

Exempla in Barlaams ok Josaphats saga

Odd Einar Haugen

University of Bergen

In Old Norse literature there are numerous examples of stories within a story. From a purely structural point of view, any such insertion may be seen as an interpolation, that is an identifiable and independent piece of narrative which appears within a larger context. According to the etymology of the word, an interpolation is a change of appearance. However, the change of appearance for its own sake, that is for embellishment only, is not typical, neither for the economical saga prose nor for the more elaborate style of learned prose. Interpolations are motivated within the context of the larger narrative, and they are generally offered – explicitly or implicitly – as illustrations of specific points in the surrounding narrative. Thus, interpolations share several traits with the so-called *exempla*, most notably the fact that they are – or may be – inserted into a larger narrative.

The Old Norwegian version of the Barlaam legend, *Barlaams ok Josaphats saga*, provides a rich source of interpolations. This saga was translated from Latin in the middle of the 13th century at the court of king Hákon Hákonarsonar in Bergen, and survives in a nearly complete Old Norwegian manuscript, Sth. Perg. fol. No. 6 (ca. 1270), as well as in a number of Icelandic manuscripts.¹ It contains well over 20 interpolations, some of which are quite entertaining, and a couple of them even found their way into Boccaccio's *Decameron*. The majority of these interpolations are also to be found both in the Latin and Greek versions, but some of them were in fact supplied by the Norwegian translator and are not known from any other versions of the legend. The interpolations are introduced by terms such as *dømi*, *dømi saga* and simply *saga*, while they in the Latin text are referred to as *parabola*, *sermo*, *narratio*, and – in a single case – *exemplum*. In this article I intend to discuss whether these interpolations constitute a homogeneous literary form, and to what extent they should be regarded as *exempla*.

The *exemplum* is a basic literary figure, which in general turns around a single idea and is set out in a single scene. It is based on analogical thinking, and may refer to any suitable material, including personal experience. A number of Greek and Latin sources discuss and define the *exemplum*, and its use can be traced back to the earliest stages of world literature, including the Homeric epic. The Greek term, *paradeigma*, literally means to put something alongside (*para*) something else, and thus emphasises the notions of analogy and recognition. Aristotle discusses the *paradeigma* in his rhetorical writings, the *Rhetoric* (*Rhet.* 1. 2. 8, 19), as well as in his logical works, *Prior Analytics* (*APr.* 2. 23–24). For Aristotle the *paradeigma* is a type of deduction, of the same nature as the syllogism, but of a less stringent kind. The *paradeigma* is based on probable, though not certain, premisses, and may turn to historical events as well as fictitious tales, such as the fables told by Aesop (*Rhet.* 2. 20. 3). The aim of the *paradeigma* is not to entertain, however, but to prove a case. This perspective is shared by Cicero, who treats the example in a number of his writings. The Latin term, *exemplum*, reflects the fact that examples are drawn, *ex-emptum*, from history, and in *De Oratore* Cicero points to the

effectiveness of introducing examples from historical persons who are worthy of imitation, “imitatio morum ac vitae” (*De Or.* 3. 53. 204–05).

In Quintilian’s comprehensive rhetoric, *Institutio oratoria*, the high point of Roman antiquity, the example is seen as part of deductive argumentation, *probatio*. The example is the use of true or probable events that are suitable for persuasion, “exemplum, id est rei gestae aut ut gestae utili ad persuadendum id, quod intenderis, commemoratio” (*Inst.* 5. 11. 6). In the tradition of Aristotle, Quintilian thus defines the example in functional terms, rather than in terms of imitation. He goes on to establish a taxonomy of different types of examples, viz. examples based on identity, difference or opposition, and furthermore makes a distinction between examples which move from the greater to the lesser and examples which move the other way round (*Inst.* 5. 11. 5–13). Quintilian adds that the examples which confront the greater with the lesser are most suited for exhortation – anyone who wants to force somebody into action should do so by drawing examples from the courage of the elders (*Inst.* 5. 11. 9–10). This is indeed an insight that a millennium later is reflected in the numerous exhortation scenes in the Old Norse sagas.

