

THE EMBER OF THE HANDS – MEMORY AND TRANSMISSION THROUGH KENNINGS IN *HARALDSDRÁPA*

Flavia TEOC*

*Center for the Study of Antiquity and Christianity, University of Aarhus, Denmark

Abstract: On 21 April 1042, the Varangian warrior and future king Haraldr harðráði blinded in public the Byzantine Emperor Mihail and his uncle Constantine. The episode is narrated by two of Haraldr's skalds: Þórarinn Skeggjason and Þjóðólfr Arnórsson. In spite of the substantial amount of analysis that has been produced on their stanzas, doubts about the participation of the entire Varangian guard still abound (Kari Ellen Gade 2009). My study answers the question by making use of memory activated through the corpus of kennings analyzed as units of repeated speech in the conceptual field of Eugeniu Coseriu's text linguistics. Essential dimensions of the internal dynamics of the text, the evocative relations represent the key problem of text linguistics. The appearance of a kenning in different texts represents, each time, an act of translation from a poetic memory to a communicative memory. Due to the reinsertion and reconfiguration processes which can be applied to them, the kennings gain new evocative functions, despite their conventional repeated nature. My study inspects the imagery in the kenning *glóðum handa* (embers of the hands) of Þórarinn Skeggjason's *Haraldsdrápa*, which also occurs in the kenning *glóðs Rínar* (the embers of the Rhine) in *Liðsmannaflokkr*, composed c. 1015-16. The analysis of kennings as units of repeated speech in *Haraldsdrápa* and *Liðsmannaflokkr* provides consistency through the activation of the evocative functions and a sharper focus on the broader perception of the collective memory as a shared body of knowledge in Old Norse poetry.

Keywords: skaldic poetry; text linguistics; kenning; memory; repeated speech

The corpus of texts surviving from medieval Scandinavia which contain vestiges about the important role of memory is quite large¹. The role of poetic sources as a vehicle for oral history in reconstructing the early history of Scandinavia is emphasized by Snorri Sturluson in the *Prologue* to *Heimskringla* (Hollander 3), though in skaldic poetry memory is never a passive recall of events. What it seems to me crucial in terms of memory is to explain how particular circumstances are activated in order to make sense of current events in poems and poetic recitation composed about kings and other chieftains. Rather than try to solve this problem by comparing contemporary sources to written reflections on a certain historical event, I propose an analysis from a linguistic perspective.

¹ Memory and oral transmission are clearly difficult terrains, but that has not stopped memory theory from becoming one of the central issues of cultural analysis of the past ten years, culminating in a recent *Handbook of Pre-modern Nordic Memory Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (Glaser et al., 2018). The interdisciplinary approaches of the case studies display the potential for future explorations in memory studies.

1. WHAT IS TEXT LINGUISTICS?

The introduction of a historical perspective in linguistic research is Eugeniu Coseriu's main contribution to the study of language², and this results in an integral view of language reality; hence the name integral linguistics. Starting from Wilhelm von Humboldt (1836/2008:82) and from the Aristotelian tradition, Eugeniu Coseriu conceives language as *energeia*, as creative activity. According to Humboldt, language is never a simple tool but it always contains a vision of the world; therefore, speaking a language means to assume, even without being aware, that vision. In the broad field of integral linguistics a text represents the product of the individual level of speech, considering that that language is (1) a generally-human activity, exercised by people (2) as members

² Eugeniu Coseriu (1921-2002) was a Romanian born linguist who researched Romance languages at University of Tübingen. As a researcher, he was concerned with problems of the philosophy of language following a Humboldtian and Saussurian heritage.

of a tradition of speech competence, (3) at a personal level.

