Heimir Pálsson

Tertium vero datur – A study on the text of DG 11 4to

1 The purpose

The aim of this paper is to try to throw some light upon an old matter of dispute; the relationship between the two main versions of Snorri Sturluson's *Edda:* on one hand the so-called *Uppsala-Edda* and on the other hand the *Regius-Edda* (and the closest relatives, T and W). This is an old apple of discord and at the core lies the question: which of the two versions is most similar to, is closest to, Snorri's original text.[1]

Scholars seem to be endlessly able to disagree on the origins of the Icelandic Sagas, especially concerning the question of orality and literacy in their history. The epic tales in *Edda* are obviously important in this discussion. No modern scholar would seriously believe that Snorri *invented* the myths in *Edda*. He collected them, presumably from the oral stage, and organised the tales to build a whole. We really have no reason to believe that he obtained those mythical tales in a written form, simply because we know of no institutions or circumstances where it would have been normal to collect written tales or to write them on parchment.

This gives us reason to believe that the collection of myths found in *Edda* includes tales that stand very close to the old oral tradition, which again makes them a very interesting topic for research, especially when the same myths can be found in quite different versions.

In the year 2007, the Swedish Research Council made a generous grant to a group of scholars concentrating their research on the manuscript *DG 11 4to* of the University Library in Uppsala University, a manuscript which may contain the oldest preserved text of Snorri Sturluson's *Edda*.[2] The present writer is a member of that team and this paper deals with some of the results of the research conducted over the past years.

The main purpose of this paper is not to present a new (or old)? stemma for the existing medieval manuscripts of *Edda*, but to try, using new qualitative methods, to come closer to answering the question of whether it is possible to trace the two main versions of the text back to the same original.

2 The material

We will start with a short presentation of the preservation of the text material along with with a short review of the research in this field. This is followed by a discussion on the nature of *Edda* as a textbook.

---

[1] I owe thanks to many people for different kinds of help during my most recent years of *Edda*studies. First of all my colleagues in the "Edda project" in Uppsala, Henrik Williams, Lasse Mårtensson and Daniel Sävborg. Doctoral student Maja Bäckvall has discussed many problems with me. Prof. Em. Vésteinn Ólason has read the article and has given wise advice in many cases.

[2] See Henrik Williams 2008.

2.1 The research

Snorri Sturluson's *Edda* is preserved, either partly or as a whole, in six medieval manuscripts and one paper copy from around 1600 of a presumably 14th-century exemplar. The six medieval ones are (and I follow Guðrún Nordal's dating):

1) DG 11 4to, Codex Upsaliensis, approx. 1300–1325
2) Gks 2367 4to, Codex Regius, approx. 1300–1325,
3) AM 748 Ib 4to, approx. 1300–1325
4) AM 242 fol. Codex Wormianus, approx. 1350
5) AM 757 a 4to, approx. 1400
6) AM 748 II 4to, approx. 1400

Numbers 1, 2 and 4 (often referred to as U, R and W) contain almost the whole of what is usually called *Edda*. Nr 3 contains the greater part of Skáldskaparmál (two folios lacking) and 5 and 6 contain only fragments, mainly of Skáldskaparmál.[3] Both Codex Upsaliensis and Codex Wormianus contain material that originally seem to have been separate works and belonging to a different context, but which were later added to the *Edda* texts.

The paper manuscript Codex Trajectinus (Utrecht 1374) is usually seen as a copy of a medieval manuscript with almost exactly the same text as Codex Regius.

The difference between the manuscripts is big enough to allow us to talk about at least five to six different versions of the work *Edda*, thus treating Regius and Trajectinus (RT) as one version, Upsaliensis and Wormianus as independent versions and the more fragmentary manuscripts as perhaps three different redactions or versions of *Edda*.[4] Guðrún Nordal (2001) has pointed out that this holds at least for Skáldskaparmál "the section of the work that deals exclusively with skaldic diction and imagery" (p. 43.)

In the following I will concentrate on the text as it is preserved in the manuscript DG 11 4to and its possible relation to the text in Gks 2367 4to. When it is not a question of the manuscripts I will talk about the different versions and refer to them as the U version and the RT version. Referring to the U version thus does not mean solely the DG 11 but the version we see in that manuscript, and the same holds for the RT version. The relationship between these versions is an old matter of dispute. Interpretations vary from looking upon the U version as a shortening of the RT version to the opposite: the U version being the original one and the RT version a revision with interpolations from some other sources. There is really no need to go through the whole discussion here, highlighting a few of the main points may be sufficient.[5]

Already in his edition of *Edda* in the year 1818, Rasmus Christian Rask took up the discussion on the Uppsala-manuscript DG 11, stating that:

[3] Since Finnur Jónsson's edition (1931) the manuscripts number 3, 5 and 6 are often referred to as A, B and C.

[4] For a survey, see Guðrún Nordal 2001:46–72.

[5] For a very clear overview over the research around Uppsala-Edda, see Heinrich Beck 2008.

> Sumir lærðir menn hafa álitið Uppsala-eddu fyrir höfundarins egit frumrit; enn mér virðist þvertámóti auðséð að hún er allra þriggja ýngst og nockurskonar ágrip af hinum. (Pp. 8–9.)[6]

Supporting his opinion Rask mentioned three different arguments: a) The headings must be the work of the scribe of U and can absolutely not be Snorri's own. No scribe would have omitted them if they had been in the original manuscript. b) Often ("allvíða") the scribe has not understood the text. Here Rask mentions the shortening of the Völuspá-quotation "Verþr oll va.lv v. ein*n ok* h." (Grape et al. 1962:5v. 1–2.) And finally c) The scribe has included some shortenings which meant that the text does not make sense or even means something different from what it is supposed to mean. It is worth noting that of course Rask only saw two possibilities: Either the RW version or the U version must be closest to the original which means that the other one must either be a shortened or an expanded version.

When Rask taks about "sumir lærðir menn" it is not at all clear to whom he is referring. However in his *Atlantica* (1679), Olaus Rudbeck mentioned DG 11 as "rätta originalet på gammalt Pergament skrifwit" without having anything more to say about it (Grape et al. 1962:24.) In the first edition of *Edda*, published by the Danish bishop P.H. Resen, *Edda Islandorum* 1665, some passages seem to originate from our manuscript, but have come there through the Icelandic version of Magnús Ólafsson, the so-called *Laufás-Edda* (compiled 1607–09.)[7]

Among the scholars, the Swedish professor Johan Ihre was the only one who had seriously discussed DG 11 before Rask. This happened mainly in Ihre's *Bref till herr Cancelli-rådet Sven Lagerbring* (1772), where he, having discussed the Lögsögumannatal and Ættartala and quoted the heading naming Snorri the author, concludes (p. 8):

> När förthenskull såsom bevist antages, att STURLÆSON är författare till vår *Edda*, och att thet exemplar, som Upsala Bibliothek äger, är en äkta afskrift af sitt original, kan vidare ingen tvivel vara, om hvad egentligen thenna skriften tillhör, eller ej.[8]

The last words should certainly be understood as a commentary upon Resen's publication of the *Laufás-Edda* (1665) and the curious edition of *Edda* made by the rev. Johannes Göransson in Uppsala 1746. This latter edition contains only Gylfaginning which follows the DG 11 text, but at the same time states that even if the manuscript once belonged to or even was written by Snorri Sturluson, *Edda* was not at all his work, but on the contrary was composed in Uppsala in "Mosis tid" (p. xxiv.) Furthermore, it is stated that the text was written not in Icelandic but in the language of the Goths (Götiska), since it is "enehanda, med det här i Riket på gamla Runstenar förvarade språket" (p. xxxiv.)

---

[6] "Some scholars have considered the Uppsala-Edda to be the author's own original; but I, on the contrary, find it to be obviously the youngest of all three [the versions Rask knew were R, W and U] and some kind of summary of the others".

[7] On *Laufás-Edda* and Resen's edition, see Anthony Faulkes 1977 and 1979.

[8] "When thus it can be considered proven that Sturluson is the author of our Edda, and that this exemplar, owned by the Upsala Library, is a true copy of the original, there can be no doubt as to what nelongs to this work or not."

Of course we cannot from Rask's expression "lærðir menn" exclude the learned people he and professor Nyerup may have met in Uppsala in the year 1812: "Þar skoðuðum við Prófessór Nyerúp hana náquæmliga 1812 á ferðum okkar" Rask writes (p. 8) and adds that in 1816 he himself made a copy of Gylfaginning in DG 11. As a matter of fact, Rask was then the first among the continental scholars to compare the DG 11 with another medieval manuscript, namely Wormianus (Regius was at that time lost, cf. Rask1818 p. 7 f.)

The publication of the three-volume edition of Snorri's *Edda* 1848–87 (by The Arna-magnaean commision) was a big event in *Edda's* history. Then, for the first time, researchers had the possibility of consulting a scientific edition of the texts of Codex Regius (in volume I with *varia lectiones* from Wormianus and other Copenhagen manuscripts), Upsaliensis and the "fragments" in volume II, followed by notes and introductions in volume III. This edition is very useful even nowadays, not least for those interested in the text of DG 11. After this publication the scholarly studies of the work really flourished.

In the year 1879, Eugene A. Mogk published the first of two monographes on *Edda Untersuchungen über die Gylfaginning*, followed the next year by a study on the Eddic poems as sources for Gylfaginning. In the first study he included the following commentary on Rask's words (above):

> Seit Rask […] den stab über A [DG 11] gebrochen hat, ist man im norden seiner ansicht über diese hs. allgemein gefolgt. Da trat Müllenhof in seiner abhandlung: Wára und Wara für die hs. A ein und fand in dieser redaction einzig und allein die ursprüngliche Gylfaginning. (1879:499–500.)

Mogk mentions that Bugge had arguments against Müllenhoff and that so did Wilken (1878), but Mogk states that the problem is that "die gründe, welche er gegen Müllenhoffs hypothese vorbringt, sind nicht anderer art als diejenigen, welche Müllenhoff für seine ansicht bringt" (ibid. p. 500.) Where Müllenhoff believed the RW version to be an expansion of the U version, Wilken saw U as a shortening of RW.

This has repeatedly been the problem: The same arguments are used for and against each hypothesis, and at this point Finnur Jónsson's somewhat confusing conclusions (1931) may stand as an example:

> Det fremgår af det her sagte, at U er, som sagt, et af de mærkeligste håndskrifter, der findes. Man har, som ovf. bemærket, søgt at forklare det så, som var det en kladde, hvorefter et håndskrift, der skulde ligge til grund for RWT, blev istandbragt. Men dette kan ikke være rigtigt. Ikke blot strider det imod alt, hvad der ellers vides om bøgers istandbringelse på Island, men det er af flere ting klart, at U netop må bero på et håndskrift, der i alt væsenligt stemte med RWT. Hvad texten selv angår, sammendrager U meget ofte denne, og forkorter den, og det ofte i den grad, at meningen forstyrres. Bortset fra, at U dog kan have bevaret det oprindelige m.h.t. enkelte læsemåder (ord og udtryk), har det sin betydning ved at vise uægte bestanddele i de andre håndskrifter. Her må man dog være varsom, da U vilkårlig udelader en del. At det har det oprindelige, når det udelader 1. kap. af Gylf., det meste af Fáfnir- Regin- og Gjukungesagnet, navneremserne […] og

> mulig et par mindre kapitler, må betragtes som sikkert. U må således siges trods alt at være et meget vigtigt håndskrift. (1931:xxx–xxxi.)[9]

Finnur Jónsson is irritated because the U does not fit into any simple stemma but according to him, DG 11 now has the original text, now a distortion. Therefore it is obvious that DG 11 is a challenge for the researcher. It is one of the oldest manuscripts, it is clearly a redaction of some older version.[10] In some cases the text is shorter than in the other versions but now and then includes information or single words that are missing in the others. It is therefore a little disappointing to see the scholars more or less give up when faced with the problem. This can be illustrated by Anthony Faulkes' conclusions (2005):

> There has been much discussion as to whether U or R and T best preserve the *Edda* as it was written by Snorri, but there is little on which to base a rational judgement. U is probably the oldest manuscript (though only by a few years), and the material accompanying the *Edda* in U implies a close connection with Snorri himself; but the arrangement in this version seems, at least to most modern readers, less logical and artistic. Scholars are reluctant to attribute what seems to be an improvement in the version in R and T to scribal alteration, and yet if R and T are closer to the original it is difficult to see what could have prompted a scribe to alter an arrangement that seems satisfactory so as to produce the illogicality of U. A third possibility, which is attractive but incapable of proof, is that U is derived from a draft made by Snorri, in which he may have assembled his material on loose leaves, and that R and T (and W) are derived from a revised and perhaps expanded version also by Snorri.[[11]] Both versions may then have been further altered by later hands. On the whole it seems best to admit that the manuscripts preserve various compilations based on the lost work of Snorri Sturluson, each of which has its own interest and value. (2005:xix–xxx.)

This is both a scientifically cautious and intelligent conclusion. But nevertheless it is a little challenging and gives reason for further discussion. So does the hypothesis made by the German scholar Friedrich Müller in his dissertation *Untersuchungen zur Uppsala-*

---

[9] "It follows from what is said here, that U is, as stated, one of the strangest manuscripts in existence. There has, as mentioned above, been attempts to explain this by assuming that there were a rough draft out of which a manuscript was produced which were to form the basis of RWT. But this cannot be correct. Not only is it contrary to everything that is otherwise known about the production of books in Iceland, but it is made clear by many things that U indeed must be derived from a manuscript which in all important aspects accorded with RWT. As for the text itself, U often contracts it and abbreviates it, and this often to such extent that the meaning is corrupted. Disregarding that U might have conserved the original in individual passages (words and expressions), it is important by indicating spurious elements in the other manuscripts. You need to be careful here, though, since U arbitrarily omits parts. It must be regarded as certain that it shows the original when it omits the first chapter of Gylfaginning, most of the Fáfnir, Regin and Gjúkungar legend, the *þulas* and possibly a couple of brief chapters. Thus U must in spite of everything be said to be a very important manuscript."

[10] This is above all discussion. One only has to look at the text in the so-called "Bragaræður" in the first part of the U version to find a rather clumsy replacement of a piece of text that has been removed from its original place in Skáldskaparmál to the "epilogue" of Gylfaginning.

[11] Even if Faulkes does not mention it here, this is more or less Friedrich Müller´s conclusion in 1941.

Edda in 1941. This young scholar was killed in the war and his theory was never really fully discussed and tested. It is usually not mentioned in the literature.[12]

Müller's conclusions, based on a comprehensive stylistic study on both of the main versions, as well as studies in various texts of all the main sources known, were very clear. A simple question lead his research on the two versions: "Wo steht nun Snorri?" And his answer was:

> Die einzige Verfasserangabe in einer Hs des Werkes selbst und die Ergebnisse der Textkritik sprechen für U, Snorris schon von den Zeitgenossen anerkannter Ruhm als Schriftsteller und Gelehrter spricht für X [the exemplar copied in RT]. Da aber nicht nur die Handschrift, sondern auch der Text von U älter ist als die längere Fassung, ist bei aller Vorsicht nur ein Schluß möglich:
>
> B e i d e F a s s u n g e n s t a m m e n v o n S n o r r i ,
>
> der Verfasser des U-textes und der Redaktor der Fassung X sind e i n e Person. (1941:148.)

This of course has not been proved and can never be if one demands certainty. But in my opinion the following study of the two versions of the text shows that it is impossible to trace both of them back to the same exemplar. It is important to stress that this does not mean that the U version is a copy of Snorri Sturluson's original. However, if we like to think of the *archetype*, a revision must have been done where a lot of new information was added and new versions of the myths were included. This would give us the original for the RTW version. On the other hand, a different revision of the original must lie behind the exemplar copied in DG

Before beginning a closer reading of the texts I find it necessary to make some comments on the textbook genre and the nature of textbooks.

2.2 The textbook and les belles lettres

Many scholars have stated that it is important to remember that *Edda* is a textbook (*kennslubók*) in poetics, then concentrating upon the last word and discussing the poetics. I in what follows would like to emphasise the term *textbook*.[13]

When Faulkes (above) talks about the U version as being less "artistic" than the others, he obviously regards the *Edda* as a piece of art, a literary whole, where the author has, among other things, created literature that might be compared with other artistic texts, for example fiction like *Egils saga*. This is in fact very common in discussions of the *Edda* and has been important in the discussion of the history of composition, especially after E. Wessén's introduction to the facsimile edition of Gks 2367 (1940.)[14]

Edda is a unique work in the medieval literature of Iceland. It is not only the sole work on Nordic mythology (Gylfaginning) or the most extensive monograph on poetics

[12] Just to name some key works, Müllers dissertation is not mentioned in Grape 1962, not in Vésteinn Ólason (ed.) 1992 nor in Guðrún Nordal 2001. For a discussion see Beck 2008 p. 9 f.

[13] By this I am not at all trying to reduce the importance of the author's literary competence. As e.g. Vésteinn Ólason (2001) has shown, his irony and literary skill is great and to be taken seriously.

[14] When dating Snorri's *Edda*, Wessén took as a starting point the question whether Snorri could have seen the work in his mind as it appears to us, starting with Gylfaginning and then proceeding through Skáldskaparmál to Háttatal.

(Skáldskaparmál). It is simply the only textbook, the only original work written in Icelandic and designed to be a comprehensive schoolbook for those young poets who want to improve their art; cf. the programe: "En þat er [at] segja ungum skáldum er girnaz at nema skáldskapar mál ok [heyja] sér orðfjölda með fornum heitum, eða skilja þat er hulit er ort …"[15] (Grape et al. 1977:38.4–6.) This is to be taken seriously. But at the same time it is important to remember that we have no knowledge to help us decide whether the original *Edda* was meant to be a manual for individual study or a schoolbook to be used in a classroom. The latter possibility encourages thoughts of the monestaries or even the domes at Skálholt or Hólar, where studies of myths can hardly have been considered important. Therefore, perhaps we should rather think of the young man who is in need of private or tutorial guidance on the road of poetry.

A piece of fiction, "les belles lettres" and the textbook differ, not only stylistically but also in the ways in which they are received. When writing a novel, the author normally "creates" a fictitious reader and writes for him/her. When writing a textbook the author creates two imagined readers. The ultimate receipient of the text is of course the student, but in between him and the author comes the teacher.[16] The medieval writers made this especially clear when creating the *magister* and *discipulus*. Both are important persons in works such as *Physiologus*, *Elucidarius*, *Speculum regale* and so on. In *Edda* we meet them in Gylfaginning as the trio Hár/Jafnhár/Þriði vs. Gangleri, and in Skáldskaparmál as Bragi and Ægir. This split reader can create real problems for the writer of modern textbooks and should not be underestimated in medieval times either. This is and has been one of the main reasons why textbooks are rewritten. They need to be constantly adapted to new teachers and every new generation of students, and new information must be added. This, of course, gives a good explanation for the different versions of *Edda* mentioned above. It may be a question of a teacher who only wants the poetic part of the work or a teacher who finds it more pedagogic to teach kennings of type A together with kennings of type C rather than with B, and so on. Besides that, the author might have gained new knowledge or discovered new sources. Therefore there may be several different reasons for creating a new version of *Edda.*

When it comes to the contents of *Edda*, the uniqueness of the work becomes even clearer. The U version is the only one that presents the material with an introductory heading. The wording can hardly be that of the editor/scribe of DG 11 since it does not cover the contents of this manuscript, but is likely to be older. There it is stated that the contents are: "Fyrst frá ásum ok Ymi, þar næst skáldskap[ar mal] ok heiti margra hluta. síðaz hátta tal er Snorri hefir ort um Hák[on] konung ok Skúla hertug[a]." (Grape et al. 1977:1.) This is not the proper place for a discussion on whether this allows us to read "skáldskapar mál" as a proper name: *Skáldskaparmál*, or whether it is simply a definition: 'the language of poetry'. But obviously this leaves out important sections in the manuscript, such as the Prologue, the Skáldatal, the Sturlungar-genealogy, the List of the lawspeakers and the Second grammatical treatise.[17] According to the wording used, none

[15] "This is important to tell young poets who want to leanr the poetical language and gain vocabulary from old terms or understand mysterious poetry…" Here, as in the rest of this paper, quotes from U are normalized and stranslated by me..

[16] In the chapter dealing with H.C. Andersen's tales in *Den dubbla scenen* (1978:174–206), Lars Lönnroth discusses a similar split recepient in the child and the grown-up.

[17] For a very clear and not at all oversimplified diagram of U. see Krömmelbein 1992:120.

of these can reliably be claimed to belong to Snorri's origial work, and maybe that is exactly what the editor is telling us with this heading. What is most important for us is that the first part of *Edda* is the one with tales about the gods and the giant Ymir, the second main part is the treatise on the skaldic language, and that Snorri is the composer of that material as well as the skald of Háttatal.

Each of the two main parts of *Edda* reveal unique collections of material, the retold myths in the first part, and the great corpus of poetry quoted in Skáldskaparmál. Neither of these collections are known to be older, as such, than Snorri, and we can just as well believe that it was upon his initiative that the collection started. Considering all the myths it is difficult to imagine one individual who is likely to have known all of them and by no means as a systematic "history of the gods". These myths had been looked upon as heathen remnants for almost 200 years and knowing and telling them can hardly have been considered suitable for a good Christian until maybe the renaissance of the 12th century made it acceptable.[18] For the oral preservation it is necessary to have a storyteller and an audience, and taking into account that the Christian belief had been the state religion since the year 1000 it is difficult to imagine a "heathen congregation" or a constantly renewed group creating the necessary context for reciting the myths and memorizing all names and happenings. It is much more likely that there were individual storytellers who used the old myths as entertainment among other kinds of tales. The wording and tales in works like the *Sturlunga collection* do not reveal old myths as common knowledge, apart from the tales obviously told about Óðinn in the surroundings of the Sturlungar family.[19] Actually, when Óðinn and Freyr are mentioned in *Sturlunga* it seems to be referring to merely jokes about them. Collecting the myths in the beginning of the 13th century could possibly be compared to the collecting of folk-tales in 19th century Europe. In that case it would be natural to expect to find different oral versions of the myths.

Just to mention a few of the myths where *Edda* could reveal different oral traditions, one could start with the creation myth. Snorri obviously knew both the Völuspá version (where the gods lift the earth from the ocean), since he quotes the first part of that scene ("Ár var alda…" Grape et al. 1977:4.23) before deciding to make the other tradition, that of Vafþrúðnismál, valid ("Ór Ymis holdi var jörð um sköpuð…" Grape et al. 1977:6.26.)[20] Both versions were obviously known in the oral tradition. Most likely the creation of the dwarfs and the list of the dwarves' names (Grape et al. 1977:8.22–9.10) also reveal different myths and lists found in the oral tradition. In one myth (Völuspá 9) the gods are described as the creators and in the other the dwarfs had come to life in the soil "kviknað í moldu niðri" or in the flesh of Ymir (Grape et al. 1977:8.23–25; cf. Faulkes 2005:15.) – A splendid example is to be found in the myth about Njörðr and Skaði. As Dillmann (1992) has suggested, the wording: "þau sættaz á þat at þau skulu

[18] See C.H. Haskins 1957. Cf. Guðrún Nordal 2001:19. Even if the more or less institutionalised movement on the continent never became an official trend in Iceland it is obvious that individuals like Einarr Skúlason in his poetry and later Snorri Sturluson in his *Edda* showed a renaissance-like interest in the past. This of course can be said to culminate in the collection of the Eddic poems in Gks 2365.

[19] The best known episode where Óðinn is mentioned is of course when the priest's wife Þorbjörg in Reykjaholt attacks Hvamm-Sturla with a knife, threatening to make him most like the one he wants to be like, that is Óðinn!

[20] This is a neat example of the textbook-author's struggle to melt together his sources. See f.ex. Heimir Pálsson 1999.

vera níu nætr í Þrúðheimi en þrjár í Nóatúnum" (Grape et al. 1977:14.4) must be based on a different oral tradition from the one presented to us in the R version "Þau sættusk á þat at þau skyldu vera níu nætr í Þrymheimi, en þá aðrar níu at Nóatúnum" (Faulkes 2005:24–25.) The mythical interpretation of the short summer and long winter of the north can not be a "correction" made in the 14th century. In Gylfaginning, when describing Baldr's funeral the author states in U: "Freyr sat í kerru ok var þar beittr fyrir göltrinn Gullinbusti eða Sligrutanni." (Grape et al. 1977:31.14–15) and in R we read: "Freyr ók í kerru með gelti þeim er Gullinbursti heitir eða Slíðrugtanni." (Faulkes 2005:47.) But in Skáldskaparmál Snorri quotes Úlfr Uggason (presumably Húsdrápa) on the same incident:

> Svá sem segir Úlfr Uggason:
>
> Ríðr á börg til borgar
> böðfróðr sonr Óðins
> Freyr ok fólkum stýrir,
> fyrstr enum gulli bysta.
>
> Hann heitir ok Slígrugtanni. (Grape et al. 1977:55.17–19.)

The text in Gks 2367, "ríðr á börgr" and "fyrst ok gulli byrstum" (Faulkes 1998:19 with textual notes) and the writing *sonr* in stead of *sonar* in DG 11 suggests that the scribes are not quite sure about the wording, but they absolutely agree on the fact that Freyr comes driving in a chariot, not *riding*, as Úlfr informs us. Both versions seem to have been known. Still a reminder of the oral tradition may be found in these examples: The text in U includes a name on Hel's gate: "Fallandaforað grind, Þolmóðnir þreskoldr" (Grape et al. 1977:16.26) where R only has "Fallanda forað þresköldr hennar" (Faulkes 2005:27.) Furthermore U calls the excrement of the eagle *arnarleir* (Grape et al. 1977:37.20) while all the other versions have *skáldfífla hlutr*.[21]

The corpus of skaldic poetry used in Skáldskaparmál is quite impressive. In the U version the author quotes some 250 half-stanzas, and if we believe that we are dealing with the same author as in *Heimskringla* where around 580 stanzas are quoted, it is impressive to note that only around 25 of Skáldskaparmál's stanzas are the same as stanzas in *Heimskringla*! This of course indicates that the author is using two different corpuses, even if the skaldic canon is mostly the same.[22] Since we may have reason to believe that the collection of stanzas for *Edda* was made before the author really became interested in the kings' sagas, this could be quite normal. As in the case of the myths there are several variations in the skaldic citations that could more easily be explained as reflecting different oral traditions than scribal errors or a misunderstanding.

The myths in the first part of the book and the *kennings* and *heiti* in the second make each part rather independent of the other. As a matter of fact, there are no references in Gylfaginning to Skáldskaparmál, and the references from the *kenning* explanations to the myths are very few. This makes each section even more independent and since there is really no time-axis in the life of the gods (except for a beginning and an end) it is

[21] Cf. Heimir Pálsson 2011
[22] Cf. Guðrún Nordal 2001:116 ff.

obviously very easy to move one myth back or forth in the collection or even to remove it, just as it is easy to experiment with the order of *kenning* chapters in the poetic section. This is once again a feature that makes the textbook really different from the fictive art of storytelling. There is no one natural way of presenting the *kennings* and *heiti*, and the author thus has his hands free to create a system that he thinks will fit for the two implied recipients of the material: the teacher and the student.

As has frequently been pointed out, there are several examples to be found in the different editions of Skáldskaparmál in *Edda* which show that citations have been moved back or forth by the editors although they forgot to change occasional references ("svá sem fyrr segir" or similar.)[23] This, of course, suggests that the editors had different opinions on the organisation of the text or that they may have been trying to adapt the work to a new context so that it would fulfill the needs of a new teacher.

2.3 The editorial work in U

Both Finnur Jónsson and Anthony Faulkes mentioned the possibility that the text of the U version is a shortening of the RT version or at least of an exemplar comparable to the latter version. Faulkes is more reluctant, stating that "there is little on which to base a rational judgement". This may be true, but nevertheless it may be worthwhile to examine the different texts once again just to see if we can find a more rational way of explaining the differences. But first I would like to give a simple survey of the editorial changes that seem to have been made by the editor of U. Whether the editor and the scribe are one and the same person or not is a problem that can be dealt with later.[24]

One of the most important changes made by the editor in the U version is to move, as it seems, all the most important myths into the first section.[25] This is obviously done deliberately and we have all reason to believe that the RTW version comes closer to the original one (if there ever was *one* original version). The editor's work can most clearly be shown by quoting the end of Gylfaginning in DG 11 and the corresponding text in R (Fig. 1.)

[23] Daniel Sävborg 2009, for example, considers an interesting example in DG 11. Even Gks 2367 shows examples of the same (cf. 1931:175.22–23).

[24] At this stage in my research it is not important to discuss when in the editorial process the extras, Skáldatal, lögsögumannatal, ættartala and the Second Grammatical Treatise were added to U.

[25] It is not at all clear whether the editor regarded the tales coming at the end of Skáldskaparmál, namely the tales of Hjaðningavíg, the smithwork of the dwarfs, the Kraki-visit in Uppsala and the (very short) Grotti-tale as real myths. They stand very close to humans.

