

‘The influence of the Latin Tradition on Snorri Sturluson’s writings’

During the second half of the twentieth century, several scholars emphasised what they took to be the learned Christian Latin background to Snorri Sturluson’s writings. For example, Walter Baetke (1952) and Anne Holtmark (1964) believed that Snorri interpreted Heathen mythology in the light of Christian theology and Ursula and Peter Dronke (1977), I myself (Faulkes 1978–9, 1983), and Margaret Clunies Ross (1987) pointed to various Latin sources, Classical, Biblical or Medieval, as possibly contributing to Snorri’s understanding of the heathen religion. This approach has mainly been concerned with the *Prose Edda*, in particular the *Prologue* to *Gylfaginning*, the foreign origin of the ideas of which had long before been argued by Andreas Heusler (1908). Heusler, however, did not believe that the *Prologue* was by Snorri Sturluson, and if he was right, much of the evidence for Snorri’s use of Latin sources disappears. In fact he argued that the use of foreign sources in the *Prologue*, which he described as ‘ein elendes Machwerk’ (‘a sorry piece of work’), was itself an argument against Snorri’s authorship. He believed Snorri would have based all his writing on native tradition. Only occasionally has anyone tried to argue for the influence of Latin Historiography on *Heimskringla* (apart from the mythological *Ynglinga saga*; see Diana Whaley (1991), 81). No one to my knowledge has argued for Latin influence on *Egils saga*, which, like the *Prologue* to *Gylfaginning*, may not be by Snorri anyway. Jakob Benediktsson, in his investigation of the extent of the influence of the Latin rules of *cursus* on Old Norse literature (1974), found that Snorri’s *Óláfs saga helga*, *Heimskringla* and *Egils saga* showed no more adherence to the rules of *cursus* than other native vernacular texts.

It is noteworthy that Ursula and Peter Dronke and Margaret Clunies Ross laid great stress on the fact that the concepts they identified as being derived from particular Latin authors appeared in the *Prose Edda* in the same order as in the supposed originals; in addition, in the case of Ursula and Peter Dronke, that aspects of the work they identified as influencing Snorri were different in the Old Norse translation that might otherwise have been his source from what was in the original Latin. The order in which a series of concepts are presented may, however, simply reflect the natural order in which such concepts presented themselves to the medieval mind. Or, of course, the order of the concepts and the presence of details not in the extant translations of the Latin originals may simply be based on fuller translations that have

not survived, or on an oral vernacular presentation of them. For even more remarkable is the fact that none of the writers mentioned has been able to point to any verbal correspondence in Snorri's work with a Latin source. It is only the concepts that can be said to be similar. He has no quotations from or references to non-Icelandic works, and unlike the priest Ari fiorgilsson he does not scatter Latin words in his text, or use Latin in his headings (Ari's surviving work is labelled *Libellus Islandorum*). Though he has prologues like Latin writers, Snorri's prologues do not include the same standard topics as those of writers in Latin (see Sverrir Tómasson 1988). In his well-known discussion of the importance of skaldic verse in the prologue to *Heimskringla* he directly contradicts the views of most Classical historians, who generally did not regard poetry as suitable for use as a historical source.

There are two words apparently used by Snorri that seem possibly to be loan-words or loan-translations from Latin. One is the term *fornafn*, which he uses in his discussion of the rhetorical devices of *kenning* and *heiti* in *Skáldskaparmál*, the second part of his *Edda*. This means 'pronoun' in Modern Icelandic and seems likely to be a loan-translation or calque of Latin *pronomen*. But although there has been much discussion of its exact meaning in *Skáldskaparmál*, it certainly does not mean pronoun there (as it does, by the way, in Snorri's *Háttatal*). It probably means the same as Latin *pronominatio*, for which the more usual term was *anonomasia*, the Greek term: that is, an expression that stands in place of (for, *pro*) a proper noun (*nomen proprium*). It is not therefore, a third category beside those of *kenning* and *heiti*, but refers to those expressions, whether kennings or *heiti*, that replace proper nouns or the names of individual people. While one might argue that this use of the term speaks for considerable knowledge of Latin rhetorical theory, in fact I think it supports the opposite view, that someone who could misuse one of the simplest of Latin grammatical terms like this, and shows no knowledge of any other aspect of Latin grammar or rhetoric, was very ignorant indeed. He has picked up a term from someone else, while his own rhetorical treatise is quite independent of classical rhetorical theory. This is shown most clearly in the fact that he shows almost no interest in metaphor or simile. Most of his explanations of kennings relate them to various pseudo-historical narratives, rather than interpreting them as figures of speech, as with, for instance, the kenning 'fire of the sea' for gold, which he claims originated from the time when Ægir, a personification of the sea, used *l̥sigull* ('shining gold') to illuminate his hall when he entertained the Æsir to a feast (*Skáldskaparmál* ch. 33). His explanations, both of kennings and of the myths that he claims underlie them, are nearly always aetiological (as for instance when *fiórr*'s

