

# Johannes Steenstrup (1844-1935) and the Rhetoric of Historiography in Denmark<sup>1</sup>

Jon A. P. Gissel  
japgissel@yahoo.dk

**Citation:** Jon A. P. Gissel, "Johannes Steenstrup (1844-1935) and the Rhetoric of Historiography in Denmark," *Hiphil* 4 [<http://www.see-j.net/hiphil>] (2007). Accessed DD.MM.YYYY.

## Introduction

Rhetoric has taken a leap forward in interest in recent decades. After a relatively low profile in the Positivistic period, she now again emerges as a major component of human culture. History too, is now generally seen as a kind of literature, which does not mean that it does not describe something outside the historian. Historians use metaphors and other literary devices as authors in other genres do. Indeed, one favorite metaphor, not least in the Positivistic era, is "sources" itself; a metaphor so used that any consciousness of its being a metaphor has been lost by the historians.

The Danish historian Johannes Steenstrup was a scholar with a wide range of interests: during his long life he wrote about folk ballads, place names, the Vikings, and the history of the Danish woman<sup>2</sup>. According to Steenstrup, history consists of individualities, a word which he uses in a broader sense than the normal one, so that it besides persons denotes ages and nations. Throughout his life he remained faithful to the principles of Danish Romanticism, the Golden Age of Danish culture in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and sought organic coherence in history. Towards the end of his many years as a Professor at the University of Copenhagen, in 1915, he wrote a synthesis of the vast field of historical study, a book of only 240 pages, which contains both a history of historiography, and a theoretical treatment of the same topic. This book, called *Historieskrivningen*, which has been sadly neglected for many years, is an impressive work, though written mainly as a manual for students. The idea of linking historical theory and method closely to the history of historiography, the general to the concrete, rather than to abstractions, is very characteristic of Steenstrup. He argues against transferring the mathematic/ natural science ideal of "certain knowledge" to history, and it is obvious that he prefers the free will to "laws in history".

## Steenstrup, heuristics, and Cicero

Steenstrup starts his chapter on "The Sources and the Art of Finding Them" (p. 177) in the following manner: "According to the teaching of Antiquity about the Art of speaking, the speaker had three duties: to find the material he could use, to arrange it, and to give his presentation the right form: inventio (Greek: heuresis), dispositio, elocutio; Cicero: quid dicat, et quo quidque loco, et quo modo."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the participants in the NNRH Conference "The Role of Rhetoric through History", in Helsinki 25-28 August 2002, for their valuable comments on my paper.

<sup>2</sup> "Den danske Kvindes Historie fra Holbergs Tid til vor", Copenhagen 1917. – On Steenstrup, see my *Den indtrængende Forstaaelse*, Copenhagen 2003; the book *Historieskrivningen* from 1915 has been reedited by me in *Johannes Steenstrup: Historiografiske og historieteoretiske Skrifter*, Copenhagen 2006 (Selskabet for Udgivelse af Kilder til dansk Historie).

<sup>3</sup> The quotation is from *Orator* XIV.43.

This remark is the point of departure for Steenstrup's treatment of heuristics, or the art of finding; i.e., the historian's search for relevant sources. What is remarkable about this procedure is not the content of the expression above, but that Steenstrup uses this reference to classical rhetoric to initiate his description of the historian's treatment of his sources. It probably cannot be stressed too much how unusual this is, compared with other Danish historical theoreticians, that he introduces the rhetorical tradition in a context where the immediate topic is documentation. In this way he puts the topic into a classical-academic context, and he uses this introduction to highlight heuristics, a part of the process of scholarship to which he attached great importance. He did this at a time when respect for classical learning had diminished, giving way to technical knowledge, also among historians, and rhetoric as an intellectual discipline had diminished in importance.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, it can be seen as a conscious attempt to emphasise heuristics rather than source-criticism, as Steenstrup throughout his life remained sceptical towards the methodological positivism of his day. Intertextuality is rich in perspective, and Steenstrup's quotation enlarges the space of his own text. He does not, however, develop the reference further; he refrains from modeling his whole presentation on the structure of classical rhetoric.