The work of Quintilian, however, only made its way to the Middle Ages in a fragmented text, and it was not until Poggio discovered the complete text of *Institutio oratoria* in 1416 that it once more became generally known in the West. The anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, long attributed to Cicero, had much greater influence in the Middle Ages, and in this text the example is defined in ciceronian terms as the imitation of historical events (*Her.* 4. 49. 62). Donat’s grammar includes the *exemplum* in the longer version, *Ars major*, in which it is defined by examples from Vergil’s *Aeneis*. Donat, who uses the Greek term *paradigma*, treats the example in the chapter on tropes and figures, and points out that it may take the form of an exhortation as well as a deterrent, “paradigma est enarratio exempli hortantis aut deterentis” (*Don.* 3. 6). This distinction is in fact reflected in *Konungs skuggsjá*:

En þþi ero þæsser luter skraðer fram aleið manna milli til minnis at aller skylldu næma oc ser ínyt færa oll goð dæmi. En þarazt hin daligho dæmi. *Kgs.* 72.19–21.

(And thus these things are written so that they can be remembered by people in the future and so that they can learn from the good examples and be wary of the inferior.)

Konungs skuggsjá was probably written during the 1250s to instruct the sons of King Hákon, the young Hákon (d. 1257) and his brother Magnús (king 1263–80). Thus, *Konungs skuggsjá* is contemporaneous with *Barlaams ok Josaphats saga*, which was translated at the royal court as well. There are also a number of other similarities between the two works. Both are didactic works, in which the dialogue between an experienced man and a novice is a thin disguise for a discussion of moral issues. And most notably in this connection, both works introduce a number of interpolated stories to exemplify the teachings, and to some extent, to divert the audience.

Barlaams ok Josaphats saga was immensely popular in the Middle Ages, and the Old Norwegian translation is but one of many vernacular European translations. From a modern point of view, the saga is long-winded, and Finnur Jónsson found the saga downright boring – “grundkedelig” (1923: 972). Even the modern translator, Hans E. Kinck (uncle of the well-known author of the same name), thought it too much of a good

thing, and after chapter 165 he started to condense his translation to about two-thirds of the original volume. Its popularity during the Middle Ages has partly been ascribed to the esoteric contents, partly to the edifying and entertaining discourse on the Egyptian, Greek and Roman gods (originally the apology of Aristides), but most of all to the wealth of interpolated stories. These interpolations can be divided into three separate groups: a series of 10 allegorical apologues, 6 parables from the New Testament, and finally 7 interpolations of legendary and Biblical material unique to the Old Norwegian translation.

1. **Apologues.** The apologues (from Greek *apologos*) are tales of an allegorical nature, all of which conclude with a moral interpretation. They are fairly short, usually between one or two pages in a printed edition. The Indian Jataka tales are seen as prototypes of these tales, which are found in all versions of the Barlaam legend, including the pre-Christian ones. The specific Christian interpretations of these tales were introduced in the Greek version, which was the first Christian version. The same tales are found with more general interpretations in earlier versions of the legend. In many manuscripts and editions of the legend, the fables are set out with titles of their own, referred to as fables or apologues. The Georgian version of the legend, *Balavariani*, which probably was the model for the Greek christianised version, had a total of 15 such apologues. In the Greek, Latin and thence the Old Norwegian version, the number was reduced to 10:

| <i>Traditional title</i> | <i>Lat. ed.</i> | <i>ON ed.</i> |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------|
| 1. The king's brother and the trumpet of death | 578.33–579.2 | 12.16–13.17 |
| 2. The four caskets | 579.2–26 | 13.19–21 + 212.1–213.15 |
| 3. The fowler and the nightingale | 587.40–588.10 | 30.23–31.25 |
| 4. The man and the unicorn | 595.11–38 | 47.29–48.21 |
| 5. The man and his three friends | 595.41–596.24 | 49.10–51.10 |
| 6. King for one year | 596.45–597.18 | 52.7–53.13 |
| 7. The king and the happy couple | 600.53–601.49 | 64.23–66.28 |
| 8. The rich young man and the poor girl | 602.5–45 | 67.1–68.28 |
| 9. The tame gazelle | 605.52–606.5 | 214.20–215.12 |
| 10. The devils that deceive men | 632.23–45 | 142.11–143.30 |