Referring to the text linguistics as a hermeneutics of sense, Coseriu suggested that there is no universally valid technique for interpreting a text, since we are never capable of foreseeing what sorts of sign-relations are activated:

If we want to consider a particular text in its individuality, we can never know in advance what kind of sign-relations can be established within it. It is really possible just to draw up a list of the general possibilities at the disposal of the one who produces a text in order to make sense. But we are talking about an open list. We will always be able to record in our list completely new possibilities of semiotic articulation in interpreting a new text. There is no mechanical method to enumerate or predict all imaginable possibilities of achieving the proper meaning (Coseriu, 2013:163).

From the perspective of text linguistics, all languages are historical techniques of discourse because they belong to the traditions of distinctive cultures (Coseriu, 2013:120; Teoc, 2015:354). Tradition includes the mechanics of speech, but also language already spoken, fragments of ready-made discourse that can be reintroduced in new contexts and circumstances, often as idioms or sayings distinct from the formal usage of the language.

The Archimedean point of text linguistics is the double semiotic articulation in a text/discourse. Put simply, what is meant is not merely an extension of what is said. According to the first semiotic relation, a kenning initially signifies something that we understand because of our knowledge of the referent and the skaldic rules, and theoretically it is possible to understand the text on this first semiotic level. However, the full recovery of the proper meaning implies the accessibility to the second semiotic articulation by activating the evocative relations throughout the text. From a linguistic perspective, the first semiotic articulation is basically concerned with the factual knowledge of a language when, at the first reading, the kenning designates what we understand “as connoisseurs of these signs and the rules of their use” (Coseriu, 2013:120). The second semiotic articulation is achieved by analyzing the evocative relations established by the linguistic sign in a text.

According to Coserian linguistics, the evocative relations developed by the linguistic sign are as follows: a) relations of the sign with other

signs expressed in rhymes, alliteration, assonance; b) relations of the signs in the given text with signs from other texts (repeated speech); c) relations of the signs with historical context completed by the socio-cultural environment; d) relations of the sign with the knowledge of things activated when the designated term is already invested with semiotic (symbolic) value in a cultural space (Coseriu, 2013:105).

From the outset of Coserian linguistics, there are two subcategories of repeated discourse: repeated speech and proverbial words. Repeated speech concerns all speech that is communicated as phraseologisms (lexical idioms such as sayings, proverbs, and catchphrases) within the linguistic community, being a form of communication appealing to previous contexts. Proverbial words are small fragments from literary or nonliterary texts that are extremely familiar within the linguistic community and can even be reproduced by heart.

In my analysis the two kennings contribute to the creation of proper meaning materialized through the change of their original textual functions and the acquiring of new semantic functions, as a part of the “reinsertion and reconfiguration processes” (Dan-Terian, 2011:104) which can be applied to them. The main assumption of my analysis is the capacity of kennings to become agents of a cultural memory as linguistic and historical sources, through the activation of the evocative function in the conceptual frame of textual linguistics. My approach is therefore that of a linguist, but I have been strongly influenced by the methodological orientation provided by Kate Heslop (2014:100), whose most salient suggestion, to my mind, is that skaldic poetry is a communicative form of memory which turned into a cultural memory when it was collected and preserved as written testimonies of the past.

2. KENNINGS AS A REPEATED SPEECH

The kenning, a short phrase which replaces a noun of ordinary discourse, represents one of the hallmarks of skaldic diction. The association of the kenning corpus with memory is an ancient one, and derives principally from the kenning imagery which, according to Bergsveinn Birgisson (2012:285), “had profound mnemonic powers that helped to render the stanzas stable during their oral transmission”.

Snorri’s *Skáldskaparmál*, presented within a framing narrative set on a question and answer

dialogue between Ægir and Bragi, is the main source of our knowledge about kennings. Primarily concerned with creating an integrative cultural history rather than delivering a list of kennings, Snorri discusses the poetic language assigned to skaldic poetry by using pre-existing skaldic poetry, orally-transmitted, as the basis for his explanations of kennings. Regarding Snorri as the main source of information about kennings, inevitably forces the reader to confront the question of how a stable system of kennings which reappear in different poems can generate multiple and different interpretations and represent each time an act of re-creation.

