

A Grammatical Structural and Word Choice Analysis of Ragnar Lothbrok in The Vikings

Zhila Ismael Bayz

English Department, College of Languages, University of Salahaddin, Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

Email: Zhila.Bayz@su.edu.krd

Asst. Prof. Lanja Abdulrazzaq Shehabaddin Dabbagh

English Department, College of Languages, University of Salahaddin, Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

Email: lanja.dabbagh@su.edu.krd

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 7/5/2025

Accepted: 9/7/2025

Published: Summer2026

Keywords:

Language Change, The Vikings, historical language patterns, grammatical analysis, word choice, cultural identity

Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.11.3.50

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study “A Grammatical Structural and Word Choices Analysis of *Ragnar Lothbrok* in *The Vikings*” is to analyze the language features of the television series of *The Vikings*. The emphasis is on the contribution of grammatical structures and word choices of the main character Ragnar Lothbrok portrayal and mirror of historical impacts that changed English language among other aspects. Engaging the analysis of ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions, Systemic Functional Linguistics SFL aids in uncovering the way language is employed by characters to communicate thoughts, establish authority and form connections. Through the analysis of sentence formations, persuasive techniques and word choices, the relationship between language, history and media determines what changes English language went through. The theoretical background serves as a frame for the application of the theories. one of the major conclusions arrived at is Ragnar’s linguistic style is predominantly marked by material processes, which focuses on physical acts, decisive nature and purposeful behavior. These transitivity selections function as language choices that reflect more profound ideological differences for instance, Ragnar embodies raw

strength, primal bravery and devotion to the gods and family.

1. Introduction

Human beings have built complex language structures that enable them to express complicated thoughts, emotional states and social rules. The sources of language are persistently debated among scholars as diverse hypotheses propose it may have originated from divine impact, environmental sounds or the evolution of cognitive processes. Nevertheless, because of the deficiency of historical artifacts, the precise time where humans started speaking is yet unknown (Ahmed, 2021)..

English language which is currently a globally dominant language has experienced vast modifications through the span of history. It started as Old English where it was significantly shaped by the Anglo-Saxon Germanic languages. During history, it adopted features from different languages. One of the first and most significant foreign impacts originated from Old Norse which was brought in by the invasions and settlements of the Vikings, specifically within the Danelaw territory. This interaction did not just expand the English lexicon but transformed sentence formation as well. Afterwards, the Norman conquest led to a considerable addition of French words particularly in sectors of law, government and literary works. These developing levels persisted into the period of Modern English in which the language was further developed through the technological advancements and globalization. The collective effect of Latin, Old Norse and French has contributed to English being among the languages with the largest vocabulary and a language with remarkable grammatical adaptability in modern times (Baugh & Cable, 2002).

As a result of its capacity for adaptation and the vast number of words it has borrowed from other languages English now serves as the leading international lingua franca. English has developed into a key facilitator of intercultural communication as it is broadly employed in business, academic settings, scientific fields and diplomatic negotiations. English appears in different variations as well, varying from Standard

English employed in formal settings to different local dialects and non-standard forms of language like pidgins and creoles. This variation proves the ability of the language to develop formed through historical, cultural and social contexts (Crystal, 2003).

Language is regarded as a spectrum of choices whereby the speaker conveys his/her experiential perception of the processes of their outside and inside experience (Halliday, 1973). As stated by Eggins (2004) transitivity involves the combination of specific types of “process, circumstances and participants” expressed through the clause’s content words. It additionally gives forms to meanings related to the three elements.

2. The Vikings Series

In both media and historical fictional works, language is essential in creating character and believable portrayal. The TV series *The Vikings* skillfully employs language to represent historical language patterns, cultural variations and power relations. One of the main characters Ragnar Lothbrok is represented with different language styles that match his strategies, personality and background. His conversations are not solely for storytelling purposes but demonstrate leadership qualities, the ability to persuade and diplomatic skills as well (Morarui, 2024).

For the purpose of analyzing language within these settings, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) offers a valuable analytical tool. Through the analysis of Ideational, Interpersonal and Textual metafunctions, SFL aids in uncovering the way language is employed by characters to communicate thoughts, establish authority and form connections. Through the application of this framework to analyze the speeches of Ragnar Lothbrok can illuminate more profound aspects of his personalities, leadership techniques and the historical impacts found within their conversations.

3. Systemic Functional Linguistics

In the early twentieth-century, diverse linguistic theories began to emerge, each holding distinct characters and fields of study, among them were those of Halliday’s SFL and Noam Chomsky’s Transformational Generative Grammar, established individually or through supporters. Each theory has offered significant contributions

with different approaches. Among these theories, Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a universally recognized and practical framework (Almurashi, 2016). Systemic Functional Linguistics is a theoretical framework within the field of social semiotics concerned with the construction of meaning, learning and mechanisms of social change. Proposed by, a British linguist Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, in the 1960's, it has evolved to include different fields within Applied linguistics, particularly educational linguistics, multimodality and Critical discourse analysis (Gebhard & Accurso, 2020). SFL functions as an analytical methodology that analyzes language as a system of choices for creating meaning shaped by context SFL operates on the principle that language is functional, where structure allows language to be used for communication. Its analysis involves three metafunctions: Ideational or Experiential, reflects human experiences, Interpersonal (shapes attitudes and social roles) and Textual (structuring discourse). Moreover, SFL offers a theoretical framework for critical linguistic analysis by examining how ideology and power are reflected in language use (Endarto, 2017).

