

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Jocelyn G. Price, 'The Virgin and the Dragon: The Demonology of Seinte Margarete', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 16 (1985), 337-57

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123650&silos_library=GEN01



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

THE VIRGIN AND THE DRAGON: THE DEMONOLOGY OF *SEINTE MARGARETE*

By JOCELYN PRICE

The stylistic and structural elaboration the Early Middle English *Seinte Margarete*¹ brings to its Latin source has been praised, in what little modern comment there is on this Katherine Group legend, but praised as "naive and sensational hagiography".² In this context it is *Margarete's* ability to heighten grotesque and horrific detail from its source that has been chiefly remarked, especially in the case of the dragon encountered by the virgin saint. It is true that the EME text permits the dragon an appearance of greater fullness and splendour than any preceding Latin or English version of the legend, and it is also true that some texts of the legend excise the dragon, or display doubt and scepticism regarding him. Yet the presence, even the very full presence, of a dragon does not consign a text to the realm of the merely sensational or naive. Especially in comparison with some other early English versions of the legend, *Margarete* knows what it is doing with its dragon: its re-working of the legend is on the whole more remarkable for confident and informed orthodoxy than naiveté. Audience response is engaged, but also contained and directed in this thematically controlled hagiography: it is not merely indulged.

In the earliest of the principal Latin versions of the legend - the 'Rebdorf' version of the seventh century - Margaret prays in her cell for the power to see her enemy and is rewarded by the appearance of the devil "in draconis specie".³ As she makes the sign of the cross, he vanishes and is replaced by a black demon whom she also defeats and then interrogates. In the later 'Mombritius' version (on which *Margarete* is based) the dragon appears in a much more elaborated and corporealized way:⁴ he gapes over Margaret with his enormous jaws and begins to swallow her, but when she makes the sign of the cross, he bursts asunder and she emerges unharmed from within him, to discover, subdue and interrogate his *confrère*, the black demon. In *Margarete* the Mombritius-type details of the dragon (his gilded locks, golden beard, teeth of iron, eyes shining like pearls, smoke- and fire-exuding nostrils, long tongue, stench and glitter)⁵ are still further vivified and expanded:

. . . ant com ut of an hurne hihendliche towart hire an unwiht of helle on ane drakes liche, se grislich þet ham gras wið þet sehen: þet unselhõe glistinde as þah he al ouerguld were. His lockes ant his longe berd blikeden al of golde, ant his grisliche teð semden of swart irn. His

twa ehnen steareden steappre þen þe steoren ant ten
 3imstanes, brade ase bascins, in his ihurnde heaued
 on eider half of his heh hokede nease. Of his
 speatewile muð sperclede fur ut, ant of his nease-
 þurles þreste smorðrinde smoke, smecche forcuðest;
 ant lahte ut his tunge, se long þet he swong hire
 abuten his swire; ant semde as þah a scharp sweord
 of his muð scheate, þe glistnede ase gleam deð ant
 leitede al o leie; ant al warð þet stude ful of strong
 ant of stearc stench, ant of þes schucke schadewe
 schimmede ant schan al. He strahte him ant sturede
 toward tis meoke meiden, ant geapede wið his genow
 up-on hire ungeinliche, ant bigon to crahien ant
 crenge wið swire, as þe þe hire walde forswolhe mid
 alle. 3ef ha agrisen wes of þet grisliche gra, nes
 na much wunder.⁶

(. . . and there came out of a corner, hastening
 towards her, a creature of hell in the shape of a
 dragon, so horrible that they [the bystanders] were
 terrified when they saw the evil creature, glistening
 as though he had been gilded all over. His locks and
 his long beard shone golden and his terrible teeth
 seemed made of black iron. His eyes shone brighter
 than stars or gemstones, broad as basins in his horned
 head on either side of his high, hooked nose. Fire
 flashed from his disgusting mouth and from his nostrils
 gushed smothering smoke, filthy and foul. He darted
 out his tongue, so long that he swung it around his
 neck, and it seemed as though a sharp sword flashed
 from his mouth, glistening like lightning and blazing
 with flame. All the cell became full of a strong and
 powerful stench and everything on which this monster's
 shadow fell, glimmered and reflected. He stirred him-
 self, and moved towards this meek maiden, and towered,
 jaws agape, above her, and began to stretch his neck
 out and draw it in as if to swallow her whole. If she
 was terrified by that frightful devil it was no great
 wonder.)

It is perhaps worth noting at the outset, that however much classical
 associations inform a virgin-dragon encounter for us, this is very
 much a medieval dragon: the eroticism of the Perseus-Andromeda
 legend is almost entirely lacking from it, and associations with
 hell, death and the devil predominate. The dragon's many appear-
 ances in the Bible are all of a threatening and hostile kind and he
 is traditionally conflated with the serpent, Satan, Leviathan and
 Lucifer in his appearances as enemy.⁷ In medieval biblical com-
 mentary, as in medieval bestiary lore and elsewhere, the devil's
 appearance as a dragon has a long and respectable history.⁸

The primary associations for the dragon of *Seinte Margarete*
 are thus unsalacious, and not as fantastical or sensationalizing as
 might at first appear. She is certainly not alone among saints in
 combating a dragon: apart from St George and St Michael, over a

dozen saints in the *Acta Sanctorum* have to deal with them.⁹ In retaining and elaborating the Mombritius-type dragon, *Margarete* is using a traditionally sanctioned image: not going out of its way to find something sensational, but utilizing the force of long-established Biblical images, such as Christ hooking souls from Leviathan's mouth in the harrowing of hell, or his treading down of the lion and the dragon, which Margaret's encounter may be seen to parallel.

The effects of trying to repress or confine the dragon's appearance in the legend are demonstrated as not necessarily happy ones if we consider the early English version found in MS CCCC 303.¹⁰ This manuscript is dated to the beginning of the twelfth century by Ker and assigned a probable provenance of Rochester.¹¹ It follows Mombritius details for the dragon but alters its order of presentation by instantly identifying him as a devil in disguise and naming him:

. . . þær inn eode an ʒrislic deofol; his nama wæs Ruffus. And he wæs swiðe mycel on dracan heowe and eall he wæs nædderfah. And of his toþan leome ofstod, eal swa of hwiten swurde, and of his eazan swilces fyres lyʒ and of his naspyrlum smec and fyr ormæte mycel and his tunʒe þreowe his sweore belyʒde.¹²
 (. . . a horrible devil went in there: his name was Ruffus. He was very large, in the form of a dragon, and he was all serpent-hued. Light gleamed from his teeth, as if from a shining sword, and from his eyes intense fire flashed, and vast quantities of smoke and fire from his nostrils, and his tongue swung right round his neck.)

