

Runenformen, sie sind gewissermaßen die Handschrift des Ritzers, aber wer die Wiedergabe sämtlicher bei Öpir belegten Runenformen (66–78) studiert, kann schon ins Grübeln kommen: Die sechs s-Runen von Sö 308 haben fünf verschiedene Formen, von den sechs s-Runen auf U 104 haben zwar drei die gleiche Form, aber die kommt auf Sö 308 nicht vor (75). So ist es sicher richtig, eine möglichst große Zahl von Kriterien zu verwenden. Sie sind nicht alle von gleichem Gewicht. Öpirs Setzerformel lautet immer “let ræisa (retta, haggva) stæin” [ließ den Stein errichten, hauen] oder “let gæra mæarki” [ließ das Denkmal machen], also mit Hilfsverb, dem Hauptverb zwischen Hilfsverb und Substantiv und immer ohne Demonstrativpronomen; fehlt das Hilfsverb oder ist die Wortfolge verändert oder ein Demonstrativpronomen vorhanden, darf man bei einem nicht signierten Stein füglich daran zweifeln, daß er von Öpir gehauen wurde. Ganz anders verhält es sich bei dem zehnten Kriterium, das besagt, es dürfe keine Fürbittformel vorhanden sein; Öpir wird keine vorgeschlagen haben, aber wenn der Auftraggeber auf einer Fürbittformel bestand? Würde Öpir den Auftrag abgelehnt haben?

Die Verfasserin schreibt Öpir nur noch 27 nicht signierte Inschriften zu, darunter zwei (U 117 und U 861), die bisher nicht mit Öpir in Verbindung gebracht worden waren; sie ist sich bei neun Inschriften nicht sicher und scheidet 38 Inschriften, die von einigen Autoren Öpir attribuiert wurden, aus.

Mir ist nur ein Druckfehler aufgefallen; die Kontamination von “mera sällan” und “mindre ofta” zu “mindre sällan” (118) ist eher lustig als störend. Man hätte sich natürlich gewünscht, daß alle Öpir-Ritzungen abgebildet worden wären, so daß man den ganzen Öpir zusammen hätte, aber das wäre wohl unbezahlbar geworden und ist ja auch nicht von der Autorin zu verantworten. Wir haben Marit Åhlén für ein schärfer umrissenes und in etlichen Punkten korrigiertes Bild von Öpir zu danken.

Fred Wulf

Kari Ellen Gade. *The Structure of Old Norse Dróttkvætt Poetry*. Islandica 49. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1995. 310 pages.

As Snorri Sturluson says in his introduction to *Háttatal*, poetry may be studied in various ways, and there are many distinctions (*greinir*) to be noted. Most of the distinctions Snorri talks about are what we in modern terms can refer to as metrical, and the word he uses is *hátrr*, which usually is translated as ‘meter’, but with the connotations ‘manner, mode, or appearance’. But poetry is obviously more than meter. The meter sets the formal distinctions, but the actual poems constitute the texts studied by literary theorists and philologists. The title of the present book implies that it concerns itself with more than pure metrics; it is the structure of the poetry that is the object of study. So *a priori* it might be expected to be about any of the many sides of skaldic poetry, the structure of its content as well as its form, and about its composition. The fact that metrics is not referred to in the title would also seem not to be accidental, since, as we shall see, the author is skeptical that an abstract metrical form can be set up for the dróttkvætt meter. Still the book is about the form of dróttkvætt, so despite its title and somewhat unorthodox approach, it should be classified as a metrical study.

In recent decades, the theoretical study of metrics has established itself as a subfield of linguistics and one of the areas of contact between linguistics and literary studies. In this work within linguistics, several important observations have been made which have clarified aspects of the nature of metrical form and the relation between linguistic structure and metrical structure. Within this tradition, views may vary on a number of issues, but there are several points that most metrists seem to agree upon. One is that even though metrical forms are defined in terms of linguistic forms, meters form their own systems, separate from the system of the language used in the composition of poetry, and a large part of the study of poetic meter involves the relation or mapping between

meter on one side and language on the other.

The book reviewed here is largely innocent of this way of thinking, but appears instead at first sight to be deeply embedded in Hans Kuhn's "paradigm" (due respect to Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* [Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1962]). Hans Kuhn's work goes back to the early decades of this century and culminates in his magnum opus *Das Dróttkvætt* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1983). Gade's stated purpose is to "reevaluate and develop further the many rules and laws that Kuhn posited for the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines and stanzas" (x).

The first three chapters form a sort of introduction to the main body of research reported. These chapters are entitled: "Function and Form of *Dróttkvætt*" (1–28), "The Constitutive Features of *Dróttkvætt*," (29–51), and "Structural Peculiarities" (52–72). Chapter 1 contains general introductory remarks concerning skaldic poetry as a genre and an enumeration of some of the main structural characteristics of the *dróttkvætt* meter, such as length of lines and stanzas, alliteration, and rhythm. There is also a brief discussion of the origin of the meter and of possible influence from Irish poetry. Here the conclusion is that the structural ties between *dróttkvætt* and Irish metrics are not very strong. We also find here a summary of previous research into word order and sentence structure in *dróttkvætt* stanzas, reporting the work of older scholars from Snorri through Konstantin Reichardt to Hans Kuhn. This is in other words an introduction to earlier research, and for the uninitiated the discussion is sure to be informative. But there are places where the reader is bound to feel uncomfortable. For example, after a brief report of Reichardt's research into the types of syntactic patterns allowed in *dróttkvætt*, there is an even briefer summary of Kuhn's analysis, so brief that the reader is left in the dark about a number of things. And then the following comment: "Despite the fact that Kuhn's laws and rules contain inherent contradictions and weaknesses, however, most scholars accept and reproduce them in their works on skaldic poetry" (21). This comment

must come as a surprise at this stage, since earlier the reader is given to understand that the present study is based on solid foundations laid by Kuhn and his predecessors.

