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Today scholarly criticism of the OE poem Andreas still addresses issues raised almost a century ago. At that time, scholars first noticed that Andreas resembled the epic Beowulf not only in narrative structure, but also in verbal expression. The apparent borrowings together with Andreas' overall martial tone seemed often inapposite in their context in this saint's life, suggesting to these critics that the author of Andreas was a less than competent poet. While some scholars still judge both the Beowulf presence and the martial diction in Andreas to be signs of the poet's deficiencies, other scholars argue that, as hagiography, Andreas is not subject to the constraints of mimesis, and that the martial diction and Beowulf borrowings usually have a non-literal significance. They believe that because Andreas is therefore an allegorical narrative, the charge of mimetic incoherence is itself inappropriate.

A close reading of Andreas supports this contention. The poet's martial language is an apt expression of the Christian metaphor of martiality found in Eph. 6. 10-17, and implies a consistent distinction between the soldier of Christ and the soldier of Satan. In addition, purposeful allusion to Beowulf (through intentional narrative parallels as well as through verbal duplications and echoes) enriches the portrait of the two opposing comitatus and suggests that the soldier of Christ is a more worthy ideal than his secular counterpart. These observations strongly suggest that the author of Andreas was an able poet, skilfully using the resources of Anglo-Saxon literary tradition to express his Christian theme.
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INTRODUCTION

Anglo-Saxon verse has not always excited an enthusiastic response from its audience of modern critics. Many scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, for instance, persisted so resolutely in calling Beowulf an "historical document" rather than "a work of art,"¹ that Tolkien was moved to protest that "[n]early all the censure bestowed on The Beowulf has been ... due to the belief that it was something that it was not" (Tolkien, p. 54). A decade later, Bonjour still found it necessary to preface his able defense of the disgressive episodes in Beowulf with the assertion that the poet "certainly knew, or thought he knew what he was doing."²

Until very recently, the Old English poem Andreas suffered similarly from scholars' reluctance to grant its author anything more than minimal poetic competence.³ Within the past decade, however, this attitude has begun to change. Many critics studying Andreas in the context of hagiography rather than of secular epic have urged a reassessment of the poem.⁴ The charge of poetic incompetence is still occasionally raised, nonetheless, in connection with the Andreas poet's use of martial diction, and his debt to Beowulf.⁵

While apologists of Andreas have defended the poet's use of Beowulf phraseology as effective poetic allusion,⁶ there has not, as yet, been an attempt to interpret both the borrowings and the martial diction as complementary parts of a complex metaphor elaborating the nature of Christian spiritual warfare.⁷ In the following chapters, I will undertake such an interpretation, first reviewing some of the critical reaction to the poem, then examining the narrative of Andreas in the context of hagiographic conventions. Finally, I will argue that a close reading of the poem suggests that both traditional martial diction and purposeful borrowings from Beowulf not only comprise
a thoughtful portrait of the Christian hero, but also explore his relationship to the secular warrior of the temporal world. The results of the analysis will, I believe, confirm the Andreas poet's expertise and leave little doubt that like most other Anglo-Saxon poets, he knew what he was doing.8
FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION


3. Examples abound and will be more fully treated in subsequent pages. Claes Schaar's criticism of the "narrative gaps" and "looseness" in Andreas (Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group, Lund Studies in English 17 (1949), pp. 318-319) and Das' opinion that the poem's martiality can produce a "ludicrous effect" (Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles, ed. K.R. Brooks (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. xx-xxi) are typical. (Henceforth these titles will be cited as CS and A, respectively).

4. Among these critics are J. Earl, David Hamilton, Constance Hieatt and Thomas Hill. Their work will be discussed below.

5. These views are held by Michael Cherniss, T.A. Shippey and Joyce Hill.


CHAPTER ONE
CRITICAL ATTITUDES TO MARTIAL DICTION
AND BEOWULF BORROWINGS IN ANDREAS

The Old English poem Andreas, unlike the epic Beowulf, has not yet received its fair share of praise. In the past, Andreas' martial tone, augmented by specific collocations and half-lines apparently drawn from Beowulf, was considered by scholars to be a sign of the Andreas poet's incompetence. While many contemporary critics are re-evaluating Andreas and readily acknowledge that its author transformed "a tale of wonder with no doctrinal purpose" into an intricate parable about the workings of salvation, the nature of Beowulf's relationship to Andreas, together with the effect of martial conventions in the latter, still occupies a central place in the continuing debate about Andreas' artistic merit. Any interpretation of Andreas which would transform these apparent liabilities into assets must first weigh carefully the arguments of those who find these features inappropriate.

In his 1906 edition, Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles, Krapp observed that some of the incidents found in Andreas resembled portions of Beowulf. In addition, Krapp provided an extensive, albeit excessively eclectic, catalogue of words and phrases common to both Beowulf and Andreas. Although the narrative similarities noted by Krapp were too general to be clearly intentional, and were in any case already part of a well-known apocryphal tale (and not, therefore, original to Beowulf), many critics believed that the presence in Andreas of specific verbal parallels in conjunction with these narrative similarities, proved that the author of Andreas relied on the work of the Beowulf poet, to remedy his own deficiencies as a writer.

Once Andreas was accepted as an imitation of Beowulf, this saint's life almost inevitably was judged as if it, like Beowulf, was a secular epic with
a literal narrative. When, on occasion, the *Beowulf* borrowings and the martial diction made less than literal sense in the context of *Andreas*, scholars inferred that the *Andreas* poet was inept and had scant control over his language and his narrative. In his thorough analysis of *Andreas*' relationship to the Cynewulf canon, for instance, Schaar concluded that "niwan stefne" (A.v. 123 "borrowed" from B.v. 1789) "does not refer to anything." Likewise, he found *Andreas* vv. 301-3 (particularly "landes ne locenra beaga") to be a nonsensical import from *Beowulf* vv. 2991-5.

Some other phrases or words, while still making literal sense, seemed to critics to possess connotations inappropriate to *Andreas*. Thus Schaar found "heah ond horngeap" (A.v. 668/B.v. 82) "better suited to Heorot than a temple" and "straete stanfage" (A.v. 1234 / B.v. 320), too "solemn" for "torture in the city of cannibals" (CS, pp. 281-2) while Brooks found "to pam beadulace" (A.v. 1118), describing the Mermedonian assault on a helpless youth, to be "another exaggeration by the poet." Instead of wondering at the purpose of these surprising infelicities and incongruities, many scholars hastened to conclude, as noted above, that the *Andreas* poet was not only a plagiarist, but an incompetent as well.

While much of today's understanding of Anglo-Saxon literature is deeply indebted to these scholars, their assessment of *Andreas* unfortunately helped to direct scholarly interests elsewhere, leaving the motivation for the poem's puzzling inconsistencies largely unexplored.

On what grounds can the rather harsh verdict of *Andreas*' detractors be contested? Although their unfavourable evaluation of the poem can be challenged collocation by collocation, such an approach succeeds only in pitting one reader's personal opinion against another's. Instead, we ought
to examine some of the assumptions implicit in the conclusions of these early critics. When these premises are made explicit, we can better decide if the charge of incompetence is justified.

It is important first to recall that before 1950, critics hadn’t studied the formulaic nature of Old English poetic diction. Although their lists of *Beowulf* borrowings found in *Andreas* consequently included words and collocations which were really part of the fabric of all OE verse, they assumed that duplications in *Andreas* of phrases and half-lines from *Beowulf* indicated conscious imitation of the latter by the *Andreas* poet. Because they did not realize that such conventional language recurred in many poems, these critics usually limited their search for common phraseology to the texts of *Andreas* and *Beowulf* alone. Such narrow comparisons further exaggerated *Andreas*’ apparent dependence on *Beowulf*.17

These early critics also supposed that their knowledge of Anglo-Saxon language and literature was reasonably complete. Any anomalies in *Andreas* were therefore judged to reflect the poet’s deficiencies rather than the limitations of modern criticism. According to such logic, however, the *Andreas* poet lacked an understanding not only of his own literature but of his native tongue as well.19 As we shall see, this surprising premise was not challenged until recent decades.

Another premise particularly damaging to the literary reputation of *Andreas* was the critics’ implicit belief that the imitation of *Beowulf* indicated not only the *Andreas* poet’s poverty of invention, but also that both *Andreas* and *Beowulf* belonged to the genre of secular epic, and that a single set of critical standards was therefore equally appropriate to both poems. This assumption led scholars, as we have seen, to criticize *Andreas*’ lack of literal
coherence without considering the likelihood that this saint's life was in fact an allegorical rather than a mimetic narrative.  

Finally, early critics neglected to examine the possibility that the Andreas poet used martial diction and Beowulf phraseology not to duplicate the secular epic, but rather to evoke that genre for purposes of comparison and contrast with his work. From this point of view, the borrowings would seem allusive rather than merely imitative, and the apparent incongruities and infelicities would be transformed into expressions of theme rather than of incompetence.  

Contemporary critics antagonistic to Andreas also seem to accept many of the assumptions of this earlier criticism. While they argue that Andreas borrows not the language of Beowulf in particular, but rather the conventions of Anglo-Saxon secular verse in general, they agree with their predecessors that the poet's purpose was imitative and that his imitation was inept. Thus Shippey says, "Whether he was imitating Beowulf or a whole epic tradition ... the author of Andreas obviously did his best to subordinate new matter to old form" and concludes that although the borrowed martiality lends a "wash of epic dignity" and unity to the poem, Andreas nevertheless fails because of its "diminished sense of reality" (pp. 124-7). Cherniss also thinks that the Andreas poet was "unable to adapt his Germanic poetic heritage to the demands of his Christian subject matter" and Faigley believes the "style of Andreas represents the pitfall of unmodified use of epic convention for religious verse."  

While no one would contest the claim that the Andreas poet freely uses the martial conventions and language of OE secular verse, that use does not (as noted above) automatically imply inept imitation. We may, therefore,
legitimately object to the conclusions of these contemporary critics on the same grounds as we object to those of the predecessors. Granted the Andreas poet uses the language of Beowulf and of martial convention generally, we need not necessarily conclude from this that he is attempting, with mixed success, to write a literal narrative.

Joyce Hill's attack on the Andreas poet's diction proceeds from linguistic grounds and deserves special consideration. She argues that much of the traditional OE martial vocabulary underwent a semantic change when used in Christian discourse ("Soldier," pp. 59-60). This change allowed writers to use words which had previously denoted the aggressive traits of pagan heroes, to describe the more stoic attributes of the Christian hero. Hill judges the martial vocabulary of the Andreas poet, however, to be inappropriate to the depiction of a saint's behavior because that vocabulary is "so heavily dependent on the heroic tradition that it inevitably arouses the wrong set of expectations" (p.72).

Clearly, this conclusion denies the author of Andreas the right to put his vocabulary to metaphoric or allegorical use. In addition, Hill's assessment rests on an inadequately documented inference of semantic shift as well as an unwillingness to distinguish narrative differences within the genre of the saint's life.25

If the attack on Andreas, then, is flawed, how well do contemporary critics favourable to Andreas defend the poem? Arthur Brodeur begins his assessment of Andreas by saying that Andreas "is in no sense an imitation of Beowulf" and that the Andreas poet uses the traditional martial diction of Anglo-Saxon secular poetry to lend "verve and color" to his verse ("Diction," p. 102). Brodeur's suggestion that poetic purpose underlies many of the
Beowulf borrowings, is supported by some useful criteria for distinguishing intentional borrowing from formulaic diction. He argues, for instance, that phrases in Andreas which combine two or more separate elements from Beowulf suggest purpose rather than coincidence as does duplication in Andreas of rare words or collocations found in Beowulf.

Having thus proven the likelihood of conscious borrowing, Brodeur fails to prove as effectively that the Andreas poet was more than a mere imitator. While Brodeur's analysis of specific passages in Andreas is perceptive, it rests ultimately on his own aesthetic taste. Apologists of Andreas must build their defense of the poem on a more substantial foundation than opinion.

Hamilton's analysis of the apparent infelicities and incongruities of language and convention in Andreas helps to fill the need for an objective evaluation of these troubling features of the poem. In his discussion, Hamilton is careful to avoid issues of either praise or blame and studies instead the relationship of the problematic passages to their context in Andreas. Like several other contemporary critics, Hamilton here assumes that allusion is a significant feature of OE verse. He argues that in the "closed field" of OE verse, the relationship between common collocations, phrases, half-lines or traditionaal themes, and their varying contexts is unusually important. Thus, whether or not the new association of phrase and context fulfilled traditional expectations or violated them, would determine much of a poem's meaning.