In *Margarete*, as in most Latin versions, the dragon's name emerges only in the saint's subsequent interrogation of the black demon. Ruffus is a traditional name for the devil but not one widely used in Old English texts: this is one of its two occurrences in vernacular works.¹³ The CCCC 303 writer may have looked ahead in his source and interpolated the name at the beginning of the dragon's appearance in order to gain *auctoritas*, or his Latin source may have given its details in a variant order. Whatever the explanation, the CCCC 303 text exhibits its information about the dragon to poor effect: to give the name of a "ʒrislich deofol" by way of introduction to him is to be bathetically rather than authoritatively familiar. The opportunity to create the dragon from Margaret's perspective is lost in this narratorial intrusion, while in the EME text, the saint's courage and faith are emphasized through the presentation of the dragon as she experiences it.¹⁴

Nevertheless, when thirteenth-century texts other than *Margarete* object to the dragon it is not to his existence as such, but to its mode and extent. Thus Jacobus de Voragine mentions both of the principal early Latin traditions in his *Legenda Aurea*, but is suspicious of the Mombritius version's account:

. . . et ecce draco immanissimus ibidem apparuit, qui dum eam devoraturus impeteret, signis crucis edidit et ille evanuit, vel, ut alibi legitur, os super caput ejus ponens et linguam super calcaneum porrigens eam protinus deglutivit, sed dum eam absorbere vellet, signo crucis se munivit et ideo draco virtute crucis crepuit et virgo illaesa exivit. *Istud autem, quod dicitur de draconis devoratione et ipsius crepatione, apocryphum et frivolum reputatur* (italics mine).

(. . . there appeared to her a hideous dragon, who sought to throw himself upon her and devour her. But she made the sign of the cross, and the dragon vanished. Or again, as another legend tells it, [placing his mouth over her head and stretching out his tongue under her heel he would have swallowed her at once, but as he pulled at her to gulp her down,] she made the sign of the cross, and caused the dragon to burst, the damsel emerging unharmed from his body. *But this legend is apocryphal, and all agree to consider it a groundless fable.*)¹⁵

The *South English Legendary* is also troubled by this version of the dragon, explaining that

aȝen kunde it were þat þe deuel were to deþe ibroȝt
 For he ne mai þolie nane deþ i nemai it leue noȝt
 And also i neleoue noȝt þat is miȝten were so stronȝe
 A so holy creature inis wombe auonge. (ll.167-70)

even though it is willing to accept that "to soþe it is iwrite þat in a monnes like / þe deuel to þis maide com" (ll.171-2).¹⁶

What is at issue here is not the dragon's existence but his degree of corporeality: his appearance as a demonic apparition, as in the Rebdorf version, is acceptable, but his actual embodiment and ability to swallow and burst are viewed with suspicion. In late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century demonology, the question of corporeality and habitat for demons is a much re-iterated and debated issue. Paul and most of the fathers agree that demons have aerial bodies and live in the atmosphere between the moon and the earth.¹⁷ The largely Augustinian consensus of Christian demonology was however at this time being re-thought. William of Conches and William of Thierry, for instance, have a controversy over the former's view that two good orders of demons live in the ether and upper atmosphere and one order close to earth, having partly aerial and partly watery bodies. William of Thierry declares this heretical.¹⁸ Later, Aquinas gives the following ruling as to where precisely demons may live:

. . . there are two places where the devils are punished: one due to them precisely as sinners, which is hell; and one due to them in their function as proving human virtue, and this is the dark atmosphere . . . although the devils, while abroad in this dark

atmosphere, are not actually imprisoned in the fire of hell, yet their punishment is not the less for that, since they know that the imprisonment awaits them. This is what is meant by the *Gloss on James*, *They take the fire of hell with them wherever they go*. Nor is this contrary to those words in *Luke*, *They begged him not to cast them into the abyss*, because their motive in asking this of our Lord was that they deemed it a punishment to be expelled from a place where they could do harm to men . . .¹⁹

Together with the question of the habitat of demons come the issues of their composition, whether and how they can physically occupy space, whether they can be seen by human eyes and so forth. While the basically spiritual nature of demons is argued for by, for instance, Victorine scholars, and accepted by Aquinas, demons are still able to adopt such bodily form as they wish and stories of their doing so are legion. This simultaneous affirmation of the essentially spiritual nature of demons together with increasing interest in their physical appearances testifies to their intensified and multifarious importance, as Norman Cohn points out: "it is a far cry from the self-confidence of the early Christians . . . demons are no mere external enemies, doomed to be defeated . . . and cast down for ever by the bearers of a militant faith . . . they have penetrated into the souls of individual Christians . . . have come to represent desires which individual Christians have, but which they dare not acknowledge as belonging to themselves . . .".²⁰

In this context, the *South English Legendary* and the *Legenda Aurea* are right to be suspicious of the dragon's destruction by bursting: he should not be able to die, as demons endure their places of punishment until Judgement Day (a position confirmed by Aquinas in the section of the *Summa* quoted above, pp.340-1). The dragon should be able to appear and to vanish when conquered but not be physically destroyed. On *Margarete's* side however it can be argued not only that the text is accepting a position on one side rather than another in a matter of contemporary and complicated debate, but also that the saint specially prays to God to see her foe, with the very full embodiment of her enemy (visible to the watchers outside her cell) being a response to her prayer, and further, that dragons are indeed considered, to a degree not easy to confine to the purely symbolic, to be inhabitants of hell. Even in Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* the dividing line between dragon as apparition and dragon as corporeal creature is hard to draw:²¹ he seems to refer to the dragon both as a spectral manifestation from hell and as an inhabitant of it. Writing about the time of the Rebdorf Latin version of Margaret's legend, Gregory mentions some devilish appearances *sub specie draconis*: the OE translation of his *Dialogues*, for instance, includes the story of a monk who is tempted to leave his monastery and sees a dragon invisible to his brethren in a symbolic vision rather than a corporeal encounter:

Sona swa he þa eode ut of þam mynstre, he gemette on þam wege standan sumne dracan on ǵæn hine mid ǵeniendum muþe. 7 se draca þa dyde, swylce he hine forswelǵan wolde . . . þa urnon þa ǵebroþru þider 7 nænigne dracan þær ne ǵesawon, ac ðone munuc byfiende . . . he þa sona ǵehet, þæt he næfre of þam mynstre ǵewitan nolde. 7 þa swa se munuc ǵeseah for þæs halǵan weres benum him on ǵæn standan þone dracan, þæt wæs deofol sylf, þam he ær fylǵde 7 hyrde, þeah þe he hine na ne ǵesawe.²²

(As soon as he went out of the monastery, he met on the path a dragon, standing ready for him with gaping mouth. And then the dragon made as if to swallow him up . . . then the brothers came running up and saw no dragon there, only the monk, trembling . . . he at once promised that he would never try to go from the monastery again. And when the monk, through the prayers of the holy man, saw the dragon standing ready for him, it was the devil himself, whom he had previously followed and listened to, though he never saw him.)