The first section of chapter 2 discusses the problem of the function of quantity in the *dróttkvætt* meter. It is a well-known fact that, apart from stress, quantity or length of syllables is relevant in the rhythm, and this expresses itself most clearly in the cadence, which is trochaic and has to contain a disyllabic word. And here, there is an absolutely unviolable constraint to the effect that the ictus has to be carried by a heavy (or long) stressed syllable, i.e., words like *landa* and *fóru* can occur there, but not forms like *vinir* or *tala*. There are further constraints which show that quantity was relevant (see, e.g., Kristján Árnason, *The Rhythms of Dróttkvætt and Other Old Icelandic Metres* [Reykjavík: Institute of Linguistics, Univ. of Iceland, 1991], 111–23), but understanding exactly what role it plays and how it interacts with stress is not an easy task.

Gade's discussion of these matters systematically avoids the question of the function of stress as a linguistic category in *dróttkvætt*, and generally speaking her statements about the rhythmical character of the meter are vague. Comments stating that the meter "appears to have been not only syllable counting but also mora counting" (29) are not very helpful, particularly since, despite Snorri's comments in *Háttatal*, there is good reason to believe that the actual number of syllables was *not* one of the constituent parts of the definition of *dróttkvætt* rhythm (see, e.g., Kuhn 67–72; Árnason 90–94). So the meter should in all probability not be characterized as syllable counting.

Apart from the question of stress and quantity in the meter, there is a long-standing dispute as to how the distinction between light and heavy syllables should be tabulated, and at the same time how disyllabic words like *tala* and *dómar* should be syllabified. One camp, represented by scholars like Pipping, sees light syllables like the first syllable of *tala* as bimoric and the consonant syllabified with the preceding syllable: *tal.a*, but the other camp, represented by, e.g., Sievers and Grundtvig, sees the consonant as belonging to the onset of the

following syllable: *ta.la*, and the syllable as monomeric. Gade sides with the former (30–31), referring to, among other things, the function of the “Bugge-Siever[s]sche Regel,” which determines the syllabic status of the proto-Germanic *i* in the desinence of *ia*- vs. *ja*-stems.

This is all very well, since the case can be argued both ways, it seems, depending on the point of view taken, but the main problem with the discussion is that it shows lack of comprehension of the relevant linguistic distinctions. This is shown, e.g., when on page 44 Árnason (*Rhythms*) is quoted as saying that “heavily stressed syllables” can fill the strong position in *dróttkvætt*, whereas the category referred to in fact is “heavy stressed syllable.” The fact that the same wording is repeated later on the same page seems to show that this is not a simple misprint but a fundamental misunderstanding on the part of the author.

An essential part of the analytical machinery with which the author equips herself is a “new system of graphic representation of *dróttkvætt* lines,” presented on pp. 45–51. Having concluded that neither Sievers’ five-type system nor the rhythmical patterns suggested in Árnason are sufficient, and that there are fallacies inherent in Kuhn’s approach, she decides to “abandon the concept of stress altogether and to focus on describing such entities as alliteration, internal rhyme, syllabic length, and lexicogrammatical categories” (45). The main advantage of this method of analysis, which the author admits is unorthodox, is supposed to be that of “focusing on the tasks at hand; namely to elucidate the restrictions on syntactic fillers of *dróttkvætt* lines and on skaldic word order and sentence patterns; to unravel the principles behind the composition of *dróttkvætt* and show what circumstances must have facilitated the comprehension of such poetry; and, finally, to shed some light on the origin and eventual demise of *dróttkvætt* meter” (46).

The notational system consists of a set of symbols defined with a mixture of phonological and morphosyntactic parameters: \bar{x} denotes “a monosyllabic nomen with three or more morae or a trimoric⁺ element in a disyllabic, trisyllabic, or tetrasyllabic word

belonging to any lexical category” (46), and \check{x} denotes an even more complicated category: “a bimoric monosyllabic nomen, the bimoric element in a disyllabic, trisyllabic, tetrasyllabic, or pentasyllabic word belonging to any lexical category, or a monosyllabic bimoric⁺ word belonging to any lexical category except the category ‘formword’ (i.e., prepositions, proclitic particles *of*, *at*, and definite article *enn*)” (46). A third symbol is \times , which denotes “a syntactically bound particle (either a proclitic formword or an enclitic inflectional ending)” (46). In addition to this there are special symbols denoting alliteration and internal rhyme.

The linguistic category which is conspicuously absent from this system is of course stress. But the reference to morphosyntactic properties in the definition of the three categories, \bar{x} , \check{x} , and \times , makes at least an indirect contact with stress, since judging from the discussion on pp. 37–38, the author appears to accept the traditionally assumed relation between syntactic categories and phrasal stress. This hierarchy is described on p. 38: “nomina” are more heavily stressed than other word classes, a finite verb is less stressed than a nomen, and the finite verb of the main clause has less stress than that of the subordinate clause. Qualifying adverbs and pronouns are more strongly stressed than finite verbs and intensifying and temporal adverbs, and prepositions may stand in the lift, but rarely alliterate. The abandonment of stress is thus only halfhearted.

Doing away with direct reference to stress implies a fundamental divergence from earlier work in this tradition, since stress is essential for both Kuhn and Sievers. But on closer inspection an even more fundamental break reveals itself, namely a blurring of the systematic distinction between metrical form and linguistic form. This differs also from Kuhn, who despite his emphasis on the composition, on what he calls “die Versfüllung,” firmly believed that the metrical form was a separate entity from the composition. On p. 98 of *Das Dróttkvætt* he says, “Die Versfüllung ist die Ausfüllung des metrischen Gerippes mit Fleisch und Blut,” and later on the same page he distinguishes “Versfüllungsregeln” and “Versbauregeln,” which accords with modern metrical theory. But in

Gade's notational system, "no claim [is made] to represent an abstract metrical level" (45). What is studied is the compositional level. Not only is this unorthodox, as the author admits, but it is questionable whether a metrical analysis without reference to a meter is possible in general. And indeed, the author cannot avoid some reference to a metrical schema; the positions 1–6, which are often referred to in the discussion, must be regarded as metrical.