Armed with these assumptions, Hamilton discovers several consistent patterns which connect the problematic passages to their context in Andreas. First, the Andreas poet uses martial imagery and Beowulf borrowings to reverse audience expectations. For instance, the gruesome cannibal practices described
in *Andreas* vv. 150a-154a, take on new meaning when this passage is read in conjunction with description in *Beowulf* of feasting and devouring:

> paet hie banhringas abrecan þohton,  
> lungre tolysan lic ond sawle,  
> ond þonne todælan dugube ond geogoþe,  
> werum to wiste ond to wilþege,  
> faeges flaeschoman

Here, the verbal parallels to *Beowulf* (B. vv. 71-73; vv. 1565-68; vv. 1629-30) invite the recollection of Danish feasting, and thus cruelly emphasize the degradation of Mermedonian *comitatus* which is reduced to dining like pre-social Grendels on human flesh.

On other occasions, the *Andreas* poet modifies traditional diction and theme to make them conform to his own poetic purposes. In the exordium of *Andreas*, for instance, the poet exerts "self-conscious control" and puts "the materials of *Beowulf* to new uses," changing established conventions slightly to suit a Christian context.

In addition, Hamilton believes that many apparently nonsensical uses of martial borrowings or diction, have a metaphoric rather than a literal significance. Thus *Andreas* vv. 360b-362a ("aefre ic ne hyrde / þon cymlicor ceol gehladenne / heahgestreonum") is not a mindless addition of heroic phrase, but an allegorical expression of the spiritual treasure ironically embodied in the impecunious Andrew and his disguised Lord (pp. 89-90; pp. 92-3).

These patterns, then, suggest that the problematic passages in *Andreas* have an allusive function. If we are also prepared to agree with Hamilton that the metaphoric significance of many of these cruces "indicate[s] a separation of genres and also of styles," we will be ready to grant that detailed study of the poem may be repaid by the discovery of an artistic organiza-
tion and thematic complexity of considerable merit. Indeed, an allegorical reading of *Andreas* permits a re-interpretation of the poem's martiality hinted at, but not fully specified, by Hamilton. In the generic context of hagiography, the martial metaphor together with the *Beowulf* borrowings, becomes an appropriate expression of the distinction between the temporal self-interest of secular militarism and the spiritual altruism of Christian martiality. Before we consider this metaphor in detail, however, we must first ascertain the allegorical nature of the *Andreas* narrative.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER ONE


5. Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles, ed. G.P. Krapp (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1906), pp. lvi-lvii. The initial association of Andreas and Beowulf was made by Fritzsche in 1879, (A, p.xxiii). Krapp's other observations about the originality and structural importance of martial conventions were largely ignored (pp.li-lii).

6. It has been argued that heroes often journey across oceans to help the oppressed in distant lands (see "Relationship," p.846).

7. Although Andreas' exact source is unknown, many versions of the saint's adventures in Mermedonia were extant in early medieval times. (see CS, pp. 14-24; A, xv-xvi). Consequently, Peters' conclusion may be simplistic (see Chap. 4 below).

9. Klaeber’s remarks about "[w]holesale borrowing of phrases, which more than once are forced into a strange context" (Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg, (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1950), p.cxi, henceforth referred to as B), assume that phrases from Beowulf ought to make literal sense in the Andreas narrative. Similarly, in CS, the Andreas poet is repeatedly described as having "taken over" material which is inappropriate to his context (pp.277-9).

10. CS, p.275. The phrase is not, however, inappropriate to the sense of renewal which Matthew feels after God’s encouragement.

11. CS, p. 275. A.v. 303 has also been judged grammatically deficient (A., p. xxy; CS, p. 278; Shippey, p.116), but Hamilton defends both form and content of the passage (PH, p.83). This disagreement is typical of many debates in Andreas criticism. Scholars espousing opposite points of view will frequently cite identical passages to corroborate their contradictory claims.

12. A., p.101. Exaggeration may be precisely the point here, for it is a measure of the degradation of the Mermedonian comitatus that they must prepare to attack a single youth as if he were a formidable army.


14. We might, for instance, contrast Shippey’s opinion that the Andreas poet’s work cannot be highly rated (p.127) with Brodeur’s judgment that "the author of Andreas was an excellent poet" ("A Study of Diction and Style in Three Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poems," Nordica et Anglica: Studies in Honor of Stefan Einarsson, ed. A.H. Orrick (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), p.102; henceforth referred to as "Diction").


16. Some other apparent borrowings were really idioms and commonplace ideas.

17. Although Schaar’s excellent analysis of Andreas includes extensive comparisons with other OE verse, Schaar too assumed that all parallels between any two particular poems increased the likelihood of one poem’s dependence on the other (CS, p.274).

19. Schaar compares A.v. 256 ("Hwanon comon ge ceolum liban") to B.v. 237 ("Hwaet syndon ge searoaebbendra") and B.v. 333 ("Hwanon ferigeab ge faette scyldas"), concluding that the *Andreas* poet misunderstood the meaning of "hwanon" (*CS*, p.280-1).

20. The term "allegorical" is used here to denote "the kind of discourse by which we say one thing but mean something else," (Philip Rollinsen, "Some Kinds of Meaning in OE Poetry," *Annuale Mediaevale* 11 (1970), p.9). Such a narrative will sometimes, but not always, imply the four-fold allegory of patristic exegesis. (David Williams distinguishes between the two kinds of allegory in *Cain and Beowulf: A Study in Secular Allegory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), pp.4-5).

21. This likelihood will be explored in chapters three and four, below.

22. Shippey adds that the *Andreas* poet used the heroic tone of Beowulf "simply because it was ready to hand ... no one could deny the resultant incongruity" (p.117). In fact, some do (*PH*, p.84).

23. Ingeld, pp. 174-5; L. Faigley, "*Andreas* and Poetic Style." This dislike of the martial is surprising in view of the frequency of such imagery in the Bible.


26. A.vv. 360-2 / B.vv. 38-44 ("Diction," pp. 97-8); particularly "cymlicor ceol" with "peodgestreonum" or "heahgestreonum").

27. A v. 668 ("heah ond horngeap") / B.v. 82; and A.v. 1236 and 985 ("stig wisode") / B.v. 320 ("Diction," p.98).


30. PH, pp. 87-8. To these passages might be added descriptions of Grendel's attack on Heorot, particularly his "wistfylle wen" (B.v. 734a) and his repulsive eating habits (B.vv. 742-743). A more detailed discussion of these verses will be found in chapter four.

31. PH, p.84. Even Hamilton sometimes finds the martial material "curious and inapposite" (p.83). Nonetheless, in "Diet," p.148, he notes that the Andreas poet also alters individual martial collocations in order to redefine martiality in terms of a saint's endurance.

32. PH, p.73. The role of the allegorical in medieval hagiography will be elaborated further in chapter two.
CHAPTER TWO

ALLEGORICAL NARRATIVE IN ANDREAS

Even the most sympathetic reader of Andreas cannot help but be struck initially by the poem's lack of documentary realism. Conditioned in his own time by the determinism of science and confronted in Anglo-Saxon literature by the formidable presence of the secular epic of Beowulf, the contemporary reader of Andreas will almost inevitably believe this saint's life to be a curiously flawed example of mimetic narrative. Indeed, one of Andreas' apologists, Thomas Hill, perceptively remarks that as a literal narrative, "Andreas would have been deep under water by the time the Mermedonians noticed they were being flooded" ("Figural," p.264).

A brief summary of Andrew's adventures in the city of Mermedonia should suffice to show the poem's lack of mimetic coherence. The poet's account begins with the imprisonment of Matthew in a land inexplicably devastated by material deprivation. The inhabitants' surprising solution to their dilemma is to capture and eat all visitors to their shores, hence Matthew's dangerous plight. Andrew, at first prudently reluctant to travel to an unknown and distant land, undergoes a miraculous change of heart and embarks on a dangerous sea journey without food, drink or financial resources, in order to rescue Matthew. Discovering a ship fortuitously piloted by a disguised Jesus, Andrew crosses a tempestuous ocean, regaling captain, crew and disciples with tales of Jesus' life. Once magically deposited on the shores of his destination, Andrew, with God's help, frees Matthew and his fellow prisoners (who then conveniently disappear from the story), is taken prisoner himself and proceeds to convert the entire Mermedon nation with a demonstration of his own faithful endurance and God's power.
Given such a plot, it is scarcely surprising that critics reading Andreas as a literal narrative find their credulity taxed. Yet, if this narrative is interpreted in other than mimetic terms, intelligent purpose can be found to underlie the apparent pandemonium. What justification, then, is there for regarding Andreas as an allegorical rather than a literal narrative? An abbreviated examination of the medieval idea of historical reality as it is reflected in the peculiar generic conventions of hagiography will show that for Andreas, (as for other saint's lives), the concealed spirit of the narrative takes precedence over the superficial literal level of historical or mimetic account. Indeed, it will become apparent that medieval Christians conflated the spiritual and the material into a coherent vision of reality which makes modern distinctions of tangible and intangible, or of actual and abstract, completely inappropriate to the study of these narratives.

For the Andreas poet and his audience, living in the intellectual shadow of Saint Augustine and other Fathers of the early Church, the history of the world was "a symbolic book, written by God" (Huppé, p.21). Thus the actual or natural world was construed as a collection of signs reflecting God's eternal and timeless knowledge of his creation. History, then, included not only the past as recorded in Scripture, but also the future foreknown by God. Although the precise distinction between the abstract and the actual implicit in this view of reality is often difficult to discern, it is at least clear that such an intellectual attitude produces a version of reality which accommodates both the visible and the invisible; the temporal and the spiritual. The Bible, which in patristic interpretation manifested this view of the natural world, served as "the model and guide for all serious writing" (Huppé, pp.3-4).
Given this world view it is scarcely surprising that the early European Middle Ages would produce a literature often more concerned with the concealed spirit or kernel of meaning than with the visible letter or husk of historical account.\(^8\) Literary works were intended to edify through an allegory which eased spiritual understanding by allowing the reader to discern the unknown or concealed spirit through the known letter or text.\(^9\) Clearly, then, it is a mistake for contemporary scholars "to take the letter for the spirit, to read allegorical literature as though it were literal and only literal" (Alcuin, p.40).

In addition to this caveat, readers of Andreas must also be aware of the peculiar conventions of the saint's life as a literary genre, which spring from this view of literature. Hagiographers forsook the mimesis of secular epic for a romance-like conventionality and artifice, in order to present a portrait of the saint which would edify the faithful.\(^10\) Hagiographers felt free to "manipulate facts and use them only as an excuse to praise God"\(^11\) through the deeds of his saint.\(^12\) The intrusion of the marvellous or the inexplicable into literary accounts of saints' lives was, for the medieval audience, in no way extraordinary or indecorous ("Lives," p.43) because hagiography was intended "to exalt an exceptional person, one who has attained supra-human dignity" (Albertson, p.26) and to reveal not literal history, but "the spiritual truths implicit in the saint's very nature" ("Typological," p.70). This conflation of the actual and the fanciful produced a narrative which was designed to illuminate the concealed spirit of divine truth and which was, therefore, in the broadest sense of the term, allegorical.

While Rollinsen wisely cautions against "mechanical and arbitrary application of patristic interpretive methodology,"\(^13\) there are sufficient grounds
for regarding Andreas as an allegory, at least in the general sense defined above. Indeed, it is the passages so frequently judged liabilities which testify to the poem's metaphoric nature, for "a riddling inadequacy, inconsistency or impossibility ... which impels the reader to seek a meaningful interpretation from traditional Christian symbolism" is a common hallmark of such narratives. In addition, Earl believes the poet's intrusion (A.vv. 1478-91) is typical of the hagiographer's insistence on the spiritual truth which underlies apparent fiction. Finally, both Earl and Hamilton cite the frequent ironic incongruity of many of the passages associated specifically with Beowulf or with martiality in general, as proof of allegorical intent:

   any ironic passage must be interpreted so that first it contradicts and then it transcends its surface meaning, irony urges us past the literal sense of the text and directs us toward allegory. ("Diet," p.157)

Allegorical interpretations of Andreas in both a general metaphoric sense and in the narrower typological sense, have not been lacking in recent years. Indeed, some of these interpretations seem so obvious that it is puzzling that they were not noticed by earlier scholars. For instance, in his "Diet," Hamilton argues that Andreas contains "forceful repetition of a few words and phrases that unfold metaphorically as the poem progresses" (p.148). Although he includes martial expressions in such a category, Hamilton concentrates primarily on the poet's varied repetition of the theme of nourishment throughout the poem and on its role as an expression of the presence or absence of spiritual sustenance. Indeed, Hamilton says that the Mermedons "are little more than a vehicle for the idea of spiritual hunger; their deprivation is unnaturally strained and can be understood only by recourse to an imposed allegorical meaning" (p.151).
Thomas Hill and M.M. Walsh are amongst those who would extend the metaphoric sense of the nourishment motif into an allegory with typological and eschatological implications. With Earl, they concur that the central concern of Andreas is conversion and that "the unity of the poem depends upon the various traditional images of conversion in the early Church, especially the imagery of baptism, the Harrowing of Hell and the Last Judgment" ("Typological," p.67). Thus, the captivity of Matthew recalls the exile and bondage of Israel's sojourn in Egypt (or postlapsarian man's bondage to Satan) while the captives' release mirrors the redemption of mankind from the imprisonment of sin through the metaphoric manna of Jesus, the Paschal Lamb. Andrew's re-enactment of the Passion reinforces the connection between the spiritual refreshment of the Eucharist and the proper nourishment which is unavailable to the Mermedons except in the most distorted form. Similarly, baptism, the nourishing drink denied the Mermedons (A.vv. 21-3), is also implicit in the cleansing flood and fire of Mermedonia's punishment. Thus, literal food and drink acquire tropological significance (the correct food for spiritual perfection) and eschatological significance (final cleansing on the Last Day).

