Sólarljóð

A poem based on forty-four mss. A modernised edn of the poem, based on the doctoral work and accompanied by extensive textual notes, was published by Njörður in 1991. Sól was first translated into English by Guðbrandur Vigfusson and F. York Powell in CPB (1883). W. H. Auden and P. B. Taylor collaborated on a trans. of Sól in The Elder Edda: A Selection translated from the Icelandic (1969). Though this trans. has Auden’s typical muscularity of expression, it is a very free version of the Icel. text.

Selection of mss represented in the apparatus

Sól is preserved only in paper copies dating from the C17th onwards. Seventy-three copies are known to the eds, in a total of 71 mss (with 2 mss each containing 2 distinct copies). All these copies were transcribed in full, collated, and the record of agreements and disagreements analysed to give a view of the relations among the mss. Thirty-two of these mss also contain copies of the narrative sequence Svipdagsmál. It appears that this poem has a similar textual history to Sól and conclusions about the relations of the mss for Svipdagsmál were used to check the conclusions reached for Sól. From this analysis, 9 of the 73 extant copies were selected as the basis for the present edn.

Like Svipdagsmál, all extant copies of Sól derive from a single copy surviving into the C17th. Thus, all copies contain five common errors likely to have been present in this single archetype: sofandi (5/5; emended to sofanda); virta (or virtus / virtur 13/6, emended to virkt); gala (or hala 26/4, emended to gæla); á væl, á vil etc. (28/4, emended to á mis); the omission of a word in 80/1 (bölvi supplied), undir (80/6). In addition to these six errors, it is likely that some of the thirteen places where readings are supplied from post-1700 copies (see below) also represent errors present in the archetype.

Five copies, dating from between 1650 and 1700, appear to descend independently from the lost archetype. These five, used in this edn, are:

1. AM 166b 8° fols 45v-48v (166b²): mid-C17th, used as the base ms. for this edn. Some eight later copies, including 427a, 428a, 1871a and 21 6 7a, appear to descend from this copy. 166b² is the oldest copy and preserves several important and distinctive readings found in no other early copy (yníðshetti 33/3, seig 37/5, harðla 43/5, munaháldusir 48/4, sýndra 59/5, ok himna skript 70/6, állum 80/6; the whole of st. 83).

2. AM 167 b 8° fols 1r-4v (167b 6°): second half of the C17th (contains sts 1-26 and 56-82). Textually close to 738 (no. 5) with which it may share an exemplar below the archetype. In terms of its influence on later copies, this is the most important single copy of Sól: some 25 later copies (including all

3. AM 155 a V 8° (155a²): second half of the C17th (contains only sts. 1-5).

4. Holm pap 15 8° 1r-8r (pap 15°): c. 1675. This has the best text of Svipdagsmál, and contains a text of Sól independent of any other early copy (so differing at some 150 places from 166b² and 738°). It supplies ten readings to this edn. found in no other of the pre-1700 copies here used (súlirg 4/6, kallálir 29/2, rér 50/5, sóru 63/3, eign 63/3, höfðu 67/2, myrðir 74/5, Björgvör 76/1, móðug á munab 77/3, or 78/5). In terms of its influence on later copies, this is the most important single copy of Sól; some 25 later copies (including all
other pre-1700 copies) descend from papp15⁵. No previous ed. has used this ms., though several have relied on copies descended from it (notably 1866⁶, used by Sophus Bugge 1867, and 1867⁷, used by Finnur Jónsson in Skj).

5. AM 738 ⁴⁴° pp. 70-84 (738⁴): dated 1680. 167b ⁶⁵, 1872⁶ and another five later copies may descend from 738⁴. In Svipdagsmál the ‘b’ group of mss associated with 214⁶ also appears descended from 738⁴, and this may also be true of the same mss in Sól.

The range of readings present in these five mss suggest that the first scribes had difficulty reading the lost archetype. The frequent disagreement on readings likely to have arisen from expansion of abbreviations (e.g., the Sváfar/Sváfur forms in st. 80) suggest that this archetype made heavy use of abbreviation, as indeed does 166b⁶ especially. Of these five early copies, 166b⁶ is the clear choice as the base text for an edn, since the distinctive and important readings listed above are present only in 166b⁶ among these early copies. However, at some 73 places 166b⁶ has a reading which appears to be inferior, and a reading found in other mss is preferred. The importance of the other pre-1700 mss can be demonstrated easily: 57 of the 73 readings accepted from other mss beside 166b⁶ come from one of the other four pre-1700 mss, with papp15⁵ being the most productive. In these cases, we can presume that 166b⁶ has miscopied its exemplar, while at least one (and often all) of the other pre-1700 mss has preserved the archetypal readings. These presumed errors in 166b⁶, which are here corrected from the other four pre-1700 mss, most frequently involve omission or addition of function words (e.g. er 4/2, 29/6, 38/3, 69/2, en 21/6) or mishandling of abbreviations (e.g. himn 7/2, fæ 13/1; perhaps gá 25/6). Other errors are more serious: e.g. the omission of naktir feir urð in 9/4. Overall, however, 166b⁶ remains considerably closer to this edited text than is any other early copy: both papp15⁵ and 738⁵ differ from the text printed here in some 150 places, compared to the 86 where 166b⁶ differs (the 73 places here mentioned, where readings are supplied from other mss, plus the thirteen points where we emend, to give a reading found in no ms).

