

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

### SUMMARY

The *Sverris saga* (*Sv.s.*) is unique among saga texts in its extensive citation of long direct discourse speeches, especially epideictic speeches. Due to the nature of *Sv.s.* as a contemporary kings' saga, the historicity of these speeches, especially those attributed to King Sverrir, has usually been accepted with reservation concerning only some aspects of formulation.

The oratorical structure of the speeches does not usually reflect medieval rhetorical theory, although good logical order is almost invariably followed. The speeches employ emotional means of persuasion extensively. Logical persuasive tactics include especially the use of quotations, proverbs, and examples. The style of the speeches is more elaborate than that of the surrounding narrative text, but only figurative expression and praeteritio are especially characteristic for the speeches. Syntactical and semantic features do not distinguish the speeches from the remainder of the text. The structure and the formulation of the speeches thus reveal to a great extent the literary activity of the saga-author.

A comparison of the speeches in *Sv.s.* with actual contemporary speeches, especially *En tale mot biskopene* (*Tale*) but also the Old Norse homilies, confirms the results of the analysis of the saga speeches. The loose oratorical structure of most of the speeches in *Sv.s.* can not be compared with the superb oratorical structure of *Tale*. The persuasive techniques are superficially similar but essentially different. Stylistic differences are also substantial.

The speeches constitute the core of speech scenes. These scenes usually have a simple basic structure consisting of a short introduction followed by a single speech (or two speeches) mainly or entirely in direct discourse and then a short conclusion. A variant of the basic scene without a conclusion is also employed. The functions of the speech scenes in the composition of *Sv.s.* are manifold. Informative speeches often replace narrative plot, whereas persuasive speeches are most often employed for characterization of persons or situations, sometimes by recapitulation. The saga-author uses speech scenes, especially speech pairs, as literary devices in the compositional and rhetorical structure of the saga.

Various indices point toward the saga-author as the source of not only distinctive stylistic elements in the speeches, but at times even the contents of the speeches. The speeches, however, seem to preserve the basic ideology of the speaker when controlled by comparison with other historical sources. The speeches do not otherwise necessarily preserve much authentic "old tradition," and they are often suspect as historical sources.

The employment of the speech scenes and the formulation of the speeches reveal literary elements. Other literary elements are also obvious in the composition of *Sv.s.*, but the kings' sagas have yet to receive a thorough analysis of literary moments.

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

One of the most interesting of the kings' sagas is the *Sverris saga* (*Sv.s.*). Sverrir's regency (1177-1202) came at the climax of the Norwegian Civil War, and historical aspects of the period have long occupied scholars (Helle *NBS*, pp. 48-64). Due mainly to the masterly portraiture of King Sverrir in the saga text, his person has fascinated both researchers and authors. A vivid picture presented frequently is that of King Sverrir as orator *par excellence*, and extensive speeches are cited in direct discourse throughout the text. Sverrir has even found a place in the Norwegian national anthem as a sharp-tongued rhetorician: "fra dets [landets] høje Sverre talet/ Roma midt imod" (Bj. Bjørnson, "Ja, vi elsker dette landet").

King Sverrir is but one of many accomplished public speakers presented in the saga, and extensive citation of speeches is a special characteristic of the *Sv.s.* The speeches are often rhetorical accomplishments which reveal sophisticated oratorical skill, sound logical presentation, and psychologically effective persuasive acumen. Speeches are presented in the *Sv.s.* in several different situations (Indrebø, pp. lxvii f.) and reflect the importance of public speaking in actual daily life. Speeches include both information and persuasion, although the persuasive element is often stronger. Deliberative military speeches comprise over 50% of all speeches presented. Kings' sagas usually present relatively few judicial speeches compared to the legal preoccupation of many family sagas (cf. *Njáls saga*); *Sv.s.* is typical in this respect. A distinctive feature of the *Sv.s.*, however, is the inclusion of many epideictic speeches.

Research in the *Sv.s.* has long been concerned with historical aspects, especially with the evaluation of the saga as historical source material. The saga belongs to the group of sagas which Nordal would classify as contemporary sagas ("samtidssagaer"). Contemporary sagas are based on actual historical events and are generally considered to have inherently greater historical value. However, realization of the literary nature of saga genres evokes the question as to whether the contents and style of the speeches presented reflect truly transmitted speech statements by the historical characters to whom they are attributed, or whether they are basically the saga-author's/redactor's literary composition.

Various historians have taken somewhat subjective approaches to this question and have come to divergent results. F. Paasche states the following concerning Sverrir's speeches (*ToS*, p. 14):

disse taler som selv i nedskrift er altfor glimrende  
og særegne, altfor ulike alle andre taler i sagaerne  
til at de kan være sagaskriverens frie digtning.

Koht, on the other hand, states concerning the speeches in Ch. 40-Ch. 100 (*MBSS*, p. 342):

Mange, kanskje dei fleste av dem, synes helst vera  
konstruert av sjølve sagaskrivaren....Some av talane  
til kong Sverre synes ha eit meir faktisk grunnlag,  
så sermerkte som dei er.

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

Many scholars, like Koht, make a distinction between Sverrir's speeches and those of other characters (Blöndal, p. 204; Schlauch, p. 298; Gunnes, p. 346; implied in F. Paasche above). This paper hopes to contribute to an evaluation of the speeches in the *Sv.s.*

Various philological problems concerning the manuscripts, the origin of the saga (sources employed and time of composition), and the author of the saga must be mentioned before proceeding (cf. *KLNM*, "Sverris saga"). The four major manuscripts (cf. Indrebø, pp. xxxi-li) are: AM 327 4° (A), *Eirspennill* = AM 47 fol. (E), *Flateyjarbók* (F), and *Skálholtsbók yngsta* = AM 81a fol. (81a). A, F, and 81a constitute one manuscript family and represent the original text more faithfully than E which is truncated. A is the *codex optimus*. This examination concerns basically the text of *Sv.s.* as given final form by the redactor of AM 327 4°, although other manuscript variants will be cited occasionally.

The most important source for information about the origin and author of the *Sv.s.* is the prologue, which is found in all four major manuscripts, but which exists in two versions. The shorter version is closest to the original which was probably written by the person who completed the saga (Holm-Olsen, p. 49). The longer version, found only in F, is expanded and altered (however, cf. Brekke, pp. 123-162). The basic information provided is that Abbot Karl Jónsson from Þingeyrar wrote the first part of the saga under King Sverrir's personal direction (i.e. 1185-1188/89); that part is known as *Grýla*. The later part of the saga is said to be based on eyewitness accounts, some of which were written down soon after the events. Holm-Olsen's results concerning the characteristics and length of the *Grýla* section (to Ch. 31, i.e. 1178, with a gradual transition to the following section) are generally accepted. One author was most probably responsible for the final form of the entire saga, which Helle (OB, pp. 49-111) dates to around or before 1210. This one person could have been Karl Jónsson (d. 1212/13).

Indrebø provides a list of speeches in the introduction to his edition of the A version of *Sv.s.* (pp. lxvii-lxxi). The list includes all instances of public oratory which consist of a speaker talking to an audience, which are presented mainly in direct discourse, and which are of some length. For convenience sake this list serves as the basic description of source material [Indrebø's "Ch. 81" is a misprint for Ch. 82]. The discussions and formal conversations listed as such (p. lxviii) are not included, except for the public debates in Ch. 60 and Ch. 117; likewise Ch. 112 is included. In addition the speeches in Ch. 162-164 and in Ch. 175 are included.

