

Alice Fardin

GENESIS AND PROVENANCE OF THE OLDEST SOUL-AND-BODY DEBATE IN OLD NORSE TRADITION

The philosophical *disputatio* between two antithetical figures that often confront and find fault with one another on metaphysical matters—such as the tumultuous relationships between vice and virtue, summer and winter, and the soul and the body—enjoyed wide circulation throughout the Middle Ages and inspired the composition of countless Latin and vernacular texts.¹ The oldest known soul-and-body debates are two Latin poems known as *Nuper huiuscemodi* (hereafter, *Nuper*), also known as the *Royal Debate*, and *Visio Philiberti*.² One theory proposes *Nuper huiuscemodi* as the direct source of *Visio Philiberti*, as demonstrated by Eleanor Kellogg Henningham through a lexical analysis of the two texts.³ A second theory views *Nuper* as a sort of imitation of *Visio Philiberti*,⁴ a text that enjoyed a wide circulation, attested by the fact that more than 157 extant manuscripts transmit this text, with a high degree of variation among them. Although a

- 1 On the philosophical *disputatio* as a literary genre, see, for instance, Michel-André Bossy, “Medieval Debates of Body and Soul,” *Comparative Literature* 28.2 (1976): 144–63, at 144. On the variety of its antithetical protagonists, see especially Barbara Pekar, “Discussing Medieval Dialogue between the Soul and the Body and Question of Dualism,” *Ars et Humanitas* 9.2 (2015): 172–99. On the international context of the debate, see Théodor Batiouchkof, “Le débat de l’âme et du corps I–II,” *Romania* 20, 77 and 80 (1891):1–55; 513–78, and Claudio Cataldi, “A Literary History of the ‘Soul and Body’ Theme in Medieval England” (PhD diss., University of Bristol, 2018).
- 2 Alessandra Capozza, “Per una nuova edizione della *Desputisun de l’âme et du corps*” (PhD diss., University of Macerata, 2011), 6–8 (hereafter cited as Capozza).
- 3 Eleanor Kellogg Henningham, ed., *An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul, Preserved in MS Royal 7 A III in the British Museum* (New York: published by the author, 1939), 68. The *Nuper huiuscemodi*. London, British Library, Royal 7 A III, fols. 123r–145r will be designated throughout as L.
- 4 George Sanderlin, “Reviewed Work(s): *An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul, Preserved in MS Royal 7 A III in the British Museum* by Eleanor Kellogg Heningham,” *Modern Language Notes* 57.3 (1942): 217–19.

reliable critical edition of the *Visio Philiberti* that may elucidate its genesis and early circulation still remains a desideratum,⁵ scholars generally agree that its text was produced in an unidentified English scriptorium.⁶ While the *Visio Philiberti* was translated into numerous European vernacular languages during the Middle Ages,⁷ the sole surviving medieval rendition of the *Nuper* to date is the Old French *Desputisun de l'âme et du corps* (hereafter, *Desputisun*), considered by Henningham as “a free and much abridged translation” of the *Nuper*.⁸ The last editor of the French text, Alessandra Capozza, notes no substantial variation from the main features of the Latin *Nuper* but indicates a simple reorganization of the original material and isolates some new narrative elements in the prologue, such as an abridgment of the *récit* and a transition from third-person narration in *Nuper* to the first person in *Desputisun*.⁹

The *Desputisun* opens with two personifications of an unknown sinner’s soul and body, which appear to an unidentified narrator, on a Saturday night, in a dream vision. The astounded man, who witnesses their dramatic dialogue as a silent spectator, sees the soul of the sinner returning to the body’s burial place and accusing the body of their terrible fate in the afterlife, as a result of a life conducted in sin, which has doomed both of them to the miseries of hell. The soul accuses the body of greed, pride, falsehood, and disobedience. She¹⁰ soon realizes that all the riches accumulated in life have been reduced to dust and that she will be punished by Christ during the Last Judgment for her lack of charity and mercy towards the poor. At the end of her speech, the body rises from his shroud to answer numerous accusations. He stresses how the hellish pains will be

5 Neil Cartlidge, “In the Silence of a Midwinter Night: A Reevaluation of the *Visio Philiberti*,” *Medium Aevum* 75 (2006): 24–45, at 24–25.

6 Cartlidge, “In the Silence,” 26.

7 Cartlidge records translations into English, French, Italian, German, Dutch, Polish, and Medieval Greek as well as an indirect influence on other European vernaculars. See Cartlidge, “In the Silence,” 24 and James Douglas Bruce, “A Contribution to the Study of ‘The Body and the Soul’: Poems in English,” *Modern Language Notes* 5.7 (1890): 193–201, at 200.

8 Henningham, *Early Latin Debate*, 48.

9 Capozza, 35–36.

10 In the following discussion, I will refer to the personifications of the body and soul respectively as masculine and feminine, as is customary in Latin, Old French, and Old Norse, according to these words’ genders in those languages (*corpus*, *cors*, *likam* and *anima*, *âme*, *sál*).

shared by both of them, and while he admits to being the physical agent of sin, he vehemently denies his part as a possible perpetrator of crimes. Subsequently, he draws a parallel between the responsibilities of people's bodies and souls in sinning and the biblical antecedent of Adam and Eve's responsibility in the formation of original sin. The body then builds his defence of contributory guilt and his own condition that is subordinate to the soul, as he acts mechanically. The soul rebuts this defence with a final speech tracing the fundamental arguments of her accusations and reflecting the ontology of evil. The scene ends with the appearance of a devil who announces their condemnation to hell, followed by other devils who, like wolves, pounce on the soul, seizing her and dragging her away while she struggles. Her desperate screams wake up the narrator, thus interrupting his dream.

The text of the *Desputisun* is transmitted in five codices, one of them being now lost: Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, 3516, fols. 140v–143r, from Saint-Omer, c. 1250–75 (P); Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 9411–9426, fols. 83v–90r, from Flanders/Northeast Artois/Hainaut, 1230 (B); London, British Library, Cotton Julius A.VII, fols. 72v–77r, from Worcester, c. 1200 (C); London, British Library, Harley 5234, fols. 180r–181v, from Durham, c. 1250 (H); †Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, L.V.32, unknown foliation (†T).¹¹ In turn, the *Desputisun* has served as the direct source of a Castilian translation known as *Disputa del alma y el cuerpo*, which is preserved in a single fragment (Madrid, Biblioteca nacional de España, V.5, núm. 9)¹² and in a Norse version, known as *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar (einn laugardag at kveldi)* [A conversation between body and soul (on Saturday evening)], the subject of this essay. Both texts date back to

11 †T (Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, L.V.32), which was once part of the Savoy royal collection, was lost in a fire at the National Library in Turin in 1904. A partial transcription of the manuscript was made by George-Jean Moucht (1737–1807) in the second half of the eighteenth century. Regrettably, the text of the *Desputisun* was not copied by Moucht, but other texts were. The following are the texts shared with R: *Bible* by Hugues de Berzé; *Voie de Paradis* by Raoul de Houdenc; *Congés* by Jean Bodel; and *Dit du pel, Dit du pélican, Conte du bachelier, Dit du dragon, Dit du Prud'homme, Dit d'envie, Dit d'amour, Dit de la Rose, Dit d'amour fine, Dit de Gentillesse* by Baudouin de Condé. See the discussion in Mauro Braccini, "Unica e esemplari creduti irrecuperabili dopo l'incendio della Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino: Un ulteriore controllo sulla copia settecentesca del cod. L. V.32," *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 47 (2001): 191–204.

12 See Antonio García Solalinde, "La disputa del Alma y el Cuerpo: Comparación con su original francés," *Hispanic Review* 1.3 (1933): 196–207.

the beginning of the thirteenth century. *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar*, edited by Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen (hereafter abbreviated WB),¹³ is transmitted in four manuscripts:

1. Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling, AM 619 4to, fols. 75v–78r (N), better known as the *Old Norwegian Homily Book*, written in Bergen between 1200 and 1225, and erroneously rubricated as *Visio sancti Pauli apostoli*.¹⁴
2. Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling, AM 764 4to, fols. 30r–v (R¹), often called *Reynistaðarbók*, a large codex that transmits *Veraldar saga* and numerous exempla, transcribed in the Benedictine convent of Reynistaðr (northern Iceland) between 1360 and 1370.¹⁵ The dialogue has no title, but the code transmits a singular attribution of the vision to an otherwise unidentified Auxentius.¹⁶
3. Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling, AM 696 XXXII 4to (R²), a fragment most likely also transcribed in the scriptorium of Reynistaðr or the Abbey of Möðruvellir towards the end of the fifteenth century.¹⁷
4. Reykjavík, Landsbókasafn Íslands – Háskólabókasafn, JS 405 8vo, fols. 10r–15v (A), a paper manuscript compiled by

13 Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen, “A Debate of the Body and the Soul in Old Norse Literature,” *Mediaeval Studies* 21 (1959): 272–89, at 278 (hereafter cited as Widding and Bekker-Nielsen).

14 The error made by the scribe causes one to question the knowledge of the *Visio Pauli* in Norway at the beginning of the thirteenth century. See especially Dario Bullitta, ed. and trans., *Páls leizla: The Vision of St. Paul*, Viking Society Texts (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2017), 26.

15 Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir, “The Resourceful Scribe: Some Aspects of the Development of *Reynistaðarbók* (AM 764 4to),” in *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, ed. Slavica Ranković et al., Papers in Mediaeval Studies 22 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012), 328.

16 The most logical identification would be Auxentius, bishop of Milan (d. 374, Milan), who was later declared a heretic and mentioned in Augustine, *Letter* 238, PL 33:1039a; Augustine was mentioned in the epilogue of the Norse text. However, this attribution seems to be a contradiction since the witness and narrator of this exemplum cannot possibly be a heretic. The most plausible explanation is a scribal error or an incorrect interpretation on the part of the copyist of R¹.

17 Gunnar Harðarson, *Littérature et spiritualité en Scandinavie médiévale: La traduction norroise de De Arria Animae de Hugues de Saint Victor. Étude historique et édition critique*, Bibliotheca Victorina 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995).

the farmer Ólafur Jónsson (d. 1800) on the island of Arney (northwestern Iceland) between 1780 and 1790. The text is introduced by a rubric that records another erroneous attribution of the text: “Her Biriast Bernardi Leidsla” (WB 280/382) (Here begins the vision of Bernard).¹⁸

The present essay traces the manuscript filiation and the paths of transmission of *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar*. Through a qualitative analysis of concurrent readings, it has been possible to confirm and expand the stemma hypothesized by Widding and Bekker-Nielsen. Furthermore, from a complete collation of *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar* with variants of the *Desputisun*, the study argues that the presence of readings typical of a so-called “Continental tradition” indicates that the lost manuscript source was a French codex, produced in a Benedictine monastery in Flanders. Subsequently, it was transferred from Flanders to a Norwegian Benedictine monastery, such as Munkeliv in Bergen, via a profitable network that connected Norwegian Benedictine foundations with their Flemish sister houses.

Manuscript Filiation

The relationship between the four manuscripts—**NAR¹R²**—has been studied by Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen, who have postulated the existence of a now-lost archetype of the Norse text, designated in their study by the siglum **Y**.¹⁹ It was soon clear to Widding and Bekker-Nielsen that the *Old Norwegian Homily Book* (**N**) retains the highest stemmatic value within the Norse tradition and that it must be fairly close to the archetype **Y**.²⁰ Two additional branches are derived from **Y**, one which

18 With “Bernard,” the scribe refers to Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153). However, the description that follows does not correspond to the biography of the well-known Cistercian monk. As a matter of fact, the Bernard referred to in **A** is defined on fol. 10r as follows: “Einn Vis oc vellærdr madr Bernhardus ad nafne var i einum Stad á leid á Englande” (WB 280/33–34) (A wise and well-educated man named Bernard was in one location travelling in England). However, this attribution is erroneous: the copist of **A** probably confused the texts of *Nuper* with that of *Visio Philiberti*, which has been often attributed to Bernard of Clairvaux. See the discussion in Jonas Wellendorf, *Kristelig visionslitteratur i norrøn tradition*, Bibliotheca Nordica 1 (Oslo, 2009), 51–42.

19 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 278.

20 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 275.

includes only **N**, and **Z**, the common ancestor of the three other Icelandic manuscripts, **405**, **764**, and **696** (see fig. 1).




Figure 1. *Stemma codicum of the Viðröðla líkams ok sálar*
(Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen, 278)

The new stemma presented here (fig. 2) partially confirms and partially expands the stemma hypothesized by Widding and Bekker-Nielsen. First, the presence of an archetype **X**, namely, the lost Old French manuscript from which two separate traditions descend, can be confirmed.²¹ The presence of a common archetype **Y** can also be confirmed on the basis of the readings discussed above. Accordingly, **Y** stands behind the four Norse manuscripts, **NAR¹R²**. Two more branches descend from **Y**: a first Norwegian line of transmission that includes **N** alone, and a second Icelandic line, **Z**, characterized by a revision of the original readings of **Y**, from which **AR¹R²** were copied. Furthermore, the presence of **Z₂**, a previously unidentified subarchetype of **Z**, must have given birth to **R¹R²** as evidenced by a number of common errors discussed above.

