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ABSTRACT

The thesis is a philological examination of the first part of the manuscript AM 764 4to, written in Northern Iceland in the latter half of the fourteenth-century.

The first part of the dissertation deals with paleographical and orthographical features of the codex which reveal that the book was in all likelihood produced in a scriptorium in Skagafjörður c. 1376-1386. An overview is given of previous scholarship concerning the manuscript and its content.

The main section is devoted to discussion of the content of folios 1-23 of the codex. It is argued that instead of being a haphazard collection of unrelated texts, the first half of the book was conceived as a whole, and that the aim of the scribes was to produce a survey of the history of the world organised into aetates mundi. The sources for the different passages in this history are clarified and the scribes' treatment of these sources is viewed against parallel Old Norse works. Special attention is devoted to Bible translations.

The third section begins with an overview of the development of universal history in the Middle Ages which subsequently serves as a basis for discussion of the place AM 764 4to has within this tradition, with regard to Latin works as well as vernacular ones. It is argued that the book was written for the nunnery at Reynistaður in Skagafjörður and may have served as a schoolbook.

The last part of the thesis contains a diplomatic transcription of the text of folios 1-23v4.
To what extent did the rise of saga literature of Iceland depend on foreign influence and learning? This issue has long divided scholars in the field of Icelandic studies and been a source of fruitful debate and, occasionally, some less illuminating diatribe. As an undergraduate at the University of Iceland I was struck by how relatively little research had been done into many of the texts that constitute the corpus of foreign learning translated into Icelandic in the Middle Ages. It seemed to me that knowing which works were studied and translated in Iceland in this period was a prerequisite for any pronouncement on the ideas which could have influenced the writers who committed vernacular literature to vellum.

The vast fields of medieval learning opened up to me during the year I followed the MA-programme in Medieval studies at the University of Toronto, Canada, and the basis I acquired there has proven invaluable. After I returned to Iceland I developed an interest in compilations and the principles governing their make-up. This was partly influenced by trends within the so-called ‘new philology’ which seeks to place the context of texts in context, so to speak, by looking at how texts are grouped together in manuscripts and what that says about the purpose and uses of the books. It was in fact in a philology class with Ólafur Halldórsson that I first heard of AM 764 4to. When I later, under the guidance of Sverrir Tómasson, started searching for an interesting compilation which could serve as subject for a PhD thesis, 764 again came to my mind. It soon showed itself to be an ideal project — it had never been edited as a whole, it seemed to be a complicated, even a slightly ridiculous miscellany and it was filled with all sorts of material which doubtless was mostly foreign in origin.
When I moved to London in 1993 to take up a post at University College, it seemed wise to move the project as well and write it as a PhD thesis in Scandinavian Studies at the University of London. I was singularly fortunate in that Peter Foote was willing to supervise my work. We soon agreed that a study of the whole manuscript would be too large a task for a thesis and decided that I would edit and comment upon the first half which constitutes a chronicle divided up into eight ages. The result is the current work which falls into four parts. The first part is centred on the paleographical and orthographical features of the manuscript and also gives an overview of earlier scholarship concerning 764. The second part constitutes the bulk of the thesis and examines the various texts which make up the chronicle. The third part aims at placing the chronicle in 764 in context with regard to European works of a similar kind and earlier vernacular attempts at world history, and showing the purpose the book is likely to have served. Finally, a transcription of the text of the chronicle follows as an appendix.

The research for this thesis was mainly carried out in four institutes/libraries: University College London, The Warburg Institute, London, Det arnamagnæanske institut, Copenhagen and Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, Reykjavík. I am greatly indebted to many people at these institutions and beyond. In Copenhagen I would like to thank Matthew James Driscoll and Jonna Louis-Jensen as well as the other members of staff at AMI and Jón Eiríksson librarian at the Royal Library Copenhagen. The staff of the Arnamagnæan Dictionary have similarly been generous with their advice and expertise and I would like to thank, in particular, Þorbjörg Helgadóttir and Veturlíði Óskarsson (now at Uppsala University). Dom Rainer Berndt (Frankfurt) and Dom P.M. Bogaert (Louvain) kindly responded to my queries on medieval exegesis and I am grateful to Gunnar Harðarson (Reykjavík) for directing me to these scholars. Már Jónsson (Reykjavík) helped with issues concerning Árni Magnússon and Stefán Karlsson (Reykjavík) answered many a question on paleographic matters. I am also grateful to Ray Page and Gill Cannell, librarian, both at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, for their assistance. In London I had the good fortune of participating in the medieval postgraduate seminar at UCL, organised by Richard Perkins, and the Old Norse reading group, Orðhenglar, where I had the opportunity to present my work and
received constructive criticism and much help from, in particular, David Ashurst, Alison Finlay, Richard North and Orri Vésteinsson. Gunnþórunn Guðmundsdóttir took me walking when relief was called for.

The first grant for this project came many years ago from Minningarsjóður Jóns Jóhannessonar. Since 1993 I have thrice received a stipend from Den arnamagnæanske Kommission, enabling me to spend a month or two, each time, in Copenhagen, working with AM 764 4to. The UCL Graduate School and the Department of Scandinavian Studies jointly funded the purchase of photographs of the manuscript. The department also granted me sabbatical leave in the spring of 1997 and a travel grant from the Dean’s Fund paid my fare to Reykjavik and Copenhagen on three occasions.

The work on the thesis was carried out alongside my other duties, first as Halldór Laxness lecturer in Icelandic language and literature in the Department of Scandinavian Studies, University College London, and then, for the past months, as a member of the staff at Stofnun Ærna Magnússonar, Reykjavik. I should like to thank my colleagues for their patience and support, in particular Michael Barnes who was Head of Department during most of my time in London, and Vésteinn Ólason, director of Stofnun Ærna Magnússonar. Special thanks are also due to two other colleagues at the SÁM, Ólafur Halldórsson who first drew my attention to AM 764 4to and later read through a version of the first section of the thesis; and Sverrir Tómasson, who has taken active interest in my work ever since I began my graduate studies. My greatest debt is to my supervisor, Peter Foote. If the work on 764 sometimes seemed like a journey through a labyrinth, it was comforting to be guided by one who at least pretended to know the way out. I have profited immensely from his learning, and the thesis from his editorial pencil. The blunders that remain are, needless to say, my own.
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A note on spelling and reference practices

A transcript of the text of the chronicle in AM 764 4to is provided in Appendix II with abbreviations silently expanded. In cases where a word is indicated by its first letter only, followed by a dot, the expansion is shown in brackets. In the main bulk of the thesis quotations from the text are normalised. The normalisation takes some notice of the orthography of the scribes. No distinction is, for instance, made in the quotations between the phonemes /q/ and /ø/ - both are rendered as ö. Spellings in -ft have been adopted instead of -pt and the middle voice ending is z. Endings for the article (n.), past part. and 2nd pers. pl. of verbs are in -t. Punctuation and diacritical marks have been added. When parallel texts are compared, attention is drawn to similar wording by the use of italics but dissimilarities are given in bold. (The reader should be aware that unavoidable complications in the printing of Old Icelandic characters result in those appearing bold and italicised.)

References to editions and studies are given in footnotes, except for a few frequently cited editions where abbreviations are used. The footnotes are numbered consecutively within each of the four main sections of the thesis. A full reference is given the first time a title appears within a section, thereafter the work is referred to by author’s surname (full name in the case of Icelandic authors) and short title. Icelandic authors are listed under their first names in the bibliography.
## ABBREVIATIONS

(For bibliographical details cf. pp. 306-316.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AÍ</td>
<td>Alfræði íslensk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMKat</td>
<td>Arkiv für nordisk filologi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANF</td>
<td>Aarbøger/Annaler for nordisk oldkyndighed og historie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOH</td>
<td>Biblotheca Hagiographia Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHL</td>
<td>Acta Sanctorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCM</td>
<td>Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCN</td>
<td>Corpus Codicum Norwegicorum Medii Aevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSA</td>
<td>Corpus Christianorum Series Apocrypha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td>Corpus Christianorum Series Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACL</td>
<td>Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Diplomatarium Islandicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>Dictionary of the Middle Ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTC</td>
<td>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdArn</td>
<td>Editiones Arnamagnæanæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EETS</td>
<td>Early English Text Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIMF</td>
<td>Early Icelandic Manuscripts in Facsimile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etym</td>
<td>Isidori Hispalensis. Etymologicarum sive originum libri xx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Håndskriftfortegnelser</td>
<td>Arne Magnussons i AM 435 A-B, 4to indeholdte Håndskriftfortegnelser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMS</td>
<td>Heilagra Manna Sögur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Honorius Augustodunensis. Imago mundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Islandske Originaldiplomer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÍM</td>
<td>Íslensk miðaldahandrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWCI</td>
<td>Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBKat</td>
<td>Kálund. Katalog over de oldnorsk-islandske håndskrifter i det Store kongelige bibliotek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLNK</td>
<td>Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Lexikon des Mittelalters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LfThK</td>
<td>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>Monumenta Germaniae historica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Patrologia Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMLA</td>
<td>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUAGNL</td>
<td>Samfund til udgivelse af gammel nordisk litteratur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. THE MANUSCRIPT

1. Description and history

The quarto which bears the number 764 in the Arnamagnæan collection is a vellum manuscript, now consisting of 43 full-sized leaves and 5 smaller leaves, some mere slips. Two small leaves, once appended to ff. 11 and 15, seem to have been lost and there are five lacunae in the latter half of the codex. Exactly how many leaves have been lost there is impossible to determine, not least because the manuscript is not made up of regular gatherings. As the diagram opposite shows, ff. 1+16 and 2+15 hold together the first part of the manuscript, inside them are smaller quires, in or between which four small slips have been inserted as ff. 2bis, 3bis, 4bis and 9bis. Folios 18+31, 19+30 and 20+29 are the backbone of the second large gathering which has, in addition to normal bifolia, five full-sized single leaves¹ and one smaller (18bis). The remainder of the codex is made up of three bifolia and six singletons. To these are to be added two leaves catalogued as fragment m in AM 162 fol. which belong in the lacuna after f. 40.² (These two leaves are not enough to fill the lacuna.) Just as it is impossible to know how many leaves the manuscript originally contained, the lacunae make it difficult to assess whether the existing leaves, as now bound, are in the original order. The foliation numbers are in a nineteenth-century hand.

¹ Fol. 17 has been sewn to the 18+31 bifolium.
² Ólafur Halldórsson (ed.) Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta .III. (EdArn A3.) København (in spe).
Fig. 1 — The gatherings. The capital letters denote the various hands, those responsible for the chronicle on ff. 1-23 are given in bold. Unidentified hands in the second half of the codex are referred to with '0'.
In his catalogue of the Amamagnæan collection Kålund gives the format of the codex as 26.6 x 17 cm which is too generous — the largest leaves are no more than 26 x 16.5 cm and some of the single leaves which have been added to the quires are considerably smaller, not to mention the slips. Many of the leaves are damaged — with slits, blots and stains. They were, indeed, not all perfect in the first place. There are, for example, some original holes in the manuscript, see ff. 29 and 35, the corner of f. 25 was cut off before writing and a slit in f. 28 has been sewn together, perhaps before writing. Folios 36v-37 and 42v32-43r are palimpsests.

The text is written across the page and the number of lines on each full page varies from 36 to 48, although 41 lines is most common. Initials are in red, green-blue or grey-white (former yellow?) ink, rubrics in red or grey-white.

The manuscript is accompanied by a short list of its contents (on two folios), drawn up by Árni Magnússon and four slips with Árni’s notes. At the end of the list Árni touches on the history of the manuscript: ‘Mig minner eg hafe feinged þetta frá Bæ [= Gaulverjæðar in Flói, Árnnessýsla], mun, öefad, hafa tilheyrít Skalholltz kirkiu, og slæstd frá Skalhollte til Bæjar, epter andlat Mag: Bryniolfs’. Subsequent notes reveal that Árni did not acquire the 43 leaves of the manuscript all at once. He says he acquired f. 38 separately but believes it to have come originally from Skálholt. Árni also records that ff. 39-43 came to him inside a codex of annals from Skálholt and that two further leaves came from the Rev. Daði Halldórsson in Steinsholt, but Daði’s daughter had acquired them from Gaulverjæðar. Which two is not immediately clear. Someone (Jón Sigurðsson perhaps) has added the conjecture ‘37-38?’ to Árni’s note, but in the light of the other notes (cf. above) it is not likely that Árni was here referring to f. 38. A closer look at Árni’s list of contents provides the solution. In the list, the sixth age of the world is not followed by the seventh and the eighth, as one

---

3 Håndskriftfortegnelser, 40-41.
4 ‘þæt Blased sem þad æfintyr er á [i.e. about Jón biskup Hallárdósson], hefe eg feinged sier j lage ...’ (cf. Håndskriftfortegnelser, 40). On another note slip: (recto) ‘fra Skalhollte mun þetta vera i fyrstu. (a)’ (verso) ‘þæt ecki stendr þad annars í neinu afhendingar registre, so þad-kynne’.
5 Håndskriftfortegnelser, 40.
6 This information is found on a note-slip not printed in Håndskriftfortegnelser: ‘Dess[e] 2. blöð eru komin til dottur S’ Dada I Steinshollte fra Gaulveria bæ í Flöa, enn eg feck þau hið S’ Dada. J Bæ er eckert meira þar af. ínvisivi. S’ Hallárdó Torfason seiger mier, ad þesse blöð hafi fækt þar (i Bæ) í rugle, og veit eckert vídara þar af, hverki hvaðan þau sief, nie hvemig hattad hafi vered. hafe og eckert vídara þar af, eda veit sig nockurn tima hafi hafa.’
would expect, but with the Life of St Malcus (now ff. 27-28). This, in turn, is followed by f. 38 (Ævintýri af Jóni biskupi Halldórrsyni) and the five leaves which Árni had acquired from Skálholt. Árni acknowledges in his notes that he has probably not put these in their correct place within the codex. To the St Malcus entry Árni adds 'desunt ultima' which indicates that he had not noticed that the conclusion to the vita is found on f. 29. It is likely, therefore, that he had acquired these two leaves, ff. 27-28, separately and that they are the ones he refers to in his note about Rev. Daði and his daughter.

Árni transcribed the text on ff. 1-3r16 as well as the annals on ff. 41-43. The former transcript is on ff. 17-28 in AM 765 4to in the Arnamagnæan Institute in Copenhagen, probably written sometime after 1720. The latter has the number 423 4to, written around 1700 according to Kålund. There are other eighteenth-century transcripts of texts from the manuscript extant. The ms. Ny kgl. Sml. 360 4to in the Royal Library in Copenhagen is a copy of Árni’s transcript mentioned above (AM 765 4to), written by Halldór Jakobsson (1735-1810), who studied law in Copenhagen 1753-56 and later became sýslumáður. The Royal Library also holds a transcript of the geographical description on f. 1r-1v29 made from 764 itself. It bears the catalogue number Ny kgl. Sml. 361 4to and was written in the second half of the eighteenth century by Guðmundur Helgason Ísfold (1732-82). The copy was probably made for the Danish historian P.F. Suhm who has written a note on the title page. Jón Marteinsson transcribed at least two sections of the manuscript. His copy of the annals on ff. 41-43 is preserved with 764 in the Arnamagnæan Institute in Copenhagen and a transcript of two further leaves (probably 39-40) is preserved in Det Deichmanske biblioteket, Oslo.

---

7 *Håndskriftfortegnelser*, 40
8 Már Jónsson, *viva voce*.
9 *AMKat I*, 628.
In the nineteenth century Jón Sigurðsson made a detailed description of the manuscript’s contents which now accompanies the codex, and he may well have been responsible for numbering the folios.

The first 23 leaves of the manuscript contain a Christian history of the world, arranged on the principle of *aetates mundi* and interspersed with additional material of encyclopedic nature. The latter half of the codex is made up of saints’ lives (including those of Remigius, Malcus and Ursula), miracles and exempla, many from *Vitae patrum*, together with material about English and Norwegian kings, genealogies and annals (see Appendix I).
2. Paleography and orthography

2.1. The scribes

The manuscript is written in several hands. To assert exactly how many, one would have to undertake an edition of the entire codex, a task which lies outside the scope of this thesis. It is nevertheless necessary for my present purpose to arrive at some conclusions, however tentative, about the number of scribes, particularly in the first half of the manuscript. Folios 1-23r are written, it seems, in seven main hands (A-B, D-H). Some of these have also written large sections in the remainder of the manuscript. Three scribes (C, I, J) have written slips or small sections and there are additional hands in the last part of the codex, on f. 33v and particularly in the annal-fragment on ff. 41-43. One hand is clearly much younger than the others, the one on 33v, which probably dates from around 1500. As can be seen in Fig. 1, one or two scribes are usually responsible, it seems, for each bifolium. (This is at least true for the first gathering, ff. 1-16.) The bifolia have then been arranged so that their content should come in chronological order, resulting in very large gatherings and an unusual arrangement of bifolia within a gathering. Such a make-up strongly suggests that the book was produced in a scriptorium where several scribes were able to work closely together and ensure some sort of coherence in the final outcome.

It therefore need come as no surprise to find that a number of the scribes display very similar orthographic practice which makes it at times difficult to tell the hands apart. This is especially true of hands A, B and F which may indeed turn out to be not three, but four or five hands. In the following analysis, Ockham's razor has been applied, and the text assigned to as few hands as was deemed feasible. The most important common features of the hands are outlined below, as well as some peculiarities of individual scribes which may prove significant in determining the date and provenance of the manuscript. This is then followed by a somewhat more detailed description of each hand, beginning in each case with vowels and followed by consonants in alphabetical order. It should be stressed that this treatment of individual hands is not exhaustive.

14 AMKat II, 185.
2.2. Features common to all hands — diagnostic features.

Caroline a is used by all scribes except C and I who write a two-storey a. In the case of hand A (and to a lesser extent F) the caroline a may sometimes resemble the two-storey type where the upper half is almost closed.\textsuperscript{15} A also seems to write cursive a occasionally (cf. ‘langbarda’ 1v22, ‘faudur’ 1v33). All hands make occasional use of aa for å, most often in the case of the prep. á.

There are instances of an unmutated medial vowel in trisyllabic forms in passages written by A, F and J. These are mostly pres. part. pl. (e.g. ‘komandum’ 18bisv28, ‘gloandum’ 22r31).

There is no sign of the general change vá > vó (vo). The absence of any evidence of this change points to a date before the end of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{16} Pret. plur. of vera, is written out ‘voru’/’uoru’ (e.g. 4bisr10, 5r7, 5v28, 6r4, 6v31) but ‘varu’ is indicated at least once (6v32). Pret. plur. of koma is komu (e.g. 6r7).

The diphthongisation of e before ng (and nk) is generally reflected in the spelling (‘eing-’), a change which increasingly characterises manuscripts from the fourteenth century onwards.\textsuperscript{17} For pret. plur. of ganga and få other spellings occur as well: the common older spelling ‘gengu’ (e.g. 6v3 E, 21r7 F), but also ‘fiengu’ (17r12 A, 6r38 D) which presumably reflects féngu, by analogy with the pronunciation of the sing. fékk.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Hreinn Benediktsson. Early Icelandic script as illustrated in vernacular texts from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Reykjavík 1965, 45.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 75.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 56.
The following forms of the pron. *engi* occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. sg.</td>
<td><em>eingi</em> e.g. 3r11</td>
<td><em>eingi</em> e.g. 8v29</td>
<td><em>ecki</em> e.g. 1r34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. sg.</td>
<td><em>einkis</em> 13v13</td>
<td><em>eingis</em> 23r23</td>
<td><em>einki</em> 15r37 (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. sg.</td>
<td><em>öngan</em> e.g. 1v31</td>
<td><em>önga</em> 21r2, 23r18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. sg.</td>
<td><em>öngum</em> e.g. 13v25</td>
<td><em>öngu</em> e.g. 1v38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. pl.</td>
<td><em>öngir</em> 23r32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no indication of the change ve > vó in e.g. *kveld*.

é is often written ie, particularly, it seems, in the pronouns *mér*, *þér*, *sér* and in pret. of the reduplicative verbs *fú*, *falla*, *hala*, *hanga*, *heita*, *láta*, *ráda*. The spelling is not common in charters before 1400 although scattered instances are found in late 14th century charters and even earlier manuscripts.

The use of a diacritic accent is restricted to the letter i except in the case of Hand H. The other scribes use the accent not to distinguish between long and short i it seems, but rather to distinguish the i from surrounding letters. The frequency varies somewhat between the hands, thus F seems to use the accent almost exclusively when the i is accompanied by n or m and is therefore difficult to make out without the accent, whereas A, for instance, applies it more liberally.

The writing of j for i as the last letter of numerals is common to all scribes. Some, but not all, make further use of j for i initially and for the prep. í.

Adjectives and adverbs are always in -lig(-).

The fem. pron. is always abbreviated h° or written out ‘hon’ — no instances of ‘hun’ were found.

---

The preposition or is everywhere written ‘or’. Three scribes (A, E and F) use both o and u as the privative prefix, others use one or the other (see below).

Several of the scribes write ‘nuckur’ for the pronoun nökkurr, albeit with a varying degree of consistency. A seems to be consistent, E, F and G less so. B, H and I write ‘nockur’/’nokkur’ exclusively — the word does not occur in the case of C, D and J. The form ‘nuckur’ is an important tell-tale feature since it has been found in several other manuscripts from the fourteenth century, AM 573 4to, AM 657c 4to and AM 596 4to, all thought to stem from Northwestern Iceland. 22

All scribes write y3 23 and all, except C, are wont to place a dot over it, not systematically however, except perhaps for J. A and C usually draw a short horizontal stroke through the tail, and so do, to a lesser extent, D, E and F. The stroke is rarely or not seen in the case of B, G and H.

æ is ligatured cursive a + e by all the scribes except C who uses a+e. The letter is used for both older æ and older æ.

C and I usually write e for æ (I sometimes with a superscript dot) and the practice crops up sporadically elsewhere (hands A, B, and H). Instances of ø have only been noted in the case of A (see below).

Scribe E sometimes writes iæ for æ following v and b (see below), a characteristic noted in a number of fourteenth-century manuscripts and charters. (One instance of this spelling was noted with H ‘uiaentir’ (32v35) and A’s spelling v’i’engi (15v17) may be an isolated reflection of the same practice.) As Janez Orešnik has pointed out, this spelling probably reflects the diphthongisation of æ, a sound change which eventually proved abortive. It is found, predominantly, in manuscripts and charters from Northern Iceland and, to a lesser degree, in manuscripts from the Breiðafjörður area. The sound-


change seems, therefore, to have been confined to Northern and Western Iceland, although scarcity of written documents from other parts of the country means that one should be careful in drawing far-reaching conclusions from this evidence.24

The symbol for ö (older q and ø) is o or au. A and F use the two more or less interchangably, the others seem to prefer o to au. The fact that in the case of D, E and H au mostly occurs before ng may be taken as evidence for the diphthongisation of the sound, a reflection of the scribes’ pronunciation.25 Only one instance of q has been noted (‘dögum’ 14r9 hand B) and other forms (ø, δ) have not been found.

All scribes write standard diphthongs — au (ligatured a+v is prominent in the case of B), ei and ey.

B, E, and H commonly write e as well as i in unstressed syllables. e occurs sporadically in the cases of the other scribes although A, for instance, hardly seems to use it at all. o for u is altogether rarer except in the case of C where it is the preferred letter.

The occurrence of the svarabhakti vowel is virtually unknown. It has been found only once written out: ‘ludurblæstri’ (3v26, hand A) and indicated in the abbreviated forms ‘austurriki’ (1r11, hand A) ‘eillfur’ (2r21, hand A), ‘set<ur>ur’ (8r25, hand E) and ‘vetur’ (1418, hand B). ‘vestur’ (1v23) is doubtful.

Most of the scribes write ascenders in a similar way: they are either straight, in which case there may be a slight angle to the left where the stroke was begun (especially hands A, D, H and J), or with a right-hand loop. The right hand loop is rare with hands D and J. At the other end of the scale are A and B who make frequent use of it. An exception to all this is Hand E. In its case the ascenders are sometimes straight, but usually with a loop either to the left or to the right.

25 Stefán Karlsson. Sagas of Icelandic Bishops, 24. As Stefán points out (p. 26) -eing and -aung are often found in the latter half of AM 573 4to, a manuscript associated with 764.
There are sporadic instances of the loss of medial sound in clusters of three in all the main hands except D.

All the main scribes write ck for kk exclusively except F who also indicates cc (see below) and I who writes kk.

All scribes write d for δ, as had become the custom in the latter half of the fourteenth century. Only C seems to embellish the letter but the other scribes frequently give the ascender a marked curl to the right. All scribes, except apparently I and J, use p occasionally for δ.

Final d or t in past part. endings, 2. pers. plur. verb forms and the suffixed article is written in accordance with the rule that when the stem is in t, d is used, but where the stem is in d, t is used. Aberrations have been noted in hand H.

f is made with a 2-like (D, H, J) or a 3-like figure (A, B, C, F, G, I) clinging to the stave. E uses both forms.

A and F use roman f in words of Latin origin.

ft spellings are strongly preferred to pt throughout, an indicator of late 14th century date.

g is made of two closed circles except in the case of scribes C and E who write a more angular g with an open tail.

gh for spirant g in intervocalic and final positions crops up sporadically in all the main hands except F.

All the hands show signs of h with an elongated second stave. In some cases, most notably in I, it ends in a long perpendicular curve to the left, a feature also

---

26 Cf. e.g. Ólafur Halldórsson. ‘Úr sögú skinnbóka’. Skírnir CXXXVII (1963), 84.
found in charters attributed to Brynjólf Bjarnarson of Akrar in Skagafjörður of whom more will be said below.\textsuperscript{28}

The loss of h in initial hl, hn and hr is almost unknown. It has been detected in the case of hands A (‘lutum’ 23r9), B (‘rapan’ 14r24) and H (‘luti’ 15r18).

k is made either with a 2-like figure (A, C, G) or a 3-like figure (B, E, F, I). D, H and J seem to use both, the second stroke of the 2-like figure frequently curves to the left making it look more like 3 than 2.

All scribes except C, D and E show some evidence of the weakening of k>g in final position. In the case of B, F, H and J the change is confined to some instances of the adverb mjök. In G and A in particular, the change has spread to the pronouns ek, mik, þík, sik, although by no means consistently. The sound-change reflected in such spellings gradually spread through Iceland in the fourteenth century. Scribes C, D and E are clearly more resistant to the change than the others.

The rule that single l is written before older ð but ll before d otherwise is faithfully observed by all scribes\textsuperscript{29} and ll is normally written before t.

Hands D, E, I and J distinguish themselves from the rest in their treatment of m and n where the last minim is elongated. This is the rule in E and J but occurs more sporadically in D and I. This feature is also found in several charters written in Skagafjörður in the last three decades of the fourteenth century and linked to the family of Akrar\textsuperscript{30} and it is frequent in manuscripts associated with the same scribal school, for instance in Stock. Perg. 4to nr. 19.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Jakob Benediktsson. ‘Um tvenns konar framburð á ld í íslensku.’ Íslensk tunga 2 (1960), 32-50.
\textsuperscript{30} Ólafur Halldórsson, ‘Úr sögu skinnbóka’, 101; Stefán Karlsson, ‘Ritun Reykjafjarðarbókar’, 126-129.
All scribes display a great fondness for -nd- spellings. Scattered examples of this practice are found in charters, and it seems to have become increasingly frequent in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{32}

q occurs only in Latin words except in the case of hand E where qu is written for kv initially. This may be a reflection of an older original\textsuperscript{33} although there are grounds for believing that this was indeed the habit of this scribe (see below).

D, E, I and J write a longshafted r which is rare in manuscripts after 1350.\textsuperscript{34}

The scribes, all bar one, make r rotunda with a 2-like figure. Only J uses the tailed 3-like form exclusively, but B seems to use both forms. All scribes, except F, have been noted writing r rotunda following a (and u and y), a feature also found in AM 573 4to and some other manuscripts produced by the same scribal school,\textsuperscript{35} which points towards a date in the latter half of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{36}

Tall f is generally much preferred to round s by all the scribes except A. The f is found both sitting on the line and descending below it in the cases of A, B and J. Elsewhere the letter seems to be on the line except in the ft ligature where it tends to drop below the line. All scribes ligature f and t as a rule.

The form of the round s is simple in the case of D and G (except for the capital S) but it is common for the other scribes to extend the lower tip upwards and to the right thereby closing the letter and sometimes drawing the stroke through it. This is especially true of A, who in addition often adds a left curl to the lower half of the letter (see below). Only A uses round s for ss and he/she is also known to combine tall f and round s, e.g. in rifs 16v4.

The majority of the hands abbreviate hans and pess- with a ligatured f. The exceptions here are A, C, F and G, where pess- is normally abbreviated

---

\textsuperscript{32} Stefán Karlsson, 'Uppruni og ferill', 69.
\textsuperscript{33} Cf. Hreinn Benediktsson, Early Icelandic script, 34.
\textsuperscript{34} Stefán Karlsson, Sagas of Icelandic Bishops, 47.
\textsuperscript{35} Jonna Louis-Jensen, 'Et forlæg til Flateyjarbók? Fragmenterne AM 325 IV β og xl,3 4to.' Opuscula IV. (BiblAm XXX.) København 1970, 153; Ólafur Halldórsson, 'Úr sögu skinnbóka', 84.
\textsuperscript{36} Cf. Stefán Karlsson, 'Uppruni og ferill', 70-71.
using an er-curl. In A, C and F, but not in G, the -an- in hans is indicated by a stroke through the h which is then followed by s/l.

x is always x³ without a bar.³⁷

z is written with a bar by all hands except D and E.

The middle voice ending is invariably z.

All the main hands regularly denote consonant gemination by a superscript dot, except A which does not seem to use it, at least not before ff. 22-23 — a fact which might indeed suggest that those were written by a different scribe. A usually writes double consonants out, but ligatures do occur (mainly pp) and he/she frequently uses a macron to indicate a second m or n.

Scribes D, E, I and J do not, or very rarely, use the nota for ok. The others do, but to a varying degree. They write the nota with a bar like they write z.

The superscript tittle is used for -er-, and for -ir in unstressed syllables. Its shape is usually simple and does not vary much from hand to hand except in the case of B, D, F and G. These scribes use a double tittle of sorts, which at times almost resembles a cursive n or an m (cf. e.g. 10v4). G uses this form of the tittle consistently, B, D and F much less so (but cf. e.g. ‘gerir’ 5r26, ‘unndir’ 6r15 and ‘ver’ 13r22). All scribes use the tittle to denote -ær- as well as -er/-ir and it is also used to denote -r- in pres. forms of the verb vera.

Superscript r stands for -ar-. Only scribe A seems to use it occasionally to denote r only (e.g. ‘ar’ 18r11).

In all the main hands the abbreviation sign for -ur (‘2’) looks like the number 8, flipped so it lies horizontally above the word (∞).³⁸ Hand E uses the upright version of the 2-like symbol as well (e.g. ‘nockur’ 7r6).

The Latin abbreviation for con- occurs in Latin words (e.g. ‘consules’ 13r13 hand F) and in the word kona (e.g. 2v26 hand A, 13r26 hand F).

The abbreviation for þúsund(ir), a superscript macron similar to a nasal stroke, cf. e.g. xv (2r14), is known from other Northwestern manuscripts, e.g. AM 573 4to, AM 61 fol. and AM 226 fol.³⁹

³⁷ Cf. Spehr, Der Ursprung, 128.
2.3. Individual hands

2.3.1. Hand A

Hand A wrote ff. 1r-4v32 (except probably 1v6-12 and except 2bis and 3bis), 15v-17r25, 17v15-20v (except 18bis, a few words at 18r14 and ll. 26-29 on 20v), probably most of 22-25 and 27-31 and sections on ff. 41-42. The main paleographic characteristic of the hand is a peculiar s. It is a round s, often with a hook added to the lower half of the letter, curling left (see e.g. 3v39). This scribe also writes a distinctive ornate y, with a hook on the tail, to the right. There is usually a horizontal stroke through the tail and a dot above the letter.

No distinction is made between long and short vowels with the exception of á which is frequently written au, especially in the word á (whether noun or preposition), see e.g. 1r35, 1v11, 1v22, but also medially (e.g. ‘hvarurmtueggia’ 1v35, ‘læinu maís’ 2v19, ‘sæamál’ 3r2, ‘talmad’ 3r10).

é is generally diphthongised before ng as evidenced by spelling such as ‘leingd’ (1r19) and ‘eingla’ (2r2) but cf. ‘penga’ (3r36).

An isolated instance of a dipthong before g was noted in ‘meigh<æ’ (22r35).

æ for e was noted in ‘hægat’ (19v2) and ‘glædi’ (22r38).

é is written e and sometimes ie, particularly in pret. of the reduplicating verbs falla, fiá, látá and ráda (whereas halda and heita are usually in -e-), and refl. pron. sér (e.g. 2v20, but cf. ‘ser’ 3r7 and ‘serhuerra’ 1v36). ie also occurs in e.g. ‘riett’ (1r19), ‘hiegoma’ (3v21) and ‘nie’ (4r34).

i/i and the semivowel are usually written i (but cf. e.g. j for i on 2v25 and in several places on f. 19v).

The privative prefix is u (‘ubrigdiligr’ 1r17, ‘utaldar’ 4r27) and, less frequently o (‘obygd’ 1v27, ‘osyniliga’ 1v38).

u/ú and the semivowel v are usually written u. v occurs sporadically, in initial and medial position (e.g. ‘vestr’ 1r38, ‘augstini’ 1v8, ‘sva’ 1v29, ‘var’ 2r25), but has not been noted finally except in numbers. Analogical v is written in the past part. of the verb verða, ‘uorðinn’ (2r4). The spelling ‘sydars’ for suðrs

38 Cf. Hreinn Benediktsson, Early Icelandic Script, 91.
occurs at 1v21, a peculiarity also found in AM 53 fol. and AM 54 fol. manuscripts which are probably both from Skagafjörður.  

\[40\]

\[40\] y and i, both long and short, are generally kept distinct but y has been unrounded in ‘firir’ (17r20 but cf. ‘fyrir’ 2r15), ‘ifir’ (1r20) and i has also replaced y in the subjunctive forms of the verb *skulu*, written out ‘skilldi’ (e.g. 4v9).  

\[41\] The adjective *mikill* is with i (the mutated form ‘myklu’ occurs at 31v3). y is written for i in ‘fylkyngar’ (16v36), a case of dittography no doubt.  

\[æ\] is sporadically written e (‘seka’ 15v25, ‘hreraz’ 15v28, ‘reningia’ 17r13) or e (‘farselligt’ 16v32, ‘nemi’ 19r20, ‘féding’ 19r41).  

\[ö\] is written o or, less frequently, au. There does not seem to be any pattern in their distribution — both can be found in the same words (e.g. ‘indialond’ 1r12, ‘laund’ 1r12, ‘Aurkin’ 2v30, ‘orkinni’ 2v31, ‘baulua’ 3r18, ‘bolua’ 3r18, ‘snoru’ 3v12, ‘snauruz’ 3v14).  

Forms and derivatives of the verb *gera*, older *góra*, are spelt ‘gior-’ when written out (e.g. ‘giorþi’ 2r5, ‘giordi’ 2r6 etc.), but abbreviated either with a superscript o (‘gort’ 3r3, 4r12) or with the er-tittle (‘gerandi’ 4r36). Prep. *gegnun* (older *gøgnun*) is so written (16v26).  

The pret. of *snúa* is in ö (e.g. ‘snoriz’ 4v14).  

The diphthongs au, ei, ey are usually so spelt. An exception was noted in ‘lofkyrtlum’ for *laufkyrtlum* (2r36), where o (ö) stands for au, in a reversal of the practice of writing ö as au (cf. above). Forms of the verb *geyma* are usually written ‘giomdi’ or ‘giaumdi’ (e.g. ‘giauma’ 4r3, ‘giomdi’ 4r10, ‘giaumdiz’ 4r11; ‘geymdiz’ on 1v8 might be scribe B) which could reflect the pronunciation of the scribe.  

In unstressed syllables i and u are the norm. o is found in forms of the verb *vera* (e.g. ‘ero’ 2r16 but cf. ‘erv’ 2r6, ‘uoru’ 2v2) and occasionally elsewhere, e.g. ‘idronar’ (4v6). Unmutated forms occur sporadically, e.g. ‘fagnadum’ (2v3), ‘signadu’ (16r9), ‘domarum’ (18r15), ‘gloanndum’ (22r21).  

c occurs in foreign words (e.g. ‘dictadi’ 4r10) and names but is not used for k.
þ occurs occasionally for ð (d) (e.g. 'miðiarþar' 1r37, 'smiðaþi' 1v12, 4r33, 'iorþ' 2r6, 2r8, 'aþra' 2v9, 'smiðaþr' 3r10, 'mep' 3v36, 16v25, 'guþs' 4r2, 'sogþu' 4v8, 'ferdagåþan' 15v9, 'dauþra' 16r7, 'heþan' 16v38, 'naþþyn' 18r1) and d (= ð) is written for þ in the word alþþýða ('alþþýþu' 16r16, 'alþþþu' 16v32).

d is normally written for older t in final position in cases which do not fall under the d-t rule (cf. p. 21), but t occurs sporadically (e.g. 'bannat' 2r34).

The free-standing n. nom./acc. sg. article is in d. Prep. við is abbreviated using a superscript d but at and huat are usually abbreviated with a superscript t. Pron. þat is spelt 'þad' when written out (1v11). A reverse spelling is indicated in 'vefþat' (2v18).

The prep. 'between' has been noted as 'midil' (3r2, 15v12) whereas 'milli' seems to be the more usual form (e.g. 1v22). ð is assimilated in 'trauþla' (16v25) and d is lost in e.g. 'elligu' (4r28 for elðligu), 'bunnþir' (17r17 for bundnir), and 'ueralþligu' (18v7 for veðralþligu).

f is insular f but roman f occurs in foreign names and place-names, e.g. 'affricam' (1r35).

Spellings in ft are common ('eftþir' 2r26 et passim, 'afþr' 3r23 etc.) but not universal (cf. e.g. 'loþti' 3r8, 'kiþpta' 4f18, 'grapþþar' 15v39). The change f>b following l or r, a Northwestern feature reflecting pronunciation,42 is evidenced by spellings such as 'kolþþr' (1r19), 'ulbalþldþa' (3r28) and 'þarþþlaþss' (22r37). The practice of writing m or mn for fn crops up sporadically (cf. 'iþamn' 4r34, 'iþammargar' 2r15), presumably again a reflection of pronunciation.

gh is occasionally written for spirant g both intervocalically (e.g. 'dagha' 2v6) and finally (e.g. 'noreþg' 1v26, 'þigh' 4r28)

The spelling reflects the palatalisation of g and k before æ (e.g. 'skiærþleiki' 1r17, 'giþæþku' 4v11) and before ö in 'giþþðí' (2r6) and 'giþþþmdí' (4r10) and similar forms.

Initial h is missing in the neuter form of the free-standing article (e.g. 'id' 1v39, 16v30 but cf. 'hiþn' 1v31). h is retained in 'auþþralþfu' (1r15). One instance of l for hl was noted ('lþþþum' 23r9).

There are some signs of the weakening of final k, e.g. 'eg' (3r33, but cf. 'ek' 3r17, 3v9), 'þig' (3r17 et passim), 'miþg' (3r27). ok is so spelt when
written out (19v3). Spellings such as 'ligt' (1r9 for līkt) and 'fatægt' (23r32) are reverse spellings which reflect the unvoicing of g before t.

pp is written as a ligature. p is simplified in 'kipti' (3v37). f has replaced p for the spirant in 'glaeds' (3v30).

q is written in foreign words only (e.g. 'quatuor' 3r10, 'aquilinensis' 17v28).

r rotunda is regularly written following the round letters, b, d, g, o, p, ṭ, but also occasionally following a.

r occurs, with superscript i, as the abbreviation of rīki (e.g. 1v26) and for the capital in e.g. 'röboas' (4v10).

rs is sometimes assimilated to ss (and the ss simplified) before t (e.g. 'fyst' 1v37, 'posta' 3v35).

Both tall ɀ and round s are used. The former is more frequent at the beginning of the manuscript whereas round s is almost exclusively used in many of the later sections written by this scribe (e.g. in the list of popes on f. 19). It is also here that ss can be found written so (e.g. 'huass' 15v15, 'messo' 15v30, 'ymissar' 16r9, 'kross' 17r22) or with the combination fs (e.g. 'rifts' 16v4, 'krofsfefrm' 16v19).

Pron. pessi is usually abbreviated using the er-curl, followed by either f (e.g. 4r8) or s (more frequent in latter sections, cf. e.g. 15v). Gen. of pron. hann is similarly abbreviated by a stroke through the h, followed by f (e.g. 3r22) or s (e.g. 4v21), although an h+f ligature is quite frequent at the beginning of the manuscript (cf. e.g. 2r29).

On t in endings see above.

z occurs in genitive sg. of nouns, pronouns and adjectives following ll, lō/lld, nn, nd, rō and t, with or without the inclusion of the dentals (e.g. 'mannz' 3v29, 'lofzins' 1r17, 'suerdz' 15v14, 'hollz' 16r15, 'kriz' 17r6)

Derivatives in δ, t + sk/sl are spelt zk/zl (cf. 'uizku' 1r6, 'giæzku' 4v11, 'fehirzlum' 4v21). z is also written in the words 'ruza' (1v25) and 'bleza' (e.g. 3r33) and in foreign names (e.g. 'boez' 4r14).

Superlatives in -st are usually so spelt following a vowel (e.g. 'fyftu' 1r2, 'næftu' 2v6) but with zt otherwise (e.g. 'fremzti' 3r19, 'yngzti' 4r17).

42 Oskar Bandle. Die Sprache der Guðbrandsbiblia. Orthographie und Lauteformen. (BiblAm
‘ystum’ 4r35). The exception ‘nedsta’ was noted (2r8). Superlatives in -ast are in zt (‘siduztu’ 3v36, ‘fridaztr’ 4r22,), but final z was noted in norduz (1v28).

2.3.2. Hand B

Hand B wrote 4v32-5v20, 14r1-37, 21v25-41, 35, probably ll. 6-12 on 1v and sections on f. 34, as well as a couple of lines here and there, for instance on f. 40v (23-24). This hand differs from the others in that it makes use of the av ligature. v for u/v also seems more frequent here than elsewhere in the manuscript.

No distinction is made between long and short vowels except that á is occasionally written aa (e.g. ‘hær’ 5r10).

é is variously written e or ie, the same word may show the two different spellings (cf. e.g. ‘nie’ 5r10, ‘ne’ 5r30).

i/i and the semivowel j are usually all written i although j occurs occasionally for the preposition í on f. 21v (cf. l. 26).

The privative prefix has not been noted.

For u/ú and v u is most common on f. 5r but the scribe seems to switch gradually to v as his preferred letter, so that on f. 14r u occurs only sporadically. i and y are kept distinct for the most part, but cf. ‘synum’ 14r24. yfír is written with a y whereas firir is so spelt when written out (e.g. 5r12). Pret. of skulu is similarly spelt with i when written out (5r6). The adj. mikill is occasionally spelt with y in contracted forms, regardless of the sound in the following syllable (e.g. ‘myklagardi’ 21v34 but cf. ‘mikladi’ 5v9).

e for æ was noted in ‘hesti’ (5v6).

ø is usually written o, sometimes au or av (ligatured), and one instance of 8 has been noted (‘døgvm’ 14r9). Older ø in the verb gøra appears as ey (‘geyrdu’ 5r24) or io (‘giordiz’ 21v35) when written out, but is usually abbreviated, using the er-curl. Prep. gegnum (older gøgnum) has not been noted.

The spelling ‘gesadi’ (5r8) for geisadi is presumably a mistake.

In endings i and e occur interchangeably (cf. e.g. ‘hluti’ 5r36, ‘hlute’ 5r37), whereas o instead of u is rare (but cf. ‘mino’ 5v4).

XVII.) Copenhagen 1956, 125.
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Apart from the ck spelling, c has been noted only in the verb *lykta* ('lyctaz' 14r21, 'lyctadri' 35r24).

\[ \phi \] occurs sporadically for ð, e.g. ‘dyrp’ (5v7, 5v11), ‘guþligri’ (14r26), ‘orþum’ (14r28).

The scribe writes d, rather than t, in endings (‘lesid’ 5r27, ‘lifid’ 5r32 etc.). He/she likewise writes ‘ad’, ‘vid’ and ‘med’. The form ‘medr’ also occurs (5r13). The pron. *pat* has not been found written out.

d is lost e.g. in ‘hollgan’ (14r27) and ‘bunnum’ (5r7).

g before n is retained in ‘gnógliga’ (14r13).

Spirant g is normally written g but gh has been noted once in ‘dagh’ (14r13).

Initial h has been lost in ‘rapan’ (14r23) but is retained elsewhere.

The spelling reflects the palatalisation of k before æ (e.g. ‘kiæmi’ 14r10) but not before e (e.g. ‘kerum’ 5v17, cf. also ‘geck’ 5r31 — the combination gæ/giæ has not been found).

Final k is weakened in ‘miog’ (5r24 et passim).

Double m has been noted in ‘framm’ (21v39).

\[ r \] rotunda is written following the round letters b, d, g, o, and \[ p \], but also following a, u and y.

\[ R \] has been noted once (14r25) as part of the abbreviation of *rikis*.

Tall \[ f \] is used almost exclusively. Round \[ s \] only occurs in association with abbreviation marks and, occasionally, in initial position. Double \[ s \] is written \[ ff \] finally (e.g. ‘ueldiff’ 5r12).

\[ z \] occurs in the genitive of nouns/pronouns, after n, ll(d/t) and t(n) (ofnz 5r8, *manz* 5r19, *einvalz* 14r1, *allz*, 14r18, 14r30, *uazfall* 21v27), in foreign names and in the word *uizka* (5r34 et passim). The superlative in -st is so written following vowels (e.g. ‘næst’ 5r9, ‘mest’ 5r20, ‘hæst’ 14r18). Other forms have not been noted.

2.3.3. Hand C

Hand C is found only on 21 lines on f. 5v (ll. 20-41). It is somewhat coarser than the other hands and characterised by broad strokes and angular letters. The scribe makes relatively little use of abbreviations and is not consistent in their
application. Conj. ok, for instance, is abbreviated four times but written out in full five times. Pron. pat is not abbreviated at all.

No distinction is made between long and short vowels, except that prep. á is once written aa.

The free-standing article is in e- (‘ena’ l. 36, ‘eno’ 40)
ée is universally written ie.
i and y are kept distinct.
i occasionally has an accent. Prep. i is twice written j (l. 21, 24).
Both ‘god’ (l. 32) and ‘gvd’ (l. 22) occur. The verb munu occurs once and is written ‘monv’ (l. 23).

The vowel u is usually written v but u occurs in ‘dariuf’ (l. 20), ‘voru’ (l. 28), ‘fyrum’ (l. 28) and (probably) ‘fcurd god’ (l. 32).
æ is written e (‘hetti’ l. 21, ‘frendi’ l. 25). The plural pronoun is ‘vær’ when written out in full, but the er-curl is used in abbreviating it (l. 23).
ø occurs in the foreign names ‘bøøl’ (l. 22) and ‘bøli’ (l. 31) but whether it stands for any phonological distinction seems doubtful.

ò for older ø is written au (‘kaustodo’ l. 24) or, more commonly, o (‘grof’ l. 21, ‘tolodo’ l. 21, ‘grondodo’ l. 25, ‘odro’ l. 29). Older ø in various forms of the verb gorá is written io (‘giord’ l. 28, ‘giort’ l. 32, ‘giorr’ l. 36), but when abbreviated the tittle is used (l. 35).

In endings i is normal but e occurs in ‘borgarennar’ (l. 39).


The scribe is wont to double consonants in both medial and final positions (‘settia’ l. 21, ‘drapp’ l. 21, ‘dreckann’ l. 22, ‘blott’ l. 31, ‘blottadr’ l. 31).
c is written in foreign names and for k following s (‘scurd god’ l. 32).

For d/ð two letterforms are used, one plain, the other with a right hand curl at the top of the ascender, a stroke also used to embellish b, k and þ. The scribe does not use the different forms to distinguish between d and ð, both forms are used for either phoneme. The plain form is generally preferred in initial position.
The palatalisation of g before ò is reflected in the spelling (cf. e.g. ‘giord’ l. 28).

ok is written so when the nota is not used (cf. above). Pronouns (acc.)

bik and sik are likewise written with k.

Final m is omitted in the 1.pers. pl. of the verb munu (l. 23)

Tall f is used exclusively.

Original final t is retained in pronouns and particles (e.g. ‘at’ l. 21, ‘ząt’ l. 25).

z is written after nd in final positions (medialandz l. 34). Superlatives are in st (‘sterkosto’ l. 36, ‘mestr’ l. 39).

2.3.4. Hand D

Hand D wrote 2bisv and 6r. This scribe does not use the nota to abbreviate conj. ok. He/she uses the flipped ur-curl, but the right half of it is not closed, which makes it look more like the Greek letter α.

In general, no distinction is made between long and short vowels. However, the prep. d is most often written a and the name Aron/Åron is twice spelt ‘aron’, once ‘aron’. á occurs once (‘án’ 6r8).

é is written variously e (e.g. ‘ne’ 6r14, ‘ser’ 6r16, ‘fe’ 6r20, ‘herodum’ 6r22, ‘ste’ 6r28, ‘brefum’ 6r30, ‘ver’ 6r32, 2bis v7, ‘het’ 2bis v6) or ie (e.g. ‘fiell’ 6r2, ‘lietu’ 6r12, ‘sier’ 6r12, ‘pier’ 6r35).

The dipthongisation of e before ng is evidenced in the pret. form of the verb fú, ‘feingi’ (6r41) but which is also written ‘fiengu’ (6r38). The pret. of ganga occurs only once, abbreviated ‘gg’ (expanded in the transcript geingu).

i/l are invariably written i as is the semi-vowel j.

The privative prefix 6- is written o (‘otali’ 6r17).

u/u and the semi-vowel v are written either u or v — no pattern is discernible in the distribution.

y has a superscript dot and a simple slender descender, usually marked with a horizontal stroke.
i and y are kept distinct. Prep. yfir is so spelt (6r25, 6r37, the -ir abbreviated), fyrir only occurs abbreviated as does pret. subj. of skulu. y is written before u in forms of the adj. mikill (‘myklu’ 6r5, ‘mycklum’ 6r32).

ö is written o except in ‘gaungu lids’ (6r16) and ‘pipna saung’ (6r38) which probably reflects the diphthongisation of ö before ng. Unstressed ö is preserved in ‘herodum’ (6r22). Forms of the verb gera are abbreviated using the er/ir-curl. Prep. gegnum (older gøgnun) does not occur.

ey is written in ‘eyrenndreka’ (6r3) and ‘eyrendiss’ (6r7).

In endings i and u are preferred to e and o. Occurrences of the latter are seen in ‘mælte’ (6r13), ‘hveite’ (6r18), ‘otte’ (6r36), ‘fjolmenne’ (2bisv2), ‘matte’ (2bisv5), ‘hafe’ (2bisv9) ‘ero’ (6r22), ‘mælto’ (6r31).

c is used in foreign names and occasionally for k in final position (e.g. ‘oc’ 6r9, 6r22, 6r33, 2bisv2, 2bisv7; ‘toc’ 2bisv3).

ö is normally written d but þ occurs in ‘hofpingia’ (6r13, 6r15), ‘bodorbi’ (6r14), ‘siþan’ (6r36, 2bisv6, 2bisv8), ‘eyþa’ (6r40).

The palatalisation of g before æ can be seen in the spelling of ‘giædi’ (6r18) and ‘agiætvztv’ (6r23).

m is doubled in ‘framm’ (6r6) and ‘ammbatt’ (2bisv10) but has been shortened in ‘skamt’ (2bisv12).

The r is long-shafted.

r rotunda is usually written after b, d, g, h, o, and þ, and frequently after a as well.

The scribe prefers to use the tall f but round s does occur, particularly in initial position (e.g. ‘sneypu’ 6r9, ‘sik’, 6r12, ‘sudr’ 6r22, ‘skotid’ 2bisv4). rs is not assimilated to ss in ‘forfe’ (6r26).

t (or th) is preferred to d in final position (apart from the t-d rule) and sometimes shows reverse spelling, e.g. ‘hunndrat’ (6r16), ‘hernath’ (6r29). Pron. pat was not found written out. The word at is usually written ‘ath’ (e.g. 2bisr3, 6r4, 6r11) but instances of ‘at’ can be found (6r9, 6r37). The article, pronouns and adjectives ending in t are not found unabbreviated.

z occurs in ‘unz’ (6r6), and in the gen. sing. of nouns after (n)d, ll or (s)t, with or without the dentals (e.g. ‘blalanz’ 6r7, ‘allz’ 6r18, ‘briostz’ 6r39).
Superlatives in -st are so spelt (e.g. ‘næst’ 6r12). Superlatives in -ast are in z or zt (‘pycuaz’ 6r21, ‘agiaeztvstu’ 6r23, ‘sterkuztv’ 6r26, ‘mattkuztu’ 6r36).

2.3.5. Hand E

Hand E wrote 6v-9v, 10v38-11r2, 36r1-13, 37v, 42v33-43r23, 4bis and a few words in l. 18r14. This hand resembles hand D in many ways, both make f with a 2-like figure clinging to the stave (although E also uses the other 3-like form) and a long-shafted r. Neither scribe is fond of the nota — D does not use it at all and in the case of E it only appears superscript on 6v. There are differences, however. The g is one of the marked characteristics of hand E, its perpendicular curves sharply to the left, creating an angle, whereas D writes a rounded, ‘closed’ g. Unlike D, E prefers the 2-like abbreviation symbol for ur although the flipped variant has been noted a couple of times (e.g. ‘konur’ 6v16). Hand E also abbreviates ull with a stroke through the II (e.g. ‘gull’ 8r24) — an abbreviation not noted in the other hands. Orthographically, hand E distinguishes itself from the others by writing ui/vi before æn which in all likelihood reflects the pronunciation of the scribe (cf. pp. 19-20 and below). Words in væn- do not occur in the text written by hand D so the two hands cannot be compared in this respect. Hand E also displays a particular morphological characteristic, only adopted by one other scribe (G): the weak form of the prepositive article, cf. e.g. ‘alla hinu mætkuztv’ (6v1), ‘hinu hæstu fioll’ (6v11), ‘hinv ebresku konu’ (8v). One instance of prep. of was noted (6v12) — the scribe writes umt everywhere else — probably an influence of the exemplar (cf. also p. 136).

Some attempt is made to distinguish between a and á. á is written in ‘andláti’ (9r39). The prep. á is often written at when not joined to the following word. In addition, the ligature occurs sporadically in various positions, e.g. ‘aeggiun’ (6v21), ‘maætkuztu’ (6v1), ‘raad’ (7r41), ‘hærlædi’ (7v35), ‘blaæland’ (4bisr5), ‘sa’ (7v4), ‘fa’ (8v1).

Both ‘nattuerd’ (7r28) and ‘nottverd’ (8v7) occur.

43 Cf. Björn Karel Pórólfsson, Um íslenskar orðmyndir, 52.
æ for e is written in ‘sættud’ (7v24) and ‘klærkr’ (36r9) but other instances of this norwegianism have not been noted.

The dipthongisation of e before ng is commonly reflected in the spelling (‘eingi’ 7r14, 7v4, 7v21, 9r24, ‘geingnar’ 9r15) but is not universal (cf. ‘gengu’ 6v3).

e is written variously e or ie. ie is more common but e is preferred following h and m (cf. ‘mer’/‘pier’ 8r28, ‘het’ 8v7, ‘her’ 9r20). Pret. of the reduplicating verbs falla, fá, hanga, halda, heita is normally in ie (e.g. ‘fiell’ 9r3, ‘fieck’ 8r10, ‘fiengu’ 9r30, ‘hieck’ 8v23, ‘hiellt’ 9r38, ‘hielldu’ 9r36, ‘hiez’ 8v21).

No distinction is made between i and ï, both of which are generally written i. Prep. ï is often written j and j is also found for initial i in ‘jndiam’ (4bisr5), ‘jnn’ (8r23), and ‘jncipiente’ (9r34). The semi-vowel j is most often written i but j frequently occurs initially, and quite consistently in names of foreign origin, cf. e.g. ‘jardar’ (6v15), ‘jarla’ (6v25), ‘judith’ (e.g. 7v17, 8r9, 8v1, 9r5, but cf. ‘iuididar’ 8v9 and ‘iudith’ 9r16, 9r30), ‘jatte’ (8v35), ‘jacob’ (9r4), ‘judas’ (9v9), ‘jamsmidr’ (9v18). The name of the holy city is spelt variously ‘ierusalem’ (e.g. 6v9) and ‘hierusalem’ (e.g. 6v13).

The privative prefix is written o (e.g. ‘ofridi’ 6v28, ‘osamvirdiligri’ 8r9, ‘ouine’ 6v21, ‘ovinum’ 7v29), or, more commonly, u/v (‘ubyria’ 9v37, ‘usigr’ 7r8, ‘utalligr’ 9r29, ‘utoluligr’ 6v33, ‘vueine’ 6v41, ‘uuinar’ 8r3, ‘vuinum’ 8v42) ‘nuckur’ and ‘nockur’ appear side by side (cf. 7r5-6).

u and û are both written u, except in some instances of the word ûvinr where v is used (cf. examples above). Furthermore, v for u has been noted once initially (‘vpp’ 7v7) and finally in the verbs settu (7v25) and mêltu (9v31, 9v34). The prep. um is occasionally abbreviated by a macron over v (e.g. 8v3). v is most often written u but v occurs sometimes in initial position, frequently in connection with abbreviations (vid, ver-, vâr- etc.).

y and i are kept distinct except for the poss. pron. dat. sinum which is three times spelt with y (7v18, 8v36, 9v33). yfir is usually so spelt (but cf ‘jfir’ 7r35, ‘ifir’ 9v10). firir has been noted once written out (4bis9) but is

\[\text{of} \text{ was gradually superseded by um in the course of the thirteenth century, cf. Peter Foote.}\]

‘Notes on the prepositions of and um(b) in Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian prose.’ \textit{Studia Islandica} 14. Reykjavik 1955, 41-83.
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abbreviated everywhere else. The scribe writes *tysvar* (8v35). The adjective *mikill* is normally spelt with *y* in syncopated forms regardless of the following vowel (*‘myckla’ 9r19, ‘myckli’ 4bis2, ‘myc(k)lu’ 4bris2, 6v12, 9v6, 9v15, ‘myclum’ 9r13; but cf. ‘mikla’ 8r8, ‘mikladi’ 8v39, ‘miklum’ 9r12), but with *i* where the disyllabic stem is preserved (*‘mikid’ 8v16, ‘mikill’ 6v2 et passim, ‘mikilli’ 6v14, ‘mikilleik’ 9v10, ‘mikilhæf’ 4bris4, ‘mikinn’ 7v8). *y* is the spelling in ‘byscupa’ (18r14) and ‘erkibyskups’ (37v15).

*æ* is frequently written for *æ* following *v* (*‘uiænst’ 7v12, ‘auruiæenna’ 8r32, ‘uiænleik’ 8r37, ‘uiænta’ 8v31) and in one instance following *b* (*‘biæn’ 36r2), in all likelihood a reflection of the scribe’s pronunciation (see above). The fact that *æ* but not *iæ* is written in ‘uægdir’ (8v40) suggests that the nasal consonant following the *æ* determines the spelling.

The 1.pers.plur. pronoun is *var* when written out in full (4bris12) but is almost always abbreviated, using the titile. The isolated spelling ‘græddi’ (8v5) for *greiddi* is presumably a scribal lapse.

*ø* is variously written *o* and *au* and no regular pattern is immediately discernible in the distribution of these (cf. e.g. ‘gofgudu’ 7v29, ‘gaugsgudu’ 7r1; ‘orum’ 7v42, ‘aur’ 7r39). However, *o* is more common by far, and *au* is mainly encountered before *ng* (e.g. ‘saung’ 6v4, ‘ualslaungu’ 7r18, ‘aunguit’ 9r3, but cf. ‘gongu’ 7r32, ‘þronguing’ 8v40, ‘ongvm’ 36r10) which renders it likely that the orthography reflects a diphthongisation of *ø* before *ng*. Older *ø* in *gegnem* is written variously *e* (7r15) and *o* (e.g. 9r3). Forms of the verb *gera* (older *gora*) are in *-er-* when written out (‘Gerid’ 7v33, ‘Gerdu’ 8r2), except the past part. which is in *-io-* (‘giorr’ 4bris9, ‘algiorr’ 36v11). The er-tittle is used in abbreviations (e.g. ‘ba mun drottin gera med bier algeruann hlut’ 8r29).

*ø>u* was noted in ‘heilug’ (7v30) and ‘herud’ (9r26 but cf. ‘herod’ 6v16, 7r33).

*ey* is written in ‘reyckiunni’ (8v25). One instance of *e* for *ei* was noted (‘enum’ 9r26).

In endings both *e* and *i* are common, but *u* seems to have replaced *o* almost everywhere except occasionally in forms of the verb *vera* and pret. of *mæla* (cf. e.g. ‘erod’ 6v18, ‘ero’ 6v26, ‘mællo’ 7r9).
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c is written in foreign names. It also occurs sometimes finally for k (e.g. ‘ec’ 7v38, ‘oc’ 4bis9, 6v9, 7r24, 7v4, 8r5, 8v13, 9r11, 9v23, ‘mioc’ 7v21, ‘sic’ 4bis4, 6v24, 7v19, 8r5, ‘toc’ 6v8, 8r6, 9r18, ‘pic’ 8r31) and, more sporadically, in medial position where it is sometimes coupled with k (‘luctu’ 6v24, ‘blicknar’ 7r16, ‘hertecknir’ 7v6 cf. ‘hertecknir’ 7r6, 7v29, ‘speckt’ 8r37, ‘mecktud’ 8v37).

δ is normally written d but þ is common following r (e.g. ‘iorþ’ 4bis8, ‘iarþrikiss’ 7r16, ‘dyrþ’ 9r31, ‘reyþþ’ 8r6, ‘fegrþ’ 8r9, ‘orþ’ 9v5 ‘fiorþa’ 9v21 ‘heyrþ’ 9v27) and crops up sporadically elsewhere, in particular between vowels (e.g. ‘Siþan’ 6v1, ‘eyþa’ 6v6, ‘aþr’ 6v13, ‘eþa’ 6v16, ‘guþs’ 7v8, ‘gyþingar’ 6v9, ‘yþrar’ 6v18, ‘hþþingium’ 7v1, ‘fæþa’ 9v24). Furthermore, þ is regularly written in the last syllable of polysyllabic words where d/ð has already occurred, cf. ‘smidaþr’ (4bis8), ‘idrusþuz’ (7r2), ‘bodarþ’ (7r26), ‘dauþa’ (7r26), ‘ardhalþz’ (7r40), ‘anndaphþz’ (9r39), ‘unndrusþuz’ (8r11), ‘grandþa’ (8r27), ‘skunndþpu’ (9r13) and ‘blonndþpu’ (9v6).

Only insular f occurs, but it is of two kinds, made with a 2- or a 3-like figure. The former variant is the more frequent and it is sometimes hard to distinguish it from p (cf. e.g. ‘steypt’ 4bis9 and ‘oftnefnda’ 4bis10). It is worth bearing this in mind while nevertheless noting that pt-spellings seem to occur a few times (e.g. ‘krapþ’ 6v19, ‘krapþe’ 8r2, ‘krapþ’ 7r3, 8v21, ‘lypte’ 9r17) although spellings in ft are the rule. In ‘appne’ (7r29) the t has been assimilated in the cluster. fn appears occasionally as m (‘iammikit’ 4bis7) or mn (‘samna’ 9r33), reflecting pronunciation.

gh occurs several times for spirant g, both finally (e.g. ‘skadsamligh’ 4bis1, ‘lanzlegh’ 4bis7, ‘dagh’ 7v2) and intervocalic (e.g. ‘bardagha’ 6v19, ‘megha’ 7r10, ‘akafligha’ 8r11, ‘sagha’ 37v15).

The orthography reflects the palatalisation of g and k before æ but not before e.

Initial h is used in forms of the article (but cf. ‘id’ 6v36) and h is preserved in ‘austrendus’ (6v27).

There is no indication of the weakening of final c/k to g in pronouns, adverbs etc. A reverse spelling occurs in ‘quiþuk’ (= kviðug 9v24).

Single m has been noted in ‘fim’ (7v12) and ‘fimta’ (9v19, 9v22) but cf. ‘fimmta’ (9v23, 9v30). The doubling of m is indicated in ‘frammt’ (7r32, 7v24, but cf. fram 8v38).
n is, as a rule, doubled before d, and nn has also been noted before g (e.g. 'gydinnnga' 8v24). The spellings 'enn'(7v2 for en), 'sinn' (7r28, 9r6 for sín), 'fiollinu' (6v13) and 'suefinnhuss' (9r13) were noted. They might be inadvertent although such spellings do occur in fourteenth century manuscripts and charters. Single n for nn occurs primarily in genitives of noun before z (e.g. manzoldrum 7r5, ranzsakido 7v32).

pp is indicated by a superscript dot in ‘opp’ (9r22).

qu is normally written for kv initially (e.g. ‘quenna’ 7v19, ‘quaul’ 8v40, but cf. ‘kualdir’ 7v7) whereas ku occurs medially (e.g. ‘aftruamu’ 8v29, ‘tuikuangadr’ 9v26). q appears otherwise only in Latin words. The conservative use of qu for kv might be put down to influence from the original — the Book of Judith makes up most of what E writes. But since qu also occurs in the few lines E writes on ff. 10v-11r, which in all likelihood is a text formulated by the scribe himself/herself designed to point the reader to a slip with further information on the Trojan wars, it seems reasonable to suggest that this was indeed a habit with the scribe who in that respect differs markedly from his/her co-writers.

r is long-shafted, but the length of the stave varies somewhat. Superscript r is the common minuscule r.

r rotunda is used after the round letters b, d, g, p and ð, after a and y and occasionally after h (e.g. ‘hrellt’ 7v27, ‘hrædiz’ 8r26) and n (‘rennr’ 7r37, 9r6). It occurs sporadically after u in abbreviated forms of várr (e.g. ‘uarra’ 8r12) and hvern (e.g. ‘huerr’ 9r6).

rl is always so spelt. The spelling ‘fyst’ has been noted (e.g. 6v30, 9v22) but cf. ‘fyrst’ (9v1).

Tall f is preferred to round s. The latter is mostly written in association with abbreviation marks or letters, cf. ‘sina’ (e.g. 6v11, 6v14), ‘sua’ (e.g. 6v37, 7r34) ‘ser’ (e.g. 7r32, 7r33), ‘sier’ (e.g. 6v34, 7r35), ‘s(agi)/s(uaradi)’ (e.g. 8r29), ‘sino’ (9r8), and in proper names (cf. e.g. ‘simon’ 9v9, ‘salathiel’ 9v15). In addition it is written initially in ‘senndi’ (6v12), ‘sua’ (6v20), ‘sinf’ (6v23), ‘sins’ (7r2, 7r4), ‘syndi’ (7r5), ‘spadir’ (7r13), ‘sinum’ (7r14), ‘sanna’ (7r16), ‘synir’ (7r39), ‘sonar’ (7v14), ‘saurlif’ (8r8), ‘son’ (9v24) ‘spamadr’ (9v29).

45 Stefán Karlsson, 'Uppruni og ferill', 69.
9v32). It was noted finally in ‘lyds’ (6v23) and ‘oss’ (7v10). Long s is written ff elsewhere. A small capital s is written in dags (9r42), presumably in order to match the rest of the enlarged word, making it a fitting conclusion.

The scribe writes d in endings, except where the d/t rule applies. The prepositions med and við are in d when written out (e.g. 6v21, 6v33). The dual pronouns vit/pit do not occur. The scribe writes pat in full (8r21). The spelling ath is common, but at occurs quite a few times (e.g. 6v6).

The freestanding n. nom./acc. sg. article is in d (e.g. ‘id’ 6v36) but when suffixed follows the d/t rule (cf. ‘landit’ 6v32, ‘hofudit’ 9r18, but ‘fiallid’ 7r18). A final t is also written in ‘hunndrat’ (4bis9).

z occurs in genitive sg. of nouns, pronouns and adjectives following ll, lð/lld, nn, nd and t, with or without the inclusion of the dentals (e.g. ‘lanzlegh’ 4bis7, ‘brioüz’ 6v5, ‘egiptalanz’ 6v34, ‘fiallz’ 6v39, ‘manzolldrum’ 7r5 ‘allz’ 7r16, ‘uatzfall’ 7r37, ‘uardhalþ’ 7r40, ‘uardhallz’ 8v27, ‘tialzins’ 8v19, ‘kraflz’ 8v40). It has also been noted in the gen. sg. of hlið (‘hlidz’ 8r11, ‘bogarhliz’ 8v29, but cf. ‘hlids’ 8v27). In addition z is written after n in ‘ranzsakid’ (7v32) and ‘unz’ (7v33).

Derivatives in ð, t + sk/sl are spelt zk/zl (cf. ‘illzku’ 7r5 ‘uizku’ 8r38, ‘fehirzlur’ 8r41, ‘fæzłu’ 8r42, ‘lidueizlu’ 9v13). z is always written in forms of the verb bleza. It is also written, as would be expected, in foreign names and place-names.

The middle voice ending is in z but the double spellings ‘safnastz’ (6v29), ‘reiknastzt’ (9v41) have been noted.

The superlative form of adjectives whose stem ends in a vowel is in st (cf. ‘hæstü’ e.g. 6v11, ‘næst’ e.g. 6v17) This is also the case with fy(r)st and mest (e.g. 6v30, 8r40). The superlative is in zt elsewhere (e.g. ‘efztum’ 7v18, ‘agíaetazta’ 7v21, ‘beztr’ 8r32, ‘sterkaztr’ 8r32), except in forms with -ast suffix and no inflectional ending, where only z is written (‘sterkuz’ 4bisv6, ‘fridaz’ 4bisv7, ‘mattkuz’ 9v19). The spelling ‘uiænst’ (7v19) is an exception.

þ is sometimes retained in suffixed þú (e.g. ‘lempu’ 8r1) but appears elsewhere as ð/d or t (e.g. ‘muntu’ 7r7, ‘littu’ 7r24, 7v39, ‘fardu’ 7v33, ‘gerdu’ 8r2). On þ medially see above.
2.3.6. Hand F

Hand F wrote 10r, 13, 17r26-17v14, ll. 26-29 on 20v, 21r-21v25, ll. 22-43 on 40r and probably sections on ff. 34-35. It is a regular hand, more gothic in appearance than most of the other ones. The use of capital letters at the beginning of sentences seems rather more frequent here than elsewhere.

Almost no attempt is made to distinguish between a and á. On ff. 17 and 21 there are, however, a few instances of aa for á (‘haarr’ 17v3, ‘maalli’ 17v7 ‘maa’ 21r5, ‘aa’ 21r17) and á occurs in ‘mál’ at 13v18.

An unmutated a occurs in ‘heitandum’ (13r36), ‘lifandum’ (21r26) and ‘hall’ (21v9) — such forms started to appear in the fourteenth century.46

The dipthongisation of e before ng/nk is commonly but not universally reflected in the spelling (e.g. ‘eingill’ 10r7, ‘eingi’ 13r11, ‘leingr’ 13r13, but cf. ‘gengu’ 21r7).

æ for e is written in ‘mærki’ (21v23). The spelling ‘lisid’ (17r28) for lesid is presumably a mistake.

The free-standing article has been noted twice in e-, ‘enne’ 10r29, ‘enir’ 13r14, but is otherwise in hi-.

é is commonly written e but ie occurs in pret. forms of some reduplicative verbs (cf. ‘fiell’ 10r11, ‘fiecc’ 10r13, ‘liet’ 13v28,) and a few other words (e.g. ‘lied’ 13v8, ‘riett’ 17v4, ‘nie’ 21r3).

i/i and the semi-vowel j are generally written i. Prep. f is occasionally written j (cf. e.g. 10r20) and j also occurs following i in genitives of Latin names (e.g. ‘darij’ 10r18, ‘iulij’ 13r31) as well as in numbers.

The privative prefix is o (e.g. ‘osamþyckiss’ 13v11) or u (‘uuingan’ 13r34, ‘uuinir’ 21r24, ‘uflyanddi’ 21v18).

u does duty, in general, for both u/u and the semi-vowel v, but v occurs a few times, particularly in various abbreviated forms of the verb vera (‘voro’ 10r11, ‘var’ 10r11, 10r13, cf. also e.g. ‘vm’ 10r6, 13r41). Analogical v/u is written in the pret. of the verb verd, cf. ‘uurdu’ (10r10).

Pron. nokkur is usually written ‘nuckur’ or even ‘nuckor’ (21v17), but instances of ‘nockur’ have been noted (e.g. 13r14).

---
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y and i are kept distinct. yfir is most often so written but ‘ifir’ has been noted (10r35, 21r7). firir is so spelt when written out (10r36). The adjective mikill is spelt with i, except in contracted forms with an ending in u (‘myklu’ 13r31, 13v32, ‘myclu’ 13v35, ‘myclum’ 21v23).

œ is written o or au but not in any regular fashion. Fol. 10r has o exclusively, o is more common at the beginning of f. 13 but au gradually becomes more frequent, used exclusively in the word aulldungar (13r11 et passim). Apart from this it is difficult to point to any pattern in the distribution of these letters since they frequently appear in the same words (cf. e.g. ‘lond’ 13r17 ‘godlaund’ 40r27, ‘kaulludu’ 13r9, ‘kolludu’ 13r12, ‘onguan’ 13v15 ‘aungan’ 13v15).

Older o is written e in gegnum (13v23). In the verb gera (older gara) -er- is indicated in ind. and subj., but the past part. sing. is written out ‘giorr’ (13r4). Pret. of smúa is in e (cf. ‘sneruz’ 10r29).

In endings e and o are rare. The latter is written in 3. pers. pl. of the verb vera, and in a few other instances (e.g. ‘sino’ 13v3, ‘Þago’ 21r8). e occurs only sporadically, e.g. ‘enne’ (10r29), ‘mæltte’ (10r41).

The suffix -indi/-endi has the latter form, e.g. ‘típendi’ (13v24) and ‘erenndi’ (10r28).

The doubling of consonants (p, t) is indicated by a superscript dot but erratically since there are plenty of examples where the dot is missing. The scribe seems to indicate 11 before t by placing a dot over the t, e.g. ‘hellt’ (13v21), ‘sellt’ (13v29).

c is written in foreign words and names, e.g. ‘Consules’ (13r16, but cf. ‘konsules’ 13r18), ‘dictatores’ (13r22), ‘dictadi’ (21r19), ‘escobar’ (10r14), ‘abbacuc’ (10r25), ‘cirus’ (10r14 et passim). It has also been noted in ‘foles’ (10r31) and ‘brac’ (21r27). The Latin abbreviation con is used a few times (e.g. 13r15, 13r26, 21v4). On ce and ck for kk see below.

þ occurs sporadically for ð, especially in the words dauði/dauðr (10r26, 10r34, 10r37, 10r38, 21r26) but also in ‘eþa’ (13v9), ‘típendi’ (13v24 but cf. ‘tidennda’ 21v17), ‘siþan’ (13v27 but ‘sídan’ everywhere else), ‘þþ’ (13v38), ‘mþal’ (17r36), ‘dyþþ’ (17v13), ‘þndaþþ’ (17r30, 21r12), ‘smiþþ’ (21r16), ‘uermþþþþþ’ (21r28).
The past part. endings are normally in d when written out (except when the d-t rule applies and in the isolated instance of 'uerit' 13r30) but are abbreviated with a superscript d or t. The peculiar spellings 'skrifard' (17r31) and 'kristnada' (21v18) are presumably inadvertent. Similarly, the suffixed article is in d, with superscript d/t used in abbreviations. A reverse spelling has been noted in 'stirndnut' (13v29). The word at is spelt variously 'ad' (e.g. 10r16) and 'at' (e.g. 10r28) when written out; pat is written out 'pad' (e.g. 10r41). Pangad is likewise written with d (13r34). Prep. vid is written out 'uid' (13r18) and abbreviated with a superscript d, með has the form 'med' (e.g. 13v18) or 'medr' (13r34) when written out.

f is insular except occasionally in foreign words ('affrica' 13v32, 'benefactorem' 21r29) where roman f is used.

fn is usually so spelt (e.g. 'iafman' 13v26), but m is indicated once in 'iamfnir' (13v30), probably a pronunciation influence.

Initial g is retained in 'gnognt' (sic! 13r38).

The spelling reflects the palatalisation of g/k before æ: e.g. 'agæti' (13r19), 'kiæmi' (13v31).

Initial h is retained in 'halfum' (17r31).

There is no sign of the weakening of final k to g in pronouns etc. except in the word mjok which is spelt variously 'miok' (e.g. 13r18) and 'miog' (e.g. 10r15). ok is so spelt when written out (13v32).

ck for kk is the rule but double c (c with a superscript dot) is indicated in e.g. 'fiecc' (10r13) and 'drecca' (13v26) and 'samþyckia' (13v40). c/k is simplified in clusters, e.g. 'drektu' (13r37), 'fracland(i)' (13v11, 21r21). Single k is written for double in 'drak' (21r3).

Single m is written or indicated in 'ofskamt' (13r20), 'fim' (10r17, 13v10).

r rotunda is written after the round letters, b, d, g, o and þ, but has not been noted, as is the case with some of the other hands, following a, h or y.

R occurs as an abbreviation for riki, with a superscript i (e.g. 13v39, 40r28).

rl is always so spelt. rs is assimilated to ss (and the ss simplified) before t ('fyst' 10r16 et passim, 'uestu' 21r16) and sk ('romueskum' 13v32). In the word orrosta rr is always written or indicated (cf. e.g. 10r11, 13r2).
Tall \( r \) is preferred to round \( s \), the latter occurring only sporadically in connection with abbreviations or initially. For \( ss \) in dem. pron. \( pessi \) \( r \) is usually indicated (abbreviated variously \( \text{per} r \) or \( \text{per} f \) although a \( p+f \) ligature also occurs. Gen. of pron. \( hann \) is frequently written out \( haf \), but otherwise abbreviated with an \( h+f \) ligature.

\( z \) occurs in the genitive of nouns, pronouns and adjectives with stems ending in \( ll, l\hbar/lld, nn, nd \) and \( t \), never with expression of the preceding dentals (e.g. ‘gull’‘z’ins’ 13r37, ‘upphallz’ 17r34, ‘fullz’ 10r22, ‘manz’ 13r27, ‘lanz’ 10r4, ‘graz’, ‘prez’ 21r1). \( z \) also occurs in ‘syrlenzkr’ (17r29).

Adjectives with superlative in -st are so spelt following vowels (e.g. ‘mest’ 13r17, ‘hæsti’ 17v14). Elsewhere superlatives, whether in -st or -ast, are spelt \( zt \) (e.g. ‘æztir’ 10r30 et passim, ‘leingzt’ 13r29, ‘nytsamligzti’ 20v27) except for a couple of instances in \( z \) (‘sidaz’ 17v31, ‘siduz’ 21v13) and one in \( st \) (‘gofgastr’ 10r38).

2.3.7. Hand G

Hand G wrote 10v-12v (except \( ll. \) 10v38-11r2), 38r-38v24 and 40v (except \( ll. \) 23-24). This is a practised hand and similar to F in many respects. However, scribe G uses a different abbreviation mark for er — a tittle akin to cursive \( n \) or \( m \), made of two or, more frequently, three minims. G also writes a simpler \( y \), the tail usually does not curve to the right and it is not marked with a horizontal stroke. The scribe seems somewhat careless, frequently leaving out letters, marks or whole words.

The weak declension of the article appears a couple of times (e.g. facc.sg. ‘hinu nyu troeam’ 11r10).

No distinction is made between long and short vowels except that \( á \) is occasionally written \( aa \) (e.g. ‘maa’ 10v11, ‘ar’ 11r1, ‘hat’ 11v8, ‘aa’ 12r9).

The dipthongisation of \( e \) before \( ng/nk \) is usually reflected in the spelling (e.g. ‘leingr’ 10v10, ‘eingland’ 11r12, ‘geingum’ 40r29).

\( é \) is commonly written \( e \) but \( ie \) also occurs frequently. It is written in pret. of the reduplicate verbs \( falla, fá, látá \) and \( rádá \) (e.g. ‘fiellu’ 10v32, ‘fieck’ 11v19, ‘liet’ 11v3 ‘ried’ 10v16 but cf. ‘red’ e.g. 10v34) and occasionally elsewhere (e.g. ‘uielte’ 11r35).
i/i is usually written i, sometimes with a diacritical mark to distinguish it from the surrounding letters. j occurs for the preposition i (e.g. 11r15, 11r33) and for capital I at the beginning of sentences. The semi-vowel j is so written initially in personal names, but everywhere else i is used (e.g. ‘iork’ 11v40, ‘giarna’ 11v21).

u generally does duty for both u/ú and v. v has been noted in the abbreviated form of um (e.g. 10v13), and at the beginning of a sentence, serving as capital (11v26). w has been noted once in the abbreviated form of vér (40v29). Analogical v is written in the pret. of the verb verða (‘uurdu’ 12v40).

The privative prefix is u (e.g. ‘uuart’ 12r10, ‘usamþycki’ 12r23, ‘ulikr’ 12v19). Pron. nokkur occurs both with o and u in the first syllable (e.g. ‘nockors’ 12v2, ‘nuckuru’ 12v16).

The scribe occasionally puts a dot over the y, but a stroke through the tail is rare (‘nyu’ 11r12). A clear distinction is made between i/i and y/ý. Forms of the adj. mikill are spelt with i except once in ‘myclu’ (10v18 cf. ‘miklu’ 10v15). yfir is abbreviated ‘yfir’, fyfir ‘firir’ and, less frequently, ‘firir’ (e.g. 10v16, 38r26).

ø is commonly written o but au occurs sporadically (cf. e.g. ‘rau<n>gu’ 10v5, ‘auxl’ 11v11, ‘faudur’ 12v31). Forms and derivatives of the verb gera are abbreviated, using the er-curl. Prep. gegnum has not been noted.

