

Lenka Jiroušková: *Der heilige Wikingerkönig Olav Haraldsson und sein hagiographisches Dossier. Text und Kontext der Passio Olavi (mit kritischer Edition)*. Band I Untersuchung [xxxi + 828 pp.]. Band II Edition und Bildmaterial [xix + 252 pp.], *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* vol. 46, 1 & 2. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2014.

#### REVIEWED BY EGIL KRAGGERUD

Let it be clear at once: these magnificent volumes represent a great scholarly achievement and will be reckoned as a major contribution to understanding the hagiography of Olav Haraldsson *from practically all angels and in all its aspects*. We have at the same time to do with a rather unorthodox publication. In spite of the unassuming parenthesis in the subtitle above, “(mit kritischer Edition)”, Lenka Jiroušková’s *magnum opus* may be seen primarily as an *edition* (or better: a bundle of interconnected editions) preceded, not by an introduction in the customary way, but by a number of separate investigations equivalent in bulk and richness to at least three separate monographs (not to speak of any number of articles).

The title itself invites a reviewer to some further preparatory comments and explanations. Concerning ‘*Dossier*’: The cult of St. Olav gave rise to a hagiographic ‘set of documents’, the scattered and partly intertwined remnants of which Lenka Jiroušková (henceforth LJ) has made the topic of her extensive and detailed studies. Concerning ‘*Text und Kontext*’: ‘*Text*’ is here a collective term pointing to a plurality of texts and subtexts (the 62 miracle accounts), each presented critically (i.e. provided with an *apparatus criticus* according to high editorial standards, testimonies and short factual comments), ‘*Kontext*’ implies the wide framework necessary to recreate as far as possible the dossier’s ‘*Sitz im Leben*’ by applying in depth investigations of a number of varied approaches as complex and demanding as anything in medieval studies. Concerning ‘*Passio Olavi*’: This is a well-known tricky designation. However, as LJ uses it in the subtitle after the word ‘*Dossier*’, we will immediately take *Passio Olavi* in its common comprehensive meaning, that is as equivalent to the combination “*Hellig Olavs liv og jærtegn*”<sup>1</sup> to quote a modern Norwegian rendering of *Passio et miracula beati Olavi*. The more correct and narrow application of the term *passio* is, on the other hand, obvious enough throughout her work by pointing technically to the account of the saint’s ‘*life and martyrdom*’. In this latter case *vita* would have been an

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the following references and e.g. Salvesen & Gunnes 1971: 141.

equally fit word to use.<sup>2</sup> The *miracula* part is very much a work in its own right in LJ's view and has accordingly claimed a substantial part of her more than 1100 pages.

As a good title should always mirror as much as possible of a book's contents LJ deserves high marks in that regard. Due already to the title's informative character the field of our legitimate expectations is from the start wide indeed.

Both with a view to those intending to read the volumes *in extenso* and those consulting it piecemeal or through the seven careful indices<sup>3</sup> I would recommend to begin with a look at the map showing the part of Europe relevant for the transmission of the dossier (vol. I, p. 675 Anh. 2: "Karte der Überlieferung der *Passio Olavi*"). The map has as its foci 15 small rings (like a lower-case 'o') differentiated by means of 5 colours and involving 8 of Europe's modern countries (Norway being not among them!). LJ has on this map illustrated a highly important result of her research, namely the division of the dossier into three so-called *recensiones*<sup>4</sup> ('recensions'), that is main groups, two of which are further divided into two 'Fassungen' (in Norwegian 'utformninger'; in English perhaps 'redactions?'). The scattered and heterogeneous material, previously partly unedited, is lucidly set out. Why I refer to the map as a starting point is not least because it immediately pinpoints the text witnesses and draws our attention to their place and function in the course of the transmission. As to the evidence itself, the manuscripts and prints, LJ has subjected them all to a diligent autopsy and thereby charted much new terrain in the process (all catalogued in the following appendix 3, pp. 676–703). I am tempted to add one further recommendation to readers following the above advice: They will greatly profit from reading chapter XIV (pp. 646–670) before the other chapters: It gives an excellent general account of the whole book.

<sup>2</sup> 'Jartei(k)n' (pl. 'jarteinir') is originally perhaps 'sign of proof'; in a northern context Ælnoth's hagiography of St. Knud is best designated with a double title as *Gesta* or *vita et passio* as to its contents; *passio* (English 'passion') is properly the martyr's death which caps it all in his *imitatio Christi* (cf. A. Blaise's *Dict. Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens s.v. 3 & 4*). *Passio Beati Olavi Regis et Martiris* is found in the Incipit of the CCC ms., whereas the younger O ms. has *vita sancti Olavi regis et martiris*. The other, largely independent part of *Passio Olavi*, is called *Miracula* and has an Incipit of its own.

<sup>3</sup> Called 'Register' (vol. 1, pp. 795 ff.) comprising a) "Personenregister" (9 double column pp.), b) "Ortsnamenregister" (9 pp.), c) "Verzeichnis antiker und mittelalterlicher Autoren, Werke und ausgewählter liturgischer Quellen" (6 pp.), d) "Verzeichnis der zitierten Handschriften und Drucke" (6 pp.). In addition vol. 2 has its own *Indices* (pp. 243–252) serving one's needs in studying the text editions: a) Index locorum geographicorum et originum, b) Index personarum, c) Index verborum et locutionum.