That the dragon is not only a spectral manifestation however but an inhabitant of hell is suggested by Gregory's other uses of it. One repentant sinner is advised to sign himself with the sign of the cross against the might of the dragon who, as he cries on his deathbed "hæfþ be ǵinen in his muþe min heafod forswolǵen" (324/26), but he finds he cannot, "forþon þe ic eom forseted 7 forðrycced mid þam scyllum þisses dracan" (325/5). Another monk, who has been a secret glutton in life, gives a vivid deathbed account of the dragon as he reveals his sin to his fellows:

"þa þa ǵe ǵelyfdon þæt ic fæste mid eow, ic æt deo ǵollice swa ǵe nyston, 7 nu forþon ic eom seald þysum dracan to forswelǵanne, se hafap ǵebunden mid his tæǵle mine cneowu 7 mine fet, 7 his heafod is onsæded in minne muð, 7 drincende min oroð he tyhp him to minne ǵast" (327/7-11).

("When you believed that I was fasting with you, I ate secretly so that you did not know about it, and now, because of that, I have been given to this dragon to swallow, and he has bound my knees and feet with his tail, his head is placed on my mouth and, drinking my breath, he draws my spirit to him.")

In Gregory's stories, the dragon exists both as symbolic vision and hellish manifestation, both as an apparition on earth and as what those who are at the brink of death can see in the life beyond. Ælfrician orthodoxy leans more to the purely symbolic in its following of Gregory, but there are other homiletic and hagiographical traditions in late Old English and much apocryphal and visionary literature reports the more concretely embodied dragons.²³ Both possibilities are still open in texts closer in time to *Margarete*: in *Sawles Warde* for instance, a messenger from hell

reports

"iteilede drahen, grisliche ase deoflen þe forswolheð
sinners ihal ant speoweð ham eft ut biuoren ant
bihinden, oðer-hwile torendeð ham ant tocheoweð ham
each greet . . .",

while later on, the *Agenbite of Inwit*, using in part the same Latin text, makes dragons figures as well as inhabitants of hell: "he is ine þe prisone of zenne in þe prote . . . of þe dragoune þet him wyle uorzuelge".²⁴

The twilight border realm which dragons (being both apparitions, what those apparitions signify and corporeal creatures) inhabit is well illustrated by the account in Book II, chapter xxiv of the *De bestiis et aliis rebus* (wrongly ascribed by the middle ages to Hugh of St Victor), where the dragon's traits, as handed down through Isidore and others to the bestiaries of the high middle ages, are rehearsed and then moralized into those of the devil:

. . . Sunt autem in Æthiopia et in India, ubi ex ipso solis incendio est jugis æstus quasi æstas. [Moralization] Huic draconi assimilatur diabolus, qui est immanissimus serpens. Sæpe in aerem a spelunca sua concitatur, et lucet per eum aer, quia diabolus ab initio se erigens transfiguratur se in angelum lucis, et decipit stultos spe falsæ gloriæ, lætitiæque humanæ. Cristatus esse dicitur, quia ipse est rex superbiæ. Venenum non in dentibus sed in lingua habet, quia suis viribus [juribus] perditis, mendacio decipit, quos ad se trahit. Circa semitas, per quas elephantes gradiuntur, delitescit, quia diabolus semper magnificos viros insequitur. Crura eorum caudæ nodis illigat, et si potest illaqueat, quia iter eorum ad coelum nodis peccatorum illaqueat, ac suffocando perimit, quia quisquis vinculo criminum irretitus moritur, sine dubio in infernum damnatur (PL 177.72).²⁵

(. . . They are found in Ethiopia and India where the sun's own heat provides a constant burning like summer. The devil, who is a very huge serpent, can be compared with this dragon. Often he rushes into the air out of his cave and shines in the air, for the devil from the beginning raising himself up transforms himself into the angel of light, and deceives the foolish with hope of false glory and human joy. He is said to be plumed because he is himself the king of pride. He does not have venom in his teeth but in his tongue, for, having lost his own power, he deceives by his lies those whom he draws to himself. He lurks about the paths frequented by elephants, for the devil always follows after men of magnificence. He binds their legs with the coils of his tail and if he can, entraps them, because he strangles their journey to heaven in the knot of sin and he suffocates them to death, for whoever

dies unrepentant in the grip of sin is certainly condemned to hell.)

In this context, Margaret's dragon could well be accepted as an emanation from hell itself, with his brother the black demon a visitor from the other traditional demonic habitat, the atmosphere. The choice for thirteenth-century hagiographic texts is not whether to accept the dragon or not, so much as how to accept him, and it is not clear that a text which accepts a concretely embodied dragon is more naive or sensational than ones which reject him. Not only is *Margarete's* choice of a full treatment of the dragon for its audience no less valid or informed than other thirteenth century texts' hesitations, but, as I shall argue later, its choice is part of a skilful and commanding thematic management of the legend as a whole.

What is true of the dragon is equally so with regard to his brother, the black demon. Most usually remarked here is *Margarete's* extension of the demon's account of his activities into a kind of inverted homily on chastity, specially directed at virgins. But it is also worth noticing the maintenance of the general framework within which such particularly directed extensions are made. *Margarete* is confident and knowledgeable in its handling of the Latin legend's demonological lore, especially in comparison with other early English versions of the legend. In Margaret's interrogation of the demon, for instance, the early English version found in MS Cotton Tiberius A III²⁶ abruptly truncates the interview ("þu deofol adumbe nu", says Margaret, 45/22) without venturing on more than the demon's account of his tempting of righteous men. It adds one detail not found in other versions - that Margaret not only throws the demon to the ground but that she "his swyðran eye ut astang and ealle his ban heo to bryrde" (44/14-15), a detail which makes one aware of the EME text's felicity in preserving instead the Latin legend's image of feudal submission (Margaret's foot on the demon's neck) and emphasizing her fearlessness in grasping the demon ("þet grisliche þing þet hire ne agras nawiht . . .", 28/10) rather than these grotesqueries.

In the CCC 303 text, Margaret's questioning of the demon is not truncated quite so abruptly and nor is the saint as violent as in Cotton Tiberius: the questioning proceeds successfully until Margaret asks the demon for an account of his origins and the powers that enable him to tempt the righteous. In the Latin legend, the demon gives a quite lengthy reply:

"Rex noster Satanus est, qui delectus est de paradyso. In libris Iamne et Mambre inuenies genus nostrum; scrutare et uide . . . Nam uie nostre super terram non sunt, sed in aere et uento . . . Salemon [sic] . . . inclusit nos in uase uno nouo, et nos mittebamur ignem ex eodem uase; et uenientes Babulonii, putantes aurum inuenire, fregerunt illud, et relaxati, impleuimus omnem orbem terrarum" (137/19-33).
 ("Our king is Satan, who was thrown out of paradise. In the book of Jamnes and Mambres you may find out

about our kind: examine it and see . . . Our life is spent not on earth but in the air and the wind . . . Solomon . . . shut us up in a new vase and we used to send fire out of the vase; and the Babylonians when they came, thinking to find gold, broke it, and, released, we have filled all the world.")

