

THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF VOLSUNGA SAGA

John Kennedy
Charles Sturt University-Riverina (Australia)

It has become a cliché in the study of translations that the translator is necessarily an interpreter of the text he or she is translating, particularly if it is a literary text. A translation of a literary text cannot fail to reveal something of the translator's attitude to the source language, the target language, and the cultures associated with them, and something of how he or she regards the task of translation. But translations also reflect the period in which they are produced, and if a text is significant enough to have been translated several times into a certain language over an extended timespan, comparison of the translations may reveal something of the varying reception of the text in the cultural history of the users of that target language.

There are several reasons why Volsunga saga seems to offer a suitable focus for comparative study, at least for someone interested in English translations. Leaving out of consideration a paraphrase by Eustace Hinton Jones and George William Cox, first published in 1872, and Jacqueline Simpson's translation of extracts in Beowulf and its Analogues, first published in 1968 by her and G.N. Garmonsway, the work has appeared in complete English translation the manageable number of five times since Eiríkr Magnússon and William Morris first presented their version to the public in 1870. As the second translation, by Margaret Schlauch, first appeared in 1930, the third by R.G. Finch, in 1965, the fourth, by G.K. Anderson, in 1982, and the fifth, by Jesse Byock, in 1990 (1), the intervals between them form a rough geometrical progression, though it would probably be unwise to attach great significance to this or to expect that the appearance of future translations of the saga will continue the pattern of reducing the interval by half! (It is worth noting, however, that a Volsunga saga translation by Haukur Bóssvarsson and Kaaren Grimstad was announced some years ago, and that although Haukur has died Professor Grimstad intends to complete the project. (2))

All five complete published translations are likely to be quite readily accessible. After being republished in several British and American editions before 1914 (3) the Eiríkr Magnússon-William Morris version reappeared in 1962 in a cheap paperback edition, with an introduction by Robert W. Gutman, and this was reprinted at least twice, in 1967 and 1971. (4) That the intended primary market was not scholars is clearly indicated by such details as the disappearance of Eiríkr Magnússon's name from the title page, the splendid horned helmet worn by the figure on the 1967 cover, and by the assurance on the first page of the book that "From the mist-shrouded world of the Norsemen come these marvellous tales of adventure, vibrant with life and imagination". Schlauch's 1930 version has had a more subdued bibliographic career, but the American-Scandinavian Foundation republished it in 1949 and 1964, and AMS Press brought out a reprint in 1976. To judge from the 1990-91 edition of the U.S. listing Books in Print, and the 1990 edition of the British Whitaker's Books in Print, only the Finch version is completely out of print, though the Eiríkr Magnússon-Morris version seems currently in print only as part of a U.S. \$600 edition of Morris's Collected Works.

Though all five versions seem to differ somewhat as to the editions of the Old Norse text on which they are based the task of comparison is simplified by the relatively straightforward manuscript situation. Volsunga saga exists in only one mediaeval manuscript (Ny kgl. Saml. 1824b 4to), dated to about 1400, and in paper versions from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries which all directly or indirectly derive from the mediaeval vellum (though they provide readings of varying degrees of usefulness where the mediaeval manuscript is illegible as a result of deterioration).

A further reason for concentrating on Volsunga saga is the fact that it is usually classified as one of the fornaldarsögur, a genre which usually receives far less attention in considerations of English translations from the Old Norse than the Íslendingasögur and konungasögur. Though Volsunga saga is an unusual fornaldarsaga (and indeed an unusual Icelandic saga) in that many of its principal characters and situations are likely to be quite familiar to educated readers of English encountering it for the first time (thanks largely to Richard Wagner) it may be of

interest to observe whether an awareness of the formaldarsögur as something different from the other genres emerges from the translations.

2

The modern reader who picks up Volsunga saga: The Story of the Volsungs & Niblungs, as Eiríkr Magnússon and William Morris called their version, will immediately become aware of the markedly archaic quality of the writing. It is full of words, phrases, and syntactic constructions no longer in general use; particularly striking is the frequent appearance in dialogue of the obsolete second person singular pronouns "thou" and "thee", and of the second person singular verbal inflection "-est". This impression of archaism owes of course almost nothing to the passage of a hundred and twenty years since the translation was first published: an anonymous reviewer in The Athenaeum for 11 June 1870 described the translation as "too elaborately and obtrusively archaic". (5)

But though never universally accepted, the approach adopted by Eiríkr Magnússon and William Morris reflected an attitude to translating ancient and mediaeval texts which was widespread at that time. An archaic style was felt to add dignity to a translation, to demonstrate proper respect for the text being translated. More importantly, it was felt to emphasise the remoteness in time of the text's composition, and to replicate in some degree the experience which a fluent reader of the source language in modern times would experience in confronting the original. Writing in 1902 W.G. Collingwood and Jón Stefánsson summed up the approach by means of an analogy:

Now in copying an old picture one may try to restore it, - to make it look as it did to contemporaries when the colours were fresh; or one may take it as we find it now. It is always dangerous to restore. We have not the contemporaries' eyes to see it with, even if we were successful in reproducing the old fashioned handiwork. So in translating a Saga, we cannot hear it read or said by the ancient Saga-teller, nor put ourselves in the place of his mediaeval audience. It is impossible to treat it as a contemporary narration. Part of the charm they found in it is gone; another charm has come to it from its faded age and coated varnish of antiquity, through which the human nature still shines, attracting us to our kin of long ago. (6)

"Our kin of long ago" is significant here, for there was an additional argument for using old words and old grammar when translating the Icelandic sagas that did not apply to Greek and Latin texts, and of this William Morris and his disciples were very aware. Old English was far more similar to Old Norse than Modern English is, and by imitating older forms of English and using where possible Germanic words rather than Romance ones the translator could stress the ancient link between the English-speaking peoples and the Scandinavians. One could also take over into English far more of the vocabulary and the grammatical constructions one found in the sagas, thus giving the English-speaking reader a better idea of what the Icelandic text was like. Writing after Morris's death Eiríkr Magnússon stressed this point:

As to the style of Morris little need be said except this that it is a strange misunderstanding to describe all terms in his translations which are not familiar to the reading public as "pseudo-Middle-English". Anyone in a position to collate the Icelandic text with the translation will see at a glance that in the overwhelming majority of cases these terms are literal translations of the Icel. originals, e.g. by-men-byjar-menn=town's people... (7)

In his "Introduction" to the 1962 reprint Robert Gutman offered as part of his defence of the translation the argument that it was a characteristic product of its era:

His [Morris's] language, rich and varied, was Victorian, of an age that in general admired the opulent, the intricate, and the ornate, as witness the great creations in architecture of Pugin and the full-voiced diapason of Ruskin's almost Biblical prose. Is Morris to be reproved because he spoke in the accents of his era? The forms he chose accord with the subject matter; the archaisms he introduced help achieve tone.

The old Norse poets sought atmosphere by the very same means; it is interesting to observe in the ancient skaldic lays the use of already obsolete words. (8)

William Morris might not joyfully have accepted every point in this defence, but doubtless he did believe that his forms accorded with the subject matter, and that the archaisms helped achieve tone. It is worth stressing, however, that similar methods were used in the many other translations from the Old Icelandic on which he and Eiríkr Magnússon collaborated, including their versions on Heimskringla and such Íslendingasögur as Bandamanna saga, Eyrbyggja saga, and Heiðarvíga saga. (9) Indeed their Volsunga saga translation, an early work, probably presents a comparatively mild example of their style. There is no evidence that they saw an archaic style as particularly appropriate to a saga of heroes and supernatural beings set in a very remote past. The same style was considered appropriate for accounts of eleventh century Icelandic farmers and twelfth century Norwegian kings.

Victorian translators of Old Norse material frequently provided copious editorial material, but here Eiríkr Magnússon and Morris were sparing in this regard: the "Preface" runs to only six pages, and there are less than two pages of notes. The edition, they claim, is directed "to the lover of poetry and nature, rather than to the student". (10) They do, however, provide an extensive selection of translations from the Poetic Edda, most of them treating of subject matter dealt with in the saga, though at least two won inclusion primarily because they appealed to the translators. (11) Some of this verse is inserted in the body of the saga translation where, of course, it joins translations of verse found in the mediaeval saga manuscript. Like other Victorian editors and translators they did not have the reverence for the integrity of the manuscript versions of medieval texts which has dominated much twentieth century scholarship.

The 1870 translation was in every sense a pioneering effort, published when the Cleasby-Vigfússon Icelandic-English dictionary was just beginning to appear. It has inaccuracies, turgid and obscure passages, and passages which bring an inappropriate smile to the modern face ("Why art thou so bare of bliss? this manner of thine grieveth us thy friends; why then wilt thou not hold to thy gleesome ways?", ch. 24, p. 82). But the reader can sense that this rendition of "the best tale pity every wrought" was a labour of love, and indeed the performance of a sacred duty, "For this is the Great Story of the North, which should be to all our race what the Tale of Troy was to the Greeks..." (12)

3

Margaret Schlauch published her The Saga of the Volsungs in 1930, soon after the midpoint of that twenty year interval between the World Wars which seems to have yielded only a modest crop of major English translations from the Old Norse. Archaism still had its supporters: E.R. Eddison argued rather passionately for old-fashioned language in an essay, "Some Principles of Translation", appended to his translation of Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar, published that same year. But an alternative view urging that the sagas be translated into an unadorned contemporary prose was gaining ground, having been strikingly exemplified in 1925 by the Laxdæla saga translation of the noted economist Thorstein Veblen. (13)

Whilst proclaiming her admiration for the Eiríkr Magnússon - William Morris translation and declaring it "essentially accurate" Schlauch complained that "the excessively archaic language he [Morris] chose to employ, out of very respect for his original, is unfortunately all but incomprehensible in places..." Her declared response was to employ a "slightly archaic style", attempting "to avoid any expressions not immediately understandable to the modern reader", and she adds: "...I have confined most archaic locutions to the dialogue". (14)

The result is a translation which often does have a decidedly archaic flavour (e.g., "Who art thou that ridest into this burg, where none may enter save by the leave of my sons?", ch. 26, p. 121). It is a style markedly in contrast to that for which Schlauch herself argued forcibly twenty years later when she translated Bandamanna saga and Droplauggarsona saga, and moreover one which she at least partly rejected in reviewing the Finch translation of Volsunga

saga in 1967: "...I may say that I now question the Biblical archaisms (morphological rather than lexicographical) which I introduced into my own translation of the saga back in 1930". (15)

The reason for the use of archaisms in 1930 was Schlauch's conviction that "...even to the Sagaman it [Volsunga saga] was a tale of remote, ancient days, of gods and demigods and half mythical kings..." (16) A very similar attitude was held at that time by E.V. Gordon, probably England's most distinguished Old Norse scholar then active. In introducing Stella Mills's 1933 translation of Hrólfs saga kraka he remarked:

One considerable risk was taken by the translator, but she is justified by the result. The translation includes many archaic forms and idioms, though it is free from any taint of Wardour Street, where so many false antiques were sold. The habit of heavy archaism has in the past given a very misleading impression of Icelandic style. Saga-tellers and saga-writers had nothing equivalent: they used the language of their own time, almost the language of everyday use. In this translation the mild archaism is not misleading. Hrólf's saga tells of events of ancient days (the sixth century), and the fourteenth century author was fully conscious of the antiquity of his matter. The flavour of archaism is just what is needed to express this consciousness. (17)

In 1950 Schlauch was still prepared to state that an archaic translation style might be defensible for the "mythical-heroic sagas" (i.e., the foraldarsögur). (18)

Like the 1870 translation that of Margaret Schlauch does not seem directed towards the student. There is an informative but non-technical introduction, and a very brief bibliography, but no indexes or notes on the translation text. The volume does usefully provide what is still the only complete English translation of Ragnars saga loðbrókar, a work appearing virtually as a continuation of Volsunga saga in the mediaeval manuscript, though only tenuously linked to it in its characters and subject matter. There is also a verse translation of the relatively short work Krákumál.

4

The third translation of Volsunga saga, by R.G. Finch, appeared facing the normalised Old Icelandic text in one of few volumes published in the brave but shortlived series Nelson's Icelandic Texts. Despite what one might expect, however, the translation was not a minor part of the edition, or a literal and unliturgical crib designed to assist students make sense of the Icelandic. Professor Finch's version reads fluently: one reviewer complained that occasionally it "sacrificed accuracy for fluency, and that is a step along the primrose path". (19)

Finch attempted "to provide an English version as free as possible from unnecessary archaisms". While accepting Schlauch's argument that "even to the Sagaman it was a tale of remote ancient days" he rejected the view that it was appropriate to signal this by self-consciously old fashioned language: "...there can be little doubt that the legendary heroes were as real to the people of the mediaeval North as those of the more immediate past, and the compiler of Volsunga saga aims at presenting his poetic material in straightforward saga style and language." (20)

It would be hard to argue that in adopting a fluent, modern, slightly colloquial prose style Finch was not in accord with the translating spirit of the times, or at least a major strand within it. The aim of the enormously popular Penguin Classics series (which produced four volumes of Icelandic saga translations as part of its large output in the 1960s) was to provide the reader with translations which lowered the barriers of time and place, rendering even poetic texts like The Iliad and The Aeneid into prose which could be read almost as easily as a conventional twentieth century novel. Whereas Victorian translators like Morris had tended to emphasise the "otherness" of what was being translated, the aim now often was to make it as accessible and enjoyable as scholarly integrity permitted.

There were dissenters, of course. Hedin Bronner harshly denounced the 1960 translation of Brennu-Njáls saga, by Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Pálsson, stating that the translation

simply is not the saga. The terseness, the dignity, the stylistic range between fire and ice, have been replaced by a chatty and pedestrian prose... And when allmikill lögmáðr (great lawman) is rendered as "outstanding lawyer", it is a Hollywood courtroom melodrama rather than the Alþing tragedy that looms before us. (21)

Perhaps fortunate in that he was working on a less exalted original Finch did not receive criticism of this severity, though it is certainly possible to point to occasions when the tone of middle class modernity jars. One example comes towards the end of the saga, when King Atli reproaches his wife Guðrún, who after slaughtering their children and serving them to him as food has now taken part in fatally wounding him. The Icelandic reads (in Finch's own edition): "ok þína sværu léztu opt með gráti sitja" (ch. 40, p. 73). It may not be a particularly successful touch in the original, but Finch's "and you often had your mother-in-law in tears" (p. 73) seems to strike the wrong note of bourgeois domesticity. Even Eiríkr Magnússon and Morris's "and thy mother-in-law full oft thou lettest sit a-weeping" (ch. 39, p. 153) or Schlauch's "and thou hast oft given my mother cause to sit weeping" (ch. 38, p. 173) seems less incongruous.

Notwithstanding its very readable translation Finch's volume is provided with the kind of apparatus traditionally associated with scholarly editions of mediaeval texts, and seems directed at an academic rather than a popular audience. The level of the material suggests an attempt to meet the needs of serious students who have been studying Old Norse for a year or two, rather than those of experienced Old Norse specialists.

5

It has been suggested in examining the first three translations of Volsunga saga that they were in large measure products of their times. With George K. Anderson's 1982 translation the situation is somewhat different. It is a posthumous publication, having been seen through the press by Geoffrey Russom after Professor Anderson's death in January 1980 at the age of seventy-nine. George Anderson had a long and distinguished career as a specialist in Old and Middle English literature and, according to T.M. Andersson, he "developed a strong interest in Norse literature towards the end of his life". (22)

The George Anderson volume does indeed have characteristics one is inclined to associate with a labour of love compiled when the pressures of a professional scholarly career have been lifted. It is in fact far more than just a translation of Volsunga saga. Also included are a "Genealogical Table", "Notes on the Pronunciation of Old Norse Words", a "Specimen of Old Norse, with English Translation", an "Introduction" to Volsunga saga, 167 often lengthy notes on the translation, an extract from Skáldskaparmál with introduction and notes, an extract from Norna-Gests þáttur with introduction and notes, an extended precis of the Nibelungenlied, a short essay entitled "Two Views of the Nibelungenlied", a "Synopsis of the Thidrekssaga", a "Glossary of Minor Characters", a 155 item annotated bibliography, and an Index. We often move far from the text of Volsunga saga; and the commentary often has a chatty, uninhibited quality avoided by most academic writers in their scholarly publications: "Müllenhoff's approach - for the time and for his country only moderately arrogant - indicates that only professional scholars can know; therefore let amateurs keep away!" (23)

But while Anderson sometimes seems inclined to refigure the scholarly battles of much earlier decades his Volsunga saga is, despite some inconsistencies and obscure passages, in a generally clear modern style. Unfortunately, however, it is very often not accurate: T.M. Andersson reported finding twenty-five translation errors in a sample of five pages, (24) and anyone comparing the translation with the original text is likely frequently to be dissatisfied by the response to the more difficult passages in the Icelandic.

The reviewers were divided in their response to the Anderson volume when it appeared in 1982. It was both praised as making a "decided contribution to the study of medieval Germanic literature" (25) and dismissed as "the bequest of a learned and spirited colleague" which "will not find a place in our scholarly libraries". (26) Many errors in details were noted, and there was an understandable uncertainty as to the audience for which the fairly expensive volume was intended. (Russom in his "Foreword" had rather unhelpfully suggested a "mixed audience of scholars, students and general readers".) Stephen A. Mitchell in *Scandinavian Studies* concluded his review by observing "...the sad truth is, we still need a reliable, inexpensive translation of *Völsunga Sǫgla*". (27)

6

Jesse Byock's 1990 translation, available in a paperback editions as well as in hardcover, is clearly an attempt to provide what Mitchell considered desirable. It is the only one of the five translation volumes to focus on presenting an English version of *Völsunga saga*, without also providing extensive translations from other works or an edition of the Icelandic text. Byock's book should not intimidate the non-specialist reader as for different reasons Finch's and Anderson's are in danger of doing: his introduction is clear and non-technical, and though there are 110 notes on the text, 85 of these are three lines or less in length.

Byock announces in his "Note on the Translation" that he has consulted the four earlier translations of the saga, and he acknowledges: "Although frequently disagreeing with their interpretations of the text, I have found all four works useful in the preparation of this translation". (28) One suspects that most competent translators follow a similar procedure, though only rarely is it acknowledged as openly as here. It is hard not to be in broad agreement with the remarks of Donald Frame, a distinguished translator from the French: "I strongly favor regarding translation, like scholarship, as a cumulative undertaking and therefore borrowing - or stealing - whenever you see that you own best solution to a problem is clearly inferior to someone else's". Before translating for publication, of course, one must have grounds for believing that one "...can markedly improve on all existing translations, and do that without anthologizing (combining everyone else's best parts)..." (29)

Byock could not be accused of being an anthologist: his translation, though in a clear modern idiom like those of Finch and Anderson, is clearly his own. Most students and "general readers" will probably find it the most useful and accessible English version of the saga, and it seems in general very accurate, though someone attempting to understand the Icelandic may welcome having available also a copy of Finch's translation, which is sometimes more literal.

7

Space unfortunately permits the comparative examination of only one short passage as rendered in the five translations. The verse stanzas, of which some thirty are embedded in the manuscript, deserve fuller attention than is possible here, and a passage of prose has been chosen instead. The following piece of direct speech is spoken to Helgi Sigmundarson by his future wife Sigrún Hognadóttir during their first meeting. (The Icelandic text is quoted from Finch's edition, but the reading of the original is not in dispute at this point.)

"Hogni konungr hefir heitit mik Hoddbroddi, syni Granmars konungs, en ek hef því heitit at ek vil eigi eiga hann heldr en einn krákuunga. En þó mun þetta fram fara, nema þú bannir honum ok komir í mót honum með her ok nemir mik á brott, því at með engum konungi vilda ek heldr setr búa en með þér." (ch. 9, p. 15)

The Eiríkr Magnússon-William Morris version is predictably archaic and somewhat wordy, and it is difficult to know what prompted the rather startling piece of alliteration towards the end:

"King Hogni has promised me to Hodbrod [sic], the son of King Granmar, but I have vowed a vow that I will have him to my husband no more than if he were a crow's son and not a king's; and yet will the thing come to pass, but and if thou standest in the way thereof, and goest against him with an army, and takest me away withal; for verily with no king would I rather bide on bolster than with thee." (ch. 9, p 28)

Schlauch's version, while still displaying archaisms, is markedly simpler and more direct than that provided in 1870:

"King Hogni has promised me to Hodbrodd, son of King Gunnar [sic], but I have sworn that I will no sooner have him than a raven; and yet it will come to pass unless thou ban him and do battle against him with thy host and take me away with thee, for with no king would I rather abide than with thee." (ch. 9, p. 68)

Finch's version, while accurate, tends in fairly characteristic fashion to combine slightly formal and slightly colloquial elements:

"King Hogni" ... "has promised me in marriage to Hodbrodd, King Granmar's son, but I have vowed to have him no more than I'd have a fledgling crow as a husband - but it will none the less come to that, unless you stop him and come against him with an army and take me away, for there is no king I would rather make a home with than you." (ch. 8, p 15)

Whilst not obviously distorting the sense of the passage Anderson is rather more free:

"King Högni has promised me to Hodbrodd, son of King Granmar, but I have sworn that I would as soon marry a young crow as marry him, and yet this will come to pass unless you can prevent him by going against him with warriors and then taking me away, for I have no wish to live with any other king than you." (ch. 9, pp 69-70)

Byock allows himself significant freedom with the original syntax - probably more than is usual in his translation. He seems faithfully to reproduce the sense of the passage:

"King Hogni has promised me to Hodbrodd, the son of King Granmar. But I have sworn that I would no sooner have him than a young crow. Yet the marriage will take place unless you stop Hodbrodd. Fight him with your army and take me away, because there is no king with whom I would rather dwell than with you." (ch. 9, p 48)

8

A reader of the five complete translations will find that all except to a limited extent that of Eiríkr Magnússon and Morris eliminate the apparently arbitrary oscillations between present and preterite which are such a characteristic feature of saga narrative. Though no one seems to be suggesting a revival of archaism in saga translation, there is today an apparently growing belief that features of saga style such as this tense variation and the often paratactic syntax should be carried over into English translations, even if the price is a kind of English prose which reads rather oddly on first acquaintance. Its supporters believe that such an approach can provide a freshness and energy missing from translations into more conventional English, and that any other approach is likely to destroy important information on the "worldview" of those who created the sagas. (30) Again, as in Victorian times, there is concern that readers of translations should not readily forget the distance which separates us from mediaeval Iceland. Though both the economics of publishing and the achievements of the first five versions must severely limit the market for new versions of *Völsunga saga* in the years immediately ahead, it seems possible to perceive at least one direction likely to be taken by future translators in their task of interpretation.

ENDNOTES

1. Eustace Hinton Jones and George William Cox, Tales of Teutonic Lands (London: Longmans Green, 1872) 31-78; G.N Garmonsway and Jacqueline Simpson, Beowulf and its Analogues (London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1968) 252-264, 276-279; Volsunga saga: The Story of the Volsungs & Niblungs, with Certain Songs from the Poetic Edda, trans. Eiríkr Magnússon and William Morris (London: Ellis, 1870; facsimile reprint London: George Prior; Totowa, New Jersey: Cooper Square, 1980); The Saga of the Volsungs, trans. Margaret Schlauch (New York: American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1930); The Saga of the Volsungs, trans. R.G. Finch (London: Nelson, 1965); The Saga of the Völsungs. Together with Excerpts from the Nornagestiháttir and Three Chapters from the Prose Edda, trans. George K. Anderson (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1982); The Saga of the Volsungs: The Norse Epic of Sigurd the Dragon Slayer, trans. Jesse L. Byock (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). Quotations from the five translations are drawn from these editions.
2. Kaaren Grimstad, letter to the writer, 24 September 1990.
3. See Donald K. Fry, Norse Sagas Translated into English: A Bibliography (New York: AMS Press, 1980) 104-105.
4. Volsunga saga: The Story of the Volsungs and Niblungs, trans. William Morris, with an intro. by Robert W. Gutman (New York: Collier, 1962).
5. Page 764.
6. W.G. Collingwood and Jón Stefánsson, trans., The Life and Death of Cormac the Skald (Ulverston: Holmes, 1902) 21.
7. Eiríkr Magnússon, ed., The Story of the Kings of Norway Called the Round of the World (Heimskringla), by Snorri Sturluson, trans. Eiríkr Magnússon and William Morris, vol. 4 (London: Quaritch, 1905; 4 vols. 1893-1905) vii-viii.
8. Gutman 79.
9. The Story of Howard the Halt: The Story of the Banded Men: The Story of Hen Thorer (London: Quaritch, 1891); The Story of the Fire-Dwellers with the Story of the Heath-Slayings as Appendix (London: Quaritch, 1892).
10. Eiríkr Magnússon and Morris, Volsunga saga v.
11. Eiríkr Magnússon and Morris, Volsunga saga vii, x.
12. Eiríkr Magnússon and Morris, Volsunga saga xx, xi.
13. Egil's Saga, trans. E.R. Eddison (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1930); The Laxdæla Saga, trans. Thorstein Veblen (New York: Huebsch, 1925).
14. Schlauch xxx-xxxii.
15. Margaret Schlauch, rev. of The Saga of the Volsungs, trans. R.G. Finch, Medium Ævum 36 (1967): 208. See also Margaret Schlauch in Three Icelandic Sagas, trans. H.M. Scargill and Margaret Schlauch (Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: O.U.P., 1950) 54.
16. Schlauch, Saga of Volsungs xxxi.

17. E.V. Gordon in The Saga of Hrolf Kraki, trans. Stella M. Mills (Oxford: Blackwell, 1933) xii.
18. Schlauch, Three Icelandic Sagas 54.
19. R.I. Page, rev. of The Saga of the Volsungs, trans. R.G. Finch, Notes and Queries N.S. 14 (1967): 280.
20. Finch xxxix.
21. The American Scandinavian Review 50 (1962): 318.
22. T.M. Andersson, rev. of The Saga of the Völsungs, trans. George K. Anderson, Speculum 58 (1983): 841. See also Russom, "Foreword" in Anderson 9.
23. Anderson 246.
24. Andersson 841.
25. Stephen A. Mitchell in Scandinavian Studies 56 (1984): 174.
26. Andersson 841.
27. Mitchell 174.
28. Byock 31-32.
29. Donald Frame, "Pleasures and Problems of Translation," in The Craft of Translation, ed. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989) 82-83.
30. See E. Paul Durrenberger and Dorothy Durrenberger, "Translating Gunnlaug's Saga: An Anthropological Approach to Literary Style and Cultural Structures," Translation Review 21-22 (1986): 11-20 and the references listed there. See also Paul Acker, "Valla-Ljóts saga: Translated with Introduction and Notes," Comparative Criticism 10 (1988): 212.