

SNORRI VERSUS THE COPYISTS. AN INVESTIGATION OF A
STYLISTIC TRAIT IN THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITIONS OF
EGILS SAGA, *HEIMSKRINGLA* AND THE *PROSE EDDA*

BY HAUKUR ÞORGEIRSSON

Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum

Introduction

IN THE 1960S THE SWEDISH SCHOLAR Peter Hallberg published a series of investigations into the vocabulary and style of medieval Icelandic prose texts (the major works are Hallberg 1962, 1963 and 1968). Hallberg's principal goals were to identify features typical of particular time periods and particular authors. Some of the most important results that Hallberg felt his works established were Snorri Sturluson's authorship of *Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar*, Óláfr Þórðarson's authorship of *Laxdæla saga* and *Knýtlinga saga* and Bergr Sökkason's authorship of a number of fourteenth-century works.

The type of research Hallberg was engaged with is considerably facilitated by digital technology and Hallberg himself expected the computer to herald a golden age of stylistic research (Hallberg 1968, 170). But as things have turned out, scholars have by and large not rushed to embrace this methodology. Recent scholarship which makes use of Hallberg's work (e.g. Helgi Guðmundsson 1997) or identifies new stylistic criteria (e.g. Katrín Axelsdóttir 2005) is a rarity. In fact, even works specifically concerned with the authorship of individual texts tend not to focus on the details of style and vocabulary. As an example, Sigurjón Páll Ísaksson's (2012) argument that *Heimskringla*, *Morkinskinna* and *Fagrskinna* are works of the same author makes no mention of Hallberg's analysis of Snorri Sturluson's prose style, even though Hallberg was at pains to establish the differences in style between *Heimskringla* and the other Kings' Sagas (see in particular Hallberg 1968, 20–21). In a similar vein, the spirited attempts by Matthías Johannessen (1997) and Einar Kárason (2010, 2012) to establish the authorship of *Njáls saga* make little or no use of stylistic criteria. As a final example, Margaret Cormack's discussion of the authorship of *Egils saga* and *Heimskringla* (2001) focuses on discrepancies in historical details and makes no direct reference to Hallberg.

It is not without reason that scholars have been sceptical about Hallberg's methods and results. Medieval Icelandic literary works are not preserved in

the original manuscripts of the authors but rather in copies at some remove. In recent years, researchers have emphasised the creative reworking of texts which medieval copyists engaged in and many have turned their attention to the study of surviving individual manuscripts as cultural artifacts while seeing speculation about the original works as fruitless or meaningless.

Thus Guðrún Nordal argues that *Egils saga* is not the work of any one author since the surviving manuscripts differ in various important respects (Nordal, 2002). In particular, Guðrún points out that the text of Möðruvallahóllabók, which is normally used for editions, is not as detailed or precise as that of the significantly older Θ (*theta*) fragment. Even if we believed Snorri was the author of the original *Egils saga*, Guðrún argues that he is definitely not the author of its Möðruvallahóllabók text.

This point is well taken, but the questions that ‘old philology’ was concerned with remain of interest and cannot be defined out of existence. There was almost certainly a particular individual who first committed the story of Egill Skallagrímsson to writing, and trying to establish his identity is a meaningful academic endeavour. Even though we can never reconstruct the original version of *Egils saga*, it is not *a priori* impossible that the surviving witnesses have preserved its stylistic features well enough for a meaningful analysis.

Nevertheless, the creativity of the manuscript tradition is a serious hurdle for any research into the stylistic preferences of medieval Icelandic authors and, indeed, a problem for Hallberg’s research. Hallberg worked from edited texts and only occasionally took note of manuscript variants. In his research into *Egils saga*, he used the *Íslensk fornrit* edition (Sigurður Nordal 1933, based on Finnur Jónsson 1886–88) and consulted the published text of the Θ fragment (as printed in Finnur Jónsson 1886–88, 335–44) but made no systematic investigation of other manuscripts.

