CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Vidi Aquam: The liturgical context of The Dream of the Rood 20a, "Swætan on þa swiðran healfe"
Authors	Ó Carragáin, Éamonn
Publication date	1983-02-01
Original Citation	Ó Carragáin, É. (1983) 'Vidi aquam#: the liturgical background to the dream of the rood 20a: "swætan on þa swiðran healfe"', Notes and Queries, 30(1), pp. 8–15. https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/30-1-8.
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/30-1-8 - 10.1093/nq/30-1-8
Rights	© The Author (1983). Published by Oxford University Press. This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in Notes and Queries following peer review. The version of record is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/30-1-8
Download date	2026-11-05 17:30:54
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/14825

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

VIDI AQUAM: THE LITURGICAL BACKGROUND TO *THE DREAM OF THE ROOD* 20a ‘SWÆTAN ON ÞA SWIÐRAN HEALFE’

Hwæðre ic þurh þæt gold ongytan meahte
earmra ærgewin, þæt hit ærest ongan
swætan on þa swiðran healfe. Eall ic wæs mid
s[o]rgum gedrefed.
Forht ic wæs for þære fægran gesyhðe Geseah ic
þæt fuse beacen
Wendan wædum ond bleom; hwilum hit wæs mid
wætan bestemed,
beswyled mid swates gange, lwilum mid since gegyrwed.
(*The Dream of the Rood*, 18–23)[1]

THE detail in line 20a of the passage above, in which the visionary symbol begins ‘to sweat on the right-hand side’, has usually been explained by reference to iconographic representations of Christ on the Cross: ‘contemporary Crucifixion scenes conventionally depict either a flowing wound or the spear-bearer himself on this side of Christ.’[2] The difficulty with this explanation is that in *The Dream of the Rood* the liquid flows, not from the body of Christ, but from the right side of the visionary symbol itself. Not only is Christ not, at this part of the poem, represented on the Cross;[3] the poet seems carefully to have avoided describing the vision explicitly as a cross in this opening passage. Instead he uses ambiguous words such as ‘sigebeam’ (13a), ‘þæt fuse beacen’ (21b) and ‘syllicre treow’ (4b).[4] The iconographic representations of Christ on the Cross furnish therefore rather poor parallels for the detail in line 20a. However, the iconographic tradition itself grew out of scriptural and liturgical traditions. These provide closer parallels to line 20a, and I shall argue that the poet was drawing on verbal reminiscence of such traditions here, rather than on any visual representation of the Crucifixion.

St. John’s gospel has Christ refer to His body as a temple which, if it were destroyed, He would raise up again on the third day: ‘Solvite templum hoc et in tribus diebus excitabo illud’ (John ii, 19).[5] As Jesus made this statement in the temple at Jerusalem, His words were ambiguous. The Jews took it as referring to the temple itself, but St. John explains that He was referring to His own body: ‘ille autem dicebat de templo corporis sui’. His words were to be fulfilled in the resurrection (John ii, 21–2). The fathers naturally saw the temple itself as foreshadowing Christ’s body (and thus also His spiritual body, the Church).[6] The features of the temple could therefore be called upon to supply visual particulars not given in the gospel accounts of Christ.

The gospels do not specify which of Christ’s sides was pierced by the spear. It was left to the apocryphal gospels to give a name (based on the Greek word for a spear) to the soldier who pierced Christ’s side.[7] Some of them also specify that

the wound was made in Christ's right side, not, as a naturalistic imagination might expect, on the left.[8] A. A. Barb has suggested that the origin of this tradition was a passage in Ezekiel's vision of the temple, and the liturgical antiphon *Vidi aquam* based on that passage.[9] In Ezekiel xlvii the guiding angel shows the prophet a stream of water issuing from the threshold of the temple, from its right side:

> Et convertit me ad portam domus, et ecce aquae egrediebantur subter limen domus ad orientem … aquae autem descendebant a latere templi dextro a meridie altaris … et ecce aquae exeuntes a latere dextro. (Ezekiel xlvii, 1–2)

This stream saves and vivifies: 'et sanabuntur et vivent omnia, ad quae venerit torrens' (xlvii, 9). As a sign of this, a fruit-tree grows on the bank of the river, and bears life-giving fruit: 'et erunt fructus eius in cibum, et folia eius ad medicinam' (xlvii, 12). This visionary stream is recalled in the final chapter of St. John's Apocalypse, where it becomes the river of life, with the trees of life growing on its banks (Apocalypse xxii, 1–3).

