

The credibility of Viking Saga's

-

**Identifying unused potential
on the example of Ragnar
Lodbrok's Sagas**

by

David Weiss

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

II. The Sagas as historical sources

III. Ragnar's Sagas

IV. The credibility of Viking Sagas – Scientific approximations

V. Identifying unused potential

VI. Conclusion

I. Introduction

The TV show *Vikings* restored the popularity of a man, who may have never existedⁱ: Ragnar Lodbrok. Since the middle ages the Danish king was incredibly famous. He and his sons defined the modern perception of Vikings.ⁱⁱ Ragnar was said to be “extremely heroic, utterly murderously and capable of extraordinary deeds.”ⁱⁱⁱ Allegedly he was one of the first men to attack the British Isles.^{iv} The show even portrayed him as the leader of the raid of Lindisfarne in 793. Actually, there is no known reference that Ragnar was involved.^v It seems highly unlikely: If Ragnar existed, he led the attack on Paris in 845.^{vi} After the successful raid Ragnar allegedly continued to be active.^{vii} His career would have lasted for more than seventy years. Although this is not completely impossible, it seems improbable. We only know about Ragnar through his Sagas.^{viii} There is no other source mentioning him directly by name. One question inevitably arises: How trustworthy are these Sagas? Waggoner, one of the most recent translators of Ragnar’s Sagas, pointed out multiple parts that are clearly fictional.^{ix} He was not the only scholar to do that. To quote Anders Winroth: “Nothing about him [Ragnar] is ordinary, not even his death, a special kind of execution. [...] The snake pit [...] was a literary topos.”^x

Ragnar’s Sagas are no different to the huge amount of other northern Sagas. Their credibility is the concern of historians for decades. Countless studies tried “to identify fictionality.”^{xi} For example: Heather O’Donoghue analyzed one *Family Saga*, trying “to measure its historicity.”^{xii} The results are always the same: The Sagas are extremely unreliable. Their creators composed their works with myths and history,^{xiii} not revealing what was based on facts and what was artificially put in to frame a narrative. This is a huge problem: Without the Sagas “the history of the Vikings has been written by their enemies.”^{xiv} We are mainly stuck with Frankish and Angel-Saxon Chronicles. That is why many scholars keep returning to the Sagas and praising them as a “major source of information.”^{xv} But the research can’t just ignore the lack of trustworthiness of the material.

The resulting problem is striking in Ragnar’s case. If he existed, he played a great role in European history. If not, there is an important mystery to solve: What is the background of his Sagas? They describe events that happened. The sack of Paris is the most prominent one. Why should the deeds have been credited to a mythological figure instead of the factual person? Ragnar’s example highlights that we can’t ignore the Sagas as historical sources as some scholars have demanded.^{xvi} We have to find new approaches to analyze the credibility of the Sagas.

This paper is also not capable of separating all credible from untrustworthy passages. However, building on previous studies it can help finding unused potential. They have been numerous attempts to analyze Viking Sagas with new theoretical approaches and fresh ideas. The results have not yet been compiled and evaluated. In doing so we can gain new insights regarding our research question. The example of Ragnar’s Sagas will demonstrate the added value of this approach. In order to separate old knowledge from new ideas, this paper must first present the Sagas as historical sources in general and the works concerning Ragnar in particular.

II. The Sagas as historical sources

The research on the Sagas is vivid. Since 1971 an international conference on the Sagas has been held every three years.^{xvii} Scandinavian, French, British and German scholars have been very active for decades and across many scientific fields.^{xviii} This is the current view of research:

- There are many different types of Sagas. This led to “problems of Saga classification.”^{xix}
- As a genre the Sagas come closest to the novel.^{xx}
- This, however, is not completely undisputed.^{xxi}
- The Sagas were created to entertain, guide and report on contemporary events.^{xxii}
- The written tradition started in the 13th century.^{xxiii} Before that, the Sagas were transmitted orally.^{xxiv}
- Many Sagas start extremely, factual but change afterwards.^{xxv}
- Sagas in old Norse language only existed in Iceland.^{xxvi}
- Sagas can rarely be checked for accuracy by comparison with other sources.^{xxvii}
- Research on Sagas is a hot spot concerning our understanding of the Viking’s civilization.^{xxviii}

For our question we can draw three central conclusions:

1. The long period of oral transmissions is a huge problem for the credibility of the Sagas. There is no way to track changes through time and space. We have to take this problem into account moving forward.
2. Sagas are no relatives to Chronicles or Annals. They served a completely different purpose.
3. Sagas hold their main value as historical sources analyzing the literary-cultural achievements of the Scandinavian tribes. In any other case we must proceed with *healthy skepticism*.

