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Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is an in-depth analysis of the Eddic poem *Grímnismál* found in the manuscript known as Codex Regius (GKS 2365 4to), located in Reykjavík, dated to c. 1270 and a fragment (AM 748 I 4to), located in Copenhagen, dated to c. 1300. While a great deal of work has been done on *Grímnismál* as part of the *Elder Edda*, there is yet no specific edition focusing on it alone.

New studies on Germanic paganism and mythology show its shifting nature and the absence of specific tenets or uniform beliefs throughout the Germanic speaking world and in time. The relatively absent sources are similarly scattered. As such, the thesis suggests a new method of study, following a focused historical approach in which only *Grímnismál* is analysed in an attempt to understand the beliefs of the people that composed it. The nature of pagan belief itself prevents one from drawing more general conclusions on ‘Norse mythology’ as a whole.

Part 1 is divided into two chapters and deals with my approach, the nature of Germanic belief, and the sources available as well as techniques of interpretation for them, all relevant to the production of the arguments made in the thesis. Part 2 deals with *Grímnismál* itself: Chapter 1 provides an analysis of the manuscripts, Chapter 2 contains my editing notes and Chapter 3 analyses the contents of the poem, Chapter 4 consists of my conclusions to this study, focusing on the cosmology and the dating of the poem. Part 3 contains the edition of *Grímnismál* and is followed by Part 4 which is the commentary to the poem. The thesis is followed by two appendices, one containing a facing transcription of the manuscripts and the other being a glossary to all words used in *Grímnismál*. Finally, this thesis includes a digital edition worked on xml. This is available in the following link:

https://starescomp.github.io/grimnismal/#idm140518410334752
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Part 1 Introduction

Chapter 1. Germanic Paganism

Anders Andrén writes that ‘there never was an archaic and unchanging Scandinavian religion’.¹ This view, contradicting popular ideas of Germanic paganism, has been analysed and discussed by a number of scholars in the past few decades. If I were asked to describe Germanic paganism in one sentence, I would say that such a thing simply does not exist. As Palmer notes, paganism is ‘something more akin to an attitude than a belief system.’² Paganism is a shifting identity, a forn siðr, ‘old way of life’, instead of a specific religion followed universally in the Germanic-speaking world.³ As it will be shown below, the surviving sources are very fragmentary and limited, and in many cases problematic to use. In his study of Greek religion, Veyne wrote that it is not necessary that mythology was directly related to religion. People might have believed in the mythology without actually practicing anything related to it in their cults.⁴ It could have been the opposite too. Pious people with regard to cults need not necessarily have believed in the myths. The same might be the case with Germanic religions. I can see why de Vries, in his study of Loki, saw ‘nothing but a medley of contradictions’,⁵ and that could be said to be the case for all of Germanic mythology.

The Eddic Poem Grímnismál has the god Óðinn narrate in the first person how the worlds of the gods are divided, which creatures live where and a number of other cosmological elements. He does all this, after having been tortured by the human king Geirrøðr, as a means to thank the king’s son, Agnarr, who helps him by giving him something to drink. This premise

---

³ Andrén. p. 108.
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shows that the knowledge that Óðinn imparts to Agnarr is not inconsequential, but of critical importance for one to have, especially a future king. By reading Grímnismál we not only get to know what a cosmological map of some of the Norse people was, but also its huge importance. But was it so for all Germanic speaking pagans, or even just the Norsemen? Making such a grand statement would imply a unified mythology and set of beliefs.

Óðinn is often presented in the secondary literature as the main god of the Æsir; I shall take him as an example here. Óðinn is a god that appears in different ‘versions’ with different attributes that could have changed through time and space. One can find a huge number of facets attributed to him. However, is Óðinn the same as Wôdan? Is the Óðinn in the Snorra Edda the same as the Óðinn in the Elder Edda? More importantly, is the Óðinn in Völuspá the same as the Óðinn in Vafþrúðnismál? Taking an even more specific case, is it the same Óðinn found throughout Hávamál? And, of course, one can ask, are all these Óðinn related to any Óðinn worshipped in the pre-Christian world? The sources mentioned here all survive from long after the people had converted to Christianity. Even more universal questions can be asked. In Skáldskaparmál, Snorri Sturluson writes:

Sjá saga er til þess at Óðinn fór heiman ok kom þar er þrælar nú slógu hey. Hann spyrð ef þeir vili at hann brýni ljá þeira. Þeir játa því. Þá tekr hann hein af belti sér ok brýndi, en þeim þótt í báður ljósum. En hann mat svá at sá er kaupa vildi skyldi gefa við hóf, en allir kváðusk vilja ok báðu henni þeir séjla. En hann kastaði heinni í lóft upp. En er allir vildu henda þá skiptusk þeir svá við at hverr brá ljánum á hláus þórum.6

This sounds like a very unjust god. As Turville-Petre writes, there are many examples in which Óðinn awarded victory unjustly, and he turned against his favourite warriors in a few cases.7

---

6 ‘The story is that Óðinn went away from home and came there to a place where nine thralls mowed hay. He asked if they wished that he whet their scythes. They assented to that. Then he took a whetstone from his belt. It seemed to them that the scythes cut much better and asked to buy the whetstone. But he answered that he who wished to buy it must give a considerable price. But all said they wished it and instructed him to sell it himself. He threw the whetstone up into the air. But when all wished to put their hands on it, then they each struck each other against their neck.’ Snorri Sturluson, Skáldskaparmál, ed. Anthony Faulkes (London, 1998). p. 4.

One could continue asking such questions for infinity. Answers to any of these questions can also be as varied as the questions themselves, with interpretations of Óðinn going as far as him being considered to be Attila the Hun. In some cases a likely answer can be given, but the main conclusion is that we simply cannot know exactly who believed in what. Andrén was correct in writing the above quote. He then goes on to call paganism a ‘multifaceted hybrid’ that mutated according to how it was needed to, and of course, throughout time and space.

The image of paganism given here is very negative, and it might seem to the reader that it is impossible to study such a field considering all the problems found in the short number of sources available to us. However, by piecing these few sources together, one can come to some conclusions on how this ‘old way of life’ was. For example, Andrén mentions how Snorri writes about how the Sun is drawn across the sky by two horses. By looking at the archaeological remains, one can see that there is a vast range of artefacts that depict this figure and date to as far back as the fourteenth century BC, with the chariot found in a bog in

---

9 Andrén. p. 121.
Trundholm in Sjælland (see Figure 1 The Sun Chariot found in Trundholm. Source: Andrén. Behind Heathendom. p. 123.). Thanks to this, one can conclude that Snorri’s depiction could be related to some real belief and not his own creation. However, it could also be a misdated archaeological interpretation on Snorri’s, or his source’s, part. This could have brought to such similar depictions in his writings. Stefan Brink makes an observation worthy of being reported in its entirety:

All cultures have myths, stories that make an unknown, metaphysical world graspable and familiar. In many cultures there is no dividing line between mythology and history, something that it is important to bear in mind when dealing with oral cultures. For early Scandinavia, we have remnants of such myths in the Poetic Edda and in Snorri’s Edda. These myths are not linear or focused stories; they normally lack logic and continuity, they are fragmentary and repetitive, and they become very ‘kaleidoscopic’ because they lack depth in time, constituting rather of fragments set in the present. Very often these myths are connected with certain physical features in the landscape, objects that, owing to their perpetual presence, make the mythical stories not only memorable but enable them to function as sanctions or witnesses to these myths.

10 Ibid. p. 124.
This image connects, rightly, mythology to landscape and naturalistic elements, creating a bridge between what people believed in and how they dealt with those beliefs. Archaeological sources point out to the importance of trees, for example, in pagan religions. Sacred trees and groves were common in the Germanic world. It is in those groves that, according to Fabech and Näsam, people believed that the gods resided, and where hierophanies took place. We may be unable to understand all the underlying concepts of naturalistic cults, but we can see their critical importance in both religion and mythology of the Germanic-speaking peoples.

The importance of the symbolism of the tree can be seen in a vast number of religions throughout the world, and Eliade has given a list of all the aspects related to it. As Andrén writes, the tree ‘has always been there, and will always be there.’ Following this idea it can hardly be seen as shocking that all kinds of sources, as will be outlined below, show the importance of the tree, especially seen as an axis mundi. As will be clear in reading Grímnismál, the main surviving literary source on Norse cosmology, the tree was central, both literally and figuratively, in the map that Germanic pagans had painted of the world, as well as their religious practices. What was the case for whoever composed Grímnismál might not have been the case for all. Not when it comes to specifics. Below, a number of surviving sources will show the

---

13 Hierophany definition: compound word that comes from Greek ἱερός ‘holy’ and φαίνειν ‘to reveal’. The word is used for ‘manifestation of the sacred’.
15 Brink. p. 41.
16 1. There is a pattern of stone-tree-altar which constitutes a microcosm of the world in most ancient religions (Australia, China, Indo-China, India, Phoenicia, the Aegean).
  2. The tree is an image of the cosmos (India, Mesopotamia).
  3. The tree is a site of cosmic theophany (India, Mesopotamia, the Aegean).
  4. The tree is a symbol of life, inexhaustible fertility, absolute reality, connected with the symbolism of water identified as the fount of immortality.
  5. The tree is the centre of the world and a supporting prop of the universe (Altaians, Scandinavians).
  6. Mystical bonds exist between the tree and man (it gives birth to men, is a repository of the souls of ancestors, is used in wedding and initiation rites).
  7. The tree is a symbol of the resurrection of vegetation, and of spring (as used in May processions).
importance of natural elements throughout the Germanic speaking world. One might see a connection between the Irminsul, the world-tree Yggdrasill, the Old Norse barnstokkr, the öndvegissúlur, ‘high-seat posts’, which, according to Tolley, symbolised such a world pillar. However, such a connection could be mistaken. Or indeed, it could be true for some medieval contexts but not for others. The reader might be forgiven for considering it a hopeless task.

Nevertheless, this does not make this study impossible. Below, I shall outline my proposed method of study, which I hope will address all these problems without making a conclusion impossible and then proceed to give a brief overview of all types of sources available for our study of Germanic paganism and more specifically mythology. My choice of choosing only one source, Grímnismál, will then hopefully be made clear as an attempt to not only provide a thorough study of this poem on its own, but also a case study testing the premise that pagan belief was not unchanging and uniform throughout the Germanic speaking world and in time.

As Terry Gunnell said in the Old Norse Mythology Conference in Aarhus (2014), whoever is part of this field of research, is a ‘researcher of the probable’. The sources are too scarce and scattered among both space and time to give one the opportunity to be able to come to definitive conclusions. This is more the case, the study of Germanic paganism, when it comes to the question of how people related to their beliefs, as opposed to the study of what these people believed in.

---

18 Tolley writes that ‘The öndvegissúlur were carved wooden posts forming the supports of the high seats; tradition relating to the time of the Icelandic settlement, set out most fully (and several centuries after the events described) in Eyrbyggja saga ch 4 (34), asserts that the Norsemen took them from their homes when they moved, and, as they neared the land they were to settle, they threw the posts overboard. The new house would be built where the pillars were found’. Source: Tolley. p. 279.

19 Terry Gunnell, “Myth and (the Knowledge of) Seasonal Change - the Myths of the Vanir,” in Aarhus Old Norse Mythology Symposium (Aarhus, 2014).
Before proceeding to explain my proposed *modus operandi*, I will have to explain my approach to the study. I come from a background as a historian of the medieval world. However, I do not exactly consider my research to be limited to the history of religion. What I ultimately consider myself to be, is a *mythologist*. My goal is to get a better understanding of the belief of pagan people in the Germanic-speaking world. This is not a study on how the people dealt with such beliefs, but of how they believed the world was created, which gods they worshipped and similar topics. Of course, such a study can easily fall into the trap of expecting a single unified set of beliefs throughout the pre-Christian Germanic-speaking world. However, my claims are much smaller than such a general assertion. What I am interested in is whether some parts of Eddic poetry can be said to come from a much older, pagan background, and what the people that composed these specific texts believed that the world of the gods was like.

My approach could be seen as a one of focused history. Instead of being ‘synthetic’ in my usage of sources, placing together everything that discusses Germanic mythology and trying to make sense of it, I argue in favour of doing the opposite, and focusing on the source at hand and the most closely related sources to it. As far as I am aware, such a method has never been used for the study of Eddic sources before. It should thus provide with a fresh view of the source. In focusing only on *Grímnismál* and looking for smaller answers, namely what the specific people from the region and time believed in, I would be able to come to more substantiated answers that would also agree with the nature of pagan belief as well. This study would also provide with a complete study of *Grímnismál* on its own, with a new and comprehensive commentary on each of its stanzas.

In order to undertake such a study, I propose an interdisciplinary approach, in which I will try to give similar weight to all the areas that are related to the study of mythology, namely history, folklore, religion, archaeology, linguistics and literature. I believe that it is only
following such an approach that one can hope to get a glimpse of the *forn siðr* of the Old Norse people through the Eddic sources. I am no trained archaeologist, neither am I a trained linguist, so I ask the reader to forgive an occasional lapse in terminology. If one can think of one bane of interdisciplinary studies, it would be that the scholar ends up being what would be called a *jack of all trades, but master of none*.

Having chosen *Grímnismál* as my main source, I shall proceed on analysing it from a linguistic perspective, in trying to see whether there are words or expressions that are not attested in Iceland but were used in Scandinavia. This will be done mainly through an etymological study of its contents, using Ásgeir Magnússon’s *Íslensk Orðsifjabók*,20 and Jan De Vries’ *Altnordisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*.21 Consequently, I will study the images given in this text and explore whether there is any archaeological material to support the text. I will also try to come to an understanding of what *Grímnismál* was supposed to represent. Was it meant to be performed? Was it a gnomic poem? Was it a heroic poem? Was it meant to give information to a skald on how the world of the gods was understood to be? What is the kind of wisdom imparted through it? All these are questions that have been met with a lot of discussion and little agreement.

Past studies of Eddic poetry have tended to rely heavily upon the works of Snorri Sturluson as interpretative aids. A number of problems arise with the use of Snorri’s works, as I shall show below. I shall thus break from most past scholarship and completely avoid using the *Prose Edda* as a source to interpret or elucidate any points on *Grímnismál*. Snorri’s work is of tremendous importance, and no scholar, including myself, who has read the *Prose Edda* even once, can ever claim to completely ignore it. Every single piece of secondary scholarship is affected by Snorri’s writings. As such, I cannot claim complete avoidance of the *Prose Edda*.

Ultimately, however, I will attempt to evade actively using any of Snorri’s works in my research. The conclusions that will arise from such a study should end up being purer in our understanding of Grímnismál and the Elder Edda in general, without risk of having been tainted by Snorri’s own ideas.

When it comes to secondary sources, there are a number of works of extreme importance that I will be referring to throughout this thesis. For instance, especially in the study of the performance of Grímnismál, I consider Terry Gunnell’s The Origins of Drama in Scandinavia,22 to be the best work in the study of drama and performance in the early Scandinavian world. Other of Gunnell’s works will be used as well. I am following Gunnell’s approach of analysing Vafþrúðnismál as a performed piece of work in my analysis of Grímnismál, since I find these two poems to be closely connected. I am also looking at Gunnell’s analysis of the performance of Völuspá, not only because of its extreme importance but also because of the similarity of its contents to Grímnismál. Margaret Clunies-Ross’s Prolonged Echoes23 is also very important in the study of mythology from a more literary perspective. John McKinnell’s articles on Hávamál will play a huge role in its comparison to Grímnismál. Works of Gíslar Sigurðsson, Pernille Hermann, Annette Lassen, Jens Peter Schødt, Vésteinn Ólason, and others, will also be of use to this study. My focus is on the use of recent scholarly works, considering the advances in the field during the past two decades. The recently published A Handbook to Eddic Poetry has been one of the most exciting additions to my library.24 Its chapters shall be used sporadically throughout this study, but the nature of the book, which focuses on Eddic poetry as a whole, prevents it from being of core value to this research. I will, controversially, refrain from using older texts such as Jan de Vries’

23 Margaret Clunies Ross, Prolonged Echoes: Old Norse Myths in Medieval Northern Society (Odense, 1994).
Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte, a book I hold dear but that I find would make this specific research more problematic instead of helping since it seeks to produce a synthetic analysis. De Vries heavily relied on the idea of a unified paganism and so his work does not fit with my modus operandi. The usage of Simek’s Dictionary of Northern Mythology might seem to be controversial. This work has been accused of having a number of mistakes throughout it. However, if used with care and after double-checking any entry that is to be used, it can prove to be of much help for specific information, as will be seen in the commentary.

The choice of Grímnismál is not a random one. As has been seen above, its subject matter is of interest from both a mythological and a religious approach, the connection of cosmology and natural elements found throughout the land being of great interest. Most scholars, until very recently, have focused their studies on Völuspá, Hávamál, Vafþrúðnismál especially, and then other mythological poems that raise more obvious questions, like Lokasenna, which to me hardly seems to be a religious composition but ultimately a secular (and satirical) one. There is a dichotomy on the interpretation of Grímnismál. Grímnismál has been seen as a very simple gnomic poem, possibly composed in Iceland, whose main purpose was to teach poets the cosmology and its names, so that they would be able to use them in their own compositions. Alternatively, it has been interpreted as being an older, pre-Christian and pre-Icelandic religious poem, possibly related to chieftains and rulers. As I hope I shall be able to prove by the end of this work, Grímnismál shows a vast number of attributes usually ignored by past scholarship, and it is actually far more likely to have been neither a late gnomic nor an early religious poem. This, as will be shown, can be seen by its compositional style, musicality, and a number of elements found in archaeological evidence about drama and

25 Jan De Vries, Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte (Berlin, 1957).
performance in Scandinavia, as well as folkloristic evidence. Having said that, I am not
claiming that no importance has been placed on *Grímnismál*'s imparting of wisdom and
knowledge, but that *Grímnismál* is possibly the poem, out of all the Eddic mythological poems,
where those two attributes are most finely balanced, if I may be allowed to use such a term.
Chapter 2. The sources

Before venturing to the study of Grímnismál, I will give a short outline of the surviving sources for Germanic pagan belief. This should provide a glimpse to both problems that emerge when one studies such a topic and the above-mentioned shifting ‘unorganised’ nature of pagan belief.

1. The Interpretatio Romana

Written sources about the Celtic- and Germanic-speaking peoples survive from as early as the Classical period. In his De Bello Gallico, Caesar describes the peoples he encountered during his expeditions north of Italy. However, one cannot accept his descriptions and interpretations of native cultic practice at face value. As De Vries writes, ‘Caesar’s remarks show a very superficial knowledge of it [Germanic religion], although they are not altogether erroneous.’

Publius Cornelius Tacitus (56 AD – first half of the second century) is the first scholar to write a whole study on the Germanic people and their lands. His works, mainly Germania, are still widely used by scholars studying the Germanic peoples. Tacitus coined the term Interpretatio Romana. This is the use of replacing the original name of a deity with the perceived Roman counterpart and identifying it as a single entity with different names. For example, he writes of the cult of pairs worshipped by the Naharvali:


30 ‘Among the Naharvali there is a grove of an ancient religion. The grove is presided by a priest in women’s clothing, and the gods worshipped are, according to the interpretatio Romana, Castor and Pollux. Thus is their divine power, their name is Alci. There are no images and no proof of an imported cult; they are though
Thus, the only thing we know about the Alci, except than that they have no images and are worshipped in a grove, is that they are Castor and Pollux. This brought past scholars, since medieval times, to find elements of the cult of Castor and Pollux and try and ‘force’ them into the cult of the Alci, having no proof, whether archaeological, linguistic or literary, other than this passage of Tacitus. Reading this passage, Hilda Ellis Davidson writes that even whether there were images of the Alci or not is questionable. Tacitus was familiar to the poet M. Annaeus Lucanus, who, in Pharsalia III, describes a Celtic sanctuary near Massalia:

Lucus erat longo numquam violatus ab evo,
Obscurum cingens connexis aera ramis,
Et gelidas alte submotis solibus umbras.
Hunc non ruricolae Panes, nemorumque potentes
Silvani Nymphaeque tenent, sed barbara ritu
Saca deum, structae diris altaribus aerae;
Omnisque humanis lustrata cruoribus arbos.
Si qua fidem meruit superos mirata vetustas,
Illis et volucres metuunt insistere ramis,
Et lustris recubare ferae: nec ventus in illas
Incubuit silvas, excusaque nubibus atris.
Fulgura: non ullis frondem praebentibus auris
Arboribus suus horror instat, Tum plurima nigris
Fontibus unda cadit, simulacraque moesta deorum
Arte carent, caesisque extant informia truncis.
Ipse situs putrique facit iam robore pallor
Attonitos: non vulgatis sacrata figuris
Numina sic metuunt: tantum terroribus addit,
Quos timeant non nosse deos.

31 Simek writes about the Alci and the Naharvali: ‘The Germanic tribe of the Naharnavali, which lived in the area now called Silesia, is only mentioned by Tacitus, who writes about sacred groves when referring to other Germanic tribes. The fact that he distinctively speaks of the interpretatio romana by referring to Castor and Pollux shows that he understood the Alcis as being twin gods. The name Alcis (Gmc *Alhiz) is related, together with Gothic alhs ‘temple’, Lithuanian elkas ‘divine grove’, either to the family of OE ealdgian ‘to protect’, and thus means ‘protective (-ing?) deity’, or else to the Germanic word alsces ‘elks’ recorded by Caesar. Since the Greek Dioskuri were partly thought of as being gods in the shape of horses, and in consideration of the etymology of Alcis as elk-, the Alcis might have been horse gods or elk gods, a theory particularly substantiated in Migration Era illustrations that show a horse-shaped variant o the Germanic twin god motif (Hauck). Supporting this interpretation are the names of the Anglo-Saxon brothers Hengist and Horsa, where a clear link to horses is given.’ Source: Simek. p. 7.
32 ‘There stood a grove
Which from the earliest time no hand of man
Had dared to violate; hidden from the sun
Its chill recesses; matted boughs entwined
Prisoned the air within. No sylvan nymphs
According to Davidson, such images could have been discounted by Tacitus, maybe because of their roughness. Evidently, very little can be said about the Naharvali or the Alci, without falling into the realm of speculation. What one could say, with little doubt, is that groves had some kind of importance for at least some of the Germanic peoples. Such a statement would be further supported by Tacitus’ description of the Semnones who apparently worshipped their gods in a grove as well:


Here found a home, nor Pan, but savage rites
And barbarous worship, altars horrible
On massive stones upreared; sacred with blood
Of men was every tree. If faith be given
To ancient myth, no fowl has ever dared
To rest upon those branches, and no beast
Has made his lair beneath: no tempest falls,
Nor lightnings flash upon it from the cloud.
Stagnant the air, unmoving, yet the leaves
Filled with mysterious trembling; dripped the streams
From coal-black fountains; effigies of gods
Rude, scarcely fashioned from some fallen trunk
Held the mid space: and, pallid with decay,
Their rotting shapes struck terror. Thus do men
Dread most the god unknown. Translation: Sir Edward Ridley, 1905.

The Semnones consider themselves to be the most ancient and noble of all the Suebi and their antiquity is confirmed from their religion. In said time, the representatives of the different tribes of all the Suebic peoples gather in a forest, sacred for ceremonies and ancient horror, and with the public killing of a human, they give start to their horrendous rite. In another way they manifest a sacred respect for that forest: no one is allowed to enter, unless if tied to a rope, showing thus their inferiority and the greatness of the divinity. If one falls, they cannot get up, but have to crawl on the ground. This religious fanaticism shows that the origin of the people is in the forest, and the god of all is from there, to whom everything obeys. The prosperity of the Semnones confirms this: they live in a hundred districts and because of their high number, they believe themselves to be the most important tribe of the Suebi’. Source: Tacitus. XXXIX. p. 46.
A few centuries later, Servius would write that a grove is an *arborum multitudo cum religione.*\(^{35}\) This fits well with later sources, both archaeological as well as literary, that mention similar practices throughout the Germanic-speaking world. More on this will be further discussed later.

Following Tacitus’ example, medieval chroniclers and hagiographers used the *interpretatio Romana* to describe the deities worshipped by the pagans. Ken Dowden quotes Maximus of Tyre’s description of an oak, worshipped in the name of Zeus (Jupiter).\(^{36}\) Procopius, writing in the sixth century, describes the practices of the *Thulites* and their worship of Ares.\(^{37}\) In the *Vita Bonifatii*, Willibald describes how Saint Boniface felled a tree that was sacred to the Hessians:

Cum vero Hessorum iam multi, catholica fide subditi ac septiformis spiritus gratia confirmati, manus inpositionem acciperunt, et alii quidem, nondum animo confortati, intemeratae fidei documenta integre percipere rennerunt; alii etiam lignis et fontibus clanculo, alii autem aperte sacrificabant; alii vero aruspicia et divinationes, prestigia atque incantationes occulte, alii quidem manifeste exeerebant; alii quippe auguria et auspicia intendeabant diversosque sacrificandis ritus incoluerunt; alii etiam, quibus mens sanior inerat, omni abiecta gentilitatis profanatione, nihil horum commisserunt. Quorum consulut atque consilio roborem quendam mirae magnitudinis, qui prisco paganorum vocabulo appellatur robor Iobis, in loco qui dicitur Gaesmere, servis Dei secum adstantibus, succidere temptavit.\(^{38}\)


\(^{37}\) Turville-Petre. p. 46.


Translation: ‘Now many of the Hessians who at that time had acknowledged the Catholic faith were confirmed by the grace of the Holy Spirit and received the laying-on of hands. But others, not yet strong in the spirit, refused to accept the pure teachings of the church in their entirety. Moreover, some continued secretly, others openly, to offer sacrifices to trees and springs, to inspect the entrails of victims; and some practiced divination, legerdemain, and incantations; some turned their attention to auguries, auspices, and other sacrificial rites; while others, of a more reasonable character, forsook all the profane practices of the Gentiles [i.e. pagans] and committed none of these crimes. With the counsel and advice of the latter persons, Boniface in their presence attempted to cut down, at a place called Gaesmere, a certain oak of extraordinary size called in the old tongue of the pagans the Oak of Jupiter.’ Source: *Vita Bonifatii*, ed. C. H. Talbot (London, 1995). pp. 126-127.
As a last example, Palmer mentions Paul the Deacon, who in *Historia Langobardorum* wrote that the Lombard god Wotan was in actuality the god Mercury who came from Greece instead of Germania.\(^{39}\)

One has to make assumptions about who the deity mentioned by these sources was, and this, according to Palmer, leads to a general Romanization of Germanic beliefs that brings us ‘with imaginative portrayals of what “Germanic paganisms” are perceived to be, rather than empirical investigations into what they were.’\(^{40}\) Instead, the more one studies Germanic paganism, the more they discover how unlikely it is that there ever was such a unified religion. Furthermore, as it can easily be seen by my examples above, the *interpretatio Romana* results to a threefold interpretation. On one hand, the writers of these texts, following such a practice, would impose their own knowledge and culture on the peoples they mentioned and interpret their gods with Roman names. On the other hand, modern historians as well, make their own kind of ‘reverse *interpretatio Romana*’ in which they impose their own predisposed ideas. Taking the *Vita Bonifatii* as an example, the Oak of Jupiter has been interpreted by historians as being an oak of Þórr or Donar.\(^{41}\) However, it could have indeed been the case that the Hessians worshipped Jupiter, and not Þórr or Donar. Even if the interpretation that Jupiter in this case would be Þórr, would not necessarily show that this Þórr is the same Þórr found in other areas and sources. In fact, it definitely could not have been Þórr *per se*, since this name form would not be possible in Old Low Franconian. Similarly, the Ares worshipped by the Thulites according to Turville-Petre could be Óðinn instead of Týr who is usually thought to be replaced by Mars and Ares (Turville-Petre does not explain why this could be the case).\(^{42}\)

---


\(^{40}\) Palmer. pp. 404-405.

\(^{41}\) Ibid. p. 411.

\(^{42}\) Turville-Petre. p. 46.
Thus, the *interpretatio Romana* proves to be very problematic for the study of the beliefs of these peoples.

2. **Christian Sources**

The discussion of the *interpretatio Romana* already showed some of the problems that Christian sources have when it comes to studying Germanic paganism. The only contemporary written material that mentions Germanic paganism comes from Christian writers, mainly missionaries that were hostile to paganism. The absence of written material from the pagans themselves shows how a concept of literature was not a part of their culture. This is not to say that there was no written language, since there is a number of runic inscriptions that survive and can be dated to the pre-Christian period. These inscriptions, however, do not deal with belief and mythology at all. Paganism has thus to be reconstructed using hostile Christian sources, and as Palmer writes, paganism, as it appears in these sources, is ‘a general characterization of Christianity's perceived antitheses rather than a specific set of beliefs’. These Christian sources do not try to understand paganism but regard it as *otherness*, using its negative elements to promote Christianity. Some writers prefer to regard paganism as something akin to magic instead of a religion. For example, Adam of Bremen writes how the Norwegian king St Ólafr rid the land of sorcerers:

*Dicunt eum inter cetera virtutum opera magnum zelum Dei habuisse, ut maleficos de terra disperderet, quorum numero cum tota barbaries exundet, precipue vero Norvegia regio monstris talibus plena est. Nam et divini et augures et magi et*

---

44 Andrén, “Behind Heathendom” p. 120.
45 Bartlett, “Reflections” p. 56.
46 Palmer. p. 403.
incantatores ceteri que satellites Antichristi habitant ibi, quorum prestigiis et miraculis infelices animae ludibrio demonibus habentur.\textsuperscript{48}

According to Adam of Bremen, these ‘monsters’ were still present in those lands, even after the conversion.

An example of a Christian source has been seen above in Willibald’s \textit{Vita Bonifatii}. As the reader notices at once, that description says very little about the Hessians’ specific beliefs or cults, except that their worshipping natural aspects of the world. Instead, it focuses on their refusal to accept Christianity. Willibald mentions pagans in another passage:

\begin{quote}
Per omnem igitur Fresiam pergens, verbum Domini, paganico repulso ritu et erraneo gentilitatis more destructo, instanter praedicabat aecclesiasque, numine contracto dilubrorum, ingenti studio fabricavit.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

Probably the most famous example of a Christian description of heathen practices in the Germanic-speaking world is by Adam of Bremen in his description of the temple at Uppsala, where statues of Wodan, Ficco, and Thor stood:\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{quote}
Solet quoque post novem annos communis omnium Sueoniae provintiarum sollemnitas in Ubsola celebrari. Ad quam videlicet sollemnitatem nulli prestatur immunitas. Reges et populi, omnes et singuli sua dona transmittunt ad Ubsolam, et, quod omni pena crudelius est, illi, qui iam induerunt christianitatem, ab illis se
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{48} Adam of Bremen, \textit{Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum} Lib. II, cap. 57, pag. 117, lin. 11. Translation: ‘They say that among other virtuous characteristics of his was a great zeal for God, so that he routed out the magicians from the land. Although all barbarism overflows with their number, the Norwegian land in particular was full of these monsters. For soothsayers and augurs and sorcerers and enchanters and other satellites of Antichrist live where by their deceptions and wonders they may hold unhappy souls up for mockery by the demons.’ In \textit{Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum}, edited and translated by Francis Joseph Tschan (New York, 1998). p. 94.

\textsuperscript{49} Willibald, \textit{Vita Bonifatii}, Cap. 8, p. 47. Translation: ‘This, then, is how he traversed the whole of Frisia, destroying pagan worship and turning away the people from their pagan errors by his preaching of the Gospel. The pagan temples and gods were overthrown and churches were built in their stead’. \textit{Vita Bonifatii}. p. 134.

\textsuperscript{50} Adam of Bremen. Lib. IV, cap. 26, pag. 258. ‘In hoc templo, quod totum ex auro paratum [Schol. 139.] est, statuas trium deorum veneratur populus, ita ut potentissimus eorum Thor in medio solium habeat triclinio; hinc et inde locum possident Wodan et Fricco. Quorum significationes eiusmodi sunt: “Thor”, inquinunt, “presidet in aere, qui tonitrus et fulmina, ventos ymbresque, serena et fruges gubernat. Alter Wodan, id est furor, bella gerit hominique ministrat virtutem contra inimicos. Tercius est Fricco, pacem voluptatemque largiens mortalibus.’ Translation: ‘In this temple, which is completely decked out in gold, the statues of three gods are venerated by the people, so that the mightiest of them Thor is in the main throne; Wodan and Fricco are in each side. Their significance is in this mode: “Thor”, they say, “presides over air, which governs thunder and lightning, winds and rains, good weather and crops. The other, Wodan, which is fury, presides over war and administers virtue against enemies. Third is Fricco, who gives peace and pleasure to the mortals.’ See also: Thomas A. DuBois, \textit{Nordic Religions in the Viking Age} (Philadelphia, 1999). p. 60.
redimunt cerimoniiis. Sacrificium itaque tale est: ex omni animante, quod masculinum est, novem capita offeruntur, quorum sanguine deos [tales] placaros est. Corpora autem suspenduntur in lucum, qui proximus est templo. Is enim lucus tam sacer est gentilibus, ut singulae arbores eius ex morte vel tabo immolatorum divinae credantur.\footnote{Adam of Bremen. SS rer. Germ. 2, Lib. IV, cap. 27, pag. 259, lin. 5-10. Translation: ‘It customary also to solemnize in Uppsala, at nine-year intervals, a general feast of all the provinces of Sweden. [...] the sacrifice is of this nature: of every living thing that is male, they offer nine heads, with the blood of which it is customary to placate gods of this sort. The bodies they hang in the sacred grove that adjoins the temple. Now this grove is so sacred in the eyes of the heathen that each and every tree in it is believed divine because of the death and putrefaction of the victims.’ Source: Gesta Hammaburgensis. p. 207.}

Here, one can see a more analytical description of the practices. Adam of Bremen also mentions how the Swedes primarily worshipped the god Þórr. Adam of Bremen echoes another chronicler, Thietmar of Merseburg, who a few years earlier than Adam wrote how the Danes would gather at Lejre in Seeland every nine years at January and sacrifice ninety-nine men and horses, dogs and chickens to their gods.\footnote{Thietmar of Merseburg, Chronicon Thietmari, ed. Robert Holtzmann (Berlin, 1935). pp. 24-25.} Thietmar’s comments on sacrifice are less negative than one would expect, and he accepts that there is a rationale behind it.\footnote{Bartlett, “Reflections”. p. 66.}

What most Christian sources seem to agree on, is that pagans the venerated trees or wooden poles and posts that might symbolise a tree. To further support this claim, the Vita St Amandi (eighth century) mentions wood and tree worship by the people that lived across the River Scheldt.\footnote{‘Per idem autem tempus, cum loca vel dioceses ob animarum sollicitudine vir Domini circuiret Amandus, audivit pagum quendam praeter fluenta Scaldi fluvii, cui vocabulum Gandao inidit antiquitas, diaboli laquei vehementer irretitum, ita ut incomi loci illius, relicit Deo, arbores et ligna pro Deo coherent atque fana vel idola adoranent. Propter ferocitatem enim gentis illius vel ob terrae infecunditatem omnes sacerdotes a praedicatione loci illius se subtraxerant, et nemo audiet in eodem loco verbum adnuntiare Domini.’ Source: Vita S. Amandi, Episcopi Et Confessoris. c. 13, p. 436. Translation: ‘While the man of God, impelled by his zeal for souls, was engaged on his travels, he heard of a region situated across the River Scheldt, to which antiquity had given the name of Ghent. This region was so caught up in the devil’s nets that its inhabitants offered worship to trees and pieces of wood instead of to God: they built shrines and adored idols. Because of the savagery of its people and the infertility of the soil no bishop had preached there nor had anyone dared to proclaim the word of God.’ Source: Vita S. Amandi, Episcopi Et Confessoris, edited and translated by J.N. Hillgarth (Philadelphia, 1986). p. 143.} In addition to the aforementioned examples, the most well-known, and
probably debated, centre of worship mentioned by Christian sources, is the Irminsul. In the Frankish *Annales Regni Francorum* it is written about Charles the Great’s invasion in Saxony:

> Et inde perrexit partibus Saxonieae prima vice, Eresburgum castrum coepit, ad Ermensul usque pervenit et ipsum fanum destruxit et aurum vel argentum, quod ibi repperit, abstulit. Et fuit siccitas magna, ita ut aqua deficeret in supradicto loco, ubi Ermensul statab.\(^{55}\)

According to Hilda Ellis Davidson:

> A pillar was an important feature of some of the holy places of the Germanic peoples. The Saxons had a high wooden pillar called Irminsul at Eresburg, thought to have been Marsberg on the Diemel, although other suggestions have been made, and this was cut down by Charlemagne in 772. The historian Widukind associated such pillars with Mars and stated that their position was chosen to represent the sun. Irmin is thought to be the name or title of a god who could be identified with Tîwaz, as an early Germanic deity associated with the sky.\(^{56}\)

As seen, she does not give any specific reason for her identification with Tîwaz. Another source mentions Irminsul, namely Rudolf of Fulda who wrote in the 860s. Rudolf identifies Irminsul as a *universalis columna*, ‘world pillar’.\(^{57}\) Jakob Grimm did an extensive study of the meaning of Irminsul, especially from a linguistic perspective:

> In the Hildebrands lied, *irmingot* is the supreme god, the god of all, not a peculiar one, agreeing in a sense with *thiodgod*, the (whole) people's god, formed by another strengthening prefix, Hel. 33, 18. 52, 12. 99, 6. *irminman*, an elevated expression for man, Hel. 38, 24. 107, 13, 152, 11. *irminthiod*, the human race, Hel. 87, 13 and in Hildebr. In the same way I explain proper names compounded with *irman, irmin*. And *irmansûl, irminsûl* is the great, high, divinely honoured statue; that it was dedicated to any one god, is not to be found in the term itself. - In like manner in the AS. has *eormencyn* (genus humanum), Beow. 309. Cod. Exon. 333, 3. *eormengrund* (terra), Beow. 1711. (and singularly in an adj. form: ofer ealne yrmenne grund, Cod. Exon. 243, 13). *eormenstrŷnd* (progenies). - ON. *iörmungrund* (terra), *iörmungandr* (anguis maximus), *iörmunrekr* (taurus maximus).\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{55}\) *Annales Regni Francorum*. a. 772, p. 32.

Translation: ‘And so he went for the first time in the parts of Saxony, began from the camp of Eresburg, and reached Irminsul and destroyed that sanctuary, and the gold and silver that was found there, he removed. And there was great drought, so there was shortage of water in the above mentioned place, where Ermensul stood.’ See also: ‘Rex vero Karlus congregato apud Wormaciam generali conventu Saxoniam bello adgredi statuit eamque sine mora ingressus ferro et igni cuncta depopulatus Eresburgum castrum cepit, idolum, quod Irminsul a Saxonibus vocabatur, evertit.’ In *Annales Qui Dicuntur Einhardt*. a. 772, p. 33.

\(^{56}\) Davidson. pp. 21-22.

\(^{57}\) Dowden. pp. 276-277.

As seen, there is a large number of possibilities that could also connect Irminsul with the World Serpent, Jormungandr. Both Davidson and Dowden connect the importance of Irminsul and similar trees or posts found in Christian sources with the World Tree Yggdrasill, found in the Old Norse literature. In fact, Yggdrasill is the most important cosmological element in Grímnismál, being mentioned seven times.

3. Better safe than Snorri

Unlike the Elder Edda, the collection of poems in which Grímnismál survives – which shall be discussed below – the Snorra Edda (probably) has a specific author. It was written by Snorri Sturluson (1179-1241). Snorra Edda is divided into five parts. The first is the Prologue, which is an euhemerisation of Norse mythology that describes the gods as descendants of the Trojans. Here, one can already see the problems that arise with Snorri’s sources. Snorri was an antiquarian who was not himself a practitioner of Old Norse heathenism and, as Faulkes writes, he was influenced by the time he lived in and the traditions of European Christianity. The second text is Gylfaginning, a prose version of the events found in Völuspá and other Eddic

---

59 Tolley gives further interpretations, some of which are summarised here: ‘Irminsul as a name has three possible interpretations. The most basic sense is "great column" - this is supported by later German usage, where the term appears as a common noun, "mighty column" or "obelisk": thus in the twelfth-century Kaiserschronik, line 602, Julius Caesar's ashes are placed on an irminsul (<< ûf ain irmensûl begruoben>>), and at line 4213 Simon Magus comes and sets himself on an irminsul (<<ûf ain irmensûl er staich>>) in full view of all the people (note the usage as a common noun). A similar significance probably also lies behind irminswel, used to describe great persons. Irmin is used as a reinforcing and magnifying prefix in other words: irmingot is "highest god" in Hildebrandslied 29, irminþiod is “mankind” in the Heliand (passim). There is, nonetheless, a sense not merely of size, but of (magical) potency in all these uses of irmin. A further possibility is to see the name of a god in Irminsul, and interpret it as "column of Irmin". Irmin, or an earlier form of the word, appears to have been one of the three sons of "Man" (Mannus), the ancestral founders of the Germanic peoples: this is to be inferred from Tacitus's name of the Herminones as one of their three divisions. Irmin thus appears as a demi-god as well as an ancestor; cf. the statement of Jordanes that the Goths worshipped their ancestors and called them Ansis, which may possibly be related to the word for "beam".

Source: Tolley. pp. 277-278.


poems, with quotes from them, but also Snorri’s expansion of the information found there. In the case of Gylfaginning one cannot know whether Snorri added original material, of his own creation, as part of his interpretation of the Eddic poems or whether he had another source, now lost to us. According to Nordal, Snorri’s use of Völuspá and his characterisation of it as forn visendi, ‘ancient lore’, shows that Snorri attributed a heathen composition to it.\(^{62}\) However, forn simply means ‘old, ancient’ and does not necessarily imply a pagan composition. The other two texts found in Snorra Edda are Skáldskaparmál, which according to Margaret Clunies-Ross is unfinished,\(^ {63}\) and Háttatáll, both of which deal with types of verse and are meant to be used as guides on how to compose poetry, especially of skaldic nature.

When it comes to the Snorra Edda, scholars disagree on whether it is useful a source as the Elder Edda. According to Brink, remnants of the myths of the pre-Christian Germanic-speaking peoples can be found in both texts, albeit the information is neither linear nor does it always seem to be logical.\(^ {64}\) Others, myself included, are more reluctant in using Gylfaginning for the study of heathenism. Snorri was a historian who seems to have been interested in keeping the poetic traditions of his people alive. However, as it can easily be seen just by reading the Prologue, his Christian background is present in his writings, and, moreover, one cannot know which parts found in Gylfaginning are Snorri’s original work or part of his knowledge of the forn siðr.

In trying to understand the purpose for which Snorri composed such a monumental piece of work as the Snorra Edda, McKinnell mentions the traditional idea that knowing mythology was necessary for skalds in their courtly compositions of praise of earls and kings.\(^ {65}\) However, he continues, this would not explain for the composition of mythological poetry,


\(^{64}\) Brink. p. 34.

since this would have little use for the praise of rulers. Snorri, being an antiquarian himself, removed from Norse heathenism by at least two hundred years, ends up giving only a glimpse of the narratives that once existed. He saw myth as something far removed from him and his time. As Pernille Hermann writes, the difference between myth and history is that:

Myth is often equated with the past, paganism, traditionality, and orality, while history is equated with the present, Christianity, conventionality, and literacy. Furthermore, myth is associated with concepts such as reversibility and dream time while history is associated with irreversibility and chronology.

As such, Snorri would write his works seeing their content as ‘the other’, which would make a great difference compared to the hypothetical heathen composers of the Elder Edda, who would consider myth as part of their society and culture. One has to find which elements of his works are indeed heathen and which not, and whether these elements come from the same set of beliefs or not. When studying the Elder Edda, one already finds themselves filled with room for their interpretation. Using, for example, Gylfaginning, a work that used a version of Vafþrúðnismál as a source, in order to understand and study Vafþrúðnismál itself, can end up bringing more questions and misunderstandings than answers. To give a few examples of Snorri’s interpretations, McKinnell mentions an event in which an old one-eyed man appears at the court of Ólafr Tryggvason at Ægvaldsnes. There, the old man keeps the king awake at night by telling old stories. Before leaving early in the morning, the old man leaves two steaks and asks the cooks to prepare them for the king. The king, however, understands that the old man was no mere mortal, and orders the steaks destroyed. There are different versions of this story, and in the one written by Snorri, this old man is identified as Óðinn. This interpretation seems likely, since Óðinn is one-eyed and is often portrayed as travelling in the guise of an old man and visiting courts. However, it might be exactly because of said stories that Snorri

---

66 Ibid. p. 50.
68 Pernille Hermann, “Íslendingabók and History,” In ibid. p. 17.
identified that old-man as Óðinn, having no other sources to support this claim, and therefore making it only an interpretation that could be just as wrong as it might be right. In fact, in another version, that old man is seen as being the devil in Óðinn’s form. An even stronger example comes from Henning Kure’s study of Snorri’s use of *Völuspá* as a source. Kure finds a number of Snorri’s quotations are influenced by Christianity or are personal interpretations.\(^{70}\) His conclusion is worthy of being quoted in its entirety:

> When we as modern scholars look for Christian influence in *Völuspá* and other Old Norse mythical poems, we are walking the same tracks as those that Snorri and other learned Icelanders did. We then find not only what our medieval colleagues found, but also what they added and modified back then. And in most cases, we do this with a preset mind thoroughly informed by Snorri’s *Edda*. At least, that seems to be the only reason for [sic.] why the basic assumption of an afterlife punishment in *Völuspá*, strophe 39, is never questioned. We continue to read *Völuspá* through Snorri’s Christian perspective. What we discover, however, may not be Christian influence on the composition of *Völuspá*, but rather the Christian reasons for preserving the heathen poem.\(^{71}\)

Having seen these examples, my reasoning for making a clear distinction between the *Snorra Edda* and the other Icelandic literary sources that deal with mythology should be understood. Snorri’s work is very important and should be used in the study of some elements of paganism. However, one needs to very careful in using Snorri as a source to assert any interpretations they might have on the *Elder Edda* and their contents.

4. **Icelandic Sources**

Including Snorri, the greatest proportion of textual evidence that we have for the study of Germanic paganism comes from Iceland. These sources were written in manuscripts in the course of the thirteenth century and after, long after, Iceland had converted to Christianity in

---


\(^{71}\) Ibid. p. 90.
the year 1000. Some scholars have argued against the use of these sources because of their late writing, but as Andrén writes:

It is fully possible to make an archaeological study of pre-Christian religion in Scandinavia without any consideration of the Icelandic literature. However, such a study would lose fundamental references to a partly non-Christian interpretative framework. Besides, the Icelandic texts exist irrespective of whether one use them or not, and they will always give a pre-understanding of this particular field of research. Therefore, my position is that a dialogue between archaeology and the Old Norse texts should be maintained, even though the use of Snorri’s texts, or other Icelandic poems or sagas, in studies of Old Norse religion leads automatically to a number of problems which have been discussed ever since the 18th century.

The Icelandic texts are medieval Christian literature, showing how authors in the 13th-century Iceland interpreted the pre-Christian history of Iceland and Scandinavia. A basic question is therefore how we should view the relationship between the fiction of the narratives, the author's society in the 13th century, and the pre-Christian society in which most of the narratives are placed. [...] We are given a detailed description of the pantheon, but - paradoxically - very little knowledge about how people related to these powers.72

The Icelandic sources can roughly be divided into three main types: sagas, Eddic, and skaldic poetry. Most of the sagas deal with stories related to the families of settlers in Iceland, and a great number of them are considered either fully or partially historical. The sagas, however, are not a main source for the study of paganism, especially mythology, with few exceptions. One of them is Egils Saga Skallagrímssonar, which deals with the life of Egill Skallagrímsson (c. 904-995 AD), a historical Icelander who was well known for his poetry. Through poems found in this saga, like Sonatorrek,73 which are attributed to Egill himself, and thus of heathen nature, one can get a glimpse of the forn síðr of the Icelandic heathens.

This brings us to the Eddic sources, the most copious literary sources used by whoever researches the Scandinavian pre-Christian world. The Eddic sources can further be divided into two parts, the Poetic or Elder Edda, and the Prose or Snorra Edda, discussed above. These are found in two different collections which survive in a small number of manuscripts. Starting

---

with the *Elder Edda*, it is a collection of literary material, mainly poetry that comes in two basic forms: mythological and heroic. The *Elder Edda* survives in a manuscript known as *Codex Regius* (GKS 2365 4to). The main poems for the study of Old Norse mythology that are included in this collection, are, in order of appearance, *Völuspá*, *Hávamál*, *Vafþrúðnismál*, *Grímnismál*.

*Völuspá*, ‘the prophecy of the völva, or seeress’, occupies pride of place. In its 66 stanzas, the völva, talking with the god Óðinn, recounts her knowledge of the past and future. She discusses the creation of the world, life, the different creatures and gods that inhabit it, such as elves, jötnar and dwarves, and ultimately Ragnarök and its aftermath. A second version of the poem exists in another manuscript, known as *Hauksbók* (AM 765 4to), which was written by Haukr Erlendsson, who died in 1334. By comparing the two texts one finds a few differences. Sigurður Nordal argued that the main part of the poem is heathen as was the author’s childhood religion. By ‘examining its place in the religious movement of the tenth century’, Nordal reaches the conclusion that the original poem was probably composed around the time of the conversion to Christianity. John Lindow further argues that the fear of dealing with a product of Christianity should be even smaller, since, as he claims, Iceland had a strong oral tradition. As such, two centuries of Christianity might not have brought significant change to the poem. However, in the *Hauksbók* edition of the poem, *Völuspá* ends with a very strange stanza that could point towards a Christian composition, if it was composed as part of the original poem, and not a later addition:

\[
\text{Þa kømr inn ríki at regindómi őflugr ofan}
\]

74 Sigurður Nordal. p. 81.
77 Ibid. p. 111.
sá er ñllu ræðr.\(^79\)

As Vésteinn discusses, a number of Old Norse deities have been put forward as to who this figure is, ranging from Heimdallr to Óðinn and Freyr. However, none seem to be the case.\(^80\)

The reason I chose to mention this stanza is to show how even Völuspá can be a problematic source, and should not be used without a previous analysis of the stanza one would quote.

The second poem of the Elder Edda is Hávamál, ‘the lay of the High One’. It is a much longer poem than the rest. In fact, it is 164 stanzas long, compared to the meagre 66 of Völuspá, for example. Its structure and contents are also different. Hávamál is mainly a didactic poem, where the speaker, usually identified as Óðinn, gives advice on how to be an honourable person and a good guest. Incongruity between the stanzas, as well as to its length (which would make it hard to remember by heart in its entirety), point to it being a collection of verses from different sources. Whether this collection was made by the scribe who wrote the Codex Regius manuscript or by an earlier person is unknown. The division of the poem according to its stanzas and meaning is thus:

The first 79 stanzas are gnomic verses, giving advice to the reader. Then the mode of the poem changes when Óðinn tells in the first person of his love adventures with the daughter (or wife) of Billingr, and with Gunnlǫð. In stanzas 111–137 the poem shifts back to a gnomic mode, giving advice to a certain Loddfáfnir. The next eight stanzas relate to a list of runes and descriptions of pagan sacrifice, some of which mention Óðinn in the third person. Lastly, the last thirteen stanzas form a different poem that has been incorporated into Hávamál, listing magic charms and spells.\(^81\)

David Evans, in his edition of Hávamál lists the most accepted division of the poem:\(^82\)

1. Gnomic Verses, which are up to stanza 79 more or less.
2. Óðinn’s adventure with Billings mær, from stanza 95 to 102.
3. Óðinn’s adventure with Gunnlǫð, from 104 to 110.

---

\(^79\) ‘Then comes the great \text| to the mighty doom | powerful from above | that rules all.’ Source: Völuspá, 55 p. 135.


4. *Loddfáfnismál*: from stanza 111 to stanza 137.

In studying Hávamál one can see that a large number of its stanzas may be of heathen nature, for example the *Rúnatal* section. Furthermore, a few examples of words show that these stanzas are unlikely to have been composed in Iceland, for example *bautasteinar* in st. 72, *þjóðann* in st. 15, the solitary fir-tree mentioned in st. 50. Even though the first stanzas are of a Gnomic nature, and thus not directly related to the world of the gods, one can get an idea of how men dealt with everyday life and their ethics. Furthermore, parts like Óðinn’s adventure with *Billings mar* and Gunnlǫð, as well as *Rúnatal* and *Ljóðatal* provide with extensive information, especially in the figure of Óðinn.

*Vafþrúðnismál*, ‘the lay of Vafþrúðnir’, is the third poem found in the *Elder Edda*. It is a conversation between a disguised Óðinn and Vafþrúðnir, in Óðinn’s quest of gaining more wisdom and knowledge and is comprised of 55 stanzas. The style of the conversation is through a wisdom contest between the two, which ends with Vafþrúðnir losing and dying after being unable to reply to Óðinn’s question of what he whispered to Baldr’s ear during his funeral. The poem is of very significant importance for our understanding of Old Norse cosmogony, since through the wisdom contest, the world of the gods is discussed in great length.

This brings me to skaldic poems, some of which are widely believed to be pre-Christian. Skaldic poetry is flooded with kennings, which are compound expressions in which whatever is alluded to is called ‘something which it is not’. One would call a ship *gjálf marr*, ‘steed

---

83 See 2.5 Linguistic Sources below.
of the sea’, or a battle *fleinbrak* ‘clash of spears’. Kennings can become exceedingly hard to understand since two or more would be put together. Taking the previous example, *fleinbraks fúr*, ‘the fire of the clash of spears’ would be used when talking about a sword. Rudolf Meissner, in his monumental work on kennings, lists a huge number of kennings related to all sorts of things, from all of the surviving skaldic poetry. To support the previous example of the importance of trees in Germanic paganism, one sees that a large number of kennings related to man have different tree names used instead:

Charakteristisch für die allgemeinen Mannkenningar sind die altertümlichen Grundwörter der Götter- und Baumnamen. Die Verwendung der Baumnamen führt Snorri rationalistisch auf *reynir* (zu *reyna*, zugleich Baumname) und *viðr* (= *vinnandil*) zurück (SnE 1, 334). Natürlich aber liegt bei Männern und Frauen ursprünglich eine poetische Vorstellung zu Grunde. In den Kenningar für den Christengott fehlen natürlich die alten Götternamen, ebenso aber auch die Bäume.

In *Skáldskaparmál*, one finds a large number of skaldic poems being quoted. In it, Snorri writes how skaldic poems should be in accordance with nature, as well as the importance of trees in relation to man:

> Hvernig skal kenna mann? [...] Ok fyrir því at hann er reynir vápnanna ok viðr víganna – alt eitt ok vinnandi; viðr heitir ok trú, reynir heitir trú – af þessum heitum hafa skáldin kallat menn ask eða hlyn, lund eða þörum viðar heitum karlkendum ok kent til víga eða skipa eða fjár. [...] Rétt er at kenna hana svá at kalla hana selju eða lög þess er hon miðlar, en selja eða lág, þat eru trú. Fyrir því er kona kölluð til kenningar þöllum kvenkendum viðar heitum.


86 *Hervararkviða*, ed. Guðni Jónsson. ch. 27.
89 Faulkes. p. 30.
90 ‘How should man be called? [...] And for this reason, that he is a tester of weapons and achiever of killings – they are all the same, achiever; *viðr* also meaning tree, tester meaning tree – of these names the poets have called men ash or maple, grove or other masculine wood names, and refer to him in terms of slaying or ships or property. [...] Right is to refer to her [the woman] thus, as calling her dealer or consumer of this which she shares out, but [the word for] *selja* or *lág*, these are trees. For this reason is woman called in kennings with all feminine names for trees.’ Source: Snorri Sturluson, *Skáldskaparmál*. XXXI. p. 40. For a more scholarly poetic translation, see: *Edda*, edited and translated by Anthony Faulkes (London, 1987).
Having seen the main Icelandic sources and already discussed a few of these in relation to trees, I shall now proceed to give a few other examples. As seen in the above discussion of Roman and Christian sources, cults are described as focusing on natural elements, one of them being the tree. Icelandic sources support this in their description of the perceived cosmology of Old Norse paganism. In fact, reading both the Elder and Snorra Edda, we see three mythological trees being mentioned, Yggdrasill, Læraðr and Mimameiðr. It is not known whether these trees are three different ones, or different manifestations or names of the same. Yggdrasill is, of course, the most well-known of these, and it is described in Grímnismál, Völuspá and Fjölsvinnsmál, and the Snorra Edda.

A variety of problems arise when it comes to using Icelandic sources, the main being the late date of the surviving texts as well as the geographical distance and environmental distinctiveness between Iceland and the rest of the Germanic-speaking world. The most widely accepted approach is, as Andrén writes, to compare the Icelandic sources with others, mainly archaeological, but also the Christian ones, and seeing whether there is any corresponding evidence on beliefs or practices. To come up with the most accurate and likely answers, though, a focused approach could prove to be more fruitful. Dating a literary source and placing it into a general geographical region and then comparing it with the archaeological remains from that specific region: the conclusions would be far stronger than comparisons with possibly unrelated sites.

Up to now, a negative view on the study of paganism has been seen. The comparison of any two sources could be deemed as unnecessary and problematic, considering the very nature of Germanic paganism, even if the sources are both Icelandic. While I believe strongly

91 Andrén, Tracing. p. 28.
92 Tolley. p. 316.
93 “Behind Heathendom.” p. 106.
on avoiding any study that presupposes a unified set of beliefs, in some cases, comparisons can be fruitful, as well as unavoidable. First of all, after studying a poem on its own and coming to different conclusions, it can be worthy to compare it to others and see where they agree and where they do not. Furthermore, even within the framework of my suggested approach on the study of *Grímnismál* and other mythological poems, it is impossible to completely ignore any other source. As discussed above, up to now, most comparisons tend to be within the boundaries of the mythological poems found in the *Elder Edda* and Snorri. Such comparisons are problematic. However, a number of other literary sources, found outside the boundaries of Eddic mythological poetry can show remarkable similarities to the poem studied. In the case of *Grímnismál*, I have found two poems that show a connection to the poem.

The first is the heroic Eddic poem *Sigrdrífunumál*. In the commentary below, *Sigrdrífunumál* will appear in the discussion of a number of stanzas. Both *Grímnismál* and *Sigrdrífunumál* are composed in the same metre, *ljóðaháttr*. Furthermore, a king named Agnarr, just like in *Grímnismál* makes an appearance in *Sigrdrífunumál*. Lastly, a number of similar stylistic choices and mythological elements are mentioned in both poems, for example the *blunnstoðum* of st. 3, or the horses of st. 16. Such examples shall be discussed below, and show the likelihood that the composer of one poem might have known the other, or that they both reflect a similar ‘version’ of Germanic paganism.

The second poem which I believe to be of critical importance is *Þórsdrápa*, quoted by Snorri in *Skáldskaparmál*. *Þórsdrápa* is one of the most complicated and difficult poems in the Old Norse language, mainly because of its number, and complexity of *kenningar*. In it, Þórr goes to the hall of a *jötunn* king called Geirrøðr, just like Óðinn’s king of the Goths. Þórr does

---

95 Ibid. p. 313.
97 Snorri Sturluson, *Skáldskaparmál*. 
what he does best, which is using his physical prowess, and overcomes all the trials brought by Geirrøðr and slays him. Snorri, who also quotes the poem in full, provides with a summary to the story telling us that after Loki was caught in falcon form by king Geirrøðr: ‘Pá lasti Geirrøðr Loka í kistu ok svelti hann þar þrjá mánuðr’.\(^{98}\) Such a topos, for example, is present in *Grímnismál* as well, where Geirrøðr imprisons and tortures and starves Óðinn for eight nights. The commentary below discusses the rarity of the name ‘Geirrøðr’, making it difficult to disregard the presence of this name as a coincidence. The reader familiar with *Grímnismál* will already have noticed the similarities within the setting of the two poems, with a god as the protagonist travelling to a faraway kingdom and engaging into a dispute with the ruler named Geirrøðr. Furthermore, even more particular elements, including kennings and the usage of specific Óðinn names show the possibility of an interesting connection between these two poems. *Þórsdrápa* could prove to be the missing link in our understanding of how the Óðinn cult could have taken over the cult of Þórr, as shall be discussed in Part 2 Chapter 3.3. In conclusion, as part of my analysis of *Grímnismál*, and especially in my attempt to place the poem in a geographic region and date it, I shall be using some of the information gained through the reading of *Þórsdrápa* and *Sigrdrífumál*. My attempt is to be meticulous in my usage of both sources and clear whenever I do so, in giving the reader the possibility of disregarding the conclusions related to such comparisons, should they not find them convincing enough.

### 5. Linguistic Sources

The least problematic category of source material regarding the study of paganism may, perhaps, be the linguistic. By tracing the meaning and etymologies of the names of gods, one

---

98 Ibid. p. 24.
Translation: Then Geirrøðr locked Loki in a chest and for three months he starved him.
can make many discoveries, as seen in the previous chapter. Moreover, toponymics, the study of place-names and their meaning, is a critical field in the understanding of paganism. For example, the Danish city of Odense comes from a theophoric Óðins vé ‘Óðinn’s shrine’. Places like Torsvi ‘Þórr’s shrine’ and Närlunda ‘Njörðr’s sacrificial grove’, similarly show the cult of some deities, and their second element show the importance of natural places, like the sacrificial grove. D. H. Green, in Language and History in the Early Germanic World, gives a vast range of examples of words that showed religious importance:

The OHG word harug has cognates in OE and ON. In OHG it occurs in the earliest sources and persists until the tenth century, translating such Latin terms as ara, delubrum, fanum, lucus and nemus, i.e. ranging from ‘altar’ through ‘sanctuary, chapel’ to ‘holy grove’. None of the examples suggest a large place of worship, but rather a small grove, particularly when harug renders lucus or nemus or when in one gloss it occurs as a translation of silva (with non-religious function), but the position is different in OE, where hearog can denote ‘wood’ as well as ‘holy grove’, but in addition a pagan ‘sanctuary’ or ‘idol’. In ON högr is attested as ‘heap of stones’, but also ‘place of worship’ (with stones as a primitive altar?) and ‘mountain’. If we accept the etymological connection with OIr. carne ‘heap of stones’ and Lat. carcer ‘(stone) enclosure, prison’, the semantic starting-point would seem to have been ‘altar’, then, as with the Latin terms above rendered into OHG, moving to ‘sanctuary, chapel’ and finally ‘holy grove’. The word can also occur as (or in) a place-name (e.g. Harrow or Harrowden in England), but the double function of the appellative, religious or non-religious, means that we cannot be certain whether the place-name refers to an original place of worship.

