

FOUR LITERARY STYLES IN THREE CENTURIES:
THE OLD ICELANDIC THEOPHILUS LEGEND

by

Peter A. Jorgensen
The University of Georgia

The story of Theophilus--the priest who fell from favor, who regained his worldly fame after renouncing Christ and His Mother and signing a pact with the Devil, and who obtained redemption through the intercession of the Virgin Mary--enjoyed popularity not only in medieval Iceland, but throughout Europe as well. The Greek original by Eutychianus formed the basis for two quite similar Latin versions, by Paulus Diaconus Neapolitanus and by Gentianus Hervetus.¹ In medieval Iceland, four quite divergent recensions of the Theophilus legend are known, each of which was edited by C. R. Unger in his *Mariu saga*. In addition, Unger prints the text of a two-leaf fragment in his introduction (here called "G"), without relating it in particular to any one of the four main versions.²

For the sake of simplicity, each of Unger's recensions will be assigned here a Roman numeral corresponding to the order in which it was printed, and the various manuscripts edited for each are listed below. Where Unger doesn't use a letter designation, one is supplied here (initially in quotation marks).

- I. A = AM 234, fol (14th century)
B = AM 232, fol (14th century)
C = AM 633, 4to (18th century)
"N" = NoRA fragm. 78 (14th century)

- II. E = Holm 1, 4to (15th century)
f = AM 240 V, fol (ca. 1300)
a = AM 240 IX, fol (14th century)³

- III. St = Holm 11, 4to (15th century)

- IV. D = AM 634-635, 4to (18th century, but evidently a careful copy of a late 14th-century vellum)⁴

Unassigned: "G" = AM 655 XIX, 8vo (1225-1250)⁵

Unravelling the relationships between the different manuscripts has not progressed very far over the past twelve decades, but such an undertaking is absolutely necessary if a chronology is to be established for the different redactions of the Theophilus legend. To this end the finding of a Latin source close to that used by the original Norse translator(s) seems to be a necessity. Since the Icelandic story of Theophilus is found in collections of Marian miracles, the obvious place to look would be in similar Latin collections.⁶ With the growth of the cult of the Virgin Mary on the Continent, the first such compendia were probably put together prior to the twelfth century, and they subsequently became increasingly common throughout Europe.⁷

An excellent candidate to serve as a suitably close source for the Icelandic Theophilus legends is a story from the Cotton collection in the British Museum in the late 12th-century ms. Cleopatra C. x., f. 104-109 (referred to here as *Cleo*), which has been edited by Carl Neuhaus.⁸ In this instance we can be initially quite confident about using this text as the basis for comparison with the Icelandic versions because there is virtually no difference between it and the Latin translation by Paulus Diaconus Neapolitanus.⁹ References to the texts below are to page and line numbers in the printed editions of Unger and Neuhaus.

Although the Latin version by Gentianus Hervetus parallels in general the events and even many details in the translation by Paulus Diaconus, the former could not have been used as a source for any of the Icelandic versions. Besides giving the name of the city as Adana and omitting phrases like *inextinguibilem flammam considerans* and *stridorem dentium* (Neuhaus, p. 14,31) that turn up in the Icelandic texts, the version of Gentianus Hervetus gives such a short list of epithets for the Virgin Mary (i.e. *totius mundi salus & refugium generis hominum, quæ est vere & proprie mater Servatoris nostri Iesu Christi*--corresponding to Neuhaus, p. 16,1-6) that none of the Icelandic versions could have been derived from it.¹⁰ Comparing the long and quite specific list of Marian epithets for each of the manuscript groups can help to quickly determine the relatedness of the different versions.

Numbers in parentheses indicate a different relative ordering in versions III and IV.

Cleopatra C. x.