Grape et al. 1977:35.7–16.	**Faulkes 2005:54–55.**
Nú er Gangleri heyrir þetta þá verðr gnýr mikill ok er hann á sléttum velli, ok er æsirnir heyra þetta sagt gáfu þeir sér þessi nöfn ásanna. at þá er langar stundir liði efaðisk menn ekki at allir væri einir þeir æsir er nú er frá sagt ok þessir æsir er nú váru, ok var Ñkuþórr kallaðr Ásaþórr. *Frá heimboði ása með Ægi*[26] Þessir æsir þágu heimboð at Ægi í Hlésey. Áðr hafði Óðinn honum heim boðit. Um kvelldit lét Óðinn bera sverð í höllina ok lýsti þar af sem logum björtum. Þórr var þar, Njörðr, Freyr, Týr, Heimdallr, Bragi, Viðarr, Váli, Ullr, Hœnir, Forseti, Loki. Ásynior: Slík,[27] Frigg, Freyja, Gefjun, Iðunn, Gerðr, Sigyn, Skulla,[28] Nanna.	Því næst heyrði Gangleri dyni mikla hvern veg frá sér ok leit út á hlið sér. Ok þá er hann sésk meir um þá stendr hann úti á sléttum velli, sér þá önga höll ok önga borg. Gengr hann þá leið sína braut ok kemr heim í ríki sitt ok segir þau tíðindi er hann hefir sét ok heyrt. Ok eptir honum sagði hverr maðr öðrum þessar sögur. En æsir setjask þá á tal ok ráða ráðum sínum ok minnask á þessar frásagnir allar er honum váru sagðar, ok gefa nöfn þessi hin sömu, er áðr eru nefnd, mönnum ok stöðum þeim er þar váru, til þess at þá er langar stundir liði, at menn skyldu ekki ifask í at allir væri einir, þeir Æsir er nú var frá sagt ok þessir er þá váru þau sömu nöfn gefin. Þar var þá Þórr kallaðr, ok er sá Ásaþórr hinn gamli, sá er Ökuþórr, ok honum eru kend þau stórvirki er Ektor gerði í Troju. En þat hyggja menn at Tyrkir hafi sagt frá Ulixes ok hafi þeir hann kallat Loka, því at Tyrkir váru hans hinir mestu óvinir.[29]

Figure 1. The end of Gylfaginning in U and R, respectively. Text in italics denotes title line. The normalized text in this and following quotes from Gylfaginning is done by Eysteinn Björnssons (http://notendur.hi.is/eybjorn, but here compared and adapted to Faulkes printed edition.)[30]

The difference is obvious. Instead of closing the section by dealing with Gylfi and beginning a brand new tale in Skáldskaparmál as in the RT version, the editor of U just changes scene and procedes in the same act. He gently moves from the fictive gods of Valhalla to Gylfi's own world in Sweden, where the "æsir er nú váru" took the names of the old ones (those in Valhöll) and proceded to Ægir's party.[31] In DG 11 there is only a tiny heading: "Frá heimboði ása at Ægi", before the tale about Iðunn and Þjazi is begun, while a main heading is placed before the next myth (about the mead of poetry) along with some sort of repetition of what has already been said: "Hér segir frá því at æsir sátu at heimboði at Ægis ok hann spurði Braga hvaðan af kom skáldskaprinn. Frá því er Kvasir [var] skapaðr. Hér hefr mjök setning skáldskapar."[32]

The question is not what but why? The answer is not at all simple and all we can do is mention a few possible explanations.

---

[26] From here on my own normalizing, since this part is not in Eysteinn Björnssons web edition.

[27] This seems to be meant as the name of a goddess! Here Gks 2367 has the words *slíkt sama* ('also').

[28] Could be read *Scolla*; Jón Sigurðsson proposed *Scolld* (= Skuld?) whereas Gks 2367 reads *Fulla.*

[29] There are good reasons to believe that the section beginning with "Þar var þá Þórr kallaðr" and ending with "hinir mestu óvinir" could be a "later" interpolation here. But in this connection it obviously does not matter whether Gylfaginning ends with the words "Ok eptir honum sagði hverr maðr öðrum þessar sögur" or "Tyrkir váru hans hinir mestu óvinir."

[30] I owe thanks to Eysteinn Björnsson for allowing me to use his web edition of the different texts of Gylfaginning. His text has been compared to the Grape et al. 1977 and Faulkes 2005 and 1998 editions. I digitalised the texts from Skáldskapamál myself. Even if I follow Faulkes in the normalizing of the text, for sake of convenience I am using only one ö for the short umlaut vowel.

[31] This of course can be interpreted as a part of Snorri's euhmerism.

[32] "Now begins the tale abour the Æsir at an invitation at Ægir, when he asked Bragi about the origins of poetry. On the creation of Kvarsir. Here start the rules of poetry."

In a lecture at the Fourteenth International Saga Conference in August 2009, Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson dealt with the very strange fact that the first three quires of DG 11, fol. 1 to 26, at a considerable period seem to have formed an independent "book", while the rest of the manuscript might have been independent, but then with a special cover for fol 27r. As far as I know this is the first time that a scholar notices this. And it calls for further discussion.

Fol. 26v in DG 11 is a famous page with a picture showing Gangleri questioning Hár, Jafnhár and Þriði. Fols 25v and 26r contain the Genealogy of the Sturlungs and the list of lawspeakers, the former ending with Snorri Sturluson's generation, the latter having his name as the last one. Of course, it is easy to associate these texts with the author. The following pages, fols 23r to 25r, contain Skáldatal, the list of poets found only here and (almost identical) in one manuscript of *Heimskringla*.[33]

As frequently pointed out, Snorri Sturluson himself is among the poets in Skáldatal, and so that list is also associated with him. All these facts could provide a sufficient explanation for an editorial change: It was material that the Sturlungs found to be important and thus it went well with the rest of Snorri's work. But that does not need to be the only explanation. A teacher who was going to use *Edda* could very well have wished to have it in two parts: One for himself, almost as a teacher's handbook, containing the myths, and one for the student(s), containing the real swotting material. He might well have noticed that some of the myths had very little to do with the poetry (such as for example the longest one, of Þórr's visit to Útgarða-Loki). Besides that, he might have thought just as the student who wrote in the margin of AM 748 I (A), asking God for mercy as he was reading this dangerous book: "Gud g*ie*fe mier ad læra þ*ess*a bok m*ed* odru godu, en hún er vond. Gud fad*er* mij<s>kvni."[34] As a teacher the editor may have wanted to spare his young students those "godless" tales?

The decision to set Skáldatal in this place could therefore have been carefully planned. Just at the end of the myths we read: "Eptir þessi sögu hefir ort Eilífr Guðrúnarson í Þ[ór]sdrápu." Eilífr is really only the second poet to get his name in *Edda* in DG 11. The other one is Þjóðólfr (more correctly: Þorbjörn hornklofi?), who is quoted at the very beginning in DG 11 before Gylfir meets the trinity (1977:3.26.) The real name-dropping has not started. Placing Skáldatal here as a list of reference for what is coming is simply brilliant – regardless of whether it was the teacher's or the student's section of the book! All the poetic citations in the Gylfaginning section come from the Eddic poetry and no authors could be mentioned. Now it is time for the real name-dropping to start, and quite many of the quoted poets appear in the Skáldatal and thus can be looked up and at least connected with dates (time) and chieftains.

Thus there may be more than one or even more than two good reasons for the rearrangement made at this point in the U version of *Edda*. It was most definitely not done without some prior consideration. The editor/scribe left a blank page on fol. 26v and it certainly seems to have been done deliberately. This could be the reason why he chose

[33] For a discussion on Skáldatal, see Guðrún Nordal 2001:120–130. Skáldatal was also included in *Kringla*, a vellum (containing Snorri's *Heimskringla*) which is supposed to have been written in 1258–1264, but now only preserved in paper manuscripts (exept for one leaf).

[34] Fol. 25r. Cf. Wessén 1945:14. The adj. *vond* here most certainly means 'evil'.

a quire with ten leaves at the beginning. The standard eight leaves would not have made it possible to end with such elegance![35]

2. 4 The scribe

Finnur Jónssons words, quoted above, about the scribe of DG 11, might give us a picture of a very irresponsible copyist; a scribe that shortens the text "vilkårligt" and may therefore produce an almost unintelligible text. In that connection Faulkes is much more cautious, writing: "it is difficult to see what could have prompted a scribe to alter an arrangement that seems satisfactory so as to produce the illogicality of U." This is important and must be considered in a wider context.

The studies made by Lasse Mårtensson so far on the paleography of DG 11 do by no means suggest a careless scribe. On the contrary; he seems to copy without attempting to mend abbreviations that he can hardly have understood (cf. Lasse Mårtensson and Heimir Pálsson 2009.) As pointed out by the present writer (op. cit.) it is completely impossible to explain the subtractions in Þjóðólfr Arnórsson's stanza to Haraldr Sigurðarson as the scribe's invention (Grape et al. 1977:79.28.) He must be copying what he has in front of him as closely as he can, without understanding it. And it is worth noting that even in a case like that, he does not skip the problem by omitting the text.

As Raschellà has pointed out (1982:16–20) the copy of the Second Grammatical Treatise in DG 11 is made with care and is absolutely the best one available. That does not seem like the work of a careless scribe!

In his study of the text in the Njörðr-Skaði myth, François-Xavier Dillmann (1992; cf. above) has shown that the text in DG 11 most certainly contains the original one of the myth regarding the information about the settlement between Njörðr and Skaði, while it is hardly possible for the scribe to have understood the importance of what he was writing – and completely impossible that he was correcting or mending the text by *lectio difficilior*. Since T and W have almost the same text as DG 11, it most likely is the scribe of R who is trying to mend the text.

The headings in DG 11 tell a special story. They are written by the same scribe as the one who copied the main text. But, as is frequently the case, they are added later. In all cases the space left for the headings is exactly correct, almost as if measured out letter for letter. This of course means that the headings were either written in the exemplar copied by the scribe and then in written form, so that he would be able to calculate the space needed. As mentioned above, it is hard to believe that the headings in DG 11 are created by the scribe. They do not cover all parts (not Skáldatal, not the genealogy, not the lawspeakers' list, not the register of Háttatal). The only heading that seems to be an innovation in DG 11 is the one for the Second Grammatical Treatise. It has been placed in the bottom line on a *recto* page (45r; Grape et al. 1977:87), not as a part of the text and leaving a vacant line above. Then the treatise starts on the *verso* page with a red capital letter, just as the other chapters added.

In other words: There is nothing in the work that would suggest a careless scribe. On the contrary: He is very exact in his copying. Later I hope to consider what innovations

[35] Both here and later it is important to realize that the manuscript DG 11 4to was created where there was no lack of parchment and one could afford to leave both half and whole pages unwritten.

he may have added, but for the moment I will suggest that the real changes were probably made at an earlier point.

3 Shorter or shortened?

If we compare the length of the prose texts in Gylfaginning and Skáldskaparmál in U and RT the difference is quite striking.[36] While the RT version contains around 22.600 words, the DG 11 only has 16.200 words or approximately 70% of the longer version.[37] However, this rate of abbreviation is not consistent (see below).

The problem has long been, as mentioned above (in chapter 2.1), that the scholars have been using the same arguments and the same examples to support their conflicting opinions on the relationship between the U and RT versions. What is considered by one to prove that U is a shortening, the other takes as an argument to prove that RT (or more correctly RTW's forerunner) is an expansion of the short passages in U.

This raises the question: If we are dealing with two medieval texts of different length, why does one of them have to be an abbreviation or the other an expansion? Why is it not possible to consider the two texts to have been of different lengths from the beginning, perhaps because they were based on different sources? – The immediate and relevant answer is very likely to be: If the verbal likeness or correspondance is great, there must be some connection. This is certainly so, but it does not have to be in writing. A storyteller, telling the same story twice, is very likely to use not only the same key words, but simply a very similar vocabulary, even if he/she has the freedom to vary, and does so. Two storytellers, who have learned the tale from one and the same teller of tales, are most likely to use almost the same key words – but presumably introduce some of their own vocabulary or special manner of storytelling. They will also be influenced by the audience.[38]

The question of a shorter or abbreviated text has led me to do two experiments. Firstly, I split the narrative texts into distinct short pieces, resulting in some 20 narrative sections in Gylfaginning and Skáldskaparmál, the 21st being the Prologue. Since my object of research is DG 11, the order of the sections is based on that manuscript. Sixteen of those sections are distinct myths that can be treated as independent themes. Four of the sections are various collections of knowledge about the gods and the world. The Prologue is a section of its own. And as the comparison shows, the difference in length is far from being close to average (approx. 70%) in most cases. In order to describe the differences

[36] It is important to note that at this point of the research I am only comparing the prose, leaving out almost all of the quoted stanzas. This is done simply because I am fairly convinced that the stanzas are fetched from different sources and obviously the poetic quotes vary in length, especially in one case: The last and longest citation from Völuspá (on Ragnarökkr) is much shorter in U than in R. That calls for a special discussion. The same holds for the long citations from Haustl†ng, Þórsdrápa and Húsdrápa in R. The textual variants in the scaldic stanzas in Skáldskaparmál will be discussed in the normalizet edition (forthcoming).

[37] The difference in the poetics, that is to say in the definitions in Skáldskaparmál, is of course somewhat smaller than this. I leave that topic until later, since we then have to go in for a close investigation of the citations (the stanzas) too.

[38] This is very well described by Lars Lönnroth 1978. In the family of the present writer there is a long tradition of storytelling. I have made some investigation, asking representatives of different generations (where I personally know that they have not learnt the tale from the same storyteller, but in that case mother and daughter) and the results allow me to draw these conclusions.

between the sections, I have tried to develop a method for comparing the important words of content in the texts. This method will be described later.

3.1 The length of separate sections

	Grape et al. 1977	*Faulkes 2005*	*Contents*	*U words*	*R words*	*U as % of R*
00	1.4	3	Prologue	1007	1725	58,4
01	3.20	7	The creation	1693	2562	66,1
02	9.2	15.5	Bifröst – Forseti	3255	3559	91,5
03	16.7	26.33	Loki and his family	1153	1158	99,5
04	19.5	29.17	The goddesses	463	520	89,0
05	20.14	30.38	Freyr and Gerðr	147	434	33,8
06	20.25	32.3	Dramatis personae	473	627	75,0
07	22.17	34.27	The giant builder, Sleipnir's birth	392	586	66,8
08	24.9	37.3	Þórr and Útgarða-Loki	2207	3468	63,5
09	29.19	44.3	Þórr and Miðgarðsormr	292	655	44,5
10	30.14	45.16	Baldr's death	610	1242	49,0
11	32.2	48.15	Loki's punishment	334	522	64,0
12	32.25	49.18	Fimbulvetr, Ragnarökkr	729	1230	59,3
		1998				
13	35.12	1	Iðunn and Þjazzi	452	996	45,7
14	36.20	4.8	The mead of poetry	392	924	42,4
15	38.10	20.17	Þórr and Hrungnir	1063	1109	95,8
16	41.3	24.17	Þórr and Geirröðr	612	593	103
17	82.1	41.29	Sif's hair	709	723	98.0
18	83.26	45.3	Andvari's gold	491	553	88.8
19	85.9	58.4	Hrólfr kraki	641	754	85,0
20	87.5	51.29	The Grotti myth	81	337	24,0

Table 1: The length of the tales in Gylfaginning and Skáldskaparmál[39]

[39] The Prologue will be discussed in chapter 4.2.7.

In Table 1 I show the length of individual texts measured in words. (The references in column 2 are to pages and lines in Grape et al. 1977; these of column 3 to Anthony Faulkes 1998 (Skáldskaparmál) and 2005 (Prologue[40] and Gylfaginning)). This table shows that the difference varies from the shortest text being only 24% of the longer version to a correspondence of almost 100%. This shows that we need a lot of explaning before being able to conclude anything about shortening or lengthening of the work. Therefore, it may be impossible to find one explanation to account for all the differences.

3.2 Three different categories

If one only studies the length of the tales in U compared with R, it is obvious that the tales fall into three different groups: Approx. 85–100 %, approx. 60–85% and below 50%, as shown in tables 2–4.

02	9.2	15.5	Bifröst – Forseti	3255	3559	91,5
03	16.7	26.33	Loki and his family	1153	1158	99,5
04	19.5	29.17	The goddesses	463	520	89,0
15	38.10	20.17	Þórr and Hrungnir	1063	1109	95,8
16	41.3	24.17	Þórr and Geirröðr	612	593	103
17	82.1	41.29	Sif's hair	709	723	98.0
18	83.26	45.3	Andvari's gold	491	553	88.8
19	85.9	58.4	Hrólfr kraki	641	754	85,0

Table 2. The text of U 85% or more of the RT version.

00	1.4	3	The Prologue	1007	1725	58,4
01	3.20	7	The creation	1693	2562	66,1
06	20.25	32.3	Dramatis personae	473	627	75,0
07	22.17	34.27	The giant builder, Sleipnir's birth	392	586	66,8
08	24.9	37.3	Þórr and Útgarða-Loki	2207	3468	63,5
11	32.2	48.15	Loki's punishment	334	522	64,0
12	32.25	49.18	Fimbulvetr, ragnarökkr	729	1230	59,3

Table 3: The text of U approximately 60–75% of the RT version.

[40] It is important to note that here I'm only comparing the length of comparable texts in the Prologue, and that is the reason for marking it as 00. Only two medieval versions, U and W, have the beginning of the Prologue. Three of the manuscripts contain the story of Gefjun (RTW) not told in U. This myth will be discussed later.

05	20.14	30.38	Freyr and Gerðr	147	434	33,8
09	29.19	44.3	Þórr and Miðgarðsormr	292	655	44,5
10	30.14	45.16	Baldr's death	610	1242	49,0
13	35.12	1	Iðunn and Þjazzi	452	996	45,7
14	36.20	4.8	The mead of poetry	392	924	42,4
20	87.5	51.29	The Grotti myth	81	337	24,0

Table 4: The text of U less than 50% of the RT version.

Obviously, counting words does not prove anything, but the differences seem to be somewhat striking. At least they raise questions about why the editor suddenly starts shortening central myths like the ones on the mead of poetry, Þórr and the serpent, and Baldr's death, all of which are considered to be really important, while the information about Loki and his family is copied almost word for word. And again, it is worth emphasising that lack of time and lack of vellum seem to be very farfetched explanations.

3.3. A closer look at examples

The clear distinction between the three groups can be illustrated by taking three examples in full length, one from each category. My choice has fallen upon Þórr and Geirröðr (100%, fig. 2), Loki's punishment (64%, fig. 3) and The mead of poetry (42.4%, fig. 4.)

3.3.1 Þórr and Geirröðr

This is one of the myths that in the U version has been removed from the (original?) context in Skáldskaparmál and placed in the last part of the first section.[41] The most interesting interpretation of this myth is the one by Margareth Clunies-Ross (1981), who takes advantage of the myth as it is presented in the U version and in Eilífr Guðrúnarson's Þórsdrápa (preserved in the R version).

Grape et al. 1977 41.3–42.20; 613 words	**Faulkes 1998:24.17–25.35; 593 words**
Þá mælti Ægir: Mikill þykki mér Hrungnir fyrir sér. Vann Þórr nokkut meira þrekvirki þá er hann átti viðr tröll? Þá segir Bragi: Mikillar frásagnar er þat vert, er Þórr fór til	Þá mælir Ægir: Mikill þótti mér Hrungnir fyrir sér. Vann Þórr meira þrekvirki nokkvot þá er hann átti við tröll? Þá svarar Bragi: Mikillar frásagnar er þat vert er Þórr fór til

[41] This part of *Edda* has in editions sometimes been given the name *Bragaræður* (The speeches of Bragi) to underline that they are not a part of Gylfaginning as it comes to us in the RT version. This heading has its origin in Icelandic tradition in the seventeenth century and can neither be said to be especially informative nor descriptive. As stated above there may be more than one explanation to the changes in the textwitnesses and in the U version the first part simply seems to consist of two scenes: in Valhöll and Hlésey.

Geirraðargarða. Þá hafði hann ekki hamarinn Mjöllni eða megingjarðar eða járngreiprnar, ok olli því Loki. Hann fór með Þór. Því at Loka hafði þat hent er hann flaug með valsham Friggjar at skemmta sér at hann at hann flaug í Geirraðargarða ok sá þar höll mikla ok settisk **þar á** ok sá inn í glugginn. Geirröðr sá í móti honum ok mælti at taka skyldi fuglinn ok færa honum. En sendimaðr komsk nauðiliga upp á höllina. [Þat] þótti Loka gott, er **hann komsk nauðuliga til hans** ok ætlaði sér stund **um** at fljúga eigi fyrri en hann hefði farit allt torleiðit. Ok er maðrinn sótti at honum beindi hann fluginn ok spyrndi við fast, ok eru þá fætrnir fastir. Var Loki tekinn ok færðr Geirröði, en er hann sá augu hans, þá grunaði hann at maðr mundi vera ok bað hann svara. En Loki **svaraði engu**. Þá læsti hann Loka í kistu sinni ok svelti hann þrjá mánuðr. En þá er hann tók hann úr kistunni ok beiddi hann orða **ok spurði hverr hann væri**. Hann **sagði**, ok til fjörlausnar sér vann hann Geirröði þess eiða at hann kæmi Þór í Geirraðargarða svá at hann hefði hvárki hamarinn **né járngreiprnar** né megingjarðar. Þórr kom til gistingar til gýgjar er Gríðr heitir. Hon var móðir Viðars ens þögla. Hon segir Þór satt frá Geirröði, at hann er **it mesta tröll** ok hundvíss jötunn ok illr viðreignar. Hon léði gonum megingjarða ok járngreipa er hon átti, ok staf sinn er Gríðarvölr[42] heitir. Þá kom Þórr til ár þeirrar er Vimur heitir, allra á mest. Þá spennti hann sik megingjörðum ok studdisk forstreymis við Gríðarvöl. En Loki helt undir megingjarðar. Ok þá er Þórr kom á miðja ána, óx áin **svá at braut um herðar** Þór. Þá kvað Þórr: Vaxat þú Vimr allz mik þik vaða tíðir jötna garða í. Veistu en<n> ef þú vex at þá vex mér ásmegin jamhátt upp sem himinn. Þá sér Þórr uppi í gljúfrunum at Gjálp[43] dóttir Geirraðar stóð þar tveim megin árinnar ok gerði hon árvöxtinn. Þá tók Þórr upp ór ánni einn stein mikinn ok kastaði ok mælti svá at at ósi skal á **stefna**. Eigi missti hann ok í því bar hann at landi ok fekk tekit **rísrunn** einn ok steig svá úr ánni. Ok því er þat orðtak at reynir er björg Þórs. En er Þórr kom til Geirröðar, þá var þeim vísat fyrst í **g[est]ahús**[44] til herbyrgis, ok var einn stóll at sitja á, ok sat Þórr þar. Þá varð hann þess varr at	Geirröðargarða; þá hafði hann eigi hamarinn Mjöllni eða megingjarðar eða járngreipr, ok olli því Loki. Hann fór með honum; þvíat Loka hafði þat hent þá er hann flaug einu sinni at skemta sér með valsham Friggjar at hann flaug **fyrir forvitni sakar** í Geirröðargarða ok sá þar höll mikla, settisk ok sá inn of glugg. En Geirröðr leit í móti honum ok mælir at taka skyldi fuglinn ok færa honum. En semdimaðr komsk nauðuliga á hallar vegginn, svá var hann hár. Þat þótti Loka gott er **hann sótti erfiðliga til hans** ok ætlaði sér stund at fljúga eigi upp fyrr en hann hafði farit alt torleiðit. En er maðrinn sótti at honum, þá beinir hann fluginn ok spyrnir við fast, ok eru þá fœtrnir fastir. Var Loki tekinn þar **höndum** ok færðr Geirröði jötni. En er hann sá augu hans, þá grunaði hann at maðr mundi vera ok bað hann svara, en Loki **þagði**. Þá læsti Geirröðr Loka í kistu ok svelti hann þar þrjá mánuðr. En þá er Geirröðr tók hann upp ok beiddi hann orða, ok sagði Loki **hverr hann var**, ok til fjörlausnar vann hann Geirröði þess eiða at hann skyldi koma Þór í Geirröðargarða svá at hann hefði hvárki hamarinn né megingjarðar. Þórr kom til gistingar til gýgjar þeirrar er Gríðr er köllut; hon var móðir Viðars hins þögla. Hon sagði Þór satt frá Geirröði at hann var jötunn hundvíss ok illr viðreignar. Hon léði honum megingjarða ok járngreipr er hon átti ok staf sinn er heitir Gríðarvölr. Þá fór Þórr til ár þeirar er Vimur heitir, allra á mest. Þá spenti hann sik megingjörðum ok studdi forstreymis Gríðarvöl, en Loki helt undir megingjarðar. Ok þá er Þórr kom á miðja ána, þá óx svá mjök áin at **uppi braut á öxl honum.** Þá kvað Þórr þetta: Vaxattu nú, Vimur, allz mik þik vaða tíðir jötna garða í; veiztu ef þú vex, at þá vex mér ásmegin jafnhátt upp sem himinn. Þá sér Þórr upp í gljúfrum nokkvorum at Gjálp, dóttir Geirröðar, stóð þar tveim megin árinnar ok gerði hon árvöxtinn. Þá tók Þórr upp ór ánni stein mikinn ok kastaði at henni ok mælti svá: At ósi skal á **stemma!** Eigi misti hann **þar er hann kastaði til**. Ok í því bili bar hann at landi ok fekk tekit **reynirunn** nokkurn ok steig svá úr ánni. Því er þat oðtak haft at reynir er björg Þórs. En er Þórr kom til Geirröðar, þá var þeim félögum vísat fyrst í **geitahús** til herbergis, ok var þar einn stóll til sætis, ok sat þar Þórr. Þá varð hann

[42] Ms.: griþar vollr.
[43] First written *Gneip*, but mended by the scribe to Gjálp.
[44] Here R has *geitahúss*. Cf. Grape's note on *gestahús.*

stóllinn fór undir honum upp **undir rafit**. Þórr stingr þá stafnum Gríðraveli upp **undir rafit** ok lét sígask á stólinn fast. Þá varð skrækr mikill ok fylgði brestr. Þar hafði verit undir stólinum dætr Geirraðar, Gjálp ok Gneip, ok hafði hann brotit hrygginn í þeim báðum.	þess varr at stóllinn fór undir honum upp **at ræfri**. Hann stakk Gríðarveli upp **í raptana** ok lét sígask fast á stólinn; varð þá brestr mikill ok fylgði skrækr mikill. Þar höfðu verit undir stólinum dœtr Geirröðar, Gjálp ok Greip, ok hafði hann brotit hrygginn í báðum.
Þá kvað Þórr: **Einu neytta ek alls megins** **jötna görðum í** **þá er Gjálf[45] ok Gneip** **dætr Geirraðar** **vildu hefja mik til himins.**	
Þá lætr Geriröðr kalla Þór inn í höllina til leika *við sik*. Þar voru eldar stórir eptir endlangri höll. En er Þórr kom gagnvart Geirröði, þá tók Geirröðr meðr töng járnsíu glóandi ok kastar at Þór. En Þórr í móti með járngreipunum ok færði á lopt járnsíuna. En Geirröðr hljóp undir **súlu sína** at forða sér. Þórr **færði á lopt síuna** ok laust í gegnum járnsúluna ok í gegnum Geirröð, gegnum vegginn ok svá í **gegnum jörðina fyrir utan höllina.** Eptir þessi sögu hefir ort Eilífr Guðrúnar son í Þórsdrápu.	Þá lét Geirröðr kalla Þór í höllina til leika. Þar voru eldar stórir eptir endilangri höllinni. en er Þórr kom *í* **höllina** gagnvart Geirröði, þá tok Geirröðr með töng járnsíu glóandi ok kastar at Þór. En Þórr **tók** í móti með járngreipum ok færir á lopt síuna, en Geirröðr hljóp undir **járnsúlu** at forða sér. Þórr kastaði síunni ok laust gögnum súluna ok gögnum Geirröð ok gögnum vegginn ok **svá fyrir utan í jörðina.** Eptir þessi sögu hefir ort Eilífr Guðrúnarson í Þórsdrápu.

Figure 2. The Þórr and Geirröðr episode in U and R, respectively. Bold text denotes significant variants.

Even at first glance the conclusion seems to be clear: These two texts must go back to the same exemplar or to two almost exactly identical exemplars. The differences (marked in bold text) are minimal and can be explained as simple stylistic variation that could have gone in both directions. The only real difference is the second stanza of Þórr in U, and since no other source has that stanza, it could be explained as a special interpolation in the U version, whatever the source might be (oral tradition would maybe seem the most natural).

3.3.2 Loki's punishment

The tales of Loki's punishment give us three explanatory myths: The shape of the salmon, the origin of the net and the reasons for earthquakes. These myths must have been among those that led a vivid life. Using myths to explain nature and especially natural disasters is a well known pedagogic method. During his Icelandic upbringing, the present writer was told of Loki's punishment as an explanation for earthquakes!

[45] Sic!

Grape et al. 1977:32.2–24; 334 words (64%)

Þá er guðin vissu þat, váru þau reið Loka, ok fal hann sik á fjall*i* nokkuru, ok váru fjórar dyrr á húsi hans at hann sæi í allar ættir. En um daga var hann í Fránangsforsi í lax líki. Honum kom í hug at æsirnir mundi setja vél fyrir hann, tók síðan língarnit ok reið **möskva** sem net er gert. Þá sá hann æsi þangat fara. Óðinn hafði sét hann ór Hliðskjálf. Loki hljóp í ána, en kastaði netinu á eldinn.

Kvasir gekk inn fyrstr, er vitrastr var. Þá skilði hann at þetta mundi vél til fiska, ok gerðu eptir fölskanum er netit brann. Fara í forsinn ok helt Þórr öðrum **netshálsi** en allir æsir öðrum. En Loki lagðisk millum steina tveggja, ok drógu þeir netit yfir hann fram. Fara öðru sinni ok binda svá þungt við at eigi mátti undir fara. Þá fór Loki fyrir netinu, ok er s[kamt] var til sjóvar, hleypr hann yfir upp þinulinn ok rennir upp í forsinn.

Nú sjá æsirnir hvar hann fór, skipta nú liðinu í tvá staði. Þórr veðr eptir miðri ánni, ok fara svá út til sjóvar. Ok er Loki sér lífsháska á sæinn at fara, þá hleypr hann yfir netit, en Þórr greip hann höndum. En hann rendi í höndum honum ok nam höndin staðar í sporðinn. Ok er fyrir þá sök laxinn aptrmjór.

Loki var nú tekinn griðalauss ok fœrðr í helli nökkurn, ok tóku hellur þrjár ok settu á enda, lustu á rauf á hverri. Þá váru teknir synir Loka, Váli ok Nari, ok brugðu Vála í vargslíki ok reif hann í sundr Nara. Þá tóku æsir þarma hans ok bundu Loka með yfir þrjá eggsteina. Stóð einn undir herðum, annarr undir lendum, þriði undir knés-bótum, ok urðu böndin at járni. Skaði festi eitrorm yfir andlit honum, en Sigun helt munlaug undir eitrdropana, ok slær út eitrinu, ok þá drýpr í andlit honum er full er munlaugin, ok kippisk hann þá svá hart við at jörð skelfr. Þar liggr hann til ragnarökkrs.

Faulkes 2005:48.16–49.17; 522 words

Þá er guðin váru orðin honum svá reið sem ván var, hljóp hann á braut ok fal sik í fjalli nokkvoru, gerði þar hús ok fjórar dyrr at hann mátti sjá ór húsinu í allar áttir. En opt um daga brá hann sér í lax líki, ok falsk þá þar sem heitir Fránangrsfors. Þá hugsaði hann fyrir sér hverja væl Æsir mundu til finna at taka hann í forsinum. En er hann sat í húsinu, tók hann língarn ok reið á **ræxna**, svá sem net er síðan. En eldr brann fyrir honum. Þá sá hann at Æsir áttu skamt til hans, ok hafði Óðinn sét ór Hliðskjálfinni hvar hann var. Hann hljóp þegar upp ok út í ána ok kastaði netinu fram á eldinn.

