

RITI KROESEN

## The great god Þórr — a war god?

No, Þórr is not a war god, at least not in the mythological stories of Iceland, as they have come down to us. A war god is a leader and propagator of battles, or at the least he takes part in them, and Þórr always fights alone against single adversaries. A single combat is never called a battle. At most one can call it a duel, depending on the circumstances. Neither can the fight between Þórr, on the one hand, and Geirrøðr, on the other, be called a battle. There is no kenning that relates Þórr to battle, nor does any saga tell us that Þórr is a patron of warriors.

The idea that Þórr is a god of war is rested on a very understandable but not necessarily justified equation between fighting and war. It already started during the Romantic period, when the mythology of the Germanic peoples first attracted a wide interest. The Romanticists (Uhland!) knew very well that Þórr was a weather god, because to them all the gods had first and foremost to do with the weather. Þórr's name is etymologically seen identical with "thunder" and he wields his mighty hammer Mjöllnir, explained as lightning and thunder, and drives his chariot along the heavens like his *alter ego* Donar with the Germanic tribes of the South. Yet in the mythological stories he was always fighting giants, and therefore he came to be considered a war god. The fact that he was always fighting alone was overlooked.

However, some scholars soon realized that Þórr's case was too complicated to be explained by his being a weather god and a war god. Important in this connection was a little book by Petersen (Petersen 1876). Although this book is on the religion of the peoples of the North in general, Þórr occupies the most important place in it. Petersen does not oppose the idea that Þórr was a war god, but his attention goes to other aspects that are much more important to him. In contrast to the stories of the two Eddas, other sources, such as the Sagas, some descriptions of the heroic deeds of Þórr celebrated by the skalds, some runic inscriptions, the testimony of Adam of Bremen, etc., are strong indications of the fact that originally Þórr was the most important god of the

Nordic pantheon and that Óðinn was in a certain sense a usurper.

To Petersen Þórr was first and foremost the "véurr" of the world and of life. This problematic word, taken from *Vpluspá* 56 (Edda, p. 13) is translated by him as 'sanctifier'.<sup>1</sup> As a sanctifier of life, he is called upon whenever people feel threatened by the dark forces of life. Most of our sources are from Iceland, and the testimony of the Icelandic sagas is that Þórr was the most venerated god in Iceland (see Turville-Petre 1958 and 1972).

Later on, another important book about Þórr was written by Ljungberg (Ljungberg 1947). His book contains much comparative material concerning the Scandinavian god and many other Indo-European gods of thunder and lightning, among whom Indra deserves special mention. As far as the Scandinavian stories go, Þórr is first and foremost the implacable enemy of the giants.

Comparative material was also collected by Schröder (Schröder 1957). According to him Þórr (like Indra and Herakles) was the son of the God of Heaven and the Earth goddess and as such the mediator between gods and men. Neither Schröder nor Ljungberg mention the idea of Þórr being a war god.

Still, the idea has persisted until today, although for a long time it stayed more or less in the background. Nobody took a stand against it. Later on, however, it became important again, judging by the following fairly recent quote from Schjødt (Medieval Scandinavia, an Encyclopedia, 1993, p. 673):

... it is much debated whether Þórr was primarily a god of fertility or a god of war. Adam of Bremen relates that Þórr is concerned with the fertility of the soil and with thunder and lightning. The West Norse sources, on the other hand, accentuate his role as a killer of giants. In relation to human warfare, Óðinn seems to have been the more important of the two. Dumézil has ... proposed that Þórr is a god of the second function, i.e. war, through comparison with other Indo-European gods ... His arguments are sufficiently convincing, and most scholars nowadays would agree that Þórr's connection with fertility has secondary importance.

Here the authority of Dumézil is invoked, the famous Indo-European comparatist, whose influence on the ideas about the mythology of different Indo-European speaking tribes has been profound. Also Scan-

---

<sup>1</sup> The different opinions about this difficult word will not be discussed.

dinavian scholarship took its cue from him. Because of him the idea became important again. At this point, I will only mention the textbook of Ström (1975) and the second print of de Vries: *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* (1956–57).