drinking from a horn whose lower end is out in the sea is explained as the origin of tides), as is the case with most primitive mythology, rather than being based on any kind of symbolism.

The other word which might suggest knowledge of Latin is the title *Edda*. It is not certain that Snorri himself gave the work this title. It first appears in the Uppsala *Edda*, a manuscript written probably in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, at least sixty years after Snorri's death (it was not applied to the so-called *Poetic Edda* until the seventeenth century, and then as a result of a misunderstanding about that book's authorship). As a common noun, *edda* means great-grand-mother in Old Icelandic, and though attempts have been made to derive the title from that word or alternatively from the Old Icelandic *óðr* 'poetry' or the place-name Oddi, it seems most likely that the interpretation of the seventeenth-century Icelandic priest Magnús Ólafsson, who produced the version of the *Prose Edda* known as the *Laufás Edda*, which became the basis of the first printed edition in 1665, is correct, that it is derived from Latin *edo* just as *kredda* ('popularly held belief or superstition') is clearly based on Latin *credo*. That is, *Edda* is 'a little book of (or about) poetry' (see Faulkes 1977; Stefán Karlsson 1971; the doubling of the *d* makes the word hypocoristic). It would then be a sort of ironically denigratory term, implying that the *Prose Edda* bore the same relationship to proper (that is Latin) treatises on poetry as firáðr í Gftu's *kredda* in *Færeyinga saga* to the proper Christian creed. The trouble with this explanation is that *edo* in Latin does not normally mean 'compose poetry'. It usually means 'publish' or 'produce', though there are a couple of places in Ovid's verse where it might mean 'compose poetry (about)'. If the name *Edda* is based on Latin *edo*, the invention suggests a person with a minimal grasp of the Latin language.

Besides these two words, the three categories in the discussion of verse-forms given at the beginning of *Háttatal*, *setning*, *leyfi* and *fyrirboðning* (rule, licence and prohibition), are so reminiscent of the three divisions of language in Donatus, *pars praeceptiva*, *pars permissiva* and *pars prohibitiva* (preceptive part, permissive part, prohibitive part), that they must be connected. But the first of the three Latin terms is taken to relate to Donatus' Books 1 and 2 (on orthography and grammar) and the second and third to his Book 3 (on figures of speech), while Snorri uses his Icelandic terms of categories of metre and verse-form. Moreover, while he divides *setning* into various sub-categories, he has only a few examples of *leyfi*, and none of *fyrirboðning*. It seems that he had never actually read Donatus.

One of the ideas about pagan gods that has been mentioned most often is euhemerism. This is the theory attributed to a Greek philosopher Euhemerus (c.300

BC), whose works have not survived, but who is thought to have been the first to propose that pagan gods were powerful kings who came to be worshipped as gods after their deaths. This idea was widespread in the Middle Ages, usually among historians. Theologians preferred to think of heathen gods as disguised devils — a concept of which there is actually little trace in Snorri’s writing. The *Prologue* to *Gylfaginning* barely mentions the euhemeristic possibility, and *Gylfaginning* and *Skáldskaparmál* do not really offer any coherent explanation of the heathen gods’ origin, but euhemerism underlies the presentation of Norse gods in *Ynglinga saga*, the first section of his *Heimskringla*. But Snorri would not have needed to read Latin to get this idea. It is widespread in earlier Icelandic writings such as Ari fiorgilsson’s *Book of the Icelanders*, and in *Skjfldunga saga*, one of Snorri’s acknowledged sources in *Heimskringla*.