Systemic Functional Linguistics establishes a well-defined methodological structure for examining discourse across different fields. In education, it explores how language shapes knowledge and promotes learning. From the perspective of sociolinguistics and ethnography, it analyzes the connection between language, identity and culture among members of social groups. In terms of media and political dialogues, it highlights how language use within specific contexts shape ideology and shapes public apprehensions. By studying the ideational, interpersonal and textual meta functions of language, SFL provides a profound insight of discourse and how it shapes human experiences and social structure (Analyzer, 2024).

4. Metafunctions

Systemic Functional Linguistics is a framework established by Michael Halliday proposes that language operates with three simultaneous metafunctions Ideational, Interpersonal and Textual. Each metafunction provides a distinct analytical approach for the analysis of conversations of characters.

the ideational metafunction emphasizes the way language is employed to explain and analyze the experiences of humans. It relates to how meaning is conveyed which evidences the manner in which semiotic assets are employed to form experiences and the field of perceived realities (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). In its essence, this metafunction aspect operates as the vehicle whereby agents convey and comprehend their reality.

The interpersonal metafunction is concerned with the social connection between the communicative participants. It analyzes meaning of the clauses along with the function of speech in communication (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). (Halliday & Hasan, 1989) define it as “the doing function” through the establishment of interpersonal relations and meaning possibilities between the addresser and the addressee. This is accomplished by the utilization linguistic and non-linguistic components within textual frameworks.

The textual metafunction centers on the structural arrangements and expresses the overall meaning formed by the Ideational and Interpersonal metafunctions. This is accomplished by means the deployment of linguistic frameworks and textual coherence within the provided context. (Halliday & Hasan, 1989) assert that its principal function is to assure that has a coherent structure in its context. Subsequently, less emphasis is given to the distinct semantic aspects of meaning which are dealt with by the other two metafunctions. As opposed to the Ideational and Interpersonal metafunctions, the textual metafunction is mainly focused on the language as a system.

5. Theme and Rheme

The Theme is the component that serves as the starting point of a message that establishes and aligns the clause within its contextual framework. The remaining part of the message at the point where the theme is developed further is identified as the Rheme within the terminological framework of the Prague school (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Language is regarded as a spectrum of choices whereby the speaker conveys his/her experiential perception of the processes of their outside and inside experience Halliday, 1973, p. 134). As stated by Eggins (2004) transitivity involves the combination of specific types of “process, circumstances and participants” expressed through the clause’s content words. It additionally gives forms to meanings related to the three elements.

6. Methodology

In this study’s context, transitivity provides an analytical exploration of Ragnar’s language to establish meaning through his application of diverse processes namely material (actions), mental (mental processes and experiential perceptions) and relational (characterizations and attributions) highlights significant features of their personalities, styles of leadership and philosophical perspectives (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). To illustrate, Ragnar’s speech patterns frequently highlight material processes which demonstrates his identity as a fighter and a strategic leader.

7. Data Analysis and Findings

This chapter introduces a linguistic analysis to Ragnar Lothbrok’s language in the Vikings series with an emphasis on his sentenced forms, lexical choices and the functions they serve. Based on Systemic Functional Linguistics, the analysis investigates how Ragnar’s identity, leading style and cultural origins are expressed through his language. The chosen statements are analyzed regarding ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions to reveal the underlying persuasive techniques within his language.

A/ Simple Sentences

A1. “*is that what you really want, my brother?*”

In terms of the ideational metafunction, a mental process is represented by the sentence as the verb “*want*” conveys will and purpose. The Senser is “*you*” (Rollo, Ragnar’s brother), who is involved in the mental process, whilst “*this*” is the phenomenon which regards to the continuing betrayal and battle. The vocative “*my*

brother” presents the event as a personal betrayal rather than a strategic choice. an internal evaluation is conveyed through the phrase *“what you really want”* which promotes Rollo to re-evaluate his purpose. The word *“this”* stays partially ambiguous allowing for various interpretations and intensifying Ragnar’s suspicions concerning Rollo’s behavior. Concerning the Interpersonal metafunction, the mood of the sentence is interrogative which means that Ragnar wants confirmation from Rollo rather than making a statement. *“Really”* is employed to add an appraisal function which helps intensify and emphasize Ragnar’s skepticism. The modality is doubtful as Ragnar is not imposing his own perspective but rather wonders if Rollo is still committed to his choice which is fighting his brother (Ragnar). The Vocative *“my brother”* is employed as a strategy for engagement through referencing their shared ties which enhances the emotional influence of the question. Rollo’s loyalty is indirectly challenged through the phrase *“is that what you really want?”* and encourages self-examination whilst subtly expresses Ragnar’s emotional pain. The claim is intensified by placing *“my brother”* at the end of the sentence emphasizing the confrontation’s emotional aspects.

