

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Philip Shaw, 'A Dead Killer? Saint Mercurius, Killer of Julian the Apostate, in the Works of William of Malmesbury', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 35 (2004), 1-22

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123791&siloleft.library=GEN01



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

..

**A dead killer?
Saint Mercurius, killer of Julian the Apostate,
in the works of William of Malmesbury¹**

Philip Shaw

Saint Mercurius of Caesarea was perhaps best known in the medieval West through his role in the death of Julian the Apostate. Although the narrative appears in numerous differing versions, the broad outline is usually as follows: Julian, on his way to fight the Persians, passes through Caesarea, where he argues with Basil, the bishop of Caesarea, and leaves, vowing to return and destroy the city. Basil and the citizens of Caesarea then pray for deliverance, and Basil is granted a vision of a lady (often identified as the Virgin Mary) sending Mercurius, who is buried in Caesarea, to kill Julian. Basil then finds Mercurius's arms missing from the church where he is buried, but they reappear the next day covered in blood; some time after this, a messenger arrives to tell how Julian has been killed by a mysterious assailant.

This episode reached the West in Latin translations of the pseudo-Amphilochian *Vita Basilii*.² Mercurius was also known in some areas through a Latin version of his own passion, but extant manuscripts of the *Vita Basilii* are considerably more numerous than those of the *Passio Mercurii*.³ The death of Julian also appears as a freestanding narrative, particularly in collections of Marian miracles.⁴ While Mercurius may not have been the object of cult in many areas in the medieval West,⁵ his role in this episode certainly made him a well-known figure. In particular, the dissemination of the narrative through Marian miracle collections—many of which contain versions of the death of Julian—probably made him more familiar to a wider audience. This article will examine the various contexts in which the killing of Julian by Mercurius appears in England in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, focusing particularly on the role played by William of Malmesbury in the dissemination of the episode, and on his complex attitude to Mercurius.

For Ælfric, around the end of the tenth century, the *Vita Basilii* belonged amongst the lives of those saints culted exclusively by those in ecclesiastical orders, rather than the population at large:

placuit nobis in isto codicello ordinare passiones etiam uel uitas
sanctorum illorum quos non uulgus sed coenobite officiis
uenerantur

[it has pleased us to set out in this volume the passions or lives of
those saints whom monks, rather than the populace at large,
worship in the offices]⁶

Presumably, then, the death of Julian was not well-known outside monastic circles in Ælfric's day. Yet within a hundred and fifty years, William of Malmesbury was able to claim that the death of Julian was a common theme for popular songs:

Iam uero de Iuliani exitu quid attinet dicere, quod pro
magnitudine calamitatis cantatur in truiis.

[Now indeed what is of importance to say concerning the death of
Julian is that it is repeatedly sung in the streets, on account of the
magnitude of the disaster.]⁷

This alteration in the episode's fortunes coincides with the early development of the Marian miracle collections which were to become so prolific in the later Middle Ages. R. W. Southern established in 1958 that such collections arose first in England in the early twelfth century. In particular, he showed that the earliest collections were produced by Anselm the Younger and Dominic of Evesham, whom he describes as 'men united in admiration for the forms of Anglo-Saxon piety'.⁸ His arguments have never been seriously challenged, and his case is a plausible one.

The suggestion that the Anglo-Saxon spiritual tradition was an important factor in the development of such collections bears further examination. This article does not propose to deal with the complete collections, however, but will restrict itself to examining how the Julian the Apostate episode developed and was used in England during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This provides not only an insight into English understandings of, and responses to, Mercurius, but also tends to confirm that this element of the Marian miracle collections was

connected with traditions that stemmed from late Anglo-Saxon England. The popularisation of the episode presents greater difficulties, and will be explored further below. Peter Carter notes in passing William of Malmesbury's comment on the popularity of the Julian the Apostate episode, but does not examine this evidence further.⁹ While attempts to recover the popular, oral dissemination of a story are necessarily fraught with difficulties, in this case it is possible to go some way towards elucidating the growth of this narrative in non-literary contexts.

Before considering the non-literary contexts for Mercurius and the death of Julian, a brief outline of the literary development of this narrative in England in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is in order. Perhaps the earliest case in England of this narrative being excerpted from the *Vita Basilii* is not in a Marian miracle collection, but in *De Miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*, attributed (though probably incorrectly) to a monk named Hermann.¹⁰ This text appears to have been composed around the end of the eleventh century, and is probably a Bury St Edmunds production.¹¹ It describes the miraculous death of Sveinn Forkbeard at the hands of Saint Edmund, and compares this event with Mercurius's killing of Julian. William of Malmesbury summarises the story—but without the comparison with the death of Julian—in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum* and *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*.¹² William appears to have used the *De Miraculis* as a source for this narrative.¹³ William may have known an account by John of Worcester, also omitting the explicit comparison with the death of Julian (though, as we shall see, maybe for different reasons).¹⁴

Hermann's *De Miraculis* provided the main source for a later collection of Edmund's miracles, compiled in several stages at Bury St Edmunds over the course of the twelfth century, and also known as the *De Miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*; Arnold attributes the composition of this text to Abbot Samson of Bury St Edmunds, but Samson's work on the collection (if he worked on it at all) was probably one of the later stages in its development, and mainly editorial.¹⁵ This text repeats the story of the death of Sveinn, but, again, does not refer to the death of Julian. Several later authors give accounts of the death of Sveinn, apparently based mainly on William of Malmesbury, John of Worcester and/or Samson's *De Miraculis*.¹⁶ None of them mention Mercurius or the death of Julian.

While this equation between the death of Julian and the death of Sveinn was being written out of accounts of Sveinn's demise, the death of Julian was nevertheless gaining popularity through the early development of Marian miracle collections. Here again, William of Malmesbury was a pivotal figure. Southern has demonstrated that the Marian miracle collection as a genre developed initially

from two texts: a collection assembled probably by Anselm the Younger during the early twelfth century, and Dominic of Evesham's *De Miraculis Sanctae Mariae*, probably composed shortly after Anselm's collection, and possibly drawing on it for one of its miracles.¹⁷ These two texts present significantly different collections of Marian miracles, with Dominic of Evesham alone providing a version of the death of Julian.