21 With regard to the direct Old French tradition of the *Desputisun*, Hermann Varnhagen's stemma has been repropoed in the present study without modification in fig. 2. Hermann Varnhagen, *Das altfranzösische Gedicht Un samedi par nuit*, Erlanger Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 1 (Erlangen: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1889), 119. It should be noted that Varnhagen's is still the only stemma available. A new edition and study of the manuscript filiation of the *Desputisun* remains a desideratum.




Figure 2. New stemma codicum of the *Vidrøða líkams ok sálar* (by the author)

The high degree of **N**'s formal correctness, compared to the other witnesses, is supported by the presence of only two significant errors, already highlighted by Widding and Bekker-Nielsen.²² The first error is found within the soul's accusation of the body, which is reprimanded for having been an "illr þráll" (evil servant), for not having served her as a "høglect herbyrgie" (comfortable host), and for illegitimately taking control over the soul and thus making her his "ambót" (maidservant). In the corresponding passage of the *Desputisun* in **P**, the body is defined as a "malvais ostal" (evil host), a reading correctly transmitted in **Z**₂ (**R**¹**R**²), where it is rendered by the expression "eligt herbergi" (vile host) and erroneously transcribed as "høglect herbyrgie" (comfortable host) in **N**, possibly through a paleographic confusion of letters. **A** transmits another erroneous reading, "dirdlegt" (honorable), which may have arisen as a semi-synonym of "eligt." In this context "eligt" should be considered the *lectio difficilior*, a rare adjective that is otherwise attested only five times in the records of the *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*²³ and that must have been present in the archetype **Y**, subsequently misread in **N** and reinterpreted in **A** (see table 1).

22 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 277–78.

23 It is attested once in *Spakmáli Prospers "Epigrammata,"* twice in *Stjórn*, and once in the indigenous romance *Viktors saga ok Blávuss*. *ONP: Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*, s.v. "eligt, eligr, éligr, eiligr," accessed 15 February 2023, <https://onp.ku.dk/onp/onp.php>.

Table 1.

P (118/163) ²⁴	N (282/11) ²⁵	A (282/43)	R ¹ (282/30)	R ² (282/17)
malvais [evil].	høglect [comfortable].	dírdlegt [honorable].	eligt [vile].	ieligt [vile].

The second significant error is found within the body's speech, in which he admits to behaving "worse than a dog" (eg em verri enn hundr; in R²). The referent for "dog" is attested in all the manuscripts of the Old French tradition (PB and CH), which transmit the noun "chien" (dog); in the *Nuper* with the Latin "cane" (dog); and in Z with the Norse "hundr" (dog). However, N transmits the second-person singular pronoun "þu" (you), a clear paleographic change of the initial letter *h-* to *þ-* and a misreading of the nasal abbreviation of the velar vowel -*ū-* (see table 2). The reading is omitted in R¹.

Table 2.

L (132/686)	P (136/618)	N (286/10)	A (287/28)	R ² (286/32)
cane [dog]. ²⁶	chien [dog].	þu [you].	hundr [dog].	hundr [dog].

Finally, the existence of Y is supported by a non-significant error. In the prologue of *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar*, the narrator reports the dialogue between the soul and the body in his sleep. The Old French tradition specifies the scene with "en mon dormant" (in my sleep), a reading reflected in Z₁ (AR¹R²) as "isuefni" ("in [my] sleep"). N attests a similar, yet not identical, form "i draume" (in [my] dream), which corresponds to the Latin "somnia" in L. The reading "draume" (dream) as semi-synonym of "suefni" (sleep) may have been introduced independently, and its agreement with the Latin text could be coincidental. In this connection, it should be noted that N and Z transmit a dative of place preceded by the preposition *í* (in), as does the Old French text P with

24 All quotations of *Desputisun* are taken from Capozza.

25 All quotations of *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar* are taken from Widding and Bekker-Nielsen.

26 All English translations throughout are my own, unless otherwise specified.

“en” (in), not the accusative preceded by the preposition *per* (**L**), denoting “through” a place, as in the *Nuper* (see table 3). However, this error does not have an indisputable transmission link; since the referents for “sleep” and “dream” are semi-synonyms, the original “sleep” could have been changed into “dream” independently in different traditions. This section of text is missing in **R**².

Table 3.

L (102/7)	P (112/3)	N (280/4)	A (280/34)	R ¹ (280/20)
per somnium [through a dream].	en mon dor- mant [in my sleep].	i draume [in dream].	sem svefn [as sleep].	isuefni [in sleep].

Furthermore, Widding and Bekker-Nielsen provided further evidence in favour of the existence of **Y**. During her speech in the Old French text, the soul stresses her inability to manage the body, in particular in **P**: “refrener” (to curb), “da mal retorner” (to retrieve from evil), “conseiller” (to counsel righteously), and “castier” (to chastise). **N** transmits the verbs “hępta” (to curb) and “fra illu hvęrfa” (to turn from evil), displaying a perfect agreement with “refrener” and “da mal retorner” in **P**. **Z** (**AR**¹**R**²), on the other hand, preserves the verbs “hirta” (to chastise), erroneously interpreted as “hjarta” (heart) in **A** through a paleographic change, and **A** reads “fra illu hverfa” (to turn away from evil), which corresponds perfectly with “da mal retorner” and “castier,” this time mistakenly transcribed by **Z**₂ and transmitted in **R**¹ as “fra villu draga” (to draw from heresy) and in **R**² as “fra villu fęra” (to move away from heresy) (see table 4). According to Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, it is plausible that **Y** included the four Norse verbs that correspond exactly with the Old French text. Subsequently, according to Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, **N** and **Y** may have selected two verbs each, thus omitting the other two.²⁷

27 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 278.

Table 4.

P (118/183–186)	N (283/3–4)	A (283/35–36)	R ¹ (283/30–31)	R ² (283/17–18)
Ne te poi <i>refrener</i> ne demal retorner, ne te poi conseillier, dolent, ne <u>castier</u> [I cannot curb you, or retrieve you from evil, nor can I counsel, wretched one, or chastise you].	Ec máttu þic æigi <i>hepta</i> oc æigi fra illu hværfa [I was not able to curb you or turn you away from evil].	eg má nú eige þitt hjarta þíða, oc ei frá illu þvi koma edr hverfa [Now I am not able to melt your heart and therefore come or turn away from evil].	ek matta þig eigi <u>hirta</u> ok eigi fra villu draga [I was not able to chas- tise you or draw you away from heresy].	Eg matta þic eigi fra villu færa ok eigi <u>hirtta</u> [I was not able to move away from heresy or chastise you].

Quite trivially, Widding and Bekker-Nielsen exclude the possibility that **A** could represent the Norse archetype.²⁸ Within her speech, the soul compares the body to a “chaisne” (oak) in all of the manuscripts—**PBCH**—of the *Desputisun*, a reading that curiously survives in **A** with the noun “eik” (oak), in contrast to the reading “gron” (pine) in **N** and **R**² (see table 5). However, the agreement of **A** with **PBCH** should not be considered genealogical, since it may well have been introduced independently in **A** at a later stage in order to replace “gron.” Indeed, “eik” is frequently used in poetry and poetic language as a common term for a tree.

Table 5.

P (120/220)	N (283/220)	A (283/44)	R ² (283/25)
chaisne [oak].	gron [pine].	eik [oak].	grein [pine].

28 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 278.

The Subarchetype Z (AR¹R²)

As already suggested by Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, AR¹R² descend from a common subarchetype designated as Z.²⁹ Through a complete collation of the Norse variants with PBCH, I have been able to isolate all textual variations that separate Z from N, such as frequent trivializations and subsequent additions that testify to the existence of Z.

In view of the ostensible difficulty in interpreting rare or archaic readings of Y (which are preserved in N), Z should be dated approximately between 1250 and 1340–50. The *terminus post quem* could therefore be placed after the production of N, that is, c. 1200–25, while the *terminus ante quem* is provided by the compilation of the oldest Icelandic manuscript R¹, from c. 1360 to 1370. Because of its fragmentary nature, R² does not transmit the same number of readings as the other Norse witnesses. However, due to the close relationship between R¹ and R², when R¹ and A are in agreement, we can be fairly certain that the reading in question was inherited from Z. On the contrary, since R¹ transmits an abridged version of Z characterized by frequent omissions of readings, the variants in agreement between R² and A are used for the reconstruction of Z.

There are two possible cases in which the variants of Z would seem to agree with L and not with PBCH, which in these cases are in agreement with N. However, these two agreements may have arisen independently in Z, and therefore it is not necessary to postulate that Z had knowledge of L. The first variant is found within one of the charges made by the soul against the body. Speaking in the first person, she accuses the body of insincerity towards God and towards herself. N's reading "ne við mik" (not with me) correctly transmits the reading of PBCH "n'envers moi" (not towards me), while Z, "uid men" (with men) is in accordance with L's "hominibus" (with men) (see table 6). However, this reading could be a subsequent error created by Z alone—namely, without having consulted L—and may have arisen through a misreading of the abbreviation *m̄* "mik" (me) with *m̄* "menn" (men).

29 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 278.

Table 6.

L (105/74)	P (112/26)	N (280/10)	A (280/42)	R ¹ (280/25)
hominibus [with men].	moi [toward me].	mik [with me].	men [with men].	men [with men].

The second case consists of a subsequent addition in **Z** within the body's speech, in which the body compares himself to Adam. While **N** only briefly mentions his name, **Z** adds the Norse formula for *protoplastus* (the first made), "en fyrsti madr" (the first man) in **R²**, a title attributed to Adam also in **L** with "primus hominum" (first of men) (see table 7). However, the presence or absence of a given titulus cannot be considered reliable when critically assessing the text. The reading is omitted in **R¹**.

Table 7.

L (171/1575)	P (136/603)	N (286/8)	R ¹ (286/44)	R ² (286/29)
Adam primus hominum [Adam, first of men].	Adam [Adam].	Adamr [Adam].	Adam hinn fyrste madr [Adam, the first man].	Adam en fyrsti madr [Adam, the first man].

The first case of trivialization is found within the soul's speech, in which she accuses the body of falsehood and of having "gall" in his heart, that is, figuratively being resentful. Here the Norse text demonstrates a typical case of diffraction *in praesentia*:³⁰ the reading transmitted by **N** "gall" (gall) corresponds exactly with the French "fiel" (gall) in **PBCH**, while **A** adds the term "eittr" (poison), and **R¹** transmits this second reading of "eittr." Consequently, **Z** must have contained variants *"gall ok eittr." This section of text is missing in **R²**.

Table 8.

P (116/139)	N (282/7)	A (282/38)	R ² (282/26)
fiel [gall].	gall [gall].	gall oc eittr [gall and poison].	eittr [poison].

30 Gianfranco Contini, *Breviario di ecdotica*, ed. R. Ricciardi (Milan, 1986), 102.

In a following passage, the soul accuses the body of perjury and of not honoring his own oaths. **N** contains the expression “þu for øfdesc eigi æiða” (You did not shy away from your oaths), which represents the sole attestation of the compound verb *forøfa* in the corpus of Old Norse literature and is indicated as a hapax legomenon by the *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*.³¹ The reading is then replaced in **Z** with a considerable simplification in **R**¹: “þu fordadiz eigi eida ranga at sueria” (You have not avoided swearing false oaths) (see table 9). This section of text is missing in **R**².

Table 9.

P (116/145)	N (282/8)	A (282/40)	R ¹ (282/27)
doutoies [have fear].	for øfdesc [shy away].	fordadist [have avoided].	fordadiz [have avoided].

Another trivialization is found within the soul’s speech, in which she metaphorically compares the body to a tree and accuses it of tyranny, since it absorbs all the sunlight and leaves the other trees in the shade. The four French manuscripts depict the stern character of the tree with the term “marbre” (marble; in **P**), as customary in the modern French expression “dur comme du marbre,” a metaphor expressed in **N** by the noun “ofriki” (tyranny). **Z** substitutes **Y**’s reading of “ofriki” with **A** and **R**²’s “ofrvexti” (excessive growth), a considerably clearer noun pertaining to the semantic field of the forest but here evoked with its negative sense (see table 10). The reading is omitted in **R**¹.

Table 10.

P (120/228)	N (283/13)	A (283/46)	R ² (283/27)
marbre [marble].	ofriki [tyranny].	ofrvexti [excessive growth].	ofrvexti [excessive growth].

Another trivialization can be found within an admonition of the soul to the body, who is accused of not having created loyal and lasting bonds in life and consequently of not being able to trust the actions of others after

31 ONP, s.v. “for-øfa.”

his death. The temporal clause “eptir hans dag” (after his day, i.e., after his death) in **N** seems to have been misinterpreted in **Z** in Iceland with “góða daga” (good days), possibly because the formula was not widely diffused at the time of its compilation (see table 11). The reading is omitted in **R**¹.

Table 11.

P (124/318)	N (285/6)	A (285/37)	R ² (285/21)
com il est en vie [while he is alive].	eptir hans daga [after his day].	góða daga [when you had good days].	goda daga [good days].

Finally, there is a case in which an archaism is replaced by its more recent and more familiar counterpart. This instance is found in a short narrative interlude in which the soul reacts one last time to the body’s speech. While **N** describes the action with the verb “øymde” (to lament), **Z** employs a semi-synonym “ueina” (to wail) (see table 12). The reading is omitted in **R**².

Table 12.

P (150/967)	N (288/12)	A (288/41)	R ² (288/27)
ert pasmee [faint].	øymde [lament].	veina [wail].	ueina [wail].