The purpose of this article is to analyse Dumézil's ideas concerning Þórr and to determine their value. It will therefore be necessary to give a brief survey of Dumézil's theory of the three functions.

According to Dumézil, the Indo-Europeans structured their world, their pantheon, and also their society into three parts. Their pantheon consisted of 1) the ruling powers who governed the universe by laws and by magic, 2) the gods of physical force, who occupied themselves with war, both offensive and defensive, and 3) the fertility gods. In human society, these gods corresponded with 1) the kings and other rulers and the priests, 2) the warriors, and 3) the farmers and manual labourers.

A general criticism can be aimed at this sociologically orientated theory. The idea that the pantheon of any people is a reflection of its society and its institutions is one that few people will find fault with. If tribes have gods who rule them, they will be copies of their kings. The same rule is valid for the gods of warriors, and those of farmers and manual labourers.

If the Indo-European pantheon was divided in three parts, this division would have been a reflection of its society. But we know practically nothing about these original Indo-Europeans, and even Dumézil does not try to give us or himself any idea about them. Some archeologists think the "Indo-European ancestors" never formed one people, nor did they, therefore, ever form one society. (Cf. different papers in Scherer (ed.) 1968). Could the ideology of their descendants have remained substantially the same during all this time, when they came to live in places separated from the original starting point in some cases by a whole continent?

It seems much more likely that, if the tribes of India, the Romans, the Scandinavians, and in some respects also the Celts, show striking analogies in their ideas, these analogies are likely to be found in their own society and its institutions. After all there are kings and priests, warriors, farmers, and labourers in many societies and their activities and mutual conflicts are often the same. In other words: if a certain society shows the three functions of Dumézil, these three functions most likely naturally arose there. In any case, many centuries separate them from the people that created the stories as we know them, centuries during which

their descendants were scattered over a large part of the world, and during which their way of life must have been subjected to continuous and profound change. Eventually they settled down to a more sedentary way of life, often mingling with different indigenous tribes, who had their own way of structuring the world. (Dumézil's theory was refuted by Belier 1989 and 1991).

Dumézil's ideas about Þórr consist of two assertions: 1) he was a representative of the Indo-European second function (that of the warriors); 2) he still fulfilled that function in the Scandinavian mythological stories. It has already been shown that the second contention simply is not true, nor does Dumézil give us very extensive analyses of the stories in which Þórr appears, to support it. Þórr fights either on his own, or with a single helper, either Þjálfi, or Loki (who can also be a hindrance). He does this to prevent that some of the goddesses should pass into the realm of the giants, or to fetch (back) some valuable objects from there (Clunies Ross 1994, pp. 111–145).

Dumézil states that he got his ideas about the second function from two books: 1) Stig Wikander: *Der arische Männerbund* (1938), and 2) Herman Lommel: *Der arische Kriegsgott* (1939). The first book is about warrior bonds, not warrior gods, and it contains only comparisons between Sanscrit and Avestian, based on linguistic material.

Lommel is more relevant to the problem in hand, but before we will explore his ideas, we must take a closer look at the word *arisch* in both titles. This adjective (Aryan in English) was originally used to refer to the Indo-Iranian tribes and the languages they spoke. They were the only people who called themselves the Aryans, the "better ones". Only later on, the adjective was sometimes used for the Indo-European languages (especially in England). (See Krahe 1966, p. 8; von Polenz 1970, p. 11.) It will not be necessary to dwell on the ominous role the idea "Aryans" went on to play in the Nazi racial theories.

It seems that Dumézil translated *Arisch* by *Indo-Européen* in the titles of those two books that inspired him to form his ideas concerning the second function. Although Wikander and Lommel used the word in its original meaning, Dumézil understood it in its later meaning. If he was aware of the discrepancy — Wikander, a close friend of his, may have pointed it out — he chose to ignore it.

