

CHRISTOPHER ABRAM

Scribal Authority in Skaldic Verse: Þórbjörn hornklofi's *Glymdrápa*

The seven stanzas and two half-stanzas of *dróttkvætt* verse which since Snorri Sturluson cited them as evidence in *Heimskringla* have been known as Þórbjörn hornklofi's *Glymdrápa* are preserved in sixteen manuscripts, and in a variety of textual contexts, but nowhere does the poem we refer to by this name exist in one manuscript in its entirety. Rather, the modern conception of *Glymdrápa* depends upon the work of modern editors: in particular, Finnur Jónsson's *Skjaldedigting* (1908–15) from which is derived Ernst Kock's revised edition (1946–50). Kock's work is perhaps more accurately termed a reinterpretation than a new edition, as he worked from the variants recorded by Finnur, and did not consult the manuscripts afresh (Frank 1985: 163). He accepted without reservation Finnur's stanza arrangement, for example, and this acceptance, in the case of *Glymdrápa*, has potentially far-reaching implications: it begs the question, who is responsible for this final, canonical text? Is the conception of *Glymdrápa* in its present form really that of an almost unknown ninth-century skald — its attribution to whom has been questioned (Jón Helgason 1953: 143) or does it owe its existence to Snorri or to Finnur Jónsson? Roberta Frank has examined these issues and warns that Finnur's dominance of the field creates a hermeneutic circle which can be difficult to break (Frank 1985: 162–3). To use any of the standard editions or lexical tools which facilitate the understanding of this difficult verse is to be only one step removed from Finnur's interpretation. New editors must carefully reconsider the basis upon which their choice of readings has been made, and must pay attention more closely than their predecessors — who have in general seem to have preferred readings which match most closely their preconceived notions about the nature of skaldic verse, or which enable them more easily to interpret the text — to the text as it is preserved (Kuhn 1934: 418). Rather than view a manuscript as a degraded remnant of a hypothetical

ideal text, we should perhaps regard the textual tradition of a skaldic verse as part of the text itself.

It is my contention that, in the case of *Glymdrápa*, we find signs that not merely the named participants in the transmission of this text — its ‘author’, its medieval anthologist and its modern editors — but also the unknown scribes responsible for the copying of each of the manuscripts, have all been part of a continuing process of interpretation and intervention as the poem has moved from its supposedly oral origins into textual form and then through medieval redaction and modern scholarly interpretation. In this the example of Old English verse may prove illuminating: this too is a supposedly oral literature which is nonetheless preserved thanks to literate scribes (O’Keeffe 1990: 4–6; Moffat 1992). As yet, such an approach does not appear to have been tried in Old Norse studies, although Pasternack’s statement, re-expressing O’Keeffe’s conclusions, that ‘the discursive formation of Old English manuscript verse was distinct to its era and place and did not hold the same statements about textual stability, originality, and authorship that modern book culture does, or that medieval Latin manuscript culture did,’ rings equally true for skaldic poetry (Pasternack 1997: 180). When Snorri Sturluson, as he does throughout *Skáldskaparmál* and *Heimskringla*, uses the formula ‘the poet says or said’ to introduce a skaldic verse he is making a statement determined by his cultural preconceptions: that skaldic verse is declaimed (Gade 1994). This cannot take us any closer to the original poet, however, than the texts allow us to go. I intend here to use the approach of examining the preserved texts as artefacts in order to question some of the conclusions reached about *Glymdrápa* by its previous editors.

Glymdrápa (cited from Finnur Jónsson 1908–15, B1: 20–21)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Hilmir réð á heiði,
hjaldrseiðs, þrimu, galdra
óðr við æskimeiða
ey vébrautar, heyja,
áðr gnapsólar Gripnis
gnýstoerandi foeri
rausnarsamr til rimmu
riðviggs lagar skíðum.</p> | <p>2. Gerði glamma ferðar
gný drótt jöru Þróttar
helkannanda hlenna
hlymræks of tröð glymja,
áðr út á mar mœtir
mannskœðr lagar tanna
rœsinaðr ok rausnar
rak vébrautar nõkkva.</p> |
|---|---|

3. Hríjóðr lét hæstrar tíðar
harðráðr skipa þorðum
þoru fáks ens bleika
barnungr á lög þrungit.

ok hjalmtamiðr hilmir
holmreyðar lit olman
lindihjört fyrir landi
lundprúðr við stik bundinn.