The traditional names of the two magicians who oppose Moses before Pharaoh (Exodus vii 11-12) were known in Old English. There is even extant an OE fragment of what seems very likely to be the apocryphal Penitence of Jamnes and Mambres.²⁷ Yet the CCCC 303 text here gives

"Sathana urne cynin3, hine 3ewræc drihten of paradises myrhþe and him þa twa land a3æf; an is 3amne and oðer is Mambre. And þider he 3ebrincð ealle þa þe he begeton mæi3 of mancynne" (177/259-62, italics mine). ("Our king Satan God drove from paradise's joy and then gave him two lands: one is Jamne and the other is Mambre. And there he brings all whom he can get from among mankind.")

The demon says nothing further by way of explanation or information before Margaret tells him to "3ewit þe heonan on wei3 and sea eorðe þe forswel3e and þu þær wuni3e to domes dæge" (177/269-70). However CCCC 303's transformation of these magicians into countries is to be explained,²⁸ the confusion here shows contrastively the confidence and knowledge of the *Margarete* version.

In the EME text, the reference to the book of Jamnes and Mambres (38/22-3) does not go astray in this way: it remains in the text, and perhaps serves as an allusion for scholars,²⁹ but is not misleadingly elaborated or rationalized for a lay audience. In the less esoteric reaches of demonology however, *Margarete* is prepared not only to follow its Latin source correctly, but to expand and clarify. The reference to Jamnes and Mambres is left as it is, but the demon's further information about his habits and nature is developed and explicated:

". . . we liueð bi þe lufte al þet measte deal, eadi meiden: ant ure weies beoð abufen wið þe windes; ant beoð aa wakere to wurchen al þet wa þet we eauer mahe to moncun ant meast rihtwise men and meidnes as þu art . . ." (38/26-30).

(" . . . we live in the air for the most part, noble maiden, and our ways are above with the winds; and we are constantly vigilant to do all the harm that we ever may to humans and especially to righteous people and to maidens such as you are . . .")

Margarete's awareness of the issues here is shown in the form of the saint's question: ". . . sei me hwær þu wunest meast; of hwet cun þu art ikumne of, ant ti cunde cuð me" (38/1-3, italics mine). (Compare Cotton Tiberius' "Saga me þin cynn and hwa þe cende" (45/16),

CCCC 303's "Hwanan wearó eow, þæt 3e mihton ahan 3odes þeowes to beswicenne?" (177/251-2), and the Latin's "Narra mihi genus tuum iniquum. Quis te genuit, aut precepit bonis operibus insidiari?" (137/11-12), none of which raise the question of habitat so specifically.) The nature and the dwelling place of demons are inter-related and crucial issues of demonology: *Margarete* gives the orthodox answer which prevails from Augustine on and which we have seen Aquinas (pp.340-1 above) maintaining. It also adds, without source or cue in the Latin, an account of why demons behave as they do. They specifically attack maidens because "Iesu Crist, godes bern, wes of meiden iboren; ant þurh þe mihte of meiðhad wes moncun iborhen; binumen ant bireauet us al þet we ahten" (38/30-3), and they attack "rihtwise þeines" (38/36) because of

" . . . onde þet et aa ant eauer ure heorte. We witen ha beoð iwrahte to stihen to þet stude þet we of feollen, ant us þuncheð hokerlich ant swiðe hofles þrof; swa þet teone ontent us, ant we iwurdeð wode þurh þe grome þet us gromeð aa wið þe gode. For þet is ure cunde, þet i þe schulde kennen. Beon sorhful ant sari for euch monnes selhðe; gomenin hwen he gulteð, ne neauer mare ne beo gleade bute of uuel ane: þis is ure cunde, makelese meiden" (38/36-40/9).

(" . . . the envy that eats always and forever at our heart. We know they have been created to ascend to the place we fell from, and it seems ridiculous and unreasonable to us, so that envy inflames us, and we become mad through the rage that is always gripping us against good people. For that is our nature, of which I have to tell you: to be sad and sorry at every man's happiness, to be delighted when he sins, and never to be glad of anything except only evil - this is our nature, peerless maiden.")

This is an explanation at once orthodox and well adapted to the needs of the text's implied audience of virgins as well as to those of other possible, more general audiences. Similarly, some of *Margarete's* additions to the Latin legend's prayers show demons as part of the created hierarchy of being in a confidently orthodox way: the saint's greatly expanded invocation of God as creator (see pp.349-50 below) after the dragon appears, for instance, includes demons as part of the natural order - "Feondes habbeð fearlac, ant engles, of þin eie" (22/26-7).

The framework for demonological lore in *Margarete* is thus generally sounder and more informed than the labels of naiveté and sensationalism would suggest. Of itself this orthodoxy would be unremarkable, except that it does indicate a competence and level of understanding not always to be relied on in the other early English versions of the legend. More interesting, however, is the author's general thematic grasp of his source material.

Unlike the saints of her sister legends, Margaret prays less for faith and courage (which she already has) than for the power to see her enemies. In dealing with the proprieties of what may or may

not be seen by human eyes, the EME text uses a distinction available in EME lexis, though one rarely used in Modern English, between what is normally invisible and what ought always to be so, between the *unsehen* (un-seen) and the *unsehelic* (un-see-able). Thus the dragon whom Margaret has prayed to see is "þen unsehene unwiht" (22/6), while the God to whom she prays is "Unsehelic godd" (22/11, italics mine). When she first beholds the black demon, "þa seh ha hwer set an *unsehen* wiht" (24/21), an apparent tautology of which the lexical distinction possible in EME makes sense. Diabolic manifestations are normally unseen because they are improper; the dragon is visible to Margaret and to the beholders in direct response to the saint's prayer, but the idols worshipped by Margaret's persecutor Olibrius are said by her to have "unsehene unwihtes" (42/7) living in them, and these are not seen at any time. When Margaret speaks generally of invisible things she uses 'unsehelic' as in "of alle sehelic þing ant unsehelic ba, swotest ant swetest" (26/24-5, in addressing God): 'unsehen' is reserved for things which ought properly to be invisible because they are unclean.

The full force of this distinction emerges when the topicality of the questions to which it refers and its thematic value for the legend of St Margaret are considered. The Mombricitus text, as Wolpers (n.4) points out, insists on concretization and visualization, but *Margarete's* pointed interest in demonic habitats and consequent degrees of visibility is not due solely to the explicitness of its source, which it in any case greatly extends. It needs to be viewed against a general late twelfth-century concern with what might be called the semiology of apparitions. Contemporary British intellectuals constantly discuss and debate the validity of apparitions as signs. Nancy Partner has vividly described the concern of late twelfth-century historians with regard to the categories of evidence admissible to their records,³⁰ and Benedicta Ward has chronicled the corresponding contemporary debates over miracles and the criteria of their validity.³¹ Decisions as to the validity of appearances in such contexts are made as much by reference to the status and integrity of the perceiver as to empirical evidence. In secular literature there is an analogous concern: this period sees the rise of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Merlin into a major imaginative figure for British and Anglo-French culture: his semi-demonic birth, special powers of perception and prophecy and his mastery of apparitions re-iterate in another genre the problems of legitimate sign reading. For Geoffrey as for John of Salisbury, Apuleius' *De Deo Socrates* is necessary reading and takes on a lease of life great as, though different from, that which it has in the pages of *De civitate dei*: for both writers the figure of the magus and the criteria of legitimacy for his powers are important preoccupations.³²

