



**UNIVERSITY OF  
ILLINOIS PRESS**

---

The Relation of Loddfáfnir to Odin in the Hávamál

Author(s): Albert Morey Sturtevant

Source: *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Jan., 1911), pp. 42-55

Published by: University of Illinois Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27700070>

Accessed: 25-05-2018 05:05 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



**JSTOR**

*University of Illinois Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*

# THE RELATION OF LODDFÁFNIR TO ODIN IN THE HÁVAMÁL.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sophus Bugge. *Studier over de nordiske Gude og Heltesagns Oprindelse af Sophus Bugge*. Christiania. 1881-1889.

Detter und Heinzel. *Sæmundar Edda mit einem Anhang herausgegeben und erklärt von F. Detter und R. Heinzel*. Leipzig. 1903.

Hazellius. *Inledning till Hávamál eller Odens Sång af Arthur Immanuel Hazellius*. Uppsala. 1860.

Finnur Jónsson. *Den Islandske Litteraturs Historie tilligemed den Oldnorske af Finnur Jónsson*. København. 1907.

Müllenhoff. *Deutsche Altertumskunde von Karl Müllenhoff*. Fünfter Band besorgt durch Max Roediger. Berlin. 1908.

Niedner. *Zur Liederreda von Felix Niedner*. Berlin. 1896.

Vigfusson, Gudbrand and Powell. *Corpus poeticum Boreale*. Oxford. 1883.

The relation of Loddáfáfnir to Odin in the Old Norse *Hávamál* has long been a mooted question. This question is fraught with many difficulties which even the most learned of O. N. scholars have not been able to solve satisfactorily. In determining this question there is, however, one very important factor upon which sufficient stress has not been laid. In v. 163 of the *Hávamál* (*Norroen Fornkvæði*, Sophus Bugge. Christiania. 1867), Odin refuses to divulge to Loddáfáfnir the eighteenth and last of the magic songs (*fimbulljóð*) in which Loddáfáfnir has been receiving instruction from the god. If the nature of this magic song can be discovered, it will throw additional light not only upon the nature of Odin in the *Ljóðatal*, but also upon the character of the pupil who is receiving instruction from him.

There are two theories in regard to the authorship of these magic songs—namely, one that the speaker is the god Odin himself, the other that the speaker is the pupil Loddáfáfnir, who claims to have heard in the Hall of the High One these songs, which are in reality, however, nothing but his own invention that he attempts, under the guise of feigned wisdom, to foist upon a credulous audience. The former theory is held by the eminent Scandinavian scholars, Sophus Bugge and Finnur Jónsson, the latter by the celebrated German scholar, Karl Müllen-

hoff. Both theories are largely due to the interpretation laid upon the structure of the *Loddfáfnismál* and its relation to the *Rúnatal* and the *Ljóðatal*.

Bugge holds (323 ff., 361 ff.) that all three lays (vv. 111-164) originally formed a single poem and that V. 111 originally introduced the *Rúnatal* (vv. 138-145), while the *Loddfáfnismál* was a later interpolation. The position of the *Loddfáfnismál*, directly following V. 111, he considers due to the fact that line 8 of this strophe—*ne of rǫþom þegþo*—which refers to the interpretation of runes, was misunderstood by the scribe as referring to advice (*rǫþ*) which *Loddfáfnir* is to receive. In the *Rúnatal*, *Odin* tells the story of his hanging upon “the windy tree,” and instructs *Loddfáfnir* in the use of magic runes; therefore, the words addressed to *Loddfáfnir* in the *Ljóðatal*, which is a part of the same original poem as the *Rúnatal*, must also have been spoken by *Odin*. The last strophe (164) of the *Hávamál* forms the conclusion of *Odin*’s speech to *Loddfáfnir* and is, therefore, rightly placed at the end of the *Ljóðatal* and not at the end of the *Loddfáfnismál*, which was a later extension of the original poem *Rúnatal*—*Ljóðatal* (111. 138-145. 146-164). A similar division is made by *Vigfusson* (*corp. poet.* I, 23 ff.).

*Müllenhoff*, on the other hand (252 ff., 266 ff., 270 ff.), makes three distinct poems of Bugge’s original one, and brings the last strophe (164) in direct connection with the *Loddfáfnismál*, which he considers as the *Hávamál* proper. By this arrangement *Müllenhoff* is forced to connect V. 111 directly with the *Loddfáfnismál* and to explain the nature of the advice given in this lay as due to the invention of a skilful minstrel, who with coarse and ironic buffoonery charges himself with practical wisdom, which he claims to have received from the god *Odin*.