All conclusions lead to a problem that hasn’t been discussed by historians yet. Sagas don’t allow the typical distinction between tradition and relics. They are both and none of them at the same time. The Sagas were purposeful crafted to be remembered. But they were not supposed to preserve historical events as accurate as possible. They also were not created to transmit certain historical narratives. The Sagas are still with us because they are expressions of art. And as that they are relics. Oral transmission holds more dimensions than writings. We know nothing of the emphasis placed on individual passages or whether, for example, irony was used in the recitation. The written Sagas expose that there was a culture of oral storytelling in the Scandinavian realm – but they can’t reveal this culture as a whole. The form of the Sagas we can deal with is always incomplete.

However, tradition and relics are important tools for historians. We use them as a starting point for our source criticism. The aspects to be taken into account for relics differ from those for tradition. That's why we usually categorize a source as a whole. Due to the chameleonic nature of the Sagas it's impossible in their case. We have to differentiate: Tradition, relics and the other parts need to be separated. Only with this method the numerous contradictions within one Saga can be explained. For example: Ragnar is usually portrayed as an ordinary man wearing shaggy clothes.^{xxxix} At the same time he is incredible wealthy. For example: The Sagas tell Ragnar tried to convince Kraká [the later Aslaug] to come with him by giving her a precious shirt as a gift. She refused to accept the present.^{xxx} This passage agrees with the fact that Viking rulers liked to show their wealth publicly.^{xxxi}

Usually we would consider Ragnar's shabby clothes and the valuable gift as tradition. He is portrayed as a humble ruler who shares his wealth with the persons he loves. However, if we break the passage apart a new point of view results. Ragnar's shabby clothes are still tradition. The precious gift is now a relic. Kraká's refusal is probably tradition, too. As the next queen she is presented with the *right* values to rule. Her refusal could also be none of these options. Maybe it's a contemporary interpolation of the 13th century writer on how women should behave: The Sagas quote direct speech of Kraká. These kinds of personal statements were probably the hardest to preserve. Already this little example demonstrates the next problem - we need a manual how differentiate. Chapter V will follow this idea.

III. Ragnar's Sagas

Ragnar's Saga are a compilation of three different works: *The Saga of Ragnar Lodbrok*, *The Tale of Ragnar's Sons* and the poem *Krákumál*. Waggoner added a few more works that touch Ragnar's family, but don't put it in the spotlight.^{xxxii} Modern studies believe that Ragnar's Sagas and the *Völsunga* Saga were supposed to be together.^{xxxiii} In doing so Ragnar's and Sigurd's stories are combined. The greatest heroes of Scandinavia should obviously be presented together. Like many others, Ragnar's Sagas were first written in Iceland in the 13th century.^{xxxiv} Sagas in general are incredibly complex. Even the Icelandic authors had problems understanding them completely.^{xxxv} They were repeatedly victims of misunderstandings. Two well-known examples demonstrate the huge consequences of this misconceptions. Firstly, the Vikings never drank out of the skulls of their enemies. One poem was falsely translated.^{xxxvi} Secondly, the *Blood Eagle*, which was shown several times in the TV show *Vikings*, wasn't a method of execution during Ragnar's times. It was introduced in the 14th century.^{xxxvii} The original author didn't understand his material correctly. It described Ragnar drawing ravens on the back of his enemies. Today we believe that this image was meant as an announcement of the death of the particular person.^{xxxviii} It is not known why the author changed the raven to an eagle.

