

MATTHEW JAMES DRISCOLL

A NEW EDITION OF THE *FORNALDARSÖGUR NORÐURLANDA*: SOME
BASIC QUESTIONS

The *fornaldarsögur Norðurlanda* (literally ‘ancient sagas of the northern lands’, but often referred to in English as ‘mythical-heroic’ or ‘legendary’ sagas) represent one of the major genres of mediaeval Icelandic saga narrative – although to what extent they actually do constitute a genre remains the subject of scholarly debate.¹ Unlike many of the standard saga genre designations – *Íslendingasögur*, *konungasögur* etc. – which actually are attested in the medieval literature, the term *fornaldarsaga* is a modern coinage, first used by Carl Christian Rafn as the title of his three-volume edition *Fornaldar Sögur Norðurlanda*, published in Copenhagen in 1829-30. Although all but one of the sagas included there had already appeared in print, Rafn’s edition brought together, for the first time, essentially all the prose narratives preserved in Old Icelandic dealing with the early history of mainland Scandinavia, i.e. before the unification of Norway under Haraldr *hárfagri* and the settlement of Iceland. Rafn’s edition thus defined the corpus and gave that corpus its name in accordance with that definition.²

In their present form, the *fornaldarsögur* are thought to date predominantly from the 14th and 15th centuries, and are thus

¹ There has, over the years, been a great deal of discussion on the question of genre, most recently treated in a round-table discussion (Quinn *et al.* 2006). One of the best discussions of this issue remains Hallberg 1982.

² Cfr. the first sentence of the preface to Rafn’s edition: «Söguflokkur sá, af hverjum þetta it fyrsta bindi nú birtist, er tilætlað at innihalda skuli íslenzku sögurnar, er greina frá atburðum þeim, er orðit hafa hær á Norðrlöndum, áðr enn Island bygðist á 9du öld, eðr með öðrum orðum, fyrir tímabil það, er áreiðanligar sagnir eru frá hafðar».

regarded as one of the younger genres of saga literature. Most of them have at least some basis in significantly older tradition, however, and it has been customary to distinguish between them on the basis of their relationship to that tradition. Thus while works such as *Völsunga saga* and *Hervarar saga ok Heiðreks*, which are demonstrably related to and/or derived from ancient Germanic poetry, have long been accorded a measure of scholarly respect, others, such as *Egils saga einhenda ok Ásmundar berserkjabana* and *Bósa saga*, with their fondness for the fabulous, stock characters, lengthy battle scenes and so on, have often been dismissed as historically unreliable and of scant artistic merit; as Rafn himself put it «að diktunar feigrðinni til lítils metandi, og að frásögninni að mestu leiti óáreiðanlegar». It was, however, perhaps not surprisingly, these same sagas which were generally the most popular, as attested by the very large number of manuscripts in which they are preserved.

The importance of the *fornaldarsögur* is many-fold. They are, to begin with, a valuable source of information on the history – at least the legendary if not the actual – of early Scandinavia. *Fornaldarsaga*-like narratives were used as a source by Saxo in his *Gesta Danorum*, as he himself acknowledges, and the sagas were combed for information about the early histories of the kingdoms of Denmark and, not least, Sweden, by 17th- and 18th-century scholars: in fact, the first saga texts ever to be printed in the original were *fornaldarsögur*, published in Uppsala in the second half of the 17th century.³

The influence of the *fornaldarsögur* is also to be found in other literary works. Almost all of them were turned into the lengthy Icelandic metrical romances known as *rímur*, generally more than once, and many also formed the basis for ballads in Norway, Denmark, Sweden and the Faeroe Islands.⁴ They have also served as a source of inspiration for more ‘serious’ writers. Johannes Ewald’s *Rolf Krage: et Sørgespil* (1770) and Adam Oehlenschläger’s *Helge: et Digt* (1814) were both based on *Hrólfs saga kraka* (the former via Saxo, the latter directly),⁵ while Esaias Tegnér’s poem *Frithiofs saga* (1825), praised by Goethe and famous throughout 19th-century Europe, was based on *Friðþjófs*

³ See Wallette 2004.