Bugge considers the speaker in all three lays as *Odin* himself, and explains the coarse platitudes in the *Loddfáfnismál*, so out of keeping with the dignified atmosphere of the *Rúnatal* and the *Ljóðatal*, on the ground that the *Loddfáfnismál* is a later extension of these two lays (V. 111. 138-164.) and that the ad-

vice given Loddfáfnir is not the invention of a "flunkerer," but the serious counsel of a wise god.

That the speaker in the Ljóðatal is Odin, and not Loddfáfnir, Bugge (361 ff.) has clearly shown. He also makes clear to what extent Müllenhoff is forced to mutilate the original form of the *Codex Regius* by the assumption that Loddfáfnir is the speaker, for in this case Müllenhoff must not only separate vv. 146-163 (Ljóðatal) from vv. 138-145 (Rúnatal), which precede the former in the manuscript, but also from v. 164, and finally he must strike out, in v. 162, those lines which are addressed to Loddfáfnir.

The intimate connection between the Loddfáfnismál on the one hand and the Rúnatal-Ljóðatal on the other, both in their direct sequence in the *Codex Regius* and in their inner relation (as wisdom imparted by the High One) render Bugge's ground far more tenable than that of Müllenhoff. If Odin is the speaker in the Ljóðatal, why deny him this function in the Loddfáfnismál? Bugge answers this question satisfactorily (326 ff.) by meeting every argument in regard to the speaker in the Loddfáfnismál. Müllenhoff says (267): "Loddfáfnir ist ein flunkerer wie nur einer seines gleichen und macht daraus kein hehl: er bedient sich der fiktion und erhabenen einkleidung nur, um seiner werten zuhörerschaft einen possen zu spielen." Bugge's answer to this is that neither the trivial advice given in v. 112, nor the reference to the proper treatment of guests and to hospitality towards strangers and beggars in vv. 132, 135, suggest in any way that Loddfáfnir is himself a poor beggar-minstrel who is here indulging in ironical self-satire. When Odin says, in v. 134, "never laugh at an aged minstrel"—*at három þul*—Müllenhoff believes that this "aged minstrel" signifies, or at least includes, the minstrel Loddfáfnir. "No one can believe," says Bugge, "that even a boastful 'flunkerer' could have Odin warn him not to laugh at himself." Finally the line, *Háva hollu i*, in vv. 111 and 164, denoting the place where Loddfáfnir receives these mystical instructions from Odin, is supported by an analogous situation in Snorre's *Gylfagynning* (I, 36; II, 253).

Müllenhoff's plight is best seen (276 ff.) in his forced interpretation of vv. 162 and 164. In v. 162, Loddfáfnir is told that he will long be without these songs of his master which will enable him to retain the love of a young woman, and is taunted with the assurance that they would be useful if he could get them. This is (according to Müllenhoff) a trick played upon the minstrel Loddfáfnir, evidently because, after the first half of the strophe, the speaker has moral scruples against telling Loddfáfnir anything more about magic love-songs, and because the speaker's own thoughts and words here fail him. In fact, in v. 163 the speaker finally refuses to divulge anything at all concerning the nature of the last (eighteenth) magic song (which he is to keep for his wife or for his sister), so that Loddfáfnir in the end is completely duped and must go away without the coveted knowledge. In this verse (163) the speaker is satisfied with assuring Loddfáfnir of his superior wisdom, but at the same time the poet forgets that it is really Odin who is supposed to be Loddfáfnir's teacher, and yet the poet makes v. 164 (which infers that Loddfáfnir heard these words in the Hall of the High One) follow as the concluding strophe of the whole poem.

Bugge, on the other hand, holds (324, Note 1) that the songs (*ljóða þessa*) mentioned in v. 162, which Vigfusson (*Corp. poet.* I, 20, 28) would remove entirely from the *Ljóðatal*, have reference not merely to the preceding lines in the same strophe, but to all the *ljóð* mentioned in v. 146 and enumerated in the following strophes 146-162. That Loddfáfnir is again addressed directly after the seventeenth song is due to the fact that Odin wishes to keep from Loddfáfnir the eighteenth and last magic song.

From Müllenhoff's interpretation of vv. 162, 163, it would appear to be his contention that if Odin really were the speaker he would not be satisfied with merely assuring Loddfáfnir of his superior wisdom (v. 163), but would divulge his knowledge as a proof of it, and that, therefore, the speaker is not Odin himself, but a literary invention of a clever minstrel. I do not believe that the attitude attributed by Müllenhoff to Odin is justifiable.

