

Carlo Alberto MASTRELLI
Università di Firenze

REFLECTIONS OF GERMANIC COSMOGONY IN THE 'KENNINGAR'
FOR "MAN/WOMAN"

In a memorable article, Franz Specht (1) accepts the comparison of the Gothic fairhwus "κόσμος, world" with the Latin quercus previously advanced by Grimm (2) and by Vendryes (3); he formulates the hypothesis that the Indo-Europeans saw in the "oak" the "vital force" and thus the same origin of the "world" and the "man" who lives in it.

This idea has been accepted by G. Bonfante also (4), who, subsequently developed it including in the equation "tree" = "world" = "man" also the concept of "universe" (5).

No one has returned to the subject to my knowledge and even etymological dictionaries of the Germanic languages that have been subsequently republished, reveal a degree of scepticism: see, for example, De Vries who s.v. fjōr "Leben" asserts "Die Etymologie ist unklar" (6). Yet, as far as Friedrich (7) has expressed a certain leaning towards that etymological interpretation, Lehmann (8), on the subject of the Gothic fairhwus remains very sceptical: "Etymology disputed".

It is strange, moreover, that this stimulating hypothesis has not been treated or even discussed in the otherwise valuable Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte by De Vries (9).

Quite recently, Meid (10) has returned to the question, confirming the etymology PERK^{WO}- / PERK^W-; this root would have had the meaning "life, vital force, protoplasm" and from this root would have derived two independent lexical sets of words, one relating to "vegetal life", the other relating to "animal life, human life" (11). The solution proposed appears resourceful, but not cogent for two reasons: 1) the root PERK^W- is never attested with the meaning of "life"; (2) the transition from the notion of "oak" to that of "life" can be "Unsinn" for our modern mentality, but it is not said that it could not be obtainable in the Indo-European historical-cultural dimension. There are too many examples of words that, through the action of historical-cultural events, have taken on with time meanings that are very distant from, and sometimes even contrasting with, the etymological premises.

However, even if I do not share his hypothesis, it is significant that Meid maintains the etymological comparison among all the words of the family. Indeed, even when Meid's argument was firmly established, it can not be excluded that in the speaker's awareness the two sets of words ("vegetal life" and "animal life") were felt to be interconnected and interdependent: it should be remembered that "the tree of the world" forms part of a precise cosmogonical vision of the Germanic peoples!

At this point, I maintain on the contrary that the equation "tree" = "universe" = "world" = "man" is correct and that rightly one can go back - through the evidence of the Greek, Indian, Latin and Germanic - to a significant and important historical-cultural period of the Indo-Europeans.

Yet even leaving out of the question whether or not one accepts the hypothesis that was advanced by Specht or Bonfante, I am of the view that careful consideration of the data concerning Germanic religion, and in particular the Nordic one, can be used to illuminate in a decisive manner the deep reason for that set of 'kenningar' for the concept of "man" and "woman" that derive from common nouns for "tree" and from names of specific trees.

Meissner (12) has put together 'kenningar' formed by means of at least fourteen names of "tree": almr m. "elm-tree", apaldr m. "apple-tree", askr m. "ash", björk f. "birch", búss m. (< lat. buxus "box"), einir m. "juniper", elrir m. "alder-tree", hegg m. "bird-cherry", hlymr m. "maple-tree", palmr m. "palm(-tree)", reynir m. "rowan-tree", pollr m. "(young) fir-tree", þorn m. "thorn", qlr m. "alder-tree".

Other 'kenningar' are on the other hand formed with five generic nouns for "tree": bþrr m. "a kind of tree (conifer?)", fiþrr m. "a kind of tree (fir?)", lundr m. "grove", funnr m. "bush ~ grove", viðr m. "tree ~ forest ~ wood".

Meissner (13) points out that lundr, viðr and runnr are never used in their collective sense, so that, when it is a question of expressing the plural sense, recourse is made to the morphological plural. From this, one gains the impression that lundr and runnr are 'variationes' derived previously from viðr that has both the singular meaning ("tree") and the collective meaning ("wood, forest"); the 'kenningar' with lundr and runnr would therefore have emerged from the collective meaning that viðr had besides the "singularising" one. Meissner, moreover, pointed out (14) that lundr, runnr and viðr are particularly frequent in the more recent skaldic poetry; nevertheless the fact that viðr is already used in an eddic poem is quite significant Sigrdrífomál 29, 5: druccin deila scalattu við dólgyðo.

