# On the Interpretation of **ialuns** in the Norwegian Runic Text B<sub>257</sub><sup>1</sup>

### 1. A Definition of the Problem

In 1964, Aslak Liestøl published a runic text inscribed on a stick<sup>2</sup> discovered during the excavation of Bryggen in Bergen. Liestøl knew that the stick had been found immediately over the layer of the great fire of 1332, so that it may have been carved in the early 14<sup>th</sup> century (unless one assumes a longer time between the inscription and the deposition of the object). The stick has been inscribed on all four sides, and is broken at one end, so that there are four corresponding lacunae in it. The text appears to be a sort of charm, where protective and hostile magic mix, and it reads as follows:

<side A> RI'1H': B41: RNHAR: RI'1: H'BI4B\*: RNHAR: H4HF: PARNIP: ARNAY: 1NINARINIP: ARAY: PRHNARI: NIP:PD [...] <side B> NIPHFH!'Y\*P4\*: Y4\*: NARY: ARX: "NAR: H1HYH\*I: P4: 414NITI: T\*NI!: Y4H-I: RIHI: PHN P [...] <side C> HY'H+AR: PHR: HY'HPHR: AR\*IAR: HR\*I: #Y4P4T4: 4PHR: RIFI: NP4T4: ANY: IATNH': Y4P: '111N: ARARI: '4BPN: ARARIARI: AR\*I: #Y4P4T4: PHR: 'HY: '14TBR+: PHR: BHRI'1: RNBN': R4BN': HP: ARAFA1BN': TAN': 14NI': ABN': R4'4: PANA [...]

¹ I am grateful to James E. Knirk for granting me access to the Runic Archives in Oslo and for his expert advise; to the directors of Bryggen Museum for allowing me to examine the runic sticks B257 and N631; to John McKinnell for his help in solving linguistic and other problems, and to Anatoly Liberman for his many careful corrections of the present text (though the responsibility for any mistakes which remain in the text is entirely my own). This article could not have been completed without the grant received from the Norwegian Government which enabled me to research both in Bergen and Oslo. My special thanks go finally to my teacher and friend, Maria Elena Ruggerini.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The inscription will be referred to by the number assigned by the Runic Archives in Oslo. The stick itself has been numbered 000/28770 by the Bryggen Museum in Bergen. The reading is based on Liestøl 1965 and its interpretation on Liestøl 1966.

ristek: bot: runar: rist: ekbiabh: runar: eaein: faluiþ: aluom: tuiualtuiþ: trolom: þreualt: uiþ:þų [...] uiþenniskøþo:skah:ualkyrriu: sual:at: eaeimehi: þo: atæuili: læuis: kona: liui: þinu g [...] eksender: þer: ekseaþer: ylhiar: . erhi: okoþola: aþer: rini: uþole: auk: ialuns: moþ: sittu: aldri: sopþu: aldri [...] ant: mer: sem: sialpre: þer: beirist: rubus: rabus: eþ: arantabus: laus: abus: rosa: gaua [...]

Ríst ek bótrúnar, / ríst ek bjargrúnar, / einfalt við álfum, / tvífalt við trollum, / þrifalt við þu<rsum> [...]/við inni skæðu / skag-valkyrju / svát ei megi / þótt æ vili / lævís kona / lífi þínu g<randa> [...] / ek sendi þér, / ek sé á þér / ylgjar ergi ok úþola. / Á þér ríni úþóli / ok iatuns³ móð. / Sittu aldri, sof þu aldri [...] / ant mér sem sjalfri þér, / Beirist rubus rabus eþ arantabus laus abus rosa gaua [...].

'I cut runes of help; I cut runes of protection; once against elves, twice against trolls, thrice against <giants> [...] against the harmful 'skag'-valkyrie, so that she never can, though she may always want to — evil woman! — <injure> your life [...] I send you, I cast on you with the evil eye (lit. "I look at you") wolfish evil and distress. May distress and a giant's wrath come upon you. Never sit, never sleep, [...] (that you may) love me as yourself, beirist rubus rabus eþ arantabus laus abus rosa gau<a>[...]'.

In 1965 Liestøl wrote an article which was translated into Icelandic and published in "Skírnir"<sup>4</sup>; in it he corrected many of his previous interpretations. He admitted readings like *rini* or *sé à bér* (which he had formerly read as *renni* and *síða þér*<sup>5</sup>); the form *rini* is particularly important, for it is the Norwegian form of a verb which would have been spelt *hrini* in Old Icelandic (from *hrina* which means 'to cleave' and metaphorically 'to take effect [of a curse]').

In his second article he held fast to two conjectures which could be neither demonstrated nor refuted: a) that the runic **skah** (on side B) was a mistake for *skass*, thus identifying the *valkyrja* with a witch, and b) that **ioluns** (his reading of **ialuns**<sup>6</sup>, on side C) was a *hapax legomenon* in Old Norse literature, which could be understood from comparison with

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The correction of **ialuns** in **iatuns** is the only point of divergence with the published text, which otherwise follows Spurkland 1991: 293.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Liestøl 1965.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Liestøl 1964: 41–42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The reading ialuns has first been proposed in Spurkland 1991: 293.

similar words in modern Scandinavian dialects. He regarded the eddic word *ioll* as a fitting starting point. This noun is also a *hapax legomenon* found in *Lokasenna*<sup>7</sup>; without considering the mutated vowel, Liestøl stated: "Det er her tale om vonde ynskje, og det ligg mein i omgrepet 'ioll', og det same ventar vi ligg attom iolun òg"."

Liestøl was followed by Barbro Söderberg<sup>9</sup>, who adduced more evidence and referred to a much longer work, in which she had offered some new data on the supposed word root<sup>10</sup>. However, alternative readings have been proposed which seem to invalidate Söderberg's theory. For example, the word in question could be understood as *oll*, assuming the initial /i/ to be part of the hastily erased preceding word; this word would also be a *hapax legomenon*, but clearly related to OE *oll* 'contempt; scorn', and might be a loanword. Even more attractive is the reading *i pllok* 'at the end of the banquet (ale)'<sup>11</sup>.