Snorri's conception of kennings is very structural: a kenning can be understood as an allusion to an already existing sequence of known facts or mythology, it is always repeated in a more or less identical form, and from this perspective can be successfully ascribed to the analysis as units of repeated speech (Teoc, 2015:354). Moreover, the use of a kenning will always create a sense of identity, provided that it belongs to a cultural tradition preserved in skaldic poetry as cultural memory. According to Pernille Hermann, skaldic poetry encapsulates a certain representation of an event described in stanzas, rather than the event itself (for further discussion see Hermann 21). We need look no further than the kenning *glóðum handa* (the embers of the hands) to see how profoundly indebted a kenning is to its previous semantic frame in order to contribute to the articulation of the proper meaning in a new stanza, taking into account the fact that the metaphoric process of speech works with "signification entities already existing in speech" (Borcilă, 1997:67).³

3. THE MATERIAL

3.1 *Liðsmannaflokkur*. *Liðsmannaflokkur* depicts a military campaign in England led by Knutr the Great, King of Denmark 1015-1016, and all ten stanzas are cited as a continuum in *ÓHLeg* (1982: 48-53) and in the excerpts (*articuli*) from the *Lífssaga* of Óláfr helgi by Styrmir Kárason inn fróði 'the Learned' in *Flat* (Whaley, *Poetry from the Kings' Sagas* 1).

For the attribution of the *flokkur* throughout Óláfr saga, Óláfr Haraldsson, the future king of Norway, is considered the speaker of

Liðsmannaflokkur, whereas in *Knytlinga saga* the stanzas are seen as a collective collection of verses composed by the *liðsmenn*, the household troops of Knutr. However, *Knytlinga saga* does not place Óláfr in England during Knutr's 1016 campaign. According to Poole, Óláfr's last actions in England, as recorded by Sigvatr in *Víkingarvísur*, for instance, are placed together with Ethelred "and included a raid against the people of Lindsey in punishment for their having assisted Knutr" (Poole 1991:275). The most probable explanation for not placing Óláfr in England during the siege is provided by Moberg who suggested that the *Knytlinga saga*'s compiler ignored the Óláfr ascription because Knutr and Óláfr were enemies "for most of their lives" (Moberg, 1941:86; Poole, 1991:94).

Although each stanza is a testimony to the ingenuity and handiness of the skald, my research will focused on the third stanza, where the kenning *glóða Rínar* occurs:

Pollr mun glaums of grímu
gjarn síðarla arna
randar skóð at rjóða
ræðinn, sás mey fæðir.
Berr eigi sá sveigir
sára lauks í ári
reiðr til Rínar glóða
rond upp á Englandi.

{Ræðinn þollr glaums}, sás fæðir mey, mun gjarn síðarla arna at rjóða {skóð randar} of grímu. {Sá sveigir {lauks sára}} berr eigi rond, reiðr, upp á Englandi í ári til {glóða Rínar}.

{The talkative pine-tree of revelry} (MAN) who brings up the maiden will gladly rush tardily to redder {the harm of the shield} (SWORD) in darkness. {That brandisher {of the leek of wounds}} (SWORD > WARRIOR) does not carry the shield, enraged, up into England in a hurry, for {the embers of the Rhine} (GOLD) (Poole, 2012:1019).

In the transparency of the stanza, we read the cultural significances deposited in the text as a potential for creating knowledge, which is examined in the fragmentary form of the repeated speech. From this perspective, the material preserved in the third stanza resembles a typical Old Norse vision of a strong antagonism between the brave *liðsmenn* and the cowardly attitude of the "guardian of Steinvǫr", who preferred to stay at home instead of participating in the siege of London. By staying home "he is not only slow into

³ Mircea Borcilă suggests in his study "The metaphoric model in poetic texts" (1997) that there is always a surplus of meaning brought by metaphors in any language and any tradition.

battle, but is not present at all” (Poole, 2012:1019). According to Russel Poole (2012:77)

the stanza appears to express contempt” for this idle warrior and it is presented in the use of kenning for gold instead of Danegeld, “the silver pennies paid as Danegeld when Scandinavian warriors fought in English campaigns” (Poole, 2012:77).