In the liturgical antiphon *Vidi aquam* the salient features of Ezekiel's vision were applied to the wound in Christ's side. As in the case of most liturgical reminiscence, the ceremony within which the antiphon was used is relevant, not just the text taken in isolation. In the early Roman liturgy, baptisms took place as part of the ceremonies of the vigil of Easter.[10] The newly-baptised were still regarded as infants in the faith, and the following week was devoted to their instruction. Vespers, for example, was celebrated each evening at St. John Lateran as a particularly solemn ceremony, presided over by the pope. It was divided into three stations — i.e., three different locations. The first three psalms and the *Magnificat* were sung in the basilica itself. Then the neophytes, accompanied by the clergy, proceeded outside the basilica *ad fontes*: to the baptistery, where the baptisms had taken place during the paschal vigil. Here a fourth psalm was sung, and a collect said. In order to sing the final psalms and conclude the ceremony, the neophytes and clergy proceeded from the baptistery to the adjoining chapel of the Holy Cross (the chapel was known as 'S. Andreas ad Crucem' because a hospital dedicated to St. Andrew stood nearby). The neophytes had been confirmed in this chapel directly after their baptism during the paschal vigil. The procession from the font to the Cross therefore commemorated the stages of their sacramental initiation. During the procession from the baptistery to the chapel of the Holy Cross, the antiphon *Vidi aquam* was sung. It united the imagery of baptism with that of the crucifixion:

> Et tunc vadunt ad sanctum Andream ad Crucem, canentes ant. *Vidi aquam egredientem de templo a latere dextro. Alleluia. Et omnes ad quos pervenit aqua ista salvi facti sunt et dicunt Alleluia. Alleluia*.[11]

The *Ordines Romani* which describe this ceremony are considered to reflect the Roman liturgy between the mid-sixth and mid-eighth centuries. [12] It was during this period that St. Augustine and his Roman monks introduced the Roman liturgy into England. So anxious were the English bishops to be faithful to Roman liturgical practice that Roman clerics, like James the Deacon and John the Archcantor of St. Peter's, were brought to Northumbria in the late seventh century to teach chant. Of several English ecclesiastics (Putta, Acca and Eddius) we are told that they were trained in the Roman tradition of chant.[13] We know that successive abbots of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow — Benedict Biscop (d. AD 690), Ceolfrid (d. AD 716) and Hwætberht (d. *circa* AD 750) — kept in touch with Roman traditions by frequent visits to Rome, and that they brought back to Northumbria whatever they considered necessary for the life of their monastery. As Bede wrote of Hwætberht, 'quaequae sibi necessaria iudicabat, didicit, descripsit, retulit'.[14] The instruction of the neophytes was falling into disuse in Rome during the seventh century because of the preponderance of infant baptism there.[15] It is however likely to have been still seen as important in Northumbria, where adult baptism was still a fact or a recent memory. No English antiphonary of this period has been preserved, but the earliest surviving antiphonary containing the *cursus Romanus*, the antiphonary of Compiegne (AD 860–880), preserves with great fidelity the text of the *Ordines* we have discussed. In this antiphonary, as in the existing texts of the *Ordines*, Carolingian scribes have introduced the necessary modifications to enable the antiphonary to be used in a Northern European church. These are kept to a minimum, however; what is striking is the fidelity with which the topography of the Lateran and its neighbouring baptistery and chapels is applied (though the Lateran itself is not named) to the chapels of a Carolingian church: '… et tunc vadunt ad sanctum Andream ad crucem canentes Ant. *Vidi aquam* …'.[16] If anything, greater reverence for the Roman sources might be expected in Northumbria during the eighth century. The processions during vespers are prescribed, with modifications, for Easter Sunday in the *Regularis Concordia* and other tenth and eleventh-century English monastic customaries, but these do not specify that the *Vidi aquam* is to be used during the ceremony.[17] However, if the opening part of *The Dream of the Rood* dates back to the Ruthwell Cross Crucifixion poem (eighth century), its original audience probably associated the *Vidi aquam* with the processions during vespers in Easter week.