Other features of Andreas have also suggested allegorical interpretation of various kinds. T. Hill finds evidence in the poem of the patristic figure of heat and cold, denoting respectively charity and sin, and of the symbolic depiction of hatred as the dragon of malitia which dwells in the mind of the wicked. Hieatt draws attention to the metaphoric implications of blindness while Szittya explains the implications of the "living stone" which is Christ. Indeed, once the legitimacy of an allegorical reading of Andreas is acknowledged, interpretive possibilities multiply, perhaps too abundantly.
Given this thickening jungle of allegorical interpretation, it may be hazardous to venture yet another reading. Nonetheless, I think there is justification for examining Andreas in the context of a theme which has been largely neglected in criticism of the poem. When Andreas is read as a metaphoric account of the continuous struggle waged by the faithful Christian against the bondage of sin and the works of the ungodly city, the effectiveness of the poem's martial diction (as well as of its specific allusions to Beowulf) becomes apparent, for the poet presents his audience with two versions of the heroism of epic. One is a portrait of the conventional but flawed ideal of martiality represented by the Mermedons, their earthly city, and, indeed, historical pagan Germanic society; the other is a precise description of a newly modified, refined and extended definition of heroism, manifested by Andrew and God's comitatus on earth. The juxtaposition of these two martial ideals allows the audience of the faithful to learn, in the vocabulary of the secular world, what behavior is expected of members of the Church Militant and peregrini in the temporal world.

What textual grounds are there for arguing that Andreas describes the conflict between the heavenly and earthly city? First, of course, the metaphor of battle is used frequently to describe Mermedonian behaviour (A.vv. 45-47; 1093-97; 1116-1125), often directed against Christians or their deeds. In addition, the poem contains several hints that Mermedonia represents the archetypal ungodly city described by St. Augustine. It is an infamous city ("maeran byrig," A.v. 40; in the OE prose variant a "ceaster lana," BH, p. 241) repeatedly likened to Rome. Its citizenry, ignorant of God and spiritual values are obsessed instead with the vanity of selfish and material gratification. They are described as "pægn deofles" (lack of concord in ms., see
A.v. 43b) and accept Satan as leader of their comitatus. In its destruction, Mermedonia closely resembles the doomed Babylon (Rev. 16.17-18).

If the Mermedons are citizens of the earthly city, it is equally clear that Matthew and Andrew are citizens of the heavenly city, sharing for awhile Adam's exile in the postlapsarian world. As actual missionary peregrini and loyal followers of Jesus, they sojourn in a foreign land where their stay is characterized by social isolation and religious persecution. As metaphoric exiles, they eat the traditional diet of alienation (hay and grass, see Henry, p.202) and endure the emotional chill of despair.

At this point in the analysis, an important paradox emerges. The Mermedons, while actual natives of their own "epel" (A.v. 21a), themselves live in a state of metaphoric exile, separated from both God and the heavenly city. They, like others who deny Christ and his apostles, are "modblinde men" (A.v. 814a), imprisoned by sin (A.v. 19a "morbre bewunden"), captives of spiritual hunger (A.v. 1158 "hungre gehaefte") and material deprivation (Greenfield, "Exile", p.202; Frey, p.294). Ironically, only their prisoner, Andrew, can return this pagan nation to its true home (A.v. 1683a). Through his teachings and the example of his enduring faith he releases the Mermedons from their bondage to sin.

Thus the poem presents the reader with several kinds of exile -- the actual exile of the missionary apostle or monk; the spiritual exile imposed on all mankind by Adam's sin; and the exile from goodness of the unrepentant sinful man -- and fully develops their often ironic interrelationship.

This depiction of the struggle between the earthly and the spiritual is peculiarly appropriate to St. Andrew, whose feast day falls at the beginning of Advent. In this penitential season, the Church remembers man's exile
on earth and bondage to Satan, soon to be relieved by Jesus' incarnation which itself foreshadows the final salvation so graphically described in Andreas (vv. 1579-90).³⁵

To express this spiritual struggle, then, the Andreas poet uses the metaphor of martiality. In this, he is not content to limit his linguistic scope. Instead, he applies to his task the full force of traditional Anglo-Saxon martial diction, augmented by specific allusions to Beowulf, thus creating within the limits of the convention an informative distinction between the comitatus of God, captained by the saint, and the comitatus of the earthly city, led by Satan.³⁶ The distinction between these two martial ideals not only clarifies the role of the soldier of Christ, but also illuminates the short-comings of an excessive secular martiality — a concern perhaps particularly meaningful in Anglo-Saxon England.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. This summary is indebted to David Hamilton, "Diet," p.67.

2. Earl finds this incident (A.vv. 1044-57) particularly significant typologically. He argues that it contains "an image obviously drawn from Exodus 14.19-20, where God hides the fleeing Israelites from the pursuing Egyptians by means of a cloud." Earl also believes that the lack of mimetic coherence in the episode is strongly suggestive of allegory ("Typological," p.88)

3. That is, the continuum of daily incident in the realm of the actual. Such historical reality can include the fictional, provided it conforms to the deterministic constraints of the natural world (see, for instance, Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1976), pp.9-37).


6. The Old Testament "had real literal meaning" and prefigured the equally real New Testament, which, in turn, foretold the historically real Parousia (Erich Auerbach, "Figura" in Scenes from the Drama of European Literature, trans. R. Manheim (New York: Meridian, 1959, pp.11-78). Clearly, however, Scripture was not completely literal, for St. Paul finds allegory in the Old Testament (Gal. 4.21-5) and does not hesitate to use allegory in his own discourse (Eph. 6.12-17). The precise distinction between literal, allegorical and typological in medieval literature is often difficult, too. See, for instance, "Allegorical, Typological or Neither?"—ed. Stanley Greenfield and Peter Clemoes, ASE 6 (1977), 285-302).

7. The medieval view of reality makes the natural world an abstraction of God's mind, whilst turning the intangibles of myth and prophecy into historical realities. Thus, for this reader at least, the boundary between the ideal and the real is obscured.

8. Huppé, pp.8-10. Sometimes concealment itself became a virtue (pp.10-11; p.30).


10. "[R]omanticism is an elevation beyond the range of the familiar into aspiration. Aspiration, elevation, exaltation, edification are all words used to describe the purpose of romance. They are the purposes of the Saint's lives" (C.W. Jones, Saint's Lives and Chronicles in Early England (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1947), p.52).

12. The presence of a similar trait in the histories of Asser and Bede shows how readily medieval writers combined the actual and the mythical.


14. Rollinsen, "Influence," p.283. For example, in *Andreas*, incidents such as the blossoming of Andrew's trail of blood, the three day duration of his ordeal and the calling forth of water from a stone, urge an allegorical interpretation.

15. "Typological," pp.68-9. This is in addition to the conventional assertion of narrators that despite their lack of expertise, they are truthful witnesses.

16. Hamilton cites the transformation in *Andreas* of a martial collocation like "swoord beran" (B.v. 2518) into "feorh beran" (A.v. 216) as an example of concrete expression of the abstract ("Diet," pp.148-9). He does not, however, elaborate on the role of martial diction in *Andreas*.

17. This motif is pervasive and includes not only the Mermedons' depraved diet and Andrew's shipboard provender, but also the poison drink which reduces man to the level of beast (A.vv. 34-39. See "Diet," pp. 148-151). This last allegorically represents the real danger confronting Matthew — that in a godless land he, too, will lose faith and as a consequence, like a beast, forfeit his hope of heaven (A.vv. 83-7). Earl would read this metaphor as part of the four-fold allegory. He believes "sylfaetan" (A.v. 175b), for instance, demands to be understood as a tropological warning against vanity.


19. For Scriptural references to spiritual food and drink, see I Cor. 10. 1-4 (Walsh, "Baptismal Flood," p.141). Appropriately, Andrew fulfills Jesus' injunction to "Feed my sheep" (John 21.15-17; see "Typological," p.78), thus counteracting the poison drink of the Mermedons just as in baptism the results of Eve's "bitran drync" (*Gullac* B v. 868b) are counteracted.

20. For instance, the parody of the Eucharist in the attack on the youth (A.vv. 1108-1116; Earl, p.79).

22. See "Typological," p.74, John 7.8. Walsh, pp. 142-3, cites John 7.37-8 (baptism as drink). The Noahic flood is a frequent type of baptism ("Figural," p.265), as is water from rock (Exodus 17.1-7; Hill, p.267) and the path through the Red Sea, Hill, p.272). This last is strongly suggested in Andreas (vv.1577-85), when Andrew leaves his prison and the flood waters part for him.


24. Constance Hieatt, "The Harrowing of Mermedonia: Typological Patterns in the OE Andreas, "NM 77 (1976), p.51. Especially the blinding in prison (A.vv. 30-2) and the "modblinde menn" (A.v. 814a) who will not harken to Jesus' words.


27. Although Earl emphasizes the role of conversion in Andreas, he doesn't construe the process in terms of the combat between the two cities.

28. Augustine, City of God, trans. H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972), pp. 593-4; pp. 911-912 (henceforth referred to as City). Alvin Lee argues that the Mermedons represent "the dryht of Hell and their kingdom is the place of damnation" (The Guest Hall of Eden (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), p.91). That place would seem to be the earthly city, under the rule of Satan (City, p. 923 and Guest Hall, p.94, "Babylonian confusion"). The final defeat of the earthly city and the final binding of Satan are prefigured by the Harrowing of Hell and both events seem implicit in Andrew's triumph over the Mermedons (see "Typological," p.77). Certainly the impending cataclysm is signalled by the Parousia-like events which occur in Mermedonia -- famine (Matt. 24.7), parent-child discord (Mark 13.12-13), and the persecution of God's apostles (Luke 21.12).

29. M.M. Walsh, in "Ecclesiastical Backgrounds of Imagery in the OE Andreas," DAI 36 (1975), 1492A (Catholic University of America), argues that military terminology is "an essential element in the patristic interpretation of the perpetual conflict between good and evil." The role of such language in early Christian literature in general and in Andreas in particular, will be discussed in the next chapter.
30. P.J. Frankis argues that references to ruins in phrases such as "enta geweorc" and "straete stanfage" are intended to evoke pagan Rome as the earthly city (see "The Thematic Significance of enta geweorc and Related Imagery in The Wanderer," ASE 2 (1973), 253-269; and City, p.600).


34. The irony implicit in the contrast between temporal and spiritual captivity is clear in A.vv. 57-58, where Matthew, although physically confined, is spiritually free because he is bound by Christ's love ("him waes Cristes lof / on fyrhplocan faeste bewunden"). The Mermedons, although physically unrestrained are, as already noted, unwitting spiritual captives of Satan.

35. The "sombre" vestments of the priest reflect the grieving, penitential character of Advent (see J.J. Campbell, Advent Lyrics of the Exeter Book (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), p.4). Significantly, many of the OE Advent Lyrics describe man's spiritual state in this season as one of captivity (II v. 8b-9a, "be we in carcerne / sittab sorgende") and homelessness (II v. 15b" eble bescyrede"). God's people await in bonds (VI v. 18a, "in bundum;" V v. 18a, "gebunden bealorapum") like weary exiles (VIII 51a,"wergum wreccan." Citations are from Campbell). These concerns seem closely associated with those of the Andreas poet and, although I have been unable to find any specific reference to Andrew in AS Advent literature, the location of his feast day at the beginning of the season suggests a probable connection between this saint and the Advent season.