⁴ See Mitchell 2003.

⁵ Lundgreen-Nielsen 1969.

saga ins frækna. Wagner drew on *Völsunga saga* at least as much as he did on the *Nibelungenlied* for his *Der Ring des Nibelungen* (1876).⁶ And while specific models are harder to identify, the influence of the *fornaldarsögur* on J. R. R. Tolkien's works, the *Star Wars* films and on modern fantasy in general is also considerable.

Unfortunately, study of the *fornaldarsögur* has long been hampered by a lack of reliable editions. Recognising this, the Arnamagnæan Commission agreed in 1937 that a new edition of the complete *fornaldarsaga* corpus should be among its first priorities. A detailed plan for the work was drawn up and an editor for the project, the Icelandic scholar Einar Ól. Sveinsson, was appointed in 1939. The advent of the war prevented the editor from taking up his duties, however, and the project was abandoned.⁷ Although a handful of *fornaldarsögur* have subsequently appeared in scholarly editions, it is unfortunately still the case that the majority of them have yet to be edited properly.

What would happen if this project were to be taken up again today? What would a new edition of the *fornaldarsögur Norðurlanda* look like *anno* 2008?

The first question which would need to be asked is quite simply what to include. Assuming that the *fornaldarsögur* do indeed constitute a genre, how many sagas are to be ascribed to that genre?

Rafn included texts of 31 sagas in his edition,⁸ three of them in two recensions, in addition to the poems *Bjarkamál hin fornu*, with *Hrólfs saga kraka*, and *Krákumál*, with *Ragnars saga loðbrókar*. Among these there are several shorter pieces dealing with Scandinavian pre-history, such as *Af Upplendingakonungum* and *Hversu Noregr byggðist*, which were for the most part taken out of longer compilations – into which they had arguably been interpolated – such as *Hauksbók* and *Flateyjarbók*. Their decidedly non-narrative nature is in sharp contrast to the sagas 'proper', however, and the justification for their inclusion could certainly be questioned. At the same time, there are others, specifically *Yngvars*

⁶ See Árni Björnsson 2000.

⁷ See my article (Driscoll 2008).

⁸ If *Hversu Noregr byggðist* and *Fundinn Noregr*, which are placed together by Rafn under the title *Frá Fornjóti ok hans ættmönnum*, are counted separately, the number is 32.

saga víðförla, *Tóka þátr Tókasonar*, *Helga þátr Þórissonar* and *Þorsteins þátr bæjarmagns*, which were not included by Rafn but certainly could have been, as they conform to his criteria of time and place. And there are still others which might also be included, for example sagas like *Ála flekks saga*, *Hrings saga ok Tryggva*, *Sigurðar saga fóts*, *Sigrarðs saga frækna*, *Vilmundar saga viðutan* and *Þjalar-Jóns saga*; these are normally classed as romances (*riddarasögur*), but while set outside Scandinavia proper, they take place in a Viking, rather than a chivalric, milieu.⁹

There is also the question of ‘lost’ *fornaldarsögur*.¹⁰ Some sagas are so completely lost that nothing remains of them at all, such as **Hróks saga svarta*, which is named in *Geirmundar þátr heljarskinns* but of which nothing survives.¹¹ There are no such references to **Ásmundar saga flagðagæfu*, but its existence can be inferred by the fact that it was the basis for a set of *rímur*, also lost. A fairly lengthy prose summary survives, *Inntak úr söguþætti af Ásmundi flagðagæfu*, written down by sr. Eyjólfur Jónsson á Völlum around 1700 on the basis of stories told him by his mother and maternal grandmother, but it is not entirely clear exactly what these stories were based on, whether the *rímur*, a written saga or, as seems most likely, both.¹² What does seem clear is that there once existed a *fornaldarsaga*-like narrative of which this is the closest representation we have. As such, one might not unreasonably argue for its inclusion in the corpus.