Cicero indeed has a noteworthy place in Steenstrup's argumentation about history: in the chapter "Whether History is a Science or an Art", Steenstrup quotes Cicero's expressions that truth<sup>5</sup> is the first law of history and contrasts him favourably with the more lax statements from Quintilian and Plutarch putting history closer to poetry (p. 163f.). This again is a part of Steenstrup's whole way of presenting his own discipline, which is a historical way of looking at historiography. Thus, expressions from classical Antiquity are relevant for the discussion, just like expressions from Steenstrup's own day, and he did not, as did the positivists among his contemporaries, dismiss historiography before the 19th century as being "unscientific."

### Steenstrup and Hugh Blair

If we turn from Steenstrup as a historiographer and theorist to Steenstrup as an historian, it is obvious that we should look at his use of metaphor. Hugh Blair writes in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, published in 1783, that the relation of similitude and resemblance is by far the most fruitful of tropes and says: "On this is founded, what is called the metaphor: when in place of using the proper name of any object, we employ, in its place, the name of some other which is like it, which is a sort of picture of it, and which thereby awakens the conception of it with more force or grace. This figure is more frequent than all the rest put together; and the language, of both prose and verse, owes to it much of its elegance and grace."<sup>6</sup> Metaphor was also an important feature in historical thinking in the 19th century, in which Leopold von Ranke compared the state to a living being.<sup>7</sup>

Like Hugh Blair, Steenstrup was concerned with both persuasion and good taste, and in his writings about the real world of the past, his historiography, he aims to bring together the life

---

<sup>4</sup> P. Hazzell and B. Herzberg: *The Rhetorical Tradition*, Boston 1990, p. 639; this anthology is not a good book in itself – it is weak in the section on the Middle Ages, and it contains nothing about the Baroque movement, which was very conscious about rhetoric – it contains, however, some important texts.

<sup>5</sup> G. Lakoff and M. Johnson argue against an objectivist view. They see metaphors as being among our principal vehicles for understanding. I can only agree with this. But I do think that they confuse the question of objective truth, in the empiricist sense, with that of absolute truth, as something we might never be able to reach, but which we cannot for that reason assume does not exist. When they talk about truth as being based on understanding, it seems to me that they continue the modernist view of the primacy of human rationality and that the danger of relativism is lurking behind their argumentation. This in spite of their praiseworthy attempt to include feelings also in their programme. Cultural and personal reality are no doubt important, but something is missing in a view that does not recognise at least the possibility of an absolute truth, and sees meaning as only relative to context and to one's own conceptual system. *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago 1980, pp. 159, 179-184.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.*, p. 818.

<sup>7</sup> A. Demant: *Metaphern für Geschichte*, Munich 1978, p. 82.

of the past and the means of style in a way that is useful, in serving the connection of the innumerable facts of history, and persuasive, in giving this connection a striking expression. Metaphor in historiography serves the purpose of connecting the various topics the historian is addressing, and turning them into a whole. Presenting ideas in the structure of an image makes them more understandable and convincing; but metaphor is often also seen as generative,<sup>8</sup> that is, the search for similitudes can bring ideas to the fore. As Steenstrup attributed heuristics great importance in the historian's work, he might not be a stranger to a process in which stylistic formulation is also a heuristic method. If such is the case, he does not consider rhetoric as merely an ornament, as the more rationalist thinkers would have it; he does not separate form and content<sup>9</sup>. The metaphor of historical development as a plant, for instance, is characteristic, indeed fundamental, for an organic view of history. But the example I should like to quote here is somewhat different; its subject is a turning point in the history of the Vikings, from Steenstrup's great work *Normannerne* (III, 1882, p. 290), and it says:

With the accession of Canute the Great to the Throne of England, the endless streams of the Vikings' expeditions flow into a great sea. The observer of this age will, instead of the long voyage along the endlessly shifting riverbanks and the limited width of vision, be able to look forward to a view across the free ocean. Now one suspects an ending of the many possibilities and catastrophes; calm and rest emerge, and matters in England find the solution, which had for a long time been considered the only possible one.