En er Æsir koma til hússins þá gekk sá fyrst inn er allra var vitrastr, er Kvasir heitir, ok er hann sá á eldin<um> fölskann er netit hafði brunnit, þá skilði hann at þat mundi væl vera til at taka fiska, ok sagði ásunum. Því næst tóku þeir ok gerðu sér net eptir því sem þeir sá á fölska at Loki hafði gert. Ok er búit var netit, þá fara æsir til árinnar ok kasta neti í forsinn. Helt Þórr **enda öðrum** ok öðrum heldu allir Æsir, ok drógu netit. En Loki fór fyrir ok legsk niðr í milli steina tveggja. Drógu þeir netit yfir hann ok kendu at kykt var fyrir ok fara í annat sinn upp til forsins ok kasta út netinu ok binda við svá þungt at eigi skyli undir mega fara. Ferr þá Loki fyrir netinu, en er hann sér at skamt var til sævar, þá hleypr hann upp yfir þinulinn ok rennir upp í forsinn.

Nú sá Æsirnir hvar hann fór, fara enn upp til forsins ok skipta liðinu í tvá staði, en Þórr veðr þá eptir miðri ánni, ok fara svá til sævar. En er Loki sér tvá kosti—var þat lífsháski at hlaupa á sæinn, en hitt var annarr at hlaupa enn yfir netit—ok þat gerði hann, hljóp sem snarast yfir netþinulinn. Þórr greip eptir honum ok tók um hann, ok rendi hann í hendi honum svá at staðar nam höndin við sporðinn. Ok er fyrir þá sök laxinn aptrmjór.

Nú var Loki tekinn griðalauss ok farit með hann í helli nokkvorn. Þá tóku þeir þrjár hellur ok settu á egg ok lustu rauf á hellunni hverri. Þá váru teknir synir Loka, Váli ok Nari eða Narfi. Brugðu Æsir Vála í vargslíki ok reif hann í sundr Narfa, bróður sinn. Þá tóku Æsir þarma hans ok bundu Loka með yfir þá þrjá steina—einn undir herðum, annarr undir lendum, þriði undir knésfótum—urðu þau bönd at járni. Þá tók Skaði eitrorm ok festi upp yfir hann svá at eitrit skyldi drjúpa ór orminum í andlit honum. En Sigyn kona hans stendr hjá honum ok heldr m*u*ndlaugu undir eitrdropa, en þá er full er munnlaugin, þá gengr hon ok slær út eitrinu, en meðan drýpr eitrit í andlit honum. Þá kippisk hann svá hart við at jörð öll skelfr. Þat kallið þér landskjálpta. Þar liggr hann í böndum til ragnarökrs.

Figure 3. The Loki's punishment episode in U and R, respectively.

In this case text in bold typeface does not help. The verbal likeness of the two texts is so great that there are only *two* content words in the U version that do not occur in the R version (see later upon *content words*): *möskvi* and *netháls*, both of which we could call technical fishermans terms (R has *rœxni* 'knot' instead of *möskvi* 'mesh' and [*h*]*elt Þórr enda öðrum* instead of *helt Þórr öðrum netshálsi*). Both differences are interesting, but could of course be due to corrections by an editor or a scribe in U as well as storytellers' natural variants. The same storyteller would be very likely to make changes like those on two different occasions. The remarkable thing is that the text in U is so much shorter than in R. If it is a shortening of the same exemplar, it is by no means artistically inferior because the text flows nicely, and as a tale, U is not at all bad. However, since some of the other episodes in U are completely unabridged, one would really like to have an explanation for the "shortening".

3.3.3 The mead of poetry

In a textbook on poetics one would expect the myth about the mead of poetry to be a central one. We only have to remind ourselves of the numerous kennings for poetry, where, with Meissner's words:

> Dichtung als Gabe, ausgeübte Kunst und dichterische Schöpfung, Gedicht werden im allgemeinen durch dieselben Kennings ausgedrückt. Die meisten beziehen sich auf die Geschichte von der Entstehung des Skaldenmets […] (1921:427.)

Meissner's survey then shows that the most usual kennings "bezeichnen den Dichtermet als den Trank oder Becher, Gefäß Odins; auch allgemeine Ausdrücke für Flüßigkeit werden verwandt" (p. 429), while the other parts of the myth leave us with much fewer kennings. The dwarfs Fjalarr and Galarr are never mentioned while other dwarfs' names occur several times (in the kenning type "dverga drykkja" or "dverga skip"). Gunnlöð is only to be found in one kenning (the Óðinn-kenning "farmr Gunnlaðar arma"), while her father, Suttungr and his relatives are quite common. Only very few kennings allude to the different shapes of Óðinn in the myth (a serpent, an eagle) and hardly any old kenning seems to mention that the "Anteil der schlechchten Dichter spritzt er hinten hinaus" (loc.cit.).

The myth about the mead reads as follows in the U and R versions:

Grape et al.1977:36. 20–37.21; 392 words (42,2 %)	**Faulkes 1998:3.10–5.8; 929 words**
Ægir spyrr: Hvaðan af kom skáldskaprinn? Bragi svarar: Goðin höfðu ósætt við Vani ok gerðu friðstefnu ok gengu til kers eins ok spýttu í hráka sínum ok sköpuðu úr mann, er heitir	Ok enn mælir Ægir: Hvaðan af hefir hafizk sú íþrótt, er þér kallit skáldskap? Bragi svarar: Þat váru upphöf til þess at guðin höfðu ósætt við þat fólk er Vanir heita, en þeir lögðu með sér friðstefnu ok settu grið á þá lund at þeir gengu hvárirtveggju til eins kers ok spýttu í hráka sínum. **En að skilnaði þá tóku goðin ok vildu eigi láta týnask þat griðamark** ok sköpuðu þar úr mann. Sá heitir Kvasir. Hann er svá vitr

Kvasir. Hann leysti úr öllum hlutum, ok er hann kom til dverganna **Falas ok Galas**, kölluðu þeir hann á einmæli ok drápu hann. Létu renna blóð hans í tvö ker ok einn ketil, er Óðrerir heitir, en kerin heita Són ok Boðn. Þeir blönduðu við hunangi við blóðið ok heitir þat þá mjöðr, ok sá er af drekkr verðr skáld ok frœðamaðr. Dvergarnir sögðu at **þeir** hefði **tapazk í mannviti**.	at engi spyrr hann þeira hluta er eigi kann hann órlausn. **Hann fór víða um heim at kenna mönnum frœði**, ok þá er hann kom at heimboði til dverga nokkvorra, **Fjalars ok Galars**, þá kölluðu þeir hann með sér á einmæli ok drápu hann, létu renna blóð hans í tvau ker ok einn ketil, ok heitir sá Óðreyrir, en kerin heita Són ok Boðn. Þeir blendu hunangi við blóðit, ok varð þar af mjöðr sá er hverr er af drekkr, verðr skáld eða frœðamaðr. Dvergarnir sögðu Ásum at Kvasir hefði **kafnat í manviti fyrir því at engi var þar svá fróðr at spyrja kynni hann fróðleiks**.
Dvergarnir buðu til sín jötni þeim er Gillingr hét, ok buðu honum á sjó at róa ok **hvelfðu** skipi undir honum.	Þá buðu þessir dvergar til sín jötni þeim er Gillingr heitir ok konu hans. Þá buðu dvergarnir Gillingi at róa á sæ með sér. En er <þeir> fóru fyrir land fram, röru dvergarnir á boða, ok **hvelfði** skipinu. **Gillingr var ósyndr ok týndisk hann, en dvergarnir réttu skip sitt ok reru til lands. Þeir sögðu konu hans þenna atburð, en hon kunni illa ok grét hátt. Þá spurði Fjalarr hana ef henni myndi hugléttara ef hon sæi út á sæinn þar sem hann hafði týnzk, en hon vildi þat. Þá mælti hann við Galar, bróður sinn, at hann skal fara upp yfir dyrnar er hon gengi út ok láta kvernstein falla í höfut henni ok talði sér leiðask óp hennar, ok svá gerði hann.**
Þat spurði Suttungr son hans, ok flytr dvergana í flæðisker. Þeir bjóða mjöðinn í föðurbœtr. Suttungr hirðir hann í Hnitbjörgum ok til gæzlu Gunnlöðu dóttur sína.	Þá er þetta spurði Suttungr, bróðurson Gillings, ferr hann til ok tók dvergana ok flytr á sæ út ok setr þá í flœðarsker. Þeir biðja Suttung sér lífsgriða ok bjóða honum til sættar í föðurgjöld mjöðinn **dýra**, ok þat verðr at sætt með þeim. Flytr Suttungr mjöðinn heim ok hirðir þar sem heita Hnitbjörg, setr þar til gæzlu dóttur sína Gunnlöðu.
Því heitir skáldskaprinn Kvasis blóð eða Sónar eða farkostr dverganna, fyrir því at sá mjöðr flutti þeim fjörlausn úr skerinu, eða Suttungamjöðr eða Hnitbjargalögr.	Af þessu köllum vær skáldskap Kvasis blóð eða dverga drekku eða fylli eða nakkvarskonar lög Óðreris eða Boðnar ok Sónar eða farskost dverga, fyrir því at sá mjöðr f[lut]ti þeim fjörlausn úr skerinu, eða Suttunga mjöð eða Hnitbjarga lögr.
Ægirr spyrr: Hversu **komsk Óðinn** at miðinum?	Þá mælir Ægir: **Myrkt þykki mér þat mælt at kalla skáldskap með þessum heitum**, en hvernig **komu þeir Æsir** að Suttungamiði.
Bragi segir: Hann fór þar sem voru níu þrælar ok slógu hey. Hann bauð at brýna ljá þeirra. Hann tók hein úr pússi sínum ok **gáfu þeir við höfuð sín**. Síðan brá hverr ljánum á háls öðrum.	Bragi svarar: Sjá saga er til þess at Óðinn fór heiman ok kom þar er þrælar níu slógu hey. Hann spyrr ef þeir vili at hann bryni ljá þeira. **Þeir játa því; þá tekr hann hein af belti sér ok brýndi, en þeim þótti bíta ljáirnir myklu betr ok föluðu heinina. En hann mat svá at sá er kaupa vildi skyldi gefa við hóf, en allir kváðuzk vilja ok báðu hann sér selja, en hann kastaði heininni í lopt upp. En er allir vildu henda, þá skiptusk þeir svá við** at hverr brá ljánum á háls öðrum.
Þá kom Óðinn til Bauga ok nefndisk Bölverkr. Baugi lézk eigi hafa vel haldit húskörlum sínum. Hann bauð at taka upp einn verk þeirra níu ok hafa til einn drykk af Suttungamiði.	Óðinn sótti til náttstaðar **til jötuns þess er Baugi hét, bróðir Suttungs**. Baugi kallaði ilt fjárhald sitt ok sagði at þrælar hans níu höfðu drepizk, en taldisk eigi vita sér ván verkmanna. En Óðinn nefndisk fyrir honum Bölverkr. Hann bauð at taka upp níu manna verk fyrir Bauga, en mælti sér til kaups einn drykk af Suttunga miði. Baugi **kvazk enskis ráð** eiga af miðinum, sagði at Suttungr vildi einn hafa, en **fara kvezk hann mundu með Bölverki ok freista ef þeir fengi mjöðinn**.
Hann **lézk ráð eiga á miðinum**, en Suttungr vill einn hafa.	
Bölverkr vann um sumarit níu manna verk, en at vetri vill hann kaupit. Fara þá til Suttungs ok beiða hann mjaðarins. Hann	Bölverkr vann um sumarit níu mannsverk fyrir Bauga, en at vetri beiddisk hann Bauga leigu sinnar. Þá fara þeir báðir <til Suttungs>. **Baugi segir Suttungi bróður sínum kaup þeira Bölverks. En Suttungr synjar þverlega hvers dropa af miðinum. Þá mælti**

synjar. Þeir fóru ok tekr **Bölverkr nafarinn Roða ok borar Hnitbjörg meðr,** ok þá brásk hann í orms líki ok skreið nafarsraufina ok hvíldi hjá Gunnlöðu þrjár nætr ok **drakk þrjá drykki af miðinum, ok var hann þá uppi allr, sitt <sinni> úr hverju kerinu.** Hann brásk þá í arnar ham ok flaug, en Suttungr í annan arnar ham ok flaug eptir honum. Æsir settu þá út í garðinn ker sín. Óðinn spýtti miðinum í kerin, en sumum repti hann aptr, er honum varð nær farit, ok hafa þat **skáldfífl ok heitir arnarleir. En Suttungamjöðr þeir er yrkja kunna**. Því heitir skáldskaprinn fengr Óðins ok fundr ok drykkr ok gjöf.	**Bölverkr til Bauga at þeir skyldu freista véla nokkvorra ef þeir megi ná miðinum, en Baugi lætr þat vel vera. Þá dregr Bölverkr fram nafar þann er Rati heitir, ok mælir at Baugi skal bora bjargit ef nafarrinn bítr. Hann gerir svá. Þá segir Baugi at gögnum er borat bjargit, en Bölverkr blæs í nafars raufina, ok hrjóta spœnirnir upp í móti honum. Þá fann hann at Baugi vildi svíkja hann ok bað bora gögnum bjargit. Baugi boraði enn. en er Bölverk<r> blés annat sinn, þá fuku inn spænirnir.** Þá brásk Bölverkr í orms líki ok skreið í nafars raufina, **en Baugi stakk eptir honum nafrinum ok misti hans.** Fór Bölverkr þar til sem Gunnlöð var ok lá hjá henni þrjár nætr, ok þá lofaði hon honum at drekka af miðinum þrjá drykki**. Í inum fyrsta drykk drakk hann al<t> ór Óðreri, en í öðrum ór Boðn, í inu<m> þriðja ór Són ok hafði hann þá allan mjöðinn.** Þá brásk hann í arnarham ok flaug sem ákafask. En er Suttungr (TU; RW: Þjazi) sá flug arnarins, tók hann sér arnarham ok flaug eptir honum. En er Æsir sá hvar Óðinn flaug, þá settu þeir úr í garðinn ker sín, er er Óðinn kom inn of Ásgarð, þá spýtti hann upp miðinum í kerin, en honum var þá svá nær komit at Suttungr myndi ná honum at hann sendi aptr suman mjöðinn, ok var þess ekki gætt. Hafði þat hverr er vildi**, ok köllum vér þat skáldfífla hlut. En Suttunga mjöð gaf Óðinn Ásunum ok þeim mönnum er yrkja kunnu**. Því köllum v[ér] skáldskapinn feng Óðins ok fund ok drykk hans ok gjöf hans ok drykk Ásanna.

Figure 4. The Mead of poetry episode in U and R, respectively. Bold text denotes significant variants.

The difference between these two versions is actually rather great. Not only is the U version much shorter (some 42% of the longer one), but it is different in several important ways. If we look at the content words (cf. section 4) in both versions, the R version offers around 250 words, the U only 137. But 12 of those 137 words are only to be found in U, not in R. Those are: *arnarleir, Falas, Galas, halda, hvíla, höfuð, látaz, leysa, púss, repja* (v.), *Roði, tapazk.* Some of these of course are of little interest, but some are really strange.

Firstly the names *Fjalas*, *Galas* and *Roði* are surprising. None of them are likely to be misreadings and they are not presented as etymologically related explanations either. Both Fjalas and Galas would really be *lectio difficilior* while Fjalarr and Galarr sound quite dwarfish! *Roði* 'the red one' is not at all a silly name for a drill but all the other manuscripts have *Rati*. Interestingly enough Hávamál (stanza 106) reads:

> Rata munn
> létomk rúms um fá
> ok um grjót gnaga (Jón Helgason 1962:30.)

This is usually thought to be a description of the same episode, and in stanza 105 and again in stanza 140 it deals with "drykk ins dýra mjaðar", which certainly does remind us of R: *mjöðinn dýra*, which does not occur in U. This of course does not prove anything, but it may be an indication of some relationship between the R-text and Hávamál, whereas U does not show any likeness.

The word *höfuð* occurs in strange context. When Baugi's slaves in R ask Bölverkr to sell them the whetstone, he says that they shall pay 'reasonably' (*gefa hóf við*). In reality

they pay with their lives. And that is exactly what the U-text says without any hesitation: *gáfu þeir við höfuð sín*! Those who believe in written intertextuality in this case of course connect *hóf* with *höfuð* (cf. Finnur Jónsson 1931), and as a misreading it is quite possible. On the other hand it does not make the U-text very convincing. Telling the slaves that they should pay with their heads can hardly be a good deal from their point of view!

The argument that the U text is a shortening of the R text becomes quite unconvincing in light of the content words that appear in U but not in R. When a text is abbreviated what one expects is not new words or that common words are replaced with less common ones (eg. *af belti sér > ór pússi sínum*) and least of all to introduce a hapax word like *arnarleir*, a word that does not seem appear in any Icelandic prose text until centuries later.[46] Furthermore the word is not used in poetry either until the 14th century (cf. Heimir Pálsson 2011.) In the following chapter we will take a closer look at the vocabulary.

4 Into the vocabulary

Several serious attempts have been made within different languages to develop methods that make it possible, with help of linguistic analysis and statistics, to find an author of unknown texts or to attribute certain texts to a known author. The presumptions are aptly described by Ellegård:

> The main assumption, or working hypothesis, underlying any attempt to determine the authorship of a text from its style or other linguistic characteristics, is that some features, or combinations of features, in a particular writer's style or language, remain reasonably constant, or change in a predictable manner, throughout his production. Moreover we asssume that some at least of these features are sufficiently rare to set the author apart from all or most of his contemporaries. (1962:8.)

Ellegård was dealing in his research with the so-called *Junius Letters* and his task was to find out wheather they could be written by one or more known authors in Great Britain. It was an investigation of the vocabulary and Ellegårds terms *plus words* and *minus words* show up in the discussions later.[47] This can be compared with Ture Johannisson's thorough study (1973) of anonymous letters often ascribed to a certain Swedish Bishop. The High Court found Johannisson's argument convincing: the bishop was indeed the author.

Within the field of Nordic philology four further studies should be mentioned. In 1927, Per Wieselgren wrote his thesis *Författarskapet till Eigla*, where he partly used syntactic features and their frequencies to "prove" that Snorri Sturluson was not the author of *Egils saga.* In 1962 Peter Hallberg published his study *Snorri Sturluson och Egils saga Skallagrímssonar. Ett försök till språklig författarbestämning.* While Wieselgren had made a stylistic analysis, Hallberg built his theory solely upon the vocabulary (see p. 15.) He compared *Egils saga* with four Sagas of Icelanders and with the total text of *Heimskringla.* In his words:

[46] In this connection cf. the discussion in chapter 4.
[47] For Ellegårds definition, see 1962:12.

> Min egen metod går ut på att fastställa, hur manga ord i hela mitt material som är gemensamma och unika för å ena sidan Snorri [the text of Heimskringla] och å den andra någon av de fem konsulterade islänningesagorna [including of course Egils saga]. Antalet sådana ord – jag kallar dem parord – tolkas som ett mått på affiniteten mellan Snorri och sagan i fråga. (1962:16.)[48]

In 1963 Hallberg published his study on Ólafr Þórðarson hvítaskáld and the authorhip of *Knýtlinga saga* and *Laxdæla saga* and in 1968 the comprehensive study *Stilsignalement och författarskap i norrön sagalitteratur*. Rolf Heller published his *Aufbau und Stil der Laxdæla Saga* in 1960 and in more works drew the attention to Sturla Þórðarson as itspossible author, a theory which then was fully presented in Marina Mundt's thesis *Sturla Þórðarson und die Laxdæla Saga* 1969. Mundt, like Hallberg, concentrated on the vocabulary, but now treating first and foremost what she called plus and minus words, then going over to semantic comparison of the vocabulary.

Sture Allén in 1971 wrote an important article "Om textattribution. Kring en avhandling av Marina Mundt", showing the weaknesses of the methods used hitherto.

In all cases the task has been to find an author or at least to attribute the text to a (given) person.[49] In the case of *Edda*, this is different. Both the U version and the RTW version are supposed to be the work of the same person, Snorri Sturluson, so we do not have to search for the author. The question is about the relationship between the versions. In the research trying to connect *Egils saga* to Snorri or disconnect it from him, only Wieselgren did make use of *Edda.* Hallberg did not even mention the possibility of finding parallells between *Egils saga* and *Edda.* I believe this is wise, for as Allén points out when describing what he calls *attributionsfaktorer*, i.e. the factors that can be used to connect two texts to the same person (source), *genre* is one of the most important factors. (Allén 1971:83, Figur 1.) Thus it would not be likely to give positive results to compare a *saga* with a *textbook.* As a matter of fact, *Edda* was useful for Wieselgren proving that Snorri could not have written *Egla*. Maybe because it was a question of different genres.

When comparing the texts of the *Egils saga* manuscripts, the so called θ-*fragment* (in AM 162 A, fol.) and *Möðruvallabók* (AM 132 fol.) Sigurður Nordal wrote:

> Allur þessi samanburður sýnir ljóslega, hvernig textinn er styttur í M án þess að neinu atriði sé sleppt, sem máli skiptir, en orðalag θ bersýnilega fornlegra og upprunalegra. Ekkert verður fullyrt um, hvort texti M á rót sína að relkja til θ. En heita má, að hvergi hafi M orð fram yfir. Eina dæmið, sem vert er að geta, er *svá beint* (289,19–20), sem vantar í θ, en vel mætti vera úr frumtextanum. (1933:lxxxv.)[50]

---

[48] "My own method was to establish how many words in my entire material that are in common and unique to, on the one hand Snorri and on the other hand any of the five Icelandic sagas consulted. The number of such words – I call them pair words – are interpreted as a measure of the affinity between Snorri and the saga in question." "Textual attribution sounds more cautious than determination of authorship."

[49] With Sture Allén's careful formulation: "Textattribution låter litet försiktigare än författarbestämning." (1971:82).

[50] "This whole comparison shows clearly how the text is shortened in M without leaving out any relevant item, while the wordings obviously are older and more original in the θ. Nothing can be said about whether

It is obvious that Nordal found this to be of importance: The shorter text does not add anything. In a piece of text of more than 1380 words he found one phrase worth mentioning.

In order to come closer to the semantically important vocabulary in the two textual versions of *Edda*, a simple test was made. First the digitalized text was lemmatized, thus giving only one form and one appearance of each lexeme. Then the *form words* (prepositions, conjunctions, most of the pronouns and so on) were removed. The rest of the vocabulary, the *content words*, was alphabetized and the two texts, U and R, were compared content word by content word. As already pointed out above, the result seems to be informative.

In the sections where the texts are of almost identical length (table 2), the difference in content words is very small or even none at all despite stylistic variations. In the sections where the content words of the U make up around 60–70% (table 3) of the R version, there is a little more variation, but in a case like Loki's punishment (described above) the difference is of no importance.

When it comes to the shortest versions, the content words in the U version are suddenly proportionally much more numerous than in the other cases, and the difference seems to be important (cf. above, the Mead of the potry episode). In the following I will briefly go through the short epic pieces in *Edda* and comment upon what seems to be of relevance.

4.1 The same exemplar?

The sections listed in Table 2 can be commented upon with a few words. In all cases the U and R versions are so close that it may well be a question of copies of the same exemplar or at least of closely related exemplars. Two of the sections have been moved in U from Skáldskaparmál to the last part of Gylfaginning. The other sections stand in the same or almost the same context in both versions.

4.1.1 From Bifröst to Forseti (Section 2, 91.5%)

Section 2 (From Bifröst to Forseti) contains the description of Ásgarðr and its surroundings and the life there. There is hardly any difference between the content words in U and R, respectively, apart from the short myth about the wind which however is included later in U, in the same wording (1977:22.8.) Stylistic variation is in no way striking except that it seems obvious that the citations from Völuspá and the list ("þula"?) of dwarf-names must have had different sources[51] and the differences in quotations from other Eddic poems are too great to be explained as misreadings or misunderstanding. In this section we also find the above mentioned myth on Njörðr and Skaði.

Conclusion: The prose in this section of U and R could possibly be two different copies of the same exemplar, but we have to refer to different sources for the poetic quotations.

---

the text in M is a shortening of the θ. But it can be stated that M hardly in any instance has an extra word. The only example worth mentioning is *svá beint* (289,19–20), lacking in θ, but it could very well have been in the originl text."

[51] Henrik Williams' discussion of the dwarf names (forthcoming) makes this quite certain. There are different sources, either oral or written.

4.1.2 Loki and his family (Section 3, 99.5%)

In this section, the wording is almost exactly the same in both versions. If they are not copies of the same exemplar it must have been a question of absolutely concordant exemplars!

Interestingly enough, a part of this section (the punishment of Loki) is to be found in the mss. AM 748 b 4to (Finnur Jónsson's A) and AM 757 4to (his B). This text has been claimed to be a shortening of the RT version, comparable to the shortenings in U,[52] and thus they call for a closer look (see Fig. 5.)

The texts in question are as follows:

A **AM 748 I b 4to; 1852:431–432**	B **AM 757 4to; 1852:515**
Frá Fenris úlfi Ámsvartnir heitir vatn, en Lyngvi hólmr í vatninu, en Síglitnir hóll í hólminum. En Þviti heitir hæll er stendr í hólinum, en Gnjöll heitir rauf er boruð er á hælinum, en Hræða heitir festr er Fenrisúlfr er bundinn með ok er henni drepit í gegnum raufina, en Gelgja spýta, er fyrir er stungit. Fjöturrinn heitir Gleifnir er honum heldr. Gervir voru tveir fjötrar til hans fyrst, þeir Drómi ok Læðingr ok hélt hvárgi. Þá var Gleifnir síðan gerr ór sex <h>lutum: Ór kattardyn ok ór konu skeggi, ór fisks anda ok ór fugla mjólk, ór bergs rótum ok bjarnar sinum; ór því var hann Gleifnir gerr. Því er þat ekki eptir síðan at þat var þá allt til haft. Ár tvær falla ór munni honum. Heitir önnur Ván en önnur Víl ok er því rétt at kalla vötn hráka hans. En Gjölnar heita granar hans.	[No heading] Ámsvartnir heitir vatn, en Lyngvi hólmi í vatninu, en Síglitnir hvoll í hólminum, en Þótti heitir hæll er stendr í hvolinum, en Ginul heitir rauf er boruð er á hælinum, en Hræða heitir festr er Fenrisúlfr er bundinn með, ok er henni drepit í gegnum raufina, en Gelgja heitir spýta sú sem fyrir er stungin. Fjötrinn heitir Gle[ip]nir sá sem honum heldr. Tveir fjötrar voru gervir til hans, þeir Drómi ok Læðingr ok hélt hvárgi. Þá var gerr Gleipnir ór sex hlutum: Ór kattar dyn ok ór konu skeggi, ór fisks anda ok ór fugla mjólk, ór bjargs rótum ok ór bjarnar sinum; ór því var hann Gleipnir gerr. Því er þat ekki eftir síðan at þat var þar allt til haft. Ár tvær falla ór munni honum. Heitir önnur Víl en önnur Ván, ok er þat rétt at kalla vötn hráka hans, en Gjölnar heita granar hans.

Figure 5. The Loki's punishment in A and B, respectively. The extracts from A and B are normalized by me.

Obviously these two texts must go back to the same exemplar. It is interesting to see the ingredients of Gleipnir in both cases presented in a didactic strophe, with the important information about the birds' milk instead of *spit*. But since these versions are supposed to be contractions from the text as we have it in R, it is of interest to compare A and B with R and U (Fig. 6):

[52] Daniel Sävborg 2009:838–839.

Grape et al. 1977:17–18

Úlfinn fœddu æsirnir heima ok hafði Týr einn til djörfung at gefa honum mat. En guðin sá hve mikit hann óx hvern dag, ok allar spár sögðu at hann mundi vera lagðr til skaða þeim. Þá fengu æsirnir þat ráð at þeir gerðu fjötur allsterkan er þeir kölluðu Læðing, ok báru hann til úlfsins ok báðu hann reyna afl sitt viðr fjöturinn. En úlfi þótti sér þat ekki ofrefli ok lét þá fara með sem þeir vildu. En it fyrsta sinn er hann spyrndi við, brot[na]ði fjöturrinn, ok leystisk hann svá ór Læðingi.

Því næst gerðu æsirnir annan fjötur hálfu sterkara er þeir kölluðu Dróma, ok báðu úlfinn reyna enn þenna fjötur ok tölðu hann verða mundu ágætan af afli, ef slík stórsmíði mætti eigi halda honum. En úlfrinn hugsaði at þess[i] fjöturr var sterkr mjök, ok þat með at honum hafði vaxit afl síðan er hann braut Læðing. Kom þat í hug at hann mundi verða at leggja sik í hættu ef hann skal frægr verða, ok lætr leggja á sik fjöturinn. Ok er æsirnir tölðusk búnir, þá hris[t]i úlfrinn sik ok laust fjötrinum á jörðina ok knúðisk at fast, spyrnir at fast ok braut fjöturinn, svá at fjarri kom niðr hlutirnir. Svá drap hann sik ór Dróma. Þat er síðan orðtak at leys[i] ór Læðingi eða drepi ór Dróma, þá er einnhverr hlutr er ákafliga sóttr.

Eptir þat óttuðusk æsirnar at þeir mundi eigi fá bundit hann. Þá sendi Alföðr þann [m]ann, er Skírnir hét, í Svartálfaheim til dverga nökkurra ok lét gera fjötur þann er Gleip[nir] heitir. Hann var gjörr af sex hlutum: af dyn kattarins ok af skeggi konunnar, af rótum bjargsins ok sinum bjarnarins, af anda fisksins ok af hráka fuglsins. En þó at þú vitir eigi áðr þessi tíðindi, þá máttu nú finna hér skjótt sönn dæmi at eigi er logit: at þér munuð sét hafa at konan hefir eigi s[k]egg ok engi dynr verðr af hlaupi kattarins ok eigi eru rœtr undir bjargi. Ok þat veit trúa mín at jafnsatt er þat allt er ek hefi sagt þér, þótt þeir sé sumir hlutir er þú mátt eigi reyna.

Þá mælti Gangleri: Þetta má ek at vísu s[já] er nú segir þú frá og þú hefir nú til dœma tekit. En hvernig varð fjöturrinn smíðaðr?

Hár segir: Þat kann ek þér vel segja. Fjöturr var sléttr ok blautr sem si<l>kirœma en svá traustr ok sterkr sem nú máttu heyra.