A number of *fornaldarsögur* survive only in *rímur* that were based on them, such as *Gríms rímur og Hjálmars*, also known as *Grimlur*. These were printed by Biörner, along with prose translations into Swedish and Latin, in his *Nordiska Kämpadater*

⁹ There’s also the question is *Þiðreks saga*, seen by some – for example Schier 1970: 82-83 – as at least closely related to the *fornaldarsögur*. *Þiðreks saga* is in many ways atypical of Old Norse works and has generally defied generic categorisation; those wishing to place it among the *fornaldarsögur* have presumably done so because it is derived – perhaps directly translated – from German sources, rather than British or French.

¹⁰ Mitchell 1991: 185, lists 13 such lost *fornaldarsögur*.

¹¹ It is possible that the saga referred to by this name is in fact identical with *Hálfs saga*; see *Hálfs saga ok Hálfsrekka*, ed. Hubert Seelow, Reykjavík 1981: 158-59.

¹² This was printed in *Íslenzkar þjóðsögur og ævintýri, safnað hefur Jón Árnason*, I: 163-71 and, more recently, *Munnmælasögur 17. aldar*, ed. Bjarni Einarsson, Reykjavík 1955: 92-104 and clvi-clxi; see also Jesch 1982.

(Stockholm, 1737) – the first (secular) *rímur* to appear in print,¹³ and the only *rímur*, to my knowledge, to appear in Latin translation. There are other examples of this phenomenon, and one could argue that, in the absence of the prose texts on which they were based, all such *rímur* should also be included in the corpus.

In such cases there often are prose texts as well, but these are secondary, in that they are prose retellings of the medieval *rímur*, what Peter Jorgensen has called «*rímur* retreads».¹⁴ There is, in fact, a younger prose version of *Grimlur* preserved in the manuscript AM 601 4to, a manuscript which also contains a prose version of *Ormars rímur*, which were also based on a lost *fornaldarsaga*. Here the situation is even more complicated, as there is also a younger *þáttur* or *ævintýri* preserved in AM 119 8vo and some half-dozen manuscripts in Landsbókasafn; this *þáttur* was then the basis for a younger set of *rímur*, composed in 1833 by Sigurður Jónsson á Reykjum.¹⁵

Probably the best known example of the «*rímur*-retread» phenomenon is *Hrómundar saga Gripssonar*, which was one of the sagas included by Rafn in his edition. Although there is evidence for the existence of a saga by this name in the medieval period – the famous wedding feast at Reykjahólar in 1119¹⁶ – this saga has not survived, and the text printed by Rafn is a late 17th-century prose version of the *rímur* known as *Griplur*, which were themselves based on that lost saga.¹⁷ A similar case is provided by *Haralds rímur Hringsbana*,¹⁸ which are thought to have been composed in the first half of the 15th century on the basis of a lost *fornaldarsaga*. There is a younger saga, probably written in the 17th century. This saga was not, according to Björn Karel

¹³ Bishop Guðbrandur Þorláksson's *Ný Wiisna Bok Med mörgum andlegum Viisum og Kuædum Psalmum, Lof sǫngum og Ríjnum, teknum wr heilagre Ritningu*, published in 1612, introducing *rímur* on religious themes in an attempt to counteract the effects of secular *rímur*; it was not a great success. See Nordal 1937: 7-30.

¹⁴ Jorgensen 1990. See also Driscoll 1997: 12-13, 194-205.

¹⁵ See Björn Karel Þórólfsson 1934: 336-38 and 416-18.

¹⁶ The scene has been the focus of much scholarly attention; see Liestøl 1945: 69-100, esp. pp. 70-75; Foote 1953-57, 226-39 (repr: 1984: 65-83); and von See 1981: 89-95 (repr. 1981: 506-10).

¹⁷ See Brown 1946-53: 51-77, and Jesch 1984: 89-105.

¹⁸ *Haralds rímur Hringsbana*, ed. Ólafur Halldórsson (Reykjavík, 1973).