It seems therefore that the oldest 'kenningar' were formed from the names of particular trees; it is therefore

not just by chance that the collectives derived from the name for a specific tree have been used in their precise collective meaning: cf. birki "birch-wood" and eiki "oak-grove".

As it is well known, the majority of these 'kenningar' do not designate so much "man" understood in the general sense, as much as man as the "warrior"; and it is perhaps for this reason that Krause (15) maintained that the 'kenningar' with the 'determinatum' "tree" had emerged in order to emphasize "strength" and "firmness" of the "warrior": "(Der Krieger)...andererseits im Kampfgetümmel fest wie ein Baum; daher die vielen Umschreibungen im Sinne von 'Baum' des Kampfes".

In no way do I believe that this can be the right interpretation. In my view, the explanation is to be sought in quite another direction and precisely in the Nordic concept of cosmogony, according to which, after the creation of the earth, the gods succeeded in creating the first men in the following way: Borr's sons found on the shore two "tree trunks" from which they formed the first human couple Askr m. and Embla f. (16). This Germanic myth has its parallels in other Indo-European traditions (17), and it is interesting to recall that Askr is none other than the common noun askr "ash" (18) and that Embla too is perhaps none other than the diminutive *Almilon (> *Elmia) derived from the common noun almr "elm-tree" (19).

This conception in Scandinavia was not only alive as an historical-cultural fact; it had also permeated language events as has already been brought to light by Grimm, Vendryes, Specht, Bonfante and Friedrich, who have been able to give a substantially correct etymological interpretation to the words Old Icelandic fírar m.pl. "men, people, nation", fjör "life", fjör m. "kind of tree ~ men (poet.)", fjörvar, fyrvar m.pl. "men (poet.)", fyrðar m.pl. "men" (20) and to these may be added also börr "conifer ~ man (poet.)" (21).

This interpretation of ours seems to be the right one, also because it succeeds in explaining as well that set of 'kenningar' for "man" which can be traced back to the notion of "piece of wood". As has been said, Askr and Embla were in fact made out of two "trunks of wood"; therefore it is fully admissible that, in the creation of new 'kenningar' for "man" recourse may have been made to words that indicated not only "live wood", but also "wood as material, substance". Following Meissner (22), here is the set in question: brandr m. "brand", draugr "dry log", hlunnr m. "roller (for launching ships)", laukr m. "mast (of ship)", meidr m. "pole", sigla f. "mast (of ship)", stafr m. "staff, post", stofn m. "stem, stump of a cut tree", toilur m. "stick, small stick".

After taking all that into consideration, the fact now becomes understandable why a few sporadic uses of common nouns for "tree, wood forest, (fire)wood" are found in the 'kenningar' that Meissner placed in the category "Fromme, Heilige, Priester" hence mitru runnr, manndyrda, lundr and hjalpar hreinstolpi (24). Less understandable is the use of such common nouns in the 'kenningar' for the divinities: there is a single case tvíviðar tollurr for "Thor"; but that can be dependent on the strong anthropologicalization of the "divinities" in the Christian phase of Icelandic culture. Moreover, Meissner (25) includes an annotation to the effect that the denominations for "tree, wood ~ forest, wood" are never used for the "Christian God".

This interpretation of ours finally allows us to understand why, in the 'kenningar' too for "woman", common nouns are used that refer to the notion of "tree, wood ~ forest, wood".

Meissner (26) points out that generally, whilst for "men" the common nouns are masculine, those for "women" are feminine. There are eight common nouns relating to specific trees: apaldr m. "apple-tree", björk f. "birch", eik f. "oak", fura "fir", lind f. "lime-tree", selja f. "sallow, willow", 'salis capraea', þella f. "young pine", þpill f. "young fir-tree".

Almost totally lacking, on the contrary, are generic common nouns for "tree" (for example lág f. "fallen tree") and only the use of one single 'collective' is known: morð f. "forest, border-land".

Parallel to the 'kenningar' for "man", those for "woman" too can have recourse to feminine common nouns referring not to "live wood", but to "wood as material, substance". Here is the list of them: hasla f. "peg or pole of hazel-wood", skorð / skorðu f. "stay, prop (for ships)", spira f. "spar", stod f. "post", tróða f. "fagot-wood". And to this list it seems to me that the following should be added: brík f. "tablet", þilja f. "deal, plank", þopta f. "(rowing-)bench", which Meissner (27) kept distinct from the previous ones since he was unable to see clearly: "welche Anschauungen hier ursprönglich zu Grunde liegen."