1. universale auxilium
2. parata protectio
uigilantium ad eam
3. Christianorum uero confugium
ad se concurrentium
4. errantium uia
5. redemptio captiuorum
6. tenebrosis lumen uerissimum
7. afflictorum confugium
8. tribulantium consolamen
9. domina nostra
10. uera mater Christi
- 11.

- 12.

- 13.

Version II (E.)

fullting ueralldarinnar
buiu skyling uakandi
manna til hennar sytandi
kristinna manna vidhialp
til hennar rennandi

lausn hertekinna
lios myrkranna
liku kvalldra
hvggan harmþrunginna
drottning vor
saunn modir guds
hin skaerasta mæsr Maria
eilifluga blezut

Version III (S.)

hvggun harmþrvnginna (4)
saunn guds modir (2)
blezut drottning himins
ok iardar oskaudd
mæsr se verandi (1)
sannan gud ok sannan
mann fædandi (3)
saunn von allra ventandi
manna (5)

"C"

1. allra fullting
2. buiu scyling uacandi
til hennar
3. sciol cristinna manna
til hennar rennandi
4. gata ultra
5. lausn hertekin(n)a
6. myrcra lios

- 7.
8. huggun qvalþra

9. drottning var
- 10.
- 11.

Version IV (D)

su er ollum helpir (1)

(þeim er þurfandi ero) (2)

wegr þeira er villtir ero (3)
lausn hertekinna (4)
hid biartaxta lios allra
þeira er i myrkrum ero (6)

huggan harmandi manna (5)

wor fru guds modir (7)
Maria (8)

At this point the very short version I (mss. *A, B, C, N*) leaves out this passage and, in general, corresponds least to *Cleo* of all the Icelandic versions. *E* supplies by far the closest text, but omits epithet no. 4, which is present in *D*. Except for version I, *St* diverges most from the Latin text, holding only items 8 and 10 in common with the Latin and unilaterally adding several additional epithets.

The results of examining just the passage above coincide to some extent with the trinary groupings by Unger and Widding. Unger considered version I (*A, B, C, N*) to represent the oldest layer and version II/IV (*E, f, a/D*) to be slightly younger. *St* was felt to represent the youngest level, being an arbitrary selection from among the miracles in the second group.¹¹ Using the criteria of style and subject matter, Ole Widding sets up an oldest group that coincides with the first 55 miracles in Unger's first group, including the Theophilus tale in version I (*A, B, C, N*). The translations are rather free, and they tend to dramatize the action with quotes from the characters.¹² Widding's next group is characterized by a more bombastic, Latinized style ("den florissante stíl") and corresponds to *Mariu saga* pp. 157-317, 401-637, including Theophilus II (*E, f, a*). Widding's third group evidences a literal, wooden style of translation and is found in *Mariu saga* pp. 690-1201. Among this group are Theophilus versions III (*St*) and IV (*D*).¹³

Doubtless the most important contribution of the Theophilus variants is that they demonstrate that version II (*E*), not assigned to the oldest group either by Unger or by Widding, is not only older than version I (*A, B, C, N*), but that version I, previously felt to represent the oldest group, is actually derived from version II. Both texts begin with several lines of virtually identical wording:

Version II (*E*)

Maurg dæme dyrdligra iarteigna fru
sancte Marie styrkia miok hiortu
syndugra manna til mikillar uonar guds
myskunnar, enn þo syndizt gudlig milldi
ok sællar Marie naliga framar aullum
dæmum i þeiri mysykkun, er þau giordu
uid þann mann, er

Version I (*A, B, C, N*)

Mörg dæmi dýrligra iartegna fru
sancte Marie styrkia miök hiörtu
syndugra manna til mikillar vánar guðs
miskunnar, en þó sýniz guðlig milldi
sællar Marie nálíga framar öllum
dæmum í þeiri miskunn, er þau gerðu
við þann mann, er