Indrebø's modified list encompasses thus 60 speeches. The total number of instances of public speaking mentioned or presented in *Sv.s.* is ca. 190. Thus ca. 30% of all possible speaking opportunities alluded to are realized with speeches. The 60 speeches contain over 70% of all direct discourse presented in the saga; 23% of the entire text is presented in direct discourse (cf. Hallberg, p. 214).

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

Reference to entire speeches is usually made simply by citing the chapter number as established by the divisions in the *Fornmanna sögur* edition. References to individual passages include page and line citations to Indrebø's edition.

Relatively few speeches presented in the *Sv.s.* conform to the teachings of medieval rhetorical theory concerning oratorical structure. In spite of some flexibility, four structural parts are almost universal in medieval theory: exordium, exposition, argument (persuasion and dissuasion), and conclusion (cf. Baldwin, pp. 303-304; Curtius, pp. 77-81). The lack of conformity with theory is understandable for some speeches, i.e. mid-battle encouragements. However, most speeches, although formulated as entire and complete, consist only of a presentation of the argument section (i.e. Ch. 126) or of an ordered set of statements (i.e. Ch. 28). Speeches may be logically constructed while still not conforming to medieval rhetorical principles (i.e. Ch. 52).

Although a conclusion is often missing (since the speeches are relatively short and straight-forward), the exordium is the structural part most often lacking. The speech in Ch. 125 presents the only obvious exordium (p. 132,6-7): "her er nu faman comiN mikill fiolþi goðra manna þyrfta ec at minu mali goðan rom alpyðu" (cf. Ch. 158, p. 166,13-14: "bað meN gefa gaum vendliga hvat hann sagði"). This phenomenon is comparable to the lack of formulaic salutation or closing in the letters quoted in *Sv.s.* (cf. p. 48,9-14, p. 150,19-28). Even a contemporary runic letter-fragment from Sverrir's son contains a formulaic introduction (Liestøl).

Sverrir's "Speech Against Drunkenness" (Ch. 104), although it lacks an exordium and presents the conclusion in narrated discourse (p. 111,29-30), is one of the few which realizes medieval rhetorical principles in its structure. The exposition first expresses thanks to most merchants and then rebukes the Hanseatic merchants. The argument concerns the dangers of drink and consists of first dissuasion (a list of losses climaxing in the loss of the soul) and then persuasion (a plea for moderation in all things). The speeches which Schlauch examines (Ch. 38, Ch. 47, Ch. 99 Sverrir, and Ch. 179, but not Ch. 60) conform somewhat to medieval structural principles.

The persuasive speeches presented are generally effective. Effectiveness can be attributed to many factors. Persuasion by threat, although frequent in other kings' sagas (consider Saint Óláfr's hard-handed method of Christianization), is not often present in *Sv.s.* (cf. however Ch. 69). The persuasion is more subtle and usually includes passionate emotional appeals. Emotional appeals are generally more effective than sober rational ones (cf. the rational and ineffective first half of Ch. 52 versus the emotional and effective second half). Some seemingly logical statements conceal emotional argumentation (i.e. the "choice" given between winning or dying with honor in Ch. 29, Ch. 47, and Ch. 154). A speaker frequently expresses his preference as a suggestion (cf. Ch. 120). Whereas implicit statements of preference can be ineffective (cf.

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

Ch. 88, p. 94,32-33: "þottuz menn finna hvat er hann villdi").

Some speeches include audience participation (cf. Ch. 76), and speakers, especially Sverrir, often identify themselves with the audience in a situation with common interests (cf. Ch. 8, Ch. 88). An identification of the speaker with the audience is also effected implicitly and grammatically by the use of hortatives instead of second person commands (there are ca. 50 instances of each in the speeches) and by the use of first person plural forms instead of first person singular ones (cf. Ch. 35 and Ch. 99 Sverrir, especially p. 106,26-27: "oc þetta fama er nu talpa ec ma os [eint fyrnaz]").

Persuasion is effected by both rational and emotional tactics. Rational persuasive tactics include especially employment of quotations and sayings and extensive use of examples. Quotations are taken from the Bible (Ch. 20, p. 22,28-29; Ch. 99 Sverrir, p. 105,29-32), scaldic poetry (Ch. 47, p. 51,3-6), Eddic poetry (the "Fáfnismál" strophe in Ch. 164, p. 178,12-14), and statements of the enemy, both hypothetical (Ch. 99 Sverrir, p. 106,31-34 and p. 107,10-14) and perhaps real (Ch. 38, p. 42,28-32; Ch. 133, p. 138,2). Extensive use is made of sayings and proverbs (i.e. Ch. 47, p. 50,15 and p. 50,23-24; cf. Indrebø's list p. lx).

Examples may be hypothetical (Ch. 47, p. 50,13-24), Biblical (Ch. 99 Sverrir, p. 105,36-106,6), or historical (Ch. 60, p. 66,28-33; p. 66,36-67,1). Historical examples are most frequent and range from alluding to heathen times (Ch. 176, p. 189,22-23) to citing the present situation (Ch. 176, p. 189,25-26). They include references to the history of Sverrir's party, the Birkibeinar, (Ch. 52, p. 57,36-58,2) and general references to the "Birkibeinar of old" (Ch. 143, p. 147,29; Ch. 164, p. 178,7).

Indrebø (pp. lxix-lxx) lists most of the emotional elements used in the speeches: appeals to fear, greed, honor, duty, vengeance, general martial spirit, and *esprit de corps*. He also lists instances of name calling and use of pejorative terms (pp. lxiii-lxiv) and emotional appeals to religion and God (pp. lxix-lxx). Attempts to capture the audience's goodwill emotionally (cf. Ch. 133, Ch. 154) include obvious flattery of the audience (i.e. Ch. 52, p. 58,14-15; cf. Lie, p. 88, for comments on *captatio benevolentia*).

Direct address to the audience is used for emotional effect. Address with other than personal pronouns occurs infrequently. Apostrophe includes the submissive "herRa" used when addressing Sverrir (Ch. 117, Ch. 138, Ch. 153), and the intimate "goðir halfar/hofþingjar/dreingir/menn" which Sverrir uses in addressing others, usually in speeches of encouragement (Ch. 47, Ch. 126, Ch. 147, Ch. 163, Ch. 179).

Few other stylistic devices are used with the same conscious persuasive intent. The speeches, however, make extensive use of typical Old Norse stylistic devices. The most characteristic stylistic ornamentation is tautological-conjunction which may also employ balanced word-placement and is sometimes alliterative. Hávarðr jarls-

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

son's speech in Ch. 99 exemplifies these elements (p. 105, 13-27): "vel oc macliga," "trauðt oc hlifðciolldr," "trauðtligi fylgð oc fulltrva," "valc oc vandkvæði," and "goðra drengia oc gofugra." Indrebø lists the occurrences of stylistic embellishments in A (pp. lv-lxv), and although the lists are not always complete, they are representative. Speeches represent only 16% of the entire text, but they contain over 50% of all tautological-conjunctions, instances of alliteration, instances of parallel construction, verbal correspondences, rhymes, and metaphors.

Svína-Pétr's speech in Ch. 96 has the strongest rhetorical flavor of all speeches. Stylistic embellishments include rhyme, various types of verbal correspondences, repetitions, and parallel constructions in addition to extensive use of tautological-conjunction, balanced word-placement, and alliteration (p. 103, 2-35):

recnir oc keyrðir, lati...illa eða þyrgit, ringia eða  
þyngia, tauta eða tutla, grið oc þætt;  
rettan hofþingia oc vitran, miukir hirðmenn oc hogværir;  
vind oc vatn, milldan oc malþniallan, landvarnar...  
landz-þtiornar, agetan oc oruggan, laff oc lykill,  
frelfi oc friði, flærðara oc falþara, fagna oc i frið  
leiða;  
rettan...oc vitran. milldan oc malþniallan retlatan oc  
friþþaman agetan oc oruggan;  
Nu er ibrotu...bratu ero nu; latit þer nu ibrot  
fara...latit oc abrot fara...