More plausible use of classical sources might be expected to be found in the passages in the *Prologue* to *Gylfaginning*, *Gylfaginning* chs 9 and 54 and *Ynglinga saga* that allude to the story of the Trojan War. He calls Troy *inn forni Ásgar>r* (the old Ásgar>r or seat of the Æsir, the Norse gods). He says very little else about Troy, and most of what he does say is wrong. He says there were twelve kingdoms there and one high king, and twelve chief languages (if we do not emend the text to mean twelve chieftains). The high king was called Priam, but none of the other persons he mentions in connection with this part of his narrative have any place in classical legend. These are Priam’s daughter Troan, her husband Munon or Mennon, their son Tror (‘whom we call fiórr’, he writes), with a foster-father Loricus, ruler of Thrace, and his wife Lora or Glora. Of Tror he says:

When he was ten he inherited his father’s weapons. He was as beautiful to look at when he came among other people as when ivory is inlaid in oak. His hair is more beautiful than gold. When he was twelve he had reached his full strength. Then he lifted from the ground ten bearskins all at once and then he killed his foster-father Loricus and his wife Lora or Glora and took possession of the realm of Thrace. We call this firúheimr. Then he travelled through many countries and explored all quarters of the world and defeated unaided all berserks and giants and one of the greatest dragons and many wild animals. In the northern part of the world he came across a prophetess called Sibyl, whom we call Sif, and married her. No one is able to tell Sif’s ancestry. She was the most beautiful of all women, her hair was like gold. Their son was Lori>i

— and then follows the invented genealogy down to Ó>inn. This is indeed *ein elendes Machwerk*, which has no known source either native or foreign, and appears to be just a collection of conventional elements mainly from *fornaldarsögur* and Romance sagas. There is also a passage in *Skáldskaparmál* (the so-called *Epilogue*, Faulkes 1998, 6) that mentions some details of the Troy story, such the killing of Hector by

Achilles, of Achilles by Alexander and of Priam by Pyrrhus, as well as the actual burning of Troy, which the writer (if it was Snorri: this is another passage labelled by some editors an interpolation) interprets as the basis of various items in Norse mythology which are taken to be allegorical retellings of them. Incidentally, this is one of the very few examples of the use of allegorical interpretation, almost all-pervasive in Medieval Latin writings, in a native Icelandic work; and is therefore suspect. All the accurate details of the Troy story in this passage could be derived from the Old Norse *Trójumanna saga* ('Story of the Trojans'); none of them comes direct from any Latin source. Here again, the picture is one of a writer who has acquired a smattering of knowledge about Classical literature and is not above parading it to support his argument about an Old Norse tradition (in this case, the origin of the Æsir in Asia Minor); but no one with any real knowledge of Latin literature could have written this. A little learning is indeed a dangerous thing. You can easily get found out.

Allegory becomes all-pervasive in Latin writings during the Middle Ages, and could be said to be one of the most characteristic ways of thinking and writing. It is also the commonest way of treating pagan (i.e. Classical) mythology, as in Martianus Capella (fifth century) and Fulgentius (early sixth century). These writers also had great influence on various western vernacular writers. Allegory was particularly used in order to give ancient texts a moral meaning acceptable to medieval Christianity, and moral allegories were widespread throughout the Middle Ages, as for instance in versions of Æsop's *Fables*. Along with allegory, personification and various kinds of symbolism were widespread in narrative, and interpretations of Old Testament narratives were commonly based on these ways of reading. One of the features of Old Icelandic prose writing in the Middle Ages that distinguish it, not only from Medieval Latin literature, but also from most other vernacular traditions, is the almost complete absence of allegory and personification as well as of figures of speech. The best-known example of allegory that does exist in Old Norse prose is the Dedication homily, which appears to be an adaptation of some Latin text or texts, while in poetry Einarr Skúlason's *Geisli* is perhaps the best example.

Unlike Fulgentius and many other Medieval Latin writers, Snorri does not interpret mythology allegorically, nor does he derive moral teaching from it. The closest he comes is in the passage in *Gylfaginning* (ch. 35) on the *Ásynjur* (goddesses).