William of Malmesbury, according to Southern and Carter, used the works of both Anselm and Dominic in compiling his own Marian miracle collection, *Miracula Sanctae Mariae Virginis*, probably composed towards the end of his life.¹⁸ That William knew both Anselm's and Dominic's work is broadly plausible, but exactly how he used these texts in composing his own requires further research. Carter states that William's version of the death of Julian is dependent on Dominic's.¹⁹ It appears that he based this claim on the overall shape of the collections (William's includes seven of the fourteen miracles recounted in Dominic's), rather than on textual correspondences between these two versions of this particular miracle. The two versions are quite different in content, wording and approach. William presents the narrative briefly, giving the broad outline but removing incidental details, whereas Dominic gives a much fuller version. Hence Dominic provides a detailed description, with direct speech, of Basil's presentation of bread to Julian, and Julian's angry response, which precipitates Julian's threat to destroy Caesarea. William, on the other hand, removes all the direct speech and reduces this part of the narrative to the bald statement that Basil 'Tulianum apostatam seueriori responso in bilem concitauerat' [he had aroused Julian the Apostate to anger by his more stern reply].²⁰ Dominic's account is also distinctive for its use of unusual or recondite vocabulary; *foenifera* [hay-bearing], *farifera* [grain-bearing], *hominifera* [human-bearing], *floccipenderent* [they should care a straw about].²¹ William's version is not lacking in linguistic ornamentation, but it does not reproduce these terms, and generally reads more straightforwardly. As we shall see, Dominic's attitude to the narrative he is presenting also seems to have differed somewhat from William's. While this does not mean that William did not use Dominic's version in composing his own, it is not improbable that he would have had access to a version of the *Vita Basilii*, which could also have influenced his account.²² A detailed discussion of how William uses his sources for each of the miracles he recounts must await a later, and longer, paper; but the foregoing discussion indicates some of the complexities and difficulties of undertaking such an analysis. J. C. Jennings has identified two manuscripts as preserving Dominic's collection more or less in its original form,

while the majority of the manuscripts give abbreviated or expanded versions of the text, or incorporate it into larger collections.²³ William's *Miracula* is one such larger collection, and his use of the death of Julian in this text must have contributed to the wider dissemination of this episode.

This brief account raises a number of problems, not the least of which is why William of Malmesbury makes no mention of the death of Julian in connection with the death of Sveinn Forkbeard, but does include the death of Julian in his Marian miracle collection. Related to this is the absence of the death of Julian from later accounts of the death of Sveinn; William's influence may have been an important factor in this development. We have also to consider how these two contemporaneous traditions relate to one another, if at all; could the use of the death of Julian as a model for the death of Sveinn have encouraged the inclusion of the death of Julian in Marian miracle collections? Or vice versa? The relationship of these textual traditions to oral traditions in the eleventh and twelfth centuries also remains to be considered. In order to understand the overall trajectory of the death of Julian in England in this period, we need first to understand William of Malmesbury's approach to this narrative.

When the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* describes the crusaders besieged in Antioch making a sally which puts the Turks to flight, it states that the crusaders believed that they saw the 'antiquos martires, qui olim milites fuissent quique mortis pretio parassent premia uitae, Georgium dico et Demetrium, uexillis leuatis a partibus montanis accurrere, iacula in hostes, in se auxilium uibrantes' [ancient martyrs who had been knights in their own day, and who by their deaths had purchased the crown of life, St George and St Demetrius, with flying banners come charging from the hill-country, showering missiles on the enemy, and aid upon themselves].²⁴ The choice of martyrs here is significant; in the *Gesta Francorum* and in Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei per Francos* the same saintly helpers are mentioned, but in these texts George and Demetrius are accompanied by Mercurius.²⁵ R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom identify the *Historia Hierosolymitana* by Fulcher of Chartres as the main source for William's account of the First Crusade.²⁶ They also see this text as the source of much of this particular chapter of the *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, but they note that 'Fulcher does not tell of the appearance of SS. George and Demetrius during the battle'.²⁷ This leaves a problem; William diverges from his main source here, but he does not quite follow either of the possible sources for the appearance of George and Demetrius. Thomson and Winterbottom hint at an answer by pointing out that George and Demetrius, without Mercurius, 'pursue the Turks after the battle of

Dorylaeum' in the *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Expugnantium*.²⁸ This is a possible explanation, but it does involve William seriously mis-reading a text which Thomson and Winterbottom consider to be an 'adaptation' of his main source, Fulcher's *Historia*;²⁹ this is a possibility, certainly, but not a very likely one. It is simpler to suppose that William took the episode from one of the obvious sources—the *Gesta Francorum* or the *Gesta Dei per Francos*—either using a manuscript which lacked Mercurius, or deliberately leaving him out. On the whole the latter suggestion seems more likely.³⁰

The question then becomes, why would William leave out Mercurius? The answer lies, perhaps, in his attitude to revenants from the grave. William's description of George's and Demetrius's wild ride is carefully couched to suggest that William is reporting what the crusaders believed, without necessarily confirming its truth. Yet immediately after this, he comments explicitly on the plausibility of the story: 'Nec diffitendum est affuisse martires Christianis, sicut quondam angelos Machabeis, simili dumtaxat causa pugnantis' [nor can we deny that martyrs have aided Christians, at any rate when fighting in a cause like this, just as angels once gave help to the Maccabees].³¹ Clearly, William was decidedly dubious about this episode, and seeks to suggest that there are good precedents for this sort of saintly activity, whilst at the same time stopping well short of claiming veracity for this particular instance. It is in this light that we should assess the absence of Mercurius in this episode.