In recent years, significant advances have been made in the study of the *Egils saga* tradition. The texts of all the medieval manuscripts are now available in diplomatic or facsimile editions and lost text from Möðruvallahóllabók has been reconstructed with the aid of early copies and, in one case, recovered with the aid of infrared photography. Building on this foundation, the time is opportune to re-examine Hallberg’s stylistic criteria and their fate in the manuscript tradition. For this article I have made a detailed examination of one issue which gave Hallberg some trouble.

The ‘en er’ versus ‘ok er’ stylistic criterion

Following up a suggestion by Baldur Jónsson, Hallberg launched an inquiry into the ratio of sentence-initial *en er* to *ok er* as a possible characteristic of Snorri Sturluson’s style (Hallberg 1963, 10). The two possibilities are

essentially synonymous and interchangeable. Sentence introductions like *En er váraði* and *Ok er váraði* can both be translated as ‘When spring came’.

Hallberg examined the ratio of *en er* to *ok er* in 69 Old Icelandic texts of various types (Hallberg 1968, 200–02). I reproduce his results below, omitting texts shorter than 10,000 words in the hope that the numbers for longer texts are more reliable.

Text	<i>ok er</i>	<i>en er</i>	<i>en er</i> ratio
<i>Heimskringla</i>	63	914	94%
<i>Þórðar saga kakala</i>	26	98	79%
<i>Þorgils saga skarða</i>	32	118	79%
<i>Prestsaga Guðmundar góða</i>	13	41	76%
<i>Íslendinga saga</i>	79	186	70%
<i>Knýtlunga saga</i>	48	110	70%
<i>Fagrskinna</i>	8	18	69%
<i>Njáls saga</i>	23	48	68%
<i>Harðar saga ok Hólmverja</i>	22	40	65%
<i>Óláfs saga ins helga</i> (‘Legendary saga’)	22	33	60%
<i>Egils saga</i>	140	192	58%
<i>Guðmundar saga dýra</i>	24	29	55%
<i>Svarfdæla saga</i>	16	17	52%
<i>Bárðar saga Snæfellsáss</i>	22	23	51%
<i>Sturlu saga</i>	32	33	51%
<i>Orkneyinga saga</i>	133	122	48%
<i>Eyrbyggja saga</i>	118	108	48%
<i>Grettis saga</i>	99	90	48%
<i>Víga-Glúms saga</i>	28	24	46%
<i>Gísla saga Súrssonar</i> (Y)	31	26	46%
<i>Sverris saga</i>	154	122	44%
<i>Örvar-Odds saga</i>	22	16	42%
<i>Hrólfs saga kraka</i>	7	5	42%
<i>Ljósvetninga saga</i> (C)	33	17	34%

<i>Laxdæla saga</i>	80	39	33%
<i>Flóamanna saga</i>	22	9	29%
<i>Jómsvíkinga saga</i> (AM 510)	60	23	28%
<i>Hákonar saga Hákonarsonar</i>	245	91	27%
<i>Reykðæla saga</i>	17	5	23%
<i>Gísla saga Súrssonar</i> (E)	39	6	13%
<i>Vatnsdæla saga</i>	51	7	12%
<i>Ragnars saga loðbrókar</i>	51	7	12%
<i>Saga Óláfs Tryggvasonar</i> (Oddr S)	99	12	11%
<i>Þórðar saga hreðu</i>	36	4	10%
<i>Völsunga saga</i>	51	5	9%
<i>Bjarnar saga Hítðælakappa</i>	35	3	8%
<i>Saga Óláfs Tryggvasonar</i> (Oddr A)	179	14	7%
<i>Hávarðar saga Ísfirðings</i>	68	5	7%
<i>Morkinskinna</i>	159	6	4%
<i>Jómsvíkinga saga</i> (AM 291)	59	2	3%
<i>Finnboga saga ramma</i>	36	1	3%
<i>Fóstbræðra saga</i> (M)	44	1	2%

Table 1. Frequency of *en er* and *ok er* in Old Icelandic texts

To summarise the table, thirteen texts fall in the range of 0–20% *en er*, while 28 texts fall in the range 20–80% *en er*. Only one text, *Heimskringla*, falls in the range 80–100% *en er*. This looks quite promising for the idea that a dominant use of *en er* is a distinctive characteristic of Snorri Sturluson's style.

