

# Leeds Studies in English

**Article:**

Andrew Hamer, 'Translation and Adaptation in Amicus ok Amilius Saga', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 16 (1985), 246-58

**Permanent URL:**

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=123636&siloleft\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123636&siloleft_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

## TRANSLATION AND ADAPTATION IN *AMÍCUS OK AMÍLIUS SAGA*

By ANDREW HAMER

Hagiography and quasi-hagiographical writing, whilst following many well-recognised conventions, nevertheless have their freedoms. Professor Cross has considerably increased our awareness of one type of freedom in his close comparison of OE and Latin saints' lives, showing how the vernacular hagiographer did not feel constrained to follow a single source, but might well weave a new or transformed narrative from a number of different Latin versions of the same story. This paper will concentrate on a different type of authorial freedom, the directing of a single source into a narrative with a new and original emphasis by making a series of related changes to the original.

The popular tale of Amicus and Amelius, the Norse version of which will be examined in this paper, was clearly well-suited to re-creation: the earlier 'hagiographic' account, seen in the Latin tradition, was expanded as a 'romance' in the OFr and ME versions.<sup>1</sup> *Amícus ok Amílius saga* is a translation of Vincent of Beauvais' version of the story in *Speculum Historiale* lib. XXIII, cap. CLXII-CLXVI.<sup>2</sup> The tale explores the self-sacrificing friendship between two men, contrasting their mutual loyalty with a series of treacherous betrayals of the trust and obligations of love by several other characters.

Eugen Kölbing, in his study of the relationship between the Norse and Latin texts, suggested that the Norse remains fairly faithful to its original.<sup>3</sup> This textual relationship will be examined in some detail again here, in order to advance the view that the Norse translator most certainly did not render Vincent's work more or less word for word; whilst comparison of the two texts is necessarily incomplete, because the opening of the Norse version is lost, there is still plenty of evidence to argue for conscious reshaping on the part of the Norse translator.<sup>4</sup> The Latin text sets up a series of parallels between characters, and especially between the two friends: these are identical in appearance, they each suffer a moral fall, each beheads for the sake of the other, and each restores another/others to their proper place in society (Amelius by healing Amicus' leprosy, and Amicus by forgiving his vassals). The Norse text, it will be suggested, develops and extends this system of parallels, drawing a contrast between the characters of Amícus and his wife, in order to make a statement about the nature of kingship and the rule of law: viz. that royal power, when exercised with mercy and love, is an important force for

holding society together.

The operation of mercy depends, of course, on an earlier admission of guilt and a sense of remorse for wrong-doing. The Norse translator expands his original at the points where, first Amelius, and then Amicus, give expression to their feelings of guilt. Amelius confesses to his friend that he has disregarded the latter's advice, and begs for his help:

"O unica salutis meæ spes heu fidem male servavi,  
quia crimen de filia Regis incurri" (CLXIII, 957a)  
("O sole hope of my safety, alas I have kept my  
faith badly, because I have rushed into a crime con-  
cerning the daughter of the King").

The Norse uses three terms to express Amilius' sense of moral confusion; the syntax too is changed, the confession beginning tortuously ("evilly has [it] now happened") and becoming nervously repetitive ("because I have . . . because I have"):

"Heyrtu einkanliga vãn minnar heilsu. Illa hefir nú  
orðit, þvíat ek hefi eigi haldit trú mína við þik þá  
er ek hét þér þá er vit skildim, þvíat ek hefi nú  
misgert ok fallit í glœp<sup>5</sup> fyrir sakir konungsdóttur"  
(186/4)

("Listen to me, particular hope of my health. An  
evil thing has now happened, because I have not kept  
my faith with you as I promised you when we two  
parted, because I have now done wrong and have fallen  
into wickedness because of the King's daughter").

Amicus' sin arises out of the desire to protect his friend. Knowing that Amelius is to fight a judicial combat to prove his innocence of the charge of having deflowered the princess (a combat which, as he is guilty, he is bound to lose), Amicus suggests that he and Amelius should exchange clothes, and each pretend to be the other. Amelius is to go to Amicus' home, while Amicus will fight in his friend's place. This ruse ensures that Amelius' opponent must lose the duel, since he will have to fight against a man innocent of the charge on which that duel is to be fought. The deceit he is guilty of troubles the conscience of the hero of the Latin version:

Tunc Amicus, conscientiaæ suæ timens, Hardericum sic  
alloquitur (CLXIII 957a)  
(Then Amicus, fearing in his conscience, spoke thus  
to Hardericus).