William expresses considerable doubt about revenants re-animating their bodies. Elsewhere in the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* he pours scorn on claims that King Alfred's spirit used to return to his body and walk around in it.³² In making a case for saintly intervention in battles, William chooses angels as his example; these are saints who cannot re-animate their own corpse, because they do not have a corpse. Of course, George and Demetrius do have corpses, but William is careful not to claim that they are appearing in the form of their own re-animated corpses; he simply claims that they appeared. This suggests an interesting reason for William to omit Mercurius. Most versions of the death of Julian present Mercurius—sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly—as re-animating his own corpse in order to kill Julian. This seems to be how Fulbert of Chartres, in the early eleventh century, understood the story; he writes in his first *Sermo De Nativitate Beatissimae Mariae Virginis* that Mary 'mortuum [Mercurium] suscitavit' [re-animated the dead [Mercurius]].³³ Ælfric's homily on the assumption of Mary, probably written before Fulbert's, seems to have been concerned with exactly how the dead Mercurius, 'ðam deadlican cwellere' [the

dead killer], could kill Julian: 'ða ða seo halige cwen hine asende swa swa we nu hwene ær sædon. þa ferde his gast swyftlice. & mid lichamicum wæpne þone godes feond ofstang' [then the holy queen sent him, just as we have said heretofore. Then his spirit travelled quickly and stabbed to death the enemy of God with a physical weapon].³⁴ Clearly, Fulbert and Ælfric are imagining the miracle in rather different ways; Fulbert appears to be claiming that Mary revived Mercurius bodily from death, whereas Ælfric seems to draw a distinction between Mercurius's actual, physical weapons and the saint himself, who is never re-animated, but goes as a soul to kill Julian. William knew Fulbert's sermon, as he used it as a source in composing the prologue to his *Miracula*.³⁵ Whether or not he knew Ælfric's homily is harder to determine.³⁶ It is possible that William's omission of Mercurius is not a mistake, but a deliberate choice, reflecting his unease with a saint best-known in the West for re-animating his own corpse. Ælfric attempts to present Mercurius not as a revenant, but simply as a soul. Both Ælfric and William are out of step with other accounts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and both, apparently, because of a desire to avoid encouraging belief in bodily re-animation of the dead.

Such a rationale would explain some of William's alterations to the account of the death of Sveinn in his source, Hermann's *De Miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*. Most obviously, it would explain why he excises all mention of the death of Julian from his version. A careful comparison of his version with that in the *De Miraculis* reveals that William does not simply remove explicit mention of the death of Julian—he also presents the death of Sveinn in a way which minimises its similarities with the death of Julian:

Sed non diu propitia diuinitas in tanta miseria siuit fluctuare Angliam, siquidem peruasor continuo ad Purificationem sanctae Mariae, ambiguum qua morte, uitam effudit. Dicitur quod terram sancti Edmundi depopulanti martir idem per uisum apparuerit, leniterque de miseria conuentum suorum insolentiusque respondentem in capite perculerit; quo dolore tactum in proximo, ut predictum est, obisse.

[However, the divine Mercy did not long leave England tossing in this sea of misery, for the invader soon met his end on the Purification of St Mary, by what form of death is disputed. It is said that while he was ravaging the lands of St Edmund, the martyr himself appeared to him in a vision and complained mildly

about the miseries of his community; and when he returned an insolent reply, the saint struck him on the head a blow from the pain of which he shortly afterwards died, as I have said.]³⁷

This account is a great deal shorter than the account in Hermann's *De Miraculis*, and it removes an important character from the narrative. The version in the *De Miraculis* involves a monk, Egelwin, whose prayers on behalf of the oppressed people of a locality from which Sveinn was demanding tribute are heard by Edmund:

Inter hæc præfato monacho querela populi commanentis eo notificata sancto, meruit sincera cordis ejus fiducia juxta quod petierat exaudiri, et ab ingruenti oppressione per opacæ noctis silentia, deditus sopori, ut humanus expetit usus, revelari [sic]. Tunc felix EADMUNDUS suorum misertus, verba cum minis rei Sueyn mittit, dicens, 'In meos quid furis, quid tributarios facis? Cessa, cessa tributum exigere, quod nullo dederunt sub rege, nec requisitum vel persolutum fuit post me eorum aliquorum tempore, quia si te ab hac infestatione non removes, prope cognosces quod Deo michique pro populo displices.'

[Among these complaints of the people remaining with the aforesaid monk, which were made known to the saint, the uncorrupted faith of his heart deserved to be heard according to what he had requested, and to be relieved from the assailing oppression through the silence of the dark night, when he was given over to sleep, as human custom demanded. Then blessed Edmund took pity on his people, and sent words with threats to king Sveinn, saying, 'Why do you steal from my people, why do you exact tributes? Stop, stop demanding tribute, which they have paid under no king, nor has it been demanded or paid after me in the time of the other kings, because if you do not desist from this persecution, you will soon come to know that you displease God and myself by your treatment of the people.']³⁸

Egelwin is a key character in Hermann's *De Miraculis*, fulfilling the role played by Basil in the death of Julian. The narrative—unlike William of Malmesbury's version—is a complex one, in which Egelwin visits Sveinn and is rebuffed. In this

passage, Egelwin appears to be a party to Edmund's exchange with Sveinn through a vision. William, however, states only that Edmund appeared to Sveinn in a vision, giving no indication how anyone could know what passed between the two in this vision. Thus William lessens the similarity between the death of Sveinn and that of Julian by removing the Basil-figure from the former. At the same time, William makes the death of Sveinn seem less credible by presenting it in such a way that the story seems to rely on having access to a vision seen only by Sveinn himself, and which appears to have been fatal. Removing Egelwin as a witness to this vision makes the narrative seem particularly unreliable.

In addition to removing the witness, William also removes the weapon from his account. While William simply states that Edmund struck Sveinn on the head, Hermann's *De Miraculis* twice claims that Sveinn was 'perfossum cuspidē' [run through with a point].³⁹ Here William accurately yet misleadingly summarises his source in order to remove any hint of the spear with which Saint Mercurius kills Julian in the *Vita Basilii*.⁴⁰ This all seems to be consistent with the idea that William was concerned to play down similarities between the death of Sveinn and that of Julian; and it also suggests that Mercurius, as a revenant, was not a figure William wished to propagate. Yet William does exactly that by including the death of Julian in his *Miracula*.

