

Heimskringla and the Compilations

Most of the Old Icelandic scholarship surviving to us is anonymous and undated, but since the beginnings of modern scholarship on the subject, Heimskringla has been placed at mid-point in the development of the Old Icelandic art of writing history. Heimskringla is thought to have risen significantly above its predecessors in clarity, fullness, and coherence, but these achievements were not fully appreciated, it is thought, by the following generations of historiographers who gathered Heimskringla, its predecessors, and much other material into unwieldy compilations. This time-honored opinion may be mistaken, as the following passages may indicate.

Oddr, ch. 4

En er at degi com geck Þorsteinn ihusit þar er þau suafu. oc það þau risa up scyndiliga oc braut fara sem scyndiligast. hann callaði akaft. oc þau biogguz itomi. Þorsteinn geck at með acava. ok hafði mikin suiga ihendi. oc let sem hann myndi liosta þau oc gera miscunnar laust. ef eigi brygpi þau við sem skiotast. oc síþan gengu þau ut. en hann eptir þeim með reiddan suigann. foru þau með þessum hetti til garðz liðs at hann oagnaði þeim. Oc er þau comu ut um garðin þa heilsaði hann Astripi. oc foruneyti hennar. Oc það hana firir geva ser oll þau orð er hann hafði mält við þau. en þer hafit með þolinmoði borit suivirðleg orð. er með allu hafet verit saclaus. En eigi hefi ec þetta gert firir sakir haðungar eþa harðyðgi er ec oagnaða yör. Nu vil ec biðia licnar firir þat er ec mæltu oc gerða oc scolu þer nu heyra hui ec gerþa sua segir hann þeim síþan slict sem huscarl B. hafði sagt. En þui uilldu ec at þer forit sem skiotast brot af minu herbergi at eigi veri þer her hondum tekin. En at skilnaði það hann þau fara til scogar er scamt var fra

þorpinu. oc það þau fara þaðan hulpu hofði til vaz þess er Miors heitir. Oc síðan fylgia vatninu allt þar til er þau sæi holm einn ivatninu litiN. hann það þau þangat vaða oc sagði eigi meira diup vazzins en take myndi i mitt lár

Heimskringla, ch. 4

En er lifði þriðjungr nætr vakði Þorsteinn upp gesti sína, það þau brot fara, mælti styggliga. En er þau váru komin á veg út ór garðinum, þá segir Þorsteinn þeim, at sendimenn Gunnhildar váru at Bjarnar ok fóru at leita þeira. Þau báðu þeim hjálpar nokkurar; hann fekk þeim leiðtoga ok vist nokkura; fylgði sá þeim fram á skóginn, þar sem var vatn nokkut ok hólmi einum reyri vaxinn. Þau máttu vaða í hólmann út; þar fálu þau sík í reyrnum. Snemma dags reið Hákon frá Bjarnar í byggðina, ok hvar sem hann kom, spurði hann eptir Ástríði. En er hann kom til Þorsteins, þá spyr hann, ef þau sé þar komin. Hann segir, at þar váru menn nokkurir ok fóru móti degi austr

Longest saga, ch. 44

En er þriðjungr lifði nætr vakði Þorsteinn upp gesti sína, ok það þau brott fara skjótt; hann mælti við þau herst, ok lét úfrýnliga. En er þau komu af garðinum út á veginn, heilsaði Þorsteinn Ástríði blíflega, ok mælti síðan: eigi hefir ek fyrir sakir grimðar eör illvilja yör svá skjótt ok harðliga kvadt brott af mínum garði, heldr fyrir því, at sendimenn Gunnhildar konungamóður ero komnir til Bjarnar eitrvæisu, þess eyrendis at taka son ykkarn Tryggva konungs ok fara henni. En nu skulut þér fara eptir minni vísan fram á skóginn, þar til er vatn eitt verðr fyrir yör; í vatninu er einn hólmi reyri vaxinn, þar má vel vaða út í hólmann, felit þér yör þar í reyrinum, ok bíðit svá þess er ek kem til yðar; en ek verð nú furst at snúa heim epti

Oddr Snorrason's version of the history of Óláfr Tryggvason is thought to have been composed in Latin ca. 1190; three translations, none of them entirely complete, none entirely agreeing with another, and all suspect of later contamination, survive to us. Heimskringla is considered a work of the mid-thirteenth century, and Oddr is considered its principal source for Óláfr Tryggvason's history. The Longest Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar is dated to the early fourteenth century; it is thought to be a conflation of Oddr and Heimskringla.