Moreover, Jakob Grimm mentions the Gothic word alhs, which is related to Greek ναός and νεών, ‘temple’. This, according to Grimm, could also be related to the Alcis

---

99 Green writes: ‘Theophoric place-names may contain a general term for the gods at large or the name of an individual god. Scandinavian place-names of the type Gudhjem, Gudme, Gudum (< Gudhem) derive from an appellative meaning ‘home of the gods’, extended to mean the place where the gods dwell and are the object of a special rite, then designating places where such worship took place. In addition to this collective word for the gods, the term *ansu- (one group of gods within the Germanic pantheon) can also be used, as in Sw. Åsum (< hem), Norw. Oslo and German Aßlar. Much more common are place-names which specify an individual god, throughout Scandinavia and especially with reference to the gods Freyr, Öðinn, Pór (but also Ullr, Freyja and Týr). This category is also represented in WG evidence: Wodan in Germany (Godesberg < Wudinsberg) and in England (Wednesbury, Wenslow), Donar in Germany (Donnesberg), whilst in England Thursley shows Viking influence), Tiu in Germany (Ciesburg for Augsburg) and in England (Tuesley). For all such place-names of theophoric nature (generic or individual deities) we may assume the presence of a religious site in or near the places in question.’ Source: D. H. Green, Language and History in the Early Germanic World (Cambridge, 1998). pp. 25-26. Also, Grimm. p. 28.


mentioned by Tacitus in *Germania* XLIII. 102 To further show the importance of trees and groves in the Germanic religions, Green writes that OS *alah*, ‘temple’, which is cognate to the aforementioned *alhs*, but also to OE *ealgian*, ‘to protect’, OLith *alkas/elkas*, ‘holy grove’, and Greek *álsos*, ‘grove’. 103 Through the study of place-names, one can see that there was a common pantheon in the Scandinavian lands. 104 One can also see the cultural perceptions of the landscapes and how people dealt with them. 105

Tracing Óðinn’s name one sees that it is cognate with Wôdan, the suffix –*an* denoting authority over the people, thus making his name mean ‘leader of the wôd’. Wôd, according to Green, is cognate with modern German *wut*, ‘rage, fury’. Green continues ‘The Germanic word could certainly be seen in a negative sense (in Gothic the form *wōþs* was used to render ‘possessed by demons’), but also positively if we take into account such cognates as Lat. *vātis*, OIr. *fáith* ‘prophet, poet’ (in *Germania* Wodan was also seen as a god of poetry). 106 This information goes well with some of the attributes found in Óðinn, such as him being the god of poetry (as mentioned above by Green), as well as him being the god of berserkers.

Language can also help with dating the Icelandic sources. By finding words that were not used in Iceland but were common in Scandinavia, one can see that some parts of *Hávamál* were probably not composed by an Icelander. Some examples of these words have been given above (2.4). 107 A meticulous study of the language used in an Icelandic text could thus help to its dating and the understanding of whether said text was probably composed after the Christian

102 Grimm. p. 66.
103 Ibid. p. 27.
106 Green. p. 79.
conversion in its entirety or whether, as Evans wrote about Hávamál, one could ‘glimpse the half-submerged hulks’ of older poems.\(^{108}\)

### 6. Comparative philology

While reading Grímnismál, similarities may be found with other Indo-European mythological sources: for example Greek or Sanskrit ones. Such comparative studies have recently re-emerged and historians of religion such as Jens Peter Schjødt have been advocating in favour of following such methodologies.\(^{109}\) For those scholars who believe that there was a Proto-Indo-European culture, it follows that there was also a common Proto-Indo-European religion and mythology as well. However, according to Beekes, there is only one name of a god that can be traced in most Indo-European languages. This is the name of the Greek god Zeus:

\[ \text{Diē\u0102s} \quad \text{*ph₂tēr (Skt. Dvāus pitā, Gr. Zeús patēr, Lat. Iuppiter).} \]
\[ \text{The word is related to ‘day’ (Skt. dīvā ‘during the day’, Arm. tîv, Lat. diēs, OIr. die);} \]
\[ \text{Zeus would then be the god of the clear skies. The word for ‘god’ is derived from the same form:} \]
\[ \text{*deiuos (Skt. devā-, Lith. diëvās, Lat. deus, OIr. dia, OIc. pl. tūvar, from this root are derived OIr. Týr, OE Tīg, OHG Zīo).}^{110} \]

Some names of other gods have been seen to be Indo-European, but haven’t been connected with other Indo-European languages, Wôdan and Venus being some examples.\(^{111}\) Old Norse Æsir, singular áss, ‘gods’ has been reconstructed to Proto-Germanic \(*\text{ansuz}\), which could be cognate with Hittite hassu-, ‘king’, as well as Vedic ásura-, and Avestan ahura-, both related to divinities.\(^{112}\) \(*\text{ansuz}\) and its connections between different religions are debated. A number
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108 Ibid. p. 8.
of scholars have also worked in trying to connect the roles of priests such as the Celtic druids and Indic *brahmīns*, but their work has proven to be inconclusive and their theories far-fetched.

Following such comparative patterns or thought, I wrote my master’s dissertation on the Old Norse myth that related to the creation of mankind and proceeded to compare it to the other Indo-European creation myths. I found strong similarities in two main forms, namely the importance of trees in said myth, and the figure of Loki. Loki is a being shrouded in mystery. Very little is known about his functions in Old Norse religion, as well as his provenance and the date when he became part of the pantheon. Moreover, his name has not been properly explained, though a large number of possibilities have been suggested by scholars. Notable scholars like Dumézil and Jan De Vries have worked on this figure. By going through Loki’s attributes, as well as the large amount of historiography about this shadowy figure, I found out that, as other scholars had written before me, one could see a number of similarities between Loki and Prometheus, especially when it comes to the creation myth. By analysing the Old Norse texts of *Völuspá* and *Gylfaginning* and comparing them with the Greek works of Hesiod, *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, I explored whether or not Loki and Prometheus are both related to the Caucasian Syrdon, as Dumézil claimed and concluded that there was probably a relation between the two. The reason I am summarising this here is to say that, as interesting as my conclusions might have been, such a comparative work ended up in the realm of distant possibility, instead of probability. In finding similarities in the importance put into trees in different Indo-European creation myths, I concluded that all these myths came from a single,

---

115 Dumézil, pp. 202-203.
Proto-Indo-European source. What I failed to realise, in this case, is that other religions, unrelated to the Indo-European-speaking peoples, shared similar elements concerning the importance of trees. For instance, as described by Mircea Eliade, the Nambakula, Kwakiutl, Nad’a, Karadjeri, Chepara and Buriat are but a few of the large number of tribes around the world in which the trees show a similar kind of importance. This example shows that finding similarities between two religions or cultures does not necessarily mean that these two cultures stem from the same proto-culture, but could be part of a more universal aspect, present in different and unrelated cultures and religions.

Comparative Indo-European studies, as interesting and important a subject as it might be, proves to be problematic for scholars in this field. When it comes to the field of linguistics, Indo-European comparative linguistics is a field that has proven to be extremely helpful and if I may be allowed to say so, interesting. However, studying the perceived similarities of a virtually unknown culture of the Proto-Indo-European people can only bring inconclusive results. I am keen to believe that there was a common culture shared by the speakers of Proto-Indo-European, including a religion and mythology. It is exactly because of my interest in such an outcome that my proposed method of studying the Proto-Indo-European world, is not to study it at all. Only when all these cultures and religions have been studied extensively on their own, may a comparison between them prove to be fruitful. Until then, any theory is as invalid as the other.

117 Mircea Eliade has done a lot of research throughout his lifetime, working in comparative religions, especially from an anthropological perspective, and, by analysing modern day shamanistic societies, he has tried to understand more of ancient religions that, according to him had similar shamanistic properties. However, his work is now mostly discredited, not only because of his affiliations with fascism, but also because his work ‘is based upon a few bits of ethnographic and historical information, interpreted through the fastidious application of unbridled imagination, exaggerations, and misrepresentations, to produce a narrative that accords with a preconceived vision the author wishes to present, no matter how farfetched that vision may be from actual ethnographic or historical circumstances.’ Source: Homayun Sidky, “On the Antiquity of Shamanism and its role in Human Religiosity.” In, Method & Theory in the Study of Religion, v. 22.1 (2010). p. 79.

7. **Comparison with Christianity**

When studying Germanic paganism, it is hard not to compare the sources with other religions, especially with what we know about the beliefs of other Indo-European speaking peoples. As seen above, most of the literary sources compare Germanic paganism with classical religions, so in a way it is almost impossible for a scholar not to do that as well. However, as seen above, the amount of material we have for comparing Indo-European religions is inconclusive.

Christianity and paganism affected each other. Studying medieval Christianity, one might find a large number of pagan elements of worship, especially wells and springs:

Thousands of springs and fountains bore (and bear) the names of saints, usually with some explanatory story, like that relating to the early British saint Decuman, martyred in Devon, who, after decapitation, carried his own head "to that spring of purest water, in which he used to wash his head, and which is still today called 'St. Decuman's fountains,' in memory and reverence to him". More examples of such similarities can be found relation to shrines. For example, Gregory of Tours’ description of the pagan shrine near Cologne, where people would make offerings to carved images of their gods in hope for healing is reminiscent of the Christian practice of incubation. At the end of the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great condemned the practices of Brunhild’s subjects of sacrificing animals and worshipping trees, in a letter to her. Palmer mentions how Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, commented on the fact that Christians had paid

121 Incubation: ritual sleep in a sanctuary in order to obtain a dream, mostly for healing. Incubation is known from sanctuaries of Asclepius, but also from other healing sanctuaries like the Amphitheatrum at Oropus. Such sanctuaries mostly had specific halls where patients slept during the night, with high walls to prevent prying. Aristophanes in *Plutus* gives a detailed description of a night in the Asclēpiēum in Piraeus, while the healing inscriptions from Epidaurus, Rome, and Pergamum although directly aimed at promoting the cult, allow some insights into the nature of the dreams, as does the diary of Aelius Aristides. Source: *Incubation*, ed. John Roberts, (Oxford, 2007).
people to stop thunder and hail, turning to other beliefs than the Christian faith in the process. Agobard proceeded with even giving what could be taken as a positive comment on paganism as opposed to such people: ‘so much stupidity has already oppressed the wretched world that Christians now believe things so absurd that no one ever before could persuade the pagans to believe them, even though these pagans were ignorant of the Creator of all things.’

Caesarius of Arles, in the early sixth century denounced these practices in one of his sermons:

> Audivimus aliquos ex vobis ad arbores vota reddere, ad fontes orare, auguria diabolica observare: de qua re tantus dolor est in animis nostris, ut nullam possimus consolationem recipere. Sunt enim, quod peius est, infelices et miseri, qui paganorum fana non solum destruere nolunt, sed etiam quae destructa fuerant aedificare nec metuunt nec erubescunt.

It is clear from the abovementioned examples, that Christianity was affected by paganism in much more than its incorporation of pagan festivals. Some similarities that one might find, however, are not related to Christianity borrowing from paganism or vice-versa, and a scholar must always keep this possibility in mind.

What the reader might perhaps find more shocking, is that paganism incorporated a large amount of Christian elements as well. For instance, specialised cult houses seem to have started appearing from the third to sixth centuries AD. This could be Christian influence (although it is possible that it was Roman influence as well). More importantly, Anders Andrén writes that the practice of wearing a Þórr hammer around one’s neck seems to have been an emulation of the wearing of the cross (or a response to that). The pagans seemed to see Christianity in a very strange way. For instance, the Frisian king Radbod, a pagan, was about
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124 Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones Caesarii Uel Ex Aliis Fontibus Hausti*. sermo: 53, cap. 1. Translation: ‘We have heard that some of you make vows to trees, pray to fountains and practice diabolical augury. What is worse, there are some unfortunate and miserable people who are not only unwilling to destroy the shrines of the pagans but even are not afraid or ashamed to build up those which have been destroyed.’ Source: *Sermons*, trans. M. M. Muller (Washington, 1957). p. 263.
to convert to Christianity, when it occurred to him to ask whether his ancestors would be in heaven or hell. When he was told that they would be in hell, he changed his mind saying that he would not leave his predecessors ‘to live in the heavenly kingdom with a few poor people’.

The comparison with Christianity shows better than anything how ‘loose’ paganism was as a religion. As with all pagan religions, having no specific scripture, religious hierarchy, temples or priesthood, Germanic paganism was open to change, as opposed to more structuralised religions such as Christianity.

While there is little doubt that Germanic paganism and Christianity affected each other, the examples mentioned above are far from conclusive and cannot help in finding out more about the pagan religion itself. Such similitudes, for example the similarity of incubation with the worship of carved images of gods mentioned above, are very thin and may be unrelated. Similarly, the appearance of cult houses in Scandinavia may be unrelated to Christianity (for instance, Uppåkra was earlier, as seen above). Just as with similarities found with other Indo-European religions, unless there is direct evidence to believe otherwise, comparisons are hardly fruitful. In fact, the importance of trees, wells and springs that is seen in Christianity could have been the result of incorporation of other beliefs, or it could indeed be part of Christianity itself; after all, the Cross could be compared to a tree.

8. Conclusion

Taking into consideration all the elements of paganism seen above, the problems that come with studying each of the sources (and the absence of sources themselves) mentioned in this chapter, most comparisons (especially to other religions or cultures) are inherently doomed to the realm of distant possibility unless undertaken very carefully and with more specific goals.

---

in mind. While a number of elements reminiscing of Christianity or other religions may be seen while reading *Grímnismál*, some of which will be even discussed below, in all cases there are arguments against such juxtapositions. The scope of this chapter was to provide with all kinds of sources available for the study of pagan myth and belief, while showing all problems that arise from using them in order to show that the approach followed in this thesis could possibly come to more valuable results. By focusing only on the source itself (and a handful of other sources of particular interest) and trying to understand the specific beliefs and practices of the people of the region and time of its composition, there is less room for error. Thus, this study of *Grímnismál* will be following Andrén’s premise on the nature of paganism.
Part 2 *Grímnismál*: Manuscripts and Contents

Chapter 1. Manuscripts

In order to understand *Grímnismál* in the versions in which it survives, and also in order to help any possible dating of what may have been the relative time period in which its original form might have been composed, a study of the surviving manuscripts is of the utmost importance. Before starting such an analysis, and showing the dating techniques and conclusions for each, some basic but important things should be discussed. *Grímnismál* survives in two manuscripts, GKS 2365 4to (hereafter GKS), and AM 748 I 4to (hereafter AM). According to Vésteinn Ólason, mistakes in spelling and some other details, and the comparison with other manuscripts, such as AM, prove that GKS is a copy and not an original.\(^{129}\) The same can be said about AM, and it seems likely that there was at least one older archetype that connects them. Trying to create a stemma from two manuscripts, one of which is in a very fragmentary form, is a counter-productive and needless job. Moreover, it does not seem like either manuscript was directly copied from the other. However, it should be important to show a small passage for Hreinn Benediktsson’s ground breaking study of Icelandic Script:

> There can be little doubt that what is now preserved of writings from the early period, down to the late thirteenth century, is only a relatively insignificant part of what was actually written in Iceland during this period, the extant sources tell us of a number of literary works which originated in this period, but of which no manuscript is now preserved. Textual critics and literary historians insert a greater or smaller number of lost copies or versions as intermediate between the ultimate original and the extant copies of a great many other works. And this is confirmed by the fact that, on the evidence of certain paleographic and orthographic features, the great majority of the extant manuscripts, even the earliest ones, can be shown to be, not originals, but transcripts of earlier copies, now lost, which, in turn, may have been transcripts, and so on.\(^ {130}\)

---


More recent scholars, such as Matthew Driscoll, have come to similar conclusions, with Driscoll estimating that less than 10% of medieval Icelandic manuscripts survive today.\textsuperscript{131} As Hreinn points out, Icelandic manuscript writing probably developed as a result of the conversion to Christianity in 1000.\textsuperscript{132} Thus, an earlier manuscript of Grímnismál or the Elder Edda in general is unlikely to have existed from a pagan hand. In his study, Hreinn also concludes that whereas Icelandic history is directly related to Norway, Icelandic writing did not develop from Norwegian. Norwegian writing was based on English writing, but it is evident from the Caroline script found in Icelandic manuscripts that Icelandic script was ‘a direct offshoot of the general medieval Latin writing. It was adapted directly to the Icelandic vernacular.’\textsuperscript{133} Only the writing of characters such as ‘þ’ and ‘ð’ would have been influenced by insular script, which had on turn taken them from earlier Germanic writing.

This is the background which the two manuscripts analysed here come from. The above mentioned information is important to be kept in mind, especially when it comes to trying to understand whether Grímnismál (together with the other poems of the Elder Edda) is of a pagan nature or not. More importantly, this shows that the chances of this poem having survived exactly in the way it is found in GKS and AM intact in its (possible) pagan roots, is an improbability. Whether it was the editor to one of those two manuscripts or someone before him, stanzas are bound to have been left out, words changed, and material added. The following analysis, however, is based in Grímnismál as found in these two manuscripts and not in what it might have been at the time of composition.

\textsuperscript{132} Hreinn Benediktsson. p. 18.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid. p. 34.
1. **GKS 2365 4to Manuscript**

GKS consists of 45 folios, sized 19.0x12.0cm.\(^{134}\) After folio 33, there is a quire missing. According to Vésteinn, this would be eight folios long.\(^{135}\) This would make the whole manuscript 106 pages long. It contains twenty-eight Eddic poems. It used to be part of the Royal Collection in Copenhagen (where it gets the GKS classmark from – and its unofficial name of *Codex Regius* of the *Poetic Edda*), was returned to Iceland in 1971, and is now held at the *Stofnun Árna Magnússonar* of the University of Iceland.\(^{136}\) According to Frands Herschend, GKS is a copy of a lost original.\(^{137}\) By looking at the headings contained in the whole manuscript, not every poem found in modern editions is preceded by a heading in the manuscript. Instead, it appears as if *Skírnismál* were part of *Grímnismál*, and the prose introduction to *Grímnismál* were a different entity compared to the poem itself. According to Herschend, this shows that the editor to GKS was ‘unwilling to present extracts of larger poems as poems or sections in their own right. Their treatment is suggestive, and what remains of the poems is probably as significant as what is left out.’\(^{138}\) By reading Herschend’s excellent study of the manuscript headings and their importance for our understanding of both the manuscript and the poems in it, it is evident that *Grímnismál* would have been considered to be important by the editor. The headings are written in red ink, and are difficult to discern (at least through the digital facsimile) while the larger initials are either in red or green ink. One can find marginalia throughout the manuscript. However, margins are reduced a lot by the trimming of the manuscript. A few minor holes are found throughout the manuscript but they all appear to be from the time of production and not later damage. For instance, on the 28th page, one can

---


\(^{136}\) Matthew James Driscoll and Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir, *Manuscripts from the Arnamagnæan Collection* (Ljubljana, 2015). p. 34.


find such a hole that has been sewn together with a green thread. A different argument has been made by Lassen. She writes that the compiler of this collection of poems might not have been the same person as the scribe, and that by looking at orthographical and palæographical sources, one can argue that the poems were compiled from many different written collections. This would agree with theory that Snorri had only three of these poems in front of him when he wrote the *Snorra Edda*: thus, only one of these small collections. Throughout the manuscript one can find a few notes in Árni Magnússon’s hand; 1 recto shows the signature of bishop Brynjólfr Sveinsson with the date of 1643, and this is the earliest date we have on the manuscript. We know that Brynjólfr sent the manuscript to Frederick III of Denmark in 1662 as a present. The binding is from 1992, and therefore can provide no help with dating the manuscript.

*Grímnismál* starts at the thirty-first line of the sixteenth page of the GKS manuscript. It ends at the twenty-first page towards the end of the ninth line, just before *Skírnismál* starts. In dating GKS, I shall focus specifically on the above-mentioned folia, since my interest lies purely in *Grímnismál* for the purposes of this thesis. Haraldur Bernharðsson’s handbook for dating Icelandic manuscripts is what I will follow. For my transcription I have used the digital facsimile found in handrit.is.

Throughout the poem and the prose introduction and conclusion, ‘þ’ is used predominantly, with ‘ð’ appearing sometimes in non-initial position. There seems to be no set

---

139 “Eddukvæði — Sæmundar-Edda,” (Stofnun Árna Magnússonar (Háskoli Íslands)).
141 “Eddukvæði.”
142 Haraldur gave this handout during the Aramangnæan summer school in manuscript studies held in Reykjavík 2015. I am very thankful for this concise guide on all the steps that need to be taken for dating Icelandic manuscripts.
143 “Eddukvæði.”
rule in distinguishing between the two, as, for example, one can find ‘Geirroþr’ (17 recto, line 6), and ‘geirroðr’ (17 recto, line 8). This information points towards the Intermediate Period of the use of ‘þ’ and ‘ð’, which is between c1225 and 1375/1400. The second step comes in the study of the middle voice. Orthographically, the middle voice ending changed between ‘-sc’, ‘-z’, ‘-zt’, ‘-zst’, ‘-st’, depending on the time period. Throughout Grímnismál, one finds but a few examples of the use of the middle voice. However, all of the middle voices end in ‘-z’.

Some examples are ‘varaz’ (17 recto, line 16), ‘nefndiz’ (in the same page, line 20), or ‘steyptiz’, (21 recto, line 8). This would put the manuscript in the dates between 1225 and 1500.

Continuing with the third step, one has to analyse the letter ‘f’ and its form. ‘Ꚇundo’ (17 recto, line 2), has an insular ‘f’. The upper horizontal bar bends slightly downward towards the lower bar. ‘Ꚇostraþi’, in the same page, line three, uses a similar ‘f’. The use of the insular ‘f’ points towards the intermediate period, between c1225 and 1375/1400. Since the ‘f’ has a bend of the upper horizontal bar, but not as much as making it a two-lobe insular ‘f’, this would point more towards a central time of the intermediate period rather than the years closer to c1225 or 1400.

Consequently, a number of orthographic features in the manuscript can help with its dating. Firstly, it should be pointed out, that to properly date a manuscript based on orthographic features alone, a very substantial amount of text is required. GKS is indeed a substantial source. Looking at the ‘ø’ and ‘ǫ’ can provide linguistic evidence. Initially they were distinct, with their Proto Nordic vowels being ‘e’ and ‘a’ respectively. However, in the early thirteenth century, the two vowels merged. In GKS, there are plenty of examples that show such merger, pointing to a composition later than the early 1200s.144

Another merger is

---

144 Some examples can be seen in the following words, with their normalised Old Norse equivalents having been taken from Grímnismál, ed. Gustav Neckel, Second ed., v. 1 (Heidelberg, 1927):

- gǫngomk – gongomc (9 recto, line 28)
- Geirrøðar – geirróþar (9 recto, line 31)
- giǫld – giold (9 recto, line 33)
- þókþo – þóþo (9 verso, line 4)
- Søkkvabekkr – Søcva beccr (9 verso, line 5)
- glǫð – glað (9 verso, line 6)
‘ǽ/ǭ’ with ‘ó/œ’, to form ‘æ’. According to Haraldur, there were two different sounds originally, with ‘ǽ’ being the result of i-umlaut of ‘á’, and ‘ǿ’ from i-umlaut of ‘ó’. In the case of this manuscript, trying to date based on this linguistic feature proved to be somewhat problematic. As can be seen by the examples, there does seem to be a distinction between the two sounds, though examples such as ‘fekin’ (10 recto, line 9), show that this was possibly changing.\textsuperscript{145} This would place the manuscript in probably the early part of the intermediate period, 1225-1375, in which scribes used distinct symbols for both sounds, but not consistently, the changes slowly disappearing in the course of the 1300s. A last phonological change to be seen is in ‘y’ becoming unrounded, for example ‘fyrir’ becoming ‘firir’. This general unrounding happened in the early fifteenth century. In the case of GKS there seem to be no such instances.\textsuperscript{146}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Valhøll – valha\textsuperscript{ll} (9 verso, line 8) \\
Miǫk – Mióc (9 verso, line 10) \\
skọptom - fc\textsuperscript{r}pton (9 verso, line 11) \\
orns - òrn (9 verso, line 10) \\
mių – miöp (9 verso, line 17) \\
Niørōr – niórpr (9 verso, line 21) \\
mogr – maugr [m\textsuperscript{a}gr] (9 verso, lines 23-24) \\
foður - f\textsuperscript{a}ðr (9 verso, line 27) \\
Heriafōr – heria f\textsuperscript{a}ður (9 verso, line 27) \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{145} Examples, in the same form as above and with ibid. as a source for the normalised edition:

\begin{tabular}{l}
naetr – nétr (9 recto, line 29) \\
Bør – Bor (9 verso, line 3) \\
svæfær - f\textsuperscript{v}ðer (9 verso, line 21) \\
lætsk – łęzk (9 verso, line 24) \\
fřečn – f\textsuperscript{č}cn (9 verso, line 24) \\
Sæhrímni - ře hrimni (9 verso, line 25) \\
æ – ġ (9 verso, line 28) \\
Lærðs – læra\textsuperscript{s} (10 recto, line 5) \\
Sečin - fečin (10 recto, line 9) \\
ðøma – døma (10 recto, line 16) \\
roetr – rôtr (10 recto, line 20) \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{146} Some examples can be seen in the following words, with their normalised Old Norse equivalents having been taken from Neckel Kuhn ibid.:

\begin{tabular}{l}
Firr - řir (9 recto, line 28) \\
drykkiar - drycciar (9 recto, line 32) \\
heita – heita (9 verso, line 2) \\
þeim – þeim (9 verso, line 9) \\
þrymheinr – þrym heimr (9 verso, line 12) \\
Breiðablik – Breiða blik (9 verso, line 14) \\
feiknstafi - řeikn flåti (9 verso, line 15) \\
Freyia - þreyia (9 verso, line 18) \\
\end{tabular}
Furthermore, phonological changes that started happening towards the end of the intermediate period (from the second half of the thirteenth century), but became more prominent from 1300 onwards, like the change of ‘vá’ to ‘vo’ (váði to vodí), the fricativisation of ‘t’ in unstressed word-final positions (þat to þad), the fricativisation of ‘k’ in unstressed word-final position (sik to sig), the diphthongisation of ‘eng’ to ‘eing’ (gengu to geingu), the u-insertion (niðr to niður), the diphthongisation of ‘ɛ’ (þér to þier) or the merger of ‘ll’ to ‘rl’ (öllungis to örlungis) and ‘nn’ to ‘rn’ (einn to eirn), are all absent completely, further pointing towards an early writing.

Orthographic features, like the replacement of ‘c’ by ‘k’, can help with dating the manuscript as well. In the case of Grímnismál, both ‘c’ and ‘k’ are used, interchangeably. The letter ‘c’ was gradually replaced by ‘k’ during the thirteenth century, and was rarely used in the fourteenth. Throughout the folia of Grímnismál, small capital letters used to denote geminate consonants are heavily present. Examples are plenty, for example in ‘Geirroþr’ (17 recto, line 6), or ‘Oþinn’ (17 recto, line 10). The use of small capitals decreased during the fourteenth century, and they were very rarely used after 1400. One does not find the palatisation of ‘g’ and ‘k’ either, another pointer to a pre-fourteenth century writing.

Lastly, looking at the palæography of the manuscript, it is evident that the script is written in a Gothic bookhand (also known as Textualis) hand, a script that developed in the second half of the thirteenth century, and was dominant until the first half of the fourteenth century. The text is narrow and regular and very easy to read. The curves are more angular, as can be seen in the ‘g’ and ‘r’ in ‘geirroð’ (9 recto, line 4). Some double consonants are conjoined, such as ‘piccia’ (9 recto, line 14). ‘u’ and ‘v’ is the same, as in ‘um’ and ‘vetrinn’ (9 Recto, line 3). However, looking at the capitalised forms of these letters, it is evident that

eitt – eitt (9 verso, line 27)
fyr – fyr (9 verso, line 32)
fyrir – fyr (10 verso, line 2)
there is a difference. ‘V’ in ‘Vindr’ (9 recto, line 1) is a good example of a curved capitalised ‘V’ which is Insular and appeared around 1200 in Iceland. It is rarely found after 1300. The left ascender is forked. With the exception of capitalised letters, the ascenders and descenders are not very long relative to the body. The ‘o’ are oval as in ‘pundo’ (9 recto, line 2). Some letters are conjoined, such as ‘ci’, which sometimes looks like an ‘a’ as a result. For example ‘ſcipino’ (9 recto, line 7) has the above mentioned instance but also shows how ‘ſ’ is conjoined to ‘c’ by a small line extending from its lower right side. All these elements mentioned here are typical of the Gothic script. However, in all cases, the characteristics are not strongly pronounced (for instance, minims are easily distinguishable). This could point towards an early Gothic period (or a more conservative scribe). The uncial ‘d/ð’ with a slanted shaft is present throughout the manuscript for both ‘d’ and ‘ð’. This ‘d/ð’ appeared in 1200. The ‘r’ rotunda is present after ‘o’, such as in ‘born’ (9 recto, line 12), but also after ‘d/ð’, as in ‘geirräðr’ (9 recto, line 10). The ‘r’ rotunda is not present after ‘a’, ‘y’, ‘v’, and ‘h’, though, a practice that started in the second half of the fourteenth century. As such, this pattern is most likely to be from sometime between 1250 and 1350. A last element to look at is the letter ‘a’. Throughout the manuscript, the ‘a’ is uncial, with a bowl and neck bending down slightly towards the bowl. For instance ‘aland’ (9 recto, line 7). This became predominant during the thirteenth century, and was gradually replaced by a two-storey ‘a’ during the second half of the thirteenth century.

By looking at all those conclusions and putting them together, one can conclude that GKS was written in a period between 1250 and 1300. This conclusion agrees with every single dating technique used above, and also agrees with the dating given to the manuscript by other secondary literature, such as handrit.is which places its composition to 1260-1280,147 Vésteinn Ólason who places it to the second half of the thirteenth century,148 the Íslenzk Fornrit edition

147 “Eddukvæði.”
to 1270,\textsuperscript{149} and others, like Clunies-Ross as well.\textsuperscript{150} Whereas all agree, dates such as 1260-1280, or even specifically the 1270s, seem to me to be too specific for us to know for sure, and the lack of many manuscripts with the same sources, or manuscripts from the same hand, does not help with decreasing other factors, such as the scribe being particularly old fashioned, or the exact opposite, which must be taken into consideration. As such, a half century dating such as 1250-1300 seems more inclusive of all those factors.

2. AM 748 I 4to Manuscript

The AM manuscript survives only in fragmentary form. Only six sheets of the AM manuscript fragment are preserved, and they can be found in the Arnamagnæan Institute of the University of Copenhagen. The fragment is very precious since it is the only other source apart from GKS to contain extant texts of Eddic poetry, and the only source in which Baldrs draumar survives. The poems contained in what survives of this manuscript are, in order of appearance: Hárbarðsljóð, Baldrs draumar, Skírnismál, Vafþrúðnismál, Grímnismál, Hymiskviða, and Völundarkviða. Of these, only Grímnismál and Hymiskviða are complete while the rest are in partial form (only the beginning of the prose introduction to Völundarkviða survives, with no poetry). Of further importance to the study of Eddic poetry is the order of these poems, which is very different to that found in GKS, something that suggests one manuscript is not a direct copy of the other. The fragment once was a single codex which included AM, which was separated by Árni Magnússon (1663-1730), dividing the Eddic poetry of the I fragment from Skaldskaparmál and genealogical lists relating to the Sturlungar in the II fragment.\footnote{Driscoll and Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir. p. 43.} This second fragment is comprised of 22 leaves. Concerning AM’s provenance, it is known that Árni got it from Halldór Torfason from Gaulverjabær. According to Driscoll and Svanhildur Óskasdóttir, the manuscript probably belonged to bishop Brynjólfur Sveinsson of Skálholt, who bequeathed all his belongings to Halldór’s father, Torfi Jónsson.\footnote{Ibid. p. 43.} If this were true, then this would mean that both surviving manuscripts of Eddic poetry once belonged to the same person, Brynjólfur Sveinsson. This is hardly of any help in dating the manuscripts, or learning anything more about their provenance, but it is definitely an interesting detail. Just like GKS, AM has red headings. It is similarly small in size and has no illustrations or decorations (at least not in the surviving leaves). This shows that neither manuscript was considered to be very
important, or great masterpieces, at the time of creation and were not produced in the most expensive (and visually stunning) way possible, such as, for example, AM 132 fol (Möðruvallabók) was. For my transcription I have used the digital facsimile edition found in notendur.hi.is, taken from Finnur’s facsimile edition of 1896.\textsuperscript{153} As above, Haraldur’s sourcebook has been of immense help in the analysis and dating of the manuscript.

When it comes to ‘þ’ and ‘ð’, the scribe is much more regular than in GKS. ‘þ’ appears predominantly in word initial positions, with some exceptions being, for instance, in compound words such as ‘gunnþro’ (4 verso, line 28), ‘fimbulþul’ (4 verso, line 28). A change to the usual scribal features is seen in ‘þaþan’ (4 verso, line 27), ‘hæþan’ (5 recto, line 4). Taking the example from above, ‘gæirrǫðr’ is found consistently throughout the manuscript (for example in 3 verso, lines 24, 28, 29, 30). On the other hand, ‘ð’ is written in a similar way to ‘d’. Since, as Haraldur writes, this does not denote a change in the pronunciation of the two letters, in my edition I have transcribed the words that would have a ‘ð’ sound with an ‘ð’ and ‘d’ with ‘d’. The regularity of such scribal features may point to a later date than the GKS manuscript, though they both still fall in the intermediate period based on the dental fricatives. Looking at the middle voice, similar problems arise as with the GKS manuscript (since the text is almost the same). ‘varaz’ is found (4 recto, line 6), ‘naefndiz’ (4 recto, line 11), and ‘stæýttiz’ (5 verso, line 24). These are exactly the same as GKS when it comes to the middle voice, and therefore would place it at a date between 1225-1500. Continuing to the ‘f’, just as the GKS, AM has insular ‘f’. Looking at the same word as above, ‘postræði’ (3 verso, line 28) has a lower descender that is more curved than in the GKS. However, as a whole, the ‘f’ would point toward the intermediate period as well, thus between c1225 and 1375/1400. The bend of the upper horizontal bar is not highly accentuated and there is no bend of the lower insular bar (two-lobe insular ‘f’), as is the case for later manuscripts of this period. As such, this can help by removing

\textsuperscript{153} “Eddukvæði,” (Den Arnamagnæanske Samling (University of Copenhagen), 1896).
the latter part of this time period and it narrows down the dating to c1225 to sometimes before
the middle of the fourteenth century.

Turning to linguistic features, AM also shows the merger of ‘o’ and ‘œ’ into a single
sound, pointing to a composition post early-thirteenth century. In the case of the ‘ǽ/ᵉ’ with
‘∅/∅’, to form ‘œ’ merger, the contrasts with GKS are strong. In fact, throughout Grímnismál
AM, one can see ‘œ’ is predominant for both ‘œ’ and “œ” sounds. There are two cases in which
one can find ‘ǽ’ used, ‘Bǽr’ (4 recto, line 9) normalised as ‘Bær’, and ‘ǽ’ (4 verso, line 15)
normalised as ‘œ’. It is evident that these changes do not show a pattern. As such, it looks
like AM is from the late intermediate period, since there is a very small difference in the
symbols used, but one that does not follow consistently the origins of the vowels. This would
place it between 1300 and 1375/1400, in all probability. Lastly, looking at the ‘y’ being
unrounded, as opposed to GKS, one can find sporadic examples of rounded ‘y’, such as ‘þreýia’

154 Similarly to GKS 2365 4to, some examples can be seen in the following words, with their normalised Old
Norse equivalents having been taken from Grímnismál, I. Text. :
gongomk – gongumz (4 recto, line 17)
Geirrðar – Geirrðar (4 recto, line 20)
giǫld – giæld (4 recto, line 22)
Þokþo – Þoktu (4 recto, line 25)
Søkkvabækkr – Søckva bækr (4 recto, line 26)
gloð – gloð (4 recto, line 28)
Valhǫll – vál hǫll (4 recto, line 29)
Mioq – Mioc (4 recto, line 31)
skǫptum – skóptum (4 recto, line 30)
þrn – ðrn (4 verso, line 1)
miǫð – mið (4 verso, line 6)
Niǫrðr – niǫrðr (4 verso, line 10)
mǫgr – mǫgr (4 verso, line 12)
Þður – þður (4 verso, line 12)
Heriafðr – Hæria þðr (4 verso, line 14)

155 The normalised Old Norse text has been taken from ibid. :
nætr – nætr (4 recto, line 19)
Bær – Bær (4 recto, line 25)
svæfr – svæfr (4 verso, line 9)
lætsk – læz (4 verso, line 12)
frœkn – frœkn (4 verso, line 12)
Sæhrimni – Sæ hrimni (4 verso, line 13)
ǽ – æ (4 verso, line 15)
Læraðs – læraðþ (4 verso, line 25)
Sækin – fækin (4 verso, line 28)
dœma – dœma (5 recto, line 5)
rætr – rætr (5 recto, line 8)
Since the proper unrounding of ‘y’ happened much later, in the fifteenth century, but few instances can be seen since the 1200s, these few examples do not allow precise dating, other than showing that the manuscript is probably pre-fifteenth century. As above, it must be said that since this analysis is specifically based on the part of AM that has *Grímnismál*, linguistic changes are not as easy to see since there is not a substantial amount of words available for a proper study. However, they ultimately agree with the rest of the dating so can be used as an (albeit weaker) further support.

Phonological changes in the Old Icelandic language show the following information and conclusions. Just as with GKS, changes such as ‘vá’ to ‘vo’, the fricativisation of ‘t’ in unstressed word-final positions, the fricativisation of ‘k’ in unstressed word-final position, the diphthongisation of ‘eng’ to ‘eing’, the u-insertion, the diphongisation of ‘é’, the merger of ‘ll’ to ‘rl’ and ‘nn’ to ‘rn’ are all absent, therefore showing that the manuscript is much likelier to have been written before 1375.

Orthographic changes, such as ‘c’ to ‘k’ are more helpful since, in this case, differences are found. For instance, ‘*komu*’ (4 verso, line 30) is used throughout the poem, while there is no ‘*comu*’ to be found. With very few exceptions, such as ‘*Miǫc*’ (4 recto, line 31), and the ‘I-c’ symbol, found for example in ‘*pekc*’ (4 verso, line 28) in which one cannot be sure whether it was meant to be read as a single symbol for a ‘kk’ or ‘cc’, or as a symbol for a ‘k’ preceeding a ‘c’. In my transcription I have chosen the latter, but I would not count it as a

---

156 The normalised Old Norse text has been taken from ibid.:  
Firr – ŋirr (4 recto, line 18)  
drykkia – dyrkkia (4 recto, line 21)  
heita – hæita (4 recto, line 24)  
þeim – þeim (4 verso, line 1)  
þrýmheimr – Þrýmhæimr (4 verso, line 2)  
Breiðablik – Braeiða blio (4 verso, line 3)  
feiknsafl – þeiknsafl (4 verso, line 5)  
Freyia – ðreyia (4 verso, line 7)  
eitt – æitt (4 verso, line 15)  
fyr – þiri (4 verso, line 19)  
fyrir – þiri (5 recto, line 20)
support for further dating the manuscript, since it is impossible to know what the scribe meant, and all three spellings can make sense (similarly all the ‘oc’ have been expanded from a symbol, and the reason for a ‘c’ as opposed to a ‘k’ is purely editorial). Such an orthographic change would date the manuscript to the fourteenth century, and points to AM being a newer manuscript than GKS, though it is important to note that one scribe might have been more innovative, or the other more conservative. Small capitals to denote geminate consonants is present throughout the manuscript, for example in ‘prigg’ (4 recto, line 7). Small capitals were rarely used after the early fifteenth century. Just as in GKS, there is no palatisation of ‘g’ and ‘k’, pointing to a similar dating as the one given by the small capitals.

Lastly, looking at the palæographical features we can deduce the following information. The hand is Gothic/Textualis as well. However, in this case, it seems to be later, as the features are more accentuated. The script is narrow and the ascenders and descenders are generally shorter relative to the body, as in ‘ifal’ (4 verso, line 7). A few cursive script elements can be seen, such as the loops on both ascenders and descenders. For example the “h” does that, as in ‘hangir’ (4 verso, line 1), where the descender loops leftwards to end up in a ‘b’ like form. Another instance of such loops can be seen in some of the ‘f’, as in ‘fvegir’ (4 verso, line 9), and similarly the ‘Þ’, as can be seen in the same word. The minims are hard to distinguish in some cases, as in ‘mikill’ (4 verso, line 18). As a whole, this script is less regular and more narrow and difficult to read. Though it would be placed in a Gothic/Textualis category, it seems to be particularly late and close to the period in which the cursive script took over. This was in the second half of the fourteenth century. Therefore, AM is likelier to be from the first half of the fourteenth century than the second half of the thirteenth century. The insular ‘V’ seems to not be present, with the ‘V’ being less pronounced, as in ‘Valgrind’ (4 verso, line 18). This would agree with the dating of the hand, since the insular ‘V’ was rarely seen after 1300. The ‘d/ð’ is uncial and with a slanted shaft. In some cases, such as ‘dag’ (4 verso, 8) it is simple,
while in others, such as ‘hæriaðdur’ (4 verso, line 24) there is a curved stroke from the tip of the shaft down to the right side of the bowl. This latter feature became predominant from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards. The use of both ‘d/ð’ forms would point towards a period close to that. The ‘r’ rotunda is present after ‘o’, as in ‘forna’ (4 verso, line 3), and after other letters such as ‘d/ð’, as seen in ‘brudr’ (4 verso, line 3), or ‘vördr’ (4 verso, line 6). It is not found after other letters. For example ‘mogr’ (4 verso, line 12) has a normal ‘r’. This points to a composition after the second half of the fourteenth century and before the fifteenth century. Lastly, the ‘a’ is a two storey ‘a’. It is somewhat more regular than the ‘a’ found in GKS, with all instances having a bend of the neck. Examples are plenty: ‘goda’ (4 verso, line 6), ‘áttu’ (4 verso, line 5), ‘valglámni’ (4 verso, line 18). This would place the dating in the period after the second half of the thirteenth century, but more likely in the first half of the fourteenth century.

Taking all this information together, the conclusions on the dating of this manuscript would place it in a period between 1300-1350. Once again, this conclusion agrees with previous secondary scholarship. For instance, the Íslenzk Fornir edition of the Elder Edda places the writing of this manuscript to 1300 or the first quarter of the fourteenth century.\(^{157}\) notendur.hi.is, where the facsimile I used has been taken from (which follows Finnur’s edition of 1896) also gives the same dates.\(^{158}\) Just as with GKS, I would prefer a safer dating that would not go any further than giving a half century span, since there are lots of variables and not enough comparative sources in order to be any more scientifically accurate.

\(^{157}\) Jónas Kristjánsson and Vésteinn Ólason. p. 23.

\(^{158}\) “Eddukvædi.” 2.
### Table 1: Dating of the two manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>GKS 2365 4to</th>
<th>AM 748 I 4to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \dot{b} ) and ( \dot{d} )</td>
<td>c1225 - c1375/1400</td>
<td>c1225 - c1375/1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Voice</td>
<td>1225 - 1500</td>
<td>1225 - 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>c1225 - c1375</td>
<td>c1225 - c1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta + \varphi &gt; \ddot{o} )</td>
<td>After 1200</td>
<td>After 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ddot{a} ) + ( \ddot{e} ) (( \ddot{a} ) &gt; ( \ddot{e} ))</td>
<td>c1225 – 1375 (probably before 1300s)</td>
<td>c1300 – 1375/1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( i + y &gt; i, i + \acute{y} &gt; \acute{i} ), ( ey + ei &gt; ei )</td>
<td>Before 15th century</td>
<td>Before 15th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{vá} ) to ( \text{vo} )</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricativisation of ( t )</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricativisation of ( f )</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphthongisation of ( \text{eng} ) to ( \text{eing} )</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-insertion</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphthongisation of ( \ddot{e} )</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merger of ( \text{ll} ) to ( \text{rl} )</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merger of ( \text{nn} ) to ( \text{rn} )</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
<td>Before 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c )</td>
<td>Around the 13th century, before 14th century</td>
<td>14th century, possibly 13th but not early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small capitals</td>
<td>Before 15th century, probably before 14th too</td>
<td>Before 15th century, probably before 14th too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatisation of ( g ) and ( k )</td>
<td>Before 15th century, probably before 14th too</td>
<td>Before 15th century, probably before 14th too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Gothic/Textualis, after 1250, before 1350.</td>
<td>Late Gothic/Textualis, elements of Cursive, Between 1300-1350.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insular ( v )</td>
<td>Before 1300</td>
<td>After 1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d )</td>
<td>After 1200</td>
<td>1300-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r ) rotunda</td>
<td>After the middle of the 13th century, before 1350</td>
<td>After the middle of the 13th century, before 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a )</td>
<td>13th century</td>
<td>After the middle of the 13th century, predominant in the 14th century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2. Editing Notes

1. Printed Edition

A good number of editions of Eddic poems have been published in the past two hundred years. However, I chose to transcribe Grímnismál by myself from the two manuscripts and make an edition for each. The reason for this is that whereas most of these editions have normalised the spelling and made it more accessible and similar to modern Icelandic, for the purposes of my research I believe that the poem should be presented in as conservative a form as it can be. Choosing to produce an edition of each manuscript version instead of one for both is natural a choice, since the two versions vary slightly from one another.\textsuperscript{159} This has also been done in the recent Íslenzk fornrit edition of the Edda but only for Völuspá,\textsuperscript{160} a choice which Judy Quinn has deemed to be a ‘commendable editorial approach since it allows us to understand the medieval witnesses better and to appreciate the variability inherent in the eddic tradition as an oral mode.’\textsuperscript{161} Choosing one version over the other when it is unknown if one was based on the other (and which one was) gives the reader a version of Grímnismál that never existed in the thirteenth century. Even if Grímnismál could be dated beyond doubt to a few centuries before the composition of GKS and AM, what survives today are those two versions and they should be used as they are in the study of the poem. This is even more important since this edition is also used in an attempt at dating the poem.

The editions produced in my study reflect my wish to show both these versions, their spelling, grammar and possible mistakes exactly as they are found in the manuscripts. As such, I have not made any emendations in changing the ‘c’ to ‘k’, for example. Even more so, I have

\textsuperscript{159} For instance sts. 23-24.
\textsuperscript{160} Völuspá, ed. Jónas Kristjánsson and Vésteinn Ólason, v. 1 (Reykjavík, 2014).
chosen not to emend ‘au’ into ‘ǫ’, ‘ø’ etc. Capitalised letters have been left as such, while the ones that were not, have not been emended, even in the case of given names or place-names. Punctuation has been left exactly as found in each of the two manuscript versions. This edition is meant to be as diplomatic as possible, while also giving the reader ease to read the poem. As such, I have divided the poem by stanzas, following previous editions so that it can be read more easily. I have chosen to keep verses 1-2 and 4-5 in the same line while leaving verses 3 and 6 on their own in order to make it easier to spot alliteration. A further change I have chosen to make was to replace ‘þ’ with ‘f’, ‘l’ with ‘s’, and ‘œ’ with ‘au’. This change makes it much easier for the reader to go through the poem. Abbreviations have been expanded and are not noted in the edition, to help with its readability. Roman numerals found in the poem have been emended into writing (marked in red) in order to help with finding alliteration and internal rhyme. Superscript word additions (or letter additions that were not part of abbreviations) have been written following the same style of the rest of the text, but marked in red. Lastly, what appear to be spelling mistakes by the scribes have been kept in the text but marked in red.

The differences from other editions are important to note. The most commonly used edition is by Gustav Neckel, who follows a similar verse division as my own but heavily regularises the spelling and only notes differences in AM in his footnotes. More recently, Íslenzk fornrit have published a new edition of the Eddic poems, made by Jónas Kristjánsson and Vésteinn Ólason, which I have used whenever quoting other Eddic poems within this thesis. Jónas and Vésteinn have chosen to show each verse in its own, separate line, and have regularised spelling following the traditional Íslenzk fornrit guidelines which bring it closer to modern Icelandic. I personally am more keen on the Íslenzk fornrit edition, when it comes to studying a given poem that I have not edited myself. If one were to regularise, I find the Íslenzk fornrit guidelines easier to read and more modern. As discussed above, the Íslenzk fornrit
edition shows both versions of *Voluspá*, though they have not chosen to do the same with the rest of the poems. A comparison of the three different editions can be seen here:

44. Askr Yggdrasils,    hann er æztr viða,
    en Skíðblaðnir skipa,
Óðinn ása,    en íóa Sleipnir,
Bilrøst brúa,    en Bragi skálda,
Hábrók hauka,    en hunda Garmr.¹⁶²

44. Askr Yggdrasils,
hann er œztr viða
en Skíðblaðnir skipa,
Óðinn ása
en jóa Sleipnir,
Bilrøst brúa
en Bragi skálda,
Hábrók hauka
en hunda Garmr.¹⁶³

---

GKS Edition

44. Ascr yggdrasils | hann er œztr viða
    en scibbladnir scipa
oðinn asa | enn ioa sleipnir
    bilraust brúa
en bragi scalda | habroc hauca
    en hunda garmr.

AM Edition

44. Ascr ýggdrasils | hann ær æztr viða
    ænn skipblapnir skipa
oðinn asa | ænn ioa slæipnir,
    bilraust brua
en bragi skallda | habrok hauka
    ænn hunda garmr
    ænn brimir sværða.

¹⁶² *Grímnismál*. Ed. by Gustav Neckel (Heidelberg, 1927). p. 64.
The differences are obvious. For the purpose of a historical analysis of the text, including its orthography, as has been done in this thesis, a more diplomatic edition of the poem, which includes both manuscript versions, instead of just noting the differences in footnotes, is important. In the case of st. 44, the extra verse in the AM edition could be of great importance, as shall be seen in the commentary below and it being lost in a footnote does not do it justice. It will also be noted that Neckel has divided his verses in a different way in the case of this stanza.

It must be pointed out that throughout the past two centuries, there have been scholars debating whether Grímnismál was composed as one poem, or whether it is a collection of different parts, put together by an Icelandic antiquarian-editor in a similar fashion to Hávamál.164 This practice of ‘chopping’ poems up, and trying to trace the original poem based on one’s expectations, has haunted Eddic scholarship in the past, but now seems to have fallen out of favor. For instance, Müllenhoff, followed by Sijmons and Gering, chose to remove the following stanzas and verses: 43-4, 5-7, 83-4, 10-20, 24, 26-35, 37-41, 43-44, 473-4, 481-2, 494-5, 501. According to them, this way, a well-connected whole that is solely about Óðinn is found, as opposed to an internal unity and cohesion which are lacking from the whole.165 According to Schjødt, in relation to Grímnismál, it was Magnus Olsen who in 1933 succeeded in making a strong case for the poem to be seen as a whole.166 Like Olsen, and Schjødt after him, I cannot claim that every single stanza of Grímnismál is original. However, trying to find which stanzas are older and which not, seems to me to be a somewhat arbitrary ‘butchering’ of the poem. As opposed to a poem like Hávamál, where it is commonly accepted that a number of poems have been connected into the whole that is found in the Elder Edda, Grímnismál makes perfect sense

165 Hugo Sijmons and Barend Gering, Die Lieder Der Edda, v. 3 (Halle, 1901). p. 184.
the way it is, with few verses being an exception, (as shall be discussed in the commentary). In addition to that, an oral poem such as Grímnismál could, and possibly did, have stanzas removed or added throughout the time from its original composition to the first writing down as part of a manuscript. It is possible that a number of verses or stanzas are indeed later interpolations, but choosing to remove them from the two versions that survive is an editorial choice with which I disagree. Where plausible arguments have been made on the interpolation of a stanza, they shall be discussed in the commentary, but my goal in the editions themselves has been to keep everything as close to the original as possible.

Following my edition, I have included a commentary to Grímnismál. The purpose of this commentary is to update the existing one, made by Sijmons and Gering in the beginning of the previous century. Since then, there has not been a commentary on Grímnismál as detailed as theirs. However, especially because of the particularly old date of their scholarship, a large number of discussions and conclusions drawn are problematic or debatable. Furthermore, their work is in German, making it less accessible to the wider public. As such, my goal is to use Sijmons and Gering selectively, focusing mainly on their analysis that agrees with the shifting nature of paganism discussed above, while sometimes showing arguments of theirs that are more problematic. Being mainly a historian and not a textual scholar, I am not going to focus on an in-depth analysis of all the stylistic choices in the poem, nor about syntax, unless I find it to be of importance to the understanding of a verse or stanza as a whole. As I have discussed above, my goal has been to analyse and understand Grímnismál on its own. For the sake of simplicity and to avoid too much repetition, in my commentary I have quoted the GKS version, noting wherever there is variation in AM. The reader will notice that a number of other primary sources are mentioned throughout the commentary. I find those to be important for the usage of the commentary in relation to other poetry, but have been careful not to use any other source in my conclusions about Grímnismál itself. In essence, the goal is to provide a complete and
in-depth analysis of Grímnismál that is based on Grímnismál but that can also be used by scholars disagreeing with my modus operandi on the study of paganism. More recently, Klaus Von See has supervised a project in Frankfurt am Main in which very detailed commentaries have been made for Eddic poetry. A number of volumes have been published, including one that I have used in my study of Sigrdrífumál, though none has been published about Grímnismál and with Von See’s death, it is uncertain whether it will ever be. The Frankfurter Kommentar, as the series is also known, contains updated scholarship on most work done until the date of publication, making Sijmons and Gering somewhat obsolete. While being a project of immense importance and impact on the study of Eddic poetry, if a fault could be found with the Frankfurter Kommentar, it is that the work is purely one of literary criticism, and does not focus on the historical elements as much as it could, which is the main goal in my own commentary.

While working on my edition and commentary, I have translated Grímnismál as well. Instead of providing a full translation to the poem as part of my editions, I have chosen to only provide a translation for each stanza in the commentary. This has been done because of a number of factors. First of all, as any person with a knowledge of Old Norse can easily tell, Larrington’s, Orchard’s, Crawford’s translations, while enjoyable to read, all miss a number of nuances from the Old Norse, or impose one definition when there are many. This is mainly because it is impossible to translate Eddic poetry, while keeping the metre, nuances, content intact while also having kept nicely readable English. A comparison of the above mentioned translations follows:

45. Fleeting visions I have now revealed before the victory-gods’ sons
now the wished-for protection will awaken;
to all the Æsir it will become known

167 Klaus Von See et. al., Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda, v. 5 (Heidelberg, 2006).
on Ægir’s benches,
at Ægir’s feast.\textsuperscript{168}

45. Now I’ve lifted my face before victory-gods’ sons,
so the wished-for sustenance will occur;
it shall fetch in all Æsir
on Ægir’s benches,
at Ægir’s feast.\textsuperscript{169}

45. I have now shown my face
in the presence of gods,
now help is on its way.
It will come
to all the gods
on Aegir’s benches,
when they drink at Aegir’s place.\textsuperscript{170}

45. I have now raised up my glances | before the sons of victory gods,
with this must the desired saving awake.
For all the gods | it must come in
onto the benches of Ægir,
at the drinking of Ægir.

Since this thesis is focused on a more academic audience, likely to be acquainted with Old Norse, I have kept my translation only as part of the commentary, and have chosen to be as literal as possible with it. In a number of cases, such as the example above, this brings awkward

\textsuperscript{170} The Poetic Edda: Stories of the Norse Gods and Heroes, trans. by Jackson Crawford (Indianapolis and Cambridge, 2015). p. 69.
English, but I find it sticks closer to the original, therefore allowing for a better understanding of the contents of the poem.

2. Digital Edition

While a printed edition has its merits, and can be very helpful especially for usage in a class, the advances of technology of the past two decades have digital publishing of critical importance for the future of academia. The Text Encoding Initiative (TEI), funded in 1987, has been able to promulgate the importance of the merge of technology with the humanities.\textsuperscript{171} Recently, a number of academic institutions have participated in an effort to digitise a great amount of primary sources, from digitising manuscripts to creating fully searchable databases. Withing the study of medieval Scandinavia, the great MeNoTa project has subscribed to the TEI ideals, with its aims to ‘preserve and publish medieval texts in digital form and to adapt and develop encoding standards necessary for this work.’\textsuperscript{172} Similarly, projects of massive scale have been undertaken by the University of Iceland, which has created the website handrit.is together with the Arnamagnæan Institute of the University of Copenhagen. The facsimile of GKS that I have used for this thesis was accessed from that site. Lastly, the Skaldic Project which has been editing all surviving skaldic poetry in a series of volumes, the latest on having been published in 2017,\textsuperscript{173} has created a vast digital database of the skaldic poetry the project has worked on, which is accessible through \url{http://skaldic.abdn.ac.uk/db.php}. Following on those footsteps, when making a new edition, I have chosen to include a digital one. This allows for a number of possibilities. First of all, a digital edition is accessible for free to anyone

\textsuperscript{171} “TEI: History,” \url{http://www.tei-c.org/About/history.xml}.
\textsuperscript{172} “Menota,” \url{http://www.menota.org/}.
with internet access, making it better for spreading knowledge worldwide. Following the guidelines set by the TEI, and providing open access to the xml files would allow other scholars to add to the edition, including more information based on their expertise and making a short poem such as *Grimnismál* contain massive amounts of knowledge. Lastly, if similar digital editions were made for all Eddic poetry, new kinds of studies could be done, on the usage of words, style and metre, that are only possible thanks to technology.

As part of my edition, I have chosen to mark stanza, verse and word divisions, making sure to distinguish between the different types of *ljóðahattr* verse, as well as giving a regularised dictionary version of each word in the poem, as can be seen from the example of st. 4:

```
<lg n="4">
  <l n="1">
    <w lemma="land">Land</w>
    <w lemma="vera">er</w>
    <w lemma="heilagr">heilact</w>
  </l>
  <l n="2" type="b-line">
    <w lemma="er">er</w>
    <w lemma="ek">ec</w>
    <w lemma="liggja">liggia</w>
    <w lemma="sjá">se</w>
  </l>
  <l n="3" type="ljod-long">
    <pb xml:id="GKS_2365_4to_9v" n="9v"/>
    <w lemma="áss">asom</w>
    <w lemma="ok">oc</w>
    <w lemma="álfr">alfom</w>
    <w lemma="nær">ner.</w>
  </l>
  <l n="4">
    <w lemma="en">enn</w>
    <w lemma="i">i</w>
    <geogName nymRef="N202">
      <w>þruðheimi</w>
    </geogName>
  </l>
  <l n="5" type="b-line">
```

Each toponym and personal name has been marked as well, and given its regularised form. I have also made a list of all these, and have included it in printed form in Appendix II below. Through the list of dictionary forms, I have added simple translations of each word, thus providing with a very simple glossary to the poem, with each word translation(s) appearing when the mouse hovers over a given word, and as a printed list also provided in Appendix II below. The spelling and editorial choices of each word within Grímnismál follows the same editorial choices discussed in the Printed Edition section above. Lastly, I have given the reader the option to have the two editions facing each other, or just one of their choice, the possibility of showing stanza and verse numbers, and a link to the facsimile marked in red, whenever a new folio starts. The end result looks very similar to my printed editions of the two poems, but contains much more information, which could be expanded greatly in the future as well and can be found by going to https://starescomp.github.io/grimmismal/#idm140518410334752.

3. **Snorri’s Grímnismál**

As part of my edition, I have chosen to include all of Snorri’s quotes of Grímnismál. I have analysed above why the usage of Snorri in the analysis of Eddic poetry can be highly
problematic. However, it should be kept in mind that Snorri was born in 1179 and died in 1241.\textsuperscript{175} This makes him older than the production date of both Eddic manuscripts discussed above. Snorri based \textit{Gylfaginning} on a number of poems, including \textit{Grímnismál} and so using the prose parts which he expanded from such poems in trying to understand those poems makes no sense. Still, it should be noted that Snorri also directly quotes a number of stanzas from \textit{Grímnismál} and other poems. ‘It is clear,’ writes Gunnell, ‘that Snorri had access to complete versions of \textit{Völuspá}, \textit{Grímnismál}, and \textit{Vafþrúðnismál} similar to those found in the Codex Regius.’\textsuperscript{176} Thus, it could be said that the earliest witness to \textit{Grímnismál} that survives is to be found in \textit{Gylfaginning} and not in either of the two above mentioned manuscripts.

While \textit{Gylfaginning} would have been composed before GKS and AM, the earliest extant manuscript, known as the Codex Uppsaliensis (DG 11 4to), found in the University Library Carolina Rediviva in Uppsala, is dated to the early fourteenth century,\textsuperscript{177} and is therefore younger than both GKS and AM. If Snorri is accepted as the author of the \textit{Snorra Edda}, and if the quotes and allusions to \textit{Grímnismál} found in all extant manuscripts that contain \textit{Gylfaginning} are accepted as having been used by Snorri and not added at a later date, the stanzas used by Snorri must predate the surviving manuscripts of \textit{Grímnismál}. This would take the \textit{terminus ante quem} for part of \textit{Grímnismál} back to at least twenty years earlier than the GKS date. It can hardly be argued that any stanza present in Snorri was composed by the scribes of GKS and AM, though they still could have belonged to a different poem that was quoted by Snorri and then interpolated to become part of \textit{Grímnismál}. As seen above, Snorri calls the poems he mentions \textit{forn visendi}, ‘old lore’. \textit{Forn} can be interpreted in many ways, and could both refer to ancient or only a couple of generations back. However, if we accept his

\textsuperscript{175} Snorri Sturluson, \textit{Gylfaginning}, p. xii.
statement that Grímnismál was ‘old’ by the time he composed Gylfaginning, its terminus ante quem could be taken back at least another few decades.