4. Þar svát barsk at borði,
borðhólkvi rak norðan,
hlifar valdr til hildar,
hregg, döglinga tveggja,
ok allsnœfrir jofrar
orðalaust at morði
(endisk rauðra randa
rødd) dynskotum kvøddusk.

7. Ríks (Þreifsk reiddra øxa
rymr; knøttu spjor glymja)
svartskyggð bitu seggi
sverð þjóðkonungs ferðar,
þás (hugfylðra hólða)
hlaut andskoti Gauta
(høf vas söngr of svírum)
sigr (flugbeiddra vigr).

5. Háði gramr, þars gnúðu,
geira hregg við seggi,
(rauð fnýsti ben blóði)
bryngøgl í dyn Skøglar,
þás á rausn fyrir ræsi
(rêð eggliuðr) seggir
— æfr gall hjørr við hlifar —
hnigu fjørvanir (sigri).

8. Menfegir bar margar
margspakr (Niðar varga
lundr vann sókn á sandi)
sandmens í bý randir,
áðr fyrir eljunprúðum
allr herr Skota þverri
løgðis eiðs af laði
lœbrautar varð floeja.

6. Grennir þrøng (at grunni)
gunnmøss fyrir haf sunnan
(sá vas gramr) ok gummum
(geðharðr) und sik jørðu,

9. Kømrat yðr né œðri
annarr konungmanna
gjøfli roemðr und gamlan
gnapstól, Haraldr, sólar.

The verses which constitute what we now call *Glymdrápa* are found in a total of sixteen manuscripts: the manuscript sigla are those used by Finnur Jónsson in volume A1 of his *Skjaldedigtning*. All manuscripts are found in Copenhagen libraries unless otherwise stated.

Heimskringla

- K: Kringla transcripts (AM 35, 36, 63fol.)
F: Codex Frisianus (AM 39fol. and 45fol.)
J1: Jöfraskinna (AM 37fol.)
J2: Jöfraskinna (AM 38fol.)

Snorra Edda

R: Codex Regius (GkS 2367 4to)

W: Codex Wormianus (AM 242fol.)

T: Codex Trajectinus (Utrecht, University Library, MS no. 1374)

U: Codex Upsaliensis (Uppsala, De la Gardie 11)

748: AM 748 4to.

1eß: AM 748 II 4to.

Haralds þátrr

Flateyjarbók (GkS 1005fol.)

Fagrskinna

A: AM 303 4to

B: AM 51fol.

Óláfs saga en mesta

61: AM 61fol.

54: AM 54fol.

Bb: Bergsbók (Stockholm, Perg. fol. no.1)

Of the nine component verses extant, seven, all of the full eight-line verses, are preserved in the four chief manuscripts of *Heimskringla*, and in the same order as they appear in the edited poem. The two half-strophes, stanzas 3 and 9 in modern editions, are supplied, the former from *Fagrskinna*, *Flateyjarbók* and *Snorra Edda*, where it is quoted in *Skáldskaparmál*. The final stanza is found only in *Haralds Þátrr hárfagri* as it is preserved in *Flateyjarbók*.

Stanza 3 cannot easily be excised from a critical edition of the poem, although it presents the editor with problems, and is perhaps an unnecessary and clumsy interpolation into the *Glymdrápa* of *Heimskringla*. It is, however, attributed to Þórbjörn in *Fagrskinna*, and the conception of the scribe who wrote this manuscript of the form of the poem undoubtedly included this half-strophe, which is copied (or miscopied) together with 4/1–4 as a whole eight-line stanza. This leaves 4/5–7 isolated as a half-strophe. There are stylistic reasons why an editor would reject this interpretation of the *Fagrskinna* scribes, as well as the reluctance to choose a reading which is opposed by all the other witnesses. It is undesirable that the first word in a stanza should be MS *ok* (emended to *auk*