It is at this point that version I shifts to a more classical, narrative style, while II maintains a more flowery text containing a plethora of borrowings from Latin (e.g. "*eleccionem, confirmera, decretum, capitulo, tracterande, insigli, consistorium, korunu, tortisa*"). It is obvious that version I is not the source of II, since I omits long passages found in both mss. *Ef* (esp. pp. 410,20-412,3 and pp. 408,26-409,10) and in *Cleo* (as well as in versions III and IV). On the other hand, version II adds several passages vis-à-vis

the Latin text that are not found in the other Icelandic versions, e.g. II, pp. 403,28-404,25, p. 405,13-16, p. 405,17-24, p. 406,5-19. There is one addition in version II, 407,14-29, although characteristically shortened and paraphrased in I, 66,18-22. The fact that both *a* and *f* share additions, Latin loanwords, and alliterative phrases with *E*, as well as a very close textual relationship in those places where the fragments overlap, indicates that fragments probably contained a text similar to *E* even in those places where there is now a lacuna. The age of *f* (ca. 1300) also shows that version II could have easily been old enough to serve as the source for version I.

It is certainly a very attractive assumption that the oldest layer of translating from Latin would employ a large number of Latin loanwords, since there would have been relatively little time to establish a vernacular tradition for handling the influx of new, and in this case, Church-sanctioned terms. Although the only complete text of version II, ms. *E*, dates from the 15th century, two fragments push the origin of version II much further back: *a* is a 14th-century work and *f* is among the oldest texts of Marian miracles extant, stemming from around 1300.

It is possible that versions II and IV are separate translations from the Latin, and any omissions in either text could be accounted for as being due to independent decisions on the part of two translators. While it is true that there are no passages that are demonstrably identical between II and IV, the texts follow each other closely enough that one could be a conscious paraphrase of the other. Furthermore, the fact that for so many other Marian miracles the texts of II and IV are virtually identical is important. If the copyist of either text, working, it is to be remembered, from an Icelandic version, seriously wished to alter the text of one of the miracles, he would have been more likely to rephrase the vernacular text before him rather than to go find someone else's independent translation or make his own from the Latin, and then insert it in place of the Theophilus version before him.

If indeed there is a dependency relationship between versions II and IV, then neither could be the source for the other. II is obviously not the source for IV, since ca. 20 lines are omitted from II at p. 415,20, but present in IV (pp. 1097,22-1098,11) and *Cleo* (pp. 16,34--17,2). Another 6 lines are omitted at II, 416,32 that are found both in IV (p. 1099,24-29) and *Cleo* (p. 417,42-45). Both ms. *E* and *a* fail to mention the wax seal on the infamous letter of denunciation (p. 418,11), and both make an addition (p. 420,4-6) not found in either IV or *Cleo*. Both ms. *E* and *f* add text at p. 410,2-4 not found in IV and *Cleo*. On the other hand IV is singular among the Icelandic texts in its introductory sentence, locating the action "*i einne borg Cilicie*," (p. 1090,27) similar to the Latin "*in una ciuitate nomine Ciliciorum*" (p. 12,16).¹⁴ Version IV makes minor omissions vis-à-vis II and *Cleo*, e.g. E405,8 *flatur nidr*, *Cleo*,12,39 *prostratus*; E405,5 *knyr bann burd*, *Cleo*,13,23 *pulsansque januam*; E412,1 *tanna gnisting*, *Cleo*,14,31 *stridorum dentium*; E414,27 *ogurligum*, *Cleo*,16,13 *illo terribili*; E414,29 *at sia*, *Cleo*,16,14 *uidere*; E418,6 *priu degr*, *Cleo*,18,13 *post triduum*. Several other examples will be found below in the discussion of

ms. G. In another context, namely in connection with variants of miracle number 5 ("Den hellige Mercurius ombringer Keiser Julian"), it was also found that mss. D and E must go back to a common source.¹⁵

Among the noteworthy stylistic features of version II are Latin loanwords (some of which were noted above), alliterating phrases,¹⁶ and rather complicated sentence constructions.¹⁷ These are features consistent with an older style of translation, features which probably drove the "author" of version I to alter his text to agree more with the classical narrative style of the times. However, there are also additions to the original in E (esp. pp. 409,28-410,25; 405,13-16; 405,17-24; 407,14-29). The first of these takes the form of a letter in very learned style from Theophilus' colleagues, but the remaining three contain quotes by the characters in the miracle. Since none of these passages overlaps with an older fragment, it is impossible to say how far back these lines from the latter three additions were added, but these additions indicate that at some point in time an attempt was made to "modernize" the narrative of version II.