But there is trouble afoot. Hallberg believed that Snorri was the author of *Egils saga*, but in the table above this work is revealed to have only a mild preference for *en er* over *ok er*. In attempting to explain this, Hallberg pointed out that the text of *Egils saga* (in the *Íslenzk fornrit* edition he was using) is rather sharply divided in this respect. In the first 30,000 words there are 152 instances of *en er* and 5 instances of *ok er* or a 97% preference for *en er*, a tendency even more pronounced than that in *Heimskringla*. In the c. 32,000-word remainder of *Egils saga* there are 40 instances of *en er* and 135 instances of *ok er* for an *en er* ratio of 23%.

Hallberg suggested that the ratio in the first half of *Egils saga* accurately preserves the original situation while the second half has been distorted by a scribe with a systematic preference for *ok er*. Hallberg found important support for this idea in the Θ fragment, which is generally agreed to be the manuscript most closely preserving the original saga. The four leaves of the Θ fragment (c. 3000 words) are all from the second half of the saga, and yet it exclusively has examples of *en er* where the Möðruvallabók text has *ok er*. This seems to support Hallberg's idea that the second half of the Möðruvallabók text is not representative of the original.

But there is another way to look at this. Möðruvallabók and Θ are the two best manuscripts of *Egils saga* and both represent the A redaction of the saga. Yet they differ in 100% of cases in their use of *en er* versus *ok er*. With so great a difference between closely related manuscripts, can we have any reasonable expectation of recovering the original practices of the author? Perhaps all we are really looking at are the preferences of individual copyists with those of the original author sealed off to us?

We can formalise these musings as two hypotheses:

Hypothesis A: By and large copyists do not do large-scale replacement of *en er* by *ok er* or *ok er* by *en er*. The situation in the Möðruvallabók text of *Egils saga* is a relatively uncommon aberration.

Hypothesis B: Copyists frequently change *en er* and *ok er* around. There is no realistic prospect of identifying the preferences of the author based on the surviving manuscripts, either for *Egils saga* or for any other thirteenth-century work.

Minor variants, like *ok er* / *en er*, are often omitted from critical apparatuses and given short shrift in stemmatic research. Certainly, the high possibility of independent innovation makes matters difficult. But in a recent study of minor variants in the manuscript tradition of *Konráðs saga keisarasonar*, the result was that even in the case of interchangeable words, 'a scribe is still considerably more likely to copy his exemplar than to switch word' (Hall and Parsons 2013, § 38).

Perhaps, then, this problem can be solved. At any rate, we can get a much clearer picture by examining more manuscripts. In the following I consider the *en er* to *ok er* ratio of all thirteen surviving medieval manuscripts and fragments of *Egils saga* (M, W, S, α, β, γ, δ, ε, ζ, η, Θ, ι, κ), starting with Möðruvallabók.

Egils saga in Möðruvallabók

In the *Íslenzk fornrit* edition of *Egils saga*, which Hallberg used, the text of Möðruvallabók is followed with three major exceptions. On page 69v,

the first 9 lines of the first column could not be read and text from W was used instead. A leaf is missing between leaves 77 and 78 and text from δ was used instead. Another leaf is missing between leaves 83 and 84 and text from Θ and W was used instead.

In effect, the text used by Hallberg is a composite text of four manuscripts. We can get a somewhat clearer picture by considering *Möðruvallabók* alone. In a fortunate development, the text on page 69v has been partially recovered with the use of infrared photography (Porgeir Sigurðsson et al. 2013). The relevant text turns out to contain one *en er* sentence. The text on the lost leaves has been reconstructed from manuscripts derived from *Möðruvallabók* in a more complete state (Bjarni Einarsson 1993; *EgEA* I).

Considering first the manuscript in its present state, it is most naturally divided into chapters 1–54 and chapters 55–87 (here and throughout I use the chapter numbers in *EgEA* I). The first part contains 160 *en er* sentences and 2 *ok er* sentences (99% *en er*). The second part contains 24 *en er* sentences and 133 *ok er* sentences (15% *en er*). The totals for the manuscript as a whole are 184 *en er* sentences and 135 *ok er* sentences (58% *en er*). If we add the reconstructions of the lost leaves, 15 *en er* sentences are added to the first part and 5 *ok er* sentences are added to the second part. The contrast between the first and the second part is even starker than in Hallberg's investigation.