This disquiet is spelt out for the audience with apparent laboriousness by the translator:

En þvíat Amícus óttaðist um sína samvizku, í móti  
hánum at berjast, talaði hann til Arderícum þessum  
orðum (186/27)

(But because Amícus feared in his conscience to fight against him, he spoke in these words to Arderícus).

But this apparently trivial expansion of his original allows the author to include the verb *berja(st)*,<sup>6</sup> a word which has considerable importance in this text, and which will be further discussed below (p.249).

The theme of law and judgement, which is so important in the Latin text, is made even more of in the Norse. An example occurs at the point where Amilius, while masquerading as the identical Amícus, places a sword in the bed between himself and Amícus' wife, and gives her a warning. The Latin reads:

Vide, inquit, ne mihi appropinquaveris, quia statim hoc ense morieris (CLXIIII, 957a)  
 ("See", he said, "that you do not approach me, because you will immediately die by this sword")

while the Norse presents the sword as an instrument of judgement:

Sé við, sagði hann, at koma eigi nær mér, þvíat ef þú gerir þat, skaltu dømd<sup>7</sup> verða þessu sama sverði (186/18)  
 ("See", he said, "that you do not come near me, because if you do that, you shall be judged by this same sword").

Justice may indeed strike a hard blow: Amicus becomes a helpless leper. His sickness, we are left to infer from the Latin text, is a punishment inflicted on him for the crime he committed in fighting the duel:<sup>8</sup>

Amicum vero cum uxore sua manentem percussit Deus morbo lepræ, ita ut de lecto non posset surgere (CLXV, 957a)  
 (God indeed struck Amicus, dwelling with his wife, with leprosy, so that he was not able to rise from his bed).

But the Norse version points much more directly to the connection between the duel and the sickness:

En Amícus var heima með sinni húsfrú, ok litlu síðar kastaði guð bardaga á hann ok barði hann með líkþrá, svá at ekki mátti hann þá ur rekkju rísa (187/8)  
 (But Amícus was at home with his wife, and shortly afterwards God inflicted a flogging on him and smote him with leprosy, so that he might not rise from his bed).

We may note, first, the use of two parallel expressions to render one original (*percussit*), a favourite rhetorical device among Norwegian translators of the thirteenth century.<sup>9</sup> In this

case, the two expressions are linked by the unobtrusive use of *polyptoton* (*bardaga . . . barði*), the latter term being the 3rd pret. sg. of *berja*, the verb used in its middle voice form (*berjast*) by Amícus, as he prepares to fight the duel. This verbal linking of the crime (the duel) with its punishment (the leprosy) is strengthened by the use at this point of *bardaga*, the normal meaning of which, outside legal contexts, is 'a fight, battle'. The word is ambiguous, however, and when applied, as it obviously may be here, to legal penalties, it means 'a beating, flogging'.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, the translator's rendering of *percussit* includes the meanings of chastisement and battling: leprosy is a second judicial combat, inflicted on Amícus as punishment for his having taken part in the first. In this case, however, the opponent is God Himself, and justice cannot be cheated.

The close similarity between crime and punishment, first seen in the person of Amícus, is extended to the Norse translator's treatment of Amícus' wife. According to the Latin, her crime is that she deserts her husband when she discovers he has leprosy:

Quem cum uxor eius, Obias nomine, sic eum exosum haberet,  
ut eum multotiens suffocare vellet . . . (CLXV, 957a)  
(And when his wife, Obias by name, considered him thus  
detestable, so that she very frequently wished to stifle  
him . . .).

Once again, the Norse text is expanded in an apparently trivial, not to say simple-minded fashion:

En húsfrú hans er Obías hét, fyrirlét hann þegar ok  
hataði sem vánd kona. Svá kom, at hon vildi mörgu  
sinni hafa kyrkt hann til bana (187/10)  
(But his wife, who was called Obías, abandoned him  
immediately, and hated him as an evil woman. It so  
came about that she wished on many occasions to have  
throttled him to death).

