As you like it?
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As a small tribute to the generous hosts of the present conference it seems, to me at least, good and proper that we remind one another once again of saga references to those particular parts of the *vestrînd* in which we are now assembled. I shall venture to do so by attempting to single out a narrative sequence which occurs in variant forms in several saga texts, all referring to events reported to have taken place in *Northumbria* or *Northumbra*. A toponym designating, of course, the part of England known in one of these texts and elsewhere in a different idiom as *Northumbria*. That is to say I want us to look once again at what is narrated in different saga texts about *Eiríkr Blood-Axe’s flight from Norway to England and his subsequent fate there*. There is, in the texts to be dealt with here, a short account of *Eiríkr Blood-Axe’s arrival in England* – where, as stated in the more elaborate versions, an earldom is bestowed on him by the king of England – king *Aðalhǫrr*. From this position *Eiríkr* eventually died in *vestrviking* as it is phrased in some of these texts, the entire corpus of preserved texts being, in the first place the *Historia Norvegiae, Ágrip, The Great Saga of St. Óláfr, Heimskringla, Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta, Flateyjarbók*, and *Fagrskinna*. Also a small section of Theodorici Monachi *Historia de Antiquitate Regum Norwagensium* and the *Orknýinga saga* need to be considered. In addition a passage from *Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar* is included in the discussion below. Even if the latter does not quite correspond to the sequence about *Eiríkr* in the other texts, it seems to relate to a stock of narrative elements present in the quoted sequences from those texts, all as it seems connecting, in some way or other, to a common core of historical lore in Norway and Iceland about Northumbria. This observation, of course, is in no way a novelty to saga research. The historicity of all this has recently been reopened for discussion in an important article by Claire Downham (2004). The aim of the present contribution, though, is not primarily to discuss the source value or the historicity of the Icelandic–Norwegian literary tradition on this particular point, but rather to consider the literary variants *per se* as part of the process of saga writing in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. For this reason only the prose parts of what is related about *Eiríkr* in *Northumbria* will be discussed.

Earlier research has, as we all know, devoted much time and energy to the difficult question of sources and textual interdependence. This is particularly true for the study of texts such as the ones just mentioned, all but three of which belong to the type of narrative commonly known as kings’ sages – a genre of sagas, which, unlike the family sagas, typically tells ‘the same story [...] many times’ to quote Theodore M. Andersson (1985, 197).

The question of interdependence in general between the larger texts involved here is, of course, too complex to be dealt with in any detail on the basis of short sequences of narrative such as the ones quoted below. As is well known the relationship between several of the texts has been discussed at great length elsewhere.
Some of the results arrived at are commonly accepted, some still open to discussion, it seems. There is, for instance, as convincingly pointed out by Ólafur Halldórsson (2001, v and 31f) every reason to think that the compiler of Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta used the first third of Heimskaðla as his principal source for the part of the saga that contains the narrative sequence that interests us here. Furthermore the relevant part of Flateyjarbók obviously depends on Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta. The relevant sequence in Ágríp, it should be added, is no doubt preceded by a corresponding part of the Historia Norwegiae (written in Latin, perhaps as early as ca. 1150, cf. Ekrem 1998, 14-21) on which it obviously leans heavily, and so on. Literary dependencies such as these notwithstanding, the scope of textual variation on a minor point like the one we have selected here, carries, it seems to me, an interest of its own as a characteristic feature of this particular type of narrative.

Even if fairly accurate copying from one text to another can be observed in some of these cases, a certain degree of variation will occur, it appears, between them. In other instances more substantial variation of narrative elements, omissions and expansions included, can be observed. A closer look at these short accounts of Eiríkr Blood-Axe’s Northumbrian experience may then, I hope, teach us something about techniques of saga writing at a lower level of the process.

An internal comparison between the sequences relevant to us here may, of course, be carried out so as to cover narrative units or shorter sequences of varying scopes. In order not to end up in too minute detail we will, for the present purpose, single out for closer study just three shorter sequences from what is told about Eiríkr and Northumbria in these texts, that is to say the various sequences about: A. His flight from Norway to England. B. Bestowal of an earldom. C. Description of Northumbria.