Glóða Rínar is a straightforward kenning for gold, which encapsulates the myth of Ægir (see below under the evocative functions), and the voice of the skald in this stanza emphasizes that *glóða Rínar* (gold) can be accepted by the lazy guardian of Steinvǫr.

It should be also clear from Poole’s analysis that *Liðsmannaflokkur* is composed from the viewpoint of the warriors following a leader, which agrees with the story in *Knytlinga saga* crediting the brave warriors with authorship.

3.2 Haraldsdrápa. Closely associated with his brother Markus Skeggjason, Þórarinn Skeggjason, the author of *Haraldsdrápa*, is a skald about whom Snorri tells us little. Even less is known about him from other sources, as *Skáldatal*, which mentions only that he was a court poet of the well-known king Haraldr Harðráði, who achieved military fame in the Varangian Guard⁴ but suffered the ultimate defeat in England at the Battle of Stamford Bridge.

Whereas Snorri’s saga is quite neutral in the descriptions of Haraldr’s relation to emperors, Byzantine sources indicate that Varangian guard displayed a considerable respect and devotion to him. For our purposes, the most important piece of information found in *Haraldsdrápa*’s verses is that Haraldr himself chooses to blind the emperor:

Náði gørr enn glóðum,
Grikklands, jofurr handa,
stólþengill gekk ströngu
steinblindr aðalmeini.

Jofurr náði enn gørr {glóðum handa}; {stólþengill
Grikklands} gekk steinblindr strongu aðalmeini.

The prince obtained even more {embers of the hands}; (GOLD) {the emperor of Greece} became stone-blind from the violent major injury (Gade, 2009:294)

The context is described by Kari Ellen Gade as follows: “the stanza refers to the blinding of the Emperor by Haraldr (and his men?)” (Gade, 2009:294). In this stanza, as Gade puts it, it is difficult to understand if the whole Varangian army participated to the event⁵.

Haraldr’s reputation as a Varangian is increased by his conformity to the paradigm of the Viking warrior, whose function within the Byzantine society was to fight in emperor’s service. However, this half stanza tells us that he deliberately subverts that model by blinding the emperor. A possible explanation for this attitudinal shift is that the emperor is a usurper of the Macedonian dynasty⁶, whose founder, Basil II, is highly respected by the future Norwegian king⁷. When Michael Kalafatos and his uncle sent Empress Zoe to monastery, the people besieged the palace, brought Zoe back and restored Macedonian dynasty. From this angle, *Haraldsdrápa* introduced us to the idea that a Viking could gain reputation in the Varangian guard not only by serving the emperor but also by publicly humiliating him. In Þórarinn Skeggjason’s half stanza the emperor’s cowardly behavior⁸ is seen as despicable and provocative for the members of the Varangian guard. Through the activation of evocative functions in my foregoing analysis, his behavior is juxtaposed with the *heimdragi* “stay-at-home” in *Liðsmannaflokkur*, where the coward misses out on expeditionary plunder, here stereotypically represented as gold through the kenning *glóða Rínar*. In Þjóðólfr Arnórsson’s *Sexstefja*, Haraldr himself is blinding the Emperor:

Stólþengils lét stinga
— styrjold vas þá byrjuð —

⁵ The emperor and his uncle were blinded on 21 April 1042, just the night before Harald left the Varangian guard and Constantinople.

⁶ The history of Scandinavians fighting for Byzantine army has been traced by Sigfus Blöndal in his study “Vaeringjasaga.” According to his research, the Varangian guard was established in 988, when the Macedonian emperor Basil II welcomed a large contingent of Varangians (Davidson, 1976:180). From that time on, the Varangians were in close relation with the imperial family and Macedonian dynasty whose last descendants were the Empress Zoe and her sister, Teodora.

