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could well be that the Ḍhil- author has been influenced here by this source.

**Porgils's dealings with Pórr; the religious element**

Chapter 20 of the saga begins by announcing Porgils's conversion to Christianity and for the next five chapters or so, we find elements in the saga which will be grouped under the above heading. 'Porgils's dealings with Pórr' covers a series of confrontations between the abandoned god and Porgils, the temptations and trials the former inflicts on the latter for his loss of faith, Porgils's steadfastness in the face of these and his final repulsion of the god. What, for want of a better term, is called 'the religious element' covers a variety of features in the saga, in fact a little more widely spread than over the five chapters mentioned above, which reveal the specific influence of Christian thought and ecclesiastical writings. This heading covers such features as different as the similarity drawn between Porgils and Christ in the saga and the characteristic stylistic features found in the descriptions of Porgils already discussed on page 238 ff above. The overall impression left by the features in question, as will be stressed below, perhaps more than anything else, gives the saga its idiosyncratic position amongst works of its genre. Even so, when we study the individual elements which go to give this impression, we shall see that they are often far from original and
can either be traced with reasonable certainty to definite sources or have obvious parallels in other works. But whereas, up to now, the main sources and analogues for the saga have been almost exclusively confined to Landnámabók, Sagas of the Icelanders and the Fornaldarsögur, we now find influences from writings of a different nature:

Among works by Icelanders, we note special similarities in the two sagas of Óláf Tryggvason written at about the end of the twelfth century by Oddr Snorrason and Gúnlaugr Leifsson. And as has been recognised for some time, these two konungsögn have close connections with international ecclesiastical literature and draw on or take as models such sources as saints' lives and the Bible. Writing a century or so later than Oddr and Gúnlaugr, the author of Fló has, it is clear, come under the direct influence of these two works. He has not been content, however, solely to borrow from his two compatriots, but, taking their example, has himself turned directly to their models. In the search for sources for the part of the saga treated here, we must therefore look for influences not only from works of native origin, but from Latin visions of holy men (or their Icelandic translations), from vision literature and from the stories of the Scripture. It should be remembered that the elements under discussion in Fló are more in evidence in the Æ-version than in the A-version (cf. pages 121-5) and in what follows comparisons are often
made with material to be found only in the longer version.

Soon after his conversion, Þorgils dreams that Þórr comes to him with evil countenance (með illiligu yfirbraði, 66/3), upbraids him for his lack of faith and threatens to make things difficult for him unless he begins worshipping him again. Þorgils gives him a sharp answer, and when he wakes he finds that his boar (töðugóðtr) is dead. Þórr soon appears again, but is again rebuffed. The following night an ox belonging to Þorgils dies. Þorgils then decides to watch over his livestock himself and when he comes in the following morning, he is bruised all over his body; we are told: Háfa menn bat fyrir satt at beir Þórr muni bá fundiz hafa (66/17–8).

Stories in which potential or new converts to Christianity are confronted in dreams by the former objects of their faith are found in other sources. In Báðr (353), the half-god Báðr visits his son Gestr in a dream the day after he has been baptized and says: 'Illa hefir bú gert (cf. Þórr's opening words at 66/4) er bú hefir látit trú bínat bá er langfeðgar bínir hafa haft...'. He then deprives him of his sight and the following day Gestr dies. In Ól mest (ii,112–3), Þórr appears to Sveinn after the latter's conversion, heldr ófrýnligr ok daprligr, and begs him to remove his image from the temple which he knows the homecoming Finnr will destroy. This Sveinn refuses to do. In a well-known story in Þorvalds Pátr viðförla (Ól mest, i, 285 ff.), Þorvaldr brings the bishop Friðrekr to Giljá, where
on three successive days, the holy man sprinkles water on
the stone where Koðran's árnaðr lives. The nights after
these three days, the árnaðr appears to Koðran in dreams
(cf. Porgils's three initial encounters with Pórr) and
complains that the bishop is throwing boiling water over
his home. In the first dream, the árnaðr begins with the
words 'illa hefir há gert... ' (cf. 66/4 and Barð) and in
the second he is described as illiligr í ásjónu (cf. Fló,
66/3). Koðran is unmoved by his lamentations and soon after
is himself baptised. One cannot help feeling that this
story about him must have been known to the author of Fló.

A few details in this first set of dreams may have been
suggested to the author of Fló by other works. In Ö1. mast
(ii, 186), Pórr is driven out of his temple by the newly
converted Pórhallr and ventfully kills a horse before
fleeing north to Siglunes. When Pórr tells Porgils that it
will be just as easy for him to kill him as his boar, he
is not uttering empty threats: not only is Gesfr killed
in Barð for his change of faith, but Piðrandi suffers the
same fate for the same reason in Ö1. mast (ii, 148). And
Nijhoff (Beschouwing, 60 and 146) is perhaps right in
thinking, when Porgils comes in 'bruised all over' (viða
hlár 66/17) after his nocturnal struggle with Pórr, that
the author of the saga is reducing the god to a revenant:
in Eyrb. ch. 55, Pórir víðleggar, after a struggle with a
dead shepherd, comes into his farm viða orðing kolblíu.
Porgils's next encounter with his 'dream-man' takes place while he is waiting for a favourable wind to set sail for Greenland. The god is not, at first, mentioned by name but is merely described as maðr... mikill ok rauðskeggjaðr. He again threatens Porgils with bad luck unless he reverts to his worship. Porgils remains unyielding, however, whereupon the man leads him onto some cliffs and addresses him as follows (68/20-1):

"ÍLikum storni skaltu vera ok lólegi í válfy vera ok kveljaz í vesóld ok básga nema þá seriz mínu maðr."

To this Porgils replies: (68/21-3): 'Nei! nei!... fer þá burt inn írdi fjární! Sá mun nár fjálum sem alla laxsti með sínum drezza ok álita ferð vára.' After this Porgils wakes up and, despite Pór's threats, sets sail.

The direct model for this last part of the encounter is clearly the story of Christ's temptation in The Gospel according to St. Matthew, ch. 4, verses 3-10. In the Vulgate this reads as follows:

\[ \text{Italics:} \text{diabo\ldots in montem excelsum valde et estendit ei omnie regnum mundi, et glorian eorum, 9. et dixit ei: Hec omnia tibi dabo, si cadens adoraveris me. 10. Tunc dixit ei: \text{Iesus: Vade Satana: Scriptum est: erin...\ldots} } \]

Unfortunately no Old Norse translation of the New Testament is known so we cannot be certain what the exact wording of a possible Icelandic text here may have been. On the other hand, various vernacular religious works quote Christ's Vade Satana in translated form and it is interesting to compare...
these with Fló's Far (bú) hurt, irn loðr. Súndr (see Note to 34/10).

There can be extremely few instances in the Family Sagas where such directly from the Bible has been so completely taken over. Knut Liestøl (Origin, 157) claims that this is the only example he knows. Stefán Einarsson (Études de linguistique et de philologie, 1959, 126) allows for more instances than this and suggests, not very convincingly, that Laxd may contain an Old Testament element. Turning to Oddr's Saga of Óláfr Tryggvason, however, we find considerable influence from Bible stories and here, as in Fló, stories of Christ are adapted to fit the saga hero. We may give some examples:

In Oddr, Ólafs, Astriðr and Óláfr flee from Norway from the persecutions of Hákon jarl, just as Mary and Jesus flee into Egypt from Herod. In Oddr's work, when Óláfr is carried off into Estonia (Oddr, Ólafs, 22 ff.), the author himself compares the story of Joseph's fate in Egypt. In the Gospel according to St. Mark, ch. 17, verses 1-9, we are told how Christ takes three favoured disciples up onto a mountain to pray. As he prays, they see his appearance change and his clothes shine like light. Two men speak with him, Moses and Elias. As they go down from the mountain, Christ tells his disciples not to tell what they have seen before the Son of Man has risen from the dead. In Oddr, Óláf (152 f.). Óláfr takes his trusted friend Porkell dyrjill into a wood. There, Óláfr prays and
stretches up his hands to Heaven. A great light then shines over Oláfr and Porkell sees him with two men dressed in white. Later, on the way out of the wood, the king commands Porkell not to tell any one of this incident while he lives. For further examples of Biblical borrowings in Oddr's work see G. Indrebo, Faarrkinna, 1917, 159-61.

Just as in Oddr's saga, then, we find in this case in Fló, a quite clear example of the modelling of the heroes experiences on those of Christ. Further, as the motif is used in Fló, it suggests not only a more general likening of Þorgils to Christ, but also of his adversary, Þórr, to the Devil. The first of these inferred comparisons will be discussed a little further below. The second needs more immediate attention.

The demonisation of heathen gods was, of course, an important part of the propaganda of the early and medieval Christian church. It found its justification in, among other sources, Psalms 95, verse 5: Quoniam omnes dii gentium daemonia. That an identification of the pagan deities with the Devil or devils was frequently made by missionaries working in early Germany, has been amply documented by H. Achterberg in his monograph Intermedia Christiania (1930; see particularly 159-76). No doubt English, German and native missionaries working in pagan Scandinavia adopted the same approach and were quick to couple the gods of Æsir, particularly Þórr, with the demons of their own religion. In Iceland, however, after
the year 1000, the influence of the Christian church grew apace and there is little evidence to suggest that belief in Þor, Freyr and, if he ever had many devotees, Óðinn, did not wane rapidly. When, then, in his book Die Religion der Nordgermanen im Spiegel christlicher Darstellung (1936, 72 ff.), Rudolf Schomerus points to a number of examples in Icelandic sources of what he calls the 'Dämonisierung und Verächlichmachung der heidnischen Götter' these can hardly be regarded as the active propaganda of an insecure religion, but are rather to be taken as the half-fossilized teachings of a well-established Church, well on the way to becoming stock elements. We must look rather here for the purely literary influence of international hagiographic writings on the Icelandic works under discussion. Of particular interest, in this connection, are stories like the one in Fló, where, it seems, the Devil assumes the form of a heathen god to tempt or deceive the good Christian. The theme is found, for example, in Oddr, Ólafs (131 ff.), where we are told how sauvinr allz mannkyns diofullin... breðr... asek mannligrin syn. til bess at hann mætti ba auðvelligar suikia men. Disguised as Óðinn, he visits Óláfr's court and leaves poisoned food for him. Óláfr is not tricked, however, and at the conclusion of the tale tells his men that '...sia diofull havi verit mað asionu Ódins.' On another occasion (Ódr. Ólafs, 173 f.), the king is sailing along the coast of Norway, when a man standing on a cliff (ahamr Ódins) hails
him and asks for a passage. This the king grants him. The man, who has a red beard, starts telling stories and eventually to preach heathendom. Finally, laughing, he jumps overboard and the king remarks: ...

The author of Fló could have got the idea of the red-bearded Pórr on the cliff and in the ship from this story.

In discussing the literary sources for Oddr's Saga of Oláfr Tryggvason, Lars Lönnroth (in Samlarer, 1963-71 f.) mentions a possible model for tales like the two mentioned above which is also of interest for the story of the temptation of Porgils in Fló. This consists of excerpts from the Life and Dialogues of St Martin by Sulpicu Severus. In the Icelandic version, the relevant passage reads as follows (HMS, i, 569):

(Of St Martin, it is said): Dioflur omoc oc stundom at freista hans i yvam lic(i)on, oc alirar oftast i like Pors epa Obens epa Freyio. En Martinus hafði crossmarc at scildi vip allre freistne beira. En harn kennde ba, i hverionge likio(m) sen beir varo, oc namdi hvern beira a namn oc fec hveriom beira ba queðio, er (beir) varo verber: Por callahi hann heimsccan, en Oben deican, en Freyio portcono.

Lönnroth sees this as an amalgamation of two passages of the Latin:

(i) Freqwenter autem diabolum dum, illud nondum artibus sanctum virum contulerit illudere, visibilum min
It is not at all unlikely that the author of Fló knew these passages either in Icelandic or Latin form.
The cult of St Martin was widespread in Iceland in the Middle Ages. At least ten churches were dedicated to him.
Church decorations frequently included pictures from his life (see KL, s.v. Martinus, Iceland). If he did know the text in question then he probably let it influence him when he has the hero of his saga tempted and persecuted by the Devil disguised as Pórr. If he did not, then one must assume the indirect influence of some such text on the saga. We shall return to the passages in the Life and Dialogues of St Martin on a detail below.

After Dorgils and his companions have been at sea for some time, they are becalmed. Autumn comes and they have still not sighted land. Provisions and water begin to run out. One night, Dorgils has a dream in which Pórr appears again. The god again tempts him - Dorgils will reach land within seven nights if he will pray to Pórr - but
the hero answers only with threats. Pórr then reminds him of an ox he once gave him. When Porgils awakes he decides to throw the animal in question into the sea. When Þorgeirr discovers this intention she demands to buy the beast for provisions, and says it is not surprising that things go badly for them when 'our Pórr' (Pórr várr) is so disgraced. Porgils is firm in his resolve, however, and the animal goes overboard.

In connection with this story, one thinks first of Freyfaxi's fate in Hrafn (ch. 6): here an animal, which, like the ox in Fló, has been consecrated to a god is wilfully destroyed with what seems to be almost Christian zeal. Þorgeirr remarks as the horse is taken up on to the cliff: '...Mun hab nú makliðst, at sá taki við hónum, er hann á.' Porgils is also probably wise in refusing to let the animal be used as food, as meat given by or belonging to the gods is seldom as wholesome as it might be.

In the story of Óinn's visit to Óláfr Tryggvason already mentioned (Oddr, Olafs, 134), food left behind by the god is lethal enough to kill a dog. In Eir (ch. 8), Pórr sends a whale to Karlsefni's followers who are short of provisions. They eat it but are immediately sick. When Þórhallr veiðimaðr tells them that inn raðskergjaði has provided the food, they throw it into the sea (so Haukshók) and pray to God. Finally when Þorgeirr remonstrates against the treatment Pórr is getting, she reminds us of the many stereotyped staunch heathens in sagas of the missionary
kings (e.g. Pórhildr in Ol._mest._ ii,186) who protest at and fear the consequences of degrading the old gods.

Soon after the drowning of the ox, Porgils and his men suffer what seems to be an inevitable shipwreck on the coast of Greenland and one cannot help feeling that Pórr is responsible. Here we should remember a story about the Christian missionary Pangbrandr, found in three Icelandic works: in Ol._mest._ (ii,159), where it is probably derived from Gunnlaugr's saga of Oláfr Tryggvason, in Nj, (264 - 6) and in Krist (27 - 8). In the first of these sources the outline of the story is as follows:

The priest leaves Iceland for Norway but is driven back by storms and forced to land in Borgarfjörður. The following winter, another storm drives the ship out of its dock and badly damages it. Two verses are quoted which the heathen poetess Steinunn is said to have declaimed about this event: (i) 'Pórr destroyed Visund for the priest; the gods drove the ship ashore. Christ did not protect the knörr when it broke to pieces. I do not think that God looked after the ship much.' (ii) 'Porr pulled Pangbrandr's great ship from off its stays, shook it, battered it, hurled it against the ground. The knörr will no longer be seaworthy for the violent storm caused by Pórr broke it to pieces.' The other two sources tell essentially the same story and quote the same verses. If there is any difference which might be relevant here it is that Nj could be understood as though Pangbrandr was on the ship when it
was wrecked.

There can scarcely be any doubt that the author of *Fló* knew this story in some form. It has already been suggested that he knew Gunnlaugr Leifsson's saga. Also that he knew *Ni* (see page *252* above). Further both the *Sturlubók*— and *Hauksbók*— redactions of *Landnámabók* were followed in their respective manuscripts by *Kristni Saga* and this was thus quite likely to have been true of *Ldn X* also. Assuming then that we are right on this point, it seems quite possible that the author of the saga was thinking of this story when, because of hostility to Pórr, he has his Christian hero becalmed, storm-battered and finally shipwrecked in the icy wastes of Greenland.

After his arrival in Greenland, Pórr no longer appears to Porgils in dreams. He continues however to dog him with bad luck and to tempt him. The slaves of the party murder Porgils's wife and abscond with the only boat they have. Porgils himself almost brings about the death of his own son. It is not, however, until they have been in the wastes of Greenland for three or four years that Porgils finally frees himself from the persecutions of the god. One day, as they are making their way along the Greenlandic coast, the hero and his men become extremely thirsty and Starkaðr suggests that they should drink a mixture of urine and sea-water. They prepare the drink but before partaking, Porgils declares that he will propose a toast
(mela fyrir minni) and speaks as follows (81/17-9): 'It arga ok it illa kykindi, er vára ferð dvelr skalt eigi bví ráða at ek skal hvárki drekka atna hafararlag nó aðir.'

As he says this, a bird flies up which most resembles a young razorbill. Later, this animal flies off in a northerly direction and Forgils's parting words to it are (82/2-5):

'Seint hefir bessi fugl við oss skilit ok taki nú allar græmir viðr honum. En við bát unum vör at eigi kom hann bví á leið sem hann vildi ok veldr Guð sjálfr bví, er vör trúm á.'

Although the identification between the young razorbill and the Devil/Pórri would seem to be quite obvious, previous commentators of the saga have not remarked on the more exact significance of the bird. We learn, however, from C. Grant Loomis's book White Magic (1948, 74) that the Devil assumes a variety of forms (including those of birds) in which to persecute holy men and other innocents. Loomis cites examples of Satan appearing as an owl, a sparrow, a raven and a swallow. A story of this type could well have been known to the Fló-author is found in The Life of St. Benedict (cf. Patrologia, lxvi) which appears in the Icelandic translation of Gregory's Dialogues in a manuscript from about 1200, AM 677, 4to (see Leifar fornra kristinna fræða íslenskra, ed. Þorvaldur Bjarnason, 1378; see page 107), and in a later manuscript (see EKS, i; see page 160). In AM 677, 4to, the episode is as follows: Á nökkrum dæri, bá o. Benedictus var eina sætun, þá kom Kristinnat honum
(fjandinn kom at freista hans, HMS; tentator súfrin, Patrologiae, bvi at nókkurr svartr fugl fló svá vor and-
liti hans at hang mátti auðveldliga taka heindi of hann vill. En hann sérdi krossmark á möt ok flæði fuglinn (flaug...berar á braut, HMS). Now if we assume that the Fló-author was here influenced by this source, the reason for Pórr choosing an álkuungi's shape would seem to be clear: as a young bird, it would, of course, be small (lit-
ill); and as a razorbill it would be more black than the majority of sea-birds - we remember here the Old Icelandic generic term for the Alcid which appears in Fló, iv, 344, as svartfygli.

A few details of the story need mention. Both St. Benedict and St. Martin put the Devil to flight with the sign of the cross. When Porgils proposes his toast, he probably made the same sign (cf. Hkr, i, 371). The ironic toast to Pórr in urine and sea-water is reminiscent of the equally ironic kveðja which St. Martin accords to Pórr, Oðinn and Freyja in the passage from HMS quoted on page *299 above. As is the case with Pórr in Ol mest (ii, 186; cf. page *294 above) and the black-clad women in the story of Píðr-andi (Ol mest, ii, 145 ff.), we should expect Pórr to make off in a northerly direction (i norðratt; cf. Note to 41/18). Finally, it is perhaps worth noting here that in the poem Hárbardaljóð (Edda, 87, A-version), the parting insult to Pórr has a similar form to Porgils's final curse on the same god at 41/19-20 (cf. Note ad loc).
To turn to what we have called 'the religious element'. The use in Fló of a borrowing from the story of Christ has already been discussed and attention drawn to a similar application of Biblical motifs to Óláf Tryggvason in Oddr, Ólafs. There can be little doubt however that the use of such stories was intended to make the audience of the sagas in question associate Fagríl with Óláf with Our Lord. In Fló, the dream at 68/19 ff. is the only clear example of a motif of this type being used, although we might also note here the 4 or 5 years the hero spends in the wildernesses of Greenland fairly soon after his conversion. Otherwise, there is, in the saga, particularly in the part which deals with Greenland, a decided tendency to give Fagríl an aura of saintliness and piety and to stress his Christian faith. In Orig, ii, 330 (in connection with the steward Pórrrinn) Fagríl's readiness to spare human life is noted: on the whole, the men he kills are genuine scoundrels; when, at the end of the saga, he kills Helgi he himself regards this deed as glammaverk ok bráðraði. The way he keeps awake to nurse a motherless child by placing hot embers beneath his feet could almost be the attribute of some saint. He is constantly admonishing his companions to mind their prayers and to keep their faith; like Sólarljóð and Husavíkamál (cf. Note to 72/9) he advises them 'to let the punishment of others be a warning to them' (72/8-11: ok nefnjaðan um við há at heir sé hiðólétir ok síðarinn.)
In connection with 'the religious element', Óreý's dream at the beginning of chapter 23 must be touched on. In this, we are told, she sees beautiful countryside (fógr herud) and shining men (bjartir menn). This vision, she believes, anticipates the expedition's deliverance from its present distress. Porgils replies that this
is a good dream but that the place she has seen must be
the Other World; there, he prophesies, she will be
helped by saintly men (helgir menn) for her pure life and
sufferings. The incident adumbrates her murder later in
the chapter.

Although this episode is told in no more than a
couple of sentences, the tone and vocabulary of these
make clear the influence of a specific branch of medieval
religious writing, the literature of the vision. The
European tradition of vision literature is well represented
in the vernacular. Such internationally known works
as Visio Thugdali and Evangelium Nikodemii appear in
Norse translation respectively as Duggals Leizla and
Niðrstigningar Saga. In imitation of the foreign genre,
we find the original Rannveigar Leizla (Bysk, ii, 243-6;
iii, 167-71), and visionary poems such as Sólarljóð
Draumkvæde owe much to it. Similar vocabulary to that
used in the episode under discussion is common in litera-
ture of this type. With the fógr heruð and fagrir
staðir of Fló, 73/4 and 8, we may compare the fagrt herad
of Mar, 965, the grænan stad miok fagran ok biartan of Mar,
1163, and the fagrir stabir oc vellir blomgabir of the
Icelandic version of the Dialogues of Saint Gregory
(HMS, i, 250). Men of shining appearance (bjartir menn)
are, of course, common elements in descriptions of Paradise
(see e.g. Mar, 536) and expressions such as hreint lif
(cf. hreinlífi) and mannraun are part of the stock vocabulary
of saints' lives e.g. Rannveig Liedla, Rannveig is helped in the Other World by three saints (helgrim) (cf. Porgils's prophesy). It should also be noted that part of Porgils's interpretation of the dream (ok manu helgir menn hjálpa hér fyrir hreið lif ok mennarvöll) is alliterative, a feature of Old Norse vision literature as well as hagiographic writing (see e.g. Æsk, iii, 170). Here, then, we have yet another example of the influence of religious literature on the author of Flóamanna Saga.

Porgils's expedition to Greenland

In his article on Flóamanna Saga in KL, Björn Sigfusson has the following to say about Porgils's journey to Greenland: 'En misslyckad Grönlandsresa, som Porgils skall har företagit, har möjligen tillhört den gamla traditionen. Resan skildras i F. med en realism, som tycks förutsätta, att en sagesman el. snarare författaren själv har företagit en resa till Grönland mot slutet av 1200-talet. Denna realism fördjupas; motiv från Landnámabók (Svebjørn galtis tragiska slut i Ostgrønl.) och andra källor lever upp och småler ihop med skräckan för mörkret, svältdöden och gengängare, som nyligen varit levande reskamrater.'

We must take issue with what Björn says here: we are inclined to doubt whether either Porgils or the author of the saga ever went to Greenland. As far as Porgils himself is concerned, if we are to believe the genealogical details and other information given in Landnámabók, he must have been sole heir to a considerable estate in
Iceland and would thus have had very little reason to emigrate. He may also have been a godi and enjoyed some degree of influence in Iceland (cf. Note to 13/19). The reason given in the saga for the journey, an invitation from Eiríkr rauði, goes back to an acquaintance which Órðils is purported to have struck up with the discoverer in Norway, but which is hardly likely to have existed (see Note to 20/23-4), and the reason the saga gives for his leaving Greenland, antipathy between him and Eiríkr is no more plausible. Finally it will be remembered that Landnámabók makes no mention whatsoever of the adventure. We would suggest that Órðils goes to Greenland in Fló rather for literary reasons (cf. page *306 above). Nor do we think the author of the saga was ever there. If he was, he would seem to be ignorant of or consciously ignored certain basic facts about the country and its settlements. On the other hand, the whole section of Fló which deals with Órðils's journey to Greenland is, as Björn suggests, rich in literary motifs. Indeed so many parallels and borrowings in this part of the saga can be pointed to that one has yet another reason to doubt that any real experiences of Greenland lie behind the story. This sub-section deals with these parallels and borrowings. The sources the Fló-author has used are mainly accounts of voyages of discovery and attempts to colonise new countries. They concern not only Greenland but also Iceland and Vinland. They include, as well as Landnámabók,
also those two sagas which are famous as sources for the Norse discovery of America, Gr and Eir. The influence of other works, not necessarily to do with adventures in uninhabited countries (e.g. Evrb) will also be noted.

There are a number of similarities between the story of Ægils’s journey to Greenland in Fló and Ærbjörn Vífilsson’s in the early chapters of Eir. Both tell of men who go to the new colony to take up invitations or promises of land by their friend Eiríkr rauði after he has colonised Greenland (Fló, 66/21-3; Eir, no. 88). Ægils and Ærbjörn both have to buy ships (Fló, 67/18; Eir, no. 91). Ærbjörn’s journey to Greenland is described as follows (Eir, nos. 93-5): Siðan létu þeir í haf. Þá er þeir hófðu út látit, var veðr hagstætt. En er þeir kómu í haf, tók af byri ok fengu þeir mikil veðr ok fórz þeim ógreitt um sumarit. Því næst kom sótt í lið þeira ok andaðið Ormr ok Halldís, kona hans, ok helmingr þeira. Sjó tók at stækka ok fengu þeir vás mikit ok vesölð á marga vega ok tóku bó Herjólfsnes á Grænlandi við vetruvitr sjálfar. Likewise Ægils’s voyage begins well but he is soon becalmed (69/3-6) and spends the whole of the summer on the high seas (cf. 69/13). While a sickness kills off half the company in Eir (cf. Fló, 72/4: Nú kom sótt í lið Jósteins, etc.), so in Fló (69/21-2) many of Ægils’s men are at death’s door. Ærbjörn makes a landfall in Greenland on the first day of winter, Ægils is wrecked there a week before that time (70/22). Both men spend
some time in Greenland before they actually arrive at Eiríkr rauði's home at Brattahlíð. During this time, members of both their parties, Porgils himself (Flo) /Guðríðr (Eir) are given premonitions ( dreams, Fló / prophesies, Eir ) about their descendants.

Porgils's expedition to Greenland is a joint one, his partner being Jósteinn bónið or Kálfaholti. Similar joint expeditions are found in the story of Snæbjörn galti in Landnámabók and of Freydis's expedition in Gr, ch.8. And as in Fló, there is friction between the two groups in both these stories. In the M-version of Fló we are told that Porgils hafði allskonar fé að hann vildi þar staðfestaz; we may compare Gr (261): Þeir hófðu með sér allskonar fénað, því at þeir ætluðu at bygja landit, ef þeir mætti þat and Eir, no.303: Þeir hófðu með sér allskonar fé ok leituðu sér þar landsnytja. While the storminess of Porgils's voyage to Greenland has a parallel in Ærbjörn's voyage (see above), as Helgi Guðmundsson remarks (Um Kjaln, 81 footnote 4) 'sjóferðarlýsingar og hrakningarögur eru töluvert algengar í ungum Islendinga sögum.' And those who followed Eiríkr to Greenland traditionally had a rough passage (cf. Ldn.Sth, 156/8-9).

Björn Sigfusson is probably right in tracing some of the motifs in the Greenland section of Fló to the story of Snæbjörn galti in Sturlábók, ch.152 (see also
This story, as Jón Jóhannesson suggests (Gerðir, 196-7), probably goes back to a lost saga of Snæbjörn which the Fló — author may also have known.

The episode in question and Fló have the following in common: both concern expeditions to Greenland, as already noted, 'joint' expeditions, made up of two parties of men (each about a dozen in number, LdnStb, 174/12; cf. Fló, 67/9-18). As far as we can gather, both expeditions land on the desert coast of east Greenland. In both accounts, the adventurers build themselves a hall (skáli) and are involved in ship-building or ship-repair. Órgil and Snæbjörn are both unwilling to let their men go out at night (cf. LdnStb, 174/18-9). In both Fló and Ldn, there are killings while one group is away from the skáli. In Ldn, a minority group has to submit to the wishes of the majority to save their lives (cf. Fló, 82/9-11).

The motif just mentioned of the skáli which Órgil and Snæbjörn gætti in Ldn build, realistic though it is, is, of course, not peculiar to these two sources. It is the conventional building of new colonists in Iceland, Greenland and Vinland. And another possible borrowing: in Gr (261) we are told how Karlsefni and his men hafa allt hafa að gerðu... at jónnum honum skyldi hær hafa allt hær, er heyr fenni til ægis. The same pooling of resources is also found in Fló (70/21). And the games played by Ósteinn and his men at 71/6,13 perhaps have a model in Gr (265) where games are played on Freyðis's
The expedition has not been in Greenland long before Christmas draws near (71/17), the traditional time when evil spirits and spooks are abroad. Accordingly Þorgils tells his men to go to bed early (cf. Fló, 18/3-4). Jósteinn and his band, on the other hand, keep up their riotous behaviour and it is not long before they meet their nemesis: on Christmas Day they hear a great calling from the north-west. Next day one of them answers a knocking at the door, goes immediately mad and dies. The day after that the dead man attacks another of Jósteinn's men and he dies. After this, Jósteinn's party perishes one after the other and before long they return from the dead and begin to persecute Þorgils and his group. The evil Þorgeirr is particularly active in this last respect. Finally Þorgils has all the bodies burnt and there is no trouble from antrröngur after that.

We have already dealt with the motif of the fight with revenants. The sort of story we have in ch. 21 is perhaps a less common, but none the less, well-defined type of antrröngur-story. The best-known example is probably the story of the Fróðárundr in Evrb (chs. 50-5). In this a shepherd comes in one evening með hljóðleikum niðrum (cf. Fló, 71/22 ff.) and it is not long before he goes mad, falls ill and dies. As a revenant he soon attacks Pórir viðleggr and kills him. Both the death now spook the farm, the epidemic spreads and very soon
six men are dead (Eyrb, 147; cf. 72/4-5.). At Christmas Dórrodr bøgífótr is drowned with six others and he himself haunts Fróðá. At the end of chapter 54, we are told that whereas there had been thirty people on the farm in the autumn, there are only six left at göi (cf. Fló, 72/13-4). Later, on the advice of Snorri göi, the revenants are conjured and there is not more trouble from them after that. And the Fló — author may also have had a story found in Eir, ch. 6 in mind here. In this, an unpopular foreman, Garði falls ill and dies on a farm in Greenland's Vestribyggð and after that the majority of the household die one after the other. Later Garði is seen in an hallucination whipping the dead (liðit) whom, it seems, he has called to their fate (cf. Fló, 72/15-6) Eventually Garði's body is burnt (cf. Fló, 72/21). In the parallel version of the story in Gr, there is an epidemic but no hauntings. There is, however, a woman involved called Grimhildr who, like Pógerðr (71/24) is æterk sem karlar (Gr, 258). Pógerðr, by the way, would otherwise seem to be modelled on the bloody and treacherous Freydís of Gr and Eir and, in her heathen belief, possibly also Pórhallr veiðimaðr in Eir. And two further details here: Pógerðs on three occasions tells his men to be quiet in the evening and say their prayers. In Grænlendinga Pátr, ch. 2 (1F, iv, 277), Sigurðr Nýjalsson, also in uninhabited parts of Greenland, tells his men 'ok or nú liðít á dag, ok vil ek, at meðum en líkilátin ok varðiðin'! (Is he, too, afraid of the super-
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murder by his thralls when he is newly arrived in Iceland. Borrowing from the part of LdnX in question (132/7-133/5) has already been suggested in connection with the jordu'—episode. Here Leifr's slaves contrive to split up the free men of the expedition and to kill them all. They then abscond með konur heira ok lausafé ok bátinn. They make off to the Vestmannaeyjar where Ingólfur eventually catches up with them and kills them. And even if the Fló—author did not have the story of Leifr in mind for the murderous slaves of Fló, it seems almost certain he did for an episode in ch. 24. LdnX, 132/28-32 reads as follows:

Hjörleif rak vestr fyrir land ok fékk hann vatnfátt. Pá tóku brælarnir írsku bat ráð at knoða saman mjól ok smjór ok kölluðu bat óborstlát; heir nefndu bat minnpak. En er bat var tilbúit, kom regn mikit, ok tóku beir pá vatn á tíjóldum. Here we would seem to have the model for Starkaðr's weird drink of urine and sea-water at 81/10-5.

We may now turn to some further details on which the Fló—author could have been influenced by Eir and Gr. As noted, the episode in Greenland where Þorgils has presentiments about the illustriousness of his descendants may have had the scene where the völva tells Guðrúr about her descendants as its model. But it may also have been influenced by Gr, ch. 6, where Þorsteinn Eiríksson makes similar prophecies about the same woman. And while the call which wakes up Þorvaldr and his men in Gr, ch. 5 and tells them to take ship may be a model for the òn völva
at 71/20, it is rather more similar to the call at 80/12 which tells the Icelanders to go out and get their ship. After their boat has been stolen, Þorgils and his men build a húðkeipr. The Fló—author certainly found plenty of húðkeipar in Gr and Eir. An island where eggs are found appears not only in Fló, 77/14-5, but also in Eir, ch.8. When Þorgils kills a bear at 80/15 ff. we may compare Eir, no.284 (but see also pages *336-8 below). At 85/1, the Fló—author confidently talks about an útibúr at Brattahlíð where Þorgils keeps his wares. We read in Eir, 58: Síðan var fluttr heim varningr heira í Brattahlíð: skorti bar eigi góð ok stór útibúr at varðveita í.

Finally in this sub-section a word must be said about the picture painted of Eiríkr rauði in Fló. No sooner has Þorgils arrived in Brattahlíð than we are told of a certain coolness between him and Eiríkr. Matters are not improved when Þorgils kills a bear in which Eiríkr is said to have believed. Later Eiríkr lets down Þorgils in the expedition against the outlaws. The saga gives, then, an unusually bad picture of Eiríkr. Underlying the whole story of the antipathy between the two men is the fact that while Þorgils is Christian, Eiríkr is an old pagan.

Now this is rather the same description which is given of Eiríkr in Eir: in chapter 5 of that saga, we find him burying a chest of silver and gold before setting out for Vinland. A little before this, we are told how he is against the acceptance of Christianity and how his wife will have nothing
to do with him because he is a pagan. In the detail of Eiríkr's religion, then, the Fló-author is following older sources. And this was convenient to him, for antipathy between Þorgils and Eiríkr could be given as the reason for the former's return to Iceland from Greenland.

Þorgils suckles his son.

Chapter 23 ends with what is the most extraordinary story in the whole saga: to save his still unweaned child after the death of its mother, Þorgils has his nipple cut off. First blood comes out, then blanda (see Note to 38/12) and finally milk. Þorgils is thus able to breast-feed his son who survives for the time being. References are made to this incident later in the saga (see 42/10, 43/17-8, 44/21 and 51/11-3).

In considering possible sources for this tale, attention must first be given to a tradition connected with the eruption of Katla in the year 1311. This is found in Jón Porkelsson, Pjóðsögur (125-6), where 'Eldrit Markúsar Loptssonar í Hjörleifshöfða' is cited as a source, as well as 'sagnir gamalla manna eystra, einkum Ragnhildar Gísladóttur frá Lambafelli (f. 1798, d. 1889)'. While we know nothing of the oral stories which Jón Porkelsson had access to, we are able to go back to Markús Loptsson's work (Rit um jarðelda á Íslandi, 1880, 9-10) and there find a story which may be translated into English as follows:
This eruption of Katla is called Sturluhlaup. It took place on the Sunday after Christmas. The resulting floods must have come either at night or with unusual speed for the farmer, Sturla Asgrímsson, who then lived at Láguey came out of the farm and was going through the yard. From there he saw the flood of water flowing down over the countryside (byggð) and coming towards the farm. At this he ran back into the house and grabbed a baby out of a cradle which stood by his and his wife's bed. Others say that he grabbed the cradle with the child in it and told the servants to entrust themselves to the mercy of the Lord. He then ran out and onto the wall around the farm. It so happened that the flood of water carried a large piece of ice (jaki) towards the farm. Sturla leaped onto this and took the child with him. The ice floated out to sea and was driven ashore some days later on Meðallandsfjörur. It had then drifted a good five miles east along the coast from the point where Sturla first got onto it. Sturla had had no time to take any food with him when he got onto the ice because everything happened so quickly. His solution therefore was to cut the nipples off his chest and to let the child suck his blood. And because he was a very strong man it was hardly noticed that he had undergone such an ordeal when he came ashore.

Although the circumstances and details of this story and the one we have in Fló are different in several respects, the common element to be found in both of them is so
comparatively rare in Icelandic tradition that it would seem quite probable that one has influenced the other. We must then, at this stage, ask ourselves if Fló has not borrowed from the story about Sturla. We note first that while the story in Fló is clearly fictitious, that the bióðsaga is far more likely to have had some basis in reality. Further, the story of Sturla is connected with a historical event which took place about the time Fló was written. The possibility therefore exists that the Fló-author was here embroidering an account of an actual happening which took place not long before he was writing. But the evidence against the bióðsaga being primary is probably stronger. Markús Loptsson’s Rit um jarðeldu itself goes back to a work by Jón Steingrimsson (1728-91) which is edited by Porvalur Thoroddsen in Safn, 1907-15 (see pages 190-9). And, in this work, while the story of Sturla (Sturli) is to be found, the detail of his cutting off his niple is absent. Jón Steingrimsson seems to have had as his sources a work by Guðmundur Rúnolfsson (about 1709-1780) which is now lost, other written sources 'ásamt frásagnir trúverðugra manna' (see Safn, 1907-15, 194). The detail in question is therefore not found in the oldest extant version of the story. For this reason, while it is not of course decisive, the present edition is inclined to regard the story in Fló as independent of the story of Sturla Ásgrimsson. And this view is given support by the existence of other possible sources for the story in the saga.
It seems preferable to take the following view of the story's appearance in Fló. It has been argued above that the Fló-author has to no small extent introduced hagiographic elements into his work: there are the descriptions of the hero which, in various ways, resemble those of holy men in the heilagra manna sögur and the bishops in the byskupa sögur (see pages *238-40); like many saints, Porgils undergoes and overcomes temptation by the Devil (see pages *293 ff.); as in many legendary works, there is a visio (see pages *308-9); and, as will be suggested below (pages *357-8), when the saga gives an account of the digging up and removal of the hero's bones, it may again be influenced by the lives of the saints. Assuming, then, that the model of the vitae was in the author's mind when he wrote Fló, it does not seem at all unlikely that he should feel the need in his work for some element of the miraculous. Miracula are, after all, amongst the commonest ingredients of the legend and were regarded as the surest sign of a holy man's favour from above. Naturally, the Fló-author had to tread carefully here to avoid the blasphemous: he could not have Porgils working a miracle for another nor make his relics in any way efficacious after his death. A miracle is rather worked on his hero's behalf during his life and in this way his piety is confirmed. And turning to the miracle itself selected by the author of the saga, we find a type common enough for a German scholar to coin a special term for it: miracles where milk is unexpectedly
produced by human beings are by H. Günter in Die christliche Legende des Abendlandes (1910, 240) referred to by the term 'Milch-Wunder'.

G. Loomis, in his book White Magic (1948), is able to refer to a number of stories in the vitae where milk is miraculously produced or babies miraculously suckled. A few examples may be given: the destitute infant Albin is found by two virgins who express the wish to be able to suckle him; with that their breasts are filled with milk and they feed the child (White Magic, 22); a woman who knew Mary Magdalene dies but even so suckles her new-born child for two years (White Magic, 108); a number of saints are able to give milk to women naturally incapable of producing it (White Magic, 42); 'two springs dedicated to Azenor had the virtue of augmenting the supply of milk of nursing mothers who drank of the water' (White Magic, 38); 'the Irish Berach was taken from his mother at the baptismal font in order that he might be brought up by the bishop. When the child cried for his mother's breast, his uncle gave him the lobe of his ear to suck. From this appendage flowed a copious supply of honey' (White Magic, 22); 'a number of martyrs, not only women but men, emitted milk instead of blood from their wounds' (White Magic, 79). The story in Fló is not very different from these miracula contra naturam.

Even so, nowhere in patristic literature has a story been found where a man actually breast-feeds a child as
Porgils does in Fló. On the other hand, in his article 'Zur Quellenkunde deutscher Sagen und Märchen', in Germania, 1880 (289-90), M. Gaster adduces a number of parallels to the story in Flóamanna Saga from Hebrew writings which are of special interest in the present context. One of these, from The Babylonian Talmud Seder Mo'ed, trans. I. Epstein, 1938, i, 245, may be quoted in full:

"Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that a man's wife died and left a child to be suckled, and he could not afford to pay a wet-nurse, whereupon a miracle was performed for him and his teats opened like the two teats of a woman and he suckled his son. R. Joseph observed, Come and see how great was this man that such a miracle was performed on his account! Said Abaye to him: On the contrary: how lowly was this man, that the order of the Creation was changed on his account! Rab Judah observed, Come and see how difficult are men's wants [of being satisfied] that the order of the Creation had to be altered for him! R. Nahman said: The proof is that miracles do [frequently] occur whereas food is [rarely] created miraculously."

Now it is particularly interesting that H. Günter in his study of the origins of Christian miracle stories (op. cit., 85) cites this very story as a possible pre-Christian source for the 'Milch-Wunder' we find in the vitae. If he is right in his suggestion, we may suspect male prudishness, prickliness and feelings of propriety as reasons for the
partial suppression of the motif in Christian literature. It is, after all, hardly in the Western tradition of manliness to suckle children. On the other hand, it is an interesting reflection on the author of Fló that he has been inhibited by no such squeamishness. Regardless of Germanic imputations of ergi to which he lays his hero open (see 44/21 and Note), he has allowed the idea of the suckling father quite explicit expression. And if his methods were unconventional here, his ulterior motive would seem to be quite clear: an anonymous correspondent reporting a 'suckling gardner' from his own experience to Notes and Queries (4/1/1890, 9) characterizes him as 'blessed beyond the sons of men'; the author of Flóamanna Saga seems to wish to present his hero in the same light.

Tröllkonur tvær.

One morning after Pórey's death, Þorgils goes out and sees a great quantity of drift floating in an opening in the ice and by it two tröllkonur, clad, we are told in the M-version (77/1), in fur kirtles making themselves large burdens from it. Þorgils runs over to them with his sword and strikes the arm off one of them. They drop their loads and flee. Later (Main Text, 40/19-21 and M-version, 80/12-4) after a warning from a mysterious voice, Þorgils and his companions catch two women (konur tvær) in the act of stealing their vessel; when surprised, these women disappear quickly.
Nijhoff (Beschouwing, 137) points to various parallels to and possible sources for these two episodes. For the first, he sees Ket, ch. 2 as a source: here Ketill, on a fishing expedition in the uninhabited parts of Hálógaland, locks up his catch in a boat-house but finds it disappears.

Aðra nót vakti Ketill. Pá só hann jötun ganga í naustit, ok batt sér byrói mikla. Ketill gekk at honum ok hjó til hans með 3xíinni á 3xlína[cf. M-text, 77/4] ok fell byrórinn ofan. Later the giant is described as a tróll. Nijhoff is probably right in seeing a direct connection between Fló and Ket here and in suggesting that the former of the two is the borrower (cf. page *261 above).

There is also a parallel story in Ket to the attempt of the two tróllkonur to steal Þorgils's craft. In ch. 3 of that saga, Ketill, this time in Finnmörk, is deprived of his boat by a troll-woman. A similar story is told of Ketill's son Grímr in Gríms Saga loðkinna, ch. 1 (Fas, i). During a sojourn in Gandvík, Grímr is woken one night by laughing and goes out to find tvær tróllkonur trying to shake his boat to pieces. Later in the chapter, we meet the parents of these two beings and they are dressed í skinnstökkum bæði (cf. M-version, 77/1). A parallel Nijhoff mentions from Friðbj (ch. 6) (cf. Untersuchungen, 111 ff.) is of less interest here. It will be noted that Ketill / Grímr / and Þorgils all encounter their giants and tróllkonur in the frozen wastes of the North, in Hálógaland / in Gandvík / and in Greenland (cf. Untersuchungen, 110 ff.)
It should be borne in mind that Ketils Saga and Grims Saga accompany each other in their oldest manuscript and if the author of Fló knew one, he may well have known the other.

The finding of the oar stump

At 77/20-78/3, the M-version contains an episode not found in the X-version. We are told how, on the Greenlandic coast, Porgils and his men find a broken oar on which a verse is inscribed in runes. This verse will be discussed at greater length in Appendix II. It will be argued there that it is a rowing song which the author of the saga knew from contemporary oral tradition. As for the episode in Fló itself, it will be stated as a possibility that we have here a motif from the story of Ingimundr prestr and his companions who perished in these parts of Greenland and left behind them an account of their death inscribed on wax tablets in runes [cf. Sturl; i, 153]. But it will be regarded as a greater likelihood that the oar was intended by the author of the saga to be taken as something left behind or lost by the absconding slaves who seem to have wintered in approximately the same place as it was found [cf. 77/11-20 and 82/11-2]. But as noted, we are on very uncertain ground here.

One can think of another possible reason why this episode should have been introduced here. The majority of Íslendingasögur contain verses which their characters are purported to have declaimed. Some of these verses
may be genuine, some may have been composed prior to the writing of the saga, some were actually made up by the authors of the sagas themselves. It will be argued in Section A of Chapter III that in all probability the author of Fló knew few, if any, oral traditions about Porgils. It also seems unlikely that he knew any verses about him. Further he may not himself have been a poet and thus not capable of composing his own verses about his hero. On the other hand, he might have felt constrained to comply with a convention which he thought demanded at least one or two verses in a saga. He therefore clutched at straws. In chapter 18, he would have been only too pleased to copy Helgi trauði's and possibly Helgi dýr's verse from LdnX (see pages *4-5 ff.). And here in chapter 24, he forced in a verse from popular tradition despite its poverty as poetry and its irrelevance to the story of the saga.

At toga hônk

A possible model for the first of Porgils's proleptic dreams (for an explanation of which, see Notes to 39/20-2 ff., 39/20-2, 39/23-4) is Haraldr harðráði's dream before the battle of Niz against the Danes under Sveinn Úlfsson. This is found in four medieval manuscripts: Morkinskinna, Flateyjarbók (Flb, iv, 139), Hulda and Hrokkinskinna (see Fms, vi, 312). The text of Morkinskinna (ed. C. Unger, 1867, 77) is as follows:
The majority of Haraldr's followers interpret their king's dream in the same way as Þorleifr interprets Þorgils's. Sveinn pulled the hönk from Haraldr and this can only bode ill for the latter. Hákon Ívarsson on the other hand offers a more subtle and optimistic interpretation. Since Sveinn has the hönk (cf. Fló's er hann hafói hónkina) it is possible that he will get tangled up (Sveini myndi áhankaz). In the ensuing battle Sveinn and his Danish army are forced to flee. This story could well have been known to the author of Fló (cf. pages *234, *279-80 above).

The swan dream

In the second dream of this series, Þorgils finds himself at home at Traðarholt. He sees a swan walking up the floor and this is friendlier towards others (bliðari (blið, M) við aðra) than towards him. He then gives the swan a shaking and after that things go better. Þorleifr pro-
phesies that Órgils will marry a young woman; to begin with her love will be cool, but later their relationship will improve. Later in the saga this prophecy is fulfilled.

Dreams where animals represent human beings are common in Old Icelandic literature. They owe their origins to a belief in fylgjur or fetches. According to this superstition, an individual, apart from his material body, also possessed a 'soul' or fylgja which in most cases was only visible to dreamers or those with special visionary powers. The fylgja's appearance in prophetic dreams, like this, is a particularly common motif. It often takes the form of a woman but more frequently, as here, of an animal. What type of animal it appears as, depends, of course, on the nature of the person it belongs to. In Atlamál, for instance, the powerful and ruthless king Atli appears in one of Kostbéra's dreams as a fierce bear, while in Völs (ch.26), Guðrún dreams of Sigurðr as a hawk whose feathers are the colour of gold. The connection between the swan and beautiful young women is a common one in Scandinavian folklore and also further afield (see H. Holmström, Studier över svenjungfrumotivat, 1919; Handwörterbuch, s.v. Schwan). For example, at the beginning of Völundarkviða (Edda, 116 f.), three valkyries come to three brothers dressed in swans' feathers. It may be possible, however, to point to a definite source for this dream in Fló. At the beginning of Gunnl (ch. 2), Órsteinn Egilsson dreams that a beautiful
pen (álpt) rests on the roof of his farm at Borg. An eagle flies down from the mountains and chatters gently (blítliga) to the pen. Another eagle comes from the south and the two male birds fight and kill each other. The pen remains sad and dejected until a falcon comes from the west. The falcon behaves gently towards her (lét blít við hana) and eventually they both fly off together. The swan here represents Þorsteinn's daughter, Helga, who is wooed by two suitors (Gunnlaug, Hrafn) who duel and kill each other. She later marries the less distinguished Þorkell. It will be noted that in both Gunnl and Fló, the pen symbolizes women of the same name. It is difficult to set a terminus ante quem for the writing of Gunnl, although most critics put it before 1300 (so KL). The dream in Gunnl seems to be particularly well integrated into the saga. If, therefore, one saga has been influenced by the other here, then one would tend to suppose that it is Fló that has been influenced rather than Gunnl.

The tree dream

Þorgils's third dream contains perhaps one of the oldest motifs of the saga. 'Tree dreams' are found in a number of foreign as well as Icelandic sources. In Daniel iv, Nebuchadnezzar dreams of a tree which Daniel interprets as representing the fate of his kingdom. In Herodotus's Histories (Book I, 108; translation by A. de Selincourt, 1954, 57-3), Astyages dreams that 'a vine grew from his
daughter's private parts and spread over Asia. Later the
daughter gives birth to Cyrus who rises against Astyages
and becomes master of Asia. The same motif appears in
various medieval European romances (see R. Mentz, Die
Träume in den altfranzösischen Karls- und Artus-Epen, 1888,
40 and 79; P. Schach, 'Some Parallels to the Tree Dream
in Ruodlieb', Monatshefte, 1954, 353-64). In the Latin
romance Ruodlieb of about 1030 (ed. F. Seiler, 1882, 353-64),
the hero's mother sees a tall, luxuriant linden on the top
of which Ruodlieb is lying on a couch, surrounded by soldiers
ready for battle. A dove places a crown on his head,
perches on his hand and kisses him. His mother interprets
the dream as prophesying great honour for her son. In a
Norman work, Robert Wace's Roman de Rou of about 1160 (ed.
H. Andresen, 1879, ii, 145), the pregnant mother of William
the Conqueror dreams of a tree growing from her body which
covers the whole of Normandy. Of Icelandic writers, Snorri
is one of the first to make use of the element, although
what his direct source was, can only be a subject for
speculation. The element is used on two occasions, once
in Hálfdanar Saga svarta (Hkr, i, 90) and again in
Magnússonar Saga (Hkr, iii, 265). Only the first of these
instances need concern us here: Before the birth of Haraldr
hárfgri, Ragnhildr, his mother, dreams that he takes a
brooch from her tunic and, as she holds it, it takes root
and grows into a tall tree. The lower part of the tree
is as red as blood, the trunk a beautiful green and the
branches as white as snow. The tree has many twigs, some
growing high up, other low down. The branches are so huge
that they spread not only over Norway but much further
afield. The dream is given its interpretation in Harald's
Saga hárfagra (Hkr, i, 148):

It should be noted here that there is a pun on the actual
and figurative sense of blómi and that the author of Fló
also introduces a pun into his version of the dream (cf.
Notes to 40/6 and 40/11-2).