What Steenstrup describes here is the change from the raids of the Early Viking Age to the formation of political units and the taking over of control of an entire country of the Later Viking Age. The metaphor expresses change, but it also expresses continuity: it is the same voyage going on, just as the Vikings continued to be of the same origin. It is a combination of the matter at hand and the image, but it is more like a fusion than an explanation. This image contains an emotional appeal, it expresses a feeling of relief: when we move out of the limited river and enter the great sea, we are relieved. As has been known in the whole tradition of rhetoric, such a stimulus for the emotions are often more persuasive than observation and reason by themselves<sup>10</sup>. Moreover, the Danes are a seafaring nation, and the image could therefore appeal to them. And as the Vikings moved around in ships, this shipping experience is a comparison appropriate to the topic, thus combining persuasion and good taste; Aristotle stressed in his *Rhetoric*<sup>11</sup> the importance of the metaphor being drawn from things related to the original thing, and yet not obviously so related. Then again, it is apparent from the whole work *Normannerne* that Steenstrup was troubled by the Early Viking Age, all the killing and plundering. So the comparison might also reflect his own relief at coming to a period of more political stability, organising of states, and peaceful work. This metaphor, then, can be interpreted in the context of its immediate surroundings, in the context of Steenstrup's larger work, in the context of the tradition of rhetoric and literature, and in the context of the Danish experience. Tenor and vehicle, the two things compared in a metaphor, are interrelated and expand each other's meanings as well as giving them a particular direction, as has been emphasised by the formalist critic I.A. Richards<sup>12</sup>. Both the literary context and the experiential context are essential to grasping the full implications of the metaphor.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Rhetorical Tradition p. 6.

<sup>9</sup> Cfr. The Rhetorical Tradition, p. 1096 (Chaim Perelman).

<sup>10</sup> The Rhetorical Tradition p. 6.

<sup>11</sup> The Rhetorical Tradition p. 149.

<sup>12</sup> The Rhetorical Tradition pp. 911 and 966.

This metaphor expresses movement, linked to the concept of time, and it also expresses linearity in the structure of narrative. The idea of history as a stream is dependent on the idea of time as a stream. But the movement also presupposes a space to move in. This type of metaphor therefore expresses an event on a large scale, a meta-event, so to speak. It is an image for a complex process. Probably for this reason, this kind of metaphor is more frequent after the Renaissance than it is before. Steenstrup actually emphasises the complexity by saying "streams" and not just "stream". Steenstrup's use of the metaphor is an optimistic one, but he prefers the image of the sea, associated less with the many possibilities than it is with greater and calmer results, to that of the stream, and this is exactly the movement in the passage, from streams to sea. Steenstrup's image involves the author and the reader by referring to the traveller, and thus the individual person makes an appearance, which would not otherwise occur in this metaphor. The image of the sea-voyage is built on top of that of the stream and sea, making it in addition a picture of historical study. A ship-metaphor is, however, only implied.<sup>13</sup>

In his argumentation he is aware of the importance of the form of the sources (*Normannerne* III, p.9). In a case of clear disagreement between the sources, Steenstrup writes, *Normannerne* III, p.7: "There is an obvious mutiny among the sources; one must take the matter resolutely in hand, brake in and arrest the leaders of the delusion." This is a clear example of the comparison being more than a single casual expression, on the contrary it is maintained through several links. P.108: "The material has somewhat the character of a mosaic, which is almost always the case where Irish sources are concerned; individual fragments look brilliant, but the material denies its service when it comes to making connections and transitions." Moving from discussion of the sources to debate among scholars, Steenstrup writes (p.103) about "the critical whirlpool." He says that a "recasting of the sources into a unity is critically inadmissible" (p. 178). About Canute the Great and his conquest of Norway, *Normannerne* III, p. 357: "he had brave, intrusive forerunners, the bribes." This is then a, somewhat ironical, portrait of the political means. P. 49: "Like pieces on a board advancing until the opponent finds himself isolated in front of a long and forceful line of attack, the Vikings were now squeezed between these castles and the sea or broken up in the North." P. 124: "... the revenge groves with more vigour in Ireland than any other place. P.154f.: In a society like the Irish the seeds of discord and conspiracy are in the air and at the least occasion they descend bringing all disastrous effects of infection." This comparison serves both the characterisation of a certain culture and the description of a particular situation. About the final period of the Anglosaxons, p. 218: "The disgrace grove every year and disaster followed like a faithful companion..." We see then, in these examples, Steenstrup using forceful and carefully thought out metaphors with regard to sources, contemporary debate, and the conditions of the historical events.