Chapters 4–6 form the main body of the book, which is a new classification of the corpus of dróttkvætt lines investigated. This corpus is described as consisting of "dróttkvætt poems from the ninth and tenth centuries as listed in Finnur Jónsson's Skj IA:1–174" (xi). In spite of the fact that Sievers' five-type system is more than a century old, this is still the model most commonly referred to by philologists, and Kuhn's work is based on it, as we have seen. Objections like those raised by William Craigie, "On Some Points in Skaldic Metre," *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 16 (1900): 341–84, seem not to have had any great effect on subsequent scholarship (but see Árnason). On the surface it looks as if this lack of overt criticism of the dominant paradigm is continued by Gade, but all is not what it seems.

According to Gade, the corpus comprises thirty-seven types of line, which are divided into three groups, Groups I–III. (The total number of lines seems to be about 3300.) According to a description on p. 49, "The types comprised in each of the three main groups display the same syllabic structure before the cadence with different syntactic organization." Groups I and II both have $\bar{x}\bar{x}$ in positions 1 and 2 as a basic characteristic, but although this is not stated explicitly at the beginning, "a proclitic \times " seems to be allowed in position 1. Also, when it comes to listing the actual types (see, e.g., 47 and 73–103), the second positions in Groups I and II are not always characterized as \bar{x} .

Group I is said to comprise Types E1–4, XE3–4, and B, which have labels with "Sieversian" connotations. The total number of types is 14, and the number of lines 916. To take a few examples, "Type E1 Even" (2 lines) is exemplified by "Happþægibil

krapta," Kormákr Ógmundarson, lv. 4.6, and "Type E2 Even" (18 lines) by "Þjófs iljablað leyfa," Bragi Boddason, *Ragnarsdrápa* 1.4. A type called "E2 Verbal Even" (15 lines) is represented by "mun sverðabrák verða," Víga-Glúmr Eyjólfsson, lv. 6.2, and "Type E3 Odd" (153 lines) by "fjallgylðir það fyllar," Þjóðólfr úr Hvini, *Haustlǫng* 4.1. "Type B Odd" (13 lines) is illustrated by "þás Hristisif hringa," *Ragnarsdrápa* 8.5.

Group II contains "Types D1–2, A2k and C", together 7 types and 814 lines. "Type D1 Odd" (30 lines) is exemplified by "ósvífrandi ása," *Haustlǫng* 5.7, and "Type D1 Even" (61 lines) by "láðvarðaðar garði," Egill Skallagrímsson, lv. 5.2. "Type A2k Odd" (8 lines) is exemplified by "svartskyggð bitu seggi," Þorbjörn hornklofi, *Glymdrápa* 7.3, and "Type A2k Even" (294 lines) by "Randvés hǫfuðniðja," *Ragnarsdrápa* 3.6. "Type C Odd" (189 lines) is represented by "vilið Hrafnketill heyra," *Ragnarsdrápa* 1.1.

The main difference between these Groups I and II seems to be that Group II always has an "enclitic" in position 4, whereas in Group I, \check{x} (i.e., "a bimoric monosyllabic nomen, the bimoric element in a disyllabic, trisyllabic, tetrasyllabic, or pentasyllabic word belonging to any lexical category" [46]) may occur in this position.

Group III consists of lines with the sequence $\bar{x}\times\bar{x}\times\bar{x}\times$, which means that it is trochaic; it is characterized as "Type A." The number of types is 16, and the total number of lines 1429. To take a few examples at random, "Type A1¹ Odd" (86 lines in all) is exemplified by "hǫrðum herðimýlum," *Ragnarsdrápa* 5.7; "Type A2¹ Odd" (3 lines) by "þorfgi væri þeirar," Skallagrímur Kveldúlfsson, *lausavísa* 3.7; "Type A¹ Even" (40 lines) by "heggir mækis eggja," Glúmr Geirason, *Gráfeldardrápa* 10.2; "Type A² Even" (80 lines) by "draum í sverða flaumi," *Ragnarsdrápa* 3.4.

In spite of the surface similarity with Kuhn and Sievers, there are important differences between this classification and the earlier ones. One is the classification of lines into three main "Groups." The assignment of types to "Groups" cuts across some basic types as assumed by Kuhn and Sievers. One such example is the classification of Type A2k, "svartskyggð bitu seggi," which for

Kuhn and Sievers is trochaic with a short second lift. For Gade this type belongs in Group II, which is characterized by two strong positions at the beginning of the line. (And in fact this interpretation accords with Craigie's typology, as we shall see.) This, like many other such breaks with the tradition of Sievers and Kuhn, is not stated explicitly, and consequently the labeling with capital letters *A*, *B*, *C*, *D*, and *E*, which in Kuhn's work still has some relation to Sievers' typology of eddic lines, becomes opaque and misleading.