Hnoss is the name of their [Freyja and Óðr's] daughter. She is so beautiful that from her name whatever is beautiful and precious is called *hnossir* (treasures) . . . Seventh is Sjöfn. She is much concerned to direct people's minds to love, both women and men. It is from her name that affection is called *sjafni*.

Eighth Lofn: she is so kind and good to pray to that she gets leave from All-father or Frigg for people's union, between women and men, even if before it was forbidden or refused. Hence it is from her name that it is called *lof* (permission), as well as when something is praised (*lofat*) greatly by people. Ninth Vár: she listens to people's oaths and private agreements that women and men make between each other. Thus these contracts are called *várar*. She also punishes those who break them. Tenth Vfr: she is wise and enquiring, so that nothing can be concealed from her. There is a saying that a woman becomes aware (*vfr*) of something when she finds it out. Eleventh Syn: she guards the doors of the hall and shuts them against those who are not to enter, and she is appointed as a defence at assemblies against matters that she wishes to refute. Thus there is a saying that a denial (*syn*) is made when one says no. Twelfth Hlín: she is given the function of protecting people whom Frigg wishes to save from some danger. From this comes the saying that someone who escapes finds refuge (*hleinir*). Thirteenth Snotra; she is wise and courteous. From her name a woman or man who is a wise person is called *snotr*.

Neither the first six of the goddesses in Snorri's account, nor any of the male gods, are interpreted in this way. It is doubtful whether all the goddesses listed by Snorri were the object of cults in heathen times. The interpretations I have just quoted are unlikely to be traditional, and they are actually just folk-etymology of their names rather than real allegories or personifications. They are very unlike the accounts of pagan figures in Medieval Latin. The only place in the *Prose Edda* — or in any of the writings attributed to Snorri Sturluson — where actual allegory is used is in the so-called *Epilogue* in *Skáldskaparmál* (between chs. 1 and 2):

King Priam in Troy was a great ruler over all the host of Turks, and his sons were the highest in rank in his whole host. That magnificent hall that the Æsir called Brimir's hall or beer-hall, was King Priam's hall. And whereas they give a long account of Ragnarøkkr, this is the Trojan war. The story goes that ʒku-fiórr used an ox-head as bait and pulled the Midgard serpent up to the gunwale, but the serpent survived by sinking into the sea. This story is based on the one about how Hector killed the splendid hero Volucrontes (this name, apparently an error for Polypoetes, is only otherwise found in the *Hauksbók* version of *Trójumanna saga*) while the great Achilles was looking on, and thus lured Achilles towards him with the head of the slain man whom they saw as corresponding to the ox from which fiórr had taken the head. And when Achilles had been drawn into this dangerous situation by his impetuosity, then the only way for him to save his life was to run away from Hector's deadly stroke, wounded though he was. It is also said that Hector pressed his attack so violently, and that his valour was raised to such a pitch when he saw Achilles that there was nothing strong enough to stand before him. And when he missed Achilles and he had fled, he slaked his wrath by killing a hero called Roddrus (the source of this name is unknown). In the same way the Æsir said that when ʒku-fiórr missed the serpent, he killed giant Hymir; and at Ragnarøkkr the Midgard serpent came with frightening suddenness against fiórr and blew poison on him and struck him his death-blow, but the Æsir did not like to admit that ʒku-fiórr had died as a result of one person overthrowing him in death even though such had been the case, and they exaggerated the story beyond what was true, when they said that the Midgard serpent suffered death there. But they adduced this, that though Achilles gained victory over Hector, yet he was to lie dead on the same field as a result. This was achieved by Helenus and Alexander. This Helenus was called Áli by the Æsir. They say that he avenged his brother and survived when all the gods were dead and the fire, with which Ásgarðr and all the possessions of the gods were burned, was extinguished. As for Pyrrhus, they saw him as corresponding to Fenriswolf; it killed Óinn, and Pyrrhus could be said to be a wolf according to their religion, for he paid no respect to places of sanctuary when he killed the king in the temple in front of fiórr's altar. What they call Surtr's fire was when Troy burned. And ʒku-fiórr's sons, Móði and Magni, came to claim lands from Áli or Viðarr. The latter is Aeneas, he escaped from Troy and later achieved great deeds. Similarly it is also said that Hector's sons arrived in the land of Phrygia and established themselves in that kingdom, driving Helenus out.