Söderberg chose not to analyse the origin and current use of the Germanic ending \*-un-az in Old Norse. This suffix of nomina agentis is rather scantily attested in Old Norse and may have been unknown to the other Germanic languages, if one disregards the single occurrence of eoten in Old English: Walde and Pokorny give the traditional explanation of jotunn and eoten as derived from \*etan, with a question mark, adding "für germ[anisches] -una- aus \*-no- fehlen wenigstens sonst Parallelen" In Pokorny's edition this remark was absent (probably because in the meantime the author had considered words such as jormun-, plunn, pjonn and hjón, moskun 13), and yet the question mark was retained 14; moreover, Pokorny gives no explanation of OE ent, which in the former edition was derived from a nominal root meaning 'stone' 15. It will be seen that no definitive explanation has been found of the etymology and semantics of e(o)te(/o)n and ent and their relation to gigant, not to speak of jotunn.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Lokasenna, str. 3, vv. 4-6: ioll oc áfo / færi ec ása sonom / oc blend ec þeim svá meini mioð 'Strife and hate / I bring to the sons of the Æsir / and I (will) blend for them offence with the mead' (ed. Neckel-Kuhn; on the meaning of this particular word see Ruggerini 1979: 50).

<sup>8</sup> Liestøl 1964: 50.

<sup>9</sup> Söderberg 1988: 365–366.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Söderberg 1984: 46-58.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> The first reading is found in Dronke 1997: 356–357. Dronke quotes also the alternative reading *i ollok*, which had been first proposed in Stefán Karlsson 1993: 263.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Walde-Pokorny 1930: 120. Cf. Falk-Torp 1910-11 s.v. jætte.

<sup>13</sup> Together with a few other words (*jormuni*, arfuni with the \*-uni suffix, and the female gender *fjorgyn*, Hlóðyn, foldyn; see De Vries 1961 s.vv.), these have been used by Torp (1974: 19) to reconstruct a rather problematic and rarely attested suffix.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Pokorny 1959 *s. v. ed-*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Walde-Pokorny 1930 s.v. (from which derives Holthausen s.v. ent).

Only one thing is known for sure: \*-un(-az) was not a productive suffix <sup>16</sup>. Wessén, in his history of the Swedish language, notes how *jotunn*, though similar in structure to denominative nouns formed with the derivative suffix \*-an-az, cannot be grouped together with them because it is a deverbative <sup>17</sup> (assuming the etymology of Pokorny to be correct).

Therefore, the whole question needs serious examination<sup>18</sup>. Early Middle English forms such as *eont* and e(o) tend testify to ancient, seemingly non-etymological, adjustments<sup>19</sup>, and this might indicate that the word structure was not clear to the speakers themselves, while in Norwegian dialects a different suffix occurs in forms such as *jotul*,  $jatul^{20}$ . In any case, postulating a broader diffusion for \*un-(az) in Old Norse has no solid foundation in fact.

It is true that the existence of the adjective j&lun in a modern Swedish dialect could be regarded as evidence for the existence of a noun such as \* $jolun/*j\&lun^{21}$ ; the reconstructed Scandinavian root from which this and other words could have been derived is \*jol(l)-, but since the best reading on side C of this runic stick is probably **idluns**<sup>22</sup>, the text would have to be corrected if it were to fit Söderberg's (and Liestøl's) theory.

I hope to demonstrate that the emendation of **ialuns** to **iatuns**, though representing a sort of *lectio facilior*, will give a much better reading, in that it offers the most economical solution and is supported by strong evidence from the texts<sup>23</sup>.

## 2. On the Runological Evidence for "reversed /t/"

There is at least one other instance in the text of a mistake brought about by confusion between 1 and  $\Gamma$ . On side B, **sual** seems to be a mistake: the scribe probably intended to write **suat**, but realized too late that it could

<sup>16</sup> De Vries 1961 s.v. jotunn.

<sup>17</sup> Wessén 1965: 48.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> In commenting the entry by Ásgeirr Blöndal Magnússon, Liberman quotes two more etymological hypotheses of *jotunn*, which could be related with a root \*od- 'grow', or share the same root of the latin odium 'hate' (Liberman 1994: 298–299).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Cf. Kunath-Kuhn 1952 s.vv. ēont and ēten. An alternative form eotan for etan is possible in some Old English dialects (cf. Campbell 1959: 88-90).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> De Vries 1961 s. v. jotunn.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Söderberg 1988: 365.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Cf. note 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> I have chosen not to examine stick B<sub>145</sub> (BRM 000/18910), which has the reading **ioluns**, since I believe it to be a correction of *ρluns* due to a completely different context, as supported by Liestøl-Krause-Jón Helgason 1962: 98–106 (cf. also Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon 1989 s.v. ölun).

not be written as a ligature, and added **at** as a separate word. A similar mistake is not improbable on side A, where the I in **trolom** may have been corrected from an original **t**. The question now is: were such mistakes rare or unknown among runemasters in the Western Scandinavian area?

The phenomenon of *venderuner* (runes with reversed direction) cannot be considered without a clear understanding of the runic script. The direction of writing in runic inscriptions was never firmly established<sup>24</sup>. The runes in the older futhark could be reversed or turned upside down without causing ambiguity, since their shapes were distinguished by a large number of features. *Venderuner* and *stupruner* (runes turned upside down) are therefore common in inscriptions in the older futhark. Already in the transitional period, we find instances of confusion between the new sign for /t/ and /l/ (as well as the new **a**- and **n**-signs)<sup>25</sup>; but with the advent of the new (younger) futhark, especially in the short-twig version, these distinctions could be limited to a single feature (so that the value of a letter could depend on the position of a single stroke)<sup>26</sup> and so confusion became frequent.