⁷ During his service in Constantinople as a member of the Varangian guard, Haraldr gained the nickname *Bulgar-burner* (*Bolgara brennir*, see *Sexstefja*, st I), assigned in the past only to Basil II Boulgaroktonos.

⁸ The Emperor and his uncle have managed to flee and found shelter in Stoudion Monastery. Hoping to save their lives, they dressed like monks.

⁴ The Varangian warriors fought in all the major battles of the Byzantine Empire until 1204, when the Crusaders defeated them. Remains of this guard continued to fight for Constantinople until 29 May 1453, the day of the fall of the city under the Turks. Testimonies about the Varangian guard appear both in the documents of the time and in Scandinavian folklore.

eyðir augu bæði
 út heiðingja sútar.
 Lagði allvaldr Egða
 austr á bragning hraustan
 gráligt mark, en Girkja
 goðu illa fór stillir

{Eyðir sútar} heiðingja} lét stinga út bæði augu stólpengils; þá vas styrjöld byrjuð. {Allvaldr Egða} lagði gráligt mark á hraustan bragning austr, en {stillir Girkja} fór illa goðu.

”{{ The destroyer of the care (GLADDENER) of the wolf (lit. Heath-goer)} had both eyes of the emperor stabbed out; war was under way then. {The overlord of the Egdir} (NORVEGIAN KING = Haraldr) placed a hostile mark on the daring prince in the east, and {the ruler of the Greeks} (= Michael) travelled a dire road” (Whaley, 2009:118).

There are no narratives attached to these descriptions in Byzantine sources, but Þórarinn Skeggjason’s and Þjóðólfr Arnórsson’s recreation of the event is credited and confirmed by Snorri Sturluson, as his skaldic sources place the same emphasis on Haraldr himself blinding the Emperor. And yet we can still discern a good deal of the proper meaning residing in the kennings *glóða Rínar* and *glóðum handa*, as it has been understood by an audience contemporary to the authors of both stanzas.

4. THE ACTIVATION OF THE EVOCATIVE RELATIONS

The memory of a kenning is a matter that privileges visions, if we are to coin the Humboldtian term, visions which are expressed through signs and reside on a linguistic plane, where the full significance residing in a kenning is susceptible to become unraveled through the activation of the evocative relations.

After reading various interpretations on *Haraldsdrápa* I became convinced that the commentaries are missing the central role played by the kenning *glóðum handa* (gold) as a unit of repeated speech, whose previous occurrence is settled in *Liðsmannaflokkur*. By a process of recalling and commemorating the siege of London in 1015, as described in *Liðsmannaflokkur*, a visual image became imprinted upon the kenning *glóða Rínar*, bringing the historical moments of London siege and the cowardly attitude of the warrior who stayed home into the present of *Haraldsdrápa*, which describes the blinding of the Byzantine emperor who is deprived by his gold / *glóðum handa*. This process of internalising the performance of an event within a kenning enabled

Viking warriors to feel the immediate presence of their predecessors and to identify with them.

4.1 Relations of the signs with historical context completed by the socio-cultural environment. A comparative analysis between the content of the two kennings *glóða Rínar* and *glóðum handa*, both of them designating the gold, reveals the contrast between what is socially acceptable and what is not; a contrast made visible through the brave and the cowardly attitude. As underlined above, the brave warriors go to fight together, and are named in the skaldic poetry by a single term, *liði*, while the coward stays at home to guard his fortune. The results from analysis of historical and textual sources bring us new insight and knowledge regarding the meaning of *liði* in the skaldic corpus, concept on which *Liðsmannaflokkur* is structured, as a way of constant instruction in virtue.