We now turn to the other manuscripts. I limit myself to the medieval fragments, which is not to deny that some paper manuscripts have textual value. No complete stemma exists, but scholars have classified the manuscripts into three redactions, A (considered the closest to the original), B and C (for recent work see Chesnutt 2005b). No medieval manuscript is demonstrably derived from another medieval manuscript.

Iota (1) fragment

To show a sample of the material and illustrate my methodology I have chosen the ι fragment, which consists of one leaf from the second half of the saga. The following list shows all *ok er* and *en er* sentences in ι and in the corresponding part of *Möðruvallabók* (M).

1. M: Skilduz þeir at þessu. **ok er** Egill var a brottu. þa kallaði J(arl) til sin bræðr (*EgEA* I, 141)
 ι : skilduz þ[eir þa] at svo bvno. <E>N er Egill var j b[ro]tt farin. Þa kalladi jarl til sin breðr (Chesnutt 2010, 186)

2. M: bioz þa til ferðar **ok er** þeir satu ifer daguerði. þa kom þar Alfr (*EgEA* I, 142)
 ι : [b]ioz þa til ferþar. **EN er** þeir satv yfer dagverdi. þa kemr þar Alfv. (Chesnutt 2010, 187)
3. M Egill for sina leið. **ok er** þeir komu a veginn þann er a skoginn la. (*EgEA* I, 142)
 ι : þeir Egill forv nv leid sina. **EN er** þeir komv á vegin þann er la á skogin. (Chesnutt 2010, 187)
4. M: fioldi spora. **ok er** þeir koma þar er leiðir skildi þa (*EgEA* I, 142)
 ι : fiolda spora. **EN er** þeir koma þar er leiþer skildi þa (Chesnutt 2010, 188)
5. M: Egill for firer **ok er** þeir foro at halsinum. þa (*EgEA* I, 143)
 ι : Egill for fyrer. **EN er** þeir Egill komv at halsinvm þa (Chesnutt 2010, 188)
6. M: a klifinu. **en er** þeir voro komner vpp i klifit. (*EgEA* I, 143)
 ι : a kleifina. **E[N] er** þeir Egill vorv komner i klifit. (Chesnutt 2010, 188)
7. M: þeir gerðu sua. **Ok er** Egill kom vpp ór klifinu. þa voro þar firer .víj. menn ok gengu aller senn at honum ok sottu hann. En ecki er at segia fra hogua viðskiptum. (*EgEA* I, 143)
 ι : þeir gera sva sem han mællti. En þar ekki sagt fra hogva vid skiptvm þeirra. (Chesnutt 2010, 188)
8. M: verit hofðu firer framan hamarinn. **ok er** Egill sa þat sneriz hann (*EgEA* I, 143)
 ι : verit hofdv vnder skoginvm. **EN er** Egill sa þat þa sneri han (Chesnutt 2010, 189)
9. M: huarertueggju sarer. **ok er** Egill kom til þa flyðu þegar (*EgEA* I, 144)
 ι : hvarertveggju sarer. flydv þeir þegar (Chesnutt 2010, 189)
10. M: sott til Vermalandz. **ok er** þeir komu a konungs fund. þa (*EgEA* I, 145)
 ι : sott til Vermalandz. **en er** þeir komv til kongs. þa (Chesnutt 2010, 190)