by Kock), when in all seven complete verses as they are preserved elsewhere, the conjunction or adverb (*oc* again in 6/5, otherwise *aðr*: 1/5, 2/5 and 8/5; *Þa er*: 5/5 and 7/5) which introduces a parenthetical statement falls with absolute regularity upon the initial word of the second *helmingr*. However, although this extra half-strophe jars in the context of the neighbouring eight-line stanzas with their patterned repetition of fifth line-initial introductions, the decision of the scribes of the writers of *Fagrskinna* (assuming, as seems likely, that their exemplar was not too dissimilar to that used by Snorri or the compiler of *Flateyjarbók*) to format the poem in this way actually displays some sensitivity to the rules of *dróttkvætt*. As demonstrated by Gade, the lines *Þar svát barsk at bordi* (4/1 or *Fagrskinna* 23/5) and *Þás á rausn fyr ræsi* (5/5 or *Fagrskinna* 25/5) fall into the same, most common category of filler of odd lines, which she identifies as type A_3^3 odd (Gade 1995: 150). Although scribal carelessness cannot be ruled out in this case, it is possible that in *Fagrskinna* we have a compiler of a historical work sufficiently versed in the *dróttkvætt* tradition that, when faced with an editorial decision, such as which of these *helmingar* belonged together, he was able to recognise common verse forms and thus make an informed decision, linking the two proximate stanzas because of their alliteration falling in the same position and deciding that 4/1 was therefore more suitable as the start of the second *helmingr* of a stanza than as the beginning of a whole new verse.

Stanza 3, however, is still unsatisfactory, albeit perhaps less so, as the opening *helmingr* of a full stanza. We rely entirely upon the reading of one manuscript — that of T, *Hriod* — to provide any alliteration in its first line, and that alliteration is suspect: all the other witnesses read *Rioðr*, which does not alliterate with either *hæstrar* or *tiðar*. It is difficult to think of a scribal error which would explain this variant occurring in one manuscript only, and the scribe of T, which usually agrees closely with R (Faulkes 1982: xxxi–iii) can therefore potentially be seen at work emending the text to create a better line of poetry. This instinct towards emendation on the part of medieval writers should make us suspicious of stanza 3 of *Glymdrápa*. All the other eight-line stanzas feature, without exception, regular alliteration: stanza 3 lacks it. As such, the editor can either explain this away as an insignificant blemish upon the poet's art, or attempt to emend it to fit the patterns established by the more correct verses attributed to the poet, as I would argue medieval writers were wont to do. As *Glymdrápa* is regarded as the earliest extant poem which exhibits all the traits of 'classical' *dróttkvætt* verse, with regular

patterns of alliteration, rhyme and caesura (Kuhn 1983: 281–3), the requirements of the metre provide a control against which to test the manuscript evidence. It is reasonable to suggest, within the context of such a conservative stylistic tradition, that any departure from these conventions in the manuscripts is the result of scribal error, rather than a deliberate literary device. In the *Fagrskinna* and *Snorra Edda* texts of stanza 3 we probably see scribes confronted by a corrupt piece of *dróttkvætt* attempting to make sense of it within their conception of what the metre entails: the writer of *Fagrskinna* notices that the stanza does not fulfil the eight-line pattern he expects, so he attempts to tack it onto a neighbouring verse. Another scribe, seeing that stanza 3 lacks alliteration, emends by adding *h* to the beginning of *Ríodr*, so that there is at least an appearance of alliteration, even if *Hríod* and *hæstrar* do not actually alliterate properly. These efforts may be unsuccessful attempts to make stanza 3 into a more respectable *dróttkvætt* verse, but they show that the scribes were at least aware of what it was they were copying. But in a modern edition of *Glymdrápa* it would seem most sensible to follow the example of the author of *Heimskringla*, and leave stanza 3 out of the main body of the text.

I would treat stanza 9, preserved in only one manuscript, with similar caution. The attraction of including this stanza, with its naming of Haraldr (9/4), in *Haralds þáttr* is understandable, but, like stanza 3, there is the strong suspicion that this verse is an addition to the ‘original’ poem. In *Flateyjarbók* stanza 9 is not named as part of *Glymdrápa*, but merely ascribed to Þórbjörn. Thus the inclusion of this half-strophe is dependent upon its proximity to other stanzas of the poem; as in the previous case, stanza 9 does not appear in its manuscript context in the same place that it has ended up in the poem’s modern edited form. It forms the first *helmingr* of an eight-line verse with 5/1–4 as the second half-strophe (Guðbrandur Vigfússon and Unger 1860: I, 572). The second half of stanza 5 is copied as the first half of another composite stanza, together with 4/5–8, and stanza 3 and 4/1–4 are joined together as in *Fagrskinna*. The compiler of *Flateyjarbók* supplied another stanza, perhaps one which he had heard attributed to the same poet, or perhaps composed a new *helmingr* himself in order to fill the gap left by the rearrangement of the verses in *Fagrskinna* or a common exemplar.