Another difference from Kuhn's classification is that whereas most of Kuhn's subtypes are defined with reference to such things as the placement of rhyme and alliteration, Gade's subtypes are mostly distinguished by the syntactic patterns. Thus the difference between the first three types in Group I is based on the syntactic composition: Type E1 Even, "Happþægibil krapta" (Kormákr Ögmundarson, lv. 4.6), has one quadrisyllabic compound before the cadence, whereas Type E2 Even, "þjófs iljablað leyfa" (*Ragnarsdrápa* 1.4), and Type E2 Verbal Even, "mun sverðabrak verða" (*Víga-Glúmr Eyjólfsson*, lv. 6.2), have a monosyllable (a noun and a verb respectively) in the first position and then a trisyllable before the cadence. Apart from the fact that the relation of Gade's analysis with that of Kuhn is obscure, there is no systematic comparison with other attempts at classifying dróttkvætt lines metrically, such as that of Craigie, which is adopted with modifications in Árnason (124–48). Craigie (381) assumed that dróttkvætt had only two basic rhythmical types, *A* and *B*, the former trochaic:

S W S W S W

Undrask oðglis landa

and the latter with inversion so that it started with two strong:

S S W W S W

ungr stillir sá milli

svartskyggð bitu seggi

A third type suggested in Árnason is the following with a weak element in the first position:

W S S W S W

ok valkøstu vestan

Here, three abstract rhythmical patterns are assumed, and the basic condition is that a

strong position can only be filled by a heavy syllable with stress (allowing for resolution by which two light syllables may fill one strong position). According to this analysis the restrictions concerning the weak positions are not as strict, since heavy syllables, even stressed ones, may occur in *W*-position, if the strong positions are filled by other stressed syllables. This proposal is briefly discussed by Gade (43–45), but rejected as too simplistic. Still, one can see that her division of the thirty-seven types into three groups has features in common with Craigie's typology. Group III, for example, trochaic and excluding lines like "svartskyggð bitu seggi" (Kuhn's A2k), corresponds well with Craigie's *A*-type, and Groups I and II correspond to Craigie's *B* with the difference that Gade makes a distinction based on the realization of position 4. The difference between Gade's grouping and that of Árnason is thus that the latter does not distinguish between the two ways of filling the fourth position, but on the other hand assumes a separate category (*C*) for lines like "ok valkøstu vestan," which begin with a weak form.

Regardless of the relative merits of each of these groupings, a comparative account like the one just sketched would have been appropriate, and in particular a clearer account of the difference between the Sievers-Kuhn model and Gade's system should have been given.

One of the most important questions concerning the structure and rhythm of dróttkvætt is the function of alliteration in the meter. Scholars have held different general views on the role of alliteration in the rhythm and its relation to metrical strength. Some, like Hollander, have maintained that alliteration was as essential to the rhythm of dróttkvætt as it was to the rhythm of the eddic meters, whereas others, such as Genzmer, have maintained that alliteration was less essential in dróttkvætt. Quoting the thirteenth-century Icelandic scholars Snorri Sturluson and Óláfr Þórðarson hvítaskáld, who both stress the significance of alliteration, Gade seems to place herself firmly in the former camp. According to her, apart from being important in the rhythm, alliteration was "one of the most important devices by which the skalds could emphasize the

cohesion between disrupted syntactic elements" (202).

Looking first at the question of the rhythmical significance of alliteration, we note an observation which recurs several times in Gade's book. It reads as follows (quoting from p. 104, where reference is made to Group I): "No nonalliterating nomen could occur proclitically to the alliterating syllable in position 5, and, in odd lines (with the exception of Types XE3–4), position 4 was occupied by a verb (E3–4), or a substantival pronoun or adverb (E3–4 Verbal; see Craigie's law). The types whose fillers demanded a nomen in position 4 (Types E1–2 and B) were avoided." Gade uses this principle to account for a number of facts she assumes to hold true for dróttkvætt. Among the things dealt with is the function of alliteration in the fourth position, the one just before the trochaic cadence. On pp. 44–45 she criticizes the treatment in Árnason of lines like the ones below as SSWWSW, but with alliteration in the fourth position, which is a metrical dip:

hinn's fór í gný gunnar
(Einnarr skálaglamm, *Vellekla* 34.3)
glaðan hyggjum svan seðja
(Guthormr kǫrtr, lv. 1.3)
Gautr ynni sér sleitu
(Sturla Þórðarson, lv. 4.7)

Kuhn (94) labels lines of this sort as X-types (B or E) and sees them as the only addition he makes to Sievers' typology based on the eddic types. These have, in his analysis, lifts in the fourth position. What Gade finds unconvincing in the analysis adopted in Árnason is the assumption that a syllable in a weak metrical position alliterates. The question is thus whether the fourth position constitutes a metrically strong or weak position.

In the majority of dróttkvætt lines, among them all fully trochaic lines and most lines with other types of rhythm, the fourth position is filled by an ending or weak word class, such as a conjunction, preposition, or pronoun:

Enn man'k þol þat's brunnu
þauga-Hlín ok mínir
(Gizurr Þorvaldsson, lv. 1.1–2)

This also goes for lines like type D and C as classified by Sievers and Kuhn (see, e.g., Kuhn 93):

fyr róg-naðra regni
(Egill Skallagrímsson, lv. 26.7)
þolverðungar Belja
(Þjóðólfr úr Hvini, *Haustlǫng* 18.3)
But stronger fillers occur in lines that Sievers and Kuhn classify as B and E, which according to them had a lift in the fourth position:
í gemlis ham gǫmlum (B)
(*Haustlǫng* 2.3)
fjórspillir lét falla (E)
(*Haustlǫng* 18.1)

And in the three lines cited above in which this filler alliterates, the case for assuming metrical strength in the fourth position seems to become even stronger.

