

STEFANUS SAGA IN REYKJAHÓLABÓK

THE LEGEND of St. Stephen, protomartyr, is extant in seven Icelandic manuscripts.¹ The oldest extant redaction is found in Sth. perg. 15 4to (ca. 1200),² the so-called *Hómiljubók*,³ which transmits both the Inventio S. Stephani, that is, the legend relating how St. Stephen's relics were discovered in the early fifth century, and the miracle sequence at the end of the legend. Three thirteenth-century manuscript fragments similarly contain matter from the Inventio: one leaf, the fragment XIV of AM 655 4to (1250–75)⁴ and two (unedited) leaves, the fragments XXII of AM 655 4to (1250–1300).⁵ Among the fragments designated NRA 67e (Riksarkiv, Oslo), dating from the early fourteenth century (1300–25), are three very small clippings of one leaf containing text (averaging only three to four words on 50 lines) from the Translatio legend, which relates how St. Stephen's body came to be moved to Constantinople.⁶ The younger manuscript Sth. perg. 2 fol. (1425–45)

¹ Cf. Ole Widding, Hans Bekker-Nielsen, L.K. Shook, C. S. B., „The Lives of the Saints in Old Norse Prose. A Handlist,” *Mediaeval Studies*, 25 (1963), 332–33.

² Unless otherwise noted, I give the dating of the *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog. Registre* (Copenhagen: Den arnamagnæanske kommission, 1989).

³ Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen, ed., *The Icelandic Homily Book. Perg. 15 4° in The Royal Library, Stockholm*, Íslensk handrit. Icelandic Manuscripts. Series in Quarto, III (Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar á Íslandi, 1993), fol. 80v4–35; 94r19–97r34.

⁴ Edited by Ole Widding in „Et Fragment af Stephanus Saga (AM 655, 4° XIV B), Tekst og Kommentar,” *Acta Philologica Scandinavica*, 21 (1952), 144–48.

⁵ The texts transmitted in AM 655 XXII correspond to the edition of Stefanus saga by C. R. Unger in *Heilagra Manna sögur. Fortællinger og Legender om hellige Mænd og Kvinder* (Christiania: B. M. Bentzen, 1877), II, 302:24–303:2; 303:11–304:2; 305:33–306:26; 307:8–34 (hereafter Hms). A section of this text transmits the miracles; these are not in the same sequence, however, as those in Sth. 2.

⁶ The fragments correspond to C. R. Unger, Hms, 303:14–17; 26–32; 304:2–9; 23–29; 305:7–10; 16–23; cf. Peter Foote, *Lives of Saints. Perg. fol. nr. 2 in The Royal Library, Stockholm*. Early Icelandic Manuscripts in Facsimile, IV (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1962), p. 24 of the Introduction. The other fragments designated 67e contain text from Tómas saga; cf. P. G. Foote, „On the Fragmentary Text Concerning St Thomas

contains a complete text, while the closely related manuscript AM 661 4to (1500–1550) lacks the concluding remarks of the legend.⁷ Sth. 2 is the basis of the edition of Stefanus saga in *Heilagra Manna sögur* (Hms, II:287–309). The longest and most extended version of the legend of St. Stephen is found in Sth. perg. 3 fol., the so-called *Reykjahólabók* (1530–40).⁸

As Peter Foote points out in the Introduction to *Lives of the Saints*, the legend of St. Stephen in Sth. 2 – and by extension also in Sth. 3 – represents a late stage of development (p. 24). The version found in these two manuscripts contains matter ultimately deriving from a number of different sources. Common to five of the manuscripts, the texts in Sth. 2, Sth. 3, AM 661, and the fragments AM 655 XXII and NRA 67e, is a narrative which Ole Widding considered an interpolation („et Indskud“; cf. „Et Fragment af Stephanus Saga,“ p. 148) vis-à-vis Sth. 15 and the related fragment AM 655 XIV, namely the account of how the relics of St. Stephen were transferred to Constantinople (ch. 12 in Hms; chs. 11 and 12 in Rhb).

The hagiographic matter that developed around St. Stephen falls into four parts: the *Passio*, which is the account of his martyrdom; the *Inventio*, which relates how his body was discovered in the fifth century; the *Translatio*, which contains two legends recounting the transfer of his relics; and the miracles attributed to St. Stephen. The events that generated the legends were commemorated on two occasions during the liturgical year: St. Stephen's martyrdom was celebrated on 26 December, while the discovery of his remains at Kaphar Gamala, near Jerusalem, in the year 415 by a priest named Lucianus,⁹ was formerly

Becket in Stock. Perg. Fol. Nr. 2,“ *Saga-Book*, 15 (1957–61), 403–50. Subsequently, references to the text in Sth. 2 will provide both the foliation of the manuscript and the pagination of the edition in Hms.

⁷ Stefanus saga in AM 661 4to ends with the words „fyrir ollum“ (Hms 309:7). The dating is a revision of that given in the *Ordbog over den norrøne prosasprog*, that is, 1400–1500. Stefán Karlsson pointed out to me that AM 661 is written in the same hand as the fragments of homiletic texts in AM 696 VIII and IX 4to, which are dated 1500–1550. Cf. the *Ordbog*.

⁸ Agnete Loth, ed., *Reykjahólabók. Íslandske helgenlegender*, Ed. Arn., A, 15 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1969), I, 213–45 (hereafter Rhb).

⁹ Cf. H. Leclercq, „Étienne (Martyre et sépulture de saint),“ in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, V, col. 632 (hereafter DACL).

commemorated – the feast was abolished in the eighteenth century – on 3 August as the *Inventio S. Stephani*. To the account of the *Inventio*, the legends relating the transferral (*Translatio*) of the relics to Constantinople and subsequently to Rome were conjoined. The *Inventio* and *Translatio* were sometimes separate narratives, for example, in some Latin redactions.¹⁰ In other instances, as in the *Legenda aurea* (1263–73) or its vernacular derivatives, such as the High German *Der Heiligen Leben* (14th century) or the Low German *Dat Passional* (15th century), the legends associated with the translation of the relics are told as part of the *Inventio*. In these popular medieval legends the account of the martyrdom remained a separate narrative, however, in keeping with the liturgical commemorations, the one in December, the other in August.¹¹

The Sth. 3 redaction of the legend of St. Stephen is unique among the Icelandic texts in that it alone contains the two *Translatio* accounts, the transfer of the relics from Jerusalem to Constantinople, and their subsequent translation to Rome, where they found their final resting place beside the remains of St. Lawrence. Ole Widding remarked on the significant expansion in Sth. 3 and noted the inclusion of the second *Translatio* (after ch. 12 in Sth. 2), which is otherwise lacking in the Icelandic manuscripts. His thesis that the additional chapter in Sth. 3 is a late interpolation – „Det kan dog være sene Interpolationer“¹² – can be corroborated (cf. IV below). The new chapter was presumably added by the compiler of *Reykjahólabók* and bespeaks a wish to recount the events relating to St. Stephen in their entirety, that is, as a continuous narrative incorporating in one account all the pertinent available legends, none of which overlaps with any other.

The literature on the Icelandic legend of St. Stephen is sparse; and

¹⁰ Cf. Boninus Mombritius, *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum*, II (Paris, 1910; rpt. Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1978): *Inventio*, pp. 493–95; *Translatio*, pp. 480–82.

¹¹ *Jacobi a Voragine Legenda aurea vulgo Historia Lombardica dicta*, ed. Th. Graesse (1890; rpt. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1965): „De sancto Stephano“, pp. 49–56; „De inventione sancti Stephani protomartiris“, pp. 461–65. *Dat Passional* (Lübeck: Steffan Arndes, 1492): „Van Sunte Steffen als he ghefunden wart“, xcvi, b–xcviii, c; „Van Sunte Steffen deme ersten merteler“, CCC.vii, c–CCCviii, a. Subsequent references are to these editions.

¹² „Et Fragment af Stephanus Saga“, p. 151.

what we know about the redaction in Sth. 3 we owe to Ole Widding's edition and discussion of the fragment AM 655 XIV in 1952 as well as his subsequent collaborative publications with Hans Bekker-Nielsen in the 1960s. Indeed, commentary on *Reykjahólabók* in general has relied on the observations of these two scholars.¹³ In their seminal article, „En senmiddelalderlig legendesamling,“¹⁴ they presented a first survey of the 25 narratives in this monumental hagiographic compilation, which is surpassed only by Sth. 2, and at that by only one legend. In the article, Widding and Bekker-Nielsen noted that the major portion of *Reykjahólabók* is a translation of a Low German source. They identified the source incorrectly, however, as the *Passionael*, which they considered a Low German translation of Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda aurea* (p. 111). This is not so. The *Passionael* is a translation of the High German *Der Heiligen Leben*, a compilation from the end of the fourteenth century, which drew on several sources, including older German verse legends.¹⁵ Although German translations of the *Legenda aurea* existed, *Der Heiligen Leben* is not one of them.

In a subsequent article, „Low German Influence on Late Icelandic Hagiography,“¹⁶ Widding and Bekker-Nielsen refined their views on *Reykjahólabók* and classified the legends in accordance with their proximity to or deviation from those in the *Passionael*. They established four groups, one of which contains texts that „are chiefly based on the older sagas [i.e., older Icelandic translations], and nevertheless the compiler has succeeded in writing these legends in a style which agrees with the style found in the other stories of the collection“ (p. 251). The greater part of the legend of St. Stephen „is based on the old saga, but the style has been modernized“ (p. 251). A footnote clarifies that the reference to the „old saga“ is to the redaction in Sth. 2.

Widding and Bekker-Nielsen had made a similar observation about Stefanus saga in the earlier article of 1960, where they commented:

¹³ Cf., for example, Werner Williams-Krapp, *Die deutschen und niederländischen Legendare des Mittelalters. Studien zu ihrer Überlieferungs-, Text- und Wirkungsgeschichte* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1986), pp. 303; 310.

¹⁴ *Maal og Minne* (1960), 105–28.

¹⁵ Cf., for example, Williams-Krapp, *Die deutschen und niederländischen Legendare*, p. 273 and passim; also Maria Höbing, *Legendarische Erzählformen des Wenzelpassionals* (Oelde i. Westfalen, 1935).

¹⁶ *The Germanic Review* (1962), 237–62.

„imidlertid er der ikke tale om nogen slavisk afskrift, det har øjensynligt været kompilators hensigt at modernisere foredraget og den sproglige iklædning ... Den tendens til en overbrodret fremstilling, vi har konstateret i *Holm 3* i forhold til den nedertyske tekst i *Pass* ved andre legender ... genfinder vi her i forholdet til en hjemlig kilde“ (p. 116). The same view, albeit expressed somewhat differently – they refer to the „long-windedness“ of the style (p. 251) – had already been voiced in their article of 1962, where Widding and Bekker-Nielsen noted that „a few minor corrections as well as a whole chapter are taken from the *Passionael*“ (p. 251). No accounting is given of the „minor corrections“; indeed, none of the assertions is supported by textual evidence. Finally, in Widding and Bekker-Nielsen's survey, „The Lives of the Saints in Old Norse Prose. A Handlist“ (p. 333), there is a remark to the effect that the Sth. 3 redaction of Stefanus saga is „based“ on a text similar to Sth. 2/AM 661, but „supplemented“ from the *Passionael* 96b-98c (the pagination is incorrect [it includes another legend, that of *Pope Stephen*] and should read 97b-98c). The reference is to „Van Sunte Steffen als he ghefunden wart.“ The „supplementary“ material in Reykjahólabók is ch. 13, which is the account of the translation of the relics to Rome.

In the following I wish to take exception to the assertions of Widding and Bekker-Nielsen and demonstrate that: 1) Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 (Rhb), while related to the Sth. 2/AM 661 (Hms) redaction, is not a modernized, embellished version of the same; 2) the Icelandic source of the text in Sth. 3 resembled the redaction represented by Sth. 2 in many ways, but also deviated significantly, especially in the *Inventio* section; 3) although Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 can for the greater part be considered a faithful copy of a no longer extant Icelandic redaction, the text did undergo two types of intervention at the hands of the Rhb compiler: a) the omission of matter that was shared with another legend; b) the inclusion of supplementary matter that derives from a Low German redaction, but not the *Passionael*; 4) the style of Stefanus saga in Sth. 3, that is, the text copied from an older source, was not revised on the basis of the *Passionael* redaction.

The discrepancies in Sth. 3 vis-à-vis the other Icelandic manuscripts, including fragments, are of three kinds: 1) divergences that normally arise in the process of copying a manuscript, that is, scribal errors, such as omitted words or misreadings; changes in the sequence of words;

the replacement of certain forms by synonyms; changes of tense; 2) omissions vis-à-vis the Sth. 2/AM 661 redaction (the complete legend is extant only in Sth. 3 and, with the exception of one chapter, in these two manuscripts), but the injection of cross references to indicate where the material can be found; and 3) deviations and additions of a type suggesting that Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 constitutes a compilation of three differently derived texts: a) the *Passio*, *Inventio*, and the first *Translatio* narrative, as well as the miracle sequence derive from an Icelandic redaction that differed significantly from Sth. 2; b) the account of the transferral of St. Stephen's relics to Rome was translated from a Low German redaction – but not that found in the *Passionael* – and incorporated into the already existing Icelandic text; c) certain historical and biblical interpolations in the *Passio* appear to derive on the one hand from another Icelandic hagiographic text and possibly also from a Low German source.

The scribe of Reykjahólabók has been identified as Björn Porleifsson,¹⁷ and it is likely that he was also the translator of the Low German legends and the compiler of the legendary. The evidence for the latter is circumstantial, however, and therefore uncertain. In the following I do not attempt to argue for or against the identification of Björn the copyist as the editor, compiler, and translator of Reykjahólabók. My major concern is not to establish whether the copyist of the Icelandic redaction of Stefanus saga, the translator of the Low German interpolations, and the editor and compiler of the text transmitted in Sth. 3 were one and the same person, but rather to analyze the text in relation to that in the other manuscripts containing the *Passio*, *Inventio*, *Translatio*, and miracle sequence of the legend of St. Stephen. Thus, references to the „compiler“ of Stefanus saga are to the individual responsible for the omissions and the interpolations in the Rhb redaction of Stefanus saga. My argument will focus primarily on the section of the legend devoted to the *Inventio S. Stephani*, since it is transmitted not only in Sth. 2 and AM 661 but also in the older

¹⁷ The hand was first identified by Mariane Overgaard, *The History of the Cross-Tree Down to Christ's Passion. Icelandic Legend Versions*, Ed. Arn. B, 26 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1968), pp. cv-cxi. Her identification was subsequently confirmed by Agnete Loth in her edition of *Reykjahólabók*, I, xxix.

manuscript, Sth. perg. 15 4to, and fragmentarily in AM 655 XIV and XXII 4to.

In his edition of and commentary on the fragment AM 655 XIV 4to, Ole Widding concluded that AM 655 XIV is a homiletic text related to that in Sth. 15, Sth. 2, Sth. 3, and AM 655 XXII, and that these texts derive ultimately from the same translation (p. 171). Whereas the conclusion that all the manuscripts ultimately derive from the same translation presumably is correct, his assessment of the Sth. 3 redaction and its place in the transmission of the legend needs to be reexamined. Widding's focus was the text of AM 655 XIV, which he examined in relation to the other manuscripts. The commentary on Sth. 3 is inadequate, however, and therefore misleading. Although Widding refers to readings in this youngest manuscript, the textual examples are few and especially in one case – the variants in the casket vision (pp. 154–55) – prejudiced by his assumption that the scribe of Sth. 3 extensively revised the text of his Icelandic source. This view is untenable.

The fragments AM 655 XXII 4to and NRA 67e have to date not been edited, but readings from them are taken into consideration in the following discussion. Similarly, the text of AM 661 4to, from which C. R. Unger printed selected variants in his edition of Sth. 2 (Hms), is drawn upon below.¹⁸ Some significant variants escaped Unger, and these play a crucial role in assessing the transmission of Stefanus saga in Iceland.