Although versions II and IV share a common source, version IV (D) generally follows the Latin text the most closely of all the versions. One exception is the list of the Virgin Mary's attributes cited above, but that stream of epithets fit in so much better with the bombastic style of version II (E, f, a) that it was probably preserved there for this reason.

Since the fragment G, printed by Unger in his introduction on pp. xxxi-xxxii, is so old (ca. 1225-50), it is important to ascertain its relationship to the other Icelandic versions.¹⁸ That which is striking about G is that despite its great age, the text evidences several deficiencies and must stem from an even older source that has not been preserved. In the first fragment, where Theophilus visits the house of the Jew, G omits: *ad circum ciuitatis* (present in all four Icelandic versions), *candelabrorum* (present in II, III, IV), *clamantes* and *flagitiosum* (both present in IV). The second fragment omits *medio noctis* (present in II, IV). An addition vis-à-vis the Latin text not found elsewhere is: *ef þu bizc bonom a hondum* G,xxxii,13-14.

While G is not the source for any of the four Icelandic versions, neither is it a copy of any of the extant texts. In the list of epithets for the Virgin Mary listed above, G preserves correctly nos. 2, 3, 4, 9, which are not found in D, and contains no. 4, which is absent from E. There is no parallel text at all in version I, and version III is too deviant to have served as the source for G. One minor addition at G,xxxii,13-14, *ef þu bizc bonom a böndom*, has no corresponding text in any of the other versions, Latin or Icelandic.

In the short fragments of G there are two passages that demonstrate how close G (xxxii,6-10 and xxxii,25-27) is to the texts of D (1096,5-11 and 30-32) and E (413,27-33 and 414,26-28).

Version II (E)GVersion IV (D)

at elldr af
 himne brenni mik ...
 at heimrinn meg
 eigi bera i sier þa
 illa hluti, sem ek giordi.
 Ok enn talar hann sua:
 Sui þier, ueslug sala,
 ris upp þu nu
 af myrkrum, þeim er þik
 haundludu, ok frammfallinn bid
 modur drottins vors
 Jesu Kristz...
 þuiat mattug er hun at græða þin
 saar.....

at elldr comi af himni ok
 brenne mic
 oc meg heimrinn eigi
 bera þa ena
 illo hluti er ec gerþa.

Vei þer uesol qnd quap
 hann ris up þu af
 myrkrum þeim er þic
 gripo.
 far oc biþ þer miscunnar
 ena miscunnsaumosto
 guþs moþor er qlom uill
 hialpa.....

at elldr kome af himne ok
 brenne mik kuikan, þuiat
 heimrinn mun eigi mega
 þola þa illa hluti, sem ek
 hefir gert mot minum
 milldazta lausnara. Nu hin
 veslugazta ðnd,
 ris upp
 af þeim myrkrum, sem þik
 hafa fangit, ok
 fall fram bidiandi til guðs
 modur, þuiat hon er
 mattug at græða þin siuku
 saar.....