The sentence has a marked Theme textually with *“Is this”* positioned at the beginning of the clause and shifts focus to Rollo’s decision in preference to the actual battle. Ragnar’s desperate cry and the cruciality of the situation is featured by the Rheme *“what you really want, my brother?”*. The term *“this”* stays vague to leave some space for Rollo to reconsider his decision. The structure of the question is intended to persuade and confront the addressee and reinforces the role of Ragnar as a competitor and a brother in grief. The employment of direct address enhances cohesion and maintains the emotional intensity of the dialogue while simultaneously enhances Ragnar’s struggle in comprehending Rollo’s actions. Moreover, the sentence becomes a powerful tool of linguistics for narrative construction of conflict, brotherhood and betrayal.

A 2. Don’t fear death.

Regarding the ideational metafunction, a material process is in the sentence given that fear is expressed through action in relation to death which is the (phenomenon). In this sentence the Actor is *“you”* which refers to Bjorn who is Ragnar’s eldest son

and the sentence is phrased as a command not a statement or request. Ragnar's warrior mindset is reflected through this sentence as death should be embraced rather than being avoided as it is a central belief of the Vikings culture. The concise nature of the sentence corresponds to the battle urgency which highlights that Ragnar is not merely providing advices but also fosters a profound ideological perspective and it resonates with the dominant Viking ideology which valued a glorious death over living long.

In terms of the Interpersonal metafunction, Ragnar's statement is in a imperative mood which means that it is a direct command not a request or statement. The text lacks modal verbs such as (should or might) which makes it supreme and underscores the authority of Ragnar's combined role as a leader and a father. The negative imperative "*don't*" conveys a sense of prohibition which indicated that the fear of death was a weakness and totally resonates with the ideology of the Viking's warriors as bravery on the battlefield is highly regarded. Ragnar as a parent is fostering Bjorn into a brave warrior and ensures that his son is embodying their warrior roots. By giving this command at precisely the right moment Ragnar doesn't merely motivate Bjorn but also solidifies their relationship by means of their shared cultural values.

Textually, there is a simple and unmarked Theme in the sentence "*don't fear death*" as the verb "*fear*" is positioned in an initial position to secure a message that is both clear and effective. The conciseness and powerful nature of the sentence structure mirrors the practical leadership style of Ragnar which is succinct, effective and action-oriented. Determination and emotional control as crucial characteristics of Vikings warriors are emphasized through the parallel structure of "*Don't fear*". By placing "*death*" as an anticipated and esteemed destiny the statement establishes a basis for the warrior journey of Bjorn and reinforces the Viking's ideology in destiny and heroic death in battle. In this sentence Ragnar' does not merely convey a personal philosophy through his use of language but a complete ideological framework of who that determines who lives and who will earn a place at Valhalla.

A3. "But at least we are still allies, King Horik!"

Regarding the Ideational metafunction, a relational process "are" is expressed through this sentence and it builds a connection between "we" which relates to

(Ragnar and King Horik) and “allies”. A status of potential instability is implied through the employment of the word “still” and signals Ragnar’s skepticism. “we” is the Actor therefore an existential and relational state is presented through the process “are stillness allies” instead of an action. Ragnar intentionally presents this neutrally although his connotative meaning subtly indicates suspicion about the loyalty of King Horik. Interpersonally, Ragnar’s sentence is declarative but the phrase “but at least” signals concession and cautiously that the alliance is undergoes tension. The sentence contains an assertive mood and yet the indirect tone facilitates ambiguity which allows Ragnar to preserve diplomatic relation and subtly express skepticism. The vocative “King Horik” is essential because by referring formally to King Horik, Ragnar highlights a balance of distance and respect. This choice conveys a calculated diplomatic strategy rather than sincere and genuine warmth which allows him to exert authority without engaging in direct conflict. Ragnar’s hidden skepticism is conveyed through the combination of “but, at least and still” which helps make the sentence’s focus less about alliance and more about power balance.

In terms of the textual metafunction, the conjunction “but” as the marked Theme presents a contrast which suggests a change in Ragnar’s attitude. The phrase “at least” introduces Ambiguity into the statement and highlights Ragnar’s tentative agreement rather than a full agreement. the core message is delivered through the Rheme “we are still allies King Horik” and yet its structure is conducive to ambiguity. The employment of the exclamation mark strengthens and emphasizes an imposed sense of confidence rather than an authentic belief. Therefore, this simple sentence is not simply a matter of diplomatic protocol but a strategic move which illustrates Ragnar’s intelligence in managing political tensions and subtly challenges the sincerity of King Horik’s intentions.

A4. “I am prepared.”

This sentence represents a relational process in terms of the ideational metafunction this clause provides characterizes Ragnar’s current condition rather than any specific action. “I” as the carrier is connected with the attribute “prepared” which means that Ragnar offers a perception of being prepared and in control. This is crucial in the context of Ragnar’s meeting with King Ecbert who is a ruler with significant authority

and his statement implies his confidence and readiness. His preparation might pertain to both the face-to-face meeting and the strategic or intellectual preparedness for negotiation.