Further evidence for the existence of **Z** arises from the numerous additions transmitted in the Icelandic witnesses, which are absent in **N**. The most evident addition consists of an epilogue in which the omniscient narrator intervenes in the first person to define the purpose of this cautionary tale among Christians. Informed of the terrible fate that could await them after death as a consequence of their evil deeds, the audience of **Z** will still have a final chance to conform to the prescribed precepts and reform their lives accordingly (table 13).

Table 13.

A (289/27–37)	R ¹ (289/12–18)
<p>oc með þáð varð skilnadr þeirra slíkr að Sinne, En Drottinn vor synde þessa Syn fyrer vorar Saker, að vier skyldum nockra forsión veita vorum bræðrum af því að oss Stodar ei, þótt vier kennum Sálunum völd af gierda vorra, Líkamer Sálunum oc Sálur Líkōmunum, þviad eingin völd meigum vier kenna Skapara vorum, er hann hefur á þessa lund mælt við oss, sem hann mælte fyrr við Adam þá er han hafde Skapad hann oc alla Skepnuna, aller hlutir eru fyrer þínar Saker giörfer, Dæðin fyrer óhlíðne, en Líf fyrer Hlíðne, Slíkt hid sama hefur hann oss og gefid sem Adam vit oc s(k)ilning að fordast Dæðann fyrer óhlíðne, enn finna Eilíft líf fyrir varðveislu Guds Heilagra Bo-dorda oc hlióta so með Gudi Dird oc sælu án enda, hvöria að sönnu veiti hann oss með Syninum oc Heilögum Anda, Amen.</p>	<p>ok uard skilnadr þeirra slíkr. en drottinn seger augustinus byskup syndi uitran þessa firi uarar saker at uer skilldum nuckura for-sio ueita bræðrum uorum. þa er gud hafdi skapat adam mælti hann sva se her adam líf þat er þer er hugat firi hlydni. se her ok dauða þann er þer er hugadr firi uhlydni sva id sama hefir drottinn uid oss mællt þviat uit ok skilning hefir hann oss líed at gera gott en sia uid illu ladi sa oss til eilifrar dyrþar er ollum er betri ok ædri ok lifir einn gud iþreningu utan ennda amen.</p>
<p>[And with it (i.e., the devils dragging away the soul), their separation occurred at once. And Our Lord showed us this vision for our benefit, so that we may show this foresight to our brethren, for it would not be useful to us—although we know the consequences of our misdeeds on our souls, the bodies on the souls, and the souls on the bodies—not to recognize any powers in our creator. And he has spoken to us in such a way, when he did speak to Adam when he had created him and all creatures: “All things are made for you: death for disobedience and life for obedience.” In that same way, as he did with Adam, he has given us wisdom and reason in order to avoid death because of disobedience and to find everlasting life because of the keeping of God’s holy commandments and to obtain God’s glory and bliss without end, which he truly grants us through the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen].</p>	<p>[And their separation occurred at once. “And the Lord,” says Bishop Augustine, “showed us this vision for our benefit, so that we may show this foresight to our brethren. When God created Adam, he said this: “Here is that life, Adam, which is provided for you for obedience. And here is also that death which is provided for you for disobedience.” In the same way, the Lord spoke to us because he has given us wisdom and reason in order to do good but guarded us against evil. He invites us to the everlasting glory where everything is better and more sublime and one God lives in the Trinity without end. Amen].</p>

The presence of such additions could be motivated by a wish to clarify otherwise obscure concepts or terms on the part of **Z**. During his speech, the body claims to have been created from mud in order to become a host for the soul. **N** transmits the noun “moldo” (nom. mold = soil/dust/mud), to which **Z** adds “jordu” (nom. jorð = earth), thus creating a synonymous couplet which, as is well-known, was one of the most common translation strategies throughout the Middle Ages (table 14).³² The reading is omitted in **R**¹.

Table 14.

P (136/632)	N (286/13)	A (287/19)	R ² (287/32–33)
terre [earth].	moldo [dust].	iördu ... oc moldu [earth and dust].	jordu... ok moldu [earth and dust].

In other cases, the additions are employed to further dramatize the narrative and obtain a greater emotional response on the part of the audience. For instance, in **N** the soul claims that after one’s death the relatives greedily take possession of the deceased’s inheritance in order to lead a life of excess at his/her expense. In this passage, **Z** adds that the deceased in question, whose goods was taken by his/her greedy relatives, will fall into oblivion “en minnaz þin alldri” (They will never remember you) (table 15). This section of text is missing in **R**².

Table 15.

P (116/99–101)	N (281/12–13)	A (281/43–44)	R ¹ (281/27–28)
tot cil qui l’ont ravi, ti parent, ti ami, en feront mais lor preu [All of those who have robbed him—your relatives, your friends—will make this their own profit].	þeir aller er tækit hafa þeir muno gera sér gaman af [All of those who have taken will rejoice].	þeir muna giöra sier gamn af þinum aðæfum; enn minnast þo þin aldre [They will enjoy your wealth, and yet they will never remember you].	þeir allir er tekid hafa þina penga munu gera ser af gaman en minnaz þin alldri [All of those who took your money will rejoice, but they will never re- member you].

32 See, for example, the discussion in Brenda Hosington, “Henry Watson, ‘Apprentyse of London’ and ‘Translatoure’ of Romance and Satire,” in *The Medieval Translator: Traduire au Moyen Age*, ed. J. Jenkins and O. Bertrand, Medieval Translator 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 13.

During his speech, the body accuses the soul of having tempted him, of leading him on the path of evil, and subsequently of cursing him. In **Z**, the body further specifies that the soul would have precluded both “sannendum ok eilifri sámd” (the truth and joys of eternal life) due to her evil behaviour (table 16). The reading is omitted in **R**¹.

Table 16.

P (136/599–600)	N (286/9)	A (286–87/45–32)	R ² (286/20–23)
ensement feis tu, maldite soies tu [Just as you do, may you be cursed].	sva æggiaðer þu mik. blotað værð þu [As you tempt- ed me, curse you].	So munde oc ei heldr afskeidis geingid hafa rád mitt, ef ei hefde ollad Eggiun þín, oc Bölvud siertu, er fyrer mig svo öllum sannindum oc eilifre sámd tapad hefr [That is how my advice would have worked out, if it had not been for all your incitement. And be cursed! Since for me all truth and eternal joy have been lost].	Sva ok mundi eigi afskeidis ganga rad mitt ef eigi ylli eggian þín. Bauluod sier þu er þu firrer mic sannendum ok eilifri sámd [<i>sic</i>] [That is how my advice would have worked out, if it had not been for all your evil incite- ment. Curse you! Since for me truth and eternal joy (...)].

In another reading, **Z** adds a formula in which it is specified that God knows everyone’s thoughts and actions, perceiving “hugt ok ohugt gort ok ogort” (the thought and the unthought, the done and the undone). It should also be noted that the adjective “óhugðr” in **Z**—then transmitted to **R**¹ as “ohugt” and with the variant “óhugsad” in **A**—is registered as a hapax legomenon in the *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose* (see table 17).³³ This section of text is missing in **R**².

33 *ONP*, s.v. “ó-hugsaðr.”

Table 17.

P (146/869–70)	N (288/5)	A (288/32–33)	R ¹ (288/23)
li rois Deus seu- lement en sat le iugement [Only God the King knows the judgment].	en guð hann væit þat væl [But God knows that well].	Gud er sá er veit hugsad oc óhugsad, giört oc ógiört [God is the one who knows the thought and the unthought, the done and the un- done].	Gud sa er ueit hugt ok ohugt gort ok ogort [That God is the one who knows the thought and the unthought, the done and the undone].

Another addition attributed to **Z** can be found within the soul's speech, when she evokes the rhetorical question of the so-called *ubi sunt*, in which she asks the body about the fate of all the goods collected throughout his life, listing them: money, silver chalices, cloaks and other robes, and horses donated by kings and by various earls. **Z** adds "haukar" (hawks) to the list of noble gifts. Moreover, there are secondary insertions possibly derived from an intermediate reading, such as "gersimar" (treasures) in **R**¹ and "gimsteinar" (precious gems) in **A**, as well as independent additions such as "gull ker" (golden goblets), which in **A** are coupled with the silver ones. Precious gems are also mentioned in **L**, where the *enumeratio* is considerably larger, resembling hyperbole. With regard to money, while **N** simply describes the habit of "iðulega at tælia" (counting it frequently), **Z** mentions the illicit practice of usury on the part of the body, which was accustomed "at uedia af oþrum" (to lay a wager on another) (see table 18). This section of text is missing in **R**².

Table 18.

P (114/65–80)	N (281/6–9)	A (281/37–40)	R ¹ (281/23–26)
<p>ou sont or li denier que tant avoies chier, que soloies nombrer et tant sovent conter? Et u sont li vaiscel qui tant estoient bel et les copes d'argent a boire le pieument? U sont li bon mantel, li boton e[t] tassell et le vair et le gris et le porpre et le bis? U sont li parlefroi que li conte et li roi te soloient doner por menceignes conter? [Now where are the coins that were so dear to you, which you were accustomed to col- lect and so frequently count? Where are the vessels that looked so beautiful and the silver cups for drinking spiced wine? Where are the fine cloaks, the buttons and buckles and white squirrel fur and gray squirrel fur and crimson and fine linen? Where are the palfreys that earls and kings used to give you as gifts in order to teach me how to count?]</p>	<p>hvar ero nu þenningar þinir þeir er þér þóttu iam góðer er þu vart vánr at samca oc iðu- lega at tælia. Hvar ero nu silf kær þæu er þér þotto sva fóggr. Hvar ero scickior þinar oc onnur clæðe. Hvar ero nu hæstar þæir er konongar oc iarlar hofðu gefet þer [Now where are your coins that seemed so good to you, which you were accustomed to collect and fre- quently count? Now where are the silver goblets that seemed so fine to you? Where are your coats and the other clothes? Now where are those hors- es that kings and earls had given to you?]</p>	<p>hvar eru nú peningar þiner er þier þóttu góðer, oc þu varst vanrr ad safna samann oc Iduglega ad telia oc ad vedia af öðrum mönnum. Hvar er nú silfr gull góts oc gull ker, edr gimsteinar Hestar edr Hakar, er Kóngar gáfu þier, oc Iarlar [Now where are your coins that seemed good to you and that you were accustomed to collect and fre- quently count and lay a wager on other men? Now where are the silver and gold goods, and the gold goblets and the precious stones, the horses and hawks that kings and earls gave you?]</p>	<p>hvar ero nv pengar þiner þeir er þer þottu goder ok uart iafnan uanr at safna saman iduliga telia ok uedia af ofþrum. hvar ero silfr ker þin ok gersimar hestar þiner eda haukar er kongar gafu þer eda jarlar eda adrer tigner menn [Now where are your coins that always seemed so good to you that you were accustomed to collect and frequently count to lay a wager on oth- ers? Now where are your silver goblets and treasures, your horses and hawks that kings and earls and other worthy men gave you?]</p>

Subsequently, within the soul's speech, she accuses the body of having made her his "ambót" (maidservant; in **N**). **Z** adds a temporal range of the action, with "ath vpp hafi" (in the beginning), which is absent in **N**. **Z** subsequently misreads the following causal clause "en þu hefir" (but you have), most likely through the metathesis of the pronoun "þu" with the preposition "up" (table 19).

Table 19.

P (118/170)	N (282/13)	A (282/45–46)	R ¹ (282/31–32)	R ² (282/17–18)
tu me fesis ancele [You made me a maid- servant].	en þu hefir gorfa mic at ambót [You made me a maid- servant].	enn þu hefr mig ambátt giört [but you made me a maidser- vant].	en þu hefir mig illa ambátt gort [but you made me an evil maidservant].	en þu hefer illa ambatt gert [but you made me an evil maidservant].

Another significant error in **Z** is an anticipation. In **N**, the soul accuses the body of never having done anything that was "er mér være til gagns" (that would be of benefit for me), a passage that in **Z** is substituted with the unfulfilment of "guds vilia" (God's will). The *nomen sacrum* "God" is found in the next sentence; therefore, it is plausible that the copyist anticipated it in his transcription, juxtaposing it with "vilia" and thus obtaining a very common sacred expression (table 20). This section of text is missing in **R²**.

Table 20.

P (112/24)	N (280/9)	A (280/41)	R ¹ (280/24)
qui me tornast a bien [that turned out well for me].	er mér være til gagns [that would be of benefit for me].	Guds vilia [God's will]	guds uilia [God's will].

Moreover, two further paleographic changes that compelled the copyist of **Z** to edit the sentences for the sake of clarity are particularly significant. The first case can be found within the soul's speech, in which she emphasizes the body's abandonment of home and family and the inability of the family to come to his aid. The original pronoun "þér" seems to have

facilitated a paleographic change in **Z**, where the erroneous reading of *þ-/h-* resulted in the introduction of the adverb “hér” (here). The formation of this error subsequently produced the deletion of the next reading “eptir þic” (behind you) in **Z**, which in the new context could hardly have made sense. The reading in **Z**, “You have left your home and family here,” thus acquires a new meaning and a substantial divergence of perspective (see table 21). The reading is omitted in **R**¹.

Table 21.

P (122/278–80)	N (284/13)	A (284/44)	R ² (284/29)
ta posession [your property].	þér [to you].	hér [here].	hier [here].

