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 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 Eddastudies. 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. 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*.

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.

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 eitt frumrit; enn mér
virðist þvertámóti auðséð að hún er allra þriggja ýngst og nockurskonar ágrip af
hinum. (Pp. 8–9.)

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. einn 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 takes 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.).

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 Gylfgaginning 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”.
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 whatbelongs 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 Arnamagnaean 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 monographs 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):


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 sagt, 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
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. 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.\footnote{Just to name some key works, Müllers dissertation is not mentioned in Grape 1962, not in Véstein\,Ólason (ed.) 1992 nor in Guðrún Nordal 2001. For a discussion see Beck 2008 p. 9 f.}

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 Verfassergabale 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:

Beide Fassungen stammen von Snorri,
der Verfasser des U-textes und der Redaktor der Fassung X sind eine 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.

\textbf{2.2 The textbook and les belles lettres}

Many scholars have stated that it is important to remember that \textit{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.\footnote{By this I am not at all trying to reduce the importance of the author’s literary competence. As e.g. Véstein\,Ólason (2001) has shown, his irony and literary skill is great and to be taken seriously.}

When Faulkes (above) talks about the U version as being less “artistic” than the others, he obviously regards the \textit{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 \textit{Egils saga}. This is in fact very common in discussions of the \textit{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.).\footnote{When dating Snorri’s \textit{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.}

\textit{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
(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 programme: “En þat er [at] segja ungum skáldum er gírnaz 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 monasteries 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 recipient 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/Driði 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. síða háttal er Snorri heftir 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 learn 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 translated 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 recipient 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 Öðinn in the surroundings of the Sturlungar family.19 Actually, when Öðinn 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 Ýfhrúðnismál, 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 Öðinn is mentioned is of course when the priest’s wife Þorbjörg in Reykjaholt attacks Hvamn-Sturla with a knife, threatening to make him most like the one he wants to be like, that is Öðinn!
20 This is a neat example of the textbook-author’s struggle to melt together his sources. See f.ex. Heimir Pálsson 1999.
vera niú 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 niú nætr í Þrymheimi, en þá aðrar niú 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 beitt fyrir göltrinn Gullinbusti eða Sligrutanni.” (Grape et al. 1977:31.14–15) and in R we read: “Freyr ök í kerru með gelti þeim er Gullinbursti heitir eða Sliðrugtanni.” (Faulkes 2005:47.) But in Skáldskaparmál Snorri quotes Úlfr Uggason (presumably Húsdrápa) on the same incident:

Svá sem segir Úlfr Uggason:

Ríðr á börgr til borgar
bóðfröðr sonr Öðins
Freyr ok fólkum stýrir,
fýrstr enum gulli bysta.

Hann heitir ok Slígrugtanni. (Grape et al. 1977:55.17–19.)

The text in Gks 2367, “ríðr á börgr” and “fýrstr 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 þresköldr” (Grape et al. 1977:16.26) where R only has “Fallanda foroð 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
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 fyrir 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, lögðumannaatal, 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 Hjálmingavíg, 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.
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.)

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 proceeds in the same act. He gently moves from the fictive gods of Valhalla to Gylfi’s own world in Sweden, where the “ærir er nú váru” took the names of the old ones (those in Valhöll) and proceeded to Ægir’s party. 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 sáttu at heimboði at Ægis ok hann spurði Braga hvaðan af kom skáldskaprinn. Frá því er Kvasir [var] skapaðr. Hér hefr mjök setning skáldskapar.”

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 Scollð (= 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 hvern maðr oðrum 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 euhemerism.
32 “Now begins the tale about the Æsir at an invitation at Ægir, when he asked Bragi about the origins of poetry. On the creation of Kvasir. 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 Priði. Fols 25v and 26r contain the Genealogy of the Sturlungs and the list of lawspeaker, 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 bōrr’s visit to Útgardā-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 giefe mie ad læra þess a bok med ogu godu, en hún er vond. Gud fader 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 P[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 (except for one leaf).

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

2. 4 The scribe

Finnur Jónsson's 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 “vilkárligt” 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 Raschelà 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, Pööödrāpa and Húöödrāpa 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grape et al. 1977</th>
<th>Faulkes 2005</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>U words</th>
<th>R words</th>
<th>U as % of R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prologue</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>58,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The creation</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>66,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>Bifröst – Forseti</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>3559</td>
<td>91,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>26.33</td>
<td>Loki and his family</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>99,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>The goddesses</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>89,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>Freyr and Gerðr</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>33,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>Dramatis personae</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>75,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>34.27</td>
<td>The giant builder, Sleipnir’s birth</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>66,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>Þórr and Útgarða-Loki</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>3468</td>
<td>63,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>Þórr and Midgarðsormr</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>44,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>Baldr’s death</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>49,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>Loki’s punishment</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>64,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>Fimbulvetr, Ragnarökkr</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>59,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

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 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 explaining 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.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>Bifröst – Forseti</td>
<td>3255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>26.33</td>
<td>Loki and his family</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>The goddesses</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>Þórr and Hrungrı́</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>Þórr and Geirröðr</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>Sif’s hair</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>Andvari’s gold</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>Þólfir kraki</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Prologue</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The creation</td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>Dramatis personae</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>34.27</td>
<td>The giant builder, Sleipnir’s birth</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>Þórr and Útgarða-Loki</td>
<td>2207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>Loki’s punishment</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>Fimbulvetr, ragnarökkr</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

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.
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. 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 Eilíf Fróðárson’s Þórsdrápa (preserved in the R version).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>05</th>
<th>20.14</th>
<th>30.38</th>
<th>Freyr and Gerðr</th>
<th>147</th>
<th>434</th>
<th>33.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>Þórr and Miðgarðsormr</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>Baldr’s death</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Íðunn and Þjazi</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.20</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>The mead of poetry</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>The Grottí myth</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

This part of *Edda* has in editions sometimes been given the name *Bragareður* (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.

---

41 This part of *Edda* has in editions sometimes been given the name *Bragareður* (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.
En er Þórr kom til Geirröðar, þar var þeim vísat fjóst í gestahús44 til herbergis, ok var einn stöll at sítja á, ok sat Þórr þar. Þá varð hann þess varr at

En er Þórr kom til Geirröðar, þar var þeim vísat fjóst í gestahús44 til herbergis, ok var einn stöll at

En er Þórr kom til Geirröðar, þar var þeim vísat fjóst í gestahús44 til herbergis, ok var einn stöll at
stöllinn fór undir honum upp undir rafiti. Pórr stingr þa staðnum Gríðraveli upp undir rafiti ok létt sigask á stöllinn fast. Þa varð skráer mikill ok fylgði brestr. Þar hafði verit undir stólnum dætr Geirraðar, Gjálp ok Gneip, ok hafði hann brotit hryggin í þeim báðum.

Pá kvað Pórr:

Einu neytta ek alls megins
jötna góðum í
þá er Gjálf₆⁴ ok Gneip
dætr Geirraðar
vildu hefja mik til himins.

Pá lætr Geirråðr kalla Pór inn í höllina til leika við sik. Þar voru eldar stórir eptir endlangri höll. En er Pórr kom gagnvart Geirråðr, þá tók Geirråðr með þöng járnspú glóandi ok kastar á Pór. En þórr í móti með þöng járnspúnum ok færði á lopt þöngsínum. En Geirråðr hjóp undir súlu sína at forða sér. Pórr færði á lopt sína ok laust í gegnum þöngsínum ok í gegnum Geirråðr, gegnum vegginn ok svá í gegnum jöröna fyrir utan höllina.

Figure 2. The Pórr and Geirråðr 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 Pórr 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!
Þá sá hann æsi þangat fara. Óðinn hafði sét hann ór Hliðskjálf. Loki hljóp þegar ok þar sjóður at hann var í húsinu í allar ættir. En þeir nefndu þeim þrí í ána, en þá hafði hann þangað með þeim 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 meira 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 forsinnum.

Nú sjá æsirnir hvar hann fór, skipta nú liðinu í tvá staði, þógur veðr eptir miðri ánni, ok fara svá út til sjóvar. Ok er Loki sér lífsháski á sæinn at fara, þá hleypr hann yfir netit, en þóðir greip hann í sundr Nara. En hann rendi í hliðum honum ok nam hliðum stofn á sporðinn. En þeir nefndu þeim þrí í ána, en þóðir greip hann í sundr Nara, bróður hans, en þeim þogt þá hliðum stofn á sporðinn. En þóðir greip þeim ok þogt þá hliðum stofn á sporðinn. Fara í annat sinn upp til forsins og kasta út netinu ok binda við svá þungt at eigi skyli undir meira fara.

Loki var nú tekinn griðalauss ok farit með hann í helli nokkurn, ok tóku hellur þar var settu á enda, lustu á rauft á hverri. Þá varu tekinn synir Loka, Váli og Nari, ok bróður Vála í vargslíki ok reif hann í sundr Nara. Þó tóku æsir þarma hans ok bundu Loka með yfir þrjár eggsteina. Stóð einn undir herðum, annarr undir lendum, þröði undir knés-bótum, ok urðu bòndin at járn. Skáða festi eitorm yfir andlit honum, en Sigyn helt munlaug undir eitdropana, ok slær út eitinu, ok þá drypr í andlit honum er full er munlaugin, ok kippisk hann þá svá hart við at jörð skelfr. Þar liðgr hann til ragnarökks.