11. M: heimleiðiss. **Ok er** þeir koma aprt til Þorst(eins) þa segia (*EgEA* I, 145)
 ı: heimleidiz. **En er** þeir koma aprt þa sogdu (Chesnutt 2010, 190)
12. M: **ok er** Egill var buinn ferðar sinnar. ok byr gaf þa (*EgEA* I, 145)
 ı: **En er** Egill [var bv]inn ferdar sínar ok byri gaf þa (Chesnutt 2010, 191)
13. M: til moz við hann. **ok er** þrælamer sa apter for þa (*EgEA* I, 146)
 ı: til lids vid han. **En er** þrælamer sa epter forina þa (Chesnutt 2010, 192)
14. M: þeir voro .vi. saman a attæru skipi **ok er** þeir skylldu vt fara þa (*EgEA* I, 147)
 ı: vorv þeir .vi. samt. **En er** þeir skylldv [v]t fara þa (Chesnutt 2010, 193)
15. M: þa var flæðrin sið dags **ok er** þeir vrðu hennar at biða. þa foro þeir vm kuelldit sið. (*EgEA* I, 147)
 ı: þa var flædr sid dags ok vrðv þeir hentar at bida. forv þeir vt or ánni vm qvellidit. (Chesnutt 2010, 193)
16. M: þann dag spurði Egill þessi tíðendi. ok þegar reid hann at leita (*EgEA* I, 147)
 ı: **Ok er** Egill spvrði tíþendi. for han þegar at leita (Chesnutt 2010, 193)
17. M: Epter þat reið Egill heim til Borgar **ok er** hann kom heim þa geck hann þegar til lokreckiu (*EgEA* I, 148)
 ı. Reid han heim epter þat. **En er** han kom in farandi þa for han þegar til lokreckiv (Chesnutt 2010, 193)

M and ı have 13 *ok er / en er* sentences in common. In addition, M has 3 *ok er* sentences without equivalents in ı and ı has 1 *ok er* sentence without equivalent in M. In my statistics on the individual fragments I only use sentences which the fragments have in common with M since sentences without an equivalent in M are less likely to have been present in the archetype. Thus, ı gets listed as containing 13 sentences of interest, all of

which have *en er*. In practice, the fragments rarely contain *ok er / en er* sentences not in M so this methodological detail is of minor importance.

Egils saga results

With the methodology illustrated in the preceding section I have examined all the medieval manuscripts and fragments of *Egils saga*. The W manuscript, which has only been published in a facsimile edition, contains 29 leaves of *Egils saga* text. It proved too time-consuming to work through all the leaves so I made do with a sample of six: 29, 34, 35, 48, 51 and 54 (selected at random but with preference for more legible pages). In all other cases I examined the complete text. The results are summarised in the following table:

Ms	<i>ok er</i>	<i>en er</i>	% <i>en er</i>	Redaction	Leaves analysed	Source
M	135	184	58%	A	38	<i>EgEA</i> I
W	2	40	95%	B	6 (of 29)	Jón Helgason 1956
S	0	8	100%	B	2	Chesnutt 2005a
α	2	12	86%	C	3	<i>EgEA</i> III
β	1	7	88%	B	1	Chesnutt 2010
γ	1	10	91%	B	2	Kjeldsen 2005a
δ	10	50	83%	B	8	Kjeldsen 2005b
ε	2	17	89%	C	3	<i>EgEA</i> III
ζ	6	16	73%	B	4	Kjeldsen 2005c
η	0	14	100%	A	2	<i>EgEA</i> I
θ	0	11	100%	A	4	Kjeldsen 2005d
ι	0	13	100%	B	1	Chesnutt 2010
κ	0	6	100%	A	2	<i>EgEA</i> I

Table 2. Frequency of *ok er* and *en er* in *Egils saga* mss.

If copyists frequently changed *en er* and *ok er* around as a matter of personal taste, I would not expect to see such a clear preference in the table as a whole. The manuscripts have an average *en er* frequency of 89%, higher than all the texts in table 1 except *Heimskringla*. Not a single manuscript has a preference for *ok er*. These results indicate a relatively high stability in the transmission of *en er* and *ok er*. It is worth looking at the second part of the saga specifically:

Manuscript	<i>ok er</i>	<i>en er</i>	% <i>en er</i>	Type
M	133	24	15%	A
W	0	22	100%	B
α	0	6	100%	C
ε	0	1	100%	C
η	0	12	100%	A
Θ	0	11	100%	A
ι	0	13	100%	B

Table 3. Frequency of *ok er* and *en er* in chapters 55–87

These results strongly support Hallberg's idea that the *Egils saga* archetype had a dominant use of *en er*, in its second half as well as its first half. We have evidence from all three redactions of the saga indicating *en er* usage. Especially valuable, as already pointed out by Hallberg, is the testimony of the Θ fragment.

The second part of the M text is revealed as the odd man out. Since the *Egils saga* text of M is written in the same hand throughout, it is unlikely that the replacement of *en er* by *ok er* took place there. Possible explanations would include that M switched exemplars in chapter 55 or that M's exemplar switched scribes in chapter 55. At any rate, the text will at some point have been transmitted by a scribe with an active preference for *ok er* over *en er*.

Heimskringla manuscripts

A sceptic might now object as follows: The preceding investigation may suffice to establish a preference for *en er* in *Egils saga*. But this is by no means sufficient to demonstrate an affinity between *Egils saga* and *Heimskringla*. Hallberg's investigation of *Heimskringla* was limited to the *Íslenzk fornrit* edition which is principally based on copies of the lost Kringla manuscript. The preference for *en er* in Kringla might well be specific to that manuscript rather than a feature of the original work.

Heimskringla is a vast work preserved in a number of manuscripts and a complete study of sentences of interest in it would be a large undertaking. But I think it will suffice to use one of its constituents as a sample. I have chosen, essentially at random, *Magnúss saga góða*. To begin with I compared the Kringla text of *Magnúss saga* with that of Codex Frisianus (Unger 1873). The result is that Kringla and Codex

Frisianus share 35 sentences of interest in *Magnúss saga*. In 34 of those cases the text of Codex Frisianus agrees with that of Kringla (32 *en er* sentences to 2 *ok er* sentences). In one case Kringla has an *en er* sentence which shows up as an *ok er* sentence in Codex Frisianus. This 97% agreement between the two manuscripts inspires confidence in Hallberg's Kringla-based results.

It might still be objected that Kringla and Codex Frisianus are both from the x-branch of *Heimskringla*'s stemma. We might imagine that the dominance of *en er* was only established in the common ancestor of the x-branch but was not a part of the original work. To investigate this possibility it is necessary to make a comparison with a manuscript of the y-branch, and I have chosen Eirspennill (Finnur Jónsson 1916), commonly considered the best y text (Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson 1951, xciv). In *Magnúss saga góða*, Kringla and Eirspennill share 37 sentences of interest. In every case the texts of the two manuscripts agree (35 *en er* sentences to 2 *ok er* sentences). This 100% agreement between manuscripts from the different branches can best be explained by both of them faithfully preserving the archetype in this matter.

The Prose Edda

Hallberg did not include the *Prose Edda* in any of his studies since his concern was principally with saga texts. A stylistic comparison between different types of texts can only be undertaken with caution and the *Edda* certainly differs from the sagas in a number of ways. Nevertheless, there seems to be no obvious reason why the choice between *en er* and *ok er* should be different in the retelling of myths from that in the relating of putatively historical events. Thus it seems worthwhile to include the *Prose Edda* in our examination. It would certainly be embarrassing for the theory of *en er* as characteristic of Snorri if the *Edda* had a preference for *ok er*.

In Faulkes's edition of the *Edda* (Faulkes 1998, 2005, 2007), there are 90 cases of *en er* to 18 cases of *ok er* (83% *en er*). This is a healthy preference for *en er*, though not quite as dominant as that in *Heimskringla*. It is once again worthwhile to look at the manuscript transmission. For convenience, I limit that investigation to *Gylfaginning*, the textual transmission of *Skáldskaparmál* being a more complicated story.

Gylfaginning is preserved in four textually valuable manuscripts, Codex Regius (R; printed in Finnur Jónsson 1931), Codex Wormianus (W; printed in Finnur Jónsson 1924), Codex Trajectinus (T; printed in van Eeden 1913) and Codex Upsaliensis (U; printed in Grape 1977, Heimir Pálsson 2012). The texts of R, W and T are close to each other and constitute the same

redaction or ‘text witness type’ (Wendt 2008) while the U text differs from them in various ways. The text of Faulkes’s edition is based on R, as are most other editions. Since the texts of R, W and T are so close they are convenient to compare. For this I have used Eysteinn Björnsson’s handy comparative edition (Eysteinn Björnsson 2005).