For the negative adverbs ei/eigi an abbreviation is normally used — e with a superscript i — but ‘ei’ is written out once (11v23).

In endings, i and u are preferred to e and o. o is found in forms of the verb vera (cf. ‘ero’ e.g. 10v12, 11r11; 3. pers. pret. pl. voro is usually abbreviated with a superscript o). e crops up sporadically in final position (cf. e.g. ‘uielte’ 11r35, ‘ueste’ 11v2, ‘brennde’ 11v2). ir endings are almost always abbreviated, using the er/ir curl.

c is written in foreign names but rarely otherwise (but cf. ‘myclu’ 10v18).

d is lost in ‘anliti’ (11v23).

ø is usually written d but þ is used as a variant, especially in words with more than one ø/d (e.g. ‘smiðaþ’ 10v15, ‘daþr’ 10v17, ‘daþpa’ 11v33, ‘andaþan’ 12r2). þ is furthermore used occasionally between two vowels (cf.
‘obin’ 10v31, ‘ofooniel’ 10v31, ‘gypinga’ e.g. 11r15, ‘sihan’ e.g. 11r37) and in few other cases (cf. ‘orinn’ 11v25, ‘apr’ 12v9, ‘hofpingiar’ 12v19),
gh for spirant g has been noted once only (‘dagha’ 11r19).
Final k has been weakened in e.g. ‘sig’ (11v7), ‘miog’ (11v10) but cf. ‘ek’ (11v24). Conj. ok has not been found written out.

There is no sign of the palatalisation of g/k before e (except possibly in the place-name ‘gietulia’ 40v28) but k is shown as palatalised before æ (cf. ‘kiamiz’ 12r28, ‘kianugardr’ 40v10).
The free-standing article was noted once without initial h (‘id’ 10v27) but is elsewhere in hi- (e.g. ‘hin’ 10v14).
The scribe writes single l before t to begin with but then seems to abandon this in favour of ll.
Single m is written in ‘grimt’ (12v13) and ‘skom’ (11v23).
r is of two types, ordinary and long-shafted. The former is used solely at first with the latter becoming more frequent from f. 11v onwards.

r rotunda is used after the round letters b, d, g, o, ð but it also occurs after a, y and u.

rl is universally so spelt. rs is usually shown assimilated, written s (‘ueste’ 11v2, ‘uesti’ 11v36, ‘fyst’ 10v4 but cf. ‘fyrst’10v16).

Tall f is preferred to round s — the latter occurs only a few times initially (e.g. ‘synir’ 10v6, ‘samuel’ 11r14, ‘sidan’ 11r37, ‘ser’ 12r10). ss is written in ‘berf’ at 11r13, elsewhere pess- is abbreviated using the er-curl (e.g. ‘berfi’ 11v13), sometimes followed by an additional r (e.g. ‘berfr’ 11v3).

In endings t is usual (except where the t-d rule applies) but not universal (e.g. ‘minkat’ 10v12, ‘skrifat’ 10v15, ‘tekit’ 11r6, ‘komit’ 38r7, but cf. ‘ucerid’ 11v37, 12r9, ‘mikid’ 12r20). hat is in d when written out (10v5), ‘ad’ and ‘at’ seem to be used indifferently (cf. e.g. 10v7-8). Prep. vid is written out ‘uid’, and a superscript d is used for its abbreviation. The freestanding n. nom./acc. sg. article is in d (cf. ‘id’ 10v27) but in t when suffixed (except where the t-d rule applies).

t has been lost in the cluster -stk- in ‘syskin’ (10v10).

z occurs in foreign names and in unz. It also occurs in gen. sing. of nouns following n(d), t (‘manz’ 10v12, ‘lanz’ 11r7, ‘landz’ 12v2, ‘skazgilldu’ 12r33). Superlatives in -st are so spelt following a vowel or after r (‘mest’ 11r5,

2.3.8. Hand H

Hand H wrote 14r37-15r, 26v29-40, 32-33r, 38v24-42. It is characterised by an insular f made with a 2-like figure whose top is usually detached from the top of the stave. The y is simple, normally without embellishments. Furthermore, this scribe writes ‘nockur’ consistently and distinguishes more clearly than the others between long and short vowels, particularly in the case of a/á.

á is often written a but á does occur a few times (e.g. ‘uáttar’ 14v5, ‘Vár’ 14v7, ‘brát’ 14v26, ‘árla’ 32r8, ‘ádr’ 32r9, ‘vág’ 32v19). Ligatured aa is quite frequent, especially for the preposition á (e.g. 14v4, 15r4, 15r9, 32v2, 32v19).

Diphthongisation of e to ei before nghik is universal.

e is commonly written ie, but spellings in e have been noted (cf. ‘ne’ 15r16, ‘herueru’ 15r34).

No clear distinction is made between i and í. These, and the semivowel j, are usually written i, with or without a diacritical mark. j occurs frequently for the preposition í, it is sometimes used initially in names (e.g. ‘joseph’ 14v14, 14v18, 14v25, 14v28, but cf. ‘ioseph’ 14v3, 14v6) and occurs at least twice in final position (‘himnj’ 15r19, ‘uatsn’ 15r26).

The scribe very occasionally distinguishes, it seems, between o and ó (cf. ‘hóf’ 14v23).

The privative prefix is u (e.g. ‘uuis’ 15r11, ‘uhe<y>riligr’ 32v15).

Both u/ú and v are written either u or v, but not according to any apparent rule; both letters appear initially, medially and finally although u seems more frequent.

i and y are, for the most part, kept distinct. firír and ýfír are so spelt when written out (15r33, 32r16) The adj. mikill is spelt with i (‘miklar’ 14v20, ‘mikill’ 32v2) except sometimes in contracted forms where y is written regardless of the vowel in the following syllable (‘mykla’ 15r21, 32v29, ‘myclu’ 32v18).
e for æ was noted in e.g. 'sekiandi' (15r12), 'ueri' (15r37) and superscript e was noted signifying re for ræ ('frenda' 15r23). The spelling 'ævæntyr' (14v16) is possibly a scribal error.

iæ for æ occurs in 'uiæntir' (32v35).

ö is commonly written o but au occurs sometimes, usually, it seems, before nd or ng (e.g. 'faung' 14v18, 'aund' 15r3, 'saungleikum' 15r12, 'aunduegis' 15r32) which might be taken as evidence for the diphthongisation of the sound before ng. Adj. fem. sg. heilug is so spelt (15r7).

e for older ø is indicated in forms and derivatives of the verb gora (e.g. 'gervuu' (sic) 14v12, 'gerd' 32r4). Pret. of the reduplicating verb snía is in -e- ('snere' 15r26).

In unstressed syllables e is common, whereas o rarely occurs (it has been noted in 'ero' 15r18, 'myrkri<n>o' 14v21 and 'ombona' 32v12).

c occurs finally for k in conj. ok. The word is usually abbreviated, using the nota, but is sometimes written out (often to fill the line it seems, e.g. 14v11, 14v28), most often with c although the spelling ok has also been noted on f. 32 (e.g. 32r32, 32r36, 32r39).

ḥ has been noted for ḥ medially in 'daubi' (14v1), 'daubvm' (15r1, but cf. 'daudir' 15r3) and 'dyrḥar' (14v2), and finally in 'leituduḥ' (15r18).

d has been lost in 'hollganar' (for holldganar 15r34). Adv. midil has that form (15r14) or 'millim' (15r15).

No firm principle can be detected in the way d or t is written in verb endings, prepositions etc., apart from the d-t/t-d rule which by and large is adhered to. The past part. and 2. pers. pl. of verbs are sometimes in d ('sprungid' 14v13, 'borid' 15r7, 'ausid' 15r31) but more frequently, it seems, in t ('snuit' 14v31, 'komit' 14v32, 'uitat' 15r22, 'fyllit' 15r30, 'berit' 15r32, 'skrifat' 15r36). The word at is usually so spelt but the spelling 'ad' has been noted (e.g. 14v1, 14v19, 14v31); bat and hvat are so spelt when written out. prep. vid is in d whereas the dual pronoun bit occurs both as 'ḥid' (15r17) and 'ḥit' (15r18). The free standing article is in d ('id' 15r33), but in t when suffixed (uatnit 15r31).

fn is written m medially in 'iamfram' (32r17).
gh occurs sporadically for spirant g, either intervocalic or finally (e.g. 'uegh' 15r13, 'dagligha' 32r2).

Spellings like 'fagiætt' (14v15) and 'kiærer' (14v25) point to the palatalisation of g and k before æ but there is no sign of it before e.

Initial h is missing in 'luti' (15r18 but cf. 'hlut' 21r26).

There is no sign of the weakening of final k to g in pronouns, adverbs etc. except in the word mjök which is spelt variously 'miog' (e.g. 14v7) and 'miok' (33r17).

r rotunda is written following the round letters, b, d, g, o, p and þ, and after a, h, u and y as well.

r has been noted in 'regina' (32r11) and 'thesaur' (32v4).

rl is always so spelt. r is assimilated to ss (and the ss simplified) in num./adv. fjursti (14r37 et passim).

Tall f is generally preferred to round s. The latter occurs not infrequently, however, initially and associated with abbreviation marks or letters. Long s is spelt with ff (e.g. 'uifl' 14v1).

z occurs in genitive sg. of nouns, pronouns and adjectives following ll, lō/lld, nn, nd and t, with or without the inclusion of the preceding dentals (e.g. 'mannz' 14v1, 'uallz' 14v8, 'landz' 15r2), in forms of the verb bleza (14r40, 15r31), in 'girzku' (14r38) and nouns as a derivative of ð/d/t+s (e.g. 'ueizlune' 15r29, 'illzku' 15r9, 'fehirzlu' 32v10, 'goz' 32v11).

The superlative of adjectives is in st following vowel + r ('fyst' e.g. 15r32), otherwise in zt ('bezta' 15r33).

2.3.9. Hand I

Hand I wrote 3bisv, 9bisr, 36r14-36v15, 36v20-37r. This scribe is somewhat inconsistent in his/her orthography (cf. e.g. use of g and k) and also displays features not or rarely seen elsewhere in the manuscript, e.g. ch-spellings for k and unorthodox use of y. The h is one of the marked characteristics of this scribe, made with a long second stave which goes below the line and is then drawn in a sharp curve to the left and downwards. There is hardly any use made of the nota, found only once (9bisr6).
á is occasionally spelt with *aa* (e.g. ‘*aar*’ 3bisv6, ‘*aa*’ 36r22) and a double *a* seems to be indicated by a superscript dot in ‘uaar’ (36v6) and ‘gaatum’ (36v22). Otherwise no distinction is made between long and short vowels.

*e* or *ei* before *ng* seem not to occur.

*é* is commonly written *ie* (e.g. ‘*hier*’ 36r16, ‘*hiet*’ 36v9, ‘*sier*’ 37r10).

*i*/i and the semivowel are usually written *i* but there are sporadic instances of *j*, especially for the prep. *l* (e.g. 36r28).

Pron. *nokkur* is so spelt (‘*nokkur*’ 36r20, ‘*nokkura*’ 37r14).

*u* does duty for both *u* and *v*. The privative prefix has not been found.

*y* for *i* is written in ‘*styrkyngar*’ (36v32), possibly a dittography. The by-form ‘*byrtiz*’ was noted (36r23, cf. ‘*birtaz*’ 36r31).

*e* for *æ* occurs frequently, sometimes with a superscript dot (e.g. ‘*bækr*’ 36r14, ‘*lërdi*’ 36r27, ‘*gres<d>i*’ 36v36, ‘*sel*’ 9bisr4, ‘*sëllar*’ 36r28, ‘*selum*’ 36v24 but cf. ‘*sæll*’ 36v23). Pron. *vær* is so spelt when written out (‘*uær*’ 36v22).

Forms of the verb *gera* are in *er* (‘*gerandi*’ 37r5). Prep. *gegnun* has not been noted.

For *ö*, *au* is more frequent than *o*. Pret. of the verb *snúa* is in *ö* (‘*snaure*’ 36v34).

*e* for *ei* was noted in ‘*stenarnir*’ (36r18).

In endings, *e* is at least as common as *i* (e.g. ‘*fader*’ 36r16, ‘*seger*’ 36v5, ‘*hefer*’ 36v10, ‘*sender*’ 36v24) and *o* has been noted as well (‘*komo*’ 36v30) although *u* is more usual.

c is used in Latin words and it occurs frequently for *k* in final position (e.g. ‘*oc*’ 3bisv4, ‘*toc*’ 36r15, ‘*pic*’ 36r15 but cf. ‘*ek*’ ‘*hik*’ 36r24) and *ch* is used for *k* medially in ‘*stormerchiliga*’ (36r17).

No instances of *þ* for *ö* have been noted. On *d* finally see below.

*f* is made with a 3-like figure whose tail is often drawn to the left across the stave, ending in a loop.

*g* is retained initially in ‘*gnog*’ (3bisv4)

There is evidence of the weakening of final *k* > *g* in e.g. ‘*miog*’ (36r15), ‘*eg*’, ‘*pig*’, ‘*mig*’ (36r24), but cf. e.g. ‘*pic*’ (36r17), ‘*ek*’ (36r24). *k* for *g* is indicated in konunks (9bisr5) and written out in ‘*gullikt*’ (37r11). These reverse
spellings reflect the unvoicing of g before s and t. Long k is written kk ('nokkura' 37r14).

The last minim of m and n is occasionally elongated (cf. e.g. 'med' 36v29, 'pānn' 36v30).

pp is written as a ligature.

qu is written for kv initially (e.g. 'quediunni' 36r21, 'quedia' 36r27). q occurs also in Latin words (e.g. 'sequenciam' 36v10).

r is long-shafted. R was noted initially in 'reis' (36v32) and 'reglu' (37r17). r rotunda is written after round letters but also after a and y.

r is assimilated in 'huesdagliga' (36r26), 'fystu' (36v2), 'fysta' (36v4).

Tall f is used exclusively except for capital S. Long s is written ff or as f with a superscript dot (e.g. 'off' 36v22).

t is preferred to d in endings (cf. e.g. 'skotit' 3bisv5, 'skrifat' 36v20, 'berit' 36v29, 'dictat' 36v6 but cf. 'dictad' 36v5). Pron. ṭat is so spelt when written out (e.g. 36r14), hvat is likewise in t ('huat' 37r12) but at is usually in d (e.g. 36r14, but cf. 'at' 36r17). d/ð has been assimilated in 'leittogi' (36r15) and an intrusive t was noted in 'stlik' (3bisv3).

z occurs in genitive nouns: 'bordz' (3bisv2), ellz' (3605).

The following superlative forms were noted — 'fystu' (36v2), 'fysta' (36v4), 'næst' (36v3) 'fremz' (36v30).

2.3.10. Hand J

Hand J wrote 18bis. The orthography is much like that of E but the ductus is rather different. J is the only scribe who writes r rotunda consistently with a 3-like figure and also makes more use of ṭ than the others.

Ligatured a is occasionally written for á (e.g. r1, v4). Otherwise no distinction is made between long and short vowels.

The dipthongisation of e before ng is reflected in the spelling (e.g. 'eingi' r9) but is not universal (cf. 'gengu' v1).

é is usually written e. ie occurs in pret. of reduplicative verbs fá ('fieck' r6) and falla ('fiell' r24).

j is frequently written for prep. f and for i and the semi-vowel initially (e.g. 'jnnan' r2, 'jardueginn' r4, 'januario' r17, but cf. 'iamsitt' r5).
Pron. nokkurr does not occur.

The privative prefix is u ('ugioll' r7, 'upolligr' r15, 'ubærilgan' r26, 'udámi' r26, 'ulikr' v15). A single instance of o- can be seen in 'odámi' (r19).

u does duty for both u/ú and v, except once in 'ver' (v19).

y and i are kept distinct. yfir is spelt with i- (r17). Forms of adj. mikill are similarly spelt with i (e.g. 'micklum' r4, 'mikinn' r7).

ö is usually written o, twice au ('auruar' r20, 'saunginn' v12).

An unmutated a occurs in 'komandum' (v29). o is preserved medially in 'olmosu' (v16). Adj. heilug is so spelt (r6).

i and u are generally written in unstressed syllables (but cf. 'herder' v5).

c is written in Latin words and for k in 'oc' (r2 et passim) and 'sic' (r16).

þ is not used for ð.

d is preferred to t in endings (except for the d-t rule). at is spelt variously with d or t (e.g. 'at' r3, 'ad' r6). The freestanding n. nom./acc. sg. article is in -d ('id' v27).

fn is spelt m in 'iamsitt' (r5).

u is written for f in 'pauans' (r28 but cf. 'pafann' v16).

gh occurs finally for spirant g in 'uegh' (r9).

There is evidence of the weakening of final k in 'miog' (r22 but cf. 'miok' r5, v15)

The palatalisation of k before æ is reflected in 'skiærr' (v8).

Single m is written in 'dimadiz' (r16).

q occurs in Latin words only.

r is long-shafted r.

R rotunda is written after a, b, d, g, h, o, u, y, þ.

R is found initially in 'Regina' (v10), 'Rogamus' (v12), 'Roma' (v14), 'Ranglæti' (v26), but also finally in 'meir' (v21). It does not occur representing rr.

Talll is preferred to round s. The latter is only found as a part of abbreviations. Double s is written ll (e.g. rill r13). s is commonly doubled in final position (e.g. 'h'v'citiss' r8, tiberiss r8, riss r13).

z is written in gen. forms 'pislaruatz' (r32) and 'uitordz' (v30) and in 'blezud' (v7, ms. 'blelezud').
Adjectives with superlatives in -st are so spelt (all the examples are of stems in vowels — ‘fystr’ r22, mest’ v4, næst’ v14). Superlatives in -ast are written z when no ending follows (‘siduz’ v12) but zt before an ending (‘siduztum’ r1).

 étape has the form ‘busunndrat’ (r8).
3. When and where written?

As will have become evident from the various remarks concerning paleographic and orthographic features of the different hands, they can all be dated to the fourteenth century, as indeed Kálund had observed.\footnote{AmKat II, 184.} Much speaks for a Northwestern provenance (Skagafjörður/Húnavatnssýslur) of the manuscript. Among the significant features in respect of the dating is the fact that the general change \( \text{va} \rightarrow \text{vo} \) has not yet taken hold in the orthography of these scribes. \( \text{vo} \) for older \( \text{va} \) is rarely found in charters before 1380\footnote{Stefán Karlsson, ‘Uppruni og ferill’, 55.} and the total absence of this feature in 764 suggests that the manuscript was written well before 1400. Furthermore, there is hardly any evidence for the diphthongisation of \( e \) before \( \text{gi/gj} \), another change which gradually spread in the second half of the fourteenth century.\footnote{Björn Karel Þórólfsisson, \textit{Um íslenskar orðmyndir}, xii-xii.} The svarabhakti vowel is rarely written in 764 and there is little if any evidence of the doubling of \( n \) in final position. Longshafted \( r \), used by D, E, I and J, is rare in manuscripts written after 1350.\footnote{Stefán Karlsson (ed.), \textit{Sagas of Icelandic Bishops}, 47.} These features speak against a late date. On the other hand the orthography reflects the diphthongisation of \( e \) to \( ei \), and to a certain extent that of \( ð \) to \( au \), before \( ng \).\footnote{Examples of these begin to appear in the fourteenth century, cf. Björn Karel Þórólfsisson, \textit{Um íslenskar orðmyndir}, xii; Noreen, \textit{Altnordische Grammatik} I, 96.} The weakening of final \( k > g \) and final \( t > d \) is similarly attested in some of the hands. All the hands show some evidence of the spelling \( ie \) for \( e \); in some cases it is quite extensive, suggesting a date in the latter half of the fourteenth century.\footnote{Björn Karel Þórólfsisson, \textit{Um íslenskar orðmyndir}, xiv; Stefán Karlsson (ed.), \textit{Sagas of Icelandic Bishops}, 27-28.} The absence of \( ð \) and limited use of the accent as well as the preponderance of \( ft \)-spellings also speak for a later date.

Scribal differences must be taken into account. Scribes D and E seem to be relatively conservative, they employ the long-shafted \( r \) and the weakening of final \( k > g \) is less in evidence here than elsewhere in the manuscript. The same is true of scribe H who in addition uses the accent to distinguish between long and short vowels. These scribes may have been older than the others and may have learnt to write around or before the middle of the century. But on the
whole the paleographic/orthographic evidence does not allow a more precise dating than ca. 1350-1390.

The content of the manuscript offers additional information which may be used to narrow this down somewhat. Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen suggested 1360-70 as a likely date for the manuscript, presumably on the basis of the annals on ff. 41-43 which break off at the year 1372 but display a change of hand after 1362 from which point several scribes seem to have taken turns in writing the entries. That part, furthermore, is written on a palimpsest. All this may indicate that the entries following 1362 were added later. At least one of the hands in question, the one which writes the entries for 1364-68, can however be identified in other parts of the manuscript (cf. hand E above, nr. 7 in Storm’s list) and as Ólafur Halldórsson has pointed out, it is unlikely that entries for 1362-72 were entered one by one over a long period, although one cannot exclude the possibility that some were added after the main part of the manuscript had been completed. (It should also be borne in mind that the annals could have been longer, since it is impossible to determine whether any leaves following f. 43 have been lost.) Ólafur mentions that the entry for 1371 concerning King Ólaf Hókonarson (1370-87) was clearly written after he reached seven years of age, that is 1377 at the earliest. In short: the manuscript had not been completed at that time; it was probably begun not long before, although its production might well have been spread over some period. The middle of the 1370s therefore is the likeliest terminus post quem, but work on the codex might have started earlier.

In his article 'Rímbeignummiður', which mainly concerns AM 731 4to, a seventeenth-century miscellany written by Björn Jónsson of Skarðsá, Ólafur Halldórsson provided a plausible terminus ante quem for 764 by showing that material in 731 was in all likelihood copied from a fourteenth-century manuscript which in turn depended on 764. The intermediary manuscript was written in either 1376 or 1386, depending on the interpretation of chronological reckoning found in the book — the latter date seems more likely if it is true that

54 Storm (ed.). *Islandske Annaler*, xviii.
55 Ólafur Halldórsson. 'Rímbeignummiður.' *Opuscula II,2.* (BiblArn XXV,2.) København 1977, 39.
764 was begun in the latter half of the 1370s. Ölafur has furthermore argued that Brynjólf Bjarnarson from Akkr in Skagafjörður wrote parts of 764 and that most of the manuscript had been completed before he died in 1381. Brynjólf’s name is the last in one of the genealogies in AM 162 fol. m which originally belonged with 764, and he is apparently the youngest person to be included in these. Brynjólf had close ties with Reynistaður—he was a steward for the convent for some time before December 1380. A close comparison of the hands in 764 with two charters believed to be in Brynjólf’s hand reveals, however, that Brynjólf cannot be one of the scribes responsible for 764 so 1386 remains the closest conjecture for the *terminus ante quem*.

Some of the hands in 764, nevertheless, display some of the same features that characterise the writing of Brynjólf and his son Benedikt (most notably hands E and I), and it is reasonable to believe that 764 belongs to the same scribal school, a school which produced quite a number of manuscripts and documents in the last third of the 14th century. Because of the charters attributed to Brynjólf of Akkr and his son Benedikt, these scribes are sometimes referred to as the school of Akkr, although Reynistaður has also been suggested as the centre of this scribal activity. The fullest account of the school is found in Peter Foote’s *Introduction* to his facsimile edition of Stock. Perg. 4to nr. 19. Foote lists 11 manuscripts and fragments written (in part at least) by the same scribe. Stefán Karlsson has pointed to nine deeds from the last three decades of the fourteenth century which show resemblance to these

---

56 Ibid., 39-40.
57 Ibid., 32-49
60 IO nos. 54 and 55; cf. Stefán Karlsson (ed.). *Ilandske originaldiplomer indtil 1450. Tekst.* (EdArn A 7). København 1963, xxxviii-ix. Stefán thought it likely at the time that Brynjólf’s hand was to be found in 764 but later retracted that opinion; cf. Stefán Karlsson, ‘Ritun Reykjarfjarðarbókar’, 127 n. 26.
62 Foote (ed.), *A Saga of St Peter*, 11-63.
63 The so-called 19 group thus comprises: Stock. Perg. 4to nr. 19, AM 122b fol. (Reykjarfjarðarbók), AM 62 fol., AM 344 fol., AM 48 8vo, AM 651 I 4to, AM 385 I 4to/AM 651 II 4to, AM 385 II 4to, AM 658 I and II 4to. Cf. Foote (ed.), *A Saga of St Peter*, 38-49.
manuscripts, all bar one written in Skagafjörður.64 Two of these are the ones mentioned above, written by Brynjólfur Bjarnarson; three are written by his son Benedikt.65 It has further been shown that hand I in AM 573 4to (Trójumanna saga/Breta sögur), which also wrote Stock. Perg. 8vo nr. 10 IX, as well as the hand in the fragments AM 325 IV β and XI,3 4to belong to the same school.66

Stefán Karlsson has pointed to the fact that the 'writing on [the] first 45 folios of 573 closely resembles the script found in certain parts of AM 764 4to ... and there are also some orthographic similarities between the two books, e.g. þ for ð, iæ for æ, and the pron[ö]un nukkur (nvckur).67 Stefán does not specify which hand he is referring to but the hand in question is probably G (cf. p. 161).

As was argued in chapter 1.2.1. the division of the hands and the make-up of the manuscript render it almost certain that the codex was produced in a place where several scribes worked closely together, a scriptorium of some sort. Some orthographic features point firmly towards Northwestern Iceland (cf. pp. 19-20), the link with 573 and the similarities with the Akrar-charters indicate that our scribes were 'Skagfirööingar', and the content of 764, learned lore and lives of holy men and — perhaps more significantly — women, strongly suggests that Reynistaður was the place for which the book was intended.68 (For a fuller discussion of the purpose and audience of the manuscript see ch. III.2.3.) And if it was intended for the nunnery, it is easiest to assume that it was written there as well.

Peter Foote has examined the evidence for Reynistaður as the home of the scribal school linked to the men of Akkrar. One of the charters associated with the school (IO 49) was written and sealed at Reynistaður in 1377, attesting to a purchase by Brynjólfur Bjarnarson of the farm Mánaskáld in Austur-

---

Three of these books were copies of Péturs saga. a strong indicator that the books were made to order.

64 IO nos. 49, 54, 55, 60, 69, 83, 91, 94, 100.
66 Louis-Jensen, 'Et forlæg til Flateyjarbøk?', 152-155; Stefán Karlsson, 'Ritun Reykjarfjarðarbókar', 127, n.26. In addition, AM 596 4to and 657c 4to share the rare form nuckur and are probably from the same area although they have not been linked directly with the Akrar/Reynistaður school. Cf. Driscoll (ed.), Sigurðar saga þögla, xxxvi-xxxix.
67 Stefán Karlsson, Sagas of Icelandic Bishops, 26
68 Both Storm (Islandske annaler, xx) and Hans Bekker-Nielsen ('Et brudstykke af en legende i et islandsk haandskrift. Hvem er W i AM 764, 4to?' Maal og minne (1963), 105) are of the opinion that the book was produced in a religious house. Storm argued for Möðruvellir in Hórgarðalur, Eyjafjörður, on the basis of the lists of abbots and abbesses — the one for Möðruvellir is more up to date than those for Munkaþverá and Reynistaður.
Húnavatnssýsla. This was in all likelihood during Brynjólf’s stewardship at the convent. As Foote points out, the scribe of this charter must have been either ‘a member of the convent’s staff or someone in the entourage of the principals’. Although Foote subsequently records that only one of the charters from before 1420 associated with Reynistaður ‘suggests that the writer probably belonged to the same school as the men of Akrar and the scribe or scribes of IO nr 49 and the Stock. 19 group of manuscripts’, he concludes that Reynistaður cannot be dismissed as the home of the scriptorium which produced these books. There were certainly literate people at Reynistaður — Foote estimates that there may have been roughly a dozen sisters there at the time, two priests and two deacons and a number of ‘próventufólk’, some of whom were probably literate. The convent owned books and children, both boys and girls, were educated there, ‘not necessarily under any ultimate obligation to take orders’. Reynistaður is therefore likely to have fostered many of the scribes who were active in Skagafjörður in the fourteenth century (as Foote mentions, the Plague of 1402-1404 seems to have put an abrupt end to this flourishing book-production); some of them must have continued to write within the walls of the convent, as clergymen or sisters, others will have gone off to pursue a secular career. Many of the books associated with these scribes contain ecclesiastical literature — saints’ lives and canon law — and are likely to have been produced by scribes at the convent for its own use or for other ecclesiastical establishments. AM 764 4to is predominantly made up of such material and it must be considered likely that it was indeed written at Reynistaður rather than by a group of scribes assembled at any of the larger farms in Skagafjörður.

69 Foote (ed.). A Saga of St Peter, 58.
70 A charter from 1380 attests a contract made with the convent by Rev. Jón Bjarnarson whereby he and his sister are secured bread and board at Reynistaður. DI III, 354.
71 There is no mention of books in fourteenth-century records concerning Reynistaður but there is a record of a book donation by a certain Úlfhildr Ketilsdóttir in 1443 (DI IV, 636-637; cf. also Anna Sigurðardóttir, Allt hafóli annan róm óður í þafadóm. Nunnuklaustrínu þvó á Íslandi á miðöldum og brot úr kristniðsu. (Úr veröld kvenna III.) Reykjavík 1988, 132-34) An inventory from 1525 lists 37 books (DI IX 320-322).
72 DI III, 752; DI IV 642-22. Cf. also Anna Sigurðardóttir, Allt hafóli annan róm, 114-115; Foote (ed.), A Saga of St Peter, 59.
73 Ibid., 59.
74 Ibid., 60.
4. Earlier scholarship on AM 764 4to.

Kristian Kålund had plans for an edition of AM 764 4to (as Alfræði Íslensk IV?) but those plans never came to fruition. Some sections of the manuscript had, however, already been printed by Kålund's time. The earliest mention of 764 in a printed book is probably Árni Magnússon's reference, in his 'Vita Sæmundi multiscii' (published as an introduction to the Edda), to a remark in 764 on Adam's height (2r26), where 764 cites Sæmundur fróði Sigfússon as the authority, a claim which Árni discredits. It was the geographical material in 764 that held the greatest interest for earlier scholars and editors. Werlauff printed variants from 764 in his Symbolae ad Geographiam Medii Ævi. Both geographical texts were included by Carl Christian Rafn and his collaborators in Antiquités Russes and he refers to the manuscript again in Antiquitates Americanae. 764 was one of the manuscripts C.R. Unger made use of in his edition of Heilagra manna sogur, where 764 provides the text of Malcus saga (ff. 27r-30r4) and Remigius saga (ff. 23v5-25r14). Although 764 also contains several exempla from Vitae patrum Unger did not use that text in the edition. Hugo Gering printed two passages from 764 in his Islendzk æventyri, the first one about Emperor Tiburtius (f. 32r28-32v23), the second an exemplum of Jón biskup Halldórsson (ff. 38v24-39r3), and the material on Bede which is found on f. 36r6-19 was published in Analecta Norroena by Th. Möbius and later included by Guðbrandur Vigfússon in his edition of selected sagas. The annals

---

76 Kristian Kålund (ed.) Alfræði Íslensk III. Landalýsingar m.fl. (STUAGNL 45.) København 1917-18, i.
77 AMKat II, 185.
80 Antiquités russes d'après les monuments historiques des Islandais et des anciens Scandinaves II. Ed. by C.C. Rafn et al. Copenhagen 1852, 443-448.
82 HMS I 437-46; II 222-27, cf. also I, xiii.
83 Islendzk æventyri. Ísländische Legenden, Novellen und Märchen I. Ed. by Hugo Gering. Halle 1882, 24-26; 84-86.
85 Icelandic sagas and other historical documents relating to the settlements and descents of the Northmen on the British Isles. Vol. II. Hakonar saga and a fragment of Magnus saga with
on ff. 41-43 were edited by Gustav Storm in *Islandske Annaler* under the heading ‘Annalbrudstykke fra Skalholt’. 

In recent decades several passages from 764 have made their way into print and scholars are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of the manuscript for the history of learning and letters in medieval Iceland. Studies which refer to paleographic and orthographic characteristics of the manuscript and its connection to the Akrar school have already been mentioned. In one of them, Ólafur Halldórsson edited three short passages from 764. What follows is an overview of other works from this century where extracts from 764 are discussed or edited, or both.

Jón Helgason edited the genealogies on 1r-2r of AM 162 fol. m in his *Byskupa sognur*. The geographical texts (or sections from them) have appeared in three works concerned with historical geography and topology: O. Pritsak’s *The Origin of Rus*; E. Melnikova’s *Drevne skandinavskije geograficheskiye sochinenia* and R. Simek’s *Altnordische Kosmographie*. Simek also prints the cosmological passage on f. 2r37-2v2. That passage had earlier been edited (as variants) and discussed by Peter Springborg in his article on the reception of Honorius Augustodunensis’ *Imago mundi* in the North. Springborg gives a brief overview of the world chronicle in 764 and, in addition to the passage mentioned above, discusses the references to Imago mundi on f. 3r4 and 3r25-29. In his monograph, *Bible Translation in Old Norse*, Ian J. Kirby treats the same cosmological passage from *Imago mundi*, as well as the Genesis material.


Ólafur Halldórsson. 'Rímbeğlusmiður.' *Opuscula* II, 2. (BiblArn XXV,2). København 1977, 32-49.

*Byskupa sognur*. Ed. by Jón Helgason. (EdArn A13,1.) København 1938, 7-12.


Ibid., 397. Simek’s transcripts are unreliable.

on f. 2r29-36, and discusses the relationship of those passages with the fragment
AM 238 fol. XIX. The remaining biblical material in 764 has hitherto hardly
received any attention from scholars. Kirby mentions the manuscript in a
footnote in his Bible Quotations regretting ‘that more of AM 764 qto is not yet
available in print, for it is likely to contain a considerable amount of biblical
material’. The situation will be marginally improved with the appearance, in
Gripla XI (2000), of the Book of Judith (ff. 5v34-9r41), edited by the current
author, who has also published a paper outlining in general the biblical material
contained in 764.

Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen edited the 764 version of Un
samedi par nuit (f. 30r5-30v4) in Medieval Studies 1959 and Elisabeth of
Schönau’s vision (f. 16r17-16v17) in Opuscula 1961. Bekker-Nielsen showed,
in another article, that the miracles on f. 34 are parts of a vita cum miraculis of
St Walpurgis/Walburga. The text of these has now been edited by Kirsten
Wolf and is due for publication in the near future. Jonna Louis-Jensen discussed
the passage on Emperor Tiburtius (f. 32r28-32v23) in an article in Opuscula
1975, where she prints the text with variants from 764 — the different texts
of this story had earlier been discussed by Alfred Jakobsen. Matthias Tveitane
devoted some attention to 764 in his study of Vitae patrum and printed the text
of the exemplum on ff. 38r35-38v23. The current author wrote an article on
the description of the coming of Antichrist and Judgment day in 764 (ff. 22r1-17

95 Ibid., 186-190
97 Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir. ‘Opbyggelige historier fra Reynistaður. Bibelmateriale i AM 764
4to.’ Renassancen i nordisk middelalder. Ed. by Jón Viðar Sigurðsson and Preben
Meulengracht Sørensen. Oslo 2000 (in spe).
99 Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen. ‘Elisabeth of Schönau’s Visions in an Old Icelandic
Manuscript, AM 764 4to.’ Opuscula II,1. (BiblArn XXV,1.) København 1961, 93-96. The same
authors also discuss this text in the article ‘An Old Norse Translation of the “Transitus Mariae”.
Mediaeval Studies XXIII (1961), 326-327. Cf. also Stefán Karlsson (ed.), Sagas of Icelandic
Bishops, 36-38.
100 Bekker-Nielsen. ‘Et brudstykke’, 102-105. Bekker-Nielsen is almost unique among scholars
in that he acknowledges the importance of AM 764 as a whole, calling it ‘et monument over
ægte monastisk flid og lærdom’ (p. 105).
101 Jonna Louis-Jensen. ‘Nogle æventyri.’ Opuscula V (BiblArn XXXI). København 1975, 263-
277.
103 Matthias Tveitane. Den lærde stil. Oversetterprosa i den norrøne versjonen av Vita Patrum.
and 22v23-23v4) and its sources in *Opuscula 1996.* Stefn Karlsson has clarified the sources and composition of the Icelandic version of *Inventio crucis,* printing examples of the extant texts, among them a short passage from 764 (f. 20r7-12). Stefn also mentions 764 in two articles on encyclopedic texts: one on a manuscript written in the 1620's by Bjrn Jnsson at Skaros (AM 186 III 8vo), the other on Membrana Reseniana 6, another Icelandic miscellany containing *inter alia* a list of popes which might be affiliated with that in 764.

The biological/physiognomical information found on f. 2r23-28 was discussed in relation with *Fostbra saga*'s 'klausur' by Jnas Kristjnsson who points to parallels in other Icelandic manuscripts as well as in foreign works. Jnas also mentions the legend of Romulus and Remus (f. 13r1-8) which is at the beginning of a version of an Accessus ad Lucanum (ff. 13r-14r22) edited by Pbrjrg Helgadttir as an appendix to her article on *Rmverja saga* in *Saga-Book 1996.* Jakob Benediktsson had earlier discussed the 764 version in the introduction to his facsimile edition of *Rmverja saga* and printed the first half of the text and Dietrich Hofmann printed variants from 764 in his article on the subject. Stephanie Wirth treats the same material, together with the passages from Breta sogur and the brief summary of *Trjomanna saga,* in her monograph on the Northern version of these works.

---

Gabriel Turville-Petre wrote an article on the Somniale Danielis in 764 with the text and a translation\(^{113}\) and he included the material on Bede, published earlier by Möbius and Guðbrandur Vigfús, in his survey of legends and stories about England and English saints in Iceland.\(^{114}\) A brief overview of all the material concerning saints in 764 can be found in Margaret Cormack’s The Saints in Iceland.\(^{115}\) Christine Fell re-examined the Bede fragments as well as the passages concerning Cuthbert (f. 36r.1-5) and Walburga (f. 34) in a paper on Anglo-Saxon saints in Old Norse sources, where she refers to AM 764, rather uncharitably, as an ‘absurd ragbag of material’.\(^{116}\)

Despite such a scornful remark scholars continue to be led to AM 764 4to as an unusually rich source of diverse material which has bearing upon many different aspects of intellectual life in Iceland in the later Middle Ages. The codex is equally, if not more, important as an example of an extraordinary compilatory work, generously displaying, in Hans Bekker-Nielsen’s words, ‘den levende interesse for omverdenen, der præger den norrøne lærdoms- og opbyggelselitteratur’.\(^{117}\) It is the aim of the present study to clarify the make-up of the first half of this important codex and shed some light on its origins and purpose. It may indeed transpire that AM 764 4to is less absurd than edifying, more a schoolbag than a ragbag.


\(^{115}\) Margaret Cormack. The Saints in Iceland. Their Veneration from the Conversion to 1400. (Subsidia Hagiographica 78.) Bruxelles 1994, 35.


\(^{117}\) Bekker-Nielsen. ‘Et brudstykke’, 105.
11. THE WORLD CHRONICLE

1. Aetates mundi

The material on the first 22 leaves of the manuscript is organised according to the medieval concept of *aetates mundi*, where the history of the world, from the Creation, is divided up into six ages. It was St Augustine’s formulation of this idea which was to become the most important one in the Middle Ages although he is by no means the first writer, not even the first Christian writer, to divide history up into ages. World ages were an important concept within Judaism and one encounters them in the works of early Church Fathers, including Origen, Jerome and Ambrose.¹ (From early on, parallels were also drawn between the Ages of the World and the Ages of Man.²) These age-schemes were based on interpretations of passages of the Bible — the four kingdoms in the Book of Daniel (2.31-35, 7.2-14), for instance, inspired a fourfold division (cf. also pp. 123-124) and the parable of the workers in the vineyard (Mt. 20.1-6) gave rise to a five-part scheme.³ But the Augustinian scheme, with its exposition of six ages (or, in fact, eight) became the favoured model. It was incorporated into Isidore’s

Etymologiae (V.38-39) and later found its way into other influential works, for example the writings of Bede and Honorius Augustodunensis.

It is in his commentary on Genesis, De Genesi contra Manichaeos, that Augustine gives the fullest account of the aetates mundi, but the concept crops up elsewhere in his writings, perhaps most famously towards the end of De civitate Dei (lib. XXII). Augustine draws a parallel between Genesis and the course of the world. As the Creation took six days, so the world will pass through six ages before reaching the seventh age, the sabbath. According to Augustine the first age extends from Adam to Noah, the second from Noah to Abraham, the third from Abraham to David, the fourth from David until the Exile in Babylonia, the fifth from the Exile to the birth of Christ, and the sixth age extends from Christ’s birth usque in finem saeculi — until the end of this world. The seventh age presented a problem. There were chiliastic ideas, popular among Christians, about an earthly sabbath after the second coming of Christ, a 1000-year reign before the Last Judgment. These ideas were influenced by Judaism and strengthened by numerological speculations which allotted each age 1000 years, resulting in a scheme of 7 x 1000 years of earthly history before the eternal heavenly kingdom. Augustine was keen to counter such millennarianism. For him the seventh age was therefore not the time of bodily resurrection but a period of rest for the souls of the righteous, it was civitas Dei peregrinans, and it also signified the life of the Church. The seventh age of the Augustinian scheme could be seen, and indeed Bede formulates it thus, as running parallel to the six ages — Abel’s soul was the first to enter it. The eighth age was beyond time, in a sense — it was to come after the Last Judgment and represented the eternal life of the blessed in Heaven. It was the age of resurrection, the eighth day which equalled the first day of a new beginning.

4 De Genesi contra Manichaeos, lib. I. PL 34, 190-193.
5 Schmidt, ‘Aetates mundi’, 293-296. The 7000 years were the result of a combination of the week of Genesis and the words of the Psalter (89.4): Quoniam mille anni ante oculos tuos tamque dies hesterna, quae praeteriit, et custodia in nocte. Cf. also Norman Cohn The Pursuit of the Millenium. Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages. Rev. ed. London 1993, 19-36.
8 Luneau, L’Histoire du salut. 326.
When Isidore and, later, Bede took up the Augustinian framework of the six ages to use in their works, they incorporated into it a calculation of the years in each age. Augustine had referred to the genealogies given in Gn 5 and 10 and Mt 1 for his chronology, giving 10 generations from Adam to Noah, the same for the next age but for the third, fourth and fifth 14 each. Isidore based his reckoning upon the Septuagint but Bede gives both the Septuagint numbers and a chronology derived from the Vulgate (which he refers to as the Hebrew chronology). For example:

Prima est ergo mundi huius aetas ab Adam usque ad Noe, continens annos iuxta Hebraicam Veritatem mille DCLVI, iuxta LXX interpretes IICCXLII, generationes iuxta utramque editionem numero X.

If one compares the two schemes this is what emerges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Isidore</th>
<th>Bede</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>940/941</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV:</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-V:</td>
<td>5197</td>
<td>3952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aetates mundi became a commonplace in historical works in the Middle Ages, be they annals, chronicles or other sorts of historiae, and they are also found in works belonging to other genres, such as homilies and poetry. This holds true for Old Norse literature as well — aetates mundi, called ‘heimsaldrar’ in Icelandic, occur in homilies and Saints Lives but first and foremost in works of (Christian) historical nature. Two such texts are of particular interest here, since they are representative of the type of chronicles to which the text on leaves 1-23 in 764 seems to belong. These are Veraldar saga.

---

9 De Genesi contra Manichaeos I, 24. PL34, 192.
10 Tristram, Sex aetates, 24-27.
11 Beda, Opera VI, 2, 463.
12 On the aetates mundi within different genres see Tristram, Sex aetates, 61-179.
thought to have been composed in the twelfth century, and the so-called *Heimsaldrar* in the manuscript AM 194 8vo. A short account of ‘heimsaldrar’ is also found in AM 415 4to and it is not inconceivable that passages of a similar kind could lurk in other less well studied manuscripts. *Veraldar saga* and *Heimsaldrar* both conform with the Augustinian scheme of *aetates mundi* (Adam-Noah-Abraham-David-Babylon-Christ) and the calculation they offer for the number of years is closest to that of Isidore. 764, on the other hand, has a different scheme and such varying arrangements were not uncommon among medieval writers. Despite the predominance of the Augustinian scheme, other traditions of *aetates mundi* divisions survived alongside it, or perhaps influenced it. The sequence of ages employed by the scribes of 764 is as follows: Adam-Noah-Abraham-Moses-David-Christ. The scribes state at the beginning, in a true Augustinian fashion, that there are six ages in this world (‘sex eru greindir í bókum alldrar þessa heims’ 1v30), but they depart from the Augustinian tradition when they put Moses at the beginning of the fourth age and make the fifth start with David. Moses is the odd one out here, but he played a part in other world age schemes. Roderich Schmidt traces the inclusion of Moses back to three-part schemes which originated in Judaism. It is, however, with Origen’s interpretation of the parable of the workers in the vineyard that a sequence similar to the one in 764 starts to emerge. For Origen the five intervals in the day (marked by the 1st, 3rd, 6th, 9th and 11th hours) represented both the ages of man and the ages of the world which were marked by Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and Christ respectively. But Origen’s interpretation still leaves us with five ages instead of six, and although we may have found the roots, it is difficult to trace the development which ultimately produced the 764-sequence. This sequence is however by no means unique to 764. It is also found in three late eleventh-century Anglo-saxon manuscripts and it is the basis for the division of world history in the Low-German *Sachsenspiegel*, compiled by Eike von Repgow in 1220-1235. Max Förster explains the sequence thus: ‘...diese neue
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14 Almost all of the manuscript is published in *AI* I.
15 *AI* III, 52-54.
Reihe [ist] wahrscheinlich so zu beurteilen, daß die alte fünfgliedrigen Origeneische Weltalterreiche ... durch Einfügung des David aus der Vulgatareihe ebenfalls auf sechs Glieder gestreckt worden ist'. 18 Hildegard Tristram classifies it as a sub-type of what she calls 'Augustinisch-Isidorisches Schema' 19 but does not offer an explanation as to how this type evolved out of that scheme. Schmidt, on the other hand, argues for the explanation that a sequence with Moses and David developed earlier out of the Origen-sequence and survived independently from the Augustinian tradition. He outlines several medieval variations on the Origen-sequence and points to a fragment in Old Slavonic with a text by Hippolyte of Rome which preserves a sequence identical to the one in 764. 20

It is well-nigh impossible to determine, with regard to 764, which of these theories is nearest to the truth. 764 is the only Icelandic source, known to me, which employs this type of sequence. It was most likely derived, ultimately, from a foreign source which has yet to be discovered.

When it comes to the number of years given for each age, 764 again differs from Veraldar saga and 194 8vo. But the numbers in 764 are highly suspect and may have been incorrectly copied. As they stand, the numbers seem to be an inaccurate mixture of the two systems (Isidore’s and Bede’s). The first age is said to contain 1600 years which is near to Bede’s reckoning. The next two ages (942 and 940 years respectively) fit in with Isidore. For the fourth age the scribe gives the curious number 657 and the fifth age is said to contain 1060 years. The total of years up to Christ’s birth is said to be 5199 which is close enough to Isidore’s 5197. This numerical inaccuracy is evident elsewhere in the manuscript, for instance in the passage on the stars and their orbits (see below p. 87). One has to give it to the scribe, however, that the numbers for the aetates mundi in 764 do add up correctly, the sum is indeed 5199. The explanation for the strange numbers given for the fourth and fifth age could be that the scribe was trying to compensate for the error that arises when Bede’s reckoning is used for the first age in an otherwise Isidorian scheme. The scribe may have inflated

18 Förster, Die Weltzeitalter, 190.
19 Tristram, Sex aetates, 35, 42-43.
the fourth and fifth age (either or both) in order to regain those 642 years lost in
the first age.

This confusion about the exact duration of each age is not in any way an
impediment to the function of the *aetates mundi* as an organizing principle. As
will become clear in the chapters to follow, the scribes of 764 brought together a
lot of heterogeneous material. The *aetates mundi* serve as a historical framework
within which the scribes manage to hold all the diverse fragments and pieces
together.
2. Totius orbis brevis descriptio

Before setting off on a journey through the six ages of world history, the compilers present the reader with a brief description of the world (1r-1v29). Similar descriptions are found in several other Icelandic manuscripts but the one in 764 is among the longest of them. They belong to a tradition which can be traced back to Isidore and beyond that to Pliny’s *Natural History*, but it has proved difficult to determine the exact source for the Icelandic passages.

The description in 764 divides the world up into three parts, as was traditional in medieval world descriptions, and it seems to be an amalgamation of mainly two texts. The description of Asia corresponds almost verbatim with the beginning of chapter 4 in *Nikolaus saga erkibyskups*, written by Bergr Sokkason. The description of Africa is confused and contains incorrect information as well as repetitions, which suggests that the scribe was trying to merge two (or more) sources. The passage on Europe, on the other hand, is paralleled in a fragment dated to c. 1300, AM 736 4to I, and in AM 194 8vo, the manuscript mentioned above in connection with *Heimsaldrar* (cf. pp 65-66). In addition, the 764 text contains two interpolations. The first one is a passage on the mythological creature the phoenix (1r19-31). That passage is also found in 194 where it is followed by another phoenix-legend not included in 764, i.e. the account of how the bird is reborn out of its ashes. The second interpolation in 764 (1r33-38) describes the four rivers that flow from Paradise, a passage which has its basis in Gn 2.10-14.

In his book, *Altíordische Kosmographie*, Rudolf Simek collated these texts and discussed their relationship. In his argumentation he presupposes that there existed a prototype of the Icelandic world description which the different versions found in manuscripts ultimately went back to. He assumes that the text in 736/194 is closest to that original description but thinks it possible that the original description had a fuller beginning than 736/194, reflected in
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22 *HMS II*, 55.
764/Nikolaus saga. Simek consequently rejects the idea that the 764 scribe might have used a copy of Nikolaus saga as a source for the first part of the description, and prefers to think that 764 and Nikolaus saga are both dependent on the same source which could have been the proto-description or, as Simek seems to think more plausible, an expanded version of the proto-description. In order to account for the phoenix-text in 764 Simek then supposes that there was a further intermediate link between the source for Nikolaus saga and 764.25

Although Simek convincingly analyses the components that make up the world description in 764 his theory about its sources seems dubious. It must be borne in mind that world descriptions were ubiquitous in medieval schoolbooks and encyclopedias and they are by no means rare in Old Norse literature either, as the text examples Simek has collected demonstrate. It thus seems unnecessary to suppose that all the extant texts are derived from the same proto-source. The fact that 764 and 194 share the passage on the phoenix, as well as the description of Europe (and other material as will be discussed in later chapters), strongly suggests that they shared a source which included all that information. As for the material in 764 which has no counterpart in 194 we must remind ourselves that the description in 764 is clearly composite: Simek has for instance shown how the inclusion of the two Mauritanias in the description of Africa (1v6-7) renders the mention of 'iij blálönd' in 1. 1v13 redundant. The 764 scribe is therefore likely to have had at least two sources to hand. The second source might have been a work also used by Bergr Sokkason, but the possibility that the 764 scribe made use of Bergr's Nikolaus saga itself, rather than its source, should not be excluded. We do not know enough about the sources Bergr Sokkason used for his Nikolaus saga.26 The chapter in question is held to be an addition to Bergr's Latin text.27 Bergr cites, in his work, inter alia St Gregory, St Augustine and Isidore but, as Sverrir Tómasson has pointed out, he may have had only an indirect access to these Latin authors.28 There are, however, grounds to believe that Bergr translated material directly from Latin, for instance from Isidore, and

25 Ibid. 331-337.
27 C.R. Unger (ed.) HMS I, xvi.
incorporated it into his *Nikolaus saga*.\(^{29}\) The chapter on Asia in the saga is an abridged version of chapter xx in book XIV of Isidore’s *Etymologiae* and it seems reasonable to suppose that Bergr did translate the text himself, rather than copy it from some Icelandic encyclopedic tractate.

As shown elsewhere, the scribes of 764 also acquired their ‘encyclopedic’ texts from books which the modern reader would not classify as encyclopedias. The passages on Antichrist and the Last Judgment, for instance, (cf. pp. 212-217), were most likely taken from *Tveggja postola saga Jóns og Jakobs*. Elsewhere in the manuscript we find material from other legendary sources, for instance *Marthe saga ok Marie Magdalenu* and there is an exemplum taken from *Nikolaus saga* on f. 31. The scribes will have had no qualms about copying the fourth chapter of *Nikolaus saga*. Their reason for doing so might have been that the world description they had to hand was less full when it came to information about Asia. It is significant here that the scribe of 764 makes one change in the text which he otherwise follows closely. Where the *Nikolaus saga* text mentions two ‘Indias’ (‘Asia maior hefir morg storelond ok hofudborgir i ser: þar er India hvartveggi ...’) the 764 scribe changes it to three. This may be because he/she knew better — because the other source stated that there were indeed three ‘Indialönd’.

As to the relationship between 764 and 736/194 it is important to bear in mind that these manuscripts probably had a slightly different purpose and their compilers therefore followed different editorial policies which affected the way they copied their material (this is less obvious in the case of 736 since it is only a fragment). Or to put it this way: discrepancies between the versions may to a certain extent be explained by the scribes’ editorial principles. The description of Paradise in 194 and 764 can be taken as an example.

It is worth noting of the description in 764 that Paradise seems here to be synonymous with the garden of Eden, the description is restricted to that Old Testament notion. It is a starting point for history rather than the dwelling-place of the blessed. The idea of Paradise as a heavenly abode comes with the New Testament and that idea was the more significant for Christians in the Middle Ages although the images and notions of the Old Testament remained

\(^{29}\) Jakob Benediktsson. ‘Stjórn og Nikulás saga.’ *Gripla* VI (1984), 7-11.
If one compares the text in 764 with that in 194 one discovers that the latter text retains allusions to the New Testament. In it Adam and the tree of knowledge are mentioned but then the scribe goes on to describe how there is perennial day in Paradise, no hatred and no hunger, and angels who sing to amuse the inhabitants. The inhabitants are ‘salur godra manna ok una þar til doma-dags, sidan er gud lauk upp, þa er hann leiddi þangat þnd þiofs þess, er lif sitt læt aþ crossinum’. This information has its equivalent for instance in Isidore, but it is not to be found in 764. The explanation for that has to be sought in the organising principles of the compilers. The crucifixion belongs to the sixth age of the world and cannot be included here if the compilers are to maintain a strict ordo temporum. This was presumably no concern of the 194 scribe since his compilation was of a different sort.

At the end of the discussion of Paradise the scribe mentions the four rivers which flow from it and this leads on to a description of countries and places to complete the description of the three continents that make up the earth. The areas around the Mediterranean are described, first Asia minor, then Africa, and finally the scribe turns to Europe, works his way north, mentions Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Russia, Finnmörk and Bjarmaland. He then writes: ‘Af Bjarmalandi ganga länd óbyggð af nórdr ætt unz Grænland tekr við. Suðr frá Grænlandi liggr Helluland, þá Markland; þaðan er eigi langt til Vínland. Íslan er ey mikil. Hon er norðuz í kristni svá at menn viti’(1v27-29).

The Middle Ages inherited from the Greeks a picture of the ‘whole world’ as a circle, and it is with the Greeks that one finds the beginnings of geographical narrative, which flourished in medieval times, in which it was possible to lead the reader around the perimeter of the earth. The medieval ‘world-tours’, visual or verbal, ‘offered their audience a pleasingly synoptic view of the earth’s circuit, embellished with curious details of its most exotic phenomena’. Such a verbal ‘world-tour’ seems to be the aim of the scribe of 764. The purpose of his brief description of the world is to orientate his audience in the world, so that they can put the historical events that follow in a geographical context. But it is interesting that, apart from the passage on

31 AÍ1, 4
Paradise, his description does not contain a lot of 'curious details of exotic phenomena'. It is very much 'down to earth' (in more than one sense). The scribe does mention exotic regions, such as the uninhabited lands north of Norway and the lands he claims lie south of Greenland. But unlike the authors of some other descriptions of these regions our scribe seems to be not in the least interested in mirabilia.

Another important geographical concept of Greek origins is the oikoumene, the 'inhabited earth' or the 'known world'. It can be defined, in the words of James Romm, 'as a region made coherent by the intercommunication of its inhabitants'. Beyond the oikoumene was 'another world, mysterious regions inhabited by monstrous races and fantastic animals. As can be deduced from our scribe's choice of words when describing Iceland ('Ísland er ey mikil ... norðuz í kristni) the oikoumene he is concerned with is the Christian world. Christianity defines the borders of the oikoumene to the north. The scribe has mentioned areas which lie outside those borders but he does not take great interest in them; they need not concern him or the audience of his book. He traverses these regions, metaphorically speaking, but his description ends at home, within the ecumenical boundaries of the Church. And so it is that, despite the fact that the boundaries of the orbis terrae had widened considerably since Roman times, our scribe still finds himself/herself sitting on the remote edge of the oikoumene — in Ultima Thule.

33 Ibid., 31.
35 Romm, The Edges of the Earth, 37.
36 Ibid., 82–83; 121-125. The borders of the oikoumene were also sometimes thought of as alius orbis.
37 On the significance of Ultima Thule see Romm, The Edges of the Earth, 156-158.
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3. Aetates I-III: Genesis garnished

3.1. Genesis and the encyclopedic tradition

The first three ages fall within the narrative of Genesis, and the Bible, not surprisingly, provides the thread which holds the text in 764 together. But it is on these pages also, that one encounters the greater part of the strictly encyclopedic material, i.e. texts of a scientific nature, contained in the codex. This is not a coincidence. A brief study of the development of Genesis commentaries reveals that the scribes of 764 work within a well-established tradition which can be traced back to the beginnings of Biblical exegesis.

Genesis, the first book of the Bible, naturally forms an introduction of sorts to the whole work and therefore quickly acquired great significance for Bible studies, and indeed for elementary Christian education. It was in Genesis one was to seek answers to questions about the beginning of the world and the origins of man, indeed the origins of history. It introduced the student to the major themes of Christianity and it became one of the most extensively commentated books of the Bible. It thus served as the basis for the exposition of crucial theological problems concerning Creation, Sin, the existence of Evil, and God’s Grace. A fundamental issue, for instance, and one which runs through all commentaries from the Greek Fathers onwards, was how to reconcile the statement that God had created all things simultaneously with the account of the six-day creation. Related to this problem was another, no less important: Was the world made immediately or through the medium of a preexisting material, materia informata? These questions are echoed in the treatise in AM 764 as we shall see (pp. 85-87).

In the Western Church, a rich tradition of commentary on Genesis developed, where the hexaëmeron took pride of place, and to which many of the

---


40 Robert E. McNally. The Bible in the early Middle Ages. Westminster, Md. 1959, 64.
most illustrious thinkers and scholars contributed. Among them were St. Ambrose (*Hexaëmeron*, PL 14), St. Jerome (*Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*, CCSL 72), St. Augustine (*De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* CSEL 28; *De Genesi contra Manichaeos libri duos* PL 34), Isidore of Seville (*Quaestiones in vetus testamentum, Quaestiones in Genesim*, PL 83), Bede (*Libri quatuor in principium Genesis*, CCSL 118A) and Rabanus Maurus (*Commentariorum in Genesim libri quatuor*, PL 107). Most subsequent commentaries depended on these works for much of their material, including the *Glossa ordinaria*, which can be described as the standard Bible reference work of the twelfth century. Much uncertainty surrounds the compilation and authorship of the *Glossa ordinaria* but Beryl Smalley has argued that the gloss on Genesis may have been compiled by Gilbert of Auxerre, who was a pupil of Anselm of Laon, also known as Gilbertus Universalis.

In all these commentaries, knowledge about the physical world, about natural phenomena and historical geography, is incorporated into the commentary in order to illuminate the reader's perception of Creation and orientate him in the geography of the lands where the events described in the Scriptures took place. This tradition can be traced back to the School of Alexandria (2.-3. c. AD), the first organised group of Christian thinkers. The Alexandrian fathers owed much to Judaism, in particular to Philo Judaeus, who in turn was imbued by Platonism. It was through the influence of Philo that the Alexandrians, in particular Origen, insisted on using secular knowledge and philosophy to throw light on the Scriptures. The seven liberal arts were seen as the necessary education for understanding the Bible. The Alexandrians, moreover, laid the foundations of allegorical exegesis based on the theory of the three- or fourfold sense of the Scriptures. In time, largely through the efforts of the Cappadocian fathers, secular learning became a tool to aid the exposition of, principally, the allegorical sense, but it also served to illuminate the historical,

---


42 Beryl Smalley, ‘Glossa ordinaria.’ *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 13, 452-457; Beryl Smalley, ‘Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128-34), and the Problem of the “Glossa Ordinaria”’. *RTh* 7 (1935), 235-262.
literal sense. The inclusion of encyclopedic material in tractates on Genesis is therefore bound up, from the earliest age, with the theory of the three or four senses of Scripture — it served to prop up the literal sense on which the allegorical and moral interpretations were built. Consequently, one finds in these works information on diverse subjects, e.g. geography and astronomy, on herbs, beasts and stones, on human physiology and the nature of angels. Genesis became, for the Middle Ages, 'the textbook of external nature'.

Bede's commentary may serve as an example. It stands conveniently in the middle, so to speak, between the Fathers on whom he relied heavily (especially Augustine) and the beginnings of the development of the Gloss. In his dedicatory letter to Bishop Acca Bede discusses the extensive commentaries of his predecessors, but then reveals that his aim is to produce a simpler work (and more accessible presumably) for the needs of the feeble. Despite this aim, Bede does not at all cut down the encyclopedic material, which indicates that he felt such learning was vital for the edification of ordinary mortals. Not only was it vital, it was a logical starting point, as it were, because nature, God's creation, was 'a book of doctrine lying open to read'. Through the study of nature one is brought to appreciation of Creation and God's grace. Quite fittingly, Bede seems to have pursued his studies not only through books for, as C.W. Jones has remarked, some sections in the commentary bear witness to his own observations of nature in his native England. Most of the information, however, still comes from the works of ancient writers. Among the subjects Bede treats are the aetates mundi (I.ii, 1093-1224), the four elements (I.i, 89-106), heaven and the firmament (I.i, 247 ff.); the stars and the planets and in that context, chronology (I.i, 480-548), geography (e.g. I.ii,10-14), animals, plus, of course, etymology (e.g. I.ii,23).

As is well known, Bede was very influential amongst later writers and many subsequent encyclopedic works rely on his books, not only the Genesis
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44 Jones, 'Some Remarks', 118.
46 Jones. 'Some Remarks', 117.
47 Ibid. 120.
commentary but also, and more importantly, works like *De temporum ratione* and *De natura rerum*, but both these works were known in Iceland from early on (cf. p. 223 and 228).

Although commentary on Genesis was a well established part of the exegetical tradition from the beginning, the twelfth century witnesses what can be called an explosion in hexaëmeral writings. As Johannes Zahlten points out, the explanation for this lies partly in the increased interest in the natural sciences, following the rediscovery of the works of Aristotle and other Greek and Arabic writers. Employing the new logic, scholars now started to seek understanding of the laws of nature independently of its Creator. The influx of classical learning in the twelfth century thus brought about a change in the relationship between theology and the natural sciences although it should be stressed that the latter continued to be seen as an ancillary subject. The renewed interest in the created world manifested itself not only in the numerous commentaries on the hexaëmeron but also in the prolific output of cosmological works by twelfth-century scholars. Among them were some which came to be known in Iceland in one form or another: Honorius Augustodunensis' *Imago mundi*, and Guillaume de Conches' *Philosophia mundi*.

Another reason for this wealth of works on the Creation produced in the twelfth century is to be sought in the development of the schools. The authors of these works were usually also masters in the schools and some of the works display in their form the new interest in a more scientific, organised, approach to the subject, an approach characteristic also of the *Glossa ordinaria*. A substantial number of hexaëmeral works in the twelfth century are ascribed to French scholars, chiefly those teaching in Chartres and Paris, but scholars from other countries, most notably perhaps Germany and England, also played their part in the dissemination of hexaëmeral knowledge.

What this brief summary must suggest, is that the scribes of 764 had a wide array of models on which to base their treatment of the Creation and the created world. To construct their book the way they did was a most natural

---

choice for a learned person in the Middle Ages, whether he or she was in religious orders or was an educated layman. The text in 764 is not a commentary on Scripture, it does not begin each section with a quotation from the Bible followed by an exposition. But it does follow the main events of Genesis, in the right order, occasionally quoting verbatim from the Bible, in other instances (and more frequently) paraphrasing the Bible text. And the Bible material is augmented with extraneous material, mostly encyclopedic, and in that sense 764 represents the continuation of a tradition which extends, as we have seen, back to Origen.

The Bible material in 764 will be discussed in the next chapter. We will now turn to the main sources which lie behind the encyclopedic material the scribes brought into their treatment of Genesis, after which the text of the encyclopedic passages will follow, accompanied by commentary.
3.2. The sources.

Medieval encyclopedias present a difficult task for the source-hunter. Much of the information collected in such works was commonplace in the Middle Ages and copied in one work after another for several hundred years. Even when scribes state their sources, the difficulties are by no means over. They may be copying from a work which relies on the given source but not from the source itself or they may be falsely attributing the passage to a particular source. Further, one should always bear in mind that although a passage seems to come genuinely from a certain work the scribes need not have had the complete work before them: they may have come across the passage in a florilegium or a similar book.

3.2.1. Isidore and Comestor.

The sources mentioned by the scribes of 764 are all works which are familiar to a student of medieval intellectual history: Gregory’s Dialogues, Isidore’s Etymologiae, Historia scholastica by Petrus Comestor and Honorius Augustodunensis’ Imago mundi (Jerome is also mentioned, e.g. 3r12, but without a reference to a specific work). All four works were well known in Iceland in the Middle Ages. Gregory’s Dialogues will be discussed below (pp. 89-90). A medieval booklist from Skálholt lists a copy of both Comestor and Isidore and the latter also features in the inventories at Hölar 1396, Viðey 1397 and Möðruvellir 1461.50 Isidore is frequently cited in Icelandic sources and a substantial part of the encyclopedic material which has survived in Icelandic manuscripts can be traced back to the Etymologiae albeit sometimes through intermediaries. This is true, for instance, of passages in Hauksbók51 and of geographical information incorporated into Nikolaus saga.52

Historia scholastica was written in the third quarter of the twelfth century and quickly became popular, also in Scandinavia. It is one of the sources for Stjórn I and Stjórn III as well as for several lives of apostles and saints.

---


52 Cf. Jakob Benediktsson. 'Stjórn og Nikulás saga', 7-11.
Substantial parts of Gyðinga saga are derived from Historia Scholastiva and fragments of Comestor’s work are also found separately. These facts have led to speculation about a possible translation of the work or part of it.

Although both Isidore and Comestor seem to have contributed to the text in more than one instance, the single most substantial source for the encyclopedic material in the manuscript seems to be a twelfth-century work by Honorious Augustodunensis, Imago mundi. Not only does most of the cosmology derive from this work but so also do passages on the reign of secular rulers which we encounter later on in the manuscript (cf. pp. 154-158). There are also echoes of two other works by Honorius in 764, Elucidarius and Speculum ecclesiae. A brief sketch of the author and his output seems, therefore, to be in order here.

3.2.2. Honorius Augustodunensis

Honorius Augustodunensis has in the past proved a rather elusive figure in the history of medieval learning, but thanks to the scholarship of Valerie J. Flint, our picture of him has recently become somewhat clearer. Honorius was probably born around 1070, perhaps into a family of the minor nobility of Savoy and the Alps. He could thus have been a kinsman of St Anselm (1033-1109), Archbishop of Canterbury (from 1093), which might explain why he went to England as a young man to pursue a career as a canon, teacher and writer, first at Canterbury, but later it seems at other English ecclesiastical establishments as well. He certainly had ties with Worcester and Rochester, and possibly with Winchester and Lincoln. It is in this period (ca. 1094-1110) that he wrote or started to write those works which are of chief concern in relation to 764: Elucidarius, Imago mundi and Speculum ecclesiae. At or after St Anselm’s death in 1109 Honorius seems to have left England for Regensburg where he became, according to Flint’s research, a canon at the alte Kapelle where he produced most of his completed works. Flint reckons he then ‘left the alte Kapelle for Lambach, or, just conceivably, St James of Regensburg, perhaps in about the years 1133/4’.

56 Flint, Honorius, 34.
Honorius thus became a monk-inclusus late in his life, and died at his monastery some years later, around 1140.

Honorius was the author of some 30 works, many of which enjoyed wide circulation in Western Europe throughout the Middle Ages.\(^{57}\) Their popularity is undoubtedly partly due to the pedagogical nature of much of Honorius' work. He seems to have been an excellent teacher who in his writings brought together and organised material from many different sources. A survey of the sources he used for *Imago mundi* reveals that they are indeed numerous, and Honorius' great achievement is to present all this knowledge in an orderly fashion and with great lucidity.\(^{58}\)

Several of Honorius' works were certainly known in Iceland. It is interesting that they are among the books most closely associated with Honorius' stay in England: *Elucidarius*, *Gemma animae*, *Speculum ecclesiae* and *Imago mundi*.\(^{59}\) The *Elucidarius* was translated into Old Norse sometime during the twelfth century.\(^{60}\) As Flint remarks, it is 'arguably the most revealing and important of all of Honorius's writings'\(^{61}\) and it was widely read. It is divided into three books and written in a dialogue where the Master instructs the Disciple in the fundamentals of Christian religion, according to the teaching of the Latin Church. It relies heavily on the teaching of St Anselm and thus is thought to have sprung from his circle in Canterbury.

*Speculum ecclesiae* and *Gemma animae* are both liturgical works. The former contains a collection of sermons for the whole liturgical year, whereas *Gemma animae* supplies explanations of the liturgy — the Mass, the canonical hours and the Divine Office (Opus Dei). Both works were probably begun in England and, when finished, soon found their way back there. Honorius is likely to have sent copies of them himself to his friends, as he did with the first recension of the *Imago mundi* in 1110.\(^{62}\) The works of Honorius seem to have been particularly well received in the diocese of Lincoln. Many of the early

---

\(^{57}\) Cf. Valerie I.J. Flint. 'The place and purpose of the works of Honorius Augustodunensis.' *Revue Bénédictine* 87 (1977), 97-127.

\(^{58}\) Cf. Valerie. I. J. Flint. 'Honorius Augustodunensis Imago mundi.' *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire au Moyen Âge*. 57 (1982), 13-18 (henceforth cited as 'Imago mundi').

\(^{59}\) Flint, *Honorius*, 6-13; 'Imago mundi', 8-13

\(^{60}\) Jón Helgason (ed.) *The Arna-Magnæan Manuscript 674a, 4to. Elucidarius.* (Manuscripta Islandica 4.) Copenhagen 1957, vi.

\(^{61}\) Flint, *Honorius*, 35.

copies of *Imago mundi* come from there as well as two twelfth-century copies of
the *Gemma animae.* The town of Lincoln played a part in the history of the
Icelandic church. At least one of the bishops of Skálholt received some education
there, namely Þorlákur bórhallsson who spent six years (1153-59) at schools
abroad, first in Paris then in Lincoln. Another future bishop, Þorlákr’s nephew
Páll Jónsson, also studied in England, perhaps at Lincoln. It is quite possible
that these relations could partly explain the readiness with which the works of
Honorius were received in Iceland.

An exemplum from *Speculum ecclesiae* was translated into Icelandic
sometime before the middle of the fourteenth century, and the *Speculum* is one
of the sources for the Bible compilation *Stjórn.* It has been argued that a homily
in the Icelandic Homily book is based on *Gemma animae* and there is material
from that same work in the Norwegian homily book and in a section of *Stjórn*
I. A fourteenth-century inventory lists *Gemma animae* amongst the books of
the Augustinian house in Viðey.

*Imago mundi* crops up in several Icelandic and Norwegian sources apart
from AM 764 4to. The work seems to have been one of the sources for *Historia
Norvegiae.* It was used in computistical treatises and geographical descriptions
and found its way into Biblical compilations, both *Stjórn* III and the fragment
of Genesis *cum* cosmology, represented by AM 238 XIX fol. and 764 4to of
which more will be said later (cf. pp. 93, 106-109). Quotations from *Imago

---

64 *Byskupa sogn.* Ed. by Jón Helgason. (EdArn A13,2.) København 1978, 183. Cf. also
Magnús Stétansson. ‘Kirkjuvald efist.’ *Saga Íslands II.* Ed. by Sigurður Líndal. Reykjavík 1975,
96; Sverrir Tómasson. *Formdalar íslenskra sagnaritara á miðöldum. Ranntókn bókmenntahefðar.*
Reykjavík 1988, 22-23.
65 Cf. *Byskupa sogn* 2, 409.
68 Karel Vrátyný. ‘Enthält das Stockholmer Homilienbuch durchweg Übersetzungen?’ *ANF* 32
(1916), 31-49.
70 Kirby, *Biblical quotation* II, 84-85.
71 *DI* IV, 110-111.
17-32. Eilif Skard. *Maaleit i Historia Norvegiae.* (Skifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademii
i Oslo II: Hist.-Filos. Klasse No. 5.) Oslo 1930, 78et passim The chief importance is
attached to a couple of sentences in a passage on volcanoes which seem to come from IM I.41, cf.
*Monumenta historica Norvegiae,* 95-96.
73 Gustav Storm. ‘De norsk-islandske bibeloversættelser fra 13de og 14de Aarhundrede og
Biskop Brandr Jónsson.’ *ANF* 3 (1886), 249.
Imago mundi are found in Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta, Kirjalous saga, Eiriks saga víðförla and Fóstbræðra saga.\(^{74}\) Anne Holtsmark suggested that Imago mundi was translated into Old Norse in the twelfth century but did not offer any supportive arguments.\(^{75}\) As was said above, translated passages of the work certainly survive in several Icelandic/Norwegian books, but there is no conclusive evidence to show that a whole translation was ever produced. That of course does not diminish the possibility that Imago mundi, in its entirety, was known and used in Iceland, and Margaret Clunies Ross has argued that Honorius’ work could have served as a model for Snorri Sturluson in the composition of his Edda.\(^{76}\)

*Imago mundi* is a cosmology in three books, written, as were Honorius’ other cosmological works (*Neocosmum* or *Hexaemeron* and *Clavis Physicae*), in an effort ‘to explain the meaning of the first four chapters of the Book of Genesis and to understand the place of man in God’s creation’.\(^{77}\) According to Flint, Honorius produced his first recension in 1110 but subsequently seems to have revised the work three times, in 1123, 1133 and 1139.\(^{78}\) In the first book Honorius treats the universe, the geography of the world, the elements and the heavenly bodies. The second book is a computistical treatise and the third treats of historical time, as it were, in a brief survey through the six ages of the history of mankind, until the reign of Henry V of the Holy Roman Empire (1106-1125). The work was originally aimed at priests, to aid them in preaching and teaching, but soon became popular among the laity as an accessible cosmology which could well serve encyclopedic purposes.\(^{79}\)

---


\(^{75}\) Holtsmark, *Studier i Snorres mytologi, 35; idem.* ‘Elementene.’ *KLNM* 3, 593-595.


\(^{77}\) Flint, *Honorius*, 46.

\(^{78}\) Flint, ‘*Imago mundi*,’ 41.

3.3. The exegetical text

The hexaëameron in 764 is characterised by the fact that its Biblical skeleton, the account of the Creation itself, is very brief. Another characteristic is that the treatise seems to centre on divine beings on the one hand and man on the other. Animals, for instance, receive scant attention. The structure of the hexaëmeral section may be described as follows:

0 The Trinity (1v31-37)

1a Creation - Day 1 (1v37-38)
1b “Primus dies seculi” (1v38-39)

2a Creation - Day 2 (2r1-2;5)
2b Lucifer (2r2-5)

3 Creation - Day 3 (2r5-6)

4a Creation - Day 4 (2r6)
4b The planets and their spheres (2r6-19)

5a Creation - Day 5 (2r19-20)
5b From Gregory’s Dialogues: Hierarchy of souls (2r20-23)

6a Creation - Day 6 (2r23)
6b The first man - biology etc. (2r23-28)
6c The Fall (2r29-36)

7 Creation - Day 7 (2r36-37)

8 Cosmology (2r37-2v2)

9 (Birth of Seth -) biology/embryology (2v2-9)

10 The first generations of mankind (2v9-20)

3.3.1. The Trinity

Hæsti guð úsýniligr verandi fyrir allar veraldir, einn f þrenning ok þrennr f eining, þat er födur eginligt at vera, af öngum getinn, eigi skapaðr, eigi getinn. Sonr er samjafn ok sameillísligr feðr í allri dýrð, af honum eigi vorðinn eigi skapaðr heildr óumræðiliga getinn. Heilagr andi er af feðr ok syni framfarandi af hvárumtvegja. (1v31-35)
This text echoes the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed which states that the Son is begotten, not made and also contains the *filioque*, that is, the doctrine that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.  

### 3.3.2. Predestination

Svá er lesit sannliga at ãôr en heimrinn var gjörr vissi þessi voldugr guð tölú ok nôfn sérhverra sinna manna. (1v35-37)

*Elucidarius* mentions that the number of the heavenly hosts was fixed:

Til hallar sinnar sette hann uisa tolo valra ripara þa er nauþsvn vas at fylla oc eige lofat vîþ at auka. Enn þessa tolo valþe hann af monnom oc englom oc greinnde .i .x. sueiter .ix engla en x.nda manna.  

### 3.3.3. Primus dies

Hann skapaði fyrst í upphafi himin ok jörd ok alla hluti syniliga ok ðsýniliga af ðngu fyrliggjanda efn. Þat var drottins dag. Sá dagr kallaz á latínu primus dies seculo, þat er it þriðja g. í marció, þat er ið náttum fyrir benedictusmessu á fóstu. Síðan greindi hann skapaða hluti á ðörum v dögu. (1v37-2r1)

As mentioned above, one of the controversies running through almost all commentaries on Genesis is that surrounding the question whether God created all things simultaneously or whether the Bible’s account of a six-day creation should be taken literally. Linked to this problem is the question of whether the world was created out of pre-existing matter, to which 764 gives a negative answer.

The majority of the Alexandrian thinkers, including Clement and Origen, maintained that the creation should be understood as simultaneous, and the Biblical division into six days was entirely symbolic. The Syrian fathers generally took the opposite view, arguing that the creation had taken place progressively through six days, each of 24 hours. The Cappadocian fathers occupied the middle ground proposing the theory that on the first day elementary matter was created, which was subsequently organised during six days as recorded in the Bible. The Cappadocian fathers were, as mentioned earlier, noteworthy for their use of secular learning in exegesis. St Basil, who greatly influenced St Ambrose, drew upon practically all the scientific knowledge

---

82 G is a Sunday-letter and refers to the third Sunday in March, cf. AI II, clxxvi.
available to him in his treatment of the hexaëmeron.\(^{83}\) This elementary material was subsequently sometimes interpreted as being the four elements, water, fire, earth and air, thus mixing Genesis with the age-old Greek cosmogonical theories.

It was St Augustine's interpretation of Genesis which was to become the most influential in the West. He insisted, against the Neoplatonists, that the world had been created \textit{ex nihilo} and by all three persons of the Trinity. Regarding the hexaëmeron he took no definite stand with the Alexandrians and against the Syrians nor vice versa. He maintained that creation had happened in an instant and so the six days spoken of in Genesis could not be interpreted literally. But he did not think that the world had emerged, fully created, the way we know it, in an instant, but that all things in the world existed from the beginning (i.e. from the creation), potentially. The opening sentence of Genesis: \textit{In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram} should therefore be taken to mean that everything in the world was implicit in this elementary matter, \textit{materia informa}, described there as heaven and earth. The account in Genesis then tells of how things in the world were realised, and again the six days should not be taken literally, as six days of 24 hours, but symbolically and in the context of the six ages of the world.\(^{84}\)

The majority of subsequent commentators followed Augustine's line. Among the exceptions is Bede who adopted a stand closer to the Cappadocian fathers, arguing that the elementary matter had been created before the first day and then organised during the six (24 hour) days. The time before the six days of Creation was indefinite.\(^{85}\) Bede's views influenced many writers in the later Middle Ages, including Honorius Augustodunensis and the school of St Victor. Our scribe, on the other hand, seems to be untouched by any un-Augustinian views, maintaining that heaven and earth, and all things visible and invisible, were created on the first day 'af öngu fyrirliggjanda efni'. The last words may indeed echo Comestor who states in the first chapter of his \textit{Historia scholastica}

\(^{83}\) Mangenot, 'Hexaméron', 2336.


\(^{85}\) Mangenot, 'Hexaméron', 2338-2339.
that ‘Moyses vero solum Deum aeternum prophetavit, et sine praecjacenti materia mundum creatum’. 86

3.3.4. Lucifer

Á oðrum degi viku gjörði hann ix engla fylki. Einn af öllum englum skapaði hann friðara öllum dörum. Sá hét Lucifer. Ok skjótliga sem hann var skapað fyllðiz hann drambsemðar ok þöttiz vera líkr guði. Því var hann steyttr niðr til helvitis, vorðinn fjandi af engli ok allir þeir er honum samþykktu urðu fjandr af englum. Pá gjörði hann ok festingar himin. (2rl-5)

The theory of the nine hosts of angels and the fate of the first angel, Satahel or Lucifer, was known to Icelanders through Honorius' Elucidarius where considerable room is devoted to angelic lore. 87 The Scriptural basis for the fallen angels is Gn 6.1-4 where it is described how the sons of God (which was taken to refer to angels) fell through intercourse with the daughters of men. Early Christianity 'shifted the fall of the evil angels back from Gen. 6:1-4 ... to an earlier stage so that it anticipated and was correlated with the human fall from paradise ... and the angelic sin came to be reckoned as envy or pride rather than lust.' 88 The fall of Lucifer is also treated in Veraldar saga and in Stjórn but neither text offers clear parallels to 764. 89

3.3.5. The planets


86 PL 198, 1056.
87 Elucidarius, 28-39.
Accounts like this one were common in medieval books of computistical/cosmological nature and similar information is indeed found in other Icelandic manuscripts. The passage in 764 can be said to fall into two parts. On the one hand there is information about how long it takes each planet to traverse its sphere, and on the other hand the distance between the planets is stated. A parallel to the first part is found in a passage written in a fourteenth-century hand in the composite manuscript GKS 1812 4to. Imago mundi contains the same information under the heading De cyclis planetarum (II.87) but without numbering the spheres. 1812 and 764 are not in complete agreement: 1812 gives numbers for the orbit of the planets more accurately than does 764, compared to the Latin text, but that is insignificant since Roman numerals were frequently corrupted when copied. Conversely, 764 shows traces of Latin where 1812 has only Icelandic (cf. luna, in primo coelo) which could possibly mean that 764 was closer to the ultimate source.