Differences between the style of the speeches and the style of the narrative prose are basically quantitative rather than qualitative. Indrebø states (p. lxv): "talane er rikare þaa stílþryð enn prosaen ikring." Some specific stylistic elements are, however, particularly characteristic for speeches. These include figurative expression (i.e. Ch. 73, p. 79, 26: "bellta-drattr"; Ch. 96, p. 103, 17: "beygt halþana a meiom storbuccum"; cf. Indrebø's list, pp. lxii-lxiii) and praeteritio (Ch. 35, p. 39, 13-14: "En eigi þarf at greina fyrir yör..."; cf. also Ch. 53, p. 59, 1-3 and Ch. 89, p. 96, 29-30). Litotes is also used with persuasive intent (Ch. 52, p. 58, 19-20: "hefir yör þat þialldan logiz er ec þagði..."). Irony and ridicule are characteristic of various speeches attributed to Sverrir (cf. Indrebø, p. lxx; Lie, p. 88).

A grammatical and syntactical analysis of the speeches also reveals minor quantitative rather than qualitative differences between the speeches and the narrative text. The general period structure varies as much within the speeches as it does in the text as a whole. Most periods are simple, but they can become complex with extensive subordinate clauses. A comparison of ten sample speeches (the comparison material in Lie, p. 106) with an equal amount of narrative text located in proximity of the speeches reveals longer periods in the speeches (250 periods as compared to 336 for the narrative sections). The speeches also reveal a higher percentage (48% in the sample material) of introduction of new peri-

ods by the conjunctions "oc" and "en" than the narrative text (38%). This difference may indicate an attempt at "oral style" in the presentation of the speeches (cf. the rambling "oc" in the speeches in Ch. 76 and Ch. 84).

The speeches do not make extensive use of excited usual or excited occasional word-placement. Initial position is, however, used for emphasis of certain words, especially the negation "eigi"/"eckí" (cf. Ch. 8, p. 7,30: "Eigi syniz mer..."; Ch. 88, p. 95,29: "Eckí munum ver tengia saman scip vár"). Use of negation is a semantic characteristic for discourse, especially direct discourse, in the family sagas (cf. Netter, pp. 176-177), and this is confirmed for the *Sv.s.* Characteristic for speeches are also instances of double negation (Ch. 35, p. 40,1: "eigi uliclict") and litotes using negation (Ch. 88, p. 94,21: "eckí vel vingaz"). Sometimes negation is used subtly in the persuasion (Ch. 88, p. 94,28-30: "Nu vil ec eigi með einræði mino leiða yör...oc vil ec eigi æðraz...").

A semantic characteristic of saga texts is the extensive use of the adverbial "nú" (often functioning in conjunctive parataxis) in one of three categories:

1. the saga-author's "nú," i.e. p. 39,7: "Nu er at segja fra...";
2. epic "nú" (cf. Hallberg, pp. 31-35, 195-197), i.e. p. 41,20: "Nv forð Birkibeinar utan at þönum...";
3. direct discourse "nú," expressing present time during the act of discourse, i.e. p. 39,13: "'nu munum ver fagran sigr vinna.'"

An overuse of "nú" as an expression of emotional engagement and immediacy occurs often in *Sv.s.* in both the narrative text (i.e. p.37, 34-39) and in direct discourse (i.e. p. 128,16-18). Some speeches are marked by the frequent use of "nú" (i.e. Ch. 38, Ch. 52, Ch.53). The ten sample speeches contain 68 instances of "nú," whereas the equal amount of narrative prose contains only 10 instances. "Nú" is also overused in the letter quoted on p. 150,21-26, but this may reflect current document practices (cf. the urgent runic letter in Liestøl which contains "nú" four times).

Material in the form of actual speeches exists which can serve for comparison when discussing the oratorical structure, persuasive tactics, and stylistic and grammatical formulation of the speeches presented in *Sv.s.* One vernacular secular speech from the Scandinavian Middle Ages is preserved in its entirety, *En tale mot biskopene* (Tale), a speech on King Sverrir's behalf intended to be read from the church pulpit and at local assemblies; the speech is most likely dated to 1199/1200 (cf. *KLNM*, "Tale mot biskopene"). In addition the speeches in *Sv.s.* can be compared with sermons and homilies preserved in the Norwegian and Icelandic manuscripts known as the *Gamla norsk homilieboek* (GNH) and the *Islandsk homilieboek* (IslH). However, the homilies belong to the European homiletic tradition, are usually translations from Latin, and represent religious rather than secular oratory (cf. *KLNM*, "Homilieboeker" and "Predikan").

Holtmark's edition of *Tale* includes a philological analysis. *Tale* has as yet received no thorough literary analysis, although two

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

recent ideological and background analyses (Breiteig; Gunnes) touch on some literary points. Both examinations compare *Tale* with speeches in *Sv.s.* (Breiteig, pp. 27-29; Gunnes, pp. 346-348). *Tale* has left no direct traces in *Sv.s.*, so comparison entails specific ideological content comparison with other speeches cited from the church/state controversy (i.e. Ch. 112, Ch. 117, Ch. 121) and other allusions to the controversy (i.e. Ch. 153, p. 161, 31-32), or general structural and stylistic comparison with other speeches.

*Tale* conforms to the prescriptions of medieval rhetorical theory concerning oratorical structure (cf. Gunnes, pp. 17-20, 348-349, 372-274; Breiteig, pp. 3-5). The various structural parts flow into each other. The exordium (p. 1, 1-10) states the purpose of the speech and is followed by the narration which consists of the allegory of society (p. 1, 11-2, 7) and a list of concrete complaints (p. 2, 8-3, 32). The discussion in the argument section consists of an intricately interwoven pattern of both proof and refutation, although refutation is the more important element. The argumentation closes with a comment on sources, some generalizations, and the list of heretics (p. 17, 36-20, 9). The conclusion (p. 20, 9-35) consists of an appeal for justice and an impressive summation of the entire speech which clearly reveals rhetorical schooling.

Although homilies have left their trace on *Tale* (i.e. the Biblical clichés; the allegory of society, cf. Gunnes, pp. 367-371), the clear oratorical structure of *Tale* contrasts with the loose structure of homilies (cf. Riising, pp. 68-86). Homilies often lack an exordium and close simply with a prayer. The body consists of the presentation of a Biblical passage or the theme for a religious feast and then all possible interpretations and ramifications. Homiletic elements are present in some speeches in *Sv.s.*, such as the Latin Biblical quotation and translation to Old Norse in the beginning of Ch. 99 *Sverrir*. Like the loose structure of the homilies, the speeches in *Sv.s.* frequently lack a clear oratorical structure. Few speeches in *Sv.s.* equal the structure of *Tale* (but cf. Ch. 104).

The persuasive tactics of *Tale* superficially resemble those employed in many speeches in *Sv.s.*, but they are essentially different. *Tale* is not only a logical presentation of one side of a controversy, it is *legal* argumentation with a strong *religious* tone. *Sverrir's* side employs the weapons of the church against the church by basing the entire persuasion on ca. 35 extensive quotations from ecclesiastical law (Gratian's *Decretum* first in Latin and then with a translation to Old Norse) and examples, quotations, and clichés from the Bible. Ca. 38% of the entire speech is composed of quotations. The types of quotations and examples employed in the rational persuasive tactics in *Sv.s.* are of a different, more popular flavor (cf. Gunnes, p. 320).