Interpersonally, the sentence is in declarative mood and makes the statement of fact instead of a request or command. No modality is carried through the verb “am” which means Ragnar conveys complete confidence rather than uncertainty or skepticism. This contributes to his self-assurance and strategic perception. Considering the power dynamics, the brief and direct structure indicates that Ragnar is not intimidated by King Ecbert. His phrasing conveys that he maintains self-control and that he will join the conversation like an equal but not as a follower.

In terms of textuality, the sentence “I am prepared” employs a simple and unmarked Theme in which “I” serves as the subject and ensures that the focus remains solely on Ragnar. The brief and concise character of the statement make it forceful and impactful which reflects his calculated nature. By not specifying his preparation, Ragnar maintains the conversation’s open-ended nature and preserves a sense of mystery and strategic ambiguity and this keeps Ecbert from immediately grasping Ragnar’s intentions and reinforces Ragnar’s state as a tactical and cunning leader.

A5. "This was a gift in good faith."

In terms of Ideational metafunction a relational process “was” is presented through the sentence “This was a gift in good faith” as it builds an identity between this “the gift” and “a gift in good faith”. The carrier (This) is linked to an Attribute (a gift in good faith) which solidifies Ragnar’s focus on trust and diplomacy. Nevertheless, due to King Ecbert’s betrayal the phrase conveys both disappointment and irony. Ragnar initially presented the gift to promote peace but now he employs this statement to tactfully indicate King Ecbert’s dishonorable actions and betrayal.

Regarding the Interpersonal metafunction, the sentence is in a declarative mood which makes a factual statement rather than a request or order. The employment of the past tense verb “was” is essential since it implies a shift in point of view as the present formerly symbolized goodwill but currently that trust has been broken. The noun phrase “in good faith” contains evaluative significance which reinforces the moral stance of Ragnar while indirectly questions about Ecbert’s integrity. The tone

is accusatory when Ragnar presents a calm and undeniable fact that will make King Ecbert to face the consequences of his actions.

Textually, “this’ is the Theme of the sentence and makes the “gift’ the main focus. The statement starts with a demonstrative pronoun “This” where Ragnar asserts that the physical proof of his goodwill is essential to the dialogue. The Rheme “was a gift of good faith” states the moral dispute and indicates that Ragnar’s trust is betrayed. The employment of past tense and strategic language enables Ragnar to maintain a diplomatic presence and skillfully express disappointment and criticism. His wording maintains a possibility for negotiation while also clearly recognizing Ecbert’s betrayal.

B. Complex Sentences

B1. If we raided together, we would not need to fight amongst ourselves.

The Ideational metafunction emphasizes the mechanisms involved in the construction of meaning pertaining to personal experience. In “If we raided together” Ragnar employs a conditional phrase which represents a hypothetical claim. A potential consequence is expressed through the main clause “we would not need to fight amongst ourselves”. The material process “raided” indicates collective action which means that the raiding would be performed as one unified group rather than separate individuals whilst “fight” signifies internal conflict which exhibits the difference between unity and division. The participant “we” relates to Ragnar and his warriors and emphasize a collective action. “Amongst ourselves” as the circumstantial element reveals the internal conflict within their group.

In terms of the Interpersonal metafunction exposes Ragnar’s persuasive strategy and leadership power. Probability is conveyed through the modal verb “would” rather than certainty which makes Ragnar’s argument more logical and persuasive rather than showing violence. “We” is employed to establish inclusivity and to reinforce solidarity amongst his warriors. Ragnar influences rather than commanding and prefers a conditional strategy that subtly promotes collaboration. The negation “not need to fight” reduces the impact of the statement and presents peace as a preferred option rather than an obligatory regulation. The strategic use of modality and pronouns reinforces his authority rather than the imposition of coercion.

Textually, the sentence is designed for maximum persuasive effect. In this conditional clause, the conditional clause precedes the main clause. And establishes a cause-and-effect chain of events that prioritizes logical reasoning. The distinction between “raided together” and “fight amongst ourselves” creates a thematic contrast which emphasize the polarity of unity and destruction. The linking devices including the repetition of the pronoun “we” promote a sense of shared responsibility. Using this specific sentence structure, Ragnar assures that his message is understood, convincing and strategically designed to impact audience choices.

B2. It seems your mother and I have produced a son that is both strong and wise.

In terms of the Ideational metafunction, an experiential meaning is primarily conveyed through the sentence “It seems your mother and I have produced a son that is both strong and wise” through the description of an event (Bjorn’s birth and characteristics). The action of producing Bjorn is represented through the material process “have produced” as “your mother and I” serve as the Actors (doers of the action), additionally, Bjorn serves as the Goal (who’s subject to the action). In the clause “that is both strong and wise” the relational process “is” identifies Bjorn’s traits. The characteristics “strong” and “wise” serve as attributes which depict him as physically strong and intellectually gifted. An interpersonal projection is presented through the phrase “it seems” which indicates Ragnar’s judgement or perception rather than a definite fact as he phrased the state more gently.