It would seem fruitless to try to link 1812 and 764 on the basis of such feeble evidence were it not for the fact that the passage in 1812 is related to two fifteenth-century manuscripts in the Arnamagnæan collection, the fragment 238 XIX 4to and the codex 685d 4to. These two manuscripts are also connected to 764 since they both contain a cosmological passage related to the one on ff. 2r37-2v2 in 764 (cf. below p. 93), and 238 furthermore contains a biblical passage

---

91 AM 238 XIX, AM 685d and GKS 1812 will be considered below. In addition to those manuscripts material of this kind is incorporated into the socalled Rím I (Af II, 60-62) where the Greek names of the planets are given. The oldest MS of Rím I, a part of GKS 1812 4to, is thought to be from late twelfth century (1187 according to N. Beckman, Af II, lxxx). N. Beckman believes the most important sources to have been Bede, Isidore, Honorius and Helpricus. (cf. Af II, xxix-xxx). Finally there is a map of sorts in AM 736 III which contains identical information about the spheres of the planets.
93 There is one interesting exception. The source which 1812 was copied from seems to have given the time of Mars' circumference as 12 years which the scribe has attempted to change to the correct number, two (cf. Af II, 247, n.2 — the passage is copied twice in 1812 and the error remains in the other place).
94 These texts (1812, 238 and 685d) introduce the idea of the seven spheres thus: 'Sió eru kollut loft í bokum, þau er himin tungl hverfi um.' (Af II, 246). 238 and 685d only mention two of the seven 'planets', i.e. the moon and the sun, but place them correctly in first and fourth sphere. 1812 and 764 have all seven spheres. Peter Springborg has advanced the hypothesis that 238 and 685 derive from the same manuscript for which 1812 was a source, cf. 'Weltbild mit Löwe', 182. This hypothesis does not explain how 764 would fit in.
linked to 764 (cf. pp. 106-107). All four texts, however, seem to be composite, and it is therefore difficult to come to any firm conclusions about their relationship.

The second part of the planet-passage in 764 does not seem to have a parallel in any of the texts printed by Kålund and Beckman in Afro. It corresponds, on the other hand, quite closely with a passage in *Imago mundi*.

The cosmological section at the end of the hexaëmeron in 764 corresponds with the text immediately preceding this sentence in both manuscripts.

3.3.6. The soul: Gregory’s Dialogues.

Firma dag skapaði hann öll kvikvendi þau er lifs anda eru. Þrjá lifliga anda skapaði guð eftir orðum Gregorii. Fyrsta þann er eigi er holdi huldr ok er eilífur. .... ok .... þat ero einglar. Þann annan er holdi er huldr ok er eilífur ok deyr aldri.

---

This passage comes from the Icelandic translation of Gregory’s *Dialogues*, fourth book:

This passage comes from the Icelandic translation of Gregory’s *Dialogues*, fourth book:

The translation is preserved in a defective state in several manuscripts, the oldest of which dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century. The work must have been known in Iceland earlier because there is a reference to it in *Veraldar saga*. There are further references to the fourth book of the *Dialogues* later in 764. Gregory is quoted on f. 22r34-36 on the subject of infernal fire (cf. p. 208), and there is on f. 22v14-20 a reference to the question of bodily resurrection (cf. p. 211). 764 also preserves, on f. 31r5-18, an exemplum from chapter 27 of the *Dialogues*, a text which is paralleled in the translation fragments.

3.3.7. The first man.

Seventeen themes come together in this short passage. The first one, that Adam was made from the four elements, illustrates the idea of man as microcosm and is common in medieval sources. It is for instance found in Isidore’s *Etymologiae* (xi.i.16). In some texts the idea is more elaborate and Adam is said to have been made from seven or eight different substances. Such a passage is preserved in Latin in AM 194 8vo and in Icelandic in AM 624 4to, a fifteenth-century manuscript, where the formulation is thus:

L[ærisveinn] s[pyr]: „Af hve maurgum hlutum var likamur Aadams gior?”
M[agister] s[varar]: Af vii hlutum, af iordu ok af sio, holld er af iordo, enn blod af sio, augo ero af soolo, enn af vinde andardrattr, af himenskepnum hugskot manz, bæði gott ok illt, af steinum ero bein, ok sæla manz af helgum anda. siaundi hlutr er af liosi heims … (Af III, 40)

96 *Veraldar saga*, 64.
97 *HMS* I, 243.
Similar treatment of this theme is ubiquitous in medieval sources, both Latin and vernacular.\textsuperscript{98}

The explanation of Adam's name is similarly well attested in medieval sources, but must have originated in a Greek tradition.\textsuperscript{99} It is an anagram based on the Greek words ανατολή (south), δυσις (west), αρκτος (north) and μεσεμβρία (east). Its earliest instance seems to be in the apocryphal Slavonic Book of Enoch but 'its currency in the west was assured by its acceptance in Augustine's \textit{Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium}.\textsuperscript{100} It is included by Honorius in his \textit{Elucidarius} and was given the following formulation in the Icelandic translation:

\begin{quote}
Discipulus Huaban toc adam nafn. Magister Af. iii. ottom heims þat es austr oc uestr norpr oc supr. Enn at griksco male callasc anatole disis artos mesembria þat es sem griplor hende til nafins Adams.\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}

The 764 scribe omits the Greek words, thereby obscuring the basis of the anagram.

The information that Adam was created in Hebron is found in \textit{Imago mundi}, as is the statement that after his death he was buried in Calvary and later transferred to Hebron. That information is also reproduced in 764 and could well have come directly from \textit{Imago mundi}:

\begin{align*}
764 & \quad \text{Imago mundi} \\
Adam lifði <\text{deccc}> ok xxx ára. & \quad \text{Ipse [i.e. Adam] vero post} \\
Hann var grafinn in loco Calvarie & \quad .\text{deccc.xxx. annos in Jerusalem} \\
oek efir tima var hann fluttr f & \quad \text{obit, in loco Calvariæ sepultus,} \\
Ebron. (2v11-12) & \quad \text{aliquamdiu requievit, deinde in} \\
& \quad \text{Hebron translatus, in terram de qua} \\
& \quad \text{assumptus est redivi. (III.1.)}
\end{align*}

\textit{Elucidarius} likewise mentions that Adam was made in Hebron but goes on to say that he died and was buried there as well.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{98} Cf. James E. Cross and Thomas D. Hill (eds.). \textit{The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Rūtes}. Toronto 1982, 67-70; Max Förster. 'Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung. Ein lateinisches Fragment des s.g. slawischen Henoch.' \textit{Archiv für Religionswissenschaft} 11 (1908), 483-512. As Förster mentions (p. 493 n.2) reverse application of this theme can be seen in Grimmismál (st. 40) and Vafbruðnismál (st. 21) where the world is made out of the flesh, blood and bones of the giant Ymir. Snorri Sturluson includes this in his Gylfaginning, cf. Snorri Sturluson. \textit{Edda. Prologue and Gylfaginning}. Ed. by Anthony Faulkes. London 1988, 11-12.

\textsuperscript{99} Förster, 'Adams Erschaffung', 477-482, 517-522.

\textsuperscript{100} Cross and Hill (eds.), \textit{The Prose Solomon}, 67. Cf. PL 35, 1465 and 1473.

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Elucidarius}, 43.

\textsuperscript{102} \textit{Elucidarius}, 45
The reference to Sæmundr led Gabriel Turville-Petre to suggest that the history of the Kings of Norway he argues Sæmundr probably wrote, might have begun ‘with the creation of the world and of the first man, just as Florence of Worcester’s English chronicle did’.\(^\text{103}\) Turville-Petre also points to the following reference in a computistical treatise in AM 624 4to: ‘I upphafi heims sagdi Sæmundur prestur at sol nyskopud rynne upp i austri midiu, en tungl fullt æ aptnne.’\(^\text{104}\) Stefán Karlsson has suggested that references of this kind might allude to a genealogy of the Skjöldungar and the Oddaverjar which traces the line back to Adam and was attributed to Sæmundur by Jón Sigurðsson.\(^\text{105}\) Leaving aside the question of authority behind the claim that Adam was sixty [dlnir (?)] one should remark that the idea that Adam was of extraordinary height is common in medieval sources.\(^\text{106}\) When Eve is introduced (2r30) it is similarly stated that she was fifty [álnir].

That Adam was made in God’s image is of course scriptural (Gn 1.27) but to this the 764 scribe adds the number of bones and veins in the human body as well as a sentence containing physiognomical lore. These additions have their parallels in several Icelandic texts, Fóstbraðra saga among them. As Jónas Kristjánsson has shown, the closest Latin parallel to the text, 764 is a thirteenth-century didactic poem which is thought to stem from the medical school in Salerno. The poem is variously named Regimen sanitatis or Flos medicinae and seems to have been known, and quoted, in Iceland and Norway in the fourteenth century.\(^\text{107}\) In lines 1242-1243 of the poem wisdom, speech, wrath, laughter and love (or lust) are linked to the same five organs as in 764:

\[
\text{Cor sapit, pulmo loquitur, fel commovet iram,} \\
\text{Splen ridere facit, cogit amare jecor.}\(^\text{108}\)
\]

Of the texts collated by Jónas it is only 764 and the so-called Syrpa, a manuscript written in the sixteenth-century by Gottskálk Jónsson in Glaumbær (BL Add


\(^{104}\) Åf II, 91.


\(^{106}\) Cf. Cross and Hill (eds.), Prose Solomon, 72.


which offer a close parallel to *Regimen sanitatis*. Gottskálk's Syrpa also contains the information on Adam and Eve's height.

### 3.3.8. Cosmology

Svá segir Imago mundi at heimrinn sé vaxinn sem egg; ok svá sem skurn er um egg svá er eldrinn umhverfum heiminn; ok svá sem albumen, þat köllum vér skjall, er næst skurninu, svá er loft næst eldi; ok svá sem þeit hvita eggs er næst albumen, svá eru vötn næst lofti; svá sem þeir rauða er í eggi, svá er jörð lukt í þessum hófuðsképnum. Jörð er úhrærlig en vötn, loft ok eldri, þat snýzt jafnan um jörðina. (2r37-2v2)

As was mentioned above, this section has a parallel in AM 238 XIX and AM 685d 4to and all three texts clearly represent the same translation of a Latin source. Peter Springborg has shown that this passage is hardly a pure *Imago mundi* text despite the attribution, and that *Philosophia mundi* by Guillaume de Conches offers a closer parallel, although the Icelandic does not follow that source perfectly either. Guillaume’s work is found with *Imago mundi* in some manuscripts and if that was the case with the manuscript from which the Icelanders ultimately derived their text, that might explain the reference to *Imago mundi* here.

It seems likely that the cosmological passages in 764, 1812, 238 and 685d all derived, at least in part, from a single vernacular source which was largely based on *Imago mundi* but with some additions. The fact that in 238 and 764 this cosmology is connected to a translation of parts of Genesis (cf. pp. 106-107) suggests that cosmology became a part of a hexadmeral tradition in Iceland, although it is impossible to say whether the hexadmeron and cosmology were already thus linked in the Latin source which was the vehicle for the import of these ideas to Iceland.

### 3.3.9. The Birth of Seth; embryology.

Pá er Adam ok Eva voru af sett Paradisi fagnaðum fæddiz þeim son síð er Seth er nefndr. Hann var fyrstr getinn með munð af karlmanni ok konu, með þeim hætti sem bækr visa til, at losti karlmannzins liggi í hans lendum en í nafla konunnar. Ok er þeira beggja sáð samblandaz með konunni er þat ásyndar vj daga næstu svá

---


Isidore is the likeliest source for the statement that man’s lust resides in his loins but in the navel in the case of woman:: ‘Lumbi ob libidinis lasciviam dicti, quia in viris causa corporeae voluptatis in ipsis est, sicut in umbilico feminis’ (Etym. XI.i.98). The last sentence in the Icelandic passage in similarly correctly attributed to Isidore: ‘Ex paterno autem semine puellas nasci et ex materno pueros’ (Etym. XI.i.145). The rest of is not, however, found in Etymologiae but parallels to that part are found in two other Icelandic manuscripts, in one of which it is similarly ascribed to Isidore:

**AM 194 8vo**

Sva segir meistari Ysodorus, at mynd mannligs likama i modur kvidi formerizst a 45 daga, ok se a hinum fyrstum 6 sidan getnadrinn vard miukligrar myndar, en padan af a 9 dagum snyz i blod, ha a 7 dagum verdr bollott holld ok augu, en ha a 16 dagum verdr þar madr allr, ha a 7 dagum vaxa hár ok negl. (Af I, 55)

**AM 461 12mo (16th c.)**

Svo segier (sic) helgar ritningar, at semiz mynd mannligs likama i modur kvidi a halftum fimantanig dagar, se hina fystu vi daga, fra þvi er getnadrinn vard, sem mkiplk (miolk), sidan a is dagum snyzt i blod, þar næst a xii dagum hleypur saman ok festiz ok verdr bollott holld ok augu, þadan fra a xvii do... (Af III, 111)

3.3.10. Cain and Abel

Tvá sonu gátu þau aðra, Abel ok Kain. Hann drap Abel meðr asnakjálka fyrir sakir öfundar er guð þektiz förn Abels. (2v9-10)

The story of Cain and Abel is scriptural (Gn 4.1-8) but the 764 scribe includes a detail not found in the Vulgate: Cain’s murder-weapon. The habit of depicting Cain’s weapon as a jawbone of an ass seems to have originated in Insular (Hiberno-Saxon) iconography and then spread to the continent. The image is common in medieval English Bible illustrations and Cain’s jawbone is referred to in vernacular literature.\(^\text{112}\) It has been suggested that the tradition arose through association with the history of Samson, so that illustrations of Samson killing the Philistines with a jawbone could have served as a model for a similar

---

depiction of Cain murdering his brother. Alternatively, pictures showing Cain wielding a coulter or a similar tool might have been interpreted with reference to Samson and his jawbone, confusing the two weapons.  

3.3.11 Encyclopedic glosses in the secunda aetas.

A few encyclopedic comments crop up in the second age as well as in the first. On reading about Noah and the Flood we learn of the size and the dimensions of the Ark (‘ccc álna lóng ok l álna breið, xxx álna undir þákít’ 2v23) and the names of the wives of Noah and his sons: Poarpa, Katafoa, Parphia, Fliva (2v26-27). This information could in both cases be derived from Comestor’s Historia scholastica, which is the source mentioned by the scribes (2v25).

On 3r4 Imago mundi is cited as the source for the information that kings are descended from Sem, knights from Japheth and slaves from Cham. Imago mundi does indeed include this information in III.1 as well as giving the age of Sem and his descendants in the second age. This is paralleled in 764 (3r4-7).

The next event described in 764 is the building of the Tower of Babel and the division of the languages. The central figure in this story is Nimrod (Nefrod in 764), whom 764 describes as a giant who was the first to proclaim himself king and who, in his pride, set about erecting the tower Babel i Babilonia: ‘Hann smíðuðu lxx risa ok ij. Þeir æþluðu at smíða hann allt upp til himinsins.’ (3r8-9).

The Bible tells how Nimrod, the son of Chus, increased in power and became king, first in Babylonia. He is neither a giant nor is he associated with Babel in the Scriptures, but because of his association with Babylon commentators came to attribute the building of the Tower of Babel to him.  

That Nimrod was considered to be a giant hinges on the Septuagint use of the word γιγας in Gn 10.8 where the Vulgate reads: ipse (i.e. Nemrod) coepit esse potens in terra. The Septuagint translation managed to influence Nimrod’s reputation in a negative way, despite the less ambiguous wording of the Vulgate. The builders of the

---


115 Arno Borst. Der Turmbau von Babel I. Stuttgart 1957, 117-118. Cf. the Glossa ordinaria, PL 113, 113

116 Borst, Der Turmbau I, 142.
tower thus became giants as well, and their number, 72, is determined by the number of languages which were said to be spoken after Babel. 764 goes against Honorius and earlier chroniclers where it claims that Nimrod pioneered idolatry and made a likeness of his father (3r13-14). The claim is due to a confusion between Nimrod and Ninus, his descendant. 117

The analysis of the sources in the foregoing sections is not exhaustive. The commentary has neither been as extensive as might be possible nor has all the exegetical material used by the scribes been commentated. (There is for instance a reference on f. 2b1s9 to a gloss ‘super epistolam [sic] Pauli ad Romanos’ which I have not managed to trace.) The commentary offered should nevertheless give some insights into the structure and content of the Genesis-based narrative the 764 scribes put together to illustrate the history of the first three aetates. We will now turn to the backbone of that narrative: the Bible.

117 Cf. IM III.2. Honorius mentions Ninus’ association with idolatry but the information that he made a likeness of his father Bel is found in Comestor’s Historia Scholastica, PL 198, 1090, and repeated in 764 on f. 10v16-17.
4. Aetates I-V: Chapters from the Old Testament

4.1. Introduction

The biblical material in the first age of the world is much interspersed with extraneous material, mostly encyclopaedic, as we have seen. The situation is different in the ages that follow: Bible material here constitutes the backbone of the historical account and this is held together chronologically by references to genealogies which are also ultimately derived from Scripture. From f. 3 onwards little is found of encyclopaedic material in the strictest sense and although the odd reference to *Imago mundi* or other sources crops up, these are mostly of a (pseudo)historical nature. The account of events is usually sketchy and it is often difficult to ascertain whether the text is based directly on the Bible or on a universal history in the style of *Historia scholastica*. There are nevertheless some passages which are quite a close rendering of the Vulgate. The pattern which emerges is one which is repeated in a similar way throughout the first half of the manuscript. The scribes seem to use a method which alternates relatively accurate translation, albeit sometimes slightly abbreviated, with short passages (perhaps only a couple of sentences) of summary nature: chunks from the Bible, often dramatic events or exempla, like the curse suffered by the people of Azedod, or the judgement of Solomon, are joined together by ‘bridges’ which are sometimes pedigrees or information about the reign of kings or judges, sometimes extremely economic accounts of previous and/or relevant events. An exception to this pattern are the translations from the Book of Daniel and of the Book of Judith, which will be treated in separate chapters. We turn first to the more fragmentary Old Testament pieces which are scattered throughout the first five aetates.
4.2. Fragmentary OT texts in 764 and their relationship with Stjórn

4.2.1. Bible translation or not?
As already mentioned, it is not always possible to determine whether the biblical material in 764 stems directly from the Bible or not. This is particularly true of the ‘bridges’, where the genealogies, for instance, may have been worked out from the Bible although it is more likely, given the evidence elsewhere in the manuscript of the use of a chronological/encyclopaedic work, that they were taken from such a source. It is however possible to maintain that the biblical material in 764 is not the result of direct translation from the Latin but rather a reworking of an existing Icelandic translation. This is because the text in 764 corresponds with sections from Stjórn III which is a Bible translation interpolated with additional (exegetical) material. The inclusion of some of these additions in 764, together with verbal correspondences, shows that the scribes depended on a copy of Stjórn III for their Bible text. Table I lists the biblical material in 764 and its parallels.

4.2.2. The compilation Stjórn
The compilation known as Stjórn is not a homogeneous work but one made up of three parts which are different in nature and of different age.118 The basic material comes from the historical books of the Old Testament but it is sometimes expanded with commentary and exegesis. It is the extent of these additions which, along with stylistic differences, primarily distinguishes the parts from each other.

---

118 Most of what will be said here about Stjórn is based on two sources, chapter 3 of Kirby’s Bible Translation in Old Norse, and an introduction to a facsimile edition of AM 227 fol. by Jakob Benediktsson (cited as ‘Inngangur’). The latter exists only in typescript since plans for the edition have been abandoned. For an overview of Stjórn scholarship see also Reidar Astås. Et bibelverk fra middelalderen. Studier i Stjórn I-II. Oslo 1987.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Icelandic parallels</th>
<th>Latin source</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2r23-36 Adam and Eve</td>
<td>(AM 238 fol. XIX 1v7-25)</td>
<td>Gn 2.22; 2.15-17; 3.1-6, 23; 6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v9-10 Cain and Abel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gn 4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v15-19 Cain’s descendants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gn 4.17-22</td>
<td>Cf. IM III.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v21-3r3 Noah and the Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gn 6.8-15; 7.6-20, 8.18; 9.13; 6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r7-11 The tower of Babel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gn 11.4-9</td>
<td>Cf. IM I.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r15-20 + 2bisr Abraham</td>
<td>Veraldar saga 15.8-16.6</td>
<td>Gn 12.2-3; 26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r20-23 Sodom and Gomorra</td>
<td>(AM 238 fol. XIX 2r7-22)</td>
<td>Gn 19.15, 24-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r25-26 Esau and Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gn 25.24-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r27-29 Job</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM III.8 Job 1.2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r29-35 Jacob — the wrestling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gn 32.24-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r35-38 Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gn 37.26-28; 41.1-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v3-19 Moses and the Exodus</td>
<td>Stock. Perg. fol. 12 IV 1v(9-17), 22-28</td>
<td>Ex 2.1-10.21; 3.3.1-12; 4.1-17 7.1-12.30; 14.21-23; 20.1-17</td>
<td>The Ten commandments are inaccurately rendered in 764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v24-27 Joshua</td>
<td>Stj III 349.9-11; (355.3; 360.7-11; 369.27-29)</td>
<td>Ios 3.17; 6.20; 10.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v28-31 A young man’s wife killed in Gabaon</td>
<td>Stj III 384.20-32</td>
<td>Speculum Ecclesiae (PL 172, 837)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v31-32 Abimelech kills his brothers and is killed in turn by a woman</td>
<td>Stj III 398.34-399.1, 402.14-16</td>
<td>Idc 9.5, 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v32-38 Samson and Delilah</td>
<td>Stj III 414.25-36; 417.22-25; (419.3-22)</td>
<td>Idc 15.16-18; 16.29-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v38-39 Eli</td>
<td>Stj III 419.26-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r1-8 The Ark of the Covenant captured by the men of Azedod</td>
<td>Stj III (434.1-25); 435.24-436.24</td>
<td>I Sm 4.10-11; 5.1-7</td>
<td>Cf. Hauksbók pp. 160-161 (a version derived from Ælfric’s sermon De Falsis Diis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r8-12 Samuel</td>
<td>Stj III 427.21; 429.25-27; (431.11; 432.17-18)</td>
<td>I Sm 1.2; 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r15-20 Saul and David</td>
<td>(Stj III 440.17-23; 441.28-33; 458.19-23; 461.17-18; 466.18; 493.11-28)</td>
<td>I Sm 8.4; 9.1-2; 16.1; 17.4; 18.7; 30.1-4</td>
<td>The closest parallel in Stjórn is a chapter heading in A: ‘Er Daudid kon- ungr reif kiapta a oarga dyri’ (458 n.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r24-31 David pleads with God to stop the killing of the Jews</td>
<td>Stj III 545.21-26; 546.11-12,29-547.6</td>
<td>II Sm 24.16-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Bible material in 764 4to and its parallels in other vernacular sources. Genealogies are excluded. Where the account in 764 is so severely summarised that it is difficult to see any verbal correspondences, the Icelandic parallel is given in brackets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Icelandic parallels</th>
<th>Latin source</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4r35-4v5</td>
<td>Judgement of Solomon</td>
<td>Stj III 558.24-559.21</td>
<td>III Rg 3.16-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v5-10</td>
<td>Solomon's penitence</td>
<td>Stj III 577.26-31</td>
<td>III Rg 11.1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v13-14</td>
<td>King Manasseh</td>
<td>(Stj III 647.23-24, 647.34-648.5)</td>
<td>Josefus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v18-26</td>
<td>The Temple of Solomon raided by Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>Stj III 652.23-37; (653.23-25), 29-35; 654.1-2</td>
<td>IV Rg 25.1, 8-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v26-5v25</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 14.30-41; 3.1-2, 6, 16-20, 47-52; 4.28-30; 5; 14.27-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v33-9r41</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liber Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v25-29</td>
<td>Elkanah and Anna</td>
<td>Stj III 427.10-11, 18-20; (429.6-8, 22-26)</td>
<td>I Sm 1.1-2, 20; 1.28-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v29-30</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>(Stj III 443.29, 460.14)</td>
<td>I Sm 10.1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v30-32</td>
<td>Nathan and King David</td>
<td>(Stj III 515.33-516.27)</td>
<td>II Sm 12.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v32-40</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 14.32-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r5-9</td>
<td>Isaiah in the days of King Hezekiah</td>
<td>(Stj III 640.35-641.13; 642.27-645.7)</td>
<td>IV Rg 18.13-17; 19.1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r9-13</td>
<td>Jeremiah and King Josiah</td>
<td>(Stj III 651.20-29)</td>
<td>IV Rg 23.29-30 Ier 1.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r13-14</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ez 1.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r14-15</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dn 1.1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r15-24</td>
<td>The transmigration; the Temple rebuilt</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Esr 1.1-2; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r25-29</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ion 1.1-3; 2.1, 3.1-6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r31-33</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>(Stj III 443.29; 459.11-460.17)</td>
<td>I Sm 10.1; 16.1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r33-37</td>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>(Stj. III 589.21-591.2; 593.17-594.20; 608.5-36)</td>
<td>III Rg 17.1-18.1; 18.27-46; 2.1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r37-38</td>
<td>Elisha</td>
<td>(Stj III 613.8-615.14; 634.21-28)</td>
<td>IV Rg 4.1-38; 13.20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r38-41</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v34-35</td>
<td>King Sisera killed by Jael</td>
<td>(Stj III 388.3-22)</td>
<td>Idc 4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Bible material in 764 4to and its parallels in other vernacular sources. Genealogies are excluded. Where the account in 764 is so severely summarised that it is difficult to see any verbal correspondences, the Icelandic parallel is given in brackets.
Stjón I consists of Genesis and the first 18 chapters of Exodus. As Ian Kirby has pointed out ‘this material is in essence not so much a translation of the Bible as a compilation based on it, in which the Bible story is augmented with considerable elaboration and commentary and also with some entirely extraneous material’. This sets Stjón I apart from the other parts, especially from Stjón II which is a close translation of the Vulgate, with some omissions and summarising, but virtually free of extraneous matter. Stjón II takes up where Stjón I leaves off in Exodus and extends to the end of Deuteronomy.

Stjón III starts with Joshua and goes to the end of Kings. The Bible text is here amplified with exegetical material though to a much lesser extent than in Stjón I. Stjón I and III also differ in that the compiler of Stjón I as a rule names the source for his interpolations, while in Stjón III references to authorities are rare. It is significant for the present discussion, however, that Stjón III twice mentions Honorius' *Imago mundi* and also contains further unacknowledged references to the work. These references serve, as Peter Springborg has shown, ‘die historische Dimension in der biblischen Erzählung von Stjón III hervorzuheben’, and are mostly concerned with chronological and numerical information (typically concerning the reign of rulers).

There are three principal manuscripts of Stjón, AM 226, 227 and 228 fol., named A, B and C respectively in Unger’s edition. Only 226 contains all three parts of Stjón, but the Stjón II part is clearly a later addition to the manuscript, written in the fifteenth century, probably its latter half. 227 contains Stjón I and III, 228 only III. 226 contains a text of the beginning of Stjón III (Joshua) different from that in the other manuscripts: it is not based directly on the Vulgate but is a fairly close rendering of chapters from *Historia scholastica*. Apart from Stjón II in 226, all the manuscripts were written in the fourteenth century, 228 in its first half, 227 about 1350 or a little later, 226 probably in the decade 1360-70. In addition to these medieval manuscripts AM 617 4to, a sixteenth-century...

---

119 Kirby, *Bible Translation*, 52.
120 Springborg, *Weltbild mit Löwe*, 175.
codex, has been shown to have independent value\textsuperscript{125} and other later manuscripts might prove of importance once a critical edition of \textit{Stjörn} is undertaken.

\textit{Stjörn} I was put together under the auspices of King Hákon Magnússon (1299-1319), possibly towards the end of his reign\textsuperscript{126} and is in all likelihood the youngest of the three parts. Opinions differ as to the age of \textit{Stjörn} II but its style and vocabulary suggest a dating to the first half of the thirteenth century, if not earlier.\textsuperscript{127} Since, as Ian Kirby has pointed out, 'there is obviously no natural unit smaller than the Pentateuch which omits Genesis and the first part of Exodus',\textsuperscript{128} it is natural to assume that \textit{Stjörn} II originally included the whole Pentateuch, and scholars seem to agree that \textit{Stjörn} II probably represents the earliest Norse Bible translation.\textsuperscript{129} Ian Kirby is furthermore of the opinion that \textit{Stjörn} III was based on an earlier translation which may have been \textit{Stjörn} II. He points out that the Bible text in \textit{Stjörn} III is considerably rewritten and that that renders it unlikely that the compiler was translating the text first hand.\textsuperscript{130} Kirby's view is strengthened by a comment which appears towards the end of \textit{Stjörn} where there is a reference to the man who translated it ('sa er savgunni hefir snvið til sinnar tvngv af latinv').\textsuperscript{131} The comment is most probably an integral part of \textit{Stjörn} III since it appears in all the principal manuscripts, and must therefore be taken as strong evidence for Kirby's theory that \textit{Stjörn} III was indeed based on an earlier translation, although it is difficult to prove that that translation was an extended \textit{Stjörn} II.

\textit{Stjörn} III shows affinities with \textit{Konungs skuggsjá}, which has led scholars to date it to a similar time, although it has proved difficult to determine which work is the older. Both are likely to have been composed around or a little after 1250.\textsuperscript{132}
4.2.3. Stjórn III and 764

A comparison between AM 764 and Stjórn reveals, as mentioned above, that the scribes of 764 copied their Bible text from a manuscript of Stjórn III. This is evident from verbal similarities and from the fact that the scribes included passages which do not stem from the Vulgate but are interpolations in Stjórn III. The clearest examples of this are a chapter taken from Honorius' *Speculum ecclesiae* (3v28-31), a passage on King Solomon for which the compiler of Stjórn III claims the authority of Ambrose (4v5-10), and the story of King Manasseh who was put in a copper ox (4v13-14). Kirby drew attention to a comment on f. 4r27 which refers to God's angel standing *between heaven and earth*. The remark is not a part of the story as it stands in the second Book of Samuel (II Sm 24.16-17); it is found in the Book of Chronicles (I Par 21.16) but was introduced into the passage from II Sm by the compiler of Stjórn III.\(^{133}\) One could also mention additions like the derogatory term 'ográf' which is applied to Delilah in one of the Stjórn manuscripts (A, cf. 417, n. 11) and in 764 (3v35) but has no basis in the Vulgate, and the comment on Eli, shared by Stjórn (419.28) and 764 (3v38-39), which states that he was 'linr ok eigi stjórsamr'.

A critical edition of Stjórn is not yet available and it is therefore not possible to come to definite conclusions about the relationship between 764 and individual manuscripts containing Stjórn III without undertaking a thorough investigation of them all — a task which lies outside the scope of the present work. It will have to suffice to say that 764 seems, in general, to be closest to B, i.e. AM 227 fol. It does not however, seem to descend directly from that codex. There are instances where 764 agrees with C (AM 228 fol.), the oldest manuscript, against B (cf. e.g. p. 436.15 ‘scripi’ C, ‘skript’ A, B and 617, cf. ‘skripi’ 764 4r6) and in at least one case 764 has a variant (an error most likely) in common with 617, against all the principal manuscripts (p. 414.35 ‘fyrsti’, ‘justi’ 764 3v34). This variant is shared, as far as can be made out, by the manuscript

\(^{133}\) Cf. Kirby, *Bible Translation*, 60.
AM 335 4to which is dated to about 1400 and contains a chapter on Samson but no other biblical stories.\textsuperscript{134}

4.2.4. 764 and the evidence for a lost Stjórn III-type Pentateuch

Since Stjórn III only contains Joshua to and including Kings while the Bible material in 764 includes passages from Genesis and Exodus as well, it follows that there are Bible passages in 764 where we lack a corresponding Stjórn III text. The question obviously arises whether these passages might throw some new light on speculations about lost Norse Bible texts.

Ian Kirby follows Gustav Storm in arguing that a Stjórn III type translation of the whole Pentateuch existed and he also supposes that, later, Stjórn I made use of this translation.\textsuperscript{135} If all the Bible material in 764 comes from a translation like Stjórn III and if that translation was also the basis for Stjórn I, one would expect to find a fair degree of correspondence between 764 and the Stjórn I text. A comparison of the two texts is not without difficulties as is obvious given their very different nature: the former is generally sketchy while Stjórn I often contains a fairly accurate translation of the Vulgate plus a wealth of extraneous material. In attempting such comparison it seems sensible to choose a passage where 764 has a relatively full text. The following could be representative.

\begin{verbatim}
764
Svá bar til at Jacob var einn saman staddr. Pá kom þar maðr ok glíndi við hann. Ok er hann mátti eigi Jacob yfir stíga tók hann afslinar lærs hans ok þegar hörnabli afl í fattinum. Pá mælti hinn komni maðr. Lát mik lausan því at nú er dagr upp kominn. Jacob s(varaði) ok þótiz vita at þat var guðs engill: Eigi mun ek þik lausan látat nema þú blezir mér. Engíllinn s(purði): Hvät heitir þú. Jacob heiti ek. Engíllinn mælti: Með öllu eigi máttu Jacob

Stjórn
... þa uar hann einn samt eptir aa aarbackanum, ok òllaðís at bidiax fyrrir. ok þar bar sua til at hann tok fang meðr einn engil sua sem uid einn huern mann. allt til þers er morgintimí var. Ok sem hann fann þat, at hann fekk eigi yfriðnut Jacob. þa tok hann i brott eina sin or hans læri. ok þegar i stad uar sem hann uisnadi. Hann talad þa til Jacobs. Gef mik lidugan. þi at nu remnr dagsbrun upp. Hann suaradi. Eigi laet ek þer laust utan þu blezir mik. Huert er þit nafn. sagdi hinn sem meðr hann taladi. Hann svaradi. Jacob. Meðr engu moti man þit nafn hedan ifra uera kallat Jacob. helldr ma þat

Vulgata
Remansit solus et ecce vir luctabatur cum eo usque mane qui cum videret quod eum superare non posset tetigit nervum femoris elus et statim emarcat dixitque ad eum dimitte me iam enim ascendit aurora respondit non dimittam te nisi benedixeris mihi ait ergo quod nomen est tibi nequaquam inquit Jacob appellabitur nomen tuum sed Israel quoniam si contra Deum fortis fuisti quanto magis contra
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{134} In addition to the Samson chapter the manuscript contains Sturlaug saga starfsama, Gibbons saga and various exempla and ‘ævintýri’. The page with the Samson material is not easily legible.

\textsuperscript{135} Kirby, Bible Translation, 63-64; 55-56
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The two Icelandic versions have very little in common beyond what can be explained with reference to the Latin. The vocabulary is not the same (cf. ‘glimdi við’/ ‘tók fang meðr’, ‘yfirstíga’/ ‘yfirlína’, ‘hröma’/ ‘visna’) and even the simplest of sentences are rendered in different ways, such as the Latin *quod nomen est tibi* which produces on the one hand: ‘Hvat heitir þú’, on the other: ‘Hvert er þitt nafn’. The Icelandic versions share one feature however: both inform the reader that the stranger is an angel, but that interpretation was commonplace in medieval exegesis.136

On the basis of this evidence one might suggest that if Stjörn I is based on a previous translation of the Pentateuch it was not the same as the one used by the scribes of 764. One can, however, find other examples where the picture does not seem quite so clear-cut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>764</th>
<th>Stjörn</th>
<th>Vulgata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ok er Moyses för</td>
<td>Moyses laust þa uendinum nidr</td>
<td>cunque extendisset Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brott af Egipta landi</td>
<td>aa hafit. sem guð hafði bodit</td>
<td>manum super mare abortilit illud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laust hann</td>
<td>honum. ok þegar í stad brast</td>
<td>Dominus flante vento vehementi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uendinum á it rauða</td>
<td>siorrim af þeim hinum stora ok</td>
<td>et urente tota nocte et vertit in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haf, en þat brast</td>
<td>sterka blásanda uindi. sem þar</td>
<td>sicum divisáque est aqua et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sundr i miðju.</td>
<td>kom meðr guds utíla. ok sundr</td>
<td>ingressi sunt filìi Israëli per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gengu þeir þurrum</td>
<td>skiptiz (286.30-33) Eptir þat</td>
<td>medium maris sicci erat enim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fótim yfir hafit, en</td>
<td>gengu allir Israëls synir þurrum</td>
<td>aqua quasi murus a dextra eorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharao för efir</td>
<td>fotum rett um mitt hafit. (287.7-8)</td>
<td>et leva ersequentesque Aegyptii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeim. Drukknaði</td>
<td>þa for allr konungsins herok ok</td>
<td>ingressi sunt post eos omnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hann þar ok allr</td>
<td>riddarar medr sinum kerrum</td>
<td>equitatus Pharaonis currus eius et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hans herr með</td>
<td>hestum ok allir hernessi fasta-</td>
<td>equites per medium maris (Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hestum ok kerrum.</td>
<td>frem eptir þeim í midia haf-</td>
<td>14.21-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þá orti Moyses</td>
<td>geilina. (13-15) sumladiz kon-</td>
<td>reversæque sunt aquæ et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantemus. Hann</td>
<td>ungrinn ok sopadzi medr aülum</td>
<td>operuerunt currus et equites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gjörði guði tjaldðuttu</td>
<td>sinum kerrum riddarum ok hest-</td>
<td>cuncti exercitus Pharaonis (Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>á eyðimörk (3v16-</td>
<td>um ... at þar drucknadi huert</td>
<td>14.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19)</td>
<td>manzbarn. (30-32) Eptir þersa ...</td>
<td>nunc cecinit Moses et filìi Israëli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iartegn ... dictati Moyses ...</td>
<td>carmen hoc Domino et dixerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantemus domino. (288.21-23)</td>
<td>Cantemus Domino (Ex 15.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although 764 and Stjörn I have a somewhat dissimilar text some words and phrases are identical and those correspondences are not readily explained by
referring to the Latin.\textsuperscript{137} With this in mind one might consider the possibility that the texts in Stjórn I and 764 go back ultimately to the same translation (of a Stjórn III type) and that the compiler of Stjórn I did not depend solely on the older translation he had to hand, but translated some of the Vulgate afresh, which could account for the divergent versions of Jacob’s wrestling cited above. Alternatively, the differences in the two texts might be explained by supposing the copy of Historia Scholastiva that the Stjórn I compiler used, contained extensive quotations from the Vulgate which the compiler sometimes chose to translate rather than using the existing translation he (or she) had to hand.

But there is more to the argument about the existence of a Stjórn III Pentateuch. Gustav Storm drew attention to two fragments, one with a Genesis-text the other with a passage from Exodus, which he claimed have the same characteristics as the Stjórn III translation.\textsuperscript{138}

The Genesis fragment is AM 238 XIX fol (c. 1500), mentioned earlier because of the cosmological passage on 2r37-2v2 (cf. p. 93) which 764 and 238 have in common and where there is close verbal correspondence between the two manuscripts. 764 also has a version of sorts of the Genesis text but here it is very hard to see any similarities between the two manuscripts. The text in 238 is much closer to the Vulgate — the 764 text seems to be a free rendering of the story of the Fall. It is inserted into the account of the sixth day of creation, before the Sabbath, and the cosmological passage is then copied immediately following the Sabbath. In 238 the cosmology also follows on from the hexaëmeron, but the story of the Fall is kept where it belongs according to the Vulgate, i.e. after the hexaëmeron proper has been covered and consequently also after the cosmological section.\textsuperscript{139} Given the summary nature of the text in 764 it is not surprising that verbal correspondences are minimal between the two texts. They do nevertheless have one rare word in common — ‘laufkyrtlar’, which is not recorded elsewhere except in Guðbrandsbiblia. It refers to the garments Adam and Eve made out of fig leaves (cf. consuerunt folia ficus et fecerunt sibi perizomata,

\textsuperscript{136} Cf. e.g. Isidore. \textit{Questiones in Veterum testamentum}, \textit{PL} 83, 266.

\textsuperscript{137} It is especially the beginning with the use of the verb ‘bresta’ which seems significant; the phrase ‘purrum fŏtum’ where the Latin only has \textit{sicci} is, on the other hand, well attested, cf. David McDougall. ‘Pétr gekk purrum fŏtum.’ \textit{Fötarkefli rist Peter Foote} 28.v.99. Ed. by Alison Finlay et al. London 1999, 18-20.

\textsuperscript{138} Storm, ‘De norsk-islandske bibeloversettelser’, 248.

\textsuperscript{139} fol. Iv8-27. Cf Kirby, \textit{Bible Translation}, 136-137.
Gn 3.7). The 764 scribes again rearrange the text at this point for they postpone any mention of Adam and Eve’s clothing until describing how God expelled them from Paradise. Regardless of that difference, the fact that 238 and 764 share the word ‘laufkyrtlar’ seems to indicate that the biblical material in both manuscripts, as well as the cosmological passage, came from the same source.

It seems, therefore, that both manuscripts used a copy which had a Bible text mixed with cosmological material but that the scribes of 764 reworked the Bible text considerably and rearranged the order of the narrative elements. They also introduced extraneous material into the biblical narrative, such as the information that Satan turned himself into a serpent with a woman’s face, a detail popularised by Comestor, which is also included in the account found in Stjórn I albeit with a different wording. 140

The other Old Testament fragment, Stock. Perg. fol. 12 IV, contains a translation of Exodus 4.19-7.15. 764 treats the same events in 3v10-13 — only three lines. It is of course difficult to decide on the basis of such scant material whether the two texts stem from the same translation, but some information may be gleaned from the comparison and it may also be relevant to the question of the biblical source for Stjórn I:

764

Ok er Moyses kom á Egiptaland sagði hann Pharao konungi vilja guðs en hann vildi eigi gera frjálsan guðs lýð. Þá kastaði Aaron niðr vendinum en hann varð at orni. Þá sendi Pharao eftir galdramónnum sinum ok bað þá sjá þetta undr. Þeir snóru sinum vöndum í höggorma, þá svalg höggormr Aarons alla þeira dreka (3v10-13)

Stock. Perg. fol. 12 IV

og er þeir komu fyrir konung toc áron uond upp og kastadi niður fyrir fætur konungi og hírdmonnum hans og varð ûndandrenn þegar ad ormr. Enn er pharao konungr sa þetta undur er ordit var þa sendi hann epter spekingum sinum og galldr manum og er þeir komu a konungs funnd og þeir sau huar höggormar moysis hrocktust. Þa kuodu þeir galдра yfer uondum sinum og kaustuðu þeim niður a golf fyrer konung og syndist konungi og hans monnum sem þeir unnder yrdi ad höggormum og er menn litu a þetta vndur syndist monnum sem hóggormr Aron gleypiti alla vondu þeira gal德拉 manna. (1v22-28)

As Kirby has pointed out, there are certain similarities between Stjórn I and the Vulgate. In phrases which have no parallel in the Vulgate. One of his examples is the wording ‘undr þetta’ in the text above, which is also found in 764. 764 is clearly closer to Stock. Perg. 12 than the Stjórn text is. Although its text is briefer, the wording is similar, both texts have ‘kastaði níðr’ (cf. Stjórn I ‘kastaði fram fyrir’), ‘hann varð at ormi’ (Stjórn I ‘hann verð hann at eitrormi’); ‘sendi eftir galdr móðum’ (Stjórn I ‘lét kalla sér ... galdrættum’). It is only in the last sentence in 764 that significant variants are found: the verb ‘svelgja’ instead of ‘gleypa’ and the noun ‘drekar’ where Stock. Perg. 12 has ‘vondu’. In the first case 764 and Stock. Perg. 12 may simply represent different abridgements of an original where the meaning of devoravit was rendered by two verbs, ‘svalg ok gleypi’, both preserved in Stjórn I. In the latter example 764 seems to echo dracones of the Vulgate but Stock. Perg. 12 follows the original more closely, rendering virgas eorum faithfully. Despite these seemingly close similarities between 764 and Stock. Perg. 12, they might nevertheless be explained by the fact that both texts adhere fairly closely to the wording of the Vulgate, were it not for the phrase ‘sjá þetta undr / sá þetta undr’ which both texts have in common with Stjórn I. If one postulates that 764 and Stock. Perg. 12 go back to the same translation one would have to suppose that Stjórn I also depended on it. The evidence is not conclusive, but if it is taken together with the examples cited above, it seems most reasonable to suppose, as Kirby does, that 764, 238 and Stock. Perg. fol. 12 IV, are all
dependent, ultimately, on the same translation, and that the compiler of Stjórn I also made some use of a text of that kind. In addition, the Stjórn I compiler seems to have translated some Bible passages himself, either directly from the Vulgate or from Historia scholastica, as he was adding exegetical glosses to his text.

The nature of the shared translation is harder to determine. As was mentioned above, the exemplar which the 764 and 238 scribes had to hand seems to have been interspersed with encyclopaedic passages and there are also traces of extraneous material in Stock. Perg. 12. This led Kirby to suppose that the translation which was the source for all these texts was of a Stjórn III-type, which is entirely plausible. He argued, further, that behind that text was another of a Stjórn II-type, and explained the relationship between Stock. Perg. 12 and Stjórn I by supposing that both ultimately went back to a Stjórn II-type translation. There is no real evidence for this assumption and if one takes the view that Stjórn I was only partly based on an existing translation, it becomes redundant.

It is perhaps also significant in this context that 764 does not contain any passages which are derived from that part of the Pentateuch which is represented by Stjórn II. The only material in 764 which belongs to that part of the Bible are the ten commandments. These are not entirely pentateuchal since the first four commandments take the following form: ‘trúða á guð ... sverja eigi hégóma við guðs nafn ... elska guð af òllu hjarta ... elska náunginn sem sjálfsan sig’ and the two last ones are omitted (cf. 3v20-23). The commandments as they stand in Stjórn (300.34-301.19) are a faithful rendering of Ex 20.2-17. They are also found in AM 194 8vo and in AM 310 4to but no two versions are entirely compatible and none of them has a formulation similar to that in 764. The 764-scribe may well have added the commandments from memory since they are likely to have been a part of elementary education — that he or she did not keep them apart from the New Testament dictates of caritas (Mc 12.30-31) could be a result of an association of the two within the catechism where the Ten

---

141 Kirby, Bible Translation, 71-72 and 150.
142 Ibid., 55-56.
143 Ibid., 72.
144 Ibid., 72.
commandments only gradually acquired a significant independent status. That development reached Norway around 1350 whereupon "Guds 10 budord" blir ... gjenstand for undervisning og omtales som almindelig kjendte af hver mand". The scribe who wrote the commandments in 764 may have been of the 'old school', educated before this change of emphasis took hold in Iceland. The adaptation of the caritas-dictates to the decalogue may have been influenced by the formulation in Romans 13.8-9 where several of the commandments are firmly linked to the precept of loving one's neighbour. Examples of a similar treatment of the decalogue are found in Old English and Old Frisian sources.

There is therefore no evidence in 764 of a text which covered the whole of the Pentateuch although the scribes clearly had some sort of text of Genesis and Exodus 1-18. It must be considered a possibility that the Bible translation called Stjórn III contained only those parts of the Pentateuch together with the existing Joshua-Kings part. That would be in keeping with the narrative-oriented editorial practice which is predominant in 764 but also clearly detectable in Stjórn III as Christine Fell has shown. The rest of the Pentateuch, after Ex 18, largely concerns the establishment of Jewish law and customs which might not have been of much interest to the Icelanders. They therefore continued the story of Moses and the Exodus with the account of Joshua, his successor, and his triumphs in Israel. Stjórn I, which was probably partly based on an existing Stjórn III translation, almost certainly never extended beyond Ex 18 and the reasons for that are made more understandable if Stjórn III never did so either. What follows is that Stjórn II stands alone and was probably produced and transmitted independently of the Stjórn III/I version, as indeed the manuscript tradition suggests.

147 There is a parallel to the formulation in 764 in a Frisian law-code from the second half of the thirteenth century where the second commandment reads 'minne thinne eunkristena like thi selvwm', cf. W.B. Lockwood. 'Vernacular scriptures in Germany and the Low Countries before 1500.' The Cambridge History of the Bible II. The West From the Fathers to the Reformation. Ed. by G.W.H. Lampe. Cambridge 1969, 416. For the OE parallels cf Cross and Hill (eds.). The Prose Solomon, 108-110.
4.2.5. The Prophets

The remainder of the biblical material is focused on the prophets, and significant events in the history of the Jews, such as the transmigration from Babylon, are linked to their flourishing, as is also the practice in *Imago mundi* for instance (e.g. III.17). The 764 text is mostly very brief and it is not easy to see whether it comes from a Bible text or simply from some sort of a list or chronicle.

The Books of the prophets often circulated separately in the Middle Ages. Part-Bibles, containing in one volume the major and/or minor prophets, or a smaller selection, were common. The question therefore arises whether the account of the prophets in 764 could have been based on such a collection of biblical texts. That does not seem, at least on the face of it, the likeliest explanation of the prophet-material in 764. No traces of an Icelandic translation of such a work have survived although a vellum codex containing the prophets in Icelandic is listed among old books belonging to the cathedral at Skálholt in 1644. It is unlikely that the scribes who worked on 764 used a Latin part-Bible directly, since evidence from the rest of the manuscript indicates that they did not normally translate anything afresh but relied on existing translations.

Given the brevity of the references to the prophets another possible explanation for this material might be that the scribes had access to some sort of catalogue of prophets. This is an attractive hypothesis since the manuscript includes other catalogues, of the apostles, of popes, patriarchs and emperors, and the scribes were thus obviously fond of lists of all types. There are, however, some things which indicate that the compilation of the catalogue of prophets was the scribes' own work. They seem to have augmented their list of prophets partly by repeating material which they had already included, such as the episode about Habakkuk and Daniel and the story of Samuel's conception and birth. They also include within their definition of prophets both those who appear as characters in the historical books of the Old Testament, and those who give their names to separate books. The scribes show that they are well aware of the reason for the

---


150 *Bjsks. Bps. A, VII, s. 53*. An inventory of Viðey in 1397 lists '12 prophetae minores' (*DI IV, 110*) and there were two 'libri prophetarum' at Hólar in 1569, one apparently with commentary (*DI XV, 217*).
terms ‘major’ and ‘minor’ when applied to the prophets for they state that ‘fyrir þá sök eru þeir hinir meiri spámenn kallaðir at þeir hafa fleiri ok meiri bær kr gert en xij aðrir þeir er hinir minni spámenn kallaz’. The major prophets are all included, but although the scribes list all the minor prophets they only elaborate on Jonah, Habakkuk and Malachi, possibly because they did not have any material to hand concerning the others. The situation was different in the case of Nathan, Elijah and Elisha, because there the scribes were presumably able to draw on their copy of Stjórn III, and the passages on Isaiah and Jeremiah also fall within the scope of the Books of Kings but are not derived from the eponymous books. The brief information on Ezechiel is on the other hand consistent with the opening of the book that goes under his name but the reference is so general that it need not have come directly from the Bible. The same may be said of a brief passage on the transmigration from Babylon, which could have come from an encyclopaedic work rather than from the Book of Ezra since the passage has no obvious verbal correspondences with the latter. Veraldar saga treats the same events equally briefly, but, again, without any verbal parallels to 764.

The information on Malachi and Jonah in 764 is without parallels in native sources and it is not a simple Bible reference because it is glossed: Malachi’s name is said to mean ‘engill drottins, at þeim [gyðingum] þóttu svá væt orð hans vera sem þá at engill guðs mælti þat er hann kvað upp’, and in the passage on Jonah Jerome is cited as authority for the identification of Jonah with the young man resuscitated by Elisha. Jerome is also referred to on f. 3r12 and these references may have the same source, which might have been a Stjórn III-type text, dependent on Historia scholastica which makes frequent references to Jerome. But there may equally well be a different explanation for these references and they need not be connected in this way; Jerome was after all auctoritas and frequently cited.

151 10r2-3. The division into major and minor prophets goes back to St Augustine, cf. A. Legner. ‘Prophet(en)’. LfThK 8, 798.
152 Veraldar saga, 39.15-40.10.
It seems that firm conclusions regarding the prophet catalogue in 764 will elude us. The scribes were clearly relying on a source which was augmented with some exegetical material. Whether this source was a glossed Bible text, similar perhaps to Stjórn III, or a text of a more encyclopaedic nature which listed some (or all) of the prophets and explained their identity and names, it is not possible to determine.

That the prophets carry such emphasis in 764 may be explained partly by the predilection the scribes show for dynasties of all sorts, as mentioned above. This fondness for tracing the sequence of leaders must be viewed in connection with the overall preoccupation with chronological order within the scheme of the aetates. That the prophets are deemed to merit such attention also has theological reasons in that they serve as prefigurations of Christ. 155 The Lord reveals himself to the prophets, or perhaps rather reveals himself to mankind through them, for as the creed states the Holy Spirit 'spoke through the prophets'. 156 The prophets were perceived as God's mouthpieces, as is clear from the comment on Malachi cited above. In the history of the world therefore, the stories of prophets may be seen as a preparation for the story of him who is greater than all, Jesus Christ.

155 Legner, 'Prophet(en)', 802.
156 This is the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed which was in use from 451 onwards, cf. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, 296-298.
4.3. The Book of Daniel

4.3.1. Daniel material in AM 764

At the end of Kings IV the Jews have been exiled to Babylon by the great king Nebuchadnezzar. Here Stjórn ends but in AM 764 this episode is followed by stories from the Book of Daniel (Dn) which are set in the times of Nebuchadnezzar and where he is one of the characters (4v26-5v25).

The Daniel material in 764 seems to have started at the wrong end, as it were, because there is on f. 4v a partly erased account, based on the deuteronomical chapter 14 of Dn in the Vulgate, of how Daniel was thrown into a den of lions at the instigation of the priests of Bel, and how the prophet Habacuc was carried from Judea by an angel to feed him. This chapter in the Vulgate borrows the motif of the lions' den from chapter 6 of the book where Daniel spends one night with the lions as opposed to seven days in the story of Bel's priests.

In 764 the brief narrative about Daniel and Habacuc is followed by a few lines (4v36-38) mentioning other evil deeds perpetrated by Nebuchadnezzar until he repented ‘með þeim hætti sem nú skal heyrraz’ (4v38). What then follows (5r1-16) is a heavily abridged version of Dn 3-4, which serves as an account of Nebuchadnezzar's repentance, and a more or less complete text of Dn 5 which tells the famous story of Nebuchadnezzar's son Belshazzar (Balthasar) who saw a hand write on the wall of his dining hall words that spelt his doom (5r16-5v20). The rest of the book is then omitted except for a brief account of the events which followed Daniel’s exposure of the priests in the stories of Bel and the dragon and led to his confinement in the lions’ den. This is the same incident which the text on 4v relates, but here there is no mention of Habacuc. This is not the whole story, however, as regards 764, for the tale of Habacuc’s journey through the air to bring Daniel food is retold on f. 9v32-40 in a section about the prophets of Israel, among them Habacuc.157

An attempt may have been made to erase the passage on 4v when the book was put together and when it was realised that not only did it preempt

157 The episode is also incorporated into Gregory’s Dialogues and can be read in the Icelandic version, cf. HMS I, 216.
events which were told later and there in the right order, but that it included the Habacuc anecdote which was duplicated in the account of the prophets.

It has been pointed out that the book of Daniel is unique among the Scriptures in that it consists of independent episodes rather than a continuous narrative.\(^{158}\) It is therefore not particularly surprising that only some of these episodes should be included in 764. The Book of Daniel falls into two parts, the first containing narratives in the third person, the second consisting of four visions or apocalypses told by Daniel himself.\(^{159}\) In addition the Vulgate version contains three stories which are regarded as apocryphal by Jews and Protestants but deuterocanonical within the Roman Catholic church. (There is also a deuterocanonical interpolation in Dn 3 of the Vulgate, the Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the three young men.) These episodes, about Susanna and Bel and the dragon, are more akin to the stories in the first part of the book, for they are proper tales. It is only this sort of material which is included in 764 — the visions are left out altogether. It probably indicates a preference on behalf of the scribes/compilers for texts with a strong narrative streak.

4.3.2. The reception of Daniel in the Middle Ages

The Book of Daniel was well known in the Middle Ages. It entered the liturgy of the Church in early times where, in addition to lectiones, parts of the deuterocanonical prayer of the three youths in the furnace (Benedictus es Domine (Dn 3.52-56) and Benedictic (Dn 3.57-88)) were used as antiphons, typically at lauds, and as hymns with Mass, particularly on the Saturday of Ember Days.\(^{160}\) The text in 764 attests this where it states that the youths ‘sungu ... guði lof dictandi psalminn Benedictic’ (5r10-11). Apart from its uses in the liturgy the book served as an inspiration for a great variety of literary works, from homilies to religious drama, from exempla to epic.\(^{161}\) This varied reception was perhaps partly due to the heterogeneity of the book itself. Despite the

---


\(^{159}\) Ad. Lenglet has argued that the way the episodes in the first part are organised creates structural parallels within the book, cf. Ad. Lenglet. ‘La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7.’ *Biblica* 53 (1972), 169-190.

\(^{160}\) Cf. F. Cabrol. ‘Benedicte et Benedictus es Domine (cantique).’ *DACL* 2, 660-664.
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apparently diverse uses to which the book was put, one can nevertheless discern
three themes which seem above all to have exercised influence on medieval
audiences and ensured the popularity of the work in the Middle Ages.

Ever since Jerome wrote his influential commentary on the book, the
visions of Daniel were seen to prefigure events leading up to the Last
Judgement, and the coming of Antichrist in particular. The Book of Daniel
thus became an important element in eschatological lore. AM 764 even bears
witness to this since, in the passage on the Last Judgment on ff. 22v23-23v4,
there is a reference to the three youths in the fiery furnace (Dn 3.19-21). Because
the Book of Daniel was thus so closely associated with the end of the world, it,
or parts of it, became a more or less fixed element in the universal histories of
the Middle Ages. Thus Icelandic works which aim to sketch Christian history
through the six ages usually refer to some of Daniel’s exploits. The most
substantial treatment is found in Veraldar saga which emphasises Daniel’s
prophetic qualities and includes a passage on his ordeal in the lions’ den and that
of the youths in the fiery furnace. The accounts of the ‘heimsaldrar’, aetates
mundi, found in AM 194 8vo and AM 415 4to refer to Daniel much more
briefly, but he is obviously one of the signposts of history as is also witnessed by
his inclusion in a cosmological-historical question and answer sequence found in
AM 624 4to.167

Another theme from the Book of Daniel which especially captivated
medieval minds was the fate of the kings Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. That
the book could be read as an admonition to rulers against pride was not lost on
medieval commentators and it gave rise to literature in other genres which
emphasised this aspect of the stories. Thus the Old English poem Daniel ‘deals

162 Commentariorum in Danielem libri III(IV) in Hieronymus presbyter. Opera Pars I, Opera
Nebuchadnezzar. The exegetical tradition of Daniel IV and its significance for the Ywain
romances and for German vernacular literature.’ Frühmittelalterliche Studien. Jahrbuch des
Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung der Universität Münster 16 (1982), 398.
163 Mark A. Zier, ‘The Medieval Latin Interpretation of Daniel: Antecedents to Andrew of St.
Victor.’ RTh 58 (1991), 47.
164 Veraldar saga, 35-39.
165 A/I, 52.
166 A/III, 53.
167 A/III, 39. Daniel is also mentioned along with the Virgin, Susanna, David, Moses, Peter and
Paul, in a prayer against illness found in AM 461 12mo, cf. A/III, 114.
168 Zier mentions that Hrabanus Maurus recommended his commentary on Daniel to King Louis
specifically with the pride and humbling of Nebuchadnezzar\textsuperscript{169}, devoting less attention to Daniel's prophetic abilities. Graham D. Caie has argued that the central theme of the poem is 'the danger of \textit{superbia}, the origin of all sins'\textsuperscript{170}, as manifested in the stories of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. There are echoes from the Book of Daniel in other literature about kings — one can only assume that the parallels thus drawn added an apocalyptic resonance to the narrative. \textit{Visio Karoli magni} from the 860s tells of a vision experienced by Charlemagne, parallel to the story of the handwriting on the wall, which purportedly foretold his downfall\textsuperscript{171}. Nebuchadnezzar's famous dream where he sees an image of gold, silver, brass and iron (Dn 2.31-35) served as a model for King Ólaf Haraldsson's dream as recounted in the Icelandic \textit{Rauðúlfs þáttr}, written in the first half of the 13th century\textsuperscript{172}. It has also been suggested that the story of king Nebuchadnezzar's pride and humiliation may have reverberated in the minds of the Icelandic audience of \textit{Hrafñkels saga}, leading them to draw parallels between the fate of the two men\textsuperscript{173}. Whether that was the case will of course remain an hypothesis but the discovery of a translation of parts of the biblical story in 764 at least makes it unnecessary to suppose that only those who could read Latin were capable of making the connection\textsuperscript{174}.

The tale of Nebuchadnezzar's dream enjoyed great popularity in the Middle Ages and Daniel's interpretation of it as signifying four successive kingdoms was to become a standard feature of histories as well as a bone of contention among historians for centuries\textsuperscript{175}. The interest in dreams and their significance was the third element that ensured the Book of Daniel its favourable reception in the Middle Ages. There is a testament to that interest in a passage in Bergr Sokkason's \textit{Nikulás saga} which discusses the nature of dreams and quotes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{169} Antonina Harbus. 'Nebuchadnezzar's dreams in the Old English \textit{Daniel}.' \textit{English Studies} 75 (1994), 489.
\item \textsuperscript{170} Graham D. Caie. 'The Old English \textit{Daniel}: A warning against pride. \textit{English Studies} 59 (1978), 1.
\item \textsuperscript{171} Zier, 'The Medieval Latin Interpretation of Daniel', 55 n. 36.
\item \textsuperscript{172} Anthony Faulkes. \textit{Rauðúlfs þáttr. A study.} (Studia Islandica 25.) Reykjavík 1966, 12-29.
\item \textsuperscript{173} Theodore M. Andersson. 'Ethics and Politics in Hrafñkels saga.' \textit{Scandinavian Studies} 60 (1988), 293-309, esp. 296-301.
\item \textsuperscript{174} \textit{Ibid.}, 301.
\end{itemize}
Daniel's words to the king. In addition, Daniel's great reputation as a dream interpreter spawned popular collections of dream lore, which were often ascribed to him and commonly known as the *Somniale Danielis*. The work probably originated in the Greek-speaking world but circulated in the West in many versions, Latin and vernacular, and became one of the most popular books of the Middle Ages. It eventually found its way to Iceland and it so happens that an Icelandic version is preserved in AM 764, although it is not contemporary with the rest of the manuscript but rather written ca. 1500 on the verso side of f. 33. The text is almost certainly derived from a copy of a longer version but it is impossible to determine when the *Somniale Danielis* was brought to Iceland; it may have been as early as the twelfth century, but it could easily have been later.

The Book of Daniel has left other traces in Icelandic medieval literature, but apart from *Raudílfs þáttr* the most significant use of Daniel material is in a homily in *Hauksbók*, a compilation from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The homily touches on the story of the youths in the fiery furnace (Dn 3), then goes on to treat more fully the story of Daniel's dealings with king Darius and his spell in the lions' den (Dn 6), and finally recounts the deuterocanonical stories of Bel and the dragon (Dn 14). The narrative is not based on the Vulgate however. As has been shown, first by J.C. Pope and later more fully by Arnold Taylor, the entire homily is a translation of Ælfric's Old English sermon *De Falsis Diis*.

---

176 HMS II, 86-87. Daniel and his prophetic abilities are furthermore referred to in *Antonius saga* (HMS I, 80, 110) and *Mauritius saga* (HMS I, 649). Cf. also n. 176.


178 There are quotations translated from Daniel in a couple of homilies as well as in *Barlaams saga ok Jósafats, Jakobs saga postola* and *Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jakobs*, cf Kirby. *Bible Quotation I*, 111-112.

179 *Hauksbók*. Ed. by C.R. Unger. København 1892-96. The homily, entitled 'Um þat hvaðan ótrú hófst' is on pp. 156-165 and is in that part of this composite work which bears the ms. no. AM 544 4to.

There is no direct connection between the *Hauksbók* text and the Daniel text found in AM 764. The latter is clearly based on the Vulgate, but only 5r16-5v20 (Dn 5) can be said to be a direct translation — the other parts are scarcely more than brief summaries of events. The 764 text of Dn 5 differs from the previous biblical passages in 764, which derive from Stjórn III, in that it is hardly at all augmented with extraneous material or comments. The translator (or the scribe) has on one occasion made a significant rearrangement. The words which the hand writes on the wall, and their meaning in Latin, are in 764 inserted into the narrative at the point when the hand appears (5r20-23) whereas in the Vulgate this information is withheld until Daniel explains the message to the king at the end of his speech (Dn 5.25-28). Apart from this change we find in the 764 text only some minor rearrangements and abbreviations, mostly at the beginning and end of the chapter, and inaccuracies or mistranslations are rare. A few words have been accidentally omitted in copying on one occasion: ‘ök fyrir þá mekt ok miklan er guð gaf honum óttaðiz hann ok hræddiz [allr lýðr]’ (5v7-8; *et propter magnificentiam quam dederat ei universi populi tribus et linguae tremebant et mutuebant eum* (Dn 5.19)), and the translator or the scribes have added ‘um vij ár’ to the description of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness (5v12). That information is taken from Dn 4.28: *et septem tempora mutabuntur super te*. There are also some minor substitutions, such as the one at 5v37 where *cui rex posuit nomen Balthasar* (Dn 5.12) is supplanted with ‘er konungr kastaði í dýragróf’, presumably because that event was more firmly associated with Daniel in the audience’s mind than the name-change.

Although the translation can thus be said to be faithful on the whole, it is not always eloquent. It gives the impression of being an odd combination of awkward near-verbatim translation and a freer, more idiomatic rendering. The style is not heavily latinate although Latin influence may be detected in the syntax and choice of word forms. As an example one might take the use of the interrogative pronoun ‘hvørr’ as relative pronoun (as well as a possible misreading of *praefatus*) in this clumsy rendering: ‘Nú sem Daniel var inn leiddr fyrir konung hverjum inn leiddum sagði konungrinn:’ (5r37-38; *igitur introductus est Danihel coram rege ad quem praefatus rex ait* (Dn 5.13)). There is also an instance of the use of ‘at’ as a relative conjunction in the sentence
‘hvær sem sá er at lesit fær þetta letr’ (5r27; the first four words clearly echoing the *quicumque* of the Latin). Both these relative contructions seem to be characteristic of comparatively late works, i.e. from the late thirteenth or fourteenth century. The present participles of the Vulgate are occasionally retained (‘ritandi’ 5r20 for *scribentes* Dn 5.5; ‘heilsandi’ 5r32 for *proloquens* Dn 5.10). Present participles and latinate uses of the past participle (e.g. as a rendering of abl. abs.) are proportionally more frequent in the summarised account of Dn 3-4, for example: ‘bjóðandi’ 5r2; ‘ofn brennanda’ (5r4; *fornacem ignis ardentis* (Dn 3.6)); ‘segjandi’ (5r11-12); ‘voru kastāðir í þviliðan ofns bruna’ (5r8; *missi sunt in medium fornacis ignis ardentis* (Dn 3.21)); ‘at bundnum höndum ok fótum’ (5r7; *ligatis pedibus* (Dn 3.20)). Not all these participial constructions can be traced to the Vulgate and hence may be taken to reflect the taste or style of the scribe who is summarising.

One of the more obvious characteristics of the style is the frequent placing of pronominal possessives before nouns:

En síðan hann hóf upp *sitt* hjarta ok digra drambsemi þá var hann niðr sett af *sinum* veldisstöði ok ríki ok brott borin hans dýrð, ok af *sinum* eignum út rekinn. Ok hjarta skógðyra var honum gefið ok miðr elgum ok skógðýrum var hans bygð um við ár. Gras át hann sem uxi ok hans líkami var vökvær dögð himinsins þar til er hann kenndiz við at hinn hæsti guð hefð valdi yfir ríki manna. (5v9-14)

Word-order of this kind is not prominent in earlier (twelfth- and thirteenth-century) Norse prose where the possessives, being usually placed after the nouns, carry light emphasis. Reversing the position changes the rhythm of the sentence and gives the possesses added emphasis, delaying the main word in the construction, the noun. This characteristic can be seen in various works from the late thirteenth and the fourteenth century — it is very pronounced in *Piðreks saga*, for instance, and is also a feature of many fourteenth-century romances. It seems to have gained currency in the course of the fourteenth century.

---

century, probably through Low German influence by way of Danish and Swedish.\(^{183}\)

There are two instances of the practice of rendering a Latin word with two alliterative Icelandic ones: 'digra drambsemi' (5v10) for *superbiam* (Dn 5.20) and 'mekt ok miklan' (5v7-8) for *magnificientiam* (Dn 5.19). The latter is also found in Stjórn I (242) and might have been the customary gloss for the Latin word. A similar tendency to amplify the text by using two words or phrases instead of one is manifested in the sentence: 'skelfdu hann mjök hugrinnigar hans ok hræddan gerðu svá mjök at losnuðu samfestingar hans lenda...' (5r23-24; *cogitationes eius perturbabant eum et conpages enum eius solvebantur* (Dn 5.6)). The word 'samfestingar' for Lat. *conpages* is paralleled in Stjórn II (307\(^{20}\)) — probably a regular school-gloss.

The vocabulary does not present many surprises. The word 'dróttinari' deserves mentioning, however. It occurs once only ('mótt guði dróttinara himins' 5v16) and is not attested elsewhere except in Stjórn I (20\(^{16}\), in a gloss taken from *Speculum historiale*. The verb 'dróttna', on the other hand, is well known and occurs predominantly in religious prose as a translation for Lat. *dominare*.\(^{184}\)

The word 'dróttinari' seems to be derived from the verb — in the same way as for example 'skapari' and the rare 'ljósberari' are formed, that is by adding the suffix '-ari' to the stem of the verb. These formations are parallel to, but later than, formations like 'dómari' or 'skipari' where the noun is derived from another noun ('dómr', 'skip').\(^{185}\) The suffix was originally a Germanic loan from Latin *-arius*, but its use in Norwegian/Icelandic may have been strengthened through Low German influence — there are certainly numerous instances of loan-words ending in '-ari' in fourteenth and fifteenth century charters.\(^{186}\)

There are not many vestiges of Latin in the vocabulary except that the Latin interpretation of the words *mane*, *thcel*, *fares* is left untranslated (5r21-


\(^{184}\) The ONP has two examples of 'dróttna' for *impero* (VP and Alex.) and one for *conforto* (Gyð.)

\(^{185}\) Allan Karker. 'Orddannelse.' KLNM 12, 639.

23). Otherwise, the translator refrained from peppering his translation with Latin words. As an example one could mention the Latin word *onager* (Dn 5.21), wild ass, which is found untranslated in the Icelandic *Physiologus*,187 but which is here translated as ‘elgr’ (5v17). The habit of associating the elk with the *onager* seems to have originated in Southern France around 1300 but it quickly caught on in Scandinavia and is common in late medieval Swedish sources.188 This usage of the word ‘elgr’ in Daniel firmly suggests that the translation is a fourteenth-century work, a dating which tallies with the other linguistic and stylistic evidence discussed earlier.

4.3.4. The context and purpose of the Daniel material in 764

The fact that Dn 5 is included in its entirety imperfectly copied from a faithful translation suggests that the Daniel-material in 764 was not written from memory. The scribes selected passages from the text to include in their miscellany, and the story of Belshazzar and the handwriting on the wall found greatest favour with them. One can but guess why the other passages are given such short shrift and some not included at all. The first chapter of Daniel does little more than set the scene for later events, except that it tells the story of how Daniel and his companions avoid eating unkosher food. It may have been omitted because it meant little to an Icelandic audience. The only item which is salvaged from this chapter is the detail about the aliases Daniel and his companions were given at the court of Nebuchadnezzar. This information is inserted into the story of the golden image and the youths in the furnace (5r4-5). Chapter 2 in Daniel tells of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the composite statue. This is omitted altogether by the 764 scribes. One could be forgiven for thinking that was because they knew it was already incorporated into *Raudulfs þáttur*, but of course there is no way of knowing.

Chapters 3 and 4, about the worship of the golden image and Nebuchadnezzar’s madness, are the first Daniel stories told in 764 if one excludes the partly erased account of Habacuc’s visit to the lions’ den. The introduction to these two stories about Nebuchadnezzar is also partly erased, but it seems to emphasise the penitential element in his fate: ‘.... nokkut af

187 Verner Dahlerup. ‘Physiologus i to islandske bearbejdelser.’ *ANOH* 1889, 266.
Nabogodonosor konungi er hann lét gera líknesku ............ [flyrsta manns ok margt illt lét hann gera allt þar [til] .............. iðran með þeim hætti sem nú skal heyraz' (4v36-38). This is then followed by a prayer beginning with ‘Christus’. It cannot be said for certain what the fragmentary Latin contained, but it appears to arise from Nebuchadnezzar’s restoration and his ‘hymn’ acknowledging God’s greatness (Dn 4.31-34). Given this assumption, and bearing in mind the theme of repentance associated with Nebuchadnezzar’s changed state, the Latin could have been a reiteration of the accepted doctrine that ‘den fullkomliga ångern var tillfyllest för uppnående av syndernes förlåtelse, redan före mottagandet av avlösningen’. The little that can be read — *In quavis hora suscipit absque mora* (4v39 ‘at whatever hour [a man] undertakes (?) without delay’) — would not be at odds with this interpretation: contrition, which is the first and insofar sufficient step to repentance, satisfaction and restoration, can be experienced at any time up to the last moment of life. After relating, on the subsequent page of the manuscript, the story of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness the scribe ends his treatment of this king with the statement that he ‘bráz alldri guði síðan’ (5r15-16), indicating that through his repentence he had been completely and permanently restored. This theme of contrition is paralleled earlier in the manuscript in the emphasis which is put on Solomon’s madness, caused by ‘the love of women’, and his subsequent repentance (4v5-10) which, as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, marks the end of the king’s story in 764. Attention has recently been drawn to the penitential elements of the Old English Daniel and although that theme is not as pronounced in the Daniel-text in 764 it seems that not only the perils of pride but also the importance of repentance was a concern of the Icelandic scribes and presumably their audience.

As is well documented the succession of the kingdoms as portrayed in Daniel 2 and 7 is not historically accurate. It is clear from Dn 2 that the first kingdom is the Babylonian one but the others are not named in the chapter nor are they specified in Daniel’s vision of the beasts representing four monarchies in chapter 7. In chapter 8, on the other hand a ram and a billygoat are said to symbolise the kingdoms of the Medes, the Persians and the Greeks. By bringing

---

188 John Bernström. ‘Ásnor.’ *KLN* 20, 460-461.
189 Jarl Gallén. ‘Botsakrament.’ *KLN* 2, 182.
190 George. ‘Repentance and retribution’, 178-184.
ch. 8 to bear on the two other accounts of the kingdoms, exegetes came up with a succession of the Babylonian (Chaldean), the Medean, the Persian and the Greek monarchies. This was not, however, historically accurate since no Median kingdom existed between the Babylonian and Persian empires. The passages in Daniel rested upon oriental traditions about four world-monarchies to be followed by a fifth. Christians came to interpret Dn 2 and 7 as a prophecy of the coming of Christ and the establishment of the Church, the fifth and greatest empire. The adoption of the theory of successive world-empires was not, however, peculiar to Judeo-Christian traditions. It was also known to the Greeks and the Romans who saw the Assyrian kingdom as the first empire, followed by the Medes, the Persians and the Macedonians/Greeks before the rise of the Roman empire.192 This sequence of succession was passed on, with varying degrees of variation, into the works of Church Fathers and other exegetical and historical works of the Middle Ages.193 A version of the Roman scheme is found on f. 9v19-22 in 764 and has a parallel in Veraldar saga (cf. p. 153). In it the Medes have been replaced by the Babylonians (Chaldeans), which may be an attempt to reconcile the succession based on Daniel with the Roman model.

Keeping track of dynasties in kingdoms far away in time and space could evidently prove tricky. Matters are not helped by confusing information, such as when Darius is said, in the Book of Daniel, to be a Mede — yet he succeeds the king of Babylonia and appears to have been in turn succeeded by Cyrus the Persian. The scribes of 764 do not seem too put out by this inconsistency and the sequence of kings is the thread which runs through their presentation of the Daniel material. Despite severe abridgements and the selectiveness with which sections of the book Daniel are copied in the manuscript, the lineage of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius, Cyrus and Cambyses/Nebuchadnezzar is maintained. One suspects the editor(s) turned for help to a vernacular work like Veraldar saga or a Latin source like Imago mundi, although complete reconciliation of the biblical narrative with the information found there was beyond them. Veraldar saga has several wordings in common with 764:

Imago mundi lists the Babylonian and Persian kings of the fifth age thus:

Regnum Babyloniorum. (...)  

Regnum Persarum.

The scribes of 764 follow the tradition reflected in the text of Imago mundi and of Veraldar saga in giving Cambyses the alias Nebuchadnezzar and assigning the story of Judith to his reign. But whereas in Imago mundi and Veraldar saga Judith is only mentioned in passing, the scribes of 764 included in their manuscript a translation of the entire Book of Judith.

---


194 The same information is also found in Bede’s Chronica majora 153, cf. Opera VI, 2, 484.
4.4. The Book of Judith

4.4.1. The origins of the Vulgate text and its reception in medieval times

Folios 5v34-6r contain an Icelandic translation of the deuterocanonical Book of Judith, not found elsewhere. This section of the chronicle distinguishes itself from the rest in that it contains a relatively full text — not a heavily abridged version of the Latin — and thus seems to constitute a deviation from the editorial principles adhered to in the rest of the chronicle. A fortunate thing indeed, given that this is the only preserved text of the translation.

The Icelandic version is clearly a translation of the Vulgate text, which differs markedly from both Old Latin versions and the Septuagint. Much uncertainty surrounds the original language of the Book of Judith but the Septuagint version is thought to be a translation from Hebrew.\(^{195}\) The Old Latin versions, in turn, are based on the Septuagint.\(^{196}\) An even greater controversy surrounds the origins of the Vulgate text, which is the work of Jerome, accompanied by his preface. It is neither a translation of the Greek text nor, it seems, of a Hebrew one. Jerome himself claims to have used an Aramaic (Chaldean) text for his translation and comparative analysis appears to confirm this.\(^{197}\) There are, however, numerous correspondences between the Vulgate and the Old Latin versions which have been explained variously as a case of the Vulgate contaminating the Old Latin, which only exists in relatively late manuscripts,\(^{198}\) or by supposing that Jerome used an Old Latin text as well as the Aramaic text for his translation.\(^{199}\) The matter is further obscured by the fact that Jerome’s method in translating the text was most likely characterised by paraphrase rather than a word-for-word rendering. The Vulgate version omits many passages contained in the Septuagint and Old Latin texts but there are also some additions which are not found in other extant versions.\(^{200}\)

---


\(^{197}\) Voigt, The Latin Versions, 52-54.

\(^{198}\) Ibid. 42-44, 50-52.


\(^{200}\) Moore (ed.). Judith, 99-100.
The Book of Judith has had a strong appeal throughout the ages, judging from the numerous versions that exist of the story and the many works of art it has inspired — from renaissance sculptures to playing cards. Although it was excluded from the Hebrew canon it remained popular among Jews — several Hebrew texts exist as well as numerous medieval midrashim (or expositions) of the story. It had a mixed reception among Christian Church Fathers, some accepted it as canonical, others did not. The Eastern Fathers seem to have been more sceptical in this respect, and generally they denied the book canonical status. In the West, on the other hand, it was recognised as part of the canon by the majority of Church leaders, for instance Hilary of Poitiers, St Augustine and Pope Innocent I, and praised by those, in particular, who like Judith chose and/or advocated celibacy (St Ambrose is a case in point).

The inclusion of the book of Judith in the Vulgate ensured its reception in the West. Judith became a symbol of the fighting Church, Christ’s bride, in the fight against Satan and she also came to represent the Virgin crushing the head of the serpent. The biblical text spawned Judith literature of other genres — Judith poems or fragments of poems have survived in Middle High German and in Old English. The Old English Judith, which dates from before 1000, has often been interpreted as a patriotic exhortation to the English facing the invasion of Danish Vikings. This reading is supported by Ælfric’s comment on the Book of Judith in a Letter to Sigewead. Ælfric also wrote a homily on Judith where the emphasis is not so much on the heroine as a model patriot but rather as an example of chastity. Ian Pringle has argued that Judith, in both Ælfric’s homily and in the poem, is ‘an example of monastic virtue’, the qualities attributed to her in both works are chastity, hope and faith. Pringle also points out that ‘the possibility that the extant manuscript of the poem was

---

202 Moore (ed.), Judith, 103.
203 Ibid., 90
204 Ibid., 64.
intended for a monastic library suggests that it was considered relevant to a monastic audience, just as Ælfric's homily on Judith was certainly addressed to a nun.  

4.4.2. Literary characteristics of the Book of Judith

The story of Judith does indeed seem a fitting read for nuns. The heroine is a widow who after the death of her husband devotes herself to chastity and piety. She is rich and beautiful but also a model of modesty and well liked by everyone. She commands such respect in her village that the priests of the people show deference to her and, what is more, she goes on to outwit the enemy and commit deeds of undisputed bravery. This combination of virtue and independence that so characterises Judith is likely to have gone down well with abbesses and their subjects.