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 fishermen’s terms (R has ræxn ‘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 “farrmr 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 schlechten Dichter spritzt er hinten hinaus” (loc.cit.).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grape et al.1977:36. 20–37.21; 392 words (42.2 %)</th>
<th>Faulkes 1998:3.10–5.8; 929 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ægir spyrð: Hvaðan af kom skáldskaprinn?</td>
<td>Ok enn mælir Ægir: Hvaðan af hefir hafizk sú íprótt, er þér kallit skáldskap?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragi svarar: Goðin höfðu össett við Vani ok gerðu fríðstefnu ok gengu til kers eins ok spýttu í hráka sínum ok sköpuðu úr mann, er heitir</td>
<td>Bragi svarar: Þat váru upphóð til þess at guðin höfðu össett við þat folk er Vanir heita, en þeir lögðu með sér fríðstefnu ok settu grið á þá lund at þeir gengu hváirtveggjum til eins kers ok spýttu í hráka sínum. En að skilmaði þá tóku goðin ok vildu eigi láta týnask þat griðamark ok sköpuðu þar úr mann. Sá heitir Kvasir. Hann er svá vitr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kvasir. Hann leysti úr öllum hlutum, ok er hann kom til dverganna Falas ok Galas, kölluðu þeir hann á einmæli ok drápú 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 blóðði ok heitir þat þar þá mjöðr, ok sá er af drekkor verð skáld ok freðamaðr. Dvergarnir söguðu at þeir heiti tapakz í manviti.

Dvergarnir buðu til sín jötni þeim er Gillingr hét, ok buðu honum á sjó at róa ok hvelfðu skipi undir honum. Þat spurði Suttungr son hona, ok flytr dvergana í flæðisker. Þeir bjóða mjöðinn í föðurboði. Suttungr hirðir hann í Hnitbjörgum ok til gæzlu Gunnlöðu döttur sínna.

Þat spurði Gillingr hét, ok buðu honum á sjó at róa ok hvelfðu skipi undir honum. Þeir söguðu Ásum at Kvasir hefði kafnat í manviti fyrir því at engi var þar svá fróðr at spyrja kynni hann fróðleiks.

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, en þat verðr at sætt með þeim. Flytr Suttungr mjöðinn heim ok reru til lands. Þeir söguðu konu hans þenna þar sá mjöðr fættu úr skerinu, en Suttunga mjöð eða Hnitbjarga lögr.

Ægirr spyrr: Hversu komsk Óðinn at miðunum?

Bragi segir: Hann fór þar sem voru nú þrálar ok slógu hey. Hann bauð at brýna ljá þeirra. Hann tók hein úr pússi sínum ok gafu þeir við hófuð sín. Siðan brá hver ljánum á háls öðrum.

Pá Óðinn sótti til náttstaðar til jötuns þess er Baugi hét, broðir Suttungs. Hann bauð at taka upp einn verk þeirra nú ok hafa til einn drykk af Suttungamiði.

Hann lézk ráð eiga á miðunum, en Suttung vill einn hafa.

Bölverkr vann um sumarit nú manna verk, en at vetri vill hann kaupit. Fara þá til Suttungs ok beïða hann mjadarins. Hann af engi sprýr hann þeira hluta er eigi kann hann órlausn. Hann fór viða um heim at kenna mönnunum fréði, ok þá er hann kom at himboði til dverga nokkvorra, Fjalars ok Galars, þá kölluðu þeir hann með sér á einmæli ok drápú hann, létu renna blóð hans í tvau ker ok einn ketil, ok heitir sal Þóreyrir, en kerin heita Són ok Boðn. Þeir blöndu hunangi við blóð, ok varð þar af mjöðr sá er hverr er af drekkor, verð skáld eða freðamaðr. Dvergarnir söguðu Ásum at Kvasir heiti kafnat í manviti fyrir því at engi var þar svá fróðr at spyrja kynni hann fróðleiks.

Pá þuðu þessir dvergar til sín jötni þeim er Gillingr heitir ok konu hans. Pá þuðu dvergarnir dverginn til róa á sæ með sér. En er þeir fórur fyrir land fram, róru dvergarnir á boða, ok hvelfiði skipinu. Gillingr var ósyndr ok týndisk hann, en engi spyrr hann þar svá fróðr at spyrja kynni hann fróðleiks.

Bölverkr vann um sumarit nú mannsverk fyrir Bauga, en at vetri beïðið hann Bauga leigu sinnar. Pá þá þeir bürður <til Suttungs>.

Baugi segir Suttungni broður sínu kaup þeira Bölverki. En Suttungar synjar þverlega hvers dropa af miðunum. Pá mælti
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 mjóðar”, which certainly does remind us of R: mjóðinn 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 þu 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 assume 
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 Ellegård’s definition, see 1962:12.
Min egen metod går ut på att fastställa, hur mange 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.)

In 1963 Hallberg published his study on Ólafr Þórðarson hvítaskáld and the authorship of Knýtinga saga and Laxdela saga and in 1968 the comprehensive study Stilsignalement och författarskap i norrön sagalitteratur. Rolf Heller published his Aufbau und Stil der Laxdela Saga in 1960 and in more works drew the attention to Sturla Þórðarson as its possible author, a theory which then was fully presented in Marina Mundt’s thesis Sturla Þórðarson undie Laxdela 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. 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 parallels 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 ljóslæga, hvernig textinn er styttur í M án þess að neinu atriði sé sleptt, sem máli skiptir, en orðalag θ bersýnilega fornlægra og upprunalegra. Ekkert verður fullyrt um, hvort texti M á rót sín 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 vantár í θ, en vel mætti vera úr frumtextanum. (1933:łxxxv.)

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.”


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 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 Skáði.

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 original 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, and thus they call for a closer look (see Fig. 5.)

The texts in question are as follows:

**A AM 748 b 4to; 1852:431–432**

**Frá Fenris úlfi**

Ámsvartnir heitir vatn, en Lyngvi hölmi í vatninu, en Síglitnir höll í hólinum. En Þviti heitir hæll er stendr í hólinum, en Gnjöll heitir rauf er boruð er á hælinum, en Hraða heitir estr er Fenrisúlfr er bundinn með ok er henni drepit í gegnum raufina, en Gelgja spýta, er fyrir er stungit. Fjöturrinn heitir Glefnir er honum heldr. Gervir voru tveir fjótar til hans fyrst, þeir Drómi ok Ledingr ok hét hvárgi. Þá var Glefnir síðan gerr ór sex lutum:

- Ór kattardyn
- Ór konu skeggi,
- Ór fiskanda
- Ór fugla mjólk,
- Ór bergs rótum
- Ór bjarnar sinum;
- Ór því var hann Glefnir gerr.

Því er þat ekki eftir 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 vön hraða hans. En Gjölnar heita granar hans.

**B AM 757 4to; 1852:515**

[No heading]

Ámsvartnir heitir vatn, en Lyngvi hölmi í vatninu, en Síglitnir hvoll í hólinum, en Þótti heitir hæll er stendr í hvolinum, en Gínul heitir rauf er boruð er á hælinum, en Hraða heitir estr er Fenrisúlfr er bundinn með, ok er henni drepit í gegnum raufina, en Gelgja heitir spýta sú sem fyrir er stungin. Fjöturrinn heitir Glefnir sá sem honum heldr. Tveir fjótar voru gervir til hans, þeir Drómi ok Ledingr ok hét hvárgi. Þá var gerr Glefnir ór sex hlutum:

- Ór kattardyn
- Ór konu skeggi,
- Ór fiskanda
- Ór fugla mjólk,
- Ór bjargr rótum
- Ór bjarnar sinum;
- Ór því var hann Glefnir 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 vön hraða hans, en Gjölnar heita granar hans.

---

Úlfinn førðu Æsir heima ok hafiði Þýr eitt til djörfing at gefa honum mat. En guðin sá hve mikit hann óx hvern dag, ok allar spár sognu at hann mundi vera lagðr til skaða þeim. Pá fengu æsirnar þat ráð at þeir gerðu fjótur allsterkan er þeir kolludu Læðing, ok báru hann til úlfins ok bádu hann reyna af sitt við fjóturinn. En úlf þótti sér þat ekki ofrefli ok létt þá fara með sem þeir vildu. En í fyrsta sinn er hann slynndi við, brotnað fjóturinn, ok leystisk hún svá ör Læðingi.

Því næst gerðu æsirnar annan fjótur hálfr starkefthvarar er þeir kolludu Dróma, ok bádu úlfins reyna en þenna fjótur ok töðu hann verða mundu ágætan af afli, ef sík stórsmiðið mjóki eigi häla honum. En úlfirinn húsada at þess[i] fjótur var starkr mjóki, þat með at honum hafiði vaaxit af sían er hann braut Læðing. Kom þat í hug at hann mundi verða at leggja sík í hættu ef hann skal frægr verða, ok lætr leggja á sík fjóturinn. Ok er æsirnar töldusk búnnir, þar hris[ti] úlfirinn sík ok laust fjörtunum á jörðina ok knúðisk at fast, spynir at fast ok bratt fjóturinn, svá at fjjarri kom niðr hlutturin. Þá drap hann sík ör Dróma. Þat er sían orðtak at leys[i] ör Læðingi eða drepi ör Dróma, þá er einhver hvítur hluttar er ákafliga söttur.