Þórólfsson, based on the *rímur*, but rather on the older saga.¹⁹ This younger saga was in turn the basis for two further sets of *rímur*.²⁰ Yet another example is *Úlfhams saga*, recently edited in admirable fashion by Aðalheiður Guðmundsdóttir.²¹ The saga exists in three distinct versions, the earliest from the 17th century, the youngest from the 19th. All derive, directly or indirectly, from *Úlfhams rímur*, also known as *Vargstökur*, which are thought to have been composed in the beginning of the 15th century – though exactly on the basis of what is unclear.²²

As we have seen, the existence of medieval *rímur* does not always guarantee that a corresponding prose narrative also existed in written form in the middle ages. There is also a significant number of post-medieval *fornaldarsögur*, works which were certainly written after the Reformation, generally on the basis of older material, in particular Saxo's *Gesta Danorum*. There are almost as many sagas of this type as there are 'proper' *fornaldarsögur* – certainly some 25. While some are only found in one or two manuscripts, others were very popular indeed. A few even managed to find their way into print, chiefly in cheap, popular editions from the second half of the 19th century or first decades of the 20th. One such is *Sagan af Starkaði Stórvirkssyni gamla*, which was written by Snorri Björnsson (1710-1803) on the basis of Saxo's *Gesta Danorum*, *Gautreks saga*, *Heimskringla* and the *Sögubrot af fornkunungum*, with verses in all probability by Gunnar Pálsson (1714-91), of which a popular edition appeared in Winnipeg in 1911. Though some of these sagas are mentioned in works such as Margaret Schlauch's ground-breaking study *Romance in Iceland*, only a handful have been the subject of detailed scholarly investigation, notably in Rosemary Power's fine article *Saxo in Iceland*.²³ Otherwise, where they are mentioned at all, they are usually dismissed as 'spurious', something entirely different from the *fornaldarsögur* of the middle ages, nothing to be

¹⁹ Björn Karel Þórólfsson 1934: 405-407.

²⁰ Finnur Sigmundsson 1966: 204-206; also *Brávallarímur eftir Árna Bööðvarsson*, ed. Björn Karel Þórólfsson, Rit Rímnafélags VIII (Reykjavík, 1965), p. cxxx.

²¹ *Úlfhams saga*, ed. Aðalheiður Guðmundsdóttir (Reykjavík, 2001).

²² Björn Karel Þórólfsson 1934: 236, lists *Úlfhams rímur* among those which were composed «eftir æfintýrum».

²³ Power 1984; I discuss this material also in my article (2003).

taken seriously. And yet they are quite clearly part of the same tradition, a tradition which, arguably, continued unbroken from the (early) medieval period until the end of the 19th century. For this reason they too, one could say, deserve inclusion in the corpus.

The foundation of any scholarly edition is an examination of all the surviving texts, or ‘witnesses’ as they are known in traditional textual criticism, a thorough interrogation of which will bring one as close to the original as it is possible to get.²⁴ Even limiting oneself to the ‘classic’ corpus of 36 sagas, viz. the 31 included by Rafn plus *Helga þátr Þórissonar*, *Ingvars saga víðförla*, *Tóka þátr Tókasonar*, *Þjalar-Jóns saga* and *Þorsteins þátr bæjarmagns*, there are a lot of witnesses to be interrogated: at last count 1542 texts, contained in a total of 779 individual manuscripts, giving an average of just a fraction under two texts per manuscript.²⁵ Of these, just over 100 are defective in one way or another, while just under 100 are fragments, i.e. where more than half the text is missing. Several contain only the very beginning or ending of the saga, in some cases obliterated so thoroughly that nothing can be read. Not infrequently this was done by none other than Árni Magnússon himself, who split up a number of manuscripts containing more than one saga (and in such cases always made an exact – one trusts, for generally there is now no way of checking – copy of the text he had eradicated). Extracts or excerpts are found in 23 cases, while about 120 are, or contain alongside the Icelandic text, translations into other languages, predominantly Swedish and Latin.²⁶

Most of these manuscripts are, or can be, dated and are written by identifiable scribes. The distribution of manuscripts and texts by century is as follows:

Century	MSS	Texts	Texts/MS
XIV	1.1%	1.5%	2.8
XV	2.9%	3.8%	2.6
XVI	0.7%	0.6%	1.8

²⁴ On traditional textual criticism see e.g. Maas 1927.

²⁵ See the appendix below.

