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It might be argued that a number of the misconceptions encountered in the field of Old Nordic religious studies today go back to the pioneering work of the Grimm brothers (and especially that of Jakob Grimm) which laid the foundations for much of the research work later undertaken in both Old Nordic studies and Folkloristics. One of the most influential features of Jakob Grimm’s work was the attractive idea that there had been one early Germanic ‘religion’ which was known throughout the Germanic countries in pre-Christian times, an idea that, of course, was rooted in a particular political agenda which had powerful implications for its own time. Another recurring idea in the Grimms’ work on mythology and religion was the conviction that the folk beliefs of their time were directly connected to the pagan beliefs of the past. Both ideas went on to be adopted by many later scholars, and can be still seen in many overviews of Old Nordic mythology or religion which attempt to produce a single overall picture, or an overarching structure. The problem is that, as modern research in folkloristics, archaeology and the workings of the oral tradition have all underlined, both of these ideas are seriously flawed. They need redressing.

As anyone with any knowledge of archaeology or Nordic and Celtic folklore knows, the idea that there was ever one basic Nordic religion, or one Nordic mythology accepted and known by all of those living across the Nordic (and even Germanic) world is patently absurd. Religious ideas and beliefs in these areas have always varied by time and place, by fashion, by cultural and social environment, and by the general demands of society. Snorri’s suggestion that Óðinn was the accepted leader of the Nordic pantheon is seriously questioned by place name evidence in Norway and Sweden, and by the simple facts that Freyr is called Freyr (‘Lord’); that Þórr has pride of place amongst the gods in both Uppsala (Adam of Bremen) and Mære (Snorri Sturluson 1941-1951: I, 317); and that Óðinn is totally unmentioned in Landnámabók. The idea that there was one idea of the world being created from Ymir (given in Vm. st. 21 and Gylfaginning ch. VII-VIII) seems conflicted by the statement in Vsp. st. 4 that the earth rose from the sea (deftly avoided by Snorri). As John McKinnell has effectively demonstrated in Both One and Many (1994), there were clearly several different images of Loki over time, and a variety of different accounts about Þórr’s fishing trip (some of which ended with him killing the serpent long before Ragnarök). The range of conflicting myths that must have been in existence within the wonderful multicultural gathering of peoples that settled in Iceland in the late ninth century is particularly evident in Snorri’s desperate attempts to construct one image of Nordic cosmology in the Prose Edda, and in the words of the Icelandic editor of the Sigurðr poems in the Codex Regius as he attempts to explain how Sigurðr died (Frá dauða Sigurðar). Written history wants facts. The oral culture, on the other hand, is and has always been happy with variation which is the name of the game in folkloristics.

It is quite clear that if Snorra Edda had been written in northern Norway or south-eastern Sweden, it would have been a very different work. It is also quite
possible that the worldview reflected in different Eddic poems is very different. (Compare, for example, *Grm.* to *Vsp.* or *Skm.*) Putting all of these poems together to try to recreate a single cosmology is a questionable process. As both Neil Price and Thomas DuBois have argued, it is time we ceased using *Snorra Edda* as a starting point for neat structural analyses of a set Nordic cosmology (where whole ideas are sometimes based on a single reference) and start thinking instead of broad, ever-changing ‘belief systems’ (see Price 2002: 26 and 54-55; and DuBois 1999: 7-8; and 10-12; on the untrustworthiness of Snorri, see Hall 2004: 53 and Jón Hnefill Ádalsteinsson 1988: 129 and 131-132).