In Icelandic sources later than Heimskringla, tree dreams
are firstly found in Harð (on two occasions: 126 f. and
129). As in Heimskringla, there are puns here on blómi.
A version of Harð (itself probably written in the south-
western part of Iceland) must have been in existence before
Fló (cf. Harð, 95 ff.) and since the dream is found in
both extant redactions of the work (AM 556 and 564, 4to),
it is likely to have been in this oldest redaction also. If,
then, there is some direct connection between Fló and Harð
here, Fló is probably the borrower. Secondly, there is a
tree dream in Bárð, ch.1:

Pá var bat á einni nótt, at Bárð lá í säng sínni, at hann dreymdi, at honum bótti trú eitt mikit koma upp í eldstó fóstra síns, Dofra. Pat var harðla margkvislótt upp til limanna. Pat óx svá skjót, at bat hrökk upp í hellisbjargit ok hví næst út í gegnum hellsisgluggann. Par næst var bat svá mikit, at brum þess bótti honum taka um allan Nóreg, ok bó var á einum kvistinum fagrsta blóm, ok váru bó allir blómamiklir. Á einum kvistinum var gullslitr. Þann draum réð Bárð svá, at í hellinn til Dofra mundi koma nokkur konungborinn maðr ok fjöðast bar upp ok sá sami maðr mundi verða einvaldskonungr yfir Nóregi. En kvistr só inn fagri mundi mérkja hann konung, er af þess ættmanni væri kominn, er bar yxi upp, ok mundi só konungr boða annan sið en bá gensi. Var honum draumr só ekki mjök skapfellesdr. Hafa menn bat fyrir satt, at bat it bjarta blóm merkti Óláf konung Haraldsson.

This dream has a number of features in common with Fló, including the gullslitr detail not found elsewhere. Bárð is a late saga which borrows from the Sturlúbók-redaction of Landnámabók and which may have been written well into the fourteenth century. On the whole the gullslitr detail seems better integrated in Fló than in Bárð. It is possible, although by no means certain, that we have a case of [115] borrowing from (rather than into) Flóamanna Saga.

The five candles

In the M-version (79/15-21), Porgils has a dream not
found in the shorter version. In the first part of this he is at home at Traðarholt and has five candles on his knee: the largest of these is no longer alight (ok fólki á inumesta). Although no interpretation is given in the saga, the meaning is clear: The five candles are the lives of Þorgils and his four companions. The largest (least burnt) of them represents the life of his son Þorfinnr; its flame has been extinguished and Þorfinnr dies while still a child, before Þorgils returns home to Traðarholt.

The flame, especially the flame of a candle, is a well-known symbol for life in pagan and, more particularly, in Christian tradition (see e.g. Handwörterbuch, s.v. Lebenslicht). In Greek myth, the Fates appear to Meleager's mother and announce that her son will live only as long as a certain brand on the hearth remains unburned. She takes the brand from the fire, puts it out and hides it in a chest. Years later the Furies instruct her to throw the brand into the fire; she does so and her son dies immediately (see R. Graves, The Greek Myths, 1960, i, 264 ff.) This story bears a striking resemblance to that of Norna-Gestr in Flb, i, 397 f.: While Norna-Gestr was still in his cradle, a völva decrees that he shall live only as long as a candle he has with him remains unburned. At his baptism three hundred years later, the candle is lit and he dies. The same motif is further found in variant D₂ of the Märchen known as 'Der Gevatter Tod' (see J. Bolte
and G. Polívka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- u. Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm*, i, 1913, 377 ff. and especially 388), a version of which is found in Iceland (see Einar Ól. Sveinsson, *Verzeichnis isländischer Märchenvarianten*, 1929, 32). Lastly, one of Gíslí's dreams in *Gísl* (ch. 22) should be mentioned here. The hero enters a hall where his friends and relations are drinking. There are also seven fires there, some of which are very low, while others burn brightly. Gíslí's good dream-woman tells him that these represent the part of his life he still has left to live. In *Fjó* we have, as here, the multiple number of flames, the dream framework and, in the second part of Þorgils's dream, a dream-woman. The *Fjó*-author could have known *Gísl* (according to *KL*, written between 1240 - 50) and may have got the idea for this dream from it, although the 'Lebenslicht'-symbol is too common to reach any certain conclusion on this point. See on a possible pun on *fjólski* in this dream Note to 79/17.

**Two polar bears**

In *Flómannasaga* Þorgils kills two polar bears. The first of these (see 4/21-3) he finds struggling in a hole in the ice with a frost-bitten paw. He kills it and he and his band eat the meat. The second killing (see 43/25 ff.) takes place at Brattahlið. A bear has been preying on the livestock of the Greenland farmers.
Meetings are held and a price is put on the animal's head. One day Órgils's son comes in and says that there is a large and beautiful dog outside. He then runs out and is attacked by the bear which has come down from the glaciers. He cries out and Órgils rushes to the scene and cleaves the animal's head with his sword Jarðhússnautr. As a result of this deed Órgils becomes famous and collects a good deal of money in bjarngjóld.

Bear-killers must always have been folk-heroes in the North. The brown bear is the largest of Scandinavia's predators and the pursuit of it, down the centuries, has been surrounded with a good deal of glamour. And when the Norsemen crossed the Atlantic to Iceland and further to Greenland in the Age of Settlement, they encountered the far larger and more aggressive polar bear, one of the few wild animals which will attack human beings unprovoked. The remark by the author of Órvar-Odds Saga (ed. R. Boer, 1888, 121) that the slaying of a polar bear ranks higher than the slaying of a tiger is a measure of the respect the beast enjoyed. Certainly its sporadic appearance in Iceland was well-remembered and its killers celebrated in folk-tradition (see e.g. Pjóðs, i, 605-9; iv, 3-6). And when Icelandic saga-writers introduce obviously apocryphal bear-killing stories into their works - whether the animal is white or brown - then these, of course, are contrived to redound to their hero's reputation. The stories of this type told
in Faer, ch.12 and VG1, ch.3 are just two examples of many in the sagas. But perhaps most like the story we have here in Flo is the one in Finnb, ch. 11: here a meeting is held and a price is put on the animal's head (cf. also e.g. Eg, 167). And here also the good farmer Bárðr offers to collect the bjarnjóld owing to Finnbogi, just as Bjálfí does for his guest, Porgils, in Flo.

Hrólf the outlaw

After the encounter with the dying Pórarinn, the next episode in the saga is the winter Porgils and his men spend with Hrólf. This must be looked at in its M-version: Hrólf is found living on a small farm on a remote fjord in Greenland. He invites Porgils and his men to stay with him and tells them at an early stage that he has fled from the settlement area (byggð) after slayings he has committed. During the winter the hospitality he provides is the best and, when the spring comes, he gives his ship to his guests. Before they part, Hrólf says he thinks Porgils will win influence and respect when he gets to the inhabited part of the country and asks him to affect an amnesty for him. This Porgils promises to do. Later, after arriving at Brattahlíð (here following the X-version), Porgils færir fram sýknu Hrólf's (45/18) and at 47/23 Hrólf is norðan kominn ok í frið tekinn.

A similar story to this is found in Faer, 14-23, 41. Here the destitute Sigmundr and Pórir lose their way on
Dofrafjall in the winter. In the middle of a snow-storm, they come upon a remote farm where they are given succour. Here they stay not just for one winter but for six.

During this time, their host (who calls himself Úlfr; cf. the like sounding name Hrólfr in Fló) looks after them well and treats them as his own sons. When they eventually do part, Úlfr (who now reveals his real name as Órkel) tells the young men how he is in fact living the life of an outlaw for the killing of one Porálfr. His final words to Sigmundr are (Fær, 23): '...en bess vil ek biðja bik, Sigmundr, at ef þú sér framkvæmd með hofðingjum, at bú munir nafn mitt ok komir mér í brift ok í sætt við sveituniga mína, hvíat mjök leiðiz mér nú í óbyggðum bessum'.

To this request, Sigmundr assents. Later (41), at the Frostapíping, we are told that flutti Sigmundr mál Órkels, mágs síns, at Hákon jarl gerði hann sýknan ok gæfi honum landsvist sína at frjálú ok Hákon jarl játtad ú Sigmundi hví skjót. Lét jarl bá senda eptir Órkeli ok liði hans, etc. Fær was written about 1220 (so KL) and we may here have a case of direct borrowing from it into Fló.

Mannjófnuðr

The account of Órgils's second bear-killing is followed by a short episode telling how the men at Brattahlíð play the game of mannjófnuðr. Eiríkr and Órgils are discussed. Kolr says that Órgils has done many deeds of prowess but Hallr, one of Eiríkr's men, says his master is a great and
famous chieftain and avers, presumably because Órgils has suckled his child, he does not even know if Órgils is a man or a woman. At this last remark, Kolr jumps at Hallr and kills him with his spear. Eiríkr tells his men to take Kolr, general fighting seems imminent but further bloodshed is averted by Órgils’s good sense. But despite a formal reconciliation between the two, good-will between Eiríkr and Órgils diminishes.

At fara i mannjófnuð was an attempt to decide by discussion who was the superior of two or more men. Stories of this pastime have, no doubt, some background in reality (cf. Note to 44/16), but we know it primarily as a literary motif from a number of Icelandic sources, including Sagas of Kings, Sagas of Icelanders and fornaldarsögur (e.g. Hkr, i, 213; ii, 256; iii, 259-62; Orkn, ch.61; Fær, ch.5; Eyrb, ch.37; Hálfa, ch.15; cf. VG1, ch.14). The usual occasion for a mannjófnuð is the feast or drinking bout and the fact that the one in Fló is in a latrine is meant, no doubt, to liven up the account with a touch of burlesque. The motif is mainly used by saga-writers when they wish to engender squabbles, enmities or fights between their protagonists (cf. Eyrb, ch.37: var bar talat um mannjófnuð, hverr bar væri gøfgastr maðr í sveit eða mestr hofðingi; ok urðu menn þar eigi á eitt sáttir, sem optast er, ef um mannjófnuð er talat). Perhaps the best known or at any rate the most protracted use of the motif is in Hkr, iii, 259-62, where the brother-kings of Norway, Eysteinn and Sigurðr
compare their respective merits (taka sér jafnaðarmenn).

But this more casual form of mannjófnuðr in Fló more resembles that in Fær, ch. 5 which takes place around sviðueldar. The grave insult Hallr offers Þorgils is reminiscent of that Flosi offers Njállin Nj, 123 (cf. Note to 44/21).

The thirty outlaws

There have already been two outlaw stories in the part of Fló which is not dependent on Landnámabók: the first was about Kolr who, as a skógarmaðr regards his sentence cavalierly and behaves exactly as he did before being convicted. The second concerns the outlaw Hrólfur who entertains Þorgils in a remote fjord in Greenland and, when he leaves, asks him to try to get his sentence lifted when he comes to the settled area. An attempt has been made to show that both these stories, to a greater or lesser extent follow set models (see pages*288 f. and *338 f. above). In chapters 25 and 26 we get yet a third story which concerns outlaws and here too it is possible to point to literary parallels for the individual elements. Thirty útilegumenn live in some islands in Eiríksfjörður; in the same way the outlawed Grettir lives on Drangey in Skagafjörður in Grett and the Hölmverjar on Geirshólmar in Hvalfjörður in Harðar Saga (a saga which the author of Fló could have known in some written form or another); cf. also the legend of the Seljumenn in e.g. Fló, i, 268. The outlaws in Fló rob the men of the mainland (we may compare Harð, 163 f.)
The latter ask the ruler of the country Eiríkr rauði, to mount an expedition against them; in the same way in Fló, i, 268, the byggðarmenn, when they think there are outlaws in the offshore islands of Selja and Kinn ask Hákon jarl to go against them and this he does. Finally, in Fló, the outlaws seem to be in the habit of stealing farmers' daughters (45/245); similarly in Harð (160), Geirr kidnaps the daughter of a farmer of Hvalfjörður.

It is, then, possible to point to literary parallels to the episode in question in Fló. It should not be forgotten however, that utilegumannasögur of rather the same type as we have here must have had an existence in oral tradition quite independent of the written word. As Jón Árnason wrote in his introductory preface to a large section in the second volume of his Pjóðsögar (Pjóðs, ii, 161) 'Utilegumannasögur eru ef til vill tóðastar allra munnumælasagna á Íslandi.' Sauðabjófnar and kvennanám are commonplaces in many of the stories Jón collects in this section. The majority of Jón's outlaw stories show, like the story in Fló (where the outlaws are ránsmenn and illmenni) a distinct antipathy towards the útilegumenn; their heroes are often men who, like Þorgils, overcome outlaws (rather than are outlaws themselves). While then, the general background to the episode in question in Fló may have been taken from stories its author had read, it could just as well have been taken from stories he had heard. And we may note here that, while he may well have read Harðar Saga in some form
or another, he could well also have known stories in oral form about the Hólmverjar, who were said to have inhabited an island in a fjord only some 70 km. to the north of Flóí, the place where he probably lived.

**Porgils deceives and overcomes the outlaws**

In chapter 26, Porgils sails with thirty men to the islands where the outlaws are and drops anchor in a hidden creek (leysnivár). He now wishes to spy on the outlaws and to find out where their chieftain is. One day, he puts on old clothes and rows to where he sees the outlaws' cooks (matsveinar) preparing food in cauldrons. He approaches them. When they ask him who he is, he pretends to be Án inn heimski (a well-known and ubiquitous Greenlandic half-wit) and behaves accordingly. Under this guise, he finds out from them the movements of their leader. After more buffoonery, he returns to his ship and, with the intelligence he now has, is able to attack the outlaws when they least expect it. He and his men set fire to their skáli and the outlaws are driven out. They ask for peace (grið) but this is refused to all but their leader. He, however, says he would never be faithful to them and is killed like his men. Porgils and his men then take over the outlaws' ships and belongings and compensate many of those who have previously been robbed by them.

Of greatest interest in this story is the way Porgils deceives the outlaws by disguise. The disguise-motif
is frequent in Old Icelandic literature and Börg (Motif-
Index, K1810-K1839.14) is able to point to a large number
of examples (see also Motieven, 81-2; Erzählungsgut, 110-1).

Three stories, two in Family Sagas and one in fornaldarsage,
are, however, of particular interest here and could well
have been models for the story in Fló. In Reykd, ch. 25,
Skúta at the Alpingi changes clothes with a poor man he
finds carrying a load of wood. He then goes to his
enemy's, Porgeirr's, booth where menn Porgeirs... fólull
viðinn, en fær hann í reikvö (cf. Fló, 46/25). Porgeirr
himself draws near to restrain them and Skúta slays him
with his wood-axe. In Fóstbr, ch. 23, we find a similar
episode to the one in Fló which also takes place in
Greenland. Pormóðr wishes to take vengeance on his foster-
brother's killers. He changes clothes with a Greenlandic
tramp, Lúsa-Oddi, who seems to be well-known. He then
goes and asks a shepherd about his prey's whereabouts.
The shepherd is deceived and tells him that they are out
fishing. Pormóðr waits at the boat-house until evening
(cf. Fló, 46/25). His enemies Pörkell, Pórðr and Falgeirr
land, also thinking he is Lúsa-Oddi. Pormóðr then attacks
them, and after a fight, finishes them all off. In
ForstVík, ch. 20, Porsteinn and Belí are involved in the
following episode: The two heroes and their men drop anchor
at Elfarsker. The two go ashore and across a headland and
see twelve ships lying off shore on the other side. They
also see tents on the land, smoke issuing from them and,
we are told, böttust bat vita, at bat mundi vera matsveinar. They disguise themselves, as vagabonds, it seems, and go to the tents and make nuisances of themselves there. The cooks abuse them and they létu endemliga (cf. Fló, 46/22-3) but ask the cooks who their leader is. Deceived by their disguise, the cooks tell them and they return to their ships. The following morning they round the headland and attack the twelve ships. After three days' fighting, they overcome the other force and take possession of their ships. They give gríð to the vanquished men however.

In connection with this last possible model for the Fló-author, it should be noted that the whole episode of the thirty outlaws in Fló can be regarded as moving from an outlaw tale to a viking tale of the type we find in the fornaldarsögur. Thus at 46/3,15 and 47/10,11,13,21, the útlelegumenn of 45/45 have become vikingar (see, however, *Note to 21/22). The leyvivágr in which Órgils hides his ships is a typical feature of this sort of story in the fornaldarsögur (see Untersuchungen, 79) and, incidently, in Hrólfs Saga Kraka (ed. D. Slay, 1960, 20), is combined with the disguise motif. And the appropriation of defeated vikings' ship and booty is, of course, a well-known feature of pirate stories in the genre in question.

Finally, we may ask the following question about the scene where the outlaws are overcome and killed: do we observe here some of the elements which go to make up the sort of situation which could have been the subject for a
Germanic heroic lay? Motifs from such lays have often been taken over and adapted by saga-writers (see e.g. T. Andersen, *The Icelandic Family Saga*, 1967, 65 ff.). The burning hall, for example, is a familiar background to the heroic situation; magnanimous offers of amnesty by victor to vanquished are also common and often spurned; and the outlaw chieftain's "...ek verðr yðr aldri trúri" at 47/17 is certainly in the spirit of *comitatus* solidarity. But any impression of the heroic plot here can only be regarded as a very fleeting one: the outlaws put up a poor fight; they themselves are quick to ask for grið; and they suffer the humiliation of a cold-blooded execution rather than fighting to the end. Cf. Note to 47/10-8.

Talking ships

While Þorgils is still acting the part of *An inn heimski*, he hears that the two ships *Stakanhofði* and *Vinagautr* have been talking to each other: *Stakanhofði* has predicted that they are going to become the possessions of Þorgils; *Vinagautr* confirms this. In the same chapter their prophesies are fulfilled.

No other stories of talking ships are known from Old Icelandic literature (although in *Laxd*, ch. 67, a cope declaims a warning verse). There are, however, examples of ships that can understand human speech. In *FóstVik*, ch. 21 is it said of the ship *Elliði* that 'he almost knew the language of men' (*kunni hann nálíga mannsmáli*), while in
Friðli, ch. 6, the same ship is addressed in a verse by the hero of the saga and reacts immediately. Turning to later Icelandic folk tradition, we find a number of stories of ships which can not only speak, but which like Stakanhófði and Vinagautr, have oracle powers (see e.g. Pjóðs, i, 400; ii, 12; iv, 52-53; Jón Pórkelsson, Pjóðsögur, 74-6). The example given here in translation is from Jón Pórkelsson, Pjóðsögur, 74-6:

'Skúta' was the name of a twelve-oared ship which for a long time belonged to Strönd in Selvogur. It always had a lull for launching and landing in Strandarsund however rough the sea was. Others say that it was one of the features of Strandarsund that there was always a lull there at three o'clock in the afternoon... It was many years after the death of Lawman Erlendur, in about 1632, that Skúta went down. It is said that the night before this happened, one of Skúta's crew could not sleep. He therefore got up and went down to the boat-house. There stood two ships which were being used in Strandarsund that winter. One was Skúta, the other another twelve-oared boat called Mókollur. When he got to the boat-house, the sailor heard that the ships were talking to each other. Mókollur began: 'Tomorrow we must part', 'No', said Skúta, 'I shall not let myself be rowed tomorrow'. 'You'll have to', said Mókollur. 'I shan't let myself be moved', said Skúta. 'Then your captain will order you to move in the name of the Devil', said Mókollur. 'Then I shall have to and the worse it will be for that', answered Skúta. Then they fell silent. The man then went home, heavy at heart and went to bed.

The morning after brought good weather for fishing and men prepared to go to sea. The man who had heard the ships in conversation the night before said that he was sick and that he was not able to row. He also begged his captain not to put to sea, but his entreaties were in vain. Both crews now set to to launch the boats and Mókollur slipped easily off the stocks. Skúta however would not move at all and the men stopped trying to launch it. But when they had rested for a time, the captain called them back and told them to push in the name of Jesus as he was accustomed to. Skúta would still not move. They tried yet a third time but they still could not budge the ship an inch. The captain got angry, shouted to the men a fourth time and said in his rage: 'Shove in the name of the Devil'. The men obeyed and the ship leapt forward.
so violently that they could hardly keep their feet. They now rowed in search of fish. As the day passed away it became very rough and men went ashore. The two boats from Strönd stayed out longer than the rest and then made for harbour. As they came to the entrance to the harbour, the captain of Mókollur said: 'It is not three o'clock yet and we must wait'. The captain of Skúta said that it was past three o'clock and they argued about this until the captain of Skúta decided to make for Herdisarvik and rowed off in that direction. Just after that the lull came and it was possible to land. The captain of Mókollur called out: 'It is now Skúta's lull', but Skúta's captain did not hear and went on towards Herdisarvik tried to put in at Bótin. But the breakers were so large that Skúta was overturned and was broken to pieces and all her crew were drowned. Mókollur, on the other hand, took advantage of Skúta's lull and got safely to land. Then the man related what had happened to him the previous night.

Talking ships with oracle powers are also known from folk traditions of other nations. In the Kalevala (runo 30, lines 7 - 14) the boat in which Lemminkäinen intends to attack the people of Pohjala weeps and warns the hero not to undertake any expedition for ten summers. Lemminkäinen disregards this and later abandons the boat when it is iced up. According to some Greek traditions, Jason's ship Argo had an oaken beam built into the prow; this had the power of speech and also delivered oracles to the Argonauts. See further on this motif F. Liebrecht, Zur Volkskunde, 1879, 365-7; and, on ships which understand human speech, The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, ed. F. Child, 1956, iv, 376-7.

Gíparr strikes Kolr with a drinking horn

In chapter 26, Ófgils and his men leave Greenland and are storm-driven to Ireland. There they stay with a certain Anakol and, as a result of a quarrel at a
drinking bout, they kill Anakol's thrall Gíparr. This episode is found in the passage 48/9-48/26. One parallel is found in Vǫðu-Brands Pátrir (IF, x, 127 f.). In Fló, Gíparr exhorts Kolr to drink in a manly fashion, in the báttr, Hárekr produces a drinking-horn and challenges Brandr to drink from it against him. In both Fló and the báttr, the taunt is given a curt reply and the challenge is refused. The non-Icelander (Gíparr/Hárekr), after further abuse, then proceeds to strike the Icelander (Kolr/Hárekr) with a drinking horn. The latter is restrained (Fló)/restricts himself (báttr) from any immediate action. It is not until some days later (Fló)/next morning (báttr) that the insult is avenged. Secondly, there could be borrowing here from a story to be found in LdnX (196): ... hóför beir (i.e. a certain Eiríkr and Hallsteinn) jóladrykkjum saman ok veitti Eiríkr fyrr vel ok trúliga en Hallsteinn veitti síðar óvingjarnliga. Hann laust Eirík með dýrshorni. Fór Eiríkr bá heim en Hallsteinn sat eptir með húskarla sína. Pá gekk Asgrímr (a friend of Eiríkr's) inn einn ok veitti Hallstein mikit sár, etc. Here, as well as the blow with the drinking-horn and the delayed revenge, we have the double Yule feast, half with one host, half with another (cf. Fló, 48/9-10, 25). We know, of course, that the Fló-author had already borrowed from the redaction of Landnámabók in question. This may, then, be a case of direct borrowing from LdnX by the author of Fló. Cf. Beschouwing, 165 f.
Porgils and Ásgrímr ask for Helga's hand

In chapter 28, Porgils returns to Iceland and, in chapter 30, on the recommendation of his son-in-law Bjarni, asks for the hand of Helga, the daughter of Þóroðr góði. We are told, however, that Helga has another suitor, Porgils's old enemy Ásgrímr Ellíða-Grímsson. By frightening Helga's brother Skapti, Porgils wins the girl. The relationship between Porgils and Ásgrímr deteriorates as a result.

In his Darstellung (61-2), Rolf Heller examines this story and rightly doubts its historicity (cf. Note to 53/20-3). Indeed, in Section A of the third chapter of this Introduction, it will be suggested that the whole of the story of the conflict between Porgils and Ásgrímr is the invention of the author of the saga. On the other hand, the Fló-author probably knew of Porgils's and Helga's marriage (or at least that they had a son) from some source or other. He has, therefore, to introduce an account of a bónorð (itself a motif; cf. Beschouwing, 123-6). And as Heller remarks (op. cit., 60): 'Es versteht sich von selbst, dass eine Werbungsgeschichte an Dramatik gewinnt, wenn zwei Rivalen einander gegenüberstehen. Mancher Verfasser hat sich das zunutze gemacht.' Heller gives a number of examples of the motif, including ones from Finnb and VG1. See further Beschouwing, 101-3.

Skapti Þóroddsson

For some reason, the author of Fló is ill-disposed toward
Skapti, the son of Þóroddr goði. At 54/5-7, just the sight of Þorgils's horses is enough to frighten him back across the Ólfusá and at 53/20 he favours Ásgrímr rather than the hero of the saga in the matter of his sister's marriage. At 59/5-13, one wonders if he is not taking advantage of his position and reputation as a skilled lawyer to get Þorgils to drop a good case (cf. Note to 59/9). Now it is interesting to observe the same negative approach to Skapti in Njáls Saga (Nj, 141; cf. footnote 4): the author of Nj, like the author of Fló, has probably made up stories to present the lawyer in a bad light; for example, in Nj, 370, Skapti has to escape from Norway in a most humiliating manner (cf. Arneshb, 27). Further, the picture of Skapti at 59/15-13 as a rather unhelpful lawyer, unwilling to assist his brother-in-law at the Alþingi, could have been suggested to the author of Fló by Nj, 370 ff., where the same character refuses to help his relatives and in-laws at the Alþingi. Scenes where Skapti is applied to for legal advice are, at all events, known from other sagas than Fló (see Krich, 47 footnote and the references cited there). In his representation of Skapti, the Fló-author would, then, seem to be following an older model (Nj), or older models.

The cock and the hen

Events at the end of chapter thirty show that the relationship between Helga and Þorgils is strained. At the beginning of chapter thirty one, it is told how the couple
are sitting together outside one day: 'The hen squawked at the cock but the cock beat her until she was exhausted. "Do you see what is going on between the cock and the hen, Helga?" said Porgils. "What of it?" Helga replied. "The relationship between other people could be like that," said Porgils. After this incident they got on better together.'

In his Verzeichnis isländischer Märchenvarianten (1929, xviii f.), Einar Ólafur Sveinsson connects this tale in Fló with a migratory legend known from the folklores of a number of countries in Western Asia, Europe and Africa. This legend, no. 670 according to Aarne's classification (see Verzeichnis der Märchengattungen, 1910), has been most thoroughly dealt with by Aarne himself in a monograph entitled Der tier sprachenkundige Mann und seine neugierige Frau (1914), although unfortunately the author of this work has not noticed the story in Fló. As it exists in the majority of versions, Aarne 670 falls into three distinct parts, of which only the third bears any resemblance to the story in Fló. The content of these parts can be summed up as follows: (i) a man is given the gift of understanding the language of animals often through an act of kindness to an animal; (ii) his wife gets to know of his special gift (often as the outcome of an elaborate series of events) and becomes curious; (iii) there is an altercation or animosity between husband and wife, frequently as the result of the woman's inquisitiveness. The man accepts advice from, or follows the example of the cock who is well able to keep
his own wife/wives under control. Often the man beats his wife. After this, her behaviour improves.

The third part of the Märchen may be exemplified by the corresponding part of the version found in The Book of the Thousand Nights and One Night (translated from the French of J. Mardrus by P. Mathers, 1964, i, 8):

'Now the merchant had a valiant cock which could satisfy fifty hens, and also a dog. And he heard the dog calling to the cock and scolding it, saying: 'Are you not ashamed of being so gay when our master is on the point of death?' Then the cock asked the dog how this was so, and, when the dog had told him the story, he exclaimed: 'By Allah, our master is extraordinarily lacking in intelligence! I myself have fifty wives, and I succeed very well by contenting one and scolding another, while he, who has only one wife, does not know the way of dealing even with her. It is quite simple; he has but to cut himself some good mulberry twigs, go back in strength to his private room, and beat her until she either dies or repents. She will not importune him with any questions on the subject after that, I do assure you.' So the cock spoke, and when the merchant heard him, light returned to his reason and he resolved to beat his wife.

The merchant entered his wife's chamber, after having cut and hidden about him certain mulberry twigs, and called to her, saying: 'Come into my private room that I may tell you my secret, out of the sight of all, and then die.' So she entered with him and he shut the door of the private room and fell upon her with redoubled blows until she swooned away. Finally, when she could speak, she cried: 'I repent! I repent!' and, beginning to caress her husband's hands and feet, did repent in very truth. Afterwards she walked out with him, and all the relatives and those gathered there rejoiced. Happy and prosperous were the fortunes of them all until their death.'

There can be little doubt that Einar is right in making a connection between the story in Fló and the Märchen.

Examples of variants representing only the third part of the tale are not uncommon and are found, for instance, in Chuvash in Russia, Lithuania and Denmark (see e.g. Gamle danske Minder i Folkmunde, ed. S. Grundtvig, 1857, 117 ff.).
The alternative to assuming a connection, is to suppose the story in Fló developed spontaneously in Iceland. This is not a very likely proposition. And any idea that it might be based on historical fact (cf. Fló, 1932, xii and Beschouwing, 104) is, of course, difficult to entertain.

With this said, however, it must be admitted that it is peculiar to find the story in an Icelandic source at such an early date. On the whole the tale is rare in Germanic Scandinavia; it is unknown in Norway and Sweden, and a Faroese version (see J. Jakobsen, Færøske Folkesagn og Eventyr, 1898-1901, 620 f.) comes directly from The Thousand and One Nights. Again, the version in Fló must rank among the oldest European variants alongside a Catalan version from the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth and one in the Gesta Romanorum (trans. J. Grasse, 1842, ii, 190-2) of about the same date or a little later (see Aarne, op.cit., 3-4). It is true that the Gesta was at least known to (although not used by) the author of the late Kirjalax saga (ed. K. Kålund, 1917; see 63 f.; cf. Aarbøger, 1917, 9 f.). But that the Gesta was written before Fló and reached Iceland in time to be used by its author there, may be regarded as a matter of some doubt. And the question is somewhat complicated by the existence of a maxim (Spruch) of content similar to the third part of the Märchen. This appears earliest in Petrus Alphonsi's Disciplina Clericalis from the first half of the twelfth century and later in the works of Reinmar von
Zweter and Freidank. In *Disciplina* (cf. *Ev*, ii, 367) this is as follows: *Fili, ne sit gallus fortior te, qui decem uxores suas justificat, tu autem solam non potes castigare.* Aarne (op. cit., 61) points out that there must be some connection between this maxim and the third part of the *Märchen* and tends towards the view that the latter is based upon the former. Einar Ól. Sveinsson (loc. cit.) in his discussion of the episode in *Fló* writes as follows: 'Die Hahn-Episode im Märchen kann von dem Spruch stammen oder beide von einer noch älteren Erzählung ... Welchen Platz im Stammbaum die oben angeführte Saga-Episode einnimmt, will ich dahin gestellt sein lassen, eine Verwandtschaft halte ich jedenfalls für sicher.' What exactly is meant by the second sentence here is not quite clear. The present editor is not prepared to accept the proposition that the story in *Fló* developed directly and solely from the maxim in Iceland. It is true that *Disciplina Clericalis* is known in an early Icelandic translation (see *Ev*, ii, 163-200, particularly 164). The work might also have influenced part of *Víga-Glúms Saga* (see e.g. *IF*, ix, xxxix). But the story in *Fló* contains certain features in common with the *Märchen* but not found in *Disciplina* (i.e. the man's threat to follow the cock's example; the subsequent improvement of the woman's behaviour). That these features developed independently in Iceland is not impossible but not likely.

In view of these facts, if an explanation is to be given for the motif's appearance in Iceland at such an early date
the present editor would suggest the following as most likely: That the story was heard by the learned author of Fló (*398ff.*) or someone close to him, in a country outside Scandinavia (England or France) where he may have been studying and where the tale was generally current. And while it may have been told in Iceland by the same man who brought it there, it did not take root. That it did not is hardly surprising: as suggested in Note to 55/10, in the Middle Ages, Iceland seems to have been a country where the chicken, if not unknown, was a rare bird. It would, then, have been a country where the story in question would have had little chance of surviving in folk-tradition.

**The lawsuit against Asgrímr**

At the end of chapter 32, after Kolr's assassination attempt, Porgils calls nine búar and delivers a summons to Asgrímr Ellíða-Grimsson to answer a charge of conspiracy to take his life. In the following chapter, the case is brought before the bing. Here Skapti tells his brother-in-law that his prosecution is void and the context suggests that the number of búar called by Porgils is incorrect. The latter is then persuaded to drop the case.

It is quite possible that the Fló-author is here borrowing from Nj. In chapter sixty of the saga, we are told: Asgrímr Ellíða-Grimsson hafði mál at sökja á pinginu... Málínu átti at svara Úlfur Úggason, Asgrími tóksk svá til, sem sjáldan var vant, at vorn var í máli hans; en så var...
vörnin í, at hann hafði nefnt fimm búa, bar sem hann átti
nið: nú hafa heir betta til varna. As in Fló, we have
Ásgrimr Eilliða-Grimsson involved here, although he is
prosecutor rather than defendant. Again, as seems to be
the case in Fló, the mistake in the prosecutors case is the
fact that he calls the wrong number of jurors. It may be
noted that while this last detail could be readily explained
in terms of what we know about the law of the Commonwealth
(see IF, xii, 152 footnote 2), this is hardly the case in
Fló (cf. Notes to 58/23 and 59/9). We have here, then, per­
haps, a rather negative comment on the Fló-author's methods
of using borrowed material.

Bone-moving

In Note to 61/8-9, the present editor inclines towards
the view that the account of the translation of the bones
of Órgils and two other men at the end of the saga is a
literary loan rather than with any basis in reality. In
that Note, similar accounts in six other sagas are referred
to, those in Heið, Eg, Ol helga, Æi, Eyrb and Grett. The
first five of these works are almost certainly older than
Fló and any of them could have influenced the Fló-author
directly. Fló differs from all of them except Heið in that
it makes no remarks about the state or nature of the bones
on their removal. Otherwise, our saga's account perhaps most
resembles that in Eyrb, 183 f.: in both sagas, the movement
of the church is over a distance of a few hundred yards
rather than to an entirely different site; in both works, the bones of three persons are involved; further, there is a certain verbal parallelism between the two sources: hann var bar jarðaðir at kirkju þeiri, er hann hafði sjálfr gera látit. En þá er bar var kirkjugarðir grafinn, váru-bein hans upp tekin ok færð ofan til beirá kirkju, sem nú er bar. Eyrb, 183; sem nú stendr kirkjan, Eyrb, 184 / Váru beir allir jarðaðir at beiri kirkju er Skapti lét gera fyrir utan lækinn en síðan váru færð bein beira í þann stað er nú stendr (sem nú er, M-version) kirkjan, Fló, 61/7-9. In both Eg and Fló, the hero's death occurs while he is staying at the home of young relatives (cf. Note to 61/4). Finally, of course, it should be remembered that the translation of bones is a common theme in saints' lives and that the author of Fló has been more influenced by such works than the average saga-writer; he may then have had their model in mind here (cf. IF, iv, xlviii footnote 1).

* * *

Conclusions

We may here briefly sum up the results of the investigation which has been carried out in this chapter. It has been shown that the saga contains a large number of borrowed elements and that these come from a wide variety of sources and are very diverse in nature. Indeed, Fló must distinguish itself among the Islendingasögur by the
number and variety of the borrowed elements it contains. As Finnur Jónsson observes in ONOM (ii, 751), 'om Torgils ophobes der de forskellige bedrifter, kraftprøver og æventyrlige ting; det er som om det havde været hensigten i én saga at samle alle mulige motiver.' As noted, Fló is to be dated to a time after the greater part of classical Old Icelandic literature had been written; and it has been shown that the Fló-author drew unsparingly on the prose works of his countrymen of the late twelfth and the thirteenth centuries. We can be certain that he drew on Sturla Dórðarson's Landnámabók. It seems highly likely that he borrowed from Egils Saga (see page *281-3) and Órvar-Odds Saga (see pages *276-8). Among a number of other íslendingasögur he knew, we may probably number at least Njáls Saga (see *250 ff.; *356-7), Víga-Glúms Saga (see page *264), Eiríks Saga rauða (see pages *309 ff.) and, perhaps less confidently, Grettis Saga (see pages *237, *244 and *252); and of other fornaldarsögur, we may reasonably suspect that at least Ketils Saga hængs and Gríms Saga loðkinna provided him with motifs (see pages *260-1, *325-7), and possibly also Piöreks Saga (see page *267) and Friðbjófs Saga (see Note to 21/17 ff. and page *262). In addition, he would appear to have been influenced by the Sagas of Óláf Tryggvason by the monks Gunnlaugr and Oddr (see pages *291 ff.). But the sagas were not his only sources. We can, for example, discern the influence of the Saints' Lives and, in one case, of the Bible itself.
(see also pages *291 ff.). Lastly, it seems clear that he enjoyed listening to stories as well as reading them, for he has introduced into his saga at least two stories which he is more likely to have heard than found in any book (see pages *346-8 and *351-6).

Finally in this Chapter, we may anticipate a conclusion arrived at in Section A of Chapter III: this is that the Fló-author knew little or nothing about Þorgils from external sources other than what he found in Landnámabók. Indeed, let us go a little further than this and assume that Þorgils was nothing more than a mere name to the author of the saga. Then, on the basis of this premise, let us briefly consider, in broader and perhaps sometimes speculative terms, how the Fló-author, sitting at his writing-table, made use of borrowed and conventional elements in the composition of his saga.

Islendingasögur frequently begin with an account of the main hero's ancestors, often stretching back to Norwegian days and telling of the family's emigration to Iceland. The reason for this last event is frequently given as conflict with Haraldr hárfagri or his allies. Obvious examples are Egils Saga and Grettis Saga. The Fló-author has decided to give his saga this type of introduction (chapters 1-9) and, like the author of Grett and certain other sagas, has based this introduction on extracts from Sturla Þorðarson's Landnámabók. These he filled out with further borrowings and material of his own. In this respect, then, Fló begins
in imitation of various older Icelandic sagas.

From the middle of chapter 10 on, the Fló-author was without Landnámabók as the basis of his narrative and for his biography of Porgils had either to resort to his own inventiveness or else to transfer to his hero stories told of other men in sources he had read or heard. That to a great extent he took the latter course has been shown by the above investigation. His first major borrowings seem to have been from Grett and Eg. The first of these two sagas seems to have provided him with his stories of Porgils's childhood and he may indeed have intended Grettir to act as a sort of foil to the boy Porgils: for, while Grettir destroys the valuable Kengála in Grett, ch. 14 (cf. page 237), Porgils's victim Illingr is merely a klárr óskost-ígt, 'a worthless nag' (14/6); and while Grettir, in Grett, ch. 50, rows madly and breaks his oars, in Fló, ch. 11, Porgils is a useful rower and a skilful fisherman. Eg, on the other hand, would seem to have provided the broader plot for the story of Porgils in chapters 12-7 (see pages 281-3): the whole story of Porgils's bid to regain his ancestral property in Norway clearly owes a great deal to similar episodes told of Egill in Eg. Indeed, apart from LdnX, Eg has probably influenced Fló more than any other single work. We remember here that Fló begins (see above) and ends (see page 357-8) in very much the same way as the older saga. And in this context, it is interesting to recall Björn Sigfússon's remark in KL (iii, column 523)
that 'man frestas att tro, att den ofta har utgjort den norm, efter vilken en släktsaga borde komponeras.' But the Fló-author was not, of course, only following Eg in his account of Porgils's first journey abroad. Young heroes frequently undertake such journeys in the Family Sagas (see pages *241 ff.). In his relationship with Gunnhildr, Porgils's behaviour may be meant to contrast favourably with that of Hrútr in Nj (see pages *250 ff.). His fights with revenants contain a number of elements paralleled in Hávarðar Saga and his duels elements paralleled in, for example, VGl. And for Porgils's adventures fyrir vestan haf, fornaldarsögur such as Örvar-Odds Saga have been used by the Fló-author as models.

In chapter 18, Porgils returns to Iceland and in chapter 20, two new themes are introduced which run concurrently to the end of chapter 24 and which, to no small extent, can be traced to older works. Firstly, there is the story of Porgils's conversion to Christianity and its aftermath (cf. pages *291 ff.). The hero is tempted and persecuted by the god Óðinn whom he formerly worshipped. Eventually, after a series of disasters, he drives the god away with a final, firm curse and after that his luck changes for the better. For the borrowings in this story, the sources are religious writings and, as argued, certain sagas of Óláfr Tryggvason. Indeed, the story of the new convert Porgils in chapters 20-24 would, in some shortened and adapted form, not be entirely out of place as a báttir in Óláfs Saga fjorn-
vasonar in mesta. The second theme is, of course, the story of Órberg's journey to Greenland to accept an invitation to colonize there. For this, the sources seem to have been Grænlendinga Saga, Eiríks Saga rauða and other accounts of voyages to uninhabited countries (e.g. Ldn).

Why the author of the saga has chosen to combine the two themes in the way he does is difficult to say. The suggestion is made above (page *306), however, that in representing Órberg as a saintly or even Christ-like figure, he wished him to spend some time in the wilderness after his conversion. He submits him, therefore, to the destitution and tribulations of chapter 20-4 to show how he stóz vel margar mannraunir er hann hlaut at bera (15/6-7).

After leaving Greenland and after adventures in Ireland and Hålogaland, Órberg returns home to Iceland for the last time and if there is any predominant theme in the remaining part of the saga, it is Órberg's quarrel with Æsgrím Ellíða-Grimsson over the hand of Helga Þórodsdóttir (pages 53-5) and the unpaid hafnartollr (pages 56-9). Indeed, there has already been a quarrel between Æsgrím and Órberg in chapter 19 before the latter went to Greenland and conflict between the two therefore appears as the plot in a relatively large part of the saga. It seems probable that the author of Fló made up these stories because he felt the need for a feud in his saga. After all, stories of feuds, historical or unhistorical, are central themes in the majority of Icelandic sagas. For example, the twenty
or so sagas analysed by T. Andersson in PART II of his book The Icelandic Family Saga (1967) have feuds as their central plots. The Fló-author could well have felt that a struggle between the hero and another Icelandic chieftain (or other Icelandic chieftains) was an essential part of any saga. He therefore made up this one between Asgrímr and Þorgils, with such ramifications as law-suits, assassination attempts and the like.

We may note two other types of conventional element which the author has included in Fló. Dreams are particularly common motifs in the Family Sagas. P. Hallberg (The Icelandic Saga, 1963, 81) remarks that 'it has been estimated that there are on the average three of four dreams per saga. Flóamanna Saga has thirteen examples. These fall into three main groups, the Auðun-dreams (22/23-23/6; 24/3-8), the Pórr-dreams (32/5 ff.) and the series of proleptic dreams at 39/20-40/18 (cf. 79/1-80/11). For all three types, possible models and parallels can be pointed to. Proleptic dreams (especially those concerning the dreamer's descendants) are particularly common type, not only in the sagas but in medieval literature as a whole. The Fló-author has, then, made ample use of this element. Secondly, the majority of sagas have verses in one form or another, either actually made up by the person to whom they are ascribed, or by some other person, frequently the author of the saga himself. On pages 327-8, it has been suggested that the author of Fló knew no verses about Þorgils or his ancestors,
was capable of composing any himself. Feeling he ought to have some poetry in his saga, he took the rather unsatisfactory way out of introducing a verse of almost complete irrelevance to his narrative in the form of the lines we find at 77/22-78/3.

Attention may incidently be drawn to a particular feature of the 'adaptation' (see pages *220-2) of certain borrowed elements in Fló. At 11/11-7, by the introduction of the motif of 'The Unlike Sons' (see pages *187-8), Atli Hallsteinsson gains a fictitious son Ölvír; in ch. 16, Porgils, like many other saga-heroes, wins a wife in a duel and later, quite possibly in imitation of Leifr in Eir (see Note to 23/15-6), begets by her a son (Porleifr); and at the end of chapter 16, no doubt in imitation of LdnX (see pages *274 ff.), Porgils wins a magic sword (another conventional element) called Jarðhússnautr. Now it is interesting to note the way that the Fló-author, having provided his hero with an uncle, a wife, a son and a sword in accordance with older models, makes sure that none of these are left in Iceland at the end of the saga. Ölvír mjóvi settles in Norway and, it is stressed (11/16-7), kom aldri til Íslands. Porgils gives Guðrún to his friend Þorsteinn (see 26/15 and Note) and she never even visits Iceland. Porleifr leaves Iceland at 51/18-9 for no apparent reason and, indeed, as his father's only son. And the sword Jarðhússnautr is given to the Norwegian, Einarr, at 60/25-6 and he leaves Iceland at 61/1-2. If we seek an explanation for these facts,
the following would seem reasonable: The Fló-author's audience could well look for descendants for Ólvinr and Þorleifr in Iceland. Again, they might ask what had become of the sword Jarðhússnautr. (Other weapons from the söguöld probably survived; cf. Note to 60/25-6.) Where (it might be asked) is the sword? Why wasn't it in the hands of Þorgils's descendants? What became of Ólvinr's and Þorleifr's children and their descendants? To avoid awkward questions like these being asked, the Fló-author was careful to get Ólvinr, Þorleifr and Jarðhússnautr ðr sögunni and away from Iceland by the end of the saga. He has adapted his borrowings in such a way as to free his hero from certain fictional encumbrances by the time he dies.

[IMPORTANT: On page *246, the following paragraph has been omitted at the point indicated:

'Meetings - intentional or incidental - with the ruling monarch of Norway (and other countries) are common stock in accounts of Icelanders' expeditions abroad and examples are numerous. The Icelander usually manages to impress the king in some way or other (cf. 20/15-8) and, as in Fló (17/15 ff.), he is frequently given gifts by the monarch when they part. See further Motieven, 127.']
CHAPTER III: BROADER CONSIDERATIONS ON FLÓAMANNAJÁGA

Section A: Historicity and oral tradition

As a starting point for this chapter of the Introduction, remarks will be quoted made by Sigurður Nordal when he discusses Flóamanna Saga in his essay 'Sagalitteraturen' in Nordisk kultur; viii, b, page 256. He writes as follows: 'I Flóamanna saga synes vi at have en lignende blanding af nogen bygdetradition og ung digtning, meget ensformig i sine gentagelser, som i sagene i denne gruppe. [Here Sigurður refers to a group of late sagas all of which he considers to have been written about 1300, e.g. Harð, Grett and Svarf.] Men sagaen er endnu ikke tilstrækkelig undersøgt til at der kan udtale nogen mening om, hvorledes dette ældre lag er overlevert.' Remarks in an essay of the type Sigurður's is are necessarily succinct and one hopes not to have misunderstood them. What we seem to have here, however, is the suggestion that the author of Fló, when he sat down to write his work, not only had a written source which mentioned Þorgils and his ancestors (i.e. LánX) but that he also knew certain traditions about them in oral form. These oral stories Sigurður appears to regard as appreciably older than the date of the writing of the saga. And while he clearly does not allow for anything more than a limited oral tradition behind Fló, 'nogen bygdetradition', the
suggestion he makes raises an important question: to what extent did the author of Fló rely on stories he had heard (rather than read) about the characters in his saga? And this leads on to a related problem: what can be considered to be historical fact? An attempt will be made to answer the second of these questions first. And here two points should be made. First, it should be noted that the following discussion concerns itself only with the story of Porgils in Fló, that is, the part of the saga which is not closely dependent on LdnX (13/15-27/15; 29/13-end). Secondly as follows: the previous section has shown that the saga contains a considerable number of 'transferred' borrowed elements (cf. pages *221 f.). When these have been stripped away, large parts of the saga have been removed. And when there are so many stories about Porgils which we believe have been transferred from other heroes in older works, it is not unreasonable to be somewhat sceptical about the historical trustworthiness of other stories told about him, even though no parallels can be found to them in the saga's corpus of potential sources.

