

To Dream or Not to Dream: A Question of Method

Guðrún Nordal
(Háskóli Íslands, Reykjavík)

1

Sturlunga saga is preserved in two major compilations from the late fourteenth century, now defective, Króksfjarðarbók (AM 122a fol.) and the slightly later Reykjarfjarðarbók (AM 122b fol.). Króksfjarðarbók is more complete, containing 110 out of 141 leaves of the original book, yet both the beginning and the end are missing, and there are lacunae within the saga (Jakob Benediktsson 1958:7-8). Reykjarfjarðarbók contains only 30 leaves out of the 180 original leaves, where *Sturlunga saga* is found on 24 leaves (Stefán Karlsson 1970:120ff; see also Ólafur Halldórsson 1963:100-2), and fragments of *Árna saga biskups*, *Prestssaga Guðmundar góða* and Bishop Guðmundr's *Jarteinir* on the remaining six leaves. Reykjarfjarðarbók is alone in integrating *Þorgils saga skarða* in the compilation, but there are also significant divergences between the two manuscripts in the rendering of the text, abbreviations or expansions. It is therefore legitimate to speak of two versions of *Sturlunga saga*. The splendour of these two volumes bears witness to the esteem in which the subject-matter was held at the end of the fourteenth century. Many paper manuscripts from the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries descend from the vellums when they were more complete than they are now. These, however, do not contain exact copies of either manuscript but a blend of the two. This makes a reconstruction of the Reykjarfjarðarbók, which is by far the more defective manuscript, difficult, yet it may be possible to trace the text of the manuscript through the testimony of one seventeenth-century manuscript in particular, the British Library Add 11,127 (*Br*).¹

It comes as no surprise, in light of the variability in the manuscript transmission of medieval texts, that the two vellums of *Sturlunga saga* contain different versions of the saga. The transmission of some of the major works informs our understanding of the evolution of Icelandic medieval saga writing. In fact, we cannot faithfully document the growth of Icelandic saga literature unless we take into account the rewriting of the sagas in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The difference between the manuscripts in this first phase of the transmission, from the thirteenth century, when the texts were first submitted to vellum, to around 1400, challenges scholars to assess each manuscript of *Njáls saga*, *Egils saga*, *Heimskringla*, *Sturlunga saga* and *Snorra Edda*, to name only a handful of important examples, instead of clinging to one standard edition of each work. In all these cases we rely on fourteenth-century manuscripts when drawing up a picture of a supposedly thirteenth-century work, and in many of these cases, though not in the case of *Sturlunga saga*, there exists an earlier fragment alongside a more complete fourteenth-century manuscript,

¹ Kristian Kålund's account of the manuscripts of *Sturlunga saga* in his edition of 1906-11 remains the most detailed and reliable to date. Pétur Sigurðsson (1933-35) and Björn M. Ólsen's 1902 remain the most detailed studies of the origin of the text of *Sturlunga saga* in the two manuscripts.

which provides us with clues to the degree of the variation in the transmission. *Njáls saga* and *Egils saga* are preserved in early fragments but also in fourteenth-century codices; both are in Mððruvallabók, for example, which has served as the standard text in recent editions even though it differs markedly from earlier manuscripts (Guðrún Nordal 2003:179-86 and Guðrún Nordal 2005:218-32). *Snorra Edda* is preserved in different versions in manuscripts from c. 1300, written at least seven decades after Snorri Sturluson first put the work together (*setja saman* is the phrase used in *Codex Upsaliensis* about his composition; see Guðrún Nordal 2001:41-72). The same uncertainty applies to the thirteenth-century *Heimskringla*, as Jonna Louis Jensen has persuasively demonstrated (1997:231-45).

In this paper I would like to highlight one important difference between the two manuscripts of *Sturlunga saga* and inquire whether, in our presentation and interpretation of the text, we are guided by the author, the compiler or the editors of the manuscripts. This is not a rhetorical question, because our findings have a bearing on how we contextualize *Sturlunga saga*, whether the two manuscripts of the saga belong in a thirteenth-century literary and political framework, or whether they reflect the understanding of thirteenth century politics by writers at the end of the fourteenth century. It is therefore essential to clarify the origin of the text, which is our main source for twelfth- and thirteenth-century Icelandic history. My examples are inspired by the major theme of this conference on the fantastic in medieval Icelandic literature, and therefore I have chosen to throw into relief two well-known dream sequences which introduce the fantastic and the supernatural into the historical framework of *Sturlunga saga*.

2

Dreams are invoked on a number of occasions in the narrative of *Sturlunga saga*. They are vehicles of moral assessment of events and key persons on the scene, and provide the author with an opportunity, in the guise of the dream person, to present the audience with an ethical evaluation of the unfolding action. A stanza spoken in a dream articulates a different point of view on the action which is difficult to convey in the prose narrative. Robert J. Glendinning made clear in his study on dreams in *Íslendinga saga* that Sturla Þórðarson preceded his narration of major events with dreams in order to evoke a moral judgment on the chieftains' conduct, such as before the battle against Bishop Guðmundr in 1209, the battle at Bærr in 1237, the battle at Örygsstaðir in 1238, and the burning of Flugumýrr in 1253. This narrative technique is not restricted to Sturla Þórðarson's *Íslendinga saga*; there are similar examples in *Hrafn saga Sveinbjarnarsonar* and *Þorgils saga skarða*. The dream persons, some of whom are known literary figures from the past (e.g. Egill Skalla-Grímsson and Guðrún Gjúkadóttir in *Sturlunga saga*), visit a named individual in the thirteenth century and by speaking in skaldic verse invoke the fantastic in the narrative.²

² I refer to Robert J. Glendinning's 1974 (186ff) discussion of the role of interpolated dream section before the battle of Örygsstaðir. See also Guðrún Nordal (1990:217-21) on the dream stanzas before the battle at Örygsstaðir and Bergljót S. Kristjánsdóttir (1990:247-51) on Jóreiðr's dreams.

The question at the heart of my paper is whether we can maintain that these dream stanzas were in the sagas made use of by the compiler of *Sturlunga saga*, or if they were introduced by the compiler or even the editor of *Króksfjarðarbók* in the fourteenth century, who seems to have favoured dream stanzas whereas the editor of *Reykjarfjarðarbók* did not. The two main dream sequences under discussion belong to that part of the saga where the compiler is thought to be following Sturla Þórðarson's *Íslendinga saga* (see below). The first one is a long dream section before the battle at Örylgsstaðir in the summer of 1238 (*Sturlunga* I, 518-21, 1946-edition ch. 136), and the second contains the dreams of Jóreiður dated to the year 1255 (*Sturlunga* II, 243-5, 1946-edition ch. 190). Jóreiður's dreams are cited in *Sturlunga saga* after a chapter (probably originating in *Íslendinga saga*) describing the combat at Þverá (Þveráfundr) in the year 1255, where Þorvarðr Þórarinnsson, Sturla Þórðarson and Þorgils skarði Bððvarsson fought two of Sturla Sighvatsson's former sons-in-law, Hrafn Oddsson and Eyjólfur ofsi Þorsteinsson. Both dream sequences are missing in *Reykjarfjarðarbók*. Which manuscript contains the original version of the compilation or indeed the text of *Íslendinga saga*? Is it even justifiable, in view of medieval ideas of authorship, to speak of an 'original' version (see Nichols 1990: 1-10 and Sverrir Tómasson 2002)? The two important dream sequences are not in the British Library manuscript, the best representative of *Reykjarfjarðarbók*, and as they are in *Króksfjarðarbók*, we can surmise that the writer of *Br* is following *Reykjarfjarðarbók* at this point. We can not be certain whether or not the dream sequences belonged to the compilation originally, let alone whether they were in Sturla Þórðarson's *Íslendinga saga*.

In my work on the editing of the 150 stanzas contained in both manuscripts of *Sturlunga saga*, I have run up against problems which highlight and bring out the extent of textual variation in the fourteenth-century manuscripts; not only the expected textual variants within individual stanzas but also a distinct variation in the number of verse citations and therefore a clear variability in the *prosimetric* form of the saga. A number of questions present themselves which will underpin the discussion in this paper: Why do the two manuscripts differ in their preservation of dreams, and dream stanzas, in particular? Are we given a more powerful rendering of Örylgsstaðabardagi in the *Króksfjarðarbók*-version where the editor introduces a great number of dream stanzas from all parts of Iceland before describing the battle? Is the depiction of Þorgils skarði in *Reykjarfjarðarbók* dramatically different because the dreams of Jóreiður are not included in the manuscript? Do the manuscripts of *Sturlunga saga* suggest an active audience in the late fourteenth century, which sought to redefine some of the key episodes in Iceland's political history of the thirteenth century?

When discussing *Sturlunga saga* we are dealing with four stages in the transmission of the text: 1) a reconstruction of the sagas, such as the 'original' *Íslendinga saga* by Sturla Þórðarson; 2) the writing of the compilation c. 1300, possibly by Þórðr Narfason; 3) the editing (or compiling) of two manuscript versions of the compilation dated to the latter part of the fourteenth century and, 4) the copies made of the two manuscripts in the seventeenth century. An editor of the stanzas and of the saga needs to ask whether it is more imperative to be loyal to the author, the compiler or the editors of the manuscripts. If we keep in mind Bonaventura's (c.1217-74) classification of book-making in the thirteenth century, the writers of two

manuscripts are perhaps more fittingly called compilers.³ But do we have a choice in the matter? We are obliged to study the manuscripts, the textual habits of the scribes and their alternative rendering of the works they are copying and editing, but by studying the variation between the two manuscripts we inevitably ponder the structure and contents of the compilation. The two manuscripts are not derived from a common original, and therefore we must clearly regard the two codices as independent witnesses to the compilation.

Kr. Kálund followed Króksfjarðarbók in his edition of *Sturlunga saga*, and supplied readings from Reykjarfjarðarbók where possible in the main text, using a smaller font. He made it very clear where he mixed the text of the two manuscripts. This editorial method works well in some parts of the saga, where there are only minor differences between the manuscripts, but in other sections it is more problematic to get a clear picture of either text, particularly in the latter part of *Sturlunga saga* where the differences between the manuscripts are substantial (post 1246). Before we go further it is of interest to mention some examples of the major differences between the compilations, apart from the already mentioned dream sequences:

1. The two manuscripts (or manuscript groups) differ in various ways in their depiction of Bishop Guðmundr Arason in *Sturlunga saga*, e.g. during his priesthood (*Sturlunga* I, 148-9), the account of his election as bishop (*Sturlunga* I, 260-2), and his death in 1237 (*Sturlunga* I, 489-92). Moreover, Reykjarfjarðarbók contained Guðmundr's miracles and thus the description of Guðmundr in Reykjarfjarðarbók, which was written in close vicinity to the episcopal seat at Hólar, is placed in context with his canonization in the fourteenth century.
2. There are significant textual variations in *Guðmundar saga dýra*, e.g. an additional chapter in Reykjarfjarðarbók about the northerners (*Sturlunga* I, 169-2, 212-13) and more details are given about Ögmundur sneis, a cousin of Guðmundr Arason (see also *Sturlunga* I, 177-8).
3. There are significant textual variations in *Þórðar saga kakala*, particularly in the chapters relating Tumi Sighvatsson's attack on farmers in the north, and his subsequent death (*Sturlunga* II, 53-56). Tumi's execution is described in more detail in Reykjarfjarðarbók, but the telling of the brutal vengeance wrought by Kolbeinn ungi's men in the Dales is more extended in Króksfjarðarbók and the stanza by the old

³ Bonaventura's explication of the different nature of authorship is cited in Minnis and Scott 1988: 229: '[W]e must note that there are four ways of making a book. For someone writes out the words of other men without adding or changing anything, and he is called the scribe (*scriptor*) pure and simple. Someone else writes the words of other men, putting together material, but not his own, and he is called the compiler (*compilator*). Someone else writes the words of other men and also his own, but with those of other men comprising the principal part while his own are annexed merely to make clear the argument, and he is called the commentator (*commentator*), not the author. Someone else writes the words of other men and also of his own, but with his own forming the principal part and those of others being annexed merely by way of confirmation, and such a person should be called the author (*auctor*).² I'll, however, be using the term *editor* in relation to the writing of the two manuscripts to avoid confusion with the *compiler* of *Sturlunga saga* c. 1300.

woman naming the chieftains attacking Sturla Þórðarson's farm at Tunga is only found in Króksfjarðarbók.

4. *Þorgils saga skarða* is only in Reykjarfjarðarbók, which places the political history after 1246 in a different light in that manuscript.
5. The narrative about Gizurr and Þórðr kakali at the royal court in Norway (*Sturlunga* II, 300-1) is only found in Reykjarfjarðarbók.
6. Significant additions are made to *Svinfellinga saga* in Reykjarfjarðarbók (chapters printed as a, b, c, d, and e in *Sturlunga* II, 116-19), particularly in relation to Þórðr kakali and his men. Pétur Sigurðsson argued that they belonged originally to *Íslendinga saga*, but they are not found in Króksfjarðarbók. It seems unlikely that the editor of Króksfjarðarbók would have omitted these chapters, and therefore it seems plausible that they were introduced by the editor of Reykjarfjarðarbók.
7. The killing of Þórðr Andréasson is only narrated in Króksfjarðarbók.
8. *Sturlu þáttir* is only preserved in copies of Reykjarfjarðarbók.

These examples show that many of the significant variations between the manuscripts involve chieftains in the north; they relate to Bishop Guðmundr, Guðmundr dýri, and the contest for power in Iceland after 1242, when Þórðr kakali and later Þorgils skarði get directly involved. Reykjarfjarðarbók was written at Akkrar in Skagafjörður in the second part of the fourteenth century and the version of events in the manuscripts may reflect the point of view of the people in Skagafjörður at the time (Stefán Karlsson 1970:129-30). We only know that a marginal note in Króksfjarðarbók, probably from the fifteenth century, mentions the farm Bær in Króksfjörður in Barðarstrandasýsla in the west of Iceland in (Kälund 1906-11:iv), so it is possible that the manuscript's origin is in the western part of the country.

The dream sections add symbolic and even apocalyptic imagery into the historical narrative.⁴ The question remains whether the dream stanzas belonged to the compilation originally, or if they were introduced by the editor of the Króksfjarðarbók in the late fourteenth century. Could the interest in the fantastic in these sections be associated with the growing interest in the supernatural in the fourteenth-century, which can be gauged from the younger sagas of Icelanders and the *foraldarsögur*? Does the friendly characterization of Guðrún Gjúkadóttir in Jóreiðr's dreams reflect fourteenth-century literary taste, rather than the literary and intellectual sentiments of a thirteenth-century audience familiar with Guðrún's formidable portrayal in *Snorra Edda* and in the eddic poetry?⁵

3

The provenance of *Sturlunga saga* is especially complicated at the point when the two dream sections are interpolated into the text of Króksfjarðarbók. Both sequences are introduced at important junctions in the narrative. The death of Bishop Guðmundr in the year 1237 precedes the narration of the battle at Örylgsstaðir. Björn M. Ólsen

⁴ I have written about the imagery in the dream stanzas elsewhere, 1990:217-21.

⁵ The fourteenth-century versions *Skáldskaparmá* in *Snorra Edda* omit the sections on the legendary heroes, such as Guðrún Gjúkadóttir, e.g. Codex Upsaliensis and Codex Wormianus, see Guðrún Nordal 2001, Table 5.1.

noted that the hagiographical description of his death (described differently in the two manuscripts) and burial breaks the narrative mode of *Sturlunga saga*, and he suggested that it was taken from *Guðmundar saga* (1902: 294-6). Scholars have speculated whether the miracles of Guðmundr were supposed to be interpolated into the Reykjarfjarðarbók manuscript of *Sturlunga saga* at precisely this junction (see Stefán Karlsson 1970:125). Björn M. Ólsen analysed the narrative leading up to the battle at Örlýgsstaðir in 1238 and concluded that the compiler was relying on two sources in his depiction of events, *Gizurar saga* and *Íslendinga saga*. He surmised that chapter 136 (in the 1946 edition), which contains the sequence of dream stanzas in question, had originally belonged to the hypothetical *Gizurar saga* (Björn M. Ólsen 1902:328). Pétur Sigurðsson, on the other hand, argued against a separate saga about Gizurr, and concluded that the dreams had certainly not been in Sturla Þórðarson's *Íslendinga saga* but inserted into *Sturlunga saga* by the compiler, Þórðr Narfason (Pétur Sigurðsson 1933-5:52-3). It is important to emphasise that it is impossible to tell whether the dream sequence belonged to the compilation originally, or whether it was introduced by the editor of Króksfjarðarbók.

The textual situation is much more complex in the latter part of *Sturlunga saga*. The narrative is intricately woven after 1242, and Björn M. Ólsen and Pétur Sigurðsson explain the sources of the compiler in a very different way. The two manuscripts present a markedly different version of events after Þórðr kakali enters the saga in the year 1242, and it is impossible to be certain whether many of the sections belonged to *Íslendinga saga* originally, as Pétur Sigurðsson maintains (Björn M. Ólsen suggested the missing link **Gizurar saga*), or if they were written by the compiler of *Sturlunga saga* or indeed by the editors of the manuscripts. By following Kålund's edition it is possible to bring to light the two narrative threads:

Króksfjarðarbók (or paper manuscripts)	Reykjarfjarðarbók (or paper manuscripts)
<i>Þórðar saga kakala</i>	<i>Þórðar saga kakala</i>
<i>Svínfellinga saga</i>	<i>Svínfellinga saga</i>
(missing)	Fragments a-e (<i>Sturlunga II</i> , 116-18) ⁶
<i>Svínfellinga saga</i>	<i>Svínfellinga saga</i>
(missing)	Fragment (<i>Sturlunga II</i> , 131-2, about Eyjólfir, Hrafn, Sturla and Þorleifr).
<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (chs. 164-66 in the 1946 edition of the saga)	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (<i>Sturlunga II</i> , 132-6)
(missing)	<i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (<i>Sturlunga II</i> , 136-185)
<i>Íslendinga saga</i> : the burning of Flugumýrr	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> : the burning of Flugumýrr
(missing)	Fragment from <i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (<i>Sturlunga II</i> , 223)

⁶ Björn M. Ólsen suggested that *c* was drawn from *Þórðar saga kakala*, but the remaining four from **Gizurar saga*. Pétur Sigurðsson thought that *c* was written by the editor or Reykjarfjarðarbók and the other four were taken from *Íslendinga saga*. The editors of the 1946 edition follow his conclusions, chs. 159-62.

<i>Íslendinga saga</i>	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (Hrani Koðránsón killed)
(missing)	Fragment from <i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 219)
<i>Íslendinga saga</i>	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (Oddr arrests Bishop Heinrekr)
(missing)	Fragment from <i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 226-9).
<i>Íslendinga saga</i>	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 229).
(missing)	Fragment from <i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 229-30).
<i>Íslending saga</i>	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (Oddr Þórarínsson killed)
Þverárfundur (ch. 189 in the 1946 edition of <i>Íslendinga saga</i>)	Þverárfundur (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 240-242)
Jóreiðr's dreams (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 243-5)	(missing)
(missing)	<i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (Þverárfundur described in more detail again)
Fragment in I (<i>Sturlunga</i> I, 298; relating Þorgils's death)	(missing)
<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (ch. 191 in the 1946 edition)	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (1258)
(missing)	Fragment (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 300-1; ch. 192, in 1946-edition); Þórðr kakali and Gizurr at the court)
<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (ch. 192, in the 1946 edition)	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (Gizurr appointed earl)
(missing)	<i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 302-3)
<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (ch. 193-4 in the 1946 edition)	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (Gizurr returns to Iceland in 1258, <i>Sturlunga</i> II, 303-5)
(missing)	<i>Þorgils saga skarða</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 305-8)
<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (ch. 195-98, in the 1946 edition)	<i>Íslendinga saga</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 308-13)
The killing of Þórðr Andréasson (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 313-17)	(missing)
(missing)	<i>Sturlu þáttir</i> (<i>Sturlunga</i> II, 321-28)

Both Björn M. Ólsen and Pétur Sigurðsson maintained that *Sturla Þórðarson* did not write the last part of the saga, chapters 191-198, depicting Gizurr Þorvaldsson's return to Iceland as an earl in 1258. Jón Jóhannesson, on the other hand, categorised them as originally belonging to *Íslendinga saga* (Jón Jóhannesson 1946:xxxv). The two last chapters of the compilation, that is chapters 199-200, relating Gizurr's killing of Þórðr Andréasson in 1264, were certainly not in *Reykjarfjarðarbók* (as they are not in *Br*), but Jón Jóhannesson suggested that they belonged to *Íslendinga saga* as well. *Sturla*

þátr was only in *Reykjarfjarðarbók* and probably introduced by the editor of the manuscript. It is therefore unclear how the compilation was brought to a close by the compiler c. 1300. The uncertainty is increased by the fact that both manuscripts are defective at the end of the compilation and we must rely on the paper manuscripts.

The dreams of Jóreiðr differ fundamentally from other dream stanzas in the saga, in that Guðrún Gjúkadóttir names all the major chieftains, explains her message and casts a moral judgment on them. In naming the chieftains, the dream stanzas echo the old woman's stanza in *Þórðar saga kakala* previously mentioned, which is only interpolated into the narrative in *Króksfjarðarbók*. I suggest that the dream stanzas were interpolated later in the compilation by the editor of *Króksfjarðarbók*. The criticism handed out by Guðrún is directed at Þorgils skarði, Eyjólfur ofsi Þorsteinsson and Hrafn Oddsson, the men depicted in detail in *Þorgils saga skarða* in the version in *Reykjarfjarðarbók*, but Þorvarðr Þórarinnsson and particularly Gizurr Þorvaldsson, the future earl, are admired. The two dream sequences in *Króksfjarðarbók* underscore the importance of Gizurr Þorvaldsson in the saga. Björn M. Ólsen noticed this emphasis on Gizurr and suggested that the dreams of Jóreiðr originated in the hypothetical *Gizurar saga* (1902:346-7). Gizurr is named in dream stanzas in both sequences: in two ambiguous dream stanzas before the battle of Örlygsstaðir, where the fighting is evoked, and in Jóreiðr's second dream where Guðrún Gjúkadóttir is unequivocal in her admiration of Gizurr, both in a verse and in her explanatory comments: '*Er þér vel til hans?*' *segir mærin*. '*Harla vel*', *segir hon* (1946 edition of *Sturlunga saga* I, 521: "Do you like him?" asks the girl. "Very much," she says').

Reykjarfjarðarbók contains a significantly different text from *Króksfjarðarbók*, as is clear from the comparison between the two versions. The depiction of the political turmoil in Iceland in the middle of the thirteenth century is altered by the interpolation of *Þorgils saga skarða*, Bishop Guðmundr's miracles and *Árna saga byskups* into the manuscript. The miracles belong possibly in the narrative right after Guðmundr's death in 1237, and thus a very different emphasis would have been placed on the death of Guðmundr in *Reykjarfjarðarbók*. The introduction of Þorgils skarði, however, adds weight to the power battle in Iceland, particularly in the north, during the time when Gizurr Þorvaldsson is in Norway, in the period which is poorly represented in *Króksfjarðarbók*.

4

An appreciation of the manuscript transmission of *Sturlunga saga*, from the thirteenth century to the end of the fourteenth century, has obvious repercussions for our interpretation of the text and the contextualization of *Sturlunga saga* in the literary tradition in Iceland and for the saga's relations with other genres, such as the Sagas of Icelanders. The differences between the two manuscripts may be due to their different origin and the editors' dissimilar evaluations of the main players in the political turmoil of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. *Reykjarfjarðarbók* has been linked to Akur in Skagafljörður, a farm close to Hólar, and the material particular to that manuscript shows a distinctive interest in events in the north. The provenance of *Króksfjarðarbók*, however, is not known before the manuscript may be connected to the west of Iceland in the fifteenth century.

We have to take seriously the limitations of the preserved text of *Sturlunga saga*. The two manuscripts present different versions of events after the year 1246, particularly after *Þorgils saga skarða* is introduced into the compilation in *Reykjarfjarðarbók*, and even the end of *Sturlunga saga* is not the same in the two manuscripts. The historical fact of Gizurr's earldom is certainly not doubted, even though his role is accentuated differently in the two manuscripts. The variation between the two versions cautions us not to mix the two unrelated texts or link sections from different manuscripts, but instead appreciate and evaluate each manuscript tradition separately. The two dream sequences are a case in point. We are not justified in interpreting the two dream sequences in relation to the original text of *Íslendinga saga*, nor in relation to the composition of the compilation. They belong to a fourteenth-century version of events as it is presented in *Króksfjarðarbók*, but not to the contemporary sagas made use of by the compiler nor in the *Reykjarfjarðarbók* manuscript written in *Skagafjörður* in the late fourteenth century.

Bibliography

- Bergljót S. Kristjánsdóttir. 1990. '“Hvorki er eg fjölkunnig né visindakona...” Um konur og kveðskap í *Sturlungu*'. *Skáldskaparmál* 1:241-54.
- Björn Magnússon Ólsen. 1902. 'Um *Sturlungu*'. *Safn til sögu Íslands og íslenskra bókmennta* III. Reykjavík, 193-510.
- Glendinning, Robert J. 1974. *Träume und Vorbedeutung in der Íslendingasaga Sturla Thordarsons. Eine Form- und Stiluntersuchung* (Kanadischen Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur no. 8). Bern, Frankfurt.
- Guðrún Nordal. 1990. 'Nú er hin skarpa skálmöld komin'. *Skáldskaparmál* 1:211-25.
- Guðrún Nordal. 2001. *Tools of Literacy. The Role of Skaldic Verse in Icelandic Textual Culture of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries*. University of Toronto Press. Toronto, Buffalo, London.
- Guðrún Nordal. 'Ars metrica and the composition of *Egils saga*'. In *Scandinavia and Christian Europe in the Middle Ages*. Papers of The twelfth International Saga Conference Bonn/Germany, 28th July – 2nd August 2003. Eds. Rudolf Simek and Judith Meurer. Bonn, 179-86.
- Guðrún Nordal. 2005. 'Attraction of opposites: skaldic verse in *Njáls saga*'. In *Literacy in Scandinavia from Middle Ages to early Modern Time*. Ed. Pernille Hermann. Odense. Odense University Press, 211-36.
- Jakob Benediktsson. 'Introduction'. In *Sturlunga saga. Manuscript No. 122 A fol. in the Arnarnagæan Collection* (Early Icelandic Manuscripts in Facsimile 1). Copenhagen, 7-18
- Jón Jóhannesson. 1946. 'Um *Sturlunga sögu*'. In *Sturlunga saga* I-II. Eds. Jón Jóhannesson, Magnús Finnbogason and Kristján Eldjárn. Sturlunguútgáfan. Reykjavík, 1946, vii-lvi.
- Kälund, Kristian. 1906-11. 'Fortale'. In *Sturlunga saga efter membranen Króksfjarðarbók udfyldt efter Reykjarfjarðarbók* I-II. København/Kristiania, i-lxxiv.

- Louis Jensen, Jonna. 1997. 'Heimskringla - et værk af Snorri Sturluson?'. *Nordica Bergensia* 14:231-45.
- Minnis, A.J., and Scott, A.B (eds). 1988. *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c. 1100-c.1375. The Commentary Tradition*. Revised Edition. Clarendon Press, Oxford. [repr. 1988]
- Nichols, Stephen G. 1990. 'Introduction. Philology in a Manuscript Culture'. *Speculum* 65: 1-10.
- Ólafur Halldórsson. 1963. 'Úr sögu skinnbóka'. *Skírnir* 137:83-105.
- Pétur Sigurðsson. 1933-5. 'Um Íslendinga sögu Sturlu Þórðarsonar'. *Safn til sögu Íslands og íslenskra bókmennta* VI. Reykjavík.
- Stefán Karlsson. 1970. 'Ritun Reykjarfjarðarbókar. Excursus: Bókagerð bænda'. *Opusculum* 4:120-40.
- Sturlunga* I-II: *Sturlunga saga efter membranen Króksfjarðarbók, udfyldt efter Reykjarfjarðarbók I-II*. Ed. Kr. Kålund. Det Kongelige Nordiske Oldskrift-Selskab. København and Kristiania, 1906-11.
- Sturlunga saga* I-II. Eds. Jón Jóhannesson, Magnús Finnbogason and Kristján Eldjárn. Sturlunguútgáfan. Reykjavík, 1946.
- Sverrir Tómasson. 2002. 'Er nýja textafræðin til? Þankar um gamla fræðigrein'. *Gripla* 133:199-216.