The west nordic area, where the short-twig system was prominent, is particularly prone to confusion between 1 and 1. Karin Fiellhammer Seim states that in a number of inscriptions in the younger futhark the positions of the two signs seem to be inverted (for example, in N229, N466, A6, A139, B35b, B301, B307, B325, B424, B615). She correctly points out that these signs cannot have inverted their positions but retained their phonetic value; rather, they must have retained their positions and changed their shapes instead, since meaningful inscriptions exhibit the same occurrence of reversed signs<sup>27</sup>. There are a few Norwegian instances: N307 and N445 show a futhark where reversed /t/ and /l/ are used consistently, and both come from western districts (Sogn og Fjordane and Møre og Romsdal). The Fortun stave church had an inscription which read INITIRIATERIAL BANK AFTER WHICH THE TEACH TO THE TEACH TO THE TEACH TO THE TEACH TO THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE TEACH THE THE THE TEACH THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE TEACH THE THE THE THE THE THE THE T (Aue Maria, gracia plena, dominus tecum. Benedicta tu in mulie[ribus]). The inscription had already a medieval ductus, but some irregular features, such as B for B, could have been archaic<sup>28</sup>; sloppy workmanship cannot be assumed, since there is a total absence of ligatures: it could

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Friesen 1933: 43.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> NiæR I: 186-204 (n. 11), 383-411 (n. 33; cf. also 406).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> For a recent overview on the general features of the elder and younger futhark, see Knirk 1993:545–554.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Seim 1993: 111.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> This inscription was lost in the fire which destroyed Fortun stave church in 1992; all that is left for examination is its edition as N<sub>3</sub>07, NIyR IV: 86.

rather be the work of an enthusiastic but inexperienced carver.

The Rødven inscription reads \[ \] \

There is one instance of a mixed system (with some inverted, some correct runes). The Flatdal tombstone reads: +  $\frac{3}{4}$   $\frac{$ 

From Bergen we have at least one instance of l-t exchange in what is otherwise a fairly correct inscription. In N631, the word **elisabet** is spelled **etlisabet**, and the best explanation seems to be that the rune-master corrected a previously carved  $\mathbf{t}^{32}$ . This stick seems to be nearly contemporary with B257.

From about the same time we find three Icelandic instances of the reversed l-t system on tombstones dating from the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries (at Borg, Ljósavatn and Grenjaðarstaður)<sup>33</sup> and in one futhark copied in a manuscript from about 1500 (AM 687d 4<sup>to</sup>)<sup>34</sup>. In an inscription from Drápuhlíð<sup>35</sup> I assumes a shape closer to  $\mathbf{k}$  (1). Marstrander believed that the reversed l-t system occurs in an inscription dated to the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Even though his arguments are not entirely convincing<sup>36</sup>, his article is an important source for the study of this particular kind of mistake. There

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Cfr. Knirk 1993: 551 for a definition of the medieval period for runes.

<sup>30</sup> N445, NIvR IV: 272.

<sup>31</sup> N157, NIyR II: 214-219.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> N631/BRM 13894 (*NlyR* VI, 1:50–55).

<sup>33</sup> Bæksted 1942: 121125, 174176, 176179.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Ibidem: 220.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Ibidem: 132-133.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Marstrander 1945: 295–298 (see also Bæksted 1942: 208–210).

are also some instances of the reversed l-t system coming from peripheral areas of the Norse-speaking world, such as Viking Ireland, where the inscription on the Killaloe cross<sup>37</sup> has been dated to not later than the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. The text is too short for us to decide whether the system was fully reversed. Finally, one inscription dating from 1200-1250 (DR 162, the Ørum-font, where the short inscription **mefecip** | **nikolaus** shows reversed l)<sup>38</sup> is known from Denmark.

According to Svante Lagman, in the corpus of inscriptions known to him, nine instances of reversed t-l occur<sup>39</sup>. This means that the phenomenon must be practically non-existent in Sweden, apparently because of the different conditions of writing (in the "long-branch" futhark commonly used in Sweden  $\uparrow$  and  $\uparrow$  cannot be confused), but it was not at all infrequent in the West Scandinavian area.

# 3. Philological Context and Literary Tradition

The closest parallel to the text of B257 is to be found in the Eddic poem *Skirnismál*, and in particular in stanza 36:

Purs rist ec þér / oc þríá stafi, / ergi ok æði ok óþola; / svá ec þat af rist, / sem ec þat á reist, / ef goraz þarfar þess.

"Giant" I carve for thee / and three staves / evil and rage and distress; / I will cancel them / just as I have carved them / if there is need for it.

This poem is considered to be one of the youngest in the *Poetic Edda*<sup>40</sup>, which means it could have been composed not much long before or even approximately in the same period as B257.

Söderberg interpreted the inscription on side C of the stick as a kind of rewording of this verse, where  $\alpha \delta i$  would correspond to what she reads as *ialuns móðr*<sup>41</sup>, but *jatuns móðr* makes a better reading. My emendation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> For which cf. Marstrander 1930.

<sup>38</sup> DR 162 (Nørrejylland. Hjørring Amt): 198.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Cf. Lagman 1989: 32-33.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> In Von See 1997: 64 the composition date of this poem is set "in nachheidnischer Zeit, vielleicht erst im 12. / 13. Jh. Nahe" and Liberman states: "Skirnismál is an unnatural (and rather inept) blend of both plots: winning a heroic maiden and taming the shrew, a blend that could appeal only to people with 'decadent' tastes" (Liberman 1996: 117); other scholars had already agreed on a late composition date (Bibire 1986: 21; Klingenberg 1996: 42), though this is not unanimous (see Dronke 1997: 400–402).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> Söderberg 1988: 365.