The second problem, also highly relevant to the argument that will be made in the following article, is seen in the way in which scholars of Old Nordic belief have regularly tended to work from the top down, applying modern concepts to those of earlier times. For many, it is hard to drop the idea (based largely on later folk beliefs influenced in part by Church propaganda) that the jötnar must all be malignant, ugly and stupid like the trolls of Nordic folklore that replaced them in later times. Dvergar are commonly depicted as being bearded and small; valkyrfur ride horses in armour as part of a kind of operatic wild hunt; and the Old Nordic álfr are seen as being ‘elfish’, something underlined by the way in which they regularly appear in English indices under the heading of ‘elves’. As I mean to show in the following, the original álfr in fact seem to have had very little to do with elves as most people saw them before *The Lord of the Rings* came to be written. Furthermore, it seems clear that the extant early Nordic sources point to a range of different understandings of álfr which varied over time and in accordance with the worldviews of the writers, something that is of course not surprising when the heart of belief in the original álfr seems to have centred in Sweden rather than in England or Iceland (where most written sources originated). The sources also indicate quite clearly a gradual development (largely under the influences of the Church and translations of French romances like *Tristrams saga* [see RS I, 174], and *Möttuls saga* [see [RS I, 259]) whereby the álfr gradually began to be blended with the early landvettir that existed in the popular consciousness of those living in the Nordic countries.

The following pages will involve a brief presentation of several key features that need to be considered in any discussion of how the scribes, poets and storytellers of the Nordic countries originally conceived the álfr. Some of the arguments presented echo those recently made by Alaric Hall in his fine thesis on *The Meanings of Elf and Elves in Medieval England* (2004). Others, however, represent different approaches or concentrate on different information.

It is evident that in early twelfth century Iceland, at least, there was still a clear difference in concept in people’s minds between nature spirits and álfr. This can be seen, for example, in *Úlfjótslög* and *Landnamabók* which say nothing about álfr, but make clear reference to both landvettir (in the sense of nature spirits: see especially S 329-330 in *Lmb.*) and bergbúar (S 329) and the beliefs that some people (mainly in the west of Iceland) believed that they dæi í hölana or into mountains like Helgafell and Mælifell (S 85, S 110 and S 197). The absence of any mention of álfr in the sense of nature spirits can also be seen in *Píóranda páttr ok Þórhalls* (1987: 2254-2255), which refers to kvikvendi living in hölar; and in *Íslensk hömilubók* in *Hauksbók* (1892-6: 167), which talks again of land vettir when discussing those beings that received food
in piles of rock or under flats in return for their support of farms. The account of Egill Skalla-Grimsson’s níðstöng activities in Egils saga (ÍF IV, 163-172) mentions landvættir þær, er land þetta byggva, and also (in two verses uttered earlier by Egill which Almqvist sees as originally being associated with this act) a more godlike being referred to as a landáss and landálfr (Almqvist 1965: 89-93; and Jón Hnefill Ádalsteinsson 1999: 153-157).

It seems that it was only in later times that álfr started becoming associated with rocks and hólar by Icelanders (see Kormáks saga, in ÍF VIII, 288; Göngu-Hrólf saga, in ÍF II, 390-391; and Jarlmanns saga og Hermanns [in RS VI, 220]; cf. The Saga of Tristram ok Ísōnd in RS I, 174), Kormáks saga’s reference to a special blood-sacrifice to the álfr in a hóll as a means of getting assistance with a cure for injury probably representing an earlier stage in the transition of beliefs from active worship or sacrifice to folk belief (cf. the account in Hauksbók mentioned above). By the time of Grettis saga Ásmundssonar (ÍF VII, 204), Bósa saga ok Herrauds (ÍF II, 474) and Sigurðar saga þǫggla (RS III, 111), the transition seems to be near complete, álfr being placed alongside óvættir, like moldbiar, fjandrú, bergrisar, norðr and tröll. Similar uses are found in romances like the Saga of Tristram ok Ísónd (RS I, 174), Móttuls saga (RS I, 259), Eilis sog ok Rósumundu (RS IV, 62 and 128) and Samsons saga fagra (RS III, 384), and other fornaldrasvígr like Norna-Gests þáttir (ÍF II, 390-391), Göngu-Hrólf saga (ÍF II, 390-391), and Hrólf saga kraka (ÍF I, 25-27) as well as Fríðris saga (1905-1911: 319), where the álfr are beginning to take on their later internationally folkloric ‘elvish’ form, slipping through solid walls, stealing children, luring innocent young men and women off safe moral pathways, and having problems with child-bearing. None of these later works make any mention of practical worship or sacrifice.