### **Steenstrup on Historiography**

In his great work about Danish historiography in the 19th century, from 1889, Steenstrup introduces the topic of the whole book with a full-page metaphor:

The nineteenth century opens with a time of rest, where historical spirit and historical scholarship are concerned. But rest can be of many forms. The field on which the seed has been sown presently can be brown and desolate in the Autumn, but still the earth hides a seed, which will soon by swarming germs appear over the earth, and which will grow up, by the augmenting warmth of the sun of the next Spring, to mighty straws and good grains. But also that field can be brown and barren after the harvest, which for some years has given the

---

<sup>13</sup> For this passage, I have profited greatly by the remarks and examples in A. Demant: *Metaphern für Geschichte*, Munich 1978 pp. 166-198.

farmer its yield, and which now alone rests to collect strength to take up the work once more, when the quiet powers in the soil have done their work. In that field, no germ is hidden as yet, but the constituting forces of Nature still prepare, in secret, that fertile mould, which in years to come shall give growth to a new crop. If we should use one of these images to depict the situation of historical scholarship at the entrance of the new century, we would have to say, as it were, that the field was desolate and barren, without yet any germs for the new crop had been put down in it.

This is a very elaborate metaphor: Steenstrup chooses between two versions of the same image, and there is no doubt that this is a very conscious image, an argumentative one, not just illustrative.<sup>14</sup> He goes on to describe the relationship between historical spirit and historical research: in his view, the 18<sup>th</sup> century lacked spirit, but not research. It is also worth noting that Steenstrup wrote this one year after the celebration of the centennial of the great Danish agricultural reforms and after his own great studies in agricultural history; that can possibly have made this particular metaphor especially urgent. Steenstrup begins by calling the opening of the age, which he is addressing, "a time of rest", which is no doubt compositionally important. Images of germs have been used about new beginnings and resumptions of old activities in history. The image of the field presupposes a farmer, it does not grow by itself like a forest; conscious human activity is therefore included in the metaphor.<sup>15</sup> Mads Mordhorst has analysed Steenstrup's use of this metaphor, pointing to the importance of organic images for the view of history in Historism. It points to a process of development, to gradual development, and to the importance of context to historical studies. Good earth and seed are needed; the desolate earth portrays the way of thinking of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century.<sup>16</sup> Steenstrup also writes about the importance of B.G. Niebuhr for the historical scholarship of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (p. 103): "He holds forward the torch and shows the new mines."

Research, scholarship, is a work of digging and is often laborious, and it is necessary that somebody shows the way, throws light over the dark mountains. This expression depicts Niebuhr as the forerunner of a scholarly historical writing, and the light as metaphor describes the development of culture. Light is a common metaphor for knowledge<sup>17</sup>, but Steenstrup's version emphasises human activity in a way that is not so usual.

Later in the same work (p. 403), Steenstrup writes about the editors of documents, who did not feel called to independent research: "They were the diligent collectors of those nuts in the forest, which others had to crack."

This expression makes apparent the reservation of Steenstrup vis-à-vis exaggerated editing, as editing for him is not the essential part of historical scholarship. His ideal is the monograph. But the diligence is in itself praiseworthy, and the work of collecting is useful. Please note that this is a genuine metaphor; there is no cautious "as it were"; the reader is confronted with a *fait accompli*, as Ulla Albeck writes. Further, the image avoids abstraction, but one concrete item characterises another; these features are characteristic of Danish Romanticism<sup>18</sup>.