This half-strophe again looks inadequate compared to the regular classical *dróttkvætt* features of the rest of the text, although its rhyme rather than alliteration is at fault:

9. Kemr at ydr ne ædri
 annar konunga
 giofle remdr und gamlan
 gnapstol haralldr sola.

Thus runs Finnur's uncorrected edition following the manuscript. In both his corrected text and that of Kock, *konunga* is restored to *konungmanna*, following a scribal correction. This at once restores *aðalhending* to 9/2. But 9/3 requires *remdr* to rhyme with *gamlan* to provide *skothending*. Although, as Gade points out, it is not entirely clear how many of the post vocalic consonants must participate in the rhyme, *md* and *ml* do not seem adequately to possess the necessary shared phonetic quality (Gade 1995: 5–6). Of the rest of *Glymdrápa*, only 4/1 *Þar svát barsk at bordi* appears to exhibit a weakness of rhyme, but this may be rectified by ignoring the editors' normalisation and adopting the reading of F: *barðz*. Stanza 9 also features the secondary alliteration of *kemr* and *konunga* in lines 1–2, augmenting the expected standard alliterating syllables. This device is found elsewhere in the poem only at 5/1–2, where *haði* and *hregg* offer secondary alliteration.

That this stanza is the only one preserved in a single manuscript, and that it does not quite match the style of the rest of the poem, suggests that it was not part of the inherited tradition of *Glymdrápa*. The nature of the problem of skaldic authorship and the preservation of skaldic poetry means we will never know whether Þórbjörn wrote stanza 9 as part of his *Glymdrápa*. We may agree with O'Keefe that 'where variants are metrically, semantically and syntactically appropriate, the scribe has read "formulaically" and has become a participant in and a determiner of the text' (O'Keefe 1990: 191) and that this alters our conception of the very nature of skaldic poetry, which is characterised by general critical consent as 'emphatically non-anonymous' (Frank 1985: 159), but we must recognise that by removing this *helmingr* to the end of the poem Finnur Jónsson and Kock after him have done neither the poet nor the scribes a service, and have taken an unwarrantable liberty with the text.

Further evidence for the ability and willingness of scribes to enter into the process of skaldic composition may possibly be seen in stanza 2. Here, however, we see the fine line between scribal intervention and scribal error. It is a matter of editorial judgement as to which is the correct interpretation of the text. The crucial line is 2/7, *ræsi maðr til rasnar*: this is the reading of J₁, which Finnur has as his base text,

although he prefers to read *ræsinaðr*; Kock's text has *ræsinaðr auk rausnar*. The manuscripts are split between the two readings. In F and the *Snorra Edda* manuscripts which contain this verse (R, T, 748, 1eß), the reading is *naðr*. They agree with each other against the other *Heimskringla* manuscripts' *maðr*. This appears to be a simple case of scribal confusion over the number of minim strokes in *m* and *n*. Skaldic poetry does not generally respond well to a traditional stemmatic approach to textual relationships (Poole 1993: 80–1), and it is by no means clear which group of texts has been (mis)copied from the other, but we can be sure that the *naðr* group was not derived from K, which has the conventional *maðr* rune ᚱ. The scribe of this manuscript was clearly convinced of the correct reading, and this is of importance to the editor. An edition of *Skáldskaparmál* must follow the reading of the *Edda* manuscripts, and this is reflected in the interpretation of the text, as provided in Faulkes's translation: here, *ræsinaðr* is part of a kenning for 'ship', 'splendid fore-sheets-snake' (Faulkes 1987: 139). This is the interpretation Kock follows, and in the context of the *Edda*, where Snorri is discussing different kennings for the sea, it is undoubtedly the appropriate one. However, *ræsimaðr*, a perfectly ordinary prose word for a chieftain or leader, would be appropriate both semantically and syntactically (Cleasby and Vigfússon 1957, s.v. *ræsimaðr*). Ship-kennings including the element *-naðr* are uncommon, and Meissner does not list this one in his standard list of skaldic kennings (Meissner 1921), although Simek does include it in his comprehensive list of Old Norse ship terminology (Simek 1982: 231). So, in a critical edition, who is to say whether we should follow this reading, rather than that of K? Is the complex and unattested circumlocution of *ræsinaðr* automatically preferable to the ordinary prose word? Should we always prefer the more difficult reading? In a situation such as this, when two variants could equally well be explained as deliberate intervention as scribal error, and both can be given satisfactory interpretations as the poem stands, there seems little option but to print both versions and discuss the issue in the textual notes.