The idea of making sacrifices to álfr (something generally quite different to the approach usually taken to the more lowly landvættir [see nonetheless the aforementioned account in Hauksbók]) is, of course, supported by Sighvatr Póðarson’s often quoted reference in Austraravísur (Snorri Sturluson 1941-1951: II, 137) to the Swedish woman in ‘Gautland’ who said she would not let him and his companions into her abode because her household was conducting a private álfrblót in the late autumn (not at jóí, as Srómann argues: 1985: 91 and 177). Similar ideas might be reflected in the Flateyjarbók (1945: II, 74-78) account of the offerings made by people to the grave mound of Ólafur Guðrøðarson Geirstaðalfr, who gains this latter by-name only after his death, when people started making sacrifices to him for ár. These activities find parallels in the account in Ynglingasaga (Snorri Sturluson 1941-1951: I, 23-25) of how Freyr received offerings in his grave til árs ok friðar, and

1 It might be noted that the locally based beliefs from Snæfellsnes about álfrækt given in Bárðar saga (ÍF XIII, 111); Byrbyggja (ÍF IV, 10); and Landnámabók (S 85) come from the same area where we find beliefs about forefathers ‘dying into’ hills and mountains (see above). On one side, they reflect commonly encountered later Nordic beliefs whereby urine and feces were sometimes put on anchor ropes to disuade water spirits from climbing into fishing boats; or eyes were washed in urine to break supernaturally created illusions. On another side, they might be seen to be part of an older local belief connected with the forefathers ‘becoming’ álfr or local gods, and the need to keep ‘their’ areas unsoiled, to ensure their continuing presence.
perhaps also Rimbert’s comment about how the Swedes of Birka started worshipped a dead king as a god (see Rimbert 1986: 54).

The idea of active worship of figures known as álfar (admittedly only supported by the above references) certainly suggests that a number of people saw these beings as having the power to influence the world around them, almost like gods. As several scholars have noted, this idea is supported by a range of other early sources, and most particularly the Eddic poems which, far from regarding them as mere landvættir, regularly place the álfar alongside the æsir and jötnar. As is well known, Háv. st.159; Grm. st. 4, Skm. st. 7, and Ls. sts 2, 13 and 30 all make use of the oral formula ása ok álfa. Other poems place the álfar alongside the æsir in lists, as in Háv. sts. 143 and 160; Skm. sts. 17-18 (Hvat er þat álfa/ né ása sonal/ né vis[sa] vana); brk. st. 7 and Vsp. st. 48 (Hvat er med ásom? / Hvat er med álftom? in both); and Sd. 18; (þær ro med álftom/ þær med álftom/ sumar med visom vónom). In Háv. st. 159, the álfar are clearly listed among the tivar.