The lack of verbal parallels between Oddr and either of the other two texts can be explained by assuming that the other two texts used Oddr's original Latin or a translation no longer surviving to us. The verbal parallels between Heimskringla and the Longest saga indicate direct borrowing.

Of the three versions cited above, Heimskringla is the odd man out. It lacks Þorsteinn's apology to Ástríðr, it collapses in one scene what the other two texts present in two scenes- Þorsteinn's directions to the island, and his later gift of a guide and provisions- and it lacks a scene found in both other versions (but not cited above) where Þorsteinn places a crying baby in the woods to mislead the pursuers. According to the conventional wisdom, Heimskringla made Oddr's narrative more efficient, but the Longest saga restored to the narrative what Heimskringla had omitted- the apology, the baby, and the delayed gift of a guide and provisions.

However, the fact that Heimskringla and the Longest saga share verbal parallels while Oddr and the Longest saga share material and formal parallels can be explained more simply by supposing that the Longest saga used Oddr as its base and that Heimskringla is an abbreviated version of the Longest saga. Under this simple explanation there is no need to imagine that the Longest

saga went to the trouble of restoring passages omitted by Heimskringla; Heimskringla simply omitted the passages from the Longest saga. Why should not the simpler explanation for the relationships among these texts be preferred?

The most compelling reason for not preferring the simpler explanation has always been the attribution of Heimskringla to Snorri Sturluson, obit 1241. Since the Longest saga has always been considered a work of the early fourteenth or late thirteenth century, the simpler explanation simply will not do. However, the attribution of Heimskringla to Snorri is no longer generally trusted, and thus there is no longer any reason to date it with Snorri's terminus ante quem.¹ If we search the scholarship for other reasons not to prefer the simpler explanation, we find more arguments in favor of the simpler reason than against it. Heimskringla's priority has rested solely on its attribution to Snorri, and only those who have challenged its priority have presented arguments from the texts.

Heimskringla's priority was first challenged by P. E. Müller in 1826. Müller's essay, "Undersøgelse om Snorros Kilder og Troværdighed," treats Heimskringla saga by saga, arguing that Heimskringla is derived principally by abbreviation from the compilations.² In order to get around the fact that Heimskringla's author died generations before the compilations were composed, Müller was led to the absurd conclusion that there must have been twelfth-century versions of the compilations available to Snorri. Had Müller not believed in Snorri's authorship, he would not have been led into what everyone considered an untenable position.

In 1867 Konrad Maurer argued that Snorri did not write all of Heimskringla- much of it was composed long after Snorri's time- and that those parts which he did write had been significantly altered by copyists.³

Maurer's arguments, which should have had a salutary effect on the study, were met by Gustav Storm's Snorre Sturlassons Historieskrivning (Copenhagen, 1873), which turned out to have been the last argument of any size put forward in defense of Snorri's authorship and Heimskringla's priority. As his title may indicate, Storm's arguments for Heimskringla's priority rest on his argument that Snorri wrote Heimskringla, and that Heimskringla survives to us in its original form. The bulk of Storm's book is an application of his hypothesis to the data; he did not specifically address the problem of Heimskringla's textual relationship to the Longest saga. Since Snorri's authorship of Heimskringla is now very much in doubt, Storm's book is no longer of authority in this matter.

Storm's book seems not to have convinced Guðbrandur Vigfússon. In 1878 Vigfússon offered the opinion that Snorri wrote the Longest saga, although the version surviving to us had been somewhat interpolated. The Heimskringla version of Óláfr Tryggvason's life, Vigfússon argued, is a "dull, skeleton-like abridgment, which, like a pirated quarto of Shakespeare, defaces the beauty it cannot hide."⁴ Vigfússon seems to have convinced no one except W. P. Ker, who maintained in 1908- the last published objection to Heimskringla's priority- that there was a common source for Heimskringla and the Longest saga. To espy this lost work, "one has to choose between the abridged and inconvenient shape of Heimskringla, in which Snorri's work appears to have been cut down and trimmed, and the looser form presented by such compilations as the longer saga of Olaf Tryggvason, where more of the original work appears to have been retained than in Heimskringla, though it has to be extricated from all sorts of irrelevant additions and interpolations."⁵

To sum up the history of the scholarship, then, Heimskringla's priority has rested on its attribution to Snorri, and no one has argued for its priority on any other grounds, even though Müller, Maurer, Vigfússon, and Ker,

four of the finest philologists of the nineteenth century, objected to the conventional wisdom; no one in the twentieth century has presented a demonstration of Heimskringla's priority or posteriority. Thus there are no reasons not to prefer the simpler of two explanations of the relationship among Oddr, the Longest saga, and Heimskringla.