Beyond of the Nordic area it is not easy to find any other documentation. Hertha Marquardt (28) has clearly emphasized how in the Anglosaxon 'kenningar' for "man" and for "woman", the set that has been derived from the common nouns for "tree" is completely lacking. And just as the 'kenningar' derived from specific or generic nouns for "tree" are lacking, so too are those drawn from nouns relating to the concept of "wood, trunk, etc.": all of which goes towards supporting my idea that those 'kenningar' are structurally linked, and come from, the same historical-cultural aspect.

Something more can be said by looking at some aspects of "anthroponymy", which, as it is well known, has close institutional and constitutional links with certain historical-cultural characteristics of the Germanic peoples.

By examining the set of names of the type Asculf, Ascwin (30), Bach (31) was able to conclude: "Nicht ausgeschlossen bleibt, dass manche germ. Rufnamen sich auf h e i l i g e B ä u m e bezogen. Auffällig ist, dass vor allem der Name der E s c h e auftritt. Aus der E s c h e und der Ulme sind nach dem nordischen Mythos die ersten Menschen entstanden. Dennoch darf nicht übersehen werden, dass asc auch "Speer" (s. "ZfDA" 41,95) bedeutet, und die in Frage stehenden Namen deshalb mindestens teilweise zu den Waffennamen zu rechnen sein können".

Förstemann (32) then considered that a long series of feminine anthroponyms derived from a base lindi and he did not exclude that they could go back at least in part, to the theme lind "lime, shield made of lime". Schröder (33) had subsequently excluded this possibility for the feminine ones in lind, but Kremer (34), with regard to the Visigothic noun Lindfredus, considers that in this case Linde- may go back rather to the Old High German base lint, Old Icelandic lind "lime", evolving subsequently in the language of the warriors, to the meaning of "shield of lime wood" and thus simply to "shield".

So long as these anthroponyms are at our disposal, it can certainly not be said that it is a question of the specific noun for a "tree" or for a "weapon" that is involved. But, if nouns of the type Aico / Aigo really were to go back to the Germanic aik- "oak" (35), in such a case we could not invoke semantic changes encountered in the anthroponyms discussed previously. Unfortunately, however, this etymology too is uncertain and nothing definitive can be said about it.

This is not the appropriate place to go deeper into this question which is still rather complex; however it can not be denied 'a priori' that the Germanic anthroponymy might have been formed even with denominations for "trees" in the historical-cultural perspective that we have proposed here. It is necessary to undertake more careful examination also of those anthroponyms that refer to, or could refer to, the denominations for "trunk, wood, piece of wood", as for example in the anthroponyms made up from bases of the type asti-, branda-, span-, staf-, stanga-, wid-, and so on.

However that may be, it seems to me that, after working through all the considerations at this point there are enough valid elements to be able to interpret the 'kenningar' for "man" and for "woman" deriving from common nouns referring to "trees" both in their specific and general senses, or from common nouns referring to "wood" in its material sense, as generated by the Germanic conception of the arboreal origin of "man".

If this hypothesis were accepted and found further confirmation, a considerable step forward in hermeneutics of 'kenningar' of this type would be made. The evaluations that had been made by Meissner (36) have seemed too vague and imprecise to us: having recalled that Snorri had given a rationalistic (sic!) interpretation (39), he had limited himself to commenting: "Natürlich aber liegt bei Männern und Frauen ursprünglich eine poetische Vorstellung zu Grunde."

So too had the evaluations recently supplied by Edith Marold (38) seemed too formal to us: she is concerned only with seeing how far the 'kenningar' for "man" containing as the 'determinatum' a common noun for "tree" are, or are not, "metaphorical kenningar", reaching the conclusion that "their 'determinatum' must itself also be considered a 'metaphor'."

In conclusion, I maintain that, besides a correct interpretation of Snorri's thoughts and more precise recognition of the debt of the Icelandic people to Latin rhetoric, an even more decisive aim should be made to recover the specifically Nordic historical-cultural horizon, prior to the spread of Christianity and direct or indirect mediaeval Latin culture.