The two examples of *liði*, for instances, provided by Judith Jesch’s analysis (2001) and presented below are describing a sea-battle in which a *lið*, as group of warriors, is identified by the name of its leader:

Sigv II,9 has *Sveins liðar* tying ships together before the battle of Nesjar, while Gísl I,12 mentions *Magnúss liðar* at the battle off Anglesey. It is noteworthy that all of the skaldic examples are in the plural, while all of the examples, both runic and skaldic, occur in genitival collocations, which correlates neatly with the practice, discussed above, of identifying a *lið* by the name of its leader (Jesch, 2001:202).

Apart from giving us a direct explanation of the linguistic function of *liði*, the two examples provide a more solid basis for revealing the strong cohesion between the warriors and their leader. Such allusions might represent a form of practical training and moral instruction⁹, and consequently, the recollection of such memories in skaldic poetry is shaping self-understanding for a warrior who belongs to a social group following a leader

The relations of the kenning *glóðum handa* with historical context, completed by the socio-cultural environment, reveals patterns and uses that can be recalled to elucidate the evocative relations within other texts related to Varangian activity in Byzantium. The analysis of the historical context of the scene depicted in *Haraldsdrápa* draws back

⁹ As Simon Nygaard argued, the ritual framework behind the performance of a poem could have created the social and the moral obligation towards the group (Nygaard, 2018:31).

to a Constantinople of the first millennium, as the capital of an empire that lived in the atmosphere of a total revival. In the atmosphere of this flourishing Empire, the first duty of the Varangian guard was to defend the emperor. Even when they left Constantinople in military campaigns they were primarily fighting to protect their emperor¹⁰ therefore, from this perspective, *liði* and *liðsmenn* seem properly to express the semantic values they hold as a Viking group fighting abroad.

Considering that it was customary to invite the Varangians to take the first plunder of a conquered fortress, and that they were also allowed to plunder the Imperial palace once an emperor died, the semantic interaction between *gold* seen as a treasure and the *ember* of the emperor's hands, must be read in the frame of the motivation and reward, as a unified understanding of the perception of *gold* in terms of plunder. The symbolic value of gold in *Haraldsdrápa*, shares a strong relation with *glóða Rínar* as unit of repeated speech, aspect which I will pursue through the analysis of the relation of the sign with the knowledge of things.

4.2 relations of the sign with the knowledge of things activated when the designate is already invested with semiotic (symbolic) value in a cultural space (Coseriu, 2013:105). In *Skáldskaparmál* Snorri Sturluson is perfectly clear about what gold should be paraphrased: gold is the Fire of the Hand, or of the Limb, or of the Leg, because it is red; but silver is called Snow, or Ice, or Hoar-Frost, because it is white (Faulkes, 1998:78). In addition, gold is called Ægir's Fire due to the following mythological tale:

Ægir went to Ásgard to a feast, but when he was ready to return home, he invited Odin and all the Æsir to visit him in three months' time. First came Odin and Njördr, Freyr, Týr, Bragi, Víðarr, Loki; likewise the Ásynjur: Frigg, Freyja, Gefjun, Skadi, Idunn, and Sif. Thor was not there, having gone into the eastern lands to slay trolls. When the gods had sat down in their places, straightway Ægir had bright gold brought in onto the floor of the hall, and the gold gave forth light and illumined the hall like fire: and it was used there for lights at his banquet, even as in Valhall swords were used in place of fire (Faulkes, 1998:101).

¹⁰ Sigfus Blöndal pointed out that as foreign mercenaries, Varangians were freed of local sympathies, so they could exert without any attachment, except to the emperor, duties such as the arrest of churchmen or aristocrats who would otherwise have enjoyed sympathy among the masses (Blöndal, 2003:243).