The second occurrence is also found within the soul’s speech, where she claims that during the body’s life—as long as he was in good health—he was esteemed by many, while after his death, he fell into oblivion. **N** describes the previous condition of the body with the adjective “hæil” (whole/healthy), which in **Z** is misread as “heime” (world) due to another paleographic change of the letters *l-/m-*. This new noun induced **Z** to add the preposition *i* to govern the dative of place, “i Heime” (in the world), thus resulting in a meaningful sentence, although one significantly different from the original reading (table 22). The reading is omitted in **R**¹.

Table 22.

P (126/357)	N (285/13)	A (285/42–43)	R ² (285/28)
bel [fair]	hæil [healthy]	i Heime [in the world]	j heime [in the world]

Another error that may be attributed to **Z** is found within the description of the soul in the prologue. In **N**, which transmits the original reading, the soul appears “grǫn sem graslaucr” (green as a chive). **Z** replaces this with the colour “gulr” (yellow).³⁴ **R**¹ is further corrupted; in fact, the

34 The colours of the soul clearly have a symbolic value. The green colour transmitted in **PBCH** and **N**, according to Michel Pastoureau, may represent the vice of avarice, madness, and disorder, which indeed coincide with the soul’s charges against the body. Towards the end of the Middle Ages, the yellow-green (yellow-lemon) colour began to assume a nega-

term “graslaucr” (chive) is erroneously transcribed as “gras maþkr” (grass worm), which appears to represent a hapax legomenon (see table 23).³⁵ This section of text is missing in **R**².

Table 23.

P (109/16)	N (280/7)	A (280/39)	R ¹ (280/22–23)
verde comme chive [green as chives].	grø̃n sem gras- laucr [as green as a chive].	sem guler graslakar [like yellow chives].	sem gras maþkr gulr [like a yellow grass worm].

Within her speech, the soul accuses the body of laziness. In **N**, the accusation is introduced by the expression “þvi segi ec þér” (therefore I say to you), while **Z** transmits the reading “víst segi þier” (truly, I say unto you), a common solemn expression of affirmation echoing the Gospels (see table 24). The reading is omitted in **R**¹.

Table 24.

P (120/203)	N (283/8)	A (283/40–41)	R ² (283/22)
Por ce te di [For this I tell you].	þvi segi ec þér [therefore I say to you]	víst sege eg þier [Truly, I say unto you].	víst segi þier [Truly, I say unto you].

In addition to the errors above, several variants concurrently support the existence of **Z**. For example, whereas **N** employs “dioflinom” (the devil), **Z** chooses “fiandanum” (the enemy) (table 25). This section of text is missing in **R**².

tive value and was thus substituted for the green in connection with the aforementioned vices—to which envy and betrayal were added—along with other charges made by the soul. In particular, in the visual arts, yellow is one of the colours used to represent Judas’s garments, to which the body in our text is compared. See Michel Pastoureau, *Figures et couleurs* (Paris, 1986), 40–42.

35 *ONP*, s.v. “gras-maðkr.”

Table 25.

P (116/123)	N (282/3)	A (282/35)	R ² (282/22)
deable [devil].	dioflinom [devil].	fiandanum [enemy].	fianndanum [enemy].

The Subarchetype Z₁ (R¹R²)

As mentioned above, Widding and Bekker-Nielsen suspected the existence of a subarchetype Z, ancestor of the three Icelandic manuscripts AR¹R². However, based on an analysis of the significant errors, another previously unidentified subarchetype—here designated as Z₁—seems to precede R¹ and R².

The first error is a case of embellishment in Z₁. In her speech, the soul accuses the body of having been a traitor, second only to Judas Iscariot, who betrayed the Lord. The original reading “svæic” (betrayed), transmitted in N and A, is corrupted in Z₁ with the verb “selldi” (sold), a New Testament echo of Judas’s vile delivery of Christ to the crowd sent by the high priests and scribes,³⁶ which replaces the well-known betrayal by Judas in Gethsemane (see table 26).³⁷

36 See, for example, Mc 14,10–11: “Et Judas Scariotis unus de duodecim abiit ad summos sacerdotes ut proderet eum illis qui audientes gavisi sunt et promiserunt ei pecuniam se daturus et quaerebat quomodo illum oportune traderet” [And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went to the chief priests, to betray him to them. Who hearing it were glad; and they promised him they would give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray him]. Mt 26,15: “Et ait illis quid vultis mihi dare et ego vobis eum tradam at illi constituerunt ei triginta argenteos” [And said to them: What will you give me, and I will deliver him unto you? But they appointed him thirty pieces of silver]. All quotations from the Vulgate are taken from *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, ed. Robert Weber et al. (1969; 5th ed., rev. 2007). All English translations of the Latin text are taken from the Douay–Rheims Bible, available at <http://drbo.org>.

37 Mc 14,43–46: “Et adhuc eo loquente venit Judas Scarioth unus ex duodecim et cum illo turba cum gladiis et lignis a summis sacerdotibus et a scribis et a senioribus. Dederat autem traditor eius signum eis dicens quemcumque osculatus fuero ipse est tenete eum et ducite et cum venisset statim accedens ad eum ait rabbi et osculatus est eum at illi manus iniecerunt in eum et tenuerunt eum” [And while he was yet speaking, cometh Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve: and with him a multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the ancients. And he that betrayed him, had given them a sign, saying: Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he; lay hold on him, and lead him away. And when he was

Table 26.

P (118/154)	N (282/9)	A (282/41)	R ¹ (282/28)	R ² (282/15)
mort [death].	svæic [betrayed].	sveik [betrayed].	selldi [sold].	selldi [sold].

Later, within her speech, the soul laments the insubordination of the body to herself. The modal verb “scyldir” (you should have), used in **N** and **A**, is replaced in **Z₁** by another modal, “ættir” (you may have), with a similar meaning (table 27).

Table 27.

P (118/173)	N (183/2)	A (282/46)	R ¹ (282/32)	R ² (282/19)
services moi [have served].	scyldir [should].	skylder [should].	ættir [may].	ættir [may].

The existence of **Z₁** is further corroborated by the charge of the soul against the body of having been enslaved by him. In **Z₁**, the reading is strengthened by the addition of the adjective “illa” (evil), an anticipation then transmitted in **R¹** and **R²** in the reading “illr þræll” (bad slave), as demonstrated in the sentence in table 28.

Table 28.

P (118/170)	N (282/13)	A (282/45–46)	R ¹ (282/31–32)	R ² (282/17–18)
tu me fesis ancele [You made me a maid- servant].	en þu hefir gorfa mic at ambót [You have made me a maidservant].	enn þu hefir mig ambátt giört [but you have made me a maidservant].	en þu hefir mig illa am- bátt gort [but you have made me an evil maidservant].	en þu hefir illa ambatt gert [but you have made an evil maidservant].

Another error is found within the soul’s speech. As seen above, the soul stresses her inability to manage the body, in particular “fra illu hværfa”

come, immediately going up to him, he saith: Rabbi; and he kissed him. But they laid hands on him, and held him.]

to turn away from evil; in **N** and **A**.³⁸ However, **Z**₁ misunderstands the reading as “fra uillu draga” (draw from heresy) (table 29).

Table 29.

P (118/184)	N (283/4)	A (283/35)	R ¹ (283/31)	R ² (283/18)
demal [evil].	illu [evil].	Illu [evil].	uillu [heresy].	villu [heresy].

Finally, there is a further addition within the speech of the soul, when she is accusing the body of causing her to lose the wealth of heaven due to his own misdeeds. In **Z**₁, the sentence is introduced by the conjunction “þviat” (because), which is otherwise absent in **N** and **A** (table 30).

Table 30.

P (118/159–62)	N (282/10–11)	A (282/42–43)	R ¹ (282/29–30)	R ² (282/16)
por la toie posnee sui dolante esgaree, por ta her- bergerie pert io durable vie [Because of your arrogance, I wander pain- fully through your abode; I lose the ever- lasting life].	fyrir þinar mis- gerningar missi ec himinrikis vist [Due to your misdeeds, I lose the abode of heaven].	þar fyrer brenn eg nú Sárt, Fyrer þinar saker misse eg nú Himnaríkis vistar [Therefore, I now painfully burn in the flames; because of you, I lose the abodes of heaven].	þviat firi þinar sakir missi ek nu himinrikis uistar [Because of your fault, I now lose the abodes of heaven].	þviat firi þinar saker misse eg himinrikis vistar [Because of your fault, I lose the abodes of heaven].

38 This is a clear biblical echo to Ps 33,15: “Deverte a malo et fac bonum inquire pacem et persequere eam” [Turn away from evil and do good: seek peace, and pursue it]; and I Pt 3,11: “Declinet autem a malo et faciat bonum inquirat pacem et persequatur eam” [Let him turn away from evil and do good: let him seek peace and pursue it].

The Old French Source Text

According to Henningham—who was responsible for the discovery of the *Nuper* and the first study of its relationships with the *Desputisun—Viðröðaða líkams ok sálar*, as transmitted in **N**, represents either a shortened vulgarization of a now-lost version of the *Nuper* or a hybrid version formed by a conflation of readings of the Latin and French texts.³⁹ Widding and Bekker-Nielsen later speculated that the Norse text may be a direct translation a now-lost French *Vorlage*, which presented a significantly reduced text compared to **PBCH**, with which the now-lost French text shared numerous readings and from which the Norse text diverges through the addition of sporadic innovations,⁴⁰ such as the explanatory clause “þat cællum vér vatncalf” (that we call water-calf) to clarify the adjective “idropicus” (hydropic) (table 31).⁴¹

Table 31.

P (112/33–36)	N (280/13–14)
com a l'idropicus, tant com il en boit plus et il gregnor soif a ia saous ne sera [Like the hydropic, the more he drinks and the bigger his thirst, he will never be satisfied].	þat heitir idropicus. þat cællum vér vatncalf. þess mæir er hinn dræcr er þa sott hefir. þes mæir þystir hann. oc værðr aldri fullr [That is called hydropic. We call that water-calf. The more the one who has this disease drinks, the more he is thirsty and never full].

39 Henningham, *Early Latin Debate*, 62–67.

40 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 273–89. Stefka Georgieva Eriksen recently has endorsed Widding and Bekker-Nielsen's hypothesis without, however, providing new textual evidence in their favour. Stefka Georgieva Eriksen, “Body and Soul in Old Norse Culture,” *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Scandinavia c. 1100–1350*, ed. Eriksen, *Disputatio* 28 (Turnhout: Brepols 2016), 393–428.

41 The compound *vatnkalf* has only four attestations in the *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose* (ONP, s.v. “vatn·kalf”) and is in all probability a calque from Old High German *waz-zarkalb* (hydropsy), which is also attested in the form *wassersucht* (hydropsy). See Ingjald Reichborn-Kjennerud, “The School of Salerno and Surgery in the North during the Saga Age,” *Annals of Medical History* 9 (1937): 321–37, at 334 n. 17.

From a preliminary collation of variants, it soon becomes evident that *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* preserves numerous idiosyncrasies typical of the Old French tradition. Proof of such dependence is found in two typical additions from the *Desputisun* that made their way into **N** and are completely absent in the *Nuper*. In the first insertion typical of the prologues of the French and Norse texts, the soul is described by the narrator as having a dull green colour, “verde comme chive” (green as chives). This reading, absent in **L**, is instead extant in **N**, where the simile is expressed with an equivalent for “graslaucr” (chive) (table 32).

Table 32.

L (103/21–24)	P (112/13–18)	N (280/7–8)
stensisque luminibus ad corpus & manibus. Inter crebros gemitus his est usa uocibus [With light standing near the body and hands, she used these words among frequent groans].	de petite figure ert cele creature et estoit, la chaitive, si verde comme chive . Del cors se complaignoit [That creature was small in shape and she, the wretch, was as green as chives. She was com- plaining about the body].	oc var sí hin auma grǫn sem graslaucr . oc henne hermdisc við licamenom oc blotaðe honum oc sagðe [And the wretched (soul) was green like a chive. And she was bothered by the body and cursed him and spoke].

Later, during her speech, the soul resorts to the rhetorical question of the *ubi sunt*, in which she lists the material goods accumulated by the living person throughout his life, which were then lost at the time of his passing. The first good is money: **PB** refer to “tant ... sovent conter” (the habit of counting money), a reading that is transmitted in **B** as “usure testoit biele” (usury) (table 33). The reading is absent in **L**.

Table 33.

L (113/241–42)	P (114/65–68)	N (281/6–7)
ubi multifaria tua nunc eraria [Where is your abundant money now?]	ou sont or li denier que tant avoies chier, que soloies nombrer et tant sovent conter? [Where are your coins now, those that you loved so much, which you were accustomed to gather and frequently count?]	Hvar ero nu þenningar þinir þeir er þér þóttu iam góðer er þu vart vánr at samca oc iðulega at tælia [Where are your coins now, those that seemed so good to you, which you were accustomed to gath- er and frequently count?]

In addition to these, the French provenance of *Viðröðla líkams ok sálar* is supported in **N** not only by a very literal translation of the *Desputisun* but also by the very same word order. Given the large number of instances, it is sufficient to refer here to one example that was already noted in Widding and Bekker-Nielsen.⁴² During her speech, the soul describes the condition of the body *post mortem*, which, because of the wickedness of his actions, is isolated from the world of the living and suffers the pains of a life of sin. Through a sentence formed by an adjective, verb, demonstrative pronoun, and noun, the text in **P** expresses “malvais ert li presens” (Bad are those offerings), rendered in **N** as “óleg er su fórn” (Bad is this offering) (table 34). The latter construction of **N** may have been perceived as obscure in the following Icelandic transmission, both because “óleg” is registered as a hapax legomenon in the *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*,⁴³ and the entire reading is completely omitted in **Z**.