Steenstrup writes about the church historian Frederik Hammerich (p. 357): "... he tore himself away from the thought of being a poet and found the way to the original sources as the healthy bread for the study."

---

<sup>14</sup> For this distinction, see A. Demant, p. 75.

<sup>15</sup> Demant pp. 102-111 exemplifies metaphors of germs and gardens, but not fields.

<sup>16</sup> M. Mordhorst: *På sporet af historien*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Copenhagen, Department of History, 2002, vol. II, pp. 115-122.

<sup>17</sup> A. Demant, pp. 7 and 9.

<sup>18</sup> For these phenomena in a Danish context, see U. Albeck: *Dansk Stilistik*, Copenhagen 1945, pp. 90-95.

The independent, fresh reading of the sources is for Steenstrup a requisite for an historian. Food is not uncommon as a metaphor. He writes about the historian C.F. Allen and the moral vigour in his work (p. 349): "If one takes a look into the workshop of the book, into the many notes, which he has put at the end of each volume, one sees the clever and long process that lies before the moment when the architect erected his beautiful edifice."

This is also a beautiful way of expressing it. "The workshop" refers to the many questions and the work with the sources; "the beautiful edifice" is the finished work, which through the notes also tells about the workshop. The expression emphasises scholarship as a process, and it does not in itself reject the idea that more than one result would have been possible. Using "edifice" to refer to a book, and calling the writer an architect, is a classical topos from textbooks; there is no doubt a literary tradition, but it is also an obvious image. From Antiquity onwards, the metaphor THE TEXT IS A BUILDING has been used to discuss the ordered arrangement of material (*dispositio*), problems involving the ordering, framing, and fitting together of materials. Oratorical composition was seen as the ordered construction of verbal building-blocks. Steenstrup, in his use of the metaphor, seems to be close to Cicero, to whom we have seen him refer explicitly; but the context is of course that of historical study in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, with emphasis on the knowledge of sources. In Steenstrup's expression there is a suggestion of the importance of the foundations, if the edifice is going to be a firm and lasting one; this thought is also present in the classical tradition. As in that tradition, Steenstrup's sentence places emphasis on the constructional process (the *clever and long process*), rather than on the finished text. This preference to the practical rather than the aesthetic aspects points to the didactic use of the metaphor, in general, and in Steenstrup's text, which, as a book about the history of historiography, is also a book about How to Write History. The clever and long process encloses the idea that one must avoid haste and work out the ordered arrangement carefully, again in accordance with the tradition of that metaphor. The construction of a material into a hierarchical arrangement of interlinking elements entails the gathering of building materials, their ordering, and then the decoration of the finished structure resembles the rhetorical pattern of *inventio-dispositio-elocutio* (or *ornatus*), to which we have already seen Steenstrup refer.

The *beautiful edifice* is a monument; given that it has the right foundation, it has also a claim of durability, and the MONUMENT metaphor is one given to historical records from an early time. In the Christian tradition, the process of exegesis of Biblical texts was figured by the construction of a spiritual building; and this metaphor in the Middle Ages expressed the wish for a coherent structure of interpretation. Such a wish must also be present in Steenstrup's expression.<sup>19</sup> Why does something become a topos? Possibly because the phrase expresses an often repeated experience. The sea, mentioned above, for instance, is natural as a symbol of many things; it is culturally natural to use it as a comparison. On the other hand, it is difficult to see whether something is a direct imitation. Moreover, Steenstrup strives to avoid banality: he refrains from calling the process "long and assiduous" or anything similar, but introduces instead the word "clever", which underlines that this is work thoughtful. The establishment of a historical work becomes parallel, by the use of this metaphor, to the establishment of a state, for which is often used the metaphor of a building.<sup>20</sup>

He writes about the historian P.V. Jacobsen, who was also a poet (p. 308), that he had outside his office "a country house in the deer park of the imagination." On the other hand, "he has such reverence for the true goals of scholarship that he in no way lets the noisy children of imagination enter his study."

---

<sup>19</sup> On the metaphor "The text as a building," see D. Cowling: *Building the Text*, Oxford 1998, pp. 138-144. I am indebted to Päivi Mehtonen for this reference.