Both Indra and Þórr are of the Indo-European type *god-of-lightning-pursuing a heavenly monster* (Ivanov and Toporov 1970). The theme of a

god (or a hero) who slays monsters, though, cannot be said to be of Indo-European provenance only. Fontenrose thought that it originated in Lesser Asia, i.e. among Semitic tribes (Fontenrose 1969). Yet Watkins proved with rich linguistic material that the theme received a special Indo-European articulation (Watkins 1995).

The similarity between Indra and Þórr is undeniable. Because they are fighters, they have to be of an enormous strength, and because that strength needs to be kept at the required standard, they can swallow enormous amounts of food and drink. They both have a red beard. And because they are thunder gods, they both use the thunderbolt as their weapon. However, as gods of lightning and thunder they belong to a huge Indo-European group of gods (Ivanov and Toporov 1970). There are some differences, too, and they are not unimportant. Þórr's name is etymologically identical with the word *thunder*, and thunderstorms must have given people the idea of Þórr riding along the sky in his chariot and wielding his mighty weapon, the hammer *Mjöllnir*. Indra is also thought to be a god of thunder and rainstorms, yet it is often noted that he is of a radiant appearance, he has a clear skin and golden hair. This points to solar traits (Meyer 1937, part III, pp. 144–53.) Lommel himself says that Indra makes the sun mount heaven.

Another difference is, that Indra is usually followed by the so-called *Maruts*, whereas Þórr always fights alone. The *Maruts* are sometimes compared to the *berserkir* (although the *Maruts* are demons and the *berserkir* human beings, be it often depicted as demons). However, the *berserkir* are followers of Óðinn.

Perhaps not even Indra is a war god in the first place, despite his undeniable links with the caste of the *Ksātrias*. Lommel evidently identifies fighting cosmic forces with human warfare, but the two occur at entirely different levels. According to Lommel, gods have to be explained as being of a total, unchanging identity to their adorers (p. 8). Some details, such as Indra's bull-shape, or his using the thunderbolt as a weapon (!), may be explained as later developments, but on the whole, Indra can best be understood as what he was, a complex unity (p. 6): "The god is a mighty fighter — he is a bull — his hair and beard are red — he makes the sun mount heaven — he hurls his thunderbolts." This unity Lommel chooses to adorn with the epithet "war god", but he modifies his own statement in a footnote that does not seem to have been noted by Dumézil: "Our title "War-god" is likewise too narrow and one-sided,

because we cannot find the right idea, which unites all things that this god is" (my translation).

The denomination seems to be arbitrarily chosen. Lommel gives his opinions with little argumentation, nor is there any notable analysis of the theories of other scholars. Perhaps, after all, his Indra interpretation is not so much different from that of other scholars (for instance Gonda, Meyer and Oldenberg).

The notion that both Indra and Þórr *originally* were weather and thunder gods has survived 19th century nature mythology, and the author of the present paper is also a supporter of this idea. In the course of time they have developed many more functions, — in Iceland the original function retired entirely to the background — but we must start from this beginning. What are thunder gods doing when they appear with so much violence in the firmament? They are pursuing and killing monsters that threaten the cosmos and all its inhabitants. By this they are the guardians of the cosmos and the promoters of fertility. (Some of these monster slayers can even be the creators of the cosmos, which is formed in that case from the dead body of a monster (Ymir, Tiamat). This idea is of primary importance, both with Indra and with Þórr. People revered them, not because they wanted to find explanations for interesting phenomena going on in the sky, but because they needed help and support from the side of the gods against the destructive forces of chaos.

There certainly is an old connection (as old as the Vedas) between Indra and the *ksātrias* (the Indian warrior-caste). However, if the question is raised of what deed Indra is most famous for, the unanimous answer will be: the slaying of the great serpent *Vṛtra*, which is a cosmic event. "(The killing of Vṛtra) is a triumph over anti-cosmic powers that want to arrest and destroy the ordered world that people can live in." (Gonda 1960, p. 56).