Craigie strongly objected to Sievers' definition of his B and E types as having lifts in position 4, arguing that systematic restrictions prevailed against heavy nominals in this position. In his opinion these lines had the same metrical form as Sievers' D-type, with two strong positions followed by two weak ones before the trochaic cadence, and this is the stance taken in Árnason, where these lines are classified as SSWWSW, as we have seen. In his investigations, Craigie noticed an interesting difference in the strength of nominals and verbs, and a special constraint to the effect that "if the word in the fourth place of a line of this type [i.e., Sievers' B and E types, which Craigie would conflate with D] is a noun or pronoun, that line can only be the second one of a couplet" (354). Although the main point of Craigie's article, which is a fundamental criticism of Sievers' system, seems to have been largely ignored by scholarship in the Sievers-Kuhn tradition, some of his observations have been noted, and the one just quoted is referred to by Gade as "Craigie's law," without this "law" being explicitly formulated for the reader to judge. The most explicit reference seems to be the following: "W. A. Craigie discovered that even lines with a disyllabic or trisyllabic compound or similar syntactic unit of the form $\bar{S}\bar{S}(\check{S})$ (Sievers's Types D4, E, and A2k) never tolerated a long-stemmed nomen in positions 3 and 4. Hence we find such lines as Rdr 5:2 *golfhǫlkvis sá fylkis*, Rdr 12:4 *Ragnarr ok fjǫl sagna*, and Rdr 13:8 *valtrauf fjogur haufuð*, but not †*golfhǫlkvis skál fylkis*, †*Ragnarr ok fjǫlð sagna*, and †*valtrauf fleiri haufuð*" (29).

The essential point Craigie wanted to make was that in lines where the first two positions were strong and heavy, the next two can be interpreted as forming two weak beats in a row. This rhythmical variant may be seen as inversion of the first weak and the second strong beat, i.e., a sort of syncope or anticipation of the second strong beat. For Craigie, this then includes lines like the following, which are treated differently and in various ways by Kuhn and Sievers:

svartskyggð bitu seggi
fyr rógnaðra regin
bqlverðungar Belja
í gemlis ham gqmlum
fjqrspillir lét falla

The important point is that in a line like “svartskyggð bitu seggi,” the fact that there is a light syllable in position 3, which could not form an ictus, is compensated for by two heavy syllables in positions 1 and 2. Although Gade pays lip service to the Sievers-Kuhn tradition, she seems in fact to recognize this, since she assigns such lines to Group II rather than the trochaic Group III, as we have seen. But again this happens without any sort of explicit motivation.

The lines with alliteration in position 4 are indeed the most difficult for a Craigie-type analysis, and it is clear that the question of the rhythmic character of such lines cannot be settled without an understanding of the function of alliteration (see Árnason 133–43). Gade’s principle that a “nonalliterating nomen” cannot stand in position 4 is relevant here. It is meant to explain “Craigie’s law,” but it also has another effect. If a “nomen” occurred in position 4, i.e., just before the cadence, it had to alliterate, which in turn had the effect that the line changed categories according to Kuhn and became an X-line, rather than a more “regular” E- or B-type in Kuhn’s sense. So, apart from the question of whether position 4 constitutes a lift, the question is also whether the difference between

hinn’s fór í gný gunnar (XB)
gautr ynni sér sleitu (XE)

with alliteration, and

í gemlis ham gqmlum (B)
fjqrspillir lét falla (E)

is great enough to assume a difference in rhythmical type. Craigie’s answer to that

question is no, and Kuhn’s seems to be yes, even though the labeling of the lines as XB and XE suggests that there is some connection between the nonalliterating and the alliterating types. Gade’s position here is unclear. Granted that the fact that “no non-alliterating nomen could occur proclitically to the alliterating syllable in position 5” explains the part of “Craigie’s law” which states that nouns are less common in odd lines than in even lines, what is still to be answered is the interesting question whether the fourth position could constitute a lift in some sense, in particular when it alliterates. Obviously, the issue cannot be resolved without first answering the question of the function of alliteration.

Gade invokes the principle of nonalliterating nominals, whereby the prohibited sequence is n+ń (should we call it Gade’s law?), to explain why lines of her subtype A2² (*ók at fornum eikum [170]) are nonexistent and lines of her subtype A2¹ are rare and contain verbal (nonnominal) fillers in positions 3–4: “eigi látask ýtar” (Hallfreðr Óttarsson, *Erfidrápa Óláfs Tryggvasonar* 10.1). In other words, lines of the sort constructed in

*hræva döggar hreggi,

where a heavy disyllabic noun, which would form a full ictus and a dip, occurs between two alliterating ictūs in positions 1 and 5, apparently do not occur.

It is a well-known fact that the *h* of *hallir* in a noun phrase like “Ægis hallir” could not alliterate in eddic poetry, whereas the *æ* of *Ægis* could; the second member of a noun phrase could alliterate only if the first one also alliterated. It is possible to interpret this as showing that noun phrases had initial stress in Old Icelandic (and other old Germanic dialects). A similar constraint was valid concerning compounds (see Árnason 71–80). The essence of these eddic constraints is that a preceding nominal somehow dominated a following one within the same construction and made it unable to alliterate outside the noun phrase or compound. Gade’s law reminds one of this, but it is stated differently, and this has the effect that it seems to make different predictions about the metricality of lines. The difference is that it does not refer to syntactic depen-

dence, but simply to order in a text. This means that it should apply to nouns that do not necessarily belong together syntactically. If the constraint in question were simply the same as the one valid in eddic metrics, then we might have expected a line like “*hræva dōggvar hreggi” to be metrical if it consisted of nouns belonging syntactically to two different noun phrases, i.e., *hreggi* (dative) representing the dislocated part of a noun phrase distinct from *hræva dōggvar*. Still, such lines do not seem to occur, and to the extent that this is an accurate observation, “Gade’s law” seems to hold to some extent.

But the law needs some modification, since lines similar to “*hræva dōggvar hreggi” have nonalliterating nominals in positions 3–4: “þvít ungr konungr engi” (Sigvatr Þórðarson, *Austrfararvísur* 16.5); “þótt síns fōður sónar,” “né þrym-Nirðir þorðu” (Haukr Valdísarson, *Íslendingadrápa* 5.5, 26.5). Here, disyllabic nouns immediately precede the cadence without alliterating, and this can be seen as due to the fact that they form second members of noun phrases or compounds. Similarly, a line like “þás hristi-Sif hringa” (*Ragnarsdrápa* 8.5) is metrical because *Sif* is subordinated to *hristi* and thus does not alliterate. But it is still not clear why we do not get lines like “hræva dōggvar hreggi” where a noun phrase like *hræva dōggvar*, with the first constituent alliterating and the second one not, could not precede an alliterating cadence. This calls for a systematic investigation.