In the text of *Gylfaginning*, there are 51 cases where R, W and T all preserve the same *ok er / en er* sentence. In 46 (90%) of those cases all three manuscripts agree on either *en er* or *ok er*. In 36 cases, the manuscripts agree on *en er*. In 10 cases, the manuscripts agree on *ok er*. In four out of five mixed cases, two out of three manuscripts have *en er*. Though the agreement is not as impressive as in the case of the *Heimskringla* manuscripts, it seems good enough for my purposes. We can conclude with reasonable confidence that the original *Edda* had a high percentage of *en er* sentences.

There are strong indications that the text of Codex Upsaliensis has undergone extensive and somewhat eccentric editing compared to the other manuscripts and is a much less reliable witness to the original work (Sävborg 2012, though see also Heimir Pálsson 2010, 2012). The U text of *Gylfaginning* has 22 *ok er* sentences and 13 *en er* sentences (37% *en er*). I regard this as one indication that the text of U is farther removed from Snorri’s original than that of RWT.

Conclusions

We can now compare the *en er* percentage of the three putative works by Snorri. To distill the results on *Egils saga* into one number I simply take an average of the *en er* percentage of the individual manuscripts (see table 2). For the *Prose Edda* I go with the state of affairs in Faulkes’s edition. For *Heimskringla* I use Hallberg’s number.

Text	% <i>en er</i>
Heimskringla	94%
Egils saga (average of mss)	89%
Edda	83%
41 other texts, >10.000 words each	2%–79%

Table 4. Percentage of *en er* in examined texts

Heimskringla, *Egils saga* and the *Prose Edda* all have an *en er* percentage higher than the comparative texts in table 1. This lends some support to the idea that they were composed by the same author. In no way would I

claim that a single stylistic feature is sufficient to prove common authorship, but this closer examination of one of Hallberg’s criteria has certainly increased my general confidence in his results.

Bibliography

- Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson, ed., 1951. *Snorri Sturluson. Heimskringla* III. Íslenzk fornrit XXVIII.
- Bjarni Einarsson 1993. ‘Um Eglutexta Möðruvallabókar í 17du aldar eftirritum’. *Gripla* 8, 7–53.
- Chesnutt, Michael 2005a. ‘Stockholm Perg. 4:o nr. 7, bl. 57r–58v’. *Opuscula* 12, 209–27.
- Chesnutt, Michael 2005b. ‘Tekstkritiske bemærkninger til C-redaktionen af Egils saga’. *Opuscula* 12, 228–62.
- Chesnutt, Michael, ed., 2010. ‘To fragmenter af Egils saga. AM 162 a fol. (R) fragm. β og ι’. *Opuscula* 13, 173–96.
- van Eeden, Willem, ed., 1913. *De Codex Trajectinus van de Snorra Edda*.
- EgEA I = Bjarni Einarsson, ed., 2001. *Egils saga Skallagrímssonar. Bind I. A-redaktionen*. Final editorial work by M. Chesnutt, J. Louis-Jensen, P. Springborg (κ fragment) and A. S. Kjeldsen (η fragment).
- EgEA III = Chesnutt, Michael, ed., 2006. *Egils saga Skallagrímssonar. Bind III. C-redaktionen*.
- Einar Kárason 2010. ‘Káseri um Sturlu Þórðarson, höfund Njálu’. *Tímarit Máls og menningar* 71.3, 67–72.
- Einar Kárason 2012. ‘Njálssaga og Íslendingasaga Sturlu Þórðarsonar’. *Skírnir* 186.2, 289–302.
- Eysteinn Björnsson, ed., 2005. ‘Snorra-Edda: Formáli & Gylfaginning. Textar fjögurra meginhandrita’. Published online at hi.is/~eybjorn/gg.
- Faulkes, Anthony, ed., 1998. *Snorri Sturluson. Edda. Skáldskaparmál*.
- Faulkes, Anthony, ed., 2005. *Snorri Sturluson. Edda. Prologue and Gylfaginning*. Second edition.
- Faulkes, Anthony, ed., 2007. *Snorri Sturluson. Edda. Háttatal*. Second edition.
- Finnur Jónsson, ed., 1886–88. *Egils saga Skallagrímssonar tilligemed Egils störré kvad*. S.T.U.A.G.N.L. XVII.
- Finnur Jónsson, ed., 1916. *Eirspennill. Am 47 fol. Nóregs konunga sögur. Magnús góði – Hákon gamli*.
- Finnur Jónsson, ed., 1924. *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar. Codex Wormianus AM 242, fol.*
- Finnur Jónsson, ed., 1931. *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar*.
- Grape, Anders, ed., 1962–1977. *Snorre Sturlassons Edda. Uppsala-handskriften DG 11. I–II*.
- Hall, Alaric and Katelin Parsons 2013. ‘Making stemmas with small samples, and digital approaches to publishing them. Testing the stemma of *Konráds saga keisarasonar*’. *Digital Medievalist* 9.
- Hallberg, Peter 1962. *Snorri Sturluson och Egils saga Skallagrímssonar. Ett försök till språklig författarbestämning*.