Faulkes 2005:27–29

Úlfinn fœddu Æsir heima ok hafði Týr einn djarfleik til at ganga at úlfnum ok gefa honum mat. En er guðin sá hversu mikit hann óx hvern dag, ok allar spár sögðu at hann mundi vera lagðr til skaða þeim, þá fengu Æsir þat ráð at þeir gerðu fjötur allsterkan er þeir kölluðu Leyðing, ok báru hann til úlfsins ok báðu hann reyna afl sitt við fjöturinn. En úlfinum þótti sér þat ekki ofrefli ok lét þá fara með sem þeir vildu. It fyrsta sinn er úlfrinn spyrndi við, brotnaði sá fjöturr. Svá leystisk hann ór Leyðingi.

Því næst gerðu Æsirnir annan fjötur hálfu sterkara er þeir kölluðu Dróma, ok báðu enn úlfinn reyna þann fjötur ok tölðu hann verða mundu ágætan mjök at afli, ef slík stórsmíði mætti eigi halda honum. En úlfrinn hugsaði at þessi fjöturr var sterkr mjök, ok þat með at honum hafði afl vaxit síðan er hann braut Leyðing. Kom þat í hug at hann mundi verða at leggja sik í hættu ef hann skyldi frægr verða, ok lét leggja á sik fjöturinn. Ok er æsir tölðusk búnir, þá hristi úlfrinn sik ok laust fjötrinum á jörðina <ok knúðisk fast at, spyrndi við, braut fjöturinn> svá at fjarri flugu brotin. Svá drap hann sik ór Dróma. Þat er síðan haft fyrir orðtak at leysi ór Leyðingi eða drepi ór Dróma, þá er einnhverr hlutr er ákafliga sóttr.

Eptir þat óttuðusk Æsirnir at þeir mundu eigi fá bundit úlfinn. Þá sendi Allföðr þann er Skírnir er nefndr, sendimaðr Freys, ofan í Svartálfaheim til dverga nokkurra ok lét gera fjötur þann er Gleipnir heitir. Hann var gjörr af sex hlutum: af dyn kattarins ok af skeggi konunnar ok af rótum bjargsins ok af sinum bjarnarins ok af anda fisk<s>ins ok af fogls hráka. Ok þóttu vitir eigi áðr þessi tíðindi, þá máttu nú finna skjótt hér sönn dœmi at eigi er logit at þér: sét muntþu <hafa> at konan hefir ekki skegg ok engi dynr verðr af hlaupi kattarins ok eigi eru rœtr undir bjarginu. Ok þat veit trúa mín at jafnsatt er þat allt er ek hefi sagt þér, þótt þeir sé sumir hlutir er þú mátt eigi reyna.

Þá mælti Gangleri: Þetta má ek at vísu skilja at satt er. Þessa hluti má ek sjá er þú hefir nú til dœma tekit. En hvernig varð fjöturrinn smíðaðr?

Hár segir: Þat kann ek þér vel segja. Fjöturrinn varð sléttr ok blautr sem silkirœma en svá traustr ok sterkr sem nú skaltu heyra.

Þá er fjöturrinn var fœrðr ásum, þá þökkuðu þeir vel sendimanninum sitt eyrindi. Þá fóru æsirnir út í vatn þat er Ámsvarnir heitir, í hólm þann er Lyngvi er kallaðr, ok kölluðu með sér úlfinn, sýndu honum silkibandit ok báðu hann slíta. Kváðu vera mundu nökkuru traustara en líkindi þóttu á vera fyrir digrleiks sakir, ok seldi hverr öðrum ok treysti með handaflinu, ok slitnaði eigi. En þó kváðu þeir úlfinn mundu slíta. Þá svarar úlfrinn: Svá lízk mér á þenna dregil sem enga frægð mega ek af hljóta þó at ek slíta í su[nd]r svá mjótt band. En ef þat er gert með list eða vél, þótt band sýnisk lítit, þá kemr eigi band á m[í]na fœtr. Þá svöruðu æsir at hann mundi skjótt í sundr slíta svá mjótt silkiband, [e]r hann hafði skjótt í sundr brotit sterka járnfjötra, en ef þú fær eigi skjótt í sundr brotit, þá muntu ekki hrætt fá guðin. Skulu vér þá leysa þik. Úlfrinn svarar: Ef þér bindið mik svá at ek fæ eigi leyst mik, skil ek at ek mu[n] seint taka af yðr lausn. Em ek ófúss at láta þat band á mína leggi. En heldr en þér frýið mér hugar, þá rétt[i] einnhverr yðar hönd sína í munn mér at veði at þetta sé falslaust gert. En hverr ásanna sá til annars ok þóttu nú vera tvau vendræði, ok vildi engi sína h[ön]d fram selja fyrri en Týr lét fram ina hœgri hönd sína ok le[ggr í] munn úlfinum. Þá tóku þeir festina ór fjötrinum, er Gelgja heitir, ok drápu henni í gegnum hellu mikla, sú heitir Gjöll, ok festu helluna langt í jörð niðr. Þá tóku þeir enn mikinn stein, er Þviti heitir, ok skutu honum enn lengra niðr, ok höfðu hann fyrir festarhæl. Þá er æsirnir sá at úlfrinn var bundinn með fullu [ok] er hann spyrndi við þá harðnaði bandit, ok því harðara er hann brauzk um, því skarpara var bandit, þá hlógu allir nema Týr. Hann lét hönd sína. Úlfrinn gapði ákafliga ok vildi bíta þá, ok feksk um mjök. Þeir skutu í munn honum sverði nökkuru. Nema hjöltin við neðra kjöptinn, en inn efra góminn blóðrefillinn. Þat er gómsparri hans. Hann grenjar illiliga ok slefa renn ór munni hans, þat er á sú er Ván heitir. Þar liggr hann til ragnarökkrs.	Þá er fjöturrinn var fœrðr Ásunum, þökkuðu þeir vel sendimanni sitt eyrindi. Þá fóru Æsirnir út í vatn þat er Ámsvartnir heitir, í hólm þann er Lyngvi er kallaðr, ok kölluðu með sér úlfinn, sýndu honum silkibandit ok báðu hann slíta ok kváðu vera nokkvoru traustara en líkindi þœtti á fyrir digrleiks sakar, ok seldi hverr öðrum ok treysti með handaafli, ok slitnaði eigi. En þó kváðu þeir úlfinn slíta mundu. Þá svarar úlfrinn: Svá lízk mér á þenna dregil sem önga frægð munak af hljóta þótt ek slíta í sundr svá mjótt band. En ef þat er gört með list ok væl, þótt þat sýnisk lítit, þá kemr þat band eigi á mína fœtr. Þá sögðu Æsirnir at hann mundi skjótt sundr slíta mjótt silkiband, er hann hafði fyrr brotit stóra járnfjötra, en ef þú fær eigi þetta band slitit, þá muntu ekki hræða mega goðin, enda skulum vér þá ley[sa] þik. Úlfrinn segir: Ef þér bindið mik svá at ek fæk eigi leyst mig, þá skollit þér svá at mér mun seint verða at taka af yðr hjálp. Ófúss em ek at láta þetta band á mik leggja. En heldr en þér frýið mér hugar, þá leggi einnhverr hönd sína í munn mér at veði at þetta sé falslaust gert. En hverr Ásanna sá til annars ok þótti nú vera tvau vandræði, ok vildi engi sína hönd fram selja fyrr en Týr lét fram hönd sína hœgri ok leggr í munn úlfinum. En er úlfrinn spyrnir, þá harðnaði bandit, ok því harðara er hann brauzk um, því skarpara var bandit. Þá hlógu allir nema Týr. Hann lét hönd sína. Þá er Æsirnir sá at úlfrinn var bundinn at fullu, þá tóku þeir festina er ór var fjötrinum, er Gelgja heitir, ok drógu hana gögnum hellu mikla, sú heitir Gjöll, ok festu helluna langt í jörð niðr. Þá tóku þeir mikinn stein ok skutu enn lengra í jörðina, sá heitir Þviti, ok höfðu þann stein fyrir festarhælinn. Úlfrinn gapði ákafliga ok feksk um mjök ok vildi bíta þá. Þeir skutu í munn honum sverði nokkvoru. Nema hjöltin við neðra gómi, en efra gómi blóðrefill. Þat er gómsparri hans. Hann grenjar illiliga ok slefa renn ór munni hans, þat er á sú er Ván heitir. Þar liggr hann til ragnarökrs.

Figure 6. The fettering of the Fenrisúlfr episode in U and R, respectively.

To get the AB version the editor obviously has to choose information from different paragraphs in the longer text, represented by U and R. If this is indeed the case, we would expect the informative vocabulary, such as names, to be comparable. But apart from the three fetters: *Læðingr, Drómi* and *Gleipnir*, which bear the same names in all four texts (if we take the variants *Læðingr*/*Leyðingr* and *Gleipnir*/*Gleifnir* to be simply normal scribal variants), there are only two other names that have same form and the same

meaning in all the texts, namely the lake *Ámsvartnir* and the island *Lyngvi*. For the others this is the situation:

Síglitnir (*hóll*/*hváll*) 'hill'	A and B (not found in U och R)
Gnjöll = *rauf* 'hole'	A
Ginul = *rauf* 'hole'	B
Gjöll = *hella* 'slab of stone'	R and U
Hræða = *festr* 'fetter'	A and B (not in R and U)
Gelgja = *spýta* 'a piece of wood'	A and B
Gelgja = *festr* 'fetter'	R and U
Ván = *á* 'river'	U and R (only one river)
Víl & *Ván* = *ár*	A and B
Gjölnar = *granar* 'lips'	A and B (no name in R and U)
Þviti = *festarhæll* 'stone'	R and U
Þviti = *hæll* 'a stick in the hill'	A
Þótti = *hæll* 'a stick in the hill'	B

Besides it may be worth noting that the kenning explanation: *því er rétt at kalla vötn hráka hans* ('that is why it is correct to call lakes his spit'), only shows up in A and B.

The conclusion is: While the R and U versions seem to go back to the same exemplar or two virtually identical exemplars, and the same can be said respectively about A and B in their turn, it is very difficult to believe that the AB version is based on the RU versions. The source in that case must be some other, possibly different oral tales, some thula or a list of names?

4.1.3 The goddesses (Section 4, 89%)

This section contains the presentation of ásynjur and valkyrjur, mostly by listing their names. There are very few content words in U of any importance that do not occur in R. The R text is a bit longer but the differences are so small that nothing can be concluded. From the textbook point of view it is of interest that U lacks all the numberings of the goddesses, who in R are listed in order: "Frigg er œzt… Önnur er Sága… Þriðja er Eir…" and so on to fourteen. A parallel is to be found in Skáldskaparmál, when the sons of Hálfdan gamli are named (Grape et al. 1977:73 cf. Faulkes 1998:101ff.) In a textbook adding such mnemonic aids would be a more likely choice than removing them.

Conclusion: This short section could be copied from the same exemplar in U as in R.

4.1.4 Þórr and Hrungnir (Section 15, 95.8%)

Among poets who needed a kenning for a shield, the tale about Þórr and Hrungnir was obviously popular. The sole of Hrungnir's foot is an image that comes up again and again in the old skaldic poetry. That, of course, could be a natural reason to place the myth not among the Gylfaginning myths but as an explanatory myth in Skáldskaparmál, as is done in the R version. But the editor of U chose to move it to the first part, clumsily leaving the introductory words: "Nú skal segja af hverju þær kenningar eru er áðr eru dœmi sögð" (Grape et al. 1977:38.10), when in fact there have been no previous examples of the kennings. As a matter of fact, the introductory words in R are not very fitting either:

"Nú skal enn segja dœmi af hverju kenni<n>gar eru er nú váru ritaðar, er áðr váru eigi dœmi til sögð, svá sem Bragi sagði Ægi" (Faulkes 1998:20.17.) Faulkes' comment is as follows:

> Though it could be a reference to *Gylf.*, and thus be intented as a supplement to it, it is perhaps more likely that this is just a continuation of (and a reference to) the narratives of the first four chapters of *Skáldskaparmál*. In either case it seeems to mark the following pages as afterthoughts. In fact these stories in chs 17–18 have little to do with the origins of kennings and have not given rise to many of them (except for the shield […]), and they contain few references to poetic diction. The references to Bragi and Ægir in them link them with those at the beginning of *Skáldskaparmál*, however, which is where they also appear in U […] and this may have been the original arrangement. (1998:169.)

This shows that the tale of Hrungnir has by no means a given place in *Edda*. It is one of the tales of Þórr's heroic travels and only the shield knits it closer to the poetry section than other tales, such as the ones about about Þórr and Útgarða-Loki.

The nuances between U and R in this tale are almost only stylistic ones and there are only a few content words in U that do not occur in R. An interesting difference is the age of the revenger: Þórr's son is *þrínættr* in U and *þrívetr* in R! On the other hand, the description in R of the clay giant's heart problems seems to be a classic scribal mistake: "en ekki fengu þeir hjarta svá mikit at hánum sóməi fyrr en þeir tóku ok mann nokkvorn, ok varð hánum þat eigi stöðugt þá er Þórr kom." (Faulkes 1998:21.) This can hardly be said to make sense, whereas the U text reads: "en ekki fengu þeir hjarta svá mikit at hánum dygði eða hæfði fyrr en þeir tóku ór meri nokkurri, ok varð hánum þat ekki stöðugt þá er Þórr kom." (Grape et al. 1977:39.16–18.)

Conclusion: There is nothing to exclude the possibility of the scribes copying the same exemplar.

4.1.5 Þórr and Geirröðr (Section 16, 100%)

This section was shown in its total length above (Fig. 2) and needs no more discussion. The exemplar copied must have been either the same or virtually identical. The U version includes Þórr's second stanza, and thus our knowledge about his poetical production is increased by almost 100%!

4.1.6 Sif's hair (Section 17, 98%)

The tale about the dwarfs' masterpieces, when they create Sif's golden hair and other marvellous things such as the ship Skíðblaðnir, the spear Gungnir, the ring Draupnir, the boar Gullinbursti and the hammer Mjöllnir, is almost exactly identical in the two versions. The content words reveal nothing – and the only peculiar feature is that the U has no names for the dwarfs. In both versions they are sons of Ívaldi but they are only given the names *Brokkr* and *Eitri* in W. In R the scribe leaves space for the names which is later filled in with *Brokkr* and *Sindri*, not *Eitri*. In U and T they have no names. – On

the other hand, the name *Mjöllnir* is only given to Þórr's hammer in U. In R the hammer has no name here.

This myth, along with the tales of Andvari's gold and Hrólfr kraki turns up in U at the very end of Skáldskaparmál. Finnur Jónsson (1931:xxx) had his explanation: "at Us skriver i det første afsnit med vilje har udeladt flere stykker, for bagefter efterhånden at tilföje dem, eftersom han fik tid og lejlighed"![53] The reason will probably always be hidden, but the question of time and opportunity seems to be farfetched. With regards to poetry, the hair, the hammer and the spear were important.

Conclusion: There is nothing to exclude the possibility of the scribes copying the same exemplar or two virtually identical ones.

4.1.7 Andvari's gold (Section 18, 88.8%)

Again, this is a section that is almost exactly identical in both versions. In R it is the introduction to tales of the Völsungar and thus quite central in Skáldskaparmál. However, in U it is placed at the end of that section, maybe because the editor looked upon the tale as a bridge between the Æsir and the humans, Völsungar and Gjúkungar, and not as a genuine myth.

The text in R and U is almost identical and the content words show no real difference. Thus, nothing excludes the possibility of the scribes copying the same exemplar or two identical ones.

4.1.8 Hrólfr kraki in Uppsala (Section 19, 85%)

In order to explain the kennings *sáð Kraka* or *sáð Fýrisvallar* towards the end of Skáldskaparmál we are told about the Danish king Hrólfr kraki's visit to Uppsala, where his mother, Yrsa, is married to king Aðils. The two versions of the tale do not differ in any important ways. The most striking difference lies in the naming in R of Hrólfr's berserks: Böðvar bjarki, Hjalti hugprúði, Hvítserkr hvati, Vöttr, Véseti, Svipdagr and Beiguðr, while U gives them no names. Of course, that would be very normal when making a conscious decision to abbreviate the text, since the berserks do not play any individual roles. They only play a part as a group. Their names are therefore not at all necessary. The content words do not show any real differences, but rather are due to stylistic nuances. Considering the name of the helmet, *Hildigautr* in U and *Hildigöltr* in R, the latter name is more similar to other names in the tale, such as *Hildisvín* and *Svíagríss*, which occur in both versions.

Conclusion: Nothing excludes the same exemplar being copied or two virtually identical ones.

Result: All the texts in table 2 can be explained as copies of the same exemplar or two almost identical texts. There are no significant differences in length in any of the considered cases and the different locations of the texts in each version can be explained in various ways. But the problem of Eddic quotation has not been solved yet.

[53] "that U's scribe in the first section intentionally omittes several parts, in order to add them later (or: and then adds them later), when he had the time and opportunity."

4.2 Possible abbreviations?

As noted above, there are at least six narrative texts in the two *Edda* versions where the shorter one, U, is about 60–75% of the longer one. Of course, the proportions make sense in a deliberate and conscious abbreviating of a text, and we thus have reason to examine the texts thoroughly. But it is important to realise that an abbreviation of a text is not at all that simple. Just a few lines close to the beginning of Gylfaginning may illustrate what had to happen before a Regius-text yielded an Uppsala-text:

> Hár segir: Eigi er ~~þar~~ **þat** lítit ~~af at segja~~. Þeir **fluttu** ~~tóku~~ Ymi ~~ok fluttu~~ í mitt Ginnungagap ok gerðu af honum jörð~~ina~~, af blóði hans sæ~~inn~~ ok vötn~~in. Jörðin var gör af holdinu, en~~ björg~~in~~ af beinu~~num~~. G~~ **g**rjót ~~ok urðir gerðu þeir~~ af tönnum ~~ok jöxlum~~ ok af þeim beinum er ~~brotin~~ **borin** váru. ~~Þá mælti Jafnhár: Af~~ **Ok af** ~~því~~ blóði**nu** er ór sáru**nu**m rann ~~ok laust fór, þar af~~ **þá** gerðu þeir sjá þann er þeir ~~gerðu ok~~ festu ~~saman~~ jörðina **í** ~~ok lögðu þann sjá í hring útan um hana, ok mun þat flestum manni ófœra þykkja at komask þar yfir.~~
>
> ~~Þá mælti Þriði: T~~ **Síðan t**óku þeir ~~ok~~ haus**inn** ~~hans~~ ok gerðu ~~þar af~~ **ór** himin ok settu ~~hann upp~~ yfir jörðina með fjórum skautum, ok undir hvert horn settu þeir dverg~~. Þeir heita svá~~: ~~Austri, Vestri, Norð<r>i, Suðri~~ **Austra, Vestra, Norðra, Suðra**. Þá tóku þeir síur ~~ok gneista þá er lausir fóru ok kastat hafði~~ ór Muspellsheimi, ok settu ~~á miðjan Ginnungahimin~~ **í mitt Ginnungagap ofan ok neðan á himininn,** ~~bæði ofan ok neðan til at lýsa himin ok jörð~~. Þeir gáfu ~~staðar~~ **staði** öllum eldin<g>um~~, sumum á himni, sumar fóru lausar undir himni, ok settu þó þeim stað ok sköpuð<u> göngu þeim. Svá er sagt í fornum vísindum at.~~ **Þ**aðan af váru dœgr greind ok áratal

The black text shows unchanged words.
Gray and ~~crossed~~ was removed from the R version and was not shown in variants in U.
Black and ~~crossed~~ was removed from the R and restored with different wording.
Bold text is new in U where deleted words have been replaced.

This is obviously more of a rewritten version than an abbreviated one. It is possible to think of a situation like the one described by Karl G. Johansson, when:

> skrivaren själv har läst den kopierade texten högt i avsnitt som han därefter skrev ned i den nya versionen, inte direkt från förlagan utan snarare från sin egen upp-läsning. (2008:118.)[54]

This obviously would mean that we, in the case DG 11, have to think of very different scribal approaches from one section to another. An explanation that would be difficult but maybe not impossible.

Another possible explanation would of course be that the editor/scribe uses different sources in different sections. But we would need an explanation for this question: Why

[54] "the reader has recited the copied text aloud in parties, which he then wrote down in the new version, not directly from the exemplar but rather from his own recitation."

does the scribe choose to use poorer sources in some cases? Or in Anthony Faulkes' words: "it is difficult to see what could have prompted a scribe to alter an arrangement that seems satisfactory so as to produce the illogicality of U" (2005:xxx.)

In the following I will comment upon the texts listed in table 3, the ones "shortened" down to approximately 60–75%. The main aim is to answer the question: Do those texts differ in some way from the texts in table 2?

4.2.1 The creation (Section 1, 66.1%)

In this section we are dealing with the presentation of Gylfi(r), Hár, Jafnhár and Þriði, the creation myths concerning heaven and earth, man, the sun and the moon. This means that we are given a lot of names for different phenomena and persons. In almost all the cases we might say that the two versions use the same names, but there are surprisingly many cases where they are written in different writing or phonemic variants are used:

DG 11	R
Names of Óðinn:	
Herjan	*Herran*/*Herjan*
Nikaðr/Nikuðr	*Nikarr*/*Hnikarr*, *Nikuz*/*Hnikuðr*
Riflindi	*Biflindi*
Salkr	*Jálkr*
Sviðarr	*Sviðurr*
The rivers:	
Fimbulþul[55]	*Fimbul*, *Þul*
Gunnþró	*Gunnþrá*
Kvöl	*Svöl*
Víðleiptr	*Víð*, *Leiptr*
Other names:	
Auðr	*Uðr*
Beyzla	*Besla*
Burr	*Borr*
Byggvir	*Byrgir*
Döglingr	*Dellingr*
Frigg Fjörgunsdóttir	*Frigg Fjörgvinsdóttir*
Ginnungagap	*Ginnungahiminn*
Glornir	*Glenr*
Hergelmir	*Hvergelmir*
Hróðrvitnisson	*Hróðvitnisson*
Muspellsheimr	*Muspell*
Nóri	*Nörfi*/*Narfi*
Ónar	*Annarr*

[55] Obviously, writing *fimbulþul* and *víðleiptr* for *fimbul þul* and *víð leiptr* can be seen as a very common scribal error. I give the names here just to show all the differences.

Apart from strange but common mistakes like writing Ginnungagap for Ginnungahiminn (which obviously is more likely to be correct) these variants do not support the idea of being based on the same exemplar. Quotations from the poems of *Edda* also seem to suggest different original sources. There are 18 content words used in U that are not found in R. Few seem to be of special importance, but they all show differences in spelling and in the use of expressions. These content words are:

aldr, eðli, efstr, endir, feigr, giptask, leiða, lofa, lýðir, merki, móðir, móti, níundi, norðr, norðrætt, sæti, vetr, önd.

If the two editors/scribes really were using the same source, they obviously treated the material differently. One example should be sufficient and of interest.

Grape et al. 1977:7.9–26	**Faulkes 2005 13.22–14.27**
Frá Nóra jötni ok Nótt, dóttur hans.	
Nóri jötunn bygði fyrst Jötunheima. Dóttir hans var Nótt. Hon var svört. Hon giptist Naglfara, sonr þeira hét Auðr. Síðan var hon gipt Ónar ok var Jörð þeira dóttir. Hana átti Döglingr, ok var Dagr sonr þeira. Hann var fagr sem faðir hans.	Nörfi eða Narfi hét jötunn er bygði í Jötunheimum. Hann átti dóttur er Nótt hét. Hon var svört ok dökk sem hon átti ætt til. Hon var gipt þeim manni er Naglfari hét. Þeira sonr hét Auðr. Því næst var hon gipt þeim er Annarr hét. Jörð hét þeira dóttir. Síðarst átti hana Dellingr, var hann Ása ættar. Var þeira sonr Dagr. Var hann ljóss ok fagr eptir faðerni sínu.
Þá tók Alföðr Nótt ok Dag, ok setti á himin ok gaf þeim tvá hesta ok kerrur, ok ríða þau umhverfis jörðina. Nótt ríðr Hrímfaxa, hann döggvir jörðina með méldropum sínum. Dagr á Skinfaxa, ok lýsir lopt ok jörð af faxi hans.	Þá tók Alföðr Nótt ok Dag son hennar ok gaf þeim tvá hesta ok tvær kerrur ok setti þau upp á himin, at þau skulu ríða á hverjum tveim dœgrum umhverfis jörðina. Ríðr Nótt fyrri þeim hesti er kallaðr er Hrímfaxi, ok at morni hverjum döggvir hann jörðina af méldropum sínum. Sá hestr er Dagr á heitir Skinfaxi, ok lýsir allt lopt ok jörðina af faxi hans.
Mundilferi átti tvau börn. Máni hét sonr hans, en Sól dóttir, ok átti hana Glornir. Goðin reiddusk því ofdrambi er þau hétu svá, ok settu þau upp á himin, ok draga þau kerru sólar þeirar er goðin höfðu skapat af þeiri síu er flaug ór Muspellsheimi.	Þá mælti Gangleri: Hversu stýrir hann gang sólar ok tungls? Hár segir: Sá maðr er nefndr Mundilfœri er átti tvau börn. Þau váru svá fögr ok fríð at hann kallaði annat Mána en dóttur sína Sól, ok gipti hana þeim manni er Glenr hét. En guðin reiddusk þessu ofdrambi ok tóku þau systkin ok settu upp á himin, létu Sól keyra þá hesta er drógu kerru sólarinnar þeirar er guðin höfðu skapat til at lýsa heimana af þeiri síu er flaug ór Muspellsheimi. Þeir hestar heita svá: Árvakr ok Alsviðr. En undir bógum hestanna settu guðin tvá vindbelgi at kœla þá, en í sumum frœðum er þat kallat ísarnkol.
Máni tók börn tvau af jörðu, Bil ok Hjúka, er þau fóru frá brunni þeim er Byggvir heitir. Sárinn hét Sœgr, en Simul stöngin. Viðfiðr hét faðir barnanna. Þau börn fylgja Mána, sem sjá má af jörðunni.	Máni stýrir göngu tungls ok ræðr nýjum ok niðum. Hann tók tvau börn af jörðunni er svá heita: Bil ok Hjúki, er þau gengu frá brunni þeim er Byrgir heitir ok báru á öxlum sér sá er heitir Sœgr, en stöngin Simul. Viðfinnr er nefndr faðir þeira. Þessi börn fylgja Mána, svá sem sjá má af jörðu.
Þá mælti Gangleri: Skjótt ferr sólin sem hon sé hrædd.	Þá mælti Gangleri: Skjótt ferr sólin ok nær svá sem hon sé hrædd, ok eigi mundi hon þá meir hvata göngunni at hon hræddisk bana sinn.

Þá svarar Hár: Nær gengr sá er hana leiðir. Úlfar tveir gera þat: Skoll ok Hatti Hróðrvitnisson.	Þá svarar Hár: Eigi er þat undarligt at hon fari ákafliga. Nær gengr sá er hana sœkir, ok öngan útveg á hon nema renna undan. Þá mælti Gangleri: Hverr er sá er henni gerir þann ómaka? Hár segir: Þat eru tveir úlfar, ok heitir sá er eptir henni ferr Sköll. Hann hræðisk hon, ok hann mun taka hana. En sá heitir Hati Hróðvitnisson er fyrir henni hleypr, ok vill hann taka tunglit, ok svá mun verða.
Þá mælti Gangleri: Hver er ætt úlfanna?	Þá mælti Gangleri: Hver er ætt úlfanna?
Hár segir: Gýgr ein býr fyrir austan Miðgarð í skógi þeim er Járnviðr heitir, ok svá heita þær tröllkonur er þar byggja. Gamla tröllkona er móðir margra jötna ok allir í vargs líkjum. Þaðan kom Mánagarmr. Hann fylltisk með fjörvi feigra manna ok gleypir tunglit, en stökkvir blóði himininn. Þá týnir sól skini sínu. Sem hér segir:	Hár segir: Gýgr ein býr fyrir austan Miðgarð í þeim skógi er Járnviðr heitir. Í þeim skógi byggja þær tröllkonur er Járnviðjur heita. In gamla gýgr fœðir at sonum marga jötna ok alla í vargs líkjum, ok þaðan af er[u] komnir þessir úlfar. Ok svá er sagt at af ættinni verðr sá einn mátkastr er kallaðr er Mánagarmr. Hann fyllisk með fjörvi allra þeira manna er deyja, ok hann gleypir tungl ok stökkvir blóði himin ok lopt öll. Þaðan týnir sól skini sínu, ok vindar eru þá ókyrrir ok gnýja heðan ok handan. Svá segir í Völuspá:

Figure 7. The Nóri and Nótt episode in U and R, respectively.

The difference is clear: The myth as it is told in U does not include the horses which in the R version pull the sun's chariot. The punishment of Glornir's kids, Sól and Máni, thus becomes much harder: They pull the chariot. The two horses, Árvakr and Alsviðr, are never mentioned in U.

The information about the wolves is also interesting. In R, Sköll and Hati run before and after the sun (no mentioning of the horses). In U they scare her. The use of the verb *leiða* is strange. It has three possible meanings. The first (and most common) is 'to lead' either by hand or symbolically. In this case it is transitive and takes the accusative for the one lead. In our context that sounds peculiar but not impossible. The second meaning (a derivative of the first?) is to 'bury' (cf. the n. *leiði* 'a grave'). That of course is possible: The wolfs will have an active role when the sun disappears. – The third possibility, and then with a different origin, is 'to loath', "*to make a person loath a thing*, with dat. of the person and acc. of the thing" (Cleasby–Vigfússon). This seems to be supported by the reflexive form *leiðask*, most often taking a subject in dative (*mér leiðisk*). But *leiðask* can also take an accusative object and then a subject in nominative: "maðr leiðisk þá andligar krásir"; "þat sjám vér opt verða at konur skiljask við bœndr sína eðr menn leiðast (v.l. afrœkjast) konr sínar" are among the informative examples in Fritzner's dictionary. Thus the meaning of U could be: two wolfs make her life a misery!

If we try to explain the U wording as a mixture of deliberate change and curious mistakes with an origin in the same exemplar as copied in R, we really need an explanation as to why the editor/scribe uses totally different methods from those we have seen in many other cases.[56]

[56] In a private comment Vésteinn Ólason points out the tempting idea that we are dealing with two students taking notes or copying what the teacher is reading out aloud or telling.