One of the main objectives of Gade’s book is, as we have seen, to “unravel the principles behind the composition of *dróttkvætt* and show what circumstances must have facilitated the comprehension of such poetry” (46). Much of the discussion of the types described in chapters 4–6 concerns the syntactic characteristics of the lines. In addition to this, there is a special chapter entitled “Sentence Patterns” (173–208).

Among the results of the author’s investigations into the syntactic structure of *dróttkvætt* texts is the observation that “odd lines are usually sentence introductory” (173). That is, odd lines are more likely to contain the beginning of a sentence than even lines. But we are not told what sort of statistics lies behind the quantifier “usually.” Moreover,

one might want to ask, what constitutes the “beginning” of a sentence in a text in which the word order is scrambled in the way it is in *dróttkvætt* poetry? Surely extraposition, i.e., movement out of the sentence to the left, seems to be one of the means available to scramble the word order. One might also wonder whether this has something to do with the fact that odd lines are either the first or the third of a *vísuhelmingr* and by definition come before even lines within that unit. This would seem to make them more likely to contain the beginnings of something, regardless of the syntactic characteristics of these constructions.

On p. 179, it is pointed out that less than four percent of “suspended” finite verbs (i.e., finite verbs that occur late or at the end of constructions) occur in line three, and this is said to be because the odd lines were “sentence introductory.” As this statement stands, it would seem to be founded on some sort of significant statistics, but the question is, of course, which comes first, the chicken or the egg. Are the lines defined as “sentence introductory” by some independent constraint (a metrical one perhaps), or is the fact that most of the odd lines tend to contain something which can be seen as the introduction of a sentence the result of other principles having to do with syntax or other linguistic factors? This we are not told. A statement like the following makes one wonder about the significance of the “sentence introductory” character of odd lines: “Line 3 [of the *helmingr*] *either* [italics added] introduces a new clause that provides the necessary alliteration (and rhyme) for the concluding statement in line 4, *or* [italics added again] it contains continuing patterns... with suspended nominal elements from an earlier line (usually line 1)” (199). Unless the italicized words *either-or* in this context are taken to mean: “and may in addition [to the sentence-introductory material],” which seems a very unlikely interpretation, this undermines the characterization of odd lines as sentence introductory — the lines may in fact contain “continuing patterns.” At the very least, readers deserve more clarification than they get here.

But despite these various shortcomings, Gade’s discussion clearly demonstrates that,

contrary to popular belief, dróttkvætt word order is far from arbitrary and that certain restrictions and principles are easily detected. (The application of these principles to explain how the texts could be understood by audiences is another matter.) One of the most interesting restrictions concerns the placement of the verb. As noted by Gade (173 and *passim*), “In independent clauses the finite verb always occurs as the first or second sentence element.” Thus we have lines like:

eigi *látask* ýtar (Hallfreðr Óttarsson,
Erfidrápa Óláfs Tryggvasonar 10.1)
færask fjöll en stóru
 (Kormákr Qgmundarson, *lv.* 42.5)

but not:

*eigi ýtar *látask*
 *fjöll en stóru *færask*

It must be noted that position is here defined syntactically, rather than metrically, since lines like the following are attested:

unnr | benlœkir *runnu*
 (Þórarinn svartí, *lv.* 6.8)

Here the verb *runnu* is in the 5–6th position in the metrical line, but syntactically in the second position. But since Gade does not seem to want to make a distinction between meter and composition, this is unclear in her text, and we are not told why, e.g., the verbs *gaf* and *eru* in the following lines, which Gade lists as examples of the verb placed late in the clause (178), are not in fact early:

allvaldr | sá's *gaf* skøldum (Glúmr
 Geirason, *Gráfeldardrápa* 3.2)
 siðr | at blót *eru* kviðjuð
 (Hallfreðr Óttarsson, *lv.* 10.2)

One wonders whether she is talking about a metrical or a syntactic position.

The other side of this fact about word order is that in “bound clauses,” i.e., clauses which are introduced by conjunctions (both main and subordinate clauses), verbs are exempted from this restriction, as shown by examples like “vekjendr | þeirs mik sekðu” (Gísli Súrsson, *lv.* 19.6). In certain instances the finite verb may be “suspended” all the way back to the end of the *vísuhelmingr*:

Ok borðróins barða
 brautar þvengr enn ljóti
 á haussprengi Hrungnis
 harðgeðr neðan *starði*.
 (*Ragnarsdrápa* 17)

Clearly the syntax of dróttkvætt is a very interesting area of study, and investigation of this corpus might well shed light on some issues in the study of Germanic word order, which has flourished in the last decade or so (see, e.g., Sten Vikner, *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*, Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax [Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1995]).

The final section of the chapter on sentence patterns is entitled “Enjambment, Vertical Placement, and the Role of Alliteration” (202–8). Here we are told that “alliteration was one of the most important devices by which the skalds could emphasize the cohesion between disrupted syntactic elements (vertical placement) or elements that were separated by the metrical caesura (enjambment).” We are given to understand that enjambment between two lines was possible if alliteration connected the elements. And this is the case in examples like the following, cited by Gade on p. 203:

bera knóttu þó *breiðan*
blóðvond hjarar Þundar
 (Kormákr Qgmundarson, *lv.* 64.5–6)

Enjambment from an even line, with only one alliterating stave in initial position, to an odd line is said to be unmetrical and “very rare.” But still it occurs “less than fifteen times” in the poetry from the ninth and tenth century. One of the seven examples listed is:

holmreiðar lét *olman*
lindihjort fyr landi
 (Þorbjörn hornklofi, *Glymdrápa* 6.6–7)

We are not told how many examples there are of enjambment with alliteration; there are seventeen examples listed on p. 203, but of course the reader should be told how many other examples there are, to be able to ascertain whether the fifteen examples of enjambment without alliteration are unmetrical. In any case one may well ask whether there was need for any special means to indicate the syntactic coherence of two sequential forms, even if they cross a metrical boundary. If such means were used to indicate syntactic coherence, one would indeed expect them to be used to indicate coherence between forms that are far apart and thus do not obviously go together (but of course the formal requirements in alliteration are such that the distance between allit-

erating positions was maximally one line). One might also ask whether it is generally plausible to assume that the skalds used alliteration as some sort of special measure to help the audience understand the text spontaneously. Isn't it in fact much more likely that the elaborate forms were meant to be difficult to understand at first, but that it was part of the process of learning the stanzas to decipher the meaning behind the elaborate diction and intricate word order?

Two opposite views have been held on the origin and development of dróttkvætt. One is that dróttkvætt developed partly through Irish influence (Craigie, Heusler, Einar Ólafur Sveinsson), and the other is that it developed without foreign influence by adding a trochee to the fornyrðislag line (Sievers, Kuhn). Like many other questions about dróttkvætt, this issue has not been settled either way, and the answer may very well lie somewhere in the middle. Gade places herself clearly in the camp of those who believe that dróttkvætt evolved from fornyrðislag ("Eddic and Skaldic Poetry: The Origin of *Dróttkvætt*," 226–38).

Gade bases her argumentation on a systematic comparison of fornyrðislag and other Old Icelandic meters on the one hand and dróttkvætt on the other, showing that "most types of syntactic fillers of *dróttkvætt* lines [before the cadence] also occur in eddic *fornyrðislag*" (227). Thus the filler before the cadence in a line like "mun sverðabrák verða" (Víga-Glúmr Eyjólfsson, lv. 6.2) is supposed to correspond to an eddic line like "sœstu, gýgiarkyn" (*Helreið Brynhildar* 14.8), and dróttkvætt "golfhólkvis sá fylkis" (*Ragnarsdrápa* 5.2) is said to correspond to eddic "Fíorgyniar burr" (*Völuspá* 56.10). The conclusion is that "the correspondences between the syntactic fillers of *dróttkvætt* and *fornyrðislag* lines are too striking to be fortuitous" (231). And indeed there is good reason to agree with Gade that the correspondence is not fortuitous, but there is no reason to assume that it proves anything about the origin of the dróttkvætt meter. There is another perfectly plausible reason why the first four positions in dróttkvætt should have similar linguistic structure to the assumed four positions in fornyrðislag, and this is that the texts in both cases come

from the same language, and the poets who composed in dróttkvætt at least knew the eddic poems, if they didn't compose them as well. There are further similarities between the two genres, e.g., in the definition of correspondence classes in alliteration; also, eddic meters were used in poetry which was skaldic (though not dróttkvætt), as Gade indeed notes. This affinity between eddic and skaldic poetry is of course something we should expect, given that we are dealing with one poetic culture and tradition. There is thus nothing new in Gade's demonstration. The same point was made by Sievers more than a century ago, when he managed to apply the same sort of typology of lines to eddic and skaldic meters. We may grant Sievers this accomplishment, even if we disagree with him and Kuhn about whether the metrical analysis involved is appropriate. The point is that the evidence based on this sort of corresponding analysis of fornyrðislag and dróttkvætt is only as good as the evidence that a Sievers-type metrical analysis is better than, e.g., a Craigie-type one. This is debatable, and we have indeed seen that Gade herself does not subscribe wholeheartedly to this analysis. Furthermore, not all dróttkvætt types have correspondences in fornyrðislag. One such case is Gade's Type A2⁵:

ógnar stafr of jöfra
(*Gráfeldardrápa* 13.3)
hrökkvi-áll of hrokkinn
(*Ragnarsdrápa* 18.3)

An additional point in Gade's argumentation (232–33) involves restrictions concerning enjambment and alliteration which are said to prevail in both fornyrðislag and dróttkvætt. "There are no *fornyrðislag* lines of Types E3–4 with nominal enjambment across the metrical caesura" except when it involves the sequence "nonalliterating demonstrative plus alliterating pronoun." This is a very complex point, and the argumentation looks rather obscure at times, but the essential argument seems to be that "the direct connections between odd and even lines in *fornyrðislag* were subject to the same rules as the connections between positions 4 and 5–6 in *dróttkvætt*" (233). One of three pairs adduced to illustrate this parallelism is the following:

hendr úrsvalar / Høgna mági (Helga-
kviða Hundingsbana II, 44.9–10)
segls Naglfara siglur (Ragnarsdrápa 5.3)

Here the alliterative pattern is the same: the noun phrases are ordered in the same way, so that the alliteration occurs on the first member of the noun phrase and the last one, rather than, e.g., the order being:

*úrsvalar hendr / Høgna mági (eddic)
*naglfara segls siglur (dróttkvætt)

These restrictions are probably due to the fact that noun phrases had initial stress, as we have seen. Thus *hendr* and *segls* would not alliterate when subordinated to a preceding nominal within the same phrase. (We may note that the dróttkvætt construct “*naglfara segls siglur” is probably rhythmically ill formed as well.) But it is of course not surprising that this constraint should prevail in both dróttkvætt and eddic meters, again since the language is one and the same. Gade thus emphasizes similarities between dróttkvætt and fornyrðislag, but as far as these similarities can be seen as due to linguistic factors inherent in the language used in both kinds of poetry, they do not prove that dróttkvætt evolved historically from fornyrðislag. And indeed there are some differences between dróttkvætt and fornyrðislag as regards alliteration. Sievers himself noted that a line like “Knútr spurði mik mætra” showed that a nonalliterating noun like *Knútr* could under certain conditions occur before the first *stuðull*, something which was not possible in fornyrðislag (Eduard Sievers, *Altgermanische Metrik* [Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1893], 101). Another fact suggesting differences between dróttkvætt and fornyrðislag would seem to be the nonexistence of A2²-lines in dróttkvætt, which Gade explains as a result of her law of nonalliterating nominals, possibly with different effects in dróttkvætt than in fornyrðislag.