This also is not allegory of the kind found in medieval Latin writers like Fulgentius, for here the Norse gods (and trolls) are taken to be equivalent to Greek and Trojan heroes, and their deeds are versions of the deeds of those heroes (the technique is rather similar to that of the *roman à clef*, whereas in true allegory characters represent abstractions). So this way of reading mythology is closest to euhemerism: the Greek and Trojan heroes came to be regarded as gods after their deaths, their deeds were transferred into supernatural ones, and their names changed. It is nothing like the allegories of Latin tradition, and there is little or no moralisation. The writer of this passage, whether it was Snorri or not, had clearly come across allegory, but has not fully understood how it works. His allegorisation of the Greek story does not give it any coherent non-historical meaning. His equivalences are also mostly preposterous, and there are many mistakes or misunderstandings of the Greek story. It cannot be used as evidence that the author was greatly acquainted with Medieval Latin tradition.

One of the most striking details in the account of the origin of heathen worship in the *Prologue* to *Gylfaginning* is where the author describes nature worship and comments: ‘En alla hluti skilðu fleir jarðligri skilningu flvíat fleim var eigi gefin andlig spekin. Svá skilðu fleir at allir hlutir væri smíðir af nokkuru efni.’ (‘They understood everything with earthly understanding because they were not granted spiritual wisdom. Thus they assumed that all things were created out of some material’.) Much of this part of the *Prologue* is a development of the ideas of Psalm 18: 2 (19: 1; ‘The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork’), Wisdom 13: 5 (‘For by the greatness and beauty of the creatures proportionately the maker of them is seen’) and Romans 1: 20 (‘For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they [the heathen — St Paul is talking about those who have not received revelation] are without excuse’; see Faulkes 1983, 291). But the final comment alludes to the debate about creation *ex nihilo* which goes back at least to the time of Plato, was still very much alive in the Middle Ages and continues down to the present day. The Biblical passages I have mentioned were favourite texts for exegesis and sermons in the Middle Ages, and much of this part of the *Prologue* could have been derived from a sermon orally delivered in Iceland in Snorri’s time. Indeed one of the possible sources most often mentioned is the sixth-century Martin of Braga’s Sermon *De correctione rusticorum*, parts of which appear in Old English among Ælfric and Wulfstan’s homilies; Ælfric’s version was translated freely into Old Norse and is preserved in

Hauksbók. Snorri's account is not closer to the vernacular versions than to their Latin original, but if he had knowledge of Martin of Braga's sermon it would have been from listening to an oral Old Norse version of it in church or by talking about such matters to learned friends. And this is how I believe such knowledge as he had of Medieval Latin theological writings would have come to him. One of his friends was the historian and priest Styrmir Kárason, later prior at the monastery on Viðey, author of a saga of St Óláfr and of a version of the *Book of Settlements*.

I am not trying to denigrate Snorri's achievement in writing *Heimskringla* and the *Prose Edda*. They are very great works, of enormous intellectual power; very different from Sagas of Kings by clerical writers and from the vernacular treatises on rhetoric by men learned in Latin. But they are great in spite of — or indeed perhaps because of — the fact that their author was not learned in the Christian Latin tradition. He was very learned in Scandinavian oral and literary tradition, and has given us the best accounts of Scandinavian history and poetry there are; and they are the best because they are not seen through the eyes of a medieval theologian, but through the eyes of an aristocratic Icelandic layman. My views of Snorri's intellectual stance (Faulkes 1993), I find, are rather similar to those of Klaus von See (2001).