In addition to the qualities of its heroine the Book of Judith makes a very entertaining read. This has long been recognised by scholars although the full merits of the text and the ingenious structure of the narrative have been brought more firmly to light in recent studies. Because Judith herself only enters the story in its eighth chapter, the first seven chapters have often been regarded as peripheral and redundant, the work thus perceived as lacking in balance. Such arguments were refuted by Toni Craven in her compositional study of the work which is based on the Septuagint text. She argues that the first half of the story serves as a necessary preparation for the events which unfold in the second half and also creates a powerful contrast to it, both in terms of structure and theme. In Part I the figure of King Nebuchadnezzar (and Holofernes by proxy) dominates the action and nothing seems to be able to stem the aggression of the Assyrians, whereas in Part II it is Judith who is the catalyst for events and the ultimate reversal of fortunes. As Craven points out, repetitions and symmetries are the building blocks of the story and she lists four types of these. Firstly,

---

‘expressed identities’, e.g. the fact that both halves end with the enemy in distress, the Jews in the first half, the Assyrians in the second. Secondly, ‘expressed antitheses’, e.g. both the Jews and the Assyrians are filled with fear which is described in identical ways but the grounds for this fear are direct opposites: the Jews fear Holofernes alive but fear descends upon the Assyrians when they learn of his death. The third type Craven refers to as ‘implied antitheses’, e.g. sexual opposites, Judith vs. Holofernes, and the opposition between Nebuchadnezzar who claims divinity for himself and Yahweh, the true God. These qualities of the Greek version do not hinge so much on the vocabulary or on grammatical or stylistic devices, but rather on characterisation and the unfolding of events, and they are therefore preserved to a large extent in the Vulgate, and consequently in the Icelandic translation. The fourth type of symmetry identified by Craven, the so-called ‘artificial identities’, fare worse in translation since they consist of ‘subtle grammatical or functional correspondences between parallel passages in the respective halves of the story’.

According to Craven, the two halves of the story are structured in an identical way, based on a three-part chiastic pattern (A-B-C-B-A). The most significant parallel between the two parts is the movement of characters between the two camps (element C), and this parallel well illustrates the identities and antitheses that characterise the whole story. In Part I it is Achior (a non-Jewish man) who is cast out by Holofernes and involuntarily crosses over into Bethulia. In Part II Judith (a Jewish woman) willingly makes the opposite journey from Bethulia to the Assyrian camp. The symmetry between the two parts is broken by the core event of the whole story: Judith’s killing of Holofernes, which has no counterpart in Achior’s actions.

Another marked characteristic of the Greek narrative, according to scholars, is the use of irony, and irony on a multiple level. It has even been claimed that this is the key to the whole story. The valour of the Assyrian

---
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army and its general, Holofernes, and the authority of the Jewish priests is repeatedly undermined by verbal puns and comic juxtapositions to underpin the ultimate irony — that the invincible Holofernes falls by the hand of the woman he intended should fall for him. Again, some of the more subtle points are lost, or at least not as pronounced, in Jerome’s translation but the more general aspects of the irony cannot have been lost on the audiences of the Vulgate text or of the Icelandic version.

4.4.3. The translation: characteristics and date

The Icelandic Judith is on the whole a faithful rendering of the Latin text in which the translator combines word-for-word translation with paraphrase. It is clear that the text in 764 is a copy — seven lines are repeated where a new scribe (E) takes over at the top of f. 6v. As mentioned earlier, the scribes do not seem to feel any urge to cut the text although there are exceptions to this, mainly of two kinds. The scribes, or indeed perhaps rather the translator, sometimes trim the text of what might be viewed as superfluous information. This is usually on a small scale as when it is described how the Assyrians bound Achior, the leader of the Ammonites, to a tree. The Icelandic text merely reads: ‘ok bundu Achior jarl við þre mikit með reipum’ (7rv18-19) whereas the Vulgate has *ligaverunt Achior ad arborem manibus et pedibus et sic vinctum de restibus dimiserunt eum* (Iud 6.9). The translator (or the scribe) is similarly liable to cut corners when it comes to geographical descriptions (and they sometimes plainly get it wrong, which perhaps is no wonder\(^{216}\)), and leave out some of the details concerning time that are found in the Latin text. An example of this is found on 6v:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Icelandic</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Nú fer Holofernes með her sinn allt til Ydumeoz á jörð Gabaa ok tök borgir þeirra. Ádr vann hann allt Apaniam</em> (6v7-8)</td>
<td><em>pertransiens autem Syriam Subal et omnem Apamiam omnemque Mesopotamiam venit ad Idumeos in terra Gabaa accepitque civitates eorum et sedit ibi per triginta dies in quibus diebus adunari praecipit universum exercitum virtutis suae</em> (Iud 3.14-15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{216}\) The geographical and historical facts in Judith are not accurate. Moore has suggested, following Charles C. Torrey, that this inaccuracy was intended, that it is one aspect of the irony of the work, cf. *Judith*, 79.
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There is another example in the following lines, where the translator simplifies the text and makes it clear that it was in Babylon that the Jews were captives:

764
En fyrir nukkurum mannsólðrum
hurfu þeir af götu þeiri er guð sýndi
þeim ok urðu þa hertknir austr f
Babylon
(7r5-6)

Vulgata
nam et ante hos annos cum
recessissent a via quam dederat illis
Deus ut ambularent in eam
exterminati sunt proelis multis
nationibus et plurimi eorum captivi
abducti sunt in terram non suam
nuper autem reversi ad Deum suum
ex dispersione qua dispersi fuerant
adunati sunt et ascenderunt
montana haec omnia et iterum
possident Hierusalem ubi sunt
sancta eorum
(Jud 5.22-23)

And, a little later, the Icelandic text conveys the sense but does not use the emphatic phrase of the Latin:

764
En er Egipta konungr sótti eftir þeim
með her sinn þá fellu vöttnin yfir
höfuð honum ok her hans. Druknúðu
þeir allir.
(6v37-38)

Vulgata
in quo loco dum innumerabilis
exercitus Aegyptiorum eos
persequeretur ita aquis coopertus est
ut non remaneret vel unus qui factum
posteris nuntiaret
(Jud 5.13)

Similarly, the translator clearly does not think Achior’s assurance that he is telling nothing but the truth worth retaining:

764
Ef þá herra laetr þér söma at hlýða
minni frásðgn mun ek segja þér
frásðgn frá lýð þessum er á fjalliniu
safnaz.
(6v28-29)

Vulgata
si digneris audire domine meus dicam
veritatem in conspectu tuo de
populo isto qui in montanis habitat et
non egredietur verbum falsum ex
ore meo
(Jud 5.5)

(This is in fact an example of how the Icelandic text prunes away details which serve to enhance the irony of the story. By emphasising the fact that Achior is telling the truth attention is drawn to the irony that Holofernes does not believe him and punishes him for his sound advice, but is later taken in by Judith’s lies, a fatal error which ultimately leads to defeat for the Assyrians.)

A more substantial abridgement occurs in speeches. The translator (or in this case quite possibly the scribe) apparently had little patience with lengthy
monologues and so shortened speeches, prayers and hymns, even those of the heroine herself. The Icelandic text usually retains the beginning of these but leaves off at the earliest opportunity in order to continue telling the story proper, as it were. A good example of this is Judith’s speech before the priests of the Jews where the Vulgate verses 8.20-27 are left out of the translation altogether, and further cuts may be seen at Vulg. 9.16-19, 11.12-16 and 16.2-21. This tendency to cut down or to summarise material which is not strictly relevant to the plot is well known from other Icelandic translations; it has for example been discussed in relation to Stjórn II,217 the Book of Joshua (B-version) in Stjórn III,218 and Gyðinga saga219, all dated to the thirteenth century.

In terms of omission and abridgment the translator of Judith thus seems to work in the same vein as translators of the late twelfth and thirteenth century. When it comes to amplification and supplementation of the Vulgate text, the translator is restrained compared with the editors of the younger parts of Stjórn and of Gyðinga saga, not to mention some translators and copyists at work in the fourteenth century who greatly expanded and ornamented their exempla.220 The Judith translator does not introduce any substantial piece of extraneous material or commentary; he or she occasionally adds a sentence, or part of a sentence, by way of explanation but this is more often than not the result of a rearrangement of the syntax undertaken to achieve an idiomatic translation.

764
Hann sendi þá sina menn ok eyrendreka til allra landa þeira er eigi voru undir hans ríki, fyrst at herja þaðan til Damasco ok Libano, til Karmelo ok Cedar ok í Galilea ok allt á hinu miklu heiði Esdrelon. Hann sendi þá ok til Samarita héraðs ok fram um Jordan allt til Jerusalem ok þaðan um alla jörð Jesse unz þeir komu allt til Blálands fjalla. Hann sendi þá þess eyrendis at biðja þessar þjóðir allar þjóna Nabugodonosor konungi (6r3-8)

Vulgata
et misit ad omnes qui habitabant in Cilicia et Damasco et Libano et ad gentes quae sunt in Carmelo et Cedar et inhabitantes Galileam in campo magno Hesdraelon et ad omnes qui erant in Samaria et trans flumen Iordanem usque Hierusalem et omnem terram Jesse quosque pervenit ad montes Aethiopiae ad hos omnes misit nuntios Nabuchodonosor rex Assyriorum (lud 1.7-10)

In the third example quoted above (6v37-38), the translator has amplified the text slightly with an alliterative addition: ‘yfir hófuð honum ok her hans’.

---
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Such alliteration occurs sporadically in the text but it is neither as marked a feature of the translation as in some other Old Norse translations\(^{221}\) nor does it usually substitute one word in the Latin by two alliterative ones, although the odd example may be found (cf. e.g. 'milldr ok miskunnsamr' (7v9) for *pius* (Iud 7.20)). Alliteration occurs more usually as a verbatim albeit stylised translation of the original:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ælfgarce</th>
<th>Vulgata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bótt þessi lýður hefði hvárki skjóld né skeyti eða sverð</td>
<td>ubicumque ingressi sunt sine arcu et sagitta et absque scuta et gladio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6v47-71r)</td>
<td>(Iud 5.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigi er þvílik konu á landinu at vænleik ok list ok vízkú ok orðfæri</td>
<td>non est talis mulier super terram in aspectu in pulchritudine et in sensu verborum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8r37-38)</td>
<td>(Iud 11.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, the translation is a faithful one, often rendering the Latin word for word. This does not mean, however, that the style is heavily latinate. Judith shows many of the features which scholars have associated with translations from the twelfth and early to middle thirteenth century and which they have referred to as saga-style, emphasising the similarities it bears to the style of many of the sagas.\(^{222}\) The style of the early translations has thus been described as relatively untainted by Latin syntax and constructions — the translators render Latin constructions using native idioms with the result that the style of translations in many cases does not differ markedly from the style of the indigenous literature.\(^{223}\) In Judith examples of this may be seen in the way characters are introduced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ælfgarce</th>
<th>Vulgata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arfaxat er nefndr Medialands konungur er undir sik haði lagt margar þjóðir</td>
<td>Arfaxat itaque rex Medorum subiugaverat multas gentes imperio suo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5v34-35)</td>
<td>(Iud 1.1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Í þann tíma var ekkja sú í Bepulia er Judith er nefnd, dóttir Merari ... Maðr hennar hét Manases</td>
<td>Et factum est cum audisset haec Judith vidua quae erat filia Merari ... et vir eius fuit Manasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7v 14-16)</td>
<td>(Iud 8.1-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{221}\) Gyðinga saga is a case in point, cf. Wolf. *Gyðinga saga*, cxxxi-cxxxii; and this is also prominent in Stjórn III. Cf. also Eyvind Fjeld Halvorsen. ‘Lærð og folkelig stil — Island og Norge.’ *KLNM* 11, 119; Idem. ‘Høvisk stil.’ *KLNM* 7, 315-318.


\(^{223}\) Jónas Kristjánsson, ‘Learned style or saga style?’, 290-291.
The syntax is paratactic rather than hypotactic and the translator frequently breaks long Latin sentences up into several shorter ones, turns present participles into indicative forms and renders absolute ablatives by (temporal) clauses:

764

Dá þyngdiz Egiptalands konungr við þá ok þjáði þá til at elta leir ok at smiða sér borgir. Þeir kölludu þá á guð sinn. En þá laust himna guð Egiptalands lýð margis kyns undrum ok ráku þeir þá þenna lýð í brott. Þá léttu af þegar undrin. En þá vildu Egiptar þegar taka þá ok þrálka. En er þeir flyðu þá lauk himna guð upp it rauða haf ok stóðu vótnin á tvær hendr svá sem veggir ok gekk þessi lýð þurrum fötum um djúp sjóvar.

(6v33-37)

Eftir þat gengu þeir á brott en Judith fór í bænahús sitt ok þyngdiz hárkæði ok jós ösku yfir hofuð sér ok fél til járðar ok kallaði til dróttins ok mæli svá: Dróttinn guð föður míns Simeons er honum gaft sverð at berjaz í móti útendum þjóðum er saurguðu ok sneyddu meyjar ok konur

(7v 34-37)

Present participles are retained on one occasion, in one of Judith’s speeches:

764

Lifir dróttinn því at mik varðveiti engill hans bæði hóðanfarandi ok fráverandi ok higat aftr hverfandi ... heldr kallaði hann mik án saurgan til yðvar fagnandi í sigri hans

Vulgata
cumque gravaret eos rex Aegypti atque in aedificationibus urbium suarum in luto et latere subjugasset eos clamaverunt ad Deum suum et percussit totam terram Aegypti plagis variis cumque eiecissent eos a se Aegyptii et cessasset plaga ab eis et iterum eosvellent capere et ad suum servitium revocare fugientibus his Deus caeli mare aperuit ita ut hinc inde auae quasi murus solidarentur et isti pede sicco fundum maris perambulando transirent

(1ud 5.9-12)

Vulgata
quibus abscendentibus Judith ingressa est oratorium suum et induens se cilicio posuit cinerem super caput suum et prosternens se Domino clamavit ad Dominum dicens Domine Deus patris mei Symeon qui dedisti illi gladium in defensione alienigenarum qui violatores extiterunt in coinquinatione sua et denudaverunt femur virginis in confusionem

(1ud 9.1-2)

The Icelandic syntax is characterised by clauses in which an infinitive or a past participle is ‘delayed’, i.e. appears at the end of the sentence, after the object or a prepositional phrase, with the articles (prepositions, adverbs) often appearing immediately before the verb. This type of syntactical construction is common in Icelandic right up to the nineteenth century, but its distribution has not been investigated thoroughly.224 This type of word order is conditioned — it is only seen in clauses with a compound verb phrase where the main verb is in

the infinitive or the past participle but the auxiliary verb in the indicative or subjunctive. The translator of Judith seems to prefer this ‘delayed-verb’ construction in clauses of this kind, and this device lends the style of the translation a certain rhythm, as the following passages illustrate:

225 Ibid. 31-33.

The rather unusual construction ‘né eigi einu’ in the first of these examples is paralleled in Stjörn III (‘eigi né einn’ 454; ‘eigi né eins staðar’ 618), though not in the B-manuscript (227 fol.).

A few examples of a historic present may be found, where the translator switches between the present and past tenses, all in the latter part of the story:

764
Judith fékk f hendr eskimey sinni beril vins ok viðsmjónser ok steyptar ertr ok brauð ok ost. Síðan ganga þær til borgariðs ok finna þar Óziam ok svá prestari borgarinnar. Ok er þeir sá hana fékk þeim óta ok undruduz ákafliðegurð hennar (8r 9-12)

Vulgata
inposuit itaque abrae suae ascopam vini et vas olei et pulenta et palatas et panes et caseurn et profecta est cumque venisset ad portas civitatis invenerunt expectantern Óziam et presbyteros civitatis qui cum vidissent eam stupentes mirati sunt nimis pulchritudinem eius (Jud 10.5-7)

Síðan tók hon hjúp hans hinn dyra en velti bolnum ór rekjkjanni á jórð. Eftir þat geng hon út ok seldi höfudit ambátt sinni ok bað hana láta f skreppe sína (8v24-26)

et abstulit conopeum eius a columnis et evolvit corpus eius truncum et post pusillum exivit et tradidit caput Holofernis ancillae suae et iussit ut mitteret illud in peram suam (Jud 13.10-11)

En er þat sá Gyðingar at heitiðingjar flyðu sækja þeir eftir með herópi ok lúðráblæstri (9r24-25)

videntes itaque filii Israel fugientes illos descenderunt clangentes tubis et ululantes post ipsos (Jud 15.3)
This is not nearly as marked a feature in Judith as in, for instance, Gyðinga saga and Alexanders saga, where over half the verbs are in the present tense. Judith seems closer to Stjórn (III) in this respect.

Scholars have attempted to ascertain the stylistic significance of the word ‘einn’, used as an indefinite article. Such usage is not in evidence here; the word appears only twice in Judith, once (9r19) as a straightforward translation of una, and once following a noun, ‘kofa einn leyniligan’ (7v17). The word is much more prominent in many of the thirteenth-century translations. As Peter Hallberg has pointed out, it is doubtful whether high frequency of the word in a text is a proof of its relatively late date — Hallberg himself prefers to interpret it as a characteristic of the translator. Bearing that in mind, one could still argue with some caution that the absence of this usage speaks for an early dating rather than a late one. ‘einn’ does occur sporadically in early texts where it appears variously before or after the noun it accompanies. The word is more frequent in younger texts and it stands there, as a rule, before the noun.

The use of the conjunction ‘unz’ is on the other hand rare in texts after 1300. The word occurs four times in Judith (6r6, 6r26, 7v33, 8r4) which indicates that the translation is a thirteenth-century work rather than a later one. A similar indication is given by the occurrence of the preposition ‘of’ (6v10) which was gradually superseded by um in the course of the thirteenth century.

The vocabulary is interesting in many respects. A good deal of it is recognisable from other translations, both of religious texts but also of romances and other texts of chivalric nature (Alexanders saga, Karlamagnús saga). It is perhaps not surprising that the vocabulary in Judith seems to show the greatest affinity to Stjórn. This is partly, of course, due to the similar nature of the originals (all are books of the Bible), but often the translators of these works also seem to have resorted to the same verbal solutions and they frequently show preference for the same words. An example of this might be the word

---
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'fulltingjari' (7r23 for defensor). Stjórn and 764 contain various examples of the related words 'fulltingja' (764:7v38 for subvenio) and 'fulltingr'/'fullting(i)' (764:7r30, 7v13, 7v23, 8v31 for auxilium, adiutorium) and these are also found in the Icelandic Homily Book whereas 'fulltingjari' does not occur in early homilies.231 The ONP has 12 examples of 'fulltingjari', half of them from Stjórn where it is used to translate the words adiutor/adiutorium (5) and auxiliator (1).232 Other verbs frequent in Stjórn and used extensively by the Judith translator are 'fyrláta' (usually for (de)relinquo) and 'treystaz' (for confido or praesum, usually in the pres.part. form), but both are also common in older religious prose, e.g. the Icelandic Homily Book.233

The verb 'förmfa' (intrans.) occurs towards the end of the text (9r35). It occurs frequently in works of religious nature and there are many examples in Stjórn where both the form 'förmfa / förmfa e-t' and the older 'föra förm' and 'föra (e-t) í förm' occur. Judith also contains the example 'föra förnir' (6v22) as well as 'gaf í förm' (9r36). 'förmfa (e-t)' is believed to be the younger expression since, according to the ONP, it is not found in older texts such as the oldest homilies and Stjórn II only has 'föra (f) förm'.

The verb 'knosa' (8r1) occurs here for the Latin contero. Jakob Benediktsson has pointed out that 'knosa' seems to be peculiar to early translations, the Icelandic Homily Book, Stjórn II and a few other thirteenth-century works.234 Jakob also draws attention to the translation 'sé hérna' for ecce which is rendered 'sé hér' in Judith (9r20). Judith, however, shows no examples of the other supposedly old characteristics listed by Jakob; for instance neither a suffixed 1st pers. pronoun nor past participle forms like 'valiðr'.235 The expression 'krjúpa undir skegg e-m' (7v4) has parallels in Trójumanna saga (O) and in Vatnsdæla saga where the verb is 'skrja' rather than 'krjúpa'.

231 Cf. Ludvig Larsson. Ordförådet i de älsta isländska handskrifterna. Lund 1891, 98.
232 The other examples in the ONP are from Marlu saga, Karlamagnús saga and Vitae patrum. It is conceivable that 'fulltingjari' was used as the general word for 'helper' (adiutor, auxiliator) whereas 'hjálpari' was reserved for salvator, cf. Larsson. Ordförådet, 148. 'hjálpari' occurs in later texts in the more general meaning, e.g. in Barl., Mich. and Flat., cf. Fritzner, Ordbog 1, 828.
233 Cf. Larsson. Ordförådet, 102, 333.
234 Jakob Benediktsson. 'Fáein orð um Stjórn II'. Sagnabíning helgard Jónas Kristjánsyni sjötugum. Ed. by Gíslri Sigurðsson et al. Reykjavík 1994, 449-454. Apart from the Homily Book and Stjórn II (4 exx.) the ONP has examples from saints lives (María., Michael, Jón ok Jakob), exempla (VP, Ævintýri) and the two Ólafs sagas (ÖH/Hkr.; ÖFFlat)
235 Jakob Benediktsson. 'Fáein orð um Stjórn II', 450-451.
Much of the rather unusual vocabulary in Judith consists of terms for exotic goods, jewellery or clothes, words occurring in translations of other works which are set in the Mediterranean world. The word 'eyrnagull' (8r7), for instance, occurs in all three parts of Stjórn and in Alexanders saga; 'hjúpr' (8r24 for conopeum) is used in Karlamagnús saga and Elís saga but also crops up in Heimskringla, Hulda and Sverris saga; 'berill' (8r10 for ascopa) is used in Stjórn (III) and Antonius saga for uter and occurs once in the Reykjafjarðarbók of Sturlunga saga; 'steyptar (or 'steyttar') ertr' (8r10 for pulentas) are found in Mariu saga hinnar egipsku and Bevers saga. When faced with the fashion-vocabulary in Judith the translator seems to have been happy to lift a word or two directly out of the Latin text — he does not, for instance, translate sandalla (8r6). The word is not found elsewhere in Old Norse prose texts but crops up in inventories, presumably denoting liturgical shoes.236 The word smaragdus (8r25) seems to be a more widely used loanword — it is found in Stjórn I and in various romances. On one occasion Judith has an Icelandic word for a phenomenon which other translators were content to call by its Latin name. The word 'lemandi' (6r21) for locusta is extremely rare. It is not used in Stjórn where locusta is retained (e.g. p. 326) but it is found in AM 310 4to (dated to 1250-1275) in a passage on the Egyptian plagues and it has been added as a sort of interlinear gloss to a passage in Hauksbók.237 ‘eskimær’ (8r10, 8v18, 9r40) is another rare indigenous word, not found elsewhere except in the prose introduction to Grimnmisdál where it is used of Fulla, Frigg's maid.238

What is clear from this brief examination of the style and vocabulary of Judith is that the translator was keen to render the text in idiomatic Icelandic, using native terms wherever possible. The translation is virtually free of commentary and other extraneous material — there is no trace of material from Comestor's Historia scholastica or other commentaries which were known in Iceland, nor does the translator draw on other books of the Bible in order to amplify the narrative. This puts the text on a par with Stjórn II but distinguishes it from Stjórn I and Stjórn III as well as Gyðinga saga. Considerations of style

236 DI III, 288, 612.
again set Judith clearly apart from *Stjörn* I which is far more latinate. *Stjörn* III\(^{239}\) and *Gyðinga saga* also seem to make more use of stylistic traits, such as alliteration and the use of ‘einn’ as an indefinite article, practices hardly seen in Judith, whereas *Stjörn* II is closer to Judith in these respects. Some aspects of the vocabulary also seem to point to a special affinity between *Stjörn* II and Judith although word-forms in Judith do not seem as old as some found in *Stjörn* II and it should by no means be overlooked that there are also similarities in vocabulary between Judith and the other parts of *Stjörn*.

Dating texts on the basis of style is a precarious undertaking and much of the evidence presented above is inevitably negative, but it seems safe to assume that the Judith-text in 764 derives from a translation done at least hundred years earlier, i.e. sometime in the thirteenth century, and that it belongs to the period which produced most of the other Old Testament translations which we know, that is the two older parts of *Stjörn* and *Gyðinga saga*.

4.4.4. The appeal of the translation

We do not know who was responsible for the translation. Whoever it was knew his or her Latin reasonably well and, if words like ‘eskimær’ are anything to go by, was quite familiar with indigenous literary language too. But why should this book of the Bible have been chosen by the translator rather than some of the others and why did the scribes choose to fill three precious folios in their book with the story of Judith nearly unabridged? The answer lies partly in the fact that Nebuchadnezzar, Holofernes and Judith had won themselves a secure place in universal histories. No account of the *quinta aetas* would be complete without them. But the reason the whole book is included in 764 must surely be that it is an excellent story and appealed to the compilers and their prospective audience. One is reminded of Gabriel Turville-Petre’s remark when discussing early religious Icelandic prose, that ‘in literature of this kind tales were told of Christ, the Apostles, and later saints less because they were edifying than because they were adventurous and entertaining.’\(^{240}\) Although the book of Judith was probably included in 764 at least partly for the purposes of edification, its literary qualities must have added to its appeal. Some scholars have advanced the view that the
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book of Judith has perhaps more things in common with a folktale than it has with much of the historical literature of the Old Testament — it is a neat tale of a hero/heroine on a rescue mission. There are not too many characters, and the tale is structured around sets of parallels and opposites as discussed earlier. Against Holofernes and his servant, Bagao the eunuch, stand Judith and her maid. Achior the Ammonite serves as a sort of involuntary catalyst in the story. The interaction between the primary opposites Judith and Holofernes then builds up to the crowning moment, the very picturesque murder. In the aftermath the roles of the Israelites and the Assyrians are reversed.

The story owes its success in no small measure to its protagonist. Judith is a very complex heroine: she is regularly presented as a saint, yet she behaves in a most unsaintly manner, lying to, seducing and killing Holofernes. She is a beautiful and a rich woman — yet the story tells us that she is not envied. ‘Engimaðr mælti til hennar illt orð’ it says in the text (7v21). Although she is beautiful and rich she chooses to lead a secluded life, wear a sackcloth and observe a regime of fasting and praying. But despite being a recluse and a woman she is able to summon the elders of the community and give them a dressing-down. She accomplishes, through her faith, wisdom and beauty and with God’s help, what the Jewish leaders are incapable of: saving her people from destruction. Her story is in that respect similar to the tale of David and Goliath, another popular Old Testament legend, but Judith’s victory over Holofernes is furthermore charged with sexual desire — inviting interpretations which see it as an ‘exemplification of the perennial battle of the sexes’.

It is not very hard to imagine the appeal this story may have had for the nuns and novices at Reynistáður, if they were indeed the intended readers of 764. The manuscript contains a number of texts (stories and miracles) about women saints: Martha, Ursula, Walburga, the Norwegian Sunnifa, the Virgin Mary (cf.
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Appendix I). In terms of space devoted to her, Judith takes pride of place along with the Virgin. The Virgin is, in this manuscript, as indeed in biblical literature in general, mostly silent. She appears in the apocryphal stories about the infancy of Jesus and in a series of miracles. Compared to her Judith comes across as a woman of flesh and blood. She accomplishes her deed with her own hands, admittedly with the help of God, but the slaying of Holofernes is not depicted as a miracle; it is a heroic action taken by a mortal woman. Judith’s thoughts are revealed through her speeches and her prayers, and the attention given to the details of her daily life, her clothes, her food, also serves to bring her closer to lesser mortals. For the nuns it will also have mattered not a little that here was a woman who was her own mistress, and last but not least a woman who commanded respect for her chastity and for her courage.

4.5. The principles and purpose of the selection of Bible passages in 764

The context of the biblical stories contained in 764 suggests that they were not intended for liturgical uses or for private devotion. It is the historical dimension which is of prime importance in the manuscript and the purpose of the text is didactic. The history is the history of salvation and the characters of the Bible are held up as examples, good and bad. It is therefore revealing to study which stories from the Bible are chosen for inclusion, for the scribes were committed to brevity and had to be very selective.

It is not surprising to find Adam and Eve, Noah and the Flood, Abraham, Moses and David included in the selection, for these are the characters which mark the beginning of each age of the world. But there are other instances, especially in the fifth age, where it is perhaps not immediately clear which principles govern the highly selective choice of material. One criterion clearly involved the prophets, as was mentioned above (cf. p. 113), but it is also evident that the scribes made an effort to include women in their text. This is manifested in the choice of stories where women are often among the principal characters, as well as in the way details about women are retained, or in some cases added, in stories which do not primarily focus on women. As examples of the latter one might take the fact that the wives of Noah, Sem, Cham and Japhet are all named in the story of the Flood although their names are not found in the Vulgate. Wives are mentioned as a rule in 764, even in the briefest of passages, and it is also noteworthy that in the passage on Jacob his sisters Leah and Rachel are mentioned, as is the fact that Rachel was infertile.

A glance through the list of Bible contents in 764 on pp. 90-100 reveals many stories where women play a vital part: Adam and Eve; Sodom and Gomorrah (Lot’s wife); the killing of the woman in Gabaon which sparked the war of the tribes of Israel; the killing of Abimelech by an unnamed woman; Samson and Delilah; Anna, the infertile wife of Elkanah who was blessed with a child, Samuel; the judgement of Solomon; Solomon’s downfall through his 

244 Jean Leclercq suggests that, on the Continent, the majority of Bible translations from Latin consisted of the Psalms and/or other texts intended for private devotion. Translations of the Pentateuch made from the Hebrew bear witness, on the other hand, to an interest in the history of
liaison with foreign women; the story of Judith and the killing of General Sisera (named king in 764) by a woman called Jael. Some of these women are models of virtue, others show themselves to be corruptible and/or corruptive. Some of them bring about the downfall of kings (or in the case of Jael and Judith, his deputy), a good deed when the king is evil like Abimelech, a regrettable one when the king is Solomon.

These stories of kings, prophets and women could serve as illustrations of virtues and vices. The prophets are, as we have seen, examples of virtue and bearers of divine wisdom whereas the kings and the women make up a more mixed party. Some of them fall prey to cardinal sins, above all pride, lust and avarice (Belshazzar, Solomon and Delilah spring to mind). In other cases the characters exemplify Christian virtues: wisdom (Solomon, Judith), strength (Samson), courage (Judith, Jael, Abimelech’s killer), chastity (Judith) and faith (Judith, Anna).

The edifying power of these Bible stories lies therefore not only in their historical significance but also in their exemplary value for the Christian: ‘La connaissance du passé devait, plutôt qu’être une exposition ou une explication des faits, servir de leçon (admonitio) ...’. When selecting ‘lessons’ for girls it would seem natural to include stories of heroes and miscreants of their own sex so that they might more easily identify themselves with characters of virtue and similarly shirk from unacceptable (female) behaviour. The selection of biblical passages in 764, with its gallery of female characters, reflects the audience for which they were in all likelihood intended: novices, women and girls, at the convent of Reynistaður.

---

5. Aetas V: Secular histories

5.1. Introduction

Folios 9v-14r27 are taken up by diverse historical material, most of which may for convenience sake be labelled *secular histories*. Historical accounts of this kind are a staple element in universal histories of the Middle Ages where chroniclers incorporated accounts of secular kingdoms in their overall scheme of salvation history. These histories could be seen as an account of the progression of mankind towards salvation; the secular kingdoms and rulers of the past served as an example for the present, whether their fate was a happy or a grim one.247

Although universal histories are so called because they lay claims to being universal both in terms of time and space, in reality their accounts are inevitably limited geographically. Through the first ages of the world the emphasis lies, predictably enough, on the Mediterranean area. That the history of the Jews was always included is self-evident — the Jews represented, up until the Incarnation, *civitas Dei*, a role later taken over by the Church (with the result that the Jews disappear from the chronicles). In addition, the chroniclers often included the reigns they believed to represent the kingdoms in the Book of Daniel (cf. above pp. 123-125). But the horizon of the chronicles usually narrows (and shifts) the closer the chroniclers get to their own times. German writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, for instance, tend to end their chronicles solely with an account of the Holy Roman Empire. The secular historical material included in works of this kind is of course dependent on the sources available to the compiler, but it is also bounded by his horizon and shaped by his intention. The lack of real universality

was therefore not always felt as a defect by the medieval universal chroniclers themselves, who, rather consciously, tried to follow a straight line in history from the beginning (the creation or Christ’s incarnation) to their present time, a line along the history of the main kingdoms, particularly the Roman Empire (and the Church), thus revealing a certain sense of continuity, but without any special interest in any history off that line.248

247 Paolo Brezzi. *Chroniques universelles*, 236-238.
The inclusion of secular histories in 764 is subject to the same circumstances: the scribes followed a conscious plan, an established tradition, but they were also likely to be interested in material concerning regions geographically close to them and they were of course restricted in their choice by the texts available to them.

On f. 9v the scribes take up where they left off on 4v before digressing into the tales of Daniel and Judith, and in the following pages they attempt to sketch the reigns of the most significant rulers and prophets before the birth of Christ. They begin with Alexander the Great and end with an account of the establishment of the Roman state and its history down to the reign of Octavian Augustus, mentioning on the way the four great kingdoms which were seen as precursors of the fifth and greatest, the Roman empire, and including a treatment of the kings of Britain. Their concern is partly to trace the origins of nations, which leads them back in time to the sons of Adam and the nations which are said to have descended from them. In order to include all this information the scribes must thus occasionally diverge from chronological order, which is nevertheless clearly one of the organisational principles they follow, and, as is to be expected, they also had to draw their material from disparate sources. A good deal comes from the Bible but the longest passages are taken from Breта sёgur and Rόmverja saga or one of its antecedents. Those passages have already been the subject of some scrutiny by scholars and consequently some of what will be said about them below is based on previous studies, and those by Ðorbjёrg Helgadёttir and Stefanie Wёrth in particular. Apart from Breта sёgur, passages parallel to sections of Rόmverja saga and brief sketches of Alexander the Great and the Trojan wars, the thread of the narrative runs through Jewish dynasties. These are not always treated in chronological order: first come the Maccabees, then the ancestors of Jesus Christ, and there then follows an account of the main prophets before the dynasties of Judah and Israel are listed. Some of this material is directly dependent on the Bible. The biblical material was discussed in the previous chapter with the exception of material related to 1 Maccabees which will be considered here in relation to Gyёlinga saga. The information on 10v-11v, where the scribes jump back to the sons of Adam in order to trace the Jewish dynasties, will also be discussed in the present chapter, for although it contains
some biblical material the Bible is not its principal source and its main purpose seems to be to outline the origins of various peoples, as is appropriate in a survey of secular histories.

The transmission of Gyðinga saga, Rómverja saga, Trójumanna saga, Alexanders saga and Breta sögur (sometimes referred to as pseudo-historical works) in Iceland reveals that they were seen to belong together, to be of the same genre. This is manifested in remarks contained in these works where the author/translator of one saga may allude to another and in the way editors augment one saga with loans from another. It is also borne out by the fact that these stories are preserved together in manuscripts. AM 226 fol. is a case in point. It contains all three parts of Sjórn followed by Rómverja saga, Alexanders saga and Gyðinga saga, all in an abbreviated form. The abbreviations and other editorial adjustments to the texts serve, as Stefanie Würth has shown, to forge these sometimes disparate elements into a whole, creating a work which aims to sketch the history of the world from the Creation until the time of Christ. Together the texts form ‘eine “zeitlose” historische Darstellung, wodurch der lineare und ungebrochene Verlauf der Geschichte deutlich wird’. As Würth points out, the number of copies that AM 226 generated shows that this amalgamation was successful and highly popular.

Another fourteenth-century manuscript which displays similar emphasis on history in a broad sense, albeit with an encyclopedic tendency, is Hauksbók, compiled at the beginning of the century for lawman Haukr Erlendsson (d. 1334) and written in part by Haukr himself. Hauksbók contains a mixture of indigenous texts and translated material, historical, cosmological and didactic. Among these texts we find Trójumanna saga, followed by Breta sögur. Icelandic scribes evidently associated the one work with the other early on, for they are found together not only in Hauksbók but also in AM 573 4to, the other main manuscript containing Breta sögur, and both sagas were almost certainly contained in 573’s sister manuscript, Ormsbók, now lost. Whereas in 573 and

---
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Ormsbók the two sagas are coupled with chivalric romances, indicating that the scribes/audiences associated them with the romance genre, Haukr incorporates them in order to create a continuous history from the Trojan war onwards:

Haukr put his editorial mark on the texts he chose and his version is characterised by abridgements which aim at highlighting the historical elements of the narrative but reducing stylistic elaborations and information not strictly relevant to the chain of events. As in the case of AM 226 the texts are selected for a particular purpose and modified to suit that aim.

The scribes of 764 have a purpose like Haukr's: to give an outline of history where historical facts generally take precedence over mythological elements or romance material. On the other hand 764 differs from Hauksbók or 226 in that the scribes are at this point only concerned with the fifth age of the world, the age which ends with Christ's birth. Hence they select only those chapters from the pseudo-histories which can be fitted into that time-slot.
5.2. Alexander the Great

The information on Alexander the Great (9vl-8) is brief but contains what might be said to be the main points of his life: the name of his father and his teacher, the beginnings of his reign and his military campaigns, the fact that out of pride he almost went where only Christ was supposed to conquer, i.e. to Hell, and finally his death and the division of his empire among his twelve successors. The beginning is clearly based on 1Mcc but it does not correspond with the wording in Gyðinga saga, which has a much freer text. It should however be remembered that the beginning of Gyðinga saga is only preserved in the shorter (younger) redaction in AM 226 where it follows immediately after Alexanders saga, so the beginning is likely to have been modified (cf. the remark 'sem fyrr var ritat').

There are sketchy references to the Maccabees later in 764 (11r31-11v4) and these refer in part to that section of Gyðinga saga which is based on Historia scholastica, but exact verbal correspondences are equally elusive there (cf. pp. 156-158). Owing to the fragmentary nature of the Maccabaean material in 764 it is difficult to determine whether the beginning of the Alexander passage is based on a version (unabridged) of Gyðinga saga, or directly on the Vulgate — or perhaps an entirely different source. In addition to echoes from Gyðinga saga (1Mcc) the Alexander passage also shows clear correspondences with the account given of Alexander in Veraldar saga:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>764</th>
<th>Veraldar saga</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander hinn riki var son Philippi Macedo. Hans meistare hét Aristoteles. Hann riktír fyrst allra konunga i Grecia án nokkuru skattgjaldí. Hann drap Darium konung Persarum ok Medorum ok er svá at kveði í bökum at hann hafi lagt undir sik mjók svá allan heim með herskildi. Starfði hann í þeim hernaði nær xij vetrum. Hann lagði ok á hálss sér undirgefnun konungum ok var hann dregginn af þeim í keru um borgir. Hann hafði þá við orð at herja til helvitis. Ok er hann var kominn með hermenn sínna í Babilon</td>
<td>Eptir Cambises helz Babilonis riki til þess er Alexander in mikli Grikia konvngr felldi Darivm konvng ok eignadiz alt riki hans. Alexander kannadi alla sydralfo heims ok bardiz við marga konvnga ok hafði íamnan sigr. hann lagði ok &lt;a&gt; hals konvngom ók ok let þa draga kerri vndir ser vm borgir. Alexander var yfirkonvngr .xii. vetr. hann drac eitr til bana í Babilon. hann let gera hofvdborg þa a Egiptalandi er Alexandria hétir. Alexander skipti riki sínv með .xii. monvum ok varo þeir allir</td>
<td>Et factum est postquam percussit Alexander Philippi Macedo qui primus regnavit in Graecia egressus de terra Cethhim Darium regem Persarum et Medorum constituit proelia multa et omnium obtinuit munitiones et interficit reges terrae et pertransit usque ad fines terrae et accepit spolia multitudinis gentium et siluit terra in conspectu eius (1Mcc 1.1-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

764 thus shows correspondences with the Vulgate on the one hand and with Veraldar saga on the other. The Vulgate material is of a general nature and it is not likely that the compilers of 764 introduced a fresh translation of passages from 1Mcc into a text based on Veraldar saga. The Vulgate text must rather have been already augmented with additional information on Alexander in the source the scribes were copying and that source would have been related to Veraldar saga. How the Alexander material these works share was introduced into Iceland is difficult to determine. It could have been a biblical commentary since information on Alexander played a relevant part in the exegesis of the Books of the Maccabees, but it is more likely that it was already part of a chronicle. A parallel to the statement in 764 and Veraldar saga that Ptolemeus gave his name to successive kings is for instance found in Imago mundi (III.24).

The information in AM 764 which is found neither in 1Mcc nor in Veraldar saga can for the most part be explained by reference to Alexanders saga, Abbot Brandr Jónsson’s (d. 1264) translation of Gautier de Châtillon’s Alexandreis. Aristotle figures prominently in the saga as Alexander’s teacher and it must also seem likely that the wording ‘er svá at kvæðit í bókum at hann hafi lagt undir sik mjökt svá allan heim með herskildi’ (M-3) alludes, at least in part, to Alexanders saga and its detailed descriptions of Alexander’s conquests. The statement that Alexander was the first king in Greece who did not pay any tribute is made neither in Veraldar saga nor Gyðinga saga, but Alexanders saga begins with a story of how incensed Alexander became, while still a boy, when King Darius’ men came ‘scatt at heimta af Philippo konunge. þann er hverr eptir
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When Alexander becomes king himself he takes his army to challenge Darius — the reader may infer that Alexander certainly did not offer to pay tribute to the Persian king.

Similarly, the words ‘Hann hafði þá við orð at herja til helvítis’ (9v5) become understandable in the light of *Alexanders saga*. Towards the end of the saga it is told how Alexander, after conquering Asia, has come ‘nalega ... til heimsenda’. There he proclaims the world to be too small for his ambition:

![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

This statement by Alexander is followed in the saga by an allegorical interpolation where Nature personified, dismayed at Alexander’s pride, travels to Hell where she urges the Lord of Darkness to find a way to stop Alexander from conquering Paradise and possibly thereafter Hell. The Lord of Darkness agrees that Alexander’s conquest must be forestalled, but he says he knows that another man will be born on Earth, ‘vndaðarlegar getinn oc vndaðarlegar borenn en ec mega scilia. Þesse man briota þessa ena sterkví berg, oc eyða vart riki með einv tre því er of mikill timi man fyllgia’. 260 This is obviously a reference to the coming of Christ and the harrowing of Hell. The hosts of Darkness then hatch a plan to kill Alexander by poison and choose as their agent his vassal Antipater of whom they say that ‘[Alexander] vill enn hava hann fherferðurn með ser. en honom leiðez sa starfe. þvían þeir tr æt elldaz’. 261 It seems likely that the scribes of 764 found here the basis for their claim that Alexander was killed by his men because they were tired of warfare: ‘leiddiz mönnunn hans mjók þvílíkt starf’ (9v6).

*Veraldar saga* mentions Alexander’s death by poisoning but does not state explicitly that it was due to treachery. Such information is found, on the other hand, in *Gyðinga saga* where it is mentioned not once but twice, 262 and goes back to the Greek Alexander romance, the so-called Pseudo-Callisthenes,
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which states that several of Alexander’s men plotted against him with the help of his servant, Iullos, who administered the poison.\textsuperscript{263} George Cary remarks in his book on medieval conceptions of Alexander that the idea that Alexander’s premature death was due to ‘treachery assisted by drunkenness was generally brought forward by writers upon kingship, concerned with the threat of treachery, the need for continence in all things, and the troubles that surround a king’\textsuperscript{264} That this element of the story was of interest to Icelandic chroniclers need not be surprising given the rich native tradition of literature on kings and kingship, and the attention devoted to the circumstances of Alexander’s death in \textit{Alexanders saga}.

\textit{Alexanders saga} cannot, on the other hand, be the source for the statement, which \textsuperscript{764} shares with \textit{Veraldar saga}, that Alexander was driven around in a chariot by the kings he had subjugated. The Pseudo-Callisthenes does not seem to contain anything similar except that it tells of how Alexander’s grieving followers put his body upon a wagon and marched from Babylon to bury him in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{265} The Pseudo-Callisthenes became the source for many Latin works on Alexander, of which Quintus Curtius’s \textit{Historia Alexandri magni} was the most influential.\textsuperscript{266} Curtius describes how Alexander punishes King Betis of Gaza by having him shackle to a chariot drawn by horses, but there is no mention of Alexander as a passenger.\textsuperscript{267} The Icelandic remark on the chariot-ride may have its origins in Curtius’s account, but it is not clear how the story came to be so elaborate, painting a picture of Alexander humiliating more than one of his vassals by having them drawing his chariot. Opinions were certainly divided from the earliest times on Alexander’s merits, and his pride was the cause for much unfavourable portrayal.\textsuperscript{268} It may be simply that the Icelander originally responsible for the introduction of this information, or his source, saw the chariot-ride as characteristic of Alexander’s pride. But it is also conceivable

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{263} \textit{Leben und Taten Alexanders von Makedonien. Der griechische Alexanderroman nach der Handschrift I.} Ed. by Helmut van Thiel. (Text zur Forschung 13.) Darmstadt 1974, 160-162.
\item \textsuperscript{264} Cary, \textit{The Medieval Alexander}, 104-105.
\item \textsuperscript{265} Ibid. 164-166.
\item \textsuperscript{267} ‘Per talos enim spirantis lora traiecta sunt, religatumque ad currum traxere circa urbem equi, gloriantre rege ...’ Quintus Curtius Rufus. \textit{Historiarum Alexandri magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt.} Ed. by Edmund Hedicke. Leipzig 1908, IV. vi. 29.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
that this portrayal was influenced by other stories of unpopular rulers riding in a chariot. 269

I Mcc provides the material for the next few lines, which relate, in a very cursory manner, the campaigns of the Maccabees. The 764 text is inaccurate here, the name of Eleazarus, one of the brothers, has for instance changed to Timotheus, possibly through confusion with Judas Maccabæus’ adversary of the same name (cf. 1 Mcc 5.6-7). The text, perhaps predictably, corresponds in places with Gyðinga saga’s account of these same events, but 764 is occasionally closer to the Vulgate Latin than the text of the saga:

764

Litlum tíma stóarr fædduz
Machabæi synír Mathathie
er svá hétu: Judas, Johann-
es, Jonathas, Thimoteus ok
Simon. Voru þeir allir hinir
mestu hermenn en þó var
Judas langt yfir aðra at styrk.

Vulgata 1 Mcc
In diebus illis surrexit Mathathi-as
filius; Ioannis... et habebat filios
quince Ioannem qui cogn-
ominabatur Gadis et Simonem,
qui cognominabatur Thasi: et
Judas, qui vocabatur Machabæ-
us: et Eleazarum, qui cognomi-
abatur Abaron: et Jonathan, qui
cognominabatur Apphus (2.1-5)

Æ er svá lesit af honum at
hann væri risi at mikilleik en
at grimmleik sem it ðarga
dýr.

Hann drap Apollonium
hershöfðingja er striðd í Æ
Israels fólk ok tók sverð hans
ok barðiz með því alla sina
daga.

Gyðinga saga
Þenna tíma birtir sík ok upp riss.
sa madr er het Mathathias jonsson
... Hann atti v. sonu alla agiêta.
Einn het Jon. ok kalladr Gaze,
Annarr simon thasi. þríd íudas
Machabhus. Fjördi Eleazar abiron.
Fimti jonathas assus. (14.5-10)

Hann var ogurligr vndir
herklæðum. mikill sem risi.
grimmigr sem leo. (20.6-7)

Jonathas hertugi bröðir Jude
sendi þjár þúsundir
hermanna til líveizlu við
Demetrium konung. Félu f
þeim bardaga e þúsunda af
þeira móttöðu mönnum.
Var só sigr mest kenndr
Jonathe. (9v8-14)

Jonathas sendir kongi ijj. kappa
med miklum her... ok drepa af
þeim þann dag c. (þúsunda)
manna. ok frelsa kong undan
dauda. of fengu of fíar. ok verda
ebrei storum agiêir af þessu
(84.13-85.2)

The similarities between 764 and the Vulgate text and the disagreement between 764 and Gyðinga saga mean that Gyðinga saga can hardly be the source for the

268 Cf. Cary, The Medieval Alexander, e.g. 80-95; 135-142
269 Christopher Marlowe’s Tamburlaine (Act IV.3) provides a later example of the use of this theme in literature, cf. The complete works of Christopher Marlowe. I. Ed. by Fredson Bowers. Cambridge 1973, 200.
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text in 764 here, at least not the only source. It is well established that Gyðinga saga contains additions to 1Mcc drawn from unidentified sources and this is especially true of the first chapter of the saga. The relationship between 764 and Gyðinga saga might therefore be explained by assuming that both drew upon the same or a similar source, a historical work of some sort, based (in part) on the Bible. Such a source has already been suggested for the passage concerning Veraldar saga (cf. above, p. 149). 764 contains two other passages which are related to Veraldar saga. The first one concerns Abraham and is added to 764 on slip 2bisr, the second one lists the four world monarchies and is found on f. 9v19-22, i.e. shortly after the passage on Alexander. These two passages correspond almost verbatim to the text in Veraldar saga (cf. 15.8-16.6 and 43.10-16), and they thus create closer parallels than the Alexander passage does where the Veraldar saga material seems to be only one of several elements in the 764 text. As mentioned above, it is not likely that the 764 scribes created their own pastiche by translating the Vulgate afresh and augmenting it with commentary from vernacular sources. A more plausible explanation would be that they used a text which had parallels to Veraldar saga as we know it, but which contained other material as well. That material might possibly have been of use to the author of Gyðinga saga. It must be stressed, however, that the whole issue concerning the relationship between all these texts remains highly conjectural. And there is more to the question of the source for 764's account of Jewish history, as we shall see in the next section.

---
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5.3. Christ's genealogy and Jewish dynasties

A red rubric in line 9v14 reads: ‘Hér hefr ættartölü eftir herleiðing hinu miklu til guðs sonar’ and after f. 9 a slip has been inserted with additional information on the kinship between the Virgin Mary and Joseph; they were third cousins. The genealogy picks up where it was last left (4v16) and brings it down to Christ, stating in the case of each man where he stands in relation to Abraham (cf. e.g. ‘Salathiel var hinn ixus ok xxus af Abrahame’ (9v15-16)). Christ's lineage is of course found at the beginning of St Matthew's Gospel as well is in Luke (3.23-38) and the scribes could well have worked out the genealogy from Scripture, but they could equally well have copied it from a chronicle which listed the generations from Abraham to Christ. The fact that the ordinal numbers have a Latin form (ending in -us) could possibly be seen as evidence for the latter explanation.

After the passage on the four monarchies on f. 9v19-22 the story of the Jews continues with an account of the prophets. Folios 9v24-10r42 are taken up by biblical material already discussed, which is organised around an account of significant prophets of the Jews (cf. pp. 111-113). We will now turn to f. 10v and an account of the origins of various states and of Jewish rulers down to the Incarnation.

The backbone of this account is a text which 764 has in common with AM 194 8vo. These two manuscripts were written at about the same time and the correspondences between them reveal that they share a common source. The beginning of the account is as follows:

764
Nú er sem hverfi aftr til sonar Adams Kains. Hann kallaz rækkr ok rekinn fyrir þann glæp er hann drap Abel bróður sinn sem fyr segir. Þá var hann xxx. Kain för unz hann kom á Índialand. Þar nam hann stað ok gerði þar borg. Þá kallaði hann Enos. Gaf hann borginni nafn sonar Þins ok gaf sér konungs nafn. Sú var borg fyrst gerr í heimi. Kain er sagt at fyrst tók fyrir ofríks sakar ok annan veg at röngu þat er aðrir áttu. At honum nám margir þeir er annarra eigu tóku ok hurfu af því honum til handa ok gerðu af því borg med þonum.

Lamek drap Kain. Synir Lameks <voru>

194
Abel son Adams var xxx, þa er Kain broðir hans va hann, þat var nær þi, er nu stendr borg su, er Damascus heitir, þat hefir vig verith fyrst í heimi. Kain Adams son var rekinn fra öðrum monnum eptir vig Æbelis bróður Þins, sem gud bauð, ok for hann þar til er hann kom á Índialand, þar nam hann stæð, ok gerði þar borg ok gaf henne nafn sonar Þins og kalladi hana Enos, su var borg ger fyrist í heimi. Kain gaf ser konungs nafn ok girtiz fystr allra manna til þessa heims metorda. Kain tok fystr allra manna fyrir ofríks sakir at raungu þat, er adrir menn attu, ok þottiz hann af þi *** ath gera, ath hann mellt ofredr um sik kvera. Ath honum namu margir þeir, er annara eign toko, ok hurfu fyrir þi honum til handa ok gerdu borg med honum. (Al 146-24) Hans son het Lamech ... hann var bani Kains frenda Þins. Iohel hit hans son, hann fann fystr manna tialld-
This information belongs to the first age. The use of the phrase 'sem fyrr segir' indicates that the scribe is well aware that he/she is repeating information offered earlier in the manuscript. He/she shows some attempt at curbing the text to avoid excessive repetition, the information about the trades Ioel, Iubal and Tubal introduced is omitted and their sister Noema is for instance left out altogether, which makes the sentence 'Pau systkin fóruz í Nóa flóði' a non sequitur. In addition the scribe shows the abridging tendency which is evident almost throughout the manuscript. He/she shortens the text wherever possible, skips a word or two, and so contracts sentences, or omits whole sentences if doing so does not disrupt the sequence of rulers.

764 traces the rulers of the Jews initially down to the time when the Trojan war is said to have taken place. When it comes to the era of the judges the two manuscripts diverge. 194 does not name all the judges; it refers to Samson and mentions that Samuel was 'efstr eptir domendur' and then goes on to name the main protagonists of the Trojan war. 764 on the other hand follows the sequence of rulers down to Akialon, giving the reign of each in years and touching upon the war between the tribes of Israel, and then goes on to tell of the Trojan wars (cf. p. 159). The two manuscripts come together again with David, Solomon and Rehoboam (11r16-17) who in 194 belong to the fourth age of the world since that manuscript adheres to the more conventional Isidorian scheme of aetates mundi (cf. above p. 66). The manuscripts are then in some sort of agreement until the end of the fourth age according to the scheme followed in 194. At that point 764 continues with a list of the kings of Israel until the
Babylonian captivity and then onwards to the time of Herod, whereas 194 moves to the Babylonian, Persian and Egyptian kings, ending with the Romans.\textsuperscript{272}

The skeleton for the account of various reigns is found already in Isidore's \textit{Etymologies} (V.xxxix), but there is additional information in the Icelandic text of a kind which makes Honorius Augustodunensis' \textit{Imago mundi} a closer parallel. Both 194 and 764 for instance list the prophets who lived during the reign of Ozias.\textsuperscript{273} Their names are found neither in Isidore nor in Bede's \textit{Chronica maiora} but Honorius includes them (IM III.17).\textsuperscript{274} Material of this sort was of course ubiquitous in chronological and historical works of the Middle Ages but since \textit{Imago mundi} was well known in Iceland (cf. pp. 82-83) and is mentioned moreover on f. 3r4 of 764 it is highly likely that that work was indeed the main source of these regnal lists in the two manuscripts. The fact that they diverge may even provide an additional argument in favour of \textit{Imago mundi} as a source. \textit{Imago mundi} divides its account of the reigns up into sections, not only according to \textit{aetates} but with subdivisions in which an attempt is made to treat the various dynasties separately within each age. This sets \textit{Imago mundi} apart from the accounts of Isidore and Bede. If the scribes of 194 and 764 were using an Icelandic translation of the \textit{Imago mundi}, it becomes more readily understandable that they should go off in two different directions, as it were, in the fifth age. They choose the information which suits their purpose. The scribe of 194 was writing a shorter work and wanted at this point to cover other reigns as well as the Jewish dynasty. The scribes of 764 were concerned with tracing the rulers of the Jews down to the time of Christ, before turning to tales of the British and the Romans.

Before continuing the discussion of the relationship between 194 and 764 it is necessary to turn to a part of the regnal list in 764 which cannot be traced to \textit{Imago mundi}. The treatment in 764 of the history of the Jews after the exile, i.e. 11r31-11v4, has a slightly different character from that of the preceding list. Starting with Judas Maccabæus, the scribe stops giving the years of each reign but at the same time the information on each king (or leader) is not quite as brief

\textsuperscript{271} \textit{AI} I, 50.
\textsuperscript{272} \textit{AI} I, 52-53.
\textsuperscript{273} Cf. 764: 11r19-20 and \textit{AI} I, 51.24-25.
\textsuperscript{274} One could also mention the information included in 764 on the Jewish civil war (10v31-34) which is paralleled in IM III.7, but not mentioned by Isidore or Bede.
as before. *Imago mundi* offers no parallels here and *Veraldar saga* says that '[s]iban sonarsynir Mathathie avndvduz þa hofdv Gydingar þa eina hofdingia er fat er i bokvm fra sagt'. 275 The history of these rulers, from Mathatias to Herod is on the other hand covered in parts I-II of *Gyðinga saga*, chs. 3-30. The text in 764 is so brief that comparison with the text of *Gyðinga saga* hardly sheds any light on the relationship between the two. One can take 764's description of Herod's reign (11v2-4) as an example:

Hann var hinn versti konungr. Hann brendi Gyðinga bækr til þess at eyða svá lögum guðs. Hann lét drepa íj. sonu sínna ok konu sínna ok á hans dögum var guð borinn.

*Gyðinga saga* says of Herod's book-burning: 'Herodes let ok brenna allt Ættar tal gyðinga at æigi syniz hans ætt suúirdlig hia þeim.' 276 The two texts are dissimilar in wording but the information they have in common is significant since it is not found in *Historia scholastica*, the main source for Part II of *Gyðinga saga*. 277 The sketch in 764 thus seems to be based on information extracted from a composite account of the history of the Jews. The textual evidence does not offer proofs for the assumption that that account was *Gyðinga saga* as we know it. It has already been suggested that the scribes of 764 and the author of *Gyðinga saga* may have made use of the same source. But because of the cursory nature of the text in 764 it cannot be ruled out that the 764 scribes used a version of *Gyðinga saga* to supplement their main source, the source 764 probably shares with *Veraldar saga* and 194, which in all likelihood contained no information about the Jewish rulers after Mathatias' grandsons.

As was discussed in chapter II.2, 194 and 764 also share material on Paradise and the Phoenix. It is most natural to suppose that that text came from the same source as the regnal lists. That source is likely to have been an Icelandic account of the *aetates mundi*, based on *Imago mundi*, but augmented with additional material. To avoid having to postulate more than one source of that kind for 764 it is simplest to suppose that a single source lies behind 194, 764 and *Veraldar saga*. That supposition seems to be strengthened by the fact that 194 and *Veraldar saga* begin with an identical paragraph on Moses as the first

---

275 *Veraldar saga*, 32.18-44.1
276 *Gyðinga saga*, 148.8-9
recorder of history: ‘Moyses het guds vinr fordum i Gydinga landi, sa er fyrstr hof þa [þrifnadar] syslo ath rita helgar þekr um guds stormerki’ etc.\(^\text{278}\)

In his article on several seventeenth-century computistical manuscripts written by Björn Jónsson at Skarðsá, Stefán Karlsson discusses the biblical genealogies in *Veraldar saga*, 194 and 764. He points out, that judging by language and vocabulary, the text in 194, which Stefán refers to as *Heimsaldrar*, seems to be considerably older than the manuscript.\(^\text{279}\) Stefán thinks that *Heimsaldrar* might have been written in the first half of the twelfth century and that Ari Þorgilsson could have been responsible for the work.\(^\text{280}\) While Ari’s authorship must remain doubtful, the texts we have in 194 and in 764 may well have their origins in the twelfth century although the evidence is of course not conclusive. The question of the antecedents of 764 will be re-examined in chapter III.2.1.

---


\(^\text{279}\) Stefán Karlsson. ‘Fröðleiksgreinar frá tólftu öld’, 334.

5.4. Troy and Breta sögur

The passage on the Trojan war is extremely short, only 12 lines. It is introduced by scribe G on f. 10v37 where he/she writes ‘Í þann tíma var setið um Troeam af Grikkjum’. Scribe G continues on f. 11r2 and writes a few lines which correspond closely to a text in Hauksbók:

764

Par fellu af Grikkja lóði sjó þúsundir hins átta tigar hins niunda hundraðs, en af Troeia lóði fellu sex þúsundir hins niunda tigar hins sjóunda hundraðs. Fyrir Grikkja lóði reð mest Agamenon ok Menalaus, en fyrir Troeio lóði reð Priamus ok synir hans Ector ok Alexander. Hann hafði tekit brott Helenu konu Menalai. (11r2-6)

Hauksbók


The numbers of the casualties on each side correspond exactly in these two texts but differ from the numbers given in Trójumanna saga,\(^\text{281}\) so this information can hardly be derived directly from the saga. The numbers in 764 and Hauksbók are identical, on the other hand, with those found in Imago mundi (III.7). It is not likely that scribe G copied Hauksbók itself since there is no evidence that Hauksbók was used as a source elsewhere in 764 despite the fact that both manuscripts contain versions of the same stories (e.g. Daniel, cf. p. 118). The above passage in Hauksbók is incorporated in a description of the world, augmenting the information on Troy. As Peter Springborg has shown, Imago mundi was among the sources for that world description,\(^\text{282}\) so it is reasonable to assume that the passage on the Trojan wars found its way into 764 as well as into Hauksbók from an Icelandic translation of Imago mundi.

It seems that scribe G was content with a mere reference to the Trojan war and did not intend to include a lengthy passage on the subject. But here a fellow scribe, E, stepped in, for lines 10v38-11r2 are written in a different hand and tell of the origins of the war:

en efni ok tilganga þessa stóra stríðs er þeir höfðu sín í milli var þessi at systir Priami konungs hafði verit hertekin af Grikkjum ok þaðan af villdu þeir bræðr hefnir þeirar svvíviru. Tók Alexander Helenam húsfrú Menelai er allra kvenna

---


Whether E was asked to produce a few lines to complement the sketchy account provided by G, or whether he/she decided to revise what G had written, it is evident that E wanted to give readers a fuller picture and thus referred them to a separate folio which presumably contained a more detailed account of the events in Troy. The folio which is referred to is now lost and we do not even know whether it ever became a part of 764 but it would in all likelihood have contained a text from *Trójumanna saga*. That work is an Icelandic version of Darius Phrygius’ *De excidio Troiae* augmented with material from other sources, including *Ilias Latina*, Vergil’s *Aeneid* and Ovid’s *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses*. It is preserved in two main redactions, α, which is based predominantly on the Darius Phrygius text and believed to be close to the original translation of it, and β, into which a lot of material from *Ilias Latina* is incorporated as well as material from Vergil, Ovid and Theodulus.  

It is the β-redaction which is found in 573, where it is followed by *Breta sögur*. It is worth noting in this context that hand G in 764 seems to be the same hand that wrote the first part of *Breta sögur* (ff. 24-45v) in 573. (573 and 764 are linked in other ways as will be discussed below in relation to *Breta sögur*.) A shortened version of β is found in Hauksbók where the beginning of *Breta sögur* is separated by only two folios from the end of *Trójumanna saga*.

A similar progression occurs in 764 where the short passage on the Trojan war leads immediately into *Breta sögur* through Eneas who fled to Rome:

```
Margir flyðu brott eftir þat at borgin [i.e. Troy] varð unnin. Einn af þeim var Eneas. Hann kom til Ítalla lands ok varð þar konungr. Hann drap elding til bana. Hann drap ðór Turnum. Eneas gat þann son er Askanius hét. Hans son var Silvius, hans son Brutus. Hann bygði fyrstr þat land er þa var kallað Alkiron. Þar reisti hann mikla borg er hann kallaði hinu nýju Troean. Þá var skipt um nöfn við hann ok kallaðr Britto en landit Brittanía ok þaðan ero Bretar komnir. (1Ir6-11)
```

*Breta sögur* is an Icelandic translation of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia regum Britanniae* with some additions from other sources. It is dated to the thirteenth century and preserved whole, or relatively whole, in two manuscripts


284 In addition to *Trójumanna saga* β and *Breta sögur* (the longer version) the manuscript contains the beginning of *Valvens þátr*. 
only, Hauksbók and the defective AM 573 4to. As mentioned above, Breta sögur are preceded by Trójumanna saga in both manuscripts. The history of Troy was very popular in medieval Europe not least, as Stefanie Würth points out, because of the tradition of tracing royal dynasties to the Trojans. That this was also practised in Iceland is evidenced by the prologue to Snorra Edda, and the transmission of Breta sögur can be seen as a manifestation of the same tendency, where the foundation of the British dynasty is linked to the aftermath of the Trojan wars.

The text in 764 is clearly closely related to that in 573, which represents the longer version of Breta sögur, while Hauksbók has a somewhat condensed text. Stefanie Würth has pointed out that 764 and 573 share the error of writing 'Alkrion' in the passage quoted above, where Hauksbók has (more correctly) 'Albió'. There are many other instances where 764 and 573 correspond closely but Hauksbók has a slightly different wording, and Würth argues in her study that the affinity between 764 and 573 is so great that the former might be a direct copy of the latter. The fact that the same scribe (G) had a hand in copying the text in both manuscripts renders that proposition even more plausible. It is eminently likely that the two manuscripts were produced in the same scriptorium, and they could either have been copied from the same manuscript which contained the 'Alkrion' error, or 573 could have been used as the direct source for 764, as Würth suggests.

764 does not contain a text corresponding to the entire Breta sögur. On ff. 11v5-12v41 it traces the lineage of British rulers from Brutus to Kambellinus in whose time Christ was said to have been born. Sections on some later rulers are found on f. 38r but all the material at the beginning of Breta sögur, which describes events in Italy based on the Aeneid, is omitted. The text in 764 begins with material taken from ch. 6, which is where Geoffrey’s Historia becomes the source for the Icelandic text.

Most of the British kings are treated only in the briefest fashion in 764 although longer anecdotes are occasionally included, e.g. Korienus’ fight with

---

285 Breta sögur have not been adequately edited. Jón Sigurðsson printed the Hauksbók text with variants from AM 573 4to in Annaler for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie 1848, 103-215; 1849, 1-145. Unger’s edition of Hauksbók (Christiania 1892-96) has no variant apparatus.
286 Würth, Der Antikenroman, 38.
287 Snorri Sturluson. Edda. Prologue and Gylfaginning, 4-5.
the giant Gogmagog, Menpricius' death by wolves and Bladud's failed attempt at flying. The text of Breta sögur in 764 thus shows the same characteristics as are evident in some of the material taken from Stjórn: more substantial passages are linked together by 'bridges' which often do no more than link characters together in a chronological order. The abridgement is on the whole quite drastic. The main emphasis seems to be on tracing the genealogy through the line of kings, and references to Jewish history contained in Geoffrey's text are on the whole retained. Minor characters are usually omitted, e.g. younger brothers who do not ascend to the throne, and only the sketchiest account is given of the achievements of the monarchs — the scribes record cities which are founded but not always their exact location. As an example of all this one could take the following passage on Ebracus (Ebrutus), Brutus the younger and his son Leil:

764

Breta sögur (AM 573 4to)

tök Ebrutus son hans riki eftir hann ok hafði bratt miklið at. Tök fyrrst at skipa riki sitt ættbornum einum mönnum en er hans hafði riki sitt skipað eftir vílja, þá minntiz hann hversu frændr hans hófðu herjað í Gallí, ok látti þar sína frændr ok ástættinn en komiz nauðugliga í brott. Þottiz hann þess skyldi at hefna. För hann þá með her sinn í Gallíam ok áttar þar margar orrostur, vann borgir, braut kastala en felldi fjölda ríkissmann. Hann þök miklið herfang í gulli ok sílfri ok kom að til Bretlands með ágetum sigri ok ógrynnari fjár. En er hann kom að þa vildi hann enn nokkuð að hafaz þat er hans nafni maðti lengi uppi vera. Lét hann þá borg gera ok kalla af nafni sínu Ebrucam. Sú borg heittir nú Jork. Þar er nú erkistól. Hann lét gera vígí þat á Skótlandi er Meya kastali var kallaðr. Ebrutus átti xx konur ok með xx sonu ok xx dætr. Brútus hét einn son Ebruti. Hann tók riki eftir fóður sinn andaðan ok rð xj vetr ok er engi saga frá honum en bræðr hans unnu Saxland undir sík ok rðu þar fyrir síðan. Son Bruti tók riki eftir er hét Leil. Hann lét gera borg ok kallaði af nafni sínu Kierleil. Þann tíma réð Solomon hinn spaki Jórsala landi. (11v39-12r4)

[followed by names ending with] Galaek, unnu Saxland undir sik ok hon var allra meýa fegurst, beirra er d Bretlandi voru ok bæzt at sér gerr. Ebrutus sendi dætr sínar allar suðr um fjall í Itálíka ríki til Sílviú fóður Albani er þa hafði þar ríki. Báð hann sílviú sjá þar fyrir þeirra kosti þat er sýna þátti til framkvæmdar er þar giftuð innanlands. Sílviús gifti þar allar ríku móbnum af Trójóu ættu. Þar hófðuð stórar eignir ok miklið vað. Ebrutus sendi sonu sína til Saxlands at vinna þar ok setti Assarikum hertuga yfir ok forsjámann, með fullyngi Sílvíj Albani gátu þeir unnís undir sú All Saxland ok réðu þar fyrir, leituðu sér þáðan annarrar landkosta. Brútus var heima með feðr sínum meðan þeir líðu báðir. Ebrutus dó þa er hann var mjögg við allðr ok hann hafði riki haft einum vetri miðr en xxx. Brútus lét vel búu gróft hans at fornúm síð. Tök hann þá ráð og ríki eftir fóður sinn ok réð xíi vetr ok er engi saga einkanliga frá honum gjör. Son hans tók riki eftir hann er hét Leil. Hann lét gera nálíga á norðanverðri Britanníu svá sem þa var kallað borg ok kallaði af nafni sinu Kierleil. Þann tíma réð Solomon hinn spaki fyrir Jórsalalandi, ok þa var reist af grundvelli templum domini, þat mæstir er fyrrst var getið í heimínunum almátukum guði til lods ok dýrðar, ok þa kom í spaka drottning af austrveg á fund Solomonis at heyra ok skynja hans speki frá annarrar manna. (31v6-32r1)

288 Würth, Der Antikenroman, 180.
The passage shows well how heavily the scribe has abridged the text. Only the barest outlines of the story are preserved: the names of kings and places and the chronological link to the Jewish dynasty (Solomon).
Rómverja saga is an Icelandic version of Sallust’s Bellum Iugurthinum and Catilinae coniuratio and Lucan’s Pharsalia with additional material drawn from other Latin sources. It is preserved in two redactions, an older and now imperfect version represented by the manuscript AM 595 a-b 4to (c. 1325-1350) and a younger abridged version found in the Sjörm manuscript AM 226 fol. and copies thereof, as well as in a sixteenth-century manuscript, Perg. 4to nr 24 in the Royal Library, Stockholm. 

Porphjörg Helgadóttir has provided a convenient synopsis of the make up of Rómverja saga:

1. A translation of the Jugurtha, though with omission of Sallust’s introduction, chs 1,1-4,9.
2. A bridging passage, giving a brief account of Jugurtha’s death, followed by a longer section on Marius and Sulla and the war between them, ending with a brief enumeration of the outstanding men of the next generation, Pompey, Caesar, Crassus and Cato.
3. A translation of the Catiline, again with omission of Sallust’s introduction, chs 1,1-4,5, and also of his long lament over Rome’s moral decline, chs 5,9-13,5.
4. A prelude to the Pharsalia, on the forms of Roman government from the foundation of the city down to the struggle between Pompey and Caesar, in effect a very summary account of Roman history within those limits.
5. An abridged prose translation of Lucan’s Pharsalia.
6. A conclusion to the Pharsalia on the aftermath of the battle, Caesar’s death, Octavian’s victories over Mark Antony, Octavian’s reign as Augustus, and finally the birth of Christ.

The text in AM 764 corresponds to parts 4 and 6 of this synopsis and does not, therefore, represent anything of the Sallust or Lucan translations. In all likelihood the material in these passages ultimately came from a so-called accessus ad Lucanum, an introductory guide to Lucan’s Pharsalia. Such a work ‘would typically include a section called summa historiae, a basic sketch of Roman history intended to give a student the background he needed to understand the events described in the Pharsalia’. The accessus which the Icelanders used must, in Porphjörg Helgadóttir’s view, have contained a summa which started with the foundation of Rome and extended as far as Octavian’s reign.

290 Porphjörg Helgadóttir, ’On the sources’, 203-204.
In his facsimile edition of AM 595 Jakob Benediktsson drew attention to the text in 764 and the fact that it had significance for the textual transmission of Rómverja saga and for the relationship between the saga and Veraldar saga. Jakob showed that the text of 764 was very close to that of 595 where the two could be compared, so much so that they might even be sister manuscripts. On the question of Veraldar saga’s relation to Rómverja saga he came to the conclusion that the author of the latter had used Veraldar saga as a source. In that case the correspondences between Veraldar saga and 764 can be explained by pointing to Rómverja saga as the intermediary.

Dietrich Hofmann re-examined the issue a few years later, collating most of the instances where Veraldar saga agrees with Rómverja saga and 764, and came to the opposite conclusion regarding the relationship between these texts. He proposed Rómverja saga as the source not only for 764 but for Veraldar saga as well.

Finally Þorbjörg Helgadóttir advanced a third theory, one which takes into account the different purposes these three works served and the different aims of their editors. She suggests that a translation of an accessus ad Lucanum with a summa historiae was made in Iceland before Veraldar saga was composed, i.e. in the twelfth century, and that this translation was used independently by the author of Veraldar saga and the compiler of Rómverja saga, who both modified the text to suit their different purposes. The same translation was then used, later, to provide the necessary material on the history of Rome in AM 764, where the scribes characteristically abridged the text by omitting some sentences and paragraphs but otherwise left the text more or less intact. To support her theory Þorbjörg produces evidence to show that Veraldar saga and 764 made independent use of the summa, i.e. independent of Rómverja saga. This seems most convincing in the case of Veraldar saga. It is more difficult to determine whether the 764 scribes were working directly from a

---

293 Hofmann, ‘Accessus ad Lucanum’, 129-149.
294 Þorbjörg Helgadóttir, ‘On the sources’, 211.
295 Ibid., 212. Þorbjörg kindly lent me a chapter of her thesis on Rómverja saga (Rómverja saga — Kildesstudier; under preparation) where she has collated all the relevant passages in Rómverja saga, 764 and Veraldar saga against the Latin sources.
translation of an *accessus* or whether their exemplar was a manuscript of *Rómverja saga*. The difficulty is caused by the abridged nature of the text in 764 and also by the defective state of AM 595 which excludes extensive collation.

As revealed above, 764 contains correspondences with *Veraldar saga* outside the material which is traditionally associated with *Rómverja saga*. These are a passage on Abraham, some phrases in a passage on Alexander and a brief statement about the greatest kingdoms of the world. Given the verbal similarities between 764 and *Veraldar saga*, especially in the passage on Abraham, it is perhaps strange that 764 does not appear to have more material in common with *Veraldar saga*, despite the fact that the two works inevitably cover much of the same ground. If the scribes of 764 had a copy of *Veraldar saga* to hand one would have expected them to make more use of it. It is therefore tempting to explain these correspondences by supposing the information the two works share was introduced into 764 not from *Veraldar saga* itself but from another source, which could then have been a common source for both works. If we follow Hofman, in supposing that *Rómverja saga* was the source for both 764 and *Veraldar saga* it would then seem natural to assume that *Rómverja saga* originally included information on Alexander and Ptolemy and the four kingdoms and even on Abraham. The beginning of the saga is lost in the older version and the younger version may not reflect the original beginning accurately since *Rómverja saga* is there incorporated into a compilation which includes *Gyðinga saga* and *Alexanders saga* as well, thus perhaps rendering sketchy information on the pre-Roman kingdoms redundant. It does not however seem likely that *Römverja saga* was ever that grand in scope. It is also important to note that the correspondences between 764 and *Veraldar saga* in the material on the Roman rulers are much vaguer than in the other instances. There are no exact verbal correspondences of the kind the passage on Abraham offers. It therefore seems safer to explain the relationship between *Veraldar saga* and 764 by supposing the scribes of the latter made use of two sources. One of them supplied material for the passages closely related to *Veraldar saga*, and was possibly the source for 194 8vo as well. The second source must then have been a work devoted to the history of the Roman rulers, either *Rómverja saga* itself, as suggested by both Jakob Benediktsson and Hofmann, or a *summa* of the kind Þorbjörg Helgadóttir postulates.
5.6. Concluding remarks

At the end of the Rómverja saga material the scribes have managed to bring the diverse strands of history down to the Incarnation and from there onwards the perspective is firmly Christian. What the material included in the fifth age shows, is that the scribes were fully aware of the historiographic tradition of universal histories. Works of that kind had been put together earlier in Iceland and it may be expected that Isidore's Etymologiae with its sketchy account of the aetates mundi and chronographical works such as Bede's De temporum ratione, which included a chronicle with references to secular rulers, had long been known and used in the country.

The sources the 764-scribes used seem to be numerous and the relationship between 764 and some of the other works mentioned in this chapter is far from clear although it seems that Honorius' Imago mundi looms large in the background. It is on the whole unlikely that the scribes responsible for 764 relied directly on Latin sources — all their material seems to come from indigenous sources which in turn made use of Latin works. It seems the scribes used Breta sögur, a work dealing with Roman history, another covering the history of the Jews, and some source for universal history which included material from Imago mundi. This last source probably also provided material for Veraldar saga and AM 194 8vo, two Icelandic works which, like 764, attempt a sketch of universal history. What emerges from the comparison of these three works is that in each case the scribes modify their sources to suit their purpose; they do not copy their material slavishly but omit, augment or rearrange it according to their needs. Since the aim of the 764-scribes seems to be not simply to produce a handbook with basic facts but a rather fuller account of world history, they collect chapters and stories from translated works where the history of certain peoples is treated more fully. They do not, however, shirk from drastically modifying these texts. In her study Stefanie Würth discusses the significant role encyclopedic works play in the transmission of the pseudo-historical works in Iceland and stresses how the emphasis there is firmly on brevitas.296 764 is a good example of this transmission since it does contain

296 Würth, Der Antikenroman, 182.
sizeable chunks from the pseudo-historical works but significantly reworked. The scribes only include what will fit into their chronological frame and they furthermore shorten all the texts they include, some of them quite severely as the example from Breta sögur shows. So despite digressing, as it were, into longer narratives about kings and rulers, the 764-scribes clearly aim for brevity and they always keep one eye on the chronology, with the result that their account of the history until the time of Christ stands somewhere between Veraldar saga and the 'heimsaldrar' in AM 194 8vo on the one hand, and the firmly narrative-oriented compilation which makes up AM 226 fol. on the other.
6. Aetas VI: Anni Domini


The account of the life, passion and resurrection of Jesus Christ, which takes up ff. 14r27-16r11, is constructed in a manner not unlike the passage on the hexaëmeron. The Bible, this time the Gospels, provides the frame of the narrative — the basic facts as it were — but these are then expanded with apocryphal anecdotes and other information which the scribes deemed relevant. The most substantial of these are passages which come originally from the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew (De infantia salvatoris) and two miracles of St Martha.

6.1.1. The Gospels

The references to the Gospels are scattered and brief. They tell of the annunciation, Jesus' birth and childhood, his baptism and the temptation in the wilderness; some of his miracles are recounted and finally the passion. An overview of this material is given in Table 2 (p. 173). This material is not taken from any one of the Gospels; there are passages from or references to all four of them. In general the references are not direct translations of the Vulgate but variously paraphrased. It is noteworthy that none of the parables is included. This is in keeping with the tendency seen throughout the chronicle to put the main emphasis on events and to avoid speeches and allegories.

The fact that all four Gospels are represented in the text might be taken as an indication that the scribes made use of a Gospel harmony, rather than a full set of all the Gospels. Furthermore, the story about Jesus in the temple at the age of twelve (Lc 2.42-51) is incorrectly attributed to St Matthew (15r9-10), which indicates that it was not derived directly from a text of Luke. The composition of Gospel harmonies began already in the first century AD and continued until well after the Reformation. The most influential of these harmonies was doubtless the Diatessaron attributed to Tatian, compiled in Syriac in the mid-second century and based on the four canonical gospels as well as some extra-canonical
The aim of the *Diatessaron* and other Gospel harmonies seems to have been above all to produce a comprehensive treatment of the life of Christ, with the result that
dans les parties communes, un texte, plus explicite ou plus satisfaisant au point de vue du compilateur, était choisi de préférence aux trois autres, qui étaient, par la même, simplement éliminés. Quant aux parties propres à chaque évangeliste, elles étaient rapprochées et réunis de façon à former un récit unique et continu.

The *Diatessaron* was widely disseminated and translated into numerous languages. The oldest manuscript of a Gospel harmony in Latin is the Codex Fuldensis, a sixth-century manuscript copied at the order of bishop Victor of Capua from an exemplum now lost. Codex Fuldensis, however, does not represent the most original *Diatessaron* text in Latin since it is ‘vulgatisé’, i.e. its readings have been adjusted to the Vulgate text of the Gospels. The manuscript evidence shows that another unvulgatisé *Diatessaron* must have existed, and that that text predates the Codex Fuldensis. The Latin *Diatessaron* became one of the sources for the Old Saxon poem *Helian*, composed in the first half of the ninth century, and it also gave rise to numerous vernacular gospel harmonies. Of these the Middle Dutch examples have received the fullest attention from scholars, most notably the Liège Harmony which was compiled in the late thirteenth century.

It has been suggested that an Old Norse version of the *Diatessaron* existed, and that readings in Old Norse homilies can be traced to such a source. Andrea van Arkel-De Leeuw van Weenen and Gilles Quispel published a preliminary note to that effect in 1978. One of the examples they cited is a variant of Mt 2.16: ‘ha sende hann meN i bebleem. oc Idt drepa alla tvæ. vetra. sveina oc yngre’. Arkel-De Leeuw van Weenen and Quispel pointed out that the Vulgate here reads *occidit omnes pueros*, but numerous Western witnesses of the *Diatessaron* ‘read or presuppose: “iussit occidi omnes pueros”’.