*Tale* is not entirely free from demagogical argumentation (cf. Breiteig, p. 11; Gunnes, p. 347), but the emotional element of the persuasive speeches in *Sv.s.* is more controlled. Quotation of enemy statements followed by ridicule is the only similarity (cf.



James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

Breiteig, p. 29). Homilies are basically explications and usually do not employ the same type persuasive tactics as those used in *Tale* or the speeches in *Sv.s.*

Two aspects of the persuasive tactics in *Tale* require closer examination: the use of *pluralis actoris* and apostrophe. *Tale* is consistent in the use of plural forms when referring to the authors of the speech or in general to King Sverrir's side; "ek" is used twice (pp. 1,2 and 8,28) to refer to the particular single person delivering the speech. The use of the first person plural is a persuasive tactic which identifies the king's case with the people's interests (cf. Breiteig, pp. 9-10; Gunnes, p. 320; i.e. *Tale*, p. 3,31-32: "bæde konongenum j þuif ok sua allu folke"). The type of variation between singular and plural present in the speeches in *Sv.s.* corresponds better with the rather free variation in other saga prose (cf. *Hkr*, I, 3,1 and 4,3; *Hkr*, I, 328,7 and 11). The homilies also show a rather free variation.

Apostrophe occurs infrequently in *Tale* and consists usually of a specification of the audience as lay or clergy or both (p. 7,36: "þer...aller lærder ok vlærdr"; cf. Gunnes, p. 345). The apostrophe typical for Sverrir in *Sv.s.*, i.e. "goðir halfar" etc., finds parallels in the direct address of various homilies (*GNH*, p. 39,3: "goðer brøðr"; *GNH*, p. 37,25: "goðer vinir"; *GNH*, p. 50,17-18: "goðer brøðr ok [y]str"; *IslH*, p. 15,4: "Góð Systken").

In spite of obvious clerical learning and extensive use of quotations from a Latin original compilation *ad hoc*, *Tale* is written in simple prose with little stylistic ornamentation (Gunnes, p. 319). The occurrences are few of tautological-conjunction, use of synonyms, alliteration, balanced word-placement, verbal correspondences, parallelism, and antithesis (i.e. there are only eight instances of alliteration in the non-quotation part of the speech). Although quotations of the enemy are found (pp. 14,5-7; 15,5-6 and 19-20), figurative expression (p. 2,30: "illra kaupfærda") and irony (p. 6,34: "godþa ambuna") are not employed to any extent. The argument consists mainly of reasoning and therefore contains many subordinate clauses introduced by "þo at" and "þuif at," and some parenthetical statements (pp. 7,12; 12,10-11; 15,17-18). Optatives are used sparingly (pp. 1,1; 6,5; 15,36), and second person commands (p. 20,16) and hortatives almost not at all.

The adverbial "nú" is employed frequently in *Tale*, often in conjunctive parataxis, as the speech-author's "nú" and to indicate the present at the time of speaking, but it is not overused as in *Sv.s.* as an indication of emotional engagement and immediacy. Epic "nú," which is found in the narration of homilies, is not present in *Tale*.

The style of Old Norwegian and Old Icelandic homilies is usually simple Translator's Prose. Only infrequently do some passages employ rhetorical ornamentation, mainly tautological-conjunction, synonyms, and alliteration. In spite of the usual religious cliché content, some passages present popular expressions similar to those in *Sv.s.* (i.e. *IslH*, p. 13,33-34: "kolld ero qveNa rôp").

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

Thus it is seen that few of the speeches in *Sv.s.* can even be compared with a real speech (*Tale*) as far as oratorical structure is concerned. Speeches in *Sv.s.* are usually logically but loosely structured direct discourse statements. The persuasive tactics are superficially the same but essentially different. The formulation of the speeches in *Sv.s.* follows grammatical conventions typical for Old Norse prose and stylistic conventions typical for the sagas but apparently somewhat foreign to the general oratorical stylistic practices at the close of the 12th century. The superficial features of the speeches in *Sv.s.* thus often reveal literary formulation (cf. Holm-Olsen, pp. 76-77, where Archbishop Eysteinn's speech in Ch. 28 is termed a "litterær omforming").

Each of the speeches in *Sv.s.* constitutes the core of a scene. The scene has a basic tripartite schematic structure consisting of a preface, a dramatic exchange or encounter, and a conclusion; in the apophthegmatic variation the conclusion is missing (Clover, pp. 57-65). The preface and conclusion provide a framework and consist of "telling" narration, whereas the weighted centerpart consists of the playing out of a miniature narrative and is staged as "showing" narration. A substantial speech in direct discourse plus the surrounding narrative, i.e. introduction of the speaker and reaction of the crowd to the speech, may be termed a "speech scene."

Many of the speech scenes in *Sv.s.* have a simple structure as illustrated by the speech in Ch. 94. The introduction consists of 1½ lines stating (p. 101, 2-3): "Vm morguninn eptir ardegis let konungr blafa til husþingis. Stoð hann þa upp oc talaði oc mælti." There follows a 24½ line speech entirely in direct discourse with no further indications of discourse. The one line close states (p. 101, 28-29): "at þeso mali varþ mikill romr oc goðr þoccuðu þeir vel konungi sitt mal."

Direct discourse is the preferred form for speech presentation within the speech scene. Whereas 30% of all discourse in *Sv.s.* is presented as indirect or narrated discourse, these forms comprise only 6% of the speech mass; over 60% of the speech scenes present speeches entirely in direct discourse. Only three extensive speeches are presented in the saga with little or no direct discourse (pp. 28, 36-29, 24; 89, 20-30; 114, 12-18). Indirect/narrated discourse is most often employed for the beginning of a speech (i.e. Hávarðr jarlsson in Ch. 99, p. 105, 13-14) or for information, even in the middle of a speech (Ch. 133, p. 138, 9-14).

Speech scenes usually concentrated on one major speech and any other instances of public speaking before, during, or after that one speech are expressed summarily (cf. the accusation in Ch. 138, p. 143, 11-13; the farmers' answer in Ch. 69, p. 76, 7-9). Over 85% of the speech scenes present only one speech, which might, however, be divided into smaller parts by breaks due to interruption by the audience (i.e. especially "battle speeches" such as Ch. 52, Ch. 76). The rest present usually only two speeches (i.e. Ch. 51).

The apophthegmatic variation is common in the speech scenes in

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

*Sv.s.* Sometimes no conclusion or audience response is necessary (i.e. Ch. 80), but the lack is striking after a rebuke (Ch. 133), a speech of encouragement (Ch. 176), or a speech calling for audience support (Ch. 125). The lack is conspicuous in the case of the speeches in Bergen after the battle of Fimreiti (Ch. 96 and Ch. 99 *Sverrir*).

Some of the speech scenes have a slightly different structure in *Eirspennill*. The general tendency in *E* is toward a simpler, more rounded style (cf. Koht, *NH*), and this is also the case in scenic composition. Some instances of public speaking are shortened (i.e. the speech about the monetary standard is shortened in Ch. 112 = K. 102, p. 361,18: "sem fyR er ritað"; the recapitulative part is dropped in the speech in Ch. 164 = K. 185, p. 423,27). In addition, Þórsteinn kúgaðr's speech in Ch. 152 (K. 161), instead of beginning in narrated discourse, progressing to indirect discourse, and finally being realized in direct discourse, is structured entirely in direct discourse. The remodeling is evident in *E*'s retention of one sentence in indirect discourse in the middle of the speech (p. 402, 10-11).