A later audience of the poem would probably have known the *Vidi aquam* antiphon from another ceremony. There is evidence from the eighth century of a continental monastic custom of blessing the cloisters with holy water before the solemn community Mass on Sundays.[18] In the mid-ninth century, continental bishops such as Hincmar of Rheims (in AD 852) and Herard of Tours (in AD 858) began to prescribe the custom for the parish clergy also.[19] The ceremony is

prescribed in the *Regularis Concordia* and in eleventh-century English monastic customaries.[20] It is universal in the early thirteenth-century Sarum customaries, which seem here to be reflecting older English traditions. [21] The *Vidi aquam* antiphon is prescribed for this ceremony during Eastertide in *Ordo Romanus L* (compiled in Germany *circa* AD 950), which may be drawing on earlier documents now lost,[22] as well as in the Sarum customaries. This *Ordo* gives a vivid idea of what a solemn liturgical procession involved:

> Die sancto paschae induti sollemnioribus vestimentis omnes clerici convenientes ad stationem ad sanctam Mariam maiorem, primitus cantant tertiam.
>
> Qua finita, respersi aqua sancta, quae pridie collecta est de fonte, tam ipsi quam et omnis populus, procedunt cum omni decore, cum crucibus et thimiamateriis, praecedentibus etiam sanctis evangeliis, cantantes antiphonas processionales. Ant. *In die resurrectionis meae,* [*dicit dominus, alleluia, congregabo gentes et colligam regna et effundam super vos aquam mundam. Alleluia.*]
> Alia. *Vidi aquam* [*egredientem de templo …*].[23]

As in the Easter vespers ceremony, the *Vidi aquam* antiphon is used here as a processional chant. The other processional antiphon used here, *In die resurrectionis meae*, was also associated with the *Vidi aquam* in the Roman Easter vespers, where it was sung at the font.[24] It is of interest, as it combines a reference to the pouring of cleansing water with a world-wide perspective reminiscent of 'men ofer moldan ond eall þeos mære gesceaft' *(Dream*, 12).

The Carolingian reformers on the continent seem to have popularized the custom of blessing holy water before solemn Mass on Sundays. It may not, therefore, have been widespread in English monastic communities before the end of the ninth century. However, a tenth-century cleric (such as the compiler of the Vercelli Book) might well have been familiar with the ceremony.

It would seem that the author of the opening part of *The Dream of the Rood* was inspired, not directly by visual representations of Christ on the Cross, but by the *Vidi aquam* antiphon (which, as we have seen, may have influenced the iconographic tradition independently). The antiphon recalls Ezekiel's vision, while the liturgical uses of the antiphon make it clear that the vision was seen as a type prefiguring the salvation won for all men by Christ on Calvary. The English poet gives us an enigmatic image, which simultaneously suggests both the Old Testament type and its continual fulfilment under the New Law.

Like Ezekiel, the English poet describes a visionary experience. When composing a passage which contains phrases such as 'geseah ic' (14b, 21b) and the variants 'þuhte me þæt ic gesawe' (4a) and 'ic … ongytan meahte' (18), a monastic poet could very naturally have recalled an antiphon which began with