This may seem inconsistent, but a closer examination of William's *Miracula* suggests that this need not be the case. William describes Basil's vision of Mary and Mercurius, and the death of Julian, in the following terms:

Tertia igitur die uidit Basilius in somnis felicissimam dominam in excellenti throno propter templum considerare, caelicolasque ministros, magna frequentia et reuerentia, assistere. Tum illam uocem iocundam pro imperio emittere: 'Vocate mihi Mercurium qui eat interficere Iulianum, in dominum et filium meum anhelō spiritu insanientem'. Illum uocatum affuisse, statimque, nuntio accepto, cum lancea iter adorsum. Is festiuitatis agregiae miles fuerat, et in eadem urbe, gentilium tempore, pro Christo passus, uitam praesentem spe futurae abiecerat. Igitur pontifex, sopore fugato, uno tantum conscio, ceteris dormire permissis, ad sculpendam somni ueritatem, ex monte, nam ibi res agebatur, in urbem ire contendit. Veniensque ad sepulcrum martyris, lanceam, quae ibi ad memoriam seruabatur, non repperit. Consultus aedituus, per quiquid sanctum est, iurat uesperī eam ibi fuisse.

Nec multo post rumore in uulgu effuso, ipsoque populo ad laudes Mariae experrecto, reperta est loco suo lancea, recenti cruore rorans. Satisque constat illa nocte, ut tradunt historiae, inuisibili uulnere uita caruisse Iulianum, ut qui malitia sua turbauerat superos, truci anima grauaret etiam inferos.

[Therefore on the third day Basil saw in dreams a most blessed mistress sitting on an exalted throne before the church, and heaven-dwelling servants, in a great and reverent throng, standing with her. Then she sent forth her delightful voice in command: 'Call Mercurius to me, who may go to kill Julian, who raves against my son and lord with his breathless spirit'. When he was summoned he appeared and, having received the command, he immediately began his journey with his lance. He was a soldier of excellent joy, and in that same city, in the time of the pagans, having suffered for Christ, he threw away his present life for hope of the life to come. Therefore the bishop, when his sleep had been driven away and he alone was awake, allowed the others to sleep, and hurried from the mountain (for there the event happened) into the city, in order to ascertain the truth of the dream. And coming to the martyr's tomb, he did not find the lance which was kept there to serve as a memorial. When he questioned the sacristan, he swore by whatever is holy that it had been there that evening. Not long afterwards, when the rumour had spread among the people, and the populace themselves had been roused to the praises of Mary, the lance was found in its place, dripping with fresh blood. And it is generally agreed that that night, as the histories inform us, Julian was deprived of life by an invisible wound, so that he who, by his malice, threw the upper regions into disorder, might burden hell with his savage spirit.]⁴¹

This treatment of the miracle is strikingly different from that in the *Vita Basilii*. It is also, as mentioned above, quite different from Dominic of Evesham's account. Where William presents the populace's knowledge of the miracle as deriving from 'rumor', Dominic, following the *Vita Basilii* more closely, states that Basil 'evigilavit cunctos, enarrans eis iuxta praelibatam visionem magnalia Dei et celerem misericordiam piissimae matris Domini' [woke everyone up, recounting to them, according to the aforesaid vision, the mighty deeds of God and the swift

mercy of the most pious mother of the Lord].⁴² Dominic claims the authority of the *Historia Tripartita* for his account of how Julian was killed, by a soldier on a white horse, who was invisible to all but Julian himself.⁴³ William, while he may be alluding to Dominic's use of the *Historia Tripartita* by his use of the phrase 'ut tradunt historiae' [as the histories inform us], completely removes the killer from this section of his narrative, by claiming that Julian died not at the hands of an invisible assailant, but 'inuisibili uulnere' [by an invisible wound].

It would appear, then, that William does not simply abridge the story. He quite deliberately reshapes the narrative, undermining Mercurius's role while carefully preserving a miraculous quality in the narrative (the invisible wound remains miraculous, despite the absence of the saint inflicting it). He cannot, of course, remove Mercurius entirely, but by removing Mercurius from the actual act of killing Julian, and by reducing this killing to a brief statement that Julian died from an invisible wound, he avoids dwelling on the gory details of Julian's death (which may have provided much of the episode's popular appeal) and he avoids the issue of Mercurius's re-animation. This reduction of Mercurius's role also serves to highlight and strengthen that of Mary, who is, after all, the key figure in the *Miracula*.

It is initially surprising, then, to find that William includes a brief summary of Mercurius's passion: 'Is festiuitatis egregiae miles fuerat, et in eadem urbe, gentilium tempore, pro Christo passus, uitam praesentem spe futurae abiecerat' [He was a soldier of excellent joy, and in that same city, in the time of the pagans, having suffered for Christ he threw away his present life for hope of the life to come].⁴⁴ Clearly William was not utterly hostile to Mercurius, as this information could easily have been omitted. He may have felt it necessary to provide some sort of basic background information about a saint who was not likely to be very familiar to his audience. This information could also be seen as focusing attention away from Mercurius's role in the death of Julian and onto his passion—which is a not atypical narrative for an early Roman martyr, and one which is unlikely to have troubled William, if he knew it.⁴⁵ At any rate, while William is very happy to edit the death of Sveinn in order to cut out Mercurius entirely, in the rather different context of his Marian miracle collection he is prepared to repeat the story of the death of Julian. He is careful, however, to downplay Mercurius's role as a revenant in this narrative.

The emphasis on Mary's role in the death of Julian in the *Miracula* may also be significant. Hermann's *De Miraculis* does not include Mary (or any comparable figure) in its account of the death of Sveinn; while it has counterparts

for Mercurius and Basil in Edmund and Egelwin, the miraculous element in this narrative is entirely the work of Edmund. If William was averse to the notion of individuals re-animating their corpses, then the idea that Mercurius could be seen as behaving independently in the death of Julian episode would have been problematic for him. If Mercurius were to be seen as paralleling Edmund, then this could cause an audience to believe that Mercurius was the principal miracle-worker in the death of Julian, and therefore that he re-animated his own corpse. William's account of the death of Julian in his *Miracula* avoids this difficulty by presenting the narrative with appropriate emphasis on Mary as performing the miracle. Even if the audience interpreted Mercurius as going body and soul to kill Julian—as they were probably inclined to do—they are still seeing not a revenant from the grave, but an individual miraculously raised from death; something more familiar from scripture, and altogether more palatable for William.

