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ABSTRACT. This article focuses on Joachim Lelewel’s interest in Old Norse literature as reflected in his paper on Old Norse literature delivered in 1806 and his book Edda that was published a year later. Lelewel’s Edda comprises the first Polish translation (partly as a concise retelling) of selected parts of the French translation of the Poetic Edda and the Snorra Edda as included in Paul Henri Mallet’s Monumens de la mythologie [...] published in 1756. Lelewel’s work is placed in the context of the rising interest in this literature before 1800, whereby special attention is put on the sources Lelewel resorted to, in particular Mallet’s publications and articles in the French literary magazine Magasin Encyclopédique. Comparing the Eddas in Lelewel’s and Mallet’s publications, one can, among other things, note that Lelewel (1) ignores the literary value of the dialogue form in Gylfaginning due to a narrow focus on the mythological content (2) relates the migration of the Scythians to northern Europe in his introduction which thus serves as a substitute for the missing Prologue to the Snorra Edda and (3) partly deviates from Mallet in his footnotes. Aspects (2) and (3) can also be linked back to Lelewel’s use of Magasin Encyclopédique.

1. ON THE RELEVANCE OF STUDYING LELEWEL’S INTEREST IN THE OLD NORSE WORLD

Joachim Lelewel (1786-1861) was an eminent figure in the Polish humanities, best known for his influential works on, for instance, Polish history and the history of geography. He was, however, also active in the field of Old Norse studies. Between 1804 and 1808, Lelewel studied at the Imperial University in Wilno (Vilnius, in Lithuanian) where he joined an academic society and, as early as 1806, delivered papers on the Scythian decent of the inhabitants of Scandinavia, runic inscriptions, and Old Norse poetry (Jabłońska-Erdmanowa, 1931:170). Lelewel’s first published work also reflects this interest in Old Norse studies. In 1807, while still studying in
Wilno, Lelewel published *Edda czyli Księga religii dawnych Skandynawii mieszkańców* [*Edda, that is the book of the religion of the ancient inhabitants of Scandinavia*]. This book was published anonymously but Lelewel’s authorship is confirmed by information in the second revised edition published under his name in 1828 (*Edda*, 1828:5, 203). Lelewel’s motivation for dealing with Old Norse literature is reflected in the title. He treats the *Poetic Edda* and the *Snorra Edda* as sources on “the religion of the ancient inhabitants of Scandinavia”. Lelewel begins his *Edda* of 1807 with a treatise on the origin of the peoples (*Edda*, 1807:3-16) before he turns to introducing and translating (from French) selected passages of the *Poetic Edda* and the *Snorra Edda* (*Edda*, 1807:17-55) that Paul Henri Mallet had published in his highly influential anthology *Monumens de la mythologie et de la poesi des Celtes, particulièrement des anciens Scandinaves* [*Monuments of mythology and poetry of the Celts, especially the ancient Scandinavians*] in 1756.¹

Neither Lelewel nor his publisher Józef Zawadzki were really pleased with *Edda* (1807), as Lelewel’s letters suggest. Altogether, Zawadzki had 300 copies of *Edda* printed but immediately gave them to Lelewel as a publisher’s advance for a book on Polish history he wanted him to write; Lelewel, however, only wanted to keep 30 copies (Letter dated 12 July 1807; Lelewel, 1878:101). In another letter, Lelewel describes his doubts concerning the publication of *Edda* and possible mistakes in his translation as he did not have access to Mallet’s book after 1805.² One can find some hints concerning the reception of Lelewel’s *Edda* in the years after its publication. Grzelak (1985:257) mentions that the book was noticed in Warsaw (comp. the letter in Lelewel, 1878:119) and in Germany where it was referred to in *Idunna und Hermode* in 1814. This German literary magazine was published by Friedrich David Gräter, likewise translator of the *Poetic Edda* (in 1789). To complete the information provided by Grzelak one can add that Gräter indicates that he had read about this Polish book in the December issue of another German literary magazine called *Intelligenz-Blatt der Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung*.³

---

¹ Wajsblum (1971:41) erroneously mentions that the third edition of Mallet’s Monumens [...] was the source for *Edda* (1807). Lelewel only used Mallet’s third edition for Hávamál in *Edda* (1828); cf. *Edda* (1828:6).

² “Namówiono mnie do tego, chwyciłem się, ale po wydrukowaniu zaczęłem się lękać, ba i żałować. To extrait zrobiłem jeszcze w 1805r., poczem tekstu francuskiego w rękę nie miałem, mogły więc być omyłki. [I was persuaded to do it, I undertook it, but after it was printed, I began to become afraid and even started to regret it. I did this excerpt still in 1805, afterwards I did not have the French text in my hands, there can, thus, be mistakes.]” (Letter dated 2 January 1808; Lelewel, 1878:110).

³ This refers to the December issue of 1813, col.2449; comp. the digitalised version at http://zs.thulb.uni-jena.de (20.09.2016). So far, I have not been able to establish where Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung had the information about Lelewel’s book from. It seems, however, likely that this information was passed to publishers in Leipzig by Zawadzki himself as he had contacts there. He had worked in Leipzig, regularly spread information on new titles to German
Lelewel was translating from French but this does not change the fact that he was the first to translate passages of the Eddas into Polish and thus he is granted an honorary place in the history of Polish and even Lithuanian Scandinavian studies. Lelewel was well aware of his pioneering role in translating from Mallet’s anthology: “W Polskim języku dotąd rzecz ta tknięta niebyła [In the Polish language, this topic has hitherto not been touched]” (Edda, 1807:19). Lelewel’s translations in the revised second edition of 1828 were followed up by a translation of parts of the Snorra Edda and the Poetic Edda (comp. Suchodolska & Żydanowicz, 1971:115-118, 121f.). His translation of the Poetic Edda was finally replaced by Apolonia Załuska-Strömberg’s Edda poetycka, published in 1986. In contrast to Lelewel, Załuska-Strömberg translated from Old Icelandic (Edda poetycka, 1986:Lf.).