36. Cherniss compares the Mermedons to "a tribe of Germanic warriors" (Ingeld, p.183). His examination of the differences in the apostolic and Mermedon comitatus are informative, but are preceded by his opinion that the exordium of Andreas is "grossly inaccurate both in terms of Christian tradition and the context of the poem" (p.175). Like Joyce Hill, Cherniss denies the poet the right to metaphoric language.
Once we acknowledge that *Andreas* may be an example of Christian allegory, the metaphoric implications of the poem’s martial language\(^1\) become apparent. Certainly, early Christian writers often used the language of warfare to describe the continuous conflict between virtue and vice. Examples abound not only in the discourse of the Fathers of the early Church, but in Scripture itself. The Psalms of the Old Testament, for instance, refer to God as a shield for the righteous and an enemy of the wicked (Ps. 3.3; 7.10).\(^2\) The Lord will attack his enemies like a soldier wielding a shield and a bow (Ps. 7.12-13; Deut. 32.23-25).\(^3\) In the New Testament, Jesus describes his earthly mission as a kind of warfare:

‘Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth, I have not come to bring peace, but a sword.’ (Matt. 10.34)

St. Paul likens the endurance, purity, love and truthful speech of the faithful Christian to the "weapons of righteousness" (II Cor. 6.4-7) and interprets the conflict between good and evil as an actual battle in which the faithful must participate fully armed:

Put on the whole armour of God that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil ... the breastplate of righteousness ... the shield of faith, with which you can quench all the flaming darts of the evil one. And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit which is the word of God. (Eph. 6.11-17)\(^4\)

This metaphor formed part of the rhetorical arsenal of the early Church Fathers, who also found it convenient to express the interactions of virtue and vice in the language of epic warfare. Thus, St. Augustine of Hippo describes the struggle between good and evil as if it were an almost endless series of battles between two mutually antagonistic cities. (*City*, pp.911-912; p.919).
The Benedictine Rule also capitalized on this conceit, urging monks in the best martial tradition to behave as warriors participating in armed combat. Service and obedience to God were construed as weapons and the entire membership of the monastic movement was metaphorically conscripted into a "holy army." Even martyrdom, the ultimate expression of non-violence, was regarded as a "conquest of the devil," and thus took a central place in God's arsenal ("Lives," p.42).

This metaphoric expression of the Christian's role in the temporal world fell on fertile ground in 7th century England, for the Anglo-Saxons were well acquainted with the political realities of martial heroism. Not only did their comitatus society spring from an earlier tradition of constant warfare, political conditions in England at the time of Augustine's arrival and long after were characterised by violence and hostility within and without the seven kingdoms.

The chief player in this historical drama of aggression was the noble warrior who belonged to the king's comitatus. He possessed, in addition to the paramount virtue of skill at arms, the attributes of courage and loyalty and was rewarded for his services with "land, treasure, food and drink." In OE verse, this politically essential man was idealized as a fearless hero who confronted the temporal world "against odds, undaunted even in death." Although far more destructive and violent than the Christian version of a hero, this Germanic warrior shared with the Christian soldier attributes of loyalty, integrity and a disdain for death, which permitted Anglo-Saxon poets to use his person as a metaphoric representation of the Christian hero, even though the latter was "a man of mind rather than body."
In Anglo-Saxon England, the conjunction of actual Germanic martiality with the metaphoric martiality of Christian theologians' rhetoric occurred after Augustine's arrival. Warfare and feud continued to be the predominant forms of political discourse, while actual armed combat was a necessary adjunct to spiritual weaponry in the defence of the faith. The resulting conflation of these two antithetical expressions of martiality is implicit in Bede's account of Coifi's conversion. Not only does Bede's description reflect an acquaintance with St. Paul's exhortation, but also a knowledge of the violence of these times:

so he [Coifi] formally renounced his empty superstition and asked the king to give him arms and a stallion -- for hitherto it had not been lawful for the chief priest to carry arms ... Girded with a sword and with a spear in his hand, he mounted the king's stallion and rode up to the idols ... as soon as he reached the temple, he cast into it the spear he carried. (Bede, History, p.28)

This conjunction of actual and allegorical martiality provided Anglo-Saxon poets with a topic of profound interest and paradox. While the traditional language and conventions of OE martial verse could be applied to expressions of the faithful Christian's moral duty, they remained signs of a secular ethic which valued an actual aggressiveness and materiality repugnant to the Christian ideology. Poets clearly recognized this paradox and explored it in their verse. In "Dream of the Rood," for instance, although Jesus is denoted by the conventional warrior noun hæleb (v.39) the poet is careful to imply that this warrior's chief virtues are submission and endurance (vv. 40-1). Similarly, the poet personifies the cross itself as a thane of Christ, paradoxically most loyal when, contrary to secular heroic tradition, it fails to defend its Lord and instead submits to His enemies (vv.37-8). Thus,
using the language and conventions of Anglo-Saxon secular martiality, the poet implicitly transforms the spiritual virtues of obedience, humility and endurance into the metaphoric weaponry described in the Benedictine Rule.

In Gublac, the language of secular heroism also becomes a vehicle for the expression of Christian ideals. Gublac, once an actual warrior ("Hwaet we hyrdon oft baet se halga wer / in þa aerestan aeldu gelufade / frecnessa fela" vv. 108a-110a)\(^1\) becomes a monk and thus a cempa (v.153a) and an oretta (v.569b) who fights for God. He confronts his demonic enemies, however, not with an actual sword, but with "gaestlicum waepnum" (vv. 177-8), the most notable of which seems to be theological debate.\(^2\) With this weaponry, the saint, like a secular hero, conquers new territory for his Lord (vv. 742-748)\(^3\) and thus demonstrates his spiritual prowess in vanquishing evil.

A close reading of Andreas shows that its author, too, was clearly aware of the distinctions between the antithetical ideals of secular and spiritual martiality. Although he uses the martial metaphor to unify his poem,\(^4\) and seems to apply the traditional diction and convention of the Anglo-Saxon secular epic indiscriminately to Christian and pagan alike, the Andreas poet is, in fact, preoccupied throughout his poem with the distinctions between the secular and Christian ethical system (PH, p.84; "Diet" p.155). His exploration of the actual differences between the two produces abundant allegorical implications and suggests his thorough knowledge of St. Paul's metaphor.

The Andreas poet is quick to distinguish between the Christian comitatus and its secular counterpart in the exordium of his poem. Although he refers to members of both troops as haeleb (v.2b, v.21a), he emphasizes their actual differences and begins to draw from those differences spiritual implications. The Christian warriors, for instance, are called "peodnes þegnas" (v. 3a)
and the Mermedons designated "deofles þegn" (v.43b; Brooks notes lack of concord, A., p.64) suggesting their respective allegiance to powers beyond the temporal sphere. Appropriately, the Christian comitatus is armed only with defensive weaponry ("cumbol" v. 4b; "rond ond hand" v. 9b; "helm" v. 10). The Mermedons, on the other hand, carry spears suitable to their role as servants of "morþres brytta" (v. 1170).23 The poet implies, however, that the Christians, being "tireadige" (v. 2b) and strong in battle (vv. 3a-4b), have nonetheless won territory at the behest of their divine leader (vv. 14a-17a; vv. 329b-331b) (perhaps through the metaphorical weaponry of the word of God)24 while the Mermedons with their more deadly weapons, have earned nothing but famine (vv. 21b-23a).

The differences between the two comitatus become even more apparent as the narrative unfolds. The epithets the poet uses to describe the leaders of the two troops, for example, imply that the secular comitatus is dependent on the temporal world, while the apostles and their disciples require only spiritual sustenance and reward. The poet suggests this distinction by modifying the traditional heroic epithet "beaga brytta."25 He refers to the Christian chief, instead, as a dispenser not of rings but of the intangible entity of life itself ("lifes brytta" v. 822).2 Satan, however, is "morþres brytta" (v. 1170) as well as a "bana" (v.17; 1293) and "morþres manfrea" (v.1313). As dispenser of death, Satan fittingly is unable to provide even the simplest of his followers' needs:

naes þær hlafes wist
werum on þam wonge, ne waeteres
drync to bruconne. (vv. 21b-23a)

Further emphasizing the other-worldly quality of the Christian reward, the poet makes the issue of material wealth a central part of Andrew's dialogue
with the disguised Jesus. In language strongly evocative of the epic Beowulf, Andreas proudly declares that

\[\text{Naebbe ic faeted gold, welan ne wiste, landes ne locenra beaga.} \quad (\text{vv. 301a-3})\]

and that for his Lord, such treasure is an unnecessary measure of merit (vv. 329b-338a). The poet, however, again makes clear that bereft of earthly treasure, Andrew and all similarly faithful followers of Jesus constitute in themselves a spiritual treasure.

Closely allied with treasure dispensing in the OE literary complex of martial topics, is the environment in which the gift-giving occurs. The Andreas poet emphasizes the satisfaction of spiritual reward and the contrasting inadequacy of temporal reward by comparing the Christian and Mermedonian contexts of treasure dispensing. While the Christian comitatus has an eternally beautiful and joyful hall awaiting them (vv. 102-6), filled with the songs of praise (vv. 871-4), the Mermedons must be content with a deserted hall (vv. 1158-1159). When they gather, the Mermedons sing not songs of celebration but rather utter incomprehensible roars of rage (v. 41b / v. 1125b) or lament their plight (vv. 1155a-1157a).

It is a measure of the Andreas poet's sensitivity to both the conventions of secular heroism and the implications of spiritual heroism, that he uses this topic of feasting and hall celebration to describe the eventual spiritual fulfillment of the Mermedon redemption. The much disputed vv. 1526-1535b constitute simultaneously an ironic conclusion to the Mermedons' actual deprivation and a metaphorical expression of the spiritual victory of salvation. It is ironic that the "meoduscerwen" coming to the Mermedons after a meagre feast day should be a death-dealing flood. This flood, however, is at the
same time the agency of their redemption (Walsh, "Baptismal Flood"). It is fitting, therefore, that this spiritual victory be expressed in language which evokes the jubilant gathering of triumphant warriors.31

The conventional epic preoccupation with weaponry provides the Andreas poet with an opportunity to describe St. Paul's allegorical arsenal as real weapons. Thus, the strength of faith becomes a shield.32 Against such protection, the heavily armed Mermedons are powerless. Although the poet emphasizes the sight (vv.45-7) and sound of their weapons (v.127), these actual arms remain ineffectual and slightly ridiculous.33

Paradoxically, the invisible weapons of the Christians are far more effective. In vv. 981a-1003b, the Andreas poet describes the work of these spiritual weapons in a way which skilfully avoids attributing the taint of graphic bloodshed to either Andrew or his God. Armed only with trust in God (vv. 984b), Andrew nonetheless arrives at the prison like a "beorn beadwe hearde," an "anraed oretta" and a "maga mode rof." His mere presence seems to precipitate the guards' death, which is described as a sleep (v.1002b) induced by death itself (v. 994b) rather than by God or by Andrew. Indeed, the saint's single action in all this is to touch the prison door (v. 999b-1000a), leaving his victims lying on the ground, the only evidence of their death being a reddening floor (v. 1003b).

The means of the saint's final victory over Satan and his demons also draws heavily on St. Paul's imagery, for Andrew uses the word of God as his sword.34 Having already suggested that sin in its ability to wound is a metaphoric weapon (v. 407a; vv. 1189b-1190a), the poet arms his Christian hero with the Gospel (v. 12; also "haliges lar" v. 654, 709,819 etc.),35 while his Satanic opponent wields a "labspell" of false teaching (vv. 1079;
see also "hearmcwید," vv.79-81). The poet describes the subsequent confrontation as if it were a literal battle. In this flyting-like contest, Satan immediately recognizes that Andrew's most powerful weapon is his preaching, and he therefore orders the saint to be struck across the mouth (v. 1300). This actual blow is followed by the metaphoric assault of insults (v. 1315b) and lies. Andrew defends himself with a simple recapitulation of the truth which Satan has distorted, and thus wins the struggle.

These examples, then, show the Andreas poet successfully manipulating the resources of his native poetic tradition to elaborate the Christian martial metaphor. A brief analysis of the heroic vocabulary the poet uses to describe the Christians and their Mermedon counterparts, shows that distinctions which encourage allegorical interpretation are present even at this level.

One of the obvious (and to some critics distressing) features of the Andreas lexicon is the abundance of its warrior nouns. Compared to the Gublac poet, for example, the author of Andreas seems profligate in his use of these words. While the Gublac poet is content with oretta and cempa ("Soldier," pp. 63-9; 71-3), the Andreas poet uses rinc, guprinc, beorn, haeleb, wigend, hildfreca, begn, and maecg to denote protagonists and antagonists alike; and gupfreca, oretmaecg, treowgebofta, and wiga (in addition to cempa and oretta) to describe Christians (see Appendix A). Although without more linguistic data than are presently available to us, we cannot automatically infer that these distinctions reflect nuances in meaning, a comparison of warrior nouns which apply exclusively to either Christian or Mermedon / demon, suggests some semantic differentiation. Typically, only the saint's enemies are described in terms of their death-dealing armament (aeschberend, frumgar, or lindgestealla), while Christians receive the less specific designation of haeleb, rinc or
begn. This lexical distinction conforms well to the poet's description of the apostles' lack of actual weapons, and their reliance instead on the arsenal of God.

While both Christians and their enemies are described as part of a group (feba, heap, bret, werod or here), only Mermedons are called a hlob or gedraeg. This distinction seems appropriate on several counts. Although Brooks defines hlob as "troop, company, throng," Bosworth and Toller add that hlob can denote a band with an unsavoury and perhaps criminal reputation. Elsewhere in OE verse, hlob refers to demons. Gedraeg also has pejorative connotations, being used occasionally to refer to a group of demons or to a multitude of sorrows. The connotations of these two nouns help to stress not only the disorder inherent in the devil's comitatus, but also the fact that the allegiance of the Mermedons to Satanic and temporal values perverts their human nature. The Christian troop, on the other hand, is restrained, disciplined and free from the angry emotional excesses of the Mermedon mob.