From an interpersonal metafunction perspective, in this sentence the focus is on the relationship between Ragnar and his oldest son Bjorn and his authorization. Modality is presented by the phrase “It seems” which reduces the claim’s certainty and makes it sound like an evaluation rather than a firm declaration. Ragnar’s common sense is reflected through his choice in preference to making a direct statement to permit diverse interpretation. “We” as the inclusive pronoun which is implied in the clause “your mother and I” grants Lagartha’s role and reinforces Ragnar’s paternal pride. Bjorn’s status is enhanced via the employment of evaluative adjectives “strong” and “wise” and portray him as a model son as this directly reveals Ragnar’s belief concerning leadership and strength as inherited qualities.

Textually, the sentence is designed for maximum rhetorical influence and internal consistency. Both parental figures Ragnar and Lagartha are balanced in emphasis through the phrase “your mother and I”. A climatic effect is established through the placement of the evaluative adjectives “strong” and “wise” at the end of the sentence which underscore the key characteristics. The parallel structure “both strong and wise” improves both the coherence and the rhythm leading to greater memorability. Furthermore, “It seems” serves as the Thematic element which guides the listener to consider Ragnar’s thoughts behind the statement rather than the merely statement itself.

B3. "Since you consort with eagles, I will draw a blood-eagle on your back.

In terms of the ideational metafunction, two distinct process are presented through the sentence. A behavioral process is in the first clause “since you consort with eagles” as “consort” indicates the past actions of Jarl Borg. The behavior is the participant “you” which refers to (Jarl Borg) whilst “with eagles” serves as circumstance of accompaniment which metaphorically depicts Jarl Borg’s alignment with powerful figures and betrayed Ragnar for personal interest. The second clause “I will draw a blood eagle on your back” the material process “draw” indicates an action accomplished by Ragnar. The Actor is “I” which refers to Ragnar and “a blood eagle is the Goal while the circumstance of location is “on your back”. The metaphorical irony is powerful as Jarl Borg wanted the power of eagles and an eagle shaped execution mark will be carved on his back.

The Interpersonal metafunction emphasizes Ragnar’s power and unavoidable nature of Borg’s destiny. The subordinating conjunction “since” creates a cause and effect relationship which depicts the punishment as a deserved consequence. In the clause “I will draw a blood eagle” the modal verb “will” conveys confidence and authority to stress the definitive nature of the punishment. The first-person pronoun “I” affirms Ragnar’s power and directly addressing Borg with “you” intensifies the specific nature of the punishment. Evaluative meaning is carried by the employment of the verb “consort” conveys a sense of ambition and disloyalty and frames the punishment as a deserved consequence rather than an act of revenge.

Textually, the sentence structure is designed for the maximum persuasive impact. In the first clause “since you consort with eagles” provides justification whilst the second clause “I will draw a blood eagle on your back” conveys the punishment and the clauses altogether emphasize the cause-and-effect framework. Cohesion and irony are created through the repetition of the term “eagle” which links Jarl Borg’s past actions with his horrific destiny. The positioning of the phrase “on your back” at the end of the sentence mitigates the full severity of the punishment which intensifies the dramatic effect of the last moment.

B4. "If he suffers in silence, he may enter Valhalla.

In terms of the Ideational metafunction, the sentence embodies a material process where an action is described with a concrete outcome. The process is composed of two segments: “suffers” which is subject to being viewed as a material or mental process and “may enter” refers to an action of moving into Valhalla. “he” is the Actor as he is the one who experiences the suffering and the possible journey to Valhalla. “in silence” is the circumstance which adds an element of manner and reveals the process of the suffering. The clause “If he suffers in silence” serves as a conditional clause which establishes a foundational requirement for the process. The notion of suffering which leads to Valhalla indicates the ideology of the Vikings in which their central beliefs are tolerance and a glorious death.

Interpersonally, the sentence “If he suffers in silence, he may enter Valhalla” represents Ragnar’s power and assessment of Viking moral standards. Probability instead of certainty is indicated through the employment of the modal verb “may” which enhances the idea in which suffering is anticipated but the reward is not guaranteed and this results in the statement being both convincing and informative which tactfully guides Bjorn to embrace pain. The conditional formation of the sentence depicts pain as a condition where Ragnar asserts his authority and teaches Bjorn to follow his path. Since Ragnar does not directly address Bjorn, his statement conveys a general truth rather than a personal recommendation. Through providing guidance to Bjorn Ragnar reinforces his authoritative position as a parent and a leader and shapes his son’s beliefs about glory and destiny.

In terms of the textual metafunction a marked Theme is in the sentence which begins with “If he suffers in silence” to emphasize the condition rather than the end result. This specific structure guarantees that the listener comprehends the anticipation before the outcome and this affirms the consequential logic present within the Norse convictions. The Rheme “he may enter Valhalla” includes the essential details that present Valhalla as a chance rather than an absolute reward. The term “in silence” highlights elements beyond simple pain which is tolerance without complaint as it solidifies the ideology of a stoic warrior. This thematic arrangement reinforces Ragnar’s position as a story teller and an ethical advisor where he shapes Bjorn’s perception of sacrifice, power and fate.

B5. “And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.”

In terms of the Ideational metafunction, a relational process is presented through sentence and the statement indicates a desire for divine mercy. The process is achieved via the verb “forgive” that is repeated twice and indicates a plea and a reciprocal action in return. In the first clause the Actor is an implied subject “you” which refers to God whilst “our trespasses” is the Goal. In the second clause the Actor changes to the plural “we” to assign humans the duty of forgiving others. The term “as we forgive” forms a conditional or a reciprocal connection to emphasize that human deeds are connected to divine forgiveness and this framework aligns with Christian theological principles which indicates that forgiving others is a condition of being forgiven.

In terms of the Interpersonal metafunction, the sentence is formed imperatively to establish a direct plea rather than a factual claim. The repeated use of “forgive” intensifies the focus and strengthens the impact to create a greater sense of immediacy of the request. The phrasing also creates a power dynamic where human being establish their status as needing divine forgiveness. Ragnar’s reiteration of Athelstan’s words signifies an association with religious belonging which demonstrates his willingness to explore the tenets of Christianity. In the end the sentence serves as a religious request and an ethical lesson which contribute to the transformation of Ragnar’s beliefs.

Textually, by employing a parallel structure, the sentence highlights the reciprocal balance of divine and human actions. An emphasize on the speaker's request is placed by the Theme "and forgive us our trespasses" which prioritizes God's compassion. A justification for the request is introduced through the Rheme "as we forgive those who trespass us" to affirm the mutual exchange of forgiveness. The conjunction "as" acts as a comparison marker to form a causal relationship between where in human forgiveness leads to divine clemency. Due to this thematic organization the statement offers persuasion and education and thereby validates theological tenets.

Compound Sentences

C1. Not that you care brother, but your niece Gyda is dead.

In terms of the ideational metafunction, two key processes are expressed through this sentence, a relational process and a mental process. A mental process is represented through the clause "Not that you care" where "you" is the implied Senser and the process is "care" which indicates "concern or emotion". The second clause "your niece Gyda is dead" depicts a relational process where the Carrier is "Gyda" and the attribute is "dead" which classifies her state. A logical contrast is established via the conjunction "but" which contrasts Rollo's lack of concern of Gyda's fatal circumstances. This contradiction emphasizes Ragnar's marked sense of betrayal by Rollo where Ragnar presents the information as factual and morally accusatory.

Interpersonally, the sentence features elements of assessment and judgement where they reinforce the power and authority of Ragnar. The phrase "Not that you care" expresses negative judgement which implies that Rollo is heartless, devoid of deserving empathy and ethically disconnected. This implied allegation modulates power dynamics as it portrays Ragnar as the source of condemnation and news. The statement is not merely a simple announcement but it is an expression loaded with emotional distance and disappointment. Ragnar does not endeavor to obtain support or comfort in his statement, instead he opts to highlight Rollo's inadequacy as an uncle and as a brother. The sentence is more than merely a factual information but it becomes Ragnar's final mark of losing trust.

Textually, the sentence has a marked Theme in “Not that you care, brother”, instead of opening with Gyda’s death, Ragnar places Rollo’s lack of concern as the primary focus to psychologically prepare Rollo’s emotional state for the impactful news. The core message is delivered through the Rheme “but your niece Gyda is dead” to guarantee that Rollo’s betrayal remains as the main focus. The conjunction “but” serves as a transition within the textual structure and reveals that the second clause challenges the prior assumption. Interpersonal engagement is increased via the vocative “brother” to indicate Ragnar’s emotional distance and personal disappointment.

C2. “I want to see your lands, and I want to see how you farm them.”

In terms of the Ideational metafunction, the sentence “I want to see your lands, and I want to see how you farm them.” the mental process “want” expresses Ragnar’s desire and intention. The verb “want” indicates mental operations and ambition which makes Ragnar the Senser whilst “to see your land” and “to see how you farm them” are the things that he desires to explore and they serve as the phenomena. The first phenomenon relates to a physical locational “your lands” when the second phenomena “how you farm them” incorporates a dependent clause which gives practical instructions rather than a straightforward observation. This comparison reveals Ragnar’s thirst for knowledge beyond property rights but extends to farming strategies which suggests a thoughtful and anticipatory mindset as opposed to just conquering. Interpersonally, the reiteration of “I want to see” enhances clarity which makes Ragnar’s intentions clear. The statement involvement with King Ecbert in a balanced approach that is neither submissive nor aggressive but rather diplomatic. Ragnar’s wordings propose a strategy for negotiation which implies that his purposes arise from understanding and adaptation rather than greed. By presenting his demand as a declaration of purpose instead of a demand. Ragnar keeps the discussion under his command and aligns himself with the values of King Ecbert and lays the groundwork for future communication and cooperation.

Textually, the sentence has a compound structure as both independent clauses are connected by the conjunction “and” to ensure balance and parallelism. The first clause “I want to see your lands” serves as the Theme which introduces Ragnar’s

purpose. The Rheme “and I want to see how you farm them” is built upon the first the initial idea which shifts the focus from land ownership to agricultural strategies. The subordinate clause “how you farm them” offers further information which reinforce Ragnar’s preference for lasting resources rather than just raiding. This construction contradicts common Viking characteristics and presents Ragnar as a leader centered on established settlement and prolonged survival.

C3. We will return to England, for that land was so generous to us the last time.

Regarding the Ideational metafunction, through focusing on action and experience, a material process is represented in the sentence “We will return to England, for that land was so generous to us the last time.”. “will return” is the main process as it indicates intent and movement where the Actor is “We” which refers to the Vikings and “to England” is the Goal which is the intended point of return. a relational process is expressed in the second clause “for that land was so generous with us the last time” as “that land” which refers to England is the Carrier and the Attribute is “so generous to us” which designs a characteristic to England. The conjunction “for” indicates causation to associate benefits of past from England’s generosity with actions of future which is returning to England. Ragnar’s strategic justification is supported by this structure as it frames it as logical action rather than an act of conquest.

In terms of the Interpersonal metafunction, authority and persuasion are reflected through the sentence. Ragnar employs the inclusive “we” to position himself as the spokesperson of his people to support coordinated intent and common purpose. Certainty is expressed through the modal verb “will” to guarantee their return to England and enhances his leadership position. Appraisal is introduced through the phrase “so generous” to frame the prior raids as a successful operation and implicitly points to England’s weakness. This strategic use of language connects to audience’s emotions and strategic understanding so that the decision is perceived as logical and destined. Concerning textuality, the statement utilizes a compound sentence structure as it consists of two independent clauses linked by the conjunction “for”. The Theme “we will return to England” focuses on future actions and joint movement which positions Ragnar as a leader who speaks for his folks. The Rheme “for that land was so generous with us the last time” offers excuse to support the causal connection.

A shift in perspective is expressed through the phrase “so generous” where it views England as a source of wealth instead of an enemy. In addition, this Thematic structure guarantees the audience initially comprehends the return decision and later on it allows for the processing for its benefits.

C4. Enough with the pleasantries, let’s make a plan.

In this sentence, through the representation of actions and events the Ideational metafunction is realized. The speaker (Ragnar) disregards superficial social interactions between his ex-wife (Lagartha) and his current wife (Aslaug) by the expression of “enough with pleasantries” as it conveys an unstated order to stop the pointless dialogue. This is proceeded by “let’s make a plan” in which the central focus is positioned on the process of planning. The ideational meaning revolves around the transformation from simple courtesies to involvement in a specific and aim focused pursuit. This transition emphasizes Ragnar’s concentration on objective issues over needless social courtesies.

The interpersonal metafunction is apparent in the way authority and solidarity is established by the speaker. The application of the imperative tense specifically in the shape of a command, personally affects the listener. The first clause neglects the present conversational state as it indicates Ragnar’s perspective on courteous exchanges as unnecessary and irrelevant. Additionally, in the second clause “let’s make a plan” an incursive first-person plural pronoun is employed to provide an instruction and encourages collective participation. This linguistic form places the speaker “Ragnar” as simultaneously a leader and a partner. As a result, the structure of this compound sentence navigates the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the receiver in a powerful but cooperative technique.

regarding the textual metafunction, the sentence “—Enough with pleasantries, let’s make a plan” has a compound formation as both independent clauses are connected by a comma to ensure cohesion. The Rheme is “enough with pleasantries” which dismisses the unnecessary social courtesies. The Rheme “Let’s make a plan” redirects the concentration from disregard to action which emphasizes the shift from pointless discussion to strategic cooperation. Ragnar’s decisive leadership is reflected through

this structure as it solidifies his authority in leading attention to future-focused planning instead of participating in a past-oriented meeting.

C5. “I acknowledge you as my brother, but I forbid you to raid with us,”

From an ideational metafunction, two mental processes “acknowledge” and “forbid” are in the sentence “I acknowledge you as my brother, but I forbid you to raid with us,”. The first clause “I acknowledge you as my brother” conveys acceptance and awareness where the second clause “I forbid you to raid with us,” expresses denial and exclusion, the Actor (I) which refers to Ragnar demonstrates power over the Goal “you” who refers to Rollo and by this Ragnar is placed as a forgiver and a punisher. This paired characteristic reveal Ragnar’s leadership manner in balancing personal connection with commitment.

Interpersonally, two independent clauses linked with “but” make up Ragnar’s sentence which indicates a contrast. Solidarity is established throughout the first clause “I acknowledge you as my brother” where the second clause “I forbid you to raid with us” asserts authority. The sentence is in a declarative mood and declares Ragnar’s verdict with no possibility for debate. The verb “forbid” indicates absolute prohibition and emphasizes Ragnar’s power over Rollo’s destiny. By addressing “Rollo” as his brother Ragnar identifies their relationship but through prohibiting his participation in the raid he displays outcomes of betrayal and asserts his authority through balancing personal bond and duty.

From a textual metafunction perspective, “I acknowledge you as my brother” functions as the Theme and Ragnar’s clemency is placed at the beginning to establish emotional impact. The phrase “but I forbid you to raid with us” serves as the Rheme and opposes the clemency with strict consequence and this highlights Ragnar’s authority final ruling. The conjunction “but” is crucial in transforming the atmosphere and indicate that the mercy showed by Ragnar does not indicate a return to full status.

10.Conclusions

This chapter demonstrates the main findings derived from analyzing Ragnar’s linguistic patterns in the Vikings series, season 2. The following points provide a

summary of how the linguistic patterns and lexical choices analyzed in the study reveal Ragnar's nature, cultural heritage and rhetorical strategies. Through presenting these findings, the chapter features how language serves as a strong mechanism to form identity and express more intricate messages.

1. Ragnar Lothbrok's language is direct and focused on action. His language often features shorter and more direct which reflects the prioritization of courage, straightforwardness and functionality based in Viking culture. Whilst instances of deep emotions or philosophical thought do occur, they are typically expressed through occasional instances of linguistic complexity strategically employed to indicate character's internal thoughts or conflict.
2. Ragnar's choice of words underscores topics like destiny, nature, power and devotion which aligns with myths and cultural beliefs of the ancient Norse. This straightforward manner does not imply a simple mindset but rather conveys authority through its directness and emotional effect that portrays Ragnar as both a fighter and a commander led by emotion and destiny.
3. One of the most significant features of the analysis is the character's unique employment of transitivity processes. Mental and relational processes are often referred to by King Ecbert which demonstrate his prosperity to comprehend, analyze and manage relationships and situations. Thus, his lead is characterized as thoughtful and reflective.
4. Ragnar's linguistic style is predominantly marked by material processes, which focuses on physical acts, decisive nature and purposeful behavior. These transitivity selections function as language choices that reflect more profound ideological differences for instance, Ragnar embodies raw strength, primal bravery and devotion to the gods and family.
5. Language is not limited to telling a story but rather vividly portrays characters and fashions worlds that are deep, complex and culturally meaningful. The significant function of language in media representations especially within the genre of historical context, where the language used in dialogue must balance historical plausibility and effective storytelling

References

- Ahmed, D. N. U., 2021. Origin Of Language: Its Kinds, Functions And Approaches. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 5(2), pp. 196-210.
- Almurashi, W. A., 2016. An Introduction to Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 4(1).
- Analyzer, D., 2024. *Functionalism in Discourse Analysis: Diverse Field Applications*. [Online] Available at: https://discourseanalyzer.com/functionalism-in-discourse-analysis-diverse-field-applications/?utm_source=chatgpt.com [Accessed 7 2 2025].
- Baugh, A. C. & Cable, T., 2002. *A History of the English Language*. 5th ed. London: Routledge.
- Crystal, D., 2003. *English as a global language*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge university press.
- Endarto, I. T., 2017. *Systemic Functional Linguistics: A Brief Introduction*. Yogyakarta, Universitas Kristen Duta Wacana.
- Gebhard, M. & Accurso, K., 2020. Systemic Functional Linguistics. In: *The Concise Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. s.l.:ResearchGate , p. 1029.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R., 1989. *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.
- Morarui, A., 2024. *Medium*. [Online] Available at: <https://medium.com/@derectumillustrator/on-masculinity-ragnar-8ce7d0978979> [Accessed 17 1 2025].

شیکردنه وهی ریزمانی و ههلبزاردنی وشه له زمانهوانی رانگار لۆسبورگ له زنجیره فایکینگهکان

پوخته:

ئامانج له نووسینی ئەم تووژینه وهیه شیکردنه وهی تایبه تهنه نیه زمانهوانیه کانی زنجیره تهله فزیوئیه کانی (فایکینگهکان)ه، جهختیش له سهر به شداریکردنی بیکهاته ریزمانیه کانی و ههلبزاردنی وشه کراوه ته وه له لایهن که سایه تی سهره کی (رانگار لۆسبورگ) که ئەو کاریگه ریه میژوو یانه دهنوینی که له چوارچیوهی کۆمه لیک لایه نی بیکه وه زمانه ئینگلیزیشیان گۆری، به هوی شیکردنه وهی ئهرکه سهر وه ریه کانی زمان له نیو خه لک و ده قدا: واتا (Systemic Functional Linguistics) زمانناسی ئهرکداری سیسته ماتیک یارمه تیده ره بۆ رومالکردنی په یوه دنگرتنی بیر و بۆچوونه کانی و چه سپاندنی هیز و بیکه یانی په یوه نیه کانی.

تحلیل البنية القواعدية واختيار المفردات للغة راغار لوتبروك في مسلسل الفایکنج

الملخص

ان الهدف من الرسالة هو تحليل الخصائص اللغوية للمسلسلات التلفزيونية المسمية (الفایکنج) وقد تم التركيز على مشاركة البنية القواعدية واختيار المفردات للشخصية الرئيسية (رانجار لوتبروك) الذي يعكس التأثيرات التاريخية التي غيرت اللغة الانجليزية ضمن الجوانب الاخرى، ان ادخال تحليل الوظائف الفوقية سواء النصيا أو بين والتي تعنى علم اللغة الوظيفية المنهجية. تساعد على كشف الطريقة استخدام اللغة لدى الشخصيات في سبيل تواصل الافكار واقامة السلطة وتكوين الروابط. ومن خلال تحليل تكوينات الجمل، وتقنيات مقنعة واختيار المفردات، العلاقة بين تاريخ اللغة و وسائل الاعلام تحدد ما مرت به اللغة الانجليزية.