While I have transcribed and edited both GKS and AM myself, doing such a task for Gylfaginning would be a task beyond the scope of this thesis. First of all, the Snorra Edda survive in a number of manuscripts dated up to the seventeenth century. Furthermore, Snorri does not quote all of Grímnismál at once, but rather has stanzas interspersed between his prose. Thus, such a transcription would have to be of snippets taken from different leaves. Lastly, while the usage of a heavily edited version of Gylfaginning such as the one made by Faulkes (which is otherwise excellent) might not work well in conjunction with my two editions because of its emendations, Heimir Pálsson has made an edition based only on the Codex Uppsaliensis (U) which is more diplomatic. I have chosen to quote all of the Grímnismál stanzas as given by Heimir, so that the three earliest extant manuscripts that contain Grímnismál (GKS, AM and U) can be seen and compared. Three numbers can be seen in each stanza quoted. The first numbers only the Grímnismál stanzas in order of appearance. The second, bracketed, gives the respective stanza in the version of Grímnismál from GKS and AM, while the third, in square brackets, shows the number of the stanza as found in Gylfaginning.
Chapter 3. The Poem

As part of this summary, I have chosen to include the information gained from the prose introduction and conclusion in parentheses. This is in order to show that the poem can make sense without the prose additions, and to allow for the possibility that the prose was a later addition to the poem, possibly even by the editor of the manuscript himself.

[King Hrauðungr had two sons, Agnarr and Geirrøðr. One day, the two boys got lost in sea until they got stranded in unknown land. There, they found an old man and his wife who took care of them during the winter. Agnarr was taken care of by the old woman, and Geirrøðr by the old man. The old man got a ship for the two boys and before he let them leave, he spoke privately with Geirrøðr. Just as they arrived back to their land, Geirrøðr jumped out of the ship and pushed it out to sea, and Agnarr was not seen again. Geirrøðr’s arrival was taken warmly, and at the death of his father, he became an excellent king. Óðinn and Frigg were observing the worlds from Hliðskjálfr when they started to argue about Agnarr and Geirrøðr. According to Óðinn, Geirrøðr had grown into a fine ruler, whereas Agnarr was breeding children with a troll-woman. Frigg said that Geirrøðr was a poor host, but Óðinn, not believing this, decided that he would go and check that himself. Frigg sent her maid to make Geirrøðr aware that an evil sorcerer was coming to his lands. She described how he would be clothed and that no dog would leap at him. Whereas normally Geirrøðr was a good host, fearing for his well-being, as soon as he found the man, who called himself Grímnir, the Masked One, he fettered him and tortured him between two fires for eight nights. Geirrøðr’s young son, Agnarr helped Grímnir by offering him a horn of drink, saying that his father had been wrong to torture him for no apparent reason. By that time, the fire had grown so close to Grímnir that his clothes started burning. It was after drinking from the horn that Grímnir said the following.] After complaining about the heat of the fire which is closing up on him, Grímnir mentions his having been in
between the fires for eight nights, with no food or drink being offered to him. He proceeds with thanking Agnarr, who was alone in helping him by offering him the horn, and wishes him good fortune. Grímnir then proceeds in listing a number of cosmological things, namely the lands inhabited by each god and their aspects. He then discusses other cosmological aspects of the world of the gods, the animals around Yggdrasill, Huginn and Munin, his two ravens, and a large number of rivers that flow around the worlds. He then calls some Valkyries to bring him a drinking horn and then goes back to discussing the cosmology by describing the Sun and Moon and the wolves that are going after them. He also briefly mentions the creation of the world out of Ymir’s body. Then, he gives a long list of names he goes by, revealing that he is in fact Óðinn. Before concluding, he condemns Geirrøðr. [Upon hearing this monologue, Geirrøðr, understanding his mistake, gets up to help Óðinn and get him out of the fires. However, his sword falls and he stumbles, getting stabbed by it. It is then that Óðinn suddenly vanishes. Agnarr then becomes the king.]

1. Metre and Performance

*Grímnismál* is composed in *ljóðaháttr*. *Ljóðaháttr* consists of three verses: two half verses and a long verse. These are called a-verse, b-verse and c-verse respectively. The c-verse, the long one, is comprised of three lifts and is unique to *ljóðaháttr*. The a-verse and b-verse are combined to form a single line since they are bound by alliteration. However, the c-verse alliterates by itself. Suzuki writes that:

In this way, *ljóðaháttr* stands out through its heterogeneity in verse- and line-composition. More specifically, asymmetry pervades these two lower levels of metrical organization: the first and the second half of the long line are diversified maximally and come closest to being polar opposites of each other; and the two successive lines, which are provided with different numbers of lifts, seem to be no more reducible to a remotely common scheme of line composition. The

---

juxtaposition of two disparate forms, then, serves as an overarching principle of composition in ljóðaháttr.\textsuperscript{179}

The poems in ljóðaháttr that survive are comparatively many: Hávamál (with the exception of a few stanzas), Vafþrúðnismál, Skírnismál, Hárbarðsljóð, Lokasenna, Alvíssmál, Helgakviða Hjörvarðssonar, Reginsmál, Fáfnismál, Sigrdrífumál, Helgakviða Hjörvarðssonar, Reginsmál, Fáfnismál, Sigrdrífumál and, of course, Grímnismál. When it comes to alliteration of the a- and b-verse, ljóðaháttr is distinguished from the other metres by the larger amount of single alliteration and smaller amount of double alliteration.\textsuperscript{180} The c-verse could be seen as having a first part that corresponds to the a-verse and a second part which ‘is embodied by a fixed value of a single lift’.\textsuperscript{181} Having three lifts, the c-verse is longer than the other two, and it has its own line since it alliterates by itself. Each stanza can be divided into two half stanzas, each consisting of an a-verse and b-verse line and a c-verse line. Seiichi Suzuki has written a very extensive analysis of all Eddic verse and devotes almost three hundred pages on the study of ljóðaháttr alone. It is of interest that his conclusion is that the oldest Eddic metre is fornyrðislag\textsuperscript{182} with málaháttr appearing later, ljóðaháttr being the youngest metre.\textsuperscript{183} The detail which Suzuki goes into is beyond the scope of this thesis. Comparing ljóðaháttr with the other Eddic metres, Schorn writes that it generally seems to be

\textsuperscript{179} Ibid. p. 574.
\textsuperscript{180} Ibid. p. 652.
\textsuperscript{181} Ibid. p. 665.
\textsuperscript{182} Gunnell, quoting Noreen, lists a number of important differences between ljóðaháttr and fornyrðislag:
1. Ljóðaháttr hardly occurs anywhere outside Eddic poetry.
2. There is less strict control of alliterative patterns in ljóðaháttr poems.
3. Kenningar (a particular form of skaldic metaphor) are used noticeably less in ljóðaháttr than in fornyrðislag poetry.
4. Variation (according to Noreen) does not occur in its true form in the ljóðaháttr poems.
5. Word order is, in general, much more natural in the ljóðaháttr poems than in those composed in fornyrðislag. The choice of using ljóðaháttr rather than fornyrðislag for the dialogic poems might be related as much to the magical/mythical subject matter of the poems in question as to the suggestion that ljóðaháttr was more naturally suited to speech than fornyrðislag.


While the first four numbers are of interest for a better understanding of ljóðaháttr in general, the fifth point is of the greatest importance and shall be analysed further in the following paragraphs.

\textsuperscript{183} Suzuki. p. 797.
‘more regimented, as the length and structure of the stanzas is more regular.’ \(^{184}\) Clunies Ross argues that:

On formal, metrical grounds Old Norse eddic poetry is indubitably a branch of the West Germanic alliterative measure, and is thus likely to be of considerable antiquity. Its subject matter also suggests antiquity: in the selection of texts that have been preserved in writing, at least, it deals with mythological lore relating to the pre-Christian religion, with narratives about the pre-Christian gods, giants, and dwarfs, and with the deeds attributed to legendary figures, such as Völundr and Sigurðr, who have known counterparts in the alliterative poetry of other West Germanic literatures. \(^{185}\)

Clunies-Ross does not make any distinction between the different Eddic metres in this statement. Thus, it could agree with Suzuki’s conclusions, while stressing the early nature of all metres.

Bertha Phillpotts was the first scholar to study Eddic poetry while looking at the possibility of performance behind it. The idea of these poems being performed makes complete sense, considering the oral tradition of the region. In fact, the moment something is read out aloud, or recited, whether it is sung or not, whether it is acted or not, it still is a performance. \(^{186}\)

In discussing *ljóðaháttr* specifically, Phillpotts argued that this was a metre that was meant to


\(^{185}\) Margaret Clunies Ross, “The Transmission and Preservation of Eddic Poetry.” In ibid. p. 17.

\(^{186}\) Phillpotts also gives a number of sources that support this:

‘But there is evidence for other types of dramatic performances in Scandinavia. In the Icelandic *Ljósvetninga Saga* we are told that on his return from a visit to the Trondhjem district in Norway, where there had been great festivities, a man called Brand, in the service of the Icelandic chief Thorkell Geitisson, instituted various entertainments, “and it is said that he first invented the *Syrpu þingslög*” - the “laws of Syrpa's thing.” The saga tells how folk came from far and near to this entertainment, and were very noisy: it was a hindrance to the household work, and Thorkell often found himself spending the evening almost alone, while his guests joined in the entertainment. He complains to Brand, who tries going to bed early, in order to discourage the visitors. “The thingmen however came according to custom, but the ‘thing’ could not be held when there was no ‘chief man’. Evidently the *Syrputhing* was a dramatised burlesque of the ceremonies and speeches of an ordinary “Thing”, and Brand go the idea from Norway, the same *Syrpuþingslög* being formed on the analogy of *Frostuþingslög*, the laws of the district round Trondhjem. The ancient “Things”, as we know, were solemnly opened by the priest-chief, the *goði*, with a religious sacrifice. The *Syrputhing*, too, has a “leader” and the ceremonial expression “heyja” for holding the Thing suggests that the representation was accompanied by religious observances, however scurrilous or ribald these may have been. The officiating priest would be a “play-priest”, *leik-goði*, and this word actually occurs in the Icelandic Saga *Vatnsdæla*, applied to one Thórólf who lived in the heathen period and who does not belong to any of the known *goði* families, or indeed to any well-known family.’

be sung.\footnote{Ibid. pp. 55-56.} In support of such a view can be found other Germanic poetry. For instance, D. H. Green writes that the poetry of the \textit{Sagelied} was meant to be sung.\footnote{D. H. Green, \textit{Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800-1300} (Cambridge, 1994). p. 41.} On whether there would be musical accompaniment, Green mentions that plucked instruments similar to the harp, \textit{leodslakke} in Old High German and \textit{hearpse} in Old English were known and used in that time period.\footnote{Ibid. p. 67.} Unfortunately, when it comes to Scandinavia and Iceland, our knowledge of musical instruments and music performed in the medieval period is very limited.\footnote{Modern musicians have tried to recreate such music: most notably Einar Selvik, who, in his bands Wardruna and Skuggsjá. Selvik has recreated primitive instruments such as bone flutes, \textit{kraviklyra}, \textit{tagelharpe}, goat horns and natural sources of sound such as rocks clashing etc. While there is no way to know that any of this music reflects what would have been specifically performed in medieval Scandinavia, it can provide an idea of how some of these instruments would have sounded, which is in itself important enough on its own for historians of music. Sources: Wardruna, in \textit{Runaljod – Gap Var Ginnunga} (Oslo2009). Skuggsjá, in \textit{A Piece of Mind and Mirror} (Marseille2016). Similarly, the band Sequentia has released the album \textit{Edda: Myths from medieval Iceland}, in which Eddic poems are performed with medieval instruments – though it should be noted that the instruments are mainly continental. Source: Sequentia, in \textit{Edda: Myths from Medieval Iceland} (New York1999).}  

\textit{Grímnismál} was never meant to be read privately. It was meant to be ‘\textit{heard, seen, and experienced}.’\footnote{Terry Gunnell, “\textit{Völsúspá in Performance},” In \textit{Approaches to \textit{Völsúspá} and Nordic Days of Judgement}, ed. Terry Gunnell and Annette Lassen (Turnhout, 2013). p. 65.} Eddic poetry is oral poetry (which now survives only in manuscript form).\footnote{For a better understanding of what this entails, see John Miles Foley, \textit{How to Read an Oral Poem} (Chicago, 2002). p. 25. ‘So writing is recent and literature is rare. On the other hand, as far as we know all peoples have composed and transmitted oral traditions, an alternate verbal technology that has shown itself not only far more widespread than texts but also much more adaptable and durable. even today the majority of the planet’s inhabitants use oral traditions as their primary communicative medium, a fact obscured by modern Western egocentrism. Virtually every single one of the fifty-five officially recognized national minorities in the People’s Republic of China, for example, possesses a thriving oral poetry. Rich traditions of oral composition and performance are alive in all regions in Africa, from the praise-poetry of the Xhosa and Zulu to the West African epics of the Banyanga and Mande.’ p. 40. ‘For many people, the designation ”oral poetry” means only one thing: verse composed and performed orally in front of a listening audience. In this first category the processes of composition and performance are usually simultaneous, as in South Slavic epic or Xhosa praise-poetry. When these paired processes are separated, we’re usually dealing with a memorized text for a later performance (sometimes by a different person), a situation that falls into our second category of Voiced Texts. In Oral Performance, however, reception is customarily live and immediate. Poet and audience participate together, and everything takes place in present time and experience. This is the easiest kind of oral poetry for us text - consumers to grasp, chiefly because it’s so opposite to literature in every respect.’}
them, and indeed the entire Old Icelandic corpus, first and foremost as readers rather than as a listening, watching audience.'

In analysing such performances, Gunnell writes:

Oral storytellers are, in many ways, very much like actors, and naturally the 'text' communicated to any audience by an actor on a stage is much more complex than the words printed on the page of a published play. It involves added elements of tone, rhythm and context. Of course, even the spoken words 'I love you' can vary intensely in meaning depending on whether they are said to a wife or a mistress, or by a postman trying to placate a rather bad-tempered dog. Their precise meaning also depends on the age, background and appearance of the actor or actress, and whether they are said in a supermarket or in the middle of a battlefield. In short, the performed text has an additional oral, aural, visual and social historical dimensions, and the general context is an essential ingredient: the character of Hamlet as performed by an eighty-year-old 'bag lady' in Times Square is bound to be very different from the Hamlet that might be performed by a young stand-up comic from Kosovo on the steps of the parliament building in Belgrade.

While Gunnell wrote the above passage in discussing oral performance in general, it is important in the understanding of whether (and how) Grímnismál would have been performed.

A number of elements found in Grímnismál, its metre, and its contents, should be seen. They corroborate the performative aspect of the poem. Ljóðaháttr as a metre is used only in direct speech, and ljóð also has magical connotations and could mean ‘spell’ or ‘magic song’.

---

194 “Legends and Landscape in the Nordic Countries.” In, Cultural and Social History, v. 6.3 (2009). p. 307. Here, Gunnell is discussing folkloristic performances. Considering the oral culture of the Old Norse speaking peoples, and especially the nature of Eddic poetry, Vésteinn Ólason showed that it is correct to consider them both literature and folklore, and study them from both aspects. As such, an analysis such as the one Gunnell gives, instead of being off topic, can help with a better understanding of the performance of Grímnismál and other Eddic poems.
195 Ilya Sverdlov goes as far as suggesting that it is the power of ljóðaháttr itself that frees Óðinn of his imprisonment in Grímnismál:

‘In Grm Óðinn finds himself bereft of his divine powers and a prisoner, but his gaoler is a mortal, so all Óðinn has to do is to regain these powers; once he has done that, his adversary is doomed. Óðinn succeeds using the power of ljóðaháttr, the metre of magical chants, which helps him to merge the mythological world of the Æsir and the world of the Eddaic stage where he was bound between the fires. The dramatic effect is due to the switching between these two worlds in the stanzas (Smirnitskaya 1993, 268).’
and:

‘Ljóðaháttr serves Óðinn as the means of regaining his godhead. At the crucial moment, when the identity of the supreme god is finally within the reach of the tortured warlock Grímnr, soon to become Óðinn again, he reaches to grasp it with a galdralag stanza, Grm 45 (quoted above). Grm 45 is all spell; in addition to a repetition of the sacred formula Ægis drekku at we find double alliteration in the second short line. Immediately after that the warlock begins to recite the names of Óðinn—only he does so in the first person, proving that the effort represented by Grm 45 did, indeed, succeed. That Grímnr has already fully become Óðinn in Grm 46 and does not postpone his apotheosis until Grm 54, where he openly calls himself Óðinn (Óðinn ek nú heiti), is
In fact, Meylan writes that *ljóð* and *rúnar* were seen as the instruments that led to Óðinn’s power.\(^{196}\) Looking at magical rites themselves, such as *seiðr*, it is probable that a singing or chanting element would have occurred as a central element.\(^{197}\) Gunnell argues that all *ljóðaháttr* poems have a dramatic nature, and the fact that they are always in the first person strengthens this dramatic aspect.\(^{198}\) In the case of *Grímnismál*, the poem is a monologue, and because of its contents it is usually classified as a ‘wisdom monologue’.\(^{199}\) Whether Phillpotts was right in specifically expecting singing, or whether this would have been acted out, or both, the performer of *Grímnismál* would ‘become’ Óðinn for the duration of this performance. The performer would thus become sacred himself, in having almost transformed to the god he would be representing.\(^{200}\) The idea of Óðinn being part of a performance is not new. In fact, Phillpotts writes, ‘there are several references in later tradition to effigies of gods which “talked” and acted.’ Saxo mentioned a statue of Odin which would speak upon being touched.\(^{201}\)

A number of stanzas in *Grímnismál* further play with the performative aspect of the poem. In fact, the usage of sounds in words used in specific stanzas seems to recreate the description of the stanza itself. For instance, Gunnell mentions st. 7 *drecca um alla daga* |...


\(^{198}\) “Völuspá in Performance.” p. 73.


\(^{201}\) Phillpotts. p. 178.
glauð or gullnom kerom., ‘drink during all days, | glad from golden vessels’, where the drecca and kerom recreate a gulping sound, or st. 24. Fimmhundruþ dúra, ‘Five hundred doors’, in which the mm, dr, and dú sounds seem to recreate a sort of warlike drumming. However, it feels to me that Gunnell may be reading too much into it. By looking at Grímnismál, even without the help of the prose introduction, we get the feeling of a stage. Óðinn, Agnarr and Geirrðr are all in the interior of a hall, where a fire would have been located. The transformation of the performer to Óðinn is further strengthened by the presence of the audience found in Agnarr especially, but also Geirrðr. In fact, while Grímnismál is a monologue, the necessary presence of Agnarr as a listening figure takes the figure of the reciter ‘out of direct communication with the audience in the present time, and places the performer in a more distanced, ‘acted’ situation.’ Through this, the performance of poems like Grímnismál would create a state of ‘between-world’, connecting the world of the gods with the real world of the audience. Larrington argues that:

As Óðinn’s monologue nears its climax, the two worlds seem to be set to converge. The threat of world destruction if the shelf before the sun should fall away (st. 38: 4-6) hints at the terrible consequences when the necessary barrier between gods and men is breached, when divine laws of hospitality and sacrifice are not obeyed. The human world was created violently from Ymir’s dismembered body parts, as recalled in sts. 41: 1-2; the rest of the universe has the same grisly origin in a raw material which is anthropomorphic at a most fundamental level.

While it seems to me that Larrington may be exaggerating a bit on her description of the creation of the world, her overall analysis of the converging of the two worlds is evident in seeing the contents of Grímnismál. The audience might not only end up having Óðinn and Agnarr in front of them, but they could also feel as if they had been transported to the hall of king Geirrðr in times long past.

---

203 The Origins. p. 352.
204 “Eddic Performance.” pp. 97-98.
205 Larrington. p. 72.
Gunnell argues that names such as Óðinn’s Grimr and Grímnir in Grímnismál, but also in other ljóðaháttr poems such as Fáfnir’s ægishjálmr, ‘terror mask/helmet’, all show the importance of a disguised, masked figure. Such figures, he writes, can be seen in the context of folkloristic images of the Northern world, such as the julebukk, Grýla, and the þingálp. All these winter figures are related to disguise and the slow revealing of the identity of the figure by the end of the story. Grýla was in fact already present as early as during the thirteenth century, already having been associated with masking and guising traditions. In fact, she would have been represented by people dressed in skins. Such characters of folklore could have arisen from either a common source or they could have been directly influenced by poems such as Grímnismál. More difficult to prove is Neil Price’s theory that what he calls ‘Viking’ funerals would have been dramatised stories, and thus performed as well. While Gunnell’s comparisons are not to be taken lightly, since the folkloristic nature of Germanic paganism may as well have affected the folklore of the Scandinavian countries, Price’s theory, while interesting, is based on far too few sources to be taken into consideration. It is thus unknowable that Eddic poems would have been performed in such funerals.

In going through Grímnismál there are a few parts which do not sound particularly enticing to hear as part of a performance. These are the two long lists of names: first the river-name list and then the list of Óðinn names. However, the latter, which is at the very end of the poem, is used as part of the narration and becomes part of the very climax of Grímnismál. It thus achieves a double purpose of both adding to the setting of the poem, but also storing a great amount of mythological information. In order to avoid monotony, Jackson argues that

---

207 “Myth and (the Knowledge of) Seasonal Change - the Myths of the Vanir.”
210 Jackson. p. 81.
variations in length and phrasing are brought, as well as the interruption of the list by adding a comment or information, as is the case with sts. 51-53. While remembering such long lists by heart sounds difficult to a modern reader, it should be kept in mind that the mnemonic skills of a performer from an oral tradition would have been better. Furthermore, elements such as alliteration, rhyme and assonance all help in learning words by heart. On the structure of those lists, Jackson writes that:

A feature of longer lists is division of the item body into sections and then into item pairs or triplets. One way of structuring a longer list is to divide it into two distinct parts each with an equal number of items, although not necessarily with an equal number of half-lines, as this eddic list demonstrates: The most-eminent list: Grímnismál 44.

The composition of these lists is also meant to make them easier to remember and recite, with techniques such as the rhyming of opening pairs Síþ oc víþ, Kaurmt oc aurmt etc. These would have signalled to the audience that a list was about to begin. Þulur, ‘lists’, have been an important style of poetry in Old Norse, and follow specific rules. Bo Ralph, in discussing whether these long Þulur should be seen as later interpolations, argued against that:

Apart from the compositional traits of the Þulur there are many other reasons for the conclusion that the Þulur are original in the Grímnismál:

1. The Grímnismál make up one of the poems in the Edda that contain the largest number of names, even with the Þulur disregarded.
2. Each mythological phenomenon is dealt with rather briefly, which is emphasized by the fact that most names mentioned are not repeated. This renders a touch of Þula-resemblance to the poem as a whole.
3. There are many stanzas not to be considered as Þulur that mention a pair of names, or that enumerates a few names. It is difficult to decide which stanzas are Þulur and which are not.

---

214 “Eddic Listing.” p. 86.
215 Ralph. p. 108.
As a further support, I would add that if one took the list of Óðinn names out of Grímnismál, it feels to me that the poem would lose its climax. As Bo Ralph wrote, Grímnismál can be seen as a longer list in and of itself. Jackson shows this by connecting st. 45 Svipom hefi ec nu ýpt, ‘I have now raised up my glances’, with st. 4, where the beginning of the numinous knowledge is.\textsuperscript{216} All the elements discussed above both support the theory of Eddic performance, but also would help it by making the poems easier to remember.

Up to now, in this section I have discussed and analysed elements that show the metric and performative aspect of Grímnismál. However, there still has been no answer given as to why would this poem have been performed. According to Larrington, Grímnismál is much closer to the style of Hávamál, as a didactic wisdom poem, and not solely as a poem listing mythological information.\textsuperscript{217} Some of this information could be interpreted symbolically. More importantly, the setting of the poem itself shows how a human would have to behave towards the divine: by showing respect. In his paper on the poem, Jonas Wellendorf chooses to focus on the fact that Grímnismál is the only mythological poem to explicitly deal with the relationship between gods and humans.\textsuperscript{218} He points out the similarities of Geirröðr with characters such as king Heiðrekr from Hervarar saga ok Heiðreks, both of them being estranged proteges of Óðinn that die after a confrontation with him in disguise. However, such a comparison could only be made if we chose to use the information of the prose introduction to Grímnismál. In the poem itself, there is no reason to see Geirröðr as once having been favoured by Óðinn in any way. Wellendorf’s conclusion is that Grímnismál appears to ‘draw

\textsuperscript{217} Larrington, “Vafþrúðnismál and Grímnismál.” p. 74.
attention to this basic fact of human existence: the divine forces that impel us to actions are only effective if they resonate within us.\textsuperscript{219}

However, other scholars have argued differently. Some have seen \textit{Grímnismál} as being an initiation ritual granting mythological knowledge,\textsuperscript{220} since it also is one of only two mythological poems – the other being \textit{Rígsþula} – to take place in the world of humans. Other scholars, such as Jere Fleck,\textsuperscript{221} have taken the above thought further and have linked it to the idea of Germanic sacred kingship,\textsuperscript{222} stating that numinous knowledge would be required for that to be attained.\textsuperscript{223} The idea of sacral kingship has been a matter of debate for a long time, while the years such kingship would have been present in, are meant to be between 500 and 1000 CE, while some scholars push it far back into prehistory.\textsuperscript{224} A number of archaeological finds could corroborate that there could have been religious importance to the performance of \textit{Grímnismál} especially in relation to masks:

First of all, there are the recurring images of the dancing, horn-helmeted man with two sticks in the seventh-century helmet-plate matrix from Torslunda, Sweden, on the Finglesham bracelet from England, and on the ninth-century Oseberg tapestry from Norway, just to mention three examples found over a wide area of the territory over a space of about two hundred years.\textsuperscript{225} Scholars argue that Óðinn being placed between two fires, as well as his having been starved, are all part of a ritualistic contact with the dead and a supernatural power.\textsuperscript{226} Some scholars

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{219} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{220} Larrington, “\textit{Vafþrúðnismál} and \textit{Grímnismál}.” p. 60.
\item \textsuperscript{221} Jere Fleck, “The “Knowledge-Criterion” in the \textit{Grímnismál}: The Case against “Shamanism”” In, \textit{Arkiv för nordisk filologi}, v. 87 (1971).
\item \textsuperscript{222} Because the term and idea of ‘sacred kingship’ has been a very disputed one, Olof Sundqvist has proposed a new concept: ‘religious ruler ideology’. This term is an ‘open concept’ and could tentatively be related to four possible religious strategies for gaining legitimacy and authority: (1) by means of the ruler’s specific relation to the mythic world; (2) by means of (religious) rituals; (3) by means of (religious) symbols; (4) by controlling the cultic organization. Source: Olof Sundqvist, “Religious Ruler Ideology in Pre-Christian Scandinavia,” In \textit{More Than Mythology: Narratives, Ritual Practices and Regional Distribution in Pre-Christian Scandinavian Religions}, ed. Catharina Raudvere and Jens Peter Schjødt (Lund, 2012). p. 227.
\item \textsuperscript{223} Larrington, “\textit{Vafþrúðnismál} and \textit{Grímnismál},” p. 68.
\item \textsuperscript{226} Schjødt, “Fire Ordeal.” p. 31.
\end{itemize}
also try to connect this ‘fire ordeal’ with Hávamál 138-141, in which Óðinn hangs from a tree for nine nights without food or drink in order to gain obscure knowledge. Schjødt agrees on such a comparison with Hávamál, and agrees in seeing the ‘fire ordeal’ in Grímnismál as being a ritual. However, he disagrees with what other scholars thought to be an initiation ritual. Instead of suggesting that Óðinn got to know the information he imparts to Agnarr because of the ‘fire ordeal’, Schjødt argues that the recipient of the ritual is instead Agnarr, to whom Óðinn imparts numinous knowledge: the knowledge necessary for a ruler to have. To corroborate his argument, Schjødt mentions the ‘importance’ of Óðinn having been tortured for eight nights instead of nine. However, as discussed in the commentary to st. 2 below, it should be noted that the event happens after the end of the eighth night, therefore, in the ninth day. Schjødt concludes his analysis of the ‘fire ordeal’ by mentioning something that to me seems to disrupt his argument more than support it. He mentions that if one avoided looking at sources outside the Old Norse speaking world – something with which I agree – they would find that fire was used to quell the powers of magicians and sorcerers in Scandinavia. This is important to keep in mind. If it was normal practice to use fire against wizards, why should we think of this ‘fire ordeal’ of Óðinn to be any sort of ritual related to giving numinous knowledge to Agnarr?

It seems to me that the poem has nothing to do with the ‘sacral’ kingship of Agnarr, or the supposed recipient of the Grímnismál ritual performance that the scholars mentioned above have argued. Instead, it seems like the expected way to deal with Óðinn since Geirrøðr thought him to be a wizard, though it could also be argued that Agnarr won Óðinn’s blessing by intervening against his father’s wishes. If, alternatively, Grímnismál is seen as a purely

Schjødt continues by mentioning how some other scholars, such as Schröder, Fleck and de Vries, found parallels between the ‘fire torture’ of Óðinn and the Díksá ritual which took place in India before the soma-sacrifice. They found that in both rituals, this was meant to be an initiation to ‘a higher spiritual riveau’.

See Commentary for more on this comparison.
229 Ibid. p. 38.
230 Ibid. p. 41.
dramatic work, the ‘fire ordeal’ is what creates the setting of tension that brings to the climax when Óðinn reveals himself. I would agree with the first part of Larrington’s conclusion, that Grímnismál seems to be a didactic poem not unlike Hávamál. Whether it was meant to be symbolical knowledge, as Larrington claims, is unclear to me. Snorra Edda as a whole show how important mythological knowledge was considered to be for a skald. There is no reason for this to have been an Icelandic or Christian innovation. As such, I would rather see Grímnismál as a poem in which the performing skald, impersonating Óðinn, would – maybe when performing for an important person for the first time – show his great skill and knowledge, while also suggesting that the king or jarl addressed would be great just like Agnarr.

2. Óðinn

There is no question as to the importance of Óðinn in Grímnismál. He is the protagonist, the speaker and the source of all the cosmological knowledge provided by the poem. By being present at the performance of the poem, or reading it, the audience gets to know a fair deal about Óðinn as well. In fact, the climax of the poem comes in Óðinn taking off his disguise of Grímnir and revealing himself as his true self in what Haugen deems ‘chant-like verses’. The last nine stanzas of the poem deal directly with Óðinn and Geirrød and provide the audience with a list of names by which Óðinn goes by. All in all, in Grímnismál, fifty-three Óðinn names are given. However, it is far from certain that Óðinn was always a god of such importance in different Germanic beliefs. In fact, as it shall be seen below, it is likely that Óðinn ‘took over’ from Þórr in the period immediately before the advent of Christianity in Scandinavia.

By studying Óðinn in general and his importance in *Grímnismál* more specifically, some conclusions can be used in the relative dating of the poem. In *The Viking Way*, the archaeologist Neil Price has compiled a list of all Óðinn names and divided them into categories depending on what aspect they may refer to.\(^{232}\) Price refers to a total of 204 names. This shows that *Grímnismál* is an extremely important source in our understanding of Óðinn and his attributes, since it contains more than a quarter of the surviving Óðinn names. Below, I have followed a similar division as the one provided by Price, but have only included the names mentioned in *Grímnismál*. The first column gives the Óðinn name as present in my GKS edition, and closer to the original manuscript spelling. The second column provides a normalised spelling, in order to facilitate the comparison with other sources. The third column provides with the information of whether an Óðinn name is mentioned by Snorri or not. This is of great interest since it is known (see above) that Snorri knew and used *Grímnismál*. The six names that appear in *Grímnismál* but are not reported by Snorri could provide interesting conclusions. For instance, Helblindi, which appears in st. 46 is not cited by Snorri, even though Snorri quotes the other names found in st. 46. This could suggest that Snorri chose to not include this name for some reason, or that this name was later emended into the poem, possibly by the editor to the first manuscript in which *Grímnismál* appeared. The fourth column of the table gives a general category of each name, following Neil Price’s subdivision. The fifth and last column lists the stanza(s) in which the name appears in *Grímnismál*.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oðinn name</th>
<th>Normalised spelling</th>
<th>In Snorri</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Stanza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Grímnir</td>
<td>Grímnir</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Trickery</td>
<td>47, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vera tyr</td>
<td>Veratýr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oðinn</td>
<td>Óðinn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frenzy</td>
<td>7, 9, 10, 14, 19, 44, 51, 53, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 heria faðr</td>
<td>Herjaþðr</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 grimr</td>
<td>Grímr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Trickery</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 gangleri</td>
<td>Gangleri</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wandering</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 herian</td>
<td>Herjan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hialmberi</td>
<td>Hjalmberi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 þeccr</td>
<td>Þekkr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 þriði</td>
<td>Þriði</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 þundr</td>
<td>Þundr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frenzy</td>
<td>21, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 úþr</td>
<td>Uðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 helblindi</td>
<td>Helblindi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 hár</td>
<td>Hár</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sáþr</td>
<td>Sáþr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 svipall</td>
<td>Svipall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Trickery</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 sanngetall</td>
<td>Sanngetal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 herteitr</td>
<td>Herteitr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 hnicarr</td>
<td>Hnikarr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frenzy</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 bileýgr</td>
<td>Bileygr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frenzy</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>baleygr</td>
<td>Báleygr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frenzy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>baulvercr</td>
<td>Bólverkr</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Trickery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>fiohnir</td>
<td>Fjölnir</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Trickery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>glapsviþr</td>
<td>Glapsviðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>fiaullviþr</td>
<td>Fjólsviðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sífháuttr</td>
<td>Síðhóttur</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>sipscemgr</td>
<td>Síðsköggr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>sigfauðr</td>
<td>Sigfóðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>hnikuþr</td>
<td>Hnikuðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frenzy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>alfaúþr</td>
<td>Alfgóðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>valfaúþr</td>
<td>Válfóðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>atríðr</td>
<td>Atriðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>farma tyr</td>
<td>Farmatýr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>iaal</td>
<td>Jalkr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>viður</td>
<td>Viðurr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>kialar</td>
<td>Kjallar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>þrói</td>
<td>Þrír</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Osci</td>
<td>Óski</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ómi</td>
<td>Ómi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frenzy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>iafnhár</td>
<td>Jafnhár</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>biflindi</td>
<td>Biflindi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>gaundlir</td>
<td>Gøndlir</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sorcery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>harbarðr</td>
<td>Hábarðr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Svipurr</td>
<td>Sviðurr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By looking at the above categories, a certain trend can be found. War is certainly the most common attribute of the Óðinn names with thirteen names relating to it, followed by frenzy with seven, and wisdom with six. Trickery comes fourth with five names, followed by pleasure with four, while the rest of the categories have three or fewer names related to them. If the number of instances in which each name appears were to be counted, then frenzy would take over as the most common Óðinn name category used in *Grímnismál*, thanks to the usage of ‘Óðinn’ in nine instances.
It is to be expected that Óðinn would be connected to war. Most, if not all, Scandinavian deities show some connection to war and the battlefield. However, looking at the meaning of these war names, one sees that only two, Svipurr and sviþrir, are related to the spear. This is peculiar, since Óðinn is generally connected to the spear. It becomes more interesting when looking into other sources. In fact, Óðinn is called Dǫrruðr, ‘spear fighter’, in Darraðarljóð.\textsuperscript{233} In Egill Skallagrímsson’s Sonatorrek, a work considered to be early and attributed to an Óðinn worshipper, Óðinn is called Geirdróttin, ‘lord of the spear’.\textsuperscript{234} In Hákonarkvíða, Óðinn is called Geirtýr, ‘spear god’, while in Stjórmu-Oddadraumr, Geirvaldr, ‘spear master’. Lastly, in Óðins nœfin, a poem that lists Óðinn names, he is called Geirðlnir, ‘spear charger’, and Geirlǫðnir,

\textsuperscript{233} Hjalmar Falk, Odensheite, (1924). p. 17.
\textsuperscript{234} Price. p. 102.
‘spear inviter’. Öðinn’s weapon is generally considered to be a spear, named Gungnir, and a number of different sources relate him to spears in many ways. In Hávamál 138-139, geiri undaðr, ‘wounded by a spear’ is critical to the achievement that brings to nam ek upp rúnar, ‘I picked up secrets (runes)’. This story is also reminiscent of one of the most well-known sacrifices to Öðinn, that of king Víkarr. This story is found in the long version of Gautreks Saga. Víkarr is a Norwegian king. His fleet is delayed by adverse winds and after using divination, his men discover that Öðinn requires the sacrifice of a man from their group. Lots are cast and the lot falls to king Víkarr himself. In light of him being the king, they agree to sacrifice him symbolically. It is thus decided that king Víkarr should be hanged by calf entrails and symbolically wounded by a piece of wood. Starkaðr, a well-known hero who is one of Öðinn’s favourites, is present at the scene, as part of Víkarr’s group. On the eve of the symbolic sacrifice, Öðinn gives Starkaðr a piece of wood that is actually a real spear. The day of the sacrifice comes and ‘Þá stakk Starkaðr sprotanum á konungi ok mælti: ”Nú gef ek þik Óðni.”’ After this, the piece of wood transforms into a spear and transfixes king Víkarr. At the same time, the entrails turn into strong withies. Thus, king Víkarr is sacrificed to Öðinn. Similarly, Turville-Petre mentions another incident in which Öðinn gives Dag his spear in order to help him achieve his revenge.

While spear names are not as common, frenzy names are plenty, as seen above. The name Öðinn itself is related to frenzy. Öðinn and its OHG counterpart Wôdan, Wotan, Wuotan, are derived from *wōðu- which means ‘frenzy, madness’. This name could also be related to poetry, magic and prophecy, being cognate with Latin vates and Old Irish faith, ‘prophet’

---

235 Ibid. p. 102.
236 Hyndluljóð, 1. p. 350.
237 Then Starkaðr stabbed the king with the spear and said: ‘Now I give you to Öðinn.’ Source: Gautreks Saga, ed. Guðni Jónsson and Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, v. 3 (Reykjavík, 1943–44). ch. 7.
238 Turville-Petre, Myth. p 47.
239 Haugen. p. 6.
and ‘poet’ respectively. Pleasure related names are not unexpected either. A number of myths and stories have Óðinn in the pursuit of different women, such as Gunnlǫð or Billings mær. It is important to not mistake this as an attribute of fertility though. None of the Óðinn stories seem to imply that. It is the opposite: Óðinn has ‘sex as fun’.240 In a way, the pleasure names are related to the trickery names, then. These trickery names are also associated with disguise which seems to be one of Óðinn main attributes. He is the god most associated with disguise:

is known for appearing under any one of a wide variety of names. Two of Óðinn’s names mean ‘the “man” in the helmet or mask’. Interestingly enough, some suggestion as to the nature of the helmet or mask in question is provided by the fact that the same two names also appear in a pula (name list) for goats. This double use of the names accordingly raises the possibility of a direct link between Óðinn and the horned figures so often encountered in archaeological material. It also adds weight to the idea that the horned figures on the Torslunda matrix and Oseberg tapestry were not merely wearing regalia but were meant to be representing somebody, a figure that even in the thirteenth century was still associated with a particular animal.241

If Gunnell’s argument is accepted, then this could show that Óðinn’s association with trickery and disguise was a relatively early one, not some addition to his attributes that may have been added during the advent of Christianity in the Germanic speaking world.

Looking into the cult of Óðinn, interesting things can be seen. Schjødt has argued that warriors and kings would have been related to Óðinn, and would be initiated in rituals in which a bond would be created between them and the god.242 It is strange that in the interpretatio Romana Óðinn has been equated to Mercury. The information gained through reading the few Old Norse sources show him to be highest of the gods, and this can be seen in Grímnismál itself, where he is called Alfǫðr, ‘all father’. This would make Jupiter a probable better equation. At the same time, Russel Poole, following Haugen’s views, argues that this could be

240 Ibid. p. 17.
explained because both Óðinn and Mercury seem to disguise themselves with names related to travel and are generally related to travellers. ‘Hermes is depicted with a staff, a sceptre, or a wand; Óðinn often travels with a shepherd’s staff. If Hermes is a wandering god, then Óðinn for his part undertakes migrations and undergoes exile.’

Mercury was also a psychopomp who carried the dead to Hades, an attribute strongly connected with Óðinn’s choosing the slain. A different explanation could be given, though, and it is the one I would choose to focus on: the interpretatio Romana could have mirrored a general trend in the Germanic cult that changed with time. When people equated Óðinn with Mercury or Hermes, Óðinn could have been a less central figure in the Germanic pantheons, while, with time, he may have taken over as the Alfóðr.

Gunnell and other scholars have argued that Óðinn was not a popular god, but that he ‘took over’ from Þórr during the time Christianity was spreading in Scandinavia:

I have recently pointed out that in spite of what the thirteenth-century Icelandic scholar and politician Snorri Sturluson might imply in Yinglinga saga and the Prose Edda, other evidence gives us very good reason to believe that few Icelanders, Faroe Islanders or Norwegians (and probably a minority of Swedes) ever conceived of Óðinn as being the chief ruling god of the Nordic pantheon (if they ever had a concept of the gods all living together in Ásgard). Indeed, it seems that the supposed “alfóðr” (Óðinn) was comparatively little known by most Icelanders, Faroe Islanders or western Norwegians, most of whom appear to have had more belief in gods like Þórr and Freyr at the time of the Icelandic settlement in the ninth century.

To this should be added the above-mentioned description given by Adam of Bremen of the Temple at Uppsala where statues of Fricco, Wodan, and Þórr stood, with Wodan, who could possibly be similar to Óðinn, being a secondary figure to Þórr. A number of sources can

---


245 Adam of Bremen. Lib. IV, cap. 26, pag. 258.

‘In hoc templo, quod totum ex auro paratum [Schol. 139.] est, statuas trium deorum veneratur populus, ita ut potentissimus eorum Thor in medio solium habeat triclinio; hinc et inde locum possident Wodan et Fricco.'
show the prevalence of Þórr as the main god in Scandinavia. The large number of Þórr’s hammer amulets, the myths associated with him, and Þórr’s associations with blessing suggest that Þórr may have been the main god in the north throughout the pagan times in Scandinavia. This could also help explaining the *interpretatio Romana* and why Þórr was linked with Zeus and Jupiter, though their common relation to thunder should not be forgotten either. According to Gunnell, a number of Óðinn myths suggest that Óðinn is a wandering god and is associated with death. This can be seen in the *Grímnismál* list of Óðinn names that are related to death. In contrast, Freyr or Þórr do not seem to have such an association with death or the afterlife.Óðinn seems to have started as being a god worshipped mainly by the warrior class and nobility, a small percentage of the overall population of the Germanic speaking peoples. In opposition, Þórr would have been worshipped by fishermen, farmers and so would Freyr. By the time that *Grímnismál* was composed, however, something had changed:

In a sense, Óðinn had made himself the god of the media, the Rupert Murdoch of Ásgarðr, and it is not surprising how successful the Old Norse media was in selling him to future generations (including ourselves), as the allfather, and father and ruler of all other previous gods, many of whom are said to be his children. Names that were probably once those of other local gods are simply said to be manifestations of Óðinn himself. Indeed, it is noteworthy how effective Óðinn seems to be at taking over spaces previously inhabited by other gods and goddesses (not least in the “official” accounts): In *Ynglinga saga* he is accredited as owning a ship elsewhere said to belong to Freyr, and Freyja’s birdskin cloak has come into the possession of Óðinn’s wife (who never uses it and has little or nothing to do with birds). In a similar fashion, we find here that Skapi has become Óðinn’s wife, and

---

Quorum significationes eiusmodi sunt: "Thor", inquiunt, "presidet in aere, qui tonitrus et fulmina, ventos ymbresque, serena et fruges gubernat. Alter Wodan, id est furor, bella gerit hominique ministrat virtutem contra inimicos. Tercius est FrICO, pacem volupatatemque largiens mortalibus."

Translation: ‘In this temple, which is completely decked out in gold, the statues of three gods are venerated by the people, so that the mightiest of them Thor is in the main throne; Wodan and Fricco are in each side. Their significance is in this mode: “Thor”, they say, “presides over air, which governs thunder and lightning, winds and rains, good weather and crops. The other, Wodan, which is fury, presides over war and administers virtue against enemies. Third is Fricco, who gives peace and pleasure to the mortals.”

See also: DuBois. p. 60.


Freyja his mistress; and that (according to Snorri), Freyr is punished for temporarily “usurping” Óðinn’s high seat when observing Gerðr.248

The study of theophoric toponyms can further the understanding of pagan Norse belief. By looking into this evidence, one can see that specific gods were objects of cult in Scandinavia: Óðinn, Þórr, Freyr, Ullr, Njörðr, Týr and maybe Freyja.249 This shows that there was some importance in an Óðinn cult. Brink writes that while toponyms related to Óðinn are found throughout Sweden and Denmark and an area of Norway, they are absent in South-Western Norway.250 This absence could possibly suggest that the time in which Óðinn reached Norway

---

250 Ibid. p. 125.

Brink also provides a list of all Óðinn related theophoric toponyms:

Norway:
1. Onsåker, Våler hd, Østfold (Odensakr RB)
2. Onsø, hd, Østfold (ON Óðinsøy, see NG, I, 309)
3. Óðinssalr, Onsø hd, Østfold (óðinssalri Fagrskinner)
4. Onsrud, Ullensaker hd, Åkerhus (a Odenshofue 1331, a Odenshofue RB)
5. ?Onsaker, Gran hd, Opland (Onsager 1667)
6. ?Onsaker, Hole hd, Buskerud (Onsager 1578)
7. ?Osland, Kirkebø hd, Sogn og Fjordane (a Odenslande 1322)
8. ?Osland, Sinn hd, Sogn of Fjordane (i Odenlanðe BK, Odhenslandh 1500=)
9. Onsøien, Buviken hd, S. Trøndelag (af Odinsyn AB Odhensøy AB)
10. Onsøien, Byneset hd, S. Trøndelag (Otthensø 1500s)
11. Óðinssalr, Beitstad hd, N. Trøndelag (see NSL p. 240)

Sweden:
1. Onsicke, Skogs-Tibble sn, Hagunda hd, Uppland (i Odhenseke 1409)
2. Odensfors/Onskarby, Tierp, Uppland (Odensfors 1480/odenskarlaby 1486)
3. Onsta, Tierp, Uppland (odenstätt, odenstat 1500s)
4. Odsunda, Tänsa sn, Norunda hd, Uppland (apud villam Odinslunde 1302)
5. Odenslund, Söderby-Karls sn, Lyhundra hd, Uppland (j odhenslunde 1365)
6. Odenslunda, Fresta sn, Vallentuna hd, Uppland (de Ødhinslundum 1351, j Odhenslundum 1409)
7. Odensholmen, ?Ôstra Ryds sn, Övertjurbio hd, Västmanland (Onsals backar 1785)
8. Odensholmen, Skånela sn, Seminhundra hd, Uppland (odens hálma 1634)
9. Odensala, sn, Årlinghundra hd, Uppland (othinsharg 1286, othinsearg 1288, othinshargh 1291, in othinshargh 1310)
10. Odinsalr, Sala sn, Övertjurbio hd, Västmanland (Onsals backar 1785)
11. Odensvi, sn, Äkerbo hd, Västmanland (Odhienwi 1351, oðinswí 1366)
12. Onsholmen, Írsta sn, Siende hd, Västmanland (odenholm 1449)
13. ?Onsjo, Fagersta, Västmanland (onsø 1486, Onssyö 1539)
14. Odenso, probably in Munktorps sn, Snevringe hd, Västmanland (aff oðizisø, i oðinzø, i oðinzó 1485)
15. Odensvi, Viby sn, Grimstens hd, Örebro, Närke (i oðhinswí 1385)
16. Odenslunda, Aspö sn, Selebo hd, Södermanland (Othinslundum 1100s)
17. Odensvi, Kattnäs sn, Daga hd, Södermanland (j Odensvi, j Odenswí 1361)
18. Onsberga, Runuta sn, Rönö hd, Södermanland (?othensberghe 1431)
19. Onsberga, Sättersta sn, Rönö hd, Södermanland (odhinsbiërgh 1364)
20. Odensberga, Gryts sn, Daga hd, Södermanland (in Oðhinsbergum 1348)
21. Odensicke, Ytterselö sn, Selebo hd, Södermanland (in oðhinseke 1331, j oðhinseke 1365)
was much later than, for example, Sweden, explaining the difference in numbers of theophoric toponyms that relate to him. One explanation is that the earlier a god became important in a place, the better the chances that toponyms would bear his name, while the later he did, the fewer chances of ‘free’ places to be named would exist. Since Þórr or other gods would not have been deleted from a pantheon, toponyms bearing their names would not need to be

22. Odensjö, probably in Rönö hd, Södermanland (j odensio 1462)
23. Odensfors, Vretaklosters sn, Gullbergs hd, Östergötland (i wdhens ass 1500, odhensffors 1535)
24. Odenstomta, Kudddy sn, Björkekinds hd, Östergötland (i odhinstomptum 1409)
25. Odensäker, Kullerstads sn, Memings hd, Östergötland (j odhensakre 1375)
26. 'Odenstad, Gillberga sn and hd, Värmland (innan Odinstadium 1355, J odhenstadhum 1361)
27. Onsön, island, Segerstads sn, Grums hd, Värmland (een öö ok heter Odhinsöö 1480)
28. Vångsgärde, Orsa sn, Dalarna (odensgerde 1539)
29. Odensala, Östersund, Jämtland (i odhinsal 1410, j odinsall 1430)
30. Odensjö, Barnarps sn, Tyeta hd, Småland (odhensioo, odhenssioo 1394, i Odhensiø 1456)
31. Odenjö, Sunnerbo hd, Småland (i odhinsredha sokn 1389, Odhensoryth 1413)
32. Odenslanda, Vederslövs sn, Kinnevalds hd, Småland (i Odhenslandom 1406)
33. Odensvi, sn, S. Tjusts hd, Småland (i Odenswiwj 1358, in odhinsiwj 1371)
34. Odensvi, Högsby sn, Småland (i Odenszwij 1358, in odhinsiwj 1371)
35. Odenstad, Gillberga sn and hd, Värmland (innan Odinstadum 1355, J odhenstadhum 1361)
36. Onsön, island, Segerstads sn, Grums hd, Värmland (een öö ok heter Odhinsöö 1480)
37. Vångsgärde, Orsa sn, Dalarna (odensgerde 1539)
38. Odensala, Östersund, Jämtland (i odhinsal 1410, j odinsall 1430)
39. Odenjö, Barnarps sn, Tyeta hd, Småland (odhensioo, odhenssioo 1394, i Odhensiø 1456)
40. Odenjö, Barnarps sn, Tyeta hd, Småland (odhensioo, odhenssioo 1394, i Odhensiø 1456)
41. Odenjö, Barnarps sn, Tyeta hd, Småland (odhensioo, odhenssioo 1394, i Odhensiø 1456)
42. Odenjö, Barnarps sn, Tyeta hd, Småland (odhensioo, odhenssioo 1394, i Odhensiø 1456)
43. Odenjö, Barnarps sn, Tyeta hd, Småland (odhensioo, odhenssioo 1394, i Odhensiø 1456)
44. Odenjö, Barnarps sn, Tyeta hd, Småland (odhensioo, odhenssioo 1394, i Odhensiø 1456)
45. Oddense, sn, Hindborg hd, Jutland (Otenssogen 1410, Odens 1463, Otthensæ 1464)
46. Omslunda, sn, Ingelstads hd, Skåne (aff Othænslundæ 1401, Othinslunda 1430)
47. Onsve, sn, Skuldelev sn, Horns hd, Jutland (Onsvel 1351, in othinshæret 1330).


This list is of importance when studying the cult of Óðinn. It is not just important in order to understand where Óðinn had theophoric place-names, but also because the number of names present (or absence) could show how the cult of Óðinn spread throughout Scandinavia.
changed. The number of Þórr theophoric place-names is striking: Norway has twenty, Gotland seven, Sweden fifty-seven and Denmark five.\textsuperscript{251} Similarly, Freyr has twenty-two names in Norway, thirty-eight in Sweden but only one in Denmark.\textsuperscript{252} Gunnell is unconvinced that Óðinn had been the head of the Norse pantheons throughout the Scandinavian peninsula and North Atlantic.\textsuperscript{253} However, the absence of theophoric placenames related to Óðinn could also have been because Óðinn was a god venerated by the elite. Strangely enough, though, in \textit{Grímnismál} Óðinn talks first about Þórr, instead of himself. Phillpotts argues that this, and Óðinn stating in st. 24 that Þórr’s hall is the greatest, show that Þórr is regarded to be first among the gods.\textsuperscript{254} The sources portrayed above convince me of the likelihood of this late advent of Óðinn. It feels as if Óðinn started out as a god of nobles and poets and slowly took over as the main god of the different Scandinavian pantheons in the time preceding and during the advent of Christianity. In fact, even if the absence of toponyms is attributed to Óðinn being mainly venerated by kings and earls, while Þórr by the farmers and fishermen, this still does change at some point in history and Óðinn appears to become the main deity throughout the \textit{populus}.

If the above conclusion is to be accepted as possible or likely, a very interesting argument could be make that could help placing \textit{Grímnismál} at a better point in time and space. In \textit{Grímnismál}, the wandering Grímnir goes to King Geirröðr’s hall. As discussed in the commentary, Geirröðr is not a common name at all. The only other place in which it appears with any significance is the skaldic poem \textit{Þórsdrápa}. Furthermore, Vésteinn Ólason, mentions that the name \textit{Grímnir} is found in \textit{Þórsdrápa} in two different \textit{kenningar}, ‘there are reasons to suspect that the composer of the \textit{Grímnismál} has the Þórr-tale in mind when he conceived the Óðinn counterpart found in the \textit{Grímnismál}.’\textsuperscript{255} The very strong similarities in the settings of

\textsuperscript{251} Ibid. pp. 131-133.
\textsuperscript{252} Ibid. pp. 126-127.
\textsuperscript{253} Gunnell, “The Season.” p. 120.
\textsuperscript{254} Phillpotts. p. 90.
\textsuperscript{255} Vésteinn Ólason, “The Composition of the \textit{Grímnismál}.” In, \textit{Akriv för Nordisk Filologi}, v. 87 (1972). p. 117.
the two poems, coupled with all the conclusions drawn from the above argument could show the likelihood that a myth such as the one found in Pórsdrápa might have been present in a region that would worship Þórr as a main god. As Óðinn slowly took over that region as the main god, the myth was changed, making Óðinn the protagonist. However, Óðinn was never a god related to jötnar, but a wandering god that travelled in the world of humans. As such, the jötunn king Geirrøðr was changed into the Gothic king Geirrøðr of Grímnismál. Óðinn is not a god that was ever thought of as dealing with issues in a physical way, but mental. He grants ecstasy to his chosen (cf. frenzy names found in Grímnismál) etc. He is not a brawler but a trickster and wise-man. As such, instead of overpowering Geirrøðr with his fists or weapon, he did so using his cunning mind and knowledge, building up the dramatic tension that also rewarded Agnarr for helping him, and revealing his true nature at the right time, thus making Geirrøðr die by his own hand. Lastly, the importance given to Þórr in Grímnismál could show a period of transition between who of the two gods was foremost.

The above discussion on Óðinn and his nature has drawn on a number of sources other than Grímnismál. Following the conclusions outlined in Part 1 on the nature of paganism and the sources themselves, this means that the arguments discussed here cannot be taken into account without keeping in mind that compared to most other conclusions in this thesis, the ones set out in this part of this chapter are easier to disagree with, and more difficult to prove. However, I have done my best to keep only the sources that to me appeared to be most authentic and most strongly related to Grímnismál itself. A number of different conclusions could be made in analysing each source that portrays Óðinn, but then the conclusion of Óðinn’s nature in Grímnismál would be shoe-horned into a general idea of a pan-Scandinavian Óðinn that would have remained relatively intact and similar throughout the Germanic speaking world. This is highly unlikely. Theophoric toponymic evidence, if used properly, is of huge

importance because it can avoid the necessity of interpretation other than the very presence (or absence) of a name in a geographical region. As such, I find it to be one of the strongest sources in the understanding of a pre-Christian cult or cults in Scandinavia and elsewhere. *Þórsdrápa* has been discussed (relatively) more than any other poem other than *Grímnismál* because of its extremely strong relations to *Grímnismál* itself.
Chapter 4. Conclusion

What is Eddic poetry? Answering this question is both easy and difficult. My conclusion is that strictly speaking there is no such thing as Eddic poetry. The Eddic poems, as seen above, do not have a single, specific kind of metre, nor do they have a specific theme, since a number of them have a heroic subject. The main reason that there is a specific distinction between skaldic and eddic poetry is not the presence of kennings. In fact, a number of Eddic poems include kennings, albeit of a simpler nature. The main reason for this distinction, it seems to me, is that Eddic poems survive in a single manuscript (with few exceptions that have been worked around by scholars), a manuscript with no skaldic metre in it. However, differences found in the different metres of Eddic poetry, coupled with the separate time periods, scope of composition, and theme of these poems, can be a strong argument against such a division between Eddic and skaldic poetry. Furthemore, such a division seems to imply that Eddic poetry would not have been performed by skalds. While nomenclature does not necessarily have to be an issue, it brings the tendency to wish to compare a given Eddic poem with another Eddic poem more so than with a skaldic poem, purely based on the fact that they are found in the same manuscript.

To make a comparison, it feels to me that the way we study the GKS manuscript is similar to what would happen if one were to come across to a book on the scriptures of Zen Buddhism in the future, with no background to the texts and their history. In terms of content, it would be really easy to compare texts such as the Lotus sutra with the Diamond sutra, Platform sutra and the Song of Zazen. They all deal with Buddhist philosophy and make a coherent sense together. However, the Song of Zazen was composed by Hakuin Ekaku in the

---

257 Quinn, “Kennings.”
258 To be clear, I am not renouncing the usage of the term ‘Eddic’, nor do I feel that it has to be changed or removed. In my opinion, it needs to be made clearer that whoever is using it is aware of abovementioned differences and is not thinking of a coherent whole.
eighteenth century in Japan, while the *Platform sutra* was written in China at some point between the eighth and twelfth centuries, the *Diamond sutra* in subcontinental Asia at some point before the fifth century, and the *Lotus sutra* similarly in subcontinental Asia but as early as the first century BCE. These texts were even composed in different languages and dialects, but to a reader with no knowledge and just the texts in front of them, gathered in one edition, they would be all in Japanese. The conclusions drawn would be very different from the ones we have now, thanks to the knowledge about each separate text. Similarly, differences between the overall similar thought of the general Mahayana schools, Ch’an and Zen would be completely lost in a generalised view of one uniform school of thought. The GKS manuscript and Eddic poetry does not provide with such knowledge, and comparisons of the texts by themselves without more knowledge on each separate one can provide problematic conclusions, as seen above.

Turning specifically to *Grímnismál*, which is the focus of this thesis, a number of other Eddic poems could be compared to it. Scholars have especially liked comparing it to *Vafþrúðnismál*. While such comparisons can be fruitful for other reasons, and these two poems do show a similarity in the subject matter they deal with, it is evident from their contents that they are referring to different ‘strands’ of Norse belief. In fact, Schjødt writes that:

One main problem is that of diversity. Even if we imagine that we could meaningfully draw some connecting lines between the scattered elements hinted at in the poems – which I believe we can, in some cases, with the help of comparative evidence [...] – we cannot be certain that they all contribute to the same version of the myth. In all oral cultures is the nature of myth to be transformational in the sense outlined by Claude Lévi-Strauss (1971: 603).

Whether it is because one poem is earlier than the other, or that one poem was composed by Christians (such as *Völuspá*), or that there was a regional difference in belief between the two

---

259 See: Larrington, “*Vafþrúðnismál* and *Grímnismál*.”

composers, the conclusion is that one should not turn to Vafþrúðnismál, or any other Eddic poem specifically, while on a quest to understand Grímnismál specifically.

This thesis started from the most important statement about Germanic paganism: its shifting identity. After discussing this and the problems that come with trying to study Germanic pre-Christian belief, I suggested a study on Grímnismál, in an attempt to understand the beliefs of its author. The conclusion is that the best way is to start small: namely with trying to understand each source separately before comparing it with others and trying to reach more grandiose conclusions. As such, the thesis focused mainly on this one poem, and analysed first its contents as a whole, and then, in a commentary, each stanza and word or phrase of interest separately, going through the very minutiae of it. The conclusions are easier to accept simply because they are not about ‘Scandinavian mythology’, ‘Norse belief’ or ‘what the Scandinavians believed in’, but much more specific: this is what the people that interacted with this poem, at least some initial form of it, could have believed in, and the people in the region and timeline in which that person lived.

Grímnismál’s focus is certainly the cosmological knowledge that Óðinn imparts to its audience. Even more so than Óðinn himself, the protagonists of the poem are the mythological landscapes, river and creatures mentioned. The commentary on the poem below discusses these cosmological features separately, but because of their importance, it is necessary to study them together and see whether the image painted by Grímnismál agrees with the popular version of Norse cosmology. As such, the first part of this conclusion shall be dealing with the cosmology of Grímnismál, showing how Andrén’s statement of the shifting nature of paganism applies here as well.