The wife's punishment is death. Her case is implicitly contrasted with that of her husband in the Latin, since she dies at the moment when he is restored to full health:

Amici vero coniux iniqua arrepta est a demone, et  
cadens per præcipitium, expiravit<sup>11</sup> (CLXVI, 958a)  
(Amícus' wife, unjust, was seized by a demon, and died,  
falling over a precipice).

Consider the Norse translation:

En í þann tíma hljóp úhreinn andi í bók húsfrú Amíci,  
ok kvaldi hana mjök illa, ok í þeim ærslum fell hon  
fyrir berg ok lauk svá hörmuliga hennar lífsdögum  
(189/17)  
(But in that time an unclean spirit ran into the body  
of Amícus' wife, and tormented her very wickedly, and

in that frenzy she fell over a precipice, and sadly ended her life in that way).

The Norse text is interestingly different, as the choice of phrasing sets up correspondences between itself and other parts of the text. Firstly, the addition of *í búk* - the emphasis on the fact that she is tormented in her body - is a reminder of Amícus' own bodily torment, his leprosy.<sup>12</sup> This similarity however serves only to emphasise the real differences between the two cases: Amícus' punishment is inflicted by God, while his wife is seized by an agent of the devil; Amícus' sin, including the killing of Arderícus, came about through his refusal to desert a helpless friend, and was motivated by love, while his wife, who frequently wished to kill him, deserted him because his helplessness had caused her to hate him.

Secondly, the phrase used to describe the operation of the unclean spirit within the woman is *hljóp í búk*, an idiomatic phrase for the onset of sickness, with the literal meaning 'ran into [her] body'.<sup>13</sup> I should like to suggest here that the Norse translator portrays the wife, having deserted Amícus, as now separated from love and God, and having now in her hate entered into a kind of contract with the devil, an interpretation suggested here by the use of the word *hljóp*. In a text whose structure is based on parallels, comparison with the other two occurrences of the word *hljóp* in the text will clarify the point: both are to be found at moments in the narrative when one character is giving a welcome to another.

The first describes the wife's own running to meet Amilíus, who she thinks is Amícus returning from court. Here *hljóp at hánum* is ambiguous, meaning both '[she] rushed towards him' (i.e. in her desire to embrace him) and '[she] attacked him'.<sup>14</sup> The ambiguity defines his wife's attitude towards Amícus as energised by aggression and lust.

The other occurrence of *hljóp* is to be found at the point in the text where Amilíus recognises the leper as his friend, and welcomes him:

Hann hljóp á hals hánum ok kastaði sér yfir hann  
grátandi (188/10)  
(He fell on his neck, and, weeping, threw himself  
upon him).

The use of *hljóp* here points an ironic contrast between the lack of self-interest on Amilíus' part at this moment, and the self-gratification which had been the wife's purpose earlier. The repetition underlines the further contrast between the fact that Amilíus, in his love for Amícus, recognises him in the leper, while the wife, whose feelings for Amícus are grounded in aggression, fails to recognise that the man she desires is not her husband.

It was noted above that at the moment when the wife deserts Amícus, the translator adds to his original an apparently naive statement of her spiritual and psychological state: "ok hataði sem vánd kona" ('and hated [him] as a wicked woman'). This addition

may now be explained quite simply as an explicit statement of what had been in fact implied in the earlier use of *hljóp* at to describe the wife's running to meet the man she takes to be her husband. The repetition of *hljóp* is a device enabling the translator to make psychologically inevitable the wife's desertion and attempted murder of the leprous Amícus: not recognising the proper nature of marriage, and seeing her husband only as a means towards her sexual satisfaction, as soon as his body is no longer sexually desirable and her lust for him therefore disappears, she is left only with her aggression. The complete phrase "hljóp únreinn andi í búk húsfú Amíci" should therefore be read against the background of the wife's separation from love, and should be seen (through the use of *hljóp*) as a parody of a love-relationship. The devil at this point welcomes the wife into a relationship with him which, since it is a relationship based on hate, inevitably finds its expression in torment.<sup>15</sup>