the word ‘vidi’, their Latin equivalent. There is a clear verbal parallel between ‘on þa swiðran healfe’ and ‘a latere dextro’. The liturgical contexts of the antiphon are also relevant to the English poem. In the early period, as we have seen, the *Vidi aquam* antiphon was used as part of the celebration of Christian initiation; later it was used as part of the preparatory rites for Mass. These liturgical uses have in common the themes of conversion and cleansing. Such ideas are relevant to the context within which the antiphon is recalled in *The Dream of the Rood*: at the opening of a poem which dramatizes the conversion of the Dreamer’s way of life from sin (13–14) to spiritual heroism (125–31). But the most important parallel is the theological one, between the scriptural and liturgical symbol and the symbol in the poem. In Ezekiel and in the *Vidi aquam* antiphon, as in the English poem, liquid flows from the right-hand side of a glorified visionary object closely associated with Christ. As we have seen, the English poet increased the range of reference of his vision by describing his visionary symbol in riddling and ambiguous terms. Similarly, he uses words which can refer to water as well as to blood to describe the liquid wlµch flows from the visionary tree. Dr. Swanton has pointed out that the verb *swætan*, with only one other exception, always means ‘to sweat’, while the associated noun *swat* ‘is used of both sweat and blood’.[25] The phrase ‘mid wætan bestemed’ (22b) can also refer to water as well as to blood. Later in the poem, when Christ has ascended the Cross, the visionary speaker unambiguously describes itself as a Cross (*rod*: 44a, 56b). In the same paragraph of the poem, at the moment when Christ has ‘sent forth His spirit’, the poet unambiguously says that the Cross is covered with blood from His side:

> Bysmeredon hie unc butu ætgædere. Eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed,
> begoten of þæs guman sidan, siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.
>
> (*Dream*, 48–9)

Even at this stage of the poem, the poet can speak in inexplicit terms about the liquid which flows from Christ’s side. A few lines later on, the Cross is said to be ‘drenched with moisture’ (‘steame bedrifenne’, 62a). The inexplicit word *steam* is theologically suitable. The poet and his audience would have been aware that water as well as blood came from Christ’s side at the moment of death (John xix, 34). This mixture of blood and water was seen to signify the sacramental life which Christ had obtained for His Church by His death; ‘Aqua scilicet qua abluimur in baptismo et sanguis quo consecramur in calice sancto’.[26] We can be sure that the Vercelli scribe was aware of the tradition. Vercelli Homily I describes how

> genam þara cempena an ond mid his spere his sidan wundode .

> ond þa sona eode þær blod ond wæter ætsomne ut of þære wunde . þæt tacnode hælo middangeardes . þæt ðurh his blod fulwihtwæter gewyrþan sceolde.[27]

If it be accepted that a liturgical reminiscence lies behind line 20a, this has implications for the interpretation of the opening vision as a whole. Recent iconographic interpretations of *The Dream of the Rood* have their own interest.[28] However, by too directly relating the enigmatic images of the opening vision to concrete objects of which the iconographic meaning is clear, they run the risk of oversimplifying our reponse to the vision. Indeed, the initial response of the Dreamer to the vision is imperfect in a similar way. It can justly be termed a conventional reaction. The Anglo-Saxons expected a cross flowing with blood to appear in the heavens ('dryhtnes rod blode flowende betweox wolcnum'[29]) as one of the signs that the end of the world was at hand. It is natural, therefore, that the vision should immediately excite the Dreamer to sorrow for his sins (13–14), and that this sorrow should be intensified, and mingled with fear, when liquid begins to flow from the tree's right side (20–21, 25). But by specifying that the liquid flows 'a latere dextro', and by using ambiguous words for the liquid, the poet associates it with the *Vidi aquam* antiphon. He thus suggests that the Dreamer's initial response of sorrow and fear is an imperfect one (it will be transformed into joy and hope after the Cross has delivered its message, 122–56). The reader of the poem is encouraged by the liturgical reminiscence not merely to share in the Dreamer's sorrow for his sins, but also to anticipate the Dreamer's final joy at the salvation obtained for all those 'ad quos pervenit aqua ista'.

The appearance of the flowing liquid is also a means by which the poet widens the temporal perspective of the opening vision. We are told that the vision is watched by 'ealle fægere þurh forðgesceaft' (10a). In the compound word 'forðgesceaft', the poet has combined connotations of creation and time.[30] The temporal dimension of the vision is widened in lines 18–23, when the flowing liquid allows the Dreamer to perceive 'earmra ærgewin', 'the former strife of wretched ones' (19a) through the gold. In the compound 'forðgesceaft', the element 'forð' had suggested future time; now, in contrast, the element 'ær' directs our attention to past history. John P. Hermann has argued convincingly that 'earmra ærgewin' refers to the ancient feud of the devil, and his followers, against God.[31] The early medieval church understood all of mankind's history within the context of this age-old struggle.[32] Indeed, the Babylonian captivity (during which Ezekiel had his prophetic vision of the restored temple in Jerusalem) was but one episode in the feud. The bleeding Cross was expected to appear in the heavens as a judgement against the men who had sided with the devil against God. But, while perceiving the feud, the Dreamer is not yet able to appreciate that it has been decided in God's favour on Calvary, and that the Cross appears here to