The employment of *verba dicendi* to introduce direct discourse in a speech scene closely parallels Netter's results for the family sagas (pp. 38-46). However, additional *verba dicendi* occur frequently almost exclusively in speech scenes and usually as the first half of a tautological *verbum dicendi* with "mælti" or "sagði" as the second element: "tala" and phrases ("toc...til orða," "toc...til mal," "scatt a þrinde," "hof sitt þrinde," "hof sva mal/...tal"). Some phrases are also employed to indicate the close of a public speech, i.e. Ch. 20, p. 22,35: "lauc...fino mali," and other phrases with "tal," "tala," "mal," and "þrindi." The use of the deictic "svá" (i.e. "mælti sva," "sagði sva," and also the synonymous "a þa leið" and "a þesa lund") is also characteristic of the speech scene. The following distribution of the ca. 135 "neutral" introducing direct discourse speeches in speech scenes exists:

<i>Verbum dicendi:</i>	Occurrences:
mæla	44%
tala	16%
svara	13%
ind → dir	10%
phrases	10%
segja	8%

Vocabulary for referring to public speaking is established by the phrases used to introduce and close speech scenes. The divisional titles in the manuscripts also indicate this vocabulary. Of the 175 chapter titles in (19 of which refer to speaking), 18 consist of "tala" plus the speaker's name in the genitive (i.e. Ch. 8: "tala *Sverris konung*"). The vocabulary in the saga may be compared to the instances where *Tale* refers to itself as a speech. The noun "rœða" (p. 1,1: "rôdo") and verb forms of "rœða" (pp. 1,2; 1,6)

James E. Knirk

are used along with "ord(a)" (pp. 1,2; 20,9), "rítníng" (p. 11,3), and the verb "lesa" (pp. 8,28; 10,14; 11,3). In addition "rœða" is used to describe a king's public speaking (p. 19,35-36: "þu í at konungar róða iæmnan vm ríkí fítt, vm konungdom fín ok vm varner firir londom finum").

The scene is the primary structural unit in saga composition, and the speech scenes play an important role in the economy of *Sv.s.* The greatest integration of speeches into the plot is achieved for informative speeches (i.e. Ch. 82). Speeches which contain enough information can almost replace any narrative plot as in Ch. 175 where Sverrir's instructions and Hreiðarr sendimaðr's comments together present the entire battle ruse. Speeches of a more persuasive nature (i.e. Ch. 88) and epideictic evaluative speeches (i.e. Ch. 104) are usually not as well integrated into the plot.

The presentation of battle descriptions in the *Sv.s.* is sometimes weak. This is compensated for by the integration of pre-battle and post-battle speeches into the plot (cf. Indrebø's discussion of pre- and post-battle speeches, pp. lxvii f.). The combination of King Sverrir's speech in Ch. 134 and Bishop Nikólás' speech in Ch. 135 presents the general battle tactics. The rest of Ch. 135 presents close-up scenes of individuals during the battle. Speeches inciting to battle (Ch. 52, Ch. 53, Ch. 147), however, are not integrated into the plot in the same way. They serve other compositional functions, namely characterization of persons or situations.

The majority of all speeches in *Sv.s.* serve to characterize situations. Speeches focus on the specific situation before or after a battle (i.e. Ch. 29 in both functions), characterize an entire military controversy (Ch. 89), and elucidate opposite sides in the church/state controversy (Ch. 112, Ch. 117, Ch. 121). Sverrir's speech in Ch. 99 describes and exemplifies the entire national political and historical situation. Speeches are also used to characterize respectively Magnús' and Sverrir's relationship to Trøndelag (Ch. 69 and Ch. 154), Østlandet (Ch. 84 and Ch. 138), and Bergen/Vestlandet (Ch. 86 and Ch. 146; cf. also Ch. 96 and Ch. 99 Sverrir).

Besides characterizing a situation, speeches may be used to characterize persons through their words. The most persuasive speeches function basically to characterize the particular speaker (i.e. Ch. 47, Ch. 88). In *Sv.s.*, as opposed to *Hkr* (cf. Lie, pp. 91-100), characterization of persons occurs basically on the individual plane. Individuals (especially King Sverrir and King Magnús) are presented, rather than types representing various social groups. The lack of stylistic ornamentation in the farmer Helgi's speech (Ch. 138) might be an attempt at class characterization, as might the vulgar tone at the beginning of Svína-Pétr's speech in Ch. 96. However, Svína-Pétr's speech (Ch. 96) is the one with the most rhetorical ornamentation, and although most of Sverrir's speeches contain stylistic embellishment (cf. Ch. 35, Ch. 59), some lack rhetorical embellishment (Ch. 120, Ch. 126). The relation of social

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

groups to each other is reflected in the speeches in the type of apostrophe used (see above).

A speaker may be characterized by the conventions in which he thinks and with which he expresses himself. Consistencies between different speeches by one person reveal aspects of the person's character as presented in the saga. Indrebø (pp. lxix-lxx) enumerates various content consistencies in speeches attributed to King Sverrir: emphasis on his origin from a remote skerry, accusing the enemy of pride, enumeration of personal wrongs, and directing appeals to God. Additional ones include the degrading expression for armies of farmers (p. 54,23-24 and Ch. 163, p. 175,8-9), the metaphor describing Haraldr's execution (Ch. 60, p. 68,6 and Ch. 99 Sverrir, p. 106,26), and encouraging patience and endurance at Tønsberg by citing the example of the enemy (p. 187,27-29 and Ch. 176, p. 189,24-26). King Magnús is also consistent in his argumentation in Ch. 60 and Ch. 84 (cf. especially pp. 67,18-19; 67,25; 90,16-17).

There also exist correspondences and some repetitions of vocabulary between speeches of similar type. The first words in Ch. 47 (p. 50,2: "Her er mikíll heR saman cominn oc fritt lið") are typical for the opening sentence of various pre-battle speeches (cf. Ch. 158, p. 166,15; Ch. 162/(163), p. 173,23; and also Ch. 125 Jarl Haraldr Maddaðarson, p. 132,6-7; cf. Lie, p. 105, for comments on this stereotype in Snorri's "battle speeches"). The contents of customary burial speeches are similar (Ch. 38, p. 44,11-20; Ch. 97, p. 104, 21-26).

Lie's research (pp. 90-91, 101-104) establishes the category of historical/didactic ('recapitulative') and historical/philosophic speeches as especially characteristic for *Hkr's Óláfs saga helga*. Recapitulation is naturally a part of speeches which characterize a political or military situation. In some cases, however, recapitulation becomes the *raison d'être* for a speech scene. Recapitulative speeches include Magnús' evaluation of his entire life immediately before his death at Fimreiti (Ch. 89), Ásbjörn Jónsson's recounting of Sverrir's actions prior to the same battle (Ch. 90), Jarl Haraldr Maddaðarson's listing of examples from his own life to illustrate his innocence (Ch. 125), and King Sverrir's last speech (Ch. 180). Speeches with a decided philosophical tendency are infrequent (but cf. perhaps Ch. 120).

One of the methods by which speech scenes are employed compositionally is with juxtaposition of contrasting speeches, i.e. a scenic parataxis of two speeches, one from each of two opposing parties. Although at times such speeches have little in common (i.e. Ch. 27 and Ch. 28), they frequently are closely related in content, function, and structure, as is the case with the pair in Ch. 52 and Ch. 53. The introductions to both scenes are similar (Ch. 52, p. 57,29-30: "lagðu saman scipin...talaði konungr fyrir liði sínu oc mælti sva"; Ch. 52/(53), p. 58,37-38: "samlogu scipunum...talaði hann fyrir liðino oc mælti a þesa lund"), both speeches employ pejorative terms and flattery, and the persuasive

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

contents of both speeches include recapitulation, evaluation of the situation, and a statement of the imminence of battle.