<sup>4</sup> One may use the English term 'edition' or (preferably) 'recension' as a translation of Latin *recensio* cf. *OED s.v. recension*.

The most important text witnesses by far are those that allow us to approach, on a safer basis than before, a sort of ‘original’, or in other words - and according to LJ’s terminology – texts constituting ‘Recensio I – Fassung A’. The full-scale re-cension of I A is incidentally also the primary focus of our whole review, all the more natural as Rec. I provides an essential condition for the cult of Saint Olav and is intimately connected with it in the Nordic countries.

The *Passio*, in the restricted sense mentioned above, is the least problematic first part of such an editorial enterprise. Although there has been much debate on the issue of early revisions of PO LJ’s work has strengthened my belief that the relatively short account<sup>5</sup> of the martyr’s life and death found its form at an early date after 1152/3. I will not exclude the possibility that it might even stem from the time of the first archbishop, Jon Birgisson (†24/2 1157), or for that matter from the period leading up to the establishment of Nidaros as the see of an archbishop. All things considered, however, *Passio* was presumably written either by the (incumbent) archbishop himself, Øystein, or under his participation and supervision. We should be careful not to state too bluntly that Øystein was PO’s author in the modern sense of the word. This is not the occasion for me to discuss the issue at length, only to state as my conviction that a *Passio Olavi* (that is combined with chosen miracles) right from the start must have been envisaged as an essential document in advancing the case of the saint’s shrine as an ecclesiastic centre for the northern regions.

The proper PO, then, is based on 5 manuscripts: 2 stemming from Yorkshire (*sigla*: CCC and O), 2 probably from central Sweden (*H* and *Dr*) and one stemming from Böödeken (Paderborn, *siglum* B\*, no longer extant, but printed in the Bollandists’ *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. VII (29th of July), Antwerpen 1731). These primary witnesses must be compared with the ‘Fassung’ B transmission, that is the abbreviated form of the *vita* shown by LJ to be carefully culled from the longer A form. As its witnesses it has mss. respectively from Anchin (Northern France, near today’s Belgium, *D*), and from Bordesholm in Holstein (*N*, early sixteenth century). In order to edit an optimal PO one should even today strive to realize the guiding ideal formulated by Storm in his introduction: “... as far as possible to restore the legend in its original form.”<sup>6</sup> Whether LJ would subscribe to this ideal *sans façon*, is another matter. For both parts of PO she bases the printed text on ‘Leithandschriften’, that is a guiding ms.; as to PO this means CCC, in such a way that readings in this ms.

<sup>5</sup> In Storm’s ed. 1880 (pp. 127–132 = 173 lines), in Metcalfe’s ed. 1881 (pp. 67–73 = 147 lines).

<sup>6</sup> Storm 1880, p. XXXII: “...saavidt muligt at restituere Legenden i dens oprindelige Skikkelse“.

may be replaced (at the good judgment of the editor, of course) by the *most frequent* variant in the other witnesses (my italics: “durch die meistüberlieferte Variante” vol. II, p. 4) in order to highlight better the common elements of the transmission (“um ... die Gemeinsamkeiten der Überlieferung deutlicher heraustreten zu lassen”). The general principle adhered to is that “variants are never reconstructed” (“Hierbei werden jedoch nie Varianten rekonstruiert”). Whatever this will mean in practise (and I have something to say in that regard below) LJ emerges as a very conscientious editor but somewhat more conservative in her principles than her predecessors Storm (1880) and Metcalfe (1881).

The *Passio* is in LJ’s edition printed in vol. 2 in the left hand columns of pp. 15–29; in the right hand column she has printed ‘Fassung B’, the abbreviated version, facing A in such a manner that the wordings of A and B can easily be compared. A is above all based on the oldest Yorkshire ms. and now at home in Corpus Christi College Library, Oxford and therefore fittingly marked with the *siglum* CCC; this important source was not known by Gustav Storm, but was edited by Frederick Metcalfe only a year after Storm’s *Monumenta historica Norvegiae*. Metcalfe, however, was able to take account of Storm’s edition. These old editions are my main references in the following. They are now in a definitive and commendable manner replaced by LJ’s edition. In the following I will only comment on the A version. The CCC ms. is according to the script specialist Michael Gullick, probably written in the 1180-ies, i.e. at a time either close to or even concurring with the period (from mid-1181 to mid-1183) when Øystein lived in exile in England. It is clear, however, that the scribe had no high or reliable competence (writing e.g. *una* instead of *uana* at P.II.4; *amore* instead of *affectu* at P.III.2, *ita* instead of *a* at P.III.5, *abhorrebat* instead of *abhorrebant* at P.V.5, adding *et* to *fabricabantur* at P.V.9 (an effective asyndetic row of passive predicates); further: writing *decoratus* instead of *decoctus* at P.VIII.3). An editor must brave the challenge of taking the scribe to task wherever necessary without an absolute guarantee in each single case. In this respect as well, LJ deserves praise often enough though not without some reservations mentioned by and by in the passage below:

On the positive side LJ has made a number of convincing decisions. Keeping the chapter divisions from Storm’s edition (Metcalfe had none; Kunin’s translation (Viking Society, 2001) has a line counter only) she has some novelties to offer: 1) she has divided the 10 chapters/sections into paragraphs/ subsections with Arabic numbers, in harmony with the system adopted by Ekrem – Mortensen in their edition of *Historia Norwegie* (2003). This was a wise decision for all practical purposes. 2) LJ has a couple of modifications in the chapter numbering: Storm’s ch. XI is grouped

under the *miracula*; 3) ch. III has now *In regali fastigio* as its beginning, not *Nec propria salute* (now III.3), and ch. VI opens with *Non cessabat autem*, not with the previous sentence *Exultabat rex* etc. which has now instead become P.V.12.4). – As to LJ's preferences among the variants I agree to some of her alterations of Storm's and/or of Metcalfe's text: e.g. at P.V.11 *infidelium* (from O and B\*) as against *fidelium* CCC, Storm and Metcalfe; at P.VI.6 LJ has adopted *quam sollicitus erga religionem* (from O and Dr); at P.I.5 she has added *nimis* and *aquilonis*; at P.VIII.5 added *pati*, and at P.IX.6 added *regem* (from the abbreviated version of D and N). All of these changes are uncontroversial improvements.

But inevitably, I myself would in some cases have preferred other textual choices: e.g. at P.1.3 *astrinverat* instead of *astrixerat* in view of O's reading and CCC's own *perstrinximus* at M.XVIII.1; perhaps I would also vote for the indicative *contulit* at P.VII.1 in view of O, Dr and Rec. II (p. 81); at P.VII.2 *secessit* is preferable to *secesit* in view of O and CCC's own *cessisse* in the following subsection; at P.VIII.1 I would print *Rusciam* instead of *Russiam* in view of O, B\* and P.VII.2, cf. also the geographical index for all Recensiones s.v. *Ruscia* where 3 exx. in CCC of *Rusci-* are recorded against only this one of *Russi-*; at P.X.2 I would follow the abbreviated version in reading *eterni regis palatia* as the original wording instead of *eterna regis palatia, cp. signifer castris aeterni regis* in the *Passio sancti Edmundi* referred to on p. 459, n. 166 (in the quotation from Hoffmann 1975, 76). And I just remind Norwegian readers of the local relevance in Stavanger of the hymn *Deus pater piissime* which ends with praising Christ as *Rex eternus* (see Gjerløw 1954: 85–109).

In a transmission with many lost witnesses and many variants in the extant material the question arises for me whether true *original* readings may have been lost in the transmission process. In *Passio* there are two cases where I have long been in favour of conjectures<sup>7</sup>: at P.V.4 LJ's text is *O quam deuote caritatis flagrantia, quantus fidei feruor excellentissimi Christi martiris pectus accenderat* etc. ("Oh, what ardour of devoted love, what fervour of faith, inflamed the breast of this most excellent martyr of Christ."). But word order is against this text: *quam* cannot go well with a noun (*flagrantia*) in a hyperbaton after the genitive combination (*deuote caritatis*), unlike *quantus* in the next syntagm: for exclamative *quam* seeks the nearest adjective or verb. In a literary style as exquisite as this *quam* should be followed by a nominative *devota* to go grammatically with *flagrantia*: "Oh, what a devoted ardour of love etc.", cf. also the resulting parallelism of quality (*quam devota + caritatis flagrantia*) versus quantity (*quantus + fidei feruor*). – At P.X.1 mss. and editions alike have this text: *Porro Domi-*

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Klassisk Forum* 1995:2, 84–86. The second corrected ed. of my booklet of texts, *Et pensum i middelalderlatin I*, Oslo 1997, never went to the printer because the course was discontinued.

*nus, qui martiri suo mercedem, pro quo tot agones pertulerat, reddere et gloriam suam, quam diutius et avidius sitierat, iam reuelare decreuerat* etc. ("Thereupon the Lord resolved to grant to his martyr the reward for which he had endured so many trials and to reveal to him his glory for which he had so long and eagerly thirsted"<sup>8</sup>, Kunin 2002: 31, ll. 15–18). The problem is that the translator has rendered the theological meaning perfectly, but misunderstood the grammar of *pro quo* which is "for whom", that is *martiri suo* "to his martyr", as if he, namely the Lord, had endured so many trials for Olav". More than 20 years ago a student<sup>9</sup> in my class of Medieval Latin made me aware of this, and I changed immediately the text to feminine *qua* (agreeing with feminine *mercedem* instead of *quo* agreeing with *martir*). The surprising end of the story is now that LJ has detected *qua* as the reading of the Swedish ms. (probably) written in Linköping ca. 1400 and now in Dresden's main library (*siglum: Dr*). A fly in the ointment is only that LJ did not adopt this reading in her text.