So far, Joachim Lelewel’s first Edda edition has been dealt with most intensively by Schlauch (1968) and Grzelak (1985), with the latter not being aware of Schlauch’s essay. Both of them focus on a comparison of Lelewel’s translation of proper names and stanzas from Hávamál and Vǫluspá with the Old Icelandic text and the translations in the publications by Paul Henri Mallet and Peder Hansen Resen. Schlauch (1968) also includes Lelewel’s revised second edition of 1828 in her discussion as well as an investigation into rimes and rhythmical prose. The fact that both Resen and Mallet to a significant extent had others do the translations for them or translated from Danish or Swedish translations is not taken up by Schlauch (1968) and Grzelak (1985) (see 2. and 4. below).

The focus of this article will not be a comparison of different translations. Instead, the work of Joachim Lelewel will be placed in the context of the interest in Old Norse literature and culture before 1800. After a look at this rising interest in the Poetic Edda, the Snorra Edda and Paul Henri Mallet’s publications, I will concentrate on the parts of the Eddas that were selected by Mallet for his Monumens […] of 1756 and trace Lelewel’s edition of that material for his Edda. As far as possible, Lelewel’s papers presented at the academic society in 1806 will be included in this discussion. Neither Schlauch (1968) nor Grzelak (1985) discuss these which may be due to the fact that they did not resort to Serejski (1958:211-214) who takes up the ones on the newspapers and published catalogues in Polish, French and German (comp. Cybulski, 1972:35, 103, 117).


Scythians and on Old Norse poetry, the latter of which is even published in Lelewel (1865b).  

An investigation into *Edda* is a prerequisite for a critical evaluation of Lelewel’s *Edda* of 1828 which deserves a study of its own. Suffice it to say at this point that *Edda* (1828) contrasts sharply with its predecessor as it is much more comprehensive (about 220 pages) and as Lelewel made use of the latest text editions and translations of the *Eddas* as well as research into mythology. Therefore, prominent names missing are even more conspicuous. Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, who published their edition (including a German translation) of the *Poetic Edda* in 1815, are not mentioned by Lelewel. In the period between the two *Edda* editions Lelewel published a translation of Joseph Chérade Montbron’s *Les Scandinaves*; Montbron in his turn translated the Latin text he found in Resen’s edition. Lelewel’s translation was published in *Tygodnik Wileński* in 1820 (Lelewel, 1865a:xv, 74-112).

### 2. INTEREST IN THE EDDAS AND MALLET’S PUBLICATIONS

The tangible starting point for the textual transmission of the *Eddas* are the Codex regius of the *Poetic Edda* (GKS 2365, 4to) that is dated to c. 1270 and for the *Snorra Edda* Codex Upsaliensis (DG 11, 4to) and the Codex regius of the *Snorra Edda* (GKS 2367, 4to), both dated to the first half of the 14th century. Apart from that, other relevant manuscripts containing *Snorra Edda* are Codex Wormianus (AM 242 fol.) dated to c. 1350, and the paper manuscript Codex Trajectinus (Utrecht no. 1374) which is dated to c. 1600. From the 17th century onwards, the *Eddas* together with the rich corpus of Old Norse prose texts were also resorted to in the rivalry between Danish and Swedish scholars who wanted to prove the great past of their respective countries. It was then that the interest in runic inscriptions as well as the collection and edition of Old Norse, in particular Old Icelandic, texts started on a larger scale with Sweden dominating in the number of publications (Malm, 1996:267f.; Malm, 2004:102-106). From the late 1620s onwards until

---

6 Schlauch (1968:57) barely mentions the paper on the Scythians.

7 Lelewel also discusses Rasmus Nyerup’s book on mythology and mentions Friedrich von der Hagen’s *Edda* edition of 1812 as well as the translations by Friedrich David Gräter of 1789 and von der Hagen of 1814 (*Edda*, 1828:5f., 202f., 206). Nyerup, von der Hagen, Gräter and the Grimms were involved in quarrels concerning the publication of *Edda* by the brothers Grimm; cf. Gottzmann (1987:69).

8 Codex Trajectinus is said to be a copy of a manuscript even older than Codex Upsaliensis and the Codex regius of the *Snorra Edda*, presumably from the middle of the 13th century (Tómasson, 1996:2f.). For a discussion of the meaning of the word *Edda*, its use for the so-called *Poetic Edda*, the genesis and interdependence of the content of the *Poetic* and the *Snorra Edda*, see Schier (1986) and Weber (1986).