4.2.2 *Dramatis personae* (Section 6, 75%)

This is a short informative section on the life and surroundings in the world of the Æsir. As before, the texts differ a little in the names given. Thus the stag standing on the roof of Valhöll has the name *Eirþyrnir* in R[57] and *Takþyrnir* in U. It is of more interest that the spelling in the following river names is different between the two texts (cf. the names in 4.2.1):

U	R
Sækin	*Sekin*
Ækin	*Ekin*
Gjöful	*Göpul*
Fyri	*Þyn*
Höll	*Böll*
Gunnþró	*Gunnþráin*
Nött	*Nyt*
Reytt	*Nöt*
Veglun	*Veg, Svinn*

As noted earlier there are also minor differences in the texts of the quoted Eddic poetry. Only in one case it seems to be a question of semantic variants, namely when R quotes Grímnismál on Valhöll, saying:

> Átta hundruð einherja
> ganga þar ór einum durum
> þá er þeir fara með vitni at vega.

U has the (more logical) text:

> Átta hundruð einherja
> ganga úr einum dyrum
> þá er þeir [ga]nga við vitni at vega.

Since *vitnir* is most commonly used to describe Fenrisúlfr, it is harder to interpret the R text, and of course U could be explained as a correction. Also the possibility that *vega með* in R could mean 'fight with' cannot be excluded.[58] On the other hand the following is usually explained as caused by a mistake in U (Fig. 8):

[57] The commonly printed name Eikþyrnir seems to be Finnur Jónssons correction. See Finnur Jónsson 1931:43.

[58] I owe thanks to Vésteinn Ólason for calling my attention to this. The prepositions *með* and *við* have very floating roles in the Nordic languages.

Grape et al. 1977 20.25–21.2	Faulkes 2005 32.3–13
Frá vist ok drykk með ásum. Þá segir Gangleri: Hvat hefir Óðinn at fá svá mörgu fólki sem þar er, ef allir vápndauðir menn koma til hans? Hár segir: Þar er mikit fjölmenni, ok mun þó eigi ofmikit þykkja þá er úlfrinn kemr. En aldri er svá mikit fjölmenni at **eigi má endask flesk þat er Sæhrímnir heitir**. Hann er soðinn hvern dag ok heill at aptni. En fáir munu þetta kunna at segja þér. Andhrímnir heitir s[te]ikarinn, en Eldhrímnir ketillinn	Þá mælti Gangleri: Þat segir þú at allir þeir menn er í orrostu hafa fallit frá upphafi heims eru nú komnir til Óðins í Valhöll. Hvat hefir hann at fá þeim at vistum? Ek hugða at þar skyldi vera allmikit fjölmenni. Þá svarar Hár: Satt er þat er þú segir, allmikit fjölmenni er þar, en miklu fleira skal enn verða, ok mun þó oflítit þykkja þá er úlfrinn kemr. En aldri er svá mikill mannfjölði í Valhöll at **eigi má þeim endask flesk galtar þess er Sæhrímnir heitir**. Hann er soðinn hvern dag ok heill at aptni. En þessi spurning er nú spyrr þú, þykki mér líkara at fáir muni svá vísir vera at hér kunni satt af at segja. Andhrímnir heitir steikarinn, en Eldhrímnir ketillinn.

Figure 8. The Valhöll food episode in U and R, respectively.

It sounds very strange to call the pork *Sæhrímnir*.

On the whole Section 6 could in both versions be copied from very similar exemplars, but the different spelling and use of names suggests that they are not copied from the exactly the same exemplar.

4.2.3 The giant builder, Sleipnir's birth (Section 7, 66.8%)

In both versions the tale of the giant builder and Loki giving birth to Sleipnir is supported by a Völuspá-citation. As shown both by Maja Bäckvall (2007) and Lasse Mårtensson (2009) the quotation must lead back to different exemplars.[59] The myth itself is exactly the same, but hardly one sentence in both versions has exactly the same wording. Thus it is very tempting to think of two oral tales or a scribe who knows the tale very well and does not consider it important to stick to the written text he is using for reference.

Taking into account that the tale in U only includes 118 lexical content words it is noteworthy that as many as 18 of them only occur in that version. Those are as follows:

dauðdagi, *dekkjask*, *eiga*, *fœra*, *för*, *Hel*, *hvína*, *láta*, *lauss*, *leita*, *litr*, *nefna*, *Niflheimr*, *sæti*, *tillag*, *valda*, *vangerr*, *ærask.*

But in fact almost all those content words have their semantic equivalent in R as shown here (Fig. 9):

Grape et al. 1977:22.17	Faulkes 2005:35.33
verðan ills dauðdaga	verðan ills dauða
spilla loptinu, ef himinninn döktisk	spilla loptinu ok himninum
eiga Freyju	eignask Freyju
hve stór björg hann fœrði til	hversu stór björg sá hestr dró
Loki hafði þá för til Svaðilfæra	Loki hafði þá ferð haft til Svaðilfœra
laust hann í Hel	laust þat hit fyrsta högg er haussinn brotnaði í smán mola
ok hrein ok hvein við	ok hrein við
létu hann	kváðu hann
var grátt at lit	var grátt

[59] It may be worth noticing that only R uses the wording "En at kaupi þeira váru sterk vitni ok mörg særi" (Faulkes 2005:35), cf. Völuspá (stanza 26) "á gengusk eiðar / orð ok særi."

ok nefndu Þór	ok kölluðu þeir á Þór
sendu í Niflheim	ok sendi hann niðr undir Niflhel.
ærðisk	æddisk
settusk guðin í sæti sín	settusk guðin á dómstóla sína
o[lli] því tillagi Loki	því réð Loki
ef nökkurr hlutr væri vangerr	ef nokkvorr hlutr væri ógjörr

Figure 9. Semantic equivalents in content words of the Giant builder and Sleipnir's birth episode in U and R, respectively.

Obviously, it is impossible to say which of the texts is a variant of the other, whereas it may seem strange in the case of U to change so many content lexemes if the aim was to shorten a tale down to about 67% of the "original".

4.2.4 Þórr and Útgarða-Loki (Section 8, 63.5%)

The tale about Þórr's visit to the giant Útgarða-Loki is an impressive collection of myths. Very few of them can be found in the poetic language (kennings or heiti). The tale of Þórr hiding in Skrýmir's glove is mentioned in Lokasenna, 60 and 62 and in Hárbarðsljóð 26. In Hárbarðsljóð 39, Þórr mentions his servant Þjálfi, who is also supposed to be Þórr's helper in Þórsdrápa, when Eilífr Guðrúnarson states that "Skalfa Þórs né Þjálfa / þróttar steinn við ótta" (Faulkes 1998:28. 'neither Þórr's nor Þjálfi's courage-stone (the heart) shivered from fear').

This is all we see the poets use from the longest tale in Gylfaginning, which might lead us to believe that at least some of the tales in the myth collection were not intended to be of any help when interpreting poetry. They were simply amusing tales, brilliantly told myths that in earlier times may have been important explanatory material: Some peculiar valleys were explained as being created when Þórr tried to hit Skrýmir; nobody had ever been able to defeat the giantess Elli ('age'); of course nobody could run faster than the mind or eat quicker than the fire; Þórr's eternal fight with the serpent had taken different forms, and his trying to lift up the cat might have ended in a catastrophe; and finally Þórr's drinking of the horn explained the tides. But those myths were not of the kind that lead to kennings or poetic metaphors.[60]

Of course, this might indicate that the myth is rather young so that the "old" poets have not been able to use it for metaphors.[61] But nevertheless it seems to be important for the author of *Edda*, maybe especially to wake the students interest!

In the discussion about the relationship between the two versions of *Edda*, this tale was given special attention by D. O. Zetterholm in *Studier i en Snorre-text. Tors färd tilll Utgård i codices Upsaliensis DG 11 4° och Regius Hafn. 2367 4°*, in 1949. In this monograph Zetterholm compared the two versions word for word, so to say, and wrote a very interesting commentary. Since his starting point was that it must be possible to see which of the texts is closest to the original, his conclusion was a little surprising. Having

[60] The sole *kenning* I find is *Þórs fangvina* 'age' in a strophe by Kveldúlfr in *Egils saga*. If that is a genuine Kaldúlfr text it shows the age of the myth.

[61] I owe Vésteinn Ólason thanks for pointing this out to me. He also mentions the literature dealing with this particular myth and its possible connections with Russian and Irish folktales. Obviously the author of *Edda* treats it as a real myth.

discussed Friedrich Müller's theory that U was a copy of Snorri's earliest experiment and R his second, he concluded:

> Frågan om utvidgning i R eller förkortning i U kvarstår.
> Mitt svar skulle vara: utvidgning i R och förkortning i U. (Op.cit. 54.)[62]

This of course is a possible explanation concerning this part of the work, but neither Zetterholm nor any other writer has tried to make it valid for *Edda* as a whole!

As we have already mentioned, this episode in U is only 64% of the R text. If we only take a look at the content words we get another picture. The U has 29 content words that R has not. Those lexemes are:

> *axkorn*, *bætr*, *enni*, *fjöðr*, *för*, *fullr*, *gata*, *gefa*, *glíma*, *hægr*, *hásæti*, *háttr*, *heim*, *hirð*, *hlaup*, *hvíla*, *látask*, *leggr*, *leiða*, *megin*, *mettr*, *Miðgarðr*, *miðnætti*, *ófljótari*, *staka*, *svima*, *þjóna*, *vesall*, *ægir*.

Grape et al. 1977:24.9–29.18	**Faulkes 2005:37.3–43.33**
axkorn	akarn
ok buðu bœtr þær er han*n* vildi.	buðu at fyrir kvæmi allt þat er þau áttu
strýkr um vangann ok ennit	strauk of vangann
þótti sem fjöðr nökkur felli	at tros nokkvot af kvistunum felli
för	ferð
fullt af slátri	fyllt af slátri
leiddi hann þá á götu	gengr með þeim braut
gefr hann upp ok vill eigi drekka	býðr hann upp hornit ok vill eigi drekka
lítilræði í þykkja at glíma við þik	lítilræði í þykkja at fásk við þik
meira en þér mun hægst vera	drykkjar meira en þér mun hagr á vera
er þeir komu fyrir hásæti	koma þeir fyrir konunginn
hefða vitat þik svá mikils háttar	at þú hefðir svá mikinn krapt með þér
þér komið mik eigi optar heim at sœkja	þér komið eigi optar mik at hitta
Engi mun sá hér innan hirðar	engi er hér sá inni
En Þjálfi tók hlaup	En er Þjálfi þreytti rásina
ok sá mann hvíla	sér hvar lá maðr
Hann lézk vera [vakn]að*r*	[lacking]
lét brotinn legg hafrsins	Kennir hann at brotinn var lærleggrinn
leiddi hann þá á götu	gengr með þeim
at öðrum enda en Logi at öðrum megin	at öðrum enda en Logi at öðrum
eða hvárt þeir sé mettir	Eða hvat er títt um þik, Þórr
Þeir ganga til Miðgarðs	ok gekk fram til miðs dags
um [m]iðnætti varð landskjálpti	En of miðja nótt varð landskjálpti mikill
þó hafa hér komit ekki ófljótari menn	ekki …menn er mér þykkir fóthvatari en svá
kasta beinunum á stökurnar	kasta á hafrstǫkurnar beinunu
ok svam yfir þat it djúpa haf	þá fór hann út yfir hafit þat it djúpa
ok þjónuðu þau honum síðan	gerðusk þau þá skyldir þjónustumenn Þórs ok fylgja þau honum jafnan síðan
engi svá vesall	engi er svá lítill drykkjumaðr

[62] "The question of expansion in R or abbreviation in U remains. My answer would be: Expansion in R and abbreviation in U."

annarr endir var í ægi þér komið mik eigi optar heim at sœkja	Annarr endir hornsins var út í hafi at þér komið eigi optar mik at hitta

Figure 10. Semantic equivalents in the Þórr and Útgarða-Loki episode in U and R, respctively.

Looking for semantic equivalents we get the above picture (Fig. 10).

In other words: This is almost exactly the same picture that we saw in the Sleipnir tale above (Fig. 9.) Almost every new lexeme in U has an equivalent in R. On the other hand, only a short example is needed (see Fig. 11) to show that the stylistic difference is much greater than, e.g., in the myth of Þórr and Geirröðr above, and if we in this case should be talking about copies of the same exemplar, we are dealing with an almost completely different method than in the Geirröðr episod (Fig. 2.)

Grape et al. 1977:24.8–27	**Faulkes 2005:37.3–30**
Hér hefr sögu Þórs ok Útgarða-Loka Þat er þá upphaf at Ökuþórr fór með hafra sína ok meðr honum Loki, ok koma at kveldi til eins bónda. Tók Þórr hafrana ok skar, ok váru þeir flegnir ok bornir til ketils. Ok er soðit var, settisk Þórr til matar ok bauð bónda til nótturðar ok börnum hans. Son hans hét Þjálfi, en Röska dóttir. Þá lagði Þórr hafrstökurnar útar frá eldi ok mælti at börnin skyldu kasta beinunum á stökurnar. Þjálfi, son bónda, laust lærlegg hafrsins með knífi sínum ok spretti til mergjar.	Þat er upphaf þessa máls at Ökuþórr fór með hafra sína ok reið, ok með honum sá ´´Ass er Loki er kallaðr. Koma þeir at kveldi til eins búanda ok fá þeir náttstað. En um kveldit tók Þórr hafra sína ok skar báða, eptir þat váru þeir flegnir ok bornir til ketils. En er soðit var, þá settisk Þórr til náttverðar ok þeir lagsmenn. Þórr bauð til matar með sér búandanum ok konu hans ok börnum þeira. Sonr búa hét Þjálfi, en Röskva dóttir. Þá lagði Þórr hafrstökurnar útar frá eldinum ok mælti at búandi ok heimamenn hans skyldu kasta á hafrstökurnar beinunum. Þjálfi, son búanda, helt á lærlegg hafrsins ok spretti á knífi sínum ok braut til mergjar.
Þórr var þar um nótti[na], ok í óttu stóð hann upp ok klæddisk, tók Mjölni ok brá upp ok vígði hafrstökurnar. Stóðu hafrarnir upp ok var annarr haltr eptra fœti. Þórr fann þat, lét bónda eða hjú hans eigi [m]undu hafa skynsamliga með farit beinunum, lét brotinn legg hafrsins.	Þórr dvalðisk þar of nóttina, en í óttu fyrir dag stóð hann upp ok klæddi sik, tók hamarinn Mjöllni ok brá upp ok vígði hafrstökurnar. Stóðu þá upp hafrarnir ok var þá annarr haltr eptra fœti. Þat fann Þórr ok talði at búandinn eða hans hjón mundi eigi skynsamliga hafa farit með beinum hafrsins. Kennir hann at brotinn var lærleggrinn.
Bóndinn varð hræddr er Þórr lét síga brúnina fyrir augun, en þat er hann sá til augnanna, hugðisk hann falla mundu fyrir sjónunum einum saman. Hann herði hendrnar at hamarskaptinu svá at [hv]ítnuðu knúarnir. Bóndi ok hjú hans báðu sér friðar ok buðu bœtr þær er han*n* vildi.	Eigi þarf langt frá því at segja, vita megu þat allir hversu hræddr búandinn mundi vera er hann sá at Þórr lét síga brýnnar ofan fyrir augun, en þat er sá augnanna, þá hugðisk hann falla mundu fyrir sjóninni einni samt. Hann herði hendrnar at hamarskaptinu svá at hvítnuðu knúarnir, en búandinn gerði sem ván var ok öll hjúnin, kölluðu ákafliga, báðu sér friðar, buðu at fyrir kvæmi allt þat er þau áttu.
Ok er hann sá hrælzlu þeira mikla, gekk af honum móðrinn ok tók af bónda börn hans, Þjálfa ok Rösku, ok þjónuðu þau honum síðan.	En er hann sá hrælzlu þeira, þá gekk af honum móðrinn ok sefaðisk hann ok tók af þeim í sætt börn þeira, Þjálfa ok Rösku, ok gerðusk þau þá skyldir þjónustumenn Þórs ok fylgja þau honum jafnan síðan.
Hann lét þá eptir hafra sína ok fór í Jötunheima ok allt til hafsins ok svam yfir þat it djúpa haf. Ok er hann kom til lands, þá gekk hann upp ok með honum Þjálfi ok Röskva ok Loki.	Lét hann þar eptir hafra ok byrjaði ferðina austr í Jötunheima ok allt til hafsins, ok þá fór hann út yfir hafit þat it djúpa. En er hann kom til lands, þá gekk hann upp ok með honum Loki ok Þjálfi ok Röskva.

Figure 11. The goat incident in the Þórr and Útgarða-Loki episode in U and R, respectively.

There is only one case in the whole section where we can clearly identify a mistake in reading/copying. When writing "Þeir ganga til Miðgarðs ok sjá borg standa á völlum nökkurum" the U scribe may have had something like R in front of him, reading: "Þórr fór fram á leið ok þeir félagar ok gekk fram til miðs dags. Þá sá þeir borg standa á völlum nokkvorum". *Miðgarðr* would then be some kind of misreding for *miðs dags*, for as far as we know, the Miðgarðr had nothing to do with Útgarðr. In the other cases the text in U flows normally and in some cases it is artistically quite as good as the other version.

As has been mentioned in the preceding chapters it is tempting to think of two different storytellers or maybe the same storyteller at two different occasions. Both versions are very smooth and flowing and reveal a trained entertainer. But it is almost impossible to believe that the same exemplar is being copied in both versions.

4.2.5 Loki's punishment (Section 11, 64%)

This section was discussed in chapter 3.3.2 and does not need any additional commentary. There are obviously important differences in the content words found in the texts in this section.

4.2.6 Fimbulvetr, ragnarökkr (Section 12, 59.3%)

In the R version, this is the last section of Gylfaginning, ending with Gangleri standing outside Valhöll, finding out that everything was just an illusion. This is followed by the section on the Trója, which is defined by Finnur Jónsson (1931 ed. 77) as an interpolation. In U the final words about Valhöll are different and then we are taken into a new scene where the real (earthly) Æsir take over.

The texts in U and R mostly contain the same content words. New lexemes in U are only 11 (semantic equivalents in R are shown within brackets):

Brimlé (Brimir), *búa* (lifa), *Eiðavöllr* (Iðavöllr), *gluggr*, *Gnipalundr* (Gnipahellir), *hanga*, *hold*, *Jötunheimar* (jötunmóðr), *mey*, *sifjar* (sifjaslit), *sýna.*

The most obvious difference between the two versions at this point is that when R quotes nine whole stanzas from Völuspá at the very end, U only quotes three. Maja Bäckvall's explanation (2007) that the U scribe only considers it necessary to include the first and the final stanza from such a long citation is certainly possible. However, it lacks parallels and as a whole it would be just as likely for the two scribes to have been copying different exemplars that reveal different traditions.

Results: If we are going to explain the texts in Table 3 as being copies from the same exemplar (except in the cases where they are obviously based on different ones!), then we also have to assume that the intentions of the scribe or editor are very different regarding the texts listed in table 2, as compared with the texts in table 3. Although it may be possible, it is hard to find a sufficient explanation for this.

4.2.7 The prologue (Section 00 58.4%)

Of the main manuscripts of *Edda* only two contain a whole prologue, DG 11 and W. The first folio of R is lacking and the prologue there starts with the words "er vér köllum

Skjöld, hans son Bjaf, er vér köllum Bjár". In T the beginning is also lacking, the text starting with "Þat sama spurðu þeir af gömlum frændum sínum, at síðan er talið váru mörg hundruð vetra, þá var hin sama jörð ok sól ok himintungl, en gangr himintunglanna var ójafn."[63] Even if W is almost a century younger than DG 11, the editors in the Arnamagnæan edition 1848 chose that manuscript for the very beginning of *Edda*.[64] In Anthony Faulkes' edition 2005 the beginning of the Prologue is based upon 17th century copies of R (2005:xxxi & 73.)

Apart from obvious interpolations in W, the text of the Prologue is quite alike in the individual versions, and even if DG 11 gives us a much shorter text, almost every content word of that manuscript can be found in the other version. There is therefore little reason to believe that the versions must originate from different originals, but as in many other cases it is very difficult to explain why the editor of U saw reason to shorten the text so radically.

The main purpose of the Prologue is to make the subject matter acceptable and to explain why it is appropriate for a good Christian in the 13th century to deal with the history of the heathen Gods. In other words, this is where we are presented with the author's euhemeristic explanation of the gods.[65] Then he uses the obviously well known *Trójumannasaga* for further expanation.[66]

Only one episode in the Prologue is of real interest for the present study. As part of Gylfaginning all the RTW manuscripts contain the myth about Gefjun and the Swedish king Gylfi. The same tale is retold in the *Ynglingasaga* in *Heimskringla* and the verbal likeness is so striking that there is hardly any reason to doubt that it was the same author who wrote the story. We have no indications that this was a widely known tale in the North in the 13th century. Saxo Grammaticus strikingly enough does not seem to know it and in the kennnings of the poets it has left no marks.[67]

In the RTW version the Gefjun myth plays no other part than introducing the Swedish king Gylfi with an entertaining tale. It is unlike all the myths in Gylfaginning (and in RTW's Skáldskaparmál too) in that the episode is, like in the sagas of the kings, confirmed by a scaldic stanza, supposed to be by Bragi Boddason, one of the most frequently quoted poets in Skáldskaparmál. The question therefore is: Why no mention in DG 11, where the episode is completely missing?

In R the myth runs as follows (Faulkes 2005:7):

> Gylfi konungr réð þar löndum er nú heitir Svíþjóð. Frá honum er þat sagt at hann gaf einni farandi konu at launum skemtunar sinnar eitt plógsland í ríki sínu þat er fjórir öxn drœgi upp dag ok nótt. En sú kona var ein at Ása ætt, hon er nefnd Gefjun. Hon tók fjóra öxn norðan ór Jötunheimum, en þat váru synir jötuns ok hennar, ok setti þá fyrir plóg. En plógrinn gekk svá hart ok djúpt at upp leysti landit, ok drógu öxninir þat land út á hafit ok vestr, ok námu staðar í sundi

[63] Normalized by Eysteinn Björnsson, as is later quotations from W.
[64] For discussion on the Prologue, see Beck 2008, Faulkes' introduction to the 2005 edition and the same author 1979, making a nice attempt to reconstruct the original text.
[65] Much has been written on Snorri's euhemerism. See e.g., Anne Holtsmark 1964:9–16. For a new and different opinion see Viðar Pálsson 2008.
[66] See Faulkes 2005:xxiii with further references.
[67] Gefjun never appears in kennings, and *Gylfi* (except for in Bragis stanza) is only otherwise a typical "sea-king's" name.

nokkvoru. Þar setti Gefjun landit ok gaf nafn ok kallaði Selund. Ok þar sem landit hafði upp gengit, var þar eptir vatn; þat er nú Lögrinn kallaðr í Svíþjóð. Ok liggja svá víkr í Leginum sem nes í Selundi. Svá segir Bragi skáld gamli:

> Gefjun dró frá Gylfa
> glöð djúpröðul öðla,
> svá at af rennirauknum
> rauk, Danmarkar auka.
> Báru öxn ok átta
> ennitungl þar er gengu
> fyrir vineyjar víðri
> valrauf, fjögur haufuð.

Every reader, having some knowledge of the geography of Sweden and Denmark, will notice that there is a grave mistake in the myth: It is not Lake *Mälaren* (Lögrinn) but Lake *Vänern* (Vænir) the myth must be aiming at. On the map it is really striking. But the teller of this tale definitely has never seen Lake Mälaren.

Now, of course, it is easy to say that the Vikings had no maps to look at. Nevertheless they had a mind-picture of the landscape, and in *Heimskringla* we can see that Snorri Sturluson had a relatively clear picture of the landscape he was describing (e.g. when telling of Sigvatr's travels through Sweden).

Now, comparing this myth with the other myths in *Edda* there is a second striking feature in it: It is geographically conditioned. No other myth is bound to a place or a country on Earth. Thus we might have reasons to ask if it is likely to have been popular in Iceland to tell tales that were closely tied to Sweden and Denmark. From the logic point of view the answer is easy: No!

In Norway it may have been different, to say nothing about the part of Sweden that Snorri visited 1218 or 1219. Eskil the lawman and his wife Kristín obviously gave him some information about Sweden and Swedish history (his nephew Sturla even claimed they had given him the banner used in the battle of Gestilren).

For an Icelander who brought the tale to Iceland after a continental visit, it is quite easy to mix two lake names. Having, maybe, neither seen Lake Mälaren nor Lake Vänern, those are simply names.[68] In other words: If Snorri heard the tale about Gefjun in his travel to Norway 1218–1220, it would be quite normal for him to mix the two names of lakes he had not seen!

This may look very subjective and speculative. But there is more to it.

The tale includes a stanza by Bragi hinn gamli or Bragi Boddason. He is one of the most frequently quoted poets in *Edda*. In the R version he is quoted at least 16 times and in DG 11 at least ten times.[69] Therefore it is mysterious that the stanza quoted in the Gefjun myth, in the beginning of the work, contains two kennings that are unique, namely *djúpröðull* 'gold' and *ennitungl* 'eye', that would fit very well into, and be an addition to, the kennings in Skáldskaparmál. But in no *Edda* version they are mentioned.

[68] This is uncertain. We do not know where Snorri's hosts in Västergötaland did live. If it was in Skara he has seen Lake Vänern!

[69] The quotations in R (and TW) include two longer ones, supposed to be part of his Ragnarsdrápa (Faulkes 1998:50 and 72) but since the U version avoids long quotations those do not appear there.

For those treating the DG 11 as a deliberate and completely confused abbreviation, of course this does not create any problem, not even when considering the fact that the R(TW)-author did not notice Bragi's stanza when composing Skáldskaparmál. It is simply a question of shortening. But considering the fact that the textbook author Snorri Sturluson was gathering his material from all over, it might be wise to rethink. Is it likely that he would miss the kennings in Bragi's stanza, if it was a part of the Bragi collection he either knew by heart, or had in written form?

As shown in Table 1 the Prologue (that is to say: the parts of the Prologue that are commonly included in all the versions) is much shorter in U than in the other versions. When looking at the content words it turns out that the U version has no important content words of its own, which might indicate that it is built on the same source as are the more extensive versions. But that does not solve the Gefjun problem! It would be unusually silly of the editor of U to cut out an entertaining and mnemnotechnically interesting tale at the beginning of the work. Thus the shortening theory becomes rather untempting.

In a separate study I have shown that in Sturla Þórðarson's *Íslendinga saga* there are indications, of an *Edda* before Snorri Sturluson's travel to Norway in 1218, and in that case the text must have been closer to the one we see in U.[70]

Now, if this was the case, it would be easy to explain the differences between U and the other manuscripts. There would have been an S1 (the original draft), written at a time when the author in some cases only had fragmentary information. From his first Norwegian expedition he returned, not only with new experience but also with new sources. Among those there might have been the tale about Gefjun and Gylfi, one that absolutely would entertain both the author and his audience. And for an Icelander who only knew the two great Swedish lakes by their names, it would have been very easy to mix them and make Mälaren play the role of Vänern.

The different versions of the whole text of the Prologue can thus be compared (Fig. 12):

Grape et al. 2007:1–3. 1007 words	**http://notendur.hi.is/eybjorn/ . 1725 words**
	WORMIANUS
Almáttigr Guð skapaði himin ok jörð ok alla hluti er þeim fylgja, ok síðast menn, er ættirnar eru frá komnar, Adam ok Evu, ok dreifðusk ættirnar um heiminn síðan.	Almáttigr guð skapaði í upphafi himin ok jörð ok alla þá hlut<i> er þeim fylgja, ok síðarst menn tvá er ættir eru frá komnar, Adam ok Evu, ok fjölgaðisk þeira kynslóð ok dre<i>fðisk um heim allan.
En er frá liðu stundir, ójafnaðisk fólkit, sumir váru góðir, sumir lifðu eptir girndum sínum. Fyrir þat var drekt heiminum, nema þeim er meðr Nóa váru	En er fram liðu stundir, þá ójafnaðisk mannfólkit: váru sumir góðir ok rétttrúaðir, en miklu fleiri snerusk þá eptir girndum heimsins ok órœktu guðs boðorð, ok fyrir því drekti guð heiminum í sjóvargangi ok öllum kykvendum heimsins,

[70] Heimir Pálsson 2011 (forthcoming). This is not at all a new idea. In his introduction to *Heimskringla* Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson (1941) pointed out that, considering Snorri's life and times, the years between 1206 and 1216 would be a very possible time for his writing of *Edda*: "Á þessum árum kann Snorri að hafa samið Eddu – nema Háttatal." (p. xxiv) "During these years, Snorri may have composed *Edda*, except *Háttatal*".)