²⁶ These translations have never, to my knowledge, been the subject of scholarly investigation, but are potentially of great interest, if only because some may be translations of manuscripts no longer extant.

XVII	28.3%	30.2%	2.1
XVIII	43.3%	41.3%	1.9
XIX	22.5%	21.8%	1.9
XX	1.2%	0.8%	1.3

As is immediately apparent from this table, the vast majority of the extant manuscripts containing texts of *fornaldarsögur* are from after the Reformation, with nearly half coming from the 18th century. This pattern of distribution is probably not dissimilar to that of other saga genres, though in the absence of more large-scale statistical analyses it is difficult to draw any conclusions with any degree of certainty. One reason for this pattern of distribution, though, is certainly the great increase in popular literacy in Iceland in the course of the 18th century, with something like universal literacy being achieved by the end of the century, which led to an increase in literary activity generally.²⁷ At the same time, not all the manuscripts included here were produced in Iceland, many having been copied, usually by Icelandic students, in Denmark or Sweden for use by Scandinavian antiquarians. Even so, the bulk of *fornaldarsaga* manuscripts from the 17th and 18th centuries were produced in Iceland itself, apparently for domestic consumption, something which cannot be entirely unrelated to the interest in this material in the rest of Scandinavia; it would be nice to know exactly how.

While a very large number of these manuscripts are obviously ‘valueless’ from a traditional textual-critical point of view, in that they are – and often admit to being – copies of extant manuscripts or, in not a few cases, printed editions, they are certainly not without their interest. The editorial project envisaged by the Arnamagnæan Commission in 1937 involved an examination of all the extant witnesses, in keeping with the precepts of the nascent Arnamagnæan School, with an eye toward identifying the ‘best text’, i.e. that which was as close as possible to the work’s original form. In the last three decades or so, not least with the advent of the so-called ‘new philology’, there has been less focus on origins and more on the processes of literary production, dissemination and reception, with the result that texts which would hitherto have

²⁷ A great deal has been written about literacy in Iceland; for a reasonably recent survey see Loftur Guttormsson 1989; for a more nuanced view see also Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon, Davíð Ólafsson 2002.

been rejected as unreliable, corrupt and worthless can now be seen as valuable sources of information on these very processes.²⁸ *Anno* 2008, one would still want to examine all the extant texts, but with an eye toward charting the entire process of transmission and identifying interesting textual manifestations of the works in question, including, but in no way limited to, those which best represent their oldest identifiable forms. One would want to describe and transcribe the individual textual artefacts as carefully as possible, but also link them to other artefacts preserving texts of the same (and other) works. More importantly, one would want to map the relationships between these artefacts and the people who produced and consumed them, to show how the ‘manuscript matrix’²⁹ worked. One would then try to present all this material as part of a dynamic, interactive digital text archive, rather than as static, read-only texts on the page (or screen), though printed texts for simple reading could easily be generated from the archive on demand. Fortunately, the technological architecture to do this exists: it is known as ‘Web 2.0’. Only in this way, it seems to me, can we do this vast and utterly fascinating body of material any justice.

Appendix: A survey of *fornaldarsaga* manuscripts and standard editions

1. **Af Upplendinga konungum**
7 MSS (Hauksbók and copies thereof); Finnur Jónsson & Eiríkur Jónsson (Kbh, 1892-96)
2. **Áns saga bogsveigis**
49 MSS (2 redactions); C. Campbell, in prep. (for SÁM)
3. **Ásmundar saga kappabana**
12 MSS; F. Detter (Halle, 1891)
4. **Bósa saga ok Herrauðs**
44 MSS (2 redactions); O. L. Jiriczek (Strasb., 1893)

²⁸ On the ‘new philology’, particularly with regard to Old Norse-Icelandic studies, see my article (2009 [forthcoming]).

²⁹ The term ‘manuscript matrix’ is used by Stephen G. Nichols to refer to the people and processes involved in the production, dissemination and consumption of manuscripts; see in particular Nichols 1990, also Nichols 1994, and 1997.