Eptir þat óttuðusk æsirnar at þeir mundi eigi fá bundit hann. Þá sendi Alföðr þann [m]ann, en Skírnir hét, í Svartálfaheim til dverga nokkurra ok lét gera fjótur þann er Gleipnir heitir. Hann var gjörð af sex hlutum: af dyn kattarins ok af skeggi konunnar, af rötum bjargsins ok sinum bjarnarins, af anda fisksins ok af hráka fuglsins. En þó at þú vitir eigi áðr þessi töðingi, þá mættu nú finna hér skjött sönnuðið sem aði 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 ættar undir bjargi. Ok þat veit trúu mín at jafnsætt er þat allt er ek hefi sagt þér, þótt þeir sé sumir hluttur er þú mátt eigi reyna.

Pá mælti Gangleri: Þetta má ek at vísu s[já] er nú segir þú frá og þú hefir nú til dœma tekit. En þeirg mik eign varð fjóturinn múaðr?

Hár segir: Þat kann ek þér vel segja. Fjóturinn var slétt ek blautur sem s[i]<l>kiræma en svá strautur ok sterkr sem nú máttu heyra.

Faulkes 2005:27–29

Úlfinn førðu Æsir heima ok hafiði Þýr eitt djörfleik til at ganga at úlfinum ok gefa honum mat. En er guðin sá hversu mikit hann óx hvern dag, ok allar spár sognu at hann mundi vera lagðr til skaða þeim, þá fengu Æsir þat ráð at þeir gerðu fjótur allsterkan er þeir kolludu Leyðing, ok báru hann til úlfins ok bádu hann reyna af sitt við fjóturinn. En úlfimum þótti sér þat ekki ofrefli ok létt þá fara með sem þeir vildu. It fyrsta sinn er úlfirinn slynndi við, brotnað fjóturinn, svá leystisk hún ör Leyðingi.

Því næst gerðu Æsirnar annan fjótur hálfr starkefthvarar er þeir kolludu Dróma, ok bádu úlfins reyna en þenn fjótur ok töðu hann verða mundu ágætan mjóki at afli, ef sík stórsmiðið mjóki eigi häla honum. En úlfirinn húsada at þessi fjótur var starkr mjóki, þat með at honum hafiði vaaxit af sían er hann braut Leyðing. Kom þat í hug at hann mundi verða at leggja sík í hættu ef hann skyldi frægr verða, ok létt leggja á sík fjóturinn. Ok er æsir töldusk búnnir, þar hristi úlfirinn sík ok laust fjörtunum á jörðina <ok knúðisk fast at, spyrndi við, bratt fjóturinn> svá at fjjarri flugu brotin. Svá drap hann sík ör Dróma. Þat er síðan orðtak at leys[i] ör Leyðingi eða drepi ör Dróma, þá er einnver hjítur hlutur er ákafliga sóttur.

Eptir þat óttuðusk æsirnar at þeir mundi eigi fá bundit hann. Þá sendi Alföðr þann er Skírnir nefndr, sendimaðr Freys, ofan í Svartalfheim til dverga nokkurra ok lét gera fjótur þann er Gleipnir heitir. Hann var gjörð af sex hlutum: af dyn kattarins ok af skeggi konunnar ok af rötum bjargsins ok af sinum bjarnarins ok af anda fisksins ok af hráka fuglsins. Ok þóttu vitir eigi áðr þessi tíðindi, þá máttu nú finna skjótt þörfum at eigi er logit: at þér munuð sét hafa at konan hefir eigi skegg og engi dynr verðr af hlaupi kattarins ok eigi eru þreir undir bjargi. Ok þat veit trúu mín at jafnsætt er þat allt er ek hefi sagt þér, þótt þeir sé sumir hluttur er þú mátt eigi reyna.

Pá mælti Gangleri: Þetta má ek at vísu s[já] er nú segir þú frá og þú hefir nú til dœma tekit. En þeirg mik eign varð fjóturinn múaðr?

Hár segir: Þat kann ek þér vel segja. Fjóturinn varð slétt ek blautur sem s[i]<l>kiræma en svá strautur ok sterkr sem nú máttu heyra.
Þá er fjöturrinn var fjórðr 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 sír úlfinn, sýndu honum silkibandit ok báðu hann slíta. Kváðu vera mundu nókkuru traustara en líkindi þóttu á vera fyrir dígrleiks 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 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.

En hverr Ásanna sá til annars ok þóttu nú vera tvau vandræði, ok vildi en gi sína hönd fram selja fyrir, sér til þeir renn 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 fullum, og er hann seldi við þá harðnaði bandit, og því harðara er hann brauzk um, því skarpara var bandit.

En hver þeir bindið mik svá at ek fæk eigi leyst mig, þá skollit þú svá at mér mun seint verða at taka af yðr hjálp. Ófúss em ek at láta þetta band á mik leggja. En heldr er þér frýið mér hugar, þá leggi einnhverr hönd sína í munn mér at veði at þetta sé falslaust gert.
meaning in all the texts, namely the lake Ámsvartnir and the island Lyngvi. For the others this is the situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kenning</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Síglitnir (hóll/hváll) ‘hill’</td>
<td>A and B (not found in U och R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnjöll = rauð ‘hole’</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginul = rauð ‘hole’</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjöll = hella ‘slab of stone’</td>
<td>R and U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hraðaða = festr ‘fetter’</td>
<td>A and B (not in R and U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelgja = spýta ‘a piece of wood’</td>
<td>A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelgja = festr ‘fetter’</td>
<td>R and U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ván = á ‘river’</td>
<td>U and R (only one river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Víl &amp; Ván = ár</td>
<td>A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjölnar = granar ‘lips’</td>
<td>A and B (no name in R and U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Þviti = festarhæll ‘stone’</td>
<td>R and U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Þviti = hæll ‘a stick in the hill’</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Þótti = hæll ‘a stick in the hill’</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 kennings eru er áðr eru deimi 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 dømi af hverju kenni<ng>gar eru er nú váru ritaðar, er áðr váru eigi dømi 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 intended 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 seems 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 þrínaetr 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 sómdí 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 Geirrðr (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 Hróðfr 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 tilføjde dem, eftersom han fik tid og lejlighed”!

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 Hróðfr 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 Hróðfr 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 Hróðfr’s berserks: Bóðvar bjarki, Hjalti hugprúði, Hvítsækr 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 jörðina, af blóði hans sæinn ok vötnin. Jörðin var gør af holdinu, en björgin af beinum. G grjót ok urðir gerðu þeir af tônnum ok jöulum ok af þeim beinum er brotin borin váru. Þeir mælti lathár: Af Ok af því blöðinu er þar sárnum 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 öftora bykla at komask þar yfir.

Ðá mælti Thríði: T Síðan tóku þeir ok hausinn 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, Norðri, Suðri Austa, Vestra, Norðra, Suðra. Þá tóku þeir síu ok gneista þá er lausir fór öf þeir kastat hafti í Muspellsheimi, ok settu á miðjan Ginnungahimin í mitt Ginnungagap ofan ok neðan á himininn, baði ofan ok neðan til at lýsa himin ok jörð. Þeir gáfu staðar staði öllum eldiningum, sumum á himi, sumur fóru lausar undir himni, ok settu þó þeim stað ok sköpuðu guð göngu þeim. Svá er sagt í fornum vísindum at. Þaðan af váru dœgr greind ok áratál

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 uppläsning. (2008:118.)

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DG 11</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Names of Óðinn:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herjan</td>
<td>Herran/Herjan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikaðr/Nikuðr</td>
<td>Nikarr/Hnikarr, Nikuz/Hnikuðr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riflindi</td>
<td>Biflindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salkr</td>
<td>Jálkr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sviðarr</td>
<td>Sviðurr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The rivers:**
- Fimbulpul
- Gunnþró
- Kvöl
- Viðleiptr

**Other names:**
- Auðr
- Beyzla
- Burr
- Byggvir
- Döglingr
- Frigg Fjörgunsdóttir
- Ginnungagap
- Glornir
- Hergelmir
- Hróðviti
- Muspellsheimr
- Nóri
- Önar

---

Obviously, writing *fimbulpul* and *víðleiptr* for *fimbul pul* 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,
- edli,
- efstr,
- endir,
- feigr,
- giptask,
- leiða,
- lofa,
- lýðir,
- merki,
- móðir,
- móti,
- núundi,
- 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**

_Frá Nóra jötni ok Nótt, döttur hans._


Þá tók Alfröðr Nótt ok Dag, ok setti á himin ok gaf þeim tvá hesta ok kerrur, ok riða þau umhverfis jörðina. Nótt ríðr Hrímfaxa, hann dögguv jörðina með mélincrepinum sínnum. Dagr á Skinfaxa, ok lýsir lopt ok þjörð af faxi hans.

Mundilferi átti tvau börn. Máni hét sonr hans, en Sól döttir, ok áttu hana Glönnir. Guðin reiddusk því ofdrambi er þau hétu svá, ok settu þau upp á himin, ok drauga þau kerrur sólar þeirar er guðin höfu skapat af þeiri sú er flaug ór Muspellsheimi.