<sup>20</sup> Demant, pp. 277-301.

This expresses the idea that it is important to keep things apart; imagination is good only if one does not confuse poetry with reality. But the two images also reflect a good deal of imagination in the use of language, of reflection over the possibilities of expression: the "deer park of the imagination" and the "noisy children of imagination" are, yes, poetic and imaginative figures.

Steenstrup's use of metaphor is effective and is characteristic of his work in general; the metaphors express his idea of the historian's task, conditions and choices, as well as the character of historiography. The use of metaphor is a means of characterisation, of an age, of a group of scholars, and of a person. Steenstrup's use of metaphors thus reflects his conception of history as consisting of individualities. Can Steenstrup get stuck in a metaphor? That is perhaps not very likely, as he uses many different images. We cannot know whether Steenstrup started with a metaphor or ended with it.

### Conclusion

Both the direct reference to classical rhetoric and the metaphors depict Steenstrup as an historian working consciously with style, more so, I believe, than any other Danish historian around 1900. Is his way of writing then rhetorical? If argumentation in itself is rhetorical<sup>21</sup>, if all language is rhetorical, as deconstructivists would have us believe, then all of Steenstrup's work is rhetorical; on the other hand, it must be relevant to point out rhetorical elements in Steenstrup's text without describing the entire text as rhetorical *per se*. He uses certain rhetorical tools, especially metaphor to describe something outside the universe of the text, that is, in a non-fictional way. The classical rhetorician uses language and style to achieve an effect, and also generative, as noted above, and this seems to me to be a fruitful way of approaching Steenstrup's manner of writing, rather than using the word "rhetoric" indiscriminately<sup>22</sup>. It is suggestive in this connection that Steenstrup was the only historian involved in the foundation of the *Dansk Forfatterforening*, the Society of Danish Authors, in the 1890s. Context is important in all of Steenstrup's work, as he is always concerned to relate his topic to something larger, and, as I have noted throughout, it is also important to his style. Metaphor is one of the ways in which he expresses context. And this is vital to the understanding of what kind of knowledge, Steenstrup's works represent: it is a knowledge that is more than the accumulation of details; it is the meeting of intuitive knowledge and empirical knowledge that makes the metaphors so important.

### Quotations from Steenstrup and their translation..

*Historieskrivningen*, 1915 p. 177:

---

<sup>21</sup> "The rhetoric of history is concerned with the tropes, arguments, and other devices of language used to write history" write Allan Megill and Donald N. McCloskey ("The Rhetoric of History" in: *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences*, 1987, ed. J.S. Nelson, A. Megill and D.N. McCloskey). Looking at it this way, Steenstrup's work is rhetorical. Lloyd F. Bitzer argues in his "The Rhetorical Situation" (*Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968) 1-14) for the importance of the situation in rhetorical theory, which must in itself be a historical project. The article is also important in emphasising the importance of the original situation. On the other hand, I think that he has a problem of exaggeration: he makes the situation the primary element to such an extent that the speaker seems to disappear as an acting person. The intention of the speaker is put aside. Also, the awareness that authors also write in a tradition is strangely absent. There is the important notion, however, that rhetorical elements are not enough to make a text rhetorical in its entirety. For Bitzer, rhetorical texts are above all political speeches. One could argue that there can be both a short-term and a long-term situation.

<sup>22</sup> I thank Gert Skriver, The University of Aarhus, for discussion of this topic.

Ifølge Oldtidens Lære om Talekunst var Taleren stillet overfor tre Opgaver, at finde det Stof, han kunde benytte, at ordne det og at give Fremstillingen den rette Form: *inventio*, (græsk: *heuresis*), *dispositio*, *elocutio*; Cicero: *quid dicat, et quo quidque loco, et quo modo*.

According to the teaching of Antiquity about the Art of speaking, the speaker had three duties: to find the material he could use, to arrange it, and to give his presentation the right form: *inventio* (Greek: *heuresis*), *dispositio*, *elocutio*; Cicero: *quid dicat, et quo quidque loco, et quo modo*.