The already observed parallelism between the tortures of husband and wife, the fact that both of them suffer bodily affliction, leads to the establishing of a final contrast between them. While it is implied that the wife meets her death, driven out from society into the mountains by her madness, there to perish by falling over a precipice, the last words to describe Amícus give no account of his death, and present his life as being both socially and spiritually fulfilled:

[hann] þjónaði guði jafnan með ást, meðan hann lifir,  
ok réð þar fyrir með ágættri hreysti ok miklum friði  
ok sambandi (189/24)  
([he] served God always with love while he lives, and  
ruled there with excellent prowess and with great  
peace and unity).<sup>16</sup>

The process of restoring Amícus to a full life begins at the moment when he throws himself on the mercy of God. Immediately, the plan comes to him to journey to Rome, where, for the first time since his illness, he is welcomed into a society. Nor is he driven from there by the inhabitants during the famine which later ensues, but rather his companions suggest that he leave. He is taken by them from Rome to the house of Amilíus, and to his restoration to health.

God's mercy, then, is the force which guides Amícus' journey towards social and spiritual rehabilitation, and Amícus makes his appeal to that mercy when he has been deserted by his wife and by the knights of Berícánum [?]. Amícus at this moment sees quite clearly that death would be a release from his sufferings (another point of contrast with his wife's case, whose own bodily tortures - *kvaldi hana mjök illa* - can only be read as a prelude to the eternal spiritual torments she is doomed to suffer). And yet he is content to leave the decision as to whether he should live or die in God's hands, as he makes his appeal:

Dá tók Amícus at gráta ok mælti svá: Hinn mildasti  
ok hinn miskunnsami faðir; lát mik annathvárt deyja

skjótt ella send mér hjálp þinnar miskunnar! ok það sveina sína flytja sik til Rómaborgar (187/25)  
 (Then Amicus began to weep and spoke in this way: "Most gentle and merciful father; let me either die quickly or send me help through your mercy!", and he asked his servants to carry him to Rome).

The syntax makes the decision to journey to Rome, and towards social reintegration and bodily health, follow immediately upon the prayer. In this way, the loving mercy of God is shown to inform the bonds of society, and to be at once vital and rational.<sup>17</sup> The picture here presented of the relationship between God and the contrite soul is contrasted with the fiend's possession of the wife, earlier characterised as a parody of a love-relationship, which results in the loss of reason and, with that, social alienation.

There remains one passage in the Norse version which is significantly different from the Latin. The latter shows Amicus forgiving the people of Bericanum, and settling down to live peacefully among them, in the fear of God:

Amicus itaque movit ad Bericanos exercitum, et tamdiu obsedit eos, donec se victos reddiderunt. Quos ipse benigne suscepit, et omnem offensionis culpam eis condonavit, Deo ulterius in timore serviens pacifice cum eis habitavit (CLXVI, 958a)  
 (And so Amicus moved his army against the people of Bericanum, and besieged them for so long, until they gave themselves up, defeated. And he received them generously, and forgave them all the fault of their offence, and serving God in fear besides, he lived peacefully with them).

In his expansion of the Latin, the Norse translator emphasises the peace of Amicus' rule, and the love, rather than fear, that motivates him:

Eptir þat fór Amicus til Berícánum fóstrjarðar sinnar með her, ok sat svá lengi um, at hann gat unnit þá er þar váru fyrir ok gáfust þeir upp í hans vald. En hann gaf öllum þeim grið með drengskap ok fyrirlét þeim sína misgerð ok þat sem þeir höfðu í mót hánum gert ok þjónaði guði jafnan með ást, meðan hann lifir, ok réð þar fyrir með ágætri hreysti ok miklum friði ok sambandi (189/20)

(After that Amicus went with an army to Berícánum, his native place, and besieged it for so long that he defeated those who were the leaders there, and they gave themselves up into his power. But he gave them all peace worthily, and forgave them their wrongdoing and that which they had done against him, and he always served God with love, while he lives, and ruled there with excellent prowess and with great peace and unity).