In arguing that Heimskringla was derived from the Longest saga, Vigfússon pointed to a mis-abbreviation in Heimskringla. The Longest saga tells how Hákon jarl left his cape at a river in the hope that his pursuers would think he had drowned, and the trick almost works (ch. 104). In Heimskringla, we read only that Hákon left his cape at the river; the rest of the story is nowhere to be found (ch. 48). Heimskringla mis-abbreviated when it forgot to finish the story or to omit it entirely. No one has ever responded to Vigfússon's argument, but a response could be made. Since Oddr tells the whole cape story (ch. 21), it could be maintained that Heimskringla mis-abbreviated Oddr, and that the Longest saga, following Heimskringla word for word, nevertheless restored the passage left out by Heimskringla. However, there is no reason to prefer such a complex explanation to the simple one.

In Oddr (ch. 19) and in the Longest saga (chs. 93 f., 99 f.) Hákon jarl sends Þórir klakka to find Óláfr and bring him to Norway so Hákon can dispose of him; Þórir's treachery is eventually exposed and Óláfr kills him. In Heimskringla (chs. 46 f.) Þórir's search and his elaborate lies are presented as in the other two texts, but once he has brought Óláfr to Norway he drops unpunished from the story. Again, two explanations are possible, the complex explanation that the Longest saga reverently adhered to Heimskringla's diction except where it was restoring passages from Oddr, and the simple explanation that Heimskringla is an abbreviated Longest saga.

P. E. Müller pointed out a peculiar passage in Heimskringla that seemed to show its dependence on the Longest saga. In ch. 80 of the former and in ch. 212 of the latter are found these sentences: "King Óláfr converted everyone living around that fjord and then he made his way south along the coast, and much of what happened during that journey was made into stories about how trolls and evil spirits provoked his men and at times even himself," The Longest saga continues with several troll stories, but Heimskringla says, "But we would rather write about those events when Óláfr converted Norway or those other countries to which he brought Christianity." This statement seems to be an explicit declaration of abbreviation, but Oddr may be brought in again and a more complicated explanation fashioned. Oddr has two troll stories in a context somewhat corresponding, and so one could maintain that Heimskringla's missing troll stories are Oddr's; the Longest saga must then have found Heimskringla's allusion to them a very handy opportunity for re-introducing them, and others.⁶ However, there is no reason to prefer the more difficult explanation.

Arguments of this sort maintaining Heimskringla's priority in relation to the Longest saga are rare. In a footnote on p. 138 of his book on Snorri, Storm remarks that in ch. 14 of Oddr Óláfr is converted by an abbot, in ch. 31 of Heimskringla by a hermit, but in chs. 78 f. of the Longest saga by both an abbot and a hermit. "Here again is seen the difference between a historian and a compiler." According to Storm, Heimskringla preferred Ágrip's story (ch. 16) of a hermit to Oddr's story of an abbot, but the Longest saga, having before him both Oddr and Heimskringla, used both stories. As plausible as Storm's explanation may be, there is nothing in it that speaks against the equally plausible explanation that the Longest saga compiled Oddr and Ágrip, and Heimskringla de-compiled the Longest saga.

Indeed, Heimskringla's remark that Óláfr took with him "priests and other learned men" when he left the hermit seems to be a relic of the verbally parallel remark in the Longest saga, when Óláfr departed from the abbot. Would a proper hermit have priests and other learned men available for Óláfr's use?

If the ancient alignment Oddr-Heimskringla-Longest saga should prove to be in error, we shall have to revise our notions of the "classical" style. Moreover, the relative and absolute chronologies of very many other Old Icelandic texts may be affected. For instance, Heimskringla has long been thought older than Laxdæla saga, and Laxdæla saga is considered older than the Longest saga because the Longest saga takes up several chapters of Laxdæla saga verbatim. However, if Heimskringla is younger than the Longest saga, then it is also younger than Laxdæla saga. Although Heimskringla lacks the long chapters from Laxdæla saga contained in the Longest saga, it nevertheless shows some relics of them. Bolli's role in Laxdæla saga is that saga author's invention;⁷ Bolli is found in no earlier source- unless that source is Heimskringla, ch. 82, where Bolli appears without introduction: "Annan dag eptir var Kjartan skírör ok Bolli Þorláksson frændi hans ok alt foruneyti þeira; var Kjartan ok Bolli í boði konungs, meðan þeir váru í hvítaváðum, ok var konungr allkar til þeira." Heimskringla makes no other reference to Bolli. Since these lines are almost identical in all three accounts, it would seem that Heimskringla's Bolli is derived from the account in the Longest saga which in turn is borrowed from Laxdæla saga.

Our sources for the conversion of Iceland to Christianity become fuller the later they are, and so Heimskringla's brief account would seem to place it among the earlier texts. However, even in its brevity, Heimskringla

reveals knowledge of much fuller accounts than the brief ones of Oddr or Ari. For instance, the Longest saga tells a story of the missionary Pangbrandr's unruliness in Norway (ch. 188), a story unknown to Oddr or Ari. Heimskringla would seem not to know the story either, except that it refers to Pangbrandr's óspekðar (ch. 73), and it has some Icelanders inform Óláfr that "Pangbrandr behaved there as he did here with you, with arrogance and killing" (ch. 84). Unless some third source is involved, Heimskringla's allusions must be to the story told in the Longest saga.⁸

A simple, broad formulation of the relationships among Oddr, Heimskringla, and the Longest saga would be that the Longest saga took up almost all of Oddr, but made some revisions and added a great deal of new material; Heimskringla analyzed the Longest saga and made a "critical" edition, omitting many speeches, prophecies, duplicated episodes, stories about Iceland and Icelanders, and much other material. The few passages found in Heimskringla's version which are not also found in the Longest saga must therefore be Heimskringla's additions to the story. Several of these few additions are paralleled in Fagrskinna, another brief encyclopedic history of the kings of Norway. Indeed, there is a sort of spiritual kinship between Heimskringla and Fagrskinna. Both tend toward a bare-bones, anti-legendary style, and both display an intense interest in skaldic poetry. Could Fagrskinna then have served as a model for Heimskringla? Was the author of Heimskringla out to Fagrskinna-ize the Longest saga? The possibility is not unsober speculation. For instance, Heimskringla and Fagrskinna agree against Oddr and the Longest saga that the young Óláfr was no aggressive warrior for Russia when he sojourned there but rather a defender of Russia, a captain in the civil militia, as it were. The Longest saga cites a skaldic verse as authority for its information about Óláfr, even

though the verse calls Óláfr vörðr, "defender." The verse is from a poem which was composed many generations after the events it describes, and both Fagrskinna and Heimskringla consistently eschew non-contemporary verse. Neither cites the verse, yet both present Óláfr as a defender, as if they knew the verse, preserved its information, but refused to cite it (Oddr ch. 8, Hkr ch. 21, Fsk ch. 21, Longest saga ch. 58). Similarly, both Heimskringla and Fagrskinna report that Óláfr raided in France, even though they do not cite the verse recorded in the Longest saga (ch. 77) which serves as a source. The verse not cited is also from the same non-contemporary poem. Thus the critical use of verse for which Heimskringla is often praised is a matter of omitting non-contemporary verse contained in the Longest saga.

Some of the evidence cited to prove Snorri's authorship of Heimskringla actually works better to prove Snorri's authorship of Fagrskinna. When reporting the legends concerning Óláfr's last battle and death, the Longest saga cites Snorri five times for five items of information (Fms II, 310 twice, 314; III, 1, 5). Since all of these items are found in the Heimskringla version, it seems that the references to Snorri are references to Heimskringla. However, Oddr has most of the information, and Fagrskinna has it all. Similarly, the "Orkneyinga þáttur" in Flateyjarbók's Óláfs saga helga (II, 429 in the 1862 edition) says, "Erlingr son Erlendz jalls segia sumir menn at fallit hafui j Ongulseyjar sunde en Snorre Stulluson segir hann fallit hafua a Ulazstiri med Magnusi konungi." Heimskringla does in fact say that Erlingr fell in Ulster, but so do Morkinskinna and Fagrskinna, and both are considered older than Heimskringla. Moreover, no surviving source but the cited passage is aware of what "some men say." The references are to information which is not original to Heimskringla, but one could say that the information is original

to Fagrskinna, if we exclude Oddr on the grounds of his Latin. Thus the references to Snorri make more sense as references to Fagrskinna than to Heimskringla.

Because of the close parallels in diction between the Longest saga and the manuscript of Heimskringla known as Jöfraskinna, Jöfraskinna is thought to have served as the immediate source for the Longest saga.⁹ However, if the Longest saga is the source for Heimskringla, Jöfraskinna is the Heimskringla manuscript closest to the original, or it is the original. In either case, it is not, as everyone has supposed, one of the most interpolated manuscripts, but rather one of the least abbreviated. Since Jöfraskinna was written by a Norwegian,¹⁰ perhaps Heimskringla is a Norwegian work, an adaptation of an Icelandic work for Norwegian tastes.

Even in recent times, Heimskringla has not been much appreciated in Iceland, whereas it has been called "Norway's second bible."¹¹ Sigurður Nordal explained away Vigfússon's opinion that Heimskringla was "dull" by pointing out that Heimskringla was practically unavailable in Iceland in Vigfússon's day, and so Vigfússon's taste had been warped by youthful readings in the Longest saga.¹² However, if tastes are shaped by repeated readings of a text, there is all the more reason to give the Longest saga a careful reading, since it was available in only one edition prior to 1958, when another edition appeared, whereas Heimskringla has been edited and translated innumerable times. In the opinion of Guðbrandur Vigfússon, "those who only know the life of King Olaf Tryggvason in the Heimskringla form must not only ^{be} ignorant of the greatest perfection to which Icelandic historical writing has attained, but are also in great danger of raising up for themselves false canons of criticism."¹³

Heimskringla is a very long work, and the discussion has dealt only with the period between the birth and death of Óláfr Tryggvason. Preceding this period are several short sagas dealing with the mythical and nearly mythical past. Following Óláfr Tryggvason's saga, Heimskringla continues with Óláfs saga helga, which takes up as many pages as all the preceding sagas. The last third of Heimskringla moves from St. Óláfr's death to the year 1177, and this portion of Heimskringla has close relations with the compilation Hulda-Hrokkinskinna.

Hulda-Hrokkinskinna and Heimskringla stand in the same relationship as the Longest saga does to Heimskringla: both Hulda-Hrokkinskinna and the Longest saga are universally regarded as derivative and unworthy of much print, but they are actually the original works and the source of most of the virtues attributed to Heimskringla. As the Longest saga and Heimskringla are supposed to have their mutual source, Oddr, so Hulda-Hrokkinskinna and Heimskringla are supposed to have their mutual source, Morkinskinna. As the Oddr-Heimskringla-Longest saga alignment is incorrect, so is the present alignment Morkinskinna-Heimskringla-Hulda-Hrokkinskinna. The last two are out of order.

Jonna Louis-Jensen's recent work, cited several times above, studies the textual relations among Morkinskinna, Hulda-Hrokkinskinna, and Heimskringla. She argues, traditionally, that Hulda-Hrokkinskinna compiled a Morkinskinna text and a Heimskringla text. Since there are two classes of Heimskringla manuscripts, an x class and a y class, and since Hulda-Hrokkinskinna shares readings with both classes, the study argues that Hulda-Hrokkinskinna must have used a now-lost Heimskringla manuscript which was of both the x and y classes. Why should not the simpler explanation- that Heimskringla is derived from Hulda-Hrokkinskinna and that is why it shares readings with both classes of Heimskringla manuscripts- be preferred?

FOOTNOTES

¹Jakob Benediktsson's essay, "Hvar var Snorri nefndur höfundur Heimskringlu?" Skírnir 129 (1955), 118-127, displays the utter poverty of evidence for the original attribution of Heimskringla to Snorri. Jonna Louis-Jensen, Kongesagastudier: Kompilationen Hulda-Hrokkinskinna, Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 32 (Reitzel, Copenhagen, 1977), pp. 43-61, reviews the evidence for attributing Heimskringla to Snorri and finds it wanting.

²The essay is found on pp. 247-332 (page numbers 261-270 are skipped) of the sixth volume of the 1826 Copenhagen edition of Heimskringla. The only two editions of the Longest saga are Saga Óláfs Konungs Tryggvasonar, Fornmanna Sögur I-III (Copenhagen, 1825-27) and Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en Mesta, ed. Ólafur Halldórsson, Editiones Arnamagnæana, Series A, 2 vols. (Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 1958). Oddr is edited by Finnur Jónsson, Saga Óláfs Tryggvasonar af Oddr Snorrason Munk (Gad, Copenhagen, 1932).

³Über die Ausdrücke: altnordische, altnorwegische & isländische Sprache, Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akademie der W., I. Cl., XI. Bd. II. Abth. (München), pp. 457-706. Most of Maurer's discussion of Heimskringla is on pp. 588-619.

⁴Sturlunga Saga, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1878), I, lxxxii-lxxxviii. Although this work was published five years after Storm's, it may not in fact be replying to Storm. From Maurer's citations to Vigfússon in Über die Ausdrücke (pp. 589, 597, 641, 650, 656, 657, 667, 673, 674, etc.) it seems that much of what Vigfússon put into the Prolegomena to Sturlunga Saga was already available to Maurer in 1867. Thus Maurer's essay is in some ways a collaboration with Vigfússon, and Vigfússon's remarks on Snorri may have been ready for printing before Storm's book appeared.

⁵Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature, 2nd edition (Macmillan; London), p. 245.

⁶Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson, Om de norske Kongers Sagaer, Det norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II, Hist.-Filos. Kl., no. 4 (Oslo, 1936), p. 130 finds that Oddr could not be Heimskringla's source for these passages, and so he supposes that a lost work by Gunnlaugr Leifsson must have been the mutual source for Heimskringla and the Longest saga.

⁷The Stockholm MS of Oddr mentions Bolli once, and thus it may appear that this version of Oddr was the source for Heimskringla's Bolli, but the most recent study of the question decides that the Stockholm MS has been contaminated from Laxdæla saga. See Rolf Heller, Laxdæla saga und Königssagas, Saga: Untersuchungen zur Nordischen Literatur- und Sprachgeschichte 5 (Niemeyer; Halle, 1961), p. 46.

⁸Gunnlaugr Leifsson's lost work is often brought up in this context, as is Hauksbók's Kristni saga. Kristni saga is unique in giving Pangbrandr a three-year stay in Iceland, perhaps because the author saw that Pangbrandr preached at one Alþing and was outlawed at a second Alþing (the Longest saga reports his outlawry); as some other sources report, Hjalti was outlawed the same summer that Pangbrandr left Iceland, and thus Pangbrandr must have been in Iceland long enough for three Alþing to take place. To fill up the third year, Kristni saga borrowed an episode which is derived ultimately from a new law introduced to Iceland in the year 1281. Pangbrandr is refused supplies by a miser, so he takes what he needs and leaves money behind. (For discussion of this issue see my "Old Law, New Law, and Hensa-Póris saga," Scripta Islandica 27 (1976), 3-12. The source for this episode was thought by Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson, p. 122, and by B. M.

Bergen

Olson, Aarbøger 1893, pp. 323 ff., to have been an "oral tradition.") Thus Kristni saga is younger than 1281 and older than 1334, the date of Haukr's death. Stefán Karlsson, "Aldur Hauksbókar," Fróðskaparrit 13 (1964), 114-121, thinks that the portion of Hauksbók containing Kristni saga is no younger than 1310.

⁹The frequent agreement between the Longest saga and Jöfraskinna against the other Heimskringla MSS has been remarked upon by Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson, p. 90 (he repeats the remark on p. iv of the first volume of the three-volume Íslensk Fornrit edition of Heimskringla), by Jonna Louis-Jensen, p. 36, and by Finnur Jónsson, "Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar (hin meiri)," Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed (1930), pp. 120-121.

¹⁰The Norwegian hand of Jöfraskinna has been pointed out by Finnur Jónsson on p. xxiv of the first volume of the four-volume edition of Heimskringla, STUAGNL 23 (Copenhagen, 1893-1900), by Sigurður Nordal on p. 24 of the first edition of Snorri Sturluson, by Jonna Louis-Jensen, p. 22, note 37, and by KHLNM, sub nomine.

¹¹Sigurður Nordal, "Snorri Sturluson: Nokkurar hugleiðingar á 700. ártíð hans," Skírnir 115 (1941), 10.

¹²Snorri Sturluson, 1st edition (Þór. B. Þórláksson; Reykjavík, 1920), p. 25.

¹³An Icelandic Prose Reader (Oxford, 1879), p. 388.