is supported not only by palaeographical considerations: in mythological lore, giants often try to gain control over the gods' women, especially Freyja (cf. Prymskviða, the tale of the giant builder<sup>42</sup> and the account of Hrungnir's visit to Ásgarðr<sup>43</sup> in the Snorra Edda). But a union between a goddess and a giant is not admissible, because an ethnic group cannot marry its female members to opponents without losing part of its power<sup>44</sup>. The opposite solution (a god, or even a man, marrying a giantess) is indeed much more frequent, and it even became a characteristic feature in the traditions concerning the origins of the most distinguished families in Norse society<sup>45</sup>. In fact, if we are to judge by the texts, a kind of sexual apartheid similar to this existed in Norse society, where chieftains (or even kings, such as Haraldr Fairhair) usually have sexual intercourse with Sami women, while the opposite never seems to occur<sup>46</sup>. Haraldr Fairhair's experience may serve as a grim instance of the failure of the coexistence of the two ethnic groups: his bride Snæfríðr died very young, but this was not sufficient to satisfy her enemies: even after her death she underwent a damnatio memoriae as witch<sup>47</sup>. Of the four children she bore to king Haraldr, Rognvaldr Réttilbeini, lord of Haðaland, was accused of being a seiðmaðr and burnt alive together with his retainers by his half-brother Eiríkr Bloodaxe. This infamous act was met with the general approval of the Norse society<sup>48</sup>.

In *Prymskviða* we find a model of the revulsion which women were supposed to feel towards giants: Pórr orders Freyja to dress up in order to go and marry in Jotunheimr. The marriage seems at the time to be the only means of recovering Mjollnir, the gods' most important weapon against their enemies. Yet Freyja refuses, and the violent effects of her anger are vividly described in str. 13:

Reið varð þá Freyja, / oc fnásaði, /allr ása salr / undir bifðiz, / stǫcc þat iþ micla / men Brísinga: / "Mic veiztu verða / vergiarnasta, / ef ec ec með þér / í iptunheima".

<sup>42</sup> Gylfaginning 42 (ed. Faulkes 1982: 34)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> Skáldskaparmál 17 (ed. Faulkes 1998: 20–21).

<sup>44</sup> Clunies Ross 1994: 95; Clunies Ross 1998: 69, 105.

<sup>45</sup> Motz 1996 b: 76-77.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Queen Gunnhildr had sexual intercourse with two Lappish sorcerers in *Haraldz saga* ins hárfagra 32 (ed. Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson 1979: 134–136); since Gunnhildr is portrayed in this source as an example of *ergi*, of evil and obscene behaviour, this episode is probably meant to show that she is no honourable woman, but a *trollkona*, a 'witch'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> Heimskringla, Haraldz saga ins hárfagra 25 (ed. Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson 1979: 125–127). Ágrip af Noregs konunga sögum 3–4 (ed. Driscoll 1995: 4–6).

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem* 34 (ed. Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson 1979: 138-139). The Ágrip reports Rognvaldr's activity as a magician (*ibidem* 2, ed. Driscoll 1995: 4), but nothing about his execution.

Wrathful became then Freyja, / and snorted in rage, / the entire hall of the Æsir / quaked under her, / shattered the great / jewel of the Brisingar: / "You know that I will / prove a most licentious woman / if I go with you / to Giantland".

Freyja is the embodiment of feminine sexuality, and as such of gods' and men's generative ability, and this must be the reason why giants are particularly attracted to her. Refusing sexual intercourse with giants, Freyja provides both mortal women and goddesses with a model of behaviour that cannot be disregarded. Even giantesses seem to attach little value to giants as sexual partners; in *Helgakviða Hjorvarðssonar* 25, Helgi refuses the offer to spend a night with the giantess Hrímgerðr in compensation for the killing of her father Hati (called j*otunn* in 17, 3). He says:

Loðinn heitir, er þic scal eiga, / leið ertu mannkynni; / sá býr í Þolleyo þurs, / hundvíss iǫtunn, / hraunbúa verstr; / sá er þér macligr maðr.

Loðinn (hairy) is named he who shall have you, / loathsome you are to mankind; / he dwells in Polley, the giant, / much wise giant, / the worst of the dwellers of wilderness; / that is a fitting husband for you.

This context could be compared to *Skirnismál* 35<sup>49</sup>, where Skírnir threatens Gerðr with a giant husband. Hrímgerðr is a typically grotesque giantess; Atli addresses her as *fála* 'female troll; ox' (16, 3) and *hála* 'giantess' (16,2; 18,1) and refers to her indirectly as belonging to the number of *gifr* 'female monsters; giantesses' (15, 3) and *kveldriður* 'a kind of witches or monsters' and as a *skass* 'monster; ogress; giantess' (23, 6); moreover, she explicitly affirms that she has *krummur* 'paws' (22, 6).

Also Skaði demanded a husband among the Æsir as compensation for the killing of her father, hoping to marry Baldr, the most beautiful of the gods. Skaði (called *scír* 'clear, bright; pure' in the poetic *Edda*<sup>51</sup>) and Týr's mother (described as *algullin* 'all golden' and *brúnhvít* 'with a fair brow / appearance'<sup>52</sup>), bear no resemblance to Hrímgerðr and the horrible giantesses of later prose sources; Gerðr is described as *allra qvinna* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> Cf. Martinez-Pizarro: 344-347.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> For a deeper insight in this particular kind of folk-lore monsters see "KLNM" s.v. kveldrida.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Grimnismál 11, 5 (ed. Neckel–Kuhn 1962).

 $<sup>^{52}</sup>$  Hymiskviða 8,  $_{5}$ –8 enn onnor gecc, / algullin, fram / brûnhvít, bera / biórveig syni 'but another one stepped forward, / adorned with gold, / with bright eyebrows to carry / an alebeverage to her son'.

fægrst 'the most beautiful among women' in Gylfaginning 37, and her beauty is also mentioned in the prose Prologue to Skirnismál.