N O T E S

- 1) Fr. Specht, Zur idg. Sprache und Kultur II: got. fairh-us, "KZ" LXVIII (1944), pp 191-200.
- 2) J.Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch, vol.III, Leipzig 1862, col.1527, s.v. Ferch (according to F.J.Stalder, Versuch eines Schweizerischen Idiotikons, vol.I, Aarau 1812, p.363),
- 3) J.Vendryes, Un nom ancien de l' "arbre", Revue Celtique XLIV (1927), pp.313-317.
- 4) In "Encyclopedia of Psychology", New York 1946, pp.848 ff.
- 5) G.Bonfante, Microcosmo e macrocosmo nel mito indoeuropeo, "Die Sprache" V (1959) (= Festschrift f.W.Havers), pp.1-8.
- 6) J. De Vries, Altnord.etym.Wb., Leiden 1962, p.25; however J.Pokorny, Idg.etym.Wb., Bern-München 1959, pp.822-823 showed his uncertainty. On the contrary, F.Holthausen, in his Vergl.u.etym.Wb.d.Altwestnord., Göttingen 1948, p.64 appeared favourable.
- 7) P.Friedrich, Proto-Indo-European Trees, Chicago-London 1970, p.137.
- 8) W.P.Lehmann, A Gothic Etymological Dictionary, Leiden 1986, p.106.
- 9) Berlin 1956 (reprint 1970).
- 10) W.Meid, Bemerkungen zum idg.Wortschatz des Germanischen, in "Das Germanische und die Rekonstruktion der idg.Grundsprache. Akten des Freiburger Kolloquiums der Idg.

Gesellschaft, Freiburg, 26-27 Februar 1981" (edited by J.Untermann and B.Brögyanyi), Amsterdam - Philadelphia 1984, pp.98-100.

11) Meid's argument is very important and therefore it is appropriate to quote it "in extenso": "Die Charakterisierung des Menschen als 'sterblich', im Gegensatz zu den 'unsterblichen' Göttern, hat im Germanischen, anders als etwa in den östlichen indogermanischen Sprachen, keinen sprachlichen Niederschlag gefunden. Wohl aber gibt es, offenbar als eine eigenständige germanische Schöpfung, eine Bezeichnung des Menschen, die ihn als mit organischem Leben begabt darstellt, offenbar in Gegensatz zur unbelebten Natur: diese ist *ferh^wija-, Ableitung von *ferh^wa-'Leben(skraft)', bezeugt in den Pluralen ahd. firi^hhos, altengl. fīras, altnord. fīrar 'Menschen' und als neutrales Kollektivum ahd. firi^hi 'Volk'.

Der etymologische Komplex, der dahinter steht, bietet Anlaß zu einigen Klarstellungen, weil auf diesem Gebiet viel gesündigt worden ist. Man hat die Gleichung aufgestellt: gotisch fairh^uus = lateinisch quercus. Eine Gleichung, die lautlich haargenau entspricht, wenn man auf der lateinischen Seite die p-qu-Assimilation rückgängig macht (quercus aus *perquus), die aber dennoch zu einem etymologischen Kurzschluß führt, wenn man die beiden Wörter direkt verbindet. fairh^uus bedeutet 'Welt', quercus 'Eiche'. Nun, die Eiche ist der Weltenbaum, folglich ist fairh^uus die Eiche, und auch die Menschen stammen dann aus Bäumen. Dies ist hochgradiger Unsinn, so geht es nicht. fairh^uus und quercus sind zwar miteinander verwandt, jedoch quasi über den langen Weg. Die unio mystica dieser Begriffe liegt weit zurück. Letztliche Grundlage ist ein voreinzelsprachliches *perk^wo- bzw. *perk^wu- 'Leben, Lebenskraft, Lebensstoff', wobei der o-Stamm das 'Leben' objektiv-materiell, der u-Stamm als schöpferisches Prinzip, als Gegenstand mystisch-religiöser Verehrung charakterisiert haben mochte. Auch die Schwundstufe *prk^w- ist auf dieser Stufe voraussetzbar. Dieser umfassende Begriff des Lebens, der sowohl animalisches wie - und dies wohl im besonderen - vegetalisches Leben umschloß, erfuhr nun eine Zweiteilung in vegetalisches Leben einerseits, animalisches, d.h. im besonderen menschliches Leben andererseits, bei im wesentlichen gleichbleibendem, sich nur allmählich differenzierendem Ausdruck. So haben wir auf der einen Seite die Baumbezeichnungen lat. quercus (o- und u-Stamm), anord. fīpr^r Bezeichnung eines Baumes, den Vorderteil in got. fairguni 'Berg', anord. fjorgyn 'Erde', beide ursprünglich 'Eichenwald' bedeutend und Verwandte im Keltischen und Baltischen habend, und Föhre, ahd. foraha mit schwundstufiger Wurzel. Mächtige, langlebige Bäume wie vor allem die Eiche und immergrüne Nadelbäume galten im

