He sende ða sona syððan to þam cyninge beotlice ærende. þæt he abugan sceold } to his man-æradene gif he rohte his foeres. Se ærendraca com þa to eadmunde cyninge and hinguares ærende him ardlice aead ("Immediately afterwards he [i.e. Hingwar] then sent a threatening message to the king that he must bow in homage to him if he cared for his life. The messenger then came to King Edmund and promptly announced Hingwar’s message.") *Ælfric LS* II.32, p. 316, ll. 43-7.
Christian messengers. For example, in his homily on the life of St. Gregory (CH II.9), Ælfric relates how the future pope initially wished to decline his nomination for the papacy for fear of being seduced by worldly glory, sending his refusal of office in an epistle to the emperor Mauricius, only to have the letter ripped from the hands of his ārendraca and torn apart by the emperor’s prefect, Germanus.¹⁷ In this instance, the term ārendraca, while applied to an obviously Christian courier, implies nothing more than the individual’s task as envoy and carries no hint of any missionary imperative to preach the gospel. Thus, despite the overtly Christian context, Ælfric’s use of the word here carries no real religious or spiritual significance.

When applied as a direct translation for apostolus¹⁸, however, ārendraca could take on a much more specific and technical meaning. In much the same way as Bede glosses apostoli as missi, so too does Ælfric use the plural ārendracan to clarify the meaning of the Old English loan-word apostolas. In his treatise on the Old and New Testaments addressed to Sigwerd of Easthealon, Ælfric describes how Christ chose the Twelve as apostles, specifying that the term means “messengers”: ða bec us secgað swutelice be Criste, hu he wundra worhte 7 hu he wæs gefulled 7 hu he apostolas geceas, þæt sind ārendracan, twelf on anginne þa þa he ærest bodode ("Those books [i.e. the scriptures] clearly tell us about Christ, how he performed miracles and how he was baptized and how he chose twelve apostles, that is ‘messengers,’ in the beginning when he first preached").¹⁹ Ælfric goes on to explain that these apostolas/ārendracas are not simply just any messengers of Christ’s word, but that the terms refer specifically to the Twelve (minus Judas and including Matthias) and Paul:

¹⁷ Ælfric, CH II.9, p. 75, ll. 96-103.

¹⁸ Ælfric was not alone in rendering apostolus as ārendrace. Indeed, the terms were broadly accepted as equivalent. Cf. the gloss ārendraca applied to apostolus in L. Kindschi, “The Latin-Old English Glossaries in Plantin-Moretus MS. 32 and British Museum MS. Additional 32246,” PhD Thesis (Stanford University, 1955).

¹⁹ Ælfric OT/NT, pp. 54-5, ll. 899-902.
These are [the ones] called by this name [i.e. apostles] in books [i.e. the scriptures]—Peter and Andrew, James and John, Thomas, Matthew and the second James, Philip and Bartholomew, Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite and Paul; but Paul was chosen after Christ’s ascension, and one also chose Matthias in place of Judas, who betrayed Christ and was then rejected. After these [i.e. the apostles], he chose seventy-two as his disciples for his mission of teaching, whom he sent everywhere, to each town where he was to come so that mankind might know of his coming; but we have not found their names written at all in books.

In listing the specific persons designated “by this name” (apostolas/ǣrendracan) and distinguishing them from the seventy-two disciples whom he identifies as leorningcnihtum (“disciples, followers, pupils”), Ælfric shows that the term apostol (and by extension ǣrendraca when used as a direct translation for apostol) carries with it not only the meaning of Christ’s messenger, but is used as an honorific to denote more specifically the Twelve and Paul. Ælfric makes this same distinction elsewhere when summarizing God’s plan for salvation history in his homily on creation (CH I.1): Þa siðþan geceas he him leorninccnihtas; ærest twelf. þa we hatað apostolas þæt ærendracan. syþðan he geceas two 7 hundseyfentig. þa sint genemnedediscipuli. þæt sint leorninccnihtas (“Then afterwards he chose pupils for himself; first the twelve, whom we call ‘apostles,’ that is ‘messengers;’ afterward he chose seventy-two, who are

---

20 Ælfric OT/NT, p. 55, ll. 902-10.

21 The editor of Ælfric’s treatise on the Old and New Testaments, S. J. Crawford, interprets the passage somewhat differently, reading þisum naman as a dative plural referring to the names of the apostles as opposed to a dative singular which would refer to the name or title of apostle. Cf. Crawford’s translation: “... and how when he began to preach he chose Apostles, that is by interpretation Messengers, twelve [sic] in number, whose names in the bookes [sic] are recorded to be these, ...” Ælfric OT/NT, p. 55. Given the deterioration of inflections due to lack of stress in Late West-Saxon, Crawford is not necessarily incorrect in his reading. In Standard West-Saxon, however, one would expect namum as the dative plural of the masculine n-stem nama, rather than naman, which can serve as the dative singular. Since Ælfric is clearly trying to make a distinction here between those called “apostles” and “disciples,” the context lends credence to a dative singular reading referring to the title “apostle” rather than the apostles’ individual names. This reading is then further supported by the fact that Ælfric makes this same distinction elsewhere in the passage from CH I.1 discussed next.
named ‘disciples,’ that is ‘pupils’”).Ælfric’s rather narrow definition here of who may be
deeded “apostles” in no way implies that the title was exclusively applied to the Twelve and
Paul by all Anglo-Saxon writers. As shall be explored later, while these thirteen would always
claim a certain primacy with regards to the name, other important missionary figures who were
responsible for introducing the Christian faith to new territories could, via analogy, be termed
apostles as well. For example, Ælfric himself follows a well-established tradition of referring
to Pope Gregory the Great as *Engliscre ðeode apostol* (“apostle to the English nation”). What
does become clear through Ælfric’s usage of *ǣrendraca* is the semantic nuancing undergone by
the word during the Old English period, a process that was not dissimilar to what happened with
Greek ἀπόστολος. Originally, *ǣrendraca* was used to denote any kind of messenger imbued with
the authority to act on the part of the sender, an open-ended meaning that the term would
continue to maintain until it fell entirely out of usage in the English language. Once identified
as a standard word for translating Greek ἀπόστολος or Latin *apostolus*, and developing under the
influence of Latin’s predominantly religious understanding of “apostle,” the term *ǣrendraca*
would accrue a more specialized meaning beyond that of a simple messenger, eventually
connoting a New Testament apostle who serves as a mouthpiece for God and purveyor of the
gospel teachings. In more limited circumstances, Old English *ǣrendraca* could even be used in
a technical sense to distinguish the Twelve and Paul from the other disciples and followers of
Christ.

Thus, Old English *apostol* and its partial synonym *ǣrendraca*, through the very essence
of their etymology and meaning, imply the missionary imperative assigned by Christ to the

---

22 Ælfric, *CH* I.1, p. 187, ll. 251-53.


24 Ælfric, *CH* II.9, p. 72, l. 1.
apostles in the gospels and the canonical *Actus apostolorum*.\(^{25}\) This mission to sow the seed of the gospels among the nations of the world such that the Christian faith may blossom and grow was absolutely fundamental to the Anglo-Saxon understanding of apostleship. Commenting on Acts 17:18 and demonstrating some knowledge either directly or indirectly of the Greek New Testament, Bede expounds upon the image of Paul as a “sower of words,” interpreting: *recte seminiverbius, id est σπερμολόγος, vocatur, quia semen est verbum dei et ipse dicit: ‘si nos vobis spiritualia seminavimus’* (“He is rightly called a sower of words (that is, σπερμολόγος), for the seed was the word of God, and he himself said, *If we have sown spiritual things for you* [1 Cor. 9:11］”).\(^{26}\) Ælfric, in one of his homilies on the nativity of the lord (*CH Supp.* 1), draws upon the gospel of Matthew, explaining how the apostles brought the light of faith into the world: *Se Hælend sæde eac to his halgum apostolum, Vos estis lux mundi: Ge syndon middaneardes leoh, for þan ðe hi onlihton manncynn to geleafan mid heora halgan lare* (“The Lord also said to his holy apostles, ‘*Vos estis lux mundi*’ (Mt. 5:14), [that is] ‘you are the light of earth,’ for they would illuminate mankind in faith with their holy learning”).\(^{27}\) Ælfric elaborates more fully on the evangelical mission of the apostles in his homily for the first Sunday after Easter (*CH I.16*):

\[
\text{Swa swa min fæder sende me; swa sende ic eow; se fæder lufað þone sunu; ac þeahhwædere he sende hine to þrowunge. for manna alysbynysse;} \quad \text{‘Just as my father sends me, so I send you.’ The father loves the son, but nevertheless he sent him into suffering for the salvation of man. Christ}
\]


Crist lufode eac his apostolas. 7 þeahwæðere ne sette he hi to cynengum ne to ealdormanunum; ne to woruldlicere blisse; ac tosende hi geond ealne middaneard to bodienne fulluht. 7 þone geleafan þe he sylf tæhte; þa bodedon hi swa lange; oð þet þa þweoran hi ofslogon; 7 hi ferdon sigefæste to heora drihtne; 28

also loved his apostles and nevertheless he did not set them up as kings or nobles, nor [were they given] to worldly bliss. Rather, he sent them through the whole world to preach baptism and the faith which he himself taught. They then preached until such a time that the wicked slew them and they went victorious to their Lord.

In this description, Ælfric makes evident the central vocation of the apostles; that is, they were sent by Christ to the ends of the earth to spread Christianity and the message of the gospels, finally to give witness to Christ’s suffering via their own martyrdoms (except, of course, for John). Thus, the missionary imperative was foundational to the office of apostle and the Anglo-Saxon understanding thereof.

Simply undertaking an evangelical mission into un-Christianized lands, was not enough, however, to define the apostles and their work. Instead, the Anglo-Saxons recognized that a certain supernatural charism was required of the apostles which lent a missionary zeal far beyond the normal desire to preach. Possessing more than a simple longing to spread the faith, the apostles were divinely enthused by the Holy Spirit and compelled to undertake their mission. This enthusiastic zeal is one way in which the events of Pentecost were interpreted. In his Expositio Actuum Apostolorum, Bede cites Gregory the Great’s Moralia in Iob when offering an explanation as to why the Holy Spirit appeared to the apostles in the form of a flame at Pentecost:

‘Per ignem quidem dominus,’ ut beatus papa Gregorius exponit, ‘aparuit, sed per semet ipsum locutionem interius fecit. Et neque ignis deus neque ille sonitus fuit, sed per hoc quod exterius exhibuit expressit hoc quod interius gessit. Qui enim discipulos et zelo succensos et verbo eruditos intus reddidit, foris linguis igneas ostendit. In significatione igitur admodum sunt.'

The Lord appeared indeed through fire, as the blessed pope Gregory explains, but by his own interior [presence] he caused speech to be produced. And God was neither the fire, nor the sound, but by what he exhibited exteriorly he expressed what he brought about interiorly. For because he caused the disciples to be internally inflamed with zeal, and skilled in words,

elementa, ut ignem et sonitum sentirent corpora, igne vero inuisibili et uoce sine sonitu docerentur corda.29 externally there showed tongues of fires. The elements, therefore, were put to use in signification, so that those who in their bodies perceived fire and sound might indeed be taught in their hearts by invisible fire and a voice without sound.30

According to Bede, therefore, the Pentecostal flame was an outward representation of the inward zeal enkindled by the Holy Spirit—a zeal that left the apostles no choice but to embark on their missionary activities. In a homily for Pentecost Sunday (CH I.22), Ælfric too draws on a passage from Gregory regarding missionary ardor, this time from the church-father’s Gospel Homily 30, treating his source passage far more loosely than Bede:

Se halga gast wæs gesewen on fyrenum tumung bufon þam apostolon for þan de he dyde þæt hi waron byrnende on godes willan. 7 bodiende ymbe godes rice; Fyrene tungan hi hæfdon þa ða hæ mid lufe godes maerpa bodedon. þæt þæra hæðena manna heortan þe ceadle werson þurh geleafleaste. 7 fæsclicium gewilnungum. mihton beon ontende to þam heofonlicum bebodum; gif se halga gast ne lærd ðæs mannes móód wiðinnan; on idel beoð ðæs bydeles word wiðutan geclypode; Fyres gecynd is þ[æt] hit fornymð swa hwæt swa him gehende bid; Swa sceal se lareow dón se þe bid mid þan halgan gast onbryrd. ærest on him sylfum ælne leahter adwæscan; 7 syððan on his underþeoddum;31

The Holy Spirit was seen in [the form of] fiery tongues above the apostles for it caused that they were burning with desire for God and preaching about God’s kingdom. They had fiery tongues when they proclaimed the glories of God with love so that the hearts of those heathen men which were cold through faithlessness and carnal desires might be opened to those heavenly commandments. If the Holy Spirit does not instruct the spirit of the man within, in vain are the words of that proclaimer spoken without. The nature of fire is that it consumes whatsoever is near to it. Thus, the teacher who is inspired with the Holy Spirit must first extinguish every disgrace in himself and then afterwards in his subordinates.

---


31 Ælfric, CH I.22, pp. 359-60, ll. 145-55. For the attribution to Gregory’s Homily 30, cf. Godden (2000), p. 180. Cp. Greg. Hom. 30, p. 261, ll. 134-38. Vel certe in linguis igneis apparuit spiritus, quia omnes quos repluerit ardentem pariter et loquentem facit. Lingua ignea doctores habent, quia dum Deum amando praedicant, corda audientium inflammant. Nam otiosus sermo docentis est, si praebere non ualeat incendium amoris. Hoc doctrinae incendium abipso Veritatis ore conceperant qui dicebant: ‘Nonne cor nostrum ardens erat in nobis cum loweretur in uia et aperiret nobis Scripturas?’ Ex audito quippe sermone inardescit animus, torporis frigus recedit, fit mens in superno disiderio anxia, a concupiscientia terreis aliena (“Or the Spirit appeared in tongues because it causes all it fills both to burn and to speak. Teachers possess fiery tongues, because when they preach out of love for God they enflame the hearts of their hearers. A teacher’s utterance is useless if it cannot provide the flame of love. The men who said: ‘Were not our hearts burning within us as he spoke to us on the road and explained the scriptures to us’ received this fire of the mouth of the Truth himself. When words are clearly heard the mind is set on fire, numbness and cold recede, the heart becomes solicitous in its desire for heavenly things on high and strange to earthly desires”). Trans.: D. Hurst, Gregory the Great: Forty Gospel Homilies, Cistercian Studies Series 123 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1990), p. 241.
As may be gleaned from a comparison with his source text in the accompanying footnote, Ælfric inserts his own voice quite a bit into his discussion of evangelical zeal. Gregory’s receding “coldness of languor” (torporis frigus), applicable to Christian and pagan alike, becomes the cold of Ælfric’s “faithlessness and fleshly desire” which is assigned more directly to “heathen men.” Consequently, the need to preach to those wholly uninitiated in the Christian faith becomes more fixed in the Old English homilist’s mind. Ælfric also hints at some natural philosophical inclinations by addressing the properties of fire itself, noting how it consumes whatever comes into contact with it. By analogy, whoever comes into contact with the Holy Spirit is necessarily consumed by missionary zeal. The flame-metaphor becomes slightly mixed when Ælfric casts the disgrace of sin (as opposed to righteous zeal) as a fire which the teacher must first “extinguish” (adwæscan) in himself, then in the student. Despite the dual imagery of flame as both missionary longing and sin, the effect of Ælfric’s point loses none of its potency, and the central role of zeal to the success of the apostolic mission remains paramount.

As proto-missionaries and archetypes for Christian evangelism, the apostles stood as an enduring example to future conversionary efforts seeking to preach the word of Christ. The same enthused zeal that the Holy Spirit granted the apostles could, from an Anglo-Saxon perspective, be gifted to future generations of religious scholars and teachers. In his Expositio Actuum Apostolorum, Bede speaks more generally about the source for missionary zeal in those looking to follow in the footsteps of the apostles:

Spiritus enim sanctus in igne et linguis apparuit, quia omnes quos impleverit ardentes pariter et loquentes facit, ardentes utique ex se et loquentes

Now the Holy Spirit appeared in fire and in tongues because all those whom he fills he makes simultaneously to burn and to speak—to burn

32 Ælfric’s natural philosophical discussion of fire’s properties may, to some extent, be inspired by another, unidentified source. The homilist treats his source material too loosely to identify any such source conclusively, but he may be drawing on the Moralia in Iob passage cited by Bede or Bede himself in so far as that passage emphasizes the manner in which the “elements ... were put to use in signification” (In significatione ... admota sunt elementa). Cf. above, p. 18, note 29.
While Bede begins here by addressing the events of Pentecost, his statement that “all those whom he [i.e. the Holy Spirit] fills he makes simultaneously to burn and to speak” broadens the scope beyond the original apostles and implies that subsequent teachers of the church have also received their compulsion to preach directly from the Holy Spirit. Whether divinely enthused or not, the learned community within the Roman Catholic Church, as successors to Peter and the apostles, were the inheritors of their missionary imperative. Bede makes clear the continuing obligation of the church to preach when interpreting Acts 12:8, stating: *spiritaliter virtutum verbique praedicandi resumere iubetur insignia* (‘spiritually it is commanded to take up again the insignia of the virtues and of the word to be preached’). As founder and figural representative of the Roman Catholic Church, the apostolic mission as it applies to Peter is of particular importance in defining the ongoing evangelical work of the church. Bede touches upon this essential connection when explaining the “fishers of men” analogy as related by Christ to Peter and Andrew.  

> *Ex hoc iam homines eris capiens, ad ipsum petrum specialiter pertinet. Exponit enim ei dominus quid haec captura piscium significet quod uidelicet ipse sicut nunc per retia piscis sic aliquando per uerba sit capturus homines totusque facti huius ordo quid in ecclesia cuius ipse typum tenet cotidie geratur ostendat.*  

> *From henceforth you shall be catching men; to Peter himself it is especially appropriate. Indeed, the Lord explains to him what this haul of fish signifies, namely that, just as he himself catches fish here with a net, so too shall he ultimately catch men with words, and the whole order of this deed should reveal what ought to be done daily in the church of which he himself is the model.*

Bede considers it “especially appropriate” for Peter to have received this address, because it is he who is to establish the church as a model of spiritual governance. When Peter is said to

---


35 Mt 4:19; Mk 1:17; Lk 5:10.

36 Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 116, ll. 630-35.
eventually “catch men with words,” he represents a precedent for preaching and conversion that the church would seek to follow in ministering to the world. Peter, as embodiment of the church’s missionary imperative, is allotted further treatment by Bede in the exegete’s interpretation of Acts 10:19-22, where the Holy Spirit compels the apostle to go down and preach to Cornelius’ messengers:

\[\text{Surge itaque et descende et uade cum eis.} \]
\[\text{Descendere de tecto et ad praedicandum ire iubetur, ut ecclesia dominum non solum alta subeundo speculetur, sed eundem etiam infimis quibusque et quasi adhuc exterius positis sed tamen ostium Simonis, id est obiedientiae, pulsantibus, ad activam vitam redeundo velut e lecto resurgendo praedicet...}^{37}\]

\[\text{Arise, therefore, and descend and go with them.} \]
\[\text{He was ordered to descend from the roof and to go to preach in order to show that the church should not only watch for the Lord by climbing to the heights, but, returning to the active life as if rising from her bed, she should preach this same Lord to all the lowliest and to those still situated outside, as it were, but [who are] nevertheless knocking at the door of Simon, that is, at the door of obedience.}^{38}\]

Through his figural exposition on why Peter must descend from the roof to preach, Bede maintains that the church cannot content itself to merely pray and seek understanding of the Lord through high-minded study. Rather, the church must condescend to preach among the “lowliest” (\textit{infimis}) and those still outside the church (\textit{exterius positis}) who willingly strive for obedience towards God.

Given their central function as missionaries, it should come as little surprise that the apostles were often looked to as paragons worthy of emulation by those Anglo-Saxons on the continent involved either directly or indirectly in mission work and that the exigencies of the apostles’ mission should provide advice for those seeking to institute missionary policy. For instance, Alcuin, though not a missionary himself, pointed to the example of the apostles when

---


advising Charlemagne in a letter from 796 (MGH no. 110) on whether or not to implement a
tithing policy for territories newly brought into the Christian fold:

His ita consideratis, vestra sanctissma pietas sapienti consilio praevidet: si melius sit, rudibus populis in principio fidei iugum inponere decimarum, ut plena fiat per singulas domus exactio illarum. An apostoli quoque, ab ipso deo Christo edocti et ad praedicandum mundo missi, exactiones decimarum exegissent vel alicubi demandassent dari, considerandum est. Scimus, quia decimatio substantiae nostrae valde bona est: sed melius est illam amittere quam fidem perdere. Nos vero, in fide catholica nati nutriti et edocti, vix consentimus substantiam nostram pleniter decimare; quanto magis tenera fides et infantilis animus et avara mens illarum largitati non consentit. Roborata vero fide et confirmata consuetudine christianitatis, tunc quasi viris perfectis fortiora danda sunt praecpta, quae solidata mens relegione christiana non abhorreant. 39

These things, therefore, having been considered, your most holy piety ought foresee through wise counsel> whether it is right to impose the yoke of tithes upon a simple people who are beginners in the faith, making a full levy from every house. We should ask if the apostles, who were taught by the Lord himself and sent out to preach to the world, required the payment of tithes in any place. We know it is good for our property to be tithed, but it is better to lose the tithe than destroy the faith. Even we who have been born<, nurtured and instructed> in the catholic faith find it hard to agree to a full tithing of our property; how much harder it is for their tender faith, their infant will and greedy spirit <not to agree to this largess>. When their faith is strengthened and they are established in the Christian life, they may, as adults, be given harder teaching, which minds soundly based in Christianity will not reject. 40

The question with which Charlemagne and Alcuin are confronted here is a complex one, dealing not simply with religious doctrine and practice, but also with the political and economic realities of financing missionaries and conducting lengthy military campaigns in the name of spreading Christianity. Acknowledging the drain such activity would place on both the imperial and ecclesiastical coffers, the temptation to tithe recently converted lands in order to help underwrite church finances would doubtlessly have seemed appealing to the emperor. Alcuin, however, seeks to temper such temptation, advising Charlemagne to prioritize faith over money. He recognizes that established Christian communities often find the tithe burdensome and argues that such a burden may snuff out the infant faith before it has had time to become fully rooted. For Alcuin, the apostles and their dedication to a life of poverty and dependence on charity offer

39 Alcuin, Epist. 110, p. 158, ll. 4-12.

a compelling example of how one should treat financial matters during a territory’s nascent stages of conversion. He raises the rhetorical question as to whether the apostles themselves required a tithe when conducting their missions. The answer is, of course, a resounding no, and Alcuin implicitly appeals to the authority and success of the apostles’ mission to justify his suggestion that Charlemagne accept only that which is willingly given to the church rather than mandate a tithe. Just as the lands converted by the apostles would come to support the church financially, Alcuin argues, so too will Charlemagne’s new territories eventually come to accept the “harder teachings” of the tithe, but not until “their faith is strengthened and they are established in the Christian life.”

Also in 796, Alcuin produced what is, perhaps, his most apostle-minded epistle (MGH no. 113) in support of Arno, Archbishop of Salzburg, whose position on the eastern frontier of the empire and expanding ecclesiastical territories required him to engage in the Christianization of the area’s pagan inhabitants. Alcuin addresses the letter to Arno, referring to him by the archbishop’s nickname, Aquila (“Eagle”).41 The nickname allows Alcuin to draw an extended comparison between Arno as a bird of prey who catches fish and the apostles who were called “fishers of men.”:

Praesagum tibi nomen inposuere parentes; licet dispensationis Dei ignari, aput quem omnia futura iam facta sunt. Qui te summa pietate caelestia ordinavit mysteria populis ministrare, et de alto supernae gratiae intuitu acutissimis spiritualium oculorum obtutibus fluctivagos de huius saeculi salo pisces ad vivificandum non ad mortificandum erue, et sacro vitrei fontis lavacro ablure, et igne sancti Spiritus ad epulas aeterni regis assare; ut verus apostolicae vocationis auditor efficiaris; dicente Christo, dum in procellosis fluctibus binas duorum fratrum germanitiae laborare aspexit: ‘Veni post me, et faciam vos fieri pescatores hominum’, non a priori

Your parents assigned a prophetic name to you, though ignorant of the dispensation of God, before whom all that is to come has already occurred. He who ordained you to minister the celestial mysteries to the peoples in the highest piety and, looking from the height of heavenly grace with the keenest gazes of spiritual eyes, to pluck the wave-tossed fish from the sea of this world, that they might live, not that they might die, and to cleanse them with the holy bath of the translucent spring, and to roast them in the fire of the Holy Spirit for the feast of the eternal king; so that you may prove a true listener of the apostolic vocation. While he watched the two pairs of

41 Alcuin, Epist. 113, p. 163, l. 12. Dulcissimo fratri et sanctissimo prae suli Aquilae Albinus salutem (“Albinus [Alcuin’s nickname] sends greetings to his dearest brother and most holy bishop Aquila [i.e. Arno]”).
brothers laboring in the stormy waters, Christ thus speaking [said]: ‘Come after me and I will make you to become fishers of men,’ not confining them to the office of their particular previous trade, but [permitting that] they might lead better fish [i.e. men], having cast their nets on the right side, to a shore of stable firmness.

Alcuin’s comparison between the eagle (i.e., Arno) and the apostles is a colorful and attractive one. He flatters Arno by stating that the archbishop sees with the keen eyes of an eagle; the eyes representing the prelate’s spiritual clarity and insight. Alcuin implores Arno to become an ardent adherent to the “apostolic vocation” (apostolicae vocationis); that is, to continue his mission to catch figural “fish” and convert new members to the church. With typical wit, Alcuin’s use of verus may also represent a mild pun playing on the image of “roasting” converts in “the fire of the Holy Spirit” (et igne sancti Spiritus ... assare); that is, the term can mean either “true” or refer to a pointed “spit.” Regardless of the extent of Alcuin’s word-play, Arno’s imperative to rescue “better fish” (meliores ... pisces) from worldly tribulations (i.e., the stormy waters) and bring them to the firm shore (ad litus ... stabilissimae soliditatis) of the church remains paramount. Lest the point of his letter be missed, Alcuin belabors the fishing comparison yet further, again emphasizing Arno’s role as missionary and latter day apostle:

Busy yourself, most capable laborer of divine work, in pursuing these [fish/men] with entire focus of mind so that, through you, Christ himself may be deemed to preach to the peoples from the stern of your vessel and to be a pious helmsman of [your] ship, from which he ordered you to spread the nets of apostolic preaching into the sea of deepest paganism.

---

42 Alcuin, Epist. 113, p. 163, ll. 13-22.

43 Translated here as the nominative masculine adjective “true” and modifying auditor, verus can also represent the genitive singular of veru (“spit”). Because verus is neuter and apostolicae is declined in the feminine to agree with vocationis, we cannot really speak of an “apostolic spit.” Nevertheless, the appearance of verus in close proximity with the “feast of the eternal king” (ad epulas aeterni regis) may be enough to call to mind the pun in an informed reader.

44 Alcuin, Epist. 113, p. 163, ll. 23-6.
Thus, Alcuin beseeches Arno to turn his undivided attention to the missionary aspect of his office and continue to “spread the nets of apostolic preaching” (*retia apostolicae praedicationis expandere*) as mandated by Christ. From Alcuin’s perspective, likely in the safe confines of Tours at this point (Alcuin was made abbot of St. Martin’s in Tours in 796), Arno’s position on the frontier and mission to the newly acquired imperial territories meant that the archbishop was indeed steering the church upon “the sea of deepest paganism” (*pelagus profundissimae gentilitatis*).

Arno’s mission in the east was not, however, the only sea of paganism that Frankish Christians were seeking to navigate with Anglo-Saxon help. Several decades earlier, the Anglo-Saxon missionary Wynfrith, better known by his Latin cognomen Boniface, set out under the patronage of the Carolingian mayors of the palace on a mission to convert those Germanic peoples still adhering to paganism. Unlike Alcuin and Arno, Boniface was on the frontlines of the missionary effort, preaching among the pagan tribes himself. The dangers inherent to such evangelical pursuits would, of course, lead to Boniface’s own death when he was killed by bandits while on a mission to convert the Frisians in 754.45 His active successes in converting the Germanic peoples and the fact that he himself was violently martyred meant that Boniface’s connections with the apostles run much deeper than with others.46 Boniface himself appears to have held St. Peter in especially high regard. After miraculously felling the so-called *robor Iobis* (“oak of Jove”), an object of veneration among the pagans, the missionary used its wood to


construct an oratory dedicated to the chief of the apostles.\textsuperscript{47} In one letter dated 735 to his frequent correspondent Eadburga, Abbess of Minster-in-Thanet and daughter of Centwine, King of Wessex (MGH no. 35), Boniface requests that she make a copy of Peter’s epistles for him written in golden script, referring to the apostle as “my lord” (\textit{mei domini}) and stating that his words have directed him on his missionary path:

\begin{quote}
Sic et adhuc deprecor, ut augeas quod cepisti, id est, ut mihi cum auro conscribas epistolas domini mei sancti Petri apostoli ad honorem et reverentiam sanctarum scripturarum ante oculos carnalium in predicando, et quia dicta eius, qui me in hoc iter direxit, maxime semper in presentia cupidam habere.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
And thus I further beg that you augment what you have undertaken [already]; that is, that you transcribe for me in gold the letters of my lord, the holy apostle Peter, in order that the honor and reverence of the sacred scriptures [may be] before the eyes of the carnal during [my] preaching, and because I very much desire to always have present the words of him who directed me on this path.
\end{quote}

Boniface’s accomplishments as missionary were not lost upon his peers, and he frequently found himself compared to his apostolic forbearers. In a letter written to him between 716 and 718 by an Abbess Egburga (MGH no. 13), the correspondent assures Boniface that, as reward for his conversionary efforts, he will receive a seat among the Twelve on the day of resurrection:

\begin{quote}
Tu autem in regeneratione, cum sederint duodecim apostoli in sedibus XII, sedebis et ibi; et quantos labore proprio adquesieris, de tantis ante tribunal aeterni regis dux futurus deauratus gaudebis.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
You, on the resurrection day, when the twelve Apostles shall sit upon their twelve seats, shall sit there also, and as many as you shall have redeemed <by your own labor>, over so many shall you wear a crown of gold before the judgment seat of the King Eternal.\textsuperscript{50}
\end{quote}

Pope Zacharias, writing to the missionary in 744 (MGH no. 57), compares Boniface to Peter and the apostles, emphasizing that he too has been touched by the Holy Spirit and enthused with divine inspiration such that he can carry out his apostolic mission among the Germans:

\begin{quote}
Levison (1905), pp. 31-2.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Tangl (1916), §13, p. 20, ll. 15-18.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
Quorum inluminatio predicationis atque doctrine Christi presidio mansit et manet catholic Dei ecclesia praefulgens horum et beati apostolorum principis Petri inluminata doctrinis. Et eorum sequi pedem ex inspiracione divina tuam sanctissimam fraternitatem in partibus illis esse credimus destinatam, ut etiam instar eorum idem spiritus sanctus in eodem te adsumpsit opere ad inluminationem gentium illarum.51

Through the light of their preaching and of the teaching of Christ the universal Church of God has stood and still stands shining forth in the splendor of their doctrine and that of the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles. It is our belief that you, most holy brother, have likewise been chosen by divine inspiration to follow in their footsteps in those lands and that the same Holy Spirit has called you to the same work of enlightenment for those peoples.52

While Boniface may have been flattered to some degree by the comparisons made by Abbess Egburga and Pope Zacharias between himself and the apostles, the missionary’s modesty, be it feigned or genuine, would doubtlessly have prompted him to dismiss such grandiose parallels. During the Roman Synod of 745 (MHG no. 59), Boniface condemns a certain Aldebert for blasphemously aspiring to be the equal of the apostles:

Tum demum in tantam superbiam elatus est, ut se aequiperaret apostolis Christi. Et dedignabatur in aliciuis honore apostolorum vel martyrum ecclesiam consecrare. Et interrogavit, quid voluiissent homines visitando limina sanctorum apostolorum. Postea in proprio honore suo dedicavit oratoria vel, ut verius dicam, sordidavit. Fecit cruciculas et oratoriolae in campis et ad fontes vel ubicumque sibi visum fuit et iussit ibi publicas orationes celebrare, donec multitudo popolorum spretis ceteris episcopis et dimissis antiquis ecclesiis in talibus locis conventus celebrabant dicentes: ‘Merita sancti Aldeberti adiuabunt nos’. Ungulas suas et capillos dedit ad honorificandum et portandum cum reliquis sancti Petri principis apostolorum.53

Finally he [Aldebert] rose to such audacity that he declared himself equal with the Apostles of Christ. He scorned to dedicate a church in honor of any one of the Apostles or martyrs and asked why men should desire to visit the shrines of the holy Apostles. Later he dedicated—or rather <I should say> defiled—oratories to himself. He set crosses and small oratories in the fields or at springs or wherever he pleased and ordered public prayers to be said there until multitudes of people, scorning other bishops and deserting the established churches, held their celebrations in such places saying: ‘The merits of Saint Aldebert will help us’ He distributed his own fingernails and hairs from his head to be honored [as sacred objects] and carried about with the relics of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles.54

Judging by his censure of Aldebert, Boniface would likely have been made uncomfortable by the claims of others that he would sit among the Twelve on judgment day. For this “apostle to the

51 Tangl (1916), §57, p. 103, ll. 3-10. For Christ’s statement that, on Judgment Day, the twelve apostles would sit on twelve seats of judgment in order to judge the twelve tribes of Israel, cf. Mt. 19:28.

52 Emerton (1940), p. 72.


54 Emerton (1940), p. 79.
Germans,” the idea that religious leaders should regard themselves as the equals of Christ’s apostles was pure sacrilege. Particularly because he revered St. Peter so highly, under no circumstances would he dare anticipate that any relics of his should be handled with the same reverence due his spiritual hero and guide. Boniface represented the pinnacle of Anglo-Saxon missionary achievement. While he drew inspiration from the apostles and sought to follow in their footsteps, he would not suppose himself one of their party. The standard of mission work which the apostles achieved in the early church, a mission so fundamental to their identity that it informed their very title and the Anglo-Saxon understanding of their office, was something to strive for, but for Boniface at least, never fully to be achieved.
2. Apostolic Witness & Authority: Historical vs. Revealed Witness

Over the centuries, many Christian preachers have participated in the evangelical mission of the church to help spread the word of the gospels. Yet their missions have not necessarily achieved for them a status equal to the original apostles. What separates the apostles, especially the Twelve, from other missionaries is the authority which their close proximity to the living and then resurrected Christ lends to their witness. Luke the Evangelist was keenly aware of the importance of this witness when composing his canonical *Actus apostolorum*. For instance, he has Peter making explicit mention of the apostles’ testificatory role in recalling Christ’s deeds and death in Acts 10:39, where Peter is reported to have said: *et nos testes sumus omnium quae fecit in regione Iudaeorum et Hierusalem quem et occiderunt suspendentes in ligno* (“And we are witnesses of all things that he did in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they killed, hanging him upon a tree”). Elsewhere, in Acts 1:21 ff., Luke draws further attention to the apostles’ physical presence by Christ’s side the entire time (*in omni tempore*) that the Lord saw fit to either enter or exit the realm of mankind.\(^1\) At the outset of his gospel narrative, Luke seeks to lend credence to his own account of Christ’s life and passion by citing the eyewitness testimony of the apostles, stating in Lk. 1:2: *sicut tradiderunt nobis qui ab initi o ipsi viderunt et ministri fuerunt sermonis* (“According as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word”).

The theological implications for the Twelve’s authority and witness are, of course, immensely far reaching. Since the Catholic Church discounts any apocryphal writings attributed to Jesus himself, the Christian faith is left with no first-hand account written by its spiritual

---

\(^1\) Acts 1:21: *... ergo ex his viris qui nobiscum congregati sunt in omni tempore quo intravit et exivit inter nos Dominus Iesus* (“Wherefore of these men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us ...”). Cf. also Lk. 24:48, where Christ reportedly tells his disciples: *vos autem estis testes horum* (“And you are witnesses of these things”).
founder. The only access to the teachings of the living Christ and proof of his death and resurrection comes through the eyewitness testimony of the Twelve. Wolfgang Bienert has eloquently summed up the theological importance of original apostles, stating:

The event of Easter is not accessible in any other way than through the testimony of the apostles, the witnesses to the resurrection. For the Christian community and its preaching, just as much depends upon the credibility of these witnesses as upon the event of the resurrection itself, through which the fate of the earthly Jesus, his preaching and his works, and above all his death upon the cross, underwent an interpretation that was repeatedly shaped afresh, that in this Jesus God’s salvation for this world lies once and for all determined, that he is the promised Messiah and redeemer of the world. In the apostolic message the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus and the interpretation of this unique event in history as an act of God for the world created and beloved by him belong inseparably together. To this the Church owes its existence, and to hand it on unadulterated is its abiding task in history.²

Given Luke’s emphasis on the apostles’ physical witness to Christ’s life, death and resurrection, many Biblical scholars and theologians have seen fit to characterize the Evangelist’s preference for eyewitness evidence as indicative of a historically based, “Lucan” conception of witness.³ But what of Paul and those missionaries of the early church who did not know Christ personally during the messiah’s life?⁴ Indeed, Paul’s apostleship has sometimes proved an uncomfortable one as he received the office of apostle only after the resurrection, when the restored Christ appeared to him on the road to Damascus (Acts 22:6-21).⁵ Based solely upon this revelatory experience and the belief that he was “preordained” to know the will of God

---
⁴ Again, Bienert raises the issue quite eloquently from the perspective of historical witness: “The apostle of Jesus Christ is first and above all a witness to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The special precedence accorded to Cephas/Peter and ‘the Twelve’ (1 Cor. 15:5) is evidently grounded in the fact that they were the first to bear witness to the resurrection of Jesus. But how can anyone who-like Paul—never met the earthly Jesus credibly bear witness to the resurrection of Jesus? On what basis is he to recognise that the risen Lord who reveals himself to him is no other than the crucified?”
⁵ Paul’s absence at the resurrection was a huge sticking point for many of the gnostic sects in early Christianity, leading to a distinct Anti-Pauline strain of gnosis (embodied in the Ps.-Clementine writings) which was marked by a preference for gospel works (canonical or, in some instances, apocryphal) and epistles attributed to the Twelve as authoritative texts. Cf. G. Lüdemann, Gerd, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 123, 130, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980-1983), esp. vol. 2 entitled *Anipaulinismus im früheren Christentum*. 
and bear witness to the resurrected Christ (Acts 22:14), Paul’s concept of witness is not historically grounded, but rather pneumatic or charismatic in nature. Nevertheless, Paul clearly thought himself an apostle, as demonstrated by his epistles, where he repeatedly refers to himself by the title (e.g. Rom. 1:1, 11:12; 1 Cor. 1:1, 9:1-2, 15:9; 2 Cor. 1:1). In Gal. 1:1, Paul clarifies how the revealed nature of his authority stems from the Lord’s own divine mandate rather than through the power of any man. As we have seen earlier, Paul may have, at times, felt somewhat insecure in his office, admitting himself to be the least among the apostles (1 Cor. 15:9). While this statement may amount to little more than a modesty topos, Paul’s humility here may also allude to an understanding that his witness was not historically grounded like that of the Twelve. This apparent deficiency in his apostleship did not, however, preclude others from labeling Paul a genuine apostle. Given that Paul plays such a central role in the Actus apostolorum, even Luke, who was normally so concerned with establishing “a chain of eye


7 Gal. 1:1: Paulus apostolus non ab hominibus neque per hominem sed per Iesum Christum et Deum Patrem qui suscitavit eum a mortuis (“Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead”).

witnesses without any gaps, for historical reliability,” apparently felt compelled to recognize his master’s apostleship on some level.9 With the elevation of Paul’s epistles into the orthodox Christian canon early on during the development of the church, his position alongside the Twelve would become cemented.10 Eventually, any sharp distinction between an historically grounded and a divinely inspired apostleship would become moot. Both notions would prove essential in defining the “apostles” of succeeding ages. An apostle would serve as a guarantor to the eye-witness testimony (i.e., the *tradtio apostolica* set forth by the Twelve) of Christ’s mysteries, while at the same time fulfilling a divinely inspired mandate to preach the gospel with an authority spiritually imbued by the Lord.

What then did the Anglo-Saxons make of apostolic witness and any potential distinction between the more historically based “Lucan” authority of the Twelve and the enthused authority of “Pauline” witness? Whatever stock they may have placed in these two notions, Anglo-Saxon authors certainly took care to distinguish which authorities of the early church were there in person to witness first-hand the events of Christ’s life, death and resurrection and which came to the calling only later. One example of this comes in Bede’s *De tabernaculo*, where the exegete offers a figural interpretation for the four rings placed on the ark of the covenant as representative of the four evangelists:11

> Et per eosdem angulos quattuor quattuor circuli sunt positi quia in cunctis mundi finibus euangelium christi salvandis fidelium cordibus praedicatur. Duo autem circuli in latere uno et And four rings were put in those four corners because the gospel of Christ is preached to the ends of all the world, so that the hearts of the faithful might be saved. And there are two rings

---

9 Bienert (2003), p. 11.


11 Cf. Ex. 25:12: *et quattuor circulos aureos quos pones per quattuor arcae angulos duo circuli sint in latere uno et duo in albero* (“which thou shall put at the four corners of the ark: let two rings be on the one side, and two on the other”).
on one side and two on the other, either because two of the evangelists became disciples of the Saviour when he was in the flesh preaching and doing miracles and the other two came to faith in him after his resurrection and ascension into heaven, ......

Here, Bede clearly differentiates between the two evangelists who became disciples of Christ “when he was in the flesh preaching and doing miracles” (i.e., Matthew and John) and the two who “came to the faith in him after his resurrection and ascension into heaven” (i.e., Mark and Luke). Likewise, Paul, while so often mentioned alongside the Twelve, generally appears with the proverbial asterisk next to his name. In the introductory section of this chapter, we have already seen how one anonymous homilist, reworking the apocryphal Transitus Mariae into Old English, has Paul draw attention to his more recent call to the apostleship and acknowledge Peter as leader of the apostles. Similarly, Ælfric names Paul in the same breath as the Twelve in his treatise on the Old and New Testaments, but is careful to add: ac Paulus wæs gecoren æfter Cristes upstige (“but Paul was chosen after Christ’s ascension”). Given Paul’s venerated status within the church and the homilist’s frequent appeals to the authority of the Pauline epistles, it is interesting that Ælfric should feel compelled to even make this distinction. Yet the exigencies of

---

12 Bede, De tab., p. 16, ll. 429-36. Bede’s interpretation of the four rings to represent the universal mission of the church (in cunctis mundi finibus) may be inspired by Gregory the Great’s Regula pastoralis, though the Northumbrian exegete’s distinction between the groups of evangelists as applied here appears to represent an original contribution. Cf. Gregory’s commentary in PL 77, col. 48D-49A.


14 Cf. above, p. 4.

15 Ælfric OT/NT, p. 55, l. 905. Cf. above, pp. 13-14. Though unrelated to Paul’s witness, Ælfric would distinguish elsewhere between Paul and the Twelve based on Paul’s earlier persecution of Christians. Cf. Ælfric, CH I.27, p. 404, ll. 117-20: ða oþre apostoli be godes hæse leofodon be heora lare unpleolice. ac þeahhwæpere paulus ana se ðe wæs on woruldcrefetel ðeldwyrhtæ noldæ þa alyfdan bileofan onfon ac mid agere teolunge his 7 his gæferena neode foresceawode (“By the order of God, the other apostles lived without danger by their teaching, but Paul alone, he who was by worldly trade a tent maker, was unwilling to accept the permitted provision, but rather provided by his own toil the needs of him and his companions”).
Paul’s apostleship require that a careful scholar such as Ælfric at least recognize the special circumstances of his calling.

The fact that Mark, Luke and Paul are acknowledged as not personally having known the living Christ does not undermine their ultimate authority. For Bede, at least, this is because their witness is either derived from or can be corroborated by the eye-witness testimony of the Twelve. In his figural interpretation of the ark’s four golden rings cited in the previous paragraph, Bede acknowledges a distinction between the two pairs of evangelists based on their witness, but does not go so far as to recognize either pair as overtly superior or inferior—simply different. Despite their typological distance on either side of the ark, both pairs occupy a common plain made possible by the universal message of the gospels. In his *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, Bede explains why the gospels of Mark and Luke can be trusted:

Mark and Luke indeed wrote at a time when they could be judged, not only by the church of Christ, but also by those apostles who still remained in the flesh. For through the Lord’s will it was brought about that the words and deeds of Christ were put together in written form, not only by the apostles who saw [Christ], but also by disciples who learned [of him] by hearing, so that subsequent teachers in the church might be supplied with confidence and an authority for preaching and writing about those things which they had not seen..

Thus, Bede makes clear that the credibility of the Marcan and Lucan accounts derives from the fact that they could be verified “by those apostles who still remained in the flesh” (presumably some of the Twelve). Although these evangelists never witnessed Christ’s passion or resurrection first-hand, both Mark and Luke still had access to historically grounded witness via the unbroken transmission of those events as first related by the Twelve—a witness that could

---

not be perverted lest it offend those who were alive to see the Easter miracle and who could censure the evangelists for any error. This appeal to authority is, of course, synonymous with that made by the Catholic Church in claiming the preservation of the *traditio apostolica* via the succession of bishops (*succesio episcoporum*) and represented by the laying of hands.  

To a certain extent, the veracity of Paul’s witness could be confirmed in a like manner. Paul became personally acquainted with some of the apostles and even tarried with Peter for fifteen days in Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18). Bede makes sure to highlight the physical connection between the two, drawing upon Jerome’s commentary on Galatians to help lay out a detailed chronology for their encounter.  

In response to the statement in Acts 9:26 that Paul travelled to Jerusalem in order to join the disciples, Bede borrows from Jerome:

> Non eum mox baptizatum credamus uenisse ad apostolos Hierusalem sed, sicut ipse Galatis scriptit, primo abisse in Arabiam et iterum reuersum esse Damascum; deinde post tres annos uenientem Hierosolymam uidissee Petrum et mansisse apud eum diebus quindecim; alium autem apostolorum neminem uidissee nisi Iacobum fratem domini.  

We are not to believe that he came to the apostles in Jerusalem immediately after he was baptized. Rather, as he himself wrote to the Galatians, he first went away to Arabia and again returned to Damascus. Then, after three years, he came to Jerusalem, and saw Peter and remained with him for fifteen days, but he saw none of the other apostles except for James, the brother of the Lord.  

---


19 Cf. Jer., *In Gal.*, PL 26, col. 328A-B.

20 Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 9, ll. 51 ff. cf. Acts 9:26-27: *cum autem venisset in Hierusalem temptabat iungere se discipulis et omnes timebant eum non credentes quia esset discipulus. Barnabas autem adprehensum illum duxit ad apostolos et narravit illis quomodo in via vidisset Dominum et quia locutus est ei et quomodo in Damasco fiducialiter egerit in nomine Iesu* (“And when he was come into Jerusalem, he essayed to join himself to the disciples; and they all were afraid of him, not believing that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and told them how he had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken to him; and how in Damascus he had dealt confidently in the name of Jesus”).

21 Martin (1989), p. 89. James, the brother of Jesus, was not among the Twelve and should not be confused with James the Greater, son of Zebedee, or James the Lesser, son of Alphaeus. Bede accords him the title apostle here in agreement with Gal. 1:19.
By establishing this meeting between Peter and Paul in no uncertain terms, Bede ascertains, albeit implicitly, that Paul was indeed privy to the *traditio apostolica* commenced by the Twelve. Consequently, his enthused witness could be seen as receiving confirmation through the physical witness of the other apostles.

In his roles as both exegete and historiographer, Bede showed a consistent proclivity toward eye-witness testimony of historical events over hearsay and enthused knowledge. In his letter to King Ceolwulf of Northumbria prefaced to the *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, Bede takes care to identify how Albinus (abbot of St. Augustine’s Abbey at Canterbury), Nothelm (archbishop of Canterbury), Daniel (bishop of Winchester), Cyneberht (bishop of Lindsey), Abbot Esius, the monks of Lastingham, and “innumerable witnesses” (*innumerorum testium*) from his home territory of Northumbria provided him not only with written sources for his work, but also eye-witness accounts of the church’s development and expansion within their respective jurisdictions.²² Bede would attempt to bring the same cautious scrutiny of sources and reliance on eye-witness testimony that he sought in producing his ecclesiastical history to his *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*. The exegete endorses Luke’s *Actus apostolorum*, stating that “his book alone is to be held worthy of belief in the church among those recounting the acts of the apostles” (*ut solus eius liber fide dignus haberetur in ecclesia de apostolorum actibus narrantis*).²³ The reason for this approval, of course, was the understanding that Luke personally knew the apostles and was an eye-witness to their lives and times. Bede goes on to

---


²³ Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Praef., ll. 43 ff. Interestingly enough, Bede did not always heed his own advice. As shall be made clear later, some of his writings, especially those regarding Andrew, drew upon apocryphal sources to help elaborate on the apostles’ passions. These sources tended to have received a certain air of orthodox approval through common usage within the church and some made spurious claims to preserving their own eye-witness testimony. Cf. below, Part II, §3 “St. Andrew in the Calendrical, Martyrological, Liturgical and Devotional Evidence,” pp. 139 ff.
explain a few lines later: *Actus uero apostolorum, et praecipue beati Pauli, cuius indiuiduus in peregrinando comes extitit, beatus Lucas sicut uiderat ipse compositum* ("The blessed Luke wrote an account of the acts of the apostles, just as he himself had seen them, and especially those of the blessed Paul, whose inseparable travelling companion he was").

In the late Anglo-Saxon period, Ælfric of Eynsham also stresses the apostles’ close physical proximity to the living Christ in several of his homilies, taking care to ground their witness in historical experience. The homilist talks about the predestined nature of their apostleship as determined by God, noting how Jesus’ designation of the apostles occurs in fulfillment of God’s will and ushers in a relationship with the living Christ that would grant them the authority to spread his word. He paraphrases the Gospel of John (Jn. 15:27) in mentioning how the apostles dwelled alongside Christ for the entirety of his time as preacher: *And ge éac cyþað gecyðnysse be mé, for ðan þe ge fram anginne mid me wunedon* ("And you too shall announce testimony about me, for you dwelled with me from the beginning"). When addressing the pericope for the fourth Sunday after Easter, Jn. 16:5-14, he lends credibility to the

---


25 Ælfric, *CH* II.22, pp. 209-10, ll. 116-45: *Eft cwæð se ylca; Swa swa he ús geceas on criste. &r middaneardes gesetyñysse; Manifestaui nomen tuum hominibus; ic geswutelode ðinne naman mannum. ðam þe ðu ðe me forgeafe of middanearde; He geswutelode his fæder naman. ærest his leorningenihtum. and siððan eallum geleaffullum mannum. þe hé of middaneardlicum gedwyldum æthréod. to his rice þurh his fæder gife. ... Crist sealde ða heofenlican láre his leorningenihtum. and hi forð eallum geleaffullum ðeodum. and hi underfengon his beboda. and onconeowan. þet drihten fram his fæder ferde. and gelyfdon þet he hine to middanearde sende* ("Then the same [i.e. Paul] spoke, ‘Just as he chose us in Christ before the creation of the world:’ (Eph.1:4) ‘I revealed your name to the men whom you gave to me from the world.’ He revealed the name of his father first to his disciples and afterwards to all the faithful men whom he delivered from worldly errors to his kingdom through his father’s grace. ... Christ then gave the heavenly learning to his disciples, and they thenceforth to all the faithful peoples. And they accepted his commandments and recognized that the Lord proceeded from his father, and they believed that he sent him into the world."). Godden identifies Ælfric’s ultimate source for portions of this passage as deriving from Augustine’s *Tractates* 105 & 106 on the Gospel of John. Cf. Godden (2000), pp. 547-48.

day’s reading by highlighting how the apostle John was a direct witness to the words of Christ.\textsuperscript{27} Upon describing the resurrection of Jesus, Ælfric is careful to stress the tangible qualities of Christ’s reappearance among the living, a corporeality that lends the apostles a palpably historical type of witness.\textsuperscript{28} Even beyond their presence during the Lord’s sermons, passion and resurrection, the homilist makes explicit the fact that the apostles, according to Acts 1:9-11, were witnesses to the Lord’s ascension, thereby extending a historically minded witness to the events which took place even after the gospel accounts.\textsuperscript{29} In one peculiar passage, Ælfric explains how the apostles’ knowledge of Christ’s humanity was not only acquired from Christ himself, but reinforced by the teachings of the Virgin Mary, whose personal witness to the messiah’s birth, thus conveyed to the apostles, permitted them to speak authoritatively on the Lord’s nativity—an event that they could not physically have witnessed for themselves.\textsuperscript{30} Over the course of his

27 Ælfric, *CH Supp.* 7, p. 340, ll. 4-7. ... swa swa Iohannes awrát, þe hit wiste eall. Án þæra godspella is þe we nú embe sprecað, and eow secgan wyliað þæs Hælendes agene wórd, swa swa he sylf sæde (“... just as John wrote, who had knowledge of it all. It is one of the gospels that we now speak about; and we wish to tell you the Lord’s own words, just as he himself said”).

28 Ælfric, *CH Supp.* 7, p. 346, ll. 136-44. He æt þa sylf and dranc openlice mid him, þæt he swa geswutolode þæt he soðlice leofode æfter his agenum deaðe, þæt he oferswīðode mid mihte, and he feowertig daga wæs wunigende mid him, þæt hy hine handledon and mid handum grapedon on his handum and fotum, hu he gefæstnod wes, and eac on his sidan hy sceawodon his dolshswaða, and hy mihton geseon þæt he soðlice aras on ansundum lichaman, oferswīðode deaðe (“He himself then ate and drank openly with them, so that he thus made clear that he truly lived after his own death, which he overcame with might. And he was dwelling with them for forty days so that they could touch him and feel with [their] hands his hands and feet, how he was fastened [upon the cross]. They also observed the scar on his side, and they could see that he truly arose in a sound body having overcome death”). Bede similarly talks about eating as proof of resurrection, though in connection with the raising of Jairus’ daughter. Cf. Bede, *In Marc.* , Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 500, ll. 456-59: Ad testimonium quidem uerae resuscitationis dari puellae manducare praecepit ne non ueritas sed fantasma quod apparebat ab incredulis putaretur (“Indeed, as a testimony to the true resurrection, he ordered that the girl be given [something] to eat lest what had appeared was thought by the incredulous ones not to be true, but rather illusion”). Cf. Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. III, Ch. 8, p. 193, ll. 1048-50.

29 Ælfric, *CH Supp.* 11, p. 417, ll. 46-9. On ðam feowverteogodan dæge ðæs ðe hé of deaðe arás, hé astáh to heofonum to his halgan Fæder, mid þam ylcan lichaman ðe hé of deaðe arærde, ætforan his apostolum, þæt him folgodon on life (“On the fortieth day after which he arose from death, he ascended into heaven to his holy father with that same body which he resurrected from death in the presence of his apostles who followed him in life”).