Obviously it is difficult to do justice to a work like the present one in a review, even a lengthy one like this, and there are several points raised by Gade’s study which deserve a more thorough discussion than the one submitted here. The general impression is that the author has made a thoughtful analysis of dróttkvætt poetry, and indeed made a number of observations that are useful and

must be noted in the future study of dróttkvætt. But lack of clarity and methodological sophistication often makes the argumentation unconvincing. Another serious defect is that the book is difficult to read and very reader-unfriendly. Little attempt has been made to help readers create for themselves a frame into which the details of the argumentation may be fitted. The argumentation is often quite complex and difficult to follow, mainly because of lack of explicit exemplification, and many of the premises that the conclusions are based on are not clearly spelled out. In addition, typographical errors make the text even more difficult to follow than it otherwise would have been. An example showing the task the reader faces in trying to follow the argumentation is the following passage from p. 74, near the beginning of chapter 4. The passage forms a part of the description of Type E2 Even, one of the first types of line to be described: “Thirteen lines are sentence concluding and four are continuing. All the words in position 1 are either long or protected by an enclitic consonant (*sonr*, *ryðs*, *viðr*). Two lines contain a hard sentence boundary after position 4, and both are sentence concluding: HolmgB 11:4 *morð / halfan tög fjorða*, Bbreiðv 1:4 *strengs / þenna dag lengstan*. The internal rhymes fall in positions 1 (13 lines) or 2 (5 lines), and the distribution is closely connected with the syntactic structure of the lines: if there is no sentence boundary after position 1, the internal rhyme may fall in position 2: *sonr aldafoðrs vildi*, *ryðs hælifól gæli*. If there is a sentence boundary after position 1, however, the internal rhyme must fall in position 1.” The terms “sentence concluding” and “sentence continuing” are not explained here, but on p. xix “sentence-concluding pattern” is defined as “type of syntactic filler that concludes a sentence,” which is not very helpful, and on the same page “sentence-continuing pattern” is defined as “a type of syntactic filler whose elements continue a sentence introduced in an earlier line.” One would have liked clear exemplification of what sort of structures are being referred to. In addition, there is a misprint in the text quoted above. Readers have to figure out for themselves that “position 4” must read “position 1” (or

so it seems?). To add to readers' discomfort, they may wonder what the significance of the final statement cited above is. Since there are only two examples of sentence boundaries after position 1, how do we know that it isn't a coincidence that in both cases the internal rhymes fall in position 1? It would have been helpful, in tackling passages like the one just cited, to have a good index to consult for definitions or clarification of terms that are used without a transparent explanation in the immediate context. But regretfully, errors in the index render it of limited use. For example, consulting the entry "sentence-introductory pattern," we are informed that the first two occurrences of this term are on pages XIII and XXI, but the term is to be found on neither of these pages. Page XIII is the end of the preface, where we find a list of eminent scholars who have helped the author in various ways, but there is no mention of the "sentence introductory pattern." Optimistic readers will of course look for page XXI, but this time they discover that there is no page XXI! The definition is on page XIX: "type of syntactic filler whose initial position introduces a new clause."

Kristján Árnason

Lars Lönnroth. *Skaldemjödet i berget: Essayer om fornisländsk ordkonst och dess återanvändning i nutiden*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 1996. 226 Seiten.

Unter dem geheimnisvollen Titel, zu deutsch "Der Dichternet im Berge", verbergen sich neun Essays, die — von einigen Ausnahmen abgesehen — durch das Thema der dichterischen Inspiration im Spannungsfeld mit dem poetischen Handwerk miteinander verbunden sind. Die chronologisch geordnete Auswahl der Gedichtinterpretationen erstreckt sich vom isländischen Mittelalter bis zur Postmoderne. Auf vier Essays mit mittelalterlichen Themen folgen fünf weitere, die sich der Rezeption des altnordischen Erbes, vorwiegend in Skandinavien, widmen. So bleiben die Bezüge vom Mittelalter zur Moderne gewahrt, und gleichzeitig wird den Veränderungen der Auffassung Rechnung getragen.

Trotzdem entsteht aus vielerlei Gründen kein völlig einheitliches, von Widersprüchen freies Bild, wie Fachgelehrte es vielleicht für wünschenswert hielten. Der Hauptgrund liegt darin, daß das Buch für ein breiteres Publikum geschrieben wurde mit dem Ziel, wie es Lönnroth im Vorwort selbst formuliert: "Att övervinna moderna läsares motstånd mot det fornnordiska kulturarvet — och samtidigt göra sig av med den götiska bråte som ingår i detta arv — kan vara lika svårt som det var för Odin att stjäla skaldemjödet från jätterna. Hur jag lyckats vet jag inte" [Den Widerstand moderner Leser gegen das altnordische Kulturerbe zu überwinden — und gleichzeitig den gotischen Plunder, der zu diesem Erbe gehört, wegzuschaffen —, kann ebenso schwer sein, wie es für Odin war, den Dichternet von den Riesen zu stehlen. Ob es mir geglückt ist, weiß ich nicht] (7). Für jeden, der sich für die Vorzüge einer Literatur einsetzt, ist es gut nachvollziehbar, daß man sie seinen Zeitgenossen vermitteln möchte, und es ist auch verständlich, daß man dafür journalistische Mittel wählt. So zitiert Lönnroth altisländische Strophen und Prosastücke häufig nur in neueren schwedischen, mit guter sprachlicher Kompetenz verfaßten