

ALBAN AND ST ALBANS  
Roman and Medieval  
Architecture, Art  
and Archaeology

*Edited by*

Martin Henig and Phillip Lindley



The British Archaeological Association  
Conference Transactions XXIV

## The late antique Passion of St Alban

RICHARD SHARPE

*The textual relationship of the three early versions of the Passio S. Albani was incorrectly understood by W. Meyer in his edition of 1904, which gave precedence to the text in T. The textual evidence is better interpreted as indicating that T and P are both derivative versions based on the older and shorter text E. Consequences of this realisation are that Meyer's argument from literary parallels for an early 6th-century date for the text becomes irrelevant, and the evidence for dating the martyrdom to the time of Septimius Severus vanishes; the literary parallels explain the Severan date as part of an undated Merovingian reworking of the text. The original version may be dated in relation to the visit to St Albans in 429 of St Germanus of Auxerre († c. 446), who housed relics of the saint in a new basilica at Auxerre. Here the story of the martyrdom was displayed on placards referred to by T, which may well have provided his source text E, the earliest recoverable version of the work; this may be dated to the middle years of the 5th century.*

From an early date St Alban was the most famous of Romano-British martyrs, and like other famous martyrs his reputation was sustained by an account of his suffering and death (*passio*) for the faith. Bede had access to a copy of this *Passio S. Albani* and incorporated it into his Ecclesiastical History of the English People (HE I, 6). Bede's version lies behind the later traditions at the monastery of St Albans, and the general lines of the story are consequently familiar. What is less well known is that there are versions of the *Passio* older than Bede. One of these is so close to Bede's narrative that it can be regarded as another copy of the text used by Bede. How much older the text may be than Bede will be the main subject of this paper.

A pointer well-known to students of post-Roman Britain is what Gildas has to say about St Alban. First he sets out the context, here in Michael Winterbottom's translation:<sup>1</sup>

God therefore increased his pity for us; for he wishes all men to be saved and calls sinners no less than those who think themselves just. As a free gift to us, in the time (as I conjecture) of this same persecution, he acted to save Britain from being plunged deep in the thick darkness of black night; for he lit for us the lamps of holy martyrs. Their graves and the places where they suffered would now have the greatest effect in instilling the blaze of divine charity in the minds of the beholders, were it not that our citizens, on account of our sins, have been deprived of many of them by the unhappy partition with the barbarians. I refer to St Alban of Verulamium, Aaron and Julius, citizens of Caerleon, and the others of both sexes who, in different places, displayed the highest spirit in the battle-line of Christ.

Gildas was writing somewhere in western Britain in the first part of the 6th century. A date around 530–40 would be uncontentious. He was evidently not in Caerleon, and his deep hostility to the British rulers addressed may suggest that he was perhaps not in their territories but in one of the towns of the Roman province, somewhere such as

Bath or Gloucester or Cirencester, that the barbarian English did not occupy until the late 6th century or after. At this point in his work he has been following the account of the persecution in the east under Diocletian, provided by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*. His dating the British martyrdoms to this period was, by his own admission, a conjecture. A few sentences later Gildas describes the effects of the end of the persecutions, 'how they rebuilt churches that had been razed to the ground, built and completed chapels to the holy martyrs, displaying them everywhere like victorious banners'. Here too he is following Eusebius, and we must not read it as an authentic account of the renewed cult of Roman martyrs in Britain. In the middle of this passage he tells the story of St Alban:

Alban, for charity's sake and in imitation even here of Christ, who laid down his life for his sheep, protected a confessor from his persecutors when he was on the point of arrest. Hiding him in his house and then changing clothes with him, he gladly exposed himself to danger and pursuit in the other's habit. Between the time of his holy confession and the taking of his blood, and in the presence of wicked men who displayed the Roman standards to the most horrid effect, the pleasure that God took in him showed itself: by a miracle he was marked out by wonderful signs. Thanks to his fervent prayer, he opened up an unknown route across the channel of the great river Thames — a route resembling the untrodden way made dry for the Israelites, when the ark of the testament stood for a while on gravel in the midstream of Jordan. Accompanied by a thousand men, he crossed dryshod, while the river eddies stayed themselves on either side like precipitous mountains. In this way he changed from wolf to lamb his first executioner, when he saw such a wonder, and made him too thirst strongly for the triumphal palm of martyrdom and bravely receive it.