besonderen Maße als Verkörperung immerwährenden Lebens und ungebrochener Lebenskraft und finden sich daher analog bezeichnet. Auf der anderen Seite haben wir das animalische, menschliche Leben, das sich ebenfalls als *perkwo-, germ. *ferhwā- (ahd. ferah, anord. fiqr) mit der davon abgeleiteten Bezeichnung für 'Menschen' *ferhwija- (ahd. firihhos usw.) und als *perkwo-, germ. *ferhwu- in got. fairhwus 'Welt' kundtut. Got. fairhwus 'Welt' geht also auf eine frühere Bedeutung 'Leben' zurück; diese Weit-Leben-Vorstellung hat ihr Analogon in kelt. *bitu- 'Welt' (gall. Bitu-riges), was etymologisch auch 'Leben' ist. Die Vorstufe des Gotischen hat also gewissermaßen als Homonyme *ferhwu- 'Leben' und *ferhwu- 'Eiche' nebeneinander; nur das letztgenannte Wort ist direkt mit lat. quercus und den anderen auß germanischen Resten der Baumbezeichnung vergleichbar; alle gehen sie aber auf eine ältere Vorstufe 'Leben' (sowohl abstrakt wie konkret vorstellbar) zurück."

12) R.Meissner, Die Kenningar der Skalden, Bonn-Leipzig 1921 (reprint Hildesheim 1984), pp.266-272.

13) Op.cit., p.266.

14) Ibidem.

15) W.Krause, Altindische und altnordische Kunstpoesie, ein Vergleich ihres Sprachstils, "KZ" LIII (1925), p.227.

16) W.Grönbech, Kultur und Religion der Germanen, vol.II, Stuttgart 1954 (reprint Darmstadt 1961), pp 238 and 293; J. De Vries, Altgerm. Religionsgeschichte, Berlin 1956-57 (reprint 1970), vol.II, p.360; E.O.G. Turville-Petre, Myth and Religion of the North, London 1964 (Italian translation Religione e miti del Nord, Milano 1964, p.366); C.A.Mastrelli, La religione degli antichi Germani, in "Storia delle religioni" (edited by G.Castellani), vol.II, Torino 1981, pp.522-525; H.Homann, Bäumkult, in "J.Hoops, Reallexikon der germ. Altertumskunde, vol.II, Berlin-New York 1976, pp.107-110.

17) J. De Vries, Altgerm. Religionsgeschichte cit., II, p.371.

18) J. De Vries, Altnord.etym.Wb., cit., p.15.

19) Ibidem, pp.101-102. Even the other etymology that connects Embla with the Greek ἄμβλαος, Gallic amella "honeysuckle" and Old-Indian āmras "mango" refers nevertheless to the name of a tree.

20) Cf. J.De Vries, Altnord.etym.Wb. cit., pp.121, 125-127, 148 s.vv.

21) Ibidem, p.70 s.v.

22) Op.cit., pp.266-272.

23) It does not seem to me that Meissner is right (op.cit., pp.264-265) to exclude draugr from this series: "draugr wird SnE 2, 497 für gleichbedeutend mit viðr erklärt. Man hat draugr als, verdorrter Stamm gedeutet und aeg. drugian, trocken werden, dryge, trocken verglichen. Sicher ist

jedenfalls, daß die Verwendung von draugr in Kenningar für Mann nicht von der unheimlichen (sic!) Bedeutung ausgehen kann, die das Wort gewöhnlich hat. Gegen die Erklärung als Baum spricht, abgesehen davon, daß draugr allein nie so gebraucht wird, der Umstand, daß draugr unter den Heiti für Baum nicht aufgeführt wird, obgleich es oft genug in Kenningar vorkommt. Die richtige Deutung des Wortes hat Neckel gegeben (Beitr.39,189 ff.)." See moreover the observations made by E.Marold, Kenningkunst, Berlin-New York 1983, pp.104-105.

24) Op.cit., p.388.

25) Ibidem, p.245.

26) Ibidem, p.399 where he points out "das ungewöhnliche ist daher beabsichtigt, wenn 600,32,4 apaldr in einer Frauenkenning verwendet wird, noch verstärkt durch ein Epitheton stórvöenn." - It seems to me that the argument runs in another way; I consider that is that the very few exceptions to the rule by which the 'kenningar' for "man" are formed with the masculine common nouns and those for "woman" are formed with the feminine common nouns, find an explanation in the fact that the semantic rule is substituted for the morphological rule so that the "determinant" becomes responsible for the masculine or feminine motion; thus, in the case of apaldr m. it is the first compound element lin- that determines the feminine character of the 'kenning' for "woman"; conversely in the case of bjprk it is the first compound element sig- that determines the masculine nature of the 'kenning' for "man".