Even historians who heavily rely on the Sagas criticize their lack of credibility in portraying Ragnar. Viggo Starcke, a former Danish politician and a member of the administration from 1957 to 1960, describes the depiction of the Viking as completely overdrawn. It is therefore difficult to separate facts from fiction, he concludes.^{xxxix} As indicated above, Ragnar's execution

was one of the particular questioned sections. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles are completely silent on this topic.^{xi} His sons are repeatedly mentioned on the other hand.^{xii} But it is uncertain how many sons he had and who the mother was.^{xiii} In addition, only Nordic sources hold Ragnar equal to Lodbrok.^{xiiii} Other sources don't state that the sons of Lodbrok are Ragnar's sons. For instance Björn Ironside, next to Ivar probably the most famous descendant of Ragnar, commanded a Viking fleet between 855-858, raiding the shores of Spain.^{xliv} The Chronicles testify about his operations. But they do not connect him to Ragnar or the Viking king that conquered Paris. The sources also mention the sons' victory over king Elle in 866.^{xlv} But there is still no word about their father. It's conceivable that the chroniclers intentionally concealed his name – maybe for propagandistic reasons.

At this moment we should return to the *elephant in the room*. Did Ragnar exist at all? His persona has been artificially crafted and we can't find him anywhere else but in the Sagas. Starcke is convinced that Ragnar lived and acted as described. His deeds were too important that his name couldn't be preserved, Starcke argues.^{xlvi} His reasoning is a good example for historians who share this view. However, Starcke's line of argumentation is problematic: He argues further that we know that some of the described events actually happened. Therefore, the name of the responsible leader must have held so much fame that it has to be kept in the memory of the people. He ignores the possibility that there was more than one Ragnar. Maybe different Vikings have accomplished the deeds. The scalds brought them together in one man to create the ideal king. This could explain why we don't even know the number of his famous sons and their mothers for sure. It is possible that some were sons of the first Ragnar and some were descendants of the second (third, fourth, etc.) Ragnar. It would also explain why the Frankish and Anglo-Saxon sources report about men with a similar name to Ragnar, but not the same. The mentioned Raginfried, Reginfried, Reginberi and Raginarius^{xlvii} could have been different kings that were merged into Ragnar. His name is also a strong indication for this possibility. It's almost exactly the northern vocabulary (*ragna*) for divinity.^{xlviii}

But would it be acceptable for the true kings to be reduced like that? The answer is complicated: The scalds were not allowed to tell about anything that was known to be false.^{xlix} The later compilers also were critical with their material.¹ This would indicate that they had to use the true name. On the other hand, many sections of the Sagas are definitely false. And we can assume that the contemporary people knew, too. For example: Ragnar himself is portrayed as a sceptic. When Kraká reveals to him that she is in fact Aslaug, he doesn't believe her and even uses the phrase "not to be believable."ⁱⁱ Later on he changes his mind, because his wife proves her supernatural abilities. But this is not important. The example highlights that the Scandinavians didn't immediately accept every story as true.

How does all this fit together? Probably the entertaining character of the stories comes into play. The people (and even the kings) accepted that known deeds were given to one man instead of numerous men, because that improved the story. And it also increased its educational value. When all great deeds were accomplished by the ideal leader it is easier to follow his example than to be inspired by the model of normal humans with flaws. The scalds had in all likelihood a

certain amount of leeway how they could present their stories. The audience wanted to listen to the most entertaining, the most educating and the truest to life stories at the same time. Some compromises were inevitably to deliver the Sagas in this way. In literature, this technique is known as alienation.^{liii} We can only speculate that the kings may have felt honoured to become a part of the ideal king.

To conclude this chapter: There was probably more than one Ragnar. Other scholars came to the same result.^{liiii} But this doesn't mean that the Sagas are completely false. It only shows one thing: "We need to learn to read the [...] Sagas."^{liiv} Chapter V will try.

IV. The credibility of Viking Sagas – Scientific approximations

Traditionally, there are two concepts to measure the credibility of Viking Sagas. Firstly, other written sources (Chronicles, Annals) are used as some kind of control group. This paper already referred to several examples. The idea is simple: If other sources report the same things, they are probably true. Secondly, we compare information provided by the Sagas with today. For instance, distances can quite easily be checked. The results of such studies are remarkable: A large part of the data provided by the Sagas has proven to be correct.^{liv}

Lately two new approaches were tested:

1. Using methods of the social sciences.
2. Comparing information with archaeological findings.

We will look at one example for each. Pádraig Mac Carron and Ralph Kenna analyzed interactions in the Iceland Sagas to identify social networks.^{lvi} Jan H. Orkisz compared described weapons with actual findings.^{lvii} Mac Carron and Kenna demonstrated that Viking social networks "were very similar to those of today."^{lviii} So they concluded that the information on everyday relationships was correct. Orkisz's results were less conclusive. He found some fitting descriptions. However, other comparisons showed no respectively hardly reflections of the descriptions in the Sagas in the findings.^{lix} Other studies are predominantly in agreement with these results.^{lx}