9 For the 16th century, see Lönroth (1998) and Malm (2004).
the end of that century, manuscripts containing the *Eddas* got to Denmark: Codex Wormianus, Codex Upsaliensis, Codex Trajectinus, the Codex regius of the *Poetic Edda* and the *Snorra Edda* and two fragments (AM 748, 4to I which also contains poems from the *Poetic Edda* and AM 748, 4to II) (Tómasson, 1996:6ff.; Malm, 2004:102f., 105). Two of these manuscripts, however, changed their owners quite soon and got to the Netherlands (via Germany; Codex Trajectinus) and Sweden (Codex Upsaliensis) respectively (Tómasson, 1996:7). In the first half of the 17th century, the Danish scholar Ole Worm (after whom Codex Wormianus got its name) came into contact with the French cardinal Jules Mazarin and his librarian while they were looking for books and manuscripts to enlarge the cardinal’s collection. Dillmann (1996:16, 22 [footnote 9]) supposes that Worm wanted to do the cardinal a favour by having the *Snorra Edda* as contained in Codex Wormianus copied and a Latin translation prepared; both the copy and the translation were sent to France in 1646. Dillmann (1996:16) notes that it was “for allersførste gang” that the *Snorra Edda* was translated.

About twenty years later, in 1665 Peder Hansen Resen published parts of the *Snorra Edda* (including a Danish and a Latin translation) as well as Völuspá and Hávamál from the *Poetic Edda* (including a Latin translation). Faulkes (*Edda Islandorum*, 1977:10) has pointed out that Resen’s contribution to these editions was primarily restricted to the Latin introduction to the *Snorra Edda*. The texts of Völuspá and Hávamál in Resen’s editions seem to be linked to the Codex regius of the *Poetic Edda*; both the texts and the notes were prepared by others (*Edda Islandorum*, 1977:77f., 87f.). The text of the *Snorra Edda* in his edition (as Resen himself also points out) was almost completely prepared by Stephan Stephanius who in turn relied on the so-called *Laufás Edda* by Magnús Óláfsson and existing Danish and Latin translations of this version of the *Edda* (*Edda Islandorum*, 1977:23f., 28, 44f.). Malm (1996:46f., 113f.) has described Resen’s selection of material from the *Eddas* as rooted in his interest for “de etiska och moralfilosofiska aspekterna” which is expressed in concentrating on the mythological content of the *Snorra Edda* and in the titles of the editions of Völuspá and Hávamál (*Philosophia [...] Ethica Odini*). Resen’s editions were known to and used by Mallet (1756:23ff.) who likewise prioritises mythological narratives and renders Hávamál as “Discours sublime ou la Morale d’Odin [the sublime discourse or

---

10 The titles of these being *Edda Islandorum, Philosophia antiqvissima norvego-danica dicta Woluspa [...] and Ethica Odini pars Eddae Sæmundi vocata Haavamaal, una cum ejusdem appendice appelato Runa Capitule [...]. A faximile of these editions can be found in *Edda Islandorum* (1977).
the morality of Odin)” (Mallet, 1756:135; for the English translation comp. Mallet, 1770:201, 205).\textsuperscript{11}

Jochens (1996:234f.) stresses that Paul Henri Mallet’s publications on Danish history and Old Norse literature can be understood as a reaction to the works of Robert Molesworth and Charles de Montesquieu.\textsuperscript{12} Molesworth, formerly English ambassador in Denmark, wrote about the coup d’etat of 1660 in Denmark and “the shift to despotism” (Jochens, 1996:235), modelled on French absolutism, that resulted from it. Molesworth’s account, published for the first time in 1694 and later also translated into French, was known to Montesquieu and as he was “[p]revented from criticizing the despotism of his own country, Montesquieu vented his anger against the Danish king” (Jochens, 1996:235). The political situation in Denmark conflicted with Montesquieu’s ideas of political freedom which he associated with the Germanic tribes (Jochens, 1996:234f.). According to Jochens (1991:403 and 1996:235), Paul Henri Mallet (1730-1807) was given the task to counter these unfavourable images of Denmark.

Mallet, born in Switzerland, was not only Professor of French literature from 1752 onwards but also the crown prince’s tutor (Jochens, 1991:403 and 1996:235). In 1755, Mallet published Introduction à l’historie de Dannemarc [...] and in the years to follow he would publish more volumes, covering Danish history from prehistory to 1660. His Monumens [...] has already been mentioned. As the full title makes clear, this book was meant “pour servir de supplement et de preuve a l’Introduction a l’historie de Dannemarc [to serve as a supplement and proof to the introduction to the history of Denmark]”. The impact of Mallet’s work is, to a great deal, also due to the language he employed. As Weber (1996:83) writes it were Mallet’s books “som for første gang gjorde nordiske tekster [...] sprogligt tiligængelige, nemlig på fransk, for et europæisk publikum” – Lelewel’s Edda proves this evaluation as well. In 1763, the second edition was published and the third one in 1787 (both comprising Introduction [...] and Monumens [...] ). By 1770, Thomas Percy had completed his English translation new editions of which were also published during the 19th century.

The interest in Mallet’s work was also intensified by an admiration for the Noble Savage along the lines of Jean-Jacques Rousseau that, according to Lönnroth (1998:233f.), “became one of the driving forces of the so-called ‘Nordic Renaissance’” on the Continent and the British Isles in the second half of the 18th century. Interest focussed on the Celts, the ancient Germanic

\textsuperscript{11} Malm (1996:203-210) discusses among other things Mallet’s (shifting) notion of the poetic and his treatment of the formal characteristics of Old Norse poetry in the first and second edition of Introduction [...].

people(s) and the Scythians as they “had not been tamed, domesticated, and corrupted by modern civilisation” (Lönnroth, 1998:234; see also Serejski, 1958:43, 54f.). A differentiation between these peoples is less important than a general enthusiasm for a non-Greek, non-Roman past. It should not be forgotten that this spirit also led to the creation of fake Celtic poetry, James Macpherson’s Ossian poems that were published in the 1760s. Mallet’s and Macpherson’s texts and ideas strongly influenced German Pre-Romantics, especially Johann Gottfried Herder (Weber, 1996:83ff.), who, at least partly, also inspired Danish and Swedish poets and thinkers of the early 19th century (Weber, 1996:85; Lönnroth, 1998:235f.).