As with Svipdagsmál, all extant copies descend from a single copy surviving into the C17th, a copy itself containing many errors. Thus, at ten points all copies contain the same error, or readings manifestly derived from the same error, suggesting this single copy itself contained erroneous readings at those ten points. Accordingly, emendation is required at all those points. Thus: ‘harða’ 2/2 (or ‘harla’); ‘søfandi’ 5/5; ‘x lifa’ 7/5; ‘virtra’ 13/6 (or ‘virrva/virrvar’); ‘gala’ 26/4 (or ‘hala’); ‘inxta’ 41/5, ‘gåldeđum’ 59/3; the omission of ‘it’ 71/6 and of ‘in’ 75/2; the omission of a word (possibly bólvi) in 80/1. At three other points, the mss show a range of impossible readings suggesting (most likely) varying attempts by the scribes to make sense of an impossible reading in the archetype, though the extent of variation makes it impossible to be sure what that original reading was: thus, the readings at 27/6, 28/4 and 49/5. In fact, there were certainly many more errors in this lost archetype than just these thirteen. It is likely that some of the places where readings are supplied from post-1700 copies also represent errors present in the archetype: thus the fifteen readings (six found in 2797⁷ alone) listed in the discussion of the four post-1700 mss used in this edition. Finally, there is 16/6, where all but two mss have ‘eldi’. There reading ‘elda’,
present in only two very late mss, is considered to have been an independent scribal emendation.

On the basis of an analysis of the history of the Sól tradition (alongside that of Svipdagsmál), four post-1700 mss are also used in this edn, in addition to the five pre-1700 copies described above. These four are:

1. Lbs 214 4° fols 149r-152v (214°): written by Vigfúss Jónsson after 1723, probably c. 1736. In both Sól and Svipdagsmál this is the ancestor of a group of some eight mss (including 215°, 329°, 64934°, 818°, 21 5 2°) labelled as the ‘b’ text of Svipdagsmál. For both poems there is evidence suggesting that this ‘b’ text derives ultimately from the copy in 738°.

2. Lbs 1441 4° fols 581r-588v (1441°): 1760) this contains a text of Svipdagsmál independent of any earlier copy, and the same appears true for its text of Sól; several later copies appear descended from this ms.

3. British Library Add. 10575 B° (10575°): C18th (only text in ms.); contains a text of Sól apparently independent of any earlier copy; several later copies appear descended from this ms.

4. Lbs 2797 4° 230-58 (2797°): written by Gísli Konráðsson in 1820. Gísli (father of Professor Konráð Gíslason) was widely learned, and may have had access to ms no longer extant. His text contains six readings found only in 2797° among the mss here chosen, and which are accepted into this text (thus veldnydr 3/6, þat kveld sálu sama 26/6, náum 33/6, skyldriðnis 51/6, hungri 71/3, þruna 77/6). It is not possible to determine whether these are Gísli’s intelligent emendations or readings derived from now-lost mss. They are treated as readings in this edn.

These four mss give a sense of the later variation found in the tradition. Further, at least two of these four (1441° and 10575°), and possibly also 214°, appear to represent lines of descent independent of the pre-1700 copies, and so might preserve archetypal readings not present in those copies. This may be the case with the nine readings þegjanda 28/6 (1441°, 10575°, 2797°), leiz á marga vegu 40/4-5 (1441°, 2797°), hófðu 72/2 (214°, 10575°, 2797°); eigu 74/3 (1441°, 2797°), meæti 75/2 (10575°, 2797°); skílja 75/4 (214°, 2797°); cymðum 75/6 (214°, 2797°); fírum 76/6 (10575°, 2797°); Böðveig 79/4 (10575°). Of these nine readings, all except that in 79/4 are present in 2797°, which may also represent independent descent.