Gerðr is never called a giantess in the poem and strangely enough, she is referred to as mær 'maiden', and also as man '(chamber)maid' (probably employed as a denigratory term) and madr 'human being' (when Skírnir in v. 27, 6 threatens her that her food will taste awful to her "more than to any human being"). Her preferred sexual partners are depicted as men, with no implication that they should be of giant race (34, 6-7) [...] I forbid to the maid the joy of men [...]"). In Snorra Edda she is even included in a list of ásynjur<sup>53</sup>, since Snorri believes Gerðr to be Freyr's wife<sup>54</sup>, and he considers Freyr. Freyia and Niorðr to be æsir<sup>55</sup>. Her descent is stated clearly: her father Gymir is called iotunn in the poem (Skirnismál 25, 5), and Snorri reports that her mother was of a giant race, the Bergrisar, while saying nothing about her father, whom he just calls "man" (Gymir hét maðr, en kona hans Aurboða; hon var Bergrisa ættar 'a man was called Gymir, and his wife Aurboða; she was of the race of Hill-giants' Gylfaginning 37). And yet, she is threatened with being forced to stay in the *iotna garðr* (30, 3) and given a giant as her only partner (35,1–6). The meaning of the threat is obscure, since iotna garðr should be her natural habitat. It is specified that the giant in question will be a three-headed hrimburs and that he will treat her in the most humiliating way; however, there is no evidence that this may be the only negative part of the curse (we do not even know if having more than one head is supposed to be a monstruous feature for the giants themselves). It has been assumed, largely because of Skirnismál, that at some stage of heathendom the word burs had a threatening character in the sources, while jotunn had a more generic meaning<sup>56</sup>, but jotnar, risar and bursar are hard to distinguish in Norse tradition<sup>57</sup>, despite the evidence from modern Scandinavian folklore<sup>58</sup>. It appears that Skirnir's curse could fit

<sup>53</sup> In Skáldskaparmál G55 (ed. Faulkes 1998: 1) Freyr and Njorðr are listed among the æsir, Gerðr together with the ásynjur.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> [...] skyldi hon þar koma [...] ok ganga þá að brullaupinu með Frey 'she would go there and then she would marry Freyr' (Gylfaginning 37, ed. Faulkes 1982: 31).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> Cf. Gylfaginning 23–24 (ibidem: 23–24). In Gylfaginning 24 Snorri even remarks: Freyr er hinn ágætasti af ásum [...] en Freyja er ágætust af ásynjum. We also have an Eddic reference about Freyr's excellency in Lokasenna 35, 6. There Njorðr states that he believes his son to be ása jaðarr 'the best of Æsir', a kenning suitable only to Öðinn alone, who is called goðjaðarr 'the best of gods' in Egill's Sonatorrek 23, 3 (ed. Finnur Jónsson 1973: 37).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Simek 1993: 107 (s.v. *Giants*).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> In Motz 1987: 216 it is stated that the "generic names" (*burs, jotunn, risi, troll*) are interchangeable. The author (*ibidem*: 217) tentatively proposes some distinctions between *hrím-bursar* and *bergrisar*, and between *jotnar* and *bursar*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> Motz 1987: 217, 234.

either a goddess or a beautiful woman of giant origins. Such was also Reichardt's opinion: he assumed the curse had been used in real life before being included in the poem<sup>59</sup>. Two more scholars shared Reichardt's views<sup>60</sup>. This means that one or more versions of this text could actually have been in use for practising magic in everyday life (even though we do not know whether an elaboration ever took place, and in which direction).

The role of giants in magic directed against women is also to be inferred from the use of the rune P in rites of hostile magic. Evidence for the negative influence of the rune P in women's lives is provided both by the Norse and the Icelandic Runic Poem (v. 3,1: Purs vældr kvinna kvillu 'the giant causes sickness to women' and Purs er kvenna kvol 'the giant causes torment to women')<sup>61</sup>. No matter whether purs is a noun or the rune name, this sentence refers to the effects of pursar on women. The use of the rune P in black magic against women is testified to in Iceland in a manuscript from the end of the Middle Ages, where a love charm reads thus:

Ef þu uillt uilla konu suo hun rati huergi nema til þin gior grauf i golfinu þar hun geingr yfer og lat i iotun geira blod og rijst hring vtañ vm og nafn hennar og stafi þessa Molldþuss og Mann þrijsteipta blad naud Komlu og gapalldr og þessa særing les þu. Eg lit a þig en þu legg a mig ast og elsku af aullum hug sit þu: huergi þol þu hvergi nema þu vner mijer þad bid eg Odin og alla þa sem kvenn runir kunnu ad rada [...]<sup>62</sup>.

If you want to charm a woman so that she goes nowhere but to you, dig a hole in the floor where she will tread and pour into it some blood from giant spears and mark a circle around it and her name and these staves: Moldburs and Maðr three times inverted (?), Blað, Nauðr, Komla and Gapaldr and read this enchantment: I look at you and you lay on me love and affection from the whole heart<sup>63</sup>; never sit anywhere, never be comfortable anywhere unless you love me. This I ask from Óðinn and all those who can read "woman-runes" [...].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> Reichardt 1939: 484-5, 494.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> Dronke 1997: 392: "[in this text] there is no attempt, or wish, to distinguish her as a giant maiden from a human maiden[...]"; Motz 1996 a: 106, directly reports Reichhardt's words on the matter.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> Respectively Dickins 1915: 24 and 28. Recently a new annotated edition of the Icelandic *Rune Poem* has appeared (Page 1998); the readings proposed in that edition, though, do not seem to vary substantially from Dickin's in the sections relevant to this article.

<sup>62</sup> Ed. Lindqvist 1921: 56-58.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> It is not clear whose heart is in question here, despite Lindqvist's assumption that it must be hers (*ibidem*: 59).

This charm shares many features with B257, such as the phrase ek lít á bik, which recalls ek sé à bér, and sit bú hvergi bol bú hvergi, which is similar to sittu aldri soptu aldri. Even more important is the reference to giants, in jotungeira blóð ('giant-spear blood'?) and then in Moldþurs ('Earth-giant'), probably some burs, with the first element serving the purpose of alliteration Mold-Mann; Mann equals Maðr, as we can see from the drawings which follow the text. Even though the names Blað, Komla and Gapaldr were probably invented, Purs, Maðr and Nauð(r) are known to have been in use alone and often in the formation of complex runes.