---

299 Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 86, 149.
Vulgate in fact reads *mittens occidit omnes pueros* and it does not seem necessary to explain the rendering in the Icelandic Homily Book with reference to Diatessaron influence. On the other hand this same phrase also appears in 764 and the wording there might in fact provide a better parallel to the *Diatessaron* since it reads ‘at hann *býðr* drepa öll sveinbörn yngri en tvævetr ...’ (14v33).

Arkel-De Leeuw van Weenen and Quispel suggested that the Old Norse *Diatessaron* readings were not derived from the vulgatised Codex Fuldensis tradition but from the more original Latin *Diatessaron*. It is regrettable that they have not yet published a fuller account of their findings. In the absence of a detailed study of all Gospel material in Old Norse it is impossible to ascertain the validity of their proposition, nor can one fully assess the status of 764 within the Old Norse Gospel tradition. Such an undertaking, however, lies outside the scope of the present work. It will have to suffice to say that a comparison of the Gospel material in 764 with quotations in other Old Norse text does not reveal any striking similarities. That renders it less likely, albeit not inconceivable, that the text in 764 and the Gospel quotations found in e.g. the oldest homilies were drawn from the same vernacular source.

To illustrate this one might take as an example the story of the wedding at Cana (Io 2.1-11). It is one of two extensive Gospel passages included in 764 and it is also incorporated into one of the homilies in the Icelandic Homily Book. The 764 text is abbreviated compared to the Vulgate and clauses and sentences which are retained in the homily are left out, but it occasionally renders individual words more accurately than the homily text does, cf. for example ‘kallaðr’ (l. 5) for *vocatus est* and ‘tákñ’ (l. 27) for *signum*. It is noteworthy that the 764 text accentuates the role of the Virgin Mary, almost giving her the credit for the miracle (cf. underlining in the text). 764 also says explicitly that Jesus blessed the water whereas the Vulgate and the homily leave the inference to the audience.

764

En A 63ru ðri sneri hann vatni f víñ f ðí Câna Galileee at brúðkaupi því at hann var til þeírar samkundu kallaðr ok hans móðir ok allir hans lærisveinar. Þar varð 000000 veizlu-fall ef Guðs móðir heði eigi

IslHom

...brúðcæðp var gorð f galílea a beð þeim es chána heiter oc vas þar móper ísue. oc vas bóðet þangat ísue oc læresveinom eíus. En es víñ þræt at samcundo. þa mælte móper ísue víþ ísue. Eige hafa þeir víñ. Íesus svaraþe. hvat er þep mér oc þér cona.

Vulgata

et die tertio nuptiae factae sunt in Cana Galilaeae et erat mater Iesu ibi vocatus est autem ibi et Iesu et discipuli eius ad nuptias et deficienti vino dicit mater Iesu ad eum vinum non habent et dicit ei Iesu quid mihi et tibi est mulier nondum venit hora mea.
As can be seen there are numerous disagreements between the two Icelandic texts apart from the fact that the 764 is much abridged. The phrase *quid mihi et tibi est* is rendered ‘hvat er með mér ok þér’ in the homily but ‘hvat kemr þat til mín ok þín’ in 764, and the remark of the governor of the feast is also dissimilar in the two texts. Individual words are translated differently, e.g. ‘mælti’ vs. ‘talaði’ for *dixerit*, ‘berit’ vs. ‘færít’ for *ferte*, ‘reiðumenn’ vs. ‘þjónustumenn’ for *minstri*, ‘kenndi’ vs. ‘bergði’ for *gustavit*. The word ‘öndvegismaðr’ for *architricleinus* might strike one as significant but the same translation is found in *Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jakobs*³⁰⁴ and could well have been a school-gloss. All in all there is not a lot that speaks for a common vernacular source of these two texts. That does not, however, preclude the possibility that the text in 764 was derived from a Gospel harmony, but whether that is the case cannot be determined until studies into the reception of the *Diatessaron* in Iceland have advanced further.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>NT material in 764</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14r27-29</td>
<td>The annunciation</td>
<td>Lc 1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r34-37</td>
<td>The adoration of the magi</td>
<td>Mt 2.1-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v3-4</td>
<td>The flight to Egypt</td>
<td>Mt 2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v31-34</td>
<td>The killing of the innocents</td>
<td>Mt 2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r1-7</td>
<td>Joseph takes Jesus and Mary to Nazareth</td>
<td>Mt 2.19-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r10-19</td>
<td>Jesus in the Temple</td>
<td>Lc 2.42-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r23-25</td>
<td>Jesus baptised and tempted</td>
<td>Mt 3.13-15; 4.1-11; Mk 1.9; 12-13; Lc 3.21; 4.1-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r26-33</td>
<td>The wedding at Cana</td>
<td>Jh 2.1-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r37-15v1</td>
<td>John the Baptist incarcerated and beheaded</td>
<td>Mk 6.17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v1-3</td>
<td>Jesus acquires 12 apostles and 72 disciples</td>
<td>Mt 10.1-4; Lc 6.13; 10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v3</td>
<td>Jesus heals the blind, deaf and dumb</td>
<td>(Mk 7.32-35; 8.22-25; Lc 7.22; Jh 9.2-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v5-8</td>
<td>Moses and Elijah appear to Jesus and the apostles</td>
<td>Mt 17.1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v8-10</td>
<td>Three examples of resuscitation</td>
<td>(Lc 8.40-56; Mk 5.21-43; Jh 11.17-45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r5-8</td>
<td>The crucifixion</td>
<td>Mt 27.45; 51-2; Lc 23.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r9-10</td>
<td>The assumption</td>
<td>Lc 24.51-52; Act 1.9-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r10-11</td>
<td>The Pentecost</td>
<td>Act 2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r11-12</td>
<td>Seven deacons chosen</td>
<td>Act 6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r12-13</td>
<td>St Stephen stoned</td>
<td>Act 7.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r13-14</td>
<td>James beheaded and Peter incarcerated</td>
<td>Act 12.1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. New Testament material in AM 764 4to.

6.1.2. The embellishment of the Gospels

The Gospel material in 764 is augmented with a few substantial anecdotes as well as some minor additions of encyclopedic nature. We shall turn first to the latter. As we have come to expect from the compilers of 764 the text betrays a visible interest in chronology, as the beginning of the Gospel account shows:

Similar information is contained in the computistical treatise named Rim I by Kristian Kålund where the information on Mary’s age\textsuperscript{305} is found as well as calculations concerning Christ’s birthday according to Bede and Jerome.\textsuperscript{306} There are discrepancies in the numbers between 764 and the main manuscripts of Rim I. The numbers in 764 correspond most closely to those in AM 731 4to which, as we have seen, is related to 764 (cf. p. 53). References to the church calendar continue throughout the New Testament stories; the temptation in the wilderness for instance is said to have taken place one night after St Valentine’s Day (15r25-26) and Mary’s resurrection allegedly took place two nights after the Feast of St Matthew (16r15-16).

The story of the annunciation and the nativity is told in but few words and the Magi receive ample attention by comparison. St Matthew’s Gospel, the biblical source of the story of the ‘wise men’, does not yield much information about them apart from mentioning that they came from the east, followed a star and brought gifts to the newborn infant: gold, frankincense and myrrh. Neither their number nor their names are given. These, and other details, were gradually added to the tradition as the Magi took their place among popular saints of the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{307} 764 states that they were three and came from Arabia with a splendid retinue; it mentions that they ‘kunnu vel stjörnúþrött’ (14r35-36), gives their names in three languages and finally says that ‘þeira blezaðir líkamir eru með guðs vilja komnir svá langt norðr í hálftuna at þeir liggja í Kolni’ (14r39-40), where they are miraculously preserved.

The earliest mention of the names of the Magi is in a chronicle commonly known as Excerpta latina barbari and dated to the seventh or the eighth century. The chronicle gives the names as Bithisarea, Melchior and Gathaspa.\textsuperscript{308} These names reappear in varying forms in later works, frequently as Balthasar, Melchior and Caspar/Jasper. They were coupled with sets of Hebrew and Greek names in the Liber de numeris, compiled ‘by an unknown Irish writer some time

\textsuperscript{305} Mary’s age when she bore Christ is given in the Pseudo-Matthew Gospel, VIII.1, cf. Libri de nativitate Mariae. Vol I. Ed. by Jan Gijsel and Rita Beyers. (CCSA 9.) Turnhout 1997.

\textsuperscript{306} Al II, 43-44.


\textsuperscript{308} H. Leclercq. ‘Mages.’ DACL 10, 1061.
after the middle of the eighth century in south-east Germany'. The Hebrew names of the Magi were, according to this source, Malgaloth, Galgaloth and Saracim and the Greek ones Damascus, Epuleus and Serenus. These names in various forms later found their way into popular works, among them Historia scholastica: 'Nomina trium magorum haec sunt: Hebraice Appellus, Amerus, Damasius; Graece Galgalat, Magalath, Sarachim; Latine Baltassar, Gaspar, Melchior.' It is most likely that the names were introduced into Icelandic sources through the Historia scholastica or a similar work.

According to the chronicle by Robert of Torigny (d. 1186) the relics of the Magi were discovered in a chapel near Milan in 1158 and six years later transferred to Cologne by Archbishop Reinhold who was also Emperor Frederick’s chancellor. The wording ‘eru ... komnir svá langt norðr í hálfnu’ in 764 implies that the scribes were aware of this transfer. The event is recorded in Konungs annáll under the entry for 1162: ‘Rainaldus erchibyskvp af Colni flvtti likhami Ávstrvegskonvnga af Mediolanoborg i Colni.’ Cologne was a well-known station on the way to Rome and it is entirely plausible that the news of the translation of the relics was brought to Iceland by pilgrims. The event is also described in the late medieval legendary Reykjahólabók, compiled by Björn Porleifsson in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. The last part (chs. 16-20) of this text, ‘Helgir þrír kongar’, relates how the bodies of the Magi were brought to Constantinople by Queen Helena but later (in 1163) offered to Emperor Henry by Aczo, a Milanese nobleman, through the mediation of Archbishop Reinhold. The relics were then brought to Cologne and laid to rest, according to the story, in the temple of St Peter.

The account of the killing of the innocents is augmented with a note on the number of the infants killed: ‘Tölu þessarra sveina kunnu vér eigi greina, en sú tal en stendr í niunda responsorio er svá heitir: centum xl iiiii milia, heyrir vist eigi til tölu barnanna heldr er hon sett in Apocalipsi Iohannis fyrir stórmerkis

---

310 Ibid., 671.
311 PL 198, 1542.
312 Leclercq, Mages, 1063-1064.
krapt' (14v34-37). 'Niunda responsorio' refers to the Feast of the Holy Innocents (ad vesperam), where the number 140 is given.315

'Herodes fëkk skjóta hæfnd svá at hann dó vesælliga eftir því sem kristninni er vel kunnigt at hann vall móðkum' (14v37-38). The scribe is no doubt correct in claiming that Christians were well aware of Herod's fate and the details of it may well have been common knowledge in Iceland in the later Middle Ages. Herod's drawn-out death is described in Gyðinga saga and similar information is found in Historia scholastica.316 Gyðinga saga and 764 also share the scriptural story of the incarceration and beheading of John the Baptist by Herod Antipas.317 The wording is similar in the two texts and a Latin source of this information in Gyðinga saga has not been identified.318 This again suggests that 764 and Gyðinga saga may have relied on the same vernacular source.

6.1.3. De infantia salvatoris.

The scribes provide unusually detailed information on the source of the two anecdotes they incorporate into the story of the flight to Egypt: 'Dat verk er kallaz Til Egiptalands vattar sú bók er heitir De infancia salvatoris' (14v5). The work in question is an apocryphal account of Jesus' infancy, the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, frequently known as Nativitas sanctae Mariae and (Liber) de infantia salvatoris. It is a Latin work, partly based on the Protevangelium Jacobi and the Infancy Gospel of Thomas, but also including passages from the Bible as well as material from unknown sources. It was composed sometime between the sixth century and the late eighth century, most probably in the first half of the seventh century.319 Its author had access to some accounts of Jesus' infancy which included miracles allegedly performed by the boy Jesus on the way from Judea to Egypt. The bulk of the Pseudo-Matthew Gospel, however, concerns the conception, birth and childhood of the Virgin Mary and the work became increasingly popular in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as veneration of the

316 Gyðinga saga, 154-161, cf. especially 156.5.
318 Wolf (ed.), Gyðinga saga, xcvi-xcix.
Virgin gained ground. The apocryphal stories of Mary and Jesus acquired a place in the history of salvation and were integrated into historical works. The *Pseudo-Matthew Gospel* was thus ensured a wide dissemination. The text was for instance used by Godfrey of Viterbo in his universal chronicle, compiled between 1185 and 1190, and it is interesting that Godfrey's choice of material concerning the life of Christ is very similar to that in 764. Like the compilers of 764 Godfrey places these apocryphal stories in their New Testament context which precedes a treatment of Roman emperors.

764 contains only three chapters from the *Pseudo-Matthew Gospel*. All are stories of miracles performed by the infant Jesus on the way to Egypt. They are not found in the *Protevangelium Jacobi* or the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*. The chapters are not in the original order in 764 and the text is very free compared to the Latin of the original. It is very likely therefore that it has passed through an intermediary (more than one). A little later in the manuscript we find papal and imperial lists from the chronicle of Martin of Troppau (cf. pp. 194-195). Martin included the same three stories from the *Pseudo-Matthew Gospel* in his chronicle, and in the same order, so the chronicle must be considered the likeliest source for the Icelandic version found in 764. The Icelandic version is considerably fuller than the chronicle-text but the additional material does not seem to stem from the *Pseudo-Matthew Gospel* itself. It is rather the result of the translator's endeavour to stage the events portrayed, adding a dimension of everyday life to the stories.

The first story records how a palm tree yields both food and drink at Jesus' command.

---

764

... svá sem þau fram komu Maria ok Joseph mjök farmóð undir þann við er palma heitir, taka þau hvíld at þeim svali þar um eina stund. Vár frá Guðsmóðir var þa mjök maðd af lóngum veg, kennir hungrs en vistir voru grunnar ok því tekr piltrínn til at neyta sínss valds at móður hans hungrí eigi ok vísar hendíni upp at eikinni svá sem í þat mark at hon skal lægja sínna hæð ok veita lóðugan þann ávöxt sem til mannfæðu var á henni vaxinn. Hon hlyðir í stað skaparans bódi ok leggr fram koll allt til jáðar. Er þá hægt at lesa þau epli sem til fýsti. Ok at því gervu reisir hon upp ok réttiz í fyrri nátíru. Undir þeim pálmiþi segir sama bók at brunnr hafi upp sprungit með smátt vatn ör

Chronica Martini

Legitur tamen in libro de infancia Salvatoris, quod Ihesu fugiente in Egyptum, cum sub una palma recubuissent, beata virgine matre pueri fame laborante, ad preceptum pueri se palma usque circa terram inclinavit et post collectionem fructus ipsius ad pristinum statum palma se erexit. Et etiam sicente Joseph ibidem ex precepto pueri Ihesu arida terra fontem produxit.

---


Pseudo-Matthaei evangelium

Factum est autem post haec in die tertia profectio suae ut Maria solis nimio fatigaretur in heremo, et uidens arborem palmae, sub umbra eius aliquantulum uellet quiescere. Et festinans Joseph perduxit eam ad palmam et descendere eam fecit de iumento. Cumque resedissent Maria, respiciens ad comam palmae, uidit eam repletam ponis, et ait: O si possit fieri ut ex istis fructibus palmae percipiem. Et ait Joseph ad eam: Miror te haec dicere, cum uidem tantam altitudinem palmae huius. Tu quidem de palmae fructibus cogitas. Ego autem de aqua cogito quae nobis iam defecit in utribus, et non habemus unde replere eos aut nos ipsos refocillare.


The text of the Chronica Martini is but a skeleton of the original story whereas the Icelandic translator has tried to put some meat on the bones. Neither text reproduces the direct speech of the original, and the second part of the story, about the well that springs up from under the roots of the tree putting an end to Joseph’s worries, is reduced to a summary where it is mentioned that Jesus performed the miracle at Joseph’s wish. The Icelandic text then adds a note about the difficulties of obtaining water ‘i þess háttar vegum’.

The remaining two anecdotes show how not only plants but also ferocious animals obey the infant Jesus:

764 Chronica Martini

Legitur etiam ibidem quod, cum in eodem itinere in ore cuiusdam spaluncam hospitati fuissent, ex eodem spalunca duo inmanissimi drachones sunt egressi, ad quorum contuitur dum beata virgo et Ioseph nimio terrore concuterentur, ad preceptum puere lhesu drachones cum omni mansuetudine inclinati capitalibus desertar.

Pseudo-Matthaei evangelium

Cumque peruenissent ad spaluncam quandam ut quasi sub ea refrigerarent, descendit Maria de iumento et sedit et habebat Iesum in gremio. Erant autem tres puere et cum Maria una puella iter agentes. Et ecce subito egressi sunt de spaluncu drachen multi, quos uidentes puere exclamauerunt. Tunc dominus cum esset nondum bimus excussit se et stans in pedibus stetit ante eos. Illi autem drachen adorauerunt eum et cum adorassent eum abierunt. ... Ipse autem dominus Jesus Christus infantulus deambulabat cum eis ut...
In this story *Chronica Martini* simplifies the scenery, omitting as it does the three servants and the maidservant who accompanied the holy family according to the Pseudo-Matthew text. The serpents are now only two but most fierce, and Mary and Joseph are terrified by them. But at the indication of the infant Jesus the serpents acknowledge him and disappear into the desert. The Icelandic text contains essentially the same information but it describes the whole event more vividly, setting the scene carefully. We learn that night is about to fall and that Joseph is busy moving all the luggage into the grotto and preparing a bed inside where the holy family is shielded from frosty dew ‘sem þar er gjarnat á náttartíma f þeim lóndum’ (a comment similar to the one about the water in the first story). Then the serpents emerge, and the Icelandic text lets them be heard before they are seen, thus enhancing the dramatic effect of the scene. The climax of the story, the miracle itself, is also enhanced in the Icelandic version which interprets Jesus’ command to the serpents in a delightful way, and the image of the humbled serpents as they ‘lægja höfuðit ok lúðra brott til eyðimerkr’ provides a fitting conclusion to the story. The Icelandic text then adds an afterthought: ‘Er þá náttbólit frjálst ok óttalaut’. The third anecdote is reduced to one sentence in the chronicle but is expanded in the Icelandic to a version which bears but little resemblance to the original Latin text, although the core image of the story, wild beasts accompanying the holy family, is preserved.
leo af eyðimörkinni fram á veginn fyrir þau. Hann gefr sik blísðan, breiðr bak ok bódar sðúr ef þau vilja nokkum léta af honum þiggia. Joseph er þess búinn ok setr upp á þann sterka karlinn hvat er hann hafñi til. Fylgir hann þeim sðúan nót ok dag alla leið fram í Egiptaland svá mjúkr ok meinlaus sem einn sauðr. (16v24-30)

The main focus of the Latin text is on the miraculous coexistence of feral animals with other beasts and humans, whereas the Icelandic text betrays more mundane interests. It is poor Joseph who has practical worries which are solved by a miracle.

These anecdotes reflect the appeal stories of the holy family had for medieval audiences. The Gospels did not have much to offer when it came to Jesus’ childhood and the everyday life of his family. Scribes and compilers made up for this lack by supplementing the narrative of the Gospels with apocryphal stories which, to judge from 764, were often treated quite freely.

6.1.4. The Letter of Lentulus
Included in the sixth age in 764, albeit not with the Gospel material, is another apocryphal text, describing Jesus’ appearance. It seems appropriate to treat that fragment at this point although it means jumping momentarily ahead. The text is placed at the beginning of the papal list which starts at f. 17r34. It is a translation of a Latin text which originated in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century and is often referred to as the Letter of Lentulus, since some of its versions are in the form of a letter ‘purporting to have been written by a Roman official, Lentulus, at the time of Tiberius Caesar’.323 It is the most detailed medieval description of Christ’s physical appearance and was widely disseminated. Ernst von Dobschütz examined the various versions of the text and came to the conclusion that those versions which ascribed the text to Lentulus were not in fact the most original ones but were the result of revision during the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. The original description, he reckoned, was the one

---

which cites ‘the books of Roman Annals’ as its source and found its way into the preface to the *Vita Christi* by Ludolf of Saxony.\textsuperscript{324} Dobschütz printed this version as his a-text and it is this version which the text in 764 resembles most closely.

Ian McDougall collected and presented examples of Icelandic descriptions of Christ in his PhD dissertation and found several examples of ‘letter’-versions in post-medieval manuscripts.\textsuperscript{325} But he was also able to point to two manuscripts with texts which correspond to the more original version although he was not aware of the text in 764. The manuscripts which McDougall mentions are AM 81 8vo and AM 124 8vo, both from the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{326} On the basis of the evidence offered by these manuscripts McDougall suggested that the oldest version of the Lentulus letter could ‘have been known in Iceland during the early part of the fifteenth century’.\textsuperscript{327} The text in 81 and 124 is clearly related to the one in 764 so we are now able to push the date for the appearance of the Lentulus text in Icelandic back several decades.

The text in 764 seems to contain several readings which are more original than those found in 81/124. It has some phrases corresponding to the Latin original which have been eliminated in the later texts. It also agrees with the Latin in the phrase that states that Christ cried a few times but never laughed. The later Icelandic texts claim that Christ cried exactly five times. They do not include this information in its original place but tag it on at the end of the text with a list of the five occasions when Christ allegedly shed tears. Nothing similar is found in the Latin versions cited by Dobschütz.

764 agrees with 81/124 in some other variations on the Latin, mainly in what it says about Christ’s hair and his nose and mouth. The Latin simply states that there was nothing at all wrong with his nose and mouth whereas the Icelandic texts describe the nose as straight with appropriate nostrils and mentions that the mouth was maidenlike, ‘meyligr’. The remark may simply be a free rendering of the Latin *impuberis* as McDougall suggests. McDougall offers

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{324} Ernst von Dobschütz. *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*. Leipzig 1899, 326-330.
  \item \textsuperscript{325} Ian Cameron McDougall. *Codex Lindesianus: An Old Icelandic Miscellany*. [PhD diss. University College London. 1983], 630-633.
  \item \textsuperscript{326} Ibid., 633 et passim Cf. also Mariane Overgaard. ‘AM 124 8vo: En islandsk schwank-samling.’ *Opuscula VII* (BiblArn XXXIV.) København 1979, 268-317, esp. 304.
  \item \textsuperscript{327} McDougall, *Codex Lindesianus*, 635.
\end{itemize}
two explanations for the inclusion of the remark, not paralleled in the Latin versions, that Christ’s hair was never touched by a razor. He suggests on the one hand that the information may be an echo of Nicephorus Callistus’ description of Christ, or that the detail was drawn “through association with the preceding reference to the fashion of the “Nazarenes”..., from Moses’ recitation of the law of the Nazarite in Numbers 6:2-5”.328 It is of course also possible that these details are derived from a version of the Latin Lentulus letter not printed by Dobschütz.

328 ibid.
6.2. Miracles of St Martha.

After the mention of Jesus' resuscitation of Lazarus with a reference to Speculum ecclesiae (PL 172, 917) the scribes inserted two miracles of St Martha, based on Vincentius' Speculum historiale. A parallel text is found in Marthe saga ok Marie Magdalene and it is well-nigh certain that the 764 scribe copied his text from a manuscript of that saga. That is evident from the way he or she introduces the second anecdote, copying first the words 'í þenna tíma bar til' (15v29) directly from the saga before changing them to 'þat bar til' upon realising that 'þenna' lacked an antecedent. The saga is preserved in three manuscripts, AM 233 a fol., Stock. Perg. fol. 2, and AM 235 fol. Unger used the first one as the main text for his edition in Heilagra Manna Sogur, but the text in 764 seems closer to the other two judging by the variants printed by Unger. They are both dated to the last quarter of the fourteenth century and thus contemporaneous with 764. 764 follows the text of the saga closely to begin with, describing the dragon Taraskonus in detail. The middle of the story, where the menace of the dragon is elaborated upon, is then omitted and the thread picked up again when Martha arrives to fetter the beast. The second anecdote, about Bishop Fronto's vision, is similarly abridged: the vision itself follows the text of the saga quite closely but when the story turns to the fruitless attempts that were made to wake the bishop, 764 skips the text of 10 lines in Unger’s edition and states merely that 'þá var býskup vakinn af klærkum' (15r36). The rest of the story is then heavily abbreviated.

The miracle with the dragon was the most prominent of St Martha legends and widely depicted in art. There is no record of a church dedicated to St Martha in Iceland nor have images of her been noted. Owing to the role she plays in Scripture as a hostess to Christ (a privilege emphasised in 764, cf. 15v10-11) she was primarily the patron of servants, washerwomen and innkeepers. That she should appeal to women in general is readily understandable, and if 764 was intended for the convent at Reynistaðr the miracles may have been meant to inspire novices.

330 Cf. HMS I, 533-535; 542-544.
6.3. The Vision of Elisabeth of Schönau

Following almost immediately on from Bishop Fronto’s vision is another vision, that of Elisabeth of Schönau (1129?-1165; the scribe of 764 incorrectly identifies her with Elisabeth of Hungary 1207-1231). Elisabeth’s vision was widely propagated, mainly because of the significance it had for Mariology. It was therefore included in compilations like Speculum historiale and Legenda Aurea. The story seems to have been no less popular in medieval Iceland for a version of it is found in Mariu saga and Arngrím Brandsson also incorporated it into his account of the life of Bishop Guðmundr ‘the good’, the so-called Guðmundar saga D. The saga was composed sometime between 1343 and Arngrím’s death in 1361 or 1362. The version in Mariu saga seems to be derived from the account of the vision found in Speculum historiale. That text is somewhat abbreviated compared with the Latin version printed by Le Fèvre in Liber trium virorum et trium spiritualium virginum. There is for instance no mention there of Christ descending towards the Virgin and accompanying her into heaven, nor does Elisabeth mention the reason for her asking the Virgin about the ascension as she does in the longer text (quia de hoc dubie in libris patrum scriptum inventur).

The version found in Guðmundar saga D and in 764 (16r14-16v17) on the other hand clearly goes back to the more original Latin text. This was noted by Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen who edited the passage from 764 and mentioned that, although the text in 764 is an abbreviated version of the vision, it ‘has occasional readings which are superior to those of the manuscripts of the

---

332 Cf. BHL 5355.
The reading *kal. Septembris* is also found in *Speculum historiale*. That work is referred to by Arngrímr the author of *Gudmundar saga* D, for instance in his commentary following the vision. Since *Speculum historiale* cannot be the main source of the vision-text in *Gudmundar saga* D, according to Widding and Bekker-Nielsen, the story of Elisabeth and her vision must have reached Iceland through other channels as well. The saga offers its own account of the text’s provenance, according to which Bishop Gudmundr had asked a Norwegian brother in Christ to inform him if he received ‘sanna vissu af upprisu birting várar frú’. Gudmundr then gets a letter from the cleric containing the vision of Elisabeth. Arngrímr presents the letter from the Norwegian cleric as bona fide and it is clear from his words that he does not attribute the text of the vision itself to *Speculum historiale*, although he refers to it in his commentary. It seems reasonable, therefore, to assume that the error in *Gudmundar saga* D is due to influence from *Speculum historiale* but that the vision itself had a different source, a source which 764 shares with the saga.

There are six vellum manuscripts of *Gudmundar saga* D extant, but only one of them, Stock. Perg. fol. 5, is complete. Of these AM 219 fol. has been found to preserve the best text. A fragment of a seventh vellum codex exists, and two paper manuscripts from the seventeenth century (AM 397 4to and 398 4to) have been shown to be copies of an eighth, a manuscript from c. 1400 which was probably lost in the fire in Copenhagen in 1728. That lost codex was in all likelihood descended from 219. In the edition of *Gudmundar saga* D, which is being prepared by Stefán Karlsson and Aðalsteinn Eyþórsson, AM 219 fol.

---

338 Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen. ‘Elisabeth of Schônau’s Visions in an Old Icelandic Manuscript, AM 764, 4°.’ *Opuscula* II.1 (BiblArn XXV.1.) København 1961, 94.
340 Biskupa sögur geytnar út af hinu íslenska bökömentafélagi I. Kaupmannahöfn 1858, 150.33.
provides the main text but 397 is used where 219 is defective. That turns out to be the case with Elisabeth's vision.

The vision as told in *Guðmundar saga* and 764 has been somewhat adapted. In the Latin text it follows another work attributed to Elisabeth called *Liber Vitaeum Det*, which she claims was dictated to her by an angel who visited her frequently. That same angel plays a part in the vision of the assumption and since the Icelandic text omits everything that precedes the vision, both Elisabeth and the angel need an introduction of sorts. The saga solves the matter thus:

The introduction in 764 is much shorter but nevertheless evidently depends on a text similar to that of the saga (the confusion about Elisabeth’s identity is presumably the scribe’s blunder):

Elizabeth dótir konungs af Ungaria gekk i klaustri xi vetra gómul. Liði hón stórum heilagríka er hon hafði lífat f klaustri xi ár bírtiz henni guðs móðir oftliga, taldandi með henni ymmissar greinir heilagrá ritninga. Hér með bírtiz henni einn guðs engill, sá <er> vandiz til hana at læra af guðlígra speki. Kenndi hon þenna engill æ hinn sama til sín komanda sem sannan vin ok kærn félaga. Ok er hon blómgaðísk með þvílíkum gígum, stundar hon því framar at líka guði sem bezt í öllum hlutm, geymundi sitt lítillæti með góðum verkum.

Ok þat gerisk, sem hon skír at vár frú, guðs móðir Mára, víðísk hennar optígar at víjtja, at hon segir leylníla einum andalíguna fedeð sínnum þar í klastrumum, hver henni gefir þat ráð at spyrja nókkurs dróttningina þá er hon bírtísk henni næsta sinni. Systir ín segir þess vilja spyrja sem inn gamli maðr vill henni ráð til gefa. Hann segir: „þat bíð ek, dótir mín, at þú spyrir hana hvárt hon hafi af dauða risit ok lífi nú með guði bæði með ónd ok líkama.”

The introduction in 764 is much shorter but nevertheless evidently depends on a text similar to that of the saga (the confusion about Elisabeth’s identity is presumably the scribe’s blunder):

Elizabeth dótir konungs af Ungaria gekk í klaustri xi vetra gómul. Liði hón stórum heilagláta ok er hon hafði lífat í klustru xi ár bírtiz henni guðs móðir oftliga, taldandi með henni ymissar greinir heilagrá ritninga. Hér með bírtiz henni einn guðs engill, sá <er> vandiz til hana at læra af guðlígra speki. Kenndi hon þenna engill æ hinn sama til sín komanda sem sannan vin ok kærn félaga. Ok er hon blómgaðísk þvílíkum gígum stundar hon því framar at líka guði sem bezt í öllum hlutm, geymundi sitt lítillæti með góðum verkum. Ok þat ger skír þann hon skír at Mára guðs móðir víðísk hennar optígar at víjtja, hvat hon segir leylníla sínnum andalíguna fedeð þar í klustrumum hver henni gefir þat ráð at spyrja drottningina núkkurs þá hon bírtiz henni næsta sinn. Hon segir þess vilja spyrja sem hinn gamli maðr vill henni ráð til gefa. Þess bíð ek dótir mín at þú spyrir hana hvárt hon hafi af dauða risit ok lífi nú með guði með ónd ok líkama. (16r17-22)

342 The text is that prepared by Stefán and Aðalsteinn for Islenzk fornrit. I am grateful to them for making it available to me. Cf. Biskupa sögur II, 151.
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Guðmundar saga and 764 thus turn the story into a third person narrative whereas the original purports to be Elisabeth’s own narration. The first person narrative is preserved in Speculum historiale and consequently in Maríu saga. After the introduction the Guðmundar saga/764 version follows the Latin version closely but the text in 764 is considerably shorter since it breaks off at 16v17 after the angel has told Elisabeth on which day Mary was resurrected.³⁴³ Guðmundar saga D contains the whole story.

The text in 764 agrees on the whole well with the text of the saga. 764 readings moreover usually agree with 397 against variants in Stock. Perg. 5 although there are instances of 764 agreeing with the latter against 397, as in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>764</th>
<th>Guðmundar saga D</th>
<th>Liber trium virorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἰ ἑσι vitran σύνδι guð þér hversu sancta María var upp numin þæði með önd ok likam</td>
<td>Sú vitran* er guð veitti þér, birtí** þat auðsýnilliga hversu vár drottning, sancta Márfia, var uppnumin til himinríkis þæði samt með önd ok likama</td>
<td>Ostensum est tibi in hac visione, quomodo tam carne quam spiritu domina nostra in coelum assumpta est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16v12-13)</td>
<td>* Í þessi vitran – Stock. Perg. 5</td>
<td>** birtí – Stock. Perg. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rendering in 764 and Stock. Perg 5 of the beginning of the sentence seems closer to the original than 397. The example also shows the tendency in 764 to shorten the text. The scribe has here left out the words 'til himinríkis' which are almost certainly original in the Icelandic, translating the in coelum of the Latin. This tendency to abbreviate lands the scribe in difficulties towards the end of the vision in 764 where he/she shortens the text so drastically that the utterances of the angel and Elisabeth get mixed up (16v14-17).)

The text in 764 is thus not identical with any of the extant Guðmundar saga texts and should be taken into account when editing the work, since it may retain original readings which have been modified in manuscripts of the saga. It is however more often the case that 764 agrees with the saga in its embellishments of the text. Whether the Latin original used by the Icelandic translator contained a more elaborate text than the one printed by Le Fèvre or whether the augmentation was the translator’s (or a copyist’s) own doing cannot be determined. The interim conclusion about the relationship between the 764 text and that of Guðmundar saga D must remain this: Arngrímur and the scribe of

³⁴³ Cf. Biskupa sögur I, 153.18; Liber trium virorum 139r.8.
764 made use of a similar text of the Elisabeth vision which had been furnished with an introduction and expanded somewhat, compared with the printed Latin version. Arngrímr then seems to have embellished the text further, which is entirely consistent with his stylistic preferences.\(^{344}\)

The possible significance of this text for a house of nuns like that at Reynistaðr would be twofold. First, Elisabeth’s vision must have appealed to women who were Benedictine nuns like her. Second, the assumption of the Virgin was an important theological issue and had attracted some controversy. This is illustrated in the story which centres on the desire on the part of Elisabeth and the monk whom she confides in to know with certainty whether the Virgin was assumed into heaven, and more particularly, whether she was resurrected in both body and spirit. The assumption of the BVM did not become a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church until 1950,\(^{345}\) but the feast of the assumption has been celebrated in some regions since the sixth century.\(^{346}\) The wide dissemination of the vision of Elisabeth of Schönau and similar anecdotes testifies to the importance of the event in the hearts and minds of people, but it is also evidence of changing views towards the assumption. Until the beginning of the twelfth century the belief of Mary’s bodily assumption had been opposed by authoritative writers of the Western Church, but as Marian devotion gained ground, so advocates of the bodily assumption increased in number.\(^{347}\)

---


\(^{346}\) Cf. Graef, *Mary*, I 133-134, 142-143.

7. Aetas VI: After Christ

7.1. The apostles.

After the passion of Christ the story follows the apostles as well as Mary. The scribes include four items from Acts: Pentecost, the names of the seven deacons consecrated by the apostles, the fate of Stephen protomartyr and finally the beheading of James the Great and the incarceration of Peter (cf. Table 3, p. 191). Pentecost is of obvious significance but the rest of the material included bears witness to the emphasis the compilers put on names and lists of names. After naming the deacons and describing the fate of Stephen, James and Peter the scribes turn to the assumption of St Mary, but return to the apostles on f. 16v17. The information there centres on the death of each apostle. Lists of the same kind are known from other Icelandic sources, namely Stock. Perg. fol. 5 and AM 660 4to, and were edited by Peter Foote. These 'postolatöl' are modelled on Latin lists of the apostles found in martyrologies and miscellanies, where 'there is much variety in the quantity and detail of the information offered' as Foote points out, though the core remains the same. This is equally true of the three Icelandic texts. 660 presents the shortest text and Stock Perg. 5 the longest. No two texts appear on the surface to have the same selection of names — although on closer inspection the selection in 764 turns out to match that of Stock. Perg. 5 — and the order in which they are presented is not the same.

The order of the apostles on f. 16v17-27 in 764 is as follows: Peter, Paul, Andrew, James the Lesser, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, Simon, Judas (Thaddaeus) and Matthias. It would appear that the sons of Zebedee have been left out altogether. But that is not the whole story because their respective deaths are in fact described elsewhere in the chronicle. James' death at the hands of Herod is scriptural and mentioned in the brief fragment from Acts on f. 16r13-14, where it is specified that James was beheaded, a detailed not included in the Vulgate. John was immersed in hot oil under Emperor Domitian so the scribes of 764 entered this piece of information at the correct place in their list of emperors

(19v31-32). The comment about John is not included in the *Chronica Martini* which is the source for the imperial list so it was almost certainly the scribes' own idea to enter it there. (It is admittedly curious that they did not do the same with Peter and Bartholomew who are both associated with Roman emperors in the 'postolatal' in 764.) It is thus likely that the list of apostles which the scribes of 764 copied contained the sons of Zebedee but that James was dropped because his death had already been recorded and John was moved so as to join his tormentor. An alternative hypothesis may nevertheless be advanced. Since 764 elsewhere contains material from *Tvöggja postola saga Jóns ok Jakobs* it is conceivable that the 'postolatal' also derived from a manuscript of that saga and that John and James were left out because their deaths were inevitably treated more fully elsewhere in the saga. The existing manuscripts of *TvöJJ*, however, do not give an account of the death of the apostles, so this explanation for the exclusion of John and James in 764 must be considered less attractive than the one offered above.

For the sake of comparison John and James have been added to the 764 'postulatal' proper in the summary in Table 3. The texts of 660 and Stock Perg. 5 was printed by Foote. The text of Stock. Perg. 5 is considerably fuller than either that of 660 and 764 and will not be reproduced in full here, nor will all the analogues identified by Foote be recounted.

The order is the same, as can be seen, in 660 and 764 except that 660 does not include Mathias at the end. Stock. Perg. 5 does, but there Thomas is shifted from no. 9 to no. 12. The accompanying text mentions that he was ‘á

---

349 Foote, ‘Postulatal’, 156.
350 Only a brief list is given, cf. *Postola sögur* 545.5-546.3.
351 On the variations in order cf. Foote, ‘Postulatal’, 156-158. The apostles were also addressed in private prayer as is witnessed by the manuscript AM 241 a fol. where the order is the same as in 764 except that Bartholomew and Thomas are reversed. Cf. *Liturgica Islandica I. Text.* Ed. by Lilli Gjerlow. (BiblArn XXXV.) Copenhagen 1980, 187. In that source James Z. precedes John but we cannot know whether that was the case in the text the scribes of 764 were copying.
Table 3. The Fate of the Apostles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. The Fate of the Apostles</th>
<th>Petrus ok Paulus voru pindir j Roma borg. undir valdli Nereoni keisara. Petrus var krossfestr ... Paulus var hoggvinn utan borgar åh hinum sama degi ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En eftr uppstigning guðs xxx árum ok vij voru þeir pindir Petrus ok Paulus. Var hann hálshögsvinn en Petrus krossfestr í Rómaborg af Nerone keisara.</td>
<td>Andreas brodrí Petri var ok krossfestr j borg þeir er Patras heitir a Achialandi. Andra postoli uar krossfestr j borg þeir er Pátaras heitir. hon stendr að Bolgara lande. þær er Eingils nes. heitir, hann uar pindir undir uallde Egéjar jarls ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas krossfestr í Akara í Griklandi a Egejar jarl.</td>
<td>Johannes ewangvelista var vpp nvminn a Asialandi j Effeso borg. Jon postoli ok guðspiaalla madr var upp numinn medr himnesku liose ut j Asia landi. j borg þeirre er Effesus heitir... hitt var fyr e hann var settur j uld smír uvellanda. j Rómaborg at Raaði Domitianí keisara ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nukkur síðar var Jacobus þróðir Johannes hálshögsvinn móti pás-kum en Petrus sett í myrkvastofu af sama Herode lítil síðar)</td>
<td>Johannes ewangvelista var vpp nvminn a Asialandi j Effeso borg. Jon postoli ok guðspiaalla madr var upp numinn medr himnesku liose ut j Asia landi. j borg þeirre er Effesus heitir... hitt var fyr e hann var settur j uld smír uvellanda. j Rómaborg at Raaði Domitianí keisara ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobus yngri var byskup xxx ára at Jórsblóm. Hann var grýttur en síðar sleginn í hófuðu med þvátta barvífl.</td>
<td>Jacobus annar broður dörrins var hann var lostinn med vifl. mjó t Jorßolimum. a kirkju þær er hann taldi tru fyrir fólk. Jacobus annar broður dörrins var hann var lostinn med vifl. mjó t Jorßolimum. a kirkju þær er hann taldi tru fyrir fólk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sama degi var Philippus krossfestr í Asia ok bundinn á krossinn. Þa halði hann lxxx ok víj ár. ij dætr hans helgar voru grafnar a sína hófuð honum hvar.</td>
<td>Philippus a Tidialandi var gróti barðr a krossi ok vpp nvminn. Philippus a Tidialandi var gróti barðr a krossi ok vpp nvminn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomeus flegin kvikr af Astrige konungi a Índialandi ok síðar hálshöginn ok fluttur eftir tímna í Beneventum en þaðan fluttiz hann af Ottone keisara ok færði helgan dóm postulans lí eيار þeirar er líggj nær Rómaborg ok geymis þar.</td>
<td>Bartholomeus var pindr flegin hvinð mið hniﬁ ok hálshöginn síðan a env yzsta Índialandi Bartholomeus var pindr flegin hvinð mið hniﬁ ok hálshöginn síðan a env yzsta Índialandi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A næsta Índialandi var Tomas laginn í gegnum með sverði af byskupi sólarhofs.</td>
<td>Thomas var hálshöginn a avdru Índia landi með sverði. Mathies ... var j borg þeirre er Naddaber heitir að Blaalandi ... hann var pindir undir uallði Hartacu konungs, ok uar með sverði stangaðar að baki ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matheus var laginn í gegnum á bak með sverði á Índialandi af Hírtaco</td>
<td>Mathes a Ethiopialandi í borg Nadaber hann var pindr ok hálshöginn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon ok Judas voru lagðir í gegnum með kesiðu á Persida landi.</td>
<td>Simon ok Jvadas voru bardir með kylfum a kaldealiandi. en færði þíðan j Babilonem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias var pindr í Judea, fyrst grýttur en síðan drepinn með exi.</td>
<td>Mathias ... voru látur að það Judas Skarioð ... en hann for med pislar dyrð heðann af heinunum ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hinu næsta India landi'. Since Bartholomew is said to have preached ‘á inu yzta India landi’ it would seem natural for the clause about Thomas to follow immediately, the way it does in 764.\textsuperscript{352} The order in 764 therefore seems to be more original.

Much of the information on each apostle in 764 has its counterpart in the other manuscripts, especially Stock. Perg. 5. There are some interesting divergences however. The first one occurs in the entry on Andrew where both 660 and Stock. Perg. 5 mention that the apostle was crucified in the city of Patras. 660 states that this place is in ‘Achia land’ whereas Stock Perg. 5 gives the Norse name for Achia, Engilsnes, and says that it is in ‘Bolgara land’. Although 764 incorrectly has ‘Akara’ instead of ‘Akaia’, the scribe has added ‘i Grikklandi’ in the margin and thus provides a more accurate placement of the province which is on the Peloponnesus.\textsuperscript{353}

764 says about James the Lesser that he was first stoned and then hit with a fuller’s bat. The stoning has no parallel in the other manuscripts nor in the legend, but \textit{Chronica Martini} mentions under the entry on emperor Nero that James ‘\textit{primo a Iudeis lapidatur, post pertica fullonis excerebratus occubuit}’.\textsuperscript{354} The scribes of 764 may have modified their copy to include this information.

The entry on Philip contains a detail, typical of 764 and its interest in holy women, where it is mentioned that his two daughters, ‘helgar’, were buried with him. A parallel is found in \textit{Philippus saga}:

\begin{verbatim}
þar voru i borginni döttr postolans tver, helgar nunnur ok ðyrligar, ok haðði hvartveggja þeira mikla meyiasveit með ser, þær er guði þionuðu í sifellu. En er postolinn var sva gamall at hann haðði siðu vetr ens niunda tigar, þa kalladi hann til sin klerka ok kenninenn ok byskupa þar nalægra borga, ok sagði þeim skammr mundu eptir lifstundir sinar, en bað þa geta vandliga guðs þóðrða ok sínna kenninga. Segia sva helgar bókr, at þa komi þar heiðnir menn með ofriði miklum ok hónðluðu postolann ok damdu hann þegar til liflatz, ok var hann síðan krossfest, ok gryttu þeir hann síðan a krossinum. ... Ok þa er döttr hans onduðuz, þa voru þær hia honum grafnar, a sínna hónð hvar.\textsuperscript{355}
\end{verbatim}

The text in \textit{Philippus saga} I represents one of two divergent accounts of the apostle’s death. According to the other tradition which is followed in \textit{Philippus}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{352} Cf. also Foote, ‘Postulatal, 166-167.
\textsuperscript{353} \textit{Ibid.}, 159-160.
\textsuperscript{355} \textit{Postola sögur}, 737.14-27
\end{footnotesize}
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saga II he died naturally. The daughters, and their burial at his side, are mentioned in both accounts. The statement in 764 that Philip was tied to the cross may be a simple error (‘bundinn’ possibly a misreading for ‘barinn’ cf. ‘barðr grioti’?) or it could have come about through a confusion with Andrew about whom sources ... generally emphasize that he was tied to his cross. The beginning of the sentence, ‘Á sama degi’, is probably a straightforward addition.

The three Icelandic texts give very dissimilar accounts of the fate of Simon and Judas Thaddeus. Stock. Perg. 5 adheres to the tradition found in the Latin passio of those two saints which describes how they chose martyrdom when set upon by priests and their mob in a temple. The claim in 764 that Simon and Judas were killed with a lance does not seem to be paralleled in the best known martyrologies.

764 is the only text of the three which specifies how Mathias was killed. Legends about Mathias were later in developing than those of the other apostles and the information that he was stoned and then beheaded is found in a late source, the so-called Mathias-legend from Trier.

7.2. Revenge upon the Jews: De bello Judaico

After cataloguing the ordeals suffered by the apostles the story turns to what the text terms ‘óðæmilig hefnd yfir gyðingum’ on account of their murder of Jesus. The narrative is here made up of sections from Book 6 of Josephus’ De bello Judaico and records events that happened shortly before Jerusalem fell to the Romans in AD 70. There are ominous portents: an unusually bright star in seen above the city, a cow bears a lamb, a door in the temple bursts open, battle hosts are seen in the sky etc. (16v28-17r4 cf. BJ 6.V.iii). And there is also a horrid story which illustrates the famine that raged within the city: A woman takes her

357 Cf. Postola sögur, 741.27-37.
358 Foote, ‘Postulatal’, 159.
own baby, cooks and eats it (17r10-15 cf. BJ 6.III.iv). 764 finally gives a brief account of the fate of the Jews once the city had fallen and refers to Josephus 'sagnamaðr' (17r15-21 cf. BJ 6.IX.ii-iii).

*De bello Judaico* was translated into Latin already in the fourth century. Two versions exist, a relatively free rendering labelled Hegesippus and a more accurate version ascribed to Rufinus Aquilensis. The text in 764 is but a series of fragments of course. It nevertheless follows the original quite closely in the first part where the omens are described. The story of the cannibalistic woman is much shortened, and so is the last section where the numbers of those killed and enslaved are somewhat confused.

Little is known about the reception of Josephus in Iceland. Parts I-II of *Gyðinga saga* contain material found in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* and *De bello Judaico*, but it is in some cases doubtful whether it was derived directly from a Latin translation of Josephus or through an intermediary like *Historia scholastica*. *Historia scholastica* cannot be the source for the *De bello Judaico* material in 764 since Petrus Comestor only goes down to the time of Nero. The question whether the *De bello Judaico* passages in 764 were introduced in Iceland through another compendium, or whether a more extensive Icelandic translation of Josephus existed in the fourteenth century, cannot for the present be answered.

### 7.3. Popes and Emperors

#### 7.3.1. Chronica Martini

Ff. 17v15-20v8 are taken up by a papal list down to Clement IV followed by a list of emperors from Julius Caesar to Frederick II. These lists are derived from a work by the Dominican Martin of Troppau, *Chronicon pontificum et

---

361 Lipsius, *Apostelgeschichten*, III.264-266.
362 *LdMV*, 634-635.
364 Cf. *ibid.*, 336-337.
366 Wolf (ed.), *Gyðinga saga*, xc-xcvi.
The chronicle was put together sometime after the death of Pope Clement IV, 29 November 1270, but before Gregory X was elected pope on 1 September 1271. There are three versions extant of the work, one of them (C) characterised by the addition to the list of subsequent popes, down to John XXI. The list in 764 ends with Clement IV and thus clearly goes back to one of the two older versions (A and B). Version A has the shortest text and 764 seems to be derived from the B-version into which short anecdotes about the popes are interpolated. Some of this interpolated material is found in 764 despite the radical abridgement of the original which otherwise characterises the text. In addition to interpolations which are original in the B-version, 764 contains a few insertions which have a different source. The longest of these are an anecdote about Pope Gregory the Great on f. 18 bis and a few stanzas against Pope Innocent III and his enforcement of the rule of celibacy (19v3-15). These will be treated below.

Papal and imperial lists are known in other Icelandic manuscripts but have not been the subject of much research. An exception to that rule are lists of emperors, popes, patriarchs and abbots which formed parts of the so-called Membrana Reseniana 6, a thirteenth-century miscellany which was lost in the fire of 1728 in Copenhagen. A copy of the lists and some other material in the manuscript was made in 1640 and is now preserved in Uppsala (DG 36). Steffan Karlsson has shown that the lists in Membr. Res. 6 (with the exception of the patriarchs) belong to a Montecassian tradition. They thus have a different source from the ones in 764 and as is to be expected the two texts differ considerably.

The Chronica Martini became a popular work and widely used. It provided a source for writers of other chronicles already in the thirteenth century and the fourteenth century saw its translation into German, Italian, French and Icelandic. A more precise date for the Icelandic translation can hardly be

367 Martinus Oppaviensis. *Chronicon*, 377-475. I am grateful to Stefn Karlsson for having identified this source.
368 Ibid. 383-384.
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given. It was mentioned above that the Icelandic text goes back to a version which had not been expanded with the names of Clement IV's successors. That in itself does not necessarily indicate that the chronicle came to Iceland early on. It is however perhaps a bit peculiar that the scribe who copied the lists in 764 does not seem to have had any knowledge of popes after Clement's death, for he/she writes: 'hér gefu vér upp fyrrst páfatal því at vér hófum eigi framar fundit in scriptis. En þá er vér finnum héðan af skulu skrifaz síðar í annálnum' (19v18-20).

7.3.2. Gregory the Great

The text on Pope Gregory is written on a slip which is inserted after f. 18. The hand on this slip (J) does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript. The text first describes a flood in the Tiber which happened in the days of Pope Pelagius. It then contains a miracle of St Gregory which is supposed to have occurred in the days of his successor, Pope Sabinian.

The story of the flood in the Tiber seems to have been well known in the Middle Ages and found its way into various chronicles. The Chronica Martini includes it in its entry on Pope Pelagius for he died of the plague which accompanied the disaster. The text in 764 is considerably amplified compared with the chronicle and seems to rely on a different version of the story. The amplifications are stylistic but also contain extra material since in 764 St Gregory is brought into the story and a Marian miracle involving him is attached at the end. The story of the flood is treated in Gregorius saga in Stock. Perg. fol. 2 which provides a much closer parallel to 764 than the Chronica Martini does.\footnote{Cf. HMS I, 387.1-389.24. There exist fragments of another text of Gregorius saga, but they do not include the passages in question, cf. The Life of St. Gregory and his Dialogues. Fragments of an Icelandic manuscript from the 13th century. Ed. by Hreinn Benediktsson. (EdArn B4). Copenhagen 1963, 51-52.}

The progression of the story is much the same in 764 and Stock. Perg. 2, but verbal differences are considerable. According to Peter Foote, the Stock. Perg. 2 version of Gregorius saga is ‘a conflation of excerpts, often much abridged, from the Vita Gregorii auct. Johanne diacono, BHL 3641 ... and the version BHL 3640 of the earlier life by Paul the Deacon’.\footnote{Foote (ed.), Lives of Saints, 22-23.} Parts of the material are common to both texts. The text in 764 contains a significant addition to the text as it...
appears in Stock. Perg. 2, namely a description of the litany which Pope Gregory is said to have instigated, and which came to be celebrated annually as the Greater or Roman Rogation (Gangdagr hinn eini, 25 April). The ultimate source for that passage is Gregory of Tours’ Decem libri historiarum, but the information was included in the vita by John the Deacon. It is not found in the vita by Paul. There does not, on the other hand, appear to be any material in 764 which is included by Paul but not by John.

As was mentioned above the text in 764 differs considerably from that in Stock. Perg. 2. The vocabulary is not the same nor is the style similar; 764 seems more elaborate. This is illustrated by the following example:

764
Hér fylgði þat, sem hon brauz annan veg út af borginni ok leitaði sjövar, at hon skolar í brott ór jardar holum mikinn fjölda höggorma ok þar með einn dreka svá mikinn at vexti sem einn stokkr væri.etta allt samt flytr hon ok flegir út í sjó. En þann tímavsem haftbran riss í móti kastar hon þessu upp a sanda tveim megu með árosumum. Var þá eigi langt áðr sólarhiti steikt þau herfíligu hra. Gekk þar af forvinds svá þjólligr snýkr at þat var dauðlagt hverju lifi. Loftið dimmaðiz ok sýndi siku með beiskri hryggó... (18bisr9-17)

Gregorius saga
Pa flaut fioldi høggorma eptir aanni ofan, þa er skolat hafði ur urðum her ok hvar, ok þar var dreki einn svá mikill, sem ass digir væri; þat fylgði allt aarvenxurrum í sio. En er ormaner kvomu í sioenn, þa do þeir allir þar. Sidan giðrdi aa hafvidri, ok rak þa alla aa land. En er þeir funudu, þa giðrdi þar af odaunan mikit. Þa kom sott mikil í Romaborg, ok feigu menn branad dauda, þeir er forvinds urdu. (HMS I 364.7-11)

The last sentence in 764 is paralleled in BHL 3641: totum aerem corruperunt.

The fragment AM 238 fol. X contains a text from Gregorius saga on f. 2v. It was edited by Kirsten Wolf who argued that the text was not related to Stock. Perg. 2. She suggested that it was rather an independent translation of the vita by John the Deacon since 238 contains none of the additions from Paul’s vita which are included in Stock. Perg. 2. 238 is dated to the fourteenth century, possibly its first half. Little is known of its history except that Árni Magnússon obtained it in 1721 from the then schoolmaster at Hólar. It is thus plausible that a translation was made of the Vita Gregorii auct. Johanne diacono in the early fourteenth century and that it circulated in Skagafjarðar where it came to be used as a source for the addition to the papal list in 764. It should also be noted
that the scribe (or the translator) seems to have a tendency to amplify the text slightly to increase its effect. The sentence, ‘Var þa eigi langt ðr sólarhiti steikti þau herfildigu hræ’ (18bisr14-15), does not, for instance, have a direct parallel in the Latin text (sed suffocatae bestiae inter salss maris turbidissimi fluctus sine mora in littore decidunt suaque putredine).

The Marian miracle, which in 764 is incorporated into the story of the litany, is not found in Gregorius saga (nor in the Latin vitae). It survives however in two collections of Marian miracles, the so called S and D collections. The text in 764 is shortened so it is hard to tell which of the two versions it resembles more closely.

The scribe responsible for f. 18bis in 764 seems to have taken the Chronica Martini as a cue, as it were, for including a shortened version of the Tiber-story taken from a life of St Gregory, adding the Marian miracle to it in an abbreviated form. He or she then concludes with the remark that ‘í þessa minning er nú hefir verið lesin er haldinn gagnagr hinn eini’ (18bisv13-14), followed by a reference to the papal list (‘Varð þessi oftnefndr Gregorius páfi í Roma sem catalogus segir’ 18bisv14)).

The miracle which follows, where St Gregory visits his successor from beyond the grave and does away with him, is included in the Chronica Martini under the entry on Sabinian but does not have a parallel in the Latin lives of St Gregory or in the Icelandic Gregorius saga. The text in 764 is amplified compared with the chronicle which relates the story thus:

\[
\text{Hic cum beato Gregorio pape post mortern derogaret et maxime ipsius liberalitati, et propter hoc egenis manum adiutricem subtraheret, sanctus Gregorius ipsum ter per visum pro culpa redarguens et quarto, cum se corrigere nollet, in capite percussit, quo tactu etiam evigilans vexatus in capite expiravit. (422.26-29)}
\]

The Icelandic text dramatises the story, introducing paupers who prompt a direct speech from Sabinian: ‘Þó at Gregorius spennti upp kirkjunnar fé sér til frægðar ok fæddi allan lýð til heimigrar dýrðar, er hvártveggja at eigi megum vér ok eigi viljum vérv svá gera sem margan tíma hefir hann.’ (18bisv17-19). The text also adds descriptive adjectives here and there, describing Sabinian as ‘steinligr í sínnu brjóstí’ (18bisv23) and Gregorius appearing to him for the fourth time ‘með ógn

378 Ole Widding. 'Norrone Marialegender på europæisk baggrund.' Opuscula X. (BiblArn XL.) København 1996, 19, 33. The two versions of the miracle are printed in Mariu saga, 224-225 and 1172-1173.
ok mikilli reiði’ (18bisv27-28). It also introduces a citation from Psalms (18bisv26). It is of course conceivable that scribe J had access to another source containing this story, just as he/she had for the Tiber story. Assuming that was not the case and bearing in mind the slight amplifications of the Tiber story, one is led to the conclusion that scribe J followed an editorial practice which somewhat contravened that of his/her fellow scribes, namely amplifying, rather than shortening, the texts.

7.3.3. Prisciani regula

F. 19v6-15 contains some stanzas in Latin against Pope Innocent III. They read something like this (the scribe is not orthodox in his use of Latin abbreviations):

```
Prisciani regula penitus cassator
Sacerdos per hic et hoc iam non declinatur
Sed per hoc solummodo nunc articulatur
Cum per nostrum presulem hoc admoveatur.

Ita quidam presbyter ceæpit allegare
Peccat criminaliter qui vult separare
Quod Deus coniunxerat feminam amare
Vero dignum duximus omnes appellare.

Nunc Innocentius immo nocens vere
Quicquid sancto docuit verbo vult delere
Et quod olim iuvenis voluit habere
Modo sanctus pontifex studet prohibere.

O quam dolor anxius o quam dampnum grave
Nobis est dimittere quod est tam suave
O romane pontifex statuisti prave
Ne in tanto crimen moriaris cave.

Paulus cælos raptus est ad superiores
Ubi multas didicit res secretores
Tandem ad nos veniens instruendo mores
Suas in quid habeat quilibet uxoros.
```

This is a version of a well-known satirical poem directed against Pope Innocent and his efforts to enforce celibacy among the clergy.379 Innocent fought vigorously against concubinage and Scandinavian dioceses did not escape his stern admonitions. He wrote to the archbishops Anders Sunesen of Lund and Olaf Lambatunga of Uppsala urging them to uproot the practice in their provinces, but

without much success. \textsuperscript{380} The enforcement of the rule of celibacy seems to have been greatly resented (and resisted) by the clergy as indeed the poem attests.

7.3.4. Agulandus

There are some minor insertions into the list of emperors as well as in the list of popes. Most of them are connected to Emperor Constantine (cf. below), and the fate of John the apostle under Domitian has already been mentioned (p. 190). St James crops up in a passage on Charlemagne (20r33-36), where it is told that the apostle appeared to the emperor and urged him to liberate his land from the heathens. It is then stated that he did so and killed the king Agulandus and his son in that crusade before erecting a church in Compostella. This information is derived from a text known as the \textit{Saga af Agulando}, one of the elements that make up the composite \textit{Karlamagnús saga}, \textsuperscript{381} but the chronology has suffered somewhat. \textit{Karlamagnús saga} makes it clear that Charlemagne first purged North Spain of Saracens and rebuilt the church in Compostella before King Agulandus waged war on Spain and was killed by the emperor’s men. \textsuperscript{382} The \textit{saga af Agulando} was not only incorporated into \textit{Karlamagnús saga} but also provided material for \textit{Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jakobs}. \textsuperscript{383} The note in 764 is very brief, but it states that Charlemagne himself ‘drap... Agulandum konung ok son hans Agulando’ (20r35). That is closer to \textit{TvpJJ} which says: ‘Þat vattar virðuligr herra Turpin erkiðyskup, at Karlamagnús konungr felldi Agulandum i Hyspania’. \textsuperscript{384} Since the saga is in all likelihood the source for the description of Judgment Day found in 764 (cf. pp. 214-217), it is reasonable to assume that the information about Charlemagne’s vision is of the same provenance.

7.3.5. Emperor Constantine and Queen Helena


\textsuperscript{382} \textit{Karlamagnús saga ok kappa hans. Fortællinger om Keiser Karl Magnus og hans jævnninger.} Ed. by C.R. Unger. Christiania 1860, 126-370.


\textsuperscript{384} \textit{Postola sögur}, 675.5-6, cf. \textit{Karlamagnús saga}, 369.
Emperor Constantine was a key figure in universal histories, since with his conversion the secular and ecclesiastical histories became entwined. There are in all three short passages in 764 which tell of the emperor and his mother, i.e. 20r7-12, 20v8-12, 21v3-25. These come from two sources, it seems. Lines 3-17 on f. 21v have a parallel in the life of St Silvester but the remaining material is derived from the legend of the Cross tree, Inventio Crucis. Steffan Karlsson has examined the Icelandic texts and fragments of the legend and shown that apart from the Latin legend, the Icelandic version printed by Unger made use of a world chronicle (apparently Bede’s Chronica maiora) and Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae. It is the first chapter of the Icelandic version, a sort of historical introduction to the legend proper, which depends on the two latter sources, and on f. 20r7-12 764 has corresponding information, but much shortened. It is clear from the inclusion of the information that the version which the scribes of 764 used must have been expanded in the same way as the version printed by Unger. Whether it was precisely the same version as that contained in AM 238 XI fol. and AM 233 a fol., from which Unger obtained his text, is more doubtful. Apart from material from ch. 1, 764 contains a parallel to ch. 2 (21v17-15) and a brief summary of the events described in chs. 3-6 (20v8-12). Chapter 2 describes Constantine’s vision of the Cross and the text in 764 differs considerably from that of 238:

764

Inventio crucis

Nukkurum tima síðar varð þat til tóenda á dögum þessa Constantiní hins kristnaða keisara at öfýandi heiðingja herr safnaðt saman at beriæ við Romanos við ánæ Danubium. Konungrinn var mjök ótt sleginn við þvílíka sögn. Þa kom at honum bjátr maðr í svefní ok sagði til hans: Eigi skaltu óttaz Constantiní, lítta upp í himininn ok sjá. Ok er hann leit upp sá hann krossmark Christs göfgülgít, hárðla bjátr. Ok þessi orð voru yfir skrifðuð: Með þersu marki muntu sigð fá. Síðan gerði konungríning líking þvílíks tákns ok bar það sama með sér til bardaga mótt heiðingjum svá sem fyrir sigmerki. Þa sló óttta miklum á heiðingja ok fljóði hverr

A þvi are er lóðít var fra burð Cristz .cc. vetra oc .xxx. oc þrír vetr, þat var a vi10. are ríkis Constantiní, þa com fljóði vikinga líðs ad Danubium þéirar ár, oc voro bunir at ganga a Romveria ríki. En er Constantinus spurði þat, þa for hann í moti með her sinn. En er hann sa, hverso mikít líð vikingar híðað, þa ægði honum at beriæ við þa. Oc a eini nott syndiz honum maðr bjátr yfirlíz oc mælltí við hann: «Constantine, hirð ægí þu at ottaz, lítta upp í himenenn.» Oc se, þa leit hann upp til himens oc sa crossmare Cristz a himne sva biart sem elldr væri; þa sa hann oc rituð þessi orð yfir: I þessó marki muntu sigr veja. Þa let Constantinus gera crossare af gulli i

---

386 HMS I, 301-308.
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It must be considered a possibility that there existed two separate versions of the legend, both expanded with historical material. The legend of the Cross tree was a popular one and for instance found its way into a homily in the Norwegian homily book, in a version unlike those in 764 and 238/233.388

It is now time to turn to the Constantine passage in 764 which is derived from the life of St Silvester. It describes how three thousand infants were brought to Rome to be killed, so that the emperor could be cured of his leprosy by bathing in their blood. As was the case with the Cross tree legend, the Icelandic texts, i.e. 764 and the parallel passage in Silvesters saga,389 differ considerably from each other, so they can hardly be derived from the same translation of the Latin source.390 The text in 764 does not include Constantine’s speech, which he makes after he realises that the children are about to be sacrificed for him, but simply states: ‘hafði hann þar mörg skynsamlig orð um’ (21v12-13). The beginning of the story is on the other hand reasonably fully translated but with vocabulary at times different from that in Silvesters saga.391 The saga contains the whole story, with the speech only a little shortened, and sticks closer to the Latin. In an article on the relationship between the Icelandic Inventio crucis and Veraldar saga Stefán Karlsson suggested that Silvesters saga was among the sources shared by the two works.392 The evidence, however, is scant and it seems that the reception of the legends of St Silvester and emperor Constantine in Iceland is more multi-faceted than Stefán allowed for.

---

388 Gamal norsk homiliebok, 102-103.
389 HMS II, 249-251.
391 Cf. e.g. 'hofbyskupar' vs. 'blötmen' for pontifices capitolii; 'farkostr' vs. 'fararskjóti' for vehiculum.
392 Stefán Karlsson, 'Inventio crucis', 126-128.
7.4. Holy men

7.4.1. Lists and fragments from saints’ lives

On 20v12-21v3 and 21v32-41 we find information and anecdotes on some of the Church’s illustrious men, among them the four doctors (Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome and Gregory), Origen, Benedict and Alcuin. The material on these pages seems to come from disparate sources. Some of it reads as if it might have come from some list or lists, as for instance at the beginning:

‘Dá er líðit var frá holdgan várs herra Jesu Christi cccc vetra voro þessir samtjöa uppi: Martinus í Turon, Jeronimus at Jórsólum, Ambrosius í Mielansborg, Augustinus hinn mikli í Affrika, Severinus í Kolni á Saxlandi, Patricius byskup er kristnað Skotland ... , Pacomius, ... Origenes, Basilius, Gregorius Nisenus, Gregorius Nazarenus (20v12-18).

The four doctors are given a characteristic each (‘Jeronimus ... hinn þönnazti ... Ambrosius ... hinn róksamlígtzi ... Augustinus ... hinn djúpazti ... Gregorius ... hinn nýtsamlígtzi’ 20v18-27), likewise reminiscent of lists.

Much of the additional information and the anecdotes seem, on the other hand, to come from saints’ lives and collections of exempla. *Augustinus saga* is thus clearly the source on which the scribes based their account of Augustine and Ambrose (20v18-25, cf. *HMS* I, 132.28-30, 135-136, 148.17-22) and towards the end of f. 21v we find references to the life of St Catherine (cf. *HMS* I 421.13-20). *Martinus saga*, is similarly a likely source for the information on the fate of Arius (21r16-18), since a parallel passage is found in a version of the saga preserved in Stock. Perg. fol. nr. 2 (cf. *HMS* I, 609.31-35). A life of St Martin might also have produced the names of St Martin, St Severin (the author of Martin’s *vita*) and possibly Bishop Patricius (he is said to have been Martin’s nephew). The scribe cites *Martinus saga* as the authority for some (or all?) of the information on Origen (21r5), but nothing equivalent is found in the three versions of the saga printed by Unger. And neither do these versions tell anything of Alcuin who became abbot of the monastery at Tours as is mentioned in 764. The scribe recounts a vision Alcuin is supposed to have experienced while a monk at the house where the brethren wore gold-embroidered clothes and had meat at every meal (cf. 20v31-34). Despite the lack of analogous passages in the preserved versions of *Martinus saga*, it is most likely that all the information linked to St Martin and Tours in 764 came from the same source, possibly an
expanded version of the vita by Sulpicius. It should be noted here that there exists a fragment from the beginning of the fourteenth century containing matter on St Martin not represented elsewhere in the Icelandic lives of the saint. Martinus saga is among the books listed in the 1525 inventory for Reynistaður. It may have been a fuller version of the saga than that represented by the extant manuscripts.

7.4.2. Vitae patrum

The inventory also lists a copy of Vitae patrum. Two of the anecdotes in this part of 764 are derived from the collection of exempla commonly known by that name. The title is somewhat misleading in that it is used to denote the Vitae patrum ‘proper’ i.e. Tyrannius Rufinus’ Historia eremitica (or Historia monachorum in Ægypto), stories about the Desert fathers, as well as the more heterogenous collection Verba seniorum. The latter contains mostly anecdotes of monks and clerics and is thought to be somewhat later than Rufinus’ collection which is dated to c. 400. Stories in these collections are often attributed to St Jerome since he was commonly thought to have been responsible for Rufinus’ work. The two anecdotes in question (on ff. 21r32-39 and 21r39-21v3) come from the Verba seniorum and are both introduced with the formula ‘Svá segir Jeronimus’. The stories are printed by Unger from AM 225 fol., a codex from c. 1400. That text corresponds closely with 764. 764 includes, later in the manuscript, twelve stories (one of them the same as that on f. 21r32-39 but copied by another scribe) from Verba seniorum (cf. Appendix I). Matthias Tveitane has discussed the relationship between 764 and other manuscripts containing Norse versions of Verba seniorum and suggested that 764 represented a more original version than that preserved in 225 since the text in 225 seems to have been reworked. The matter merits further consideration which will not be undertaken here. It will suffice to mention that when comparing the texts one should take into account the tendency to abbreviate, so characteristic of the 764 scribes. Further, Tveitane does not seem to have taken all the Verba seniorum

394 Di IX, 321.
396 The source of the third anecdote, immediately preceding these two, has not been found.
anecdotes found in 764 into account. Many of them correspond closely with the text printed by Unger, but some (e.g. the one on f. 37r) seem to be derived from a different version.

Exempla of this kind were popular in the Middle Ages, especially of course among nuns and monks. These stories were for instance used for reading aloud at table and Vitae patrum is even mentioned in the Rule of St Benedict as an appropriate read.\textsuperscript{398} The wealth of such material in 764 suggests that such readings were one of the purposes the book was intended for.

\textsuperscript{397} Ibid., 18,
8. Aetates VII-VIII: In fine seculorum

8.1. Hell, Purgatory and Refrigerium Sanctorum

At the top of f. 22 it is announced that, after sketching briefly what has happened in the sixth age, it is now time to turn to events which will signal the end of that age. What follows is a brief account of the coming of the Antichrist (22r3-17). Its immediate source is chapters 50-54 of Tveggja postola saga Jóns ok Jakobs. Since the account of Judgement Day in 764 (22v22-23v4) is of the same provenance, both passages will be discussed together below (pp. 212-217).

At the end of the account of the Antichrist the text refers to what in the Glossa ordinaria and subsequently was termed refrigerium sanctorum. It is stated that after the fall of Antichrist 45 days will be granted ‘góðum mönnum ... til náða en röngum til yfirbótar’. No one knows, it says, how long it will be thereafter until Judgment Day and the end of the world. This information comes from a work by Hugo Ripelin of Strasboug, Compendium Theologicae Veritatis (Book 7 ch. 14, on Hugo and his work cf. p. 212), but the origins of the idea of refrigerium sanctorum lie with St Jerome. In his commentary on Daniel he interpreted Dn 12.11: et posita fuerit abominatio in desolatione dies mille ducenti nonaginta, as referring to the reign of the Antichrist, lasting three and a half years (cf. 764: ‘hált iiij' ár’ 22r14). The text in Daniel continues with: beatus qui expectat et pervenit ad dies mille trecentos triginta quinque, and by subtracting 1290 from 1335, Jerome was left with 45 days between the end of the reign of Antichrist and the Last Judgment. This period was a time of peace but its purpose, according to Jerome, was to test the faith of believers. Specifying how many days would pass before the coming of Christ could be seen as contravening other scriptural passages which stated that men could not know the exact time of the Lord’s coming. Bede, who took up Jerome’s interpretation, attempted a reconciliation by implying that the 45 days should not be taken

---


400 A similar information is found in Elucidarius where the days of repentance are said to be 40 and that no one knows when Judgment Day will come, cf. Elucidarius, 129.11-14.

literally. His example was followed by Haimo of Auxerre who solved the problem by supposing that after the 45 days there would be another period of unknown duration. It is Haimo's formulation which Hugo adopts in *CTV* and Haimo also seems to be responsible for the idea that the 45 days were 'granted to the elect who had wavered during Antichrist's persecutions so that they could then do penance and be saved'. Whether they would be similarly occupied during the indefinite period up to the Last Judgment is not made clear, neither in *CTV* nor in 764.

As was discussed in chapter II.1, the 764 scribes follow an aetates-scheme which presupposes that the souls of the dead exist in the seventh age which runs concurrent with the first six ones. Men enter this age at the hour of death and the dwelling-place of each is determined by his deeds in his earthly life. It was undisputed in the Middle Ages that after the Last Judgment the saved would dwell in heaven and the damned would burn in Hell, for all eternity. Less certainty surrounded the fate of the souls between death and the Last Judgment. They were thought to await the Judgment in different dwelling-places and knowledge of those could only be mediated to the living through visions and visitations.

764 mentions three regions of the underworld:


As Jacques Le Goff has demonstrated, the idea of purgatory as a place did not emerge until towards the end of the twelfth century. Before that Augustinian ideas had prevailed, which held that after death the entirely good went directly to heaven and the entirely evil to hell. In between were one or two groups of souls (for Augustine the not entirely good and not entirely evil) which had to be purged.
but the location of the purgation was not fixed. \textsuperscript{404} By the end of the twelfth century the landscape of the other world had become more clearly defined. There were now three regions: heaven, hell and purgatory. In addition there were two limbos, \textit{limbus patrum} and \textit{limbus infantium}, which were successors of sorts to the notion of the Bosom of Abraham, a place where the souls of the righteous, who lived before the time of Christ, were to rest. The \textit{limbus patrum} was presumably empty after Christ’s passion since that was believed to be the place Christ descended into to free the souls of the patriarchs. The \textit{limbus infantium} presumably still admitted unbaptised children, but it did not have the same status as the other three dwelling-places since it was for infants who had not sinned themselves but were only tainted by original sin. \textsuperscript{405} 764 only mentions one limbo, and seems to refer to the \textit{limbus patrum}. It is nevertheless curious that it is termed \textit{limbus inferni}. This may simply be analogous to the term \textit{puteus inferni} (22r22) for the abyss of hell. Alternatively, \textit{inferni} might be an error for \textit{infantium} in which case the ultimate source for this information would have included both limbos. This is highly speculative however. Whatever the origins of the term they used, the scribes of 764 did not concern themselves further with the limbo but proceeded to describe the three other places and the souls which dwell there. According to them both inferno and purgatory are within the boundaries of hell (‘helviti’) with fire in both places. The scribes quote Gregory the Great to explain how it is that the heat of the fire is felt in different degrees in purgatory and in inferno (according to the sinfulness of the souls suffering it), a reference to the fourth book of the \textit{Dialogues}. \textsuperscript{406}

The idea of purging by fire rested on the doctrine of sin, where a distinction was made between mortal sins and lesser sins which came to be termed \textit{venial}. The souls tainted by venial sins were the material for purgatory, and the doctrine of venial sins became the substance on which the whole edifice of suffrage was built. For the punishment of lesser sinners could be mitigated through the intervention of the living, with the help of intercessors. The doctrine of venial sins had its scriptural basis in John’s First Epistle but it was first


\textsuperscript{405} Le Goff, \textit{La naissance}, 299.
outlined by Tertullian. The idea was developed more fully by St Augustine and Gregory the Great although the term ‘venial’ did not come to be applied until the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{407} St Gregory’s treatment of the subject in \textit{Moralia in Job} but primarily in the fourth book of the \textit{Dialogues} was to become very influential and the examples of venial sins which are given in 764 are clearly drawn from the latter source:

Sem tamen, ut praedixi, hoc de parvis minimisque peccatis fieri posse credendum est, sicut est assiduus otiosus sermo, immoderatus risus, vel peccatum curae rei familiaris, quaee viex sine culpa vel ab ipsis agitur, qui culpam qualiter declinare debant sciunt; aut in non gravibus rebus error ignorantiae, quae cuncta etiam post mortem gravant, si adhuc in hac vita positis minime fuerint relaxata (77, 396)

764 seems to have turned the Latin around slightly or followed a text in which the adjectives were already muddled, for the examples listed there are ‘parflaus hlår, óstilîlgîr málàstr eða heimlig gleði eða þat annat er varla má forđaz’ (22r37-38). ‘parflaus’ corresponds with \textit{otiosus} and ‘óstilîlgîr’ with \textit{immoderatus}. (An echo of Gregory’s \textit{immoderatus risus} is also found in the \textit{Icelandic Homily Book} where the homilist talks of death: ‘Liþen er óstîlîr hlår oc leicr’.\textsuperscript{408})

764 owes a greater debt to St Gregory than merely these quotations. When faced with the problem of how to describe the horrors and delights of the other worlds in his \textit{Dialogues}, Gregory resorted to storytelling. He described the purgation of sins (which he believed would happen in the place where they were committed) through a series of \textit{exempla}. This way of conveying the agonies awaiting sinners set the pattern for descriptions of the other world throughout the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{409} The scribes of 764 follow this tradition and choose three visionary \textit{exempla} to illustrate the horrors of hell, the suffering in purgatory and the heavenly bliss. But their choice of stories nevertheless departs from the line taken by Gregory. For whereas Gregory described the other world as seen through the eyes of men, usually monks or clerics, the main characters in the miracles included in 764 are women. This is in line with the development of visionary literature. Early examples of the genre centred around men as

\textsuperscript{406} \textit{nam sicut in hoc mondo sub uno sole multi consistunt, nec tamen eiusdem solis ardorem aequaliter sentiunt, quia alios plus aestuat, atque alios minus. Gregorius Magnus Dialogi libri IV.} Ed. by Umberto Moricca. (Fonti per la storia d’Italia.) Roma 1924, 303.

\textsuperscript{407} Le Goff, \textit{La naissance}, 293.

\textsuperscript{408} \textit{Homiliu-bök}, 49.14.

visionaries but visions experienced by women became gradually more frequent and from the thirteenth century onwards the majority of visions were attributed to women.\footnote{Peter Dinzelbacher. \textit{Visionen und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter}. Stuttgart 1981, 226-228.}

The first story (22r26-32) tells of a woman who indulged in carnal sins so that her soul was committed to hell upon death. Her daughter is visited in sleep by a handsome man who leads her through a valley of horror and disgust. There the daughter sees her mother being immersed in a fiery pit and sucked by serpents.

The purpose of some of the stories included by Gregory in his Dialogues was to emphasise the importance of suffrage, i.e. intercession by the living for the dead.\footnote{Gregorius Magnus, \textit{Dialogi}, 315-320. Cf. Le Goff, \textit{La naissance}, 126-127.} The next tale in 764 (22r41-22v6) has the same aim and it is preceded by a note on the ways in which the living can free souls in purgatory from suffering:

\begin{quote}
iii hlutir eru þeir er lærisföð segja at andir fræli af þinu: messur, ólímusugerðir, fóstur, bænir heilagra ok eigi sónr þeira er í þessi veröld eru, sem vitni berr þessi hlutr er fylgir (22r39-41)
\end{quote}

These means of suffrage were common knowledge for every Christian in the Middle Ages. St Augustine advocated a trilogy of suffrage, masses, prayers and alms,\footnote{Cf. Le Goff, \textit{La naissance}, 113.} but fasts were also regularly included, e.g. by Bede.\footnote{Ibid. 141.} The Icelandic \textit{Speculum penitentis} (15th c.) lists the following suffrages for venial sins:

\begin{quote}
auðl sacramenta og allar helgar vigslir og blezaner og einkanliga biskups blezan.
fyrir vax vigslir, fyrir bæna halld faustur og aulmausv gerdir. et per signa humilitatis et devocionis ...\footnote{Knud-Erik Holme Pedersen og Jonna Louis-Jensen. \textit{Speculum penitentis.} \textit{Opuscula VIII.} (BiblArn XXXVIII.) København 1985, 222.}
\end{quote}

The story used in 764 to illustrate the usefulness of suffrage is a Marian miracle which is also included in the so called B-collection of Marian miracles found in three manuscripts (AM 232 fol., 234 fol. and 633 4to).\footnote{The miracle is number 33 in the collection, cf. Ole Widding. \textit{'Norrøne Marialegender på europæisk baggrund.' \textit{Opuscula X.} (BiblArn XL.) København 1996, 13.} The text in 764 follows the text printed by Unger closely, but leaves off before the end.\footnote{Cf. \textit{Mariu saga}, 120-121. The text in 764 ends on 121.11.} The miracle was obviously chosen by the 764 scribes because it describes delivery from

\begin{quote}

\end{quote}
purgatory. It does not however, except indirectly, illustrate the efficacy of prayers, despite what is promised in the introduction to the story in 764 (cf. the citation above). The last part of the story in its full form stresses the importance of confession. The scribes of 764 may have left that part out so that the miracle would better fit their purpose of illustrating the role of intercessors in delivering souls from torment.