William's response to Mercurius seems atypical. Although Samson's *De Miraculis* and most later texts do not mention the death of Julian as a parallel for that of Sveinn, these texts do not evidence any concern to downplay similarities between the two episodes—quite the reverse. The vagueness of the expression 'perfossum cusvide' [run through with a point] was exploited in a rather different fashion by Samson's *De Miraculis* than it was by William. Where William summarised this so as to make no mention of a weapon at all, the *De Miraculis* echoes its source's turn of phrase, rendering the first instance of 'perfossum cusvide' as 'lancea perfossum' [run through with a lance].⁴⁶ The second instance is treated more freely, making it clear that Edmund is the wielder of the lance: 'sancti Ædmundi lancea rex Swein transverberatus occubuit' [king Sveinn died, pierced through by the lance of Saint Edmund].⁴⁷ No longer do we have Edmund stabbing Sveinn with some indeterminate pointed object; in Samson's *De Miraculis*, Edmund behaves very specifically like Mercurius in the *Vita Basilii*, who uses his lancea to kill Julian.⁴⁸ The description in Samson's *De Miraculis* of the moment of Sveinn's death is much fuller than that in Hermann's *De Miraculis*, and echoes the account in the *Vita Basilii*:

Samson's *De Miraculis*:

intra cubiculum regi adhuc vigilanti subito miles astitit ignotus, miræ pulchritudinis, vibrantibus armis ornatus. Vocansque proprio nomine regem ait, "Vis habere tributum, O rex, de terra sancti Ædmundi? Surge, ecce, suscipe illud." Qui consurgens, in

toro resedit, sed mox conspectis armis terribiliter vociferari cœpit. Quem continuo miles, *impetu* facto, lancea *perfossum abscedens* reliquit.

[Within the bedroom of the king, who was still awake, an unknown soldier of wondrous beauty was suddenly present, adorned with glittering arms. And calling the king by his own name he said, 'You want to have tribute, O king, from the country of Saint Edmund? Lo, get up, receive it.' He, raising himself, sat up in bed, but immediately caught sight of the weapons and began to cry out terribly. The soldier forthwith made his attack and, departing, left him run through with a lance.]⁴⁹

Vita Basilii:

transacta nocte septima militum excubiæ eum custodirent, quidam *ignotus miles cum armis* aduenit, & lanceam valide *vibrans*, *terribili impetu* eum *confodit*, moxque *abcedens* nusquam comparuit: at miserrimus ille horrendum in modum dire vociferans, blasphemansque expirauit.

[When the seventh night had come to an end and a guard of soldiers was guarding him, a certain unknown soldier came with his arms, and, forcefully wielding his lance, pierced him through with a terrible attack, and, departing immediately, was nowhere to be found: but that most wretched man, crying out terribly and blaspheming in a horrible manner, died.]⁵⁰

The shared vocabulary in these passages is marked in italics. While this is clearly not a slavish copy of the account in the *Vita Basilii*—indeed, the incorporation of Edmund's speech precludes such copying—this version of the episode does seem to be quite deliberately modelled after the death of Julian in the *Vita Basilii*.

The same tendency is reflected in some of the other versions of this narrative. Matthew Paris's *La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei*, for instance, composed between 1236 and 1245, is explicit about the weapon used being a lance: 'La nuit li vint la vengeance / Ke acurez fu d'une launce' [Vengeance came to him during the night, and he was run through by a lance].⁵¹ The account given by John of

Worcester (and followed by Simeon of Durham and Roger of Hoveden) was perhaps influenced by Hermann's *De Miraculis*, as it repeats that text's use of the word *cuspis*; and it may be related to the earliest stage (between c. 1100 and c. 1124) of Samson's *De Miraculis*, which also reports that Sveinn 'vociferari cœpit' when he saw Edmund approaching.⁵² This account also appears to have made use of Dominic of Evesham's version of the death of Julian, or something like it, as it notes specifically that Edmund was visible only to Sveinn, just as Mercurius is visible only to Julian in Dominic's narrative.⁵³ Clearly, John recognised the similarities between the death of Sveinn and that of Julian (or had access to the explicit parallel in Hermann's *De Miraculis*), and was happy to make this parallel more obvious by incorporating elements from a version of the death of Julian. This presents a sharp contrast with William of Malmesbury's evident concern to dissociate Edmund's miracle from the death of Julian. While we cannot demonstrate with any certainty that this literary trend went hand in hand with an oral tradition concerning the death of Julian, the readiness with which these authors incorporated elements of the death of Julian into the death of Sveinn suggests that we can probably trust William's claim for popular dissemination of the death of Julian.

It is striking, however, that explicit references to Mercurius and the death of Julian tend not to return to versions of the death of Sveinn during this period. The relationship between these two miracles seems to have been one which was obvious, and, perhaps for that very reason, not referred to directly. This relationship can perhaps allow us to say something about the way the death of Julian episode spread in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and in particular, how it moved out of the narrow context of monastic devotions to Basil of Caesarea and became a popular story. As Mary Clayton has shown, Marian cult was an important aspect of Anglo-Saxon Christianity and especially of the programme of worship in the monastic centres of the Benedictine Reform, in particular Winchester.⁵⁴ The possibilities of the death of Julian as a Marian miracle were exploited in England by Ælfric and on the Continent by Fulbert of Chartres, demonstrating that already in the early eleventh century the episode was beginning to be viewed by some from a Marian perspective. This Marian approach to the episode, already apparent in late Anglo-Saxon England, could have contributed to its ready adoption into the developing genre of Marian miracle collections in twelfth-century England.