As our purpose is not at present to discuss at any length the question of interdependence between each of these texts, a quick look at the first of these thematic units (point A above) will suffice to provide a rough grouping of the ten sequences. Firstly, then, the sequences numbered as 3, 4, 5, and 6 below, constitute a major subgroup about Eiríkr’s flight from Norway telling us that he first travelled to the Orkneys with many men and from there south to England, raiding Scotland en route, according to nos. 4, 5, and 6 – the latter three slightly more elaborate than the first one, and close enough to one another to be regarded as variants of the same version of the text – equal to those that originate from copying processes elsewhere. Variation within a group such as this is, in consequence, primarily of a linguistic and philological interest and shall be left at that for the present purpose. The sequence no. 3 just states that Eiríkr travelled south from the Orkneys with an army. It may well be considered as a base upon which the others have expanded, but should, nevertheless, be regarded as a text version of its own in this context. When it comes to describing Northumbria, sequence no. 6 makes it one third of England as opposed to one fifth in the two other variants of this version (sequences 4 and 5). This may, however, reflect a quite common error in the copying process affecting details belonging to the category of accidentals, to borrow a term from modern textual criticism (cf. Greg 1966, 374–391). Sequence no. 9, which is a translation into early modern Danish, seems close to sequences nos. 4–6, but is abbreviated to a degree that makes it a version of its own.

The sequences nos. 1, 2, 7, and 8 all very briefly tell that Eiríkr fled to England, 2 being the more elaborate, mentioning the accompanying men (skipaliði) and raids en
route (úttlegu ok hernad). Sequence no. 10 relates only marginally to this story, of
course, standing quite apart from the other sequences as it does. Sequence 7
considerably differs from nos. 1 and 2 when it comes to points B and C stated above,
where it is closer to nos. 4–6. This clearly makes it a version of its own, as is the case
also with sequences nos. 1, 2, and 8.

Textual variation within a narrative sequence of fairly limited scope such as the
one about Eiríkr Blood-Axe’s Northumbrian experience to a great extent, then,
confirms what is already well known about the textual history and the interrelations
between the larger works from which they are taken. This leaves us with three main
groups of sequences containing variation – omissions included – of a few narrative
units in seven plus one versions of the story of Eiríkr Blood-Axe and Norðimbralnd –
the seven versions being the following of the sequences listed below: I (no. 1)
(Historia Norwegiae), II (no. 2) (Ágríp), III (no. 3) (The Great saga of St. Óláfr), IV (nos. 4–6) (Heimskringla, Óláfr saga Tryggvasonar en mesta, Flateyjarbók), V (no. 7)
(Fagrskinna), VI (no. 8) (Historia de Antiquitate Regum Norwagensium), and VII (no. 9)
the Orkneyinga saga. Sequence no. 10 (Egil’s saga Skalla-Grimsonar) will be left
at that for the moment.

If they were listed in the assumed chronological order Fagrskinna should, of
course, be placed before Óláfr saga Tryggvasonar en mesta and Flateyjarbók. The
Historia de Antiquitate Regum Norwagensium was composed, it seems, some time
between 1178 and 1183 (Foote 1998, xii). This leaves us with six plus one versions
being composed within a fairly short period of time – between the 1150’s and the
(late) 1230’s, judging from the present state of research. The exact dating of the
version constituted by sequence no. 9 cannot be established with any degree of
certainty. The translation is assumed to have been done in Western Norway in the
latter half of the sixteenth century (Finnbogi Guðmundsson 1965, cxvi). It cannot be
established, however, whether or not the transmitted text in itself constitutes an
abbreviation, compared to sequences nos. 4–6, or if this is due to an edited text in the
old language from which it has been translated. For that reason this version is less
interesting to the present discussion.

On looking more closely at what is said about the appointment of Eiríkr as Earl of
Northumbria (point B above) the following narrative units can be identified in the
corpus taken as a whole:

1) He is well received by his brother’s foster-father (no. 1)

2) He is cleansed at the baptismal font / is (to be) baptised (nos. 1, 4-6 and
   7)

3) He is appointed earl of (the whole of) Northumbria (by the king) (nos.
   1, 2, 7, and 9)

4) He is offered Northumbria by the king in order to obtain peace between
   Eiríkr and Hákon (nos. 3 and 9)

5) He accepts this (nos. 3 and 9)

6) Negotiations between the kings result in an agreement that Eiríkr
   should take over Northumbria in order to defend it against Danes and
   other Vikings (nos. 4–6)