The third exemplum in 764 (22v7-14) describes the fate of a righteous soul. It is stated at the beginning that books tell of many places where the souls of the righteous rest until Judgment Day. The story then tells of a labourer (‘akrkarl’) who despite his frailty worked the field and kept his own counsel. After he dies his daughter is visited by a boy ‘með eldligri ásjónu’ (22v9) who takes her to Elysian fields where she sees many thousand men, shining in countenance, her father among them. She asks her father to allow her to stay there with him but he says that cannot be for some time. Following on from the story the scribes refer briefly to the beginning of ch. 25 of the fourth book of Gregory’s Dialogues which is an answer to Peter’s question whether the souls of the righteous are admitted into heaven before the resurrection. (The text has no counterpart in the preserved fragments of the Icelandic translation (cf. p. 90) but corresponds to parts of chs. XXV-XXVI in the Latin text.)

764
En Gregorius segir svá í fjórðu bók
Dialogorum at þat sé eigi trúanda af öllum réttlátu manna öndum því at hann segir at þá vantaði nukkut á algjört réttlaeti ok munu þá hvílað í góðum stað framan til hins mikla dóms. En þeira andir, segir
Gregorius, er með öllu eru algævar ganga skjót eftir sitt andlát í dýrð himinrikis þar sem sjálfr Guð er fyrir, sannandi þetta með sanneikins orðum er svá segja í guðspjallinu: Ubicunque fuerit corpus illuc congregabuntur aquile [Lc 17.37]. (22v16-20)

Greg. Dial.
Gregorius. Hoc neque de omnibus iustis fateri possimus, neque de omnibus negare. Nam sunt quorundam iustorum animae, quae a caelesti regno quibusdam adhuc mansionibus differuntur; in quo dilationis damno quid aliud innuitur, nisi quod de perfecta iustitia alicquid minus habuerunt? Et tamen luce clarius constat quia perfectorum iustorum animae, mox ut huius cæns claustra exequut, in caelestibus sedibus recipiuntur: quod et ipsa per se Veritas adtestatur, dicens: ubicunque fuerit corpus, illuc congregabuntur aquilaes. quia, ubi ipse Redemptor est corpore, illuc procul dubio colleguntur et animae iustorum.417

With that the scribes have managed to give an account of the three places into which the souls of the dying are received (not counting the limbo which, as mentioned above, was of little consequence to the audience of these texts). They
have described hell, purgatory and the heavenly place where rest the souls of the righteous and of those who are freed from purgatory. They have also outlined the ‘conditions for entry and exit’ that apply in each place. The seventh age has thus been accounted for insofar as that is possible and the final chapter of the chronicle can begin.

8.2. Antichrist and Last Judgment

8.2.1. Hugo Ripelin’s Compendium Theologicae Veritatis

It was mentioned above that the passages in 764 on the coming of Antichrist (22r1-17) and the Last Judgment (22v22-23v4) are derived from Tveggja postola saga Jóns og Jakobs (TvpJJ), chapters 50-54 and 56. The main source for these chapters of the saga is a theological manual, Compendium Theologicae Veritatis (CTV) compiled around 1260 by the Dominican writer Hugo Ripelin of Strassburg, but often incorrectly attributed to Albertus Magnus.

Hugo’s Compendium was a popular work in the Middle Ages and played a considerable role in disseminating lore about Antichrist and the end of the world. It seems to have been well known in medieval Iceland, as Ian McDougall has shown. Works with similar titles appear in inventories for the monasteries at Viðey and Þingeyrar, but more conclusive evidence for the popularity of Hugo’s work in Iceland is provided by ‘the many instances in which Icelandic authors cite passages from CTV in translation’. In addition to TvpJJ the work has been shown to be the main source for the Speculum penitentis, as well as providing material for the prologue to Mariu saga II, the theological manual preserved in AM 672 4to and other fifteenth-century manuscripts, and the physiognomic treatise in Codex Lindesianus (late 15th c.)

417 Gregorius Magnus, Dialogi, 263,
418 Postola sógur, 614-626.
and other younger manuscripts.\textsuperscript{422} \textit{TvpJJ} has been dated to around 1300 which means that \textit{CTV} must have reached Iceland not long after Hugo compiled it.

The chapters on Antichrist and the Last Judgement in \textit{TvpJJ} are based on chapters vii-x, xii-xxv, xx, xxvi, xxviii and xxxi of Book VII of \textit{CTV, De ultimis temporibus},\textsuperscript{423} but the author of the saga has also drawn material from other sources. The Apocalypse of St John is one of them, some material may have come from a commentary on the Apocalypse and there is also a passage which stems from Isidore’s \textit{Etymologies}\.\textsuperscript{424} The \textit{TvpJJ} is thus clearly a composite work and its author remoulded his material to suit his purposes. He does not include the chapters from \textit{CTV} in extenso but chooses paragraphs, sometimes rearranges them and then incorporates them into the saga where they can fit. That \textit{764} is based on the \textit{TvpJJ} rather than on a translation of \textit{CTV} also used by the author of the saga is evidenced by the inclusion in \textit{764} of material which does not come from \textit{CTV} but is part of the saga.\textsuperscript{425}

8.2.2. Antichrist

The account of Antichrist in \textit{764} (22r1-17) is a heavily abridged version of the text in \textit{TvpJJ}, hardly more than a précis. \textit{764} traces only the barest outline of the rise and reign of Antichrist: his birth in Babylon; his arrival in Jerusalem where he proclaims himself as the son of God and where the Jews build a new temple for him; the arrival of Enoch and Elijah who preach against him and are killed and assumed into heaven; the death of Antichrist on the Mount of Olives. Brief though this treatment is, it nevertheless contains all the main points of the lore of Antichrist as it came to be known in the Middle Ages. It was Adso of Montier-en-Der (c. 910-992) who composed the most influential treatise on the Antichrist and it was on this that many later authors, including Hugo Ripelin, relied. It is in the form of a letter to Queen Gerberga and follows the life of Antichrist from

\textsuperscript{422} \textit{Ibid.} 140 and 144-146.
\textsuperscript{424} Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir, ‘Dömsdagslysing’, 187.
\textsuperscript{425} The best example of this is the passage on the corporeal gifts, cf. pp. 216-217. One can also mention modifications like the one on 22r7 where \textit{764} reads: ‘smiðandi upp þat mustari er niðr var brotit fyrir þeirra glæpi af Tito ok fóður hans’. \textit{CTV} only mentions Romans and so does \textit{TvpJJ} but there reference is made to events related earlier in the saga: ‘uppreisandi þat musteri, er forðum brutu þeir niðr meðr sinum glæsum, en romverjar eyðdu ok at velli lögdu með svörtum kolum ok ausku, sem fyrir var greint í þessi söggu’. (\textit{Postola sögur}, 614.18-21).
conception to death.\(^{426}\) (It already contains all the information offered in 764 except the assumption of Enoch and Elijah.\(^{427}\) ) Antichrist, who proclaims himself to be Christ, provided a parallel and a contrast to the true Christ, and his life imitates the life of the Saviour. This is also reflected in the form of Adso’s treatise which resembles the structure of saints’ lives, thereby creating a sort of \textit{vita Antichristi}.\(^{428}\) By giving it such a well-known form Adso ensured the popularity and influence of his treatise. Hugo Ripelin’s \textit{CTV} was one of the popular sources through which the lore of Antichrist was disseminated.\(^{429}\) He devoted chapters 7-14 of Book 7 to the subject. Thus it appears that the outline of the life of Antichrist which the scribes of 764 included in their chronicle had passed through only two intermediary sources: from Adso to Hugo, from Hugo to \textit{TvpJJ}, the source for 764. The scribes, true to form, stripped the text of the saga of all redundant material, ending up with the naked facts, as it were, about Antichrist.

8.2.3. The end of the world — and of a chronicle

The passage on Judgment Day and the end of the world (22v22-23v4) is based on chapter 56 of \textit{TvpJJ} and was much less abbreviated by the 764 scribes than the chapters on Antichrist. The passage in 764 begins with a short prologue introducing the chapter from the saga. It begins with a reference to St Matthew’s description of the Son of Man coming with power and great glory, sending his angels with a great blast of the trumpet (Mt 22.30-31). It is then told how all souls will assume their bodies and come to the Judgment.\(^{430}\) God will arrive with nine hosts of angels, with patriarchs, prophets, apostles and saints.\(^{431}\) The scribes then cite the \textit{Dies irae}: ‘Sá dagr kallaz dagr reiði, dagr kvalar ok eymdar, dagr myrkrs ok þoku, dagr lúðrs ok kallz. Sá dagr mun mjökk vera beiskr ok grimmr öllum ýmillum’ (22v27-29). All these notions were commonplace in Christian


\(^{427}\) That is taken from \textit{CTV}. The assumption of Enok and Elias was also well known through the Gospel of Nicodemus, cf. \textit{Mórstiðningarsaga}, HMS II, 16.


\(^{429}\) Ibid. 77-79.

\(^{430}\) Cf. \textit{Elucidarius}, 130.5-9.

eschatology and 764 may here be compared to *Elucidarius* although there is no direct link between the two texts.

*TvpJJ* provides the text for the remainder of the passage. The text of the saga is mainly based on chapters xv, xx, and xxxi of Book 7 of *CTV*, but a few paragraphs seem to be taken from chapters xxvi and xxviii. The first part of the text in *TvpJJ* describes the cleansing of the world through fire while the second part deals with the joys of heavenly existence.

The idea of fire as an agent of purging and rejuvenation has a long history in Western thought. It is illustrated in the myth of the phoenix which is reborn out of its own ashes and which in Christian exegesis came to signify the Christ or the Christian soul. This is for instance evident in the Icelandic version of *Physiologus*:

\[
\text{Fenix markar drotten várn i eple sino þvi, es hann brenner sikh ok lifgar. Sva tok
jesus christus sialfraýe pisl a licamma sinn ok reis vpp a .iii. dege oc fek ollom
falselo ...}
\]

For Christians the pronouncements of Paul in 1Cor 3.13-15 became the basis on which the medieval idea of purgatory rested and with time fire became the enduring image of the trial that awaited the souls. The text in *TvpJJ* describes how the doomsday fire fulfills a fourfold role: it punishes evil men, it purges good men of sins, it destroys the flesh of men and beasts, and cleanses the elements. This reflects theories of fire that developed in the thirteenth century, and are evident for instance in Guillaume de Auvergne’s treatise *De universo*. Guillaume differentiates between ordinary (earthly) fire, fire that consumes, perpetual fire (hellfire) which burns without consuming and purgatorial fire which consumes only sins. The text in *TvpJJ* also seems to portray fire as the most fundamental of the elements since it is through fire that the other elements are reformed. St Augustine linked fire to God himself and even though that

---


433 Werner Dahlerup. ‘*Physiologus*’, 256.

434 *uniuscuiusque opus manifestum erit dies enim declarabit quia in igne revelabitur et uniuscuiusque opus quale sit ignis probabit si cuius opus manserit quod superaedificavit mercedem accipiet si cuius opus areserit detrimentum patietur ipse autem salvus erit sic tamen quasi per ignem.*


idea is nowhere stated in TvpJJ it might nevertheless underlie the hierarchy of the elements.

The second part, about the heavenly bliss, dwells predominantly on the spiritual and corporeal gifts which the blessed receive in heaven. The author of TvpJJ here supplements the CTV text with another source which is not readily identifiable. The CTV records that the gifts are seven in all, three spiritual (dotes animae) and four corporeal (dotes corporis).\footnote{Albertus Magnus, Opera, 253-258.} In TvpJJ however, the corporeal gifts are said to be seven and although the spiritual gifts are not numbered, six are described, twice the number given in CTV. The doctrine about the gifts had its roots in the bridal-mystique where Christ was seen as the bridegroom and the Church (and by extension all Christians) his bride. The gifts were seen as parallel to gifts bestowed on the bride by the groom upon their union.\footnote{Nikolaus Wicki. Die Lehre von der himmlischen Seligkeit in der mittelalterlichen Scholastik von Petrus Lombardus bis Thomas von Aquin. Freiburg 1954, 209-212 and 220.} The doctrine seems to have originated in the late twelfth century and the first author to link three spiritual gifts with four corporeal ones was in all likelihood Stephen Langton.\footnote{Ibid. 202-203.} The doctrine grew, at least partly, out of ideas attributed to Anselm of Canterbury who allegedly taught that in heaven fourteen 'blessings' (beatudines) would be conferred on the righteous, seven corporeal and seven spiritual.\footnote{Ibid., 203-205.} The main exposition of these ideas is found in a work by one of Anselm's disciples, Eadmer,\footnote{Eadmeri monachi Liber de beatudine coelestis patriae. PL 159, 587-606.} but they also influenced another of his students, Honorius Augustodunensis. He refers in his Elucidarius to the fourteen attributes as gloriae, rendered 'dýrðir' in the Icelandic translation of that work.\footnote{Elucidarius, 142.} The Icelandic Elucidarius lists the gloriae corporalis as 'fegró', 'fróleikr', 'styrkt', 'frelsi', 'sællífi', 'heilsa' and 'óðauðleikr', corresponding to pulchritudo, velocitas, fortitudo, libertas, voluptas, sanitas and immortalitas. The gloriae animae are 'speki', 'vínáttta', 'samþykki', 'veldi', 'vegr', 'óruggleikr' and 'fógnúðr', corresponding to sapientia, amicitia, concordia, potestas, honor, securitas and gaudium.\footnote{Ibid. 142-143.} Eadmer's treatise agrees with Honorius' list except that his chapter on sanitas is given the heading De impassibilitate.\footnote{PL 159, 591.} TvpJJ and
764 state that ‘likaminn mun ... verða bjartr, ópínanlígr, gagnfærílígr, skjótr, sterkr, heill ok langlífr’.\textsuperscript{446} \textit{CTV} lists the four \textit{dotes corporis} as claritas, impassibilitas, subtilitas and agilitas\textsuperscript{447} which correspond to the first four attributes in \textit{TvpJJ}. \textit{TvpJJ} therefore seems to combine the two lists, adding fortitudo, sanitas and immortalitas to the four gifts in \textit{CTV}. The spiritual gifts seem to be six in \textit{TvpJJ} as was mentioned above, although the matter is slightly complicated by the way each gift tends to be described in two words: ‘speki ok vizka’, ‘ást ok vinátta’, ‘samþykki’, ‘sæmd ok virðing’, ‘náðir ok gleði’ and ‘friðr’. \textit{CTV} gives the three \textit{dotes animae} as cognitio, dilectio and comprehensio.\textsuperscript{448} \textit{TvpJJ} seems to have taken the first two on board, which correspond more or less with the first two in \textit{Elucidarius}, and then added concordia, honor, gaudium and securitas, leaving out potestas (as well as comprehensio).

The author of \textit{TvpJJ} seems therefore, to have had a source which provided the Anselmian list of beatudines. The differences in vocabulary seem to exclude \textit{Elucidarius} as that source. The doctrine of the gifts was a popular one in the late Middle Ages and often included in summae of various kinds, so it may prove hard to pinpoint the exact source for the amalgamation in \textit{TvpJJ}.

The chronicle ends, fittingly, by proclaiming that the heavenly bliss enjoyed by the souls of the righteous shall have no end: ‘Skulu góðir menn lífa með guði feðr ok hans helgum mónnum æ ok æ utan enda.’ (23v3-4).

\textsuperscript{446} \textit{Postola sögur}, 625.6-8.
\textsuperscript{447} Albertus Magnus, \textit{Opera}, 256-258.
\textsuperscript{448} Albertus Magnus, \textit{Opera}, 254-255.
III. UNIVERSAL HISTORY

1. The writing of universal history in the Middle Ages.

1.1. The genre.

It will have become evident in previous chapters that AM 764 4to should not be described as a haphazard collection of diverse material. On the contrary, its compilers worked in at least a semi-systematic way towards their goal of tracing the history of the world from its beginning in the Creation until the Last Judgment. The concept that lies behind the compilation of 764 was by no means the innovation of the Icelandic scribes — it had been in use for a millennium and produced numerous works that provide parallels to the world chronicle found in 764.

It is common to all these works that in them history is presented as a linear succession of events while at the same time an attempt is made to cover the history of diverse peoples and reigns. This endeavour is usually underpinned by the use of genealogies and the concept of aetates mundi. The history told in these works is the history of salvation, the history of mankind is in other words synonymous with salvation history. Although the question of medieval historical genres has been much debated in recent decades,¹ there is a general consensus that these works should be grouped under the label universal histories. Hans-Werner Goetz defines the genre thus:

¹ For a review of the problem see Franz-Josef Schmale. Funktion und Formen mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreibung. Darmstadt 1985, 103-125 (Chapter IX, Historiographische genera) and Bernard Guenée. 'Histoires, annales, chroniques. Essai sur les genres historiques au Moyen Age.' Annales 28 (1973), 997-1016.
Its theme is universal history as a whole, from the beginning of the world (the creation) or at least the incarnation of Christ until the times of its author ... and sometimes ... even beyond, thus containing either the six (or seven) ages of the world or just the sixth age. It is characterized by its context within the history of salvation, manifested in the divine background, the division into ages (aetates) and kingdoms (regna), typological comparisons, a linear conception of history as a limited period and a search for the position of the author's present age in the divine concept of salvation. As historiography, it is marked by its chronographical nature and, in spite of mixed and transitional forms, in most cases contains history of the past rather than of the present. 2

A.-D. van den Brincken divided the genre further into three different types of works: series temporum, mare historiarum and imago mundi. 3 The first type represents a firm adherence to the chronological order, to the succession of eras and reigns from the beginning to the time of writing. The second type is characterised by a fuller narrative; the works belonging to this sub-genre are more elaborate and attempt a more thorough treatment of historical events, elucidating the causes and consequences of actions and events and giving evaluations of people and their actions. The style of these works tends to be more elaborate than that of the series temporum which is often simple and paratactic. The third type is however the one which most drastically embraces the principle of brevity. Works of this kind are encyclopedic in nature, sometimes hardly more than lists, and they are often inserted into longer works in order to give a brief overview of world history. Although this subdivision of the genre is helpful when it comes to gauging the purpose and function of the different works, it must be stressed that individual works may display characteristics drawn from all three subtypes (cf. the reference to 'mixed and transitional forms' in the quotation from Goetz above). One should therefore not think of the three types as closed categories but rather as different trends within the writing of universal history in the Middle Ages.

The universal chronicle is an essentially Christian genre (although a similar development can be seen within Islamic historiography) and its foundation is the Bible. At the core of it lies the Incarnation and Christ's passion around which all other events are organised, in a linear chronology. It is the

history of the revelation, it shows God's guiding hand at work in the history of mankind. One of its main characteristics, however, is the way it seeks to combine sacred and secular history *sub specie salvationis*. That was already the aim of the work which marks the beginning of Latin world chronicles, Eusebius' history in the form which Jerome gave it.

The content of the chronicles is therefore by no means restricted to biblical events and characters but room is given to a wide array of secular information, much of it bound up with the curriculum of the *septem artes liberales*. The strive to link the secular to the sacred meant that placing secular events within the scripturally based chronology was essential, and one will therefore often find in these works references to political events such as the foundations of cities and states, or cultural information such as notes on the origins of trades and disciplines, or on poets and writers. Universal chronicles may, as a result, contain a wealth of material not directly pertaining to sacred history nor even to church history.

The structural elements of universal chronicles are closely connected to the preoccupation with maintaining an *ordo temporum*. The chronicles are therefore organised through the use of serial principles. The use of *aetates mundi* has already been discussed (cf. pp. 63-65) and so has the theory of the four monarchies (pp. 123-124). These organising features are a staple element in medieval world chronicles, as are genealogies and lists of many kinds. Isidore was the first to use the *aetates* in a world chronicle. They are a prominent feature of his *Chronica maiora*; and he secured the four monarchies a place within the tradition of universal history with his commentary on the Book of Daniel. Some writers, Otto of Freising for instance, based their work on an exposition of the idea of two cities or two states, Christian (represented by Jerusalem) and pagan (represented by Babylon). Dualism of a similar kind also shows itself in typological parallels which are drawn in many universal histories. The most basic of these organisational principles, however, were genealogies and similar lists. The genealogies of the Bible served as the basis for chronological calculations; by studying them scholars arrived at fixed numbers for the years contained in each *aetas*. Biblical genealogies were matched with lists of secular rulers — a practice started by Eusebius and of which the third book of Honorius' *Imago mundi* is a good example — and if the succession of rulers was unclear writers
were sometimes forced to tidy the lists up a bit, as we saw in the case of Nebuchadnezzar who was also named Cambises (cf. p. 125). For accounts of post-biblical times lists played no lesser part as is witnessed by papal lists which formed the backbone of the Church’s history together with lists of ecumenical councils. On the secular side were lists of emperors and other rulers.

In order to place 764 within the tradition of universal histories it will suffice to mention only a few works which illustrate the development of the genre in medieval Europe. 4

1.2. The development of the medieval world chronicle.

The origins of the medieval universal chronicle lie in late Antiquity where the first example of a Christian world chronicle may be said to be the *Chronographiae* by Sextus Julis Africanus (d. after 240), which traces the history from Adam until the year 217. 5 Sextus’ work was among the sources used by Eusebius of Cesarea (263-339) in his *Χρονικά τῶν ἁπαντῶν*. Eusebius’ work is no longer extant in its original Greek version and it became known to medieval audiences in the form given to it by St Jerome. 6 That work, although sometimes referred to as Jerome’s chronicle, was not his original composition but an expanded version of the chronicle by Eusebius. Eusebius made Abraham his chronological centre so to speak, and worked out the dynasties of secular rulers by reference to the years of Abraham. In Jerome’s version (compiled c. 380) the chronicle extends from the birth of Abraham to AD 378. It was immensely influential so that one might say it became the foundation on which all later Latin chronicles were built. As was mentioned above, Eusebius and Jerome ‘established the precedent of combining sacred history with “the chronology of every age, the kings of all nations ...”’. 7 Jerome calculated the number of years for each era from Adam to Christ, based on the Septuagint, and his chronology

---

4 The following account is largely dependent on Anna-Dorothee v. den Brincken’s pioneering study *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising*, Düsseldorf 1957.
was to remain the dominant one until Bede. Jerome's work belongs to the first category of world chronicles: it is a *series temporum*, brief in style and paratactic.

One of the most popular historical works in the Middle Ages was Orosius' *Historiarum adversum paganos libri septem* (AD 417/418). The aim of the work is to illustrate how Christianity, or God's plan for the salvation of mankind, will inevitably conquer the world. In Orosius' world this happens through the unity of Christianity with the Roman empire, and secular history therefore lies at the centre of his work. Written shortly after Alaric had taken Rome, the work seeks to reconfirm the primacy of Rome as the seat of both secular and ecclesiastical power. Orosius may thus be said to have paved the way for more secular oriented chronicles. He also set an example by beginning his chronicle with a short geographical description of the known world, a practice followed by many medieval chroniclers, including the scribes of 764.

Isidore of Seville compiled two universal histories, *Chronica maiora* (AD 615) and *Chronica minora* (AD 627), based on the former and incorporated into the *Etymologies* (V.xxxix). In his introduction to the *Chronica maiora*, Isidore places himself as a successor to Sextus Julius Africanus, Eusebius and Jerome. These authors constitute his main sources, along with the Bible, but he also relied on other writers, e.g. Augustine, Pliny, Rufinus and Josephus, although he does not seem to have known Orosius. As was already mentioned, Isidore became the first author to use the *aetates mundi* scheme as an organisational element in his history and he also distinguishes himself from his predecessors by beginning his chronicles with the hexaëmeron, whereas earlier histories had begun with Adam. After the fall of the Western empire, Isidore continues the line of Roman emperors with the Byzantine rulers, a practice also seen in 764.

The next landmark in the development of universal chronicles are the works of Bede — perhaps the most important chronicler of the Middle Ages. His chronicles were part and parcel of his chronological studies and were incorporated into his handbooks on chronology. Bede pioneered the chronology

---

10 Isidorus, *Chronica*, 424.
of Dionysius Exiguus, which used the Incarnation as its starting point, with the result that the Incarnation took over from the Passion as the event which defined the chronology of Christian history. (This had the further consequence in the West that world chronicles which began with the birth of Christ started to emerge.) Bede made his mark in Iceland, as elsewhere in the West — the oldest Icelandic Easter table which has survived, dated to the first half of the twelfth century, is based on Bede’s chronology, and the earliest Icelandic historians, Ari fróði and Sæmundur fróði, likewise seem to have based their chronology on Bede.12

After Jerome, Bede exerted the greatest influence on later chroniclers and his works enjoyed an almost canonical status for more than three centuries. Like Isidore, he wrote two chronicles, but began by writing a chronica minora followed by chronica maiora. The first is a small compendium of world history, the second an expanded version with deeper theological thinking. Both chronicles were but parts of larger works, the shorter one was incorporated into De temporibus (AD 703), the longer one makes up the last part of De temporum ratione (AD 725).13

Like Isidore, Bede eschews the framework of the four world monarchies, but builds his history on the aetates mundi, together with lists which for instance trace the succession of emperors to date. In his Chronica maiora, salvation history based on the Old Testament takes precedence during the first four ages. The fifth age is based on Jerome to a large extent and this part is considerably fuller than in the smaller chronicle, but the time after Christ is nevertheless given more space than pre-christian ages. In that part, the sixth age, Church history is central and Bede records disputes over doctrine as well as other events. Following on from the chronicle proper is a short eschatological treatise where Bede treats the coming of Antichrist and the Last Judgment and describes the seventh and eighth ages of the world.

Bede’s sources were numerous. In addition to the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina he used the chronicles by Jerome, Orosius and Isidore together with

11 Isidoreus, Chronica, 394-395; Brincken, Studien, 93.
numerous other works of a similar sort. He apparently set great store by the *Liber pontificalis* and he used secular works, Josephus's *Antiquitates, Contra Apionem* and *Bellum Judaicum* amongst them, as well as sacred commentaries and saints' lives.\(^{14}\)

*De temporum ratione* 'very quickly became the standard definition and textbook for the study of computus'.\(^{15}\) As a result of the propagation of the work Bede became the dominating influence on universal history writing until the twelfth century. Not only was he the main source for many chronicles but his chronology was the received one. Universal history thus became part and parcel of chronology, an element in the study of how time passes. The emphasis was therefore necessarily on recording past history, and contemporary events insofar as they were included were viewed in the mirror of the past. Chronographical works, wide in scope, predictably exerted a more extensive influence on the medieval public than individual works which treated more narrowly defined topics or were limited in time and space. World chronicles were widely disseminated, copied, abbreviated, expanded and brought up to date.\(^{16}\)

With time however, and with the increase of literacy and the development of the schools and other institutions within the intellectual sphere, historiography became more diversified. Bede's hegemony receded towards the end of the eleventh century, Jerome resumed his place at the forefront and his chronology won over Bede's. Local history was given more space in the histories as chroniclers became increasingly interested in their own age, but at the same time they, at least those writing in the Holy Roman Empire, saw their own epoch (ravaged by the Investiture contest) as a succession to the Roman Empire and hence interest was renewed in Rome and its predecessors. The theory of the four monarchies now becomes ubiquitous. Compilers were not satisfied with the brief treatment secular rulers were given by Isidore and Bede. They turned increasingly to Jerome and Orosius, but also to literature which specifically dealt with classical heroes and events, with the result that Alexander the Great, for instance, began to receive much fuller attention and his popularity was greatly


\(^{16}\) Schmale, *Funktion und Formen*, 148-150.
enhanced. The eleventh and twelfth centuries witnessed a string of ambitious world chronicles where secular history is given considerable room although salvation history continues to serve as the backbone. Amongst these are the chronicles by Frutolf of Michelsberg (AD 1101; reworked by Ekkehardt), Sigebert of Gembloux (AD 1111), and Hugo of Fleury (AD 1109/1110). The sources these writers use are numerous but they select their material with discernment. The diminishing Bedean influence is evident in the fact that the works are more inclined to narrative, and chronology is relegated to a sub-role. All three betray an interest in faraway countries. This last characteristic is significant inasmuch as these three works were all written only a few years after the launch of the first crusade.

The twelfth century saw dramatic changes in the political and intellectual milieu of Europe and these necessarily influenced the way history was written, not least universal history. First, the known world, the oikumene, was expanding. With the crusades, western Europeans were brought into direct contact and conflict with regions which had long been no more than names in books. The geographical picture was therefore vastly changed and called for adjustments: a knowledge of the geography and history of regions outside the Holy Roman Empire gave a broader meaning to the term 'universal'. But not only was the 'outer', geographical world changing. Important changes also occurred in the world of learning. Education was developing fast with the establishment of cathedral schools and universities. The twelfth and thirteenth century witnessed the influx of classical learning on a far greater scale than before with the rediscovery of Aristotle and other authors. The disciplines expanded (I have already mentioned the explosion in commentaries on Genesis which came as a result of increased interest in the natural sciences, cf. p. 77) and it thus became an increasingly demanding task to produce books which would give an adequate overview of the known world. Such works needed to be ever larger in scope, as Vincentius’ Speculum maius testifies. One might therefore be justified in saying that in some ways the universal chronicle was absorbed by the encyclopedias. On the other hand, the needs of the schools and their pupils called for a briefer

---

treatment of the history of the world, for works of a more propaedeutical nature. Works which were tailored towards these needs displayed a more superficial treatment of the history, as is seen in works like Honorius' *Imago mundi*. But universal chronicles were not only expanded or condensed to suit the needs of new readers, material not belonging to universal history proper was often introduced, thereby pushing out the limits of the genre. Some compilers expanded their works with extensive passages on contemporary and/or local history, other chronicles came close to being collections of exempla. That is for instance true of a sub-genre, the so-called *Chronicae Martinianae*, modelled on the chronicle by Martin of Troppau and popular with the new orders, Dominicans and Franciscans. In the later Middle Ages the distinctions between the different genres therefore seem to become even more blurred. This is related to the fact that, as a result of the development in education whereby the laity became more literate, historiography became more diverse, as mentioned above. Rather than aiming to tell the history of mankind and the greatest secular powers, such as kings and emperors, people increasingly wrote works directed at a special, limited group, local history flourished and vernacular languages became an accepted medium for historical writing alongside Latin. By the twelfth and thirteenth centuries world chronicles in the vernacular start to appear, first in verse, later also in prose.

The development of universal history writing in the later Middle Ages has not been adequately studied. As is evident from what has been said above, the spectrum of works which could fall under the category is wide and the diversity increases as the Middle Ages wear on. With that and with the increasing number of works, which in turn become potential sources for other works, the focus of research unavoidably shifts more towards the role of the compiler and to

---

19 Some of these books use illustration extensively, cf. for instance a richly illuminated manuscript in the Corpus Christi College library, Cambridge, CCCC 83 fol. (13th c.), where biblical history together with lists of popes and emperors is shown largely through pictures.
the purpose he meant his work to serve. Bernard Guenée has argued that in compilations from the thirteenth century one can perceive a development towards a more catholic taste on the part of compilers in their selection of material (which agrees well with what was said above about renewed interest in secular rulers, for instance), and also an emerging distinction between author and compiler. The art of excerpting the works of earlier authors and making a new work out of them seems to become a more clearly defined activity, where the virtue of the compiler lies in conciseness and in the quality of judgment he shows in choosing his material. The reader is not left in any doubt as to the nature of the work he has in his hands. It is made clear in the title and/or in the prologue that it is a compilation and with time compilers even begin to divulge their names to their readers, which indicates that their profession has reached a more elevated status. It is worth bearing these developments in mind when it comes to assessing the achievement of the compilers of 764.

rimkrönor. Studier i funktion, stoff, form. (Studia litterarum Upsaliensia 8.) Nyköping 1971, although he leaves universal chronicles out of his main discussion.

2. Universal history in Iceland.

2.1. The origins of universal history in Iceland.

It has already been mentioned (p. 223) that the chronology of Bede was the one adopted by the earliest known historians in Iceland and his chronographical works were undoubtedly known in some form to educated Icelanders from the eleventh century onwards. The works of Honorius Augustodunensis were also introduced into Iceland early on, as were Isidore’s *Etymologies*. The Latin tradition of composing a chronicle of main events through the *aetates mundi* thus became known to Icelandic writers through the works of Isidore, Bede and Honorius, and Icelanders seem to have attempted a vernacular version of ‘heimsaldrar’, or ‘aldartala’ early on — the writing of universal history thus belongs to the earliest attempts at historical writing in Iceland. Two works of the kind, still extant, can be dated to the twelfth century, one with certainty, namely *Veraldar saga*. For the other the evidence is circumstantial, but Stefán Karlsson has argued convincingly that the *Heimsaldrar* preserved in AM 194 8vo were originally committed to vellum sometime during the period 1121-1139.

*Veraldar saga* and *Heimsaldrar* thus stand as examples of an early phase of universal history writing in Iceland. Both these works are relatively brief and would be classified as *series temporum* in A.-D. van den Brincken’s scheme. *Heimsaldrar* is the shorter of two. The story of the Jewish people naturally dominates the narrative but place is nevertheless found for other Mediterranean peoples and rulers, e.g. the Trojans, the Romans and the Egyptians. The account effectively comes to an end with the fifth age, for nothing is related of events in the sixth age. As was discussed in chapter II.5.3. (p. 156), it is plausible that the *Heimsaldrar*, in the version we know it, was in part ultimately based on Honorius’ *Imago mundi*.

---

Veraldar saga is significantly longer than Heimsaldrar. It exists in two versions, A and B. A differs from B in that it omits allegorical glosses on the first five aetates which Jakob Benediktsson, who edited the work, believes to have been part of the original version. Veraldar saga brings history down to the times of Frederic II Barbarossa, making the year of the emperor's death, 1190, a plausible terminus ante quem for the composition of the work. It includes, in the fifth age, material on Troy, Aeneas and the beginnings of the Roman empire. In the sixth age, the story follows the emperors, from Augustus and Tiberius to the fall of the Western Roman state, whereafter the thread runs through the Carolingians and the emperors of the Holy Roman empire. Much attention is devoted to significant events in the history of the Church.

There are four medieval manuscripts or fragments of Veraldar saga extant, the oldest dated to c. 1200, as well as several younger copies. Jakob Benediktsson suggested that the work might be a translation of a Latin source, a world chronicle based on Bede and Isidore to which an account of the history of the Holy Roman empire had been added. But Jakob further conceded that Veraldar saga's author must have treated his source (or sources) quite freely, modifying the text when he thought necessary, adding information and modifying the formulation. Given that it has so far proved impossible to point to a specific source for Veraldar saga, the view that it was an original compilation by an Icelander has been gaining ground. As discussed in chapter II.5.2. (p. 153), it is likely that for some of his information the author of Veraldar saga depended on the same source as 764.

As will have become evident in previous chapters, the relationship between 764 and these earlier works, as well as other fragments mentioned in chapters II.5.2.-II.5.3., is a tangled one and there is little hope of solving the riddle once and for all. But it seems reasonable to conclude that the earliest phase of universal history writing in Iceland saw the composition of other works comparable to Veraldar saga and Heimsaldrar (insofar as this piece can be counted representative of early Icelandic learning). It is equally plausible to think that it was chiefly Honorius' Imago mundi which lay behind such composition, 

28 Ibid., lii.  
29 Ibid., liii.
though without implying that he was ever the sole authority the Icelandic authors turned to, and that such a twelfth-century compilation, perhaps more than one, ultimately served as a source for 764.

The seeds of the chronicle in 764 had thus already been sown in the twelfth century. This is true in terms of content as well as form. Some of the material which ultimately found its way into 764 was already available to those who were compiling *Heimsaldrar* and *Veraldar saga*. And the frame to which the scribes of 764 adhere seems to be more or less in place in *Veraldar saga* with its progression from the history of the Mediterranean area to the kings and emperors north of the Alps, and its slant towards Church history.

The influence of universal history can be detected in other Icelandic works which would hardly be classified as world chronicles. In chapter II.5.1. it was discussed how compilers in the thirteenth and above all the fourteenth century endeavoured to bring together works that would illustrate the course of history from the Creation to the time of Christ. AM 226 fol. and Hauksbók were there taken as examples of such compilations. (That enterprise is mirrored in compilations of indigenous material, where the content is different but the method, whereby several (long) texts are linked together to forge a continuous history, is similar. One can here point to the *Sturlunga saga* compilation as an example or the large works covering the reigns of Norwegian kings: *Morkinskinna, Fagrskinna* and *Heimskringla*. ) AM 764 4to, with its wealth of disparate material and firm commitment to an *aetates*-based chronology, is a different kind of work. It is to its place in the development of universal history, in Iceland and generally, that we must now turn.

### 2.2. 764 and the tradition of universal history.

Scribe A begins fol. 1r with the following words:

Í upphafi þessa lita annála bæklings skulu véi skrifa nukkut litit af heimskringlunni ok af þeim lóndum er í henni standa ok eigi slóð hófuðborgum, hversu þær hafa í fyrstu smíðaz til þess at ljósara verði lesanda manni eða tilhlýðanda þeirra atburða eða tóenda er vorðit hafa frá því er guð skapaði verðldina ok véir hófum fundit í böku skilrirkum eða annálum fyrri manna ok svá hefr (1r1-5).

---

This preface is brief but nevertheless says something about the view the scribes had of their work. They call it 'lítill annálavæklingr' which must be taken as an instance of affected modesty given the size and scope of the book. The use of the term 'annálar' indicates a preoccupation with chronological treatment of past events and implies that the scribes viewed their work as a *series temporum*. They intend to tell of events which have occurred since God created the world, so it is clear that their history begins with the Creation and that it is a Christian history. The scribe also states explicitly that this is not an original work but depends on books and annals compiled by previous generations. Their account of the history of the world is preceded by a passage on the *orbis terrae*, regions and towns, for the benefit of the reader or the listener.

The preface thus contains allusions to the nature of the work, its scope, its orientation, its sources and compilation, and its audience. These elements merit a closer inspection.

Although the words 'lítill annálavæklingr' indicate a short work resembling a work of the *series temporum* subtype, it is clear that neither is AM 764 a 'væklingr' nor is its content adequately described by the word 'annálar'. The second half of the manuscript contains a lot of material which is not brought under any chronological headings, and even though one were to take the words 'annálavæklingr' to refer only to the first half — the chronicle — that part still contains passages and chapters which are far longer than any entry in annals. If we were to use A.-D. van den Brincken's subcategories to describe 764, we would thus have to say that the chronicle partakes of two categories, namely the *series temporum* and the *mare historiarum*. For the scribes show themselves to be most concerned with keeping track of the chronology with the tools available to them: calculations of the years within each *aetas*, genealogies and other lists etc. But their work also contains parts where stories of certain events are told in full, e.g. Judith's killing of Holofernes, the Triumvirate and the fate of Julius Caesar, the story of St Martha and the dragon. The last example just mentioned further reveals that legendary material, miracles and exempla were also seen to merit inclusion. With all the necessary reservations, that may be said to be a characteristic of a late medieval universal chronicle (cf. pp. 225-226) and we can
point to *Veraldar saga*, where no miracles or legends are found, for contrasting comparison.

The scope of the work is thus broad in terms of genres. The same is true of its chronological scope which extends from the earliest beginnings before Adam and to the thirteenth century. There the sources apparently run dry and the scribes dare not, it seems, add anything unvouched for by other (earlier) writers. The scribes also shy away from commenting upon the material they are copying and they make no attempt at linking the events they are recording with contemporary events in their own environment, which is a practice often seen in universal chronicles. They do not, it seems, see it as part of their task to record Icelandic history or make any allusions to domestic events. The geographical scope depends, like the historiographical one, on the sources, as is inevitable. Because the main source for medieval history in the chronicle is the *Chronica Martini*, the events recorded are those related to the popes and emperors listed there. 764 is thus linked to German chronicle writing, as is *Veraldar saga* albeit through a different source. (It is interesting that works written by Dominicans are among the most important sources for 764. There is Martin of Troppau’s chronicle, already mentioned, and *Compendium theologicae veritatis* by Hugo Ripelin of Strassburg which turned out to be the ultimate source for most of the matter in the eighth age in 764.) Honorius Augustodunensis is thought to have spent the last part of his life on German soil, at or near Regensburg, but he probably wrote *Imago mundi*, the work which provided some of the material in 764, while in England. In the present context it is convenient to see Honorius as a bridge between English and German traditions of learning for 764 contains a lot of material which originated in England. The most extensive passage of that kind in the chronicle is of course the chapters from *Breta sögur*, but passages on Bede and on English saints later in the manuscript also reveal a connection with English hagiography.

The different regions of medieval Europe were of course united by the over-arching hegemony of the Roman church. The orientation of the chronicle in 764 is never in doubt — it is a Christian world history, as is made clear by scribe A in the preface. In compiling it the scribes followed the rich tradition of medieval universal chronicles, but drew on material made available to them
through the relations established between the Icelandic church and ecclesiastical institutions in neighbouring countries.31

When scribe A writes that he/she and his/her collaborators are relating events which they have found in books and annals ‘fyrri manna’ the reference is to works by his/her fellow countrymen. This is of course not evident from the formulation, but the investigation of 764’s sources which has been carried out as a part of this thesis strongly suggests that little or nothing of the material included in the manuscript was translated directly for the book. The fact that the scribes make no bones about the debt they owe to previous writers may, if we believe Bernard Guenée’s analysis of the development of compilation in the thirteenth century, be seen as another characteristic of late medieval chronicles. The wording of the scribe could be taken to indicate that compilation from already existing sources was seen as an activity separate from original writing. This is not to say that people in the Middle Ages could not tell whether they were writing their own text or copying someone else’s, but rather that the act of compiling books from existing sources had become so widespread or common as to be regarded as a special kind of book production.

That kind of production presupposes a wealth of existing material. And a wealth of material puts the onus on the compiler when it comes to choosing what to include. The choice must necessarily be affected by the prospective audience of the book. Scribe A referred to readers and listeners in his/her preface and we shall now, lastly, sum up what can be concluded about the purpose and audience of 764.

2.3. The purpose and audience of AM 764 4to

As discussed in chapter I.3. of this thesis there is convincing paleographical and orthographical evidence for assigning 764 to a scribal school active in Skagafjörður in the latter half of the fourteenth century and associated with the farm Akrar and the convent at Reynistaður. The fact that the manuscript contains predominantly religious texts of various kinds, e.g. bible passages, saints’ lives, miracles, exempla from Vitae patrum, seems to speak in favour of making

Reynistaður the place where 764 was compiled. The scribes needed access to quite a number of books, it seems, and the convent certainly possessed at least a modest library. The oldest document with detailed information about the books at Reynistaður is an inventory from 1525. Among the works listed there we find ‘biblia. ... vitas patrum ... niculaus saga og gudmundar saga ... ij bækur med jarteignum af mariu og kallamagnus saga’, which might all have been used by the 764 scribes although they clearly had other works to draw on as well.

In excerpting the books available to them and giving the compilation its form the scribes are likely to have been directed by the intended purpose of the book. If indeed the book was produced for the nunnery at Reynistaður, what specifically was the aim in its compilation? We can turn the question around and ask whether nuns needed a special kind of book.

There are medieval books specifically made for women, among them the Speculum virginum, a work aimed at nuns or novices. As religious houses for women multiplied in number in the later Middle Ages, not least in Northern Europe, book production flourished in many convents. The increasing number of women who took the veil also provided a milieu for the development of literary genres or types of books specifically aimed at their group, such as the Speculum virginum. The work was probably compiled in the middle of the twelfth century and is preserved in over fifty manuscripts, some of which contain the work translated into a vernacular language — there is for instance a Swedish translation extant, made in the fifteenth century at the Birgittine house at Vadstena. The work comprises twelve books and is in the form of a long dialogue between the priest Peregrinus and the nun Theodora, virgo Christi. It contains discussion of the various aspects of virginity, chastity and life under a religious rule. After discussing the virginal state as the perfect imitatio Christi

32 DI IX, 321.
36 Ibid., 32-37.
and the importance of renouncing the world and taking the veil, the dialogue
turns to virtues and vices. Chastity and humility are praised but the virgin is
warned against pride. To illustrate the virtues women from the history of
mankind are presented (Book IV), among them the Old Testament heroes Judith
and Jael. The most important role model for virgins, however, is the Virgin
Mary herself and she is accordingly given ample room in the book. The
*Speculum virginum* also contains a section on the hexaëmeron and the six ages of
the world (Book VIII) which is intended to show how the spirit gradually
conquers over the flesh — how the virtues gain ground as mankind progresses
through history. Book IX is characterised by numerology and there the seven
spiritual gifts are recounted as well as several other phenomena grouped in
sevens (e.g. the main events in Christ’s life, the cardinal virtues). The work ends
with an exposition of the Pater noster. This crude description cannot be the
basis for an extensive comparison between *Speculum virginum* and 764, but a
couple of significant features should be pointed out.

First, it is important to note that the two works are very different in form.
The *Speculum virginum* is in the well-known form of a dialogue between a
master (Peregrinus) and a pupil (Theodora) and the diverse material in the book
is united by its theme: virginity as the means to exalt the spirit so that it may be
unified with God. 764 nowhere uses the dialogue form and its main theme is not
spirituality or life in a convent. It is a universal history whose unifying element is
chronology as ordered within the *aetates*.

It is on the other hand noteworthy that both works contain material and
references of a similar kind. The hexaëmeron and the six ages of the world are
obvious links but since they are ubiquitous in medieval literature this detracts
somewhat from the significance of the parallel. The seven spiritual gifts are
likewise common, but it is a theme associated with spirituality and may thus be
counted especially suited to people of religious orders. But the most valuable

---

37 Matthäus Bernard. *Speculum virginum. Geistigkeit und Seelenleben der Frau im
Hochmittelalter*. Köln 1955, 6-13; Anne Holtsmark. ‘Didaktisk litteratur.’ *KLN/M 3*, 73.
38 *Speculum virginum*, 105. Judith and Jael are praised for their humility as well as their
courage and so are a string of secular women, e.g. Semiramis and Helena, Constantine’s
mother, both included in 764.
39 An overview of the content and structure of the work is given in Bernard, *Speculum
176-181.
parallel between the two works is the way historical characters, mostly women, are presented to the reader as models — in the *Speculum virginum* this is done explicitly, in 764 implicitly (cf. pp. 142-143). It has been argued that from the twelfth century onwards the imitation of saints took on increased importance in the spirituality of men and women vowed to conventual life. Writers of the time ‘voice explicit theories of the impact of one person on another as a shaping by or adoption of patterns that affect the outer as well as the inner person’.40 Women and men of the past became examples to follow or shirk from, and every man or woman was himself/herself a model to others. The essence of religious life was of course the imitation of Christ and the apostles, but increasing diversification of religious orders meant there were many models on offer. It seems only natural that when seeking models who could inspire (young) nuns to imitate Christ, the author of the *Speculum virginum* and the compilers of 764 should choose female heroes of the past.

There seems thus to be some case for arguing that AM 764 4to is indeed a ‘women’s book’ — that were it the product of a monastery the choice of material would probably have been somewhat different. As the stories of women were meant to edify and to influence the every day conduct of the readers and listeners, the book might have been used for reading out, for instance at table. The first half of 764, can however, hardly be described as a story-book, and some sections do not seem ideal for the purpose of reading out aloud (e.g. the list of popes). It is, after all, a universal history and although model-women are presented there, that does not seem to be the sole object of the exercise.

The sheer amount of material included in the manuscript and the almost relentless emphasis on *brevitas* leads one to suspect that this was a work not principally intended for edifying entertainment, but rather for the schoolroom where a lot of disparate things had to be taken on board and committed to memory. The pedagogy of listing things is evident in many places — one could mention the plagues in Egypt (3v13-16), the Commandments (3v19-23), the books attributed to Moses (3v24) and to Solomon (4r32-33), the major and the minor prophets (10r1-3, 24-25), the apostles (16v18-27) and so on and so forth. There is also an emphasis on linking characters in the history to place-names,

---

40 Caroline Walker Bynum. ‘Did the twelfth century discover the individual?’ *Jesus as Mother.*
truly intertwining geography and history as indeed scribe A proclaims in his/her short preface. It has been mentioned frequently on these pages that the compilers of 764 set great store by chronology. This is evident not only in their endeavour to maintain *ordo temporum*, but also in the way precise dates of events are given by referring to the liturgical year. It is for instance recorded that Christ resisted the temptation in the desert ‘i. nót eftir festum Valentini martyris’ (15r25-26) and that the Creation took place three nights before the feast of St Benedict (1v37-39). There are thus numerous references to chronography although the book does not contain ‘rím’. There is also, here and there, information concerning hymns and other liturgical texts. The evangelists are all named (17r26-32), but it is also recorded e.g. that Isaiah was the author of the canticles *Confitebor* and *Domine audivi* (4v15), Habacuc composed *Audite coeli quae loquar* (9v32), St Ambrose and St Augustine the *Te Deum* (20v25-26) and Athanasius *Quicumque vult* (21r19). All these bits and pieces have their place in the formal education of a Christian.

Children were sent to Reynistaður for educational purposes, as was mentioned in chapter 1.3. (p. 56). It is likely that they were taught, at least partly, by some of the nuns. Little is known about the education of Icelandic nuns but the literature is not entirely without references to learned women. Jóns saga helga (B-version) tells of a woman, Ingunn jungfrú, at the school at Hálar: she was no less learned in ‘bóklistir’ than her male fellow students — ‘kenndi hon morgum grammaticam’.41 Although the schools at Hálar and Skálholt were probably the most august institutions of learning in the country, priests were also educated in the monasteries and nunneries, where their schooling is likely to have encompassed the trivium and something of the quadrivium, albeit to a varying degree of thoroughness. To cover the curriculum the teachers and pupils needed texts of diverse kinds.

We do not have a clear picture of the books and texts used in the teaching. The grammars of Donatus and Priscianus were undoubtedly part of the elementary curriculum and inventories from Icelandic monasteries list Isidore’s *Etymologiae*, *Grecismus* by Eberhard of Béthune and *Doctrinale* by Alexander de Villa-Dei to name but a few. Honorius’ *Elucidarius*, Pope Gregory’s

Dialogues and Alcuin's De virtutibus et vitiiis were translated early on and some of the works of St Augustine were undoubtedly known and used. This is by no means an exhaustive list of the books mentioned in charters, but although we possess the titles of some of the works which made up the libraries of these institutions it is difficult to determine which of them were used for teaching and at what level. In the words of Niels Haastrup:

Det kan ikke uden videre fastslås, hvilke skolebøger man har brugt i de middelalderlige skoler; og langt mindre kan det med sikkerhed siges, hvilke skolebøger der var centralt placeret på de forskellige niveauer, og hvilke der blot tjente som sekundært lærestof.

But he continues:

De håndskrifter der bærer tydeligt skolepræg, er ofte blandingshåndskrifter med en lang række excerpter og notater, oftest af uidentificerede forfattere, utvivlsomt nedskrevet efter diktat fra lærere (ofte ældre disciplo) og således overleveret i generationer.

This is indeed reminiscent of 764. The compilation of the chronicle in 764 was a teamwork, sometimes slightly chaotic, but nevertheless organised. It was in all likelihood an original compilation as can be seen from the additions and changes the scribes made in its make-up as they went along (cf. the repetition of the story of Habacuc, the slips inserted here and there to add information about events already covered, etc.). It does not seem to have been written down to dictation; many sections are clearly copied from other manuscripts. But it is very likely that the aim was to collect most of the material at hand which could be used in the schooling of nuns and clerics. The fact that the work is in many ways rough around the edges might suggest that this book was a draft, a first attempt at an ambitious compilation which was meant to cover the history of the world from its origins and possibly right up to the times of the scribes. Such may have been the intention of the compilers at Reynistaður — whether that was the case and whether such plans ever came to fruition, we will never know. We only possess the work as it appears in AM 764 4to which is in itself a worthy monument to the ambition and diligence of these unknown scribes in Skagafjarður.

41 Biskupa sögur gefnar út af hinu íslenzk bókmentafélagi. I. Kaupmannahöfn 1858, 241.
43 Niels Haastrup. 'Skolebøger.' KLMN 15, 642.
APPENDIX I

The content of AM 764 4to

The aim of this list is to give an idea of the content of the manuscript as a whole. The material in Part I is not listed in detail but references are given to chapters in the thesis where more elaborate lists of the content can be found. For the material in Part II references are made to editions of passages and parallel texts.

Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r1-1v29</td>
<td>Description of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v30-2v20</td>
<td>Prima aetas: The hexaëmeron; Adam-Lamech (cf. p. 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v20-3r15</td>
<td>Secunda aetas: Noah and the Flood; the Tower of Babel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r15-3v3</td>
<td>Tertia aetas: Abraham-Amram (cf. p. 99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v3-4r20</td>
<td>Quarta aetas: Moses-Saul (cf. p. 99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r20-14r27</td>
<td>Quinta aetas: David-Augustus (cf. p. 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v26-5v25</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v33-9r41</td>
<td>Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v1-8</td>
<td>Alexander the Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v8-14</td>
<td>The Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v22-10r41</td>
<td>Prophets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v37-11r12</td>
<td>The Trojan war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v4-12v41</td>
<td>Breta sögur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r1-14r19</td>
<td>Rómverja saga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r27-21v41</td>
<td>Sexta aetas: Christ-Antichrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v5-30</td>
<td>De infantia Salvatoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r27-16r14</td>
<td>The Gospels (cf. p. 173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v11-16r5</td>
<td>St Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r14-16v17</td>
<td>The vision of Elisabeth of Schönau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v17-27</td>
<td>Postulatal (cf. p. 191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v27-17r21</td>
<td>De bello Judaico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17r32-17v14</td>
<td>The Letter of Lentulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v15-20v8</td>
<td>Chronicía Martíni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18bis</td>
<td>Gregory the Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20r7-12/20v8-12</td>
<td>Inventio crucis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v12-21r20</td>
<td>Church Fathers and other holy men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21r20-21v3</td>
<td>Vitae patrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v3-25</td>
<td>Emperor Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22r1-17</td>
<td>Antichrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22r18-22v21</td>
<td>Septima aetas: Hell, purgatory and refrigerium sanctorum — three exempla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22v22-23v4</td>
<td>Octava aetas: Judgment Day and celestial bliss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II

Ex = exemplum
Mar. = Mariu saga
Mir = miraculum
Par = parallel text
VP = Vitae patrum

23v5-25r14  Remigius saga (Ed. HMS II, 222-227.)
25r14-25v23  VP (Par.HMS II, 625.35-628.7)
26v29-38  BVM Mir. Inc. Einn góðr Guðs maðr fann fyr áblástr heilags anda
27r1-30r4  Saga heilags Malci (Ed. HMS I, 437-446.)
30r5-30v6  Un samedi par nuit (Ed. Widding and Bekker-Nielsen. ‘A Debate of the Body and Soul’, 280-289.)
30v7-31r  VP (Par. HMS II, 662-4.)
31r4-17  GregDial (Par. HMS I, 243.)
31r18-28  VP Inc. Nukkur einsetu maðr sá um dag hvar einn riddari reið ok skjal<d>sveinn hans
31r28-32  VP (Par. HMS II, 630.24-31.)
31r32-31v2  Ex. Inc. Sá var einn riddari eigandi vel penga haldandi ríkuligt borð daglaga
31v2-13  Cirrus king of Persia changes Eufrates’ course; death of St Nicholas
31v14-24  St Ursula
31v24-30  Ex. Inc. Í þeim kastala er Emaus heitir fæddiz á nukkurum tíma einn smásveinn algjör at allri skipan upp til nafla en upp þaðan voru íj.
31v30-37  Nikolaus saga (Par. HMS II, 83.13-23.)
31v37-41  GregDial (Par. HMS I, 245.15-30)
32r1-27  BVM Mir. (Par. Mar. 104849, cf. also 764 26v29-38)
32r28-32v24  Ex. (Par. Islendzk awentyr! I, 24-26.)
32v24-33r29  Ex. Inc. Í Italia landi stendr sú kirkja er Trajectis heitir. Vóx <þar> upp einn ungr maðr er Heinrekr hét
33r30-40  BVM Mir. (Par. Mar. 815-816.)
33v  Somniale Danielis (Ed. Turville-Petre, ‘An Icelandic version of the Somniale Danielis,’ 19-36.)

lacuna

34r1-24  St Walburga. Mir. beg. def. Expl. margfaldar þakkir hæsta guðs konungs er einn gerir dásamliga hluti á himni ok á jörðu
34r25-33  St Walburga. Mir. Inc. Í þeim stað er heitir Thile
34r34-34v8  St Walburga. Mir. Inc. Enn var annar maðr lítlt haldinn í því þorpi er Wisibadun kallaz
34v9-34v20  St Walburga. Mir. Inc. Í hálftum Gallie ok Equitannie
34v21-36  St Walburga. Mir. Inc. Í ánni Rin stendr ein litlit ey
34v37-  St Walburga. Mir. Inc. Í því þorpi er heitir Santuvc. End def.

lacuna

35r1-16  St Sunniva. Mir. beg. def. Expl. þeim sama sé lóf ok dýrð, sæmd ok virðing um allar aldri veralda.
35r17-35v24  VP (Par. HMS II, 655.3-656.34.)
35v25-31  VP (Par. HMS II, 656.35-657.6.)
35v32-38  VP (Par. HMS II, 657.7-20.)
35v39-41  VP (Par. HMS II, 657.21-32.)
lacuna

36r1-5 St Cuthbert (cf. BHL 2021 (ch. 38-39))
36r6-19 Venerable Bede (Ed. Turville-Petre. 'Legends of England in Icelandic Manuscripts', 107.)
36r20-27) BVM Mir. Inc. Nokkur síðsamr klerkr var í hálfum Borgundie
36r28-32 BVM: Mir. Inc. Svá finnз skrifat í miraculis sællar Marie
36v1-23 The writings of Church fathers
36v24-34 St Peter. Inc. Enencius ok Valerius …. byskupar förur norðr um fjall
36v34-38 St Peter. Inc. Petrus sendi ok Martialem
37r1-18 VP. Inc. Nokkur heilagr faðir byggjandi í eyðimörk var upp gripinn í extasism. (cf. HMS II, 608.6-609.6, but that is a different text)
37v St Edward the Confessor (Par. 'Saga Játvarðar konúngs hins helga,' ANOH 1852, 14-16)

lacuna

38r1-34 English rulers, beg. def. (seems to be a much abridged version of Breta sögur cf. ANOH 1849, 134-144.)
38r35-38v23 VP. (Ed. Tveitane. Den larde stil, 20-21.)
38v24-39r2 Bishop Jón Halldórsson (Islandzk aventyri, 84)
39r3-40r21 Chapters from Ölafs saga Tryggvessonar (Ed. Ölafs saga Tryggvsonar en mesta III, 67-71)
40r21-41 Upphaf allra frásagna (Par. FMS XI, 412-414.)
40v1-41 World description (Ed. Simek, Altnordische Kosmographie, 445-446.)

lacuna

162 fol. m

1r-2r Genealogies (Ed. Byskupa sögur I, 7-12)
2v Brot um fornan átrúnað (VP) (Par. Edda Snorra Sturlusonar II 1852, 635-636.)

41r43v35 Annals (Ed. Islandske Annaler, 216-229).
APPENDIX II

AM 764 4to ff. 1-23v: Transcript
Hand A [J upphaði] þerfa litla annala bæklings Íkulo uer Íkriða nuckud litid aþ heimf kr [ínglunni ok] aþ þeim loddnum er íhenni flannada ok eigi fíðt þóþudborgum huerfo þær hafa ípyftv

Hand B [J klokkalingi] þerfa ílitla annala bæklings Íkulo uer Íkriða nuckud litid aþ heimf kr [ínglunni ok] aþ þeim loddnum er íhenni flannada ok eigi fíðt þóþudborgum huerfo þær hafa ípyftv

Hand C [J upphaði] þerfa litla annala bæklings Íkulo uer Íkriða nuckud litid aþ heimf kr [ínglunni ok] aþ þeim loddnum er íhenni flannada ok eigi fíðt þóþudborgum huerfo þær hafa ípyftv

Hand D [J upphaði] þerfa litla annala bæklings Íkulo uer Íkriða nuckud litid aþ heimf kr [ínglunni ok] aþ þeim loddnum er íhenni flannada ok eigi fíðt þóþudborgum huerfo þær hafa ípyftv

Hand E [J upphaði] þerfa litla annala bæklings Íkulo uer Íkriða nuckud litid aþ heimf kr [ínglunni ok] aþ þeim loddnum er íhenni flannada ok eigi fíðt þóþudborgum huerfo þær hafa ípyftv
pat [er] ecki er fikærarr par hittaz ok þeti natuuru fteinar bidellium ok onichiluf. aunnum
a h(eitir) gyon hon þellr um blaland ok oll þerf ennходим hon skillr afiam ok africam ok hon
þellr umhuerþif egipletalond. þridia a h(eitir) tigrif hon þellr um þiriam. þiðda a h(eitir) eufra
[te]f þar þalla badar imidiarþar fio hon þellr ígegunum babilon hina miklu
ok kemr ífitik þramþa anstikokia. veþtr ínapid lig<g> þin minni afia. gyrdir at
henni fioz villimgegin utan til auftærtau. sunnan at geïng; fioz er kallaz mare

1v
[e]gipciun nordan at geng; fioer `h(eitir)` euxinum en uftan proponticlis. Afia minni h
epir iþer þuþlikar halþur bittinnam. frigiam. galaciam. lidiam. cariam. pamphiriam [fam]
3 ariam. liciam. þar þendþ mirrea borg. iafia þenndi ok effesf þerg ok patera cili[cia]
antiochia nichomedia borg þenndi íbittinam. Afircia kallaz annar þridiu
ngi iardar iþeim hlust er feerkland id mikla. `þat er all 000tt ok k[all]dea land` fciitia þat er nÝv fviþiod hin mik
6 la. pentapolis. tripolif. bizancia. kartagina. nvmidia. maviitationia. [fín]g
itan ok annad mauitiana. þar vt ûndon eigi langt þenndi eyin þadini
a þar geymdiz heilag; domi augvftini byskuf þær .cc. ok ßxxx aþ þat til er
9 lidbannand konungu longobadnum liet fækia med fûnun legatif ok plytia heim
isitt riki iþa borg er papeníþif heitir ok geymiz iapnan fidadan iþeiti kir
kiu er kallaz a latinu æseæum celum þad þydiz a norænu gu
12 liig; himinn þar ÿer er kaldea land þar þendþ hin mikla babilon hana ÿmidaþi femi
ramiþ huþtrv nini þar er perfida land ok iþ blalond ok arabia land þar geþ reykelli inog þar
þendþ barg cartago ok barg ypoonenfif þar er ok fitþars land. þidí þuþiþiþ kallaz europa er na
þn tok aþ þeim manni er europa h(eta) midjaðar fioar fiklir africam ok europaum auftan
uerþi europa er garda riki en subi aþ girkland þar þendþ constanþinopolis er ÿam tok aþ con
þtanþu hinum mikla kaþarsa er nu kallaz miklagadþitalia `j henne þenndi borg 00000øn` tok ÿam aþ italo þad
18 er mikid riki ok þenndi þirir þunnan þiallþar þann er menn kalla mundui þiall þenniþ midiu
þenndi romu barg er ÿam tok aþ romulo þar þenndi ok turon `000 i tur(on) 00 fy000 0b00 0spåtal 00a 00010` ok mediolunan. At utanuerdu
italia er pulland þar ÿt'e`ndar þar langbarda land þenndi inorþaunuerþiitalia þirir norðan norðan a uftarr
21 er fæxland en til uftyd prakland. iþpaniam er ur kollum fpanland er mikid riki ok liggir þud; til mi
þjarþar haps milli langbarda lannz ok þráklannz. Rin heitir aþ mikil er þeill norþ pra mundio
þiall milli þráklannz ok saxlannz irinar kuþfum norþa til haþ. þirir norðan fæxland er danmark ues[t]ur
24 þadan liggia þerf þind eingland irland skotland. auftir aþ fæxlandi er hunaland þad er liðid rike
suþiþiod liggir þirir auftan danmark en noþegi þirir norðan en auftir aþ noþegi er ruþa land ok noþ[r]
þadan tartara riki þirir norðan noþeg er þinnmork þadan ukr landinu til lannorþif adi komi til biarm
27 a lannz æp biarmalandi ganga lond obygld æp norði ætt unz grændland tekr uid fudi ðra
grændland i> ligg; hellu land þa markland þadan er egi langt til uinlannz ifland er ey mikil hon er nor[d]
uz ikríftni íva at menn uiti j til almenniligar uppifu hinn viý byriaz a hinum mikla de
30 Sex ero geindir ibokum alldar þerfa heimf. hinn vitj er egi þerfi liñi helld; iðuð þamar
gi ok he þr’ organ ennda. fua heþr hinn pyñta heimf allði iguds naðni þyrfr [h(einsalldr)]
Hæfti gud ufyniligi urernd þirir allar urerldir inn ípenning ok þennr íeiningo
33 þad er paudur eigíningt at uera æp ongum getinn egi ðkapad eigi getinn. sonor er fam
íþna ok sameilpligti þeði alltri diyrþ. æp honum egi uordinn egi ðkapad helld; ommæðiliga
getinn. heilag; anddi er æ þed; ok fyni þramparandi æp huauumueggia.2 suar er lefð
36 fannliga at æþ en heimrinn uar gojor. uiffr þerfi uollðugi gulp tolu ok nosp fer huer
ra finna manna. hann ðkapad pyft í upphæþ hinim ok iœð ok alla hluti fyniliga ok
osynliga æp ongu þirir liggjandar éþi þad uar diottiñ dagð fa d(ag) kallaz ala
39 tinu primus dief feculi þad er id þsidia .g. marico þad er iý nattum þirir benedictusmessu ða
2r þauftu sidan geindi hann ðkapad hluði æt odum .v. dogum. A œþum degi uiku gioi
di hann íx eingla pyłki. einn æ þallum einglum ðkapad hann þridara ollum odum fa het
3 lucþer ok skotliga fem hann uar ðkapad pylldiz hann dambsemmdar ok þottis vera liðr guþi
þvi var hann ð<e<ytr niðt til helutif uorrínn þiannði æþ einfli ok allir þeit er honum famþyc
ktu urdu þiand; æþ einglum þa gíðrei hann ok þeðtingar himin. hinn þridia d(ag) fì
6 o ok iœþ mëp uotnum. hinn þiðda d(ag) þiðdi hann fol tungl ‘þa íttol fol <i>autfr tungl <i>uefrí’ ñlionur þær erv allar þ
aftar ok hæþ ongan gang undan teknum viý planetif þeim fetti hann þann gang fem fíd
an heþir haldzid. luna h(eitir) pyña planeta hon er fkipud inedfla lopti uif iœþ in primo
9 caelo hon gengi þinn hring æt. xx. ok íx dogum ok viý flunndum. onnum planeta h(eitir) mercurius hon er
i œþu lopti hon gengi þinn hring .c. ok xxx ok íx. daga. þridia h(eitir) uenus hon er iþridia lopti hon gerir
þinn hring .cc. xl ok viý. d(aga) þiðda. pl(aneta) h(eitir) fol hon er iþiðda lopti hon gerir þinn hring .ccc.
12 ok lx. ok v. d(aga) ok viý flunndir. þiðta. pl(aneta) h(eitir) marf hon er ív.* iœþ hon gerir þinn hring íj ãr. Jupiter h(eitir)
hinn viý hon er ifetta lopti hon gerir þinn hring a .xij ætum sionda h(eitir) faturnus viý .* l(opti) hon ge
rir þinn hring a .xxx. ‘ara’ æþ íœþu til tunglfr eru xv (þusundir) milna ok dc.xx. ok v. ðra tungli til mercu
15 rium viý (þusundir) milna dccc. ok xij æþ mercurio til uenerem iammargar fem þyrir. æþ uenere til folar .xx. (þusundir) m(ilna)
ccc. ok xxx ok iý milur. æþ folu til martem ero xv (þusundir). m(ilna) dc.xxv. æþ marte til iouem .vi (þusundir). dccc
ok xij. æþ ioue til ñtionum iammargar fem þyrir. æþ faturno til þeðtingar h(imins) xx (þusundir) ok iý (þusundir) .ccc.xx
18 ok vi. m(ilur). æþ iœþu til þeðtingar himinaf ero miur ðamantalar .c. (þusundir) ix (þusundir) .ccc. lxxv. ok þo at ftið
nur fyniz ganga ok autfr iuefr a ÿ j dégum snuaz loptin med ñtionunum. þiðta d(ag) ðkapad
hann oll kuikundt þau er. lísf annda ero þria lipliga annna ðkapadi gud ep<til> oxum gregorij
þyta þann er eigi er holldi huld; ok er eiligrur '0000 ok 000000 þat eró einglar', þann annan er holldi er huld; ok er eiligr ok
deyr aildri 'þad er manna allra'. þridia annna ðkapadi þann þann er holldi er huld; fa deyrr mehr holldi þad er all
ra kuikundt þeia er lipliga onnd hafa. A hinum fetta d(egi) þormeradi hann þyta mann ap. þ
ioum höfudifennum. lópti. elldi. íorú. utami. þann mann kalladi hann adum íaferm takandi
ferhuern þfag íhans íaungí ap pioum högud ættum. hann ur ðkapadi íebon þerfí madr hinn þyfi var
lx at hæd eptir fogn þeimundar hann var ðkapadí eptir liñkñíku þfals guds at liñkñí þormi ha
þannði .cc.xl ok viið bein. en .ccc ok lx æþa sua segiz 'at' aþ hiarnu gangi ut uizka en
mael aþ lungu.'3 reidí aþ gallí.4 hlár aþ miltti. en liñkñí þyfin aþ líñrin
ok at adam fòpandó tok gud rip aþ íhans hægni fídu ok gíödi þar aþ konu íana kalladi
hann euam íuhr ur .l. at hæb þau fetti gud bædi íaparadifum ok leyþdi at þau æti auoxt þeir
ra tri<a> er þeim likadi en banniði at þau æti aþ þui tre er ftoð imidi paraðifo ok hann kalladi
 líps tre þa kom til eþu þiandinn ihognoomi liki eptir en i þremra hlt fyndiz hann hafa
meytig annhit hann taladi5 at hon mundi eta aþ þui tre er gud banniði ok mundi hon þa uita gott
ok illt. ok hon íua bleckt at bannat epli ok gaf fídan adami Gud reiddiz þeim ok rak
þau bòtt aþ þeim þaga fíad þau högdu þar uréid eigi leiði; en fex þuundir þa klæ
36 dduz þau lókrytllum. A aesiunda d(egi) hueildiz gúþ aþ òllu uerki fa kallaz fábatín þat
er huilldr d(agr) Sua segir ymago mundi at heimrínu fe uaxinn fém egg ok sua fém fíkurn er um egg
sua er elldrin umhuernum heimirn ok sua fém albumen þat kollum ver ikiall er næft fíkuminu sua er lo
pt næft elldi.6 ok sua fém id huíta eggs er næft albumen sua ero uotn næft lopti
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sua fém id rauda er ieggi sua er ioþ lukt ípeftum höfudifennum. Jód er úthærili
gen uotn lopt ok elldr þat þynj íapnan um íóðina. Pa er adam ok eua uou æp
3 fett paraðíti þagnadum þæddiz þeim fon fa er feth er nêipdí hann ur þyfr getiñn med
munud aþ karlnnini ok konu. meþ þeim hætti fem bækir uifa til at lofti karlnnzninf
lìggi íhans lenndum en ínaþa konunnr ok er þeia béggi aþ fad fambilandaz med kon
6 unni er þat afyndar vj. dagha næftu sua fém miolk ok þadan íx. d(ogum) lidnum uerdí þat blod
ok at enn xij d(ogum) lidnum ftyrkkiz. ok þadan xx. d(ogum) lidnum er mannzinf liñkñíku algíor sua
segir ok yfodoous ethemologíarum at fucinbarnid uerdí aþ priouú konunnar. en meybarnid
9 aþ fadi karlnnznin. tua fonu gatu þau aþa abel ok kain hann drap abel meðt
afna kialka þir fakir opundar er gud þektiz þorn abell pedgin hans ðyttu hann .c. ara tiræt
sua segiz at þau hapi at fídan xxx. fona ok iammargar dætr. Adam líþi <dcccc> ok xxx ara
12 hann ur graþinn inloco caluarie ok eptir tima ur hann pluttir íebon. seth fon adamf líþi .dccc
c. ara ok xij. hanf fon; enof l(ipdi) dccc. ok v. ar. hanf fon; kainan .dccc. ok x. ar. hanf fon; malaleel .dccc. ok lx ok ix ar. hanf fon; iared. hanf fon; enok er upp uar numinn til himna ok Ikal koma med elia ok beriaz moti a
ntichristo ok þar palla þa matufale .m. hanf fon; uar lamek hann l(ipdi) dccc. lxx viij. ar. hanf fynir uoro þeir noe ok iubal er pyft þann hliodsgra iþnot þridi h(et) ioel er pyft þann hufo fmid þiodi h(et) tubalkam hann þann pyft manna at blafu ruada ok allan malm syftir þeir `h(et)` noema er pyft þann uþnat ymifligs hattar enok er upp uar numinn fem pyrr. segir uar hinn vijdi aþ adam hann þann pyft allra manna boktaþa feting laitnu malff. eber þadan ero ebeie þad þydir ebeðfr her lyktaz hinn pyfti heimf allði hapandi ifier .m. `ok` dc. ara. annar h einma(l)ar

Her heþ annar heimf allði a noa lameks l' fyni hann einn þann guþ rietlatan þa þyld diz ioþm aþ mikilli ill<z>ku manannu huananag guþ reiddiz hann mæli þa uð noa gerdu ok aþ liettum triam hon Ikal uera .ccc. alna long ok .l. alna bœid .xxx. alna unndir þakid

bika hana utan ok innan. sex alnar e(e)ix. þætr þat er iammikid þær heita geometrie alnar. auln hu[ar] er halþ annar þot frua segir. j iffoia íscoðtica. þa uar noe .dc. uetra er hann geik í oikina con a hanf het poarpa þri fynir hanf kam. sem. iapsed gengu iookina cona kamf h(et) kataþloa. kona fem parph00

ta cona iapsed þlúa. þat uar x° kal(endas) mai þat er iij nattum þirir gagnagah hinn eina. eigi uoro þíkar io: kinni ok eigi þoglar þeir er þlota auatni en oll onnu kiikenndi tuenn. þa þæddi fioinn en lukuz upp himinauæar ok rígníxl. d(aga) ok natta ífamt geik þa þlodit xv. alna[r u]

pp aþ hæftum þiollum do þa allt man<ø>þkyn heiminentum utan þersir vij mein Aurkin plaut a fionum uel xij manudu. gud byrgdi fialþr dyrj a oikinni

Crístullúf Glugga

Menn atta ok þuglar

mannhaeg kuikende

Uifsta rum

mannhaett kuikende

Sagiina eda faurrum
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noe geck or oikinni ij nattum þirir tueggia postola messo a uarid þa mæli gud uid noa boga minn mun ek fettia ífkyum sua fem mark fattmalf midil min ok þin ok iarard þad kallaz regnbogi

sua segiz ok at guþ hapi Þerfí oð talad. idar mig at ek heþi gort man<ø>inn noe l(ipdi) allz dccc c` ok l. ara sua f(egir) ymago mundi at þra fem þe komnir konungur en aþ iapsed riddarar. en þra kam þælar sem l(ipdi) dc. uetra
hanf fon araphath l-ipdi) cccc ok xxx ok viij ar. hanf fon kainan l-ipdi) cccc lx. ok atta ar. hanf fon fale l-ipdi) cccc xxx ok ii ar heber l-ipdi) cccc lx ok iiij ar. palek .cc. xxx ok viij ar. ragau l-ipdi) cc ok xxx ok ix ar. seruth l-ipdi) cc .xxx. nachot c ok xl. ok atta ar. thare cc. ok v. ar. Neprod h(et) einn rifi hann gaf per pytf manna konungs napn hann uar xxx a

Lna har hann pyldiz perf ojmetnadar upp at gera ftopul babel ababiliona hann fimdu lxx

rifa ok ij þeir æþudu at fmidan hann allt upp til himininf ok er hann uar fmidabu sua at hann uar at hæd quatoor milia pasfuum .ij. pasfuf gera þadnu. þa leit gud driþ þeia ok talmadi fmidina sua at þa uard tu ngna fkipiti taladi þa eindi þeia hinni fomu tungu ero æ. sidan lxx ok ij tungur þa

landiz ftopul fmidan suu l(egir) ieronimus prestr at ein tunga gangi um ij pyfuu himafalldra til abrahamf `ok uar þat eþieka` en sidan haþa þar dreþuz um allan heim. neprod rifi gioci pyftr manna skurgod ok gio:
di þat eþir þaudur finum Zoæaftr konungi rikti nær þerfum tima hann þann pyft piolkyngi hann drap ninu

her lykta<z> annar heimf alldi haþandi .cccccc. xl ok ij ar þudi heimsalldr || mælit üid hann mi

PRidi h(eims) alldi heþz aa abraham fyni thare hann kona h(et) pyft fara en sidan fara gud kinn man man ek þig gera ok kyn þitt man margpalda fem þfonur himinf bleza man ek þeim er

þig bleza en baulua þeim er þig boulu. abraham atti ij fonu ifmael<8> ok ylac guþ baud at þa heþiz umf[kurad ðkirm med þeim hætti at med huoffum steinkþi þkuli af findsay hinn þremzti partr getnadar limf allra karlfanna hiellza fidi um næstu ii heimf alldra.
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Hand D neðð: abraham var ipfyttu hoþdingi aa lanndi þvi er kallidea heitir. þeit voru þirr bæði: abraham oc aran ok nathor ok er piolmennæ mikid komit pra

þeim ollum I þann tima toc alþydan ath blota fkurðgodum. oc þyþir þvi ath abraham oc aran bæði villdu eigi blota þa var þeim badum skotid jeld brenn anda. en elldrinn matte ecki gera ath abraham þyþir sakir helgi hanf oc verðleika

6 en aron liet þar lid fitt ok at eþir eiinn fon er loth het. Siþan baud gud abrahame at þara ap postrlanndi fino oc pra þrænndum oc bad hann leita lann þeis er ver kollum iotala lannd. abraham þot fiden med loth brodur fynt finum ok bygdi iotala lannd

Sva fegir glöfa super epistolum pauli ath romanos. ath cetura hæpe heitid þrîlda abua he. en agar kallaz haþa verit ambatt hon uar modir ifmaelíf sonat abaha
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Hand A nær þerfum tima

21 rigndi elldi ok bænnsfteiini ipir fodomitaft borgir þui þar pydþu karlmen fin imilli ok þar ap fucku þei nidi þuiat þar punnduz eigi x. menn riettlai. loth brodur fon abahame ok deþr hanf. ij þrefalad gud. en hufrv loth leit apr ok uard hon at fallt steini. A þerfum tima uar melchifede
Hand D  
Peelli melkiñedex hepir rikt ipeim kañala er falem heitir oc șvi er hann kalladñ konungr

falen fa stadi er ñkant ñra iðdan10 par eor mog uottn oc ñpar ucitti
iohanneñ baptista ñolkinu ñkiri

Hand A  
abaham obbiit. do. ña er hann uar .c. uetra lxxx ok
v. yfac atti ña konu er rebecca h(et) hon ñæddi ij fuexna jeinum burd er fuu hetu
eñu hann uar lodinn fem faudñ ok icalb hann ñæddiz meñ peim hætti at hann hellt um il bódur finñ

Hand B  
C14
uid hann at hann ðkulé prelf lyd hanf ap ualldi pharaonif en hann mælti mot. þa f(agedi) gud aron brodir þinn fkal 
para med þer ok þirir þann uonn er þu heldi: ai man ek ða egiptraland med morgum byñum sua at þad 
anap man phara ogea ðpp lyd minn. ok er moyeþf kom ægipta land fagdi hann pharaoni konungi uil 
ja guds en hann uilldi eigi gera prialfan gudly lyd þa kaftadi aron nidi uenndin en hann uard at omi 
þa fenndi þarað eþir galldra monnum finum ok bad þa fia þetta unndi þeis fnou finum uondum ihoggor 
ma þa fualg hoggormr arons alla þeita deka. þa laulf gud egiptrum med þuilikum byñum. þyf 
ta at oll uotn fnauruz iblod. annat bolna fott. iij. my. sua at þylldi nafar ok augu. iij. ðtorar 
plugur. v. þall iþenad þeita. vj. þrofkar iuotnum þeit er þeim fþilltu. vij. hagl vij. þeis fmanoglar er 
atu grafot akra. niuñnda mykr. x*. topuduz allir þrumburdir. ok er moyleþf þor brott aþ egip 
þa landi laust hann uenndinum aid rauda hap. en þat bræft funndi imidiu. geingu þeis þurum þotum ipir 
ahapid. en phara oþ þeþir þeim duknadi hann þar ok allr hanf herr med heftum ok kerrum. þa oti moý 
sfe þantamus. hann giodei gudi tialldub aedydimork. nær þeim tima fualg iodin dathan ok 
abiron liþandi. Gud gaf honum .x. laga bodød. ðkripud aþpilloudum med ðialfl hanf þirigi. þyfna uar 
trva agud. annat füeriu eigi hiegonu uid gudf na. iij. elka gud aþ ollu hiarta. iij. elka 
nauðngin fem fialkan fig. v. at fullyða þuat dagð. vj. at uefgama þaudur ok modur. vij. þor 
daz mandrap. vij. horaz eigi. ix*. ðtele eigi. x*. bera eigi ligguitni. hann giodei. v. bækkr er fuða heita ge 
nefif. leuíticus. numeris. deuntronimus. exodus. obbiti moyleþf þann hapdi .c. ok xx. ara. eþir hann uar io 
fue fkipadu horgoti ipir lydinn. hann leiddi ifraelf lyd med fer agydinda. land. med morgum iartenum 
þeis geingu þurum þotum ipir iodað. iericho borg hapadi nidi: þirir ludurblæstri gydinga. þirir hann 
þtód ok folin um heilan dagð þa er hann uann Borgina gabaon. o(biit). c. ok x. ara. aþ iosue allt til faulf 
uoro iudicf seitt þat `eru domarar* ipir gydinga lyd. sua bar til iborg gabaon at þonuduz faman æs 
ku menn ok toku unga mannz konu ok þaungdu henni til faurlipif sua at þeis gengu at henni dauði 
ok til minningar þulikis gæps fkipu `hopdingia þeþa ðtadar [00cein]` þeis hennar likam i xij partef fenndandii ser huern hlut xij ættum 
ifraelf lydf. Geœon aþi .lxx. fona ok um priam þann er abimelekh h(et) hann drap fina alla bæði 
aeínum degi honum uard þat at bana at kona þelldi kuernitein ihopud honum || afna uikla þa 
Manue h(et) þadir famonfi hins þerka hann hægir uerd þertkaþtz manna ðkapad hann drap .m. manna med einum 
a þyfi hann margin. hann hærdi einn iagfl iafna iagonalman ok þusti þar at uatn ok flockti sua 
hanf þotto en at hann uar ad kominn at þotum ap mæði. hann uar þukinn ok blindandi: aþ eini putu 
er dalila h(et) ok at þiduzu banad hann nnmmmm manna meþ þeim hætti at hann þelldi oþan æpa 
hollina med þeim atbud at hann kipti at ðtad þeim fþolpa er henni hiellt upp ok leit hann `fua` lisp fitt 
hann uar domari .xx. ara. ely kennimadr uar domari ipir gydingum .xl ara ok er fagt at hann ueri linr ok 
eigi õtomfamir. synir hann ok gydinga lyd: attu bardaga uid philistim þíllu þar ap gyþingum 
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xxx (busundan) en hertekin ok døttinf ap heidingium ok pluttu hana iborgina azotum ok fettu imustari gulp fins dagonif. vm morgunin eptir komu preftar dagonif til hopfinf ok sa hann liggia aiódud ok ap brotid hopud ok henndi sua at huartuegga la utan gatta, ok pirir þerfa fok giauma æ. sidan al lil blotmenn ok heidingiar iazoto at fíga alldri at þefpfiolld þar er þei gagana iblothus dago níf. þar kom reidi døttinf ípir azotos med þeim hætti at þei þunudu nedan. en bæir ok borgir fucyk níd ok akar imidui heradi, en þar þæðdu myf of mein kulkuenni. þeim þoldu morg þkipri i azoto ok íkomm til bana, ok er þeim of þig þtangada med þúiliku apelli mæltu þeim med fíer alldri ikal ok þerfi leing; meþ off uera þúiat gud gerir mikil byfn at off, hely o(bít) niæt; ok viij ara. samu el uar næft eptir hely domari þon helkana ok aunnu hon uar ubyria ap; hon get samuelem þa dictated hon cantic-an exultavit. nepndi famuel uar þpamadr ok giorði fattmalp ok hina helgu er i giaum-diz himna miolid ok unndrin ok log-mapls þpiolldin hann giaumdi ok þat helga kennimanns klædi er appot kallaz ok airon þennimadr bar ok sua uar gotr at ínnar hliðiðbiolli hengu níði ap ollum mecum Nv huergr april til ætterr tolou “iac’obs” patriarcha iudaf uar einn ap þanf fonum xij, þanf uar þæref. þanf. fon efom hanf fon aram. hanf fon aminadab. hanf fon. nafon. hanf fon salomon. hanf fon booz. hanf fon obeth. hanf fon íeðfe er odu napni h(et) ysai. hann uar hinn xiix ap abaham Ok er her uar komid beiddu hopdingar gydinga at hann íkildi íkipa þeim konung en gulp baud samuele at hann íkyli taka til konungs saul fon feis hann uar bardaga madr mikill ok hopdi h ærrí en þleifr menn adir med honum uoro þírðr fynir yfi viiý j daudí h(et) him yngzti hann drap golíath risa er [uar] vj alna har ok lóga hann uar íflýkr at apli sua at hann réip kiapta hins oarga dyfr ok kienn ióro þtum sua at þetta uar hliðið med þtrengleikum saul þelldi „m“ en daudí „x.m“ saul piell íbardaga ok fon hanf jonathaf her lyktaz hinn þjodzi heimf alldi þæsandi „d.c.l. ok viij ara. þið m+ið þeilmalld“ || íkol d(ottur) sauls fimti h(eims) alldi hegpu æ d(aui)ý fyni íeße saul uar þynnfr konung; en þar næft daudí hann uar ok ípamadr hann atti mi atti hann ok pleiri huþpeýur iam-pram abfalon h(et) fon hanf. hann heþir uerid allla manna þridaztr. annar h(et) so lomon hann heþir uerid allla manna ultraztr. hanf modir uar berfabe ed uriaf hapti att. marga adæ fo nu atti daudí. sua bar til adogum dautif konungs at gydinga lyði reiti en<n> døttin þirir morg tìespell þa baud gud dautí at telia gydinga lyð ok þeisa þeim er þerf uoro uerid en dautí fænndi oab hortego en þor eifalþr sem gud baud þa sendni d[ot]líinn deip íallt ríkid um þij daga ok do eigi þerða en lxx (busundu) karlmannu en utaldr konur ok bom. þa fa dautif) eiguð gudf standa milli himinif ok iardar ipir einum gardi ok drap polkid med elligu sueri dautí k(onungr) reitti þa halsinn unndir suerdí ok m(ælti) þers bid eg þýg døtt i nn minn at þetta sverd fnuiz mer ahalf ok reidi døttinf miinf sediz helldi æ mer ok minu kyni en þolk gudf se nu pleira hogguid þirir minar sakir ok er gud heyrði hanf sua miuka bæn liet gud ap at deipa polkid. dauí l[þði] lxx ara gøp hanf þinj tom allt til þerfa dags. solom on tok kongdom eptir þaður finn hann uar himn „vj“ ok xx. ap noa en hinn xv ap abaham hann gordi iiþ bækr er sua heita ecclefsiastef. cantica canticoum. liber fapientie. hann fimðaþ þyf[r] gudi muðari sua at huarki adí nie sidan heþir þuílikt uerid reiðt íam agièet. konungar uida um heim
ok dotning saba ap yztum endimorkum heimf komu at heyra speki þersa konungs.
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Hand I Solumon k(onungr) fetti xij hoporhingia til þess at annaz honum bod ur þra audru oc allri hanf hird finn manud hverr þeia en til bodz ur at etla xxx me'i'lli fimiliubau
df oc tau flík rugar báud .x yxn þeit oc xx hagge' in'gna .c. hruta oc umræm f<X>ga:
hrut oc aunur uedi dyi er jápan man uro gnoc oc enn alipuglar Salomenf mustari uar
lj alna langt oc xx alna bæit en xxx alna hatt en fktöt þram ap mustarinu uar
6 fue langt fem mustarit uar bæit en þat uar x alna bæit þat uar vij aar i fmid

4r
Hand A sua bar til
36 at .ij. portkonur komu aþund solomonis kunnig geranđi sin uanndæþi aunur talar su
minn herra s(egir) hon uid tuer bygdum eitt herbergi ok ungt son med huarri ok er ek uar soþanndi
reis hon upp hliodligca ok tek brotit minn son lipanda en lagdi sinn son daudan þar
eptir [þa] suaradi onnr þu lyg: minn son lipir en þinn son þaungdir þu til bana. Ok er k
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ongrinn unndirfrænnd: þeia þæxti bíd; hann þa þer bitr suerd med hueri hann bad skipa su
ndi imidiu sueninum at sinn part tæki huar þeia. þa s(agi) onnr gerid eigi sua laitid hana helldi ha
pa. þa [tok]' onnr til oða sníðid sunndi sua at huargi nioti. þa m(ælli) konungrin<þ> taki su kona liþa
nda barn sitt at eigi uilldi depa lata. þuiat hon gat þat. ok pirir þuillkan dom konungfin<þ> loðfud uall haf
speki. hann uard tældi aþ kuennu aft sua syrgiliga at hann tignadi skurged. Sua segs eþs
6 kar bæktr at fakir idonor lieti solomon k(onungr) draga sig .v. sinnum um stræti íosaða borgar
ok þar næft hafði hann komid med .v. unndum imustari doittins. þat sama er hann hafði gera latid ok med
þeim uonduum bauð hann iiij. logmonnum at beria sig ok apheda en þeis sogðu allir eitt sogðu
sig aldri skilldu leggia hennði a krist doittins. Segiz sidan at hann hafði siolþr bar
<d>t sig. hann uar konung .x.l. uetra. robað hafí. fon: uar hinn xv<æ> ap abaham. abias hinn xvij<æ> asax[v]
iij<æ>. hann uar likr dauð at giæżku. íosaðad 'h(inn)' .xix<æ>. íosa h(inn) xx<æ>. ozias .ixx<æ>. iaicham ij<æ> xx<æ>. a[k]<az
iij<æ>. ok xx<æ>. ezekias iiij<æ> ok xx<æ> hann uar godi konungi uid hans allði lagði gud xu. ar hann gjodi canntikan ego
dixi. manases hinn. v<æ> ok xx<æ>. hann liet pina. yfáiam spammad modurbrodur sinn ok saga
sunndi med tresog hann uar setr ieróxas snoið hann þa til guds ok þaz honum alldri sidan þersi
15 ysaiað gjodi þa bok er liber ysayaf kallaz ok ij. cantica cónítebo ok domine audiui A
mon. vi<æ> ok xx<æ> . Josías vi<æ> <ok> xx<æ>. jeconias er odu nanri h(et) iaichim uar þa .xv'iii' uetra ok rikti
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Hand F

Hannom, som är benämnd i praktiken, är ett varumärke som tillhör Nobogodonosor konung. I berättelsen om de föregående händelserna, finns det nämnd att han är en mycket viktig och känd personal. Han har möjligheter att avgörande avgöra de framgångsrika kampen om staden. Han är en stark och beslutsam leder, som monterar sin mission med stora ensamheter.