As Nancy Partner points out, John of Salisbury states the *raison d'être* of record-making in these terms:

My aim, like that of other chroniclers before me, shall be to profit my contemporaries and future generations. For all these chroniclers have had a single purpose; to relate noteworthy matters, so that the invisible things

[*invisibilia Dei*] of God may be clearly seen by the things that are done (italics mine).³³

Gerald of Wales is also concerned with the boundaries of admissible apparitions and the evidence of the spiritual world in a similar way when he considers his own re-telling of the story of Meilyr, a wild man with unusual powers of perception who, though illiterate, could identify false statements on the page of a book because he could see demons pointing to the relevant places (always specially numerous, Gerald adds, if a copy of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* were to be placed in Meilyr's lap). After concluding his story of Meilyr's life and powers, Gerald says

It seems most odd to me, among all these other remarkable circumstances, that Meilyr was able to see these demons [*spiritus illos*] clearly with the eyes in his head [*oculis carneis*]. Spirits cannot be seen with our physical eyes, unless they themselves assume corporal substance [*nisi assumptis corporibus*]. Given that they had assumed such corporal substance, and thus made themselves visible, how was it that they could not be seen by other individuals who were assuredly present and were standing quite near? Possibly they could be seen only by some supernatural sort of physical vision [*corporali visione miraculosa*], rather like that in the Book of Daniel, when King Belshazzar saw the writing on the wall . . .³⁴

Others consider that the ability to perceive demons is purely dependent on the qualities of the perceiver: William of Newburgh gives an account of a peasant whose innocence and simplicity are rewarded by God with this ability. Thrown from his mare this Ketell sees 'two little demons' ("*duos quasi Æthiopes parvulos*") sitting in the road and laughing at him. He perceives that they have no further power to hurt him, goes on his way rejoicing and is given by God the gift of being able to see demons henceforth ("*ab illa die et deinceps daemones haveret conspicabiles*").³⁵

The distinction between *invisibilia Dei* and demonic apparitions handled at lexical level in the EME text also operates in the thematic organization of this version of the legend. Even more than its Mombritius-type source, *Margarete* emphasizes both the inscrutability of God himself and the extent to which his creation is a legible sign of his presence and nature. God's judgements for instance, are "dearne" (18/25, without Latin equivalent, and again at 46/18), but his creation is a legible embodiment of them. Where the Latin source gives a cue for the idea of God as measurer and controller of the created universe, the EME text retains and drives home the idea:

" . . . þu wisest wurhte of alle, merkedest þe heouene ant mete wið þi strakte hond ant wið þe icluhte þe eorðe; þu steoresman of sea-stream, þu wisent ant wealdent of alle wiht þe iwrante beoð

sehelic ant *unsehene*" (46/21-4; italics - indicating phrases without Latin equivalents - mine).

" . . . you, wisest creator of all, marked out and measured the heavens with your extended hand and with your closed hand, the earth: you, controller of the sea's current, *you, guardian and ruler of all creatures that are made, visible and invisible.*"

Again in her prayer after the dragon appears, the Latin Margaret prays to God as the creator and controller of redemptive history:¹⁸

"Deus", inquit, "inuisibilis, quem abissi et thesauri eius contremiscunt; qui formasti paradysum indeficientem, et mari terminum posuisti, et non transibit preceptum tuum; infernum deuastasti; diabolum ligasti; qui extinxisti potestatem draconis magni et uirtutem eius, respice in me et miserere mei . . ." (134/3-8).

("O invisible God", she says, "before whom hell and its fastnesses tremble; who made the imperishable paradise and who set the sea's limits (and it will not transgress your commands); who harrowed hell and bound the devil; who has destroyed the power of the great dragon and his strength, behold me and have mercy on me . . .")

The EME retains this, but greatly elaborates the account of God's nature in terms of his manifestation of himself in the visible world:

"*Unsehelic*e godd, euch godes ful, hwas wreaððe is se gromful þet helle ware ant heouenes ant alle cwiķe þinges cwakieð þer aþeines, aþein þis eisful e whit . . . help me, mi lauerd. Þu wrahtest ant wealdest alle worldliche þing. Deo þet te heieð ant herieð in heouene, ant alle þe þinges þe eardið on eorðe; þe fischeþe þe i þe flodes fleoteð wið finnes, þe fliħinde fuheles þe fleoð bi þe lufte, ant al þet iwraht is, wurcheð þet ti wil is, ant halt þine heastes bute mon ane. Þe sunne reccheð hire rune wið-uten euch reste. Þe mone ant te steorren, þe walkeð bi þe lufte, ne stutteð ne ne studegið, ah sturieð aa mare; ne nohwider of þe wei þet tu hauest iwraht ham ne wrencheð ha neauere. Þu steorest þe sea-strem, þet hit flede ne mot fir þen þu merkest. Þe windes, þe wederes, þe wudes, ant te weattres, buheð þe ant beið. Feondes habbeð fearlac, ant engles, of þin eie. Þe wurmes ant te wilde deor, þet o þis wald wunieð, libbet efter þe lahe þet tu ham hauest iloket, luuewende lauerd; ant tu loke to me ant help me, þin hondiwerd, for al min hope is o þe. Þu herhedest helle ant ouercome ase kempe þe acursede gast þe fundeð to for-do me. Ah her me nu ant help me . . ."

(22/11-32: italics - indicating the few phrases with direct Latin equivalents - mine).

("Invisible God, filled with all goodness, whose wrath

is so fierce that *hell's creatures* and heaven's and all living things *tremble before it*: against this terrible creature . . . help me, my Lord. You made, and control, all earthly things: those who praise and glorify you in heaven, and all the things that dwell on earth; the finned fishes who float in the waters; the winged birds who fly in the air, and everything that is made, does your will and obeys your commands, except man alone. The sun runs her course without any rest. The moon and the stars which revolve through the skies do not cease or stop, but move perpetually; nor do they ever turn out of the course you have wrought for them. *You direct the sea's current so that it may flood no further than you mark out.* The winds, the storms, the woods and the waters bow to you and give you obedience. Devils, and angels, fear your anger. The worms and wild animals who dwell in the forest, live according to the law you have ordained for them, beloved Lord, and may you look on me and help me, your handiwork, for all my hope is in you. *You harrowed hell* and overcame as champion the cursed spirit who tries to destroy me. Hear me now and help me . . .")

The point here is of course not the originality of the expansion, but the informal appropriateness with which standard motifs and ideas are added to emphasize a particular thematic stress.

At Margaret's final prayer, the EME text once again emphasizes the inscrutability of God together with the legible universe of signs he creates. In the Latin we get

"Deus, qui palmo celum mensus es et terram pugillo mensurasti, mari quoque limitem posuisti, exaudi deprecationem meam . . ." (139/30, 140/1-2).