Med huerium hætti mun ek
 frammi standa
 fyrir hans ogurligum domstole
 ok minn munn upp ath luka
 bidiandi

hui myna ec treystast at
 standa fyrir ogorligom
 domstoli Christz sonar
 mins. oc
 biþia

Huersu mega ek hafa
 traust til at standa fyrir
 hans
 domstoli
 bidiandi

Based only on the list of epithets cited earlier, the text of *G* appears closer to *E* than to any others. In addition, there is a rather lengthy addition at *E*,407,14-29 not found in the other three main versions nor in the Latin, but one sentence in that addition: *mier þotti þu allra manna likaztr at uinna nockura bot aa minu male* *E*,407,15-16 bears a semantic relation at the appropriate position in *G*: *ec ueit at þu ert margs kunnandi. oc uil ec þic biþia ef þu mettir rap i sia at ec fenga enn slika uirþing sem fyrr* *G*,xxx,9-11. Only *E* and *G* (and neither of the Latin texts) note that the Virgin Mary spoke to Theophilus *sua sem nockut reiduglig* *E*,414,19--*belldr repuliga* *G*,xxxii,20.

The list of epithets for the Virgin Mary demonstrated that the almost perfect *E* could not stem from *G* or *D*, and that neither of these latter two could stem from *E*, since they alone contain the fourth epithet. In addition *G*, but not *E*, preserves the Latin *tenens manum* when Theophilus is led before the Devil (*G*,xxx,26). It appears that *E* then further embellished upon the common source of *E* and *G* (=Y*). For example, *E*, alone among the three manuscripts, adds to the Latin text, as when the meeting place is said to be in *einn skogr ok riodr* (408,5-6), that the Devil had a crown on his head (408,8), and that he wore regal raiment (408,9). In the first of the three columns just cited, *E* is the only text to insert (after *Kristz*) the clause *at bun likne þier med sinne milldi*.

Because so little text is preserved in *G* it is difficult to say whether version IV stems from the common source of *G* and *E* (Y*) or whether IV must stem from the next higher

node. In several instances *D* preserves a better reading than does *G* or *E*, but not usually better than both. There are, however, two adjectives corresponding to *nefandus* and *flagitiosus* that are preserved at *D*, 1092,23 and 32 but not in either *G* or *E*, which would indicate that *D* is more likely indebted to a manuscript (*X**) that, in turn, served as the common source (*Y**) for *E* and *G*.

Version III (*St*) cannot have served as the source for any of the other three Icelandic versions, since it omits a very long passage near the end that is present in *Cleo*, II, IV and (albeit in characteristically shortened form) in I. On p. 1090,5 in version III text is skipped that corresponds to II,419,6-25 and IV,1102,16-20, while at III,1090,8 there are absent 11 lines corresponding to II,419,30-420,6 and 29 lines found in IV,1102,26-1103,19 (= *Cleo* pp. 19,28-20,2). Version III is the only text that mentions the name of the bishop who passes away as being "Basilius," and this is probably an addition in III, since the name occurs in none of the analogous texts printed in Dasent's edition. Added text is also found at III,1083,31-1084,5, but not at the corresponding places in version I, II (*E,f*), or IV.

On the other hand, none of the versions I, II, or IV was the source for III. Version I is simply missing too much text found in *Cleo* and III. Version II (*E*) obviously did not serve as the source for III, since the substantial passage containing the names Raab, David, and Peter is present in III (p. 1087,28-1088,1) and in *Cleo*, but not at II,415,20. *G* has some slight similarities of wording in comparison with III:

G,xxxii,8-9 ris up þu af myrcrum þeim er þic gripo
St,1086,13 ris upp þu af myrkrvm, þeim er þik gripu

G,xxxii,22 er neittir syni minom grøðþara hems oc mer
St,1086,33 þu neitadir syni minum grædara heimsins ok mer

However, *G* does not mention several details common to III and *Cleo*, i.e. *or borginni, fagra tortisa berandi* (*St*,1082,24,28), and the two short additions found in *G* (xxxii,9-11,13-14) do not occur in *St*. Version IV (*D*) was likewise not the source for III, since the former evidences several omissions and inaccuracies vis-à-vis *Cleo* or III:

pulsansque ianuam] berr a hurd *St*,1082,16; ÷ *D*.
 stridorem dentium] gnisting tanna, *St*,1085,11; ÷ *D*.
 tribunali illo terribili] hans ogrligum domstoli *St*,1087,3-4;
 hans domstoli *D*,1096,31.
 post triduum] þria daga *St*,1089,6; ÷ *D*.
 candidiorem niue] snio huitari, *St*,1090,5, ÷ *D*.
 post triduum] þria daga *E*,1090,16, *St*,1090,16; vij daga *D*,1104,2.