These four mss give a sense of the later variation found in the tradition. Further, at least two of these four (1441° and 10575°), and possibly also 214°, appear to represent lines of descent independent of the pre-1700 copies, and so might preserve archetypal readings not present in those copies. This may be the case with the six readings þegjanda 28/6 (1441°, 10575°), leiz á marga vegu 40/4-5 (1441°), vænardreka 54/2 (10575°), hófðu 72/2 (214°, 10575°); eigu 74/3 (1441°), Böðveig 79/4 (10575°). Of these six readings, four (those in 28, 40, 72, 74) are present in 2797°, which may also represent independent descent.
Altogether, fifteen readings are adopted from these later four copies: six found only in 2797\(^*\) among these copies, and apparently arising by emendation from Gísl Konráðsson; and nine found in at least one of the other three (of which eight are also in 2797\(^*\)), possibly by independent descent from the lost archetype. One other reading, *elda* in 16/6, is found in two post-1700 mss, and is considered a scribal emendation. Thus, the edited text differs from the base ms. 166b\(^*\) in 86 places as follows:

1. 13 emendations found in no copy
2. 57 readings preferred from the other four pre-1700 copies
3. 15 readings preferred from four post-1700 copies
4. 1 reading preferred from the other 64 copies

Mss not recorded in the apparatus to this edn

All variants present in the nine mss described in the last section are recorded in the Readings. Beside these nine, the sixty-two other mss known to contain texts of *Sól* (64 texts, with 2 mss each containing 2 distinct texts) are listed here. As stated above, the texts of all these were transcribed and collated, and the selection of the nine mss used based on analysis of this collation. None of these sixty-two can be shown to derive independently from the archetype as can many of the nine here used. Indeed, it can be demonstrated that many of these sixty-two derive from mss among these nine: thus the 25 (approximately) descending from papp15\(^*\), the 8 descending from 166b\(^*\), another 8 descending from 214\(^*\).

Evidence of these ms. relations for the text of *Svipdagsmál* in these mss may be found in Robinson 1991; the eds propose to give a full discussion of the ms. relations for both *Svipdagsmál* and *Sól* in a separate publication. While the readings in these mss may be of interest to (for example) cultural historians investigating the reception of older Christian poetry in C18th Iceland, they are of diminishing value where the aim is the establishment of a best text for modern readers.

The 62 mss are:

**Copenhagen:** AM 427 fol\(^*\) (427\(^*\)) fols 29r-36r: 1756; AM 428 fol\(^*\) (428\(^*\)) pp. 70-87: 2nd half of C18th; AM 750 4°\(^*\) (AM750 4°\(^*\)) fol. 36v: 2nd half of C17th (contains only sts. 1-10 and part of st. 11); NKS 1108 fol\(^*\) (1108\(^*\)) pp. 255-66: c. 1750; NKS 1109 fol\(^*\) (1109\(^*\)) pp. 482-501: c. 1770; NKS 1110 fol\(^*\) (1110\(^*\)) fols 3r-6v: C18th; NKS 1111 fol\(^*\) (1111\(^*\)) pp. 449-67: c. 1750; NKS 1866 4°\(^*\) (1866\(^*\)) pp. 349-55: 1750; NKS 1867 4°\(^*\) (1867\(^*\)) pp. 67-72: 1760, written by Ólafur Brynjólfsson; NKS 1869 4°\(^*\) (1869\(^*\)) pp. 647-71: c. 1770; NKS 1870 4°\(^*\) (1870\(^*\)) fols 2r-8v, 161r-2v: after 1689, c. 1700; NKS 1871 4°\(^*\) (1871\(^*\)) pp. 127-52: 2nd half of C18th; NKS 1872 4°\(^*\) (1872\(^*\)) pp. 229-58: 2nd half of C18th; NKS 1891 4°\(^*\) (1891\(^*\)) pp. 179-91: c. 1770 (contains sts. 1-26, 57-82); Thott 773 a fol\(\) (773a\(\)) pp. 446-60: c. 1770; Thott 1492 4°\(^*\) (1492\(^*\)) fols 156r-62v: c. 1770.