My above focus on the text of *Passio* reflects my view of it as the single most important text written in Norway in the catholic era. From the ecclesiastical point of view, however, the short account of Olav's life and death was only the necessary preamble to the hopefully much longer and definitely more propagandistic part containing trustworthy examples of the saint's perpetually beneficent holiness. These stories of divine (or saintly) intervention (vol. 2, pp. 30–76) have a complicated transmission through various stages dealt with by LJ with due acumen and stamina. The edition of the whole corpus of Rec. I, fifty miracles altogether, is very complex in its transmission (cf. the orientation in vol. 2, pp. 3–4) and LJ makes an almost heroic attempt at mirroring its complexity by means of different script fonts and degrees on the printed pages. For each *miraculum* she has listed the ms. evidence in the margin. The miracles vary in length from barely two lines (XXXII, XXXVI, XL) up to something resembling short stories, e.g. XIII or XVIII. The variants are recorded in a full *apparatus criticus*. When *testimonia* and 'Sachkommentar' are added in at times only half a page is available for the miracle text itself. I am impressed by LJ's editorial competence and care. We will have reason to be very grateful users of vol. 2 in the future. LJ's numbering of the miracles has every chance of becoming the standard one from now on: Storm had only miracles up to the number XX, many of which were without a Latin form for him. Metcalfe did not care to give his great catch of miracles a numbering, so we welcome the numbered collection on display now. The

<sup>8</sup> The same mistake in E. Skard's translation (1930): "Men no hadde Herren avgjort å gje martyren sin den løna han hadde halde ut så mang ein strid for, og unna honom den æra han hadde tyrsta etter så heitt og lenge".

<sup>9</sup> Arild Waaler, now Professor of Informatics at the University of Oslo.

one miracle left out by CCC, the 'Miles Britannicus', has got 'L' as its permanent number. Thereby it is being marked as a legend passed over seen from the perspective of CCC, but LJ has rightly inserted it where it obviously belongs according to two witnesses of the Rec. I group (*H* and *O*), namely between M.IX and M.X. I ask myself again, however, why the 'Leithandschrift' should have so strong an authority at the sacrifice of a hypothetical better archetype. An ascending numeric sequence pure and simple for the whole corpus of Rec. I miracles would in my view be an even better solution.

The CCC ms. stands admittedly apart from the other sources of this group in that it has the whole bundle of *miracula* (minus one). More than half of them were not known to the world before Metcalfe published the ms. The most noteworthy miracle, not least for historians, is M.XXXVII, the *Tractatus Augustini*, which reports a serious incident when Øystein himself was summoned to decide an important matter concerning the construction of the cathedral; he alone, and not his retinue, fell from the ramp which collapsed under the weight of stones and men. Thanks to Olav's intercession, however, Øystein was fit not only to attend the celebration on St. Olav's festal day three days later, but was *miraculously* able to preach and carry out mass as well. The detailed first person account vouches for Øystein's authorship.

Acknowledging the high quality, rich information and many good decisions evidenced in LJ's text of the *Miracula* (e.g. *posterum* instead of *postremum* at M.X.1) I would nevertheless allow some space for a few marginal corrections and comments to consider for a future editor; in the order of LJ's text:

**M.1.1** *consolationis*: write *consolatoriis*. The quotation from the Vulgate, Za 1.13, should accordingly be corrected to *uerba consolatoria*. – **M.II.5** *que*: write *qui* with *O*, *B\** (and Storm); cf. also Uppsala, Cod. C 308 quoted in vol. 1, p. 368. Why *que* in a miracle as important as this? – **M.L.1** *confractu*: write *confractus*. – **M.XIII.18** *eiusdem*: write *eisdem*. – **M.XIII.37** *nisi liberato curationem etiam beneficio: liberato* stems from *D* ousting CCC's/ Metcalfe's *liberatio*, but *beneficio* is wrong; replace it therefore by the nominative *beneficium* (going with *curationum*). – **M.XIX.2** *quo*: but *qua*, referring to *ea die* with *B\** (and Storm), is indeed preferable for one adhering to Storm's pursuit of *veritas*. – **M.XXVIII.6** *arram maiorum promittens*: cf. the discussion vol. 1, p. 487, n. 89. I for one take *maiores* here as 'aristocrats', 'the grandes of society', cf. e.g. *Glossarium Suecanum s.v. magnus* II.2.b) and c). – **M.XXVIII.17** *uicino*: I reckon *vicino* as suspect (**M.XXX.1** has *in uicino*); *tutiora* should be taken as an elative (= *tuta*), not as a comparative with comparative force and *uicino* as an abl. comp. (= *quam uicinum latibulum*). – **M.XXIX.1** *in prouintia Europa trans montes*