Among the apologues that were excluded, at least one, the amorous wife, was explicitly erotic, and probably judged as unsuitable in a Christian context. Another apologue, on the king who ate his own children, may have been excluded for being offensive. Other apologues do not seem equally problematic, and may have been removed for reasons of consistency or lack of appropriateness. Still, the Christian version was not completely bowdlerised. In the last tale, a young prince who never had met with women encounters some highly attractive specimens and is told that these creatures are devils that deceive men. He then claims that these devils are exactly what he longs for. This tale,

which found its way into the *Decameron*, is interpreted allegorically, and thus does not detract from the piety of the legend. In his study of the Old French version of the Barlaam legend, Jean Sonet offers a valuable survey of the dissemination of the apologues in other works, among them the widespread collection of sermons by Jacques de Vitry (1949: 18–49).

In *Barlaams ok Josaphats saga* the apologues are either introduced as *dømisögur* or by phrases such as “this reminds me of”, “this is parallel to”. In the table below the introductory (and some times concluding) phrases in *Barlaams and Josaphats saga* are compared to those found in the Latin text (Basel edition of 1559):

| | <i>Latin designation</i> | <i>Lat. ed.</i> | <i>ON designation</i> | <i>ON ed.</i> |
|-----|---------------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------|
| 1. | — | | eina dæme sagu | 12.16 |
| 2. | — | | — | |
| 3. | tamen exemplum similes sunt | 587.39 587.40 | eina dæme/sagu þat er likazt | 30.20–21 30.21 |
| 4. | similes esse parabola | 595.11 595.39 | þykki ... likazt at iafna dæme sagu | 47.29–30 49.5 |
| 5. | similes sunt sermo[nem] | 595.42 596.25 | þykkir mer likazter dæme sagu | 49.10 51.12 |
| 6. | — | | þessarrar sagu | 53.14 |
| 7. | — | | ein dæme | 64.21–22 |
| 8. | similis eris narratio | 602.5 602.46 | þykki ... likazt dæme saga | 67.1 68.30 |
| 9. | eundem modum ... timeo fieri | 606.5–6 | ottomz ... at sama hætti fari Dømi saga [title] | 215.12 214.20 |
| 10. | narratio[nem] | 632.22 | dæme sagu | 142.10 |

The only apologue not to be identified in either the Latin or the Old Norwegian text is the second one, but this is obviously due to the fact that it appears in tandem with the first apologue. Otherwise, there are three more apologues, Nos. 1, 6 and 7, which are given a specific introduction in the Old Norwegian text, but not in the Latin one.

The most conspicuous conclusion to be drawn from this list is the lack of terminological unity in the Latin text. The apologues are referred to as *sermo*, *narratio*, *parabola*, *exemplum*, by general phrases (*similes esse*) or not at all. In comparison, the Old Norwegian text uses the term *dømisaga* in a majority of instances. It is, of course, possible that the apologues in some way were highlighted in the Latin exemplar used by the Norwegian translator, e.g. by marginalia or even by separate titles. The Latin text survives in more than 60 manuscripts (Sonet 1949: 76), and we do not know which exemplar the Norwegian translator had before him. However, the textual variation among the Latin manuscripts and early editions, including the Basel edition, seems to be fairly limited.²

Whatever the nature of the Latin exemplar, we may conclude that the Old Norwegian text quite consistently identified the apologues as exemplary interpolations in the text.