Thus, Maðr is the basis for the runic Ægishjálmr, a complex sign with the magical ability of focusing the victims' love on the magician<sup>64</sup>. The use of such runes (called gamanrúnar 'runes of pleasure') to win the friendship of the best members of society has been attested in Hávamál<sup>65</sup>, and the English Runic Poem seems to agree with its Icelandic equivalent which quoted an old proverb66, Madr er mannz gaman 'mankind's delight is in each other' also known from Eddic poetry<sup>67</sup>. Here the Scandinavian version could acquire a different meaning, referring to the power of the rune Y to secure sexual satisfaction (which is perhaps the commonest meaning of gaman) to its user. Nau $\delta(r)$  'constriction' points in another direction: it is employed against women as an important tool in love magic (evidence for it is provided in Sigrarifumál<sup>68</sup>), and it is mentioned together with Purs in Kvennagaldur, a modern Icelandic love-charm<sup>69</sup>. This word was used in magic with various meanings: in Sigtuna-galder, three brár ('woes') and nine nøðir are invoked on the 'wolf', apparently a sickness demon<sup>70</sup>; in the somewhat later Ribe Charm

65 Hávamál 120, 5–6 góðan mann / teygðo þér at gamanrúnom 'draw to yourself a valiant man / through runes of pleasure'.

<sup>64</sup> Ibidem: 46 n. 4 (cf. also De Vries 1957: 216).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> Icelandic Runic Poem 14, 1 (ed. Dickins 1915: 32; line 14, 2 adds ok moldar auki, following the Norwegian poem's wording of 14, 1 Madr er moldar auki 'Man is augmentation of dust', ibidem: 26); English Runic Poem 59, 1–2 Man byh on myrghe / his magan leof 'A man is in joy / dear to his relatives' (ed. Dickins 1915: 18).

<sup>67</sup> Hávamál 47, 6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> Sigrdrifumál 7 (Olrúnar scaltu kunna, / ef þú vill, annars quæn / vélit þic í trygð, ef þú trúir; / á horni scal þær rísta / oc á handar baki / oc merkia á nagli Nauð 'You must know the ale-runes, / if you do not want another man's woman / to cheat you, while you trust her; / on the drinking horn you must carve them / and on the back of the hand / and sign Nauð on the (your?) nail'. Both the Icelandic and the Norwegian poems (8, 1) quote the same line about this rune: Nauð er þýjar þrá 'Constriction is the woe of the female thrall' (ed. Dickins 1915: 30 and 26 respectively). It could be thought to have been in use to enthral a woman so that she will be forced to love the person for whose benefit the charm has been uttered.

<sup>69</sup> Jón Árnason 1862: 449.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> Lindquist 1932: 28–36.

(dating from about 1300<sup>71</sup>), nine *nouḥær* are conjured up to help healing the patient, as if they were spirits of some sort<sup>72</sup>. Therefore, *Purs* is to be considered a powerful rune in magic against women with a clear sexual meaning: the alternative to the magician is a hideous giant.

The curse in *Skirnismál* appears to be a crescendo whose culmination is the carving of four (three?) signs<sup>73</sup>: first *Purs*, and then *ergi*, æði, úþoli. It is at this point that Gerðr surrenders and consents to marry or have sexual intercourse with Freyr. Söderberg argues that while *ergi* and úboli are mentioned in our text, the reference to æði 'rage, fury, madness, frenzy' must be seen in the phrase *ioluns móðr*, which would mean something like 'foolish mood', since the root she has reconstructed seems usually to refer to empty talking, more than to rage<sup>74</sup>.

It is clear from the word's root (the same as in the adjective  $\dot{o}dr$  and the verb  $\dot{w}da^{75}$ ) that  $\dot{w}di$  is connected with both rage and madness; in the Homíliubók,  $\dot{w}di$  is explicitly said to be the consequence of  $rei\dot{o}i^{76}$ . This is the precise meaning of jatuns  $m\dot{o}dr$ , as we can infer from the occurrence of the compound jotunmóðr in both  $Volusp\dot{a}$  and Grottasongr. In the former, it is used to describe the threatening world snake, Miðgarðsormr (which is not a giant itself, but was generated by Loki with the giantess Angrboða according to Snorri  $^{77}$ ), in the latter about Fenja and Menja, two giant maids who are about to destroy their master's prosperity and kill him. In both cases, therefore, we know the state of mind designated by jotunmóðr to be blind fury that will lead to disaster  $^{78}$ .

The same compound occurs in similar contexts in *Snorra Edda*. Here we have a clear example in the giant builder's fit of temper after he realizes that he will not succeed: his rage is so fierce that the gods call for

<sup>71</sup> Moltke 1985: 494.

<sup>72</sup> Moltke 1960: 122-123.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> It is uncertain whether *Purs* is to be considered as a rune repeated three times (one for *ergi*, the second for  $\alpha \partial i$ , the third for  $\dot{u} boli$ ) or as a rune itself followed by three other distinct runes (see von See: 135–136).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup> Söderberg 1988: 365–366.

<sup>75</sup> De Vries 1961: s.vv.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> [...] En ef hon [scil. ræiðin] værðr æigi stilt með scyn (æmi þa sny (c hon í øðe 'but if it [wrath] is not soothed with reason it then turns into rage' (Homíliubók, ed. Indrebø 1931: 27).

<sup>27).

77</sup> Angrboða hét gýgr í Jotunheimum. Við henni gat Loki þrjú born. Eitt var Fenrisúlfr, annat Jormungandr [...] 'Angrboða was the name of a giantess in Giantland. With her Loki had three children. One was Fenrir the wolf, the second the world snake [...]'Gylfaginning 34 (ed. Faulkes 1982: 27).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>78</sup> Voluspá 50, 3–4 (snýz iormungandr / i iotunmóði 'the Miðgarðsormr writhes / in giant fury'); Grottasongr 23, 1–4 (Mólo meyiar / megins kostoðo, / óro ungar / i iotunmóði 'The maids ground / they tried [their own] might / the young women were / in giant fury').