---

261 In a recent publication, Schjødt has argued for similar approaches in the study of Eddic poetry as to the ones I have followed in this study (albeit with a few differences). In his view, this is the best way for historians of religion to understand pre-Christian belief in Scandinavia. See: ibid. especially pp. 132-135.
The second part of this conclusion deals with a more complicated and controversial matter, the bane of any Eddic scholar: the dating of the poem. Stefan Brink once said that no sane person would try to date Eddic poetry anymore.\textsuperscript{262} It is too risky and there are far too many factors that need to be taken into consideration. However, by focusing on \textit{Grímnismál} alone, and thanks to the common elements found in \textit{Þórsdrápa} as seen above, I believe that my conclusions are as strong as they can be in such a situation. In my conclusion on dating, I shall be gathering all data collected throughout this thesis and putting it together in order to show why there is a strong case for giving \textit{Grímnismál} a date between the mid tenth and mid eleventh centuries in Norway.

\textsuperscript{262} Stefan Brink. Personal communication.
1. Cosmology

A number of the elements described in *Grímnismál* do not agree with the popular image of Old Norse cosmology. Some elements, such as Ásgarðr, are completely absent, while others are different than in other sources. In trying to connect all information gained from all mythological sources, a number of scholars have created visual and descriptive representations of the Norse *imago mundi*. Finnur Magnússon in the late nineteenth century was the first scholar to create a map of the worlds of the gods. His ideas have been followed by scholars such as E. V. Gordon, Branston, and others. Margaret Clunies-Ross has written an excellent overview of Finnur’s influence on scholarship on this subject. In the popular world, books such as Neil Gaiman’s *Norse Mythology* mention such a cosmological view, and even otherwise excellent publications such as Larrington’s *The Norse Myths* include such maps, with a large tree (Yggdrasil), skewering disks which are meant to represent different worlds, including Ásgarðr, Miðgarðr, Hel and so on.

These images are an attempt to make some sense to the modern reader, but they probably would have made even less sense to an Old Norse speaker of the pagan era. Issues with using such a vast number of sources and trying to create a single cosmological image of Scandinavian paganism are only to be expected, considering the aspect of this religion (see Pt. 1 Chapter 2). The image gained by extracting all information on cosmology found in *Grímnismál* and shifting the information around in coherent groups, is as follows:

269 The numbers in brackets refer to stanza numbers.
(40) Earth was shaped from the flesh of Ymir. From his blood the sea was created, and from his bones the mountains. From his hair tree and from his cranium sky. (41) From his brows middle enclosure was made by the blithe gods for the sons of men. From his brains, clouds were created. (37) The sun is dragged from Árvacr and Alsvíþr. (38) Svauull stands in front of the sun, shield to the shiny god. If he falls from there, mountains and seas must burn. (39) Scaull is a wolf that accompanies the bright faced god to defend the wood. But another wolf, Hati, son of Hróþvitnir, must run before the moon.

(31) The ash of Yggdrasill has three roots which stand in three directions, with Hel living under one, the Hrímþursar (frost giants/frost ogres) under another, and human people under the third. (32) A squirrel named Ratatoskr runs up and down the ash of Yggdrasill. He bears the eagle’s word(s) from above and tells it/them to Níþhauggr below. (34) Under the ash of Yggdrasill many ormar (it can mean serpent, or dragon, or worm) are found: Góinn and Móinn, who are Grafvitnir’s sons, Grábacr and Grafvaulluþr, Ófnir and Sváfnir. They always must harm the branches of the tree. (35) A stag bites from above the ash of Yggdrasill. On the side it rots. From below, Níþhauggr damages it by cutting. (33) There are four stags that gnaw high twigs from towering necks. Their names are: Dáinn and Dvalinn, Dúneýr and Duraþrór.

(8) Glaðsheimr is where Valhaull is. It is gold bright. (9-10) More descriptions are given about Óðinn’s hall: a vargr [wolf or criminal] hangs westwards of the doorway, and an eagle dangles over it. It is raftered with spear-shafts, and thatched with shields, while it is strewn with corselets around the benches. (22) Valgrind stands on flat land before holy doors. Its grating is old and it is locked in in a cord. (23) Bilscirnir is made of five hundred and forty hall floors or chambers. The rafters of this hall are probably also spears. (24) Valhaull has five hundred and forty doors through which the chosen warriors go. (25) On the hall of Óðinn there is a goat called Heiþrún, and it bites on Lęraþr’s limbs. She has to fill the scapker. (26)
Eikþurnir is the name of a stag which stands on the hall of Öðinn and bites from Léraðr’s limbs. From Eikþurnir’s horns water drips into Hvergelmir from which all waters have their ways.

(27) There are rivers: Síþ and Víþ, Sękin and Eikin, Svaul and Gunnþró, Fiorm and Fimbulþul, Rín and Rennandi, Gipul and Gapul, Gaumul and Geirvimul, which turn around the treasure of the gods, Þún and Vin, Þaull and Haull, Graþ and Gunþorin. (28) There are also: Víná, Vegsvinn, Pióðnuma, Nýt and Naut, Naunn and Hraunn, Slíþ and Hríþ, Sylgr and Ylgr, Víþ and Ván, Vaund and Straund, Giaull and Leiptr, all of which fall near to men but fall to hell afterwards. (21) There is a river called Þund which makes a rushing noise. (29) Also there are four more rivers, Kaurmt, Aurmt and the two Kerlaugar, which Þórr must wade each day when he goes to the ash of Yggdrasill. The bridge of the gods burns with fire. This bridge could refer to (44) Bilraust, best of bridges. (30) Gods ride horses when they go judge at the ash of Yggdrasill.

(4) Þrúðheimr – holy land lying near to æsir and álfar – home of Þórr. (5) Ýdalir are the dales where Ullr lives. (6) Álfheimr was given to Freyr. (6) Valaskjálfr is a settlement in which glad gods thatched halls with silver in the old days. (7) Saucqva beccr is where cold waves are. Öðinn and Sága drink every day from golden vessels there. (11) Þrymheimr is where Þiazi lived but now Scaði, his daughter lives there. It seems to be in ruins and ancient. (12) Breiðablik is where Baldr has made halls. He is called king of men and a high-timbered sanctuary presumably is there. (13) Himinbiorg is where Heimdallr resides and drinks mead in a secure hall. (14) Fiolcvangr is where Freyia rules the excellences of seats in the hall, and chooses half of the slain, which presumably go there. (15) Glitnir is supported with gold and thatched with silver, and forseti dwells most days there. (16) Nóa tún are where Niórþr has made halls. He is called king of men and a high-timbered sanctuary presumably is there. (17) The land of Víþar seems to have no buildings, but is bushy, grassy and woody.
The lands where the gods reside are generally thought as being different worlds, or part of the different world. However, the term world in English has a number of connotations. This world is somewhere where a human being cannot go by any natural means. The general idea is that all these mythological beings resided in a heaven or different heavens, but this word is now completely Christian in the minds of most scholars. It could be interpreted as being a different dimension, or universe, from a more scientific perspective, or it could be a place that transcends the physical universe. Each of these words is problematic, as there is a need for a word about a realm that is not inflected by Abrahamic ideas but is also not heavily ‘scientific’. Similarly, using words and ideas from a Greek or Roman cosmology could lead to another sort of interpretatio Romana, which would be problematic as well. Turning to an unfamiliar language and culture which does not partake of this thought-nexus, and looking into Hindu and Buddhist cosmology: the Sanskrit word loka takes a specialised meaning when it comes to cosmology. That meaning is ‘world, division of the universe (the two worlds = heaven and earth; the three, = the same and the atmosphere or the lower regions; seven worlds are commonly spoken of); heaven; earth’, and is akin to what is being discussed here. For present purposes, I shall use the word loka to define that notion.

Going back to Grímnismál, the lands of the gods are the following: 1. Þruðheimr – Þórr. 2. Ýdalir – Úllr. 3. Alfheimr – Freyr. 4. Bǫr/Valaskialfr - ? 5. Saucqva beccr – Óðinn and Sága. 6. Glaðsheimr – Hroptr (Óðinn). 7. Þrymh eimr – Scaði. 8. Breiðablik – Baldr. 9. Himinbiorg – Heimdallr. 10. Fiolcvangr – Freyia. 11. Glitnir – forseti? 12. Nóa tún – Niorþr. 13. Vîpars land – Vîpar. Some of these – most notably Álfheimr – are thought to be different and individual spatial entities, or lokas than the others. It is evident that heimr is important in the naming of these places. According to Cleasby-Vigfússon, heimr can also mean ‘abode, village, land,

region’ instead of solely ‘world’.

The prose introduction of *Grímnismál* supports the idea that *heimr* does not describe different *lokas* when Óðinn sits on Hlíðskjálf and sees over *heima alla*, over all *heimar*. The closest translation to *heimr* is probably found in Greek *οἰκουμένη*, the translation of which is similarly problematic in English, but with the ultimate sense of ‘an inhabited region’. Lastly, it is worth noting that a number of place-names in the inhabited world of the humans had the -heimr suffix. Þrúðheimr in Norway and Álfheimr in the Swedish province of Bohuslän are examples of that. If *heimr* were used to define different *lokas* then surely it would not be found in place-names around Scandinavia. Furthermore, *Grímnismál* itself does not specify the location of these places. It does not say whether they are to be found on a celestial place or on earth.

Looking at two stanzas found in *Grímnismál* such a unifying cosmological view can be further supported:

4. Land er heilact | er ec liggia se  
asom oc alfom nær.  
enn ðprðheimi | scal ðórr vera  
unz um riufaz regin.  

29. Kaurmt oc aurmt | oc kerlaugar tvër  
þer scal þorr vaða  
hverian dag | er hann dóma ferr  
at asciyiggdrasils.  
þvi at as bru | brenn aull logo

---

275 [The] land is holy | which I see lying | near the ásir and the álfar. | But in Drúðheimr | must Þórr be, | until the gods are torn apart.
heilog votn hlóa.\textsuperscript{276} Thanks to st. 4 we know that Þórr lives in Þruðheimr, has to cross Kǫrmt, Ærmt and the two Kerlaugar to reach the ash of Yggdrasill. As can be seen in the commentary to st. 29, Kǫrmt and Ærmt appear to be actual toponyms in Norway. Furthermore, even if this were a coincidence, the reading of these two stanzas implies that wherever Þórr is coming from, which presumably is Þruðheimr, is divided from Yggdrasill by rivers. Furthermore, st. 20 tells that:

\begin{flushleft}
20. Huginn oc munninn | fliauga hverian dag
\hspace{0.5cm} iormun grund yfir.
oumc ec of of hugin | at hann aptr ne comiþ
\hspace{0.5cm} þo siámc meirr um muninn.\textsuperscript{277}
\end{flushleft}

Of great importance here is \textit{iormun grund yfir}, ‘over the great ground’. If Huginn and Munninn are indeed ravens, as they are interpreted to be, the stanza seems to imply that this is happening in one \textit{loka}.

The argument discussed up to now – on whether there were many \textit{lokas} in which the gods resided or not – is not a particularly controversial one. In fact, while the above-mentioned maps make little sense, no scholar explicitly states that, Nóa tun is in a different \textit{loka} than Breiða blik, for example. However, by focusing on \textit{Grímnismál}, this argument can be taken further into connecting the \textit{loka} of the gods and the land of human habitation into one and the same. In reading \textit{Grímnismál} st. 31 we learn that:

\begin{flushleft}
31. Þriár rǫtr | standa aþria vega
\hspace{0.5cm} undan asci yggdrasils:
hel býr undir einni | annarri hrímþursar
\hspace{0.5cm} þriðio mennzkir menn.\textsuperscript{278}
\end{flushleft}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{276} Kǫrmt and Ærmt | and the two Kerlaugar, | Þórr must wade them | each day, | when he goes to judge | at the ash of Yggdrasill, | Because the bridge of the gods | burns with fire, | holy waters boil.
\textsuperscript{277} Huginn and Munin | fly each day | over the great ground, | I fear for Huginn | that he shall not come back, | though I fear more for Munin.
\textsuperscript{278} Three roots | stand in three directions | from under the ash of Yggdrasill. | Hel lives under one, | under another the hrímþursar, | under the third human people.
Mankind, Hel and the *hrimþursar* are all explicitly said to reside underneath the roots of Yggdrasill. Recalling st. 29, we are reminded that Yggdrasill is also connected to the *loka* of the gods. Most importantly, the name of the land where mankind resides should be taken into account: *miðgarðr*. Sts. 40-41, discussing the creation of the world, say the following:

40. Ór ymis holdi | var iorþ um scaupuð
   enn or sveita sær
   biorg or beinom | baðmr or hári
   en or hausi himin\(^{279}\)

41. enn or hans brám | gerðo blið regin
   miðgarð manna sonom.
   enn or hans heila | voro þau in harðmoðgo
   scy aull um scaupuþ.\(^{280}\)

Not only is there no mention of more than one world being created, but *jörð*, ‘earth’, is given in the singular. Furthermore, *miðgarðr* means ‘middle enclosure’, suggesting that it is part of the world. Its creation from brows is also of interest, since it could point to the idea that Ymir’s brows were used to fence off an area of land in which mankind was left to reside. In reading st. 44, we learn that *bilraust* is the best of bridges. *Bilraust*, which is also called *bifröst* in some other sources, is thought to refer to the rainbow (see commentary on st. 44 above). Rainbows start somewhere on Earth and finish somewhere on Earth too. Yet, no matter how one might try to reach the beginning or end of a rainbow, he shall ultimately and utterly fail to do so. As highly developed as the Norse understanding of the world might have been, there is no reason to believe that they had understood the way a rainbow works. Its unapproachability possibly
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\(^{279}\) From the flesh of Ymir | was the earth shaped [but from blood the sea, | mountains from bones, | tree from hair | but from cranium sky.

\(^{280}\) But from his brows | the blithe gods made | middle enclosure for sons of men. | But from his brains | they, all the hardminded clouds | were shaped.
made it a matter of wonder and awe. *Bilrøst* could be a bridge that gods used, but that humans could not. Its starting point could be in the part of earth that is *miðgarðr* while its ending point could be outside said enclosure, and thus in the part of the world inhabited by gods and other mythological beings. If *bilrøst* is indeed the rainbow, why should one picture it the way that Snorri describes it, changing its shape into an actual bridge to the heavens, when it could be the actual rainbow? Otherwise, the interpretation mentioned by Brink and Lindow (see commentary to st. 44), which suggests that *bilraust* could refer to the sea, can suggest a single *loka.* All these interpretations would support the hypothesis of the gods residing in this *loka.*

A last support to this interpretation could be found in the list of river names in sts. 27-28. As it can be seen in the commentary to these stanzas, a number of these rivers could be related to, or actually be, real rivers in Norway (or lakes and rivers in Sweden). Even if that were not the case, two of the rivers, Rín and Víná, definitely refer to the Rhein and the Dvina, both present in this world, but said to pass by the lands of the gods and fall to Hel.

If one chose to look at other sources that could be related to *Grímnismál*, further support can be found. As has been seen above, I believe *Grímnismál* to be strongly connected to the skaldic poem *Þórsdrápa*. In its second stanza, the 74th of *Skáldskaparmál*, we read the following:

2. Geðstrangrar lét göngu
   gammleið Þórr skǫmmu
   - fýstusk þeir at þrásta
   *Þorns niðjum – sik biðja,
   þár er *harðvenjuðr gorðisk
Gandvíkr Skotum ríkr
endr til Ymsa kindar

---

Iðja setrs frá Þriðja.\textsuperscript{282}

The part of interest in this stanza, is the kenning \textit{Gandvíkr Skotum}. It literally can be translated as ‘of the Scots of Gandvíkr’. Gandvíkr literally translates as ‘the bay of the wizard’s staff’ and in this case, as a place-name, it refers to the White Sea or Kanadalaks Bay on the edge of the White Sea. The Scots of Gandvíkr are \textit{jǫtnar}. Thus, a mythological being is explicitly said to reside close to the White Sea.

The idea of a unified world between mythological beings and humans is not a shocking one. Ancient Greeks believed that too and while making comparisons is not yet advisable, the knowledge that such a concept was not completely alien in the European pagan world is comforting. The image given by the specific reading of \textit{Grímnismál} implies no \textit{loka} or heavenly region. In fact, scholars such as Jens Peter Schjødt and Jonas Wellendorf, have argued that there is no evidence for a celestial location for the gods if one disregards Snorri.\textsuperscript{283} Furthermore, very recently, works by scholars such as Brink and Lindow also have agreed with my interpretation.\textsuperscript{284} The very fact that such scholars have seen the need to discuss this issue, shows that it is far from agreed universally. While the attempt of actually making a visual representation of this cosmological map would still make little sense to a modern viewer, there seem to be no contradictions within it and it should be kept in mind that the understanding of the world that a modern reader has is very different from the understanding of a pagan from medieval Scandinavia. Comparing this cosmological map painted by \textit{Grímnismál} to other Norse sources we find further proof of Andrén’s statement of the shifting nature of paganism.

Translation: Þórr swiftly let the vulture-path bid him on the going to the path severe to the frame of mind – they made themselves eager to crush Þorn’s offspring. then when *the court-accustomed one of Iði’s seat more mighty than the Scots of Gandvíkr makes himself [travels] moreover to Ymsi’s offspring from the Third One.

\textsuperscript{283} Wellendorf, “Homogeneity.” p. 51.

\textsuperscript{284} Brink and Lindow. p. 187.
The absence of places such as Ásgarðr or Múspellshimr, and beings such as Loki or Týr does not necessarily mean that they would have appeared later, but could simply imply regional variation. This shows that the unified maps mentioned above are highly problematic.
2. **Dating of Grímnismál**

A number of conclusions have been drawn throughout, and they have all been seen above and can be found in the commentary to the poem. If some of those are taken together, they could help with an understanding – or narrowing, at the very least – of the time period and region in which *Grímnismál* would have been composed. The *terminus ante quem* would be the 1230s, before the death of Snorri, since he quotes part of the poem. However, it should also be kept in mind that Snorri himself deems the poems he quotes as *forn siðr*, as seen above, therefore pointing to an earlier composition. Thus, I would expect the latest composition date to be before 1200. While Snorri’s interpretations may be doubtful, there is no reason for disbelieving his statement that the sources he quoted were old.

The first big question would be whether this is a Christian or a pre-Christian poem. Only a couple of stanzas could possibly suggest that it was composed by a Christian, and these are discussed in the commentary. However, some of the performative elements of the poem, discussed above, support a pre-Christian composition. Furthermore, a number of word choices, such as trees not present in Iceland or *haf*, ‘sea’, usually used for the Northern Sea, or generally large bodies of water, and not used while in Iceland, point to a continental composition rather than an Icelandic one. Taking into consideration the different river names and the strong likelihood that a number of them would have been present in Norway, coupled with Kaurmt and Aurmt, as well as *haf* itself, could all point to a coastal part of Norway. If the connection to *Þórsdrápa* is accepted – and it appears to be a likely one – it could be of great help. The author of *Þórsdrápa* is known: Eilífr Goðrúnarson. He lived in the tenth century and worked under Hákon Sigurðarson (c. 937 – 995) for whom he apparently composed the poem. Hákon resided in the Trøndelag region, somewhere where a good number of Óðinn-related toponyms are present too, as seen above. If *Grímnismál* was indeed composed using *Þórsdrápa* as an example, then it would have to be composed in the second half of the tenth century at the
earliest and probably before the middle of the eleventh century, when most of Norway had been Christianised. As seen above, it is unlikely that the poem was related to sacred kingship – if there ever was such a thing. At the same time it feels unlikely that this might have been a poem meant to teach up and coming poets about the cosmological knowledge that would be necessary in order to compose ‘trendy’ Old Norse poetry. It seems unlikely that Grímnismál would have been composed with a similar goal to the Snorra Edda in mind. I personally like to think of the poet of Grímnismál wandering around and telling the noble-man he is being hosted by this story of a bad king (Geirrœðr), and a good king, who would be the addressee of the poem, Agnarr. Agnarr would be represented by the noble-man who would be addressed in the second person (st. 2) and praised for his prowess and magnanimity. The poet, by taking the disguise of the wandering god of poets Óðinn would thus become Óðinn more effectively than anyone else. By portraying his great numinous knowledge, the poet would show-off his skills and knowledge as a poet.

These different conclusions can be more or less likely. I see little doubt that Grímnismál, at least in some form, would have been composed in the Norwegian coast somewhere, and I find it likely that there is some sort of relation between Pórsdrápa and Grímnismál, and if not with the poem of Pórsdrápa itself, at least with the myth behind it. The two poems reflect a similar understanding of cosmology and likely derive from a similar region. Similarly, little doubt can be found in the non-Christian composition of the bulk of Grímnismál. Arguments such as Egeler’s on Eikþurnir and st. 26 (see commentary to st. 26 below), can still be accepted, but are not enough to dismiss the whole poem as Christian. Similarly, my picturesque image of the skald performing his Grímnismál in front of an earl or king, and the
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reasons behind it, is even more difficult to prove, though it is still possible. Here, Bernt Thorvaldsen’s analysis of dating of Eddic poetry is of importance:

Although the concept of ‘reasonable identity’ is perhaps more useful than trustworthy, I tend to agree with Fidjestøl (1999: 195) when he argues that ‘the question of their dating is accessible to rational deliberation’. Although the date of the first oral performance of an eddic poem is probably out of reach in most cases, the failure of our methods does not necessarily indicate that the poems are young, or that the oral delivery of eddic poetry is comparable to that of the South Slavic songs. After all, many eddic poems are explicitly presented as old in Snorra Edda and in the fornaldrarsôgrur (sagas of ancient times), and the eddic mode is associated with heroes of the distant past (see Clunies Ross 2005: 6-13).

Whatever the nature and reason behind the composition of Grímnismál was, and whether I am right in placing it in a region of Norway and between 950 and 1050 or not, it remains as one of the greatest masterpieces of the Old Norse language.

---

Chapter 1.  

Fra sonom. hrauðungi konungs.


gecc at grimni oc gafhanom horn fult at drecca. sagði at konungr gorði illa er hann let pína hann sac lausan. Grimnir dracc af þa var eldinn sva kominn at feldrinn brann af grimni. hann qvad.

**Grimnis mal**

1. Heitr erti hripuþr | oc heldr til micill 
góngomc fir fundi. 
loði sviþnar | þott ec a lopt berac 
brennomc feldr fyr.

2. Átta nætr | sat ec milli elda her 
sva at mer mangi mat ne bauð. 
nema einn agnarr er | er einn scal ráða 
geirróþar sonr 
gotna lande.

3. Heill scaltu agnarr | allz þic heilan bíþr 
veratyr vera. 
eins drycciar | þu scalt aldregi 
betri giold gera.

4. Land er heilact | er ec liggia se 
asom oc alfom nær. 
enn íprüfheimi | scal þórr vera 
unz um riuðaz regin.

5. Ýdalir heita | þar er ullr hefir 
ser um gorva sali. 
alfheim freýr | gafo i ardaga 
tivar at tann fç.

6. Bór er sa inn þriði | er blið regin
silfri þaucþo sali.
valasclalf heitir | er vëlti ser
ás iardaga.

7. Saucqva beccr heitir enn fiorði. | enn þar svalar knego
unnir ýfir glýmia.
þar þau oðinn oc sága | drecca um alla daga
glaðð or gullnom kerom.

8. Glaðs heimr heitir enn fimmti. | þars enn gull biarta
vaþlhaull við of þrumir.
enn þar hropt kýs | hverian dag
vaðn dauþa vera.

9. Miöc er auþkent | þeim er oðins koma
sal kynni at sia
vargr hangir | fyr vestan dyrr
oc drupir aurn yfir.

10. Miöc er auþkent | þeim er til oþins koma
sal kynni at sia.
scauptom er rann rept | scioldom er salr þakiþr
bryniom um becki strát.

11. Ærym heimr heitir enn sétti. | er þiazi bío
sa inn amatki iotunn.
enn nu scaði byggvir | scír bruðe goða
fornar toptir fauður.

12. Breiðablik ero in siundo | enn þar baldr hefir
ser um gorva sali.
áþvi landi er | ec liggia veit
fóst fëcien stafi.

13. Himinbiorg ero en atto | enn þar heimdll
qveþa valda veom.
þar vorþr goða | dreccr ivẹro ranni
 glaþr goða mioþ.

14. Fiolcvangr er inn niundi | enn þar freyia reþr
 sesa costom isal.
 halfan val | hon kýs hverian dag
 enn halfan oðinn á.

15. Glitnír er inn tíundi. | hann er guli studdr
 oc silfri þackþr íp sama.
 enn þar forseti | byggir flestan dag
 oc sveþer allar sakir.

16. Noa tun ero en elliptu. | enn þar niorþr hefir
 ser um gorva sali.
 manna þengill | enn meins vani
 hatimbþøþom haurg.

17. Hrísi vex | oc há grasi
 vin|pars land. viði
 en þar maugr af lęzc | af mars baki
 fröcn oc hefna fauður.

18. Andhrímnir | læþr ield hrimne
 sę hrimni soðinn.
 flesca bezt | enn þat fáir víto
 hvat ein heriar alaz.

19. Gera oc freca | sæþr gunntamiþr
 hroþigr heria fauðr.
 enn viþ vín eitt | vapn gaufugr
 oðinn è lifir.

20. Huginn oc munninn | flíuga hverian dag
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iormun grund yfir.
oumc ec of of hugin | at hann aprtr ne comiph
þo siáme meirr um muninn.

21. Þytr þund | unir þióþ vitnis
    fiscr floði f.
    ár straumr | of micill
    val glaumi at vaþa.

22. Val grind heitir | er stende velli á
    heilog fyr helgomdurom.
    forn er su grind | enn þat fáir vito
    hve hon er ilás lokin.

23. Fimmhundraþ golfa | oc um fiorom togom
    sva hygg ec bilscírni meþ bugomo:
    ranna þeira | er ec rept vita
    míns veit ec mest magar.

24. Fimmhundraþ dúra | oc um fiorom togom
    sva hygg ec at valhaullo vera.
    átta hundraþ einheria | ganga or einom durom
    þa er þeir fara at vitni at vega.

25. Heiþrún heitir geit | er stendr haulló a heriafaðurs.
    oc bitr af læraþs limom
    scap ker fýlla | hon scal ins scíra miaðar
    kna at su veig vanaz.

    oc bitr af læraþs limom
    enn af hans hornom | drýpr ihvergelmi
    þaðan eiga287 votn aull vega.

287 finnur has o
27. Síþ oc víþ | søkin oc eikin  
svaul oc gunnþró  
fiorm oc fimbulpul. | rín oc rennandi  
gipul oc gaupul.  
gaumul oc geirvimul. | þær hverfa um hodd goða.  
þýn oc vin  
þaull oc haull. | graþ oc gunnþorin.

28. Vín á heitir enn | aunnor vegsvinn  
þriðia þiodnuma.  
nýt. oc naut. | naunn. oc hraunn.  
slíþ oc hríþ.  
sylgr oc ylgr. | víþ oc ván  
vaund oc straund.  
giaull ocleiptr | þær falla gumnom nër  
er falla til heliar hepan.

29. Kaurmt oc aurmt | oc kerlaugar tver  
þær scal þorr vaða  
hverian dag | er hann döma ferr  
at asciyggdrasils.  
þvi at as bru | brenn aull logo  
heilog votn hlóa.

30. Glaþr oc gyllir | gler oc sceiðbrimir  
silfrinotpr oc sinir  
gísl oc fálhofnír | gultopr oc letfeti  
þeim riða êsir íóm  
dag hvern | er þeir döma fara  
at asci yggdrasils.

31. Þríár rǫtr | standa aþria vega  
undan asci yggdrasils:  
hel býr undir einni | annarri hrimþursar
þriðio mennzkir menn.

32. Ratatoscr heitir ikorni | er renna scal
   at asci yggdrasis.
   arnar orð | hann scal ofan bera
   oc segia níþhauggvi níþr.

   agaghalsir gnaga.
   dainn oc dvalinn. | dúneýr oc duraþror.

34. Ormar fleiri | liggia undir asci yggdrasils
   enn þat uf hyggi hverr. osviþra apa.
   Goinn oc moinn | þeir ero grafvítnis synir
   grabacr oc grafvaulluþr
   ofnir oc svafnir | hygg ec at þe scyli
   meiþsqvisto mó.

35. Ascr yggdrasils | drygir erfiði
   meira enn menn viti
   hiórtr bír ofan | enn ahlipo fúnar
   scerþer níþhauggr neþan.

36. Hrist oc mist | vil ec at mer horn beri
   sceggiauld oc scaugul.
   hildi oc þrudí | hlaucc oc herfiþtur.
   gaull oc geiraþulul.
   randgriþ. oc raþgriþ | reginþeif
   þer bera einheriom ául.

37. Arvacr oc alsvíþr | þeir scolo upp heðan
   svangir sol draga.
   enn und þeira bógom | fálo blíf regin
   çør isarn kol.
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38. Svaul heitir | hann stendr solo fyr
   scioldr scinanda góði.
   biorg oc brim | ec veit at brenna scolo
   ef hann fellr ifrá.

39. Scaull heitir ulfr | er fylgir eno scírleita góði
   til varna viðar.
   enn annarr hati | hann er hroð vitnis sonr
   sa scal fyr heiða bruði himins.

40. Ór ymis holdi | var iorþ um scaupuð
   enn or sveita sær
   biorg or beinom | baðmr or hári
   en or hausi himin

41. enn or hans brám | gerðo blið regin
   miðgarð manna sonom.
   enn or hans heila | voro þau in harðmoðgo
   scey aull um scaupuþ.

42. Ullar hylli hefr | oc allra goða
   hverr er tecr fyrstr afuna.
   þviat opnir heimar | verþa um ása sonom
   þa er hefia af hvera.

43. Ivalda sýnir | gengo iardaga
   scíþblaðni at scapa.
   scipa bezt | sciroðm freý
   nytom niardar bur.

44. Ascr yggdrasils | hann er ǫztur viþa
   en scíþbladnir scipa
   oðinn asa | enn ioa sleipnír
   bilraust brúa
   en bragi scalda | habroc hauca
en hunda garmr.

45. Svipom hefi ec nu ýpt | fyr sigtiva sonom
   við þat scal vilbiorg vaca.
   aullom ásom | þat scal inn coma
   ępis becci á
   ægis drecco at.

46. Hetomc grimr | hetomc gangleri
   herian oc hialmberi.
   þeccr. oc þriði. | þundr. oc üpr.
   helblindi. oc hár.

47. Saþr oc svipall | oc sanngetall
   herteitr. oc hnicarr
   bileýgr baleygr | baulvercr fiolnir.
   Grimr oc grinnir
   glapsvíþr oc fiuellvíþr

48. Ssipháuttr sipsceggr. | sigfauðr. hnikuþr
   alfauþr valfauþr
   atríðr oc farma tyr. | eino nafni
   hetomc aldregi
   siz ec meþ folcom fór.

49. Grimne mic héto | at geirraðar
   enn ialc at ósmundar
   enn þa kialar | er ec kialca dró.
   þrói þingom at.
   Osci oc ómi. | iafnhár oc biflindi
   gaundlir oc harbarðr meþ goðom.

50. Svipurr oc svíþrir | er ec het at sauce mimis
   oc dulþa ec þann inn aldna íótun.
   er þa ec miþvpinis varc | ins móra burar
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orðinn einn bani.

51. Aúlr ertu geirroþr | hefr þu of druccit
   miclo ertu hnugginn
   er þu ept mino gengi | ollom ein heriom
   oc oþins hylly.

52. fiolþ ec þer sagða | enn þu fat um mánt
   of þic vela vinir
   mæki liggia | ec se mins vinar
   allan idreyra drifinn.

53. Ëggmoþan val | nu mun yggr hafa
   þitt veit ec lff um liþit
   varar ro dísir | nu knattu oðin siá
   nalgaztu mic ef þu megrir

54. Öppinn ec nu heiti | yggr ec áþan het
   hetumc þundr fyrir þat:
   vacr oc scilfingr | váfuþr. oc hroptatytr.
   gautr oc ialcr meþ goðom.
   Ofnir oc svafnír | er ec hygg at orðnir se
   allir af einom mer.

Geirroþr konungr. sat oc hafði sverþ um kne ser oc brugðit til miþs. Enn er hann heyrþi at
oðinn var þar kominn stop hann up oc vildi taca o. fra eldinom. Sverþit slapp or hendi hanom
visso hioltin niþr. konungr drap foþi oc steþptiz afram enn sverþit stod igognom hann. oc fecc
hann bana. Öppinn hwarf þa. Enn agnarr var þar konungr lengi síðan.
Fra hrauðungi konungi


hann pinndi þenna mann saklausan. Grimnir drakc af þa var ælldrinn sva kominn at fældrin brann af grimni. hann. qvað.

**gímnis mal**

1. Hæitr ertu hripuðr | oc hælldr til mikill
göngumz firr funi
lóði sviðnar | þott æk a lopt væra
brænnumz fældr firi.

2. átt nætr | sat æk millum ællda hær
sva at mær mangi mat næ bauð
næma æinn agnarr | ær æinn scal raða
Gæirrǫðar son
gotna landi.

3. hæill scaltu agnarr | allz þik hæilan biðr
væra týr væra
æins drýkciar | þu scallt alldrægi
bætri giæld gæta.

4. land ær hæilagt | ær æc liggia sæ
asum oc alfum nér
æn iþrúðnhæimi | scal þorr væra
unz of riufaz rægin.

5. Ýdalir hæita | þar ær ullr hæfir
sær um gærva sali
alfhæim fræý | gafu iardaga
tifar at tannfæ.

6. Báér sa hin þríði | ær blip rægin
silfrí þóktu sali
vala skálf hætitir | ær vællti sær
ass iardaga.
7. Sǫkeva bæker hæitir hinn fiord | ænn þar svalar knægu
    unnir ýfir glýmia
    þar þau oðinn oc saga | drækca um alla daga
    glød Ír gullnum kærum.

8. Glaðs hæimr ær hinn fimti | þars hin gull biarta
    vél höll við þrumir
    ænn þar hroptr | kýss hværian dag
    vapndauða væra.

9. Miǫk ær auðkent | þæim ær oðins koma
    salkýnni at sia
    skóptum ær rann ræpt | skiaulldum ær salr þakiðr
    brýníum um bæcki stráð.

10. Miǫc ær auðkent. | þeim ær til koma
    sia at sia
    vargr hangir | firi væstan dýrr
    oc drupir orn ýfir.

11. Drýmhlæimr hæitir hinn sætti | ær þiazi bio
    sa hinn amatti iótnun
    ænn nu skaði býggir | skir bruðr goða
    forna toptir faður.

12. Bræipa blio æru hin síaunndu | ænn þar balldr hæfir
    sær um gorva sali
    a þvi landi | ær æk liggia váet
    fæsta feiknstafr.

13. Himinbiǫrg æru hin áttu | ænn þar hæimdall
    kvæða vallda væum
    þar vorðr goða | drækci iværð ranni
    glaðr hin goða miǫð.

14. Folcvangr er hinn níundi. | ænn þar freýja ræðr
sæssa kostum isal
halfan val | hon kýss hværan dag
ænn halfan oðinn á.

15. Glitnir. heitir enn tfundi | hann ær gulli studdr
oc silfri þaktr hit sama
ænn þar forsæti | býggir flæstan dag
oc svæfir allar sakir.

16. Noa tun ær. hinn elliptu | ænn þar niǫrðr hæfir
sær um gorva sali
mana þængill | hinn mæins vani
hatimbruðum hǫrgi ræðr.

17. hrisi væx | oc ha grasi
vídars land víði
ænn þar mógr of læz | afmarsbaki
frækn oc hæfna fǫður.

18. andhrinnir | lætr iæld hrimni
sæ hrimni soðinn
flæska bæzt | æn þat fáir vitu
hvæt æinhæria alaz.

19. Gæra oc fræka | sæðr gunntamiðr
hroðigr hæria fǫðr
ænn við vin æitt | vapngofugr
oðinn á lifir.

20. Huginn oc muninn | fliuga hværian dag
iðrmun grund ýfir
oumz æc um hugim | at hann aptr næ komi
þo siamz ec mæirr um muninn.

21. þýtr þundr | unir þioðvitnis
22. Valgrind hæitir | ær stændr vælli a 
   hæilög firi hælgum dýrum 
   forn ær su grind | ænn þat fair vitu 
   hvæ hon ær ilas um lokin.

23. fimhundrut dýra | oc fiorum tigum  
   sva kvæt æk a val hóll væra 
   atta hundrut æinhaeria | ganga sænn or æinum dýrum 
   þa ær þæir fara við vitni at væga.

24. Fimm hundrut golfa | oc um fiorum tigum  
   sva hýgg æk a valhóll væra bilsaðir með bugum 
   ranna þæira | ær æk ræðt vita 
   mins væit ec mæst magar.

25. hæiðrun hæitir gæit | ær stændr hóllu a hæriafoður 
   oc bitr af lærads limum 
   skapkær fylla | hon scal hins skira miaðar 
   kann su væig vanaz. 

26. eikþýrnir hæitir hiótr | ær stændr hóllu a hæriafoður 
   oc bitr af lærads limum 
   ænn af hans hornum | drypr i hværgælmi 
   þðan æiga vøtn òll væga.

27. Síð oc við | sækin oc ækin  
   svøl gunnþro 
   fíorm oc fimbulþul | rin oc rennandi 
   gipul oc gopul 
   gómul oc gæirvimul. | þær hværfa um hoddgoða 
   þýn oc vin
þöll oc höll | gráð oc gunnþorin.

28. Vina hæitir ænn | ònnur væg svin
þröðia þioðnuma
nýt oc nótt | nónn oc hrönn
slið oc hrið
sýlgr oc ýlgr | við oc vað
vønd oc strønd
gjöll oc lœiptr | þær falla gumnum nær
ænn falla til hæliar hæðan.

29. körmt oc òrmt | oc kærláugar tvær
þær scal þorr vaða
dag hværn | ær hann dæma færr
at aski ýggdrasils
þviat asbru | brænn òll loga
hæiloð çoın hloa.

30. Glaðr oc gýllir | glær oc skæið brimir
silfrin toppr oc sinir
gisl oc falæpnir | gulltoppr oc lættfæti.
þæim riða æsir ioum
dag hværn | ær dæma
at aski ýggdrasils.

31. þriar rætr | standa a þria væga
und aski ýggdrasils
hæl býr und æinni | annarri hrimþursar
þriði mænzkir mænn.

32. Raratoskr hæitir ikorni | ær rænna scal
ataski ýggdrasils
arnar orð | hann scal ofan bæra
oc sægia niðhöggvi niðr
33. hírtir æru oc fjórir | þæirs afhæfingiar á 
gaghalsir ganga 
dainn oc dvalinn | dýnæýrr oc dýrafrró.

34. Ormar flæiri | liggia und aski ýggdrasils 
ænn of hýgggi hværr osvinra apa 
goinn oc moinn | þæirro graf vitnis sýnir 
grabakr oc grafvölluðr 
opnir oc svafnir | hýgg æk at á skýli 
mæðar kuistu má.

35. askr ýggdrasils | drýgir ærfiði 
mæira ænn mænn ofviti 
hiört bitr ofan | ænn a hliðu funar 
skærðir niðhoggr næðan.

36. hrist oc mist | vil æc at mær horn bæri 
skægg ðlld oc skogul 
hilldr oc þruðr | hlókc oc hærfiður 
goll oc gæirðumul 
randgríð oc raðgríð | oc ræginlæif 
þær bæra æinhærium ðll.

37. arvakr oc alsviðr | þær scolo upp næðan 
svangir sol draga 
æn und þæira bogum | falu blið rægin 
æsir isarn kol.

38. Svalin hæitir | hann stendr solu firi 
skiðlldr skinanda guði 
bíørg oc brim | æk væit at brænn scolo 
æf hann fællr ifra.

39. Skoll hæitir | ulfr ær fýlgir hinu skirlæita guði 
til vaurna viðar
40. Or ýmis hólldi | var iqrð um skópuð
ænn or svæita síór
biðrg or bæinum | baðrmr or hári
ænn or hausi himinn

41. ænn or hans brám | gærðu blið rægin
míðgarð manna sonum
ænn or hans heila | voru þau hin harðmoðgu
ský óll of skópuð.

42. Ullar hýlli hæfir | oc allra göða
hvær ær tekr fyrstr afuna
þviat opnir hæimar | væða of asa sonum
þa ær þær hæfia af hværa.

43. Ivallda sínir | gængu iardaga
skiðblaðni at skapa
skipa bæzt | skirum fræý
nýtum niardar bur.

44. Ascr ýggdrasils | hann ær æztr viða
ænn skipblapnir skipa
öðinn asa | ænn ioa slæipnir,

*bilraust* brua
æn bragi skallda | habrok hauka
æn hunda garmr
æn brimir sværða.

45. Svipum hæfi æk ýpt | firi sigtífa sonum
við þat scal vilbiðrg vaka
óllum asum | þat scal inn koma
ëgis bækci á
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ægis drýkciu at.

46. hætumz grimr | oc ganglæri
   hærian oc hialmbæri
   þækcr oc þriði | þuðr oc uðr
   hærblindr oc hár

47. saðr oc svipall | oc sanngetall
   hærtæitr oc hnikarr
   bilæýgr balæýgr | bǫlværkr fiǫlnir
   grimr oc grimnir
   glapsviðr oc fiölsviðr.

48. Siðhauttr siðskæggr | sigfæðr hnikuðr
   alfðr
   át riðr oc farmatýr. | æinu nafni
   hætumz siz æc fólkum fór.

49. Grimni mik hætu | at gæirrǫðar
   Ænn íálk at asmundar
   Ænn þa íálk | ær æc kíalka dró
   þor þingum at
   viður at vigum | oski oc omi
   iafnhar oc biflindi
   göndlír oc harbarðr með godum.

50. Sviðurr oc sviðrir | ær ec hæt at sökemímis
   oc dulða æk þann hinn alldna iotun
   þa ær æk miðvitnis var | hins mæra burar
   orðinn æinbani.

51. Ælr ærtu gæirrǫðr | hæfir þu ofdrukcit
   miklu ærtu hnugginn
   ær þu ært minu gæði | òllum æinhærium
   oc oðins hýlli.
52. Fiöl æc þær sagðac | ænn þu fatt um mant
  ofþik væla vinir
  mæki liggia ec | sæ mins vinar
  allan iðræyra drifinn.

53. æggmoðan val | nu man ýggr hafā
  þitt væit æc lif ofliðit
  vþárrro disi | nu knattu oðin sia
  nalgaztu mik æf þu mægir.

54. Oðinn æc nu hæiti | ýggr æc aðan hæt
  hætumz þundr firi þat
  vákkr oc skilfingr | váfuðr oc hroptatýr
  gautr oc iálkr mæð goðum.
  Ofnir oc svafnir | æc hýgg at orðnir sæ
  allir at æinum mâr;

  Gæirrǫðr konungr sat oc hafði sværð um knæ sær brugðit til miðs æn ær hann hæyrði at
  oðinn var þar kominn þa stoð hann upp oc vill taka oðinn fra ældinum. Sværðit slapp or hændi
  honom oc vissu hiþilltin niðr konungr drap fæti oc staþttiz a fram ænn sværð stoð ûgænum
  hann oc fækc þar af bana. enn agnarr varð konungr.
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1. (40) [10] Ór Ymis holdi | var jǫrð um skǫpuð, 
en ór sveita sjór
b. ór b. | b. ór h.
en ór h. h.

2. (41) [11] En ór hans brámr | gerðu blíð regin 
Miðgarð manna sonum, 
ok ór hans heila | vóru þau in harðmóðgu 
ský ǫll um skǫpuð.

3. (29) [21] Kǫrmt ok Ǫrmt | ok Kerlagar tvær, 
þær skal Þórr vaða 
hvern dag | er hann dóma ferr 
at aski Ygdrasils, 
því at Ásbrú | brennr ǫll loga, 
en heilög vǫtn flóa.

4. (35) [23] Askr Ygdrasils | drýgir erfiði 
meira en menn um viti: 
Hjǫrtr bítr neðan289 | en á hliðu fúnar, 
skerðir Niðhǫgr neðan.

5. (34) [24] Ormar fleiri | liggja undir aski Ygdrasils 
en þat um hyggi hverr ósvinnra apa. 
Góni ok Móni | þeir eru Gravitnis liðar. 
Grábakr ok Grafvǫlduðr. 
Ófnir ok Sváfni | hygg ek | at æ muni 
meiðs kostum má.

6. (46) [28] Hétumsk Grímr | ok Gangleri, 
Herjan, Hjálmberi, 

---

288 Snorri Sturluson, _The Uppsala Edda_. pp. 20, 28, 30, 32, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 54, 56, 58, 60.
289 Other Manuscripts have ofan. Ibid. p. 30.
Þekkr, Þríði, | Þuðruðr,  
Helblindi, Hár

7. (47) [29] Saðr, Svipall, | Sanngetall,  
Herteitr, Hnikarr,  
Bileygr, Báleygr, | Bölverkr, Fjölnr,  
Grímnir, Glapsviðr, Fjölsviðr

8. (48) [30] Siðhötttr, Siðskeggr, | Sigfoðr, Atriðr,  
Hniðuðr, Alfþoðr, Farmatýr,  
Óski, Ómi | Jafnhár, Biblindi,  
Geldnr, Hárbarðr,  
Sviðurr, Sviðrir, | Jálkr, Kjalarr, Viðurr,  
Þrór, Gautr,  
Jálkr, Veratyr.

9. (23/24) [31] Fimm hundruð gólfa | ok fjóratugu  
svá hygg ek Bilskirni með bogum.  
Ranna þeirra | er ek ræfr vita  
míns veit ek mest magar.

10. (12) [32] Breiðablik heitir | þar er Baldr hefir  
sér um gerva sali  
á því landi | er ek liggja veit  
fæsta fæingstafi.

11. (11) [35] Þrúðheimr heitir | þar nú Þjazi býr  
sá enn mátki jötunn.  
En nú Skaði bygg<1>r, | skír brúðr guma,  
forna toptir fóður.

12. (14) [36] Fólkvangr heitir | en þar Freyja ræðr  
kosta beztum sal.  
Hálfan val | hon kýss hvern dag,  
en hálfan Óðinn á.

13. (13) [37] Himinbjörg heitir, | en þar Heimdallr býr,  
kveða valda véum,
vörtum guða. | Drekkir í væru ranní
  glaðr en<
  góða mjóð.

14. (15) [38] Glitnir heitir salr, | hans er g(ulli) s(tuddr)
ok silfri s(ama).
  En þar Forseti | byggvir f(leston) d(ag)
ok svefr allar sakar.

15. (36) [42] Hrist ok Mist | vil ek at mér horn beri.
Skegold ok Skógl
  Híldr ok Þrúðr | Hlókk ok Herfjótr
Gjóll ok Geirahóð
ok Randgríðr ok Ráðgríðr | ok Reginleif,
  þær bera einherjum òl.

16. (18) [43] Andrímnir lætr | í Eldrímini
Særímini soðinn,
  fleska bezt | en þat fáir vitu
  við hvat einherjar alast.

17. (19) [44] Gera ok Freka | seðr gunntanigr
hróðigr herjafeðr.
  En við vín eitt | vápnagaffiðr
  Óðinn æ lifir.

18. (20) [45] Huginn ok Muninn | fljúga hvern dag
jörnumgrund ýfir.
  <Ó>unj ek Hugin | at hann aprot kemr,
  þó sjámyz ek meir um Muninn.

  svá hygg ek á Valhóllu vera.
  Ætta hundruð einherja | ganga ór einum dyrum
  þá er þeir ganga við vitni at vega.

20. (44) [47] Askr Ygdrasils | er ózt réða
  en Skíðblaðnír skipa,
  Óðinn ása | en jóa Sleipnir,
Bifröst brúa
en Bragi skálda, Hábrók hauka
en hunda Garmr.
Part 4 Grímnismál – Commentary

Title

Whereas Codex Regius reads Frá somon Hrauðungs konungs, ‘About the sons of king Hrauðungr’, the AM748 I 4to fragment writes Frá Hrauðunki konungi, ‘About king Hrauðungr’. This second title is quite strange since nothing is told about king Hrauðungr in the prose or poem other than that he was a king that fathered Geirrøðr and Agnarr.

According to Sijmons and Gering (hereafter abbreviated to S&G), Hrauðungr is a mythical tribe name,\textsuperscript{290} mentioned for example in Hyndluljóð 26:

\begin{verbatim}
26. Sá var víðir
frá Vǫlsungi
ok Hjǫrdís
frá Hrauðungi
en Eylimi
frá Qðlingum.
Allt er þat ætt þín,
Óttar heimski.\textsuperscript{291}
\end{verbatim}

The name should come from *Hrauðr, which, however, does not appear anywhere other than as a feminine noun hrauðr meaning ‘breastplate’. It is also cognate with hrjóða ‘make empty’, ‘make room’ (especially by slaughtering one’s enemies).\textsuperscript{292} Having the title of the prose introduction be Frá Hrauðunki konungi in AM748 I 4to, would point out to the importance that such a name might have borne at the time of composition. If, for example, the Hrauðungs as a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{290} Sijmons and Gering. p. 184.
\item \textsuperscript{291} Hyndluljóð, 1. p. 464.
\item Translation: He, the leader, was | from the Vǫlsungs | and Hjǫrdís | from the Hrauðungs | but Eylimi | from the Qðlings. | All those are your kin, | Óttar, you fool.
\item \textsuperscript{292} Sijmons and Gering. p. 184.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
dynasty were connected to the king Hrauðungr mentioned in the poem, this would connect Geirröðr and Agnarr with Sigurðr. Another explanation could be that whoever composed the prose introduction mistook the name Hrauðungr for a given name and ‘made him’ into a king, when originally it was supposed to show a lineage connection of Geirröðr and Agnarr to the tribe of the Hrauðungs.

**Prose Introduction**


King Hrauðungr had two sons; one was called Agnarr and the other Geirrauþr. Agnarr was ten winters [old] and Geirrauþr eight. They, the two of them, rowed a boat with their fishing tackles to fish small fish. A wind drove them into the ocean outwards. In the darkness of night they were wrecked against land and went up, [they] found one cottager. There they were for the winter. The old woman fostered Agnarr but the old man Geirrauþr [*and taught him advices*]. In the spring the old man got for them a ship. But when they, the two of them including the old woman, led them to the beach, then spoke the old man private speech with Geirrauþr. They got favourable wind and came to the landing places of their father. Geirrauþr was forwards in the ship. He leapt up onto land but shoved out the ship and said: ‘Go there where the she-troll will take you’. It drove the ship out [*to ocean*], but Geirrauþr went out to the farm[s]. He was there well welcomed. Then his father was dead. Then Geirrauþr was taken as king and became a noteworthy man.

*Agnarr* is not a common name. It would be *Agan-hari* in OHG but is not attested in any source. However, the name appears in a few mythical sources, before it stopped being
used. For instance, an Agnarr is mentioned in Sigdrífumál when Sigdríf holds gives victory to an Agnarr, against Óðinn’s wishes:

En annar hét Agnarr, 
Auðu bróðir, 
er vætr engi 
vildi þiggja.  

There is no way of telling whether this Agnarr would be related to either Geirrøðr’s brother or son, but judging from Óðinn’s favouring his enemy, if there is any relation, it is more likely that this Agnarr would be Geirrøðr’s brother. That being said, Óðinn is well known for abandoning his chosen warriors or rulers so it is not out of the question that the Agnarr mentioned by Sigdríf could be Geirrøðr’s son.

**Geirrauþr** comes from *Geir-frøþr*, and according to S&G is found in OHG as *Gêr-frid* (Gothic *Gaisa-frîpus*). There are only two known historical bearers of this name: a slave of Hjörleifr in the fifth chapter of *Landnámabók*, and the settler Geirrøðr mentioned both in *Landnámabók* and *Eyrbyggja saga*. When looking at mythical characters named Geirrøðr, the giant that fought Þórr in *Þórsdrápa* comes to mind, and the possible relationship between the two has been discussed in Part 2 Chapter 3.3. According to Jonas Wellendorf,

---

293 Ibid. p. 184.  
294 Sigdrífumál. 2. p. 314.  
Translation: But the other was called Agnarr, | brother of Auða, | which naught | wished to receive.  
295 Sjömons and Gering. p. 185.  
“Hjörleifr herjaði víða um Írland ok fekk þar mikit fé. Þar tók hann þræla tíu, er svo hétu: Dufþakr ok Geirrǫðr, Skjaldbjǫrn, Halldórr ok Drafrítr.”  
Translation: Hjörleifr made war in Ireland and fetched there great wealth. There he took ten thralls, which are so called: Dufþakr and Geirrǫðr, Skjaldbjǫrn, Halldórr and Drafrítr.  
297 “Geirröður hét maður, er fór til Íslands, og með honum Fínngear son Þorsteins öndurs og Úlfar kappi: þeir föru af Hálogalandi til Íslands. Geirröður nam land inn frá Þórsá til Langadalr; hann bjó á Eyri.” Source: Branston. c. 34.  
Translation: A man was called Geirröðr, who traveled to Iceland, and with him Fínngear, son of Þorsteinn öndur, and Úlfarr kappi: they traveled from Hálogaland to Iceland. Geirröðr settled the land from Þórsá to Langadalr. “Geirröðr hét maðr, er nam land inn frá Þórsá til Langadalr ok bjó á Eyri; með honum kom út Úlfarr kappi, er hann gaf land umhverfis Úlfarsfell, ok Fínngearr, sonr Þorsteins öndurs; [...]”. Source: *Eyrbyggja Saga*, ed. Einar Sveinsson and Matthías Pórðarson, v. 4 (Reykjavík, 1985). c. 7. p. 11.  
Translation: A man was called Geirröðr, who settled the land from Þórsá to Langdalr and lived in Eyri; with him came Úlfarr kappi, who he [Geirröðr] gave land around Úlfarsfell, and Fínngearr, son of Þorsteinn öndurr; [...]
Geirrøðr has common elements with Heiðrekr from Hervarar saga. Both kings are described favourably and yet are ‘estranged protégées of Óðinn’. Similarly, both end up dying after meeting a disguised Óðinn.298

dorgar is a very rare word. It is translated as ‘fishing tackles’. Cleasby et al. write that dorga means ‘to fish with a dorg, only used when fishing through holes in the ice, while La Farge translates it as ‘fishing lines’.299 De Vries translates it like La Farge, and connects it to the dialects of Orkney and Shetland, where dorro and darro respectively mean ‘fishing line’ as well.300 Also metaphorically used in Iceland to mean ‘to go angling for a thing’ or ‘go dangling after it’.301 According to Ásgeir Magnússon, dorg is cognate with Sanskrit draga (dorg < *durgō (Hvarfstig)).302

sma fisci is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, which would directly translate as ‘small fish’. This would show that they did not go fishing with nets, which would have been called stór fisci ‘large fish’.303

haf is very important for understanding the region in which the Introduction of Grímnismál was composed. In fact, haf, whereas thought of as ‘sea’, is usually more specifically used for ‘ocean’. This would put the composition of the Introduction somewhere along the Norwegian coastline, Northern Scotland, or Iceland.

ok kenndi honum rāð is only found in the AM748 I 4to fragment. Its absence from the Codex Regius does not change the meaning of the Prose Introduction a lot. However, it does give a stronger underlining of the Old man’s fostering of Geirrøðr.

300 De Vries, Altnordisches. p. 79.
302 Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 121.
303 Sijmons and Gering. p. 185.
**hliop** could be translated both as ‘leapt’ and ‘ran’.

**smyl** is translated here as ‘she-troll’. It is a very rare word that is present only in these two versions of the Prose Introduction of *Grímnismál*, making it an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. Cleasby et al. translate it as ‘the evil one’. According to S&G, there is no doubt that *smyl* is a synonym for *troll*, *gramr*, and they give similar examples from other sources, where another word for ‘she-troll’ has been used in a similar way, to make a good case for such a meaning. Reading the sentence on its own, one can surmise that *smyl* is some sort of female evil creature.

**i haf** is only present in AM748 I 4to. Its presence does not change the meaning of the Prose Introduction.

**Geirrauðr gecc út.** In AM748 I 4to instead of *út* has *upp* ‘up’. *Upp* would make more sense in this context since Geirrøðr is running from the sea towards the farms, whereas *ganga* *út* is usually said when one goes towards the sea.

**bóiar** is found in its singular in AM748 I 4to (béia).


---

304 See Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 908. for more.
305 “[...‐] das wort ist ein synonym von *troll*, *gramr* usw. Vgl. Hrbl 60; farpu nú þars þik hafe allan gramer!; Br 113; *gramer* hafe Gunnar; Am 30; eige hann jotnar; Fms VI, 216[13]; hafti þik allan troll; Kormaks s. (ed. Möbius) 42[13]; *troll* hafti þik allan ok svá gull þitir; Grett. saga c.4, 4 (Sk. B II, 462); *troll* hafe Tréfót allan; Njála c. 36, 1; *troll* hafti þína vini; Haralds s. harbr. c. 28: *hafti* þik allan troll; Flat. III, 349[4]: *hafti* þik troll svá slegan usw.” Source: Sjímons and Gering. p. 185.
sagði at konungr gorði illa er hann let pána hann sac lausan. Grimnir dracc af þa var eldinn sva kominn at feldrinn brann af grimni. hann qvad.

Óðinn and Frigg sat in Hliðskiálf and saw around all worlds. Óðinn said: ‘Do you see Agnarr your foster-son, where he begets children with a she-troll in the cave? But Geirrauþr my foster-son is a king and sits now at lands.’ Frigg says: ‘He is that unshameful in regards to food that he tortures to death his guests if it seems to him too many come.’ Óðinn says that it is the greatest lie. They bet about this matter.

Frigg sent her serving maiden, Fulla, to Geirrauþr. She told the king to be careful that a man versed in magic, he who was come there into the land, not to cause his death, and said it to be the mark on it that no hound was so frenzied that it would leap at him. But that was the greatest faslehood that Geirrauþr was not good with food. And yet he lets seize that man which hounds did not wish to attack. That man was in a black cape and named himself Grímnir and said nothing more in number about himself, although he might be asked about. The king let him be tormented until he talks and be set between two fires, and he sat there eight nights.

King Geirrauþr had a son ten winters old, and he was called Agnarr after his brother. Agnarr went to Grímnir and gave him a full horn to drink, he said that the king acted wrongly when he let him be tormented without having offended. Grímnir drained it. Then the fire had reached the stage that the cape burned off Grímnir. He said:

Hliðskiálf is probably derived from hlið ‘door, limb, lock,’ and from PIE *kel, ‘wattle, fence’. However, Brink and Lindow write that a second meaning should be given: ‘opening, narrow inlet’. skialf is not uncommon in Scandinavian toponyms and means ‘shelf, elevation, hillock’.306 It is thought to be Óðinn’s seat, from which he looks over all worlds, as described here. It is found only in this instance of Grímnismál, and Skírnismál, and then used by Snorri in Gylfaginning. It is a strange word for ‘high-seat’. Furthermore, the fact that it is only used in these two poems can show that either may have borrowed the word from the other. This could point towards a later composition of the Prose Introduction, after the first collection of Eddic poems was made in Iceland, or to a later composition of Skírnismál which would have

been affected by *Grímnismál*. Hliðskiálf as a high-seat is reminiscent of archaeological remains of high seats throughout the Scandinavian world, as discussed extensively by Olof Sundqvist.\(^{307}\) In skaldic poetry, Óðinn is called *Hliðskiálfar gramr* and *Hliðskiálfar harre*.\(^{308}\) However, these names do not help in our understanding of what Hliðskiálf was supposed to be, other than showing, once again, its connection to Óðinn. According to S&G, there is also a Christian connection, with a legend in which a similar seat exists in heaven, from which God can see everything that happens on earth.\(^{309}\) *Skjálf* is even more difficult to interpret. There is a possibility that it could be related to Old English *scylf*, *scelf*, ‘peak, crag’.

*qvelr* is a very interesting and strong choice of word for this context. In fact, it means ‘torturing to death’ and is cognate with English ‘to quell’.

*escis mey* is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. According to Cleasby et al. it means ‘a lady’s maid’.\(^{310}\) In reading the sentence on its own, it is understood by the context that Fulla is a female person working under Frigg.

**Fulla.** Does not appear anywhere else. However, the Second Merseburg Incantation mentions Frija’s sister and names her Volla, which seems to be the same name:

```
Phol ende uuodan uuorun zi holza.
du uuart demo balderes uolon sin uuoz birenkit.
thu biguol en sinthgunt, sunna era suister;
thu biguol en friia, uolla era suister;
thu biguol en uuodan, so he uuola conda:
sose benrenki, sose bluotrenki, sose lidirenki:
ben zi bena, bluot si bluoda,
lid zi geliden, sose gelimida sin!
```


\(^{308}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 186.

\(^{309}\) Ibid. p. 186.

\(^{310}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 134.

\(^{311}\) Translation (by Bill Griffiths): Phol and Wodan were riding to the woods, and the foot of Balder's foal was sprained | So Sinthgunt, Sunna's sister, conjured it. | and Frija, Volla's sister, conjured it. | and Wodan conjured it, as well he could: | Like bone-sprain, so blood-sprain, | so joint-sprain: | Bone to bone, blood to blood, | joints to joints, so may they be glued. Source: *Second Merseburg Incantation* ed. Bill Griffiths (Ely, 2003).
If Frija is indeed the same goddess as Frigg (at least in a very loose sense, as discussed in Part I, Chapter 2), then the Fulla in the Prose Introduction of Grímnismál could be much more than a ‘random’ lady’s maid, but a trusted kinswoman to Frigg.

*fyr gerþi. In this context, fyr gerþi could mean ‘bewitch’. I have chosen to keep the translation of ‘cause his death’ as it seems to me to be a safest translation that avoids conjecture.

*fiolkunnigr maðr* could be translated both as ‘a man lined in magic’ and ‘a man knowing many things’.