We can see a pattern: The more generally valid or well-known an information is, the more likely it is to be accurate. We can probably conclude that the opposite is true, too: The more specific a claim, the less credible it is. This is already dictated by logic. Information on talks or descriptions of the appearance of persons were difficult to preserve correctly due to the phase of oral transmission. O'Donoghue has also noted this. She describes conversations in a Saga she analyzed as "highly likely to be authorial invention."^{lxi} However, an exception to this pattern can be found in recourse to Chapter III: Names and persons could have been altered.

V. Identifying unused potential

Research to date has shown that we need to differentiate between three layers in terms of credibility in the sagas that are interwoven:

1. Some sections are true.
2. Others might be true.
3. Some sections are (most likely) false.

They are not separated from each other but can be found together. This makes it so difficult to distinguish between fact and fiction. This is where the idea comes in that we need to learn how to read the Sagas. It is noticeable that the true passages have a descriptive character and are of high general validity. They provide information about the composition of nature, distances, known events or, for example, habits of the Vikings. These descriptions create the world in which the stories told by the scalds play. They form a narrative framework. The provided information is probably true, because the scalds wanted to give their audience a chance to connect with the tell. Their stories are therefore based on the reality of life. To this day historical novels are using this kind of framework which can be characterized as a certified historical environment.^{lxii}

The dubious sections mainly form the actual plot. We follow the protagonists on their journeys and accompany them in the accomplishment of their deeds. The clearly untrue sections are story-telling stylistic devices to present situations and characters in the sense of the narrative of the Saga. Most of the times they are easy to identify. Supernatural events are such tools, for example. When protagonists meet gods, this shows that they are chosen. In Ragnar's Sagas several people meet Odin. They are all famous.^{lxiii} The father of the Norse gods also blesses his chosen ones "with the best of clothes and weapons."^{lxiv} This explains, why Orkisz couldn't identify every weapon mentioned in the Sagas in archaeological findings. Sometimes they are just plot devices. Other untrue sections are more difficult to identify. They seem very unlikely, but most the times there is no way to proof it. Therefore, every conversation has to be considered as false. The layers 2 and 3 apparently form a continuum. In most cases we can hardly determine the line between "possibly true" and "most likely false". The approach "wrong in case of doubt" seems more advisable for the scholar than "good faith".

As historians, we can largely ignore the third layer. Instead, we focus on one and two. These layers bring back the distinction between relics and tradition. Layer one provides the relics. The scalds didn't want later historians to use these sections of their works to write the history of the Vikings. Layer two is tradition - the plot was crafted to be remembered in this way. We can treat it as such.

Let's return to Ragnar's present for Kráka and see, if our new reading style will help us. We ignore the conversations. The plot as the tradition-section consists of two actions: Ragnar offers the shirt, but Kráka refuses to accept it. In order to assess credibility, we need to ask questions about plausibility. For example: The scene takes place in Norway - far from Ragnar's Danish home. How likely is it that he's just got this precious piece of clothing for a woman with him? We can see that this plot is improbable. However, nowhere is mentioned that Ragnar's precious gift was unusual or inappropriate. This is our relic: It was obviously normal for rulers to use expensive gifts to solicit women.

But can we really ignore the conversations? Let's have a look on another section of the Saga. At the beginning of chapter V Ragnar and his men arrive in Norway.^{lxv} They find a little harbour

and sleep on their ships. The next morning the cooks leave the camp to bake bread. They find a farm that is run by an old woman. The cooks demand that she helps them. The woman, Grima, refuses, because she is too old. In her place her daughter will help, she offers. The men accept and we meet Kráka for the first time. She is described as “the loveliest of all women.”^{lxvi} The cooks ask the old woman, if the girl is her daughter. Grima affirms. The men say that she and her daughter must be “incredible unlike.” They have “never seen a maiden so beautiful.” Grima on the other hand is “the greatest monstrosity.”^{lxvii}

The exaggerations in this section are immediately noticeable. A contrast between Grima and her (step-)daughter is built up. The objective is to emphasize the beauty of Kráka. Such examples can be found throughout the whole Sagas. That's why the conversations aren't trustworthy. The other layers offer interesting information once again. Through the narrative framework we learn some everyday habits:

- The men sleep on their ships.
- The cooks leave in the morning to bake bread.
- Farmers are expected to help.
- However, they can refuse, if they offer an alternative.