27) Ibidem, p.411.

28) H.Marquardt, Die altenglischen Kenningar, Halle 1938, p.233 [131]. See also what she adds on p.244 [142]: "Als Entsprechung zu den altnordischen Kriegerkenningar mit Grundwort 'Baum' wird bisweilen angeführt: werbemas Ex.487. Der Sinn dieser Umschreibung ist aber sehr zweifelhaft, zumal gar nicht sicher ist, ob überhaupt die Krieger gemeint sind. Da die ganze Stelle sehr dunkel und der betreffende Halbvers überdies metrisch zu kurz ist, wird eine sichere Deutung wohl immer unmöglich bleiben. (Die Deutungsversuche sind bei Krapp, Notes, p.214 zusammengestellt.) Kriegerkenningar mit Grundwort 'Baum' sind im Altenglischen nicht belegt".

29) The lack of such 'kenningar' for the Anglosaxon area must not be considered absolute and original from there: it may derive solely from the strong conversion to Christianity and from a relevant change in that culture.

30) Cf. E.Förstemann, Altdeutsches Namenbuch, I: Personennamen, Bonn 1901 (reprint München-Hildesheim 1966), coll.147-150; H.Kaufmann, Ergänzungsband zu E.Förstemann, Personennamen, München-Hildesheim 1968, pp.40-41.

- 31) A. Bach, Deutsche Namenkunde I, 1: Die deutschen Personennamen, Heidelberg 1952, p.215 § 195. — Cf. G. Schramm, Namenschatz und Dichtersprache, Göttingen 1957, pp.99-100: "Wo an erster Stelle der Namen eine Waffe genannt wird, da dürfen wir diese - anders als an zweiter Stelle - in ihrer ursprünglichen Bedeutung verstehen ausserdem in Aska- "Esche(nspeer)" z.B. in wgot. Ascarius, ags. Aescwald, dt. Ascwin (im Norden nicht sicher belegt, da Askmaðr wohl ursprünglich Beinamen mit der Bedeutung "Wiking" war). Weitere Baumnamen mit Waffenbedeutung - Ulme, Linde, auch Eiche? - sind nicht so weit verbreitet."
- 32) Op.cit., coll.1058-1060.
- 33) E. Schröder, Die Pflanzen und Tierwelt in den deutschen Frauennamen, "ZNF" XIV (1938), p.105, n.1; Cf. A. Bach, loc.cit. and H. Kaufmann, op.cit., p.237.
- 34) D. Kremer, Die germanischen Personennamen in Katalonien, Barcelona 1969-1972, pp.62-63.
- 35) Vide W. Bruckner, Die Sprache der Langobarden, Strassburg 1895, pp.219-220; E. Gamillscheg, Romania Germanica, vol.I, Berlin-Leipzig 1934, p.313; D. Kremer, op.cit., p.49.
- 36) R. Meissner, op.cit., p.245.
- 37) "Die Verwendung der Baumnamen führt Snorri rationalistisch auf reynir (zu reyna zugleich Baumname) und viðr (= vinnandi) zurück". Cf. Snorri Sturluson, Edda (ed. F. Jónsson, København 190, p.95 § 29 [31]): "Ok fyrir því at hann er reynir vápnaða ok viðr víganna - alt eitt ok vinnandi; viðr heitir tré, reynir heitir ok tré; af þessum heitum hafa skáldin kallað manninn ask eða hlyn, lund eða gðrum víðar-heitum karlkendum ok kent til víga eða skipa eða fjár.". A similar explanation - that could be defined "parasemantic" - is also supplied by Snorri for the 'Kenningar' for "woman", whether in the same place, with reference to the name of the "tree" ("Rétt er at kenna hana svá, at kalla hana selju eða lóg þess, er hon miðlar, en selja eða lóg - þat eru tré. Fyrir því er kona kölluð til kenningar þllum kvenkendum víðar-heitum."), or further on (p.112 § 44 [47], with reference to a "fallen tree-trunk" "Hon er ok lóg kölluð þess, er hon gefr; lóg heitir ok tré þat, er fellr í skógi".
- 38) E. Marold, op.cit., p.32.

(translated by Thomas Baldwin)