Because Indra functions at *entirely different levels*, the supposition that one activity developed out of the other cannot be so easily dismissed. It seems very plausible that in the course of time the god developed into the patron of warriors. Seeing that he was such a mighty fighter, the *ksātrias* wanted to have his protection and help. Plausible, yes, but not inevitable. Again: there is little evidence that Þórr ever was the leader of warriors or the patron of warrior-bonds.

In Dumézil's theory one finds the same identification of heavenly fighting and human warfare, which is presented with so little analysis and argumentation, that his theses come to resemble axioms. He gives

us the following characterization of Indra: "In Indra one finds . . . the movements, the duties, the necessities of brutal (physical) force, which, if applied to battle, produces victory, loot, power" (my translation) (in "*Les Dieux des Indo-Européens*" 1958, p. 12).

About Þórr he says the following: "Þórr, with his hammer, is the fighter against the giants (thunderstorms arising as a result) and therefore the saviour of the threatened gods; likewise, with his lightning-weapon, Indra saves gods and men from the threat of Vṛtra and other demons. Like Indra, Þórr consumes huge amounts of drink and food, he often acts alone and he likes to brag." (p. 24). It seems as if the similarities with Indra are enough for Þórr to be a god of battle!

In *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-européens* (1955, my translation, p. 55) : "(Þórr) is the god with the hammer, the enemy of the giants, whom incidentally he resembles in some ways (think of his "frenzy"), the thundering god (as his name indicates), and, if he serves the farmer and gives him rain, it is, even in modern folklore, as it were, a by-product of battle, in a violent and "atmospheric" way, not earthly and productivity-enhancing".

In *Les Dieux des Germains* (Paris 1959) there is even less of a definition. After a short description of Þórr as a fighter (which he undoubtedly is), Dumézil proceeds with retelling some of the well-known Þórr stories, plucked from the pages of the Snorra Edda. These stories are all about fights with giants, and they have nothing to do with battle. More will be said later on one of these stories, the fight with *Hrungnir*.

The resemblance between Þórr and Indra has already been discussed. Another god chosen by Dumézil as a representative of the second function is the Roman god *Mars*. Not many stories are known about him. The current opinion about him is that he was originally a chthonic god and as such commanded fertility. There are also strong reasons to consider him a death-god. Hermansen takes over Dumézil's idea (and that of Wissowa) that the Roman *Mars* was the old god of war the Indo-Europeans brought with them, but he does not elaborate on this. Instead, he makes much of some old gods of the indigenous Italian tribes whose identity was, according to him, confused with this Indo-European god's (Hermansen 1930). Balkestein thinks that *Mars* was a chthonic god who had to do with death and fertility (Balkestein 1963).

*Mars* does not seem to occupy a very important place in the Roman pantheon, and what Dumézil has to say about the second function with the Romans is more about the followers of *Mars* than about the god him-

self. In the same way, he is much more elaborate about the famous warrior Starkaðr than about Þórr.<sup>2</sup>

De Vries became a staunch supporter of Dumézil's theories. Due to this, the design of the second edition of his *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* (1956–57) was a complete revision of the first (1936–37). In this first edition, the data on Germanic-speaking tribes on the Continent are treated separately from those on the Scandinavian peninsula, which, in the opinion of most scholars, is the correct procedure to follow; there are too many gaps to be filled, in place as well as in time, to treat them together. In the second edition all such meticulousness was thrown to the winds. De Vries thought it important to trace back the Scandinavian religion through its Germanic ancestry to the distant Indo-European past, and to link it with the religion of the other Germanic-speaking peoples.