Contrasting juxtaposed speech pairs are used for providing battle tactics for both sides (Ch. 120 Hallkell Jónsson and Sverrir; Ch. 134 and Ch. 135; Ch. 165 farmers and Sverrir; cf. also the ruse in Ch. 175) or for focusing both sides of a controversy by characterization of leaders or situations (Ch. 152 and Ch. 153; Ch. 165 farmers and Sverrir; Ch. 52 and Ch. 53). Discrepancies between the statements and expectations of the two speakers in contrasting speech pairs can have an ironic effect (i.e. in Ch. 154 King Sverrir obtains a fleet and in Ch. 155 Bishop Nikolás boasts over Sverrir's military weakness; cf. Ch. 165 farmers and Sverrir; Ch. 176 and Ch. 177). In addition to contrasting juxtaposition of speech pairs, complementary juxtaposition is also used, i.e. two speeches with the same topic (Ch. 8 and Ch. 9) or with similar contents from one contending side (Ch. 89 and Ch. 90). *Eirspennill* sometimes drops one of the speech scenes in complementary juxtaposition (i.e. Nikolás sultán's speech in Ch. 97 [K. 88, p. 347, 22-24] and Hávarðr jarlsson's speech in Ch. 99 [K. 90, p. 348, 16-18]).

The battle of Fimreiti is the climax of the saga, and speech pairs are employed extensively before and after the battle (cf. Koht, *ONS*, pp. 23-24). Speeches are presented which focus attention on Maríu-súðin (Ch. 80) and on the multitude of opponents (Ch. 84; cf. Ch. 83 and Ch. 86), two decisive moments in the battle. Sverrir presents a persuasive speech and a short informative one before the battle (Ch. 88), and parallel pre-battle speeches by the opposition are presented in Ch. 89 and Ch. 90. The contrasting speeches in Ch. 88 and Ch. 89 contain allusions to the outcome of the battle (Ch. 88, pp. 94, 39-95, 1: "konungiN i hel fetia"; Ch. 89, p. 96, 37: "hvart er ver erum þa með lifi eða andapír"). The five Birkibeinar post-battle speeches contain some general content consistencies: Ch. 94 and Ch. 97 at the battle site, and Ch. 96, Ch. 99 Hávarðr jarlsson, and Ch. 99 Sverrir in Bergen.

Besides having compositional functions, the speech scenes also have rhetorical functions in the structure of the saga. One of the rhetorical functions of discourse in narrative texts served by speech scenes is the dramatization of particular passages. The dramatization effect is primary when a sentence or two of narration could accomplish the same presentation (i.e. Ch. 154). The dramatization effect accounts for the introduction of two flashbacks among the speech scenes (Ch. 152 and Ch. 159).

Although the introduction of long speeches (cf. Ch. 52 and Ch. 53) may have a retarding effect on the plot development (cf. Andersson, *IFS*, pp. 40-43), they function simultaneously to produce tension by postponing the imminent and focusing attention on oppositions. Tension is also produced by the cumulative effect of a string of similar speeches (i.e. complementary juxtaposition; cf. also Ch. 27 and Ch. 76). Tension may be produced by providing the saga-audience with more information than the saga-characters, i.e. after the

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

speech in Ch. 28 the saga-audience knows that Archbishop Eysteinn's ship will appear, but only the four ships manned by townsmen begin the battle.

Tension may result from an ironic discrepancy between the statement in a speech and reality presented earlier or later in the text. Bishop Nikolás' statements in Ch. 155 have such an effect due to the preceding description of Sverrir's battle preparations in Ch. 154 (cf. the statement on p. 166,27: "var þat annan veg en Baglar ætluðu"). A similar disparity exists between the farmers' pledge in Ch. 165 not to separate (p. 179,15-16) and their actions later (p. 179,37-38: "Varþ þa a þa leið at þeir somu er alldri sogðuz sciliaz mundu. þa flyði in veg hverR"). A statement from a speech can be used for comic effect too. Bishop Nikolás encourages his men in Ch. 135 (p. 139,21-22: "ero Birkibeinar sva banfettir at sverþin þeira munu ecki bita"), but he must immediately swallow his words (cf. p. 140,2-3: "litz os sva sem Birkibeinum biti nu sverþin"). One speech is structured on irony, King Sverrir's speech after Jarl Erlingr's death (Ch. 38). It repeatedly employs an if-then statement in which the conditional clause becomes more ironic with each utterance (i.e. pp. 42,34-43,1: "ef þetta er sva sem erkibyscup hefir sagt").

Speeches also present an opportunity for the saga-author to present subjective information in the form of feelings and opinions of saga-characters. This is accomplished by the use of modal auxiliaries, subjunctives, and the present tense indicative of such verbs as "sýnask," "finnask," "þykkja," and "sik vanta" (cf. especially Ch. 133, but also Ch. 8, Ch. 9, Ch. 147, Ch. 155).

The opportunity is also provided for reasoning and explanation. The longer periods found in the sample speeches reflect a greater number of subordinate clauses per period. Although direct discourse speeches comprise only 16% of the total text, they contain high percentages of the total occurrences of two connectives: "því at" = 24%, and "þó at" = 51%. Concessive clauses at times function in the persuasion (i.e. Ch. 133, p. 138,2: "þó at Nicolaþ byscup segi þat eigi").

The *Sv.s.* is unique among sagas in its extensive and outstanding employment of speech scenes. A similar quantity of saga speeches of corresponding length can be found only in later kings' saga compilations, especially *Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta*. The length of speeches there is often due to the ornateness of Late Style (cf. the rhetorical embellishment of Þorgeirr Ljósvetningagoði's speech, II, 194-197). In no other saga text, however, are speech scenes employed as adeptly as literary devices in the compositional and rhetorical structure.

Lie's research (pp. 85-90) implies that the use of speeches in the *Sv.s.* led Snorri to extensive employment of similar speech scenes in the composition of *Hkr.* But speeches are presented there less frequently, usually lack the fervor of speeches in *Sv.s.*, and are not often used in contrasting juxtaposition. *Hákons saga Hákonarsonar*

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

(HsH) also employs speech scenes which sometimes resemble those in *Sv.s.*, but the saga contains only half as many such scenes, and they are not used with the same compositional skill. The HsH is based in part on documents preserved in the archives of the chancellery established in the last years of Sverrir's life. Documents and letters are cited frequently in the saga text, and answers to messengers are often recounted. The multitude of speeches presented in Ch. 71-80 and supposedly held at the National Assembly in Bergen in 1223 might also be based on protocol.

Koht explains *Sv.s.*'s employment of speech scenes as due to the fact that (MBSS, p. 342): "Sverre var vel den fyrste kongen som heldt talar"! Speeches, however, are also employed in an early Latin history from Sverrir's reign (*Historia de profectione Danorum in Hierosolymam*, Ch. 5, Ch. 17, and the conversation with Sverrir in Ch. 14). Speech scenes have a long tradition in both historical texts (cf. Pericles' "Funeral Oration" in Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War*, Bk. II, Ch. 35-46; Tacitus, *De vita Julii Agricola*, Ch. 30-32 and 33-34) and more literary epic texts (cf. Agamemnon's address to the Achaean Royal Council and to the Achaean troops in Homer, *Iliad*, Bk. II; Hrōðgār's harangue in *Beowulf*, l. 1700-1784).

The speeches in *Sv.s.* do not usually reflect the oratorical structural, persuasive, or stylistic conventions of real public speeches from the end of the 12th century. The speech scenes reveal a high degree of refinement in their construction and in their employment in the compositional and rhetorical structure of the saga. The literary creativity of the saga-author is thus detected in some aspects of structure and stylistic formulation of the speeches and in the employment of the speech scenes. Still many scholars maintain the validity of the basic contents of the speeches, i.e. Koht (MBSS, p. 349):

Det trur eg da er fortænasta til saga-samlaren at han har berga for oss nokre ekte Sverre-talar — ekte i den meininga at dei gjev att det sanne innhaldet og noko av dei sermerkte talevendingane.