30 Ælfric, *CH* I.30, p. 431, ll. 52-60: ðeacgwæðere þeah heo synderlice iohhannes gymene betaht ware hwætewere heo drohtnode gemeanelice efter cristes upstige mid þam apostolicum werode, infarenende 7 utfarenende bæwax him; 7 hi ealle mid micetre arwûrøynysse 7 lufe hire penodon; And he him cuðlice ealle ðing ymbe cristes menniscynysse gewissode; for þan þe heo fram frymðe gewislice þurh þone halgan gast hi ealle geleornode 7 mid agenre gesihðe
literary output, therefore, Ælfric constructs a powerfully consistent image of the apostles’ historically based witness which, from the homilist’s perspective, lends authority to the life of Christ all the way from his birth to his post-resurrection ascension into heaven.

Given that Bede and Ælfric so ardently champion the historically based witness of the Twelve and its ability to confirm the subsequent witness of others, the question remains as to how the Anglo-Saxons understood the Holy Spirit’s role in relation to witness. Ælfric makes several statements about how the Holy Spirit could inspire knowledge of Christ that may be interpreted as substantiating revealed witness. When relating how Mary instructed the apostles on Christ’s humanity, the homilist describes how they also perceived knowledge through the Holy Spirit so that they could understand the truth of matters: ... *þeah ðe þa apostoli þurh þone ylcan gast ealle þing undergeaton. 7 on ealre soðfæstnysse gelærede wurdon* ("... although the apostles perceived all things through the same Spirit and became educated in every truth"). In another instance, Ælfric’s renders Jn. 15:26 into Old English as: *Þonne se Frofungást cymð þe ic eow asénde ... he cyð gecyðnysse swiðe cuðlice be mé, þæt is, þæt he bið gewitnyss eallra mina weorca* ("When the Spirit of Mercy comes which I shall send to you, ... he shall announce testimony very accurately about me; that is, he will be a guarantor to all my works"). These statements assigning the Holy Spirit an active role in providing witness to the Twelve, however,

---

31 Ælfric, *CH* I.30, p. 431, ll. 58-60.

32 Ælfric, *CH Supp.* 9, pp. 378-79, ll. 5-9. Cp. Jn. 15:26: *cum autem venerit paracletus quem ego mittam vobis a Patre Spiritum veritatis qui a Patre procedit ille testimonium perhibebit de me* ("But when the Paraclete comes, which I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, he shall give testimony of me").
remain relatively rare utterances among Anglo-Saxon writers. More often than not, the Holy Spirit is interpreted in relation to the Twelve as an inspired means for them to express the witness they acquired through physical means or as a preparatory enthusiasm to ready audiences of future converts to receive that witness. That is to say, the possession of witness is one matter, whereas the ability to fully understand and skillfully convey that witness is another entirely, often requiring the inspired help of the Holy Spirit.

In a homily for Pentecost Sunday (CH I.22), Ælfric appropriately addresses the subject of the Holy Spirit, explaining the essential preparatory role that it plays in helping the apostles express their witness and prime their audience for acceptance of the faith. The homilist relates how: ... se halga gast com ofer þam ápostolon on fyrenum tungum. 7 him forgeaf ingehíd ealra gereorda; for þan ðe se eadmoda heap geearnode æt gode; þæt iu ǽr þæt modige werod forleas (“... the Holy Spirit came over the apostles in fiery tongues and gave them an understanding of all tongues, for the humble host earned from God that which long before the proud company lost”). Thus, the *ingehíd* or “understanding” received by the apostles is not the witness itself, but rather the power to express that witness in the languages necessary to be understood by the peoples of the world. The Holy Spirit, of course, also enkindled that fiery zeal in the apostles to undertake their missions and prepared the way by warming the frigid hearts of the unfaithful.Ælfric goes on to state that preaching, even that of the apostles, is in vain without the help of the

---


34 Cf. above, pp. 18-19. Ælfric, *CH* I.22, p. 359-60, ll. 145-50. Se halga gast wæs gesewen on fyrenum tungum bufon þam apostolon for þan ðe he dyde þæt hi waren byrnende on godes willan. 7 bodiende ymbe godes rice; Fyrene tungan hi hæfdon þa ða hi mid lufe godes mærpa bodedon. þæt þæra hæðenra manna heortan þe ceald þæra keorthan þurh geleafleaste. 7 flesclicum gewilnungum. mihton beon ontentende to þam heofonicum beboldum (“The Holy Spirit was seen in [the form of] fiery tongues above the apostles for he caused that they were burning with desire for God and to preach about God’s kingdom. They had fiery tongues who proclaimed the glories of God with love so that the hearts of those heathen men which were cold through faithlessness and fleshly desire might be opened to those heavenly commandments”). For this section of the homily’s possible dependence on Gregory the Great’s Homily 30, cf. above, p. 18, note 31.
Holy Spirit to first open the hearts of men: *gif se halga gast ne lærd ðæs mannes móód wiðinnan; on idel beoð ðæs bydeles word wiðutan geclypode* (“If the Holy Spirit does not instruct the spirit of the man within, in vain is the word that proclaimer spoken without”). Elsewhere, the homilist seeks to distinguish why the Holy Spirit first appeared to Christ as a dove (Mt. 3:16; Mk. 1:10; Lk. 3:22; Jn. 1:32), but to the apostles in the form of a fiery tongue (Acts 2:3). Broadly speaking, Ælfric determines that the Holy Spirit manifests before Christ in the form of a dove, a symbol of meekness, innocence and peace, because Christ himself was “dwelling in this world with mildness, innocence and concord” ([drohtniende on ðisre worulde mid bilewitnyssé. 7 unscaeddóinysse. 7 gesibsumynysse](#)), whereas that same spirit appears as fire before the apostles, because they were “burning with desire for God and preaching about God’s kingdom” ([byrnende on godes willan. 7 bodiende ymbe godes rice](#)). Ælfric then interprets the Holy Spirit as it appears to both Christ and the apostles as the source for the meekness and zeal that all those filled with the grace of God ought feel. This mention of grace then helps call to Ælfric’s mind the various graces conferred upon mankind by the Holy Spirit as listed in 1 Cor. 12:8-10:

> He sylð his gife þam þe he wile; sumum menn he forgifð wisdom. 7 spræce. sumum góðd ingehíd. sumum micelne geleafan. sumum mihte to gehalenne untruman; sumum witeunge. sumum tosced goddra gasta 7 yfeltra; sumum he forgifð mislicere gereord. sumum gerecdynysse mislicra spræca; 7 Ealla þas ðing deð se halga gast todælende ægwylycum be ðam þe him gewyrð. for He gives his grace to those whom he wishes. To one man he gives wisdom and discourse. To one good understanding. To one the power to heal the sick. To one prophesy. To one discernment between good and evil spirits. To one he gives various tongues. To one the interpretation of different sayings. All these things does the Holy Spirit distribute to each as

---

35 Ælfric, *CH* I.22, p. 360, ll. 150-52. Cp. Bede’s comment on the call of the four in Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 114, ll. 574-75: *Nisi dominus cor illustrauerit auditorum, doctor in nocte laborat* (“If the Lord will not have illuminated the heart of the listeners, the teacher labors in the dark”).

36 Ælfric, *CH* I.22, p. 359, ll. 139-40.

37 Ælfric, *CH* I.22, p. 359, ll. 146-47.

38 Ælfric, *CH* I.22, p. 360, ll. 156-58. *On culfran antícynysse. 7 on fyres hiwe wæs godes gast æteowod. for þan ðe he deð þæt da beoð bylewite on unscaeddóinysse. 7 byrnende on godes willan þe he mid his gife gefylð* (“God’s spirit was manifested in the likeness of a dove and in the form of fire because he causes those whom he fills with his grace to be meek in innocence and burning in desire for God”).
These graces, while perhaps granted individually to certain lesser men, were gifted in their entirety to the apostles in order to help them spread the gospels. Witness itself is not listed among the graces imbued by the Holy Spirit, though the understanding and skill necessary to interpret and preach that witness remains implicit.

Does this emphasis on physical witness and the Holy Spirit’s role in purveying that witness mean that Anglo-Saxon scholars somehow denied the importance of Paul’s revelation on the road to Damascus? The simple answer to this question is “no.” Paul was obviously counted among the apostles as evidenced by his title in liturgical calendars, his inclusion in poems like Cynewulf’s *Fates of the Apostles*, and the fact that Ælfric is generally referring to Paul when citing simply *se apostol cwæd*. The interesting point about Paul’s pneumatic witness is how Anglo-Saxon writers develop the apostle’s revelation in a way that it substitutes for physical witness by instructing Paul on the historically grounded events of the Easter miracle. In his exposition on how Paul lost his sight on the road to Damascus and suffered blindness for three days (Acts 9:8-9), Ælfric explains that it was because he had denied the physical resurrection of Christ:

\[\ldots\text{falling, he lost bodily sight; arising, he received his mind’s enlightenment. Three days he dwelt without sight, because he denied Christ’s}\]

---

39 Ælfric, *CH* I.22, p. 361, ll. 179-85. 1 Cor. 12:8-10 is also cited in Greg., *Hom.* 30, the ultimate source for this part of the homily. Cf. Godden (2000), p. 181. Bede mentions that how the variety of the languages revealed to the apostles at Pentecost signifies the variety of graces proffered by the Lord and the Holy Spirit: *spiritualiter autem varietas linguarum dona variarum significat gratiarum* (“Moreover, the variety of tongues spiritually signifies the gifts of the various graces”). Bede, *Exp. Act*, Ch. 2, ll. 55 ff.

40 For the title “apostle” applied to Paul in liturgical calendars, cf. several of the entries for June 29 (the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul) or June 30 (the feast of St. Paul) in F. Wormald, ed., *English Kalendars before A.D. 1100* (London: Harrison and Sons, 1934), pp. 7, 21, 49, 77, 91, 105, 119, 133, 147, 161, 175, 189, 203, 217, 231, 245 & 259. For Paul’s inclusion in Cynewulf’s *Fates of the Apostles*, cf. ASPR 2, p. 51, ll. 11 ff. For some examples of Ælfric’s citing of Paul merely as *se apostol*, e.g. Ælfric, *CH* I.6, p. 228, ll. 124-25; *CH* I.6, p. 230, ll. 188-89; *CH* I.12, p. 279, l. 114; *CH* I.14, p. 293, ll. 107-8; etc.
Ælfric, therefore, makes a typological connection between the physical resurrection of Christ on the third day and the physical restoration Paul’s eyesight after three days. Bede is somewhat more explicit in emphasizing the physically and historically grounded nature of the episode:

\[\text{Quia dominum non crediderat tertia die mortem resurgendo uicisse, suo iam instruitur exemplo qui tenebras triduanas luce reuersa mutaret.}\]

Since he had not believed that the Lord had conquered death by rising on the third day, he was now taught by his own experience of the replacement of three days of darkness by the return of the light.  

Bede drives home the point that Paul actually learns to accept the historical fact of the resurrection, not through any eye-witness encounter, but through his own experience (\textit{suo ... exemplo}) of a “resurrection” in the loss and recovery of his sight. Thus, Bede insists on the corporealization of Paul’s witness in very physical terms. Though Paul may not have been present for Christ’s passion and resurrection, his witness is no longer entirely “revealed,” but granted a tangibility of its own.

Even if Bede seeks to corporealize Paul’s witness on some level or confirm it through his proximity with the Twelve, the exegete would never go so far as to deny the power and significance of the apostle’s revelation. In commenting on the healing of Paul’s sight at the hands of Ananias (Acts 9:17-18), Bede acknowledges that “in his face it is revealed that he received the true light in his mind” (\textit{monstratur in facie quod uerum lumen iam recepit in mente}). While expounding on how the Holy Spirit descendend upon Paul and Barnabas while preaching in Antioch and ordered them to embark on an evangelical mission (Acts 13:1-2), Bede

---


42 Bede, \textit{Exp. Act.}, Ch. 9, ll. 22 ff.


further recognizes the revealed nature of Paul’s apostolic authority.\textsuperscript{45} Several verses later, in Acts 13:9, the apostle, formerly named Saul, is first referred to by his new name. Bede uses this transition in name to interpret Acts 13:2 as the moment of Paul’s true designation as apostle, implying that both the office and name were gifted by authority of the Holy Spirit. The exegete tries to date the event relative to the Lord’s passion, stating: \textit{Videtur Saulus iuxta ordinem historiae tertio decimo post domini passionem anno apostolatum cum Barnaba Paulique accepisse uocabulum} (“According to the historical order of events, it seems that it was in the thirteenth year after the Lord’s passion that Saul received, with Barnabas, the office of apostle, and the name Paul”).\textsuperscript{46}

In the end, Paul’s revealed witness had to be accepted by Anglo-Saxon scholars. The apostle’s elevated status within the church meant that his authority was unimpeachable. Ælfric even refers to Paul’s teachings and acts as “inscrutable” (\textit{unasmeagendlice}), though it is perhaps enlightening that he would feel the need to even make such a comment.\textsuperscript{47} Nevertheless, the Anglo-Saxon Church recognized his witness as something very different from the witness of those apostles physically present during Christ’s preaching, death, resurrection and ascension. The witness of the Twelve remained grounded in their historical proximity to the events of Easter and Pentecost, a fact that was repeatedly stressed throughout Anglo-Saxon exegesis and dominated the discussion of witness in general. Paul and his peculiar form of witness could be granted some degree of equivalency with that of the Twelve, but it could not supersede historical witness in the Anglo-Saxon mind. Nowhere does the Anglo-Saxon Church make a case for the

\textsuperscript{45} Acts 13:2: \textit{ministrantibus autem illis Domino et ieiunantibus dixit Spiritus Sanctus separate mihi Barnaban et Saulum in opus quod adsumpsi eos} (“And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas, for the work whereunto I have taken them”).

\textsuperscript{46} Bede, \textit{Exp. Act.}, Ch. 13, ll. 2 ff. Trans.: Martin (1989), p. 117.

\textsuperscript{47} Ælfric, \textit{CH} I.27, p. 404, l. 121.
superiority of “Pauline” over “Lucan” modes of witness. Some scholars such as Bede would make occasional attempts to augment the pneumatic nature of Paul’s witness by highlighting his personal encounters with the apostles and emphasizing how the physical aspects of his revelation helped him to understand the historical events surrounding Christ. Despite any such attempts, however, Paul’s witness would remain uniquely revelatory and his appearance among the apostles would continue to require qualification such as Ælfric’s clarification in his tractate on the Old and New Testaments: *ac Paulus wæs gecoren æfter Cristes upstige* (“but Paul was chosen after Christ’s ascension”).

48 Cf. above, p. 33 and note 15 on the same page.
3. The *Traditio apostolica* and the Apostolic Succession of Witness

The Anglo-Saxon Church was cognizant of the fact that the witness established by the apostles, physically in the case of the Twelve and more spiritually in the instance of Paul, was simply the beginning. Through the *traditio apostolica*, that witness must be passed down in an unbroken chain in order to maintain its legitimacy and secure the salvation of successive generations. As the eponymous progenitors of apostolic tradition, the apostles were essential in helping define the identity of the church and its mission to preserve and spread Christ’s teachings. Anglo-Saxon religious scholars would never lose sight of this fact and continually interpret the acts of their apostolic forbearers in ways that reinforced this mission and their own apostolic identity.

The apostles, with Peter in particular, would become a sort of shorthand for the universal church in biblical commentary. Bede, for example, parallels the apostles, who were made fishers of men by Christ (Mt. 4:19; Mk. 1:17; Lk. 5:10), with the learned churchmen of his day:

> Piscatores sunt ecclesiae doctores qui nos rete fidei comprehensos et de profundo ad lumen elatos quasi pisces litori sic terrae uiuentium aduehunt. Quasi enim quaedam retia piscantium sunt complexae praedicantium dictiones quae eos quos ceperint in fide non amittant.\(^1\)

The fishers are the learned men of the church who convey us, caught up in the net of faith and raised from the abyss into the light, to the land of the living like fish to the shore. Indeed, it as if certain nets of fishers were the hauls of those proclaiming the teachings [of Christ], which might seize them in the faith, not to let them go.

According to Bede, therefore, the *doctores* of the church were perpetuating an established tradition set forth by the apostles by figuratively “fishing” the unfaithful from the “abyss” of ignorance and delivering them to the “light” of faith and eternal life. This relationship between the apostles and the contemporary church is further underscored by Bede when he applies a figural interpretation of 1 Kg. 7:23-25 to his reading of the canonical list of apostles presented in Lk. 6:13-16:

\(^1\) Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, pp. 113, ll. 545-51.
for when, as a typological representation of the church, Solomon built a temple to the Lord, he also made a bronze ‘sea’ [i.e. laver] in which the priests were washed. And he placed it upon the haunches of twelve oxen, of which three faced the north, three the west, three the south and three the east, thus figuratively representing the apostles and the successors of the apostles who were going to cleanse all the plains of the four-cornered world from the blemish of sins through faith and confession of the Holy Trinity.

The twelve oxen, of course, numerically correspond to the twelve apostles. Bede takes care, however, to note that the typology of the cleansing laver made by King Solomon was not merely meant to indicate the Twelve, but should be extended to the successors of the apostles as well. Thus, the present church and its mission to continually preach the gospels to the four corners of the earth is made explicit, and the learned men of the church are seen to advance the apostolic witness of the true faith (i.e., the confession of the Holy Trinity). Borrowing from Augustine’s *Quaestiones in Matthaeum*, Bede seeks to draw further connections between the apostles and the church of his day, this time demonstrating how that same dedication to the apostolic mission leads both apostle and church into suffering. Here, Bede advances the notion that Peter’s distant trailing of Christ to his passion typologically represents the pains suffered by the church in pursuit of its continued evangelical mission throughout distant lands:

Quod ad passionem euntem dominum a longe sequitur petrus significabat ecclesiam secuturam quidem, hoc est imitaturam, passiones domini sed longe differenter; ecclesia enim pro se patitur at ille pro ecclesia.³

Because he follows from a distance the Lord going to [his] passion, Peter did signify the church which would indeed follow (that is, it would imitate) the sufferings of the Lord, though at a distance [and] differently; for the church suffers for him and he for the church.

² Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 6, p. 132, ll. 1270-77.

Essential to the preservation of the *traditio apostolica*, of course, was the election of church leaders who could preserve and practice the witness of Christ’s teachings for future generations. Aware of this fact, Bede finds precedent for the nomination of church leaders in Acts 6:1-3. In this passage, the apostles choose seven of their disciples of “good reputation” (*boni testimoni*) to help minister to the Greek widows who were being neglected in care:

> For this reason, the apostles or the successors of the apostles throughout all of the churches now decided upon seven deacons who would be of higher rank than the others, and who would stand closer around the altar, like the columns of the altar. Their being seven in number is not without some symbolism.  

The parallel drawn by Bede here exhibits concerns about how the ministration of a congregation’s day-to-day affairs could detract from an apostle or bishop’s ability to focus on the preservation and propagation of the gospel teachings. As the apostles cannot “leave the word of God” in order to “serve tables,” so too do their successors, the bishops of the church, need help with more mundane tasks in order to allow them time to concentrate on the more demanding issues affiliated with the religious mission (Acts 6:2). Therefore, it is necessary to appoint a symbolically significant number of seven deacons to help out with the administration of the church’s daily matters. The altar may prove a figural representation of the faith to which the deacons, having been permitted to stand closer, now have special access. On the other hand, it is possible that Bede’s reference may grant insight into actual liturgical celebrations of the exegete’s own time, hinting that the seven chosen deacons would presumably stand in close proximity to the altar “like chosen columns” during mass.

---

4 Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 6, ll. 10 ff.

Wielding greater power and influence than the deacons, the bishops of the church were considered the actual successors, both literally and spiritually, of the apostles. It is through them, the *successio episcoporum* (the ostensibly unbroken tradition through which bishops are imbued with spiritual authority as represented through the laying on of hands and a direct line of descent from the original apostles is established) that apostolic witness is thought to be preserved. Ælfric explores the relationship of the bishops to the apostles in a homily for Pentecost Sunday:

Ælfric describes how the Holy Spirit passes from apostle to bishop through their “bishoping;” that is, through their being made bishops. He relates how the apostles and bishops are essentially “of the same office” (*þæs ylcan hades*), meaning that the witness and knowledge given them by the apostles becomes their duty to pass on. Thus, just as the apostles laid hands on them, they are to lay hands on the faithful and baptize them in the name of the Holy Spirit. Ælfric makes clear elsewhere, however, that the bishops, while they have the power to baptize with water, do not themselves have the power to bestow the Holy Spirit on others, but can only invoke it in Christ’s name so that the Spirit will descend upon the baptized. What is within their power is the ability to bear witness to Christ’s teachings, death and resurrection—a power which can be perfected through the aid of the Holy Spirit. 

---


7 Cf. abover, pp. 40-2.
4. The Apostles and Right Teaching

According to the Anglo-Saxon Church, the simple passing on of apostolic witness from bishop to bishop over the centuries is not enough to fulfill the apostolic mission. That witness must be presented to the people in an orthodox and correct manner. As a dedicated teacher himself and inheritor of the tenth-century Benedictine Reform, Ælfric had quite a bit to say about the role and nature of right teaching. According to Ælfric, it is the teacher’s duty to instruct Christians in such a manner that they can avoid falling into sin: *For ði sceolon þa lareowas þa unbindan fram heora synnum. þa ðe críst geliffæst þurh onbryrdnyssé* (“For this reason, the teachers must unbind them from their sins, those whom Christ brought to life through inspiration”).¹ As the first purveyors of Christ’s teachings and evangelizers of the faith, the apostles were, excluding the Lord himself, the archtypal teachers of the church under the New Dispensation. After Christ, they established the precedent in terms of style and interpretation that the church would subsequently follow for two millenia.

Given this profound identification between apostle and teacher, it comes as little surprise that Ælfric should use Christ’s statement to his apostles that they were the salt of the earth (Mt. 5:13) in his homily celebrating the feast of multiple apostles (*In natale plurimorum apostolorum*) to discuss the role of teachers:

Lareowum gedafenað þæt hí mid wisdomes sealte geleaffulra manna mod sylton. þæt swa hwá swa him genealæhó be geondstred. mid swæcce ðæs ecan lifes; Swa swa sealht hylt ælce ne mete wið forrotodnyssé. swa sceal ðæs wisdomes bodung healdan manna heortan. wið brosnunge fulra leahtra.²

It is fitting for teachers that they should salt the minds of faithful men with the salt of wisdom so that whosoever approaches them may be sprinkled with the flavor of that eternal life. Just as the salt preserves each food against spoiling, so shall the preaching of wisdom maintain the hearts of men against the decay of foul sins.

¹ Ælfric, *CH* I.16, p. 310, ll. 84-6.
² Ælfric, *CH* II.36, p. 308, ll. 133-36.
By including this powerful image in a homily dedicated to apostles, Ælfric makes an implicit connection between the apostles and those teachings with which he intends to “salt” and preserve the minds of his audience; that is, he seeks through right teaching to be the “salt of the earth” just as Christ had deemed the apostles to be. That the souls of his flock were in need of a good “saling” is understood and the stakes were indeed high for both teacher and student. In his homily for Judgment Day, Ælfric makes clear the potential rewards and punishments for good and false teaching respectively, stating: ONSE bið se án genumen, and se oðor forlæten, þonne se Hælend genimð to his halgum englum ða góódan lareowas into Godes rice, and þa yfelan beoð wiðútan belocene (“When the one is taken and the other rejected, then the Savior shall take among his holy angels those good teachers to the kingdom of God, and those evil ones shall be locked outside”). ³ The teachers to which Ælfric refers were, of course, the bishops and mass-priests of his day. For Ælfric it was clear that the teacher’s head was on the proverbial chopping block for his or her students. If the students failed to acquire the necessary knowledge for them to understand the orthodox faith and embark upon their own salvation, the teacher’s soul was also at stake. But if the students received right teaching and were set on the path to salvation, the teacher would reap the rewards of the eternal kingdom.

An yfel lareow was often interpreted as one that espoused heresy. By Ælfric’s day the major doctrinal heresies of the early medieval West had long since been put to rest, though heresy in general was still a concern in so far as a hapless teacher might misinterpret scripture or dust off the teachings of some long condemned and heterodox tome. In Bede’s time, however, some of these heresies were still more or less fresh in the church’s collective memory. With unorthodox teachings ever a major concern to him, Bede sought to interpret some of the events

³ Ælfric, CH Supp. 18, p. 598, ll. 196-99.
of the *Actus apostolorum* in light of doctrinal controversy. For example, he explains the heavenly linen that appeared to Peter in Acts 10:11 as representative of the church’s incorruptibility against sin and heresy:

> Vas illud ecclesiam significat incorruptibili fide praeditam; linteum enim tinea non consumit quae vestes alias corrumpit. Et ideo qui uult ad mysterium ecclesiae catholicae pertinere, excludat de corde suo corruptionem malarum cogitationum et ita incorruptibiliter firmetur in fide, ut prauis cogitationibus tamquam a tineis non rodatur in mente. Aliter, tinea hereticus est uestimentum domini corrumpere uolens, sed domino dispensante non ualens.⁴

This vessel signifies the church, endowed with an incorruptible faith, for a moth, which corrupts other cloth, does not consume linen. Therefore, whoever wishes to be part of the mystery of the catholic church should root out from his heart the corruption of evil thoughts, and in this way he may be incorruptibly strengthened in faith, so that he will not be consumed by perverse thoughts, *<as if by> moths, in his mind.* Alternatively, the moth is a heretic, wishing to corrupt the Lord’s robe, but unable to do so because the Lord does not permit it.⁵

In this passage, Bede begins by citing Augustine’s Sermon 149, noting how God has rendered the Christian faith immune to corruption. Following Augustine, Bede goes on to argue that good Christians, desiring to become a part of the immaculate church, must first rid themselves of spot by rooting out any evil thoughts in order to avoid being consumed by sin “as if by moths.” Bede, however, departs from his source by pointing out a potential cause for such perverse and dangerous notions. Instead of interpreting the moth merely as sinful thought, he offers the alternative explanation that the moth signifies a full-blown heretic attacking the “fabric” of the church through false teaching. Elsewhere, the exegete demonstrates how the true and orthodox instruction of the apostles can be employed in order to combat unorthodox beliefs. For example, he uses Peter as a witness against the Arian heresy when commenting Acts 2:34:

> Dicit dominus domino meo, sede a dextris meis. Prius nomen domini apud Hebraeos τετραγράμματον est, quod proprie in deo ponitur; secundum, quod commune mortalibus quo et reges et ceteri homines appellantur. Quod si...

> The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand. The first name of the Lord among the Hebrews is the tetragrammaton [i.e. YHWH], which is used exclusively for God. The second [name] is the one common among mortals by

---

⁴ Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 10, ll. 35 ff. The italicized portions of the passage are drawn from Augustine’s Sermon 149. For the source text, cf. *PL* 38, col. 308-9.

nobis obponere uoluerit heresis Arriana, ex hac diuersitate minorem filium, patrem esse maiorem, respondebimus ei: illi nomen inferius conuenire cui sedere imperatur. Sicut et beatus Petrus consequenter exposuit: Quia et dominum eum et Christum deus fecit hunc Iesum quem uos crucifixistis. Non enim divinitas crucifixa sed caro est, et hoc utique fieri potest quod potuit crucifigi.\textsuperscript{6}

The Arian heresy, as Bede explains, sought to interpret the Son as subordinate to the Father. Here, the exegete points to an argument purportedly made by the Arians that the Father’s superiority is demonstrated by the exclusive use of the tetragrammaton to refer to God, whereas Christ is awarded the inferior title of Lord which he shares with mortal rulers and nobles. Bede follows Jerome’s commentary on the Psalms in stating that it is appropriate that the lesser appellation be given to Jesus since he is the one ordered to sit at the right hand of the father. Whereas Jerome’s commentary continues by discussing Christ’s role on Judgment Day, Bede breaks off from his source material to incorporate Peter’s words in Acts 2:36 as proof against the heresy. According to Bede, the apostle’s assertion that God made Jesus both Lord and Christ attests to both the divine and human nature of the Son. Because it was Christ’s flesh that died upon the cross and not his divine nature, the exegete maintains the Son’s divinity and place as coequal among the Holy Trinity. The implication follows that Jesus is appropriately termed Lord in a fashion similar to earthly rulers due to his humanity, while the lesser title does nothing to diminish his divine status as the anointed Christ. This is not the only time Bede would employ Peter as a witness against heresy. In his commentary on Acts 5:4, the exegete relies on Peter for

\textsuperscript{6} Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 2, ll. 201 ff. The section following the citation of Acts 2:34 is drawn from Jerome’s commentary on Psalm 109 (110). For the source text, cf. Jer., In Ps. 109, ll. 1 ff. Bede’s addition of Peter’s quote as an authority against Arianism appears to be his own contribution.
evidence of the Holy Spirit’s divinity in combating the heretical views of the Pneumatomachians.7

Bede, however, was not alone in calling upon Peter and the apostles as witnesses against heterodoxy. Perhaps the most famous instance is that of Wilfrid of York, who, according to both Stephanus’ Vita Wilfridi and Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica, figuratively summoned the testimony of Peter at the Synod of Whitby in 664 to oppose the Irish contingent’s dating of Easter and stance on clerical tonsure.8 Noting that the Roman Church had already decided the matter at Nicaea and evoking Peter as the rock upon which the church was built, Wilfrid mockingly challenges, “Tell me who is greater, Colum Cille or the apostle Peter, in the kingdom of heaven?”9 Interestingly enough, Colmán, the leader of the Irish faction, maintained an apostle in his corner as well, drawing upon John in his party’s defense.10 In a face-off between Petrine and Johannine authority, however, it seems that Peter won out as England aligned itself with Rome in ecclesiastical matters.

In his attempts to fend off heterodox teachings on the continent, Alcuin clearly identified with the apostles. When writing a letter to Radon, abbot of St. Vedast’s (dated between 790-793),

7 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 5, ll. 14 ff.
9 Enuntiate mihi, utrum maior est Columcilleae an Petrus apostolus in regno coelorum. The quote is from VW, X, pp. 22-23. Cf. the parallel passage in Bede, HE, III.25, p. 306, where Wilfrid compares the authority granted Peter and that given to Colum Cille. Colum Cille, otherwise known as St. Columba, was the founder and figurehead of the Irish mission.
10 Bede, HE, III.25, p. 300. Mirum quare stultum appellare uelitis laborem nostrum, in quo tanti apostoli, qui super pectus Domini recumbere dignus fuit, exempla sectamur, cum ipsum sapientissime uixisse omnis mundus nouerit (“It is remarkable how you should be willing to call our labor stupid in which we strive to follow the example of that apostle who was worthy to recline on the breast of the Lord, when the entire world knows him to be the wisest man to have lived”).
796), he mentions how he feels that they are living in the “perilous times” (*tempora periculosa*) foretold by Paul in 2 Tim. 3:1. According to Alcuin, the times are made perilous by the emergence of “pseudo-learned” men (*pseudo-doctores*) who introduce new sects (*novas sectas*) “that seek to pollute the purity of the Catholic faith through impious assertions” (*qui catholicae fidei puritatem impiis adsertionibus maculare nituntur*). Therefore, in order that the doctrine of truth may prevail, it is necessary that men like Radon and himself “manfully defend the bastions of God” (*castra Dei viriliter defendere*). In another letter (written between late 800 and early 801), Alcuin exhorts Riculf, archbishop of Mainz, to continue striving to repair schisms in the church, comparing at length the archbishop’s efforts to those of Peter. Alcuin acknowledges Riculf to have been “laboring with the blessed Peter for the entire night in the waves” (*cum beato Petro tota nocte in undis laborantem*) and bemoans that heterodoxy had given rise to “so great a tear suddenly made in the apostolic net” (*tanta scissura apostolici reti subito facta est*). In similar fashion to Wilfrid and Bede before him, Alcuin draws on the testimony of an apostle, this time John, to combat a specific heresy. Alcuin appeals in a letter to Felix (c. 793), bishop of Urgel and proponent of Adoptionism, to abandon his unorthodox teachings:

---

11 Alcuin, *Epist.* 74, p. 117, ll. 11-16.

veteris novique testamenti serie non invenitur.\textsuperscript{13} after such thunder, fashioning his birth with the new name of adoption, which is not found in the entire sequence of the Old and New Testament.

Unfortunately for John’s legacy, it appears that his testimony was equally as ineffective in this instance as it was at the Synod of Whitby, for Felix does not appear to have forsaken his Adoptionist beliefs; he was condemned at the Council of Frankfurt in 794 and died in exile in Lyon in 818.

Right teaching did not simply consitute the fight against heresy. Also of import when it came to good teaching was observance; that is, a teacher must practice what he or she preaches, thereby setting a positive example for students. Bede stresses this aspect of instruction when addressing the opening lines of the \textit{Actus apostolorum}:

\begin{quote}
Et notandum quod ait: \textit{Quae coepit Jesus facere et docere: primo facere, postea docere, quia Jesus bonum doctorem instituens nulla nisi quae fecit docuit.}\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

It must also be noted that he [i.e. Luke] says, ‘\textit{which Jesus began to do and to teach}’—first ‘to do’ and afterwards ‘to teach,’ because Jesus, establishing [what is] a good teacher, taught nothing except those things which he did.\textsuperscript{15}

The Alfredian era translator of the Old English \textit{Cura pastoralis} waxes somewhat more eloquent on the issue of observance:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Swæ ða lærowas hi drincað swiðe hlutor wæter, ðonne hi ðone godcundan wisdom þornið, & eac ðonne hi hine læræð; ac hi hit gedrefað mid hira agnum undeæwum, ðonne ðæt fólc bisænað on hira undeæwum, nalles on hira lære. ðæh ðæt fólc ðyrste lære lære, hi hie ne magon drincan, ac hio ðæh gedrefed mid ðæm þe ðæ lærowas oðer doð oðer hi læræð.}\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Thus, the teachers, they drink very pure water when they learn the divine wisdom and also when they teach it. But they agitate it with their own vices when the people takes an example from their vices and not from their teaching. Though the people thirsts for the teaching, they may not drink. Rather, they are agitated when the teachers do one thing [and] teach another.


\textsuperscript{14} Bede, \textit{Exp. Act.}, Ch. 1, ll. 10 ff.

\textsuperscript{15} Martin (1989), p. 9.

\textsuperscript{16} OE \textit{Cura pastoralis}, p. 30, ll. 4-9.
Through this drinking metaphor, the anonymous translator identifies how teachers, even when preaching right doctrine, can upset the efficacy of their lesson by giving way to vice and acting contrary to their teaching.

While good instructors were responsible for providing right teaching and actively observing their pronouncements, the onus was not entirely theirs alone. For right teaching to succeed, students also had to play their part. First of all, the students must have their hearts and minds opened by the Holy Spirit such that they could be receptive to proper instruction.\(^{17}\) Furthermore, the student was not to overanalyze the instruction, allowing the teacher to determine what was and was not the correct meaning. In this respect, Bede draws on the apostles’ misreading of the parable of the mouth, body and heart (Mt. 15:15; Mk. 7:17) as an example in what was a rare instance of overthinking on their part:

\[
\text{quod aperte dictum fuerat et patebat auditui apostoli per parabolam dictum putant et in re manifesta mysticam quaerunt intelligentiam corripiunturque a domino quare parabolice dictum putant quod perspicue locutus est. Ex quo animaduertimus uitiuosum esse auditorem qui obscure manifesta aut manifeste dicta obscura uelit intellegere.}\quad^{18}
\]

What had been said openly and made accessible for hearing, the apostles think was said as a parable, and in a matter that is manifest, they seek a mystical understanding and are reproached by the Lord for how they believe it spoken parabolically, that which he spoke evidently. From this we observe that a hearer is most wrong who wishes to understand manifest things obscurely or obscure sayings manifestly.\(^{19}\)

Thus, while teachers are responsible for the salvation of their students, they can only be held accountable so far. If the students’ hearts have not been primed by the Holy Spirit or if they willfully misinterpret the meaning of a lesson by looking for figural meanings where the teacher intends only literal (or vice versa), then there is little that the teacher can be expected to do.

\(^{17}\) Cf. above, p. 41and note 35 on the same page.

\(^{18}\) Bede, \textit{In Marc.}, Bk. II, Ch. 7, p. 522, ll. 1304 ff. The passage is lifted verbatim from Jerome. For Bede’s source, cf. Jer., \textit{In Matt.}, Bk. II, ll. 1500 ff.

5. The Apostles as Exegetes and Interpreters of the Word

One of the skills necessary for a good teacher, especially one of scripture, is the ability to interpret the text in helpful and enlightening ways. As Christ interpreted the word of God, so too were the apostles expected to interpret Christ’s teachings.\(^1\) Identifying himself as primarily a teacher by way of Biblical exegesis, Bede necessarily latches on to this aspect of the apostolic office.\(^2\) Consequently, we may speak of the apostles as the first Christian commentators on scripture, setting a standard after which Bede himself strove. In his commentary on Mark, Bede explicitly states that it was common practice for the apostles (and the evangelists) to interpret Old Testament events in light of their typological or Christological significances:

Nam et familiaris constat esse evangelists atque apostolis cum de ueteri testamento testimonia assumunt magis sensum propheticum ponere curare quam uerba.\(^3\)

For it is agreed to be common practice for the evangelists and apostles, when they take up the testimony from the Old Testament, that they are at pains to bring forth the prophetic sense rather than the words.

Bede gives us an example in his *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum* of Peter exercising his ability to interpret Old Testament prophesy when the apostle recites from the Psalms in Acts 1:20, stating: *scriptum est enim in libro Psalmorum fiat commoratio eius deserta et non sit qui inhabitet in ea et episcopatum eius accipiat alius* (“For it is written in the book of Psalms: Let his residence be deserted and let there be none to inhabit it; and let another take his bishopric”). Bede comments:

Plani quidem sunt isti uersiculi et palam beato

---


\(^3\) Bede, *In Marc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 500, ll. 443 ff.
Thus, Bede demonstrates how Peter interpreted the Psalms typologically, showing how the Old Testament foretold the betrayal of Christ by Judas and the election of Matthias to replace the fallen apostle among the Twelve. Bede goes on to note how Peter has combined passages from Ps. 68:26 (69:26) and Ps. 108:8 (109:8), itself an act of erudite interpretation. The Northumbrian exegete later gives another example of Peter’s ability to interpret the Psalms in Acts 2:34-35, this time Ps. 109:1 (110:1), where David foretells of an invitation to sit at the right hand of the Lord:

Sicut enim, inquit, haec quae notissima sunt beatus Daud non de sua sed de domini sui ascensione praedixit, qui emittendus ex Sion, id est de regia eiusdem Daud stirpe, uenturus et dominatus esset in medio inimicorum suorum, sic et illa quae praemisi non ad Daud sed ad Christi mortem et resurrectionem pertinere

He [i.e. Peter] says, for just as the blessed David made these [prophesies], which are most familiar, not about his own [ascension], but about the Lord’s ascension, who was sent forth from Sion, that is, from the royal lineage of that same David, and who was to come and to rule in the midst of his enemies, so too should you recognize that

---

4 Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 1, ll. 211 ff.
6 Ps. 68:26 (69:26): *fiat habitatio eorum deserta et in tabernaculis eorum non sit qui inhabitet* ("Let their habitation be made desolate; and let there be none to dwell in their tabernacles"); Ps. 108:8 (109:8) ... *et episcopatum eius accipiat alter* ("and his bishopric let another take"). For Bede’s identification of the different passages, cf. Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 1, ll. 218 ff.
7 Acts 2:34-35: *non enim David ascendit in caelos dicit autem ipse dixit Dominus Domino meo sede a dextris meis donec ponam inimicos tuos scabillum pedum tuorum* ("For David ascended not into heaven, but he himself said: The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool"). Cp. Ps. 109:1 (110:1): *dixit Dominus Domino meo sede a dextris meis donec ponam inimicos tuos scabillum pedum tuorum* ("The Lord said to my Lord: Sit thou at my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool"). Peter’s originality in this interpretation is less clear as Matthew uses the same passage to refer to Christ’s ascension: Mt. 22:44. Note also that Bede demonstrates Paul’s ability to interpret typologically, describing how the lanterns in Acts 20:7-8 represent the apostle’s aptitude for shedding light on scriptural enigmas “with the lamp of plain explanation” (*lampade planae expositionis*). Cf. Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 20, ll. 13 ff. Martin has noted where the first part of the passage echoes Arator’s epic poem on the acts of the apostles. Cf. Martin (1989), p. 159.
those things which I mentioned before do not pertain to David, but to the death and resurrection of Christ.

Once again, Bede depicts Peter operating in the role of a prototypical exegete, deftly deducing Christological readings from Davidic prophesy. As a commentator himself constantly seeking out new figural and typological interpretations linking the Old and New Testaments, it is not hard to imagine how Bede would have looked up to Peter and his fellow apostles as spiritual progenitors of his beloved discipline.

---

6. The Apostles and the “Eloquence” or “Skill” of Preaching

Given the apostles ability to bear accurate witness, demonstrate right teaching and interpret Old Testament scripture in a complex exegetical and typological manner, it would seem to follow that they would be able to do so in an eloquent and skillful way. As regards the eloquence of the apostles, there seems to have been some confusion amongst Anglo-Saxon scholars. In his second letter to the Corinthians (2 Cor. 11:6), Paul downplays the elegance of his own speech while still underscoring the profundity of his letters, stating: *et si inperitus sermone sed non scientia* (“For although I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge”). Elsewhere in 1 Cor. 2:13, Paul draws attention to the vulgar style of his nevertheless perspicacious writings: *quae et loquimur non in doctis humanae sapientiae verbis sed in doctrina Spiritus spiritualibus spiritualia comparantes* (“Which things we also speak, not in the learned words of human wisdom; but in the doctrine of the Spirit, comparing spiritual things with spiritual”).

Acts 4:13 explicitly portrays Peter and John as illiterate (*sine litteris*) and ignorant (*idiotae*) men when it comes to formal learning, a notion that is not lost on Bede in his commentary:

Inlitterati mittuntur ad praedicandum ne fides credentium non uirtute dei sed eloquentia atque doctrina fieri putaretur, ut apostolus ait: *Non in sapientia uerbi ut non evacuetur crux Christi*. Idiotae enim dicebantur qui propria tantum lingua naturalique scientia contenti litterarum studia nesciebant, siquidem Graeci proprium ἰδιον uocant.¹

Unlettered men were sent to preach, so that the faith of those who believed would not be thought to have come about by eloquence and teaching instead of by God’s power. As the apostle says, *Not in the wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ be made void* [1 Cor. 1:17]. They were called ‘simple men’ who were content with only their own language and natural knowledge, and did not know the study of letters, since for ‘one’s own’ the Greeks used the word ἰδιον.²

---

¹ Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 4, ll. 37 ff. The source for the first line of Bede’s exposition here has previously been overlooked by scholars. The exegete is here drawing from Jerome’s commentary on Matthew. Cf. Jer., *In Matt.*, Bk. I, ll. 404ff: *isti primi uocati sunt ut dominum sequentur; piscatores et inlitterati mittuntur ad praedicandum ne fides credentium non uirtute dei sed eloquentia atque doctrina fieri putaretur.*

In expositing upon the significance of Peter’s and John’s lack of letters and learning, Bede draws upon yet another interjection of humility made by Paul (1 Cor. 1:17), a statement which lends the passage meaning. Bede is careful to point out the necessity of the apostles’ lack of eloquence, explaining that converts must necessarily be swayed by the truth of Christ’s teachings in their simplest form, unadorned by extravagant rhetoric. This intial interpretation of the apostles’ humble abilities would seem to square soundly with Ælfric’s statement in his homily for the first sunday after Easter (CH I.16):

Crist lufode eac his apostolas. 7 þeahhwædere ne sette he hi to cynengum ne to ealdermannum; ne to woruldficere blisse; ac tosende hi geond ealne middaneard to bodienne fulluht. 7 þone geleafan þe he sylf tæhte.³

Christ also loved his apostles and nevertheless he established them not as kings nor as governors nor in worldly bliss; rather he sent them through the entire world to preach baptism and the faith which he himself taught.

As Lawrence T. Martin has pointed out, however, Bede later moderates his stance on the apostles’ lack of letters in his Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum, nuancing the meaning behind sine litteris and idiotae to denote a lack of rhetorical training as opposed to outright illiteracy or ignorance.⁴ Bede’s retraction for Acts 4:13 reads:

Sine litteris dicit non quod litteras nescirent, sed quod grammaticae artis peritiam non haberent; namque in Graeco apertius pro hoc verbo ἄγράμματοι, hoc est inlitterati habetur. Idiotae autem propriè inperiti vocantur; denique in epistola ad Corinthios, ubi scriptum est, etsi inperitus sermone sed non scientia, pro inperito in Graeco ἰδιώτης habetur.⁵

‘Without letters’ does not say that they did not know [their] letters, rather that they had no expertise in the art of grammar. In the Greek it is more clear, for in place of this word is used ἄγράμματοι [i.e. ‘inarticulate’], that is inliterati. Idiotae, however, are more properly called ‘unskilled.’ Finally, in the epistle to the Corinthians, where it is written, and if [we] be unskilled in speech but not in wisdom, it uses ἰδιώτης in the Greek for ‘unskilled.’

Bede first takes up the rendering of the Greek term ἄγράμματοι into the Latin sine litteris. He stresses how the original Greek carries with it a sense of being uninitiated in grammar (literally

³ Ælfric, CH I.16, pp. 308-9, ll. 48-51.
⁵ Bede, Retr. Act., Ch. 4, ll. 12 ff.
“ungrammared”) or inarticulate. For Bede, *sine litteris* (“without letters”) is too narrow in meaning and inaccurately connotes that the apostles were unable to read and write altogether. Rather, he prefers the use of *inlitterati* which can carry the meaning of “illiterate,” but is more general in its meaning of “ignorant” or “uneducated” (in this case, ignorant of rhetorical skill). He also takes issue with the translation of Greek *ἰδιώτης* into Latin *idiotae* (“ignorant, uneducated”). Bede notes how the original Greek carries a meaning of “unskilled” or lacking in professional knowledge. He cites the Latin translation of 2 Co 11:6 as providing a more accurate notional interpretation by employing the term *inperitus* (“unskilled”) under similar circumstances. Based on this usage, the exegete argues *imperiti* gets closer to the essential meaning of *ἰδιώτης* than does *idiotae*. By insisting that Acts 4:13 portrays Peter and John as missionaries who are “inarticulate” and “unskilled” rather than outright “illiterate” and “ignorant,” Bede acknowledges that the apostles were “literate” in so far as they could read and write, but “unskilled” in the art of grammar or rhetoric. This nuanced interpretation allows for the apostles’ ability to write their epistles, but to do so in a manner that lacks rhetorical flourish in the classical sense.

Yet when Bede comments on Peter’s preaching to the Israelites in Acts 2:22, the exegete seems to credit the apostle with some degree of rhetorical talent:

> Quasi doctus magister prius incredulos commissi reatus admonet ut iusto timore conpunctis consilium salutis postmodum oportunius inpendat, et quia scientibus legem loquitur ipsum Christum esse qui a prophetis esset promissus ostendit. Nec tamen hunc prius auctoritate sua dei filium nominat sed uirum probatum, uirum iustum, uirum a mortuis suscitatum, non usitata cum ceteris atque communi resurrectione, id est in finem saeculi dilatata sed tertia die celebrata, ut singularis et gloriæ resurrectionis assertio

As a learned teacher, he [Peter] first admonishes unbelievers for the crime which had been committed, so that once their consciences had been stung by righteous fear, he might afterward devote [his discourse] more advantageously to the plan of salvation. And because he is speaking to those who know the law, he shows that Christ himself is the one promised by the prophets. Nevertheless, here Peter does not at first give him the name Son of God on his own authority. Rather [he calls him] a man approved, a righteous

---

6 ἀγράμματος can mean “illiterate” in the sense of being unable to read or write, but is also applied to animals incapable of speech.
man, a man raised from the dead—not raised with others in the ordinary and general resurrection (that is, the resurrection which is deferred to the end of the world), but raised in that resurrection celebrated on the third day, so that his assertion of a unique and glorious resurrection might acquire [the value of] a testimonial to his eternal divinity. 8

Here, Peter is shown to be acutely aware of his audience. Since he is speaking to Jews who are intimately familiar with Mosaic law, he develops his teaching along those lines so as to demonstrate how the prophets were foretelling the coming of Christ. Bede then argues that the apostle exploits rhetorical strategy by first withholding the name of Jesus. Peter does this, according to Bede, “on his own authority.” By taking it upon himself to initially suppress the name of the incarnated Jesus, Peter emphasizes Christ’s divinity over his humanity and allows the mysteries of the resurrection to take precedence in his preaching. This conscious choice represents a selective and oratorical approach on the apostle’s part rather than a straightforward recitation of Christ’s life and suffering. Peter’s acquaintance with law, prophecy and rhetorical manipulation might be interpreted as “literate” in a manner far beyond the mere ability to read and write. Elsewhere, Bede makes note of Peter’s ability to teach “by the testimony of the prophets and the law” (*prophetarum legisque testimonio docet*), while praising the apostle for being able to preach both “briefly” (*breviter*) and “clearly” (*dilucide*). 9 Taken in conjunction, these comments seem to express a feeling on Bede’s part that Peter is certainly skilled in the art of preaching. If we define eloquence as the ability to speak “briefly” and “clearly,” as opposed

---


9 Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 3, ll. 51 ff.
to addressing an audience with ornate diction, then we may also look upon Peter as “eloquent” in addition to “skillful.”

Even if Peter were considered to be vulgar and unskilled in rhetoric, Paul appears to Bede as a literate apostle in every sense of the word. The exegete makes much of his ability to preach to the Stoics and Epicurians in Acts 17 by referencing their own philosophers rather than the prophets and Judaic law.

His enim qui prophetarum fidem non recipiebant non Moysi, non Esaiae uel alicuius prophetarum, sed auctorum suorum loquitur testimoniiis, uersum uidelicet Arati decantans et de falsis ipsorum quibus contradicere non poterant sua uera confirmans. Magnae quippe scientiae est dare in tempore cibaria conseruis et audientium considerare personas.  

To those who did not receive the faith of the prophets he spoke not with the testimony of Moses or Isaiah, or of any of the prophets, but with the testimony of their own authors. He recited a verse from Aratus, and from the falsehoods of those to whom they could not object, he confirmed his own truths. Surely it is the mark of great knowledge to give fellow servants their fare at the proper time (Pr 31:15) and to take into account the particular individuals who are one’s listeners.

Thus, Paul’s ability to manipulate secular philosophical teachings in a convincing manner speaks for a certain skill and eloquence in preaching that both he and Bede would normally seek to suppress.

Ælfric, on the other hand, seems somewhat less adverse to recognizing the skill of apostolic preaching:

Da halgan apostolas þurh þone Halgan Gást wurdon swa gelærde þæt hi witodlice spræcon mid eallum geréordum üncuðra þeoda, and hi læran mihton mancynn on worulde of þam ealdum böcum þe hi är ne cuðon under Moyses lage, mid micclum andgite gástlicra getácnunga, swa swa him God onwreah.  

Those holy apostles became so learned through the Holy Spirit that they spoke certainly with all the tongues of unlearned peoples and could, with great understanding of allegorical meanings, instruct mankind throughout the world from those ancient [i.e. Old Testament] books which they previously did not know under the law of Moses, just as God had revealed to them.

---

10 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 17, ll. 84 ff.
12 Ælfric, CH Supp. 7, pp. 348-49, ll. 196-201.
The apostles’ knowledge and rhetorical ability is attributed by Ælfric to the Holy Spirit, thereby confirming its preperatory role in the proper expression of witness and acceptance of right teaching. The precise source of this talent, whether inherent or supernaturally imbued, in no way negates the fact that the apostles, in the end, “spoke certainly” (*witodlice spræcon*) regardless of the target language. Ælfric seems to attribute to them a level of literacy since their teachings are either derived from or promulgated through the “old books” (*ealdum bócum*) previously unknown under Mosaic law. Furthermore, they can skillfully apply an understanding of “spiritual significations” (*gástlicra getácnunga*) in their lessons.

Ultimately, the Anglo-Saxons recognized teaching as an art and, as the Alfredian translator of the Old English *Cura pastoralis* suggests, the “art of all arts” (*craeft eallra craefta*). The Old English translator also emphasizes the teacher’s ability to temper lessons such that they are neither overwrought nor underemphasized: *Se lareow sceal mid geornful[l]ice ingehygde foređencean na ðæt an ðætte [he] ðurh hine nan woh ne bodige, ac eac ðæt he nane ðinga ðæt ryht to suiðe & to ungemetlice & to unaberdlice ne bodige* ... (“The teacher must, with diligent understanding, take care beforehand not only that he not, through himself, preach error, but also that he not preach anything that is right too exceedingly or too immoderately or too intolerably”). The apostles, with their ability to relate sound doctrine and decipher typological meanings within the Old Testament in an unadorned style while still preaching clearly, concisely and convincingly could be viewed as an embodiment of this ideal—an ideal that, by some definitions of the term, may be described as eloquence. The apostles, therefore, while perhaps

---

13 Cf. above, pp. 40-42.

14 *OE Cura pastorialis*, p. 30, ll.

15 *OE Cura pastorialis*, p. 95, ll. 15-18.
not trained in the formal arts of grammar and rhetoric, were nevertheless considered by the
Anglo-Saxons to be artists in their own right and imbued with a certain eloquence.
7. The Apostles as Arbiters of Salvation and their Place in Salvation History

The endgame for all this right and eloquent teaching, as stressed by Ælfric, was the salvation of the faithful. Consequently, Anglo-Saxon writers placed much emphasis on the role of the apostles in helping facilitate deliverance and their place within salvation history as a whole. One of the more powerful expressions of the apostles’ part in salvation is their charge to baptize the faithful in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit (Mt. 28:19). In his comment on Acts 1:5, where Christ predicts how the apostles will be baptized in the Holy Spirit, Bede explores the apostles’ agency in their injunction to go forth and baptize all nations:

Cum ergo diceret dominus, quia Iohannes quidem baptizavit aqua, nequaquam subiunxit, uos autem baptizabitis, sed, uos autem baptizabimini spiritu sancto; quia neque apostoli neque sequaces eorum, qui usque hodie baptizant in ecclesia, aliter quam Iohannes, id est, in aqua baptizare praevaeinant. Sed tamen inuocato Christi nomine adest interior virtus spiritus sancti quae homine aquam tribuente baptizatorum animas simul et corpora purificet....

Therefore, when the Lord said, John indeed baptized with water, he did not continue with, ‘yet you shall baptize,’ but with yet you shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit [Acts 1:5], because neither the apostles nor their followers [i.e. successors], who still baptize in the church to this day, had the power to baptize except as John did, that is, with water. However, when the name of Christ is invoked, the interior power of the Holy Spirit is present, which, with the human administration of water, simultaneously purifies the souls and the bodies of those being baptized.