*blár* can mean both ‘blue’ and ‘black’. It is cognate with Latin *lividus* ‘of the color of lead’. Cleasby et al. seem to give the meaning of ‘blue’ more importance than ‘black’.\(^{312}\) La Farge, only translates it as blue.\(^{313}\) Moreover, considering the rarity of blue dyes in the Northern part of Europe, this could be a sign of Grímnir’s high status, in this case as a god. *Blár* is a particularly interesting since it appears to also have been used on descriptions of fire as well.\(^{314}\) Disagreeing with the above interpretation, Georg Brückmann writes that *blár*, when referring to textiles would be taken to denote a black colour.\(^{315}\) Brückmann’s work on Old West Norse colours is admirable, and he has gathered all instances in which *blár* appears denoting the colour of clothing. By analysing all these sources, his conclusion is that *blár* is synonymous to the German *schwarz* when it comes to clothing.

*sac lausan* is a legal term. Cleasby et al. translate it as ‘sackless’, ‘innocent’ and ‘not guilty’, and mention its importance as a legal term as well.\(^{316}\) I have chosen to translate it as ‘without having offended’ to underline its legal importance.

---

\(^{312}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfús son p. 68.

\(^{313}\) La Farge p. 25.


\(^{315}\) Ibid. p. 17.

\(^{316}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfús son. p. 509.
setia milli elda tveggia. Placing Grímnir between two fires instead of just tying him up close to one fire is a very interesting choice.

VIII nêtr is of great importance. Whereas scholars, such as Ursula Dronke,³¹⁷ focussed on the number eight not being the traditional nine, which has a great importance in the Old Norse world, it seems to me that this shows that Grímnr’s exposition of the world of the gods started after the eight nights, meaning that it started on the ninth. The number nine seems to have been a holy number to pre-Christian Scandinavians.³¹⁸ Other Eddic works, like Vafþrúðnismál, mention that there were nine worlds. The sacrifices at the temple of Uppsala, described by Adam of Bremen (and mentioned in Part I – Chapter 2) were also performed every nine years. According to Turville-Petre, Óðinn is a god specifically associated with the number nine and with sacrifice.³¹⁹ He also mentions Hákon the Great, a pagan king, who ‘sent nine princes to Óðinn and the raven was eating their flesh.’³²⁰ Another deity that has importance in relation to the number nine is the god Heimdallr. In fact, in Hyndluljóð, it is written of him that:

35. Varð einn borinn
í árdaga
rammaukinn mjók
rǫgna kindar;
ní báru þann
naddgófgan mann
jǫtña meyjar
við jarðar þróm.

³¹⁹ Turville-Petre, Myth and Religion. p. 49.
³²⁰ Ibid. p. 53.
³²¹ Hyndluljóð, 1. p. 466.

Translation: Born was one | in the old days | very strong | of the god’s kind; | nine bore him | stud-glorious man | jötunn maidens | at the edge of the earth.
Such a connection shows, in my view, that the number nine was not important only specifically to Óðinn but generally. While a number of sources connect the number to Óðinn, this could be only because more sources survive that focus on him than, for example, Heimdallr.

*oc het Agnarr eptir broþur hans*: naming his son Agnarr after his brother might have important connotations, as Jonas Wellendorf has stated in a paper, the relevant passage of which is worthy of being quoted in its entirety:

In time, he [Geirrødr] also becomes the father of a son, whom he names Agnarr. We might see the choice of this name as Geirrødr's attempt to finish what he began by pushing his brother out at sea. Thus he not only shoved his brother aside, he symbolically prevents Agnarr from regaining any position in the world of men by appropriating his name. This appropriation of the name is necessary because Agnarr is not dead, and therefore we should not see Agnarr II as his reincarnation. Geirrødr's usurpation of his brother's name amounts to an absolute exclusion of Agnarr from the world of men. Barred entry into the human society, Agnarr is reduced to a subhuman existence breeding half trolls with an ogress in the wilderness. (If Odinn's words are to be trusted: ‘hann elr bǫrn vid gygi i hellinum’ [why the definite form *i hellinum*? ‘in his/her/their cave?’]).

Thus, Geirrødr doubly banishes his brother by making him unable to return to the world of men.

**General remarks**

According to S&G, a similar story to the one in the Prose introduction of *Grímnismál* is found in a fairy tale from Norway and Lapland. In the story:

[...] daß zwei brüder, Hans Nikolai und Lyk-Anders, die söhne eines reichen bauern in Helgeland, sich kurze zeit nach dem tode des vaters in einem boote nach einer insel begeben, um von dort dischergerat, das im sommer zurückgeblieben war, heimzuholen. Sie werden mit ihrer arbeit spät fertig und der ältere bruder überredet den jüngeren, die nacht über noch auf der insel zu verweilen. Am nächsten morgen aber, als Lyk-Anders erwacht, ist Hans Nikolai verschwunden: er ist nach hause gesegeilt, hat dicht an der küste das boot zum kentern gebracht und berichtet daheim, daß der bruder ertrunken sei, worauf er sich in besitz des gesamten

---

nachlasses setzt. Der auf der insel zurückgebliebene Lyk-Anders nährte sich, so gut es ging, von muscheln, erlegten vögeln (or hatte zum glück seine hüchse mitgenommen) und geangelten fischen. Im spätherbst landet eine prächtige jacht an der insel: das fahrzeug ist von see-zwergen bemannt, die eine schöne menschliche jungfrau mit sich führen, die sie als kind geraubt haben und mit einem der ihren verheiratet wollen. In dem auf der insel befindlichen boots-schuppen wird die hochzeitstafel hergerichtet und mit silber – und goldgeschirr besetzt, worin die köstlichsten speisen sich beinden. Nachdem die zwerges gespeist haben, beginnt zu lustiger musik ein wilder tanz, am dem die braut jedoch nicht teilnimmt. Lyk-Anders, der durch eine luke im dache zugesehen hat, schleicht sich jetzt zu der jacht und wirft seinen feuerstahl darüber (das bekannt mittel, um zauberei zu zerstören und macht über zauberische gegenstände zu gewinnen), kehrt dann zum schuppen zurück und feuert seine büchse ab, gerade über den kopf der braut. Die erschreckten zwergen stürzen aus der tür und rennen nach der jacht; als sie merken, daß dieselbe ‘gebunden’ ist, erheben sie ein jammer-geschrei und verschwinden dann in einen felshöhle. Die braut war in schuppen zurückgeblieben: sie ist mit Lyk-Anders entfernt verwandt, betrachtet ihn natürlich als ihren retter und hat nichts dagegen ihn zu heiraten. So segeln sie denn mit der zauberjacht, die wie Freys schif Skiblaphner immer günstigen fahrwind hat, und mit allen den schätzen, die die zwergen zurückgelassen haben, heim. Er ist nun viel wohlhabender geworden als sein trauloser bruder; diesen aber verzehrt der neid, und da er ahnt, woher der große reichtum gekommen, begiht er sich nun auch nach der insel. Dort stellt er sich aber so ungeschick an, daß die zwergen macht über ihn gewinnen und ihn wahnsinnig machen.³²³

The similarities between Lyk-Anders and Agnarr, and Hans Nikolai and Geirrøðr are obvious. Whereas the extent to which S&G try to connect this fairy tale to Grímnismál seems to me to be a bit forced,³²⁴ it is not hard to imagine that fairy tales such as the above-mentioned one could have been adapted from mythological material that had transcended to folklore. However, the opposite, namely that this mythological story came from folklore, could also be the case.

S&G also focus on the idea of ‘royal fratricide’, which according to them is something common in the Norse world (an example being Eiríkr blóðøx killing three of his brothers) but is also a common motif in ancient Greece.³²⁵ A similar story is also found in Hervarar saga ok

³²⁴ For example, they argue that the name Agnarr was changed to a similar-sounding and common Anders on purpose. Source: ibid. p. 182.
³²⁵ S&G mention two stories found in Herodotus, namely that of Cambryses and Smerdis, and the theft of the treasury of Rhampsinit. Source: ibid. p. 183.
Heiðreks where Heiðrekr kills his brother Angantýr with the sword Tyrfingr.326 Both Heiðrekr and Geirrøðr end up dying by their own sword. Even more importantly, Heiðrekr, like Geirrøðr, had been fostered by someone other than his father, a man named Gizurr, which could be an Óðinn name.327 Lastly, Heiðrekr named his son Angantýr, after his brother, in possibly a similar fashion that Geirrøðr did in the Prose introduction of Grímnismál.

The Prose introduction gives some extra information to the poem and shows the reasons for which Óðinn is tortured between the two fires. However, it does not seem to me to be a necessity for Grímnismál to make sense.328 Taking Sverdlov’s comment on Vafþrúðnismál, ‘the prose commentary is unnecessary’ since one can find a dramatic climax in the poem itself, in the moment where Grímnir reveals his true self.329 According to McKinnell, the prose ending could also traditionally have been part of a different poem, possibly Vafþrúðnismál.330 The question of the validity of the prose introductions has been a long debated one, and most, if not all, scholars that have studied Eddic poems with such an introduction or conclusion, have debated whether they were later additions or not.331 To me, the most sensible conclusion is given by Terry Gunnell, who simply states that these prose introductions are ‘of questionable origins’.332 Having said that, I do not claim that Grímnismál had necessarily not been meant to have a prose introduction and conclusion. As Gunnell writes, the prose account gives a good

325 “[...] ok brá þá sverðinu, ok lýsti af mjök ok sindraði; hann eiskraði þá mjök, ok héldt við berserksgáng. Nú með því, at þeir bræðr voru tveir saman, en Tyrfingr varð mans bani hvern tíma, er honum var brugðit, þá hjó hann bróður sinn banahögg; þetta var sagt Höfund.” Source: Hervarar Saga Ok Heiðreks. (H) ch. 6.

Translation: [...] and [Heiðrekr] drew then the sword [Tyrfingr], and it shone and scintillated much; he [Heiðrekr] then raged much, and showed a berserker’s fury. Now they, the two brothers, were the only two there. But since Tyrfingr was a man’s bane each time it was drawn, then he [Heiðrekr] cut his brother’s death blow; Höfund was told of these matters.

327 Sijmons and Gering. p. 183.
328 Schjødt disagrees with this statement, arguing that the prose frame narratives are ‘very important’ for our understanding of the poem. Source: Schjødt, “The Fire Ordeal.” p. 29.
329 Sverdlov. p. 70.
331 See also: Larrington, “Vafþrúðnismál and Grímnismál.” p. 59.
narrative frame to the poem. Thus, it may have been that originally, the audience of *Grímnismál* were aware of the story, making the prose unnecessary, and that the editor, knowing this story, put it down to writing. However, taking into consideration that prose could change throughout time much more easily than poetry, since it needs not follow a specified metre, it becomes a more dubious source in this case. If one chooses to count the prose as having been composed when the poem itself was, then *haf* plays a very important role in focusing the region of composition to the coasts of Norway or Iceland. The Prose being the most dubious part of the poem, I have chosen not to rely on its contents for my analysis of the poem.

**Stanza 1.**

Heitr ertu hripuþr | oc heldr til micill  
góngome fir funi.  
loði svíþnar | þott ec a lopt berac  
brennomic feldr fyr.

Hot are you, swift one, | are rather too great.  
Go in respect of me further, fire!  
The cape singes, | though I bear [it] aloft,  
the cape burns in front in respect of me.

*hripuþr* is a rare poetical word. It means ‘fire’ according to Cleasby et al.  

---

334 This is also why the information gained by reading the Prose introductions and conclusions has been added in square brackets in the summary given above.  
funi is a very rare poetical word. According to Cleasby et al. it might be related to Greek πῦρ ‘fire’ and could be cognate to German funke.\textsuperscript{336}

This stanza gives an introduction of the situation in which Grímnir finds himself in. Hearing it (or reading it) without the Prose Introduction, one can understand how the speaker is close to a fire, so much that it has started burning his cape. This does not seem to be something that the speaker has done to himself on purpose since he ‘complains’ about the fire. As such, it is not far-fetched to think that he is being held close to a fire against his will.

Stanza 2.

Átta nêtr | sat ec milli elda her
sva at mer mangi mat ne bauð.
nema einn agnarr er | er einn scal ráða
geirróþar sonr
gotna lande.

Eight nights | I sat between the fires here,
so that to me no man offered food,
with the exception of Agnarr alone | who alone must rule,
Geirraúpr’s son,
the land of the Goths.

gotna lande. S&G argue that this could be emended to Gotom.\textsuperscript{337} I see no reason for such an emendation.

This stanza continues giving information related to the previous one. Here we learn that the speaker has been in this condition (close to a fire against his will) for eight nights before he

\textsuperscript{336} Ibid. p. 178.
\textsuperscript{337} Sijmons and Gering. p. 188.
started talking, making this the ninth day since this ordeal of his started. We also learn that he was left without food (and possibly water) until that moment, in which one Agnarr, the son of Geirrðr gave him something to eat or drink. We also learn that this Geirrðr rules over the land of the Goths, and is therefore a king.

This stanza, more than any, is reminiscent of Hávamál 138-139, in which Óðinn, speaking in the first person, describes how he hung from a tree for nine nights:

138. Veit ek, at ek hekk vindga meiði á nætr allar nú, geiri undaðr ok gefinn Óðni, sjálfr sjálfum mér, á þeim meiði er manngi veit hvors hann af rótum renn.338

139. Við hleifi mik sældu né við hornígi, nýsta ek niðr, nam ek upp rúnar, oepandi nam, fell ek aptr þaðan.339

I have argued elsewhere about the possible pagan composition of these stanzas.340 The Hávamál stanzas have been compared to the image of Christ on the Cross. The wounding by a spear strengthens such image.341 The hanging of Óðinn is not as shocking, since he is a deity related to hanging, and a large number of Óðinn names show that. In both cases, the speaker has had no food. The similarities to Grímnismál can be easily spotted. In both cases something

---

338 I know, that I hung | on that windy tree | nine whole nights, | wounded with a spear | and gave to Óðinn, | myself to myself, | at that tree | that no one knows | where its roots grow.
339 Not by means of loafs and cheers | nor by means of drinks, | I peered below, | I picked up secrets (runes), | picked them screaming, | I fell back from there.
341 Hávamál, 7. p. 29.
happens to the speaker in nine nights. [See entry on *VIII nêtr* above for more information on the importance of the number nine.]

However, there are some important differences as well. For one, whereas Óðinn appears to have hung on a tree on his own volition, in *Grímnismál* 1 one sees how the situation Grímnir is in is against his will. Furthermore, whereas in *Hávamál* Óðinn completes nine nights without food or cheers, in *Grímnismál* Grímnir does not complete this since Agnarr brings him a drink, and therefore cheers him as well. These differences could show that whereas in *Hávamál* one can definitely see that the situation Óðinn was in gave him a mystical experience that brought to him arcane knowledge, what will follow in the next stanzas of *Grímnismál* need not be something of this sort.

Lastly, it should be noted that this stanza does not follow the traditional system of *ljóðaháttr* of having six half-lines, but has an extra half-line.

### Stanza 3.

Heill scaltu agnarr | allz þic heilan biþr
veraty vera.
eins drycciar | þu scalt aldregi
betri giold gera.

You must be whole, Agnarr, | because Veratýr
bids you be healthy.
For one drink | you must never
get better yeald.

*Heill scaltu* can also be translated as ‘hail to you’.
Veratýr is an Óðinn name. This can be testified by the fact that it is present in st. 54 as part of the list of Óðinn names.

This stanza completes the introductory triplet that shows the audience what has been going on. After hailing Agnarr, Grímnir tells him that Óðinn will bless him. This could be interpreted as already indicating that Grímnir is in actuality Óðinn as shall be seen much later in the poem. It is in this stanza as well that we see that what Agnarr offered Grímnir was indeed one drink. This is important in relation to the idea of ‘liquid knowledge’. Getting knowledge from a drink is a motif commonly found in Germanic sources. In Sigrdrífumál, Sigdrífa offers Sigurðr a horn fullt mjadar ok gaf honum minnisveig.\footnote{Sigrdrífumál, p. 313. Translation: ‘a horn full of mead and gave him memory-drink.’} According to Judy Quinn:

In the depiction in Sigrdrífumál, knowledge is derived from a source beyond human society, and it is conceived to be either elementally, or through a process of mysterious manufacture, a liquid that can be offered in a drinking horn. This seems to be the broad conception exhibited by early poetry and mythology in Scandinavia, that knowledge can be understood as a drink that can be prepared, offered and imbibed, and it is a rather different conception from, say, the notion of inspiration, where insight is transferred from mind to mind to mind by metaphysical means invisible and non-potable.\footnote{Judy Quinn, "Liquid Knowledge: Traditional Conceptualisations of Learning in Eddic Poetry," In Along the Oral-Written Continuum: Types of Texts, Relations and Their Implications, ed. Slavica Ranković, Leidulf Melve, and Else Mundal (Turnhout, 2010). p. 209.}

Another example of liquid knowledge can be found in the form of the mead of poetry. In Hávamál we are told by Óðinn himself the story of how he got the dýra mjǫð, ‘precious mead’:

104. Inn aldna jǫtun ek sótta;  
 nú em ek aprt um kominn;  
 fátt gat ek þegjandi þar;  
 mǫrgum orðum  
 mælta ek í minn frama  
 í Suttungs sölum.\footnote{Hávamál, 7. p. 60. Translation: ‘The old jǫtunn I sought; now I am back; little I got by being silent; many words | I spoke in my benefit | in Suttung’s halls.’}

105. Gunnlǫð mér um gaf  
 gullnum stóli á  
 drykk ins dýra mj∂ar;  
 ill iðgjǫld
lét ek hana eptir hafa
síns ins heila hugar,
síns ins svára sefa.345

Other references are also found in a large number of kennings that relate poetry to mead and a stanza of \textit{Völuspá} also shows a possible reference to the idea of ‘liquid knowledge’:

28. Ein sat hon úti,
þá er inn aldni kom,
yggjungr ása,
ok í augu leit:
“Hvís fregnið mik?
Hví freistið mín?
Allt veit ek, Óðinn,
hver þu auga falt:
í inum mæra
Mímisbrunnr.”
Drekkr mjǫð Mímir
morgin hverjan
af veði Valföðrs.
Vituð ér enn – eða hvat?346

I shall not discuss the unorthodox length of this stanza here, but it is worth pointing out to the reader the mead that Mímir drinks, as well as the \textit{Mímisbrunr}, ‘well of Mímir’. Óðinn appears to have gained positive powers (in this case numinous knowledge) by sacrificing an eye in the well of Mímir. The idea of knowledge or powers gained through drinks is present in many other mythologies, and one cannot help but think of the \textit{soma} of the Indo-Iranian peoples, and as Quinn points out, the effects gained are usually positive.347 Such a \textit{topos} is also found in the magical powers gained by drinking the magic potion that the druid Getafix brews for one small village in Armorica.

345 Ibid. p. 60.
Translation: ‘Gunnloð gave me | on a gold seat | to drink the precious mead; | ill recompense | I let her have in return | for her sincere feelings, | for her heavy mind.’
Translation: Alone she sat outside | then when the old came, | terror-fearful god, | and stared into the eyes: |
“What do you ask me? | Why do you try me? | I know all, Óðinn, | of where you hid your eye: | in the great | well of Mímir.” | Mímir drinks mead | each morning | from the pledge of the father of the slain. | Do you know – or what?”.
This stanza also shows that what will follow is told by Grímnir as a way of thanking Agnarr for his help and good treatment, as opposed to the people who put him in this situation, whose identity, solely based on the poem, is as yet unknown.

There is a small difference in the AM version in this stanza. The last verse has *gæta*, ‘get’, instead of *gera*, ‘make’.

**Stanza 4.**

Land er heilact | er ec liggia se
asom oc alfom nær.
enn iþruðheimi | scal þórr vera
unz um riufaz regin.

[The] land is holy | which I see lying
    near the ásir and the álfar.
But in Þrúðheimr | must Þórr be,
    until the gods are torn apart.

*álfom* can be translated as ‘elves’. However, its exact meaning is not definite. We do not know exactly what the *álfar* were. As such, I have chosen not to translate it. For more information on the *álfar* see Alaric Hall’s *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England*.348

*Þrúðheimr* literally means home of Þrúðr, Þrúðr being cognate with Gothic *propjan* which is in turn translated from Greek *γυμνάζειν* ‘excercise’.349

---


349 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon, p. 746.
According to Dronke, the land next to the álfar and the æsir is not yet inhabited. No explanation is given by Dronke as to why she considered it to be the case so it might be surmised that she made a distinction between the land mentioned in the first three verses and Þrúðheimr. Whether such a distinction should be made, there being no name of a god mentioned for that land does not necessarily make it uninhabited. It could just as well be miðgarðr.

With this stanza, a long description of the world of the gods and their abodes starts.

Stanza 5.

Ýdalir heita | þar er ullr hefir
ser um gorva sali.
alfheim freýr | gafo i ardaga
tivar at tann fě.

They are called Ýdalir, | there where Ullr has
made for himself.
The gods gave Álfheimr | to Freyr in days of old
as tooth-money.

Ýdalir means ‘dales of yew’. This place is not attested in any other source. The only possible relation might be with a place-name in the North of Scotland and called Udale and a Udale in Lancashire. This has first been recorded in the second half of the sixteenth century and according to Robert Bevan-Jones, it could be connected to the veneration of Ullr in Norse Scotland. According to Henry Adam Bellows ‘The wood of the yew-tree was used for bows

---

350 Dronke. p. 127.
in the North just as it was long afterwards in England.\footnote{Grímnismál, edited and translated by Henry Adam Bellows (Princeton, 1936). p. 88.} This would connect Úllr and Ýdalir to bows.

**Úllr** as a god is a very shadowy figure, if he ever was a god at all. Cleasby et al. write that Úllr is cognate with Gothic *wulþus* ‘glory’.\footnote{Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 648.} According to Rudolf Simek, Úllr is mentioned in kennings for ‘warrior’.\footnote{Simek. p. 339.} A great number of place names in Norway show that he held some importance in religion.\footnote{Sijmons and Gering. p. 188.} De Vries also connects the name to a runic inscription in which *[o]wlþewaR* appears, and dates the inscription to c. 300, showing that if such connection is correct, Úllr was an old name.\footnote{De Vries, Altnordisches. p. 633.} The name appears to be cognate with Gothic *wulþus* and translated from Greek ὀδόγα, ‘glory’.\footnote{Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 1084.}

**Alfheim** means home of the álfr. This place is not recorded in any sources other than this stanza and by Snorri Sturluson,\footnote{Snorri Sturluson, Gylfaginning. ch. 17. p. 19.} who might have taken it from stanza 5 of Grímnismál. However, outside of a mythological setting, it appears as the toponym of a region in Sweden. As such, nothing more can be said on this place other than what this stanza gives us, namely that it was given to Freyr as tooth-money and is now his abode.

**Frey** is generally taken to denote the god Freyr. It should be noted, however, that the name could also mean ‘lord’. If this were the intention of the composer of Grímnismál, then one could argue that Ýdalir and Alfheimr are somehow related and that Úllr is the lord mentioned that gets the tooth-money. According to Dronke, Freyr is a ‘younger figure’ of Úllr.\footnote{Dronke. p. 127.} This argument would make sense from the perspective that st. 6 mentions Valaskiálfr as being the third place when there have been three places mentioned already (see st. 6 for...
more). If Frey would be seen as *frey* for Ullr, and Ýdalir part of Álfheimr, then the ‘mistake’ from st. 6 would disappear.

**Stanza 6.**

> Bǫr er sa inn þriði | er blið regin
silfrí þaucþo sali.
valascialf heitir | er vęlti ser
ás iardaga.

That settlement is the third, | which the glad gods
thatched the halls with silver.
It is called Valaskiálf | which the god made with skill
for himself in the old days.

*Bör er sa inn þriði* seems to be a mistake. There have already been mentioned three places, namely Þrúðheimr, Ýdalir and Álfheimr. Furthermore, if st. 4 does indeed talk about two different places, then four places have been mentioned. This would make Valaskiálf the fourth or fifth. See st. 5 for an explanation on this.

*Valaskiálf* means ‘the seat of the slain’. It is only mentioned in Eddic poetry, and later by Snorri. However, it is not stated who built it, if it is indeed a building.

The ás mentioned here is presumably Óðinn, judging from the places relation to the slain, though no specification is given.

**Stanza 7.**

---

360 Sijmons and Gering. p. 189.
Saucqva beccr heitir enn fiorði. | enn þar svalar knego unnir ýfir glýmia.
þar þau oðinn oc sága | drecca um alla daga glauð or gullnom kerom.

The fourth is called Saucqva beccr | but there did the cold waves crash over.
There they, Óðinn and Sága, | drink during all days glad from golden vessels.

**Saucqva beccr** means ‘sunken bank or bench’.\(^{361}\) Interestingly, Cleasby-Vigfússon-Craigie write that it is the seat of Freyja according to *Grímnismál*, connecting Sága with her. See commentary for st. 14 for more on the similarities between the two goddesses.

**Sága** is a very obscure deity. It is ‘often used in circumlocutions of a woman, *silki-sága, òl-sága*’.\(^{362}\) Ásgeir traces the name to *sjá* ‘to see’, and ultimately to *sègwòn* ‘he/she who sees or forsees’.\(^{363}\) S&G point the possibility of Sága being the goddess Frigg, known to be Óðinn’s wife and mentioned in the prose introduction of *Grímnismál*.\(^{364}\) Whereas I believe there is good cause to consider Sága as Óðinn’s consort in *Grímnismál*, I would remind the reader that without taking into consideration the prose introduction, Frigg does not appear at all in the poem itself. As such, it could be the case that in different ‘versions’ of Germanic belief, Óðinn was married to different goddesses, which then merged when the mythological material was brought to Iceland. Sága could be Frigg, but she could also be Freyia, who is mentioned in st. 14, and who herself might not be a deity of her own, but a common noun used to mean Sága (or possibly Frigg, who as seen now could also be Sága). Whereas a likely answer to which of the three goddess names would ultimately be thought to be Óðinn’s consort is

\(^{361}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 620.
\(^{362}\) Ibid. p. 516.
\(^{363}\) Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 792.
\(^{364}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 190.
unlikely to be found, Sága seems more likely to be a given name as opposed to Freyia (see commentary on st. 14 for more) and, as such, I have chosen to capitalise her name.

**Stanza 8.**

Glaðs heimr heitir enn fimmti. | þars enn gull biarta
\[\text{365} \text{valh}lau\text{ll við of þrumir.}\]
enn þar hropt kýs | hverian dag
vapn dauða vera.

The fifth is called Glaðs heimr, | there where gold bright
Valhaull lies wide.
But there Hroptr | chooses each day
the weapon-dead men.

*Glaðs heimr* means ‘gladness home’.

*Hroptr* is an Óðinn name.

*Valhaull:* means the ‘hall of the slain’. By basing our knowledge of the chosen warriors on st. 51, we see a connection with Óðinn which is further strengthened by a great number of his names and also sts. 14 and 24. As such, even if one disregards every other source, it seems very likely that Valhaull is a hall related to Óðinn. Simek writes that:

this image of the warriors’ paradise given in Grímnismál derives, although not in all details, without a doubt from folk-belief, but nonetheless several elements can be found already in 9th and 10th century skaldic poetry: in Þórbjǫrn Hornklofi’s *Hrafnsmál* (the shield-covered hall), in Eyvind’s *Hákonarmál* and in the *Eiríksmál.*

---

365 The manuscript writes alhaull,
366 Simek. p. 347.
This is critical for the dating of *Grímnismál*, since it shows that such a place existed in the minds of people in the ninth and tenth centuries.

**Stanzas 9. – 10.**

\[
\text{Miōć er auþkent | þeim er oðins koma} \\
\text{sal kynni at sia} \\
\text{vargr hangir | fyr vestan dyrr} \\
\text{oc drupir aurn yfir.}
\]

\[
\text{Miōć er auþkent | þeim er til oþins koma} \\
\text{sal kynni at sia.} \\
\text{scauptom er rann rept | scioldom er salr þakiþr} \\
\text{bryniom um becki strát.}
\]

It is very easily recognized, | for them who come to Óðinn

to see the hall recognition.

A wolf hangs | westwards of the doorway,

and an eagle dangles over.

It is very easily recognized, | for them who come to Óðinn

to see the hall recognition.

With spear-shafts is the hall rafted, with shields is the hall thatched,

with corselets around the benches it is strewn.

*þeim er til Óðins coma* is interesting. This could be translated both as ‘for them who come to Óðinn’, but also as ‘for them who come to Óðinn’s’ which would probably mean, those who go to Óðinn’s hall.
**varg** which has here been translated as ‘wolf’, can also be translated as ‘outlaw’ or ‘criminal’, metaphorically, ‘as someone who is to be hunted down as a wolf, esp. used of one who commits a crime in a holy place, and is thereon declared accursed.’

It should be noted that in AM, these two stanzas are the other way around, though this does not seem to change the poem or the meaning.

**Stanza 11.**

Þrym heimr heitir enn sétti. | er þiazi bíó
sa inn amatki iotunn.
nen nu scaði byggvir | scír bruðe goða
fornar toptir fauður.

The sixth is called Þrym heimr, | where Þiazi lived,
that, the mighty giant.
But now Scaði dwells in, bright bride of the gods,
ancient ruins of [her] father.

**Þrym heimr** means home of Þrym. Þrym means ‘noise’, possibly a thundering one.

It can also be related to ‘battle’. S&G write that since this place belonged to the giant Þjazi, it has no place in such a list, even though Scaði apparently lived there for a short period before going to live with her husband, Njǫrðr.

**Scaði** is a grammatically masculine *n*-stem. As a goddess, Scaði is married to Njǫrðr, whose name seems to be cognate to the goddess Nerþus mentioned by Tacitus. As such,

---

367 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 680.
368 Ibid. p. 747.
369 Sijmons and Gering. p. 191.
370 *Germania* 40 says: ‘Contra Langobardos paucitas nobilitat: plurimis ac valentissimis nationibus cineti non per obsequium sed proelis et periclitando tuti sunt. Reudigni deinde et Aviones et Anglii et Varini et Eudoses et Suardones et Nuithones fluminibus aut silvis muniuntur. Nec quicquam notabile in singulis, nisi quod in
Scaði could have originally been a male deity later changed into female when Njörðr became Njǫrðr. The name could be cognate with *skape ‘to harm’. Alternatively, it could also be related to Greek *Σκοτήια, ‘darkness’, while Ásgeir writes that the origin is very uncertain since the worship and role of the goddess is unknown. He writes that the name could be linked with Gothic skadus, ‘shadow’, which agrees with the S&G supposition and could make Scaði a deity of the darkness and underworld, or the Arctic, which is dark for half of the year, but also writes of the possibility of the name being cognate with Latin scatère, ‘to roll down’. Scandinavia, and the name of the Southern Swedish province of Skåne, Skáney in Old Norse, could both be related to Scaði. Skåne is where the cult site of Uppåkra was situated. The site seems to have been a major centre of Iron Age ritual in Scandinavia.

_scír bruðr goda_ comes against the explanation of Scaði’s name which makes her a goddess of darkness and the underworld, since the idea of a shiny goddess whose name is cognate with darkness makes little sense. It is interesting to also note that _scír_ is an adjective also used for describing Freyr in stanza 43 of _Grímnismál_.

This stanza is quoted in _Gylfaginning_. _Prym heimr_ is emended by Heimir as _Prúðheimr_. _heitir enn sétti_ is changed to _heitir_, and _goda_ appears as _guma_, ‘men’.

**Stanza 12.**

commune Nerthum, id est Terram matrem, colunt eamque intervenire rebus hominum, invehi populis arbitrantur.’ Source: Tacitus. p. 46. Translation: ‘The scarcity of number makes the Langobards notable, which, notwithstanding being surrounded by many powerful nations, keep their security not submitting themselves, but by facing wars and perils. Instead, rivers and forests protect the Ruedigni, Aviones, Anglii, Varini, Eudoses, Suarines, and Nuitones. Nothing noteworthy in each of them, other that they all worship Nerthus, the Mother Earth, and believe that she intervenes on human affairs and descends between her people.’

Sijmons and Gering. p. 191.

Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 824.


Alex Woolf has given me an idea of his on this matter. According to him, snow north of the Arctic Circle could bring brightness in darkness. Source: Private Conversation.
The seventh is called Breiðablik, but there Baldr has made halls for himself, in that land where I know to lie fewest of treachery-staves.

Breiðablik means ‘Broad gleaming’. This is the only source (other than Snorri, who quotes Grímnismál) where it appears.

feícn stafi is very interesting and obscure. It literally means ‘treachery staves’. Stafr ‘staff, stick’, can also mean ‘written letters, staves’. This meaning has derived from magic twigs that would have been used in divining the future. It could also refer to ‘baleful, evil runes’. Feícn stafi is reminiscent of Sigrdrífunamál 3, where blunstofum appears. According to Vésteinn and Jónas, the meaning of blunstofum is ‘sleep runes’. If correct, this makes it more likely that feícn stafi has a magic connotation, and denotes evil, harmful spells.

This stanza is also quoted by Snorri. It appears almost the same, with the exception that heitir is found instead of ero in siundo, following a similar pattern as with st. 11.

Stanza 13.

Himinbiorg ero en atto | enn þar heimdall qveða valda veom.
þar vorþr goða | dreccr ivęro ranni glaþr goða mioþ.

376 La Farge. p. 57.
377 Sigrdrífunamál, 2. p. 313.
The eighth is Himinbiorg, | but they say
Heimdallr to have control over sanctuaries.
There, the warden of the gods | drinks in a secure hall
glad [the] good mead.

Himinbiorg means ‘Heaven precipices (especially on a sea-side)’.\(^{378}\) The name also appears twice in Gylfaginning.

\(\text{vörr} \text{goða} \) ‘warden of the gods’ as an attribute of Heimdallr, also appears in Skírnismál 28 \(\text{vöðr} \text{með} \text{goðom} \) ‘warden among the gods’.\(^{379}\) Heimdallr is a very shadowy figure, and has been connected with many facets of Norse mythology. In my M.Litt. dissertation I discussed his relationship with trees. He seems to be a very ancient deity, as Schröder writes:

“Ist Heimdall der “Wächter der Götter” (\(\text{vörr} \text{goða} \)) ist Agni “des Himmels Wächter” (\(\text{divās} \text{pāyūh}, 8, 60, 19\)), und nachdrücklich wird immer wieder seine Wachsamkeit hervorgehoben: “der wachsams Hirte des Volkes” (\(\text{jānasaya} \text{gopā jāgrvh}, 5, 11, 1\)), ein “nach allen Seiten Schauender”; er ist der Gott, “der mit den Augen die beiden Geschlechter beobachtet wie ein Wächter di Wege”, “mit hundert Augen blickend”. Ebenso heißt es auch von Mitra, der mit Agni manche Züge gemein hat, er “gibt auf die Völker Acht, ohne die Augen zu schießen”, und vom iranischen Mithra im 10, \(\text{Mithra-} \text{(Mihir-)} \text{Yašt} \text{des Awesta}^{*} .)^{380}\)

Furthermore, Heimdallr seems to be directly related to Yggdrasill and the idea of an \textit{axis mundi}:

In Völuspá 27, the völva says how she knows that the \(\text{hljóð} \) ‘hearing’ of Heimdallr is hidden beneath Yggdrasill.\(^{381}\) There has been some difficulty in the interpretation of \(\text{hljóð} \). Some scholars believe that it is the Gjallarhorn.\(^{382}\) The fact that it lays underneath it connects Yggdrasill to Heimdallr. Heimdallr’s hearing is important, and the pledging of it to the World Tree reminds of Óðinn, who gave one eye to

---

\(^{378}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 64.  
\(^{381}\) Völuspá XXVII. ‘Veit hon Heimdalar | hljóð um folgit | undir heiðvønum | helgum baðmi; | á sér hon ausaz | aurgum forsi | af veði Valfþórs. | Vítuð ér enn – eða hvat?’ Translation: ‘I know of Heimdallr’s | hljóð hidden | under the used to the blue clarity of the heavens | holy tree; | she sees it pour | in a muddy fall | from Vafþótr’s pledge. | Do you know now – or what?’  
\(^{382}\) Völuspá. pp. 56-57.
the well of Mímir beneath Yggdrasill. Tolley believes that Heimdallr is a reflection of an *axis mundi*. In *Lokasenna*, Loki states that Heimdallr is bound to stay immobile. Tolley supports his theory by mentioning that Heimdallr’s *örgu baki* is reminiscent of the *hvíta auri*, described in *Voluspá* XIX, which is found laded upon Yggdrasill. In the Eddic poem *Prýmskviða*, Heimdallr is also called *hvítastr ása* ‘whitest of the gods’. This strengthens Heimdallr’s connection to Yggdrasill, which seems very likely.

In addition to that, Heimdallr seems to be directly related to humans, which is interesting in juxtaposition to the importance he is shown to have in the world of the gods in Stanza 13. In the first stanza of *Voluspá*, mankind is called *mǫgu Heimdalar*, directly relating him to it. However, Heimdallr is not mentioned at all in the stanzas that relate to the creation of mankind by a trio of other gods. Another Eddic poem, *Rígsþula* shows Heimdallr, who goes by the name Rígr, wandering around the world and contributing to the birth of thralls and slaves, freemen, and earls and kings. Whereas the purpose of this thesis is not to discuss the multiple facets of Heimdallr (a whole thesis dedicated on this subject would probably not be enough), I deemed it important to give some examples of different attributes given to this god in other Eddic sources. This not only shows how different Eddic sources can be, but also that the Heimdallr

384 Tolley, p. 369.
385 Liddell and Scott. 48. pp. 417-418. ‘Þegi þú, Heimdallr! | þér var í árdaga | it ljóta lif of lagit; | aurgu baki | þú munt æ vera | ok vaka vǫrðr goða.’ Translation: “You be silent, Heimdallr. | in days of yore for you | an ugly short life | with your back dirty | you must for ever stand | and be awake warding the gods”.
386 *Voluspá*. ‘Ask veit ek standa, | heitir Yggdrasill, | hár baðmr, ausinn | hvíta auri; | þaðan koma dǫggv | þars á dala falla, | stendr æ yfir grœnn | Urðarbrunni.’ Translation: ‘I know an ash standing | called Yggdrasill, | a high tree, ladled | hvíta auri; | the dews come from there, | that fall to the dales, | stands ever green | in Urðr’s well.’
387 Tolley. p. 375.
388 *Prýmskviða*, ed. Jónas Kristjánsson and Vésteinn Ólason, v. 1 (Reykjavík, 2014). 40. p. 424. ‘Þá kvað þat Heimdallr, | hvítastr ása, | vissi hann vel fram | sem vanir aðrir: | “Bindum vér Þór þá | brúðar líni, | hafi hann it mikla | men Brisinga.” Translation: “Then said Heimdallr, | the whitest of the gods. | he knew well what will come | as the other vanir: | “We bind then on Thor | the bridal linen, | he has it great | Brisingr’s necklace.”
390 *Voluspá*. I. p. 6. ‘Hljóðs bið ek allar | helgar kindir, | meiri ok minni | mǫgu Heimdalar; | vildu, at ek, Valföðr, | vel fyr telja | forn sjöll fira, | þau er fremst um man.’ Translation: I request hearing from all | of the holy offspring, | greater and lesser | sons of Heimdallr; | you will, Valföðr, that I | will relate to you | tales of ancient events of gods and men, | that are furthest back in time from man.
found in *Grímnismál* need not be related to the Heimdallr found in *Lokasenna* and so on. *Grímnismál* gives no information that would connect Heimdallr to either the world tree (or any other *axis mundi*), nor to mankind, but instead portrays him solely as the watchman of the gods.

This stanza is quoted by Snorri. *Heitir* replaces *ero en atto*. *Býr*, ‘lives’, is added after *heimdall*. Otherwise, the stanza is similar.

**Stanza 14.**

Fiolcvangr er inn niundi | enn þar freyia ręþr
sesa costom isal.
halfan val | hon kýs hverian dag
enn halfan oðinn á.

The ninth is Fiolcvangr, | but there Freyia rules
the excellences of seats in the hall.
Half of the slain | she chooses each day,
but half Óðinn has.

*Fiolcvangr* ‘people field’ or ‘host field’. It is only mentioned here and by Snorri who quotes this line.

*Freiya* is commonly understood to mean the goddess, sister of Freyr, Freiya. Just like Freyr in the masculine, Freiya can mean ‘noblewoman, housemother’.\(^{392}\) Her attributes appear to be similar to Freyr’s, and I would argue that there is a slight possibility that the two were originally a single entity, perhaps an androgynous one. Alternatively they both could have been just a polite way to address male and female deities. Just as it has been discussed with regard

\(^{392}\) Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 208.
to Freyr, above, I find it probable that only one of them was a deity at one time, or that both
titles were used as terms of address for male and female deities.

_Halfan val | hon kýs hverian dag, | enn halfan Oðinn á._ According to S&G it is very
strange that Freyja would be the one to have half of the slain, and they would expect Frigg,
Óðinn’s wife, to have half of the slain instead. They mention Finnur Jónsson’s edition of 1888
in which he replaced Freyja with Frigg in this line.\textsuperscript{393} I do not see any reason for agreeing with
such an emendation, which is heavily based on conjecture.

Taking into consideration that there is a chance that Freyr and Freyja might have been
the same entity, a different reading to this stanza could be made. If that were the case, one could
argue that the two might not appear in the same source/beliefs if the source is old. As such, this
would give this stanza a very different reading, in which _freyia_ would be not seen as a personal
name, but a common noun that would denote a lady. This lady would presumably be Óðinn’s
consort, as S&G and others have argued. Whereas Frigg is not mentioned in _Grímnismál_ at all,
there is another goddess that could fulfill this attribute, Sága. For more information about Sága
in _Grímnismál_, see the commentary on st. 7.

Snorri quotes this stanza as well. As with the two above, _heitir_ is found instead of _er
inn niundi_. _Sesa costom isal_ is also different: _kosta beztum sal_.

**Stanza 15.**

_Glitnir er inn tíundi. | hann er guli studdr
oc silfri þackþr íp sama.
enn þar forseti | byggir flestan dag
oc sveþfer allar sakir._

\textsuperscript{393} Sijmons and Gering. p. 192.
The tenth is Glitnir, | it is supported with gold
   and with silver thatched likewise.
But there Forseti | dwells most days
   and lulls all sakes.

_Glitnir_ means ‘the shining’. It appears only in this stanza in Eddic sources, and is then
used by Snorri in Gylfaginning. It also appears as a horse name in Snorri.\(^{394}\)

_forseti_ is, according to Snorri, a god. He is the son of Baldr and Nanna.\(^{395}\) Other than
_Grínismál_ 15 and the passage in Snorri, _forseti_ does not appear as the name of a god
anywhere. There is one place-name in Norway, according to S&G, that bears his name,
Forsetalundr ‘Grove of Forseti’.\(^{396}\) However, taking the meaning of _forseti_ as a common noun,
as well as its later usage in Iceland, is ‘president, presider, peace-maker’ and it may not be
related to a specific deity but may be a title or attribute.

In support of there being a god named Forseti is the _Vita sancti Willibrordi_, in which,
the saint is said to have visited an island called Fositesland, after the god which the people that
lived there worshipped.\(^{397}\) According to Simek, there have been attempts in connecting Fosite
with a Nordic god named Forseti by trying to find a common base-form *Forsete or *Forsite, which would have been interpreted as Forseti in the north. Another etymology of the name Fosite sees him as being a loan-word from the Greek god Ποσειδῶν ‘Poseidon’. This would make Fosite and Forseti sound similar, but unrelated to each other. Simek finishes his entry on Forseti by stating how Forseti being similar to Fosite, does not strengthen his relation to the law:

The hypothesis that Forseti is, as Snorri suggests, a god of law and legal disputes (de Vries), is found wanting because the derivation of Forseti from Frisian does not give the meaning of the Nordic name any more proof and as such cannot be considered in order to support this theory, however suggestive it might appear at first sight.

Whereas there are arguments that are both in favor and against a relationship between Fosite and Forseti, I have chosen to take the safe path and not claim that there is one. The absence of the ‘r’ in the name cannot be explained. I have thus chosen to not capitalize forseti as a personal name and leave it with the meaning the word has on its own, which has the stanza make as good a sense as it would if forseti had been the name of a deity.

*flestan dag* is awkward, as it does not mean ‘the majority of the day’, but ‘most days’, according to S&G.

*svefer allar sakir*. I have chosen to translate this as ‘lulls all sakes’, sakes with the meaning of ‘offenses, prosecutions for legal offense’. This line is the only reason for which the god Forseti (if there is indeed a god named Forseti) is seen as being a god of law.

This stanza is also quoted in *Gylfaginning*. It is the same.

---

398 Simek. p. 89.
399 Ibid. p. 89.
400 Sijmons and Gering. p. 193.
Stanza 16.

Noa tun ero en elliptu. | enn þar niorþr hefir
ser um gorva sali.
manna þengill | enn meins vani
hatimbroþom haurg.

The eleventh are Nóa tún, | but there Niorþr has
made halls for himself,
king of men | the one who lacks harm
rules a high-timbered sanctuary.


It could be a kenning for ‘sea’. The word could also be cognate with the Biblical name of Noah, the similarity in sound being obvious, and the relation of Noah to the Flood and building of the Ark is something that can support such view.\(^{402}\) _Tún_ is cognate with English ‘town’ but in Old Norse mainly meant ‘hedge, enclosure’.

_Niorþr_: a lot can be said about this deity. By seeing that Niorþr resides in Nóa tun, one can surmise that he is a deity related to the sea. A number of sources other than _Grímnismál_ support such statement, so there seems to be little doubt about said relation. From st. 43 of _Grímnismál_ we also know that Freyr is his son. According to Simek, Niorþr is a name that

---

\(^{401}\) Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 673.

\(^{402}\) It should be noted, however, that the Oxford Dictionary of first names does not list this as a possibility: ‘in the Bible it is implied that it means ‘rest’ (Genesis 5:29, ‘and he called his name Noah, saying, this same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed’). One tradition indeed explains it as derived from the Hebrew root meaning ‘to comfort’ (see Nahum) with the final consonant dropped.’

appears scarcely in Skaldic poetry and is mainly found in Eddic poetry, and that apart from the above-mentioned information, little else is known about him. This would point to Niörþr being a late addition to the Germanic pantheon, but his name itself points otherwise. In fact, Tacitus mentions the worship of the goddess of the earth Nerthus (presumably *Nerþuz), a passage quoted in my commentary on st. 11. According to Ásgeir, Niörþr stems from Proto-Germanic *nerþu- which is cognate with Latin nerìōsus ‘strong’. There is no explanation on the change of sex (an apparent swap between Skaþi and Niörþr, as mentioned above), but Simek explains it by writing that *Nerþuz was either a divine brother and sister, or a hermaphrodite. The connection between the goddess Nerthus and Niörþr further strengthens his relation to the sea, since, as seen in Germania, the cult of Nerthus was centred on a sacred island. Toponymic evidence could also support the relation of Niörþr/Nerthus with the sea when one looks at the ones found in Norway, where all of them are found near the coast. As opposed to this, when one looks at the place-names related to him/her in Sweden, all of them are in inland regions, pointing to a fertility attribute. This difference is further evidence to the fragmentation of Germanic beliefs and the different regional aspects of cults. Whereas it is evident that Niörþr was worshipped in both Norway and Sweden, and he could have been both a deity of fertility and the sea (his stemming from a “Mother Earth” goddess shows the obvious relations to fertility), the cult centred on him evolved differently in the two different regions. Looking at the information we get from Grímnismál, it is evident that Niörþr is a god related

403 Simek. p. 234.
404 Tacitus. ch. 40. p. 46.
405 Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 671.
406 Germania continues the chapter describing such veneration: ‘Est in insula Oceani castum nemus, dicatumque in eo vehiculum, veste contectum; attingere uni sacerdoti concessum. Is adesse penetrali deam intellegit vectamque bubus feminis multa cum veneratione prosequitur.’ Source: Tacitus. ch. 40. p. 46.
Translation: In an island of the Ocean, there is an untouched grove, and in it a covered vehicle; that only the priest can touch. He feels the presence of the goddess and follows her with great veneration, when she is taken to the vehicle carried by cows.
407 Simek. p. 234.
to the sea. This could support a Norwegian composition of the poem, or, if nothing else, show
the unlikelihood of *Grímnismál* having being composed in Sweden.

**manna þengill:** it is interesting to see the connection of Niorþr with mankind. An
explanation could be that Niorþr, being related to the sea, would be a central deity for a
seafaring community. As such, this would further point to a composition of the poem from
somewhere close to the sea. It is interesting, however, to remind the reader of Heimdallr’s
relation to humans as well, mentioned in the commentary of st. 13, and further seen in other
Eddic sources.\(^{408}\)

**hatinbroþom haurg** recalls *Völuspá* 7.\(^{409}\) This could be taken as having two distinct
meanings. *hǫrg* can be translated as sanctuary, meaning a closed temple space, which in this
case, being ‘high-timbered’, would be large and made of wood, but could also be an altar of
stone erected on a high place and built in open air,\(^{410}\) in which case, the high-timbers could
point to a forest with large trees. The second meaning reminds one of the worship of Nerthus
mentioned by Tacitus, but the long period of time between the composition of the two sources
makes such a connection a weak one. What is important, in this case, is to remind the reader
that an open space within a forest with large trees is something that would not be present in
Iceland. Whereas the composer of *Grímnismál* could have travelled to mainland Europe, or just
heard about forests, I find it more likely to believe that the composer would use landscapes that
would be familiar to them and the listener. Thus, *hatinbroþom haurg* would, in this case, point
towards a composition around a region where forests were present.

\(^{408}\) See *Völuspá* and *Rígsþula* especially.

\(^{409}\) *Völuspá*. St. 7, p. 293.

‘Hittusk æsir | á Iðavelli, | þeir er hǫrg ok hof | hátinbruðu; | afla logðu, | auð smíðuðu, | tangir skópu | ok tól
göðu.’

Translation: ‘The gods met themselves | on the plains of Iða, | they which sanctuaries and temples | built high-
timbered; | wealth they smithed, | smith’s tongs they shaped | and tools they made.

\(^{410}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 311.
The last verse is a bit different in AM. Instead of *hatimbroþom haurg*, it reads

*hatimbruðum hǫrgi ræðr.*

Stanza 17.

Hrísi vex | oc há grasi
----------|-----------------  
*vin*pars land. viði
  en þar maugr af læce | af mars baki
   frǫcn oc hefna fauður.

The land of Víþar | grows with bush
  and high grass and with wood.
But there the offspring lets himself be | bold from a steed’s
  back to avenge his father.

*Hrísi vex* according to S&G is agreeing with *Hávamál* 119,\(^411\) and according to them this is not a coincidence but proof that either poem has been influenced by the other.\(^412\) I do not find any reason to consider this to be the case. Whereas *hrísi vex* obviously appears in both cases, something growing with bush does not seem to me to be any special idiom. Are S&G trying to tell us that nobody likes Víþar and thus his land is never visited? I find that this would be reading too much into the stanza, and see no reason to agree with S&G.

*Víþarr*: according to Ásgeir could mean ‘he who controls the wide state’.\(^413\) However, this definition is not certain, according to Simek. He also writes that Víþarr is not mentioned

---

\(^{411}\) *Hyndluljóð*. 119, p. 346.

‘Ráðumk þér, Loddfáfnir, | en þú ræð nemir, | njóta mundu ef þú nemr, | þér munu góð ef þú getr: | veiztu, ef þú vin átt, | þanns þú vel trúir, | far þú at finna opt, | þvíat hrísi vex | ok hávu grasi | vegr er vætki tröð.’
Translation: This I advise to you, Loddfáfnir, | but you should accept this advice, | you will benefit if you accept it, | it will do good to you, if you are able: | know you, if you have friend, that one which you trust well, | fare you to find him often, | because with bush it grows | and high grass | the way that no one treads on.

\(^{412}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 193.

\(^{413}\) Ásgeir writes exactly the following: ‘sá sem ræður viðlendu ríki. Source: Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 1130.
in any skaldic poetry but appears only in Eddic sources. There is a small number of place-names in Norway that could show his existence as a god, but are not enough to prove whether there was a cult centred on him. Simek is also sure that Víþarr is a relatively ‘young’ god.\(^{414}\)

\textit{viði} is interesting in looking at editorial variation. Rory McTurk writes:

My next example, a more complicated one, is intended to illustrate a possible variety of response of the same kind as is illustrated by a number of Robinson's Old English examples. It is from \textit{Grímnismál}, str. 17, which may be quoted from Neckel's edition as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
Hrísi vex oc há grasi Víðars land, viði.
\end{verbatim}

This, as printed by Neckel, presumably means: 'Víðarr’s land is overgrown with brushwood and tall grass; with a forest'. In this interpretation, the word \textit{viði} is seen to parallel the expression \textit{Hrísi... oc há grasi} and to provide an example of what in Campbell’s terms would be called a summarizing parallel, a compression of a preceding word or phrase and the exact opposite of the expanded parallel, discussed above. In Bugge’s edition, on the other hand, the word \textit{Viði} is printed with a capital \textit{V} and presented as the name of Víðarr’s land; whereas Neckel takes this word as a strong masculine common noun (\textit{viðr}) in the dative, Bugge takes it as a strong neuter proper noun (\textit{Viði}) in the nominative. In Bugge’s text, then, while it is the last word in the quoted passage that constitutes the second expression in the variation, as in Neckel’s,. it is \textit{Viðars land} (rather than \textit{Hrísi... oc há grasi}) that constitutes the first, and it is the specifying rather than the summarizing type of variation that is involved (it may be noted at this point that Paetzel, who was using Bugge’s edition, does not include the relevant expressions among his examples, presumably because, once again, he takes them as a clear-cut instance of explanatory apposition; or possibly because he was aware of the alternative reading that Neckel’s text reflects, and regarded the case as too doubtful generally to merit inclusion).\(^{415}\)

I have chosen to keep \textit{viði} as a common noun and not as the name of Viðarr’s land.

\textit{Enn þar maugr of læzk | af mars baki | frǫcn oc hefna fauður.} Here we are explicitly told that Víþarr is the son of someone, unsurprisingly, but these lines probably point out that Víþarr’s father is either present in the poem, or is someone well known to the audience of \textit{Grímnismál}. It also mentions the avenging of the father, which shows that whoever the father

\(^{414}\) Simek. p. 359.

may have been, he is dead. In other sources, Víþarr is seen as being the son of Óðinn. There is
no specific reference to this in Grímnismál, and the knowledge that the speaker here is Óðinn
himself, and therefore someone alive, does not agree with such an idea. Óðinn could be
speaking about the future, but taking all of the stanzas of Grímnismál into consideration this
seems unlikely to me. Having said that, we are given no other idea as to who that father might
be, and, thus, I would choose to refrain from explicitly naming Óðinn as the father of Víþarr,
as likely a conclusion as this might be, since there is no reason to do so basing one’s conclusions
only on Grímnismál itself.

Dronke’s commentary on this stanza is of particular interest, not because of any
particular insight provided to the understanding of this stanza, but because it is an excellent
example of why her work on the Elder Edda is problematic:

The settled contentment of the gods, with their own valuable lives and
responsibilities and their gold-gleaming homes, is shattered by a glimpse of a
deserted land, already overgrown by gorse, a patrimony which Óðinn’s young son
has abandoned to see and kill his father’s killer – traditionally the Wolf. In Vsp 55
Víðarr’s avenging blow to the Wolf’s heart is the centre of the stage – þá er heft
fóður. In Grím Víðarr’s land is in anticipatory neglect, as if the lad were setting off
on a long, dedicated pilgrimage of vengeance. The emphasis is on his will, his sense
of duty. We are not told that he achieved anything. Why does Óðinn – who is here
the poet – allude to a tale of vengeance for his own death? Probably, it is
deliberately to generalize, to point out that there is more than one wolf to
exterminate – the Einheriar are constantly out on the attack (23) – and then to
emphasize that Óðinn’s death is a myth.416

What Dronke sees described in this stanza is nowhere to be found in Grímnismál. There is no
reason to specifically consider the description of Víþarr’s land as one of abandonment. Such
conclusions seem to come from Dronke’s mind who then seems to have tried to find support
in other poems which might be completely unrelated to Grímnismál.

416 Dronke. p. 128.
Stanza 18.

Andhrímnir | læt ield hrimne
sę hrimni soðinn.
flesca bezt | enn þat fáir víto
hvat ein heriar alaz.

Andhrímnir | puts in Eldhrímnir
Sehrihnir boiled,
best of fleshes. | But that few know,
with what the chosen warriors are fed with.

**Andhrímnir** means, according to Ásgeir, ‘a man with a sooty front’, the *hrim* meaning ‘the black soot on a kettle’.\(^{417}\) S&G choose to translate the name as ‘er dem russ ausgesetzte’.\(^{418}\) *And*, related to ‘an’ of ‘answer’ in English, denotes whatever is ‘opposite, against’. *Hrím*, though, could also mean ‘rime, hoar frost’, and Hrímnir is also a name of a giant in the Edda.\(^{419}\) One does wonder whether Andhrímnir is meant to be a personal name or not. We could just be seeing a description of a cook, instead of someone specific.

**Eldhrímnir** has the same second part of the compound as Andhrímnir, with the first being *eldr*, ‘fire’.\(^{420}\) By reading the stanza, there seems little doubt that Eldhrímnir is some form of cooking pot. As above, it could be that the name itself is not meant to denote a specific pot, but maybe be of more generic or descriptive nature.

**Sehrímnir** once again has the same second part – *hrím* which could have the meanings mentioned above. The first part could refer to the sea, therefore making the meaning ‘sooty sea-creature’. This meaning of the name, though, does not really agree with the rest of the

\(^{417}\) Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 17.
\(^{420}\) Ibid. pp. 125-126.
stanza. In fact, *flesca bezt*, points to Sĕhrimnir being a pig, since *flesk* means only ‘pork, bacon’. As far as I can see there is no explanation for this. My idea is that Sĕhrimnir could have originally been a sea-creature that would have been part of the mythology and maybe specifically food for the chosen warriors, possibly a kind of whale, which is known as *Marsvín*, ‘sea swine’. At some point was changed to a pig, with the name remaining intact. It would work well with the idea that *Grímnismál* was composed somewhere close to the coastline if Sĕhrimnir were a fish. However, I must admit that I cannot base this interpretation in any source.

Dronke’s explanation of this stanza is very interesting though it also seems difficult to believe. She suggests that Sĕhrimnir is a black boar coming out of the ocean to be cooked by the sun, which is Andhrimnir. The black boar would signify the ‘sooty Earth’, which provides food.

This stanza appears in *Gylfaginning*. It is mostly the same. The sixth verse appears as

\[
\text{við hvat einherjar alast} \quad \text{instead of} \quad \text{hvat ein heriar alaz.}
\]

**Stanza 19.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gera oc freca} & \quad | \quad \text{seðr gunntamiþr} \\
\text{hropigr heria fauðr.} & \\
\text{enn viþ vín eitt} & \quad | \quad \text{vapn gaufugr} \\
\text{oðinn ę lifir.} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The accustomed to war, | boastful father of hosts

sates Geri and Freci,

---

421 Ibid. p. 160.
It should be noted, however, that according to Paul Bibire ‘The word itself seems to have something to do with slicing or cutting, so gives no indication of what sort of thing it might have been slicing.’ This could more easily point to a more universal meaning of the word *flesk*, at least in earlier times. Source: personal communication.
422 Dronke. p. 128.
weapon noble Óðinn | lives always
   but with wine alone.

  
  **Gera oc Freca** means ‘the Greedy one’ for both names. It is generally agreed that Geri and Freki are wolves that belong to Óðinn.\(^{423}\) Based on *Grímnismál* alone, we can understand that they are two beings that Óðinn sates, something that shows they are living creatures, and possibly animals.

  
  *gunntamípr* is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. The first part, *gunnr* means ‘war, battle’, and the second is related to *tamr*, ‘ready’. La Farge translates it as ‘accustomed to battle’.\(^{424}\)

  
  **hroþigr heria fauðr** could be translated both as ‘boastful father of hosts’ but also as ‘glorious father of hosts’. There is little doubt that this refers to Óðinn, since he is the main protagonist of this stanza.

  
  **enn viþ vín eit** is a very peculiar line. According to S&G, one should not be thinking of the *vino immortalitatem nanciscitur* or the ἀμβροσία, since Óðinn is not immortal.\(^{425}\) Reading *Grímnismál*, however, we have no information on whether the author considered Óðinn to be immortal or not. What I find extremely peculiar is the choice of drink that the composer has given Óðinn. Wine was not a common drink among the Germanic speaking peoples, and Óðinn is usually coupled with mead in other sources. The rarity of wine would probably make it a high status consumption. However, people would have known about it. Many ideas come to mind as to why the composer would have chosen *vín* as the drink that nourishes Óðinn. First of all, this could be a metric choice, since *mjǫð* would not fit properly in this line. Secondly, the rarity of wine itself could make it a sought-after drink that only the most wealthy would be

\(^{423}\) Simek. p. 90, 106.

\(^{424}\) La Farge. p. 95.

\(^{425}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 194.
able to afford. Óðinn, being generally seen as a god of nobility could easily be seen as someone that would drink such a prized liquid. The choice of vín could also be of a regional nature. Otherwise, it could show that the poem was written in a part of the Norse world where wine was accessible more easily through trade. If the composer of Grímnismál believed that the gods resided in the world of human habitation, maybe he believed that Óðinn resided further south of the Germanic lands, where wine would have been plentiful. All of these ideas are not based on any sources, however, but conjecture, and therefore their nature is to be taken as such.426

*vapn gafugr* is another ᾳπαξ λεγόμενον that means ‘weapon-noble’. This being used to describe Óðinn is very peculiar, since Óðinn’s known weapon of choice is the spear, a weapon that was probably never considered noble. This is interesting with regard to the shifting nature of paganism. In fact, as seen in the analysis of Óðinn names in Part 2 Chapter 3.3, there is a distinct absence of spear related names for Óðinn in Grímnismál. According to Green, most Germanic warriors would be equipped by a spear and a wooden shield, both made almost entirely out of wood.427 The rarity of iron is also mentioned by Tacitus who writes that:

> Ne ferrum quidem superest, sicut ex genere telorum colligitur. Rari gladiis aut maioribus lanceis utuntur: hastas vel ipsorum vocabulo frameas gerunt angusto et brevi ferro, sed ita acri et ad usum habili, ut eodem telo, prout ratio poscit, vel comminus vel eminus pugnent. Et eques quidem scuto frameaque contentus est; pedites et missilia spargunt, pluraque singuli, atque in immensum vibrant, nudi aut sagulo leves.428

The sword, requiring more iron, would have been used only by the wealthiest of men instead.