Pórr who instantly kills him<sup>79</sup>, while in Skáldskaparmál Hrungnir's wrath makes him follow Óðinn into his enemy's kingdom, Ásgarðr. This situation will lead to his defying Porr and his death in a duel<sup>80</sup>. In the same chapter, Þórr is described as being í ásmóði (enraged, as is fitting for an ass) while approaching the place where he will slay Hrungnir and receive permanent injury from a fragment of the giant's whetstone<sup>81</sup>. This is the only place in which Snorri refers to the physical damage suffered by Þórr, so that móðr always seems to foreshadow an event which will have negative consequences. In the saga literature, this word occurs in Porsteins báttr Bæjarmagns, where it is used to describe the mood of the giant jarl Agði when he learns that his king Geirroðr has been slain by a Christian<sup>82</sup>; after an unsuccessful attempt to take revenge upon Porsteinn (who in the meantime has also convinced Agði's daughter to desert her father), he lets his followers bury him alive in a mound "with many riches", as is proper for a pagan funeral rite<sup>83</sup>. These examples suggest that jatuns móðr must be a state most closely tied with æði and distinct from jaluns móðr, which would at best mean something like 'an idiot's temper'.

#### Conclusions

There are four reasons why an emendation is, in my opinion, desirable: a) confusion between /t/ and /l/ is easy to explain, and it is not uncommon in medieval Western Scandinavia; b) the present runemaster seems particularly prone to it, considering the slip in side B; c) in the light of the parallel between Skirnismál and  $B_{257}$ ,  $jatuns\ mó\partial r$  offers the most satisfying parallel to  $accepta distance models and a curse against a woman, especially of a sexual kind (as stated in side D's antu mér sem sjalfri <math>p\acute{e}r$ ), is very common in Old Norse literature and is therefore to be expected, even if Skirnismál were not the model for  $B_{257}$ .

The reading proposed is of importance in classifying the text and in placing it in the context of the popular culture of medieval Bergen, which, although it was no longer the capital of the whole Western Scan-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> Gylfaginning 42 (ed. Faulkes 1982: 35).

<sup>80</sup> Skáldskaparmál 25 (ed. Faulkes 1998: 20–22).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>81</sup> Ibidem: 21–22.

<sup>82</sup> Porsteins báttr Bæjarmagns 11 (ed. Guðni Jónsson – Bjarni Vilhjálmsson 1943–44: 413).

<sup>83</sup> Porsteins þáttr Bæjarmagns 12, (ibidem: 416).

dinavian world, was still one of the largest cities of the time, where innovative linguistic and palaeographic features had made their way into Old Norse tradition.

## Bibliography

- Almqvist, B. 1965: Norrön niddikting I. Nid mod furstar. Nordiska texter och undersökningar 21, Stockholm
- Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon 1989: *Íslensk Orðsifjabók*, Orðabók Háskólans, Reykjavík
- Bibire, P., 1986: "Freyr and Gerðr: the Story and its Myths". R. Simek Jónas Kristiannsson H. Bekker-Nielsen (eds.), Sagnaskemmtun. Studies in Honour of Hermann Pálsson. Böhlau, Graz-Wien, pp. 19–40
- Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson 1979: *Heimskringla* 1, Íslenzk Fornrit XXVI, Hið islenzka Fornritafélag, Reykjavík (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)
- Bæksted, A. 1942: *Islands runeindskrifter*. Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 2, Munksgaard, København
- Campbell, A. 1959: Old English Grammar, Clarendon Press, Oxford
- Clunies Ross, Margaret 1994: *Prolonged Echoes* (1st vol.). The Viking Collection 7, Odense University Press, Odense
- Clunies Ross, Margaret 1998: *Prolonged Echoes* (2<sup>nd</sup> vol.). The Viking Collection 10, Odense University Press, Odense
- De Vries, J. 1956–57: *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* (2<sup>nd</sup> vol.). De Gruyter, Berlin–Leipzig (second, revised edition)
- De Vries, J. 1961: Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Brill, Leiden
- Dickins, B. (ed.) 1915: Runic and Heroic Poems. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- DR: Jacobsen, Lis og Moltke, E. (eds.) 1942: Danmarks runeindskrifter, Munksgaard, København
- Driscoll, M. J. (ed.) 1995: Agrip af Nóregs konungasögum. University College of London, London
- Dronke, Ursula 1997: *The Poetic Edda, vol. II. The Mythological Poems*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Falk, H.S. Torp, A. 1910–11: Norwegisch-dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Carl Winter, Heidelberg
- Faulkes, A. (ed.) 1982: Snorri Sturluson. Edda. Prologue and Gylfaginning. Clarendon, Oxford
- Faulkes, A. (ed.) 1998: Snorri Sturluson. Edda. Skáldskaparmál. University College of London, London
- Finnur Jónsson (ed.)1973: *Den Norsk-Islandske Skjaldedigtning* B I. Rosenkilde og Bagger, København
- Friesen, O. von 1933: Runorna, Nordisk Kultur 6. Bonnier, Stockholm