2. Parables from the New Testament. There are six complete parables from the New Testament, two from the Gospel of Matthew, three from the Gospel of Luke, and one, the parable of the sower, which is told by Matthew, Mark and Luke. As one would expect from the nature of their source, the parables are fairly short, ranging from less than 100 words to well over 450 words. In addition to these parables there are numerous Biblical allusions in the text, including allusions to other parables, but they do not form any separable pieces of narrative.³ The list below presents the source of the six parables and their location in the Latin and Old Norwegian texts.

| <i>Title and Biblical reference</i> | <i>Lat. ed.</i> | <i>ON ed.</i> |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| 1. The sower (Matthew xiii 18–23, Mark iv 2–8, Luke viii 4–18) | 578.7–30 | 11.6–29 |
| 2. The rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi 19–31) | 585.54–586.7 | 27.5–21 |
| 3. The wedding feast (Matthew xxii 1–14) | 586.7–23 | 27.21–28.19 |
| 4. The wise and the foolish virgins (Matthew xxv 1–13) | 586.23–41 | 28.20–28 |
| 5. The prodigal son (Luke xv 11–32) | 591.14–28 | 38.4–39.12 |
| 6. The good shepherd (Luke xv 4–7) | 591.28–32 | 39.15–24 |

As can be seen from the list below, the parables are consistently introduced both in the Latin version and the Old Norwegian one:

| <i>Latin designation</i> | <i>Lat. ed.</i> | <i>ON designation</i> | <i>ON ed.</i> |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Ait ... Dominus | 578.7 | sva sagðe | 11.6 |
| 2. per parabolas mirabiles | 585.53 | Aðra sagu tekr dæme | 27.5–6 |
| 3. comparat ... parabolas | 586.7, 9 | I eimf sagu iafnar | 27.21 |
| 4. et aliam parabolam | 586.23 | iafnar ... i einni sagu | 28.20 |
| 5. in parabola quadam | 591.14–15 | eina dæmesagu | 38.1 |
| 6. Ecce parabolam hanc | 591.27 | Aðra sagu | 39.12 |

With the exception of the very first parable, all parables are introduced by the term *parabola* in the Latin text (as they are in the Greek), while the Old Norwegian translator has chosen the term *saga*, and, in one case, *dømsaga*. The fragmentary translations of the Bible into Old Norse, especially of the New Testament, implies that there was no generally accepted term for *parabola* in Old Norse, and so the translator may have opted for the generic term *saga*.

3. **Legendary and Biblical interpolations.** Finally, there are 7 interpolations unique to the Old Norwegian translation. Of these, the four longest ones are of legendary nature, while the three remaining interpolations – all of which are fairly short – relate Biblical material. These interpolations are not known from the Latin or Greek text, nor from any of the earlier or contemporaneous vernacular versions.

| <i>Contents</i> | <i>ON ed.</i> | <i>Designation</i> | <i>ON ed.</i> |
|---|---------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Anthony (January 17) | 44.16–46.33 | nokkor sva dæme til þess | 44.14–15 |
| 2. Gregory the wonderworker [thaumaturgus] (November 17) | 55.3–58.11 | dæme iartteignir iartteign iartteign | 56.17 56.18 56.20 56.39 |
| 3. Pelagia (October 8) | 77.3–79.23 | nokkor dæme til þess | 76.41 |
| 4. Thais (October 8) | 80.21–82.27 | vtaluleg dæme fimmast til þess enn nokkor dæme | 80.13 80.16–17 |
| 5. Dagon (1 Sam. v 1–5) | 157.7–158.4 | hœyr her ein dæme | 157.5 |
| 6. Peter (Act. iii 1–9) | 220.21–221.13 | demi saga [title] | 221.1 |
| 7. John (cf. <i>Spec.</i> <i>Hist.</i> 10: 39) | 221.20–222.2 | fra postolom [title] | 221.20 |

The interpolations are generally introduced as *dømi*, and in the case of Gregory the wonderworker, they are also referred to as *jartegn(ir)*. The only exceptions to the term *dømi* are the last two interpolations, which are entitled “demi saga” and “fra postolom” respectively. There is a lacuna in the Old Norwegian manuscript at this point, so the titles have been supplied from one of the Icelandic manuscripts (AM 232 fol.). Thus, one may conclude that the term *dømi* is consistently used in the Old Norwegian version for this type of interpolation.