í örkinni. Eptir þat bygðisk enn veröldin af þeim, en allr fjölðinn afrœktisk þá guð. En hverr mundi þá segja frá guðs stórmerkjum er þeir týndu guðs nafni? En þat var víðast um veröldina er fólkit viltisk. En þó veitti guð mönnum jarðligar giptir, fé ok sælu ok speki at skilja jarðliga hluti ok greinir þær er sjá mátti lopts ok jarðar.	nema þeim er í örkinni váru með Nóa. Eptir Nóaflóð lifðu átta menn, þeir er heiminn bygðu, ok kómu frá þeim ættir, ok varð enn sem fyrr at þá er fjölmentisk ok bygðisk veröldin, þá var þat allr fjölði mannfólksins er elskaði ágirni fjár ok metnaðar en afrœktusk guðs hlýðni, ok svá mikit gerðisk at því at þeir vildu eigi nefna guð. En hverr mundi þá frá segja sonum þeira frá guðs stórmerkjum? Svá kom at þeir týndu guðs nafni, ok víðast um veröldina fansk eigi sá maðr er deili kunni á skapara sínum. En eigi at síðr veitti guð þeim jarðligar giptir, fé ok sælu, er þeir skyldu við vera í heiminum. Miðlaði hann ok spekðina, svá at þeir skilðu alla jarðliga hluti ok allar greinir þær er sjá mátti loptsins ok jarðarinnar.
Þat undruðusk þeir er jörðin ok dýr höfð[u] saman náttúru í sumum hlutum, svá ólíkt sem þat var. Þat er eitt er jörðin e[r] grœn í hám fjalltindum ok sprettr þar upp vatn, ok þurfti þar eigi lengra at grafa en í djúpum dal. Svá er ok dýr eða fuglar, at jafnlangt er til blóðs í höfði sem í fótum. Önnur náttúra er sú jarðarinnar at á hverju ári vex á henni [gra]s ok blóm, ok á sama ári fellr þat. Svá ok dýr eða fuglar, at því vex hár eða [fja]ðrar ok fellr á hverju ári. Þat er in þriðja náttúra jarðarinnar at hon [er opnuð], þá grœr gras á þeiri moldu, er efst er á jörðunni. Þeir þýddu björg ok [stei]na móti tönnum ok beinum.	Þat hugsuðu þeir ok undruðusk hví þat mundi gegna er jörðin ok dýrin ok fuglarnir höfðu saman eðli í sumum hlutum ok þó ólík at hætti. Þat var eitt eðli at jörðin var grafin í hám fjalltindum ok spratt þar vatn upp, ok þurfti þar eigi lengra at grafa til vatns en í djúpum dölum. Svá er ok dýr ok fuglar at jafnlangt er til blóðs í höfði ok fótum. Önnur náttúra er sú jarðar at á hverju ári vex á jörðunni gras ok blóm, ok á sama ári fellr þat allt ok fölnar, svá ok dýr ok fuglar, at vex hár ok fjaðrar ok fellr af á hverju ári. Þat er hin þriðja náttúra jarðar, þá er hon er opnuð ok grafin, þá grœr gras á þeiri moldu, er efst er á *jörð*unni. Björg ok steina þýddu þeir móti tönnum ok beinum kvikenda.
Svá skilðu þeir af þessu at jörðin væri kvik ok hefði líf með nökkurum hætti, er hon fœddi öll kvikvendi ok eignaðisk allt þat er dó. Þangat til hennar tölðu þeir ættir sínar.	Af þessu skilðu þeir svá at jörðin væri kvik ok hefði líf með nökkurum hætti, ok vissu þeir at hon var furðuliga gömul at aldartali ok máttug í eðli. Hon fœddi öll kykvendi, ok hon eignaðisk allt þat er dó. Fyrir þá sök gáfu þeir henni nafn ok tölðu ætt sína <til hennar>.
Sá þeir þat at ójafn var gangr himintungla, sum gengu lengra en sum. Þat grunaði þá at nökkurr mundi þeim stýra, ok mundi sá vera ríkr, ok ætluðu hann mundu verit hafa fyrri en himintunglin, ætluðu hann ráða mundu skini sólar ok dögg jarða[r] ok vindum ok stormi. En eigi vissu þeir hverr hann var, en því trúðu þeir at hann ræðr öllum hlutum.	*TRAJECTINUS* Þat sama spurðu þeir af gömlum frændum sínum, at síðan er talið váru mörg hundruð vetra, þá var hin sama jörð ok sól ok himintungl, en gangr himintunglanna var ójafn. Áttu sum lengra gang, en sum skemra. Af þvílíkum hlutum grunaði þá, at nökkurr mundi vera stjórnari himintunglanna, sá er stilla myndi gang þeira at vilja sínum, ok myndi sá vera ríkr mjök ok máttigr. Ok þess væntu þeir, ef hann réði fyrir höfuðskepnunum, at hann myndi ok fyrr verit hafa en himintunglin, ok þat sjá þeir, ef hann ræðr gangi himintunglanna, at hann myni ráða skini sólar ok dögg loptsins ok ávexti jarðarinnar, er því fylgir, ok slíkt sama vindinum loptsins ok þar með stormi sævarins. Þá vissu þeir eigi, hvar ríki hans var. Af því trúðu þeir, at hann réð öllum hlutum á jörðu ok í lopti himins ok himintunglum, sævarins ok veðranna.
Ok til þess at þeir mætti muna, þá gáfu þeir öllum hlutum nafn með sér, ok síðan hefir átrúnaðr breyzk á marga vega, sem menn skiptusk eða tungur greindusk. En allt skilðu þeir jarðliga, þvíat eigi höfðu þeir andliga gipt, ok trúðu at allt væri af nökkuru efni skapat eða smíðat.	En til þess at heldr mætti frá segja eða í minni festa, þá gáfu þeir nöfn með sjálfum sér öllum hlutum, ok hefir þessi átrúnaðr á marga lund breyzk svá sem þjóðirnar skiptusk ok tungurnar greindusk. En alla hluti skilðu þeir jarðligri skilningu, þvíat þeim var eigi gefin andlig spekðin. Svá skilðu þeir at allir hlutir væri smíðaðir af nökkuru efni.

Veröldin verðr greind í þrjár hálfur. Einn hlutr var frá suðri til vestrs ok um Miðjarðarsjá, sá heitir Affríka, en syðri hlutr er heitr svá at þar brennr af sólu. Annarr hlutr frá vestri til norðrs ok inn til hafs, heitir Evrópa eða Enea, en nyrðri hlutr er þar kaldr ok vex eigi gras ok eigi má byggja. Frá norðri um austrhálfuna til suðrs heitir Asía. Í þeim hluta veraldarinnar er öll fegrð ok eignir, gull ok gimsteinar. Þar er mið veröldin, ok svá sem þar er betra en í öðrum stöðum, svá er þar ok mannfólkit meir tignat en í öðrum stöðum at spekt ok afli, fegrð ok öllum kostum.	Veröldin var greind í þrjár hálfur. Frá suðri í vestr ok inn at Miðjarðarsjó, sá hlutr var kallaðr Affríka. Inn syðri hlutr þeirar deildar er brunninn af sólu. Annarr hlutr frá vestri til norðrs ok inn til hafsins, er sá kallaðr Evrópa eða Enea. Inn nyrðri hluti er þar svá kaldr, at eigi vex gras á ok engi byggir. Frá norðri ok um austrhálfur allt til suðrs, þat er kallat Asía. Í þeim hluta veraldar er öll fegrð ok prýði ok eignir ok jarðarinnar gull ok gimsteinar. Þar er ok mið veröldin, ok svá sem þar er jörðin fegri ok betri öllum kostum en í öðrum stöðum, svá var ok mannfólkit þar mest tignat af öllum giptunum, spekinni ok aflinu, fegrðinni ok alls kostar kunn*ust*unn*i*.
Þar var sett Rómaborg, er vér köllum Troju. Í Troju váru tólf konungdómar ok einn yfir öllum öðrum. Þar váru tólf höfuðtungur.	Nær miðri veröldinni var gört þat hús ok herbergi er ágætast hefir verit, er kallat er Troja, þar sem vér köllum Tyrkland. Þessi staðr var miklu meir*i* görr en aðrir ok með meira hagleik á marga lund með kostnaði ok föngum, er þar váru til. Þar váru tólf konungdómar ok einn yfirkonungr, ok lágu mörg þjóðlönd til hvers konungdómsins. Þar váru í borginni tólf höfuðtungur. Þessir höfðingjar hafa verit um fram aðra menn, þá er verit hafa í veröldu, um alla manndómliga hluti.
Konungr hét Menón, hann átti dóttur Príamus konungs Trojam. Sonr þeira hét Trór, er vér köllum Þór. Þá var hann tólf vetra er hann hafði fullt afl sitt. Þá lypti hann af jörðu tíu bjarnstökum senn. Hann sigraði marga berserki senn ok dýr eða dreka. Í norðrhálfu heimsins fann hann spákonu eina er Sibil hét, en vér köllum Sif. Engi vissi ætt hennar. Sonr þeira hét Lóriði, hans sonr Vingiþórr, hans sonr Vingenir, hans sonr Móða, hans sonr Magi, hans sonr Sefsmeg, hans sonr Beðvig, hans sonr Atra, er vér köllum Annan, hans sonr Ítrmann, hans sonr Eremóð, hans sonr Skjaldun,	Einn konungr, er þar var, er nefndr Munón eða Mennón. Hann átti dóttur höfuðkonungsins Príami, sú hét Tróan. Þau áttu son, hann hét Trór, eða Thór. Hann var at uppfœzlu með hertoga þeim er nefndr er Lorikus, en <er> hann var tíu vetra, þá tók hann við jöfnun föður síns. Svá var hann fagr álitum, er hann kom með öðrum mönnum, sem þá er fíls <bein> er grafit í eik. Hár hans er fegra en gull. Þá er hann var tólf vetra, þá hafði hann fullt afl. Þá lypti hann af jörðu tíu bjarnstökum öllum senn, ok þá drap hann Lórikum hertoga, fóstra sinn, ok konu hans, Lóra eða Glóra, ok eignaði sér ríkit Trakía, þat köllum vér *Þ*rúðheim. Þá fór hann víða um lönd ok kannaði allar heimshálfur ok sigrað<i> einn saman alla berserki ok alla risa ok einn inn mesta dreka ok mörg dýr. Í norðrhálfu heims fann hann spákonu þá, er Síbil hét, er vér köllum Sif, ok fekk hennar. Eigi kann ek segja ætt Sifjar. Hon var allra kvenna fegrst, hár hennar var sem gull, þeira son Lóriði, er líkr var feðr sínum. Hans son var Einriði, hans son Ving, hans son Vingenir, hans son Móði, hans son Ingi, hans son Seskef, hans son Heðvig, hans son Athra, er vér köllum Annan, hans son Úrmann, hans son Heremóð, hans son Skjaldun,
er vér köllum Skjöld, hans sonr Bjaf, er vér köllum Bör, hans sonr Jat, hans sonr Guðólfr, hans sonr Finnr, hans sonr Frjálafr, er vér köllum Friðleif, hans sonr Vodden, er vér köllum Óðin.	*REGIUS* er vér köllum Skjöld, hans son Bjaf, er vér köllum Bjár, hans son Jat, hans son Guðólfr, hans son [Finn], hans son F*ría*llaf, er vér köllum Friðleif. Hann átti þann son er nefndr er Vóden, þann köllum vér Óðin. Hann var ágætr maðr af speki ok allri atgervi. Kona hans hét Frigíða, er vér köllum Frigg.
Þessi Óðinn hafði mikinn spádóm. Kona hans hét Frigida, er vér köllum Frigg. Hann fýstisk norðr í heim með mikinn her ok stórmiklu fé, ok hvar sem þeir fóru þótti mikils um þá vert ok líkari goðum en mönnum. Þeir komu í Saxland ok eignaðisk Óðinn þar víða landit, ok	Óðinn hafði spádóm ok svá kona hans, ok af þeim vísindum fann hann þat at nafn hans mundi uppi vera haft í norðrhálfu heimsins og tignat um fram alla konunga. Fyrir þá sök fýstisk hann at byrja ferð sína af Tyrklandi ok hafði með sér mikinn fjölða liðs, unga menn ok gamla, karla ok konur, ok höfðu með sér marga gersemliga hluti. En hvar sem þeir fóru yfir lönd, þá var ágæti mikit frá þeim sagt, svá at þeir þóttu líkari goðum en

þar setti hann til lands gæzlu þrjá syni sína. Vegdreg réð fyrir Austr-Saxlandi. Annarr sonr hans hét Beldeg, er vér köllum Baldr, hann átti Vestrfál, þat ríki er svá heitir. Þriði sonr hans hét Sigi, hans sonr Rerir, faðir Völsungs, er Völsungar eru frá komnir, þeir réðu fyrir Frakklandi. Frá öllum þeim eru stórar ættir komnar.	mönnum. Ok þeir gefa eigi stað ferðinni, fyrr en þeir koma norðr í þa*t* land er nú er kallat Saxland. Þar dvalðisk Óðinn langar hríðir ok eignask víða þat land. Þar setr Óðinn til lands gæzlu þrjá sonu sína. Er einn nefndr Veggdegg, var hann ríkr konungr ok réð fyrir Austr-Saxalandi, hans sonr var Vitrgils, hans synir váru þeir [V]itta, faðir Heingests, ok Sigarr, faðir Svebdegg, er vér köllum Svipdag. Annarr son Óðins hét Beldegg, er vér köllum Baldr, hann átti þat land, er nú heitir Vestfal. Hans son var Brandr, hans son Frjóðigar, er vér köllum Fróða, hans son var Freóvit, hans son Úvigg, hans son Gevís, er [vér k]öllum Gavé. Inn þriði son Óðins er nefndr Siggi, hans son Verir. Þeir langfeðgar réðu þar fyrir er nú er kallat Frakland, ok er þaðan sú ætt komin er kölluð er Völsungar. Frá öllum þessum eru stórar ættir komnar ok margar.
Þá fór Óðinn í Reiðgotaland, ok eignaðisk þat, ok setti þar son sinn Skjöld, föður Friðleifs, er Skjöldungar eru frá komnir. Þat heitir nú Jótland er þeir kölluðu Reiðgotaland.	Þá byrjaði Óðinn ferð sína norðr ok kom í þat land, er þeir kölluðu Reiðgotaland, ok eignaðisk í því landi allt þat er hann vildi. Hann setti þar til landa son sinn er Skjöldr hét, hans son hét Friðleifr, þaðan er sú ætt ko[min, e]r Skjöldungar heita, þat eru Danakonungar, ok þat heitir nú Jótland er þá var kallat Reiðgotaland.
Þaðan fór Óðinn í Svíþjóð. Þar var sá konungr, er Gylfi hét, ok er hann frétti til Asíamanna, er æsir váru kallaðir, fór hann í móti þeim ok bauð þeim í sitt ríki. En sá tími fylgði ferð þeira, hvar sem þeir dvölðusk í löndum, þá var þar ár ok friðr, ok trúðu menn, at þeir væri þess ráðandi, þvíat ríkismenn sá þá ólíka flestum mönnum öðrum at fegrð ok viti. Þar þótti Óðni fagrir vellir ok landskostir góðir, ok kaus sér þar borgar stað, sem nú heita Sigtún, skipaði þar höfðingja í þá líking sem í Troju. Váru settir tólf höfðingjar at dœma landslög. Síðan fór Óðinn norðr þar til er sjór tók við honum, sá er hann ætlaði at lægi um öll lönd, ok setti þar son sinn til ríkis, er Sem[in]gr hét, en nú heitir Nóregr, ok telja Nóregskonungar ok svá jarlar þangat ættir sínar. Með Óðni fór Yngvi, er konungr var í Svíþjóðu eptir hann, ok Ynglingar eru frá komnir.	Eptir þat fór hann norðr þar sem nú heitir Svíþjóð. Þar var sá konungr, er Gylfi er nefndr, en er hann spyrr til ferða þeira Asíamanna, er æsir váru kallaðir, fór hann móti þeim ok bauð at Óðinn skyldi slíkt vald hafa í hans ríki sem hann vildi sjálfr. Ok sá tími fylgði ferð þeira, at hvar sem þeir dvölðusk í löndum, þá var þar ár ok friðr góðr, ok trúðu allir, at þeir væri þess ráðandi, þvíat <þat> sá ríkismenn at þeir váru ólíkir öðrum mönnum þeim er þeir höfðu sét at fegrð ok at viti. Þar þótti Óðni fagrir landskostir ok kaus sér þar borgstað, er nú heita Sigtúnir. Skipa<ði> hann þar höfðingjum ok í þá líking, sem verit hafði í Troja, setti tólf höfuðmenn í staðinum at dœma landslög, ok svá skipaði hann réttum öllum sem fyrr höfðu verit í Troju ok Tyrkir váru vanir. Eptir þat fór hann norðr þar til er sjár tók við honum, sá er þeir hugðu at lægi um öll lönd, ok setti þar son sinn <til> þess ríkis er nú heitir Nóregr. Sá er Sæmingr kallaðr, ok telja þar Nóregskonungar sínar ættir til hans ok svá jarlar ok aðrir ríkismenn, svá sem segir í Háleygjatali. En Óðinn hafði með sér þann son sinn er Yngvi er nefndr, er konungr var í Svíþjóðu, ok eru frá honum komnar þær ættir er Ynglingar eru kallaðir.
Þeir æsirnir tóku sér kvánföng þar innan lands, ok urðu þær ættir fjölmennar, um Saxland ok um norðrhálfuna. Þeira tunga ein gekk um þessi lönd, ok þat skilja menn at þeir hafa norðr hingat haft tunguna í Nóreg ok Danmörk, Svíþjóð ok Saxland.	Þeir æsir tóku sér kvánföng þar innan lands, en sumir sonum sínum, ok urðu þessar ættir fjölmennar, at umb Saxland ok allt þaðan um norðrhálfur dreifðisk svá at þeira tunga, Ásíamanna, var eigintunga um öll þessi lönd, ok þat þykkjask menn skynja mega af því at skrifuð eru langfeðganöfn þeira, at þau nöfn hafa fylgt þessi tungu ok þeir æsir hafa haft tunguna norðr hingat í heim, í Nóreg ok í Svíþjóð, í Danmörk ok í Saxland, ok í Englandi eru forn landsheiti eða staðaheiti, þau er skilja má at af annarri tungu eru gefin en þessi.

Figure 12. The Introduction in U compared to W, T and R, respectively. In this example I use Eysteinn Björnssons normalized text (http://notendur.hi.is/eybjorn/).

Obviously the Prologue is built upon written sources of some sort and it is clear that the editors of different versions have had different sources. This holds true for both the mythologic and historic part of the tales. It is commonly stated that the Prologue shows how important it was for Snorri to find an excuse for writing heathen mythology. Recently Viðar Pálsson (2008) by comparing the information on the Prologue to what we can read in *Sturlunga* has come to the conclusion that Snorri maybe did not at all need all those excuses.

4.3 Students' notes or real shortenings?

Now we will turn to the real "abbreviations", listed in table 4. Since the text in the U version makes up less than 50% of the text in the RT version, there may be reason to stress that at least five or six tales in this section can be considered to be very important, both from the mythological and the poetic point of view. It is sufficient to mention Þórr's fight with the serpent, which was retold in pictures on stone and metal all over the Nordic part of the world during the Viking ages or the tale of Freyr and Gerðr, which was supposedly the closes thing we have to a "gospel" for the rituals at the offerings to the fertilitygods. To take myths of that kind and compress them to the borders of incomprehensibility would be a strange operation that really needs some explanation.

4.3.1 Freyr and Gerðr (Section 05, 33.8%)

In his long essay on the original form and composition of *Edda* (1898), Finnur Jónsson included a few pages as an answer to Eugene Mogk who had claimed that the two versions of this episode to go back on two different Eddic poems. Finnur summarizes:

> Resultatet af det foranstående er urokkeligt, kort og godt dette: Fremstillingen af Freys og Gerðrs kærlighed er fuldstændig identisk i a l l e håndskrifter; i U er den systematiskt forkortet og stilen sködeslöst behandlet, hvorved et par fejl er indlöbne. (1898:352.)[71]

Just to show how the discussion can go on, one may quote E. Mogk 27 years later. His commentaries are just as selfconfident as are Finnur Jónsson's:

> F. Jónsson hat … beide fassungen nebeneinander gestellt. Aber da mußte er sich doch auch die frage vorlegen: wie steht es bei den andern dœmisögur der Edda? Nicht eine einzige von den zahlreichen zeigt in U eine solche kürze gegneüber R wie diese, in allen ist der zusammenhang bis ins äußerste bewahrt. […] In fragmentarischer kürze ist die erzählung in U zwischen cap. 36 und 38 eingeflochten, das dann der bearbeiter der R-fassung wegen seiner kürze und zwar aller wahrscheinlichkeit nach auf grund der Skírnismál erweitert hat. (1925:407.)

[71] "The result of the previous is unshakeable, in short that the description of Freyr's and Gerðr's love is completely identical in a l l the manuscripts; in U it is systematically abbrevated and the style treated carelessly, whereupon a couple of mistakes have occurred."

Earlier in his essay Finnur had claimed that "U intet som helst nyt indeholder" ("U does not contain anything new" p. 350.) If *nyt* means new details, it is correct, but if we look at the content words of both texts it may be worth mentioning that in the very short text (containing all in all only 49 content words) U has 5 words that do not occur in R: *ástir, hitta, hnefi, vænn, verra.* Even if some of them have semantic equivalents in R it is always a question of different lexemes. This can be taken as an argument that the two versions came from two different tellers of tales. But the most important thing seems to be that if U was a shortening of the other version, then the editor/scribe has wiped out any mark that could reveal his knowledge of the poem Skírnismál!

Even if Mogk was not right with regard to the complete uniqueness in relative length of texts (there are in fact examples of still more differences than this), he is absolutely right in pointing out that by shortening in this way, the editor really had gone too far.

Judging from the "contemporary" stanzas in *Sturlunga*, Freyr was definitely one of the more memorable Æsir/Vanir, but none of the kennings mentions his proposal to Gerðr, and Skírnir is only mentioned in Skírnismál and once more as a messenger in *Edda* (Grape et al. 1977:17.17 *Þá sendi Alföðr þann [m]ann, er Skírnir hét, í Svartálfaheim*). Gerðr is "hyppig i kvindekenninger" (Lex. Poet.) but being common, she only appears as any other lady in Ásgarðr (in kennings like *váða Gerðr, gullhrings Gerðr*) with no special characteristics of her own.

The texts as a whole in the *Edda* versions are really very different (Fig. 13). If we compare this with Skírnismál in Codex Regius of the mythic poetry and the few lines of prose that follow the poem, it is obvious that the myths in the different versions of *Edda* must be based on some information that does not belong to the poem. If we suppose that both the U and R versions have the same original source, it would be most reasonable to believe that when composing the R text, the editor/scribe had Skírnismál to aid him, while the editor of the U text did not know the poem.

Once again I think we have reason to believe that we are dealing with two different oral sources.

Grape et al. 1977:20	Faulkes 2005:30–31
Gymir h[ét] maðr en kona hans Aur[b]oða, hann v[a]r bergrisa ættar. Dóttir þeira var Gerðr, allra kvenna vænst. Þat var einn dag at Freyr gekk í Hliðskjálf ok sá um heim allan, ok er hann leit í no[rðrætt], þá sá hann á einum bœ mikit hús, ok þar gekk kona út, ok lýsti af hár[i] hennar bæði lopt ok lög, ok svá hefnd[i] honum þat mikillæti er hann settisk í þat *i*t helga sæti at hann gekk brott fullr af harmi. Ok ekki svaf hann, er hann kom heim ok þeir Skírnir hittusk. Þá fór Skírnir at hitta Gerði ok kom saman ástum þeira. Hann fekk Skírni í hendr sverð sitt, en hann [hafði] þá ekki sverð er þeir Beli hittusk, en drepa mátti hann Bela með hnefa sínum. En verra er honum þat, þá er hann missir sverðsins er M[u]spellsmegir herja ok hann bersk við þá.	Gymir hét maðr, en kona hans Aurboða, hon var bergrisa ættar. Dóttir þeira er Gerðr, er allra kvenna er fegrst. Þat var einn dag er Freyr hafði gengit í Hliðskjálf ok sá of heima alla,en er hann leit í norðrætt, þá sá hann á einum bœ mikit hús ok fagrt, ok til þess húss gekk kona, ok er hon tók upp höndum ok lauk hurð fyrir sér þá lýsti af höndum hennar bæði í lopt ok á lög, ok allir heimar birtusk af henni. Ok svá hefndi honum þat mikla mikillæti er hann hafði sezk í þat helga sæti at hann gekk í braut fullr af harmi. Ok er hann kom heim, mælti hann ekki, hvárki svaf hann né drakk; engi þorði ok krefja hann orða. Þá lét Njörðr kalla til sín Skírni, skósvein Freys, ok bað hann ganga til Freys ok beiða hann orða ok spyrja hverjum hann væri svá reiðr at hann mælti ekki við menn. En Skírnir kvazk ganga mundu, ok eigi fúss, ok kvað illra svara vera ván af honum. En er hann kom til Freys, þá spurði hann hví Freyr var svá hnipinn ok mælti ekki við menn. Þá svarar Freyr ok sagði at hann hafði sét konu fagra, ok fyrir hennar sakar var hann svá harmsfullr at eigi mundi hann lengi lifa ef hann skyldi eigi ná henni. Ok nú skaltu fara ok biðja hennar mér til handa ok hafa hana heim hingat hvárt er faðir hennar vill eða eigi, ok skal ek þat vel launa þér. Þá svarar Skírnir, sagði svá at hann skal fara sendiferð en Freyr skal fá honum sverð sitt. Þat var svá gott sverð at sjálft vásk. En Freyr lét eigi þat til skorta ok gaf honum sverðit. Þá fór Skírnir ok bað honum konunnar ok fekk heitit hennar, ok níu nóttum síðar skyldi hon þar koma er Barey heitir ok ganga þá at brullaupinu með Frey. En er Skírnir sagði Frey sitt eyrindi þá kvað hann þetta: Löng er nótt, löng er önnur, hvé mega ek þreyja þrjár? Opt mér mánaðr minni þótti en sjá hálf hýnótt. Þessi sök er til er Freyr var svá vápnlauss er hann barðisk við Belja ok drap hann með hjartarhorni. Þá mælti Gangleri: Undr mikit er þvílíkr höfðingi sem Freyr er vildi gefa sverð svá at hann átti eigi annat jafngott. Geysimikit mein var honum þat þá er hann barðisk við þann er Beli heitir. Þat veit trúa mín at þeirar gjafar mundi hann þá iðrask. Þá svarar Hár: Lítit mark var þá at er þeir Beli hittusk. Drepa mátti Freyr hann með hendi sinni. Verða mun þat er Frey mun þykkja verr við koma er hann missir sverðsins þá er Muspells synir fara ok herja.

Figure 13. The Freyr and Gerðr episode in U and R, respectively.

4.3.2 Þórr and Miðgarðsormr (Section 9, 44.5%)

As mentioned above, this myth was obviously very well known all over the cultural area of the Nordic people, and in *Edda* it is indirectly mentioned several times through the kennings that are presented to us. Compared to the very sophisticated tale we get in R, the U version is quite poor (Fig. 14):

Grape et al. 1977:29	Faulkes 2005:43–45
Eptir þenna a<t>burð snýr Þórr heimleiðis, ætlar nú at hitta Miðgarðsorminn, ok kom til jötuns nökkurs, er Eymir er nefndr.	Þá mælti Gangleri: Allmikill er fyrir sér Útgarðaloki, en með vælum ok fjölkyngi ferr hann mjök. En þat má sjá at hann er mikill fyrir sér at hann átti hirðmenn þá er mikinn mátt hafa. Eða hvárt hefir Þórr ekki þessa hefnt? Hár svarar: Eigi er þat ókunnigt, þótt eigi sé frœðimenn, at Þórr leiðrétti þessa ferðina er nú var frá sagt, ok dvalðisk ekki lengi heima áðr hann bjósk svá skyndiliga til ferðarinnar at hann hafði eigi reið ok eigi hafrana ok ekki föruneyti. Gekk hann út of Miðgarð svá sem ungr drengr ok kom einn aptan at kveldi til jötuns nökkurs, sá er Hymir nefndr. Þórr dvalðisk þar at gistingu of nóttina. En í dagan stóð Ymir upp ok klæddisk ok bjósk at róa á sæ til fiskjar. En Þórr spratt upp ok var skjótt búinn ok bað at Hymir skyldi hann láta róa á sæ með sér, en Hymir sagði at lítil liðsemð mundi at honum vera, er hann var lítill ok ungmenni eitt.
En um morgininn bjósk jötunn at fara til fiskjar. Þórr vill fara með honum, en jötunn lét ekki gagn mundu at kögursveini þeim, mun þik kala ef ek sit lengi ok útarla á mið[u]m sem ek em vanr. Þórr reiddisk honum mjök ok kvað þat eigi víst, ok spurði hvat þeir skyldi hafa at beitum. Eymir bað hann fá sér beitur. Þórr tók uxann er heitir Himinrjóðr, er Eymir átti, ok sleit af höfuðit, ok settisk í austrrúm. Ok þótti Eymi hann heldr róa mikit, ok lét þ[á] komna á þær vaztir sem hann var vanr ok bað þá eigi róa lengra. Þórr lézk vildu enn miklu lengra róa. Eymir kvað þat hætt við Miðgarðsorminn. Þórr vill róa, Eymir varð ókátr. Þórr greiddi vaðinn ok lét koma á uxahöfuðit á öngulinn, ok fór til grunns.	Ok mun þik kala ef ek sit svá lengi ok útarliga sem ek em vanr. En Þórr sagði at hann mundi róa mega fyrir því frá landi at eigi var víst hvárt hann mundi fyrr beiðask at róa útan, ok reiddisk Þórr jötninum svá at þá var búit at hann mundi þegar láta hamarinn skjalla honum, en hann lét þat við berask, því at hann hugðisk þá at reyna afl sitt í öðrum stað. Hann spurði Ymi hvat þeir skyldu hafa at beitum, en Ymir bað hann fá sér sjálfan beitur. Þá snerisk Þórr á braut þangat er hann sá öxna flokk nokkvorn er Hymir átti. Hann tók hinn mesta uxann, er Himinhrjótr hét, ok sleit af höfuðit ok fór með til sjávar. Hafði þá Hymir út skotit nökkvanum. Þórr gekk á skipit ok settisk í austrrúm, tók tvær árar ok röri, ok þótti Hymi skriðr verða af róðri hans.Hymir reri í hálsinum fram ok sóttisk skjótt róðrinn. Sagði þá Hymir at þeir váru komnir á þær vaztir er hann var vanr at sitja ok draga flata fiska. En Þórr kvezk vilja róa myklu lengra, ok tóku þeir enn snertiróðr. Sagði Hymir þá at þeir váru komnir svá langt út at hætt var at sitja útar fyrir Miðgarðsormi. En Þórr kvezk mundu róa eina hríð, ok svá gerði, en Hymir var þá allókátr. En þá er Þórr lagði upp árarnar, greiddi hann til vað heldr sterkjan, ok eigi var öngullinn minni eða óramligri. Þar lét Þórr koma á öngulinn oxahöfuðit ok kastaði fyrir borð, ok fór öngullinn til *g*runns. Ok er þá svá satt at segja at engu ginti þá Þórr miðr Miðgarðsorm en Útgarðaloki hafði spottat Þór, þá er hann hóf orminn upp á hendi sér. Miðgarðsormr gein yfir oxahöfuðit en öngullinn vá í góminn orminum. En er ormrinn kendi þess, brá hann við svá hart at báðir hnefar Þórs skullu út á borðinu. Þá varð Þórr reiðr ok fœrðisk í ásmegin, spyrndi við svá fast at hann hljóp báðum fótum gögnum skipit ok spyrndi við grunni, dró þá orminn upp at borði. En þat má segja at engi hefir sá sét ógurligar sjónir er eigi mátti þat sjá er Þórr hvesti augun á orminn, en ormrinn starði neðan í mót ok blés eitrinu.
Miðgarðsormrinn beit á önglinum, ok kom í góminn. En ormrinn brá við fast svá at báðir hnefar Þórs skullu við borðinu. Þá fœrðisk Þórr í ásmegin, spyrndi við fast svá at hann hljóp báðum fótum í gegnum skipborðit ok spyrndi við grunni, dró þá at sér orminn ok upp viðr borðinu. En engi hefir sá sét inar ógurligstu sýnir, er eigi hefir þat er Þórr hvesti augun á orminn, en hann starði neðan á móti ok blés eitrinu.	
[Jö]tunninn varð litverpr er hann sá orminn, ok særinn fell inn nökkut. En er Þórr greip hamarinn, fálmaði jötunninn til agnsaxins ok hjó við borðinu vað Þórs, en ormr sökk í sæinn. En Þórr kastaði hamrinum	Þá er sagt at jötunninn Hymir gerðisk litverpr, fölnaði ok hræddisk er hann sá orminn ok þat er særinn fell út ok inn of nökkvann. Ok í því bili er Þórr greip hamarinn ok fœrði á lopt þá fálmaði jötunninn til agnsaxinu ok hjó vað Þórs af borði, en ormrinn söktisk í sæinn. En Þórr kastaði hamrinum eptir honum, ok segja menn at hann lysti af honum höfuðit við grunninum, en ek hygg hitt vera þér satt at segja at

ok laust við eyra jötninum, svá at hann steyptisk at borðinu, ok laust af honum höfuðit við háunu[m]. En Þórr óð til lands.	Miðgarðsormr lifir enn ok liggr í umsjá. En Þórr reiddi til hnefann ok setr við eyra Ymi, svá at hann steyptisk fyrir borð ok sér í iljar honum. En Þórr óð til lands.