Bede, therefore, notes that the apostles do not themselves have the ability to bestow the Holy Spirit through baptism. Rather, like John the Baptist before them, they, in principle, have only the power to baptize in water (i.e., the baptism of penance). Unlike John, however, because they themselves have been baptized in the Holy Spirit, the apostles have the power to invoke the Holy Spirit by baptizing in the name of Christ. Bede makes clear that it is only through the invocation of Christ’s name and his agency that the “interior power of the Holy Spirit is present.”

---

1 Cf. above, pp. 50-1.
2 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 1, ll. 41 ff.
4 Cf. Mk. 1:4.
Thus, the apostles are seen to baptize for the remission of sins as intermediaries of divine grace aided by the power of Christ and the Holy Spirit. In this passage, Bede also alludes to the fact that priests and bishops have inherited the power to baptize from the apostles and, like the apostles before them, are dependent on the invocation of Christ to validate that baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Beyond baptism, the apostles were also viewed as playing an active role in salvation by aiding in the judgment over those who would and would not be saved. This is especially true of Peter, who, according to Mt. 16:19, was given the keys to the kingdom of heaven and assured that those he either binds or looses on earth would likewise be received in heaven. This power of Peter is often applied by Bede to interpret the miraculous events of the apostle’s life as related in the Actus apostolorum. For example, Bede explains Peter’s healing of the cripple before the temple of Jerusalem in Acts 3:1 in light of this faculty, describing how the temple represents the Lord and Peter the guide who necessarily leads the chosen to the Lord:

> Porta templi speciosa dominus est per quem, si quis introierit, saluabitur. ... sed Petri est in templum perducere, cui pro confessione forti et cognomen petrae et claues caeli sunt date. 

> The beautiful gate of the temple is the Lord. Whoever enters through him will be saved. ... but Peter is the guide into the temple. To him, in virtue of his strong profession of faith, the epithet of ‘rock’ and the keys of heaven were given.

Elsewhere, Bede interprets Peter’s miraculous escape from Herod through the iron gates of Jerusalem (Acts 12:10) as representative of salvation in the Lord, the path to which, formerly narrow, was broadened “by the footsteps of the apostles” (apostolorum uestigiis) more generally:

> Angusta immo ferrea erat porta quae ducit ad Hierusalem caelestem, sed apostolorum uestigiis nobis est iam facta meabilis, qui sanguine proprio ferrum uicerunt hostium. De hoc Arator: Ferrea quid mirum si cedunt ostia Petro? Quem deus aetheriae custodem deputat aulae, Ecclesiaeque

> The iron gate which leads to the heavenly Jerusalem was narrow indeed, but it has now been made passable for us by the footsteps of the apostles, who by their own blood prevailed over the enemies’ iron. On this Arator has: What wonder is there in the iron gates making way for

---

5 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 3, ll. 16 ff.

The apostles were not just guides along the path to salvation. Rather, they also wielded the power to punish the unrighteous. Bede highlights as much by paralleling Peter’s cursing of Simon Magus (Acts 8:19-23) and Paul’s infliction of blindness upon Elymas (Acts 13:8-12):

Ælfric goes on to note the continuity between the apostles’ power and the authority of subsequent bishops to either forgive or condemn the sinful:

Thus, Ælfric uses the apostles’ ability to forgive sins as an opportunity to offer instruction on the rights and responsibilities of bishops. By cautioning bishops to exercise their power of forgiveness righteously, Ælfric makes clear that their capacity to absolve people of their sins is not ipso facto inherent to the office of bishop, but rather gifted by Christ and maintained through
his consent. Should a bishop prove so irresponsible as to abuse the power, that ability can be revoked by the Lord.

According to orthodox Christian theology, the role of the apostles in assisting salvation was preordained by God and part of the plan for salvation history. Through several of his homilies, Ælfric manages to firmly place the apostles within that plan. In \textit{CH I.22} for Pentecost, the homilist outlines three ages of the world: “without law” \textit{(buton ē)}, i.e., the world before Mosaic law; “under the law” \textit{(under ē)}, i.e., the age of the Old Testament patriarchs living under Mosaic law; and “under God’s grace” \textit{(under godes gyfē)}, i.e., the present era ushered in by Christ and the New Dispensation.\textsuperscript{12} The apostles, of course, belong to the latter age, and Ælfric explains that an understanding of their teachings can help mankind understand the eponymous grace which lends the period its name: \textit{we ne sind na buton ē ne we ne moton healdan moyses ē lichamlice ac godes gifu us gewissað to his willan gif we gemyndige beoð cristes beodum 7 þæra apostola lare} (“We are not without any law at all, nor must we bodily maintain the law of Moses, but God’s grace reveals to us his will if we are mindful of Christ’s commandments and the teaching of the apostles”).\textsuperscript{13} The homilist goes on to read the apostles’ knowledge of tongues gifted them by the Holy Spirit at Pentecost in the age of grace as restoring that which was previously lost at Babel during the age under law, thus drawing a typological connection between the Old and New Testaments which underscores the divine nature of God’s plan.\textsuperscript{14}

In his homily for the twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost (\textit{CH I.35}), Ælfric explores Christ’s parable of the wedding-feast for the king’s son (Mt. 22:1-14) in a manner that explains

\textsuperscript{12} Ælfric, \textit{CH I.22}, p. 355, ll. 33-8.
\textsuperscript{13} Ælfric, \textit{CH I.22}, p. 355, ll. 36-8.
the transition from the age under law to the age of grace. According to the parable, the king slaughters bulls and fatlings (Ælfric renders altitia as gemæstan fugelas “fattened birds”) in preparation for the feast. The invited guests do not come and the king is compelled to send his messengers forth in order to gather impromptu guests. Ælfric draws on Gregory the Great’s Homily 38 on the gospels for inspiration, interpreting the bulls and fatlings as follows:

Those bulls betoken the patriarchs of the old law who, by permission of the old law, could slay their enemies in the manner of a bull. ...

Those fattened birds betoken the holy teachers of the New Testament, who are fattened with the grace of the Holy Spirit to such an extent that they wish for the spiritual way of life of the journey on high. ... What does ‘My bulls and my fattened birds are slain’ mean but as if he said: ‘Behold the lives of the of the patriarchs and understand the sayings of the prophets and the preachings of the apostles about the humanity of my son, and come to the wedding.’

The apostles, represented by fattened birds, are seen in apposition to the prophets of the Old Testament, signified by the bulls. That both are provided at the feast, Ælfric interprets to mean that his audience, in the age of grace, should remain mindful of the prophets of the Old Testament, while still seeking to understand the “preachings of the apostles” (ápostola bodunga). Thus, the apostles and their typological parallel in the prophets serve once-again as a reminder of the interconnectedness of the two ages under law and under grace and God’s plan for the history of salvation.

According to Mt. 19:28, the apostles would not simply preach salvation, but on Judgment Day they would actually sit on twelve celestial seats in judgment of mankind. This exalted position at the end times would prove their ultimate and most profound place within salvation.

---

We have already seen how Abbess Egburga proposed that Boniface would sit among them on that day. Ælfric relates how the apostles would occupy the twelve seats, stressing that they would judge both Gentile and Jew, despite the ill treatment received by Christ from the Jewish community:

Those holy apostles who followed the Savior in true learning shall afterwards be the judges of all mankind on that great day, both of the Jews and of other peoples, even though they [i.e. the Jews] come from that evil race which rejected Christ and likewise slew [him].

Ælfric confirms this image of the twelve seats of judgment in his homily for the feast of St. Paul but expands to talk about how the apostles would occupy the first of four companies.

The apostolic company’s unique attributes are that they shall judge, but not be judged. Ælfric further relates how a second group of the chosen, the faithful in Christ, shall not themselves be judges but will receive a kindly sentence such that they are redeemed and set apart from the rejected. The other two companies are comprised of the rejected, the one condemned because they had knowledge of the faith but scorned it, the other made up of heathen peoples who will perish without judgment because they had no awareness of God.

---

17 Ælfric, CH Supp. 4, p. 271, ll. 125-31.
18 Ælfric, CH 1.27, p. 406, ll. 164-81.
Combined, these images of the apostles as purveyors of salvation, either through baptism, sentences meted out while preaching, or their ultimate enthronement upon the seats of judgment, would leave an indelible mark on the Anglo-Saxon mind and those of medieval Christians in general. Their ability to facilitate redemption would prove a key trait in liturgical and private devotion to the apostles, where the faithful would consistently seek out their intercession both in this life and the life to come.19

---

19 Catherine Cubitt has noted where King Æthelred convened a counsel in Winchester at Pentecost (993) in order to absolve him of a curse levied against him in the foundation charter of New Minster, Winchester (966) for the removal of church properties. Cubitt comments, “The timing is surely significant: the Holy Spirit was the divine agent of forgiveness and its descent upon the apostles at Pentecost conveyed to them and to their successors the bishops the power to absolve sins.” C. Cubitt, “The Politics of Remorse: Penance and Royal Piety in the Reign of Æthelred the Unready,” Historical Research 85 no. 228 (2012), p. 184.
8. The Apostles as Spiritual Physicians and Healers

Part of the apostolic imperative commanded by Christ was to heal the sick and exorcize demons as a witness to the Lord’s own miracles. Luke makes this clearly in his account of the call to the apostles when he writes in Lk. 9:1: *convocatis autem duodecim apostolis dedit illis virtutem et potestatem super omnia daemonia et ut languores curarent* (‘Then calling together the twelve apostles, he gave them power and authority over all demons, and to cure the sick’).¹

The hagiography of early medieval England would, of course, provide testament to the ongoing presence of miracles in the world. Stephanus would attribute miraculous feats to Wilfrid, bringing his patron closer in line with the apostles whose shrines he often visited in Rome. So too would Willibald recount miracles performed during Boniface’s mission in his life of the saint. Even the normally sober Bede would include wonders in his ecclesiastical history if he felt that he had the stories on good authority or that they conveyed a suitable moral lesson. Few self-respecting Anglo-Saxons, however, would lay claim to an ability to perform marvels themselves. Consequently, any imitation of the miraculous feats of the apostles tends to surface in the rich hagiographical tradition and represent a highly literary, rather than practical identification with the apostles. By and large, the miraculous healings performed by the apostles were interpreted, at least within exegetical circles, as physical manifestations and figural representations of the apostles’ ability to heal spiritually.

Though enacted by Christ himself, the famous healing of Peter’s mother-in-law (Mt. 8:14-15; Mk 1:29-31; Lk. 4:38-39) is intimately connected with the apostles Peter, Andrew, James the Greater and John since they stood witness to the event. Bede interprets:

Si uirum a daemonio liberatum moraliter animum ab immunda cogitatione purgatum significare dixerimus, consequenter femina febribus tenta sed

If we shall have said that a man, freed from a demon, signifies in a moral sense the soul cleansed from foul thought, accordingly a woman

¹ Cp. Mt. 10:1; Mk. 6:7.
ad imperium domini curata carnem ostendit a concupiscientiae suae feruore per continentiae praecepta frenatam.² suffering from a fever but cured at the command of the Lord, demonstrates the flesh restrained from the heat of its own concupiscence through the dictates of chastity.

Despite what is in hindsight a rather chauvinistic comment playing on the stereotype of female concupiscence, Bede’s moral interpretation of the physical healing is clear: Led by Christ, the individual can overcome physical temptation to achieve spiritual healing through restraint.

As for the miraculous healings performed by the apostles themselves, we have already seen how Peter’s curing of the cripple before the temple of Jerusalem was interpreted as a metaphor for salvation through the teachings of the apostles.³ The ability of Peter’s shadow to heal the sick (Acts 5:15) is understood by Bede in a similar way:

Tunc Petrus umbra sui corporis uisibiliter alleuabat infirmos, qui etiam nunc inuisibili suae intercessionis umbraculo fidelium infirma roborare non cessat. Et quia Petrus ecclesiae typus est, pulchre ipse quidem rectus incedit, sed umbra comitante iacentes erigit; quia ecclesia, mente et amore caelestibus intendens, quasi umbratice transcurrit in terra et hic sacramentis temporalibus figurisque caelestium renouat quos illic perpetuis remunerat donis.⁴

At that time Peter visibly relieved the infirm by the shadow of his body. Now, he does not cease to strengthen the infirm among the faithful by the invisible screen of his intercession. And because Peter is a type of the church, it is beautifully appropriate that he himself walked upright, but by his accompanying shadow he raised up those who were lying down. So the church, concentrating her mind and love on heavenly things, passes like a shadow on the land, and here [on earth], with sacramental signs and temporal figures of heavenly things she renews those whom there [in heaven] she rewards with everlasting gifts.⁵

The fact that Peter’s shadow does the healing and not the apostle himself allows the exegete to explore the invisible influence and legacy of the apostle. The apostle may not appear in person to intercede on a penitent’s behalf, but his presence through the teachings of the church which he helped establish has the ability to offer spiritual healing and subsequent salvation. Bede

² Bede, In Luc., Bk. II, Ch. 4, p. 111, ll. 447-52.
³ Cf. above, p. 69.
⁴ Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 5, ll. 31 ff.
comments on another healing by Peter, this time in Lydda, where the apostle cures Eneas, a man bedridden with palsy for eight years (Acts 9:33-34):

Aeneas iste genus significat humanum infirmorum prius delectatione languescens sed apostolorum opere et ore sanatum. Quia enim et mundus ipse quattuor plagis sublimatur et cursus saeculi annuis quattuor temporibus uariatur, quicumque praesentia labentiaque gaudia complectitur quasi bis quaternario annorum numero grabato sternitur eneruis. Grabatum quippe est ipsa segnities ubi requiescit animus aeger et infirmus, id est, in uoluptate corporis et omni delectatione saeculari.  

This Aeneas signifies the ailing human race, at first weakened by pleasure, but healed by the work and words of the apostles. Since the world itself is raised up in four territories, and in this world the course of the year is divided into four seasons, anyone who embraces the unstable joys of the present is as though flattened upon his bed, devoid of energy for twice times four years. For the bed is that sluggishness in which the sick and weak soul takes its rest in the delights of the body, that is, and in all worldly pleasures.

Bede uses the eight years of Eneas’ illness to establish the sickly man as representative of the whole human race, that is, all those who dwell throughout the four corners of the earth under the influence of the four seasons. The man’s sickness is interpreted as being caused by a spiritual weakness stemming from the love of worldly pleasures. Only through the “work and words” of the apostles can the man overcome the indolence brought on by commitment to secular rather than spiritual concerns.

Thus, the miraculous healings enacted by the apostles are consistently interpreted in light of spiritual healing. Whatever exterior ailment suffered by the sick was brought on by an interiorly diseased faith or devotion. Bede makes clear that the teachings of the apostles and, by extension, the church can serve as a balm to mankind for the remedy of spiritually derived illness. It is through their treatment, a regimine of faith, penance and spiritual reflection, that the individual can seek ultimate salvation and the restoration of his or her soul.

---

6 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 9, ll. 75 ff.
9. The Universality of the Apostolic Mission

While much has been made of the apostolic mission and the potential for salvation through right teaching and spiritual healing, the question remains: For whom was this salvation intended? The Anglo-Saxon Church would doubtlessly have responded with an inclusive “everyone!” Bede states as much when he comments on Lk. 3:6 (Et uidebit omnis caro salutare dei “And all flesh shall see the salvation of God”), writing: Quia omnis caro accipitur omnis homo (“For ‘every flesh’ is understood as ‘every man’”).¹ Bede goes on to state in his exposition on the word *effundam* in Acts 2:17 that the potential for salvation does not discriminate on the grounds of class, age or gender:

Verbum effusionis ostendit muneris largitatem, quia non ut olim prophetis uiritim et sacerdotibus tantum sed omnibus passim in utroque sexu conditionibus et personis sancti spiritus esset gratia condonanda.²

The word effusion shows the lavishness of the gift, for the grace of the Holy Spirit was not to be granted, as formerly, only to individual prophets and priests, but to everyone in every place, regardless of sex, state of life, or position.³

The various tongues gifted to the apostles by the Holy Spirit were naturally interpreted by Bede as intended for preaching to all nations.⁴ Ever the linguistic scholar, Bede also recognizes that these tongues represent not only different languages, but also dialectal variations on a single language—Hebrew. Commenting on Acts 2:9, Bede expounds:

Judaem hoc loco non totam gentem sed partem Judaea here does not signify the entire nation, but

¹ Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. I, Ch. 3, p. 77, ll. 2268-69. There is, of course, the issue of God having foreknowledge of the elect and the idea that many are called, but few are chosen (Mt. 22:14). We need not be too concerned with the issue here, as the implication is that anyone, regardless of their background, may potentially belong to the elect so long as they have accepted Christ as savior and manifest that faith through good works. Lynne Grundy includes an interesting discussion of Ælfric’s sometimes conflicted views regarding preordination of the elect in her book on the homilist’s theology. Cf. L. Grundy, *Books and Grace: Ælfric’s Theology*, King’s College London Medieval Studies 8 (London: King’s College London, Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 1991), pp. 122 ff. I am aware of no similar study with respect to the matter in Bedan exegesis and theology.

² Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 2, ll. 116 ff. Bede may be loosely echoing Jerome here. e.g. Jer., *In Ez.*, Bk. III, Ch. 9, ll. 595 ff.: verbum effusionis poenarum ostendit magnitudinem. Cp. Acts 2:17: … effundam de spiritu meo super omnem carmem … (“... I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh ...”).


illius, hoc est tribum Iuda et Beniamin, significat ad distinctionem uidelicet Samariae, Galilaeae, Decapoleos, et aliarum in eadem provincia regionum quae, licet omnes una lingua loquerentur Hebraea, domesticam tamen singulae dicendi speciem habuere distinctam.\(^5\)

part of it, that is, the tribe of Juda and Benjamin, especially in distinction from Samaria, Galilee, Decapolis, and the other regions in the same province. There, although all spoke one language, Hebrew, nevertheless [the residents] of each region had a distinct local way of talking.\(^6\)

In the corresponding section of his *Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum*, Bede expands this discussion of language variation, noting that the Greek tongues spoken in some of the provinces listed were dissimilar enough to represent essentially different languages: *In Graeco non habetur in hoc loco variis linguis sed aliis linguis* (“In the Greek [text] it does not say in this passage ‘varieties of languages,’ but rather ‘different languages’”).\(^7\)

The crucial distinction that needed making with regard to the universality of the apostolic mission was that the new law was intended not just for Christ’s own people, the Jews, but also for the Gentiles. Accordingly, the *Actus apostolorum* was put to significant use in establishing this fact. Peter’s statement in Acts 4:11 that Jesus, rejected by the Jews, has nevertheless become the cornerstone of the temple is given extensitve treatment by Bede. The exegete draws a vibrant picture interpreting the two walls joined by the cornerstone as representing the Jews and Gentiles, themselves united in a universal faith in Christ:

\begin{quote}
Aedificantes erant Iudaei qui, cunctis gentibus in desolatione idolorum morantibus, ipsi soli legem et prophetas ad aedificationem populi cotidie legebant. Hi, dum aedificant, peruenerrunt ad lapidem angularem qui duos parietes amplectetur, id est, inuenerunt in scripturis propheticis Christum in carne uenturum qui duos conderet populos in semet ipso, et quia ipsi in uno pariete stare, hoc est soli salui fieri, malebant, reprobauerunt lapidem qui non erat aptatus ad unum sed ad duos. Verum deus, illis licet nolentibus, hunc ipse per se posuit in caput anguli, ut ex duobus testamentis et ex duobus
\end{quote}

The builders were the Jews, while all the gentiles remained in the wasteland of idols. The Jews alone were daily reading the law and the prophets for the building up of the people. As they were building, they came to the cornerstone, which embraces two walls—that is, they found in the prophetic scriptures that Christ, who would bring together in himself two peoples, was to come in the flesh. And, because they preferred to remain in one wall, that is, to be saved alone, they rejected the stone which was not one-side, but two-sided. Nevertheless, although they were unwilling, God by himself placed this [stone] at

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \(^5\) Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 2, ll. 86 ff.
\item \(^6\) Martin (1989), p. 30.
\item \(^7\) Bede, *Retr. Act.*, Ch. 2, ll. 36 ff.
\end{itemize}
Thus, Bede links not only the Jewish and Gentile peoples with the cornerstone of Christ, but also their sacred teachings. The Old Testament, therefore, would not be made irrelevant by the New Testament. Instead, both would be valued as forming the figural walls of one, universal church. The teachings of one would inform rather than negate the other.

Beyond the temple in Jerusalem, the apostles themselves could embody the universal nature of the Christian faith and its attendant salvation. There is, of course, the oft repeated distinction between Peter as apostle to the Jews and Paul as apostle to the Gentiles. To some extent, Bede pays deference to this belief by comparing the lame beggar healed at the door of the temple by Peter and John (Acts 3:1-8) and Paul’s healing of the cripple in Lystra (Acts 14:7-9):

Sicut claudus ille quem Petrus et Iohannes ad portam templi curant salutem praefigurat Iudaeorum, ita et hic Lycaonius aeger populum gentium longe a legis templique religione remotum sed Pauli apostoli praedicatione collectum, ... Sed haec tempora expositioni conueniunt; nam ille primis fidei temporibus, cum nee poterit gentibus uerbum crederetur, hic uero Iudaeis ob perfidiam expulsis et damnationis pulvere respersis inter noua conuersae gentililitatis gaudia sanatur.  

Just as that lame man whom Peter and John cured at the door of the temple prefigured the salvation of the Jew, so too this sick Lycaonian prefigured the people of the gentiles, who were for a long time remote from the religion of the law and the temple, but who were brought in by the preaching of the apostle Paul. ... The times [when the two cures occurred] are appropriate to the exposition, for the former [i.e. the lame man cured by Peter and John] was cured in the earliest days of the faith, when the word was not yet believed by gentiles. The latter [i.e. the lame Lycaonian] was cured in the midst of the new joys of the converted gentile world, when the Jews had been excluded for their lack of faith and sprinkled with the dust of damnation.  

Through these two healings, Bede establishes how the narrative chronology of Acts signifies the historical chronology of the Christian conversion, observing how Peter first converted the Jews

---

8 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 4, ll. 16 ff.
10 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 14, ll. 9 ff.
in the earliest days of the faith, while Paul later set about converting the Gentiles after the initial spring of Jewish converts had dried up.

Interestingly enough, Bede does not seem to require Paul in order to verify the universality of the Christian faith, as he appears to accomplish this just as well through Peter and the Twelve. The exegete manages to establish the fact that Jew and Gentile alike were welcome to the apostolic mission from his explication on the original calling of the four according to the Gospel of Luke. In Lk. 5:2, Jesus sees two ships, which Bede interprets as the peoples, stating: *Duae naues secus stagnum posita circumcisionem et praeputium figurant* (“The two ships positioned along the lake figurally represent circumcision [i.e. the Jews] and foreskin [i.e. the Gentiles]”).¹² When Christ gets into Simon Peter’s ship, Bede relates: *Nauis simonis est ecclesia primitiua de qua paulus ait: qui enim operatus est petro in apostolatum circumcisionis operatus est et mihi inter gentes* (“The ship of Simon is the primitive church about which Paul says: ‘For he that wrought in Peter for the apostleship of the circumcision wrought also in me towards the Gentiles’”).¹³ The primitive church (*ecclesia primitiua*) is, therefore, defined as the early church headed by Peter and geared towards the Jews before Paul’s conversion and the subsequent expansion of the mission to the Gentile peoples. Bede later clarifies the meaning of the second ship, interpreting: *Alia nauis ut praediximus est ecclesiae de gentibus quae et ipsa non sufficierte una nauicula piscibus impletur electis* (“The other boat that we previously mentioned is the church of the Gentiles which, one boat having not been sufficient for the fish, is filled by the elect”).¹⁴ Thus, Bede explains how one ship, i.e., the Jewish people, was not adequate for the number of souls Christ and the apostles sought to save through the new faith. Rather, the faith

---

¹² Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 113, ll. 540-41.

¹³ Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 114, ll. 557-59.

¹⁴ Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 114, ll. 587-89.
was necessarily expanded to a second ship or people, the Gentiles, in order to take in the spiritual haul desired by the Lord.

Bede’s most expansive commentary in his *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum* on the universality of the Christian mission comes with Peter’s vision of the heavenly vessel that descends thrice before the apostle on a linen sheet in Acts 10:11-16. According to Luke’s chronology in the *Actus apostolorum*, the event transpires after Paul is introduced to Peter by Barnabus (Acts 9:26-30) and comes in direct response to the sending of messengers by the Italic centurian, Cornelius (Acts 10:1-7). Through this vision, Peter comes to understand the universality of the faith. First, Bede interprets how the four corners of the sheet (Acts 10:11) represent the four areas of the world to which the church extends. He then expounds on how the various four-footed beasts, creeping things and fowls of the air seen in the vessel signify “all peoples, impure in their errors” (*omnes gentes ... erroribus inmundae*). When a voice speaks to Peter, telling him to arise, kill and eat (Acts 10:13), Bede explicates:

It [the voice that Peter heard] told him: Arise to make ready to preach the gospel. Kill in the gentiles what they had been, and make [them] what you are; for whoever eats food lying outside of himself turns it into his own body. Therefore it [the voice] taught that the nations, which had formerly lain outside through their lack of belief, would, once their former life had been put to death, be incorporated within the society of the

---


17 Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 10, ll. 54 ff.

There is absolutely no doubt in Bede’s mind that the cryptic vision gives Peter the mandate to expand the apostolic mission to the Gentile peoples. This mission would, of course, be carried out in large part by the Twelve. Hence, Bede sees the four cords holding the corners of the sheet which descends three times (Acts 10:16) as producing the apostolically significant number twelve, stating: *Quia per quattuor partes orbis terrarum mysterium sanctae trinitatis a duodecim apostolis praedicandum erat* (“For the mystery of the holy Trinity had to be preached throughout the four parts of the world by the twelve apostles”). Consequently, Bede portrays the mission of the Twelve as unequivocally universal. The Anglo-Saxons, especially those such as Alcuin and Boniface most concerned with evangelism, would doubtlessly have interpreted this mandate as inherited from the apostles and would seek its continuance in spreading the faith whereever their journeys brought them.

---


20 Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 10, ll. 84 ff.

10. The *Vita apostolica* and the Eremitic Life of Anglo-Saxon Monks

Also important to the Anglo-Saxons, especially monastic communities such as Bede and Ælfric inhabited, was the apostolic lifestyle or *vita apostolica* established by the Twelve.¹ Christ himself mandated that the apostles lead a humble existence removed from worldly concerns and dependent on the charity of their converts. Mk. 6:9 relates: “And he commanded them that they should take nothing for the way, but a staff only: no scrip, no bread, nor money in their purse, but to be shod with sandals, and that they should not put on two coats.”² Similarly, Lk. 9:3 recalls: “And he said to them: Take nothing for your journey; neither staff, nor scrip, nor bread, nor money; neither have two coats.”³ The two gospel accounts are close to one another, but not identical. Bede appears to have lost some sleep over the fact that Mark says “but a staff only” and Luke states “neither a staff.” The punctilious exegete was apparently worried about whether or not the Twelve were permitted a staff as they spread Christ’s teachings throughout the world. Luckily, Augustine of Hippo had already wrestled with the matter so that Bede could cite him as an authority.⁴ Based on what Augustine has to say, Bede concludes that both readings are to be accepted as they represent the seemingly conflicting statements “God tempteth no man” (Jm. 1:13) and “the Lord your God trieth you” (Deut. 13:3). Thus, the having a staff signifies the fact that the Lord may be relied upon not to trick or seduce his followers, while the absence of the


² Mk. 6:8-9: *et praecepit eis ne quid tollerent in via nisi virgam tantum non peram non panem neque in zona aes sed calciatos sandaliis et ne induerentur duabus tunicis.*

³ Lk. 9:3: *et ait ad illos nihil tuleritis in via neque virgam neque peram neque panem neque pecuniam neque duas tunicas habeatis.*

⁴ Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. III, Ch. 9, pp. 194-95, ll. 1114-62. For Augustine’s original, cf. Aug., *De cons. eu.*, Bk. II, Ch. 30, p. 175, ll. 8-20.
staff refers to the hardship under which all Christians are tried. Bede’s trouble over the apostolic staff, while enlightening with regards to the scholar’s exegetical methods and dependence on source material, remains somewhat overly literal when trying to gain a sense of how the directives for living received by the apostles were viewed in respect to Anglo-Saxon monastic living.

Anglo-Saxon clerics clearly viewed their monastic life as rooted in the work and life of the apostles. Ælfric draws attention to the fact that monasticism as an institution had its origins in the Twelve’s choice of bishops when establishing new dioceses during the years following Christ’s death. In CH I.22, the homilist relates how the apostles personally installed James the Just as bishop in Jerusalem and that it was his example and that of his successor, Simeon, that inspired the monastic way of life in so far as monks were expected live within the confines of the monastery and lead a life of celibacy.

The events of Pentecost were interpreted as significant in their reflection of the monastic hours of prayer. Noting also the influence of Daniel and Christ himself, Bede explains how the descent of the Holy Spirit at the third hour (Acts 2:15) helped to affirm the regimen of prayer honored by the monks:

Afterwards, [but] before they dispersed, the apostles set James, who was called “the Just,” in Christ’s seat, and all the faithfull congregation obeyed him according to God’s instruction. He then occupied that office thirty years; and after him, Simeon, kinsman of the Lord. In accordance with that example, the [various forms of] monastic life were established with the observance that they [i.e. the monks] dwell in the monastery in celibacy according to the command of their founder and all their possessions be [held] in common among them, just as the apostles established.

The events of Pentecost were interpreted as significant in their reflection of the monastic hours of prayer. Noting also the influence of Daniel and Christ himself, Bede explains how the descent of the Holy Spirit at the third hour (Acts 2:15) helped to affirm the regimen of prayer honored by the monks:

5 Ælfric, CH I.22, p. 358, ll. 102-8.
Tria enim tempora quibus Danihel in die flectere genua sua et adorare legitur tertia, sexta, et nona hora ab ecclesia intellegitur; quia et dominus tertia hora spiritum sanctum mittens, sexta ipse crucem ascendens, nona animam ponens eadem horas nobis ceteris excellentius intimare et sanctificare dignatus est.  

Now we read that three times a day Daniel bent his knees and prayed, and the church understands these to have been the third, sixth, and ninth hours. Also the Lord sent the Holy Spirit at the third hour, ascended the cross at the sixth, and he yielded up his soul at the ninth. He thus saw fit to enjoin these same hours preeminently upon the rest of us and to sanctify them.  

While sext was made holy by the crucifixion and nones by Christ’s ascension, Bede believed that the apostles’ reception of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost sanctified the liturgical hour of terce and necessitated its inclusion among the canonical hours of worship. 

The monastic life was intended above all to be a modest one, divorced from secular affairs. Ælfric’s statement that Christ loved his apostles, but did not establish them as secular rulers was meant to reinforce the humble nature of the apostles and, by extension, monastic living. Those monks that belonged to powerful families were expected to give up the comforts of their households and withdraw from the world. The life was not an easy one, but it was one that enjoyed the precedence of Christ and the apostles as Ælfric explains:

Cuð is gehwylcum snoterum mannum þæt seo eald æ was eaðelice þonne cristes gesetnys sy; for ðan þe on þære næs micel forhæfednys ne þa gastlican drohtnunga þe crist syððan gesette.  It is known to every wise man that the old law was easier than Christ’s mandate is, for in it [i.e. the old law] there was no great restraint nor spiritual way of life which Christ and his apostles

---

6 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 2, ll. 110 ff.


8 Bede interprets Paul’s shipwreck in Acts as indicative of the perils of focusing on worldly matters: Ideo nauis ista perit, quia non leui cursu fluctibus superlapsa est, sed ipso aequoris fundo uiolenter infixa, partim solo retinetur, partim unda uexante confringitur. Tali est profecto casus animi huic saeculo dediti, qui cum mundi desideria calcare neglexerit, quia proram intentionis terrae funditus infigit, totam operum sequentium compagem curarum fluctibus soluit (“This ship perished because it did not glide over the waves with a smooth movement. Rather it became violently stuck upon the sea floor, a part only held fast, while part was broken up by the smashing waves. Such, without a doubt, is the fate of a mind attached to this world. When such a one has made no effort to trample mundane desires underfoot, he fixes the prow of his intention radically upon the earth, and therefore with the waves of cares he dashes to pieces the whole structure of works which follow [from that intention]”). Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 27, ll. 60 ff. Trans.: Martin (1989), p. 190. Martin is likely in error with his translation of partim solo retinetur as “a part only held fast,” and may be read alternatively as “partly held by the soil,” where solo derives from solum “soil.”

9 Ælfric, CH I.16, pp. 308-9, ll. 48-51. Cf. above, pp. 16-17, 62.
Ælfric viewed the new restraint ushered into the world by Christ and the apostles as a lesson crucial to salvation and would use it as a jumping off point to expound upon the two major forms of restraint, bodily and spiritual, in his homily for the feast of John the Baptist (CH I.25). Should this restraint, however, become overly taxing and threaten the health of one of the monks, then it could be eased. Bede finds a figural example of this need to exercise a compassionate form of restraint in the example of Peter’s incarceration in Jerusalem. Here, Bede responds to the saving angel’s pronouncement to Peter in Acts 12:8 that the apostle should gird himself, put on sandals and wrap himself up in his tunic, imaging why the apostle should have been discovered in such a disheveled state in the first place.

Et prophetas et apostolos cingulis usos fuisse legimus, cuius sibi Petrus ligamenta propter rigorem carceris ad horam laxauerat, ut tunica circa pedes dimissa frigus noctis utcumque temperaret, exemplum praebens infirmis, cum uel molestia corporali uel iniuria temptemur humana licere nobis aliquid de nostri propositi rigore laxare.¹¹

We read that both the prophets and the apostles made use of waistbands. Peter had undone the ties of his <for a while> on account of the chillines of the prison, so that his tunic, lowered about his feet, might lessen somewhat the cold of the night. This provides an example to the weak—when we are tried by bodily affliction or unjust treatment by men, we are permitted to relax somewhat our intended rigor.¹²

Since the lure of money and earthly possessions was such a terrible temptation, monastic communities sought to hold their property in common. This measure was naturally based on the example of the apostles. Drawing upon the assertion in Acts 2:44 that the apostles shared all things in common, Bede contends that such a system reflects a sense of community and mutual respect: ... magnumque est fraterni amoris indicium omnia possidere nihil proprium habentes (“... and the possession of everything without [anyone] having anything of his own is a great

¹⁰ Ælfric, CH I.25, p. 384, ll. 153-56.
¹¹ Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 12, ll. 33 ff.
token of brotherly love"). Money, of course, was a troublesome necessity for both apostles and monasteries to survive. Hence, Bede cites Arator in showing how the apostles approved of Barnabas donating of all his wealth to the Twelve (Acts 4:36-37), but still reminding his reader in the same breath that they generally shunned riches:

```
Destitui debere probant, quod tangere uitant,  
Calcandum que docent, quod subdunt gressibus  
aurum; | De quo terrenae ueniunt ad pectora curae  
| Consimili iactatur humo.  

They [the apostles] approved of the abandonment of that which they avoided touching, and they taught that gold, which they spurned, should be trampled under foot. Anything from which earthly cares come to the heart is in the same way cast to the ground.
```

Whatever surplus of money a monastery may have acquired should be given to the poor and needy. Bede uses the example of Peter and John’s encounter with the crippled beggar in front of the temple as an example of this generosity. Peter, of course, does not have any money to give (Acts 3:6), but vows to give whatever he can—a miraculous healing:

```
Alioquin beatus Petrus dominici memor praecepti quod dicitur: Nolite possidere aurum et argentum, pecuniam quae ad pedes apostolorum ponebatur non sibi recondere, sed ad usus pauperum qui sua patrimonia reliquerant, reseruare solebat.  

In any case, blessed Peter, mindful of the Lord’s command which was spoken, Do not possess gold and silver [Mt 10:9], did not hoard for himself the money which was put at the feet of the apostles, but he was wont to reserve it for the use of the poor who had lost their birthright.
```

The vita apostolica, so perfectly embodied by the Twelve and their practice of self-denial, was a constant source of inspiration to devout monastic communities. It is little wonder, therefore, that Ælfric, in ending his most extensive homily addressing the monastic life (CH I.27 for the feast of St. Paul), should choose to close his work with an exhortation that those belonging to monastic orders should seek to emulate the apostles:

---


16 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 3, ll. 28 ff.

17 Martin (1989), p. 44.
Is nu for þy munuchades mannum mid micelre gecnyrdnyssé to forbugenne þas yfelan gebysnunga; 7 geeuenlæcan þam apostolum. þæt hi mid him 7 mid gode þæt ece lif habban moton.\textsuperscript{18} For this reason it is now [fit] for the men of the monastic state to shun those evil examples with great eagerness and imitate the apostles so that they may be permitted to have that eternal life with them and with God.

11. The Persecution and Passions of the Apostles: The Ultimate Witness

Closely connected with the idea of self-denial is the concept of suffering. Few in the church’s history were considered to have suffered more than the apostles. Not only were their itinerate missions and apostolic way of life constant sources of travail, but they were also subject to persecution by the various governments and peoples they encountered while preaching. With the exception of John, all of the apostles met their end while winning the bloody crown of martyrdom.1 To a certain extent, these persecutions could be interpreted as helping to spread the teachings of Christ rather than suppress them as Bede explains in his comment on Acts 8:1:

Hoc est quod dominus ipse praecepit: Cum persequentur uos in ciuitate ista fugite in aliam; illius enim nutu gerebatur ut tribulationis occasio fieret euangellii seminarium.2

This is what the Lord himself commanded: When they persecute you in one city, flee to another. [Mt. 10:23] It occurred according to the Lord’s will, so that the occasion of tribulation might become the seedbed of the gospel.3

In other words, Bede argues that by harassing Christians, the tormentors simply drove them into other towns where they would find new converts and establish new communities. Consequently, the exegete focuses on the positive effect of persecution and how it provided the apostles with additional impetus to spread the word.

The tortures and martyrdoms endured by the apostles were also a powerful form of witness to the sufferings of Christ. On occasion the apostles might be granted some remembrance of Christ’s pain while enduring torture or imprisonment. For example, when an angel looses Peter’s chains in Jerusalem, the heavenly messenger first strikes the apostle on the

---

1 On the Anglo-Saxon understanding of John’s exceptionalism with regard to martyrdom, cf. Bede, Hom. 9 & Ælfric, CH I.4.

2 Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 8, ll. 2 ff. The last sentence is derived from Jerome’s commentary on Mt. 10:23. Cf. Jer., In Matt., Bk. I, ll. 1670 ff. Cf. Acts 8:1: facta est autem in illa die persecutio magna in ecclesia quae erat Hierosolymis et omnes dispersi sunt per regiones Iudaeeae et Samariae praeter apostolos (“And at that time there was raised a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all dispersed through the countries of Judea, and Samaria, except the apostles”).

3 Martin (1989), p. 44.
side in order to arouse him (Acts 12:7). Bede interprets the blow as a reminder of Christ’s wound from the lance:

   Percussio lateris commemoratio passionis Christi est, de cuius ulnere salus nostra profluxit; et nobis quoque pressurarum catena retentis tale solatium ipse reddit apostolus Petrus, dicens: Christo igitur passo in carne et uos eadem cogitatione armamini.⁴

   The striking of his side was a remembrance of the passion of Christ, from whose wound our salvation poured forth. And to those of us who are bound by the chain of persecution, the apostle Peter himself gave this comfort: *Since Christ therefore has suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same intent* [1 Pet. 4:1].⁵

This intent of martyrdom was certainly a powerful weapon in the apostolic arsenal of witness. Through this ultimate and bloody act of testimony, the apostles could transcend the simple act of preaching about the Lord’s life, death and resurrection. Instead, they could demonstrate on a very visceral level to onlookers the extent of Christ’s love for humanity such that he died for the remission of sins. It was not unheard of that this final act of witness could pay immediate dividends in the recruitment of souls to the faith. Commenting on the passion of James the Greater (Acts 12:1-2), Bede draws upon a tradition he attributes to Clement of Alexandria in order to emphasize how the man who turned the apostle over to the authorities was himself converted to Christianity:

   De hoc Iacobo Clemens Alexandrinus historiam quandam dignam memoria refert. Et is, inquit, qui obtulerat eum iudici ad martyrium, Iacobum scilicet, motus etiam ipse confessus est se esse Christianum. Ducti sunt autem ambo pariter ad supplicium, et cum ducentur in uia rogauit Iacobum dari sibi remissionem. At ille parumper deliberans, pax tibi, inquit, et osculatu s est eum. Et ita ambo simul capite plexi sunt.⁶

Concerning this James, Clement of Alexandria reports a certain memorable story. He says that the man who turned him (that is, James) over to the judgment of martyrdom was himself moved to confess himself a Christian. Both were led away together to punishment, and while they were being led on the way, he asked James to forgive him. He considered for a moment and said, ‘Peace be to you,’ and kissed him. And so both were beheaded at the same time.⁷

---


⁵ Martin (1989), p. 112.


Interesting is that fact that Bede obviously uses an apocryphal account of James’ passion to derive the scene, for the canonical Actus apostolorum relates nothing about the events of the apostle’s death outside of the fact that he was killed by the sword at the behest of Herod Agrippa. Bede was normally very suspect of non-Lucan authorities regarding the apostles and rarely applied them to his exegesis, but the attribution to Clement of Alexander was probably enough to sway the exegete’s credulity in this instance. The increase of the faithful, however, was not the only reward to be gained from an apostle’s martyrdom. In his homily for the feast of St. Bartholomew, Ælfric stresses how the apostle also secured his own eternal salvation by enduring a painful death:

Wite þeahhwæðere gehwa þæt nan man buton earfoðnyssum ne becymð to þære ecan reste. þa ðæcrist sylfnoldheagenricbutonmicelearearfðnyssasestigan;Swaecachisapostoli. 7 þæhalganmartyrasmidheoraagemunfeoreþætheofoonlicericebecapodon.9

Let anyone know, nevertheless, that no man arrives at that eternal rest without suffering. When Christ himself did not wish to ascend to his own kingdom without great suffering, so too did his apostles and those holy martyrs purchase that heavenly kingdom with their own life.

This statement that “no man arrives at that eternal rest without suffering” was doubtlessly meant to be broadly applicable to Ælfric’s audience. Those given to piety in Anglo-Saxon England were not expected to experience literal martyrdoms like the apostles, but their example could demonstrate the purifying and salvific act that was suffering. Ælfric employs the contrasting “martyrdoms” of James and John in order to establish two different types of martyrdoms, the latter of which was more apt to be fulfilled by those of faith who were not faced with immediate religious persecution or death. Ælfric explains:

Twa cynn sind martirdomes. Án dearnunge. oðer eawunge; Se ðe on ehþynsse for cristes geleafan his lif álæt. se bið openlice martir; Eft se ðe forberð ðurh gedýlde hosp. and teonan. and ðone lufað þe hine hatað. and his agene unlustas. and

There are two kinds of martyrdoms. The one privately, the other publicly. He who loses his life in persecution for Christ’s faith, he is openly a martyr. Also, he who endures contempt and harm with patience, and loves him who hates him,

and rejects his own vices and the temptation of that invisible devil, he is undoubtedly a martyr in the more hidden sense.

We know that James was beheaded for the Lord’s faith and that John, his brother, ended his life unslain in peace. But he was nevertheless a martyr, for he maintained that private suffering in his mind, though he was not martyred bodily. And we have the ability to be martyrs, though we are not killed with iron, if we truly maintain that patience in our minds.

Thus, internal suffering could, according to Ælfric, replace actual execution as a form of martyrdom. Any Christian was vulnerable to suffering and, therefore, inclined to experience “private” martyrdom similar to what John endured. This suffering was not to be lamented. On the contrary, it was to be endured with patience and even exalted. Bede provides the example of Paul’s and Silas’ escape from prison (Acts 16:25) as a lesson in how one should revel in suffering:

Deuotio simul apostoli pectoris et uirtus exprimitur orationis, cum et illi hymnos in imo carcere cecinerint et eorum laus terram commouerit carceris et fundamenta concusserit et aperuerit ostia atque ipsas postremo uinculatorum catenas resoluuerit. Aliter: quicumque fidelium omne gaudium existimat, cum in temptationes varias inciderit libenterque gloriatur in infirmitatis suis ut inhabitet in eo uirtus Christ.¹²

The devotion of the apostles’ hearts and the power of prayer are expressed [here] together, since in the depths of the prison they sang hymns, and their praise moved the earth of the prison, shook the foundation, opened the doors, and finally loosened the very chains of those who had been bound. In other words, anyone of the faithful considers it all joy when he falls into various trials. [Jm. 1:2] And he gladly glories in his infirmities, so that the power of Christ may dwell in him [2 Co 12:9].¹³

If all suffering was a form of martyrdom to be extoled, then it stands to reason that the apostles would be held up frequently as exempla demonstrating how to endure hardship with dignity and help console those in pain. On more than one occasion in his epistles, Alcuin would

¹⁰ Ælfric, CH II.37, p. 314, ll. 132-37.
¹¹ Ælfric, CH II.37, p. 315, ll. 146-52.
¹² Bede, Exp. Act., Ch. 16, ll. 54 ff.
draw upon the statement in Acts 5:41 regarding how the apostles were “rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus.”\textsuperscript{14} Shortly after the raid on Lindisfarne in 793, Alcuin cites the passage in a letter to Æthelhard, former Abbot of Louth and bishop of Winchester, who had recently been elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{15} Alcuin tells Æthelhard that he should not fear the persecution of the viking incursions, imploring him to remember the sufferings of both Christ and the apostles. In similar fashion, he quotes the same verse in a letter trying to console the Abbess Æthelthryth on the death of her son King Æthelred I of Northumbria, who was murdered in 796.\textsuperscript{16} Whether or not this appeal to the apostles and their agony was effective in assuaging the anxieties of either Æthelhard or Æthelthryth remains unknown. Regardless, the apostles and their passions endured in Anglo-Saxon England as potent images which aimed to teach forbearance in the face of adversity and the ultimate reward of eternal salvation granted to those who suffered it well.

\textsuperscript{14} Acts 15:41: \textit{et illi quidem ibant gaudentes a conspectu concilii quoniam digni habiti sunt pro nomine Iesu contumeliam pati} (“And they indeed went from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus”).

\textsuperscript{15} Alcuin, \textit{Epist.} 17, p. 46, ll. 2-4.

\textsuperscript{16} Alcuin, \textit{Epist.} 105, p. 151, ll. 32-3.
12. The Pre-eminence of ‘The Twelve’

Outside of the Twelve there were several others who received the appellation “apostle” in Anglo-Saxon England. Most notable, of course, was Paul, who was offered a special place alongside the Twelve due in no small part to his large role in Luke’s *Actus apostolorum*, the canonical authority granted his epistles and his highly developed cult in Rome.\(^1\) Even though Paul might be considered an “honorary” member due to his unique status, he was only occasionally integrated fully into their ranks. As explored above, the revealed nature of his witness set him apart from the historically grounded witness of the Twelve.\(^2\) Ælfric even remarks on how, unlike the other apostles who lived off the charity of their converts according to the dictates of the *vita apostolica*, Paul was forced to toil in his trade of tent-making to make ends meet.\(^3\) Surviving liturgical calendars show evidence that Barnabas was often venerated as an apostle and Timothy less consistently.\(^4\) Gregory the Great was, of course, granted apostle status by the Anglo-Saxons given his role in inaugurating the mission from Rome to the south of Britain. Bede refers to Gregory as “[he] whom we can and ought rightly call our apostle” (*quem recte nostrum appellare possumus et debemus apostolum*). Following in the tradition of Bede,


\(^4\) Wormald (1934), pp. 35, 63, 77, 105, 119, 133, 147, 161, 175, 189, 195, 203, 217, 231, 245, 259 (for Barnabas); p. 100 (for Timothy).
Ælfric refers to him on occasion as *Engliscre ðeode apostol* “apostle of the English people”\(^5\) or *ure apostol* “our apostle.”\(^6\)

Despite the occasional appropriation of the title “apostle” by others, the collective use of “the apostles” in Anglo-Saxon texts generally refers to the Twelve, sometimes including Paul. The canonical lists of the apostles (Mt. 10:2-4; Mt. 3:16-19; Lk. 6:14-16; Acts 1:13) all list twelve, with the exception of Acts, which drops Judas after the events of the gospels, but quickly moves on to add Matthias in his place (Acts 1:26). Bede gives a lengthy and detailed explanation of the need for the election of Matthias:

> In undenario numero Petrus apostolus remanere metuit; *omne enim peccatum undenarium est, quia dum peruersa agit praecepta decalogi transit.* Vnde quia nulla nostra iustitia per se innocens est, tabernaculum quod arcam domini continet intus undecim uelis cilicinis desuper obuelatur, numerumque apostolorum duodenarium redintegrat, ut per duas senarii partes - ter enim quaterni decus dipondius - gratiam quam uerbo praedicabant aeterno numero seruant, ut qui mundo quadriformi fidem sanctae trinitatis praedicaturi erant, domino dicente: *Ite docete omnes gentes baptizantes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti*, iam operis perfectionem numeri quoque sacramentum firmarent. Iuxta altiorem aut intellectum damnum ecclesiae, quod in falsis fratribus patitur, acenus ex parte maxima perdurat incorrectum. At cum in fine mundi populus Iudaeorum qui dominum crucifixit reconciliandus ecclesiae creditor, ulul quinquagesimo die propinquante apostolorum est summa restaurata.\(^7\)

The apostle Peter was apprehensive about continuing with the number eleven [of apostles], *for every sin is an eleven, because when one does wicked things he goes beyond the commandments of the decalog* (Greg. *Moral* 32, 15, 27 (*PL* 76:652C). Hence, because no righteousness of ours is innocent of itself, the tabernacle which contained the Lord’s ark was covered from above by eleven veils of goats’ hair [*Ex 26:7*]. He [Peter] restored the number of apostles to twelve, so that through two parts of six each (for three times four is twelve) they might preserve by an eternal number the grace which they were preaching by word, and so that those who were to preach the faith of the holy Trinity to the four parts of the world (in line with the Lord’s saying, *Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* [*Mt. 28.19*]) might already certify the perfection of the work by the sacramental sign of [their] number as well. According to a deeper sense, however, the evil which the church suffers in false brethren remains so far uncorrected for the most part. But since at the end of the world it is believed that the Jewish people who crucified the Lord are to be reconciled to the church, as the fiftieth day drew nigh the full number of apostles

---

\(^5\) Ælfric, *CH* II.8, p. 72, l.1.

\(^6\) Ælfric, *CH* II.16, p. 162, l.40.

\(^7\) Bede, *Exp. Act.*, Ch. 1, ll. 174 ff. The second sentence is taken from Gregory’s *Moralia in Iob*. Cf. Greg., *Mor. in Iob*, Bk. 32, ll. 156 ff.
For Bede, the number eleven was untenable. Eleven was considered to represent sin because it surpassed the number ten, significant as the number of commandments, by one. Yet it did not reach the faultless number of twelve made perfect by the fact that it is the result of three times four, with three representing the Holy Trinity and four representing the four gospels and the four corners of the earth to which Christ’s teachings must be spread. Though not explicitly stated, implicit in Bede’s claim that the Jewish people will be reconciled to the church in the end times is the fact that the twelve apostles represent the typological equivalent of the twelve tribes of Israel, whom Mt. 19:28 foretells they will judge upon the twelve seats of judgment. Ælfric and Egburga’s letter to Boniface, as we may recall, both picked up on this fact. In his commentary on Luke, Bede restates, albeit much more succinctly, his assertion of the number twelve’s perfection:

Qui bene duodecim sunt electi ut uidentem mundi salutem quam uerbo praedicarent suo quoque numero mystice commendarent. Ter enim quaterni decus dipondius.  

Rightly were twelve chosen so that they could also recommend mystically by their number the salvation of the world which they preached by their word. For three times four is twelve [literally $10 + 2$ pounds weight].

From there Bede would launch into his figural interpretation of the bronze laver made by Solomon according to 1 Kg. 7:23-25, where the pool is placed on the haunches of twelve oxen, signifying the twelve apostles, with three oxen facing in each of the four directions, thus giving the significant division of twelve into three and four, representing the Trinity and the four corners of the world respectively.

---


10 Bede, In Luc., Bk. II, Ch. 6, p. 132, ll. 1267-70.

11 Bede, In Luc., Bk. II, Ch. 6, p. 132, ll. 1270-77. Cf. above, p. 47.
Thus, through the authority of the scriptures and the exegetical interpretations of its significance, the number twelve became indelibly impressed upon the Anglo-Saxon psyche. The inviolability of the number twelve became so influential, in fact, that sometimes one apostle had to be dropped in order to make room for Paul. It was usually the latecomer Matthias whose position was suppressed. For example, Aldhelm, when composing his tituli for the dedication of altars to the twelve apostles, neglects to include Matthias, but manages to add Paul (in second place after Peter, no less). Perhaps recognizing the slight, Aldhelm would go on to produce an independent dedication to Matthias. Cynewulf, on the other hand, would show no such compunction. In his *Fates of the Apostles*, the poet includes Paul right beside Peter and cuts Matthias altogether, thereby maintaining the essential number of twelve. Careful Anglo-Saxon scholars such as Bede and Ælfric who were writing to instruct would not dare commit such an exclusion, but they were writing in exegetical and homiletic modes which placed a high value on accuracy. Aldhelm and Cynewulf, working in more aesthetic modes, were doubtless

---


14 Aldhelm, *Opera*, p. 32.
overpowered by the symmetry and perfection of the number twelve, opting rather for the overall artistic effect as opposed to the integrity of right teaching.