*Vapn gafugr* could be another remnant of older beliefs where the main deity might have not been Óðinn, but possibly Þórr, as has been discussed, whose weapon is a war-hammer. The

426 Hence the absence of references.
427 Green, Language. p. 69.
428 Tacitus. ch. 6. p. 8.

Translation: ‘Not even iron abounds, as one may deduce from their kinds of weapons: few use swords or large lances. Spears or, to use their own word, *framea* are what they carry: with a short and narrow blade, but so sharp and easy to handle that with one and the same weapon they can as needed fight face to face or from a distance. The horseman is content with shield and *framea*, but foot-soldiers also rain down javelins: each man a number, propelling them a huge distance, naked or lightly clad in a short cloak.’
peculiar thing is that the war-hammer itself seems to bear little more importance than the spear, being a tool of a trade more than a weapon itself.

Snorri quotes this stanza as well in *Gylfaginning*. It appears exactly the same as in *Grímnismál*.

**Stanza 20.**

Huginn oc munninn | fliuga hverian dag
iormun grund yfir.
oumc ec of of hugin | at hann aptr ne comiþ
þo siámc meirr um muninn.

Huginn and Munin | fly each day
over the great ground.
I fear for Huginn | that he shall not come back,
though I fear more for Munin.

**Huginn oc Munin**: these names have mainly been translated as ‘Thought’ and ‘Mind’ by most scholars,\(^{429}\) whereas they actually mean ‘Thoughtful’ and ‘Mindful’. Huginn and Munin are thought to be ravens, and many other sources point to that. *Grímnismál* does not specify this, but we are told that they *fliuga hverian dag iormun grund yfir*, which makes them winged creature and thus, likely birds. A number of skaldic lines support the view that they are ravens and there seems to be little doubt about that.\(^{430}\) Birds seem to have had some sort of relation to mental faculties. For example, *Hávamál* 13:

Óminnishegri heitir

---

\(^{429}\) Simek. p. 164, 222. 
see also: Dronke. p. 129. 
\(^{430}\) Simek. p. 222.
sá er yfir ǫlðrum þrumir,
hann stelr geði guma;
þess fugls fjǫðrum
ek fjǫtraðr vark
í garði Gunnlaðar.431

Dronke writes of an explanation of why the heron is connected to forgetfulness:

In 1968 Lennart Elmevik reviewed the inconclusive state of scholarly opinion on óminnis hegri. He was himself most nearly convinced by Finnur Jónsson's suggestion that the linking of the drunkard's mental torpor with the heron arose from the bird's characteristic ability to stand motionless in water watching for prey, as if oblivious of all around it: 'Jag föreställer mig, att åsynen av en häger i sådan ställning, till synes glömsk av allt, bör ha kunnat egga en skalds fantasi. Steget till att låta fågeln i fråga ingå i en metafor för ölrusets glömska behöver sedan inte ha varit långt.'432

According to Kate Heslop, óminnis hegri is:

an 'anti-Muninn', a bird which personifies forgetting as the active obliteration of memory, hovering and snatching (stelr) memories like so many fish. The two passages share not only the bird image, but also the theme of anamnesis or 'calling back to mind', in the phrases aptr uf heimtir and aptr né komið. This theme points up the way in which memory, in Ann Rigney's words, 'begins not in the plenitude of experience but in the absence or pastness of the moment or period being recalled'. The raven Muninn was once there, and Óðinn nervously awaits his return, while óminnis hegri steals his victim's integrity to immobilizing effect, and it is not certain that the drinker will be able to retrieve his stolen geð once he has sobered up. Judy Quinn has pointed out the importance of distinguishing in Hávamál between Odinic and human experience, and it is possible to read this passage straight, as concluding the gnomes about moderation in consumption of alcohol in str. 11-12 with a warning of its amnestic effects. On the odinic level, however, óminnis hegri works, like the óminnisveig, magically rather than naturally.433

Furthermore, Hermann writes that ‘traditions other than Old Norse have understood birds as images for the mind, and thus as symbols of memories and thoughts.’434 By reading this stanza,

---

431 Hyndluljóð. p. 324. Translation: It is called heron of forgetfulness | he who tarries over aledrums, | he steals upon the mind of people; | with this bird’s feathers | I became fettered | in the enclosure of Gunnlað.
434 Pernille Hermann, “Key Aspects of Memory and Remembering in Old Norse-Icelandic Literature.” In ibid. p. 15-16.
one can understand that Huginn and Munin have a close relation to the speaker, which we know to be Óðinn.

**iormun grund** means ‘great ground’, which is taken to mean ‘Earth’ by S&G.\(^{435}\) La Farge instead translates it as ‘immense surface’.\(^{436}\) The meanings of *iormun* have been discussed in Part 1, Chapter 2.2. *Grund* is, according to Cleasby-Vigfússon, ‘a green field, grassy plain’.\(^{437}\) Paul Bibire, however, interprets the word as meaning ‘the base of the things in the world, the lowest level physically’.\(^{438}\) Ásgeirr traces the etymology of *grund* to PIE *gheren*-, ‘to grind, pulverise, crumble’.\(^{439}\)

**comip** is a very awkward word. It has been emended to *komi* by Jónas and Vésteinn.\(^{440}\) *Comip* could be a mistake for *comi at*.

AM *komi*, which would make the line be *at hann aptr ne comi*, ‘that he shall not come back’.

AM adds *ec* before *meirr um muninn* in the last verse.

This stanza appears in *Gylfaginning* and is mostly the same. *Aptr ne comip* appears as *aptr kemr*.

### Stanza 21.

```
Þytr þund | unir þióþ vitnis
fiscr floði í.
ár straumr | of micill
```

\(^{435}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 194.
\(^{436}\) La Farge. p. 139.
\(^{437}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 217.
\(^{438}\) Personal Communication.
\(^{439}\) Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 283.
\(^{440}\) Grímnismál. p. 372

Jónas and Vésteinn write: *aptr né komit*: komi ekki aftur (neitunin tvítekin).
val glaumi at vaþa.

Þund makes a rushing noise, | a fish is content
in the flood of Þióþvitnir.
A river stream | seems too great
for the noise of the slaughtered to wade.

Þund means ‘to swell up’. It is only mentioned here in the Eddic corpus. It could merely mean water, or maybe a river. The kenning þundar glitnir supports the view that Þund would be a river name.441

Þióþvitnis possibly means ‘nation-wolf’, but the -vitnir part is uncertain. This could be referring to Fenrir, but Grímnismál does not elucidate the audience on that. It probably shows that this would be understood by the audience. Dronke seems to imply that Þióþvitnir is ‘the world serpent’, though gives no explanation as to why.442

unir Þióþvitnis | fiscr floði í could both be translated as ‘a fish is content in the flood of Þióþvitnir’, or ‘Þióþvitnir’s fish is content in the flood’. In both cases the meaning seems obscure, especially taking into consideration the meaning of Þióþvitnir. S&G have a very interesting explanation of these two lines, which is worth being reported here in its entirety:

vitner ist ein mehrfach überliefertes ökent heiti des wolfes (s. zu Vm 534). Durch des steigernde präfix þjóþ- (vgl. þjóþ-góþr, þjóþ-leîþr, þjóþ-marr, þjóþ-sterkr usw.) wird der hier gemeinte wolf als ein furchtbares, gefährliches untier bestimmt; es kann daher kaum von einem anderen als von Fenrer die rede sein, der beim weltuntergange die sonne verschlingen wird (Vm 46, 47): diese ist der im luftmeere schwimmende ‘fisch’. Þjóþvitnes gehört also zu fiskr, nicht, wie Detter-Heinzel annehmen, zu flóþe, und dies ist auch sicherlich nicht die aus dem geifer des Fenrer entstandene V∙n (s. unten zu 283), denn daß in diesem geifer fische sich wohl fühlen (una) könnten, ist eine vorstellung, die dem dichter scwerlich in den sinn kam. [Boer (Ark 22, 140 ff. schlange. Der strom, der Valhöl umgibt, hieße also nicht Þund, sondern Valglaumner, wie B. durch konjektur herstellt. Diese auffassung, die viel fü sich hat, ist im wesentlichen bereits von Bugge (Fkv. 79b, 3972) begründet worden.]443

441 Sijmons and Gering. p. 195.
443 Sijmons and Gering. p. 195.
Basing one’s explanation solely on *Grímnismál*, the foregoing citation seems unconvincing. The fish of Þióþvitnir could refer to the sun.\textsuperscript{444} Not taking any other source in consideration, the first three lines of this stanza are far too obscure to understand, and even using what S&G write, the explanation does not become significantly better.

*val glaumi* is an ἁπαξ λεγόμενον and its meaning is uncertain. It literally would mean ‘noise of the slaughtered’. La Farge is uncertain as well, and gives a tentative (and awkwardly complicated) translation of ‘host of the slain hastening towards Valhall’.\textsuperscript{445} According to Bibire, it could refer to a horse or a giant name. If it refers to a giant, the last three lines of this stanza could mean that rivers around Valhaull are too great for the giants to wade. On the other hand, if it refers to a horse, one cannot help but think of another two stanzas in this poem, namely 29 and, to a lesser extent, 30, in which, as shall be seen below, Þórr has to cross rivers to reach the ash of Yggdrasill, and similarly the other gods might have to do the same.

This stanza as a whole, especially if the *unir Þióþvitnis | fisc r floði í* is a reference to Fenrir swallowing the sun, and *val glaumi* is about giants, could be taken as describing an Apocalyptic event. The *ragnarǫk* is a well-known event even to people uninterested in Old Norse literature and culture. Whereas it is never mentioned by this name in *Grímnismál* this could show that the composer of *Grímnismál* had an apocalyptic event in mind. Whether it was *ragnarǫk* as we know it (and whether it was named such), or whether it included different details is unknown. Of the Eddic poems, *Völuspá* is the one with the heaviest connotations of *ragnarǫk*, and the problem there is the agreed Christian composition of that poem.\textsuperscript{446} If references to an apocalyptic event had been limited to *Völuspá* and the allusion in *Grímnismál* it would be easy to dismiss the whole notion of an apocalypse as being Christian. However,

\textsuperscript{444} La Farge, p. 310.
\textsuperscript{445} Ibid., p. 276.
possible references akin to the one in *Grímnismál* are found in other poems as well, making the matter more complicated. In conclusion, based on the reading of *Grímnismál* alone, this stanza is problematic. Not knowing for certain what most of these names refer to, it is very difficult to come to any more definitive conclusions about the stanza.

AM is a bit different in this stanza. The fifth verse reads *þikcir of mikill* instead of *of micill*.

**Stanza 22.**

Val grind heitir | er stende velli á
   heilog fyr helgomdurom.
   forn er su grind | enn þat fáir vito
   hve hon er ilás lokin.

It is called Valgrind | which stands on flat land
   holy before holy doors.
Old is this grating, | but few know it,
   how she is locked in in a cord.

*Valgrind* means ‘grating of the slain’.\(^{447}\) According to Simek, Valgrind would be the fence in front of Hel, but not a gate to Valhauull, a statement which contrasts with S&G’s interpretation.\(^{448}\)

*heilog fyr helgom durom* is interesting in that it means ‘before holy holy door(s)’. This is present in both manuscripts, something that makes it less likely that it would be a mistake. It could be that *heilog* refers to Valgrind. *Durom* can mean both ‘door’ and its plural, ‘doors’.

---

\(^{447}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 675.
\(^{448}\) Simek. p. 346.
Through this stanza, it is impossible to understand whether the poet is describing one or more doors.

*hve hon er í lás lokin* would be translated as ‘how she is locked in in a cord’, ‘she’ agreeing with *grind* from the fourth line. *Lás*, however, could also mean ‘cord of a trap’.  

Cleasby-Vigfússon-Craigie translate it as ‘latch, lock’.  

AM has the above verse with *ilas um lokin*.

**Stanzas 23-24.**

Fimmhundrúp golfa | oc um fiorom togom  
sva hygg ec bilscirni meþ bugomo:  
ranna þeira | er ec rept vita  
míns veit ec mest magar.

Fimmhundrúp dúra | oc um fiorom togom  
sva hygg ec at valhaullo vera.  
áttadundrúp efnheria | ganga or einom durom  
þa er þeir fara at vitni at vega.

Five ‘hundred’ hall floors | and beyond four tens,  
so I think is Bilscirnir all together.  
I know to be the greatest | of my offspring  
of those halls which I know to be rafted.

Five ‘hundred’ doors | and beyond four tens,  
so I think to be at Valhaull.  
Eight ‘hundred’ chosen warriors | walk out of one doorway  
then when they go to fight the wolf.

---

449 Paul Bibire, Personal communication.  
450 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 377.
Note that sts. 23 and 24 are in inverted positions in AM 748 I 4to, with the one about Valhauull appearing first.

**Fimm hundruþ** does not mean five hundred as in 500 but 600 since it should be remembered that the Scandinavian long hundred comprised a ‘hundred and twenty’. Thus, in Bilscirnir there are six hundred (600) doors and beyond forty (40). Six hundred and forty does not appear to hold any special importance in Germanic culture, nor does any number higher than that. Whether this was a random choice of number, maybe based on the metre of poetry, or a specific number that would have meant something to the composer and the audience is unknown.

**sva hygg ec:** *hygg* is a peculiar choice of a word here. It means ‘to think, believe, mean, to suppose’. The speaker, whom we know to be Óðinn, thus, shows uncertainty on the number of hall floors or rooms in Bilscirnir and doors in Valhauull. This is peculiar, especially taking into consideration that Valhauull is supposed to be a hall in Óðinn’s own domain. An explanation could be that this form fits metrically and was therefore used for this purpose.

**Bilscirnir** means ‘astonishing-bright’.

Ibid. p. 62.


Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 55.


It is perhaps worth noting that the name of this hall has a close relative in another hall’s name, an obviously ‘real’ hall, namely Skiríngssalr, the old name for the royal estate/farm Huseby, at Tjølling, Vestfold, Norway. *Skiríng- is not known.
either as a word or a name, and there have been many proposals for interpreting the name (see Brink 2007a: 60-3). These range from an old name for the bay down at Kaupang, or a by-name for Freyr. An interesting suggestion was put forward by Andreas Nordberg (2003), that the name of the hall may have meant ‘the shining, radiant salr’.455

If Nordberg’s suggestion were to be accepted, this could connect Skiringssalr and its meaning to the ‘light’ etymologies provided by Simek and Ásgeir.

\[ \text{Ranna þeira | er ec rept vita | míns veit ec mest magar.} \]

I translate this as ‘I know to be the greatest | of my offspring | of those halls which I know to be rafted.’ Rafted here probably means that spears are rafted in those halls. The greatest offspring has been taken to be referring to Þórr.

These two stanzas are also found in Gylfaginning. They appear exactly the same, with the exception of um before fiorom togom.

### Stanza 25.

\[ \text{Heiþrún heitir geit | er stendr haulló a heriafauðrs.} \]
\[ \text{oc bitr af læraþs limom} \]
\[ \text{scap ker fýlla | hon scal ins scíra miaðar} \]
\[ \text{kna at su veig vanaz.} \]

A goat is called Heiþrún | which stands on the hall of the father of hosts
and bites from Lęraþr’s limbs.
She must fill | the Scapker
that drink does not diminish.

**Heiþrún** appears to be a creature that damages Lęraþr. Clunies-Ross describes Heiþrún (and Eikþurnir from the following stanza):

---

455 Brink and Lindow. p. 184.
There are also other animal-like beings who represent sinister malign forces. They belong among what Georges Dumézil referred to as the 'cosmic bestiary' (1973f[1959]) of birds and animals that inhabit the World Ash, Yggdrasill, and another cosmic tree, Læraðr, which is mentioned in Grímnismál 25-6. The destructive power of these creatures is expressed in Grímnismál 35 through the image of the effect of animal overgrazing on the leaves, barks and roots of Yggdrasill.456

The meaning of the name is a very obscure name. According to Ásgeir, heip- might be a word related to any kind of magic.457 –rún, on the other hand, can mean any of the following: ‘to enquire, mystery, secret conversation, hidden lore, mystery, written character, rune’ and can also be related to magic.458 Simek writes that heiðr could be a ritual word related to sacrificial mead and mentions similarities with the goat from Greek mythology Ἀμάλθεια.459

Scapker is a very obscure word. It could be a given name of an item. scap- means ‘frame of mind’, while –ker is a ‘cask’.

Heríaðauðrs means ‘father of hosts’ and is an Óðinn name.

Læraðs appears to be a tree judging from this and the following stanza. Simek mentions its possible meaning as being ‘causer of harm’ (related to læ), but admits that it is an awkward name for a mythological tree.460 It has generally been thought to represent Yggdrasill, and Andrén writes of it that:

In Old Norse cosmology, then, the tree stands out as a distinct but complex figure of thought. I therefore think that we should not regard Yggdrasill as the 'true' world tree, but should consider Yggdrasill, Mimameid, Lærad, and Voslung's tree, and possibly 'the sacred tree', 'the windy tree', 'the measuring tree', and 'the gallows tree', as variations only, whereas other names were probably linked to different myths in which different aspects of the figure were emphasized.461
The importance of trees and the idea of an *axis mundi* has been discussed in Part I. However, it is also important to note how both Yggdrasill and Léraþr are mentioned in *Grímnismál*, a fact that makes the idea of them referring to the same tree more unlikely. However, it could also be that both names refer to the same tree, something that the audience of *Grímnismál* would have known.

**Stanza 26.**

\[\text{Eikþyrnir heitir hiortr | er stendr ahaullo heriafáuðrs.}\]
\[\text{oc bítr af Léraþr limom}\]
\[\text{enn af hans hornom | drýpr ihvergelmi}\]
\[\text{þaðan eiga votn aull vega.}\]

A stag is named Eikþurnir | which stands on the hall of the father of hosts
and bites from Léraþr’s limbs.
But from his horns | it drips into Hvergelmir,
thence all waters have their ways.

*Eikþurnir* is ‘the one with the oak-like antlers’.\(^{462}\)

*Hvergelmi* is the ‘bubbling cauldron’. Egeler argues that this is likely a pagan name, because Snorri tries to reconcile what *Grímnismál* 26 says about it with some other strand of knowledge that places it to a primeval time with which its description here would not agree.\(^{463}\)

*Enn af hans hornom | drýpr í Hvergelmi, | þaðan eiga votn aull vega.* These three lines are very important in the study of the cosmology of *Grímnismál*. In fact, as discussed in Part 5 Chapter 1, this shows that all rivers (the ones mentioned in sts. 27 and 28, but also

---

\(^{462}\) Simek. p. 70.

possibly all sources of water of the world) get their water from the water that drips into Hvergelmir, pointing to the idea that there are no different worlds between the abodes of the gods and humans, but a single one, the world of human habitation.

Matthias Egeler describes the great similarity found in this stanza with medieval Christian imagery that was present in Europe during the twelfth century. In fact, a number of important churches, especially in Rome, would have had depictions of the cross, with four rivers going downwards, almost like roots (see st. 31) and in some instances stags drinking water from them. Such similarities, along with the list of river names provided in st. 27-28, Egeler argues, and the fact that most of the river names seem to be completely unknown to Old Norse lore, mean that these three stanzas are of a Christian composition. On the list of river names and their being unknown, Egeler argues that they ‘are [all] invented names without any real cosmological significance or any indications of traditional roots’, a statement that presupposes that every single source on Scandinavian pre-Christian cosmology survives today (see sts. 27-28 below for more on the rivers). While it is strange indeed that most of the rivers in the list appear unknown to the modern scholar, the possibility that they would have represented something to the intended audience of Grímnismál cannot be ruled out. Egeler writes that the composer of these stanzas purposely invented the river names, in an attempt to contrast them to the four rivers mentioned in the Bible. Two of the four Biblical rivers, Pishon and Gihon, would have been virtually unknown to a European audience, considering the geographical distance, and therefore were equated with the Ganges and the Nile. However, in this analysis, Egeler forgets to mention that all rivers would have been known to Europeans simply because they were in the Bible itself. On the question of why some of the rivers mentioned in Grímnismál are actual known rivers of the Scandinavian world, Egeler says it

464 Ibid. pp. 18-22.
465 Ibid. p. 32.
was a ‘concession to the contemporary world and contemporary Norse literature’.\footnote{Ibid. p. 32.} As a whole, Egeler’s suggestions are at least enticing and they do provide a valid explanation for this stanza and the list of river names. However, a few things should be kept in mind. For starters, it is interesting that the Christian imagery described above would have been taken in two different ways in the same poem. Basically, the four rivers that are starting at the foot of the cross and going downwards just like roots, is meant to be both the reason for st. 31’s description of Yggdrasill and the division of the worlds, and as the description of Hvergelmir and the source of all waters. This feels problematic. Furthermore, another issue, which Egeler admittedly notes in his article,\footnote{Ibid. pp. 27-28.} is that while in the Christian imagery the stags are usually two or more and are only drinking from these rivers, \textit{Grímnismál} only mentions Eikþurnir and makes him a critical actor in the source of water, through the dew of his antlers. Moreover, the motif of liquid dripping from horns, as Egeler himself argues, appears to be a purely pagan one.\footnote{Ibid. p. 31.} It should be added that Clunies-Ross, in discussing the animals mentioned in \textit{Grímnismál} and related to Yggdrasill and Læraþr could be seen as referring to a ‘cosmic bestiary’, a term coined by Georges Dumézil and present in other religions as well.\footnote{Clunies Ross, \textit{Prolonged Echoes}. p. 63.} Eikþurnir has thus not been necessarily emulated from Christianity. Lastly, I would argue that there are two other things that should be kept in mind when thinking about this. While Egeler’s arguments are convincing, why would this Christian composer choose to blend such elements together and why should he have included a list of more than thirty rivers – breaking the metre – instead of just the four? I am unable to find a persuasive answer to that. Furthermore, even if stanzas 26-28 are taken to be of a Christian composition, which could be the case, that does not
make all of *Grímnismál* into a poem composed in the Christian period. These stanzas could be an interpolation, or have been composed by the editor himself.

**Stanza 27.**

*Síð oc víþ | sękin oc eikin  
svaul oc gunnþró  
fiorm oc fimbulþul. | rín oc rennandi  
gipul oc gaupul.  
gaumul oc geirvimul. | þær hverfa um hodd goða.  
þýn oc vin  
þaull oc haull. | graþ oc gunnþorin.*

*Síþ* and *Víþ*, | *Sękin* and *Eikin*,  
*Svaul* and * Gunnþró*,  
*Fiorm* and *Fimbulþul*, | *Rín* and *Rennandi*,  
*Gipul* and *Gaupul*,  
*Gaumul* and *Geirvimul*, | they turn around the treasure of the gods,  
*Þýn* and *Vin*,  
*Þaull* and * Haull*, | * Graþ* and *Gunnþorin.*

*Síþ* means ‘slow’. Hale suggests that it could instead be related to *sīðr*, ‘long, hanging’. There could be parallels found with the Swedish Sibro, which is also related to *sīðr*, or Sidus, derived from the same word.⁴⁷⁰  

*víþ* could mean ‘wide’. Alternatively, it could be related to *vīðr*, ‘wide’. Taking the *vīðr* etymology, it could be related to *Via*, Barvio and Vidflaa, all being Norwegian river names, as well as *Breia*.⁴⁷¹

⁴⁷¹ Ibid. p. 168.
sękin means ‘hurrying forward’. A similar river name could be found in the Norwegian Sokna.

eikin means ‘frenzied’. If that were the case, Eikjola, found in Norway would have derived from a similar name. Alternatively, eikin could be linked to eik, ‘oak’, and is a common element in river names. A third explanation for this river name would derive it from aka, ‘to move, drive’, and parallels are found in rivers such as Akurda and *Aka in Norway and Agabæk in Denmark.472

svaul means ‘cold’. A number of Norwegian toponyms are possibly formed from a river name *Svala. The lake Suluvatnet could also be related, as well as the Swedish Svalen. Lastly, Cleasby-Vigfússon identify svaul as the Swale in England.473

gunnþró means ‘courageous’. The Norwegian Trona could be etymologically parallel with the -þró element. Hale suggests that gunnþró means ‘the one which travels swiftly or wildly in its course.’474

fiorm means ‘hasty’. Similar river names can be found in the Fjermendal and Fjermestad.475

fimbulþul means ‘rushing violently’. The Norwegian Humla and Kumra are semantically similar.476

rín is the Rhine.

---

472 Ibid. p. 169.
473 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 780.
474 Hale. p. 170.
475 Ibid. p. 170.
476 Ibid. p. 171.
rennandi appears as part of a ship kenning according to S&G. It could be related to renna, ‘to run’. A number of river names in Norway are formed from renna. Hale quotes Magnus Olsen who interpreted this as meaning ‘the one which is always free of ice’.

gipul oc gaupul seem to both be related to ‘yawning’ and indicate well-flowing rivers with steeply sloping shores. The Norwegian Gipa and possibly Gjeispa are probably related to gipul, while the pastures known as Goppollen are related to gaupul. The name of these pastures is probably derived from a river that flows in their vicinity.

gaumul is cognate to gamall, ‘old’, and could refer to an old riverbed.

geirvimul means ‘swarming spear’. The -vimul element could be related to the district called Vimar or Vimir. The idea of rivers swarming with spears would have been common among Scandinavians, writes Hale, and is also found in the Haddingssagnet in the Gesta Danorum of Saxo Grammaticus.

þer hverfa um hodd goða translates as ‘they turn around the treasure of the gods’.

þýn means ‘rushing’. It also appears in Njáls saga as part of a kenning for gold. There are several rivers in Norway with a similar name and meaning, such as Tya, while Cleasby-Vigfússon identify þýn as the Tyne.

vin is unknown. It could be referring to the vín á mentioned in st. 28, in which case it would be the Dvina. (see st. 28 below).

---

477 Sijmons and Gering. p. 198.
478 Hale. p. 171.
479 Sijmons and Gering. p. 198.
480 Hale. p. 172.
481 Ibid. p. 172.
482 Sijmons and Gering. p. 198.
483 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 780.
þaull means ‘swollen’. Hale writes that it is identical to þǫll, ‘young fir tree’. This would connect it to the Tollaan and Tolga rivers.\textsuperscript{484} Cleasby-Vigfússon connect þaull with the Scottish river Thuil.\textsuperscript{485}

haull means ‘sloping’. It could be related to Hallen and Haldalen, while a number of lake names in Sweden have a similar root.\textsuperscript{486}

graph is probably derived from gráðr, ‘hunger, greed’.

gunnþorin means ‘more pugnacious’, or ‘daring’.

\textbf{Stanza 28.}

\begin{verbatim}
Vín á heitir enn | aunnor vegsvinn
þríðia þíðnuma.
nýt. oc naut. | naunn. oc hraunn.
    sliþ oc hríþ.
    sylgr oc ylgr. | víþ oc ván
    vaund oc straund.
giaull ocleiptr | þér falla gumnom nér
    er falla til heliar hepan.
\end{verbatim}

Yet, wine river is called, | another Vegsvinn,
a third Þíðnuma,
Nút and Naut, | Naunn and Hraunn,
    Sliþ and Hríþ,
Sylgr and Ylgr, | Víþ and Ván,
    Vaund and Straund,
Giaull and Leiptr, | they fall near to men
    but fall to hell hence.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{484} Hale. p. 174.
\textsuperscript{485} Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 780.
\textsuperscript{486} Hale.
\end{flushright}
vín á, as will also be seen in Part 5 Chapter 1, could be referring to the Dvina. It means ‘wine river’.

vegsvinn is problematic. It could stem from vegr, ‘way’ and svinnr, ‘quick, swift’, which occurs in a number of Norwegian toponyms such as Svindalen. Vegsvinn would mean ‘the one who flows rapidly’.487

þiodnuma could mean ‘misleader of peoples’. Alternatively, it could be related to Norwegian nome which could derive from ON *numi, ‘a little lake right beside a river, water container’. Þjóð- could in this case mean something like ‘great, powerful’.488

nýt possibly means ‘milk coloured’. It could instead be related to nyt, ‘enjoyment, produce, use’, relating to its richness in fish. The Swedish river names Gagnån and Nytteström derive from a similar meaning (and Nytteström the same root), as well as the Norwegian Nøsle and Nøtterøy.489

naunt could, according to S&G, mean ‘the stinging or burning one’,490 or be cognate with Gothic gantjan, ‘to wet’, OHG naz, ‘wet’, and the Low German river Nette. In such a case, a similar name would be found in the Swedish lake Naten.491

naunn means ‘bold’.

hraunn is related to hrǫnn, ‘wave’. Gira and Unna in Norway have both similar names and refer to rivers with rough waters.492

487 Ibid. p. 176.
488 Ibid. p. 176.
489 Ibid. p. 178.
490 Sijmons and Gering. p. 199.
491 Hale. p. 178.
492 Ibid. p. 179.
**slíþ** means ‘terrible, fearful’. The river Otta in Norway is semantically parallel to slíþ.

**hríþ** means ‘stormy’. Fjuka and Frysja are semantic parallels to hríþ.\(^{493}\) Cleasby-Vígðuson instead connect hríþ to the English Reed.\(^{494}\)

**sylgr** means ‘devouring’. Svelga in Norway has the same etymology, just as Svelgsá in Iceland does.\(^{495}\)

**ylgr** means ‘wolf’. The Norwegian river Ylja would thus be related to it. A number of river names in Scandinavia seem to be derived from wolf words, such as the Ulva, Ulvaen and Ulven.\(^{496}\)

**víþ** see above.

**ván** means ‘hope’. Toponyms such as Vonbækken and Ona are derived from the same. Alternatively, according to Hale, ván

‘is possibly an old ‘noa-’ name with the meaning of ‘hope, good prospects’ and called after a large, well-known river in the Norway of the pre-Christian period. [...] Ván could [potentially] be the old name for this river which is still found in the lake Vänern. The name also seems to occur in a couple of skaldic kennings, for example, *fránskíðs af mér Vánar* (*Plácitúsdrápa* 9/4) and *Vánar dags á Spáni* (*Útfarardrápa* 2/2).\(^{497}\)

**vaund** means ‘the difficult’. Otherwise, it could be related to *vǫndr*, ‘wand’, which would connect it to the district Gand and the lake Gjende and a number of river names related to *stafr*, ‘stick’.\(^{498}\)

\(^{493}\) Ibid. p. 179.
\(^{494}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 780.
\(^{495}\) Hale. p. 179.
\(^{496}\) Ibid. p. 180.
\(^{497}\) Ibid. p. 181.
\(^{498}\) Ibid. p. 181.
strauð is unknown. It seems to be identical to strønd, ‘shore, coast’, but the relation of that to a river is difficult to find.

giaull means ‘resounding’. The toponyms Gjellestad, Gjeldal and Gjellebæk all are etymologically related to giaull, while a river Gjold seems to have formed a number of place-names in Denmark.\textsuperscript{499}

leiptr means ‘lightning’ possibly referring to its speed.\textsuperscript{500} It could also be referring to its shine, which would thus connect leiptr with the Norwegian Lysa and Skinaaen rivers.

þēr falla gumn nom nēr | er falla til heliar hepan. translates to ‘they fall near to men but fall to hell hence.’. Considering the information based on st. 26, these rivers have their origin in Hvergelmir, pass by where mankind resides and then proceed to fall to hell.

Christopher Hale, who has written an detailed article on the river names in Grímnismál states his belief that sts. 27-28 are an interpolation to ‘enlarge on the word vǫtn in st. 26.’\textsuperscript{501} While all of Hale’s connections and derivations are not definitely proven, the original interpretation of these rivers being all (with the exception of rín and vín á) made up does not seem as strong. As Hale shows, a number of these rivers show connection to rivers and other place-names found in Scandinavia, especially in Norway, but also in Sweden. Some of these could be the names of actual rivers, while some rivers may have once been named as such and then their names changed, having survived only in compound names.\textsuperscript{502} If the different metre and nature of these stanzas do indeed show that they were interpolations in Grímnismál, Hale’s analysis points to it being a very early interpolation, probably before Grímnismál was taken to Iceland. The evidence portrayed here makes Egeler’s argument about the Christian nature of

\textsuperscript{499} Ibid. p. 182.  
\textsuperscript{500} Sijmons and Gering. p. 199.  
\textsuperscript{501} Hale. p. 165.  
\textsuperscript{502} Ibid. p. 182.
st. 26 (see above) more problematic. One of Egeler’s main arguments is that these rivers were all made up by the mind of a Christian composer and that they bore no ‘contemporary real world relevance’. While this may have been the case to an Icelandic scribe who put Grímnismál down to parchment, it does not seem to have been the case for the composer of this river list.

Stanza 29.

Kaurmt oc aurmt | oc kerlaugar tvær
þær scal þorr vaða
hverian dag | er hann dómma ferr
at asciyggdrasils.
þvi at as bru | brenn aull logo
heilog votn hlóa.

Kaurmt and Aurmt | and the two Kerlaugar,
Þórr must wade them
each day, | when he goes to judge
at the ash of Yggdrasill,
Because the bridge of the gods | burns with fire,
holy waters boil.

**Kaurmt** is, according to S&G, derived from *karmr*, ‘bulwark’. What is particularly interesting is that a large island off the coast of Norway, in the region of Rogaland, now called Karmøy, used to be called by this name, normalised as Kǫrmt.

---

503 Egeler. p. 25.
504 Sijmons and Gering. p. 200.
*aurmt* is more difficult to derive. It could be related to ‘something that divides itself into arms that form a delta’.\(^{505}\)

**kerlaugar tvær.** Kerlaug is attested in the first stanza of *Snefríðardrápa*, a poem attributed to king Haraldr hárfagri Halfdanarson:

Hneggi berk æ ugg
ótta; hlýði mér drótt;
dána vekk dul at mey
drauga á kerlaug.
Drôpu lætk ór Dvalins greip
dynja, meðan framm hrynr
— rekkum býðk Regins drykk
réttan — á bragar stétt.\(^{506}\)

The meaning here is definitely related to liquid and possibly as a river. The meaning of *Kerlaug* is ‘bath tub’.

*Kaurmt oc aurmt | oc kerlaugar tvær* seem to be the names of four bodies of water – usually regarded as rivers. This can be surmised by the author’s usage of *vaða*, ‘to wade, to go through shallow water’.\(^{507}\) As seen above, at least one of them, Kaurmt, is problematic to think of as a river, considering that it survives as an island name in Norway. It could possibly relate to the sound separating the island from the mainland. If there is indeed a connection between the two, this could add to a theory of a composition of *Grímnismál* in the Norwegian coast, and possibly not far from where Karmøy is located.

---

\(^{505}\) Ibid. p. 200.

\(^{506}\) Haraldr hárfagri Hálfdanarson, *Snefríðardrápa*, ed. Russel Poole (Turnhout, 2002). p. 68. Translation (by Russel Poole): I constantly carry trepidation <in the rock of fear> [HEART]; let the company hear me; I bring to light a delusion after the maiden’s death in <the cup-liquid of the undead> [POETRY]; I make the dráp ring out from <the grasp of Dvalinn <dwarf>> [MOUTH], as it rushes forth on <the path of poetry> [TONGUE]; I offer men <a correct drink of Reginn <dwarf>> [POETRY].

\(^{507}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 673
heilog votn, it does not seem strange that waters would be deemed ‘holy’. A tradition seems to have existed and can also be attested in Helgakviða Hundingsbana I, 1.3 where heilǫg vǫtn are mentioned.\textsuperscript{508} It could also be connected to a similar ancient Greek tradition, which can be seen in Homer ἱερῶν ποταμῶν, ‘holy rivers’,\textsuperscript{509} and Hesiod ἱερὸν ῥῶν Ὠκεανοῖο, ‘holy river Oceanus’,\textsuperscript{510} to name a few.

The idea of Þórr wading a river seems to have been used in at least one other text: Pórsdrápa. Considering the possible connections with Grímnismál, it is of interest to see the passage in its entirety. See Pórsdrápa 5-8 (77-80):

5. Ok geþverrir *varra
vann fetrunnar Nǫnnu
hjalts af *hagli oltnar
hlauþár um ver gaupu.
Mjók leið òr stað stókkvir
stikleiðar veg breiðan
urðar þrjóts þar er eitri
óestr þjóðar fnæstu.

6. Þar Í mǫrk fyrir markar
málhvettan byr settu
(ne hvélvǫlur hálar)
háf- skotnaðra (sváfú).
Knátti hreggi höggvin
hlýmphǫl við möl glymja
en fellihryn fjalla
Feðju þaut með steðja.

\textsuperscript{509} Homer, Odyssey, ed. A. T. Murray (London, 1919). Book 10, v. 351
7. Harðvaxnar sér herðir
hallands ok sik falla
(*gatar maðr) njótr (hin neytri)
njarð- (ráð fyrir sér) -gjarðar.
Þverrir lætr nema þýrri
Þors *barna sér Mǫrnar
snerriblöð til svíra
salpaks megin vaxa.

8. Óðu fast (en) *fríðir
(flaut) eiðsvara Gauta
setrs vikingar snotrir
(*svarðrunnit fen) gunnar.
Þurði hrǫnn at herði
hauðrs runykvva nauðar
jarðar skafls af afli
áss hretviðri blásin.511

Of interest are also other similarities with Grímnismál to be found in this passage. Both Ymir’s
blood as being water is mentioned (see sts. 40-41) and Óðinn is called Gautr, which is given in
the list of Óðinn names in Grímnismál.

Translation: 5. And the honour-lessener [Thor] of the wake-hilt-[rock-]Nanna [troll-wife] caused the swollen
rivers, rolling with hail over the lynx’s sea [mountains], to be foot-crossed. The violent scree-villain-[giant-
]scatterer very much disturbed the broad staked-track-way [river] where mighty rivers spewed poison.
6. There they pushed shooting-snakes [spears] in the fish-trap forest [river] against the talkative [noisy] fish—
trap-forest wind [current]. The slippery wheel-knobs [stones] did not lie asleep. The clanging-file [ferrule] did
bang on stones, and the mountains’ falling-noise [river] rushed along, beaten by storm, with Fedia’s anvil
[rock].
7. The stone-land’s [sword’s] impeller [warrior, Thor], possessor of the strength-girdle, let the mightily-grown
waters fall over him. One could have found no better course for oneself. The diminisher of Morn’s children
[giants] said his might would grow as high as the world’s roof unless the violent Thorn’s [Ymir’s] neck blood
[water] diminished.
8. The fine oath-bound Gaut’s [Odin’s] residence [Asgard] vikings [Æsir], battle-wise, waded hard while the
sward-flowing fen [river] flowed. The earth-drift-[mountain]-wave [river] raged mightily, blown by stormy
weather, at the ridge-land [mountain] room-[cave-]dwellers’ [giants’] trouble-worsener [Thor].
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hlóa is an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. According to Cleasby-Vigfússon, it means ‘to bellow, roar’, and is meant to relate to rivers or cascades.512 However, others believe that hlóa means ‘to become hot, to boil, cook’.513 If so, this could be related to st. 38 of Grímnismál.514

This stanza as a whole could be referring to some lost myth about Þórr.515 It should be noted that verses 4 through 6 are to be found in st. 30 as well. This could mean that lost verses in one of the two stanzas might have possibly been replaced with these. It is important to note, however, that these verses are to be found in this stanza in Snorri’s edition so, if st. 29516 had changed or added them, this had happened before Snorri’s time. It could be interpreted that because the as bru, ‘bridge of the gods’ – which could be related to bilraust from st. 44 – is burning, Þórr has to wade the rivers instead.

This stanza is also quoted in Gylfaginning and is almost the same. en is added before heilog votn hlóa.

Stanza 30.

Glaþr oc gyllir | gler oc sceðbrimir
   silfrintoptr oc sinir
gísl oc fálhofnir | gulltopr oc letfeti
   þeim riða þísir þóm
dag hvern | er þeir döma fara
   at asci yggdrasils.

Glaþr and Gyllir, | Gler and Sciðbrimir,
   Silfrintoptr and Sinir,
Gísl and Fálhofnir, | Gulltoppr and Léttfet.

512 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 272.
513 La Farge. p. 115.
514 Sijmons and Gering. p. 200.
515 Simek. p. 183.
the gods ride those horses
each day | when they go to judge
at the ash of Yggdrasill.

_Glaþr_ means ‘glad, cheerful’.

gyllir means ‘gold coloured’.

gler means ‘luminous’. It can also be found in a þulur in which it is the name of a bow, and is used in skaldic poetry for kennings that relate to the sea.

_sceiðbrimir_ means ‘the snorting one’.

_silfrintoþtr_ is ‘the one with silver-white hair’.

_sinir_ is ‘the sinewy’.

_gísl_ is ‘the radiant’.

_fálhofnir_ means ‘the one with covered hooves due to hair growth’.

_gulltopr_ means ‘the one with gold hair on his forhead’.

_letfeti_ means ‘the one with a light pace’.

Most of these horses are also mentioned in a short þulur known as _Þorgrímsþula_:

1. Hrafn ok sleipnir
hestar agætir
valr ok lettfeti
var þar tialdari
gulltopr ok goti
getit heyrþac sota
mór ok lungr með mari.

---

517 Sijmons and Gering. p. 201.
2. Vigg ok stufr
var með skefaði
þegn knatti blackr bera
silfr toppr ok sinir
sva heyrþac faks of getit
gullfaxi ok ior með goþum.

3. Bloðughofi het hestr
ok bera qvaðu
auflgan atriða,
gisl ok fallhafnir,
glær ok skeiðbrimir,
þar var ok Gullis of getinn.\(^{518}\)

One might notice the absence of Glaþr in the þulur. Furthermore, and more interesting, would be the absence of horses such as Sleipnir, Blóðughófi and Hófvarpnir in the list of ås-horses in stanza 30.

Stanza 31.

Þriár rǫtr | standa aþria vega
undan asci yggdrasils:
hel býr undir einni | annarri hrimþursar
þriðio mennzkir menn.

Three roots | stand in three directions

---


Translation: Hrafn and sleipnir | excellent horses | valr and lettfeti | there were racers | gulltopr and goti | I heard soti get | móð and lungr with mari.
Vigg and stufr | were with skefaði | þegn I know blackr to bear | silfr toppr and sinir | so i heard fak get | gullfax and ior with the gods.
Bloðughofi is named a horse | and bears request to | strong atrið. | gisl and fallhafnir, | glær and skeiðbrimir, | there was also Gullir to get.
from under the ash of Yggdrasill.  
Hel lives under one, | under another the Hríμþursar,  
under the third human people.

*hel* here could be interpreted in different ways. It could be referring to hell, the abode of the dead. Alternatively, it could mean ‘death’. It could also be referring to Hel, the goddess of the underworld. According to Simek, Hel is a ‘very late Poetic personification of the underworld Hel’. The first kennings referring to her are from as late as the tenth century, and the most detailed description is given by Snorri and is heavily influenced by Christianity. I hesitate to consider *hel* in st. 31 as necessarily being that personification, though that usage could certainly agree with the possible composition date of *Grímnismál*. While it seems certain that it is considered some sort of being (see *býr*), connecting her with the Hel described by Snorri feels to be a huge leap.

*hríμþursar* probably refers to *jǫtnar*. *Hríμ* means ‘rime, hoar frost’, while the compound would refer to some sort of frost-*jǫtnar*. *Þurs* is considered to be an older term than *jǫtunn* and is also found in *Hávamál* 109, *Skírnismál* 30, 34. While the usage in *Grímnismál* could be seen as anachronistic, it is interesting that two other Eddic poems with possible pre-Christian roots contain the same.

*mennzkir menn*. Clarification that it is human people that live under the third root of Yggdrasill is needed since the term *maðr* could have been used for other anthropomorphic beings as well. Dronke writes that all the damage to Yggdrasill mentioned in st. 32-35 come from the ‘realm of men’, and that this realm is in a state of ‘dereliction and danger’.

---

519 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 254.  
520 Simek. p. 138.  
Stanza 32.

Ratatoscr heitir ikorni | er reonna scal
   at asci yggdrasis.
arnar orð | hann scal ofan bera
oc segia níþhauggvi níþr.

The squirrel is called Ratatoscr | who must run
   at the ash of Yggdrasill.
From above he must bear | the eagle’s word
   and say to Níþhauagr below.

*Ratatoscr* could mean ‘boring-tooth’.\(^{522}\) It is a squirrel and according to Simek is just an ‘embellishing detail’.\(^ {523}\) According to Bugge, the *rati* part of this compound cannot mean ‘drill’ because this was not a word used in the North. He instead translates the name as ‘rat-tooth’.\(^ {524}\) Lastly, Cleasby-Vigfússon translate *rati* as ‘the traveller’ and the whole name as ‘Toskr the climber, Toskr the traveller’.\(^ {525}\)

*arnar.* S&G mention that according to different scholars, a stanza is missing between 31 and 32. This conclusion is brought by the absence of an explanation on what the *ǫrn* of st. 32 is. They go as far as reconstructing such a stanza by using information taken from Snorri’s *Edda*:

Ǫrn sitr á asks limom
es vel kveþa mart vita;
öglér einn höñom augna í mille

\(^{522}\) La Farge. p. 212.
\(^{523}\) Simek. p. 261.
\(^{525}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 483.
Veþrfǫlner vaker.\textsuperscript{526}

As S&G agree, such an addition has little to no effect in the understanding of the poem. It is, therefore, pointless. It is common to try and explain every single aspect of a text. However, there is no need to give any name to the eagle, or any more information. It could either be that the audience was expected to know which Ǫrn was mentioned, or that it just did not matter at all.

\textit{orð} could be translated in both the singular and plural.

\textit{níþhauggvi} is a problematic word. \textit{Hauggvi} means ‘hewer’. The length of the vowel of the \textit{níþ} element is not certain. It could be, in a normalised spelling, either \textit{nið}, ‘malice, slander’, or \textit{nið}, ‘the darkness of the moon’. It could be ‘abusive hewer’ or ‘dark hewer’.\textsuperscript{527}

\textit{arnar orð | hann scal ofan bera | oc segia níþhauggvi níþr}. As others have pointed out before, these verses recall a fable by Phædrus:

Aquila in sublimi quercu nidum fecerat;
Feles cavernam nancta in media pepererat;
Sus nemoris cultrix fetum ad imam posuerat.
Tum fortuitum feles contubernium
Fraude et scelestia sic evertit malitia.
Ad nidum scandit volucris: Pernicies ait
Tibi paratur, forsan et miserae mihi;
Nam fodere terram quod vides cotidie
Aprum insidiosum, quercum vult evertere,

\textsuperscript{526} Sijmons and Gering. pp. 201-202.
Translation: An eagle sits on the ash’s foliage | who is said to know much; | between his eyes one hawk | Veþrfǫlner is awake.
See also Snorri Sturluson, \textit{Prologue and Gylfaginning}. 16. p. 18: Ǫrn einn sitr í limum asksins, ok er hann margis vitandi, en í milli augna honum sitr haukr sá en heitir Veþrfǫlni.
Translation: One eagle sits on the foliage of the ash, and he knows much, but between his eyes sits a hawk who is named Veþrfǫlni.

\textsuperscript{527} Bibire. Personal Communication.
See also: La Farge. p. 194.
Ut nostram in plano facile progener opprimat.
Terrore offuso et perturbatis sensibus
Derepit ad cubile setosae suis:
Magno inquit in periculo sunt nati tui;
Nam, simul exieris pastum cum teneo grege,
Aquila est parata rapere porcellos tibi.
Hunc quoque timore postquam complevit locum,
Dolosa tuto condidit sese cavo.
Inde evagata noctu suspenso pede,
Ubi esca se replevit et prolem suam,
Pavorem simulans prospecit toto die.
Ruinam metuens aquila ramis desidet;
Aper rapinam vitans non prodit foras.
Quid multa? Inedia sunt consumpti cum suis
Felisque catulis largam praebuerunt dapem.
Quantum homo bilinguis saepe concinnet mali,
Documentum habere stulta credulitas potest.528

In Gylfaginning 16, Snorri writes of Ratatoscr that it berr ǫfundarorð milli arnarins ok Níðhǫggs, ‘brings grudging words between the eagle and Níðhöggr’.529 Because of the absence

---

528 Phaedrus, Fabulae Æsopieae, ed. L. Mueller (Leipzig, 1876). Book 2.4.
Translation by Christopher Smart:
An Eagle built upon an oak | A Cat and kittens had bespoke | A hole about the middle bough; | And underneath a woodland Sow | Had placed her pigs upon the ground. | Then treacherous Puss a method found | To overthrow, for her own good. | The peace of this chance neighbourhood | First to the Eagle she ascends— “Perdition on your head impends, | And, far too probable, on mine; | For you observe that grubbing Swine | Still works the tree to overset, | Us and our young with ease to get.” | Thus having filled the Eagle's pate | With consternation very great, | Down creeps she to the Sow below; | “The Eagle is your deadly foe, | And is determined not to spare | Your pigs, when you shall take the air. | Here too a terror being spread, | By what this tattling gossip said, | She slyly to her kittens stole, | And rested snug within her hole. | Sneaking from thence with silent treai | By night her family she fed, | But look'd out sharply all the day, | Affecting terror and dismay. | The Eagle lest the tree should fall, | Keeps to the boughs, nor stirs at all; | And anxious for her grunting race, | The Sow is loth to quit her place. | In short, they and their young ones starve | And leave a prey for Puss to carve. | Hence warn'd ye credulous and young, | Be cautious of a double tongue.

529 Snorri Sturluson, Gylfaginning. 16. p. 18.
of ofundarorð in Grímnismál, however, S&G find that such a comparison is not valid. It is likelier that Snorri might have been influenced by Phædrus than the composer of Grímnismál.

Stanza 33.

Hirtir ero oc fiorir | þeirs af hęfingar á.
agaaghalsir gnaga.
dainn oc dvalinn. | dúneýr oc duraþror.

There are also four stags, | they who gnaw things lifted up from towering necks.
Dáinn and Dvalinn, | Duneýr and Duraþrór.

hefingar is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. Its normalised spelling could either be hefingar, hæfingar, or höfingar. La Farge translates it as ‘something which raises itself up’, but ultimately its meaning is unknown and its role within the sentence is not understood.

agaghalsir is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. It means ‘towering’ probably. The gag element is not uncommon. It can be seen regularly in Norwegian as well, gag-hals and gag-halsad being found in the region of Hallingdal. According to Bibire, háls has a wider meaning than English ‘neck’. It can be used for a pass between two mountains, a lower point of a ridge, etc.

þeirs af hefingar á. | agaghalsir gnaga. are a very difficult couple of verses to translate or understand, mostly because of hefingar and agaghalsir. A possible translation, and the one I reached with the help of Bibire, is ‘they who gnaw | things lifted up from towering necks.’

---

531 La Farge, p. 130.
533 Paul Bibire. Personal Communication.


dainn means ‘dead’. It is usually thought of as being a dwarf name, while here it is clear that it refers to a stag.\textsuperscript{534} According to S\&G, such a chthonic name makes these stags ‘animals of the underworld’ in mythical imagination.\textsuperscript{535} While this could be the case, I would refrain from thinking too much about connections between these names, dwarves, and the underworld.

dvalinn is another dwarf name. It means, ‘the slow one, the sleeping one’.

dúneýr means ‘the brown eared one’. It could be a corruption of the dwarf name Durner.\textsuperscript{536}

duraprpr means ‘slumber boar’. It does not appear as a dwarf name.

This stanza is particularly problematic. First of all it is not complete, missing a long line. Because of the uncertain meaning of agaghalsir, the meaning of the whole stanza becomes more dubious.

Stanza 34.

Ormar fleiri | liggia undir asci yggdrasils
enn þat uf hyggi hverr. osvpiþra apa.
Goinn oc moinn | þeir ero grafavitnis synir
grabacr oc grafvaullupr
ofnir oc svafnir | hygg ec at ã scyli
meiþs qvisto má.

More in number wyrms, | lie under the ash of Yggdrasill

\textsuperscript{534} Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 97.
\textsuperscript{535} Sijmons and Gering. p. 203.
\textsuperscript{536} Ibid. p. 203.
but it each of unwise apes considers it:
Góinn and Móinn, | they are Grafvitnir’s sons,
Grábacr and Grafvaulluþr,
Ófnir and Sváfnir, | I think that always must
harm the branches of the tree.

*Ormar* can mean ‘serpent, dragon’ as well as ‘worm’.

*uf* is an outfilling particle like *of*. It can also be used as a preposition. It appears to be a scribal form between *of* and *um*.

*Góinn*. The meaning of this name is uncertain. Simek writes that it could possibly mean ‘land animal’.\(^{537}\)

*móinn* has an uncertain meaning as well. It could be related to ‘moor’.\(^{538}\)

*grafvitnis* is interesting. It is to be expected that Grafvitnir is an *ormr* as well. However, *vitnir* is a wolf name. It is important to note that in GKS 2365 4o, the *a* is above the line and is in another hand. The name means ‘grave wolf, ditch wolf’.

*grabacr* means ‘gray back’. It is a poetic synonym to the Ormr lange ship from *Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar*.\(^{539}\)

*grafvaulluþr* means ‘the one burrowing in the field’.

*ofnir oc svafnir* is a particularly problematic verse. The same two names are found in st. 54 as Óðinn names. A connection with *ormar* that damage Yggdrasill and Óðinn feels unlikely. Ofnir means ‘the twisting one’, while Svafnir ‘bringer of sleep’.

\(^{537}\) Simek. p. 115.
\(^{538}\) Ibid. p. 222.
\(^{539}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 203.
It should be noted that this stanza is longer than the usual ljóðaháttur metre by three verses.

This stanza is quoted by Snorri. Instead of Goinn oc moinn, the Uppsala Edda version has Góni ok Móni. Furthermore, instead of synir, liðar, ‘family, host, people’, is used. Lastly, scyli is found as muni, ‘will’.

Stanza 35.

Ascr yggdrasils | drygir erfiði
meira enn menn víti
hiótr bítr ofan | enn ahliþo fúnar
scerþer níðhauggr neþan.

The ash of Yggdrasill | suffers more hardships
than men might know:
a stag bites from above, | but on the side it rots,
from below Níþhauggr damages it by cutting.

dyrgr erfiði is also found, according to S&G, in Homiliubók 49.32. The meaning of ‘suffering, enduring’ in this verse is rare.540

This stanza also is quoted in Gylfaginning. Um is added before víti. In the Uppsala Edda manuscript is written Hjörtr bítr neðan, but Heimir notes that all other manuscripts have ofan so it would be probably expected to be a scribal error.541

---

540 Ibid. p. 204.
Stanza 36.

Hrist oc mist | vil ec at mer horn beri
sceggiauld oc scaugul.
hildi oc þruði | hlaucc oc herfiotr.
gaull oc geiraulul.
randgriþ. oc raþgriþ | reginłęif
þer bera einheriom ául.

I wish that | Hríst and Mist to bear a horn to me.
Sceggiauld and Skaugul,
Hildr and Þrúðr, | Hlaucc and Herfiotr,
Gaull and Geiraulul,
Randgriþ and Ráþgriþ | Reginłęif.
They bear ale to the soul heroes.

*hrist* means ‘the shaking one’.

*mist* means ‘mist’.

*skægg ǫlld* means ‘the age of swords’. It is a term related to *ragnarǫk*.

*skǫgul* could be related to Gothic *skôhs*, (which is, in turn, used to translate Gr. *δαιμων*), ‘demon’. The meaning is uncertain.

*hildr* means ‘battle’.

*þruðr* means ‘powerful’.

*hløyk* means ‘noisy’.

---

542 Bibire, Personal Communication.
543 Sijmons and Gering. p. 42.
hærfjótur means ‘army fetter’. This is also the name of the panic that Óðinn can induce to his enemies.

goll means ‘noise’.

gæirrómul means ‘the one charging with a spear’.

randgríð means ‘shield-truce’. Could be referring to the destroying of shields.\(^{544}\)

raðgríð, normalised as Ráðgríð would mean ‘the destroyer of plans, advice’. Otherwise it could be ‘advice truce’. S&G would emend the spelling to Raðgríð, therefore giving the name a meaning of ‘destroyer of slaughterers’.\(^{545}\)

reðginleif means ‘daughter of the gods’. This also was a common given name for females in Iceland.\(^{546}\)

The different female names mentioned in st. 36 all seem to be valkyrie names. Most are found in other sources as well, including Völuspá. Valkyrjar derives from valr, ‘battle-dead’, and kjósa, ‘to choose’. Simek has suggested that before being identified as women and related to Óðinn, the valkyries were demons of the dead.\(^{547}\)

This stanza is quoted by Snorri. It is mostly similar, though ok is added after randgrip and reðginleif. Furthermore, geiraulul appears as Geirahöð.

**Stanza 37.**

Arvacr oc alsvíhr | þeir scolo upp heðan
svangir sol draga.
enn und þeira bógom | fálo blíþ reðin

\(^{544}\) Ibid. p. 205.
\(^{545}\) Ibid. p. 205.
\(^{546}\) Ibid. p. 206.
\(^{547}\) Simek. p. 349.
ęsir isarn kol.

Árvacr and Alsvíþr, | hungry they must up from here
drag the sun.
But under their shoulders | the blithe gods, ęsir,
hid the cold iron.

**Árvacr** means ‘early awake’. Presumably a horse or some other quadruped. Árvacr appears in the *Snorra Edda* as the name of an ox.\(^{548}\)

**alsvíþr** is generally thought of as a dwarf name and not a horse name.\(^{549}\) It means ‘all swift’.

**Árvacr oc alsvíþr** both appear in the Eddic poem *Sigrdrífumál* st. 16:

Á skildi kvað ristnar
þeim er stendr fyr skínanda goði,
á eyra Árvakrs
ok á Alsvinn’s hófi,
á því hveli er snýsk
undir reið Rungnis,
á Sleipnis tongnum
ok á sleða fjoþrum,\(^{550}\)

This stanza seems to agree with the information given by st. 34. It furthermore adds to our knowledge that at least Alsvíþr is hoofed. Both animals could be oxen, considering oxen are also hoofed.

---

\(^{549}\) Bibire, Personal Communication.
\(^{550}\) *Sigrdrífumál*. pp. 316-317.

Translation: On a shield she said to carve | that which stands in front of the shining goddess, | on the ear of Árvakr | and on Alsvinn’s hoof, | on this wheel that turns | under the carriage of Rungnir, | on the tongue of Sleipnir | and on the fetters of a sledge.
svangir would literally mean ‘slender’, especially when used about horses, but could also mean ‘hungry’ metaphorically.\textsuperscript{551} Within this context, both could be the case.

isarn kol is a most peculiar thing. It would literally mean ‘cold iron’ but as S&G write, the meaning behind this cold iron is completely unknown:

[...] gedacht hat, wird wohl immer verborgen bleiben. Snorre (Gylfag. c. 11 = Sn. E. I, 56; in U fehlt die stelle) erklärt sie als zwei blasebälge (vindbelgir): diese sind aber niemals aus eisen hergestellt worden [s. Finnur Jónsson, Ark. 14, 197f.]. – Eine merkwürdige parallele aus Shirleys ‘Triumph of peace’ (1633) weist M. E. Seaton nach (Ark. 29, 343): dort ist von verschiedenen erfindungen die rede, darunter von der eines jockeys, der einen wunderbaren zaum konstruiert haben soll, in dessen hohles gebiß ein gas (vapour) eingelassen ist, welches das pferd so kühlt und erfrischt, daß es niemals ermüdet.\textsuperscript{552}

With the exception of the doubtful meaning of isarn kol, and the possibly bovine nature of Arvacr and Alsvíþr, this stanza is quite straightforward in giving the audience the knowledge that these two animals (probably horses but also possibly oxen) drag the sun. They are slim, possibly because of hunger. The blithe gods have hid isarn kol, ‘cold iron’ underneath the shoulders of Arvacr and Alsvíþr. The first part of this stanza is reminding of Helios – who may be identified as Apollo\textsuperscript{553} – dragging the sun with his horsed chariot. The names of his horses are dissimilar in different sources, but none bears even a remote resemblance to Arvacr or Alsvíþr, making any attempt to consider the first part of st. 37 as having been directly influenced by the Helios myth unlikely.

Stanza 38.

Svaül heitir | hann stendr solo fyr  
scioldr scinanda góði.  
biorg oc brim | ec veit at brenna scolo

\textsuperscript{551} La Farge, p. 253.  
\textsuperscript{552} Sijmons and Gering, p. 206.  
\textsuperscript{553} Walter Burkert, \textit{Greek Religion}, ed. John Raffan (Cambridge (MA), 1985). p. 120.
ef hann fellr ifrá.

He is called Svaull, | who stands in front of the sun,
   shield to the shiny god.
I know that | mountains and seas must burn
   if he falls from there.

*Svaull* means ‘the cool one’. It also appears as a river name in st. 27, though there seems to be no connection between the two. This shield seems to be identified as the sun disc which would be in front of the *seinanda goði*, ‘shining god’, and possibly also makes him invisible to mankind. A similar idea, which connects the sun ‘shield’ with divinity is found in *Þórsdrápa* 4 (76):

Ok *gangs vanir gengu
gunnvargs; himintǫrgu
Fríðars vers til fljóða
frumseyris kom dreyra,
þá er bǫlkve<i>tir brjóta
bragômildr Loka vildi
bræði vændr á brúði
bág sef-Grímnis mága. 554

Here, the extremely complex kenning *frumseyris fljóða vargs Fríðars himintǫrgu* is of interest.