In fact, the present editor has been able to find very little in the story of Porgils as told in Fló which seems likely to be related in any way to the historical person's life. The hero's nickname, found in various sources other than Fló (see Note to 13/4) suggests, indeed, that, as we are told in LdnX, his father died when he was still young and
that his stepfather was called by the name Órrabeinr/Errubeinn. But we must ask ourselves whether a nickname like Órrabeinsstjúpr/Errubeinsstjúpr is likely to have been given to a person who left his stepfather's home at as early an age as Porgils does in Fló. The adventures Porgils goes through in his boyhood and on his first journey abroad are nearly all stereotyped elements (see pages 245-83) and one doubts very much whether the journey itself ever took place. There is, then, no reason to believe that the historical Porgils married a woman from Caithness, had a son by her or acquired and owned a sword called Jarðhússnautr: the way the sword and the woman are conveniently given away (60/25-6 and 26/15) and the son, Porleifr, finally leaves Iceland without leaving children there is extremely suspect (cf. pages 365-6). We may be equally suspicious of Porgils's marriage to Pórey: she is a figure whose name seems to have been borrowed from various women of the Oddaverjar family (see Note to 29/19-23); one of her children by Porgils (Porfinnr) dies at an early age; their daughter, Pórný, is not known from Landnámabók or from any other source, nor do we hear anywhere that she had any children by Bjarni spaki, an historical figure, whom the saga says she married. In fact, it seems reasonable to regard both mother and daughter as entirely fictitious (cf. Arnessb, 52 and footnote 1, 92 and 283). In Note to 13/19, the possibility is discussed that Porgils
(and/or possibly also Porgrimr errubeinn and/or Heringr) held, at some time or another, one of the three lórmóðar of the Arnesþing and the conclusion reached that he or they may well have done so. The saga tells us that Porgils was quick to accept Christianity when it spread to Iceland and the Norwegian historian, Theodricus, writing at the end of the twelfth century, tells us that a man he calls Thorgils de Aulfusi was one of the first Icelandic chief-tains to be baptized by the missionary Pangbrandr. By Thorgils de Aulfusi the hero of our saga could well be meant, although there is another strong candidate (see Note to 32/4-5). But we have no reason to believe the saga's report of Porgils's strong reaction against the old religion or of his saint-like piety. Here the writer of the saga has drawn on similar pictures of new converts painted by older writers (see pages *291 ff.). And, as noted (pages *309-10), one doubts that the historical Porgils ever went to Greenland: if Ldn is right in making him sole heir to his great-grandfather's landnám, he would have enjoyed the advantages of a large estate in Iceland and, as already noted, may have had a göðorð; his reasons for making the dangerous journey across the Greenland Sea, either as a colonist or in any other capacity, would, then, be obscure. Few of the stories told of his stay in Greenland sound convincing as historical fact and many of them can be shown to be borrowed elements. And Eiríkr rauði, with whom Porgils is purported to have stayed, appears as
a stock figure (see pages *318 f.). Nor can the visit
to Ireland and Norway after Greenland have any great histor-
ical basis. It is the last part of the saga when Porgils
has returned home from abroad which requires the closest
examination in the present context and it is probably in
this part of the saga that the fewest borrowings and motifs
can be pointed to (see, however, pages *289-91, *350-7; the
einvigi-episode, 55/17-55/9). A story like the one of
Porgils's dealings with his son-in-law, Bjarni, concerning
Pórný's dowry, even if the two men were in-laws (but see
above), is, however, hardly one which is likely to have
been remembered over any lengthy period of time and is
thus not likely to be historical. The saga's report of
Porgils's marriage to Helga Póroddsdóttir has, on the
other hand, a good chance of being fact, although it
should be stressed that no other source says the couple
married, only that they were father and mother of the same
son (Grimr glómmuðr); cf. Notes to 61/14-9 and 61/20-3.
The stories which surround their marriage in Fló are un-
likely to be true: one (53/26 to 54/11) seems to have
been made up to put Skapti Póroddsson in a bad light
(cf. pages *350 f.); and that in which Helga goes to
Hjalli (54/21 to 55/8) seems either to be a borrowing
itself (see Note to 54/21-55/8) or to be made up as a
background to the cock and hen-episode (ch. 31), which
itself is obviously apocryphal (see pages *351 ff.).
Whether there is any historical basis for the account of
Porgrils's quarrels with Asgrímr Eilíða-(Gríms)son is difficult to determine. The present editor is inclined to interpret stories about friction between the two men as follows: The author of the saga wished to represent his hero as an important chieftain in Saga Age Iceland. He would have known Asgrímr from Njáls Saga as both a powerful and influential figure. He therefore made up stories to show how Porgrils was able to hold his own or even get the better of Asgrímr. We note in this connection the way that, at 63/11-2, the quite general fact that Asgrímr bæ ekki af [Porgrilsí] á bingum is adduced to give an idea of what a powerful man Porgrils had become. There is certainly no other source which mentions strife between the two men. Some of the stories about incidents in their quarrels can be shown to be literary borrowings (see e.g. *289-91). We also note how free from serious casualty (of any person known from other sources) the feud between them is and to what a sudden and peaceful conclusion it is brought (chapter 33). For these reasons and others (see pages *363 f. and Note to 53/20-3), it seems best to regard the account of the quarrel as fictitious (cf. Einar Árnórsson's remarks in Arnesh, 149). We may also be sceptical of the story of the killing of Helgi Austmaðr by Porgrils and the latter's dealings with his two brothers (chapter 34). It may be suggested that the author of the saga invented this largely to account for the absence of the sword Jarðhússnautr among Porgrils's descendants (cf. pages
Finally, there are the circumstances surrounding Órgils's death and burial at the end of the saga and the removal of his bones from one grave to another. At first sight, the matter-of-fact way these events are recounted and indeed the very insignificance of some of them (e.g. Óra's broken leg) perhaps more than anything else in the saga give the impression that we may here be dealing with historical facts. But on closer investigation, the present editor has become doubtful that this is indeed the case: in Note to 61/6-9, it is argued that it is unlikely that Bjarni spaki died before Skapti Þóroddsson as the saga implies; in Note to 61/8-9, it is suggested that it is unlikely that there was, at the time in question, a law demanding the removal of bones from one graveyard to another when a church was moved; and on pages 357-8, the view is taken that the account of the bone-moving in Fló is, in fact, a literary borrowing. We may, then, be sceptically disposed towards the passage in question as history. But against this conclusion (although not strongly), attention should be drawn to Note to 61/7-9 and also to the fact that Órgils's living the last part of his life at Hjalli in Ólfus (cf. 88/26) and dying there could account for Theodricus's referring to him as Thorgils de Aulfusi (see Note to 32/4-5).

After these considerations, we are unwilling to concede that the story of Órgils as told in Fló contains many
more historical elements than the following:

(1) that Þorgils was among the first Icelandic chieftains to accept Christianity;

(2) that he held a góðorð at some time or another;

(3) that he married Helga Þóroddsóttir and had a child or children by her;

(4) that he died and was buried at Hjalli in Ólafs.

And it should be stressed that even on these points (with the probable exception of the third) we can only be tentative. (This applies particularly to the first and fourth point.)

We may now go over to the first question posed above, that of the oral element in the story of Þorgils. On any of the four points mentioned above, the author of the saga could have been drawing on local traditions preserved by word of mouth since the Saga Age. But here again we must be extremely wary. If Theodricus is, in fact, referring to our Þorgils in his twelfth chapter (see Note to 32/4-5), and if the author of the saga is drawing on local tradition when he tells of Þorgils's early conversion, it is a little peculiar that, in Fló, the hero has parted company with Þangbrandr and the more famous chieftains who accepted Christianity at the same time as he (Hallr, Hjalti, Gizurr). Particularly Þangbrandr and Gizurr would have been well-known from oral tradition and the author of Fló probably also knew them both from written sources. It would seem that the man Theodricus refers to as Thorgils de Aulfusi would have been a member of a small body of men
who worked for and almost fought for the acceptance of the Christian faith at the Assembly of 999 (1000?) (see again Note to 32/4-5). But there is no mention of any of this in Fló. And there is no reason why the author of Fló should not have made the statement that Þorgils tók ... í fyrra lagi við trú and concocted the stories of his hero's religious zeal without the support of any tradition, historical or unhistorical, spoken or written. As has been argued above, the pious, Christian, Þorgils of Fló is a stock figure, the stereotyped new convert, for whom there are various literary parallels. Even though it may be our hero to whom Theodricus refers, then, one may well doubt that the author of Fló was relying on oral tradition (or indeed a written source) for his statement at 32/4-5.

Rather the same argument could apply to the saga's representation of Þorgils as a goði (cf. Note to 13/19). This he may historically have been. But it could easily also be fortuitous that the author of Fló makes him one. The author of Harða, for instance, probably makes Grímkell Bjarnarson a goði without any historical basis (see Arnesh, 256 ff.). Taking an overall view, then, we may reasonably reduce the possible historical oral tradition to which the Fló-author had access to cover point 3 and, less certainly, xxx points 2 and 4 mentioned above.

The element of historical oral tradition in the story of Þorgils in Fló thus appears to be minimal, information which could be expressed in a couple of sentences. What
could now be asked is this: could there have been, in oral tradition, any stories with no basis in reality, which were connected with Þorgils's name and which the author of Fló incorporated in his saga? Here a threefold answer may be made: First, as follows: it is true that the issue of historicity in the Icelandic sagas must be regarded as largely independent of the issue of the oral tradition which lies behind them (cf. Problem, 50, 108 ff.). Clearly from lack of historicity, one cannot argue absence of oral tradition. One must make allowance not only for accretions and deformations in the course of oral transmission, but also for omissions. On the other hand, as a general rule, it is reasonable to suppose some proportion, in the type of oral tradition we are here concerned with, between historical and unhistorical elements. Thus the more adventurous and full of incident a man's life actually is, the more likely it is to attract apocryphal legends in later times. Conversely, the stay-at-home in fact is far less likely to be celebrated in fiction. Practically all we know of the historical Þorgils is the nickname of his stepfather, the names of his wife and children and possibly also of the place where he died. If he did lead a life full of incident, a life remembered in oral tradition for more than the first or second generation after his death, then these oral traditions have perished. But we have no reason to suppose that they existed. And because the historical oral element in the saga, as we have
it, is so negligible, we have reason to suspect that
the unhistorical oral element will be so also.

Second, the present editor can find no story in Fló
concerning Órgils which he can see any good reason for
singling out as originally an oral composition about the
same man. It is true that there are tales in Fló which
seem to belong basically to folk repertoire (see e.g.
pages *254 ff.; *351 ff.); but we have no reason to sus­
pect that these existed in oral form with Órgils as their
protagonist. Further, as noted, large parts of the saga
can be shown to contain literary borrowings from works
about other men than Órgils. The saga is exceptionally
free of verses, and where these exist (77/22-78/3), or
may have existed (28/25), they have nothing to do with
Órgils. Occasionally bater sagt-formulae appear in
the saga; but these, we may reasonably suppose, are nothing
but stylistic devices (see Note to 3/2). In the one
case where a local place-name is related to an event in
Órgils's life, it seems unlikely that this is not a story
made up by the author of the saga (see Note to 58/14).
Otherwise, no known place-names in Flói contain Órgils's
name and only two, Hæringstaðir and Loftsstaðir, can be
related to characters in the story of Órgils, and rela­
tively minor characters at that. No other Icelandic source
has stories to tell of Órgils.

Finally, there are the methodological difficulties
which the positing of oral stories behind the sagas
involves in general and which Nijhoff's thesis makes clear for Fló in particular. Two examples of the sort of reason Nijhoff gives in Beschouwing to support his theories of an oral tradition behind Fló may here be quoted (see also pages 109-10):

(page 72) 'De dood van Pórey is...zoo beschreven, dat we wel moeten aannemen hier met een echt verhaal te doen te hebben en van den voorspellenden droom en de voorgevoelsmotieven hebben we gezegd, dat dit alles echte sagastijl was; wij kunnen dit gedeelte dan ook heel goed in een mondeling verhaal verwachten.'

(page 104) 'Hierna [in chapter 32] volgt het incident, dat Porgils...het touw doorhakt, als Asgrimr en zijn personeel bezig zijn diens boot aan land te trekken, ten gevolge waarvan Asgrimr, die in witte kleeren is gehuld, achterover in de modder valt, met eenige vrouwen boven op zich. Deze clownerie lijkt haast te veel op een van de streken van Tijl Uilenspiegel, om ze in een IJslandsche saga te verwachten. Het is weer een los populair verhaaltje over Asgrimr.'

Arguments of this type are common in Nijhoff's book. They are, if not arbitrary, subjective, based on doubtful premises and, in some cases, contradictory, doomed to arrive at highly uncertain conclusions. On the other hand, it is arguments not very different from these that we should have to invoke if we were to posit oral tales behind Fló. Not only, then, does it seem unlikely that apocryphal oral...
stories about Þorgils have been included in Fló, but, if
they had, it would seem to be virtually impossible to
single them out.

We may return, then, to Sigurður Nordal's remarks on
Fló. The present editor finds it impossible to concur
with him in his assumption of an 'ældre lag' of 'bygde-
tradition' behind the saga as we have it, or to agree
with his characterization of it as a 'blanding af nogen
bygdetradition og ung digtning'. An attempt has been
made to demonstrate that the element in question, 'bygde-
tradition', hardly exists at all in the saga. Indeed, the
very fact that the author actually copied word for word
information about the early settlers of the district from
a work by an utanheradssmaðr and has very little new to add
himself suggests a certain poverty of oral tradition in
Fló at the time he was writing. And Sturla Þórðarson,
it seems, knows little or nothing of Þorgils, either from
oral or written sources (cf. pages *206-7). Indeed, it
could have been the very absence of information about Þor-
gils which made the Fló-author choose him as the hero of
his saga: he may have wanted a free hand to do with his
hero as he wished. But however this may be, two inter-
connected facts are now clear about Fló as a literary
phenomenon. First, it is quite obvious that far from
countenancing any view of the saga in terms of the 'Free
Prose theory', we cannot regard it as in any significant
way dependent on orally preserved material. But (and
secondly) to borrow words from Theodore M. Andersson (Problem), not only was the decisive moment in the genesis of Flóamanna Saga not the decision 'to transcribe tradition', it was not even 'the active intervention of an author'. The author of the story of Porgils was not, as some writers of Icelandic sagas have been characterized, an historical novelist. He was not, as far as can be seen, re-forming old stories and traditions about his hero, adding to them or remodelling them. He had no skeleton of historical fact to fill out. Here we have rather the pure novelist at work. He began with a mere name, Porgils Órrabeinsstjúpr (married to Helga Pórodds dóttir). To this name he connected stories he either made up himself or had read or heard told concerning other men. He also invented most of his main characters, introduced one or two stock figures (Gunnhildr konungamóðir, Asgrímr Ellíða-Grímsson, Eiríkr rauði) and disposed of them as he wished. If he felt himself tramèlled by exterior factors in the course he had his narrative take, these factors hardly included (cf. however pages *365-6) considerations of 'historicity'. What happens to Porgils in Fló, as has been demonstrated in Chapter II of this introduction, is rather governed by the conventions of the folk-tale and the saint's life and, more important, the model of earlier sagas about other heroes.
Section B: Critical considerations. The saga's place in Old Icelandic literature

Flóamanna Saga has not fared well at the hands of the critics. Sigurður Nordal's judgement has already been cited. Einar Arnórsson refers to it as a 'léleg skáld-saga' and Jan de Vries's remark on it is 'alles ist nur eitler Plunder.' It would be doing a disservice to the better works of Old Icelandic literature to rank Flóamanna Saga among them. When we compare it with that masterpiece of medieval European prose literature, Njáls Saga, with such works as Egils Saga or Hrafnkels Saga, or indeed with any of the better Icelandic sagas, its limitations become obvious. Structurally, it cannot be regarded as having any particular merit: the narrative is, for the greater part, essentially episodic; we are hurried from one story to the next without there being anything which could be called a larger plot, a wider framework holding the saga together. The rhetorical devices T. Andersson (The Icelandic Family Saga, 1967, ch. 2) notices in the sagas are largely absent in Fló. Stylistically, it is, because of the nature of the X-version, difficult to judge, but the M-version, which of the two redactions is closer to the original, holds no great promise in this respect (cf. pages *119-21). Character delineation in the saga is all too often two-dimensional, too often lacking in depth. But with these strictures made, it must be stressed that there are facets of the saga which will hold appeal *
for the casual twentieth century reader of the saga. He will enjoy the account of Porgils's struggle with Pórri (the wider plot, perhaps, of part of the saga). Here he encounters the sinister god, arrogant and dangerous at first, but growing gradually more impotent in the face of the hero's steadfastness. There is something climactic about their final encounter (81/5-82/5): pathos, the bizarre, irony, the humorous and the stirring are all blended with remarkable effect. First there is Starkaðr's abject suggestion which poignantly stresses the desperate plight of the party; the comedy of the small bird which the red-bearded god has now reduced himself to; and the hero's final curse, thundered out across the waves as the evil spirit flies to Hell. And while, as remarked, many of the characters of the saga lack colour, this is not true of Porgils, not, at any rate, as he is portrayed in chapters 20-8. We admire his stoicism in his trials, we feel his warm-heartedness for his comrades and his love for his wife and we are touched by his constant solicitude for his motherless son, Porfinnr (who is himself touching). It is not difficult to forgive him his moments of impetuosity or anger, the near murder of his son at 78/10 ff. and the threat to kill a trusted companion who has buried the boy's body at 51/8-9. His compassion for the sick Pórarinn at 82/14-5 more than makes up for these lapses. In Porgils, then, we see glimpses of a character more appealing to the modern mind than the average accepted type of saga hero.
It is, then, the middle part of the saga which probably has most for the modern reader to appreciate. But it would, of course, be wrong to judge the saga only by twentieth century standards. Its repetitions of motif (aptrgongur; hólmôngur; assassination attempts), while possibly offensive to modern taste, would not have troubled medieval sensibilities as profoundly, if at all: as Vera Lachmann writes in connection with Harðar Saga (Alter, 123 ff.), 'die Saga schaut Motivwiederholung nicht.' Nor, of course, would the stereotyped and second-hand nature of many of the stories told have bothered the medieval audience. They would have been happy with patterns which had found acceptance in the past and delighted in old themes in new settings. And if these old themes were enlarged or decorated with new elements, so much the better. Thus, for example, the kerganga-variation of hólmanga in ch. 17 would, no doubt, have pleased them immensely, as would the skilful adaptation of the tree-dream motif in chapter 24.

And it is paradoxical that, while Fló perhaps to a greater degree than any other Family Saga contains conventional elements (cf. pages *358 f.), it sometimes distinguishes itself among them by its startling originality. The use of a Biblical borrowing must be practically unparalleled in the Family Sagas. Few saga-heroes would dream of breast-feeding their sons (cf. page *325). What the medieval Icelandic audience would have wanted was a story with plenty of action and movement and in Fló they certainly had
it. And we may note that the large number of paper manuscripts of the saga from later centuries bears witness to its continued popularity among the people of Iceland in more modern times.

We may now go on to consider Fló in its literary-historical context and here we have to anticipate the conclusions of the following section where it is argued that the saga was written at the end of the thirteenth century or the first few decades of the fourteenth. There is much in our saga which may be regarded as typical of this period and which it has in common with Family Sagas of a similar age. Like Grettis Saga (late thirteenth or beginning of fourteenth century), the first part of Fló, which deals with the hero's colonist ancestors, is merely a conflation and adaptation of relevant passages in the Sturlubók-redaction of Landnámabók. The stories of Porgils's boyhood also have their parallels in Grettis Saga (see page *361 above). Particularly typical of Family Sagas of this period is the account of Porgils's first sojourn abroad: its fights with revenants are similar to those in Hávarðar Saga (also a late saga) and Grettis Saga. With its duels, it resembles, for example, Svarfdæla Saga. Its Viking stories, which come under the strong influence of the fornaldrarsögur (e.g. Órvar-Odds Saga), have parallels in several Íslendingasögur of comparable date (again, for example, Svarfdæla Saga). And the story of a quarrel between the hero of the saga
and another Icelandic chieftain in chapter 19 could be found in any Family Saga, early or late (cf. pages 363-4). A reading of the first nineteen chapters of Fló will, then, hold no surprises for the initiated student of Icelandic literature who, in advance, is made aware of its age.

Jóns Saga Baptista (Post, 849-931), by the priest Grímur Hólmsgiststeinsson and written about 1290, is swelled out with lengthy quotations from various works of the Fathers of the Church. Referring to these, Grímur says: 'I believe that their length will be displeasing to those who would rather listen to secular Viking tales (veraldligar vikingasögur) than the glorious works of the chosen warriors and champions of Christ crucified' (Post, 929). Earlier (Post, 849), he has referred to those who always grow weary of that which is told concerning the champions of Christ and who take pleasure rather in 'lying sagas' (skróksögur). There have been various views expressed on the implications of these remarks by Grímur. Einar Ol. Sveinsson (Sturlungaöld, 1940, 155 f.), who posits an ever widening gap between clerical and secular culture in Iceland in the second half of the thirteenth century, sees them (and, indeed, much more in Grímur's work) as indicative of the prejudices and policies of the clerical side. Lars Lönnroth (Scripta Islandica, 1964, 38 ff.) thinks he goes too far in this: he thinks that both clerical and profane literature were equally enjoyed by both orders until a time past the
middle of the thirteenth century and is able to adduce documentary evidence to back up his view. On the other hand, Lönnroth would probably admit that Einar's ideas are valid for a time about 1300 (cf. Lönnroth, op. cit., 39 lines 15-9). Further, however much one inclines to Lönnroth's view about the respective popularity of secular and clerical literature in the thirteenth century, Grímur's remarks make one thing clear: they provide evidence for a definite antithesis in the mind of an Icelander writing about 1300 between, on the one hand, sagas which deal with the acts of godly and pious men and, on the other, those which have the fantastic exploits of 'vikings' and the like as their subject. In modern terminology (and here with special reference to the first quotation from Grímur's work), we are justified in identifying the genres in question with the heilagra manna sögur on the one hand, and sagas of a fornaldarsögur-type on the other. And that a dichotomy of this sort was not peculiar to Grímur's view of things is satisfactorily demonstrated by passages from Laurentíus Saga and Flóres Saga ok sona hans which will be referred to below.

Accepting, then, the antithesis heilagra manna sögur (or helgisögur)/fornaldarsögur as belonging to at least some Icelanders' literary outlook in about the years 1300, we may return to Fló, for, when we read on in the saga from the end of chapter 19 and contrast the content of chapters 20 to 24 with what has gone before, it is the gulf
between these two very different types of literature which, one feels, in certain respects, is bridged in our saga. But here immediate reservations must be made.

It is by no means suggested that Flo is a sort of hybrid between a fornalðarsaga and a saint's life; it is unmistakably what in modern terminology is called an Íslendingasaga. Porgils is hardly a typical Viking figure and certainly not a 'chosen warrior of Christ'. There is no attempt to project fornalðarsögur-motifs onto helgi-sögur-motifs or vice versa. The saga contains elements from these two genres only in particular sections, and these relatively small sections. The hagiographic elements are not always easily recognizable as such. But with these concessions made, one must recognize the fact that that which gives Flo its unique position among the Íslendingasögur, particularly those Íslendingasögur which, like Flo, are influenced by the fornalðarsögur, are the elements one finds primarily in chapters 20 to 24 and which have been dealt with in Chapter II under the heading 'Porgils's dealings with Pórr; the religious element' (pages *291 ff.; see also pages *238-40; *322-5). The transference to the hero of a borrowing from the Bible (34/7 ff.; 68/18 ff.) must, as has been noted above (*296; cf. also ONOI, ii, 752 footnote), be practically unparalleled in the Family Sagas. Few Family Sagas can, like Flo, show influence from vision literature, slight though it is (cf. pages *307-9). A miracle worked on behalf of the saga-hero
(if such we have in Fló; cf. pages 322 ff.) must be a rarity. The very obvious tendentiousness of the relevant parts of the saga is unusual: Þorgils's steadfastness in his temptations (cf. Note to Introduction 99), for instance, or the story where those who neglect their prayers (in contrast to those who mind them) are visited by disease and death; last, the very definite tendency to make something of a saint out of the hero of the saga. All this alongside stories of viking raids, duels and áptrégongur, makes for a certain incongruity of content in the saga which becomes all the more apparent against the background of Grímr Hólmsteinsson's remarks already cited.

A moment ago, the word 'unique' was used of Fló's position in Icelandic literature and this perhaps needs some justification. When we look from Fló for examples of roughly contemporaneous Icelandic sagas which show comparable influence of hagiographic literature, it is difficult to find parallels. We have already referred to the extensive use of borrowings, not only from the Bible, but also from vitae, in the Lives of Óláfr Tryggvason by Oddr Snorrason and Gunnlaugr Leifsson. But, while these works and Fló have a certain amount in common (cf. Fló, 1932, xiii), it should be remembered that over a century divides Oddr Snorrason from the author of Fló. Both Oddr and Gunnlaugr were writing at a time when connections between Kings' Sagas and hagiographic liter-
ature were close ones. But the works of their successors, for example, Snorri and the writers of the earlier *Islandingsörgur*, are, by and large, free from hagiographic elements. Oddr, Ölafs would be of much greater comparative interest were Fló one of the earliest of the Icelandic sagas. - In Njáls Saga, an aura of piety is given to Njáll, while Hóskuldr Hvítanessgøði has been seen as a Christ-like figure. Njála was written in the same part of Iceland as Fló and not long before it. But the use of elements from religious literature in Nj is of an entirely different type from that in Fló, as is its character portrayal, which is considerably more subtle. - Possibly of interest in this context are böttir of the type represented by Svaða Pátr ok Arnórs kerlingamefs (*IS*, viii, 335 ff.): here saintly acts of piety are attributed to an early Icelandic convert to Christianity; alliterative epithets and phrases are not spared. But again there are also great differences from Fló, which will appear to any reader of the böttir. Further, the dating of the böttir is rather uncertain: while some would put it in the late fourteenth century, Finnur Jónsson (*ONOI*, ii, 753) and Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson (*Om de norske kongers sagaer*, 1937, 107-8) think it must be the work of Gunnlaugr Leifsson. - Finally, to contrast rather than compare, we may glance at the sagas with which Fló is usually bracketed in the standard literary histories. When we read through Grettis, Hávarðar, Harðar, Svarfdæla and Finnboga Sögur, we observe what might
be called an almost complete absence of the sort of elements which are being remarked on in Fló.

It is, then, difficult to find any work of approximately the same age as Fló which provides a convincing literary parallel to it. One is left to speculate on the possible background to the curious mixture of 'religious' and 'profane' ingredients we find in the saga. That Grímr Hólmsteinsson was not alone in his disapproval of secular sagas is clear from Einarr Hafliðason's deprecatory mention of heicinna manna sögur in the prologue to his Laurentíus Saga (ca. 1350?). On the other hand, how far clerics of apparently such uncompromising views were in the majority is much less certain (cf. Hermann Pálsson, Sagnaskemmtun Islendinga, 1962, 150 f.). And even if they were in a majority (which one doubts), there must have been those among the Icelandic clergy, who, irrespective of their own literary tastes, were realistic enough to appreciate that there were, in the words of Flóres Saga (Drei Lyg, 121), fleiri menn, er líti[1] skemtun bykir at heilagra manna sögum. Thus a man with a more pragmatic approach than Grímr or Einarr, and yet as committed as they to religious edification, might well have been prepared to mix instruction with entertainment in a work as palatable to the layman as Fló would have been. And it is perhaps worth mentioning here that if we move on two or three decades from the date of Grímr's death, we hear of a man in Iceland who could have been perfectly willing to exploit profane literature
in the interests of religious edification. The Bishop of Skálaholt from 1322 to 1339, Jón Halldórsson, was a Norwegian by birth and a Dominican by education. His order, ever since its foundation in the early thirteenth century, had always been prepared to turn secular literature to the use of the Church. Of Jón himself, it is said: 'No man of his order was better able to turn his hand to diversion and entertainment, and for the reason that his audience were often not all of the same disposition, so he accommodated himself accordingly, that all might derive pleasure from his words; for this reason, his tales were both of profane character and 'big-worded' (stórörðar)' (Ey, i, 87). There can, of course, be no question of this Norwegian having written Fló. But with a man like Jón in Skálaholt - and here we remember Flói's proximity to the see - an approach to the secular literature of Iceland may have been more generally adopted of which Fló is a representative product.

But this is all postulation. Another idea about the background for the writing of Fló will be put forward in Section C of this chapter and it might be possible to explain Fló's unique character in terms of this theory (see page *420). But whatever the explanation here may be, the first concern of the literary historian must be to notice the facts: what makes Fló most remarkable in the present context are elements in it which we otherwise find in two Kings' Sagas from about the turn of the
twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is the appearance of these elements in Fló which, for the present editor as a student of Old Icelandic literature, makes the saga most interesting.

Section C: Date, place and circumstances of the writing of Flóamanna Saga. Author

i. Preliminary investigations

In attempting to date Fló, an obvious cornerstone for establishing a terminus post quem is the writing of the Sturlubók-redaction of Landnámabók, for, as has been shown in Chapter II, there can be no doubt that the author of Fló made use of this work. The date of Sturlubók is not known with complete certainty. Most scholars, however, incline to the view that Sturla, who, as noted died in 1284, wrote it in the latter part of his life. We know, at any rate, that he made use of a number of older works for his redaction, the latest of which seems to be Hønsa-Póris Saga. Høns, it has recently been demonstrated by Björn Sigfússon (in Saga, 1962, 345-70) was probably not composed before 1274. It may be taken as certain, then, that Sturlubók was not written before 1275 and it may not even have been finished before 1280. Allowing a few years, as is reasonable, for Sturla's work to become known, for a copy of it, ÍdnX, to be made (cf. pages *158 ff.) and for the author of Fló to put his saga together, we may put the latter's date after about 1285. Such a terminus post quem accords well with the fact that
Fló borrows from a number of other works of 13th century Icelandic literature, including probably Njáls Saga (see page *359 above), which can hardly have been composed much earlier than 1275.

Also in Chapter II, it has been suggested that the author of Fló knew Grettis Saga (see page *359 and the references cited there) and Grims Saga loðinkinna (see pages *326 f.). Both these sagas, at least in their present form, themselves draw on the Sturlubók-redaction of Landnámabók. If we accept that Fló does borrow from either or both of them, then it would seem reasonable to date it after 1290.

A certain terminus ante quem for the writing of the saga is, of course, provided by the date of its earliest known manuscript. No scholar has put the writing of *M after the middle of the fifteenth century and some think it may have been written in the last decades of the fourteenth century (see pages 16 f.). Further, the latest common source for the manuscripts of the X-group was almost certainly written during the life-time of Jón Hókonarson and probably not after 1390 (see Section D of Chapter I and particularly Notes to Introduction 36 and 45). It is therefore reasonable to date the common source for *M and *X, i.e. *F, to before about 1385. On the basis of the arguments produced so far, we may put the original of the saga between 1290 and 1385.

'The Age of Manuscripts' and 'Literary Relations' are just two of the touchstones for assessing the age of sagas
which Einar Ol. Sveinsson mentions in his essay *Dating the Icelandic Sagas*. We may now consider some of the other criteria he enumerates which could help us to date the saga more precisely within the 95 years between 1290 and 1385.

First to dismiss two of them: 'Artistry' (*Dating*, ch. 13) and 'Clerical and Romantic Influences' (*Dating*, ch. 12) are probably of no particular value in this context. 'The Decline of Realism' (*Dating*, ch. 14) has frequently, perhaps too frequently, been used as a measure by which to calculate the age of a saga: lack of verisimilitude has often been taken as a sign of late date of composition. By this criterion, Fló would, of course, be late, but might be grouped with such sagas as *Grettis Saga*, *Hávarðar Saga* and *Svarfdæla Saga* rather than with a later group represented by *Bárðar Saga* and *Króka-Refs Saga*. From Einar's chapter 'Linguistic Evidence' (*Dating*, ch. 11) one point of interest arises. At 81/11 of Fló, we find the form hefi-k; Einar writes (page 101): 'The suffix -k, -g (for ek) after verbs was common both in poetry and in prose in the twelfth century, but it gradually vanished. It is common in the *Morkinskinna*, but it may be counted rare in manuscripts of the Family Sagas, although it does occur both in *Laxdøla* and in *Njála*.' So far 'Literary Relations' has only been used to establish a terminus post quem. Only once in the chapter on the sources and analogues of the saga is it suggested that Fló may have influenced another saga (see page *334 above). This is rather an uncertain
case however and the date of Bárðar Saga is not known definitely. 'Historical Evidence' (Dating, ch. 8), Einar defines as 'when a saga mentions people and events of an age later than that with which it is concerned, or else it alludes to practices or details of antiquity which give evidence of its age'. Einar includes under this heading genealogies traced down to later generations, statements that a given building was standing at a given time and the use of legal terminology. There is a certain amount of evidence of this type in Fló. First is the genealogy at the beginning of chapter 6 down to Kálf Brandsson. If this is not a later interpolation (as the genealogy down to Jón Hálkonarson at the end of the saga must probably be), it not only shows that Fló was written after about 1240, when Kálf was born (see Note to 8/8), but suggests also that it may have been written before his death, which cannot have been much later than 1320. Second, we may allow ourselves under this heading to discuss the knowledge, or absence of knowledge, of the laws of the Icelandic Republic reflected in the saga. As is well known, the code of law represented by the Grágás-manuscripts was not in force after 1271 when Járnsíða was introduced. Járnsíða was itself followed by Jónsbók in 1281. This last date corresponds fairly closely to the very earliest date Flóamanna Saga could have been written. If, then, we find a knowledge of the laws of the Republic reflected in Fló, this would suggest, although, of course, by no means prove,
that the saga was written by a man born not much later than 1265. Now it seems likely that Fló does reflect such a knowledge. Thus at 9/7, the author is able to play with the word *gagnsók*, which is not found in the post-Commonwealth law. He knows of the *hafnartollr* which was no longer payable after union with Norway (see Note to 51/1). He is familiar with the laws concerning lost property to be found in *Grágás* (see Note to 32/1-2). And when Porgils rides í *Eyrna* to deliver a summons to Asgrím at 59/3-4, the incident reveals a knowledge of the niceties of the relevant procedure according to Icelandic law up to 1271 (see Note to 59/3).

By themselves, none of the pieces of evidence adduced in the preceding paragraph can be given much weight. Taken together, however, they are probably of greater value: they suggest that the saga was written in the earlier part of the period in question, rather than the later part. One would, then, date the saga nearer to 1300 than to 1400.

To establish a further *terminus post quem* for the writing of Fló within the period 1290-1385 is not easy. Reflections of contemporary events in sagas (cf. 'Contemporary History', *Dating*, ch. 9) sometimes suggest a date after which they must have been written. On the other hand, there is not much reason for connecting Fló with any such events (see however Notes to 42/7 and 43/23-4). But here one point should be noted: in Note to 8/20, attention is drawn to the fact that, at 116/26-7, *LdnHkb* has *Bóðvarstóptir* while,
at the corresponding place, Fló has Bôðvarsstaðir. One possible way of interpreting this circumstance would certainly be to assume that Fló was written after Haukr's version of Landnámabók, although other explanations are, of course, possible. Haukr's version of Landnámabók is now generally thought to have been written between 1306-8 (cf. page *150). Taking together all the evidence for dating Fló within the period 1290-1385, we may, then, definitely prefer the years between 1290 and 1330, and, within this period, may much more tentatively suggest the years between 1310 and 1330.

The tendency to locate the author of a given saga in the area in which its events take place is a natural and understandable one. It has been particularly marked in the introductions to the Family Sagas found in the Íslensk forn­rit-series. The main argument is the knowledge of local topography shown by the author. Obviously one must make reservations here: a man could have lived in one area, acquired a knowledge of the local topography, moved to an entirely different part of Iceland and then written a saga about the district surrounding his first home. Alternatively, a saga-writer may never have been in the area in question but have collected data about local geography from others. But cases like these must be regarded as exceptional. And we have good reason for assuming that the author of Fló lived in Flói. When, for example, he adds fyrir dyrr to the notice in LdnX about the place where
Hásteinn's setstokkar drifted ashore, he displays what would seem to be an intimate knowledge of the coastline of Flói (see Note to 6/14-5). The út he interjects into the text of LdnX at 29/5 can, by comparison with Ñi, be shown to be used correctly (see Note ad loc). Such phrases as austr í herað (65/10) and fyrir neðan gringarárð (87/19-20) again suggest familiarity with the topography of Flói and other local features. And when the author of the saga remarks (64/22-3) that Kolr átti bú austr hjá Kálfholti, he would certainly seem to be putting himself to the west of the Pjórsá, for Kálfholt is practically on the left bank of that river. Oddi, for example, would therefore seem to be ruled out as the home of the author of Fló. In view of these facts, then, it is reasonable to accept that Fló was written by a man who knew Flói well and indeed probably lived there when he wrote the saga (cf. ONOI, ii, 752).

'Forfatteren har uden tvivl været gejstlig,' was Finnur Jónsson's dictum on the author of the saga (Fló, 1932, xiii): 'Derom vidner den religiøsitet, som han lader Tor-gils være besjælet af.' The distinction between lay and learned this statement presupposes may be regarded as a meaningful one for the time Fló was written. During the last century of the Republic and before, the boundary between the clergy and the laity had been relatively fluid. Many of Iceland's secular chieftains had enjoyed a clerical education or taken orders. Some of them had spent their last days as monks in monasteries whose patrons they may
have been. No doubt a number of them could read and write. Professional clerics often married, were occupied as farmers and, in times of feud, took up arms to support the owners of the churches to which they were tied. During the course of the thirteenth century, however, the division between the two orders became more clearly defined as the Church became more autonomous: The Pope and a foreign archbishop got a tighter grip on the Icelandic church; the application of canon law became stricter and the celibacy of the priesthood more strongly enforced. Secular control of the bishops of the country and the individual churches and their priests was considerably diminished. The position and outlook of the Icelandic priest of 1300 was considerably more different from that of the Icelandic layman than it had been a century before.

How far literacy extended to the complete layman in Iceland during the thirteenth century is debatable. Einar Ol. Sveinsson (Skírnir, 1944, 173-97) has argued that the ability not only to read, but also to write was widespread in the country at this time. Einar's views have been disputed, again by Lars Lönnroth in Scripta Islandica, 1964, 52 ff. Certainly Einar's remark (op. cit., 197) that, at some time in the thirteenth century, 'ritlist er orðin almenn meðal leikmannna', is very much overstating the case. One inclines far more to Lönnroth's view that, although there quite clearly were layman in thirteenth century Iceland, most of them belonging to the chieftain class, who had
learnt both to read and write, they were in a very decided minority in comparison with the total lay population. And as far as the average yeoman farmer is concerned, there is little evidence to suggest that he could write any more than his counterpart in, say, Norway or England. We must, then, a priori, assume that the author of Fló was a cleric. And this presupposition is reinforced when we actually read Fló. As has been noted already, Fló distinguishes itself among sagas of its own age by its specially 'learned' character. It draws on saints' lives, its author could well have known Latin; its element of didacticism is very marked. Anyone, then, attempting to argue that Fló is the work of a man who had not had a clerical education would, it may be said, be doing so in the face of a number of indications to the contrary.

If we assume, then, that the author of the saga was a cleric, we may reasonably look around for some religious establishment to which he may have been attached. According to the document usually called Kirknataf Páls byskups (DI, xii, 7-8) which is a complete list of churches in the Diocese of Skálaholt about 1200, we note churches at the following places in Fló: Oddgeirshólar, Hróarsholt, Villingaholt, Hraungerði, Gaulverjabær, Gegnishólar, Stokkseyrr, Laugardælir, Kallaðarnes. Vilchinsbók (DI, iv, 51 ff.), from the end of the fourteenth century, mentions churches at all but the first of these places and, in addition, at Hæringsstaðir (about 4 km. north-east of Trað-
arholt) and Sandvík. A third document, DI, i, 410-1, provides evidence for a church at Ra Gunnheiðarstaðir in 1220. One point is worth noting here: there is, as far as the present editor has been able to establish, no evidence of there ever having been a church at Traðarholt, which Flóamanna Saga gives as the home of its hero, Þorgils. If the author of the saga was a cleric, then it is logical to look elsewhere than Traðarholt for his permanent place of residence. This does not mean, of course, that he was not commissioned by a farmer of Traðarholt with antiquarian interest in the farm he owned. It does suggest, however, that we should turn our attention rather to the kirkjustaðir in the more immediate neighbourhood of Traðarholt. Attention would thus reasonably be focused on four farms in Traðarholt's immediate vicinity: these are Stokkseyrr (about 3 km. west of Traðarholt), Hæringsstaðir, Gagnishólar (a little to the east of Hæringsstaðir) and Gaulverjabaer (about 6 km. west of Traðarholt).

ii. Flóamanna Saga Gaulverjabaer Haukr Erlendsson

In what precedes, the attempt to date the writing and localize the author of the saga has been uncommitted. The conclusion is there arrived at that Fló is most likely to have been composed by a cleric in the years between 1290 and 1330, somewhere in Flói, perhaps on one of four church-farms in the immediate neighbourhood of Traðarholt. A more specific idea may now be put forward about the circumstances in which the saga was written in connection with
the farm last mentioned there, Gaulverjabær. For, while we know, in fact, very little about what was going on in Flói during the time Fló could have been written, if we look at the Annals for the year 1308, we find an entry concerning Gaulverjabær which is of interest in the present context. This reads as follows in the Annales Regii version (Ann., 149; cf. 201, 341 and 391): Arni byskup ok herra Haukr settu lærðra manna spítal í Gaulverjabær. 'Arni byskup' is Arni Helgason, Bishop of Skálaholt from 1304 to 1320. 'Herra Haukr' is, of course, Haukr Erlendsson (died 1334), well-known as owner and partial scribe of Hauksbók and a servant of the Norwegian crown in both Iceland and Norway. About the establishment at Gaulverjabær, we have the following few details: From an episcopal decree from 1345 (DI, ii, 792), it can be seen that every priest in the diocese should pay a mörk to it. Vilchinsbók (DI, iv, 58) says that the beneficiarius at Gaulverjabær, Síra Hrafn, collected four merkr as spítalstøllr. A formula for an oath found in DI, ii, 507, perhaps suggests that the hospital was dedicated to Saint Magnus. The hospital cannot still have been in existence in 1555 (see KL, s.v. Hospital. Island). This is all the preserved sources tell us about the institution. On the other hand, we can make certain assumptions about it. It was presumably a home for old and sick priests. But despite the disabilities of its inmates, it could well have been something of a centre of learning. There may even have been a small school there.
It would be surprising if it did not have its own collection of books and manuscripts. Its proximity to Eyra, Iceland's foremost port of the time, would ensure it the advantage of easy contact with other countries. It is quite possible that a certain amount of copying and even original literary work went on there. If, then, we assume that Flo was written after 1308, we have, all else being equal, already reasons for connecting it with Gaulverjabær.

There are, however, more specific reasons for making such a connection. First, there is the interest the saga-writer seems to take in the farm. He makes certain of mentioning Loptr, the original inhabitant of Gaulverjabær in chapter 5. More significant is the way Þorgímr Þrábeinn sends his five-year old stepson to Loptr (‘...vinnar hins...’; 14/23) at Gaulverjabær after he has slain the horse Illingr. It is true that stories where 'starker Hans'-characters are forced by their parents to leave home (cf. Erzählungsgut, 5) may have been the author's model here and the hero has to go somewhere. But one cannot help feeling that the whole episode about the killing of Illingr is introduced with a view to getting Þorgils to Gaulverjabær. The farm is, at any rate, the scene of the greater part of Þorgils's boyhood days. When the author of the saga has the ten-year old Þorgils catch some thralls breaking open a grave-mound, he would appear to be thinking of the natural knolls which surround the farm at Gaulverjabær (see Note to 15/22) and thus to be displaying familiarity with the place. Before
leaving for Norway, he endows his friends at the farm with silver and gives a ring to Loptr. And when he returns home from his first journey abroad, it is stressed that his foster-father, Loptr, is still alive. (29/13-4), although this fact seems to have no real relevance to any subsequent event in the saga.

But a stronger reason for connecting the saga with the spíttalt at Gaulverjabær is the interest its hero would undoubtedly have held for one of the founders of the institution, Haukr Erlendsson. That Haukr took a special interest in his ancestors has long been recognized and can be clearly seen from Hauksbók, the various parts of which were either written by Haukr or under his supervision. When, for example, we find Eiríks Saga rauda included in the codex, the reason, at least partly, must be the fact that Þorfinnr Karlsefni, the main character of the latter part of the saga, was one of Haukr's ancestors and a genealogy from him down to Haukr is found at the end of the redaction of the saga in Hauksbók (cf. Eiríks Saga rauda, ed. G. Storm, 1891, v; Hauksbók, ed. Jón Helgason, 1960, xviii). In what is probably a copy of lost parts of Hauksbók in AM 281, 4to, there is a genealogy from Adam down to Haukr. And in LdnHkb itself, Haukr traces the descendants of nine landnámsmenn to his father (LdnHkb, chs. 175, 187, 232, 315, 326, 348), to his mother (LdnHkb, ch. 101), to his wife (LdnHkb, chs. 99, 326) and even to his stepmother, Járngerðr (ch. 55).

It may be noted at this point that Haukr never mentions his
paternal grandfather nor this last's ancestors: he always traces his father's ancestry via his paternal grandmother, Valgerðr Flosadóttir.

In an article in Ámælisrit called 'Föðurætt Hauks lögmanns Erlendssonar', Pétur Sigurðsson (163) suggests that of all the pedigrees Haukr traces via his father to himself in Hauksbók, he considered those going back to Hámundr heljarskinn (LdnHkb, 187) and Hóða-Dórðr (ch. 175) the most important. The reasons given for this conclusion are not, in the present editor's opinion, entirely satisfactory. We have probably much better reason to suspect that of the seven lines of ancestry Haukr traces from himself in LdnHkb (this number includes that by his mother), he was most interested in the ones going back to Flosi Þórbjarnarson (LdnHkb, ch. 315) and Hásteinn Atlason (LdnHkb, ch. 326). That Haukr was particularly interested in Flosi has already been noticed by Jón Jóhannesson (Gerðir, 181) and will appear incidently from what follows. What the present editor is particularly concerned with arguing in the present context are reasons why Haukr had special cause to be interested in his descent from Hásteinn (Hallstein) Atlason, the great-grandfather of the hero of Flóamanna Saga. In following the argument here, the reader is particularly referred to the genealogical table on page *425 of this thesis.

First, of all the genealogies Haukr traces back to original settlers of Iceland, only two involve as few as two
female links, the one to Þorstein hvíti in LdnHkb, ch. 232, and the one via Þorgils to Hásteinn Atlason. Second, in chapter 326 of LdnHkb, Haukr is not only able to take his own ancestry back to Hásteinn Atlason, but also that of his wife: Grímr Ingjalðsson, great-grandson of Þorgils was father of Börkr, great-great-grandfather of Haukr and also of Einarr, great-great-great-grandfather of his wife Steinunn. This is the only case in LdnHkb of a double genealogy to both Haukr and Steinunn. Third, in ch. 348 of LdnHkb, while the Ölfusingar are being dealt with, Haukr's genealogy back to Grímr glómmuðr, son of Helga Póroddsþóttir (she is not mentioned in ch. 326) and Þorgils Pórðarson, is traced in exactly the same way as in ch. 326. The reason for the repetition here could well have been Haukr's special pride or interest in Helga's forefathers: the Sturlubók-redaction of Landnámabók says that her great-great-grandmother was an Irish princess and we know Haukr had a special interest in Irishmen (see Um Kialn, 73 ff.). A fourth reason why Haukr (and his wife also) should be particularly interested in this line of his descent must be argued here at greater length.

If we look at '6. ættskrá' at the back of the second volume of the 1946-edition of Sturlunga Saga (ed. Jón Jóhannesson, Magnús Finnbogason, Kristján Eldjárn), we find a genealogical table which in its essentials traces the same lines of descent as that on page *425. Haukr is at the bottom of it. The ancestors of his great-grand-
father, Flosi prestr, are traced back to Valla-Brandr. The forefathers of his great-grandmother, Ragnhildr, go back to Porgils errubeinsstjúpr. The heading given to this table is 'Vallverjar og Flóamenn'. The first of these names is definitely old (cf. Ldn, 1963, 366). 'Flóamenn', on the other hand, has not been found in any medieval source, unless the modern title of our saga is the original one (cf. pages 119-20). Further, the reference to Haukr as a 'Flóamaðr' in the edition mentioned above, if such is intended, is one made by modern scholars. Even so, in attempting to link the only Family Saga which deals with the men of Flói in the Saga Age with Haukr Erlendsson, it would be of interest to establish how far the latter might have thought himself as a Flóamað(u)r, or felt himself connected with the district in question.

Now the six original settlers of Iceland to whom Haukr traces back his father's ancestry and the districts where they settled are as follows:

*Ldn* [Hkb], ch. 175: Höfða-Pórör: Skagafjörður
" " 187: Hámundr heljarskinn: Eyjafjörður
" " 232: Porsteinn hvíti: Vápnafjörður
" " 315: Flosi Porbjarharson: Rangárvellir
" " 326: Hásteinn Atlason: Flói
" " 348: Þorgrímur Grimólfsisson: Ólfus

We first note that the last three of these six settled areas relatively close to each other in the south-western part of Iceland with Flói in the middle and see one immediate reason
why Haukr should be particularly interested in the south-western lowland of the country. The areas settled by the other three are not concentrated in this way. And although on his father's side, Haukr was descended from settlers in Skagafjörður, Eyjafjörður and Vápnafjörður, his connection with these men was by virtue of their female descendants marrying into the Vallverjar family several generations before his time. Thus for his connections with a descendant of the two northern Icelandic settlers, Hámundr and Höða-Pórðr, Haukr had to go back six generations to find a man who actually lived in the north of Iceland, i.e. to Porsteinn ranglátr á Grund í Eyjafirði. Porsteinn's daughter married a man from Rangárvellir and it was their daughter, Halla, who married a Vallverji (Bjarni prestr Bjarnason). And Haukr's connection with people who actually lived in Vápnafjörður was no closer: six generations back from him we come to Flosi Kolbeinsson, who married a Vápnfirðingr, Guðrún Pórisdóttir. Going via Haukr's grandmother, then, Haukr's family for at least three generations back are not to be regarded as Vápnfirðingar, Eyfirdingar or Skagfirðingar, but as Vallverjar and Flóamenn.

We may now give special attention to Haukr's great-grandparents, Flosi prestr Bjarnason and Ragnhildr Barkardóttir. Now Flosi prestr would have been of particular interest to Haukr. He was probably a godórðsmáðr and a man of learning. Genealogically, he belonged to the Vallverjar, in whom, as already noted, Haukr took a special
pride. Again, as just mentioned, Flosi embodied Haukr's
descent from three other landnámsmenn. But the girl from
Flói he married also had fine ancestry. Her family had
lived in Flói since the age of settlement and she traced
her lineage in direct male line back to a Norwegian jarl,
Atli, who was no doubt, an historical figure. By only two
female links, Ragnhildr was said to be related to an Irish
king. And her uncle, Einarr of Kalláðarnes was an ancestor
of Haukr's wife Steinunn. In this marriage between Flosi
and Ragnhildr, the six lines of descent Haukr traces to his
father all come together in partners he would have consider­
ed equally high-born.

And we may dwell on this marriage a little longer. In
the indexes to modern editions of the relevant sources about
Flosi presti, he is frequently referred to as 'Flosi á
Baugsstóðum'. Now the present editor has not been able to
find any ancient source which actually appends the farm's
name to Flosi's in this way, or which actually says that
he lived there. On the other hand, this last proposition
seems highly likely. Flosi was one of three brothers and
probably not the eldest. His bride, on the other hand, was
the heiress of Baugståðir. It is reasonable to assume that
when his father-in-law, Bórrkr á Baugsstóðum, died in 1222
(Ann), or even well before, Flosi crossed the Þjórsá and moved to the farm. He would thus have become a Flóamaðr
by residence and marriage if not by birth. And even if he
did not actually live at the farm, we can be absolutely
certain that he owned it: here Sturl, i, 386, provides the evidence: This sources tells how a certain Dugfúss Porleifsson was involved in quarrels west in Dalir and in the course of these suffered injuries. These were compensated but after the conclusion of the affair in about 1226, Dugfúss bought Baugsstaðir in Flói from Flosi and moved there. About this event, a contemporary poet, Amundi smiðr, declaimed this verse:

```
Sitt réð selja
sandauðigt land
fullsviðr Flosi
fúss Dugfúsi.
Nú hefir keypta
kvalráðr fala
geirs gylmstærir
glaðr Baugsstaði.
```

Now what is particularly interesting here is that the man who bought Baugsstaðir from Haukr's great-grandfather was himself great-grandfather of Haukr's wife. Steinunn's connection with Flói by virtue of her descent from Einarr i Kallaðarnesi (after whose granddaughter she was named) was thus reinforced. And here on a farm in Flói in the 1220's, probably only some forty years before Haukr's birth, we find, as it were, the main streams of Haukr's ancestry running together. And it is worth noting that Baugsstaðir lies less than 5 km. from Gaulverjabær, where Haukr founded the spítall in 1308, and less than 3 km. from Traðarholt,
where the author of Flóamanna Saga lived or is said to have lived.