Figure 14. The Þórr and Miðgarðsormr episode in U and R, respectively

Looking at the total vocabulary, R contains 655 words while U only uses 292 (44,5%.) If we look at the content words the picture is different. Then R gives us 152 lexemes while U has 94 (ca. 62%), and among those there really are only 7 new lexemes in U:

bíta, *gagn*, *kögursveinn*, *látask*, *mið*, *morginn*, *ókátr*.

Besides this, the name of the giant is a variant in U: *Eymir*, while R uses (the more common giant name) *Hymir* (v.l. *Ymir*). All of the new lexemes in U, except *mið*, have a semantic equivalent in the R text.

Obviously, most of the details are the same in both versions. The greatest difference comes at the very end, where the U version seems to describe the giant's death: "laust af honum höfuðit við háunu[m]" while the R version only makes him dive into the ocean. Even if the R makes Þórr throw his hammer, heading for the serpent, we get the storyteller's commentary, stating that nevertheless the serpent is alive. But in most cases the R is simply more loquacious and literary.[72]

Thus to explain the shorter text in this case as a very deliberate shortening is not at all impossible, if we could explain why the editor finds that to be wise just in this very famous myth. Two different oral versions of course also could explain the differences.

4.3.3 Baldr's death (Section 10, 49%)

The myth describing the beginning of the end, the killing of Baldr and Baldr's funeral, is much shorter in the U version than in the RT version, namely only 49%. In both versions it comes straight after the tale about Þór and the serpent and the the whole text reads as follows (Fig. 15):

Grape et al. 1977:30.12–32.2	**Faulkes 2005:45–48**
Þá mælti Gangleri: Mikit afrek var þetta. Hár svaraði: Meira var hitt vert, er Baldr inn góða dreymði hættligt, ok sagði ásum. Frigg beiddi honum griða, at eigi grandaði honum eldr né járn né vötn, málmr né steinar né viðir, sóttir né dýr, fuglar né	Þá mælti Gangleri: Hafa nokkvor meiri tíðindi orðit með ásunum? Allmikit þrekvirki vann Þórr í þessi ferð. Hár svarar: Vera mun at segja frá þeim tíðindum er meira þótti vert Ásunum. En þat er upphaf þessar sögu at Baldr inn góða dreymði drauma stóra ok hættliga um líf sitt. En er hann sagði ásunum draumana, þá báru þeir saman ráð sín, ok var þat gert at beiða griða Baldri fyrir alls konar háska. Ok Frigg tók svardaga til þess at eira skyldu Baldri eldr ok vatn, járn ok alls konar málmr, steinar, jörðin,

[72] This, and other interesting sources (e.g. *Hymiskviða*), make this episode worth a special study (forthcoming by Henrik Williams.)

eitrormar.

Ok er þetta var gert, var þat skemtan Baldrs at hann stóð upp á þingum. Skyldu sumir skjóta at honum, en sumir höggva, sumir grýta. Hann sakaði ekki.

En er Loki sá þat, líkaði honum illa, gekk til Fensala til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Spyrr Frigg ef hann vissi hvat menn höfðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, en hann sakar ekki. Þá mælti Frigg: "Eigi munu vápn né viðir bana Baldri. Eiða hefi ek af öllum tekit.

Þá mælti konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Bal[dr]i?

Frigg svaraði: Viðarteinungr einn vex fyrir vestan Valhöll, er heitir mistilteinn. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðsins. Þá hverfr konan.

En Loki gengr til ok tekr mistil-tei[ni]nn ok slítr upp með rótum, gengr til þingsins. En Höðr stóð útarliga í mannhringinum, er hann var blindr. Þá mælti Loki við hann: Hví skýtr þú eigi at Baldri? Hann svarar: Þvíat ek sé ekki, ok þat annat at ek em vápnlauss. Loki mælti: Gerðu í líking annarra manna ok veit honum atsókn. Ek mun vísa þér til hans. Skjót þú at honum vendi þessum.

Höðr tók mistilteininn ok skaut í gegnum Baldr. Ok var þat mest óhappaskot með guðum ok mönnum.

Nú sá hverr til annars ok allir með grimmum hug til þess gert hafði. En engi mátti þar hefna í griðastaðnum.

Allir báru illa harminn, en Óðinn verst. Var þar grátr fyrir mál. Þá spurði Frigg hverr sá væri með ásum er eignask vildi ástir hennar ok ríða á Helvega at ná Baldri meðr útlausn. Hermóðr, son Óðins, fór ok reið Sleipni.

Baldr var lagðr í skipit Hringhorna ok ætluðu guðin fram at setja með bálgerð, ok tóksk þat eigi fyrri en Hyrrokin kom til. Hon reið vargi ok vargar váru at taumum. Ok nú fengu eigi berserkir haldit taumunum. Hon dró fram skipit, ok at fyrsta viðbragði hraut skipit ór hlunnunum. Þá vildi Þórr ljósta hana, en guðin banna þat.

Lík Baldrs var borit á bálit. Nanna Nefsdóttir [spr]akk er hon frá. Þórr vígði bálit með Mjölni, ok hann viðirnir, sóttirnar, dýrin, fuglarnir, eitr, ormar. En er þetta var gert ok vitat, þá var þat skemtun Baldrs ok Ásanna at hann skyldi stand*a* upp á þingum, en allir aðrir skyldu sumir skjóta á hann, sumir höggva til, sumir berja grjóti. En hvat sem at var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta öllum mikill frami. En er þetta sá Loki Laufeyjarson, þá líkaði honum illa er Baldr sakaði ekki. Hann gekk til Fensalar til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Þá spyrr Frigg ef sú kona vissi hvat Æsir höfðusk at á þinginu. Hon sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, ok þat at hann sakaði ekki. Þá mælti Frigg:

Eigi munu vápn eða viðir granda Baldri. Eiða hefi ek þegit af öllum þeim.

Þá spyrr konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Baldri?

Þá svarar Frigg: Vex viðarteinungr einn fyrir vestan Valhöll, sá er mistilteinn kallaðr. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðsins.

Því næst hvarf konan á brut. En Loki tók mistiltein ok sleit upp ok gekk til þings. En Höðr stóð útarliga í mannhringinum, því at hann var blindr. Þá mælir Loki við hann:

Hví skýtr þú ekki at Baldri?

Hann svarar: Því at ek sé eigi hvar Baldr er, ok þat annat at ek em vápnlauss.

Þá mælir Loki: Gerðu þó í líking annarra manna ok veit Baldri sœmð sem aðrir menn. Ek mun vísa þér til hvar hann stendr. Skjót at honum vendi þessum.

Höðr tók mistiltein ok skaut at Baldri at tilvísun Loka. Flaug skotit í gögnum hann ok fell hann dauðr til jarðar. Ok hefir þat mest óhapp verit unnit með goðum ok mönnum. Þá er Baldr var fallinn, þá fellusk öllum Ásum orðtök ok svá hendr at taka til hans, ok sá hverr til annars ok váru allir með einum hug til þess er unnit hafði verkit. En engi mátti hefna, þar var svá mikill griðastaðr. En þá er Æsirnir freistuðu at mæla, þá var hitt þó fyrr at grátrinn kom upp, svá at engi mátti öðrum segja með orðunum frá sínum harmi. En Óðinn bar þeim mun verst þenna skaða sem hann kunni mesta skyn hversu mikil aftaka ok missa Ásunum var í fráfalli Baldrs.

En er goðin vitkuðusk, þá mælir Frigg ok spurði hverr sá væri með Ásum er eignask vildi allar ástir hennar ok hylli, ok vili hann ríða á Helveg ok freista ef hann fái fundit Baldr ok bjóða Helju útlausn, ef hon vill láta fara Baldr heim í Ásgarð. En sá er nefndr Hermóðr inn hvati, sveinn Óðins, er til þeirar farar varð. Þá var tekinn Sleipnir, hestr Óðins, ok leiddr fram, ok steig Hermóðr á þann hest ok hleypti braut.

En Æsirnir tóku lík Baldrs ok fluttu til sævar. Hringhorni hét skip Baldrs. Hann var allra skipa mestr, hann vildu goðin fram setja ok gera þar á bálför Baldrs. En skipit gekk hvergi fram. Þá var sent í Jötunheima eptir gýgi þeiri er Hyrrokkin hét, en er hon kom ok reið vargi ok hafði höggorm at taumum, þá hljóp hon af hestinum, en Óðinn kallaði til berserki fjóra at gæta hestsins, ok fengu þeir eigi haldit nema þeir feldi hann. Þá gekk Hyrrokkin á framstafn nökkvans ok hratt fram í fyrsta viðbragði, svá at eldr hraut ór hlunnunum ok lönd öll skulfu. Þá varð Þórr reiðr ok greip hamarinn ok myndi þá brjóta höfuð hennar, áðr en goðin öll báðu henni friðar. Þá var borit út á skipit lík Baldrs, ok er þat sá kona hans, Nanna Nepsdóttir, þá sprakk hon af harmi ok dó. Var hon borin á bálit ok slegit í eldi. Þá stóð Þórr at ok vígði bálit með Mjöllni, en fyrir fótum hans rann dvergr nokkurr, sá er Litr nefndr, en Þórr spyrndi fœti sín um á hann ok hratt honum í eldinn, ok brann hann.

spyrndi dvergnum Lit á bálit. Þar váru þá öll guðin. Freyr sat í kerru ok var þar beittr fyrir göltrinn Gullinbusti eða Sligrutanni. Heimdallr reið Gulltopp, en Freyja ók köttum sínum. Þar váru ok hrímþussar. Óðinn lagði á bálit Draupni ok hest Baldrs með öllum reiða.	At þessi brennu sótti margs konar þjóð: fyrst at segja frá Óðni, at með honum fór Frigg ok valkyrjur ok hrafnar hans. En Freyr ók í kerru með gelti þeim er Gullinbursti heitir eða Slíðrugtanni. En Heimdallr reið hesti þeim er Gulltoppr heitir, en Freyja köttum sínum. Þar kömr ok mikit fólk hrímþursa ok bergrisar. Óðinn lagði á bálit gullhring þann er Draupnir heitir. Honum fylgði síðan sú náttúra at hina níundu hverja nótt drupu af honum átta gullhringar jafnhöfgir. Hestr Baldrs var leiddr á bálit með öllu reiði. En þat er at segja frá Hermóði at hann reið níu nætr dökkva dala ok djúpa svá at hann sá ekki fyrr en hann kom til árinnar Gjallar ok reið á Gjallarbrúna. Hon er þökð lýsigulli. Móðguðr er nefnd mær sú er gætir brúarinnar. Hon spurði hann at nafni eða ætt ok sagði at hinn fyrra dag riðu um brúna fimm fylki dauðra manna. En eigi dynr brúin jafnmjök undir einum þér, ok eigi hefir þú lit dauðra manna. Hví ríðr þú hér á Helveg? Hann svarar at ek skal ríða til Heljar at leita Baldrs. Eða hvárt hefir þú nakkvat sét Baldr á Helvegi? En hon sagði at Baldr hafði þar riðit um Gjallar brú, en niðr ok norðr liggr Helvegr.
Hermóðr reið níu nætr til Gjallarár ok á gulli hlaðna brú. Móðguðr gætti brúarinnar, ok hon mælti: Fyrra dag reið Baldr hér með fimm hundruð manna, en eigi glymr miðr undir þér einum. Þá reið hann at Helgrindum, ok sá þar bróður sinn. Hann bar fram boð sín, en sú ein var ván um brottkvámu hans ef allir hlutir gráta hann með ásum, kykvir ok dauðir, en ella haldisk með Helju. Baldr fekk honum hringinn Draupni, en Nanna sendi Frigg fald, en Fullu fingrgull. Þá fór móðr aptr í Ásgarð ok segir tíðindi. Þá báðu guðin alla hluti gráta Baldr ór Helju, menn ok kykvindi, jörð ok steina. Tré ok allr málmr grétu Baldr, sem þú munt sét hafa at þessir hlutir gráta allir í frosti ok hita. Þat er sagt at guðin finna gýgi í helli nökkurum, er Þökt nefndisk, biðja hana gráta sem allt annat Baldr ór Helju. Hon svarar: 52. Þökt mun gráta þurrum tárum Baldrs helfarar, kyks eða dauðs. Haldi Hel því er hefir. Þar var Loki raunar.	Þá reið Hermóðr þar til er hann kom at Helgrindum. Þá sté hann af hestinum ok gyrði hann fast, steig upp ok keyrði hann sporum, en hestrinn hljóp svá hart ok yfir grindina at hann kom hvergi nær. Þá reið Hermóðr heim til hallarinnar ok steig af hesti, gekk inn í höllina, sá þar sitja í öndugi Baldr bróður sinn, ok dvalðisk Hermóðr þar um nóttina. En at morni þá beiddisk Hermóðr af Helju at Baldr skyldi ríða heim með honum, ok sagði hversu mikill grátr var með Ásum. En Hel sagði at þat skyldi svá reyna hvárt Baldr var svá ástsæll sem sagt er. Ok ef allir hlutir í heiminum, kykvir ok dauðir, gráta hann, þá skal hann fara til Ása aptr, en haldask með Helju ef nakkvarr mælir við eða vill eigi gráta. Þá stóð Hermóðr upp, en Baldr leiðir hann út ór höllinni ok tók hringinn Draupni ok sendi Óðni til minja, en Nanna sendi Frigg ripti ok enn fleiri gjafar; Fullu fingrgull. Þá reið Hermóðr aptr leið sína ok kom í Ásgarð ok sagði öll tíðindi þau er hann hafði sét ok heyrt. Því næst sendu Æsir um allan heim örindreka at biðja at Baldr væri grátinn ór Helju. En allir gerðu þat, menninir ok kykvendin ok jörðin ok steinarnir ok tré ok allr málmr, svá sem þú munt sét hafa at þessir hlutir gráta þá er þeir koma ór frosti ok í hita. Þá er sendimenn fóru heim ok höfðu vel rekit sín eyrindi, finna þeir í helli nokkvorum hvar gýgr sat, hon nefndisk Þökk. Þeir biðja hana gráta Baldr ór Helju. Hon segir: 54. Þökk mun gráta þurrum tárum Baldrs bálfarar. Kyks né dauðs nautka ek karls sonar: haldi Hel því er hefir. En þess geta menn at þar hafi verit Loki Laufeyjarson, er flest hefir illt gert með Ásum.

Figure 15. The Baldr's death episode in U and R, respectively

When the texts are lemmatized and we compare the lexemes we find that U includes about 64% of R's content words as well as 30 content words that are not found in R, namely:

> *afrek, aka, atsókn, bálgerð, bana, banna, beittr, boð, brottkváma, draga, eitrormr, faldr, glymja, grimmr, grýta, gull, hlaðinn, hundruð, ljósta, mál, miðr, ná, óhappaskot, rót, sonr, takask, ván, ætla.*

Furthermore, two place names are different in U: *Gjallará* for *Gjöll* and *Fensalir* for *Fensalr*.

We have seen that in some cases the content words in U have almost complete equivalents in R, word for word, so to say. In Baldr's death it thus is of interest to look at the context:

Grape et al. 1977:30.12–32.2	**Faulkes 2005:45–48**
Mikit afrek var þetta. Freyj*a* ók köttum sínum veit honum atsókn ætluðu guðin fram at setja með bálgerð Eigi munu vápn né viðir bana Baldrien guðin banna þat Freyr sat í kerru ok var þar beittr fyrir göltrinn Gullinbusti Hann bar fram boð sín sú ein var ván um brottkvámu dró fram skipit eitrormar Nanna sendi Frigg fald með fimm hundruð manna eigi glymr miðr undir þér einum ok allir með grimmum hug sumir höggva, sumir grýta til Gjallarár ok á gulli hlaðna brú gulli hlaðna fimm hundruð vildi Þórr ljósta hana Var þar grátr fyrir mál eigi glymr miðr at ná Baldri meðr útlausn var þat mest óhappaskot ok slítr upp með rótum Hermóðr, son Óðins tóksk þat eigi fyrri en Hyrrokin kom til sú ein var ván um brottkvámu hans ætluðu guðin fram at setja	Allmikit þrekvirki vann Þórr Heimdallr reið hesti […] en Freyja köttum veit Baldri sœmð fram setja ok gera þar á bálför Eigi munu vápn eða viðir granda Baldri goðin öll báðu henni friðar Freyr ók í kerru með gelti þeim er Gullinbursti heitir þá beiddisk Hermóðr af Helju hratt fram í fyrsta viðbragði eitr, ormar Nanna sendi Frigg ripti fimm fylki dauðra manna eigi dynr brúin jafnmjök undir einum þér allir með einum hug sumir höggva til, sumir berja grjóti á Gjallarbrúna. Hon er þökt lýsigulli þökt lýsigulli fimm fylki myndi þá brjóta höfuð hennar er Æsirnir freistuðu at mæla, þá var hitt þó fyrr at grátrinn kom upp eigi dynr brúin jafnmjök fái fundit Baldr ok bjóða Helju útlausn hefir þat mest óhapp verit unnit ok sleit upp Hermóðr inn hvati, sveinn Óðins sent […] eptir gýgi þeiri er Hyrrokkin hét skal hann fara til Ása vildu goðin fram setja

Figure 16. Semantic equivalents in content words of the Baldr's death episode in U and R, respectively.

If we compare this to the episodes already discussed, like Þórr's visit to Útgarða-Loki, there seems to be a clear difference. First of all we see different linguistic metaphores like U's: "Var þar grátr fyrir mál" compared to R's: "er Æsirnir freistuðu at mæla, þá var hitt þó fyrr at grátrinn kom upp", but we also meet with "mistakes" in R and not in U. This seems to be the explanation for Móðgunnr's comment to Hermóðr. In U: "Fyrra dag reið Baldr hér með fimm hundruð manna, en eigi glymr **miðr** undir þér einum" whereas R gives us the (corrupt?) wording: "hinn fyrra dag riðu um brúna fimm fylki dauðra manna, en eigi dynr brúin **jafnmjök** undir einum þér". In a similar way, U's information about Hermóðr being Óðinn's son is in better coherence with him meeting Baldr, his brother, than R's wordings about Óðinn's **sveinn** who later turns out to be Baldr's brother.

The difference in content words (compared with the equally long texts) is hard to explain without assuming that they are copied from different original sources (perhaps two different oral versions?).[73] Nevertheless, of course it may be possible that the text is a revised shortening.

4.3.4 Iðunn and Þjazi (Section 13, 45.7%)

This myth, which deals with the thrilling (and frightening) episode when Iðunn and her apples fall into the hands of the giants, was obviously a well-known one. However, its correct place in the myth collection of *Edda* has created problems. Originally it seems to have been among those myths that belong to Gylfaginning. After Bragi has been presented by Hár, he proceedes by introducing his wife. The texts is almost exactly the same in both versions:

> Kona Braga heitir Iðunn. Hún varðveitir í eski sínu epli þau er guðin skulu á bíta þá er þau eldaz, ok verða þá allir ungir, ok svá mun verða til Ragnarökkrs.
>
> Þá segir Gangleri: Allmikit þykki mér guðin eiga undir gæslu Iðunnar eða trúnaði.
>
> Þá mælti Hár ok hló við:
>
> Nær lagði þat ófæru einu sinni. Kunna mun ek þar af at segja. En þú skalt nú heyra fleiri nöfn guðanna. (Grape et al. 1977:15.8, cf. Faulkes 2005:25, and his note p. 64.)

Hár postpones the tale and thus the presentation is unique in *Edda*.[74] The storyteller simply seems to forget that he has promised to tell about the stolen apples, deciding to find a place for it in Skáldskaparmál instead of Gylfaginning. In the R version it is placed at the very beginning of Skáldskaparmál (1998:1–3), before the tale about the mead of poetry, which as a matter of fact would be the ideal opening myth about poetry. Then again, in R we are given a long citation from Haustlöng in Skáldskaparmál, repeating the same myth.[75]

---

[73] It is worth noting that while scholars usually expect it to be a scribal error, when we read in U that Hyrrokin was riding on a wolf "ok vargar váru at taumum" instead of R's "ok hafði höggorm at taumum", it might as well be a different metaphor where *vera at taumum* really means 'holding the reins'. – I owe Maja Bäckvall thanks for leading me to this interpretation.

[74] This makes Faulkes burst out in his commentary: "Clearly a reference to the story of the loss of the apples and the near-disaster that resulted […] the *ek* refers perhaps as much to Snorri as to Hár." (2005:64.)

[75] It is the common idea that Haustlöng was the main source here. A close analysis of the texts shows that it is possible to find connections between the poem and the R tradition, but none at all with the U version.

In the U version in DG 11 we are presented with the myth of the apples in scene two in the first main part of *Edda*, Gylfaginning or "Bragaræður". The tale is thus placed among the myths that have been moved from their (original) place in Skáldskaparmál to follow up the other myths in Gylfaginning. Iðunn is then mentioned again in Skáldskaparmál (comparable to R), but without a reference to Þjóðólfr's Haustlǫng.

The two versions of the myth are quite different in many ways, it seems. The wording is as follows (Fig. 17):

Grape et al. 1977:35.12–36.17	**Faulkes 1998:1–3.8**
Þessir æsir þágu heimboð at Ægi í Hlésey, Áðr hafði Óðinn hánum heim boðit. Um kveldit lét Óðinn bera sverð í höllina ok lýsti þar af sem logum björtum. Þórr var þar, Njörðr, Freyr, Týr, Heimdallr, Bragi, Viðar, Váli, Ullr, Hœnir, Forseti, Loki. Ásynjur: Slík, Frigg, Freyja, Gefjun, Iðunn, Gerður, Sigun, Skolla, Nanna.	Einn maðr er nefndr Ægir eða Hlér. Hann bjó í ey þeiri er nú er kölluð Hlésey. Hann var mjök fjölkunnigr. Hann gerði ferð sína til Ásgarðs, en er Æsir vissu ferð hans var honum fagnat vel ok þó margir hlutir með sjónhverfingum. Ok um kveldit, er drekka skyldi, þá lét Óðinn bera inn í höllina sverð, ok váru svá björt at þar af lýsti, ok var ekki haft ljós annat meðan við drykkju var setit. Þá gengu Æsir at gildi sínu ok settusk í hásæti tólf Æsir, þeir er dómendr skyldu vera ok svá váru nefndir: Þórr, Njörðr, Freyr, Týr, Heimdallr, Bragi, Viðarr, Váli, Ullr, Hœnir, Forseti, Loki; slíkt sama Ásynjur: Frigg, Freyja, Gefjun, Iðunn, Gerðr, Sigyn, Fulla, Nanna. Ægi þótti göfugligt þar um at sjásk. Veggþili öll váru þar tjölduð með fögrum skjöldum. Þar var ok áfenginn mjöðr ok mjök drukkit. Næsti maðr Ægi sat Bragi, ok áttusk þeir við drykkju ok orðaskipti.
Bragi segir Ægi frá mörgum tíðindum.	Sagði Bragi Ægi frá mörgum tíðindum þeim er Æsir höfðu átt.
Óðinn, Loki ok Hœnir fóru um fjall, fundu öxnaflokk, taka eitt nautið ok snúa til seyðis. Rjúfa tysvar seyðinn ok var eigi soðit. Þá sá þeir örn yfir sér ok lézk hann valda at eigi var soðit. Gefit mér fylli ok mun soðit. Þeir játa því.	Hann hóf þar frásögn at þrír Æsir fóro heiman, Óðinn ok Loki ok Hœnir, ok fóru um fjöll ok eyðimerkr ok var ilt til matar. En er þeir koma ofan í dal nakkvarn, sjá þeir öxna flokk ok taka einn uxann ok snúa til seyðis. En er þeir hyggja at soðit mun vera, raufa þeir seyðinn ok var ekki soðit. Ok í annat sinn er þeirr raufa seyðinn, þá er stund var liðin, ok var ekki soðit. Mæla þeir þá sín á milli hverju þetta muni gegna, Þá heyra þeir mál, í eikina upp yfir sik ok sá er þar sat kvazk ráða því er eigi soðnaði á seyðinum. Þeir litu til ok sat þar örn eigi lítill. Þá mælti örninn:
	Vilið þér gefa mér fylli mína af oxanum, þá mun soðna á seyðinum. Þeir játa því.

Thus *hárir ok gamlir* in R has a parallel in Haustlöng; *þjórhluti fjóra* in Haustlöng gives the same information as R "lær oxans tvau ok báða bógana." In those cases U gives different information.

Hann lætr sígask á seyðinn, tók annat uxalærit ok bóguna báða. Loki þreif upp stöng ok laust á bak erninum. En hann brá sér upp við höggit ok flýgr. Stöngin var föst við bak erninum. En hendr Loka voru fastar við annan stangar enda. Örninn flýgr svá at fœtr Loka námu niðri við jörðu ok grjóti. En hendr hugði hann slitna mundu ór axlarliðum ok biðr friðar.	Þá lætr hann sígask ór trénu ok sezk á seyðinn ok leggr upp þegar it fyrsta lær oxans tvau ok báða bógana. Þá varð Loki reiðr ok greip upp mikla stöng ok rekr á kroppinn erninum. Ñrninn bregzk við höggit ok flýgr upp. Þá var föst stöngin við kropp arnarins ok hendr Loka við annan enda. Ñrninn flýgr hátt svá at fœtr taka niðr við grjótit ok urðir ok viðu, [en] hendr hans hyggr hann at slitna muni ór öxlum. Hann kallar ok biðr allþarfliga □rninn friðar, en hann segir at Loki skal aldri lauss verða nema hann veiti honum svardaga at koma Iðunni út of Ásgarð með epli sín, en Loki vill þat. Verðr hann þá lauss ok ferr til lagsmanna sinna ok er eigi at sinni sögð fleiri tíðindi um þeira ferð áðr þeir koma heim.
Örninn lézk hann eigi mundu lausan láta nema Iðunn kæmi þar með epli sín. Loki vill þetta ok ferr brott með eiði.	
Hann teygir hana eptir eplunum ok biðr hana hafa sín epli, ok hon fór. Þar kom Þjazzi jötunn í arnar ham ok flaug með hana í Þrúðheim.	En at ákveðinni stundu teygir Loki Iðunni út um Ásgarð í skóg nokkvorn ok segir at hann hefir fundit epli þau er henni munu gripir í þykkja, ok bað at hon skal hafa með sér sín epli ok bera saman ok hin. Þá kemr þar Þjazi jötunn í arnarham ok tekr Iðunni ok flýgr braut með ok í Þrymheim til bús síns.
Æsir gerðusk œfrir mjök ok spurðu hvar Iðunn væri. En er þeir vissu, var Loka heitið bana nema hann færi eptir henni með valsham Freyju. Hann kom til Þjazza jötuns er hann var róinn á sæ. Loki brá henni í hnotar líki ok flaug með hana. Þjazzi tók arnar ham ok flaug eptir þeim.	En Æsir urðu illa við hvarf Iðunnar ok gerðusk þeir brátt hárir ok gamlir. Þá áttu þeir Æsir þing ok [spyrr hver annan] hvat síðarst vissi til Iðunnar, en þat var sét síðarst at hon gekk ór Ásgarði með Loka. Þá var Loki tekinn ok fœrðr á þingit ok var honum heitit bana eða píslum.
	En er hann varð hræddr, þá kvazk hann mundu sœk<j>a eptir Iðunni í Jötunheima ef Freyja vill ljá honum valshams er hon á. Ok er hann fær valshaminn flýgr hann norðr í Jötunheima ok kemr einn dag til Þjaza jötuns. Var hann róinn á sæ, en Iðunn var ein heima. Brá Loki henni í hnotar líki ok hafði í klóm sér ok flýgr sem mest. [E]n er Þjazi kom heim ok saknar Iðunnar, tekr hann arnarhaminn ok flýgr eptir Loka ok dró arnsúg í flugnum.
En er æsir sá hvar valrinn fló, þá tóku þeir byrði af lokarspánum ok slógu eldi í. Ñrninn fékk eigi stöðvat sik at fluginum, ok lausk eldi í fiðrit, ok drápu þeir jötuninn fyrir innan ásgrindr.	En er Æsirnir sá er valrinn flaug með hnotina ok hvar örninn flaug, þá gengu þeir út undir Ásgarð ok báru þannig byrðar af lokarspánum, ok þá er valrinn flaug inn of borgina, lét hann fallask niðr við borgarvegginn. Þá slógu Æsirnir eldi í lokarspánu en örninn mátti eigi stöðva er hann misti valsins. Laust þá eldinum í fiðri arnarins ok tók þá af fluginn. Þá váru Æsirnir nær ok drápu Þjaza jötun fyrir innan Ásgrindr ok er þat víg allfrægt.
En Skaði, dóttir hans, tók öll hervápn ok vill hefna hans. En þeir buðu henni at kjósa mann at fótum af liði þeirra.	En Skaði, dóttir Þjaza jötuns, tók hjálm ok brynju ok öll hervápn ok ferr til Ásgarðs at hefna föður síns. En Æsir buðu henni sætt ok yfirbætr, ok hit fyrsta at hon skal kjósa sér mann af Ásum ok kjósa at fótum ok sjá ekki fleira af. Þá sá hon eins manns fœtr forkunnar fagra ok mælir: Þenna kýs ek, fátt mun ljótt á Baldri. En þat var Njörðr ór Nóatúnum.
Hon sá eins manns fœtr fagra. Hon mælti þá: Þenna kýs ek, fátt mun ljótt á Baldri. En þat var Njörðr.	