---

**Faulkes 2005 13.22–14.27**


Þá tók Alfröðr Nótt ok Dag son hennar ok gaf þeim tvá hesta ok tvær kerrur ok setti þau upp á himin, at þau skulu riða á hverjum tveim dœgrum umhverfis jörðina. Ríðr Nótt fyrri þeim heiti er kallaðr er Hrímfaxi, ok at morni hverjum dögguv hann jörðina af mélincrepinum sínnum. Sá hesta er Dagr á heitir Skinfaxi, ok lýsir allt lopt ok þjörðina af faxi hans.

Þá mælti Gangleri: Hversu stýrir hann gang sólar ok tungs?

Hár segir: Sá maðr er nefndr Mundilfæri er áttu tvau börn. Þau váru svá heita frá þeim, ok gipti hann þeim manni er Glæni hét. En guðin reiddusk þessu ofdrambi ok tók þau systkin ok settu upp á himin, létu Sól keyra þa hesta er drógu kerru sólarinnar þeirar er guðin höfu skapat til at lýsa heimanaf þeiri sú er flaug ór Muspellsheimi. Péir hestar heita svá: Árvakr ok Alsviðr. En undir þeim heitaðu settu guðin tvá vindiðal, at kelo þá, en í sumum fræðum er þat kallat ísarnkol.

Máni tók börn tvau af jörðu, Bil ok Hjúka, er þau fóru frá brunni þeim er Byggvir heitir. Sárin hét Sœgr, en Simul stóting. Viðfróð hét faðir barnanna. Þau börn fylgja Mána, sem sjá má af jörðunni.

Pá mælti Gangleri: Skjótt ferr sólín sem hon sé hrædd.

---
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 wolves 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 þændr sína eðr menn leiðast (v.l. afrækjast) konr sinar” are among the informative examples in Fritzner’s dictionary. Thus the meaning of U could be: two wolves 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\textsuperscript{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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sækin</td>
<td>Sekin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ækin</td>
<td>Ekin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjöful</td>
<td>Göpul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyrí</td>
<td>Þyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Höll</td>
<td>Böll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnþró</td>
<td>Gunnþráin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nött</td>
<td>Nyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reytt</td>
<td>Nöt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veglun</td>
<td>Veg, Svinn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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]ngra 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.\textsuperscript{58} On the other hand the following is usually explained as caused by a mistake in U (Fig. 8):

\textsuperscript{57} The commonly printed name Eikþyrnir seems to be Finnur Jónssons correction. See Finnur Jónsson 1931:43.
\textsuperscript{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.
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. 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,
- dekkjasku
- eiga, færa,
- fær, 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**

- verðan ills dauðdaga
- spilla lopintu, ef himinninn döktisk
- eiga Freyju
- hve stór björg hann færði til
- Loki hafði þa fór til Svaðilfœra
- laust hann í Hel
- ok hrein ok hvein við
- léitu hann
- var grátt at lit

**Faulkes 2005:35.33**

- verðan ills dauða
- spilla lopintu ok himminum
- eignask Freyju
- hversu stór björg sá hestr dró
- Loki hafði þá ferð haft til Svaðilfœra
- laust þat hit fyrsta högg er haussinn brotndað í smán mola
- ok hrein við
- kváðu hann
- 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 eðar / orð ok særi.”
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.

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. 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 till 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.)

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, hátr, heim, hirð, hlaup, hvíla, látask, leggr, leiða, megin, mettr, Miðgarðr, miðnætti, öfljótari, staka, svíma, þjóna, vesall, ægir.

Grape et al. 1977:24.9–29.18

ok buðu bætr þær er hann vildi.
strýk um vann òk en nit
þótt sem fjöðr nökkur felli
för
fullt af slátri
leiddi hann þá á götu
gefr hann upp ok vill eigi drekka
lítiræði í þykka at glíma við þik
meira en þér mun hägst vera
er þær komu fyrir hásæti
hefða vitat þik svá mikils háttar
þær komið mik eigi optar heim at òckja
Engi mun sá hér innan hirðar
En Þjálfi tók hlau
ok sá mann hvíla
Hann lézk vera [vakn]aðr
lét brotinn legg hafrsins
leiddi hann þá á götu
at òðrum enda en Logi at òðrum megin
eða hvárt þær se mettir
Þeir ganga til Miðgarðs
um [miðnætti varð landskjálp]t
Þó hafa hér komit ekki öfljótari menn
kasta beinunum a òckjum
ok svam yfir þat it djúpa haf
ok þjónuðu þau honum súðan
engi svá vesall

Faulkes 2005:37.3–43.33

akarn
buðu at fyrir kvæmi allt þat er þau áttu
strauk of vangann
at tros nokkvot af kvistunum felli
ferð
fyllt af slátri
gengr með þeim braut
byðr hann upp hornit ok vill eigi drekka
lítiræði í þykka at fásk við þik
drykkjar meira en þér mun hagr á vera
koma þær fyrir konunginn
at þ þefðir svá mikinn krappt með þér
þær komið eigi optar mik at hitta
engi er hér sá inni
En er Þjálfi þreytti rásina
sér hvar lá maðr
[lacking]
Kennir hann at brotinn var lærleggrinn
gengr með þeim
at òðrum enda en Logi at òðrum
Eða hvat er títt um þik, bórr
ok gekk fram til miðs dags
En of miðja nótt varð landskjálp mikill
ekki …menn er mér þykki fóthvatar en svá
kasta á hafrstökurnar beinun
Þá fór hann út yfir hafít þat it djúpa
gerðusk þau þa skyldr þjónustumenn þórs ok fylgja
þau honum jafnan súðan
engi er svá litill drykkjumaðr

—The question of expansion in R or abbreviation in U remains. My answer would be: Expansion in R and abbreviation in U.”
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

**Hér hefr sögu Þórs ok Útgarða-Loka**

Þat er þá upphaf at Ökuþórr fór með hafra sína ok með honum Loki, ok koma at kveldi til eins bóna. Tók Þórr hafra ok skar, ok váru þeir flegrík ok bornir til ketils. Ok er soðit var, settisk Þórr til matal ok baðu bóna til nótturðar ok börnum hans. Son hans hét Þjálfi, en Röskva döttir. Pá lagði Þórr hafrostökurnar útar frá eldi ok mélti at börnin skyldu kasta beinunum á stökurnar. Þjálfi, son bóna, laust lærleg hafsrns með knífi sínum ok sprettili til mergjar.

Þórr var þar um nótt[na], ok í öttu stóð hann upp ok klaedisk, tók Mjölni ok brá upp ok vígið hafrostökurnar. Stóðu hafnar upp ok var annarr haltr eftir farit. Þórr fann þat, let bóna eða hjú hans eigi [mj]undu hafa skymsamliga með farit beinunum, let brotinn legg hafsrns.

Bóndinn varð hræddr er Þórr lét síga brúnina fyrir augun, en þat er hann sá til augnanna, hugðisk hann falla mundu fyrir sjónunn einum saman. Hann herði hendrar at hamaraskaptnu svá at [hv]jánuðu knúarinn. Bóndi ok hjú hans láðu sér frídrar ok buðu þær er hann vildi.

Ok er hann sá hræzlú þeira mikla, gekk af honum mórðrinn ok tók af bóna börn hans, Þjálfa ok Rösku, ok þjónuðu þau honum síðan.

Hann lét þá eptir hafra sína ok fór í Jötunheima ok allt til hafsins ok svam yfir þat í dýja haf. Ok er hann kom til lands, þá gekk hann upp ok með honum Þjálfi ok Röskva ok Loki.

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

Faulkes 2005:37.3–30

Pá 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 búaða ok fá þeir náttstað. En um kveldi tók Þórr hafra sína ok skar báða, eptir þat váru þeir flegrík ok bornir til ketils. En er soðit var, þá settisk Þórr til náttverðar ok þeir lagmenn. Þórr baðu til matal með sér búaðanum ok konu hans ok börnum þeirra. Sonr búa hét Þjálfi, en Röskva döttir. Pá lagði Þórr hafrostökurnar útar frá eldunum ok mélti at búaði ok heimamenn hans skyldu kasta á hafrostökurnar beinunum. Þjálfi, son búa, helt á lærleg hafsrns ok sprettili á knífi sínum ok braut til mergjar.

Þórr dvalðisk þar of öttina, en í öttu fyrir dag stóð hann upp ok klaeddi sik, tók hamarrinn Mjöllni ok brá upp ok vígið hafrostökurnar. Stóðu þá úpp hafnarinn ok var þá annarr haltr eftir farit. Þat fann þórr ok talði at búaðinn eða hans hjón mundi eigi skymsamliga hafa farit með beinunum hafsrns. Kennir hann at brotinn var lærleggrinn.

Eigi þarf langt frá því at segja, vita megu þat allir hversu hræzlu þeira mikla, gekk af honum mórðrinn ok séðarisk hann tók af bóna börn hans, Þjálfa ok Röskva, ok gerðuk þau þá skyldir þjónustunum þórs ok fylgja þau honum jafnan síðan.

En er hann sá hræzlú þeira, þá gekk af honum mórðrinn ok lét hann þá eptir hafra ok byrjaði ferðina austr í Jötunheima ok allt til hafsins, ok þá fór hann út yfir hafit þat í dýja. 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. Pá sá þeir borg standa á völlum nokkvorum”. Miðgarðr would then be some kind of misreading 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, ragnarökk (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):

- Brímlé (Brimir), búa (lifa), Eiðavöllr (Iðavöllr), gluggr, Gnipalundr (Gnipahellir), hanga, hold, Jötunheimar (jötummóðr), 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 vör 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.”