‘The influence of the Latin Tradition on Snorri Sturluson's writings’

Abstract:

It has usually been assumed that Snorri Sturluson, both as historian and mythographer, was a learned writer, within the tradition of European historiography and the Christian Latin tradition of medieval Europe. His euhemeristic attitude to the pre-Christian pagan religion of Scandinavia seems to support this, and attempts have been made to interpret his rhetoric, political attitudes and historical method in the light of contemporary historical writing. But there is little trace of any knowledge of the Latin language in his works, nor any verbal correspondence with any Latin texts. His treatment of grammatical categories and of classical legend such as the story of the Trojan War suggests that he was almost entirely ignorant of Latin tradition on these topics. He rarely if ever uses any of the characteristic modes of Latin writing, such as allegory or symbolism, or the classical figures of speech, or any kind of figurative language (in his prose writings).

It is the contention of this paper that Snorri's euhemerism is derived from earlier vernacular writers such as the priest Ari fiorgilsson, and that such knowledge as he had of Christian theology and Latin writings was derived from oral communications from learned friends, or from vernacular preaching in churches. His historical, mythological and grammatical learning was almost exclusively derived from native vernacular writings. He had no Latin learning.

Words:

edda — Latin *edo*; *fornafn* — Latin *pronomen*, *pronominatio*
setning, *leyfi*, *fyrirboðning* — Latin *pars praeceptiva*, *pars permissiva*, *pars prohibitiva*

Quotations:

1. When he was ten he inherited his father's weapons. He was as beautiful to look at when he came among other people as when ivory is inlaid in oak. His hair is more beautiful than gold. When he was twelve he had reached his full strength. Then he lifted from the ground ten bearskins all at once and then he killed his foster-father Loricus and his wife Lora or Glora and took possession of the realm of Thrace. We call this *firúheimr*. Then he travelled through many countries and explored all quarters of the world and defeated unaided all berserks and giants and one of the greatest dragons and many wild animals. In the northern part of the world he came across a prophetess called Sibyl, whom we call Sif, and married her. No one is able to tell Sif's ancestry. She was the most beautiful of all women, her hair was like gold. Their son was Loriði . . . (Snorri Sturluson, *Edda*, translated by Anthony Faulkes, p. 3)

2. Hnoss is the name of their [Freyja and Óðr's] daughter. She is so beautiful that from her name whatever is beautiful and precious is called *hnossir* (treasures) . . . Seventh is Sjǫfn. She is much concerned to direct people's minds to love, both women and men. It is from her name that affection is called *sjafni*. Eighth Lofn: she is so kind and good to pray to that she gets leave from All-father or Frigg for people's union, between women and men, even if before it was forbidden or refused. Hence it is from her name that it is called *lof* (permission), as well as when something is praised (*lofat*) greatly by people. Ninth Vár: she listens to people's oaths and private agreements that women and men make between each other. Thus these contracts are called *várar*. She also punishes those who break them. Tenth Vǫfr: she is wise and enquiring, so that nothing can be concealed from her. There is a saying that a woman becomes aware (*vǫfr*) of something when she finds it out. Eleventh Syn: she guards the doors of the hall and shuts them against those who are not to enter, and she is appointed as a defence at assemblies against matters that she wishes to refute. Thus there is a saying that a denial (*syn*) is made when one says no. Twelfth Hlín: she is given the function of protecting people whom Frigg wishes to save from some danger. From this comes the saying that someone who escapes finds refuge (*hleinir*). Thirteenth Snotra; she is wise and courteous. From her name a woman or man who is a wise person is called *snotr*. (ibid., pp. 29–30)