As Ströms (1985: 199), Schjædt (1991: 306-307), Ellis Davidson (1988: 105 and 173) and most recently Hall (2004: 35-53) and Ármann Jakobsson (2006) have all underlined, several Eddic poems seem to use the word álfa to refer specifically to the vanir gods, particularly Ls. sts. 2, 13 and 30 (the talk of ása ok álfa/ er hér inni ero, which gave basis to the introductory prose statement Marti var þar ása ok álfta); Háv. st. 159; and Grm., all of which refer to the álfar but make no use of the word vanir in lists of beings (in spite of their apparent knowledge of the vanir gods’ presence). This applies especially to Lok. and Grm.. The same idea might also conceivably lie behind Skáldskaparmál, ch. 39, which notes that men can be compared to æsir, jötnar and álfar. It might also be seen in Egill’s verses uttered in connection with the niðstöng where the possibly interchangeable words landáss and landálfir are deliberately used for single godlike beings, the first being listed alongside Freyr and Njörðr (IF IV, 163-165; Almqvist 1965: 89-93; and Jón Hnefill Aðalsteinsson 1999: 153-157, where the suggestion is made that the landálfir is actually Freyr). Connections between the vanir and the álfar are, of course, underlined still further by the statement in Grm. st. 5 that Freyr received Álfheimr as tannfé, as well as in the implicit connections between Freyr, his ‘servant’/ alter-ego Skírnir and the sun (known as álfróðull in Vm. st. 47, and Skm. st. 4); in the associations between the vanir and whiteness (cf. the description of Heimdallr in Prm. st. 15); and in the earlier mentioned parallels between the grave mound worship of Freyr and Ólafr Geirstaðaðýr. These connections were clearly well-noted by J. R. R. Tolkien who seems to have gone out of his way to underline the idea for his ur-mythology that ‘Ingwé’ was ‘the most high lord of all the Elvish race. He... sits at the feet of the Powers and all Elves revere his name... The Vanyar were his people; they are the Fair Elves...’ (Tolkien 1977: 52-53). In Tolkien’s elvish, ‘Vanyar’ means ‘the fair’, something which, knowing Tolkien’s approach, might well be meant to reflect the Indo-European word albha* meaning ‘white’ or brightness, cf. OE Ælfsyne (see Hall 2004, 56-57; and 71-76).²

² It might also be worth remembering that despite their prevalence in early sources, the Eddice álfar are never mentioned by name, unlike the æsir, the jötnar, the ávergar and the valkyrjas. It seems to be expected that we know who they are. This, to my mind, adds further support for the idea that they were seen as being synonymous with the vanir.
Things are nonetheless not as easy as they might seem. As noted above, it should come as no surprise that different Eddic poems seem to originate in — and reflect — slightly different belief systems: For example, it is questionable whether Skrn. originated in an area where Óðinn was seen as the highest god, in spite of the reference to Draupnir in st. 21-22, and the slightly dubious mention of Freyr illegally sitting in Óðinn’s seat in the prose introduction. Some of the Eddic poems make it clear that, unlike the performers of the recorded Lok. and Grm., their creators seem to have seen the álfar as having been an individual divine race, different to both the vanir and the æsir, since they mention all three as existing alongside each other as equals: see Sd. st. 18 and Skrn. st. 17-18 (both mentioning vísl vanir and álfar); Alv. (throughout), Vm. (which talks of Njörðr returning to the vísl vanir [st. 39]) but also mentions the álfröðull); Prn. (which mentions first æsir and álfar alone as divine powers in st. 7, then in st. 15 describes Heimdalr as one of the vanir); and Vsp. (which talks of the war between the æsir and vanir in st. 24, but later refers only to æsir and álfar [st. 48/51, a strophe which, interestingly enough, appears in the Codex Regius directly before the mention of Freyr’s later foe at Ragnarök, Snr.]

Alongside all of the above, we have Völundarkviða which, as several scholars have noted (see for example McKinnell 1990: 3; and Ármann Jakobsson 2006) seems to originate in yet another different belief system to the other Eddic poems (not least because of its mention of swan-maidens, which are referred to in the prose as valkyrior). Here the word álf (used to describe Völundr by the narrator and by Njóðr in st. 10 [álf í sóló] st. 13 and 32 [visi álfar]) seems first and foremost to refer to ‘otherness’ rather than holiness or direct ‘elvishness’, but especially the kind of dangerous, supernatural ‘otherness’ that was commonly connected to the Sami or Finnr in both saga times and in later folklore. There is no reference to either divine powers (over and above that of flight) or any of the qualities normally associated with the idea of the early landvættir.