But not even Steinunn's ancestors remained at Baugsstaðir (see Vígfúss Guðmundsson, Saga Eyrarbakka, 1945, 228 ff.). And where Flosi prestur's family moved to after leaving the farm is not certain. But the suggestion made by Einar Arnórsson (Arnesb, 235) that for his sandaúðigítt land Flosi got Strönd í Selvági on the southern side of the Reykjanes peninsular about 20 km. west of the Ólfsúsa has a good deal to recommend it. And if not Strönd í Selvági, most probably Nes í Selvági. Flosi himself died in 1235 (Ann), probably as a monk in one of Iceland's monasteries. And wherever Flosi and his daughter Valgerðr (Haukr's grandmother) lived, few have doubted that, while Haukr's father did have property at Ferjubakki in Borgarþjörður, his principal place of residence was in Selvágr, probably at Strönd (see e.g. Safn, 1886, 43; Arnesb, 233 ff.; cf. Gerðir, 53). Assuming, then, that Flosi did move to Selvágr or that if he did not, Erlendr sterki, at any rate, lived there, the following should be borne in mind. Selvágr was a relatively isolated district. The other settlements out along the peninsular, Krýsuvík and Grindavík, were at a distance of respectively 20 and 40 km. and equally small as Selvágr. On the other hand, this last district, both geographically and administratively belonged to Arnesping on the fertile south-western lowland of Iceland. The inhabitants of Selvágr would always have looked east, rather than west or
north, for outside contact. To the east, lay the road to
the local bing at Arnes, to the national assembly at Ping-
vellir, to the country's ecclesiastical centre at Skálak-
holt and to its foremost international port at Eyrar. And
although 20 or 30 km. of desert country divided Selvágr from
the nearest settled area to the east, communications with
neither Ölfus nor Flói would have been difficult. An easy
morning's ride would have taken Erlendr, for instance, over
hard, even terrain to the Ölfus side of the Kallavörnes
ferry, which was the gateway from the west to Flói. From
the road Erlendr might have looked up to Hjalli and rememb-
ered how, centuries before, his ancestor Þóroður goði had
lived there. A shorter ride would have taken him to Por-
lákshofn from where, under favourable weather conditions, a
brief journey by boat could have brought him to Eyrar in the
centre of Flói or even to Baugsstaðir where his grandfather
had lived. And the journey from Selvágr to Eyrar would
probably have been a frequent one for men like Erlendr,
eager for contact with Norway. It may be suggested, then,
that although he probably lived in Selvágr, Erlendr would
by no means have felt that he had lost contact with the dis-
trict not only where his immediate ancestors had lived, but
also where, in the Age of Settlement, landnámsmenn from
whom he traced his descent had settled and thrived.

And one can probably say much the same about Erlendr's
son, Haukr. Now it must be admitted here that we do not
know whether Haukr was a legitimate child or not. If his
mother, Jórunn, was Erlendr's concubine, then he may, of course, have spent his childhood at her home, the location of which we are ignorant, but which was quite possibly in the western part of Iceland. But it is also reasonable to assume that he spent a certain amount of time with his father in Selvágr. Already in his boyhood, Haukr is thus likely to have visited Flói and could well have felt certain ties with the area. And even if he did not do this at an early age, what we know of his life suggests far greater contact with the south-western part of Iceland than with any other part. In 1294, the first date we hear of him, he is Lawman for the Southern and Eastern Quarters of Iceland. On the several journeys he made between Iceland and Norway in the course of his life, he must at some time have passed through Eyrar, and it is easy to imagine him, waiting for a favourable wind from Iceland, passing the time visiting (or more probably revisiting) the homes of his settler-ancestors in Flói or the mounds where they were said to be buried. Between 1306 and 1308, it is usually considered that he was sýslumaðr for the area between Botnsá and Pjórsá. Helgi Guðmundsson (Um Kjáln, 1967, 82) suggests that he may have spent these two years at or near Viðey (off modern Reykjavík). But surely Selvágr is a more likely proposition (cf. DI, ii, 361-2), or even Gaulverjábær where he founded the spitall at the end of this period. But wherever he stayed during this time, his duties as sýslumaðr would, no doubt have taken him to Flói on frequent occasions.
After Haukr left Iceland for Norway in 1308, we do not hear of him again in the country before 1330 or 1331 when he arrived on a tax-collecting mission. In the course of this last, he may, it is true, have travelled round the whole of Iceland, and may have visited the landræm of his ancestors in the north and north-east of the country. But these would have been fleeting visits and ones undertaken at the very end of his life. In 1334, Haukr was dead, almost certainly in Bergen in Norway.

To sum up. Of the Saga Age Icelanders to whom Haukr could trace his lineage, we may assume that he was especially, if not most, interested in the descendants of Atlíjarl. And to put things a different way, it would be difficult to point to a couple living about the time Fló was written who had better reason to be interested in the hero of the saga, Þorgils, than Haukr and his wife Steinunn. This fact gives us some grounds for connecting the writing of Fló in some way with Haukr. And when we find that Haukr founded a home for clerics at Gaulverjabær in 1308 and note not only the saga's special interest in that farm but also the more general reasons for locating its author there, then some connection between the saga and the spital becomes probable rather than possible. Should this last proposition not be acceptable, however, it must be pointed out that the saga could have been written for Haukr and yet have no connection with Gaulverjabær. On the other hand, if the saga was written at Gaulverjabær at any time in the
period 1300 to 1330, it would be a remarkable coincidence if its author did not have Herr Haukr and his wife Stein-unn in mind.

Assuming a connection between Fló and the spítall at Gaulverjabær, one may wonder about the more precise circumstances in which the saga was written. It could, for example, have been written in the years immediately prior to 1308 and have been presented to Haukr in the hope that he would choose the farm as the place for an establishment it was known that he and the bishop intended to set up. In that case, one might suspect that the author of the saga was the priest at the church there. But in the attempt to date the saga made above (pages 392-7), a time after the writing of the Hauksbók-redaction of Landrámabók is preferred, and the period between 1310 and 1330 suggested. Could then Flóamanna Saga rather have been written in gratitude to the spítall's founder(s), and then by one of its inmates? Between 1308 and 1322, it is usually assumed that Haukr was in Norway and there is good documentary evidence for this assumption (cf. Note to Introduction 127). The saga could have been composed for him during this time and sent abroad to Bergen where he was. On the other hand, between 1323 and 1329 both Norwegian and Icelandic sources are silent about him. If, as some have supposed (e.g. Finnur Jónsson in Hauksbók, cxxvii), Haukr spent this period in his home country, this would perhaps be the best time to assume that the saga was written.
Having used the two factors 'interest in Gaulverjabær in Fló' and 'Haukr's and Steinunn's descent from the hero of Fló' to argue a connection between the Guðrøra manna spitall and the writing of Flóamanna Saga, we must now ask ourselves whether we have not arrived at what Hallvard Lie, in his well-known critique of the Íslensk fornrit-edition of Grettis Saga (Maal og Minne, 1939, 138) terms 'en nullitet...som litteraturvidenskapelig hjælpefaktør'. Can our conclusion contribute anything to our understanding of the saga? Unfortunately we know so little about the institution at Gaulverjabær or, indeed, about the life of Haukr Erlends-son that we are naturally handicapped here. There are, however, a number of possible points of contact to which attention may be drawn, and a numbered list of these is given here. Some of them, the present editor would be the first to admit, are tenuous, and these are mentioned in the latter part of the list:

(1) First we must notice the beginning of ch. 6 in Fló which tells of Flosi Þorbjarnarson. Why, we wonder, has the author of the saga mentioned Flosi and the area he settled at all here? Now it is true that he does mention other landnámsmenn who do not have any direct relevance to the narrative of the saga but who settled in the parts of Flói adjacent to Hallsteinn Atlason's landnám. But Flosi settled a good way away from Eyrrar, according to LdnStb., not only to the east of the Þjórsá, but also to the east of the Rangá; Þórir Ásason (see LdnStb., ch. 373) who settled
to the immediate north of Hallsteinn's Landnám is not, on the other hand, mentioned in the opening chapters of Fló at all. It could be argued that the Fló-author referred to Flosi and his outlawry from Norway to elucidate the words fyrir hónn heira Flosa beggia móðurbróður síns at 7/20-1. But one feels that the Fló-author, admittedly quite capable of considerable digression, was able to marshal the borrowings he made from Landnámabók rather better than this. Elsewhere he has been quite able to edit LdnX to suit his purposes and the words at 7/20-1 could easily have been omitted.

The explanation for the introduction of Flosi here could be the special interest he and his father seem to have held for Haukr Erlendsson. As has already been noted, Haukr traces his ancestry back to Flosi in LdnHkb, ch. 315. Fosi's granddaughter Þuríðr married Valla-Brandr, first ancestor of the Vallverjar from whom Fosi prestr Bjarnason (see above) was descended in direct male line (see genealogical table on page 425). And, to use Jón Jóhannesson's words, 'þess sjást víðar merki, að [Haukur] hefir lagt sérstaka rækt við frásagnir um ætt Þorbjarnar hins gaulverska, enda voru þau hjón þeði frá honum komin' (Gerðir, 181): in both chapters 12 and 323 of LdnHkb, Þorbjörn is brought in where Sturlubók in the corresponding places had no mention of him at all. And a point of greater interest: in LdnHkb, ch. 305, Haukr adds to the account given in Sturlubók, ch. 346, the information that Jórundr
Hrafnsson married Púríðr, daughter of Þorbjörn inn gaulverski, and continues: var brúðkaup heira í Skarfanesi at Flosa er öll land áttim Pjórsár ok Engár. As Jón Jóhannesson (Gerðir, 180 f.) observes, Flosi Þorbjarnarson must be referred to here. And as regards this last's property between Pjórsá and Engá, it is particularly interesting to note that while LánX only gives him land to the east of the Rangá, Fló probably also gives him land to the east of the Pjórsá (see 8/3-4 and Note). Surely more than coincidence accounts for the partial agreement between Fló and LánHkb on this point. Could not the Fló-author have Flosi colonize land to the east of the Pjórsá (and to the west of the Rangá) in deference to Haukr's own conceptions of the extent of his forefather's property?

Now the interest the mention of Flosi in Fló undoubtedly has in the discussion of whether the saga was written for Haukr Erlendsson is rather lessened by the fact that, in the saga as we now have it, Fosi's descendants are not traced towards Fosi prestr, Haukr's great-grandfather, let alone to Haukr himself. The line is rather taken to the Oddaverjar, from them, by an illegitimate daughter of Sæmundr Jóns-son, Margrét (see Note to 8/7), to the Asbirningar, a family from Skagafjórður, and finishes with a member of that family, Kálfr Brandsson, about whom we unfortunately know very little (cf. Note to 8/8). Now Kálfr could well have been alive when the saga was written (cf. page *395 above). We have therefore even to reckon with the possibility that Flóamanna
Saga was written, not for Haukr, but for Kálfr. But while this last fact should certainly be admitted, the following points should also be noted. First, on the basis of the scanty information we have about Kálfr, it is difficult to see what interest our southern saga would have had for this northern chieftain. Second, the very paucity of our knowledge about Kálfr makes further investigations and thus any useful conclusions concerning him impossible. Third, it is perfectly possible that the genealogy to Kálfr in ch. 6 is a later interpolation, as at least part of the genealogy to Jón Hákonarson at the saga's end probably is. And here we remember that the M-version may have had a textual history in Skagafjörður (or at least the northern part of Iceland) (see pages *16 ff.) and that the X-version has a textual history in Húnavatnssýsla, which is not far from Skagafjörður (on this third point, cf. however pages *421-4 below). Finally, the first part of the genealogy at the beginning of ch. 6 was almost certainly in the original version of the saga. And even though it could have been introduced there because Fosi was Kálfr's ancestor, it could also have been introduced because he was Haukr's.

(2) It has been argued earlier in this Introduction (pages *158 ff.) that the author of Fló did not use the original of Sturla Þórðarson's redaction of Landnámabók (i.e. Sturlubók) but a copy of it, LdnX, which was also used by Haukr when he made his redaction in Hauksbók. This proposition becomes all the more likely if there was
some connection between Haukr and the Fló-author. One might even imagine that Haukr owned LdnX, copied its text into Hauksbók in the years 1306-8 and then gave it to the establishment at Gaulverjabær as part of its library.

(3) There are reasons for suspecting that Haukr was particularly interested in Ireland (see Um Kjaln, 77 ff.) and Greenland (cf. Hauksbók, ed. Jón Helgason, 1960, xviii). That the hero of Fló visits both these countries may have something to do with the fact that the saga was written for Haukr.

(4) Fló might, according to the idea put forward here, be looked on as a work written by a cleric for a man with primarily secular interests or written by a cleric for a bishop and man with primarily secular interests. Could not either circumstance explain the curious blend of 'religious' and 'secular' elements we find in the saga and which has been discussed in the previous Section?

(5) The young Þorgils gives valuable presents to his friends and companions at Gaulverjabær before he leaves for Norway in chapter 12. Haukr was also benefactor of the people at the farm before he went to Norway in 1308. Or are Þorgils's gifts in Fló a hint?

(6) As has been mentioned above, the spítall at Gaulverjabær was probably dedicated to Saint Magnús. In Saga (1962, 475), Magnús Már Lárusson notes that there was also a hospital of Saint Magnús in Caithness in Scotland (cf. J. Mooney, St. Magnus - Earl of Orkney, 1935, 275). Could
the men of Gaulverjabær have regarded the hospital in Caithness as a sister establishment? And if they did, is it a coincidence that one of Porgils's wives is a woman from Katanes?

Finally, making the assumption that Fló was written for Haukr Erlendsson and his wife in the first decades of the fourteenth century, it is not difficult to see a way in which a copy of it could have found its way very quickly into the hands of the family of Jón Hákonarson, for whom it was, in all likelihood, being copied at the end of that century (see Section D of Chapter I). The prepenultimate person mentioned in the X-version of the saga is Gizurr galli of Viðidalstunga (Húnavatnssýsla), grandfather of Jón Hákonarson. Now Gizurr's connection with Haukr did not reside solely in the fact that, five generations back from him, his ancestor Einarr í Kallaðarnesi was brother of Bókr á Baugsstóðum, Haukr's great-great-grandfather. There were more recent connections: Gizurr's wife, whom he married in 1313, was the niece of Járngerðr, Haukr's stepmother (cf. page *404). And an even closer family tie would have been through Haukr's wife, Steinunn: Gizurr galli's father Björn and Steinunn's father Ali (Oli) were both sons of Svarthófði Dugfússon and the two were thus first cousins. Lastly, in 'Excursus I' of his monograph Um Kjaln (pages 94-9), Helgi Guðmundsson has produced good arguments to show that Haukr, on two occasions, used his influence in Norway to help Gizurr, once in about
1308 and again in about 1318. Indeed, Helgi suggests that Haukr might even have sold a farm in Norway in order to ransom his wife's cousin from the Swedes. There is, then, good reason for believing that Gizurr and Haukr were well acquainted.

Gizurr survived to the remarkable age of 101 (died 1370), outliving his cousin Steinunn by nine years. Haukr, on the other hand, died in 1334, leaving, we may now posit, a copy of Fló in his wife's possession. In the years after her husband's death, Steinunn and Gizurr would, no doubt, have maintained some sort of contact. (As far as we know, they were both only children.) A copy of Fló could therefore easily have found its way into Gizurr's hands at Víðidalstunga (or those of his son(s)), if indeed it had not already done so while Haukr was still alive. It would thus have been accessible to Gizurr's grandson Jón as soon as he started his copying activity and the fact that at least two copies of it were probably made for him (or at any rate during his lifetime) (see pages 85-7) would thus be more readily explicable.

If this construction comes near the truth, it would be interesting in at least two respects. First, it would suggest that there were a relatively small number of intermediate manuscript links between the original version of the saga and *X. This circumstance would in turn explain the way * sometimes so minutely mirrors the text of LdnX (see pages 65-7 and 158). It would further suggest
that the shortened version of the saga was in fact made for Jón Håkonarson (which it is, at any rate, theoretically convenient to accept) and also that many of the obscurities, gaucheries and inconsistencies we find in the X-version are not all due to the X-redactor but could also have been present in the original of the saga (cf. the remarks on pages *119 ff.). Second, it would cause us to take a very careful look at the end of the saga and to wonder if the larger part of the genealogies we find there in the X-version may not, after all, have also been in the original of the saga. Quite irrespective of the issue of Fló having been written at the spítall at Gaulverjábær for Haukr, one has reason to suspect that the genealogies to the bishops Þorlákr and Jórungr (61/16-9) may in fact have been in the original version of the saga. Why, we must ask ourselves, should the scribe of *X have been concerned with appending these to the saga if he had not found them in his original? In the body of the saga, it is stated that Þorlákr Þorhalls-son was one of Þorgils's descendants (see 40/14), so it would be quite natural for the saga-writer to trace the line down to him, at any rate, at the saga's end. And let us assume that the saga was written for Haukr and his wife Steinunn. It could well, in that case, have concluded with a genealogy down to both of them similar to that in chapter 326 of LdnHkb: Þorgils's descendants would be traced via Einarr í Kallaðarnesi to Steinunn and then via Börkr Í Haugsstóðum to Haukr. A scribe working for Jón Håkonarson would have
found it a relatively simple matter to turn the genealogy to Steinunn into one to Jón: instead of the words móður Ala, fóður Steinunnar (cf. LdnHkb, 115/29), he would have written móður Bjarnar, fóður Gizurar salla, fóður Hákonar, fóður Jóns. Because he wanted to end the saga with Haukr's name, the author of Fló may, as is done in LdnHkb, ch. 326, have put Haukr's genealogy after that of Steinunn. But the scribe of *X may also have wanted to put his patron's name last and may, at any rate, not have been particularly interested in Haukr. He might therefore easily have omitted a genealogy from Bókr to Haukr he found in his exemplar. Similarly, the scribe of *M (or more probably a forerunner) could well have been interested neither in the genealogies to the bishops nor to Haukr and his wife. He might therefore have omitted the lot.
Notes to Introduction

Chapter I

1 Information given on the individual manuscripts in this list is, unless otherwise stated, that furnished by the appropriate catalogue cited.

2 Positive attempts to establish the existence of manuscripts of the saga in the following collections have proved fruitless: The Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library, Edinburgh, The Royal Irish Academy, Dublin and John Ryland's Library, Manchester (see O. Skulerud, Catalogue of Norse Manuscripts in Edinburgh, Dublin and Manchester, 1918); Uppsala Universitets Bibliotek, Uppsala (see V. Gödel, Katalog öfver Uppsala Universitets Biblioteks fornisländiska och fornorska handskrifter, 1892); Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (see O. Skæbne, Catalogue des manuscrits danois, islandais, norvégiens et suédois de la Bibliothèque Nationale des Paris, 1887); Riksarkivet, Oslo (private communication from Dr. Lars Hamre of 19/10/1967; Dr. Hamre also informs the present editor that he knows of no manuscripts of Fló in other Norwégian collections); The Bodleian Library, Oxford (see A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, i, ed. R. Hunt, 1953).

3 The majority, possibly all, of the leaves of AM 564 a, 4to, which J. McKinnell has argued originally belonged to the same manuscript as *445 b, were also obtained by Arni Magnússon from Ormur Daðason (see Katalog, i, 718, and Bibl, xxx, 326).

4 This information may be gathered from notes at the end of each item in B.
5 On Slip d of AM 486, 4to, Æni writes: (recto) 'Petta er sama hond og á Bárðar Saga Snafellsács fram í Lax-
dælu og Eyrbyggju er Magnús sál. Jónsson léði mér. Er svo þessi bók komin frá Hitardal í fyrstu. Vérte.' (verso) 'Petta hefur ritað einhver sá sem hefur ætlað að imitera hond Síra Pórðar, kannske Þörsteinn Pórðar-
son, ungr.' After the words 'léði mér', the following is added in a different ink: 'p : Einar's Eyjólfssonar. Certum.'

6 This discussion anticipates the conclusions of Sections C and E of this Chapter and Section A of Chapter II.

7 When chapters of Þ are referred to in the following, their numbers, unless otherwise stated, are given from K. Þ has a different system of numbering.

8 See page *61.

9 Although Guðbrandur was undoubtedly the first to show that part of *445 b was the source for part of Þ, Finnur Magnússon, who knew only Folio 5 of the vellum, suggests in Ghm (ii, 14) that 'det er vel mueligt, at det om-
mældte vidtløftige Stykke af Recensionen Þ [i.e. our Þ] nedstammer fra andre Brudstykker' of *M. All things considered, this was a particularly happy conjecture.

10 See page *100.

11 Calculations of this type are made on the basis of the Fornsögur-edition, rather than this edition, because of its greater regularity in length of line.

12 In the Fornsögur-edition, the passage corresponding to 87/1-89/5 of this edition takes up about 50 lines, while the corresponding part of the X-version take up about 48.
13 The date of the writing of $P$ is thus a _terminus antequem_ for the writing of $LdnPb$.

14 Compare with the present argument Finnur Magnússon's remark in _Gml_, ii, 189: 'Ordene i Strophens 3die og 4de Linie ...ere aldeles forskjellige fra alle Land- namas Exemplarer, hvorved vi især 'erholde den vigtige Oplysning at det mere som indeholderes in F [i.e. our $P$] end Sagaens øvrige Exemplarer ikke kan være udkrevet af Landnama, i det mindste ikke i nyere Tider eller af de dens Codices som vi nu kjende.'

15 From Note to 6/14-5, it will be clear that the word _dyrr_ was used in the original saga for 'opening in coastal belt of rocks'; it has been misunderstood by Einar (cf. page *26 f. ). - Finnur Jónsson (Flo, 1932, v) also regarded the following readings in $P$ as the innovation of the scribe of that manuscript: _misjafnar ævistundir er hann hvaut at líða_ (cf. _mannraunir...bera, 15/6-7_); _líka, 63/7; samt, 63/19_. All these readings are found in $J$ (a manuscript which cannot be derived directly or indirectly from $P$), so he cannot be right on this point.

16 Órhallur Vilmundarson arrived at this conclusion before I did and was kind enough to communicate it to me before I began working on the manuscript tradition of the saga (cf. Note to Introduction 64 ).

17 Thus if *$X$, *$Y$ and *$x$ had _Blaðini_ at 23/3 and 9, 24/4 (cf. Textual Notes to these places), _Blaðin_ might also have arisen in $K$ and *$Z$ as a result of minim confusion.

18 Cf. however Textual Note to 36/22.

19 Finnur Jónsson (_LdnStb_, 225/4) regards AM 107 folio's
(i.e. LdnStb's) -mann as a mistake for -man as, apparently, does Jakob Benediktsson (Ldn, 1968, 376/8). That Sturluhbók, LdnX and Kossabók had -manns is, however, confirmed by the present investigation.

20 At 17/10, AM's reading agrees with that of the Z-group.

21 What the significance of Arni's addition in square brackets at 2/10 (see Textual Note ad loc) is is impossible to say.

22 The fact that AM's [reikud] at 41/9 agrees with A's reading is, of course, of no significance in this context.

23 In Arni's exemplar, e appears to have been used as a spelling for 'ræ': at 54/10, for example, Arni underlines the ræ in Ketill's óhræddu and writes e above it. Further, words with 'ræ' are sometimes spelt with 're' at 46/16, for example, Arni underlines the ræ in Ketill's Grænlande and writes e above it. As a 'back' spelling, d⁴⁷ could therefore appear for 'dregz'. But the form Arni has at 15/5 has no g.

24 It will be observed that the majority of these examples are found in the first six chapters of the saga. This fact may be significant.

25 Corresponding to fyrir hónnd beira Flosa beggja, móður-bróður síns (7/20-1), S has fyrir hónnd móður sinnar ok beggja móðurbróðra sinna. (fyrir hónnd beira Flosa beggja móðurbróður síns). Then, in the margin, Jón writes in brackets 'önnur bók hefur svo', doubtless intending to imply that the words fyrir hónnd beira Flosa beggja móðurbróður síns come from a source other than his normal exemplar. But this is clearly wrong: the words in brack-
ets, as the readings of $k$ and $A$ show, were clearly those of $\*y$ and $\*Y$ and, as $\text{ldnStb} (223/24-5)$ shows, those of $\*X$, $\*F$ and the original of the saga. Nor is $S$'s first reading found in any of the $Z$-group manuscripts used for this edition. Facts like these underline the potential unreliability of Jón's statements about his exemplars and the copies he made themselves.


28 Quoted from *Bibl*, xxx, 282-3.

29 Guðbrandur Vigfússon's theories on *Vatnshyrna* were first published in *Formsögur*, xiv-xvi and in *Bardoarsaga Snaefellsass Viglundarsaga*, ed. Guðbrandr Vigfússon, 1860, ix-xi. When Guðbrandur's views are referred to in this Section, it is to those put forward in these two places.

30 Spelt *Watzhyrna*; see Jakob Benediktsson's edition in *Opera*, ii, 57 (lines 19 and 32), 69 (line 14) and 100 (line 15).

31 The manuscript could hardly have been divided into two parts after it reached Resen's library for there is no vellum in the Resenian catalogue which contains both these sagas.

32 Jón may also have commissioned the writing of the manuscript *Hulda* (see *Hulda*, ed. J. Louis-Jensen, 1968, 14 ff.).
33 In fact, the Icelandic genealogist Steinn Dofri was the first to show how the codex could have got to Vatnshorn í Haukadal in an article published in *Svar* (Winnipeg, 1921) entitled 'Bútar úr Óttaðsögðu Islendinga frá fyrrri öldum' (cf. *Bibl*, xxx, 280 footnote 9). The present editor has, unfortunately, not seen Steinn's article.

34 On the fly-leaf of AM 448, 4to, we read in Grímur Thorkelin's hand: 'Ex Codice Academicum in folio in Bibliotheca Reseniana'. Assuming Grímur has good authority for what he says here, and bearing in mind that *R* was the only manuscript in Resen's library which contained *Eyrbyggja Saga* (see page *77*), then we must accept that AM 448, 4to is a copy of the saga in *R* (cf. also *Eyrbyggja-Saga*, ed. Grímur Thorkelin, 1787, viii). With the order *Stjórnu-Ódda Draumr, Bergbúa Pátrtr, Kumlþúa Pátrtr* and *Draumr Forsteins Síðu-Hallssonar* in AM 555 h, 4to and AM 564 c, 4to (which were originally one manuscript), we may compare the order 'Stiðru Odda draumr, Bergbua þattr, 2 Drauma vitraner' (this last description fits Kumlþúa Pátrtr and Draumr Forsteins Síðu-Hallssonar admirably) in Arni Magnússon's account of the contents of *R* (cf. page *76*). No other vellum which contains these four items is known to have been in Copenhagen in 1686 (cf. page *72*) or indeed to have existed at all. Cf. *Bibl*, xxx, 282-3 and 288.

35 On page 294 of his article in *Bibl*, Stefán writes: 'gh er ekki notað nema í *ymghilldr* C2v, *yngvildr* (tvisvar) og *ynghu(i1ldr)* C3r, sbr. *fanghelsi* F898 og 903. Annars bregður gh örsjaldan fyrir í F, t.d. *almughans* F901.' Both *K* (left uncorrected by Arni Magnússon) and *A* spell *Yngildr* at 49/19 with *ngh* between the two vowels, while El (Asgeir's part of E) *kxxxkkkcccxxxkxxxkxyp*.
and IB 225, 4to, a copy of Laxdaela Saga probably made from *R (cf. Bibl, xxx, 297) have the spelling Ínhvilliði (cf. Eyrb, 1, and Laxd, 1). Lind (Dopnamn, columns 1119-21; Supplement, columns 817-9) gives a large number of forms of Ínhvilliðr but only one other of these is spelt with an h: this is in Fló, i, 229, the part of Flateyjarbók written by Jón Póðarson!

36 Stefán Karlsson (Bibl, xxx, 299) argues from the fact that the use of n above the line for 'in' and 'inn' appears only in columns 1-10 and 899-905 of Flateyjarbók, that Vatnshyrna was written after these columns, i.e. that it was written after about 1391. On the other hand, if we accept the order of the Resenian catalogue as that of *R itself, we note that while the exemplar for E appeared as the vellum's fifth item and the exemplars for H and C at its end (cf. Arni Magnússon's supplementary notes on *R), what we may now identify with *Y would have come as its first item. If therefore we find no examples of the use of n above the line for 'in' and 'inn' in the copies of the text of Fló in *R, this might well suggest that Vatnshyrna began to be written before the columns of Flateyjarbók in question were written and that Magnús began to use the abbreviation in the course of writing *R. An investigation of manuscripts likely to have been copied from the second, third and fourth items of *R (i.e. Laxd, Vatns and Høns) might throw more light on this matter.

37 It would seem that by about 1395, Magnús had left Jón Hákonarson's service and by 1397 could well have been at the monastery at Helgafell (cf. Bibl, xxx, 300; Gerðir, 55 footnote 1). It is conceivable that *Y was written at Helgafell (with the rest of Vatnshyrna), that *Y was a copy of Fló brought with him from Húna-
vatnssvæla (Víðidalstunga?) and that *X was Jón Hák­
onarson's own copy. And in this connection, it is
interesting to note that the areas represented by the
sagas in Vatnsbyrna are geographically ranged around
the Snæfellsnes peninsula (cf. Ólafur Halldórsson,
Heiðafeðabók for Ós, 1966, 51). But it is suggest­
ed in Note to Introduction 36 that *X was written
before 1395. Cf. also what follows below.

38 Indeed, it would be interesting to see if the ortho­
graphy of K betrays any signs of Magnús's spelling.
For example, as noted, Ketill spells Yngildr at 49/19
with an h; see Note to Introduction 35.

39 See this edition 75/2-3 (and Note ad loc, where the
Greenlandic 'squirrels' are vindicated).

40 The present editor would argue that the episode in
which the rune-inscribed oar is found (this edition,
77/20-78/3) was in the original of the saga; cf.

41 Guðbrandur knew nothing, of course, of the one or
two removes between the exemplar for AM and A and
the latest common source(s) for K, AM, A and P

42 Finnur refers here to the episode where the rune­
inscribed oar is found.

43 Cf. ONOI, ii, 750.

44 At the beginning of his article in 'TgF' (429),
Björn writes: 'Hér skal t.d. ekki andmælt beint
þeirri ríkjandi skoðun, að hinn aðaltextinn að
Flóamannas., B-gerðin [i.e. the M-version] muni
víða orðinn eithamahað orðfleiri en frumsagan var.'
One wonders if Björn here seeks to imply that there are reasons to suggest that the M-version has been lengthened. If so, one would like to know what they are. If anything, the present editor has noted signs which suggest that the M-version itself has perhaps been shortened: see, for example, Notes to 68/1-2, 72/20 and 84/5; also Orig., ii, 640 footnote (cf. Note to 32/7-9); was there any explanation in the original of the saga for the katlar mentioned at 74/20-1? But the evidence here is not strong enough to form the basis for any statement on this point.

45 There are various external factors which suggest *X's and *M's independence of each other and which, taken together, are probably decisive: (i) It has been suggested above (see Note to Introduction 36) that *Y, the latest common source for AM and A, was written about 1391 or somewhat before. It is not unreasonable to assume that *X was written five years before *Y, and thus about 1385 at the latest. 'Pseudo-Vatnshyrna', on the other hand, while it might have been written as early as the 1380's, is more likely to be somewhat later (cf. page 17); indeed, before J. McKinnell's investigations, 445 b was usually dated to 1400 or rather later (see e.g. Katalog, i, 640). (ii) Stefán Karlsson (Bibl, xxx, 284) argues that the copy of Pórðar Saga hreðu in Vatnshyrna cannot be a copy of the saga in 'Pseudo-Vatnshyrna' (AM 564 a, 4to). (iii) Einar Sveinsson (IF, viii, lvii) regards the text of Vatns in 445 b as 'sumstaðar betri, sumstaðar verri' than that in Vatnshyrna. (iv) Björn Sigfússson (KL, iv, column 104) is able to state that 'den bästa av [Eyrbyggja sagas] bevarade hdskr. var Vatnshyrna'; but even so the version in 445 b has independent value (cf. IF, lvii ff.). See further on this whole matter Bibl, xxx, 335 ff.
46 Perhaps we are expected to assume that the stolen awls of 74/22 were used in making Fórarinn's tent.

47 Somewhere before 72/20, the M-version has omitted to say that Þórgóðr has died. - It seems doubtful that the author of the saga referred to Ægrímir Ellíða-Grimsson as Ægrímir Ellíðason (cf. 63/25). - Minor mistakes in M (e.g. at 82/16, 83/13 and 88/7; cf. Note to 85/19) have not been taken into account in this list.

48 If it should seem unnecessary to attempt to combat theories put forward as long ago as Nijhoff's (1937) and Guðbrandur Vigfússon's (1905) or, in Chapter III, Section A, to make such a lengthy case against any extensive 'oral tradition' about Þorgils, then attention may be drawn to two remarks made about Flo in K. Schier's Sagaliteratur published in 1969 (page 57): one is that Flo, with Grett, Svarf and Harði is 'vermutlich um 1300 aus älteren Sagas umgearbeitet'; the other is that it is 'auf ältere Tradition zurückgehend?'

49 The only review of Nijhoff's book seems to be that of S. Krijn in Museum, xlvi, 1938, columns 14-6. Miss Krijn disagrees with Nijhoff on a number of points (including his assumption that 'the Christian redactor' and the redactor of 'Fl. 2' were different persons) but even so regards it as 'zeer aannemelijk, dat we een F 1 en een F 2 kunnen onderscheiden'.

50 Surely the ten pages between Fornsögur, 149/14, the point corresponding to the end of Folio 4, and Fornsögur, 159/16, the point corresponding to the beginning of Folio 5, should be divided by 4, which is the number of pages in the shorter text in Fornsögur, i.e.
145/10-149/14, corresponding to Folio 4 (cf. page *36 above).

51 This edition, pages 71-2.

52 The following discussion anticipates much of what is said later in this Introduction, particularly pages *291-309 and also Section B of Chapter III.

53 See pages *291-*309.

54 The somewhat more speculative nature of what follows will be apparent.

55 See Note to 1/6.

56 In *E, Hákon jarl may have fallen in his battle against Atli jarl (cf. 2/1) and, at about 2/5, there may have been some statement to the effect that Hallsteinn ruled Sygnafylki and Firðafylki after the death of his father (cf. LdnX, 224/14). See pages *172-3.

57 See however 13/13, Note to 14/23, pages *243 f. and page *245.

58 Instead of material amounting to 134 lines in the shorter text of the Fornsögur-edition (as for Folio 4), there would have been material amounting to 164 lines in Fornsögur to each leaf of *M (164 = half of 328, that is half of the number of lines in the shorter text in Fornsögur between the point corresponding to the end of Folio 4 and the point corresponding to the beginning of Folio 5). Of course, if there were three leaves (cf. also page *36) between Folio 4 and Folio 5, then a considerable amount of material has been lost. But this is, as noted, the less likely proposition. And another
fact speaks against it: in the passage immediately following the lacuna, there has, as noted (see Note to Introduction 12), been little or no shortening.

59 Finnur Magnússon's B is probably to be identified with Brit. Mus. Add. 11,111 fol.

60 See pages *37-8; Note to Introduction 14; page *134; cf. Note to Introduction 9.

61 In this connection, it is interesting to note the plural af bessum verkum at 47/22; contrast af bessu verki at 12/7 and 44/9.

62 The editors of Fornsögur and Fló, 1932 are not entirely consistent in this however. Thus, at 22/27, Fornsögur has már bó and, at 43/4, Fló, 1952 has kominn. On the other hand, Pórhallur Vilmundarsson, in his edition for the Islenzk fornrit-series, normally has A's readings when they agree with the Z-group over against K. But he is not entirely consistent in this respect either: at 43/4, he has koma and, at 55/2, syndiz.

63 The present investigation has also shown that the scribe of P probably started taking readings from MP before the words Pórey hét kona... (63/1; cf. 29/18), with which previous editors have begun their texts of PM (see pages *38-*54 above). This result is, however, as noted, of little practical value in establishing a text of PM before the point in question.

64 As mentioned in Note to Introduction 16, before the present editor started work on the textual history of the saga, Pórhallur Vilmundarsson had arrived at the conclusion that the latest common source for the Z-group was independent of the latest common source for K, A
and S. Further, in the footnotes to his edition of the saga for the Islenzk fornrit-series, the proofs of which, as noted, he has been kind enough to make available to me, he gives a number of variant readings from the Z-group which he presumably regards as potentially superior to those of the Y-group. Some of these are recorded in the Textual Notes to the present edition and those which are not are as follows:

2/14  dóttir ] sonardóttir B J P
7/8-9  vinaðir ] auðugir B J P
7/19  Gaulverska ] Háleyska B J P
8/13  xv ] xx B J P
8/23  eptir ] + bessu játar Bóðvarr B J P
10/2  húskarlar ] + hans B J P
15/8  ix ] tíu B J P
15/10  margt ] allt B J P
16/1  xv ] tuttugu B J P
16/5-6  ok er ham var xvi. vetra, beiddiz ] bar eptir óskaði B J P
16/7  ösvinn[rli ] ösvinn J P
17/5  sik eiga ] at hamn ætti B J
17/22  í vestr-Vikina ] vestr (austr) í Vikina B J P (vestr í Vikina in Þórhallur's main text
19/27- ok uggir mik at eigi megi fagnaðaröl heita.
20/1  hví at vér hafim nú leitat hans marga daga ] en mik uggir bó, at fagnaðaröl heita megi, ok munum vár eigi burfa marga daga hans at leita B J P
25/20-1  hvat skilit var ] sem heyrðu hvat skilit var B J P
28/8  láta ]+Petta var um kveldit B J P
28/8  bokka eðr hót ] óbokka B J P
32/2  sjóðinn ] fésjóðinn B J (=P)
32/25  Þorgils áhlýðdiz lítt við bat ] Pat áhlýðdiz Þorgils B J (Þórhallur regards this as an emendation.)
A few remarks may be made on the Z-group readings here. The fact that, at 32/2 and 33/6, B and J agree with PM over against the Y-group does not necessarily mean that they have the reading of *X: as has been shown above (pages *30 ff.), the scribe of P, when copying MP, frequently reverted to his Z-group exemplar and took readings from it: résjóðinn and godðóri could therefore easily have found their way into P from *Z (cf. Note to 33/6). At 16/1, an age of fifteen for Porgils would seem to be more the age young Icelanders think of making their first journeys abroad than twenty (cf. quotation from VG1 on page *242). A reading í eyjum at 45/7, is surely better than that of *Z: at 46/9 and 24, islands are mentioned in *Z just as they are in *Y. And one can see no real reason why Pórhallur Vilmundarson should adopt J’s and B’s vestr í Vikina into his main text in preference to the Y-group’s vestr-Vikina. All in all, there is no compelling reason why any of these Z-group readings cited by Pórhallur should be preferred to those of *Y in reconstructing a text of *X.

65 However mechanical this procedure may seem, it is gratifying to note how, when applied to a short

Chapter II

66 Haukr's postscript may be quoted in its entirety from Ldn, 1968, 395 and 397: Nú er yfir farit um landnám bau, er verit hafa á Islandi, eptir því sem fróðir menn hafa skrifat, fyrst Ari prestr hinn fróði Porgilsson ok Kol-skeggr hinn vitri. En þessa bók ritaða [ekl]. Haukr Erlendsson, eptir þeiri bók, sem ritat hafði herra Sturla legraðr, hinn fróðasti maðr, ok eptir þeiri bók annarri, er ritat hafði Styrmir hinn fróði, ok hafða ek bat ór hvárri, sem fremar greindi, en mikill þorri var bat, er þar segðu eins báðar, ok því er þat ekki at undra, þó [at] þessi Landnámabók sé lengri en nokkur onnur.

67 On the basis of parts of LdnPóð unedited when Jón Jón-annesson wrote Garðir, Jakob Benediktsson is able to show that Melabók contained the following stories which were also found in chapters 5-8 of Sturlubók (cf. LdnStb, 131/15-133/28): (i) the quarrels of Leifr and Ingólfr with the sons of Atli; (ii) Leifr's adventures in Ireland; (iii) the story of the Irish thralls murdering Leifr and making off to Vestmannaeyjar (cf. Ldn,
In this connection, attention may be drawn to some rather problematic agreements between LdnPöb and Fló over against LdnSkb and LdnStb in the section which deals with the quarrel over Viðiskógr and Pórör's killing of Hrafn: Hrafn Porvīdarsón, LdnSkb, 177/9, and LdnStb, 225/20] + móðurbróðir hans, LdnPöb, 21/6-7, and Fló, 8/18; Smalamaðr, LdnSkb, 177/11, and LdnStb, 225/23] Smalamaðr (saúðamaðr s(egirá) Landnáma), LdnPöb, 21/10; sauðamaðr, Fló, 10/2; vetrar(1), LdnSkb, 177/16, and LdnStb, 225/28] + andaðis Atli (Atli andaðis, LdnPöb) heima í Traðarholti, LdnPöb, 21/17, and Fló, 11/8-9; hann, LdnSkb, 177/16, and LdnStb, 225/28] Pórör, LdnPöb, 21/17; cf. Fló, 11/18; bessu, LdnSkb, 177/20, and LdnStb, 225/33] + verki, LdnPöb, 21/25, and Fló, 12/7. We may also note LdnPöb's unique reading at 21/22-4: Ózurr ok Porgrímr feðgar liggjs í einum haugi báðir skammt frá Traðarholti.

There would seem to be three possible sources for these readings in LdnPöb: (a) lost parts of the Melabók-redaction of Landnámabók; (b) the X-version of Fló; (c) the M-version of Fló. It would be desirable, although not absolutely necessary to assume that all these readings came from a single source. In favour of (a), and against (b) and (c), is the reference to Landnáma at 21/10 of LdnPöb; it is by this name that Pórör normally refers to the Melabók-version of Landnámabók (cf. Gerðir, 25 (N.B. line 26) f.; Ldn, 1968, 375 footnote).
And if the reading saudamaðr (together possibly with others mentioned) is taken from lost parts of LdnMlb then we must at least consider the possibility that that redaction has come under the direct influence of Fló in the appropriate section: it will be argued below (pages 204 ff.) that the whole story of the quarrel over Viðiskógr was not in the Styrmisbók-redaction of Landnamabók but was introduced into the Landnáma tradition by Sturla Póðarson (see however Note to Introduction 72); further, an agreement between LdnMlb and Fló (saudamaðr) over against Sturla-bók (smaļamaðr) points to direct influence by Fló on LdnMlb; finally, we know that the Melabók-redaction of Landnamabók did draw directly on certain Isleningasögur, particularly those in which, as in Fló, ancestors of the Melamenn appear (see Ldn, 1968, lxxxvii and 380-1 footnote 3). On the other hand, if the Melabók-redaction did draw on Fló, one would really expect to find more evidence of it in LdnPðb. The evidence for the use of Vatnsdæla Saga by the Melabók-redaction is considerably greater (cf. Ldn, 1968, lxxxvii). Indeed, were it not for the readings of LdnPðb at 21/10 and 21/22-4, one might prefer to assume that Pórður himself was drawing on the X-version of Flóamanna Saga. We know that he did draw directly on various sagas (cf. Gerðir, 29 f. and 33-5) and could well have taken the reading at LdnPðb, 21/17, for instance, from Fló to elucidate an otherwise rather obscure series of events in his Skarðsárbók-exemplar. Finally, while Einar Eyjólfsson seems only to have used *M from Folio *2 on (cf. pages 50 ff.), it is not entirely out of the question (although one must admit rather unlikely) that Pórður had access to the part of *M which contained the story of the Viðiskógr quarrel. And the leaves of *M in question might have belonged together with the leaves of *445 b which con-
tained the Melubók-Landnámabók. The reference to Landnáma at 21/10 might therefore be explained.


70 The following point may be worth making: If we accept (i) the stemma on page 166 and (ii) that Ol mest, LdnHkb and Fló all have a common source later than the latest common source they share with LdnStb (cf. page 166), then we would, on the basis of this opposition: Fló = LdnHkb / Ol mest = LdnStb, have to posit an intermediary (we may call it LdnY) between Sturlubók and LdnX:

```
Sturlubók (gerðu)
  /\            /\            /\  
LdnY (gerðu) Resensbók (gerðu)
  /\                  /\        /\     
LdnX (fóru) Fló   LdnHkb (fóru) Ol mest LdnStb (gerðu)
```

71 For chapters 2-3, 6-8 and 18 of 'Fl. 2', Nijhoff (Beschouwing, 8 f., 17-21, 24-9, 172) sees as sources, in addition to 'Fl. 1' and Landnámabók, three oral stories. His main argument for the existence of these again seems to be the fact that the chapters in question contain considerably more material not found in Landnámabók than chapters 1, 4, 5, 9 and 10. But much of the extra material in the chapters in question can be shown to be literary borrowings or additions to Landnámabók's text by the author of the saga himself (see pages 173-80, 183-8, 192-6). And another of Nijhoff's arguments (Beschouwing, 8), based on the appearance of such phrases as svá er sagt at 3/2 and 3/18 has very little weight in this connection (cf. Note to
72 In the above, it is assumed that the story of the quarrel over Víðiskógr and its aftermath was an introduction into *Landnámabók* by Sturla Þórðarson; the possibility exists, although is considerably less likely, that *Styrmisbók* was here drawing on a source other than its normal *Landnámabók* exemplar; cf. Note to Introduction 68.

73 After the above had been written, the following statement by Finnur Jónsson (*Ldn*, 1) was noticed by the present editor: 'Kap. 376 (331) [*LdnStb*, 225/8-226/2] synes tildels at være et uddrag af en saga (en ældre, tabt Flóamannasaga?; jfr. den nu eksistende meget unge saga). Noget lignende synes at gælde om det følgende kap. [*LdnStb*, 226/2-29]'. As noted, the present editor does not think it likely that anything which could be called 'an older Flóamanna Saga' is the source of *Sturlubók*, chapters 376 and 377. On the other hand, Finnur's remark is clearly of interest to the above discussion, particularly as Jón Jóhannesson (*Gerðir*) and Jakob Benediktsson (*Ldn*, 1968) appear to be silent on the possibility of a source of the type the present editor visualizes lying behind the chapters in question.

74 It is possible to think of other phenomena which might qualify as sources. It is suggested on page *300* that the Fló-author, when writing his saga, may have been influenced by pictures of St. Martin which he knew from church decorations. And gestures conventionally used when telling (oral) stories (cf. H. Chaytor, *From Script to Print*, 1945, 55) could conceivably also be classified as sources.

75 There may well have been 'subconscious influence' by
Some critics accept statements like... as evidence for oral sources (see e.g. Note to 3/2).

On the other hand, we should not entirely despair of finding an author's actual written source. The manuscript AM 677, 4to could actually have been read by the Fló-author and elements borrowed from it introduced into his saga (see pages *304 f.). Cf. Einar Sveinsson, A Njálshöfu, 1943, 10 f.

Compare with Fló's bingrækr við þá er eigi vildu sik vel síða (89/10-1), The Legendary Saga of St. Öláfr's ósvífr við ósíðamenn (Olaís Saga hins helga, ed. O. A. Johnsen, 1922, 27).

R. Boer thinks that the story of Þórr's and Hámir's fishing expedition has influenced Grett (see Grettis Saga, ed. R. Boer, 1900, 182 footnote).

Professor Peter Foote has suggested to the present editor that Loptr's words at 16/11 may be an adumbration of Þorgrimr's death at 28/β3. In that case there may be no omission here.

An interesting discussion of Gunnhildr's background and character by Sigurður Nordal is to be found in Samtíð og saga, i, 1941, 135-55; cf. Darstellung, 133 ff.

Compare the words of Gunnhildr at Fló (17/14) with Haraldr's parting words to Hrútr in Nj.

Note also the possible use of like-sounding names, e.g. Gyrðr instead of Gyrgir at 24/9; cf. page *279 f.; Hrólfjr. instead of Ólfjr at 42/7; cf. page *339.
The inappropriateness of the designation 'pre-animistic' for such beliefs is rightly pointed out by C. von Sydow (N., xix, 99).

Although 'The Bear's Son's Tale' will be referred to in the following analysis of the story of Porgils's fight with Björn's father, it has been felt unnecessary to describe the type in detail here. A full discussion will be found in F. Panzer's Studien zur germanischen Sagengeschichte, i, 1910, 1-246 (cf. R. Chambers, Beowulf: An Introduction, 1959, 41-68). Some scholars prefer to call the type 'The Three Stolen Princesses' (see G. Garmonsway and J. Simpson, Beowulf and its Analogues, 1968, 331).

From the following analysis, it will be apparent that the first aptrganga story in Fló has much in common with the account of Óláfr's fight with Þormóðr in Háv, ch. 2. Whether the likeness is great enough to posit a direct connection between the two is another matter. Further, it is difficult to date these two sagas comparatively and there to say which is most likely to have influenced the other.

The part played by the duel in the legal system of Viking Age Iceland is stressed by K. Maurer (Upphaf allsherjarríkis á Islandi, 1882, 176 ff.; Maurer's views met opposition from V. Finsen (Om det oprindelige Ordning af nogle af den islandske Fristats Institutioner, 1888, 116 ff.).

For a discussion of the duel in the Viking Age, see KL, s.v. Einvígi and Holmgang; O. Bø, Medieval Scandinavia, 1969, 132-48.

Because of its lack of conformity to pattern, Porgils'
duel with Helgi in chapter 34 is left out of consideration in this connection.

90 A good analysis of these stories is given by Dehmer in Erzählungsautom, 86-91.

91 Cf. also A. Drachmann, De navngivne Sværd, 1967 19 f.

92 In (c), in the account of the kerganga, we are told that Æorgils hafði sverðit Jarðhússnaut. Randviðr hafði álnarkefli ok digrt mjók. In Note to 26/23-5, 27/3-4, it will be suggested that rather than being a literary or oral element, the story of the kerganga was invented by the author of the saga on the basis of certain types of duel which were actually taking place on the Continent at the time he was writing. Likewise, when the author of the saga was writing, the ell-long cudgel seems to have been a common weapon used in single combat (see again Note to 26/23-5, 27/3-4) and thus may well be a detail from reality rather than from literature. It is, however, interesting to note a literary parallel to Æorgils's and Randviðr's weapon in rather an unexpected source, 'King Frodo's Law of Duel' in Saxo (128): Sin autem quavis de re pugilem popularis impeteret, ipsum armatus exciperet cubitali dumtaxit stipite pugnaturum. Parallels to Saxo of this type in the Icelandic sagas must be rare. They are not unknown however. Sigurður Nordal (Hrafnkatla, 1940, 38) points out that Sámr's treatment of Hrafnkell in Hrafn, ch. 5, is strongly reminiscent of Jarmeric's punishment of the Wends in Saxo, book 8. Sigurður seems to suppose that both Hrafn and Saxo go back to a common source. But is it not possible that Saxo could have influenced both Hrafn and Fló directly?
Of the words *Par váru ok tvær konur; var önnur ung ok fríð en önnur gómul ok bó fríð* (24/24-5), Dehmer (*Erzählungsart*, 135 (note 434)) remarks that this is 'eine Formel, die auch sonst in den I.-S. auftritt'. He gives no examples, but on page 136 (note 458) compares with the words in Fló a passage from Fær (14: *bar sátu konur ii., önnur við aldr en önnur ung stúlka; báðar váru bær fríðar sjónum*).

On possible, historical background to stories of Scandinavians rading *jarðhús* in Ireland, see *Ibn*, 1968, cxxxvi and the references cited there.