("O God, you who have marked out heaven with your palm and with your fist have measured the earth, and have also set bounds to the sea, hear my prayer . . .")

in the EME, the equivalent prayer is

"Drihtin, leodes lauerð, alle ha beoð duhtie, þah ha dearne beon ant derue, þine domes. Me is nu deað idemet her, ant wið þe lif ilenet: þi milde milce ich þonki hit. Ðu folkes feader of frumscheft, schuptest al þet ischeþen is. Ðu wisest wurhte of alle, merkedest þe heouene ant mete wið þi strahte hond ant wið þe icluhte þe eorðe; þu steores-mon of sea-stream, þu wissent ant wealdent of alle wiht þe iwrahte beoð, seheliche ant unsehene. Buh þine earen, healent godd, ant bei to mine benen . . ." (46/17-26: my italics indicate phrases with Latin cues or equivalents). ("Lord, ruler of men, all your decrees are beneficent, though they are inscrutable and difficult. Death is

now decreed for me here, and life with you granted:
 I thank your gentle mercy for it. You, the father
 of the peoples of creation, made all that is. You,
 wisest creator of all, marked out and measured the
 heavens with your extended hand and with your closed
 hand the earth; you, controller of the sea's current,
 you, guardian and ruler of all creatures that are
 made, visible and invisible. Incline your ears,
 saviour God, and listen to my prayers . . .")

This stress on the created universe as a manifestation of God is the theological and imaginative complement to the demonic manifestations of the legend. Demons and idolatry are naturally and frequently linked with each other in medieval discussion from the late twelfth century onwards, perhaps less through fear of resurgent paganism as a historical actuality than because of the internalization of the demonic pointed to by Norman Cohn (see p.341 above). Demons include among their many attacks on men the predilection for entering idols and giving false responses, or making inanimate natural material appear falsely miraculous so as to distract men into taking so much delight in the beauty of created things as to mistake them for gods, instead of trying to know the Lord of them.³⁶ As Margaret herself says, in an addition to the Latin legend's "idolorum surdorum et mutorum" (138/11-12), it is not only that Olibrius worships "witlese wiht . . . blodles ant banles, dumbe ant deaue baðe" but that "unsehene unwihtes wunieð ham in-wið", and Olibrius honours these as his lords (42/5-9). On the other hand Christian images and imagery are legitimate because "the spiritual realities signified by images are the proper objects of Christian reverence".³⁷

Thus the constant stress in *Margarete* that Olibrius' idols are "wið monnes hond imakede" (14/26) is complemented by the saint's perception of herself as God's creation, as his "handiwerc" (22/29) and his "wummon" (6/19), and her own ability to witness truly to his powers, and to perceive them ("Ich habbe isehen" is Margaret's seven times repeated joyful assertion throughout the EME text's expansion of the Latin's prayer after the dragon's defeat at 26/1-16). *Margarete* is the only one of the three early English versions to create any sort of context for the striking effusion of similes at the beginning of the Latin legend, when Margaret, threatened by the approach of Olibrius's men, places herself in a series of homologies with God's created world: "Video enim me uelut ouem in medio luporum, et facta sum sicut passer ab aucupe in rete comprehensus, et piscis ab hamo, ac uelut a cane caprea" ("I see myself, like a sheep, surrounded by wolves, and I am caught as is a sparrow, seized in a net by the fowler, and as a fish by the hook, and as the roe by the hound", 129/30-3). All versions retain something of this series with minor expansions or additions, but in CCC 303 (172/70-2) and Cotton Tiberius (40/32-3), the similes remain without parallel and without particular purpose as compared with *Margarete* (8/7-10). In *Margarete*, the saint as God's handiwork and as part of his natural created order has thematic relevance in the light of the text's continuing stress on the visible universe as a sign of God.

Margaret's own development as a sign is also notable throughout the text: for instance, in a departure from the Latin's "dolor meus . . . conuertatur in gaudium" (131/15), she asks that her tortures be not seen to have affected God's creature ("pet hit ne seme nohwer, ne suteli o mi samblant, pet ich derf drehe" 14/2-3). The demon, on the other hand, is not to understand "se dearne ant se derf þing of godes dihelnesse" (38/13) as his protection of Margaret and is denied any information about the saint (38/14-16).

Interestingly, ample as the opportunities are for the development of the 'bride of Christ' topos, these are not particularly taken up with regard to Olibrius's and Margaret's confrontation.³⁸ (In *Margarete's* sister legend of *Iuliene*, on the other hand, they are greatly amplified with respect to the saint's confrontation with her father over her fiancé Eleusius.)³⁹ Instead the thematic emphasis is kept on Margaret not so much as Christ's bride but as God's creature, just as in her prayers the thematically distinctive emphasis is less on the preservation of her virginity than on her desire to see and deal with her invisible enemies. Virginity is here principally a sign that Margaret is God's creature ("he hauet his merke on me iseiled", 12/12-13): its *sponsa Christi* aspect is relatively undeveloped in favour of the theme of *invisibilia Dei* and their relation to the visible world.

It is also noteworthy that, especially in comparison with the interior setting of *Iuliene*, *Margarete* has a plethora of external messengers and signs, apart from the saint herself: the dove (cf. 16/15, 28/32, 44/13-15, 48/8), the light (28/30), the shining crosses, earthquakes and thunderings (28/32, 48/9, 44/13-15, 48/7) and the chorus of angels (52/4-5) are all retained from the source with thematic consonance. The English author has not rejected these things with a little learning, but has preserved and elaborated their meaning in a framework of theological orthodoxy which he understands very well, and within which he directs and contextualizes the emotional responses drawn from his audience. So too, the extra emphasis (unusual in the context of the Katherine Group Lives), on Margaret's legacies: these are all an insistence on connections between the visible and invisible worlds *via* legitimate signs. Margaret's presence, then her cult, her *memoria* (which the demon in the EME version explicitly had hoped to stamp out, 28/4-5), her legend, her audience's contact with even the materials on which the legend is transcribed, all testify to the power of valid connection through genuine signs, between heavenly power, and corporeal human existence. In this context, Margaret's dragon makes a fittingly explicit appearance as the saint's, and heaven's, opponent.