There is an obvious parallel between the case of the sinning citizens, defeated and yielding themselves into Amícus' power, and the entire case of the leprous hero, helpless and weeping with contrition, surrendering to God the decision about whether he should live or die, and benefiting from God's mercy. Thus it follows that in showing mercy to the inhabitants of the city, Amícus follows the example set by God and thereby acts as a proper Christian ruler. The exercise of royal mercy, and its resulting social benefit, is seen in the process from *gríð* to *friðr*: "En hann gaf öllum þeim gríð . . . ok réð . . . með . . . friði".

That these terms, which are found in the familiar legal formula *gríð ok friðr*,<sup>18</sup> should co-occur in this way establishes the correct legal function of the Christian ruler. His justice operates through mercy rather than through summary execution, a theme which has been hinted at earlier in the substitution of *dæmd verða* for *statim . . . morieris*.

The many references in the text to the process of law receive their fulfilment in the person of Amícus, who wields finally both mercy and *vald* 'power, authority, dominion'. The word has no original in the Latin text. It should be noted that *vald*, the proper attribute of royalty, comes to Amícus only after his cleansing, and sums up the contrast between his final status and his earlier condition of beggar and bedridden leper.<sup>19</sup> It is this combination of mercy and authority which makes it an appropriate decision on the translator's part to render *cum eis habitavit* by *réð þar fyrir*.

The operation of mercy within the heart of Amícus is emphasised by the way in which the concept of misdeeds done against him is repeated in a clause. The Latin "omnem offensionis culpam eis condonavit" is rendered "fyrirlét þeim sína misgerð ok þat sem þeir höfðu í mót hánum gert". And there is further rhetorical play in *fyrirlét* as a translation of *condonavit*. *Fyrirláta* is ambiguous: while the basic meaning of the word is 'to let go' or 'give up', *fyrirláta* has the specialised meanings of 'forgive' and 'forsake'.<sup>20</sup> While *fyrirlét*, with Amícus understood as its subject, clearly means 'forgave' in this passage, the word's one other occurrence in this text must be read as meaning 'forsook'. On discovering that her husband has leprosy, "húsfrú hans er Obías hét, fyrirlét hann þegar ok hataði sem vánd kona", where *fyrirlét* has no Latin original. Once more the contrast is made between on the one hand, husband and reconciliation, and on the other, wife and alienation.

While *fyrirlét* is an example of rhetorical play through repetition, the immediately following words contain another rhetorical device, this time of verbal echo of the other occasion when a helpless individual had begged Amícus for mercy and had been granted it.

The translator's emphasising through an expansion of the original the breaking of faith with Amícus to which Amilíus refers in his plea to his friend (emphasising at the same time thereby Amilíus' recognition of his own guilt), has been briefly commented upon above. Amilíus' speech develops the sense of sin already

present in the Latin *crimen*. "Illa hefir nú orðit" has no Latin original, while "crimen de filia Regis incurri" is expanded into "ek hefi nú misgert ok fallit í glocp fyrir sakir konungsdóttur". It is the verb *misgera* which here anticipates the later "fyrirlét þeim sína misgerð", and which, like the word *glocpr* with which it co-occurs, has religious as well as moral meaning.<sup>21</sup>

The rhetorical development of the text in terms of verbal echoes and repetitions, in order to give emphasis to situational parallels, finds further expression in the linkage of cleanliness, health, and mercy. The metaphorical use of *heilsa*, 'health', in Amilíus' plea to Amícus: "Heyrtu einkanliga ván minnar heilsu" simplifies the ambiguity of the phrase *salutis meæ*, which may mean both 'my health' and 'my safety'.<sup>22</sup> The use here of *heilsa* reinforces a point that was noted above, that the appeal for, and the granting of, mercy are shown in this text to lead directly to recovery and rehabilitation.