This may not have got all the essentials of the story that remained popular through the middle ages — the loss of the second executioner's eyes, for example — but it is none the less an adequate précis of the Passion. Readers have speculated whether Gildas's source was a copy of the text or oral information from his contemporaries. In some sense the answer to that question is in the text: Gildas and his fellow-citizens were unable to visit the shrines of the martyrs, because they were occupied or at least cut off by the pagan English. He is unlikely to have visited or to have met someone who had visited the place, so it seems probable that this is as much derived from a written source as what precedes and follows it from Eusebius. There is a strong possibility therefore that the *Passio S. Albani* was written before 530; indeed, one would imagine that, if Gildas knew the text, it would have to predate the Anglo-Saxon occupation of Hertfordshire. A document from sub-Roman Britain is not out of the question.

This discussion should have been transformed with the discovery of three textual witnesses to the *Passio* that was Bede's and, most likely, Gildas's source. Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947), working on Constantius's *Vita S. Germani* for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, in 1903, realised that the Carolingian revision of that work had incorporated from Bede a paragraph that did not belong to Constantius's text; Bede had taken it from the *Passio S. Albani*, which Levison found described by the Bollandists from a 9th/10th-century manuscript in Paris (P); to this he added two copies in London of a shorter but related text.<sup>2</sup> Levison was also aware that Gildas knew a version of the story close to the one in this *Passio*. Wilhelm Meyer (1845–1917) was professor in Göttingen and one of the leading experts in Europe on early medieval Latin. He was working on manuscripts in Turin in 1903 where he recognised a text (T) that was similar to this *Passio* but in an earlier manuscript from the late 8th century.<sup>3</sup> He was at work on the problems presented by this *Passio* when he came upon Levison's newly published discussion.

Meyer's first problem was textual. Here were three versions of the *Passio*, one (P) very close to Bede, the other (T) seemingly older. The third version (E), apparently close to the Paris text (P) but much shorter, existed in two Carolingian copies and two later ones. Levison had provided the references for the two copies in London, and Meyer had traced through catalogues the others in Autun and Einsiedeln. His discussion of these three witnesses is complex, and it is tangled up with issues that are not strictly textual, and with literary questions about the relationship between the original text and other, equally fluid, equally dateless, *passiones* of saints from Roman Gaul. It may have been the density of his argument that led to the limited reception of the text in England where there would surely have been an interested audience. His work was reviewed by J. B. Bury in Cambridge; it was welcomed by Hugh Williams at Bala; and it was used by the Belgian Bollandiste Hippolyte Delehaye.<sup>4</sup> But very soon it passed almost out of view. Since it was summarised in English in 1941 by Levison himself, Meyer's work has passed out of sight.<sup>5</sup> Sheppard Frere, writing about the Roman martyr, and Charles Thomas, writing about Christianity in Roman Britain, seem neither of them to have gone behind Levison to Meyer's edition of the *Passio*.<sup>6</sup> John Morris, in a paper widely treated as authoritative on the date of the martyr, engaged with the text, but he was not primarily interested in the *Passio*, when or where it was written, and he overlooked a key point that completely overthrows his argument.<sup>7</sup> So far as I have found, only Ian Wood has actually discussed the composition of the *Passio*, and that very briefly. He follows Meyer in regarding the text as a work of Merovingian date, 'which cannot have been written much before the sixth century and which is probably not much later than that either'.<sup>8</sup> He importantly departs from Meyer in regarding the original text as from Auxerre and serving the anti-Pelagian interests of St Germanus of Auxerre.

The earliest direct textual witness for the *Passio* is a manuscript now in Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS D. V. 3 (known as T). It was written, according to T. A. M. Bishop's judgement from the script, at Nôtre-Dame de Soissons in the late 8th century.<sup>9</sup> It is a collection of some forty *passiones*, mostly from post-Roman Gaul, and its contents have been summarily described by the Bollandist Albert Poncelet.<sup>10</sup> For many of the texts contained this manuscript provides the earliest witness, so that it is without doubt a manuscript of wider importance than simply as the earliest text of the *Passio S. Albani*. The copy of this passion, however, contains many mistakes that forced Meyer to attempt conjectural readings in his edition. The other witness regarded as important by Meyer is now Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS lat. 11748 (designated P), written in the late 9th or early 10th century and from Saint-Maur-les-Fossés. The contents of this manuscript were described by Poncelet and his colleagues, a wide-ranging collection of about fifty *passiones* and *uitae*.<sup>11</sup> Bede's source was very like this P-text. Meyer's third text, which he calls an excerpt (E), is substantially shorter than the other two witnesses. This version is attested by four manuscripts: London, BL MS Add. 11880 (s. ix<sup>1</sup>); Autun, Séminaire, MS 34 (s. ix/x); London, Gray's Inn, MS 3 (s. xii<sup>1</sup>, St Werburgh's abbey, Chester); and Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 248 (s. xii).