The legend of St Margaret reflects its formation in the fifth or sixth century after the era of martyrdoms: it owes far more to ideology than to historical fact. As it reaches its EME re-creator, it is with the increased stridency and propagandist stance of the Mombritius version, with all its insistence on concretization and visualization. This stridency remains in the EME version as Margaret directs and stage-manages her own martyrdom in a series of self-conscious demonstrations and imitations of Christ, hoping from the beginning to be "an of þe moni moder-bern pet swa muchel drehen

for drihtin" (6/3-4), requesting specific signs ("Send me þi sonde i culurene heowe", 16/15) and praying for her bath of torture to become a visible baptism of the spirit ("lef þet hit to me beo beað of blisse ant fulluht of font stan, . . . Cume þe hali gast o culures iliche, þe o þi blisfule nome blesci þeos weattres" 44/3-6) and so on. Her prayers are answered and events and phenomena group themselves around her as validating signs in a highly explicit manner. One consequence of this is that *Margarete* gives far less of a sense of the interior life and growth of a saint than does its sister legend of *Iuliane*. Yet as a mnemonic figure, a sign, of hagiography's purposes, *Margaret* is vivid and unforgettable in her EME re-creation and the context there created for her is one that suitably both reflects and illuminates the particular direction given to hagiographical preoccupations in the legend of this explicit and forceful saint. Her dragon is not a lapse from, but a part of the working method of this version of her legend - a working method which, seen in context, is one of some sophistication. As an English re-handling of a Latin source, the EME *Margarete* is by no means to be despised.⁴⁰

NOTES

- 1 The Early Middle English version of St Margaret's legend is often referred to as *Sainte Marherete*, following the title of F.M. Mack's edition, EETS 193 (London, 1934). *Margarete* is here used throughout, in accordance with the spelling of MS Bodley 34 which will be the base text of the forthcoming edition of the Katherine Group by Dr Bella Millett and myself. I am grateful to my co-workers on the editorial board for their care and attention in the editing of this paper and to my colleague John O'Brien for help with Pseudo-Hugh of St Victor: any remaining errors are my sole responsibility.
- 2 Cecily Clark, "Early Middle English Prose: Three Essays in Stylistics", *Essays in Criticism* 18 (1968) pp.361-82, esp. p.367. Mack, *Marherete* p.xxxii, commends the author's power of vividly arousing horror or pity as a skill which overcomes the "tedious verbal repetition" resulting from the "elaboration demanded by the alliterative method".
- 3 *Acta Sanctorum* Juli V p.37. For further discussion of the Latin versions of Margaret's legend see G.H. Gerould, "A New Text of the *Passio* S. *Margaritae* with Some Account of its Latin and English Relations", *PMLA* 39 (1924) pp.525-56; E.A. Francis, "A Hitherto Unprinted Version of the *Passio Sanctae Margaritae* with Some Observations on Vernacular Derivatives", *PMLA* 42 (1927) pp.87-105; see also Mack, *Marherete*, and references. Professor Cross has recently discovered a hitherto misplaced version of Margaret's *passio* in the course of his work on the Old English *Martyrology*: with his usual kindness he has made his work on this version available to me.
- 4 For a discussion and comparison of the Rebdorf and Mombritius versions see Theodor Wolpers, *Die englische Heiligenlegende des Mittelalters* (Tübingen, 1964) pp.101-6 and pp.170-6.
- 5 For convenience I follow the Mombritius text from the manuscript (MS Harley 2801) printed by Mack, *Marherete*, pp.127-42. Citations from this manuscript will henceforth be identified in the text by page and line numbering as in Mack.
- 6 Text as in Mack, *Marherete*, pp.20 and 22 (MS Bodley 34) but with abbreviations expanded: translation mine.
- 7 See, for example, *draco* and *serpens* in the *Concordantiæ Bibliorum Sacrorum iuxta Vulgatam*, dir. Bonifatius Fischer (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1977). The dragon as enemy has been recently discussed by Northrop Frye, *The Great Code* (London, 1982) p.187f. et passim.
- 8 For some thirteenth-century examples cf. Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De Proprietatibus Rerum* 11, xix (complete text most conveniently available in Trevisa's translation, ed. M.C. Seymour et al. (Oxford, 1975): see especially Vol. 11, pp.86-7), and further, M. Salvat, "La présentation du diable par un encyclopédiste du XIII^e siècle: Barthélémi l'Anglais" in *Le Diable au Moyen Age, Sénéfiance* 6 (Aix-en-Provence, 1979) pp.473-92; Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum* I, V, "De Daemonibus", ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, Bonn and Brussels, 1851; repr. New Jersey, 1966).
- 9 See C.S. Loomis, *White Magic: An Introduction to the Folklore of Christian Legend* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948) p.65 and Appendix.
- 10 Ed. Bruno Assmann, *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben* (Kassel, 1889) no. XV.

- 11 N.R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957) pp.99 and 105.
- 12 Assmann, *Angelsächsische Homilien . . .*, p.175, ll.182-6 (hereafter CCCC 303 is cited in the text by page and line number as in Assmann).
- 13 Cf. e.g., the "Narratio Sancti Augustini" ed. T. Wright and J.O. Halliwell, *Reliquiae Antiquae* (London, 1845) vol. 1, p.59, "So sore ruffyn toggyd his rolle"; Chester Cycle, Play 1, Primus Demon, " . . . Ruffyn, my frende fayer and free, / loke that thou kepe mankinde from blesse" (ll.260-1), ed. R.M. Lumiansky and David Mills, *The Chester Cycle*, EETS SS 3 (London, 1974) p.11. While common in later texts, in Old English this name for the devil occurs only in CCCC 303's version of Margaret's legend and in the Cotton Tiberius A III version (see p.344 and n.26), according to the *OE Microfiche Concordance*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey and R.L. Venezky (Toronto, 1980). The name is used of a heathen man in *Elfric's Lives of the Saints* ed. W.W. Skeat, EETS 76, 82, 94, 114 (London, 1881-1900; repr. as two volumes, 1966) 1, p.472. Written texts are of course not exhaustive evidence: cf. the currency suggested by the existence of William II's nickname, Rufus.
- 14 To be quite fair to CCCC 303, it must be said that some Latin versions do allow Margaret to name the dragon after defeating him but before hearing the black demon's account of him, thus implying a familiarity and control for the saint in her encounter with the demonic which also fore-closes on the audience's emotional identification with the saint's situation. Harley 2801 is among these: "Vidi enim Rufonem demonem in terra prostratum . . ." (134/25-6).
- 15 Ed. Theodore Graesse (Vratislavia, 1890; repr. Osnabrück, 1969) p.401: tr. G. Ryan and H. Ripperger (New York, 1941; repr. 1969) p.353 (with my additions).
- 16 Ed. C. D'Evelyn and A.J. Mill, EETS 235 (London, 1956; repr. 1967) 1, p.297. On CCCC 145, the manuscript used here, see M. Görlach, *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary*, Leeds Texts and Monographs, N.S. 6 (Leeds, 1974) pp.77-9.
- 17 See further Montague Summers, *The History of Witchcraft and Demonology* (London, 1926; repr. 1967) *passim*; *Le Diable au Moyen Age* (cited in note 8 above); J. Burton Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London, 1972) *passim*.
- 18 Burton Russell, *Witchcraft . . .*, pp.109-12.
- 19 *Summa Theologiae*, Ia, 64, iv, 1 and 3, ed. Kenelm Foster, Blackfriars Edition, (London, 1968) pp.296-9.
- 20 *Europe's Inner Demons* (St Albans, 1976) pp.68 and 73.
- 21 Wolpers, *Heiligenlegende . . .*, p.174, suggests that Gregory's dragons are, like the one in the Rebdorf version of Margaret's legend, "nur teuflisches Blendwerk . . . ein Symbol, nicht ein konkretisiertes Ungeheuer", but this does not seem to me to be clearly the case when traditional descriptions of Hell and the life beyond are involved.
- 22 *Dialogues*, II, xxv. I quote from the edition of MS CCCC 322 of Bishop Wærferth's OE translation by H. Hecht, *Bischof Wærferths von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen* (Darmstadt, 1965) p.156. MS CCCC 332 is dated to the second quarter of the eleventh century by