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. 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. Then he uses the obviously well known Trójumannasaga for further explanation.

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.

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 lóndum 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 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 Bragí’s stanza) is only otherwise a typical “sea-king’s” name.
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. 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. 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grape et al. 2007:1–3. 1007 words</th>
<th><a href="http://notendur.hi.is/eybjorn/">http://notendur.hi.is/eybjorn/</a>. 1725 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almáttigr Guð skapaði himin ok jörð ok alla hluti er þeim fylgja, ok síðast menn, er ættinar eru frá komnar, Adam ok Evu, ok dreifðusk ættinar um heiminn síðan.</td>
<td>WORMIANUS Almáttigr guð skapaði í upphafi himin ok jörð ok alla þá hlut&lt;í&gt; er þeim fylgja, ok síðarst menn tvá er ættir eru frá komnar, Adam ok Evu, ok fjölgðusk þeira kynslóð ok dre&lt;i&gt;fösk um heim allan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En er frá liðu sundir, ójaðnafísk fólki, sumir váru gðóðir, sumir líðu eptir girndum sínum. Fyrir þat var drekt heiminum, nema þeim er meðr Nóu váru</td>
<td>En er fram liðu sundir, þá ójafnafísk mannfólki; váru sumir gðóðir ok rétttraðir, en miklu fleiri snærusk þá eptir girndum heimsins ok órækt guðs boðorð, ok fyrir því drekkí guð heiminum í sjóvargangi ok öllum kykvendum heimsins,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

70 Heimir Pálsson 2011 (forthcoming). This is not at all a new idea. In his introduction to Heimskringla Bjarni Ædalbjarnarson (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 Edda – nema Hattatal.” (p. xxiv) “During these years, Snorri may have composed Edda, except Hattatal.”
í örkinni. Eptir þat bygðisk enn veröldin af þeim, en allr fjöllönn afvirkvikt þá guð. En hverr mundi þá segja frá guðs störmurkum er þeir týðdu guðs nafni? En þat var viðast um veröldina er fólkið viltisk. En þó veitti guð mánnum jarðilgar giptir, fé ok sælu ok speki at skilja jarðliga hluti ok greinir þær er sjá mátti lopts ok jarðar.

Pat undruðusk þeir er jörðin ok dýr höfð[u] saman náttúru í sumum hlutum, svá ölíkt sem þat var. Þat er eitt er jörðin e[?] grein í hám fjalltindum ok spretti 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 fónum. Ónnur náttúra er sú jarðarinnar at á hverju ári vex á henni [gra]ls 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], þa grær gras á þeirri moldu, er efst er at jörðunn. Þeir þýddu hjör og [stei]na móti tönnum ok þeim enn kvikvendi.

Svá skilðu þeir af þessu at jörðin væri kvik ok hefði líf með nökkurum hætti, er hon fœddi öll kvikvendi, ok þeir vissu þeir at hon var furðulíkt gömul at aldartali ok máttug í eðli. Hon fœddi öll kykvendi, en hon eignaðisk allt þat er dó. Pangat til hennar töldu þeir ættir sínan.

En þeir þat at ójafn var gangr himintungla, sum gengu lengra en sum. Pat grunaði þá at nökkurr mundi þeim stýra, ok munið sá vera ríkr, ok ætluðu hann mundu verit hafa fyrrí en himintungl, ætluðu hann ráða mundu skini sólar ok dögg jarð[ar] ok vindum ok stormi. En eigi vissu þeir hvert hann var, en því trúðu þeir at hann ræðr öllum hlutum.

Ok til þess at þeir mætti muna, þá gáfu þeir öllum hlutum nafn með sér, ok sísan hefri átrúnaðr breyzik á margu 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 efní skapat eða smíðat.
Veröldin var grein í þrjár hálfur. Frá suðri í vestri ok inn at Miðjarðarsjó, sá hlutur var kallaður Affríka. Inn syðri hlutur þeirrar deildar er brunninn af sólu. Annarr hlutur frá vestri til norðrs ok inn til hafns, er sá kallaður Evrópa eða Enea. Inn nyrðri hlutur er þar svá kaldr, at eigi vex gras á ok engi bygging. Frá norðri ok um austurhálfur allt til suðurs, þat er kallað Asía. Í þeim hluta veraldar er öll fegrð ok prýði ok eignir ok jarðarinnar gull ok gmsteinar. Par er ok mið veröldin, ok svá sem þar er betra en í öðrum stöðum, svá er þar ok mannfólk hita ðegn at tagn af öllum giptunum, spekinni ok aflinu, fegrðinni ok alls kostar kunniustum.

Nær miðri veröldinni var gört þat hús ok herbergi er ágetast hefir verit, er kallað er Troja, þar sem þær köllum Tyrkland. Þessi staðr var miklu með görr en aðrir ok með mira hagleik á margra lund með kostnaði ok fóngum, er þar váru til. Þar váru töfl konungdómar ok einn yfirkonungr, ok lágu mórg jöföldin til hvers konungdómsins. Þar váru í borginni töfl höfuðungur. Þessir höfingjarg hafa verit um fram aðra menn, þá er verit hafa í veröldu, um alla manndómliga hluti.

Einn konungr, er þar var, er nefndr Munón eða Mennón. Hann átti döttur höfuðkonungsins Priámi, sú hét Tróain, þau áttu sonar, hann hét Trór, eða Thór. Hann var at uppfézu með hertoga þeim er nefndr er Loríkur, en <er> hans var tíu vetra, þá tók hann við jöfnun föður síns. Hár hans fór þegar líkt við jörðu tíu bjarnstökum öllum. Hann var fullt afl, þá hafði hann fullt afl. Hann átti köllum Anflófr, hans son Vígmóð, hans son Beðvígg, hans son Atra, er þar köllum Annan, hans son Þrjómann, hans son Ærsmóð, hans son Skjaldun, er þar köllum Skjóld, hans son Bjaf, er þar köllum Bör, hans son Jar, hans son Guðólfr, hans son Finnr, hans son Frjálfr, er þar köllum Fríðleif, hans son Vóden, er þar köllum Öðinn.

Þessi Öðinn hafði mikinn spádom. Kona hans hét Frígíða, er þar köllum Frígg. Hann fýstisk norður í heim með mikinn her ok stórmiklu fél, ok hvar sem þeir fóru jöföldi mikils um þá vert ok líkari goðum en mönnun. Þeir komu í Saxland ok eignaðisk Öðinn þar viða landit, ok
þar setti hann til lands gæzlu þrjá syni sína. Vegðreg réð fyrir Austr-Saxlandi. Annarr sonr hans hét Beldeg, er vér köllum Veggdegg, var hann ríkr konungr ok réð fyrir Austr-Saxlandi, hans sonr var Vitrgils, hans synir váru þeir [Vjitta, faðir Heingests, ok Sigarr, faðir Svebdegg, er vér köllum Svipdag. Annarr son Öðins hét Beldeg, er vér köllum Baldr, hann átti þat land, er nú heitir Vestfál. Hann var Brandr, hans son Frjóðigar, er vér köllum Fróða, hans son var Freóvit, hans son Úvigg, hans son Gevis, er [vér köllum Gavé. Inn þríði son Öðins er nefndr Siggi, hans son Verir. Þeir langfægðr réðu þar fyrir er nú er kallat Frakland, ok er þaðan sú aett komin er köllum Völsungar. Frá öllum þessum eru stórar ættir."}

Pá fór Öðinn í Reiðgotaland, ok eignaðisk þat, ok setti þar son sinn Skjöld, föður Friðleifs, er Skjöldungar eru frá komnir. Þat heitir nú Jótland er þaðan sú ætt komin, er Skjöldungar heita, þat er Danakonungar, og þat heitir nú Jótland. Skifnaði þeir hafði í Troju, setti öllum öllum sem fyrr höfðu verit í Troju ok Tyrkir váru vanir.

Eptir þat þar norð þar sem nú heitir Svíþjóð. Þar var sá konungr, en Gylfi er nefndr, en er hann sprýr til ferða þeira Asiamanna, er æsir váru kallaðir, fór hann móti þeim og setti þar son sinn til þess ríkis er nú heitir Nóregr. Sá er Sæmingr kallaðr, og telja þar Nóregskonungar sínar ættir til hans ok svá jarlar ok aðrir ríkismenn, þeir sem segir í Háleygjatali. En Öðinn hafði með þenn son sinn er Yngvi er nefndr, er konungr var í Svíþjóðu, og eru frá honum komnir þær ættir er Ynglingar eru kallaðir.