I. A copy of an older Icelandic redaction

The major portion of Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 is a faithful copy of an older Icelandic redaction of the legend. Contrary to what Widding and Bekker-Nielsen believed, the deviations and additions in Sth. 3 do not reflect amplification on the part of the scribe but rather variants in the source, which agreed now with one, now with the other extant manuscript of the legend. Ultimately the extant manuscripts derive from the same, presumably 12th-century translation, which is transmitted in re-

¹⁸ I am grateful to the Stofnun Árna Magnússonar for ordering photographs of the manuscript from Det Arnamagnæanske Institut in Copenhagen for my use during a research sojourn in Iceland in 1991.

duced form in the homiletic redaction in Sth. 15.¹⁹ Comparison of the variants in the extant manuscripts shows that Sth. 3 occasionally transmits a unique scribal error; at other times misreadings in Sth. 3 correspond to those in other manuscripts. Despite its greater length owing to interpolated material, especially the additional chapter (see IV below), Sth. 3 occasionally lacks a passage from the original translation, which is transmitted, however, by the other manuscripts; furthermore, what appears to be scribal amplification (Widding and Bekker-Nielsen's „overbrodert fremstilling“) turns out to be – when comparative material, both Icelandic and Latin, is adduced – matter deriving from an older redaction of the translation.

It is not the intent of this essay to account for the stemmatic interrelationship of the extant manuscripts of Stefanus saga, or to reconstruct the text of the original translation. The primary aim in this section is to establish the credibility of Sth. 3 as a reliable copy of a no longer extant redaction of Stefanus saga. The material presented is not intended to be exhaustive but rather illustrative and exemplary. A critical edition of the legend is a desideratum, as the following will show.

Certain types of discrepancies among the manuscripts, especially Sth. 2, AM 661, and Sth. 3, the longest extant texts, are the result of scribal carelessness, now in the older, now in the two younger manuscripts. There are a number of misreadings of names in Sth. 3, for example: „þeir menn er kranensis af þeirre borg er Krone heiter“ (219:25), which Sth. 2 (44vb25; Hms 293:5) and AM 661 (6v18–19) transmit correctly: „þeir menn er kallaz cyrenensis af cirene.“ Sth. 3 transmits the incorrect *Dethalia* (231:28), whereas Sth. 2 (47ra15; Hms 301:21), Sth. 15, and AM 655 XIV correctly write *Debathalia*; similarly, Sth. 3 writes *Helagabri* (228:29), but the correct form, *Delagabri*, is found in Sth. 2 (46va2; Hms 299:15), Sth. 15, and AM 655 XIV. The name *Bassus* is spelled correctly in Sth. 15 and AM 661 but Sth. 3, which writes *alcvs* (242:11), and Sth. 2, which writes *Ballus* (48va34); Unger corrects the name to *Bassus* (Hms 307:22).

Not only proper names are subject to corruption. The word „hoslz“ in the phrase „hoslz med akre“ in Sth. 3 (221:2) is a nonsense word,

¹⁹ The fragment AM 655 XXII may be part of what was originally a homiletic text. On leaf 1r7–17 is a passage that includes commentary on the celebration of the feast that

perhaps a corruption of „helli“ in Sth. 2 (45ra20; Hms 293:39) and AM 661 (7v17). The first word in an account of a miracle is corrupt in Sth. 3, which writes <Q>*vinna* (242:7), when it should be, as in Sth. 2, *Nvnna* (48va30; Hms 307:18) (cf. *Legenda aurea*, p. 465: „Item quandam sanctimonialem ...“). The scribal error occurs, however, also in AM 661, which writes *Kvinna nockur* (22v21). In another instance, the adjective *cristna* – „han atte dóttor cristna“ – in Sth. 15 (96r26–27), Sth. 2 (48va5; Hms 306:34), and AM 661 (22r17) is misread as a name in Sth. 3: „hann atte eina dottvr er Kristina hiet“ (243:5). In the miracle sequence the word *viðsmiör* (Sth. 2: *vidsmiör* [48vb2; Hms 307:29]; Sth. 15: *viþsmior* [96v24]; AM 655 XXII: *við smor* [2v9]) appears in corrupt form in Sth. 3 as *vid sinior* (242:20).

Conversely, however, Sth. 3 occasionally has the better reading vis-à-vis other manuscripts, for example, the name „Jeoretheo“ (221:3), which appears in the corrupt form „seoretheo“ in Sth. 2 (45ra22; Hms 294:1) and AM 661 (7v18). A correct reading in Sth. 3 is at times supported by AM 661, for example, when Sth. 3 (232:9–10) writes „a einvm steine“ and AM 661 (16v17) follows suit with „a steinne,“ but Sth. 2 has the scribal error „a sveini“ (47ra35; Hms 301:37). Similarly, both Sth. 3 (232:26) and AM 661 (17r14) write *kystv* – a reading that is supported by the Latin „Et osculantes relliquias“ (Mombritius, 495:40) – whereas Sth. 2 deviates with *þvstv* (47rb10; Hms 302:12). AM 661 (20v6) supports the correct reading *keisaren spyr* in Sth. 3 (236:27), whereas Sth. 2 writes *keisar(inn) svar(adi)* (48ra16; Hms 305:10). AM 661 (3r17) writes: „finnzt hier suo mikit um“ and agrees with Sth. 3: „finnzt þetta so mikit“ (216:22–23), which makes better sense contextually, while Sth. 2 has the variant „finniz her ecki vm“ (44ra9; Hms 289:28).

Even more instructive is a comparison of variants where the texts of the fragments and of Sth. 15 overlap with those of Sth. 2, AM 661, and Sth. 3. Scribal carelessness is evident, for example, when we read in Sth. 3 that Lucianus hears his name called three times in a dream vision, but the actual words that follow read: „Lvciane Lvciane. fardv j Jervsalem“ (227:18). Sth. 2 (46rb7; Hms 298:22) and AM 661 (12v22) have the original reading, however, in which the name is repeated

resembles Rhb 233:3–10 and Hms 302:21–24, but it is longer and apparently not related to the hagiographic redactions.

three times, as do Sth. 15 (80v32) and AM 655 XIV (2r11). In another passage Sth. 3 skips a word, so that the passage „vrdv margar j ollvm stodvm“ (233:16–17) only makes sense in reference to „ok vrdv margar iarteignir“ in Sth. 2 (47rb30; Hms 302:29) as well as AM 661 (17v15); this reading is supported by AM 655 XIV (2v39) and AM 655 XXII (1r5).

Conversely, readings in Sth. 3 reveal the omission of words in Sth. 2. When Juliana asks Bishop Cyrillus that she be permitted to remove the remains of her husband, the bishop refuses her request in Sth. 3 „þvi at hann qvezt eigi vita hvors likamvr være enns helga Stefanno eda bonda hennar“ (234:17–18). Whereas the corresponding passage in Sth. 2 omits mention of the husband: „hvors likami var eda ens sæla stephani“ (47va14–15; Hms 303:14–15) – as happens in AM 661 (18v3–4) – the reading in AM 655 XXII supports the variant in Sth. 3: „[li]kami var stephanus. eða bvanda hennar“ (1v4), as does NRA 67e: „stefanus eða bva[nda]“. Some lines later a similar phrase occurs: „hvor kistan er enns helga Stefane edr bonda þins“ (Sth. 3, 234:31–32). This time Sth. 2 contains the full text: „hvar er kista ens helga stephani. eda bonda þins“ (47va31–32; Hms 303:29–30), but AM 661 writes: „huor hier er kista bonda þins“ (18v20–21).

A comparison of the manuscripts shows that the readings in Sth. 3 vacillate; they agree now with one, now with another manuscript, which Ole Widding had also remarked upon (1952, p. 151). Now and then Sth. 3 agrees with an original reading in Sth. 2, at other times with a corrupt variant. For example, Sth. 3 agrees with Sth. 2 (45ra11; Hms 293:30) in writing „<H>eyrit menn brædr og fedr“ (220:26). Unger rejected this reading in favor of „Hēyrit mik fedur ok brædur“ in AM 661 (7v6), but the corresponding passage in the Acts of the Apostles attests that Sth. 2 and 3 transmit the original translation: „Viri fratres et patres, audite“ (Acta 7:2). Similarly, Sth. 2 (45va40–41; Hms 296:14–15) agrees with Sth. 3, where we read: „eda giorda eigi min avnd alla þessa hlvte“ (224:2–3); AM 661 writes *hond* instead of *avnd* (10r22), to the contrary, and reference to the Acts shows that this time the correct reading is transmitted in the last: „Nonne manus mea fecit haec omnia?“ (7, 50). A third example of agreement between Sth. 2 and 3 is similarly misleading. Both manuscripts write: „Hvar skvlvm vær þa pin leita“ (Sth. 3, 228:28–29; Sth. 2, 46va1; Hms 299:14–15), but the di-

verging „huar skulu uier yduar leita“ in AM 661 (13v19–20) turns out to transmit a Latin „Et ubi uos queremus?“ (Mombritius, 494:26–27).

A survey of the variants provides evidence of a progressive reduction of text vis-à-vis the original translation, which is evident now in the one, now in the other manuscript. In Sth. 3 we read: „skirn af sancte Petre og sancte Johannes efteræ“ (228:11–12), while Sth. 15 contains an additional element: „skírn af læresvéinom criz pettare oc iohane“ (94v4). The reading in Sth. 2 – „skirn af lærisveinvn kristz“ (46rb31; Hms 299:4) – and AM 661 (13v13), with which AM 655 XIV (2r21) concurs, suggests that this passage may have undergone so-called complementary attrition. Vis-à-vis what is presumably the full text in Sth. 15, the manuscripts Sth. 2 and AM 655 XIV have lost the names of the apostles, while Sth. 3 transmits them but without the identification.

Comparison of corresponding passages in all the manuscripts shows attrition of text vis-à-vis the original translation, even in Sth. 3, which otherwise often transmits a fuller text, although it cannot always be determined whether this reflects the original translation or later scribal intervention. The reading „og hafda eg hann heim j mitt hvs nockvra stvnd“ in Sth. 3 (228:17) is supported, albeit in shorter form, by AM 655 XIV „oc uar hann með mer“ (2r22), while Sth. 2, AM 661, and Sth. 15 do not transmit the text. Conversely, the passage „oc þurra fözlo at hafa“ in Sth. 15 (94v17) is transmitted by Sth. 2 (46va7; Hms 299:20), AM 661 (14r5), and AM 655 XIV (2r29), but is lacking in Sth. 3.

The miracle sequence contains two striking examples of a loss of text in Sth. 3 – in one instance also in Sth. 2 – which is transmitted, however, both by the oldest manuscript, Sth. 15, and by AM 661, a manuscript contemporaneous with Sth. 3. In the account relating how the pagan Marcialis is both cured and converted through the intercession of St. Stephen, Sth. 2 and Sth. 3 share a rather cryptic text. While Sth. 2 writes: „ok mællti þetta eitt ord ok hafdi hann þav ord j mvnni sem stephanvs þa er hann var griothi bardr“ (48va15–17; Hms 307:4–6), Sth. 3 contains the same with only minor variation: „enn efteræ hafde hann þav ord j mvnne er Stefanvs mællte þæ er hann var med griothe bardr“ (243:14–16). The reading in AM 661 attests that the corruption in both Sth. 2 and 3 is the result of text having been lost because a scribe's eye presumably skipped from one occurrence of *ord* to the next:

ok mællti þetta eitt ord þadan fra medan hann lifde, drottenn taktu anda minn, ok hafde hann þau ord j munne sem Stephanus þa er hann uar griote bardur, (22v5–8)

That this early sixteenth-century manuscript actually transmits an original reading is attested by Sth. 15, which reads:

oc mælte han þetta éitt orþa síþan meþan han lifþe. Dróttē tacþu anda min. Oc hafþe han þa orþ síþarst i mune sem stephanus þa es han vas grióte barþr. (96v1–3)

There is a second example of loss of text because the same word is repeated twice within a short interval, but this time only in Sth. 3. In a miracle tale relating how a woman – failing to get cured by superstitiously wearing a ring around her neck – turned to St. Stephen and was healed, the account concludes in Sth. 3 with the following remarks:

þa hafde hvn þessa jartheiknn til vitnis heilsv sinnar þeirrar sem hvn væntte sier af envm sæla Stefano. fieck hvn þa sidan gavfvgt giaf ord j borg þeirre er Karthago heiter. (243:33–244:2)

The readings in Sth. 15, Sth. 2, and AM 661 attest that this time a scribe's eye skipped from the first mention of *stephano* to the next, thereby dropping an original text, as attested by Sth. 15, which writes:

þa hafþe hon iartéin þessa. fyr vitne héilso sínar þeirrar es hon vætte af stephano. oc castaþe hon fingrgolleno a ána. oc tóç hon héilso sem hon vætte af enom helga stephano. Hafþe síþan gæfugt giaforþ í borg þeire es cartágo heiter. (97r5–8)

The passage is also transmitted in Sth. 2 (48vb20–25; Hms 308:6–10) and AM 661 (97r5–8).

Throughout Stefanus saga in *Reykjahólabók* there is additional compelling evidence that it is an occasionally flawed copy of an older Icelandic redaction, and the Inventio section of the legend provides further evidence of matter dropped or misread in the course of copying. St. Stephen's body is laid to rest in Jerusalem in the main church, which is called Sion, because, according to the Sth. 2 redaction,

þar er hann hafði erkidiakn vigðr verit af postolvm gvdz. Enn ion
byskvþ gaf luciano presti nockura luti af beinvþ hans ok þa adra
helga doma er þar fvndvzt med honvm. (47rb13–16; Hms
302:14–17)

The same text is found in AM 661 (17r18–21). In Sth. 3, however, the passage is corrupt, and suggests that Björn Porleifsson had omitted some words, realized the error, and added in the margin (together with an x in the text for insertion) the name „Luciano“, which Agnete Loth then placed between ‘` at the spot in the edition where the x appeared in the manuscript:

Þar hafde hann adr verit erchidiakn at þeirre kirkivnne er post-
olar gvdz vigdv hann ‘Luciano` en þa adra helga domena er þar
fvndvzt gaf biskvp. (232:29–31)

The text makes no sense, since the name is in the dative case. The abbreviated form of *biskvp* is almost directly beneath the abbreviated *hann* on fol. 117b, and Björn presumably had intended *Luciano* to be inserted after *biskvp* (cf. Rhb 232, n. 31). Nonetheless, even if the name had been inserted at the end of the sentence, the text would still be corrupt. The reading in Sth. 2 (above), which is supported by the other manuscripts (Sth. 15: 95v35–36; AM 655 XIV: 1v33–34; AM 661: 17r18–21), suggests that the text Björn was copying may originally have resembled the following:

Þar hafde hann adr verit erchidiakn at þeirre kirkivnne er post-
olar gvdz vigdv hann. en *nockura luti af beinum hans ok þa adra*
helga domena er þar fvndvzt gaf biskvp *Luciano*.

The nature of the corruption is such that it could easily have arisen in the course of copying, but not translating a text.

Another corrupt passage further supports the argument that *Stefanus saga* in Sth. 3 is a copy of an older Icelandic redaction. In the same section of the legend dealing with the translation of the relics of St. Stephen, Lucianus has a dream in which the body of St. Stephen is spoken about in metaphorical terms. Lucianus dreams that when he tells the bishop about Gamaliel’s visits, the bishop informs him that he will now have to take away from him his great ox, and Lucianus will have to be content with the others he owns. Upon awakening, Lucianus decides to go see the bishop, but not to reveal this second dream,

for he suspects that if he told this dream too, then, according to the text in Sth. 2, the bishop would realize

at stephanvs var enn mikli öldvngr enn vagn eda kerror væri
helgar kirkiur enn syon enn ætzsta kirkia kallaz enn mikli vagnn
(46vb29–31; Hms 300: 34–36)

The corresponding passage in AM 661 agrees with the above, except that it lacks the modifier *mikill* before *uagn* (15v13).