*australes*: on the corrupt *Europa* LJ has comments also on p. 432 with n. 72. *Europa* should have been marked as corrupt with the crux † in the text itself. I guess that the original reading was the adj. *euroa*. The hagiographer wants to point to the south-eastern part of Norway as the scene, probably somewhere on the lower part of Glomma in Østfold. *Eurus* for the East and (south-) east wind is well known in medieval Latin. – **M.XXXI.1** *cum monasterio*: LJ writes in the app. crit. on *cum* “*add. et exp. CCC*”: should it not be “in *add. CCC et exp. Metcalfe*”? Cf. Metcalfe in his note: “‘in’ inserted in C.C.C. after ‘cum’ by error.” – **XXXIV.6** *Bergas*: “by a mistake of the scribe”, according to Metcalfe. Then *Bergis* is very probable, cf. *Bergas* ‘to Bergen’ and *Bergis* ‘in Bergen’ (*Prof. Dan.* 10). – **M.XXXVII.3** *unico matris sue*: read instead probably *unico matri sue* (dative, parallel with *sibi*): LJ’s app. crit. has “*unico filio coni. METCALFE, p. 104, n. 3*”; that is not so: Metcalfe wanted only to explain the word *unicus*. Metcalfe’s edition has no proper app. crit. according to modern requirements and is therefore easily misunderstood. – **M.XXXVII.4** *pons* is Metcalfe’s obvious emendation of the ms. *ponens* put in his text; he should have done it the other way round: put *pons* in the text as LJ does (who should herself have made her app. crit. clearer). – **M.XXXIX.7** *isdem nobilis* is hardly acceptable in the *Miracula* (*pace* Stotz 1998, 125), and so thought Metcalfe by his *sic* in his note, cf. e.g. *idem* M.XIX.2, *ille idem* M.XLVII.7. – **M.XXXIX.26** *ueniunt*: I would propose either *uenit* or *ueniunt rumores*. – **M.XLI.1** *Ringissacr* with app. crit.: “*Ringissair CCC (coni. METCALFE, p. 109, n. 3)*”. Metcalfe says: “ought to be written *Ringisacr*” (i.e. with one *g* and one *s*). – **M.XLVII.18** *Profert uotum et confirmat, ut, si diuinitus respici meruerit, et baptismum suscipere et martiris ecclesiam quamtotius potuerit uisitare*: A disapproving *sic* also in Metcalfe p. 110. I believe that the archbishop and his chapter would not have given this sentence their approval. The late Inger Ekrem (who gave me a preliminary text on the basis of Metcalfe’s edition towards the end of 1997) considered deleting *ut* after *confirmat* and change *totius* (gen. of *totus*) to the adv. *toties* (‘many times’). Her suggestions should be accepted: *toties* is obviously right; *totius* is admittedly a current form in early Spanish medieval Latin with the meaning ‘totally’, ‘completely’ (Stotz 1998: vol. 4, 137), but here the scribe of CCC has absent-mindedly drifted into the more common word form instead of writing *quam toties*. But Ekrem’s first suggestion, to delete *ut*, is also convincing. A less convincing alternative would be (in conflict with the well-known classical *consecutio temporum* rule) to write *ut . . . conspiceret et . . . uisitaret*. – **M.XLVII.4** *Quem cum ad se conspiceret, eum salutatione preuenire uisus est*: LJ has no comment on the text. However, here as well the text is to some degree corrupt. Met. considered supplying *uenire* or alternatively replacing *ad se* with *adesse* (on the basis of a supposed *adee* with a horizontal stroke above the *e*’s). I would call this



latter suggestion brilliant (for *adesse* cf. also M.IV.8 and M.XXXIX.18). Metcalfe's latter alternative was rightly adopted by Ekrem. – As is understood from my basic position concerning the principles for an edition of *Passio et Miracula beati Olavi I* for one would not give e.g. graphemes like *sollerscias* (M.XIV.5) my approval or accept the wavering between *languor* and *langor* (both within M.XVIII.20).

But let not these passages obscure my respect and admiration for LJ's research and the results coming out of it. The first volume testifies overwhelmingly to the richness of the investigations. I must confess, however, that I am nowhere near competent enough to pass verdicts on each of the fourteen chapters, nor will these, as a matter of course, appeal to every reader in equal measure. In any case I will have to express my opinions (if I have some) as briefly as possible. I should like to add that The Table of Contents laid out in vol. 1 (pp. v-xix) is so detailed that it makes up for the lack of a 'Sachregister' of the usual kind. The following is not a summary of the book, only some impressions from my reading.

Ch. I ("Zum historischen, kulturellen und literarischen Kontext", pp. 1–31) is an excellent summary of the background and should be recommended as a survey to any student reading German with ease.

Ch. II ("Das hagiographische Dossier Olavs des Heiligen – die *Passio Olavi* (BHL 6322–6326)"<sup>10</sup>, pp. 32–57) sorts out the whole dossier in the form of three recensions: Rec. I (with the main A version and the shortened B version), Rec. II (with one version C) and Rec. III (with two variant versions D1 and D2). I consider this chapter as a fundamental one in this respect. LJ is thereby able to emphasize the manuscripts *H*, *CCC* and *D* as the oldest witnesses of Rec. I (but not necessarily the best, cf. some of my comments above). Rec. II and III illustrate the later very free development of Rec. I.

Ch. III ("Formal-inhaltliche und textkritische Heterogenität der Textzeugen der Recensio I: Die Frage der Fassungen", pp. 58–94). LJ analyses scrupulously the stylistic and syntactical differences between the versions Rec. I A and B. In an instructive way she focuses in particular on defining the versions ('Fassungen'). The narrative freedom observed in the *miracula* is not the least interesting aspect in this chapter. The *miracula* part of the *Passio Olavi* is indeed a world of its own not only with regard to the transmission.