His description of Þórr had to be adapted to this change of ideas. The adaptation is only slight, however. In the first edition, nothing is said about Þórr being a god of war. In the second, there is only about half a page at the end of the chapter concerning that aspect of Þórr. It is worthwhile to quote it extensively (my translation, pp. 152–53):

"Þórr is the god of thunder because he is strong." Now, considering that Þórr's name is identical with the word *thunder*, one would rather expect: "Because he is the god of thunder, he is strong." But let us continue:

"He is the patron of warriors; he slays the enemies by virtue of the strength of the hammer he sways." We maintain our objections. After a comparison with Indra, who is indeed the patron of the *ksātrias*, de Vries continues with a comparison between Þórr and Óðinn:

They are like each other, because both have a connection with war: yet they are fundamentally different. The sly Óðinn, who operates through magical means, is very different from Þórr, the courageous fighter, as has been demonstrated with due clarity by the poet of *Hárbarðsljóð*. If Óðinn is the god of royal strength and power, Þórr is the god of the warrior class as a whole. Óðinn is the leader of the *comitatus*, bound to him by a solemn oath, Þórr is the leader of the whole army. Because, in the Germanic world, the army consisted of the free farmers (*Adelbauern*), he is also intimate with the people of the country as a whole. And because life for the Germanic-speaking peoples is to a large extent ori-

---

<sup>2</sup>I do not agree with Dumézil's interpretation of the Starkaðr story either. De Vries gave a totally convincing explanation of it in an article that he wrote, before he came under Dumézil's influence; later on he retracted his ideas (de Vries 1955 and 1963).



ented on war, the farmers also try to win his protection for their daily work. As far as war is concerned, he comes to stand beside Óðinn. On the other hand, there is contact between him and the real gods of the farmers, the *Vanir*, which occasionally erupts into conflict.

We can be brief about Þórr's contacts with the *Vanir*. In the first place Þórr is a defender of the cosmos, who keeps the dark and destructive forces that threaten it, at bay. Therefore he is amongst other things a promoter of fertility. The *Vanir* are fertility gods *pur sang*, who make the corn grow on the fields and make the cattle thrive in the barns. But one cannot say that the *Vanir* are the *real* gods of the farmers, whereas it is abundantly clear that, for many farmers (almost all farmers on Iceland!) Þórr was the all-important god, and helper, and a trusted friend.

Moreover, the place that the *Vanir* occupy in the Nordic pantheon is satisfactorily explained by an old theory, that Dumézil never took position against, viz., that they were the gods of an ancient sedentary and agrarian people in Scandinavia who were overrun by the Indo-European invaders (Eckhardt 1940). If this theory is accepted, occasional overlaps are not surprising, on the contrary, they are bound to arise.

There is one story about Þórr to which both Dumézil and de Vries have paid particular attention, viz., the one about his fight with the giant *Hrungnir*. Þórr is accompanied here by his servant *Þjálfi*, who quickly despatches *Hrungnir*'s companion, the giant *Mökkurkálfi*, made of clay, "with little glory" (*Skáldskaparmál* 25, Sn.E. 100–04. Dumézil 1959, de Vries, *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte II*, 1957, pp. 133–37.)

Dumézil's interpretation is that here we have a story about the initiation of the young warrior — here represented by *Þjálfi* —, who has to slay a *dummy*, because it is known that young initiandi sometimes had to fight a dummy that resembles a monster (cf. the episode of *Hötrr* in the *Hrólfs Saga kraka*). De Vries follows Dumézil in this.

If this interpretation were right, it would be an important link in Dumézil's theory. But Lindow has proved beyond a doubt that what is described here as a duel is indeed nothing more than a formal duel, in which all rules of duels are being followed (Lindow 1996). Therefore, it cannot be an initiation-story.

*Hárbarðsljóð* gives us a particularly clear picture of the characters of Þórr and Óðinn and the way in which they contrast. The stanza alluded to by de Vries (24) deserves to be quoted in full (Edda, p. 82):

Var ek á Vallandi      ok vígum fylgðak,  
atta ek jofrum,      enn aldri sættak,

Óðinn á jarla enn Þórr	þá er í val falla, á þræla kyn.
---------------------------	------------------------------------

De Vries himself proposed to emendate *þræla kyn* into *karla kyn*. That could possibly be done, but it is not really necessary. It could also be that the poet who wanted to glorify the values of military life — he was evidently on the side of Óðinn —, expressed his disdain for the farmers by calling them *þrælar*.