In Þórbjörn's *Glymdrápa*, however, the clearest indication of scribal intervention in the text comes in stanza 8. This stanza is a significant part of the poem's value as a historical source, describing as it does one of Haraldr harfagri's battles: it has been discussed historiographically in two recent articles (Weber 1994; Von See 1994). This verse is preserved in all four manuscripts of *Heimskringla*, and in *Óláfs saga en mesta*, where it is the only stanza from *Glymdrápa* to be quoted. With this lim-

ited range of redactions, it is more nearly possible to establish a textual hierarchy. Bb is derived from 54, which in turn is based on a version of *Heimskringla* that is closely related to J₁ (Ólafur Halldórsson 1993: 449). Accordingly, when J₁ departs from the other manuscripts by recording 8/5 *froðom* as *pruðum*, 54 and Bb follow this, in opposition to K, F, J₂, and 61, which appears to have been copied from a different branch of the *Heimskringla* family tree. At 8/4, we see the same thing: the scribe of J₁ has misread the tall *s* of *sandmens* for an *l*, and has probably misunderstood the *-men* element of the word, as he adds an extra *n*, changing the word from the hapax *landmens* ‘land-necklace’, to the well-attested prose word *landmenns* ‘landmen’ (that J₂, whose retention of *froðom* shows that it was not copied directly from J₁, also misreads this letter suggests that their exemplar must have been indistinct at this juncture) and 54 copies *landmens*. J₁’s miscopying of *sandmens* means that the word in position 1 of 8/4 no longer alliterates with 8/3, as it must in *dróttkvætt*, and as it does throughout the rest of the *Heimskringla* version of the poem: alliteration in odd lines falls in position 5 of the line throughout the poem with the exception of 2/1 and 8/5, where position 3 alliterates with the head-stave. This is, however, acceptable within the rules of *dróttkvætt* (Gade 1995: 4). A modern editor of the poem would undoubtedly wish to emend to restore alliteration to lines 8/3–4, especially as the scribal error is so transparent here. The scribe of 54 has already undertaken to perform such a task, however.

Recognising that 8/3–4 *sandi . . . landmenns* does not alliterate, 54 emends to read *landi . . . landmens*, in the process restoring the correct spelling of *-men*, and preserving the original necklace-imagery. He presumably chose to emend *sandi* rather than *landmens* to strengthen the alliteration of 8/3, to give *lundr van sócn at landi/ landmens*. Elsewhere in the poem, over half of the odd lines in the full eight-line strophes, 16 out of 28, feature this type of alliteration, and where this is not present, the head-stave is usually not a stressed syllable, as in all the conjunctions or prepositions introducing parenthetic clauses at the start of second *helmingar*. So, even though there is no evidence from the rest of *Óláfs saga en mesta* that the scribe of 54 knew *Glymdrápa*, he seems to have had sufficient sensitivity to the *dróttkvætt* metre actually to improve this line which arrived at his desk in a corrupted form. In fact, this one scribe is responsible, in *landmens*, for preserving a hapax legomenon in the poetic corpus, which, whilst it may well have been the poet’s original intention, would have disappeared through lax copying had it not been for the scribe of 54’s efforts at revision. Furthermore, his decision to replace

bý in the exemplar with *gný* in 8/4 cannot readily be explained as a copying error. Rather, the redactor seems to have recognised that the sense of the stanza has changed following his first emendation, and that *býr landmens* 'dwelling of the land-necklace' made less sense than *býr sandmens*, and returned to the safer option of another battle word in *gnýr*, which means 'clash' or 'din', especially of wind, waves or weapons, perhaps influenced by the phonetic proximity of *býr* 'dwelling' to *býrr* which, according to Cleasby-Vigfússon 'always denotes the wind on the sea'. It is a skilful piece of work, keeping the sort of clashing battle imagery which dominates the poem, and from which it takes its title, while at the same time making sense of a corrupt text. As far as stanza 8 is concerned, there have been at least two poets at work. Even though operating in a textual tradition which is concerned with the preservation of skaldic verse as evidential or illustrative material within a prose context, centuries after the supposed heyday of the skalds who are quoted, there were scribes who themselves were sufficiently part of the skaldic tradition to be able to 'compose' their own verse. As such, the notion of authorship within this genre must be reassessed.