Looking at the last decades of the 18th century, one should also mention the foundation of the Arnamagnean Commission in 1772 and its efforts in editing Old Norse texts such as sagas and the Poetic Edda (Malm, 2004:107). Lelewel resorted to the first two volumes of the Commission’s Edda edition (published in 1787 in 1818) for his Edda (1828:5).

3. LELEWEL’S THOUGHTS ON THE ORIGIN OF THE PEOPLES AND OLD NORSE LITERATURE

Among the university teachers Joachim Lelewel had in Wilno, Gottfried Ernst Groddeck is credited with having formed Lelewel’s academic interests. Lelewel himself acknowledged how he was influenced by Groddeck who later also became his friend (Śliwiński, 1932:30, 33). Groddeck (1762-1825) was Professor of Greek and librarian at the university in Wilno but his academic horizon also comprised geography and the study of religions (Śliwiński, 1932:31f.; Serejski, 1958:204f.; Rothe, 2016:1-5). Groddeck’s mother tongue was German, he had studied at the university in Göttingen and had numerous contacts to other scholars. Thanks to that background, prevalent subjects in German academic discourse were made known to Lelewel and his fellow students (Serejski, 1958:205, 207). Moreover, as Wajsblum (1971:40) writes, Groddeck “propagated the study of the Icelandic language as one of the most valuable keys to linguistics”.

Traces of Groddeck’s influence can be found in the very first footnote of Edda (1807:3). There, Lelewel refers to an article on myths yet without providing Groddeck’s name (for a discussion of this article see Grzelak 1985:243). Many years later, Lelewel (1858:9) would also explicitly mention that information on trends in French and German academic circles given by Groddeck inspired work at the academic society in Wilno and “[w]ydanie Eddy 1807 bylo tego owocem [the publication of Edda in 1807 was a fruit of this]”. A further dimension to Lelewel’s interest is added by Serejski (1958:213) who argues that the links between the inhabitants of northern Europe and the Slavs can serve as an explanation. In support of Serejski, one
can mention a remark at the end of Lelewel’s paper on Old Norse poetry at the society in 1806.\(^\text{13}\)

Among the ancient peoples, Lelewel was most interested in the Scythians. He discussed them in the introductory passage in his *Edda* (1807:4-16, xiv) and the year before, in 1806, in a paper he wrote for the academic society. This paper on how the Scythians came to Northern Europe also included observations on their customs and their religion;\(^\text{14}\) moreover, he also quotes passages from Old Norse literature so that it in part overlaps in content with his work on Old Norse poetry for the society that same year.\(^\text{15}\) Lelewel’s singling out the Scythians is in accordance with the 18\(^{th}\)-century evaluation of ancient peoples. Following John Pinkerton, Lelewel believed them to be the oldest people and identified them with the Goths (*Edda*, 1807:4f.).\(^\text{16}\) Consequently, he could arrive at the conclusion that “Skandynawowie byli Scytami [Scandinavians were Scythians]” (*Edda*, 1807:18 [footnote]; also 4). As already Załuska-Strömberg has noted, the appeal of Pinkerton’s theory did not prevent Lelewel from critically commenting the weak evidence offered by Pinkerton (*Edda*, 1807:10 [footnote b]; *Saga o Gunlaugu*, 1968:XLI).\(^\text{17}\) The fact that Lelewel draws on Pinkerton’s work instead of Mallet’s preface in *Edda* (1807) has been interpreted in more general terms by Grzelak (1985:241f.) as a display of Lelewel’s knowledge of contemporary academic works and also self-confidence in judgement. So far, research has not taken into consideration that Lelewel’s interest in the Scythians may also have been intensified by the notion of the Asian decent of the Æsir which is discussed in

---

\(^\text{13}\) The quote reads: “Nieśmy poszanowanie dla tych narodów, które nigdyś przed nami tę ziemię dzierżyły [We hold respect for those peoples who once before us held this land]” (Lelewel, 1865b:40).

\(^\text{14}\) The full title of this work is ‘Ostatnie Scytów do Skandynawii przybycie [The final arrival of the Scythians in Scandinavia]’. Only the accompanying foreword to it is printed in Lelewel (1865b:25-28), the paper itself has, to my knowledge, not been published but is preserved in the manuscript Biblioteka Raczyńskich 1387. Serejski (1958:211f.) resorted to it for his discussion of Lelewel’s view on history.

\(^\text{15}\) These passages are placed in footnotes which actually cover the whole page. Lelewel (1806:6r-7v) relates content on the Jomsvikings and Ragnar Loðbrók that he found in Mallet (1755:132ff., 201-206). Moreover, Lelewel (1806:7v-9r) quotes from *Hervarar saga* which is also used in his paper on poetry.

\(^\text{16}\) Pinkerton’s *Dissertation on the origin of the Scythians or Goths* is mentioned in *Edda* (1807:4). Grzelak (1985:242) writes about “wyraźnie oznaczone cytaty [exactly indicated quotations]” from Pinkerton’s work in *Edda* (1807:5-11). Lelewel uses quotation marks but the passages I have compared rather suggest that a classification as quotations from Pinkerton’s *Dissertation [...] is not justified. Moreover, Lelewel, after having mentioned Pinkerton and some other authors, informs his readers that he did not have all their books at hand, therefore using “wyciąg skąd inąd [an excerpt from elsewhere]” (*Edda*, 1807:4).