It would be translated as ‘the main diminisher of the maidens of the enemy of the goddess of the shield of heaven’, referring to Þórr. Himintarga is the ‘shield of heaven’ and could be specifically referring to Svaull.

Translation: And the ones accustomed to the course [battle] of the battle-wolf [sword] travelled; the heaven-targe-[sun]-dwelling’s [sky’s] blood [water] of the women [Gialp and Greip] of Frid’s first defiler [giant] was reached [i.e. the river Vimur], when Loki’s bale-avter [Thor], guilty of hastiness, wished, deed-unsparing, to open hostilities with the bride [Gialp] of rush-Grimnir’s [giant’s] kinsmen.
Source: *Edda*. p. 83.
Svaul heitir | hann stendr solo fyr | scioldr scinanda góði. heavily reminds of the first two verses of Sigdrífumál st. 16: Á skildi kvað ristnar | þeim er stendr fyr skínanda goði. This definitely connects st. 37 and 38 of Grímnismál. Furthermore, it could show a connection between the two poems as well, though whether they both refer to a similar myth, or one has emulated the other, is unknown.

AM has Svalin instead of Svaul.

Stanza 39.

Scaull heitir ulfr | er fylgir eno scírleita goði
til varna viðar.
enn annarr hati | hann er hroþ vitnis sónr
sa scal fyr heiða bruði himins.

The wolf is called Scaull, who accompanies the brightfaced god to the defense of wood.
But another, Hati, he is the son of Hróþvitnir, he must run before the shining lady of the sky.

Scaull is problematic. According to Simek it means ‘mockery’. However, it could be related to skollr, ‘fox’. In this case, though, there is no doubt that Scaull is a wolf.

scírleita goði means ‘brightfaced god’.

varna viðar is somewhat problematic. S&G choose to emend varna to ísarn, ‘iron’. However, varna viðar could make sense on its own. The first three verses would thus mean

---

555 Sigdrífumál. p. 316.
Translation: On a shield she said to carve | that which stands in front of the shining goddess.
556 Simek. p. 292.
557 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 554.
that Scaull accompanies the brightfaced god to the defense of wood. According to Bibire, ‘defense of the wood’ could be explained by prose sources in which the sun is seen on land, going down to the wood at sunset.\textsuperscript{558} The wolf could follow the sun as it goes down, and the woods could symbolise the sun reaching safety. I would prefer such an explanation to S&G’s emendation.

\textit{hati} means ‘hater’ and certainly refers to a wolf as well.

\textit{hroþ vitnis} means ‘fame wolf’. The same name appears in \textit{Lokasenna} 39:

\begin{quote}
Handar em ek vanr
en þú Hróðrvitnís;
ból er beggja þrá;
úlfgi hefir ok vel,
er i þóndum skal
bíða ragnarǫkr.\textsuperscript{559}
\end{quote}

This suggests that \textit{hroþ vitnir} could be identified with Fenrir, making \textit{hati} Fenrir’s son.

\textit{heiða} can be translated as ‘shining’ but also as ‘glorious’ or ‘bright’.

\textit{heiða bruði himins} here refers to the moon.

The stanza as a whole is interpreted as having two wolves, one trying to catch the sun, and the other trying to catch the moon. However, it is important to note than the three verses about \textit{hati} use \textit{fyr}, ‘before, in front of’.\textsuperscript{560} This feels somewhat strange if one is to picture a wolf trying to catch the moon. Furthermore, the absence of a verb of movement is to be noted, with S&G adding one such in order for the stanza to make more sense.\textsuperscript{561} Lastly, the usage of

\textsuperscript{558} Bibire. Personal Communication.
\textsuperscript{559} \textit{Lokasenna}, ed. Jónas Kristjánsson and Vésteinn Ólason, v. 1 (Reykjavík, 2014). p. 416. Translation: Of a hand I am lacking | but you Hróðrvitnir; | longing is misfortune to both; | the wolf is also not well, | who in fetters must | endure for ragnarǫkr.
\textsuperscript{560} Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. pp. 180-182.
\textsuperscript{561} Sijmons and Gering. p. 207.
skal should be taken into consideration. Skal translates to ‘must’, and denotes ‘fate, law, bidding, need, necessity, duty, obligation, and the like’, according to Cleasby-Vigfússon.562 As such, it could be argued that hati has to run away from the moon, rather than the opposite. If this were the case, and the reasoning for such a story will probably remain a mystery, the whole last part of this stanza could have a very different meaning from the one traditionally given.

Dronke sees the two wolves as being a sort of escort to the sun and moon, instead of trying to catch them.563

**Stanzas 40-41.**

Ór ymis holdi | var iorþ um scaupuð
enn or sveita sær
biorg or beinom | baðmr or hári
en or hausi himin

enn or hans brám | gerðo blið regin
miðgarð manna sonom.
enn or hans heila | voro þau in harðmoðgo
scy aull um scaupuþ.

From the flesh of Ymir | was the earth shaped
but from blood the sea,
mountains from bones, | tree from hair
but from cranium sky.

But from his brows | the blithe gods made
middle enclosure for sons of men.
But from his brains | they, all the hardminded clouds
were shaped.

562 Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon. p. 560.
Ymir appears in different Eddic poems, including Vafþrúðnismál 21 and 28, Hyndluljóð 33 and Vǫluspá 3. He is generally regarded to be a jǫtunn. Its Proto-Germanic form would be *jumia-. The name could be linked to ymja, ‘to whine, cry’ and might have to do with ‘awareness’. Henning Kure writes that whether such an etymology would be correct, the connection with screaming or whining would have been evident to an Old Norse speaking audience. It is more probably cognate to Avestan yǝ̄ma- ‘twin’, Sanskrit Yama, Latin geminus, all having the same meaning. De Vries agrees with the twin etymology as well. According to Ásgeir, the name ultimately means ‘hermaphrodite being’ and he connects Ymir to Tuisto, who is mentioned in Tacitus and whose name similarly has a meaning of duality.

sveita means ‘sweat’, but is also commonly used as ‘blood’.

hardmöðgo means ‘hardminded’. It is an interesting choice of adjective to describe clouds.

These two stanzas remind of Vafþrúðnismál st. 21:

Ór Ymis holdi
var iǫrð um scǫpuð
en ór beinom biǫrg,
himinn ór hausi
ins hrímkalda iǫtuns
en ór sveita síór.

564 Simek. p. 377.
566 De Vries, Altnordisches. p. 678.
567 Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 1165.
568 Vafþrúðnismál. p. 62.

Translation: From the flesh of Ymir | was the earth shaped | but from bones the mountains, | sky from cranium | of the rime-cold jǫtunn | but from blood the sea.
Three verses are exactly the same as in st. 40 (1, 2 and 6). Verses 3 and 4 is also similar (in content) to verse 4, 6 of st. 40 respectively. According to S&G, the Vafþrúðnismál version was based on the more detailed one from Grímnismál. I would avoid making such claims, and as a response to S&G would wonder why would the composer of the Vafþrúðnismál stanza choose to add the fifth verse, with information that does not appear in either of the two Grímnismál stanzas, when there were more things to be added from there.

These two stanzas appear in Gylfaginning and are exactly the same. The last three verses of st. 40 are heavily abbreviated.

Stanza 42.

Ullar hylli hefr | oc allra goða
hverr er tecr fyrstr afuna.
þviat opnir heimar | verþa um ása sonom
þa er hefia af hvera.
Each who grasps first onto the fire | has the support of Ullr
and all gods,
because open worlds | come about
concerning the sons of the gods.

Ullar cf. st. 5 above. S&G consider Ullr here to be possibly referring to Óðinn.\textsuperscript{569}

hverr er tecr fyrstr afuna. would translate to ‘each who grasps first onto the fire’. Some scholars have chosen to emend afuna to af funa, ‘of fire’.\textsuperscript{570}

\textsuperscript{569} Sijmons and Gering. p. 211.
Þvìat opnir heimar | verþa um ása sonom | þa er hefia af hvera. translates to ‘because open worlds | come about | concerning the sons of the gods.’ S&G write that:

In den alten nordischen häusern befand sich im first des daches eine öffnung [...], um das licht herein und den rauch hinaus zu lassen [...]. Unter dieser öffnung wurde das feuer entzündet und in der nähe derselben waren, wie es scheint, die ketten befestigt, an denen man die kessel aufhing. Diese konnten somit, namentlich wenn sie hoch emporgezogen waren, demjenigen, der vom dache in die halle hineisehen wollte, den einblick unmöglich machen. Óþenn [sic.], der aus seiner üblen lage erlöst sein will, wünscht, daß die kessel herabgenommen werden, damit die asen vom himmel herab ihn sehen und ihm zu hilfe kommen können.571

Bo Ralph instead chooses to treat opnir heimar as opin jǫrð, meaning ‘open soil, land from which the upper layer of soil is removed’.572

Andreas Nordberg has written an article trying to explain the contents of this stanza. He argues that st. 42 describes a ritual meal related to a blót.573 Whoever performed such ritual would get the blessing of Ullr and all the Æsir. Nordberg translates the whole stanza thus:

“‘The one who first uses the sacred fire in order to cook the ceremonial meal,’ or, ‘The one who lifts the cauldron with the ceremonial meal off the sacred fire, / has the race of Ull and all the gods, / because the cosmic worlds will open around the sons of the Æsir (i.e. the gods), / when the cauldrons are lifted off the fire and the communion meal can begin’.”574

As a whole, to me this stanza feels off compared to the rest of the poem, whether Nordberg’s interpretation is to be followed or not. It does not seem to be of a gnostic nature, or to relate with anything cosmological at all, but rather feels gnomic, like the larger part of Hávamál, though the kind of advice given here is obscure.

Stanza 43.

Ivalda sýnir | gengo iardaga

571 Sijmons and Gering. p. 208.
573 Ibid. p. 58.
574 Ibid. p. 60.
Sciþblaðnir at scapa.
Sciþ bezt | sciþom freý
Nytom niarðar bur.

The sons of Ívaldi | went in the early days
to shape sciþblaðnir,
best of ships, | for bright Freýr,
for the profitable son of Niorþr.

**Ivalda** could mean ‘mighty’,\(^{575}\) or ‘owner of the bow’, from *iwawaldan, or ‘he who rules over the yew-tree’ or be derived from *Inhu-waldan. The first could be referring to Ullr, the second to Skaði and the third to Yngvi.\(^{576}\) This name is shrouded in mystery. The sons of Ivaldi are thought to be dwarves, suggesting that Ivaldi himself would be one.

**Sciþblaðni** is also a strange name. *Skiþ* is a ‘flat piece of wood’ (and is the origin of ski), while *blaðnir* should be ‘the bladed one’. *Blad* can also mean ‘leaf’. Thus, it would mean ‘bladed flat piece of wood’, ‘plank-bladed-one’ or something similar. S&G translate it as ‘made of small thin planks’. Dronke writes that Sciþblaðnir is a metaphor for the sun, to be interpreted as moving over the ocean of the sky.\(^{577}\) As with many others, this interpretation is not supported by any sources. The name of this ship is elsewhere only mentioned in the *Snorra Edda*, which expands on the information given here. However, as with any such descriptions by Snorri, one should be cautious in using them to explain Eddic poetry.

**Nytom niarðar bur.** means ‘for the profitable son of Niorþr’. This probably refers to Freyr. A similarity can be found with *Vafþrúðnismál* 13, in which *nýþ regin* is mentioned.\(^{578}\)

---

\(^{575}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 208.
\(^{576}\) Simek. p. 177.
\(^{577}\) Dronke, *The Poetic Edda*. p. 133.
\(^{578}\) *Vafþrúðnismál*. p. 61.
Machan writes that the usage of *nýr* would not be expected of a Vafþrúðnir, and he thus places it in the mouth of the composer.\(^{579}\) If that is the case, this would apply to Óðinn as well.

**Stanza 44.**

Ascr yggdrasils | hann er óztr viða  
   en skíþblaðnir scipa  
oðinn asa | enn ioa sleipnir  
   bilraust brúa  
en bragi scalda | habroc hauca  
en hunda garmr.

The ash of Yggdrasill, | he is the noblest of trees  
but skíþblaðnir of ships,  
Óðinn of gods | but of steeds Sleipnir,  
   Bilraust of bridges,  
but Bragi of skalds, | Hábróc of hawks  
but of hounds Garmr.  

*sleipnir* means ‘sliding one’. It is generally identified with Óðinn’s horse. He is also mentioned in *Sigrdrífmál* 16, *á Sleipnis tónum*,\(^{580}\) further connecting that poem – and more specifically, that stanza – to *Grímnismál*. Sleipnir generally appears in many other sources, listed by S&G.\(^{581}\)

*bilraust* is somewhat problematic. Cleasby-Vigfússon translate it as ‘rainbow’.\(^{582}\) S&G translate it as ‘the deceptive way’.\(^{583}\) *Bilraust* is thought to be identical to *bifröst*, mentioned by Snorri, who says it is the rainbow. Ásgeir also translates it as ‘rainbow’ and tentatively

---

\(^{579}\) Ibid. p. 80.  
\(^{580}\) *Sigrdrífmál*, pp. 317.  
\(^{581}\) Sijmons and Gering, p. 209.  
\(^{582}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon, p. 62.  
\(^{583}\) Sijmons and Gering, p. 208.
traces the etymology of *bifröst* to ‘trembling path’ and *bilröst* to ‘the colourful path’. Lastly, La Farge translates it as ‘road that gives way, road that fails’, but gives no explanation for this. All the connections to the rainbow could have been influenced by Snorri and thus should not be taken to face value. It is not even certain that *bilraust* is a bridge. If it is related to the gods, which seems likely, it could be the *as bru* mentioned in st. 29. Otherwise, Brink and Lindow, mentioning Deavin’s work, propose the possibility that *bilraust/bifröst* could be a poetic metaphor for the sea, ‘and hence the name denoting a bridge that connects the sea and the world’.

*bragi* is identified as a poet god, though *Grímnismál* itself does not specify this. Interestingly, he appears in *Sigrdrífumál* 16:

á bjarnar hrammi
ok á Braga tungu,
á úlfs klóm
ok á arnar nefi,
á blóðgum vængjum
ok á brúar sporði,
á lausnar lófa
ok á líknar spori,

This is a further connection between the two poems. Bragi also appears in *Lokasenna*, sts. 11, 12, 15, 16, 18 and is said to be Íðunn’s husband in the prose introduction. It could be that Bragi is Bragi Boddason inn gamli, considered to be the first skald. This could either mean that

---

584 Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon. p. 54.
585 La Farge. p. 23.
586 Brink and Lindow. p. 186.
587 *Sigrdrífumál*. p. 316.
Bragi here is not a divine being at all, and is just mentioned as the best of skalds, or that by the time this stanza was composed, Bragi Boddason had become a mythical figure and had been deified, or was known to be historical and was presumed to have undergone some sort of apotheosis.

**habroc.** It is obvious by this verse that this is the name of a hawk. The first element of this word is *hár*- ‘high’, while the second is more problematic and would probably be *brók*, ‘breeches’, giving the hawk’s name a meaning of ‘high breeches’. The meaning behind this name is very obscure.

**garmr** means ‘rag’ though S&G translate it as ‘the grim, the evil’. Other than him being a hound, nothing else is known.

In AM a tenth verse is added at the end: *ænn brimir sværða*, which means ‘but brimir of swords’. Brimir is sometimes associated with Ymir and thought to be the same. An association that also includes swords is found in *Sigrdrífumál* 14:

Á bjargi stóð
med brimis eggjar,
haði sér á hofði hjálm;
þá mælti Míms hofuð
fróðligt í fjyrsta orð
ok sagði sanna stafi.

If Brimir and Ymir are indeed the same, the fact that they are mentioned in this stanza of *Sigrdrífumál* could suggest that *brimis eggjar* and *Míms hofuð* refer to the same thing. If *enn*

---

589 Sijmons and Gering. p. 57.
590 Simek. p. 44.
591 *Sigrdrífumál*. p. 316.
Translation: On a mountain stood | with brimir’s edge, | had a helm on his head; | then spoke Mimir’s head | wise the first word | and said true knowledge.
*brimir sværða* is read with this in mind, it could be suggesting that knowledge and wisdom is the best weapon, giving this verse a very different meaning. A similar thought can be made in reading Snorri’s account of Heimdallr’s ‘sword’. In *Gylfaginning* 27, it is said that *Heimdalar sverð er kallat hǫfuð*, ‘the sword of Heimdallr is called head’.592 This is only found in Snorri’s writings so it is unknown whether it was made up by him, the misunderstanding of some source, or it was indeed taken from some source now lost. If read in relation to *Grímnismál* 40 and *Sigrdrífumál* 14, it feels to me that all refer to the mind, knowledge wisdom etc. as opposed to actual swords.

This stanza appears in *Gylfaginning*. It is exactly the same as the GKS version.

**Stanza 45.**

Svipom hefi ec nu ýpt | fyr sigtiva sonom  
við þat scal vilbiorg vaca.  
aullom ásom | þat scal inn coma  
égis becci á  
ægis drecco at.

I have now raised up my glances | before the sons of victory gods,  
with this must the desired saving awake.  
For all the gods | it must come in  
onto the benches of Ægir,  
at the drinking of Ægir.

*Svipom hefi ec nu ýpt*. *Svipom* refers to the speaker’s face or appearance of the face according to S&G. According to them, it should not make sense in the context.593 La Farge

---

similarly agrees and translates it as ‘face’.\(^{594}\) Its translation would be ‘I have now raised up my glances’.

*fyr sigtiva sonom* is a problematic verse according to S&G. The alliteration of is wrong and they would emend it to *sigtiva mǫgom*\(^{595}\).

*vilbiorg* is an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. It is here translated as ‘desired saving’.

*ėgis* means ‘sea, ocean’. It may be cognate with Greek Ὠκεανός.\(^{596}\) In Grímnismál there is no such suggestion about the nature of this being. According to Simek, *ėgir* appears in pre-Christian skaldic poetry, for example in Sonatorrek, and thus seems to be an old creation.\(^{597}\) S&G consider *ėgir* here to be referring specifically to Geirrøðr.\(^{598}\) Considering the meaning of this name, I wonder whether this actually refers to a personification to the sea or not. It could be actually referring of the sea itself and some myth that does not survive.

*aegis drecco at.* recalls the setting of Lokasenna.\(^{599}\) Hymiskviða sets up the narrative background for the drinking at *aegir*’s.\(^{600}\)

**Stanza 46.**

Hetomc grimr | hetomc gangleri
herian oc hialmberi.
þeccr. oc þrîði. | þundr. oc uþr.
helblindi. oc hár.

I am called Grímr, | I am called Gangleri,

---

\(^{594}\) La Farge, p. 256.
\(^{596}\) Cleasby and Guðbrandur Vigfússon, p. 758.
\(^{597}\) Simek, p. 1.
\(^{598}\) Sijmons and Gering, pp. 210-211.
\(^{599}\) Lokasenna, 1. pp. 408-421.
Herian and Hiálmberi, Þeccr and Þriði, Þundr and Uþr, Helblindi and Hár.

Grímr means ‘mask’. Neil Price, who has compiled a comprehensive list of Óðinn names and where they appear, dividing them into the attributes they may refer to, lists Grím under the ‘trickery names’. 601

gangleri means ‘wanderer’ and is listed under the ‘wanderer names’ of Óðinn. 602

herian means ‘the army one’. 603

hialmberi means ‘helmet wearer’.

þeccr means ‘well liked, clever’.

Þriði means ‘third’. This is an important divinity name, and was also used by Snorri in Gylfaginning.

Þundr is normally thought to be a Þórr name. It means ‘thunder’ or ‘sweller’. It also appears as a river name in st. 21, and in Hávamál 145.

Uþr means ‘lover, beloved’.

Helblindi means ‘Hel blind’ according to Price. 604 S&G prefer the AM spelling of hærblindr which would give it a meaning of ‘he who blinds warriors’. 605 The latter feels more

---

602 Ibid. p. 105.
603 Price. p. 105.
605 Sijmons and Gering. p. 211.
believable to me, as there has been no connection between hel and Óðinn in this poem. This name does not appear in Gylfaginning.

**hár** means either ‘the one-eyed’ or ‘the high one’. It also appears in Völuspá 21.

Bo Ralph argues that the three stanzas starting with st. 46 should instead be edited as one. His argument is based on there being no divisions visible in in the manuscripts. While his argument is certainly valid, I would point out that there are no indications of any stanza division in the manuscript, therefore leaving the choice of how to divide and edit ‘unorthodox’ stanzas in the poem up to the editor. In the end, whether they are to be seen as one stanza or more makes little difference to our understanding of the poem.

In AM, instead of hetomc gangleri, the hetomc is replaced with oc.

Snorri quotes this stanza. It is generally the same with few exceptions. All oc are absent, and instead of þundr oc uþr, the name is found as one: Pudruðr.

**Stanza 47.**

Saþr oc svipall | oc sanntgetall
                herteitr. oc hnicarr
        bileýgr baleygr | baulvercr fiolnir.
       Grímr oc grímnir
            glapsviþr oc fiaullviþr

Saþr and Svipall, | and Sanngetall,
      Herteitr and Hnicarr,
 Bileýgr, Báleygr, | Baulvercr, Fiolnir,
      Grímr and Grímnir,
     Glapsviþr and Fiaulsiþr.
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_Saþr_ means ‘the true one’. It also appears in Einarr Gilsson’s _Drápa_ on Guðmundr Arason st. 13.\(^{607}\)

_svipall_ means ‘changeable’.

_sanngétall_ means ‘the one that guesses the truth’.

_herteitr_ means ‘army glad’.

_hnicarr_ means ‘inciter’. It also appears in _Reginsmáli_ 19.\(^{608}\)

_bileýgr_ means ‘poor sighted’, probably referring to Óðinn’s one eye.

_baleygr_ means ‘flame eyed’. It also appears in Hallfróðr Óttarsson’s _Hákonardrápa_ st. 6 and Gíslí Illugason’s _Erkíkvaði_ st. 1.\(^{609}\)

_baulvercr_ means ‘evil doer’. It also appears in _Hávamáli_ 109.\(^{610}\)

_fiólñir_ means ‘concealer’. It also appears in _Reginsmáli_ 19.\(^{611}\)

_grimnir_ means ‘the masked one’. It also appears in Ulfr Uggason’s _Húsdrápa_ 1, Hallfróðr Óttarsson’s _lausávísur_ 9, Rǫgnvaldr jarl’s _lausávísur_ 7,\(^{612}\) and in _Þórsdrápa_ 3.\(^{613}\)

_glapsvíþr_ means ‘seducer’.

_fiaullvíþr_ is generally emended as _fjólsvíðr_ and means ‘very wise’.

---

\(^{607}\) Price. p. 102.


\(^{609}\) Price. p. 103.

\(^{610}\) _Hyndluljóð_. p. 344.

\(^{611}\) _Reginsmáli_. p. 301.

\(^{612}\) Price. p. 105.

\(^{613}\) Snorri Sturluson, _Skáldskaparmál_. as st. 75. p. 26.
This stanza is quoted in *Gylfaginning* as well. All *oc* are absent as above and *Grimr* is not repeated.

**Stanza 48.**

Síspháuttr sísþsceggr. | sigfaðr. hnikuþr
alfaþr valfauþr
atríðr oc farma tyr. | eino nafni
hetomc aldregi
siz ec meþ folcom fór.

Síþhauttr, Síþsceggr, | Sigfaðr, Hnikuþr,
Alfaþr, Valfauþr,
Atríðr and Farmatýr. | By one name
I have never been called,
since I went with peoples.

*Síspháuttr* means ‘the man with the deeply pulled down hat’. The image of Óðinn with a hat covering most of his face is a *topos* in the *sögur*.\(^{614}\)

*sísþsceggr* means ‘long beard’.

*sigfaðr* means ‘victory father’. It also appears in *Vǫluspá* 53,\(^ {615}\) and *Lokasenna* 58.\(^ {616}\)

*hnikuþr* is similar to *hnicarr* from st. 47 and means ‘inciter’.

*alfaþr* means ‘all father’. It also appears in *Helgakvíða Hundingsbana I* 38,\(^ {617}\) and in Arnór Þórðarson’s *Þórfinnsdrápa* 4.\(^ {618}\)

---

\(^{614}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 213.

\(^{615}\) *Völuspá*, 1. p. 305.

\(^{616}\) *Lokasenna*. p. 419.

\(^{617}\) *Helgakvíða Hundingsbana I*. p. 254.

valfaupr means ‘father of the slain’. It also appears in Völuspá 1 and 27.\textsuperscript{619}

atriðr means ‘attacking rider’.

farma tyr means ‘god of cargoes’. It also appears in Háleygjatal 2.\textsuperscript{620}

siz ec mep folcom fór. translates as ‘since I went with peoples’. However, folcom could also be translated as ‘armies’, giving this verse a very different meaning.

In AM, this stanza appears with substantial differences. valfaupr is not present, and instead of an extra half line, it is six verses long. Æinu nafni | hætumz siz æc fólkum fór is found instead of eino nafni | hetomc aldregi | siz ec mep folcom fór.

This stanza appears in Gylfaginning, the last of the Óðinn name list. It is very different. Atriðr is added before hnikuþr. eino nafni | hetomc aldregi | siz ec mep folcom fór. does not appear at all and is replaced with names that are found in other stanzas. Osci oc ómi | iafnhár oc biflindi | gaundlir oc harbarðr appear, mep godom not being present. Heimir has normalised gaundlir to Geldnir which seems to be a particularly different name. Ialc, kialar, viður\textsuperscript{621} and þrói all appear but without the further information given in st. 49 of Grímnismál. Svipurr oc sviprir from st. 50 are mentioned and gautr and ialcr from st. 54. Lastly, Veratýr, who is not found in the Grímnismál list of Óðinn names closes the list in Gylfaginning. However, Veratýr is the first Óðinn name to be mentioned after Grímnir, in st. 3.

\textbf{Stanza 49.}

Grimne mic héto | at geirraðar
enn ialc at õsmundar
enn þa kialar | er ec kialca dró.

\textsuperscript{619} Völuspá. p. 291 and p. 298.
\textsuperscript{620} Eyvindr skáldaspillir, Háleygjatal.
\textsuperscript{621} See st. 49 below.
þrói þingom at.
Osci oc ómi. | iafnhár oc biflindi
gaudlir oc harbarðr meþ goðom.

Grímnir they called me, | at Gairrauðr’s
but lalc at Qsmundr’s
but then Kialar, | when I dragged a jaw.
Þrór at things,

Viðr at slayings
Ósci and Ómi, | Iafnhár and Biflindi
Gaundlir and Hárbarðr with gods.

_Grimn_ see st. 47.

_ialc_ means ‘gelding’. It also appears in Einarr Helgason skálaglamm’s _Vellekla_ 24. 622

_ósmundar_ means ‘protege of the _æsir_’ and who it refers to is unknown according to S&G. 623

_kialar_ means ‘nourisher’ according to Price, 624 or ‘boatman’ according to S&G. 625

_erc kialca dró._ would translate to ‘when I dragged a jaw’. However, _draga kialca_ could also mean ‘to drag a sledge’. 626

_þrói_, normalised as þrór, means ‘thriver’.

_Osci_ means ‘desired’. It also appears in Óttar svarti’s _Óláfsdrápa sænska_ 2. 627

_ómi_ means ‘the highest’.

---

622 Price. p. 105.
623 Sijmons and Gering. p. 213.
624 Price. p. 102.
625 Sijmons and Gering. p. 214.
626 La Farge. p. 143.
627 Price. p. 105.
iafnhár means ‘just as high’.

biflindi means ‘the shield shaker’. This name does not appear in Gylfaginning.

þrói þingom at. | Osci oc ómi. | iafnhár oc biflindi is, according to S&G, an interpolation in fornyrðislag. An extra half line appears in AM, making the whole part of this stanza: þror þingum at | viður at vigum | oski oc omi | iafnhar oc biflindi, ‘þror at things, | viður at slayings | oski and omi, | iafnhar and biflindi’. McKinnell writes that while most scholars have interpreted this name to show that Óðinn would also be related to legal cases, the kenning Prós þing refers to battle and this should be the interpretation in this case.

Viður would mean ‘killer’. It also appears in Bragi enn gamli Boddason’s lausavísa 2.

gaundlir means ‘staff wielder’ or ‘enchanter, sorcerer’.

harbarðr means ‘grey beard’.

Stanza 50.

Svipurr oc sviþrir | er ec het at saucc mimis
oc dulþa ec þann inn aldna iötun.
er⁶³¹ þa ec miþviþnis varc | ins mǫra burar
orðinn einn bani.

Sviþur and Sviþrir | when I was named at Sauccmímir’s
and I deceived that the old iötun,
then when I was become, | the sole bane
of the famed son of Miþviþnir.

⁶²⁸ Sijmons and Gering. p. 214.
⁶³⁰ Price. p. 103.
⁶³¹ er in margin.
**Svipurr oc sviþrir** both mean ‘spear god’.

**saucc mimis** is a given name that means ‘the quarrelsome jotunn’ or the ‘valiant jotunn’. He appears in *Ynglingatal* 2. 632

**miþviþnis** means ‘sea wolf’. Appears as a dwarf name in *Völuspá* 11. 633

**orðinn æinbani.** This verse is missing in the GKS version. It translates as ‘[I was] become the sole bane’

### Stanza 51.

Aúlr ertu geirroþr | hefr þu of druccit  
miclo ertu hnugginn  
er þu ert mino gengi | ollum ein heriom  
oc oþins hylli.

You are drunk, Geirrauþr. | You have overdrunk.  
By much you are deprived of  
when you are deprived of my retinue, | all the soul heroes  
and Óðinn’s favour.

**oc oþins hylli.** is, according to S&G, corrupt in both manuscripts. 634

### Stanza 52.

fiolþ ec þer sagða | enn þu fat um mánt

---

634 Sijmons and Gering. p. 215.
of þic vela vinir
męki liggja | ec se mins vinar
allan idreyra drifinn.

Many a thing I have told you, | but few you remember,
friends practice deceit around you.
I see my friend’s sword | lying all sprinkled
in blood.

Stanza 53.

Eggmoþan val | nu mun yggr hafa
þitt veit ec líf um liþit
varar ro dísir | nu knattu oðin siá
nalgazstu mic ef þu megir

Yggr shall now have | the edge-weary slain,
I know your life is over.
The goddesses are hostile, | you can see Óðinn,
you bring yourself near to me if you can.

_Eggmoþan_ translates to ‘edge-weary’.

_yggr_ means ‘terrible’. It is probably related to the first element of Yggdrasill and is an Óðinn name. It also appears in _Vafþrúðnismál_ 5, _Hymiskviða_ 2, and _Fáfnismál_ 43.

_varar ro dísir_ translates to ‘the goddesses are hostile’. S&G have edited the text to úfar instead of varar. Úfar means ‘unruly, uproarious’, keeping a similar meaning and appears

---

635 Ibid. p. 163.
636 _Vafþrúðnismál_. p. 59.
637 _Hymiskviða_. p. 399.
mainly in the Old Norwegian form of Old Norse. The AM manuscript version has \textit{vvar} instead. \textit{Varar} is similarly edited to \textit{úfar} by Jónas and Vésteinn. If it is to be taken to be \textit{úfar}, it is of immense importance since it is a further support for a Norwegian composition of the poem.

\textit{ef þu megir} means ‘if you can’. According to S&G, this implies that it is impossible for Geirrøðr to actually bring himself near Óðinn.

in AM, \textit{um liðit} is found as \textit{ofliðit}.

Stanza 54.

Óðinn I am now called, | Yggr I was called before,
They called me Þundr before it,
Vacr and Scilfingr, | Váfuðr and Hroptatýr,
Gautr and Iæacr with gods,
Ofnir and Sváfnir, | which I think that all be
become of me alone.

\textit{yggr} see st. 53.

---

\textsuperscript{639} Sijmons and Gering. p. 215.
\textsuperscript{640} Grímnismál. pp. 378-379.
\textsuperscript{641} Sijmons and Gering. p. 215.
þundr see st. 46.

vacr means ‘the watchful’.

scilfingr could mean ‘sitting on a high seat’, related to skjálfr, ‘high seat’. It could alternatively be related to Skjælf, Skälf which is a name given to Norway and mainly Sweden.642 This name could thus place Óðinn as ancestor of the Norwegians or Swedes.

váfuþr means ‘hanging’.

hroptatyr probably means ‘tumult god’. It also appears in Hávamál 160,643 Ulfr Uggason’s Húsdrápa 8 and Eivindr Finnsson skáldaspillir’s Hákonarmál 14.644
gautr means ‘the Geat, the Goth’. As a given name, it was popular in Norway.645 It is uncertain whether this could be used as a support to a Norwegian composition.

ialcr see st. 49.

vacr oc scilfingr | váfuþr. oc hroptatyr. | gautr oc ialcr meþ goðom. According to S&G, this is an interpolation, the reason given being that ialcr is mentioned in st. 49. Whether this is the case or not, it should be noted that this stanza is three verses longer.

Ofnir oc svafnir see st. 34. Both names are given as ormar there. Here it is evident that they refer to Óðinn. Ofnir means ‘inciter’ and it does not appear in Gylfaginning. Svafrnir means ‘sleep bringer’ and also appears in Þórðr hornklofi’s Haraldskvaði 1.646

---

642 Ibid. p. 216.
643 Hyndluljóð, 1. p. 355.
644 Price. p. 106.
645 Sijmons and Gering. p. 216.
646 Price. p. 104.
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er ec hygg at orðir se | allir af einom mer. Would translate to an awkward English ‘which I think that all be | become of me alone.’ Af appears as at in AM and is considered by S&G to be the right reading.\(^{647}\)

Prose Conclusion.


King Geirrauþr sat and had a sword on his knees and drawn to the middle. But when he heard that Óðinn was come there, he stood up and wished to take Óðinn from the fire. The sword slipped from his hands, the hilt faced downwards. The king stumbled his foot and fell forwards, but the sword stood through him, and he got his bane. Óðinn then disappeared. But Agnarr was there king long after.

The prose conclusion given to Grímnismál adds little to no information to the poem and feels unnecessary. Whereas the prose introduction is not necessary, it expands on the setting in which Grímnir’s monologue takes place. Here, it seems evident that the writer used information gained from st. 52, where the bloodied sword is mentioned, as well as st. 51 which mention’s Geirrøðr’s drunkenness. It should also be considered that Agnarr is mentioned in the beginning of the poem and is the main recipient of the numinous knowledge provided by Grímnir, especially st. 2: nema einn agnarr er | er einn scal ráða | geirróþar sonr | goتنا lande, ‘with the exception of Agnarr alone | who alone must rule, | Geirrauþr’s son, | the land of the Goths’, the choice of ending the story with him becoming a king is far from unexpected.

\(^{647}\) Sijmons and Gering. p. 216.
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Appendix I  Transcriptions

Chapter 1.  GKS 2365 4to Facing Facsimile Diplomatic Transcription
31. Hrðungr konungr atti tva fónom. hrðunga konungf. aftr vera.
32. fono het annarr agnarr en annarr geirðuðr. Agnarr
33. var x. vetra enn geirðór viii. vetra. þeir ræro tveir á
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55. báti með dorgar finar at fína þífi. Vindr rac þa í hafut
56. í nát myrkrí bruto þeir víð land. oc gengo up þundo cot bónda
57. einn. þar várð þeir um vetrinn. Kerling þostradi agnar enn
58. karl geirroð. At vári þecc karl þeim þeip. Enn er kerling þ´av
59. leiddo þa til sundar þa mélí karl ein mélí við geirrað. þeir
60. þengo býr oc qvomo til flarðva þarðurf finn. Geirróðr var þram
61. í þeip hann hliop up aland enn hra þat þeipino. oc mélí. þarðu
62. þar er þinýl háfi þic. Scipit rac ut. Enn geirroðr gek ut til
63. bójar hanom var vel þagnat. þa var þaþir halið andaþr. Var þa geir
64. rærð til konungl tekin. oc varð maðr ageþr. Öppin oc Frigg fato i
65. hliðcialþo oc sa um heima alla. oðinn mélí. Ser þu agnar þostra
66. þinn hvar hann elr born við gygi ihellinom. Enn geirróð þostrí minn
67. er konungr oc þitr nu at landi. Frigg þegir. Hann er mat niþingr fa at hann
68. qvelr gefi fína eþ honum þiccia oþ margir coma. Öppin þegir at þat er in
69. mesta lygi. þar veðia um þetta. mál. Frigg þendi eþcif meý sína
70. þullo til geirroðar. Hon bað konung varaz at eigi þyr gerþi hanom þolíki
71. nýigr maðr. fa er þar var kominn iland. oc fagði þat marc á at engi
72. húððr var ðva olmr at a hann mundi hliþpa. Enn þat var inn melfi he
73. gomi at geirróðr veþi eigi matgoþr. oc þo læþr hann handtaca þann Mínu
74. er eigi vildó hundar araða. Sa var þélði blám oc neþndiz
75. grimmir. oc fagði ecci þleira þra ser þott hann veþi at þþurþr. Konungr let
76. hann þína til þagna oc þetia milli elda tveggia oc fat hann þar viii.
77. næþr. Geirróðr konungr atÍ fón x. vetra gamlan oc het agnarr
78. eþþir broþur halið. A gnarr gecc at grimmí oc gæþhanom horn þult
79. at drecca. fagði at konungr gorði illa er hann let þína hann fæc laþ
80. fan. Grinnir dracc æþ þa var eldrinn ðva kominn at þeldrinn
81. Heitr ertu hriþur þr oc heldr Grimmí mal brann æþ grimmí. hann qvad.
82. til micill góngomc þir þumi. loði ívþnar þott ec a
83. lopt berac brennomic þeldr þyr. Átta næþr fát ec mil
84. li elda her sva at mer mangi mat ne það. nema einn agnarr er
85. er einn fæl ráða geirróðar fón gotna lande. Heill fæltu agnarr
86. allz þic heilan biþr veraty vera. einþ dryerciar þu fælt al
87. dregi betri giold gera. Land er heilact er ec liggia fe
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1. afom oc alþom nér. enn þbruðheimi fcal þórr vera unz um riutaz
2. regin. Ýdalir heita þar er ullr heðir ser um gorva fáli. alþheim
3. þreyr gato i ardaga tivar at tanþ þe. Þor er fa inn þriði
4. er blið regin filþri þæcþo fáli. valaſcjalþ heitr er veſti ser ōs
5. iardaga. Sæcqua beccr heitr enn iii. enn þar fvalar knego unnir
6. ýþir glýmia. þar þær oðinn oc fága drecca um alla daga glað or
7. gulinnom kerom. Glaði heimr heitr enn v. þarf enn gull biarta
8. alþhlæll við oc þrunir. enn þar hropt kýs hverian dag va
9. þn dauþa vera. Miþi er æþkent þeim er oðins koma fal kynni vargr hangir
10. þyr veſtan dytr oc drupir ærn þýþir. Miþi er æþkent þeim er til oðins
11. koma fal kynni at fia. fæþptom er rann reþ fcioldom er fár þa
12. kþþr brýniom um becki fl 입. þrym heimr heitr enn vi. er þiazi
13. þio fa inn amatki iotunn. enn nu fæði byggvir fскir bruðe goda
14. þornar toptir fœður. Breiða blik ero in fiundo enn þar baldr heþir
15. ser um gorva fáli. æþi landi er ec liggia veit þofta þeicn ftaþi.
16. Himþnbiorg ero en atto enn þar heimdaſl þeþpa valda veom. þar vorþr
17. goda dreccr iþeroc ranþi gliþr goda miþp. Fiolevangr er inn
18. niundi enn þar þreyia reþþr fesa costom fial. halþan val hon
19. kýs hverian dag enn halþan oðinn á. Glitnir er inn x. hann er guli
20. studdr oc fíþri þakþþr íþ fama. enn þar þorþeti byggir þleſtan
21. dag oc lveþer allar fákir. Noa tun ero en xi. enn þar niþþr
22. heþir ser um gorva fáli. manna þengill enn meinþ vani hæþbro
23. þom hærþg. Hriþi vex oc há grafi viþþar fæður. viþi en þar ma
24. uþr æþ læþc af marþ baki þoðn oc heþna þavþur. Andh
25. rîmnr þeþ þið hrimme fœ hrimni fððinn. þeleþa bezt
26. enn þat þáir vito hvat ein heriar alaz. Gera oc þreca fæþr
27. gunntamiþ þroþþgr heria þavþr. enn viþ vín eþþr vapn gãþ
28. þugr oðinn e líþir. Huginn oc munninn þliuga hverian dag
29. iormun grund ýþir. oume ecþ hugin at hann aþþr ne comþp
30. þo fãþeme meirr um munnir. Þyþr þund uninþ þiþþp vît
31. niþ þiþþr þloði î. ár þþmr oc miciþl val glaðþi at va
32. þa. Val grind heïþir er fþende velli á heilog fyr helgom
33. duþom. þorn er fþ grind enn þat þáir vito hve hon er ilás
34. lókin. Fimþhundþþ goþa oc um þiþom togom fva hygg

648 alþái.
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1. ec bilfcimi meph bugomo: ranna þeita er ec rept vita minf veit
2. ec meft magar. Fimnhundenþ dúra oc um þiorom togom sva hygg
3. ec at valháril llo vera, viii. hundrunþ einheria ganga or einom
4. durom þa er þeit þara at vitni at vega. Heiþrún heitir geit
5. er þendr hahrÍó a heriþarþ þef. oc bitr aþ læths limom þcap ker þý
6. lla hon lcal inf lsira miaðar kna at fu veig vanaz. Eikby
7. niþr heitir hiortr er þendr ahàrIl lo heriþarþ þef. oc bitr aþ lær
8. aþl limom enn aþ hanþ hornom drýpr ihvergelmi þadan eiga\footnote{finnur has o} votn
10. Þimblþulþ. rín oc rennandi gípal oc gáþul. gáþrul oc geirvi
11. mul. þer hverþa um hodd goða. þýn oc viþ þarIl oc haþIl. graþ
14. vánrd oc fránþd. gíþIl ocleiptr þer þalla gunnom nér er þalla til
15. heliar hepan. Kaýrmt oc ármt oc kerlþgar tver þer þeal þorr
16. vaða hverian dag er hann doma þerr at afciþgdraþil. þvi at
17. af bru brenn arIl logo heilog votn hlóa. Glaþr oc gyllir gler
18. oc fceiþbrimir filþrintoptr oc finir gíl oc þálþóðnir gulltopr oc
19. leþteti þeim riþa eþir íom dag hvern er þeit doma þara at af
20. ci þygþdraþil. þriþr roþr flanda aþria vega undan aþci
21. þygþdraþil: hel byþ undir einni annari hrímþþurþriþiþo mennþkír
22. menn. Ratatolcr heitir ikorni er renna fcaþ at aþci þygþdraþil. arnar
23. orð hon lcal oþan bera oc fegia níþaþgevi níþr. Híþir ero oc þóirir
24. þeirf aþ heþingar á. agaghþslr gnaga. dainn oc dvalinn. dýneþr
25. oc duraþþor. Ormar þeleir lggia undir aþci þygþdraþil’ enn þat þþ
26. hyggi hverþ. ofviþa apa. Goinn oc moinn þeit ero graþvitnþ fynir
27. grabacr oc graþaIlþþr oþnir oc saþþnir hygg ec at þ eþyli meþþ
28. qviþlo má. Aþcr þygþdraþil’ drygir erþþiþ meira enn menn vtí
29. híþóþr bitþ oþan enn aþliþo þúnaþ ferþer níþaþggr nþþan.
30. Hríþ oc miþ vil ec at mer horn beri þeegþaIl oc saIl gull. hildi
31. oc þrudí hlaIlcc oc herþþotur. gáIl oc geirþþlul. randþþiþ. oc raþ
32. griþ reginleþþ þer bera einherioþ 4Il. Arvacr oc afviþþr

\footnote{finnur has o}
10 verso
1. þeir fколо upp heðan Ívangir fól draga. enn und þeira bógom þálo
2. blið regin eflr ífarn kol. Svær heitir hann stendr fólo þyr fici
3. oldr fíçinanda göði. biorg oc þrim ec veit at brenda fколо ef
4. hann þellr ifrá. Svær heitir úlfr er þylgir eno þcirleita göði
5. til varna viðar. enn arrann hati hann er hroþ vitnið fónr fa focal
6. þyr heiða brúði himint. Ór ymið hóllari var ioþ um fcarþuð enn
7. or feita fær biorg or beinom baðmr or hári en or haði hi
8. min enn or hanf brað gerðo blið regin miðgard manna fónom. enn
9. or hanf heila voro þav in hardmodogo féy avl um fcarþuþ. Ullar
10. hylli hefr oc allra göða hverr er tecr þyrfr aþuna. þviat opinir
11. heimar verþa um álta fónom þa er heðia æþ hvera. Ivalda fýnir
12. gengo iardaga fçibblaðni at fçapa. fçipa bezt fcirom þrey
13. nytom niardar bur. Afcr yggdrafilf hann er þztr viþa en fciþ
14. bladnir fçipa oðinn álta enn ioa fleipnir blirþið brúa en bragi
15. fcalda habroc hærca en hunda garmr. Svipom heþi ec nu
16. --- ýþ þyr figtiva fónom víð þat fcal vilbiorg vaca. avlom álom þat
17. fcal inn coma egíð becci á ægíð drecco at. Hetomc grímr hetomc
18. gangleri herian oc hialmberi. þeccr. oc þroði. þundr. oc úþr. helbli
20. gr baleygr barlvercr þolnir. Grímr oc grímr glaspvíþr oc þar lýþr
21. Sfíþr átrr fíþcegggr. fíþr. hnikþþr álþþr valþþr atrúðr
22. oc þarma tyr. eino náþni hetomc aldregi fíþ ec meþ þolcom þór.
23. Grímmn mic héto at geirrðar enn íalc at òfímundar enn þa kial
24. ar er ec kialca dró. þrói þíngom at. Ofci oc ómi. íþþhár
25. oc bíþíndi gándlír oc harbarðr meþ goðom. Svipurc oc fvíþr
26. er ec het at fár ec mimíð oc dúþa ec þann inn aldna íótun.
27. er650 þa ec míþvíþníf vare ínþ mórar burar orðin enn bani.
28. Aúlr ertu geirroþr heþr þu oc druccit miclo ertu þnugg
29. inn er þu ert mino gengi olom ein heriom oc óþins hylli.
30. þoþl oc þer fagða enn þu ðat um mánt oc þic vela vinir
31. meki liggia ec se mins vinar allan idreyra driþn. Egg
32. moþan val nu mun yggr haþa þítr veit ec líþ um líþit

650 er in margin
11 recto
1. varar ro thír nu knattu oðin tíá nalgaðtu mic ef þu
2. megir Oþinn ec nu heiti yggr ec áðan het hetume þundr þytir
3. þat: vacr oc feiltiŋr váþupr. oc hroptatyr. gátr oc iæcr meþ
4. godom. Oþir oc ívaþir er ec hygg at orðir fe allir æ einom mer.
5. Geirrophr konungr. fat oc haði ðverþ um kne ser oc brugðit til miþ. Enn er
6. hann heyrþi at oðinn var þar koninn stóð hann up oc vildi taca o.
7. þra eldinom. Sverþit flapp or hendi hannom vífþo hioltin níþr. konungr
8. drup þoti oc þleýtiz aþram enn ðverþit flod ígöþom hann. oc þece hann bana.
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22. 

23. Hrðungr konungr atti .ii. fónu. hæt annarr agnarr ðungi konungi

24. æn f.annarr geirrðr. agnarr var .x. vetra æn æirrðr .viii. vætra

25. þeir ræru .ii. a bati med dorgir ðinar at ðmáþiliki. Vindr rak þa

26. ihaþ ut. þeir brutu ináttmýrkri við land oc gængu upp þundu

27. kot bonda æinn. þar voru þeir um vætrinn. kærling þofraidi agnar æn karl

28. þostráði geirrð. oc kændi honum rað. at vár þækc karl þeim ðkip. ænn

29. ær þær kærling laiðdu þa til fkipþa meðli karl æinæli við geirrð.

30. þeir þængu býr oc komu til þæðva þóður þinf. Geirrðr var þram i

31. ðkipþi. hann hliop upp a land æn hraut útr ðkipinu oc meðli þar þu nu þar
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4 Recto
11. ær ímýl háti þík. Skipat rak íhaþt ut ænn gæirrðr gækc upp til bêia
12. honum var þar væl þagnat æn þáðir hans var þa andaði. Gæirrðr var þa til konungla tækinn
13. oc varð maðr agætr. Óðinn oc þrigg þatu íhlípíkiðlaþ oc fa um alla hæima. Óðinn mælti
14. Ser þu agnart þóftra þinn hvar hann ælr þorn við gýgi ihællinum. ænnst konungr þoftri
    minn
15. oc fír at löndum. Frigg lagði hann ær matniðingr fa at hann kvaðr gæfti. lögir æþ honom
16. þíkcia of margir koma. Óðinn lagði at þat ærhin mæfta lýgi. þav væðia um þetta mal
17. þrigg þáði æft augaþ. Þina. til Gæirrðar. hon bað konung varaz at ægvi þiri gærðin honum
18. þiðkungr maðr fa ær var kominn iland oc þagoði þat mark a at ængi hundr
19. var fva ómlr at a hann mundi hlaupaf. ænn var hin mæfti hægomi at gæirrðr
20. konungr væti ægvi matgoðr. ænn þo lei tr konungr handtaka þann mann ær ægvi vildlu
    hundar
21. a hlaupa fa var i þelldi blám oc næþndiz grrnnir oc þagoði ækci þláira
22. þra fær þott hann væri at íprüfdr. konungr lætr þina hann til þagna oc fætia milli
23. ællda oc fá þar. viii. nætr. Gæirrðr konungr átíþ þa fón. x. vætra gamlan oc hétt
24. agnarr æptir broður hans. Agnarr gækc at grimmí oc gáþ honum horn þúlt
25. at dráekka oc þagoði at þáðir hans gærði ær hann pinnði þænma mann faklãfran.
27. Þeitr er tu hripuðr oc hærlír til mikrignon grrnníð mal
28. þirr þuni loði fviðnar þott æk a lopt væra brænnumz þelldr þiri. áttá
29. nætr fá æk millum ællda hær sva at mær mangi mat næ bað
30. næma æinn agnarr ær æinní fcal raða Gæirrðar þon gotna landi. hællí fcal
31. tu agnarr allz þík hæilan bídor væra þýr væra æníf drýkciar þu fcalft all
32. drægi bætri gieæll geta. land ær hæilagt ær æc liggja ðe afum oc alþum
33. nær æn íþrúðnæhími fcæl þorr væra unz of riufaz rægin. Ýðalir
34. hæita þar ær ullr hætír fær um gerva fáli alþæim þreyg gátu íardaga tíþar
35. at tannþæ. Bær fa hin þríði ær blip rægin fíþri þóktu fáli vala íkált
36. hætír ær vælltí fær af íardaga. Sókeva bæçr hætír hin þíord ænn
37. þar ívalar knægu unnir þýtír glýmía þar þavr óðinn oc faga dráekka um alla
38. daga gþð þor gullnum kærum. Gláðf hæimr ær hin þímti þarf hínn
39. gull biarta vál hóll við þrumur ænn þar hroþpr kýll hveðrían dag vaptndær
40. ða væra. Míðk ær ðókent þeim ær öðinní koma falkýnni at fía ìkoptum
41. ær ranm ræpt fkiðÍlldum ær faðr þakiðr brýníum um bækci ftráð. Míðc
Appendices
Appendices

4 Verso
1. ær æðken. þeim ær til koma þia at þia vægr hangir þir væftan dýrr oc drupir ørn ýpir.
2. Þrynhæimr heitir hinn fætti ær þiazi bio fa hinn amatki iðtun ænn
3. nu fkaði býggir fikir bruðr goða þorna toptir æður. Braeða bio æru hin
4. s’æmundu ænn þar ballr æðir fær um gorva fali a þvi landi ær æk liggia véit
5. þæfta þeikniþaf. himinbiorg æru hin áttu æn þar heimdlall kvæða
6. vallda væ um þar vorðr goða dræk icæru ranni glaðr hin goða miðd. Folc
7. vængr er hinn ix. ænn þar þreyja ræðr fæfla koftum ifal halþan val hon kýfl
8. þverian dag ænn halþan oðinn á. Glitnir. heitir ænn x. hann ær gulli þuðdr oc fílþri þaktr
9. hit sama ænn þar þorfaði býggir þæftan dag oc fíþir allar fákir. Noa
10. tun ær. hinn xi. ænn þar niðræðr æðir fær um gorva fali mana þængill hinn
11. þæinf vani hatimbrúðum hórgi ræðr. hrifí væx oc ha gráði viðarf land
12. viði ænn þar mógr øt læz æþmarðbaki þrákn oc hæþna þþur. andhrim
13. sér lætr ælld hrimmi fæ hrimmi fóðinn þæftka bæzt æn þat þáir vitu
14. hvat æinhæria alaz. Gæra oc þráka fæðr gunntamðr hroðigr hæría þþr
15. ænn við vin æitt vapngöþgr oðinn æ liþir. Huginn oc muninn þlíuga
16. þverian dag íormun grínd ýþir oumz æc um hugim at hann aprt næ komi
17. þo þiamz eðc meirr um muninn. þýtr þunðr unir þiðvítiní þíkr þló
18. ði i ár þraunur þíkír øt mikill valglæmni at væða. Valgrind heitir ær
19. fændr vaæli a hæilio þir hælgrum dýrum þorn ær fu grínd ænn þat þáir vi
20. tu hve hon ær illaf um lokin. þimhundrut dýra oc .xl. sva kvat æk a val höll
21. þæra atta hundrut æinhæria ganga fenn or einum dýrum þa ær þheir þara við vitni
22. at væga. Fimm hundrut gofta oc um þiorum tigum sva hýgg æk a valhöll væra bil
23. fikrni með bugum ranna þeira ær æk reðt vita minf væit ec meft
24. magar. hæiðrun heitir gæit ær fændr höllu a hæriþður oc bitr af
25. þraðl línum ikkapær þylla hon fcal hinf íkira miaðar kann fu væig
26. vanaz. eikþýrnið heitir hótrr ær fændr höllu a hæriþður oc bitr
27. æþðl línum ænn af hans hornum drypr i hvergælim þalþan æiga vøtn öll væga.
28. Síð oc við fækin oc ækin ívoq --- gunþbro þorm oc þimbúlpul rin oc ren
29. nandí gipul oc gopol gómul oc sæirvimul. þær hvaerþa um hoddgoða
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5 Recto

1. þýn oc vin þoll oc hóll gráð oc gunnþorin. Vína hæitir ænn ǫnnur væg
2. fvin þriðia þoðnuma nýt oc nôt ǫnnn oc hrónn flíð oc hrið þýgr oc ýldr
3. við oc vað vónd oc frónd giði oc láeipt þær þalla gunnum nær ænn
4. þalla til hæiðar hæþan. kormt oc þormt oc kærl `广汽 . .i. þær fcal þorr váða
5. dag hværn ær hann dæma þært at afki ýggdrafilf þviat afbru brænn ǫll loga
6. hæilogo vót n hloa. Gláðr oc gýllir glær oc Íkæidi brimir fílþrinn toppr oc finir
7. gíf oc þalægnir gulltoppt oc lætræti. þæim riða æfir ioum dag hværn ær dæma at
8. afki ýggdrafilf. þriar rætr fíanda a þríja væga und afki ýggdrafilm hæl býr
9. und æinni annarri hrimþurfari þriðiu mænzkir mænn. Raratofr hæitir ikorni
10. ær rænna fcal atafki ýggdrafilf`arnar ord hann fcal opan bæra oc fægia niðhöggi niðr
11. hirtir æru oc .iii. þæirl `aþætingiar á gaghalfir ganga dainn oc dvalinn
12. dýnæyr oc dýraþrór. Ormar þleiri liggia und afki ýggdrafilf ænn oþ hýgg
13. gi hvært olvinna apa goinn oc moinn þeirro graf vitni fýnir grábakr oc graf
14. vólluð opnir oc fvaþnir hýgg æk at æ íkylí máiðar kuftu má. afkr ýgg
15. drafill drýgir ærþiði máeira ænn mænn opviti híoirtr bitr opan ænn a hliðu þu
16. narlæðir niðhöggar þæfan. hrið oc miðt vil æc at meir horn bæri íkægg ǫllld
17. oc íkogul hílldr oc þrudr hloþk oc hærtiþur goll oc gærirþul mul rândrið
18. oc raðgríð oc reinglaéíþ þær bæra æinhærium ǫll. arvark oc alfviðr þeir
19. fcal upp hæðan fvaþgir fól draga æn und þeira bogum /ubuntu blíð rægin æfir
20. ífærn kol. Svalin hæitir hann fænðr fólu þiri fkiþólfr fkinanda guði biörg
21. oc brím æk vaðit at bran híðo æf hann þællr íþra. Skóg hæitir ulþr ær
22. fýlgir hinu fkiðræita godi til vau'na viðar ænn annart hati hroðnitnil
23. fún fa fcal þiri hæiða bruði himin. Or ýmíl hoðldi var iðr um íkópuð ænn
24. or fvaþita fíor biörg or bæinum báðnir or hári ænn or hårli himinn
25. ænn or hans brám gerdur blíð rægin midgard manna fónum ænn or hans heila voru
26. þæi híð bráðmodugu íký ǫll oþ íkópuð. Úllar hýlli hæþir oc allra goða hvært ær
27. tek þyfr þauna þviat opnir hæimar værða oþ afá fónum þa ær þeir hæ
28. þia af hværa. Ivallda fýnir gangu iardaga fkiðblaðni at íkapa íki
29. pa bæzt fkirum þráý nýtum niðarð bur. Afcý ýggdrafill hann ær
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5 verso
1. æzt vīða ænn Ðkipblapnir Ðkipa ðíninn afa ænn ioa ðlæipnir, ðhraði þrua æn
2. bragi ðkallda habrøkk hærka ænn hunda garmr ænn brimir ðvaða. Svípurm hæ
3. þi æk ýpt þirí fígítþa þonum vīð þat feal vilbiþgr vaka ðllum afum þat feal inn
4. koma eðgís þækci á ægíaðr drýkciu at. hætumz grímr oc ganglæri hærian
5. oc háilmaðri þækr oc þröði þuðr oc uðr hærblindr oc hár faðr oc ðvipall oc
6. fanngetall hærtæitr oc hnikarr bilæýgr balæýgr þolværk þþnir grímr
7. oc grímnir glapvíðr oc þíllvíðr. Síðhærþr fíðkægger fígðæðr hni
8. kuðr aldþðr át riðr oc þarmatýr. æinnu naþni hætumz fíz æc þólkum
9. þór. Grimmi mik hætu at gæirþðrar ænn íálk at afmündar ænn þa
10. íálk ær æc kílka dró þror þingum at viður at viðurum olki oc omi
11. íaþnhar oc bitlindi gondlír oc harbarðr með godum. Svíðurðr oc lýðtrír
12. ær æc hæt at lýkkemimí oc duloða æk þann hinn allðna íþton þa ær
13. æk miðvítimí var híní mæra buraðr ordínn æðmáði. Ôlr ærtu gæirþðr
14. hæþr þu oðrðukí miklu ærtu hnuγginn ær þu ært minu geði ðllum
15. eínherium oc ðónnís þlíli. Fjölæ æc þær fagðac ænn þu þatt um munt oþþík
16. væla vinir mæki liggia æc fí fínn vinar allan íðræýra dríþinn. æggmo
17. ðan val nu man þýgr haþa þítt vaeæ æc líþtíðit vðáro diðr nu
18. knatuð oðinn fía nalgautu mik æt þu mægir. ðódinn æc nu hæ
19. ti þýgr æc áðan hæt hætumz þundr þirí þavÝkr oc ðkílþíngr vâþðr
20. oc hroþþatýðr gæþr oc íálkr með godum. Ôþnir oc ívaþnir æc hýgg at orð
21. nír fæ allir at æínnum marr:. Gæirþðr konungr láþ oc hafði ðvaðð um knæ fæer
22. brugðit til miðl æn ær hann hæýrði at oðinn var þar kominn þa ðloð hann upp
23. oc vîll taká oðinn þra ældðimur. Sværðit flapp or hændi honom oc vîllu híolltíþ niðr
24. konungr drah þæti oc ðlæýttis a þram ænn ðvaðð ðloð igægnum hann oc þæc þar æþ
25. bana. enn aγnarr vâþd konungr.
# Appendix II  Index of Names and Glossary

## Chapter 1.  Index of Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GKS 2365 4to</th>
<th>AM 748 I 4to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnarr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Álfheimr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Árvakr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ásmundr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Báleygr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biflindi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bileygr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilröst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilskirnir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breiðablik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brímir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bölverkr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dáinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agnarr
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.4, 3.1, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.4, 3.1, Conc.