- Guðni Jónsson Bjarni Vilhjálmsson (eds.) 1943–44: Fornaldarsögur Norðurlanda. Bókaútgáfa Forni, Reykjavík
- Holthausen, F. 1934: Altenglischen etymologisches Wörterbuch. Carl Winter, Heidelberg
- Indrebø, G. (ed.) 1931: Gamalnorsk homiliebok. Cod. AM 619 4°. Kjeldeskriftfondet, Oslo
- Jón Árnason 1862: Íslenzkar þjóðsögur og æfintýri I. Leipzig
- Klingenberg, H. 1996: "For Skírnis. Brautwerbung eines Werbungshelfer". Alvíssmál 6, pp. 21–62
- Knirk J. E. 1993: "Runes and Runic Inscriptions". Ph. Pulsiano (ed.), *Medieval Scandinavia*. Garland, New York–London, pp. 545–555
- Kurath H. Kuhn S. M. 1952: *Middle English Dictionary* 5. Michigan University Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan
- Lagman, S. 1989: "Till försvar för runristarnas ortografi". Runrön 1, pp. 27-37
- Liberman, A. 1994: Review of Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon, Íslensk Orðsifjabók (Reykjavík 1989) reprinted in Word Heath. Wortheide. Orðheiði. Essays on Germanic Literature and Usage (1972–1992). Il Calamo, Rome, pp. 292–302
- Liberman, A 1996: Review of von See La Farge Picard Heß, Skírnismál: Modell eines Edda-Kommentar (Heidelberg 1993). Alvíssmál 6, pp. 114–118
- Liestøl, A. 1964: Runer frå Bryggen, Bergen (særtrykk av Viking 1963)
- Liestøl, A. 1965: "Rúnar frá Björgvin". Skírnir, 139, pp. 27-51
- Liestøl, A. 1966: "Runes from Bergen". Minnesota History 40, 2, pp. 49-58
- Liestøl, A. Krause, W. Jón Helgason 1962: "Drottkvætt-vers fra Bryggen i Bergen". *Maal og Minne* 1962, pp. 98–106
- Lindquist, I. 1932: "Religiösa Runtexter I. Sigtuna-galdern". Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskapssocieteten i Lund 15, Lund
- Lindqvist, N. 1921: En isländsk svartkonstbok från 1500-talet. Appelsberg Boktryckeri, Uppsala
- Marstrander, C. J. S. 1930: "Killaloekorset og de norske kolonier i Irland". *Norsk Tidsskrift forSprogvidenskap 4*, pp. 378–400
- Marstrander, C. J. S. 1945: "To islandske runeninnskrifter". Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap 13, pp. 295–318
- Martinez-Pizarro, J. 1988: "Woman-To-Man Senna". Teresa Pàroli (ed.), Poetry in the Scandinavian Middle Ages. Atti del XII congresso di studi sull'alto Medio Evo (Spoleto, 4–10 settembre 1988). Spoleto, pp. 339–350
- Moltke, E. 1960: "Runepindene fra Ribe". *Nationalmuseets Arbejdsmark*, pp. 122–136
- Moltke, E. 1985: Runes and Their Origins. Denmark and Elsewhere. National-museets Forlag, Copenhagen 1985 (trad. P. G. Foote; original title Runerne i Danmark og deres oprindelse, København 1976).
- Motz, Lotte 1987: "The Families of Giants". Arkiv för nordisk filologi 102, pp. 216– 236
- Motz, Lotte 1996 a: "The Power of Speech: Some Eddic Poems and Their Frames". Amsterdamer Beiträge zur ältere Germanistik 46, pp. 105–117

- Motz, Lotte 1996 b: "Kingship and the Giants". Arkiv för nordisk filologi 111, pp. 73–88
- Mundal, Else Steinsland, Gro 1989: "Kvinner og medisinsk magi". Kvinnors Rosengård, Stockholm, pp. 97–121.
- NIyR II: Olsen, M. (ed.) 1951: Norges Innskrifter med de yngre Runer II. Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt, Oslo
- NIyR IV: Olsen, M. (ed.) 1957: Norges Innskrifter med de yngre Runer IV. Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt, Oslo
- NlyR VI, 1: Liestøl, A. (ed.) 1991: Norges Innskrifter med de yngre Runer VI,1. Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt, Oslo
- NIyR VI, 2: Sanness Johnsen, Ingrid (ed; red. J. E. Knirk), Norges Innskrifter med de yngre Runer VI, 2. Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt, Oslo
- NiæR I: Bugge, S (ed.) 1905–1913: Norges Indskrifter med de ældre Runer I. Kildeskriftfondet, Christiania
- Neckel G. Kuhn H. (eds.) 1962: Edda. Die Lieder der Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. Carl Winter, Heidelberg
- Page, R. I. (ed.) 1998: "The Icelandic Rune-Poem", Nottingham Medieval Studies
  42
- Pokorny, J. 1959: Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Francke, Bern-Stuttgart
- Reichardt, K. 1939: "Die Liebesbeschwörungen in For Skirnis". Journal of English and Germanic Philology 38, pp. 481–495
- Ruggerini, Maria Elena 1979: *Le invettive di Loki*. Testi e studi di filologia 2, Roma von See, K. La Farge, Beatrice Picard, Eve Priebe, Ilona Schulz, Katja 1997: *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda* (2<sup>nd</sup> vol.) Heidelberg
- Seim, Karin Fjellhammer 1998: De vestnordiske futhark-innskriftene fra vikingtid og middelalder form og funksjon. PhD-dissertation, Norges teknisknaturvitenskapelige universitet, Trondheim
- Simek, R. 1993: Dictionary of Northern Mythology. D.S. Brewer, Cambridge
- Spurkland, T. 1991: En fonografematisk analyse av runematerialet fra Bryggen i Bergen, PhD-dissertation, Universitetet i Oslo, Oslo
- Stefán Karlsson 1984: "Loki's Threat: On Lokasenna 3.4". Twenty-eight papers presented to Hans Bekker-Nielsen on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday 28 April 1993. Odense, pp. 257–266
- Söderberg, Barbro 1984: "Till tolkningen av några dunkla passager i Lokasenna". Scripta Islandica. Isländska Sällskapets årsbok 35, pp. 43–86
- Söderberg, Barbro 1988: "En runstrof fra Bryggen". J. Einarson Barbro Söderberg (eds.), *Ingemar Olsson 25 augusti 1988*. Stockholm, pp. 361–368
- Torp, A. 1974: Gamalnorsk Ordavleiding. Gleerup, Lund
- Walde, A. Pokorny, J. 1930: Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Gruyter, Berlin-Leipzig
- Wessén, E. 1965: Svensk Språkhistoria II. Ordbildningslära. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm