

LONDON MEDIÆVAL STUDIES : MONOGRAPH No. 4
Edited by G. KANE, F. NORMAN, A. H. SMITH

THE PSEUDO-TURPIN CHRONICLE
IN ICELAND

Printed for LONDON MEDIÆVAL STUDIES
by TITUS WILSON AND SON, LTD., KENDAL

THE PSEUDO-TURPIN CHRONICLE
IN ICELAND : A CONTRIBUTION TO
THE STUDY OF THE KARLAMAGNÚS
SAGA □ BY PETER G. FOOTE

LONDON MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

*To be had at International University Booksellres, Ltd.,
39 Store Street, London, W.C.1*

1959

PREFACE

Our debt to the Icelanders for their great saga-literature has long been admitted. Less generally recognised is the debt we owe them for the many translations of foreign works which were made both in Norway and Iceland in the middle ages but which are preserved for us almost entirely in Icelandic manuscripts. These translated works cover many fields of learning and literature and rarely have the same literary value as the native sagas of Icelanders and Kings' sagas. On the other hand, we are not likely to understand the unique literary culture of medieval Iceland without giving them proper consideration. The impression of contrast and catholicity in the Icelanders' literary taste is not least valuable: the author of *Njáls saga* must have known much translated romance and ecclesiastical literature, may well have read the *Karlamagnús saga* itself, — yet he writes *Njáls saga*. These translations are also important in that their study may well contribute to the study of their foreign originals. In a recent series of books and papers (see Abbreviations), Professor Paul Aebischer has shown what valuable results may be obtained for the student of Old French literature by a detailed study of the translations of *chansons de geste* and other texts contained in the *Karlamagnús saga*. In doing so he has also been able to throw much light on the genesis of the translations themselves and of the compilation as a whole. The present short study is concentrated upon only a small part of the whole compilation and is concerned chiefly with the relationship between Icelandic texts containing material from the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle and the date and provenance of the original translation of that work. The results have wider implications for the study of the compilation as a whole, but while they involve some modification of Professor Aebischer's design, they build essentially upon his foundations. It is regrettable that, as things are, results from such a study

can be achieved only with reservations dictated by the state of the texts available. None of the four principal texts considered here exists in a definitive edition, and I shall be lucky if every piece of textual evidence cited remains valid when such editions are finally made.

I am especially under obligation to Mr Haraldur Sigurðarson of the Landsbókasafn, Reykjavík, for information about the manuscript fragment, Lbs. 2454 8vo, and for photographs of it; to Dr Ole Widding, Chief Editor of Den Arnamagnæanske Kommissions Ordbog, for many lexicographical references; and to Professor G. Turville-Petre and Mr C. A. Robson of Oxford, who both read this essay in draft and made valuable suggestions for its improvement.

I should like to express my thanks to the Editors of *London Mediæval Studies* for publishing this essay in their monograph series. My warmest gratitude is due to Professor A. H. Smith, whose constant kindness, encouragement and support I have enjoyed through the past ten years.

Department of Scandinavian Studies,
University College London.

PETER G. FOOTE

CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
CHAPTER ONE		
The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle in Iceland		
I	The principal texts	I
II	The Pseudo-Turpin translation: the relationship between the Icelandic texts	II
III	<i>J</i> , <i>Kms. B</i> and Vincent of Beauvais	15
IV	The end of the <i>saga af Agulando</i> in <i>Kms. A</i>	25
V	The end of the compilation <i>Kms. A</i>	26
CHAPTER TWO		
The provenance and date of the Pseudo-Turpin translation		
I	Style and language in the translation of Pseudo-Turpin and of <i>Aspremont</i>	35
II	Loan-words in the Pseudo-Turpin translation	40
III	The place of <i>Kms. A</i> in the development of the <i>Kms.</i> compilation	45
IV	The background of the Pseudo-Turpin translation	48
APPENDIX 1:	The source of <i>J</i> ch. 87	52
APPENDIX 2:	A note on style	55

ABBREVIATIONS

TEXTS

Agul. A

Saga af Agulando, in the A-version of *Karlamagnús saga* (Kms. 264-370).

Agul. B

Saga af Agulando, in the B-version of *Karlamagnús saga* (Kms. 126-263).

Aspremont

La Chanson d'Aspremont (ed. L. Brandin, 1919-21; second edition 1923-4).

Bps.

Biskupa sögur (gefnar út af hinu íslenska Bókmentafélagi, 1858-67).

Hms.

Heilagra Manna Sögur (ed. C. R. Unger, 1877).

Isl. Ann.

Íslandske Annaler indtil 1578 (ed. G. Storm, 1888).

J

Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jacobs (in C. R. Unger, *Postola Sögur* (1874), 536-711).

KMK

Karl Magnus Krønike (in C. J. Brandt, *Romantisk Digting fra Middelalderen III*, 1877).

Kms. (A, B)

Karlamagnús saga ok kappu hans (ed. C. R. Unger, 1860; A- and B-version).

PT

The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle (*Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandī*, ed. C. Meredith-Jones, 1936).

Roland

La Chanson de Roland (ed. F. Whitehead, 1947)

V

Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* (quoted from *Bibliotheca Mvndi. seu Speculi maioris Vincentii . . . Bellovacensis . . . Tomus Quartus*. Dvaci M.DC.XXIV).

OTHER WORKS

Aebischer, *Différents états*

P. Aebischer, 'Les différents états de la *Karlamagnús saga*', in *Fragen und Forschungen . . . Festgabe für Theodor Frings* (1956), 298-322.

Aebischer, *Rol. Bor.*

idem, *Rolandiana Borealia* (Université de Lausanne, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres XI, 1954).

Aebischer, *Studia Neophil.*

idem, 'Karlamagnús saga, Keiser Karl Krønike danoise et Karl Magnus suédois', in *Studia Neophilologica* XXIX No. 2 (1957), 145-79.

Aebischer, *Textes norrois*

idem, *Textes norrois et Littérature française I* (Société de Publications Romanes et Françaises XLIV, 1954).

Aebischer, *Versions norroises*

idem, *Les Versions norroises du "Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient"* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. CXL, 1956).

David, *Etudes*

P. David, *Etudes sur le Livre de Saint-Jacques attribué au Pape Calixte II*, I-III, 1946-8.

Folz

R. Folz, *Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne* (Publications de l'Université de Dijon VII, 1950).

Hämel, *Überlieferung*

A. Hämel, *Überlieferung und Bedeutung des Liber Sancti Jacobi und des Pseudo-Turpin* (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl., Jahrgang 1950, Heft 2).

Finnur Jónsson, *Litt. Hist.*

Finnur Jónsson, *Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litteraturs Historie*, 1920-24.

Kålund, *AM Kat.*

Kr. Kålund, *Katalog over den Arnamagnæanske Håndskriftsamling*, 1888-94.

Storm, *Sagnkredsene*

G. Storm, *Sagnkredsene om Karl den Store og Didrik af Bern*, 1874.

van Waard, *Etudes*

R. van Waard, *Etudes sur l'origine et la formation de la Chanson d'Aspremont*, 1937.

Chapter One

THE PSEUDO-TURPIN CHRONICLE IN ICELAND

The aim of the investigation in this first chapter is to elucidate the relationships between those Icelandic texts that contain matter from the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle and to distinguish the sources from which that matter was drawn. A brief description of the principal texts is given by way of introduction, in the hope that this will both clarify the nature and extent of the problems to be considered and provide the essential references for any student who wishes to pursue the subject further.

I The principal texts

(i) *The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* (PT)¹

This work is prefaced by a letter purporting to have been written by Archbishop Turpin to a certain Leoprاندus. In it he says that he has written a description of Charlemagne's wars against the Saracens in Spain in accordance with Leoprандus's request, who had found the records of Saint-Denis deficient in this respect. Chs. 1-5 of the history tell of Charlemagne's vision of St James, who exhorts him to free his shrine and country from the pagans, and of Charlemagne's successful invasion and his return to France. In ch. 6 the African king Aigolandus is introduced. He invades Spain in Charlemagne's absence and his dealings and battles with the Emperor are described in the following chapters until finally he is defeated and killed (ch. 14). Chs. 15-16 tell of the massacre of Christians who were greedily despoiling those slain in the battle, and of Charlemagne's defeat of Furre, *princeps quidam Navarrorum*. Ch. 17 recounts Roland's encounter with the giant Ferracutus,

¹ A full synopsis of PT with a commentary is given in H. M. Smyser, *The Pseudo-Turpin* (Mediaeval Academy of America Publ. No. 30, 1937), 17-51.

to whom he explains the nature of the Trinity and the mysteries of the Incarnation and Resurrection before finally slaying him. Ch. 18 tells of Charles's final success in a battle where the Christians were at first discomfited by a terrifying stratagem employed by the Saracens. Ch. 19 describes the restoration of order and the privileges conferred by the Emperor on Compostella. Ch. 20 gives a description of the person and character of Charles. Chs. 21-29 are concerned with the battle of Ronceval and the *passio Rotolandi*. Ch. 30 tells of the privileges conferred on Saint-Deris after the Emperor's victorious return, followed by a description of his vision of St Dionysius, who promises forgiveness of sins to those who die fighting the Saracens in Spain. Ch. 31 describes the seven liberal arts, depicted in the Emperor's palace. In ch. 32 Turpin describes a vision he had of devils who say they are going to fetch the soul of Charlemagne; they soon return empty-handed and explain that when they were on the point of success a certain headless man from Galicia had appeared and thrown so much stone and timber into the scales against them that they had to give up: the headless man is of course St James and the stone and timber represent the churches Charlemagne had built in his honour. The vision is followed by a brief account of the Emperor's death and burial. The final chapter and some additions need not be recapitulated here.

PT is thought to date from about 1140 and is doubtless of French origin.² It does not seem to have become popular or influential until towards 1200,³ though it was used in the *Vita Caroli* composed in connection with the canonisation of Charlemagne in 1165.⁴ Its textual history is extremely complex and it has not yet been properly edited. A. Hämel, who has made the greatest contribution to its study, knew the text in 139 Latin manuscripts and distinguishes five main

² C. Meredith-Jones, *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi* (1936), 74 (c. 1130); Smyser, *op. cit.* 2 (1140-50, following Bédier); David, *Etudes* III, 110 (vers 1140); a similar date is presupposed by Hämel, *Überlieferung*, 52-60.

³ Cf. R. N. Walpole, *Philip Mouskés and the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* (University of California Publ. in Modern Philology, Vol. 26, No. 4, 1947), 359-68.

⁴ Edited in G. Rauschen, *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (1890); dated 1270-80, see Folz, 214-221.

versions, with a sixth known to him only in a single exemplar.⁵ A prime text is that found in the famous Compostellan codex, the *Liber Sancti Jacobi*, dated before 1173.⁶ Three of the other versions are derived from this text, including the most popular of them, called the *Libellus* by Hämel and known to him in 66 manuscripts.⁷ The original of this version was very close to the text of the *Liber* and it must have been made before 1200.⁸ It exists now in a longer and in an abridged version, and it was from a Latin text of the longer *Libellus*-version that the translation of chs. 1-18 of PT now found at the opening of the *saga af Agulando*, the fourth branch of the *Karlamagnús saga*, was made. None of the Latin texts so far published, however, represents the precise source of the translation, although it seems in the main to have belonged to the sub-division of the *Libellus*-version which Hämel distinguishes by the letter W.⁹ This sub-division is represented by a manuscript with the sigla C.3 in Meredith-Jones's edition of PT, where it is used in the apparatus accompanying the text from the *Liber Sancti Jacobi* (called *Codex Calixtinus* in the edition). It is of some interest that this particular class of manuscripts of the *Libellus*-version appears to have special connections with the British Isles:¹⁰ the route by which much romance literature reached Norway and Iceland in the early middle ages. In the following I normally quote only from the text of PT as it is found in the *Liber Sancti Jacobi* (with page and line references to Meredith-Jones's edition), restricting the examples as far as possible to instances where it is evident that the translator was using a similar text.

⁵ *Überlieferung*, 11-44.

⁶ *Liber Sancti Jacobi*, I Texto (transcripción de W. M. Whitehill), 1944. Parts of the codex were copied in 1173, see e.g. Meredith-Jones, *op. cit.* 36, Hämel, *Überlieferung*, 22.

⁷ *Überlieferung*, 42-3.

⁸ The manuscript of the shorter *Libellus*-version published by Smyser is dated between 1179 and 1200, see Smyser, *op. cit.* 52.

⁹ On the sub-divisions of the *Libellus*-class and the manuscripts of it available in print, see A. Hämel, 'Aus der Geschichte der Pseudo-Turpin-Forschung', *Romanische Forschungen* 57 (1943), 244. I have assembled what evidence there is for the parentage of the translation in 'A Note on the Source of the Icelandic Translation of the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle', *Neophilologus* 43 (Afl. 2, April 1959), 137-42.

¹⁰ Cf. Meredith-Jones, *op. cit.* 22; R. N. Walpole, in *Speculum* 22 (1947), 260-62.

(ii) *La Chanson d'Aspremont*

This long *chanson de geste*, of over 11,000 lines, is devoted to the story of Charlemagne's wars with Agolant and his son Eaumont. The work divides roughly into four parts: the embassies of the Saracen Balan to Charlemagne, of Archbishop Turpin to Duke Girart, and of Duke Naimés to Agolant; the warfare with Eaumont and his death; the warfare with Agolant and his death; the conclusion tells of the baptism of the Saracen ladies and the marriage of the Saracen queen to the son of Girart. The main part of the *saga af Agulando* in *Kms.* is based on the two middle sections of the French poem and is introduced by the chapters translated from PT mentioned above.

Aspremont is thought to date from soon after 1185,¹¹ and the arguments of Szogs in favour of a lost *Vorstufe* do not seem to have been generally accepted (he dates the present poem to c. 1170-80).¹² In any case, he concludes that the original of the translation in the *saga af Agulando* could not have been 'weit entfernt' from the text of the poem now known.¹³ Unfortunately, there is no critical edition of the poem. One complete text is available in the edition of L. Brandin and some others have been printed in part.¹⁴ It has been shown however that the source of the translation in the *saga af Agulando* must have been closer to the text found in two manuscripts with the sigla P² and P³ and another with the sigla L² than to the text of the Wollaton Hall manuscript published by Brandin.¹⁵ My quotation from the French text is restricted

¹¹ van Waard, *Etudes*, 216 ff.; followed by Ph. A. Becker, 'Aspremont', *Romanische Forschungen* 60 (1947), 27, and E. R. Curtius, 'Über die altfranzösische Epik II', *ibid.* 61 (1948), 448.

¹² S. Szogs, *Aspremont* (Romanistische Arbeiten XVIII, 1931), 125-31.

¹³ *ibid.* 137. Szogs' discussion of the translation of the poem in *Kms.* is confused, not least because he takes the *Agul. B* version as his starting point, known to him apparently in G. Paris's translation (*Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes* (1865), 3 ff.) of Unger's summary of that text (*Kms.* LXIV ff.).

¹⁴ L. Brandin, *La Chanson d'Aspremont*, 1919-21, second edn. 1923-4; see further the references in R. Bossuat, *Manuel Bibliographique* (1951), 26-8, and *Supplément* (1955), 22. A recent survey of the state of textual research is to be found in J. Monfrin, 'Fragments de la *Chanson d'Aspremont* conservés en Italie', *Romania* LXXIX (1958), 237-41.

¹⁵ van Waard, *Etudes*, 189 ff. and 264 note.

to material that can be used to set off syntactical mannerisms in the translation (see pp. 36-7 below), and from a comparison between Brandin's text and what is available of the P² and P³ texts,¹⁶ it does not appear to be too hazardous to follow Brandin in the relevant passages.

(iii) *Karlamagnús saga* (*Kms.*)

This compilation of translations from foreign sources on the career of Charlemagne and his champions is known in two major versions, denoted A and B. The translations are thought to be of Norwegian origin, but the compilation is preserved in Icelandic manuscripts: A in AM 180 c fol. (c. 1400) and 180 a fol. (fifteenth century), B in the paper manuscripts AM 180 d fol. (c. 1700) and 531 4to (written by Ketill Jörundsson, died 1670).¹⁷ For these manuscripts the sigla A and a, B and b are used respectively. In the following I use *Kms. A* and *Kms. B* to refer to the two versions as a whole, and when they appear without qualification they are to be taken as including the a and b forms of the text, insofar as these are available (cf. below).

In the Riksarkiv in Oslo are fragments of three different codices which contained texts from the *Kms.*¹⁸ The first group is dated to the latter part of the thirteenth century and is of Norwegian provenance;¹⁹ they contain part of the *Þáttr af Runzivals bardaga* and their text is said to be somewhat different from and in general better than that preserved in *Kms. A*.²⁰ The second group of fragments are thought to be from an Icelandic manuscript from the early fourteenth century; they contain part of the *saga af Agulando* in the *Kms. A* version (see below) and parts of the sixth and seventh branches of *Kms. (Af Otvel and Af Jorsalaferð)*. The third

¹⁶ P. Meyer, 'Fragment d'Aspremont', *Romania* XIX (1890), 223-4, 226-8; W. Benary, 'Mitteilungen aus Handschriften der Chanson d'Aspremont', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* XXXIV (1910), 1 ff.; L. Brandin, *Aspremont*, second edn. 1923-4, II 181 ff.

¹⁷ Unger, *Kms.* XXXVI-XLI; Kälund, *AM Kat.* I 148, 146; 149, 679.

¹⁸ Unger, *Kms.* XL-XLI; the fragments are printed *Kms.* 556-66.

¹⁹ NRA 61; see D. A. Seip, *Palæografi* (Nordisk Kultur XXVIII:B, 1954), 66.

²⁰ Aebischer, *Rol. Bor.* 47-51.

group of fragments are from an Icelandic manuscript written about the middle of the fourteenth century; the text they contain is also from the seventh branch of *Kms.*

In the Þjóðminjasafn, Reykjavík, is a vellum leaf, from a manuscript thought to have been written late in the fourteenth century, containing part of the *saga af Agulando* in the *Kms. B* version (see below).²¹ The manuscript from which it comes probably represents the original from which both *B* and *b* are derived. A vellum fragment in the Landsbókasafn Íslands, which is said to be from a text of *Kms.*, is in fact from the *Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jacobs*.²²

It has been shown that manuscript *a* frequently has better readings than *A*²³ and that manuscript *b* stands nearer than *B* to their common original.²⁴ A new edition of *Kms.* is badly needed, but meanwhile we must rely upon Unger's text, where the main body of the work is based on manuscripts *A* and *B* and where the textual apparatus is incomplete. In dealing with the translation of PT, I have naturally adopted readings from manuscripts *a* and *b* whenever comparison with the Latin shows that they are likely to give the more original text.

Kms. A is defective, since in both the main manuscripts the end is lacking (*A* ends *Kms.* 480/11, *a* 531/6) and there are other lacunæ. It represents an older version of the compilation than *Kms. B*, but the manuscripts in which it is

²¹ See Jakob Benediktsson, 'Skinnblað úr Karlamagnús sögu', *Skírnir* CXXVI (1952), 209-13. Manuscript Lbs. 156 4to (written 1687) is said to be like *b* but contains a fuller text; it has not been used in any edition. See Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, *Karlamagnús saga* (1954), I, Formáli XV.

²² Lbs. 2454 8vo, described as from *Kms.* by Páll E. Ólason, *Skrá um handritasöfn Landsbókasafnsins* III (1935), 348 (followed by Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, *Karlamagnús saga* (1954), I, Formáli XV). The fragment, which is better described as in 4to, consists of two conjoint leaves, of which the outer sides are said to be almost completely illegible. The right-hand leaf has been cut vertically so that it is now only about half its original width, and both leaves have been cut across the top, with damage to the text; the fragment shows clear signs of having been used as a wrapper round a book. The left-hand leaf verso covers the text in *Postola Sögur* (1874), 669/20-670/27 (*nar iðendi . . . nafni*); the right-hand leaf recto starts *ibid.* 683/4 (*i staðinn*) and ends 684/8 (*dyrd[ar]*), but much of the intervening text is lost. Páll E. Ólason dates the fragment to c. 1450, but it appears to be older than this, probably from the latter half of the fourteenth century.

²³ Cf. van Waard, *Études*, 191, on the *Aspremont*-translation.

²⁴ Jakob Benediktsson, *loc. cit.*

preserved do not necessarily give a better text than the *Kms. B* manuscripts. *Kms. B* includes one whole saga (*af frú Olíof ok Landres*, *Kms.* 50 ff.) which is not in *Kms. A*, and the two versions differ greatly in other parts of the compilation, especially in the *saga af Agulando* and in the account of Roland's death in the *þáttur af Runzivals bardaga*; the end of *Kms. B* must also differ greatly from the original end of *Kms. A*; on these see pp. 22-4, 26 ff. below.

The terminus post quem for the composition of *Kms. B* is the date of the new work it contains, which was translated soon after 1287.²⁵ The other limit is set by the date of the Þjóðminjasafn-fragment (late fourteenth century). It has usually been dated to the very end of the thirteenth century, but Storm gives the limits c. 1290-1320.²⁶ *Kms. A* has been assigned to before 1250 and to c. 1250-75.²⁷ On this see further, pp. 24-5, 47 below.

(iv) *The saga af Agulando*

The text of this saga in *Kms. A* will be referred to as *Agul. A* (*Kms.* 264-370), that in *Kms. B* as *Agul. B* (*Kms.* 126-263). Chs. 1-23 in *Agul. A* (*Kms.* 264-82) are translated from PT chs. 1-18; chs. 24-124 (*Kms.* 282-369) are based on *Aspremont*, *laisses* 199-504²⁸; on the sources of the final chapter, 125 (*Kms.* 370), see pp. 25-6 below. The combination of the two sources in this way has necessitated the omission of the account of the death of Agolandus given in PT ch. 14, and *Aspremont* has to be located in Spain throughout, not in Calabria as in the

²⁵ See *Kms.* 50. Herra Bjarni Erlingsson of Bjarkey came across an English text while he was in Scotland after the death of Alexander III (1286) and had it translated; Herra Bjarni died in 1313. See Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 65; Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, *Karlamagnús saga* (1954), I, Formáli XX-XXI.

²⁶ Unger, *Kms.* III; E. Mogk, *Geschichte der norwegisch-isländischen Literatur* (1904), 865 (beginning of the fourteenth century); Finnur Jónsson, *Litt. Hist.* II 967 (beginning of the fourteenth century); Jan de Vries, *Altnordische Literaturgeschichte* (1941-2), II 465-6 (towards 1300 or perhaps 'etwas später'); Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, *op. cit.* Formáli XVI. Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 67.

²⁷ Unger, *Kms.* III (first half of thirteenth century); Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 14 (1240-50); Mogk, *op. cit.* 864 (first half of thirteenth century, some sixty years before *Kms. B*); de Vries, *op. cit.* 464 (um 1250); Finnur Jónsson, *Litt. Hist.* II 967 (1250-75).

²⁸ van Waard, *Études*, 204-10, gives a useful table of correspondences between the chapters of the translation and the *laisses* of the poem.

poem. The joining of the two sources has resulted in numerous inconsistencies between the two parts²⁹ (cf. below on *Agul. B*).

The text of *Agul. A* has to be made by combining the text of manuscripts *A* and *a*, since both suffer from lacunæ: *A* supplies *Kms.* 264-280/7, 290/11-293/16, 302/30-end, *a* supplies the intervening text but not completely, see *Kms.* 286/16, 300/1, 27. The Riksarkiv-fragment supplies a small part of the big lacuna beginning *Kms.* 286/16, see *Kms.* 558/20-33. It should be noted that the readings of the fragment appear to agree more often with *a* than with *A*, but the exact relationship of the fragment and *a* cannot be decided on the basis of Unger's apparatus. The fragment does not contain any of the translation of PT and is consequently of less importance in the present study.

In *Agul. B* the saga has been almost completely rearranged and re-written at much greater length and often in a much more florid style. The author of this new version makes some use of sources other than a text of *Agul. A* in the chapters translated from PT (see p. 11 ff. below), but he introduces no new material in the *Aspremont*-translation. What occasioned the revision seems first and foremost to have been the discrepancies resulting from the combination of PT and *Aspremont* in *Agul. A*. This is well seen, for example, in the presentation of Roland. In *Agul. A* he appears as a fully-fledged champion in the Ferracutus-episode from PT (*Kms.* 277-81), but later in the *Aspremont*-translation he is still treated as a youth who has not yet won his spurs, even after slaying the redoubtable Jamund (see *Agul. A* ch. 77, *Kms.* 328). In *Agul. B* greater consistency is achieved by omitting the entire Ferracutus-episode and by replacing Roland by Engiler amongst the four noble youths who were only knighted in the hour of need (*Agul. B* ch. 62, *Kms.* 220). The author of *Agul. B* undoubtedly achieves a coherency of matter and style lacking in *Agul. A*, but he has lost much of the verve of the original *Aspremont*-translation.

²⁹ Cf. van Waard, *Etudes*, 193; Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, *op. cit.* Formáli XXVII.

Despite *Agul. B*'s thorough revision of the *Agul. A* text, it may still contain readings which are nearer the ultimate original than those in the extant manuscripts of *Agul. A* (cf. the examples, pp. 11, 45 below). In cases where *Agul. B* contains material which must have stood in the original text but which is now lacking in *Agul. A*, we can never be sure, of course, that the phrasing has not been altered to a greater or less degree.

(v) *Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jacobs (J)*³⁰

This is a composite text telling of the lives and miracles of the two sons of Zebedee. The life of St John is based on the Pseudo-Mellitus *Passio Sancti Iohannis*,³¹ but the life of St James appears in the main to be a reworking of the older life in Icelandic, elsewhere found independently.³² (It is not unlikely that the life of St John was also already available in translation when the texts were combined in the present saga). Although it is a composite work and includes new material (see below), it is not one that has been expanded by accretion. This is clearly shown, for example, by the mutual references between the Prologus and the end of the work (cf. *J* 538/4-7 and 704/28-30) and by such a reference as is found at the end of ch. 34 (*J* 592), looking forward to ch. 83 (*J* 666).

Amongst the new material included in *J* is part of the same PT-translation as is found in *Agul. A*. After the vitæ proper are ended in *J* come first the following chapters:

Ch. 83 (666-67) The text refers back to the location of St James's tomb in Spain and speaks of the ravages of the Saracens.

Ch. 84 (667-69) Charlemagne is introduced, and from 667/29

³⁰ C. R. Unger, *Postola Sögur* (1874), 536 ff.; cf. Forord, II-III, XXIV-XXV.

³¹ *ibid.* Forord, XXIV (cf. J. A. Fabricius, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti* III (1743), 604-23). Unger, followed by Finnur Jónsson, *Lit. Hist.* II 871, seems to think the whole saga had a single Latin source, but the reference, *sá er þessa sögu diktadi í latínu*, 647/15, comes in the life of St John and scarcely applies to the life of St James; cf. next note.

³² Cf. *Jacobs saga postola* I, ch. 2 ff. (*Postola Sögur*, 514 ff.) with the *Tveggja postola saga*, ch. 21 ff. (*ibid.* 570 ff.).

the text is a version of the PT-translation, corresponding to *Kms.* 264/23 ff.

Chs. 85-6 (669-71) The PT-text continues up to a point corresponding to *Kms.* 267/15. At the end a passage corresponding to *Kms.* 267/15-19 (PT 103/11-15) is omitted.

Ch. 87 (671-2) A PT-text; *J* 671/3-17 corresponds to *Kms.* 267/19-23 (PT 103/16-19) and has been expanded; the remainder *J* 671/17-672/2 corresponds to *Kms.* 267/23-26; on the relationship between the two texts here, see pp. 52-4 below.

Ch. 88 (673-5) *J* continues with the PT-text up to 674/33, corresponding to *Kms.* 267/27-268/18. The chapter ends thus, 674/33-675/3:³³

En hvat munu vér segja mega af því sterka stríði, sem Karlamagnús framit hefir fyrir frelsi Jacobi móti Agulando konungi ok hans syni ok mörgum öðrum illum mönnum, svá langan tíma sem Turpin erkibyskup vátar í sínu letri, at hann barðiz við heiðnar þjóðir út xliii ár, áðr Agulandus konungr fell, ok fullkomliga frjálsaðiz ríki hans in Hyspaniis.

It is clear from this passage that the author of *J* knew his PT-translation only as part of a *saga af Agulando*, since Agulandus's son is not mentioned in PT, though he plays a prominent part in *Aspremont* and in the saga where it is based on the French poem. The mention of Turpin *í sínu letri* is a reference to the so-called Leoprandus-letter which serves as a prologue to PT (see PT 87/1-19, *Kms.* 264). There is another instance where *J* shows a knowledge of more of PT than is actually reproduced, at 669/26-27, where there is a reference to Turpin and Roland which must depend on PT 123/2-7, *Kms.* 272/5-7.

The text of *J* is printed from paper copies of the so-called Codex Scardensis. The original is dated by Unger to c. 1325,³⁴ and by Eiríkr Magnússon, who examined the codex itself, rather less precisely, to the first half of the fourteenth century.³⁵

³³ Where necessary I have normalised all quotations in Icelandic.

³⁴ *Postola Sögur*, Forord, III.

³⁵ 'Kodex Skardensis', *Arkiv* 8 (1892), 241. The specimen of the text there printed, 244-5, is insufficient to allow any firm opinion on the date; the occasional use of *d* for *ð* might suggest that it was written nearer 1350 than 1300, but there may be special causes, cf. D. A. Seip, *Palaeografi* (1954), 138.

Unger gives variants from other manuscripts and it appears that some of these must have independent value in establishing the text of the original PT-translation in the *saga af Agulando*. I give a single example:

PT 93/13-14	pro cuius fide in his horis ad expugnandam gentem perfidam veni
<i>Agul. A</i>	fyrir sakir trúar þinnar kom ek til þjóða þessarra í þessi lönd (so <i>A</i> ; <i>a</i> after þinnar reads: kom ek í þessi lönd af vantrúaðri þjóð)
<i>Kms.</i> 265/35	sakir þinnar trúar kom ek í þessor lönd at leysa þau undan svívirðuligu yfirboði heiðinna þjóða
<i>Agul. B</i>	sakir þinnar trúar kom ek í þessi lönd
<i>Kms.</i> 130/23-5	
<i>J</i> Cod. Scard. 669/13-14	
<i>J</i> AM 651 4to ³⁶	sakir þinnar trúar kom ek í þessi lönd at eyða ótrúrri þjóð

Here the last text quoted must undoubtedly represent the original translation most exactly; *Agul. B* has the same sense and must depend on a correct text, but the stylistic revision has completely altered the phrasing. It is thus clear that in any edition of the first part of the *saga af Agulando* it will be necessary to give proper consideration to the manuscripts of *J*.

II The Pseudo-Turpin translation: relationship between the Icelandic texts (*Agul. A*, *Agul. B* and *J*)

The PT-text in *Agul. A* is written in a plain Icelandic, generally close to the Latin but with few latinate constructions; there are omissions, some lengthy, but few additions. *J* apparently represents a revised form of the same original; the style is more elaborate and shows, for example, a much greater use of present participial constructions. *J* often agrees with manuscript *a* against manuscript *A*, and has on occasion a better or more complete text than is found in either *A* or *a*; the original text can sometimes be best reconstructed by a combination of *A* and *J*. The following examples will illustrate the relationship.

³⁶ A manuscript from c. 1400, see Kálund, *AM Kat.* II 55.

- (1) PT 103/7-8 altissimus scilicet quantum solet volare in
sublime corvus
Agul. A þar sem hrafn er vanr at fljúga
(*Kms.* 267/11-12)
J 670/33-34 svá hátt í lopt upp, sem fugli (see *loc. cit.*
lect. var.) er venjuligt at hefja sik
- (2) PT 93/10-12 Prima urbs, quam obsidione circiuit, Pampi-
lonia extitit. Et sedit circa eam tribus
mensibus et nequivit eam capere, quia muris
inexpugnabilibus munitissima erat.
Agul. A Pampilonia heitir borg sú er Karlamagnús
(*Kms.* 265/31-33) konungr sat fyrst um þrjá mánaði ok fékk
J 669/9-11 eigir unnit, svá vǫru hennar mǫrar sterkir.
sitjandi fyrst um þá borg er Pamphilonia
heitir, ok fekk eigir unnit, sakir þess at hennar
mǫrar vǫru sterkir ok úsigranligir. Ok sem
hann hefir um setit þrjá mánaði
- (3) PT 91/10-11 sua ineffabili gratia
Agul. A omits
(*Kms.* 265/7)
J 668/18-19 fyrir sína óumræðiliga mildi
- (4) PT 89/18 Statimque intuitus est in celo quendam
caminum stellarum
Agul. A Ok jafnskjótt sá hann á himni einn stjörnuveg
(*Kms.* 264/31)
J 668/3-6 Ok sem hann hefir þvflíkar hugsanir, veittiz
honum einkanlig sýn optliga um nætr, á
þann hátt at hann sér líkams augum undar-
ligan stjörnuveg á himninum
- (5) PT 93/12-13 fecit precem Domino
Agul. A bað Karlamagnús konungr til guðs
(*Kms.* 265/33)
J 669/11-12 biðr hann til guðs í himinríki
- (6) PT 93/19-20 His auditis mirabilibus, Sarraceni Karolo
ubique pergenti inclinabant
Agul. A Ok er Saracinar spurðu þessi undarligu
(*Kms.* 266/3-4) (a, om. A) tíðendi, lutu þeir honum hvar
sem hann fór
J 669/20-22 Ok er Sarraceni spyrja þessi undranartíðindi,
hversu hrunit hafa mǫrar Pamphilonie,
lúta þeir Karlamagnúsi konungi, hvar sem
hann ferr

Examples (4) to (6) especially will show how far the stylistic revision in *J* can remove the wording from that of the Latin source.

Turning now to *Agul. B*, we find that the editor of that version must have made use of a text like *J*, not *Agul. A*, in the chapters where both were available. Compare these readings in *Agul. B* with those of *J* in examples (5) (6) above:

<i>Kms.</i> 130/21-22	snýr hann til fulltings almáttigs guðs í himinríki
<i>Kms.</i> 130/34-36	Ok er Saraceni þeir sem byggja í nálægum stöðum, fréttu hversu mýrar Pamphilonie hafa stórmerkiliga niðr hrunit . . .

And further:

PT 89/11	Baioariam
<i>Agul. A</i>	Bæjaraland
(<i>Kms.</i> 264/26)	
<i>J</i> 667/31, <i>Agul. B</i>	omit
(<i>Kms.</i> 128/34)	
PT 93/18-19	Sarracenos vero qui babtizari voluerunt ad vitam reservavit, et qui renuerunt illos gladio trucidavit
<i>Agul. A</i>	. . . en alla þá sem eigi vildu láta skírast
(<i>Kms.</i> 266/2-3)	lét hann hálshöggva (<i>a</i> , drepa <i>A</i>)
<i>J</i> 669/19	en aðra lét hann hálshöggva
<i>Agul. B</i>	en hina lætr hann alla hálshöggva
(<i>Kms.</i> 130/33-34)	
PT 107/2	Romaricus
<i>Agul. A</i>	Romarik
(<i>Kms.</i> 267/37)	
<i>J</i> 674/10, <i>Agul. B</i>	Romaticus
(<i>Kms.</i> 139/34)	

There are also some verbal similarities between *Agul. B* and *J* which show that the latter was in its present form, i.e. the *Tveggja postola saga*, when it was used in *Agul. B*, since here the correspondences are not in the PT-text at all. In ch. 82 of *J*, for example, the writer turns from St John to St James and his *ríki* in Spain:

fýsir oss at sjá þessu næst, hvat fram ferr vestr í miklu Hispania, þar sem hinn sæli Jacobus postoli Jóns bróðir á heima (*J* 666/18-20)

In the prologue of *Agul. B*, *Kms.* 126/7-9, we read:

þat ríki hafði hann fyrirætlat til einsligrar ok ævinligrar virðingar
sínnum signaða vin Jacobo postola Jóns bróður

In the context in *J* the description of James as John's brother is perfectly natural; in *Agul. B* it is unexpected. Again, after the Leoprandus-letter in *Agul. B* there follows what is, in relation to *Agul. A*, a much expanded account of St James's mission to Spain, his martyrdom and the return of his relics there; see *Kms.* 127/28-128/30, and cf. *Agul. A*, *Kms.* 264/17-21, which is here a more or less literal translation of PT (see the text of the manuscript denoted A.1 in Meredith-Jones's edition, p. 88 footnote). Here too there are similarities in phrasing between *Agul. B* and parts of *J* which are not from the PT-translation, e.g.

<i>J</i> 666/28-29	í þeim stað, er Liberum donum heitir
<i>Agul. B</i>	í þeim stað er landsmenn kölluðu á þeim
(<i>Kms.</i> 128/10-11)	tíma Librarum Domini en nú nefnist Com- postella (cf. also <i>J</i> 669/30)
<i>J</i> 666/31-33	þar til at . . . eitraði fjándinn þær heiðnar þjóðir, er Moabite heita ok Sarraceni, til þeirar guðs reiði at herja landit ok eyða kristnum dómi
<i>Agul. B</i>	þar til at guðrækir Saraceni ok Moabite
(<i>Kms.</i> 128/12-17)	hermannliga grimmaðust með ránum ok manndrápum upp á fyrr greind ríki . . . ok svá görsamliga eyddu þeir fjándans limir heilagri kristni . . .
<i>J</i> 667/5-6	at hann hefir sik mjök lágt ok leyniliga
<i>Agul. B</i>	hverr . . . á þeirri jörðu hvíldist bæði lágt
(<i>Kms.</i> 128/24-26)	ok leyniliga

As far as it went then, it appears that the editor of *Agul. B* used *J* in preference to *Agul. A* for the PT-text, doubtless because the style of *J* was more to his taste. The possibility that the similarities noted above could result from the use of *Agul. B* by *J* is out of the question, because *J* follows the order of PT and *Agul. A* closely while *Agul. B* does nothing of the

kind. Consider, for example, the two following sentences in *J*, 673/1-674/5:

Litlu síðarr en Karlamagnús keisari kemr heim í Franz, herjar hundheiðinn konungr á hans ríki Hispaniam, Agulandus at nafni, tilkominn af Affrika, vinnandi undir sik með hörðum herskildi allt ríkit, niðr brjótandi alla kristni ok drepanði alla kristna menn eðr af landinu brott rekandi. Ok er Karlamagnús keisari spyrr þessi hörmungartíðendi, dregr hann her saman þegar í annat sinn ok ferr í Hispaniam.

This corresponds closely to *Agul. A*, *Kms.* 267/27-33, though it has been subjected to stylistic revision in *J* (none of the present participles is found in *Agul. A*), and the *Agul. A* passage is practically a literal translation of PT 105/12-18. But if *J* were derived from *Agul. B*, it would have been necessary to piece together this information from the following places:

<i>Kms.</i> 133/27-28	Á þessum tíma var yfir Affrica sá heiðinn konungr er hét Agulandus
<i>Kms.</i> 137/12-17	En þegar þessi guðs úvinr kemr in Hispanias með sínum þjónum . . þessir fjándans limir stríða upp á guðs hjörð ok hans helgasta postola meðr miklum herskap, brjóta niðr alla kristni, drepanði kristna menn eðr brott reka í útleigð
<i>Kms.</i> 138/1-3	Þenna tíma er þvílíkir hlutir fara fram in Hispaniis sitr ágætr herra Karlamagnús í Aguisgranum í Franz, ok er hann fréttir þau hörmungar tíðendi . .
<i>Kms.</i> 139/1-3	Eptir þetta býr Karlamagnús keisari sinn her . lyptir síðan sinni ferð brott af Frans

Agul. B also contains additional PT-material, drawn from another source, and of this there is no trace in *J*.

III *J*, *Kms. B* and Vincent of Beauvais

(i) *The PT text*

Ch. 88 in *J* ends with the words quoted above on p. 10, and ch. 89 (*J* 675/5-6) then begins repetitiously thus:

Þat vátar virðuligr herra Turpin erkibyskup, at Karlamagnús konungr felldi Agulandum í Hispania.

The rest of the chapter contains a translation of PT ch. 19, on Charlemagne's conferment of privileges on Compostella. This chapter was taken, however, not from an independent PT-text, but from Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum historiale* (abbreviated *V* hereafter), where in Lib. 24 PT is given almost complete, somewhat abridged but often verbatim, in Vincent's usual manner. The opening of the chapter in *J* suggests that the writer may be turning to another source, and there are the following distinctive correspondences between *J* and *V* (Lib. 24, cap. xvii):

<i>JV</i>	omit PT 171/1-3, 12-13, 15-17
PT 171/6	Kalendas Iunii
<i>JV</i>	kalendas Julij (<i>J</i> 676/30, beginning of ch. 90).

The end of this chapter in *V* is considerably abridged, but none of the material lacking there is to be found in *J* ch. 89, although it is true that the writer here is referring to the earlier part of his lives of the two apostles and appears to be following no special source.

Ch. 90 in *J* largely consists of a reply to a rhetorical question, where the author imagines a reader wondering why Charlemagne should have been able to usurp the Church's power in the way described in ch. 89. He refers to the authority given to the Emperor by Pope Adrian I and quotes the testimony of Pope Gregory VI on the excellent state of Christendom in his time. The source for this was undoubtedly *V*, Lib. 25, cap. xxiv, but the author of *J* was not translating directly from the Latin here, but basing his remarks on an Icelandic version of the whole passage in *V*, Lib. 25, cap. xxi-xxv, printed by C. R. Unger in *Mariu saga* (1871), 453-65.³⁷

³⁷ Vincent is quoting from William of Malmesbury, apparently the sole source for this story about Gregory VI; cf. *De Gestis Regum Anglorum* (ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 1887), I 246 ff. A comparison shows that *V* must have been the source for the Icelandic text: cf. *Mariu saga*, 455/24-30, with *V*, Lib. 25, cap. xxi, which contains material not found in William at all. Other legends in the same collection in *Mariu saga*, unconnected with William, also appear to be from *V*, cf. e.g. *Mariu saga*, 438-444, with *V*, Lib. 17, cap. ciii. It may be noted that the collection of legends found in *Mariu saga*, including the story about Gregory VI, is extant in two fragmentary manuscripts dated to c. 1300 (AM 240 fol. V and 655 4to XXXII, see Kålund, *AM Kat.* I 208, II 66), which indicates that *J* could also be from about the same date.

In ch. 91, having heard of Charles's merits, we now hear of the rewards he enjoyed from St James. After his return from Spain he was always somewhat sick, until finally at Aquisgranum, where he had built a wonderful round church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, he fell mortally ill. The matter here goes back to PT 231/16-17, 233/5-7, but it is also in *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xxv, which was probably the source.

Ch. 92 gives a translation of the vision seen by Archbishop Turpin at the moment of the Emperor's death, ultimately from PT ch. 32. In one reading here the Icelandic text is nearer *V* than the independent PT:³⁸

PT 229/11-12	tetrorum agmina innumerabilia militum
<i>V</i> Lib. 24, cap. xxv	tetrorum spirituum agmina infinita
<i>J</i> 678/9	mikill flokkur helvízkra anda

In other respects there are no striking dissimilarities between *V* and PT, and the Icelandic translation is comparatively free; the source was doubtless *V*. The text after the end of the vision in *J*, 678/34-679/7, appears to be the work of the Icelandic author, where he makes explicit the role of St James in effecting the Emperor's salvation (cf. p. 21 below). The final sentence, *J* 679/7-9, is however from PT 235/8-9, but it is also found in *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xxv, where it ends the section borrowed from PT there just as it ends the chapter in *J*.

Ch. 93 is on the obsequies of Charlemagne and is undoubtedly from *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xxv, where the author Vincent refers to as Chronographus is quoted;³⁹ the text is completely different from PT.

Ch. 94 in *J* makes the transition back from Charles to St James and Compostella, and ch. 95 begins:

Pá er liðit var frá higatburð várs herra Jesu Cristi m.c. xx ok
iiii ár, andaðiz ágætr herra mildrar minningar Calistus páfi,

after which comes a version of the pseudo-Calixtian preface to the Jacobean miracles. The ultimate source is the *Liber*

³⁸ The text of *V* on which this chapter is based is also printed by Unger, *Kms.* XXXV.

³⁹ Also printed by Unger, *Kms.* XXXVI; cf. PT 233/3-7.

Sancti Jacobi,⁴⁰ but the source here is *V*, Lib. 26, cap. xxx, which begins: Anno domini 1124. obiit bonæ memoriæ Papa Calixtus . . . , followed by the same preface. In chs. 96-119 *J* follows *V* closely, see Lib. 26, cap. xxxi-xlii, where the text often differs considerably from that of the *Liber Sancti Jacobi*.⁴¹ The only irregularity in the Icelandic text is that for some reason cap. xxxviii in *V* has been displaced in *J* and appears at the end as ch. 119. In the last chapters of *J*, 120-23, the writer returns to St John.

In brief, it may be said that from ch. 89 onwards *J* is almost entirely based on material from *V*, Lib. 24 and 26. If *J* made use of *V* in this way, however, the question arises whether some of the instances where *J* appears to have a better PT-text than *Agul. A* in chs. 84-88 may not be the result of reference to *V*. I have found no case where this appears at all likely, except probably in *J* ch. 87, where the ultimate source is PT ch. 5 (103/16-105/11). Since the discussion of this is necessarily somewhat inconclusive, I have relegated it to Appendix 1, pp. 52-4 below.

It was shown earlier that *Agul. B* used *J*, as far as it went, in the PT-chapters, and we have just seen that *J* made extensive use of *V*, probably in ch. 87 and certainly from ch. 89 onwards. It can also be shown that *Agul. B* made independent use of the PT-text given in *V*. A single example will suffice. Ch. 3 in PT largely consists of a long list of Spanish cities. In *Agul. A* and *J* this is drastically cut down, so that three lines of text, *Kms.* 266/19-22, *J* 670/7-10, correspond to PT 95/15-99/14. In *V* this chapter has also been much abridged, see Lib. 24, cap. vi, but in a completely different way.⁴² *V* begins:

In Galitia tunc acquisiuit 13. vrbes inter quas Compostella tunc erat parua. In Hispania sunt vrbes 26.

⁴⁰ *Liber Sancti Jacobi* (1944), 259 ff.

⁴¹ On the miracles see David, *Études* II (1947), 47 ff.; his observations, *ibid.* 64, on the collection in *V* are inaccurate.

⁴² The text in *V* here depends on the version, already abridged, in *Helinandi . Chronicon*, cf. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 212, col. 848.

This appears in *Agul. B, Kms.* 131/13-15, as:

Var á þessum tímum í Galícia þrettán borgir með Compostella, en sex ok tuttugu in Hispaniis.

The remainder of the passage in *Agul. B, Kms.* 131/15-20, on the annual miracle at the grave of St Torquatus, is from the same source (cf. PT 97/17-99/4).

In the light of such evidence it appears safe to conclude that any extensive additional material from PT which is found in *Agul. B* but not in *Agul. A* or *J* (as far as it goes) was derived from *V*. On the other hand, given the relationship between the texts, it is still possible for *Agul. B* to have minor readings which are more original than those of *Agul. A* or *J*, and then it can only be a matter of opinion whether a detail in *Agul. B* is from the original PT-translation or whether it has been introduced from *V*.⁴³ An instance of the introduction of a large section of additional material in *Agul. B* is found in chs. 3-4 (*Kms.* 132-33), on the honours accorded to St Dionysius by Charlemagne and the saint's appearance in a vision. The ultimate source is PT ch. 30, but the text is also in *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xxii. The two Latin texts are very similar, and there is only one reading to indicate that *Agul. B*'s source was *V* and not some other PT-text. *V* is the only one of the available PT-texts to have *in crastinum* at PT 219/23, which reappears in *Agul. B, Kms.* 133/10 as *þegar um morgininn*.

There is a correspondence to be noted between the beginning of ch. 89 in *J* and of ch. 3 in *Agul. B*. *J* 675/5-7 reads:

Þat vátar virðuligr herra Turpin erkibyskup at Karlamagnús konungr felldi Agulandum í Hyspania. Gekk þá ríkit aprt í góðan stétt undir ágætan keisara.

Cf. *Agul. B, Kms.* 132/19-20:

At frelstu ríki Hispaniarum ok í góða stétt skipaðu heldr ágætr herra Karlamagnús keisari brott af Hispania . . .

⁴³ Consider e.g. the name Furra, which appears in *Agul. B* (*Kms.* 156/3, 6, 10, 26), cf. PT 145/17, 147/7, but not in *Agul. A* (see ch. 14, *Kms.* 276-77); in the same passage *Agul. B, Kms.* 156/24, has *oratorium* (so PT 147/5), while *Agul. A* has *kapella*, *Kms.* 276/35; *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xiv, has the same readings as PT. The name in *Agul. B* might be from *V*, but it is less likely that *oratorium* would have replaced *kapella* on the same authority; the original PT-translation probably read as *Agul. B*.

The phrasing appears to depend on PT 179/15-17:

Postquam Karolus magnus, imperator famosissimus, totam Yspaniam diebus illis ad Domini et apostoli eius sancti Iacobi decus adquisiuit, rediens ab Yspania . . .

This is the opening of ch. 21 in PT, where the story of Ronceval is told. In *V* the same chapter (Lib. 24, cap. xviii) follows on immediately from PT ch. 19, which is translated in *J* ch. 89, but this opening sentence is not found in the printed text of *V*. There is nothing corresponding to it anywhere in *Agul. A*. In the light of the other evidence, however, it is easier to assume that this sentence was present in the manuscript of *V* known to the author of *J* and that it was shifted to its present position by him, than it is to believe that he was familiar with more of an independent PT-text than is found in *Kms. A*.⁴⁴ *Agul. B* clearly knew the *J*-text at this point, but after making use of the opening sentence he replaced *J*'s material from *V* with other material, also from *V*. To judge by his omissions, the author of *Agul. B* was not much interested in the privileges granted either to Compostella or Saint-Denis, and his attention was held rather by Charlemagne and the absolution promised to crusaders by St Dionysius.

It will be clear from the foregoing that the author of *Agul. B*, following three sources, *J*, *Agul. A* and *V*, (and possibly others?) and rearranging and rewriting as he goes, has left a fair problem to the modern student.

(ii) *Um kraptaverk ok jartegnir*

As we have seen, *Agul. B* made use of *J*, in which material from *V* was already included, and also made independent use of *V*. Now, at the end of *Kms. B* there is a section called *Um kraptaverk ok jartegnir*, the first five chapters of which are

⁴⁴ Cf. the discussion by Aebischer, *Versions norroises*, 126 ff., on chs. 1-3 of the *Um kraptaverk ok jartegnir* (*Kms.* 541-7). "Que le texte de Vincent dont s'est servi le traducteur norrois ait été en tout point identique à celui que nous connaissons par l'édition de 1473, c'est ce qui est invraisemblable", *ibid.* 151. (There are no significant differences between the editions of 1473 and 1624 in the texts under discussion here).

from the *Speculum historiale*.⁴⁵ These five chapters are not found elsewhere in Icelandic, but the following three (*Kms.* 553-555) correspond to *J* chs. 90-93 (cf. pp. 16-17 above), and the question arises whether *J* is derived from *Kms. B* or *Kms. B* from *J* at this point. If we assume the editor of *Kms. B* to have been the man who produced the revised *Agul. B*, then on *a priori* grounds it would appear probable that he made further use of *J* in this final section. What internal evidence there is supports this conclusion. The two texts differ considerably in ch. 6 of the *Um kraptaverk* which, while containing the essential matter of *J* chs. 90-91, for the most part departs far from them in phrasing. That there is a written link between the two is certain however, because of the identical concluding sentences: *Ok sem hann er nærri andláti geriz (gerðist Kms. B) sá hlutr sem nú skal segja (J 677/32-33, Kms. 553/18-19)*. Chs. 7 and 8 of the *Um kraptaverk* agree closely in wording with *J* chs. 92-93, and there is no hope of deciding which is original in the greater part of the text. At the end of ch. 7 in *Um kraptaverk*, however, occurs the following peroration, *Kms.* 554/20-24, corresponding to *J* 679/4-9:

En hvat er ætlanda hverr þessi maðr var, er fjáendr kölluðu höfuðlausan mann, utan auðsýnt er at hinn sæli Jacobus þoldi hálshögg af sverði Herodis konungs, en birtist nú í fulltingi síns vinar Karlamagnús með kirkna uppsmiði, hvaðan þat gefr vel skilja, at sá sem kirkju eflir ok upp reisir, smíðar sjálfum sér himinríki.

From *hvaðan* onwards the text translates PT 235/8-9 (In hoc ergo exemplo datur intelligi quia qui ecclesiam ædificat regnum Dei sibi præparat; cf. *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xxv),⁴⁶ but the remainder must be from the translator himself, and it indubitably belongs better in a *Jacobs saga* than in a *Karlamagnús saga*.⁴⁷

We may thus conclude that the editor of *Kms. B* made use of *V* and *J* in this final section, in the same way as in the

⁴⁵ Cf. Unger, *Kms.* XXXIV; Aebischer, *Versions norroises*, 136.

⁴⁶ Also printed by Unger, *Kms.* XXXV.

⁴⁷ It should though in fairness be pointed out that the author of *Agul. B* is constantly mindful of the honour due to St James and makes good the deficiency of *Aspremont* in this respect; cf. e.g. *Kms.* 186/11 ff., 195/31, 235/18 ff.

B-version of the saga af Agulando. He did not bother to retranslate material from *V* which he already had in Icelandic in *J*, although, as in ch. 6 of *Um kraptaverk*, he was quite ready to re-write his source in order to put Charlemagne in the foreground. He occasionally reproduced matter from *J* that was less appropriate in his own work. It may finally be regarded as certain that the man responsible for the revised *Agul. B* was also the editor of the whole *Kms. B*.

(iii) *A parallel in the þáttir af Runzivals bardaga*

The editor of *Kms. B* held the *Speculum historiale* in high regard as an authoritative work, for he also made use of it in his revision of the translation of *La Chanson de Roland*.⁴⁸ Again, however, he made use of material from *V* that was already available in Icelandic translation. The text in question is found in the footnotes to *Kms. 524-25*. Previously in this branch the text of *Kms. B* follows in the main *Kms. A* and *Roland* (up to line 2396), though with the consequential omission of Turpin from those who fought and fell at Ronceval (his place is taken by Valtari). The death of Roland is then described, followed by an account of the vision which in PT ch. 25 is experienced by Turpin: he sees devils carrying the soul of the heathen king Marsirus to Hell and they report that Michael is escorting the soul of Roland to Heaven. The story of the vision is introduced here with the words: *Sú bók er heitir Speculum historiale . . .*, so that there can be no doubt that *V* was the source for this PT-material (cf. *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xviii-xx, PT chs. 21-23, 25). But it at once becomes clear that the editor of *Kms. B* has not translated this from *V* himself, when we compare his text with that of the *Michaels saga*. Ch. 11 in *Michaels saga* (*Hms. I* 690/16) begins: *Svá er lesit í Karlamagnús sögu mikla keisara . . .*, and this is followed by a setting of the scene at Ronceval. That the

⁴⁸ Björn K. Þórólfsson, *Rímur fyrir 1600* (1934), 487 ff., followed by Aebischer, *Rol. Bor.* 78, speaks in general terms of the influence of PT on *Kms. B* (although Björn quotes from *V*). It is important though to understand that it is only the PT known in *V* that is in question.

Karlamagnús saga here referred to is not the same text as our present *Kms.* is shown immediately by the introduction of *tveir konungar Marsirius ok Deligandus sendir af konungi Babilonis* (*Hms.* I 690/17-18), which clearly translates *V*, Lib. 24, cap. xviii: duo Reges Saraceni Marserius et Beligandus . . . missi ab Amiraldo Babylonis.⁴⁹ The following text is not a close translation, but we find that Roland kills King Marsirius; Roland's death is then described and in the following chapter is a translation of Turpin's vision, beginning with the words: *Sú bók heitir Speculum Historiale* . . . (*Hms.* I 692/3). The whole text is clearly the same as that found in *Kms. B*, but the latter does not begin until partway through the *Michaels saga* extract from *V* (*Hms.* 691/16), and the editor of *Kms. B* has to omit the specific reference to Marsirius in Turpin's vision in *V* and *Michaels saga*, because he has in this point followed *Kms. A* and *Roland*, where Marsilius, as the name appears there, is wounded but not killed (see *Kms.* 519/17-19, *Roland* 1903, 1913). In Turpin's vision in *Kms. B* he becomes simply 'the heathen king'. The fact that *Kms. B* is thus less original than *Michaels saga* and contains moreover only part of the whole passage shows that the *Michaels saga* must be the source. Final evidence that this is so is found in the reading at the end of the episode there, *Hms.* I 692/27-29, where the writer stresses the whole point of his quotation of the story of Roland with the words:

hvaðan vér munum frá venda, því at nú er vitni borit, at Mikael fylgir völdum mönnum til eilífra fagnaða.

There is naturally nothing corresponding to this in the Latin of *PT* or *V*, but the same sentence is found in *Kms. B*, where the alteration of *Mikael* to *englar guðs* (in accordance with the text of *Roland*, 2393-6, cf. *Kms.* 524/20-22) does little to make it appropriate in the *Kms. B* context.⁵⁰ Once again the editor

⁴⁹ Cf. *PT* 179/19-21: duo reges sarraceni, Marsirus et Beliguandus . . . ab admirando Babilonis . . . missi. The king Beliguandus (Deligandus in *Michaels saga*) does not appear in the *páttir af Runzivals bardaga*.

⁵⁰ It may be said that the stricture, *pó at sumar norrænubækir segi öðruvísi af því efni*, *Hms.* 692/6, repeated in *Kms. B*, loc. cit., also reads more naturally in a text that is not a *Karlamagnús saga* than in one that is.

of *Kms. B* adapted a translation already available, though probably at the same time making independent use of *V*,⁵¹ and again he, or his amanuensis, borrowed a little too much.

(iv) *A terminus post quem for Kms. B*

This demonstrable use of *Michaels saga* is important because it establishes a new terminus post quem for *Kms. B* (cf. p. 7 above). *Michaels saga* is the work of Bergr Sokkason, see *Hms. I* 713/5-8, better known for his *Nikolaus saga* (*Hms. II* 49 ff.). Bergr became a monk at Þingeyrar in 1317, after having been taught by Laurentius Kálfsson at Munka-Þverá⁵²; Laurentius went to teach there in 1312.⁵³ In both *Michaels saga* and *Nikolaus saga* Bergr is referred to as *bróðir*,⁵⁴ and it is of course most unlikely that he began his literary work before he became a monk, especially since he was still *in statu pupillari* after 1312. In 1322 Bergr became prior of Munka-Þverá and in 1325 abbot;⁵⁵ for some reason he resigned his office in 1334, but became abbot again in 1345.⁵⁶ The date of his death is unknown.⁵⁷ We may reasonably believe that he did not begin to write until c. 1320 at the earliest, but the suggestion that the description of him as *bróðir* restricts the period of his authorship to the years 1317-22 when he was a simple monk is, as Sigfús

⁵¹ Björn K. Þórólfsson, *op. cit.* 487 ff., has shown that the manuscript used by Þórður Magnússon for his *Rollants rimur* must have stood nearer the original *Kms. B* and have contained more material from PT than do the extant manuscripts of this version. *V* must have been the source for this extra material as for the rest.

⁵² *Bps. I* 832, *Isl. Ann.* 266. I follow the chronology of Einar Hafliðason (1307-93), author of *Laurentius saga* and the so-called *Lögmannsannáll*.

⁵³ *Bps. I* 824-5; cf. *Isl. Ann.* 265.

⁵⁴ *Hms. I* 713/7, II 49/15.

⁵⁵ *Bps. I* 840, 898; *Isl. Ann.* 346 (s.a. 1325), 396 (s.a. 1325). To become abbot in 1325 Bergr must have been born not later than 1300, but not necessarily much before it, cf. E. N. Brekke, *Sverre-Sagaens Opphav* (Skrifter utg. av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II Hist.-filos. Kl., 1958, No. 1), 110-111.

⁵⁶ *Isl. Ann.* 220 (s.a. 1334), 349 (s.a. 1334), 211 (s.a. 1345), 222 (s.a. 1345).

⁵⁷ Jón Þorkelsson, *Diplomatarium Islandicum*, III 311, gives 1350 as the date of his death, cf. also Unger, *Hms. Forord XV* ('omtrent 1350'), Páll E. Ólason, *Íslenskar Eviskrár I* 150; Finnur Jónsson, *Litt. Hist.* III 90, followed by Jón biskup Helgason, *Íslands Kirke* (1925), 126, gives 1345. I do not know of any source for these dates; 1350 is probably based on a purely hypothetical estimate made by Finnur biskup Jónsson, see his *Historia ecclesiastica Islandiae* (Havniæ 1772-78), IV 45. Neither do we know when Hafliði, the next abbot, succeeded Bergr; Hafliði died in 1370, *Isl. Ann.* 288, 280. (Jón Espólin seems to have been the first to accept 1350 as the certain date of Bergr's death, see *Íslands Arbækur i sögu-formi I* (1821), 81; followed by Janus Jónsson, in *Tímarit* 8 (1887), 205).

Blöndal points out,⁵⁸ obviously wide of the mark.⁵⁹ One might guess that the years 1334-45 were the chief period in which he wrote. At any rate, we may be certain that the *Kms. B* dates from after 1320, possibly well after, and it would probably not be far wrong to point to Þingeyrar, Þverá or Hólar as the likely place for its composition.⁶⁰ There can be little doubt that the author was a cleric.

IV The end of the *saga af Agulando* in *Kms. A*

The investigation so far has led to some clarification of the editorial problems to be faced in the PT-chapters in the *Kms.*-versions, and perhaps to a better acquaintance than we had before with the methods of that fourteenth-century Icelander, of formidable eloquence and at home in a well-stocked library, who undertook the revision of *Kms.* known to us in *Kms. B*. It has not, on the other hand, been possible to discover any additional PT-material in *J* or *Kms. B* that is likely to have come from an independent PT or from the same PT-translation as was used in *Agul. A*. There remain the end of the *saga af Agulando* and the end of the whole compilation in *Kms. A* to consider.

As Storm remarked,⁶¹ the phrasing at the end of the *saga af Agulando* depends on the end of ch. 18 and the beginning of ch. 19 in PT (cf. *Agul. A*, ch. 125, *Kms.* 369-70, *Agul. B*, *Kms.* 263/32-38, with PT 169/4-19), although there is no question of close translation. One sentence in the Icelandic,

⁵⁸ Unger, *Hms.* Forord XVI, Finnur Jónsson, *Litt. Hist.* III 91; cf. Sigfús Blöndal in *Skírnir* CXXIII (1949), 81.

⁵⁹ He is referred to in the annals as Brother Bergr both s.a. 1325 and 1345, *Isl. Ann.* 346, 211. Cf. e.g. the marginal notice in AM 235 fol. *Vér bróðir Ógmund með guðs náð byskup i Skálholti* (Kálund, *AM Kat.* I 197).

⁶⁰ The Hólar-inventory of 1396 lists a *Jacobi saga* and a *Karlamagnús saga*, and in 1394 the church at Reykir in Tungusveit, a few miles away in Skagafjörður, owned a *Michaels saga*; see *Dipl. Isl.* III 613, 530. Two fourteenth-century writers who are known to have made use of the *Speculum historiale*, other than Bergr Sökkason, are Árni Lárentiusson and Abbot Arngrímur, both monks of Þingeyrar; see *Dunstanus saga*, in *Icelandic Sagas II* (Rolls Series, 1887), 404, and *Guðmundar saga*, in *Bps.* II 154. It had been used in the thirteenth century by Grímur Hólmsteinnsson (died 1298), priest in the south of Iceland, in his *Jóns saga baptista*, see *Postola Sögur*, 856/5-6.

⁶¹ Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 57.

however, has nothing corresponding to it in the Latin at this point, *Kms.* 370/6-8:

Fór Karlamagnús konungr þá með spekt ok friði ok hvíldi lið sitt, en lét alla þá sem fallit höfðu flytja til heilagra staða undir bænahald kennimanna.

Chs. 27-29 in PT are devoted to an account of the sepulture of those who fell at Ronceval; most of them were buried at Arles and Bourdeaux, some at Belin, Roland himself at Blaye, and so forth. The Emperor gives great alms for their salvation, and to the church at Blaye he makes a donation of lands in return for which the canons must perform one prime duty: before the festival of those who fell at Ronceval they are to feed and clothe thirty paupers and to say *triginta psalteria, totidemque missas cum vigiliis ceterisque plenariis defunctorum obsequiis* (PT 215/21-22). The Icelandic, *lét . . . flytja til heilagra staða undir bænahald kennimanna*, suits this so well that we are probably justified in regarding it as dependent on a knowledge of these chapters in PT.

V The end of the compilation *Kms. A*

The end of the whole compilation is lacking in the defective extant manuscripts of *Kms. A* (see p. 6 above). The only source that may give an indication of what stood in them is the Danish *Karl Magnus Krønike* (abbreviated KMK),⁶² an abridgment, often textually important, based on a manuscript of the *Kms. A* redaction. There, after the story of 'Villum Cornitz', KMK 185/8 ff., it says (1) that Charles returned to Paris and was 102 years old; he fell sick and on his sick-bed asked his counsellors to accept his son 'Lodarius' as emperor, to which they all agreed. Charles lived another four years after this. There is then (2) an account of the vision seen by Turpin at the moment of the Emperor's death (cf. p. 2 above), but Turpin as the visionary has been replaced by 'sanctus

⁶² Edited by C. J. Brandt, *Romantisk Digting fra Middelalderen*, III (1877); see Aebischer, *Rol. Bor.* 67-78.

Egidius' — *han hafðe waretth keyserens skriftefader*. This is followed by (3) a brief notice of his obsequies: Archbishop Turpin and other clergy anointed the body with balsam and dressed it in splendid robes; he was buried in the church under the altar with a crown on his head and his sword nearby.

This account in KMK has been discussed in detail by Aebischer.⁶³ He thinks that section (1) may well be from the end of what he calls *La Vie romancée de Charlemagne*, the single lost source probably used, as he has demonstrated, in the first part of *Kms.* (pp. 1-49),⁶⁴ and used again to provide the basis for the text in KMK 176/4-21 and possibly KMK 176/22-180/14.⁶⁵ He points out that in that first part of *Kms.* only one son of Charlemagne is known, Löðver (*Kms.* 43/20, 46/36), and he thinks that it is this name which reappears here at the end of KMK latinised as Lodarius.⁶⁶ It cannot be said that Aebischer's hypothesis is impossible, but the evidence is slight and based to some extent on a misunderstanding. In the first place, it should be noted that, except for the son called Karlot who appears often in the story of Oddgeir danski (*Kms.* 76-125), no reference is made anywhere else in *Kms.* to Charlemagne's sons. Aebischer's argument would be stronger, if a son with some other name appeared in the compilation and if the name-form Löðver-Lodarius then appeared only in the first part and at the end of KMK in contrast to some other more common form: an argument Aebischer has effectively used in the case of the name-pair Namlun-Nemes.⁶⁷ Aebischer commits the error, however, of thinking that, because Lodarius is possibly a latinisation of Löðver, Löðver itself must be the Icelandic equivalent of Lotharius.⁶⁸ If that were so, then there would be reason to suspect a connection between the first part of

⁶³ Aebischer, *Différents états*, especially 314-19; *Studia Neophil.* especially 158-61.

⁶⁴ See his *Textes norrois*.

⁶⁵ *Différents états*, 310-14; *Studia Neophil.* 155-8.

⁶⁶ *Différents états*, 314; *Studia Neophil.* 158-9.

⁶⁷ *Différents états*, 311; *Studia Neophil.* 156.

⁶⁸ The hypothetical Lotharius of the first part he takes to be the twin-brother of Louis the Pious who is said to have died young, see *Textes norrois*, 59, *Différents états*, 314.

Kms. and the end of KMK, since they would contain in effect a common historical error, or at least a common historical perversion. But Lööver is in fact regularly used in Icelandic as the equivalent of Ludovicus and Louis, cf. e.g. *Isl. Ann.* 96, s.a. 814: *Lodovicus pius filius Karoli . . . regnavit ferme xxvij annos*, with the Icelandic version, *ibid.* 172, s.a. 815: *Löðvér hinn mildi son hans ríkti xxvij ár*.⁶⁹ The name Lotharius, on the other hand, always seems to be used in its Latin form (cf. *Isl. Ann.*, Navneregister, s.n.). The fact that Charlemagne had a son, Ludvig or Louis, who succeeded him, was however a commonplace, in Iceland as elsewhere; it is found in several of the Icelandic annals and in the *Veraldar saga*, for example, not to mention a translated text such as the *Elis saga ok Rósamundu*,⁷⁰ so that there would be nothing remarkable in his appearance as Lööver in the Icelandic text which formed the basis of KMK when an account of Charlemagne's death and the imperial succession was being given. It should be recalled too that the identification of Lodarius in KMK with Lööver in Icelandic is only an assumption: possibly the Icelandic text on which KMK depends also had Lodarius, and, of course, if that were so, all grounds for seeing a connection with the first part of the compilation and the name Lööver there would disappear.

The conclusion concerning this section (I) must then be that the evidence adduced by Aebischer is quite insufficient to show that *La Vie romancée* was the source.⁷¹ In the absence of positive evidence it is better to leave the question open. It must however be said that there is nothing corresponding to this KMK account in PT, and it is clear that the KMK-text here is unrelated to *Kms. B* (*Kms.* 553/1-19).

⁶⁹ See further the references in *Isl. Ann.*, Navneregister, s.n. Lodovicus, Lovis, and *Thomas saga erkibyskups* (Rolls Series 1875-83), Index s.n. Hlödvir, Lofuiss.

⁷⁰ See *Isl. Ann.*, Navneregister, s.n. Lodovicus pius; Jakob Benediktsson, *Veraldar saga* (1944), 71/6; *Elis saga ok Rósamundu* (ed. E. Kölbing, 1881), 207, s.n. Hlödver.

⁷¹ One may wonder further whether a source like the postulated *Vie Romancée* would have had the biblical reference to David's crowning of Solomon in his lifetime (KMK 185/14-15, cf. I Kings, 1.30-46, I Chronicles, 29.20-25). Charlemagne is often compared to David in early Latin eulogies, cf. Folz, 2 and note 5, but I do not know how popular the idea became.

Aebischer does not distinguish (2) and (3) as I have done, but the two parts do not concern the same thing and in any case they must, ultimately if not immediately, be derived from different sources. I will pass on to (3) first. Aebischer has pointed out that the source for the description of the embalming and burial of Charlemagne must have been similar in some respects to the account given in the chronicle of Ademar (Adhémard de Chabannes).⁷² So many of the striking details given by Ademar are omitted, however, that it is impossible to come to any precise conclusions as to the nature of the immediate source or the connection between that source and Ademar. There are similarities between the account in KMK and that found in *J* and *Kms. B*, but that is because *V*, the source of the two latter texts, is quoting a passage from 'Chronographus', whose description was itself related to Ademar.⁷³ There is no likeness between the account in KMK and that in PT. The possibility thus exists that this section too was derived from *La Vie romancée*, but again the evidence is lacking. An important detail, and one that can hardly have come from that postulated source, is the appearance of Turpin in KMK to conduct the Emperor's funeral. In *Kms. A* (*Kms.* 522/24-25) Turpin dies at Ronceval and it is unlikely that he would have been resuscitated so lightly in the original of that redaction. In the KMK-account of the battle, on the other hand, Turpin survives, though severely wounded (KMK 174/12-18), and it is thus possible to introduce him at the end. His escape at Ronceval is obviously the major feature which has occasioned the minor feature, his appearance at the funeral, and not the other way round, as Storm thought.⁷⁴ Aebischer infers from this and other differences between *Kms. A* and KMK that the latter is derived from a modified redaction of *Kms. A*, younger than the one we possess, and

⁷² *Différents états*, 316-7; *Studia Neophil.* 159-60; *Ademari Historiarum liber II*, in *MGH Script.* IV 118; the passage in one text of *Eginhardi abbatis annales*, quoted Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 104, col. 480, goes back to Ademar.

⁷³ *Différents états*, 316 note 80; *Studia Neophil.* 159 note 4; with references.

⁷⁴ *Sagnkredsene*, 64-65, 164.

this seems undeniably correct.⁷⁵ But this finding also emphasises the uncertainty of the investigation, for if this detail is the result of revision, what else in the KMK account may not be due to a later editor of the original compilation?

To return finally to section (2), the description of the vision. Aebischer finds a possible connection here with *La Vie romancée* in the person of Egidius.⁷⁶ He appears otherwise in *Kms.* only in the first part of the compilation, with the name Egidius once and, according to Storm and Aebischer,⁷⁷ several times with the name Gilia. Aebischer's conclusion is tentative: the name may have been introduced at some later stage in the transmission, as appears to have happened at KMK 164/4-5, where the name of Egidius replaces that of St Dionysius found in the other texts;⁷⁸ or it may be that *La Vie romancée* was the source. In that case, Aebischer would presumably regard the vision itself as being derived from this same source, but he does not say this explicitly.

It will doubtless be generally agreed that the ultimate source for the story of the vision is PT, the oldest text in which it appears (from c. 1140)⁷⁹; the vision is there attributed to Turpin. The question is whether the story came into *Kms. A*, and so into KMK, by way of an intermediate French text, *La Vie romancée*. This is possible chronologically, because Aebischer assigns the postulated French source to c. 1200,⁸⁰

⁷⁵ *Différents états*, 319-21; *Studia Neophil.* 170-71. In this modified *Kms. A* the escape of Turpin at Ronceval was possibly due to influence from PT, as Aebischer tentatively suggests, though it might also be an internal inference, perhaps from the Leoprandus-letter at the beginning of the PT-text in *Agul. A* (*Kms.* 264). It might even be due to the influence of the *Kms. B* redaction itself, for the modified redaction known to us through KMK does not seem to represent a stage between *Kms. A* and *Kms. B* in the sense that the latter was necessarily based on such a modified text: in other words, the original of KMK must be younger than the *Kms. A* version, but it does not follow that it is older than *Kms. B*. Aebischer's dating of the original of KMK, *Studia Neophil.* 172, (which would in any case have to be revised in the light of the new terminus post quem proposed p. 24 above for *Kms. B*), depends on this chronological assumption. *Kms. B* itself was not, after all, an edition that replaced *Kms. A*, since manuscripts of the latter were still being copied half a century or more after the *Kms. B* redaction was produced.

⁷⁶ *Différents états*, 317-9; *Studia Neophil.* 160-61.

⁷⁷ *Sagnkredsene*, 38; cf. Aebischer, *Textes norrois*, 65-66.

⁷⁸ *Différents états*, 318; *Studia Neophil.* 160.

⁷⁹ Cf. Folz, 225.

⁸⁰ *Studia Neophil.* 167-70.

about the time when the influence of PT was first making itself strongly felt. There is nothing in the language of the passage in KMK that points to a translation from Latin rather than French, though this is not surprising since we are dealing with a Danish abridgment of an Icelandic or Norwegian text. The Latin form 'sanctus Egidius' is of no significance, and although there are two instances of agreement in phrasing between KMK and the account of the vision in *J-Kms. B* (which was translated directly from the Latin of *V*) and one instance where the Danish text is closer to the Latin than *J-Kms. B*,⁸¹ these may still be accidental.

We should consider for a moment the appearance of the name Egidius in the first part of *Kms.* (p. 31). Charlemagne goes to confess before Egidius (*fyrir Egidio ábóta* in *Kms. B*, *for en abboth, som hetth Egedius* in KMK 11/1-2), but does not confess the sin of incest. Egidius absolves him, but while he sings mass afterwards the archangel Gabriel comes and places a document on the paten; the document reveals Charles's sin, Egidius reads it to him and he then confesses it. Gaston Paris first thought the appearance of the name Egidius pointed to a Latin source, but he later changed his mind, and other writers have argued on good grounds against the need for this supposition.⁸² They have, on the other hand, not stopped to ask whether it is likely that the Latin form Egidius would be found in a French source: a French source, moreover, which elsewhere is supposed to have used a French form of the name Gilles, rendered everywhere else in the first part of

⁸¹ Cf. KMK 185/20-21 *wij skulle fare och tage keyser Karls siell*
Kms. 553/29-31 (J 678/12-14) Vér gerumst fram . . . þess erendis at taka
sál Karlamagnús konungs

KMK 185/22-23 *faren then samme wegh igen*
Kms. 553/32 (J 678/15-16) at þær farit þessa leið apter

PT 229/17-18 (*V*, Lib. 24, cap. xxv) *Adiuero te per nomen Domini nostri*
Ihesu Christi

KMK 185/22 *ieg biwder ether wndher Jhesu Christi naffn*
Kms. 553/31-32 (J 678/14-15) Ek søeri yðr fyrir nafn hins (omitted Kms.)
hæsta guðs.

⁸² Gaston Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne* (1905), 378; idem, *La Vie de Saint Gilles* (1881), LXXVI; E. C. Jones, *Saint Gilles* (1914), 42; Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 38, 41; Aebischer, *Textes norrois*, 65-66.

Kms. by Gilia.⁸³ The answer must be that it is most improbable, both on general and particular grounds. The introduction of the form Egidius is much more likely to have been made at some stage after the French source had been translated. An adequate explanation of such a change is not far to seek: the story of St Egidius's receipt of the angelic document in connection with an unconfessed sin of Charlemagne's is found in the *Vita S. Egidii*, composed by c. 1000,⁸⁴ and it seems most likely that the person who made the substitution did not recognise the name Gilia, but did recognise the story: and changed the name accordingly.⁸⁵ It may be said that, although the Egidius and Gilia of the first part of *Kms.* were doubtless originally the same figure, there is nothing in the Icelandic text as it stands to show that they must be identified as one. The substitution is less likely to have been made by the original translator, who presumably, if he had recognised Gilia as Egidius once, would have done so more often, than by a later scribe or editor, in whom we need assume no knowledge of the French form of Egidius's

⁸³ On the French forms of the name, see G. Paris, *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, LXXIII.

⁸⁴ *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. I, 299-304; *Analecta Bollandiana* VIII (1889), 102-20; E. C. Jones, *op. cit.* 99-122; cf. Gaston Paris, *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, XLVI-XLVII; E. C. Jones, *op. cit.* 18-35. The story of the *Vita* compared with the account in *Kms.* has often been discussed, see Paris, *op. cit.* LXXV ff. and *Histoire poétique*, 378 ff.; Jones, *op. cit.* 38-45; Louis Michel, *Les Légendes Épiques Carolingiennes dans l'œuvre de Jean d'Outremeuse* (1935), 168-71.

⁸⁵ Knowledge of the legend of St Egidius may at least be safely presumed in Iceland in the thirteenth century, because the ancient (before 1214) and wealthy church at Sauðafell was dedicated to him, see Sveinn Nielsson, *Prestatal og prófesta á Íslandi* (1949-51), 159; a fragment containing part of a translation of his *Vita* is extant in AM 238 fol. XVI, from the beginning of the fifteenth century (Kålund, *AM Kat.* I 202-3). Cf. also *Hauksbók* (1892-6), 177/4, and the interesting passage in *Hrafn saga Sveinbjarnarsonar*, *Bps.* I 642, on Hrafn's pilgrimage to Saint-Gilles and his invocation of the saint (before 1200). Possibly there is a connection between the promise of one prayer fulfilled for any pilgrim to Saint-Gilles, *er mált er af alþýðu*, as it says in *Hrafn saga*, and the promise of absolution of any sin if Egidius is invoked which is supposed to have formed the conclusion of the angelic document delivered to him (see E. C. Jones, *op. cit.* 109). The cult of Egidius must have been well known in continental Scandinavia in the twelfth century, cf. for Denmark, Hans Olrik, 'En dansk pilegrimsfærd fra begyndelsen af 12. århundred', in *Historisk Tidsskrift* (Dansk), 6 Række, 3 Bind (1891), 232-5. It may be noted e.g. that the Norwegian *Strengleikar* (ed. R. Keyser and C. R. Unger, 1850), 38/25, translate a *Saint-Gile* by *tíll hins hælga Egidii*, cf. *ibid.* 107 note *ad loc.* For *Il(i)ansborg*, -*mess*a, -*vegr*, see Fritzner, *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog*, s.v.; the proper name *Ilian* is attested in Norway in the fifteenth century, see E. H. Lind, *Norsk-isländska Dopnamn* (1905-15), 621; cf. F. P. Magoun, in *Mediaeval Studies* VI (1944), 336-7. This form for *Gilles* was probably derived through German.

name.^{85a} If we thus conclude that the appearance of Egidius with that name in *La Vie romancée* or in the original translation of that source is unlikely, it becomes less probable that there is any *original* connection between this and his appearance at the end of KMK. In other words, the similarity seems more probably to have arisen in the course of the translated texts' transmission.

It is possible to propose an alternative explanation of the combination of Egidius and the vision without having recourse to *La Vie romancée*; given the paucity of texts, it is bound to be tentative.⁸⁶ Suppose the editor of *Kms. A* knew the story of the vision in PT, probably already in translation (see pp. 45 ff. below), and wished to include it at the end of his compilation, in combination with material (sections (1) and (3) above) from other unidentified sources. He could obviously not attribute the vision to Turpin whom he had left dead on the field of Ronceval, but would have to find a substitute. The Egidius who appeared once in the first part of his compilation was eminently suitable to play the part in Turpin's stead. He had been the father-confessor of the Emperor, when the sin confessed was most likely to weigh the balance against the Emperor's soul, and the confession of Charles on that occasion had been forced by means of divine agency through Egidius and on account of his merits. We might thus believe that the compiler took the vision from PT, replaced Turpin by Egidius, and made a precise reference back to his only other appearance with the words that appear in KMK as *han haffde waretth keyserens skriftefader*.

There are, it is true, omissions and simplifications in the KMK account compared with PT, but these may be readily explained, or at least tolerated, on the grounds that the former is an abridgment based on a modified *Kms. A* text. But two positive discrepancies between the two accounts, other than the name Egidius for Turpin, must be mentioned. In KMK

^{85a} Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 38, also maintains that the name 'har vistnok ikke hørt hjemme i Sagaens ældre Haandskrifter.'

⁸⁶ Cf. Storm's brief remarks, *Sagnkredsene*, 65, 164.

Egidius is sitting in *eth ærmethe hws* and he sees more than three hundred devils, while in PT (229/9-12) Turpin is in *ecclesia ante altare* and he sees *tetrorum agmina innumerabilia militum*. I see no hope of accounting for the difference in number (perhaps some original misreading of *tetrorum?*), but in the detail of the hermitage the influence of the legend of St Egidius may again be recognised: the editor of *Kms. A* might well have decided, for reasons of consistency, to put Egidius in an appropriate habitat⁸⁷ (note that KMK gives him his due title of *sanctus*). It may at any rate be pointed out that the hermitage would be equally at odds with the information given in the first part of *Kms.*, where Gilia is said to be *legatus af Rómaborg* (*Kms.* 24/5) and where Egidius is called abbot (in *Kms. B* and KMK, so it is doubtless original). His status is not otherwise defined in the first part, either as Gilia or as Egidius. The title of abbot given him there as Egidius is of course appropriate,⁸⁸ but like the name itself may well depend on a knowledge of the *Vita*. This slight discrepancy suggests, but cannot prove, that the introduction of Egidius in the first part of *Kms.* and his introduction as the visionary at the end of the compilation were not the work of the same man.

Thus, it must at least be said that it is neither impossible nor implausible that the story of the vision at the end of KMK was originally derived in *Kms.* directly from PT. It remains to be seen in the remainder of this essay whether it is possible to demonstrate the likelihood of the existence of a complete translation of PT in thirteenth-century Iceland.

⁸⁷ St Egidius, allegedly Athenian by birth, fled to France and became a hermit in a forest, nourished by a hind.

⁸⁸ According to the legend, Egidius founded a monastery on lands donated by a certain king 'Flavius', who had discovered him in his retreat; on the historical basis for this, see e.g. the summary of Gaston Paris, *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, LXXII.

Chapter Two

THE PROVENANCE AND DATE OF THE PSEUDO-TURPIN TRANSLATION

I Style and language in the translations of PT and *Aspremont*

It has generally been believed that the translations of PT and of *Aspremont* that are combined in the *saga af Agulando* in *Kms.* were made by the same man.⁸⁹ It is true that a sharp stylistic difference was noted between the two parts,⁹⁰ but this difference seems to have been considered due to the markedly different styles of the Latin and French sources. The former is on the whole a simply written work, attempting no richness of description, and the pious moralisings, where the style may become more florid, are for the most part omitted in the Icelandic text we now have. The translation of PT, best preserved in *Agul. A*, generally follows the Latin closely, and Storm especially commented on the writer's success in attaining a natural vernacular rendering.⁹¹ *Aspremont* on the other hand is in verse and the presentation is dramatic and colourful. The translation here departs much more readily from the original, abridging and paraphrasing on a much larger scale than in the PT-chapters. It has also been noted that the combination of the two sources left numerous inconsistencies unresolved (cf. p. 8 above). These differences do not in themselves prove that the two works were translated by different men and only mechanically combined, but they certainly could not be used to prove the contrary.

The sources undoubtedly had a strong influence on the style and vocabulary of the translation, and it is not easy to find

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. Unger, *Kms.* XX; Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, *Karlamagnús saga*, I, Formáli XXVI.

⁹⁰ Unger, *Kms.* XXI; van Waard, *Etudes*, 192.

⁹¹ Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 57.

points of style that can be readily contrasted in isolation from the foreign originals. There is, however, one important grammatical feature where the difference between the two parts is striking and where the influence of the sources, or its absence, confirms rather than weakens the impression of dissimilarity. This is in constructions with the present participial.

In the PT-chapters there are the following examples:

- (1) fylgjandi (*Kms.* 264/9; perambulans PT 87/9)
- (2) þiggjandi (*Kms.* 265/21; impetrantes PT 91/25)
- (3) lýsandi (*Kms.* 265/21; narrantes PT 93/1)
- (4) mælandi (*Kms.* 265/33; dicens PT 93/13)
- (5) fótgangandi menn, bísni (*Kms.* 269/17, 281/36, 281/39; pedites PT 111/21, 165/6, 10)
- (6) fótfarandi menn (*Kms.* 272/35; pedites PT 127/2)
- (7) ríðandi menn (*Kms.* 262/34, 282/9; milites, equites PT 127/2, 167/3)
- (8) ef ek verð lifandi sigraðr (*Kms.* 274/21; paraphrase of PT 133/12-13: si gens mea convincitur, ego baptismum accipiam, si vivere possum)
- (9) at úvitanda Karlamagnúsi (*Kms.* 276/18; Karolo ignorante PT 143/22)

It will be seen that where the constructions are characteristic of *den lærde Stil*, to use Nygaard's term, i.e. in the appositional use of the participle of transitive verbs in an active sense as in (1) to (4) above, and in the construction imitating the ablative absolute, (9)⁹², the Icelandic usage depends directly on the Latin source. The instances of such imitation are in fact remarkably few, considering how rich the Latin is in constructions with the present participle. The French on the other hand makes comparatively rare use of such constructions, but the Icelandic text from *Aspremont* reveals a very different state of affairs from that found in the PT-chapters. Here are a few examples drawn from ten pages or so of the *Aspremont*-translation:

- (1) En ef hann er lengi lifandi, þá vinnr hann at vísu ríki Karlamagnús konungs nema almáttigr guð sé hann styðjandi (*Kms.* 291/28-30)

⁹² M. Nygaard, *Norron Syntax* (1906), 240-41, 238.

- Se rois Eaumons puet vivre longuement,
 Soie estra France, se Dex ne l'en desfent (*Aspremont* 4758-9)
- (2) ok 2 þúsundir váru fyrir ríðandi konungs fylking (*Kms.* 295/5-6)
- (3) ef hann væri á himna guð trúandi (*Kms.* 295/20-21)
- (4) þér þekkiligri var engi maðr mér þjónandi (*Kms.* 295/25)
 onques nul homme mieuz autre ne serui⁹³
- (5) ok verum honum ömbunandi þat er hann var oss skipandi
 (better: skapandi; *Kms.* 296/21-22)
 Il n'i a plus a Deu nos comandon,
 Qui nos forma, qant nos nen estion (*Aspremont* 5023-4)
- (6) Herra Girarð at komanda höfuðmerkinu heiðingja (*Kms.*
 297/25-6; cf. *Aspremont* 5076 ff.)
- (7) Maðr mun svá lengi vilja höfðingja sínum fylgja, at hann sé
 bæði tapandi sér ok honum (*Kms.* 297/35-36)
 Tant puet li hon son seignor cier tenir
 Que il i pert, qant vient al departir (*Aspremont* 5111-12)
- (8) hann var miklu ríki valdandi (*Kms.* 299/30-31)
 Savies om fu et de grant riceté (*Aspremont* 6582)

Examples (2) and (3) above have nothing corresponding to them in the available French texts, but they occur in a passage which translates a *laisse* in *-ant* (*Aspremont* 4866-4926)⁹⁴ and might be directly attributed to that: it can be seen elsewhere that such *laisses* have influenced the translator in his use of the present participle.⁹⁵ But in the other examples, and in numerous others elsewhere in the text, there can be no question of the source's influence. This predicative use of the present participle of transitive verbs in an active sense belongs almost exclusively to *den lærde Stil*,⁹⁶ and it is not paralleled by anything in the PT-chapters. It seems unlikely that a man

⁹³ This line is not in the manuscript published by Brandin, cf. *Aspremont* 4929 ff., but is found in the Berlin manuscript, Gall. 48, see Bekker, *Der Roman von Aspremont* (Phil. und hist. Abhandlungen der Kön. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, 1847), 28.

⁹⁴ Cf. with example (3) *Aspremont* 4925: Karles le vit, qui bien ert Deu creant.

⁹⁵ Cf. especially *Kms.* 338/23-4, 339/8-10, 350/2-3 with *Aspremont* 8000-01, 8049-53, 8737-9. The examples quoted above are from part of the text supplied by manuscript A, but similar examples are of course to be found in the later part of the text from A; cf. e.g. examples (not prompted by the French) at *Kms.* 323/20, 326/23-24, 332/23, 333/8, 354/23-24, 354/32 (cf. *Aspremont* 7021, 7217-8, 7552, 7593, 9579 ff., 9591).

⁹⁶ Nygaard, *op. cit.* 241-2. It is noteworthy that the author of *Agul. B* only makes use of similar constructions thrice (*Kms.* 201/18, 242/25, 255/11, in no case repeating an instance from *Agul. A*), although he commonly uses the pres. part. appositionally and the pres. part. of transitive verbs predicatively with *vera* in a passive sense (Nygaard, *op. cit.* 244-6).

who used the present participle in such restrained measure when translating from Latin, and then demonstrably subject to the influence of his original, should, when translating from French, make a new and unnatural use of the participle when in many cases nothing can be found in his source to warrant it. The most reasonable conclusion is that the two translations are not by the same man.

Numerous other differences in vocabulary and syntax may be detected between the two parts, but they are less suitable for comparison for the reason stated earlier. I might note in passing the absence from the PT-text of the comparative and superlative adjective, *vildri*, *vildastr*, favourite words in the *Aspremont*-translation (they occur 12 times in the first 10 pages of the *Aspremont*-text, *Kms.* 283-92). They mean as a rule no more than *betri*, *beztr*, and they could have equally well been used in the earlier part of the saga as in the later.

Any close study of the orthography of manuscript *A* of the *saga af Agulando* is impossible from Unger's more-or-less normalised edition, but in two points, where we may be confident he has not altered the forms of the manuscript, there are interesting discrepancies between the chapters from PT and those from *Aspremont*.⁹⁷ The first concerns the form of the definite article. In the PT-text, *Kms.* 264-280/7, forms in *h-* make up only 4-5% of the total number, while in the following text of the *Aspremont*-translation, after the lacunæ, i.e. *Kms.* 290/11-293/16, 302/30-334, forms in *h-* make up about 75% of the total number. Thereafter the forms in *h-* show a marked decline and in *Kms.* 334-369 (disregarding the final chapter, cf. p. 26 above), they average 17-18%, while in no part of the *Aspremont*-text comparable in length with the PT-chapters does the figure fall below 10-11%.⁹⁸ This must reflect the work of different scribes, perhaps at different stages in the text's transmission, but the low figure for the PT-

⁹⁷ I have only drawn on manuscript *A* for the study of the article and of the prepositions.

⁹⁸ The figures are: *Kms.* 264-80: 42:2; *Kms.* 290-93, 302-34: 35: 104; *Kms.* 334-69: 130:28 (figures for forms in *h-* given second).

chapters compared with the high figure immediately following is suggestive. Unfortunately, however, the first lacuna in manuscript *A* makes it impossible to see whether the marked change came precisely at the end of the PT-chapters or not.

The other linguistic feature is more conclusive. In the PT-chapters preposition *of* occurs, while in the version of *Aspremont* it is not found; nor indeed have I noticed it anywhere else in the whole *Kms.* I give a list of the occurrences of prep. *of* and *um* to be found in the PT-chapters in *Agul. A* (in manuscript *a*, to judge from Unger's textual notes, which are admittedly inadequate, *of* has been sometimes, but by no means invariably, replaced by *um*):

- fór . . . of Hispaniam (*Kms.* 264/10)
- of morgininn (*Kms.* 268/10)
- of daginn (*Kms.* 269/5 and 269/6)
- flýði Agulandus . . . út of inar lægstu smáttur staðarins (*Kms.* 270/34)
- of daginn (*Kms.* 271/10 and 271/11)
- Agulandus . . . flýði nú undan of Portos Sephareos (*Kms.* 271/22)
- of morgininn (*Kms.* 274/32 and 278/11)
- mik má hvergi særa nema of nafnann (*Kms.* 278/29)
- um nætr (*Kms.* 265/1)
- sat um þessa borg (*Kms.* 266/27)
- svá er búit um sjálfa líkneskjuna (*Kms.* 267/10)
- sátu um staðinn (*Kms.* 270/30)
- um kveldit (*Kms.* 271/6)
- um morguninn (*Kms.* 271/9)
- um stöðir (*Kms.* 271/18)
- fór . . . út um Portos cisereos (*Kms.* 273/4)
- um morgininn (*Kms.* 275/32)
- kringdi um þá (*Kms.* 276/5)
- um höku (*a*, háls *A*; *Kms.* 277/36; = per mentum, PT 151/3)

From this list it can be seen that the examples of *of* are widely distributed and not restricted to any stereotyped usage. It does not occur except in phrases of time and place, but apart from the instance at 267/10 the same is true of *um*. The use of prep. *of* is distinctively Icelandic: here in sixteen pages of text we have nearly three times the number of instances to be found in all the oldest Norwegian manuscripts (down to c. 1250)

put together.⁹⁹ The inference must be that the PT-chapters were translated in Iceland, unlike *Aspremont*, which much in the language suggests must have been translated in Norway.

Prep. *of* is not only a distinctively Icelandic form, it is also a sign of early origin. In the PT-chapters half of the prepositional forms are *of*, and if we disregard the cases where it is likely that *um* was always preferred,¹⁰⁰ particularly for the translation of *circa*, Kms. 266/27, 270/30, and possibly in *kringdi um þá*, 276/5, the percentage of *of* rises to about 58. I have shown elsewhere that *of* in such large measure is likely to occur only in texts written in the earlier part of the thirteenth century.¹⁰¹ When we consider the date of the manuscript in which these *of*-forms occur (c. 1400) and the fact that its text must have passed through the hands of more than one scribe for whom it would have been natural to replace *of* by *um*, it seems likely that *of* was originally the regular form in the PT-translation. It should then be assigned to a date fairly near the beginning of the thirteenth century. No one knows the date of the translation of *Aspremont*, but few people, I think, would be willing to ascribe it to such an early period.

II Loan-words in the PT-translation

Against such an early dating as that just proposed for the PT-translation might be urged the words of foreign origin found in the text. Some brief consideration must be given to such words here, although their study is beset with many difficulties. First, we are more or less at the mercy of the lexicographers, who are generally more concerned with defining meaning than recording every instance of a word's occurrence. Second, we must recall that the PT-translation is a text that has passed through the hands of a compiler. And third, it must be observed that where such words occur in the *Agul. A*

⁹⁹ Anne Holtsmark, *Orðforráðet í de eldste norske Håndskrifter til ca. 1250* (1955), s.v. *of*.

¹⁰⁰ Peter Foote, 'Notes on the Prepositions *of* and *um*(b) in Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian Prose', *Studia Islandica* 14 (1955), 52.

¹⁰¹ *ibid.* 78-9.

manuscripts but their use is not confirmed by *J* or *Agul. B*, we can not even be sure that they were to be found in the original compiled text of the *saga af Agulando*, much less in the original PT-translation.

Words of foreign origin are comparatively numerous, but the majority of them are attested elsewhere in Icelandic and Norwegian texts that have their origin in the first half of the thirteenth century, and these cause no difficulty.¹⁰² The same is true of words that are lifted bodily from the Latin source; these are sometimes but not always given a vernacular form.¹⁰³ Some words of English or English-Latin origin are likely to have been borrowed earlier than the thirteenth century,¹⁰⁴ and some more 'learned' words, although not attested in early sources, could perhaps have been borrowed at any time.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Many of them are ecclesiastical: *predika*, *postuli*, *kapella* (cf. note 43, p. 19 above), *pílagrimsfærð*, *djöfull*, *musteri*, *kanoki*, *regla*, *kirkja*, *klaustr*, *rita*, *sál*, *skríptaðr*, *húslaðr*, *ölmosa*, *pálm*, *blezan*, *byskup*, *munkr*, *klerkr*, *abóti*, *nón*, *kross*. Others are: *keisari*, *herra*, *hertugi*, *riddari*, *skillingar*, *peningar*, *león*, *míla*, *kastali*, *prís*, *stétt*, *byrja*, *glafel* (cf. *Laxdæla saga*, ch. 77), *dúkr*, *kurteiss*, *náttúra*, *harpa*; *latín* does not seem to be found in early writings, but as a technical-commercial word it cannot be counted to any distinct period. On all these words see Anne Holtzmark, *op. cit.*, L. Larsson, *Orðförráðet i de älsta isländska Handskrifterna* (1891), Fritznér, *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog* (1883-96), F. Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter des Altwestnordischen* (Palaestra LXXXV, 1909).

¹⁰³ *diskórda* (for pass. *discordasse*), *paradísium*, *kastrum*, *kantilena*, *prefectus*, *kóróna*, *persóni*. The use of the vb. *studera*, *Kms.* 265/2, depends on the Latin PT 91/5, *Cui hæc summo studio cogitanti*; it is used again in the form *studia*, *Kms.* 279/37, but is not otherwise attested in early sources. It may be noted that forms like *studia*, *diskórda* are thought to be earlier than forms in *-era*, though they cannot indicate any precise period; see D. A. Seip, *Norsk Språkhistorie til omkr. 1370* (1955), 208. Other such words take on a romance look, *marchisar* (for *marquisii*), *prínz* (for *princeps*), and it is interesting to note that the translator, or the editor of *Kms. A*, used the 'French' form *Sendíne* in the phrase: *á þeim annál er liggir í staðnum Sendíne*, *Kms.* 264/12-13, 127/21; cf. PT 87/13: *sancti Dionisii cronica*. A form of Denis without the radical *-s* is extremely rare in Old French, but it is hard to decide on what its absence here depends: textual corruption, radical *-s* regarded as the nominative ending, a desire to give the word the appearance of an Icelandic dative? I am grateful to Professor B. Woledge, University College London, for the comment on the French form.

¹⁰⁴ *kempa*, *port* (cf. Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter*, 48-9).

¹⁰⁵ *annáll*; *prófa* is thought to be from OE *profian* (Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter*, 49), but does not seem to occur early, unless its use in *Hungvaka* (Jón Helgason, *Byskupa sögur* (1938), 97/12) is original (work from c. 1210, manuscript seventeenth century); cf. also *Eyrbyggja saga* (ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, *Íslensk Fornrit* IV, 1935), 27 (ch. 15), and *Formáli*, LI, where the editor finds the use of the word not necessarily incompatible with a date of origin between 1200 and 1245; *undirstanda* makes a late impression, but is probably from OE *understandan*, and occurs in a number of translated romances from before 1250, see Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter*, 2, 153. Its use in *Agul. A* is probably not original: it occurs there in a paraphrase and the vb. used in *Agul. B* is *heyra*; cf. *Kms.* 270/2, 150/13, PT 115/9-10.

Three rare words call for some further comment. They are *amendasnot* (*Kms.* 279/22, not in *Agul. B*; for *amigdala*, PT 155/25; first element French, the origin of the -s uncertain); *tabur* (from Latin, Low German or French?); and *banel* (French in origin; via Low German?).¹⁰⁶ Their French origin and their possible importation via Low German would suggest a date later than the first quarter or so of the thirteenth century, but on the other hand their rarity makes it difficult to argue in favour of any particular date on such general grounds. One might indeed suggest that a compound like *amendasnot*, which is apparently unique, was used because there was as yet no generally accepted word for 'almond', which would in turn suggest an earlier rather than a later period: before the introduction of forms like *almandr*, *alemandel*, probably from middle English,¹⁰⁷ and the final adoption of the German *mandel* (mod. Icelandic *mandla*).

According to the dictionaries the word *tabur* occurs only in the *saga af Agulando*, but there is at least one further instance in *Kms.* 502/24, where it is taken straight from the French of *Roland*, line 852.¹⁰⁸ In the PT-chapters in *Agul. A* it has the form *tabur* and translates *timpāna* (*Kms.* 281/41 (*Agul. B*, *Kms.* 157/18), 282/12, 16; PT 165/12, 167/6). In the *Aspremont*-chapters it has the form *tabor* (*Kms.* 288/36, 37 (*Agul. B*, *Kms.* 180/33), 305/5, 344/7); in the first instance it is taken straight from the poem (*Aspremont* 4415), though this

¹⁰⁶ Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter*, 77 (cf. 87), 163; 83, 162; 65, 162. *banel* is from French *banere*, *banière*. I have not found a form in -el in any dictionary, and the only possible parallel in Old Scandinavian is *manel* (ultimately from *manière*, so Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter*, 84, apparently with some doubts). The consonants *l*, *n*, *r* were notoriously unstable in Old French and Anglo-Norman (see R. E. Zachrisson, *Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-names* (1909), 120-36), and the word may have been borrowed (orally) in this form. Some of the rhymes quoted by L. E. Menger, *The Anglo-Norman Dialect* (1904), 87 (e.g. *nature: nule: contraire; bataille; itel: mer*), seem to provide close parallels. It is not of course certain that a form in -el was used in the original PT-translation. Change of *r* to *l* is known in Norwegian (native words and loanwords), but in them the dissimilatory cause is obvious, see A. Noreen, *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik* (1923), § 253.2.

¹⁰⁷ Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter*, 87.

¹⁰⁸ I discount its appearance in *Rémundar saga* (ed. S. G. Broberg, 1909-12), 244/6-8: *Var nú blásit . . . bæði með hornum ok lúðrum, bumbum ok tabúrum*, since this probably depends directly on the *saga af Agulando* (known to the author of *Rémundar saga* in the *Kms.* A version, see *ibid.* LIII), cf. *Kms.* 288/35-6: *þeir blésu lúðrum ok hornum, trumbum ok taborum*.

is not the only time the word occurs there; in three of the four instances it is coupled with the word *trumba*, as it is also at *Kms.* 502/24, so that the phrase has all the appearance of a fixed alliterative formula in these translations from French sources. The difference between the spellings in the PT-translation (the usual Latin form) and that in the *Aspremont*-translation is worth noting, but naturally proves nothing. An interesting point that must be made, however, is that *tabur* in the PT-context is a much more 'authentic' word than *timpana*. *Ta(m)bur* is of Arabic origin and was used of musical instruments employed by the Moors in warfare; cf. especially this quotation from 1212: *Personantibus igitur valide instrumentis Maurorum, quae Hispani appellant Tambures, figunt gressus Saraceni*¹⁰⁹ (cf. PT 165/11-12: *tenentesque singuli singulas timpanas, quæ manibus fortiter percuciebant*). In the PT-episode a military stratagem of the Moors is described, so the word *tabur* suits the context admirably. It is possible that the alteration of *timpana* to *tabur* had already been made in the PT-text used for the translation, although it is not found in any of the available texts. The word may have been introduced by the man who first joined PT and *Aspremont*. On the other hand, however, the possibility that this piece of information, doubtless by about 1200 a commonplace to the crusading soldier, was known to the original translator of PT, cannot under the prevailing circumstances be rejected (cf. pp. 49-50 below).

It is not so easy to see why the word *banel* should have been used to translate *vexillum* (*Kms.* 282/18 (*Agul. B.*, *Kms.* 158/15), PT 167/14), when the native *merki* was to hand (cf. *merkistöng*, *Kms.* 282/18, 23, for the pole of this same *banel*). The word does not occur again in the saga, where in the *Aspremont*-chapters *höfuðmerki* is the usual word for *estandart* (cf. *Kms.* 297-300 and *Aspremont* 5043-5131, where the words often occur). It seems to be otherwise attested only in considerably

¹⁰⁹ Du Cange, *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis*, s.v. *tabur*, and see rest of article there.

later texts: once in Norwegian, in a document from 1323 (*vndir namfne ok bonele konongs vars*),¹¹⁰ once in the form *baniel* in old Swedish in a manuscript from the first half of the fifteenth century,¹¹¹ and once again in Icelandic as a variant (to *banenum*) in a manuscript of the fifteenth-century *Landrésrimur*.^{111a} It is unlikely that the word was introduced in the PT-translation by the man who compiled the *saga af Agulando*, since he might then be reasonably expected to have used it elsewhere. There seems no reason, however, why the word 'banner' should not have been known and used in Scandinavia in the early thirteenth century. As a technical term it has a military and feudal background, aspects of western life with which the Scandinavians early became familiar, not least through the crusades themselves (cf. pp. 49-50 below), and by the beginning of the thirteenth century the banner proper was becoming common.¹¹² The writer may indeed have wished to emphasise that the standard was of the banner-type, a square or rectangular flag flown from the side of the staff, distinct from the older and better-known standards of the gonfanon-type, with tails or streamers, or the labarum-type, flown from a cross-bar.¹¹³ Why he should wish to do so must remain obscure, but it is tempting to think that it was because he knew that the Moors used such standards — as it appears in fact that they did.¹¹⁴

One word remains in the PT-text which undoubtedly points to a date after the middle of the thirteenth century, but it may, I think, be safely dismissed as a later insertion: it is peculiar to the *A*-manuscripts, and it may be said again that, if the PT-translation is from say 1220-30, then some 150-175

¹¹⁰ *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, VII 117/24.

¹¹¹ K. F. Söderwall, *Ordbok öfver Svenska Medeltids-Språket* (1884-1918), s.v.

^{111a} *Landrésrimur* IV 17, see Finnur Jónsson, *Rímnasafn* (1905-22), 427; idem, *Litt. Hist.* III 53 (the *rimur* 'næppe yngre end 1450') and similarly Björn K. Þórolfsson, *Rímur fyrir* 1600 (1934), 289-90, 390-93.

¹¹² Cf. *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon for nordisk Middelalder* I (1956), s.v. *Baner*, especially col. 335. Its first use recorded in *NED* is c. 1230.

¹¹³ On medieval standards, see L. Arntz, 'Mittelalterliche Feldzeichen', *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst*, 28 (1915), 165-80.

¹¹⁴ Cf. the illustrations following pp. 40, 116, 126, 130, in Rodrigo Amador de los Rios, *Trofeos militares de la Reconquista* (1893).

years elapsed before the manuscripts we have of it were written. The word is *æfintýr*, *Kms.* 269/8:

Deir undruðu þetta æfintýr ok eignuðu guði þenna atburð,

which translates PT III/9-10:

et ultra quam dici fas est admirantes, tantumque Dei miraculum gratiæ divinæ adscribentes.

The word thus occurs in a paraphrase without any corresponding term in the original; neither is it found in *Agul. B*, where the sentence, insofar as it is closer to the Latin, must represent the original text more closely than *Agul. A*; thus, *Kms.* 148/2-3:

En allir er þenna atburð sá, undraðust mjök ok eignuðu þetta guðligri miskunn.

It is consequently not difficult to believe that the word *æfintýr* was not used in the original text.

From this discussion it appears that any case brought against the early dating of the PT-translation based on the evidence of the loan-words in that text must be dismissed with at least a verdict of non-proven.

III The place of *Kms. A* in the development of the *Kms.*-compilation

If we thus conclude that PT and *Aspremont* were not translated by the same man, and not even in the same country or in the same period, it follows as a matter of course that PT was not translated specifically for inclusion in *Kms.* or for combination with the French poem. We have to think of the original Icelandic text as an independent version of the chronicle, and it is natural to assume that the whole work was put into Icelandic. The appearance of preposition *of* in the PT-chapters strongly suggests that this part of the text had never passed through a Norwegian stage of transmission, and the natural conclusion is that the *Kms. A* version we have

represents an Icelandic modification of an earlier *Kms.* compilation in which no translation of PT was used. It is then likely that *Aspremont* appeared more or less complete in that earlier compilation — an assumption supported by the present state of that text, where some knowledge of the part lacking at the beginning is presupposed and where there are indications that the part omitted at the end was also known.¹¹⁵ The editor of *Kms. A* replaced the earlier part of the *Aspremont*-translation with the opening chapters of the PT-translation and based the conclusion of the *saga af Agulando* on another part of the PT-text (it was presumably he who was responsible for the abridgment of the end of *Aspremont*); possibly, too, he used the story of Turpin's vision from PT to embellish the end of the whole compilation. His preference for PT over *Aspremont* cannot be certainly explained, but probably it was because the chronicle, for all its comparative brevity, covered a wider field and introduced more of 'historical' interest than the poem, whose earlier part is largely concerned with the embassies of Balan and Naimés. On the other hand, the struggle with Agolandus and the story of Ronceval were told in much greater detail in the translations of the French poems and they were naturally preferred in their turn. The combination of PT and *Aspremont* was done mechanically enough,¹¹⁶ but clearly the editor of *Kms. A* was not like the editor of *Kms. B*: he cared less about inconsistencies between the parts of the work, nor did he apparently have such respect for Turpin's authority that he was willing to undertake the laborious task of 'revising' the narrative of the French poems in the light of the chronicle.

Aebischer has distinguished four stages in the development of the *Kms.*¹¹⁷: (1) the translation of the lost *Vie romancée de Charlemagne*, now imperfectly represented by the first part of *Kms.*; (2) the version in *Kms. A*; (3) a modified *Kms. A* version represented by the Danish KMK; and (4) the version in

¹¹⁵ Cf. Storm, *Sagnkredsene*, 56; van Waard, *Etudes*, 192-3, 215.

¹¹⁶ Cf. the way in which the reader is suddenly surprised by: *Nú lýkr hér hinna fjórðu bóka*, *Kms.* 293/15, the first reference to any division into books.

¹¹⁷ *Différents états*, 319-21; *Studia Neophil.* 171-2; cf. note 75, p. 30 above.

Kms. B. The scheme must now be expanded to include a fifth stage, between (1) and (2), a stage represented by a compilation where *Aspremont* probably appeared whole and where the end of the *saga af Agulando* and possibly the end of the whole work had a different form. It may well have differed from the present *Kms. A* in other respects as well, but, at any rate, it seems certain that the Icelandic editor who introduced the PT-material was an editor rather than a compiler and was working on a collection of texts, presumably gathered together in Norway, much the same as is now found in *Kms. A*.¹¹⁸

The precise date of origin of the present *Kms. A* version remains unknown. It has generally been assigned to c. 1250-75 or earlier (see p. 7 above). A date about the middle of the century would not be inappropriate for the compilation on which *Kms. A* is based and may serve as a terminus a quo. The downward limit is set by the date of the second group of Riksarkiv fragments (see p. 5 above), assigned to the beginning of the fourteenth century (they contain bits of the *Aspremont*-translation in a text close to that of manuscript *a*, and presumably contained the PT-chapters), and further by the date of the *Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jacobs*, which may be as old as c. 1300 (cf. note 37, p. 16 above) and must at any rate be older than *Kms. B*, itself not earlier than c. 1320 and possibly from 1330-40.¹¹⁹ The limits remain comparatively wide, but it is

¹¹⁸ Although the French texts were translated in Norway, there is no certainty that they were there collected into the compilation we know through *Kms. A*, probable though it is. The Norwegian fragments of the *Þáttur af Runzivals bardaga* from the latter half of the thirteenth century (cf. p. 5 above) do not of course prove the existence of the whole compilation, and their date cannot properly be used as a terminus ante quem for the whole compilation. Some of the translated texts may well have led a separate existence, either alone or in smaller collections. It is worth noting that the Swedish translation, *Karl Magnus* (on which see Aebischer, *Rol. Bor.* 59 ff.) contains only two branches from *Kms.* Aebischer's belief (*Studia Neophil.* 172) 'que plusieurs traducteurs ont travaillé en même temps, chacun sur un ou plusieurs récits et sous une direction unique' raises many difficulties. (D. A. Seip, *Palæografi* (1954), 66, says of the Riksarkiv fragments of the *Þáttur af Runzivals bardaga*: 'Der er visstnok isl. mellomledd mellom norsk original og denne avskr.' If this is so, it suggests a rather curious state of affairs, but the likelihood that the fragments are from a codex containing the whole *Kms.* compilation would perhaps be thereby strengthened.)

¹¹⁹ The fact that *Kms. A* does not include the *saga af frú Olíaf*, translated soon after 1287 (see p. 7 above), might suggest that it dates from before that time. It is however impossible to say how long that text took to reach Iceland or how long it might have taken the editor of *Kms. A* to obtain a copy.

to be hoped that detailed work on other parts of the compilation will be able to provide a more precise estimate.

IV The background of the PT-translation

In conclusion it may be worth considering briefly how well such a work as PT accords with what we know of the general historical setting and the literary background in the period c. 1190-1220.¹²⁰ Interest in Charlemagne would seem to go back at least to the birth of King Magnús Ólafsson, although Snorri's story of the derivation of his name may as well be the inference of a later period or his own.¹²¹ The influence of legends about the great Emperor can be seen in the Norwegian *Ágrip*, from about 1190, where in the Snjófríðr-episode a story told of Charlemagne has been adapted to the history of Haraldr hárfagri,¹²² and in the *Rauðs þáttr*, from about 1200, where there is an analogue of the story of the wonderful hall and the boasts told in *Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*.¹²³ Interest in geography and the pilgrim-routes is shown in the twelfth-century *Veraldar saga* and in Abbot Nikulás's *Leiðarvísir*, from c. 1150, and the voyages of Sigurðr Jórsalafari and Earl Rögnvaldr kali were not forgotten.¹²⁴ The earliest written accounts of their expeditions (apart from *Hryggjarstykki* in the case of King Sigurðr) are from this period.¹²⁵ It has been suggested that the *Historia de projectione Danorum in Hierosolymam* was addressed to Karl Jónsson, abbot of Þingeyrar (died 1212 or 1213), although it is true that this history is more interested in the visit of the Danish crusaders

¹²⁰ Cf. especially Sigurður Nordal, *Litteraturhistorie* (Nordisk Kultur VIII:B, 1953), 207-8.

¹²¹ *Óláfs saga helga*, ch. 122, in Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson, *Heimskringla* II (1945), 209 ff.