5. **Egils saga einhenda ok Ásmundar berserkjabana**
68 MSS; Å. Lagerholm, ASB 17 (Halle, 1927)
6. **Eiríks saga víðförla**
56 MSS (4 redactions); Helle Jensen, Ed.Arn. B 29 (Kbh, 1983)
7. **Frá Fornjóti ok hans ættmönnum** (i.e. Hversu Noregur byggðist & Fundinn Noregur)
31 MSS (Flateyjarbók and MSS derived therefrom); Guðbrandur Vigfússon & Unger (Chria, 1860-1868)
8. **Friðþjófs saga frækna**
41 MSS (2 redactions); L. Larsson, STUAGNL 22 (Kbh., 1893), ASB 9 (Halle, 1901); G. Wenz (Halle, 1914)
9. **Gautreks saga ok Gjafa-Refs**
57 MSS (2 redactions); W. Ranisch (Berlin, 1900)
10. **Gríms saga loðinkinna**
67 MSS; Jean Morag Rankine 1967 (Diss. UCL); Sarah M. Anderson (Diss. Cornell)
11. **Göngu-Hrólf's saga**
69 MSS; Gillian Fellows Jensen, in prep. (Ed.Arn.)
12. **Hálfðanar saga Brönufóstra**
59 MSS (3 redactions); Jóhannes Bjarni Sigtryggsson 2000 (Diss. HÍ)
13. **Hálfðanar saga Eysteinssonar**
58 MSS (3 redactions); F. R. Schröder, ASB 15 (Halle, 1917)
14. **Hálfs saga konungs ok Hálfsrekka**
58 MSS (2 redactions); L. Andrews, ASB 14 (Halle, 1907); H. Seelow (Rvk, 1981)
15. **Heiðreks saga konungs ok Hervarar** (= Hervarar saga)
80 MSS (3 redactions); Jón Helgason, STUAGNL 48 (Kbh, 1924); G. Turville-Petre & Chr. Tolkien (London, 1956¹, 1976²); Chr. Tolkien (London, 1960)
16. **Helga þáttr Þórissonar**
7 MSS (Flateyjarbók and MSS derived therefrom); (not in Rafn)
Guðbrandur Vigfússon & C. R. Unger (Chria, 1860-1868)
17. **Hjálmþé(r)s saga ok Ölvis**
34 MSS; R. L. Harris (Diss., Iowa, 1970)
18. **Hrólf's saga Gautrekssonar**
66 MSS (2 redactions); F. Detter (Halle, 1891)
19. **Hrólf's saga kraka**
59 MSS; Finnur Jónsson, STUAGNL 32 (Kbh, 1904); D. Slay, Ed.Arn. B 1 (Kbh, 1960)
20. **Hrómundar saga Gripssonar**
33 MSS; no ed. since Rafn

21. **Högna saga Hálfðanarsonar** (= Héðins saga ok Högna, Sörla þátr)
17 MSS; Guðbrandur Vigfússon & C. R. Unger (Chria, 1860-1868)
22. **Illuga saga Gríðarfóstra**
37 MSS; no ed. since Rafn (ed. by Halla Guðnadóttir in prep.)
23. **Ingvars (Yngvars) saga víðförla**
22 MSS; (not in Rafn) E. Olson, STUAGNL 39 (Kbh, 1912)
24. **Ketils saga hængs**
62 MSS; Jean Morag Rankine 1967 (Diss. UCL); Sarah M. Anderson (Diss. Cornell)
25. **Norna-Gests þátr**
26 MSS; Guðbrandur Vigfússon & C. R. Unger (Chria, 1860-1868)
26. **Ragnars saga loðbrókar**
43 MSS (2 redactions); M. Olsen, STUAGNL 36 (Kbh, 1906-08)
27. **Ragnarssona þátr** (Þátr af Ragnarssonum)
6 MSS (Hauksbók and copies thereof); Finnur Jónsson & Eiríkur Jónsson (Kbh, 1892-96); Bjarni Guðnason, ÍF 35, (Rvk, 1982)
28. **Sturlaugs saga starfsama**
49 MSS (2 redactions); O. Zitzelsberger (Düsseldorf, 1969)
29. **Sögubrot af nokkrum fornkonungum í Dana ok Svíaveldi**
18 MSS; C. af Petersens & E. Olson, STUAGNL 46 (Kbh, 1919-25); Bjarni Guðnason, ÍF 35 (Rvk, 1982)
30. **Sörla saga sterka**
31 MSS (2 redactions); no ed. since Rafn
31. **Tóka þátr Tókasonar**
11 MSS (Flateyjarbók and MSS derived therefrom); (not in Rafn) Guðbrandur Vigfússon & C. R. Unger (Chria, 1860-1868)
32. **Völsunga saga**
39 MSS; M. Olsen, STUAGNL 36 (Kbh, 1906-08); Kaaren Grimstad (Saarbrücken, 2000)
33. **Þjalar-Jóns saga** (Jóns saga Svipdagssonar)
39 MSS; (not in Rafn) Louisa Fredrika Tan-Haverhorst (Leiden, 1939)
34. **Þorsteins saga Víkingssonar**
65 MSS; no ed. since Rafn
35. **Þorsteins þátr bæjarmagns**
53 MSS; (not in Rafn), no ed. since Fornmanna sögur (Kbh, 1825-37)
36. **Örvar-Odds saga**
69 MSS (3 redactions); R. C. Boer (Leiden, 1888) & ASB 2 (Halle, 1892)