Meyer printed the texts of T and P literally with only a very abbreviated text of E in parallel; he then presented edited texts of T and P and Bede's chapter, signalling the relationship with E sometimes by spaced type and sometimes only in relation to P. This presentation of the text embodies Meyer's judgements in a way that makes it less than easy to consider the evidence.

The simple textual fact is that, once one has overcome the miscopyings of individual witnesses, it becomes possible to see that anything shared by T and P is also present in E. There is nothing in E that is not in both T and P, and there is nothing in common between those passages of T and P not shared with E. Meyer correctly inferred that E is the vital link between T and P. In forming a view of the nature of that link, however, Meyer lost sight of the textual evidence and worked from what appears to have been assumption.

There is little doubt that T, the version in the earliest manuscript which Meyer himself had discovered in Turin, offered the most interesting as well as the most corrupt text. Meyer made the assumption that this was closest to the original. To get from T to P, he supposed that E was an abridgement of T; a copy of this abridgement then served as the basis for elaboration that produced the text in P. In arriving at this judgement, Meyer was influenced by non-textual arguments.

The T-text, after a sententious prologue that can be paralleled elsewhere, opens with an historical context. 'Siuero igitur imperat qui'; it begins, which was altered in the manuscript to read 'Sciuro imperat qui'; neither reading makes sense, and the text was restored by Meyer to read:

Seuerus igitur imperator, qui contra Christianorum colla tpendebat [frendebat Bury] ac sicut leo rapiens et rugiens diebus ac noctibus contra Christianum nomen fremebat, eo tempore in prouinciis Galliarum cupiens Christianum nomen abstergere et ecclesiam Christi nuper [Christiano per T; Christianam per Meyer; Christianam nuper Levison] fundata <m> cogitans deuastare . . .

This passage is unique to T, but the next section also contains the name of the emperor:

Eo tempore Seuerus imperator ad Britanniam dirigit regionem, et cum in prouincias illas ingressus fuisset . . .

Again this dating reference is unique to T. The P-text reads simply 'Tempore persecutionis'. Meyer did not believe that a redactor such as P would have removed so important a fact as the identity of the emperor and the date of the martyrdom. He believed, perversely in my view, that the omission of this important point demanded a ruthless abbreviator, and this led to his supposition that E was the product of such radical pruning. He then inferred that P was a padded text later than E; such padding could not restore significant facts that had been omitted in the process of abbreviation. An assumption about what a reviser might alter was thus added to an assumption as to what was the primary witness. None the less it provided a transmission that was credible to Bury and Levison, the only scholars who show any evidence of having considered the question.

Meyer seems not to have recognised evidence in the text that proves these inferences to be erroneous. According to T the martyr was tried before *Caesar*, who is once identified as Severus (§ 5); E and P refer to his judge only as *iudex* throughout. Meyer was content to believe that T was the original and overlooked the fact that in § 14 all three versions agree on the reading 'Denique iudex sine obsequio . . .', proving that *iudex* is the original reading. The introduction of *Caesar* is a modification made in T. Levison certainly realised this, arguing that another phrase in T showed that this text, in spite its Severan scene-setting, had introduced the style of *Caesar*, and that the original had simply used *iudex*. This phrase is italicised in its context here:

Tunc impiissimus Caesar exanimis, tanta nouitate percussus, *iniussu* etiam *principum* iubet de persecutione cessare . . .

Meyer was conscious of this problem too. Both knew that it means 'without orders from the *principes*'; it is logically impossible for Caesar to act without orders from himself, and therefore to Levison the judge was original. He regarded this as modifying the transmission but not overthrowing Meyer's treatment of T as closest to the original. The argument here is not textually based but it is fully compatible with the inference from §14 that the original version read *iudex*.

There is an obvious and simple solution to the textual question. Meyer was correct to realise that E is the intermediary in the textual relationship between T and P. The textual evidence, however, is fully explained if E is the parent of both the longer versions. Each felt that the bare story needed some fuller embellishment. The redactor of P achieved this by the use of his imagination, filling out the pious thoughts and prayers of Alban in the course of the story. The redactor of T, on the other hand, drawing on a familiarity with other examples of the genre, elaborated a trial scene before Caesar as well as adding a pious prologue.

This work of revision in T misled Meyer in several ways. His assumption that T was the original or nearest to original of the three versions led him into a complex argument for the dating of this text. He identified several parallels with a *Passio SS. Irenaei Benigni Andochii*,<sup>12</sup> including frequent references to *iniquissimus Caesar* and *impiissimus Caesar*. While some of the parallels appear rather to be clichés of the genre, others may well be textual borrowings. Meyer argued — and I cannot say that this argument was ever very persuasive, though it has not previously been contested — that the parallels pointed to common authorship of the two works. This does not get one very far, since the authorship of the Burgundian passion text remains unknown. Meyer advanced an argument for its date from Gregory of Tours, who tells a story of how a Passion of St Benignus, not previously known, was presented to Bishop Gregory of Langres.<sup>13</sup> This Gregory, the historian's uncle, was bishop between c. 506 and 540. Meyer inferred from the story that this Passion of St Benignus was newly written at the time, an interpretation that the text will not bear; he equated such a work, sight unseen, with the integrated *Passio SS. Irenaei Benigni Andochii*, something for which there is no evidence; and he deduced that the two *passiones* were both written in Burgundy during the episcopate of Gregory of Langres. Not only are the steps in the argument very questionable; Meyer added to the implausibility by his thinking that, since Gildas had guessed that Alban suffered in the time of Diocletian, that writer must have been using a secondary version of the *Passio* with the reading 'tempore persecutionis'. According to Meyer's account, therefore, the original was composed after 506 but before 540. It had already been revised and the revised text had reached Britain before Gildas was writing around 530 or 540. Bury found this chronology unacceptably restricted, but his solution was to consider that Gildas was using oral rather than written information and was therefore not relevant to the dating argument.

In several ways Meyer and Levison after him failed to appreciate the implications of their own reasoning. They recognised that *iudex* had to be the original reading, replaced by *Caesar* only in T. One might have thought, therefore, that this imperial reworking would also have introduced the references to Caesar by name as Severus. The Burgundian martyrs Irenaeus, Benignus and Andochius, according to the *Passio* discussed by Meyer, suffered under the emperor Aurelius, and the wording that relates to the emperor fits with the borrowings between that text and the *Passio S. Albani*. To Meyer and Levison, therefore, the Severan date was a fiction, part of the imperial adaptation, introduced as part of the parallel with the *Passio SS. Irenaei Benigni*

*Andochii*. To Meyer those parallels were the key to his dating of T, which he treated as the original rather than simply as an imperial reworking.

The whole Severan context belongs to the revision by the redactor of T, someone familiar with other late antique *passiones* who used his knowledge to good literary effect. He created a more interesting text than the one he started from, and he persuaded two great scholars that his work should form the basis for any understanding of the *Passio*. The character of his work, entirely literary, deserves fuller investigation. The texts in which Meyer found parallels, possibly the redactor's sources, are themselves little understood, dateless and the subject of no text-historical study. I refer to the Passions of SS. Eleutherius, Quintinus, Symphorianus, and others, besides the Irenaeus sequence. More investigation here will help us to understand the literary evolution of such *passiones* in Merovingian Gaul, but it sheds no light on the *Passio S. Albani* in its original form.

This revision of the textual history of the *Passio* means that the text will not provide a date for the martyrdom of St Alban himself. The whole of the Severan dating comes from T and, on my reading of the text, was introduced as part of the reviser's work in the Merovingian period. Meyer at one level recognised this and concluded about the saint's own date, 'We do not know. The only passage that belongs to all three versions and has been seen as having any bearing on the Severan date is the phrase 'iniussu principum'. Believing that Alban was tried before Caesar, Meyer and Levison could not see how the emperor could be said to act without orders from the emperors. John Morris had a different approach to that problem, but it is too clever by more than half. He pointed out that in 209 Geta had the title *Caesar* when his father Severus and brother Caracalla had the title *Augustus*. They therefore, campaigning in the north while Geta was left in command in southern Britain, were the *principes* who had given Caesar no order to stop the persecution. I doubt whether the author of the *Passio* knew any such detail about the state of Roman Britain at the beginning of the 3rd century or at any other time. Losing both *Caesar* and Severus from the original text, however, takes away the problem. There is nothing strange about saying that the local magistrate or *iudex*, presumably the governor, acted without orders from the emperors. Both the explicit and implicit basis for the Severan date for the martyrdom, and in particular for dating it to A.D. 209, will not support any such inference. The date of Alban's martyrdom is unknown. One may say that the author of the original *Passio* supposed him to have suffered at a time when there was more than one *princeps*, but that is certainly not a precise guide to a date during the long period of Christian persecution.

At this point we may turn away from the consequences of a mistaken construction of the textual history to ask what follows from my inference that E has preserved the nearest to an original text.

First it is entirely possible that this is the form of the text known to Gildas, since its reading 'tempore persecutionis' is primary and serves as the basis of Gildas's conjecture that Alban suffered under Diocletian.

Second, this short text includes the extremely interesting passage about St Germanus and the relics of St Alban that had first drawn Levison's attention to the *Passio* before Meyer's discovery of the version in Turin. The text ends:

When St Germanus came to Alban's basilica, carrying with him relics of all the apostles and of several martyrs, he ordered the grave to be opened for him to place precious gifts in the same place, in order that the lodging of a single grave might hold *membra* of saints brought together from

various regions whom heaven had received as equal in merit. Once these were honourably disposed and united, with violent devotion and a pious boldness of faith he took from the place where the blood of the martyr had flowed a lump of earth in which it was visible that the ground was red with blood preserved from the martyr's death, while the persecutor was pale. When all these things were revealed and made known, a huge crowd of people was brought to God, with the help of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom is honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

This story is the most historically revealing in the *Passio*. It provides a basis for establishing a *terminus ante quem* for the work. In the Life of St Germanus by the priest of Lyon, Constantius, Bishop Germanus's visit to St Albans is briefly alluded to: 'the bishops [Germanus and Lupus] sought out the martyr Alban in order to give thanks to God through him'.<sup>14</sup> Constantius was writing in the 460s or 470s, and he clearly knew that Germanus had visited St Albans. The briefness of his allusion suggests that it was unnecessary to say more on this point because it was already well known to his audience. It is surely possible that he and his audience were acquainted with the story told at the end of the *Passio S. Albani*. That, certainly, seems to be the inference of Bede, who, after copying a passage from the Life of St Germanus, including the reference to his visit to St Albans, inserted this story from the *Passio*. Bede, it appears, recognised an allusion to the story; and from Bede the same story was interpolated into Carolingian copies of the Life of St Germanus. Here is a basis for thinking that the *Passio* predates Constantius, though its reference to Germanus as *sanctus* most likely means that it did not have exactly this form until after his death in or near 446.<sup>15</sup>

Third, we can also infer the context for which it was composed and from which it passed into wider circulation. In T there is a passage inserted into the story just quoted, between the words 'several martyrs' and 'he ordered', which points to the context of the text:

Alban had revealed himself to Germanus on his journey, and now, so St Germanus himself relates, St Alban met him on the stormy seas. But while he had been keeping vigil by night at his basilica, in the dawn when he had given in to sleep, St Alban appeared to him and communicated by revelation to him what had happened at the time of his martyrdom, and he made this public in order that the events should be preserved in writing on placards.

It would seem reasonable to infer that, in explaining how this story came to be known to him, the reviser is actually recording that he has started with a text written on placards (*tituli*) such as were commonly displayed in conjunction with a reliquary in late antique Gaul. The E-text is certainly brief enough to have been displayed on placards, and this interpolation in T tells us that the reviser understood Germanus to have had some part in this record. Germanus, a much later source from his own church of Auxerre tells us, 'also founded a basilica of St Alban within the walls of Auxerre, which he dedicated in honour of the martyr, and he honourably disposed there the relics that he had brought with him from Britain'.<sup>16</sup> This was written at Auxerre in the ninth century, when it is evident that there was a church of St Alban that housed relics believed to have been brought by Germanus from St Albans. This could not have been inferred from Constantius's Life of St Germanus, which is silent about his dedication of churches and very brief about his visit to St Albans. It could have been inferred from the *Passio S. Albani*, but why should there have been any desire retrospectively to create interest in this British martyr unless there had been a genuine starting-point for that interest at Auxerre?