The Flemish Redaction

The first scholar to investigate the manuscript tradition of the *Desputisun* was Hermann Varnhagen, the only scholar to have prepared a *stemma codicum* of the French text.⁴⁴ Varnhagen hypothesizes a common archetype, identified as **O**, from which two separate branches originate:

42 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 276.

43 *ONP*, s.v. “ó-ligr.”

44 Varnhagen, *Das altfranzösische Gedicht*, 113–87.

a first subarchetype β , from which **PBT** are derived. Since **BT** share some common errors absent in **P**, Varnhagen postulated the presence of a common ancestor α shared by **BT**. The other subarchetype from which **CH** are derived is indicated in Varnhagen's stemma by the siglum γ .




Figure 3. *Stemma codicum of Desputisun de l'âme et du corps*
by Hermann Varnhagen (1889)

As mentioned at the beginning, **P** derives from Saint-Omer (c. 1250–75), **B** from the Flanders/Artois/Hainault region (c. 1230), **C** from Worcester (c. 1200), and **H** from Durham (c. 1250); basing her study on Varnhagen's stemma and confirming his assessment of the manuscripts' filiation, Capozza labels γ , along with its descendants **CH**, an "Insular" tradition and defines β , along with **PB**, a "Continental" one.⁴⁵ The latter must have also included **T**, which, based on an analysis of the shared texts, must have been fairly close to **B** and was possibly even produced in the same Hainaut/Artois scriptorium. β is characterized by the inclusion of

⁴⁵ Capozza, 96.

a “Continental” epilogue, which is entirely absent in γ . This includes a final response of the soul, in which she addresses directly to God some theological questions concerning predestination to sin and humans’ moral and spiritual weakness. The soul is well aware that she no longer has access to redemption or to the intercession of the angels. During her speech, some devils arrive and predict her condemnation to hell, and they assault her like hungry wolves grabbing a lamb that is being dismembered, carrying her away amid desperate screams. The cries of the soul awaken the narrator from his sleep and interrupt his dream vision. **N** preserves much of the Continental epilogue, as shown by the collations available in the appendix. However, it should be noted that the Norse text abridges the Continental text, most notably omitting (1) the soul’s unheard cry for help to the angels; (2) the devils’ speech issuing the soul’s condemnation; and (3) the awakening of the narrator.⁴⁶ The dependence of **N** on the Continental tradition is supported by the readings of **N**, which—in addition to agreeing with **PB** throughout the text—are reflected in **P** and **B** individually when one of the two is corrupt. Given the high stemmatic value of **P** within the Continental branch, it has been chosen as the base text with which to collate the readings of the Norse text. Alternatively, the readings of **B** are chosen when **P** is clearly corrupt or incomplete and the readings of **B** are supported by **L**.

One of the rare corruptions in **P** is represented by an erroneous reading within the typological description of the body as a second Adam and the soul as the synthesis of Eve and the serpent of Eden. While the reading of **B** “serpent” (serpent) is supported by **L** “serpens” (serpent) and corresponds with **N** “ormr” (serpent), **P** transcribes “present” (presence) through a metathesis caused by the assonance of the two nouns (table 36).⁴⁷

46 However, it should be noted that **Z** (**AR**¹) adds another epilogue, in which the narrator explains that the vision was shown by God to be an exemplum for the listeners. This ending, however, does not depend on either the Insular or the Continental editorial tradition.

47 The closest possible source I was able to identify is *Carmen XXXVI, De lapsu primi hominis* (On the Fall of the First Man) by Marbodius of Rennes (1035–1123), part of the *Carmina varia*, which presents the same string of charges (Adam < Eve < the serpent). “Eva fefellit eum; sed eum non falleret Eva, Ni decepta foret; serpens deceperat Eva.” (Eve deceived him; but Eve would not have deceived him if she had not been deceived. The serpent had deceived Eve.) Marbodius Redoniensis Episcopus, *Carmina varia*, PL 171:1555d–1634c; this is the only available edition of the collection.

Table 36.

L (172/1581)	P (136/605)	B (222/611)	N (286/9)
serpens [serpent].	present [presence].	serpent [serpent].	ormr [serpent].

The Flemish Connection

The possible origin and history of **X**, the now-lost French manuscript source from which *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* was prepared, have been previously discussed by Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, who advanced the hypothesis that the Norse translator may have been a Norwegian cleric trained in France with a good grasp of French, a rather unusual skill for the dawn of the thirteenth century.⁴⁸ As a matter of fact, *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* represents the earliest known Norse translation of French material, preceding the well-known Norwegian translations of French *romances*, *chansons de geste*, and *lais* by at least twenty-five years. A French, rather than an English, provenance of the text is further confirmed by the very readings of the Norse text, which—as demonstrated above—closely mirror the two Continental manuscripts of the French tradition, while differing considerably from the Insular subfamily. In assessing the provenance of the now-lost French source consulted for the composition of the Norse text, there is reason to believe that it may have been a codex produced in Flanders toward the end of the twelfth century. By distinguishing Vallonian and Picardian phonetic idiosyncrasies, as well as the presence of a Picardian calendar *Calendrier français* (fols. 1r–2v) transmitted in **P**, Claudia Guggenbühl was able to identify Saint-Omer (Hauts-de-France) as the scriptorium that hosted the production of **P** during the years 1250–75.⁴⁹ Moreover, a linguistic and orthographic survey allowed Julia Bastin to place the preparation of **B** in Flanders or in the neighboring counties of northeastern Artois or Hainaut around 1230.⁵⁰

48 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 275–76.

49 Claudia Guggenbühl, *Recherches sur la composition et la structure du ms. Arsenal 3516*, *Romanica Helvetica* 118 (Basel und Tübingen: A. Francke, 1998), 36–38.

50 Julia Bastin, “Trois dits du XIII siècle du ms. 9411-26 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique,” *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire* 54 (1941): 467–507, at 467–69.

Relations between Flanders and Norway between the Twelfth and the Thirteenth Century

Relations between Flanders and Norway began as early as the twelfth century, as demonstrated by Lars Boje Mortensen, who highlighted a substantial Norwegian influence in France, primarily due to the spread of the cult of Óláfr Haraldsson the Saint (995–1030).⁵¹ With regard to the oldest surviving witness of *Passio Olavi*, the so-called Anchin Manuscript—Douai, Bibliothèque Marceline Desbordes-Valmore (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 295—Mortensen demonstrated that the codex must have been produced in twelfth-century Flanders and highlighted the preservation of Norse proper names and toponyms in their original graphic form (while all other names are regularly Latinized), as well a more sound knowledge of Norwegian geography.⁵² Furthermore, after a careful analysis of the cult of St Óláfr in Northern France, Mortensen proposed the codex's transmission from Flanders to Paris (and not vice versa) and highlighted how the passage from the North Sea to Paris was favoured by the geographical features of both the Anchin area and Flanders, which facilitated the arrival in Paris by ship through the ascent of the Scarpe River.⁵³

The presence of French texts in western Scandinavia around 1150 is further attested by an English palimpsest preserved today in Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling, AM 618 4to (Britain—Iceland, 1150–1599), which originally contained the bilingual Latin-French *Psalterium Davidis* (fols. 1r–116r) and *Hymni et cantica ex testamento veteri* (fols. 116r–118v). In the early modern period, the French text had been subsequently scraped off and replaced with an early modern Icelandic translation of the Latin text.⁵⁴

Further evidence of a Norwegian interest in northern French manuscript production is attested by two French codices, recently surveyed

51 Lars Boje Mortensen, “The Anchin Manuscript of *Passio Olavi* (Douai 295), William of Jumièges, and Theodoricus Monachus,” *Symbolae Osloenses* 75 (2000): 165–89, at 169–74.

52 Mortensen, “Anchin Manuscript,” 169.

53 Mortensen, “Anchin Manuscript,” 169–73.

54 For a summary description of the manuscript, see “AM 618 4to,” *Skráningarfærsla handrits, handrit.is*, accessed 17 February 2023, <https://handrit.is/manuscript/view/da/AM04-0618/0#mode/2up>.

by Synnøve Midtbø Myking, that were exported to Norway during the thirteenth century.⁵⁵ The first manuscript was produced in Paris in 1230 and is known as *Kristina Psalter*, Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, GKS 1606 4to, which belonged to Kristín Hákonardóttir (1234–62), who was the daughter of King Hákon and was married to the brother of the king of Spain, Felipe de Castilla (1231–74). How the manuscript came into Kristín’s possession is still the subject of debate: a first hypothesis identifies it as a wedding gift from the king of France, Louis IX, to Kristín; a second hypothesis sees it instead as a gift of friendship to Kristín and alliance with Norway on the part of Louis IX.⁵⁶ It is also significant that, in order to reach the groom in Spain from Bergen, Kristín had to travel through France. After her death in 1262, some of her entourage returned to Norway, in all probability carrying, along with other goods, the *Kristina Psalter*. The travel is described in chapter 356 of the *Hákonar saga Hákonarsonar* by Sturla Þórðarson (1214–84), in which the bishop of Hamar Peter is said to have travelled through Flanders: “But bishop Peter fared overland into Flanders, and he came somewhat later. Andrew Nicholas’ son stayed behind in France then twelve months.”⁵⁷

The second manuscript presented by Myking to demonstrate renewed contacts between Flanders and Norway during the reign of King Hákon Hákonarson is Aslak Bolt’s (archbishop of Oslo, 1428–50) Bible, today Oslo, Deichmanske Bibliotek (no call number). This manuscript was produced in Paris around 1250, subsequently purchased by Aslak in the fifteenth century, and finally rediscovered in 1710 within Niðaróss’s old city walls. This Bible may have reached Norway during the thirteenth century, when numerous clerics were studying in Flanders or Paris, a

55 Synnøve Midtbø Myking, “The French Connection: Norwegian Manuscript Fragments of French Origin and Their Historical Context” (PhD diss., University of Bergen, 2017), 136–45. The study of the two manuscripts is part of a larger project, called FLANDRIA, with the aim of examining the contact between Flanders, Norway, and Denmark in the High Middle Ages and the influence on Scandinavian culture. See “Research,” Synnøve Midtbø Myking, University of Bergen, accessed 17 February 2023, <https://bit.ly/46vueRL>.

56 Myking, “French Connection,” 139.

57 *The Saga of Hakon and a Fragment of the Saga of Magnus with Appendices*, trans. George Webbe Dasent, *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Ævi Scriptores 4* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1894), 316–17. “En Pétr byskup fór landveg í Flandr, ok kom hann nökkuru síðarr. Andrés Nikulásson var eftir í Franz þá tólf mánaði.” Sturla Þórðarson, *Hákonar saga Hákonarsonar, Bøglunga saga, Magnúss saga lagabætis*, ed. Sverrir Jakobsson et al., Íslenzk fornrit 31–32, 2 vols (Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag, 2013), II, 202.

city that was commonly reached by Norwegians via the aforementioned Flemish route.⁵⁸

Subsequently, proof of the renewed relations between Flanders and Norway is evident in the circulation of the manuscript Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal.lat. 1963, dated 1250–65, a manuscript that transmits the *Histoire d'Outremer*— also known as *L'Estoire d'Eracles*—a French translation of the Latin work *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, which narrated the story of the crusade of William of Tyre (d. 1186).⁵⁹ The manuscript, probably produced in the eastern Mediterranean area, had been in the possession of the Queen of Norway, Isabella Bruce (c. 1272–1358), who had married King Eiríkr Magnússon (1268–99) in 1293; she was the sister of the king of Scotland, Robert Bruce (1274–1329). According to Bjørn Bandlien, Pal. lat. 1963 arrived in Norway with some Norwegians who had left for the Seventh Crusade during the reign of King Hákon Hákonarson (1204–63). It appears, in fact, that Elinard of Senninghem (d. 1273), a Flemish nobleman residing in the vicinity of Saint-Omer, had gone to Bergen in search of a ship and crew to travel to Caesarea (Anatolia), in order to reach King Louis IX of France (1214–70) in 1251.⁶⁰ While this remains one of the possible scenarios, it highlights how the Norwegian monarchy was strongly linked and connected with other European families, and particularly with Flemish ones. The relationships between the Norwegian monarchy and the family of Elinard of Senninghem subsequently intensified during the thirteenth century.⁶¹

In addition to the manuscript evidence, the relations between Norway and Flanders are further attested by the presence in Norway of some French artefacts: three lead crosses bearing a French inscription and a gold ring. The lead crosses, found in Stavanger and in Hardanger, contain inscriptions of French hymns. The two crosses found in the diocese of Stavanger—respectively, Stavanger, Stavanger Museum, Madla 248 and Stavanger, Stavanger Museum, Bru 263—transmit a section of the hymn *Deus pater piissime*, for which Lilli Gjøløw hypothesized two possible traditions. One possibility is that the inscription may ultimately derive from

58 Myking, “French Connection,” 140–42.

59 Bjørn Bandlien, “A Manuscript of the Old French William of Tyre (Pal. Lat. 1963) in Norway,” *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 62 (2016): 21–80, at 21.