Ch. IV ("Der *Passio*-Teil und die Mirakel als einheitliches Werk? Sprachlich-stilistische Analyse der *Passio Olavi*", pp. 95–179). The linguistic and stylistic aspect

<sup>10</sup> The reference is to *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, Brussels 1898–1901, <sup>3</sup>1992.

is further pursued and elaborated in this chapter. LJ is able to correct many sweeping statements in E. Skard's *Sprache und Stil der Passio Olavi* (1930). For example looms the influence of Vergil disproportionately large in Skard's study, whereas LJ reduces it to practically nothing more than reflexions of the common heritage of transmitted phrases. The chapter contains a number of separate more technical investigations (of e.g. rhetorical figures, *colores rhetorici* etc.) underlining the overall impression of a fairly wide divide between the two parts, the *Passio* proper and the *Miracula*. The cursus forms are analysed with competence, but with meagre results (as could be expected I dare say).

Ch. V ("Zu überlieferungs- und textgeschichtlichen Merkmalen der *Passio Olavi*", pp. 180–218) contains a topic of great interest for the discussion of the chronology of the *miracula*: LJ discusses the genesis of the collection and distinguishes between an early phase ('Schicht': M.1-9 with their connection to the scaldic poem *Geisli*) and a later phase comprising M.50 + M.10-21). She has convincingly spotted and marked typographically the additions made in a third phase represented by the Norse version at the end of *Gammelnorsk homiliebok*. It is important to pursue the idea that the collection of miracles went through stages as early as *ante* 1180 (when Øystein went into exile). LJ elucidates also for me why an abbreviated version B was made: it was not meant to play a role in the liturgy, but as a medium to propagate more effectively Nidaros and its cult. Here and elsewhere LJ constantly stresses that the *Passio* and the *Miracula* are works independent of each other.

Ch. VI ("Die *Passio Olavi*, die englischen Zisterzienser und die Verehrung Olavs in England (Quellen im Kontext)", pp. 219–269). This chapter contains a thorough codicological description of the important CCC ms. It is diagnosed as a far from perfect copy originating in Fountains, Yorkshire, the Cistercian mother cloister of Lyse south of Bergen (the *Coenobium Vallis Lucidae*, which was the first Cistercian establishment in Norway, cf. its foundation document printed in Storm's *Monumenta*, (1880, 169–172). Thanks to LJ's diligent autopsy one might with her assume that CCC was intended for use in Norway. In that case we may be grateful that it never reached Norway. In our country it would never have stood any chance of surviving the reformation. LJ gives a fascinating account of Øystein's enforced two year stay in England (at Bury St. Edmond's and Lincoln), an exile involving a lot of highly interesting issues relevant both for Olav's standing as a saint in England and for Norwegian church history. LJ makes a case for considering CCC a Cistercian propagandistic pamphlet to further Nidaros as a gravitational centre of the North.

Ch. VII ("Die *Passio Olavi* und die Verehrung Olavs in Nordfrankreich (Quellen im Kontext 2)", pp. 270–321). It must be forgiven that I mark this chapter

as one of special interest to some of us. It has as its centre the ms. *D* from Anchin in Flandern, a ms. to which L.B. Mortensen devoted a thorough study in *Symbolae Osloenses* (2000). *D* was evidently written in the last quarter of the twelfth century and raises at least three important issues: a) the role of St. Olav in Normandie and Flandern, b) the influence on Anchin emanating from Olav's cult status in England, and c) the relation of Anchin, respectively to Nidaros in the North and to the Victorines in Paris where prominent Norwegians were educated for shorter or longer periods in the twelfth century. It would go beyond the confines of this review to render and discuss LJ's sober treatment of the issues. One important result seems to me to be that she is playing down the significance of whatever contact there may have been between the clergy of Nidaros and Anchin.

Ch. VIII ("Die *Passio Olavi* und die liturgische Verehrung Olavs in Skandinavien und Norwegen (Quellen im Kontext 3)", pp. 322–383) starts with the depressing fact that the introduction of the Lutheran creed led to almost a total annihilation of written material belonging to the old church in Norway. The Latin *Passio Olavi* would have been nearly a hypothetical entity for us had it not been for the saint's dossier abroad. Nevertheless, much can be said about St. Olav's office due to the last archbishop's *Breviarium Nidrosiense* reflecting English influence. The chapter deals with the end product of the liturgy of Nidaros, the *Ordo Nidrosiensis Ecclesiae* for which Øystein was the main architect (an *ordo* splendidly edited by Lilli Gjerløw almost fifty years ago). It is a sort of consolation for every latinist in Norway that the famous hymn *Lux illuxit laetabunda* (based on the *Passio* and influenced by St. Victor) is often heard nowadays. The chapter deals also with the cult of Olav in Sweden with strong centres at Vadstena and Linköping. According to LJ the cult developed there very much in tandem with that in Norway. However, the Swedish remnants of the liturgy are to an astonishing degree much richer than what is the case in Norway. Last, but not least LJ gives an up to date account of the extant breviaries. Throughout she is fair in her occasional criticism of the research carried out by previous researchers (among whom are Ekrem, Mortensen and Østrem in more recent times).