\(^\text{17}\) Later, Lelewel changed his view on this aspect as becomes clear from a letter to his brother Prot (letter dated 11 February 1808; Lelewel, 1878:115) and his foreword to *Edda* (1828:5).
Pinkerton, Mallet (1755:e.g. 12f., 36f.; Mallet, 1755 is also referred to in Edda 1807:30 [footnote 15] although for different information)\(^{18}\) and in another French source, *Magasin Encyclopedique* (Rozen, 1805a and Rozen, 1805b:254).\(^{19}\) As for one of the articles in *Magasin Encyclopedique*, its author Rozen (1805a:e.g. 357, 361)\(^{20}\) presents passages of Old Norse literature linked to mythology, primarily *Ynglinga saga*, thereby also referring to the notion that the realm of the Svear is identical with the home of the Scythians. Lelewel resorted to this article by Rozen for two of his works (Lelewel, 1806:10r-12v; Lelewel, 1865b:32).

Same as Mallet, Lelewel treats the *Eddas* as a source for pre-Christian religion (comp. the titles and *Edda*, 1807:15ff.) but the lengthy elaboration on the migration of the Scythians is characteristic of Lelewel’s *Edda* (1807) only. Mallet also mentions the Scythians, mainly in his *Introduction [...]* (Mallet, 1755:e.g. 12, 16, 23f., 36f.; Mallet, 1756:135), at times doubtful as regards their name. Mallet did not differentiate between the Celts and the “anciens Scandinaves [ancient Scandinavians]” (compare, for example, the title of the first edition of his *Monumens [...]*, something that Lelewel was critical of (*Edda*, 1807:18f. [footnote c]).\(^{21}\) Mallet begins his preface with commenting on how valuable the study of religion is: “C’est sur cette Scène [...] que les hommes sont véritablement représentés tels qu’ils sont [It is on this stage [...] that men are represented, as they really are]” (Mallet, 1756:Avant-Propos 3; English translation Mallet, 1770:i). He argues that the Celtic influence can be traced to his day, for instance in legislation and the position of women (Mallet, 1756:Avant-Propos 8). Jochens (1996:236f. and in more detail 1991:403-406) has drawn the attention to the fact that the notion of strong and independent Old Norse (i.e. not just generally Germanic) women and the Norse origin of chivalry are first voiced in Mallet’s works although the extracts from the *Eddas* and Skaldic poetry he has chosen only provide weak proof of this.

\(^{18}\) It is also taken up in Mallet (1756:4 [footnote a]).

\(^{19}\) The full title being *Magasin Encyclopedique, ou Journal des sciences, des lettres et des arts*. In his works for the academic society, Lelewel refers to the issues of June and August which means issues 3 and 4. Lelewel’s summary of Rozen (1805a) is printed in Lelewel (1865a:21-25).

\(^{20}\) Apart from the name, it is mentioned that Rozen held a doctorate from the university in Uppsala (Rozen, 1805a:356; Rozen, 1805b:250). Due to this and information in *Nordisk Familjebok* (http://runeberg.org/nfcc/0486; 19.09.2016) I assume him to be Gustaf Rosén (1772-1835).

\(^{21}\) The term Celts is not used in the title of the second edition of 1763. It should also be added that Mallet’s English translator Thomas Percy did not share this broad definition of Celts (compare the changed title – the Celts are not mentioned – and the rendering of the original ‘Celtique’ as, for example ‘Gothic’, ‘ancient Runic’ or ‘northern’ in Mallet, 1770:xvi, xviii, xxvi, 183).
In a side note to his paper on Old Norse poetry Lelewel also refers to the topos of the respect for women.22

This paper for the academic society (Lelewel, 1865b:28-41) starts with a list of influential publications in the field, from Ole Worm’s works on runic inscriptions to editions of the Eddas (Lelewel, 1865b:28ff.).23 Lelewel also informs his listeners that he was familiar with the content the Poetic and the Snorra Edda which had become known thanks to Paul Henri Mallet (Lelewel, 1865b:31f.).24 In the remaining part Lelewel concentrates on Old Norse poetry in general, which in form and content might not appeal to contemporary readers in the first place: “Umysł Skandynawów […] przyodziewał się w mniej kształtne może dla nas wyrazy [the mind of the Scandinavians […] clothed itself in, maybe to us, less formed expressions]” (Lelewel, 1865b:33).

Lelewel in part groups this poetry according to content, differentiating “religious verses” (Lelewel, 1865b:34) and poems drawing on historical events or heroic deeds (Lelewel, 1865b:28 [title], 30). When writing about the poets, Lelewel employs the loan word “Skald” (Lelewel, 1865b:31, 35f., 39f.). Lelewel characterises Old Norse poetry as containing “piękne i mocne wyobrażenia, w których jednak prostota i ciemność zawsze panują, a wszystko tchnie powagą i ponurością [beautiful and strong images, in which, however, plainness and darkness always rule and everything breathes seriousness and gloominess]” (Lelewel, 1865b:34; a similar description on 37f.).