The cure that produces this recovery is seen as a type of cleansing. The angel of Amícus' vision informs him that Amilíus should kill his two sons "ok með þeirra blóði skyldi hann þvá<sup>23</sup> Amícum, ok þar af mundi hann heill verða" ('and with their blood he should wash Amícus, and from this he would become healthy'). At the moment when Amilíus cleanses his friend there are five references to cleansing:

En blóð þeirra, sem hann hafði látit renna í eitt stórt glerker, tók hann ok þó í Amilíum féлага sinn, ok meðan hann þó hann, talaði hann þessi orð: Herra Jesús Krístr, sagði hann, þú er heilan gerðir líkþrán mann með orði þínu, virð mik til at hreinsa þenna minn féлага ok hreinan gera, þvíat ek helta út blóði sona eptir boði engils þíns, ok er hann hafði lokit böen sinni, varð Amícus heill þegar ok hreinsaðr allskostar (188/33)

(But he took their blood, which he had made run into a large glass vessel, and washed in it his companion Amilíu[s] [sic], and while he washed him, he spoke these words: "Lord Jesus Christ", he said, "you who made whole the leper with your word, vouchsafe to cleanse my companion and make him clean, because I shed the blood of my sons according to the command of your angel", and when he had ended his prayer, Amícus became immediately whole and cleansed in all respects).<sup>24</sup>

By contrast, the spirit who enters the wife and causes her fatal madness is *úhreinn* ('unclean'), a common enough term in Norse,<sup>25</sup> but here made part of his system of rhetorical parallels and contrasts by the translator.

A final series of parallels involves the rebellious subjects. The Latin has Amícus mistreated by his vassals as well as by his wife. The Norse text grounds their action in aggression, as it had done the wife's, whereas in the Latin they are referred to

simply as *illi impij* (CLXV, 957a). The Norse reads: "reiddust þeir ok börðu þjónustumennina" (187/22) ('they grew angry and beat the servants'). The verb *börðu* (3rd pret. pl. of *berja*), used to render *verberauerunt*, links their crime with that of Amícus, and anticipates the parallelism between the cases of these subjects and their lord that had first been made in the Latin text: they each weep with contrition as they surrender their fate into the hands of a just authority. And in the Norse only, because of the use of *bardaga* to describe the infliction of leprosy on the hero, this parallelism is extended, so that both subjects and lord are seen as defeated in battle.

By means of these parallels, Amícus' position towards his subjects is shown to recapitulate that of God towards him, and his treatment of the rebels is as socially integrative as had been his own spiritual rehabilitation at God's hands. In *Amícus ok Amilíus saga*, it is the ruler's responsibility to govern with love (*með ást*), and to seek to restore society to health (*friðr*),<sup>26</sup> which is realised through a reaffirmation of the social bonds (*samband*, literally 'connection').<sup>27</sup>

This concern to show that the health of a society is intimately connected with the existence of a proper relationship between ruler and people, a relationship founded on Christian principles of justice and mercy, is also a major concern of the author of *Konungsskuggsjá*, written in Norway during the late thirteenth century.<sup>28</sup> In this text, the long discussion of the king's responsibilities for administering justice (chapters XLII ff.) follows shortly after the accounts given of famine, and the reasons for it, and of the duties of the king's retainers. Here the most serious type of famine is that which occurs within the souls of the people themselves, a moral view of famine which suggests that a Scandinavian audience might well have seen the famine in *Amícus ok Amilíus saga* as, like the leprosy, a symptom of alienation (in this case of a whole people) from God.

These coinciding thematic concerns may be added to the evidence produced here of stylistic and ideological traits that have been recognised as characteristic of Norwegian court-translations: an easy familiarity with rhetorical techniques (less obtrusive here than in some Norwegian translations<sup>29</sup>) and a tendency to point up the moral of the original.<sup>30</sup> Because *Amícus ok Amilíus saga* exists only in one Icelandic manuscript, there can be no certainty, but the translator's narrative technique, as examined in this paper, supports the view that this translation from Vincent of Beauvais was originally made in Norway.<sup>31</sup>