Works cited

Editions

- Brávalla rímur eftir Árna Böðvarsson*, ed. Björn Karel Þórólfsson, Rímnafélagið, Reykjavík 1965.
- Fornaldar Sögur Norðrlanda*, ed. Carl Christian Rafn, H.F. Popp, Kaupmannahöfn 1829-1830.
- Hálfsaga ok Hálfsrekka*, ed. Hubert Seelow, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, Reykjavík 1981.
- Haralds rímur Hringsbana*, ed. Ólafur Halldórsson, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, Reykjavík 1973.
- Íslenskar þjóðsögur og ævintýri, safnað hefur Jón Árnason*, ed. Árni Böðvarsson & Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, Bókaútgáfan Þjóðsaga, Reykjavík 1954-61 (1st ed. 1862-1864).
- Munnmælasögur 17. aldar*, ed. Bjarni Einarsson, Leiftur, Reykjavík 1955.
- Úlfhams saga*, ed. Aðalheiður Guðmundsdóttir, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, Reykjavík 2001.

Secondary Literature

- Árni Björnsson, 2000. *Wagner og Völsungar: Niflungahringurinn og íslenskar fornbókmenntir*, Mál og menning, Reykjavík 2000; English translation, *Wagner and the Volsungs: Icelandic sources of Der Ring des Nibelungen*, Viking Society for Northern Research, London 2003.
- Björn Karel Þórólfsson, *Rímur fyrir 1600*, Safn Fræðafélagsins um Ísland og Íslendinga, Möller, Kaupmannahöfn 1934.
- Brown, U. 1946-53. *The saga of Hrómund Gripsson and Þorgilssaga*, «Saga-Book», 13 (1946-53): 51-77.
- Driscoll, M. J. 1997. *The unwashed children of Eve: the production, dissemination and reception of popular literature in post-Reformation Iceland*, Hisarlik Press, London 1997.
- Driscoll, M. J. 2003. *Fornaldarsögur Norðurlanda: The stories that wouldn't die*, in Á. Jakobsson, A. Lassen, A. Ney (eds.), *Fornaldarsagornas struktur och ideologi: Handlingar från ett symposium i Uppsala 31.8–2.9 2001*, Uppsala Universitet - Institutionen för nordiske språk, Uppsala 2003: 257-67.
- Driscoll, M. J. 2008. *Plans for a new edition of the fornaldarsögur, anno 1937*, in Á. Jakobsson, A. Lassen, A. Ney (eds.),