A brief look at the adjectives used by the poet to describe each comitatus is also instructive, for he differentiates between adjectives equally typical of OE martial description, in order to distinguish unique and significant features of the Christian warriors and the Mermedons. The Christian troop is repeatedly described in terms of the abstractions of courage, strength, wisdom and fame ("maga mode rof" v. 984, hildedeor, ellenheard, anaed, domweorbung, frome, waerfaest). The Mermedons and their demonic associates, however, are not only domleas, they are also described in adjectives which emphasize their bloodthirstiness (heorugraedig, heorugrim, waelgifre, waelgraedig, waelgrim, waelreow). Their eagerness for violence is also implicit in adjectives which emphasize their anger (eorre, bolgenmod, gealgmod). In this way, the
repeated association of the Mermedons with the excesses of slaughter and anger strengthens the reader's impression of the Christian *comitatus* as a contrastingly stoic force, constant in its duty even in the midst of chaos. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the adjective *tireadig* is reserved for God's heroes alone until the Mermedon nation in its spiritual rebirth also earns the designation *tireadig* (v. 1681).

This examination of martial lexicon, together with a consideration of some of the common conventions of martiality in *Andreas*, shows that the author is consciously manipulating OE poetic martial traditions to elaborate the portrait of the Christian hero — the embattled pilgrim of the heavenly city. These are not, however, the only means used by the poet to distinguish secular hero from spiritual hero. He also intentionally evokes *Beowulf*, inserting features of that epic into his own narrative to further enrich his descriptions of secular and spiritual martiality. The complex effects of this process will be discussed in the next chapter.
1. Like Schaar, I include here "notions which belong to the martial sphere" (CS, p.309)); that is, the warrior and his battles together with his weapons, feasts and treasure.

2. All Scriptural citations are from The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952).


4. St. John's description of the Apocalypse is also indebted to the language of epic warfare (Rev. 21.7-10).


6. They were "Cristes þegnas compliende wiþ deoflu daeges and nihtes" ("Soldier," p.59. See also Rule, p.1, 11. 8-10).

7. "Soldier" and Blair, The World of Bede, p.133. Even the peaceful scribe became a warrior capable of wounding Satan with his words (Blair, p.127).

8. Germanic society "depended for its nourishment upon continuing warfare and violence" (Blair, p.33.) Later, in the 5th and 6th centuries, the constant need for gold with which to reward the comitatus continued to fuel tribal aggression (see Christopher Brooke, The Saxon and Norman Kings (Glasgow: Fontana / Collins, 1963), pp.58-9).

9. In the 7th century, the AS king played a game of "endlessly repeated wars" and was "likely to end ... slain in battle with his head and hands stuck up on stakes" (The Anglo-Saxons, ed. James Campbell (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), p.56). In addition, rivalry for leadership encouraged feuding and produced bands of exiles who preyed on the countryside (Campbell, p.56). In later centuries, Viking predation replaced civil discord as a common form of aggression.


11. H.L. Rogers, "Beowulf's Three Great Fights," Review of English Studies 6 (1955), p.340. Beowulf provides a clear expression of this ideal in vv. 438-455, when Beowulf stoically accepts the likelihood of his own death (see also Brooke, pp.54-5). The fact that this epic can also be interpreted as Christian allegory shows how easily allegorical and literal martiality could be combined.
12. Levin L. Schucking, "The Ideal of Kingship in Beowulf," Modern Humanities Research Association Bulletin 3(1929), 143-154. See also the Breca adventure in Beowulf and Beowulf's prophecy about Ingeld's wedding feast (particularly vv. 2041-2069a).

13. J.T. Casteen, "'Andreas': An OE Poem and its Contexts," DAI 31 (1970), 4708 A (University of Virginia). Although other poems (notably Judith) describe a Christian hero performing acts of physical violence, this warrior usually fights spiritual and mental battles, (see Gublac A, vv. 344a-347, particularly "swa sceal oretta a in his mode / Gode compian")

14. Even the metaphor of the warrior-monk was realized with the influx of young warriors to monastic life (Albertson, AS Saints and Heroes, p.19).

15. Bede's history is full of accounts of armed conflict in defence of faith. For instance, Oswald, like the later Byrhtnoth, was faced with the literal necessity, of defending his faith. Significantly, he armed himself for the struggle with spiritual as well as actual weaponry (see Bede, A History of the English Church and People, trans. Leo Sherley-Price (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1977, pp.141-2). In The Anglo-Saxons, Campbell also notes the association of Oswald's cross with actual weaponry (p.56). See also Blair, AS England, p.122, for Wilfred's arrival in pagan Sussex.

16. Except for Beowulf, the existence of such secular martial verse is hypothetical. The digressions in Beowulf and the Finnsburg Fragment, however, argue that this kind of verse did exist, if only in oral form.


18. Fleming, p.54. For the conventional opinion of unaggressive behavior like this, see Wiglaf's castigation of Beowulf's cowardly comitatus.


20. Gublac's conversations with the demons of his island provide the poet with an opportunity to show the word of God acting as a sword. "Soldier," contains a more extensive analysis of heroic vocabulary in Gublac, pp.65-9.


23. The poet emphasizes their deadly weaponry with varied repetition of nouns denoting or containing the idea of "spear":

Eodon him þa togenes    garum gehyrsted, lungre under 
elinde;    nalas late waeron    
eorre aescherend    to þam orlege. (vv. 45a-47b)

24. Matthew's role as writer of Gospel is inserted in the exordium where we would more usually expect a description of armed might conquering new territory (see B. vv. 3a-6a).

25. In Beowulf, an epithet describing a king and leader of the comitatus (B.v. 35, 352 etc.).

26. As blaedgifa (v.84, 656) God also distributes "vigour, spirit, life" (Brooks' definition). The epithet, unique to Andreas, also emphasizes the intangible spiritual benefits won by the Christian hero. Appropriately, the saint will be the agency through which God introduces this vigour to the formerly destitute Mermedons (cf. vv. 1517 and vv. 1718-1720).

27. Although it is somewhat artificial to separate them from martial diction in general, the Beowulf borrowings will be discussed in the next chapter. Here it is sufficient to note that these lines emphasize the distinction between a traditional temporal measure of worth and the spiritual measure of merit.

28. A.vv. 360b-362a. See also PH, pp. 89-90. The point will be more fully discussed in chapter four, below.

29. Meoduscerwen wearþ 
aeftor symbeldaeg;    slaep tobrugdon 
searuhæbbende.    Sund grunde onfeng, 
deope gedrefed;    duguþ wearþ afyrhted.    (vv.1526b-1529) 

biter beorpegu.    (vv.1532b-1533a)

30. I translate "ale-dispensing" and with R.M. Lumiansky ("The Contexts of OE "Ealuscerwen," and "Meoduscewen," JEGP 48 (1949), 116-126) and Harvey de Roo ("Two OE Fatal Feast Metaphors: Ealuscerwen and Meoduscerwen," interpret the noun to be ironic in its description of flood as part of a feast (for differing interpretations see B., p. 466 and, "Diction," pp.100-2. E.B. Irving Jr. (A Reading of "Beowulf" (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p. 108) disagrees with Brodeur's translation). In addition, I attribute to "meoduscerwen" the positive connotations appropriate to the redeeming drink of baptism and Eucharistic wine, as well as the usual connotations of celebratory feast. This "in malo" / "in bono" interpretation was not unusual in the discourse of the time (see Alcuin, p.40 and p.84).
31. Appropriately, the joy of the spiritually redeemed is also described in the language of hall celebration:

secga seledream ond sincgestreon
beorht beagselu (vv.1656-7a; see too, vv.1672-3)

32. For instance, both Matthew and Andreas are secure in the protection of God's love (vv. 54a-58b; 116a-117b; 534-5), while God is Himself defined as "aebelinga helm" (v. 277, 623, 655) and "helm aelwihta" (v.118). In addition, Hamilton in "Diet" argues that the poet transforms the actual weapons of Beowulf (v. 437a and 2653b) into allegorical arms (A.v. 174, 216, 282, 430 etc.).

33. Even with a heavily armed force the Mermedons fail to kill either the sacrificial youth, or Andrew himself.

34. Words also initiate the final flood (vv. 1492a-1496b) which itself originates from the word of God carved in stone (vv. 1508b-1516b).

35. Hamilton ("Diet," p.155) notices that Andrew is a warrior who teaches.

36. The demons call their confrontation with the defenseless Andrew a gub (v. 1349b), secgplega (v. 1353a), and gegnslega (v.1356a). Satan concurs (v. 1369a). While the description of the interaction of good and evil as a battle is frequent throughout the poem (v.47, 1146, 1205, 234, 951 etc.), it seems in this passage particularly to reinforce the implication that the word of God is a metaphoric sword.

37. Satan accuses Andrew of pride (v. 1318a), of sin (v. 1300), and of practicing evil arts (v. 1362). Satan also exaggerates Andrew’s physical strength, calling him aeglaeca (v. 1359). Finally, the devil misconstrues (through deceit or stupidity) the spiritual nature of Jesus’ victory over death.

38. Significantly, Satan’s flawed verbal weaponry is often composed of platitudinous heroic exhortations (vv. 1182b83b; 1328-1333) which ironically fail to stimulate his brave warriors (vv. 1343b; 1332b) to victory. Cherniss notices, as well, that Satan behaves like a traditional war chief in urging the Mermedons on to revenge (vv. 1179a1183; see Ingeld, p.183). Thus, in making Satan the spokesman for traditional martiality, the poet again undermines the worth of that ethic.


41. Gublac B, vv. 894a-897a:

Oft to þam wicum weorude cwomun
deofla deaþmaegen dugupa byscerede,
hloþum þringan

See also v. 915.

42. Brooks (A., p. 63 in a footnote to v. 43) disagrees but see B.v. 756a ("secan deofla gedraeg") and "The Wife's Lament," v. 45a ("sǐnsorgna gedraeg"). It ought to be repeated here that the inference of these distinctions is tentative. Nouns such as here, for instance, can also have pejorative connotations (although not, I think, as emphatic as those of hlob and gedraeg. See here in Toller). It would require a thorough analysis of OE nouns designating "army" to make this hypothetical distinction a certainty.

43. Mermedon vocal performance is reminiscent of the cacophony of devils (cf. Gublac A, vv. 262-265).

44. Adreogan is the verb typically used to describe the saint's actions in a fight (v. 73; vv. 1482-6).
Any analysis of the martial metaphor in *Andreas* is incomplete if it neglects the role played in this saint's life of allusion to *Beowulf*. Before discussing the function such allusion, however, we must first show that it exists, for although echoes of *Beowulf* have long been heard in *Andreas* (A, p. xxiii and "Relationship," p. 844), the reason for the similarities (pp. 4-7 above) together with the mechanics of the allusive process, have been favourite topics of critical debate.

In his 1906 edition of *Andreas*, Krapp observed that the overall narrative structure of *Andreas* was strikingly similar to portions of the *Beowulf* narrative (p. lv). In each poem, the hero undertakes an ocean voyage in the company of faithful companions in order to reach a distant land and there free the oppressed from the grisly attentions of cannibal foes. Although these narrative parallels are obvious, both Peters and Brooks argue that they are too commonplace to be significant and are, in any case, reflections of the original apocryphal tale and not, therefore, the product of poetic invention.¹

These arguably fortuitous parallels to *Beowulf* in *Andreas* do not, however, exist in isolation. Instead, they are often accompanied by descriptive passages which echo the language or content of similar scenes in *Beowulf*. These passages are found in neither the early Greek version of Andrew's story, nor in the tenth century OE prose account. The unique conjunction in *Andreas* of ready-made narrative parallels with such verbal embellishment suggests a poet intentionally re-arranging his material in order to emphasize his allusion to another work.

Thus while all extant versions of Andrew's adventures describe the Mermedons as cannibals, not all accounts devote equal attention to the horrific implications
of their nature.² To emphasize the parallel between the antagonists of Andrew and Beowulf, the Andreas poet includes in his narrative an unusually extensive description of the Mermedon diet which echoes accounts of Grendel’s depravity.

Significantly, the Greek version says only "the men of that city ... ate the flesh and drank the blood of men" (ANT, p.453), and the OE prose account in Blickling Homilies similarly understates the Mermedons’ unpleasant diet:

\[
\text{segb bonne þæt þæt me on þære ceastre waeron þæt hi hlaf ne aeton, ne waeter ne druncon, ac aeton manna lichaman, and heora blod druncon.}^3
\]

Thus of all variants of the tale extant, only the Andreas poet’s version is specially tailored to emphasize this particular narrative parallel to Beowulf.