60 Bandlien, “Manuscript,” 39–40.

61 Bandlien, “Manuscript,” 60.

an eleventh-century manuscript, today Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, Manoscritti, MS B 63/1–4.⁶² A second hypothesis suggests that the inscription is derived from a twelfth-century manuscript from Corbie in Picardy (Northern France), today Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 12020 (*olim* ancien fonds Saint-Germain 332).⁶³ The hypothesis of a northern French *Vorlage* for the inscription is supported by a second inscription on Bru 263, *Alma chorus domini*, of certain French origin. The third cross, Bergen, Bergen Museum, B6267, found in the Hardanger, transmits an inscription of the hymn *Christe, Salvator*, apparently of Norman origin but already circulating in Corbie in the twelfth century. Therefore, the transmission of the French hymns to Norway most likely followed a route through Picardy, rather than Norman routes.⁶⁴ Madla 248 is dated roughly 1270 and 1315, and provides evidence of renewed contacts between Norway and Flanders in the late thirteenth century.⁶⁵

The gold ring has been dated to the end of the twelfth century and was destined for Norwegian aristocracy. It transmits a French inscription of a declaration of friendship and was discovered in the old trading town of Veøy (Møre and Romsdal County), today Trondheim, Vitenskapsmuseet, Institutt for arkeologi og kulturhistorie, T21673.⁶⁶ According to Helge Nordahl, the location of its forging could be a northern region of France, which would also include Flanders.⁶⁷ Subsequently, the statue of *Notre Dame des Miracles*, located in the Saint-Bertin church (Saint-Omer) and produced around 1230, which depicts a Madonna and Child, has the same polychromy and carving as the Madonnas and Child typical of the churches of Hove (1230–35) and Kyrkjebø (1240–60), of certain Flemish influence.⁶⁸

62 For a summary description of the manuscript, see “Roma, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, Manoscritti, ms. B 63/1-4,” Manus Online: Manoscritti delle biblioteche italiane, accessed 17 February 2023, https://manus.iccu.sbn.it/opac_SchedaScheda.php?ID=16226.

63 Myking, “French Connection,” 133.

64 Myking, “French Connection,” 134–35.

65 Myking, “French Connection,” 135.

66 The inscription reads, “ERI*CENTR*EAMI*SE:*IES*VIDRU*AMIE*AM*,” which has been interpreted as, “Eric entre amis et je suis drue amie, A.M.” (Eric among friends and I am a true friend, A.M.). According to Helge Nordahl, the inscription may be written in a French metre. See the discussion in Myking, “French Connection,” 135.

67 Myking, “French Connection,” 135–36.

68 Unn Plahter, “Norwegian Art Technology in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries:

In the following decades, the close relations between Flanders and Norway were evident in the presence of a Flemish cleric known as Jón flæmingi (c. 1260–1320), in the service of Bishop Jorundr in Niðaróss.⁶⁹ Jón, clearly of Flemish origin, is mentioned as a student of canon law at the University of Paris and Orléans. He was fluent in both Latin and French, yet he had inadequate oral skills in the Norse language, as attested by the Þ-manuscript of *Lárentíus saga byskups* preserved in Reykjavík, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum, AM 404 4to (c. 1650). It is highly likely that at the time of the composition of N, other Flemish intellectuals were residing in some of the most prominent cities of Norway. During the second half of the thirteenth century, the close contacts between Flanders and Norway are further testified by the presence of Torfinn, bishop of Hamar, at the monastery of Ter Doest (Bruges), where he had been in exile since 1282. Torfinn's journey to Ter Doest is narrated in a Latin poem by Walter de Muda (fl. c. 1250–1300). Torfinn died in 1285 and was buried at that monastery;⁷⁰ however, he is not an isolated figure but falls within a circle of clerics closely connected to Ter Doest for economic reasons. Archbishop Jón Rauði of Niðaróss (d. 1282) instructed his trusted men to deposit or withdraw money from Ter Doest Abbey around the years 1281–1301.⁷¹ Flanders thus proves to be not only a transit location for Norwegians travelling south but also a factual Norwegian outpost on the Continent.

From the evidence discussed, it emerges that the contacts between Flanders and Norway were active as early as the twelfth century. These were maintained for at least three centuries through the reciprocal exchange of material goods and the transit of Norwegian nobles in Flanders, as well as through the settlement of some Norwegian prelates and their retinues. The acquisition of a specific Flemish *Vorlage* of *Desputisun* in Norway may therefore have been aided by Norwegians passing through

Materials and Techniques in a European Context,” *Zeitschrift für Kunsttechnologie und Konservierung* 28 (2014): 298–332, at 309–10.

69 Fulvio Ferrari, “*Lárentíus saga byskups*: Between History and Historiography,” in *Saints and their Legacies in Medieval Iceland*, ed. Dario Bullitta and Kirsten Wolf, *Studies in Old Norse Literature* 9 (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2021), 168.

70 Synnøve Midtbø Myking, “Money Deposits and Shipwrecked Saints: The Norwegian Presence in Medieval Bruges,” in *Ad Brudgias portum: Bruges’ Medieval Port System as a Maritime Cultural Landscape*, ed. W. De Clercq et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming).

71 Myking, “Money Deposits.”

Flanders on their return home from journeys on the Continent or by the presence of Norwegian clerics at the cathedral schools of Picardy, Hainaut, and Artois.

The Routes of Textual Transmission from Flanders to Norway

The most recent study on *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* was published by Stefka Georgieva Eriksen in 2016. Based on previous studies, she hypothesizes as a possible place of production an Augustinian monastery of canons regular, which may have hosted both the composition of *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* and the preparation of **N** in its entirety.⁷² The Norse text may in fact present distinctively “Augustinian” characteristics, such as the use of a typical Augustinian mindset and visionary descriptions. According to Eriksen, such Augustinian traits may be ascribed to some Norwegian clerics who studied in an Augustinian environment.⁷³ However, as already noticed by the author, the philosophical lexicon typical of Augustine’s speculations—such as the distinction between the verbs “vita” (to know) and “hyggja” (to think), corresponding to the Latin *scientia* and *sapientia*—is not employed in the text.⁷⁴ However, as I shall try to demonstrate, historical and textual evidence does not support a possible Augustinian provenance of the text. Among the Norwegian centres of culture active during the early thirteenth century, the Cistercian monasteries of Lyse (Vestland) and Hovedøya (Oslofjord) should be excluded from the possible centres that may have hosted the composition of the vernacular text, since they were closely affiliated with their founding monasteries in England, such as Fountains Abbey (North Yorkshire) and Kirkstead Abbey (Lincolnshire).⁷⁵ Eriksen points out that both *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* and **N** in its entirety may have been composed and prepared by a scribe with strong ties to England. However, in consideration of the evidence provided in this study, the most plausible attribution of the Norse text remains, in my

72 Eriksen, “Body and Soul,” 400–406.

73 Eriksen, “Body and Soul,” 395.

74 Eriksen, “Body and Soul,” 403.

75 Henry Goddard Leach, “The Relations of the Norwegian with the English Church, 1066–1399, and Their Importance to Comparative Literature,” *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 44.20 (1909): 531–60, at 540–42.

view, Widding and Bekker-Nielsen's hypothesis, which identifies the translator as a Norwegian cleric trained in France.⁷⁶ Historical evidence of the production and circulation of the Latin text, as well as its subsequent reworkings in French are uniquely circumscribed in a Benedictine milieu. As mentioned above, *Nuper* should be considered a very rare text within the corpus of medieval Latin literature, being transmitted as a *codex unicus* in the aforementioned L, a miscellany of historical and religious character, produced in all probability by Bishop Laurence of Durham (d. 1154) during the first half of the twelfth century.⁷⁷ Approximately a century later, manuscript H of *Desputisun* was also produced in Durham at the Benedictine priory of St. Cuthbert (634–87), where it was kept for about four hundred years until the seventeenth century.⁷⁸ Approximately in the same years, codex P of *Desputisun* was being prepared at the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Bertin in Saint-Omer in Flanders.⁷⁹ According to Emily Jean Richard, manuscript C of the Insular version of *Desputisun* could also be located within a Cistercian or Benedictine monastery in the city of Worcester.⁸⁰ It can thus be assumed that the *Desputisun* text reached Norway due to the close connections between the Norwegian Benedictine monasteries and their Continental counterparts. The high accuracy of the variants of *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar*, as well as their proximity to the archetype of the Norse text Y, would naturally suggest that, in spatial and temporal terms, the composition of Y occurred in close proximity to the Benedictine monastery of Munkeliv in Bergen around 1200–25. Consequently, the translation of the Flemish source-text should be dated to shortly before or after the accession to the throne of King Hákon Hákonarson in June 1217—the king who famously commissioned the translation of numerous chivalric romances from French into Norse.⁸¹

76 Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, 275–76.

77 Henningham, *Early Latin Debate*, 20–31.

78 Capozza, 34.

79 Capozza, 70.

80 Emily Jean Richard, *Body-Soul Debates in English, French and German Manuscripts, c. 1200–c. 1500* (PhD diss., University of York, 2009), 38.

81 The oldest text among such translations is *Tristrams saga ok Ísöndar*, a Norse rendition of the French poem *Tristan* by Thomas of England (fl. c. 1100–99), translated in 1226 by Brother Robert, an English or Norman monk active at the Norwegian court during the first half of the thirteenth century. Subsequently, once he became abbot of an unspecified Norwegian monastery, Robert wrote his translation of *Elis saga ok Rósamundu* around

Although the latest possible date for the production of *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* is contemporary with the translation of *Tristrams saga ok Ísǫndar*, on the basis of historical and editorial considerations, I would exclude Brother Robert as a possible translator of *Desputisun*. In fact, the French visionary body-and-soul dialogue is thematically, stylistically, and lexicographically distant from the Arthurian and courtly matrix of the texts translated by Robert, which does not include any of the theological, eschatological, and soteriological material typical of *Desputisun* and its Norse translation. Furthermore, Brother Robert was probably active in an English Cistercian centre in Norway, such as that of Lyse or Hovedøya,⁸² while a Benedictine milieu can be hypothesized for the preparation of Y.

Conclusion

In terms of genre, sources, and dating, the text of *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* undoubtedly represents a *unicum* within the corpus of Old Norse literature. From the textual evidence examined, the version transmitted in N emerges as the closest possible textual witness to the archetype Y. As previously demonstrated by Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, through qualitative analysis of concurrent readings, it is also possible to ascertain the existence of a subarchetype that today is lost, designated as Z by the two scholars, the ancestor of the three Icelandic manuscripts A, R¹, and R². Furthermore, the existence of an additional *codex interpositus* Z₁ has been established on the basis of significant errors shared by R¹ and R². In addition, from a complete collation of *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* with variants of the *Desputisun*, conclusions can also be made about the French *Vorlage* underlying the Norse text. From its agreements and omissions within the French manuscript tradition, it is logical to assume that it necessarily had to belong to the Continental tradition rather than to the Insular tradition. The lost French source-text must have preceded

1250 and *Strengleikar* in 1270. Furthermore, King Hákon Hákonarson also commissioned *Mottuls saga* and *Ivens saga*. Other texts on Arthurian topics, such as *Parcevals saga*, were translated during his reign. For a recent study, see Francesca Coscia, “L’amour courtois in Scandinavia: La versione norrena dei lais di Marie de France negli Strengleikar” (PhD diss., University of Naples “L’Orientale,” 2018), 32.

82 Isidro Rivera, “Brother Robert,” in *The New Arthurian Encyclopedia*, ed. Norris J. Lacy (New York: Routledge, 1996), 56.

the transcription of the two surviving manuscripts, **PB**, which preserve older and more concise readings, more faithful to the text of the *Nuper*. A Flemish and Benedictine context of producing **PB** would therefore suggest that the lost French codex was transferred from Flanders to a Benedictine monastery, such as Munkeliv in Bergen, via a profitable network that connected the Norwegian Benedictine monasteries to the Flemish sister houses. Moreover, the exchange of material goods, which naturally also included manuscripts, was certainly supported by the commercial routes that were well-known to Norwegian travellers on their way to Europe, routes that were already attested from the first half of the twelfth century and were maintained for at least two centuries. Consequently, the Norse text could plausibly be attributed to a Norwegian cleric with a good grasp of French, who may have completed the task between King Hákon Hákonarson's accession to the throne in 1217 and the material preparation of the *Norwegian Homily Book* before 1225. Once available at a Munkeliv scriptorium in Bergen, the Norse translation of the *Desputisun* may have been incorporated into the *Norwegian Homily Book* in order to provide a final narrative framework for the eschatological and soteriological speculations in the cycle of forty-one Norse homilies preceding it in the codex. Due to its peculiar provenance, tone, and literary genre, *Viðrǫða líkams ok sálar* represents a highly valuable *pièce de résistance* for the entire homiliary. Through its vivid scenes and dramatic accusations, the readers are urged to expiate their own sins in time before being tragically condemned to the miseries of hell without any possible path to redemption.