It would appear to me probable that the E-text of the *Passio S. Albani*, preserved in four English and Continental copies and available also to the redactors of two

elaborated versions in Merovingian Gaul, is in essence that displayed on placards in the basilica dedicated to him by Germanus between his visit to Britain, probably though not certainly that in 429, and his death in or around 446. The text that has been preserved was not simply that written down for Germanus but a version modified, presumably after his death; the modifications at least include the addition of the word *sanctus* to describe Germanus, and may but need not include the whole account of his visit to St Alban's basilica in Britain. This account was part of the text known to Constantius of Lyon in the 460s or 470s. It would appear that we have a window of fifty years within which to date the composition of the *Passio*, with the possibility that it has survived with only a tiny alteration since the lifetime of Germanus. He had visited the place of the martyr's burial and may provide a witness to what was related there at the time of his visit in 429.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Association is grateful to the Association for Roman Archaeology for a grant towards the publication of this paper.

## NOTES

1. Gildas, *De excidio Britanniae*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom (Chichester 1978), 19-20; discussed with notes by H. Williams, *Gildas de Excidio Britanniae*, Cymmrodorion Record Series 3 (1899), 22-29. For a fuller reading of the passage, see R. Sharpe, 'Martyrs and local saints in late antique Britain', in *Local Saints and Local Churches in Great Britain in the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford forthcoming).
2. W. Levison, 'Bischof Germanus von Auxerre und die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 29 (1903-04), 97-175 (at p. 149).
3. W. Meyer, 'Die Legende des h. Albanus des Protomartyr Angliae in Texten vor Beda', *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, philologisch-historische Klasse, new ser. 8 (1904), 3-81.
4. J. B. Bury, reviewing Meyer's paper, *EHR*, 20 (1905), 345-47; H. Williams, *Christianity in Early Britain* (Oxford 1912), 106-09; H. Delahaye, reviewing Meyer's paper, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 24 (1905), 397-99; H. Delahaye, *Les Passions des martyrs* (Brussels 1921), 403-07.
5. W. Levison, 'St Alban and St Albans', *Antiquity*, 15 (1941), 337-59.
6. S. S. Frere, *Britannia. A History of Roman Britain* (London 1967); S. S. Frere, *Verulamium Excavations*, 2 (London 1983); A. C. Thomas, *Christianity in Roman Britain* (London 1981), 48-50, 378.
7. J. Morris, 'The Date of St Alban', *Hertfordshire Archaeology*, 1 (1968), 1-8; reprinted *ibid.*, 9 (1983), 15-19.
8. I. N. Wood, 'The End of Roman Britain: continental evidence and parallels', in *Gildas: New Approaches*, ed. M. Lapidge and D. N. Dumville (Woodbridge 1984), 1-25 (at pp. 12-14).
9. T. A. M. Bishop, 'The scribes of the Corbie a-b', in *Charlemagne's Heir. New perspectives on the reign of Louis the Pious*, ed. P. Godman and R. Collins (Oxford 1990), 523-36 (at p. 535).
10. A. Poncellet, 'Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Latinorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Taurinensis', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 28 (1909), 417-78 (at pp. 419-22).
11. A. Poncellet et al., *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Latinorum Parisiensium* (Brussels 1889-93), 3, 4-9.
12. This text was printed in part by Meyer, 73-78; it has been edited in full from the same manuscript by J. van der Straeten, 'Les actes des martyrs d'Aurélien en Bourgogne', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 79 (1961), 115-44, 447-68. Meyer's edition corresponds to pp. 455-58 of van der Straeten's text.
13. Gregory of Tours, *Gloria martyrum*, § 50, trans. R. Van Dam (Liverpool 1988); Meyer, 21-23.
14. Constantius, *Vita S. Germani*, § 16, ed. W. Levison, *MGH Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, 7(1) (1919), 247-83. On the date of Constantius's work see my paper cited in n. 1.
15. R. W. Mathisen, 'The last year of St Germanus of Auxerre', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 99 (1981), 151-59.
16. *Gesta episcoporum Autissiodorensium*, § 7, ed. L.-M. Duru, *Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne* (Auxerre 1850-63), 2, 315-21.