Summary Statement

Valeri Susan Heuchan, in the title of her recent dissertation, summarized the image of St. Paul in Anglo-Saxon England as “All Things to All Men.”¹⁵ I would argue that this description is applicable to the apostles in general. The Anglo-Saxons had a very specific, though complex conception of who the apostles were and what constituted their essential role in the faith. Generally, the term *apostol* conjured associations with the Twelve and Paul, though at times it could be extended as an honorific to include some of the disciples of the apostles or noteworthy church fathers, such as Gregory the Great, responsible for the conversion of previously pagan nations. Their office included zealous missionary work, providing witness to the miracles of Christ through both their testimony and their own passions, teaching sound doctrine in an eloquent yet accessible manner, interpreting scripture in its typological and Christological sense, securing the salvation of the faithful, and interceding with the Lord on behalf of the penitent. Depending on the needs, situation or outlook of a particular scholar or work, any one of these apostolic duties could be stressed. Alcuin and Boniface, with their participation in the conversion of the Germanic peoples on the continent, would often look to the apostles as paragons worthy of emulation in their own evangelical struggles, taking solace and inspiration in the achievements of the apostles’ successful missions. Wilfrid, Bede and Alcuin, so often concerned with the schismatic movements of their day, would call upon the true witness and right teaching of the apostles to help vanquish heretical practices as they arose. The consumate

¹⁵ Heuchan (2010).
exegete, Bede would sometimes draw attention to the apostles’ ability to explain scripture both accurately and deeply, thereby establishing an interpretive tradition within the church that Bede himself sought to uphold and build upon. Bede and Ælfric, both important learned men in the reform movements of their day, would view the apostles in their role as the architypal teachers of the church, seeking to follow in their footsteps and help secure the salvation of their respective flocks. Additionally, Bede and Ælfric, as members of monastic houses, would look to the apostles and the vita apostolic as the forbearers of their own chosen life of self-denial and contemplation. All of these aspects of the apostolic office combined to form a highly nuanced concept of “apostolicity” imbedded within the collective mind of Anglo-Saxon scholars. Considering how theologically essential the apostles are to the Christian faith, it comes as no surprise that the apostles were omnipresent in the religious literature of Anglo-Saxon England, pervading everything from exegesis to epistle. Only through a thorough understanding of the apostolic concept and how it was percieved in the Anglo-Saxon Church, however, can we begin to appreciate the rhetorical ends to which the apostles were applied in Old English and Anglo-Latin literature.
PART II

The Cult of St. Andrew in Anglo-Saxon England

1. The Cult of St. Andrew in the Historical and Dedicatory Evidence

Veneration for St. Andrew in England was derived from and remained oriented throughout the Anglo-Saxon era toward the apostle’s cult in Rome. Though Andrew was likely revered alongside his apostolic brethren in the Romano-British church and among the Irish missionaries in northern Britain, the first dedicatory evidence we have for the apostle comes with the Roman sanctioned mission of St. Augustine to the south of England. At Pope Gregory the

1 Roman veneration for Andrew dates back to at least the end of the fourth century when Pope Siricius (384-399) dedicated a church to the Apostle. While this section focuses primarily on the direct correspondence between the early English missionaries with Rome, one cannot omit entirely the possibility of cross-pollination with Andrew’s extensive cult in Frankish Gaul, where it was firmly established since the fourth century. Cf. E. Ewig, “Die Verehrung orientalischer Heiligen im spätrömischen Gallien und im Merowingerreich,” in Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag von Schülern und Freunden zugeeignet, ed. P. Classen & P. Scheibert, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1964), pp. 385-400; E. Rose, ed., Missale Gothicum: e codice Vaticano Reginensi Latino 317 editum, CCSL 159D (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 263-65. In his Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli, a work in which the contents of the Acta Andreae are epitomized, Gregory of Tours (c. 539 – 594) claims to have been born on the feast of St. Andrew. Cf. M. Bonnet, ed., “Georgii Florentii Gregorii episcopi Turonensis Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli,” in Gregorii Turonensis opera: Miracula et opera minora, MGH Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum 1.2 (Hannover, 1885), §38, p. 396, l. 7. The composition of this summary text would seem to denote a peculiar veneration for the Apostle in Francia during Gregory’s time. Gregory of Tours also makes mention of churches either dedicated to Andrew or containing his relics elsewhere in his works: e.g. a certain St. Andrew’s in Clermont-Ferrand according to his Historia IV.31 and a church containing Andrew’s relics in Burgundy, after the destruction of which the relics were translated to Neuvy-le-Roi near Tours. For the entry in the Historia, cf. B. Krusch & W. Levison, ed., Gregorii Turonensis opera: Libri Historiarum X, 2nd edition, MGH Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum 1.1 (Hannover, 1951), p. 165. For the passage on Neuvy-le-Roi, cf. Bruno Krusch, ed., “Georgii Florentii Gregorii episcopi Turonensis libri octo Miraculorum, I. Liber in Gloria martyrum,” in Gregorii Turonensis opera: Miracula et opera minora, MGH Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum 1.2 (Hannover, 1885), §30, p. 56, ll. 12-24.

2 Bede, HE, I.23, p. 68. Bede dates the mission to the fourteenth year of the reign of the Byzantine emperor, Maurice Tiberius. This would place the onset of the mission between August of 595 and August of 596, with Augustine and his monks likely arriving in England c. 597. For Augustine’s departure from Rome, compare the entries in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 595 in the A-Text (ASC-A, p. 25) and 596 in the E-Text (ASC-E, p. 22).
Great’s behest, Augustine was consecrated bishop early on in his mission and received the *pallium* by 601. The honor of the *pallium* elevated Augustine to the head of a new British archdiocese independent from the Frankish metropolitan sees, and Gregory quickly made his wish clear that Augustine should create an apostolically significant number of twelve bishops to administer dioceses under the new archbishop’s jurisdiction. Augustine’s first church

3 Gregory responds to Augustine’s question about the need for multiple bishops for episcopal consecrations by stating that Augustine must necessarily consecrate bishops by himself due to the infrequency of visits to Britain by already established Frankish bishops. Once Augustine has consecrated enough bishops then, according to Gregory, he should proceed with the standard practice of having three or four bishops present at future episcopal consecrations. Cf. Bede, *HE*, I.27, p. 86. While initially having left Rome at the head of his retinue as “prior” or “abbot” (Bede, *HE*, I.23, p. 70: *Reamanti autem Augustino praeposito uestro, quem et abbatem uobis constitutimus, in omnibus humiliter oboedite*), Gregory clearly intended Augustine to be ordained bishop once the Angles had been converted (Bede, *HE*, I.23, p. 68: *… Augustinium, quem eis episcopum ordinandum, si ab Anglis susciperentur…*). Consequently, Augustine was consecrated bishop by Etherius, metropolitan bishop of Lyons (Bede mistakenly identifies him as archbishop of Arles, cf. Bede, *HE*, I.24, p. 70), either on his way to Kent or shortly after 597 on a special trip to Arles. For the misidentification of Etherius’ see and the problematizing of Bede’s account on the ordination of Augustine as bishop, cf. J. McClure & R. Collins, ed., *Bede: The Ecclesiastical History of the English People; The Greater Chronicle; Bede's Letter to Egbert*, Oxford World Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), sv.* Etherius*, *Arles*, bishop of Arles*, pp. 370-73.

4 Bede, *HE*, I.29, p. 104. Bede places Augustine’s reception of the *pallium* in the chapter directly following the one that contains Gregory’s response to Augustine’s questions. Gregory’s response is dated internally to the nineteenth year of Maurice Tiberius’ reign, i.e., some five years after Augustine’s departure from Rome (cf. above, p. 101, note 2). This would seem to imply that Bede dates Augustine’s elevation to archbishop sometime between August of 600 and August of 601. Cp. the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entries for 601 in the A-Text (*ASC-A*, p. 25) and the E-Text (*ASC-E*, p. 22), where both agree Augustine received the *pallium* from Gregory in this year.

5 Bede, *HE*, I.29, p. 104: *…ita ut per loca singula XII episcopos ordines, qui tuae subiaeant dictioni, quattuor Londoniensis ciuitatis episcopus semper in posterum a synodo propria debeat consecrari, atque honoris pallium ab hac sancta et apostolica, cui Deo auctore deseruio, sede percipiat (“… so that you may ordain twelve bishops in separate locations, who ought submit to your jurisdiction; but thenceforth the bishop of the city of London should always be consecrated by his own synod, and, moreover, he should receive the honor of the *pallium* from the holy and apostolic see, in which I serve through God’s authority”). Shortly after this passage, Gregory indicates that, upon Augustine’s death, York should become the seat of its own archdiocese with twelve bishoprics under its jurisdiction, independent from London, and receive the *pallium* as well. Gregory further stresses that whichever of the archbishops was first consecrated should be considered senior with respect to honor. It is significant that Gregory, without regard to contemporary political or social realities within Britain, assumes that the previous Roman administrative centers should provide the template for future ecclesiastical organization. Under the benefaction of King Æthelberht of Kent, Augustine establishes his episcopal seat at Canterbury (Bede, *HE*, I.33, p. 114) rather than at London (belonging to the kingdom of the East Saxons at the time), thereby setting the precedent for the future archbishops in Britain. Cf. McClure & Collins (1999), sv.* London*, p. 373. This report of Gregory’s instructions regarding ecclesiastical organization would go on to fuel a centuries long power struggle between the two archdioceses in which York would stress its independence from Canterbury, while Canterbury would repeatedly claim jurisdiction over York.
dedication was, of course, that of his newly established arch-episcopal seat at Canterbury, a restored old Roman church, which he devoted to the holy Savior. The archbishop then followed with the founding of a new monastery in honor of Saints Peter and Paul just to the east of Canterbury. After these two dedications, Augustine set about fulfilling Gregory’s desire to increase the number of bishoprics by installing Mellitus as bishop to the East Saxons with his seat at London and Justus as bishop of the first sub-diocese within Kent, that of Rochester.

---

6 i.e., Christ Church Canterbury as it would later become known. Bede, *HE*, I.33, p. 114: *At Augustinus, ubi in regia ciuitate sedem episcopalem, ut praeeditimus, accept, recuperavit in ea, regio fultus adminiculio, ecclesiam, quam inibi antiquo Romanorum fidelium opere factamuisse didicerat, et eam in nomine sancti Salvatoris Dei et Domini nostri Iesu Christi sacrauit, atque ibidem sibi hattiationem statuit et cunctis successoribus suis* (“Having received the episcopal see in the royal city [i.e. Canterbury], as we previously related, Augustine, aided by royal support [i.e. King Æthelberht of Kent], restored a church there, which, as he had learned, was made in ancient times through the labor of the Roman faithful, and dedicated it in the name of the holy Savior, our Lord and God, Jesus Christ; and he established a dwelling there for himself and all his successors”). Levison (1946, p. 259) draws upon Birch’s *Cartularium saxonnicum* to provide at least one example from the charter evidence where the church at Canterbury is identified side by side as both *ecclesia Christi* and *ecclesia Salvatoris*. Cf. W. de G. Birch, ed., *Cartularium saxonnicum: A Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*. vol. 1, part 2 (London: Whiting, 1885), §291, p. 406, dated 798. In §291, Æthelhard (Archbishop of Canterbury, 793-805) mentions how his predecessors, Archbishops Bregowine (761-764) and Jænberht (765-792), had complained about wrongs committed against the “Church of the Savior” by a certain Cenwulf, King of the East Saxons (*questi sunt de injuria ecclesiæ salvatoris illata et apud Cenulfum regem Occidentalem Saxonom*), but several lines later confers several small books of wisdom from “Christ’s Church” (*ex illa ecclesia Christi sapientes libellos*) to the monastery at Cookham. Levison also draws attention to Birch §214, which may be the earliest reference to Augustine’s Church of the Savior by the name Christ Church. According to this earlier charter, dated 774, King Offa addresses Archbishop Jænberht as residing *ad ecclesiæ Christi*. The 774 and 798 charters appear respectively as §111 and §1285 in P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 8 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1968). According to Sawyer’s annotated bibliography, the 774 charter is considered partially suspect, but likely draws on a genuine eighth-century charter, while the 798 charter is generally considered authentic.

7 Bede, *HE*, I.33, p. 114: *Fecit autem et monasterium non longe ab ipsa ciuitate ad orientem, in quo, eius hortatu, Aedilberct ecclesiam beatorum apostorum Petri et Pauli a fundamentis construxit, ac diversis donis ditauit, in qua et ipsius Augustini, et omnium episcoporum Doruernensium, simul et regum Cantiae poni corpora possent. Quam tamen ecclesiam non ipse Augustus, sed successor eius Laurentius consecravit* (“He [Augustine] also founded a monastery not far to the east of the city, in which, through his [Augustine’s] encouragement, Æthelberht constructed the church of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul from its foundations and enriched it with various gifts, so that the bodies of Augustine himself and all the bishops of Canterbury as well as the kings of Kent might be placed in it. Augustine himself, however, did not [consecrate] this church, rather his successor Laurence consecrated [it]”).

8 Bede, *HE*, II.3, p. 142: *Anno dominicae incarnationis DCIII*, Augustinus Brittaniarum archiepiscopus ordinuit duos episcopos, Mellitum uidelict et Iatum; Mellitum quidem ad praedicandum provinciae Orientalium Saxonom, qui Tamense fluo dirimuntur a Cantia, et ipsi orientali mari contigui, quorum metropolis Lundonia ciuitas est.... Ubi uero et haec prouincia uerbum ueritatis praedicante Mellito accept, fecit rex Aedilberet in ciuitate Lundonia ecclesiam sancti Pauli apostoli, in qua locum sedis episcopalis, et ipse, et successoribus eius haberent (“In the year of our Lord’s incarnation, 604, Augustine, archbishop of the peoples of Britain, ordained two bishops, Mellitus as well as Justus; Mellitus to preach in the province of the East Saxons, which is separated from Kent by the river Thames...”)
According to Bede, a church consecrated to St. Andrew was erected at Rochester in 604 by King Æthelberht of Kent for use as the new episcopal seat: “…in qua rex Aedilberet ecclesiam beati Andreae apostoli fecit (“…in which [Rochester] King Æthelberht built the church of the blessed apostle Andrew”). Bede’s account of St. Andrew’s construction and subsequent endowment offers the first evidence for a church being dedicated specifically to Andrew in Britain and is confirmed by one of the earliest existing charters (Sawyer $1), also dated 604, where Æthelberht apportions lands at Southgate for the use of the clergy at Rochester. Æthelberht’s allocation of the lands directly to Andrew and his church (tibi Sancte Andrea tueque ecclesiae, “to you St. Andrew and your church”) offers valuable insight into the Anglo-Saxon mindset when deeding land to a church or monastery. The property was not viewed as a mere contribution to the bishop for the provisioning of the diocese, but rather the donation was considered a gift to the apostle and borders on the sea to the east. Its capital is the city of London…. Indeed, when this province had accepted the word of truth through Mellitus’ preaching, King Æthelberht built the church of the apostle St. Paul in the city of London, in which [Mellitus] himself, as well as [his] successors, should hold his episcopal seat”).

9 Bede, HE, II.3, p. 142: Iustum uero in ipsa Cantia Augustinus episcopum ordinuit in ciuitate Dorubreui, quam gens Anglorum a primario quondam illius, qui dicebat Hrof, Hrofescaetrae cognominat (Indeed, Augustine ordained Justus bishop in Kent itself, in the city of Dorubrevis, which the Angles call Hrofescaetrae [i.e. Rochester] after one of its rulers, who was named Hrof). Drawing upon Bede as its source, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle also places the consecration of Mellitus and Justus in 604. Cf. the entry for 604 in ASC-A, p. 26 and ASC-E, p. 22.

10 Bede, HE, II.3, p. 142.

11 Bede, HE, II.3, p. 142: …qui etiam episcopis utriusque huius ecclesiae dona multa, sicut et Doruernensis, obtulit; sed et territoria ac possessiones in usum eorum, qui erant cum episcopis, adiecit (“…who [Æthelberht] later gave many gifts to the bishops of each of these churches as well as to that of Canterbury; but also he added territories and possessions for the use of those who were with the bishops”).

12 A. Campbell, ed., Charters of Rochester, Anglo-Saxon Charters 1 (London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1973), §. 1, p. 1: ego Æthelberhtus rex filio meo Eadbalo admonitionem catholice fidei optabilem. Nobis est aptum semper inquirere. qualiter per loca sanctorum pro anime remedio vel stabilitate salutis nostre aliquid de portione terre nostre in subsidis servorum dei devotissimam voluntatem debeamus offerre. Ideoque tibi Sancte Andreae tuaeque ecclesiae que est constituta in ciuitate Hrofibreui ubi presse uidentur lustus episcopus. trado aliquantulum telluris mei (“I, Æthelberht, king, to my son Eadbald, [send] the most desirable admonition of the Catholic faith: It is appropriate for us to always seek out how we might, with most devoted willingness, offer some portion of our land to the shrines of the saints in aid to God’s servants for the help of the soul and the assurance of our salvation. For that reason, I hand over a small amount of my land to you, Saint Andrew, and to your church, which was erected in the city of Rochester, where bishop Justus seems to be in charge”).
himself. This gift would then be administered on behalf of the apostle by the church. As Æthelbert implies, by deeding the land directly to Andrew, he hopes to secure his own salvation through the patronage and intercession of the apostle.\textsuperscript{13} Down through the centuries, similar endowments would be granted to St. Andrew’s at Rochester with the intent of enlisting the apostle’s support, a fact that is evidenced by a charter recognizing King Æthelred II’s gift of six sulungs of land at Bromley, Kent along with swine-pastures in the Weald (Sawyer §893, dated 998).\textsuperscript{14} As Catherine Cubitt points out, “Æthelred is made to acknowledge that he has done wrong to St. Andrew and requests that this restitution may win the mercy of the saint, famed for praying for sinners as he was crucified.”\textsuperscript{15}.

That Augustine should earmark the seat of his very first subdiocese for dedication to Andrew comes as little surprise,\textsuperscript{16} for the archbishop likely felt a special connection to the Apostle stemming from his time in Rome as prior of St. Andrew’s monastery on the Coelian Hill.\textsuperscript{17} Augustine’s dedication of the church at Rochester to Andrew was a savvy decision in several respects.\textsuperscript{18} The monastery on the Coelian Hill was founded by none other than Gregory

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. above, p. 104, note12. St. Andrew’s at Rochester continued to grow in wealth and influence throughout the Anglo-Saxon period and beyond. For gifts, grants and wills bestowing property to St. Andrew’s at Rochester, cf. Sawyer (1968): §§1, 27, 30, 37, 88, 129, 157, 271, 321, 671, 893, 1457, 1458, 1511, 1514. Due to the continued and pervasive use of Sawyer’s numbering to refer to Anglo-Saxon charters, Sawyers numbers have been retained, though the standard edition is now that of Campbell (1973)

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Campbell (1973), §32, pp. 42-44.


\textsuperscript{16} It is unclear whether Augustine (d. 604) survived to consecrate the church himself, or, as was the case with the monastery of Saints Peter and Paul at Canterbury, the consecration was left to his successors. Cf. Bede, \textit{HE}, I.33, p. 114.


\textsuperscript{18} Though Bede relates that St. Andrew’s was built by Æthelberht, it is a safe assumption that the choice of the church’s patron saint lay with Augustine himself. Cf. Bede, \textit{HE}, II.3, p. 142.
the Great, and a further dedication to Andrew would, via the pope’s reverence for the selfsame Apostle, do honor to the man whom Bede considered worthy of the appellation “apostle” to the “Anglian people.” Thus, a dedication to Andrew would enhance, not only the Apostle’s cult, but Gregory’s as well. Furthermore, Augustine’s dedication would orient the see of Rochester toward Andrew’s cult in Rome, establishing a direct, apostolic line of succession from the original apostles to Gregory as founder of St. Andrew’s monastery to himself as prior all the way down to Justus and successive bishops. Through this dedicatory allusion, Augustine underscored Gregory’s and, by extension, his own “apostleship,” while simultaneously grounding the authority of the see of Rochester in an unbroken chain stretching back to St. Andrew himself. The gravitas that Gregory and Augustine’s veneration lent the cult of Andrew would prove highly influential in subsequent years as dedications to the apostle began to increase. In his seminal work on the early English church and its continental connections, Wilhelm Levison lists seven attested dedications to Andrew in the seventh and eighth centuries including the cathedral at Rochester, monasteries at Hexham, Oundle, and Wells, an oratory and cell of Wilgils near the mouth of the Humber, and a church at Ferring as well as one near Pagham. To these earlier consecrations we may possibly add several ninth and tenth century dedications involving

---

19 When Gregory took monastic orders in 573, he turned his family estate on the Clivus Scauri of the Coelian Hill into a monastery dedicated to St. Andrew. Cath. Encycl., vol. 6, p. 478.

20 Bede, HE, II.1, p. 122: *De quo nos conuenit, quia nostram, id est Anglorum, gentem de potestate Satanae ad fidem Christi sua industria conuerit, latiorem in nostra historia ecclesiastica facere sermonem, quem recte nostrum appellare possimus et debemus apostolum* (“About whom it is fitting for us to give an extensive account in our ecclesiastical history, for he converted our people, that is [the people] of the Anglians, from the power of Satan to the faith of Christ through his own industry; [he] whom we are justly able and ought to call our apostle”).

religious houses at Donhead (St. Andrew and St. Mary),\textsuperscript{22} Gussage (St. Andrew),\textsuperscript{23} Milbourne (St. Andrew),\textsuperscript{24} Meon (St. Andrew),\textsuperscript{25} and Pensham in Pershore (St. Andrew).\textsuperscript{26}

The fact that Wilfrid, sometime bishop of York from 664 until his death in c.709,\textsuperscript{27} founded two of the early monasteries listed by Levison, those at Hexham and Oundle, is highly indicative of the bishop’s critical role in the seventh-century expansion of Andrew’s cult. Geographically speaking, it is tempting to associate Wilfrid with the north of Britain. It is here

\textsuperscript{22} Sawyer (1968), §357, dated to the reign of Alfred the Great; and §630, dated 956 in the reign of King Eadwig.

\textsuperscript{23} Sawyer (1968), §357, dated to the reign of Alfred the Great.

\textsuperscript{24} Sawyer (1968), §391, dated 934(?) in the reign King Æthelstan.

\textsuperscript{25} Sawyer (1968), §718, dated 963 in the reign of King Edgar.

\textsuperscript{26} Sawyer (1968), §786, dated 972 in the reign of King Edgar. Also of possible interest for place-names relating to Andrew, there is a charter dated 842 pertaining to a certain \textit{Andredesdune} (the manuscript evidence reads \textit{Andredeseeme} or \textit{Andredesdime}) in which King Æthelwulf of Wessex grants land to his \textit{princeps}, Eanwulf. Cf. Sawyer (1968), §292. In a study of English church dedications in pre-Reformation England, Frances Arnold-Foster gives the staggering number of 690 churches dedicated to St. Andrew, cf. F. Arnold-Forster, \textit{Studies in Church Dedications, or England's Patron Saints} (London: Skeffington & Son, 1899), I, p. 71. Drawing upon Arnold-Foster’s work, Bond gives a slightly more conservative number of 637. Cf. F. Bond, \textit{Dedications & Patron Saints of English Churches: Ecclesiastical Symbolism, Saints and their Emblems} (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), p. 17. These numbers would imply a popularity for Andrew just shy of the Virgin Mary, St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Michael. Unfortunately, the methodologies used in these studies make it impossible to determine what percentage of these numbers belong to churches founded in the Anglo-Saxon period. Thus, these numbers can be of only limited use here. The result is a clear \textit{desideratum} in scholarship for a study of church dedications which would pick up where Levison left off and cover the ninth through the eleventh centuries. I am aware of two works that seek to continue Levison’s investigation of English church relations with the continent into the subsequent centuries, but neither offer broad analysis regarding dedications. Cf. D. Rollason, C. Leyser & H. Williams, ed., \textit{England and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876-1947)}, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 37 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010); and V. Ortenberg, \textit{The English Church and the Continent in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Cultural, Spiritual, and Artistic Exchanges} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992). Alison Binns has provided an insightful study of monastic dedications for the period just after the Anglo-Saxon era. Cf. A. Binns, \textit{Dedications of Monastic Houses in England and Wales, 1066-1216}, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion 1 (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1989).

\textsuperscript{27} Wilfrid’s title as bishop of York involves a complicated history as related by both \textit{VW} and Bede, \textit{HE}. Originally made bishop of York at the behest of King Alfrith (sub-king of Deira), Alfrith’s father, King Oswiu (king of Bernicia 642-670 and then also of Deira 655-670), had a rival bishop of York installed, St. Chad, while Wilfrid was away in Francia seeking consecration. Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, would eventually intervene with the result that Chad retired to Liechfield monastery and Wilfrid assumed the bishopric of York. Wilfrid was later exiled by Oswiu’s son, Ecgfrith (king of Northumbria 670-685), in 678 and had to petition pope Agatho in Rome to be reinstated. Wilfrid did not receive back his bishopric until after Ecgfrith’s death, only to be exiled again by Ecgfrith’s brother and successor, Aldfrith, in c. 691. Wilfrid would once again petition Rome, this time to pope John, but would not see the diocese of York reinstated to him again until after Aldfrith’s death in 704. Cf. below, pp. 112 ff.
that the bishop exercised his greatest influence and veneration for Andrew took deepest root (Andrew would, of course, eventually become identified as the patron saint of Scotland). 28

Indeed, Wilfrid is often recognized for having first introduced the Roman cult of Andrew to the peoples north of the Humber via his foundation of Hexham in 672. 29 Yet Wilfrid’s sphere of influence stretched far beyond that of Northumbria, due in no small part to the large amount of time he spent in exile from his seat at York. It was during one of these periods of banishment that he brought Andrew’s cult to the East Midlands, where he dedicated a church to the apostle at the monastery at Oundle. 30 Wilfrid would maintain close relations with this Northamptonshire house for the rest of his life and eventually died there while on a visit. 31

Even further south, the frequently overlooked churches of St. Andrew at Ferring (est. second half of eighth century) 32 and Pagham (est. perhaps in the tenth century) 33 may yield possible connections with Wilfrid. During another one of his itinerate missions, the displaced bishop went about preaching to the South Saxons and, with the help of lands granted him by the sympathetic King Æthelwealh, he established a cloister at Selsey dedicated to St. Peter. 34 In all likelihood, Wilfred used his

---

28 For the rise of Andrew’s cult in Scotland, cf. U. Hall, St. Andrew and Scotland (St. Andrews: St. Andrews University Library, 1994).
29 VW, XXII, pp. 44-46.
30 VW, LXV, pp. 140: Postremo ad monasterium eius, quod in Undolum posuit est, in quo olim Andreae apostoli dedicavit ecclesiam, pervenerunt; ibique statim a languore infirmitatis coangustatus, ita ut intellegeret vicinum sibi esse finem huius vitae…. (“Finally they arrived at his monastery that is located at Oundle, in which he previously dedicated a church to Andrew the Apostle; and there he was quickly impeded by the feebleness of infirmity, such that he understood the end of his life was near”).
31 VW, LXV, pp. 140.
34 VW, XLI, pp. 82-84: Rex namque mitis et pius per Deum factus, villam suam propriam, in qua manebat, ad episcopalem sedem cum territoris postea additis LXXXVII mansionum in Seolesiae sancto novoque evangelistae et baptistae, qui sibi suisque cunctis vitae perpetuae viam aperuit, concedit, ibique, fratribus suis congregatis,
conversion of the South Saxons as another springboard to further the cult of his beloved Andrew, though there is no record of his personally consecrating any churches to the apostle. Æthelwealh chose Selsey to be the episcopal seat of his kingdom, and the villages of Ferring, located some fifteen miles down the coast, and Pagham, only three miles away, would have fallen under its jurisdiction. Therefore, it is easy to imagine how the memory of Wilfrid as founder of Selsey monastery and his peculiar reverence for Andrew may have exercised a powerful influence over the subject Ferring and Pagham’s choices of patron saint. Thus, the evidence that can be gathered from the documentary and historical record depicts Wilfrid as exercising a vast sphere of influence and working ceaselessly to proliferate Andrew’s cult throughout the entirety of Anglo-Saxon England, from the far reaches of Northumbria all the way to the coast of Sussex.

Wilfrid apparently showed an affinity toward Andrew even at an early stage in his career. According to Wilfrid’s biographer, Stephanus, the future bishop journeyed to Rome as a young man, where he visited the various shrines of the saints and martyrs, but the account draws special attention to Wilfrid’s visit to the oratory of St. Andrew:

coenobium ad requiem fundavit, quod usque hodie subiecti eius possident ("The king [Æthelwealh], who had been made gentle and pious by God, gave his own estate, in which he lived, to be an episcopal see, adding to it afterwards 87 hides in Selsey. This he granted to the new and holy evangelist and baptist [Wilfrid] who had opened for him and for all his people the way to everlasting life, and there the bishop gathered his brethren and founded a cloister and retreat, which his followers possess up to this day").

According to the scholarship cited by Sawyer, general consensus is that charter §230 is a tenth century forgery. There is no telling, therefore, if or when a St. Andrew’s church was founded at Pagham before the tenth century. If the dedication and founding date given in the charter were to represent the reflex or memory of some real seventh century church, then the church may have been dedicated during Wilfrid’s lifetime and could very well have fallen under his influence. Indeed, charter Sawyer §230 mentions Wilfrid by name as receiving lands in Sussex from King Cædwalla of Wessex (who came to dominate Sussex) on behalf of the church at Pagham. This would certainly speak to Wilfrid’s influence over St. Andrew’s at Pagham. If there were a church dedicated c.680-5, this date would coincide nicely with Wilfrid’s first period of exile by order of King Egfrith, when the displaced bishop was active in Sussex. Cf. Kelly (1995), p. 101-3. Stephanus places Wilfrid’s time in Sussex between 681 and 686. Cf. VW, XLI, p. 81. As the case stands, there was likely no church of St. Andrew’s at Pagham during Wilfrid’s day. The existence of the charter does, however, imply that there was a St. Andrew’s church at Pagham by the tenth century, and it is possible that the long shadow of Wilfrid and his veneration for Andrew somehow influenced the dedication. The church at Ferring was, of course, founded some years after Wilfrid’s death. If his mission was not quite within living memory of some the village’s oldest inhabitants, the children or grandchildren of Wilfrid’s contemporaries would still have been alive.
...et in oratorio sancto Andreae apostolo dedicato ante altare, supra cuius summitatem III euangelia posita erant, humiliter genuflectens, adiuravit in nomine Domini Dei apostolum, pro quo passus est, ut pro sua intercessione Dominus ei legendi ingenium et docendi in gentibus eloquentiam euangeliorum concedisset. Et sic factum est, ut multorum testimonio comprobatur.\(^{36}\)

In the oratory dedicated to St Andrew the Apostle, he humbly knelt before the altar above which the four gospels had been placed, and besought the Apostle, in the name of the Lord God for whom he suffered, that the Lord, by his intercession, would grant him a ready mind both to read and to teach the words of the Gospels among the nations. And thus it came to pass as many bear witness.\(^{37}\)

The exact identity of this oratory remains unknown, but Betram Colgrave, the editor of the *Vita Wilfridi*, offers some enlightening speculation: “This may have been the oratory under St Peter’s or another in the Via Labicana. However, it is much more likely to have been the monastery of St Andrew on the Coelian Hill, the home of Gregory and Augustine and consequently, as Raine truly says, ‘a most sacred place to any pilgrim from England.’”\(^{38}\) If this identification is correct, Stephanus would seem to place Wilfrid firmly within the line of succession for Andrew’s cult established by Augustine, and a desire to continue this succession may help to explain the reasoning behind Wilfrid’s various dedications to the apostle.\(^{39}\) In those passages relating the bishop’s three trips to Rome, Stephanus takes care in each instance to mention Wilfrid’s habit of collecting relics for the adornment of English churches, and we may safely assume that these relics included some of Andrew’s among them.\(^{40}\) No church in Anglo-Saxon England would

\(^{36}\) *VW*, V, p. 12.


\(^{40}\) *VW*, V, p. 12 represents his first trip to Rome (*Iile vero servus Dei cum reliquiarum sanctarum quas illic invenit auxilio in pace Christi protectorus, iterum ad patrem suum archiepiscopum Lugdunae Galliae civitatis commode pervenit* “Truly, he [Wilfrid], a servant of God setting out in the peace of Christ with the aid of holy relics which he found there, returned safely to his father, the archbishop of Lyons, a city of Gaul”); XXXIII, p. 66 represents his second trip to Rome to petition Pope Agatho for his see at York (*Ile vero sanctus pontifex noster... circuiens loca sanctorum ad orationem per plures dies et reliquiarum sanctorum ab electis viris plurimum ad consolationem ecclesiarum Britanniae adeptus, nomina singularum scribens, quae cuiusque sancti essent reliquiae, multaque alia bona, quae nunc longum est enumerare, ad ornamentum domus Dei more suo lucratus*... “Truly, he [Wilfrid], our holy bishop ... going for many days round the shrines of the saints in order to pray, he procured a great deal of holy relics from elect men for the betterment of the churches of Britain, writing down the names of each one [and] to
have been considered complete without holy reliquaries in their possession, and any relic of St. Andrew would have greatly bolstered the status of the apostle’s cult, especially at institutions such as Hexham or Oundle. Wilfrid’s prayer at the oratory of St. Andrew is also significant in its request for assistance in acquiring key apostolic virtues. As demonstrated above, the apostles were interpreted first and foremost as authoritative purveyors of the true word. Wilfrid’s plea for Andrew’s help bears this association in mind, for he views the apostle as the appropriate intercessor to grant him *legendi ingenium et docendi eloquentiam* (the natural capacity for reading and eloquence for teaching), qualities that would prove essential to his missionary work as well as his performance at Whitby.

Scholars have hitherto been content to explain Wilfrid’s dedications to Andrew in terms of his personal reverence as related by Stephanus and the precedents established by Gregory and Augustine. Yet the case of Hexham’s dedication may imply certain political factors behind Wilfrid’s choice of Andrew as well as an intimate familiarity with apocryphal legends regarding the apostle. Unequivocally, Wilfrid was a figure deeply enmeshed in the politics of his day. According to both Stephanus and Bede, he served as the chief spokesman for the Roman faction which saint the relics belonged, as well as acquiring many other good things, which it is tedious to enumerate now, for the adornment of the house of God, according to his custom”); LV, p. 120 represents his third trip to Rome to petition Pope John (*Ille autem sanctus pontifex noster sciens oboedire, cum sociis loca sanctorum circumiens moreque suo ab electis viris sanctas reliquias nominatim congregans aliaque indumenta purpuresque et serica ad ornamenta ecleisiarum lucratus…* (However, he [Wilfrid], our holy bishop, knowing to be obedient, went around with his companions to the shrines of the saints, gathering, according to his custom, holy relics confirmed by name from elect men as well as obtaining purple and silk vestments for the adorning of churches…)).

41 Unfortunately, I am unaware of any catalogues of reliquaries establishing provenance for Hexham or Oundle. It would be interesting to see if the houses once held relics assigned to St. Andrew. John Blair has provided a helpful list of Anglo-Saxon saints, noting their various shrines and relics, but does not deal with universal cults. Cf., J. Blair, “A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Saints,” in *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West*, ed. A.Thacker & R. Sharpe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 495-565.


at the synod of Whitby in 664. While his forceful personality served him well in establishing the Roman tonsure and calculation of Easter as the standard practice in Northumbria, that same overbearing manner apparently caused friction between him and his superiors. Both King Ecgfrith of Northumbria and his successor King Aldfrith saw fit to expel the bishop from their realm, and his obstinate refusal to surrender his see precipitated a longstanding falling-out with Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury. Wilfrid was repeatedly forced to appeal to Rome for his right to the bishopric and, despite papal absolution and backing, continued to struggle for the better part of a quarter century to assert his authority over York. Most relevant for the dedication of Hexham to St. Andrew is the quarrel that arose between Ecgfrith and Wilfrid, ultimately leading to the bishop’s first exile from Northumbria.

The details of the this Northumbrian feud have been lost to time and scholars must rely largely on Stephanus and Bede to reconstruct the particular reasons behind the rival parties’

44 VW, X, pp. 20-23; Bede EH, III. 25, pp. 181-189.

45 Expulsion by Ecgfrith: VW, XXIV, pp. 48-51; Bede, HE, V.19, pp. 522 ff. Expulsion by Aldfrith: VW, XLV, pp. 90-93; Bede, HE, V.19, pp. 524 ff. It should be noted that Bede used Stephanus’ work as a source and Bede’s V. 19 represents an epitome of VW with some additional material.

46 The exact nature of Theodore’s falling out with Wilfrid is unclear. Stephanus claims that Ecgfrith managed to turn Theodore against Wilfrid via bribery (VW, XXIV, 48-49). In his edition of VW, Colgrave responds to this claim, stating, “Eddius [Stephanus]’s story that Theodore was bribed is quite incredible considering what we know of the archbishop’s character.” (VW, sv. Division of the Diocese, p. 168). Colgrave further explains that the division of the see of York, which Stephenus attributes to Ecgfrith’s actions in 678, had already been set into motion by Theodore at the synod of Herford (673), where Wilfrid was tellingly absent and represented by proctors (quibus etiam frater et consacerdos nostro Wilfrid, Nordanhymbrorum gentis episcopus, per proprios legatarios adfuit). Cf. Bede, HE, IV.5, pp. 348 ff. Particularly relevant is the ninth capitulum of the synod, providing for the division of dioceses: capitulum in commune tractatum est: ‘Ut plure episcopi crescente numero fidelium augerentur’; sed de hac re ad praesens siluimus (“[This] capitulum was discussed in common, ‘That more bishops shall be increased with the growing number of faithful,’ but we were undecided about this matter at the time”). It is clear that, while Theodore wished larger dioceses to be divided among more bishops for the better administration of the faithful, no definitive action was take regarding York or other bishoprics. Given Wilfrid’s long struggle to preserve all of his holdings at York, Hexham, Ripon and elsewhere, it is a logical conclusion that the capitula at Hertford may have caused some friction between himself and the archbishop. As not to totally defame Theodore, Stephanus recounts a lengthy scene in which the archbishop offers an apology to Wilfrid and the two are reconciled (VW, XLIII, pp. 88-91). Apparently not a fan of Wilfrid, the generally more reliable Bede makes no mention of either bribery or a reconciliation. Furthermore, Bede, while maintaining a respectful tone toward the bishop of York, also omits all of the miracles Stephanus ascribes to Wilfrid, adding only one not found in VW where Wilfrid miraculously brings an end to a drought in Sussex and teaches the South Saxons to fish (Bede, HE, IV.13, pp. 372 ff.).
mutual animosity. What exactly instigated the falling-out between king and bishop remains a mystery, though there are several possible reasons and contributing factors. In chapter XXIV of his *Vita Wilfridi*, Stephanus places the blame largely on the poisonous influence of Ecgfrith’s second wife Iurminburg in what amounts to a highly literary account of dubious historical value. More likely is the fact that King Ecgfrith, together with Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, had become jealous of Wilfrid’s ever expanding influence in the north, a development which represented a potential threat to their own authority. Consequently, Theodore’s move to partition the see of York at the synod of Hertford in 673 and Ecgfrith’s subsequent ousting of Wilfrid in 678 may have been an attempt to check the bishop’s increasing power. Additionally, the relationship between Ecgfrith and Wilfrid may have been strained before the king ever ascended the throne of Northumbria. According to the the *Vita Wilfridi*, the young Wilfrid had fostered a close friendship with Ecgfrith’s older half-brother, Alhfrith, the co-ruler of Deira (from c. 655) under their father Oswiu and the man who backed Wilfred’s ordination and bestowed upon him the monastery of Ripon. Bede appends the detail that Alhfrith stood behind Wilfrid’s ascension to the see of York, sending him to Gaul to be consecrated by Agilberht, bishop of Paris. Alhfrith, however, later had a falling out with

---

47 I will be addressing the background of the feud and its influence on Wilfrid’s decision to dedicate the monastery of Hexham to Andrew at greater length in a forthcoming article tentively entitled “St. Andrew and St. Wilfrid: Toward an “Apocryphal” Explanation for the Dedication of the Monastery at Hexham.”


Oswiu and fought against his father alongside a Mercian army. Bede provides neither a date for the battle (it must have taken place sometime after Wilfrid’s consecration in 664 and before Oswiu’s death in 670) nor Alhfrith’s ultimate fate, but the internal family struggle and Wilfrid’s close friendship with Alhfrith may have helped to sour the bishop’s relations with both Oswiu and his son and successor Ecgfrith.

More pertinent to the discussion of Andrew’s cult, however, is another personal reason why Ecgfrith may have fostered an early animosity toward Wilfrid; that is, the bishop played an active role in helping the king’s first wife, Æthelthryth (better known as St. Audrey), leave him to take monastic vows. This queen of Northumbria grew to prominence in the Anglo-Saxon period as one of the preeminent virgin saints of the English Church. According to Bede, Æthelthryth, daughter of King Anna of the East Angles, was first married to an ealdorman of the South Gyrwe named Tondberht, but her husband died soon after their marriage, apparently before the union could be consummated. Ecgfrith and Æthelthryth’s marriage was not a close one, most likely due to the queen’s deep-seated piety and desire for sexual continence. Bede asserts that the two were married for twelve years with Æthelthryth remaining in the “perpetual

53 Bede, HE, III.14, p. 254.
55 Bede includes a verse elegy in praise of Æthelthryth and her virginity in his Historia ecclesiastica, comparing her to more universally recognized virgin saints such as the virgin Mary, Agatha, Eulalia, Thecla, Euphemia, Agnes and Cecily. Cf. Bede, HE, IV.20(18), pp. 396 ff.
56 Bede, HE, IV.19(17), p. 390: Accepit autem rex Ecgfrid coniugem nomine Aedilthrydam, filiam Anna regis Orientalium Anglorum, cuius sepius mentionem fecimus, uiri bene religiosi, ac per omnia mente et opere egregii; quam et alter ante illum uir habuerat uxorem, princeps uidelicet Australium Gyuiorum vocabule Tondberht. Sed illo post modicum temporis ex quo eam accepit, defuncto, data est regi prae fato (“Then king Ecgfrith received a wife by the name of Æthelthryth, the daughter of Anna king of the East Angles, of whom we have oft made mention, a very religious man, distinguished with respect to all things in both mind and deed. Another man had her as wife before him, the leader of the South Gyrwe named Tondberht. But he having died a short time after having received her, she was given to the aforementioned king”).
and glorious chastity of virginity.” 57 Æthelthryth would go on to leave her husband for the monastic life, entering the cloister at Coldingham and eventually becoming abbess of her own foundation at Ely. Bede relates:

For a long time she had been asking the king to allow her to relinquish the affairs of this world and to serve Christ, the only true King, in a monastery; when at length and with difficulty she gained his permission, she entered the monastery of the Abbess Æbbe, Ecgfrith’s aunt, which is situated in a place called Coldingham, receiving the veil and habit of a nun from Bishop Wilfrid. A year afterwards she was herself appointed abbess in the district called Ely, where she built a monastery and became, by the example of her heavenly life and teaching, the virgin mother of many virgins dedicated to God. 59

While Æthelthryth’s relinquishment of her worldly duties may seem at first to disregard Paul’s injunction that a wife should not depart from her husband, 60 the practice whereby a noble person would give up the secular world for the religious life was highly regarded in Anglo-Saxon England. Several kings such as Æthelred of Mercia and Cædwalla of Wessex were celebrated for abdicating their earthly crowns in favor of either monastic vows or pilgrimages to Rome. 61

In an interesting case of history repeating itself, Cuthburh, the wife of Ecgfrith’s brother and successor Aldfrith, followed in her sister-in-law’s footsteps by leaving her husband as well and

57 Bede, HE, IV.19(17), p. 390: … cuius consortio cum XII annis uteretur, perpetua tamen mansit virginitatis integritate gloriosa (“…whose partnership he enjoyed for twelve years, though she remained in the perpetual, glorious chastity of virginity”).


60 1 Cor. 7:10. Paul goes on in 1 Cor. 7:11 to say that if a woman does leave her husband, that she should either remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband. To the Anglo-Saxon mind, this passage may have allowed for a husband or wife leaving their spouse for the purposes of entering the celibate and religious life. Paul makes clear that continence is preferable to marriage and that he would prefer all to lead a chaste life like himself, but acknowledges that God grants appropriate gifts to different people according to their chosen way of life (1 Cor. 7:7).

founding a monastery at Wimborne. While Stephanus acknowledges Æthelthryth’s decision to become a nun, he remains oddly silent on Wilfrid’s part or Ecgfrith’s reaction. Bede, on the other hand, makes explicit the bishop’s central role as well as Ecgfrith’s displeasure, claiming Wilfrid himself as a direct source:

… sicut mihimet sciscitanti, cum hoc, an ita esset, quibusdam uenisset in dubium, beatae memoriae Uilfrid episcopus referebat, dicens se testem integritatis eius esse certissimum; adeo ut Ecgfridus promiserit se ei terras ac pecunias multas esse donaturum, si reginae posset persuadere eius uti conubio, quis sciebat illam nullum uirorum plus illo diligere. When I asked Bishop Wilfrid of blessed memory whether this was true, he told me that he had the most perfect proof of her virginity; in fact Ecgfrith had promised to give him estates and money if he could persuade the queen to consummate their marriage, because he knew that there was none whom she loved more than Wilfrid himself.

Wilfrid obviously did little or nothing to persuade the queen to sleep with her husband. Much to the contrary, Wilfrid likely encouraged Æthelthryth to enter the monastery, for it was he himself who consecrated her and gave her the veil. Several eminent scholars have already noted how the relationship between Wilfrid and Æthelthryth may have contributed to the bishop’s eventual exile in 678. Frank Stenton remarks, “His fall from power was an indirect result of his relationship with the queen, for he incurred the ill will of King Ecgfrith, her husband, by encouraging her desire for the religious life.” Somewhat less emphatically, Bertram Colgrave

---

62 Cf. the entry for 718 in ASC-A, p. 34; ASC-E, p. 35.

63 VW, XIX, pp. 40-41: ... concordia vero inter eos sopita et regina supradicta ab eo separate et Deo dicata, triumphus in diebus regis desinit (“the harmony between them [i.e. Ecgfrith and Wilfrid] having fallen insensible and the aforementioned queen having been separated from him and consecrated to God, the king’s success came to an end in his own days”).


66 Cf. above, p. 115.

offers how Æthelthryth’s receiving the veil from Wilfrid “helps to account for Ecgfrith’s later hostility.”

Wilfrid’s foundation of the monastery at Hexham dedicated to St. Andrew further complicates the political picture. According to Stephanus, the bishop established his religious house in c. 672 or shortly thereafter on lands granted him by queen Æthelthryth: Nam Inaegustaldessae, adepta regione a regina sancta Aethelthrithae Deo dicata, domum Domino in honorem sancti Andreae apostoli fabrefactam fundavit (“For at Hexham, on territory received from the holy queen Æthelthryth, [who was] dedicated to God, [Wilfrid] founded a house to the Lord built in honor of the holy apostle Andrew”). The dedication to Andrew taken in combination with the patronage of Æthelthryth may be quite significant. While scholars have identified Wilfrid and Æthelthryth’s relationship as fueling Ecgfrith’s animosity, none to my knowledge have ever drawn attention to the parallels between Andrew’s own demise and that of the bishop of York.

According to apocryphal traditions circulating throughout Christendom, Andrew met his death under circumstances eerily similar to those of Wilfrid’s exile in the town of Patras, having taken his apostolic mission to the region of Achaea. While in Achaea, Andrew is reported to have miraculously cured queen Maximilla from an illness, after which the queen turned to Christianity and desired to lead a life of sexual continence and religious devotion. Maximilla’s new found zeal for the faith and love of abstinence was met by open hostility from her husband, King Agetes. Seeking support for her decision, the queen often prayed and sought out the advice of Andrew, who encouraged her in her chastity. Maximilla managed to stave off

---

68 VW, p. 165, sv. ‘Aethilthryth.’

69 VW, XXII, pp. 44-47.

70 Cf. below, Part II, §4 “St. Andrew in Apocryphal Tradition,” pp. 205 ff.
Aegetes’ advances for a time by playing a “bed-trick” in which she surreptitiously substituted one of her handmaidens for herself in the king’s chamber; but when the servant grew prideful in her newfound role as royal mistress, the plot was revealed. Realizing that he had been duped and Maximilla remained chaste, Aegetes became enraged and held Andrew responsible for turning his wife against him. As a result, the king had Andrew imprisoned, publically tried, and crucified.

Wilfrid’s personal veneration for the apostle as well as his ceaseless struggle to orient the Northumbrian church toward Rome since the synod of Whitby in 664 certainly factored into the bishop’s choice of dedication, but there may also have been other political motivations at work. Someone as devoted to Andrew as Wilfrid would doubtlessly have been aware of many of the apocryphal legends circulating about the saint. By consecrating the monastery at Hexham to Andrew, Wilfrid may have consciously been drawing a connection between Andrew and Maximilla’s relationship and that of himself and the monastery’s benefactress. Stephanus’ chronology is difficult to determine, but it would seem from the biographer’s wording that at the time of her grant to Wilfrid, the queen had already dedicated herself to God. With the foundation of Ely taking place in 673, ostensibly one year after her admission to the monastery at Coldingham, Æthelthryth’s taking of monastic vows and her grant allowing for the establishment of a monastery at Hexham in c. 672 must have transpired in relatively quick succession of one to the other. Unfortunately, no writings by Wilfrid himself have survived, so it is impossible to confirm his exact intentions behind the dedication. Yet it is entirely plausible

---

71 For apocryphal Latin narratives about Andrew’s passion circulating on the continent and possibly in Britain during Wilfrid’s time, cf. below, pp. 211 ff.

72 Cf. the entry for 673 in ASC-A, p. 31; ASC-E, p. 30.

73 Cf. above, p. 115.

74 Unfortunately the exact date of Æthelthryth’s grant to Wilfrid cannot be confirmed by the charter evidence.
that the bishop viewed his struggle to help Æthelthryth enter the religious life as consonant with Andrew’s support of Maximilla’s chastity. Through this allusion to apocryphal tradition, Wilfrid could honor both the queen and their friendship by casting Æthelthryth in the role of Maximilla and portraying himself as a contemporary version of his beloved Andrew. At the time of Hexham’s foundation, it would have been impossible for Wilfrid to foresee exactly to what extent Ecgfrith would play Aegetes to his Andrew, though, as evidenced above, Wilfrid may have already seen the writing on the wall, being acutely aware of a simmering feud between himself and the king. The consecration of Hexham to Andrew, therefore, would not have assuaged tensions in any way. In fact, the dedication to Andrew may have been interpreted as a slap in the face to Ecgfrith with Wilfrid rubbing the king’s nose in his successful support of Æthelthryth’s withdrawal from secular life. It is perhaps going too far to infer that Wilfrid would have acted so inexpediency with regard to the king, but the bishop was never one to pull punches and this apocryphal allusion may yet help scholars enrich their understanding of the reasons fueling Ecgfrith’s animosity.

By the time Wilfrid died at the monastery of Oundle, appropriately dedicated to St. Andrew, the apostle’s cult had taken root throughout England. Due in no small part to the example set by such influentinal figures as Gregory the Great, Augustine of Canterbury and Wilfrid himself, veneration for the apostle would continue to thrive for centuries to come. That reverence would impress itself upon nearly all facets of Anglo-Saxon literature and can be traced through the surviving calendrical, martyrological, liturgical, devotional, homiletic, hagiographical and secular verse traditions.
2. St. Andrew in Canonical Scripture and the Exegetical Evidence

While Andrew is consistently mentioned in all of the canonical lists as being one of the original Twelve disciples of Christ and among the primary apostles, the scriptures offer very little insight into his life and deeds. Outside of indicating the disciple’s position in Christ’s inner circle, the *Actus apostolorum* makes no further specific comment on Andrew, merely incorporating him silently into the collective discussion of the apostles with regards to Pentecost and the subsequent missionary work undertaken by the group as a whole. Despite the general reticence of the *Actus apostolorum*, Andrew does figure prominently in a handful of episodes in the gospels. Most important for the development of the apostle’s cult is the notion of Andrew as brother of Simon Peter. Through this close familial relationship with the chief of the apostles and their mutual identification in the Synoptic Gospels as the first two disciples called to Christ, Andrew would obtain an added level of reverence as compared to some of his lesser apostolic brethren. According to the Gospel of John, in fact, Andrew was to be understood as the very first of the apostles to have become a disciple of Christ. In this account, he is identified as one of two disciples following John the Baptist when the teacher acknowledges Jesus to be “the Lamb of God.” Andrew then leaves John the Baptist to follow Jesus and, going to his brother and declaring that he had found the messiah, becomes responsible for first introducing Simon

---

75 Mt. 10:2; Mk. 3:18; Lk. 6:14; Acts 1:13


77 Mt. 4:18; Mk. 1:16; Lk. 6:13-14; Jn. 1:40, 6:8.

78 Mt. 4:18; Mk. 1:16; Lk. 6:14
Peter to Christ. Andrew’s declaration of Jesus as the messiah makes him, according to John, the first of the Twelve to offer this assertion, thus standing in contrast to the Synoptic Gospels in which Peter is the first to make a similar declaration. This identification of Andrew as the first (chronologically speaking) of the apostles to enter into the discipleship of Christ would later emerge in the early Christian church as one of the saint’s defining attributes, with occasional reference to this fact appearing in the Anglo-Saxon literary and liturgical traditions.

The Gospel of Mark goes beyond the other two Synoptic Gospels by making mention of Andrew’s involvement in a couple of other biblical events. According to Mk. 1:29-32, Jesus and several of his disciples (Andrew is presumed to be among them) leave the synagogue in Capharnaum to stay at the house of Peter and Andrew, where Christ miraculously heals Simon Peter’s mother-in-law of a fever. Andrew, therefore, is interpreted as a key witness to this early healing in Christ’s career. Later, Mark makes more specific mention of Andrew as one of the disciples on Mt. Olivet who ask Jesus about the exact time and nature of the signs portending the destruction of the second temple of Jerusalem as prophesied by Christ himself. Other than Andrew’s initial call to discipleship and these two subsequent episodes, the Synoptic Gospels remain silent on the apostle’s particular involvement in the events of the New Testament.

The Gospel of John proves slightly more forthcoming in providing two further details on Andrew in which the apostle is named in close proximity with Philip. In the first instance, John
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79 Jn. 1:35-42.


81 Andrew and Peter, having entered into the service of Christ in Mk 1:16-18, are among the disciples who are collectively said to have accompanied Jesus to Capernaum in Mk 1:21.

82 Cp. Mt. 8:14-15 and Lk. 4:38-39 where mention is made of Christ entering Simon’s house and healing the mother of his wife, but the name Andrew is omitted as joint inhabitant of the residence.

83 Cf. Mk. 13:3 where Andrew is listed alongside Peter, James and John as those present. Again, cp. Mt. 24:3 and Lk. 21:7 where both of the other Synoptic Gospels do not mention the names of those disciples present.
mentions both Philip and Andrew’s incredulousness at the feeding of the multitude gathered in the desert to hear Jesus preach. Here, the fourth gospel expressly attributes the following words of doubt to Andrew: *est puer unus hic qui habet quinque panes hordiacios et duos pisces sed haec quid sunt inter tantos* (“There is a boy here who has five barley loaves and two fish, but what are these among so many?”).\(^{84}\) Later, following the raising of Lazarus, John also identifies Andrew and Philip as the two disciples who announce the desire of several Greek Gentiles to meet with Jesus, thereby prompting Christ to proclaim that the hour is at hand in which the son of man should be glorified.\(^{85}\) C. McMahon has commented on how the Greek origins of the names Andrew and Philip as well as their purported homeland in Bethsaida, a Gentile region of Palestine, make them the most appropriate intermediaries between Jesus and the Greek proselytes.\(^{86}\) Andrew’s presence during Jesus’ revelatory announcement of the final hours firmly establishes the apostle’s place within the events leading up to Christ’s imprisonment and eventual crucifixion. Taken in conjunction with this apostle’s early service as a disciple and his observation of the healings at Capharnaum, this episode helps authenticate Andrew as one of the central witnesses to Christ’s career from its early stages to the bitter end.