The focus on poetry also determines Lelewel’s approach to other Old Norse texts which gain value because of the poetry they contain. This becomes especially obvious in his comment on Erik Julius Björner’s edition of fornaldarsögur (Lelewel, 1865b:29 [footnote 9]) and his treatment of Hervarar saga, from which Lelewel only quotes Hervararkviða, a song that relates Hervǫr’s plead to her dead father Angantýr at his grave mound (Lelewel, 1865b:35f.). In a side-note on Hervarar saga, Lelewel (1865b:37) finds the

---

22 There, Lelewel concludes that it is “Skandynawczyk któremu dziś oświecona Europa wdzięczność niesie, że postawił w niej tę płeć na stopniu na jakim dziś ją widzimy [the Scandinavian, whom today enlightened Europe expresses her gratitude that he here [in Europe] put that sex on the level on which we see it today]” (Lelewel, 1856:38).

23 The full title being ‘O dumach i pieśniach skandynawskich [On Scandinavian elegies and songs]’, with the Polish term ‘duma’ denoting an epico-lyrical poem, a kind of elegy that takes up heroic deeds or historical subjects. Comp. http://encyklopedia.pwn.pl/haslo/duma;4008059.html (20.09.2016). A digitalised version of Lelewel (1856) can be found at http://sbc.org.pl. This work by Lelewel is also shortly discussed in Serejski (1958:213f.). Jabłońska-Erdmanowa (1931:170) and Lelewel (1878:66; letter dated 9 April 1806) also mention another paper on runic inscriptions that Lelewel prepared for the society. This one is not published in Lelewel (1865b) but some illustrations with runes can be found there (no pages numbers; in the digitalised version included after the table of contents).

24 This is in line with the information Lelewel provides in the letter mentioned earlier (Lelewel, 1878:110). Mallet is mentioned several times in Lelewel (1865b:30-33, 38, 40) sometimes spelled incorrectly as Maket or Maltet.
depiction of giants and other supernatural beings worth mentioning as this proves exceptional vivid imagination: “nigdzie okwitszych takowych urojeń znaleźć nie możemy jako u Skandynawów [nowhere can we find such a rich imagination than with the Scandinavians]”. A look at where Lelewel got to know about Hervarar saga is instructive in terms of reception history, both as regards the language and the editions used. As the footnotes reveal, Lelewel had read about Hervör, Gefjon and other mythological/literary protagonists in issues of Magasin Encyclopedique (Lelewel, 1865b:33, 35ff., 39), the same journal that has been mentioned before in connection with the Scythians. This French journal was published by Aubin Louis Millin who was also in contact with Lelewel’s teacher Gottfried Ernst Grodeck, probably from 1806 onwards, as Rothe (2016:42) assumes.

4. EXCERPTS FROM THE POETIC AND THE SNORRA EDDA

In Edda (1807:19), Lelewel explicitly informs his readers that he created an abridged version of Mallet’s French translation.25 Therefore, it would be beside the point to list all omissions so I will concentrate on aspects that seem characteristic for Mallet’s and Lelewel’s approach.

It should not be forgotten that at the time when Mallet and Lelewel got in contact with the Eddas, work with the Old Norse texts was complicated by the fact that there was a lack of grammars for this language before 1811.26 Mallet himself described his knowledge of Old Norse as “fort imparfaitement [very imperfect]” and he mentions that he resorted to Danish and Swedish translations (Mallet, 1756:Avant-Propos 22, 23). Yet Mallet could also rely on the help of people who had studied the Eddas in the original language, among them the Icelander “Mr. Eriksen” (Jón Eiríksson) thanks to whom, as Mallet writes, the translation of Hávamál became more exact than the one in Resen’s edition (Mallet, 1756:Avant-Propos 22, comp. Mallet, 1770:xxx).27

Lelewel follows Mallet in including basic information on the medieval Icelandic scholars associated with the Eddas: Sæmundr Sigfússson, who then was believed to have written the Poetic Edda, and Snorri Sturluson. Lelewel is, however neither interested in the manuscript transmission of the Eddas nor the accessible editions and manuscripts (Peder Hansen Resen is barely

25 In Lelewel’s words: “Dziś przedsiębierzemy iak náykrótszym sposobém, wykład obu Edd wykonać. Maliesta wiec skrócenie jest naszym przedmiotem [Today we embark on how to translate both Eddas in the shortest way. The abridgement of Mallet is therefore our subject]” (Edda, 1807:19).

26 In her article on the brothers Grimm, Gottzmann (1987:68) stresses that apart from Rasmus Kristian Rask’s grammar that was published in 1811, only the one by Runólfur Jónsson was available, the last edition of which had already been published in 1703.

27 This aspect is not put into consideration by Grzelak (1985) who arrives at a highly critical evaluation of Mallet’s translation.
mentioned by Lelewel; *Edda* 1807:18) – aspects that Mallet (1756:Avant-Propos 23-26) takes up.

Mallet places the extracts of the *Snorra Edda* before the *Poetic Edda*. Lelewel’s arrangement seems more natural as he starts with extracts of the *Poetic Edda* which is also the elder one of the two. Resen’s two editions of the *Poetic Edda* only comprise material from *Völsög* and Hávamál. Following Resen, Mallet and Lelewel likewise only include extracts of these so called mythological poems which is also motivated by their interest in pre-Christian religion. *Völsög* is only scarcely covered by Mallet. The eleven stanzas he chose, about the end of the world and the new beginning, are quoted in his comments to the *Snorra Edda* (Mallet, 1756:115f., 119, 122; in Resen’s edition 59 stanzas). Of these, Lelewel selected seven for his *Edda* (1807:16, 20), almost exclusively those about the end of the world. Grzelak (1985:247ff. and 250) has compared the Old Norse text of *Völsög* with Mallet’s and Lelewel’s translations and concludes that Lelewel’s translation is close to its French source, thus also keeping the mistakes that can be found in Mallet’s version. Grzelak (1985:249, 250f., 253) makes this observation also concerning other words and phrases. As regards Hávamál, stanzas 138 to 164 (numbering according to *Edda* Neckel Kuhn, 1983) are published separately from the other stanzas in Resen’s edition as Runa Capitule (*Edda Islandorum 1977*: c 1r-c 2v). This is imitated by Mallet (1756:144-149) who includes one stanza (number 144) from Rúnatal and stanzas from Ljóðatal as the final part of the *Poetic Edda*. Moreover, Mallet quotes stanzas from Baldr’s draumar in this section, a poem that is not transmitted in Codex regius or Resen’s edition. Of the material that Mallet published as Hávamál, Lelewel included only about a quarter, most notably resigning from stanzas from Ljóðatal and Baldr’s draumar (comp. Mallet, 1756:136-149 and *Edda*, 1807:21-25).