Appendix

Collations of the “Continental” Epilogue Transmitted in PBN

P (150–6/955–1078)	B (229–32/941–1060)	N (288–9/9–7)
<p>Adont m'estoit avis qui li cors s'ert asis, restendoit soi ariere de lonc en lonc sa biere, tant forment s'estendi que la biere en croissi, et ietoit I sospir com hom qui veut morir. L'ame quant ce veoit merveilleus doel faisoit, chaitive se clamoit et sovent se pasmoit. Après quant ert pasmee, crioit: “Maleuree, mar fui onques criié, iamais ne serai lié! Hai, lasse, dolente, tant dolerouse atente, chaitive creature, tant malvaise aventure! Rois del ciel et de terre porcoi mostras ta gerre, vers une feble cose qui seul parler n'en ose?</p> <p>Moult ai vers toi grant ire, se io l'osaie dire, car quant tu me crias moultes fois m'esgardas, que ia ior ne vesquise qui pechie ne feisse. N'est nus hom en cest monde</p>	<p>Et ce mestoit avis Or li cors kiert assis Sestendoit en le biere Et ou lit ou il iere</p> <p>Lame qui ce veoit Merveilleus doel faisoit Dolente se damoit Et souvent se pasmoit Et quant se estoit pasmee Sicrioit con diervee Crioit maleuree Mar fusses tu crie Jamais ne serai lie Ne point assouagie Ahi lasse dolente En doulerese atente Caitive creature Con dolente aventure Dieus te laisse pener Et si ne pues finer Rois dou ciel et de tiere Pour coi sueffres tel <i>guerre</i> Viers une creature De mal toute seure Et si est fole chose Car nus parler nen ose Car <i>quant</i> tu me crias Mortel fais me dounas Ainc ior estre ne poi</p>	<p>Sva syndisc mér at bucren lağðesc niðr oc rétte sic sva hart at kistu fialar tóco at braca, en sialfr hann andvarpaðe sva sem maðr er andasc vil.</p> <p>En sálan þa er hon sa þat. þa toc hon at ráðasc oc øymde sec oc mælte sva. Vesol scepna em ec at ec scal bíða guðs ræiði. Guð hvi metr þu þic þes at syna áfl þit við iam u styrct vétr sem ec em. þvi at þu scapaðer mic dauðlegan. oc meðan ec mátta lifa. þa var engi sá dagr at ec scyldi ægi syndir gera. oc engi maðr annar lifir sva at hann syngasc ægi. Vesol er su scepna er slict er fyrir lagt.</p>

qui de pechie soit monde,
 tant soit de sainte vie
 qui ne face folie;
 malvaie est la nature
 qui suefre tel eniure!
 Pere, tu me crias
 et puis me reformas,
 porcoi fis creature
 quant de lui n'en as cure?
 Moult est ce grant dam-
 age
 quant tu qui es tant sage
 deignas ainc faire rien
 que ne tornait a bien.
 Pas ne te loeront
 cil qu'en infer seront,
 ia de ta grant pitié
 nul ior ne seront lié
 li crestien qui vivent,
 desputent et estruient.
 Ce dient li plusour
 que moult est grant dolor
 s'il restoit a plaisir
 que ia doivent perir
 icele creature,
 la qui formé nature
 fesis prendre a ton fis
 por oster de peris
 en ancien forfait
 qui Adam avoit fait.
 Por no redempcion
 soffri il passion
 et fu en la crois mis
 por sauver ses amis.
 Quant il por nos fu mort
 dient que c'est grant tort,
 que li siens anemis
 est tant poësteis,
 que ice volt saisir
 porcoi il volt morir;

Seiou pechie nen oi
 Carnest hom en cest
 monde
Qui de pechie soit monde
 Tant soit de sante vie
Qui ne fache folie
 Poure est li creature
Qui acele aventure
 Sire forment maidas
 Et puis me refusas
 Pour coi fais creature
 Puis que de li nascure
 Ja ne te loeront
 Cil ken infier iron
 Ja de te grant pitie
 Ne se seront or lie
 Li crestijen qui vivent
 Desputent et estruient

Et dient li plusour
Que mout est grant do-
 lour
 Sil te fust apleisir
 Jane deust perir
 Jcele creature
 Pour qui fraille nature
 Fesis prendre ton fil
 Pour oster de peril
 Del anchien forfait
Que adans avoit fait
 Il fu atort jugies
 Et naures et playes
 Et el sepulcre mis
 Pour sauver ses amis
 De nule creature
 Neust dius si grant cure
 Come cil de nous eust
 Se li pechies ne fust
 Que nous vier lui fesimes

Guð scapare min
 hvi scapaðer þu mic
 oc ofsacaðer siðan.
 Undarlect þyccir hvi
 þu visdóms brunnr
 scapaðer þa luti er æigi
 gafosc væl. ðeir aller
 er fara til hælvitis ecci
 monu þeir lofa miscun
 þina. oc þeir er en lifa í
 veroldo. þeir þrætta sin
 í millum.

En flestir mæla sva at
 þeim þyccir unndarlect
 er þin scepna scal fyrir
 farasc siðan þu mazt
 son þin sva lítils at þu
 lézt hann taca manlega
 ásyn.
 Fyrir vára læusn þolde
 hann þínsl oc var á cros
 næglðr. þvi næst þa
 þolde hann dauða. Nu
 er þat unndarlect hvi
 fianden er sva diarfr at
 hann þorer misgranda
 oc mis þyrma þvi er
 guðs sonr þolde dauða
 fyrir. Oc sva væinaðe
 sér su sál.

il volt morir por nos
 et nos tolir as lous.
 Li leus si s'aproisma
 vers moi si m'engingna,
 plus c'or serai perdue
 iamais n'arai aiue.
 Tostans ai aplorer
 qui me puet conforter,
 car ainc ne fu cel angle
 ne icel saint arcangle
 apostle ne martir
 qui me peust garir.
 Sempres ne soie prise
 et el puis d'infer mise,
 tant com se dementoit
 cele ame et se plaignoit.”

Puis venoit un deable
 comme leus ravisable,
 cele ame saisisoit
 fierement li disoit:
 “Qui chi vous amena,
 mal garant vous sera,
 a voistre cors pullent
 faisies parlement,
 or se repentiroit
 li fel se il pooit.
 Ni a mais recurrence,
 plus poise en la balance
 le soie iniquité

Quant nous le de
 guerpimes
 Pour no redemption
 Souffri dius passion
 Car il suffri le mort
 Pour nous ce fu atort
 Mais li sien anemi
 Furent trop posteif
 Jce est lokison
 Pour coi ot passion
 JI volt pour nous morir
 Pour nos pechies tolir
 Unsdes leus ravissables
Que on claime deables
 Uns viers lui sa proisma
 Si locist et mania
 Toustans mist aplorer
 Neme puis conforter
 Car il na ou ciel angele
 Saint ne sainte
 narcangele
 Apostre ne martir
Qui me puisse garir
 Sempres ne soie prise
 Et dedens infier mise
 Cele ame escroit
 Forment se desmentoit
 Aha ce estes vous
 Deables miervillous
 Et mout fiers et hisdeus
 Ravissables com leus
 Lame mout sescroit
 Diabes li disoit
 Ame vien anous cha
 Mal garans te sera
 J cil tiens cors pullens
 Acui tiens parlemens
 Or se repentiroient
 Se faire le pooient
 Tart est lor repentance

En i þvi como fiandr oc
 toko hana á bræut oc
 báro hana sva u þyrmi-
 lega sem vargar marger
 bera sæuð æin. En hon
 øpte ascrámalega en þat
 stoðaðe henne ecci. Þvi
 at dómr hennar vár þa
 loken.

que ne fait carité.
 Plus pesoit avarice
 qui verté ne iustice,
 por ce mestes livrés
 et en infer dampnés.
 El noir fu infernal
 avras malvais ostal,
 en la grant pullentie
 nos feras conpaignie».
 L'ame estoit entre II,
 com aignel entre lous,
 et noir et triste et blee
 tote descoloree.
 Li felon l'enportoient
 de rien ne l'espargnoient,
 pechoient li le dos
 et le ventre et les os.
 Ele getoit grant cris
 a oels crioit mercis,
 ele crioit forment
 moult angoisseusement;
 mais ce ert por noient
 que nul preu ni atent.
 Tel paor oi del cri
 Que io men esperi.

Trop poisent en balance
 Pour ce sont il dampne
 Et en infier livre
 Jssies diable fors
 Et si prenes le cors

Lame estoit entre-ij.
 Come agnaus entre leus
 Noire et descoulouree
 Et forment triboulee
 Li felon l'emportoient
 De rien ne les pargnoient
 Depiechent li le dos
 Et le ventre a lor cros
 Et le crioit forment
 Et angousseusement
 Tel paour oi du cri
 Qui ie men esperi

P	B	N
<p>Then I think that the body had sat, stretched out to dispute lengthwise in his coffin; he stretched so hard that the coffin broke, and he sighed, like a man who comes to die. When the soul saw the wonderful duel made, wretched, she lamented and often fainted. After</p>	<p>Then I think that the body had sat, stretched out to dispute lengthwise in his coffin and in the bed where he lies. When the soul saw the wonderful duel made, she lamented and often fainted. After she had fainted, she cried, "Damned one, I never cried, I will</p>	<p>So it seems to me that the body lay down and stretched so hard that the coffin took to break/crack; but he himself groaned so like a man who wants to die. But when the soul saw that, she then began to fear and to lament herself and thus spoke: "I am a</p>

she had fainted, she cried, "Damned one, I never cried, I shall never be happy! Alas, weary, sorrowful, so painfully waiting, wretched creature, such a bad destiny! Kings of heaven and earth, why do you wage war against a poor thing who alone dares to speak? Many feel great anger toward you, if I dare to say so, because whenever you cried to me, you looked at me many times, (seeing) that I did not refuse that I did not sin. There is no naked man in this world who cleanses himself of sin, who leads such a holy life that he does not face mischief; wretched is the nature that suffers such injury! Father, you reproach me and then reform me; why do you make a creature, inasmuch as you do not care for him? This great damage is much, when you, who are so wise, deign to do nothing that did not turn out well. Those who will be in hell will praise your great mercy, and the Christians who live, argue, and quarrel will still be alive. Many say that

never be happy, born not satisfied! Alas, weary, sorrowful, so painfully waiting, wretched creature, such a bad destiny! God abandon you to suffer and if you cannot pay. Kings of heaven and earth, why do you wage your war against a creature all free from evil? And if the thing is crazy, why don't we dare to speak? Who alone dares to speak? Many feel great anger toward you, if I dare to say so, because when you deadly cried to me, you looked at me, a day is never short, that I did not sin. There is no naked man in this world who sins, who does not face mischief no matter how holy his life; wretched is the creature who suffers such injury! Father, you are shouting at me and then reform me; why do you make a creature since you do not care for him? Those who will be in hell will not praise your great mercy, and the Christians who live, argue, and quarrel who will still be alive. Many say that, that the great pain is much if it will oppose pleasure, that

wretched creature, and I shall wait for the anger of God. God, why do you think to show your power with a creature as weak as I am? Why did you create me a mortal? And while I was alive, there was not a day when I did not commit sins. And no other man lives who does not sin. Wretched is that creature that is made of such a nature. God, my creator, why did you create me and, after that, accuse me? Wonderful one, it seems unbelievable how you, the fount of wisdom, have created things that do not prove to be good. All of those who go to hell should not praise your mercy. And those who live in the world wrangle between them. But most talk so that, to them, it seems extraordinary that your creature should die, since you valued your son so low that you let him take on a human aspect. For our redemption, he suffered the Passion and was nailed to the cross. And he subsequently suffered death. It is now incredible that the devil

the great pain is much if it will oppose pleasure, that this creature will have to die, whose form you made your son take in order to deliver from the fruit that Adam had done in the ancient offence. For no redemption, he suffered the Passion and was hung on the cross to save his friends. When he had died for us, they say that it is wrongful, that he without enemies is so powerful that here he wants to seize because he wants to die; he wants to die for us and take us away from wolves. The lions so are coming closer to me so they deceive me; more than gold will be lost. I will never get help. I have lamented about everything, which can comfort me, because there is no angel of Heaven, saint, holy archangel, apostle, or martyr who can protect me. I will always be taken and then put in hell," as this soul lamented and cried. Then a devil came as a predatory lion, who seized the soul and fiercely said, "The one who brought you will be

this creature will have to die, whose weak nature you made your son take in order to deliver from the danger of the ancient offence that Adam had done. He was wrongfully judged and nourished and bent and placed in a tomb to save his friends. God does not take care of any creature, as he make use of us, if they were not sinners, that we did toward him when we abandoned. For no redemption, he suffered the Passion, because he suffered the death, that it is wrongful for us, but he without enemies is so powerful his motivation is here because he had his passion. He wants to die for us to deliver us from our sins. The lions are coming closer to me so they deceive me; more than gold will be lost. I will never get help. I have lamented about everything that can comfort me, because there is no angel of Heaven, saint, holy archangel, apostle, or martyr who can be a witness for me. I will always be taken and then put in hell," as this soul lamented and cried. Then

is so daring that he dares to hurt and outrage [humanity], as the Son of God suffered death." And that soul wailed in that way. And in that moment, devils came and took her away, as violently as many wolves carry a sheep. And she cried in terror. But that did not help her, because her judgment was made.

a bad witness for you, you debate with your stinking body or he would regret the evil if he could. Never recourse, his iniquity weighs more in the balance than doing charity. Greed weighs more than not turning to justice, for this sorrowful weight and damned in hell. The black was infernal; you will have evil lodging. In the great sink, we will keep you company." The soul was among those, like a lamb among wolves, both black and sad and blue, all discoloured. The criminals carried her away, spared her nothing, wounded her back and belly and bones. She let out a great cry, with her eyes cried for mercy, and cried very agonizingly. But she is doing it for nothing for they pay no attention to her prayer. I heard such fear in the cry that I awoke.