Yet another level of meaning running alongside all of the above is that found in the various histories of the early Norwegian kings, in which Álfheimr is not a mythical site, but rather a land ruled by Swedes (or at least non-Norwegians), situated southeast of where Oslo is today, and north of Göteborg, between the rivers Gotaelf (Gotaälven) and Raumelf (Glåma): see Ynglinga saga (Snorri Sturluson 1941-1951, I, 79); Sögubrot af fornkonungum, in FN II, 133; and Forsteins saga Vikingssonar, in FN II, 185-186. In those accounts where Álfheimr is mentioned (in a period prior to the birth of Haraldr hárfagr), Swedish territory to the south of Raumarliki is seen as beginning with the contested area of Þingvallmark (around Oslo), and continuing south into Álfheimr (cf. the town Alvheim north of Göteborg, in present-day Bohuslän, but also running east into Dalstrand). It might be noted that while this wooded low-land territory would still have been relatively wet at this time (containing a number of álvar or rivers), it is also the area that contained the greatest concentration of Bronze Age rock carvings related to agricultural fertility, including human figures, boats and sun images (and a great deal of so-called álkvárnar, or cup-marks carved into rocks which were still used for local offerings in later times: see, for example, Hygen and

Admittedly there is nothing in Grm to suggest that the reference to Álfheimr being inherited by Freyr — forefather of Swedish kings — should not be meant to refer to a geographically known area that was annexed by the Ynglingar in their move west.
Bengtsson 2000 and Davidson 1964: 107). There can be little doubt that the people in the early medieval period knew of these images, and that the sites around them (often closely associated with Bronze Age grave-mounds) retained an element of sacredness or at least mysticism, just as they did in later times. There is good reason to believe that when Sighvatr encountered an álfaðr̩ on his way through ‘Gautland’, he was in an area close to Álfheimr, or an area where these álfar were well known.

Álfheimr, however, was more than just a simple place name. Historical sagas suggest that it drew its name from that of a regal forefather named Álf konungr Ínngamli, who, according to Hversu Noregr byggðist (FN II, 144-145; from Flateyjarbók), headed the pedestal on the maternal side of Haraldur hárfagr’s line, while his father’s people are said to go back to Óðinn (here said to be the father of Freyr). This choice of mythological forefathers can be no coincidence. The importance of the name Álf is, of course, also seen in the fact that it is used as a prefix not only in the names of Álf’s descendants, but also those of a number of Anglo-Saxon kings and prominent Icelanders in later times. The first Álf is thus said to be father of Álgir/Alfarin and grandfather of Gandálfr/Álf, who réð fyrr Álfheimr. Alfarin/Álgir’s daughter is the famous Álfhildr, first wife of Guðrøðr Hálfdánarson and accredited mother of Óláfr Geirstaðaálf (and sometimes Ragnar lodbrókar): see Snorri Sturluson 1941-1951: I, 79 and 87; Pátr Ölafs Geirstaðaáfss in Flateyjarbók 1945: II, 74-78; Forstein’s saga Vikingssonar [FN II, 185-186]; and Sögubrot af fornkonungum (FN II, 133) which, in addition to providing similar genealogical information, directly connects the people or rulers of this area to the supernatural álfr̩, underlining at the same time their fairness:

... þat er kunnig í öllum fornnum sögum um um það folk er Álfar hétu, en þat var miklu fríðara en engi önnur mannikind á Norðurlöndum, þvi at allt foreldri Álfhildar, móður hans [Ragnars lodbrókar], ok allr ættbálkr var kominn frá Álf gamla. Þat voru þá kallaðar Álfar ættir.