- Hallberg, Peter 1963. *Ólafur Þórðarson hvítaskáld, Knýtlinga saga och Laxdæla saga. Ett försök till språklig författarbestämning.*
- Hallberg, Peter 1968. *Stilsignalement och författarskap i norrön sagalitteratur. Synpunkter och exempel.*
- Heimir Pálsson 2010. 'Tertium vero datur. A study on the text of DG 11 4to'.
Published online at uu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:322558.
- Heimir Pálsson, ed., 2012. *Snorri Sturluson. The Uppsala Edda. DG 11 4to.*
Trans. A. Faulkes.
- Helgi Guðmundsson 1997. 'Tveir þættir'. *Um haf innan. Vestrænir menn og íslenzk menning á miðöldum*, 278–84.
- Jón Helgason, ed., 1956. *The Saga Manuscript 9. 10. Aug. 4to in the Herzog August Library, Wolfenbüttel.* Manuscripta Islandica 3.
- Katrín Axelsdóttir 2005. 'Gunnlaugur Leifsson og Ambrósíus saga'. *Skírnir* 179.2, 337–49.
- Kjeldsen, Alex Speed, ed., 2005a. 'AM 162 A γ fol (Reykjavík)'. *Opuscula* 12, 51–70.
- Kjeldsen, Alex Speed, ed., 2005b. 'AM 162 A δ fol (Reykjavík)'. *Opuscula* 12, 71–153.
- Kjeldsen, Alex Speed, ed., 2005c. 'AM 162 A ζ fol (Reykjavík)'. *Opuscula* 12, 154–82.
- Kjeldsen, Alex Speed, ed., 2005d. 'AM 162 A θ fol (Reykjavík)'. *Opuscula* 12, 183–208.
- Matthías Johannessen 1997. 'Njála(n)'. *Sagnir og sögupersónur. Helgispjall*, 49–96.
- Nordal, Guðrún 2002. 'Egill, Snorri og höfundurinn'. *Lesbók Morgunblaðsins*, December 21st 2002, 8–9.
- Nordal, Sigurður, ed., 1933. *Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar.* íslenzk fornrit II.
- Sigurjón Páll Ísaksson 2012. 'Höfundur Morkinskinnu og Fagurskinnu'. *Gripla* 23, 235–85.
- Sävborg, Daniel 2012. 'Blockbildningen i Codex Upsaliensis. En ny metod att lösa frågan om Snorra Eddas ursprungsversion'. *Maal og minne* 1, 12–53.
- Unger, Carl Richard, ed., 1871. *Codex Frisianus. En Samling af norske Konge-sagaer.*
- Wendt, Bo 2008. 'Eddan och texttermerna. Kort terminologiskt genmäle till Henrik Williams'. *Scripta Islandica* 59, 177–79.
- Þorgeir Sigurðsson, Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson and Haukur Þorgeirsson 2013. 'Ofan í sortann. Egils saga í Möðruvallabók'. *Gripla* 4, 91–120.