No special attention is otherwise given to Fló's use of 'die epische Dreizahl' in this thesis. See however on this subject Beschouwing, 131-4 and L. Alfred Bock in Arkiv, 1921, 261-313 (particularly pages 274 ff.) and 1922, 51-83.

From chapter 19 to the middle of chapter 25, and from chapter 33 to the end of the saga, the M-version is preserved and comparisons are often made with it rather than with the X-version.

The actual verse is not quoted. Jón Olafsson's text simply says that *Gestr kveðr bá vísu þeirrar meiningar, at hann veri búinn til at leika við hann sem Styr ok rjóða báðar kír hans í bloyði*. Could the Fló-author have got the idea for Órey's red cheeks at 64/12 ff. (30/22 ff.) from this verse?

Both these sagas were originally written in Latin but are now known only in Norse translation. On the difficult question of their preservation, see KL, s.v. Olafs saga Tryggvasonar and the references cited there. Gunnlaugr's work presents particular problems as its
translation exists only as part of Ol mest which was written in the first part of the fourteenth century.
The question of exactly what parts of the latter belonged to Gunnlaugr's work has been studied by Bjarni Áðalbjarnarson in Om de norske kongers sagaer (1937, 92 ff.). Bjarni's conclusions, it should be noted, have not gone unchallenged (e.g., A. Holtsmark in Nordisk Tidskrift, 1937, 615). Even so, it may be pointed out at this stage that four out of the five passages from Ol mest referred to in this sub-section are considered by Bjarni to be derived from Gunnlaugr's saga (the exception is the story of Finnr and Sveinn in Ol mest, ii, 112-3). For the general literary background to Gunnlaugr's and Oddr's works, the present editor is indebted to L. Lönnroth's 'Studier i Olaf Tryggvason's saga', Samlaren, 1963, 54-94.

Various scholars (e.g., H. Ljungberg, Den nordiska religionen och kristendom, 1938, 125) think that Porgils's dreams of Þórr represent the intellectual struggle of a heathen before his final conversion to Christianity. One rather doubts if the author of the saga intended to represent Porgils's conversion in any such way. It was rather immediate and complete. As E. Vesper (Christen und Christentum in den isländischen Sagas, typewritten Leipzig thesis, 1950, 104) writing about Porgils's dreams remarks: 'um seelische Konflikte handelt es sich dabei nicht, sondern um die vom Verfasser konstruierten verschiedenartigsten Situationen in denen ein Christ sich zu bewähren hat.'

Compare also the way Þórr kills Porgils's livestock with the way Glámr kills horses in Grett, ch. 35.

For the same reason, no doubt, Porgils lét hæiti af nýta the boar at 32/12.

In A Njálsbúó (1943, 8 ff.), Einar Ól. Sveinsson argues the influence of Gregory's Dialogues on Nj, and in Nordica et Anglica (ed. A. Orrick, 1968, 140-7), D. Strömbäck the influence of the same work on the early Kings' Sagas. Strömbäck's article, entitled 'Some Remarks on Learned and Novelistic Elements in the Icelandic Sagas', is of broader interest to the whole subject here under discussion.

Christian visions in Old Norse literature are discussed by K. Liestøl, Draumkvæde, 1946, 79-91.

The word helgir, because of its alliteration with hjálpa and hreint, would seem to be more original than the M-version's dyrôligir.

Other instances of the influence of vision literature on the family sagas must be few and far between. Gísli's dream-strophes in Gísl, where the hero tells of his visions of the Other World, clearly contain Christian symbolism (see G. Turville-Petre, 'Gísli Súrsson and his Poetry', Modern Language Review, 1944, 387 f.), whether these strophes were composed by the author of the saga or somewhat earlier is uncertain.

The author's apparent ignorance of Greenlandic conditions (cf. Notes to 45/7-8, 45/19, 47/23, 70/23, 84/25; cf. Notes to 38/24 and 75/2-3) is surprising, particularly when compared with the relatively accurate picture of the country and its topography given in Króka-Refs Saga, a work which must have been roughly contemporary with Fló (cf. LF, xiv, xxxvi f.). In this respect Fló seems to tend towards works like
Jókuls Pátr Púasonar (ÍF, xiv, 46-59) where Greenland is represented as a land of trolls (cf. Note to 79/17-20), or Bárðr, where, as well as trolls, there are cauldrons full of gold, wild bulls and other fantastic features.

108 Helgi also draws attention to these elements in chapters 15 and 27-8 of Fló.

109 Of the passage in question, Nijhoff (Beschouwing, 77) writes: 'Overigens schijnt deze passage van de dorst en het middel ertegen wel echt. Het doet sterk denken aan het oude scheepsjournal van Willem IJsbrantsz. Bontekoe.' While, however, Bontekoe (Louvraenel, 1646, 17-8) may have drunk his own urine, he strongly recommends his men not to drink sea-water.

110 In connection with this story in Fló, Hermann Pálsson (Tímarit Máls og Menningar, 1960, 54) draws attention to a learned 'clause' found in Hauksbók (116) (based on Plinius, who in turn cites Aristophanes; see KL, s.v. Hermafrudit): Ernorfrodite heita menn er geirvörtu hafa ina hægri sem karlar, en hina vinstri sem konur; beir mega vera bæði fàður ok mæður barna sinna ('Hermafrudites are those men whose right nipple is as a male's and left nipple as a female's. They can be both father and mother to their children.' ) Hermann believes that Fló is here influenced by a 'clause' of similar content and sees this influence among those exerted by international works of learning on sagas relating to America and Greenland (cf. Hermann Pálsson, 'Islenzkar fornsvögur og Isidor frá Seville', Tímarit Ævarafnissfrélagas Islendinga, 1966, 36-7). The present editor is not convinced by Hermann's arguments, particularly in view of his own theories as to the episode's significance and origins. - In Morgunblaðið
S. Frederiksen produces a story from East-Greenlandic Eskimo tradition so similar to this one in Fló, that one must assume direct influence by the latter in modern times, rather than that both stories reflect events which actually took place.

Fur garments are, in general, a common garb for trúll-konur (see Motif-Index, F455-2.44 and, e.g., Órv, 23).

Ém áhankaz must be understood in the sense (i) 'someone becomes entangled' (see Zoëga, 32) and (ii) in some such sense as 'to go wrong for someone'.

On belief in fylgjur, see Rel, i, 224 ff.; Myth, 227 ff.

H. Naumann (in Edda, Skalden, Saga; ed. H. Schneider, 1952, 324) considers the closest parallel to the dream in Snorri is Ruodlieb and Schach (op. cit.) also suggests that the German poem was Snorri's source. The present editor finds the Norman version closer, however (cf. J. de Vries, Kleine Schriften, 1965, 193).

This motif would also have been known through Tree of Jesse iconography; cf. KL, s.v. Jesse rot och stam.

Porgils playing the half-wit in a boat at 46/25-6 and being laughed at by those he is deceiving reminds us of Gísli doing the same thing in Gísl, ch. 26.

Note also the way in which Porgils, when he does win back his ancestral lands in Norway (23/25-6), is quick to put them into Þorsteinn's hands (26/12-3).
Research in its present state regards much of what is said in Landnámabók, at least that work in its original form (cf. pages *149* ff. above), as reasonably trustworthy from an historical point of view. This applies to the names of the landnámsmenn and their descendants and the extent of the land they settled when they came to Iceland. There is no special reason for mistrusting a good deal of what Fló has borrowed from LdnX on these points (cf. also, for example, 12/4-5 and Note). On the other hand, as already observed, Sturla Pórðarson in his redaction of Landnámabók has added much material from Icelandic sagas of the thirteenth century and from other sources and this material is often quite untrustworthy from an historical point of view. Thus, for example, one has little or no faith in the stories of Ingólfr, Leifr and the sons of Atli (chapters 2 and 3), nor the circumstances surrounding Helgi's killing of Þórgímir (chapter 18). Further, one doubts whether the material with which the Fló-author fills out LdnX contains much that is historical and it seems certain that it contains much that is unhistorical. On the other hand, there are points on which the author of Fló has either changed or added to LdnX had and on which he might have been influenced by what might be called 'bygdetradition' (see note to No. 40 on page *182*; the way he has changed Hásteinn in LdnX to Hallsteinn; cf. the remarks on the first word of Helgi trausti's verse in Appendix I).

Cf. KL, s.v. Flóamanna saga: 'Sagans slutdel, kap. 29-35, som verkar vara släkttradition, handlar om
It is not necessary in this context or indeed at all to go into the 'chronology' of the saga in detail (cf. Guðbrandur Vigfússon, 'Um tímal til Islendingasar—sögum í fornöld', Sæf, 1856, 421-2; Íslandsögur, xxv f.; Orig, ii, 632; ÓNÓ, ii, 751; Fló, 1932, xii f.; Arnesb, 50 ff.; 'TGF', 445 footnote). One place has been pointed out where the sequence of events in Fló would seem to be at odds with what can be deduced from Ari's Íslendingabók (see Note to 61/6-9); and Þorgils's meeting Eiríkr in Greenland would be much better thought of as taking place before the official acceptance of Christianity in Iceland rather than after it. There are also other places where the saga seem defective in this respect (cf. Arnesb, 52: 'Sagan úr og grúir af tímaskekkjum'). But even if Fló's chronology could be perfectly reconciled with exterior chronology, this fact would, of course, not be an argument for historicity (cf. Problem, 42 and the references cited there).

And even these words have echoes elsewhere: Vatns, ch. 46: Koðrán tok trú ok skírn í fyrsta lagi ok kona hans.

An aspect of the historical Þorgils's life is possibly hinted at by the reference in Byskupa Ættir (see Note to 61/14-9) to one of his sons, Einarr (not mentioned in Fló), as fóstri Knúts ins ríka. While the name Knútr is found applied to Icelanders, the present editor has not been able to find record of any one in Iceland bearing it as well as the nickname inn ríki. On the other hand, Knútr inn ríki is the normal Icelandic name for Canute the Great and he and Þorgils must have been approximate contemp-
oraries. The historical Þorgils may therefore have visited Denmark or even England.

123 Indeed, when we discover that the Fló-author may, at 58/21–2, have been influenced by a story from Islb, ch. 3, where a man slays his thrall or freedman at a place since called Kolsgjá (see Note to 58/14), we may even wonder if the name Kolslékr itself is not the invention of the Fló-author. It is, at any rate, no longer known as a place-name (see Note to 58/22).

124 As noted (pages *111 ff.), the 'religious' element in Fló actually led the editor of the saga in Oríg to date his 'Thorgisl's Saga' to about 1200.

125 Bysk, iii, 2; fornaldarsögur and Islendingasögur would seem to be referred to here (cf. Hermann Pálsson, Sagnaskemmtun Islendinga, 1962, 150). If prejudices like Einarr's were widely nurtured, we can see one very good reason why a clerical author of Fló should choose Þorgils, rather than his father or grandfather, as hero of his saga.

126 Who is more likely to have brought the story of the cock and hen (55/9–14) to Iceland than Jón Halldórsson, educated in Paris and Bologna, and known for his story-telling (cf. page *356)?

127 The theory that Fló was written at Gaulverjabær for Haukr Erlendsson expressed in Section C of this chapter is not incompatible with the idea that it was written under the influence of Jón Halldórsson's view to secular literature. Jón must surely have known Haukr, for both men must have spent a good deal of their time in Bergen between the years 1310 and 1320 (Ev, ii, viii; Hauksbók, iii). Jón might even have owed his
preferment partly to Haukr's influence. And with Eyrar known to be Jón's landing-place on his first arrival in Iceland in 1323 (see Ann, 152, 205, 346, etc.), it is easy to assume that he made immediate acquaintance with Haukr's foundation, a connection he would, no doubt, have closely maintained.

128 The evidence of the form -at at 59/7 (87/1) and Vas-k-alt at 77/22 is of little importance here as both forms appear in set phrases or verses (cf. Dating, 97 and 101 and footnote 6).

129 It is perhaps worth noting, however, that Bárðar Saga may have influenced Víglundar Saga; cf. J. de Vries, Altnordische Literaturgeschichte, 1967, 532. - In Note to Introduction 68, the possibility that the Melabók-redaction of Landnámabók was influenced by Fló is mentioned. It is usually conjectured that the Melabók-redaction was either compiled by Snorri Markússon á Melum or by his son Þorsteinn, Abbot of Helgafell (died 1353), with preference given to the first alternative (see Ldn, 1968, lxxiii f. and the references cited there). If Snorri Markússon did know Fló, then a terminus ante quem for the dating of the saga would be 1313, the date of Snorri's death. But the evidence that Fló did in fact exert influence here is unfortunately too tenuous to be seriously taken into account in the present context.

130 Cf. also Note to 65/7 and the use of the word ómaga-bú at 67/19 (cf. Note to 33/14). Björn Sigfússon remarks ('TgF', 446): 'Skortur þekkingar á þjóðveldis-lögum mun haфа verið eiththvað minni hjá höfundin en Vaz. ritara.'

131 It should however be noted here that we do have a ref-
ere in the sources to Traðarholt at the end of the thirteenth century. Ægrímr Órsteinnsson, originally from Vatnsdalr in the north of Iceland, was given Baugsstaðir by Bishop Árni Þorlákon and probably moved to that farm in the 1270’s. He later quarrelled with the bishop however, and by 1284, it seems, had moved to Traðarholt in anticipation of the bishop turning him out of Baugsstaðir. The words of Arnar Saga byskups (Bysk, i, 391) are: Herra Ågrímur var bá ok kominn byggðum í Traðarholt. Þar hafði hann látit húsa sér til vara, ef byskup taki af honum Baugsstaði. They suggest that the farm was in a bad state of repair until Ægrímr moved there (or perhaps even uninhabited) and it is not, at any rate, surprising that we hear of no church there. Ægrímr died in 1285 and it is usually assumed that his son Eyjólfr, who, like his father was a sýslumaðr, lived on at Traðarholt, although there is no direct statement to this effect in any source. Eyjólfr himself died in 1302 and we know nothing of the inhabitants of the farm until the seventeenth century. It might even have been uninhabited when Fló was written. And there are other reasons against a connection between the writing of the saga and Ægrímr’s son or descendants. One is that if Fló was written for (or even by) any member of this family, it would be more than a little peculiar that the author of the saga should choose, as the worsted opponent of his hero, a man called Ægrímr, who, like Ægrímr Órsteinnsson was a newcomer to the south of Iceland from the north (cf. Orig, ii, 632 f.). See further on Ægrímr and Traðarholt: Bogi Benediktsson, Sýslumannaæfirl, 1909-15, 202-4; Vigfús Guðmundsson, Saga Eyrarbakka, 1945, 230; Guðni Jónsson, Bólstadaðir og búendur í Stokkseyrarhreppi, 1952, 24 and 177.

132 We learn from Ragn (169) that Höfða-Pórðr was a
descendant of Ragnarr loðbrók. And Haukr traced his ancestry back to Hófða-Pórðr (cf. page 407). These facts could well account for the appearance in Hauka-bók (pages 458-67) of Ragnarsson's Pátrr.

133 Cf. however with the following argument the following in Ldn, 1968, lxxix, concerning LdnHkb: 'A svæðínu frá Kjalarnesi til Akraness...kveður einna mest að viðbótvum og breytingum Hauks, og hefur hann vafalitið stuðzt við munnmæli sem lifað hafa á þeim slóðum...
Pessar viðbætur Hauks benda til sérstaks kunnuggleika á því svæði sem um er að ræða, og er líklegt að hann hafi átt heima lengur eða skemur á þeim slóðum.'

134 Could Kálfur have anything to do with the spíttetr at Gaulverjabær? The saga might even have been written there by him or under his supervision.

135 In chapter 22 of the saga (see particularly M-version), the Greenland-farers are living together in a hall divided into two by a partition. Jósteinn and his party occupy one half: they stay up late into the night, play games and generally enjoy themselves. But for this they get their punishment. Þorgils's party, on the other hand, as their leader admonishes them on no less than three occasions (cf. page 119), lead a quiet life, go to bed early and mind their prayers: they are saved from the plague which strikes down the other party. The moral of the story is obvious. Now it is interesting that in seeking to establish a connection between Haukr Erlandsson and Kjalnesinga Saga, Helgi Guðmundsson writes as follows (Um Kjaln, 81 footnote 4): 'Ef til vill ma...nefna...atriði, sem [kemur] ekki fyrir í Kjalnesinga sögu...Björn Póðarson...[in Skírnir, 1946, 110] segir: "Hér skal bent á það sérstaklega, að Haukur lögmaður
hefur ekki hirt um að rita upp frásögnina um gleði og skemmtan í Brattahlið [cf. Eir, nos. 265-7]."
Má bera þetta saman við orð Jóhannesar Halldórssonar ...
[concerning Kjaln in IF, xiv, xvii]: "Menn fara til leika, en ekki er frekar sagt frá þeim leikum."'

136 Helgi Guðmundsson (Um Kjaln, 80) suggests that one of Haukr's books, Hauksbók, might be located in Húnavatnssýsla 'upp úr miðri 14. öld'.

137 We should have to reconsider it if we wish to explain the genealogy down to Kálf Brandsson in ch. 6 by supposing that he owned a manuscript of the saga (cf. page *419).

138 And here we remember that *M, like *X, may easily have been written in the northern part of Iceland (see pages *16 f.) and that we know of no other medieval manuscript of the saga than the original, *F, *X, *Y, *Y' and *M.

139 Cf. page *123: 'These omissions would certainly seem to localize the X-redactor in a part of Iceland other than the south-western lowland.'
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(For abbreviations used in Textual Notes, see page 91)

445 b - AM 445 b, 4to in its present form (see page *14 ff.)

*445 b - The original manuscript of which the leaves of 445 b are surviving fragments.

A - AM 517, 4to (see page *21).

App - The section of the text of P edited as Appendix I of this thesis. Any numbers following an oblique stroke (e.g. App/13) are line numbers.

AM - Variant readings added by Arni Magnússon to Ketill Jörundarson's text in K (see page *20).

B - The copy of Fló in IB 45, 4to (see page *22).

C - AM 564 c, 4to. Any following references are folio references.

E - AM 448, 4to. Any following numbers are this manuscript's page numbers.

(F) - The parts of Flateyjarbók (Gl. kgl. smi. 1005, I-II, fol.). Following references are column numbers.

*F - The latest common source for *M and *X.

Fló - Flóamanna Saga (this edition unless otherwise stated).

Folio *2 - The folio immediately preceding Folio *3 in *445 b.

Folio *3 - The folio immediately preceding Folio 4 in *445 b.
Folio 4 - Folio 4 of 445 b
Folio 5 - Folio 5 of 445 b

H - AM 555 h, 4to. Any following references are folio references.

J - The copy of Fló in AM 165 m, fol. (see pages *22-3).
K - AM 516, 4to (the part written by Ketill Jörundarson) (see pages *19-20).

KZ - Variants added by Ketill Jörundarson to the main text of K, which have as their source a manuscript called ZK (cf. page *64).

LdnX - The manuscript of Landnámabók used by the author of Fló (whether identical with Sturlubók or not; on the question of their identity, see pages *158 ff.). It has occasionally been convenient to refer to LdnX by page, line or chapter and, when this is done, it is according to LdnStb (see Bibliographical abbreviations).

M - The fragments of Fló in 445 b.

*M - The text of Fló in *445 b.

MP - The fragments of *M (not all of which survive now) to which Einar Eyjólfsson had access when he wrote P (see page *30).

*R - A now lost manuscript containing Fló which was presented to the University of Copenhagen in 1675 (cf. pages *75 ff.).

Resensbók - A now lost manuscript containing a copy of Sturla Pórðarson's redaction of Landnámabók which was an intermediary between Sturlubók and LdnStb (cf. page
150 and Gerðir, 10).


Sturlubók - The original manuscript of Sturla Pórðarson's redaction of Landnámabók. It has occasionally been convenient to refer to this by page, line or chapter and, when this is done, it is according to LdnStb (see Bibliographical abbreviations).

X - The latest common source for the texts of the X-group.

X-group - The group of texts: K(AM), A, S, B, J and P (without PM).

Y - The latest common source for the texts of the Y-group.

Y-group - The group of texts K(AM), A and S.

Y1 - The latest common source for the texts of the Y-group.

Y1 - The manuscript of the Skarðsárbók-redaction of Landnámabók used by Pórður Jónsson when he compiled LdnPósb (cf. page 44).

Z - The latest common source for the texts of the Z-group.

Z-group - The group of texts comprising AM, A and S.

Z - The latest common source for the texts of the Z-group.

Z - The group of texts comprising B, J and P (without PM).


Z-group - J and P (without PM).

ZK - The manuscript on which certain marginal readings in K are based (cf. page 64).

P - AM 515, 4to (see pages 23 ff.).

PM - That part of P which is a copy of MP (see pages 30 ff.).
PM4 - The part of P which is mainly a copy of Folio 4
  (cf. pages *30 ff.).
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(Occasionally quotations from other editions are given in normalized form in this thesis and this is done without signal. Where proper names are involved (e.g. when biographical details are given in the Commentary), page references are not always given, but the reader is referred to the index in the work cited.)

Aarbøger - Aarbøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie, 1866-
Afmælisrit - Afmælisrit helst Einari Arnórssyni, 1940.
Alter - V. Lachmann, Das Alter der Harðar Saga, 1932.
Arkiv - Arkiv för (for) nordisk filologi, 1883-
Arbók - Arbók hins íslenska fornleifafélags, 1880-
Arnesb - Einar Arnórsson, Arnesbing á landnáms- og sögu-öld, 1950
Attatáknarir - Stefán Einarsson, 'Attatáknarir í fornritum',


Beschouwing - P. Nijhoff, De Flóamanna Saga. Een Textkritische Beschouwing over de Sammenstelling en de Bronnen, 1937 (Utrecht thesis; appeared also as volume 3 of Van Gorcum’s Litteraire Bibliotheek, 1937).

Bibl - Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana, 1941-
Blöndal - Sigfús Blöndal, Islensk-dönsk orðabók, 1920-1.
Brattahlid - P. Nörlund and M. Stenberger, Brattahlid, 1934.


DT - Diplomatarium Islandicum, published by Híð íslenzka bókmentafél ag, 1857-

Drei Lyg - Drei Lygisgur, ed. Á. Lagerholm, 1927.


Eir - Eiríks Saga rauða, ed. S. Jansson in his Sagorna om Vinland, 1945 (pages 26-81; occasionally referred to by the numbers of the sections into which Jansson divides his text).


Fas - Fornaldarsögur Norðurlanda, ed. Guðni Jónsson and Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, 1943-4.

Fgr - Fagrskinna, ed. Finnur Jónsson, 1902-3.


Fló - Flateyjarbók, ed. Sigurður Nordal, 1944-5.

Fló - This edition of Flóamanna Saga.


Fms - Fornmanns sögur, 1825-37.

Folkeæt - V. Grønbech, Vor Folkeæt i Oldtiden, 1955.

(Fló is edited on pages xxii-xxviii (introduction), 119-61, 168-85.)


Friðbj - Friðbjófs Saga ins frækna, ed. L. Larsson, 1901.

Fritzner - J. Fritzner, Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog, 1954.

Fær - Færeyingasaga, ed. Finnur Jónsson, 1927.

Gaardnavne - O. Rygh, Norske Gaardnavne, 1897-1924.

Gerðir - Jón Jóhannesson, Gerðir Landnámabókar, 1941.

GhM - Grønlands historiske Mindesmærker; ed. Finn Magnusen (= Finnur Magnússon), 1938-45. (The edition of Fló is in volume ii, pages 1-221.)


Grág, i - Grágás, Islændernes Lovbog i Fristatens Tid, ed. Vilhjálmur Finsen, 1852, the two volumes containing the Icelandic text, referred to as 'a' and 'b'.


Heið - Heiðarvíga Saga, ed. Sigurður Nordal and Guðni Jónsson in IF, iii, 1938.


HMS - Heilagra manna sögur, ed. C. Unger, 1877.
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Höns - Hóensa-Póris Saga, ed. Sigurður Nordal and Guðni Jónsson in IF, iii, 1938.
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Joleik - A. Joleik's translation of Flóamanna Saga (see page *132).
Jónsbók - Jónsbók, ed. Olafur Halldórsson, 1904.
Jón Porkelsson, Pjóðsögur - Jón Porkelsson, Pjóðsögur og munnmæli, 1899.
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Krist - Kristnisaga in Kristnisaga Páttir Þorvalds ens viðforla, Páttir Isléifs biskups Gizurarsonar Hungavaka, ed. B. Kahle, 1905.


Ldn - Landnamabók I-III. Hauksbók. Sturlubók Melabók m.m., ed. Finnur Jónsson, 1900.
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Ljós - Ljósvetninga Saga, ed. Björgn Sigfússon in IF, x, 1940.

LM - Lesbók Morgunblaðsins, 1925-.

LP - Sveinbjörn Egilsson, Lexicon Poeticum, revised by Finnur Jónsson, 1931

Map 1 - Eyrarbæki N. A., 1:50000 map, published by
Geodætisk Institut, 1952.


Mar - Mariu Saga, ed. C. Unger, 1871.


Mon - Monumenta Historica Norvegiae, ed. G. Storm, 1880.


Niedner - F. Niedner's translation of Flóamanna Saga (see page *132).


NK - Nordisk kultur, 1931-56.

Ohlmarks - Å. Ohlmark's translation of Flóamanna Saga
(see page 132).

ONOI - Finnur Jónsson, Den oldnorske og oldislandske
Litteratur Historie, 1920-4.

Opera - Arngrim Jónse Opera Latine conscripta, ed.
Jakob Benediktsson, 1950-7 (= Bibl, ix-xii).
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Origin - K. Liestøl, The Origin of the Icelandic Family
Sagas, 1930.

Orkn - Orkneyinga Saga, ed. Finnbogi Guðmundsson in IF,
xxxiv, 1965.

Ol helga - Den store saga om Olav den hellige, ed. O. A.
Johnsen and Jón Helgason, 1941.

Ol mest - Ólafs Saga Tryggvasonar en mesta, ed. Ólafur
Halldórsson, 1958-61.

Patrologiae - Patrologiae Cursus completus. Series latina,
ed. J. Migne, 1844-64.

Post - Postola sögur, ed. C. Unger, 1874.

Privatboligen - Valtýr Guðmundsson, Privatboligen på
Island i Sagatiden samt delvis i det øvrige Norden,
1889.

Problem - T. Andersson, The Problem of Icelandic Saga

Ragn - Ragnar's Saga loðbrókar, ed. M. Olsen in Volsunga
Saga ok Ragnars Saga loðbrókar, 1906-8.
Rel - J. de Vries, Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte, 1956.
Safn - Safn til sögu Islands og íslenskra bókmêta að fornu og nýju, 1856-
Saga - Saga Tímarit Sögufélags, 1949-
Saga-Book - Saga-Book of the Viking Society for Northern Research, 1911-
SnE - Edda Snorra Sturlusonar, ed. Finnur Jónsson, 1931.
Stokks - Guðni Jónsson, Stokkseyringa saga, i, 1960.
Syntax - M. Nygaard, Norrøn Syntax, 1905.
Theodricus - Theodricus monachus, Historia de Antiquitate Regum Norwagiensium, ed. G. Storm in Mon.
Tilnavne - Finnur Jónsson, 'Tilnavne i den islandske Oldlitteratur', Aarbøger, 1907, pages 161-381.
Uddanelse - Bjørn Bjarnason, Nordboernes legemlige Uddan-
else i Oldtiden, 1905.
Um Kjálk - Helgi Guðmundsson, Um Kjálnesinga Sögut, 1967.
Um Njálu - Einar Sveinsson, Um Njálu, 1933.
Untersuchungen - H. Reuschel, Untersuchungen über Stoff
und Stil der Fornaldarsaga, 1933.

Vilmundarson, Pórhallur - see Pórhallur Vilmundarson.
Vígl - Víglundar Saga, ed. Jóhannes Halldórsson in IF,
xiv, 1959.

Vorlesungen - K. Maurer, Vorlesungen über altnordische
Rechtsgeschichte, 1907-10.


Zoëga - Geir Zoëga, A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic,
1961.

Pjóðhættir - Jónas Jónasson, Islenzkir bjóðhættir, 1945
Pjöös - Islenzkir bjóðsögur og ævintyri, collected by
Jón Árnason, second edition by Árni Böðvarsson and
Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, 1954-61.

Þorkelsson, Jón - see Jón Þorkelsson.

PorstVik - Porsteins Saga Vikingsson in Fas, ii, 183-246.

Pórhallur Vilmundarson - Unpublished material on Flóamanna
Saga provided by Professor Pórhallur Vilmundarson of
the University of Iceland (cf. page *3).

Ey - Islendzk æventyri, ed. H. Gering, 1882-4.

Eyviskrár - Páll Olason, Islenzkar æviskrár, 1948-52.

Ǫrv - Ærvar-Odds Saga, ed. R. Boer, 1892.
Flóamanna Saga


Pá er Haraldr inn hárfagri gekk til ríkis í Noregi, mægðið hann við Hákon jarl Grjóttgarðsson ok fekk hann þá Sygnafylki Hákoní, mági sínum, en Haraldr konungr fór í Vík austr en Atli jarl vildi eigi laust láta ríkit fyrir en hann fyndi Harald konung. Jarlarnir þreyttu þetta með kappi svá at hvártveggi dró lið saman. (funduþ)
á Fjöllum í Stafanessvági ok fekk Hákon jarl sigr en Atli jarl varð sárr ok var fluttr í Atlaey ok dó þar ór sárum. Atli jarl átti eptir þrája sonu: hét einn Hallsteinn - hann var elzt ok vittrastr þeira bræðra - þá Hersteinn 5 ok Hólmeininn. [Hall]steinn átti Dóru Ólvisdóttur. Peir bræðr lágu í hernaði.

hvárun. Verður þat af kjörum at þeir fara allir saman
ok leggjaz í hernað ok er svá sagt at Leifr var hvatr ok
róskr í óllum mannraunum. Ingólfur var vitr maðr ok
ágætr í óllum atlögum ok allri karlmennsku. Þeim varð
5 gott til fjár um sumarit ok kómu heim um haustit. Hró-
mundur var þá andaðr, faðir Leifs. Nú mæla þeir móti með
sér annat sumar ok heldu þá enn í hernað allir saman ok
fengu þá miklu meira herfang en it fyrra sumarit. Ok sem
þeir kómu heim um haustit, var örn, faðir Ingólfurs,
10 andaðr.

Hallsteinn býr þeim fóstbræðrum, Ingólfu ok Leifi,
heim til veizlu ok þat þágu þeir ok at skilnaði gaf hann
þeim góðar gjafir. Síðan buðu þeir fóstbræðr þeim jarls-
sonum til veizlu. Þeir bjóða ok at sér miklu fjölmenni
15 ok vilja eiga undir meira ef nokkut kann í at skeraz.
Nú koma þeir bræðr til veizlunnar ok er mönnnum skipat í
sæti. Helga bar ól at veizlunni; hon var allra kvenna
vænst ok kurteisust. Svá er sagt at Hersteinn lítr opt
til hennar blíðliga ok at þessari veizlu strengdi hann
20 þess heit, at annathvárt skyldi hann Helgu eiga eðr enga
konu ella. Kvaz hann nú fyrstr hafit hafa þenna leik
- 'ok áttu nú, Ingólfur,' segir hann. Ingólfur svarar:
'Hallsteinn skal nú fyrst um mæla, því at hann er vár
vitrastr ok várr formaðr at óllu.' Hallsteinn mæli:
25 'Þess strengi ek heit: þótt mér sé vandi á við menn, at
ek skal eigi halla réttum dómi, ef mér er trúat til
dyggjar um.' Hersteinn mælti: 'Eigi er þessi heistrengin
þín þeim mun skýrlist grí sem þú ert reiknaður vitrari en vér, eðr hversu muntu gera ef þú átt við vini þína um eðr óvini?
Hallsteinn svarar: 'Þar ætla ek sjálfum mér fyrir at sjá.'
'Þess strengi ek heit,' segir Ingólfr, 'at skipta við engan 5 mann erfð, nema við Leif.' 'Eigi skiljun vér þetta,' segir Hersteinn. Hallsteinn kvaz gerla kunna þetta at sjá - 'Leifi vill hann gipta Helgu, systur sína.' Leifr strengdi þess heit, at vera eigi verryfræðu. Hallsteinn svarar: 'Eigi mun mikit fyrir því, því at faðir þinn fór 10 fyrir illvirkja sakir af Pelamörk ok hingat.' Nú þróyr veizluna ok er ekki til samfara mált af Hersteins hendi. Fóru jarlssynir heim frá veizlunni ok sátu í büm sínnum um vetrinn ok svá þeir fóstbræður ok er nú allt kyrrt.

nú at etja, frændi,' sagði hann, 'ok mun þat drængiligr at veita þér lið, Leifr frændi.' Þar var kominn Ólmóðr inn gamli Hörða-Káraðon. Hann berz þá með Leifi ok váru þau orrostulok, at Hersteinn fellr en Hölmsteinn verð 5 sárr ok flýr. Ólmóðr mælti þá: 'Far þú heim með mér eptir stórvinri þessi.' Leifr mælti: 'Skammt er heim í Fjórðu ok hefir þú mikit lið ok gott mér veitt, frændi. Vilda ek gjarna at þú farir heim með mér.' Eptir þetta skildu þeir ok heldr Leifr til móts við Ingólf ok sagði honum allt 10 hversu farit hafði. Ingólfur segir mikit vera at orðit ok biðr þá báða saman vera ok svá gerðu þeir ok heldu fjöl- mennt um vetrinn.

Pann sama vetr för Hölmsteinn at þeim Ingólfur ok Leifi ok vildi drepa þá. En þeir fengu njós af ferð hans ok 15 fóru í móti honum. Varð þá enn orrosta mikil ok fell þar Hölmsteinn. Eptir þat dreif lið at þeim föstbræðrum, vinir þeira ok frændr ór Firðafylki. Váru þá sendir menn til Hallsteins ok bjóða settir með því móti at þeir vilja leggja undir dóm Hallsteins. Sagðið Ingólfur honum 20 vel trúa til rétttæmis ok bað hann muna heitstrenging sína. Hallsteinn kvað nú mikit at orðit - 'ok er nú mikill vandi í at dæma þetta mál,' — ok hefr svá sína ræðu: 'Hersteinn, bróðir minn, líz mér sem unnit hafi til óhelgi sér ok vil ek eigi fé fyrir hann dæma né mannsektir. En 25 Hölmsteinn fór til hefnda eptir bróður sinn ok því dæmi ek fyrir dráp hans fallnar eignir ykkrar ok báða ykkr burtu heðan ór Firðafylki áðr þríf vetr eru liðnir, ella falli
bítt óhelgir.' 'Slíks var at ván,' sagði Ingólfr. Síðan
bjugguz þeir bræðr út til Íslands, sem segir í Landnámabók. Við Ingólfr er kenndr Ingólfsföði sunnanlands. Ok
lykr þar nú þeira viðskiptum.

5 4. Eptir fall Atla jarls mjóva safnaði liði Sigurðr
jarl, son Hákonar gamla, með ráði Haralds konungs ins
hárfgra ok vildi drepa Hallstein. Við þetta stókk Hall-
steinn undan ok út til Íslands fyrir þessum ófriði, sem
þá gerðu margir gildir menn, at þeir flyðu óðul sín fyrir
10 ofríki Haralds konungs ok unnu ár stórvirki nökkur. Hall-
til steinn skaut setstokkum fyrir borð í hafi þitt heilla sér
eptir fornnum síð; þeim sveif á land þar sem síðan heitir
Stokkseyrr en skipit kom í Hallsteinssund fyrir austan
Stokkseyri ok braut þar. Setstokkarnir kómu fyrir dyrr á
15 Stáfjörðu fram frá Stokkseyri. Viða höfðu menn þá land num-
it. Hallsteinann nan land milli Rauðar ok Ólfusár upp allt
til Fúlalækjar, Breiðanýri alla upp at Holtum ok bjó at
Stjórnusteinnum. Hallsteinn átti Þóru Ólvisdóttur. Atli ok
Ólvir váru synir þeira. Hallsteinssund er fyrir austan
20 Stokkseyri, þar sem braut skip Hallsteins. Óllum munnnum
þótti mikils vert um Hallstein. Sagðiz hann skyldu hér
ílendaz. Var munnnum mikil auðusa á því, þeim er í náð
honum váru, ok þótti mikill hófuðburður át honum sakir òttar
hans. Varð Hallsteinn mikilmenni ok andaðiz hann í elli sinnj
25 Ok eptir andlát hans, skiptu þeir bræðr með sér erfð-
um. Bjó Ólvin at Stjórnusteinnum; þat heita nú Ólvistóptir.
Hafði Atli í móti allt landnám milli Rauðar ok Ólfusár,
Traðarholt ok Baugsstaði. Ólvrir andaðiz ungr. Tók
Atli þá allan arf eptir hann ok gerðiz mikilhæfr maðr.
Præll hans hét Brattr. Hann var höllr honum í sýslu sinni.
5 Honum gaf Atli frelsi. Hann bjó í Brattsholti. Slíkt
sama gerði hann við annan, er Leiðólfr hét. Hann bjó
á Leiðólfsstöðum. Þeir váru mikilhæfir menn ok vel vingað-
ir ok höllir mjökk Atla.

5. Hallsteinn hét maðr. Hann fór ör Sogni til Íslands.
10 Hann var mágr Hallsteins Atlasonar. Honum gaf hann inn
ytra hlut Eyrarbakka. Hann bjó á Framnesi. Hans son
var Porsteinn er veginn var at fálkagreptri. Hans son
var Porbjörn er bjó á Framnesi. Í þenna tíma kom út
Loptr, son Orms Fróðasonar. Nú er at segja frá Atla at
15 hann var ríkr maðr ok hlutdeilinn ok líkr í mörgu lagi
frændum sínum. Loptr fór af Gaulum til Íslands, ungr at
aldrí, ok nam land á milli Þjórsár ok Rauðar upp til Skúfs-
lækjar, Breiðamýri upp til Súluholts, ok bjó í Gaulverja-
bæ, ok Oddný, móðir hans, döttir Porbjarnar ins Gaulverska.
20 Loptr fór utan it þriðja hvert sumar fyrir hönd þeira
Flosa beggja, móðurbróður síns, at blóta at hofi því
er Porbjörn, móðurfaðir hans, hafði varðveitt at Gaulum.
Frá Løpti er margt, stórmenni komit. Þá kom út Por[víðr],
bróðir hans af Vórs. Loptr gaf honum land á Breiðamýri
25 ok bjó hann í Ossabæ. Hans börn váru þau Hrafn ok Hallveig.
Pessir menn váru nú allir samtíða.


Bóðvarr hét maðr. Hann var leysingi Özurar... Hann bjó á Bóðvarsstöðum við Viðiskóg. Honum gaf Özurr hlut nökkurn í skóginum ok mælti svá fyrir at hann skildi sér skógin, ef misdaði þeira yrði, ok átti Bóðvarr engan erfingja eptir.

Órn hét maðr. Hann bjó í Vælugerði. Hann átti Þorgreiði Baugsdóttur, systur Stena snjalla í Snjallshofða. Erni varð vant um haustit lx. geldinga ok hefir eigi góðan róm á Bóðvari ok berr á brýnn honum at hann muni tekit hafa.
Böðvarr duldi þess ok unni honum engra bóta fyrir; þóttiz sitja í trausti ríkra manna, er Hrafn var Þorðarson, frændi Eyrar-Lopti. Um várit stefnir Örn Böðvari um stuld. Þykkiz Böðvarr sér nú eigi einhlítr um vörn málsins ok sækir at Atla Hallsteinsson, því at hann var honum nær en Hrafn, ok tjár honum málit. Atli segir at eigi sé örvænt at menn finni gagnsakir í máli Arnar. Eptir þat tók Atli við öllu fé Böðvars með hæðsöllum. Stendr nú svá til þings. A þingi er mál búit til sóknar á hendi.

10 Böðvari ok kom málit í dóm. Pá gekk at dómum Atli með fjölmenni ok bað Örn fella niðr málit - 'elligar mun ek ónýta þat fyrir þér.' Örn kvaz ætla at eigi mundi ónýtt verða, nema með ofráki. 'Má vera,' segir Örn, 'at torsótt verði at eiga við jarlborna menn sem þú ert, Atli. Hygg ek at meir eyðir þú málit fyrir fégirni þína en réttindi, sem frændr þínir hafa gert.' Við þessi orð varð Atli reiðr mjökk ok eyðir málit fyrir Erni ok hrekr hann sem mest af málinu.

7. Litlu síðar andaz Böðvarr. Eptir andlát hans kall-aði Hrafn til Viðiskógsins fyrir hónda Þorgrims kampa ok þannar Atla afneyzlu skógarins ok sagði honum máldaga þeira Özurar ok Böðvars ok leiddi vitni um. Atli kvaz ætla at láta eigi sitt fyrir Hrafni; kvað hann lítt minnaz á þat er faðir hans gaf honum sitt land. Hrafn kvað þat fyrir lónu aprt bætt ok kvaz vilja hafa sitt. Atli varnaði honum skógarins ok skildu at því.
Einhvern dag býr Atli ferð sína til Viðiskógar. Leiðólfr, leysingi hans, var í ferð með honum ok húskarlar tveir. Þeir hjuggu skógininn. Þat er sagt at sauðamaðr Hrafns hafði gengit at fé um daginn. Hann getr at líta 5 hvar þeir eru í skóginum. Hann hleypr heim sem skjótast ok segir Hrafni at Atli mun hafa nyttjar af skóginum, slíkar sem honum sýniz; — höggva þeir þar sem beztr er skógrinn ok er þat at vánum at ekki hafir þú þrek við jarlbornum mónnum. Hrafni varð mjók reiðr við þessa sögu ok 10 býr ferð sína ok ferrar við inn višada. Mann þar til er þeir komu í dal þann er síðan er kallaðr Ormundadalr ok þar finnaz þeir Atli. Dá mælti Atli: 'Við liðsmun villtu nú etja, Hrafn.' 'Pat skal fyrirfurða um burðamuni,' segir Hrafn. Þegar slær í bardaga með þeim ok sækjaz þeir. Atli 15 ok Hrafni ok verða þeira viðskipti harðfeng. Leiðólfr verð ok vel ok vill nú launa [frelsis]gjófina ok um síðir vill hann flyja ok fell hann þá ok hafði mann fyrir sik. Atli drap einn húskarl Hrafns ok sötti Hrafn hann þó. Tveir fellu menn Hrafns en [Atli] var þá særðr til ólífis.

20 8. Önundr bildr hét maðr ok var landnámsmaðr. Hann nam land fyrir austan Hröarslæk ok bjó í Önundarholti. Hann átti Porgerði, döttur Sigmundar Sighvatssonar rauða. Sigmundr var faðir Marðar gigju. [ Önundr ] kom nú at skilja þá Atla ok Hrafn ok fylgdi Atla heim ok bað hann til sín 25 fara — 'ok skal ek veita þér óll hægindi.' Atli kvað þat vel boði en heim kvaz hann vilja í Traðarholt ok lét
eigi örvænt at þat fylgdi nafni at hann dæi af sárum sem Atli jarl, fððurfaðir hans.

Pórðr hét son Atla. Hann var ix. yetra er þetta var tíðinda. Atli heimti hann til sín ok kvaz ætla at hann mundi af sárum deyja. 'Áttu,' segir hann, 'allt fé eptir mik ok ef þú ert þínun fræendum likr, þá muntu hifna fðður þins ok svá segir mér hugr um at þú munir verða mikill fyrir þér ok þínir ættmenn.' Eptir þat andaðiz Atli heima í Traðarholti ok var hann heygðr sem þá var síövenja til.

10 Pórðr tók við fé óllu ok ráðum eptir fðður sinn. Hann var fríðr sýnum, bráðsproskaðr ok mikill fyrir sér. Ólvir hét son Atla annarr ok kallaðr Ólvir mjóvi. Þeir bræðr váru öskaplíkir. Pórðr varðveitti bú í Traðarholti en Ólvir réz í kaupferðir þegar á unga aldri ok var áburðarmaðr mikill. Síðan réz hann í hernað ok var inn mesti víkingr. At lyktum settiz hann at þúm í Sogni ok kom aldri til Islands. Pá réð fyrir Noregi Eiríkr blóðóx.

9. Pá var Pórðr xv. yetra gamall er hann hugsar um fððurhefndir. Hrafn var garpr mikill en Pórðr þöttiz ungr. Svá er sagt eiththvert sinn at Pórðr frétti at Hrafn var riðinn út í Einarshöfn til skips ok var einn í reið ok ætlaði heim um kveldit. Hrafn var í blári kápu ok gyrðr sverði ok hafði spjót mikit í hendi ok gullrekinn á falrinn. Þeir feðgar höfðu átt spjót þat. Hann hafði eigi við bardaga búiz. Pórðr sitr fyrir Hrafní hjá Hagavági ofan frá Traðarholti, einn samt. Hann hafði spjót í hendi ok
vill nú annathvárt hefna fǒður síns eðr fá bana. Ok um
kveldit, er Hrafn ríðr heim, hljóp Póðr at honum óvörum
ok lagði á honum spjótinu. Hrafn fell af baki ok skildi
Póðr við hann dauðan ok er þar haugr hans fyrir austan
5 götuna en fyrir vestan er Atlahaugr ok Ólvisaughr ok Hall-
steinshaugr. Póðr ferr nú heim ok þykkir hann vaxit hafa
af þessu verki. Síðan er leitat um sættir við Póðr af
mágum Hrafns ok frændum. Póðr kvaz þat mundu sýna at hann
var enginn ójafnaðarmaðr en kvað sík nauðsyn til reka at
10 hefna fǒður síns. Kvað þat skyldu sína sætt at í faðma
felliz allt þat er í hafði gerz. Þessi sætt játtuðu frændr
Hrafns, því í þeim þótti þetta engi ójafnaðr ok sættuz
heilum sáttum.

Póðr gerðiz ágætr maðr. Hann fekk Pórunnar, dóttur
15 Ásgeirs Austmannsskelfis; var hann af því svá kallaðr at hann
drap skipshófn í Grímsárósi fyrir þat er hann var áðr rætr
af þeim. Ásgeirr var it mesta mikilmenni. Pórunn var ok
skórungr mikill. Póðr eignaðiz skóg þann er þeir höfðu
deilt um.

Pá er Póðr hafði ii. vetr ok xx., þá keypti hann skip
20 í Knarrarsundí ok vildi utan fara ok heimta erfðir sínar,
þær er frændr hans höfðu átt í Sogni ok konungr helt, ok
kvað Pórunni fara skyldu en hon kvaz vilja eptir vera
ok kvað þat ráðligra. Póðr reiddiz við þessi orð ok tók
25 mikit fé er hann átti, ok fal í jórðu. Pórunn mælti þá:
'Pat máttu gera at fela féit en svá segir mér hugr um
at litlar nytjar munir þú hafa fjár þess er þú átt í
Noregi ok sví hér." Síðan tók hon við öllum eignum þeira.

10. Porgils hét son þeira. Hann var tvævetr er Þórðr fór utan. Pat skip hvarf ok spurði í ekki til síðan ok vetri síðar kom út Porgrímur Órrabæinn í Bjarnarsundi. Hann var Pormóðarson. Hans móðir var Þuríðr Ketilbjarnardóttir at Mosfelli. Porgrimr var hraustmenni mikit. Hann var í Traðarholti um vetrinn með Pórunni ok var henni it mesta traust at honum ok líkaði henni vel við hann ok bað hann með sér dveljaz ok ráða sjálfan kaupi. Hann kvaz þat vilja 10 ok mælti til samfara við hana; kvaz ellígar ekki þar vera mundu hjá henni, nema hon giptiz honum. Hon hugsar þetta með ráði vina sinna ok frænda. Pat var þrem vetrum síðar ..því at hon vildi reynaz hugum við hann ok skap sitt. Pá er iii. vetr váru líðnir, fekk hann Pórunnar ok váru 15 samfarar góðar þeira í milli. Porgrímur þótt í inn mesti garpr ok heldr ódæll. Hafði hann verit víkingr ok víða af því órróttr ok af því var hann kallaðr Órrabæinn en Porgils, stjúpson hans, var kallaðr Órrabeinsstjúrp. Porgrimr var góðr forstjóri heraðsins. Hann var vel til 20 Pórunnar ok sonar hennar, Porgils. Þar stöð mikit fé saman er þau áttu óll.

Pat er sagt eitt sumar, er menn kömu til mannamóts í fjórbaugsgard Í Lóns, þá var Porgils finn vetra er hann þangat veik ok vildi vera at sveinaleik; markar 25 sér vóll ok kvaz vilja at vera. Sveinar sögðuz hafa sammælzi á at sá einn skyldi at leiknum vera er nökkuru
kvíkindi hefði at bana orðit. Réz Porgils þá frá leiðnum ok þótti þó illa er hann var fráskila gerr. Um kveldit fara menn heim.

Porgrímr var at öllu fé auðugr. Hann átti margt kvik-5 fé, bæði sauði ok naut. Einn hestr hét Illingr er hann átti; þat var klárr ókostigr. Ok er menn váru sofnadir um nóttina, þá vakir Porgils ok íhugur sitt mál ok vildi eigi optar ór leiðnum gerr vera. Hann stóð upp ok tekr sér beizl ok gekk út síðan ok sá hross hjá garði. Hann 10 snýz þangat til ok tekr hestinn Illing ok leiðir til húss nókkurs. Síðan tekr hann spjót í hónd sér ok engr at hestinum ok rekr spjótit í kvíðinn ok fellr hann dauðr niðr. Porgils leggzi niðr síðan.

Ok um um morguninn er mýnum var til verks skipat, biðr 15 Porgrímr heim reka Illing en hann fannz eigi. Var Por-
grími sagt þetta. Hann kvað hestinn þar verit hafa um kveldit ok bað enn leita. Fara þeir ok finna dauðan hestinn; segja Porgrími. Hann kvaz eigi sjá mann til þess at górnaz at eiga illt við hann. Porgils svarar:

Ek veldr því at hestrinn er dauðr.' Porgrímr spurði hvi hann gerði þat. Porgils sagði hver sökk til var. 'Ekki munum vit eiga skap saman,' sagði Porgrímr. 'Far þú nú til Lopts, vinar þíns, því at ekki verðum við samlyndir.'

Eptir þat fór Porgils í burt í ní sama dag ok til 25 lOpts. Tók hann við honum ágæta vel. Svá er sagt at Por-
gils var fríðr maðr sýnum ok drengiligr í viðbragði ok skýrligr, hár á vóxt ok réttvaxinn, sterkr at aflí, harðgerr ok skjótráðr, gegn ok þruggr, þróigr ok allra manna bezt vígr ok inn hraustasti í öllum mannraunum þegar honum 5 dróz aldr sem frá mun verða sagt. Hann var stórlýndr ok þó stóðugr, hjartaprúðr ok hugstorr, stóz vel margar mannraunir er hann hlaut at bera.