However, apart from that, in this stanza a description is given of Óðinn's activities in war, not of Þórr's. It is not really necessary to suppose that the subjunctive clause *þá er í val falla* also bears a relation to the *þrælar*. It could well be that this stanza reflects to the allegiance which ordinary people (not the war-lords) owe to Þórr.

Þórr was the protector of frail human lives by his unrelenting pursuit of giants (*Hárbarðsljóð* 23, 5–8, Edda, p. 82):

... mikill myndi ætt jötna, vætr myndi manna	ef allir lifði, undir miðgarði.
---	------------------------------------

His best known deed, the fight with the great world serpent, known from many literary as well as pictorial sources, must also have cosmic significance (Meulengracht Sørensen 1986). Some of these sources will have it that Þórr indeed killed the monster. If that version was the oldest one, Þórr may be compared with Indra indeed. However, in other versions, the fight remains undecided and, in the *Völuspá*, Þórr and the serpent meet again for their final fight during *Ragnarøk* and then kill each other. Although there is something to be said in favour of the supposition that the *Ragnarøk* end of the story is a younger development, it would not be warranted to dismiss it, just to suit the theory that Þórr goes back to Indo-European times.

In this context we must mention an article by de Vries in which he tried to support Dumézil's theory that Þórr was the original war god of the Germanic-speaking tribes: *Sur certains glissements fonctionnels de divinités dans la religion germanique*, notably first published in *Hommages à Georges Dumézil* (de Vries 1960 and 1965). This article consists of two parts. In the general introduction, de Vries refers to one of his earlier papers (de Vries 1958), in which he put forward the theory that the invading Germanic tribes that caused so much trouble to the empire of Rome in its latter days, consisted of bands of young warriors, comparable to the old Germanic *comitatus*, described by Tacitus, "We should not think of people who wander about with women and children" (p. 60). He supposes that the Viking bands were still organized in the same way.

Now de Vries focuses on the Scandinavian peoples during the Viking period. This period, in contrast with the earlier one, is amply documented, both in Scandinavian and non-Scandinavian sources. During the colonisation of Iceland, Þórr was the god most revered, and de Vries points out, that although the settlers were farmers, they had originally led the active lives of Vikings. As warriors they must have been the followers of the god of the second function; later on, they were documented to be followers of Þórr; it follows, according to de Vries, that they still adored Þórr, because he was their old war god.

At this point he seems to forget that the groups who emigrated to Iceland were completely differently organised from those early war tribes. Not only did they take with them their wives and children, but also their domestic animals, and often also the pillars of the seat of honour belonging to the head of the family as a sign of continuity. On these pillars, the likeness of Þórr was sometimes depicted (*Eyrbyggja Saga*, ÍF III (1935), p. 7). When they came near the shore, they wanted Þórr to point out their future homestead to them; therefore they threw the pillars overboard and promised that they would build their new home on the site where these were washed ashore. Evidently they did this, not because Þórr was a war god, but because they trusted him to rule their entire life; they were farmers and obviously wanted to continue their life as farmers. Here we have got the clear and unequivocal proof of the fact that the allegiance of ordinary people to Þórr was *not* due to his being a war god.

When this faulty way of reasoning is abandoned, there will be no trouble with the fact that there are some (sometimes rather uncertain) testimonies concerning Vikings revering Þórr in the British archipelago as well as in Norway. These Vikings were originally farmers, and they could not have wholly forgotten the god who had protected them in their homeland. If perhaps he had temporarily retired to the background, owing to the organisation of the war bands, he became all-important again when that organisation was abandoned, especially in the case these Vikings became settlers — and farmers again! — in a foreign country. Our conclusions must therefore be directly opposite to those of de Vries in the paper we just discussed and in his *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* (see above): First and foremost, Þórr was the god of the ordinary people, i.e. farmers.