Doubt concerning the historical validity of the contents of speeches in the *Sv.s.* has been directed at individual speeches. Schreiner (pp. 561-570) bases his dating of the composition of *Sv.s.* on what he regards as an ideological anachronism in farmer Helgi's speech in Ch. 138. Likewise the validity of the concrete contents of some speeches has been doubted (cf. Holm-Olsen, pp. 72-73, where Sverrir's promise in Ch. 35 is discussed).

Elements from one part of *Sv.s.* may have been borrowed to fill out other summary statements about similar happenings (i.e. the two trips through Järnberaland in Ch. 12 and Ch. 25, cf. Holm-Olsen, p. 83). The two pre-battle speeches by Magnús followed by a warning by Ormr konungsbróðir presented before Norðnes (Ch. 53) and before Fimreiti (Ch. 89) might fall into this category, since other elements from the battle of Fimreiti were borrowed by the description of Norðnes (cf. Berntsen, pp. 226-236). A scene which borrows is



James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

historically suspect.

The ideological contents of various speeches, however, agree surprisingly well with other historical sources. Dagfinnr bóndi in *HsH*, Ch. 75 (*F*, III, 56,28-39), quotes a formulation of Sverrir's program which agrees with the presentation in *Sv.s.* He attributes the formulation to Sverrir in the pre-battle speech(es) before Flóruvágur and/or Jónsvellir. However, the speeches presented in the *Sv.s.* in Ch. 120 and Ch. 147 do not contain the statement. In *HsH*, Ch. 199 (*F*, III, 149,17-24), the example (Ch. 47, p. 50,13-24) presented in Sverrir's speech before the battle at Íluvellir is cited and attributed to Sverrir. The verbal formulation is distant from the formulation in *Sv.s.*, so no direct literary influence is obvious. The wording on Sverrir's seal as quoted by the contemporary historian William of Newburgh (I, 232: "Suerus Rex magnus, ferus ut leo, mitis ut agnus") provides grounds to consider the ideology of a statement in Sverrir's speech in Ch. 104 as genuine (p. 111,24-25: "her-mæN ʃcylldu vera i friði ʃem lamb. en i ufriþi agiarnir ʃem leon"). Gunnes (p. 346) finds the ideology of *Tale* in complete harmony with that of *Sv.s.* However, the seeming validity of the ideology does not guarantee the authenticity of the speeches.

An unevenness exists in the composition of the *Sv.s.* This is due to different types of sources of perhaps different "saga-authors" (*KLNM*, "Sverrir saga"; Koht, *MBSS*). The four compositional sections are:

1. Ch. 1-31 (*Grýla*),
2. Ch. 32-100 covering the period 1178-1185,
3. Ch. 101-128 covering the period 1185-1195,
4. Ch. 129-181 covering the period 1195-1202.

The unevenness in the overall composition is reflected in an unevenness in the composition of the speeches.

The act of speaking has a clear function for the bias of the *Grýla* section (Ch. 12, Ch. 20, Ch. 26; cf. Holm-Olsen, p. 85). These speeches were most controlled by Sverrir, yet they are *least* characterized by biting humor, mocking irony, sayings, and proverbs. The speeches in section two are the longest and most fascinating. Section two reveals the best literary employment of the speech scene in the compositional scheme of the saga. Section three contains mainly political speeches concerning the church/state controversy. Although Ch. 101-109 encompass the period Abbot Karl Jónsson was in Norway, only one speech is included, the systematic "writing-table" product in Ch. 104 (*F*. Paasche, *SP*, p. 206, uses the "writing-table" nature of this speech to argue for its authenticity). The biased funeral oration in Ch. 107 is presented in narrated discourse. The speeches in section four are short and lively, but they are not as artistic as those in section two. Section four again reveals a refined literary employment of the speech scene in the composition of the saga.

The use of figurative expression is a special characteristic of

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

the speeches, but similar expression is found in the narrative text (i.e. p. 16,12: "sem mys i holur"). As Koht says (*MBSS*, p. 338): "Men vi narrar oss sjølv når vi trur det er Sverre sjølv vi her hører." Identical figurative expressions used both in the direct discourse of a speech and in the narrative text (cf. Indrebø, p. lxii) include calling battle "caupferþ" (pp. 16,35; 17,3-4; 176,15) and describing defeated men as "taN-farir" (pp. 128,13; 180,17). Identical phrases are used by Sverrir and the narrative text to describe hypocrisy (pp. 101,36-37; 107,5-6) and to describe the same retreat (pp. 174,36; 175,1-2). The figurative expression for "to attack" ("vitia") is employed by Archbishop Eysteinn and by King Sverrir (Ch. 28, p. 30,20; Ch. 88, p. 94,12; cf. Magnús' figurative use of "gongu-dryckio" and "scenkia" in Ch. 86, p. 92,8-10). The expression "sem faðir i kvi" is used by two speakers (Ch. 89 and Ch. 90), and a similar expression is found in the narrative text (p. 25,4). Also irony and biting humor are not foreign to the narrative text. After the farmers' cry (p. 179,31-32): "drepi hann hoGi hann. leGi hann. drepi heftiN undir honum," the narrative text continues with a mocking (p. 179,32): "þetta var mælt en eigi gert."

Until a critical edition of *Sv.s.* exists, caution must be exercised when comparing individual passages and stylistic elements in one manuscript version. Although *E* is known for its simple style, especially the frequent lack of tautological-conjunction where other manuscripts have this figure (cf. Indrebø, pp. xxxx, lvi-lviii), the situation may at times be reversed or more complicated, i.e. the alliterative passage in the speech in Ch. 176:

*A* (p. 189,28): "biuct eða bratt"

*81a* (p. 247,10): "liufth edr leitth"

*E* (p. 432,24): "liufft e(ða) leitt. biukt eða bratt"

*F* (II,696,22-23): "liuft edr leitt blitt edr stritt biugt edr bratt"

A figurative expression may be present in *E* which the other manuscripts lack (i.e. p. 392,11: "kaulldum kolum"); *A* does not use (Ch. 23, p. 25,3; Ch. 76, p. 82,35) a figurative expression found in the narration of *Grýla* and in a speech by Sverrir and employed by all other major manuscripts, "dyn fíri dyR" (cf. *E*, pp. 278,13; 327,12). Manuscripts at times have favorite expressions, such as "valc oc vandkvæði" in *A* (i.e. p. 129,33-34; all other major manuscripts have "nauð," cf. *E*, p. 372,14). In addition one must keep in mind the stereotype nature of such expressions.

The contents of speech pairs reveal at times striking correspondences, such as the similarity between the battle instructions in Ch. 134 and Ch. 135. Sverrir directs troop movements in the order "Nun-nu-þetr," "a eyrom," and "at bryGiom," and Bishop Nikulás does the same. The relationship between Sverrir's encouragement in Ch. 52 (p. 58,13-15) and Magnús' directions in Ch. 53 (p. 59,13-14) foreshadows the course of the battle and seals Magnús' fate. The importance of a speech statement for foreshadowing the development of the plot is most obvious in Ch. 120. After giving instructions before the battle of Flóruvágur, Sverrir warns his men (p. 127,20-

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

21): "Gæti menn vel vapna *finna* oc ara. því at þeira munum ver þurfa hvarir *sem* sigraz." The oars turn out to be the decisive element in the battle, as the enemy accidentally break their oars, have no control, and are beaten one-by-one.

