



Fig. 26 Romanesque sculpture of Andrew (1170; from the tomb monument of Lazarus in Autun)

Bibliography: ■ M. Lechner, "Andreas," *LCl* 5 (Freiburg 1994 [= ¹1973]) 138–52. ■ L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'art Chrétien* vol. 3.1 (Paris 1958) 76–84. ■ J. de Voragine, *Legenda aurea* (Paris 2004) 17–28. ■ H. van de Waal (ed.), *Iconclass*, vol. 1.1 (Amsterdam 1985) 44.

Barbara Baert

Andrew, Acts of

The *Acts of Andrew* were composed in Greek in the second half of the 2nd century. They belong to the oldest apostle apocrypha, together with the Acts of John, Peter, Thomas and Paul, with which they are closely related. They describe Andrew's sojourn in the Greek province Achaia and the city Patras, followed by his martyrdom through crucifixion. The *Acts Andr.* were most likely written by an educated convert, who composed the work in order to spread the truths he had found in Christianity.

The greater part of the original Greek *Acts Andr.* is now lost. The final part of the *Acts Andr.*, narrating the apostle's martyrdom, is preserved in a few Greek fragments, transmitted in manuscripts from the 10th to 15th centuries. This part is also transmitted in an Armenian version from the 6th century.

The first part of the *Acts Andr.* can only be reconstructed with the help of a Latin revision, the *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli*, presumably written by the Gallic hagiographer and bishop of Tours, Gregory (538–594). This source of the second half of the 6th century recounts Andrew's wanderings and preaching in Greece before he arrived at Patras. Most likely Gregory had a Latin translation of the entire Greek *Acts Andr.* at his disposal. Two other Latin fragments from the 6th century, relating the apostle's martyrdom (the Latin *Passio* with the incipit *Conversante et docente*, and the document entitled *Epistola presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae*), indicate likewise that the *Acts Andr.* were well-known in the Latin West in the 6th century. The Latin accounts of Andrew's acts and martyrdom, mainly the *Liber de miraculis* and *Conversante et docente*, are closely related to the *Apostolic History* of Pseudo-Abdias.

A part of the *Acts Andr.* corresponding to Gregory's *Liber de miraculis* ch. 18 is transmitted in a Coptic papyrus dating to the 4th century.

The Encratite tendency of the *Acts Andr.* is particularly visible in the rejection of marriage, represented by the narrative's central theme: Andrew's relation with Maximilla, the proconsul Egeates' wife. She converts to Christianity and accedes to the circle of Andrew's disciples. This causes Egeates' anger, leading to Andrew's arrest and crucifixion.

Eusebius is the first source which testifies to the existence of the *Acts Andr.* (*Hist. eccl.* iii.25.6). Augustine attributes the *Acts Andr.* to Leucius, while Innocent I (*Ep.* 6.7; 405 CE) mentions Xenocharides and Leonidas as the authors. Both Eusebius and Inno-

cent express themselves in a negative way on the *Acts Andr.*, dismissing them as false. The dualistic and Encratite tendencies of the *Acts Andr.* might explain their popularity among the Manichaeans and the Priscillianists. The use of the *Acts Andr.* in these and other deviant milieus caused their repetitive condemnation (Leo I, *Ep.* 15.15 and the *Decretum Gelasianum*).

In addition to the Acts of Andrew there are several other Greek traditions of Acts of this apostle, where Andrew is accompanied by one of the other apostles: Peter, Matthias, Bartholomew, Paul, Philemon. The origin of some of these writings (*Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the city of the cannibals* and the *Acts of Peter and Andrew*) are most likely to be found in monastic milieus. The relation between these texts and the *Acts Andr.* is in most cases indefinite. The *Acts of Andrew and Matthias* are incorporated in Gregory of Tours' Latin *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae*.

Bibliography: ■ *The Apocryphal Acts of Andrew* (ed. J.N. Bremmer; Studies in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 5; Leuven 2000). ■ J.-M. Prieur, *Acta Andreae* (CChr.SA 5–6; Turnhout 1989). ■ J.-M. Prieur, "Actes d'André," in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, vol. 1 (eds. F. Bovon/P. Geoltrain; Paris 1997) 875–972. ■ J.-M. Prieur, "Actes d'André et Matthias," in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, vol. 2 (eds. P. Geoltrain/J.-D. Kaestli; Paris 2005) 483–519. ■ J.-M. Prieur, "Actes de Pierre et André," in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, vol. 2 (eds. P. Geoltrain/J.-D. Kaestli; Paris 2005) 521–38.

Els Rose

Andrew, Acts of Peter and

→ Andrew, Acts of

Andrew, Fragmentary Story

→ Andrew, Acts of

Andrew and Mattathias, Acts of

→ Andrew, Acts of

Andrew of St. Victor

Andrew's activity becomes historically accessible when he, about 1147–48, was elected as the first abbot of the recently founded Victorine daughter abbey of Saint-James in Wigmore (Wales). After about six years Andrew had to leave his convent because of unbridgeable difficulties. He spent his exile, until about 1161–62, in his Parisian mother abbey. Then the canons of Wigmore called him back, and Andrew stayed with them until his death in the year 1175.

First of all we have to underline the unique fact that Andrew's works are exclusively exegetical commentaries; moreover, Andrew commented only

on books of the OT and on almost all of them. During his first literary period until 1147 the commentaries on the Heptateuch and on the books of Kings must have been composed. During the Parisian exile, from 1153 until 1162, Andrew had written most probably the *expositiones* on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezechiel and the Minor Prophets. In a third period – while still in Paris, then eventually in Wigmore – he might have turned over to the Hagiographa. In the understanding of his reception of the *Hebraica veritas* Andrew not only ranks the book of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, but also the book of Daniel to this kind of *ordo* of OT writings.

In all his works Andrew comments on Jerome's Latin Bible translation, the Vulgate. His choice of sources and the considerable number of authors used by Andrew leave us to presume that he always worked on the basis of firsthand biblical manuscripts, and not on the *Glossa* or manuscripts containing Jerome's works. As Jerome's medieval successor, Andrew intended, with his exegetical production, to advance within the field of biblical textual criticism as well as in exegesis as translation.

Andrew's textual criticism consists essentially of two steps: first of all he discusses the value of the different textual variants which he knows from the patristic tradition or of which he gained knowledge through his manuscript study and comparisons; then he decides in favour of one emendated reading; then he re-arranges the biblical text differently from the way he could have known it from the Bibles accessible to him. In general, Andrew undertook such new text arrangements with remarkable care. Regarding both procedures Andrew has recourse to information from the rabbinic tradition, Flavius Josephus as well as the *Midrash Rabbah*, and to his Jewish informants.

A characteristic trait of Andrew's choice of the sources consists in the fact that it reflects his exegetical intention. He searched for the *Hebraica veritas* in the same way as his model Jerome did. Therefore he questioned the whole Jewish-Christian exegetical tradition, with respect to references which could deliver the desired profile to his works. It is incontestable that Andrew, beyond that, received a considerable amount of new Jewish scriptural interpretations.

The second and most important aspect of Andrew's textual criticism concerns the problem of the relationship between the original and its translation, between the Hebrew text of the OT and its Latin rendering by Jerome. For Andrew the improving or correcting criticism of a given translation is transformed into the privileged instrument of textual explanation. On the part of the contemporary rabbinic commentaries the concepts which Andrew received in Latin act as interpretations. The literal sense of the OT as Andrew worked it out depends, basically, on a process of translating.