The above corresponds to the text in the Epistola Luciani, the ultimate source of the Inventio narrative:

Intellexeram enim quia sanctus Stephanus ipse est bos maximus;
et quia carri illi, de quibus dicebat, sanctæ essent Ecclesiæ; et
Sion prima Ecclesia, ipsa esset carrus major.²⁰

Sth. 15 contains a reduced and therefore not as transparent version of the interpretation, since the name of the church is omitted:

at en meste ocsen stephanum. en kerror mercþo kirkior. oc en
mesta kerra mercþe templum domini. (95r20–21)

The text in Sth. 3 contains two scribal errors but otherwise resembles that of Sth. 2. The corruption can only be the result of carelessness in copying or else a misreading, presumably of abbreviations, either by Björn or the scribe of his source:

at Stefanvs være hinn 'mikle' olldvngren. en vagnen edr kerran
være hans helgar bæner. en Syonn enn æzta kening kallazt mikle
vagn. (231:2–4)

The internal logic of the dream sequence demands that the „carts“ be identified as churches, and Sion is subsequently correctly identified in Reykjahólabók as the *höfuðkirkja* (232:29), that is, the *ætzsta kirkia* of Sth. 2. The two variants – *bæner* and *kening* – presumably are a misreading of abbreviations. How an original *kirkiur* came to be misconstrued as *bæner* is not readily apparent; perhaps the abbreviation had been *kk* and the *k* was misread as *b*. A second abbreviation of

²⁰ „Epistola Luciani ad omnem ecclesiam, de revelatione corporis Stephani martyris primi et aliorum,“ in: *Sancti Aurelii Augustini, Hipponensis Episcopi, Opera Omnia*. Patrologia Latina, 41. Col. 814. Subsequent references to the „Epistola Luciani“ are to this edition.

kirkia must have generated *kening*, but the reasoning that identified Sion as the Church's teaching and then metaphorically as a cart is impenetrable. Recourse to AM 655 XIV does not elucidate the problem. Although the fragment contains the *Inventio* narrative, this dream is not transmitted.²¹

The above are examples of the types of misreadings and corruption which attest that the legend of St. Stephen in Sth. 3 – with the exception of one chapter (see below) – is a copy of an already existing redaction. Although I would not go so far as to call it a „slavisk afskrift“ – what Widding and Bekker-Nielsen maintained the saga is *not* – the text shares so many readings with other manuscripts and has scribal errors of a kind incurred only in the process of copying, that one can indeed argue that the Sth. 3 redaction is a fairly dependable copy, without substantial intervention (in text shared by all the manuscripts), of an existing Icelandic redaction. The text of this redaction deviated, however, in a number of remarkable aspects from the texts transmitted in the other manuscripts.

The Icelandic source of Stefanus saga in Sth. 3, while corresponding for the most part with readings in the other extant manuscripts in the sense that the texts can be read side by side, nonetheless deviates at times quite drastically or contains a fuller text. Widding and Bekker-Nielsen interpreted this as scribal embellishment and amplification, but it can be shown that additional or deviating text is not to be attributed to creative writing on Björn's part but to his source. The most striking example of this occurs in the roses-and-saffron dream in the *Inventio* (discussed in III below), but other such instances of what appears to be scribal augmentation actually transmit text already found in the source, thus suggesting that this source had occasionally transmitted a fuller text than the one in Sth. 2 and AM 661, manuscripts

²¹ In „Et Fragment af Stephanus Saga“ Ole Widding discusses this dream and remarks on the discrepancies between the Sth. 15 and Sth. 2 redactions. He posits two different translations to explain the divergences, because he believes that Sth. 2 is a copy of the redaction in Sth. 15 („Afskriveren af Holm 2 folio-Redaktionen har kasseret den Oversættelse, han fandt i Holm 15,4^o-Redaktionen, og har givet en mere ordret Oversættelse“ [p. 154]. This explanation is implausible. Despite the greater age of the Sth. 15 redaction, it is evident that it is a revised and reduced version of the translation, which is more faithfully transmitted in the younger manuscript Sth. 2, as the discussion of the roses-and-saffron dream in section III makes evident.

that with the exception of one chapter are similar in length to the Sth. 3 redaction.

One such instance of what appears to be amplification – but is *not* – on Björn's part occurs when Gamaliel exhorts Lucianus to find the body of St. Stephen as well as his own, that of his son, and Nicodemus. In Sth. 2, he exhorts Lucianus:

lvk þv vpp skyndiliga grof þeiri er jliggia likamir vorir oræktir at drottinn luki vpp dyrvm milldi sinnar fyrir mankyninv þviat heimrinn færizt j margann haska (46rb9–12; Hms 298:24–27)

The reading in Sth. 15 concurs with the above (80v34–35; 94r19–20), as does AM 661 (13r3–7). The corresponding passage in Sth. 3 is more expansive, however:

lvk þv helldr vpp skyndelega gravf þeirre er j liggia likamer vorer vrægtter þviat vær ervm fyrer longo gleymdes af veralldlegvm monnvm og liggivm j einvm ovidrqvæmlegvm stad. far til og lvk vpp dyrvm millde þinnar fyrer mannkynennv þviat heimvrenn færizt nv j margann haska. en drotten minn vill leyfa þat at vær eigvm vpp hefiast vr þeim stad sem nv ervm vær honvm til lofs en monnvm til gagnsemda. (227:21–27)

On the surface the preceding might be interpreted as Björn's amplification, but this is not the case. The text is corrupt – either because of a copying error on Björn's part or because it already existed in his source – as comparison not only with Sth. 2 shows, but also with a Latin redaction. The plea in Sth. 3 „lvk vpp dyrvm millde þinnar“ should be directed to the Lord, not to Lucianus. The above explanation for opening the tomb, however, is attested in Latin sources. The redaction edited by Mombricitus reads:

Aperi nobis festinanter monumentum : *ubi in negligentia positæ sunt nostræ reliquiæ* : ut per nos aperiat deus et Christus eius et spiritus sanctus ostium clæmentiæ suæ in hoc mundo . periclitatur enim sæculum in multis causis : quæ in eo singulis diebus fiunt. (493:47–50)

The Latin redaction deviates somewhat from Sth. 3 but attests the authenticity of the Icelandic text. Although the corresponding passage in the *Legenda aurea* is an abbreviated version, it nevertheless transmits an additional element of the Sth. 3 redaction. Gamaliel says:

summa cum diligentia nostros patefacito tumulos, *quia indecenter despecto loco reconditi sumus*, vade igitur et dic Johanni episcopo Hierosolimitano, ut nos in honorabili loco reponat, quia, cum siccitas et tribulatio mundum concusserit, *nostrorum suffragiis Deus mundo propitiari decrevit*. (pp. 461–62)

Like the *Legenda aurea*, the *Passionael* version transmits a reduced text, but it derives from a source that, like Sth. 3, had contained both reasons for the exhumation:

du scalt vnse graue openbaren dar wy begrauen lyggen wente wy sint lange vorgheten wezen. vnde liggen in ener vnthemeliken stede. ... dat is dem volke nutte vnde guet. wy willen en gnade wedder van gode vorweruen. dat bederuen se woel. (xcvii, b-c)

The above Latin and Low German redactions attest that the additional matter in Sth. 3 vis-à-vis Sth. 2 is to be attributed not to „scribal embellishment,” as Widding and Bekker-Nielsen suggested, but rather to the source, which had contained a fuller version of Gamaliel’s words than that transmitted in Sth. 2.

A second example of greater verbosity in Sth. 3 occurs toward the end of the Inventio narrative, where the Church’s commemoration of the Passio and Inventio are remarked upon:

Helga dommaner fvndvzt anann dag jola þa er vær holldvm af piningvni enn fim nottvm efter Olafs messo var hann pindr þo at heilog kirkia hallde og annat fyrer þann skyld at so sem hann var hinn fyrste pislar vottvr efter pisl drottens so vilia og helger kenne fedr at hathid þessa gvdz vinar heilags Stefani skvle vera og næst hathidar deige sins blezada herra drottens vors Jesv Christi. enn fvndigingar hathiden halldizt j staden æ piningar deiginvm sem fyr seiger. (233:3–10)

The reference to „Olafs messo” attests the Icelandic character of the source of the above, but the corresponding text in Sth. 2 is much shorter:

helgir domarnir fvndvz ok vorv færdir æ annan dag jola þa er vær holldvm piningvnni. enn fim nottvm eptir olafs messv hyggivm vær at hann væri pindr. þa er vær holldvm minning fvndningar hans. (47rb20–24; Hms 302:21–24)

Lacking in the Sth. 2 redaction – as is the case in AM 661 (17v4–9) – is the explanation for the celebration of St. Stephen's Passio the day after Christmas, when in fact he was martyred on the day when the church celebrates the finding. Sth. 3 provides the answer, and this answer derives from a longer version of the Inventio. The narrative closes in the *Legenda aurea* as follows:

Haec inventio sancti Stephani facta est ea die, qua ejus passio celebratur et ejus passio in hac die fuisse dicitur. Festa autem ab ecclesia mutata sunt duplici ratione ... Decuit enim, ut nativitati Christi continuaretur natale sancti Stephani, qui primus pro Christo martirium sustinuit, quod est nasci in coelo, ut per hoc notaretur, unam ex alia sequi, ... (p. 463)

Jacobus's text is quite exegetical and therefore lengthy at this point, but it is evident that Sth. 3 derives from a longer redaction that had transmitted additional information concerning the celebration of the two feasts.

Although the Inventio and first Translatio accounts furnish the best evidence for positing a longer and deviating Icelandic redaction as primary source for Sth. 3, a final instance of „amplification“ in the Passio section can also be shown not to be Björn's but to derive from a longer redaction. We read that after the crucifixion Pilate feared that he had incurred the wrath of the emperor Tiberius, and therefore, the Sth. 2 redaction reports, he names his friend Adrianus as emissary,

ok sendir til romam med miklvm fiarhlvt ok storvm giöfvm at tvlka mál sitt ok af saka sig fyrir keisaranvm. Adrianvs rædz a ferdina ok bera vedr hann vestr j hafit miog ok at lyktvm at galizki lande (43va25–29; Hms 288:2–5)

The above generates the account of the healing of Vespasian. The corresponding passage in Sth. 3 is rather verbose and explains how Adrianus comes to be in Galicia when he had actually intended to sail to Rome:

Med þessvm manne sender Pilatvs storlega mikin fiarhlvt keisaranvm og bidr Adrianvm at thvlka sitt mál til hit beztha og af saka hann af þessare savk sem fremst gæthe hann so ad keisa'r'en yrde sier ecki reidr þo at so kynne til at bera. at nockvr qvittvr kæme til hans eyrna af þessv greindv efne. Petta giorer

Adrianvs at hann rædt æ ferdina. og thekt þo eigi allt efter því sem hann villde. fyrer því at hann fær mikin storm j hafit og þvervidre so at vindvren bæger honvm af sinvm veg og vestvr j hafit. so miog at lygtvm kemvr hann vestvr j Galiciam (214:5–14)

The story of Vespasian is also incorporated in *Gyðinga saga* – as is the story of Veronica's sudarium – and the passage in *Gyðinga saga* accords in its brevity with that in Sth. 2 (Post. s. 155:1–4). Although the corresponding account in the legend of St. James the Less in the *Legenda aurea* deviates considerably, it furnishes evidence that a Latin redaction had contained the explanation for Adrianus's detour:

Videns Pylatus, quia Jesum innocentem condemnauerat, timens offensam Tyberii Caesaris pro se excusando nuntium nomine Albanum ad Caesarem destinavit. Eo autem tempore Vespasianus monarchiam in Galatia a Tyberio Caesare tenebat; *nuntius igitur Pylati a ventis contrariis in Galatiam pellitur et ad Vespasianum adducitur.* (p. 299)

The name Albanus – who appears otherwise as the envoy who brings Veronica to Tiberius – attests that Jacobus de Voragine derived his account from a variant version; nonetheless, his redaction bears witness to the authenticity of the reading „hann fær mikin storm j hafit og þvervidre ... vestvr j hafit“ in Sth. 3; that is to say, the „interpolation“ is not due to Björn's embellishing the text of his source but rather to the source itself.²²

²² The reading in 214:11–13 has a bearing on *Gyðinga saga*, for a young redaction, DKNVSB 41 8vo, designated T by Jón Helgason, contains a parallel text: „og kiemur ä fyrer honum mötvindur“ („*Gyðinga saga* i Trondheim“ *Opuscula*, V, Bibl. Arn. XXXI, København: Munksgaard, 1975, p. 367). Since *Gyðinga saga* shares with *Stefanus saga* the tales of Vespasian and Veronica, Jón Helgason briefly discussed the Sth. 2 redaction of *Stefanus saga* in „*Gyðinga saga*,“ pp. 370–71. He believed that the source of the Vespasian and Tiberius narratives (Pilate legend) in *Stefanus saga* was an older and more complete redaction of *Gyðinga saga*. The possibility that there had existed an independent legend of Pilate on which both *Gyðinga saga* and *Stefanus saga* drew, he considered less likely. He failed to consider another possibility, however: that the Vespasian and Tiberius narratives in *Gyðinga saga* derive from a redaction of *Stefanus saga* or even another sacred legend. The common reading in Sth. 3 and T (Jón Helgason cites a variant in the edition by Surius [p. 367], while the variant I cite occurs in the *Legenda aurea*) makes the last a possibility, as does the appearance of the name Volusianus in T, in which case, however, the connecting link may be the no longer extant Jacobs

The full import of the role the Sth. 3 text plays in transmitting Stefanus saga will only become clear once there exists an edition of the legend that utilizes all manuscripts. The source of the Sth. 3 redaction of Stefanus saga was indeed related to the texts transmitted in the other extant manuscripts, but repeatedly the deviations unique to Sth. 3 are so significant – the most striking of which occurs in the *Inventio* (cf. III below) – that one can posit as its source an Icelandic redaction into which, at an unknown point, text from a variant version of the legend had been introduced. This variant version competed on the continent with the redaction that presumably represented an older stage and which is known from the other Icelandic manuscripts.

II. Editorial intervention in Stefanus saga

Variants and scribal errors attest that Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 transmits a copy of an older Icelandic redaction of the legend. Nonetheless, at the same time that Stefanus saga in Reykjahólabók is a copy of a no longer extant manuscript, it also represents the work of an editor and compiler, who is presumably identical with Björn, a compiler who was a hagiographer par excellence. Time and again Reykjahólabók attests that the compiler was hagiographically literate and had at his disposal a good library. Often he knew of more than one version of events, and chose either to interpolate the divergent material or make reference to it.²³ Occasionally the compiler commented upon discrepancies between versions known to him, but nonetheless incorporated deviating material into his redaction for the sake of completeness. If he consid-

saga minna (cf. section II of this article). This is not the place to undertake an investigation of the fate of Vespasian and Tiberius in Iceland, but the Sth. 3 redaction might point toward a solution. See Kirsten Wolf's overview of the non-Icelandic and Icelandic tradition of the legend of Pilate, „The Sources of *Gyðinga saga*,“ *ANF*, 105 (1990), 140–55; on the Vespasian and Tiberius narratives, pp. 150–53.

²³ For a striking case of the transmission of variant redactions in another narrative in Rhb, see Marianne E. Kalinke, „The Icelandic „Gregorius peccator“ and the European Tradition,“ *The Sixth International Saga Conference*. 28.7. – 2.8. 1985 (Copenhagen: Det arnamagnæanske Institut, 1985), pp. 575–84; „*Gregorius saga biskups* and *Gregorius auf dem Stein*,“ *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 113 (1991), 67–88.

ered his main source wanting, he intercalated text from another version or redaction.