Þeir æsirnið tóku sér kvánföng þar innan lands, ok urðu þar ættir fjölmennar, um Saxland ok um norðrhlíðuna. Þeira tunga ein gekk um þessi lónd, ok þat skilja menn at þeir hafa norðr hingat haft tunguna í Nóreg ok Danmörk, Svíþjóð ok Saxland. mönnum. Ok þeir gefa eigi stað ferðinni, fyrir en þeir koma norðr í þár land er nú er kallat Saxland. Þar dvalósk Öðinn langar hríðir ok eignask víða þat land. Þar setr Öðinn til lands gæzlu þrjá sonu sína. Er einn nefndr Vegðegg, var hann ríkr konungr ok réð fyrir Austr-Saxlandi, hans sonr var Vitrgils, hans synir váru þeir [Vjitta, faðir Heingests, ok Sigarr, faðir Svebdegg, er vér köllum Svipdag. Annarr son Öðins hét Beldeg, er vér köllum Baldr, hann átti þat land, er nú heitir Vestfál. Hann var Brandr, hans son Frjóðigar, er vér köllum Fróða, hans son var Freóvit, hans son Úvigg, hans son Gevis, er [vér köllum Gavé. Inn þríði son Öðins er nefndr Siggi, hans son Verir. Þeir langfægðr réðu þar fyrir er nú er kallat Frakland, ok er þaðan sú aett komin er köllum Völsungar. Frá öllum þessum eru stórar ættir ættir ok margar.

Pá byrjaði Öðinn ferð sínar norðr ok kom í þat land, er þeir köllum Reiðgotaland, ok eignaði þómi þeim at þeim svo eld þeir vildi. Hann setti þar til landa son sinn er Skjöld hét, hans son hét Fríðleifr, þaðar er sú aett komin, er Skjöldungar heita, þat er Danakonungar, og þat heitir nú Jótland er þar er kallat Reiðgotaland.

Eptir þat þar norð þar sem nú heitir Svíþjóð. Þar var sá konungr, en Gylfi er nefndr, en er hann sprýr til ferða þeira Asiamanna, er æsir váru kallaðir, fór hann móti þeim og setti þar son sinn til þess ríkis er nú heitir Nóregr. Sá er Sæmingr kallaðr, og telja þar Nóregskonungar sínar ættir til hans ok svá jarlar ok aðrir ríkismenn, þeir sem segir í Háleygjatali. En Öðinn hafði með þenn son sinn er Yngvi er nefndr, er konungr var í Svíþjóðu, og eru frá honum komnir þær ættir er Ynglingar eru kallaðir.

Þeir æsirnið tóku sér kvánföng þar innan lands, ok urðu þar ættir fjölmennar, um Saxland ok um norðrhlíðuna. Þeira tunga ein gekk um þessi lónd, ok þat skilja menn at þeir hafa norðr hingat haft tunguna í Nóreg ok Danmörk, Svíþjóð ok Saxland.
Figure 12. The Introduction in U compared to W, T and R, respectively. In this example I use 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 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 supposed to 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 alle håndskrifter; i U er den systematiskt forkortet og stilen skødelsöst behandlet, hvorved et par fejl er indlöbne. (1898:352.)

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:


71 “The result of the previous is unshakeable, in short that the description of Freyr’s and Gerðr’s love is completely identical in all the manuscripts; in U it is systematically abbreviated 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 Skínmir is only mentioned in Skírnismál and once more as a messenger in Edda (Grape et al. 1977:17.17 Pá 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.
Gymir hét maðr, en kona hans Aurboða, hon var bergrisa ættar. Dóttir þeirra er Gerðr, er allra kvenna færst. Þat var einn dag at Freyr gekk í Hliðskjálf ok sá um heim allan, ok er hann leið í no[rðrætt], þá sá hann á einum bœ mikit hús, ok þar gekk kona út, ok lýsti af hár[i] hennar bæði í lopt ok á lög, ok svá hefndi honum þat mikla mikillæti er hann hafði setzið í þat helga sæti at hann gekk í braut fullr af harmi. Ok er hann kom heim, efti hann ekki, hvárti svafl hann né drakk; engi þorði ok krefja hann orða. Þá léð Njörðr kalla til sín Skírnir, skörsvein Freys, ok bað hann ganga til Freys ok þeir hann hafði ok spyrja hverjum hann var í svá reiðr at hann mælti ekki við menn. En Skírnir kvæk ganga mundu, ok eigi fúss, ok kvað illra svara vera ván af honum. En er hann kom til Freys, þá spurið hann hví Freyr var í svá hniðin ok mælti ekki við menn. Þá svarar Freyr ok sagði at hann hafði sét konu fagra, ok fyrir hennar sakar var hann svá harmsfulr at eigi mundi hann lengi lífa 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 sendiðeð en Freyr skal fá honum sverð sitt, þat var svá gött sverð at sjálf þá gask. Þá léð Freyr eigi þat til skorta ok gaf honum sverðið. Þá fór Skírnir ok bað honum konunnar ok fekk heitit hennar, ok nú nótum síðar skyldi hon þar koma en Barey heitir og 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 þryjár?
Opt mér mánaðr
minni þótti
en sjá hálfi hýnót.

Þessi sök er til er Freyr var svá vápnlauss er hann barðisk við Belja ok drap hann með hjartarmör. Þá mælti Gangleri: Undr mikir er þvöllur höfðingi sem Freyr er vildi gefa sverð svá at hann átti eigi annat jafngott. Geysimiket mein var honum þat þa er hann barðisk við þá er Beli heitir. Þat veit trúa mín at þeirar gjafar mundi hann þá íðrask.

Þá svarar Há: Lítit mark var þa at er þeir Beli hittusk. Drepa mátti Freyr henn með hendi sinni. Verða muna þat er Frey mun þykja vör við koma er hann missir sverðsins er 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):
En um morgininn bjósk jötuna at fara til fiskjar. Þórr vill fara með honum, en jötunn lét ekki gagn mundu at kógursveini þeim, mun þik kala ef ek sit lengi ok útarla á miðfljum sem ek em vanar.

Þórr reiddisk honum mjökk, en kvað þat eigi vist, ok spurði hvat þeir skyldi hafa at beitum. Eymir bað hann fá sér beitur. Þórr tók uxann er heitir Himinjóðr, er Eymir átti, ok sleit af hófuðút, ok settisk í austrrúm.

Ok þótti Eymi hann heldr róa mikit, ok lét þá konna á þær vaztir sem hann var vanr ok bað þá eigi róa lengra. Þórr lézk vildu enn miklú lengra róa. Eymir kvað þat hætt við Miðgárdsorminn. Þórr vill róa, Eymir varð ókátr.

Þórr greiddi vaðinn ok lét koma af úxahöfuðit á öngulunni, ok þótti Eymi hann heldr róa mikit, en ormrinn bráði það henvin gjöf til þess, er þótti Eymi buðið um það þótti Eymi þat henvin hjóðuð til vinað.

Þórr gekk á skipit ok settisk í ásmegin, spyrndi við grunni, dró þá sér orminn ok upp viðr skipit ok spyrndi við grunni, dró þá sér orminn upp viðr skipit ok spyrndi við grunni, dró þá sér orminn upp viðr skipit ok spyrndi við grunni, dró þá sér orminn upp viðr skipit ok spyrndi við grunni, dró þá sér orminn upp viðr skipit ok spyrndi við grunni.
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 hauðu[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.

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 Þórr and the serpent and the the whole text reads as follows (Fig. 15):

---

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

Ok er þetta var gert, var þat skemtun 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 ílla, gekk til Fensala til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Spyrð Frigg ef hann vissi hvat menn hòðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, en hann sakar ekki. Þá mælti Frigg: "Eigi munu vápn eða viðir bálir granda Baldri. Eiða hefi ek af öllum tekit.

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

Frigg svaraði: Viðarteinungur einn vext yfirin vestan Valholl, sér heitir mistileitinn. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðöins. Þá hverfr konan.

En LokRI gengur til ok tekr mistileit[ni]nn ok síðu upp með rótum, gengur til þingins. En Höðr stóð útarliga í mannhringinum, er hann var blíndr. Þá mælti Loki við hann: Hví skýtr þú eigi at Baldri? Hann svarar: því er eignask vildi allar ástir hennar ok hylli, en vili hann ríða á spyrndi fœti sín um á hann ok hratt honum í eldinn, ok brann hann. Þá stóð Þórr at ok vígði bálit með Mjölni, ok hann eigi berserkir haldit taumum. Hon vargar váru at taumum. Óðinn sá hverri til annars ok allir með einum hug til þess er unnit hafði verkit. Þá gekk Hörr til konan: Hví skýtr þú ekki at Baldri?

Hann svarar: því ek sé eigi hvat Baldri er, ok þat annat at ek em vápnlauss.

En er þetta var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta ekki, sumir berja grjóti. En hvat sem at var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta öllum mikill frami. En er þetta sá LokRI Laufeyjarson, þá líkaði honum ílla er Baldr sakaði ekki. Hann gekk til Fensalar til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Þá mælti Frigg ef sú kona vissi hvat Æsir hòðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, ok þat at hann sakaði ekki. Þá mælti Frigg:

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

Pá spyrð konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Baldri?

Þá svarar Frigg: Vex viðarteinungur einn fyrir vestan Valholl, sér heitir mistileitinn kallaðr. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðöins.

En er þetta var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta ekki, sumir berja grjóti. En hvat sem at var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta öllum mikill frami. En er þetta sá LokRI Laufeyjarson, þá líkaði honum ílla er Baldr sakaði ekki. Hann gekk til Fensalar til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Þá mælti Frigg ef sú kona vissi hvat Æsir hòðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, ok þat at hann sakaði ekki. Þá mælti Frigg:

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

Pá spyrð konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Baldri?

Þá svarar Frigg: Vex viðarteinungur einn fyrir vestan Valholl, sér heitir mistileitinn kallaðr. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðöins.