This need not indicate a spread of the episode beyond the monastic context within which Ælfric situates the *Vita Basilii*. Fulbert does write of the episode

that 'haec historia notissima est' [this narrative is extremely well-known], but it is not clear whether this refers to the currency of the narrative only among ecclesiastics or also among the laity.⁵⁵ While he (like Ælfric) gives only two examples of Marian miracles—the death of Julian, and the story of Theophilus—he does claim that 'plurima scripta sunt exemplorum argumenta' [several proofs from examples have been written].⁵⁶ We need not suppose that he is referring to a Marian miracle collection, but this does suggest that he was reading existing texts with an eye for the Marian miracles contained within them; and it is plausible that this sort of interest in Marian miracles should have contributed to the development of the early collections.

Ælfric's and Fulbert's interests in Marian miracles are to a large extent the product of their usefulness as arguments for expanding Marian cult. Such arguments are not, however, the stuff of popular culture. The extension of the death of Julian into the popular sphere in England may have had little to do with the monastic-centred expansion of Marian devotion in the Benedictine Reform. By the later eleventh century, devotion to the Virgin may have become more a part of the laity's experience of religion. This is also the period in which Hermann's *De Miraculis* was composed. This text ignores the Marian aspect of the death of Julian, focussing instead on Mercurius as the miracle-worker, and hence promoting Edmund as the key figure in the killing of Sveinn. This rejection of the Marian aspect of the miracle may well have been one of the elements of this account which troubled William of Malmesbury. An account focussing on Mercurius could, nevertheless, have been precisely the sort of narrative which helped to popularise the death of Julian. William's comment on the popularity of the episode refers to it as Julian's *exitus* (rather than a miracle of Mary, or, indeed, Mercurius) and states, not without a trace of disapproval, that it is sung 'pro magnitudine calamitatis' [on account of the magnitude of the disaster]. If the episode is presented in this way, Mary's role can be largely, or even wholly, ignored; but Mercurius still has to kill Julian, and thus Mercurius's role remains central, as in Hermann's *De Miraculis*. As I have discussed, the late eleventh century also saw the spread of a new crusade-miracle involving Mercurius. This narrative would probably also have heightened awareness of Mercurius among the wider population. The death of Sveinn, moreover, links Mercurius and the death of Julian with a popular English saint. These factors seem likely to have contributed to the spread of this episode from monastic devotions and theological arguments into popular, oral tradition. The use of Mercurius as a comparison for

Edmund in Hermann's *De Miraculis* in particular may reflect—or even have contributed to—the episode's popularity as reported by William of Malmesbury.

If English popular culture in the early twelfth century was disseminating a version of this narrative which tended to focus on Mercurius killing Julian, rather than on Mary's role as the miracle's instigator, the Marian miracle collections of this period were taking the opposite approach. These texts may not initially have been widespread or popular. Yet they were disseminated widely in the thirteenth century, and many of the stories contained in them probably became part of popular culture as a result. In the case of the death of Julian, however, there was popular interest in the story already in the early twelfth-century, focussing on Mercurius as the killer of Julian—and this was gradually eclipsed over the course of the twelfth century, largely thanks to Marian miracle collections, by a version of this miracle which instead emphasises Mary causing Mercurius to kill Julian. William of Malmesbury would, no doubt, have been pleased.

NOTES

¹ This article is a much-revised version of a paper delivered at 'Homicidal Tendencies: Murder and Manslaughter in Western Iconography and Literature', Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Leeds, 10 January 2003. I would like to thank all those at the symposium, whose comments and suggestions have been invaluable, and especially Victoria Thompson. I would also like to thank Margaret Cormack, who first got me started on Edmund and Mercurius, Penny Simons for her aid with Anglo-Norman verbs, and Justin Hastings-Merriman, who read and commented on a draft of this piece. Any errors which remain are mine alone.

² For a brief introduction to the *Vita Basilii*, see John Wortley, 'The pseudo-Amphilochian *Vita Basilii*: an apocryphal life of Saint Basil the Great', *Florilegium*, 2 (1980), 217-39.

³ See *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Manuscripta* (<http://bhllms.fltr.ucl.ac.be/>, accessed 27 September 2004), nos. 1022-1024 (*Vita Basilii*) and nos. 5933-5934 (*Passio Mercurii*).

⁴ For a useful survey of the 'miracles of the Virgin' genre, see Guy Philippart, 'Le récit miraculaire marial dans l'Occident médiéval', in *Marie: Le Culte de la Vierge dans la Société Médiévale*, ed. by Dominique Iogna-Prat, Éric Palazzo and Daniel Russo (Paris: Beauchesne, 1996), pp. 563-90.

⁵ An exception would appear to be the Beneventan area, as Mercurius appears in the Beneventan liturgy: see the Beneventan antiphons in *CURSUS: An Online Resource of Medieval Liturgical Texts* (<http://www.cursus.uea.ac.uk/>, accessed 27 September 2004), nos. c1410, c1453, c1649, c4070 and c4633.

⁶ *Aelfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. by Walter W. Skeat, EETS, 76, 82, 94 and 114, 2 vols (London: Trübner, 1881-1900), 1, p. 2. My translation.

⁷ From William of Malmesbury's Commentary on Jeremiah, quoted in Peter Carter, 'The historical content of William of Malmesbury's Miracles of the Virgin Mary', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 127-65 (p. 139, n. 2), from Oxford, Bodleian MS 868, fol. 105^r. My translation.

⁸ R. W. Southern, 'The English origins of the "Miracles of the Virgin"', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, 4 (1958), 176-216 (p. 177). On the authorship of Dominic see pp. 182-83; on that of Anselm see pp. 183-200.

⁹ Carter, 'Historical content', p. 139.

¹⁰ On the authorship of this text, see Antonia Gransden, 'The composition and authorship of the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi* attributed to "Hermann the Archdeacon"', *Journal of*

Medieval Latin, 5 (1995), 1-52 (pp. 39-44). Although Gransden's argument against the attribution to Hermann is convincing, for the sake of clarity I will refer to this text as Hermann's *De Miraculis*.