Andreas is also unique in its elaboration of the saint’s sea journey.⁴ The Andreas poet describes the pilot’s ship in language which duplicates the Beowulf poet’s praise of Scyld’s vessel:
He also strengthens the specific association between Andrew and Beowulf as fellow ocean travellers, by calling Andrew's ship a "famigheals fugole gelicost" (A.497).\(^5\)

Finally, the manner of Andrew's arrival in Mermedonia is described in language clearly suggestive of Beowulf's approach to Heorot, reinforcing the structural parallels to Beowulf inherent in Andrew's journey.

A.985: Stop on straete (stig wisode)
B.320: Straet waes stanfah stig wisode.

Such emphasis of broad narrative parallels between the two poems through their conjunction with other echoes of Beowulf argues that Andreas' resemblance to Beowulf is not fortuitous, but perhaps planned. Nonetheless, some further similarities of language or content must be found to increase the likelihood of allusion. Yet while the text of Andreas contains a wide variety of verbal and narrative echoes of Beowulf\(^6\) the question of their allusive force precipitates considerable debate.\(^7\)

Naturally, if a poet wishes to allude to another literary work, he must include in his own text an imitation of that other work sufficiently obvious to be recognized by his audience. The critic who intends to prove the presence of allusion, must likewise be able to show that the composite parts of that allusion clearly proclaim their provenance. Unfortunately, the peculiar nature of OE verse complicates this usually straightforward task.
Since Magoun applied Lord and Parry's theories to Anglo-Saxon verse, arguing that it was composed in the main of linguistic units consisting of "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a central idea" ("Oral-Formulaic Character," p. 194), scholars have agreed that the frequent duplication of collocation and phrase in OE verse reflects some general characteristic of the composition process. Indeed, OE poets may have composed their verse by modifying individual expressions from a communal formulaic stock to suit the alliterative and metrical requirements of their own work. This sharing of poetic expression extended to the duplication of conventional themes as well (Greenfield, "Exile," pp. 200-6). As a result, the Anglo-Saxon verse canon is filled with the varied repetition of a limited number of verbal expressions and thematic conventions. Clearly, in such a literature, the provenance of an individual collocation or phrase is difficult to ascertain.

This verbal conventionality has caused some critics to doubt the existence of intentional allusion in OE verse. We need not be so extreme, however, for despite the homogeneity of OE verse (Shippey, p. 95) Anglo-Saxon poets still had the freedom to decide what formulae best suited their needs. The duplication of expression in two poems implies similar poetic needs fulfilled, and thus suggests a possibly significant relationship between two otherwise independent contexts. In addition, it is likely that a poet could emphasize the intentionality of his borrowings by organizing them in a way which made their allusive significance plain. This, indeed, is the assumption implicit in Brodeur's suggestion that it is the conjunction of apparently insignificant verbal echoes of Beowulf within individual passages of Andreas, which implies intentional allusion.
In attempting to determine which passages in Andreas allude to Beowulf, I have taken Brodeur's argument a step further. While I assume that extensive verbal parallels are usually intentional and allusive, I also include in my catalogue of allusions those verbal echoes which coincide with some other narrative or rhetorical parallel to Beowulf. For instance, A.125b-28 contains verbal echoes of two passages found in Beowulf, and all three passages refer to armed men gathering to discuss plans of attack. It seems likely, therefore, that readers of Andreas already familiar with Beowulf would be reminded of that secular epic when they encountered these verbal echoes of Beowulf in the text of Andreas.

A.125b-28:  
Dugub samnade  
haebne hildfrecan  heapum brungon  
(gubsearo gullon,  gara hrysedon)  
bolgenmode  under bordhreopan.  

B.226b-7a:  
syrkan hrysedon  
gubwaedo  15  

B327b-30a:  
byrnan hringdon,  
gubsearo gumena;  garas stodon,  
saemanna searo  samod aetgaedere,  
aescholt ufan graeg.  

Similarly, by combining conventional epic expression with a synonymous variation of a Beowulf line (A.1b "on fyrndagum /B.1b "in geardagum") and an alliterative emphasis of "prym" also found in the first lines of Beowulf (A.3 / B.2), the Andreas poet evokes the introductory portion of Beowulf. The content of the verses immediately following the first three lines of Andreas further strengthens the exordium's allusive force.

On other occasions, the parallel between scenes found in both Andreas and Beowulf is emphasized by the Andreas poet's incorporation in his own work of a rhetorical convention used by the Beowulf poet in a similar scene,
again in conjunction with some form of verbal echo. Thus the verbal echo of B.237a ("Hwaet syndon ge") and B. 333a ("Hwanon fertigeaþ ge") contained in A.256 ("Hwanon comon ge") and A.258b-59 ("Hwanon eazorstream / ofer yþa gewealc eowic brohte?") is augmented by the poet's use of a rhetorical convention of the superlative also found in the beach encounter in Beowulf:

\[
\begin{align*}
A.471: & \quad \text{Naefre ic saelidan selran mette.} \\
A.493-4: & \quad \text{swa ic aefre ne geseah aenigne mann bryp bearð, haeleþ \text{ be gelicne.}} \\
B.247b-8: & \quad \text{Naefre ic maran geseah eorla ofer eorðan, þonne is eower sum.}
\end{align*}
\]

Likewise, the poet applies to the description of the Mermedons, the envelope pattern from Beowulf which so effectively conveys the ominous quality of Grendel's approach. By combining this rhetorical device with an additional verbal parallel, the Andreas poet forces his reader to recognize an allusion to Beowulf.

\[
\begin{align*}
A.1219: & \quad \text{Aefter þam wordum com werod unmaete} \\
A.1269b: & \quad \text{þa com haeleþa þreat} \\
B.702b: & \quad \text{com on wanre niht} \\
B.710a: & \quad \text{þa com of more under mistleopum} \\
B.720a: & \quad \text{Com þa to recede rinc sþpian}
\end{align*}
\]

The envelope concludes with an arresting verbal parallel.

\[
\begin{align*}
A.1388: & \quad \text{Com þa on uhtan mid aerdeage} \\
B.126: & \quad \text{þa waes on uhtan mid aerdeage}
\end{align*}
\]

In both instances, the coming of dawn brings evil tidings of physical suffering.
These subtle echoes of the language and content of *Beowulf*, together with the broad narrative parallels noticed by Krapp, make *Andreas* into a kind of literary palimpsest whose most recent text occasionally permits a view of an earlier work.

What is the purpose of such continual evocation of *Beowulf*? Close reading shows that this allusion enriches the texture of the *Andreas* poet's martial metaphor by juxtaposing well-known examples of secular martiality with the spiritual martiality of the saint. The effects of this juxtaposition, however, are variously imitative and contrastive, and need some individual explanation.

The *Andreas* poet often alludes to *Beowulf* in order to convince his audience of the extraordinary merits of his Christian heroes and their disciples. By describing Matthew, Andrew or even Jesus as if each were a Danish king or a Geatish warrior, he creates a communion of heroes, not unlike the communion of saints. Indeed, the technique of fostering a flattering comparison through the imitation of other works is a traditional practice of hagiographers. In *Andreas*, the device not only makes an unfamiliar heroism part of an accepted tradition, but also permits a comprehensible description of the ineffable.

As already noted (see above, p. 31), the exordium of *Andreas* places the Christian hero firmly in the tradition of conventional epic heroism and invites us to compare him particularly to the Danish warriors and kings described in *Beowulf*.

A.1-3: Hwaet, we gefrunon on fyrdagum
twelfe under tunglum tireadige hæleb
þeodnes þegnas. No hira þrym alæg.20

B.1-3: Hwaet, we Gardena in geardagum
þeodcyninga þrym gefrunon
hu þa aþelingas ellen fremedon.
Like the Danes of long ago, the Christians are victorious warriors who possess "might, force ... greatness, glory," (B., p.414) and are also part of an ancient mythical tradition of heroism, begun "on fyrdagum." They are therefore a fit subject for celebration in epic verse.

The connection between Dane and Christian is further strengthened when Matthew like Scyld, overcomes the obstacle of being "feasceaf funden" (A. 181a / B.7a), and demonstrates his pre-eminence by becoming a pivotal force in the establishment of Christianity just as Scyld was central to the founding of Danish power.21

Andrew and Beowulf also share heroic traits. Like the secular warrior, the saint is a "haele hildedeor" (A. 1002 / B. 1816) whose steadfast bravery merits supernatural assistance.22 As is usual in heroic tradition, both Beowulf and Andrew are supported by a loyal *comitatus*23 and excite genuine affection in others:


B.1626-8: Eodon him þa togeanes,  Gode þancodon, þrypic þe þegna heap,  þeodnes gefegon, ðaes þe hi hyne gesundne  geseon moston.

Unswerving resolution in the pursuit of a goal is another trait typical of both Beowulf and Andrew and is implied in the parallel drawn between them as they confront their respective tasks in a foreign land. Andrew, like Beowulf and his Geats, follows the path set out for him:

A.984-5: maga mode rof,  meotude getreowe. Stop on straete  (stig wisode).

B.320-la: Straet waes stanfah,  stig wisode gumum aetgaedere.24
Even the intangible qualities of divinity can be expressed as actual heroic traits. To emphasize the resemblance of the disguised Jesus to the ideal warrior hero, the *Andreas* poet makes Andrew's reaction to the divine pilot conform in part to the Dane's initial reaction to Beowulf and his companions. Andrew's questioning of the pilot, for instance, echoes the Geats' interrogation by the coastguard and hall guard (see *A*.256-9 / *B*.237-40a; 333-5a, p. 48 above). The sailors on both vessels clearly excite a similar curiosity. Indeed, Andrew's rather surprising inquiry "Where have you come from?" instead of the expected "Where are you going?" suggests a remarkable appearance in need of explanation. The nature of this extraordinary quality is made explicit later in the narrative by the repetition of superlatives noted above (p. 48).

Like Hroðgar, Andrew is amazed at the presence of this excellence in one "nalas wintrum frod" (*A*.506b). Not surprisingly, Andrew also addresses the pilot as "wigend hleo," an epithet used elsewhere to describe king Beowulf (*B*.2337b).

If the *Andreas* poet is thus able to describe the spiritual hero in the language and conventions used in *Beowulf* to portray the secular hero, he is also able to juxtapose the Germanic and Christian warrior in order to emphasize the distinctions between them. The stoic fatalism of the secular hero, for instance, is inappropriate to the saint whose faith in God must not waver. Thus, while Beowulf rather proudly asserts that:

*Beowulf* 632-6: "Ic þaet hogode, þa ic on holm gestah, saebæt gesæt mid minra secca gedriht, þaet ic anunga eowra leoda willan geworhte, oppe on wael crunge feond grapum faest."

Andrew criticizes his disciples for similar expectations of death:
A.429-34: 'Ge þaet gehogodon, þa ge on holm stigon,  
þaet ge on fara folc feorh gelaeddon  
ond for dryhtnes lufan deap þrowodon,  
on aelmyrcan eþelrice  
sawle geseadon. Ic þaet sylfa wat,  
þaet us gescyldeþ scyppend engla.

The same distinction in the attitude of the two heroes is expressed later in the narrative, again in the idiom of Beowulf.

A.458-60: Forþon ic eow to sobe secgan wille,  
þaet naefre forlaeteb lifgende God  
eorl on eorþan,  
gif his ellen deah.

B.572b-3: Wyrd oft nereþ  
unfaegne eorl, þonne his ellen deah!

Although equal in fortitude and courage, only the Christian hero is assured of God’s support, while the temporal hero must rely instead on the whim of fate. Thus "ban gebraec," deadly in the world of Beowulf (B.1565b-68a; 2507-8a), may be rendered harmless by God’s power, and "hatan heolfre" is no longer a sign of death as it was for Aeschere (B. 1423a), but of rebirth (A.1277a; 1441-1449).

In his juxtaposition of Germanic warrior and Christian, the Andreas poet also distinguishes between the rewards sought by the two comitatus. The nations of Beowulf, like their historic counterparts, rely on tangible wealth to signify an individual’s merit and to maintain the unity on the comitatus. The Christian, however, prides himself on a temporal poverty which he judges indicative of spiritual wealth. Thus Jesus tells his followers to eschew earthly treasure, while Wealþeow recognizes Beowulf’s merits by bestowing material gifts:

A.332-9: "Farþ nu geond ealle eorþan sceatas  
emne swa wide swa waeter bebugeþ,  
opþe stedewangas straete gelicþ
Similarly, when Andrew discusses with the pilot his inability to pay for passage, he describes his own poverty as an absence of the treasure prized in *Beowulf*. Andrew tells the disguised Jesus, however, that he will be paid nonetheless in the intangible tokens of spiritual reward.