No satisfactory answer has ever yet been given either as to the nature of this eighteenth song in v. 163 or as to why the speaker refuses to divulge it.

V. 163 reads as follows:

þat kann ec ip átiánda,  
 er ec æva kennig  
 mey ne mannz kono,  
 — alt er betra  
 er einn um kann,  
 þat fylgir lióða locom,—  
 nema þeirri einni,  
 er mic armi verr  
 eða min systur se.

This eighteenth I know  
 which never I shall tell  
 to maid or man's wife,  
 — 'tis far better  
 for one alone to know,  
 this is the end of my songs —  
 save to her alone  
 who shall embrace me,  
 or to my own sister.

"Detter und Heinzel" (p. 150) refer to this passage as obscure: "Der Inhalt ist dunkel." Felix Niedner (p. 4) considers the strophe as a literary invention on the part of the poet, which has its precedent in the *Vegtamskviða*, v. 12. He agrees, then, with Müllenhoff that Loddfáfnir and not Odin is the speaker here, and that Loddfáfnir is simply availing himself of a conventional literary form which is used in other Eddic poems in connection with Odin's wisdom: "dass wir es nicht mit Reden Odins an Loddfáfnir sondern mit solchen Loddfáfnirs, die er seinen Zuhörern gegenüber vorgiebt von Odin empfangen zu haben, zu thun haben, spricht schon das zeugniss der auch sonst, z. B. bei der *Vegtamskviða*, gut orientierten Papierhandschriften." Although Niedner agrees that Odin is elsewhere the speaker in the *Ljóðatal*, yet he considers this strophe (v. 163) as the literary device of a "flunkerer," "der sich der fiktion und erhabenen einkleidung nur bedient, um seiner werten zuhörerschaft einen

possen zu spielen." But the situation is entirely different in the Vegtamskviða from that in strophe 163 of the Ljóðatal. In the Vegtamskviða, Odin asks the "*völva*" a question which in itself in no wise reveals his identity.

He asks, v. 12 :

Hveriar 'ro þær mæyjar,  
æ'r at muni gráta  
ok a himin verpa  
halsa skautum?

Who are the maids  
that bitterly weep  
and sling the sail-sheets  
high in the air?

There is nothing in this question to reveal Odin's identity. But is there nothing to reveal his identity in v. 163 of the Ljóðatal? I believe that both these passages are reflections of the *Vafþrúpnismál*, v. 54, ll. 4-6, in which Odin, who has appeared before the giant under the guise of an assumed name, suddenly reveals his identity by asking a question which no one knows except himself. In the case of the Vegtamskviða we have, to be sure, a mere conventional imitation of the same motif in that here Odin's question, though having no connection with his own character or personality, produces the effect of revealing his identity. But in v. 163 of the Ljóðatal we have an actual means of discovering Odin's identity. In the *Vafþrúpnismál*, v. 54, ll. 4-6, Odin asks the giant Vafþrúpnir :

Hvat mælti Óðinn  
aðr a bal stigi,  
sialfr i eyra syni?

What spake Odin  
into his son's ear  
ere he stepped on the pyre?

No one on earth knows the answer to this question but Odin himself, since his son Balder has long ago been dead. The giant Vafþrúpnir recognizes immediately that it is Odin with whom he has been contesting, and acknowledges his defeat by his inabil-

ity to answer an impossible question. He says in the last strophe of the lay: "no man knows what thou in days long past didst whisper into thy son's ear; now I see 'tis *Odin* with whom I have been contesting in words of wisdom. Thou art ever the wisest of men." So, too, in the "*Hervarar saga ok Heiðreks konungs*" (C. VI, 263), which in the passage in question is based upon the *Vafþrúðnismál*, *Odin* asks the same question of King *Heiðrek*:

"*Hvat mælti Óðinn í eyra Baldri áþr hann var á bál um borinn?*" *Heiðrek* answers: "The words thou didst speak no one knows but thee alone." So, too, in a corrupted passage in the "*Ketilssaga hæings*" (C. IV) and in the "*Fornaldar sögur*" (II, 125) this question appears as a symbol of that which is impossible to answer: "*huat er þat at bál segir bani flagði.*" This question, then, the answer to which no one knows except *Odin* himself, serves to reveal completely and without mistake his identity. Why does *Odin* wish to keep from *Loddfáfnir* the eighteenth magic song?