Russell Poole, in perhaps the first self-conscious re-examination of skaldic editing, has stressed that this type of poetry possesses 'flexible fixity', and that it is to misunderstand the nature of the genre to imagine each text as immutable and having one uniquely viable interpretation (Poole 1993: 104–5). The textual variants of *Glymdrápa* support his assertions, but in my view his concept of 'variability' does not go far enough. He wishes to 'direct attention to the status of skaldic discourse as a social practice', but he fails to recognise that this discourse depends entirely on a scribal practice. The evidence of the 'flexible fixity' of *Glymdrápa*, where no two manuscripts preserve the same verses in the same order, and where scribes take it upon themselves to emend their exemplar, and perhaps even to invent complementary material which then becomes accreted into the textual tradition, gives a clear indication of the illusory nature of skaldic authorship. This is not to deny the importance of the named skald in the composition of the poem, but too often modern editors treat medieval scribes as troublesome intermediaries, obstacles between themselves and the author which have to be overcome with modern sophistication. This is the chief failing of the editions of Finnur Jónsson and Ernst Kock: they believe that there is a fixed, perfect text that can somehow be reclaimed. However, the scribes who used this material in their sagas or metrical treatises self-consciously altered their material to suit their needs, and the manuscripts which sur-

vive record not a single fixed text, but a series of scribal performances which form a dialectic between writers and readers of skaldic verse (and this includes editors) which continues to this day. A new edition of Þorbjörn hornklofi's *Glymdrápa* should take this into account: there is little basis other than convenience for continuing to regard the standard twentieth-century editions as valid representations of an authentic authorial intention.

Bibliography

- Bjarni Einarsson 1984: *Ágrip af Nóregskonunga Sögum. Fagrskinna — Nóregs Konunga Tal*. Íslensk Fornrit 29, Hið Íslenska Fornritafélag, Reykjavík.
- Cleasby, R. and Guðbrandur Vigfússon 1957: *Icelandic-English Dictionary*. 2nd edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Faulkes, A. 1982: *Edda: Prologue and Gylfaginning*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Faulkes, A. 1987: *Snorri Sturluson. Edda*. Everyman, London.
- Finnur Jónsson 1908–15: *Den norsk-islenske skjaldedigtning*. 4 vols., Kommissionen for det Arnsmagnæanske Legat, København.
- Frank, R. 1985: "Skaldic Poetry". Carol J. Clover and John Lindow (ed.) *Old Norse-Icelandic Literature. A Critical Guide*. *Islandica* 45. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY and London, pp. 157–96.
- Guðbrandur Vigfússon and C.R. Unger 1860–68: *Flateyrbók: En samling af norske konge-sagaer med indskute mindre fortaellinger om begivenheder i og udenfor Norge samt annaler*. 3 vols., P. T. Malling, Christiania.
- Gade, K. 1994: "On the Recitation of Old Norse Skaldic Poetry". Heicko Uecker (ed.) *Studien zum Altgermanischen: Festschrift für Heinrich Beck*. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde 11. De Gruyter, Berlin and New York, pp. 126–51.
- Gade, K. 1995: *The Structure of Old Norse Dróttkvætt Poetry*. *Islandica* 49. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY and London.
- Jón Helgason 1953: "Noregs og Islands digtning". Siguðr Nordal (ed.) *Litteraturhistorie: Norge og Island*. Nordisk kultur 8b. Bonnier, Stockholm, pp. 3–179.
- Kock, E. 1946–50: *Den norsk-isländska skaldediktningen*. 2 vols, Gleerup, Lund.
- Kuhn, H. 1934: "Die Skaldendichtung". Alfred Goetze, Wilhelm Horn and Friedrich Maurer (ed.) *Germanische Philologie: Ergebnisse und Aufgaben: Festschrift für Otto Behagel*. C. Winter, Heidelberg, pp. 19–28.
- Kuhn, H. 1983: *Das Dróttkvætt*. C. Winter, Heidelberg.
- Meissner, R. 1921: *Die Kenningar der Skalden: Ein Beitrag zur skaldischen Poetik*. Rheinische Beiträge und Hilfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie und Volkskunde 1. K. Schroeder, Bonn and Leipzig.