In the world of *Beowulf*, however, reward is tangible and is frequently earned by bloodshed rather than by charity. Hygelac, for instance, gives his warriors "hund þusenda/ landes ond locenra beaga" (B.2994b-5) as a reward for the murder of Ongenþeow. Even Beowulf himself earns his "fraetwe ond faetgold" (B.1921) by killing his enemies.

This comparison of treasures reaches an emphatic conclusion in the poet's juxtaposition of Scyld's magnificent ship with the pilot's vessel. Using a collocation drawn from *Beowulf*, he describes Jesus' boat, filled with indigents, as a vessel whose cargo is as valuable as all Scyld's wealth (A.359-63a; B.36b-39a, p. 45 above). Fittingly, Scyld's ship of death is here transformed into an instrument of spiritual rebirth and renewal by virtue of its excellent
cargo.

Allusion to *Beowulf* is also used to encourage a comparison of Mermedon and monster. Although the resulting association between the villains of *Andreas* and *Beowulf* strengthens the resemblance of the two heroes who each must struggle with similar opponents, it also reveals the extent to which the search for material gratification has transformed the Mermedons into a bestial parody of the secular ideal. Their eating habits, for instance, might easily have been learned at Grendel's table (A.23b-5 / B.741b-45a, p. above). In their excessive aggression, the Mermedons become monstrous entities. Like Grendel, they mindlessly and relentlessly pursue the taste of blood. As already noted, the *Andreas* poet emphasizes the parallel by borrowing the repetition of the verb "com" from the description of Grendel's approach to Heorot (A.1219, 1269b, 1388-90a / B.702, 710a, 720a, 126-7, p. 48 above).33

As leader of the Mermedons, Satan shares in this communion of monstrosity. Like Grendel, he is an "atol aeglaeca" (A.1312 / B.592), as well as a "helle haeftling." Even his discourse resembles the howls of Grendel.

A.1341-2: Ongan eft swa aer ealdgenībla, helle haeftling hearm leop galan.

B.785-88a: wop gehyrdon, gryre leob galan Godes andsacan, sigeleasne sang, sar wanigean helle haefton (see also A., p.110).

The poet's description of Mermedonia itself suggests that city has affinities with the lair of a dragon. The comparison is fitting for two reasons. First, the dragon, like Grendel, typifies the aggressive excesses of the Mermedon society.34 In addition, this monstrous serpent is a central player in the apocalyptic drama,35 and is therefore appropriately associated with a city
whose collapse suggests the ultimate destruction of the earthly city.

Like the dragon's lair, Mermedonia is set among "harne stan" (A.841a / B.887; 2553; 2744). Although not itself a cave like the dragon's home (B.3046), the city is surrounded by caves (A.1232; 1539) and shares some of the architectural features of the interior of the dragon's lair.

A.1492-95a: He be wealle geseah wundrum faeste under saelwage sweras unlytle stapulas stondan storme bedrifene, eald enta geweorc.36

B.2715b-19: þa se aebeling giong, þæt he bi wealle wishycgende gesaet on sesse, seah on enta geweorc hu þa stanbogan stapulum faeste ece eorþprec ed innan healde.

The similarity between the two abodes does not, however, extend to their ultimate fate, for while the temporal hero can neither undo the harm caused by the dragon, nor make this cave into fit human habitation, the saint with God's help, can transform the lair of the Mermedons into a facsimile of the heavenly city.37

Finally, to make perfectly clear that the monstrous nature of the Mermedons is the result of an excess of certain qualities of the secular hero, the Andreas poet juxtaposes the Beowulf comitatus with the citizenry of Mermedonia. This comparison, of course, is scarcely flattering to the warriors of Beowulf.

In one of his first descriptions of the Mermedons, the Andreas poet emphasizes their impressive armed appearance, evoking memories of similar descriptions in Beowulf (A.125b-28 / B.226b-7a; 327b-31a, p.47 above). The Mermedons, unlike the Geats, however, are not armed to encounter dangerous monsters, but rather to accost helpless travellers. Indeed, the poet implies that the Mermedon version of heroic aggression is sufficiently exaggerated to be almost comic. The unequal confrontation between comitatus and unarmed
victim is thus described a "beadulac" (A.1118b). 38

Like Beowulf, the Mermedons trust in strength but their trust is both excessive and inappropriate. In Mermedonia the ideal of epic combat is transformed into indiscriminate and cowardly slaughter. The Andreas poet implies this perversion of the heroic ethic by approximating portions of the description of Beowulf's struggle with Grendel's mother and with Daeghraefn, into his description of the Meredon feast plans:

B.1565b-68a: [H]e yrringa sloh
þæt hire wiþ halse heard grapode, 
banhringas braec; bil eal þurhwod 
faegne flaeschoman.

B.2507-8a: 
ac him hildgrap heortan wylmas, 
banhus gebraec.

A.150-4a: 
þæt hie banhringas abrecan þohton, 
lungre tolysan lic ond sawle 
ond þonne todaelan dugube ond geogobe, 
werum to wiste ond to wilpege, 
faeges flaeschoman.

Aggression usually directed toward enemies is, in Mermedonia, turned toward innocent strangers.

In this violent and barren land, whose halls are permanently deserted (A.1158-9 / B.145-6, CS, p.284), the lack of any spiritual satisfaction is expressed metaphorically in a dearth of treasure as well as an absence of food (A.1113a1116b). The terrible cycle of feast and fear which prevails in Beowulf (PH, p.91) is here replaced by continuous misery, and no celebration precedes the Mermedons' constant laments.

B.128-9a: þa waes aefter wiste wop up ahafen, 
micel morgensweg.

A.1155-58b: þa waes wop haefen in wera burgum , 
hlud heriges cyrm; hreopan friccan 
maendon meteleaste, meþe stodon 
hungre gehaefte.
The Mermedons in their desperation, violate the laws of hospitality to strangers and to the indigent still sacred to the Danes and thus postpone their salvation and extend their misery.

The tragic decay of a once noble ideal is most succinctly expressed in the Andreas poet's juxtaposition of Danish and Mermedon hall celebration (see A.150-4a, p. above) also:

A.1121-23a: þæt hie þæs cynhtes cwealm corþre gesohton
dugube ond eogope, dæl onfengon
lifes to leofne.

B.71-3: ond þær on innan eall gedaelan
geongum ond ealdum swylc him God sealde
buton folcscaere ond feorum gumena.

Ironically, the Mermedons, unlike the Danes, have nothing to share except the lives of men.

Throughout his narrative, then, the Andreas poet modifies the materials of Beowulf to suit his own purposes. The result is a complex comparison of saint and secular hero which sometimes enhances the merits of the saint and at other times emphasizes the extent of the Mermedon fall from the high standards of epic heroism found in Beowulf. The consequent elucidation of the Christian martial metaphor transforms the abstract conflict between cupiditiy and charity into a dramatic struggle between two kinds of warriors. This transformation also makes the Andreas poet's narrative particularly relevant to an Anglo-Saxon audience, itself still caught in the toils of a feud-riven comitatus society. It is therefore no accident that Andreas, like Beowulf, concludes with a recitation of the kingly power to which the Christian owes allegiance. Significantly, this king's dominion is infinite and His rule eternal. For the Andreas poet and the newly converted Mermedons, He is the "god cyning" (B. 11b).

A.1717b-22: ond cwaedon þus:
"An is ece God eallra gesceafte! Is his miht ond his æht ofer middangeard breme gebledsod, ond his blaed ofer eall in heofonþrymme halgum scineþ wlitige on wuldre to widan aldre, ece mid englum; þaet is æþele cyning!"
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. Although the Andreas poet's "ultimate" source was probably the Greek apocryphal tale (A.p. xv), the version to which he had immediate access is no longer extant. Frey warns us, however, against automatically attributing to a lost source, modifications which may be the product of a later poet's ingenuity (see Frey, "Exile and Elegy," p.293). Indeed, the heterogeneity of later redactions (CS, pp.14-24; A. pp. xv—xviii) suggests the popular tale may have existed in our poet's time in many forms. The parallels between Andreas and Beowulf may well therefore be the product of the poet's intentional manipulation of a variety of sources. This possibility has significantly different implications from those arising from early critics' contention that Beowulf was a model for Andreas (see pp. 4 - 7 , above).

2. The 12th century Latin Codex Casanatensis contains the most graphic descriptions of the Mermedons' unpleasant nature (CS. p.15). Some earlier version of this particular account may have suggested to the Andreas poet a similar emphasis in his own work.

3. BH, p.229. Matthew's probable fate is similarly understated: "dry dagas nu to lafe syndon, ðæt we hine willaþ acwellan & us to mete gedon," (p.231). See also the similar prose version in Corpus Christi Ms. 198, in Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader, revised J.R. Hulbert (New York: Holt and Co., 1935), p.113).

4. "Andrew and his disciples ... found a little boat and three men" ... "I never saw such steering: this ship is as if on land"" (ANT, p.454). In the tenth century OE version, the pilot has a "medmyclum scipe" (BH, p.233), and the actual journey receives little attention even though it excites "saewe ege" (p.235; similarly in the Corpus Christi variant, pp.116-7).

5. Compare to "flota famiheals fugle gelicost." (B.218).


7. Almost all catalogues of Beowulf borrowings differ in their contents. A.359-63a, for instance is variously judged insignificant (CS omits it); inappropriate (A., p. xxiv); or part of an effective metaphor (PH, pp.97-8).

8. The exact nature of this process is problematic. While a detailed examination of theories of AS verse composition is beyond the scope of this chapter, it is important to note that there is no consensus on the supposed oral nature of the composition process (L. Benson "Literary Character," pp.334-5; Shippey, p.96). In addition, the definition of "formulaic" remains ambiguous (F.H. Whitman, "The Meaning of "Formulaic" in OE Verse Composition, "NM76 (1975), 529-537).
9. Creed describes this hypothetical composition process. Shippey is more succinct: "In one sense the poetic diction is like a meccano-set; it stays the same but you can do all sorts of things with it" (p.95). Naturally, these ideas remain conjectural.

10. See "Relationship," p.845 and Blake, English Language, who argues that in medieval times "[no] single English text was sufficiently well known for an author to assume his readers would be so familiar with it that he could allude to its verbal expressions" (p.21).

11. "Diction." In a similar way, A.1492-95a implies B.2715b-19.

12. The phrase "verbal parallel" denotes an imitation which consists of the verbatim duplication of two or more words. Thus A.985 suggests B.320 and A.1011-13 suggests B.1626-28. To a lesser degree A.429 recalls B.632.

13. Not all duplications of Beowulf have allusive force. Some act merely as convenient verbal fillers, permitting ease of poetic expression (see Appendix B).

14. The phrase "verbal echo" denotes imitations which are synonymous rather than identical, or imitations which are composed of single words rather than extensive collocations (for instance, A.127b "garas hrysedon" / B.226b "syrncan hrysedon").

15. Peters notes the resemblance, p.857. These are the only two occurrences of "hrysedon" extant in OE verse.

16. Juliana 1-3; Exodus 1-3 and other poems use variations of "hwaet" "gefrunan" in their initial verses. Peters (pp.853-4) and Bartlett (p.91) argue, therefore, that the exordium is completely conventional. Schaar disagrees (CS, p.275).

17. Brooks reaches the same conclusion (A*, p. xxiv).


19. Hagiographers borrowed freely from one another in order to endow the individual saint with the traits of all saints. See C.W. Jones, Saint's Lives and Chronicles, pp.60-1.

20. Passages cited in this chapter are drawn from Schaar, Peters and Hamilton.

21. A.12-13: "se mid Iudeum ongan aerest / wordum writan." See also, B.4-11.

22. In both Andreas and Beowulf swords miraculously dissolve (A.1145-6; B.1608-1615).
23. At least initially, Beowulf and Andrew are followed by fearful yet faithful men (A.377b-80a / B.691-2). In the end, however, it is only Christian loyalty which endures (A.405-14) for the secular warriors, bought by treasure, fail to support their lord in battle (B.2864-72).

24. Because Mermedonia resembles Heorot in some ways, the parallel is strengthened. Both city and hall are equally well-known (A.40b / B.74-82a). Although both await destruction by fire (A.1550-53a / B.82b-85), Mermedonia unlike Heorot, will be saved by Andrew's faith.

25. Significantly, Jesus' ship is also a "brante ceol" (A.273b).

26. In his allusion, the Andreas poet is careful to apply to his Christian hero only those attributes appropriate to this spiritual warrior. Jesus is therefore praised for his wisdom and seamanship and Beowulf for his physical prowess and his weaponry.


28. Gold was "the symbol of wealth and grandeur: a king must be able to display it in his hall, on his armour, on his wife: he must be able to lavish gifts of gold on his followers -- but yet remain wealthier than they. This meant a constant struggle to provide ... loot" Brooke, Saxon and Norman Kings, p.58. The tragic consequence of this scramble are predicted by Beowulf in his report to Hygelac (B.2032-69). See also Patricia Silber, "Gold and its Significance in Beowulf," Annuale Mediaevale 18 (1977), 5-19.