There is one secret in the world which he will reveal to no man, and that is the secret which he spake into the ear of *Balder* upon the funeral pyre. Whatever this may have been; whether *Odin's* words were a reflection of Christian influence, as *Bugge* believed (p. 64), and had reference to the resurrection of the son *Christ* after his death upon the cross, or whether they referred to the pagan doctrine of the new life after *Ragnarök*, in which *Balder* returns to earth again, these words belonged to *Odin* alone, and as such are a secret with him. In the *Vafþrúðnismál* he proves himself to be the wisest of all men. In the *Vegtamskviða* he is the father of magic song, v. 3 (*galldrs fǫður*). As the wisest of gods and men, and as master of witchcraft and magic song, *Odin* instructs the pupil, *Loddfáfnir*. In strophe 163 he refuses to give his pupil instruction in things to which he alone is secret. Thus he makes a fitting conclusion to his long array of magic songs by bringing *Loddfáfnir* to realize that it is the all-wise god *Odin* who is his master. He does this by hinting at that secret which no one knows but himself. *Odin* never



reveals his identity by a direct statement, but always by this indirect method of characterization, which cannot fail of recognition. The words he spake into Balder's ear may very well have referred to the new life in which Balder is to return to earth again, and Odin could very well have transformed these words into a magic formula (*fimbulljóð*). The future life with its inscrutable mystery is well suited as a subject for a magic song. The last of all the magic songs thus contains the great mystery of the universe. It is the Allfather alone who knows this mystery. His refusal to divulge it is in keeping with the mystical character and dignified tone of the *Rúnatal* and *Ljóðatal*. He is the all-wise and omnipotent God, and as such he shrouds the last of his instructions in the deepest mystery of all. His personality and identity are unmistakable when he refers to an event to which he and the dead alone are privy. Thus the refusal to divulge this last magic song is not the imitation of a mere literary convention, as in the *Vegtamskviða*, but an instance of Odin's method of revealing his identity as genuine as in the *Vafþrúpnismál* itself. If in the last magic song there were nothing by which Odin could be identified, or which could in any way be connected with his personality, then it might be conceivable, as Müllenhoff believes, that Loddfáfnir (as the speaker) merely avails himself of a literary tradition concerning Odin, as in the *Vegtamskviða*. But that a means of identification does actually exist is shown by the fact that Odin in the *Vafþrúpnismál* is in possession of a secret which not even the wisest of giants possesses. Why attribute, then, Odin's refusal to divulge a secret which he alone possesses to a mere conventional literary form? Odin's refusal to divulge this secret is as natural as his desire to defeat the giant Vafþrúpnir by asking him an impossible question. In both instances he displays his superiority in wisdom. In instructing his pupil, Loddfáfnir, he thus takes occasion to show his mastery over the whole world of magic song and witchcraft by still keeping in secret the greatest of all mysteries, which only he and the god Balder ever have known.

In the last three lines of this strophe (163) Odin says that

—4

no one shall learn this secret from him except his wife or his sister:

Nema þeirri einni,  
er mic armi verr  
eða min systir se.

Save to her alone  
who shall embrace me,  
or to my sister.

Felix Niedner (p. 6, Note 1) holds that these lines are the literary fiction of Müllenhoff's "flunkerer," since Odin's wife, Frigg, according to the testimony of the Lokasenna (v. 29), knows the destiny of all things (*öllum orlofum*), and since there is no evidence that Odin ever had a sister. Any fiction to this effect, he says, would be in the mouth of the highest God a joke of the most insipid character. "Ich verstehe aber nicht, wie Bugge und Jónsson bei ihrer Ansicht die v. 163, als echten Abschluss beibehalten können: denn wenn Odin am Schluss sagt, er wolle sein achzehntes Lied niemand mitteilen, als seiner Gattin oder Schwester, so ist das erste allenfalls noch zu verstehen, da Frigg nach Lokas. 29 '*öllum orlofum*' kennt, aber von einer Schwester Odins ist sonst nirgends die Rede und die Fiktion einer solchen wäre doch im Munde des höchsten Gottes ein recht saftloser Scherz: jene Bemerkung erklärt sich nur als Witz eines Spielmannes, und zwar ein recht schlechter, wie Müllenhoff (a. a. O. S. 276) hervorgehoben hat."

I fear that Niedner has made too literal an interpretation of these three lines in question. We have here merely a reflection of Old Norse social conditions infused into the conception of Odin's relations to his family. Such a reflection is characteristic of all the Old Norse mythology. In fact, the *Völuspá* is a very vivid reflection of political and moral conditions of Norse society in the tenth century, and the *Hávamál* itself is for a large part a compendium of social and ethical maxims upon which that society based its rule of conduct. When Odin says that he will divulge this secret to no one except his wife or his sister, he refers to the intimate members of his own family. To confine

his secret to the bosom of his family is tantamount to still keeping his secret. A stranger cannot, in the nature of things, have a share in those secrets which are to be confined to the sacred precincts of family life. The holy relation of man to wife or to sister in the Old Norse family did not, as it does not in the family today, permit of such a breach of natural fidelity. Whether Frigg did or did not know "öll orlog," or whether Odin never did have a sister, the situation is not thereby in any way disturbed. Odin reflects the natural attitude of any Old Norse "paterfamilias" towards the members of his family and towards the outside world. Therefore, Loddfáfnir, the pupil, is refused this secret which Odin is willing to communicate to those who are confined within the sacred precincts of the family bond. Such an attitude does not reflect the character of a jocose minstrel who is inventing a situation which he thinks he will deceive his audience into believing, but the serious and responsible character of the god Odin himself. Such a responsible character is compatible with the Old Norse conception of Odin as the highest god. The dignified and elevated tone of the *Rúnatal* and the *Ljóðatal* is, by this attitude on the part of Odin, enhanced rather than diminished. Furthermore, the concluding strophe in which Odin refuses to divulge this secret is the culmination and final revelation of Odin's elevated character and all-masterful mind. From a literary view-point, therefore, this strophe proves the poet of the *Ljóðatal* to be a writer of highly artistic sense, in that he here sustains the dignified tone of his whole poem, and not to be, as Müllenhoff would have him (p. 295), "ein lockerer gesell." The *Loddfáfnismál*, on the other hand, is the work of a later interpolator, as Bugge suggests (326 ff.). That Odin here should descend from his dignified height in the *Rúnatal* and the *Ljóðatal* is not at all surprising when we consider the fact that the subject-matter in the *Loddfáfnismál* does not concern the mystical elements of witchcraft, runes or of magic songs (except perhaps in vv. 113, 114, where Odin warns Loddfáfnir never to sleep in a witch's bosom), but is the practical advice upon everyday matters given to a member of Old Norse society, who appears

in mythical form. Here the poet clothes his picture in a mythical garb, with Odin as the teacher and Loddfáfnir as the pupil. This is exactly the same relation as we have in the initial strophes of the *Hávamál*, vv. 1-78, which are arranged under the general title of the "Speech of the High One," only that in the *Loddfáfnismál* the relation between teacher and pupil is expressed. In fact, Finnur Jónsson believes (p. 49) that vv. 1-78 are not a "Spruchgedicht," as Müllenhoff would have them (p. 260), a mere collection of ethical and social maxims whose authorship is unknown, but that they are Odin's speech, the *Háva Mál*. In his wanderings upon earth, Odin has come to a farm, has been well received, and thus gives to men, in return for their kind hospitality, his wisdom and advice, in the form of social and ethical maxims. Both vv. 1-78 and the *Loddfáfnismál* serve as necessary members of the whole body of the *Hávamál*. In the *Loddfáfnismál*, Odin gives advice to his pupil, Loddfáfnir, in essentially the same manner as he does to an unknown audience in vv. 1-78. In fact, there are several verses in the *Loddfáfnismál* which seem to be direct reflections of certain verses in vv. 1-78: for instance, those which refer to friendship and the relations it involves: cf. vv. 42 ff. with vv. 119 ff. of the *Loddfáfnismál*. In v. 44 we have:

*Veitstu, ef þu vin átt  
þann er þu vel trúir,  
oc vill þu af hanom gott geta:  
geði scaltu við þann blanda  
oc giofom scipta,  
fara at finna opt.*

In v. 119:

*veitstu ef þu vin át  
þannz þu vel trúir,  
farðu at finna opt.*

And in v. 124:

*síðom er þa blandat.*

In the *Loddfáfnismál* the relation between Odin and his audience, which we have in vv. 1-78, is given poetical expression by

the presence of a mythical pupil, Loddfáfnir (cf. B. 335 ff.). Thus the Loddfáfnismál is essentially a Háva Mál immediately connected with the Rúnatal and the Ljóðatal by a later interpolator who misunderstood the significance of line 8 in the initial strophe (111) of the Rúnatal:—*ne of rǫpum þegþo*—believing “*rǫpum*” to mean “advice” rather than “the interpretation of magic runes” (p. 327 ff.). Having seen that Loddfáfnir was addressed in v. 162, the interpolator caused the “*rǫþ*” (advice) likewise to be addressed to Loddfáfnir in vv. 112-137, forming the so-called Loddfáfnismál. This advice given to Loddfáfnir is in keeping with the same conditions of Norse society to which vv. 1-78 give expression. V. 112 of the Loddfáfnismál, which gave Müllenhoff grounds for believing the speaker to be a “landfahrer” and a “flunkerer,” is a picture of Old Norse social conditions true to the history of civilization, as Hjalmar Falk points out (*Maal og Minne*, Vol. I, Christiania, 1910). In the *Ynlinga Saga* (C. 14) it said of the King: “*um nóttina gekk hann út í svalir at leita ser staðar.*” So, too, Odin, in v. 112, warns Loddfáfnir:

*Nótt þú risat  
nema á niðsn ser,  
eða þu leitir þer innan ut staðar.*

Hence the discrepancy in tone between the Loddfáfnismál, on the one hand, which, like vv. 1-78, deals with matters of practical wisdom, and the Rúnatal and Ljóðatal, on the other hand, which deals with the mystical elements of nature and the gods. All three lays, however, form a consistent part of the whole Hávamál.

Loddfáfnir is, therefore, not a “landfahrer” or a “flunkerer,” but a mythical character whom Odin addresses as his pupil and instructs in the art of witchcraft and magic songs, and to whom finally (due to the work of a later interpolator) he imparts his advice upon affairs of practical wisdom.<sup>1</sup> That Loddfáfnir is an

<sup>1</sup> Yet it is not necessary to change *manna mál* (V. 111, l. 6) to *Háva mál*, as Müllenhoff maintains (252 ff.). In the first place, the reading *manna mál* is supported by the plural verb *þegþo* in l. 8, as B. remarks (p. 331). Secondly, it is perfectly conceivable that Odin at

historical character, a minstrel such as Müllenhoff maintains, is not at all probable in the light of the facts shown in the foregoing analysis.

The character of the eighteenth and last magic song (v. 163) has, therefore, thrown additional light upon the relation of Odin to Loddfáfnir. The analysis of this strophe has served to weaken Müllenhoff's theory that the speaker in the Loddfáfnismál, Rúnatal and Ljóðatal is not Odin, but the literary invention of a clever minstrel. Bugge, on the other hand, seems to me to have found the true relation of things, but has failed to explain two very important points. In the first place, he maintains that the Loddfáfnismál is the work of a later interpolator, which accounts for the difference in tone between the Loddfáfnismál, on the one hand, and the Rúnatal-Ljóðatal, on the other; but yet he does not sufficiently support his own contention. The foregoing analysis shows that the difference in tone between these two parts of the Hávamál is due to the fact that the Loddfáfnismál is a part of the Háva Mál (Speech of the High One), which, like vv. 1-78, deals with things of practical wisdom, given in the form of advice to a mythical pupil, Loddfáfnir; while the Rúnatal and Ljóðatal deal with witchcraft, magic songs and the mysteries of nature. Secondly, Bugge has given no explanation either as to the nature of the eighteenth magic song or as to the reason why Odin refuses to divulge it. The foregoing analysis shows that there is actually a mystical secret of which Odin is in possession, and, furthermore, it shows why this secret could serve as a fitting culmination to Odin's imposing array of magic songs.

the "Urðar brunn" is addressing an audience one of whom is Loddfáfnir. Loddfáfnir may, therefore, be the individual and personal representative of Odin's audience. The "Speech of the High One" in the Loddfáfnismál, Rúnatal and Ljóðatal is thus addressed to a mythical individual, while in vv. 1-78 Odin's audience is not specified.

Furthermore, the "Urðar brunn" (V. 111, l. 3), where Odin addresses his audience, is the regular meeting-place for the council of the gods (tingsted) and as such may be conceived as the "Hall of the High One" (*Hávahǫllu* í) since Odin is the chief member of the assembly and its speaker upon this occasion. Odin's "Hall" is here the place of assembly at the "Urðar brunn."

This analysis of strophe 163 of the *Ljóðatal*, therefore, serves to strengthen and extend Bugge's position, which, on the whole, has been accepted by Old Norse scholars as essentially correct.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Kansas University, October, 1910.