7) He agrees to defend Northumbria [and to be baptised] (nos. 4–6)
A description of Northumbria (point C above) is given in variants 3, 4–6, 7 and 9 only, containing the following units:

1) Northumbria is said to be one fifth of the whole of England (nos. 3, 4–6, and 9)
2) Eiríkr resides in York – as, according to tradition, did the sons of Lodbrok (nos. 4–6)
3) Northumbria has been inhabited primarily by Norsemen since the sons of Lodbrok conquered the land (nos. 4–6)
4) Northumbria owes its name to the Norsemen, because they ruled the land for a long time (nos. 7)
5) Many place-names are given in the Norse tongue such as Grimsby and Haukshjóð (nos. 4–6 and 7)

As we have seen already only part of this knowledge can be understood as having been transmitted merely by copying from one written text to another – that is to say the pieces of information transmitted from one variant to another within one version as seen in sequences 4–6. This implies that the accumulated knowledge about Eiríkr in Northumbria in medieval Norse historiography, as we know it today, must have been extracted from various sources – written and possibly oral. Even if it is not a theme in the present discussion there is every reason to go along with Downham’s hypothesis that ‘in the Scandinavian sources, legends concerning Eiríkr blóðœx became influenced by, and were combined with the legends of Eiríkr of York’, this to a certain degree ‘on the assumption that they depend on an oral tradition’ (Downham 2004, 55 & 58). At any rate there certainly was not a chronological unidirectional process in which the accumulation of information took place by way of transmission from one written version to the next.

Whatever textual interrelation there is between the seven versions we have identified here, most of them seem to have been edited in some way or other from a larger stock of information than is contained in any one version. If we take a look at what is told in the sequences concerning point B above, the narrative unit about Eiríkr’s baptism is present – in variant forms – in sequences nos. 1, 4–6 and 7 only, having been left out of nos. 2, 3, 8, and 9. Several scholars have explained the similarities for instance between Historia Norvegiae and Ágríp as the result of their having a common source, even if there is nothing to contradict the possibility that Ágríp used Historia Norvegiae directly (cf. Driscoll 1995, xv with references). In either case the omission of the narrative unit about the baptism in Ágríp should be seen as a deliberate editorial act in the making of the saga narrative about Eiríkr in Northumbria – turning the story in a certain direction. The point for us to notice here is that Ágríp does not include the piece of information about Eiríkr’s baptism in its narrative – information, we must assume, that was available to the compiler of that particular text.

Furthermore, variants 1, 2 and 7 simply state as a fact that Eiríkr was appointed Earl of Northumbria by the English king. No. 8 just relates that he was honoured by the king, whereas nos. 3 and 4–6 connect specific (but different) conditions to the appointment. Within the context of saga writing this kind of narrative amplification obviously serves the function of historical motivation or explanation – a recycled narrative unit developed so as to give individual features to the texts.
When it comes to the description of Northumbria (point C above) this, as we have seen, is a part of the narrative that is totally absent from sequences 1, 2, and 8. Furthermore, the information about the relative size of Northumbria is, in this context, present only in 3, 4–6, and 9, that is to say primarily in the variants which, as we all know, are commonly attributed to Snorri Sturluson. The occurrence of a small detail such as this in Egils saga – in a somewhat different narrative context – is worth noticing. Even if it does not, of course, prove anything, it is there to remind us of the long-lasting discussion about the authorship of Agla. Indeed, a narrative unit recycled.

The fourth version (sequences nos. 4–6) alone amplifies the text by expanding on the Norse history of Northumbria, adding the story about the sons of Lodbrok in York and the subsequent harryings of Danes and Norwegians after their having lost the land – again obviously serving the function of historical motivation or explanation, as is the reference to numerous place-names of Norse origin. Version V (no. 7) (Fagrskinna) seems to be edited much on the basis of the same historical knowledge as version III and IV (nos. 3 and 4–6) (cf. also Indrebsø 1917, 132ff. and Finlay 2004, 11). In Fagrskinna, however, the Danes are edited out – Northumbria or Nordumbraland, this version claims, owes its name to the Norwegians because of their long domination of the area – a point evidenced by the very same place-names as given in evidence for the presence of Danes and Norwegians in version IV (nos. 4–6), Grimsbær and Hauksfjot/Haugsfjot. Whether Fagrskinna derives this from Heimskringla (no. 4) or from some common source, cannot, of course, be established on the basis of this particular point alone. In its insisting on the Norwegian element, ruling out the Danes in its presentation of Northumbrian history prior to Eiríkr Blood-Axe, Fagrskinna does, however, demonstrate a deliberate editorial will to lead the narrative in a more specific direction than we find in version IV (nos. 4–6). A pro-Norwegian or anti-Danish bias in Fagrskinna, already pointed to by Indrebsø (1917, 257f.), may then be taken to have been decisive even for its presentation of Scando-Northumbrian historical relations, that is to say at a relative low level of the saga narrative as a whole.

Close studies of textual variation on a relatively synchronic level may therefore help us better to see the literary merits and techniques of medieval Norse-Icelandic historiography than a diachronic approach which has the issue of sources and textual interdependencies as its main focus. It may even help us to come to grips with difficulties which may be encountered in that line of research – having, among many other things, resulted in the need to postulate three different versions of Hryggjarstykti as sources for the sections on Sigurðr lembidjánk in Morkinskinna, Fagrskinna, and Heimskringla respectively – in order to explain the variation between them (cf. Bjarni Guðnason 1978, 54f.) etc.

The same story could obviously be told many times, but not necessarily with exactly the same purpose, that is to say more or less ‘as you like it’. Whether or not the variation encountered in Norwegian-Icelandic texts about Eiríkr blöðsuðr derives from what Downham takes to be ‘Scandinavian pseudo-history’ cannot be established on the basis of a textual comparison like the present one. It certainly does not contradict the claim, however, that ‘Scandinavian historians and saga-writers may have been keen to develop stories about the son of Haraldr hárflagri in England’ (Downham 2004, 69f.).
1. **Historia Norwegiae:**

...regno privatus in Angliam profugus secessit; ibi a pedagogico fratri sui bene suspexit fonteque baptismatis lotus toti Northimbriae comes praeficitur eratque omnibus gratissimus, quousque improba uxor ejus scilicet Gunnilda illo adventasset. Cujus pestiferam rabiem non ferentes Northimbrì iugum illorum intollerabile statim a se discuserunt; at ille in Hispania finibus cum piraticam exerceret, bello temptatus occubuit....

[ed. Storm, 1880, 105f.]

2. **Ágrip:**

En þat gërðsk þá umb Eiriks ævi biliðar er hann flittisk með skipaliði vestr til Englands ok var i útúlegu ok hernaði ok beiddisk miskunnar af England konungi, sem Aðalsteinn konungur hafði hónum heiti, en hann þá af konunginum jarlirki á Norðimbralndi, gërðsk þar enn með þóðum Gunnhildar konu sinnar svá grimur ok greypir við lýð sinn at hann þóttisk varla bera mega. Af því réðsk hann í hernað ok í viking viða í Vestri landum, ok fell Eiríkr í Spániðandi.

[ed. Driscoll, 1995, 16]

3. **The Great Saga of Óláfr Haraldsson:**


[ed. O. A. Johnsen and Jón Helgason, 1941, 17]

4. **Heimskringla:**

IV. KAPÍTULI

Eiríkr konungur hafði fjölumenni mikit um sik, heilt þar fjölða Norðmanna, er austan hafði farit með homun, ok enn kómur margir vinir hans slóan af Nóregi. Han hafði land lítut. Pá fór ham jafnán í hernað á sumrum, herjaðu á Skotland ok Suðreyjar, Írland ok Bretland ok aflaði sér svá fjar.

[ÍF XXVI, 152–53]

5. Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mestur:

for hann fyrst til Orkn eyía ok hafði þaðan með ser lið mikit. þa sigldi hann suðr til Englandz ok tók at hería. En er þat spurei Aþalsteinn konungr. þa sendi hann menn sínna til Eiríks ok bauð honum at taka at ser land í lín. letz þar ulíla sina kosti til leggía. at þeir Hakon deildi enga v hafu. Eiríkr konungur þekktíz þam kost, fóro þa þenn imilli konunganna, ok samdís þat með sínka málan. at Eiríkr skylldi hallda Norðimbra land af Aþalsteini konungi ok vería þar landit fyrr Dönum ok Óðrum uikingum. Eiríkr skylldi lata skiraz. kona hans ok börn ok alt lið þat er honum hafði þangt þygt. Var Eiríkr þa skirðr ok tók tru retta. Norðimbralend er kallat finntungur Englandz. Eiríkr hafði at setu j forvik. þar sem þenn segia at fyrr hafi setir Loð brokar (synir). Norðimbralend var mæst byggð Norð mónum sínan Loðbrokar (synir) ummu landit. heriúðo þar optíla sínan Danir ok Norðmenn. er ualld landzins hafði gengit undan þeim. Mörg heiti landzins ero þar gefin á norðena tungu sem Grimr sker1 ok Hauks fót ok mörg ónur. En þvíat Eiríkr konungur hafði lónd litil en heilt þar fiólda mikinn. Norðmanna er austan hofðu farit með homun. ok enn korno margir vinir hans sínan af Nóregi. þa fer hann lafsan íhernat aðsumrum. hann heriáði vn Skotland ok Suðr eyjar. Írland ok Bretland. ok aflaði ser svá fjar.

[Ólavur Halldórsson(éd.) 1958, 22–23]

6. Plateyjarbók:

for hann fýst til Orkneyia ok hafðe þadan lid mikit med ser. þa siglde hann suðr til Binglands ok heriade þar. En er þat spurei Aþaldr konungr. þa sendi hann menn til Aþiriks ok bauð honum at taka þar af lande. letz þar ulíla sina kosti til leggía at þeir Hakon konungur deildi ónguar uhéfur. Aþiriks konungur þekktíz þann kost. fóro þa þenn mille konunganna ok samdís þat með einkamálan at Aþerek skylldi hallda Norðimbralend af Aþaldré kon ungi. ok vería landit fyrir Dönum eðr Óðrum vikingum. Aþerek skylldi skirazt lata þa konan hans ok börn ok alt hans lid er með honum hafðe farit. var Aþerek þa skirðr ok (tök) vid tru ok alt lid hans. sidan tók hann skatta ok skylldr af Norðimbralend ok settíz þar þm kýrt. er þat kallat þridingur af Bingande. Aþirik sat j Jorvik þar er þenn segia at fyrr hafuri setti Loðbrokar synir. Norðimbralend er kallada af Norðmonnum sidan þeir bygdu þat. en sidan Loðbrokar synir heriúðu þar ok vnum landit. sau eigi sidr heriúðu þar Nordmenn ok Danir optíla. þuiauull landzins hafðe þa vnum þeim gengi. Mörg heite landzins eru þar gefin a norðena tungu sem Grimsbærk ok Hauksflöt ok enn fleire. En þui at Aþerek konungur hafðe land litit en heilt þar fiólda Nordmanna er austan hofðu farit med honum ok nordan kuomu margir vinir hans af Nóregi ok fer hann jafnan j hernad a sumrum. hann heriade vn Skotland Suðreyjar ok Írland ok Bretland ok aflade ser su fjar.

[Vigfusson & Unger 1860, 50–51]

1 Var.: Grims bær, gorms sker.
7. **Fagrskinna:**


**K.7. Eiríkr tækr riki a Norðumbralande.**

Eiríkr konungr þa er hann toc riki a Norðumbralande. hugsaðe firi ser bversu viðlendr faðir hans var. þa er hann reð firir ollom Noreghi. oc morgum skattlandum. oc þottiz liit hava til forraðes. oc firi þa sok lagðuz hann i vestrving oc heriaðe viða a Vestrland.

[ed. Funnur Jónsson, 1902–03, 26-27]

8. **Theodoricus Monachus:**

Ipse vero Erius ad Angliam navigavit et a rege honorifique suspicatus ibidem diem obit. Iste annis tribus recognit, quorum duos solus, tertium cum fratrem.

[ed. Storm, 1880, 7]

9. **Orkneyjinga saga:**


[IF XXXIV, 17-18]

10. **Egils saga:**

Norðumbraland er kallat fimmtungr England, oc er þat nordast, næst Skotlandi fyrir austan: þat høfu haft at formu Danakonungar; Jorvik er þar høfuostaðr. Þat riki átt; Aðalsteinn ok hafti sett yfir jarla två; hét annarr Álfgeirr, en annarr Goørek; þeir sátu þar til landvarnar, bæði fyrir ágangi Skota ok Dana eða Norðomanna, er mjök herjuðu á landit ok þottuð eiga tilkall mikit þar til lands, því at á Norðumbralandi váru þeir einir menn, ef nökkut var til, at danska sett átti at faðerni eða móderni, en margir hvárirveggju.

[IF II, 129]
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