Pat er sagt at þá er Porgils var í. vetra gamall, beiddiz hann at róa á sjó með húskórlum Lopts ok var þat 10 eptir honum látit sem margt annat. Porgils kastaði færi sínu fyrir borð ok dró eínn mikinn flatan fisk en engi annarr veiddi um daginn. Ok er hreggit tók at vaxa, reyndiz þat at Porgils hafði numit at róa, þótt hann væri ungr. Síðan lögðu þeir at landi. Loptr kvað í slíku 15 marka mega hverr hann mundi verða. Ganga nú heim ok dró Porgils eptir sér fiskinn er hann gekk eptir götunni. Pá losnaði moldin þar er hann dró fiskinn ok kenndi er varð fyrir nökkut hart. Litir hann þá til ok sér at þar liggr silfrbaugr. Nú fara þeir heim ok selr Porgils 20 Lopti bauginn, fóstra sínum, til varðveizlu.

12. Vetri síðar varð sá atburðr at þrálar nökkurir brutu haug til fjár sér en Porgils kom at þeim ok kvað þat ekki vera þeira fé ok tók af þeim iii. mérkr en hraktu þá sjálfa. Hann fekk Lopti fé þetta ok svá allt annat 25 þat er hann aflaði. Varð hann nú frægr mjökk, þótt hann væri ungr.
Pá er Porgils var xv. vetra, þá fýstiz hann utan at fara.
Var hann vel þroskaðr bæði at viti ok afli. Hann beiddiz
fjárskiptis af Þorgrími, stjúprðour sínum. Loptr bað hann
dveljaz hjá sér enn um vettrinn ok kvað hann mundu síðar at
5 öllu meira fram koma. Hann gerði svá ok er hann er xvi.
vetra, beiddiz hann enn fjárskiptis. Þorgrímr kvað þess
enn eigi kost - 'því ósvinn[r]i líz mér þín fjárvarðveizla
en mín.' Porgils kvaz nú vilja hafa féit - 'en ef ek fær
 nú eigi, þá mun ek fá í þriðja sinn er ek heimti,' - ok
10 ferr síðan ok segir Loptri. Loptr kvað þat hug sinn at
Þorgrímr mundi eigi fyrir standa þá er Porgils heimti næst.
Fekk Loptr honum þá fé til utanferðar. Porgils kvaz lítit
fé hafa vilja at sinni. Ok er hann er búinn til ferðar,
kallaði hann til sín leiksveina ok kvaz vilja launa þeim
15 gleði ok góða fylgd - 'skulu þér hér taka iii. merkr silfrs
er ek tók af þráðunum en Loptr, fóstri mín, skal hafa baug-
inn ok vingan mína.' Eptir þat fór Porgils utan í Knarrar-
sundi með lítit fé ok kom til Noregs um haustit ok var með
þeim manni um vettrinn er Óláfr hétt. Hann bjó á Hóða-
20 landi. Hann var ríkr maðr ok vel vitr.

Í þenna tíma réð Haraldr gráfeldr Noregi með þörum
bræðrum sínum ok Gunnhildr konungamóðir. Þau fóru at veizl-
um um vettrinn, sem þá var síðr til. Óláfr bjó veizlu í
25 móti konungi ok módur hans með mikilli vegsemð ok er þau
höfðu at veizlunni verit um hrið, þá spurðu þau hverr sá
væri inn mikill maðr ok inn vegligi er þar var. Óláfr
svarar: 'Hann er Íslenzkr.' Konungur sagði at hann mundi
vera mikillar ættar - 'því at hann hefir þess háttar
yfirbragð.' Þorgils var í leikum með konungi ok þótti
honum mikit gaman at honum ok gengu Þorgilsí allir leikar
vel. Þá mælti konungr: 'Pik mun ek kalla Þorgils kappa
5 minn.' Þorgils sagði þá konungi sik eiga stórar erfðar
í Sogni eptir göfga frændr sín. Konungr svarar: 'Móðir
mín hefir nú bú á jörðum þeim ok hon hefir á þeim allt
forræði; því hyllstu hana at ok mun þér þá vel duga.' Þor-
gils kemr nú á þetta mál við Gunnhildi. Hon svarar þessu
10 vel ok bauð honum hirð[vist] með konungi. Þorgils kvaz
lít við látinn at vera með konungshirð ok kvað nei við
því. Drotning varð reið ok spyrndi nætt sínum til hans ok.
hraðt honum frá hásætinu ok varnaði honum þá fjárins ok
sagði hann eigi kunna at þiggja sóma sinn. Konungi var
15 vel til hans ok gaf honum silfr á laun, svá at þat var
góðr kaupeyrir. 'Má hér af græðaz,' segir konungr, 'ef
gæfa vill til ok vitja mín kunnliga ok allra helzt ef
módir mín er eigi nær.' Síðan för konungr frá veizlunni.

13. Um várit segir Þorgils Óláfi at hann vill fara
20 kaupferð um sumarit ok leita svá undand ójafnaði Gunnhildar.
Óláfr lét vel yfir því. Var Þorgils í kaupferð um sumarit
ok túkz þat vel en um haustit kom hann í vestr-Víkina ok
ferr til konu einnar er Gyða hét. Hon var ekkja. Son
átti hon er Auðun hét. Þau veittu honum bæði af inni
25 mestu dyggð. Gyða var margkunnandi á fyrnsk[u] ok fróð-
leik. Auðun var vel til Þorgils ok mælti til vináttu
er hann för í brutt.

Eptir þat för Porgils til eins ríks manns er Björn hét
ok var þar vel haldinn. Þar váru góð híbýli ok heldr
snemma háttat. Porgils spurði hverju þat gegndi. Honum
5 var sagt at faðir Bjarnar hafði fyrir litlu andaz ok þat
með at hann gengi aprtr. Váru menn ok hræddir við hann.
Porgils gerðiz rammr at afli. Þat var opt um vetrinn at
Porgils heyrði lanit úti um þekjuna. Ok eina nótt var þat
at hann stóð upp, tók ðxi í hönd sér ok gekk út. Hann sá
10 draug fyrir dyrum standa, mikinn ok illiligan. Porgils
færir upp ðxina en þessi snýr undan ok til haugsins ok,
sem þeir koma þar, snýr draugrinn á móti. Takaz þeir
fangbrögðum, því at Porgils hafði sleppt ðxinni. Var þeira
atgangr bæði harðr ok grimmligr svá at upp gekk þórðin
15 undir fótum þeim. En at lyktum varð svá, með því at Por-
gilsí var lengra líf ætlat, at draugrinn fell á bak aprtr
en Porgils ofan á hann. Tekr hann þar þá hvíld ok náir
síðan ðxi sinni. Höggr Porgils þá af honum hófuð ok
mælir síðan yfir honum at hann skuli engum manni at meini
20 verða. Varð aldri vart við hann síðan. Björn virði Por-
gils mikils, er hann hafði gert þar svá mikla híbýlabót.

Eina nótt bar þat til at lostit var högg á dyrr. Gengr
Porgils út. Er þar kominn Auðun Gyðuson, vinr hans. Por-
gils heilsar honum vel ok spyrr hvat hann vill. Auðun
25 kvaz þurfa hans liðsinnis; sagði móður sína, Gyðu, andaða
ok nökkut orðit hafa kynliga um hennar dauða;—'stukku
ok allir menn á burtu, því at engir þorðu við at vera.
Nú vilda ek fara með hana til greptrar ok fylgdir þú mér.' 'Þat skal vera,' kvað Porgils. Síðan ferr hann með Auðuni at óvitanda Búrni. Koma til bæjar Auðunar; finna þar húsfreyju dauða; búa nú um líkit. 'Skaltu, Porgils,' segir Auðun, 'gera kistu at móður minni ok undir knakka; reka síðan á kistuna sterkar henkr, því at þurfa mun þess alls við, ef hlýða skal.' Er nú þetta allt saman gert. Auðun sagðið nú mundu gera ráð fyrir kistunnin; - 'skulum vit nú draga hana í burtu, færa niðr í jörð ok bera á ofan sem mestan þunga.' Fara nú síðan ok, sem þeir hafa farit um hríð, tekr at braka mjökk í kistunni ok því næst bresta af hankarnir ok kemz Gyða ór kistunni. Pá fara þeir til báðir ok tóku hana ok þurpti alls við ok váru þeir báðir sterkrir menn. Þat taka þeir bragðs at þeir flytja hana til báls er Auðun háði búit. Síðan kasta þeir henni á bálit ok váru hjá meðan hon brann. Pá mælti Auðun: 'Mikla vingan hefir þú mér nú syn, Porgils, ok góða karlmennsku, sem þú munt í öllum stóðum. Sverð ok kyrtill vil ek gefa þér en ef svá verður at ek kalla síðar til sverðsins, þá vilda ek at þú létir laust en ek mun fá þér annat vápn, þat er gott er.' Nú skilja þeir við svá búit ok ferr Porgils aðtr til Bjarnar.

Nú er þar til at taka at Björn saknar Porgils. Fær hann af þessu mikla ógleði ok kvaz þar misst hafa góðs manns - 'ok er þat illa at tröll eðr óvættir hafa tekitt hann. Skulum vör þat þó gera í heiðr við hann at drekka erfi hans ok uggir mik at eigi megi fagnaðarví heita,
því at véri hafim nú leitat hans marga daga." En um veizlu þessa kom Porgils heim ok verð Björn honum harla feginn ok eykr þá aðtr veizluna ok eptir hana fóru menn heim.

5 14. Í þenna tíma tók Hákon Hlaðajarl ríki í Noregi. Pá sagði Porgils Birni at hann vildi leita eptir eignum sínum í Sogni. Björn svarar: 'Réttilg er þat en uggrir mik at Hákon jarl kalli sér bæði þat ok annat, því at hann er mjök féggjarn, ok er óvænligt um at hann vili til láta við þik en flytja vil ek þitt mála, þá er hann komr hér til mín.' Nú kemr jarl at ákvæðnu til veizlunnar ok flytr Björn fyrir honum mála Porgils ok sagði mikit frá vaskleik hans ok atgervi. Hákon jarl kvað þat nú vera sína eign en kvaz þó vilja sjá manninn. Ok er Porgils kom fyrir jarl, mælti Hákon til hans: 'Mikill maðr ertu ok sterkligr, fríðr sýnum ok líkligr til giptu ok vil ek bjóða þér til mín. Líttum síðan á þitt mála.' Porgils kvaz þat þiggja vilja.

15. Þórsteinn hét maðr ok var kallaðr inn hvíti. Hann var lendr maðr Hákonar jarlars. Hann var vinsæll ok átti eignir nær jörðum Porgils. Þeir lögðu mikla vingan saman ok váru með jarli báðir. Porgils gaf Þórsteini kyrtilinn Auðunarnaut; hann var af nýju skarlati. Pá var ok með Hákonjarli Eiríkr rauð[i], íslenskr maðr, 25 er síðan fann ok byggði Grænland. Hann var ungr maðr
ok kurteiss ok inn mesti vin Þorgils.

Pat var enn éinn dag at Þorgils vekr við jarl sitt
mál um jarðírnar. Hákon jarl svarar: 'Vel gez mér at
framferð þinni en eigi er [ek] víss í at vita hverr fram-
5 kvæmdarmaðr þú munt verða. Mun ek ok eigi þessar eignir
upp gefa utan þú sýnir mér nökkurn frama í gerðum þínnum
ok skaltu heimta skatta mín af Suðreyjum er ek hefir
misst um þrýja vetr.' Þorgils biðr hann fá hófingja til
ferðarinnar - 'en ek mun fylgja honum sem manndómr minn
10 er til.' 'Þú skalt formaðr vera,' segir jarl, 'fyrir ferð
þessi, því at þú reynir þeim mun meir þína dáð ok karl-
mennsku.' Þorgils mætti: 'Lát fara með þér Porstein
hvíta.' 'Hann skal því ráða,' sagði jarl. Porstein
kvaz fara munðu ef Þorgils vildi.

15 Nú búaz þeir ok hófðu tvau skip ok ekki mjökk skiput.
En er þeir koma til Æyjanna beða þeir skatta ok fengu
lítit af. Um haustit heldu þeir til Kataness ok brutu
skip sínu en týndu fjærhlut. Menn heldu allir. Óláfr
hét jarl er réð fyrir ríki því. Hann frétti til manna
20 Hákonar jarls ok bað þá til sínu fara. Pat þiggja þeir ok
váru þar um vetrinn.

Surtr járnhauss hét maðr, víkingr mikill ok inn mesti
illgerðamaðr. Hann lá úti lón gum um Vestrlönd. Pat var
einn háattr hans, ef konur váru fríðar ok vel at sér, at
25 hann tók þær at sér um hríðar sakir en menn þorðu eigi
í móti honum at standa. Systir Óláfs jarls hét Guðrún,
hon var fríð kona sýnum ok vel at kvennligum listum
búin. Surtr jórnhauss finur Oláf þenna vetr ok vill fá systur hans til fríllu ella til eiginnorðs. Oláfr svarar: 'Patt væri mér lítil styrkr, þótt þú gerðir sem best mættir þú, en þá allra sízt er þú eft ráðinn til illa at 5 gera ok mun ek neita þessu gjafóði.' Víkingrinn mælti þá: 'Gakk á hölm við mik ella berz við lið mitt ok safna liði í mótí.' Jarl mælti: 'Betrar er at deyja virðulíka en lifa skammsamliga.' 'Pann kost kýss þú nú er þér geg-nir verr ok þér mun minnisamr verða ok ver níðingr ef 10 þú kemr eigi.' 'At vísu skal ek koma,' segir jarl, 'í móti þér eðr annarr maðr ella,' - ok skildu við svá búit.

Eptir þat kvaddi jarl þings ok sagði þar fyrir hverju áfelli hann var orðinn; - 'vil ek þeim manni gipta Guð-rúnu, sýstur mín, er Surti verður at bana, því at ek veit 15 at sá einn mun til þess ráðaz at mér mun engi ösmæð í því verða.' Engir urðu til at svara jarli, þótt ráðit þætti fýsiligt, því at mónnum þótti ills ván af Surti jórnhaus. Þeir Porgils ok Porsteinn rædduz við ok þótti Porsteini fýsiligt en Porgilsí fannz fátt um. Por-20 steinn mælti: 'Viltu þennu kost, vínur?' Porgils svarar fá um. Síðan sagði Porsteinn jarli at hann mundi til ráða. Jarl tekr því vel.

Um nóttina eptir, dreymdi Porgils at Auðun, vin hans, kæmi at honum ok mælti: 'Pú sefr en jafnt mun vera sem 25 þú vakir. Pú skalt á hölm ganga við berserk þenna, því at þér unnum vér sæmdar. En Surtr þessi er bróðir minn ok er hann mér þó ekki þarfr. Er hann ok ít mesta ill-
menni. Þess spyrð hann jafnan, þá er hann hefir hátt hólmsgöngur, þann er hann skal berjaz við hvárt hann hafi sverðit Blaðin; en ek gaf þér þat en þú skalt fela þat í sandi ok seg honum at þú vitir eigi hjólt þess fyrir 5 ofan jörð. Eptir þat hvarf Auðun í burt. Porgils vaknar ok sagði Porsteini, vin sínum, drauminn.


Um várit segja þeir jarli at þeir vilja herja um sumarit. Nú halda þeir at Suðreyjum ok gera þeim kost hvárt 20 þeir vilja pola hernað ok manndráp eðr gjalda skatt Hákoni jarli. En þeir kjörur at gjalda slíkt sem á var lagit. Síðan var allt lukt.

Eptir þat föru þeir austr til Noregs ok hitta Hákon jarl. Fagnar hann þeim vel. Þeir greiða honum féit ok 25 gefa honum þó at auki sæmligar gjafir. Jarl jättir Porgilsí nú öllum eignum sínum. Váru þeir með jarli
um vetrinn í góðu yfirlæti. At sumri vilja þeir í hernað en ætla til jarls at vetri.

Eina nót kom Auðun at Þorgils ok heimti at honum sverðit Blaðin - ’en ek mun fá þér fyrst óxi en innan 5 lítils tímá gött `sverð.’ Þorgils kvað hann vísat hafa skyldu sverðit. Auðun bað hann hafa þókk fyrir ok gaf honum fíngrgull. En er Þorgils vaknaði, var sverðit burtu ok þótti honum svipr at. Síðan herja þeir um sumarit.

Gyrðr hét víkingr er þeir finna um sumarit undir ey 10 einni. Um morguninn fór skúta frá skipum Gyrðs til þeira Þorgils ok kvaz Gyrðr vilja gera félag við þá. Þetta fór fram ok skal Gyrðr hafa jafnmörk skip ok at helmingi allt hlutskipti. Herja nú um sumarit ok varð þeim gött til fjár. Eyðdu mjök illþydi ok hernaðarmönnum en létu bændr ok 15 kaupmenn fara í friði.

Þeir komu til Írlands um sumarit. Var þar skógur fyrir er þeir komu at. Gengu síðan upp í skógin ok í einum stað sá þeir fallit lauf af tré. Þeir kippa upp eikinni ok finna þar jarðhús undir. Þeir sjá menn með vápnum 20 niðri í húsínu. Þorgils gerir sínum mönnum kost at sá skal eignaz íi. kostgrípi er fyrstr gengr í húsit en allir játta því nema Gyrðr. Þeir þat hljóp Þorgils í húsit ok varð þar engi mötstaða. Þar lá klæði blátt ok á tveir gullhringar ok sverð gött. Þar váru ok tvær 25 konur; var önnur ung ok frið en önnur gömul ok þó frið.

Þorgils gekk um húsit ok var viða berg undir. Hann hafði í hendi eina rótakylfu ok barði henni á báðar hendr ok
stókk flest undan. Þorsteinn fór með honum. Ok er þeir
gengu ór jarðhúsinu, tóku þeir konu þá ína yngri ok
fluttu með sér til skipa ok svá ína eldri. Nú sækir
líðit fast eptir þeim æn þeir Porgils komaz til skipa ok
5 láta þegar frá landi. Nú gekk maðr ór líðinu, því er eptir
sótti, ok mælti langt erindi. Þeir skildu eigi hans mál.
Pá mælti kvínnan á Norrænu ok sagði þeim at hann vildi
upp gefa þat er þeir hófðu fengit af fénu - 'ef þér
látið okkra lausar. Þessi maðr er jarl ok son minn en ek
10 er Vikversk at móðurkyni. Munu þér þá ok bezt njóta
gripanna er svá er gert, því at þungi fylgir sverðinu.
Son minn heitir Hugi; hann býðr þér, Porgils, fé heldr
en þér takið mik í burtu. Er yór ok ekki hann í okkr
burt at taka.' Porgils hlýðir þeira ráðum ok flytr þær
15 til lands. Hugi jarl gekk með fagnaði á móti Porgilsí
ok gaf honum hring einn, annan móðir hans, mærin inn
þriðja ok mæltu síðan vel fyrir honum.

17. Eptir þetta vilja þeir Porgils ok Þorsteinn hætta
hernaðinum ok skipta fjárhlut. Gyrðr kallaði til grip-
20 anna. Porgils kvað þar marga vitnismenn til vera hvat
skilit var. Gyrðr kvaz aldri jättat háfa ok vill heldr
berjaz en missa gripanna. Porgils kvað ráðligra at
leggja eigi allt lið í hættu - 'ok reynum heldr tveir.'
Því jattar Gyrðr. Síðan berjaz þeir. Hafði Porgils
25 sverðit Jarðhússnaut ok höggr til Gyrðs ok undan honum
fötinn fyrir neðan ókla. Skildu við svá búit. Lífði
Gyrír síðan ok var kallaður Gyrír inn halti.

Eptir þat fóru þeir til Noregs ok váru með Hákonin jarli um vetrinn. Guðrún, kona Porgils, fæddi þá svein-barn; hann var Þorleifr nefndr.

5 En er varar, vill Porgils út til Íslands til eigna sinna. Gaf Hákon jarl Porgilsi aþtr allar eignir sínar, þær er hann átti í Sogni, ok skildu þeir jarl með vin-áttu. Sat hann nú at búm sínum um sumarit ok svá um vetrinn. Porgils sagði Þorsteini at hann vill vitja

10 eigna sinna á Íslandi - 'því at þeir varðveita er mér er ekki um. Hefi ek nú látit skip búa ok flutt þangat til mikit fé. En jarðir þessar er ek á hér skaltu varðveita til handa Þorleifi, syni mínun. Hefi ek þik reynt góðan dreng. Mun ek nú ok launa þér með einni gjöf;

15 skal ek gefa þér Guðrúnu, konu mínun, því at þat hefir ek fundit at þú hefir lagt ástarþokka til hennar, þótt þú hafir vel með því farit.' Þorsteinn þakkaði Porgilsi gjöfina ok þótti mólnnum mikils um þetta vert.

Porgils for kaupferð eina á Upplönd ok Svíþjóð

20 ok var um vetr hjá bónda þeim er Prándr hét. Hann var auðigr maðr ok átti dóttur er Sigriðr hét. Hana vildi eiga sá maðr er Randviðr hét; hann var illmenni ok kappi mikill. Prándr synjaði honum ráðsins. Þá bauð Randviðr Prándi hólmgöngu þá er kolluð er kerganga; skal þar

25 berjaz í keri ok byrgja yfir ofan ok hafa keflí í hendi. Prándr vildi heldr berjaz en gipta dóttur sína svá illum manni. Porgils meðti þá til Prándar: 'Vel hefir
. þú mér vist veitt ok skal ek þat góðu launa ok mun ek berjaz við Randvið fyrir þík. 'Prándr kvaz þat þiggja mundu. Porgils hafði sverðit Jarðhússnaut. Randviðr hafði álnarkefli ok digrt mjök. Var byrgt yfir kerít.  
5 Randviðr bað þegar leggja fyrst, því at á hann var skor­at. Hann gerði svá ok kemr í keflit ok sprakk þat í sundr ok hljóp sverðit í kviðinn á Randvið. Hann mælti þá: 'Fá þú mér nú sverðit en þú haf keflit ok mun ek leggja til þín með sverðinu.' 'Mér þykkir nú,' sagði Por­gils, 'þetta vera spænir en eigi kefl.' Litlu síðar dó Randviðr; hafði hann treyst fjölkynngi sinni, því at hann hafði margan mann fellt með þessi hólmgøngu. Porg­gils dreg tvá aðra víkinga; Snækoll ok Snæbjörn. Prándr launaði Porgils vel. Fekk hann víring mixla af þessu  
10 verki. Hann bjóz síðan út til Íslands um sumarit éptir.  
18. Óláf r tvennumbrúni hét maðr. Hann kom til Íslands ok nam Óll Skeið á milli Þjórsár ok Sandløkjar. Hann var hamramr mjök. Óláf bjó á Óláfsvöllum. Hann liggr í Brúnahaugí undir Vörðufelli. Óláf átti Ashildi ok váru 20 synir þeira Helgi ok Þór, faðir Þorkels, fóður Gull­kárs, fóður Orms, fóður Helgu, móður Odds Hallvarðssonar.  
Porgrímr Órrabeinn lagði hug á Ashildi, þá er Óláf var dauðr, en Helgi trausti, son hennar, vandaði um ok fór frá búi sínu til hennar ok kvaz eigi vilja fíflingar 25 hennar ok kvað óvirðing í vera, bæði henni ok frændum hen­nar. Hon bað hann sik eigi reiðan gera; kvað ekki hans
færi at keppa við Porgrím. Hann svarar: 'Auðsætt er þat at maðrinn hugnar þér vel en ek mun eigi at sitja honum slíkar svívirðingar.' Skilja þau nú tal sitt.

Porgrímur gistir á Oláfsvöllum. 'Áshildr gerði honum 5 göðan beina ok fóru mjók saman hugir þeira. Hon sagði Porgrími hvert tal þeira Helga hafði verit. Helgi ræðir ok um kvánum Porgríms; kvaz illa við una; bað hann af láta. Porgrímur kvaz eigi hirða um hans þokka eðr hót ef hennar vili væri til. Nú leiðir hon Porgrím á götu 10 ok gaf honum mikit fingrgull áðr þau skildu. Áshildi kvaz grunr á at þau mundu eigi optar sjáz. Porgrímur kvaz ætla at finna hana brátt. Hon kvað vel ef svá væri. Skilja við svá búit.

Porgrímur reið nú leið sina fyrir neðan Áshildarmýri. 15 Helgi sat fyrir honum hjá gatnamótí. Ok er þeir funduz, bað Helgi hann af láta kvánum ok gera sér eigi skapraun í þessu. Porgrímur kvaz eigi hafa barnaskap, kvaz búinn at reyna alla hluti við hann. Helgi kvaz ætla at at málfnum mundi ganga - 'ok er þat vel at vit reynim okkr.' 20 Síðan bôrðuz þeir snarpliga ok lengi. Porgrímur var þá á inum efra aldri ok mæddiz skjótt ok varð sárr mjók. Helgi sækir at fast er hann sér at Porgrími latar ok lýkr svá með þeim at Porgrímur fellr fyrir Helga.

Um kveldit kom Helgi heim. Spurði Áshildr hann tíð- 25 inda en hann sagði slík sem váru. Hon svarar: 'Mikit hefir þú at gert ok vaxit muntu þykkjaz hafa af þessu verki; en ek kann segja þér at þetta er þinn höfuðbani.'
Helgi tók sér fari í Einarshöfn ok ætlar utan.


10 Þatu þeir hárða hríð en fyrir fjólennís sakir fell Helgi ok móður með honum ok einn móður af hinna líði. Var síðan sæz á málit ok felluz vígin í fæðma.

Porgils kom út á Eyrum. Lóptr, fóstri hans, sat í búi sínu. Margt hafði tíðinda ordit meðan Porgils var 15 utan. Þórunn, móðir hans, var ok Ónduð. Porgils fór heim í Tráðarholt. Tók bróðir hans vel við honum ok búu þeir bræðr nú báðir saman þessi misseri.


25 Porgils bað Þóreyjar ok var hon honum gipt. Váru þeira samfarar góðar.

Sørli kvaz þat mundu gera eptir hugbokka sínum en hirða ekki um orð hans. 'Þú munt ráða,' segir Kolr. 

Ánnan dag kom Sørli ok sat á tali við Guðrúnu ok um kveldit ferr hann seint heim. Ok er hann kemr skammt frá bænum, sprettr Kolr upp fyrir honum. Verð ekki af kveðjum. Hógg Kolr Sørla banahögg ok för heim ok sagði Guðrúnu at stóðvaðar váru kvámur Sørla. Hon kvaz eigi þat lasta mundu en kvað eigi svá búti hlýða mundu því at hann var þingmaður Ásgríms Ellíða-Grímssonar; - 'far nú ok hitt Porgils, því at hann þykkir mér líkligastr til at veita þér nökkut skjól.' Kolr kemr í Traðarholt. Þat var síð um kveld. Menn váru at mat. Pórey gekkt fram ok til dyra ok bauð fóstra sínum þar at vera. Hann sagði henni tíðindin. 'Þú skalt þat,' segir Pórey, 'vita við Porgils hvárt hann vill nökkut traust veita þér eðr ekki, ok láttu hljótt um þik.' Hon leiddi hann í skot eitt; síðan gekkt hon til stofu. Porgils mælti: 'Hví skulu menn svá lengi bíða matar í kveld enda hefir þú fengit rauðan lit.' Pórey svarar: 'Satt er it fornkveðna at "spakir menn henda á mórgu mið"; mús hljóp áðan á kinn 25 mér en mér er hon harla ópekk.' 'Svá má vera,' segir Porgils. En er þau kómu í rekkju um kveldit, kvaz Porgils vilja vita hvat í framgöngunni hafði verit um kveldit.
Hon sagði honum allan atburðinn ok kvaz ásjá vilja veita Kol - 'ok muntu ok svá gera fyrir mín skýld.' Þorgils kvaz svá gera mundu.

Um morgun fór Þorgils til bús Kol's ok lét fara á 5 burt fé allt með sér ok Guðrúnu en lét eptir ömegð aðra. En er þeir váru burt fænir, kom Ásgrímur; ætlar hann at taka upp fyrir Kol fé allt ok hafði hann ekki. Kolr sitr hjá Þorgilsí um vetrinn.

Ok um várit býr Ásgrímur mál til á hendr Kol. Lætr 10 Þorgils eigi sem hann viti. Verðr Kolr sekr skógarmaðr. Þorgils ríðr sem áðr um heraðit ok Kolr með honum; sækja mannamót ok verðr nú óþokki mikill manna á milli. Höfðingjum þykkir mein á þessu ok leita um sættir. Þorgils býðr ekki sættir.

En hvert sinn er hann kemr á mannamót, sýnir hann það sjóðinn. Váru þar í þrjár merkr silfrs ok gekk enginn við at setti.

20. Nú kom kristni á Island ok tók Þorgils í fyrra lagi við trú. Hann dreymdó eina nótt at Pórr kemti at honum með illu yfirbragði ok kvað hann sér brugðiiz hafa. 'Hefir þú illa ór haft við mik,' segir hann, 'valit mér þat er þú áttir verst til en kastat silfri því í fúla tjórn, er ek átta, ok skal ek þér í móti koma.' 'Guð mun mér hjálpa,' segir Þorgils, 'ok er ek þess sæll er okkat félag sleit.'

Ok er Þorgils vaknar, sá hann at þóðugólfr hans var dauðr. Hann lét grafa hann hjá tóptum nökkurum ok lét ekki af nýta.


Þorgils var it mesta mikilmenni. Honum kömu orðsendingar af Grænlandi at Eiríkr rauði þýr honum til sín ok at hafa þá kosti er bezta hefir hann til. Þorgils áhlýðði búit 25 lítt við þat. Hann hafði þá var þér xiii. vetr. Skip kom af hafi. Var þar á Þorleifr, soð hans, ok hafði góða
gripi at færa honum. Þorleifr var þá xx. Porgils talar við konu sína ef hon vildi fara til Grænlands. Hon kvað vanbreytt um. Hann sagði at Eiríkr hafði sent sér orð um;
- 'má ok at þú sér eptir, ef þú vill þat.' 'Misráðit mun,' 5 sagði hon, 'at þangat sé farit en þó skal ek fara ef þú ferr.' Hæringr tók við gózum Porgils. Þórný hét döttir þeira Porgils ok Þóreyjar; hon var viðvetra. Þor-
leifr skal fara með þeim, Kolr ok bróðir hans, Starkaðr, ok Guðrún, systir þeira, Snækollr ok Ózurr, þrælar hans, ok
10 x. aðrir þrælar ok ráðsmaðr hans, Þórarinn, því at Porgils ætlaði bæ at reisa, þá er kæmi til Grænlands. Jósteinn ór Kálfrholti réz til ferðar með Porgilsí við xii. menn, Þorgerðr, kona hans, ok sonr. Porgils kaupir nú skip í Leiruvági. Þórólfr hét maðr er Porgils fekk bú í hendr
15 en Hæringi fekk hann lx. hundraða mórent vi. álna aura, annat en staðfestur.

Porgils gisti at Póroðds at Hjalla. Með honum var í ferð Þórný, döttir hans. Þar tók hon sótt ok beið Porgils þar iii. nætr. Sagði hann at þat staði ekki fyrir ferð
20 hans, þótt hon væri sjúk; - 'má vera at hér sé hennar forlög.' Póroðdr kvæz ætla at hon. mundi giptudrjúg verða ok langlíf. Lét hann hana eptir ok gaf henni xl. hundraða, ef hon þyrpti. Porgilsí kvæz nú fyrir þykkja at fara en léz eigi nenna aprtr at setjaz.

25 21. Porgils bíðr nú byrjar ok dreymir at maðr kæmi at honum, mikill ok rauðskeggjaðr, ok mælti: 'Ferð hefir þú
ætlat fyrir þér ok mun hon erfið verða.' Draummaðrinn
sýndiz honum heldr greppligr. 'Illa mun þyr faraz,' segir
hann, 'nema þú hverfir aptr til míns átrúnaðar. Mun ek
þá enn til sjá með þér.' Porgils kvaz aldri hans umsjá
5 hafa vilja ok þá hann burt dragaz sem skjótast frá sér -
'en mín ferð tekz sem almáttigr Guð vill.' Síðan þótti
honum Þórr leiða sik á hamra nókkura, þar sem sjóvar-
straumr brast í björgum; - 'i slíkum bylgjum skaltu vera ok
aldri ór komaz, utan þú hverfir til mín.' 'Nei!' sagði
10 Porgils, 'Far á burt, inn leiði fjandi! Sá mun mér hjálpa,
sem alla leysti með sínum dreyra.' Síðan vaknar hann ok
segir drauminn konu sinni. 'Aptr munda ek setjaz,' segir
hon, 'ef mik hefði svá dreymt ok eigi vil ek segja Jósteini
draum þenna ok eigi dörum mónnum.'
15 Nú kemr byrr ok sigla þau út ór firði. Hafði Jósteinn
skip fyrir framan siglu. Ok sem þau koma ór landsýn, tekz
af byrr allr ok veljaz þau úti lengi svá at bæði varð mat-
fátt ok drykkjarfátt. Porgils dreymdí at inn sami maðr
kæmi at honum ok mælti: 'Fór eigi sem ek sagða þér?'
20 Þórr talaði þá enn margt við Porgils en Porgils rak hann
frá sér með hörðum orðum.

Tekr nú at hausta ok mæltu sumir menn at þeir skyldi
heita á Þórr. Porgils bannaði þát ok sagði at menn skyldi
missmíði á finna, ef nokkurr maðr blötaði þár í skipi.
25 Við þessi orð treystiz engi á Þórr at kalla.

Eptir þetta dreymdí Porgils at sami maðr kom at honum
ok mælti: 'Enn sýndiz þát, hversu trúr þú vart mér, er menn
vildu á mik kalla en ek hefir beint nú fyrir þínnum mánnum
ok eru nú komnrir at þrotum allir, ef ek dugi þeim eigi en
nú muntu taka höfn á sjau nóttta fresti, ef þú hverfr til
mín af nökkurri alvöru.' 'Þótt ek taka aldri höfn,' segir.
5 Porgils, 'þá skal ek þér ekki gott gera.' Þórr svarar:
'Þótt þú gerir mér aldri gott, þá gjalt þú mér þó góz mitt.'
Porgils hugsar hvat um þetta er ok veit nú at þetta er
einn uxi ok var þetta þá kálfr, er hann gaf honum. Nú
vaknar Porgils ok ætlar nú at kasta utanborðs uxanum. En
10 er Porgerðr verðr þess víís, falar hon uxann því at henni
var vistafátt. Porgils sagðiís vilja ónýta uxann ok engum
selja. Porgerði þótti nú illa. Hann lét kasta uxanum
útbyrðis ok kvað eigi kynligt þótt illa færiz, er fé
Þórs var innbyrðis.

15 22. Öau eru nú útí um hrið ok höfðu harda réttu. Pór-
arinn var knástr maðr annarr en Porgils; hann var xx. at
aldri. Þat er sagt at þeir brutu skipit undir Grænlands-
jóklum í vík nökkurri við sandmöl. Tók skipit í sundr í
efra rúmi. Menn helduz allir ok svá fé. Bátr var ok heill.
20 Stafn rak upp við syðra land. Þá var vika til vetrar.
Jóklar miklir gengu tveim megin víkkrinnar. Þeir gera sér
nú skála ok í þverðili. Búa nú sínum megin hvárir. Mjól
nökkut höfðu þeir til atvinnu sér. Henda ok af selum ok
eiga þat allir saman. Dautt var fé þeira flest. Porgils
25 manna varð betri hluti af veiðifangi. Varð hann lengrum
hlutsælli. Hann bað sína menn vera hljóðlátu ok siðsama
á kveldum ok halda vel trú sína. Pórey var mjök þunguð.
Pát er sagt at Jósteinn ok hans menn gerðu mikit um sík 
ok höfðu náttleika með háréysti. Nær vetr nóttum varð Pór-
ey léttri at sveinbarni ok hét Porfinnr. Hon bjargaðsiz 
5 lítt við þá fæðu er til var. Porgils hafði útróðaramenn 
með þrállum Jósteins.

Líðr nú á vetrinn ok dregr at jólum. Porgils biðr menn 
hljóða vera ok fara snemma í rekkju. Jólamorgun var veðr 
gott ok váru menn úti um daginn ok heyrðu óp mikit í út-
10 norðr ok kemr annarr dagr í jólum. Porgils háttar snemma 
ok er þau höfðu sofít svefn, kom Jósteinn inn ok hans menn 
ok er heldr mikit um þá. Ok er þeir váru niðr lagzir, er 
drepit högg mikit á dyrr. Pá mælti einn þeira: 'Góð tíð-
indi munu nú vera,'–ok hljóp út ok varð hann þegar ærr. En 
15 um morguninn deyr hann. Svá ferr annan aptan at maðr æriz 
ok kallaz sjá hinn hlaupa at sér, er áðr dó. Eptir þat 
kom sött í lið Jósteins ok deyja vi. menn. Pá tekr Jó-
steinn sött ok deyr hann. Síðan eru þeir kasaðir í mjöll-
inni. Porgils ræðir um við sína menn ok bað þá við sjá 
20 slíkum fáðæmum. Á bak jólum gengu þessir menn allir aprtr. 
Pá tók Porgerðr sött ok andaz þar næst hverr at þórun þeira 
manna er með Jósteini höfðu véréit. Pórarinn léz síðast. 
Váru nú allmiklar aptrgöngur ok söttu mest Porgils. Óll 
váru þau dauð í miðja gői. Ekki mátti Porgils ok hans 
25 menn í burt færar meðan aptrgöngur váru sem mestar. Í 
þenna hluta skálans gengu þau mest aprtr er þau höfðu átt. 
Porgils lét brenda þau óll á báli ok varð þaðan af ekki
mein at aptrgöngum.

Nú líðir á vetrinn ok máttu þeir eigi burt leita fyrir ísum ok fengu sér vistir um sumarit. Annan vetr andaðiz Guðrún, systir Kols, ok gróf Porgils hana undir rámi sín u 5 ok, er várar, megu þau ekki í burt komaz.

23. Pat er eitthvert sinn at Pórey sagði draum sinn Porgilsí at hon kvaz sjá fógr heruð ok menn bjarta - 'ok get ek at vér leysimz burt òr þessum vandræðum.' Porgils svarar: 'Góðr er draumr þinn ok þó eigi ólíkastr 10 at viti til annars heims ok munir þú eiga gott fyrir hónendum ok munu helgir menn hjálpa þér fyrir hreint líf ok mann-raunir.' Hon bað hann burt leita òr öbyggðum, ef þeir mætti. Porgils kvaz eigi yfir þat sjá.

efni í.' En er þeir komu innar í skálann, heyrðu þeir snörgl nokkut til rekkju Póreyjar. Ok er þeir komu þar, sjá þeir at hon var ónduð en sveinninn saug hana dauða. Leituðu þeir um hana ok fundu ben litla undir 5 hendinni, sem mjóvum knifóddi hefði stungit verit. Mjökk var þar allt blóðugt. Pessa sýn hafði Porgils svá sét at honum þótti mestr harmr í vera. Burt var sópat óllum vistum. Um nóttina vill Porgils vaka yfir sveinimum ok kvaz eigi sjá at hann mætti álengdar lifa - 'ok þykki 10 mér mikit ef ek má eigi honum hjálpa. Skal þat nú fyrst taka til bragða at skera á geirvörtuna [mér],' - ok svá var gert. Fór fyrst út blóð, síðan blanda ok lét eigi fyrr af en ör fór mjólk ok þar fæddiz sveininn upp við þat. Þeir Porgils sóttu fast at veiðifangi ok gerðu sér einn húðkeip 15 ok bjuggu innan með viðum.

24 Einn morgun er Porgils einn úti ok sér í vók rekald mikit ok þar hjá tröllkonur tvær ok bundu byrðar miklar. Porgils hleypr til þangat ok hafði sverðit Jarðhússnaut ok hógr til annarrar með sverðinu í því er hon færiz undir 20 byrðina ok rekr af henni hóndina. Byrðrin fellr niór en hon hljóp í braut. Síðan taka þeir rekaldit ok eru þá vistir núgar.

Síðan losnar íssinn ok leitar Porgils ok hans menn þá í burt ok komaz til Seleyra um sumarit ok váru þar um vetr-25 inn.

At sumarmálum fóru þeir þaðan ok fundu ey litla. Hálf-
um mánaði síðar fundu þeir svartbaksegg ok gáfu sveininn. Hann át hálft egi. Þeir spurðu hví hann át eigi. Hann svarar: 'Því spari ek minn mat, at þér sparið yðvarn mat.' Þeir dragaz nú fram með jöklinum ok koma at björgum brøtt-5 um; brýna upp skipinu; reisa þar tjald. Ok um morguninn gengr Kolr út ok sér eigi skipit; leggz síðan niðr ok vill eigi-segja Porgils. Litlu síðar kom Porleifr út ok getr eigi um. Porgils kom út ok sér at skipit er á brautu ok sagði þeim hvarf skipsins - 'sér ek nú ekki annat til,'

10 kvað Porgils, 'en at tapa verði sveininnum.' Porleifr svarar: 'Ekki er þat til.' Hann bað þó at þat skyldi gera. Taka þeir nú sveininn ok biðr Porleifr Kol tapa piltinum. 'Eigi mun ek þat gera,' segir Kolr, 'því at ek veit at þegar af líðr Porgilsí þetta þá er honum þat inn mesti 15 harmr; en ek ætta Porgilsí gott at launa.' Síðan fara þeir inn ok látu úti eptir sveininn. Porgils spurði þá hvárt þeir hefði drepit sveininn. Þeir kváðu þat eigi vera. Hann þakkaði þeim fagrliga er þeir hófðu svá gert. Var þá sóttur sveinninn ok var hann hjá Porgilsí um nóttina.

20 Þá sagði Porgils draum Sinn: 'Ek þöttumz á þingi vera á Íslandi. Þótti mér sem vit Ásgrím Ellíða-Grimsson togaðim [eina hónk] ok missti hann.' Porleifr svarar: 'Par muntu enn koma til Íslands ok skipa málum við hann ok mun þér betr ganga.' 'Svá má vera,' segir Þorgils.

25 Aðra nótt dreymsi hann ok sagði: 'Ek þöttumz heima vera í Traðarholti ok var þar fjólmennt. Ek sá álpt eina ganga eptir gólfinu ok var blíðari við aðra en mik. Þá hrista ek
hana ok var hon þaðan af miklu betr til mín.' Porleifr svarar: 'Þar muntu kvángaz, faðir, ok muntu lítt í fyrstu njóta ástar hennar ok mun þat þó vel dragaz.'

'Enn dreymdi mik,' segir Þorgils, 'at ek væra heima í 5 Traðarholti. Ek sá á kné mínu innu hægra, þar váru vaxnir fimm hjálmlaukar saman ok kvísluðuz þar af margir laukar; ok ofarliga yfir hófuð mér bar einn laukinn en svá var hann fagr sem hann hefði gullslit.' Porleifr svarar: 'Sé ek draum þinn. Þar muntu eiga fimm børn. Frá þeim munu 10 kvíslaz margar ættir á Íslandi. En ek mun ekki þar aldr ala ok mun ek auka ætt mínana annarsstaðar. En inn fagri laukrinn mun werkja þat at einhverr maðr mun frá þér koma, sá er ágætr mun verða.' Ok þat gekk eptir síðan, því at frá Þorgils er kominn Þorlákr biskup inn helgi.

Porleifr mælti þá: 'Þat dreymdi mik, faðir, at mér þótti Þórý, systir mín, gefa mér osthleif ok váru af bárur- nar.' Þorgils mælti: 'Þar mun af it harðasta af kostum okkrum, er af váru bárurnar.'

Pá heyrðu þeir öð mikit. Var þá kallat at Íslendingar 20 skyldi taka skip sitt. Þeir ganga út skjótt ok sjá tvær konur. Pá hurfu skjótt. Björn einn brauz um í vök ok var brotinn í hrammrínn. Þorgils hleypr til ok leggr bjórnninn með sverði. Dó dýrit af því lagi. Þorgils þrífr þá til hlustanna ok vill eigi at sökkvi dýrit.

25 Draga upp síðan ok gera til. Þorgils deildi þá stykki sér hverjum þeira ok ná af slíku marka hversu þungan mata- arafla þeir áttu. Porleifr mælti: 'Matsparr ertu nú,
faðir.' 'Já, son minn, þat háfir at svá sé.'

Síðan snúa þeir til hafs ok róa fyrir framan margar vikr ok, er þeir kómu fyrir eitt fjarðarmynni, gekk þeim þá með mikill meði. Tekr þá nú at þyrsta fast. Þeir váru, 5 fimm saman með sveininum. Þeir gerðuz þá mjök máttfarnir af þorsta en var hvergi nær vatn. Þá mælti Starkaðr: 'Þat hefi ek vitat menn hafa gert, ef líf þeira hefir við legi, at menn hafa blandat saman sjó ok hlandi.' Þeir taka nú auskerit ok míga í ok blóndaðu við sjó ok báðu Porgils leyfis at drekka. Hann kvað várkunn á en kvaz þó hvárki banna né lofa. En er þeir ætluðu at drekka, bað Porgils þá fá sér ok kvaz skyldu mæla fyrir minni. Hann tók við ok mælti svá: 'Ðú, it argasta dýr, er ferð vára dvelr, skalt eigi því ráða at ek né aðrir drekki sinn þarfagang.' Í því fló fugl, því líkastr sem álkuunghi burt frá skipinu ok skrákti við. Porgils hellti síðan útbyrðis ör auskerinu. Síðan róa þeir ok taka sér vatn ok var þat síð dags. Þessi fugl flaug í norðrætt frá skipinu. Porgils mælti: 'Seint hefir fugl þessi við oss skilit ok taki nú allar gramir við honum. En við þat megun vér una at hann kom eigi því á leið sem hann vildi.'

At þrim nóttum liðnum, sá þeir tjald af lérepti. Þeir kenndu at þat var tjald Póreyjar. Fundu þar brytja Porgils ok spyrja með hverju faraldi hann hafði þar komit. Hann sagði þá kostaboð þeira Snækolls við sik ef hann vildi eigi fara, at þeir mundi drepa hann; 'Snækollr stakk mjóvu járni á Póreyju.' Porgils svarar: 'Eigi veit ek
hvers þú ert af verðr en ósannlig þykkri mér þín sögn ok 
skaltu ekki lífa lengi.' Þar var hann drepinn ok grófu 
hann þar. Fara síðan í burt.

Nú tekr at hausta ok koma þá í fjörð einn. Láta at 
5 landi ok sjá at þar var naust. Brýna þar upp skipinu ok 
ganga frá sjó ok koma at bæ. Þar var maðr úti ok heilsar 
á þá ok spyrr at nafni ok þeir hann. Þessi kvaz Þrólfr 
heita ok bauð þeim þar at vera. Þat þiggja þeir ok er Por-
finnr fenginn konum til geysmslu ok er honum mjólk gefin.
10 Sagði hann mjólk fður síns ekki svá líta. Eru þeir þar 
um vetrinn.

Um várit býðr Þrólfr Pogilsí þar at vera með sínum 
mönnum en þá bauð hann honum skip sitt ef hann vildi burtu 
fara. Pogils þakkar honum en kvaz skipit hafa vilja; - 
15 'væri ok skylt at launa þér góðu.' Þrólfr kvaz ætlfa at 
hann mundi gott af honum hljóta - 'því at þú munt í mikla 
virðing koma ok, ef svá væri, þá mættir þú mik í frið kaupa 
við byggðarmenn, því at ek er í ófriði við þá.' Pogils 
játtar því ok mæla þar hvárir vel fyrir dórnum.

20 Fara suðr fyrir land ok koma í fjörð ok lögðu í lægi. 
Síðan tjölduðu þeir ok í því bili sá þeir skip ok var þat 
kaupskip. Sigldu þeir á fjörðinn ok hófðu eitt veðr hvári-
irtveggju ok kömu at einni lendingu. Pogils mælti: 'Petta 
eru góð tíðindi. Fari þít, Porleifr ok Kolr, ok vitið 
25 hverir þessir eru.' Síðan fóru þeir ok kömu at skipinu 
ok ganga út á þat. Aptr við lytingina sat maðr í rauðum 
kyrtli ok sprettr upp þegar ok fagnar Porleifi. Var þar
kominn Þorsteinn hvíti, fóstri hans ok stjúpfaðir. Hann spyrr at Porgils. Þeir sögu at hann var þar. Þorsteinn für til fundar við Porgils. Varð þar fagnafundur. Kvað kominn af Islandi ok kvað ráð hans standa heilt; 5 kvað ekki þar til hans frétt hafa á fjórum vetrum; sagði Þórnýju, dóttur hans vera gipta Bjarna í Gróf Þorsteins-syni rauða landnámamanns - 'ok er Þorleifr kom eigi apr til Noregs, bjó ek skip mitt ok för ek til Islands ok var ek þar tvá vetur ok fréttta ek ekki þar til þín. Fór ek þá 10 hingat at leita þín.' 'Góðs þótti mér at þér ván,' segir Porgils.

Menn komu brátt til þeirra. Bóndi sá er þar bjó næst hét Þórir. Hann bauð Þorsteini til sín ok þangat för hann. Eiríkr rauði bauð Porgils til sín ok þat þekktiz hann. 15 Þangat fóru xii. menn með honum. Porgils er skipat gagnvart Eiríki ok þar utar frá sat Þorleifr, þá Kolr, þá Starkaðr. Þorfinni var fengin fóstra ok vill hann ekki mjölk drekka fyrir en myrkt var. Dá var hann af brjóstí vaninn. Ekki var Eiríki margt til Porgils ok var vistin 20 með minna þokka veitt en Porgils hugði. Pat frétti Porgils at þrálarnir váru þar í landi ok lét eigi sem hann vissi.

25. Pat bar til um vetrinn at bjarnðyr lagðiz á fé manna ok gerði mikinn skaða. Pat var einn tíma at menn komu til 25 kaupa við Porgils ok váru menn margir í útibúri því er varningsgrinn var í. Pat var Þorfinnr. Hann mælti við
fóður sinn: 'Hér er úti, faðir, ræki fagr ok mikill.'
Porgils svarar: 'Hirð eigi um þat ok hlaup eigi út.'
Sveinninn hljóp út sem áðr ok var þar bjarndýrit fyrir.
Þat svippti honum undir sik. Sveinninn kvað við hátt. Porgils hljóp út með sverðit Jarðhússnaut. Dýrit hafði leik- 
it við sveininn. Porgils hóggr á milli hlustanna á dýrinu 
ok klýfr haussinn ok fellr þat niðr dauð; en hann tekr 
sveininnok var hann lítt sakaðr. Verð Porgils nú ágætr 
af þessu verki ok þótti stór heill til hans horfit hafa.
10 Ekki fannz Eiríki til þessa verks en lét þó til gera dýrit.
Sógðu þat sumir menn at Eiríkr hefði haft á því fornan 
átrúnað.