In the *Reykjahólabók* redaction of Stefanus saga there are three major discrepancies vis-à-vis the Sth. 2 redaction: 1) an entire minor legend has been excluded, that is, the account of how the emperor Tiberius is cured by means of Veronica's sudarium; 2) repeatedly material of a historical nature is interpolated and at the end of ch. 6 occurs a lengthy intercalation consisting mostly of passages taken from the gospel of St. Luke. These interventions – the omission as well as the intercalations – are accompanied by references to the legend of St. James the Less; 3) an additional chapter is interpolated before the miracle sequence, and this is demonstrably translated from a Low German source (cf. IV below). The notable discrepancies between Sth. 3 and the other manuscripts as well as certain interpolations vis-à-vis the other texts, permit us to postulate on the one hand the existence of an otherwise unattested older redaction of Stefanus saga (cf. III below), and on the other hand repeated intervention in the text of this redaction through excision and interpolation.

Chs. 2 and 3 relate how Vespasian, the ruler of Spain, and Tiberius, the Roman emperor, are each cured. Vespasian is suffering from a nose disease called *vespas*, and to this, according to the legend, he owed his name. He is healed when he professes belief in Jesus Christ; he subsequently swears an oath to avenge Christ's death, and the narrator's voice interjects to remark that he kept his promise when he became emperor (215:32–216:1) and that Josephus, that is, Josephus Flavius, the first-century Jewish historian, who was in Jerusalem when the events occurred, gives an account of the same. The source of this information is provided:

og nockvt af því greiner j sancte Jacobs savgv ens yngra. og var
 efter pisl drottens vors Jhesv Christi þetta er þeir fedgar Thitvs
 og Vespasianvs komv fyrer stadenn Jervsaleem med sinn her .xl.
 vetvr og einvm betvr. enn svmar bækvr greina tveimvr vetrvm
 vmm fram .xl. en hvat sannazt er hier vmm þat veit gvd bezt af
 ollvm. (216:1–6)²⁴

²⁴ A similar remark is made in the *Helgir þrír kongar* (I, 30:6–7) after a reference to conflicting information in other books: „en hvat þar sannazt er vmm þa veit þat gvd allra bezt.“ References to variants and comments as to ignorance concerning the truth

The „interpolation“ – Ole Widding refers to the preceding as „et længere Indskud“ (p. 151) – corresponds to a comment, but in variant form, found in the legend of James the Less in the *Legenda aurea*:

Cum autem Iudaei nec admonitionibus converterentur nec tantis prodigiis terrentur, post XL. annum dominus Vespasianum et Titum Jerusalem adduxit, qui ipsam civitatem funditus destruxerunt. (p. 299)

The tale of the healing of Vespasian is also found in the *Legenda aurea*, but the account, which Jacobus de Voragine calls „apocryphal“ („sicut in quadam hystoria invenitur, licet apocrypha“ [p. 299]), is related not in the legend of St. Stephen, but rather in that of James the Less (ch. LXVII). The tale is intended to explain why Vespasian and Titus came to destroy Jerusalem forty years after the martyrdom of St. James. According to the *Legenda aurea*, the source of this information is the same as in Sth. 3, namely Josephus.

The following chapter in *Reykjahólabók* relates how the emperor Tiberius, who is afflicted by a cancerous growth on his cheek, sends a close friend named Albanus to Jerusalem, in order to seek out the miracle worker said to be able to heal by means of a single word. When Albanus learns that Jesus Christ has been crucified, he prepares to return to Rome without having accomplished his mission. At this point another intervention by the compiler occurs:

og j þeirre favr hafde hann med sier eina qvinnv er hiet Veronica. sem med gvdz fyllthinge veitte keisaranvm fvlla hialp til sins meinlætis. sem seiger j Jacobs savgv minna. og nefnnizt þessi Albanvs sem sendebode keisarans var j svmlegvm bokvm. Volvsianvs. hvern at hans trvr heimoglegr vinr var. (217:15–20)

The entire legend referred to above is found in the Sth. 2 redaction (ch. 4, 44ra36–44va16; Hms 290:15–291:35). The account of how Tiberius is healed is also related in the *Legenda aurea*, but unlike the Vespasian tale it is incorporated into „De passione domini“ (ch. LIII, pp.

need not necessarily be those of the compiler or scribe of *Reykjahólabók*. Similar cross references and attestations of ignorance abound in continental legendaries, both Latin and vernacular, for example in the *Legenda aurea*, where we read in „De passione Domini“: „Hucusque in praedicta historia apocrypha leguntur. Quac utrum recitanda sint, lectoris iudicio relinquatur“ (p. 234).

232–33) rather than the legend of James the Less. In Jacobus de Voragine's redaction the emperor's friend is named Volusianus (pp. 232–33), thus attesting the reliability of the reference in Sth. 3 to a variant name in other books. The compiler of Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 presumably decided to omit the legend of Veronica because he saw no sense in including the same tale in two different legends, and apparently considered the legend of James the Less a more appropriate vehicle for the miracle tale than Stefanus saga.

The legend of St. James the Less is not found in Reykjahólabók, but circumstantial evidence suggests that the comment may be Björn Þorleifsson's, who was either planning to copy or translate the legend of James the Less or had already done so. We know that Björn wrote another hagiographical manuscript, of which only fragments are transmitted (AM 667 V and XI 4to), that is, of the legend of the Cross-Tree, as well as the legends of Sts. Andrew, James the Greater, Philipp, and Mark.²⁵ The fragments suggest that the manuscript had contained the life of Christ and those associated with him, namely the apostles and evangelists. From the repeated cross references in Reykjahólabók to the legend of St. James the Less and the omission of an important narrative segment of the legend of St. Stephen with the comment that we can find this matter in the legend of St. James the Less, one can infer that if Björn had not produced an anthology of lives of the apostles and evangelists prior to *Reykjahólabók* – Mariane Overgaard considers the fragments in AM 677 anterior to *Reykjahólabók* and dates them ca. 1525 (*The History of the Cross-Tree*, p. CIX) – then he at least was intimately familiar with the texts that would be a part of it. Therefore Björn seems to have made a conscious decision into which legends narratives common to two or more saints should be incorporated. This assumes that Björn functioned not only as copyist but also as

²⁵ See Mariane Overgaard, ed., *The History of the Cross-Tree Down to Christ's Passion*, pp. xcix–cxi; Agnete Loth, *Reykjahólabók*, I, xxi–xxii. See also Stefán Karlsson, „Ritun Reykjarfjarðarbókar. Excursus: Bókagerð bænda,” *Opuscula*, IV, Bibl. Arn., XXX (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1970), p. 138; Jonna Louis-Jensen, „Den yngre del af Flateyjarbók,” *Afmælisrit Jóns Helgasonar*. 30. júní 1969 (Reykjavík: Heimskringla, 1969), pp. 235–50. She writes: „Björn Þorleifsson var en øvet skriver, med hvis karakteristiske hånd der foreligger dels et meget stort antal diplomer, dels det store legende-håndskrift Perg. fol. nr. 3 i Stockholm (fragmenter af endnu et legende-håndskrift med hans hånd er bevaret i AM 667 4to)” (pp. 243–44).

compiler. Should the references to the legend of James the Less not be Björn's, however, then one would have to assume that the cross references already existed in the manuscript he was copying, which seems unlikely.

Like the account of the healing of Vespasian, which appears not only in the legend of St. Stephen but also in others, for example, in abbreviated form in the legend of Sts. James (the Greater) and John in *Postola sögur* (602:26–603:17), the tale of Tiberius and Veronica occurs now in one, now in another legend. Unger edited the redaction of the tale (156:1–157:28) that is found in *Gyðinga saga* as part of the „Saga af Pilatus,” which he printed as a supplement (pp. 151:14–159:20) to „Petr's saga postola” in *Postola sögur*. In the *Legenda aurea* the story of Veronica is incorporated into the above-named account of the Passion of the Lord (pp. 232–33). The reference to Jacobs saga minna in connection with Veronica thus suggests that there had existed a redaction of the legend of James the Less containing the account of Veronica's healing of Tiberius. The existence of this legend of St. James the Less in a no longer extant redaction may be suggested by the concluding words of ch. 3: „sem skrifat stendr j fyr greindre savgv sancte Jachobs” (218:6). The legend of Veronica presumably was part of at least three different narratives in Iceland, namely Stefanus saga, Gyðinga saga, and a no longer extant Jacobs saga minna. Furthermore, matter from Stefanus saga, including a résumé of the legend of Tiberius and Veronica, is incorporated into a fourth hagiographic text, Petr's saga postola.²⁶

Whereas the tale of Veronica was excised from the legend of St. Stephen because one could read it in a no longer extant Jacobs saga minna, a text consisting of a series of citations from the gospel of St. Luke was interpolated at the end of ch. 7. This chapter recounts the martyrdom of St. Stephen, and in conclusion his death is interpreted as a cause of the divine retribution visited upon Jerusalem at the hands of Vespasian and Titus: „Og j þeirre reisv fylltetz þat 'ord`er drotten vor mællte er hann var leiddr vt af stadnvm Jervsaleem...” (226:2–3). There follows an interpolation that concludes with the comment that

²⁶ C. R. Unger, ed., *Postola sögur* (Christiania, 1874), 32:29–35:15 (hereafter Post. s.). Cf. Peter Foote, ed., *A Saga of St. Peter the Apostle. Perg. 4:o nr 19 in The Royal Library, Stockholm* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1990), p. 14; facs. 20r–v.

whoever wishes to hear more about the same, should look in the legend of St. James the Less (226:30–31). Earlier in this same chapter we read that the first men to cast stones at St. Stephen laid their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul. His subsequent conversion is documented with a reference to St. Luke the Evangelist: „hinn helge Lvcas gvdz spialla madr seger so“ (225:6). The reference is not to the gospel, but to the Acts of the Apostles (9:3–19). This comment presumably is not the work of the compiler of Sth. 3, however, for the cross reference also exists in Sth. 2 (45vb37; Hms 297:12).

A subsequent reference to St. Luke occurs in the long interpolation at the end of the chapter. This interpolation is a weaving together of paraphrases of the words of Christ concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, which are drawn from three different chapters in the gospel of St. Luke, although the reference only mentions ch. 19: „*efter því sem sanctvs Lvcas skrifar vt af j .xix. capt.*“ (226:18). The text on p. 226:2–16 ultimately derives from Lk. 23:27–31; Christ's touching comparison of Himself to the protective mother hen – „*hvat opt at eg hefvr viliat hialpat þier og safnat at mier þinvm bavnvm vnder mitt 'skavth' jafnt og hënan hvn giorer vid sina vnga er hvn hylvr og geymer vnder sinvm vængivm*“ (226:22–24) – is drawn from Lk. 13:34; and the final citation (226:25–29) comes from Lk. 19:41–44.²⁷

The interwoven citations from Sacred Scripture conclude with the comment: „*og hverr sem af þessv vill meira heyra. þa leite j sancte Jacobs savgv ens yngra*“ (226:30–31). Since there is only the reference to ch. 19 of the gospel of St. Luke, when in fact the material is drawn from three different chapters, it is unlikely that the compiler of Sth. 3

²⁷ Lk. 23:27–29 (=226:2–16): „*Sequebatur autem illum multa turba populi et mulierum, quae plangebant et lamentabant eum. Conversus autem ad illas Iesus dixit: „Filiae Ierusalem, nolite flere super me, sed super vos ipsas flete et super filios vestros, quoniam ecce venient dies, in quibus dicent: „Beatae steriles et ventres, qui non genuerunt, et ubera, quae non lactaverunt!“ Tunc incipient dicere montibus: „Cadite super nos!“ et collibus: „Operite nos!“““ Lk. 13:34 (=226, 20–25): „*Ierusalem, Ierusalem, quae occidis prophetas et lapidas eos, qui missi sunt ad te, quotiens volui congregare filios tuos, quemadmodum avis nidum suum sub pinnis, et noluistis.*“ Lk 19:41–44 (=226:25–29): „*Et ut appropinquavit, videns civitatem flevit super illam dicens: „Si cognovisses et tu in hac die, quae ad pacem tibi! Nunc autem abscondita sunt ab oculis tuis. Quia venient dies in te, et circumdabunt te inimici tui vallo et obsidebunt te et coangustabunt te undique et ad terram prosternent te et filios tuos, qui in te sunt, et non relinquent in te lapidem super lapidem, eo quod non cognoveris tempus visitationis tuae.*““*

himself had assembled the citations. Had he done so, he presumably would have provided more accurate references. Therefore it would seem that he simply lifted the entire section from the legend of St. James the Less. Indeed, the third quotation drawn from St. Luke – „at einginn 'steinn' mvne þar verða liggiande ofann æ avdrvm saker þinnar ohlydne og drambseme et cetera“ (226:27–29 – occurs in the legend of St. James the Less in the *Legenda aurea*, where we read:

sed non solum ob mortem Jacobi, sed etiam ob mortem domini praecipue destructio ista facta est, secundum quod dominus dicit: non relinquent in te lapidem super lapidem, eo quod non cognoveris tempus visitationis tuae. (p. 298)

In addition to the scriptural interpolation, ch. 7 contains a minor, but nonetheless noteworthy deviation from the text in Sth. 2. When St. Stephen was stoned, his assailants laid their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul, and the narrator's voice interjects with a reference to another *text*: „og fyr var gethid jsavgvne fostbroðrs heilags Stefani. sem nv er Pall postole“ (Rhþ, 224:32–33). In Sth. 2 and AM 661 the comment takes a somewhat different form, however, for the reference is to Saul, „er fyrr var getid fost broðvr heilags stephani sa er nv pall postoli“ (45vb28–29; Hms 297:4–5). Both references are correct. In the first chapter of Stefanus saga, Stephen and Saul are identified and contrasted as students of Gamaliel. Whereas the authorial comment in St. 2 identifies Saul as the foster brother of Stephen, who had been mentioned earlier, the comment in Sth. 3 does not identify Saul but rather the source of the information presented about him, namely the legend of his foster brother, Páls saga postola, where we read:

Ok þa er Stephanus var gryttr fostbroðir hans, fyr því at hann hellt retta tru, þa var Saulus þar við staddr ok varðveitti klæði þeira manna, er þat gerðu, ok var i aullum raðum með þeim, er Stephanum gryttu, en þotti ser eigi sama at leggja hendr æ hann. (Post. s., 237:33–238:3)

There are two explanations for the discrepancy in the reference to Saul in the two redactions. In Sth. 2 it is text-internal, but in Sth. 3 the comment refers to a text other than itself. The redaction of Stefanus saga that Björn Porleifsson was copying may have been part of a com-

pilation that included Páls saga, or Björn himself may have produced the variant, either consciously or subconsciously, because he either had already copied Páls saga or was going to include it in the same compilation that contained Jacobs saga ins yngra.

In addition to the preceding evidence that the compiler of Stefanus saga both deleted and inserted material found in related, presumably Icelandic hagiographic texts, there are discrepancies and „interpolations“ vis-à-vis the Sth. 2 redaction that suggest the compiler also interpolated matter deriving from a Low German source. Whether the compiler excerpted from an existing Icelandic translation of a Low German legend of St. Stephen or whether excerpted matter from a Low German text was translated specifically for incorporation into Stefanus saga cannot be determined.