En þat varð at sætt, at æsir skyldu hlœ<g>ja hana, en hon hugði at þat mætti engi gera. Loki batt sér geitarskegg undir hreðjarnar ok létu þau ýmsi eptir ok skrækti hvárr tveggja hátt. Þá lét hann fallask í kné Skaða ok þá hló hon. Þá var sætt ger með þeim.[76]	Þat hafði hon í sættargjörð sinni at Æsir skyldu þat gera, er hon hugði at þeir skyldu eigi mega, at hlægja hana. Þá gerði Loki þat at hann batt um skegg geitar nokkvorrar ok öðrum enda um hreðjar sér ok létu þau ymsi eptir ok skrækði hvárttеggja við hátt. Þá lét Loki fallask í kné Skaða ok þá hló hon. Var þá gjör sátt af Ásanna hendi við hana.
Óðinn gerði þat til föðrbóta við Skaða at hann tók augun Þjazza ok kastaði á himininn ok gerði af stjörnur.	Svá er sagt at Óðinn gerði þat til yfirbóta við hana at hann tók augu Þjaza ok kastaði upp á himin ok gerði af stjörnur tvær.
Auðvaldi hét faðir Þjazza. En er synir Auðvalda tóku arf, tók hverr munnfylli af gulli. Er nú gullit kallat munntal jötna, en í skáldskap mál þeirra.	Þá mælir Ægir: Mikill þykki mér Þjazi fyrir sér hafa verit, eða hvers kyns var hann? Bragi svarar: Ölvaldi hét faðir hans, ok merki mun þér þykkja ef ek segi þér frá honum. Hann var mjök gullauðigr, en er hann dó ok synir hans skyldu skipta arfi, þá höfðu þeir at gullinu er þeir skiptu at hverr skyldi taka munnfylli sína ok allir jafnmargar. Einn þeira var Þjazi, annarr Iði, þriði Gangr. En þat höfum vér orðtak nú með oss at kalla gullit munntal þessa jötna, en vér felum í rúnum eða í skáldskap svá at vér köllum þat mál eða orðtak, tal þessa jötna.

Figure 17. The Iðunn and Þjazi episode in U and R, respectively.

Counting the words in the two versions we find that while R uses 996 words, U only uses 452 words or around 45% of R. – The picture shown by examination of the content words is different since the content words in U are some 63% of those in R (156:248), but once again U includes a remarkable amount of its own content words, at least 17:

> *axlarliðr, bak, eiðr, föðrbætr, geitarskegg, heimboð, jörð, látask, lið, logi, naut, æfrir, tysvar, uxalærit, valda, þiggja, þrífa.*

Besides this there are (as usual) different forms of names: *Auðvaldi* in U is *Ölvaldi* in R, *Skolla* in U is *Fulla* in R.

A comparison of the different lexemes gives the following result:

Grape et al. 1977:35.12–36.17	**Faulkes 1998:1–3.8**
hugði hann slitna mundu ór axlarliðum	hyggr hann at slitna muni ór öxlum
Stöngin var föst við bak erninum	Þá var föst stöngin við kropp arnarins
Loki vill þetta ok ferr brott með eiði	nema hann veiti honum svardaga …, en Loki vill þat
Óðinn gerði þat til föðrbóta við Skaða	Svá er sagt at Óðinn gerði þat til yfirbóta við hana
Loki batt sér geitarskegg undir hreðjarnar	Þá gerði Loki þat at hann batt um skegg geitar nokkvorrar ok öðrum enda um hreðjar sér
æsir þágu heimboð at Ægi	***
fœtr Loka námu niðri við jörðu ok grjóti	fœtr taka niðr við grjótit ok urðir ok viðu
lézk hann valda	sá er þar sat kvazk ráða því
kjósa mann at fótum af liði þeirra	kjósa sér mann af Ásum
lýsti þar af sem logum björtum	váru svá björt at þar af lýsti
taka eitt nautið	taka einn uxann

[76] Neither Margaret Clunies Ross (1989) nor John Lindow (1992), when interpreting the sexual roles and acts of Skaði and Loki, did discuss the difference between the texts, when DG 11 makes Loki bind the goat's beard "undir hreðjarnar", while he in R obviously uses a rope. The DG 11 wording is markedly more bizarre!

Æsir gerðusk œfrir mjök	gerðusk þeir brátt hárir ok gamlir
gerðusk þeir brátt hárir ok gamlir	raufa þeir seyðinn ok var ekki soðit. Ok í annat sinn
annat uxalærit ok bóguna báða	lær oxans tvau ok báða bógana
lézk hann valda	kvazk ráða því
Loki þreif upp stöng	[Loki] greip upp mikla stöng

Figure 18. Semantic equivalents in content words of the Iðunn and Þjazi episode in U and R, respectively.

The information given in the texts does differ in some important cases. The eagle in U "tók annat uxalærit ok bóguna báða" while his brother in R "leggr upp þegar it fyrsta lær oxans tvau ok báða bógana". In this case the R version is supported by Haustlöng (Faulkes 1998:31):

> En af breiðu bjóði
> bragðvíss at þat lagði
> ósvífrandi ása
> upp þjórhl<ut>i fjóra.

Changing four pieces of meat to three is certainly choosing the *lectio difficilior*, since the *lær* and *bógar* usually go in pairs.[77]

When everything is taken into consideration, this seems to be one of the myths where it is easiest to believe in two different sources for the two different versions.

4.3.5 The mead of poetry (Section 14, 42.4%)

This section was discussed in chapter 3.3.3 and there is no need to add anything here. It is almost impossible to believe in the shortening-theory here.[78]

4.3.6 The Grotti tale (Section 20, 24.0%)

The tale about the mill Grotti and the two maidens, Fenja and Menja, which is used to explain the use of the kenning: *Fróða mjöl* for gold, is not such a common myth, apart from the note explaining the salt in the sea. The two versions are so different that a discussion is hardly needed:

[77] Henrik Williams has drawn my attention to the fact that the U version might be the original one, since there are three pieces of meat, just as there are three gods in the tale. It is their meal the eagle is stealing!

[78] In a special study (2011) I have shown important verbal connections between the mead-tale in U and tales about Snorri himself in *Sturlunga*.

Grape et al. 1977:87.5–12	**Faulkes 1998:51.29–52.21**
Gull er kallat mjöl Fróða því at Fróði konungr keypti ambáttirnar Fenju ok Menju, ok þá fannz kvernsteinn einn svá mikill í Danmörku at engi fekk dregit, en sú náttúra fylgði at allt mjöl, þat er undir var malit, varð at gulli(t). Ambáttirnar fengu dregit steininn. Konungr lét þær mala gull um hríð. Þá gaf hann þeim eigi meira svefn en kveða mátti ljóð eitt. Síðan mólu þær her á hendr honum. Sá var höfðingi fyrir er Mýsingi hét, spekingr mikill.	Hví er gull kallat mjöl Fróða? Til þess er saga sjá at Skjöldr hét sonr Óðins er Skjöldungar eru frá komnir. Hann hafði atsetu ok réð löndum þar sem nú er kölluð Danmörk en þá var kallat Gotland. Skjöldr átti þann son er Friðleifr hét er löndum réð eptir hann. sonr Friðleifs hét Fróði. Hann tók konungdóm eptir föður sinn í þann tíð er Augustus keisari lagði frið of heim allan. Þá var Kristr borinn. En fyrir því at Fróði var allra konunga ríkastr á Norðrlöndum þá var honum kendr friðrinn um alla Danska tungu, ok kalla Norðmenn þat Fróða frið. Engi maðr grandaði öðrum þótt hann hitti fyrir sér föðrbana eða bróðrbana lausan eða bundinn. Þá var ok engi þjófr eða ránsmaðr, svá at gullhringr einn lá á Jalangrsheiði lengi. Fróði konungr sótti heimboð í Svíþjóð til þess konungs er Fjölnir er nefndr. Þá keypti hann ambáttir tvær er hétu Fenja ok Menja. Þær váru miklar ok sterkar. Í þann tíma fannsk í Danmörk kvernsteinar tveir svá miklir at engi var svá sterkr at dregit gæti. En sú náttúra fylgði kvernunum at þat mólsk á kverninni sem sá mælir fyrir er mól. Sú kvern hét Grotti. Hengikjöptr er sá nefndr er Fróða konungi gaf kvernina. Fróði lét leiða ambáttirnar til kvernarinnar ok bað þær mala gull ok frið ok sælu Fróða. Þá gaf hann þeim eigi lengri hvíld eða svefn en gaukrinn þegði eða hljóð mátti kveða. Þá er sagt at þær kvæði ljóð þau er kallat er Grottasöngr. Ok áðr létti kvæðinu mólu þær her at Fróða svá at á þeiri nótt kom þar sá sækonungr er Mýsingr hét ok drap Fróða. Tók þar herfang mikit. Þá lagðisk Fróða friðr. Mýsingr hafði með sér Grotta ok svá Fenju ok Menju ok bað þær mala salt. Ok at miðri nótt spurði þær ef eigi leiddisk Mýsingi salt. Hann bað þær mala lengr. Þær mólu litla hríð áðr niðr sukku skipin ok var þar eptir svelgr í hafinu er særinn fellr í kvernaraugat. Þá varð sær saltr.[79]

Figure 18. The Grotti myth in U and R, respectively.

The text in U contains only 81 words compared to R's 337 (24%). To imagine that a sober scribe could treat a fair tale so is almost absurd. The unique content words in U are really only the comment on Mýsingr: *spekingr mikill*, which really is a strange comment on a person that does not even matter in the tale. On the other hand, *Grotti*, the name of the mill, is not mentioned in U.

In this case, again, we have the possibility of comparing the text in the way it is told in A and B (see 4.1.2 above).[80] There the tale reads as follows:

A AM 748 4to; 1852:431	B AM 757 4to, 1852:515
Þat er rétt at kalla jörð hold Ymis, en sæ blóð´hans, en heim Miðgarð brár hans, en ský heila hans. Kvern heitir Grótti er átti Fróði konungr. Hon mól hvetvetna þat er hann vildi, gull ok frið. Fenja ok Menja hétu ambáttir þær er mólu. Þá tók Mýsingr sækonungr Grottu ok lét þær mala hvíta salt á skipum sínum þar til er þau sukku á Péttlandsfirði. Þar er svelgr síðan er sær fellr í auga Grottu. Þá gnýr sær er hon gnýr ok þá varð sjórinn saltr.	Þat er rétt at kalla jörð hold Ymis, en sjá blóð hans, Miðgarð brár hans, en ský heila hans. Kvern hét Grotti er átti Fróði konungr. Hon mól hvatvetna þat er hann vildi, gull ok silfr ok aðra hluti, Fenja ok Menja hétu ambáttir þær er mólu. Mýsingr herkonungr tók Grottu ok lét mala hvíta salt á skip sín þar til er þau sukku á Péttlandsfirði. Þar er svelgr síðan, því at sjór fellr í auga Grottu. Þá gnýr sjór er hon gnýr, ok þá varð sjórinn saltr.

Figure 19. The Grotti myth in AM 748 and AM 757, respectively.

[79] Apart from the RTW manuscripts this text is to be found in AM 748 II (C), with almost exactly the same wording, See Jón Sigurðsson et al. 1852:577.

[80] Cf. Daniel Sävborg 2009.

In R and U the myth primarily has the function of explaining the kenning: *Fróða mjöl.* In U it more or less stops at that, while R proceeds to add the explanation of the salt in the sea. Interestingly enough that is the reason for telling the tale in both A and B. In those cases it has nothing to do with kennings for gold. In *Reallexicon,* Hans-Peter Nauman has drawn attention to the fact that the myth takes place in different areas:

> Die Kombination mythischer, sagen- wie märchenhafter Motive erfährt eine ätiologische Erweiterung […] bei gleichzeitiger Lokalisierung in den Pentland Firth zw. Schottland und den Orkneys, – der Schiffahrt durch starke Gezeitenströme gefährlich –, wobei auf den Orkneys folkloristiche Traditionen bis in die Neuzeit an „Grotti Finnie" und „Grotti Minnie" und ihre Salzmühle erinnern. (1999:99.)

The intention in U is to explain the kenning *mjöl Fróða,* in A and B to explain the salt in the sea and in R both! In A and B the scene has been moved from Danemark to Pantland, thus making it normal to talk about the maelstrom.

It is hardly possible to explain the short texts of AB and U in the same way, and none of them can convincingly be traced back to R.

5 Conclusions: *Tertium vero datur*

My research in the texts of the myths in DG 11 and Gks 2367 has lead to following conclusions:

1. Several of the myths in both versions go back to the same exemplar or near identical exemplars. This holds true for the myths listed in Table 2.
2. In several cases it would be possible to explain the narrative texts in U as a deliberate shortening or rewriting of texts of the type we see in R. This holds for most of the texts listed in Table 3, but here the differences in content words, has to be taken very seriously. – In any case we need an explanation for the very different editorial policies concerning the two categories in Tables 2 and 3.
3. In several cases the narrative texts in U are difficult to explain as shortenings of the texts we know from R. This holds for the very short texts in Table 4 and a study of the content words seem to support the theory.
4. It is likely that the author of *Edda* had to rely upon oral tradition for the myths he was retelling. In most cases it would be easy to explain the differences between the two versions as going back to different storytellers or the same teller on different occasions.

Thus I find it necessary to reject the Aristotelian logic formula "*Aut est, aut non est, tertium non datur*," – in our case that either the U is an abbreviated or the R is an expanded text, and thus I claim: *Tertium vero datur.* Surely there must be a third possibility!

In chapter 2.1 I mentioned Friedrich Müller's dissertation *Untersuchungen zur Uppsala-Edda* (1941). Now I find it tempting to repeat his main theory: B e i d e F a s s u n g e n s t a m m e n v o n S n o r r i !

This of course has not been proven and most certainly never can be. But my study of the two versions of the text shows that it is hardly possible to trace both of them back to the same exemplar. It is important to stress that this does not mean that the U version is a copy of Snorri Sturluson's original. However, if we like to think of the *archetype*, a revision must have been done where a lot of new information was added and new copies of the myths were included. This would give us the original of the RTW version. On the other hand, a different revision of the original must lie behind the exemplar copied in DG 11.

This of course leaves us with several difficult questions. One would be the question of compositional time. When did Snorri compose *Edda*? Since Wessén's introduction to the facsimile edition of Gks 2367 in 1940 it has been more or less accepted by the scholars that the *work* could not be constructed earlier than 1223–1225. This was Anne Holtsmark's belief in her and Jón Helgason's edition 1950. Three years later Sigurður Nordal published his and Jón Helgason's *Litteraturhistorie* and stated:

> *Edda* (*Snorra-Edda*) er det eneste af Snorris skrifter, der tilskrives ham i et bevaret haandskrift af selve bogen. Dens sidste del er Háttatal, afsluttet i vinteren 1222–23. At Edda er fuldført omkring denne tid, men paa grundlag af ældre forarbejder, kan betragtes som nogenlunde sikkert. (1953:219.)[81]

It is obvious that composing a work like *Edda* must have taken long time. The author had no one model to follow.[82] He was trying to create a textbook in poetics and at the same time gathering the scattered myths from the heathendom that had been abolished 200 years earlier. This author does not just sit down in a library in the year 1223 and writes the book.

In my view the most appealing theory would be that Snorri started gathering his material as early as during the years in Oddi (maybe around 1200 or even earlier) and eventually produced his first sketching (as suggested Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson) in 1206–18, that is to say before his first visit to Norway. In a special study (forthcoming 2011) I try to show that the libellous stanza with which Snorri was greeted at returning home from Norway 1220, really contained a quotation from his *Edda*, just in the wording we have in the *Uppsala-Edda.*

The next question of course would be: If this was so and Snorri rewrote (reedited) his Edda when he had composed Háttatal, why on earth would someone make a revision of the first draft around that time or even after that?

The only intelligent answer I can find is: A teacher! A teacher/tutor who had used the first draft and found it mostly useful, did not want a new textbook.[83] On the other hand this particular teacher may have wanted a new edition, compiling all the myths in the first part and thus making the structure more pedagogic. He might have asked for the headings, just to make the work a little more appetizing for the students and easier to use

---

[81] *"Edda* (*Snorra-Edda)* is the only of Snorri's writings that is attributed to him in a preserved manuscript of the work itself. Its last part is Háttatal, finished in the winter 1222–23. It may be regarded as reasonably certain that *Edda* was completed around this time, but on the basis of older sketches."

[82] Cf. Ursula and Peter Dronke 1977.

[83] This is known internationally. It takes long time to renew textbooks because the teachers do not want to change their teaching methods.

for the teacher. But to fully discuss the possible structures of this ancestor of DG 11 is a different task.

The third, and maybe the most difficult question, is of course: Why would someone in the beginning of the fourteenth century want a copy of a more primitive version of *Edda* than he knew there to exist?[84]

Again we have to search for the most intelligent answer and look at the historical and cultural context. The texts most likely added to the work in this stage are Skáldatal, Lögsögumannatal, Ættartala Sturlunga and The 2nd grammatical treatise. The three first very clearly connect the manuscript with the Sturlungs, Snorri's relatives. He is the last one to be mentioned in Lögsögumannatal, his generation concludes the Ættartala, and he is among the latest poets to be mentioned in Skáldatal. The only other copy of Skáldatal that we know of, was connected to Snorri's Heimskringla in the Kringla manuscript. For a teacher of Snorri's family, a version/redaction like the one we have in DG 11 would make sense.

A further discussion of individual parts in this complicated history of a work in progress will have to wait.

Uppsala September 2009 to June 2010

[84] As Lasse Mårtensson (2010) has shown the register of Háttatal on fol. 48r in DG 11 is based upon the Regius text of Háttatal, not the U text, Thus the scribe or the editor of DG 11 must have known that there was another version.

Literature

Edda

The manuscripts

A AM 748 Ib 4to. Text in Jón Sigurðsson et al. 1852:397–494. Quotes are in my normalization.
B AM 757 4to. Text in Jón Sigurðsson et al. 1852:501–572. Quotes are in my normalization.
C AM 748 II 4to. Text in Jón Sigurðsson 1852:573–627. Quotes are in my normalization.
R *Regius*. Gks 2367 4to. Text in Faulkes 1998 1 and 2 and 2005.
T *Trajectinus*. Utrecht 1374. The text quoted from the Prologue is in Eysteinn Björnsson's normalization.
U *Upsaliensis* DG 11 4to. Text in Grape et al. 1977. Quotes are in my normalization.
W *Wormianus*. AM 242 fol. Text quoted from the Prologue is in Eysteinn Björnssons normalization.

Editions

Eysteinn Björnsson, http://notendur.hi.is/eybjorn
Faulkes, Anthony (ed.), 1998.1. *Edda. Skáldskaparmál*. Introduction. Text and Notes. Viking Society for northern Research. University College London.
Faulkes, Anthony (ed.), 1998. 2. *Edda. Skáldskaparmál.* Glossary and Index of Names. Viking Society for northern Research. University College London.
Faulkes, Anthony (ed.), 2005. *Edda. Prologue and Gylfaginning.* (2nd. ed.). University College London.
Finnur Jónsson (ed.), 1931. *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar.* Udgivet efter håndskrifterne af Kommissionen for det Arnamagnæanske Legat. København. Gyldendalske Boghandel – Nordisk Forlag.
Grape, Anders et al. 1977 (utg.): *Snorre Sturlassons Edda. Uppsala-handskriften DG 11*. 2. Transkriberad text och paleografisk kommentar. Uppsala. Uppsala universitetsbibliotek.
Grape, Anders, 1962 (utg.): *Snorre Sturlasons Edda. Uppsala-handskriften DG 11*. [1]. Facsimileedition i ljustryck. Stockholm. Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek.
Jón Sigurðsson et al. (ed.), 1848. *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar.* Tomus primus, continens: Formáli, Gylfaginning, Bragaræður, Skáldskaparmál et Háttatal. Hafniæ. Sumptibus Legati Arnamagnæani. J.D. Quist.
Jón Sigurðsson et al. (ed.), 1852. *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar.* Tomus secundus, continens: Tractatus philologicos et additamenta ex codicibus manuscriptis. Hafniæ. Sumptibus Legati Arnamagnæani. J.D. Quist.
Rask, Rasmus Kr. (ed.), 1818. *Snorra-Edda ásamt Skáldu og þarmeð fylgjandi ritgjörðum* Eptir gömlum skinnbókum. Stockhólmi: Prentuð í hinni Elménsku prentsmiðju.

Other sources

Allén, Sture, 1971. Om textattribution. Kring en avhandling av Marina Mundt. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi.* 86/1971, pp. 82–113.

Beck, Heinrich, 2008. Die Uppsala-Edda und Snorri Sturlusons Konstruktion einer skandinavischen Vorzeit. *Scripta Islandica* 58/2007, pp. 5–32.

Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson, 1941. Formáli. Snorri Sturluson *Heimskringla* I. *Íslenzk forntrit* XXVI.. Pp. v–cxl. Reykjavík. Hið íslenzk fornritafélag.

Bäckvall, Maja, 2007. Völuspá i Uppsala-Eddan. En nyfilologisk undersökning. D-uppsats i svenska språket/nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet.

Cleasby, Richard and Guðbrandur Vigfússon 1874 (2nd. Ed. With a Supplement by W.A. Craigie, 1957). *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*. Oxford at the Clarendon Press.

Clunies Ross, Margaret, 1981. An interpretation of the myth of Þórr's encounter with Geirröðr and his daugthers. In: Ursula Dronke et al. (ed.) *Specvlum Norroenvm. Norse Studies in Memory of Gabriel Turville-Petre.* P.370–391. Odense University Press.

Clunies Ross, Margaret, 1989. Why Skaði laughed. Comic seriousness in an Old Norse mythic narrative. In: *Maal og minne.* Pp. 1–14.

Dillman, François-Xavier, 1992. Textafræði og goðafræði. Um þörfina á betri útgáfu á *Snorra-Eddu*. In: Úlfar Bragason (ed.) *Snorrastefna 25.–27. júlí 1990.* Pp. 9–18. Reykjavík. Stofnun Sigurðar Nordals.

Dronke, Ursula and Peter, 1977. The Prologur of the Prose *Edda*: Explorations of a Latin Background. In: Einar G. Pétursson & Jónas Kristjánsson (ed.) *Sjötíu ritgerðir helgaðar Jakobi Benediktssyni 20. júlí 1977.* Pp 153–176. Reykjavík. Stofnun Árna Magnússonar.

Ellegård, Alvar, 1962. *A Statistical Method for Determining Authorship.* The *Junius* Letters, 1769–1772. *Gothenburg Studies in English*. 13. Göteborg. Elanders Boktryckeri.

Faulkes, Anthony (ed.), 1977. *Two Versions of Snorra Edda from the 17th Century. Volume II. Edda Magnúsar Ólafssonar (Laufás Edda).* Reykjavík. Stofnun Árna Magnússonar.

Faulkes, Anthony (ed.), 1979. *Two versions of Snorra Edda from the 17th Century. Volume I. Edda Islandorum. Völuspá. Hávamál. P.H. Resens Edition of 1665.* Reykjavík. Stofnun Árna Magnússonar.

Finnur Jónsson, 1931. Indledning. In: *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar.* Udgivet efter håndskrifterne af Kommissionen for det Arnamagnæanske Legat. Pp. i–lix. København. Gyldendalske Boghandel – Nordisk Forlag.

Fritzner, Johan, 1886–1896. *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog*, Kristiania. Den Norske Forlagsforening.

Guðrún Nordal. 2001. *Tools of literacy.* The role of skaldic verse in Icelandic textual culture of the twelfht and thirteenth centuries. Toronto. University of Toronto Press.

Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, 2009. Hvernig leit Uppsalabók út í öndverðu? In Agneta Ney et al. (ed.) *Á austrvega*. Saga and East Scandinavia. Preprint papers of The 14th International Saga Conference. Pp.343–345. Gävle University Press.

Göransson, Johannes (ed.), 1746. *De yfverborna atlingars eller sviogötars ok nordmänners Edda*. Upsala. Henric Hecht.

Hallberg, Peter, 1962. *Snorri Sturluson och Egils saga Skallagrímssonar*. Ett försök till språklig författarbestämmning. *Studia Islandica* 20. Reykjavík.
Hallberg, Peter, 1968. *Stilsignalement och författarskap i norrön sagalitteratur.* Synpunkter och exempel. *Nordistica Gothoburgensia* 3. Göteborg.
Haskins, C. Homer, 1957. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.* New York [first ed. 1927].
Heimir Pálsson, 2011. Fyrstu leirskáldin. *Són.* 8/2011. (Forthcoming).
Heimir Pálsson, 1999. Að sætta heimildir. Lítið eitt um starfsaðferðir Snorra Sturlusonar. In: Haraldur Bessason and Baldur Hafstað (ed.) *Heiðin minni.* Greinar um fornar bókmenntir. Pp. 159–179. Reykjavík. Heimskringla.
Holtsmark, Anne, 1950. Innledning. In: Anne Holtsmark & Jón Helgason (ed.) Snorri Sturluson*: Edda. Gylfaginning og prosafortellingene av Skáldskaparmál. Nordisk filologi. Tekster og læreböger til universitetsbrug.* I. Pp. v–xiv. Köpenhamn, Oslo, Stockholm.
Holtsmark, Anne, 1964. *Studier i Snorres mytologi.* Oslo 1964. Universitetsforlaget.
Ihre, Johan, 1772. *Bref till herr Cancelli-rådet Sven Lagerbring,* rörade then Isländska EDDA, och egentligen then handskrift theraf, som på Kongl. Bibliotheket i Uppsala förvaras. Upsala. Joh. Edman, Kongl. Acad. Boktr.
Johannisson, Ture, 1973. *Ett språkligt signalement. Nordistica Gothoburgensia* 6. Göteborg.
Johansson, Karl G., 2008. Delen och helheten i medeltidens handskriftskultur – *Hervarar saga ok Heiðreks konungs* och Hauksbók. In: Auður G. Magnúsdóttir et al. ”Vi skall alla vara välkomna”. Nordiska studier tillägnade Kristinn Johannesson. *Meijebergs Arkiv* 35. Pp. 117–135.
Jón Helgason, 1962 (ed.). *Eddadigte* I. Völuspá : Hávamál. *Nordisk filologi. Texter og lærebøger*. 4. bind. 2. udgave. København, Oslo, Stockholm.
Krömmelbein, Thomas, 1992. Creative Compilers. Observations on the Manuscript Tradition of Snorri’s *Edda.* In: Úlfar Bragason (ed.) *Snorrastefna* 25.–27. júlí 1990. Pp. 113–129. Reykjavík. Stofnun Sigurðar Nordals.
Lindow, John, 1992. Loki and Skaði. In: Úlfar Bragason (ed.) *Snorrastefna* 25.–27. júlí 1990. Pp. 130–142. Reykjavík. Stofnun Sigurðar Nordals.
Lönnroth, Lars, 1978. *Den dubbla scenen. Muntlig diktning från Eddan till ABBA.* Stockholm. Prisma.
Meissner, Rudolf, 1921. *Die Kenningar der Skalden. Rheinsche Beiträge* I. Bonn & Leipzig.
Mogk, Eugene A., 1879. Untersuchungen über die Gylfaginning. In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*. Pp. 477–537.
Mogk, Eugene A., 1880. Untersuchungen über die Gylfaginning. Zweiter teil. In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur.* Pp. 203–334.
Mogk, Eugene A., 1925. Zur bewertung des Cod. Upsaliensis der Snorra-Edda *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur.* Pp. 402–414..
Müller, Friedrich W., 1941. *Untersuchungen zur Uppsala-Edda.* Dresden. Verlag M. Dittert.
Mårtensson, Lasse & Heimir Pálsson, 2009. Anmärkningsvärda suspensioner i DG 11 4to (Codex Upsaliensis av Snorra Edda) – spåren av en skriven förlaga. *Scripta Islandica*. Isländska sällskapets årsbok 59/2008. Pp.135–155.

Mårtensson, Lasse, 2010. Översikten över Háttatal i DG 11 4to, dess funktion och ursprung. *Gripla* 21 (forthcoming).
Naumann, Hans-Peter, 1999. Grotta söngr. In *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde.* Dreizehnter Band. Pp. 98–100. Berlin. New York. Walter de Gruyter.
Raschellà, Fabrizio D., (ed.), 1982. *The So-Called Second Grammatical Treatise*. An Orthographic Pattern of Late Thirteenth-Century Icelandic. *Filologica Germanica* 2.
Rask, Rasmus Kristian, 1818. Til lesendanna. In Rask (ed.) *Snorra-Edda ásamt Skáldu og þarmeð fylgjandi ritgjörðum* Pp. 5–15. Stockhólmi. Prentað í hinni Elménsku prantsmiðju.
Sigurður Nordal (ed.) 1953. *Littertaturhistoris. B. Norge og Island. Nordisk kultur VIII : B.* Stockholm, Oslo, Kbenhavn.
Sävborg, Daniel, 2009. Redaktionen av *Skáldskaparmál* i Codex Upsaliensis. In Agneta Ney et al. (ed.) *Á austrvega*. Saga and East Scandinavia. Preprint papers of The 14th International Saga Conference. Pp.837–844. Gävle University Press.
Vésteinn Ólason, (ed.), 1992, *Íslensk bókmenntasaga* I. Reykjavík. Mál og menning.
Vésteinn Ólason, 2001. List og tvísæi í Eddu. *Gripla* XII: Pp. 41–65.
Viðar Pálsson, 2008. Pagan Mythology in Christian Society. *Gripla XIX*. Pp. 123–155.
Wessén, Elias, 1940. Introduction. In *Corpus Codicum Islandorum Medii Aevi. Vol. XIV. Codex Regius of the Younger Edda.* Ms No. 2367 4to. Pp. 5–23. Copenhagen. Einar Munksgaard.
Wessén, Elias, 1945. Introduction. In *Corpus Codicum Islandorum Medii Aevi. Vol. XVII. Fragments of the Elder and the Younger Edda.* Pp. 9–23 Copenhagen. Einar Munksgaard.
Wieselgren, Per, 1927. *Författarskapet till Eigla*. Akademisk avhandling. Lund. Carl bloms Boktryckeri.
Wilken, E., 1878. *Untersuchungen zur Snorra Edda.* Paderborn.
Williams, Henrik. 2008. Projektet Originalversionen av Snorre Sturlassons Edda? Studier i Codex Upsaliensis. Ett forskningsprogram. *Scripta Islandica*. Isländska sällskapets årsbok 58/2007, pp. 85–99.
Zetterholm, D.O., 1949. in *Studier i en Snorre-text.* Tors färd tilll Utgård i codices Upsaliensis DG 11 4° och Regius Hafn. 2367 4° *Nordiska texter och undersökningar* 17. Stockholm, Köpenhamn. Hugo Gebers förlag. Ejnar Munksgaard.