In the second part of de Vries' paper, the continental peoples are reviewed. This takes us to other and *older* times. We can be brief about it. Since this article is about Þórr, it will not be necessary to discuss the

other gods. As regards the war bands of some other tribes (the Franks), a reasonable case can be made that Wodan was their god, others (the Saxons) revered Tiwaz-Sahsnot. There is no evidence whatsoever that Donar was supplanted by these other gods. Þórr was not revered as a war god in Scandinavia and therefore the conclusion reached by way of deduction that Donar was the original god of the Germanic war-bands is not tenable.

Our final conclusion must then be that Þórr was *not* a war-god. Originally he must have been a god of lightning and thunder, and, because he fought the monsters of infertility, he became the protector of fertility. Naturally it was especially the farmers who revered him. But in Iceland he became much more than a fertility god. He was the people's great helper, wheresoever and in whatever circumstances he was their loved and trusted friend.

## Bibliography

### Texts

- Edda*, ed. G. Neckel/H. Kuhn, Heidelberg, Max Winter Verlag 1962.  
*Danakonunga Sögur*, ed. Bjarni Guðnason, Íslenzk Fornrit (ÍF) XXXV, Reykjavík 1992.  
*Eyrbyggja Saga*, ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson and Matthías Þórðarson, ÍF IV, Reykjavík 1935.  
*Fornaldar Sögur Norðrlanda* (FSN), ed. Guðni Jónsson, Íslendingasagnaútgafan, Reykjavík 1976.  
*Heimskringla I*, ed. Bjarni Aðalbjarnason, ÍF XXVI, Reykjavík 1941.  
*Hervarar Saga ok Heidreks*, ed. and translated by Christopher Tolkien, Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd, London—Edinburgh—Toronto and New York 1960.  
 Saxo Grammaticus: *Gesta Danorum*, ed. J. Olrik and H. Ræder, Copenhagen 1931. Translated by Peter Fisher, edited with comment by Hilda Ellis Davidson, Cambridge 1979–80.  
 Snorri Sturluson: *Snorra Edda*, ed. Finnur Jónsson, København 1931.

### Literature

- Johannes Balkestein: *Onderzoek naar de oorspronkelijke zin en betekenis van de Romeinse god Mars*, diss. Leiden, Van Gorcum & Comp., n.v., Assen 1983.  
 Wouter Belier: *Feiten, Fouten en Fabels, Ontstaan en ontwikkeling van Georges Dumézil's "Idéologie tripartite"*, diss. Leiden 1989. Engl. translation: *Decayed*