announce not judgement but salvation. It is not until the Cross has explained how its own fate and that of all men was transformed by the Crucifixion (78–94) that the Dreamer will be able to understand how the former strife between man and God has been replaced by a glorious creation ('mære gesceaft', 12b) in which the blessed rejoice for eternity ('þurh forðgesceaft'). Lines 11–12 are recalled, and placed in historical perspective, by the Cross at lines 80–3. But the way in which 'earmra ærgewin' (19a) echoes and contrasts with 'fægere þurh forðgesceaft' ()0a) already suggests in an enigmatic way the patterns of salvation history which the Cross will later explain.

At the beginning of his book on Solomon's temple, Bede says that the temple 'was made as a figure of the Church' ('in figuram facta est sanctae universalis ecclesiae'[33]). The concept of *figura* is a valuable one, as it indicates that objects or events, without losing their historical reality, can also symbolize other events and facts of sacred history.[34] The visionary tree of *The Dream of the Rood* 1–27 is not to be reduced to an allegory. It cannot be simply identified either with Christ or with the Church;[35] later in the poem, the Cross itself explains clearly its own nature. Nevertheless, the opening vision of the poem is enigmatic, suggesting various kinds of significance for the symbol.[36] The richness and variety of these suggestions seem designed to prevent a reader from coming too readily to a conclusion on the matter.

Part of the poet's technique is to provide the symbol with certain features which suggest Christ's body. It is possible that he intended the vision as a whole (including the 'men ofer moldan ond eall peos mrere gesceaft' of9–12) to suggest Christ's spiritual body, the Church. The *beacen* comes as a messenger of the Lord, if the manuscript reading of 9b ('engel dryhtnes') is accepted. The minor dispute as to whether this phrase refers to 'Christ on the Cross'[37] or the Cross itself[38] shows modern scholars caught in false alternatives. The poet is concerned, not with Christ *on* the Cross, but with Christ symbolized *in* the visionary object. Such enigmatic images prepare us for the intimate union of Christ and the Cross ('unc butu ætgædere', 48a) at the moment of Christ's death. Thus, like that other 'angel of the Lord', Gabriel, whose name was interpreted as 'the valour of God', 'fortitudo Dei', the vision represents Christ's power and victory ('sigebeam' 13a, 'wealdes treow', 17b[39]). The five gems on the crossbeam of the symbol suggest Christ's five wounds (a naturalistic image based on traces on the Cross of the nails, could not yield more than four gems; the fifth wound was that made by the spear in Christ's side[40]). Finally, the liquid which flows from the right side of the tree is a symbol of the salvation won by Christ, and proclaimed by the Church. It therefore anticipates in visual terms what the Cross will later announce verbally (28–121).

With the swift alternation in the appearance of 'þæt fuse beacen' in lines 21–3,

the symbol is no longer static but dynamic: its restless changing prepares us for the moment when it will speak to enlighten the Dreamer. In addition, the repeated alternation ('hwilum … hwilum') between liquid and treasure emphasizes that the Cross is not merely glorified but life-giving. Its present jewelled splendour is seen to be inseparable from the stream of salvation which was prefigured in Ezekiel's vision, was achieved on Calvary, and is available 'ðurh ða rode' (119) until the end of time. The Carolingian writer Hrabanus Maurus (himself a pupil of the Northumbrian, Alcuin) identified the stream flowing from the temple in Ezekiel's vision with 'our Saviour's teaching'.[41] It may have been a similar insight which led the poet to describe liquid flowing 'on þa swiðran healfe' as an immediate prelude to the speech of the Cross.