Because the canonical scriptures are relatively quiet when it comes to Andrew’s role in the New Testament, the apostle’s appearance in biblical commentaries and exegetical homilies tends to be muted as well. Andrew does, however, appear from time to time in the exegesis of Bede, though mostly in the same breath as his more distinguished brother, Peter.
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\(^{84}\) Jn. 6:8-9. Cp. Mt. 14:17; Mk. 6:38; Lk. 9:13 where all the Synoptic Gospels record the feeding of the multitude with five loaves and two fish, but attribute the initial doubt to the disciples collectively.

\(^{85}\) Jn. 12:20-23.

\(^{86}\) Cath. Encycl. vol. 1, s.v. “Andrew, Apostle, St,” p. 403; For more on the appropriateness of Andrew’s Greek name and the erroneous attempts of Origen and Jerome to provide Semitic etymological derivations as well, cf. Peterson (1963), p. 1.
The Name “Andrew”

In his exposition on the Gospel of Luke, composed c. 716, Bede utilizes the list of the twelve chosen apostles (Lk. 6:13-16) as an opportunity to explore the etymological derivations of their individual names. Regarding Andrew’s name, Bede writes:

Porro Andreas Graecum nomen est et ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, hoc est a uiro uirilis appellatur. Quibus recte vocabulis apostolorum prii decorantur qui mox agnum Dei a Iohanne cognouerunt eum uidere et audire curauerunt. Furthermore, Andrew is a Greek name and ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, that is, he is called ‘manly’ [because his name derives] from ‘man.’ The first of the apostles are rightly glorified with these names, those who soon afterwards recognized the Lamb of God through John [the Baptist] and took care to see and hear him.

David Hurst, the editor of the CCSL edition of Bede’s In Lucae evangelium expositio, correctly points to Jerome’s Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum as supplying the venerable monk with his etymological source material. In interpreting the origins of the biblical names, Jerome actually remarks twice on the derivation of the name Andrew, once when commenting on the Gospel of Matthew and again when addressing the Actus apostolorum. In the first instance, Jerome merely seeks a Hebrew root for the name, writing: andreas decorus uel respondens pabulo (“Andrew, [meaning] noble or responding to nourishment”). Later, however, Jerome offers a competing Greek derivation alongside the Hebrew etymology, displaying a clear preference for the Greek origin: andreas decus in statione uel respondens pabulo. sed hoc uiolentum. melius autem est, ut secundum graecam etymologiam ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, hoc est a uiro, uirilis adpelletur (“Andrew, [meaning] splendor in station or responding to nourishment; but this

87 Hurst, CCSL 120, p. v.
88 Bede, In Luc., Bk. II, Ch. p. 133, ll. 1305-1309.
90 Jer., Hebr. nom., p. 134, l. 15; PL 23, col. 839.
[interpretation] is forced; it is better that, according to the Greek etymology, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς (that is, from ‘man’) he be called ‘manly.’”91

In his Etymologiae, a work also known to Bede,92 Isidore of Seville makes use of Jerome, but avoids making any qualitative judgment on the diverging etymologies, offering both with equal weight: Andreas frater Petri carne, et cohaeres gratia. Secundum Hebraeam etymologiam interpretatur decorus, siue respondens; sermone autem Graeco a uiro uirilis appellatur (‘Andrew, brother of Peter in the flesh and co-heir in grace. According to the Hebrew etymology [the name] is interpreted as ‘noble’ or ‘responding;’ however, in the Greek language he is called ‘manly’ from ‘man’”).93

At a cursory glance, Bede could conceivably have drawn upon either Jerome’s Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum or Isidore’s Etymologiae as his source. It is even possible that he consulted both works, employing the one to confirm the other. The fact, however, that Bede accurately provides Jerome’s Greek ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς (for which Isidore offers no equivalent) suggests that Jerome was indeed his true source. Bede also appears to have been sympathetic toward the patristic writer’s explicit endorsement of the Greek etymology over that of the Hebrew, as he declines to offer the Hebrew etymology at all in this instance. This exclusion may betray Bede’s tacit agreement with Jerome that the Greek derivation represents

---


92 For the widespread existence of Isidore’s Etymologiae in Anglo-Saxon England, cf. Gneuss, Handlist of A-S Mss. (2001), §§154.5f, 176e, 185e, 188.8e, 311e, 442.4e, 460e, 469, 497.2e, 498.1f, 524.4f, 561, 682, 690e, 784.5e, 821f, 885f, 919.3e; idem, Books and Libraries in Early England, II. pp. 664-65, IV. 114, 116, 118, 122, 128-9. For Bede’s specific use of the Etymologiae, cf. Ogilvy, Books Known to the English, p. 167. Laistner has argued that, while Bede made extensive use of Isidore’s works, he often remained skeptical of his predecessor, noting that, “Bede, whose sense of literary property was in general so unusually high, especially during an age when plagiarism ordinarily was not felt to be improper, treats Isidore with more freedom or less respect than his other authorities.” Laistner goes on to point out that Bede cites Isidore in at least three instances, only to correct him. M. L. W. Laistner, “The Library of the Venerable Bede,” in Bede: His Life, Times, and Writings; Essays in Commemoration of the Twelfth Centenary of his Death, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Reprint, New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), p. 256.

93 Isid., Etym., VII.9, ll. 24-27.
the superior one. Bede further confirms his approval of the Greek etymology and silent dismissal of the Hebrew in his *In Marci evangelium expositio*, composed sometime between 725 and 730, where he expands slightly upon his earlier exposition on Luke, though rendering the more succinct nominative ἄνηρ “a man” for Jerome’s ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς:

Andreas graecum nomen est et interpretatur uirilis ab eo quod graece uir appellatur ἄνηρ. Quo aptissime vocabulo decoratur ille qui ad praedicationem iohannis mox agnum dei sequi uidere et audire curauit et postmodum ipsum se uocantem relictis omnibus sequi ipsi perpetuo adhaerere non tardauit.

Andrew is a Greek name and is interpreted as ‘manly’ for the reason that man is called ἄνηρ in Greek. He is decorated by this most appropriate word, who, in accordance with the preaching of John [the Baptist], took care to quickly follow, see, and hear the Lamb of God, and afterwards did not delay to attach himself to the one summoning him, all the others having been abandoned, to follow him forever.

Aligning himself with Jerome’s preferred derivation and eschewing Isidore’s more balanced approach, Bede uses the Greek root underlying Andrew’s name to establish manliness or virility as one of the apostle’s key attributes—a characteristic that would indeed play well in his construal of the apostle as hunter elsewhere in his exegetical commentaries. Bede, however, is not content to simply reiterate Jerome’s etymology and acknowledge Andrew as being “manly.” Instead, the Northumbrian exegete elaborates on his source material, drawing explicit attention to the role which the apostle’s virility played in his call to the discipleship. According to Bede, Andrew is appropriately deemed “manly” because it is this virtue which leads him to heed the instruction of John the Baptist. Additionally, this virility is the seat of the apostle’s strength, allowing him to swiftly and decisively follow Jesus in perpetuity despite the accompanying hardships. By asserting the suitability of Andrew’s etymological derivation, Bede
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94 Hurst, *CCSL* 120, p. v.


96 Cf. below, pp. 133 ff.
implies that it is the inherent courage of a “manly” individual which permits the saint to emerge as one of the *apostolorum primi*, thus rendering him an appropriately strong trail-blazer for future disciples in Christ. This bold image of Andrew as a man imbued with exceptional virility is certainly a striking one, making it tempting to suppose that Bede’s etymologically infused interpretation somehow informed those Anglo-Saxon verse traditions which cast the apostle in more heroic and militaristic terms. While such influence may cautiously be acknowledged as plausible, any specific attempt to bridge the gap between exegetical and heroic traditions would prove precarious, requiring the type of firm textual and philological parallels that are difficult to prove.97

The Call of Peter and Andrew

Discussion of Andrew in Anglo-Saxon exegesis was not limited to the etymological significance of his name, for biblical commentators also addressed several of the events in which the apostle figured prominently. The episode which received by far the most extensive treatment was Andrew’s call to the discipleship alongside his brother, Peter, to become “fishers of men.”98

In his gospel commentaries, Bede’s concern with the passage is primarily historical in nature,


98 Mt. 4:18; Mk 1:16
though occasionally he touches upon some deeper significances. Bede’s *In Marci evangelium expositio* begins its elucidation of Mk. 1:16-17 by citing Jerome’s *Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei* on the parallel passage in Mt. 4:18-20, quoting: *Isti primi uocati sunt ut dominum sequentur. Piscatores et illitterati mittuntur ad praedicandum ne fides credentium non in uirtute Dei sed eloquentia atque doctrina putaretur* (“They were the first called to follow the Lord. Fishers and the unlettered were sent to preach lest the faith of believers be thought [to have arisen] not through the might of God, but rather through eloquence and teaching”).

Thus, Bede quickly draws attention to the fact that Peter and Andrew were the first two summoned to follow Christ and that their occupation as fishermen was significant in assuming a lack of eloquence and learning, thereby allowing the word of God to succeed via its own merit rather than through any rhetorical embellishment. This understanding of the apostles as being unlettered (*illitterati*) agrees with Bede’s statement in the *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*. We have seen already, however, how the exegete later nuanced this view in his *Retractatio*, granting that the apostle were indeed literate, though not highly trained in the arts of grammar and rhetoric. He also recognized their ability to preach “briefly” (*breviter*) and “clearly” (*dilucide*). Thus, whatever eloquence Andrew and the apostles possessed was due, according to Bede, to their simplicity of style rather than formal rhetorical training or ornate speech.

The rest of Bede’s rather lengthy comment on Mk. 1:16-17 is lifted verbatim from St. Augustine of Hippo’s *De consensu euangelistarum*. As the title suggests, Augustine’s work

---


103 Aug., *De cons. eu.*, pp. 140-41.
was concerned with establishing the harmony of the four gospels and systematically seeks to explain away any apparent contradictions or inconsistencies that may arise in the differing accounts as provided by the evangelists. Augustine viewed in particular the varying accounts of Peter and Andrew’s call to Christ as potentially problematic for the Christian readership.\footnote{Aug., \textit{De cons. eu.}, pp. 134-41.} The Gospels of Matthew and Mark agree in placing the episode in Galilee and both have Jesus stating that he will make the two of them \textit{piscatores hominum}.\footnote{Mt. 4:19; Mk. 1:17.} The Gospel according to Luke also situates the calling in Galilee, but makes no mention of Andrew and has Christ declaring to Simon Peter alone that he shall henceforth “catch men” (\textit{ex hoc iam homines eris capiens}).\footnote{Lk. 5:7.} Luke additionally relates the miracle of the full nets and notes how James and John were Peter’s associates, not necessarily Andrew (\textit{similiter autem Iacobum et Iohannem filios Zebedaei qui erant socii Simonis}).\footnote{Lk. 5:10.} As stated above, the Gospel of John veers even more drastically from the accounts found in the Synoptic Gospels by making Andrew the first to follow Christ and establishing him as the one who introduces Simon Peter to Jesus.\footnote{Jn. 1:35-42.} Furthermore, John also places the event near the river Jordan, the site of John the Baptist’s preaching, and has Andrew and Peter subsequently following Jesus into Galilee where they find Philip and Nathaniel.\footnote{Jn. 1:43-51.} Bede, the meticulous author of the \textit{Historia ecclesiastica} as well as an historically minded exegete often engaged with nuanced literal interpretations, apparently shared Augustine’s concerns that these outward inconsistencies might perplex readers and cause them to question the
authoritative nature of scripture. As a result, the Northumbrian commentator also deemed it necessary to clarify any seeming contradictions and evidently felt that he could do no better than to invoke the expert opinion of the learned bishop of Hippo.

Augustine’s explanation is a rather prolix and convoluted one, but must necessarily be understood in order to contextualize Bede’s excerpt. Over the course of his commentary, the bishop of Hippo posits a timeline that incorporates all four Gospel accounts, though, at times, it is difficult to distinguish all of the particulars due to the circuitous nature of his treatise. According to Augustine, the events as related by John took place first; that is, Andrew was initially a disciple of John the Baptist, left to follow Jesus, and was the first to introduce Simon Peter to Christ near the river Jordan. Afterwards, Andrew and Peter followed Christ to Galilee, but were not yet officially acknowledged as “disciples,” because Augustine interprets the miracle of changing water into wine at the wedding in Cana as first awakening their true belief. Only after this belief had firmly taken root could they accurately be termed “disciples” in the fullest sense of the word. Any reference to them as “disciples” prior to this event is simply an acknowledgement that they would later become Christ’s disciples and were, in hindsight, familiar to the evangelists by that title. Augustine then interprets Luke’s account of the miracle of the full nets as happening next. Once in Galilee and before the wedding at Cana, Christ finds Peter (Andrew is assumed by Augustine to be with him) fishing again with his associates James and John. It is at this instance that Christ prophesies to Simon Peter alone that he would “catch men,” but does not yet officially “summon” him. On yet another occasion,
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113 Aug., De cons. eu., p. 141
the Lord, in accordance with Matthew and Mark, finds Peter and Andrew fishing again (Augustine makes it clear that just because Peter had been prophesied to catch men, he was not predicted to never again catch fish) and calls them both to follow him and become “fishers of men.” Shortly thereafter, James and John are officially summoned into Christ’s service. Then, together with James, John and other followers gathered in Galilee (i.e., Philip and Nathaniel), Andrew and Peter continue with Christ into Capharnaum, where they subsequently witness his preaching at the synagogues, the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law, and are all later invited to the wedding at Cana where their belief is truly inspired and their “discipleship” confirmed.

Augustine’s argument here is a fine example of academic pleading that, despite the writer’s impressive erudition, remains fraught with problems, not the least among which is his failure to account for John’s assertion that Andrew came to Peter claiming to have found the Messiah. Such a declaration by Andrew would doubtless constitute a true belief in Christ much earlier than Augustine would allow for with the wedding at Cana. Bede, however, apparently saw no problem with Augustine’s work and incorporates it into his own exegesis without comment or reservation.

In borrowing from Augustine, Bede draws from that section of the *De consensu evangeliistarum* dealing primarily with the inconsistencies between Luke and the other two Synoptic Gospels’ accounts of Peter and Andrew’s calling. Taken out of its original context, the passage can be difficult to follow, but hopefully the previous summary of Augustine’s recommended timeline will make it more accessible. Bede follows Augustine, stating:
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114 Aug., *De cons. eu.*, p. 141.
115 Aug., *De cons. eu.*, p. 139.
However it may be asked how he summoned the fishermen in pairs from [their] boats, first Peter and Andrew, and then, proceeding a little ways, the other two, the sons of Zebedee, just as Matthew and Mark relate; whereas Luke says that both of their boats [i.e. both Peter and Andrew’s] were full with that great take of fish. And [Luke] comments further that Peter’s companions, James and John the sons of Zebedee, were summoned to help because they were not able to pull up the full nets, and they were likewise amazed at the great multitude of fish which was caught. And he [i.e. Christ] said only to Peter, “Fear not, from henceforth you will be catching men.” Immediately after having led the boats to land, they followed him. From this it must be understood that what Luke relates happened first, and that they were not at that time summoned by the Lord, but rather it was foretold to Peter alone that he would catch men. Thus, it was not spoken as if he would never again catch fish, for we read that after the resurrection of the Lord they were fishing. Therefore, it is said that afterwards he would catch men; it is not said that he would not later catch fish. Thus, this passage is provided in order [that we might] understand that, according to [their] custom, they returned to the catching of fish, so that what Matthew and Mark relate about how [Christ] called them in pairs and how he himself ordered that they follow him, first the two, Peter and Andrew, then afterwards the other two, the sons of Zebedee, later came to pass.

The fact that Bede inserts this passage directly following the aforementioned citation from Jerome’s *Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei* lends insight into the exegete’s methodology and primary interest with the biblical passage. Bede first provides Jerome’s commentary in order to distinguish Peter and Andrew as the first two disciples of Christ taken from humble rather than learned beginnings. Then he turns to Augustine to offer proof of this primacy in the face of potentially contradictory passages elsewhere in the gospels, while simultaneously expounding further upon the disciples’ identification as fishermen. No where in his comment on Mk. 1:16-17 does Bede insert his own voice. He simply moves from scriptural citation to Jerome to the lengthier excerpt from Augustine. Bede’s lack of comment may be understood as a tacit agreement with his patristic forbearers and demonstrates a level of satisfaction with their

---

responses. Apart from the short excerpt from Jerome regarding the apostles’ lack of trained eloquence, the passage remains entirely grounded in a literal interpretation of the events of the Bible, as Bede does not attempt to illuminate any moral, Christological or eschatological significances in this instance.

In his *In Lucae evangelium expositio*, Bede had previously used part of the same passage from *De consensu evangeliistarum* to comment on the parallel Lucan account (Lk. 5:2-11; specifically verse 11), thereby demonstrating a prolonged trust in the veracity of the Augustinian work. Yet Bede’s commentary on the episode as related by Luke goes beyond the excerpt from Augustine and reveals approaches that deviate from the largely historical bent used in his comment on Mk. 1:16-17. In some respects, this varied tendency might be related to the opportunities afforded by the lengthier and more literary Lucan account. Bede provides the following elucidation on Lk. 5:2:

Et uidit duas naues stantes secus stagnum. Duae naues secus stagnum positae circumcisionem et praeputium figurant. Quas bene Iesus uidisse perhibetur quia in utroque populo nouit dominus qui sunt eius eorumque cor a fluctibus saeculi huius ad futurae uitae tranquillitatem quasi ad soliditatem litoris uidendo, hoc est misericorditer uisitando, prouehit.  

119

And he saw two boats standing by the lake. The two boats positioned by the lake represent circumcision and foreskin. It is presented appropriately that Jesus had seen them [i.e. the two boats], for among both peoples [i.e. Jews and Gentiles] the Lord knew who were his [2 Tim. 2:19]; and he conveys their heart from the tides of this world to the tranquility of the future life as if to the firmness of the shore by his looking, that is by visiting [them] mercifully.

Here, Bede views the two boats as figural representations of the Jewish and Gentile communities to whom Christ and his “fishers of men” would preach the new faith. Though Luke does not explicitly mention Andrew in this instance, we can tell from Bede’s commentary on Mark and his use of Augustine’s harmonizing treatise on the gospels, that the exegete assumed his


119 Bede, *In Luc.*, Bk. II, Ch. 5, p. 113, ll. 540-45.

120 This and other related passages from Bede’s commentary on Luke are discussed above, pp. 81-2.
presence. Consequently, as one of the fishermen called to Christ in this scene, Andrew (as well as Peter, James the Greater and John) helps represent the universal nature of the Christian church and the apostolic mission.

Andrew as Fisherman and Hunter

Bede’s spiritual interpretation of Peter and Andrew’s call to Christ while fishing extends beyond just allegorical readings of the apostles and their boats as representatives of the universality of the church. Elsewhere, in his commentaries on the Old Testament, Bede also draws typological parallels between the apostles and certain Old Testament figures, thereby accentuating the unity of faith underlying the Old and New Testaments that biblical exegetes had so long worked to express. In his exposition on Genesis 10:10, Bede identifies Nemrod as the founder of Babylon and discusses the ruler in terms of the etymological derivation of his name, meaning “tyrant” or “devil.”121 He then explains how the apostolic fishermen of the New Testament stand as typological opposites to the figure of Nemrod:

… cui persona quoque uenatoris non imerito aptatur. Ponit namque in silua huius mundi suarum pedicas insidiarum atque homines sua natura et ingenio mundos quasi ceruos et capreas decipiendos uenatur ad mortem—contrarius nimirum illis uenatoribus, qui animas hominum ob id sua docetna capere quaerunt, ut ad uitam pertrahant aeternam. Quibus Dominus loquitur, Venite, inquiens, post me, et faciam nos fieri piscatores hominum. Quorum ob id patria Bethsaidea, id est “domus uenatorum,” dicta est, quoniam homines erant uenaturi ad uitam.122

The character of a hunter deservedly fits him [i.e. Nemrod] as well. For he places the snares of his deceits in the forest of this world, and by deception he hunts to the death men who, like stags and roes, are innocent of his nature and cleverness—the opposite indeed of those hunters, who seek with their teaching to seize the souls of men to lure them to eternal life. To these the Lord speaks, saying, Come after me, and I will make you to be fishers of men. For this reason, their home was called Bethsaida, that is, the house of hunters, since these men were going to hunt for life.123

122 Bede, In Gen., p. 146, ll. 141-50.
Here we find Bede the linguist at work again, borrowing another etymology from Jerome, this time for the place-name Bethsaida: *Bethsaida, domus frugum, uel domus uenatorum* (“Bethsaida, [meaning] ‘house of crops,’ or ‘house of hunters’”).

Though neither Andrew nor the other apostles are given overt mention here, the identification of Bethsaida clearly implies Andrew, Peter and Philip, who are referred to in Jn. 1:44 as coming from that town.

The preceding biblical passage in Gen. 10:9 establishes Nimrod’s identity as a hunter, stating: *et erat robustus venator coram Domino ab hoc exivit proverbium quasi Nemrod robustus venator coram Domino* (“And he was a stout hunter before the Lord, from which came the proverb: Even as Nimrod, the stout hunter before the Lord”). Bede, of course, casts the tyrant Nimrod in highly negative terms, drawing upon the common trope of the devil as a hunter of souls who lures the innocent into the snares of eternal death via his cunning and trickery. The exegete then uses Andrew, Peter and Philip’s origin in the “house of hunters” to establish a New Testament counterpoint to this Old Testament villain, thereby highlighting a typological parallel that ties together the two traditions.

Andrew and Peter’s identity as fishermen can be seen as an extension of their role as “hunters.” These fishing apostles, however, are hunters for good, collecting the souls of men...

---

124 Jerome’s etymology appears in at least four of the works attributed to him. It first appears as cited here in his *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominorum*. Cf. Jer. *Hebr. nom.*, p. 135, ll. 21-22; *PL* 23, col. 839. The etymology also appears in 1) *Commentarii in Ezechielem*, p. 28, ll. 496 ff. 2) *Tractatus in Marci evangelium*: *bethsaida interpretatur domus uenatorum: de ista enim domo missi sunt in totum orbem uenatores et piscatores* (“Bethsaida is interpreted ‘house of hunters: from that house, therefore, hunters and fishers were sent through the whole world’”); 3) *Commentarii in evangelium Matthaei*: *Unde et viculus Petri et Andreae hoc appellatur vocabulo: Bethsaida enim in lingua nostra interpretatur, domus venatorum* (“Whence the village of Peter and Andrew is named by this word: For Bethsaida in our tongue is interpreted ‘house of hunters’”); *PL* 25, col. 275D.


126 The association with fishermen and hunters as the servants of God belongs to a long-standing tradition that can be traced back to the Old Testament. Jer. 16:16 relates: *ecce ego mittam piscatores multos dicit Dominus et piscabuntur eos et post haec mittam eis multis venatores et venabuntur eos de omni monte et de omni colle et de cavernis petrarum* (“Behold, I shall send many fishers, says the Lord, and they shall fish them; and after this I shall send to them many hunters and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and from the caverns of the rocks”). Cf. also Jer., *In Ezech.*, p. 28, ll. 496.
into the nets of eternal life via their holy teachings rather than through any base snares like Nemrod. Though Bede does not specifically mention Andrew’s virility in this instance, it is plausible to suppose that the apostle’s inherent “manliness” may have been considered by the exegete to be an apt attribute for one of Christ’s “hunters” for life.

By extension, the apostles would come to represent all preachers of the true faith. Bede later reaffirms this image of Christian teachers as hunters in his commentary on Ezra 3:7:

\[
\text{Vnde bene Sidonii uenatores Tyrii coangustiati interpretantur ; uenatores quippe sunt sancti praedicatores cum uagos atque erraticos malorum sensus retibus fidei Christo subiciendos capiunt ipso dicente : Venite post me, et faciam uos fieri piscatores hominum ; idem sunt et coangustiati quia presuram habent in mundo tametsi confidentes quia dominus uicerit mundum.}\]

127

Hence it is well that the name Sidonians is said to mean ‘hunters’ and Tyrians ‘hemmed in.’ For holy preachers are indeed hunters when they constrain the wayward and erring minds of the wicked with the nets of faith in order to subject them to Christ, as he himself says: \textit{Come, follow me, and I will make you become fishers of men}; these preachers are also ‘hemmed in’ because in the world they have tribulation, even though they remain confident that the Lord has overcome the world.128

Though the passage deals more broadly with Christian preaching, it is noteworthy that Bede again draws the connection between the fishing apostles and the act of hunting. Also interesting is the concept of preachers “hemming in” the devout in a manner typologically antithetical to the Old Testament Tyrians. Whereas faith is often cast in liberating terms, here Christian teaching is seen to seize with nets the “wayward and erring” feelings of evil men in order to subjugate them to faith in Christ. Bede also expounds upon the idea that those leading the religious life are themselves \textit{coangustiati}, hemmed in by the tribulations that accompany devout living. Thus, it is tempting to ponder whether Bede himself, a monk who admittedly never strayed far from his religious house at Wearmouth-Jarrow, might have had cause to identify with those \textit{coangustiati}

---


as he remained in the monastery weaving the nets of Christian learning through his exegetical commentaries.

Later in his commentary *In Ezram et Neemiam*, the venerable exegete once again brings the *piscatores hominum* of Mt. 4:19 to bear, this time expounding upon the *Porta Piscium* or “Fish Gate” erected by the sons of Hassenaah in Neh. 3:3:

Typice autem sicut grex domini fideles sic etiam pisces solent appellari, unde sicut et Petro ait, *Pascce oues meas*, ita etiam eidem cum Andrea et ceteris apostolis promittit dicens, *Veni post me, et faciam us fieri piscatores hominum*, de quibus item piscatoribus per parabolum dicit, *Elegerunt bonos pisces in uasa malos autem foras miserunt*. Porta ergo piscium aedificatur in Hierusalem cum illi gradus ordinantur in ecclesia per quos electi a reprobis quasi boni pisces a malis segregati ad consortium perpetuae pacis inferantur, porta piscium aedificatur cum illis uirtutum operibus fideles seruiunt quibus intuentes se proximos a fluctibus perturbationis et concupiscientiae mundialis ereptos ad tranquillitatem ac pacem vitae spiritualis introducunt.  

Typologically, however, just as a flock stands for the Lord’s faithful, so in the same way are they frequently called ‘fish’. Hence, just as he says to Peter, *Feed my sheep*, [Jn. 21:17] so too he promises Peter together with Andrew and the rest of the apostles: *Come, follow me, and I will make you become fishers of men*. [Mt. 4:19] In a parable he likewise says about these same fisherman, *They collected the good fish in baskets, but threw the bad away*. [Mt. 13:48] Therefore, the Fish Gate is built in Jerusalem when those orders are established in the Church through which the elect, separated from the reprobate like good fish from the bad, may be brought into the fellowship of perpetual peace; and the Fish Gate is built when the faithful devote themselves to those works of the virtues by which they may rescue their neighbours, who observe them, from the waves of worldly agitation and desire and introduce them to the tranquility and peace of the spiritual life.  

Here, Andrew earns explicit mention from Bede, though once again he is paired with his brother Peter and the other apostles. The apostles’ occupation as fishermen and Christ’s promise to make Andrew and Peter into “fishers of men” establishes an anagogical relationship between a certain gate in Jerusalem, i.e., the *Porta Piscium*, and the Christian missionaries. Whereas Bede’s previous employment of the fisher apostles yielded negative typologies in which Andrew and Peter stood in contrast to Nemrod, the Simonians, and the Tyrians, this comment offers a reading built on a more positive correlation. Bede shows how the “Fish Gate” and the Christian mission both function in similar capacities, protecting the faithful “fish” within and cordonin

---


Thus, all who seek salvation must first strive to enter the Fish Gate, i.e., the Catholic Church, and live in the tranquility and peace of a spiritual life.

Because the exegetical materials related to Andrew often discuss him in relation to other apostles such as Peter or fail to make explicit mention of him at all, it is easy to lose sight of the apostle amid all the commentary and analysis. A survey of Andrew as he appears in Bede’s commentaries allows us to see the venerable scholar exercising nearly all of skills as an exegete. There is, of course, Bede the linguist, who borrows largely from Jerome in order to define this apostle as the embodiment of “manliness” and a “hunter” for Christ. For Bede, Andrew’s virility was key in allowing the apostle to leave his nets and follow Jesus. As a moral commentator, Bede hints at the tropological significance that Andrew’s strength has for all Christians who must courageously struggle in order to achieve salvation. Andrew’s characterization as a fisher or hunter also allowed Bede to establish typologies between the apostle and Old Testament figures such as Nemrod, the Simonians, and the Tyrians, thereby revealing how hunters for Christ strove to save the faithful in opposition to the devil’s hunters who sought to ensnare the unsuspecting through sin. In like manner, Andrew and his fellow fisher apostles can be equated with the Porta Piscium in Jerusalem’s City of David, interpreted as a symbol of the church’s ability to sift out the wicked and protect the faithful. Elsewhere, Peter and Andrew’s boats come to represent the two peoples touched by Christ’s teachings—both Jews and Gentiles—thus denoting the universality of the apostolic mission. Behind all of these figural interpretations of Andrew’s place in the Bible, however, lies Bede’s more literal exposition, best exemplified by his commentary on Mark and his use of Augustine to establish the harmony of the gospels with regards to Peter and Andrew’s call to follow Christ. Bede, of course, did not necessarily think in
strict terms of a four-fold exegetical method and rarely applied all modes at once. Still, he finds the opportunity here and there to bring all of these methods to bear on Andrew, thereby gifting the Anglo-Saxon scholar’s inheritors, both exegetical and literary, a variety of ways to look at and interpret this popular apostle.

131 Scott DeGregorio argues: “But nowhere in his own interpretive practice did Bede rigidly or consistently apply this fourfold scheme. He could speak just as contentedly of three or two senses, and indeed it is the basic twofold distinction between a literal/historical meaning on the one hand and some kind of spiritual meaning on the other—variously termed ‘allegorical,’ figurative,’ ‘mystical’ or ‘hidden’—that informs the hermeneutical procedure most often followed in his Old Testament commentaries.” S. DeGregorio, “Bede and the Old Testament,” in The Cambridge Companion to Bede, ed. Scott DeGregorio (Cambridge,UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 133.
3. St. Andrew in the Calendrical, Martyrological, Liturgical and Devotional Evidence

Due to the universality of the original twelve Apostles cults and their prominent place within the veneration of the Western church as defined by Roman practice, it comes as little surprise that St. Andrew’s celebration on November 30 is consistently acknowledged throughout the calendrical and liturgical evidence surviving from Anglo-Saxon England. The exact origin for the appointment of the feast of St. Andrew to this specific date, however, remains obscure.

Among the earliest evidence for the dating of the feast of St. Andrew is a fragmentary Gothic calendar attributed to the fourth-century missionary Ulfilas (c. 311 – c. 383, made missionary bishop to the western Goths c. 341), where the entry *andriïns apaustaulus* appears towards the end of November.\(^1\) The oldest extant Roman calendar, the so-called *Depositio martyrum* (c. 354), fails to list Andrew among its martyred saints.\(^2\) In fact, the brief *Depositio martyrum* declines to mark the feast-days for any of the twelve Apostles save Peter and Paul on June 29.

Of similar antiquity is the “Syriac Breviary” (alternatively known as the “Calendar of Antioch”), which was originally compiled in Greek between 362 and 381, but survives only in a Syriac synopsis dating to c. 411.\(^3\) The synopsis begins with the feast of St. Stephen on December 26 and abruptly stops at November 24, thus rendering it unclear as to whether the basic outline of

---

\(^1\) PL 18, col. 880. Several scholars have interpreted the entry as representing November 30. Cf. P. M. Peterson, *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter: His History and Legends*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 10; E. Rose, ed., *Missale Gothicum: e codice Vaticano Reginensi Latino 317 editum*, CCSL 159D (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), p. 263. Caution should be maintained, however, as the manuscript presents a letter (the thirtieth in the table for November) below the line for Andrew’s feast. Consequently, the Ulfilas calendar may demonstrate that the celebration was thought to be held on November 29 instead.


the calendar has been preserved in its entirety.\textsuperscript{4} Because Andrew’s celebration falls within the gap in dates, it is impossible to determine whether the Apostle’s feast was included in the Greek original.

The first conclusive evidence for November 30 as the date for the feast of St. Andrew appears in the highly influential \textit{Martyrologium Hieronymian}. This martyrology appears to have been of Greek origin and was translated into Latin by a northern Italian monk sometime in the first half of the fifth century, when it was falsely attributed to Jerome as a means of increasing its prestige.\textsuperscript{5} Under the auspices of its Hieronymian authority, the Ps.-Jerome martyrology found widespread dissemination throughout the medieval West and became the source for numerous subsequent local martyrologies and calendars.\textsuperscript{6} According to Migne’s text, the \textit{Martyrologium Hieronymian} includes celebrations for all the apostles except Matthias. Andrew’s passion is twice recorded with both entries pointing to November 30 for the feast-day. The first note appears toward the beginning of the martyrology where the original apostles are treated as a group and their individual feasts are marked. The text reads: \textit{II kal. Decembris. Natalis Andreae apostoli in civitate Patras provinciae Achaiae} (‘2nd kalends of December [i.e. Nov. 30], the death

\footnote{\textsuperscript{4} Lietzmann (1903), p. 16.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{5} R. Bryan, “Martyrology of St. Jerome,” in \textit{New Catholic Encyclopedia}, 2nd ed., vol. 9 (Detroit: Gale, 2003), pp. 234-5. Bryan vaguely dates the \textit{Martyrologium Hieronymian} as “early fifth century,” as opposed to Le Brun’s more specific assertion of “middle of the 5th century (c. 431).” Cf. Le Brun, “Martyrologies,” in \textit{New Catholic Encyclopedia}, 2nd ed., vol. 9 (2003), p. 233. The initial Latin translation has been lost to time and the original contents must necessarily be reconstructed based upon the earliest surviving manuscripts (eighth century) which all stem from a Gallican revision made in the late sixth or early seventh century.}

of the apostle Andrew in the city Patras of the province of Achaea’). The second entry appears in the appropriate place within the calendrical cycle and represents a reiteration of the previous note, reading: *Pridie kal. Decem. In Provincia Achaia, civitate. Patras, natalis S. Andreae apostoli et martyris* (‘The day preceding the kalends of December. In the province Achaea, in the city Patras, the death of the apostle and martyr St. Andrew’). Thus, while not a liturgical document *per se*, the Ps.-Jerome martyrology does bear witness to one of the earliest instances in which the celebration of St. Andrew, as identified within the context of liturgical feasts, is connected with apocryphal traditions about his passion in Achaea, a connection that will be allotted more detailed analysis later in this chapter.

Even with the onset of the sixth century, however, there is not absolute uniformity in the acknowledgement of November 30 as the feast of St. Andrew. For instance, a manuscript preserved in the monastery at Cluny contains a copy of a calendar with associations to Carthage (compiled c. 505) and which marks Andrew’s celebration on November 29. This “Martyrology of Carthage” also includes the feast of Peter and Paul on June 29 as already attested in the *Depositio martyrum* and the *Martyrologium Hieronymian*, although, unlike the Ps.-Jerome martyrology, it remains silent on the other apostles. Such evidence may suggest that Andrew, along with Peter and Paul, was among the first of the Apostles to have his feast fixed within the Christian calendar, though the facts are admittedly circumstantial and may simply point to a

---

7 *PL* 30, col. 435D.

8 *PL* 30, col. 484A. In addition to marking the feast of St. Andrew on November 30, Ps.-Jerome also denotes the saint’s consecration as bishop of Patras on February 5 (*Non. Febr.*), the translation of certain relics of Andrew, Luke and John the Evangelist to the Italian city of Aquileia on September 3 (*III non. Sept. ... In Aquileia, ingressio reliquiarum sanctorum Andreae apostoli, Lucae, Joannis evangelistarum*), and the dedication of a basilica to St. Andrew on November 3 (*III non. Novemb. Dedicatio basilicae sancti Andreae Apostoli*). Cf. *PL* 30, col. 442B, 474A, 481A respectively. As we are dealing with Migne’s rather uncritical text, it is unclear which of these entries were original to the Latin translation of the fifth-century and which represent later accretions by the time of the earliest manuscripts in the eighth century.

9 Lietzmann (1903), pp. 5-8; Andrew’s entry appears on p. 7.
particular local veneration for the saint. Because apocryphal traditions about Andrew’s passion had already begun to crystalize as early the mid-second century, it remains plausible that a late November date was associated with the Apostle some decades or even centuries before the mid-fourth-century date permitted by the *Ulfius Calendar* and the posited Greek *Vorlage* of the *Martyrologium Hieronymian*. Regardless of the exact date, however, the feast of St. Andrew had been uniformly fixed on November 30 throughout Christendom by the end of the fifth century and, therefore, before either the Irish or Roman missionaries began their conversion of Anglo-Saxon England. Consequently, when figures such as Augustine of Canterbury and Wilfrid of York helped to popularize the cult of Andrew in early Anglo-Saxon Britain, they had already inherited a fixed feast for St. Andrew based upon established continental precedents, not the least among which was the ever growing *sanctorale* espoused by Rome.

**Andrew in the Anglo-Saxon Calendars**

As is the case with so much of the material from the Anglo-Saxon period related to liturgical and devotional practice, the calendrical evidence tends to be rather late. Of the twenty liturgical calendars written in prose before the year 1100 listed in Francis Wormald’s edition (he excludes metrical and “historical” calendars), only one of these (Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Digby MS 63, ninth century) can be dated before the tenth century, though the editor highlights two others which similarly represent an “early type of English kalendar” but survive only in tenth or

---


eleventh century manuscripts (Salisbury Cathedral Lib., MS 150 and London, BM, Cotton Nero A. ii). Despite widely disparate geographic provenances and dates of composition ranging between the ninth and eleventh centuries, every single one of Wormald’s calendars list November 30 as commemorating the passion of Andrew the Apostle. Moreover, Andrew’s passion is often given special indication within the manuscripts as a major feast, perhaps even a solemnity (the highest ranking of liturgical days according the Roman Rite), to be celebrated by a fast or extended offices. Two of the three calendars established by Wormald as representing an “early type,” Digby MS 63 and Salisbury Cathedral MS 150 (Cotton Nero A. ii is the exception), mark November 30 with a cross to denote the special level of devotion assigned to the feast, perhaps even that of a solemnity, the highest ranking of liturgical days according to the Roman Rite. This same cross appears next to the feast–days of the other original apostles as well as major celebrations such as the Circumcision of the Lord, Epiphany, the Annunciation to Mary, the Invention of the Cross, All Saints Day, Christmas, and the feasts of popular saints such as Pope Gregory I, Augustine of Canterbury, Benedict of Nursia, and Pope Lawrence. Such reverential treatment demonstrates that worship of Andrew and his apostolic brethren were, in some ways and at an early stage, on par with the most important celebrations of the Anglo-Saxon calendar. Wilfrid of York would doubtless have been pleased that his own feast was marked in Digby MS 63 (the calendar is of appropriately northern provenance) with a like cross, elevating him to a status akin to his beloved Andrew.13

Furthermore, all three of the “early type” calendars, Cotton Nero A. ii included, recognize a vigil on the eve of St. Andrew’s, i.e., November 29. Andrew was not alone among the apostles, however, in receiving a vigil office. The “early type” calendars also unanimously

13 Wormald (1934), pp. 1, 5.
acknowledge vigils on June 28 in anticipation of the feast of Peter and Paul (June 29) and on October 27 before the feast of Simon and Jude (October 28). The calendars in Salisbury Cathedral MS 150 and Cotton Nero A. ii further exhibit the high degree of reverence felt for Andrew by indicating a celebration for the octave of the Apostle’s feast (December 7), an honor that is only shared with Peter and Paul among the rest of the circle of Twelve.14

Following the example established by this “early type,” subsequent stages in the Anglo-Saxon calendrical tradition would remain relatively uniform in recognizing a vigil, feast and octave for Andrew, though they vary somewhat in the level of devotion accorded each celebration. Representing calendrical usage in the Glastonbury community, the tenth century calendar contained within the “Leofric Missal” (Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Bodl. MS. 579) and the related calendar found in the “Bosworth Psalter” (London, BM, Additional MS 37517) both make note of a vigil office for the saint and mark the feast of Andrew with an “F” to indicate the special status of the feast.15 The “F” may indicate a solemnity as with the cross in the “early type” calendars, a fact that is supported by the Leofric and Bosworth calendars also emphasizing Epiphany, the Annunciation, Mary’s Assumption, Christmas as well as the feasts of the other apostles and important saints with the same mark.16 These manuscripts, however, go a step beyond the “early type” calendars by marking the octave of Andrew’s feast (December 7) with

14 All three of the “early type” calendars mark the octave of the feast of Peter and Paul on July 6 as well as the octave for the feast of St. Lawrence (August 10) on August 17. Salisbury Cath. MS 150 and BM Cotton Nero A. ii additionally recognize the octave of Epiphany, whereas the Digby and Salisbury manuscripts mutually indicate the octave of St. Agnes.

15 Wormald (1934), p. vi. Though the calendar contained within the “Bosworth Psalter” is related to that found in the “Leofric Missal” and represents to some extent Glastonbury usage, it should be noted that the “Bosworth Psalter” was in use at St. Augustine’s in Canterbury and represents the interdependence and complexities of provenance that the various calendars and liturgical practices of Anglo-Saxon England are subject to when viewed with appropriate academic scrutiny.

the addition of an “S,” denoting that the octave was awarded the status of a second-class feast.\textsuperscript{17}

Given the already crowded nature of the liturgical calendar in December with the celebrations leading up to Christ’s nativity, recognition of Andrew’s octave with even a second-class feast would represent no small honor. Though not universally the case, several of the calendars associated with Winchester or influenced by Winchester practice reveal a comparable respect for the feast of St. Andrew and its octave. For instance, the Winchester calendar contained within London, BM Arundel MS 60 highlights the importance of Andrew’s feast with a capital script colored in blue ink,\textsuperscript{18} while calendars in London, BM Cotton MS Vitellius E. xviii (c. 1060 and associated with both Old and New Minster, Winchester)\textsuperscript{19} and London, BM Arundel MS 155 (first quarter of the eleventh century and associated with Christ Church Canterbury, but demonstrating Winchester influence)\textsuperscript{20} both mark the octave for special reverence with a cross.\textsuperscript{21}

As a result, Andrew emerges as the only Apostle besides Peter and Paul to be consistently honored with a vigil office, major feast-day (often marked by a solemnity), and octave

\textsuperscript{17} Wormald (1934), pp. 55, 69. The “S” is used frequently to mark the status of numerous lesser saints and martyrs, but denied many whose feasts were of only limited importance to the Anglo-Saxon Church. Also of note is another manuscript belonging to this “Leofric” or Glastonbury circle, the late eleventh century Cambridge, University Library MS Kk. v. 32, where a cross was added next to the feast of St. Andrew but was then subsequently erased. Cf. Wormald (1934), p. 82. The fourth calendar which Wormald assigns to this family, that found in London, BM Cotton MS Vitellius A. xii, makes no explicit mark to denote the importance of the feast of Andrew or its octave celebration. Cf. Wormald (1934), pp. vi, 96-97. One other calendar found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 422 is of Sherborne provenance, but demonstrates the influence of the “Leofric group” and Winchester calendars. It too marks the feast of St. Andrew with an “F,” but does not give any overt acknowledgment of the added importance associated with the octave. Cf. Wormald (1934), pp. 194-95.

\textsuperscript{18} Wormald (1934), p. 152. London, BM Arundel MS 60 likewise uses blue capital script for the Circumcision of the Lord, the Feast of Peter and Paul, the Nativity of Mary, the Feast of Simon and Jude, All Saints Day, the Feast of Saint Nicholas, Christmas, and the Feast of John the Evangelist. Eleventh century calendars from Bury St. Edmunds in Suffolk (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Reginensis Lat. 12) and Croyland in Lincolnshire (Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Douce MS 296) similarly delineate the feast of St. Andrew with capital script colored in gold and blue respectively. Cf. Wormald (1934), pp. 250, 264.

\textsuperscript{19} Wormald (1934), pp. vi, 155.

\textsuperscript{20} Wormald (1934), pp. vi, 169.

\textsuperscript{21} Wormald (1934), pp. 167, 181.
celebration (sometimes given additional status beyond regular feasts) in the religious communities throughout Anglo-Saxon England. Such broad uniformity speaks to his cult’s peculiar and universal popularity within the early English church and doubtlessly reflects the influence of continental (Roman and/or Gallican) models of veneration.22

Andrew in the Anglo-Saxon Martyrological Tradition

Complementary in function to those calendars appended to liturgical documents is, of course, the martyrology. Much like the calendars, the martyrology sets out to catalogue the feast-days of the saints in the order that their celebrations occur within the liturgical year, but often transcends the scope of the more terse calendars by providing additional information regarding the circumstances of a martyr’s passion and sometimes the final resting place of the saint’s relics. By their very nature, therefore, martyrologies provide an interesting confluence

22 The exact emergence of Andrew’s threefold celebration including specific masses or offices for the vigil, feast and octave is difficult to determine with any precision and will be the subject of a future study by the author. An initial survey of several early sacramentaries surviving from the continent demonstrates that the liturgical veneration of the saint grew in prominence at a time roughly contemporaneous with the early expansion of the Anglo-Saxon Church within Britain. The so-called “Leonine Sacramentary,” more appropriately referred to as the Sacramentarium Veronense due to its unique preservation in an early seventh-century manuscript produced in Verona (Verona, Bibl. capitolare, cod. 85), represents a rather haphazard compilation of libelli missarum (small liturgical books providing the variable material for the celebrant necessary for the celebration of the mass on various feast-days) that were in use in Rome from at least the mid-sixth century onwards. This earliest witness to mass liturgy in Rome (scholarly consensus maintains that the collection is, in part, reflective of earlier papal usage, though the esoteric and personal nature of the collection makes it likely that it was compiled for use by Roman presbyters) provides four different formularies for the feast of St. Andrew, but does not include any such material for the vigil or octave. Cf. C. L. Feltoe, ed., Sacramentarium Leonianum (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1896), pp. 156-59. Positive evidence for the recognition of all three celebrations comes in the mid-seventh century with the Old Gelasian sacramentary (uniquely represented by a mid-eighth century Frankish recension of a Roman liturgical book: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Reginensis Latinus 316, fol. 3-245 with its conclusion preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Codex latinus 7193, fol. 41-56), though due to the Frankish stage in transmission, it remains unclear whether the appearance of the vigil, feast and octave represents original Roman practice or Gallican influence. Cf. L. C. Mohlberg, ed., Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316/Paris bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56) (Sacramentarium Gelasium), Rerum Ecclesiaticarum documenta. Series maior. Fontes 4 (Rome: Herder, 1968), pp. 164-65. Subsequently, “New” or “Eighth Century Gelasian” sacramentaries would continue to recognize all three celebrations for Andrew. Cf. A. Dumas, ed., Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis, vol. 1, CCSL 159 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), pp. 215-17, 221; O. Heiming, ed., Liber sacramentorum Augustodunensis, CCSL 159B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1984), pp. 123-24, 128; Patrick Saint-Roch, ed., Liber sacramentorum Engolismensis: Manuscrit B.N. Lat. 816, Le sacramentaire gélasien d'Angoulême, CCSL 159C (Turnhout: Brepols, 1987), pp. 224-26, 230-31.
between the orthodox commemoration of feast-days and those apocryphal traditions which became attached to certain saints, gradually acquiring an authority of their own via their association with the assigned liturgical celebration. That said, the martyrology should not be considered as serving precisely the same “liturgical” role that was fulfilled by the calendar. Whereas both types of documents outline the course of the *sanctorale* and could be used to mark feast-days, the calendar, as evidenced in the previous section, was also used by individual religious houses to determine which saints should be celebrated and the degree of veneration to be afforded a given feast. The martyrology, on the other hand, served as more of a source-book in preserving information about the saints necessary for informed preaching about a particular life.23 The generic distinctions between calendar and martyrology are sometimes blurred, but remain generally useful upon considering the manuscript context and customary utility of a given work.

A good example of a calendrical-martyrological hybrid from Anglo-Saxon England is a metrical calendar composed in Latin during the tenth century. Sometimes referred to as “Æthelstan’s Kalendar” due to its inclusion in a psalter purportedly owned by the king (the name

---

23 The precise usage of martyrologies remains a topic of some debate. In his introductory volume to his edition of the Old English *Martyrology*, Kotzor demonstrates how Gregory the Great writes in a letter to the patriarch of Alexandria about how he has *collecta in uno codica nomina* (‘a collection of names in one codex’) in order to mark the passions of *omnium martyrum* for the individual days of the year (*per dies singulos*). That Gregory’s book was more than a simple calendar is revealed by his comment that the book not only contained the name but also the *locus et dies passionis* (‘the location and day of the passion’), such that he could appropriately preach about the martyr. Kotzor also relates how the eighth century Gaulish *Ordo XVII* (detailing the mass for a Frankish monastery) describes the deacon lifting a chalice and reading aloud the *natalicia sanctorum* for the day according to a martyrology (*secundum martirilogium*). Furthermore, Kotzor points to Canon 13 from the Synod of Cloveshoe (747) as offering evidence for the English practice of reading from a martyrology of the Roman church (*juxta martyrologium ejusdem Romanae Ecclesiae*) during mass. Whether or not these latter two examples were “martyrologies” in the truest sense of the word is unclear and they may represent mere calendars or some form of recorded litany. Cf. G. Kotzor, *Das altenglische Martyrologium*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Abhandlungen, n.F., Heft 88 (München: Beck, 1981), I, pp. 233-35. Kotzor cites de Gaiffier for further continental evidence for the necessity of a martyrology in the celebration of mass. Cf. B. de Gaiffier, “De l’usage et de le lecture du martyrologe: Témoignages antérieurs au XIe siècle,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 79 (1961), pp. 40-59. The question remains as to whether the “narrative” martyrologies and their relatively short summations of a saint’s life were used as the readings in the mass and divine office for a given feast, or whether longer homilies and sermons were needed. For further discussion on the use of martyrologies in monastic and cathedral settings, cf. Kotzor (1983), I, pp. 235-41.
Æthelstan can still be read beneath the illumination on the frontispiece), its entry for Andrew reads: *II Kal. Dec. Andreas patitur pridias in Aehia sanctus* (‘2\textsuperscript{nd} calends of December, the holy Andrew suffers in Achaea on the day prior [to the kalends of December]’). Because the Æthelstan Kalendar retains a tabular format helpful in calculating feast-days and is appended to a psalter, its use as an aid for liturgical reckoning or private devotion seems likely, hence its general classification as a calendar. Despite these calendrical characteristics, however, the inclusion of apocryphal details similar to those found in the *Martyrologium Hieronymian* lends the work a distinct martyrological flavor as well. Even with this degree of detail, the entries within the metrical calendar remain too brief to warrant separate recitation during the individual saints’ respective feasts. More likely is that the Æthelstan Kalendar was intended to be read in full as a cohesive work of poetry, perhaps providing a contemplative verse adaptation of the calendar that could aid the audience in memorizing a portion of the *sanctorale*. Significant here is how the metrical calendar, like standard prose martyrologies, bridges the gap between the reckoning of Andrew’s liturgical feast and the hagiographical elements drawn from apocryphal traditions about his passion in Achaea.

With regard to its martyrological character, the tenth-century Æthelstan Kalendar actually belongs to a wider tradition of metrical martyrologies circulating in the Christian West during the early Middle Ages.\footnote{25 Among the metrical martyrologies circulating in the Christian West during the Anglo-Saxon period were the anonymous *Martyrologium Poeticum*, a Latin verse martyrlogy attributed to Wandalbert of Prüm (ninth century),} Most significant of the Latin verse martyrologies for the Anglo-Saxon

period is the so-called *Martyrologium Poeticum*.\(^{26}\) Once falsely attributed to Bede himself, the *Martyrologium Poeticum* mentions the death of Wilfrid II of York (†744/745) and must necessarily postdate Bede (†735), though such an entry betrays the work’s possible eighth century Anglo-Saxon, or even Northumbrian, provenance.\(^{27}\) Andrew, however, is accorded only one line in the poem, which supplies no more information than the date of his passion and feast: 

\textit{Andreas pridies juste veneratur ab orbe} (‘On the day before [the kalends of December] Andrew is rightly venerated by the world’).\(^{28}\)

Verse martyrologies of this sort seem to have been popular in Anglo-Saxon England and even exerted influence upon vernacular traditions. The Anglo-Saxon poetic corpus preserves one such martyrology composed in Old English verse known simply as the *Menologium*. Likely composed in the latter half of the tenth century,\(^{29}\) the Old English *Menologium* survives uniquely in BL Cotton Tiberius B. i, fol. 112r-114v, where it follows a complete text of the Old English

---


\(^{27}\) Also of note is the fact that, while Bede lists a martyrology among the list of his works included in the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (to be identified with his prose martyrology), no mention is made of a specifically verse martyrology. *HE* V.24, p. 570. For the entry on Wilfrid II (feast-day April 29), cf. *PL* 94, col. 604A. Other Anglo-Saxon saints included in the martyrology and pointing toward either a Northumbrian provenance or influence include Cuthbert (March 20), Ecgbert of Ripon (April 24), and Wilfrid I of York (here April 24, though his feast is elsewhere marked as October 12). While Wilfrid II’s death provides a \textit{terminus post quem} for the poem, no firm \textit{terminus ante quem} has been established and the work may indeed have been composed sometime in the mid to late eighth century.

\(^{28}\) *PL* 94, col. 606A.

Orosius and precedes the C-Text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.\textsuperscript{30} Given its context among these “historical” works, the intention behind the poem’s inclusion here seems to be an attempt to bolster the more Christian aspect of the manuscript’s overarching “historical” narrative, and its emphasis on accurately reckoning feast-days may represent some tangential relationship to the Chronicle’s preoccupation with chronology and an understanding of Christian time.\textsuperscript{31} Also, like the metrical calendars and the Martyrologium Poeticum, the Old English Menologium may have served as a useful tool in helping its audience to internalize the principal celebrations found within the sanctorale. There is apparently no known direct source for the poem. Because the included saints are so universally revered and the details of their passions remain rather vague, the author of the Old English Menologium could have drawn upon any number of calendars, martyrologies, passion narratives or a combination thereof for inspiration.\textsuperscript{32} Like the Martyrologium Poeticum, the Old English Menologium offers little in the way of apocryphal detail other than to confirm that Andrew indeed suffered a passion:

\begin{align*}
\text{And þæs embe seofon niht,} & \quad \text{sigedrihtne leof,} \\
\text{æþele Andreas} & \quad \text{up on roderum} \\
\text{his gast ageaf} & \quad \text{on godes wære,} \\
\text{fus on forðweg.} & \quad \text{fus on forðweg.}\textsuperscript{33}
\end{align*}

And seven nights after that [i.e. the feast of St. Clement], dear to the victory-lord, the noble Andrew gave his soul into the keeping of God in the heavens above, desirous for the journey hence.

Students of Old English poetry will doubtlessly take note of the martial tone so frequent among vernacular verse renderings of Christian tradition. In this passage Andrew is cast as the particularly loved individual of a sigedrihten “victory-lord,” thereby implying that the relationship between God and the Apostle is similar to that ideally found between a king and his

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. ASC-C, pp. 3-10.