A major discrepancy occurs in the depiction of St. Stephen when he stands up to respond to the testimony of the false witnesses. In Sth. 3 we read that „asiona heilags Stefani vard so skær og klar sem ein sol“ (220:11), but Sth. 15 (80v7) and Sth. 2 (293:19) agree, as does Petrs saga (Post. s. 35:1), in likening his face to that of an angel. This is in accord with the ultimate source of the Passio, namely the Acts of the Apostles, 6:15, „tamquam faciem angeli,“ which is transmitted in Sth. 2: „syndiz andlit hans fagrt sem eingils asiona“ (44vb40–41; Hms 293:18–19). (In AM 661 [7r12–13] the modifier *fagr* is lacking, as is the case in Petrs saga.) The variant reading in Sth. 3 occurs in the context of the following passage, which is unique to Sth. 3:

þa stod vpp biskvp þeirra og mællte til Stefanvm. heyrer þv nv. hveriar saker at þeir bera þig. Gef þv nv svar fyrer þig ef þv matt. so at oss mege þat synazt avllvm at þv hafer rett at seigia. Þa synnde drottenn sinvm vin mikla dyrd. þviat asiona heilags Stefani vard so skær og klar sem ein sol. So at aller þeir er j mvsterinv vorv vndrvdnzt hvat þat mvnde þyda fyrer því at þeir skilldv þat ecki at heilagr ande var med honvm og styrckte hans hiarta med fvllkomine vithzkv sanleiksins so at hann lioslega vt leidade fyrer þeim heilaga rithning med merckilegv andsvare er hann æ gvdz vegna veitte þar. og veik fyrst j vpp hafe sina thavlv med lofsamlegvm ordvm thil almatthogs gvdz. (220:7–18)

By comparison, the corresponding text in Sth. 2 is abrupt. It lacks the staging, the explanation for Stephen's appearance, and the reaction of

the onlookers to his appearance. Yet the following also contains an element lacking in Sth. 3, the explanation for the sequence followed by St. Stephen in his defending speech:

ollvm þeim er a þinginu vorv ok sa enn helga stephanvm syndiz andlit hans fagrt sem eingils asiona. höfðingi kennimanna spvrdi þa hvort þessir lutir væri svo sem þa voro flvttir honvm j mot. hin helgi stephanvs dvaldi þa ecki andsvor merkilig at veita enn því at hann var avitadr ok rægdr af gvdlostvn j gegn gvdi ok moyses logvm veik hann j vpphafi sinnar tolv lofsamligvm ordvm til sialfs gvds (44vb39–45ra4; Hms 293:17–23)

The texts above represent variant redactions of the trial scene. The material in Sth. 3 derives from a text that contained a passage resembling the following excerpt from the *Passionael*:

Do sprack de biscop to sunte Steffen. Du hefft de sake wol gehoert dar du vmme angheklaget werst. antwerde vns. Do dede god eyn teken in sunte Steffen dat syn anlath so licht vnde klaer waert als der sonnen schyn. wente de hylgheghest was mit em vnde help em dat he gans wol vnde wijsliken sprak. vnde vthlede de hylghen scryfft. (CCCvii, c-d).

The loan words *klar* and *vt leidade* in Sth. 3 suggest that the source of the above was Low German, for the word *útleiða* had only the literal, not the metaphorical meaning in Icelandic. Björn's source presumably contained the word *vthlede*, as does the corresponding passage in the *Passionael*, and the Low German word was transmitted as a calque in Sth. 3. Such transference of meaning from Low German into Icelandic is not an isolated occurrence in Reykjahólabók; indeed, a similar transference, but with a resultant error occurs in the second Translatio account in *Stefanus saga* (cf. IV below). The source of the above appears to have been a Low German redaction that was more verbose than the one found in the *Passionael*, which is itself a compilation of condensed versions of originally longer texts.

That the compiler was working with more than one text when he produced the Passio section of the legend is attested by the cross references discussed above, the excision of the Veronica legend, the commentary on the variant name Volusianus, and the inclusion of the biblical matter at the end of the Passio. Furthermore, there is a transition

from the Passio to the Inventio in Sth. 3 that is absent in the other redactions. Both Sth. 2 (46ra16–17; Hms 297:30–32) and Sth. 3 (225:27–28) remark that the relics of St. Stephen were found on the day in December on which we commemorate his passion. Thereupon we are told in both redactions that his death was avenged in the days of Vespasian and Titus, which, according to Sth. 2, occurred forty years or somewhat later (46ra21–23; Hms 296:36–37); Sth. 3 is vague and writes only that some time passed (226:2), „sem fyr seiger.“ Hereupon the excerpts from St. Luke are interpolated and the chapter ends in Sth. 3 with another reference to Vespasian and Titus, „sem fyr seiger og hverr sem af þessv vill meira heyra. þa leite j sancte Jacobs savgv ens yngra“ (226:30–31). The two references are to the earlier interpolated comments regarding the vengeance exacted by the two emperors, where the remark is made that this occurred either 41 or 42 years after the death of Christ (216:4–6; see above).

Whereas the Inventio Stephani commences abruptly in Sth. 2 and Sth. 15, without any transitional comment, an introductory statement in Sth. 3 suggests that its source for this part of the legend could originally have been independent of the Passio. Such is indeed the case in most of the older recensions, both Latin and vernacular.

<N>v efter því sem vor andleg moder heilog kirkia helldr vm þetta halld sem hier eftera fer. af sancte Stefans likama. hins fyrsta pislar vottz drottens Jhesv Christi er hann var fvndenn. En þat skiede æ dogvm tvegia konga þeirra er so hiethv. Annar hiet Honorivs. en annar Theodosivs. þa er menn skrifvdv arvm efter gvdz bvrð .cccc. og xvij. ær. og æ þessvm sama thima var sæ einn prestvr er Lvcianvs hiet. (226:32–227:4)

The introductory sentence is analogous to many an initial statement in homilies, for example, on the Resurrection in Sth. 15, which begins: „Vpriso tíþ drottens su er ver holdom nu“ (33v35), or Whitsun: „Sia dagr er nu holdom ver“ (10r19). A parallel to the above introduction to the Inventio exists in the *Passionael*, in which the Inventio and Translatio are separate from the account of the Passio:

De moder der hylgen kerken begheit hutten dat fest des hylighen ersten mertelers sunte Steffens. alze syn hylghe lycham ghefunden wart vnde dat is ghescheen do men screef .cccc.xvij. Id was to iherusalem ein prester de hete lucianus. (xcvii, b)

Common to Sth. 3 and the *Passionael* is the homiletic character of the opening sentence and the dating, but the Low German version lacks a reference to Honorius and Theodosius. Honorius is named, however, in the opening sentence of the Inventio account in the *Legenda aurea*, which reads: „Inventio corporis protomartiris Stephani anno domini CCCXVII Honorii principis anno VII facta fuisse narratur“ (p. 461). The reference to the reign of the two emperors also occurs in the Sth. 15 (80v25) and Sth. 2 (46ra41–42; Hms 298:14–15) redactions, not by way of introduction, however, but as a chronological reference point for the night during which Lucianus experienced his dream vision:

lucianvs prestr var lǫngvm at kirkiu ok abænṽm ok var vanr at sofa j kirkiu skoti. enn þetta gerdiz aðǫgṽm konvnga þeira er annar het honorivs enn annar theodosius (46ra39–42; Hms 298:12–15)

The homiletic character of the opening statement of the Inventio in Sth. 3, as well as the fact that the historical reference occurs initially in Sth. 3, but *in medias res* in Sth. 15 and Sth. 2, suggest that Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 is a copy of a redaction that distinguished more neatly between the Passio and Inventio accounts, and that derived ultimately or was revised from a version that transmitted the Passio separately from the Inventio and Translatio narratives, in keeping with the liturgical calendar. This is the case in the *Legenda aurea* and the vernacular legendaries deriving from it. The central portion of the Inventio narrative provides the most convincing evidence for positing as source of Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 a redaction that diverged substantially from the one transmitted in the other Icelandic manuscripts, a redaction deriving from a version popular on the continent in the Middle Ages, in which the dream of Lucianus had undergone a striking transformation vis-à-vis the original account set down by Avitus.

III. The roses-and-saffron dream

Central to the Inventio section of the legend of St. Stephen is a dream vision given to a priest named Lucianus, the principal figure responsible for the finding of the saint's body. Following the introductory comments discussed above, the narrative proper in *Reykjahólabók* opens as Lucianus lies down to sleep in a corner of the church af-

ter many hours of prayer. He sleeps so lightly that „travtt visse hann hvort at hann vagtte eda svæfe“ (227:12–13). In this somnolent state an old, bearded man appears to him, touches him with a golden wand, and calls his name three times. He identifies himself as Gamaliel and relates that St. Stephen's body had been left unburied outside the city walls after his martyrdom. Gamaliel, who knew of Stephen's sanctity, had his body secretly removed at night to his own town, twenty miles distant from Jerusalem. There he placed the saint's body into a new sarcophagus, which he had intended for himself. In the same tomb are now three other persons: in a coffin at the feet of St. Stephen lies Nicodemus, and in another sepulcher rest Gamaliel's son and, at his son's side, Gamaliel himself. Lucianus is to ask the bishop of Jerusalem to seek out the remains and to give them an honorable burial. Upon being asked where to look for the bodies, Gamaliel tells Lucianus the name of the place, and disappears.

The above is the first of three apparitions by Gamaliel. Upon awakening, Lucianus prays to Christ and asks that the vision be repeated as a sign that it was sent from God and that he could trust what he was being told. Consequently, Gamaliel visits him again, the first time to inquire why Lucianus has not yet acted upon his request, and subsequently to reproach him angrily for still not having taken action. These appearances are accompanied by a vision. In the first Gamaliel shows him several caskets filled with roses and saffron and tells him that they symbolize the coffins he is to find. The priest's second dream vision occurs when Lucianus is once again in a state between sleeping and waking, for „þa dreyimde hann annan dravm mote því at hann vaknnade“ (230:14–15). In the latter dream Lucianus himself is one of the protagonists; it is the ox-and-cart dream discussed in section I above.

The roses-and-saffron vision is transmitted in five manuscripts, in Sth. 15, AM 655 XIV, Sth. 2, AM 661, and Sth. 3. The variants in the account of the vision manifest not only that the text of Sth. 3 is for the most part a faithful copy rather than a revision of an older Icelandic text but also that the *Inventio* section of the legend derives from a different redaction than the other manuscripts.

In the casket vision the several coffins containing the remains of St. Stephen and three other individuals are symbolically identified for Lucianus. There is an odd discrepancy, however, between the vision

granted Lucianus and the preceding account of the burial of the saints as well as the subsequent discovery of their remains. According to Gamaliel (228:6–25), he placed the body of Saint Stephen into a new stone sarcophagus that he had let fashion for himself. When Nicodemus died, he had him put into another sarcophagus. Finally, his son Abibas was laid to rest in a third sarcophagus, and next to him, in this same coffin, Gamaliel in turn was placed. At the end of the *Inventio* account, the actual discovery of the saints is not described, but a dream vision granted a monk named Migetius (231:34–37) intimates that the finding of the remains is in accord with what Gamaliel had reported about their burial.

After Lucianus's first unsuccessful attempt to find the coffins, Gamaliel appears to Migetius and shows him three golden beds in a tomb, and in one of these beds an old man and a young man are lying side by side. The old man, that is, Gamaliel himself, informs the monk that he and the others are the lords of the tomb, and that the great and righteous ox – *hinn mikla olldvng og en rettlatha* (232:1) – also rests there. Reference is thus made in Migetius's dream to Lucianus's second dream, in which St. Stephen is symbolized by an ox (see above). The cross reference to the earlier dream is flawed in Sth. 15, Sth. 2, and AM 661, for the word *öldungr* does not occur: St. Stephen is merely identified in Sth. 15 as „*en gæfgasta gøps vin oc en retlata*“ (95v15) and as „*enn mikla oc enn rettlata*“ in Sth. 2 (47ra27–28; Hms 301:31) and AM 661 (16v11). The AM 655 XIV redaction is further reduced; the reference to St. Stephen is lacking. Otherwise the texts are in harmony.

The dream vision granted Lucianus is significant for an assessment of the Icelandic redactions of *Stefanus saga*, since the manuscripts in which it is found manifest a process of reduction and apparent revision; furthermore, there are significant discrepancies in the Sth. 3 redaction. The deviations are not to be attributed to the scribe, that is, Björn Porleifsson, but rather to the source of Sth. 3, which contained a different redaction of the *Inventio*.

When, after Gamaliel's first appearance, Lucianus takes no action to find the remains of St. Stephen and the others, Gamaliel appears to the priest once more and scolds him. In answer to Lucianus's query as to how he will be able to identify the individuals correctly, Gamaliel grants him a vision of several caskets filled with flowers and herbs and explicates their meaning. A comparison of the texts shows that there

are three redactions of the dream, namely, Sth. 15/AM 655 XIV; Sth. 2/AM 661; and Sth. 3. The texts in Sth. 15/AM 655 and Sth. 2/AM 661 derive ultimately from the same source, but Sth. 3 from a different redaction. To be noted is the fact that the dream in the older manuscripts represents the original version of the *Epistola Aviti*, whereas that in Sth. 3 transmits a redaction that was popularized by the *Legenda aurea*.

Sth. 15 and AM 655 XIV are related to each other by virtue of common similes (white as snow, red as blood) and the fact that neither text identifies the flowers. There is an odd discrepancy, however: in Sth. 15 there are three gold caskets and one silver, that is, four caskets in all, whereas AM 655 mentions only two gold caskets, so that the total number of caskets comes to three.

Sth. 15: þá sýnde honom gamaliel þrjá gollega kistla. en en fiórþa silfrlegan fullan ilmanda grass. þrír golleger kistlar vóro fuller fagrablóma tváir huítra sem snær. en ein ráþra sem blóþ. En es lucianus spurþe hvat þat merþe. þá svaraþe gamaliel. þetta ero helger domar órer. Sa es ráuþa blóma hefer. þar es heilagur dómr stefanus es huíler til hógre handar í áustr átt fra haucs durom. en dyren vóro sunan a hægenom. En anar kistell. þar es héilagr dómr nikodemus sa es huíler i gegn durom. En en silfrlege kistell þar es abibás sonr mín. es hréinlifr andapesc. oc es han af þui sýndr silfre biartare með góþom ilm. En han huíler i ene sámo stéinþro sem ec svasem tuiburar oc es su í hæstom staþ. (94v24–33)

AM 655 XIV: Þa syndi Gamaliel honum tva gullega kistla oc hinn þriðia silfrlegan. fula ilmandi grasa tueir huitra. sem snær. en einn rauðra sem blóþ. lucianus spurði huat þetta merði? Gamaliel suaraði. þetta ero helger domar varer. Sa er rauða bloma hever. sa er varr herra stephanus er huilir til hógri handar iaustr ætt fra haugs durum. En annarr er nicodemus er huilir i gegn durum. En hinn silfrlegi kistill. er abbibas. sonr minn er reinlifr andapisc oc er hann af því syndr silfri biartari með goþam ilm. hann huilir isomu steinþro sem ec. (2r34–39)

Sth. 2: þá syndi Gamaliel honum þrjá gyllkistla enn hin fiorda silfrligan fullan ilmandi grasa. Þrír gyllgir kistlar vorv fullir af rosvm. Tveir hófdv hvitar rosor. en hin þridi ravdar sem blod. enn hinn fiordi sa er silfrligr var fvllr af kroge ilmanda. En er

lvcianvs *spurdi [sv *Sth.* 2, sagde *AM* 661] hvat þetta merkti þa svaradi Gamaliel þetta erv helgir domar vorer Sa er ravdar rosor hefir þat er vor herra hinn helgi stephanvs er hvilir til hægri handar j avstr att fra havgs dyrvm en annar kistill er nichodemvs sa er hvilir j gegn dyrvm. Enn hinn silfrligi kistill er abibas son min er hreinlifr andadizt ok af því syndr silfri biartare med godvm ilm enn hann hvilir j enni somv steinþro sem ek (46va18–32; Hms 299:29–300:1; *AM* 661:14r18–14v11)

The dream is bipartite, consisting of the vision and its explication. The two parts are joined by a transitional sentence containing Lucianus's request for an interpretation. Three of the texts (*Sth.* 15, *Sth.* 2, and *AM* 661) share an inconsistency: Lucianus is shown four caskets, but the contents of only three are explained. One of the caskets containing white roses (flowers) is superfluous, since the four bodies rest in three caskets, and this is in harmony with the account Gamaliel gave Lucianus about the burial. One of the caskets is of bright silver, and this is explained as symbolizing Abibas's virginity. In the vision, as reported in *Sth.* 15, *Sth.* 2, and *AM* 661, not only the numbers are flawed, since one casket is left unaccounted for, but also the symbolism, for if Gamaliel, Abibas's father, who is not a virgin, rests next to his son in the silver casket, then silver as representative of virginity is an imperfect metaphor, since it is applicable only to one of the bodies in the coffin.