Everything about these accounts suggests that the people of this area seem to have seen themselves – or at least their rulers – as going back to ‘Álf’, and that the name itself carried a degree of sacredness. Obvious parallels can be seen with other personal names based on the names of favourite deities like Þórr/Thor or Freydis, something that points to a key difference between the words dis and álfr̩, the former being a group description while the latter seems to be based on a name. (Hall, it might be noted, follows Turville-Petre in seeing the distr̩ as being a female equivalent of the álfr: see Turville-Petre 1964: 231 and Hall 2004: 37-39 and 196.) The ‘name’ Álf, however, might itself have roots in a descriptive euphemism like ‘Týr’, ‘Freyr’ or ‘Óðinn’, here describing the bright qualities of the god as a means of avoiding direct naming (see also Hall 2004: 36 and 45; and Kuhn 1978: 272).

I have deliberately avoided discussing Snorri Sturluson’s famous account of ljósálfr̩ and dökkálfr̩ and his implied connections between the álfr̩ and the dvergar in Gylfaginning ch. 17 and 34, and Skáldskaparmál ch. 46 for the simple reason that most scholars nowadays see this account as being spurious, based to a large extent on the image of angels given in Elucidarius (itself a translation from Latin: see, for example, the discussion in Hall 2004: 33-34; on the question of dvergar parallels, see
further Motz 1973-4 in particular). No sources are found for such a division in types of áðfār in any of Snorri’s known sources. In part, it echoes the Church’s deliberate attempt in the Middle Ages to equate all popular nature spirits with demons or fallen angels (an idea reflected in numerous exempla-based folk legends found all over the Nordic area).

However, as a number of scholars have suggested, it might also be another example of Snorri trying to make a whole picture out of the conflicting views of the áðfār which occur in different sources, some of which seem to connect the áðfār with death and grave cults (as in the statement in Háv. st. 142, that Déinn was the leader of the áðfār and in the earlier noted account of Œlafr Geirstaðaálfr), while others seem stress their beauty, their brightness, and their connection to the sun (see, for example, Sögubrot af fornkonungum noted above; and the references to Ælfscyne and the álfrðuð). Rejecting De Vries’ suggestion (1956: I, 257-260) that the worship of the áðfār should simply be seen as a death or forefather cult, Ström (1985: 198-199), Schjædt (1991: 306-307); Simek (1993: 25-26) and Steinsland: 248 (2005: 338 and 345) have all underlined that associations with forefather worship need not rule out connections with brightness or fertility. Indeed both elements are clearly involved in the accounts of the worship of Freyr’s and Œlafr Geirstaðaálfr’s grave mounds, which find parallels in ancestor worship in many other societies, and also the ways in which the Nordic farm guardian spirits such as the gardvord, haugtusse or rudningskarl (who received offerings on their grave-mounds up into the early twentieth century) were seen as protecting all aspects of farm life (see, or example, Shetelig 1911; and the Gulaþingslög which suggests this practice was well known in medieval Norway: see Gulatingslovi 1981: 44). This makes sense, at least for some of the early understandings of the áðfār as deities, whether they are seen as being vanir or separate entities.

All in all, the source material available to us underlines that we should be highly wary about ever referring to the earlier manifestations of the áðfār as ‘elves’ unless we use the term in the Tolkien sense of the word whereby they represent a form of godlike entity associated with the land. Tolkien, of course, was making a deliberate attempt to wrest the original áðfār away from latter-day Faëriedom (see Tolkien 1988, and especially 1988: 31, which underlines his view that with regard to the stories of the vanir and others, myth and history often blended). At the same time, however, we should be very wary about taking all the various early references to the áðfār as referring to one and the same concept, over and above the idea that they are clearly powerful ‘others’ with the potential to harm at a distance (hence the later idea of the ‘elf-shot’). As I have shown here, everything about these references suggests that they stem from a variety of different belief systems originating in different times and different environments, something that does not rule out the fact that all of these different beliefs could have lived side by side in multicultural settlement Iceland before they gradually blended into the latter-day Icelandic áðfār and huldufólk (cf. the Nordic huldre; undirjordiske, and áðvar), a process that can be seen occurring in works created from the late thirteenth century onwards.
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