Mr. Nicolas Jacobs has kindly brought to my attention reminiscences of the *Vidi aquam* antiphon in the work of two modern writers. The first is in *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce: 'O, tell me all I want to hear, how loft she was lift a laddery dextro'.[42] There are two reminiscences of the antiphon in *The Anathemata* by David Jones: 'From the dripping impost the gusted drops moisted the ransom'd flesh of both of us – from the *right* side of the gate, captin.' (p. 130; *right* italicized in the original); and

> I saw water
> coming from the *right* side, about midships;
> yet her list were heavy to her lade-board …

(p. 139; *right* italicized in the original). In his commentary on the poem, which he wrote in collaboration with the poet, René Hague remarks that 'water issuing from the right-hand side is an image that [David Jones] found particularly moving[.] It came to him from several sources: from the *Dream of the Rood*, v. 20, where blood issues from the right …'. Hague goes on to list the wound of Longinus' spear, the antiphon, and the scriptural sources of the antiphon.[43] It is particularly interesting that the modern Welsh poet should have associated *The Dream of the Rood* (to which he makes several references in *The Anathemata*[44]) with the liturgical antiphon. It suggests that the interpretation of line 20a advanced here, if it be accepted as historically plausible, helps us to see *The Dream of the Rood* within a living tradition of liturgical reminiscence in English literature.

NOTES

1 Quotations from the poem are taken from *The Dream of the Rood*, edited by Michael Swanton (Manchester. 1970) I wish to thank Nicolas Jacobs and Alastair Minnis, who read versions of this paper in typescript and made valuable suggestions.

2 Swanton, 109. Dr. Swanton explains that 'the early church assumed it to have been the right side for exegetical reasons', and gives a reference to a passage in Bede's *De Templo Salomonis Liber*, in which Bede explains that the door of the temple, being on the right side of the temple, prefigures Christ's body, wounded on the right side: *PL*, xci, 753; see now *Bedae Venerabilis Opera*, II: *Opera Exegetica*, vol. 2a, edited by D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 119A (Turnhout, 1969), 165–6. The passage from Ezekiel, discussed below, is likely to have influenced Bede's interpretation in this passage. Ute Schwab, 'Das Traumgesicht von Kreuzesbaum: ein ikonologischer interpretationsansatz zu dem ags. Dream of the Rood', *Philologische Studien: Gedenkschrift für Richard Kienast*, edited by Ute Schwab and Elfriede Stutz (Heidelberg, 1978), 131–192, gives a list of representations of Christ on the Cross with the wound on the right (and, occasionally, on the left) side (pp. 149–50).

3 See below, p. 14 and notes 37 and 38.

4 See Swanton, 63–5.

5 Quotations from the Vulgate are taken from *Nova Vulgata Biblorum Sacrorum Editio* (Vatican, 1979).

6 See below, p. 13 and note 33

7 *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, second edition, edited by F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford, 1974), 835 under 'Longmus'; E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, translated by R. Mel. Wilson, 2 vols (London, 1963–5), I, 469 ('The Acts of Pilate' in 'The Gospel of Nicodemus', early fifth century); II, 377–8 ('The Acts of Paul', second century).

8 *Evangelia Apocrypha*, edited by C. de Tischendorf, second edition (Leipzig, 1876), 311 (Greek version of the 'Gospel of Nicodemus', I, B, chapter xi). The detail is not in the Latin version (pp. 362–3). The detail is also found in 'The Arab Infancy Gospel' chapter xxxv (p. 200). This is a late text, and the story told there seems designed to explain an existing exegetical or iconographic tradition by reference to an incident from the childhood of Christ.

9 ‘The Wound in Christ’s Side’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xxx1v (1971), 320–1. Barb relies mainly on the *Vidi aquam* antiphon (discussed below) as used in the modern (pre-Vatican II) Roman missal (aspersion on Sundays). He does not consider when or how this antiphon was used in the early medieval penod.

10 My account of the ceremony is summarized from M. Richetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, second edition. 4 vols (Milan, 1955–64), IV. 130–1: his account is based on the *Ordines* edited by Andrieu (next note). See also L. Duchesne. *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris. 1925). 334.

11 *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*, edited by M. Andrieu, 5 vols, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 11, 23, 24, 28 and 29 (Louvain, 1931–61), Ordo XXVII, No. 77 (III, 365–6). See also Ordo XXXB, No. 80 (III, 476–7).