- H. Gneuss, "Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100", ASE (1981) pp.1-60, no.92 and was probably written at Worcester (i.e. in the Katherine Group area).
- ²³ Milton McC. Gatch, *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto, 1977) esp. p.102.
- ²⁴ Sawles Warde ed. J.A.W. Bennett and G.V. Smithers in *Early Middle English Verse and Prose* (Oxford, 1968) p.251, ll.103-7: *Ayenbite of Inwit* ed. R. Morris, EETS 23 (London, 1868; repr. 1895; rev. P. Gradon, 1979) pp.173-4.
- ²⁵ On the manuscript tradition of Pseudo-Hugh of St Victor, see Francis J. Carmody, "De Bestiis et Aliis Rebus and the Latin Physiologus", *Speculum* 13 (1938) pp.153-9: on the dragon's traditional enemy, the elephant, see further J.E. Cross, "The Elephant to Alfred, Ælfric, Aldhelm and others", *Studia Neophilologica* 37 (1965) pp.367-73: on the circulation of Victorine and associated texts in the West Midlands in this period, see the thesis of my student Elaine Hutchins, "An Investigation of Sawles Warde and its Context", MA thesis (Liverpool, 1984) ch.2, "The Latin milieu: the Victorines" pp.26-42 and references.
- ²⁶ Ed. T.O. Cockayne, *Narratiunculæ Anglice Conscriptæ* (London, 1861) pp.39-49. The manuscript is dated as mid-eleventh-century by Ker (*Catalogue*, p.248) and assigned a Christ Church, Canterbury provenance (date and provenance are confirmed by Gneuss, "Manuscripts . . .", no.363). Quotations will be identified in the text by page and line number in Cockayne, *Narratiunculæ*
- ²⁷ J.D.A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English 597-1066* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967) p.171; Ælfric mentions "Iamnes and mambres" as "dry-men" who "fela sædon . . . þurh deofles cræft" (Skeat, *Lives of Saints*, 1, p.373, ll.114-15). The fragment "Mambres Magicus" from MS Cotton Tiberius B V fol. 87 (early eleventh century, Winchester, see Gneuss, "Manuscripts . . .", no. 373) is edited by Cockayne, *Narratiunculæ* . . . , p.50; see also M.R. James, "A Fragment of the 'Penitence of Jannes and Jambres'", *Journal of Theological Studies* 2 (1901) pp.572-7.
- ²⁸ Perhaps the two magicians have become two lands by confusion with Mamre, Abraham's dwelling place (cf. K.R. Brooks, ed., *Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1961) pp.xvii and 89 and p.25, *Andreas*, ll.788-9, " . . . þæt he on Mambre becom/beorhte blican, swa him bebead meotud"). Perhaps this is a further crumb of evidence that a tradition of lands where evil-doers dwelt was known to the Anglo-Saxons, as pointed out by Professors Cross and Hill in their comment on *Adrian and Ritheus'* puzzling "Malefica" (l.20) for the place where Enoch and Elias await their final death (J.E. Cross and T.D. Hill, ed. *The 'Prose Solomon and Saturn' and 'Adrian and Ritheus'* (Toronto, 1982) pp.144-5). The tradition of Neptalim and Zephlon as lands where the inhabitants of Hell await the coming of Christ was also known in OE versions of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (cf. W.H. Hulme, "The OE Gospel of Nicodemus", *PMLA* 13 (1898) pp.457-542, esp. p.497, "þæt land Zabulon 7 þæt land neptalim"; J. Jackson Campbell, "Latin Tradition and the Literary Use of the *Descensus ad inferos* in Old English", *Viator* 3 (1982) pp.107-58). In one or another of these ways, the mistake in CCC 303 may have been a bold and yet quite sensible attempt to make sense of a corrupt or confusing version of the Latin legend.
- ²⁹ One major late twelfth-century intellectual's interest in the matter of the book is indicated by John of Salisbury's discussion of "Jannes and Jambres" as magicians who "vied in signs and miracles with Moses" (*Policraticus* ed. C.J. Webb (Oxford, 1909) I, p.50; tr. Joseph B. Pike,

- Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers* (Minnesota, 1938; rep. New York, 1972) p.40).
- ³⁰ *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago and London, 1977) esp. chapter 5. For a general survey of these issues in medieval thinking, see David L. Jeffrey, ed., *By Things Seen: Reference and Recognition in Medieval Thought* (Ottawa, 1979) Introduction, pp.1-21.
- ³¹ *Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record and Event, 1000-1215* (London, 1982) esp. chapter 1.
- ³² For John of Salisbury see *Policraticus*, I, ix-xiii and II, i-xvii, tr. Pike, *Frivolities* . . . pp.39-54, 55-87, for discussion of signs and their validity, and p.297 for specific reference to *De Deo Socrates*; for Geoffrey of Monmouth see B. Clarke, ed. and tr., *Geoffrey of Monmouth: Vita Merlini Britanniae* ed. Acton Griscom (New York, 1929) VI, xviii, p.381, "Nam ut apulegius de deo socratis perhibet. inter lunam et terram habitant spiritus. quos incubos demones appellamus . . .".
- ³³ Partner, *Entertainments* . . . , p.188, and see M. Chibnall, ed. and tr., *John of Salisbury: Historia Pontificalis* (London, 1956; repr. 1962) p.3.
- ³⁴ Ed. J.F. Dimock, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. VI, Itinerarium Kambriae et Descriptio Kambriae*, Rolls Series (London, 1868) I, v, p.61; tr., Lewis Thorpe, *Gerald of Wales: The Journey Through Wales and The Description of Wales* (Harmondsworth, 1978) pp.120-1.
- ³⁵ Partner, *Entertainments* . . . , p.129, and see R. Howlett, ed., *Historia Rerum Anglicanum* I, 2, xxi "De quodam Ketello, et gratia divinitus illi collata". See also Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus* . . . , V, xxviii.
- ³⁶ See the discussion in Alastair Minnis, *Chaucer and Pagan Antiquity* (Cambridge and Totowa, 1982) ch.2 "The Shadowy Perfection of the Pagans" and references.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, p.38, and see Aquinas, *Summa Ia*, i, ix and x.
- ³⁸ Wolpers, *Heiligenlegende* . . . , p.171, points to the addition of *sponsa Christi* motifs as between the Rebdorf and Mombritus Latin versions, and the motif is still further elaborated as *Margarete* handles it. However, in the context of the English Katherine Group this development is relatively slight.
- ³⁹ See my "*De Liflade of Seinte Iulienne and Hagiographic Convention*" (forthcoming).
- ⁴⁰ As always, Professor Cross has been generous with information and encouragement in the writing of this article: it is all the greater a pleasure to dedicate it to him.