*Normannerne* (III, 1882, p. 290):

Med Knud den Stores Bestigelse af Englands Trone udmunde Vikingetogenes uendelige Strømme i et stort Hav. Betragteren af denne Tidsalder vil, i Stedet for den lange Sejlads forbi de evindelig skiftende Bredder og den korte Sevidde, kunne glæde sig til et Blik over den frie Havflade. Man øjner nu en Afslutning paa de mange Muligheder og Omvæltninger; der bliver Ro og Hvile, og Forholdene i England finde den Løsning, som man længe havde anset for den ene mulige.

With the accession of Canute the Great to the Throne of England, the endless streams of the Vikings 'expeditions flows into a great sea. The observer of this age will, instead of the long voyage along the endlessly shifting riverbanks and the limited width of vision, be able to look forward to a view across the free ocean. Now one suspects an ending of the many possibilities and catastrophes; calm and rest emerge, and matters in England find the solution, which had for a long time been considered the only possible one.

*Normannerne* III, p. 7:

Der er et aabenbart Mytteri mellem Kilderne; man maa tage alvorligt paa Sagen, bryde ind og sikre sig Hovedmændene til Vildfarelsen.

There is an obvious mutiny among the sources; one must take the matter resolutely in hand, brake in and arrest the leaders of the delusion.

P. 103:

den kritiske Malstrøm

the critical whirlpool

P. 178:

Sammenstøbning af Kilderne

recasting of the sources into a unity.

P. 108:

I øvrigt har Stoffet her som næsten overalt, hvor der kun haves irske Kilder at bygge paa, noget vist mosaikagtigt i sit Væsen; enkelte Stykker kunne være glimrende nok, men naar det gjælder om at forbinde eller finde Overgange, nægter Materialet ofte sin Tjeneste.



The material has somewhat the character of a mosaic, which is almost always the case where Irish sources are concerned; individual fragments look brilliant, but the material denies its service when it comes to making connections and transitions.

P. 49:

Som Brikker rykke frem paa et Bræt, indtil Modparten ser sig afspærret foran en lang og stærk Angrebslinie, saaledes vare nu Nordboerne klemte sammen mellem disse Borge og Havet eller sprængte Nord paa.

Like pieces on a board advancing until the opponent finds himself isolated in front of a long and forceful line of attack, the Vikings were now squeezed between these castles and the sea or broken up in the North.

P. 124:

... frodigere end paa noget andet Sted voxer paa Irland Hævn.

... the revenge groves with more vigour in Ireland than any other place.

P.154f.:

I et Samfund som Iernes flyve Spirerne til Splid og Komplot omkring i Luften, og ved den mindste Anledning slaa de ned med alle et Smitstofs ulykkebringende Virkninger.

In a society like the Irish the seeds of discord and conspiracy are in the air and at the least occasion they descend bringing all disastrous effects of infection.

P. 218:

Skjændslen steg da med hvert Aar, og Ulykken fulgte som tro Staldbroder...

The disgrace grove every year and disaster followed like a faithful companion...

About Canute the Great and his conquest of Norway, *Normannerne* III, p. 357:

han havde kjække, indtrængende Forløbere, Bestikkelserne.

he had brave, intrusive forerunners, the bribes.

*Historieskrivningen i Danmark i det 19de Aarhundrede*, 1889, p. 1:

Det nittende Aarhundrede begynder med en Hviletid, hvad historisk Aand og Granskning angaar. Men Hvile er af forskjellig Art. Den Mark, hvorpaa Sæden nylig har staaet, kan om Efteraaret være brun og øde, og dog gemmer Mulden en Udsæd, som snart ved mylrende Spirer vil vise sig over Jorden og som med det næste Foraars stigende Solvarme vil gro op til mægtigt Straa og god Kjærne. Men ogsaa den Mark kan efter Høsten ligge brun og bar, der i nogle Aar har givet Landmanden sit Udbytte og som nu alene hviler for at samle Kræfter til engang paany at tage Arbejdet fat, naar de stille Magter i Grunden have virket. I den er endnu ingen Spire gjemt, men Naturens dannende Kræfter berede dog i Skjul den frugtbare Muld,

som ad Aare skal give Væxt til en ny Afgrøde. Dersom vi vilde anvende et af disse Billeder paa Historieforskningens Tilstand ved det nye Aarhundredes Komme, maatte vi nærmest sige, at Marken var øde og bar uden at endnu Spirer for den nye Afgrøde vare nedlagte i den."