The text in *AM* 655 XIV transmits the faulty symbolism, but the scribe must have realized either that the number of caskets contradicted the account of the entombment of the saints or that one casket was left unaccounted for, and thus he corrected the number of golden caskets in the manuscript – as Widding pointed out (p. 154) – from three to two, and the total number of caskets to three. Widding concluded (p. 154): „Forlægget har utvivlsomt nævnt 4 Skrin ialt, tre Guldskrin og et Sølvskrin ligesom Holm 2 fol. (299³¹) og Homil. (202¹¹ [=*Sth.* 15]).“ Widding did not account for the revised numbers, but the explanation is simple: the scribe attempted to reconcile the vision with the facts of burial reported earlier by Gamaliel. His intervention in the text was not thorough enough, however, for he failed to realize that once there were only two gold caskets he needed to make an additional change. As the text stands, the snow simile applies to the gold caskets, and the

blood simile to the silver casket. The text of Sth. 15 shows that in AM 655 the sentence containing the referent of the similes, *fragrablómi*, has dropped out.

Ole Widding concluded that all the manuscripts of *Stefanus saga* derive from the same translation, but he also stated that the text of Sth. 2 appears to have been corrected on the basis of a Latin source: „Teksten i Holm 2 fol. synes at være rettet efter en latinsk Grundtekst“ („Et Fragment af *Stefanus Saga*,“ p. 171). In discussing the casket dream, Widding relied exclusively on the Latin edition by Surius, and implied that the first mention of the fragrant herbs in the silver casket is an anticipatory scribal duplication of the second occurrence of the same, and thus to be ascribed to an Icelandic redactor (p. 155). Consequently, when the redactor of Sth. 2 compared the text he was copying with a Latin text – according to Widding – „møder han Sætningen igen efter Omtalen af Guldskrinene, hvorfor han oversætter den paany i en lidt afvigende Version“ (p. 155). The explanation, while plausible, is incorrect. One of the two Latin redactions (B) of the fifth-century „*Epistola Luciani ad omnem ecclesiam*,“ which is the ultimate source of the *Inventio* texts in the medieval legends, already contained the double mention of the saffron:

Et statim deposuit inde quatuor calathos, tres aureos, et unum argenteum, plenos rosis: et unus ex ipsis plenus erat croco. Unus vero de tribus calathis rubentes valde rosas habebat tamquam sanguinem, quem et ad dexteram meam posuit. Alii vero duo pleni erant rosis albis, in modum lilii, sed rosæ erant. Et quartus calathus crocum habebat, cujus odor fragrabat suavissimus. (cols. 812, 814)

The divergent redaction A of the *Epistola Luciani*, while not containing the twofold mention of saffron, nonetheless furnished the model for the structure transmitted in the Icelandic manuscripts:

Et statim attulit quatuor calathos, tres aureos, et unum argenteum. Tres eorum pleni erant rosis: duo habebant albas rosas, et tertius rubicundas coloris sanguinei: quartus vero calathus argenteus plenus erat croco bene olente. Et posuit eos ante me. Et ego dixi ei: Quid sunt isti, domne? Et dixit mihi: Lipsana nostra sunt. Qui rubras habet rosas, ipse est dominus Stephanus, qui a dextris positus est ad orientem ab introitu monumenti. Secundus calathus, dominus Nicodemus est, positus contra ostium. Unus vero calathus ar-

genteus, Abibas est filius meus, de utero testimonii, id est iteratus in lege, immaculatus ex utero matris suæ excessit e mundo, propterea in similitudinem argenti mundissimi apparuit. (col. 811)

It is unlikely that the redactor of the source of Sth. 2 had „corrected“ an existing Icelandic translation (p. 155). It is more plausible that Sth. 2 (and AM 661) actually represents the original translation from Latin into Icelandic, while Sth. 15 and AM 655 XIV, despite being older manuscripts, transmit a text revealing intervention by an Icelandic redactor who modified the contents and description of the gold caskets and who furthermore deleted the second reference to the herbs. In the case of AM 655, a further intervention occurred in an attempt to harmonize the information given by Gamaliel and that conveyed symbolically in the dream concerning the number of coffins/caskets involved.

According to Widding, „Holm 3 fol. omskriver denne Beretning stærkt“ (1952, p. 155). It is true that the corresponding text below is much longer, but it is not the result of scribal revision. The fuller text already existed in Björn's source, which transmitted a longer and deviating Latin redaction of the vision.

Sth. 3: Sidan synde hann honvm fíorar hirdzlv r edr kistla og vorv þrí r af þeim gíorder med þat skírazta gvll. en einn þeirra var af sílfre. Og ein af þeim þrí mvr gvll kistlvnm er fyr greindízt var fvlvr af ravdv m rosv m. en hín er tveír vorv fvller af hvítvm rosv m. en hín fíorde var fvlvr af þeirre jvrtt er safran heiter og er vel jlmanda krydd. Lvcíanvs svarar og seíg er at síer líthezt vel æ kistlana en seígert þo ecki at helldr vítha hverrn kístílen at hverr þeirra eígr. Gamalíel svarar. þann kístelín sem fvllr er af ravdv m rosv m. Sá heyrer tíl heílogvm Stefane. og þydízt þær ravdv rosenar víd hans píslar vátte og sv gvlllega korona er hann bá r nv æ sínv hafvde. Enn hín er tveír gvll kístlarnér sem fvller vorv af hvítvm rosv m þeir heyrdv tíl Níchodemvs felaga mínv m og míer. og teíknar vít þav .íj. skír híorttv er vít hófdvm báder tíl drottens vors Jesv Chrísto. en sá hín fíorde sílfvr kístelín er fvlvr var med safran heyrer tíl syne mínv m Abibas og merckís víd hans hreínan og ofleckadan meýdom amedan hann lífde og því synezt hann sílfre bíarttare med godvm jl m. (229:11–28)

Like the other redactions, Sth. 3 also contains a discrepancy, but here the contradiction exists between what Gamaliel tells Lucianus

about the location of the bodies and the content of the dream that is meant to identify the coffins. Whereas in the other redactions the dream vision is in harmony with the facts of the burial, there is nonetheless one casket too many (except in AM 655 XIV), while the symbolism of the silver casket is flawed. This flawed version of the dream nevertheless corresponds to the oldest redaction, that found in the *Epistola Aviti*, the Latin translation of the account of the *Inventio* sent to Avitus by Lucianus, the priest responsible for the discovery of St. Stephen's body in 415.

The dream in Sth. 3 represents a variant redaction. It is internally consistent and reveals an unusually balanced structure. The very symmetry of content and the internal logic result, however, in a disparity between the dream and the previously reported and subsequently confirmed facts of the burial. From a narrative perspective, the dream in Sth. 3 is superior to that of the other redactions: not only is every casket accounted for, but the symbols are fully elucidated; furthermore, the entire account is characterized by a strictly plotted progression of information. Thus, the gold casket and the red roses fittingly represent St. Stephen, who was a martyr and now bears the martyr's gold crown. The gold caskets filled with white roses symbolize two saints who did not endure martyrdom, and whom the church classifies as confessors, namely Nicodemus and Gamaliel himself. White here does not represent virginity but rather the purity of their devotion to Christ. Finally, Abibas remained a virgin throughout life and this is symbolized by the bright silver of the casket and the fragrant saffron.

In the dream reported by Lucianus to Avitus there were four caskets but the bodies rested in three coffins, because Gamaliel and Abibas shared a coffin. The clause „ubi ambo positi sumus quasi gemini“ occurs in redaction A of the *Epistola Aviti* (col. 811). In this respect the texts in Sth. 15, AM 655, Sth. 2, and AM 661 derive from a redaction that transmitted the original version of the dream. The more verbose and deviating text in Sth. 3 derives from a different redaction. Although Ole Widding had made a similar observation,²⁸ certain com-

²⁸ Ole Widding wrote: „Holm 3 fol. er selvstændig i Forhold til Holm 2 fol. og må være afskrevet efter et Haandskrift, der ligger forud for det fælles Forlæg for Holm 2 fol. og AM 661, 4°. Noget sikkert Stemma lader sig ikke opstille“ („Et Fragment af Stefanus Saga,“ p. 155).

ments concerning Sth. 3 suggest that he thought the discrepancies in Sth. 3 were the work of the copyist – whom we now know to have been Björn Porleifsson – rather than that they already existed in his source. This is not the case. Widding writes that Sth. 3 „giver ofte en noget forkortet og delvis omredigeret Tekst med sproglige Fornyetelser. Der findes dog ogsaa betydelige Udvidelser i Forhold til Holm 2 fol. og 661, 4^o, som Haandskriftet i det hele er nært beslægtet med“ (p. 151). The explanation for the deviations in Sth. 3 in the *Inventio* section of *Stefanus saga* is that this portion of the legend derives not from the common source of the other manuscripts, but rather from another text that contained a redaction of the dream similar to that found in the *Legenda aurea*, which reads as follows:

Ostenditque ei tres calathos aureos et quantum argenteum, quorum unus erat plenus rosis rubentibus et alii duo rosis albis. Quantum etiam ostendit argenteum plenum croco dixitque Gamaliel: hi calathi nostri sunt loculi et nostrae reliquiae sunt hae rosae. Calathus plenus rubeis rosis est locus sancti Stephani, qui solus ex nobis martirio meruit coronari, alii duo rosis albis pleni mei et Nicodemi sunt loculi, qui sincero corde in confessione Christi perseveravimus, quartus vero argenteus croco plenus est Abibae filii mei, qui candore virginitatis pollebat et mundus de mundo exivit. (pp. 462–63)

The dream in Sth. 3 derives from a redaction that modified the original vision into a superior narrative; it is more of a literary construct than Lucianus's original dream. The logic could not be more lucid nor the structure more contrived. In all there are four caskets, and these are subdivided into three gold caskets and one silver. Of the gold caskets one contains red roses, while the other two contain white roses; the silver casket is filled with saffron (of the other redactions, only Sth. 2 also specifies the herb, although it contains the older Latin, rather than the ultimately Arabic loan word, which had currency both in Latin and in the vernacular in the Middle Ages). The sequence of the symbolism as well as the explication of the same follows the order in which saints are generally classified, that is, martyrs, confessors, virgins; hence, St. Stephen; Sts. Nicodemus and Gamaliel; St. Abibas. Or, to put it another way, the most important and oldest saint, the proto-martyr, and the least known and youngest, Abibas, bracket the two

confessors, Nicodemus and Gamaliel. The enumeration of the contents of the four caskets is followed by their explication. The vision is granted, after all, in order to enable Lucianus to identify the saints, but the meaning of the symbolism is not immediately apparent. Thus, there follows an explication of each symbol. Here it should be noted that redaction B of the *Epistola Aviti* also contains an explication of the casket filled with red roses: „quia ipse solus ex nobis martyrio meruit coronari“ (col. 814).

There are essential differences in the nature of the dream in Sth. 15/ Sth. 2/AM 655/AM 661 on the one hand, and Sth. 3 on the other. The former places four bodies in three coffins, the latter in four. Furthermore, the former mentions the white roses/flowers before the red roses/flowers, whereas in the latter this sequence is reversed, so that the order in which the symbolism is interpreted is the same as the order in which the symbols were initially presented. Whereas the two redactions of the *Epistola Aviti* agree in placing four bodies in three coffins, they deviate in the order of the roses: in redaction A the white roses are mentioned before the red – „duos habebant albas rosas, et tertius rubicundas coloris sanguinei“ (col. 811) – whereas in B the order is reversed: „Unus vero de tribus calathis rubentes valde rosas habebat tamquam sanguinem, ... Alii vero duo pleni erant rosis albis, in modum lillii, sed rosæ erant“ (col. 812). Thus, one of the distinguishing features of the two Icelandic versions is also a distinguishing feature of the two redactions of the *Epistola Aviti*. Finally, Sth. 3 deviates from the version found in the other manuscripts by not intercalating information about the position of the caskets within the tomb. The relationship of the symbolical caskets to physical features of the tomb was part of the original version, as redaction A of the *Epistola Aviti* attests, whereas the popular medieval version, epitomized in the *Legenda aurea*, dispensed with the reality of the tomb to focus on the symbolism alone.

The most striking discrepancy between the two Icelandic versions of the dream relates to the coffins. Presumably a Latin redactor became aware that one coffin too many appeared in the vision, or else realized that Gamaliel should not lie in the silver coffin that represents virginity, and thus decided to place the four bodies in four different coffins. Jacobus de Voragine dealt with the ensuing discrepancy between the dream and the facts of burial by leaving the latter vague. In Gama-

liel's account of the burial in the *Legenda aurea* there is no mention of coffins, only of the fact that the four are entombed in one place. Similarly, when the bodies are recovered at the end of the Inventio narrative, the *Legenda aurea* mentions only that the four bodies rest in one tomb, while the vision granted the monk Migetius is not included.

A comparison of the dream in the *Legenda aurea* with that in Sth. 3 shows that this Icelandic version ultimately derives from a redaction similar to Jacobus de Voragine's text, for he provides not only an identification of each saint with the appropriate casket, but also an explication of the symbolism in each case. The Sth. 3 and *Legenda aurea* redactions are also linked in that the sequence of the caskets shown coincides with the sequence of their explication.

How did this variant dream vision come to find a place in *Reykjahólabók*? There is every indication that the Inventio narrative derives from an older Icelandic redaction, and this derived in turn from a text that was similar to the one on which Jacobus de Voragine's account is based. In the source of the Inventio account in Sth. 3 no attempt had been made, however, to reconcile the dream with the facts of burial, whereas in the *Legenda aurea* the inconsistency was resolved through the removal of specific details.

The account of the burial and the report of the dream in the *Passionael* correspond to those in the *Legenda aurea*, which is not surprising, since one of the sources of the *Passionael* as a whole, albeit of its High German predecessor, *Der Heiligen Leben*, was Jacobus de Voragine's compilation. The legend „Van Sunte Steffen als he ghefunden wart“ is headed in the *Passionael* by a woodcut depicting the sleeping Lucianus with Gamaliel at his side, who points toward four caskets (xcvii, b). The dream vision is as follows:

do wise de he em .iiij. schone vate. de dre weren gulden. vnde eyn was sulueren. Dat ene gulden vat was vul roder rosen. De anderen twe weren vul witter rosen. Dat .iiij. sulueren vat was vul saffaran. vnde lede em do vth wat dat bedudedede vnde sprack Dat vat mit den roden rosen is sunte Steffens sarck mit deme hyllichdome. De roden rosen beduden syne marteles. vnde de krone de he nu dreghet. De twe guldene vate mit den witten rosen. de synt min vnde Nicodemus. vnde beduden de luttere herren. de wy hadden to gode. Dat .iiij. sulueren vat vul saffaran. ys

myns soens abibas. vnde bedudet de kuschkeyt de he hadde van synen kyntliken daghen. (xcvii, c-d)

The coincidence of the Sth. 3 and *Passionael* redactions in the dream vision is *per se* not remarkable, since the same coincidence exists between Sth. 3 and the account in the *Legenda aurea*. Furthermore, to be noted is a deviation at the end of the vision, where we read in the *Passionael* that the silver *vat*, that is, vessel or container, full of saffron signifies Abibas's „chastity from the days of his childhood.“ The Sth. 3 redaction expresses this in a rather different way. There the silver casket signifies „hans hreinan og ofleckadan meydóm amedan hann lifde og því synezt hann silfre biarttare med godvm jlm“ (229:26–28). The basic meaning in both redactions is the same, of course, but the manner of expressing it is rather different. The Icelandic suggests a Latin source, one presumably deriving ultimately from redaction B of the *Epistola Luciani*, where we read: „Quoniam filius meus castus et immaculatus excessit e mundo, propterea in similitudinem argenti mundissimi apparuit“ (col. 814).²⁹ Not only does Sth. 3 duplicate the Latin collocation „castus et immaculatus,“ but it also transmits the explanation for the silver. Furthermore, in the Germanensis codex of the *Epistola Luciani*, the variant „virgo et immaculatus“ occurs (col. 184, fn. 2), which is reflected in the Icelandic *meydómr*.