I Staden av Jerusalem legererar en mogen man. Han är mycket vanlig och har en ständig beskickning av gifter och kändisar. Han är en mogen och erfaren ledare, som är bekant med alla de maktfulla männen i området. Han är en utmärkt Legislature och gjort sig uppmärksam på de flesta av unika och intressanta händelserna.

Hannom, som är benämnd i praktiken, är ett varumärke som tillhör Nobogodonosor konung. I berättelsen om de föregående händelserna, finns det nämnd att han är en mycket viktig och känd personal. Han har möjligheter att avgörande avgöra de framgångsrika kampen om staden. Han är en stark och beslutsam leder, som monterar sin mission med stora ensamheter.

Hand A

Hand A är ett varumärke som tillhör Nobogodonosor konung. I berättelsen om de föregående händelserna, finns det nämnd att han är en mycket viktig och känd personal. Han har möjligheter att avgörande avgöra de framgångsrika kampen om staden. Han är en stark och beslutsam leder, som monterar sin mission med stora ensamheter.

Hand B

Hand B är ett varumärke som tillhör Nobogodonosor konung. I berättelsen om de föregående händelserna, finns det nämnd att han är en mycket viktig och känd personal. Han har möjligheter att avgörande avgöra de framgångsrika kampen om staden. Han är en stark och beslutsam leder, som monterar sin mission med stora ensamheter.
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Nobogodonosor kongs liet gera gulliga likneskiu ihieradi babilonif å þeim velli er kallaz duam lx ad hæd. biodanndi ad allir menn iriki hans

fkilldv hana uegfama hon vat xxiii alna digt en þa er neittvydu fkilldu fetia iogn bennanda. Sidaak ok mifak ok abdenago þeir hetu odu napni. anna niaf adaziaf mifael þei hopdv urid herleiddir ot ierusalem. þeit neittudu b
do kongs. þui baud konginn ad kynnda fkilldi vij hlutvmheitara opn ypir þad fem uani vat til ad kynnda ok ad bynnvm hondvem ok potvm vou þeit kaftadir þiulikan opn buna. ge<e) fadi login ut ypir calldeof .xl ok ix. alna ok benndi þ a alla er næft geingu. þa ífe gudf eingill nidi iogninn fua fotermerkliga ad huakí fkaðdi ellðinna hax nie klaði afþeðum helgum fueinum þa fungu þeir gudi loj dictandni pfalmm benedicite. þa kom rodd ypir konginn fua. fe
giandi. þu munnt vera nidi fettir ap þinum uelldiff f[o]ll þirir þinar maigat illgerdir ok med: fkgodyum munntv liþa vm vij av ok bita grafn fem vxi. a þeisi fomu flundu pyllduz þeðir hlutir allir. hau hauf ok negl uxe nliking

fkgodya en þirir ben daniélis þa hann aprl alla tign finf uelldiff ok braz allðri gudi fídan Nobogodonosor kongi riki ibabilon .xl ok iiðj aut. þa tok riki. balltafar fon hanf. hann liet bera inn iholl fina ieinni fumkunndv oll gullker
þau er þadir hanf haði gripid oð mastaur gudf <i> ierusalem ok fua fem konginn ok hanf menn dæcku gladir ap þeðum kerum birtjuz þingi fua fem manz hannði ritandi vpp avegg hallatinan þar fem liof vat ad með þeði oðd. mane. þad er ad latinu. deuñ numerauit regnum tuum. annad oð tekel. þad er alatinu. apenfum eft iudicium tuum. þiðia oð pharef. þad er a latinu. diuifum eft regnum tuum. þa fkipti fkiott vm ypir haðd afianu kongfin Ok fkeldu hann mio g hugensningar hanf. ok hæddan geydu tua miog ad lofhudu famþelningar hanf lennda fua ad kne hanf boðuz fin amedal. Þa kalladi kongi med mikilly roddv
ad pirir hann fskildi leida piolkunniga menn ok galldra menn. kongi taladi suä til fpekinga
babilonie huerr fem fa er ad lefild þarr þetta letr ok mer gerir liofa þess þying
þa fkal hann vera fkyrydd purpura ok hann fkal gullmen hafa a finum halli. ok hann fkal vera
hinn þridi mefrt iminu riki. þa geingu inn allir fpekingar konginf ok mattrv eigi
lefa letrid ne fegia þyding konginum huadanaþ balltafa kongi vard miog hrygj[gl]
ok hann menn S[idan] geck dotning inn pirir kong þirir þad fem ad hærdi boriz ok taladi til
kongins honum fva heilfandni. kongi lipid ad eiliþu. eigi Íkelþ þig þinan hug
renningar. ok þin afiona eigi um fkipidiz einn madr [e]r iriki þinu sa er hepir ifer.
annu guds ok adogum þodur þinf þanzt med h[onum] uizka ok fpeki vmþram adia
menn ok fpekinga ok þui fkipadi þadir þinn hann hórdningia ypir adra fpekinga ok
[g]allaðra menn. kann hann ad rada ok rit fkya d[1]auma ok leyfa bunna hluti
ok birta mykuka hlute þessi madr er daniel er kongi kafindi idyra [grop] N
v fem daniel var inn leiddi pirir kong huerium inn leiddvm fagdi konginn. ervt da
niel ap herteknum honum gydinga er þadir minn leiddi hingad ap gy[d]
inga landi. ek heyri fagtt ap þier ad þu hærip anna gudanna ok meiri u
izku ok fpeki en adrir menn Nv geingu inn þirir mik fpekingar ok uisennda [menn]
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ad þeiti fskildu lefa þetta ritt ok fegia mer þyding. ok mega þeiti eigi ut fkyuva fkihning
þesss mafl. en ek heyii sua fagt ap þier ad þu kunnir ad birta mykuka hluti ok
purpura ok hafa gulligt men aþinum halli. ok þu fkal[lt] uera himn þridi mefrt imi
no riki Daniel fvaradi a þenna hatr. þinar giaþar kongi fkolu mer ecki gep þer
6
odum. en ek mun lefa þier riitid ok þyding þess. heydu kongi. himn hefti gud gap. þ
ed þinum. Nobogodonofor. riki ok megn. dyrþ ok tign. ok þirir þa mekt ok mik
lan er gud gap honum ottadiz hann ok hærdid. þa fem hann uilldí drap hann. ok þa fem hann
villde pinni hann. ok þa fem hann uilldí mikiði hann. þa fem hann villdi lægði hann. En ÿ
dan hann hóp upp fitt hiaata ok digra dramblemi þa var hann nídi fettr ap þinum u
llliff fóli ok riki ok brott borin hann dyrþ ap þa þinum eignum ut rekinn ok hiaata ÿko
gdyva var honum gepid ok med elgum ok fkgodymum var hann bygd vm vjþ aþ. graf at hann fem
vxi ok hann likami var uokuðad daugg himinsins þar til er hann kenndiz vid at hinn hæfti
gud hepir valid þir riki manna ok huern fem hann vill fetr hann upp ypir þad. En þþ balltafa. ÿ
on hann lægdir eigi þitt hiaata þar fem þþ uififir alla þa hluti. heildi hópt þþ þik upp
mot gudi drottnara himins suä ad þþ ok þinir menn husþeyut ok þælfa duckud ap þess
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vm kerum fem grinip voro ot hanf hufi. ok þv kongt lopar ok dykar god ymiflig. gullig. fil
18

ptrlig. eirlig. ianlig. trelig en þv dykadir eigi þann gud er þinn annda hepir ilin
valldi þirir þa fauk er þelfi hlutr. hannar ap honum fenni; ok ritadi þetta fem þv fier
her fkiotliga eþir þeffi tidenndi var hann deepinn ap kalldaif Hand C Eþir hann var dariuf konungr
21

hann liet fettia danielem j dyra groq med þeim hettii. at babilonif. menn. to
lodo til hanf selldv off danielem er nîdr braut gyd vart16 begl. ok drapp dre
ckann er uer tignvdvm ella mony ver drepa17 þik ok allt þitt hyfki. þa
24

felldi hann þeim danielem. en þeir kaustodo honum j dyra groq þar "v(oru)".vij.
leonof ok grondodo honum ecki. Eþir þat var cirkf konungr prendi. hanf. hann
leypdi heim þerd gydinga lyd eþ<teir>. lxx. ara til gydinga landz. fid
27

an tok<v> þeir at没啥 vpp falomonf mvfari giordu18 þeir þat vex
ti. `000` þeir voru at kirkiv giord þeffari .xl. ok .vi. vetr. Eþir lyrum. var. cambi
fem honf er odro napni hiet nabogodinofer hann rickti i miklo borg
30

niniven a frylandi. vm nepnda. borg. er .iij. daga leid. hana smidadi minus
konungr fem beli er blott haqa ap haqiz. hann var blottadr daudr. eþir honum
var scurrd god giort þat er fumar þiodir kalla baal. en gydingar beelz
33
eebub 000000000000000000 Hier byriaz lagha ap hinne blezudu
Arpaxat er neðdr medialandz konungr || judith heilagri ecki
[er u]ndir fik hapi [I]agt margar þiodir. ok eþir þat liet hann gera fi
36

er ena fterkofo borg ok kalladi hana ektabanif hon var giou ap
steini ok fva fterk at lxx alna voro havir ueggir hennar en .xxx
alna þykir turna hennar fettí hann .c. alna haqa hann liet hildinn
39

borgarenar uppi vera turnonom ok var hann þa meðfr konungr latinn iaufr
uegi ap fino riki a eno xij ari rikif hans kom nabogod<on>ofok k(onungr)
[a]fjirie ap niniue ok bardiz uid arpaxat a vidum uelli er
42
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Hand D kallad: er ragau ok liggd amedal euraten ok tigrin ok iadapan þat var iriki erioch
konungr ierichorum manna ok þiell par arphaxath eþir þetta ox mikit riki nabogodonosös
3

ok ox miok opmetnad: hanf. hann fenni þa fina menn ok eyrenndieka til allra lannda
þeirra er eigi voun undir hanf riki. þyft ath heria þadan til damasco ok libano til kar
meio ok cedai ok igalilea ok allt a hinv myklu heidi esđelion hann fenni þa ok
6

til samarita herads ok grømm um ioðan allt til iehrusalem ok þadan vm alla ioð ideff vnz þeir
komv allt til blalanz piella. hann fenni þa þeff eyrendiff ath bidia þeffaf þiodir allat þiona
Nabogodonosor konungi. En ðeit ðoro virdingalauisir aptr ok an ollum foma. ða vard konungr akaplīga reidi ok ðori ðir ðinn ðlot oc riki at hann ðkildi ðēmpa ðēstum biðodum ðêflaus sneypu capitulum 000
A hinu xviii ari rikirf (Nabogodonosors) k(onungs) affiríc kalladi hann til fin alla tignar menn rikirf sinf bæði iarla ok radgiapa ok berferki ok fagdi hugfan fina ath hann settladi ðeﬃ
lonnd unndir sik ath leggja ok lietv ðeir sier ðat uel lika. Þvi næst kalladi Nab(ogodonosor) konungi til sin oloperenm hōþpingia riddara sveitar sinnar ok mællte vid hann. þu skaltt þara til alla uesfirlaanda ok ðepla þeim er eigi uilja hlyda minv bodoþi ok ueldli ok fkal auga þitt ne eigi einv riki
uaþia ok hueria þog skalltv unndir mitt riki ða fennði oloperemf til fin iarla ok hōþ pingia affiría ok taldi ser humndrat þuľunda ok .xx. þuľunndir gaungu lǐdf til bardaga buit ok liet ðat lid þara þirir med otali ǔpsallda klypiada ap uĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭĭippi
þiolda nauta ok alál kynf þiaut. med hueté ok all<z>konar gīæði ap ölü af ðiðria. En hann por eþtrir med hefta lídi ok voro ðat xîj þuľundídr. Gull ok fiþr hæði hann ok mikit ak aplika ðap konungis þe Sva var heri fa mikill ath allt laðnd þotti vognum ok heftvm ok bog
monnum þakik þem þa er lemmendî þalla þykkuaz at iotþ. Òc þa er þia heri korm þa affir ia herodum til mikilla þialla er heita ange, þau eró til sudi ok til vinþtri hannadat er þorr acele þiðra ok cíclica. Þa brenndi oloperemf alla kaiala þeita. hann braut hinv agiæ
tvztv þog melothi ok rennti alla fonv thælis ok alla gýdinga er þar bygdu uid eydimerkr ok til fudilanda. En er hann þor yþir eyþraten kom hann til mefopotamiam ok braut alla þogir hinur ﬀerkuzytt allt þra þose ðambré vnz hann kom til ﬀuau. hann tok ath her
þangi alla fonv madian ok allt þe þeia en drap alla þa er honum ðotdu imot þad an ðie hann nidi at uollu damaþi at dogum kornskurdat ok bænddi alla akra ok oll alldintre ok uingarda bæð hann upp ath hoggua ok ottuduz menn þenna hemath at huert lannd capitulum
þa senddu menn hōþdingiaþ bæði kongar ok iatilat med þeþum or huerre þog ok heradi aþ þiðra ok mefopotamiaþ ap sabal ok líbía ok cíclica til holoperenm ok mællo suå. Latî ap reidi þin við off þuiat betra þickir off ath þiona mycklum konungi Nabogodonosor en vera drepnir. Vilium ver iðið uæld geþþa borgir uatac oc allað eignir hiadird varar naut ok faði geィþte hefta ok vînadda oc oll auðegi var ok manf menn. ver ok varir fynir uilium geraz ydiir menn. kom þu heri ok ne yt varrat þionkanar þem þier likar Nu þarr holoperemf sva unnit oll lonnd þeʃi unndir Nobogodonosfot
k(onung) Sipan ualdí hann alla hina mattkuztv konungi til badaga manað ollum bøgum. En sua mikill otte var yþir monnum at konungar ok adir hōþdingiaþ ap hueri þog er holoperemf por til þa geþgu med liófkerum ok koðonom hōþum ok pidum ok pipna faung. En þott þeir gerdi þeʃfa koftat þa þengu þeirt þo
eigir myktaþ grimmleik brioþzt hanþ ok braut hann þo nıði þogir þeia ok hiþ upp alldintre þeia Nobogodonosor konungi bæði ok holoperenm ath eyþa ollum godum ok skyllda alla til þeʃ þa er hann þeði unnid ath þeir kalladi ongan annan gud en Nobogodonosor. Nu þarr holoperem
Hand E [fua unnid] oll lond undir fik `ok` nabogodonosor konung. Sjælan uldi hann alla hinu matkuztv hermenn konungi til bardagamanna o: ollum blogum En fua mikill ötte var ypir monnum ath konungar ok adir hopdingia
3 a: huerre bog er holoperndapor til þa gengu med ljoskerum ok ko oonum houpum ok þidlum
ok pipna faung En þott þeit gerdi þefar koftar þa þengu þeir þo eigi myctan grimmleik
þöf hæf ok braut hann þo ntid: borgir þeia ok hio upp alldintre þeira Nabogodonosor baud ok
holoperme ath eyþa ollum godum ok fylilda alla til þeit þa er hann gæti unnid at þeit kalla
di aungan annan gud en Nabogodonosor konung Nu þeir holopermes mer hann finn allt til ydumeoz
a: ioþ gabaa ok toq borgir þeira. adu vann hann allt apamiam cap(itulum) || ok mustare dottins sem
9 þad þragu gyþingar þeir er bygdu gydinga land oc ottudut at þeir mundu nidi: biöta ierusalem
þeir hopdu gert um aðrar burger. þa fenndu gydingar öp allt famaria herad ok allt til jereicho at
allir þærdi eignir finar upp a: hinu hæftu piöll ok gerdi þar uirki um bæi sina. ok fæmadi at fier
her or byg<g>iz til bardaga Æleachim kennimadr senndi brep um allt gydinga land til hinnar myclu heidar
efdraelon ath allir kæmi til hierusalem aþ þeit þære aþ piöllinn Gydingar gerdu fem hann baud Æleachim guds
kennimadr bad allan lyd kalla til drottinnf med mikill itadþeite ok litilæta hugi sina ok fkyrdayz
15 harkledi ok þalla til jardar j muftare drottinnf þirir gudu alltare ok bidda gud at þeir yrdi eigi herteknir
þa konur þeira eþa bon eda eydyd herod þeira e(da) borgir e(da) faugardir þadþrar þeira helgir e(da) þeir fí íalgr hney
þir aþ h<e>idnum þiodum þia næst þor Æleachim byskup um allt gydinga land ok mælste fua uit lydinn. Vita Íko
18 lu þier þat at drottinn heyrir bænir yþrar eþ þier erod itadþafir j þoftum ok bænum jauhtli dottinnf Miniz þier
þat moytlu þionoftu madr gudir er eigi fígradi amalek med uapnum bardagha þan er tresflyt zraptri finum
ok herlidi íkóildum finum oc rindeum ok hefda liði helld: fígradi hann með helgum bænum. sua munu
21 þier fígra yþra alla ouine eþ þier erud itadþafir j yðum bænum þeim er þier tokud upp. Vid þefsa aegg
þun hann gerduz þeirit þadþafir jfinum bænum ok þeirdu þornir gudi haðklæðum fkyrdir ok iufu moll
du þ hopd þier ok badu aþ öllu hiasta til drottins at hann uitiði lyds sinuf. þa fprudi holopermes
24 hopdingi affiri a: gydingar biogufn til mottudo ok lucutu fíc a: hinum hæftum piöllum hann þyll
díz þa upp miikillai reidi ok kalladí til fin alla hopdingia moab ok jarla amon ok mælfi fua
Segid mer huerre fe lyd fía er fítr aþ piöllum eþa hueria: ero borgir þeira eda huerfu mikill er zraptr þeia e(da)
27 lidf þioildi e(da) huerre er konungþ þeira e(da) þirir hui hajna þeir at gera fem allar þiodir þeir er byggia aþfredalun
a er eigi þanda moti offi med orþídi. þa fuasadi jái fona ammon er hettur achtar ok mælste Ép þu hera la
tr þier foma at hyða minne þrafgogn mun ek fegia þier þrafgogn pra lyd10 þefsum er apialinn fæmstz. Hann er ky
30 nnjad aþ kallæa ok bygdi þylt þi meopotamia þui at hann uildli eigi gopga þau god fem þeira þed: þeir er a
kallæa landi uou ok þirirlietu þeir offi log finna þedra en gogudu hinna gud er þeim baud at þara aþ þgin
ga land ok bygdu þeit j aþæn En er hallære kom a: landit þa þoro þeit: a: egipta land ok uaro þar cccc uetra
258
ok piolgodiz pha fia lydi fua at pha var utolulig heri med ollu. pha thyngdiz egiptalanz konungti
uid pha ok thiadi pha til at ellta leir ok tigii ok atth fimida sier borgir. thei kolludu pha fia gud finn En pha
lauf thimna gud egiptalanz lyd margyfyn unndrvm an raku thei pha fenna lyd j brott pha lietu ap the
gar unndrin. en pha uilldu egipar thegar taka pha ok phaelka Ener thei pldyu pha lauk thimna gud upp id rau
da ha ph ok ftdo uottin ataur henndi sua sem ueggir ok geck thefli lydi thurum potum um diup fiovar Ener
[egipta konungr fotti eptir theim med her finn pha piellu uottin ypir hopud honum ok her hanf. drvcknudu thei allir En
[er theffli lydi geck ohu ruada hahe phoro thei um eydimerk paltl theff er fyna heitir er alldri hapdi adi
[madr mattr] byggia. pha gerdi guf theiia pha uottin fett theim til drvckia er adi uoro beifk oc peddi pha par ap himna
miol[i xi] utera ok figradi guf theiia alla theiia vuihe pha er uid pha borduz. pott theffli lydihepdi huarki fkiold
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ne fkeyti epha fuerd ok ecki figradi fhenna lyd eph hann var hlydinn gudi. en thegar er thei fypir ok gauggu
du aunnur gud pha urdu thei herteknir. nu idrvpuz thei ok hurpu gra botum ok til gudf sins pha gap
himna gud theim krapit til mottfudo pha figrdvu thei marga konunga kanaenuk omebeum oc perezeum jetheum
eueum ok amooreum Aullatt er thei misferdu egi j aulgite gudf sins pha uoro med theim godir hlitur buiat gud theiia
hatar iIlku En piri nuckurum manzoldium hurpu thei ap gotu theiie er gud syndi theim oc urdu pha
herteknir auft j babillon Nu leita phu hera minn eptir ep ilzka theiia fe eptir noktur j motte uila guds
ok gomung pha at theiia dailiga ok mun guf theiia felia pha j hond pier ok muntu pha unndir pik leggia. en epi egi
er gud theiia reit theim pha megu veru amot theiia ftnanda buiat gud theiia mun hlija theim ok munv uer pha uifiit cap(itulum)
pha er achiho hapdi theetta maell reidduz allir hopdingiai h(oloferni) ok atldudu ad drepa achiho ok maeltlo. hvrr
er theffii mad er fenu ifrals egir ftannda megha a mot Nabogodonor k(onungi) ok her hanf vunpulausa menn ok an krapte <ok> kia
nkf budarg<> iportrar ok at akio uite at hann bleckir off gonum nu pha at theim apioliin ok er uer tham tekna hop

dinga theiia theg ram hann pha par meid am theim at allai biodir uite ath Nobogodonofer er gud janh pha eigi er honum adei
pha er thei hopdu theetta maelti pha reiddiz holofernef akapluga ok maeltli vid achiho. phu spadir off at gydingar mundu vard
ueitir vera ap gudi sinum piriir off pha mun ek fyna pier at eigi er gud nema Nobogodonor buiat pha er vrd pem gyy
dinga ikailltu med dreppin uera. oc pha er mtt fuerd thei iegunem pinar sidur muntu reyn at Nabogodon<> sor
konungur allz iaipikiff. ok eph bu hyggi sanna fpa theina hui blinarc pha um andlit uid theffii od min. phau bad holofernes
finum monnur at takahaii jail ok leida til borgar betulum ok felia jehnndi gydingum thei poro Ener theiialgaludz
piailid pha poro ai mot theim ualfiauuu fteinar ok hurpu fenndimenn artr ok bunndu achiho jaiil vid tre mikid med re
ipum ok ftdu fiden apund hera finf en fynir ifrals fitiu ojan ott borg betulia ok leyfu achiho ok leiddu
iborgina ok fettu amedal lydflf ok prettu piriir hueria fok affiria menn fettu hann pha bunndinn eptir A theim dogum uoro thei hopdin
giar ojidaf fon mic fiomns ok karme er odyr napne het gothonil En achiho fagdi theim al
la hlyte pha er hann hapdi maelti vid holoferne n ok hurfu thei attldud ad drepa hann. pha er thei figradi fonu ifrals piriir pha
er hann fagdi gud himinf uera puftlingiaia theiia Ener hann hapdi theetta maellit pha piell allir lydi til bener med grate ok m
ælltu drottinn gud himins ok iðard líttu að opmettnud þeïa ok suá²1 fiaðu lítillæti var j augalite heilagra manna. oc
fjödu at þu þirir lætr eigi þa er þier treytfaz en þu lægr þa er tauta hafa j ser ok ifnum kræfta Eptir þat gloddu
þeï achoi jat ok fógdu. Gud þedra uarr að ræða þuf að þu bodapir kræft. hann mun laita þik fia dafaða holopernif ok
hann manna En þa er drottinn uarr ge²³ þælum finum þetta þrelfe fe hann þa ok þinn gud at þu þirir þa þrænnndum þi
num til hann fem þier likar. þa er ozial hæði þetta ðælltok hann achoi j hus finn ok gerdi mikinn nattuerd ok kal
ladi til fin alla þefta ok motuduz þeï allir faman at appne þuðia þeið hoppðu fæftad um daginn Síðan kall
30 aði ozias allan lyd til kirkju i þorginna ok badu þeï þar allt fulltingis ap gudi finum cap(itulum) || þufunnda
A ðopum degi baðu holoperforif herinum at fítga upp apialld þat er þethulia þenndi a ok hæði þa c
gongu lidif ok xx (þusunndir) en hefta lid tueur þusunndir ok xx ok þat lid um þramm er hann hæði ualdal ðer unga
men til bardaga buid þoro upp apialld oþanuert ok fia þa þýr moug herod þadan ser dothaim oþ þeim þtad aþ pial
linu er kallaz belina ok suþa þadan til clemsa þtadar er eigi er langt pra efðrelon. ener gydingar fia liddþoldinga þe
þa þiell þeï til iðard ok ifuðu molllu þir hopud sier ok badu at gud ðraels þenndi mikinn fins þýr
36 lyd finum Þptir þat tekui þeï uapn fin ok fettu lid uid oll einftige er til þorginarra lagu ok uardueyttu fíc fua
nætr ok daga en holoperfin þeirr uida um þialld ok þinni brvnn er ðo renni miok mikik uatzpall ap fud
rætt til þorginarra en fkont pra þorginne uoro brvnnar þeï er hðoloperfi) menn fia at gyðingar mundu [þier] pra uatn taka leyniliba
þa geingi til hðoloperfi) þynum amob ok maellu synir ðraels treytfaz eigi aur eda þpioti helldt ueria
þa þioll ok uirki en þo mat<1><u> þa bardaga lauft þýrðí fíttiga. settu uardhalþu menn til brvnna þëффara er þeiða
sier uatn or tekid ok mattu þa suþa uapnlaust dreþa ok mun þier þa bratt uppgeþin þorgin þetta ræd likaði
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[uol] holoper[n]e ok ollum hæs hofþingium ok fette hann c. manna um hvurð brvnn Ener þadan lidu xx dagar þa uar þo[tid] uattn
[allt] j þorginna sua at þa uar eigi meirr enn dagh at deila. þa þognuduz faman allir karla ok konur ungrir ok gamlir þirir
3 oziam ok mællo allir einne roddu Dæme gud mille uarr ok þin þuðia þu gerdir o þí er ðu uilldað eigi þæla þrid
malum vid affíria ok þirir þui fellði gud off j herndi þier oc þirir þui er einið fia er off tei þaer ver kriþump umndir fkegg
þier med þoðfa ok mikille gloton Nu þoùn ver allir ok geþum off upp fialþýrra holoperne þuðia betra er at ver
loþum gud hetteknir en deiþum aþ hungri konur uarai ok born þeþid reum ver jðag hímin ok iðod ok gud þe
dra uarri er off heþpru þynnda uarri at þegar er vier²4 geþum upp borgina hðoloperne) fe fkmamir uarir liþdagar er þier erud kualdir j lo
ngum þoðfa. Ener þeið hoppðu þetta þællt uard gratr mikill ok þyþj þyrk kirkju mikinn hluta nætr ok kolludu til guþs
9 ok mællo Milgert hóþum ver med þedræm varum rangliga gerðum ver. en med þui at þu eft millt ok mikunnfam; gud mis
kunna þu oss at med þinum bardaga heþpr þu læglætí varf. hird eigi þu at felia þa er þier iatta hennnd
vuina þinna þeïa er ecki kunna þit náþ þat eigi þegi þeï suþa huar er nu gud þeïa ener þeiða meðduþ aþ grati ok kalli
12 þa þognudu þeï. þa reif upp oziaf ok mælta verþiþer ftaðþafir ihug ok bidium þim daga mikunnar guds ma
vera at hann taki aþ off reði sîna²³ ok geþe dyð þame sîno Nu ep eigi kem hæf þulltingi aþeþi fúnndu gerum þa fem
‘J’ þann tíma uar eckiða fu j þeþulja er judið er neþð dottir merati sonar ydox s(onar) þoþep cap(itulum). || þier mælid
Pa mællete holoper(nis) vid hana. vel gerdi gud er hann fændi þik til uarr ok þu gepr þenna lyd j hendt off ok27 eþ hann gerir þetta ðalltu uera meft metin j holl Nabogodonesors konungif ok þitt napr mun nept ahueriu landi Sidan baud holoperfini hana leida j tialld þat er pirir voro þeirhirzur hafn ok bad hana þar vera ok bad 00 [henne]
geþa uift aþ hafn þæzlu En Judith s(uaradi) eigi ma ek neyta aþ þeim hlutum þuy en ek [þeip neytt] þeitaat
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þæzlu er ek hepe med mer Eþ þat bytr s(agi) holopermes er þu tokt med þier hui mun vm ver eigi þa þa þier, Judith s(agi)
Lipir andi þinn hera minn þuiat eigi hæpir at ek gera þat ambatt þin þuy en gud gerir þa alla hlute pirir minar
henndt er ek ættlada Nu leiddu þeiþa hana j þa bud sem hann haðdi bodi, hon bad sier geþa leyeþ at gangu ut vm
nætr at bidiaþ pirir til drottins ok bad holopermis hana gangu fem hon ullidi ok gogga gud finn unz lidi þri; da
gar Nu þor hon ut vm nætr jdal hia heth’v lie ok þor ðallt uattin ok bad gud ðrael at hann græddi gotv henn
at til prelingar lyd finum en hon uar um daga ðialldi ok tok eiki þæzlu þuy en uð aþtan. A þridia degi gerne
holoperfinif pagnada notverd finum monnum ok mællet við hinn æzte þion finn er het vagu þardu ok bid hinv
ebefiku konu fialþraþa famlyckiaþ at byggia med mer þuiat þat er logmal j affiria eþ kona gerir mear
manne finum at hann late hana eina, þa geck vagau aþunnd iudidar ok mæltil. Eigi ðalltu þoriþaz god kona at ga
nga jnn til hera mins at þu þriet uerglofum aþ honum ok dykkud þagnadi med off. Judith ðuaradi. hui muna
ek meþa mot hera minum allt þat er gott er j gudf augliti mun ek gera ok huat fem honum likar mun þat bezt ver
a a ollum dogum líþ mins Nu ftod hon upp ok bio fik tiguliga ok geþk j landtialld holoperfini ok ðt
od pirir honum en haihta hafn brann igernd til hennaok mælte hana fua Sitt her oc dreck íkremtun þuiat þu þant mimkunn
ap varre gipto. hon ðuaradi Dæcka mun ek hera þuiat meire er idag þug minum en þuy hafdi uerid aminum
líþ dogum Nu at hon þar ok drack aþ þui er þionofu menn hennat hopðu til biið caputilum || gum. vm aþtanin fíð þorv
Holoperfin var gladi miök ok katr ufta hana ok drack þua mikid at alldir haðdi hann flukt drvekt aþ ollum finum do
menn til ðueþs ok uagau þionofu’ modr’ h(oloperfin) fueþtialld hafn ok þor aþraut ok uowo allir menn modir
ap uindyckiu en Judith uar ein eþþir hia h(oloperfin) ok ekkinær hana er h(oloperfin) laa fognad jrecþi fíne akap
liga drvekkin þa mælte iudith uð þionofu mey sina at hon ftædi vid dun tialzinf ok uardueitt þau, en iud
ith ftod pirir reckiu hafn ok bad med taum ok mællte hliott Styktu’mik’ d<>)ottin gud gydinga ok lattu a þeþaui
21 tid kræþ hannda minna ok fuænom þu hiez pirir at þeipia upp ok eplu hierusalem bog þina. Lattv mik
algera þat er ek hepe ættlal ok trvat at þu mound urda lata. Ener hon haðdi þetta mælþa þa geck hon til ok bra
fverði hans fialþ þui er hieck afþolpanum yþir hopði honum ok greip ihau honum <ok> mæltil. Styktu mik diottinn
24 gud gydinnga æþeli tid. hon hio þa tyfuð at hafli honum ad; ap geck hopðud Sidan tok hon hiup hafn
hinn dyta en uellti bolnum or reyckiunne ne iþþ þeir þat geþi hon ut ok felldi hopðud[id] ambatt finne ok
bad hana lata íkrem þina Sidan geþing <þæ> mille herhuda at uanda finum ok komu þa ecki idal bethulie hell
27 dí geiþu þar þegar til hliðs ok mællete Judith til uardhæll manna er voro a uegum borgarinna. Lukiþ upp borgarhliðum þuia
gud er med off er gerdi kræþ lyd gydinga. ok er þei kenndu mal hennat kolludu þeit a þeira borgarinnat ok ra
Hon geck ihinn hæftra ftd iborginne ok er allir þögndu mælilte Judith Logiðer drotch gud varn er eigi þirir laetr þa er uiaanta ap honum þulllingi ok með mer umbatt finne þylldi miðkunn þina þær hann leið hylki gydinga ok drap hann varn andkota æfði noott. Sidan tok hon oF íkreppunne hopud (h(öloперn)) herfhopdingia all irie manna ok suu hiuf hanf ok mælile. Líþir drotchinn þuiat mik uardueiæting eílingh hann þæði hedanagarðandi ok þrauerandni ok higat aþir huganýrði ok mið liett dinu magam ætta faurgaz helldi; kalladí hann mik an faurgan til yduarr þagnandi ifígrí hann ok æþrkuamu minne ok þrellingu yduarre Njatte þer honum allir þuiat hann er godi þuiat miðkunn hanf er um alldir. En allir ðopud gud ok mæliltu uð hana Drotchinn blezadi þik ikrapê fy num er át angu liett verða ovine uata þirir þík. oziæ mælile uð hana hopdingi þinghusf gydinga lydf M eckutu rætu döttur um allir konur þram ap drotchne gudí ífraisf hinum hæfia. Blezadi er drotchinn er íkapadi himin.

ok iþop er þik fýykte til ad fíada ap hopud (h(öloперn)) þuiat idag miðkledi hann nafn þitt at eigi huerpe lop þitt ok mun [ne] manna er þeti miñnæs kraþ drotchins ífípellu þuiat þa uædir eigi onnd þinne j þonguing ok quaul kynþ þins helldi; [tiedir] þu off lauglîte gudí ðar Ener allir fonnudu þetta uar þangat kalladí aþioi jari ok er hann kom þa mælti juthið uð hann Gud Ísraëlu er þu bart uittre hann heþndi þin a vụnum þinum. hann fneid ap fialtr hopud altra
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trvlaufra manna aþ þessi noott med minne henni. ok at þu reynir at fua er sira her hopud (h(öloперn)) er haþnadi j fundum opmettnadi gudi ífrais ok þier ognadi bana ok mælti fua þa er lýð ífrais euerd hertekinn íkal mino fuerdí.

gegnum grapa þinar fídur Ener aþchos òa hopud holoperin þa þiæll hann níði; launguít Ener hann raknadi við þiel l hon to þota honum ok meðlan blezud fíer þu gudi þinum huerre tialldbud jacob byggir þuiat huerre þió d ok huerre þiod er heyir nafn þitt mun þopa fundí. þa mælti judith udall aljud. Heyre þier bæði þeite þier upp hopud þetta aþborgr uegg til fynîf ok er foll rann upp taki huerre sinn einu uapn sinn ok gangi ot borg inne med gny ok fittig eigi opan at þeim helldi germ gynn fr mfeita. þa munu uardenn pljya til hopdingia fins ok ukeía hann til bardaga. en þa er íaþla þeita rensa til landtialz holoperin munv þeit fia buk hann liggfannnda iblodí sino ok mun þa ýpir alla mikill otte koma Ener þier þa þið þila fækja eþir þeim ouggir þuiat drotchinn mun þa pella ovine ydra unndir þætr yð. Ener aþchos iðal aþa kraþ þann er gud gerdi gydingum þa þirir liett hann heidiðn fíd ok trvdi gudi ok tokkumkurðar íkrim Nu þegar idogun þeflu þeit upp hopud (h(ölopern)) at borgar uegg Sidan toko þeit uapn fín oc geingv ut

12 ot borginne med mighkirmu gny ok heropi þat fa uardenn affíria ok runnu til herbuda. Ener heidiingiai uduer uarir uid þeck þeim otta oc þkunnuþu allir med þýf myllum til fœþnhúsí holoperin ok ættcludu at hann skylde uakna uída hæeytí þuiat eíling þðodi að ukeia hann e(da) inn ganga Ener þar komu allir hopdingiai affíria manna badu þeit þi ona hann. Gangd inn uagau ífœþnhudina ok uekid hann þuiat nu ero myynar geingnar ut om holum þinum ok þor ra at eggia off til oostost. þa þeck vagau inn ok þód þirir þoralldínur ok hudið at þau judith mumdu þopa þæði faman en hann heyiði ekti til þeita. þa þeck hann til ok lypte þporplinu ok fa þegar bol holoperiñ. en fa hueri hop

18 udit ok la hann þurdndi aþþþu. Vagau toc þat aþæp med grati ok reþ ap þier klæði ok geck ibud er
iudit uar uon at fopə ok ðann hana eigi þar ok hliop þa ut til lýdinf ok mæltie Ein kona ebrek gerdi myckla
fneypu Nobogodnosor konungi Se her holoqernem liggia ai iðdu en hòpod hanf er ibrottu ca(pítum) || pullir ok radagerd
21 En er hopdingiai afferi heydju þetta rípþ þei klæði æþ fier allir ok urdu fua haeddir ok þelms
þneriz þra þeim gerdiþ þa opp ok gratr ok aksaplyg uenin herlidinu ok þui næst toku þeit plotta sua ðkioten
et eigi beid finñ naunñg ok þoðaz en ebrekka lýd er þeit ða ok heydju fækia eptir fier ok hluup
24 þe heidingiai þra ollum upnum ok þisþlitum finnum þm heidar ok bye Ener þat fá gydingar at heidingiai þlydu
fækia þeit eptir med heropí ok ludrablefri þu þuiat affería menn hluup umsaugea iholur en gydingar þoro jenum
plöckí þeit alla hermenn er þeit mattu þána þa fenndi oziat hopdingi gydinga menn iallar borgir ok herud ok
27 bad sennda menn eptir þeim afferiþ monnum ok reka plottan allt abrott ðer herudum gydina lanþ En þeit er eptir voro geing
inn herburði afferiþ ok toku þar herpang mikid hardla ok poru med iborgina En þeit er plottan hoppa rekid hurnþ
aþr til bethulie ok fopnuðu faman þmalu þeim er affería menn hoppu eptir leipðan ok uar þat utalligð auðt er
gydingar piengu þar Æleachim borsek kom ði hierusalem med ollum finnum prestum at fia iudith Ener hon kom þpirir hann lopg
du hana allir ok mæltv, þu eit dyþ hierusalems at þu elkaðar herinlile ok tokt eigi mann eptir þinn bonda
ok þirir þu ftrykty þic drottinn ok munu uera loþud at eilipu, þa fuorudu lyðir ok foðgu fua þat verði þat verði Eptir
þat gerdu gydingar þat rad at þapna faman ollu herpangi afferiþ ok piengu riddaram þat fem holopernif hafði hapt jgulli
ok filþri ok dyum gimteinfum þat gau þeit judith. Ok tignadi allr lýdi med konumok meyum ok bonum
jognas fãng ok hofpußlegt judith. þenna loplongi fyingandi drottne ok mæltv suu þacaþtente do
36 mino in timpanif. cantate deo in cithaif. Eptir þenna svigok allr lýdi til hierusalems at þormræa ok eþna heit fin
judith gaþ iporn gudi hup þann er holopernif hafði at ok uapn hanf þa var þar allr lýði þeilagiðr þeimton ok hie
Ildu þagnadar til þria manudu med judith-iminn<in>g þessa ðeit Þeim þat þor huer til þina þeimkynna ok uar judith
meft metin ibethulia hon hielt herinlile alla fina daga iminning finñ ðeit. judith var þ bethulia
alla æpi fina þra þandáli manafed bonnda fins þeim degi var hueri牛奶er hattid halldin judith lîpði
.c. ok .v. uetr hon gaþ prelæ elfkimey finne adi at andzíþ. hon var graþin hia bonda finnum ok gret hana al
42 lr lýði vij. daga. Ok eptir þat var allðri geingíd ariki gydinga ok er minning fia haldlin j þeppu allt til þessa Dags
9v
Alexander hinn riki uar fon philippi macedo hanf meifjare het arifotoles. hann rikit þyft
allra konunga igrecia an nokcorv ðakkjagaldì. hann drap darium konung perfarum ok medoum ok er
3 s[u’a ath quedit ibokum at hann þaþi lagt unndir fik miokfva alla heim med herifildi. ðata
þadi hann j þeim hermadi nær xij. uetreyv hann lagdi ok a half fer unndir þeim konungiok var hann dreginn æ þeim j
kerru um borgir. hann haþdi þa uíd oþþ at heria til heluitil ok er hann uar kominn med hermenn fina j babilon hi
6 na mycul leiddiz monnum hanf miok þuþlik ftau þþu blosndulu þeir dryck hanf med eitr uarþ þat hanf ba
ne hann gaþ xij monnum riki ðitt ok gerdi þa konunga. Tholomeuñ het konungr a egipta lanndi ok þadan æp het huerr
sem einn tholomeus oþrv naphe Litlum tima ðidari þædæz machabæi synir mathathie er suu
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hetv judaf johannes jonathaf thimoteus ok simon voro þeir allir hinir meftv hermann. en þo va-
judaf langt þir adra ath fytik er sua lefid ap honum ath hann vare rífe ath mikilleik en ath
grimmelik fem íp ðarga dyr. hann drap apollonium herf hoðingia er þriddi aþ ífraþól þolk ok tok fuerd
hanf ok bardiz med þui alla sina29 dagha. Jonathaf hertiþgi biodir Jupiter þein þeira þurðurður joyranna til lidue
izlu vid demetrium konung piellu þ þeim bardaga c. þusunna aþ þeira motfódu monnum var fa fígi meft
kennðj Jonatho Hier hepr ættartolv eptir herleidung hinu mikly til gudf (íonor)
her byriaz ættatala gudf fonar eptir herleidung hinu mycul salathiel var hinn íxus ok
xx ap abrah<ame>e zeþobabel hinn xxxxx. Abiud h(ln) xxxi11u. Eliachim xxxii11u. Azor xxxiii11u. Sad
Joseph xl1v11u hann var jarnkimði hann þafnadi þrv sanctam mariam þui þui var hann ættladi aþ mósgum
þadir guds

9bísr
Hand I Gudf modir uar dottir ioaichimf hanf þ(adir) uar ðarþanÞa hanf þ(adir) leui annar hanf s(on) uar melchi hanf
f(on) uar mathan hanf f(on) iacob hanf f(on) iofep er kallaz m
ad: marie fel maria uar hin xl af nathan ðyni
dauð konunfl en jofhep uar hin xxvi11u af falemone konungi
bodor datanf þui uo00 þau jofiep ok maia
gudf modir þiðda manni huart
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Hand E I hinun þímta heimfalldi haþ þiogur konungriki mattekuz verid ad: romveria riki ho
þz Eitt var riki affíriþom þ niñue Annat var riki kaldeoum þ babilon þra dogum nobogodonofos konungs
id þriðia var perfárum riki þadan þra er ciruf var konungur. gricka riki var id þiða fídan alexandner hinn uí
þolí uar konungr. hid þímta uar roma riki en hverfþv roma riki epildiz fikal fíðarí greina en skal þýft skripa aþ
þammonon gudf þer er verit haþ þjímta heimfallndi oc þirir þpadu gudf higaktuamu. Einn aþ þéim
fagdi sua fýrýlga ath már mundni verda quiduk ok mundi þeþa son þann er emanuel
mundi kallaz þat er gud med off capitolum || husþprif hanf þet anna en onnuð penenna vid hennes atte hann .x.
Elkanara er nêndad madr fonn ieroboam fonar heliu s(onar) thau s(onar) suph hann var tuikuangadu
fonu “en” anna var ubyja þar til er gud heystþi þen hennar ok gaphenne þon ða het. samuel. hann var
kíerr gudi. Anna uarþ miok gloð vid þetta ok löpadi gud aþ ollu hiarta þa outi hon cani
cann Exulteat coþ meum; Samuel var spamadr hann smurði til konungs saul ok litluðaí dauð konung eptir
guds bodi. hann var þylfr spamadr þ þímta heimf allldri eptir þui sem bær uifa til Eptir hann næst uar na
tan spamadr hann bar þui mali dauid konung ath hann hepdf radit bana urie riddera finum en tekid husprv hanf ser
til famlagf. Abbacuk spamadr hepir gert kantican audite celi quae loquar. sua\(^3\) bar til a hanf dogum at þa er
hann þærdi daguerb verkmnonum fynum þa kom til hanf guds eingill ok bad hann þara fendifor sina fua til hanf talanndi. ber
þenna daguerb at kaldea land jnbabyloniam til danielem er fettr <var> jdyra grog ok hepir þar veririj vij da
ga sua at hann hepir huarki etib ne druckid. þa fvaraþi abbakuc spamadr. Ecki kann ek at þara þeþla fenndi
perd. þuisat allidi kom ek jnbabyloniam ok eigi fa ek dyra grog þa tok eingillinn fkiott til rada hann greip annar
re henndi þharid ok hop hann upp jlopt ok bar hann alla leid jnbabyloniam ok fetti hann nidi a dy
ra graup þar er þirir uar daniel; þa taladi spamadrinn her er daguerbr daniel er gud fenn
dí þier oc er hann hapdi snãtt\(^1\) bar gadf eingill hann atop a lama hatt fem þyr er Þk
riþat ath hann tok jhuþiril hini ok fette hann nidi a gyþinga landni. Her neft ðkulo
ver fegia med ðtuttu mali at þeim spamnonnum fem meþthattar reiknaftzt j bokum

10r
Hand F Fiþir haþa spamenn beþr gert þeþi er hinir me’i ri spamenn ero kalladir þer<þ> i ero nopn þeþia yfiaf here
mial ezekiel ok daniel. þirir þa fok ero þei hinir meiri spamenn kalladir at þei haþa þeþri ok
meiri beþr gert en xj adhir þeþi er hinir minni spamen kallaz. yfaya hafdi þpadom adogum konungu g
ydingo lanz þeþia er fua hetu oziat. iotam achaþ ezekiel. ok manafse\(^2\) er fettr va iriuxan.
Adogum ezikie konungu kom fennakerib konungu aþ ninibe borg hinni miklu agydinga land ok fetti
her finn wm borgina israelus om uildi unna hana. en aþ benum ezekiel ok yfaye er þeþi badu gad m
ifkunnar þirir borginni ok eingill gadf ok drap adhernonum .c.(þusundir) ok haljan niunda tug þununda, eþpir þat
huarp fenncheribb aþt ninibe ok litu fidar drapiu hann fynir hanf fialþf iblothusi þa er hann bloata
god fiß. Jeremiah tok þpadom adogum iokfie konungf ok hapdi til þeþf er naboðodoñofu uann íe
rusalem ok herleiddi gydinga lyd fem þyr ðegir. uordo ir<þ>ri herleidin. ezekiel daniel annanías
azarías micael er fettir voro ibrennanda opn fem þyr var íkríþat. jofiaf konungu yeil ioufoftu. afa konungu,
zezkiaf ok iofiaf voro godir konungar konmir aþ dauid en þleþir adhir migerdru iblotfkap. Jeremiah var eþpir
i israelus þa er hon var eydd. en ezekiel piecc vifdom aþ gudi ok tok sfaleikf anna aþa er hann var iherleid
ingu hia a þeþi er efsober heitir Daniel tok þpadom ibabilon adogum naboðodoñofu konungs
en hann uard miog gamali ok var upp til þeþi er þei uoro konungar dairuþf ok cirus ibabilon þeþi leydþu lyd gudf
aþþurþ til sinf lanz ot babilon þat var aþyf ari konungïdofm ciiri ad gydingar herþu heim agyd
inga lanz simtígir þununda manna. þa toku þeþi ad enndenary i israelus templum domini en heþdar þiodir
striddu fua apa at lasa ðund þor liþid þram um mustarif gerdina. A odu ari darj konungf er odu
napni. het yþåþif voro þyldir lxx uetra þra þei er israelam var unninn ok lyðd gudf var herleid<þ> i. en heremias. hapÐi
sagat at lxx uetra mundi lydþ gudf vera janaud herleidaring. en hann leþtíz ot anaud aodu ari
konungf domf darj. þat uar at tulu þernar þusfundir þusunda ok fex hundud þusunda ok viþj (þusundir) manna
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3

hon f(on) eber ap honum ero kommir ebæi vm hant da
g a hopz ttopul fmid hin mika. hant f(on) phalecc a hant dogum baa gud stopu
l fmid hann uar śmidâł imiklu borg babion med þeim hætti fem ðyu er ikripat ok huer
ia huþru nini liet śmida. þirir þeuí borg ried pyfþ bel konungi þadir nini. en
er er bel uat dauþ; þa lætr hann gera liknek<di> u epitir honum ok baud monnum ad gopga þad
a þad dogum ragau phalecel fonar hopz rika fuþiþoða òhinna mycul. þar ried konungi þa
pyfþ er thaneuf "heitir". uid hann er kennd að fu er thaneif heitir. hon ikir africam ok euro
pam Seruñc fon ragau lipdi cc ok xxx að þann tima bygdiz egipta land þar ried
pyfþ fó konungi er uizuef het. þa nachir ahanf dogum hopz rika affir. þar ried py
йт egialuñ ok beluf konungar, þa þate þadir abahamf aþ ahanf dogum hopz piolky
ngi þa het zooastrif hann uar konungi abactria ñua er fag at hann hlo ðyu en hann gí
et þa er hann uar gædd. Abaham fón þase þann pyfþ ftioumu þisott hann leiddi gud
þott ap ualldi káldeoum 'fem ðyu er ikripad' hant fón yfáci að hann dogum bygdiz aigira riki
ap þeim konungi er irakuf het. hant fón jacob er odu næti het ifrael Móylef <uar> kominn ap
leuí þymi jacobf hann leiddi ifrael þolk þír id rauda hap þa uar hann uel attræði þadan
þou þeim aeydimork ok uoro þar xl uetra Her næft ifal fegia huerir hopdingia; redu þirir
gydingum jofue uar pyfþ epitir myfhen hann fyþidí gydingum xx ok ij at. kaleph. lipdi
c. aad hann ftyþidí gydingum ð þann tima uoro þeim ikrit faturnuf ok iupiter þa
kalla menn þor ok òphin. omoniel ried xl aad. aloht riet lxxx aad þa þar bad
agi mikill med fialþum gydingum uoro allir amot benaþinif kyni þiellu ap
benaþinif æþ. c. ok halþ þiditug: þufunnda en ap gydingum xl þifunn
da. sangar red .x. at Delphoñ red xl. aad þa þar diepinn físaþe konungi med þeim hæ
tti at fu konar er iabel hett fettí nagla auanga honum ok ut um annan. Ge
deon red xl. aad. abimelech iij ar. Dula xxx ok iij at. Jair xx ok iij at. leydí
uj at. aðebáin uij at. akialon .x. at. J þann tima uar fétid um troeþm ap grikium
Hand E en æme ok tilganga þæfa fíosu stridf er þeir hopðu ñin imille þar
þeþi at fyþíri priami konungs hæþdi uerid hertekin ap grikiam ok þadanap
uillard þeir bæði heþna þeirrau fúuírdur tok alexander helen
am huþþru menelai er allra quenna heþir verid þriduzt ok plútte
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iprigia lannd boduz þeir egi vm mcira æme moig ar ut ok þengu
mannation 'mikid' Lef her næft bladit e[r] ikripat er ap trœo borg" Hand G þar þiellu ap
grickia lidi ñiau þufunndir hinf atta tigar hinf niunnda hunndra<d> .en ap trœa
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lidi piellu fex þusunndir hinf niunndað tigar hin<>< faunda hunndra<d>s. þirir grick ía lidi red meft agamenon ok menalauft. en þirir troeo lidi red priamus ok fynir hafn 6 eccttor ok alexander. hann haði tekí bodd helu konu menalag margir lýdu brot<>
þer þad ad borgin uard unnin einn æ þeim uar enesaf hann kom til itali lanz ok uard þar konung; hann drap eldining til bana hann drap ad turnum. enesaf gat hann fon <er> alkaunuð h(et) hann fon uar 9 filuus. hann fon butuf þann bygdi þystr þad land er þa uar kallad alkrion þar refti hann mikla borg er hann kalladi hinu nyu troeom þa uar fskipt um nofn uid hann ok kal ladi biro to enlanit britannia ok þadan ero betar komnir. þad er nu lunduna borg 12 er hann kalladi nyu troeom en lanndit heitir nu eingland après bietlandi nu íkal æ tr huerpà til þerf uer húþum þirir litið þra. labdon uar domati uiiij æ. samfon fterki. uar xx æ. d(omari) heli kennemadr xl æ. æ hann dogum bygdi brito eingland. samuel þpamadr x þa uar 000 mefta000 uf' 15 ij æ. þa uar fauv tekinn til konungf ypir gyþinga hann ried xx æ; hann þiell joosto ok med honum fynir hann f þeim piolom er gelboe heita Þéir faul uar dauid fon iesse konung; xl uetra þa folo mon fon hann xl uetra. roboaf xvij æ. abiai æ. æ. afa xl ok i. æ. æ. hann dogum uar heli 18 af þpamadr. jofaphat xxv æ. þa uar helias upp nu minn. oziuf ðok ði æ um hann dagha uoro uppi þpammenn gudf. ysfiau. ofee. ioel. amof. abdiaf ionaf. mikeaf. joatan rikti xv æ. akaz xvi æ. þiann tima reiftilz romaborq ezeki 21 af xxx ok iiij ði manafef. ð. ok v. æ amon ði æ. jofiaf xxx ok i. æ. þar uar uppi hierimi af þpamadr. jeconial ði. manadi. þa uar herleiding hin mikla. eleachim xi æ 24 þa ried ciruf konungi bablon hann37 leyrd hiemgerd gydinga polki. hierroboaf xx 27 ok ði æ hann ua abiaf konung; nabath ði æ. baða ñx ok iiij æ. hela ði æ. hann ua þæll hanf fa er zambri het. hann ried vij dagu sidan uar hann ueginn. amri ried xij æ. achabb x 27 ok æ. okoziaf ði æ. hann þiell or loft riði ok do. iomam æ. æ. hann dap hieu þæll 29 akaf. hieu xx ok viij æ. joachaz xvi æ. joabb xvi æ. jeroboam xl ok i. æ. æ. æ. zakariaf vi manud u'. hann ua feiluf ok riet .i. manad. sidan drap manaen hann. fæ ried .x. æ. fac e'tia .ij. æ hann ua paceuf hertoge hann ok ried xx æ. hann ua ofiaf ok ried xx æ. hann uard hertekinu æp 30 falmanafar affiria konungi ok mikill gyþinga pioldi. j þeii herleidingu uar tobiaf ok þei pedgar39 þa eydduz gyþinga riki unz matathiaf ok fynir hanf rifu amot heindum þiðum. judaf machabeuf uar fon mathathie. hann helt upp morgum foknum uid heid 33 nar þiodir ok haði fígi auatl þott hann haðed liitud lid en adur mikit hann þiell j fokn þa badiz hann uð bakidein40 h'e'íduñ hoþdingia. Þéir hann uar hoþdingi io nathaf biðdir hann hann uielte triphon hoþdingi sidan uar fímon er heði uar 36 hertogi ok kennimadr hann uar fúkinþ ap thoþomeo 'magi [iñum]' hann uar brodir þeia iudaf ok ionathaf Þéir hann ried iohan nef fon hann hennu inufelæzta miadr. sidan aústoñoful. sidan alyx
ander fon hafn en eptir hann alexandra kona hafn ij a sidan fynir hennat auitboluf ok hircanuf þeit uoro ofattir baudi ok uilfi huartueggi einn haþa rikit alt sækir
hircanuf trautf romueria ok þo þompinsuf þil med honum ok uar auitboluf tekinn en hir canuf ried xxx ok iij a þa uoro gydingar fkatgildir unndir romueria sipan var antgon
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hann drap antoniusf romueria hertugi en fetti herudef konung ypir gybinga hann uar þyft konungu
ypir gydingum þeita manna er ekti uoro þerat kinndar. hann uar hinn uefte konungu hann þen[n]de gy
þinga bækr til þerf at eyda fua logum guðf hann liet diepa ij fonu fina
ok konu fina ok ahanf dogum uar guð boinn[í] þyft at bretlandi hann hand tøk
Her þeit ad segia æþ beta konungum hueir rikt haþa þirir higad buðinn butus rikti
goc 'ma' gogg rifa er uar xij alna haþ. koteinef het einn hopðingi æþ troea
monnum hann uar ipylgd med buto hann bio fig til glimur udi rifann tokuz sidan til
ok uar glima þeita þudud fterklig at fia þeit blefu haþ ok þigu nidi haþ. ri
fínn tok koteineum fua haþ at brotnudu riðin .ij. j hægri fídu enn eitt
iuniftri koteineo rann miog ikkap er hann uar suæ paþ tekinn þærdiz hann þa
jalla auka æþl finn hann hop upp rifann æ auxl fer ok rann med hann þrama
fiouar hama nockua ok kaftadi honum þar æþ opan. riðinu uar imorgum hlutum er
hann kom afe. þerfi riði uar fua ftekr at hann reij upp digra eik med roton. locricius
uar fon buti hinn elzti hann ried þirir þeim hluta rikfik eptir podnu finn er æ o
llum þotti kiofialgast en albanacutk toð riki er þa uar kallad albania æþ
hanf naþni en sidan fkatlon. ymer konungr drap albanacum en baudi hanf locrinos ok kam
ber baudi hanf boduz uid ymbu en hann plydi ut a anna tyndiz ymer ok
pioldi hanf manna ok tok aín æþ honum naþni ok fua landit ok uar kallad nonþim
braland. locrinos pieck dottus koteinei konungif æþ kornbreita landi en hann hæði þo þ
ellt hug finn til þeinaar meyat er efralldifff het ok allra meya uar þegift
En er koteineus þra þerfa at hann uill þerfa mey eiga lipf giama. þa þor hann aþun
d locrici med æfingi ok kaþa. hann geck ad honum med bugdu nuuerdi ok ygdu
anlitli ok meylli. þu ætlar ei medal fkom<em>ok</em> ok hadung uid off odd aera ep þu
matt rada. mannutu egi huersu ek heþi gert uid þodni þinn igodri pylgd
en nu ætlar þu a eyda fampoum uid dottur mina. ad unndri em ek eþ
inn ok auuirdi æþ eði ok manna miþfi eþ fuabitt fkal hlyda. villdi korineus
þa rada ad konungi. þa fduod menn imili. settuþ þeit ok pie<em>k</em> locrinos guendale
nam dottur hanf fem ætlad uar. Eptir dauþa kosenei liet locrinos eina guend
alenam en tok fer til hufreyu astralldem. guendalena þor heim til korn
bretta lannz litlu fidari gerði hon her a henndi locrinu þiell hann þar þa red guendalena
rikinu hon liet dæckia astrallde ok dottur hennar íeinni að ok er hon hafði
riki raddi[2] x. að tok madan riki þefð finn en hon fettiz at kombretalandi
ok red þar. riki allt til dæþa dagf þann tima uar famuel þamadr agyðinga
landi. þa uar ok uppi omeruf snillingi. madan uar hoguær i riki înó ok er eingu
faga þra honum. þa toku riki synir hafn menpriciuf ok malin. menpricius uar hinn u
efi madr þuiat hann þyddiz kála en aðti þo þrída konu En er hann hafði konung þ k
allad uerid xx uetr þa þor hann um dag altok adyaveidar ok uard þraðkila monnum
finum. þa hlipo ad honum uarga þ[io]ldi ok ripu hann ifunndi þann tima uar
faul konung; ýpir gyðinga landi. þa tok riki ebútuf fon hanf. hann reitti þa þorg
er hann kalladi ap finu [napni] ebracam fu borg heitir nu iok þar er nu erki
fotll. hann liet gera uigi þad alkotandi er meya kaftali uar kallad. ebútus
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atti xx konur ok med xx fonu ok xx dætr. butus h(et) eínn fon ebruti. hann tok riki eþtir podu
ínn andápan ok red xîj uetr ok er eíngu faga þra honum. en bæði hanf unnu faxland
3 unndir fíg ok redu þar þírir fídan son bruti riki eþtir er h(et) leil hann let gera borg ok kalla
di ap napni finu kierlel. þann tima red folomon honn ipaki iofala landi ly
brídibráf hon fon leilf hann tok riki eþtir podu; ínn andápan hann uar mikill fko
rungi: ok þton[af]a<mg> hann fætti alla þa þem hann gat en rak hína or lannid hann liet
gera kantarabyggi ok margar aðar borgir hann uar konung þi ok xx. eþtir hann tok riki fon hanf er h
et bladud hann uar uitr ok radugi. hann uar miðg þolkunnign ok kenndi þa íþrott þar
9 að landi ok namu margir fídan en er hann hafði xx uetr konung; uerid þa liet hann gera
fer þiapham ok uilid plúega at þia þýr riki fítt ok þotti ser þa fíði auuurt koma
En er hann uar koninn þipáðhaminn ok <hafði> plögur um þtund biladi þiapad haminn datt hann þa
10 nidi ok landíz iftycki. bladur uar konung þi xx aż. leið hét hanf fon hann uar gildi konung;
hann hafði <lagt> unndir fíg kombreta land ok fktod land. leið aði þjá dætr en onga<cn> fon hann uar
konung þi ulatra. hanf erpi uar duckit xij manudu. godella dottir leirf riki eþtir hann
15 v. að hon uar uinfæl ap finum unndir monnum. þa toku riki marganus ok konedaguf. do
ttur fynir leirf konedagus drap þráenda ínn íbardaga. red þa konedagus eint
riki iiu uetr hinf þiouda tigur. þa uoru agyðinga lannid þpamenn yfaaf ok ofee ok
þa uar romu borg reif þa gunnduellil xi kalenda[fíj] maj. son konedagi tok riki eþtir
hann fa h(et) riuallo. ahanf dogum rigndi blodi iij daga ok iij nætr eþtir þat kom mann
pall mikid. eptir riallem tok riki gošgričuf fon hanf, ūa hanf (on) filius. ūa iago ūf
21 tu fon goroci. ūa kinmarus fon filuij. ūa goðo44 dago eptir hann toko riki fynir hanf .ij.
het annar perue<en> en anann poruex hann drap þerue biðdu finn en eualle mo
dir þeia drap þoruex ok þerna hennat med þoxum. ūa var mikid uþamþycki um .v. konunga
24 æpi þar til er fa madr heriadi abetland er dunalo h(et) hann uar f(on) glotenif kornbretæ konungs
pyft drap hann pinecum en ūidan þelldì hann ibardan radacum ok þatatuim ūidan
uard hann konung. abetlandi hann liet þygt ælra breta konunga gera fer koounu æp gulli
27 hann fetti hopa rett þann at eingi madr ūkildì fuu iilt gert hopa at hann ūkildì eigi prid
hæpa eþ hann kæmiz ahopa gard. at þeim hætti uoro ūidan ūett kirkugíð eþ
tir þui fem nu haldaz hann eydði ollu高雄 ranum ok hernadi. hann héngði ok sua hardliga
29 þipum at eingi þoði þuildì at þremia. hann red þetlandi xxx uetra ūidan
hann tok koounu. dinuállo atti ìj fonu het annar belinus en annar biennis þeit
attu hardan bardaga en modir þeia ðetti þa Eptir þat logdu þeit undirð fik aeinum
33 xij manudum þrakland ok oll riki þau er liggia þirir nordan piall ok þkazgilldu alla k
onga þa er þar uoro aþ þirir. þeit heriudu ok attil til roma borga; ok þelldu confufæ gab
ium ok perlentum er uoro þyrir roma borg ikipudu ūidan borgina þinum monnum. þor biennis um
alla italiam ok rak fuu mikinn hernad at minnum uar hætí leingi þian. belinus þor
heim til riki'í þinn hann liet gera turn þyrir anni temp ok riki leingi ūidan. guguit h(et)
fon belini. hann heriadi til danmerkr þuiat fa konung er þar red þirir uilldi eigi giallda ðykl
39 dir ne fkaatta fem hann haþdi iattad belino þ(odur) hann guguit þelldì konunginn ok ðagdi
undirð sig allt land. en er hann fneri æþri ot [þeisf herferð] hitti [hann u]artholomeui konung
med xxx ikipa hann bad [s]er prid la[=z] fagdiz haþa oðit þangat fæhaþa en
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adU landplotta ðþspanlandi ok rekt um hap innan eigi fíkemr en xviiij. manadi hann beid
di þþ konungi nokkuf landz at byg gia a. konungi gal honum þad land er nu heitir irland guguit
3 uard elli dauþ. Guîtelmu tok riki eptir þodut finn hann fetti þau log er kollud uoro mar
ciane log þau uoro diuþpettri en þau er adt uoro þau log uoro þar leingi ðidan hall
din. hann uard fottaþuþ. siðillius het hanf fon. hann þelti riki þyft med modur finni ðidar red
6 hann riki allt til elli. eptir hann tok konungdom ganaruþ. þar næþ þrillu fon hanf er het moruidus
Mouüduf var ramu ad æþli ok uuageinn eþ hann uard reidi eina berferek heriadi anordimbra
land. moruidus uard miøð reidi þerfum hlut ok þor þegar imoti med finn her tokz med þeim bardagi
9 ok ecki langt æþi moruiduf piek figt. hann uar þa suð reidi at hann hio med fíno fuerdi
til bana huem er þirir hann kom þar til er hann matte eigi þirir maði. en þa er eptir uoro baud hann at þ
TEXT CUT OFF IN ORIGINAL
itandum piudum ok d'e'yd; med þeim hætti at þeis ftepytu gulli uellannda imunn honum ok mæltu þetta ypir. til gull'z'inf pyfti þik ennda diektu nu gullid fua at þu hapir gnognt. lauk nu fua ypir hanf æpi. juliuf þor til faxlanz med lid fit
iarin æ fuauara landi var mestr motfthaudu madt iulij. hann hædi lagt un ndir fiik mikinn hluta faxlanz ok þriflanz iulij hadi þar margar ortofur ok hœpu ymfr fi. Pompeiufl magnus þor med fer finn pyft med fiipa lidi vm
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gricklanz hap ok gricklanz eyar ok bardiz þar uid uikinga margar ortofur er þar hœpu margt iltt gert og hœpu þjolda lidi hann drap þa fuma en rak alla æfænum ok æf ikipum
Sidan helt hann liðo fino ut ypir hap ok bardiz þar uid metridatem konung iponto ok figa di hann. þadan þor hann ífpanland ok ðigrandi þar fertoir konung. Æptir þad þor hann icirinland ok rabita land ok gydinga land ok uan<n> nændar þiðir unndir roma riki. hann bardiz iaufr riki
uid ij konunga ok xx ok uann þa alla. æptir þad kom hann til roma borgar ok gengu mot honum aulldungar ok oku honum ilgullkerru í þof hap er þeis kolludu kapitolium. þadanap var hann kallad þadir borgamarin || menn þa er hann hædi honum lied til þylgdar en iulius uill
Pompeiufl fendi osd iulio at hann þæri heim til romaborgar eþa fenndi honum alla fina di huarki gera uoro þa ok þeis þim uetr uti er iulius atti ad Þrida. uard þetta upþap til ofamþvekiss þeia maga. sidan þor iulius um allt31 faxland pracland ok þrifland valland ok eingland ok
lagdi þav riki oll unndir fiik er voru þirir nordan mundiu piall. Pa dæmdu aulldungar j roma borg med radi pompeio ad iulius skiðli einkif foma eiga uon þirir þan fi. eg er hann ynni þadan ípra er hann hlyddi eigi bododi þeia ox þa þiandfkapt þeia imillj. sua
fegir luscatus at iulius uilidi ongian manna uita fer hærra. en pompeius aun
gan fer iþan þa er iulius hædi ðigrad yþpaniam ok yberium þer hann ut ypir hœsid æptir pompeio ok attu þeis ij orrostot var hin fídari ithessalonia landi þiéllu þar þleðir kappar pompeio en hann ðalþr plydi ok med honum kato spekinga er gert heipir hugfimnzz mal ok med þeim 000 Pompeius plydi aegipta land ok uænti fer þar þridar en hann uard þar ðeþin fuliklda med þeim hæti at þipþinnuis ridderi þolomæi konungl er þa red egipta landi ok er p(ompeius) fa bana
finn radinn uapdi hann motlinum um hœut fer ok lauk ðaman augum ok hellr32 ad fer ondunni. ok eigi uilidi hann spilla fiini þreigd med ne einu andurapi. þa var hann laginn i gegnum med færdi en hann þagdi fem łaudi ok lauk fua hanf æpi kato var en ilep
tini er hann spuri þau þipþendi ad iuba konung; var ðigrandi ok pompeius var þallinn. þottiz hann þa fia at iulius riki mundi ganga ypir alla uerolld. en hann uilidi aungum kofti honum þiona. tok hann þa þad rad ad dœcca eittr med finum uilía ok do hann med þui. Jultuf kom nu til ho
pfinf 'er capitolium var kallad' ok geck inn. fiiban uar lokid aptyr dyrum ramliga. ROADCASTS ok cassiuf at
iulio ok færdu hann v. farum ok xx med fimam handfauxum ok liet hann par lip ltt ok er likit
firdnadi var hondin firdnut ad beipu uer hanum hæði fellt39 uerid ok uar eckt brotid
innfiglid. en þa er brepid uar fed uar þad arirad ad hann uar uatad uid ad þara aftepnu
na til hopfinf ok fagt ad honum uar bani radinn ep hann kæmi þar. Lik iulij uar fidan bi
tent eþt romuefkm fid ok uapn handf ok merki. sidan uar afkan tekin oll ok buid um
dylriga ok latid koma ier knapp einn mikinn ok uar hann allir a at fia fem gull uerri fa
umbuningsu uar gædd upp afteintolpan þann er færnirt atogiu ok heitir þad petra54
iulij en pilaginar falla pettarf nal Syfrir iulij cefarif het actia eltri m
yclu en iuljuf hennar dottir het octauia ok uar honor modir augufi
uar hann ok aþ þui kallad octauianuf augufi. antoniusf ok augustus boreuz uid
roma. þar þellu ircius ok pinfa þa uar augustus einn ypir romerha her þar til aþ þe<;> r øttuz þeit
antonius med þeim hætti at þeir fikillu uera ii hopdingar ypir roma riki iænir at metoþum
þad uar liða flund ad þeir metti þat famyckcia ad uera iænir men fnkint þeir þa
rikinu ok hlaut augustus roma borg ok þad riki er þar uar til fikild. en antonius tok þad riki er liggj
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Hand B þirr vtan há, vard augustus einvallz konung; ypir ollum heimi ok var þa kallad; augustus cesar. En
þa er augustus kom aud þeim ollum íromabor er hann eignadiz a egiptalandi. eþtir dauþa antonij
ok cleopatre liet hann brenda ielldi oll fíkviða blæð romveria. aþ þvi liet hann þad gera ad hann v
illd ad allir romveria; væri þriatir ahanf dogum ok einki ætte oðrum fíkuld ad giallda hann g
allt aþ finvm þiahtlut hverium manni fíkuld fina. augustus bæt<r>mi romsgar bædi íþvi ad
hann liet gera morg hus ok hallir innan borgar þav er mikid fkravt var ad. hann liet vel bva oll ftr
æti þav er íromabor voro. hann liet öt borgarveggj eþla ok sua vigi vmhuærim borgina. augustus mælte ok sua
þirr vinvm finvm. leir borg var roma er ek tok uðri eina suå fíkilmuz ek uð ad nav er hon marmara borg
pra þvi er ok laðt ad hallær kom suå mikih ahanf dogvm ad þíoldi manna do aþ sullti. En augustus
fynndi sua aðfriki fitt vid borgar menn. ad hann lyftli þvi þirr alþydv epi eigi kæmi vifsir ok leiðangri i
n<;> an iij natta þeirra er næftor voro. villdi hann drecka helldi eïtr ok d<;> ya er en fia velofld aå
polkinv. en ahanf dogvm vard fa atburð ad iborginna ípatt vpp vidfimof brvnin o; biaa;
gi einv. einn dagh suå gnogliga. ad huerti madr matti vpp afa suå suam villdi ok virdv rom
veriai ad íþvi merki miðkvnfemii keisaran. en eþt fikliamndi 'menn' virda ad íþvi merki guds
mískunn ív er birtiz ahanf dogum þa er drot<;>inn jhesus christus var bordin iheim þenna. augustus. hæpir verid
meitr fíonar madr allra romveria konunga ípownm fid ok hann fette þann prid vm allan heim er eging
hepir verid flikr hvarki ad ne fid. aþ hanf napni hepir hvert flem eïn ypir konungí roma velldif
æd oc uelita lidug[an] þann avoxt sem til mannþedu var áhennæ uaxinn. hon hlyder iftad fkap ara<ın>f bodi oc leggî þram koll allt til iæadur. er þa hægt at lefa þau epî feñ em til þylti. oc
12 at því gervuu relifiz hon upp oc rietizz ippuxi natturv. Vndir þeim palmuði fegrî fama bo
k at brunnr hæst upp þpunugwed med fmannt uautn oc ioxdunne þirir bodþkap hinf un
ga ihesu þirir þen joseph oc naudyn þeia þarleingdar. þviat i þess háatar uegum er þat uautn
15 miøg þagiætt at bedi fie monnum dygt oc þaustkiotum. capitulum 0000
Nv [kal legia annad ææntyi er til bar iperd þeia. Sem en lidt leingra uegi[n]m
koma þau pra[m] eitt kuellíð þirir helli nockurn. ftenndi nv natt at oc er þvi ma
18 al at taka þar gifting. plytr joseph þaung þeia inn ihellif munnnan oc ætlæ þar
um ad buaz fakir fkiols tid hielu þal þem þar er giaan anattar tima iþeim lônundum
oc sem hann þæz iftpainu. heyra þau fignud maria hau oc huañgægæ nockæn
11 inm imykrid sua at þau ottaz bedi oc þvi næft skrida þram huggjum tueþ ap fi
inne bygd oc uilia undan lata gefturn þessum. Ener þeit nalgaz vara prv benndir ihesus med
henni finne at þeit skuli kunna sin högg oc þara med eingum opþopa þeit gera fva
24 lægia hopudit oc ludra brott til eydimærkr er þa nattold triumf oc otta lauft. Sem
þau þara þadan oc en lida dagar kiaþir joseph nokkud lágliga at þarang[r] þeia þir
þi lietta þviat eykrinn dregz oc mædid bæti ap grafleyfi oc þofta. Oc sua þiát geingi
27 eînn leo ap eydimorkinn þram auegin þirir þau. hann geþr sik blidan breidt bak oc
badar fidur. ep þau uilia nockurn lietta ap honum þiggia. joseph er þess bunin oc
setr upp þann fterka karlinn huat er hann þæði til þylgir hannþ þeim fisan nott oc dag
30 alla leid þram i egipta land þua miukr oc meinlauf fem eînn faudit capitulum
Nv er herodef konung; varð uíff ad neþdir konungr hopdu heim fnoit til finna her[a]
da oc komit ecki ahanf þunnd eþir þvi fem hann beiddi þylliz hann bolginnar rei
di sua þramt at hann byði ðeþa oll sueinþom yngri en tuæuþr þau er voro
iborg bethlehem oc hennar endimorkum. tolu þeffaþr fueina kunnu ver eigi greina en
34 su tala „er“. ftenndi ji niunda refponfonio er þua heitir. Centum xl iiiii milia h
36 eyris uíff egi til tolu barnanna helldi er hon fett in apocalipþi iohannif þirir lóf merkif
kræpt. herodef piek skioita heþnd suat a þann do uesælliga eþir þui
sem kriftninne er uel kunnigt at han<ın> uall modkum Ap herode hinum <gamla>
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At dauþvm gamla herode birtiz annan tima gudf eingill joseph sua segiandí ris
upp oc tak sueinþn ihefum oc modur hánf oc þar heim aiód gydinga landz. þviat þeit ero
3 nu dauðir er leitudu at glata aund sueinþins Sidan þor hann þerd sina * þat kallaz
in Latin: relegatio pueri ex egipcio habet er vir ydes ianuarii, oc er hann heydi at achilas
son herodes mundi rikia j iudea hui ottadiz hann at para hangat, oc pirir gudliga aminn<i>ng jsue
rne ad hann skilldi byggia jborg nazaeth reddiz bar upp ihefus mariu son ok bar ap var hann kallad
ihefus nazaenus. Sua f egreg heilug rtning at pirri menn hapi borid ihefum, tefir maria diotning, sim
eon gamli. jofeph poetpradir hann. maria mar bar hann jkudi finvm. simeon jpadme. jo
sefth ai herdum ser fem hann plut<i>t i hann undan il7' za heredef fram til egipturn. Sua bodar math
<j>uf gudspialla madr at ihefus por xij uetra med sinne saelle modur ok jofeph til iostala borgar
at muftaraf hatid ok sati badi udu uuih hurar hann uar um tima. en hv var fok til ssef ad
sekiandi lydi ap rikineu skilldi ganga med faugleikum badi til mustarif ok dra var fa fettning:<
upp at ad ifinvm uegh skilldi huart uera greinligt kallat ok kuendi. oc pirir bsefa sok at fa
l marla ok jofeph skildu fin imidil. hudi huart taitia pilittinn med odu uera. oc
epir hrigga daga leit fem var prv sancta maia tinni hann fitia ifialpu muftarin millim
spekinga egi uanbuinn at faura ne fpyia. segir hon tua til hanf. son hvi fyndiz tixer suu
ad gera. Ek ocفادir tinn leitudum tinn harmandi. ta fvaradi ihefus. huat er pat er bid le
itudoj mini. viicv bid egi pat. al mer byiaa at gera pah luti er podu minf ero
ahimn. Han<i>n> por ta heim med taim inathetoc oc heim alydinn fem afvii mai maak
a at hann fotti uatn til lekiai ep naudsyn beiddi oc hanf signud modir bod honum
21 Enn ma fa travz fakir hanf mykla litiilafet at hann hapi at ftadit oc pullung ueti<i>t>
poitr podur finvm jofeph piviat pat er uitat at hann kunne vel iammid ap varum <herra>
Nv tann tima fem uari herra tok fkirm ap joni baptista prenda sinvm apjutug alldie
24 geina gudspioil at hann pastadi xl daga oc pridieadi natta ta hungradi hann fem
mann piandinn preiftrad hanf oc vard ypir stiginn pat er i. nott epir stetvm valent
ini m(arityris) En a odu aii flere hann uatnj iuin<i> j kana galieele at budekaap
27 piviat hann var til taitia famkundu kalladi oc hanf modir oc allir hanf laerifueinar. par var
000000 [ueizlu] pall ep gudf modir hebd egi egi pammi ftadit. hon taladi uid fon
finn afesfa leid. fon minn phtyr vin ad uetilune. h(ann) f(uarar) huat kemr pat
til minn e(da) tinn. oc enn talad hanf. pullit vj steinker ap uatni tua uar gert sem
hanh baud. hann blezadi uatnni oc taladi fidan til bionofu manna ausid upp nv
oc berit pyft aunduegiff manni. oc er hann kenndi fagdi hann sua. tixer geymdut allt her til
33 id beutra uin beata takn pammi skapauin pyft pirir manna augum
Lidu hedan sua timar varf drottins hollganar ok herueru ad teii plutv a<i>
lir med dasemdum oc allzkyns iategnum tua ad hanf matt jodi
36 oc urksi mai einki fkya Sva prin. fkirpat ad anna modir mariu
ok efmeria modir elfabeth ueri fyfr. hon uai modir iohnanif baptiste hann b
an[...adi ad heredef helldi uid hond fer brodur konu sina er h(et) herodiadis ðvi var hann fettr
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Hand A imyrkua stopu mot paskum ap herode ok xij manudum sidar uar hann halshoginn. ða tok guds son ser til pylgdar xij ða kalladi hann postola ok iodu lagi. Ixx ok ij ða kalladi hann sina læ ristueina. tok hann ða at gepa syn blindum en dunburn mail daupum heym. hann sadder ok v (pusundir). manna ap v. bauahleipum ok ij piskum. en annan tima þeddi hann .iij. (pusundir) meþ vij bauahleipum ok þam smepiskum at utauldum konum ok bornum. næ. þersum tima ste hann upp ipiial tabor. ok med honum

ijj postolar petrvs iacobus iohannes þa syndiz asiona hans sem skinandi sol en klædi hans biost sem sniour. þar komu ok ij spammenn moyses ok elias ok kenndi petrvs þa bada. en hapdi huar ngi pyrr sied. hann reisti ijj menn ap dauda unga dottur iayri ihusi. eckiu son iborgar