Alfoðr
GKS 2365 4to: 48.3
AM 748 I 4to: 48.3

Álsvíðr
GKS 2365 4to: 37.1
AM 748 I 4to: 37.1

Andhrímnir
GKS 2365 4to: 18.1
AM 748 I 4to: 18.1

Atriðr
GKS 2365 4to: 48.4
AM 748 I 4to: 48.4

Álfheimr
GKS 2365 4to: 5.4
AM 748 I 4to: 5.4

Árvakr
GKS 2365 4to: 37.1
AM 748 I 4to: 37.1

Ásmundr
GKS 2365 4to: 49.3
AM 748 I 4to: 49.3

Bálgr
GKS 2365 4to: 47.4
AM 748 I 4to: 47.4

Biflindi
GKS 2365 4to: 49.8
AM 748 I 4to: 49.9

Bileygr
GKS 2365 4to: 47.4
AM 748 I 4to: 47.4

Bilröst
GKS 2365 4to: 44.6
AM 748 I 4to: 44.6

Bilskirnir
GKS 2365 4to: 23.3
AM 748 I 4to: 24.3

Bragi
GKS 2365 4to: 44.7
AM 748 I 4to: 44.7

Breiðablik
GKS 2365 4to: 12.1
AM 748 I 4to: 12.1

Brímir
AM 748 I 4to: 44.10

Bölverkr
GKS 2365 4to: 47.5
AM 748 I 4to: 47.5

Dáinn
Appendices

**GKS 2365 4to: 33.4**
AM 748 I 4to: 33.4

**Duneyrr**
GKS 2365 4to: 33.5
AM 748 I 4to: 33.5

**Duraþrór**
GKS 2365 4to: 33.5
AM 748 I 4to: 33.5

**Dvalinn**
GKS 2365 4to: 33.4
AM 748 I 4to: 33.4

**Eikin**
GKS 2365 4to: 27.2
AM 748 I 4to: 27.2

**Eikþyrnir**
GKS 2365 4to: 26.1
AM 748 I 4to: 26.1

**Eldhrímnir**
GKS 2365 4to: 18.2
AM 748 I 4to: 18.2

**Falhófnir**
GKS 2365 4to: 30.4
AM 748 I 4to: 30.4

**Farmatýr**
GKS 2365 4to: 48.4
AM 748 I 4to: 48.4

**Fimbulþul**
GKS 2365 4to: 27.4
AM 748 I 4to: 27.4

**Fjóltnir**
GKS 2365 4to: 47.5
AM 748 I 4to: 47.5

**Fjólsvíðr**
AM 748 I 4to: 47.7

**Fjórm**
GKS 2365 4to: 27.4
AM 748 I 4to: 27.4

**Forseti**
GKS 2365 4to: 15.4
AM 748 I 4to: 15.4

**Fólkvangr**
GKS 2365 4to: 14.1
AM 748 I 4to: 14.1

**Freki**
GKS 2365 4to: 19.1
AM 748 I 4to: 19.1

**Freyja**
GKS 2365 4to: 14.2
AM 748 I 4to: 14.2

**Freyr**
GKS 2365 4to: 5.4, 43.5
AM 748 I 4to: 5.4, 43.5

**Frigg**
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**Fulla**
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**Gangleri**
GKS 2365 4to: 46.2
AM 748 I 4to: 46.2

**Garmr**
GKS 2365 4to: 44.9
AM 748 I 4to: 44.9
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Gautr
GKS 2365 4to: 54.6
AM 748 I 4to: 54.6

Geirrōðr
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.6, 49.2, 51.1, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.6, 49.2, 51.1, Conc.

Geirvīmul
GKS 2365 4to: 27.7
AM 748 I 4to: 27.7

Geirǫnul
GKS 2365 4to: 36.6
AM 748 I 4to: 36.6

Geri
GKS 2365 4to: 19.1
AM 748 I 4to: 19.1

Gipul
GKS 2365 4to: 27.6
AM 748 I 4to: 27.6

Gísl
GKS 2365 4to: 30.4
AM 748 I 4to: 30.4

Gjōll
GKS 2365 4to: 28.10
AM 748 I 4to: 28.10

Glaðr
GKS 2365 4to: 30.1
AM 748 I 4to: 30.1

Glaðsheimr
GKS 2365 4to: 8.1
AM 748 I 4to: 8.1

Glapsviðr
AM 748 I 4to: 47.7

Glitnir
GKS 2365 4to: 15.1
AM 748 I 4to: 15.1

Glær
GKS 2365 4to: 30.2
AM 748 I 4to: 30.2

Góinn
GKS 2365 4to: 34.4
AM 748 I 4to: 34.4

Grafvitnir
GKS 2365 4to: 34.5
AM 748 I 4to: 34.5

Grafvölluðr
GKS 2365 4to: 34.6
AM 748 I 4to: 34.6

Grábakr
GKS 2365 4to: 34.6
AM 748 I 4to: 34.6

Gráð
GKS 2365 4to: 27.11
AM 748 I 4to: 27.11

Grímnir
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., Title, 47.6, 49.1
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., Title, 47.6, 49.1

Grímr
GKS 2365 4to: 46.1, 47.6
AM 748 I 4to: 46.1, 47.6

Gulltoppr
GKS 2365 4to: 30.5
AM 748 I 4to: 30.5

Gunnþorin
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GKS 2365 4to:</th>
<th>AM 748 I 4to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunnþró</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>27.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyllir</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gøll</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gømul</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gøndlir</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>49.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopul</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hati</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hábrók</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hár</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hárbarðr</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>49.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiðrún</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heimdallr</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herblindr</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herfjötur</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herjann</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herteitr</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildr</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himinbjörg</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjalnbér</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AM 748 I 4to: 46.3

Hlíðskjálf
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

Hłökk
GKS 2365 4to: 36.5
AM 748 I 4to: 36.5

Hnikarr
GKS 2365 4to: 47.3
AM 748 I 4to: 47.3

Hnikuðr
GKS 2365 4to: 48.2
AM 748 I 4to: 48.2

Hrauðungr
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

Hrist
GKS 2365 4to: 36.1
AM 748 I 4to: 36.1

Hröð
GKS 2365 4to: 28.6
AM 748 I 4to: 28.6

Hroptatýr
GKS 2365 4to: 54.5
AM 748 I 4to: 54.5

Hroptr
GKS 2365 4to: 8.4
AM 748 I 4to: 8.4

Hróðvinir
GKS 2365 4to: 39.5
AM 748 I 4to: 39.5

Hróðn

GKS 2365 4to: 28.5
AM 748 I 4to: 28.5

Huginn
GKS 2365 4to: 20.1, 20.4
AM 748 I 4to: 20.1, 20.4

Hvergelmir
GKS 2365 4to: 26.5
AM 748 I 4to: 26.5

Höll
GKS 2365 4to: 27.10
AM 748 I 4to: 27.10

Ívaldi
GKS 2365 4to: 43.1
AM 748 I 4to: 43.1

Jafnhár
GKS 2365 4to: 49.8
AM 748 I 4to: 49.9

Jalkr
GKS 2365 4to: 49.3, 54.6
AM 748 I 4to: 49.3, 49.4, 54.6

Kerlaugar
GKS 2365 4to: 29.2
AM 748 I 4to: 29.2

Kjalar
GKS 2365 4to: 49.4

Kǫrmt
GKS 2365 4to: 29.1
AM 748 I 4to: 29.1

Leiftr
GKS 2365 4to: 28.10
AM 748 I 4to: 28.10

Léttfeti
Appendices

Læraðr
GKS 2365 4to: 25.3, 26.3
AM 748 I 4to: 25.3, 26.3

Læraðr
GKS 2365 4to: 30.5
AM 748 I 4to: 30.5

Læraðr
GKS 2365 4to: 41.3
AM 748 I 4to: 41.3

Móinn
GKS 2365 4to: 16.2, 43.6
AM 748 I 4to: 49.8

Móinn
GKS 2365 4to: 16.1
AM 748 I 4to: 16.1

Móinn
GKS 2365 4to: 20.1, 43.6
AM 748 I 4to: 20.1, 43.6

Móinn
GKS 2365 4to: 34.7
AM 748 I 4to: 34.7

Móinn
GKS 2365 4to: 34.4
AM 748 I 4to: 34.4

Móinn
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 7.4, 9.2, 10.2, 14.6, 19.6, 44.4, 51.6, 53.5, 54.1, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 7.4, 9.2, 14.6, 19.6, 44.4, 51.6, 53.5, 54.1, Conc.

Níðhǫggr
GKS 2365 4to: 28.5
AM 748 I 4to: 28.5

Níðhǫggr
GKS 2365 4to: 35.6
AM 748 I 4to: 35.6

Níðhǫggr
GKS 2365 4to: 32.6, 35.6
AM 748 I 4to: 32.6, 35.6

Níðhǫggr
GKS 2365 4to: 54.7
AM 748 I 4to: 54.7

Níðhǫggr
GKS 2365 4to: 34.7
AM 748 I 4to: 34.7

Níðhǫggr
GKS 2365 4to: 7.4, 9.2, 14.6, 19.6, 44.4, 51.6, 53.5, 54.1, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: 7.4, 9.2, 14.6, 19.6, 44.4, 51.6, 53.5, 54.1, Conc.

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 28.5
AM 748 I 4to: 28.5

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 28.4
AM 748 I 4to: 28.4

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 7.4, 9.2, 14.6, 19.6, 44.4, 51.6, 53.5, 54.1, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 7.4, 9.2, 14.6, 19.6, 44.4, 51.6, 53.5, 54.1, Conc.

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 34.7
AM 748 I 4to: 34.7

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 16.1
AM 748 I 4to: 16.1

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 28.4
AM 748 I 4to: 28.4

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 36.7
AM 748 I 4to: 36.7

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 16.2, 43.6
AM 748 I 4to: 16.2, 43.6

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 36.7
AM 748 I 4to: 36.7

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 49.7
AM 748 I 4to: 49.7

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 49.8
AM 748 I 4to: 49.8

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 49.7
AM 748 I 4to: 49.7

Óðinn
GKS 2365 4to: 32.1
AM 748 I 4to: 32.1

Randgríðr
GKS 2365 4to: 36.7
AM 748 I 4to: 36.7

Ratatoskr
GKS 2365 4to: 36.7
AM 748 I 4to: 36.7

Ráðgríðr
GKS 2365 4to: 36.7
AM 748 I 4to: 36.7

Reginleif
GKS 2365 4to: 28.4
AM 748 I 4to: 28.4
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GKS 2365 4to: 36.8
AM 748 I 4to: 36.8

Rennandi
GKS 2365 4to: 27.5
AM 748 I 4to: 27.5

Rín
GKS 2365 4to: 27.5
AM 748 I 4to: 27.5

Saðr
GKS 2365 4to: 47.1
AM 748 I 4to: 47.1

Sangetall
GKS 2365 4to: 47.2
AM 748 I 4to: 47.2

Sága
GKS 2365 4to: 7.4
AM 748 I 4to: 7.4

Silfrintoppr
GKS 2365 4to: 30.3
AM 748 I 4to: 30.3

Sinir
GKS 2365 4to: 30.3
AM 748 I 4to: 30.3

Síð
GKS 2365 4to: 27.1
AM 748 I 4to: 27.1

Síðfóðr
GKS 2365 4to: 48.2
AM 748 I 4to: 48.2

Síðhöttr
GKS 2365 4to: 48.1
AM 748 I 4to: 48.1

Síðskóggr
GKS 2365 4to: 48.1
AM 748 I 4to: 48.1

Skaði
GKS 2365 4to: 11.4
AM 748 I 4to: 11.4

Skeggjöld
GKS 2365 4to: 36.3
AM 748 I 4to: 36.3

Skeiðbrimir
GKS 2365 4to: 30.2
AM 748 I 4to: 30.2

Skilfingr
GKS 2365 4to: 54.4
AM 748 I 4to: 54.4

Skíðblaðnir
GKS 2365 4to: 43.3, 44.3
AM 748 I 4to: 43.3, 44.3

Skogul
GKS 2365 4to: 36.3
AM 748 I 4to: 36.3

Skôll
GKS 2365 4to: 39.1
AM 748 I 4to: 39.1

Sleipnir
GKS 2365 4to: 44.5
AM 748 I 4to: 44.5

Slið
GKS 2365 4to: 28.6
AM 748 I 4to: 28.6

Strønd
GKS 2365 4to: 28.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>AM 748 I 4to</th>
<th>GKS 2365 4to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Svalinn</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sváfnir</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sváfnir</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sviðrir</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sviðurr</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svipall</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svöl</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylgr</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>8.3, 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sæhrímnir</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sœkin</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Søkkvabekkr</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GKS 2365 4to: 28.2
AM 748 I 4to: 28.2

Veratýr
GKS 2365 4to: 3.3
AM 748 I 4to: 3.3

Viðurr
AM 748 I 4to: 49.7

Vin
GKS 2365 4to: 27.9
AM 748 I 4to: 27.9

Víð
GKS 2365 4to: 27.1, 28.8
AM 748 I 4to: 27.1, 28.8

Víðarr
GKS 2365 4to: 17.3
AM 748 I 4to: 17.3

Við
GKS 2365 4to: 28.1
AM 748 I 4to: 28.1

Vönd
GKS 2365 4to: 28.9
AM 748 I 4to: 28.9

Yggdrasill
GKS 2365 4to: 29.6, 30.9, 31.3, 32.3, 34.2, 35.1, 44.1
AM 748 I 4to: 29.6, 30.9, 31.3, 32.3, 34.2, 35.1, 44.1

Ygg
GKS 2365 4to: 53.2, 54.2
AM 748 I 4to: 53.2, 54.2

Ylgr
GKS 2365 4to: 28.7
AM 748 I 4to: 28.7

Ymir
GKS 2365 4to: 40.1
AM 748 I 4to: 40.1

Ýdalir
GKS 2365 4to: 5.1
AM 748 I 4to: 5.1

Þekkr
GKS 2365 4to: 46.4
AM 748 I 4to: 46.4

Þjazi
GKS 2365 4to: 11.2
AM 748 I 4to: 11.2

Þjóð numa
GKS 2365 4to: 28.3
AM 748 I 4to: 28.3

Þjóðvitnir
GKS 2365 4to: 21.2
AM 748 I 4to: 21.2

Þórr
GKS 2365 4to: 4.5, 29.3
AM 748 I 4to: 4.5, 29.3

Þrúðheimr
GKS 2365 4to: 4.4
AM 748 I 4to: 4.4

Þrúðr
GKS 2365 4to: 49.6
AM 748 I 4to: 49.6
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GKS 2365 4to: 36.4
AM 748 I 4to: 36.4

Þrymheimr
GKS 2365 4to: 11.1
AM 748 I 4to: 11.1

Þundr
GKS 2365 4to: 21.1
AM 748 I 4to: 21.1

Þundr
GKS 2365 4to: 46.5, 54.3
AM 748 I 4to: 46.5, 54.3

Þyn
GKS 2365 4to: 27.9
AM 748 I 4to: 27.9

Þǫll
GKS 2365 4to: 27.10
AM 748 I 4to: 27.10

Ægir
GKS 2365 4to: 45.6, 45.7
AM 748 I 4to: 45.6, 45.7

Ǫrmt
GKS 2365 4to: 29.1
AM 748 I 4to: 29.1
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Chapter 2. Glossary

af: off, from, out of, beyond, of
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 17.4, 17.5, 25.3, 26.3, 26.4, 33.2, 42.6, 54.9
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 17.4, 17.5, 25.3, 26.3, 26.4, 33.2, 42.6, Conc.
ala: to give birth to, to nourish, to support, to feed
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 18.6
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 18.6
aldinn: ancient
  GKS 2365 4to: 50.3
  AM 748 I 4to: 50.3
aldregi: never
  GKS 2365 4to: 3.5
  AM 748 I 4to: 3.5
aldri: never
  GKS 2365 4to: 48.6
allr: all, entire, the whole
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 3.2, 7.5, 15.6, 26.6, 29.8, 41.6, 42.2, 45.4, 51.5, 52.6, 54.9
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 3.2, 7.5, 15.6, 26.6, 29.8, 41.6, 42.2, 45.4, 51.5, 52.6, 54.9
anda: to breathe, to expire
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
annar: one of two, the other
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 28.2, 31.5, 39.4
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 28.2, 31.5, 39.4
api: ape
  GKS 2365 4to: 34.3
  AM 748 I 4to: 34.3
aptr: back, back again
  GKS 2365 4to: 20.5
  AM 748 I 4to: 20.5
askr: ash tree, fraxinus
  GKS 2365 4to: 29.6, 30.9, 31.3, 32.3, 34.2, 35.1, 44.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 29.6, 30.9, 31.3, 32.3, 34.2, 35.1, 44.1
at: towards, against, to, at, at first, at the beginning
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.3, 5.6, 9.3, 10.3, 20.5, 21.6, 24.3, 24.6, 25.6, 29.6, 29.7, 30.9, 32.3, 34.8, 36.2, 38.5, 42.4, 43.3, 45.7, 49.2, 49.3, 49.6, 50.2, 54.8, Conc.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.3, 5.6, 9.3, 10.3, 20.5, 21.6, 23.6, 29.6, 29.7, 30.9, 32.3, 34.8, 36.2, 38.5, 42.4, 43.3, 45.7, 49.2, 49.3, 49.6, 49.7, 50.2, 54.8, 54.9, Conc.
aþkenndr: easy to recognise
  GKS 2365 4to: 9.1, 10.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 9.1, 10.1
á: on, upon, during, towards, at, to
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.5, 12.4, 21.4, 22.2, 25.2, 26.2, 28.1, 31.2, 33.2, 35.5, 42.3, 45.6
áðan: a little before, a little while ago, erewhile
  GKS 2365 4to: 54.2
  AM 748 I 4to: 54.2
áfram: with the face downward, forward
  GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

ágætr: famous, goodly, excellent
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

álfr: elf, fairy
GKS 2365 4to: 4.3
AM 748 I 4to: 4.3

árdagar: in the days of yore
GKS 2365 4to: 5.5, 6.6, 43.2
AM 748 I 4to: 5.5, 6.6, 43.2

áss: god
GKS 2365 4to: 4.3, 6.6, 29.7, 30.6, 37.6, 42.5, 44.4, 45.4
AM 748 I 4to: 4.3, 6.6, 29.7, 30.6, 37.6, 42.5, 44.4, 45.4

áttu: eight
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.1, 24.4
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.1, 23.4

átti: eighth
GKS 2365 4to: 13.1
AM 748 I 4to: 13.1

baðmr: tree
GKS 2365 4to: 40.5
AM 748 I 4to: 40.5

bak: back
GKS 2365 4to: 17.5
AM 748 I 4to: 17.5

bana: bane, death
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

bani: bane, death
GKS 2365 4to: 50.6
AM 748 I 4to: 50.6

barn: child, baby
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

bátr: boat
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

bein: bone
GKS 2365 4to: 40.4
AM 748 I 4to: 40.4

bekkr: bench, bank
GKS 2365 4to: 10.6, 45.6
AM 748 I 4to: 9.6, 45.6

bera: to bear, to carry
GKS 2365 4to: 1.5, 32.5, 36.2, 36.9
AM 748 I 4to: 32.5, 36.2, 36.9

betr: better
GKS 2365 4to: 18.4
AM 748 I 4to: 18.4

biðja: to beg
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 3.2
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 3.2

bíta: to bite
GKS 2365 4to: 25.3, 26.3, 35.4
AM 748 I 4to: 25.3, 26.3, 35.4

bjarg: rocks, precipices
GKS 2365 4to: 38.4, 40.4
AM 748 I 4to: 38.4, 40.4

bjártr: bright
GKS 2365 4to: 8.2
AM 748 I 4to: 8.2

bjóða: to bid, offer
GKS 2365 4to: 2.3
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AM 748 I 4to: 2.3  
**blár**: blue, black  
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.  
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.  

**blíðr**: blithe, gentle  
GKS 2365 4to: 6.2, 37.5, 41.2  
AM 748 I 4to: 6.2, 37.5, 41.2  

**bógr**: the shoulder of an animal  
GKS 2365 4to: 37.4  
AM 748 I 4to: 37.4  

**bóndi**: husband-man, farmer  
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.  
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.  

**brá**: eyelid  
GKS 2365 4to: 41.1  
AM 748 I 4to: 41.1  

**bregða**: to move swiftly, to break up, to break off, to upbraid  
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.  
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.  

**búna**: to burn  
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.6, 29.8, 38.5  
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.6, 29.8, 38.5  

**brim**: surf  
GKS 2365 4to: 38.4  
AM 748 I 4to: 38.4  

**brjóta**: to break  
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.  
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.  

**bróðir**: brother  
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.  
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.  

**brú**: bridge  
GKS 2365 4to: 29.7, 44.6  
AM 748 I 4to: 29.7, 44.6  

**brúðr**: bride  
GKS 2365 4to: 11.5, 39.6  
AM 748 I 4to: 11.5, 39.6  

**brynja**: coat of mail  
GKS 2365 4to: 10.6  
AM 748 I 4to: 9.6  

**bura**: to bow, to draw the net round  
GKS 2365 4to: 23.3  
AM 748 I 4to: 24.3  

**burr**: son  
GKS 2365 4to: 43.6, 50.5  
AM 748 I 4to: 43.6, 50.5  

**búa**: to live, to abide, to dwell  
GKS 2365 4to: 11.2, 11.4, 15.5, 31.4  
AM 748 I 4to: 11.2, 11.4, 15.5, 31.4  

**byrr**: a fair wind  
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.  
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.  

**bær**: town, village  
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 6.1  
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 6.1  

**dagr**: day  
GKS 2365 4to: 7.5, 8.5, 14.5, 15.5, 20.2, 29.4, 30.7  
AM 748 I 4to: 7.5, 14.5, 15.5, 20.2, 29.4, 30.7  

**dauðr**: dead  
GKS 2365 4to: 8.6  
AM 748 I 4to: 8.6
dís: a sister, a goddess or pietess, a female guardian-angel, a maid
  GKS 2365 4to: 53.4
  AM 748 I 4to: 53.4

dorg: an angler's tackle
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
draga: to drag, to carry, to pull
  GKS 2365 4to: 37.3, 49.5
  AM 748 I 4to: 37.3, 49.5
drekka: to drink
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 7.5, 13.5, 45.7, 51.2
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 7.5, 13.5, 45.7, 51.2
drepa: to stumble
  GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
  AM 748 I 4to: Conc.
dreyri: blood
  GKS 2365 4to: 52.6
  AM 748 I 4to: 52.6
drífja: to drive
  GKS 2365 4to: 52.6
  AM 748 I 4to: 52.6
drjúpja: to drip
  GKS 2365 4to: 9.6, 26.5
  AM 748 I 4to: 10.6, 26.5
drykkkr: drink, beverage
  GKS 2365 4to: 3.4
  AM 748 I 4to: 3.4
dríaþja: to commit, perpetrate
  GKS 2365 4to: 35.2
  AM 748 I 4to: 35.2
dylja: to conceal, to bide
  GKS 2365 4to: 50.3
  AM 748 I 4to: 50.3
dyrr: door, doors
  GKS 2365 4to: 9.5, 22.3, 24.1, 24.5
  AM 748 I 4to: 10.5, 22.3, 23.1, 23.5
daema: to give judgement, to pass sentence
  GKS 2365 4to: 29.5, 30.8
  AM 748 I 4to: 29.5, 30.8
ef: if
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 38.6, 53.6
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 38.6, 53.6
eggmóðr: edge-weary
  GKS 2365 4to: 53.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 53.1
eiga: to possess, to have
  GKS 2365 4to: 14.6, 26.6
  AM 748 I 4to: 14.6, 26.6
egi: not
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
einmæli: private talk
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
einn: one
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.4, 2.5, 3.4, 18.6, 19.4, 24.4, 24.5, 31.4, 36.9, 48.5, 50.6, 51.5, 54.9
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.4, 2.5, 3.4, 18.6, 19.4, 23.4, 23.5, 31.4, 36.9, 48.5, 50.6, 51.5, 54.9
ek: I
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 4.2, 5.3, 6.5, 12.3, 12.5, 16.3, 20.4, 23.3, 23.5, 23.6, 24.3, 34.8, 36.2, 38.5, 45.1, 48.7,
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49.1, 49.5, 50.2, 50.3, 50.4, 52.1, 52.5, 53.3, 53.6, 54.1, 54.2, 54.8, 54.9, Conc.

AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 4.2, 5.3, 6.5, 12.3, 12.5, 16.3, 20.4, 20.6, 23.3, 24.3, 24.5, 24.6, 34.8, 36.2, 38.5, 45.1, 48.6, 49.1, 49.5, 50.2, 50.3, 50.4, 52.1, 52.4, 52.5, 53.3, 53.6, 54.1, 54.2, 54.8, 54.9, Conc.

ekki: not

GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

eldr: fire

GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.2, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.2, Conc.

ellefð: eleventh

GKS 2365 4to: 16.1
AM 748 I 4to: 16.1

en: but, and

GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 4.4, 7.1, 7.2, 8.1, 8.2, 8.4, 11.1, 11.4, 12.2, 13.2, 14.2, 14.6, 15.4, 16.2, 16.5, 17.4, 18.5, 19.4, 22.5, 26.4, 28.1, 34.3, 35.3, 35.5, 37.4, 39.4, 40.3, 40.6, 41.1, 41.4, 44.3, 44.5, 44.7, 44.9, 49.3, 49.4, 52.2, Conc.

AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 4.4, 7.2, 8.4, 11.4, 12.2, 13.2, 14.2, 14.6, 15.4, 16.2, 17.4, 18.5, 19.4, 22.5, 26.4, 28.1, 28.12, 34.3, 35.3, 35.5, 37.4, 39.4, 40.3, 40.6, 41.1, 41.4, 44.3, 44.5, 44.7, 44.9, 44.10, 49.3, 49.4, 52.2, Conc.

engi: none, no one

GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.3
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.3

eptir: after

GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

er: which, who, that, there where


erfiði: toil, labour, trouble

GKS 2365 4to: 35.2
AM 748 I 4to: 35.2

es: which, who, that, there where

GKS 2365 4to: 8.2
AM 748 I 4to: 8.2

eskimær: lady's maid

GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

faðir: father

GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 11.6, 17.6
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 11.6, 17.6

fagna: to be fain, to rejoice

GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

falla: to fall

GKS 2365 4to: 28.11, 28.12, 38.6
AM 748 I 4to: 28.11, 28.12, 38.6

fara: to go, to travel

GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 24.6, 29.5, 30.8, 48.7
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 23.6, 29.5, 48.6

fá: to fetch, to catch, to seize

GKS 2365 4to: Intro., Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., Conc.

fár: few
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GKS 2365 4to: 12.6, 18.5, 22.5, 52.2
AM 748 I 4to: 12.6, 18.5, 22.5, 52.2

_feikn:_ portent
  GKS 2365 4to: 12.6
  AM 748 I 4to: 12.6

_fela:_ to hide, to conceal
  GKS 2365 4to: 37.5
  AM 748 I 4to: 37.5

_feldr:_ cloak
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.6
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.6

_fé:_ cattle, property
  GKS 2365 4to: 5.6
  AM 748 I 4to: 5.6

_fimm:_ five
  GKS 2365 4to: 23.1, 24.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 23.1, 24.1

_fimmti:_ fifth
  GKS 2365 4to: 8.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 8.1

_finna:_ to find
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

_firr:_ away
  AM 748 I 4to: 1.3

_fiskr:_ fish
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 21.3
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 21.3

_fjórði:_ fourth
  GKS 2365 4to: 7.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 7.1

_fjórir:_ four
  AM 748 I 4to: 23.2, 24.2, 33.1

_fjólð:_ much
  GKS 2365 4to: 52.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 52.1

_fjólkunnigr:_ skilled in the dark art
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

_fleiri:_ more
  GKS 2365 4to: 34.1
  AM 748 I 4to: 34.1

_flesk:_ pork
  GKS 2365 4to: 18.4
  AM 748 I 4to: 18.4

_flestr:_ most
  GKS 2365 4to: 15.5
  AM 748 I 4to: 15.5

_fljúga:_ to fly
  GKS 2365 4to: 20.2
  AM 748 I 4to: 20.2

_flóð:_ flood, inundation, deluge
  GKS 2365 4to: 21.3
  AM 748 I 4to: 21.3

_folk:_ folk, people
  GKS 2365 4to: 48.7
  AM 748 I 4to: 48.6

_forn:_ old
  GKS 2365 4to: 11.6, 22.4
  AM 748 I 4to: 11.6, 22.4

_fóstr:_ to foster
  GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
  AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
fóstra: foster
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

fótr: foot
   GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
   AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

fram: forward
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

frá: from
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 38.6, Conc.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 38.6, Conc.

frækn: valiant, stout
   GKS 2365 4to: 17.6
   AM 748 I 4to: 17.6

fullr: full
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

funi: flame
   GKS 2365 4to: 42.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 1.3, 42.3

fúna: to rot, to decay
   GKS 2365 4to: 35.5
   AM 748 I 4to: 35.5

fylgja: to follow
   GKS 2365 4to: 39.2
   AM 748 I 4to: 39.2

fylla: to fill, to pour
   GKS 2365 4to: 25.4
   AM 748 I 4to: 25.4

fyrir: before, in front of
   GKS 2365 4to: 1.6, 9.5, 22.3, 38.2, 39.6, 45.2, 54.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 1.6, 10.5, 22.3, 38.2, 39.6, 45.2, 54.3

fyrrigróra: to forfeit
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

fyrstr: first
   GKS 2365 4to: 42.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 42.3

gagháls: with neck thrown back
   GKS 2365 4to: 33.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 33.3

gagn: use, avail
   GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
   AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

gamall: old
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

ganga: to go
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 24.5, 43.2, 51.4
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.3, 23.5, 43.2, 51.4

gefa: to give
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 5.5
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 5.5

geut: goat
   GKS 2365 4to: 25.1
   AM 748 I 4to: 25.1

gerá: to do
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 3.6, 12.3, 16.3, 41.2
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 12.3, 16.3, 41.2

gestr: guest
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GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

geta: to get
AM 748 I 4to: 3.6

gjald: tribute, payment
GKS 2365 4to: 3.6
AM 748 I 4to: 3.6

glaðr: glad
GKS 2365 4to: 7.6, 13.6
AM 748 I 4to: 7.6, 13.6

glaumr: lusty crowd of men, a host of warriors (with val-)
GKS 2365 4to: 21.6
AM 748 I 4to: 21.6

glymja: to rattle, to clash
GKS 2365 4to: 7.3
AM 748 I 4to: 7.3

gnaga: to gnaw
GKS 2365 4to: 33.3
AM 748 I 4to: 33.3

goð: god
GKS 2365 4to: 11.5, 13.4, 27.8, 38.3, 39.2, 42.2, 49.9, 54.6
AM 748 I 4to: 11.5, 13.4, 27.8, 38.3, 39.2, 42.2, 49.10, 54.6

goti: Goth
GKS 2365 4to: 2.7
AM 748 I 4to: 2.7

góðr: good
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 3.6, 13.6, 43.4
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 3.6, 13.6, 43.4

gólf: floor
GKS 2365 4to: 23.1

AM 748 I 4to: 24.1
gras: grass, herbage
GKS 2365 4to: 17.2
AM 748 I 4to: 17.2

grind: lattice door, gate
GKS 2365 4to: 22.4
AM 748 I 4to: 22.4

grund: ground
GKS 2365 4to: 20.3
AM 748 I 4to: 20.3

gull: gold
GKS 2365 4to: 7.6, 8.2, 15.2
AM 748 I 4to: 7.6, 8.2, 15.2

gumi: man
GKS 2365 4to: 28.11
AM 748 I 4to: 28.11

gunntamiðr: valiant
GKS 2365 4to: 19.2
AM 748 I 4to: 19.2

gýgr: ogress, witch
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
gofugr: noble, worshipful
GKS 2365 4to: 19.5
AM 748 I 4to: 19.5

góra: to make
GKS 2365 4to: 5.3
AM 748 I 4to: 5.3

haf: sea, ocean
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

hafa: to have
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GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 5.2, 12.2, 16.2, 42.1, 42.6, 45.1, 51.2, 53.2, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 5.2, 12.2, 16.2, 42.1, 42.6, 45.1, 51.2, 53.2, Conc.

halfr: half
GKS 2365 4to: 14.4, 14.6
AM 748 I 4to: 14.4, 14.6

handtaka: to seize, to capture
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

hanga: to hang
GKS 2365 4to: 9.4
AM 748 I 4to: 10.4

hann: he
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 9.2, 10.2, 15.2, 20.5, 23.4, 24.6, 26.4, 29.5, 30.6, 30.8, 32.5, 33.2, 34.5, 37.2, 37.4, 38.2, 38.6, 39.5, 41.1, 41.4, 44.2, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 9.2, 10.2, 15.2, 20.5, 23.6, 24.4, 26.4, 29.5, 30.6, 32.5, 33.2, 34.5, 37.2, 37.4, 38.2, 38.6, 41.1, 41.4, 42.6, 44.2, Conc.

harðmóðigr: hard of mood
GKS 2365 4to: 41.5
AM 748 I 4to: 41.5

haukr: hawk
GKS 2365 4to: 44.8
AM 748 I 4to: 44.8

hauss: skull, cranium
GKS 2365 4to: 40.6
AM 748 I 4to: 40.6

hár: high, tall, hair
GKS 2365 4to: 17.2, 40.5
AM 748 I 4to: 17.2, 40.5

hátimbra: high-timbered
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 42.4
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 42.4

hefna: to revenge
GKS 2365 4to: 17.6
AM 748 I 4to: 17.6

heió: brightness of the sky, shining
GKS 2365 4to: 39.6
AM 748 I 4to: 39.6

heilagr: holy
GKS 2365 4to: 4.1, 22.3, 29.9
AM 748 I 4to: 4.1, 22.3, 29.9

heili: brain
GKS 2365 4to: 41.4
AM 748 I 4to: 41.4

heill: good luck, auspice, 'be whole!'
GKS 2365 4to: 3.1, 3.2
AM 748 I 4to: 3.1, 3.2

heimr: world, lying in a place. related to Gr. οίκον 
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 42.4
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 42.4

heita: to call, to give name to
GKS 2365 4to: 5.1, 6.4, 7.1, 8.1, 11.1, 22.1, 25.1, 26.1, 28.1, 32.1, 38.1, 39.1, 46.1, 46.2, 48.6, 49.1, 50.2, 54.1, 54.2, 54.3
AM 748 I 4to: 5.1, 6.4, 7.1, 11.1, 15.1, 22.1, 25.1, 26.1, 28.1, 32.1, 38.1, 39.1, 46.1, 48.6, 49.1, 50.2, 54.1, 54.2, 54.3

heitr: hot
GKS 2365 4to: 1.1
AM 748 I 4to: 1.1

hel: the abode of the dead
GKS 2365 4to: 28.12
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AM 748 I 4to: 28.12

heldr: more, rather
GKS 2365 4to: 1.2
AM 748 I 4to: 1.2

hellir: cave
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

herja: harrying, battle
GKS 2365 4to: 18.6, 24.4, 36.9, 51.5
AM 748 I 4to: 18.6, 23.4, 36.9, 51.5

heyra: to hear
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

héðan: hence
GKS 2365 4to: 28.12, 37.2
AM 748 I 4to: 28.12, 37.2

hégómi: falsness
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

hér: here
GKS 2365 4to: 2.2
AM 748 I 4to: 2.2

himinn: heaven
GKS 2365 4to: 39.6, 40.6
AM 748 I 4to: 39.6, 40.6

hin: the
GKS 2365 4to: 12.1, 16.1, 41.5
AM 748 I 4to: 12.1, 13.1, 16.1, 41.5

hinn: the
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 6.1, 11.3, 14.1, 15.1, 39.2, 45.5, 50.3, 50.5
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, 11.1, 11.3, 13.6, 14.1, 15.1, 16.5, 39.2, 45.5, 50.3, 50.5

hjalt: the knob at the end of a sword's hilt, the guard between the hilt and blade
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

hjótrr: hart, stag
GKS 2365 4to: 26.1, 33.1, 35.4
AM 748 I 4to: 33.1, 35.4

hlíð: slope, mountain
GKS 2365 4to: 35.5
AM 748 I 4to: 35.5

hlóa: to bellow, to roar
GKS 2365 4to: 29.9
AM 748 I 4to: 29.9

hnöggva: bereft
GKS 2365 4to: 51.3
AM 748 I 4to: 51.3

hodd: hoard, treasure
GKS 2365 4to: 27.8
AM 748 I 4to: 27.8

hold: skin and flesh, body
GKS 2365 4to: 40.1
AM 748 I 4to: 40.1

horn: horn
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 26.4, 36.2
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 26.4, 36.2

hón: she
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 14.5, 22.6, 25.5, 27.8, 28.11, 29.3, 36.9
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 14.5, 22.6, 25.5, 27.8, 28.11, 29.3, 36.9

hrinda: to push, to kick
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

hriður: fire
GKS 2365 4to: 1.1
AM 748 I 4to: 1.1

hrímþurs: rime-giant
GKS 2365 4to: 31.5
AM 748 I 4to: 31.5

hríð: shrubs, brushwood
GKS 2365 4to: 17.1
AM 748 I 4to: 17.1

hróðugr: glorious
GKS 2365 4to: 19.3
AM 748 I 4to: 19.3

hundr: hound
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 44.9
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 44.9

hundrað: a hundred (120)
GKS 2365 4to: 23.1, 24.1, 24.4
AM 748 I 4to: 23.1, 23.4, 24.1

hvar: where
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

hvát: what
GKS 2365 4to: 18.6
AM 748 I 4to: 18.6

hverfa: to turn around
GKS 2365 4to: 27.8, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: 27.8

hverr: who, which, each, every
GKS 2365 4to: 8.5, 14.5, 20.2, 29.4, 30.7, 34.3, 42.3, 42.6

hvé: how
GKS 2365 4to: 22.6
AM 748 I 4to: 22.6

hyggja: to think, to mean, to believe
GKS 2365 4to: 23.3, 24.3, 34.3, 34.8, 54.8
AM 748 I 4to: 24.3, 34.3, 34.8, 54.8

hylli: favour, grace
GKS 2365 4to: 42.1, 51.6
AM 748 I 4to: 42.1, 51.6

hæfing: aiming at
GKS 2365 4to: 33.2
AM 748 I 4to: 33.2

holl: hall
GKS 2365 4to: 25.2, 26.2
AM 748 I 4to: 25.2, 26.2

hønd: hand
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

hørg: heathen place of worship
GKS 2365 4to: 16.6
AM 748 I 4to: 16.6

in: in
GKS 2365 4to: 13.1

inn: the
GKS 2365 4to: 25.5
AM 748 I 4to: 25.5

it: the
GKS 2365 4to: 15.3
AM 748 I 4to: 15.3

í: in, within, during, into
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GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 4.4, 5.5, 6.6, 13.5, 14.3, 18.2, 21.3, 22.6, 26.5, 38.6, 43.2, 52.6, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 4.4, 5.5, 6.6, 13.5, 14.3, 18.2, 21.3, 22.6, 26.5, 38.6, 43.2, 52.6, Conc.

 bókorni: squirrel
GKS 2365 4to: 32.1
AM 748 I 4to: 32.1

illr: ill, evil
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.

ísarn: iron
GKS 2365 4to: 37.6
AM 748 I 4to: 37.6

jór: stallion
GKS 2365 4to: 30.6, 44.5
AM 748 I 4to: 30.6, 44.5

jörl: earth
GKS 2365 4to: 40.2
AM 748 I 4to: 40.2

jörmun: great
GKS 2365 4to: 20.3
AM 748 I 4to: 20.3

jótunn: giant
GKS 2365 4to: 11.3, 50.3
AM 748 I 4to: 11.3, 50.3

karl: man
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

ker: tub, vessel
GKS 2365 4to: 7.6, 25.4

kerling: old woman
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.

kórum: jaw-bone, a kind of sledge
GKS 2365 4to: 49.5
AM 748 I 4to: 49.5

kjós: to choose, to elect
GKS 2365 4to: 8.4, 14.5
AM 748 I 4to: 8.5, 14.5

knú: to know how to do a thing, can
GKS 2365 4to: 7.2, 25.6, 53.5
AM 748 I 4to: 7.2, 25.6, 53.5

kné: knee
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

kol: coals, charcoal
GKS 2365 4to: 37.6
AM 748 I 4to: 37.6

koma: to come
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 9.2, 10.2, 20.5, 45.5, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 9.2, 10.2, 20.5, 45.5, Conc.

konungr: king
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., Conc.

kostr: condition, chance, opportunity, choice, quality
GKS 2365 4to: 14.3
AM 748 I 4to: 14.3

kot: cottage, hut, small farm
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

kunna: to know, to understand
GKS 2365 4to: 9.3, 10.3
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AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 9.3

_kveða_: to say
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 13.3
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 13.3, 23.3

_kvelja_: to torment
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

_kvistr_: twig, branch
GKS 2365 4to: 34.9
AM 748 I 4to: 34.9

_land_: land
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.7, 4.1, 12.4, 17.3
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.7, 4.1, 12.4, 17.3

_lauss_: loose
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

_láss_: latch, lock
GKS 2365 4to: 22.6
AM 748 I 4to: 22.6

_láta_: to let, to put, to place, to suffer, to grant, to behave
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 18.2
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 18.2

_látask_: to let oneself be
GKS 2365 4to: 17.4
AM 748 I 4to: 17.4

_leiða_: to lead, to conduct, to make a person loathe a thing
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.

_lengi_: long, for a long time
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.

_lífa_: to be left, to live
GKS 2365 4to: 19.6

AM 748 I 4to: 19.6

_liggja_: to lie
GKS 2365 4to: 4.2, 12.5, 34.2, 52.4
AM 748 I 4to: 4.2, 12.5, 34.2, 52.4

_lim_: foliage of a tree, crown of a tree
GKS 2365 4to: 25.3, 26.3
AM 748 I 4to: 25.3, 26.3

_liða_: to go, to pass, to move
GKS 2365 4to: 53.3
AM 748 I 4to: 53.3

_líf_: life
GKS 2365 4to: 53.3
AM 748 I 4to: 53.3

_loði_: fur cloak
GKS 2365 4to: 1.4
AM 748 I 4to: 1.4

_loga_: burn with a flame
GKS 2365 4to: 29.8
AM 748 I 4to: 29.8

_lopt_: loft, air, atmosphere
GKS 2365 4to: 1.5
AM 748 I 4to: 1.5

_lúka_: to shut
GKS 2365 4to: 22.6
AM 748 I 4to: 22.6

_lygi_: lie
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

_maðr_: man
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.3, 16.4, 31.6, 35.3, 41.3
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.3, 16.4, 31.6, 35.3, 41.3, 53.2
margr: many
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

mark: mark
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

marr: sea, steed
GKS 2365 4to: 17.5
AM 748 I 4to: 17.5

matr: food
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.3
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.3

mágr: brother in law, father in law, son in law
GKS 2365 4to: 23.6
AM 748 I 4to: 24.6

mál: speech, faculty of speech, suit, action, cause
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., Title
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., Title

máttigr: mighty
GKS 2365 4to: 11.3
AM 748 I 4to: 11.3

með: with
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 23.3, 48.7, 49.9, 54.6
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 24.3, 49.10, 54.6

mega: may, might, to have strength to do
GKS 2365 4to: 34.9, 53.6
AM 748 I 4to: 34.9, 53.6

mjǫðr: mead
GKS 2365 4to: 13.6, 25.5
AM 748 I 4to: 13.6, 25.5

mjǫk: much
GKS 2365 4to: 9.1, 10.1, 23.6
AM 748 I 4to: 9.1, 10.1, 24.6

muna: to mind, to call to mind, to remember
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 52.2, 53.2
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 52.2

myrkr: mirk, murky, dark
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GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
mækir: sword
GKS 2365 4to: 52.4
AM 748 I 4to: 52.4
mæla: to speak
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
mær: famous, glorious, great
GKS 2365 4to: 50.5
AM 748 I 4to: 50.5
mogr: boy, youth
GKS 2365 4to: 17.4
AM 748 I 4to: 17.4
nafn: name
GKS 2365 4to: 48.5
AM 748 I 4to: 48.5
nálgask: to approach, to come near to
GKS 2365 4to: 53.6
AM 748 I 4to: 53.6
nátt: night
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.1
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.1
neðan: from beneath, from below
GKS 2365 4to: 35.6
AM 748 I 4to: 35.6
nefna: to name
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
nema: except, save, but
GKS 2365 4to: 2.4
AM 748 I 4to: 2.4
né: not
GKS 2365 4to: 2.3, 20.5
AM 748 I 4to: 2.3, 20.5
niðr: down
GKS 2365 4to: 32.6, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: 32.6, Conc.
niðingr: villain, truce breaker
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
níundi: ninth
GKS 2365 4to: 14.1
AM 748 I 4to: 14.1
 nú: now
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 11.4, 45.1, 53.2, 53.5, 54.1
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 11.4, 53.2, 53.5, 54.1
nýtr: fit, usable
GKS 2365 4to: 43.6
AM 748 I 4to: 43.6
nær: near
GKS 2365 4to: 4.3, 28.11
AM 748 I 4to: 4.3, 28.11
of: over, similar to 'um'
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 8.3, 20.4, 21.5, 34.3, 51.2, 52.3
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 4.6, 21.5, 34.3, 35.3, 41.6, 42.5, 51.2, 52.3, 53.3
ofan: from above
GKS 2365 4to: 32.5, 35.4
AM 748 I 4to: 32.5, 35.4
ok: and
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.2, 4.3, 7.4, 9.6, 15.3, 15.6, 17.2, 17.6, 19.1, 20.1, 23.2,
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24.2, 25.3, 26.3, 27.1, 27.2, 27.3, 27.4, 27.5, 27.6, 27.7, 27.9, 27.10, 27.11, 28.4, 28.5, 28.6, 28.7, 28.8, 28.9, 29.1, 29.2, 30.1, 30.2, 30.3, 30.4, 30.5, 32.6, 33.1, 33.4, 33.5, 34.4, 34.6, 34.7, 36.1, 36.3, 36.4, 36.5, 36.6, 36.7, 37.1, 38.4, 42.2, 46.3, 46.4, 46.5, 46.6, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 47.6, 48.4, 49.7, 49.8, 49.9, 50.1, 50.3, 51.6, 54.4, 54.5, 54.6, 54.7, Conc.

AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.2, 4.3, 7.4, 10.6, 15.3, 15.6, 17.2, 17.6, 19.1, 20.1, 23.2, 24.2, 25.3, 26.3, 27.1, 27.2, 27.4, 27.5, 27.6, 27.7, 27.9, 27.10, 27.11, 28.4, 28.5, 28.6, 28.7, 28.8, 28.9, 28.10, 29.1, 29.2, 30.1, 30.2, 30.3, 30.4, 30.5, 32.6, 33.1, 33.4, 33.5, 34.4, 34.6, 34.7, 36.1, 36.3, 36.4, 36.5, 36.6, 36.7, 36.8, 37.1, 38.4, 42.2, 46.2, 46.3, 46.4, 46.5, 46.6, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 47.6, 48.4, 49.7, 49.8, 49.9, 49.10, 50.1, 50.3, 51.6, 54.4, 54.5, 54.6, 54.7, Conc.

opinn: open

GKS 2365 4to: 42.4
AM 748 I 4to: 42.4

orð: word, words

GKS 2365 4to: 32.4
AM 748 I 4to: 32.4

ormr: snake, serpent

GKS 2365 4to: 34.1
AM 748 I 4to: 34.1

óask: to dread, to fear

GKS 2365 4to: 20.4
AM 748 I 4to: 20.4

ólmr: savage, furious, worrying

GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

ór: out of, from

GKS 2365 4to: 7.6, 24.5, 40.1, 40.3, 40.4, 40.5, 40.6, 41.1, 41.4, Conc.

ósvinnr: unwise

GKS 2365 4to: 34.3
AM 748 I 4to: 34.3

pína: to torment, to torture

GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

rann: house

GKS 2365 4to: 10.4, 13.5, 23.4
AM 748 I 4to: 9.4, 13.5, 24.4

raptr: roof, ceiling

GKS 2365 4to: 23.5
AM 748 I 4to: 24.5

ráda: to advise, to counsel, to rule, to consult

GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.5, 14.2
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.5, 14.2, 16.6

regin: gods

GKS 2365 4to: 4.6, 6.2, 37.5, 41.2
AM 748 I 4to: 4.6, 6.2, 37.5, 41.2

reka: to drive, to thrust, to throw, to push violently

GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

renna: to run

GKS 2365 4to: 32.2
AM 748 I 4to: 32.2

repta: to roof

GKS 2365 4to: 10.4
AM 748 I 4to: 9.4

ríða: to ride

GKS 2365 4to: 30.6
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AM 748 I 4to: 30.6

**rjúfa**: to break, to rip up, to break a hole in
GKS 2365 4to: 4.6
AM 748 I 4to: 4.6

**róa**: to row
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**róť**: root
GKS 2365 4to: 31.1
AM 748 I 4to: 31.1

**salr**: hall
GKS 2365 4to: 5.3, 6.3, 9.3, 10.3, 10.5, 12.3, 14.3, 16.3
AM 748 I 4to: 5.3, 6.3, 9.3, 9.5, 12.3, 14.3, 16.3

**samr**: the same
GKS 2365 4to: 15.3
AM 748 I 4to: 15.3

**sá**: this, that, such
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 6.1, 11.3, 22.4, 25.6, 39.6
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 6.1, 11.3, 22.4, 25.6, 39.6

**seđja**: to satiate, to feed
GKS 2365 4to: 19.2
AM 748 I 4to: 19.2

**segja**: to say
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 32.6, 52.1
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 32.6, 52.1

**senda**: to send
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**sess**: seat
GKS 2365 4to: 14.3
AM 748 I 4to: 14.3

**setja**: to seat, to place, to set, to put
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.2
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.2

**sétti**: sixth
GKS 2365 4to: 11.1
AM 748 I 4to: 11.1

**sigtívar**: victory gods
GKS 2365 4to: 45.2
AM 748 I 4to: 45.2

**silfr**: silver
GKS 2365 4to: 6.3, 15.3
AM 748 I 4to: 6.3, 15.3

**sinn**: his, hers, its, theirs
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**sitja**: to sit
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., Conc.

**síðan**: since
GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

**síðan**: since
GKS 2365 4to: 48.7
AM 748 I 4to: 48.6

**sjaundi**: seventh
GKS 2365 4to: 12.1
AM 748 I 4to: 12.1

**sjá**: to see
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 4.2, 9.3, 10.3, 52.5, 53.5, 54.8
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 4.2, 9.3, 10.3, 52.5, 53.5, 54.8
Appendices

sjásk: to fear
   GKS 2365 4to: 20.6
   AM 748 I 4to: 20.6

sjóða: to cook
   GKS 2365 4to: 18.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 18.3

skapa: to shape, to form, to mould
   GKS 2365 4to: 25.4, 40.2, 41.6, 43.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 25.4, 40.2, 41.6, 43.3

skapt: shaved stick, shaft, missile
   GKS 2365 4to: 10.4
   AM 748 I 4to: 9.4

skáld: skald, poet
   GKS 2365 4to: 44.7
   AM 748 I 4to: 44.7

skera: to cut
   GKS 2365 4to: 35.6
   AM 748 I 4to: 35.6

skilja: to part, to separate, to divide, to distinguish, to discern, to understand
   GKS 2365 4to: 2.5, 3.1, 3.5, 4.5, 25.5, 29.3, 32.2, 32.5, 34.8, 37.2, 38.5, 39.6, 45.3, 45.5
   AM 748 I 4to: 2.5, 3.1, 3.5, 4.5, 25.5, 29.3, 32.2, 32.5, 34.8, 37.2, 38.5, 39.6, 45.3, 45.5

skip: ship
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 43.4, 44.3
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 43.4, 44.3

skína: to shine
   GKS 2365 4to: 38.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 38.3

skírleitr: pure of countenance
   GKS 2365 4to: 39.2

AM 748 I 4to: 39.2

skírr: clear, bright, pure
   GKS 2365 4to: 11.5, 25.5, 43.5
   AM 748 I 4to: 11.5, 25.5, 43.5

skjöldr: shield
   GKS 2365 4to: 10.5, 38.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 9.5, 38.3

ský: cloud
   GKS 2365 4to: 41.6
   AM 748 I 4to: 41.6

sleppa: to slip, to slide
   GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
   AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

smár: small
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

smýl: she troll
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

sonr: son
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.6, 34.5, 39.5, 41.3, 42.5, 43.1, 45.2
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.6, 34.5, 39.5, 41.3, 42.5, 43.1, 45.2

sól: sun
   GKS 2365 4to: 37.3, 38.2
   AM 748 I 4to: 37.3, 38.2

spyρja: to ask, to speer
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

stafr: staff, post
   GKS 2365 4to: 12.6
   AM 748 I 4to: 12.6
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**standa**: to stand

**steypa**: to 'make stoop', to cast down, to overthrow
- GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
- AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

**straumr**: stream, current, race
- GKS 2365 4to: 21.4
- AM 748 I 4to: 21.4

**strá**: straw, to strew, to cover with straw
- GKS 2365 4to: 10.6
- AM 748 I 4to: 9.6

**strönd**: border edge, strand, coast, shore
- GKS 2365 4to: Intro.

**styðja**: to steady, to prop
- GKS 2365 4to: 15.2
- AM 748 I 4to: 15.2

**stþóva**: to soothe, to halt
- GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
- AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**svalr**: cool, fresh
- GKS 2365 4to: 7.2
- AM 748 I 4to: 7.2

**svangr**: slender, slim, thin
- GKS 2365 4to: 37.3
- AM 748 I 4to: 37.3

**svá**: so, thus
- GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 2.3, 23.3, 24.3
- AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 2.3, 23.3, 24.3

**sveiti**: sweat, blood
- GKS 2365 4to: 40.3
- AM 748 I 4to: 40.3

**sverð**: sword
- GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
- AM 748 I 4to: 44.10, Conc.

**sviðna**: to be singed
- GKS 2365 4to: 1.4
- AM 748 I 4to: 1.4

**svipr**: a glimpse of a person
- GKS 2365 4to: 45.1
- AM 748 I 4to: 45.1

**svæfa**: to lull to sleep
- GKS 2365 4to: 15.6
- AM 748 I 4to: 15.6

**sær**: sea
- GKS 2365 4to: 40.3
- AM 748 I 4to: 40.3

**sök**: charge, offense
- GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 15.6
- AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 15.6

**taka**: to take hold of, to seize, to grasp
- GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 42.3, Conc.
- AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 42.3, Conc.

**tann**: tooth
- GKS 2365 4to: 5.6
- AM 748 I 4to: 5.6

**tigr**: ten
- GKS 2365 4to: 23.2, 24.2
- AM 748 I 4to: 23.2, 24.2

**til**: to
- GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.2, 10.2, 28.12, 39.3, Conc.
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AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.2, 10.2, 28.12, 39.3, Conc.

tíu: ten
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

tíundi: tenth
GKS 2365 4to: 15.1
AM 748 I 4to: 15.1

tívi: god, divinity
GKS 2365 4to: 5.6
AM 748 I 4to: 5.6

to: green tuft, green grassy place, place marked out for a house or building
GKS 2365 4to: 11.6
AM 748 I 4to: 11.6

tveir: two
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 29.2
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 29.2

úlfr: wolf
GKS 2365 4to: 39.1
AM 748 I 4to: 39.2

út: out
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

vaka: to be awake
GKS 2365 4to: 45.3
AM 748 I 4to: 45.3

vala: to wield, to rule, to cause
GKS 2365 4to: 13.3
AM 748 I 4to: 13.3

vanr: wont, accustomed
GKS 2365 4to: 16.5
AM 748 I 4to: 16.5

unz: till that, till, until
GKS 2365 4to: 4.6
AM 748 I 4to: 4.6

up: up
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 37.2, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 37.2, Conc.

vaða: to wade, to go through shallow water
GKS 2365 4to: 21.6, 29.3
AM 748 I 4to: 21.6, 29.3

van: to wane
GKS 2365 4to: 25.6
AM 748 I 4to: 25.6

vapr: to beware of
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**GKS 2365 4to:** Intro.
**AM 748 I 4to:** Intro.

**vargr:** wolf, outlaw
GKS 2365 4to: 9.4
AM 748 I 4to: 10.4

**varna:** to warn off
GKS 2365 4to: 39.3
AM 748 I 4to: 39.3

**vatn:** water
GKS 2365 4to: 26.6, 29.9
AM 748 I 4to: 26.6, 29.9

**vaxa:** to wax, to grow
GKS 2365 4to: 17.1
AM 748 I 4to: 17.1

**vápn:** weapon
GKS 2365 4to: 8.6, 19.5
AM 748 I 4to: 8.6, 19.5

**vár:** spring
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**veđja:** to lay a wager, to bet
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**vegr:** way, road
GKS 2365 4to: 24.6, 26.6, 31.2
AM 748 I 4to: 23.6, 26.6, 31.2

**veig:** strong beverage, drink
GKS 2365 4to: 25.6
AM 748 I 4to: 25.6

**vel:** well
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**vera:** to be
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.1, 2.4, 3.3, 4.1, 4.5, 6.1, 8.6, 9.1, 10.1, 10.4, 10.5, 12.1, 13.1, 14.1, 15.1, 15.2, 16.1, 22.4, 22.6, 24.3, 33.1, 34.5, 39.5, 40.2, 41.5, 42.3, 44.2, 50.2, 50.4, 51.1, 51.3, 51.4, 53.4, 54.8, Conc.

AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.1, 1.5, 3.3, 4.1, 4.5, 8.1, 8.6, 9.1, 9.2, 9.4, 9.5, 10.1, 10.2, 12.1, 13.1, 14.1, 15.2, 16.1, 22.4, 22.6, 23.3, 24.3, 33.1, 40.2, 41.5, 42.6, 44.2, 50.2, 50.4, 51.1, 51.3, 51.4, 53.4, Conc.

**verða:** to become, to happen, to come to pass
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 42.5, 50.6, 54.8
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 42.5, 50.6, 54.8, Conc.

**vestr:** west
GKS 2365 4to: 9.5
AM 748 I 4to: 10.5

**vetr:** winter
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

**vé:** mansion, house, sanctuary
GKS 2365 4to: 13.3
AM 748 I 4to: 13.3

**véla:** to defraud, to trick, to deal, to manage
GKS 2365 4to: 6.5, 52.3
AM 748 I 4to: 6.5, 52.3

**við:** with, against, by, at, close to
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 19.4, 45.3
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 19.4, 45.3

**viðr:** tree
GKS 2365 4to: 17.3, 39.3, 44.2
AM 748 I 4to: 17.3, 39.3, 44.2
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vilbjǫrg: help desired, help in need
   GKS 2365 4to: 45.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 45.3

vilja: to wish, to will
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 36.2, Conc.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 36.2, Conc.

vindr: wind
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro.

vinr: friend, kinsman
   GKS 2365 4to: 52.3, 52.5
   AM 748 I 4to: 52.3, 52.5

vissa: certain knowledge, certainty
   GKS 2365 4to: Conc.
   AM 748 I 4to: Conc.

vita: to wit, to have sense, to be conscious
   GKS 2365 4to: 12.5, 18.5, 22.5, 23.5, 23.6, 35.3, 38.5, 53.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 12.5, 18.5, 22.5, 24.5, 24.6, 35.3, 38.5, 53.3

vitnir: wolf
   GKS 2365 4to: 24.6
   AM 748 I 4to: 23.6

víðr: wide, large
   GKS 2365 4to: 8.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 8.3

víg: fight, battle
   AM 748 I 4to: 49.7

vín: wine
   GKS 2365 4to: 19.4
   AM 748 I 4to: 19.4

værr: comfortable, tranquil
   GKS 2365 4to: 13.5
   AM 748 I 4to: 13.5

völlr: field
   GKS 2365 4to: 22.2
   AM 748 I 4to: 22.2

vörðr: warden, warder
   GKS 2365 4to: 13.4
   AM 748 I 4to: 13.4

yfir: over, above
   GKS 2365 4to: 7.3, 9.6, 20.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 7.3, 10.6, 20.3

yppa: to 'up with' a thing
   GKS 2365 4to: 45.1
   AM 748 I 4to: 45.1

þaðan: thence, from there
   GKS 2365 4to: 26.6
   AM 748 I 4to: 26.6

þann: that
   GKS 2365 4to: 50.3
   AM 748 I 4to: 50.3

þar: there, at that place

þat: that, it, therefore
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 18.5, 22.5, 34.3, 45.3, 45.5, 54.3
   AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 18.5, 22.5, 45.3, 45.5, 54.3

þau: they
   GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 7.4, 41.5
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AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 7.4, 41.5
þú: then, at that time
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 24.6, 42.6, 49.4, 50.4, Conc.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 23.6, 42.6, 49.4, 50.4
þekja: to thatch
GKS 2365 4to: 6.3, 10.5, 15.3
AM 748 I 4to: 6.3, 9.5, 15.3
þengill: captain of a thing, prince, king
GKS 2365 4to: 16.4
AM 748 I 4to: 16.4
þessi: this, these, those
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro.
þing: thing, assembly, meeting, gathering
GKS 2365 4to: 49.6
AM 748 I 4to: 49.6
þjóta: to emit a whistling sound
GKS 2365 4to: 21.1
AM 748 I 4to: 21.1
þó: though, yet, but yet, nevertheless
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 20.6
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 20.6
þótt: although
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.5
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.5
þríði: third
GKS 2365 4to: 6.1, 28.3, 31.6
AM 748 I 4to: 6.1, 28.3, 31.6
þrír: three
GKS 2365 4to: 31.1, 31.2
AM 748 I 4to: 31.1, 31.2
þruma: clap of thunder
GKS 2365 4to: 8.3
AM 748 I 4to: 8.3
þú: you
GKS 2365 4to: Intro., 1.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 51.1, 51.2, 51.3, 51.4, 52.1, 52.2, 52.3, 53.3, 53.5, 53.6
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 1.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 51.1, 51.2, 51.3, 51.4, 52.1, 52.2, 52.3, 53.3, 53.5, 53.6
því: this, because
GKS 2365 4to: 12.4, 29.7, 42.4
AM 748 I 4to: 12.4, 29.7, 42.4
þykkja: to be thought, to seem
GKS 2365 4to: Intro.
AM 748 I 4to: Intro., 21.5
æ: for ever
GKS 2365 4to: 19.6, 34.8
AM 748 I 4to: 19.6, 34.8
æðri: higher, highest
GKS 2365 4to: 44.2
AM 748 I 4to: 44.2
ǫl: ale
GKS 2365 4to: 36.9
AM 748 I 4to: 36.9
ǫlr: worse for ale, worse for drink
GKS 2365 4to: 51.1
AM 748 I 4to: 51.1
ǫrn: eagle
GKS 2365 4to: 9.6, 32.4
AM 748 I 4to: 10.6, 32.4
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