The plot is the appearance of Kráka. The scalds definitely wanted her to be remembered as “the loveliest of all women” who wasn't living in a palace, but on a farm. This is also connected with Ragnar's past, but we don't need to go into detail about that. More important is that Kráka is presented as a beautiful woman living in modest conditions. She doesn't directly meet Ragnar's men (or himself) as the daughter of Sigurd and Brynhildr. She is a “clever peasant girl.”^{lxviii} Some Scandinavian rulers probably fell in love with such women. To conclude: The plot itself could be true, but not with these protagonists. Grima and the men are story-telling stylistic tools to introduce Kráka. We can derive universal assumptions from this scene. However, the specifics are not usable as an historian (except in a work about Nordic literature).

VI. Conclusion

We asked for the historical credibility of the Sagas and were trying to find unused potential. As this paper has illustrated there are options, if we no longer analyse the sagas as a whole, but differentiate them. We have to work out the genre-specific peculiarities. Previous studies have shown that the narrative framework in particular provides trustworthy content. This means, if we identify this framework, we identify valuable information at the same time.

The plot of the Sagas might be true, but not in the presented way. This is a special kind of tradition. We must assume that the specifics such as names or personal descriptions are (largely) incorrect. However, the actual plot can be accurate. The events described may have occurred in a different context. If we detach the plot from the actors and regard it as normal behaviour, we can gain new insights. I still consider the plot as tradition and not relic, because the actions were still deliberately designed and enriched with story-telling stylistic devices. Besides, I can only make logical assumptions, too. I can't offer certainty either. That's why I used the word potential in the title and throughout this paper. However, I am convinced that my

approach has added value for subsequent studies on the credibility of the Viking Sagas. It can help to determine the direction of research. Perhaps in this way we can in the future separate fact from fiction in the possibly applicable sections. And that must be the goal.^{lxxix}

ⁱ Ben Waggoner: *The Sagas of Ragnar Lodbrok*, New Haven 2009, p. XXI.

ⁱⁱ *Ibid.*, p. X.

ⁱⁱⁱ Anders Winroth: *Die Wikinger – Zeitalter des Nordens*, Stuttgart 2019, p. 50f.

^{iv} Christopher van Dyke: *The Legend of Ragnar Lodbrok – Viking Kind and Warrior*, Los Angeles 2016, p. I.

^v The widely accepted date is June 8th of 793, but the sources don't tell a name of one of the Vikings – Michael Swanton: *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, London 2000, p. 41.

^{vi} Known as *Reginbergi* – Waggoner 2009, p. XXI.

^{vii} For example: He is said to be the man who destroyed Flanders in 858 – Viggo Starcke: *Denmark in World History – The sons of Lodbrok*, 2nd edition, Philadelphia 1968, S. 190. The author also points out some other possible Ragnars.

^{viii} Waggoner 2009, p. X describes the Sagas in detail.

^{ix} *Ibid.*, p. XV.

^x Own translation of Winroth 2019: p. 51.

^{xi} Heather O'Donoghue: *Old Norse-Iceland Literature – A short introduction*, Oxford 2008, S. 36.

^{xii} *Ibid.*: p. 37.

^{xiii} Rudolf Pörtner: *Die Wikinger Saga*, Düsseldorf 1975, p. 348.

^{xiv} Starcke 1968: p. 164.

^{xv} E.g. Jan H Orkisz: Pole-weapons in the Sagas of Icelanders – a comparison of literary and archaeological sources, in: *Acta Periodica Duellatorum* 1 (2016), pp. 177-212, p. 177.

^{xvi} Hermann Pálsson: Saga, in: *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 2019, link: <https://www.britannica.com/art/saga#ref50967> (27.10.2019) provides a good overview.

^{xvii} Sagaconferences.org (27.10.2019) – more than 600 papers in full text can be found.

^{xviii} Compare e.g. Regis Boyer: *Les Vikings et leur civilization – Problèmes actuels*, Paris 1976, p. 6. This work has been reissued several times. I quote the first edition to demonstrate that different scientific fields are dealing with the Sagas for more than fifty years.

^{xix} Waggoner 2009: p. XIII. Nevertheless it was tried repeatedly, compare e.g. O'Donoghue 2008: pp. 22 ff.