Further evidence supporting a connection between the sea and the gold is evident in Snorri's explanation of *nygerving*, the substitution of synonyms for the determinant. Snorri is describing in *Skáldskaparmál* 41/7–17 how by substitution of words of related meaning "the correspondence between the literal meaning of the kenning and what it actually refers to becomes remoter, so that the meaning of words is so to speak extended" (Faulkes, 1998: xxxviii). Consequently, a word for sea may be substituted for the name Ægir because the name is included in the semantic field created by the story of how the god of sea "used gold as a source of light when he entertained the Æsir to a feast" (*Skáldskaparmál*, ch. 33, in Faulkes, 1998). In this episode of *Liðsmannaflokkr* analyzed above resides an expression that mirrors a myth transformed into a metaphor¹¹ whose actualization relies on the skald's skill to master the context of the metaphor in such ways as to consciously elaborate the proper meaning of his stanza.

The occurrences of kennings for gold in skaldic poetry are often bound to kings or chieftains, however the term *glóð* (ember) does not set ahead such symbolic significance in *Haraldsdrápa*. Haraldr "obtained the gold" during the plunder started after the blinding of the Emperor. In contrast, the kenning goes beyond the boundaries of the first semantic level and brings a newly created circumstance into the structure provided by *Liðsmannaflokkr*.

Following the analysis of the textual linguistics, it can be inferred Þórarinn Skeggjason chooses the kenning *glóðum handa* to praise the attack of the entire Varangian guard and the blinding of the emperor for the reason that it strongly evokes the circumstances of *Liðsmannaflokkr* - a common attack abroad, which praises the *liðsmenn*'s bravery in strong contrast with a cowardly attitude.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The memory of a kenning is a matter that privileges visions expressed through words and

¹¹ As we know, in various parts of *Skáldskaparmál*, narratives are also included to account for the origins of some of the kennings by recounting the myths and legends that were thought to have given rise to them. In her article "Myten og metaforen: Inngangen til en (ny) skapende bevissthed i Norden (2002), Sanda Tomescu-Baciu starts from Lucian Blaga's vision on the relation between myth and metaphor, in the broader context of Giambattista Vico's notion that myths function as transformed metaphors.