The question to be answered is whether the Sth. 3 dream already existed in the manuscript being copied or was interpolated from another

²⁹ The correspondence between Sth. 3 and the *Passionael* in writing *saffran* (as opposed to *krog* in Sth. 2) does not prove Low German provenance. Although Westergård-Nielsen lists the word *safran* as a loan from Low German, the word had currency both in Norway and Iceland. It is attested in the fourteenth century, for example, in the phrase „pipar ok safran“ in Kong Magnus Erikssöns Retterbod of 1346 (*Norges gamle Love* III 166:17) and again in Kong Haakon Magnussöns Retterbod of 1358, where we read „pipare safran“ (NGL, III, 177:5). The word also occurs in two fifteenth-century manuscripts, the so-called *Lækningabók* (Kr. Kálund, ed., *Den islandske lægebok. Codex Arnarnagæanus 434a, 12mo.* (Copenhagen, 1907) and in the RoyalIrAcad 23 D 43, edited in *An Old Icelandic Medical Miscellany* by Henning Larsen (Oslo, 1931). In the latter, the identification of *crocus* with *sæfran* is clearly established (12v, # 38, p. 65), thereby suggesting that *krog* and *saffran* were understood as synonyms. Of interest to us is that a new section of the manuscript, according to Larsen, „forms the beginning of a leechbook“ (fn. 2, p. 115), which has as title the sentence: „Hier hefir lækna boc þorleifs biorns sonar“ (p. 21; cf. p. 115 of the edition) whom Henning Larsson conjectures to be the father of the copyist of *Reykjahólabók* (pp. 21–23).

source. Speaking for the existence of this redaction of the dream in the Icelandic source from which the *Inventio* section of *Stefanus saga* was copied is the inherent contradiction between the dream vision and the account of the burial and finding. Throughout *Reykjahólabók* the compiler functions very much as a hagiographer who wishes to transmit as complete a record of a saint as possible and who is therefore willing to transmit variant, even contradictory matter. When he does so, however, he also remarks on the discrepancies, as happens for example, in the divergent accounts transmitted in *Gregorius saga biskups* (cf. *Rhb*, II, 24:13; 24:28; 25:1), or when he comments on the variant names Albanus (in his source of *Stefanus saga*) and Volusianus in other books (217:18–19; see section II above). If the dream had been interpolated from a second source, the compiler presumably would have noted that it contradicted the preceding and subsequent factual information. Indeed, the method of incorporating deviating information that is evident elsewhere in *Reykjahólabók* – but most strikingly in *Gregorius saga biskups* – suggests that the compiler would not have suppressed one variant in favor of another, but would have incorporated both, but accompanied by commentary. It appears implausible that the source of *Stefanus saga* in *Sth*. 3 had contained the *Sth*. 2 redaction of the dream, and that the compiler had rejected this in favor of the variant represented by the *Legenda aurea* redaction. The very fact that the contradiction between the account of the burial and the dream was allowed to stand suggests that a manuscript was being copied that already contained the contradiction rather than that the copyist/compiler rejected a dream that concurred with what preceded and followed in the legend – as in the *Sth*. 2 redaction – in favor of one that contradicted earlier and subsequent information.

In the *Legenda aurea* and the *Passionael* the two *Translatio* accounts constitute a part of the *Inventio* legend. Like the *Inventio* in *Sth*. 3, which derives from a no longer extant Icelandic redaction, the first *Translatio* account, while related to that in the other manuscripts, nonetheless derives from a different redaction, one characterized by an otherwise unknown introductory interpolation to the story of how the body of St. Stephen came to be transferred to Constantinople. The *Inventio* narrative (ch. 10) in *Reykjahólabók* concludes with a reference to St. Augustine that is not found in the other manuscripts:

en efter því sem sanctvs Avgvstinvs skrifar vt af þa hafe helgr domr Stefani færdr j bvirtv vr fyr greindvm stad og kirkiv j Syon og hier maa vel heyra. (233:18–20)

This final sentence of ch. 10 is at once transitional and introductory to the first Translatio legend in ch. 11. Whereas the account does not exist in Sth. 15, which here appends the miracles to the Inventio, the Sth. 2 (AM 661) redaction introduces the legend as follows:

<A>lexander het oлдungr ein j iorsala borg sa er kirkiu let gióra enum helga stephano a sinv fe sialfs adogvm jons byskvps (47rb32–34; Hms 302:31–33)

The corresponding text in Sth. 3 presumably derives from a different redaction and contains an explanation for the generosity of Alexander:

Svo bar thil at j borg þeirre er Constantinopolem heiter var einn rikr rad mann þar j stadnvm er Ale<x>ander hiet. hann atte og eina gavfvga qvinnv er Jvliana hiet. Þesse herann med sine qvinv giordv sier ferd vt yfer hafit til vors herra grafar. og þa er hann kom vppa vegen þaa var honvm sagt j fra morgvm og storvm jar-theiknvm er³⁰ gvd drotten birtte vida fyrer verdleik heilags Stefani. og af þessv fieck hann mikla elskv til sancte Stefans og liet giora honvm eina kirkiv af sialfs sins fie. Petta var og aa dogvm Jon biskvps. (233:21–29)

Whereas the shorter text of Sth. 2 could be interpreted as representing a condensation of a common older source, another textual discrepancy in the first Translatio account supports the contention that in this section of the legend Sth. 2 and Sth. 3 represent two different redactions. In Sth. 2 (AM 661) we read that eight years after the death of Alexander, his wife Juliana wished to move to Constantinople and to take her husband's body with her:

Atta vetrvm sidarr villdi iuliana fara af iorsala lande til mikla gardz ok hafa med ser likama bonda sins því villdi hvn til mikla gardz at fadir hennar lifdi ok var þar ok hvn var þar odalborinn ok af því odrv at hvn villdi eigi giptaz en henne var til þess miok bægt. (47va6–11; Hms 303:7–11)

³⁰ Sth. 3 writes *eg*.

The corresponding passage in Sth. 3 writes that this occurred seven years later; it also transmits Juliana's reasons for wishing to move, but in a deviating sequence:

Siav vetrvm sidar vilde Jvliana fara til Jorsala landz³¹ og `kom `til Mikla gardz og villde f   at hafa med likama bonda sins.   viat h  n var   ar   ttvd og fader hennar lifde   ar. og so j avdrvm matha var hennar miog freistad vmm   at at h  n skyllde gipttazt. en h  n villde   at ecki. (234:9–14)

The discrepancy in numbers also exists in non-Icelandic sources. In the *Translatio* account edited by Mombritius, we read „Post octo annos“ (480:43), whereas the *Legenda aurea* writes: „Evolutis ergo VII annis Juliana ejus uxor in patriam suam volens redire“ (p. 463), while the *Passionael* transmits a variant of this: „vnde syne vrouwe bleef dar noch .vij. iaer“ (xcviii, a). Neither the Latin redaction edited by Mombritius, however, nor that in the *Legenda aurea* transmits the motivation given in the two Icelandic redactions.

There is a second discrepancy in numbers in the first *Translatio* account. When a scholar is fetched to translate the Hebrew text on the coffin containing the body of St. Stephen, we read in Sth. 2 that he arrives „med tveim vitnis m  nnvm“ (48ra40–41; Hms 305:28–29), but in Sth. 3 he is accompanied by „fimm vitnis monnvm“ (237:16). The reading in Sth. 2 corresponds to that in Mombritius's edition, „cum duobus protectoribus“ (482:26). Although the *Legenda aurea* does not transmit this scene, its source may have contained the variant reading found in Sth. 3.

Finally, just as the *Translatio* account in Sth. 3 opens with a longer introductory passage, it also closes with a reference to the many pilgrims who sought out the shrine of St. Stephen – but this is not found in Sth. 2:

og vard helgr domvren   ar j nockvr ar og giordizt   angat mikil sogkn af ymsvm londvm saker othalegra jartheikna giorda er gvd almatthogr synde   ar syndogvm monnvm fyrer arnadar `ord` heilags Stefani. (238:11–14)

³¹ The text is corrupt, and should read *af Jorsalalande*, as in Sth. 2. Presumably Bj  rn had tried to make sense of the text by inserting the word *kom* over the line between *og* and *til*.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above is that not only the Inventio narrative but also the first Translatio account in Sth. 3 derives from an Icelandic source that represented a different version than the one found in the other Icelandic manuscripts. This hardly comes as a surprise, for the Translatio was transmitted in Latin and vernacular redactions as part of the Inventio. The source of these two sections of Stefanus saga in Reykjahólabók presumably was a redaction that did not contain the second Translatio legend.

*IV. The „Interpolated“ Chapter in Sth. 3
and the Structure of the Miracle Sequence*

Ch. 13 of Stefanus saga, which Widding and Bekker-Nielsen identified as material deriving from a source other than an older Icelandic redaction, is an account of a second transferral of the relics of St. Stephen, this time from Constantinople to Rome, where they came to rest next to those of his fellow martyr St. Lawrence. On one level the legend of the translation of the relics of St. Stephen to Rome is a miracle story. Eudoxia, the daughter of Emperor Theodosius is possessed by the devil, and in order to obtain a cure, her father wishes to send her to Constantinople to visit the grave of St. Stephen. The devil, however, announces through her that he will not leave her body until the relics of St. Stephen have been brought to Rome. When the emperor asks the Constantinopolitans to cede their relics, he is told that they are willing to give up their saint only in exchange for the relics of St. Lawrence, and this is agreed upon. The relics of St. Stephen are to be placed in the church of St. Peter in Chains, but when the bearers arrive there, the body becomes so heavy that they are unable to move it. The devil intervenes again and announces that St. Stephen wishes to rest nowhere except at the side of St. Lawrence. On this occasion the princess is cured. When the remains are borne to the church of St. Lawrence, a minor miracle attesting the posthumous friendship of the two saints takes place: St. Lawrence moves aside to make room for his fellow martyr. Again there is supernatural interference, for when the Constantinopolitans now attempt to remove the remains of St. Lawrence, they fall to the ground unconscious. The body of St. Lawrence is once more placed beside that of St. Stephen, and heaven voices its

approval: now the city of Rome has received in one grave two martyrs, St. Lawrence of Spain and St. Stephen of Jerusalem.

Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen thought that matter for a „few minor corrections“ as well as a whole chapter had been „taken from the *Passionael*.“³² This is not the case. An analysis of the additional chapter in the Sth. 3 redaction and a comparison with the corresponding matter in the *Passionael* and the *Legenda aurea* shows that the chapter is a translation from Low German; like the other translated legends in *Reykjahólabók*, however, the source was not the *Passionael* but a much longer text, one that in some respects resembled the text of the *Legenda aurea*.

The most striking evidence of the Low German origin of ch. 13 is a mistake, but one that becomes apparent only by comparison with the text in the *Passionael*. After the relics of St. Stephen have been placed next to those of St. Lawrence, *Reykjahólabók* reports: „Sidan fara þeir til og vilia thaka helgan domen og þrív til serckssins. er beinenn lagv j“ (241:6–8). If the above is read by itself, no incongruity is immediately apparent. Reference to the text of the *Passionael* shows, however, that the phrase *til serksins* must be an error that was generated by a Low German cognate. The Constantinopolitans do not reach for the shirt or shroud containing the body of St. Lawrence, but rather for the coffin, as we read in the *Passionael*: „vnde tasteden dat sark an“ (xcviii, c). Although the Icelandic above was not translated from this Low German text, its source must have contained the word *sark*, like the *Passionael*, and the translator was led astray by it. Although *sark* is etymologically related to Icelandic *serkr*, it can only mean „coffin“ in Middle Low German.³³ There is a second clear indication that ch. 13 is

³² „Low German Influence on Late Icelandic Hagiography,“ p. 251. Already in his edition of AM 655 XIV (1952) Ole Widding had suggested that ch. 13 might be a late interpolation.

³³ In addition to the presumed mistranslation of *sark* with *serkr*, occasioned by their similarity, the loan word *stallbrodvr* may also have been taken over from the Low German source. When the devil announces that St. Stephen does not wish to come to rest in St. Peter's in Chains in Rome, he says: „hann vill j þessv mvstere ecki vera og hverrge nema hia Lavrencivm stallbrodr sinvm“ (240:14–15). There is no corresponding text in the *Passionael*. On the whole, the translator of the legends that derive from Low German was quite reliable, but occasionally an error generated by a related word in Icelandic did occur. An example similar to the one in the second *Translatio* occurs in the legend of St. Nicholas of Tolentino, where we read that the saint „bar og mikit mothlæte

a translation from Low German. The voice that is heard when the body of St. Stephen is finally laid to rest beside St. Lawrence apostrophizes Rome: „O þv edle stadr Roma“ (241:20–21), and this mimics the wording found in the *Passionael*: „O Rome du eddel stat“ (xcviii, c).

Despite the above evidence that ch. 13 derives from Low German, the *Passionael* could not have been the source. Not only is the interpolated chapter much longer than the corresponding section of the *Passionael*, but there are significant differences between the two in content and style, such as the use of indirect discourse in the Icelandic version but direct discourse in the Low German. The argument advanced by Widding and Bekker-Nielsen that the translator revised and expanded the text of the *Passionael* is untenable. They apparently were unaware of the fact that the *Passionael* legends themselves are on the whole quite abridged versions of older texts. Furthermore, throughout Reykjahólabók there is evidence that passages that might otherwise be interpreted as an expansion and revision of the *Passionael*, actually correspond to text found in older German legends.³⁴ This seems to have been the case in Stefanus saga. The translated legends in Reykjahólabók attest that there existed longer Low German redactions than the abridged versions in the *Passionael*. The caveat expressed by Karl-Ernst Geith concerning exclusive reliance on the *Acta*

j sinv hiartta vegna fathækra manna og vthlendra og þeirra annara er j navdvm vorv stadder“ (II, 152:14–15). The passage makes sense, but the corresponding text in the *Passionael* – „He hadde ok medelidinghe mit den armen elenden seken minschen“ (Cxlx, a) – suggests that here, just as in Stefanus saga, there was a slipup. The adjective *elenden*, etymologically the same as Icelandic *erlendr*, does not refer to poor foreigners who were ill, but was used idiomatically; when coupled with *sek*, *elend* refers to those suffering from leprosy (cf. Karl Schiller and August Lübben, *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 1875; rpt. Vaduz: Sändig, 1986).

³⁴ It should be noted once more that the *Passionael* is nothing but a Low German version of *Der Heiligen Leben*, the author/compiler of which drew on older legends, which he abridged severely, and this explains why some apparently „interpolated“ passages in Reykjahólabók correspond to text in older German sources. See „The Icelandic ‘Gregorius peccator’ and the European Tradition,” pp. 575–84; „Gregorius saga biskups and Gregorius auf dem Stein;“ also „Osvalds saga konungs;“ *The Eighth International Saga Conference. The Audience of the Sagas*, August 11–17, 1991 (Gothenburg University, 1991), I:268–277.

Sanctorum and imprints of individual manuscripts in the case of the Latin legends, applies to Low German hagiography as well:

Die in den letzten Jahren vorgelegten und die gesamte Ueberlieferung einer Legende einbeziehenden Untersuchungen haben gezeigt, dass es nicht ausreicht, sich jeweils auf die Texte der ASS oder auf Drucke einzelner Handschriften zu stützen. Die einzelnen Legenden können bei aller Konstanz des Textes in sprachlich und auch sachlich durchaus voneinander abweichenden Fassungen zeitlich und regional verbreitet gewesen sein.³⁵

It is presumptuous and methodologically unsound to think that sixteenth-century Icelandic versions of Low German legends could derive only from the *Passionael*, simply because it existed in print.