Extracts from the *Snorra Edda* constitute the largest part of the publications by Mallet (1756:1-132) and Lelewel (*Edda* 1807:26-55). For a better understanding of Mallet’s and Lelewel’s handling of the *Snorra Edda*, a short look at the manuscripts is necessary. The four main manuscripts of the *Snorra Edda* all include four parts: the Prologue, Gylfaginning, Skáldskaparmál and Háttatal. Apart from differences in the wording, especially between the Codex regius of the *Snorra Edda* and Codex Upsaliensis (*Edda Uppsala*, 2012:xliv-1v), further material is inserted between the four parts, most notably between Skáldskaparmál and Háttatal: the Second Grammatical Treatise in Codex Upsaliensis and all four Grammatical Treatises in Codex Wormianus (*Edda Faulkes*, 1982:xxix-v.; van Nahl, 2013:31 [table 1]). Codex Upsaliensis is the

---

28 This observation was also made by Grzelak (1985:246).
29 Grzelak (1985:250) writes that the excerpt from *Völsög* was “przelożony w całości przez Lelewela [was translated in its entirety by Lelewel]” but Lelewel only translated the verses he found in Mallet (1756:115f., 122), not the ones in Mallet (1756:119).
only manuscript of the *Snorra Edda* that includes the name *Edda* and the information that Snorri Sturluson composed it (Faulkes, 1982: xiii ff.). It remains difficult to establish in which order the four parts where created and in how far Snorri Sturluson was involved in this; furthermore, some questions concerning the unity of composition and the title *Edda* arise from the relation between Gylfaginning and Skáldskaparmál (*Edda Uppsala*, 2012: lxvii-lxxiii; van Nahl, 2013:29-33, 43-47; see also *Edda* Faulkes, 1982:xiv).

Mallet decided not to publish the Prologue although he found it in Resen’s *Edda Islandorum* and in Johan Göransson’s edition of the *Snorra Edda* based on Codex Upsaliensis (Mallet, 1756: Avant-Propos 24 f.). Göransson’s edition, published in 1746, included selected parts of Codex Upsaliensis, namely the Prologue, Gylfaginning and the note about Snorri Sturluson. Mallet himself also had access to Codex Upsaliensis and used it occasionally for his translation (Mallet, 1756: Avant-Propos 24 f.). Although Mallet omitted the Prologue, he gives his readers an idea of its content. It is a text “où l’on croit voir revivre le fameux Rudbeck dans la personne de l’auteur [where one believes to see the famous Rudbeck revived in the author]” (Mallet, 1756: Avant-Propos 25).

This allusion refers Olof Rudbeck’s *Atland, eller Manheim*, published in four volumes in 1679-1702, in which, to quote Malm (2004:105), Rudbeck “interpreted Greek mythology as a twisted retelling of Swedish history.” The omission of the Prologue of the *Snorra Edda* shows that Mallet was not aware of its function, that is the attempt to place Old Norse mythology in the Christian medieval concept of history, thereby also legitimising its transmission (*Edda* Faulkes, 1982: xv; *Edda* Krause, 1997: 258). As the Prologue is not included in Mallet (1756), it cannot be found in Lelewel either. As has already been mentioned above, Lelewel was familiar with the topos of the Asian descent of the Æsir as shown in his introductory passage on the migration of the Scythians to northern Europe. Lelewel’s introduction to *Edda* (1807) can therefore be seen as a substitute for the missing Prologue to the *Snorra Edda*.

The extracts from Gylfaginning are very comprehensive in Mallet’s edition (Mallet, 1756: 1-124). This can also be said about Lelewel’s version if measured against the total number of pages of his *Edda* (1807: 26-52). Mallet includes a section with comments after each narrative, something that is not imitated by Lelewel. Lelewel’s comments are mostly included in footnotes. Some of them are based on the comments in Mallet (1756) but occasionally

---

30 In his second edition of *Monumens [...]*, Mallet calls the Prologue “morceau rempli d’inepties [absurd piece]” (Mallet, 1763: 33; English translation Mallet 1770: xxiv ff.).

31 There, Lelewel also refers to Pinkerton’s evaluation of Óðinn as allegory (*Edda*, 1807:10 [footnote b]). A similar evaluation in Mallet (1755:36 f.).