Þat er sagt um vetrinn at menn sátu í náðahúsi í Bratta-
hlíð ok þó eigi allir senn, því at sumir stóðu fram í 
15 húsinu. Þar var Kolr ok Starkaðr. Þat var tal þeira at 
þeir föru í mannjofnuð ok tóluðu um Porgils ok Eirík.
Sagði Kolr Porgils morg afreksverk gert hafa. Pá svarar 
sá maðr er Hallr hét - hann var heimamaðr Eiríks -: 'Þat 
er ójafnt,' segir hann, 'því at Eiríkr er hofþingi mikill 
20 ok frægr en Porgils þessi hefdir verit í vesöld ok ánauð ok 
óvist er móð hvárt hann er heldr karlmaðr en kona.' Kolr 
svarar: 'Mæl þú manna armastr,' - ok leggr í gegnum hann 
með spjóti. Fekk hann þegar bana. Eiríkr bað menn sina 
upp standa ok taka Kol. Kaupmenn allir hlaupa til ok veita 
25 Kol. Porgils mælti þá: 'Þat er nást, Eiríkr, at þú hefnir 
sjálfur heimamanns þíns.' Nú eiga hlut í beggja vinir.
Þykkir eigi auðsöttligt at fara at þeim. Nú sættaz þeir
með því at Porgils ok Eiríkr skulu gera um. Þeir verða vel ásáttir um gerðina en þó fækkaðiz síðan með þeim ok ætlar Porgils þar ekki langvistum at vera.

Um vetrinn bar þat til at mein mikit varð at útilegu-5 mólnum. Þorsteinn hét sá er fyrir þeim var. Þeir váru xxx. ok sekir allir. Urðu menn af þeim fyrir ránnum miklum ok sögðu til Eiríki. Þeir lágu í eyjum nõkkurum í Eiríks- firdi. Eiríkr berr upp mál þetta fyrir Porgilsí ok kvaz vilja hans liðsinni til hafa. Porgils kvaz eigi til þess 10 farit hafa til Grænlunds at leggja sik í hættu við ill-menni; kvaz illt hlotit hafa af Eiríki en kvaz þó eigi nenna at synja ferðaramar fyrir nauðsyn landsmanna ok kvaz búinn, þá er Eiríkr vildi fara, en kvaz viljá gera til lykta áór sín erindi - 'ok vertu þá búinn, er ek geri 15 þér orð.'

Eptir þat foru þeir til skips ok ætluðu at fara um ina vestri byggð því at menn hófðu eigi goldit Porgilsí bjarn-gjöldin. Porgils færir fram sýknu Hrólfís svá at hann skyldi vera friðheilagr. En er Porgils kom í Vestribyggð, tók við 20 honum sá maðr er Bjálfi hét. Hann kvaz mikla þókk kunna hans þarvámu - 'skal ek taka saman fé þitt því at þú ert frágar maðr ok muntu mér at liði verða því at ek er í nauðum staddr. Hér liggja fyrir eyjar þær er ránsmenninir eru í ok ætlar hófðingi þeira hingat ok taka á burt döttur 25 míná. Vil ek at þú sér hér til trausts ok varnar.' Porgils kvaz þat gera mundu. Bónið ferr nú ok tekr saman féit ok koma eigi víkingarnir. Bónið kemr heim. Porgils
mælti þá: 'Pú hefir kostat oss, bóndi, en vær höfum get.
bér ekki til gagns svá búit. Nú mun ek farar til móts við
vikingana, þvi at ösýnt er um þinn frið þegar vær erum
burtu.' Bóndi þakkar honum en kvað þó mikit í hættu þar er.
5 Porgils var ok hans menn.

Hann sendi orð Eiríki at hann kæmi með jafnmarga menn.
Ok er Eiríki kómu orðin, kvaz hann mundu koma ok verða
ekki seinni til eyjanna en þeir. Þeir Porgils koma nú
10 við eyna ok var Eiríkr ekki þar kominn. Porgils gerir
þá ráð við menn sína. 'Leitt er mér,' segir hann, 'frá
at hverfa en sjá þykkumz ek Eiríki í gegnum. Hann ætla
at vísa oss á illmenni þessi ok hyggr at vær munum eigi
nenna frá at hverfa þótt hann komi eigi.' Ekki höfðu
15 víkingar til lands komir síðan Porgils kom í Vestribyggð.

Sá maðr var á Grænlandi er án inn heimski hét. Hann
hljóp um allt land, kunnr öllum mörnum. Porgils lá í
einum leyvíági ok hafnleysu. Eitthvert sinn, stígir Porgils
á bát ok rær frá skipinu. Hann sér matsveina á
20 landi ok höfðu graut í kötlum. Porgils hafði vánd klæði
er hann kom til þeira. Þeir spurðu hvern hann var. Þeir
Porgils svarar: 'Ek heitir án.' Þeir hlógu at honum enda lét
hann heimskliga. Hann spyrr hvar höfðingi þeira er. Þeir
sögðu hann vera í eyjunni skammt í burt ok þangat ván til
25 þeira um kveldit. Þeir færðu hann í reikjó. Ferr Porgils
nú til báts síns ok hvelfir honum undir sér. Þeir hlógu
at honum ok mæltu: 'Undarliga bregðr nú við,' sagði annarr.
'Hvat er þat?' sagði félagi hans. 'Maðr er kominn í byggð-
ina, sá er Þorgils heitir, mikill og frægr, ok því kemr
höfðingi várr eigi til lands. Ok heillabrigði er nú orð-
it. Ek heyrdi í morgin, er ek kom út, þetta mæla skipin:
þat skip er Stakanhöfði hét mælti þetta: "Veiztu þat,
Vinaغاutr, at Þorgils skal eiga okkr?" "Veit ek þat,"
sagði annat skipit, "ok þykki mér þat vel," - ok ætla ek,'
segir hann, 'slíkt fyrir tíðindum.' Nú ferr Þorgils apr
10 til skips síns. Í þat mund róa vikingarnir at lægi. Þor-
gils leggr þá at þeim. Váru vikingarnir komnir til skála.
Koma þeir Þorgils þá á óvart ok lætr hann þegar leggja eld
í skálann. Varð lítil vörn af vikingunum. Gefa þeir sik
upp ok tíðja griða. Þorgils kvað þess enga ván fyrir mórg
15 illvirki er þeir höfðu unnit. Var lið þeira allt drepit
utan þeir buðu formanni þeira grið. Hann kvaz eigi þat
þiggja vilja - 'því at ek verðr yór aldri trúr.' Hann
var þá höggvinn. Tóku þeir þar fé mikit ok höfðu þat með
sér ok svá skipin, Stakanhöfða ok Vinaغاut. Fóru nú til
20 lands. Tók Bjálfí vel við þeim. Þorgils gaf mórgum mœn-
um fé, þeim er misst höfðu fyrir vikingunum, ok hefir þó
mikit sjálf. Verðr hann nú vinsæll af þessum verkum.
Hrölfur var þá norðan kominn ok í friði tekinn. Þorgilsi
líkar illa við Eirík. Þorgils spyrr til Snækolls ok kvaz
25 vilja finna hann. Þorsteinn hvíti kvað betr fallit at
hann seldi Snækoll við verði en dræpi hann. Pat gerði
Þorgils. Prælarnir höfðu fengit góð kvánföng. Þorgils
tekr fé allt af þrælunum en seldi þá í þrældóm.

Eptir þetta für Porgils burt með góðri sæmd ok virðing.
Tala nú um hvárt þeir skulu þar vera um vetrinn eðr burt
5 halda. Porsteinn kvað óráðligt burt at halda er sumar var
mjök áliðit. Tóku menn sér þá vistir nær skipi. Porgils
var á vist með þeim manni er Anakol hét. Var honum þar
blíðliga veitt.

Nú líðr á vetrinn. Anakol var vanr at drekka í burtu
10 um hálf jól. Hann bauð Porgilsi at fara með sér. Hann
þá þat. Þeir Kolr ok Starkaðr váru heima meðan til um-
sjár við Porfinn. Gíparr hét þræll Anakols. Hann bað
Kol drekka karlmannliga. 'Er þat auðsætt,' sagði hann,
'at þér þykkiz mikils verðir.' Kolr kvaz ætla at ráða
15 drykkju sinni en hann eggjan sinni. Gíparr ámælti honum
mjök ok þar kom at hann laust Kol með horni ok bað hann þat
hafa fyrst ok bíða svá íns verra. Starkaðr gekk á milli
ok vildi eigi hefna láta fyrir en Porgils kæmi heim.

Nú koma þeir Porgils ok bóndi heim ok er þeim sagðr
20 þessi atburðr. Porgils kvað þat vel vera þött eigi hefði
heft verit - 'hófum vér þegit góða vist í vetr hjá
bónda. Nú vil ek til bóta mæla,' ok svá gerði hann.
Bóndi kvaz ekki þræla mundu mun géra þött þeir hnippiz.
Porgils kvað eigi vel svarat. Ok er boðsmenn váru burtu
25 farnir, þeir er drukkt hófðu þar efra hlut jólanna, töku
þeir Porgils Gípar ok drepa hann eptir jólín. Síðan fóru
þeir Porsteinn til skips ok bjugguz til varnar. Þeir sá
lið mikit fara með skjóldum, eigi færa en c. manns. Pá mælti Porgils: 'Má vera at oss sé skjót fullliða.' Pá berr brátt at ok tók hóföingi þeira til ordá: 'Pat var mér þá í hug er Porgils þessi gaf í mitt vald systur mína at eigi munda ek efla flokk í móti honum.' Pá var kominn Hugi jarl ok bauð þeim með sér at vera ok þat þágu þeir. Hugi lét bæta skip þeira ok váru þeir með honum þat eptir var vetrar. Systir Huga lifði ok fagnaði þeim vel. Móðir hennar var ónduð. Jarl lét heimta saman fé Porgils ok til skips færa ok setti málum þeira svá at þeim hugnaði vel honum ok gaf þeim gjafir áðr þeir fóru burt.

27. Síðan létu þeir í haf ok velktuz úti lengi ok kömu við Hálogaland um haustit ok brotnaði kjöldrinn undan skipinu. Björn hét góðr bóndi. Hann tók við Porgilsi, Þorfinni, Þorleifur ok Starkaðr vistuðu þar í nánd. Snemmdis bættu þeir skip sitt.

Sá maðr hvarflaði þar um land er Randviðr hét. Hann var illmenni mikit. Hann kom til Bjarnar bónda ok kvaz vilja Yngiðr taka við döttur hans er Yngiðr hét eðr berðiz við hann ef hann vildi þat heldr. Þorsteinn vildi berjaz við þenna mann. 'Eigi vildum vér,' segir Porgils, 'at þú hefðir þik í hættu fyrir illmenni þetta ok vil ek heldr berjaz við hann.' Porgils finnr Randvið ok bað hann láta bónda vera í friði, gamlan mann. Hann kvaz einskis mundu hans orð um þat virða. Porgils mælti: 'Ek vil leysa bónda.' Porgils gengr á hólm við Randvið ok höggr þégar skjóld hans önýtan.
Pvi næst hógr hann kappann sundr í miðju en við hóggit skaut Randvíðr sverðinu utan á kné Porgilsí ok særdí hann. Pat sár greri svá at fótr hans sá var skimnri síðan ok varð hann aldri óhaltr. Björn þakkar honum vel ok bauð Porgilsí fé en hann kvaz þat ekki til fjár gert hafa. Skildu þeir vinir.


Nú vildu þeir fara með lík Porfinns til kirkju. Porgils kvað þá lengi fylgzi hafa; sagði þá ok ekki at svá bánu skilja mundu. Porsteinn spurði Starkað hvárt hann vildi heldr teygja Porgils á land eðr fara með líkit til graptrar.
29. Sigmundr hét maðr. Hann heimti skiptoll at Porsteinni því at hann átti land at annaz þar er þeir váru komnir. 

Litlu eptir þing kómu þeir Porgils út ok fór hann heim 15 í Traðarholt ok Porsteinn með honum ok aðrir félagar.

Porgils var í Traðarholti um vetrinn ok þeir bráðr með honum, Kolr ok Starkaðr. Með honum váru fleiri menn þótt eigi sé nefndir. Hæringr veitti þeim vel. Porgils mælti eitt sinn við bróður sinn: 'Einn hlutr þykki mér at við þik, frámið, er þú léz svá mikit fé fylgja dótturn minni, 25 Þórnýju, þá er þú giptir hana Bjarna i Gróf.' Hæringr svarar: 'Vel þótt þá sét fyrir kosti hennar er hon hafði hundrað hundraða; en ef þér þykkr nökkut oftekit, þá haf
af mínu fé slíkt er þer vel líkar.' Porgils vildi þat með engu móti.

30. At liðnum vetri tekr Porgils við búi sínu ok ðórnum fjárhlutum. Felldu menn þegar mikla virðing til Porgils.

5 Hann var heldr fár við Bjarna, mág sinn.

Um várit kom fjólmennt til Arnesspringa. Kom þar Porgils ok Bjarni, mágr hans, ok Pórný, dóttir hans. Porgils gekk einn morgun til búðar Bjarna ok tók sverðit Jarðhússnaut í hönd sér. Ok er hann kemr í búðardyrnnar, sér

10 Pórný, dóttir hans, at hann er kominn ok bað Bjarna upp standa. Kvað honum eigi hlýða svá búit; sagði fósur sinn reiðan. Bjarni spratt upp þegar, því at hann var vitr maðr; hann gekk í móti Porgilsi ok fagnar honum vel ok bað honum þar at vera - 'ok allt mitt góz er þer heimilt til þess at

15 þer megi þá betr líka við mik heldr en áðr.' 'Þetta er allvel mælt,' segir Porgils, 'ok skal þetta þiggja, ella óvíst hversu farit hefði.' Bjarni bað honum þá til heimboðs. Porgils kvaz fara mundu af þinginu með honum ok hafa burt fé slíkt er honum líkaði. Bjarni bað hann því ráða ok

20 koma þeir í Gróf ok leit Porgils á féit ok kvaz burt mundu hafa xx. kýr ok c. ásauðar. Pórný bað hann taka slíkt er hann vildi ok sagði þat mundu bezt gegna at hann réði fyrir.

Maðr hét Pórólfr. Hann hafði verit með Pórði, fósur

25 Porgils, ok náinn fráendi. Hann átti fé at Porgilsí ok beiddi Porgils at hann mundi gjalsa Pórólfrí xl. c. Bjarni
hét at hann skyldi ráða. Skildu við svá búa. Ok er Þor­
gils kom heim, kom þar Þórny, dóttir hans. Þorgils spyr­
hvat hon vill. Hon sagðiz vilja fylgja fé sínu ef honum
þætti þat meiri sómi at skilja með þeim Bjarna - 'ok ráða
5 þess manns traust undan mér er þér er mestr batí í; ok
þér er sjálfrátt at láta þinn hlut fyrir neinum manni ef
þit eruð at einu ráði báðir.' Þorgils svarar: 'Vel ferr þér,
dóttir, ok vel ferr ykkur báðum. Nú skaltu heim fara ok vil
ek eigi skilja ráðahag með ykkur Bjarna,' - ok leggr þeim
10 nú svá penninga at þeim vel líkar. Ok um sumarit býðr
Þorgils Bjarna ok báðum þeim heim í Traðarholt ok þágu
þar góðar viðtökur ok miklar gjafir ok er nú góð vináttta
með þeim Bjarna.

Einhvern tíma segir Þorgils Bjarna at hann vill leita
15 sér kvánfangs. Bjarni kvaz þat gjarna vilja: 'Þú skalt bið-
ja Helgu, dóttur Þórodds goða í Ólfusi Eyvindarsonar,
frændja míns.' En þar var svá farit frændsemi at móðir
Þórodds var Þórþór, dóttir Þórmóðar, en Þórey var móðir
Þorsteins goða, fóður Bjarna spaka. Þorgils veðr nú bón-
20 orðit. Skapti tók því seint ok svá Helga sjálf. Þótt
maðr heldr størlyndr ok þó heldr gamall. Annarr maðr bað
ok Helgu; var þat Ásgrimr Elíða-Grimsson. Svarar Skapti
þar vel til en Þórroðdr vill heldr gipta Þorgilsí. Nú
var þetta talat á þingi ok var ekki at gert. Líða nú þau
25 misseri.

Ok annat sumar eptir, ríðr Þorgils til skips í Einars-
höfn. Hann fréttir til ferska Skapta ok vildi fyrir víst
finna hann. Porgils reið til Flóagafls við sétta mann.
Peir váru með honum bræðr, Kolr ok Starkaðr, ok Pórólfr, frændi hans, ok tveir húskarlar. Peir váru í hrísnum
nökkurum ok bíða svá Skapta. Petta var nær Kallaðarnesi.

5 Skapti sá frá ferjunni at hestar með söðum gengu með ánni.
Skapti sagði at þeir mundu aprt snúa; kvaz frétt hafa at
síðar mundi betri kaupin ok fóru þeir heim. Póroddr spurn-
ði hví hann færi svá skjótt aprt - 'eðr hræddiz þú hann
hraunskeggjann Porgils? Ok þætti mér þat betra at ríða
10 óhræddum um heraðit ok gipta honum Helgu en vera hvergi
óhræddr um þik.'

Á þingi um sumarit var talat um gjaförð Helgu. Dregr
Póroddr fram með Porgilsí en Skapti með Ásgrími. Póroddr
mælti þá: 'Ek kann sjá hversu fara mun: ef Porgilsí er
15 synjat konunnar, þá mun þat margra manna vandræði en ek
væntir með vingjófum góðum at Ásgrímr láti ðappalaust.'
Nú við þessi atkvæði Pórodds var þat af ráðit at Porgilsí
var fóstnuð Helga ok var brúðhlaup at Hjalla. Pá var Porg-
gils hálfsextugr. Ferr hann nú hein í Traðarholt með Helgu
20 ok var hon mjök fálát.

Ok eitt sinn, er Porgils var á burtu at byggja jarðir
sínar, kvaz Helga vilja fara til Hjalla ok heim um kveldit
ok það húskarl einn fara með sór. Ok er þau koma til Hjalla,
kvað Helga húskarlinn ekki þurfa sín at bíða. Skapti tök
25 vel við Helgu en Pórodðr illa. Er hon þar margar nætr.
Porgils kemr hein ok lætr sem hana viti eigi. Ok einn dag
býr hann ferð sína ok ríðr til Hjalla ok váru menn at mat.
Porgils gengr með borðum álvpnaðr ok at Helgu, tekr í hönd henni ok leiðir hana út ok þótti þeim sem inni sátu, maðrinn ekki dælligr. Skapti þiðr menn eptir sækja. Póroddr svarar: 'Porgils sækir eptir sínu ok skal mönnun 5 eigi hlýða at farar eptir honum.' Porgils ríðr nú heim ok sendir hann orð Skapta at þeir hittiz. Er nú svá gert. Sættaz nú við tilstilli Pórodds ok gerðiz vinátta með þeim ok varð Porgils hófðingi ok virðingamaðr mikill.

31. Frá því er sagt eitthvert sinn at þau Porgils ok Helga sátu úti ok hrein hænan við hanaðum en haninn leggr at henni ok berr hana þar til hon mæðiz. Porgils mælti: 'Sér þú, Helga, sameign þeira hana ok hænu?' Helga svarar: 'Hvers er þat vert?' segir hon. 'Svá má vera,' segir Porgils, 'annarra viðeign.' Geraz nú góðar samfarar þeira. 15 Son áttu þau Porgils ok Helga er Grímr glömmuðr hét. Porgils var nú gamall ok þó hraustr.


25 Annan dag ferr Porgils ok hittir Sám. Hann fagnar honum vel. Ok litlu síðar kom Bjálfi ok spurði hví hann væri
ðar ok kvaz enga þökk kunna hans kvámur. 'Ekki ferr ek at því,' segir Þorgils, 'því at vel má ek þar koma sem þú kemr ok þar sem þú hefur boðit Sámi einvígi, skaltu mér mæta en ekki honum.' Bjálfi svarar: 'Pat kemr til þess, at Sámr greyit þorir eigi at berjaz við mik.'

Nú ganga þeir á hölm ok er ekki sagt frá viðskiptum annat en Þorgils drepr Bjálfa ok frelsti svá bónda; 'ok nauztu þess at,' segir Þorgils, 'at þú vart svá nær mér.'


20 32. Eitthvert sinn hittir [Þorgils Ásgrím] ok björ at hann minniz í nökkuru um tollinn. Ásgrímr segir at skip koma þar sem auðit verðr en kvaz eigi vanr at gjalda skip-tolla sem smábændr ok bað hann eigi heimta slíkt. Þorgils kvaz þat fyrir annars hond gera en eigi fyrir sína ok skilja þeir nú við svá þúit.

Um várit váru menn kvæðir af Ásgrími til skipsdráttar
ok kom fjöldi manns. Pyttar váru um sandan víða ok váru fullir með vatni þó at fjara væri. Ægrímr tók á festum í fremra lagi ok váru þar mest konur hjá honum. Hann var í litklæðum. Tóku nú fast á. Maðr reið á landinu 5 fyrir ofan, mikill vexti, ok hafði bolðxi í hendi. Hann horfir á skipdráttinn. Ægrímr eggjar nú fast at menn herði sik vel. Ok er Porgils var kominn at flæðarpyttinum, sá hann at Ægrímr helt á strenginum. Hleypr hann þá til ok hógr strenginn ok verðr aprþrlaupit hart ok hrarar Ægrímr í pytinn ok konurnar á hann ofan. Urðu öll klæðin Ægríms vát ok þrekktótt ok svá hann sjálfr. Petta þykkir honum mikill svívirðing ger til sín. Verðr nú viss hvorr gert hefir ok kvað þá Porgils varla mega við svá búit skilja. Pórhallr bað hann utan fara - ' ok megi þá sjatna þessi 10 öþokki er millum ykkar er.' Ægrímr kvaz mundu ráða sjálfr ferðum sínun.

Pát var einhvern tíma at Pórhallr bað Ægrímr, fóður sinn, fara með sér til kvánbæna til móts við Bjarna bónda í Gróf. Ægrímr sagði at þat var í mórgu lagi góðr kostr - 20 'en illt þykki mér at Porgils er þar nokkut við riðinn.' 'At Porgils er ekki mein,' segir Pórhallr. Síðan fara þeir. Bjarni svarar vel ok er þessum ráðum ráðit. Ægrímr biðr at Porgilsí skuli ekki bjóða til boðsins. Bjarni svarar ok kvaz honum mundu allvel fagna af hann kæmi - 25 'en gera eigi mann til hans fyrir bæn þína.' Bjarni býz nú við brúðhlaupinu.

Einn dag kemr Þórný inn ok segir at maðr reið ör skótum
neðan - 'ok er líkr fóður mínun.' Bjarni gekk út ok var Porgils kominn ok þræll hans með honum. Bjarni fagnaði honum vel. Porgils mælti: 'Hví bautt þú mér ekki til boðsins, mágr?' 'Pérf er jafnan sjálfboðit,' segir Bjarni, 'ok þá velkominn er þú vill verit hafa.'

Ásgímr kom um kveldit ok gekk Bjarni í móti honum ok fagnaði honum vel. Pá spurði Ásgímr hvárt Porgils væri þar. Hann kvað hann þar vera - 'ok mun hann hér dveljaz. Gerða ek nú sem þú mæltir, at ek bauð honum eigi, en ávallt skal hann vera hér hjá mér er hann vill.' Ásgímr verðr óðr við ok vill riða heim. Pórhallr biðir hann eigi þat gera. Ok þat verðr at hann er þar ok er heldr óglatt um boðit. Ok er menn búaz frá boðinu, sjá menn at þeir fara húsa á milli, Ásgímr ok Kolr þráll, ok tóluð.


Nú þykkir Porgilsí Ásgímr sannr at fjörráðum við sik. lætr nú safna mónum ok verða vel xl. Átlar nú at fara (tí) stefnuþórmóts við Ásgírm. Nú hittir Gizurr hvíti Porgils ok spyrð hversu hann átlan til um ferðir sínar. Hann kvaz átla at sækja heim Ásgírm Ellíða-Grímsson. Gizurr sagði
Dætur er óráða til því at hann er miklu fjölmennari en þú.

Porgils kvæs eigi híða um fjölmenni hans. Nú letr Gizurr ferðarinnar ok, at þæn hans, reið hann í Eyna ok kvæddi nú búa. Eptir þat fara þeir í burt ok þykkir sem lögfullt sé.


1534. Helgi hét Austmaðr er út kom í Einarshófn ok átti ferð upp í herað ok fór með varning sinn upp í Prándarholt. Porgils reið at ór Gróf. Þeir riðuz á móti, Porgils, ok riðu hart. Ók er þeir riðuz á víxl, stakaði Porgils mjökk svá af baki ok hló at honum við, Austmaðrinn, en Þorgils var allbjúgr á baki, því at veðr var kalt. Helgi meltti þá: 'Litt sér þat nú á þér, Þorgils, at þú hefir verit kall-aðr garpr mikill enda ertu nú gamall.' Þorgils svarar: 'Ekki hafa menn þat mjökk plagat hér til at gabba mik en svá hæðiliðr ok gamall sem þér þykkir ek vera, þá byð ek þér þegar 25 í stað einvígi ok er þá fullreynt hvárr af þörnum berr.'
Helgi kvað enga ván í at hann hrykki eigi við - 'ok mun líttill frami í at bera af fretkarli þínun.' Austmaðrinn hafði bolóxi í hendi. Porgils mælti: 'Hvassara vápn munu hafa þurfa ef bíta skal hófuðbein mín.' Porgils hafði 5 sverðit Jarðhússnaut ok alvápnaðr ok hljóp geyst at honum ok hógrgr til hans með sverðinu ok kom á ðóxlina ok vannz honum þat skjótt til bana. Porgils var þá lxxx. ok kvað þetta verit hafa ít mesta gláppaverk ok kvaz þetta mundu bæta.

10 Tveim vetrum síðar kómu tveir bræðr Helga út ok varð eigi vart við skipkvámaða. Hét annarr Einarr en annarr Sigurðr. Þeir fóru þegar í Traðarholt ok var þat um kveld ok váru eigi í almenningshúsum. Ok um morguninn, er verkmenn váru farnir til starfs, fóru þeir bræðr heim í bæinn 15 ok námu staðar við skáladyrð ok tóluðuz með um hríð hversu þeir skyldu með fara; - 'Ekki þykki mér gott at drepa gamlan mann.' Porgils heyrir nú þeira umræðu ok sprettr upp þegar ok tekr sverðit Jarðhússnaut ok bað þá at ganga ef þeir vildi. Einarr mælti: 'Ekki þarf at eggja okkr til bróður- 20 hefnda, því at fullvel megum vit þik yfirvinna ef vit viljum. En ekki skal þér nú, bóndi, nökkurn ófríð gera ok skal nú vera annat erindi okkar bræðra.' Porgils tók þessu vel ok svarar: 'Ek er ok þess miklu fúsari því at ek þykkjumz sjá gerla at þú munt vera göðr ok þar sem ek drap bróður ykkarn, 25 þá vil ek þat fullu bæta; ok vil ek, Einarr, gefa þér nú sverðit Jarðhússnaut, því at mér líz svá á þik at þú megir þat vel bera. Bróður þínun vil ek fá fimm merkr
silfrs.' Síðan skildu þeir með góðum vinskap ok fóru þeir bræðr utan eptir þat.

Þat var einn tíma at þau Porgils ok Helga fóru til Hjalla til heimboðs. Ok eptir þat tók Porgils bóndi sött. Hann var þá hálfníðræðr. Hann lá viku ok andaði síðan. Þessu nærri andaði Póroðdr bóndi ok Bjarni bóndi inn spaki.

Váru þeir allir jarðaðir at þeiri kirkju er Skapti lét gera fyrir utan lækinn en síðan váru færð bein þeira í þann stað er nú stendr kirkjan, því at Skapti hét at gera kirkju þá er Dóra braut fót sinn, þá er hon var at léreptum sínum.


Sonr Gríms glammaðar Porgilssonar var Ingjaldr, faðir Gríms, faðir Einars, faðir Hallkóðlu, móður Steinunnar, móður Herðísar, móður Bjarnar, fóður Gizurar galla, fóður Hákonar, fóður Jóns.
M-VERSION

PM

(AM 515, 4to. ff. 27v, line 26 - 41v, line 19)
Pórey hét kona ok var Porvarðisdóttir. Porfinna hét móðir hennar; hon bjó í Odda. Porvarð var andaðr. Pórey var á fóstri í Kálfaholti með þeim manni er Jósteinn hét, gildr þýði. Jósteinn átti systur Porvarð í Odda er Por-
5 gerðr hét; þau váru børn Pórðar Freysgoða. Kolr ok Starkaðr váru fóstbræðr Póreyjar. Guðrún hét systir þeira ok var hon líka fóstrsystir Póreyjar. Pórey var skórurgr mikill ok frið sýnum. Þeirar konu biðr Porgils Órrabeinsstjúpr ok þann kost fær hann ok gerði brullaup til hennar. Samfarir
10 þeira váru góðar. Hæringr bjó nú á Stokkseyri. Porgils bjó í Traðarholti ok gerðií hann ríkr maðr svá at Ásgrímr Ell-
iðason bar ekki af honum á þingum.

Sórlí hét maðr. Hann bjó skamt frá Kálfaholti. Hann venr kvámur síinar í Kálfaholt á fund Guðrúnar, systur þeira
15 Starkaðar ok Kols. Einn tíma ferr Kolr á leið til Sórla ok biðr hann láta af kvánum til Guðrúnar, systur þeira. Sórlí
kva[z] mundu þat gera eptir hugbokka sínum en hirða ekki um orð hans. 'Pú munt ráða,' segir Kolr.

Annan dag eptir ferr Sórlí samt á tal til Guðrúnar ok um
20 kveldit ferr hann seint heim. Ok er hann kemr skamt frá
bænum, sprettr Kolr upp fyrir honum. Verðr ekki af kveðjum.
Högr Kolr hann banahögg; ferr síðan heim ok segir Guðrúnu
at stóðvaz muni um kvárum Sórla upp heðan. Hon kva[z] eigi
þat lasta en kvað eigi svá búit hlýða mundu, því at hann var
25 gjafvínr ok þingmaðr Ásgríms Ellíðasonar; 'far nú ok hitt
Porgils; hann þykki mér líkligastr at veita þér nókkut lið.'
Kolr kemr í Traðarholt. Pat var síð um kveld. Menn sátu yfir borðum en Þórey húsfreyja bar mat í stofu. Þá var bar-it á dyrr ok gekk hon til hurðar ok heilsar vel Kol, fóst-bróður sínum, ok býðr honum þar at vera. Hann vill eigi þar.

svá vera at eigi viti hon tíðindi er í hans ferðum váru ok segir henni síðan vígit. Hon lastar lítt ok kvez við skulu leita at veita honum ásjá - 'en þó er nökkut vanstillt til við Porgils en ærit er traust ef hann vill veita þér ok mun ek fylgja þér í skot er hér er um skálann ok heyrðu þaðan á viðræður okkar Porgils.' Hann gerir svá ok eptir þat ferr hon í stofuna. Porgils mælti: 'Hví skulum vér svá lengi bíða matar í kveld? Ok gott hefir þér orðit til fjár í framgöngunni: klæði rautt hefir þú fengit.' 'Eigi veit ek þat,' segir hon, 'en satt er it fornkveðna at "spakir menn hendu á mörgu mið"; músl hljóp áðan á kinn mér en hon er mér harla óþekk.' 'Svá má vera,' segir Porgils. En er þau kömu í rekkju, þá kvaz Porgils vita vilja hvat í framgöngunni hafði gerz. Hon segir honum allan atburðinn ok kvaz hon ásjá vilja veita Kol - 'ok muntu svá gera fyrir mína skuld.' Porgils kvaz svá gera mundu; - 'hefi ek góða vin-áttu haft af Kol,' segir hann.

Um morguninn eptir fór Porgils austr til bús Kols - hann átti bú austr hjá - ok tók upp féit allt ok lét fara Guð-rúnu með sér en lét eptir ómegð adra. En er þeir váru burt 25 farnir, kom Ágrímr ok ætlar upp at taka fé Kols ok hafði hann ekki. Kolr sitr hjá Porgilsi um vetrinn.

En um várit eptir býr Ágrímr málið á henn Kol. Lætr
Porgils sem hann viti eigi. Verður Kolr sekr um vígsmálit. Porgils ríðr allt at einu um heraðit ok Kolr með honum. Sækja mannamót ok geriz af því ópokki millim heraðshöfðingja. Herðsmönnum þykkr mein at ok leita um sættir en Porgils býðr engar bætr fyrir Kol. Herðsmenn leggja nú fund til ok leggja allir fé til við Ásgrím ok bæta víg Sörla; gefa ok fé til sýknu honum ok var þetta gert án ráðs Porgils. Sýkna Kolr var færð annat sumará þingi ok er þó fátt um með þeim höfðingum.

Eitt sinn ríðr Porgils til hestapings austr í herað ok Svartr, verkstjóri hans, með honum. Var þá góð gleði um daginn. Ásgrímr var þar ok talta margt við Svartr. At kveldi ríðr Porgils heim en Svartr reið nær honum ok fann Porgils at hann vill ætið riða seinna. Grunar hann þá ok gefr honum færi á sér. Ok er Porgils varir minnst, hóger Svartr til hans en Porgils kastar sér ór söðlinum. Porgils þrífr Svartr ok spyrr hverju gegnir. Hann segir at Ásgrímr þauð honum þetta. En þá er hann svipti Svartri, fell fészjörð undan yfirhöfn hans. Segir hann þá at Ásgrímr hafi gefit honum fé til hófuðs Porgils. Hann drepr Svartr þegar í stað. Eptir þat ríðr Porgils fram at sínnum mönnnum ok segir þeim hversu farit hefði. En hvert sumar er hann kemr ú mannamót, sýnír hann fészjóðinn ok váru þar í iii. merkr silfrs, þess er bezt var, ok gekk engi við at ætti. Porgils kyzz þat fé hafa mundu ok hafa sitt satt við, hvar Svartri hafði fémgit.

Hú kom Kristni á land ok tók Porgils í fyrsta lagi síð
kristinn ok helt vel trú sín. Ok er hann hafði viðr kristni tekit, þá dreymdi hann einhverja nótt at Þórr kæmi at honum með illiligu yfirbragði ok kvað hann sér brugði[z] hafa - 'ok hefir þú illa ör ráðit, valit mér þat ór þínu fé er þú 5 áttir verst til. Dú kastaðir sjúfrí því í fúla tjórn er ek átta ok skal ek þar í móti koma.' 'Guð mun mér hjálpa,' segir Þorgils, 'ok er ek þess sæll er okkat félag sleit.' Ok er Þorgils vaknaði ok kom út, sá hann at tóðugöltr hans var dauðr ok lét hann grafa hann hjá töpt nökkurri ok vildi 10 eigi láta af neyta.

Enn barz Þórr í draum Þorgilsi ok sagði at sér yrði eigi meira fyrir at taka fyrir nasir honum en tóðugelti hans. Þorgils segir: 'Guð mun því ráða.' Þórr hét þá at gera honum fjárskáða. Þorgils kva[z] eigi um þat hirða. Aðra 15 nótt eptir dó uxi gamall fyrir Þorgilsi. Dú sat hann sjálfr hjá um nóttna eptir fyrir nautum sínum ok, er hann kom heim um morguniinn, var hann víða blár. Hafa menn þat fyrir satt at þeir Þórr muni fundiz hafa. Eptir þat tök af fallit. Þorgils var it mesta mikilmenni, harðr maðr ok frækinn.

20 Nú líða fram stundir. Ok er skip ganga landa á milli, þá koma orðsendingar af Grænlandi at Eiríkr rauði býðr Þorgils út til Grænlands til þeira kosti er beztra hefur hann fong á. Þorgils áhlýddiz lítt. Ok er hann hafði búit hér xiii. vetr kom skip af hafi. Par var á Porleifr, 25 sonr hans, ok hafði góða gripi at fara honum. Þorgils tök vol við honum. Þorgils talur við konu sína ef hon vill fara með til Grænlands. Hon kvað vunbreytt um. Hann
kvað Eirík hafa sent sér orð - 'ok máttu vera eptir ef þú vill ok gæta búð okkars en ek fari.' Hon kvað því mun du misráðit at farit væri - 'en fara vil ek ef þú ferr.'

Porgils fekk nú í hendr Hæringi, bróður sínum, fé sitt til 7 5 varðveizlu ok svá tók hann við goðorði því, er Porgils haft hafði. Hann vill at landit í Traðarholti sé eign erfingja hans ef hann kemr eigi til. Porný hét döttir þeira Porgils ok Póreyjar; var hon þá viði. vetra gómul. Þessi ráða-

breytni Porgils spurðiz nú viða um sveitir. Þorleifr skal 10 fara með honum, Kolr ok Starkaðr, bróðir hans, ok Guðrún, systir þeira, Snækollr ok Ózurr, þrælar hans, ok Pórarinn ráðsmaðr. Þrælarnir váru alls x. Porgils hafði nefnda menn mest fyrir því ef hann vildi bæ láta reisa á Grænlandi. Þeir váru allir öfligrir menn. Porgils hafði allskonar fé ef 15 hann vildi þar staðfestaz. Jósteinn bóndi ðr Kálfa holti réz ok til ferðar með honum ok brá búi sínu; hann var með xiita mann. Þorgerðr fór ok, kona hans, ok Pórarinn, son þeira; hann var inn knásti maðr. Porgils kaupir nú skip. Þór-

ölfr hét maðr er Porgils fekk í hendr ómagabú en Hæringi, 20 bróður sínum, seldi hann í hendr lx. hundraða iii. álna aura, annat en staðfestu.

Porgils gisti ok þau á Hjalla í Ólfsúi. Þar var ok í ferð með honum Porný, döttir hans, ok ætlaði hann at hon skyldi fara. Þar tók hon sött ok beidd Porgils iii. nætr 25 ok kvað þat eigi mundu standa fyrir ferð sinni ok gaf henni xl. iii [álna] aura ef hon þyrpí til at taka ok kvað vera mega at þat væri forlög hennar. Þóroddr kvaz ætla at hon
mundi giptudrjúg vera. Porgils segir Póroddi at hann kveæ
mundu mjök treystaz ummælum Eiríks rauða. Póroddr segir:
'Opt verðr vant til manna at aéla ok eigi at síðr at maðr
leggi mikinn kost til.' Porgilsi kveæ nú fyrir þykkja mikit
5 at fara en kveæ nú eigi nenna aétr at hverfa. Skilha þeir
nú þeir Póroddr ok Porgils bíðr nú byrjar ok dreymir hann
at maðr kemr at honum, mikill ok raðskeggjaðr, ok mælti:
'Ferð hefir þú aélat fyrir þér ok mun erffið verða.' Draum-
maðrinn sýndiz honum greippligr ok mælti til hans: 'Alla
10 stúnd hefir þú mér verit gagnstæðígr, þóttu værir heiðinn
maðr, en oss er mikill missir orðinn at síðaskipti þínu.
Aðr var allt fólk leitandi til várs trausts ok fulltings
ok ertu sem þeir er oss vilja þyngst ok mun illa faraz ef
þú vill eigi aétr til mín hverfa um átrunað. Mun ek þá
15 enn um sjá yðar ráð.' Porgils kvæz aldri hans umsjá vilja
hafa; bað hann burt draga[z] ok skiljaz viðr sik sem skjót-
ast - 'tekt ferð mín sem Guð vill,' huggíz hann svara í
svefninum. Síðan þótti honum Pórr fára sik á hamra nökkura,
þar sem sjóvarstormr brast í björgum, ok nú segir Pórr:
20 'I sílikum stormi skaltu vera ok þó lengi í válki vera ok
kveljaz í vesöld ok háaska nema þú geriz minn maðr.' 'Nei:
nei!' segir Porgils. 'Farþurt, inn leiði fjándi! Sá mun mér
hjálpa sem alla leysti með mínum dreyra ok á líta ferð vára.
Síðan vaknar hann ok segir drauminn Póreyju, konu sinni,
25 'ok dvína munda ek láta ferðina ef mik hefði fyrri þvílíkan
draum dreymt ok eigi vil ek segja láta Jósteini nê þórum
mónnum þenna draum. Hon kvað þetta eigi góða furðu ok kvað
vel ráðit [þótt] hann setti fátt við Pór - 'ok aptr munda ek setjaz ef mik hefði þvílíkan draum dreymt.'

Nú kemr byrr ok sigla þeir út eptir fíroði á haf góðan byr. Hafði Jósteinn skip fyrir framan siglu. Ok er þeir koma ór 5 landsýn, þá tekr af byri alla ok velkJaz þeir úti lengi þar til er bæði verðr átfátt ok drykkafrátt á skipi þeira. Eina nóttd dreymir Porgils at sá sami maðr kemri at honum ok mælti: 'Fór eigi sem ek gat? Því at þú hefir neitat minu fulltingi ok ásja. Má enn vera at betriz um hag þinn ef þú vill mik 10 þýðaz.' Hann kveð þat aldri vilja, þótt lif hans lægi við; bað óvin á brott dragaz ok koma aldri optar ok vaknar hann eptir þat. Útivistin harnar mjök.

Tekr nú at hausta. Mæltu sumir menn at þeir mundu blöta Pór til byrjar; kváðu betr þá farit hafa ráð manna er þeir 15 blötuðu hann ok kváðu ráð at fella þangat hugi sína. Porgils segir: 'Ef ek verð varr við þat at nokkur maðr blótar ok geriz guðníðingr, þá skal ek þat hardliga hefna.' En viðr þessi orð hans tresyzt engi at kalla á Pór.

Pá dreymdí Porgils enn eina nótta at inn sami maðr kemri 20 at honum ok mælti svá: 'Enn síndir þú hverrr þú vart mér, þar eð menn vildu mik þýðaz. Hefi ek nú beint fyrir þóv því at margir eru skipverjar þínir at bana komnir ok enn muntu hófn taka á vii. nótta fresti ef þú vill mik athyllaz.' Porgils segir: 'Þótt ek taka aldri hófn skal ek þér aldri gott gera 25 ok ef þú kemr optar, skal ek gera þér nokkura skómm.' Hann segir: 'Þótt þú gerir mér ekki gott, þá gjaltu mér þat er ek á ok þú hefir mér heitit.' Porgils hrakti hann með mórg-
um orðum ok við þat för hann á brott. Porgils vaknar ok
hugsar hvat hann muni þar eiga ok nú man hann at hann gaf
fyrir lóengu Pór kálf einn. Porgils segir þetta Þóreyju ok
var þetta þá gamall uxi ok kvað aldri þat skyldu innanborðs
5 er hans kanna væri á ok segir hann því þar hverfa mundu
um skipit. Hon kvað þat vel fundit. En er Þórgarðr vissi
þetta, at Porgils ætlar at kasta út uxanum, þá falar hon
uxann er þeim var vistafátt. Porgils afsvaraði ok vill
óþýta uxann. Hon reiddiz við orð hans - 'ok er eigi undar-
10 ligt þótt illa takiz, er Þórr várr er svá svívirðr ok mikit
munu nú menn verr kunna fyrir sér en þá er menn sæmdu hann
í mørgum hlutum.' Porgils hirdir ekki um orð hennar ok lét
skjóta útbyrðis uxanum ok kvað eigi kynligt þótt illa færiz
er fé Þórs var innanborðs.
15 Ok eru þeir nú enn úti um hrið. III. mánuði váru þeir
í hafi ok hofðu harða réttu ok litla byri. Þórarinn, son
Jósteins, var knaðr maðr annarr en Porgils. Hann var tví-
tugr at aldri. Pat er sagt at þeir brutu skip sitt síð
dags undir Grænlandsjökulum í vík nökkurri við sandmöl.
20 Skipit tók í sundr í efra rúmi. Menn helduz allir ok fé.
Bátr komz ok heill á land. Stafninn rak upp við it syðra
landit. Þá var vika til vetrar. Jóklar miklir gengu fram
ii. megin víkrinnar en til vestrættar vextu þeir byggðar.
Gera sér nú skála allir saman ok í þverbili; búa nú sinu-
25 megin því hvarír pilsins; hafa mjól nökkut sér til atvinnu; henda af
rekum slíkt er þeir fengu ok eiga allir saman. Fé þeira
var dautt flestalt. Hirzlr Þeira várú í skála þeira.
Porgils manna hlutr var jafnan betri af veiðifangi. Varð hann um flest hlutsælli. Porgils beiddi at menn vildi vera hljóðlátir síð á kveldum ok síðsamir ok heldi vel trú sín.
Póreyju húsfreyju var mik[it] framat ok var lítt heil. Pat er sagt at Jósteinn ok hans menn váru lónum úti síð á kveldum ok gerðu mikit um sik ok höfðu náttleika. Jósteinnehicles eitthvert sinn við Porgils; kvað sér þykkja mikinn mun veiðifangsins. Porgils kvað þá eigi einn veg rækja - 'því at þér haldið lengr við á kveldin en vör erum at fyrri.'

Jósteinn vildi þá skipta láta öllu veiðifangi ok svá var gert ok varð Porgils jafnan hlutsælli ok skortir þá hváríga. Svá er sagt at fátt var með þeim. Váru þeir Porgils spakir ok hljóðir en hinir höfðu náttleika með miklu erfiði ok háreysti. Nær vetrnótum varð Pórey léttari at sveini þeim er Porfinnr hét. Hon hjúkaði lítt við þessa fæðu er til var. Pórar- inn Jósteinsson hafði útbroða með præulum Jósteins.

Líðr nú á vetrinn ok dregr at jólum ok ræðir Porgils um at hann vill at menn sé hljóðlátir ok síðsamir ok fari snemma í rekkju. Jólamorgun var á veðr gott ok váru þeir þá lengi úti um daginn ok heyrðu óp mikit í útnorðr ok nú kemr annarr aptann í jólum. Pá náttar Porgils snemma ok ferr í rekkju ok er þau höfðu sofít svefn, þá koma þar Jósteins menn ok er mikit um lið þeira ok búaz til matar. Porgerðr var í öllu háreysti með þeim ok var hon sterk sem karlar.

Ok er þau eru at mat, þá er drepit á dyrr mikit hógg ok snjallt. Pá mælti einn þeira: 'Góð tíðindi munu nú í nánd vera.' Sá hleypr út ok þykkir þeim er inni váru fresta
innkvámu hans. Nú ganga þeir Jósteinn út. Er sá þá ærr er úti var. Ok um morguninn deyr hann. Mótlíkt ferr annan aptan, at maðr æriz ok deyr skjótt ok þóttiz sjá þann hlaupa at sér er fyrr dó. Nú kom sótt í lið Jósteins ok deyja vi.

5 menn ok þá tekr Jósteinn sótt inn xiita dag jóla en Porgerór sitr yfir honum ok lýr hann sótt ok deyr hann ok eru þeir nú kasaðir þar í mólinni. Porgils helt þá sínnum mönn- um öllum ok ræðir jafnan um við þá at þeir sé hljóðlátir ok síðsamir; bað þá láta sér annars víti at varnaði verða, minnaz á guðliga hluti ok fremja nú skynsemð um kristnihald sitt ok söngva. Á bak jóllum ganga þau óll aprt ok einna mest Porgerór. Pórarinn léz síðast af líði Jósteins; var hann grafinn undir skipshréini en óll váru þau dauð í miðja gói. Váru þá miklar aprtgöngur ok sóttu óll at Porgilsí.

10 Porgils segir þá at Porgerór hefði lið sitt allt ok hon þyrpti þá ekki fleira at kalla ok eptir þat létþir af sótt- inni. Ekki máttu þeir Porgils í brott hefjaz meðan aprtgöngur váru mestar. Í þeim hluta skálans gengu þau mest aprt er þau hófðu áðr átt en þó gengu þeir í hinn hlut

20 skálans ok sótti Porgerór konur mest. Ok er svá hafði fram farit um hríð, þá lét Porgils brenda þau óll á báli ok var þá ekki mein at aprtgöngu þeira síðan. Þeir Porgils hófðu skip á stokka sett ok mjök gert át óðru ok hófðu hvárir-tveggju at skipbúnaði verit.

25 Nú líðr af vetrinn ok máttu þeir þó eigi á brott komaz fyrir ísum. Þeir fá sér vistir um sumarit. Ok annan vetr eptir, þá andaðiz Guðrún, systir Kols. Kolr grefr
hana undir rúmi sínú ok, er várar, þá mega þeir eigi á brott komaz.

Pátt er enn eitthvert sinn sem optar bar at at Dórey segir draum sinn Porgils, at hon þóttiz sjá fógr heruð ok 5 menn fagra ok bjarta - 'ok vænti ek,' segir hon, 'at vér leysimz heðan í burt þr ánanauð þessarri.' Porgils segir: 'Góðr er draumr þinn ok þó eigi ólíkari at viti meir til annars heims hluta ok munu eiga fyrir hönðum fagra staði ok munu dýrðigir menn hjálpa þér fyrir gott líf þitt ok 10 mannraunir.' Hon bað þá í burt leita ef þeir mætti. Porgils kvez eigi yfir þat sjá.

Hon lá í rekkju jafnan ok einhvern góðan veðræði ræðir Porgils um at þeir muni ganga á jökla upp ok vita ef þeir sæi ísinn nökkursstaðar leysa. Dórey kvez þess öfús at hann 15 gengi nökkursstaðar frá henni. Hann kvaz skammt fara mundu. Hon kvað hann ráða mundu enn sem fyrr. Praelarnir skyldu róa at veiðifangi um daginn ok Þórarinn bryti skyldi ýta þeim ok vera hjá Dóreyju en Porgils ætlaði at ganga á jökulinn. Þeir Porsefr ok Kolr ok Starkaðr beidduz at fara með honum 20 en Porgils kvað forystulaust heima ef eigi væri nökkrir þeira hjá Dóreyju - 'ok trüm vér ærit vel þrælunum í þessu.' Þeir fóru þó allir á jökłana. Porgils hafði bolóxi í hendi ok gyrðr sverðinu Jarðhússnaut. Þeir gengu til eyktar ok hófðu farit árla morguns. Ok er nón var dags, þá sneru þeir aprtr 25 ok gerði á veðr hart. Porgils gekk fyrir þeim ok hitti vel leiðina. Kómu at skálanum ok sá eigi skipit; kómu inn ok váru á brott kisturnar allar ok svipt fénu ok mennirnir
á burt. Porgils mælti: 'Nú munu ill efní í.' Koma innar í skálann ok var þar myrkt. Þeir heyra til rekkju Póreyjar snórl ok þat sér Porgils at hon er ónduð en sveinninn só hana dauða. Porgils leitar um hana ok finnr einsstaðar at harðnat var holdit ok ben lítit undir hendinni, sem mjóvum knífsoddi hefði stungit verit. Mjók var þar allt blóðugt í rúminu. Þetta hafði svá orðit at Porgilsí var mestr hammer. Grafa þeir hana hjá Guðrúnu. Porleifr leggr á alla stund at gleðja fáður sinn. Á burt var ok sópat óllum vístum.