Ch. IX ("Augustiner-Chorherren, Holstein und Dänemark: Die *Passio Olavi* in Norddeutschland (Quellen im Kontext 4)", pp. 384–412). This is the first chapter that widens our knowledge of the role of St. Olav in the late centuries of the medieval period as reflected by Rec. II and III. The region Sleswick – Holstein plays an important role in the diffusion process that reached the German realm by having a double orientation, northwards towards Denmark (in periods: Denmark – Norway) and southwards and eastwards towards the Hanse cities along the Baltic Sea. The *N* ms. from Bordesholm points to a cultural interchange with Denmark, likewise Segeberg

in the same region. One cannot escape agreeing with LJ that the German Hanse League was the main factor in the widening of the saint's sphere of influence. For the Hanse merchants who had a strong basis in Bergen Olav and Sunniva became the guardian saints who were accordingly rewarded with a strong status in the episcopal see and city of Lübeck.

Ch. X ("Der *rex sanctus* und seine *miracula*: Zur funktionalen Typologie der Olavmirakel und zur Konstruktion von Heiligkeit in der *Passio Olavi*", pp. 413–467). Some important distinctions are made here: first between *miracula in vita* (that is M.1 and M.10) and the large majority of miracles, *m. post mortem*; the latter category is divided into 1) miracles of healing, 2) of rescue, 3) of penalty and 4) of proof (M. 35); fruitful is also the distinction between distant miracles (either in Norway or abroad) and miracles attached to the saint's shrine in Nidaros. To LJ's typological distinctions belongs moreover the useful divide between pilgrims appealing to the saint ('Bittpilgerfahrten') and pilgrims offering their gratitude to him ('Dankpilgerfahrten'). LJ defines three types of holy kings (*rex sanctus*): the royal monk displaying *sanctitas monastica*, the king slain in battle, the king murdered or betrayed (*sanctitas politica*), LJ outlines Olav primarily as a missionary preaching the gospels in royal attire. Olav is less akin to the holy kings of England than to the royal ideal embodied for instance by kings in the periphery of Christendom like King Wenzel in Bohemia.

Ch. XI ("Der Topos der wundersamen Gefangenenbefreiung: Recht und Gerechtigkeit im Licht der Olavmirakel (Fallstudie 1)", pp. 468–513): this is the first of two important case studies devoted to the *miracula*. The miracle of rescue from imprisonment has as its origin in the New Testament Acta 12.4–11 (Peter) and 16.25–34 (Paulus and Silas). Here as well the typological definitions of the miracle material are central in the analysis. The comparison of the examples is clarifying indeed and beautifully executed. LJ sees the relevant miracles in relation to the codified juridical system in the period (the Gulathing law is particularly prominent in this chapter).

Ch. XII ("*Visus est ei vir Dei*: Zu Darstellungsform und Funktion von Träumen und Visionen in den Olavmirakeln (Fallstudie 2)", pp. 514–570). No less important and central to the whole corpus of miracles is LJ's analysis of the multifaceted notion *visio* (equally important in dreams and in the waking state). LJ deals with its manifestations both diachronically and more specifically in miracle accounts before coming to our Olav's *miracula*. She emphasizes that the visions are, to a great extent, the factor determining the course of events in the accounts. Due to a *visio* the needy person finds healing in a great many cases (*visio* → *sanatio*) thereby attaining a closer relationship with God, Christ, saint Olav and the Nidaros cathedral. On the whole, in this chapter LJ's particular strength comes convincingly to the fore in elaborating

categories and distinctions that are useful and relevant analytical tools. We perceive an expert knowledge at work; it was already at work in her earlier Brill publication *Die Visio Pauli* (2006). Her mastery of the scholarly literature on the subject is no less impressive than her independent judgement. Besides, the hagiographer becomes a more tangible figure in this chapter. He is no mere reporter, but is responsible for shaping the account to reflect the interests of the Nidaros chapter and its saint in the best way possible. We have every reason to believe that the archbishop's supervision was playing a self-evident role in the authorizing and 'editing' process.

Ch. XIII ("Die *Passio Olavi* in den Händen der Kaufleute: Die Recensiones II und III", pp. 571–645). The historian and church historian will here find an important elucidation of the later stages of the saint's cult in the catholic era of Northern Europe. Rec. II (which clearly builds on Rec. I) has some new miracles (No. 51–58 in this edition) reflecting the fact that St. Olav had become the common saint of Norway and Denmark (after 1380). Olav has no longer King Knut as his fiercest rival, but his own brother; Olav does not die on the battlefield, but is crucified like Christ. The importance of the city of Lübeck and its episcopal see becomes prominent by way of the before-mentioned monastic centres of Holstein. *Passio Olavi* was translated from Latin into German around the year 1500 and printed in Lübeck. "Olav belonged to the daily life of Lübeck", LJ concludes (p. 595). The Hanse trade on Bergen is the essential condition for this development. Rec. III, likewise derived from Rec. I, has two branches centering on Greifswald with connections to Sweden and Gotland. The mss. belonging to Rec. III can be dated to the second and third quarter of the fifteenth century. This Rec. has altogether three miracles of its own (No. 61–63) and a *vita* of Olav with an interesting account of the pilgrimage of Olav's father to Spain (Santiago), returning via Bordeaux and his relation to a *femme fatale* there. LJ analyses the link between this Rec. and the Legendary Saga's 'romantic' account of Harald's meeting with Sigrid Storråde.

Ch. XIV ("Das Nachleben des Heiligen und das Leben der *Passio Olavi*: Fazit", pp. 646–670) is a very useful summary with a bird's eye view on the vast material handled in the previous chapters.

It remains to be added that this reviewer has constantly enjoyed the high printing quality and the conscientious proof reading going with it. Very seldom he has

<sup>41</sup> I was taken aback when I read that the *Passio* contained "Wendungen", albeit "vereinzelt" from Tacitus, but nothing of the sort is recorded in the 'Index verborum et locutionum' (vol. II, pp. 248–252); on p. 526 LJ writes as infinitive for *expergefactus expergefaci* instead of *-fieri*; on p. 537 *calidum ... balneum* is rendered 'kaltes Bad' instead of 'warmes Bad'; on p. 542 we find 'Nidaros' instead of 'Novgorod' as the scene of M.XX (with a misleading n. 106 also on

had reason to be annoyed at mistakes and questionable assessments.<sup>11</sup> As a boon in its own right the second volume contains 60 pages of excellent illustrative material.

Hopefully, I have managed to convince interested readers that this investigation is extraordinary in depth and thoroughness. The bibliography (more than fifty pages) testifies to this although I for one do not automatically praise enormous bibliographies. But anyone taking the ca. 2250 footnotes into account will understand that this vast scholarly bibliography has been digested and integrated into LJ's work as part of her solid basis. Each of the topics dealt with will definitely be rewarding for future students. Above all LJ has given us an edition of the whole dossier of texts, soberly assessed, organized, and edited. Norway has every reason to be grateful to her for this achievement, a κτήμα ἐς αἰεὶ ('a possession for all time') I would say with Thucydides. Needless to say, then, the two volumes deserve a prominent place in every institutional library caring for medieval studies.

## Bibliography

- Acta sanctorum Iulii, Ex Latinis et Graecis, aliarumque gentium Monumentis, servata primigenita veterum Scriptorum phrasi, Collecta, Digesta, Commentarisque et Observationibus Illustrata . . . e Societate Jesu Presbyteris Theologis. Tomus VII: Iulii.* Antwerpen: Jacobus du Moulin, 1731.
- BLAISE, Albert. 1954. *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- BLH = *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, Brussels 1898–1901, <sup>3</sup>1992.
- EKREM, Inger & MORTENSEN, Lars Boje (edd.). 2003. *Historia Norwegie*. Translated by P. Fisher. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum.
- GJERLØW, Lilli. 1954. "Deus pater Piissime og blykorsene fra Stavanger bispedømme". *Stavanger museums årbok* 1954: 85–109.
- HOFFMANN, Erich. 1975. *Die heiligen Könige bei Angelsachsen und den skandinavischen Völkern*. Neumünster: K. Wachholtz.

---

p. 541). – I do not quite understand why LJ a couple of times speaks about "der rätselhafte Theodoricus"; perhaps she has found Theodoricus' ch. 13 about the baptism in Rouen (in my view 'confirmation') enigmatic by being introduced by the phrase *et ego legi in Historia Normannorum* etc. (see p. 300) for which passage I have launched an interpretation different from that of Mortensen, see *Collegium Mediaevale* 25, 2012, 114. It is also a little odd that she makes much play of the fact that the first printed edition appeared in 1684 as if a period of half a millennium between the composition of the *Historia* - via a medieval ms. (now lost) - and the first printed edition were something extraordinary.

- JIROUŠKOVÁ, Lenka. 2006. *Die Visio Pauli. Wege und Wandlungen Einer Orientalischen Apokryphe im Lateinischen Mittelalter. Unter Einschluss der Altsechischen und Deutschsprachigen Textzeugen*. Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- KRAGGERUD, Egil. 1995. "Middelaldernøtter". *Klassisk Forum* 1995.2: 79–87.
- . 2012. "Hellig-Olavs dåp hos Theodoricus Monachus og i hans kilder". *Collegium Medievale* 25: 104–123.
- KUNIN, Devra (transl.). 2002. *A History of Norway and the Passion and Miracles of the Blessed Óláfr*. Translated by D. K., edited with an introduction and notes by Carl PHELPSTEAD. Viking Society for Northern Research. London: University College.
- MORTENSEN, Lars Boje. 2000. "The Anchin manuscript of Passio Olavi (Douai 295), William of Jumièges, and Theodoricus Monachus: New evidence for intellectual relations between Norway and France in the 12th century". *Symbolae Osloenses* 75: 165–189.
- SALVESEN, Astrid & GUNNES, Erik (edd.). *Gammelnorsk homiliebok*. Oslo 1971. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- SKARD, Eiliv. 1930. *Sprache und Stil der Passio Olavi*. Avhandlingar utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1932: 1. Oslo: Dybwad.
- STORM, Gustav. 1880. *Monumenta historica Norvegiae*. Kristiania:
- STOTZ, Peter. 1998. *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters 4: Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.
- UNGER, Carl Richard (ed.) 1877. *Heilagra manna sögur*. Bd. I. Christiania.

---

**Egil Kraggerud** is Professor (emeritus) of Classical Philology, Oslo.

---