\textsuperscript{31} Dobbie, ASPR 6 (1942), p. lx-lxi.

\textsuperscript{32} Dobbie, ASPR 6 (1942), p. lxii.

\textsuperscript{33} Dobbie, ASPR 6 (1942), p. 55, ll. 215-218a.
loyal retainer. As any great Anglo-Saxon hero in battle, the saint is eager to meet his death (fies on forðweg) in order to achieve victory. That triumph is attained here through the witness to the faith made by Andrew’s martyrdom—a key feature of the apostle’s office.\textsuperscript{34} The reference to Andrew giving up his spirit into the care of God may demonstrate some verbal resonances with apocryphal accounts in which he “sent forth” his soul (emisit spiritum) to the Lord,\textsuperscript{35} though the phrasing is common enough not to warrant direct literary borrowing. The fact remains that, outside the ambiguous reference to a passion and the saint’s “giving up the ghost,” the Old English \textit{Menologium} offers no specifics that can conclusively tie the poem’s entry for Andrew to any one surviving narrative or martyrlogical account.

Given the condensed nature of metrical martyrologies like the \textit{Martyrologium Poeticum} and the Old English \textit{Menologium}, one might conjecture that there was simply no room to incorporate further specifics derived from apocryphal sources. Certainly, apocryphal details could be considered secondary to the verse martyrology’s primary purpose of communicating the \textit{sanctorale} in a succinct and memorable fashion. A quick comparison with roughly contemporaneous verse martyrologies produced on the continent and Ireland, however, shows that other traditions were less hesitant to include particulars drawn from apocryphal legend. For example, the Benedictine monk Wandalbert of Prüm composed a somewhat lengthier Latin verse martyrology in mid-ninth century Francia, incorporating several apocryphal elements regarding Andrew’s mission in Achaea:

\begin{quote}
Andreas pridie praecellet apostolus amplis
Virtutum fulgens radiis titulisque per orbem,
Qui indomitos verbo signisque subegit Achaeos.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

On the day preceding [the kalends of December],
the apostle Andrew surpasses many throughout
the world, gleaming with the rays and honors of


\textsuperscript{35} Cf. below, p. 190.

While forgoing any explicit mention of crucifixion, Wandalbert makes vague reference to the preaching (perhaps the two days Andrew is said to have preached from the cross before he died) and miracles (\textit{verbo signisque}) which Andrew conducted in Patras. Furthermore, the monk of Prüm gives plain indication of the Achaean conversion achieved by the saint (\textit{indomitos ... subegit Achaeos}). While certainly a hagiographical commonplace, the rays which Andrew exudes (\textit{fulgens radiis}) may reference yet another apocryphal element, i.e, the celestial light which surrounded Andrew upon his death according to traditions derived from an apocryphal passion narrative known as the \textit{Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae}.\footnote{Cf. below, pp. 212 ff.} Oengus the Culdee is more overt in referencing Andrew’s crucifixion in his early ninth century vernacular Irish verse martyrology, stating:

\begin{flushleft}
  Andreas as dánú
  fri croich, cèim as úagu,
  dobeir barr, no bású,
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushright}
  Andrew who is boldest,
  against a cross — step most
  perfect, — puts a top, which I
  declare, on November’s hosts.\footnote{Stokes (1905), p. 237.}
\end{flushright}

Taking such comparative evidence under consideration, the poet’s choice to refrain from apocryphal mentions about Andrew in the Old English \textit{Menologium} is certainly a puzzling one. Though Wandalbert and Oengus clearly demonstrate that a certain balance could be achieved, the author of the \textit{Menologium} most likely felt that greater detail would have proven too cumbersome for a shorter poem and overshadowed the work’s primary focus on demarcating the feast-days themselves. Andrew is not alone in his treatment as the Old English \textit{Menologium}
gives very little detail, save for the occasional reference to the duration of suffering, about the passions of any of the apostles.

These later verse martyrologies emerged within the context of a much more extensive and well established prose martyrological tradition. We have already seen the apocryphal details about Andrew’s consecration as bishop and subsequent passion in Patras as related by the fifth-century *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*. The terse entries of the Ps.-Jerome martyrology would become greatly expanded by subsequent generations of Christian scholars, and the Anglo-Saxon contribution to this process would prove quite extensive. Taking the *Martyrologium Hieronymian* as his starting point, it was the venerable Bede who composed the first known “historical” or “narrative martyrology,” supplementing his laconic source with whatever material he had at his disposal on the saints. Bede describes his martyrology at the end of the *Historia ecclesiastica*:

*Martyrologium de nataliciis sanctorum martyrum diebus, in quo omnes, quos inuenire potui, non solum qua die uerum etiam quo genere certaminis uel sub quo iudice mundum Martyrologium de nataliciis sanctorum martyrum diebus, in quo omnes, quos inuenire potui, non solum qua die uerum etiam quo genere certaminis uel sub quo iudice mundum

40 Cf. above, p. 140 and note 6 on the same page. Though they cannot be discussed at length here, I would also draw attention to a Latinate prose tradition about the resting place of saints that circulated within the Insular sphere. Largely derived from information found in Jerome, subsequent scholars such as Isidore of Seville (*De ortu et obitu patrum*) and the derivative Hiberno-Latin Ps.-Isidore (*De ortu et obitu patriarcharum*) produced a couple of the most influential and widely consulted works on the subject. A distant descendant of this tradition may be found in Durham, Cathedral Library, A.IV.19, in which an addition to the original Durham Collectar provides a list of the resting places for all of the original Apostles ("Nomina locorum in quo apostoli requeiescunt") along with John the Baptist and Stephen in formulaic Latin prose with an interlinear Old English gloss. The entry for Andrew reads: *Beatus Andreas apostolus requiescit Patras, in provincia Achaia* ("The blessed Apostle Andrew rests in Patras, in the province of Achaia") with the Old English gloss *se eadg’ ap’ geresteð in ðær byrig on mægde achaia.* Cf. J. Stevenson, ed., *Rituale Ecclesie Dunelmensis, nune primum typis mandatum*, Surtees Society 10 (London: J. B. Nichols & Son, 1840), p. 196.

41 The terms “historical” or “narrative martyrology” refer to those martyrological compilations which include lengthier narrative entries about the passions of the saints as opposed to the terse passages offered by the *Martyrologium Hieronymian*, verse martyrologies or calendars with some additional material beyond the date of the feast. The term “historical martyrology” has fallen out of favor because there is very little “historical” information to be found in the historiographical and hagiographical entries. As a result, the term will henceforth be jettisoned in favor of “narrative martyrology.” For the inadequacy of the term “historical martyrology,” cf. Kotzor (1983), I, pp. 176-77.
The resulting fruit of his labor was a prose martyrrology that was, at times, markedly more expansive than Ps.-Jerome’s. In the century following his death, Bede’s *Martyrologium* was disseminated across the continent, where a successive line of martyrrologists including Hrabanus Maurus († 856), Florus of Lyon († c. 860), Ado of Vienne († c. 875), and Usuard of St. Germain († c. 875) continued to revise, redact or expand Bede’s text. Unfortunately, no exemplars offering an unmodified version of Bede’s original martyrrology have survived and scholars must study the interpolated texts of his martyrrological successors in order to discover the precise content advanced by the Northumbrian scholar. Thanks to the erudite efforts of Henri Quentin to extrapolate the various layers preserved within the early medieval martyrrologies, scholars today such as Jacque DuBois have been able to arrive at an approximation of Bede’s text. The reconstruction of Bede’s genuine entry for Andrew is rather underwhelming,

---

42 *HE* V.24, p. 570.

43 The translation is that of Colgrave and Mynors, *HE* V.24, p. 571.


50 Following Quentin’s analysis, Jacque DuBois has attempted an edition of Bede’s martyrrology along with those of an anonymous martyrrologist from Lyon and Florus of Lyon. Cf. DuBois (1976). Despite Quentin’s and DuBois’ best efforts, however, scholarship regarding Bede’s martyrrology has continued to be mired in confusion due in no
granting only a notice akin to a calendrical entry: Natale sancti apostoli.\textsuperscript{51} This is true of most of the original Bedan entries for the apostles, as only Peter and Paul (June 29) are given a lengthier narrative entry.\textsuperscript{52} The expansion of Andrew’s martyrlogical entry would have to wait for the work of subsequent martyrlogists seeking to develop Bede’s work further.\textsuperscript{53}

Andrew in the \textit{Old English Martyrology}

The tradition of narrative martyrlogies inaugurated by Bede and further developed on the continent would later circle back to Britain as models, if not direct sources, to influence one of the most impressive examples of hagiographical learning to be produced in the Old English vernacular—the \textit{Old English Martyrology} (hereafter \textit{OE Mart.}). As the first narrative martyrology to be preserved in a vernacular language, the \textit{OE Mart.} remains of great interest to


\textsuperscript{52} DuBois (1976), pp. 116-17.

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. below, pp. 159 ff.
historians of liturgical and hagiographical writings. The text survives only fragmentarily in six manuscripts (the earliest of which dates to the late ninth century), but the remnants reveal a remarkable accomplishment of some two hundred and thirty-eight narrative entries that appear to draw upon a wide range of hagiographical materials.

In his 1900 edition of the text, George Herzfeld first posited the view that the Old English Martyrology was likely a direct translation of a single Latin martyrology, but because no existing exemplar of a Latin compilation can be found to account for all the entries and details of the vernacular work, such a hypothesis has fallen into subsequent disfavor. On the opposite extreme, James E. Cross has advanced a hypothesis through a series of articles published throughout the 1970’s and 1980’s that the Old English Martyrology is an original compilation assembled by an extremely learned ninth-century scholar who himself conflated and abridged up


55 For detailed discussion of the surviving manuscripts and their contents, cf. Kotzor (1981), I, pp. 43-117; Rauer (2013), pp. 18-25. Rauer gives a cautious date of composition ranging from c. 800 – c. 900. Rauer (2013), p. 12. The earliest datable fragment certainly provides a terminus ante quem of 900 for the OE Mart. The OE Mart. has often been associated with the Alfredian program of vernacular prose translations produced in the late ninth century. In the introduction to her edition, Rauer explores the possibility that the OE Mart. may have pre-dated Alfred’s reform movement, though this suggestion remains speculative. If the martyrologist was drawing on continental martyrologies as models, a number of which appeared in the second and third quarters of the ninth century, then it seems unlikely that the vernacular work was compiled much earlier than Alfred’s reign. Indeed, given the rise in production of Latin narrative martyrologies in the mid-ninth century, a composition date for the OE Mart. in the second half of the ninth century would correspond well with the increased interest in the genre and contextualize the work in its wider Western European literary context.

to two hundred Latin sources drawn from an extensive library of late classical and early mediaeval texts.\textsuperscript{57} Michael Lapidge has since written in defense of this view of the martyrrology’s compiler, pointing to the library amassed by Acca at Hexham as the ideal crucible in which such an achievement could likely have been performed.\textsuperscript{58} While Cross’ research into the sources of the \textit{OE Mart}. have helped bring to light many of the ultimate or antecedent writings which inform its entries, the question remains as to which texts were known directly to the compiler. Christine Rauer recognizes as much when she offers the following words of caution in the introduction to her new edition of the \textit{OE Mart}.:

Given this hypothetical component in the composition of the \textit{Old English Martyrology}, it is important to bear in mind that the sources identified for the Old English text ... could have been used directly or indirectly by the martyrrologist. An unknown portion of the source texts identified so far should in that case technically be regarded as so-called antecedent sources, rather than as texts which were directly known to the martyrrologist.\textsuperscript{59}

Since many of the sources purported by Cross to have exercised direct influence upon the compiler of the \textit{OE Mart}. may, instead, have been arrived at indirectly, it is my personal view that the compilation process was somewhat simpler than what Cross and Lapidge have supposed.


\textsuperscript{58} M. Lapidge, “Acca of Hexham and the Origin of the \textit{Old English Martyrology},” \textit{Analecta Bollandiana} 123 (2005), pp. 29-78. In his article, Lapidge makes a compelling case that the \textit{OE Mart}. took much of its framework, if not necessarily content, from a Latin martyrrological tradition that stretches back to a seventh-century Northumbrian phase in the transmission of the Ps.-Jerome \textit{Martyrologium Hieronymian}. Despite recognizing the influence of a Latin martyrrology in establishing the broad outline of the \textit{OE Mart}.’, Lapidge still accepts that much of the content for the \textit{OE Mart}.’s entries is drawn directly from a wealth of hagiographical writings. The existence of the Northumbrian phase in the development of the \textit{Martyrologium Hieronymian} was first demonstrated by Pádraig Ó Riain in his article, “A Northumbrian Phase in the Formation of the Hieronymian Martyrology: The Evidence of the Martyrology of ‘Tallaght’,” \textit{Analecta Bollandiana} 120 (2002), pp. 311-63.

\textsuperscript{59} Rauer (2013), p. 4.
Let us see how we might be able to simplify Cross’ list of purported sources for the *OE Mart.*’s entry for Andrew.\textsuperscript{60} The section for the feast of Andrew on November 30 reads as follows:

On þone þryttygoðan dæg þæs monðes byð Sancte Andreas tyd þæs apostoles. He wæs Sancte Petres bròðer, and he wæs se æresta Dryhtnes þegen, and he ys cweden se wyltiga þegen, for þam þæs wæs wlitig on lychaman and he wæs wlitig on moðe. And æfter Cristes upæstiægnynsse he gecyrde twa mægða to Godes geleafan, þæ wæron þus genenned: Scyððiam þæ mægðe and Achaiam þæ mægðe. And on Patria þære ceastre he wæs ahangen on rode, and myd mycelo leohete he onsende hys gast to Gode. And Egeas se ealdorman se þæ hyne het ahon, þyg ylcan dæge he wæs fram deofle forbroden and he sweolt. And þæs Egeas broðor, se wæs on naman Stratoþes, and Egeas wif, þære nama wæs Maximille, hig bebyrigdon Andreas lichaman myd wyrtgemengynnysum and myd swetum stencum. And on Constantinus dagum þæs caseres, Andreas lic wæs þanon alæd on þa ceastre þæ ys nemned Constantinopolim.\textsuperscript{61}

On the thirtieth day of this month is the feast of the apostle St. Andrew. He was St Peter’s brother, and he was the first of the Lord’s disciples, and he is called the comely disciple for he was fair in body and he was beautiful of mind. And after Christ’s ascension he converted two nations to God’s faith, which were thusly named: the people of Scythia and the people of Achaea. And in the city of Patras he was hung upon the cross, and with a great light he sent forth his spirit to God. And the governor Egeas, he who ordered him hung, was pulled apart by a devil on the same day and he died. And the brother of that Egeas, he who was named Stratocles, and Egeas’ wife, whose name was Maximilla, they buried Andrew’s body with spices and sweet perfumes. And in the days of the emperor Constantine, Andrew’s body was taken thence into the city which is named Constantinople.\textsuperscript{62}

In his 1979 article, “The Apostles in the *Old English Martyrology,*” J. E. Cross provides the only detailed source analysis yet conducted on the apostle entries and identifies a minimum of four (and possibly as many as six) sources needed to account for the entry for Andrew’s feast.\textsuperscript{63} According to Cross’ hypothesis, these sources would include Book III of the Ps.-Abdias *Virtutes apostolorum,*\textsuperscript{64} the passion narrative *Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae* (*BHL* 428, 429), and another source that may have influenced the Anglo-Saxon *OE Mart.*

\textsuperscript{60} For an explanation of the contemporay Latinate sources that may have influenced Anglo-Saxon writings on Andrew’s passion, cf. below, Part II, §4 “St. Andrew in Apocryphal Tradition,” pp. 211 ff.

\textsuperscript{61} Rauer (2013), §233, p. 222.

\textsuperscript{62} Rauer (2013), §233, p. 223.


\textsuperscript{64} Cf. below, pp. 217 ff.
hereafter *Epistula*), the Hiberno-Latin *De ortu et obitu patriarcharum* of Ps.-Isidore, and possibly Jerome’s *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum* and a Hiberno-Latin text from the eighth or ninth century preserved in Cracow Cathedral Chapter Library MS. 43. Cross proposes that the Old English martyrologist incorporated details regarding the etymology of Andrew’s name, the dual missions to Scythia and Achaea, and the translation of his body to Constantinople based on entries found in either Isidore’s *De ortu et obitu patrum* and Ps.-Isidore’s *De ortu et obitu patriarcharum*. He also adds that the Hiberno-Latin text preserved in the Cracow Cathedral Library offers a closer parallel to the *OE Mart.’s* *wlitig on lychaman and he wæs wlitig on mode* with the reading *decorus et fortis in corpore et anima*. For the events of Andrew’s passion, Cross suggests that the compiler of the *OE Mart.* acquired his details on the miraculous light surrounding Andrew, Aegeas’ death at the hands of a demon, and Stratocles’ presence at the apostle’s burial from the *Epistula*, while Maximilla’s role in Andrew’s entombment is lifted from Ps.-Abdias.

A comparison between the *OE Mart.’s* Andrean entry and that of Ado of Vienne’s mid-ninth century martyrology proves enlightening. Ado’s text reads:

```plaintext
In civitate Patras provinciae Achaiae, natale
```

---

65 Cf. below, pp. 212 ff.
66 Cf. *PL* 83, col. 151A.
70 Cross (1979a), p. 28
71 Cross (1979a), p. 28.
72 Cross (1979a), p. 27.
Ado has already done quite a bit of conflating himself. The first part of the entry regarding the location of Andrew’s passion in Patras and his dual mission to both Achaea and Scythia is derived verbatim from Florus of Lyon’s martyrology. So too is the final section about the translation of Andrew’s relics. The rest of the entry, as noted by the martyrology’s editors DuBois and Renaud, is derived from the Epistula. From this passion narrative, Ado derives the details regarding Andrew’s incarceration, flogging and binding upon the cross (as opposed to

---

75 Dubois & Renaud (1976), p. 217. Florus of Lyon’s entire entry reads as such: *In civitate patras, provinciae Achaiae, natale beati Andreae apostoli, qui etiam apud Scythiam praedicavit. Cujus sacra ossa, vigesimo Constantii imperatoris anno, Constantinopolim translata sunt.*
76 Dubois & Renaud (1984), p. 5 where they cite BHL 428.
being nailed) in order to prolong the torture of crucifixion. He also displays knowledge of the celestial brightness that bears Andrew’s soul to heaven, a feature unique to the *Epistula* and generally taken as positive evidence for its use as a source. Moreover, the specific text of the *Epistula* utilized by Ado is closely related to a recension published by Boninus Mombritius, a fact that is evidenced by the inclusion of Maximilla’s role in burying Andrew’s body.\(^{77}\) Because the Mombritius recension of the *Epistula* incorporates this apocryphal fact, Cross was clearly in error when he stated, “Only in Pseudo-Abdias does Maximilla, Egeas’ wife, bury the apostle.”\(^{78}\)

If the Old English martyrologist had consulted with Ado’s or a similar entry, much of the compiling work would have been done already. The overarching structure shared by both Ado and the *OE Mart.* would have been achieved; that is, both begin with the dual missions to Achaea and Scythia and end with the translation of the saint’s bones. Additionally, Ado’s text could have established a precedent for interpolating details about Andrew’s passion based on the Mombritius recension of the *Epistula* into the middle of the entry—a strategy that the vernacular *OE Mart.* follows as well. Establishing the direct or indirect use of the Mombritius recension allows us to apply Okham’s razor and shorten Cross’ list of potential sources by at least one; that is, we can dispense with the need for Book III of Ps.-Abdias since the particular version of the *Epistula* consulted in Ado includes the detail about Maximilla tending to Andrew’s body.

The possibility that Ado’s entry served as a model for the *OE Mart.* does not, however, negate the fact that the compiler was conflating further sources. There are certain features in the Old English entry that cannot be accounted for by Ado’s text. For instance, Ado makes nothing of the etymology of Andrew’s name. Nor does he mention the death of Aegeas at the hands of


\(^{78}\) Cross (1979a), p. 27.
demons or his brother Stratocle’s help in burying Andrew. With regards to the etymology, the *OE Mart.* need not have been directly familiar with the texts of Isidore, Ps.-Isidore or Jerome as Cross seems to suggest. By the ninth century, this knowledge was fairly widespread and could be found in any number of sources from Bede to liturgical compilations.⁷⁹ Perhaps more appropriately, the Old English martyrologist could have found the material in another ninth-century martyrology, that of Rhabanus Maurus:

Natale sancti Andreae apostoli, qui interpretatur
‘uirilis’ uel ‘decorus,’ frater petri. Hic
predicauit Scithia et Achaiam, ibique in ciuitate
patras cruci suspensus occubuit.⁸⁰

The passion of the holy apostle Andrew, which
is interpreted ‘manly’ or ‘noble,’ the brother of
Peter. This one preached in Scythia and in
Achaea, where, in the city of Patras, he died,
suspended upon the cross.

For the *OE Mart.*’s assertion that Aegeas died at the hands of demons, we must necessarily go back the *Epistula* itself.⁸¹ The presence of this detail in the *OE Mart.* likely denotes that the compiler had direct knowledge of this particular source. If the vernacular martyrologist was directly consulting the *Epistula*, then he was in good company, using methodologies similar to those of Ado himself. Finally, the claim made by the *OE Mart.* that Stratocles helped with the preparation of Andrew’s body and subsequent burial is a little more problematic in that there is no clear source for this detail in the surviving apocryphal traditions. It may indeed be, as Cross

---

⁷⁹ For Bede’s knowledge of the etymology of Andrew, cf. above, pp. 123 ff.


⁸¹ The *OE Mart.*’s assertion that Aegeas died on the very same day (*þyg ylcan dæge*) seems to correspond more closely with the *Epistula*’s claims than with those of competing passion narratives like Ps.-Abdias or the *Conuersante et docente*. The latter two both maintain that the proconsul’s death took place at night when he cast himself from a great height after being possessed by devils. Cf. M. Bonnet, “Passio Sancti Andreae Apostoli,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 13 (1894), §7, p. 378; J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, (Hamburg, 1703-1719), II, p. 515. The *Epistula* recognizes a much more immediate demise in which Aegeas is seized by demons and convulses to death before every reaching home. Cf. M. Bonnet,“Passio sancti Andreae apostoli” in *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, ed. R. A. Lipsius & M. Bonnet, 3 vols. in 2 (1891-1903), II.1 (1898), §15, p. 35; Mombritius (1910) I, 107, ll. 42-5.
suggests, “a hasty reading and conflation from the Passio [i.e. Epistula] where Stratocles took the body of Egeas.”

By no means does the current study seek to impugn the Old English martyrrologist’s skill as a compiler and redactor. The entry on Andrew and the martyrology as a whole clearly demonstrate the compiler’s familiarity with a vast range of hagiographical traditions and the keen ability to weave together those source materials. J. E. Cross’ work on the sources of the OE Mart. remains indispensable by virtue of its laying the foundation for further source analysis on the text. In this instance, however, the process of compilation appears to be somewhat simpler than Cross originally supposed and needs slight revision. There is no reason to assume knowledge of Ps.-Abdias given the details found in the Mombritius recension of the Epistula. In fact, Ado of Vienne clearly used a closely related version of the Epistula when composing his martyrological entry for Andrew. We cannot rule out the possibility that the compiler of the OE Mart. was consulting already conflated texts such as appeared in existing Latin martyrologies. Because the compiler of the OE Mart. was doing just that—compiling a martyrology—it stands to reason that he would have looked to some kind of Latin model (or some combination of multiple Latin martyrologies) for inspiration and content. While by no means a conclusive suggestion, we may posit a situation in which the Old English martyrrologist consulted one or more martyrologies (possibly those of Ado and Hrabanus) in conjunction with a more extensive passion narrative such as the Epistula. Ado, himself drawing upon Florus and the Epistula, could have inspired the entry in both form and general content. Hrabanus and the Epistula could have been used to flesh out further detail. Thus, we could potentially be dealing with as few as three immediate sources for the OE Mart. rather than upwards of six. Because there is no tenable “single bullet theory” providing a lone source for the entirety of the OE Mart., scholars

---

82 Cross (1979a), p. 28.
have been hitherto all too willing to overlook the potential influence of earlier martyrologies altogether, a situation compounded by the fact that neither Rauer nor Biggs list a single martyrology among the possible sources for the text.\textsuperscript{83} If source studies are to progress with any degree of accuracy, then such an oversight must be avoided and extant martyrologies must be factored into a reappraisal of any subsequent source analysis.

**Apocryphal Traces of Andrew in Anglo-Saxon Sacramentaries and the Liturgy of the Mass**

Since martyrologies represent a point of confluence between the liturgical celebration of the saints and apocryphal details about their passions, a worthwhile question emerges regarding the extent to which such apocryphal details found their way into the text of the liturgical formulae actually read or sung during the mass and offices for the feast-days. In her informative essay entitled, “St. Andrew in Anglo-Saxon England: The Evolution of an Apocryphal Hero,” Marie M. Walsh argues that an influx of apocryphal themes into mass and office liturgies helped influence Anglo-Saxon opinions about apocryphal traditions, priming more cautious and suspicious minds for acceptance of certain apocryphal accounts as authoritative.\textsuperscript{84} Doubtlessly due to the sparse and fragmentary remains of Anglo-Saxon liturgical sources, Walsh largely draws her evidence from parallels in continental liturgy. In particular, she points to echoes of Andrew’s passion found in the liturgy of the mass from the ninth-century supplement to the Gregorian Sacramentary\textsuperscript{85} as well as to extensive apocryphal themes incorporated into the

\textsuperscript{83} Rauer (2003), pp. 103-9; Biggs (2007), pp. 39, 42.


Gallican celebration as represented by the *Missale Gothicum* (compiled c. 700). While Walsh indeed points to a verifiable continental tradition in which the liturgy of the mass for Andrew’s feast is fleshed out with apocryphal motifs from at least the early eighth century onwards and which could possibly have exercised influence upon Insular liturgical practice, the matter remains unresolved because she neglects to address any definitively Anglo-Saxon liturgical sources. In fact, Els Rose has stated that the apocryphally inspired formulaires of the *Missale Gothicum*’s feast for Andrew have no parallels outside of the Gallican liturgical record. It remains to be seen, therefore, whether Anglo-Saxon liturgy bears witness to apocryphal details about Andrew.

As regards the liturgy of the mass, the majority of the prayers found in Anglo-Saxon massbooks for Andrew’s feast focus on the intercessory and salvific role of the apostle. The collects especially, through their brevity and highly formulaic character, tend to focus on

---


87 Rose (2005), p. 266. Rose notes that only the *benedictio populi* for Andrew’s feast in the *Missale Gothicum* has parallels elsewhere, specifically in “New” or “Eighth Century Gelasian” sacramentaries, but this particular benediction includes no apocryphal material of note. To go a step further, some scholars have claimed that the early documents of the Roman mass liturgy contain no specifically Gallican features. Cf. D. M. Hope & G. Woofenden, “The Medieval Western Rites,” in *The Study of Liturgy*, revised edition, ed. C. Jones et al. (London; New York: SPCK; Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 274.
intercession and refrain from any biographical material. The result of this trend is that these prayers contain very little of interest with relation to apocrypha.\textsuperscript{88} However, the \textit{praefatio} (the prefatory prayer introducing the \textit{Sanctus} and directly preceding the Canon of the Mass) tends to offer some latitude when it comes to literary embellishment.\textsuperscript{89} It is within these prefaces that vestiges of apocryphally inspired material may occasionally be found. The extant prefaces used for Andrew’s feast and found in Anglo-Saxon liturgical sources fall into two categories: 1) a comparatively brief preface with no apocryphal themes and based upon more purely Roman-Gregorian models such as the Hadrianum;\textsuperscript{90} 2) a slightly longer preface derived ultimately from the Supplemented Hadrianum, which was expanded by Carolingian liturgists to suit the needs of


\begin{footnote}{89}About the \textit{praefatio}, Eric Palazzo writes: “The preface … is the richest piece from the literary point of view and the enunciation of the liturgical theology of a feast; it is often the place where a position on a dogmatic or doctrinal question is made expressly clear. In certain cases, such as the feasts of saints, the preface takes on the tone of a hagiographic panegyric.” E. Palazzo, \textit{A History of Liturgical Books}, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), pp. 25-26.

\begin{footnote}{90}This group of prefaces is represented by the Leofric Missal and the Missal of New Minster, Winchester. Cf. Warren (1883), p. 169; Turner (1962), p. 187. Compare the text of these near identical prefaces with that of the Hadrianium text: Deshusses (1971), §768, p. 291. Gregorian sacramentaries are purported to derive from the liturgical practices and reforms instituted by Pope Gregory the Great (†604). During the late eighth century, Charlemagne became worried with the lack of uniformity in liturgy and sent to Pope Hadrian I for a liturgical exemplar to help standardize practice in is realm and received the so-called “Hadrianium” text which the pope assured was a copy of the book used by Gregory himself. While the “Hadrianium” survives only in interpolated copies, a close approximation of the original text has been reconstructed by Jean Deshusses in the afores cited reference. For the history of the Gregorian and “Hadrianium” type sacramentaries, cf. Vogel (1986), pp. 79-85; Palazzo (1998), pp. 51-4.
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Frankish presbytes, and containing a brief mention of Andrew’s crucifixion. 91 This second
group, represented by the prefaces found in the Missal of Robert of Jumièges and the
Winchcombe Sacramentary, offers the following allusion to Andrew’s crucifixion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplemented Hadrianum Text</th>
<th>(translation of the Supplemented Hadrianum Text)</th>
<th>Missal of Robert of Jumièges</th>
<th>Winchcombe Sacramentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... Ut id quod libera praedicauerat uoce, nec pendens taceret in cruce. Auctoremque uitæ perennis tam in hac uita sequi, quam in mortis genere meruit imitari. Ut cuius praecepto terrena in semetipso crucifixerat desideria, eius exemplo ipse patibulo fieretur. Utrique igitur germani piscatores, ambo cruce eleuantur ad cælum, ... 92</td>
<td>So that what he had preached with a free voice, hanging from the cross, he did not fall silent about. And he deserved to follow the author of everlasting life in this life, as well as to imitate [him] in the manner of death, so that he himself might be fixed to the gibbet according to the example of him who had, by his very own decree, crucified earthly desires. Thus, each of the two fishermen brothers were both raised by the cross to heaven...</td>
<td>... Ut id quod libera praedicauerat uoce, nec pendens taceret in cruce. Auctoremque uitæ perennis tam in hac uita sequi. quam in mortis genere meruit imitari. Ut cuius praecepto terrena in semetipso crucifixerat desideria, eius exemplo ipse patibulo fieretur. Utrique igitur germani piscatores. ambo cruce eleuantur ad cælum. 93</td>
<td>... ut id quo libera prædicauerat uoce, nec pendens taceret in cruce. Auctoremque uıtæ perennis ſtam in hac uıta sequi, quam in mortis genere meruit imitari. Ut cuius præcepto terrena in semetipso crucifixerat desideria, eıus exemplo ipse patibulo fieretur. Utıque igitur germanı / piscatores, ambo cruce eleuantur ad cĕlum. 94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In positing her hypothesis about the encroachment of apocrypha, Walsh does point to the
proper preface for Andrew’s feast contained within the ninth-century Supplemented Hadrianum
as evidence of apocryphally infused liturgy of the mass. 95 With the evidence presented in the
Missal of Robert of Jumièges and the Winchcombe Sacramentary, there is positive proof that the
Supplemented Hadrianum’s proper preface, complete with apocryphal images of Andrew’s

91 The “Supplemented Hadrianum” sacramentary was based on that of the Hadrianum text sent to Charlemagne by
Pope Hadrian I between 784 and 791. Because the Hadrianum was originally designed for papal usage only, the
Frankish presbytes found the book lacking in some respects. Consequently, Carolingian liturgists (likely
spearheaded by Benedict of Aniane) sought to supplement the Hadrianum with liturgical matter already in use in


passion, did indeed find circulation in Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice. This *praefatio* remains grounded in canonical scripture via its acknowledgement of Andrew’s fraternal relationship to Peter, their occupation as fishermen, and a shared willingness to follow Christ in his humble manner of living. Yet the preface also references how Andrew was keen to imitate Christ in his manner of death, eagerly submitting himself to crucifixion. Most revealing as regards apocryphal motifs is the account of Andrew’s preaching from the cross and refusal to fall silent despite the torments suffered during his martyrdom (*nec pendens taceret in cruce*). This image is commonly found in apocryphal narratives of the Apostle’s passion such as the *Epistula*, Book III of Ps.-Abdias and the *Conuersante et docente*. Consequently, no immediate source for the apocryphal details can be identified.

In addition to apocryphally infused *praefationes*, it is possible that the Anglo-Saxon Church also embellished the liturgy of the mass with apocryphal motifs via antiphons and tropes. The evidence is rather meager, but the Caligula Troper contains a chant reserved for the feast of St. Andrew that alludes to the apostle’s missionary sojourns:

```
Cum populis pietate sui medicamine ferret
ad rectum reuocans tramitem moribunda sequentes:
Undosi studio peragrantes marmora ponti
Cum mali illorum perflans dulcedine corda 97

With his own piety as a remedy to the peoples, he bore those following mortal things, recalling [them], to the righteous path; as the wicked [ones] travel purposefully over the marble-like surfaces of the tumultuous sea, he sweeps clean their hears with a gentleness.
```

This chant remains frustratingly vague in its recollection of Andrew’s evangelizing mission. The reference to those journeying across the surface of a wave-ridden sea (*undosi studio peragrantes marmora ponti*) may be an allusion to Andrew’s boat trip over rough waters to the land of

---

96 Cp. Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, pp. 30-34; Fabricius (1703-1719), II, p. 510; Bonnet (1894), p. 375.

Mermedonia during which a disguised Christ served as his helmsman.  

If this is indeed the case, this would be the first and only reference in Anglo-Saxon liturgical sources to the secondary apocryphal acts in which Andrew rescued his apostolic brother Matthias (or Matthew depending on the recension) from the land of the cannibals. One must bear in mind, however, that those *peragrantes* are not Andrew himself, but rather his converts and flock. Thus, the undulating waters may simply reflect the common Christian motif in which the troubles of the secular world are likened to the beating waves of an ocean.

In proximity with the chants offered for Andrew’s feast-day, the Caligula Troper provides an illumination of the saint following Christ with an apocryphally inspired caption. The attached legend reads:

```
Hic pater andreas cruce quem constrinxit egeas
Quem post se reuocat ihesive dum littora calcat,
Classibus omissis sequitur conamine cordis.  
```

The main focus of the caption is the scripturally based allusion to Andrew’s choice to follow Christ after having abandoned his fellow fishermen to become a fisher of men. That said, the first line admits an overt mention of Aegeas and the Achaean leader’s role in crucifying the Apostle. While not a chant intended to be read during the mass, the caption does illustrate a distinct association within the minds of the manuscript’s compilers between the apocryphal tradition and the votive mass in honor of the saint. Any subsequent use of the troper in preparation for the mass of Andrew’s feast would doubtlessly reinforce such a connection and the celebrant or archcantor consulting the chant book would find themselves briefly pondering the apostle’s martyrdom at the hands of Aegeas. This association between Andrew’s passion and

---

98 Cf. below, p. 224 ff.

his votive celebration could then be fleshed out more thoroughly via appropriate readings or homilies addressing the saint.

Apocryphal Traces of Andrew in Anglo-Saxon Office Books and the Liturgy of Hours

While sacramentaries and supplementary materials related to the liturgy of the mass have been shown to yield largely vague references to Andrew’s martyrdom, the scarcity of apocryphal information found in these sorts of sources should come as little surprise. The central focus of the mass, and by extension its liturgy, is, of course, the eucharistic celebration. Due to this emphasis, there is relatively little latitude outside of the prefaces and occasional chants for the incorporation of apocryphal matter within sacramentaries and other books used in the mass. The celebration of the divine office in the monastaries and ecclesiastical centers of Anglo-Saxon England, however, presents a vastly different prospect for apocryphal elaboration. The various hours celebrated in the divine office meant that there were more opportunities to explore the lives and passions of a given saint when venerating his or her vigil, feast, or octave. Indeed, selections from patristic writers and hagiographic vitae or passiones were regularly read as part of certain hours of the divine office, thereby enriching worship through authorities beyond that of just canonical scripture. One might suppose, therefore, that the liturgy of the divine office, more commonly referred to as the Liturgy of Hours, would prove more forthcoming in its evidence for apocryphal intrusion.

During the early Middle Ages, the divine office was notoriously idiosyncratic with regard to the details of its celebration, varying to a high degree from one religious house to another. While popular monastic rules such as that of St. Benedict of Nursia could exert a certain degree of standardizing influence in the structuring of the Liturgy of Hours, there existed nothing akin to
the Roman Breviary of today’s Catholic Church. Ultimately, the exact dimensions and specific *formulae* found in office liturgy was left to the discretion of individual religious communities. In her article, Walsh uses the monumental *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex* edited by René-Jean Hesbert to point to apocryphal material found in the antiphons of the divine office for the feast of St. Andrew, one of which even alludes to the Apostle’s mission to Mermedonia in accordance with the secondary acts:

> In the second and third nocturns of Matins, in Lauds, and in Vespers for the feast, verbatim snatches from the apocryphal Latin passion are frequent. Andrew’s address to the cross contributed to at least ten of these antiphons and responses, but there are also references to several other apocryphal themes, among them the proclamation by the people of Andrew’s innocence, his not wanting to be taken down from the cross, his continued preaching from the cross, and his burial by Maximilla. Through a rather general reference to Mermedonia, the third antiphon before the gospel at Vespers provides the sole antiphonary link to the geographical variant preserved in the Old English *Andreas*: “Andreas, apostolus Domini, magnum operatus est miraculum: in templo Dei praedicando jugiter, convertit populum Myrmidonem.”

Unfortunately, Walsh again neglects to consult the Anglo-Saxon evidence directly. That Walsh should content herself with continental evidence to make her point is in some ways understandable since the Anglo-Saxon evidence for office liturgy is even more sparse and fragmentary than that of the liturgy of the mass.

Alicia Corrêa lists eight surviving office books or fragments from Anglo-Saxon England, not all of which are readily accessible via critical editions. The earliest of these office books, the late ninth or early tenth century Durham Collectar (preserved in Durham, Cathedral Library, A.IV.19), is a collectar containing primarily the *capitula* (short readings for the individual hours) and a smattering of closing collects for the occasion. Because the Durham Collectar proper

---

100 Walsh (1981), p. 104. Walsh does not specifically identify those ten antiphons to which she is referring. Nor does she delineate which Latin redactions of the Andrew narrative she thinks may have served as their source.


does not incorporate the chants, antiphons and hymns sung by the participants, the liturgical compilation can provide only partial insight into the practice of the votive offices for Andrew’s feast-day. This particular office book derives the majority of its capitula and collects from the mass liturgy, formularies which have already been demonstrated to be of limited apocryphal significance. In fact, there are only two capitula in the Durham Collectar’s liturgy for Andrew’s feast which may be of any apocryphal interest. The first includes a rather non-specific pronouncement that God made Andrew holy in his own faith and gentleness and then chose him from among all flesh (\textit{In fide et laenitate ipsius sanctum fecit illum, et elegit eum ex omni carne})\textsuperscript{103}, a rather benign allusion to the Lord’s help in strengthening Andrew during his passion and applicable to most any martyrdom. The second is a statement that the Lord girded the apostle with a “belt of justice” and adorned him with a crown of glory (\textit{circumcinxit eum zona iustitiae, et induit eum Dominus coronam glorie})\textsuperscript{104}. If the belt of justice (\textit{zona iustitiae}) is interpreted in its more metaphorical sense as a swath or area, the motif may offer a possible reference to the heavenly brilliance that accompanied the assumption of the apostle’s spirit.

After the Durham Collectar was received by the religious community of Chester-le-Street sometime before c. 970, the original manuscript was supplemented with an additional three quires containing a haphazard florilegium of assorted liturgical and educational materials\textsuperscript{105}. Corrêa plausibly interprets this miscellaneous addition to the collectar as an indication that the office book in its original form was found unsatisfactory for direct use in the divine office by the Chester-le-Street community and ultimately functioned as a “commonplace book” in which


\textsuperscript{104} Corrêa (1992), §484, p. 199.

\textsuperscript{105} Corrêa (1992), pp. 76-80.
scribes would add material in order to preserve it for use at a later date. Though not part of the original Durham Collectar, the supplementary quires contain a hodge-podge of additional prayers, antiphons and hymns current in late tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England, one antiphon of which is devoted to Andrew in particular:

Andreas Christi famulus dignus Deo apostolorum, germanus Petri et in passione socius. Andreas vero rogabat ad populum, ne impedirent passionem ejus.  

Andrew, servant of Christ, worthy of the apostles to God, brother of Peter and companion in passion. Truly, Andrew asked the people that they not hinder his passion.

While the chant does not recount the saint’s passion in great detail, it does reference how Andrew’s method of martyrdom, i.e., crucifixion, was shared with his brother Peter. Furthermore, the ultimate source of the antiphon’s second sentence is clearly the apocryphal Epistula from which it borrows verbatim. Compare the antiphon’s reading with the Epistula’s account: Andreas uero rogabat populum ut non inpedirent passionem eius.

Though not a full-fledged breviary, the eleventh century Leofric Collectar, compiled for Bishop Leofric of Exeter sometime during his episcopate from c. 1050-1072, records more extensively than the Durham Collectar the various versicles, responds and antiphons that fleshed out the celebration of hours. Several of the capitula are drawn directly from scripture such as those for first vespers (Jn. 1:35-37), matins (Jn. 1:41-42), and second vespers (Mt. 4:18), and the collects are largely derived from formulae found in the Liturgy of the Mass. Some of the chants, however, reveal apocryphal evidence much more in line with the additional antiphon found in the miscellania attached to Durham, Cathedral Library, A.IV.19. For example, a respond and

107 J. Stevenson, ed., Rituale Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis, nunc primum typis mandatum, Surtees Society 10 (London: J. B. Nichols & Son, 1840), p. 153. Because it was not included within the original Durham Collectar, this antiphon falls outside the purview of Corrêa’s more recent edition, but can be found in Stevenson’s older edition of the complete manuscript Durham, Cathedral Library, A.IV.19.
108 Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1 p. 24.
versicle for first vespers relates the apostle’s crucifixion and the public’s protestations of his innocence:

\[ R. \text{ Homo dei ducebatur ut crucifigerent eum.} \]
\[ \text{populus autem clamabat uoce magna dicens .} \]
\[ \text{innocens eius sanguis sine causa dampnatur .} \]

\[ V. \text{Cumque carnifices ducerent eum ut} \]
\[ \text{crucifigeretur factus est concursus popolorum} \]
\[ \text{clamantium et dicentium. innocens.}^{110} \]

The man of God was being led forth so that they might crucify him. The people, however, were crying with a loud voice, saying, “His innocent blood is condemned without cause.”

And when the butchers had led him forth so that he could be crucified, a crowd of people formed, crying out and saying, “[He is] innocent.”

While the respond appears to be a free reworking of the apocryphal passion, the subsequent versicle demonstrates verbatim correspondences with the *Epistula*. Some literary license is taken at the end of the versicle by replacing the crowd’s longer protestation of Andrew’s guiltlessness with a simple cry of “Innocent.” It is possible that an interjection of this sort would have been more effective in the responsorial singing of a liturgical setting. The following table demonstrates the parallels between the Leofric Collectar’s versicle for first vespers and the *Epistula* with the matching phrases highlighted in bold:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leofric Collectar</th>
<th>Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae</th>
<th>Translation of the <em>Epistula</em> Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Cumque carnifices ducerent eum ut crucifigeretur factus est concursus popolorum clamantium et dicentium.</em> innocens.(^{111})</td>
<td><em>cumque eum carnifices ducerent, concursus factus est popolorum clamantium ac dicentium:</em> Iustus homo et amicus dei quid fecit ut ducatur ad crucem?(^{112})</td>
<td>And when the butchers had led him forth, a crowd of people was formed, crying out and saying: “[This] just man and friend of God, what did he do that he should be led to the cross?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similary, the chants provided by the Leofric Collectar for second vespers contain a respond and antiphon which relate Andrew’s crucifixion and the apostle’s famous address to the cross.

---


\(^{111}\) Dewick (1914), p. 250.

\(^{112}\) Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, p. 24.
R. Dilexit andream dominus in odorem suauitatem dum penderet in cruce dignum sibi computauit martyrem quem uocauit apostolum dum esset in mari et ideo amicus dei apellatus est.

 [...] In euang. Ant. Cum peruenisset beatus andreas ad locum ubi crux parata erat exclamauit et dixit o bona crux diu desiderata et iam concupiscenti animę preparata, securus et gaudens uenio ad te ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius qui peependit in te.  

When the blessed Andrew had arrived at the place where the cross had been raised, he exclaimed and said, “O good cross, long wished for and now raised for a desiring soul, I approach untroubled and rejoicing to you so that you, exalting, may receive me, his disciple, who hangs upon you.”

Once again, the respond represents a looser retelling of Andrew’s apocryphal crucifixion, while the antiphon for the gospel reading, like the versicle for first vespers, seeks to condense its source material and incorporate verbatim snatches from the Epistula. Here, the verbal parallels between the Leofric Collectar’s antiphon for second vespers and the Epistula are highlighted in bold:

Leofric Collectar

Cum peruenisset beatus andreas ad locum ubi crux parata erat exclamauit et dixit o bona crux diu desiderata et iam concupiscenti animę preparata, securus et gaudens uenio ad te ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius qui peependit in te.  

Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae

Cumque peruenisset ad locum ubi crux parata erat, uidens eam a longe exclamauit uoce magna dicens: Salue crux quae in corpore Christi dedicata es et ex membrorum eius margaritis ornata. antequam te ascenderet dominus, timorem terrenum habuisti, modo uero amorem caelestem obtinens pro uoto susciperis. sciris enim a credentibus quanta intra te gaudia habeas, quanta munera praeparata. sequeris ergo et gaudens uenio ad te, ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius qui peependit in te, quia amator tuus semper fui et desiderauit ampleciti te. o bona crux quae decorem et pulcritudinem de membris domini suscepisti, diu desiderata, sollicita amata, sine intermissione quaesita

Translation of the Epistula Text

And when he had arrived at the place where the cross had been raised, seeing it from afar, he exclaimed with a loud voice, saying: Hail cross, you who are consecrated in the body of Christ and adorned with the pearls of his limbs. Before the Lord climbed you, you maintained earthly fear; now truly, obtaining heavenly love, you are received as a promise. For you are known to believers; how many joys you have within you, how many rewards were prepared [within you]. Therefore, untroubled and rejoicing, I approach you so that you, exalting, may receive me, the disciple of him who hung upon you, for I was always your devotee and desired to embrace

---

113 Dewick (1914), p. 251.

114 Dewick (1914), p. 250.
et aliquando iam concupiscenti animo praeparata, accipe me ab hominibus et redde me magistro meo, ut per te me recipiat qui per te redemit me.\textsuperscript{115} you. O good cross, you who received ornament and beauty from the limbs of the Lord, having been long desired, anxiously loved, sought for without pause, and now at last prepared for the longing soul, take me away from mankind and deliver me to my master, so that he may receive me through you, he who redeemed me through you.

The Leofric Collectar’s office for prime further references Andrew’s address to the cross with its antiphon: \textit{Salue crux pretiosa suscipe disipulum eius qui peependit in te magister meus christus} (‘Hail precious cross, receive the disciple of him who hung upon you, my master Christ’).\textsuperscript{116} This particular antiphon, like the versicle for first vespers, seems to draw upon the \textit{Epistula}’s phrasing: \textit{suscipias me discipulum eius qui peependit in te}. An abbreviation indicating the same antiphon may be found for second vespers: \textit{Salue crux pretiosa}.\textsuperscript{117} The office for sext also provides an apocryphally inspired antiphon: \textit{Biduo uiuens pendebat in cruce pro christi nomine beatus andreas et docebat populum} (“The blessed Andrew hung living upon the cross for two days in the name of Christ and taught the people”).\textsuperscript{118} In this case, however, I have not yet been able to identify an exact word-for-word correspondence with an apocryphal narrative. The \textit{Epistula} does mention Andrew surviving on the cross to preach for two days: \textit{... quia iam secunda die in cruce positus ueritatem praedicare non cessat} (“…for on the second day that he was positioned on the cross he did not cease to preach the truth”).\textsuperscript{119} Using the word \textit{biduo} and the verb \textit{docere} to denote instruction to the populus, the antiphon’s phrasing shows closer

\textsuperscript{115} Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, pp. 24-26.

\textsuperscript{116} Dewick (1914), p. 250.

\textsuperscript{117} Dewick (1914), p. 252.

\textsuperscript{118} Dewick (1914), p. 250.

\textsuperscript{119} Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, p. 29, ll. 2-3.
affinities with Book III of Ps.-Abdias (Biduo enim suspensus vivit, quae res miraculo non caret: & quod plus est, loquitur adhuc, & nos sermonibus reficit “For he lived suspended for two days, a deed which is not lacking in the miraculous; and what is more, he speaks still and restores us with speeches”)\(^{120}\) and Ado’s martyrological entry for Andrew (biduo inibi supervxit, non cessans ea quae Christi sunt populum docere “He survived for two days in that place, never ceasing to teach the people those things which are of Christ”).\(^{121}\)

Many of the same apocryphally inspired chants present in the Leofric Collectar can also be found in the late eleventh-century Wulstan Portiforium. The antiphon for prime, the antiphon for sext, and the respond and versicle for first vespers are all witnessed in this manuscript.\(^{122}\) This correspondence, however, is not surprising given the fact that the two office books draw indirectly upon a common liturgical archetype likely compiled in Liège.\(^{123}\) The supplement made at Chester-le-Street to Durham, Cathedral Library, A.IV.19 demonstrates that there were indeed formulae in Anglo-Saxon office liturgy that used verbatim quotes from apocryphal sources for Andrew’s passion from at least the late tenth century onwards. The rather terse allusions witnessed in Durham, Cathedral Library, A.IV.19, however, are a far cry from the more extensive use of apocryphal material found in the Leofric Collectar and the Wulstan Portiforium.

Comparing the relatively paltry evidence of apocryphally inspired formulae elsewhere in Anglo-

\(^{120}\) Fabricius (1703-1719), II, p. 513. Cp. the Mombritius recension: Mombritius (1910), p. 107, ll. 11-12. Note that the Ps.-Bedan Martyrology of Cologne draws on this same tradition: Biduo enim suspensus vivit, quae res miraculo non caret: & quod plus est, loquitur adhuc, & nos sermonibus reficit (“For he lives suspended for two days, a deed which is not lacking in the miraculous; and because he is pious, he speaks still, and restores us with speeches”). Cf. PL 94, col. 1120A.


\(^{123}\) Dewick & Frere (1921), pp. xvii-xix, xxi-xxv.
Saxon office books with the rich chants found in these two genetically related liturgical works, one may tentatively surmise that the majority of apocryphal influence on the Liturgy of the Hours stems from continental practice at places such as Liège. Since the Leofric Collectar and the Wulstan Portiforium represent only a single shared tradition, it remains difficult to define with any precision the pervasiveness achieved by apocryphally informed prayers in the divine office. Furthermore, because both the Leofric Collectar and Wulstan Portiforium date back to the mid or late eleventh century, they arrived too late to have any influence on Ælfric or his immediate contemporaries. The books’ appearance in England, however, is likely indicative of the close relationships between English and continental religious houses first established during the Benedictine Reform of the tenth century and continued on into the eleventh. Thus, we may speculate that such apocryphally infused formulae may already have found their way into English monasteries during that period, though the fragmentary evidence of Anglo-Saxon office liturgy cannot confirm this fact.

Andrew in “Altar Dedications”: Aldhelm and Alcuin

The oldest apocryphal reference to Andrew’s passion surviving from Anglo-Saxon England may be found in what is ostensibly a seventh-century altar dedication to the apostle contained within Aldhelm’s Carmina Ecclesiastica. This particular metrical dedication is found third (after Peter and Paul) among a sequence of similar verses devoted to the other twelve

---

124 The remaining office books listed by Corrêa are either missing the votive offices for Andrew or were not readily available in critical editions at the time of writing. This study cannot, therefore, hope to provide a complete picture of the Anglo-Saxon liturgical evidence for the divine office, as fragmentary as it may be. Cf. Corrêa (1995), pp. 45-60.
The work appears in the standard edition by Rudolf Ehwald under the title “In duodecim apostolorum aris.” Given this context, the work may be more appropriately considered in light of the collective veneration of the apostles. Aldhelm’s emphasis on ara (altars) has led scholars to suppose that the poems represent metrical tituli to be inscribed in the church or on individual altars. Michael Lapidge has drawn attention to the fact that such tituli were often gathered into collections (syllogae) during the early middle ages in order to facilitate the composition of further dedications. Certain continental syllogae have even been demonstrated to provide sources for tituli by early Anglo-Saxon churchmen such as Milred, bishop of Worcester (†775), though no such collection has been, to my knowledge, forwarded as a source for Aldhelm’s altar dedications to the “twelve” apostles. Lapidge further posits that Aldhelm’s series of apostolic tituli may “imply that it was conventional in early Anglo-Saxon England to dedicate altars within a church to the twelve apostles.” Further evidence for the collective nature of the “In duodecim apostolorum aris” is Lapidge’s assertion that the metrical dedications were never intended as individual inscriptions in any true epigraphical sense due to the inclusion of a thirteenth verse embodying a “manifestly literary” conclusion in which Aldhelm states: Iam bis sena simul digessi nomina patrum... (‘Now I have

---

125 Aldhelm apparently felt the need to include Paul, but still maintain the integrity of the number Twelve. Perhaps in an effort to redeem any perceived snub to the apostle, Aldhelm later composed an independent verse in honor of Matthias. Cf. Aldhelm, Opera, p. 32; above, p. 98.


129 Lapidge & Rosier (1985), p. 41. Lapidge further notes the existence of twelve altars in Bugga’s church as referenced by Aldhelm in the third metrical titulus of the Carmina Ecclesiastica, the so-called “In ecclesia Mariae a Bugge exstructa,” though in this case the apse (absida) is dedicated to Mary, whereas the apse is dedicated to St. Peter in “In duodecim apostolorum aris.” Cf. Aldhelm, Opera, p. 16, l. 40.
arranged all together the twice six names of the [apostolic] fathers…). This reference by the author to the cohesive nature of the work leads Lapidge to justly conclude that “Aldhelm was attempting something other than the composition of church dedications.” What precisely this other purpose was remains unclear. Despite the unified character of the work, Aldhelm’s verse on Andrew represents a relatively self-contained unit and reads:

Hic simul Andreas templum tutabitur ara, Petri germanus, qui quondam funera laetus, Horrida perpessus sancta cum carne peependit. Quem Deus oceani lustrantem flustra phasello, Caelitus adscivit gradiens per litora ponti; Protinus Andreas compunctus voce Tonantis, Credidit aeternum salvantem saecula regem, Pendula capturae contemnens retia spretae, Et dicto citius Christi praecepta facessit.