29. The Mermedons' destitution, however, is spiritual as well as material. See "Diet," p. 151.

30. A.474a-479 conclude this rhetorical envelope with a varied restatement of A. 271-6. There is, of course, another juxtaposition implicit here, for the Mermedons too lack rings and treasure. Their poverty, however, implies no spiritual merit.


33. The verb *neosan* (A.v. 1389b) is particularly associated with Grendel's first examination of Heorot (B. 115: "Gewat pa neosian syþpan niht becom").

34. Both Grendel and the dragon use their great strength only to destroy. The dragon's rage at the theft of a single cup implies in addition an obsessive reliance on the things of this world, echoed in the Mermedons' hunger for flesh, rather than for the word of God.
35. [C]ity, p.906 and Davidson, Gods and Myths, p.205.

36. The collocation "eald enta geweorc" may be intended to evoke the earthly city as well. (See Frankis, "enta geweorc," pp.253-69).

37. Thus Wiglaf can only stare helplessly at the source of his people's ruin. Andrew, on the other hand, transforms "eald enta geweorc" into an instrument of cleansing and rebirth (A.1503-8).

38. See B.1561a for a more appropriate use of "beadulac."

39. See B2540b; 1533b and compare to A.984, in which the saint is said to trust in God.

40. See also PH, pp.87-8. The related trait of anger in combat is shared by Beowulf and Mermedon alike (A.128, 1221 / B.1539, 2550). Significantly, this characteristic is typical of monsters as well (B.723, 2220, 2304) but is lacking in the saint.

41. Compare B.4-7a to A.177b-81a. Scyld "feasceaf funden" is nurtured nevertheless, while Matthew is imprisoned.

42. In imprisoning Matthew and his followers, they fail to hear Matthew's message of salvation.

43. Fittingly, the [A]ndreas poet's words also echo Grendel's hall behavior (B.731-34a) and thus implicitly equate Mermedon, Dane and monster.
CONCLUSION

It is clear that Andreas cannot be dismissed as a pale imitation of Beowulf. When we concede that the author of Andreas probably knew what he was doing (as Tolkien, Bonjour and Bartlett have argued on behalf of other OE poets) the apparent incoherence and loose ends of the Andreas narrative are resolved and the poem's allegorical intent becomes plain. As the preceding discussion shows, studied in its appropriate hagiographic context, this saint's life can be understood as a complex description of spiritual warfare which simultaneously criticizes the actual martiality of the Anglo-Saxon world and its secular heroes.

Of what importance is the recognition that Andreas is not merely the pathetic effort of a mediocre talent? Naturally, a better understanding of any poem is its own reward. There are, I think, at least two additional implications arising from this re-assessment of Andreas which are worthwhile. First, we may have in Andreas evidence that at least one Anglo-Saxon poet consciously alluded to the work of another. Given the limited nature of extant OE verse, we may never know how unusual or how widespread such a practice was. The likelihood of its having some role in other Anglo-Saxon poems, however, ought not to be dismissed without further study. Second, and perhaps more important, we have in Andreas, an excellent example of the flexibility of OE poetic diction in the hands of an able writer. We can, therefore, readily dismiss criticism which denies the creative possibilities of the highly conventional Anglo-Saxon verse form, in favour of scholarship which is prepared to grant the likelihood of artistic merit where we least expect it. As the work of Tolkien, Bonjour, Bartlett and others proves, such open-mindedness is rarely misplaced.
APPENDIX A

NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES CITED
(an elaboration of "Heroic Vocabulary," CS, p.309-14)

M—Mermedon
D—Demon
S—Satan
Ch—Christian

Warriors
aeglaeca: M-1131; S-1312
aesberend: M-47, 1076, 1537
beorn: M-219; Ch-239. frequent indiscriminate use
cempa: Ch-230, 324, 461, 538, 991, 1055, 1446
frumgar: M-1068
gupfreca: Ch-1333
guprinc: M-155; Ch-392
haeleb: M-21,38; Ch-2. frequent indiscriminate use
hildfreca: M-126; M-1070
lindgestealla: D-1344
maecg: doubting Jews 772; M-1708; Ch-422
oretmaecg: Ch-664
oretta: Ch-463,983; David-879
rinc: Roman-967; M-1116; D-1343
treowgebofta: Ch-1050
þegn: frequent indiscriminate use
wiga: Ch-1711

Groups
gedraeg: M-43, 1555
hlob: M-42, 992, 1389, 1543
Adjectives: positive
anraed: Ch-232, 983
collenferhþ: Ch-349, 538, 1578
domweorþung: Ch-355, 1006
ellenheard and ellenrof: Ch-350, 410, 1254, 1392
from: Ch-8, 234
hildededeor: Ch-1002
modrof: Ch-1496
rof: Ch-9, 473, 625, 984, 1469, 1676
sigerof: Ch-1225
tireadig: Ch-2, 665, 883; M+Ch-1681
waerfaest: Ch-416, 1273, 1310

Adjectives: Negative
bolgenmod: M-128, 1221
(deap)reow: S-1116, 1314, M-1334
domleas: M-995
eorre: M-47, 1076
gealgmod: M-32, 563
heorugrim: M-31
heorugraedig: M-79; perverted prisoners 38
waergifre: M-1271
waergraedig: M-135
waergrim: wounds given to Andrew-1415
waerleow: M-1211
Adjectives: ironic use

cene: M-1204
collenferhp: M-1108
rof: D-1343

Nouns: ironic use

eaeglaeca: Ch-1359
APPENDIX B

A PARTIAL CATALOGUE OF BEOWULF BORROWINGS IN ANDREAS

(Citations not discussed in chapter four, and derived from Peters, Schaar, and Hamilton)

Conventional Collocations: no specific allusion to Beowulf
(see Peters' critique of Krapp, 1906)

A.106 / B.933: "to widan feore"
A.242 / B.2777: "beacna beorhtost"
A.259 / B.464: "ofer ypa gewealc"
A.421 / B.1950: "ofer fealowne flod"
A.818 / B.2115: "ondlangne daeg"
A.843 / B.572: "windige weallas"
A.845 / B.1951: "sihe gesohte"
A.850 / B.3024: "wigend wecccean"
A.1574 / B.847: "brim weallende"
A.1616 / B.1370: "feorh gesaeldon / feorh seleb"

Verbal Echoes: no specific allusion to Beowulf

1. (see Schaar, pp. 281-2)

A. (737b-9) þæt he onfoldan stod,
stan fram stane. Stefnaefter cwom

B. (2552b-3) stefn in becom
heapotorht hlynnan under harne stan.

The citation from Andreas refers to the voice of the stone angel; the citation from Beowulf, to Beowulf's challenge to the dragon. Although the passages contain similar vocabulary, they are otherwise unrelated and it is therefore unlikely allusion to Beowulf is intended. The Andreas poet seems, instead, to be borrowing only to enhance description.
2. (see Hamilton, "Placing the Hero," p.90)

A. (1135-38a) þæt Andrea earmlic þuhte, peodbealo þearlic to gebolianne, þæt he swa unscyldig ealdre sceolde lungre linnan.

B. (1474-8) 'Gębenc nu se maera maga Healfdenes, snottra fengel, nu ic eom sipes fus, goldwine gumena, hwaet wit geo spræcon gif ic aet þearfe þiðre scolde aldre linnan.

This conjunction of expression may be idiomatic, for 'to loose one's life' scarcely seems an unusual collocation.

3. (See Schaar, p.285)

A. (1279) þurh þaes beornes breast blat ut faran

B. (2551) Weder-Geata leod word ut faran

The phrase "ut faran" certainly emphasizes Andrew's pain, but this collocation of a commonplace preposition and verb may be idiomatic. It seems unlikely to attract sufficient attention to imply specific allusion to Beowulf. (see also Daniel 6 "ut aforon" and Vainglory 41 "word ut faran.")

4. A.123 / B.1789: "niwan stefne" and "nihthelm"

"Niwan stefne" is a common collocation, but its conjunction with "nihthelm" is exclusive to Beowulf and Andreas. This duplication, however, seems too pedestrian to be allusive. It is unlikely that the similarity would stimulate an audience to associate the passage with a specific context.

5. (see Brodeur, "Diction," p.100)

A.1094b-96a / B. 853-6

These two descriptions of mounted soldiers share no similarity of expression.

Juxtaposition of "Beowulf" with Old Testament Jews

1. A.668 / B.82 "heah ond horngeap"

Both Heorot and the Jewish temple are described in this way. Although Schaar finds the parallel inappropriate (pp. 281-2), the excessive pride reflected in the construction of the giant hall is certainly implicit in the High Priest who so aggressively confronts Jesus.
2. **A.** (767b-70a)  
Man wridode  
geond beorn breost, brandhata niþ  
weoll on gewitte, weorm blaedum fag,  
attor aeelfaele.

**B.** (2714b-5a)  
bealoniþe weoll  
attor on innan


---

**The Association of Beowulf Warriors and Christians**

1. (from Schaar, p. 280)  
   **A.** 474b-6:  
   Ic wille þe,  
eorl unforcúþ, anre nu gena  
bene biddan (Andrew to pilot)

   **B.** (426-28)  
   Ic þe nu þa,  
brrego Beorht-Dena, biddan wille,  
eodor Scyldinga, anre bene  
(Beowulf to Hroþgar)

These passages are quite similar in both form and content. Andrew, like Beowulf, asks a favor which will speed his task. Nevertheless, because the duplication of expression may be commonplace, we cannot be certain that the similarity between Beowulf and Andrew would be remarked.

2. (see Peters, p. 857)  
   **A.** 1037:  
generede fram niþe (Andrew saves Mermedons)

   **B.** 827:  
generede wiþ niþe (Beowulf saves Danes)

Verbal duplication, in conjunction with similar content (each hero saves the oppressed) is counterbalanced by the possibility of idiomatic expression. (cf. "Genere me wiþ niþe" *Psalms* 139.1)

---

**The Association of Beowulf Warriors and Mermedons**

1. (see Schaar, p. 285)  
   **A.** (1349-50)  
   þaer þu gegninga gube findest  
frecne feohtan gif þu furþur dearst

   **B.** (525-8)  
   þonne wene ic to þe wyrsan gebingea  
þeah þu heaponraesa gehwaer dohte,  
grimre gube, gif þu Grendles dearst  
nihtlongne fyrst nean bidan."

The demons behave like Unferhþ.
2. (see Schaar, p.286)
A.(1526b-7) Meoduscerwen wearp aefer symbeldaege
B.(767b-69) Denum eallum wearp ceasterbuendum, cenra gehwylcan eorlum ealuscerwen.

This controversial passage helps to emphasize the decay of hall-feasting in Mermedonia. In Andreas, the drink-dispensing is a devastating flood, following a non-existent feast. See chap. 3, this thesis.

3. (see Peters, p.857)
A.(1270 / B.498) duguþ unlytel

This is a rare collocation, but its meaning is too commonplace to have much allusive force. "Dugupe ond geogupe", however, is frequent in Beowulf (160, 621, 1674) and rare elsewhere. Its use in Andreas (152 and 1122) is probably allusive (see chap. 4, this thesis).

4. A.(999b-1000a) Duru sona onarn þurh handhrine
   1002b-3: Haebene swaefon dreore druncne, deapwang rudon.
B.(721b-2) Duru sona onarn fyrbendum faest syppan he hire folmum aethran
B.(728-30a) Geseah he in recede rinca manige, swefan sibbegedriht samod aetgaedere, magorinca heap.

Hamilton ("Placing the Hero," p.86) cites this as an example of the Andreas poet's reversal of expectations in this allusion to Beowulf. In Andreas, the touch on the door brings release for the Christians, but is associated with death for both Mermedon and Dane. Although similarity of situation could account for the parallel here, the resemblance seems sufficiently striking to be allusive.

The Association of Monster and Mermedon

1. (see Schaar, pp.284-5)
A.(1275b-77a) Swat ypum weoll, þurh bancofan, blod lifrum swealg hatan heolfre
B.(741b-43a) slat unwearnum bat banlocan blod edrum dranc
The Mermedons' torture of Andrew is compared to Grendel's dismemberment of Danish warriors.

2. A. (1072-4) Wendan ond woldon wiperhycende, þæt hie on elþeodigum æt geworhton weotude wiste; him seo wen geleah.

B. (vv. 2321-3) Haefde landwara lige befangen, baele one bronde beorges getruwode wiges ond wealles him seo wen geleah.

With effective understatement, both poets describe the disappointment resulting from misplaced trust. The excessive materialism of dragon and Mermedon causes their downfall.
(see also B. 734a: Grendel's "wistfylle wen").

3. A. 836b-7: Sceadu sweþerodon wonn under wolcnum
B. 650-1a: scaduhelma gesceapu scripan cwomon wonn under wolcnum.

The conjunction of formulaic half-line with an additional reference to shadow, associates Mermedonia and its inhabitants with the creatures of darkness.
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