En er þetta var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta ekki, sumir berja grjóti. En hvat sem at var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta öllum mikill frami. En er þetta sá LokRI Laufeyjarson, þá líkaði honum ílla er Baldr sakaði ekki. Hann gekk til Fensalar til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Þá mælti Frigg ef sú kona vissi hvat Æsir hòðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, ok þat at hann sakaði ekki. Þá mælti Frigg:

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

Pá spyrð konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Baldri?

Þá svarar Frigg: Vex viðarteinungur einn fyrir vestan Valholl, sér heitir mistileitinn kallaðr. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðöins.

En er þetta var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta ekki, sumir berja grjóti. En hvat sem at var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta öllum mikill frami. En er þetta sá LokRI Laufeyjarson, þá líkaði honum ílla er Baldr sakaði ekki. Hann gekk til Fensalar til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Þá mælti Frigg ef sú kona vissi hvat Æsir hòðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, ok þat at hann sakaði ekki. Þá mælti Frigg:

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

Pá spyrð konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Baldri?

Þá svarar Frigg: Vex viðarteinungur einn fyrir vestan Valholl, sér heitir mistileitinn kallaðr. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðöins.

En er þetta var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta ekki, sumir berja grjóti. En hvat sem at var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta öllum mikill frami. En er þetta sá LokRI Laufeyjarson, þá líkaði honum ílla er Baldr sakaði ekki. Hann gekk til Fensalar til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Þá mælti Frigg ef sú kona vissi hvat Æsir hòðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, ok þat at hann sakaði ekki. Þá mælti Frigg:

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

Pá spyrð konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Baldri?

Þá svarar Frigg: Vex viðarteinungur einn fyrir vestan Valholl, sér heitir mistileitinn kallaðr. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðöins.

En er þetta var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta ekki, sumir berja grjóti. En hvat sem at var gert, sakaði hann ekki, ok þótti þetta öllum mikill frami. En er þetta sá LokRI Laufeyjarson, þá líkaði honum ílla er Baldr sakaði ekki. Hann gekk til Fensalar til Friggjar ok brá sér í konu líki. Þá mælti Frigg ef sú kona vissi hvat Æsir hòðusk at á þinginu. Hann sagði at allir skutu at Baldri, ok þat at hann sakaði ekki. Þá mælti Frigg:

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

Pá spyrð konan: Hafa allir hlutir eiða unnit at eira Baldri?

Þá svarar Frigg: Vex viðarteinungur einn fyrir vestan Valholl, sér heitir mistileitinn kallaðr. Sá þótti mér ungr at krefja eiðöins.
At þessi brennu sötti margar konar þjóð: fyrst at segja frá Ôðni, at með honum fór Frigg ok valkyjur ok hrafnar hans. En Freyr ok í kerru með geti þeim er Gullinbursti heitir eða Slórugtanni. En Heimdallr reið desti þeim er Gulltoppr heitir, en Freyja kottum sínum. Þar kömr ok mikit fólk hrímþursa ok bergrisar. Óðinn lagði á bílit gullhring þann er Draupnir heitir. Hestur Baldrs var leiddur á bílit með öllum hjartum. Þar er at segja frá Hermóði at hann reið nú nætur dökkva dala ok dýupa svá at hann sá ekki fyrir enn einna í þann kom til árinnar Gjallar ok reið á Gjallarbrúna. Hon er þóð lýsigulli. Óðinn lagði á bílit Draupni ok hest Baldr með öllum hjartum. Þar váru ok hrímþussar. Óðinn lagði á bílit Draupni ok hest Baldrs með öllum reiða.

Hermóðr reið nú nætur til Gjallarar ok á gulli hlána brú. Möðguðr getti brúarinnar, ok hon mælti: Fryra dag reið Baldr hér með fimm hundruð manna, en eigi glymr miðr undir þér einum. Þa reið hann at Helgrindum, ok sá þar bróður sín. Hann bar fram boð sín, en sú ein var ván um brottkvámu hans ef allir hlutur gráta hann með ásum, kykvir ok dauðir, en ella haldisk með Helju.

Baldur fekk honum hringinn Draupni, en Nanna sendi Frigg fald, en Fullu fingrugull. Þá fór móðr aprtr í Ásgarð og segir þóindi. Bóðu guðin alla hlutur gráta Baldr ör Helju, menn ok kykvind, jörð ok steina. Þó ek allir málmr gráta Baldur, sem þú mun sæt hafa at þessir hlutur gráta allir í frosti ok hita.

Þat er sagt at guðin finna gýgr í hellu nokkurum, er Pökk nefnd disk, biðja hana gráta sem allt annat Baldr ör Helju. Hon svarar:

52. Pökk mun gráta þurrum tárum Baldrís helfarar, kyks eða dauðs. Haldí Hel því er hefir.

Þar var Loki raunar.

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, eitormr, faldr, glympja, grimmr, grýta, gull, hlaðinn, hundrað, 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**
Mikit afrek var þetta.
Freyja ok köttum sínun
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 bóð sín
sú ein var ván um brottkvámu
dró fram skipit
eitormar
Nanna sendi Frigg fald
með fimm hundrað manna
eigi glymr miðr undir þær einum
ok allir með grimmum hug
sumir höggva, sumir grýta
til Gjallarár ok á gulli hlaðna brú
gulli hlaðna
fimm hundrað
vildi þórr ljósta hana
Var þar grútr fyrir mál

---

**Faulkes 2005:45–48**
Allmikit þrekvirki vann þórr
Heimdallr reiði hesti [...] en Freyja köttum
veit Baldri seðmø
fram setja ok gera þar á bálfor
Eigi munu vápn eða viðir granda Baldri
guðin eðl báðu henni fríðar
Freyr ok í kerru með gelti þeim er Gullinbursti heitir

þá beiddisk Hermóðr af Helju

hratt fram í fyrsta viðragði
eit, ormar
Nanna sendi Frigg ripti
fimm fylki dauðra manna
eigi dynr brúin jafnmjök undir einum þær
allir með einum hug
sumir höggva til, sumir berja grjóti á Gjallarbrúna. Hon er þókt lýsigulli
þókt lýsigulli
fimm fylki
myndi þá brjóta hófuð hennar
er Æsirnir freistuðu at mæla, þá var hitt þó fyrir at
grátrinn kom upp
eigi dynr brúin jafnmjök
fái fundit Baldr ok bjóða Helju útlausn
hefir þat mest óhapp verit unni
ok sleit upp
Hermóðr inn hvati, sveinn Óðins
sent [...] eptir gygi þeir 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 fyrir 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 glymir 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?). 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 bída þá er þau eldaz, ok verða þá allir ungir, ok svá mun verða til Ragnarókkr.

Þá segir Gangleri: Allmikit þykki mér guðin eiga undir gæslu Iðunnar eða trúnaði.

Þá mælti Hár ok hló við:

Hár postpones the tale and thus the presentation is unique in Edda. 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.

---

73 It is worth noting that while scholars usually expect it to be a scribal error, when we read in U that Hyrrokkin 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 Haustlöng.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grape et al.</th>
<th>Faulkes 1998:1–3.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Þessir æsir þágu heimboð at Ægí í Hlésey, Aðr hafið Óðinn hánum heim boðit. Um kveldit lét Óðinn bera sverð í hollina ok Lýsti þar af sem logum björtum. Þórr var þar, Njörðr, Freyr, Týr, Heimdallr, Bragi, Viðarr, Váli, Ullr, Hœnir, Forseti, Loki. Ásynjur: Slík, Frigg, Freyja, Gefjun, Iðunn, Gerður, Sigun, Skolla, Nanna.</td>
<td><strong>Thus hærir ok gamlir</strong> in R has a parallel in Haustlöng; <strong>þjórhluti fjóra</strong> in Haustlöng gives the same information as R “lær oxans tvau ok báda bóganu.” In those cases U gives different information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óðinn, Loki ok Hœnir föru um fjall, fundu öxnflokk, taka eitt nautið ok snúa til seyðis. Rjúfa þysvar seyðinn ok var eigi soðið. Þá sá þeir ór yfir sér ok leðk hann valda at eigi var soðit. Gefit mér fylli ok mun soðit. Þeir játa því.</td>
<td>**Enn maðr er nefndr Ægir eða Hlér. Hann bjó í ey þeir er nú er kölluð Hlésey. Hann var mjökl fjölkunnigr. Hann gerði ferð sína til Ásgarðs, en er Æsir vissu ferð hans var honum fagnat vel ok þó margir hlutir með sjönverfingum. Ok um kveldit, er drekka skyldi, þá lét Æginn bera inn í höllina sverð, ok vàru svá björt at þar af lýsti, ok var ekki haft ljós annat meðan við drykkju var setit. Pá 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 gögfugligt þar um at sjásk. Veggðili öll vàru þar þjölud með fógrum skjöldum. Þar var ok áfenginn mjödr ok mjök drukkit. Næsti maðr Ægi sat Bragi, ok áttusk þeir við drykkju ok örðaskipti. Sagði Bragi Ægí frá morgum tóíundum þeim er Æsir höfðu átt. Hann hóf þar frásögn at þrír Æsir fór to heiman, Óðinn ok Loki ok Hœnir, ok þorú um fjöll ok eyðamaðr ok var ilt til mator. En er þeir koma ofan í dal nakkvar, sjá þeir öxnflokk, taka eitt nautið ok snúa til seyðis. En er þeir hyggja at soðit mun vera, raufa þeir seyðinn ok var ekki soðið. Ok í annat sinn er þeir raufa seyðinn, þá er stund var löðin, ok var ekki soðið. Mæla þeir þá sí í milli hverju þetta muni gegna, þá heyra þeir mál, í eikina upp yfir sér ok sá er þar sat kvask ráða því er eigi sö lda á eyðinum. Þeir litu til ok sat þar ór eigi lítill. Þá mælti örninn: Vilið þér gefa mér fylli mína af oxanum, þá mun söðna á seyðinum. Þeir játa því.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hann lætr sígask á seyðinn, tók annat uxlærit ok bóguna báða. Loki þreif upp stöng ok laust á bak erinnun. En hann brá sér upp við höggját við flýgr. Stöngin var fóst við bak erinnun. En hendr Loka voru fastar við annan stangar enda. Þrøninn flýgr svá at feetr Loka námu niðri við jörðu ok grjóti. En hendr hugði hann slitna mundu ór axlariðum ok biðr friðar.