Quis numerare valet populosis oppida turbis, Illius eloquio quae fana profana friabant, Credula pandentes regi praecordia Christo? Nempe vicem Domino solvebat calce cruenta, Dum crucis in patulo suspensus stipite martyr, Ultima mortalis clausit spiracula vitae, Purpureas sumens Christo regante coronas.

Here too Andrew shall protect the church through [his] altar, the brother of Peter, who formerly hung by [his] holy flesh, having happily endured horrible death(s). He whom, moving over the surface of the ocean in a light vessel, heavenly God [i.e. Christ], walking along the shores of the sea, admitted. At once, Andrew, inspired by the voice of the Thunderer [i.e. God], believed in the eternal king saving the world. And disregarding the hanging nets with [their] abandoned haul, with a word he performed Christ’s commands more quickly.

Who is able to enumerate the towns with [their] populous crowds which, on account of his eloquence, demolished [their] profane temples, stretching out [their] believing hearts to Christ the King? Truly, he discharged [his] repayment to the Lord through [his] bloody end when, as a martyr suspended on the wide-spread beam of the cross, he concluded [his] final breath of [this] mortal life, obtaining the purple crown(s) from the reigning Christ.

Aldhelm’s allusions to Andrew’s apocryphal passion remain rather vague, simply referring to the apostle’s “happy” endurance of martyrdom and his bloody death upon the cross. Due to this lack of specificity beyond an acknowledgement of crucifixion, it remains impossible to ascertain the precise sources used by Aldhelm, be they continental tituli or longer apocryphal narratives. Despite this dearth of apocryphal detail, there are several noteworthy features to be found Aldhelm’s treatment of Andrew. The author’s rhetorical question regarding any one

---

130 Aldhelm, Opera, p. 31.
132 Aldhelm, Opera, pp. 22-23.
individual’s inability to “enumerate the towns with [their] populous crowds” may refer to a general familiarity with apocryphal acta relating the apostle’s various evangelizing missions throughout the Mediterranean. The insistence that Andrew visited multiple oppida broadens the apostle’s missionary activity beyond simply Patras in Achaea and may allude to numerous other missions in places such as Scythia, Mermedonia, and further locales mentioned in more extensive accounts like that of Gregory of Tours’ Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli. Another interesting feature of Aldhelm’s dedication to Andrew is his use of “pagan” imagery such as his epithet Tonantis (‘of the Thunderer’) for God, which conjures associations with Helenistic Zeus or even Germanic Þórr. As we shall see with Alcuin below, the adoption of pagan epithets for heavenly figures appears to have been common practice in the composition of such dedications and may betray the influence of earlier tituli from late antiquity. Such pagan apppellations may also represent cross-pollination with another tradition from late antiquity, i.e., the heroic verse adaptations of canonical scripture by writers such as Juvenecus, Sedulius and Arator. For instance, in Book V of his Carmen Paschale, the fifth-century poet Sedulius refers to Christ’s answer from God as proceeding ab ore Tonantis (‘from the mouth of the Thunderer’). Similarly, the sixth-century poet Arator relates how Peter’s healing prayer for Tabitha (Acts 9:40) reaches the Thunderer in the heavens: Tunc magis alta petens oratio fusa Tonanti | Mox super astra uolat, propriis quae clauibus intrat (‘Then, reaching higher, the prayer, poured out to the Thunderer, quickly flies above the stars, where it enters by means of its

133 Gregory of Tours relates Andrew’s missionary activity in various other towns and areas such as Amasia, Siope, Nicaea, Nicomedia, Thrace, Perinthus, Macedonia, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Corinth. Cf. below, pp. 214 ff.

134 Cf. below, p. 182.

own keys). The same sort of pagan diction which Aldhelm infuses into his dedication to Andrew achieves an interesting affect by forming a classically heroic literary context around the apostle that is consonant with the hero’s boldness in the face of martyrdom. It is this same heroic strength that makes him a powerful and apt intercessor for the protection of the church. Thus, the heroic quality of Andrew’s apocryphal passion underscores the apostle’s suitability as guardian, which, from the opening lines, Aldhelm’s dedication stresses is the chief function of the saint’s altar.

The production of tituli for church and altar dedications continued in Anglo-Saxon as a common learned endeavor beyond Aldhelm’s day. Bede composed similar dedications in heroic or elegiac metre (heroico metro siue elegiaco) as attested by a now lost Liber Epigrammatum mentioned in his list of works at the end of the Historia Ecclesiastica. Lapidge has identified the remnants of several elegiac dedications by Bede which have been partially transcribed or epitomized in John Leland’s Collectanea, though none of the verses pertain directly to the apostles. Alcuin of York, while primarily recognized for his literary contributions within the Frankish milieu of Charlemagne’s court, may be considered to some degree as representing an extension of Anglo-Saxon learning and literary practice. Four tituli by Alcuin and dedicated to altars of St. Andrew have been preserved, all of which do not exceed six lines and are scripturally based, focusing primarily on the Gospel of John’s recognition of the apostle as the first of the disciples to follow Christ. One of the tituli, recorded as having been inscribed on

137 HE V.24: Librum epigrammatum heroico metro siue elegiaco (‘A book of epigrams in heroic or elegiac metre’).
139 Dümmler (1881), LXXXVIII.x, p. 307; LXXXVIII[I].xx, p. 312; XCIX.xvi, p. 326; CIX.v, p. 336.
the wall of a church dedicated to St. Vedast, bishop of Arras, is significant in depicting Andrew as an “apostolic teacher” (*Doctor apostolicus*). Two of the dedications describe Andrew’s particular duty as protecting the consecrated ceiling (*tecta sacrata*), though whether this responsibility is to be interpreted in the literal sense as maintaining the church’s ceiling or metaphorically as guarding the heavenly firmament is unclear. Only the fourth of these *tituli* actually includes any apocryphal references:

```
Hoc altare suis meritis defendat ab hoste
Andreas Christi familus, qui retia mundi
Contempsit, Christum tota virtute secutus,
De crusce qui sacra felix conscendit Olimpum.  
```

```
May he defend this altar through his merits from the enemy, Andrew, servant of Christ, who scorned the nets of the world, followed Christ with complete virtue; who, happy, ascended to Olympus (i.e. Heaven) from the sacred cross.
```

Like Aldhelm’s altar dedication, Alcuin’s *titulus* remains vague in terms of apocryphal detail, an understandable situation given the necessary brevity of the inscription. Also like Aldhelm, Alcuin employs heroic diction with the pagan image of *Olimpum* as an epithet for Heaven. This classically derived appellation for the heavenly kingdom is well attested in Arator’s heroic adaptation of the canonical *Actus apostolorum* and even occurs once in Juvenecus’ classical reworking of the gospels. Thus, like his predecessor, Alcuin creates a heroic context around

---

140 Dümmler (1881), LXXXVIII[I].xx, p. 312. While Alcuin’s association with the church of St. Vedast must be primarily considered within a Frankish context, it is worthy of note that the saint’s cult was the subject of regional veneration in Anglo-Saxon England as evidenced by several liturgical manuscripts and calendars. Cf. Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, 5th revised edition (2011), p. 432. For the role of the apostles as teaches, cf. above, pp. 50 ff.

141 Dümmler (1881), LXXXVIII.x, p. 307; XCIX.xvi, p. 326.

142 Dümmler (1881), CIX.v, p. 336.

143 Alcuin employs a similar epithet for Andrew as an inhabitor of Olympus (*habitator Olympt*), i.e., an inhabitor of Heaven, in another of his altar dedications to the Apostle. Cf. *ibid.*, XCIX.xvi, p. 326.

Andrew through the use of classical allusion, thereby subconsciously bolstering in the mind of his audience the Apostle’s valor and worthiness as the altar’s guardian.

Andrew in the Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church

In addition to occasional and dedicatory inscriptions for the consecration of churches and altars, Anglo-Saxon hymnody provides another source of devotional verse which held an importance place within ecclesiastical and monastic veneration of the apostles. Votive hymns to Andrew would certainly have been sung during the liturgical celebration of the saint’s feast-day (especially in the divine office) and may, perhaps, have found usage in more private devotion to the saint as well. As compared to the more strictly defined liturgical formularies, the hymn was more open-ended and flexible in format, making the medium a suitable vehicle for the potential inclusion of extensive details about a saint’s life, be they scripturally based or derived from apocryphal and hagiographical sources. Unfortunately, the most commonly attested hymn about Andrew attached to the Apostle’s veneration in the divine office is rather brief and void of apocryphal detail:

```
Andreas pie sanctorum mitissime
Opti[n]e nostris erratibus veniam
Et qui gravamur sarcina peccaminum
Subleva tuis intercessionibus.
Annue Christe. 145

O pious Andrew, most mild of the saints,
Obtain pardon for our errors
And we who are oppressed with the burden of sins
Lift [us] up through your intercessions.
O Christ, allow [this].
```

This particular hymn is found in the Durham Hymnal (Durham Cathedral Library, B.III.32) with a full Old English interlinear gloss as well as in the hymnal sections found in the

---

145 J. Stevenson, ed., *The Latin Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church, with an Interlinear Anglo-Saxon Gloss*, Surtees Society 23 (Durham: George Andrews, 1851), p. 126. I have emended Stevenson’s reading of *optime* to *optine*. At the time of writing, there was no access to the manuscript of the Durham Hymnal (Durham Cathedral Library, B.III.32) to either confirm or reject Stevenson’s reading. Certainly *optine* makes more sense grammatically and contextually. The manuscript’s interlinear Old English gloss *begyt* accords with *optine*, and the reading *optine* is attested in the Leofric Collectar and the Wulstan Portforium’s text of the hymn.
manuscripts containing the Leofric Collectar\textsuperscript{147} and Wulstan Portiforium.\textsuperscript{148} The beginning of
the hymnal attached to the Wulstan Portiforium attributes its hymns to St. Ambrose and notes
that they are to be sung during the individual hours of the divine office in accordance with the
monastic ordinance of St. Benedict of Nursia.\textsuperscript{149} More specifically, the Leofric Collectar itself
provides the incipit of the hymn for Andrew to be sung for first vespers, while the hymnal
section of the manuscript contains the entire song grouped together with the hymns dedicated to
the other apostles. The hymn is purely intercessory in nature, asking Andrew to obtain
forgiveness for those that have sinned, and offers no biographical details, canonical or
apocryphal, about the Apostle.

On folio 11v, the Durham Hymnal contains a second hymn to be sung on the feast of St.
Andrew not found in the manuscripts of the Leofric Collectar and the Wulstan Portiforium.
Once again, the Latin hymn appears with a full Old English interlinear gloss. Unlike the more
commonly attested Ambrosian hymn with direct connections to the Benedictine office, however,
this particular Durham hymn to Andrew is longer and apocryphally charged.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Nobis ecce dies ordine congruo \\
Venit nunc celebris clarus amabilis \\
Quo victor super alta \\
Scandit prope sidera. \\
Andreas Domini sanctus apostolus \\
Germanusque Petri principis incliti
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Behold, the renowned day, illustrious [and] \\
delightful, now comes to us in proper sequence, \\
in which the victor climbed over the heights, near \\
to the lofty stars. Andrew, the holy apostle of the \\
Lord and brother of the renowned prince Peter,
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

himself a virile prince, was a companion in

\textsuperscript{146} Stevenson (1851), p. 126. The interlinear gloss of the Durham Hymnal reads: The Old English gloss reads: \textit{ó eala þu arfæsta halgena lîpesta | begyt urum gedþeldum forgyfenysse | 7 þa de beod gehefegode mid herbene synne | upaþeþe mid þinū þingrædum} ("O behold, you of the honorable, holy [and] most gracious ones, receive forgiveness for your sins; and those who are laden with the burden of sin, lift [them] up through your intercessions"). A more recent edition and study has since appeared: Inge B. Milfull, \textit{The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the 'Durham Hymnal,' }CSASE 17 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

\textsuperscript{147} Dewick (1914), p. 411.

\textsuperscript{148} CCCC MS 391, p. 269 [accessed via the Parker Library on the Web]. The text of the Wulstan Portforium’s hymnal has not yet been edited in full, though incipits are provided in Dewick & Frere (2021), pp. 605-606.

\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Incipiunt hýmni Ambrosiani canendi per singulas horas secundum contistarttime patris nostri Benedicti} (“[Here] begin the hymns of Ambrose to be sung for the individual hours according to the ordinance of our father Benedict”). Dewick & Frere (2021), p. 605. Found on p. 227 of CCCC MS 391.
Given the hymn’s opening celebration of the coming of the “illustrious” and “delightful” day, it was likely intended to be sung during one of the morning offices, perhaps matins. Though the hymn is ostensibly dedicated to Andrew and clearly refers to his feast-day, the song is voiced largely in the plural in reference to both the saint and his brother Peter, both of whom are described as princes or leaders in the Christian faith. Andrew’s own identification as a princeps virilis demonstrates more specifically a reflex of his name’s etymological meaning. Like the antiphon for Andrew found in the material appended to the Durham Collectar, the chief apocryphal theme in this song of the Durham Hymnal is the brothers’ shared “companionship” in martyrdom through the cross, perhaps pointing to the motif’s particular popularity in northern Britain. This companionship, of course, extends to include Christ as well, allowing both Andrew and Peter to follow in the Lord’s footsteps via a common mode of death. While these apocryphal allusions to Andrew and Peter’s crucifixions are indeed key to the hymn’s portrayal of the apostles as strong and exemplary leaders in Christ’s teachings, the scripturally based image of the brothers as fishermen remains the song’s real focal point. The fisherman theme

150 Stevenson (1851), p. 38.
151 Cf. above, pp. 123 ff.
152 Cf. above, pp. 172-73.
provides the extended metaphor propelling the hymn forward.\textsuperscript{153} It is as fishermen that Andrew and Peter are able to “seize” the Christian flocks, “ravage” (i.e., “empty out”) the seas of the world, and make a “haul” of the kingdom of heaven. Verbs such as \textit{rapiunt} and \textit{vastant} lend a rather violent and martial tone to the song; a quality not entirely consonant with the more pastoral image of fishing. Such aggressive terminology, however, is not wholly out of place, for these are fishermen in a much more heroic sense, whose valorous capabilities permit them to plunder the world’s seas, i.e., the various peoples encountered during their missionary journeys, for potential Christian converts. The hymn’s forceful diction elevates Andrew and Peter to warriors for Christ, metaphorically trolling the Mediterranean for a fresh haul of Christian souls and capable of facing martyrdom with bravery and resolve.

The two most extensive hymns dedicated to Andrew from Anglo-Saxon England are preserved among the poetic works of the venerable Bede. Both hymns have been published in J. Fraipont’s edition of Bede’s “\textit{Liber hymnorum, Rhythmi, Variae preces},” but have attracted woefully little attention from subsequent scholars.\textsuperscript{154} Almost nothing has been written on them, and this state of neglect means that they have never been fully analyzed or sourced. If the attribution to Bede is correct, and without strong evidence to the contrary I see no reason to question it, then the hymns likely date to the first quarter of the eighth century. The composition of the hymns within the chronology of Bede’s works is unknown and cannot, therefore, be dated with any more precision. In her 2003 article on apostolic \textit{passiones} in Anglo-Saxon England, Aideen M. O’Leary tentatively suggests the \textit{Epistula} as Bede’s source for his second hymn to

\textsuperscript{153} For Andrew as fisher and hunter, cf. above, pp. 133 ff.

Andrew ("In natali sancti Andreæ hymnus alter"), while admitting that the hymn bears resemblances with other surviving passion narratives for Andrew, stating:

The hymn closely resembles both extant Latin passion-texts of Andrew in terms of events, emotions, and vocabulary, but these details are especially similar to the longer version in the ‘Letter of Priests and Deacons of Achaia’ (BHL 428).155

O’Leary’s claims for a closer similarity between Bede’s “Hymnus alter” and the Epistula is based solely on the composer’s statement that a miraculous light was sent down to escort Andrew into heaven upon his death. Absent in Gregory’s De miraculis, the Conuersante et docente, and the composite Book III of Ps.-Abdias, this particular motif appears to be unique to the Epistula and is often interpreted as evidence for its influence. Frederick M. Biggs’ more recent contribution on apocrypha in Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture, while it addresses the potential use of the Epistula in Anglo-Saxon England, makes no mention of the passio’s possible influence on Bede.156 O’Leary’s assertion of Bede’s familiarity with the Epistula appears fundamentally sound, and the following shall provide further evidence that the venerable scholar did indeed consult the Epistula or some closely related tradition when composing his hymns. In order to do so, I offer the full text of the “Hymnus alter” alongside parallel passages from the Epistula with analogous themes and vague verbal resonances highlighted in bold. Because Bede’s “Hymnus alter” has not yet, to my knowledge, appeared in a full modern English translation, I also offer a modern English rendering in parallel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analogous Passages from the Epistula</th>
<th>Bede’s “In natali Sancti Andrae hymnus alter”</th>
<th>Translation of Bede’s “Hymnus alter”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salve crux…</td>
<td>1. Salve, tropæum gloriae, Salve, sacrum uictoriae</td>
<td>1. ‘Hail’ monument of glory! Hail holy sign of victory, through which, God, having suffered death, redeemed the depraved world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… quæ in corpore Christi</td>
<td>2. O gloriosa fulgidis</td>
<td>2. May you shine forth with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

155 O’Leary (2003), 114. Marie M. Walsh previously drew attention to Bede’s dependence on apocryphal passion narratives in composing his hymns, though she makes no attempt to identify a specific source. Cf. Walsh, pp. 105-6.

156 Biggs (2007), 42.
1. Once you oppressed the race of mortals with pallor inducing fear, but now you replenish the hearts of the faithful with joyous love.

2. Behold, it is a pleasure for believers to enjoy your embraces, which give birth to such joys and extend the doors of heaven.

3. You who, after the sweet limbs of the creator, are made sweeter than honey to us and made preferable to all the honors of the world.

4. I am glad to approach you now. I embrace you with arms of love. Through you I ascend to the celestial pleasures.

5. So you, welcoming [and] nourishing one, take me up, a young servant of him, the lofty master, who redeemed me through your glory.’

6. Thus speaks Andrew, examining the erected beams of the cross, and, handing over [his] garment to a soldier, he is lifted onto the tree of life.

7. Nor, high above does he cease to preach from the cross to the crowd of those standing around [and] to open up the eternal life with God and the kingdom of heaven.

8. And on account of the fiery faith of those of the crowd, the frightened judge promised through oaths to release this man from the grisly death.

9. But Andrew, beholding the paths of heaven and the king of heaven among a celestial crowd of delightful fellow-citizens on a citadel, [said]:

10. ‘Jesus, I implore,’ he said, ‘O
Bede’s “Hymnus alter” is a devotional work meant to be sung in a liturgical setting. Noting the song’s devotional aims, O’Leary is correct in emphasizing the hymn’s focus on Andrew’s humanity and courage. It is the saint’s mortality and bravery in the face of death that makes him worthy of martyrdom and the praise of subsequent Christian communities. In the penultimate stanza, the chanting of the blessed victor, i.e., Andrew, upon the cross is likened to

157 Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, pp. 24-34.

158 Bede, Hymn, pp. 437-38.

the singing of the faithful and leads fluidly into the final stanza’s *exordium* proper for prayer and the intercession of the Lord. The generic limitations of a hymn as well as its emphasis on praise and intercession means that Bede is not concerned with faithfully relating every detail of Andrew’s passion that we would expect to find in an apocryphally inspired hagiographical narrative. Rather, Bede’s “Hymnus alter” broadly follows the sequence of ideas found in the *Epistula* and represents a rather free, poetic reworking and significant contraction of its source. Consequently, there remain no verbatim parallels such as those found elsewhere in the Anglo-Saxon literary record.\(^{160}\) Despite this lack of word-for-word borrowings, there remains good evidence that Bede owed something to the *Epistula* or some closely related tradition. The most striking proof comes in stanzas 14-16, where, as O’Leary has already pointed out, Bede recounts the heavenly brilliance which surrounds Andrew and eventually bears his soul to heaven when the saint expires. In dedicating three stanzas to the miraculous *splendor*, Bede lends the motif an otherwise unprecedented level of importance, thereby underscoring the triumphant nature of the apostle’s death and the Lord’s recognition of his sacrifice. Ever the close reader, Bede also maintains a keen eye for poetic potential in his source material. For example, the venerable scholar clearly recognizes the fact that no human eye could look upon Andrew due to the brightness of the splendor (*praes ipso splendore oculi eum non possent humani aspicere*), but renders the notion somewhat more poetically and concisely in stating that the brilliant light was “brighter than the sun” (*Splendorque sole clarior*).

Bede’s “Hymnus alter” also includes several other motifs or images that point to the *Epistula* as its source. In stanza 8 of the hymn, the author relates how Andrew hands over his garment to a soldier (*Tradensque uestem militi*), a detail that parallels the *Epistula*’s account of

\(^{160}\) Cf. below pp. 197 ff. with regard to verbatim excerpts found in the “Prayer Book of Aedelulad” or liturgical formulae preserved in Anglo-Saxon office books.
how the apostle relinquishes his vestments to the “butchers” before being crucified (et uestimenta sua tradidit carnificibus).161 Specific mention of Andrew’s “vestments” is largely absent in both the Conuersante et docente and Ps.-Abdias, though the term does appear in some variant readings of the two texts.162 However, even in those variants which explicitly relate how Andrew is said to “strip himself of his clothes” or “cast off his vestments” (expolians se uestimentis in a variant of the Conuersante et docente; exuens uuestimenta sua in some versions of Ps.-Abdias), the verb tradidit is used to refer to Andrew’s surrendering of his own person to Aegeas’ attendants rather than his clothes.163 Thus, Bede’s use of tradensque more closely reflects the context of tradidit in the Epistula, where the object of the verb is Andrew’s garments and not the apostle himself. Furthermore, Bede undertakes a theological reclaiming of the symbolic meaning of the cross, describing in stanza 3 how it was once an emblem which evoked fear from mankind, but through Christ’s sacrifice has been refashioned into a sign of joy to replenish the faltering human heart. This reinterpretation of the feelings conjured by the cross mirrors Andrew’s statement in the Epistula that, where once the cross “maintained earthly fear” (timorem terrenum habuisti), it is now taken up as a symbol representing the Lord’s promise of eternal salvation. No close analogue to the transformation of the cross’ symbolic significance appears in the Conuersante et docente and Ps.-Abdias. Additionally, there is an interesting verbal resonance found in stanza 6. Here, Bede renders the Epistula’s desideraui amplecti te (“I

161 Cp. the identical reading in Mombritius (1910) I, 107, ll. 2-3.

162 The parallel section in Conuersante et docente reads: et haec dicens beatissimus expolians se et tradidit ministris, et illi ligantes manus et pedes eius secundum quod eis fuerat praeceptum suspenderunt eum in cruce (“And the most blessed one, speaking this and stripping himself, surrendered to the attendants, and they, binding his hands and feet according to what they had been ordered, suspended him upon the cross”). Bonnet (1894), §4, 376, ll. 10-12. Bonnet notes in his critical apparatus how at least one manuscript (Paris BN lat. 12603) adds vestimentis following expolians se, thereby denoting that the Apostle was “stripping himself of his vestments.” Fabricius’ edition of Ps.-Abdias reads: Et haec dicens beatissimus Andreas, expolians se tradidit ministris (“And the most blessed Andrew, saying this and stripping himself, surrendered to the attendants”). Fabricius notes a variant reading exuens uuestimenta sua (“casting off his own vestments) in place of expolians se. Fabricius, 512.

163 Cf. above, note 162 on this page.
desired to embrace you”) with *Te caritatis brachiis complector* (“I embrace you with arms of love”). The verbs are not precisely the same, yet they derive from a common root (*plecto, plectere*) and convey a similar meaning of “embrace.” While the other Latin recensions of Andrew’s martyrdom make much of the apostle’s willingness to die, they do not cast that desire in the image of an embrace.

Since Bede does not lift verbatim snatches from the *Epistula*, it is difficult to determine with greater precision what version of the text he may have had in his immediate employ. Consequently, we cannot say whether his source text resembled more closely the Bonnet recension or the version published by Mombritius. Nevertheless, the motifs and imagery that he employs more closely resemble the *Epistula* than any other contemporary Latin martyrdom for Andrew, and in the absence of further evidence we may suppose that some version of the *Epistula* was in circulation in Anglo-Saxon England by the late seventh or early eighth centuries such that Bede had recourse to consult it when composing the “Hymnus alter.”

Bede’s “In natali sancti Andreae hymnus prior” is much harder to source with any degree of certainty. Here I give the full text of the hymn as edited by Fraipont as well as a modern English translation:

1. Nunc Andreae sollemnia
   Laetis canamus mentibus,
   Apostolatus gloriam
   Qui ornat triumpho sanguinis

2. Quem piscibus per turbida
   Dum rete nectit aequora,
   Christus uocauit cum suis
   Ad regna caeli fratribus

3. Misitque late gentibus
   Verbum salutis pandere
   Ac saeculi de fluctibus
   Mentes leuare credulas..

4. Qui mox fidei lampade
   Dum lustrat oras Graeciae,

---

1. Let us now sing with happy minds the solemnities [i.e. the feast-day] of Andrew, [let us sing] the glory of apostleship who bears witness through the triumph of blood.

2. Whom, from across the stormy sea, Christ called away from [his] fish as he mended his net, along with his own brothers, to the kingdom(s) of heaven.

3. And [whom] he sent far and wide among the people to spread the word of salvation and lift believing minds from the surges of the world.

4. He who next, with the torch of faith, while he walks the shores of Greece, shining with the light.
Dieque Christi fulgidus
Erroris umbras effugat.

5. Achaeus armis adpetit
Dux lucis arma tetricis,
Miles Dei sed fortiter
Hostis repellit impetum.

6. Pandit crucis mysteria,
Quae dira mortis pristinae
Solut potenter uincula
Mundoque uitam contulit.

7. Agni refert et hostiam,
Qui nos ab hoste liberans
Vita beat trans aethera
Regnoque secum perpeti.

8. Inclusus atro carcere
Lucis minister aurea
Pacis uias ad sidera
Pandit cateruis plebium.

9. Caesus flagellis septies
Tormenta risit omnia,
Septena quem repleuerant
Iam dona sancti Spiritus.

10. Tandem leuatus in crucem
Terram reliquit sordidam
Mundisque felix passibus
Poli petiuit ianuas.

11. Excepit alma ciuitas
Nostrumque mater omnium
Laetata Christi martyrem
Apostolumque maximum.

12. Conguadet omnis ciuium
Nobis chorus caelestium
Magni uidens perennia
Nunc Andreae sollemnia.¹⁶⁴

of Christ, drives away the shadows of error.

5. The Achaean leader [i.e. Aegeas] assails with
dark arms the arms of light, but the soldier of God
boldly repels the attack of the enemy.

6. He opens up the mysteries of the cross, which
powerfully loosed the cruel shackles of the
original death and conferred life into the world.

7. And he recalls the sacrifice of the lamb, who,
freeing us from the enemy, blesses us with life
beyond the ether and the everlasting reign with
him.

8. Shut up in a dark prison, the minister of light
extended the ways of peace up into the golden
stars to the crowds of peoples.

9. Struck seven times with lashes, he scoffed at
all torments, he whom the seven gifts of the Holy
Spirit have already replenished.

10. At last, elevated upon the cross, he left
behind the foul earth and, happy, with clean steps,
made for the doors of heaven.

11. The nourishing city and the mother of us all
happily received the martyr of Christ and greatest
of the apostles.

12. Every chorus of celestial citizens rejoices
together with us, witnessing now the perennial
solemnities [i.e. the annual feast] of the great
Andrew.

Stanzas 2-3 appear to be scripturally based, with the second stanza referring to Andrew’s calling
by Christ to abandon his nets in accordance with the gospels¹⁶⁵ and the third stanza referencing


¹⁶⁵ Mt. 4:18-20, Mk. 1:16-18
the missionary imperative given the Apostles as related in the canonical *Acts*. Beginning with the fourth stanza, the hymn delves more explicitly into Andrew’s apocryphal mission to Patras, though the allusions are vague in comparison with the details of his salutation to the cross found in the “Hymnus alter.” The fourth stanza of the “Hymnus prior” sees Andrew spreading the light of Christ’s teaching into Greece and the fifth stanza makes explicit reference to the Apostle’s struggles with the Achaian leader, i.e., Aegeas. Stanzas six and seven witness Andrew’s preaching of Christ’s mysteries and salvific crucifixion, facts that could have been derived from any number of versions of the saint’s martyrdom. The references to Andrew’s imprisonment and flagellation in stanzas eight and nine might also have originated from other versions of the apostle’s passion narrative. The *Conuersante et docente* and Ps.-Abdias relate how Andrew was whipped twenty-one times before being crucified (*Sic proconsul septem eum ternionibus flagellis caesum crucifi gi praec epit*.... “Thus, the proconsul ordered that he, struck with three times seven lashes, be crucified”). The *Epistula* includes the same detail: *Tunc Aegeas iussit eum flagellis caedi extensum. quique cum septem terniones transisset, eleuatus est atque adductus ante eum* (“Then Aegeas ordered him, stretched out, to be struck with whips, and when he endured three times seven [lashes], he was lifted up and brought before him”). In this instance, therefore, the *Epistula*, the *Conuersante et docente* and Ps.-Abdias all agree more readily with one another than with Bede, for the “Hymnus prior” acknowledges only seven lashes (*Caesus flagellis septies*) rather than three times seven. It is possible that Bede’s exemplar had already simplified the number related passages, though it is equally plausible that the author himself abbreviated his

---

166 Acts 1:8
167 *Conuersante et docente*, 374. The Ps.-Abdias text is quite similar, differing only in the variants *flagellis* and *flagellorum*: *Sic Proconsul septem eum ternionibus flagellorum caesum crucifi gi praec epit*.... Cf. Fabricius, 510.
168 AAA, II.1, 22.
source in order to stress the typological parallel between the lashes that Andrew receives and the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{169} In the end, the apocryphal details of the “Hymnus prior” are too universal among the various versions of Andrew’s passion to name a definitive source. Yet, given Bede’s extensive use of the \textit{Epistula} in the “Hymnus alter,” it seems reasonable to surmise that the same text likely influenced the “Hymnus prior” and should be considered the preferred source for comparative analysis.

The “Hymnus prior” is clearly a self-contained song as evidenced by the emphasis on Andrew’s \textit{sollemnia} in the first and final lines of the hymn. Andrew’s crucifixion in the tenth stanza, his acceptance into heaven by the Virgin Mary in the eleventh,\textsuperscript{170} and the call for celebrants to rejoice in his “perennial sollemnities” in the twelfth form a fitting conclusion to the song. Despite the evident autonomy of the “Hymnus prior,” I would argue that the song was meant to be read or sung in closer connection to the “Hymnus alter” than has hitherto been recognized. Noteworthy is the fact that, save for the closing summation of Andrew’s crucifixion and assumption into heaven in the final stanzas of the first hymn, the two songs do not greatly overlap with regard to detail or structure. The “Hymnus prior” establishes the first part of Andrew’s \textit{acta}, relating how the saint was called into the apostleship of Christ, travelled the Mediterranean in search of converts, arrived in Achaia, preached the mysteries of the Lord, and was ultimately imprisoned and flagellated at the order of Aegeas. The “Hymnus alter” picks up in detail where the final verses of the first hymn offered only a broad summary of the saint’s crucifixion. Thus, the second hymn opens with a detailed rendering of Andrew’s address to the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{169} For the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, cf. Is. 11:2-3; above, p. 41-2.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{170} I have not yet found a source for Andrew’s reception into heaven by the Virgin Mary. This fact is not included in the \textit{Epistula}, Gregory’s \textit{Liber de miraculis}, the \textit{Conuersante et docente} or Ps.-Abdias. It is possible that this image is Bede’s own invention as he imagines the apostle’s journey into the kingdom of heaven.
\end{flushleft}
cross, theologically reclaims the cross as a symbol of victory, and focuses on the miraculous brilliance which helped transport the Apostle’s soul into heaven. Consequently, the two hymns combine to form an emotionally charged rendering of Andrew’s life from initial calling to final martyrdom. Because they represent self-contained units, the two songs may have been intended for singing at different hours of the Divine Office or, perhaps, on different days (i.e., first vespers on the vigil of Andrew’s feast and second vespers on the feast of St. Andrew itself). The second hymn, however, provides the logical sequel and conclusion to the first. As a result, I would posit that Bede composed the two hymns at roughly the same time and using the same source materials, anticipating that they would be sung or read in conjunction with one another. The two hymns, therefore, must be reevaluated by future scholars as a masterful and cohesive verse rendering of Andrew’s apocryphal passion, likely based upon a version of the Epistula.

Andrew in Private Prayer: The Case of the “Prayer Book of Aedeluald”

In the century following the appearance of Bede’s hymns, the Epistula clearly exercised its direct influence on at least one manuscript associated with devotional piety and liturgical interests. Frederick M. Biggs has drawn attention to the Epistula’s use in the so-called “Prayer Book of Aedeluald,” a miscellany of devotional materials assembled in Mercia c. 820-840 and now preserved in fol. 2r-99v of the famed Book of Cerne.171 Here, Biggs notes that Item 66

---

(referred to as such according to the section numbering of Kuyper’s edition) is taken with “minor changes” from Andrew’s salutation to the cross as recorded in the *Epistula*, though he makes no attempt to ascertain whether the text was excerpted from the Bonnet or the Mombritius version.

In order to underscore Biggs’ point and offer some preliminary insight into the prayer-book’s affinities with the variant texts, Item 66 is here given alongside both the Bonnet and Mombritius recensions, with deviations between the three marked in italics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonnet Recension of the <em>Epistula</em></th>
<th>Item 66 in the “Prayer Book of Aedelauald”</th>
<th>Mombritius Recension of the <em>Epistula</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue crux quae in corpore Christi dedicata es et ex membrorum eius margaritis ornata. antequam te ascenderet dominus, timorem terrenum habuisti, modo uero amorem caelestem obtinens pro uoto susciperes. sciris enim a credentibus quanta intra te gaudia habeas, quanta munera praeparata. securus ergo et gaudens uenio ad te, ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius qui pepedin in te, quia amator tuus semper fui et desideraui amplecti te. o bona crux quae decorem et pulcritudinem de membris domini suscepisti, accipe me ab hominibus et redde me magistro meo, ut per te me recipiat qui per te redemit me.</td>
<td>Salue sancta crux quae in corpore christi dedicata es et ex membris eius tamquam margaretis ornata antequam te ascenderet dominus, timorem terrenum habuisti. Modo uero amorem caelestem obtinens pro uoto susceperis. scires enim a credentibus quanta gaudia habeas. Quanta munera praeparata. Securus ergo et gaudens uenio ad te. Ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius qui pepedin in te. Scires enim a credentibus quanta in te gaudia habeas. Quanta munera praeparata. Securus ergo et gaudens uenio ad te. Ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius qui pepedin in te. Quanta in te gaudia habeas. Quanta munera praeparata. Securus ergo et gaudens uenio ad te. Ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius qui pepedin in te. Scires enim a credentibus: quanta in te gaudia habeas: quanta munera praeparata: Securus ergo et gaudens uenio ad te: Ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius: qui pepedin in te: quia amator tuus semper fui: et desideraui amplecti te. O bona crux: quae decorem et pulcritudinem de membris domini suscepisti dui desidera sollicita quaesita et aliquando iam concupiscenti animae praeparata. Accipe me ab hominibus et redde me magistro meo ut per te me recipiat qui per te redemit me.</td>
<td>Salue crux pretiosa: quae in corpore Christi dedicata es et ex membris eius tamquam margaretis ornata ante quam in te ascenderet deus timorem terrenum habuisti: modo uero amorem caelestem: obtinensque uoto suspenderis. Scires enim a credentibus: quanta in te gaudia habeas: quanta munera praeparata. Securus ergo et gaudens uenio ad te: ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum eius: qui pepedin in te: quia amator tuus semper fui: et desideraui amplecti te. O bona crux: quae decorem et pulcritudinem de membris domini suscepisti dui desidera sollicita quaesita et iam concupiscenti animo praeparata accipe me ab hominibus: et redde me magistro meo: ut per te me recipiat: qui per te redemit:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

172 Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, pp. 24-6.

173 Kuypers (1902), §66, p. 161. (“Hail holy cross, you who were consecrated in the body of Christ and adorned with the pearls of his limbs. Before the Lord ascended you, you maintained earthly fear. Now truly, you obtain heavenly love; you are to be received as a promise. For you are known to believers; how many joys you might hold, how many rewards are prepared. Therefore, untroubled and rejoicing, I approach you so that you, exalting, may receive me, the disciple of him who hung upon you, for I was always your devotee and desired to embrace you. O good cross, you who received ornament and beauty from the limbs of the Lord, having been long desired, anxiously loved, sought for without pause, and now at last prepared for the longing soul, take me away from mankind and deliver me to my master, so that he may receive me through you, he who redeemed me through you. Amen.”)

In general, the Bonnet and Mombritius recensions agree with one another against the text found in the “Prayer Book of Aedeluald.” Most significantly, the fuller variants of the *Epistula* contain the phrase *quia amator tuus semper fui et desideraui aplecti te* (“for I was always your [i.e. the cross’] devotee and desired to embrace you”), whereas the compiler of the prayer-book excises the passage entirely. Similarly, the compiler deletes the phrase *intra te / in te* to arrive at *enim a credentibus quanta gaudia habeas*. Furthermore, both the Bonnet and Mombritius variants agree on the present participle reading *obtinens* against Item 66’s likely corrupt second-person present active *obtines*, as well as the reading *animo* against the prayer-book’s *animae*. Item 66 shares several closer affinities with the Mombritius text over that of Bonnet. Both the prayer-book and Mombritius read *membris* against Bonnet’s *membrorum*, and both contain the conjunction *tamquam/tanquam*, whereas Bonnet omits the word.\(^{175}\) Likewise, both Item 66 and the Mombritius recension modify the noun *crux* with an adjective (*sancta* in the prayer-book and *pretiosa* in Mombritius), while Bonnet’s text makes no such attempt.\(^{176}\) Despite these similarities, it would be premature to recognize the Mombritius variant as providing a definitively closer match with the prayer-book’s excerpted passage. Arguing against such a hasty assertion are two instances in which the Bonnet text provides closer readings to those found in Item 66, i.e., *dominus* against Mombritius’ *deus* and *suscepteris/susciperis* against Mombritius’ *susponderis*.\(^{177}\) Until further research can ascertain more precisely the textual history of the *Epistula* and the relationship between the Bonnet and Mombritius versions, no

---

\(^{175}\) In his critical apparatus, Bonnet recognizes *membris et. tamquam* as a variant reading that appears in several manuscripts. Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, p. 25.

\(^{176}\) Bonnet recognizes no such variant reading in his critical apparatus. Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, pp. 24-5.

\(^{177}\) Bonnet recognizes *susponderis* as a correction in at least two manuscripts, but does not note any occurrences of *deus* in place of *dominus*. Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, p. 25.
decisive judgment can be made as to which recension is closer to the text contained within the “Prayer Book of Aedeluald.”

Since Item 66 lifts this passage from Andrew’s salutation to the cross nearly verbatim from the Epistula, it is unclear precisely how the excerpt was intended to function within a devotional setting. The insertion of amen at the passage’s conclusion implies that the excerpt was indeed intended to be spoken as a prayer. Absent, however, are the typical pleas for intercession generally found in prayers dedicated to saints. Instead of being intercessory in nature, the recitation of Andrew’s address here probably served as an opportunity for reflection on the part of the devotee. By reading or reciting this passage in a moment of private study, the reader could ponder the theological significance of the cross as the symbol of Christ’s (and Andrew’s) victory over death. Like Andrew, the audience is compelled to focus on the hope which the cross promises for the salvation of the faithful. Directly following this excerpt, however, is a more typical intercessory prayer to Andrew.178 In addition to the theological meditation offered by the passion narrative, therefore, the passage may also have primed its audience for the intercessory prayer to come, highlighting the apostle’s strength, heroism and suitability as intercessor.

Aedeluald’s intercessory prayer to Andrew is attested in a slightly different form in the miscellaneous devotional material appended to the Wulstan Portforium during the late ninth century.179 Consequently, I give the Aedeluald recension alongside that of the Wulstan Portforium’s manuscript. The translation is based primarily on the Wulstan version because it is slightly more extensive, but because both texts are apparently corrupt, some readings from the


Aedeluald text are silently adopted where they make better sense. Divergences in the two texts are italicized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oration 67 in the “Prayer Book of Aedeluald”</th>
<th>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 391 (Manuscript containing the Wulstan Portiforium)</th>
<th>Translation based on the text of CCCC MS 391</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ó Andreas sancte pro mé intercede Ut euadam pure flammæ dure poenæ.</td>
<td>O andreae† sanctae† pro me intercede, ut euadam pure flammæ dure pene.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, intercede for me so that I might evade the flames of pure, unalleviated punishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Té nunc peto care mane atque nocte ne dormiam strictæ animæ in morte.</td>
<td>O andreae† sanctae† pro me intercede pro me ne inimicus preualeat nimis quia sum inanis atque cinis.</td>
<td>I entreat you now, O dear one, remain both day and night lest I fall asleep in death with a fettered soul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ó andreas sancte ne me derelinquas cum impiis perire.</td>
<td>O andreae† sanctae† ne me derelinquas cum impiis perire.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, may you not abandon me to die among the impious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancte mé dignare sanare in fine.</td>
<td>O sanctae† esto nunc adiutor atque gubernator meus, ut sit michi adiutor rex caeli creator. O sanctae† in te nunc confido christi miles magnus quia sum infirmus pauper atque paruus.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, I confide in you now, great soldier of Christ, because I am a weak and mean beggar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ó Andreas sancte esto nunc adiutor atque gubernator ut sit mihi tutor rex caeli creator.</td>
<td>O sanctae† esto nunc adiutor atque gubernator meus, ut sit michi adiutor rex caeli creator.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, dear comrade of Peter, having abandoned the fishing-nets, you are great in deeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ó Andreas sanctae in te nunc confido christi miles magnus quia sum infirmus pauper atque paruus.</td>
<td>O sanctae† in te nunc confido christi miles magnus quia sum infirmus pauper atque paruus.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, you are true fisherman of the human race, when you abandoned easy nourishment, you declared the illustrious words of the gospel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O sanctae† comes christi carus retibus relictis tu Magnus magnus in factis.</td>
<td>O sanctae† comes christi carus retibus relictis tu Magnus es in factis.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, you are virile victor, you strong warrior, you [are] my supporter, you [are] my healer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu magnus magnus in legis splendor summi solis.</td>
<td>O sanctae† comes christi carus retibus relictis tu Magnus es in factis.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, in the end you shall sit in a most sublime seat, you shall shine splendidly with the King of Kings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ó Andreas sanctae† tu uerus piscator generis humani sagina cum lenius euangelii claris uerba declarasti.</td>
<td>O sanctae† tu uerus piscator generis humani sagina cum lenius euangelii claris uerba declarasti.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, you will be an illustrious citizen of the wonderful city; you will reign with the King of Kings without end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ó Andreas sanctae pallis in fine sublimi sede fulgebis praeclare cum regnorum rege.</td>
<td>O sanctae† tu uerus piscator generis humani sagina cum lenius euangelii claris uerba declarasti.</td>
<td>O holy Andrew, you will be an illustrious citizen of the wonderful city; you will reign with the King of Kings without end.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

180 For instance, I take the reading sedebis ("you will sit") in the “Prayer Book of Aedeluald” as making better sense than sedibus ("with seats") in CCCC MS 391 and have adopted the reading accordingly.


holy Andrew, intercede for me so that I might evade the flames of genuine, stern punishment; that I might be able to have eternal life with Christ and with all the saints in the world without end. Amen.

The repetitive and formulaic structure of the oration in which each section begins *O andrea sancta* provides an interesting cadence that, in turn, renders a meditative affect to the prayer as a whole. The speaker repeatedly asks for the Apostle’s intercession with Christ in order to avoid the punishments of sin and secure the salvation of his or her soul. Andrew’s identification as a *comes* or companion of Christ makes him an apt intermediary within the Lord’s inner circle. Potentially more helpful by way of intercession and example is the Apostle’s portrayal as a “virile victor” and “strong warrior.” By referencing the reader’s spiritual hollowness and poverty, the prayer draws a stark dichotomy between the saint and the participant. This contrast between the apostle’s triumphant heroism and the reader’s shortcomings as a good Christian would have been made all the more prevalent had the reader previously ruminated upon Andrew’s salutation to the cross as was likely the case in using the “Prayer Book of Aedeluald.” While the prayer itself largely avoids any apocryphal reference or detail, knowledge of such traditions would have informed and strengthened the prayer’s underlying message. In the end, the intercessory oration leaves us with an image of Andrew as an intrepid champion to be emulated by weaker souls in life and a worthy supporter for the spiritually bereft in the time of judgment.183

183 This same representation of Andrew and the devotion afforded him may also be found in a second intercessory prayer contained within the appended devotional material of CCCC MS 391. Cf. Hughes (1958), p. 10: *Sancte andreae apostole frater petri pro honore eius et amore illius intercede pro me, ut donatur michi remissio omnium peccatorum meorum, et adiuua me in nouissimo die, et dominus omnium permittat in regnum aeternum peruenire, cui est honor et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen* (“O holy apostle Andrew, brother of Peter, for his honor and love of him, intercede for me so that the remission of all my sins might be granted to me; and help me in the final day so that the Lord of all things might permit [me] to arrive in the eternal kingdom, to whom is the honor and the glory in the world without end. Amen.”).
As witnessed by the calendrical, martyrrological, liturgical and devotional evidence, Andrew’s cult and the celebration of his feast on November 30 were both highly developed and widespread in Anglo-Saxon England. He was among the few saints to receive a vigil, feast and octave celebration in the Anglo-Saxon liturgical year. Often that feast was marked in the calendars as a solemnity, the highest rank of liturgical feast, a fact that may have influenced Bede’s writing of the “perennial solemnities” for Andrew in his first hymn dedicated to Andrew. The importance of Andrew’s feast may have exerted pressure on Anglo-Saxon liturgists to locate information about the apostle’s apocryphal passion as preserved in the martyrrologies and hagiographical narratives, subsequently incorporating details from those sources into liturgical prayer. The influence of apocrypha on the liturgy of mass was, not surprisingly, relatively slight, though allusions were known to appear via a praefatio found in the Missal of Robert of Jumièges and the Winchcombe Sacramentary. Apocryphal intrusion is understandably better documented within the Liturgy of Hours where the Leofric Collectar, Wulstan Portiforum and the addition to the Durham Collectar all show verbatim accretions supplied by the Epistula. In the end, the liturgical and devotional representation of Andrew that emerged in Anglo-Saxon England was chiefly heroic. His courageous embracing of the cross and apocryphal salutation found use in the chants of the divine office, Anglo-Saxon hymnody, and was even included in books for private prayer. The etymological derivation of the apostle’s name as meaning “manly” or “virile” found expression outside of exegesis as represented by a hymn calling for the saints intercession in the Durham Hymnal. In several altar dedications by Aldhelm and Alcuin, this valiant portrayal of Andrew was further enhanced by “pagan” diction influenced either directly or indirectly by the heroic epics and scriptural verse adaptations of late antiquity. He is even explicitly referred to in
private prayer as a “true victor” and “strong warrior.” Thus, the various literary sources used in constructing and celebrating the feast of St. Andrew worked together in constructing a fearless and intrepid image of the apostle in the Anglo-Saxon consciousness. With this depiction firmly in mind, the jump to full heroic verse epic as evidenced by the Old English *Andreas* was, perhaps, not so great a leap after all.
4. St. Andrew in Apocryphal Tradition

Apocryphal narratives about the deeds and martyrdom of St. Andrew have been in circulation among the Christian communities of the near East and North Africa since at least the late second or early third centuries.1 Of the disparate traditions preserved from antiquity, two are of primary importance to the Anglo-Saxon understanding of the apostle’s life and death. The first and perhaps oldest tradition stems from the so-called Acta Andreae (AA), a lengthy narrative originally composed in Greek which relates the apostle’s crucifixion in the town of Patras at the hands Aegetes, ruler of Achaea.2 Through the intermediation of several Latin redactions, AA provides the ultimate source for the generally accepted details of Andrew’s passion and informs much of the Anglo-Saxon written record surrounding the liturgical celebration of the Apostle’s feast-day, i.e., martyrological entries, dedicatory hymns, and the second half of Ælfric’s homily on the saint (CH I.38).3 A second tradition, first fully attested in the fifth or sixth centuries, is often referred to as the Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the Land of the Cannibals (AAM).4 Instead of offering a passion narrative, AAM focuses on Andrew’s earlier exploits in Mermedonia, a mythical land of cannibals, where he purportedly rescues his fellow apostle.


4 The original Greek text has been edited by M. Bonnet in Lipsius & Bonnet, (1891-1903), II.1 (1898), pp. 65-116. Two of the primary Latin recensions appear edited in F. Blatt, ed., Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud Anthropophagos, Beiheta zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 12 (Giessen, 1930).
Matthias (consistently confused with Matthew in the Old English corpus) from becoming dinner, converts a number of the pagan captors to Christianity, and kills the remaining non-believers via a miraculous flood. This later tradition gained widespread acceptance in Anglo-Saxon England alongside Andrew’s passion story and, in some ways, may have even surpassed it in popularity. Though not utilized by Ælfric in his homiletic writings, *AAM* served as the source for two anonymous Old English homilies closely related to one another, one of which is represented in the famous Blicking collection.\(^5\) Furthermore, *AAM* stands as the ultimate source behind the only surviving Old English epic poem dedicated to an apostle, *Andreas*, thereby attesting to the tale’s admired status and inherent potential for producing entertaining narrative.\(^6\) Since source study is so crucial to our understanding of the Anglo-Saxon reception and use of apocryphal *acta* and *passiones*, this section will outline in brief the transmission history of these two influential traditions from their earliest attestations down to those early medieval retellings which best shed light on the now lost exemplars used by Old English scribes. This section is heavily indebted to the work of previous scholars better versed in early Christian writings than myself, and I have tried to acknowledge that indebtedness in the footnotes. While there is little in the way of


original argument here, I hope that this digest of transmission history will serve as a convenient introduction to the apocryphal sources. The reader should be forewarned that there has been much scholarly debate about whether \textit{AA} and \textit{AAM} represent two truly distinct traditions or embody the fractured remains of a single and more comprehensive version of \textit{AA}.\footnote{e.g. A. de Santos Otero, “Later Acts’ of Apostles,” in \textit{New Testament Apocrypha}, ed. W. Schneemelcher, revised edition, 2 vols. (Cambridge, UK: James Clarke & Co., 1992), II, pp. 443-47; A. Hilhorst & P. J. Lalleman, “The Acts of Andrew and Matthias: Is it part of the original Acts of Andrew?,” in \textit{The Apocryphal Acts of Andrew}, ed. J. N. Bremmer, Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 5 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), pp. 1-14.} Except perhaps for the compilation and epitome of Andean tradition produced by Gregory of Tours,\footnote{Cf. below, pp. 214 ff.} there is scant evidence to support that Anglo-Saxon scribes were familiar with any recension in which the two traditions were fully combined. Since Anglo-Saxon writers consistently treated the traditions as discrete narratives, so too will the following discussion.

\textbf{The Greek \textit{Acta Andreae}}

Of the original Greek \textit{AA}, only fragmentary remains exist in relatively late manuscripts, all of which preserve merely the concluding passion narrative. Thus, given the surviving content of \textit{AA}, the name \textit{Acta Andreae} is somewhat misleading in that the extant material represents a \textit{passio} and does not preserve the preliminary miracles and evangelical deeds of a saint normally found in hagiographical \textit{acta} or \textit{vitae}.\footnote{Some would argue that the extant remains of \textit{AA} represent only the conclusion of the original text, which would itself have included a more expansive account of Andrew’s \textit{acta} and earlier exploits. On the debate, cf. Hilhorst & Lalleman (2000), pp. 1-14. To help the reader become familiar with the plot elements and details belonging to the \textit{AA}, I have included an appendix with a summary of the most extensive manuscript witness. Cf. Appendix I.} Nevertheless, early mentions of apocryphal narratives about Andrew made by Eusebius of Caesaria,\footnote{Eusebius, \textit{HE} III.25, p. 253, ll. 13 ff.} Philaster of Brescia,\footnote{Philastrius Brixensis, \textit{Liber de haeresibus}, ch. 88: PL 12, col. 1200A.} and the Ps.-Gelasian
Decretum\textsuperscript{12} all refer to the circulation of an \textit{actus}, and the title \textit{Acta Andreae} has consequently persisted as a term of convenience to this day. The current standard edition of \textit{AA} is the one produced by Jean-Marc Prieur for \textit{Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum}.\textsuperscript{13} While Prieur’s edition is the product of diligent research by a highly learned and competent scholar, it should be consulted with some degree of caution. In presenting his text of \textit{AA}, Prieur identifies at least five Greek recensions that he feels offer substantive clues as to the original content and wording of \textit{AA}.\textsuperscript{14} The text of his edition, therefore, incorporates readings from multiple recensions and represents an idealized reconstruction of the original \textit{AA} rather than the text as it truly appears in any one surviving manuscript. Prieur’s editorial methodology works from the premise that \textit{AA} was originally composed in its lengthiest form and was later redacted by subsequent generations of scribes, who, in particular, saw fit to abbreviate a number of \textit{AA}’s extended speeches. Eusebius’ early criticism of \textit{AA}’s phraseology may indeed point to the original narrative’s penchant for prolixity and verbosity.\textsuperscript{15} Consequently, Prieur may have good reason for conflating the various recensions in order to produce the fullest possible text that can account for all the material attested in his manuscripts. That said, one should recall that interpolation was also a frequent occurrence in early manuscript transmission. Just because a given recension contains additional material not attested elsewhere in the manuscript tradition does not mean that its unique readings necessarily offer clearer insight into the original text. Bearing this caveat in mind and approaching the text with the appropriate degree of skepticism,

\textsuperscript{12} PL 59, col. 175.


\textsuperscript{14} Prieur, CCSA 5 (1989), pp. 2-8; \textit{idem}, (1992), II, pp. 104-5.

\textsuperscript{15} Eusebius, \textit{HE} III.25, p. 253, ll. 13 ff.
Prieur’s edition remains the most accessible and best approximation of *AA*’s original content for comparison with later Latin redactions and their vernacular adaptations. One must simply keep a close eye on Prieur’s critical apparatus, where the editor adequately acknowledges the manuscript sources for his text and provides significant textual variants.