^{xx} O'Donoghue 2008: p. 23. She points out that modern translations „look and and feel like novels.” – *ibid.*: p. 24. The newest German translation of Ragnars Sagas is a very good example – Alfred Bekker: *Ragnar der Wikinger – Die ganze Saga*, Lengerich 2013. Bekker deals very *liberal* with the contents of the original Sagas. He doesn't identify himself as a translator and there is no scientific appendix whatsoever.

^{xxi} For example, Russell Poole argues in favour of treating the Sagas as a special genre – Russell Poole: *Viking Poems on War and Peace: A Study in Skaldic Narrative*, Toronto 1991, p. 195.

^{xxii} Waggoner 2009: p. XIV.

^{xxiii} Pörtner 1975: S. 346 ff.

^{xxiv} Jürg Glauser: Sagas and Space – Thinking Space in Viking Age and Mediaval Scandinavia, in: *ejss* 47,1 (2017), pp. 164-167, p. 166.

^{xxv} O'Donoghue 2008: p. 40.

^{xxvi} Pörtner 1975: p. 347.

^{xxvii} O'Donoghue 2008: p. 36.

^{xxviii} Boyer 1976: p. 8. Older studies considered the Viking's degree of civilization to be similarly high to that of the Greeks and Romans.

^{xxix} Waggoner 2009: p. XXII.

^{xxx} *Ibid.*: p. 11.

^{xxxi} Winroth 2019: p. 21.

^{xxxii} Waggoner 2009: p. X.

^{xxxiii} Jonathan Bellairs: The Saga oft he Volsungs – With the Saga of Ragnar Lodbrok – Review, in: *Comitatus* 49 (2018), pp. 265-268, p. 266.

^{xxxiv} Winroth 2019: p. 50f.

^{xxxv} *Ibid.*: p. 53.

^{xxxvi} Waggoner 2009: p. IX.

^{xxxvii} Winroth 2019: p. 54.

-
- xxxviii Ibid. It is possible that the *Blood Raven* were introduced in the 14th century, because the people thought Ragnar executed his enemies in that way.
- xxxix Starcke 1968: p. 188.
- xl Waggoner 2009: p. XXII.
- xli Ibid.
- xlii Ibid.
- xliiii Ibid: p. XXIII.
- xliv Starcke 1968: p. 193.
- xlvi Winroth 2019: p. 51.
- xlvii Starcke 1968: p. 188.
- xlviii Waggoner 2009: p. XXI.
- xlviiii Rudolf Simek: Ragnarök, in *Lexikon der germanischen Mythologie*, Stuttgart 1995, S. 330.
- xlviix Pörtner 1975: p. 350.
- l Waggoner 2009: p. XV.
- li Own translation of Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen: *Ragnar Lodbroks Sagen*, Beslau 1828, p. 39.
- lii Rainer Schönhaar: *Historischer Roman*, in: *Metzer Literatur Lexikon. Begriffe und Definitionen*, Stuttgart/Weimar 2007, pp. 318f.
- liiii Rory McTurk: *Ragnarr Lodbrok in the Irish Annals*, in: *Proceedings of the Seventh Viking Congress*, Dublin 1976, p. 94.
- liiii O'Donoghue 2008: p. 24.
- liiii Pörtner 1975: p. 348.
- liiii Pádraig Mac Carron/ Ralph Kenna: *Viking sagas: Six degrees of Icelandic separation – Social networks from the Viking era*, in: *Significance* 10,6 (2013), pp. 12-17.
- liiii Orkisz 2016.
- liiii Mac Carron/ Kenna 2013: p. 12.
- liiii Orkisz 2016: p. 191.
- liiii For example, Jürg Glauser demonstrated that the transfer of spatial concepts to the Sagas also underlined the credibility of the associated information – Glauser 2017.
- liiii O'Donoghue 2008: p. 39.
- liiii Schönhaar 2007: p. 318f.
- liiii For example Starkad, Waggoner 2009: p. 109.
- liiii Ibid: p. XXI.
- liiii Ibid: p. 8.
- liiii Ibid.
- liiii Ibid.
- liiii Marilyn Jurich: *Scheherazade's sisters: trickster heroines and their stories in world literature*, Westport 1998, p. 160.
- liiii O'Donoghue 2008: p. 36.