Hurðirnar hófðu þeir ok frá teikit húsunum ok hvílutjaldit var í burtu. Um nóttna vildi Porgils vaka yfir sveinninum ok minntiz þá drengiliga á karlmennsku ok kvaz eigi sjá mega at barn þat mætti lífa nema mikit væri til unnit ok vill hann eigi at þat deyi. Lær hann nú saxa á geirvörtuna á sér ok kemr þar blóð út. Síðan lætr hann tegjja þat ok kom þar út blanda ok eigi lét hann af fyrr en þat var mjólk ok þar fæddiz sveinninn við. Ok um nóttna trúði hann sér eigi til vóku fyrr en hann lét glóð undir fær tr sér. Pat er sagt at þeir Snækollr ok aðrir þrálar hófðu skipið í brott teikit. Ketil inn meira hófðu þeir en lítil ketill var eptir, er Pórey hafði átt, ok flykkisstúfr einn ok svá nafrar í burt váru sem í tölakistunni hófðu verit. Pórarinn bryti var ok á brott horfinn. Þeir Porgils eru þar enn nökkura hrið ok sækja fast at veiðiföngum ok verðr þeim mjók ekki mein at dórum óvættum. Leita þeir enn víð at gera sér farkost ok eru nú smíðartöl heldr fá. Gerðu þeir sér einn húðkeip ok bjuggu innan með viðum. Líðr nú á
sumarit ok sjá menn ekki um yistaröng brýnliagt. Deir bjuggu um húðkeipinn ok ... ok byrgðu ok lifðu nú viðr reka ok smá-
dýri íkorna.

Um morguninn, er Þorgils kom út, sá hann rekald mikit í 5 völk einni ok þar* hjá tröllkonur ii. í skinnkyrtlum ok bundu sér byrðar ákafliga stórar.

* Folio 4 of AM. 445 b, 4to begins with the word þar (see p. 77).
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par (hjá) konur ii. í skinnkyrtum ok bundu sér byrðar ákaffíga (m)iðlar. Þorgils hleypr þagat til ok hógr hrægar til annarrar með sverðinu Jarðhússnaut í því er hon færðiz undir byrðina ok rekr af henni hóndina uppi viðr óxlina.

Byrðrin fell niðr en hon hljóp á burt. Þeir taka [reka]ld-it undir sik ok er þá eigi vistaskortr um vetrinn.

Ok er várar er mjökl uppi vistin. Þorgils kvaz leiðar þarvísitin - 'ok losnar nú ísinn,' sagði hann, 'ok munu vér á burt leita.' Þeir fara á braut ok hafa með sér ket-ilinn. Dragaz nú með jökulnum fram ok á ísinn at öðru hverju. Ok um sumarit kömuz þeir suðr til Seleyja á kep-innum en lítit máttu þeir hafa af fóngum sínun. Þar fengu þeir sela nóga ok váru þar um vetrinn.

At sumar-málum fóru þeir þaðan ok kömu þá við ey nókkura litla. Hálfum mánaði síðar, þá fundu þeir svartbaksegg. Þeir sjóa eggin ok etr sveinninn Porfinnr eitt eggit ok eigi allt. Þeir spyrja hann því hann æti eigi allt. Hann segir: 'Pér sparið yövar mat ok vil ek ok spara minn mat.' Þeir váru á skipi sínu á nöttum en fóru á land um 20 daga ok fá þó lítit fang. Ok einn dag fundu þeir árar-stúf einn ok váru á rúnar þessar:

Vas-k-a[t] ek dási,
es ek þessa dró,
opt, úsjaldan,
ár at bórði.

Sjá gerði mér
Árið bragð nú enn fram fyrir jöklna ok koma þá at björg-
5 um nökkurum bröttum ok brýna þar upp skipinu ok hafa þar
dvöll ok reisa þar tjald ok hófðu nær engar vistir. Ok um
morguninn gengr Kolr út ór tjaldi ok sér hvergi skipit ok
við þat leggz hann niðr ok vill eigi segja Porgils ok
þykkir aðr ærinn harmr hans. Litlu söðar gengr út Por-
10 leifr ok sér eigi skipit. Getr hann ok eigi um. Síðan
riss Porgils upp ok litaðiz um ok sér eigi skipit ok sagði
þeim at skipit var í burt - 'ok má ek eigi sjá þat at við
sveininn megi leita ok tapi honum.' Porleifr segir: 'Þat
liggr ekki til.' Porgils biðr þat þó gera. Eptir þat taka
15 þeir við sveininum. Kolr bað Porleif tapa honum; - 'þat
samir mér eigi,' sagði hann, 'ok skal ek þat eigi gera.'
'Þá er betr ok, Kolr,' sagði hann, 'fyrir því at eigi skal
ek honum týna. Hefi ek lengi verit með Porgils ok á ek
honum margt gott at launa ok ef týnt er sveininum, þá mun
20 honum svá mikit þykkja at eigi er sýnt at hann lifi eptir.'
Nú láta þeir sveininn úti eptir en þeir ganga inn í tjaldit.
Porgils spurði hvárt dreppin væri sveinninn. Þeir kváðu
eigi þat vera. Hann þakkar þeim ok sagði ósýnt hversu hann
bæri - 'ok er gott til góðra drengja at taka ok hafi þit
25 firrt mik miklum glæp ok mun ek aldri þykkja síðan dugandi
maðr. Ok svífr nú ýmsu á mik.'

Um nóttina eptir er sveinninn hjá Porgils ok um morgen-
inn segir Porgils draum sinn: 'Ek þóttumz vera,' sagði hann, 'á Islandi á Alþingi ok þótti mér sem vit Ásgrímr toguðum eina hónk ok allr lýður horfði á ok hann missti hankar[inn]nar.' Porleifr segir: 'Par muntu enn koma til Islands, faðir minn,' sagði hann, 'ok skipta málum við Ásgrímr ok mun þat vel ganga.' 'Slíkt má vera,' sagði Porgils, 'þótt nú þykki eigi líkligt ok er vel ráðit.'

Aðra nót dreymdi hann enn ok sagði enn Porleifi. 'Ek þóttumz vera,' segir hann, 'heima í Traðarholti ok var þar fjólfennt mjók ok sá ek álpt eina ganga eptir gölfini ok var hon blíð við aðra en mik. Pá hrista ek hana ok var þá betr.' 'Par muntu,' sagði Porleifr, 'kvángaz ok mun kona þín vera ung ok muntu í fyrstunni missa ástar hennar ok mun þó vel dragaz.'

15 Ina iii. nót dreymdi Porgils enn at hann þóttiz vera heima í Traðarholti - 'ok kerti v. váru á kné mér,' sagði hann, 'ok fólski á inu mesta. Ok enn dreymdi mik at kona kæmi at mér ok kvað mik kominn í tún sitt,-'ok þykki mér illa er þér hafið etit egg Porfinns,-'ok hon segir mér at sveinar hennar hefði tekit skip várt.' Porleifr segir: 'Par munu vér í burtu komaz.'

'Enn dreymdi mik,' sagði Porgils, '(at ek vær)a heima í Traðarholti. Ek sá á kné mér inu (hægra at) þar váru vaxnir hálmlaukar v. saman ok þ(ar) af kvisl(uðu)z margir 25 laukar ok ofarliga yfir hófuð mér bar einn lauk(inn). Svá var hann hár ok svá var hann fagr at hann hafði gullslit á sér.' (Porleifr segir): 'Sé ek draum þínn. Par muntu
eiga v. börn ok frá þér munu kvislaz margar ættir ok ötal manna mun frá þér koma. En ek mun eigi á Íslandi aldr ala ok mun ek æxla ætt mína annarsstaðar. En inn fagri laukr, þar mun nökkurr maðr sá frá þér koma er ágætar: 5 maðr mun vera en allir aðrir þínir ættmenn." En þat gekk svá eptir at frá honum er kominn inn helgi Þorlákr biskup.

Þorleif dreymdbi enn draum ok sagði fôður sínum: 'Góð- an draum hefir mik enn dreymt ok heðan af mun batna ráð várt. Mér þótti sem Þorný, systir mín, gæfi mér osthleif 10 ok væri af b[á]urnnar.' 'Vera má,' sagði Porgils, 'at hon gæfi ef hon mætti.'

Ok nú heyra þeir kall mikit ok þiðja Íslendinga taka skip sitt - 'ok hafi þér illa við orðit.' Þeir gauga nú út ok sjá konur íi. er tekkit höfðu skipit. Þær hurfu skjótt 15 ok þa heyruðu þeir at björn einn brauz um í vök einni ok var brotinn á hramminn. Porgils hleypr til bjarnarins ok leggr til hans með sverði. Björninn deyr við þat lag. Porgils þrifr í hlustinark ok lætr eigi søkkva. Síðan drógu þeir hann á ísinn ok hlöðu skipit. Dýrit var kalit á fyrra 20 fæti ok má af slíku marka hve mikinn háska þeir korgils höfðu af fjúki ok frosti í þessari ferð, er dýrit var órkumlat af kulda. Þat er sagt at Porgils deildi stykki hverjun þeira. Þeim þótti of lítit ok ræddu um með sér því hann væri svá harðbýll. Þorleifr mælti: 'Matsparr 25 þykkir þú nú, faðir minn,' sagði hann. Porgils segir: 'Svá vill vera, son minn, því at eigi hæfir oss annat, svá sem þóð sem öfr erum vör þrekaðir.'
Róa nú fyrir fjórðinn fram ok verðr sein fórin.
Snúa nú til hafs meir ok róa af margar víkur; fóru gagn- 
leiði. Pá rýmdiz íssinn ok breidduz sundin. Fóru utar-
liga fyrir fjórðu fram; drógu skipit stundum milli vakanna.

5 Nú koma þeir á einn mikinn fjórð; stefna fyrir utan mynnit 
til lægis. Ok um daginn gerði máði mikil á þeim. Porg-
gils var þó miklu hraustastrum allt. Tekr þá nú at þyrsta 
mjökk. Þeir váru þá v. með sveíninum Þórfinni, þórgils ok 
Porleifr, Kolr ok Starkaðr bræór. Vatnit var hvergi í nánd 

10 ok verðr þeim nær farit af drykkleysey. Pá mælti Starkaðr:
'Þess hefi-k vitat dæmi at menn hafa blandat allt saman,
sjó ok hland.' Taka nú ausskotuna ok miði í ok kvádu þat 
gert vera ef líf manna lægi við ok báðu þórgils leyfis at.
En hann kvað várkunn á; kvei hvárki banna né leyfa - 'en 

15 eigi mun ek drekka,' segir hann. Þeir gerðu drykkinn.
Þórgils kvei nú vilja taka við ausskotunni ok kvei skylldu 
mæla fyrir minni. Hann mælti svá: 'Pú, it arga ok it illa 
kvikindi, er vára ferð dvelr skalt eigi því ráða at ek skal 
hvárki drekka minn þarfagang né aðrir.' Ok í því bili fl(ó 

20 fugl, því) líkastr sem álkuungi, ok skrákt við illiliga. 
Þórgils (segir: 'Petta) er enn lítil laun hjá því sem vert 
var en þér firðuðið) ok glæpnum en hugstætt má oss verða 
þessi skómm ok hneisa (ok heðan af mun batna um várt ráð.
Róm nú at ísnum ok v(erator) kátir ok glaðir ok lagði oss nú 

25 nær ok vildi Guð at vór forðaðim þessa skómm.' Taka þeir 
nú vatn á ís[um] ok var þat síð um daginn. Pá segir Por-
gils at sjá mundi af hvers völdum var ok, er þeir váru á
súnum, þá fló fuglinn í norðrætt frá skipinu ok var stórum illiligr. Porgils mælti: 'Seint hefir þessi fugl við oss skilit ok taki nú allar gramir viðr honum. En við þat unum vér at eigi kom hann því á leið sem hann vildi ok veldr

5 Guð sjálfr því, sá er vér trúm á.'

Koma nú síðan viðr ey eina ok váru þar iðar en þeir sá tjald af lérepti ok kenndu þar lintjald Póreyjar ok fundu þar Pórarinn brytja sjúkan. Þeir spyrja hverju faraldl hann hafði þangat komit. Hann sagði kostaboð þeira


Tekr nú at hausta ok koma á fjórð einn ok inn í fjórðinn ok kömu at nausti. Brýna þar upp skipi sínu ok ganga upp frá sjó ok sjá bæ líttinn ok þar var maðr úti fyrir.

20 Hann heilsar þeim ok spyrð hverir þeir væri eðr hvaðan þeir væri at komnír. Þeir sögðu sem farit var ok spyrja hann at nafní. Hann kveð Hrólfur heita ok þyð þeim þar at vera ok þat þiggja þeir. Konur gezma Þorfinns ok var honum mjólk gefin. Hann kvað ekki þannig lita mjólk fóður síns. (hafa)

25 Hrólfur kveð stokkit fyrir víga sakir ör byggð. Var hann inn greiðasti við Porgils; kvað skip farit hafa þar um sumarit ok komit ekki við land en sagði leið ekki svá
länga sem torsóttu. Ok þar eru þeir um vetrinn.

Ok er várar þýr hann þeim þar at vera ok slíka kosti sem hann hefir til skips ef þeir vilja. Þorgils segir honum vel fara ok kveð skipit vilja þíggja - 'ok væri 5 skylt at launa þér með góðu.' Hrölfur kveð ætla at hann myndi af honum giptu hljóta - 'því at ek væntir at þú mun þí góða virðing koma ok, ef svá verör, þættir þú mik í fríð þíggja aprtr í byggðina'. Þorgils heitr honum því ok mæla þar hvárir vel fyrir óðrum.

10 Fara nú suðr fyrir landit ok gefr þeim vel fararleiði ok haustar fyrir þeim. Koma við vetr á Eiríksfjörð; beita fyrir landit; heldu síðan inn í fjörðinn ok þogðu í lægi ok tjölduðu. Ok í því bili sá þeir kaupskip er utan sigldi í fjörðinn ok þogðu í lægi ok hófðu eitt veðr hvár-15 irtveggju. Kómu at einni hófn ok lendingu. Þorgils mælti: '(Petta eru) góð tíðindi. Farið, Porleifr ok Kolr,' sagði Þorgils, 'ok hittíð mennina ok (munu þeir) kunna at segja nokkur tíðindi.' Fóru nú ok koma at kaupskipinu ok gen(gu út á) skipit. Aprtr viðr lyptingina sat maðr í 20 rauðum kyrtili ok sprettr upp (þégar) ok fagnar Porleifi vel. Þar var Porsteinn hvíti, fóstri hans ok stjúþaðir. Hann spyrr at Þorgilsi. Þeir segja honum at hann var þar. Porsteinn ferr þégar til fundar viðr hann ok verör þar fagnafundr. Kveð Porsteinn kominn af Íslandi ok kvað ráð 25 hans standa heilt ok hófðu ekki til hans spurt á íiíi. vetrum. Sagði Dórnýju, döttur hans, gipta Bjarna í Gróf Porsteinnssyni rauða landnámamanns - 'ok er Porleifr kom
eigi til, bjó ek skip af Noregi ok fór ek út til Islands ok var ek þar íi. vetr. Ok er ekki fréttiz til yðvar, þá fýsti mik at leita yðvar higat. Nú er ek fæginn orðinn yðrum fundi ok allt miti skal yðr jafnheimult sem mér.'

5 Porgils kvað æ ekki mætti stórum betr í haldi koma, sem at honum væri ván. Halda nú um morguninn þangat; tjalda nú búðir á landi.

Menn komu brátt til þeira ok bóníði sá er þar bjó næst hét Pórir; hann bauð Porfinni til sín ok þangat fóru hann.

10 Bóníði vísar þeim til hafnar. Ryðja skip ok bera af fóng sin. Eiríkr rauði býðr Porgilsí til sín ok þat þekkiz hann ok óll[um] þeim er hann vildi at þagat færi ok þangat fóru xii. menn í Brattahlíð. Porgilsí er skipat gagnvart Eiríki á annan bekk, þá Porsteiní it næsta honum utar frá, þá Porleífi, Kol ok Starkaði. Porfinni var fengin fóstra ok vildi hann eigi mjólk drekka fyrri en myrkt var at ok þá var hann af brjósti vandr. Ekki var Eiríkr margr til þeira ok verða vistin ekki með þvílíku bragði sem Porgils ætlaði. Porgils fréttir at þrælarnir váru þar í landi með mikla kosti ok sögðu fátt satt frá ferðum sínum. Porgils lét sem hann vissi eigi.

Pat varð þar um vetrinn at bjarnðyr lagðiz á fé manna ok gerði mikinn skaða morgum manni. Eru þá stefnur at áttar ef þat mætti af ráðaz ok þar kom at fé var lagt til 25 hófuðs dýrinu ok gerðu menn or hvárritveggju byggðinni. Fátt lét Eiríkr sér til finnaz. Ok um vetrinn, er á líðr, kóm man til kaupa viðr þá Porgils ok Porstein, ok eru

Frá því er sagt eittveri sinn um vetrinn at menn sátu í heimilishúsi þar í Brattahlíð ok þó eigi allir senn, því at sumir stóðu fram í húsin er mannarmargt var. Þar var Kolr 20 ok sveitungr hans. Þat er sagt frá tali þeira at þeir fóru í mannjófnuð ok ræðu um Porgils ok Eirík. Sagði Kolr Porgils mórg afreks—...
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...Hann kvez ix. búa kvatt hafa. Skapti segir: 'Var-at af vöru, sleikti um þvöru. Lát niðr falla; engu er nýtt.' Porgils segir: 'Því mun þat sæta?' Skapti segir: 'Kunnig eru mér svá lög, mágr, at ek veit at rangt er til búit ok eru þau ein málaefni með ykkur Æigrími at bezt er at niðr falli. Hafa svá farit skipti ykkur Æigríms flest at þú ert ekki vanvirð í, þótt bit skilið við svá búit. Unnum vör þér sæmdar ok hógsetu heðan af ok má af þér margt tala þat er mikilmannliðt er ok skórunigt.' Ríða menn nú af þingi ok sefaz Porgils við umtölur mága sinna ok vina.

Helgi hét Austmaðr er út kom í Einarshöfn ok átti ferð upp í herað ok ferr með varning sinn upp í Prándarholt. Porgils reið at ofan ór Gróf ok riðuz á móti. Helgi reið Porgils næsta af baki ok hló at honum er hann var bjúgr á baki; kvez eigi þat mega á sjá at hann hefði verit garpr mikill. Porgils reiddiz við ok mælti: 'Ekki hafa menn þat gert at færa spott at mér. En svá hæðiligr sem þér þykki ek nú vera, þá býð ek þér einvígi þegar í stað ok er þá reynt hvárt þú berr skjótt af mér.' Þeir hittuz fyrrir neðan gringard en veðr var á kalt í móti Porgilsi ok sat hann því bjúgr á baki. Helgi kvað sér engan frama í: 'at bera af fretkarli þínum'-en kvez þó eigi vilja undan ganga. Austmaðrinn hafði ðxi í hendi ok leit á ðxina ok þótti sljó. Porgils mælti: 'Hvassara vápn muntu þurfa ef bíta skal mín hófuðbein ok er vápn þitt ókarlmannliðt.' Porgils hafði sverð sit, Jarðhússnaut, ok var alvápnmaðr
sem hann var aldri döruvis. Porgils hljóp þegar geystr at honum Austmanninum ok hóogr til hans með sverðinu Jarðhússnaut ok kom sverðit á ðxлина ok var svá mikít sár at honum vannz þat skjótt til bana. Þá var Porgils viitugr. Porgils kvað þetta orðit glappaverk ok braðræði ok kvei þetta helzt bæta vilja.

Ok ii. vetrum síðar kóm[u] út í Einarshófn ii. bræðr Helga ok ætla til hefnda. Hét annarr Einarr en annarr Sigurðr ok varð ekki vart við skipkvámu. Þeir fóru þegar í 10 Traðarholt ok kóm þar snemma dags ok var Porgils í hvílu sinni en verkmenn váru á fótum ok konur. Ok er [þeir] bræðr kómu at bænum, þá töluduz þeir við hversu með skyldi fara. Einarr mælti: 'Iilt þykki mér at drepa gamlan mann, frægjan ok vinsælan, ok er skaði mikill ef hann lætr af 15 beraz.' Porgils verðr nú varr við ok sprettr upp þegar ok tekir Jarðhússnaut ok bað þá at ganga ef þeir vildi ok bráz þó nökkut á fótinn halta. Einarr mælti: 'Eigi viljum vit bræðr gera þér ófrið ok skal annat verða eyrindi okkat ef ek ræð.' Porgils tók þessu vel ok hýrðiz skjótt í viðærgói 20 ok sagði svá: 'Ek er þess miklu fúðari ok muntu vera góðr dregrir. Ok þar er ek drap Helga, bróður ykkarn, þá vil ek þat bæta ok gefa vil ek þér, Einarr, sverðit Jarðhússnaut - því at þú ert verðr at bera - bróður þínum v. merkr silfrs, nema þit skiptið annan veg,' - ok skildu þeir vel ok dreng-25 iliga. Fóru þeir utan eptir þat.

Eitt sinn er þau hjón fóru til bús á Hjalla, tók Porgils þar sótt. Þá var hann hálfníræðr. Hann lá viku ok andaðiz
þar ok váru þeir í eina gróf lagðir, Pórodör ok Porgils ok Bjarni inn spaki, at þeiri kirkju er Skapti lét gera fyrir utan lækinn. En síðan váru færð beinin í þann stað sem nú er kirkjan því at Skapti hét at gera kirkju þá er Póra, 5 kona hans, braut fót sinn, þá er hon var at léreptum sínum.

Porgils þótti inn mesti merkismaðr, vinfastr ok vinveittr, þrautgóðr ok þróttigr, eljunarmaðr ok óáleitinn, ok helt sik við alla til jafns, þótt miklir menn ok sterkir ætti í hlut. Þótti hann ok inn mesti sveitarhöfðingi.

10 Hann var sáttgjarn ok svinnr en móðugr ok mjök þungrækr við þá er eigi vildu sik vel sída. Hann var tryggr ok guðhræðdr trúækinn, guðhræðdr ok góðr vinum sínum. Er ok margt stórmenni frá honum komit ok víða dreifz hér um land vár.

Munum vérr nú hættta fyrst at segja frá Porgils Órrábéins-
15 stjúpa ok lýkr þar sógu þessi.
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J: AM 165 m, fol.

P: AM 515, 4to

PM: That part of P's text which is mainly a copy of M

X: The group of texts comprising AM, A and S

*Y: The latest common source for K, AM, A and S

Z: The group of manuscripts comprising B, J and P

X: The group of texts comprising K(AM), A, S, B, J and P

*X: The latest common source for the texts of X

(Some of the above abbreviations are occasionally used of the scribes of the appropriate texts rather than the texts themselves.)
Textual Notes to Main Text

Chapter 1

1/1  gullskeggr K(in corner of page) A S Z ] hárfagri  
   K(crossed out by K)

1/14  Rers sonar K S(Rersonar) B J ] rera AM(in square  
   brackets in margin); rera sonar A

1/17  Dofrafóstri K Z ] + en y

1/19  Noregi K B P ] + pá y J

1/20  jarl Grjótgarðsson y Z ] í Grjóttgarði K; AM has  
   jarl over K's i and changes e in K's Grjóttgarde  
   to sson; Grjóttgarðsson written by K beneath Grjótt-  
   garði but crossed out by AM

1/21  Sygnafylki y Z ] K writes Firðafylki first; this is  
   crossed out by K and K writes Sygna underneath it;  
   AM puts diagonal stroke through Firða-

1/21  Haraldr konungr K(in margin) A S Z ] Hákon konungr  
   K; this is crossed out and underlined by K and the  
   same scribe writes jarl above konungr

2/2  ór y B J ] af K P

2/5  [Hall]steinn emendation from corrections in K, A  
   (cf. 6/18) ] Hólmsteinn X; K writes Hallsteinn in  
   margin over which AM writes rectius but which he  
   crosses out; he also writes vide infra Cap. 4 by  
   the side of K's Hallsteinn; rectius Hallsteinn  
   Arni Magnússon in A

2/5  Ólvisdóttur A S Z ] Ólfsdóttur K but underlined
and crossed out by K; Ólvis written in margin by K

Chapter 2

2/8 Gripssonar AM A Z ] Greipssonar K S

2/10 Fjöulum K A S Z ] AM adds [i slöð] above line after Fjöulum; this is crossed out by AM who also writes slöð slöt in the margin which he also crosses out

2/10 Son K(in margin) A S Z ] Bróðir K(crossed out by AM)

2/18 splíks K S Z ] líks A

2/21 Ingólf K A S Z ] + en AM

2/24 ðörum A S J ] + en K

2/25 ek K ] + ok A

3/1 saman K S B J ] samt A

3/4 atlögum K B J ] álögum A; AM crosses out K's t and adds accent over a

3/8 it AM A Z ] ÷ K S

3/9 kómu v Z ] fóru K

3/15 undir K A S ] + sjálfum sér K(above line; crossed out by AM) Z

3/15 meira K A S ] + ðörum K(above line; underlined by AM)

3/20 þess K A J ] þat S B P

3/21 fyrstr hafit hafa A S Z (B and J: fyrst) ] hafit hafa fyrstr K

3/23 mæla K Z ] + segir hann A S

3/25 heit K Z ] + segir hann A S
Chapter 3

5/1 sagði hann A S J P(segir) ] ÷ K B
5/2 þar var K S Z ] ok var bar A
5/6 Fjörðu y Z ] fjórðinn K
5/10 mikit K S Z ] + hafa A but underlined
5/11 ok (2) AM or K (above line) S Z ] ÷ K (in main text)
A
5/14 vildi K (ætlar Z) ] + hann y
5/14 njósn A S Z ] njósnir K
5/15 honum A S J P ] + ok K B
5/15 ok A S Z ] ÷ K
5/21 nú (1) y Z ] ÷ K
5/22 í K S ] á A
5/22 hefr K A ] hóf AM (but crossed out by AM) Z
5/23 óhelgi sér AM A (A originally wrote óhelgis but final
-s crossed out) Z ] óhelgis K
5/26 fallnir eignir ykkar K (in margin; underlined by
K (or AM)) A S Z ] silfurs vegnar merkr K (crossed
out and underlined by K and AM)
5/26 burtu K S Z ] ÷ A
5/27 þrír y Z ] tveir K
6/2 bræðr y Z ] báðir K
6/3 sunnanlands y Z ] ÷ K
Chapter 4

6/20 mǫnnum K S ] ÷ A Z
6/24 hann K S ] ÷ A Z

Chapter 5

7/13 ðrn K(crossed out by AM or K) J ] ÷ A S
7/13 á K J P ] at A S
7/19 Gaulverska K(in margin) A ] lenzka K(crossed out by K); Háleyska S Z
7/22 móðurfaðir hans A S Z ] K has faðir hans (Atla) with (Atla) crossed out probably by K. AM adds móður before K's faðir
7/23 Por[viðr] emendation from marginal note in K (see 8/14 and 9/2) ] Pormóðr X, K has Pormóðr crossed out and Porviðr s. Landnama fol. 94 in margin

Chapter 6

8/4 eystri K S Z ] A writes ystri first and then adds e above line before it
8/5 Pórunn K A(crossed out by Arni Magnússon) ] Asný Arni Magnússon in A P
8/6 Kolbeinn, faðir Pórunnar K A ] Kolbeinn, faðir Jórunnar S B J; Arni Magnússon has a sign before A's Kolbeinn and writes at the bottom of the page in A: Corrige: var Flosi, faðir Kolbeins, fōður Guðrúnar. He also crosses out A's Pó in Pórunnar and writes Guð above it; Flosi, faðir Kolbeins, fōður Guðrúnar P
móður K S Z ] something illegible (Björn?) is added by A but is also crossed out by same scribe

8/14 Porvíðar K (in margin) A Z (P has Porvíðardóttir)] Pormóðar K S

8/22 engan K S P ] enga A
8/23 eptir K S Z ] ÷ A
8/25 Stena K (with dotted line underneath) A ] Steins S Z

9/2 Porvíðarson AM A Z ] Pormóðarson K
9/4 vörn K Z ] varnir v
9/11 málit K Z ] + en A S
9/16 bessi orð v Z ] betta K

Chapter 7

9/25 aptr v Z ] ÷ K
10/6 segir K B P ] sagði A S J
10/13 segir K J ] sagði A S B

10/17 hafði A S ] + þó K (added above line) Z
10/19 en [Átli] emendation from Z ] einn var K; AM underlines K's einn and adds en above it; en var A S

Chapter 8

10/20 Ónundr K Arni Magnússon in A (rectius Ónundr) Z ] Amundr AM A
10/23 [Ónundr] emendation from K B P ] Ónundr K B P;
Amundi y J (Because y and J agree on the more difficult Amundi, it is reasonable to assume that this was the reading of *Y and *X; Önundr is therefore to be regarded as an emendation.)

11/11 sýnum K B J + ok A S J P

Chapter 9

11/25 Hagavági X ] hauga urð s. Landn. fol. 96 K (in margin)
   (cf. LdnSkb, textual note to chapter 374, line 21)

12/3 á honum A ] át (að honum K (with -ð in að crossed out by AM)); á hann S

12/9 var A S B J ] er K P

12/15 Austmannsskelfis K Z ] Austmannaskelfis A S; AM changes K's -manns- to -manna-.

Chapter 10

13/4 Bjarnarsundi K A S ] Knarrarsundi K (in margin; underlined by AM) Z

13/13 *X was defective here. K's reading at 13/14 is an attempt to emend the text.

13/14 Pá (Ok Z) er...hann y Z ] at hann fekk K (underlined by AM)

13/17 af því (2) K Z ] þar af A S

13/24 þangat veik K ] fór þangat AM; þangat fór A S

13/24 ok y Z ] hann K

14/14 Ók A S (En Z) ] ÷ K

14/14 biðr A S Z ] bað K

14/17 dauðan y Z ] ÷ K
Chapter 11

14/22 sagði A S B J ] segir K P
14/25 inn K Z ] þann A S
14/26 Lopts A S Z ] + ok K
15/1 viðbragði v Z ] yfirbragði K (with yfir underlined by AM) 
15/2 sterkr y ] rammr K
15/3 allra y ] ÷ K
15/5 dróz y Z ] jókz K; AM has d°z [dëz] in margin
15/8 gamall K Z ] + þá A S
15/19 fara y Z ] koma K

Chapter 12

15/23 en A S Z ] ok K
15/25 nú K J P ] ÷ A S B
15/26 ungr y Z ] ekki ennpá vígr K
16/1 þá A S Z ] ÷ K
16/2 proskaðr K S Z ] A writes þokkaðr first but changes it to proskaðr
16/2 hann beiddiz K Z ] Beiddiz hann A S
16/3 *X seems to have been defective here; AM has ok fekk ekki in margin but this is underlined
16/7 ósvinn[r]i emendation from S ] ósvinni A S
16/22-3 veizlum K Z ] veizlu A S
16/26 vegligi A S Z ] ungligi K
17/5 sik eiga K ] at hann eiga y
17/5 erfðir y Z ] eignir K
17/10 hirð[vist] emendation from AM Z ] hriðína K; hirðína A S; hirðvist AM Z
17/12 því y Z ] ÷ K
17/12 reið A S Z ] afareið K (with afareið crossed out by K)
17/14 Konungi K Z ] Konungr y

Chapter 13
17/21 Porgils A S B J ] + nú K
17/25 fyrnsk[u] emendation from Z ] fyrnsk K A S | fyrnska, Z
18/8 um y Z ] ÷ K
18/16 draugrinn K ] draugr A S
18/22 lostit K Z ] lagt A S
19/1 hana y Z ] henni K
19/2 hann y Z ] Porgils A S
19/3 Koma A S Z ] + þeir K
19/5 undir K S B J ] undan A M A
19/12 kemz y Z ] kemr K
19/13 þurpti A S B J ] þurptu þó K; þyrpti A M
19/14 bragðs K (til bragðs Z) ] bragða y
19/19 kalla A M (AM has kalli, here normalized as kalla);
    kalla K A S Z
19/21 ok A S Z ] ÷ K
19/24 af þessu K Z ] þessu A S
20/1 hafim A M A ] hófum K S
20/1 nú K ] ÷ A S
20/3 aptr veizluna A S ] vinaveizluna K; A M adds af after þá

Chapter 14
20/5 I þenna A S Z ] K writes Penna with capital letter;
I added later by AM

20/7 er A S Z ] væri K
20/7 i Sogni ] in margin in A

Chapter 15

20/22 Porgils gaf Porsteini K Z ] Porsteini gaf Porgils A S
20/24 rauð[1] emendation from AM and Z to agree with
32/23 and 43/14 ] rauðr K A S; rauði AM Z
21/4 [ek] emendation from AM Z ] ek AM(above line) Z;
÷ K A S
21/5 eigi þessar eignir A S Z ] þessar eignir eigi K
21/10 segir K B P ] sagði A S J
21/16 koma K Z ] kómu A S
21/20 fara K Z ] + . ok A S
21/22 Surtr jarnhauss K A S ] Surtr járnhófði K(in margin;
underlined by AM) Z
21/25 hriðar sakir y Z ] hrið K
22/1 Surtr K Z ] Svartr y
22/5 neita K Z ] níta y
22/13 orðinn K Z ] undir A S
22/14 Surti K Z ] Svarti y
22/17 Surti K Z ] Svarti y
22/26 Surtr K Z ] Svartr y
22/27 mér pó A S Z ] pó mér K
23/1 hefir hátt y(háir Z) ] hefr K
23/3 Blaðin K Z ] Blaðni AM A
hjölt þess K(þess hjölt Z) ] hjölt sverðs þess AM; hjölt þess sverðs A S

Chapter 16

23/8  ok y Z ] ÷ K
23/9  Blaðin K Z ] Blaðni AM A
23/12 Surts K Z ] Svarts y
23/15 Surti K Z ] Svarti y
23/17 né A S Z ] ok K
23/20 vilja A S Z ] vili K
23/21 Hákonj jarli A S Z ] Hákónnar jarls K
24/4  Blaðin K Z ] Blaðni AM A
24/5-6 hafa skyldu y Z ] skyldu hafa K
24/7  vaknaði K J P ] + þá A S B
24/9  finna K Z ] fundu A S
24/20 niðri K J P ] inn A S
24/21 gengr y Z ] gengi K
24/23 ok K S Z ] + ok A, but varð superimposed
24/25 en K J P ] ÷ A S
24/27 henni y ] hana K
25/2  gengu[ASZ] ] + upp K(crossed out by AM)
25/10 þá ok K Z ] ok þá A S
25/11 þunga K Z ] þungt A S
25/13 ok y Z ] ÷ K

Chapter 17

25/21  var S Z ] + um K; ÷ A
26/21 döttur A S Z ] + þá K
26/26 berjaz K S Z | giptaz berjaz A (with giptaz crossed out and underlined by A and possibly also Arni Magnusson)

27/8 en þú haf keflit ok y (en (ok J)) haf þú keflit ok Z | ok K (crossed out by AM)

27/9 segir K B | kvað A S J P

Chapter 18

28/2 at (2) K S Z | added by A above line

28/2 heldr A S Z | sír ekki K

28/3 sitja K S Z | A writes setja first but later changes it to sitja

28/3 slíkar svivirðingar A S | þessa svivirðing K;
slíka svivirðing AM Z

28/6 Helga K Z | ÷ A S

28/6 ræðir K S Z | A writes ræðr first but this is changed to ræðir

28/19 reynim AM | reynum K A S Z

28/25 en A S B J | ÷ K

29/3-4 [Ketil]bjarnarsonar emendation from correction in K and from P (cf. 13/5) | Kolbjarnarsonar K (with et written over o probably by K) A S B J; Ketilbjarnarsonar P

29/15 ok A S Z | ÷ K

29/18 kona A S B J | + hans K (crossed out by AM)

29/21 [systur] emendation from P (cf. 29/22) | dóttur
systur K (underlined by AM) A S; systur dóttur
Chapter 19

30/1–2 Kálfholti K A S B J ] Kolsholti K(in margin: underlined by K)

30/2 venr y B J ] vandi K

30/10 kveðjum K J ] + með þeim A S B

30/16 ok A S J ] ÷ K B

30/17 til K S B J ] added above line in A

30/18 tíðindin A S B J ] tíðindi K

30/27 verit K B J ] orðit A S

31/4 bús K S B J ] A writes búrs first but r is crossed out

31/7 fé K B J ] féit A S

31/23 gegni y ] gegnir K B J

31/24 svipti K B J ] + honum y

31/25 hófuðs K B J ] hófuð A S

32/1 hann A S B J ] + þar K

Chapter 20

32/4 í fyrra lagi y ] ok menn hans K

32/5 eina nóttr AM A S ] aðra nóttr eptir K

32/6 sér brugðiz y ] trú brugðit K

32/7 segir K ] sagði A S

32/7–8 er þú áttir verst til A S (max versta B J) ]

32/10 er y B J ] at K

32/10 sleit K(in margin) A(added in margin) S B J ] er
slétt K(underlined and crossed out by K and AM)

væri K A S ] yrði K(in margin; underlined by AM) B J

af fallit K B J ] af affallit A S

rauði v B J ] rauðr K

lít K ] brátt K

búit K B J ] verit v

xx. A S B J ] + vetrar K(underlined by AM)

tók K B J ] tekr A S

Leiru- K(in margin) A S B J ] leyni- K(crossed out by K and/or AM)

ferð K B J ] ferðum A S


Chapter 21

erfið K B J ] erfitt AM; erfit A S

grepligr K B J ] greypilgr A(with final r changed to t) S

hamra nökkura y (hamra bratta B J) ] hamar nökkurn K

brast v B J ] barz K

svá y ] + K

ok eigi y (ok eigi heldr B J) ] ok K

út þr firði K(in margin; underlined by AM) A S B J ] af í Borgarfirði K

af A S B J ] með K

taka K S B J ] added in margin in A

segir K ] sagði A S
35/7 um y ] ÷ K
35/10 þess K(crossed out by AM) B J ] ÷ A S
35/13 færiz y B ] færi K
35/13 er K S B J ] added in margin in A

Chapter 22
35/15 eru y B J ] váru K
35/18 sandmöl y B J ] sandfjór K(crossed out by AM)
35/25 manna y B J ] mónnum K
36/11 svefn K A S ] dúr K(in margin; underlined by AM)
36/15 deyr hann K S B J ] added in margin in A
36/16 er K S B J ] ÷ A
36/18-9 mjöllinni K A (A writes moldinni first; he then underlines it but uses final i as first minim of mjöllinni) S B J ] mólinni K(in margin; underlined by AM)
36/22 Þórarinn K A S B J ] Þorgefr K(in margin; underlined by AM)
37/4 gróf K B J ] gref AM S; grefr A(with final r added later)

Chapter 23
37/8 ok K B J ] ÷ A S
37/8 leysimz AM A ] leysumz K S B J
37/9 þó eigi ólíkastr A S ] þat er líkligt K; þó eigi ólíkastr AM
37/13 eigi yfir þat sjá K A S ] eigi sjá ráðrúm til þess K(in margin; underlined by AM) B J
37/15 vita K S B J ] viti A
37/16 nökkit A S B J + burt K (crossed through by AM)
37/21 prælunum A S B J prælum K
37/26 munu y B J eru K
38/6 allt blóðugt K B J alblóðugt A S
38/7 mestr harmr í vera y B J mestr í vera harmr K
38/8 Forgils y B J hann K (crossed out by AM)
38/10 mikit K A S B J pat allmikit AM
38/11 á geirvörtuna [mér] emendation from B á geirvörtuna K; af mér geirvörtuna AM; geirvörtuna A S J
38/12 út K (crossed out by AM) A S B J ór AM
38/14 sér y B J K has sjern with final n crossed out by AM

Chapter 24

38/16 sér K S B J , above line in A
38/20 rekr y J tekkr K B
38/23 þá K B J ÷ A S
39/1 þeir K B J þar A S.
39/4 koma A S B J kómu K
39/6 gengr y B J kemr K (crossed out by AM)
39/6 skipit A S B J + ok K
39/18 þeim A S B J þat K
39/22 togaðim AM A toguðum K S B J
39/22 [eina hónk] emendation from M einn hótt K A S B J
39/24 þat y B J (after ganga) ÷ K
39/27 en K S B J við A (added above line)
40/5 inu K því A S
með sverði B J ] ÷ K

brifr A S B J ] ÷ K

ok taka sér vatn K A S ] K has in margin ok sjá
vatn renna and, in main text, af added between taka
and sér and til added between sér and gagns; all
these changes are underlined by AM; ok sjá vatn
renna ok þat taka þeir sér B; ok sjá vatn renna ok
taka sér J

allar AM ] allir K A M(allfr in square brackets) A
(allir) S B J

spyrja K B J ] + hann v

hverju K A S B J ] hverri AM

gott af honum hljóta K B J ] af honum gott hljóta A

eitt K B J ] ÷ A S

ok K B J ] ÷ A S

eru K S B J ] A writes erut first but final t
crossed out

stjúpfaðir K B J ] + hans A S

varð K B J ] var A S

kominn A S B J] koma K

ok...Islands B J ] ÷ K

segir K J ] sagði A S B

næst K B J ] nærenri A S

Eiríki margt K B J ] Eiríkr margr A S

Chapter 25

á K B J ] at A S
Chapter 26

43/25 því y B J ] þar K(crossed out by AM)

44/3 Sveinninn hljóp út sem áðr K S B J ] written twice in A

44/21 en K A S ] eðr AM Z

44/24 taka A S Z ] þegar K(crossed out by AM and possibly also K)

45/1 at K Z ] þeir y

45/1 gera um K(um gera Z) ] gera A S; AM underlines K's um

45/4 varð A S B P ] var K J

45/10-1 illmenni K Z ] illmennin A S

45/11 en A S Z ] ok K

45/14 til lykta áðr sín erindi K ] áðr til lykta sín erindi A S

45/18 færir y Z ] færði K

46/13 munim AM ] munum K A S Z

46/13 illmenni þessi K Z ] illmenninnin A S

46/25 reikud AM(in square brackets) A S ] rekkud K(spelt rekkud)(crossed out by AM); reikhús K(in margin; underlined by AM) Z

47/14 biðja K B ] beiða y J P

47/18 Tóku þeir K B ] Peir tóku y J P

47/21 misst K S(added above line) ] ÷ A

48/6 sér y Z ] ÷ K

48/7 Anakol A S Z ] Anakol K(with very faint length mark)
Anakol (K: Anakol with very faint length mark)
var vanr K, Z ] Anakol var vanr A (with var vanr crossed out); var S (with Anakolr added later above line after it)

48/12 Gíparr S (K has Gípar- at 48/15 and 48/26; A’s evidence on the length of the i is inconclusive)
Gíparr K; Gunnarr K (in margin; underlined by AM) Z

49/7 ok y, Z ] K

49/11 honum A, J, P ] beim K, S

Chapter 27

49/12 velktuz y, Z ] velkjaž K

49/17 um y, Z ] við K (crossed out by AM)

49/23 bónda vera K, Z ] vera bónda A, S

Chapter 28

50/20 þá y, Z ] K

50/22 lík K, S, Z ] + Porsteinn A, but underlined

Chapter 29

51/18 Porleifr fór utan K, A, S ] K adds Porsteinn ok before Porleifr and u to end of fór (K’s additions underlined by AM); Porsteinn ok Porleifr sigldu aprtr Z

51/24 svá K, S, Z ] + þú A (but underlined)

51/27 oftekit K, A, S, Z ] + í AM

Chapter 30

52/13 hann A, S, J, P ] ok K

52/20 leit A, S, Z ] lítr K

Chapter 31

52/26 hann y.Z ] Bjarni K

53/10 penninga k.A.S ] + fyrir fét k(in margin; underlined by AM) Z

53/12 ok (2) k.Z ] ÷ A.S

53/16 biðja k.S.J.P ] + P A, but crossed through

53/21 heldr (1) k(crossed through by AM) A.S ] ÷ Z

53/26 ríðr v.Z ] fór k(crossed out by AM)

54/7-8 spurði v.Z ] spyrr K

54/9 þat v.Z ] þér K

54/24 húskarlinn v.Z ] húskarl K

54/24 ekki þurfa sín k.Z ] sín ekki þurfa A.S

55/2 þótti A.S.Z ] sýndiz K

55/2-3 þeim sem inni sátu maðrinn AM.S(þeim er inni sátu maðrinn B; þeim er (+ þar P) inni sátu maðrinn J.P) ] maðrinn þeim inni sátu K; maðrinn sem inni váru A(with váru crossed out and sátu added in margin by A)

55/7 tilstilli k.Z ] AM writes v[= v]st: (= við[um]stilli ?) over K's tilstilli and also underlines k's til-

55/7 umstilli A.S

55/7 gerðiz v.Z ] geriz K

Chapter 31

55/12 Helga svarar y.Z ] ÷ K

56/2 segir k.J.P ] sagði A.S.B

56/4 þess k.J.P ] + segir hann A.S.B

56/11 fórum k.Z ] ferðum ð
56/13 Gunnvör AM A S ] Guðvör K(underlined by AM);
Geirvör K(in margin; underlined by AM) Z

56/14 Hófdæ K S Z ] A writes Grófr first but underlines it
and writes Hófdæ

56/16 [Porgils] átti land nær skipalægi [Asgríms] AM's
emendation ] Asgrímr átti land nær skipalægi Porgils K J (both with Porgils written in margin after
skipalægi) P; Corrige Porgils a: l: n: sk: l: asgríms
AM; Asgrímr átti land nær skipalægi A S; Asgrímr
átti land með skipalægi Porgils B
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56/20 hittir [Porgils Asgrím] AM's emendation ] hittir
Asgrímr Porgils K A S; Corrige hittir Porgils Asgrím AM

56/23 smá AM A S Z ] síra- K

57/2 fjara K Z ] fjaran y

57/5 bolóxi K S Z ] + mikill A (but underlined; followed
by some word with ok superimposed)

57/5 Hann K Z ] ok A S

57/13 pá K B ] ÷ A S J P

57/13 pá Porgils varla mega y (Porgils varla við svá búit
skilja mega Z) ] varla mega þá Porgils K

57/19 sagði A S B J~] segir K P

57/20 nókkut y Z ] í nókkuru K

57/21 mein K Z ] + faðir A S

57/24 honum mundu K A S J P ] mundu honum AM
er K S Z ] + al A(but underlined)

hvikaði K(K's vi underlined by AM) Z ] hinkaði y

til móts y J (á móts P) ] móts K B

sagði þat K (kvað þat Z) ] svarar: 'Þat er y
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segir A S Z ] kvaz K

evju K Z ] hví y

sagði hann y Z (segir P) ] ð K

gerla K Z ] ð A S
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á móti K A S ] + Helgi ok AM

albjúgr y (ádr bjúgr J P) ] bjúgr K B

nú á þér K Z ] á þér nú A S

hvárr K AM Z ] hverr A S

eigi y J P ] ð K

óxlina K Z ] óxl honum A S

ok (2) y Z ] ð K

Einarr en annarr Sigurðr K Z ] Sigurðr en annarr

Einarr A S

váru K Z ] þeir A; þar S

mann K A S ] + segir Einarr K (in margin; underlined by AM) (sagði Einarr B; J has Einarr sagði and P

Einarr segir before 'Ekki þykki...60/16)

okkar K S ] okkat A

at K Z ] sem A S

vil K Z ] skal A S
Chapter 35

61/8  lækinn K A S ] AM crosses out -n in K's lækinn; læk Z

61/16  var Þórhall's son K Z ] ÷ A S

61/18  faðir A S Z(fður J ] faðir Jóns, fður K

61/20  Sonr y Z ] Børn K

61/21  faðir (1) K J S ] fður AM A B

61/21  faðir (2) K J ] fður y B

61/22  galla y Z ] gamla K
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63/13 Kálfaholti ] hjá Kolsholtri er Sórlabær en ekki
   Kálfholti P in margin

63/17 kva[z] emendation ] kvað P

63/23 kva[z] emendation ] kvað P

64/9 þér ] + um P but underlined

65/1 vígsmálit ] P has cross over this word and skógarmaðr in margin

65/14 ríða ] + frammi P in brackets; dotted line underneath

65/22 hvert ] + sinn P but crossed out

66/3 brugði[z] emendation ] brugðit P

66/14 kva[z] emendation ] kvað P

67/25 eigi ] + svá nær P but underlined

67/26 [álna] emendation ] ÷ P

68/15 yðar ] + mál P with dotted line underneath

68/16 draga[z] emendation ] draga P

68/18 Þórr ] + sij P but crossed out (or underlined ?)

68/19 sjóvarströndr ] P has cross over this word and
   sjóvarströnd in margin

69/1 [þótt] emendation ] því P

69/6 átfátt ] P has cross over this word and matarfátt in margin

69/26 mér ] P has cross after this word and góz mitt
   in margin

70/6 Pórarinn ] + Porgils P but underlined
70/26 þeir ] + mega [with dotted line underneath
71/4 mik[it] emendation ] mik [with Pörey var mjök
þunguð in margin
71/8 veg ] vel written in P first but corrected to veg
71/21 aptann ] P has cross over this word and
dagr in margin
72/6 hann ] added later in P at line division
73/21 ærit ] P has cross over this word and eigi in
brackets in margin
74/14 saxa ] P has cross over this word and skera in
margin
74/26 nú ] + fark P but underlined
75/2 ok(l) ] followed by space in P.
Textual Notes to M
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77/1  (hjá) cf. 38/17 ] M has torn edge
77/2  (m)iklar cf. 38/17 ] M has torn edge
77/5  taka [reka]ldit emendation from X-version (38/12) ]
77/20 Vas-k-a[t] emendation (cf. Mediaeval Scandinavia, 1969, 93 and 95 footnote) ] Vaskaði M
78/25 aldri ] aldri aldri M (with line division in between)
79/4  hankar[in]nar emendation ] hankarnar M
79/22 (at ek værr)a cf. 40/4 ] M has hole
79/23 (hægra at) cf. 40/5 ] M has hole
79/24 þ(ar) cf. 40/6 ] M has hole
79/24 kvísl(uðu)z cf. 40/6 ] M has hole
79/25 lauk(inn. Sv)á cf. 40/7 and Introduction, page 147 ] M has hole
79/27 (Porleifr segir) (No room for svarar which is the shorter version's reading at the corresponding place (40/8)) ] M has hole
80/10 b[á]rurnar emendation from the X-version (40/16) ] bórurnar M (cf. Note to 40/15-8)
81/12 ausskotuna spelt ðrskotuna in M; ð is to be regarded as a back spelling for 'au' and rs as a back spelling for 'ss' (cf. Altisl. 198). Further on this word, see Note to 81/12).
81/16 ausskotunni spelt aurskotunni (cf. Textual Note to 81/12)
81/19–20 fl(ð fugl, því) cf. 41/15 ] M has hole
81/21 (segir: 'Petta) ] M has hole
81/22 en M ] Pórhallur Vilmundarson emends to er
81/22 firðu(ð m)ik ] M has hole
81/23 (ok he)ðan ] M has hole
81/24 v(erum) ] M has hole
81/26 ís[num] emendation ] isin M; Finnur Jónsson (Fl16, 1932, 48 footnote) believes that this could be read as ísnum but this is doubtful although not inconceivable (at 81/24 M spells ísnum thus: isnu). Both Guðbrandur Vigfússon (Fornsögur, 180/22) and Pórhallur Vilmundarson read ísinn here
82/16 (með) ] M is illegible (cf. Introduction, page *15)
82/16 land[i] emendation ] land M
83/16 (Petta eru) cf. 42/23–4 ] M has torn edge
83/17 (munu þeir) ] M has torn edge
83/19 gen(gu út á) cf. 42/26 and Introduction, page *147 ] M has torn edge
83/20 (þegar) cf. 42/27 ] M has torn edge
84/12 þíll[um] emendation ] þíll M

Folio 5

88/7 kóμ[u]  kóμx emendation ] kom M
88/11 [þeir] emendation ] ÷ M