While the fourth-century mentions of an *Actus* or *Acta Andreae* by Eusebius and Philaster of Brescia attest the circulation of a work at least similar to *AA* if not identical with *AA* itself, there is earlier analogous evidence of the traditions contained within *AA*. The first such evidence comes in the form of parallel details found in the so-called Manichean Psalter. One of these psalms, referred to as “The Psalm on Patience,” mentions six apostles (Andrew among them) and contains matter derived from apocryphal *acta* or *passiones*. Regarding Andrew, the psalm relates how the apostle miraculously survives being burned alive when the house where he was staying is set ablaze and further recounts how he and his disciples achieved their ultimate victory via crucifixion. These specifics, however, do not align perfectly with what we know of *AA*, which fails to include the apostle’s near immolation and makes no mention of Andrew’s disciples joining him on the cross. Another psalm contained within the psalter, “There were ten virgins,” shows greater affinities with *AA*. Here, Maximilla, the wife of Aegeates, is referred to in flattering terms as a “shamer of the serpent,” her husband having been directly

---


referred to as a serpent or as the son of the serpent in *AA* itself.²⁰ These lines have been interpreted, therefore, as a possible literary allusion to *AA*’s account of how Maximilla shamed her wicked husband by taking a vow of chastity and refusing to sleep with him any longer. This second psalm also mentions Maximilla’s sister, Iphidama, among the virgins who received the good news of Christ’s teachings, thereby including another character found in *AA*. Subtle differences, however, remain between the details of the Manichean psalm and those of *AA*. Whereas the psalm portrays Iphidama as being imprisoned herself, *AA* merely states that she visited Andrew while the apostle was in captivity. Such divergences mean that the compiler of the Manichean Psalter likely had no direct knowledge of *AA* as it survives today, but the common cast of characters, the recognition of Andrew’s crucifixion, and the possible literary allusion to Aegetes as “the serpent” demonstrate enough correspondences to posit a possible indirect dependence.²¹ The Manichean Psalter survives fragmentarily as a Coptic translation from Greek in a papyrus dating to the second half of the fourth century.²² Despite the fourth-century dating of the papyrus, scholars believe that the text of the psalms themselves is somewhat older and probably derives from a Syriac original stemming from the end of the third century.²³ Thus, the Manichean Psalter provides a third-century *terminus ante quem* for apocryphal traditions about Andrew akin to, if not indirectly derivative of *AA*, and it is quite possible that the *AA* were circulating some time before.

The fact that all of the Greek witnesses to the “original” *AA* are of a relatively late date (none are found in manuscripts predating the tenth century) is reason to approach the tradition


with a degree of caution. Despite the lack of early manuscripts, however, we may safely assume that they represent in general content, if not in exact wording, a tradition that goes back to at least the second or third centuries.

The Latin passiones

Derived from the Greek AA, there are a number of Latin redactions that emerged in the sixth century and came exercise a profound influence on Andrew’s cult by helping disseminate knowledge of the apostle’s apocryphal passion throughout the Christian West. Among the numerous recensions, there are four of potential importance to the Anglo-Saxon literary tradition:

1) *Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae*²⁴ *(BHL 428; RBMA 199, 5-6; CANT 226) [hereafter Epistula]*

2) Gregory of Tours’ *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli*²⁵ *(BHL 430; RBMA 198,8; CANT 225) [hereafter Liber de miraculis]*

3) *Conuersante et docente*²⁶ *(BHL 429, RBMA 199, CANT 231)*

4) Book III of the Ps.-Abdias *Virtutes apostolorum*²⁷

---


²⁶ Edited: M. Bonnet, “Passio Sancti Andreae Apostoli,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 13 (1894), 373-78. Note the title’s potential confusion with the *Epistula*.

²⁷ Unfortunately, no modern critical edition of the Ps.-Abdias *Virtutes Apostolorum* has yet appeared. Any statements about the content or form of the text must be predicated by a cautionary note acknowledging that scholars
Of these four, the text known today as the *Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae*, appears to have exercised the most immediate influence on Anglo-Saxon England. As evidenced above, the *Epistula* impressed itself upon Anglo-Saxon liturgy,\(^{28}\) Bede’s Andrean hymns\(^{29}\) and the Prayer-Book of Adelward,\(^{30}\) emerging as one of the chief sources in Britain for Andrew’s passion. The *Epistula* relates the apostle Andrew’s interrogation at the hands of the proconsul Aegeas as well as his subsequent crucifixion at Patras in the Greek province of Achaia. Though the *Epistula* draws upon the literary tradition established by *AA*, the precise nature of its immediate source, be it a more ancient Greek recension or a later Latin epitome, remains unclear.\(^{31}\) In any case, the *Epistula* appears to have been composed originally in Latin around the beginning of the sixth century and it became the inspiration for at least two subsequent Greek translations.\(^{32}\) At least two variants of the Latin *Epistula* have appeared in

\(^{28}\) Cf. above, pp. 174 ff.

\(^{29}\) Cf. above, pp. 187 ff.

\(^{30}\) Cf. above, pp. 197 ff.

\(^{31}\) The beginning of the *Epistula* (§§1-8 in Bonnet), which includes Andrew’s interview before Aegeas, appears to have little to do with the original Greek *Acta Andreae* and may represent an original composition. Cf. Joseph Flamion, *Les Actes apocryphes de l’Apôtre André et les textes apparentés* (Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil, 1911), 115-16; Prieur, CCSA 5 (1989), pp. 13-14.

\(^{32}\) For the *Epistula*’s original composition in Latin and its relationship to the Greek translations, one of which apparently interpolated material from a recension of the earlier Greek *Acta Andreae* (corresponding to ch. 10-15), cf.
print, one edited by Maximillian Bonnet in 1898 and a second appearing in the late-fifteenth century collection of saints’ lives compiled by Boninus Mombritius. Bonnet’s text, based on some twelve manuscript witnesses, is generally considered the standard edition in that it uses modern critical methods to arrive at an approximation of the narrative’s original contents. The Mombritius recension represents a slight revision on Bonnet’s reconstructed text up through §14, at which point the conclusion of the Mombritius text becomes more extensive, including additional details about Aegeas’ wife, Maximilla, and brother, Stratocles.

The Epistula takes its modern title from an opening address attributed to the Achaian presbyters and deacons, who purport to give an eye-witness account of the apostle’s passion. Over the centuries, however, the Epistula has been referred to by a variety of names. Bonnet chose to publish his text of the Epistula under the title “Passio sancti Andreae apostoli.” Likewise, this particular passion of Andrew is referred to generically as a passio in the Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina, and Anglo-Saxon scholars have fallen into the habit of referring to it simply as the “Passio S. Andreae” or the “Martyrdom of Andrew.” The imprecision of such vague cognomens is, indeed, unfortunate, as it may lead to confusion with numerous other Latin and Greek narratives about Andrew’s passion. In order to better distinguish this particular narrative from others of similar content, I have adopted the title

---


33 Cf. above, p. 211, note 24.

34 Passionem sancti andreae apostoli quam oculis nostris uidimus omnes presbiteri et diacones ecclesiarum Achaiae scribimus uniuersis ecclesiis quae sunt in oriente et occidente et meridiano et septemtrione in Christi nomine constituitis. (“We, all the presbyters and deacons of the churches of Achaia, write the passion of the holy apostle Andrew, which we saw with our eyes, for all the churches established in the name of Christ that are in the east and west and south and north.”). Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, pp. 1-2.


Epistula presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae as found in the Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti, and any further reference to the Epistula is meant to denote the Latin text in general with distinctions drawn between the Bonnet and Mombritius variants as needed. In general, citations are taken from Bonnet’s critical edition, though, as will become clear, the Mombritius text’s conclusion must necessarily be referenced on occasion.

In tracing the usage of the Epistula in Anglo-Saxon England, one must also consider the potential influence of competing sources. Gregory of Tours’ Liber de miraculis recounts Andrew’s various miraculous deeds from his initial foray into the land of the cannibals and leading up to his eventual martyrdom. Gregory informs us that his work is an epitome of a much larger narrative which was considered by many to be apocryphal due to its “excessive verbosity” (nimiam verbositatem). The now lost source for Liber de miraculis is held to have been a Latin reworking of the ancient Greek Acta Andreae or a relatively complete version thereof. Consequently, Gregory’s condensed account is thought to be of great importance for the reconstruction of the original Greek work, of which only the concluding passion narrative is preserved in various fragmentary remains. The Liber de miraculis recounts how Aegeas was driven to hatred toward Andrew when the apostle defended Maximilla’s decision to leave her husband for a life of prayer and chastity, but does not itself include a full account of the saint’s crucifixion. Rather, Gregory offers a terse summary of Andrew’s torture and death, mentioning that Maximilla cared for and buried the apostle’s body. As an excuse for his cursory treatment, Gregory states that he has not set out the martyrdom at length because it was already recorded.

37 In this adoption I am also following the editor of the Greek AA, J.-M. Prieur, who uses the modern French equivalent L’Épître des presbytres et diacres d’Achaïe.

38 Bonnet (1885), p. 377.
with skill elsewhere. Since Gregory’s account of Andrew’s passion is highly abbreviated, it is of limited value as a source for the apostle’s martyrdom. Nevertheless, the Liber de miraculis remains important to the present discussion for its ability to connect Andrew’s passion with the apostle’s support of Maximilla’s chastity and because it would become an important source for Book III of the Ps.-Abdias Virtutes Apostolorum. Definitive knowledge of the Liber de miraculis in Anglo-Saxon England remains a matter of conjecture. A fragmentary copy of Gregory’s work (BL Cotton Nero E.i, fol. 53v-54v, representing the first ten chapters and a portion of the eleventh from the Liber de miraculis) was appended to an eleventh-century hagiographical collection belonging to the family of saints’ lives known as the “Cotton-Corpus Legendary,” i.e., the copy formerly held at Worcester and surviving in British Library MS Cotton Nero E.i (now two volumes, pars I & II) and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 9. In the manuscript, the narrative appears under the title “Vita sancti Andreae apostoli” with a rubricated colophon erroneously attributing the work to William of Malmesbury. This section of the Liber de miraculis was not, however, original to the manuscript and appears to have been

39 Passionis quoque eius ita ordinem prosecuti non sumus, quia valde utiliter et eleganter a quodam repperimus fuisse conscriptum. Bonnet (1885), §37, p. 396. (“And thusly we did not pursue the events of his passion, for we found that it was very effectively and elegantly recorded by another.”)

40 The Liber de miraculis is not discussed as a source in Ogilvy’s study of books known to the Anglo-Saxons (often inclusive to a fault). Cf. J. D. A. Ogilvy, Books Known to the English, 597-1066, Mediaeval Academy of America Publication, no. 76 (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1967), pp. 154-55. Lapidge also omits mention of the Liber de miraculis in his seminal study of books in Anglo-Saxon Libraries. The Liber miraculorum cited by Lapidge in his index refers to Gregory’s Miraculorum libri viii (CPL 1024), which covers the glory of the martyrs, the lives of the fathers, and the glory of the confessors, not the Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli (CPL 1027). Cf. M. Lapidge, The Anglo-Saxon Library (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 392-93. Likewise, Gneuss’ handlist of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts lists only Gregory’s Historia Francorum, Libri miraculorum (i.e., CPL 1024) and De virtutibus S. Martini as preserved in manuscripts known to have circulated in Anglo-Saxon England. Cf. H. Gneuss, Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001), p. 167. Furthermore, as of the publication of this article, the FONTES database does not list the Liber de miraculis as a potential source for any Anglo-Saxon authors.
added by a later hand from the second quarter of the twelfth century.⁴¹ A twelfth-century date for the accretion would also allow for the false attribution to William of Malmesbury († c. 1143). A fuller version of the Liber de miraculis is also found in a collection of saints lives compiled at Salisbury in the second half of the eleventh century and now preserved in Dublin (fol. 1r-9r of Dublin, Trinity College MS 174).⁴² The imprecise dating of the manuscript means that Gregory’s work may have been known to the latest phase of Anglo-Saxon learning, but may also imply that the text found its way to Britain shortly after the Norman invasion. Consequently, English acquaintance with Gregory’s Liber de miraculis cannot be assumed prior to the Anglo-Norman period.

The more extensive account of Andrew’s passion to which Gregory refers in his apology for summarizing the apostle’s martyrdom was most likely the so-called Conversante et docente.⁴³ Similar to the Epistula, the Conversante et docente represents a true passio in that it recounts exclusively the apostle’s questioning before Aegeas, subsequent torture, and ultimate crucifixion and burial. The apostle’s prior missions and miraculous deeds are left out completely. Also like the Epistula, the Conversante et docente takes its modern title from its incipit and is also referred to variously as the “Passio S. Andreae.”⁴⁴ According to both Flamion and Prieur, the Conversante et docente was composed in Latin during the sixth century and

---


⁴⁴ Bonnet (1894), p. 374: Conversante et docente et praedicante verbum dei beato Andrea apostolo apud Achaiam, comprehensus est ab Aegeate proconsule in civitate Patras. (“The blessed Andrew, having been speaking and teaching and preaching the word of God in Achaia, was seized by the proconsul Aegeates in the city of Patras.”)
demonstrates dependence on both the *Epistula* and the ancient Greek *AA*. The precise relationship between the *Epistula* and the *Conuersante docente*, therefore, remains somewhat unclear. The texts may stem from a common Latin rendering of the concluding section of the Greek *AA*, or the *Conuersante et docente* may derive directly from the *Epistula*, excising certain details or phrases from its source text while borrowing others from variant traditions. The association between the two *passiones* must remain the subject of future study, and it should suffice to state here that the two texts represent closely related, though not identical, traditions. As is the case with Gregory’s *Liber de miraculis*, there is no physical proof that the *Conuersante et docente* was circulating in England during the Anglo-Saxon period. As far as I am aware, the first positive evidence for the passion narrative’s presence in Britain is the text’s inclusion in the same hagiographical compilation from Salisbury that contains Gregory’s *Liber de miraculis*. Because this collection was compiled in the second half of the eleventh century, it is difficult to ascertain whether the *Conuersante et docente* was first known in England before or after the Norman invasion.

The final competing narrative which relates Andrew’s passion is the Ps.-Abdias collection of apostolic histories variously known as the *Historia apostolorum* or the *Virtutes apostolorum*. Compiled during the sixth century and later falsely attributed to Abdias of Babylon, a disciple of Christ said to have been consecrated as bishop in Babylon by the apostles Simon and Jude, the *Virtutes Apostolorum* encompasses ten books which each relate the lives of

---

45 Prieur addresses briefly the subject of the two texts’ relationship with one another in Prieur, CCSA 5 (1989), p. 14. For a more extensive analysis arguing that the *Conuersante et docente* derives its interrogation scene directly from the *Epistula*, but recalls the Greek text more closely with regards to Andrew’s final exhortation to his Christian brethren, cf. Flamion (1911), pp. 43-50.

46 The *Conuersante et docente* appears on fols. 9r-10r of Dublin, Trinity College MS 174. Colker (1991), no. 174. It is perhaps interesting that these two texts, previously compiled together for use in Book III of Ps.-Abdias, should appear independently here in succession of one another. Their appearance together may attest to an early stage of transmission history in which the two texts were viewed as complimentary works, but before they were fused into a single, cohesive narrative in Book III of the *Virtutes apostolorum*. 217
one or more of the Twelve Apostles.\textsuperscript{47} Book III, the section dedicated to Andrew, actually represents a composite text which weaves together material from Gregory of Tours’ \textit{Liber de miraculis} and a passion narrative similar to the \textit{Conuersante et docente}.\textsuperscript{48} The resultant chapter covers the apostle’s life from his initial missionary work in the Mediterranean to a detailed account of his martyrdom in Patras. Due to its dependence on the \textit{Liber de miraculis} and the \textit{Conuersante et docente}, it can be difficult to determine whether Ps.-Abdias or its source texts inform subsequent traditions. In his \textit{Retractio in Actus Apostolorum}, Bede cites a collection of \textit{passiones apostolorum} as a source for Simon the Zealot’s martyrdom in Persia which he admits was categorized by many as apocryphal.\textsuperscript{49} The details that he provides are consonant with the passion of Simon and Jude as related by Ps.-Abdias, a fact that has led Lawrence T. Martin to acknowledge the Northumbrian scholar’s familiarity with at least this section of the \textit{Virtutes Apostolorum}.\textsuperscript{50} However, as Charles D. Wright has pointed out, “Bede need not be referring

\textsuperscript{47} It is unclear when the attribution to Abdias of Babylon first took place. When Wolfgang Lazius published his 1551 text of the apostolic histories (the source for Fabricius’ eighteenth-century edition, cf. above p. 211, note 27), he included an introduction which claimed that the first-century orator Julius Africanus was the first to translate the work into Latin from a Hebrew original recounted by Abdias of Babylon. Cf. W. Lazius, \textit{Abdiae episcopi Babyloniae Historia certaminis apostolorum} (Basel, 1551), p. 1. Because the collection was first compiled in the sixth century, this introduction is itself a fabrication, though of uncertain date or origin. The related apostolic histories published by Nausea in 1531 do not include this introduction and it is possible that the erroneous attributions to Abdias as composer and Julius Africanus as Latin translator are later medieval or early modern imaginings unknown during the Anglo-Saxon period. Certainly, any potential references to the Ps.-Abdias collection in Anglo-Saxon England do not identify Abdias of Babylon as the author. In any case, Fabricius reprinted Lazius’ introductory material in his later edition and the attribution has remained dominant ever since. Cf. Fabricius (1703-1719), II, pp. 390-93.

\textsuperscript{48} Elliott (1993), pp. 235, 525.

\textsuperscript{49} M. L. W. Laistner, ed., \textit{Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum apostolorum et Retractatio}, Publications of the Mediaeval Academy of America 35 (Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1939), p. 95. Laistner highlights where Bede is drawing on a passion of Simon and Jude by using single quotation marks. This is somewhat confusing because Bede is certainly not citing verbatim from any of the martyrdoms as printed in Nausea, Lazius, Fabricius or Mombritius.

\textsuperscript{50} Martin (1989), p. 23, note 8.
specifically to this work.\textsuperscript{51} That is to say, Bede may have known a passion of Simon and Jude different from the one printed by either Lazius or Fabricius as part of the Ps.-Abdias collection.\textsuperscript{52} Consequently, there is no consensus as to whether Bede and subsequent Anglo-Saxon scholars knew the Ps.-Abdias \textit{passiones} in part or in whole, if at all.\textsuperscript{53} It is quite possible that a contemporary collection of \textit{passiones}, several individual narratives of which may also have informed the Ps.-Abdias anthology, was circulating in seventh-century England such that it was available to Aldhelm and Bede for consultation.\textsuperscript{54} If this were indeed the case, there is no reason to assume that Book III of Ps.-Abdias was in use in Anglo-Saxon England. As it stands, there are no manuscript witnesses from Anglo-Saxon England that can attest to a complete collection of the apostolic histories generally associated with Ps.-Abdias.

\textbf{Andrew’s Passion in Ælfric’s CH I.38 and the “Cotton-Corpus Legendary”}

The most extensive use of the \textit{Epistula} in Anglo-Saxon England was made by Ælfric of Eynsham, who loosely rendered the passion narrative into Old English for the second part of his composite homily for Andrew’s feast-day (\textit{CH} I.38). As Malcolm Godden explains in his essential commentary to the \textit{Catholic Homilies}, Ælfric originally composed a strictly exegetical homily for the Gospel passage of the day, Mt. 4:18-22, in which Andrew is chosen along with


\textsuperscript{52} O’Leary suggests either the version printed by Nausea (BHL 7749) or the variant printed under Ps.-Abdias by Lazius and Fabricius (BHL 7750) might serve as an adequate source text. O’Leary (2003), p. 117. In addition, I see no objection as to why the Mombritius variant (BHL 7751) could not have served as a source for Bede. Though it appends an additional conclusion to that found in Lazius and Fabricius, it is not substantially different from the others in that it too relates how Simon and Jude were killed in the city of “Suamnir” (i.e., Suanir) in Persia.

\textsuperscript{53} Godden (2000), 613; Biggs (2007), 38.

\textsuperscript{54} For a list of possible \textit{passiones} included in this hypothetical collection, cf. O’Leary (2003), p. 117.
Peter, James the Greater and John to become one of Christ’s disciples.Ælfric later composed an account of Andrew’s passion which may have been intended as a separate sermon in his Second Series. Within Ælfric’s own lifetime, however, his account of the apostle’s martyrdom was affixed to the earlier, exegetical homily in order to produce the composite text that is published in Clemoes edition of the First Series. Godden further states that Ælfric’s text more closely resembles the Bonnet recension than the version recorded by Mombritius. This fact is born out by a cursory comparison of the three texts (i.e., CH I.38, Bonnet and Mombritius). Since a detailed defense of Ælfric’s dependence on a narrative closely related to the Bonnet recension would prove far too tedious to present here, it must presently suffice to state that Ælfric’s homily aligns more closely with the conclusion of Bonnet’s passio at precisely the point where the Mombritius recension differs most drastically in detail. For example, Ælric, like Bonnet, omits Maximilla’s role in Andrew’s burial, and CH I.38’s statement that Stratoles obtained the apostle’s body (7 his broðor heold þæs halgan andreas lic mid micelre arwurðynysse þæt he ætwindan moste) resembles loosely the assertion of the Bonnet recension that the Christian neophyte absconded with the holy corpse (frater uero eius tenens corpus sancti Andreae euasit). While Ælfric’s knowledge of the Epistula appears an unassailable fact, more problematic is Godden’s claim that “Ælfric probably found the source in his copy of the Cotton-

---

57 CH I.38, pp. 507-19.  
59 Cp. CH I.38, p. 519, ll. 344-45 with Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1, pp. 35-6.
Corpus Legendary.” Such a statement begs the question of whether a version of the *Epistula* was originally part of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary.

Whether or not the *Urexemplar* upon which the extant manuscripts of the “Cotton-Corpus Legendary” were based originally included any kind of passion for Andrew remains uncertain. As stated above in the introduction to Gregory’s *Liber de miraculis*, the earliest manuscript belonging to the Cotton-Corpus family of legendaries (the eleventh century manuscript preserved in British Library MS Cotton Nero E.i, pars I & II and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 9) does not appear to have originally contained an account of Andrew’s martyrdom. The “Worcester Cotton-Corpus Legendary,” so-called for its former associations with that monastic school, was at some point felt to be deficient in lacking a *passio* for Andrew and a now fragmentary account of Andrew’s acts drawn from Gregory of Tours’ work (though falsely attributed to William of Malmesbury) was added by a twelfth-century hand (BL Cotton Nero E.i, pars I, fol. 53v-54v). Closely related to the “Worcester Cotton-Corpus Legendary” is a late eleventh-century hagiographical collection held in Salisbury Cathedral Library (Salisbury Cath. Lib. MSS 221 & 222; formerly Oxford, Bodleian Library, Fell 4 & 1 respectively). Incomplete for the months of November and December, this legendary currently lacks a passion of Andrew. A contemporary list of contents found on fol. 184 indicates that a passion narrative for Andrew was intended for inclusion. Because Salisbury Cath. Lib. MS 222 ends mid-page with a complete life of St. Richarius by Alcuin and the following narrative is not begun on the same folio (as is the custom

---

61 Cf. above pp. 215ff.
elsewhere in the manuscript), it is unclear whether the rest of the legendary has been lost or was simply not completed by the team of scribes.\textsuperscript{64} In the end, the contemporary list of \textit{passiones} and \textit{acta} may represent little more than the source exemplar’s contents rather than those of the “Salisbury Cotton-Corpus Legendary” itself. Even if this list provides some evidence for the inclusion of an Andrean narrative in the \textit{Vorlage}, we can no longer determine whether that narrative was derived from Gregory’s \textit{Liber de miraculis}, the \textit{Conuersante et docente} or some version of the \textit{Epistula}. As was the case with the “Worcester Cotton-Corpus Legendary,” the religious community at Salisbury appears to have felt the lack of a passion story for Andrew. The Salisbury scribes later remedied this deficiency by including material drawn from Gregory’s \textit{Liber de miraculis} and the \textit{Conuersante et docente} in a supplementary hagiographical volume (Dublin, Trinity College 174) compiled during the late eleventh or early twelfth century.\textsuperscript{65}

Two twelfth-century manuscripts belonging to the Cotton-Corpus family also survive, both of which include versions of the \textit{Epistula}. The one manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian, MS Bodley 354, contains a version similar to the Mombritius recension.\textsuperscript{66} The other, Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS P.7.vi, includes a version “virtually identical” to the text printed in Bonnet.\textsuperscript{67} According to Godden, however, the narrative in the Hereford manuscript goes beyond the point where \textit{CH} I.38 and the Bonnet recension leave off, further describing Maximilla’s role


\textsuperscript{65} Colker (1991), I, p. 320.

\textsuperscript{66} Godden (2000), 319.

\textsuperscript{67} Godden (2000), 319.
in Andrew’s burial and the subsequent miracles performed at his tomb. The resultant picture is a confounding one. Of the four surviving Cotton-Corpus manuscripts, one (Salisbury) lacks a passion for Andrew, though one was apparently intended for inclusion. Another (Worcester) contains the fragmentary remains of Gregory’s *Liber de miraculis* added sometime in the twelfth century. The remaining two manuscripts (Bodley and Hereford) both postdate the Anglo-Saxon period and contain different recensions of the *Epistula*, implying that the texts were supplied separately. Barring new evidence, it would appear that the *Urexemplar* originally lacked a narrative for Andrew such that the scribes from the various monastic schools felt compelled to add information on the popular apostle piecemeal, over time as material was available. This is not to say that Ælfric’s direct *Vorlage* of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary was necessarily missing an apocryphal *passio* about Andrew. A version of the *Epistula* closely related to Bonnet’s text may have been previously supplemented to his copy of the hagiographical compilation before the homilist came to consult his exemplar. Equally plausible, however, is that Ælfric arrived at his copy of the *Epistula* independently. Competing versions of the *Epistula* were certainly circulating in the England of his day and on into the Anglo-Norman period. Anglo-Saxon England’s widespread familiarity with the *Epistula* and its repeated use since the time of Bede meant that the text carried with it a sense of authority. That authoritative status was doubtless so strong by Ælfric’s time that the homilist would have identified the text as neither apocryphal nor potentially heterodox, thereby allowing its welcome treatment and inclusion in his *Catholic Homilies*.

---

Andrew in the Land of the Mermedonians

Apart from the story of Andrew’s passion, the other major apocryphal tradition informing Anglo-Saxon knowledge of the apostle’s deeds is the Πράξεις Ανδρέου καὶ Ματθεία εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῶν ἀνθρωποφάγων, otherwise known by the Latin title Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos provided by Friedrich Stegmüller in his Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi. The legend tells how Matthias (or sometimes Matthew) was imprisoned by cannibals in the land of Mermedonia. Christ appears to Andrew three days before the incarcerated apostles is to be eaten and orders him to travel across the Mediterranean to save his apostolic brother. Initially doubting the success of such a mission due to the great distance and short time given him to make the journey, Andrew finally concedes to make the trek and try to rescue his fellow apostle. While preparing for his departure, Christ appears to him disguised as a helmsman and offers to take Andrew aboard his ship. Andrew agrees and is miraculously ferried to Mermedonia. There he rescues the other apostle, converts several of the cannibals, and destroys the rest with a miraculous flood. The origins of the tradition are just as obscure, if not more so than those of AA. It remains possible that AAM represented the beginning section of AA as Gregory of Tour’s epitome of the latter might suggest, though the Frankish scholar may just as well have been looking at a lengthy Latin source that had already conflated the two traditions. If not a part of the second or third-century AA, the legend informing AAM may go back to at least the fourth

---


70 It should be noted that the Greek and Latin recensions of the legend variously identify Matthaeus (i.e., Matthew) or Matthias as the apostle in captivity in Mermedonia, denoting some obvious confusion in the legend’s transmission. The Syriac and Old Slavonic recensions name Matthew, where as the Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic renderings consistently give Matthias. Cf. de Santos Otero (1992), p. 445, where the author believes Matthias to be the original name. The surviving Old English texts (Andrewes, Blickling XIX, and Bright’s text of MS CCC 198) all render Matthew as the apostle in distress.

71 de Santos Otero (1992), II, pp. 443-44.
century. Aurelio de Santos Otero points to a Coptic life of St. Shenute written by Besa (BHO 1074-75) which tells of Jesus, disguised as a helmsman, conveying Andrew to his destination.

De Santos Otero states, “Since Shenute was born in 333 and his biographer and successor Besa lived in the 5th century, it is to be assumed that the latter in composing the Vita of his master laid hold of legends which were in circulation in Egypt during the 4th century.”

Regardless of the precise date of origin or the nature of AAM’s relationship to AA, Anglo-Saxon scholars and scribes came to the legend via Latin intermediaries that first appeared in the sixth century. James Wilson Bright identifies at least four Latin recensions. The first recension, which served as a common source for Blickling XIX and the anonymous homily found in MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198, is now largely lost, though a small fragment of this recension is preserved in the Codex Vallicellensis and has been published by Maximillian Bonnet. A second recension, comprising a complete prose version that represents a different and expanded Latin version, has been preserved the twelfth-century Codex Casanatensis 1104 and published F. Blatt. A third, abridged recension of the tale is preserved in University of Bologna MS 1576 and has yet to be published in full. Finally, a complete metrical version is preserved in Codex Vaticanus Lat. 1274, though, according to Bright, “it stands at a very far remove from the Lost Latin original of the OE prose.”

---

73 Bright (1971), p. 204.
74 For editions, cf. above, p. 206, note 5.
75 Lipsius & Bonnet (1891-1903), II.1 (1898), pp. 85-8
76 Blatt (1930), pp. 33-95.
77 The first two pages are provided in F. Holthause, “Eine neue lateinische Fassung der Andreaslegende,” Anglia 62 (1938), pp. 190-92.
the evidence for the lost Latin original is so fragmentary, any comparison between the Old English prose renderings and its source material must undergo precise evaluation alongside the Greek original in order to determine any innovation or unique contribution on the part of the Anglo-Saxon writers. The Latin source for the verse *Andreas*, while it may or may not be related to the Latin source for the prose homilies, cannot be identified with any certainty. Brooks regards the metrical prose recension of Codex Vaticanus Lat. 1274 as a “link” for the transmission of the legend from the continent to Anglo-Saxon England, but whether or not it or a similar recension had any direct bearing on *Andreas* cannot be definitively asserted. In addition to the four recensions identified by Bright, one must also bear in mind §1 of Gregory of Tours’ *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae* of Gregory of Tours which relates an epitomized version of the narrative.79

---

79 Bonnet (1885), pp. 377-78.
5. St. Andrew among the Mermedonians and the Apostolicity of the Old English Andreas

Most scholarship on Andreas over the last century and a half has centered around philological research and the verbal similarities that the poem shares with Beowulf and those poems of Cynewulf identified by the author’s runic signature. Only in the last quarter century have scholars turned toward a more interpretative approach to Andreas, seeking to gain more insight into the author’s voice, the intended audience, and the theological underpinnings which inform the text. Perhaps the most successful of these more recent approaches have been the figural readings forwarded by Thomas D. Hill and Marie M. Walsh. Both of these scholars have analyzed Andreas in the manner which a biblical exegete would treat scripture, reading the text with an eye for multi-layered interpretations of the literal, moral, typological and eschatological variety. The result of this approach is that Hill and Walsh have advanced a triangulated typological reading in which Andrew represents a Christ-like figure through his suffering among the Mermedonians and his ability to deliver salvation to those willing to convert, while simultaneously drawing on Old Testament allusions to, among others, the Noachian deluge, Noah and the rock of Horeb, and Moses and the parting of the Red Sea, in order to construct a theologically driven meditation on baptism and its role in the deliverance of the faithful. While such readings are, without question, highly revealing with regard to the text’s meaning, they necessarily focus on the latter part of the narrative where Andrew summons water from a stone pillar, which, in turn, affects a flood that drowns the non-believers while sparing those penitents willing to convert.


The result of such emphasis on the final section of *Andreas* has been an uneasy glossing over of the first part of the narrative where Andrew is first called upon by God to rescue Matthew, ferried by Jesus disguised as a boat-captain to Mermedonia, and quizzed by the concealed Christ on his ability to faithfully relate the teachings and sufferings of the Lord. Hill has conceded the problem of reconciling the first half of *Andreas* with his figural interpretation of the end, stating:

A further problem concerns the relationship between the conclusion of *Andreas* and the poem as a whole. […] But the typological patterning of the earlier part of the poem strikes me as being less complex than that of the conclusion, and in the first sections of *Andreas* the poet seems to be concerned with explicit moralization rather than figural narrative.³

While it may sound overly simplistic at first, what scholars have yet to do is step back and view the figure of Andreas in light of his role as an apostle. When compared to the prose homilies about Andrew in the land of the Mermedonians, the *Andreas*-Poet seems to offer his greatest expansion and original contribution during the dialogue exchange between Christ and Andreas while on the ship, a fact that should not be casually passed over. By applying what we have learned in Part I of this dissertation about the Anglo-Saxon understanding of the apostles, this section will take issue with Hill’s assertion that the first part of *Andreas* consists more or less of simple moralizing and lacks real figural significance. Contrary to this interpretation, the first part of *Andreas* represents a highly nuanced meditation on theologically charged concepts of apostleship that help contextualize the typological and eschatological implications found in the poem’s conclusion.

Throughout the course of the narrative, the *Andreas*-Poet methodically sets about establishing his protagonist in light of the apostolic criteria discussed in Part I. Andreas receives his mission to Mermedonia directly from God (ll. 174-188). In addition to his divine mandate,

---

Andreas is clearly portrayed as a living example of Christ’s teaching through his life of poverty and intinerate preaching. When the helmsman tells the apostle that he can travel with the ship to Mermedonia so long as he pays his fare, Andreas informs the helmsman that he has neither money nor property with which to finance the voyage:

‘We willingly and gladly wish to bear you with us over the fish’s bath right to that land where desire urges you to visit after you have given your agreed payment, the appointed money, on the terms that the guardians of the ship, the attendants upon the wave-plank, will allow you.’ Speedily, Andreas, one needing friends, spoke to Him with words: ‘I have neither beaten gold nor rich treasure, nor am I knowledgeable about wealth or the enticement of men, [about] land or interlocking rings, that I may whet your desire, [your] longing in the world, as you declare with word.’

(II. 292-304)

Wholly dependent on the sailors’ charity to ferry him across the sea, the saint recalls Christ’s own instructions for the apostles to lead a humble existence, throughout which God would provide everything necessary for the fulfillment of their divine mission:

‘Travel now through all the corners of the earth, even so wide as the water encompasses or the roads traverse the plains. Preach afterwards the bright faith to the towns over the expanse of the earth. I shall maintain you in safety. You will not need to take treasures on this journey, neither gold nor silver. I shall provide to you a liberal supply of each good thing according to your own judgment.’

(II. 332-339)

4 Brooks (1961), p. 10, II. 292-304. All further citations from *Andreas* are from Brooks’ edition and reflect his line numbers. Blickling XIX similarly relates Andrew’s concern about payment: *Se halga Andresas him andswerede, ‘Gehyraþ gebroþor, ne habbað we fersceat; ah we syndon discipuli Driht[if]nes Hælendes Cristes þa he geceas, & þis bebed he us sealdæ & he cwæð, ‘Ponne ge faran godspel to lærenne, þonne nebbe ge mid eow hláf, ne feoh, ne twyfeald hraegl.’* Blickling XIX, p. 233. (“Listen, brother, we do not have the fare, but we are disciples of the Lord Savior, Christ, whom he chose; and this commandment he gave us and spoke: ‘When you travel to teach the gospel, then do not have with you a loaf, nor wealth, nor twofold robes’”). The passage in *Andreas*, of course, represents a significant expansion over the prose text.
Furthermore, Andreas demonstrates the ability to perform miracles as a witness to Christ’s own marvels. Presumably he heals his fellow apostle Matthew in a lacuna occurring in the manuscript between ll. 1024-25. He is also responsible for summoning the water from a stone pillar in order to affect the conversion of the Mermedonians (ll. 1498 ff.), the event which Walsh interprets as a figural baptismal flood. The ability to baptize in the name of Christ in order to invoke the Holy Spirit was, of course, one of the powers granted to the apostles by Jesus and an important part of the apostolic tradition the handed down to the bishops of the church.

The most important criteria, however, in defining an apostle are those characteristics pertaining to the apostle’s underlying theological significance, that is, his role as guarantor, disseminator, and interpreter of historically grounded and divinely sanctioned witness necessary for salvation. The poet takes care to situate the hero within the inner circle of the Christ’s own followers, making repeated references to Andreas as one of the Twelve. Indeed, from the very outset of the poem, the audience is made keenly aware of Andreas’ historical position among the original disciples.

Hwæt, we gefrunan on fyrndagum twelfe under tunglum tireadige hæleð, þeodnes þegnas5

Behold! we heard about, in days past, twelve renowned heroes, beneath the heavens, the Lord’s thanes.

(1-3a)

The poet continues to draw the audience’s attention to Andreas’ preeminent status by making further reference to the Twelve in lines 881-885a and lines 1418-1424. In the prior of these two passages, the poet significantly places Andreas in the physical presence of Christ, thereby grounding him in historical witness: “Also, we saw you, renowned heroes, numbered twelve, mighty in virtues, standing before the son of the Creator” (Swylce we gesegon for suna meotudes

5 Cp. Beowulf, ll. 1 ff.
æðelum ecne eowic standan twelfe getealde, tireadige hæleð). Later, during Andreas’ relation of Christ’s preaching in the temple, the poet makes what is, perhaps, his most interesting iteration regarding the number of the apostles.

Swa gesælde iu, þæt se sigedema ferde, frea mihtig. Næs þær folces ma on siðfate sinra leoda, nemne ellefne orettmæcgas geteled tireadige; he wæs twelfta sylf.

So it happened long ago that the victory-judge, the Lord almighty, traveled forth. There was not more people of his nation on the journey but for the eleven, [those] counted heroes; he was himself the twelfth.

(661-665)

According to this statement, only eleven apostles followed Jesus, with Christ himself bringing the number to the requisite twelve. This variation in the number of the apostles stems from the poet’s refusal to count Judas Iscariot among Christ’s orettmæcgas, because the former apostle’s betrayal of his Lord rendered him unworthy of remembrance as a warrior for Christ. While denying Judas a place among the Twelve, the poet is also mindful not to contradict any literal or historical reading of scripture, which would preclude Matthias from constituting one of their number during Christ’s period of preaching. After all, Matthias would not yet have been included among the inner circle of the Twelve because he would first be elected among their number after the events of Easter (Acts: 1:22-26). The eschatological and historical significance of the Twelve, however, was so preeminent in the poet’s mind, that he felt it necessary to maintain the traditional figure, perhaps drawing on the conception of Christ as apostle established in the Epistula ad Hebraeos (Heb. 3:1), where chapter three opens: unde fratres sancti vocatiois caelestis participes considerate apostolum et pontificem confessionis nostrae Iesum (“Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly vocation, consider the apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus”).

Having firmly established Andreas among the Twelve, the poet is not content to have this historical association serve as the sole evidence for the apostle’s eye-witness authority. Instead,
the *Andreas* poet has the saint make direct reference to his source for Christ’s teachings—that is, Jesus himself.

For the poet’s audience, Nu ic þe sylfum secgan wille
oor ond ende, swa ic þæs æðelinges
word ond wisdom on wera gemote
þurh his sylfes muð symle gehyrde.

*(ll. 648-651)*

Now I wish to tell you yourself from the beginning to the end just as I heard continually the words and wisdom of that noble one in a gathering of people from his own mouth.

Having experienced the Lord’s sermons from Christ’s own mouth, the authority of Andreas’ witness is confidently grounded. Through his proximity to the living Jesus, Andreas is qualified to access and give accurate testimony about the true words of Christ’s preaching.

Yet simple eye-witness testimony does not an apostle make. An apostle must be capable of both accurately and persuasively relating that witness, interpreting the word of God for his audience such that they can understand the Gospel’s significance. This is the attribute that the *Andreas*-Poet is most concerned with exploring, as he spends what may seem an inordinate amount of time on the colloquy between Christ, disguised as the helmsman, and Andreas. Whereas modern sensibilities tend to prefer the action of a narrative to move at a brisk pace, working efficiently toward a climactic resolution, the conversation between Jesus and the apostle may seem overly long. Before the saint’s journey even really begins, the *Andreas*-Poet pauses for well over four hundred lines to show Christ testing Andreas on his ability to recount his witness. The Anglo-Saxon poet cannot, of course, be recognized as introducing into the narrative what amounts to a sort of apostolic job interview, for the episode is present in the Greek, Latin and other Old English redactions of the legend. What can be stated with confidence is that the poet recognized the importance of this passage in establishing the authority

---

6 Note that in Blickling XIX, Andrew relates only the miracle of Christ calming the water (Mt. 8:26, Mk. 4:39, Lk. 8:24). Blickling XIX, p. 235. The same is true in MS CCCC 198. Bright (1971), pp. 209-10, ll. 88-95. Andreas’ test is much more involved in the heroic poem, where he is compelled to tell multiple stories about the living Christ.
of Andreas’ witness and sought to expand and elaborate on the dialogue to a highly original extent.

As the sea grows violent and threatens the safety of the apostle and his retinue, the disguised Christ issues a sort of dare to Andreas to prove he was actually one of Christ’s thanes by recounting something of the Lord’s teachings:

Gif ðu þegn sie  þrymsittede,  
wuldocyninges,  swa ðu wordes becwist,  
rece þa gerynu,  hu he reordberend  
lærde under lyfte.  Lang is þes siðfæt  
ofr fealuwe flod;  fræfra þine  
mægas on mode.  If you are the thane of the one dwelling in triumph, the king of glory, as you affirm through word, relate those mysteries, how he taught the bearer of speech [i.e. mankind] under the sky. Long is this journey over the tawny sea: comfort your men in [their] heart[s].

(ll. 417-422a)

Andreas responds to Christ’s challenge by recalling the apostles’ own journey with Christ across the sea to Gerasenes as found in Mark 4:36-40 and Luke 8:22-25.

Þa seo menigo  When the many began to cry out in the ship,  
ongan clypian on ceole,  the king immediately arose,  
cyning sona aras,  the joy-giver of angels,  
angla eadgiva,  [and] stilled the waves,  
þyum stilde,  the water’s surgings,  
wateres wælmum,  [and] subdued the winds.  
windas þreade;  The sea settled, the measure of the sea’s currents became calm. Then our heart[s] rejoiced after we saw under heaven’s span that the winds and waves and the terrible water were made fearful before the awesomeness of the Lord. 
þæt næfre forlæteð  Therefore, I wish to tell you truly that the living  
forfælde God  God never abandons a man of earth if his  
eorl on eorðan,  courage is strong.

(ll. 449-460)

Thus, the apostle not only meets the challenge to relate something of Christ’s teaching, but he is also capable of using his witness to identify an episode from Christ’s life which has an immediacy for his audience at sea. Furthermore, Andreas manages to interpret the moral significance of the event to his followers. Just as the apostles were to trust in Christ to deliver
them safely across the rough waves, so too must Andreas’ thanes trust that God will intervene to aid those that take courage in Him, a sentiment, of course, echoed famously in *Beowulf.*

The helmsman is not yet content, however, with Andreas’ response and further questions him on his ability to give witness to Christ’s teaching and asks to hear about the Lord’s preaching in the temple (ll. 557-571) and the further miracles he performed (ll. 603-616). Andreas patiently responds to these requests, but when the Lord asks yet a fourth time (ll. 624-627), the apostle begins to become skeptical and impatient, especially since the leading questions that the helmsman poses demonstrate a clear knowledge of Christ’s life and teachings. Andreas asks:

```
Hwæt frinest ðu me,     frea leofesta,  
wordum wretlicum,     ond þe<h> wyrdæ gehwæs  
þurh snyttra cæft     soð oncnawest?
```

(ll. 629-631)

Why do you ask me, dearest lord, with ornate words, though you recognize the truth of each (of) event(s) through [your] skill of wisdom(s)?

The helmsman responds that he has continued to question the saint because he is so impressed with Andreas’ eloquence.

```
Ne frine ic ðe for tæle     n
on hranrade,     ac min hige blissað,  
wynnun wrídæð,     þurh þine wordlæðe  
æðelum cene; ne eom ic ana ðæt,  
ac menna gehwam     mod bið on hyhte,  
fyhrhæ afrêfed,     þam þe feor oððe neah  
on mode geman     hu se maga fremede,  
godbearn on grundum
```

(ll. 633-640a)

I do not ask you in order to find fault, nor through censorious rebuke, on the whale-road, but my mind exults, increases with joys, through your inviting words abounding in excellence. Nor am I the only one; rather, the heart is hopeful in each man, the mind comforted, for those far and near who remember in the heart how the Son, the child of God, performed on earth.

Thus, the concealed Christ sanctions Andreas’ witness on account of his *wordlæðe* “inviting words” or “eloquence.” Now believing the helmsman’s desire to hear him recite to be well-intentioned, Andreas proceeds to recount Christ’s teaching in the temple for almost two hundred lines (ll. 644-821). As Andreas himself later recalls, the lengthy passage is “a great number of

---

words.” The speech represents a heroic rendering of scripture akin to the Cædmonian tradition and remains unparalleled in the Old English prose homilies derived from the same legend. Whereas a modern reader might interpret Andreas’ recital as unnecessarily digressive, the poet doubtlessly intends this, the apostle’s greatest and longest speech in the poem, to serve as an example of the apostle’s supreme oratory skill.

The Andreas-Poet’s expansion on the dialogue between the concealed Christ and Andreas offers his most clear contribution to the narrative, and his belaboring of Andreas’ ability to accurately and eloquently relate the miracles of the Lord is quite significant when viewed in light of the typological readings advanced by Hill and Walsh. If Andreas is to be read typologically as a Christ-figure, as likely he should, then he ought serve as such throughout the entire poem and not just the conclusion. Perhaps it is important to recall the image found in Heb. 3:1 of Christ himself as an apostle, an image that may even be echoed in the poet’s inclusion of the Lord when referring to the Twelve in lines 661-665. Jesus served as the authorised emissary of God, preaching and disseminating the word of the Lord as only he, the Son of the Father, could confidently bear witness. Through his witness and role as God’s apostle, Christ interprets the Lord’s revelation to his disciples and speaks to the salvation of the faithful in the world to come. By analogy, the Andreas-Poet conscientiously uses the first part of his narrative to firmly ground his protagonist in his role as a Christ-like apostle, one who serves to forward the traditio apostolica which Jesus set in motion and which Andreas himself witnessed along with his brother disciples. Like an apostle-Christ, he is sent by the divine order of God to travel to a strange and hostile land, Mermedonia, so that he might suffer and ultimately effect the salvation of those willing to listen to the truth of his witness. Before his departure in the first part of the narrative and his suffering among the cannibals, Andreas has a moment of hesitation when he

---

9 *Ic on brimstreame spræc worda worn* (“I upon the ocean-current speak a great number of words”) (ll. 903b-904a)
questions God as to whether or not he would be able to travel to Mermedonia within the allotted time, a moment that might typologically parallel Christ’s own doubt in the garden (ll. 190 ff.). Furthermore, he restores the power of sight to the blinded Matthew in much the same manner that Christ healed the sick.

In spending so much time on the colloquy in which Jesus quizzes Andreas on his ability to faithfully recount all that he witnessed “from Christ’s own mouth,” the poet effectively heightens the theme of apostleship and its theological importance for the salvation of mankind. Because Andreas was one of the Twelve, a fact that the poet never forgets, he is already instilled with an exalted degree of authority. Yet, through Christ’s testing of him, Andreas proves himself worthy of his task and receives the Lord’s praise for his speaking ability, an item not mentioned in the Old English prose homilies. Consequently, Andreas’ authority emerges not merely from his own proximity to the earthly Jesus, but also from Christ’s explicit endorsement. To gain the Lord’s approval, the apostle’s testimony cannot simply be factual, but it must also be eloquent and persuasive in a manner consonant with the enthused powers of locution granted to the Twelve at Pentecost. The first half of the poem, therefore, offers a prolonged meditation on the power of witness and the theological need for that witness to be historically based and divinely approved. It is only with such divine sanctioning that the apostle can sally forth and effectively employ his speech acts to unleash a baptismal flood, punishing the wicked and saving those willing to accept the truth of the Lord’s word. Thus, from an eschatological perspective, the Andreas poet recognizes that salvation is not accessible to Christians except through the reception of authoritative witness. By using the character of Andreas to explore the concept and theological underpinnings of apostleship, the poet reveals the true source of an apostle’s power—true and eloquent witness. Once Andreas has proven his ability to deftly wield this power, as
Christ did before him, only then can he accomplish his salvific mission and bring a typologically coherent narrative to its figural conclusion. Hill’s statement that the typological patterning is somehow less complex in the first part of the narrative can, therefore, be dismissed. Andreas functions as a Christ-like figure in the poem from beginning to end, proving himself to be an adept teacher in the first part of the narrative and a savior in the latter half, thereby mirroring Jesus’ own progression in the gospels.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Anglo-Saxon understanding of “apostolicity,” that is, all the qualities, characteristics and duties that go into the making of an apostle and his office, was by no means a new or foreign construct when it emerged in early medieval England after the introduction of Christianity. The very nature of apostolicity, with its emphasis on the true preservation of witness and apostolic authority to be passed down from generation to generation, is in and of itself a conservative force, resistant to profound change or radical innovation. The Anglo-Saxon scribes and scholars who engaged with the apostles and their office relied heavily on the scriptures and authoritative patristic works to inform their view of apostleship. This fact becomes readily apparent when one takes into consideration the large degree of citation and paraphrase from patristic and earlier medieval sources found in the works of such eminent figures as Bede and Ælfric. Such a recognition, however, does not mean that the literature dealing with the apostles was in any way static. On the contrary, Anglo-Saxon writings on the apostles demonstrate a vibrancy and enthusiasm that, in the very least, matches the work of their patristic forbearers. The Anglo-Saxon Church found itself perpetually occupied with this group of theologically essential saints. Observing the way in which source materials were constantly being excerpted, redacted, expanded and applied in new and interesting contexts reveals a religious culture very much absorbed with the apostles and all they represented. This very process of editing and interpreting denotes an innovative impulse within the Anglo-Saxon Church, one that could even compel
writers in early medieval England to insert their own voice via original exposition or the identification of new figural readings and typological parallels based on inherited motifs. Whereas Bede and Ælfric may have drawn frequently upon their sources, the product of their effort and diligent study was something new that they could deservedly call their own. While the early English Church did not invent the concept of apostolicity, Anglo-Saxon exegetes, liturgists and homilists certainly managed to lend it added nuance.

If anything, the Anglo-Saxon Church took great inspiration from the apostles and found ways to employ them as rhetorical tropes to help forward its own mission. The apostolic imperative to preach the gospels throughout the world helped fan the flames of missionary zeal felt by such figures as Alcuin and Boniface. The apostles’ role as arbiters of the true faith and eye-witnesses to Christ’s teachings, life, death, resurrection and ascension provided authority to the arguments of Wilfrid, Bede and Alcuin when seeking to combat heresy. To Ælfric, an educator dedicated to furthering the advances of the Benedictine Reform, the apostles were model teachers to be emulated in their struggle to save the souls of their disciples and converts through right teaching and eloquent clarity. For monastic communities in general, the *vita apostolica* as embodied by the lives of the apostles, with its emphasis on restraint, chastity, humility, generosity and denial of worldly pleasures, lay at the very core of their way of living. Episodes from the lives of the apostles could be interpreted as establishing precedents for the liturgical practices found in the Liturgy of Hours or instructing religious houses about when the ascetic strictures of the monastic life might be eased in accordance with brotherly compasion. For all Christians, the role of the apostles in salvation history was of an importance second only to Christ himself. They alone permitted access to the salvific teachings of the Lord. They would be the ones to sit on the twelve seats next to Christ at Judgment Day, imbued with the power to
either forgive or condemn the faithful. They could serve as powerful intercessors between God and the living. All these significances lent an immediacy to the apostles and their cults in nearly every facet of Anglo-Saxon life.

St. Andrew offers a particularly enlightening case study for the cults of the apostles. His particular cult was firmly established at an early stage in the development of the English Church and disseminated widely throughout the land via the efforts of such prominent figures as Augustine of Canterbury and Wilfrid of York. His immense popularity as a saint meant that he enjoyed a peculiar level of devotion in Anglo-Saxon England that could only be eclipsed by the likes of Christ, Mary, Peter and Paul. Because of his admired status, there is a great deal of surviving literary evidence, especially in the way of apocryphal material, that can help provide a detailed picture of the apostle’s veneration. Meeting the demand for knowledge of the saint, apocryphal traditions about Andrew managed to infiltrate Anglo-Saxon literature to a high degree. Apocryphal stories about his passion informed the altar dedications of Aldhelm and Alcuin, the hymns of Bede and the Durham Hymnal, prayer books such as Aedeluald’s, martyrlogical entries, the liturgy of the mass (to a lesser extent), the divine office (to a somewhat greater extent), and the homilies of Ælfric. Traditions about his earlier exploits also found widespread acceptance as evidenced by Blickling XIX and the only surviving heroic poem about an apostle, Andreas.

When viewed through the lens of “apostolicity,” the various Anglo-Latin and Old English works touching on Andrew reveal interesting uses of the apostle. By addressing Andrew’s call to follow Christ alongside Peter, Bede manages to read the fisher-apostles as representing the universality of the Christian church and its mission. The etymologies of Andrew’s name and his purported birthplace in Bethsaida allow the exegete to construct an image of the apostle as a
virile hunter catching souls for the Christian faith and standing in opposition to evil Old Testament hunters such as Nemrod. This portrayal of Andrew, of course, helps highlight the role of the apostles in salvation history and as spiritual healers. Though perhaps unrelated historically to the classical, heroic traditions that informed the composition of continental and Insular *tituli*, the apostle’s representation as a masculine huntsman may have reinforced the martial images forwarded in altar dedications. The same warlike prowess that made the apostle the ideal guardian for church altars would extend to his potency as intecessor. Intercessory prayers such as that found in the Prayer Book of Aedeluald and the Wulstan Portiforium played up the apostle’s martial qualities, depicting the same strength and daring Andrew displayed at his crucifixion as a boon to those in need of his divine assistance. In *Andreas*, of course, the apostle would also be portrayed in the militaristic terms so prevalent in Old English verse. Again, while the heroic images of Andrew in both exegesis and vernacular poetry are likely derived from disparate generic conventions (i.e., etymologies vs. verse epic), they could not help but reinforce one another. When Anglo-Saxons thought of Andrew, they likely thought of a virile hero fighting for the salvation of mankind. Andrew was, of course, much more than that. As the Old English *Andreas* shows, he was the consumate apostle in every sense of the word. Read as a meditation on apostolicity, the verse epic expands upon the source legend in order to underscore Andrew’s roles as missionary, right teacher, spiritual healer and arbiter of salvation. Perhaps most significant with regard to the Old English poem is Andrew’s role as witness. The lengthy colloquy between the disguised Christ and Andrew carefully foregrounds the apostle’s physical proximity to the living Jesus as well as his ability to accurately and eloquently preach his witness to the Lord’s teachings and miracles. As mentioned above, apostolicity as a concept was nothing new in Anglo-Saxon England. Yet, by keeping in mind the office of apostle and its constituent
duties, we can look at the apostles in literature through a lens that is very much similar to how the Anglo-Saxon authors themselves viewed the saints. Perhaps everything old will become new again, or at least lend new and insightful readings.
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