NOTES

- 1 A brief description of the different versions of the story will be found in MacEdward Leach, ed., *Amis and Amiloun*, EETS OS 203 (London, 1937) pp.ix-xxxii, from which the terms 'hagiographic' and 'romance', as applied to the textual history of this legend, are adapted. Leach (p.xiii) places the Norse text among the 'hagiographic' versions.
- 2 The Norse version was edited by E. Kölbing, "Bruchstück einer Amícus ok Amilfus saga", *Germania* XIX (1874) pp.184-9. In this paper, references to Kölbing's edition are given by page and line-number. References to the Latin version are given by chapter, page, and column number to volume IV of Vincentius Bellovacensis, *Speculum quadruplex, sive, Speculum maius: naturale, doctrinale, morale, historiale*, 4 vols. (Graz, 1964-5).
- 3 Kölbing, "Bruchstück", p.184: "ja mit Ausnahme weniger Stellen ist geradezu Wort für Wort übertragen". E.F. Halvorsen, *The Norse Version of the Chanson de Roland* (Copenhagen, 1959) p.21, comments that "the translation follows the Latin source closely, even to the point of imitating certain syntactical features".
- 4 The Norse version now begins at the point where Amícus gives Amilfus the double warning about the King's daughter and the treacherous Arderícus, before leaving the court to visit his home.
- 5 See, in *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, initiated by Richard Cleasby, revised by Gudbrand Vigfusson M.A., Second Edition, with a Supplement by Sir William A. Craigie (Oxford, 1962) *glæpr*: 'crime, wickedness'. The word has anti-Christian, sinful connotations. The adjective *glæpa-fullr* is glossed by Cleasby-Vigfusson as 'full of wickedness, ungodly'.
- 6 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *berja*. The basic meaning is given as 'strike, beat, smite'. In legal contexts it referred to the punishment of flogging, or scourging. The verb has the meaning 'fight' when used, as here, with the enclitic reflexive pronoun.
- 7 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *dcema* 'to give judgement, pass sentence'. All the prose examples cited there refer to legal judgements.
- 8 Vincent's text is here different from the other Latin versions, which represent the affliction of leprosy as a chastising brought about through God's love. These versions read ". . . de lecto surgere non posset, juxta illud quod scriptum est: *Omnem filium, quem Deus recipit, corripit, flagellat et castigat*". See E. Kölbing, ed., *Amis and Amiloun*, *Altenglische Bibliothek Band II* (Heilbronn, 1884) p.CIII.
- 9 For a brief statement of the major stylistic levels and devices used in Norwegian literature of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, see Halvorsen, *Norse Version*, pp.1-11. An early study which remains useful is R. Meissner, *Die Strengleikar. Ein beitrag zur geschichte der altnordischen prosaliteratur* (Halle, 1902).
- 10 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *bar-dagi*. The rhetorical linking of *bardagi* with *berja* underlines their shared meaning of 'flogging, scourging'.
- 11 Given our lack of knowledge about the development of this legend, it is worth pointing out that a closely similar fate is suffered by Egeas, the persecutor of the Apostle Andrew, in Bonnet's *Passio*. See J.E. Cross,

"The Apostles in the Old English Martyrology", *Mediaevalia* 5 (1979) pp.15-59, p.27: "*Ægeas uero areptus a daemónio antequam perueniret ad domum suam in uia in conspectu omnium a daemónio uexatus expirauit* (Bonnet, p.35). The other version records that *de loco alto se praecipitauit* (Fab.II, 515)".