resides on a linguistic level, where the full significance sedimented in a kenning is unraveled through the activation of the evocative relations. At the very scene of the events, the language employing kennings in skaldic poetry tangibly connects the warrior and the audience with mythological and historical events, in which the warriors are equal to heroes from the collective memory (see Rappaport, 1999; Nygaard, 2018). Due to the similar images actualized in the two skaldic stanzas, the cohesion among Varangian warriors expressed by reframing the kenning *glóða Rínar* in the second semiotic articulation of the kenning *glóðum handa* in *Haraldsdrápa*, is no longer seen schematically but as elements in a strong net of relations weaved by the evocative function of kennings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Attwood, Katrina. (2005). Christian Poetry. in *A Companion to Old Norse-Icelandic Literature and Culture*. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing. 43-64.
2. Birgisson, Bergsveinn. (2012). Skaldic Blends Out of Joint: Blending Theory and Aesthetic Conventions. *Metaphor and Symbol*. 27: 4. 283-298.
3. Borcilă, Mircea. (1997). The metaphoric model in poetic texts. in J. Péntek, (ed.), *Text și stil, Text and Syle, Szöveg és stílus*. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară. 97-104.
4. Blöndal, Sigfus. (2003). *The Varangians of Byzantium: An Aspect of Byzantine Military History*. Translated by Benedikt S. Benedikz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Carroll, Jayne. (2009). (Introduction to) Markús Skeggjason, *Eiríksdrápa*, in Kari Ellen Gade (ed.), *Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 2: From c. 1035 to c. 1300*. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 2. Turnhout: Brepols. 432-60.
6. Coseriu, Eugeniu. (2013). *Lingvistica textului – o introduce in hermeneutica sensului*. Iasi: „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House.
7. Dan-Terian, Simina. (2011). *Semantica textelor românești – abordare în perspectiva integralista*. Cluj-Napoca: Babes-Bolyai University.
8. Davidson, Hilda & Roderick, Ellis. (1976). *The Viking road to Byzantium*. London: Allen and Unwin.
9. Faulkes, Anthony. (1998). *Edda: Skáldskaparmál: 1. Introduction, Text and Notes and Skáldskaparmál: 2 Glossary and Index of Names*. London: Viking Society for Northern Research/ University College London.
10. Gade, Kari Ellen. (2009). (Introduction to) Haraldr harðráði Sigurðarson, *Lausavísur*. In Kari Ellen Gade (ed.), *Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 2: From c. 1035 to c. 1300*. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 2. Turnhout: Brepols. 42-46.
11. Gade, Kari Ellen. (2009). ‘Þórarinn Skeggjason, *Haraldsdrápa* 1. In Kari Ellen Gade (ed.), *Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 2: From c. 1035 to c. 1300*. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 2. Turnhout: Brepols. 294-295.
12. Hermann, Pernille. (2007). *Íslendingabók and History*. In Pernille Hermann et al. (eds): *Reflections on Old Norse Myths. (Studies in Viking and Medieval Scandinavia I)*. Turnhout: Brepols. 17–32.
13. Heslop, Kate. (2014). *Minni and the Rhetoric of Memory In Eddic, Skaldic, and Runic Texts*. In Pernille Hermann et al. (eds.): *Minni and Muninn: Memory in Medieval Nordic Culture*. Turnhout: Brepols. 75–107.
14. Humboldt, Wilhelm von. [1821] (2000). De l'influence de la diversité de caractère des langues sur la littérature et la culture de l'esprit. In *Sur le caractère national des langues et autres écrits sur le langage*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
15. Jesch, Judith. (2001). *Ships and men in the late Viking Age: the vocabulary of runic inscriptions and skaldic verse*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
16. Moberg, Ove. (1941). *Olav Haraldsson, Knut den store och Sverige*. Lund: Gleerup.
17. Nordal, Guðrún. (2001). *Tools of literacy the role of skaldic verse in Icelandic textual culture of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
18. Nygaard, Simon. (2018). ...nú knáttu Óðin sjá: The Function of Hall-Based, Ritualised Performances of Old Norse Poetry in Pre-Christian Nordic Religion. In Mette Bruus and Jesper Hansen (eds.), *The Fortified Viking Age*. Odense: Odense City Museums and University Press of Southern Denmark. 26-34.
19. Poole, Russel. (1991). *Viking Poems on War and Peace: A Study in Skaldic Narrative*, issue 8 of Toronto medieval texts and translations. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
20. Poole, Russel. (2012). Anonymous Poems, *Liðsmannaflokkur* 3. In Diana Whaley (ed.),

- Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 1: From Mythical Times to c. 1035*. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 1. Turnhout: Brepols. 1019.
21. Poole, Russel. (2012). (Introduction to) Anonymous, *Liðsmannaflokkur*. In Diana Whaley (ed.), *Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 1: From Mythical Times to c. 1035*. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 1. Turnhout: Brepols. 1014.
 22. Rappaport, R. A. (1999). *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 23. Sturluson, Snorri. (1964). *Heimskringla: History of the Kings of Norway*. Translated by Lee M. Hollander. Austin: University of Texas Press/ American-Scandinavian Foundation.
 24. Teoc, Flavia. (2015). The kenning as unit of repeated speech. In *Oltre Saussure. L'eredità scientifica di Eugenio Coseriu / Beyond Saussure. Eugenio Coseriu's scientific legacy*. Udine: Fraco Cesati Editore.
 25. Tomescu-Baciu, Sanda. (2002). Myten og metaforen: Inngangen til en (ny) skapende bevissthet i Norden. In Janet Garton & Michael Robinson (eds.), *On the threshold, new studies in Nordic literature*. Bergen: Norvik Press. 84-89.
 26. Whaley, Diana. (2009), Þjóðólfr Arnórsson, *Sexstefja 7*. In Kari Ellen Gade (ed.), *Poetry from the Kings' Sagas 2: From c. 1035 to c. 1300*. Skaldic Poetry of the Scandinavian Middle Ages 2. Turnhout: Brepols. 118-119.