12 Andrieu. III, 242–3 and 461–2.

13 See G. G. Willis, ‘Early English Liturgy from Augustine to Alcuin’, m *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy*, Alcum Club Collections, 50 (London, 1968), 189–243 (at pp. 201–2); É. Ó Carragáin, ‘Liturgical Innovations Associated with Pope Sergius and the Iconography of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses’ in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by R. T. Farrell, British Archaeological Reports, 46 (Oxford, 1978), 131–47 (at pp. 138–9).

14 Bede, *Historia Abbatum*, xviii, in *Venerabilis Bedae Opera Historica*, edited by C. Plummer, 2 vols (Oxford, 1896), I, 383.

15 Richetti (note 10 above), IV, 130; see also J. D. C. Fisher, *Christian Initiation: Baptism in the Medieval West*, Alcuin Club Collections, 47 (London, 1965), 3–4.

16 *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, edited by R.-J. Hesbert and R. Prevost, 6 vols (Rome, 1963–79), I, 184. This antiphonary (Paris, B.N. fonds latin 17436) was compiled for Charles the Bald (d. AD 877): see Hesbert and Prévost, 1, xvi1–xviii. The antiphon is also prescribed for Easler vespers m other early antiphonaries which contain the *cursus Romanus*: the antiphonary of Verona (eleventh-century), and the Bamberg antiphonary (twelfth-century): see Hesbert and Prévost, I, 185 and 182.

17 *Regularis Concordia – The Monastic Agreement*, edited by T. Symons (Edinburgh and London, 1953), 48; J. B. L. Tolhurst, *The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey, Winchester*, Henry Bradshaw Society 69–71, 76, 78 and 80, 6 vols (London, 1932–42), VI, *Introduction to the English Monastic Breviaries*, 217–8 and 226.

18 A. Franz, *Die kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter*, 2 vols (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909), 1, 633 (1he earliest evidence for the monastic ceremony comes from St. Gall); L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, 2 vols (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1932–3), I, 478; A. Groegart, *The Mass. A Liturgical Commentary*, 2 vols (London, 1958), I, 97–8.

19 Franz, I, 98–9. Franz (I, 99) also mentions that the ceremony is prescribed in the so-called Homily of Leo IV, a Frankish document of AD 855.

20 Symons, *Regularis Concordia*, 19 and 34: *Decreta Lanfranci Monachis Cantuariensibus Transmissa*, edited by D. Knowles in *Corpus Consuetudmum Monasticarum*, edited by K. Hallinger, 10 vols (Siegburg, 1963–80), III, 49–50; Tolhurst, VI, 142.

21 A. Jefferies Collins, *Manuale ad Usum Percelebris Ecclesiae Sarisburiensis*, Henry Bradshaw Society, 91 (London, 1960), 1–4; see also XI, where he dates the *Benedictio salis et aquae* as of the date of the earliest Sarum consuetudinary, AD 1210. See also W. H. Frere, *The Use of Sorum*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1898–1901), I, 53; J. Wickham Lep, *The Sorum Missal* (Oxford, 1916), 11.

22 Andrieu, V, 71 and 72. The antiphonary of Hartker, wntten at St. Gall *circa* AD 1000, and other aniiphonaries containing the *cursus monasticus* reflect this use of the *Vidi aquam*: Hesbert and Prévost, II, 328 and 784–5.

23 Andrieu, V, 299 (Ordo L. chapter xxxi, Nos. 1–3). *Thymiamaterium* means a censer or thurible: see A. Souter. *A Glossary of Later Latin* (Oxford, 1949), 420.

24 Andrieu, III, 364 (Ordo XXVII, No. 74) and 476 (Ordo XXX, No. 78); see also the *cursus Romanus* antiphonaries: Hesbert and Prévost, 1, 182–3. 185, and III, 271.

25 Swanton, 109.

26 Bede, *De Templo*: Hurst (note 2 above), 166

27 Vercelli Homily I, fol. 8r22–8v2; see *Die Vercelli-Homilien*, edited by M. Förster, Bibliothek der angelsachsischen Prosa, XII (Hamburg, 1932), 39–40.

28 Such as those by Ute Schwab (note 2 above) and A. E. Mahler, '*Lignum Domini* and the Opening Vision of *The Dream of the Rood*: A Viable Hypothesis?', *Speculum*, liii (1978), 441–59. B. Raw, '*The Dream of the Rood* and its Connections with Early Chnstian Art', *Medium Ævum*, 39 (1970), 239–56, is properly cautious about the relevance of iconography to the poem

(see especially pp. 241–2).

29 Vercelli Homily II, fol. 9v9; Förster, 44. This passage also recurs in Homily XXI, fol. 115r9; and the appearance of a 'sige beacen of heofonum' is mentioned among the signs of the week before Judgement Day in Homily XV, fol. 82v19. The Cross was expected to be a sign of God's wrath: Homily XXI, fol. 115v15–16, associates 'seo reðe rod ond se rihta dom·, the fierce Cross and true Judgement. É. Ó Carragáin, 'How Did the Vercelli Collector Interpret *The Dream of the Rood?*', *Studies in English Language and Early Literature in Honour of Paul Christophersen*, edited by P. M. Tilling, Occasional Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching, No. 8 (Coleraine, 1981), 63–104 discusses these passages (pp. 70–2). For further references, see Swanton, 64–5 and 78.

30 See Swanton, 104, who points out that the word is used elsewhere to mean both 'creation, the created world' and 'future destiny or state'.

31 '*The Dream of the Rood* 19a: *Earmra Ærgewin*', *English Language Notes*, xv (1978), 241–4.

32 See J. Rivière, *De dogme de la Rèdempt,on au début du moyen âge* (Paris, 1934), 1–61; R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London, 1967), 223–6.

33 *De Templo*: Hurst, 147.

34 See E. Auerbach, 'Figura', in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (New York, 1959).

35 J. Canuteson, 'The Crucifixion and the Second Coming in *The Dream of the Rood*', *Modern Philology*, lxvi (1969), 293–7, sees the Cross as a symbol of the Church.

36 On the enigmatic nature of the opening vision, see P. Orton, 'The Technique of Object-Personification in *The Dream of the Rood* and a Comparison with the Old Enghsh Riddles', *Leeds Studies in English*, xi (1980), 1–18.

37 W. Helder, 'The *Engel Dryhtnes* in *The Dream of the Rood*', *Modern Philology*, lxxiii (1975), 148–50.

38 W. F. Bolton, '"The Dream of the Rood" 9b: "Engel" = "Nuntius"?', *Notes and Queries*, ccxii, (1968), 165–6. Barbara Raw (note 28 above) shows that in Early Christian art the Cross itself was a symbol of Christ (pp. 242–3).

39 On 'fortitudo Dei' in the poem, see É Ó Carragáin, 'Crucifixion as Annunciation: the Relation of *The Dream of the Rood* to the Liturgy

Reconsidered', *English Studies*, lxiii (Dec. 1982). The manuscript reading 'wealdes treow' is defended by Swanton, 107; the usual emendation to 'Wealdendes treow' would also suit the present argument.

40 Schwab (Note 2 above), 147.

41 'Ex quo perspicuum fit sacras esse aquas et Salvatons nostri significare doctrinam': *Commentaria in Ezechielem*, XIX, xlvii; *PL*, CX, 1051. This chapter of Hrabanus is a full and pertinent discussion of the image of water as a symbol of the Holy Spirit in the Bible. See further *Dictionnaire de Spimualité* (Paris, 1937–), IV, cols 8–29, under 'Eau'.

42 *Finnegans Wake* (London, 1939), 198 lines 14–15; see Brendan O Hehir and John Dillon. *A Classical Lexicon for Finnegans Wake* (Berkeley and London, 1977), 163; and Roland McHugh, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake* (London, 1980), 198.

43 René Hague, *A Commentary on the Anathemata of David Jones* (Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, 1977), 167

44 For example, the illustration in *The Anathemata* (London, 1952), 241; and the final lines of the poem: 'What did he do yet other / riding the Axile tree?' (cp. *Dream*, 9a: 'uppe on þam eaxlegespanne').