On the whole, however, the similarity between versions III and IV is the most striking, although passages of some length are rare.

Version IV (D)

Theophilus fellr til fota erchibyskupinvm,
bidiandi at hann geri hann lidugan af
þessum vanda

1091,16-17

at elldr kome af himne ok brenne mik
kuikan, þuiat heimrinn mun eigi mega
þola þa illa hluti, sem ek hefir gert mot
minum milldazta lausnara. Nu hin
veslugazta önd, ris upp af þeim
myrkrum, sem þik hafa fangit,
ok fall fram
bidiandi til guds modur, þuiat hon er
mattug at græða þin siuku saar

1096,5-11

Hversu mega ek lita aasionu hins blezada
ok hins rettlata mins sonar, þess er þu
dirfdizt at neita, svo at ek bidi fyrir þier?
Huersu mega ek hafa traust til at
standa fyrir hans (+ogurligum E)
domstoli bidiandi

1096,28-32

ek elska miok kristna menn, einkanliga
þa sem med rettri tru ok godum vilia
sækia til mins musteris

1097,2-3

Version III (St)

Theophilus er fyrir fotum erkibyskups
framm fallandi ok aa alla vega vndan
þuilikum vanda sik bidiandi

1081,2-4

at logandi eldr af himne komandi mane
drepa mik, þui at eigi maa heimrinn
mina illzku bera.

Ooson aumri ond minni, ris upp þu af
myrkrvm, þeim er þik gripu,
ok leita liossins!
Bid þu meyna Mariam,
at hon græði þik

1086,11-14

Huersu ma ek lita i aasionu sonar mins at
bidia, at hann fyrirgefi þer syndir, saa
hinn sami, er þu vesall madr neitadir.
Med hverium hætti skal ek treystaz at
bidia þer miskunnar frammi standandi
fyrir hans ogrligum domstoli

1086,34-1087,4

ek elskar alla kristna menn, einkanliga þa
sem med rettri tru ok reinu hiarta ero til
mins musteris rennandi

1087,11-13

Since *D* and *G* each contain different readings in common with *St* and *Cleo*, a source common to *D* and *G* (possibly *X*¹⁸) must be responsible for the text in *St*. Is it possible that this common source for *D* and *St* was a Latin manuscript, and that both are independent translations? If one is dealing with a scribe trying to follow his source, the few parallels between the Icelandic texts cited above certainly don't prove the dependence of one on the other, but if the scribe (or author) was attempting to turn out a different literary product, then the parallels would indicate occasional lapses on the part of the redactor of *St*. Certainly there is no doubt that version I was a conscious attempt to produce a story *very* different from its Icelandic predecessor, version II (*E*). As noted above, not only are the opening lines of *E* and version I identical, but additions to *E* vis-à-vis the Latin texts also occur in version I (e.g. setting the meeting with the Devil in a clearing, and having him dressed *í konungs skríði, ok hafði kórónu á höfði* I,67,1). Furthermore, versions I and II alone have the bishop cause Theophilus to be seated next to him (I,67,20; II(*E,f*),410,4).

In this respect it is noteworthy that *ad circum ciuitatis* 'to the circus of the city,' *Cleo*,13,32 is mistranslated by all four main versions as "out of the city."¹⁹ While it is possible that unfamiliarity with Roman civilization was responsible in each case for the similar mistranslations, it could also indicate that only one translation was made from the Latin and that the remainder are reworkings of the Icelandic text.²⁰ If this was indeed the case, it would seem that the original translation was probably a product of the late 12th or early 13th century and similar to *G* or *D* (version IV).