Although the translated legends in *Reykjahólabók* tend on the whole to be more dramatic than those of the *Passionael*, because the third-person narrative of the latter frequently corresponds to dialogue in *Reykjahólabók*, the converse occurs occasionally in ch. 13 of *Stefanus saga*. There are not only differences in content between chapter 13 and the corresponding section in the *Passionael*, but also discrepancies in style. When the emperor decides to send his daughter to Constantinople to be cured, the devil himself speaks in the *Passionael*:

Ik wyl dyt vat nicht rumen. beth sunte Steffen to Rome kumt.
so moet yk vth. wente de hyllighen apostele willen. dat he scal to
en komen. (xcviii, b)

In Sth. 3, the passage commences in indirect discourse but then shifts to direct discourse, and otherwise also follows a different sequence:

þa svarade andskothen at honvm kæme þat fyrer ecki. fyrer því
at hann sagdizt sitt ecki mvndv vma fyr en heilagr domr Stefans

³⁵ Karl-Ernst Geith, „Die ‘Abbreviatio in gestis et miraculis sanctorum’ von Jean de Mailly als Quelle der ‘Legenda aurea’,“ *Analecta Bollandiana. Revue critique d'hagiographie*, 105 (1987), 290–91. The bibliographical survey of the High and Low German as well as Dutch legends by Williams-Krapp (*Die deutschen und niederländischen Legendare*) supports the validity of Geith's remark for vernacular hagiography as well, and demonstrates the remarkable diversity – as yet unexploited by literary historians – of the existing vernacular compilations.

kæme til Rom. þviat postolar gvdz villjæ þat at hann kome til þeirra. og verd eg þæ at fara vr minv herberge þo mier þyke mikit fyrer en vist ecki fyre. (238:30–239:3)

In the *Passionael* there is only one reference to the pope in the negotiations for the exchange of the relics. It takes place after the emperor has unilaterally, or so it seems, declared his willingness to trade St. Lawrence for St. Stephen. The *Passionael* reports that it was difficult for the Constantinopolitans to give up their saint, but „se deden dat doch vmme des keysers willen“ (xcviii, b). Only now does the emperor report to the pope and his cardinals concerning the negotiations. The lack of proper protocol in these negotiations – which are, after all, primarily an ecclesiastical matter – is striking, and the text in Reykjahólabók bears witness that the Low German text in the *Passionael* has been drastically reduced. In the Icelandic version we read that the Constantinopolitans agree to the exchange in the first place because the offer was made in conjunction with the pope's advice and approval (239:17–19; 23). When the emperor receives word of the reaction from Constantinople, he sends word to the pope, who in turn orders his cardinals to undertake the mission to fetch the relics of St. Stephen. If one reads the *Passionael* text alongside the redaction in Reykjahólabók it becomes clear that the abrupt and insufficiently motivated character of the Low German text is the result of abridgment. In the Icelandic legend, however, we are told that not only the negotiations for the exchange but also the procedures for doing so are a joint ecclesiastical-imperial venture: „fer þetta allt efter því sem bæde pafen og keisaren hofdv giortt rad fyrer“ (239:33–240:1). Although the *Legenda aurea* itself transmits abridged texts of longer redactions, it attests that the exchange of relics is suggested and carried out only after the emperor has consulted the ecclesiastical establishment, notably the pope, who is identified as Pelagius:

Quod cum imperator audivisset, a clero et populo Constantino-politano obtinuit, ut corpus sancti Stephani Romanis daretur et ipsi beati Laurentii corpus acciperent. Tunc imperator Pelagio papae super hoc scripsit, papa vero de consilio cardinalium imperatoris petitioni consensit. Missi igitur Constantinopolim cardinales corpus sancti Stephani Romam deferunt et Graeci pro accipiendo corpore sancti Laurentii prosequantur. (p. 464).

Whereas the *Passionael* briefly comments that when the relics arrived in Rome, „do ghink me en entyeghen mit dem hyllichdome“ (xcviii, b), the solemn character of the reception is given its due in *Reykjahólabók*: „þæ giorde pafen vt j mothe þeim dyrlæga processio og fylgde þeim so jnn j staden Roma“ (240:2–3).

Chapter 13 concludes by giving the year 425 as the date when the above events occurred, and then the following transitional sentence occurs:

Sanctvs Avgvstinvs skrifar og at drotten hefvr giortt margar og miklar jartheigner fyrer sancte Stefanvs skvld. þo einkannlega sex menn er vagter hafa verit af davda fyrer hans arnadar ord. sem hier mæ vel heyra efteræ. (241:24–27)

The same statement, but minus the anticipatory „sem hier mæ vel heyra efteræ,“ occurs in the *Legenda aurea*: „Refert Augustinus in libro XXII de civitate Dei VI mortuos ad invocationem sancti Stephani suscitatos“ (p. 465) and in the *Passionael*: „Sunte Augustinus beschrift. dat vnse here mennighen heft sund ghemaket. vnde vth synen noden ghehulpen dorch sunte Steffens wyllen. vnde besunderghen heft he .vj. mynschen van deme dode vorwekket“ (xcviii, c).

Unlike *Reykjahólabók*, the *Legenda aurea* and the *Passionael* relate the legend of St. Stephen as two distinct narratives, as the Passio and the Inventio. Both legendaries mention the resurrection of six individuals, but only the *Legenda aurea* records the miracles briefly, while the *Passionael* omits them. The *Legenda aurea* notes at the end of the Passio narrative that St. Augustine relates six resurrection miracles, and that through the intercession of St. Stephen „multos a variis languoribus curasse“ (p. 54). There follow the accounts of four cures. The *Passionael* does not refer to St. Augustine at the end of the Passio narrative, but relates two cures, without, however, introducing them with a transitional sentence. The Latin and the Low German legendaries thus diverge in the transmission of the miracles.

Common to Sth. 3, the *Legenda aurea*, and the *Passionael* is the conclusion of the second Translatio narrative, but in Sth. 3 there is an additional element, the authorial remark „sem hier mæ vel heyra efteræ.“ It is the structural link to the miracle sequence. In the other Icelandic manuscripts, AM 655 XXII excepted, the miracles appear to be an afterthought, in any case not an integral part of the narrative. In

Sth. 15 (96r13) and AM 655 XIV (2v40) the miracles are abruptly, and without transition, appended to the Inventio; in Sth. 2 they commence after the first Translatio narrative has come to a rather conclusive end, thus suggesting that there is no more to tell. To the concluding formulaic reference to the Holy Trinity (48rb24–25; Hms 306:13–14), which is also found in Sth. 3 (238:10–11), the Sth. 2 redaction adds: „*honvm se vegr ok dyrd vm allar alldir verallda amen*“ (48rb25; Hms 306:14–15). Alone AM 655 XXII, like Sth. 3, contains an introductory, or transitional, sentence to the miracles: „*Sva er sagt at margar iartegner gerþ-ozc at kirkiom þeim er helg[apar varo] stephano*“ (2r19–20). Two manuscripts conclude the narrative proper with the Inventio (Sth. 15 and AM 655 XIV) and two with the first Translatio (Sth. 2 and AM 655 XXII), to which they append the miracles. Only in Sth. 3 are the miracles successfully integrated into the narrative.

If one compares the conclusion of the legend of St. Stephen in Sth. 15/Sth. 2/AM 661/AM 655 XXII on the one hand and Sth. 3 on the other, the redactions are distinguished not only by virtue of the greater length of the Sth. 3 redaction, which alone relates how the relics of St. Stephen were translated from Constantinople to Rome, but also because of deviation in the sequence of the miracles. In the Sth. 2/AM 661 redaction, as in Sth. 15, the miracles are told in the following sequence:

- 1) a blind woman regains her vision during the episcopacy of Preiectus
- 2) a bishop named Lucillus has a growth on his hand and is cured
- 3) a priest named Eukarius is cured of kidney stones; he subsequently succumbs to an illness and dies, but is then raised from the dead
- 4) Marcialis, a sick pagan, is cured and converted to the faith;
- 5) at the same time and in the same place two poor sick men are cured, the one a citizen, the other a foreigner
- 6) in the city of Audurus a young boy who had been run over by oxen is raised from the dead
- 7) a nun is raised from the dead
- 8) the young daughter of a man named Bassus is raised from the dead

- 9) the son of a farmer named Herenus is raised from the dead
- 10) the son of a government official named Eleusinus is raised from the dead
- 11) an old woman is healed from an incurable disease
- 12) a brother and a sister are healed of spastic seizures

The above sequence corresponds to that found in St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei*.³⁶

In AM 655 XXII, on leaf 2r, the miracles also commence with the cure of the blind woman; then there is a lacuna owing to the fragmentary state of the leaf, and on the verso the miracles continue with the end of nr. 5 above. Presumably the missing portion of the bottom recto and top verso of the leaf contained nr. 4, which is a comparatively long account, and possibly nr. 3. The following miracles do not have the same sequence, however, as those in Sth. 2/Sth. 15: the cure of Marcialis is followed by nrs. 10, 9, 7, 6, 2. Given the serial nature of the miracles, none of which is dependent on another, a change in sequence is not out of the ordinary. The fragment AM 655 XIV concludes with the words: „Þa er preiectus byscup for með helg[an]“ (2v40). Thus the first miracle in this redaction corresponds to that in the sequence listed above.

Sth. 3 contains yet a third sequence, one which shows that at least in one redaction of the legend the sequence of the miracles was generated by their type. As was pointed out above, only Sth. 3 interjects a transitional sentence between the account of the translation of St. Stephen and the miracles, and it is this sentence which necessarily determines the sequence of the first six miracle stories. Vis-à-vis the sequence in Sth. 15/Sth. 2, the order of miracles in *Reykjahólabók* is: 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12. The sequence of miracles is bipartite, consisting of six accounts of persons being raised from the dead, and six relating cures.

The symmetrical structure of the miracle sequence in Sth. 3 presumably derives from the redaction Björn was copying. The *Passionael* does not contain the resurrection miracles, but the reference to St. Augustine suggests that the ultimate source of the German legendary had

³⁶ Bernardvs Dombart and Alphonsvs Kalb, ed. *Sancti Avrelii Avgvstini: De civitate Dei*, Libri XI-XXII, Avrelii Avgvstini: Opera, XIV, 2, Corpus Christianorum: Ser. Lat., 48 (Turnhout, 1955), XXII, 8, pp. 821-27.

also contained them. The *Legenda aurea* confirms this. Although Jacobus de Voragine has reduced the accounts of the six resurrection miracles to one or two sentences each, they follow the same sequence (*Legenda aurea*, p. 465) as that found in *Reykjahólabók*. Since Jacobus de Voragine tended to abbreviate and summarize matter from his sources, one can assume that the longer versions in *Reykjahólabók* ultimately derive from a Latin redaction – there is no evidence of Low German influence here – which contained fuller reports of the miracles, and this redaction may also have been the source of the miracles in the *Legenda aurea*. At the conclusion of the *Passio* narrative, the *Legenda aurea* relates miracles 1, 4, 11, and 12 above, while the *Passio-nael* only transmits miracles 4 and 12.

The deviation of the miracle sequence in Sth. 3 from the one in Sth. 15/Sth. 2/AM 661 on the one hand, and AM 655 XXII on the other, supports the thesis that Björn Porleifsson's source was an Icelandic redaction that deviated markedly from the other manuscripts. A number of corrupt readings in the miracle sequence (cf. section I above) were incurred in the process of copying a manuscript. The scribal errors may already have existed in Björn's source. Since the sequence of the resurrection miracles in Sth. 3 corresponds to that in the *Legenda aurea*, the source of which was a Latin redaction, the bipartite sequence of miracles in *Reykjahólabók* – which deviates from that in the other manuscripts – presumably derives ultimately from a source similar to that known to Jacobus de Voragine.

V. Conclusion

Stefanus saga in *Reykjahólabók* is the result of four different types of literary activity: copying, editing, translating (from Low German), and compiling. The scribe has been identified as Björn Porleifsson, and there is every reason to presume that he was also the translator of the Low German texts in the legendary, and *ipso facto* the editor and compiler.³⁷ There is no evidence that Björn was a revising, „embellishing“ scribe; on the contrary, he was a careful, albeit not error-free,

³⁷ Sverrir Tómasson writes in *Íslensk bókmenntasaga* II (Reykjavík: Mál og menning, 1993), p. 278, that *Reykjahólabók* „hefur að geyma 25 helgisögur sem Björn Porleifsson á Reykhólum setti saman og sumpart þýddi“.

copyist. A comparison of Stefanus saga in Sth. 3 with the text of the legend in the other extant manuscripts provides evidence that Björn was copying an older Icelandic redaction of the *Inventio*, first *Translatio*, and miracle sequence that was in some instances markedly different from the other preserved texts. The most striking deviations are found in the content of the roses-and-saffron dream in the *Inventio* and the structure of the miracle sequence.

The Sth. 3 redaction of Stefanus saga contains the most complete legend of St. Stephen in Iceland, for unlike the redaction represented by Sth. 2, it includes a second *Translatio* account before the miracle sequence. This second *Translatio* derives from a Low German legend – not from that in the *Passionael*, but from a longer redaction. In interpolating the translation from the Low German, presumably for the sake of completeness, Björn revealed himself to be a compiler, a facet of his literary activity evident also in other parts of Stefanus saga. The *Passio* section of the legend appears to derive ultimately from the same Icelandic translation of the legend as the other manuscripts, yet it manifests considerable editorial intervention. Björn deleted matter – for example, the story of Veronica, because it could be read in another legend, that of St. James the Less – at the same time that he intercalated into Stefanus saga scriptural matter, which possibly also derives from the legend of St. James. Björn, the editor and compiler, went about his work with respect for the reader, for when he intervened in the text he was copying, he provided cross references.

Stefanus saga, as transmitted in *Reykjahólabók*, is the work of a hagiographer who set about transmitting as complete a record of the saint's *Passio*, *Inventio*, *Translatio*, and miracles as was available in Iceland at the time. The Sth. 3 redaction of Stefanus saga is superior to that in the other manuscripts – despite its idiosyncratic Icelandic lexicon and syntax – inasmuch as it is a compilation of late medieval knowledge about St. Stephen. Björn Þorleifsson copied an already existing Icelandic translation from the Latin but supplemented the text by translating additional material found in a Low German redaction. Contrary to what has been claimed, Björn, as copyist and translator, neither modernized the language nor modified the content of his source(s). Nonetheless, he appears to have worked in the awareness of his *œuvre* as a whole and therefore made conscious decisions to exclude matter recounted elsewhere. He was a thoughtful editor who

provided cross references and recognized the value of variants: he apprised the reader of their existence even while refusing to take a position concerning the better reading. *Stefanus saga* reveals the work of a scholarly mind and methodology, and constitutes a significant contribution to late medieval hagiography.

EFNISÁGRIP

Sagan af Stefáni frumvotti er varðveitt í nokkrum íslenskum miðaldahandritum. Í Hómilfubókinni (Sth. perg. 15 4to) frá um 1200 er hluti sögunnar varðveittur, einnig í þremur handritsbrotum frá 13. öld. Aðalhandrit sögunnar eru Sth. perg. 2 fol. frá fyrri hluta 15. aldar, AM 661 4to og Reykjahólabók (Sth. perg. 3 fol.) frá fyrri hluta 16. aldar. Textum þessara handrita ber ekki saman og leggur höfundur áherslu á að rannsaka tengsl sögunnar í Reykjahólabók við hinar gerðir hennar og sýnir fram á að Björn Þorleifsson, skrifari hennar, hefur unnið á sjálfstæðan hátt úr efnivið sínum. Hann hefur stuðst við eldri, íslenskar gerðir sögunnar sem og lágbýska gerð er hann sumpart þýddi.