¹²² See Jan de Vries, 'Het Snjófríðlied van Harald Schoonhaar', in *De Libris: Bibliofiele Brevet til Ejnar Munksgaard* (1940), 165-72.

¹²³ See J. Turville-Petre, *The Story of Rauð and his Sons* (Viking Society, 1947), 6-7.

¹²⁴ On Scandinavian piratical attacks on the Spanish coast in the early twelfth century, see P. Riant, *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte* (1865), 74, 237-8.

¹²⁵ Finnur Jónsson, *Ágrip* (Altnord. Saga-Bibliothek 18, 1929), 50-51; *Morkinskinna* (1928-32), 338 ff.; *Fagrskinna* (1902-3), 328 ff.; Sigurður Nordal, *Orkneyinga saga* (1913-16), 230 ff.

to Norway in 1191 than in the details of their further journey.¹²⁶ Numerous pilgrimages abroad were made by Icelanders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries¹²⁷ and, although Rome was most frequently visited, the one early pilgrimage to Compostella that we know of was made precisely in this period, when shortly before 1200 Hrafn Sveinbjarnarson *fór . . . vestr til Jacobs*.¹²⁸ The cult of St James, the patron of pilgrims, must have been well known in Iceland as elsewhere, though he has a place in the dedications of only four known medieval Icelandic churches (his brother St John occurs in twenty-eight).¹²⁹ Even so, he is by no means at the bottom of the list, and his cult did not gain real momentum in northern Europe until the twelfth century. Two early manuscripts, from the first half of the thirteenth century, contain the independent *Jacobs saga*.¹³⁰

It is in this same thirty years or so that the Scandinavians as a whole were most closely involved in the crusades against the Saracens. Danes fought the Moors in Portugal in 1189 and 1197,¹³¹ while the defeat of Alfonso VIII of Castile by the

¹²⁶ L. Holm-Olsen, 'Ulv fra Lauvnes og skriftet om de danske korsfarere', *Historisk Tidsskrift (Norsk)* 35 (1949-51), 459-83.

¹²⁷ See Bogi Th. Melsted, *Ferðir, siglingar og samgöngur (Safn til sögu Íslands IV, 1907-15)*, 585 ff.; Einar Arnórsson, 'Suðurgöngur Íslendinga í fornöld', *Saga* II 1 (1954), 1-45.

¹²⁸ *Bps.* I 642; cf. *ibid.* 668. Cf. the name *Jakobsland* for Galicia, first recorded in Einarr Skúlason's *Sigurðardrápa* (before 1130), see Finnur Jónsson, *Den norsk-isl. Skjaldedigtning* (1912-15), A I 455; other references in Fritzner, *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog*, s.v. For pilgrimages to Compostella from Iceland in the later middle ages, see e.g. *Isl. Ann.* 356 (s.a. 1354), and Bogi Benediktsson, *Sýslumannæfir* II (1889-1904), 158. On Danish pilgrimages to Compostella in the late twelfth century, see Riant, *op. cit.* 299, 301. Cf. further the verse of a hymn ascribed to Bishop Fulbert of Chartres found in the *Liber Sancti Jacobi* (p. 194): Armeni, Greci, Apuli, / Angli, Galli, Daci, Frisi, / Cuncte gentes, lingue, tribus / Illuc pergunt muneribus. On pilgrimages to Compostella generally, see Yves Renouard, 'Le pèlerinage à Saint-Jacques de Compostelle et son importance dans le monde médiéval', *Revue historique* CCVI (1951), 254-61, and E. R. Labande, 'Recherches sur les pèlerins dans l'Europe des XIe et XIIe siècles', *Cahiers de Civilisation médiévale* I (1958), 156-69, 339-47.

¹²⁹ Guðbrandur Jónsson, *Dómkirkjan á Hólum (Safn til sögu Íslands V, 1915-29)*, 57. The first use of Jacob as a personal name in Iceland also occurs in the second half of the twelfth century; in Norway it does not occur until later, chiefly in the fourteenth century; see E. H. Lind, *Norsk-isländska Dopnamn* (1905-15), 613-14, and Björn Sigfússon, 'Tökunöfn', *Afmæliskevæðja til Alexanders Jóhannessonar* (1953), 45. Björn's suggestion that the name in Iceland may owe more to the Swedish king, Jakob Ólafsson, than to the saint seems unlikely; the king was in any case more often known by the name Önundr, see e.g. *Óláfs saga helga*, ch. 94 (*ed. cit.* p. 156).

¹³⁰ AM 645 4to, 655 4to, XII-XIII (Kálund, *AM. Kat.* II 51, 61).

¹³¹ A. Fabricius, 'Korstøge fra Norden til den spanske Halvø', *Aarbøger*, 1900, 30-36.

Almohades at Alarcos in 1195 roused western Christendom to the renewed dangers of pagan conquest in Europe itself. When Pope Innocent III preached the Fifth Crusade at the Lateran Council of 1215 (the promises of indulgence to crusaders and those who assisted them have familiar echoes in PT¹³²), there was a ready response in Norway, where King Ingi took the cross, though he died in 1217 before he could set out.¹³³ *Hófr Jórsalaferð hin mikla*, say the Icelandic annals under that year,¹³⁴ and there can be little doubt but that it was great news everywhere in the north, however 'paltry' the Norwegian effort may have appeared elsewhere.¹³⁵ A contingent of the Norwegians who did set out then stayed fighting in Spain and Portugal with some of the Frisian and German fleet with which they sailed¹³⁶; en route they visited Compostella, as the Danish and Norwegian crusaders had done in 1189.¹³⁷

If we turn from this crusading atmosphere to the earliest known works of popular edification in Icelandic, we find the *Elucidarius* and the *Physiologus*, both extant in manuscripts from about 1200. (I do not suggest, of course, that these works were unknown in Norway at the same time, but whether they existed in the vernacular there is uncertain). Parts of PT, especially the Ferracutus-episode, have marked affinities with these works, with their presentation of elementary orthodox theology illustrated by examples from 'natural science',¹³⁸ and in some respects the Icelandic version of PT may be compared with the *Elucidarius* in its efforts to achieve a plain vernacular style.¹³⁹ It may be noted further that PT itself achieved its greatest vogue in Europe in just this

¹³² Cf. C.-J. Héfélé, *Histoire des Conciles* V 2 (1913), 1394-5, especially with PT ch. 30.

¹³³ Fabricius, *loc. cit.* 36 ff.

¹³⁴ See e.g. *Isl. Ann.* 125.

¹³⁵ S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* III (1954), 146.

¹³⁶ Fabricius, *loc. cit.* 40, 42-7.

¹³⁷ *ibid.* 33, 39.

¹³⁸ Cf. e.g. *Elucidarius* (Jón Helgason, *The Arna-Magnaean Manuscript* 674 A, 4to; *Manuscripta Islandica*, Vol. 4, 1957), fol. 2r: *Svd sem þú sér þrenning í sólu, þat es eldr ok hiti ok ljós*, with PT 157/2-3: *In sole tria sunt, candor, splendor et calor, et tamen unus sol est*; both illustrations of the Trinity.

¹³⁹ On the style of the *Elucidarius*, see G. Turville-Petre, *Origins of Icelandic Literature* (1953), 139-40; Jón Helgason, *op. cit.* XXIV ff.

same period; all its various versions were made shortly before or shortly after 1200 (cf. pp. 2-3 above), and its translation into the vernacular was just beginning: the earliest French (or Anglo-Norman) translations — there are six of them — all date from the period c. 1200-1220.¹⁴⁰ The foreign connections attested by the studies in France and England of Bishops Þorlákr and Páll of Skálholt in a slightly earlier period may well have significance here.¹⁴¹

The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle had something for everyone. It introduced the famous Emperor and his champions; it took the readers to foreign parts and the shrine of St James; it told of crusading warfare, with visions of divine intervention, and it promised absolution to those who took the cross; it provided Christian moral instruction in the exemplum of Romaricus (PT ch. 7) and in the story of Agolandus and the paupers (PT ch. 13) — here even at Charlemagne's expense; in the Ferracutus-episode it provided a giant whose Achilles' heel was his navel and whom Roland can batter with theology as well as with weapons; it told the heroic tale of Ronceval, more stirring than most accounts of martyrdom.

Such a text was likely to find a ready audience in Iceland in the early years of the thirteenth century with such a literary and historical background as that sketched above. In no other period would a translation of the Chronicle have quite the same relevance as at that time. That we have an Icelandic version from that date need cause no surprise: it would perhaps have been more remarkable if it had not been translated.

¹⁴⁰ Walpole, *op. cit.* 364-66 (see note 3, p. 2 above).

¹⁴¹ Magnús Már Lárusson has recently emphasised the fact that Þorlákr and Páll, especially the latter, would move in high social circles while they were abroad (amongst just such people as those who commissioned the French translations of PT), and that it was a romance culture they would chiefly imbibe; see his 'Mariukirkja og Valþjófsstaðarhurðin', *Saga* II 1-2 (1954-55), 134-6. Cf. further H. L. Rogers, 'An Icelandic/Norwegian Name for Westminster', *Medium Ævum* XXVII (1958), 20.

APPENDIX I

The source of J ch. 87

The ultimate source for ch. 87 in *J* is PT ch. 5 (103/16-105/11). In the PT-translation in *Agul. A* this chapter is abridged, see *Kms.* 267/19-26; in manuscript *a* there is a slightly fuller and better text, see *ibid.* note 7, but the essential abridgment remains. In the first part of the chapter in *J*, 671/3-17, the text is expanded, but the additional phrasing does not seem to depend on any external source except perhaps at 671/6-7: *hann sér musteri . . . Jacobi . . . bæði litit ok fornfá gat í Compostella*. This sentence does not appear in *Agul. A*; in *Agul. B*, *Kms.* 131/6-7, there is a corresponding phrase (*litit ok fornfá gat borgarreysi*), but this is most probably taken from *J*. The ultimate source for this is doubtless PT 95/18-19, *Compostella quamvis tunc temporis parva*, but it is also found in *V*, Lib. 24, cap. vi, which might thus be the source. In the remainder of the chapter, and in contrast to *Agul. A*, *J* has a text that is not shortened; on the other hand, it is not a closely literal translation and PT and *V* have similar texts, so that evidence to show that the one or the other must have been the source is not immediately forthcoming. The abridged text in *Agul. A*, *Kms.* 267/23-26, could have been reduced from a text like that found in *J*, but immediately before the abridgment begins in *Agul. A* there is a suggestive difference between the two. PT 103/18-19 reads:

	canonicos secundum beati Ysidori episcopi et confessoris regulam
Cf. <i>V</i> , Lib. 24, cap. vii	canonicos secundum regulam sancti Isidori
<i>Agul. A</i>	kanoka eptir reglu Ysodori (<i>sic</i>) byskups
<i>Kms.</i> 267/22-3	
<i>J</i> 671/16-17	canonicos eptir reglu sancti Ysidori

Here *J* appears closer to *V* than to *Agul. A* and PT. Again, the last sentence in *V*, Lib. 24, cap. vii, begins: *Et præter has*

(scil. *ecclesias*), where PT 105/11 has only *et*. *V*'s reading may conceivably be reflected in *J* 671/32: *ok hér út í frá* (cf. var. lect. ad loc.). On the other hand, it should be noted that *J*, although not abridged like *Agul. A*, still omits some things that are found in both PT and *V*: it does not mention the church built *apud urbem Bitterrensiūm* (PT 105/6), nor does it give the precise location of the churches built in Gascony and Paris, PT 105/8-9, 10-11, cf. *V* Lib. 24, cap. vii.

In *Agul. B*, *Kms.* 133/13-23, there is also an unabridged text. There is nothing in the readings there to show that this was borrowed from *J*, and it occurs in a different context and following a passage which was derived independently in *Agul. B* from *V* (see p. 19 above). Considering the propensity of the editor of *Agul. B* for rewriting and rearranging his sources, these points may not have much significance, and it is noteworthy that *Agul. B* also omits the reference to the church *apud urbem Bitterrensiūm* and the description of the site of the church in Paris, just as *J* does. *Agul. B* does however have a translation of the description of the site of the church in Gascony. In PT, 105/8-9, this reads:

inter urbem quæ vulgo dicitur Axa et sanctum Iohannem Sorduæ,
via iacobitana

Cf. *V*, Lib. 24, cap. vii inter vrbem Asam et sanctum Iohannem
Sordue via Iacobita

Agul. B miðil borgar Azam ok staðar hins heilaga
Kms. 133/20-22 Jóhannis er kallast Sordue, hjá þeirri kirkju
ligr eitt stræti er nefnist Via Jacobita

Of the available PT-texts only *V* omits *quæ vulgo dicitur* and reads *Iacobita* for *iacobitana*, so that it seems most likely that *V* was the source of the Icelandic text at this point. It may be that *Agul. B* was the first to adopt this from *V*, but it seems odd that it should make good this one omission in *J* while not repairing the other two. It is conceivable that this reading was also originally in *J* but has been lost in our extant texts, and if that were so there could then be no doubt that *J* in this chapter was expanding an abridged PT-translation

in the *saga af Agulando* at his disposal by reference to *V*. On the other hand, it might be that the text of *V* used in Iceland already lacked the references to the church *apud urbem Bitterrensiūm* and to the site of the Parisian church (cf. note 44 above), and if that were the case, there could be no hope of deciding whether *J* is likely ever to have had the same reading as *Agul. B* in the description of the site of the Gascon church. In this state of uncertainty it is doubtless safest to assume that in ch. 87 *J* was making use of *V*; it is at any rate impossible to conclude that he knew this text unabridged in the *saga of Agulando* which he used for chs. 84-86 and 88. It would perhaps not be unnatural for the author of *J* to be more zealous in repairing this deficiency in *Agul. A* than he was at other times, because the churches built by Charlemagne in honour of St James were relevant to his theme. But in chs. 84-86 and 88 he seems to have been content to copy out the *saga af Agulando* he had in front of him, without modifying it in the light of the parallel Latin text he knew in *V*.

APPENDIX 2

A Note on Style

It may not be out of place here to add a note on the stylistic features of the PT-translation as it went through its successive revisions. It has sometimes happened that critics when considering versions of an Icelandic work translated from a lost Latin original (particularly in the case of Oddr Snorrason's life of Ólaf Tryggvason and Gunnlaugr Leifsson's life of Jón Ögmundarson¹⁴²) have felt it safe to argue that the version which shows the more latinate style is nearer the original translation. The conclusion to be drawn from a comparison of the various versions of the PT-translation is that, at any rate when the manuscripts are themselves not very old, such an assumption is quite unsafe. If we were to consider the following sentences on stylistic grounds alone, for example, we should probably conclude that (2) or (3) represented the Latin original most closely; (1) might be an abridgment of one of the others. But it will be seen that, in fact, (1) for all its plainness is almost a literal version of the Latin.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) <i>Agul. A</i>
(<i>Kms.</i> 266/3-5) | Ok er Saracinar spurðu þessi undarligu tíðendi, lutu þeir honum hvar sem hann fór, ok sendu á vega fyrir hann skatta ok skyldir ok gáfu í hans vald borgir ok heruð. |
| (2) <i>J</i> 669/20-23
(cf. note 10 <i>ad loc.</i>) | Ok er Sarraceni spyrja þessi undranartíðindi, hversu hrunit hafa múrar Pamphilonie, lúta þeir Karlamagnúsi konungi, hvar sem hann ferr, sendandi fram á vegu fyrir hann skatta ok skyldir, gefandi í hans vald heruð ok borgir. |

¹⁴² Cf. Finnur Jónsson, *Litt. Hist.* II 386, 396; Sigurður Nordal, *Borgfirðinga sögur* (*Íslensk Fornrit* III, 1938), CXLVIII.

- (3) *Agul. B*
 (*Kms.* 130/34-
 131/1)

Ok er Saraceni þeir sem byggja í nálægum stöðum, fréttu hversu múrar Pamphilonie hafa stórmerkiliga niðr hrunit, ok hennar allt hit fyrra afl skjótliga fyrirvorðit, skelfast þeir stórliga mjök í sínum hugskotum, svá framt at sakir þess mikla ótta er guð lætr nú yfirkoma þeirra hjörtu, fara þeir út af sínum herbergjum rennandi fram á veg fyrir keisarann, berandi með sér skyldir ok skatta, gefandi sjálfa sik ok allt þat sem þeir höfðu at halda upp undir hans vald ok vilja.

Compare the Latin text which lies behind these forms of the Icelandic, PT 93/19-95/1:

His auditis mirabilibus, Sarraceni Karolo ubique pergenti inclinabant, et mittebant obviam ei tributum, et reddebant se ei urbes, et facta est tota illa terra illi sub tributo.