came a devil wondrous and very fierce and awful as predatory lion, who seized the soul and fiercely said, "The one who brought you will be a bad witness for you, you debate with your stinking body or he regretted the evil if he could. Never recourse, his iniquity weighs more in the balance than doing charity. Greed weighs more than not turn to justice, for this sorrowful weight and damned in hell. The black was infernal; And come out, devils, deliver her to Hell, and take the body." The soul was among those, like a lamb among lions, black and discolored, and very tormented. The criminals carried her away, spared her nothing, wounded her back and belly and bones. She cried loudly and agonizingly. I heard such fear in the cry that I awoke.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
CONSPECTUS SIGLORUM

Viðröðla líkams ok sálar

N = Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling
AM 619 4to, fols 75v–78r (Bergen, 1200–1225) (*Old Norwegian Homily Book*)

A = Reykjavík, Landsbókasafn Íslands – Háskólabókasafn
JS 405 8vo, fols 10r–15v (Arney, c. 1780–1791)

R¹ = Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling
AM 764 4to, fol. 30r–v (Reynistaður, c. 1360–1370)

R² = Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling
AM 696 XXXII 4to (Reynistaður, c. 1500)

Nuper huiuscemodi

L = London, British Library
Royal 7 A III, fols 123r–145r (Durham, 1109–1154)

Desputisun de l'âme et du corps

P = Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal
3516, fols 140v–143r (Saint-Omer, 1250–1275)

B = Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale
9411–9426, fols 83v–90r (Flander/Nort-east Artois/Hainaut, 1230)

†T = Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale
L.V.32, unknown foliation (Wallonia, 1200–99), destroyed during the fire of
National Library in 1904

C = London, British Library
Cotton Julius A.VII, fols 72v–77r (Worcester, c. 1200)

H = London, British Library
Harley 5234, fols 180r–181v (Durham, c. 1250)

MANUSCRIPTS

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale

9411–9426 [B]

Copenhagen, Den Arnamagnæanske Samling

AM 618 4to

AM 696 XXXII 4to [R²]

AM 619 4to (*Old Norwegian
Homily Book*) [N]

AM 764 4to [R¹]

Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek

GKS 1606 4to (*Kristina Psalter*)

Douai, Bibliothèque municipale

295 (*Anchin Manuscript*)

London, British Library

Cotton Julius A.VII [C]

Royal 7 A III [L]

Harley 5234 [H]

Madrid, Biblioteca nacional de España

V. 5, núm. 9

Oslo, Deichmanske Bibliotek

Aslak Holt's Bible (no call number)

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal

3516 [P]

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

lat. 12020 (*olim* ancien fonds St Germain 332)

Reykjavík, Landsbókasafn Íslands – Háskólabókasafn

JS 405 8vo [A]

Reykjavík, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum

AM 404 4to

Rome, *Biblioteca Vallicelliana*
Manoscritti, ms. B 63/1–4

Turin, *Biblioteca Nazionale*
L.V.32 [T]

Vatican City, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*
Pal. lat. 1963

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Augustine. *Letter 238*, PL 33:1039a.
- Bullitta, Dario. ed. and trans. *Páls leizla: The Vision of St. Paul*. Viking Society Texts. London: Viking Society For Northern Research, 2017.
- Capozza, Alessandra. “Per una nuova edizione della *Desputisun de l’âme et du corps*.” PhD dissertation, University of Macerata, 2011.
- Dictionary of Old Norse Prose = Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog: Dictionary of Old Norse Prose (NorS)* at the University of Copenhagen, <http://onp.ku.dk/onp/onp.php>. (ONP). The Arnarnagnæan Collection. Department of Nordic Studies and Linguistics.
- Henningham, Eleanor Kellogg. ed. *An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul, Preserved in MS Royal 7 A III in the British Museum*. New York: published by the author, 1939.
- Marbodius Redoniensis Episcopus. *Carmina varia*, PL 171:1555d–1634c.
- Sturla Þórðarson. *Hákonar saga Hákonarsonar, Bøglunga saga, Magnúss saga laga-bætis*, ed. Sverrir Jakobsson et al. Íslenzk fornrit 31–32, 2 vols. Reykjavík: Hið íslenska fornritafélag, 2013.
- The Saga of Hakon and a Fragment of the Saga of Magnus with Appendices*, trans. George Webbe Dasent. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Ævi Scriptores* 4. London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1894.
- Varnhagen, Hermann. *Das altfranzösische Gedicht Un samedi par nuit*, Erlanger Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 1. Erlangen: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1889.
- Widding, Ole and Bekker-Nielsen, Hans. “A Debate of the Body and the Soul in Old Norse Literature.” *Mediaeval Studies* 21 (1959): 272–89.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Bandlien, Bjørn. “A Manuscript of the Old French William of Tyre (Pal. Lat. 1963) in Norway.” *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 62 (2016): 21–80.

- Bastin, Julia. "Trois dits du XIII siècle du ms. 9411-26 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 54 (1941): 467–507.
- Batiouchkof, Théodor. "Le débat de l'âme et du corps I–II." *Romania* 20, 77 and 80 (1891): 1–55; 513–78.
- Bossy, Michel-André. "Medieval Debates of Body and Soul." *Comparative Literature* 28.2 (1976): 144–63.
- Braccini, Mauro. "Unica e esemplari creduti irrecuperabili dopo l'incendio della Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino: Un ulteriore controllo sulla copia settecentesca del cod. L. V.32." *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 47 (2001): 191–204.
- Bruce, James Douglas. "A Contribution to the Study of 'The Body and the Soul': Poems in English." *Modern Language Notes* 5.7 (1890): 193–201.
- Cartlidge, Neil. "In the Silence of a Midwinter Night: A Reevaluation of the *Visio Philiberti*." *Medium Aevum* 75 (2006): 24–45.
- Cataldi, Claudio. "A Literary History of the 'Soul and Body' Theme in Medieval England." PhD dissertation, University of Bristol, 2018.
- Contini, Gianfranco. *Breviario di ecdotica*, ed. R. Ricciardi. Milan: Einaudi, 1986.
- Coscia, Francesca. "L'amour courtois in Scandinavia: La versione norrena dei lais di Marie de France negli Strengleikar." PhD dissertation, University of Naples "L'Orientale," 2018.
- Eriksen, Stefka Georgieva. "Body and Soul in Old Norse Culture." *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Scandinavia c. 1100–1350*, ed. Eriksen, Disputatio 28. Turnhout: Brepols, 2016.
- Ferrari, Fulvio. "Lárentius saga byskups: Between History and Historiography." *Saints and their Legacies in Medieval Iceland*, ed. Dario Bullitta and Kirsten Wolf. Studies in Old Norse Literature 9. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2021.
- Guggenbühl, Claudia. *Recherches sur la composition et la structure du ms. Arsenal 3516*, Romanica Helvetica 118. Basel/Tübingen: A. Francke, 1998).
- Gunnar Harðarson. *Littérature et spiritualité en Scandinavie médiévale: La traduction norroise de De Arrha Animae de Hugues de Saint Victor. Étude historique et édition critique*. Bibliotheca Victorina 5. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995.
- Hosington, Brenda. "Henry Watson, 'Apprentyse of London' and 'Translatoure' of Romance and Satire." *The Medieval Translator: Traduire au Moyen Age*, ed. J. Jenkins and O. Bertrand, Medieval Translator 10. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Leach, Henry Goddard. "The Relations of the Norwegian with the English Church, 1066–1399, and Their Importance to Comparative Literature." *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 44.20 (1909): 531–60.
- Mortensen, Lars Boje. "The Anchin Manuscript of *Passio Olavi* (Douai 295), William of Jumièges, and Theodoricus Monachus." *Symbolae Osloenses* 75 (2000): 165–89.
- Myking, Synnøve Midtbø. "Money Deposits and Shipwrecked Saints: The Norwegian Presence in Medieval Bruges." *Ad Brudgias portum: Bruges' Medieval Port System as a Maritime Cultural Landscape*, ed. W. De Clercq et al. Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming.

- Myking, Synnøve Midtbø. "The French Connection: Norwegian Manuscript Fragments of French Origin and Their Historical Context." PhD dissertation, University of Bergen, 2017.
- Pastoureau, Michel. *Figures et couleurs*. Paris, 1986.
- Peklar, Barbara. "Discussing Medieval Dialogue between the Soul and the Body and Question of Dualism." *Ars & Humanitas* 9.2 (2015): 172–99.
- Plahter, Unn. "Norwegian Art Technology in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: Materials and Techniques in a European Context." *Zeitschrift für Kunsttechnologie und Konservierung* 28 (2014): 298–332.
- Reichborn-Kjennerud, Ingjald. "The School of Salerno and Surgery in the North during the Saga Age." *Annals of Medical History* 9 (1937): 321–37.
- Richard, Emily Jean. *Body-Soul Debates in English, French and German Manuscripts, c. 1200–c. 1500*. PhD dissertation, University of York, 2009.
- Rivera, Isidro. "Brother Robert." *The New Arthurian Encyclopedia*, ed. Norris J. Lacy. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Sanderlin, George. "Reviewed Work(s): *An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul, Preserved in MS Royal 7 A III in the British Museum* by Eleanor Kellogg Heningham." *Modern Language Notes* 57.3 (1942): 217–19.
- Solalinde, Antonio García. "La disputa del Alma y el Cuerpo: Comparación con su original francés." *Hispanic Review* 1.3 (1933): 196–207.
- Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir. "The Resourceful Scribe: Some Aspects of the Development of *Reynistaðarbók* (AM 764 4to)." *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, ed. Slavica Ranković et al. Papers in Mediaeval Studies 22. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012.
- Wellendorf, Jonas. *Kristelig visionslitteratur i norrøn tradition*. Bibliotheca Nordica 1. Oslo: Novus, 2009.

ÁGRIP

Uppruni og ferill elstu viðræðu sálar og líkama í norrænni hefð

Efnisorð: umfjallanir um tengsl sálar og líkama, Norska hómilubókin, Reynistaðarbók, Flanders [Flæmingjaland], engilnormanskar bókmenntir, skrifstofur benediktína, *Un Samedi par nuit*, norræn textafræði

Greinin fjallar um handrit, varðveislu og dreifingu textans *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar*, elstu umfjöllun um tengsl sálar og líkama sem varðveitt er í norrænni þýðingu. Um er að ræða fremur nákvæma en þó samþjappaða þýðingu á engilnormönsku kvæði sem gengur ýmist undir heitinu *Desputisun de l'âme et du corps* eða *Un Samedi par nuit*. Norræni textinn er varðveittur í fjórum handritum: AM 619 4to (*Norska hómilubókin*), AM 696 XXXII 4to, AM 764 4to, og JS 405 8vo. Með því að bera saman og kanna fjölda þeirra leshátta sem eru samhljóða staðfestir greinarhöfundur og bætir við stemma (ættartré handrita) sem sett var fram af Ole Widding og Hans Bekker-Nielsen árið 1959. Sú staðreynd að í norræna textanum eru leshættir sem eru dæmigerðir fyrir það sem nýlega hefur verið skilgreint sem „meginlandshefð“ engilnormönsku handritanna bendir til þess að upphaflegt og nú glatað frumrit textans hafi verið franskt skinnhandrit sem að öllum líkindum var gert í flæmsku benediktínaklaustri (Picardy, í norðausturhluta Artois eða Hainaut) á síðari hluta tólftu aldar. Síðar kann handritið að hafa borist frá Flanders (Flæmingjalandi) til systurklosturs benediktína í Noregi – eins og Munkeliv í Björgvin – enda vel þekkt og staðfest að ábatasamt tengslanet verslunar og klausturmenningar var á milli skrifarastofa í klaustrum í Flanders og Noregi á tímabilinu frá tólfstu til fjórtándu aldar.

SUMMARY

Genesis and Provenance of the Oldest Soul-and-Body Debate in Old Norse Tradition

Keywords: Soul-and-body debates, *Old Norwegian Homily Book*, *Reynistaðarbók*, Flanders, Anglo-Norman literature, Benedictine scriptoria, *Un Samedi par nuit*, Old Norse Philology

This article traces the manuscript filiation and the routes of textual transmission of *Viðrøða líkams ok sálar*, the first soul-and-body debate that is preserved in Old Norse translation, a fairly faithful yet succinct translation of the Anglo-Norman poem known alternatively as *Desputisun de l'âme et du corps* and *Un Samedi par nuit*. The Norse text survives today in four manuscripts: AM 619 4to (*Old Norwegian Homily Book*), AM 696 XXXII 4to, AM 764 4to, and JS 405 8vo. Through a

qualitative analysis of concurrent readings, the present study confirms and expands the stemma hypothesized by Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen in 1959. The presence in the Norse text of readings typical of a newly identified “Continental tradition” within the Anglo-Norman family of manuscripts indicates that the now-lost manuscript source may have been a French codex, produced in all probability in a Flemish Benedictine monastery (Picardy, northeastern Artois or Hainaut) during the second half of the twelfth century. Subsequently, the codex may have been transferred from Flanders to a sister Benedictine house in Norway—such as Munkeliv in Bergen—via well-attested profitable monastic and trade networks that connected Flemish and Norwegian scriptoria between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries.

Alice Fardin
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
University of Turin
Studio 303, V piano Palazzo Nuovo
Via S. Ottavio 20
10124 Torino, Italy
alice.fardin@edu.unito.it