3. King Priam in Troy was a great ruler over all the host of Turks, and his sons were the highest in rank in his whole host. That magnificent hall that the Æsir called Brimir's hall or beer-hall, was King Priam's hall. And whereas they give a long account of Ragnarøkkr, this is the Trojan war. The story goes that Þku-fiórr used an ox-head as bait and pulled the Midgard serpent up to the gunwale, but the serpent survived by sinking into the sea. This story is based on the one about how Hector killed the splendid hero Volucrontes (this name, apparently an error for Polypoetes, is only otherwise found in the *Hauksbók* version of *Trójumanna saga*) while the great Achilles was looking on, and thus lured Achilles towards him with the head of the slain man whom they saw as corresponding to the ox from which fiórr had taken the head. And when Achilles had been drawn into this dangerous situation by his impetuosity, then the only way for him to save his life was to run away from Hector's deadly stroke, wounded though he was. It is also said that Hector pressed his attack so violently, and that his valour was raised to such a pitch when he saw Achilles that there was nothing strong enough to stand before him. And when he missed Achilles and he had fled, he slaked his wrath by killing a hero called Roddrus (the source of this name is unknown). In the same way the Æsir said that when Þku-fiórr missed the serpent, he killed giant Hymir; and at Ragnarøkkr the Midgard serpent came with frightening suddenness against fiórr and blew poison on him and struck him his death-blow, but the Æsir did not like to admit that Þku-fiórr had died as a result of one person overthrowing him in death even though such had been the case, and they exaggerated the story beyond what was true, when they said that the Midgard serpent suffered death there. But they adduced this, that though Achilles gained victory over Hector, yet he was to lie dead on the same field as a result. This was achieved by Helenus and Alexander. This Helenus was called Áli by the Æsir. They say that he avenged his brother and survived when all the gods were dead and the fire, with which Ásgarðr and all the possessions of the gods were burned, was extinguished. As for Pyrrhus, they saw him as corresponding to Fenriswolf; it killed Óðinn, and Pyrrhus could be said to be a wolf according to their religion, for he paid no respect to places of sanctuary when he killed the king in the temple in front of fiórr's altar. What they call Surtr's fire was when Troy burned. And Þku-fiórr's sons, Móði and Magni, came to claim lands from Áli or Viðarr. The latter is Aeneas, he escaped from Troy and later achieved great deeds. Similarly it is also said that Hector's sons arrived in the land of Phrygia and established themselves in that kingdom, driving Helenus out. (ibid., pp. 65–6)

References:

- Walter Baetke (1950): *Die Götterlehre der Snorra-Edda*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse 97, 3).
- Jakob Benediktsson (1974): 'Cursus in Old Norse Literature', *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 7, pp. 15–21.
- Ursula and Peter Dronke (1977): 'The Prologue of the Prose *Edda*: Explorations of a Latin Background', *Sjötú ritgerðir helgaðar Jakobi Benediktssyni*, pp. 153–176. Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar.
- Anthony Faulkes (1978–9): 'Descent from the gods', *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 11 [1983], pp. 92–125.
- Anthony Faulkes (1983) : 'Pagan Sympathy: Attitudes to Heathendom in the Prologue to Snorra Edda', in *Edda: A Collection of Essays*, ed. R. J. Glendinning and H. Bessason, Manitoba, pp. 283–314 (University of Manitoba Icelandic Studies 4).
- Anthony Faulkes (1977): 'Edda', *Gripla* II, Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, pp. 32–39.
- Anthony Faulkes (1993): 'The sources of Skáldskaparmál: Snorri's intellectual background', in *Snorri Sturluson. Kolloquium anlässlich der 750. Wiederkehr seines Todestages*. Herausgegeben von Alois Wolf. Tübingen: Gunther Narr, pp. 59–76 (ScriptOralia 51).
- Anthony Faulkes (1998): Snorri Sturluson. *Edda. Skáldskaparmál*. 1. Introduction, Text and Notes; 2. Glossary and Index of Names. London: Viking Society for Northern Research.
- Andreas Heusler (1908): *Die gelehrte Urgeschichte im altisländischen Skrifftum*. Berlin: Verlag der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Anne Holtsmark (1964): *Studier i Snorres mytologi*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget (Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II. Hist-filos. klasse. Ny serie no. 4).
- Margaret Clunies Ross (1987): *Skáldskaparmál: Snorri Sturluson's ars poetica and Medieval Theories of Language*. Odense: Odense University Press (The Viking Collection 4).
- Klaus von See (2001): 'Snorri Sturluson and the Creation of a Norse Cultural Ideology', *Saga-Book* XXV:4, pp. 367–393.
- Stefán Karlsson (1971): 'Eddukredda', in *Bríarí á sextugsafmæli Halldórs Halldórssonar 13. júlí 1971*, pp. 25–33.
- Sverrir Tómasson (1988): *Formálar íslenskra saganaritara á miðöldum. Rannsókn Bókmenntahefðar*. Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar.
- Diana Whaley (1991): *Heimskringla. An Introduction*. London: Viking Society for Northern Research.