* * *

Summing up, it can be seen that the terminology of the Old Norwegian text is quite consistent. The apologues are referred to with the term *dømisaga*, the New Testament parables with the term *saga*, and the unique interpolations with the term *dømi*. This is probably not a coincidence, especially as the Latin text is vacillating in its designation of the apologues.

From a structural point of view, what unites the three types of interpolation is the simple fact that they are interpolated in the text, i.e. they are identifiable and separable pieces of narrative, which are clearly delimited in the prose. For example, when Barlaam has told and interpreted the apologue on the man and the unicorn, Josaphat is greatly

pleased, and as the obedient pupil he is, adds that the story certainly is true and good – “Uið þessa dæme sagu. varð. Josaphat gœysi glaðr. Oc mællte til. barlaams þesse er sorn saga. oc rett roða.” (*Barl.* 49.5–6). Then he asks to be taught by more tales of this kind – “Nv bið ec þik at þv birttir mer iðulega. með slikum sagum” (*Barl.* 49.7). This request is a cue for another apologue, the one on the man and his three friends.

From a morphological point of view, the apologues and the parables all include a specific interpretation, *skýring* or *þýðing*. In most cases, the interpretation is integrated in the tale itself, while in some cases it is explicitly introduced as an interpretation, – “en nv skal ec segja þer. þýðing þessarra luta” (*Barl.* 48.23). While the New Testament parables usually are condensed into a single image, some of the apologues are fairly complex allegories with a number of elements. This is especially so for the apologue of the man and the unicorn. In this tale, a man who flees from a unicorn (in a pre-Christian version, an elephant), falls into a deep pit. Luckily, he catches hold of a shrub, and while holding on to this shrub he sees two mice, one white and one black, eating at its roots. In the pit underneath him there is a fierce dragon waiting to devour him. While he hangs there suspended between life and death, some drops of honey are falling from the shrub. He tastes the sweetness of these drops, and immediately forgets all his troubles.

This apologue is included in several of the pre-Christian versions, but with only a few modifications the allegory was integrated into Christian doctrine. As the table below shows, the elephant, signifying the drift towards death, was replaced by the unicorn and re-interpreted as death, which is no more than a metonymic shift, and the dragon, originally signifying death, was taken as a symbol of hell. Otherwise, both versions are a dramatic reminder of the swiftly passing delights of this world, and thereby the value of leading an ascetic life. The pre-Christian version referred to here is the Arab Ismailitic one, *Kitab Bilawhar wa Budasf* (ed. by Gimaret 1971: 88).

| <i>element</i> | <i>pre-Christian version</i> | <i>Christian version</i> |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| the unicorn [elephant] | the pressures that drive men towards death | death |
| the pit | this world | this world |
| the shrub | our time on earth | our time on earth |
| the white and the black mouse | day and night | day and night |
| the dragon | death | hell |
| the drop of honey | the passing delights of this world | the passing delights of this world |

The third group of interpolations, the legendary and Biblical material introduced by the translator, does not include any interpretation. These narratives are just as exotic as the apologues, especially the legendary ones, but are rather added *ad delectandum*; they fit into the narrative, but do not exemplify the doctrine, which would be a more demanding task besides being in all likelihood beyond the mandate of the translator.

The three groups of interpolations may be analysed in a simple presence/absence matrix, as shown below. All contain a separable piece of narrative, but only the first two types (A and B) have been supplied with an interpretation. With regard to religious authority, however, the last two types (B and C) go together, as they are taken either directly from the Bible or from collections of legendary material. The apologues in type A belong to the profane sphere of life and are christianised only by virtue of the specific interpretation given in the text. The originally pre-Christian apologue of the man and the unicorn, which was changed only in minor details in the Christian version, illustrates the religious neutrality of these allegorical tales.

| Type | ON term | narrative | interpret. | authority |
|----------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| A. Apologues | dǫ́misaga | + | + | - |
| B. Parables from NT | saga | + | + | + |
| C. Leg. and Bibl. material | dǫ́mi | + | - | + |

In this table, the opposition \pm *interpretation* is neatly reflected in the terminological opposition \pm *saga*, i.e. a distinction between types with an interpretation and types without. On the next level, the opposition \pm *authority* is reflected, though not as neatly, in the distinction between the full-fledged term *dǫ́misaga* on the one hand and its two components *dǫ́mi* and *saga* on the other. Whatever the value of this table, the tripartite terminological distinction between *dǫ́misaga*, *saga* and *dǫ́mi* does seem motivated by the nature of the three types of interpolations, and should be taken as an indication of a consistent terminological analysis by the Old Norwegian translator.

So far, the interpolations have been seen as simple additions to the text. The term *exemplum* in the Latin text – and the corresponding Old Norwegian term *dǫ́misaga* – suggest that at least some of these interpolations should be considered as exempla. There certainly are systematic differences between the three types of interpolations, but possibly not greater than differences of the kind one may encounter between subgroups of a larger group. The *exemplum* is a notoriously difficult term to define, and most definitions seem to be either too general or too specific.⁴ This is not the place to go into detail, but on the basis of several general discussions of the *exemplum*, I would suggest the following list of characteristic traits:

1. The *exemplum* is only realised as an *exemplum* when it is introduced into a larger narrative as an example of a specific point in this narrative.
2. The *exemplum* is part of an argument, i.e. it has a logical function in the text. It is not a mere embellishment, but is introduced to support or prove a certain point.
3. The *exemplum* is basically divided into a text and an interpretation. However, in obvious cases the interpretation may be left out.
4. The *exemplum* typically aims at diversion.
5. The *exemplum* has a moral, though not necessarily a religious one.

These traits partly overlap and do not amount to a well-formed set of sufficient and necessary conditions. A grey area is probably unavoidable in any conceptual analysis. However, given the above list of characteristic traits, it is possible to make a tentative delimitation.

1. The three types of narrative – A, B and C in the matrix above – are all realised as interpolations, i.e. inserted into a larger text at appropriate points. This is a formal delimitation which aims to distinguish between potential exempla (those to be found in collections of exempla) and actual exempla (those that have been taken into use in a text).

2. The narratives of type A and B are introduced to exemplify and thus support specific points in the text. For example, the apologue of the king for one year is told to illustrate the vanity of this world, and how man can pass through it safely. The moral of the apologue itself is rather mundane – the elected king wisely sends away his worldly treasures to the island to which he is going to be banished. The Christian interpretation is supplied by Barlaam, who effectively integrates the tale into his teachings. The narratives of type C are less integrated in the text. They are appropriate, but they do not in fact support any specific points in an argument, or only do so in a very general sense. They are inserted à propos – rather as if the translator was saying “by the way, this reminds me of ...”

3. As shown above, types A and B have separate and explicit interpretations, while type C has no interpretation, at least not explicitly so. For example, the Old Norwegian interpolation on St. Anthony seems to be motivated simply by the fact that Anthony is referred to in passing, and the translator thought it worthwhile to add an extract from his *vita*. However, a number of interpolations in other texts are recognized as exempla without having any explicit interpretation. In many cases the interpretation of the exemplum is evident and simply does not need to be spelt out. In such cases one would expect to find an implicit interpretation which turns the interpolation into an exemplification. Such implicit exemplification does not seem to characterise any of the narratives of type C.

4. All interpolations in the Old Norwegian text are effective diversions, especially types A and C.

5. The narratives of type A and B have a moral lesson, although it is only by virtue of the allegorical interpretation that the moral of type A is integrated into the main text. As for the interpolations of type C, the legends on Thais and Pelagia are given *in extenso*, and thus express the lesson of the legend itself. The other interpolations are extracts from larger works and do not lead to a specific moral.

On the basis of this discussion, the apologues (type A) and the parables from the New Testament (type B) should be seen as exempla. They are introduced into the text to support a specific point, they are supplied with an interpretation and they add their weight to the argumentation of the main text. In other words, the the argumentation would be less persuasive if they were removed. The interpolations unique to the Old Norwegian trans-

lation (type C) constitute a border case. To be sure, they aim at diversion, and they are appropriate in their context. However, if the functional aspect is given prominence, as was done by Aristotle and Quintilian, they will probably fall outside the corpus of exempla. Metaphorically speaking, the interpolations of type C reflect the contents of the surrounding prose, but do not bring it forward through a logical movement. This should not be taken to mean that they are of less interest than the apologies and parables, but rather that they are of a slightly different, less exemplificatory type.

Notes

1. Cf. the list in the edition by Magnus Rindal (1981: *13–14).
2. I have made comparisons between the Basel edition of 1559 and the four manuscripts in the British Library, Add. 17299, Add. 35111, Harley 3958 and Harley 5293. No substantial variation was found.
3. According to the index in the edition of the Greek version (Woodward and Mattingly 1967: 636–40) there are approximately 700 Biblical allusions and references.
4. The exemplum has received extensive attention in a number of works, e.g. in the monograph by Bremond et al. (1982) which includes an extensive bibliography.

Literature

- APr.* = Aristotle. *Prior Analytics*. Tr. Hugh Tredennick. Loeb classical library. London 1962.
- Barl.* = *Barlaams ok Josaphats saga*. Ed. Magnus Rindal. *Norrøne tekster* 4. Oslo 1981.
- Barlaam and Ioasaph*. [Greek version.] Tr. G.R. Woodward and H. Mattingly. Loeb classical library 34. London 1967.
- Barlaam et Josaphat*. [Latin version.] Ioan. Damasceni historiorvm Christi militvm e' graeco in latinvm versa. In *Beati Ioannis Damasceni opera* 1: 569–656. Basel 1559.
- Bremond, Claude, Jacques Le Goff, and Jean-Claude Schmitt. 1982. *L'«exemplum»*. *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental* 40. Turnhout: Brepols.
- De Or.* = Marcus Tullius Cicero. *De Oratore*. Tr. E.W. Sutton. 2 vols. Loeb classical library 348–49. London 1948.
- Don.* = Aelius Donatus. *Ars grammatica*. Ex recensione Henrici Keilii. *Grammatici Latini* 4: 367–402. 2. ed. Hildesheim 1961.
- Finnur Jónsson. 1923. *Den oldnorske og oldislandske litteraturs historie* 2. Copenhagen.
- Gimaret, Daniel, ed. 1971. *Le livre de Bilawhar et Budasf selon la version arabe ismaélienne*. *Hautes études islamiques et orientales d'histoire comparée* 3. Genève.
- Her.* = [Marcus Tullius Cicero.] *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Tr. Harry Caplan. Loeb classical library 403. London 1977.
- Inst.* = Marcus Fabius Quintilianus. *Institutio oratoria*. Ed. Helmut Rahn. 2 vols. Darmstadt 1972–75.
- Kgs.* = *Konungs skuggsjá*. Ed. Ludvig Holm-Olsen. 2. ed. *Norrøne tekster* 1. Oslo 1983.
- Rhet.* = Aristotle. *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. Tr. John Henry Freese. Loeb classical library 193. London 1975.
- Sonet, Jean. 1949. *Le roman de Barlaam et Josaphat*. Vol. 1. *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite latine et française*. Louvain.
- Spec. Hist.* = Vincentius Bellovacensis. *Speculum Historiale*. Duaci 1624.