Lelewel also places short retellings of Gylfaginning in the footnotes (Edda, 1807:31, 34, 42) or relates information from e.g. Mallet (1755) or other sources that are not always indicated (e.g. Edda, 1807:29f., 32, 39). One can find, for instance, a footnote on Jötnheimr that reads “dziż Gestrykland [today Gästrikland]” (Edda, 1807:30). Thanks to the paper presented at the society in 1806 and the sources he mentions there, one can reconstruct that Lelewel must have read about this speculative identification of the giants’ home with a part of Sweden in an article on Hervarar saga in Magasin Encyclopedique (Rozen, 1805b:250f. [footnote 2]). The French translations and comments on that saga published there were based on Olof Verelius’ edition of 1672 and thus Rozen (1805b) also relates speculations on where to find Jötnheimr and Manheimr.

Gylfaginning opens with the so called Gefjon episode, the story of how the Swedish king Gylfí reward a woman named Gefjon by giving her as much land as four oxen could plough in one day and one night and thus explaining the creation of a lake in Sweden (often identified as Mälaren) and the Danish island Sjælland. As Gefjon is of the Æsir, this episode is often understood to motivate Gylfí’s interest in the power of the gods and his journey to Ásgarðr thus establishing a link between the Prologue and Gylfaginning. The linking function of the Gefjon-episode has been critically evaluated by van Nahl (2013:101ff.) who has demonstrated that this assumption cannot be upheld for the Snorra Edda. Furthermore, van Nahl (2013:102f.) points out that thanks to the omission of this episode in Codex Upsaliensis, Gylfí is not characterised as naive and prone to carnal desires. Mallet, following Codex Upsaliensis, does not relate the Gefjon-episode – Mallet (1756:3) also comments its missing linking function – and neither does he include the narratives on the wind and the seasons (narratives 18 and 19, numbering according to Edda Faulkes, 1982:20f.) which are to be found in Resen’s edition (Edda Islandorum, 1977:c 3v, g 4r-v).

Gylfaginning displays a characteristic narrative frame, the deception by the Æsir, and within this frame, knowledge about the gods is displayed in dialogues, a form that is known from the mediaeval Latin tradition as well as Eddic poetry, for example Vafþrúðnmál (Edda Faulkes, 1982:xxv). Thanks to this technique, the narrator can distance himself/herself from the content of the mythography (Edda Krause, 1997:261; Clunies Ross, 2005:176, 182f.). Thus, this technique serves the same end as the Prologue in finding a way to justify the relation of pagan content. Mallet (1756) included Gylfaginning with its narrative peculiarities. Lelewel, however, found it not necessary to keep the dialogue structure and merely mentions in the short introduction to Gylfaginning that the Swedish king Gylfí asked Hár, Jafnhár and Priði about

---

33 The excerpt and comments were prepared by Rozen (1805b) and published in two instalments (the second one in issue 5, p. 311-337).
the world and the gods (Edda, 1807:26). In accordance with his focus on religion and mythology, Lelewel only presents the “treść rozmowy [content of the conversation]” (Edda, 1807:26), thereby ignoring the literary form of Gylfaginning.

Skáldskaparmál is included in an extremely condensed form in Mallet (1756:125-132). He explains his selection with his interest in mythology. After having retold the story of how Óðinn stole the mead of poetry, he writes “après cette singulière fiction, on trouve dans l’Edda diverses fables qui non presque aucun rapport à la Mythologie [After this remarkable fiction, there are many Fables in the Edda which have little or no relation to mythology]” (Mallet, 1756:129; English translation Mallet, 1770:189). Mallet (1756:130f.) also includes some examples of kennings. Mallet’s already shortened Skáldskaparmál is summarised once more by Lelewel (Edda, 1807:55). Lelewel only relates the episode of the theft of the mead of poetry in more detail. Then, one can find the sentence “Koniec Eddy nowéy [End of the Younger Edda]” (Edda, 1807:54) and afterwards the list of kennings from Mallet’s chapter on Skáldskaparmál. With this list, Lelewel’s Edda (1807) ends.

Háttatal is not part of the editions by Resen and Göransson. Although Mallet had access to Codex Upsaliensis, he did not include Háttatal in his Monumens [...] and consequently, it is not included in Lelewel’s book. Háttatal is a poem praising king Hákon and jarl Skúli but at the same time it also serves to illustrate verse forms and thus fulfils a poetological function. It does not contribute to Mallet’s (and Lelewel’s) interest in mythological content.

Finally, a distinctive formal feature of Lelewel’s Edda should be mentioned that has also attracted the attention of Załuska-Strömberg (Saga o Gunnlaugu, 1968:XLVI) and Grzelak (1985:246). In contrast to Mallet, Lelewel included an index of names (Edda, 1807:I-XIII).

Summing up, one can see that although Joachim Lelewel follows Paul Henri Mallet quite closely in his shortened version, there are still some aspects in which Lelewel’s Edda (1807) differs from its source. These are (1) Lelewel’s introduction focusing on the migration of the Scythians, (2) no discussion of manuscripts or the reliability of the text editions of the Eddas, (3) the sequence of the Eddas with the Poetic Edda placed first, (4) a failing awareness for the literary value of the dialogue form in Gylfaginning due to a narrow focus on mythological content, (5) the comments in the footnotes and

---

34 This is also noted by Schlauch (1968:60) for the first edition of Edda but without possible reasons behind that change.

35 Whereas Mallet followed Codex Upsaliensis in omitting narratives 1, 18 and 19, he is not following it in incorporating narratives such as about Íðunn or the mead of poetry from Skáldskaparmál into the latter parts of Gylfaginning; cf. Edda Uppsala (2012:lvff.)
(6) the index of names. *Edda* (1807) proves that Lelewel aspired to make maximum use of the limited sources he had, notably French ones. Besides, it is an illustrative example of the reception of Old Norse literature around 1800.
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