- Moffat, D. 1992: "Anglo-Saxon Scribes and Old English Verse". *Speculum* 67, pp. 805–27.
- O'Keeffe, K. 1990: *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 4. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ólafur Halldórsson 1993: "Óláfs saga Trygvassonar". P. Pulsiano (ed.) *Medieval Scandinavia: an Encyclopedia*. Garland Encyclopedias of the Middle Ages 1. Garland, New York, pp. 448–9.
- Pasternack, C. 1997: "Post-Structuralist Theories: the Subject and the Text". K.O'Brien O'Keeffe (ed.) *Reading Old English Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 170–91.
- Poole, R. 1993: "Variants and Variability in the Text of Egill's Höfuðlausn". R. Frank (ed.) *The Politics of Editing Medieval Texts*. AMS Press, New York, pp. 65–105.
- Von See, K. 1994: "Glymdrápa-Str. 8 — ein „methodologisches Problem“?". *Skandinavistik* 24, pp. 146–8.
- Simek, R. 1982: *Die Schiffsnamen, Schiffsbezeichnungen und Schiffskenningar im Altnordischen*. Wiener Arbeiten zur germanischen Altertumskunde und Philologie 14. Verlag Karl M. Halosar, Wien.
- Weber, G. 1994: "Zu Snorri Sturlusons Ausschöpfung der Skaldendichtung als historischer Quelle: Glymdrápa Str. 8 als methodologisches Problem". Heiko Uecker (ed.) *Studien zum Altgermanischen: Festschrift für Heinrich Beck*. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde 11. De Gruyter, Berlin and New York, pp. 677–85.

verse	Hælmætradráða										Haralds þáttir		Fsgsráskinnna	
	J1	J2	K	F	R	T	W	U	748	Íeð	Flateyrbók	A	B	
1. 2	skúðs þrunu	skyþz þrunu	soþz þrunu	seðz þrunu										
1. 2	galittra			at galittra										
1. 3	maðiba		meiði											
1. 4	vebratar		vebratar											
1. 4	heygia		heyja											
1. 5	gripnis		gripnis											
1. 6	gnystramndi fori		gnystramndi fori	gnystramndi lén										
1. 8	rúðs		rúðs	rúðs										
2. 1	Giordiz		Giordiz											
2. 2	ioRo		ioRo	ioRo										
2. 3	heilkaðað		heilkaða	heilkaða										
2. 3	hlaanna		hlaanna	hlaanna										
2. 4	hlynn		hlynn	hlynn										
2. 4	reks		reks	reks										
2. 4	tróð		tróð	tróð										
2. 5	adr		adr	adr										
2. 5	meatir		meatir	meatir										
2. 6	skioðr		skioðr	skioðr										
2. 6	lagar		lagar	lagar										
2. 6	lenna		lenna	lenna										
2. 7	ressi maðr		ressi maðr	ressi maðr										
2. 8	nakua		nakua	nokkva										
3. 1				Riðr										
3. 1				hestrar	hestrar									
3. 2				barþym	barþym									
3. 3				flaks	flaks									
3. 3				enn	enn									
3. 4				lang þrungill	lang þrungill									

Glymðrápa manuscript variants

verse	Helmskriftdaga										Haralda þáttur		Fagriskinna	
	J1	J2	K	F	R	T	W	U	748	1e6	Flateyrbok	A	B	
4. 1	þar			þarðz								þars	þanz	
4. 2	þarkus											þarkvi	þarkvi	
4. 3	þifar											þifdar		
4. 4	þreG			þreGs										
4. 4	þueGla			þueGla										
4. 5	þusnæfir			þusnæfir								þusnæfir	þusnæfir	
4. 8	það			það								það	það	
4. 8	þynskotum			þynskotum								þynskotum	þynskotum	
4. 8	þvæðz			þvæðz								þvæðz	þvæðz	
5. 1	þaði													
5. 1	þar													
5. 1	þruðu			þruðu								þruðu	þruðu	
5. 2	þeira þreGG uð											þeira þreGG uð	þeira þreGG uð	
5. 3	þrusti			þrusti								þrusti	þrusti	
5. 4	þryggau			þryggau								þryggau	þryggau	
5. 4	þ													
5. 4	þynn													
5. 6	þæGluðr			þæGluðr								þæGluðr	þæGluðr	
5. 6	þæGlr													
5. 7	þæfr													
5. 7	þenub			þenub								þenub	þenub	
5. 7	þifar													
5. 8	þionantr													
6. 2	þunMars			þunMars										
6. 4	þobvarðr			þobvarðr										
6. 6	þolmeypar			þolmeypar										
6. 7	þyr			þyr										
6. 8	þlig			þlig										

Glymdrápa manuscript variants