¹¹ On the dating of the *De Miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*, see *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. by Thomas Arnold, Rolls Series 96, 3 vols (London: HMSO, 1890-6), 1, pp. xxviii-xxix and 33, note (a). Gransden agrees with Arnold that the author usually identified as Hermann was probably writing shortly after the death of Abbot Baldwin of Bury St Edmunds, in 1097 or 1098, but argues that he may have taken much of the story of the death of Sveinn from 'a now lost work of St. Edmund's miracles and cult composed late in Ethelred II's reign (978-1016)': 'The composition and authorship', p. 26. If she is correct, this would place the origins of this narrative very close to the date of Sveinn's death. See also Rodney M. Thomson, 'Two versions of a saint's life from St. Edmund's abbey: Changing currents in XIIth century monastic style', *Revue Bénédictine*, 84 (1974), 383-408 (p. 386).

¹² *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. by R. A. B. Mynors, completed by R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998-1999), 1, p. 308. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi De gestis Pontificum Anglorum Libri Quinque*, ed. by N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series 52 (London: Longman, 1870), p. 155.

¹³ See *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2, p. 163.

¹⁴ See *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. by R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995-), 2, p. 476; on the relationship between the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* and John's *Chronicle*, see pp. lxxvii-lxxiii in the introduction to this volume. On the possibility of William's use of John elsewhere, see *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2, pp. 70 and 93.

¹⁵ See *Memorials of St. Edmund's*, ed. Arnold, pp. xxxix-xl. Arnold's text is taken from a mid-thirteenth-century manuscript, which represents a late stage in the text's development; Thomson, 'Two versions', pp. 385-93, sees this text as one influenced by Samson's editorial activities, as well as some alterations after Samson. Gransden, 'The composition and authorship', p. 5 note 22, states that she does not find Thomson's arguments for Samson's role in the process entirely satisfactory, but gives no reasons for this. For the sake of clarity, I will refer to this text as Samson's *De Miraculis*.

¹⁶ These include Matthew Paris in his *Abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae*, in *Matthæi Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani: Historia Anglorum*, ed. by Frederic Madden, Rolls Series 44, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1866-1869), and in *La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei*, ed. by Kathryn Young Wallace (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1983), pp. 6-7; Simeon of Durham, *Historia Regum*, in volume 2 of *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, ed. by Thomas Arnold, Rolls Series 75, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1882-1885), 2, pp. 145-46; John Lydgate in 'To St. Edmund' in *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, ed. by Henry Noble MacCracken, EETS

e.s. 107 and EETS o.s. 192, 2 vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1911-1934), 1, pp. 124-27 (p. 126); and at greater length in the collection of Edmund's miracles—in Lydgate's style, but not certainly by him—added to his verse life of Edmund, edited in *Altenglische Legenden: Neue Folge, mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen*, ed. by C. Horstmann (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1881), pp. 428-440 (pp. 428-33); Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. by Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-1980), 1, p. 156; and Roger Hoveden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series 51, 4 vols (London: Longman, 1868-1871), 1, p. 78. The accounts of Roger and Simeon are clearly derived from John of Worcester's, with which they are almost identical. It is surprising, as Bell has remarked, to find that Gaimar, who demonstrates an 'obvious knowledge of St. Edmund materials', makes no mention of this miracle in his brief account of Sveinn's death: *L'Estoire des Engleis*, ed. by Alexander Bell (Oxford: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1960), p. 254 (note to lines 4157-62; see p. 132 for the text of this passage).

¹⁷ For the development of Anselm's collection, and the period in which it was assembled, see Southern, 'English origins', pp. 198-200. On the date of Dominic's collection and its relationship with Anselm's, see Carter, 'Historical content', p. 137. As Southern points out ('English origins', p. 199), Anselm was for a while abbot of Bury St Edmunds. It would therefore seem likely that he was aware of the earlier *De Miraculis*, although his collection of Marian miracles does not seem to have included a version of the death of Julian.

¹⁸ See Southern, 'English origins', pp. 200-201 and Carter, 'Historical content', pp. 133-37.

¹⁹ Carter, 'Historical content', p. 133.

²⁰ 'El libro De Laudibus et Miraculis Sanctae Mariae de Guillermo de Malmesbury, O. S. B. († c. 1143)', ed. by J. M. Canal, *Claretianum: Commentaria Theologica Opera et Studio Professorum Collegii Internationalis Claretianum de Urbe*, 8 (1968), 71-242 (p. 133). My translation.

²¹ 'El libro "De Miraculis Sanctae Mariae" de Domingo de Evesham (m.c. 1140)', ed. by José-María Canal, *Studium Legionense*, 39 (1998), 247-283 (pp. 269). My translations.

²² Canal does not suggest a specific textual link between William's and Dominic's versions of the death of Julian, instead pointing to the *Vita Basilii* as the ultimate source for both accounts; but he agrees with Carter in believing William to have been influenced by Dominic's work (see 'El libro "De Miraculis"', ed. by Canal, p. 269 (n. 21) and p. 92; Carter, 'Historical content', p. 137). It does not seem likely that William did not know Dominic's work, but further work on exactly how William used this source would be invaluable.

²³ J. C. Jennings, 'The writings of Prior Dominic of Evesham', *English Historical Review*, 77 (1962), 298-304 (pp. 300-301).

²⁴ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 1, pp. 638-39.

²⁵ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2, p. 320.

²⁶ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2, p. 299.

²⁷ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2, p. 320.

²⁸ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2, p. 320.

²⁹ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2, p. 312.

³⁰ The manuscript variants noted in Hill's edition of the *Gesta Francorum* do not include the omission of Mercurius: *The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Nelson, 1962), p. 69; see also pp. xxxviii-xlii on the manuscripts of this text. Likewise, the edition of the *Gesta Dei per Francos* in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, 5 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1844-1895), 4, pp. 113-263 (p. 206) does not indicate a manuscript variant involving the omission of Mercurius. Of course, this is not proof that a manuscript containing such a variant does not and did not exist—indeed, no proof of this is possible—but it suggests that on the whole it is likely that the copies of these texts available to William would have included Mercurius.

³¹ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 1, pp. 638-39.

³² *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 1, p. 196.

³³ 'Texto crítico de algunos sermones marianos de San Fulberto de Chartres o a él atribuibles', ed. by J. M. Canal, *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 30 (1963), 55-87 (p. 60). This passage can also be found in *Patrologia Latina*, 141, col. 323B. My translation.

³⁴ *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series: Text*, ed. by Peter Clemoes, EETS s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 438. My translation. On the relative dating of Fulbert's and Ælfric's versions, see Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 240.

³⁵ Carter, 'Historical content', p. 133.

³⁶ Ælfric's explanation that Mercurius's spirit undertook the killing, but with a physical weapon, follows a brief explanation of Mercurius's martyrdom. As Loomis has pointed out, a similar explanation of the martyrdom appears in Adgar's mid-twelfth-century Anglo-Norman collection of Marian miracles: Laura Hibbard Loomis, 'The Saint Mercurius legend in medieval England and in Norse saga', in *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, ed. by Thomas A. Kirby and Henry Bosley Woolf (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1949), pp. 132-43 (p. 135 and pp. 138-139). As we shall see, William of Malmesbury also includes a very brief explanation of Mercurius's passion in his version of the death of Julian in his *Miracula*. It is possible that Ælfric, William and Adgar all had a similar Latin exemplar in front of them; the similarities between these passages are not so striking as to suggest a direct relationship between any two of them, although this cannot be ruled out. If Godden is correct to identify the anonymous *Certamen Sancti Mercurii Martyris* as Ælfric's source for this passage, these three authors may all have had access to versions of this text: M. R. Godden, 'The Sources of Catholic homilies

Saint Mercurius in the works of William of Malmesbury

1.30 (Cameron B.1.1.32)' (1990), *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register*, <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/> (accessed 30 September 2004).

³⁷ *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 1, pp. 308-9.

³⁸ *Memorials of St. Edmund's*, 1, p. 35. My translation; note that 'revelari' is clearly an error for 'relevari', and has been translated accordingly.

³⁹ *Memorials of St. Edmund's*, 1, pp. 37 and 38. My translation.

⁴⁰ *De Probatis Sanctorum Historiis, Partim ex Tomis Aloysii Lipomani, Doctissimi Episcopi, Partim etiam ex Egregiis Manuscriptis Codicibus*, ed. by Laurentius Surius, 6 vols (Cologne: Calenius, 1570-1576), 1, 10. A version of the *Vita Basilii* fairly similar to that printed by Surius was apparently circulating in England by the time Ælfric wrote *Catholic Homilies*, first series, number 30: see Godden, 'The Sources of Catholic homilies 1.30 (Cameron B.1.1.32)', *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register*, <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/>.

⁴¹ 'El libro De Laudibus', ed. by Canal, pp. 133-34. My translation.

⁴² 'El libro "De Miraculis"', ed. by Canal, p. 270. My translation. See *De Probatis Sanctorum Historiis*, ed. by Surius, 1, p. 10.

⁴³ 'El libro "De Miraculis"', ed. by Canal, p. 270.

⁴⁴ 'El libro De Laudibus', ed. by Canal, p. 134. My translation.

⁴⁵ The brief account of Mercurius's passion given by William does not match anything in the *Vita Basilii*, but anyone with knowledge of other early Roman martyrs' passions could have inferred such a passion from the *Vita Basilii*. On the possible relationship between this passage and similar passages in other accounts of the death of Julian, see note 36 above.

⁴⁶ *Memorials of St. Edmund's*, ed. by Arnold, 1, p. 118. My translation. Also printed in Thomson, 'Two versions', p. 404.

⁴⁷ *Memorials of St. Edmund's*, ed. by Arnold, 1, p. 119. My translation. See also Thomson, 'Two versions', p. 404; the reading printed by Arnold is from London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.viii (Thomson's manuscript T), of the mid-thirteenth century; Thomson notes (p. 404) that New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS 736 (his manuscript P) contains a slightly different reading, which Thomson believes to represent the state of the text before Samson edited it in the late twelfth century, while his manuscript T exhibits the changes made by Samson (on the dates of these manuscripts, see Thomson, p. 385). In both this and the previous example, the resemblances with the account of Julian's death in the *Vita Basilii* existed before the alterations which Thomson ascribes to Samson.

⁴⁸ *De Probatis Sanctorum Historiis*, ed. by Surius, 1, p. 10.

⁴⁹ *Memorials of St. Edmund's*, ed. by Arnold, 1, p. 118. My translation. See also Thomson, 'Two versions', p. 404; all the vocabulary which this passage shares with the *Vita Basilii* was already present in the first stage of the development of this text, which Thomson places between c. 1100 and c. 1124 (p. 385), with the exception of *abscedens*, which constitutes

one of the alterations which Thomson argues that Abbot Samson introduced (*abiens* being the earlier reading).

⁵⁰ *De Probatis Sanctorum Historiis*, ed. by Surius, 1, p. 10. My translation.

⁵¹ *La Estoire*, ed. by Wallace, p. 7 (lines 217-18); on the authorship and dating of *La Estoire*, see pp. xvii-xxiii. My translation.

⁵² See *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. Darlington and McGurk, 2, p. 476; *Symeonis Monachi Opera*, ed. by Arnold, p. 146; and *Chronica Magistri Rogeri*, ed. by Stubbs, p. 78. Also *Memorials of St. Edmund's*, ed. by Arnold, p. 37 and p. 118. See also Thomson, 'Two versions', pp. 385 and 404.

⁵³ See *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. Darlington and McGurk, 2, p. 476; *Symeonis Monachi Opera*, ed. by Arnold, p. 146; and *Chronica Magistri Rogeri*, ed. by Stubbs, p. 78. Also 'El libro "De Miraculis"', ed. by Canal, p. 270.

⁵⁴ Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary*, *passim*; see especially pp. 61-88.

⁵⁵ 'Texto crítico', ed. by Canal, p. 60. *Patrologia Latina*, 141, col. 323B. My translation.

⁵⁶ 'Texto crítico', ed. by Canal, p. 60. *Patrologia Latina*, 141, col. 323A. My translation.