**Reykjavík:** Lbs 215 4°\(^*\) (215\(^*\)) fols 262r-8v: date as for 214\(^*\), c. 1736, also written by Vigfúss Jónsson; Lbs 437\(^*\) (Lbs437\(^*\)) fols 30v-3v: 1770-80; Lbs 709 8°\(^*\) (709\(^*\)) pp. 79-94: C18th; Lbs 1199 4°\(^*\) (1199\(^*\)) fols 93r-5v: 1650-1860; Lbs 1249 8°\(^*\) (1249\(^*\)) 62r-7r: 1791-1805; Lbs 1393 8°\(^*\) (1393\(^*\)) pp. 1-11: C19th (contains sts. 1-49); Lbs 1458 8°\(^*\) (1458\(^*\)) fols
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36r-42v: 2nd half C19th; Lbs 1562° 4° (1562°) fols 7r-12v: c. 1770 (contains sts. 11.2-82); Lbs 1588° (1588°) fols 140r-3v: 1750-99; Lbs 1692 8° (1692°) fols 2r-12v: 1st half C19th; Lbs 1765 4° (1765°) fols 17r-26v: 1854-75; Lbs 2298 8° (2298°) pp. 1-11: 1835-6; Lbs 631 4° (631°) fols 90r-2v: c. 1800; Lbs 636 4° (636°) fols 140r-3v: 1750-99; Lbs 719 8° (719°) fols 1r-6v: c. 1750; Lbs 756 4° (Lbs756°) fols 115v-19r: 1777; Lbs 818 4° (818°) fols 20r-2v: 2nd half of C18th; Lbs 932 4° (932°) fols 7r-8v: c. 1792, written by Ólafur Jónsson of Purkey; Lbs 966 4° (966°) fols 17v-21v: c. 1792, written by Ólafur Jónsson of Purkey; Lbs 903 8° (903°) fols 26r-38r (marked 1-13) and 40r-19: c. 1750, possibly written by Eggert Ólafsson; Adv 21 4 7° (21 4 7°) pp. 270-82: c. 1750, written by Oddur Jónsson c. 1755; Adv 21 6 7° (21 6 7°) pp. 95-101: before 1750; Adv 21 6 7 a° (21 6 7 a°) fols 133r-8v: before 1750.

Dublin: Trinity College, Dublin 1027° (1027°) fols 128r-38v: 17th.

Uppsala: UppsUB R 691 4° (R691°) fols 42r-49r: 2nd half C18th; UppsUB R 692 4° (R692°) pp. 12-16: C18th (unreadable after v. 70); UppsUB R 682 fol° (R682°) fols 2r-9v: end C18th; UppsUB R 682 A° fol° (R682 A°) pp. 9-45: c. 1685; a copy by Helgi Ólafsson of papp46°.

London: BLAdd 4877° (4877°) pp. 439-55: C18th; BLAdd 11165° (11165°) fols 139-44: c. 1770; BLAdd 6121° (6121°) fols 71v-7r: C18th; BLAdd 11173° (11173°) fols 11r-19: C18th.


Berlin: Berlin Staatsbibliotek Ms. germ. qu. 329° (329°) fols 210v-15r: written by Oddur Jónsson c. 1755.

Harvard: Houghton Library Ms Icel. 47° (47°) pp. 342-52: c. 1756, a copy of 1866° by Jón Eiríksson. This manuscript appears to have been the base of the 1787 Arnamagnaean edn (see Robinson 1991).
1. Fé ok fjörví rænti fyrða kind
sá inn grimmi greppr;
yfir þá götu, er hann varðaði,
mátti enginn kvikr komaz.

Sá inn grimmi greppr rænti kind fyrða fé ok fjörví; enginn mátti komaz kvikr yfir þá götu, er hann varðaði.

The fierce man stole property and life from the offspring of men; no one might pass alive over that road which he guarded.

Mss: 166b⁴(45v), papp15⁴(1r), 738⁴(80r), 155a⁴(8v), 167b 6⁴(1r), 214⁴(149r), 1441⁴(581), 10575⁴(1r), 2797⁴(230).


Notes: [All]: The poem appears to start in medias res. — [3] greppr ‘man’: Although some mss capitalise greppr, they also erratically capitalise other nouns throughout the poem. Björn M. Ölsen (1915, 26-7) contends that both greppr and gestr (2/6) are pers. names, but this cannot be substantiated. — [4-5]: The alliteration is defective here and götu is unmetrical; the reading may have been imported from 2/6. Skj B and Skald, following Bugge, emend to of hann veg ‘over that road’ to eliminate the metrical problem. — [6]: mátti ‘might’ and náði ‘managed to’ appear in free variation across the whole ms. tradition, but náði is preferred by the majority of mss listed among the Readings. — [6] kvíðr ‘alive’: This reading occurs in 62 mss; 166b⁴’s kvíðr ‘belly, womb’, makes little sense in context.

2. Einn hann át, opt, hardliða;
aldri bauð hann manni til matar,
áðr en móðr ok meginliðill
gestr gangandi af götu kom.

Hann át einn, opt, hardliða; hann bauð aldrí manni til matar, áðr en móðr ok meginliðill gestr gangandi af götu.

He ate alone, often, sternly; he never invited anyone for a meal, before a weary, exhausted stranger came walking from the road.

Mss: 166b⁴(45v), papp15⁴(1r), 738⁴(80r), 155a⁴(8v), 167b 6⁴(1r), 214⁴(149r), 1441⁴(581), 10575⁴(1r-v), 2797⁴(230).