The nineteenth century opens with a time of rest, where historical spirit and historical scholarship are concerned. But rest can be of many forms. The field on which the seed has been sown presently can be brown and desolate in the Autumn, but still the earth hides a seed, which will soon by swarming germs appear over the earth, and which will grow up, by the augmenting warmth of the sun of the next Spring, to mighty straws and good grains. But also that field can be brown and barren after the harvest, which for some years has given the farmer its yield, and which now alone rests to collect strength to take up the work once more, when the quiet powers in the soil have done their work. In that field, no germ is hidden as yet, but the constituting forces of Nature still prepare, in secret, that fertile mould, which in years to come shall give growth to a new crop. If we should use one of these images to depict the situation of historical scholarship at the entrance of the new century, we would have to say, as it were, that the field was desolate and barren, without yet any germs for the new crop had been put down in it.

P. 103:

Han holder Faklen frem og viser de nye Gruber.

He holds forward the torch and shows the new mines.

P. 403:

De vare de flittige Samlere af Nødderne i Skoven, som Andre maatte knække.

They were the diligent collectors of those nuts in the forest, which others had to crack.

P. 357:

... han udrev sig fra Tanken om at blive Digter og fandt Vej til de originale Kilder som det sunde Brød for Studiet.

... he tore himself away from the thought of being a poet and found the way to the original sources as the healthy bread for the study.

P. 349:

Kaster man et Blik ind i Bogens Værksted, i de talrige Anmærkninger, som han har hensat ved Slutningen af hvert Bind, ser man, hvilken snild og lang Proces, der ligger forud for det Øjeblik, da Arkitekten rejste sin skønne Bygning.

If one takes a look into the workshop of the book, into the many notes, which he has put at the end of each volume, one sees the clever and long process that lies before the moment when the architect erected his beautiful edifice.

P. 308:

... et Landsted i Phantasiens Dyrehave... saa stor Agtelse har han for Videnskabens sande Maal, at han ingenlunde indlader Phantasiens støjende Børn i Studerestuen.

...a country house in the deer park of the imagination... he has such reverence for the true goals of scholarship that he in no way lets the noisy children of imagination enter his study.

## **Bibliography**

### ***Works by Steenstrup quoted:***

*Normannerne I-IV*, Copenhagen 1876-1882.

*Historieskrivningen i Danmark i det 19de Aarhundrede (1801-1863)*, Copenhagen 1889.

*Historieskrivningen. Dens Udvikling gennem Tiderne, dens Væsen og Formaal*, Copenhagen 1915.

### ***Works on Rhetoric and Style used:***

D. Cowling: *Building the Text*, Oxford 1998.

A. Demant: *Metaphern für Geschichte*, Munich 1978.

P. Hazzell and B. Herzberg: *The Rhetorical Tradition*, Boston 1990.

U. Albeck: *Dansk Stilistik*, Copenhagen 1945.

### ***Works about Steenstrup:***

Jon A.P. Gissel. "Johannes Steenstrup og Danmarks Riges Historie," *Historisk Tidsskrift* 93/1 (1993) 47-64.

-----, "Johannes Steenstrup som folkevis- og stednavneforsker," *Fortid og Nutid* 1993/3 s. 215-234.

-----, "Johannes Steenstrup og kulturhistorien," *Historie* 1995/1 s. 81-101.

-----, *Den indtrængende Forstaaelse*, Copenhagen 2003.

Jon A. P. Gissel (ed.). *Johannes Steenstrup: Historiografiske og historieteoretiske Skrifter*. Copenhagen: Selskabet for Udgivelse af Kilder til dansk Historie, 2006.