As one might expect, the original translation was probably a conservative one, like mss. *D* and *G*, literal and dry. Version II (*E,f,a*) represents a (late 13th-century?) refinement of this conservative text and resulted in "den florissante stil." Version I constitutes a direct, down-to-earth reaction to the flowery style of version II. Based on the age of all the extant manuscripts in version I, this "classical" recension is probably a 14th-century phenomenon, although one can never be certain about how many manuscripts have gotten lost. The sequence of styles postulated here would indicate that the classical saga style might not owe so much of its development to the early translation of religious texts, existing rather as an oral style that gathered enough prestige in the 13th-century sphere of secular writing before infiltrating the religious scene in the 14th century. Because version III (*St*) stems from a node above *D* and *G*, and since *G* probably dates from the first half of the 13th century, version III is not the youngest of the textual styles, and it is most likely also a product of the early 13th century.

This indebtedness of version III to manuscripts like *D* or *G* would explain the dry, wooden styles found in both versions III and II, but it doesn't explain why someone would want to substitute one dry, wooden style for another. In this connection it should be noted that even the closely related texts *D* and *G* can hardly be classified as close copies of one another. Besides the omissions and additions it appears that the scribes were going

out of their way to make their sentences different, by using synonyms, circumlocutions and varied word order. It is possible that stylistic experimentation was an accepted, late 12th- or early 13th-century phenomenon that then spawned subsequent, bolder attempts at individualistic written expression in the vernacular.

Notes

1. George Webb Dasent, *Theophilus in Icelandic, Low German and other Tongues* (London, 1845), pp. xi-xii, 94-96.
2. (Christiana, 1871), I = pp. 65-69, pp. II = 402-421, III = pp. 1080-1090, IV = pp. 1091-1104, "G" = pp. xxi-xxxii.
3. Mss. *f* and *a* are fragmentary, with the first overlapping about 20% up to and just past the middle of the text in *E* and the second overlapping about 20% at the very end of *E*.
4. Unger, p. xiv.
5. Among the 39 manuscripts containing the miracles of Mary listed by Ole Widding, Hans Bekker-Nielsen, and H. L. Shook, *The Lives of the Saints in Old Norse Prose: A Handlist*, in *Medieval Studies*, vol. XXV (1963), pp. 322-323, those numbered as follows correspond to the manuscripts listed above: 3=G, 6=f, 10=A, 11=B, 12=N, 31=St, 33=E, 38=D.
6. This assumption is borne out by number 5 (LXVIII) in Unger's edition ("Den hellige Mercurius ombringer Keiser Julian"), which exists in a Latin collection of Marian miracles, in a Latin *vita* of Basil the Great, and in an Icelandic translation of the latter. In the case of this miracle, it was the tale from the Latin Marian collection that provided the closest text for the Icelandic miracle. Peter A. Jorgensen, "Julian the Apostate and Manuscript Relatedness in *Martu saga*," forthcoming.
7. On the growth of the Marian miracle collections, see A. Mussafia, "Studien zu den mittelalterlichen Marienlegenden," *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Academie der Wissenschaften*, vols. 113 (1887), pp. 115 (1888), 119 (1889), 123 (1891). Cf. also H. L. D. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. 2 (London, 1893), pp. 586-594.
8. *Die lateinischen Vorlagen zu den alt-französischen Adgar'schen Marien-Legenden* (Aschersleben, 1886), pp. 12-21.
9. Edited in the *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. 4 (1863), 4 February, pp. 489-493.
10. Edited by Laurentius Surius, *Vitae sanctorum ex probatis auctoribus & mss. codicibus...*, (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1617), p. 41.
11. Unger, p. iv.