The contents of some speeches, although seemingly straightforward, play an important role in the overall rhetorical structure of the saga. Sverrir motivates his bid for peace for Hreiðarr sendimaðr in Ch. 179 as follows (p. 192, 16-19): "nu vil ek þat firi-gefa þeim firir gud<sup>s</sup> sakir ok vanta þar a mot af honum firir-gefningar þess er ek hefir honum a moti gert eigu þer ecki fídr *þælur enn* ek." This gesture prepares for God's forgiveness of Sverrir upon his death in the following chapters (p. 194, 3-17). Sverrir's statement at the close of the speech in Ch. 99 also gains meaning and importance through the way in which he died (p. 107, 14-15: "En vera ma sva at Sverrir verþi *fott-daðr eigi* at *fiðr*").

Thus, although the underlying ideology seems to be authentic, various indices point toward the saga-author as the source not only for various literary stylistic elements, but also for the characteristic figurative expression, irony, and humor, and some other special expressions, as well as at times even the concrete contents of the speeches. One "cannot conclude in general that the speeches preserve 'old tradition'" (Koht, *ONS*, p. 133). The speeches are generally suspect historical sources, and characterizations of Sverrir based on those attributed to him are also suspect (i.e. F. Paasche, *KS*, pp. 220-225).

The speech scenes in *Sv.s.* are literary devices of great importance for the composition of the saga. They constitute only one of the literary elements. Another, foreshadowing, was already mentioned above. "Disregarding of a warning" (cf. Andersson, *IFS*, pp. 51-52) is also employed in the *Sv.s.* (i.e. Jarl Erlingr in Ch. 34 and again in Ch. 36, p. 40, 16-24; King Magnús at the close of the speeches in Ch. 53 and Ch. 89; cf. Sverrir's men in Ch. 28, especially p. 30, 13-15). The saga text sometimes mentions that two people wore the same clothing during a battle. Whether this information is used in the economy of the plot in that the two are confused with one another (concerning Sverrir, p. 180, 2-12) or not (i.e. p. 97, 31-33), the situation is a saga cliché.

In spite of extensive historical and philological criticism, the kings' sagas have seldom been thoroughly examined from a literary standpoint in order to determine the extent and nature of various literary aspects. Andersson (*StS*, p. 438) has attempted structural analysis of some kings' sagas, but the structure proved to be basically biographical and sequential (except for Oddr Snorrason's recounting of the battle of Svöldr which uses dramatic techniques). Andersson (*StS*, p. 441) also indicates a more productive line of approach when he mentions the stylistic similarities between family sagas and contemporary sagas. In any case, the literary moments in the basic compositional and rhetorical structure of the kings' sagas need to be more thoroughly examined.

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES:

- GNH = *Gamalt norsk homilieboek*. Ed. G. Indrebø. Oslo, 1931.  
*Historia de profectione Danorum in Hierosolymam in Scriptores minores historiae Danicae medii aevi*. Ed. M. Gertz. Kbh., 1922. II, 444-492.  
Hkr = *Heimskringla*, I-III. ÍF, 26-28. Ed. Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson. Rvík., 1941-1951.  
HsH = *Hákons saga Hákonarsonar in Flateyjarbók*, III, 3-233. Cf. Sv.s., F.  
IslH = *Homiliu-Bók: Isländska Homilier efter en handskrift från tolfte århundradet*. Ed. Th. Wisén. Lund, 1872.  
Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta. EdAM, A:1-2. Ed. Ólafur Halldórs-son. Kbh., 1958/61.  
Sv.s. = *Sverris saga*: A, E, 81a, F, *Fornmanna sögur*.  
A = *Sverris saga etter Cod. AM 327 4°*. Ed. G. Indrebø. Kria., 1920.  
E = *Eirspennill - AM 47 fol.* Ed. Finnur Jónsson. Kria., 1916. Pages 255-438.  
81a = *Det Arnamagnæanske Haandskrift 81a Fol. (Skálholtsbók yngsta)*. Ed. A. Kjær (and L. Holm-Olsen). Kria./Oslo, 1910- (1947). Pages 1-254.  
F = *Flateyjarbók*. Kria., 1860-68.  
*Fornmanna sögur*, VIII. Kbh., 1834.  
Tale = A. Holtsmark. *En tale mot biskopene: en sproglig-historisk undersøkelse*. NVAOS II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. 1930. No. 9. Oslo, 1931.

## LITERATURE:

- Andersson, T. *IFS = The Icelandic Family Saga: An Analytic Reading*. Cambridge, Mass., 1967.  
— "—". *StS* = "Splitting the saga." *SS*, 47:4 (1975), 437-441.  
Baldwin, C. *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400)*. NY, 1928.  
Blöndal, Lárus. "Grýla." *Á góðu dægri. Afmæliskeðja til Sigurðar Nordals*. Rvík., 1951.  
Breiteig, B. *Studier i "En tale mot biskopene."* TVSS. 1966. No. 1. Thm., 1966.  
Brekke, E. *Sverre-sagaens opphav: tiden og forfatteren*. NVAOS II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. 1958. No. 1. Oslo, 1958.  
Clover, C. "Scene in Saga Composition." *ANF*, 89 (1974), 57-83.  
Curtius, E. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. 4th ed., Bern, 1963. (1st ed.: 1948.)  
Gunnes, E. *Kongens ære: Kongemakt og kirke i "En tale mot biskopene."* Oslo, 1971.  
Hallberg, P. *Stilsignalement och författarskap i norrön sagalitteratur*. *Nordistica Gothoburgensia* 3. Göteborg, 1968.  
Helle, K. *NBS = Norge blir en stat 1130-1319. Handbok I, Norges historie*. Oslo, 1964.  
— "—". *OB = Omkring Bøglungasögur*. *UBÅ* 1958, Hist.-antikkv. rekke. No. 7. Bergen, 1958.

James E. Knirk, U.S.A.

Holm-Olsen, L. *Studier i Sverres saga*. NVAOA II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. 1952. No. 3. Oslo, 1953.

Indrebø. Cf. *Sv.s.*, A.

KLNM = *Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder fra viking-tid til reformasjonstid*. Oslo, 1956 ff.

Koht, H. MBSS = "Mennene bak Sverre-soga." *SoS*, 65 (1959), 337-350.

—". NH = "Norsk historieskriving under kong Sverre, serskilt Sverre-soga." *Edda*, 2 (1914), 67-102.

—". ONS = *The Old Norse Sagas*, NY, 1931.

Lie, H. *Studier i Heimskringlas stil: dialogene og talene*. NVAOS II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. 1936. No. 5. Oslo, 1937.

Liestøl, A. "Sigurd Lavards rúnakefli." *MM*, 1964, 1-11.

Netter, I. *Die direkte Rede in den Isländersagas*. Leipzig, 1935.

Paasche, F. KS = *Kong Sverre*. 4th ed., Oslo, 1966. (1st ed.: 1920.)

—". SP = "Sverre prest." *Edda*, 3 (1915), 197-212.

—". ToS = "Tendens og syn i Kongesagaen." *Edda*, 17 (1922), 1-17.

Riising, A. *Danmarks middelalderlige prædiken*. Kbh., 1969.

Schlauch, M. "The Rhetoric of Public Speeches in Old Scandinavian (Chiefly Icelandic)." *SS*, 41:4 (1969), 297-314.

Schreiner, J. "Omkring Sverres saga." *NHT*, 36 (1952-53), 561-578.

William of Newburgh. *Historia rerum Anglicarum in Rerum Britannicarum mediæ ævi, Scriptores*. 2 vols. London, 1884-85.