- Gods, Origin and Development of Georges Dumézil's "idéologie tripartite"*, Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 7, Leiden, New York, Copenhagen and Cologne 1991.
- Georges Dumézil: *Mythes et Dieux des Germains*, Paris 1939.
- id.: *Les Dieux des Germains*, Presses Universitaires de France 1959.
- id.: *Les Dieux des Indo-Européens*, Presses Universitaires de France 1952.
- id.: *Aspects de la Fonction Guerrière chez les Indo-Européens*, Presses Universitaires de France 1956.
- id.: *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens*, Presses Universitaires de France 1969.
- id.: *Mythe et Épopée*, 3 volumes, Presses Universitaires de France 1982.
- K. A. Eckhardt: *Der Wanenkrieg*, Germanenstudien 3, Bonn, L. Rohrscheidt 1940.
- Joseph Fontenrose: *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins*, University of California, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1969.
- Jan Gonda: *Die Religionen Indiens, I. Veda und alterer Hinduismus*, die Religionen der Menschheit, ed. W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1960.
- Gustav Hermansen: *Studien über den italischen und den römischen Mars*, Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag, København 1930.
- Vjaceslav V. Ivanov and Vladimir N. Toporov: "Le mythe indo-européen du dieu de l'orage poursuivant le serpent: reconstruction du schéma" in: *Échanges et communications, Mélanges C. Lévi-Strauss*, Mouton, Paris, The Hague 1970.
- Hans Krahe: *Indo-germanische Sprachwissenschaft I*, Sammlung Götschen, Walter de Gruyter & Co, Berlin 1966.
- John Lindow: "Thor's Duel with Hrungnir", *Alvíssmál* 6, 1996, pp. 3–20.
- Helge Ljungberg: *Tor: Undersökningar i indoeuropeisk och nordisk religionshistoria*, vol. 1: *Den nordiska åskguden och besläktade indoeuropeiska gudar: Den nordiska åskguden i bild och myt*. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1947.
- Herman Lommel: *Der arische Kriegsgott*, Religion und Kultur der alten Arier, Band II, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main 1939.
- Preben Meulengracht Sørensen: "Starkaðr, Loki og Egill Skallagrímsson", in *Sjöttíu Ritgerðir helgaðir Jakoby Benediktssyni*, Reykjavík, Stofnun Arna Magnússonar 1977, pp. 759–68.
- id.: "Thor's Fishing Expedition" in: *Words and Objects*, ed. by Gro Steinsland, Norwegian University Press, Oslo 1986, pp. 257–78.
- J. J. Meyer: *Trilogie altindischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation*, III: Indra, pp. 144–53, Max Niehaus Verlag, Zürich–Leipzig 1937.
- Henry Petersen: *Om nordboernes gudedyrkelse og gudetro i hedenold. En antikvarisk undersøgelse*. C. A. Reitzel, Copenhagen 1876.
- Peter von Polenz: *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, Sammlung Götschen, Walter de Gruyter & Co, Berlin 1970.
- Anton Scherer (ed.): *Die Urheimat der Indogermanen*, Wege der Forschung CIVI, Darmstadt 1968.

- Jens-Peter Schjødt: "Þórr" in: *Medieval Scandinavia*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano et alii, Garland Publishing, New York 1993, pp. 672–73.
- Åke V. Ström: *Germanische Religion*, in: Åke V. Ström and Haralds Biézais: *Germanische und Baltische Religion*, Religionen der Menschheit, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart–Berlin–Köln–Mainz 1972–73.
- E. O. G. Turville-Petre: *Myth and Religion of the North. The Religion of Ancient Scandinavia*, Weidenfeldt and Nicholson, London 1964.
- Jan de Vries: *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte I–II*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1936–37.
- id.: "Die Starkadssage", *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 1955, pp. 281–97. Repr. in *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 20–36.
- id.: *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*, 2d pr., Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1956–57.
- id.: "Einige Bemerkungen zum Sachsenproblem", *Westfälische Forschungen* 11, 1958, pp. 5–10.
- id.: "Sur certains glissements fonctionnels de divinités dans la religion germanique" in: *Hommages à Georges Dumézil*, Collection Latomus, Bruxelles 1960, pp. 83–95. Repr. in *Kleine Schriften*, Walter de Gruyter & Co, Berlin 1965, pp. 151–61.
- H. Wagenvoort: "The Origin of the Ludi Saeculares", *Mededelingen Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, afd. Lett. N.R. 14 14, no. 4, repr. in *Studies in Roman Literature, Cult and Religion*, Leiden, E. J. Brill 1956, pp. 193–212.
- Calvert Watkins: *How to kill a Dragon, aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, Oxford University Press, New York – Oxford 1995.
- Stig Wikander: *Der arische Männerbund*, Studien zur indo-iranischen Sprach- und Religionsgeschichte, Lund 1938.
- id.: Review of Dumézil's *Aspects de la Fonction Guerrière chez les Indo-Européens*, *Paul und Braunes Beiträge (Tübingen)* 56, 1978, pp. 468–71.