- Fornaldarsagaerne: Myter og virkelighed*, Museum Tusulanum, København 2008: 17-25.
- Driscoll, M. J. 2009. *The words on the page: Thoughts on philology, old and new*, in J. Quinn, E. Lethbridge (eds.), *Creating the medieval saga: Versions, variability, and editorial interpretations of Old Norse saga literature*, University Press of Southern Denmark, Odense 2009.
- Finnur Sigmundsson (ed.) 1966. *Rímnatal*, Rímnafélagið, Reykjavík 1966.
- Foote, P. 1953-57. *Sagnaskemtan: Reykjahólar 1119*, «Saga-Book», 14 (1953-57): 226-39, repr. in *Aurvandilstá: Norse studies*, Odense University Press, Odense 1984: 65-83.
- Hallberg, P. 1982. *Some aspects of the fornaldarsögur as a corpus*, «Arkiv för nordisk filologi», 97 (1982): 1-35.
- Jesch, J. 1982. *Ásmundar saga flagðagæfu*, «Arv», 38 (1982): 103-31.
- Jesch, J. 1984. *Hrómundr Gripsson revisited*, «Skandinavistik», 14 (1984): 89-105.
- Jorgensen, P. A. 1990. *The neglected genre of rímur-derived prose and post-Reformation Jónatas saga*, «Gripla», VII (1990): 187-201.
- Liestøl, K. 1945. *Til spørsmålet om dei eldste islenske dansekvæde*, «Arv», 1 (1945): 69-100.
- Loftur Guttormsson, 1989. «Læsi», *Munnmenntir og bókmennning*, Íslensk þjóðmenning VI, Bókaútgáfan Þjóðsaga, Reykjavík 1989: 119-44.
- Lundgreen-Nielsen, F. 1969. *Mulm og Skræk og Kamp og Død: Johs. Ewalds 'Rolf Krage'*, «Danske Studier», 1969: 5-19.
- Maas, P. 1927. *Textkritik*, Teubner, Leipzig-Berlin 1927; English translation by B. Flower, *Textual criticism*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1958.
- Mitchell, S. A. 1991. *Heroic sagas and ballads*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca (NY) 1991: 185
- Mitchell, S. A. 2003. *The fornaldarsögur and nordic balladry: The Sámsey episode across genres*, in Á. Jakobsson, A. Lassen, A. Ney (eds.), *Fornaldarsagornas struktur och ideologi: Handlingar från ett symposium i Uppsala 31.8–2.9 2001*, Uppsala Universitet – Institutionen för nordiske språk, Uppsala 2003: 245-56.
- Nichols, S. G. 1990. *Philology in a manuscript culture*, «Speculum: A journal of medieval studies», 65, 1 (1990): 1-10.

- Nichols, S. G. 1994. *Philology and its discontents*, in W. D. Paden (ed.), *The future of the middle ages: Medieval literature in the 1990s*, University Press of Florida, Gainesville 1994: 113-41.
- Nichols, S. G. 1997. *Why material philology? Some thoughts*, in H. Tervooren, H. Wenzel (eds.), *Philologie als Textwissenschaft: alte und neue Horizonte*, «Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie», 116 (1997): 10-30.
- Power, R. 1984. *Saxo in Iceland*, «Gripla», 6 (1984): 241-58.
- Quinn, J. et al. 2006. *Interrogating genre in the Fornaldarsögur*, «Viking and medieval Scandinavia» 2 (2006): 275-96.
- Schier, K. 1970. *Sagaliteratur*, Metzler, Stuttgart 1970.
- See, K. von. 1981. *Das Problem der mündlichen Erzählprosa im Altnordischen*, «Skandinavistik», 11 (1981): 89-95, repr. in *Edda, Saga, Skaldendichtung*, Winter, Heidelberg 1981: 506-10.
- Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon, Davíð Ólafsson 2002. *Barefoot historians: Education in Iceland in the modern period*, in K.-J. Lorenzen-Schmidt, B. Poulsen (eds.), *Writing peasants: Studies on peasant literacy in early modern northern Europe*, Landbohistorisk Selskab, Århus 2002: 175-209.
- Sigurður Nordal 1937. *Introduction to Bishop Guðbrand's Vísnaþók 1612*, Monumenta Typographica Islandia, V, Munksgaard, Copenhagen 1937: 7-30.
- Walette, A. 2004. *Sagans svenskar: Synen på vikingatiden och de isländska sagorna under 300 år*, Sekel Bokförlag, Malmö 2004.