12 hliði. en lazarus þerðagaðan kalladi hann ap groð. sua segir speculum ecclesia at lazarus uæri biskup x xx ara. ikip. sidan systur hanf uoro®i maria magdalena ok marta er audladiz at lada isitt her bergy sialþan guds son. sa hlutr giodiz þa er sæl marta uar uid ana rodanum einn mi

kill deki uar amidil þeia stada er annar h(et) arelainum en annar auton skamt pra a þeiti er ro danus h(eitir) hans hínir þremri hlutir uoro sem apogli hínir sidari hlutir sem a þiski hann uar digari en ux i leiningr en hestr hopud hapdi hann sem leo. tenn hans uoro huassar sem suerdz oddar. þax hapdi hann mikid sem hestr huass kambi geck abaki honum sem bieðauzr egg. heistr uar ahonum flöt ok snartp hann hapdi vj þat purduliga sterka klaer hans uoro sem abiri halri hans uar sem æitr omi þat er uppéra u`i`engi hapdi hann ij langa ok bieða siga at þeit huldu allan hans likam ok uoro þeia su ðyrkuur ok stykirkir at þir þeia traustleika lietti hann eigi þirir nie einum hoggupnurm nie þlugupnurm nie nuckurum uiguelum sua uar hann sterkr at hann matti med suin apli ok grimleik uid iapaz e(da) sigra xij biñnu

21 e(da) leona þersi dreki uar ap lannz monnum kalladi thara`s conus. þat hugdu menn at hann mundi getinn uera

ap þeim sio deka er leuiatan h(eitir) ok i iobs bok er nepndt ok hapi sa deki þarid eþit hínun mikla hapi auflan ap galacia asie. ok er hann hinn grimzti deki ok liggi isio e(da) uotnum ok hapi þat kuikynndi er igalica er ok bonakum h(eitir) blandaz uid sio dekan til þersa getna
dar þetta olma dyr bonakum er sua illrar naturnu at uerþi wellheitu driti um xxx padma ¿can¿u u eg sem skeyiþ þyghi aþa er þat sekia ok bennr ap huat er þirir urðs. hin blezada marta ge<

[o]skialpandi at þersum deka ~þar hann la iskogi adauds mannz hrei` ok stautil ipir hann uigud uatni. ok kros< dsottins bar hon med ser

24 su a sem skioild aurragan moti þersu illgusa dyrri. en hann urerd uid þersi hennar til þeki suva otta fullr ok umattuþu at hann matti or þeim stad huergi huera, ok ecki mein gera. en

hon balt hann med sinum linnda þui næst dirr d`uz menn uid ok baurdu hann til ban[a i þenna tima] bar

27 'Pat bar` til iborginni petragoricasæ þa er þronto byskup saung messo [i] sjalþri hopud Kirkunnj at hann sopna di iþeim suneþi uitradiz honum sialþr gud ok m(eitli) minn elskeþili uin þronto eþ þu uilt
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ennda þitt þirir heit þat sem þu hez 'hus'prv uarri marthþ þar nu skotliga at uelta henni grauptr
ok pylg mer ok er hann hædi þetta mælt þoro þeit 'a' augabraði ðiðra I konum ok geingu ikirkju marte
ok toku at synjia med odium þpir hennar likam, helldu þeit þær med sinum eiginiligum
honndum, þirir syngandi, en audum an[n]saurandi badir þeit þaru hennar likama ok ileidi logdu
þa uar byskup uakinn aþ klerkum byskup sagdi þa ho ho bæði; minir hui uoktu þier m
ig sua skiiot. ek hepi at segja ydi agætjan aburd ihefus christus leiddi mig aþ
þersum stad til likylygiu sællar marthe sinnar husþprv ok nu nu hoþum uid uci[t]t henni
graptrar þionostu. hann sagdi ok at þa er þeit geingu brott or kirkjunn spordi einn bódir
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þers stadar sialþan duottinn huerr hann uæri e(da) hu'a ðan hæn uæri e(da) huert napñ hann ætti. en hann
suaradi honum auengu ok syndi honum opna bok þa hann hædi ihenndi ahenni uar ecki annat
skriþat en þetta uers in memoia eterna erid iusta hospita mea ab auditu42 malo non
timebid in die nouissimo þat er sua at skilia, jeilipri minning mun uera riettuís husþryv min
eigi mun hon ottaz uid heyn illa hluta ahiñum sidazta degi capit(ulum) || suat a myrkt uard
þa er ihesus hæði xxx ara ok uel iij. uar hann kroþestr "langa þria d(æ)g) aþ gydingum soþnadi solin
med ollu en steinar bustu. leidi dauþa opnuduz kaustudu upp dauþa
manna likaumum. mustaris tialld ripnati at opanuerdu allt til nedsta

60 ok þadan þra a xlda d(egi) ste hann til himins nær standandi hans signadv
modur mare ok asianum nær .c. manna ok þadan .x. dogum lidnum sendi hann hinn helga andu
sinum postolum. siau diakna uigdu postolar guds stephanum. philiçum. pretolum. nitarornem .th
12 imotum. paramenam. nicolaum. er smidari maunez uillum. anaste ari eþir guds s
onar pil uar stephanus gyþtr. ok nuckuru sidar uar iacobus broðir iohannis halshaugguinn m
oti paskum. en petrvs settir imyrkuostou aþ sama herode litlu sidaru. siau arum ep
15 tir pining guds uar sæl mær maria upppumin en þadan a xlda d(egi) tok hon holz uppisu þat er
i ði. natum eþir matheus messo uar þat langan tima miog uuist þirir aldyþu. en huersu þat uard lio
st skal her næst geinæ. elisabeth d(ottir) konungs aþ ungaria geck iklaustr .xì uera gomul lipdi
18 hon stoum heilagliga ok er hon hædi lipat iklaustri xi æ ríþiz henni guds modir optilla. talandi med henni
ymissar geinir. heilaga nitorama her med ríþiz henni einn guds ei<ne gill sa uandiz til hans at leira
aþ gudligir speki kendi hon þenna eingil. æ hinn sama til sin 'komanda' sem sannan uin ok kieran þe
21 laga ok er hon blomgaz þúlikum gioùum stunnar þúlikum hon þui þramar at lika gudi sem bezt iollum hlu
tum giomandi satt liðillæti med godum uerkum ok þat geriz sidan hon skir at maria guds modir. uird
iz hennar optilla at uitia. huat hon s(eigir) leyniliga sinum annadaligum þedt þar iklastrinu huerr henni geþur
þat rad at spyria ðotningina nuckurs þa hon bíþiz henni næsta sinn hon segiz þers hon segiz
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pers uilia spyría sem hinn gamli madr uill henni rad til geça. pers bid eg dottir min at þu
spyrí hana huart hon hæf þa dauda risid ok lípi nu med gudí. med onndd ok likama. ok næsta tima
sem sæl maría birtíz (elisabeth) tala þær med ser hardla kíseliga þat uar in octava affúncionís sancte marie
medan guds þionosta plútiz ikìrkiinni leid lietr hópí iþir (elisabeth) ihueriðm hon birtíz hfeiðlog) mær
maría e(elisabeth) spyr hana þa diargíla suá segiandrí dótini min sæta. eþ þat likadi gudí64
uöldum ur giarna uita huart þu heip at eins iannadan upp risid ok riki tekid med þínum sy
ni e(da) reistu áþ daþa bæði meþ óndd ok likama spyr ek þir þa sok þersa hlutar þína m
illdi at mer er sagt at egi þinniz skriþat ibokum heilagra þéda aþ þíni upp nunning dóttningin s(tuaradi)
hennar mað þat þa spyrí mattu egi at sinni uis uerda en þo er þat þirir ælát at þersi hlutr
fikal þirir þig birtaz ok audsynzæm sem þersi syn huert þr bregir þyrinsyn kunnigst hinum gam
la þaudur huersu þarid haþi spurning ok annuþo meþ drot(n(ingunni)65 en sa godi broadir leggi þat til
at nunnan taki upp ea(n)> kannligar bænir guds modur til sæmdar inning þersa þirir heiz ok hall
di þeim dagliga þar til þram kemr uitránin lidi nu sua heilf ar at þersa lutar þorir nunnan huar
ki at spyría guds modur marianm nie sinn h'e' imoligan eingil þott þau birtiz henni bæði e
þir uana þar til at affúmpció sancte marie stenndi værr a oðu æri þa sykiz elisabeth
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sua þramt at hon liggt miog máttarin ire`c`kiu asialþa hatíðina en þann tima sem haleit
þíonosta geriz aþeim belezada degi lied iþir hana þungt umegín ok þui næst sier hón m
3 iog þirri eina þeinþo þíonní sier hon ligga sem kuenligan likama. alla uega umbergis Þo
du heima menn himin. rikis. biþirir guds einglar med skinanda lióíi ok liitli sidar rifs þersi cona u
pp med dyrþ mikilli er adi la îegonína luþa þ(henni)66 einglar plytiandi hat ióþt upp
6 med gopuglighri skipan þag<ur> a hlíoda þar til at mot kemr æ híminríkíþ kuría þag ok dyrtlígi
umpam sonu mananna liþanní guds son med morgum hirdsúctum sinna hirdmanna sa sami drottinn beri isi
nini hendi h(eilagan) kros meþ þogu merki er þa skipud agíæt proccñcio geck þersi dóttning suá inn j
þagnadinn er adi haþi þirir liitli upp risid æþ groþinni ad héþli konungí leidir hana meþ ser. sidan
byrgiz þuílik proccñcio þrøtt aþ hennar aþugum. lið þa liitli ñmunnd adi sæl maría birtíz henni synir
hon blezud henni andlit sitt blitt en talar ecki uid hana. ok sem hon liði þrøtt kemr sami eingill
12 þa talar hon þegar til hans suá segiandrí hera min huat merkir su syn er eg sa þirir skomu e(ingillinn) s(tuarar) þa. îhei
ri uitrán syndi gud þer huersu sancta maría uar upp nunin bæði med onndd ok likam. eþir þuílika uí
tran þær hon þilla heissu. ok asialþan octauu daginn talar 'e(nn)' sami eingill til hennar. bid ek
at þu. segir mer huersu langi timi leid þrøtt aþ uppnumning uarar prv adi þyldþi hennar liikamlig u
ppisa e(ingillinn) suarar. õþann sama d(ag) sem nu dy<o>kaz hennar affúmpcio leid hon brot æ þersu liþi. en axlda d(egi)
þadan þar er nono kalendas octobris reis hon æ daþa eþir þat huara eþingillinn henni at syn. nær xiiij a
rum eptir pisil chriz skiptuz postular til lannda. en eptir upp stigning guds xxx arum ok uij uoro þeir pindir petrvs ok paulus uar hann halshaugguinn en petrvs krofespêtr iroma borg ap nerone keisara. andeas krospestr jakara 'j g<><ieland' ap egea jarli jacobus yngi uar byskup xxx ara at iosolum hann uar gyttur en sidar sle

ginn jhopud med puattara baruip. asama degi uar philippus krofesm iasia ok bunndinn ak<><osinn þa hæði hann lxxx ok vij ar. ij dær hans helgar uoro graynar asina honnd honum huar. Bartholomeus plegin kuikr ap astrige 'konungi' aindialandi ok sidaz halshog<>< inn ok pluttu 'eptir tima' j beneuentum en þadan pluttiz hann ap ottone

keisara ok þeir dni helgan dom postulans til eyar þeir er liggj nærr romaboig ok ge ymiz þar anæsta aindialandi uar tomas laginn igegnum meþ suerdæ ap byskupi solar hops matheus uar laghinn igegnum abak meþ suerdæ abalandi ap hirtaco simon ok iudas uoro lagdriggener meþ kesi a

persida landi. mathias uar pindi j iudea þyst gyttur en sidan dæpinn meþ exi kapitulum | | u er
Fioum tigum uttra eptir pisil guds sonor kom udeadilig heþnd gydingum aðann hat en stiarna s komet h(ettir) uar sien allt ar igegnum ípír yerusalem meþ ogurligu liosi ok hordþi blodeþillinn aborgina

þat uard ok id næsta ar viii+ d(ag) aprílis þa er mikid piołmenni uar komid til paska hallz j yerusalem. a ixdu
 fueðnu nætr uar sua mikid lios sied ípír solomons mustari at plestir menn ætludu dag liosan ok helz þat halþa stund þotti þat aldydu parselligt en prædimenn suglu þeigdar lios uera a þe<><ri somu paski tida uar ein kuiga til þornar leidd ok þirir allra augum bar hon lamb. vm midnættis sk eid einna nott huþ i. imustarinu ap eiri ok malmi gior lurk meþ lasum ok læst meþ lokum ok sua þung at traulla matu xx menn huþa hana lausa lauks upp sialþrápi at auðung

manni uid komandna þat unndi uarþ ok sied nær iosala þalli syndiz sem uapnadar pylkyngra til bardaga bunar ioþtinu meþ umsat a borgina ok þa er ken<><imenn komu imustarid at þæra pornir heyr

du þei manna mal þenna hat þoum brott heþan. en<>< bar sua til at einn madr íhefus at næþi rann um bor
gina ok kallar meþ þersum hætti kall ap austri kall ap uesti k(all) ap sudri k(all) ap nordi k(all)
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ap ollum attum ípír ollum monnum ok kall ípír budguma ok budi ok allan lyd þetta kallar hann bæði not ok d(ag) þa uar hann telekn ap hoftëningum ok mög kualt en hann kallar þui meir sua uar hans kuald at holldit geekt allt ap beinumun en allðri uarþ hann oþir þirir sig ok eigi komu tar ap hans augum en kalladæ æ. id sama at þersu iud logu uer yerusalem ok uei. þersu næst koma þei uespasianus ok titus meþ miklum her til iosala borgar nærr paska tid gy<><inga

þuiau nu kom su stund er þeim uar heþnd hugud þirir sina gleþi þirir pisil kriz ok stephani ok io cobi huþtueggia ok matheie ok þirir margar aþpar uhæþur. þangad hæði saþnaþ mikill piol di sua at þar eigi minni manntala en xxx sinna huþnnd þusunnða huerig mati þar mat

ne uistir uij uediþ haþa huetueña uar þar at lyktum etid þat er tonn matti apesta iamuel

skuar sem bellti halmr ok gras þorni su sagd segir josephus at þar uar komin ein goþug húsþrv hafandði
med ser einn miog ungan son sinn hon uard þundin æ spnautungum þeim er allt gripu meþ
12 rani þat þeir riengu nad ok er mikid hungr; geck at þersari konu talar hon sua heyr minn son
þu erþ reningia brað eg gat þig ok eþtir þat drap hon hann ok steikið ok at halpan ok er hon sier rans
menn talar hon sua etid þetta. þetta er minn <son> er eg snædda. ok er þeit heyrdu sua óskranlig konunn
15 ar oð húrþ þeir brott. en þa er borgin uar unnin telr sua iosephus sagna madr at eigi lieti þar þær
ri menn liþi en xi dýrum. c. þusunnda adt borgin ueri unnin en ásidan uoro sumir xi dýrum bættir
en meþ sumum leikid asuerdum edl spitoa oddum en þeir menn er undir geingu uoro bunnir ok sell
dir til egiptalannz edl annara hierada at hauggua biarg edl telgia giot till halla giot
da allar elri menn en xvíj uetra. en þeit hinir yngri uoro selldir mansali. en þeit menn allir er selldir
uoro ero taldir. x. þusunnda. eþtir þat uar borgin oll nidi brotin eþtir þui sem sialtr dottin hæpti þirir
21 sagt. helyas adrianus liet upp gera ierusalem ok baud at hon skilí elya æ hans náþni heita hann
liet graþa nidi: iij krossa uar einn kross drottnis uars ihesu en þeit ij er þíopor uoro apindir en iþeim stad
er gud uar pindi liet hann setia f' r'eyu likneski at huer guds uina sem þar uilîl bidiaz þirir skili
24 hann þar sia þreyu en eigi kross mark. siau tigum `ok v' uetra eþtir pisl kruz anndapiz ion postoli austr
ieþeþo þa hæpti hann xć ok ix ar. hans þramperdar dagi a ions messo baptiste asumarid
Hand F' pioir ero gudspialla menn. matheus marchus lucas iohannef. matheus. er pyrr het leui samfetti fitt gudspiall med
ebreskum malshætti in iudea. en marchus. tok fitt gudspiał æ postogn petri postola meiftara sins hann uar
byuskop in alexandria ok þoldi þar pílaruættir þirir guds náþna suar er leifd' æ honum at hann hyggi æþer þumalþin
30 grinn at hann skilí eigi mega taka byuskopiða lign. lucas uar fyrilenzkr at ætt hann fíkrapí si fitt gudspiał eþtir
parsogn fins meiftara palf postola hann gerði ok þa bok er kallaz actus apostoluoum hann kunni læknifí líft hann ann
dapiz ihalþum bittinie en þu hæpti lxx ok iij ar fins alldif. johannes fíkrapí fidez fitt gudspiall
a 'ójanuerdum dogum fins lipí ok fuá heþr jn principio erat uerburn et cetera capitulum de specie falva[tori]/
33 Her byriaz katalogus fummoouum pontificum romanouum þat er suar fém paua tala e(da) fíkpan þuia t her
segir huá hueri þeira heþr logtekid krifinn 67l dominun til upphalz heþium uer pyît a uamum lauf
nara ihetu christo er bædi er konunggr ok kennamdr. suar þinaz fíkrapí iromuekum annalibus iudeouum ok
36 geyzmaz at gæðari mannhynfin ok uar liugi lauardi ihetus marju fon hæpi uerid meþ
al madr ahed rettuxinn ok uerdiulgí at lita hann hæpi dyrliðt annlit fuá þramt at æ tianndi
ok hann sia<æ>ndi menn fíkldu bædi mega ottaz hann ok elfka. hæppandi har hardla þagst þar at iarana `til'
39 fem ny upp runnin hnot fu er kallaz alatinu auellana nux rietthær ofan at eyuum

17v en þadan niedi hauck nockud. þállannda opan aa axlír med þargurfnunum lok
3 kum. reik hæfi hann eþtir midiu høði ad fíd þeirra man<n>æ er nazarei uoru k
alladir en þeir letu alldri ftnera knip. har fitt eda íkegg 59 ennid flett ann nuckurum
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byskups stola. Fabianus pri(m)us romanus at ætt. sat. xiii ar. vj manadi (tæmdiz) s(ætid) x d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at iapnan skildli u71 igiaz krismi askir dag. Cornelius pri(m)us romanus. at ætt. sat. iij ar. ij manadi x d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at kennimmenn skildli
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sueria eih ep þeir uilldi ok naðsyn beiddi. lucius pri(m)us romanus at ætt. sat iij ar ij manadi iij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at huer byskup heði iapnan hia sier ija prefta ok ija diakna. stephanus pri(m)us) romanus

3

at ætt sat iij ar ij manadi xv d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at kenninnenn skildli eigi bera mesfo klæði utan kirkiu. sixtus secundus grecus at ætt. sat iij ar xi manadi hann sk(ipadi) at iapnan skildli mefsta syngiax iþirir altari. dioni sius pri(mus) sat iij ar iij manadi vij d(aga) Felix pri(mus) sat iij ar. x manadi xxv d(aga) Euticius pri(mus) tuscus at ætt sat viii ar2 x manadi v d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid xv d(aga) Gaius pri(mus) dalmatine at ætt sat xj ar iiij manadi xv d(aga) Marcellinus pri(mus) romanus at sat vj ar. iij manadi xxi d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid xv d(aga) hann uar nauðgapi ap dioclecianno at bera reykelsti þirir skurgod um sinum. Ílitu sidar gíopí hann þagra þætti ok þirir badr at honum skildli groþt uicitaz þar til at

9

c ok lxxx. sidan þoldi hann pislar ætti ok þirir baðr at honum skildli groþt uicitaz þar til at

12

petr postoli utradiz til pers at hann væri sæmliga geþtadi. Meccellus pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat vj ar xxij d(aga) Eusebius pri(mus) grecus at ætt sat iij ar iij manadi xx d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid vij d(aga) Mecliades pri(mus) aper70 at ætt sat iij

18

ar. vj manadi vij d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid xijij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at þæsta eigi diottinif daga Silvester pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat xxij ar xi manadi (tæmdiz) sætid xv d(aga) hann uetti skim hinum mikla conftantinoo ok heinsadi hann ap liþra Hand E þa geyrdiz byfcupa fynoduf fua mykill ath72 Hand A þar uoro occ ok xviþ byskupar at

22

þei þirir dæmdu arrium preft ok hans þy’1 garar. þersi silvester snauri elenu dotningu ok xij d[o] marum ok miklum odum piolda til riettrar tvrра gývinga trv. hann uar xxx. ok v.Æ<ti> æþ petro þa uar lidit æ þollgan preft til þers er silvester tok pua dom. occ ok xvj ar. Marcus pri(mus) romanus

26

at ætt sat iij ar vij manadi xx d(aga) lucius. ijm7 romanus at ætt. sat iij ar iiij manadi vj d(aga) liberiufr pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat iij ar vij manadi (tæmdiz) sætid xxiij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at lauglî hion skildli saman uigiaz ap kennimnonum. Fe lix. ijm7 romanus at ætt sat iij ar vij manadi ij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) ep byskup er heþi þirir sauð ok kalladt laugliga

30

til þings skal hann koma. þyrsegdi liberius sat. v. ar. æþir pelicem þui at lipanda liberio uar skipatí

39

felix uilllu paui en raku liberium jutledd Damasus pri(mus) h’r73 panus at ætt sat xviiij ar vij manadi x d(aga) ‘claruit jo[alphabet] et ba[r]llam’ (tæmdiz) sætid xxxi d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at gloria patri skildli syngiax miðil psalma. cericus pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat xv ar

44

iij manadi x d(aga) (tæmdiz) xx d(aga) hann atti byskupa þing imiklagardi með ecc ok x1 byskupa. anastafius pri(mus) roma<n>us at ætt sat iij ar xxvi d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid xxiij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at eingi klekr skildli uigiaz jannars byskups dæmí

63

an olopi Jnnoncencius pri(mus) albanus at ætt sat xv ar iij manadi xx d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid xxiij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at eingi skildli

69

uigiaz til þez ep hann væri at nuckurum lim unadî. Zosimus pri(mus) grecus at ætt sat. i. ar vij manadi xxv d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid xx d(aga) h(ann) sk(ipadi) at uigia kerti moti paskum Bonificius pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat iij ar vij manadi iij d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid viij d(aga) Celestius pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat viij ar. i. manad70 ix d(aga) (tæmdiz) sætid xxi d(aga) hann sk(ipadi)

79

ti messo skildli syngiax judica mei deus et difcerne c(ausam) m(eam) d(e) psalminn. syxtus iij. romanus at
ætt sat xiiij ar xix d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid xxij d(aga) leo pri(mus) tuscus at ætt sat xxi ar manad i. vij ok xx d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid xij d(aga) hæt ur prestat er hann leit miog prida konu er hann gær henni guid' likama apaska dag suar at uarla

pieck hann boid kenni hann þersa sauk sinni hægri henni þui tok hann oxi ok hio ap sier hen
dina ok eptir litinn tima gær honum hondin þirir guds modur ban hann sat synodum ca
Ilcedenonsis. ylarius pri(mus) sardus at ætt sat vi. ar. v manad i d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid x d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at einki klerkr skilldi
kladaz leikmanna bunati. Simplicius pri(mus) tibirinous at ætt sat xv ar. vi manad i v'i j d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at einki byskup skilldi sk<i>pa sier eptir sig komanda hirdi Felix iij" romanus at ætt sat viij ar. vj manad i
manadi xv d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid v d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at uigia kirkjur as byskupi. Gelasiuf pri(mus) aper<3>U at ætt sat iiiij ar viij

johannes pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat ij ar iij manadi t(æmdiz) sætid viij d(aga) ahans dogum uard pracland kristid. Felix iij" sabinus at ætt. sat. iij ar iij manadi viij d(aga) bonifatius iij sabinus at ætt sat. ij ar xxvi d(aga) þersi iij giodu ecki þat

er merkiananda urei. Johannes. iij." romanus at ætt sat ij ar iij manadi viij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid viij d(aga) hann þirir dæmdí maximianum
byskup arriannum. Agapitus pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat xi manadi xxviij d(aga) Seueriæ pri(mus) campanus at ætt sat i. ar. x manad i uar s
enndi iutled ok þar depinn. Vigilius pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat xxij ar. vij manad i xxviij d(aga) þa tæ<3>diz paua sæ

tid um iij manad iahns tima uar roma borg tekin as gottif en preslj þirir patricium. pelagius pri(mus) romanus
at ætt sat iij ar. x manad i xxviij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at uillu menn skilldu uera þaungdir ap ueralligum uaulldum
Johannes iij" romanus at ætt sat xij ar xi manad i xxiiij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid x manadi hann ennðibætt kirkjur ok kirkiugarda postolanna
benedictus pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat iij ar. manad xxviij d(aga) pelagius iij" romanus at ætt sat. x. ar iij manad xx d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid

Hand J Sua bar til miog asiduztum dogum pelagij paua at a fu er tiberif h(eitir)
occellr innan tfladar jrom tok fuar ubærligilan uoxt aþ ak
aþligum regnum oc þeyvotton at þann geyping er hon bar at borginni to
k eigi þaruegin innan tfladar oc hlioþ hon upp ajaþueginu med suar m
icklum unndium ad um hrid geck hon miok iamfit bogarmurinum her med
þor þat ad hufin heil þerdi hon aplot. pieck heilug kirka þat aþ
mikinn fkaþ þui at konholud hennar med illum kofti þoror þar j ug
iold oc suar margt þulhundrat þælæ h' v eitff tok þa tiberiff at þat
þerrei egingeint. her þylgði þat. sem hon brautu annan ugeg
ut aþ borginni oc leitadi fiowar at hon fioklar j bnot ou jadad

288
holm mikinn piolda hoggouma oc þarmed einn dæka fua mikinn
ad uexti fem einn flóckr uære. þetta alltarið þlytr hon oc þleygir ut
j fio En þann tíma fem hæþåan ríff j moti káttar hon þéttu u
afannda tueimmegum med at ofinum uar þa eigi langt ad folaat hi
ti ftekti þau herpligð hæ geck þar ef þouinndis sau upolligí fn
ykr ad þat uar dauðligt hugu ðiþi. loðfið dimadiz oc fynnði þic med
beiktí hrygg oc j manadi januarió fem þéffu dumba kom þeim i
pir romam þyldgi sau hæðligi ogn ad menn dittu nítt j dauda
med þu kyni fem þpioði uæri lagt j fmaþarma. her med þot þat ad
æmi ad menn f Lithuaniaugum fem logandi auðar þlygi ap log
21
tinu j gegnum mennina oc þuí uar eingi dratr j daudanum helldi kom
hann sau bratt fem auga bragd en þéff er miog gæinanda ad þyfir al
Ira manna þann boiar uard þirir þéffu dauda þkoti postolig hera pelagius
24
pau. þiell þa fua nítt þolkið ad margir gardar j borginu uouu med, ollu
aleyddir. en utan boiar eyðdi fua tiberif moig herud med finum þot
uexti ad fuart var þærir oc flik uðami hafi eini madr heyxt þyrð k
omud hapa. moti þúiliku æpple kallad til guds med odum lyd
gregoriður ef þa uar erkídaðan pauan hann ðkípari bæna halli
cum vij letania. klerkar allir fí:lldu ganga j kirkju johannis baptise. munnkar
30
allir oc klauðra menn j kirkju johannis oc pauvi guds þflauatta Nu
nuu alllá j kirkju choðme oc damiani. Leikmenn allir íkirkiu mar
celli þflauaz. allí giptar konur íkirkiu þstethan prothom<arty>rið Eckiur
33
allá j kirkju uitalis þataðir menn oc born j kirkju heilagræt cecilio

18 bis v
gengu fídan þall fæmt til matri kirkju cumprocesfione. þa baud
fæll gregoriður ad ut fíllldi beraz liknelfi gudl modur er bokin
3
segir ad luakar euangelista hapi gert. var nu dauda myrkríð
fem meðt oc mannþalll akapaz fua ad æ einne dagtunnd fem þolkid
gerði letaniað duðtu nítt lxxx manna. en fæll G(re)(oriuþ) herder þolkid þuí þra
6
man bíd þá hatt kalla til almættig guds oc hafn fætu modur. syndi
hon þa oc blezudí" fína mildi þuí ad æ afjanu hennai liknelfi
tenndi fem folaeiðið sau þkíar ad myyrkrid þlydi biott undan. her med
9
þyldgir þat ad upp iloðtir íþir íkriþíne heyrar himinrikif eingla.
fætum roddum fyngianandi. þuliklæt ṣe þegna celi leṭare. "a(lleluia)' quia quem mervifith
postare a(lleluia) refurrexit ficit dixit a(lleluia) fæll greg(orius) tekir unndir oc leggr þetta uid
ingla faunginn. Ota pro nobis dominam rogamus a(lleluia) þau oð erof ðiduz
j ant(iphona) j þelfa minning er nu heþir uerid lefin er halldinn gagndagi hinn
eiν vard þeppe onþeppe greg(orius) páui j roma fem chataloguf þegir Naet ep
tir hann uard pause sabinianus oc uar miôlik xgregiotio þui ad þær þatækir menn
loupudandana gregotium en badu þapann þega fer olmofu en
hann fuaradi med þeffum hætti. þo ad gregotuþ fagdi hann þpennti upp kirkui
maþ þe ser til þragdar oc þæddi allan lyd til heimligra; dydar er huartu<<ggia
at eiγi megum ver oc eiγi uilium uer fua gera sem margan tima heþir hann fu₇ ta
lad birþiz heilag; greg(orius) honum j fuepi þem finnum me blindum oðum
ok hialþfamþligum aminingum bid; hann uikia finum hag mei₇₇₉₇ til
uaþkynndar uid hinu þatæka en leggia ap aleitni uid fik. en fakin þeff at
herna þapinn uar fia þeinligi i finu briofti at hann hampad ollum
þeffum þrîm aminingum hellt þem þûþu fina hond pra allri mi₇₉kun
uïd þatæka en fïod a umleþrum til gregotium þapæ kemι honum maklig fكري
pt þui ad eþþir oðum d(aui)ds fetti hann þinn munn ihimin upp ok taladi ra
27 nglaeti me hauada. hvar þirþ h(eilagr) gregorius kemï til hann id þioða finn nu me
ogn ok miki₇ili reïiði fêr honum þann þlag ihopudid þem hann uar bana
faï. Lîpï hann fua leingi fidan at hann mati fêgia eþþir komandum monnum
30 til uìotidz huadan leiddi hann bana
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Hand A Gregorius pr(mus) læriþadir kristinnar romanus at ætt sat xiiij ar vi manadi x d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid v manadi xv d(aga) hann setti
viγ munkli₇i hann samse₇t i asciæïent bok ok marga adra merki₇liga hluti. fœbi ni anuæs im tu
12 Icus at ætt sat i ar ii manadi ix d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid vi manadi xvij d(aga) bonifaci₇us iij" romanus at ætt sat i xx manadi bonifaci₇us iij." mæřfœl at ætt sat vi. ar. viγ manadi xxv d(aga) hann þa ap po₇ka cesære at uigia panteon til sœmdar ollum
helgum Deu₇fœdit pr(mus) romanus at ætt sat iij ar. xx d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid i. manad ok viïj d(aga) hann uar son subdi₇aksns
stephani. honoïus pr(mus) kampanus at ætt sat xij ar xi manadi xxvj d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid xvij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid xvij d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at hallida cate
dram petri. Seuerinus pr(mus) romanus at ætt sat i. ar. iij manadi xxix d(aga) Johannes iij" dalmatinus at ætt sat i. ar. ix manadi
xxvii d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid i manad xijj d(aga) hann leyṣti hertekna menn me gozi kirkinnar. the'oodus pr(mus) tu₇f
18 cœs at ætt sat. vi. ar. v manadi Martinus pr(mus) tiburtinus at ætt sat. vj. ar. iij manadi xxv d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid. xvij d(aga) Olimp
hu₇ hortogi sœndi þion sinn til at dœpa hann er hann sau₇ng. messo. en en sa uard þegar blindi. Eug
enius pr(mus) romanus at ætt sat iij ar. ix manadi xxij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid i manad xxvii d(aga) Vitell'i'uf pr(mus) signenn at ætt sat xiiij
vi manandi t(æmdiz) sætid. iij manandi xiiij d(aga) hann samsetti romueskran saung ok samhli' í'odabi med sætum órgans son. Deodatus pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat iij ar. iij manandi xiiij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid iij manandi xviij d(aga) hann kysti lîkþran manok uard ok uard sa þegar heill. bonifacius iv" romanus at ætt sat iij ar. v manandi vj d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid. i manad hann liet gera þann sta
d er kallaz paradium sat er onnur" hul[a pauanf. Agathus pri(mus) facielisís at ætt sat. i. ar vj
manandi iij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid. v. ar vij manadi; leo. iij." siculus at ætt sat. x manadi xviij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid ij manandi Conon pri(mus) i
x d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid. i manad xviij d(aga) Sergeiul pri(mus) antiochenus at ætt sat xiiij. ar vij manadi xviij d(aga) ok t(æmdiz) sætid. i
manad xxi d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at i ætt skilldi synyngiæ gnis dei juherri messo. leo tertius romanus at ætt sat. i. ar. ix manadi johannes
v." grecus at ætt sat iij ar ij manadi xiiij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid. i manad x d(aga) johannes vj." sat i. ar. vi manadi xvij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid.

sinius. i." romanus at ætt sat xx ar. t(æmdiz) sætid ij manadi Constantinus pri(mus) fyrus at ætt sat vij ar. xx d(aga) temdiz sætid
xl d(aga). Gregorius. i." yrysus at ætt sat xviij ar. viiij manadi xxiiij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid xji d(aga) hann snoi hiod germanonum
til kriz. Gregoriuf. iij." [roman]us at ætt sat. x manadi viij d(aga) Zacarias pri(mus) grecul at ætt sat x ar iij manadi xv d(aga)
t(æmdiz) sætid xij d(aga) hann giodi munk bodid pippini konungs ienamus iij manadi at ætt sat. v. ar xxvij d(aga)
(æmdiz) sætid. i manad vi d(aga) Pauluf pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat. x. ar. i manad (æmdiz) sætij. i. ar. i manad Constantinus iij hann uar
ap leikmonnum. sat at ætt i. ar. i manad Stephanus iij [siculus] at ætt sat i. ar v manadi xv d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid viij d(aga) adrian[us]

\( \text{pr} \) (\( \text{mus} \)) romanus at ætt sat xxiiij ar v manadi xv d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid. iij d(aga) leoi iij" romanus at ætt sat. xx ar. v manadi xv d(aga) t(æm
\( \text{diz} \) sætid iij

d(a) hann sk(ipadi) at ganga i jaga d(i)gan med litanjaf at beidni maurici byskups vienne er hann haþ
heidit þirir hallæi stephanuf iii" romanus at ætt sat viij manadi pascal pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat vij ar xvij d(aga)
Eugenius iij.\(<\text{us}>\) romanus at ætt sat. iij ar i manadi Valentine pri(mus) romanus. at ætt sat xl d(aga) Gregoriuf
quartus. romanus at ætt sat. xj d(aga) hann ennþbættæi kirkû heilags marci Sergeiuf iij" romanus at ætt [sat]
þiu at temdiz sætid ij manadi xv d(aga) hann uar kalladî of poçi 00000000000000000000000000000000
000 hann sk(ipadi) at hurr paui skilldi mutera sitt nap fær hann er tekinn til paua leo v" 000
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at ætt sat viij ar. iij manadi viij d(aga) t(æmdiz) sætid. iij manadi xv d(aga) benefitus iij." romanus at ætt sat i. ar vj manadi x d(aga) t(æmdiz)
v d(aga) Pauluf iij." romanus at ætt sat. x. ar. i manadi (æmdiz) sætid .i. ar. Stephanus. v." romanus at ætt sat iij ar. Nicho
lauf pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat iij ar iij manadi xx d(aga) hann sk(ipadi) at eþir anndlat paua skilldu cardinalef komja

\( \text{ein} \) \( \text{nd} \) \( \text{ok} \) \( \text{kiofa} \) \( \text{sier} \) \( \text{pa} \) \( \text{paua} \) \( \text{romanum} \) \( \text{ep} \) \( \text{sa} \) \( \text{uaer} \) \( \text{ti} \). Adrianus iij" romanus at ætt sat. v. ar. johannes vij" romanus at ætt sat. x. ar. iij d(aga) a hans tima komu sarraceni ap italiak ok benndu kirkû h(eilags) benedicti. M
arinus pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat. i. ar. v manadi Adiarius iij" romanus at ætt sat. i. ar. iij manadi Stephanus vii" romanus. at ætt
sat vij ar ix d(aga) Pizacao pri(mus) sat. v. ar vi manadi bonifacius iij" sat xv d(aga) Stepanus vi<us> sat .i. ar. iij manadi T
heodouss iij<us> sat xx d(aga) johannes. octauuf sat i. ar. iij d(aga) benedictus iij" romanus at ætt sat iij ar iij manadi leo v
i." sat xl d(aga) christofous pri(mus) romanus at ætt sat vij manadi hann uar brott rekinn ap sinu paua sætti ok uard ep
tir þat merkr sriugus iij romanus at ætt sat vij ar vij manadi xviij d(aga) Anaftaus iij" sat i. ar. yando pri(mus)
romanus at ætt sat vij manadi Johannes ix" romanus at ætt sat xiiij ar i manadi iii d(aga) Leo viij" romanus at ætt sat vij manadi Stephanus
sua ok pat at ha uou solh v aurp 'aiolanott' er kriftr uar botinn en aionf d(egi) baptiste alumar en pau hoka
um ij dægi ahunndadi uetto tolærædu, ha uar lidip pra hægat burd uars hera .m. cc
ok xv. ar. hepir ßetta bing uerid ih ßridia piolmensaz. neðndi innocencius giudi ok
ær laugbækr er heita decretalef ßhurium hann fikapið at prestar skilldu mep aungu moti
på sier eiginkuen<>.a med hiukkapar sambanndi. ordinalibus ßotti miog imoti skapi
þúlikr bodskapi pauanf huadan ap þei ger rita. priciàn regulæ penitus cassator
sacerdos primus hic et hoc iam non declinatur sed per hic solummodo nunc articulatur cum per nostrum presulem hoc ammo
ueatur. Jta quidam presbyter ceptit allegare peccat criminaliter qui uult separare quod deus con iunx
erat þeminam amare vero dignum duximus omnes appellare. Nunc innocencið immo no
cens uere quicquid fancto docuit uerbo uult delere et quod olim iuuenis uoluit haber
e. modo fanctus pontifex studet prohibere O quam dolor anxius oquam damnum graue no
bis est dimittere quod est tam suae o romane pontipex statuifti praue ne intanto
crimine moiaris caue Paulus celos raptus est adsuperoises ubi multas di
dicit res secrecioes tandem ad nos uenici instruendo moxes suas in
quid habeat quilibet uxoes honosius iij" romanus at ætt sat x x x. vii manadi xxii d(aga) Gægiuriuf
ix" campanus at ætt sat xiiij ar hann uar electus gior ann pestum gregoriij hins mikla Eugeniui
iij" sat daga. innocens iij" sat xij. ar, silueter iij" sat pa d(aga) alexander iij" vj ar
j finum papa domi. Clemens iiiij." sat iij ar xx manadi her gepu uer upp pyt paau tal þuitat uerr
hopum eigi pramarr punndit inscriptis. En þa er uer pinnum ðedan ap" pra skulo skripaz sid
ar j annalnum. ap sælum petro ok til clementem quartum uoru .c.lxxx ok viiij pauat at roma su
u. bok er kallaz 'chironica' martini segir at undir padanum se .c.ok xx erchibyskupar en. dccc. ok lx ly<d>byksupa. med
piogum patriarchis keilera tal | et augustus hann toki pioamtigum ok ij arum piriir
HER. byriaz keisara tala juliuhip hinu pëtyi. eþrii hann octoianuiu e<r> odu pasñi h
þæding kriz en annadþip iij arum sidar. hann uar jollum hlutum godi keisari. utan hann elskadi
miog gird lostasemi. hann. liet. deipa. ouidium. meistara. j utlegð piriir þa sauk at hann hæpidi di
crat iij bakr de arte amanndi. þat er at gilia konur. þa tyberius hinu þidi hann uar mikill diy
ckiu madr. Gaius riki iij ar. x manadi undir petro. Nero riki xiiij ar. undirdr. petro. hann drap modur
sina ok systur ok meistara hann lypti pyt uapnum moti krisnum monnum. Galla uar jiber
nia. en uifellius. jgermania þeþ styrdv viij ar roma ueldi þar drap huarr annan. Vespa
sianus riki ix ar xi manadi a dogum lini. Tytus riki iij ar. undir. lino ok cloeto. þa Domicianus brodir ty
ti hann rikiixij ar adogum cleti ok clements hann liet setia jon postola jketil uellanda uidsm
ios. Nerua riki i. ar iij manadi undir. clemente ok anakleto. hann piriir dæmti allar skipar domiciani
tralanus riki atima anakleti ok eauristi xix. ar. adianus riki atima eauristi ok alexandr iok
sixi xxi. ar. antonius riki atimum zelesphoi ok annara xxiij ar ok iij manadi Marcus antonius
uerus\textsuperscript{82} riktu atima ygini xix. ar. Comodus aurelius cum lucio antonio riktu. a
timum socherij ok eleuterij. xiiij ar. helyas pertinax rikt atima eleuterij ok zepherini. xx ar. an
tonius karakallia rikt atima. zeperini ok calixti vij. ar. macerinus rikt atima calixti. i ar
alexannder rikt atima urbani ok pontianii xiiij. ar. Maximianus rikt atima pontiani ok antheri
ok fabiani xvj ar. hann tok riki eptir diocleianum ok liet depa mauricium jarl ok med
honum. vj. \textit{tusundir} dc. lx ok vj. adogum \textit{persa maximiani} ok herculiani uoro pindar xvij \textit{tus}
unndir kristina manna aeinum manadi. Go\textit{dianus rikt atima fabiani vj ar.} \textit{Philippus rikt a}
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tima fabiani vij. ar. hann uard ystr kesara kristinn med syni sinum. Decriuf rikt atima. C
omeli. i. ar hann uar hinn uesti keisari hann liet pina laurentium. Gallus rikt a timum cor
nelij. lucij. stephani. ij. ar. iiij manadi Valerianus rikt a (tim) stephani. ok lucij. ij. ar x
v (aga) Claudius rikt a (tim) euciciani ok gaij. i. ar vj manadi aurelius rikt a (tim) euciciani ok ga
ij. v. ar. \textit{tacita} justus rikt a (tim) gaij. vj manadi Probus rikt a (tim) gaij iiij ar iiij manadi fioianus rikt a tima
gaij. i. ar xx daga Catus rikt a tima marcellii. ij. ar. Diocleianus rikt a (tim) ostantini ok li
cinij. x ar. Galerius rikt a tima eusebij. ij ar. Constancius. adogum diocleianii hur
pu biетar unndan homer-\textit{erium} ok eyddiz \textit{pat} oll kristini \textit{pa} sendu romereiir cons
9
\textit{\langle t\rangle} antium \textit{t\langle l\rangle} einglanz \textit{pa} uar \textit{p}\textit{tir} sa hoppdinger er koel het hann uar konungr a einglandi en
eptir anndlat koels tok constancius kondorf hann tok dottur hans er helena het
med henni gat uij henni son er constantinuf \textit{h\langle et\rangle} hann uar xxx ara konungr ok baud oprid krist
num monnum hann uard lik\textit{pr} ok tok tru \textit{ap} siluesto paau. \textit{maxencius} uar son diocl
eanoi unndir huerium katerina uar pind. constantinus rikt a (tim) liberij. xx. ar. julia
nus gudnidingi hann diap mercurius. jioniuianus rikt a tima pelisicis vj manadi valen
cinianus rikt a (tim) damasi xi. ar. Valens rikt a tima damasi iiij ar. \textit{theodosius}. hinn mi
kli tok rik \textit{t\langle a\rangle} er lidit uar pra holgan guds närr cccc. homun birti gud um almennliga uppisu
med \textit{\textit{t}eim} hatti at vij souend suapu jeinum helli. ccc. ok. 'lx. ok ij. ar. archadius rikt a tima s
erici xiiij. ar. honoesius ok \textit{theodosius} rikt a tima jinocenciij. xv. ar. theodosius
hinn minni rikt a tima bonipacij. xxvij. ar. valencianinus rikt a tima leonis vij. ar. Leo rikt a
tima leonis vij. ar. Zeno rikt a tima simplicij. xxvij. ar. anastasius rikt a tima pelicis xxvij ar.
juftinus rikt a tima homisle ix. ar. justinianus rikt a tima pelisicis ok anara xxx ara. justinus
ritk a tima johannis. xi ar. tyberius rikt a tima johannis xij ar. Mauricius rikt a tima pelagij ok gregorij. xx.
ar. Foca rikt a tima gregorij ok fabiani ix. ar. hann skipadi at roma skilid uera haest sett i heilagri kri
stni Craciarius rikt a tima deodati. xxxi. ar. hann diap kosdoa ok son hans aglerhiminunum j
einuigi hann liet gera \textit{\textit{t}ann glerhinim med \textit{\textit{t}ei} list at \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{t}}}dan dogguadiz} iot \textit{ap uotnum
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Constantinus riki a tima deodati
ok annara xvij ar. Justinianus riki a tima sergij. x ar. leo
riki a tima hins sama sergij iij ar. Tyberius r<ikt> a tima johannis vij ar. justinus riki a tima sisnimij. vj
ar. philippus riki a tima constantini. i ar. v manadi anastasius riki a tima gregorij iij ar. theodofius
riki a tima gregorij .i ar. Leo riki a tima gregorij. xxv. ar. Constantinus riki a tima zacharie. x ar.
j manadi ij d(aga)
ahans timum bar sua til at solin pal sina geisla ok uard dauk<lc> xiiij daga hugdu margir at
bat mundi uera sakir þeia meizla er keisarin poldi. karlamagnus riki atima leo
nis. xij ar. i manad iij d(aga) þa uard lidiþ ap holllan guds. dccc. ok ij ar. Ñarr þeim tima uitradiiz
jseupni iacobus postoli karlamagnusi konungi at hanni skildi þrelsa land hans unndan heidinna manna
ualldi ok i þeiri herped drap hann agulandum konung ok son hans. ok reisti sidan id. dyrligzta mus
tari. jn compostella. en ad hanni uard keisari por hann alangbarda lann<es> at ben advian. paua
ok hertok desiderium konung ok husþriv hans ok pluti med sier heim þpran hann uar konung "ok keisari' xl ok. vj
ar. nær. lx<em> utera sidar. tok konungdom haralld: harþagi j noregt. lodouicus riki a tima pascalis. i ar
ix manadi lotarius riki a tima sergij. ix ar. carolus riki a tima johannis v. ar. Carolus riki a tima johannis
.i ar. x manadi Lodouicus riki a tima christopoi vj. ar. berengarius riki a tima sergij vij ar. hu
g[o] riki a tima johannis. ok leonis. xx vij<ai> lotarius riki a tima agapiti ij. ar. berengarius

riki a tima johannis vj ar. Otto riki a tima benedicti. vj ar. Otto riki a tima benedicti ok johannis xxj ar
Otto riki a tima gregorij ok johannis. xij ar. Heinricus riki a tima johannis. x ar. Conrado riki a tima silues
tri. xiiij ar. Heinricus riki a tima elementis xi ar. Heinricus riki a tima gregoriij xvij ar
Heinricus riki a tima pascalis xv. ar. lotarius riki a t(tima) innocenciij xij ar. Conrado riki a tima
Celestini xv ar. Fridericus riki a tima adiani ok alexandi xxxv. ara. Heinricus riki
a tima Celestini vij. ar. v manadi Otto riki a tima jnoccenciij ok honotij. Fridericus riki a tima gregoriij. iij.jste
anno abincarnacione domini m."cc." xx." Lotarius ij ahans timum. uar solin at sia sem
blod ok eþir pa daga kom mikid manþall capitulum || hon liet handtaka ïudam ok
Pa er lidit uar pra hollgan uars hera ihêfu christi ccc ok riki helena dotnmi<n>g
nauðgandi hann til at segia huar guds krosf uar þolgin en hann geop xx. potsþoi
j iod nid ok pân þria krossa þa uar boîinn guds kros iþir dauþan man ok reis sa þe
gar upp. Pa er lidit uar pra hollgan uars hera jœsv. christi. cccce uutra uou persir samtida uppi
martinus ituron. jeronimus at iosaulum. ambosius. i mielans borg. augus
tinus hinn mikli iapþrika. seuerinus. j kolni asaxlanndi. Patricius byskup er
kristnadi skotland hann uar systur son martini het þadir hans tokes. pacomius hann
uar aboti honum birtiz guds eingill ok sagdi honum skyrt med. huerium hætt hallda skild
i. paska halld. oigenes prestr. basilius. Gegoiius nisenus. Gegerius naza
zenus. Jeronimus er einn ap iij doctoribus ok kalladi hinn idnazi. ambrosiu
ij. hann segiz hinn raukse<em>ligzti</em> hann uetiti augustino skinar embætti þa uar augustinus. x
xx. en theodos<em>us</em> hinn mikli tok rikiss stioann. suþ pinz skripat. at þa er augustinus þre
10
21
andiandt antoni munks taladi hann þersi osd mikid er þo um at uppdir menn
taka hondum himinin en þær med þrodleik uarn deckiumuz iheluiti. august
nus hinn iiþ. hann kallaz hinn diupazti hann heþir skipat kanoka reglu. hinn annadiz þa
24
hann hæði lxx ara ok vj ar. hans hiarta giomiz iborg þeili er uercellis heitir ok þutnar huer
n tima er su bok er lesin sem hann dictadi detrinitate. ambrosius. pirir hann snoiz oll
italia. til riettrar tryar. hann oti teudem med augustino <strong>Hand F</strong> nepndi august(inus) gerdi .m. boka ok xxx
27
gregoriuf hinn iij<sup>a</sup> dokto; hann feqiz hinn nytfam i'gztí hann senndi augustinan abota at kristna eing
land ab inacarnatione domini .d. hann uar þyft erkibyskup ikannicia iceinglandi ok eþrir tima
uar þarn dunstanus erkibyskup ok lanþrancus ok anfelmus. <strong>Hand A N</strong>&lt;$\alpha$&gt;1 þersum tima "blomgatiz" albinus er sidan h(et) alquinus ap
honunam nam karlamagnus vij hopud listir þersum alquino þal ahenni karlamagnus mun
kliþi, martini til stionar. þpui munkliþi klæduz munkar gullsmettum skuam
ok gullskotnum klædum þei gudduz iænan med: kiot ipir sitt bord. Einn ap.
munkum sa um nott ij eingla ganga þpeia d&lt;o&gt;tritorium ok hapa idauda alla munk
a nema þann einn er synina sa uard þersi opt nepndi alquinus aboti ipir þui klaustri
agrimundus konunger persara þerdad þpannoniam ok er hann kom til eins stodu uaz
36
hitti hann vij smasuæina hueria ein potkona hæpi getid j einum burd ok
hæði ætalat at tostima þeim ok er konungin leit þuiðikan hlut reid hann nær ok riet
ti þram kesuina er hann bar iænndi. en einn ap smasuæinum tok um kesuina. konun
39
gunn umndadi eigi litt sueinsins til tekiu ok sagdi at þersi atburðs mundi m
ikid hapa at merkiu þui tekri hann pilltinn ok hepir med sier. heim isitt riki ok læ
tr uannduirkliga upp þæda uard hann eþir tima kongi ilumbardi
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<strong>Hand F</strong> a aunduercum dogum ieronimi prez uar oigenous prestr at uigflu. pinz sua fktiadat at hann hæ
i lipad helgu liþi fem her ma heyra þyft ilæring ok boka gerd hann hæði onga fæng at
3
liggia i. ecki bar hann fkinhofur eði fuarta fkuu. alltri at hann kiot nie dað uin. þad er
lyrgilit at heyra er nuckuris fegia at ullia hapi punndiz ihanf bokum en fimir feg
ia at uanndir menn hæpi fktid þui ihanfs bækri fem heyraz ma ifaug<sup>v</sup> martini byskups
6
þa er lidit uar þra burd uarf hera cccce "ok" xxxv ara kom einn piaendi apunnd iuda uid hæp
eitt ok fagdiz uera moysef ok baud at leida þa ipir aiofala land en þei trudu honum ok gen
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gu afoio med honum ok tynduz plextir en pei toku tru er lipid þago. hundradi ok niu

9 arum eþir þramperd martini byskups. obbiit benedictus aboti hann fetti xij munklipi ok xij bræði
ahuerið hann er regluþadir fuartmunka. þiowum arum þyrr ur firði kloðoneuþ hinu þyfti
pracka konung þap remigio erkibyskupi renf borgar. ann(o) ab incar(nacione) domini dce xl ur þæði karlamagnus konungr

hann tok riki xxx"uutra ðidar en lipid þadanap xl ok vj uetr hann annadþiz kalendaf þeðvarj. 'ann(o)' ab incar(nacione) domini
dccclxx. rigendi blodí in italianda landi ok þa þirþiz þad þugla kyn er heitir locuþa þad þapdi vi
uængi ok vi þætr ok iþ tennr steinum hardari þad eydði mikinn part þap gallia þar med

15 þylgdi fuu ftyrk hallæri at nær þiduingi manfolksins do. a dogum ieronimij þ(rez)
uar alexander erkibyskup in alexandria þa uar þar arriuf þrefti er smidþiþ ueftu uillus er sidan.
kallaþ þuila uella þegen þap hans naþni hann do med þeim hætti at hans oll inn þili þraku nidi

18 ðt hanþ þula buk þa þann þetldi at gera þinir naðufyniar. eþir neðgan alexandum uard
byskup athanasiaþ hann dictadi cantikan quicumqueuult. sæll nicholauf minirree borgar byskup.
 obbiit þa er lidit uar pra burd uarf hera ihefu christi dc lxxx ok viij ar [aue(neutri)] || ia þirir syndugum

21 [J] þraclandi er sa þadit 'er' kallaþ parif iþeim ftau uar einn cantoþ hann lagði þad juana finn at bid
kriftnum fallum þeim er þar uroo graþaþdir þeim kirkju gaurdum fenn hann geck um dagliuma fyngiandi god
puþlga þamlindi neþpreudisf uin uar til d(in)ag) þa þann laf neþDan þpalm hlupu at

24 honum hans meftu uuinir hann iþalþ þari fækianndi cantoþ uard miog otta sleginn ok beiddi
aþ gudi þulþings ok honum gafað med þeim hætti at iðostin fuu haar ðtòd a lauk upp finn kuid
kaðandi upp þøandum monnum þeim er þar uouu daþþir graþmir med þeim uerkuþorn um handþønum er

27 þeir uouu iþerfi uerolld berandi gerdu mikla þyþriolld ok uapna brac hlaþandi aþ opfoknar
menn cantoþis fuu harta ok frart at þeim þynþid fu koþt beþtr at elfka þlottan uemðþu
þeir fuu karþmanliga finn benefacþoþ þad er uelgerdar mann eþir þad hirþu þei med fkiot[r]i ra[l]

30 aþþ til fina graþraþtað er þad mikill gðgodgingis; at minaz oþliga med finum þænum
þramldina manna þap heiminum þiata margi er skiotliga kallaþ: aþ heiminum eu(en)[tyri]
Sua fegir ieronimus þreftir þa hann kanni heilagra manna þipat at þar uæri fa madr er appelles h(et)

33 hann uar iarnsþið; nuckum tíma nær miðnætti fíeri þiandinn aþf purðuligri þegurð
einnar ungáur konu fotti þidan apunnd guds mannz þar hann uakti at fimþiþ uer
ki þinu sau em bidxandí fimdari h(eilagr) appelple gœþ þegar gloanda ðarnið oþ aþlinum

36 berií hendí ok rak þraman akueþð þerfi nykornu konu en hon þlyði þegar brot
ylandi ok snauþtandí fua at allir þæði er umhuereþt þyztu heyrdu hennar
opp þadan aþ þapdi h(eilagr) appelles aldri tong holl<2> hellt hann gloanda ðarni med

39 berií hendíi ok fakadi hann ecki [aue(neutri)] || hann þirir umegni ok piell aþramm reif upp ðidan ok g;
Nu fegir fuu ieronimus at einn aboti siflanuþ at naþni fæ þia þæðum uard
et miog þæþi íþpurduu huu hann geþe sil(uannu) abo(ti) s(uarar) <ongu> en gret fem ad; þeit skýldþu huun til at
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til ad segia sauq graz sins hann s(uurar) þa ek þot<ö>umz leiddi til doms ok fa ek marga med uarrum bunadi þar a til kuala en marga ueralldar menn til hinna rikiss. her þirir sytur h(eilagr) silanus, ok uilldi alldri ut ganga

þa sinu herbergi æue(ntyri) lene drottningar hann uar iþyftu grimmr úid kriftna menn ok let þa pina

Pa er lidit uar þap guds þæding ecc lx ok viij ar uar keisari constantius son constancij ok he

med ymifligu kyni kualanna. þa reiddiz gud honum ok laufi hann med hinnu þulzutu likþra

ok er sua þlod haf hag um tima. radlodu honum hans høg byskupar at hann skylldi laugaz iblodi un

gra barna fua at hann skildi þadan þap mega taka likamþ heilfu. huat sua gerdiz an hans uito

di. þuij iþ þufundir ungra barna komu ieinn þlad til roman. Ok einn dag er konungrinn geck ut

þap finni hall heyrandi mikinn gráok þyt er mød; getu fín born konungrinn uar eþþir

þrettandi þirir hueria sok conunr geti fua sart þa uar honum sagdt allr til gangi þeia
graz þa s(uurar) keifarrin at þat fe eigi uel þallid at diepa einn meinlaufsEn mann en allra

helz fua mikinn þiolda meinlaufsEn barna. haþdi hann þar maug kfynsamlig oðd

um ok þau fiðuz at hann baud þenna kuenna þiolda huerþa heim til finna heimkynna med

gloþum þogum ok þridum þarkoft ok finum bornum. her skioþt eþþir komu til hafþ ifþepni pe

truf ok pauluf biðanndi honum at hann fenndi eþþir þilueþtro þaþa. ok hann mundi fyna honum med

fanneik huat honum byraði at gera upp þadan. huat eigi þarþ her at fðris þuij þat mai heýra

ok j fugu þilueþtri þapa Nuckorum tima fíðar uard þat til tidennda adogum þerþa constantiini hi

nf þrinnadta keisara at uplyaðndi heidningia heri þapnadiz faman at beriaþ ud romanof uig

ana. danubium konungrin uar miog otta fleginn úid þuðila fogn. þa kom at honum bairt mar

madr ifþepni ok fágdi til hans eigi fkalutu ottaz constante, liutt upp j himinn<ö>n ok fia. ok er hann lei
tupp fa hann kroð mark criz gaþugligt harlida biart ok þersi ðud uoro ypir fðripud med þersu mar

ki muntu figþ. þa sidan gerdi konungrin liking þuðilað taknþ ok bar þad fama med ser til bardaga

mot heidningum sua þem þirir þigamærki. þa slo otta myclum aheþdingia ok þydi huerþ

fem mati þiellu þar æþim degi margar þusunndir manna æþ heidningum þap þeifarrinn

þa marggualld loþ gudi þirir þuðilkan figþ. Hand B danubíæf er fua ðtoþ. áþ er æþ þui

ma merkiad j þana þalla lx ðtoþ. áþ ok hon þellr þliþ Ú fex ðludum hon er ðæ
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rft uazpall ’fuþ’ ad ecki er þuðilkt j þerfum þiidûngi heimfins er europa kall

az Sv er meft a iollvm heimi er gænþer heitið hon þellr vm afjæm

000uþ þellr vm egiþtalánd. þirir fynnan faxland þellr ainn rodan. en rin þellr

30

nærð kolni. Tavax uauttn ero a iofala landi heitir annat jút en annad da

þ þellr fín að huaru vattnin ok metaz vndrj þiull libano er þa e

ein að uan ok heitið fúi ðiðan. [capitulum] || giptla landi. hinþ þrìði að iofolvm. þìor
33 Fíorir ero patiatska fíolaí einn ianthiocka a fyulandi annarrj j alexandria a e
di imyklagardi a gricklandi. Í nępdrj borg alexandria var athanásjuf eru bokyup
a hanf dogvm. gíodiz auíus villa pvar kisari conftantinus hín mykli hann bólidi m
ikinn mot gang aþ autianif. sua at aþ þui ma märka ad hann var. vi. uetr ieinni
iaðholv hann var bokyup xl uetra. hann diktaði pfalmin quicumque uult. nępdrj borg þol
di ok pfiasauætte hín helgazta mær katerina dottir kofti konungf hon var hals
39 hoggun þaut pramm aþ hennai helgu<p>Ívira þogur miolk. hennai likama toku
guþf einglat. ok baru ipiallid fýnay ok goþv þai med þullah fæmd. aþ
hennat fteinþro þlytr þrannm ðkaer olevm. Hac oleum fyna te glósificent katerina
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Hand A Ny heþir ureid sagt med stuttu mailu huaft gíoz heþir j. vj." h(eims) alldir ok en skulo uer skriþa huaft til
mun bera j enda nępñ h(eims) alldir ok helgir læriþed hæða sett insnar bækir aþ antichristo
3 hann mun þædaz íbahlon hinni myklu aserklandi aþ kyni dan. íþersum dimmastad er anti
christus pyft getinn midil karlmannz ok konu ok er þat þrio liggi íkuidi konunnar þa likenes
kú bæss uünininn ok þyllir med sinum kræþi þædiz sidan ok kallaz glatanar son hann mun þer
daz agydinga land segiandi gydingum sig uera kíft þeim þírur heitinn. þa munu plyckiaza saman
gydingar ok þyljía honum smíandandi upp þau mustari er nídr uar biotid þírur þeia glæpi aþ títo ok
þoduð hans. j þeþ[ta] id nya mustari mun antichristus bera sitt onndueg segiandi skí uera guds son
9 ok mannz. antichristus mun ipyftu koma til íosala borgar hann mun ríka halþt ar í irusalem þa munu koma
snendir aþ gudi enok ok helyas at snua gydingum til rettrar trvar þeim munu predica .m." dagha
cx. lx ok vj þat er samanleþid. iij. ar. sem guds son predicatdi. þa bada mun antichristus drepa lata en
éþir .iij. daga lidna munv þe<ci>r upp risa ok uegnndi þeia munv heyra þuílika rodd. stígð upp
hegtal til mín enok ok helyaf. med biotiu skyi munv þeim upp stiga til híminds. Éþir þram
þeim þeita til guds mun antichristus rika xv daga en allz mun hann ríka halþt íiiþ ar. hann mun uera dreppin
12 ipialli olúaet sútranndi drambsamr afínum uléldum stóli nær þeim þtad er gud fte upp til hímima þa munv
géaz godum monnum xl ok v dagar til nada en rongum til yþírbotar. Einigu uetiu huerus langt þad
an er til doms dags ok ennda heims mun þa heilug kri'f'tini igodum þrdi húilaz til ennda uerlallah
15 Ap vij"a h(eims) alldir kun<n>um ver þaat at segia þuiat hann er eigtj j þerus liþi helldi iðdu sem ver gatum || viii h(eims) a(IIIdr)
i þyftu ok byrizia adaðda stundnu hueru manzn þa er sal ok li kami gera finn skílnat suæ sem uerolldinni
er uel kunnigt at holdit þerr imolld ok uerdt at ongu en onndin þerr uynílaga or þersari uerolld ok
21 j þann stad er huerr heþir ser til werkat. j heluiti ero iij stadir geinndir þra odium. hinn hardazti kallaz
puteus infermi uel abyßuf þat er þytfu e(da) diup heluítis. annarrj"fladt: kallaz purgatóriúm þat þy
dir hœinfonaar stad. iij segiz limbus infermi þat er suæ sem bélti e(da) lista er geingi umhuerüm. j þeim þtad huil
duz allra rietlatra manna salur þeia sem þædþuz i upphaþi heims allt til piningar kriz þa leid
di hann þær allar `[a]brot' med ser er hann dæmd þeis uerdar þær anndir sem þongdar ero af þæturr synndum er `o' leid
dar til kuala heluitis fem lesit er ibokum. Ein syndug kona lipdi eþtir pyþtum likamans ok er hon do þor
hennar sal ikuular heluitis. hon atti eþtir eina dottur hon uar leidd isuegni ap einum pogum manni
all þar til er þau komu at einum dal pullum aþ annztayg ok opoka ipersum dal uar einn opin e(da)
pyttir allr loganndi ok aþ ser senndanndi hæsdi i `gar fyur hins snarpazta ok þulazta reyks
þ þersum dal ok eymdar þtat uar modur hennar sokt allt upp ypir a릭or eller hoggomar þpodmu ok fugu
hennar holld ok hounnd fuartir anndir anddar þtodu ypir henni ok þþftu henni med gloandnum þpodum þ þenna logan
da fuelg ok er hon sa fina dottur kaldali hon. o. ho min dottir hialptu aumligri modur þinni
morg onnur dæmi meyta yþau er synndugir menn kuellaz ikuol heluitis allir med
einni ok somu pinu sem her misgerdu med sama hætti. Einn er heluitis elld: eþtir oðum gre
gorii þapa ok mun þo meygh<a> misiaþt heitir kennaz syndugum monnum. til likingar at taka er solin
er þuiat hon skin `eigi' iamheitt um ueroldina þeis allir sem brott lida aþ þersum heimi ok haþa med ser uer
nialia peccata þat ero liksnamligar synndir sau sem er ydliga þarblaus hlar uftilligil malshatr
e(da) heimlig glædi e(da) þat annat er uarla ma þordaz p<ar>a þennan heinsonar stad sem uer gatum þyrr ok ero
þar sau leingi sem guds mikunn uill uid þa skipa. iiii hlutir ero þeis er leriþed: segia at anndir
preisi aþ pinu meðfur. olmofugerdir. þoftur þarini heiragra ok eigi sidi þeia er ipersi uerold ero sem
uittni ber; þersi hlutr er þylgir. Sua bar til isaliþri roma næfta dag þirar mariu messo þyrr at. i. husþpr
þor þra messo sa hon ganga moti ser þa konu er annadaz hæþdi xij manadum þyrr en er hon kenndi at
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þersi kona uar onndut þa þæddiz hon þa sagdi hin dauþa haþ eigi þu. husþprvin spurdí þa huerfu
su henni. uæri hon segir hertil heþi ek uerid imyklum kuolum þynndir minar þar er ek heþi geruar ok munat eigi til
at segia þar uar dalr mikill sem ek uar ok þiolldi manna ok er sa dalr oðummegum sau kaldí at hue
tuþna þryss er þar kemr en oðummegum eðldt: þenandi en idag kom þar sæl maria ok ley
þi mik þadan ok meira manþiþla en her se írom bögr ok leiddi oss ipaga þtadi ok ba
d oss þar uerda til þers er oss uæri meiri dyrþ uetti. Margir huðlar stadír ero geindir ibokum
huþerium salur rietlatra huþal til doms dag. Sa uar einn akkrar oð mæddiz imyklu
uunmegni likamans hann uar þæodí ok rietlat þegar hann reis øt rekiþu starþadi hann akvuek
þæm kom at hann annþapiz dottir hans lipdi eþtir henni birtiz isuegni einn dieingi med eller afþonu
han badu hana ganga ser ok eru þau konu aþein blomgatan uoll ok þagau med allri unatsemi þil i'ota
nndi med unndarlígum ilm ok sætlique skinannnda med biþtu liosi aþeim uelli sa hon margar þusundndir
þiartra manna med mikilli gledi. medr þeim monnum litar hon þedt finn pyþdan allri þegurd hann geck
þegar mot henni kallandí sætíliga fina dottur kysti ok þadmøti en hon pylld aþ imyklum pag
nati bidì podì sinn at hann lopadi henni þar at uera en hann kuad þat eigi uera mega at sinni. þetr dia
kn spurdì gregorium huart anndir rietlætra munv mega leidad inn ihiminrikis dyrd adi þei taki
hollz upprius. en gregor(ius) s(eigr) sua i þioðu bok dialogoum at þat se eigr trvannda aþ ollum rietlætra manna
onnðum þuiat hann s(eigr) at þa unannta nuckæ aþ algioþ rietlætir ok munv þo þa huilaz igodum þtad
þraman til hinf mykla doms en þeia anndir s(eigr) gregor(ius) er med ollu ero algervar ganga skiet eþtir sitt ann
ðlat j dyrd himinrikiss þar sem sialþr gud er þiri sannandri þetta med sannleiksins oðum er sua
segia igudspiailu. vbicunque fuerit corpus illuc congregabuntur aquile. gepum uer her upp at
skripta þleira aþ huilld salnanna er mest geiingi um vij° heims allðt en þv skulu uer segia
nuckud litness aþ sidazta allðri ok sua heþr cap(itul)m || la med myklu lundblæstri þa munu
SVa seig matheus at gud mun koma medr myklu kraþti ok ueldi hann mun sennda sina eng
saman saþaz allar þiodir ok taka hueru sinn likama er hann bar iþersu liþi skunndandi þram. a.
id mykla þing þa mun koma gud sialþr til domsins at dæma urørøldina þar munv koma med honum ix eing
la þylkingar himneskra kraþta þar munv ok ner uera plockar hoþpunþtada ok spamanna ok dyrd p(ostu)lan<en>a ok utolu
lig talis pliaruatta iattara ok meya þar munv þa ok uera komirr allir lydir miog otta pullir sa dagi
kallaz d(agr) reidi d(agr) kualar ok eymdar d(agr) myrkr ok þoku d(agr) luds ok kallaz sa d(agr) mun miog uera
beiskr ok grimmr ollum umiildum. ok þa er gud krim sem ver sogdum til domsins at dæma heiminn þar aþ
segir david Jgnif ante ipsum precedit. Eildi þersi mun uera sua mikill at hann m<un> haþa embætti itíj el
lda þat er at skilia at heluitif elldi mun pina alla menn heinsanar elldi mun benna sýndrin aþ
godum monnum. Jardlíti elldi mun upp eyda oll kuikuendri ok likami allra manna þeia er þa sem þa
lípa sua at þe þar þe þar at aufru uerd. Lóttáltelldi mun heinsa hoþud skepunur ok enndýna
þirir þenna elldi mun upp benna asianna jardínarrau suat aþ þersa heims þigura mun at aungu uerd. þersi el
ldi mun haþa upphæþ midskëdis ok ennda þuiat sua skiot mun uerdur uppþia likamanu ok tilkuama
domarans til domsins ok þa mun benna allir heimr umhuþerum ennda þui at endaþum dominum mun elldri
nn þylla ok þullgera uilja ok oskurð domarans. Jte maledicti inignem eternum þa mun elldrím iueþ
þa draþa ok steþja alla menn heiluiti. Eildi þersi mun heinsa itíj hoþuskeþnr. vatn. löst elld
jod aþ heini mun benna þungi ok dimma. vatn. þuiat aþ þui mun benna þrost ok kuldi. löst þuia aþ
þui mun benna allir myrkleiki. elld þuiat aþ honum mun heinflæþ aþ ollum meinsomum hlutum
himinn er heinn ok þui mun hann ecki heinsaz helldi enndýnaþ þat er at skilia at hann mun aþ lie
ta sinni ras ok umrenningsu suat þumat þuiat hann mun kyrÞ stanna jstok ok stadaþastr ok vera
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biartari en nu. þa mun sol standa jauti en tungl juestri þar sem þau uoru jyustu skopud
sem pyrr segir. mun þa sol uera vij hlutum biartari en nu. þa mun vera eþlir dagi en eingi
nott þersi endýnaþ ok heinsan mun eigi uera medan syndgir menn ero jheiminnu. en þegar eþtir

301
uiizka solomonis er uar allra manna uitraztr. vanmattr styrkleiki samsonis er uar al
Ira manna styrkaztr. liotleiki þegið apsalonis er allra manna uar þridaztr. þatækt riki
augusti k(eisa)ra er uar manna rikaztr. heilagra manna þognudur er sua mikill at eigi ma mølaz. sua
margándi at eigi ma teliaz. sua gnogi at eigi ma eydaz. sua dyrdarpüllr at eigi ma enndaz
er þa huerr þui sælli sem þeþir betr lipat ydulig hatid mun þar uera ok sætr eingla saungi
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ingi mun þar vera tungna sunndhliodan helld; munv þa allir tala einni tungu. eptir ø:
dum bernardi ok lipanði gladir ok þagnandi j eilipri dyðum um eenndalgar ueraldir þuiat þa e[r]
liðnar ero þusund þusunda ara er þa iammær ennda sem adi skulo godir menn lipa med
gudi þeði ok hans helgum monnum æ ok æ utan ennda

---

1 the word is followed by an e with a tittle, but a dot has been placed beneath it to correct the mistake
2 there is a reference here to a marginal note which is illegible
3 corrected by the scribe from lundan
4 corrected by the scribe from gallinu
5 uncertain
6 corrected by the scribe from elldinum
7 there is a slit in the vellum here but this seems to be the correct reading although it is hard to see what the letter is supposed to stand for
8 there is a reference here to a marginal note which is illegible
9 these words are followed by the letters luk but dots have been placed beneath them to correct the mistake
10 corrected by the scribe from israelem
11 there is a reference here to a marginal note which is illegible
12 a few words seem to have been erased here
13 corrected by the scribe from fonum xij
14 corrected by the scribe from damarar
15 corrected by the scribe from iobs
16 corrected by the scribe from vart gyd
17 ms. drepa
18 ms. gioaldi
19 corrected by the scribe from lid
20 ms. sina
21 ms. gepum
22 ms. pier
23 ms. sua
corrected by the scribe from *patragoricas*

ms. *hau'a'dan*

the scribe first wrote *abscondito malo* but added *auditu* above the line

several words have been erased here, replaced by a sign (чки) referring to a slip, now lost

corrected by the scribe from *gudliga*

the abbreviation mark used looks like the er-tittle but dots are placed before and after the word

ms. *lefid*

ms. *kritisn*

corrected by the scribe from *kreg eda har lit*

ms. *und'iarlit*

corrected by the scribe from *sat romanus*

ms. *ui*

*hann* is written in the margin but it is not clear where that should be inserted into the line

ms. *aster*

a sign has been introduced here, possibly referring to a slip, now lost

abbr. as *manadi*

ms. *alter*

ms. *blelezud*

ms. *onnur*


ms. *almanual*

corrected by the scribe from *ap hedan*

ms. *nerus*

ms. *lannz*

corrected by the scribe from *vij xx*

ms. *doctoribius*

corrected by the scribe from *laungy*

ms. *annnar*

corrected by the scribe from *allra*
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