Örninn lézk hann eigi mundu lausan láta nema Íðunn kæmi þar með epli sín. Loki vill þetta ok fær brott með eiti.

Hann tveygr hana eptir epilum ok biðr hana hafa mín epli, ok hon for. Þar kom þjózzi jötunn í hnoti enda ham ok flaug með hana í þrúðheim.

En er þæir sá hvar valrinn fló, þá tóku þeir byrði af lokarspánum ok slógu endi í. Þrøninn fékk eigi stóðvat sik at fluginum, ok lausk eldi í fíðrit, ok drápu þeir jötunnin fýrir innan Íðunn.

En Skaði, dóttir hans, tók öll hvervápn ok vill hefna hans. En þeir buðu henni at kjósa manna at fótum af líði þeirra.

Hon sá eins manns feetr fagra. Hon mælti þá: Þenna kýs ek, fátt mun ljótt á Baldri. En þat var Njörðr.

Pá lætr hann sígask ór trúnu ok sezk á seyðinn ok leggr upp þegar it fyrsta ler oxans tvau ok bóða bógana. Pá varð Loki reiðr ok greip upp mikla stöng ok rekr á kroppinn erinnun. Þrøninn bregzk við höggját við flýgr upp. Pá var föst stöngin við kropp arnarins ok hendr Loka við annan enda. Þrøninn flýgr hátt svá at feetr taka niðr við grjótiit ok urðir ok viðu, [en] hendr hans hyggjur hann at slitna muní ór óxlu. Hann kallar ok biðr allþarflega þræinn friðar, en hann segir at Loki skal aldri lauss verða nema hann veiti honum svardaga at koma Íðunni út of Ásgarð með epli mín, en Loki vill þat. Verðr hann þá lauss ok fær till lagsmanna sinna ok er eigi at sinni sögð fleiri tíðindi um þeira ferð aðr þeir koma heim.

En at ákveðinni stundu tveygir Loki Íðunni út um Ásgarð í skóg nokkvorn ok segir at hann hefdir fundit epli þau er henni munu gripir í þykjkja, ok bað at hon skal hafa með sér mín epli ok bera saman ok hin. Þar kem þar þjózzi jötunn í arnarham ok tekr Íðunni ok flýgr braut með ok í þrýnheim til bús míns.

En þæir urðu illa við hvarf Íðunnar ok gerðusk þeir brátt hárir ok gamlír. Þá áttu þeir þæir þing ok þygur hver annan hvat Íðunnar, en þat var sét síaður at hon gekk ór Ásgarði með Loka. Pá var Loki tekinn ok færða at þingit ok var honum heitit bana eða þýgum.

En er hann varð hreðdr, þá kvazk hann mundu seeð< ]; a eptir Íðunni í Jötunheimuna ef Freyja vill lið honum valshams er hon án. Ok er hann fær valshaminn flýgr hann norðr í Jötunheimuna ok kemr einn dag til þjózzi jötuns. Var hann róinn á sée, en Íðunn var ein heima. Brá Loka henni í hnotar líki ok hafði í klómi leður ok flýgr með.

En æsirnir sá at valrinn fló, þá gengu þeir út undir Ásgarð ok baðu þannig byrðar af lokarspánum, ok þá er valrinn flaug inn af borgina, lét hann fallask niðr við borgarvegginn. Þá slógu æsirnir endi í lokarspánu en Íðunn mátti eigi stóðva er hann misti valsvins. Laust þá eldinum í fíðri endaarins ok tók þa at fluginum. Þá varu æsirnir nær ok drápu þjózzi jötun fýrir innan Ásgrindr ok er þat vig allfrægt.

En Skaði, dóttir Þjózzi jötuns, tók hjálm ok brynju ok öll hvervápn ok fær till Ásgarðs at hefna fíðrit sín. En æsir buðu henni sætt ok yfirbætr, ok hit fyrsta at hon skal kjósa sér manna af Ásum ok kjósa at fótum ok sjá ekki fleiri af. Þá sá hon eins manns feetr forknannar fagra ok meðir: Þenna kýs ek, fátt mun ljótt á Baldri. En þat var Njörðr ór Nóatúnnum.
En þat varð at sætt, at æsir skyldu hlœja hana, en hon hugði at þat mætti engi gera. Loki batt sér geitarskegg undir hreðjarnar ok létu þau ymsi eptir ok skráksti hvárreytt teggja hátt. Þá lét hann fallask í kné Skáða ok þá hló hon. Þá var sætt ger með þeim. 76

Óðinn gerði þat til fðörbóta við Skáða at hann tók augum Þjazza ok kastaði á himininn ok gerði af stjórnur.

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.

76 Neither Margaret Clunies Ross (1989) nor John Lindow (1992), when interpreting the sexual roles and acts of Skáði 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!

Swá er sagt at Óðinn gerði þat til yfirbóta við hana at hann tók augu Þjazza ok kastaði upp á himin ok gerði af stjórnur tvær.

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 þer þykka þefk eðk segi þer frá honum. Hann var mjög gullauðigr, en er hann dó ok synir hans skyldu skipta arfi, þá höfðu þeir at gullinu er þeir skiptu at hverr skýldi taka munnfylli sína ok allir jafnmargar. Einn þeirra var Þjazi, annarr löð, þriði Gangr. En þat hófum vér orðtak nú með oss at kalla gullit munntal þessa jötna, en vé felum í rúnum eða í skáldskap svá at vér köllum þat mál eða orðtak, tal þessa jötna.

Figure 17. The Íðunn 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:

\[
\text{axlarliðr, bak, eiðr, fðörbætr, geitarskegg,heimboð, jórð, látask, lið, logi, naut, æfrir, tysvar, uxalærit, valda, þíggja, þrífjá.}
\]

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:
Æsir gerðusk œfrir mjök
gerðusk þeir brátt hárir ok gamlir
annat uxalærit ok bóguna báða
léžk hann valda
Loki þreið upp 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 Haustløng (Faulkes 1998:31):

En af breiðu bjóði
bragðvíss at þat lagði
ósvvífrandi ása
upp þjórhlǫut 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.
Grupe et al. 1977:87.5–12

Gull er kallat mjöl Fróða því at Fróði konungr keypti ambáttirnar Fenju ok Menju, ok þá fannz kvernsteinin einn svá mikill í Danmörku at engi fekk dregit, en sú náttúra fylgði at allt mjöl, þat er undir var malit, varð at gulliti(t). Ambáttirnar fengu dregit steininn. Konungr lét þær mala gull um hríð. Pá gaf hann þeim eigi meira svefn en kveði máttjóð eitt. Síðan mólur þær her á hendr honum. Sá var höfðingi fyrir er Mýsingi hét, spekingr mikill.

Faulkes 1998:51.29–52.21


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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>AM 748 4to; 1852:431</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>AM 757 4to, 1852:515</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat er rétt at kalla jörð hold Ymis, en sær blóð’hans, en heim Miðgarð brár hans, en ský heila hans. Kvern heitir Grótti er átti Fróði konungr. Hon móð hvatvetna þat er hann vildi, gull ok fríð. Fenja ok Menja hétu ambáttir þær er mólu. Þá tók Mýsingr sækonungur Grottu ok lét þær mala hvíta salt á skipum sínum þar til er þau sukku á Pettlandsfirði. Þær er sveglr síðan er sær fellr í auga Grottu. Pá gnýr sær er hon gnýr ok þá varð sójörinn saltur.</td>
<td>Pat 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 móð hvatvetna þat er hann vildi, gull ok sílf fr aðra hluti, Fenja ok Menja hétu ambáttir þær er mólu. Mýsingur herkonungur tók Grottu ok lét mala hvíta salt á skip síðan þar til er þau sukku á Pettlandsfirði. Þær er sveglr síðan, því at sjór fellr í auga Grottu. Pá gnýr sjór er hon gnýr, ok þá varð sójörinn saltur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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:


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: *Beide Fassungen stammen von Snorri!*
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 Holtmark’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.)

It is obvious that composing a work like *Edda* must have taken long time. The author had no one model to follow. 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. 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?²⁸⁴

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, Lógsögumannatal, 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 Lógsögumannatal, 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

---

²⁸⁴ 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.
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