- 12 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *lík-prá* 'leprosy', a compound of *lík* n. 'the body' and *prá* f. 'throe, pang, longing'. Leprosy, then is 'body-pangs'. By contrast, Amilíus, anxious about his seduction of the king's daughter, is described as *hugsjúkr* (Cleasby-Vigfusson g.v.) literally 'mind-sick': "Ok meðan Amilíus var hugsjúkr ok leitaði sér ráða um þetta . . ." (186/2) ('And while Amilíus was mind-sick and searched for a plan about this . . .'). The Latin has nothing equivalent to *hugsjúkr*, and reads simply "Qui dum consilium quaereret . . ." (CLXIII, 957a).
- 13 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *hlaupa* §2 (special usages). The authors quote from *Grettis saga: hljóp blástr* ('mortification') í *búkin*.
- 14 Cf. Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *at-hlaup* 'onslaught, assault'.
- 15 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *kvelja* 'torment'. The word is frequently used of the tortures of Hell, thus: *untu kveljask með fjándanum í Helvítis loga*, 'you will be tormented with the fiends in the flames of Hell'; *nú er hann huggaðr en þú kvaliðr*, 'now is he [Lazarus] comforted while you are tormented'.
- 16 This passage marks the end of the Norse text. In common with the other Latin versions, Vincent's text goes on to recount the deaths of the two friends, who fall on the same day, fighting for Charlemagne and Christianity. Note, too, the present tense in *meðan hann lifir*.
- 17 See further n.26 and n.27 below.
- 18 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.vv. *friðr*, *gríð*; see also the articles on *gríð* in *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon for Nordisk Middelalder*, vol. V, pp.463-7. For *friðr* see also n.26 below.
- 19 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *vald*, related to *valda* 'to wield'. While translated here as 'power', the word has the meaning 'authority' at the same time. Note the phrases *vald ok lög* 'power/authority and law', *vald ok dóm* 'power/authority and judgement'. The compounds *valdsmaðr*, *einvaldi*, *fólkvaldi* are used of rulers, as is the present participle of *valda*, *valdandi* (also used of God as ruler).
- 20 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *fyrir-láta*.
- 21 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.vv. *mis-göra*, *mis-görð*.
- 22 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *heilisa*, and see *salus* in, for example, Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, repr. 1958). In medieval Latin, *salus* also means 'salvation': see R.E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List* (London, 1965).
- 23 The Latin reads *ablueret* (CLXVI, 957a).
- 24 There are two references to cleansing in the Latin text: *þó* renders *aspersit* 'sprinkled'; there is no Latin original for the second occurrence of *þó*; *hreinsa* translates *mundare* 'cleanse'; *hreinan gera* has no Latin original; *hreinsaðr* translates *mundatus est* 'was cleansed'.

- 25 The term is Biblical in origin. See, for example, Matt. xii 43 *immundus spiritus*.
- 26 For a discussion of *friðr* as a key force for binding kinsmen and friends together to form the basis for society, see Vilhelm Grönbech, *The Culture of the Teutons*, trans. W. Worster (Copenhagen, 1931) vol.I, chapter 1. Grönbech comments (p.32) that *friðr* is the force that makes kinsmen "'friends' one towards another, and 'free men' towards the rest of the world". See too, p.35, where *friðr* is said to find, during the later medieval period, "definite expression in laws, to wit, in the statutes of the medieval guilds, a continuation not precisely of the clan, but of what was identical with clanship, to wit, the old free societies of frith or communities of mutual support".
- 27 See Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v. *sam-band*. Note too the compound *sambandsmenn* 'confederates'.
- 28 See Anne Holtsmark, "Kongespeillitteratur", in *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon* vol. IX, pp.61-8. For the text see L. Holm-Olsen, ed., *Konungs skuggsiá* (Oslo, 1945).
- 29 See, for example, Halvorsen, *Norse Version*, p.10 and pp.17-24.
- 30 So, for example, *Erex saga*, a translation of Chrétien's *Erec et Enide*, made in Norway during the thirteenth century. See *Erex saga and Ívens saga: The Old Norse Version of Chrétien de Troyes's Erec and Yvain*, translated, with an introduction by Foster W. Blaisdell, Jr. and Marianne Kalinke (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1977) pp.xiii-xvii. For an account of a moralised translation that uses some of the structural devices seen here in *Amícus ok Amilíus saga*, though with a rhetorically more ornate style, see my forthcoming *On the Composition of the Strengleikar*.
- 31 The vellum manuscript, Stockholm 6, 4<sup>o</sup>, from c. 1400, also contains *Ívens saga* and *Parcevals saga*, translations of Chrétien's *Yvain* and *Perceval* made during the reign of Hákon Hákonarson (1217-63): see E.F. Halvorsen, "Ívens saga", *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon*, vol.VII, p.528, and the same author's "Parcevals saga", *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon*, vol.XIII, pp.116-17. Halvorsen, *Norse Version*, pp.10 and 21, apparently views *Amícus ok Amilíus saga* as an example of late "Court Style", or "Late Style", as found "in the works written at the time of Hákon V (1299-1319)". Sam Henning, *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon*, vol.I, pp.127-9, also sees the translation as belonging to the reign of Hákon V, "'at the same time as *Stjórn*'" (a vernacular compilation from Genesis, Exodus, Petrus Comestor and interestingly, *Speculum Historiale*).